Q. I'm going to go ahead and get started.

So to warn folks we may go over by a minute or two by my estimation.

We will cover everything by Q and A at the end. So welcome everyone who
is joining this webinar.

On assembly bill 1418.

Specifically on monitoring compliance with the law.

The law went into effect January 1st
of this year.

This is a law probably speaking

aims to curb the use by local governments

of the so-called crime free policies

nuisance ordinances

and the crime
programs that are in the state. A background of the bill it was introduced by assembly member she is a representative out of Los Angeles. It covers Long Beach
and Hawthorne and it was co-sponsored by the national housing law project and western central non-poverty and CRLA founda Marcos I will be presenting on some of the topics today
and with me is my
coopresent he were
Tina and I will go
over to her for a
quick intro.
Thank you so much
for spending part of
your morning with us
and special thanks
for Marcos with all

00:03:11.000 --> 00:03:13.000
of his leadership

00:03:13.000 --> 00:03:14.000
effort. As I said

00:03:14.000 --> 00:03:15.000
I'm with western

00:03:15.000 --> 00:03:16.000
sens interpreter law

00:03:16.000 --> 00:03:18.000
policy and advideo

00:03:18.000 --> 00:03:20.000
Kate and I know I

00:03:20.000 --> 00:03:21.000
have a few of you

00:03:21.000 --> 00:03:22.000
and good to see you

00:03:22.000 --> 00:03:23.000
again.
And I think that is it for intros Marcos

I will pass it back over to you so we can get started whenever we're ready. Let's get into the presentation let me share my screen why it's the case
across the country. There are some key provisions in AB 1418 there include prohibitions in the law and local government agencies and key definitions and probably the most helpful of that section is amp B 14 to a couple of existing crime as l
mentioned we're going to try to have Q&A about ten minutes at the end. But the most important part is to get through all of the substance on the bill and monitoring and compliance and
all of that kind of

such.

If folks have questions and we run out of time you can reach out to me or Tina for followup.

Tina: As an additional reminder. Are the materials going to
be available for
glf
folks.
A. I have a little bit of an outline of the presentation and a couple of other helpful materialities for folks to sort of have with.
Tina: So these crime free policies there are
policies there are
two types.

There is a crime

flee nuisance

ordinance.

When we look at the

nuisance ordinances

they are generally

mandatory local laws

that will penalize

the owners or
tenants for broadly

and vaguely defined

nuisance behavior

and criminal

activity that occurs

on or near the

property.

And come pier that

to a crime free

program. The
programs are

volunteer and they

have some main come

component. They

have training by the

local police

department for

owners and it

include is your
surveillance

00:07:34.000 -- 00:07:35.000
the tenants.

00:07:35.000 -- 00:07:36.000
Another thing to

00:07:36.000 -- 00:07:37.000
note about these

00:07:37.000 -- 00:07:38.000
volunteer programs

00:07:38.000 -- 00:07:40.000
is that they usually

00:07:40.000 -- 00:07:41.000
will require or

00:07:41.000 -- 00:07:44.000
encourage a crime

00:07:44.000 -- 00:07:45.000
free lease addendum.

00:07:45.000 -- 00:07:46.000
When you are helping
your tenant and

helping your client,

when you get the

lease you can often

determine if that

property is in a

voluntary crime free

program based on the

lease addendum. And

the last one to note
is there is usually

a certificate

certificatecation

programs and they

will use it as a

marketing to show

that the property

are safe and it's to

encourage people to
live in their properties. They are not only harmful for tenants but also harmful for property owners. And the landlord can be penalized for not taking eviction action against the tenant. But, these programs are really harmful in that they destabilize the community and they even destabilize households because the household can be evicted for the behavior of one individual.

So what this does is uniting it as a monitoring tool for marginalized communities which we will talk about later.

And then they require background checks as we said earlier of all tenants both percent tech and existing tenants.

And in suppose to that the
Arizona police department wanted

to create these programs that

would enforce crime base-based
crime prescreenings.

-- prevention. Really that

black and brown families and

individual are considered
dangerous and so white

communities need to protect

themselves by engaging in over
policing black and brown families.

That is how we came to the legacy of these crime free housing programs, and ordinances. They are really just another way to perpetuate racial segregation and harassment against black and brown families. And the purposes
as I said earlier is to protect the white communities and to determine who is deserving in their word of living in these communities. So the next slide please. In California there is 136 with jurisdictions that have the program. You will see it in a higher population where there
is black and brown familys.

I see them in Oakland and Richmond but not necessarily in Brisbane where there is a high population of white families. There is a fantastic article that was written by the LA Times. There is 147 California jurisdictions that have some variation.
If you look at the study in 2023, it estimated that 4.5 million California renters are exposed to these ordinances. And there are 2,000 Nationwide that will have that. As I said earlier, this is a justification for these programs by the police department that initially started them and by some
community members that the programs or the ordinances are intended to reduce crime. It's not a surprise to y'all which we will talk about in a little bit, that is not necessarily the case. Some other benefits is that, you know, it's been shown to increase property value.
They say there is a stronger relationship between the law enforcement and the community they serve. It’s not saying what community they actually search but I think we can all read between the lines. It makes families feel safer because they have this crime free property that they live in. But as I
alluded to we all know that

there are harmful repercussions of these programs.

There is zero evidence that they reduce crime.

I membered the LA Times attar art Kel

article they found that crime was stable or on the decline

whrep they adopted these
programs. But the only thing that they saw was increase in black and Latin households moving into the neighborhoods. There is a very, very clear correlation between the preference of CFP and the demographic change of the communities.
And because of that it was one of the task portion priorities.

As I stated it has no effects on crime. And they really just found that the jurisdictions that's have these programs disproportionately impact black residents and households. And they are in naibtd where
neighborhood that

have a lower per capita income.

Usually that will also translate
to the racial composition of the

neighborhood. So we know that

black and brown families tend to

have lower incomes due to

centuries of housing
discrimination, racism and

wealth stripping.
We see in those communities they are also more highly policed and and usually these pro housing programs are a way of policing for the white communities. We know these programs have a negative impact on black and brown families. And so, as I
said earlier we know when there

is a racial motivation behind

these laws.

They are disproportionately

enforced against our communities

which will naturally impact the

housing stability and increase

the risk of homelessness. So it

increases the risk of other

things like anxiety, stress,
depression, where they are allowed to live.

As we know we all work in this area and we know that housing is the bedrock of a person's life. So by dictating where a person can and cannot live that impacts their ability to access housing and voting rights. So we know these programs by
acting as a deterrent for black

and brown families they're harm

our communities they have an

impact of people of domestic

violence and they will say a

call to emergency personnel the

police officers could be seen as

a violation of the lease

addendum and it could be seen as
a nuisance. So we did also see with the 2023 rent study that there was not only an increase in surveillance and blissing there was also an increase in the number of evictions because as we stated and Marcos is going to go into a little more detail.

The purpose one of the ways in
which the police or the landlord enact these programs is through forcefully evicting households.

Thank you all.

Marcos: let's get into 1418 and discuss these policies that do nothing to combat crime.

AB 1418 is not an outright preemption.

And the bill would be largely
ineffective. And so we set

instead

what we did was focus on the

most common crime free policies

and mandatory evictions and the

bill prohibits them one by one.

These are the features at least

that is our sort of we think

it's the foundation of the
discriminatory crime free

00:20:39.000 --> 00:20:49.000
policies and it would render

00:20:49.000 --> 00:20:52.000
them inoperable for a tool for

00:20:52.000 --> 00:20:54.000
replacement. Let's talk about

00:20:54.000 --> 00:20:56.000
the prohibitions. This applies

00:20:56.000 --> 00:21:01.000
to local government agencies and

00:21:01.000 --> 00:21:05.000
not private landlord. AB 1418

00:21:05.000 --> 00:21:07.000
forces governments from any

00:21:07.000 --> 00:21:09.000
policy or rule regulation that

00:21:09.000 --> 00:21:12.000
does any of the following.
Imposes or threatens to penalize any person as a consequence of mere contact with law enforcement even if it occurs on or near the property. It employ prohibits their association with another household member who has a contact with law enforcement.
or a criminal conviction. You

evict a person for a -- in other

word a conviction would be

required. Use of police

provisions.

This particular provision would

prohibit broad definition of

nuisance and behavior and

criminal activity. And it makes
a single violation of the lease.

And that is because state UD law

requires a breach to be material

and it requires an opportunity

to cure in most cases.

The law also prohibits requiring

or encouraging an owner on land

or land

landlord to perform criminal

background checks. AB 1418 prey
prohibits that defines nuisance as emergency service calls or act or admission not considered a nuisance under Code section 3479 and it prohibits any policy that requires an important to obtain an occupancy permit as a condition of leasing a rent it
will property within a juster

digs and it prohibits for

renting to persons on the

registry or preventing them from

renting an apartment unit within

the jurisdiction.

jurisdiction.

Moving on to key definitions.

Personal means the actual or
threatened assessment of fines

or penalties or eviction or

failure to renew a tendency.

Denial of a housing subsidy.

And suspension and close a new

nuisance property and threatens

nuisance action. Law

enforcement agency very

expansive.

It means any department or
agency of the United States the

state local government or any

political subdivision there of,

authorized to engage in or soup

or

supervise or the prosecution of

both criminal and civil law.

This include agencies like ICE

and the state Department of

Social services CPS.
As I mentioned it applies to local government agencies. That definition include entities like cities and counties and special districts and the like. It also include public housing authorities or PHA's but there is a little more to that T there is case law that holds that
whether a public housing

authority is considered a local
government agency or is context
dependent. However, those cases
don't want to address the same
question here and that is
whether that a law that is to
apply to local government
entities applies to local
government housing authority.
The only case is considering whether a public housing agency is a local government agency for purpose of the brown net.

So in that case the court held in the affirmative and it explained that a housing authority is local in scope and character and is restricted gee.
geographically and it is a

created by and is an agent of

the state rather than a agency

of any city or county or local

government.

Long story short that particular

case considered public housing

authorities local agencies and

answered that question as to
whether laws apply to local
publicity agencies apply to
class housing authorities.

Some of the confusion about this
you know, state agency versus
local agencies seems to stem
from language that refers to
refers to
public housing authority as
agents of the state.
It clarifies that a PHA is not a state agency in the literal sense. It's an agency in a theoretical sense. It performs within a state wide concern and within limited boundaries. The case cited in the slide has some helpful language that explains that public housing authorities don't
function independent of state

law and they are considered

administrative arms of the state

and they are tasked with

pursuing state concerns and

effecting legislative

objectives. If you run across a

situation where public housing

authority is using a crime free
it has some variation of a crime

free policy and you are

struggling to find that hook to

say that AB 1418 applies to that

particular agency, you know sort

of rely on the authority that I

just sort of summarized but

reach out to us and we can think

it through and come up with the

most logical and strongest
argument.

I think it's okay to mention

that the people that reached out
to the riverside public county

authority about this very issue

and they agreed that AB 1418

applies to public housing

authority and they are doing a

way with the crime agree policy.

It was very much as Tina
described with the different

provisions and make any lease

material violation of a lease

and not allowing for an

opportunity and things of that

nature.

All right. So, now that we've

have a little better sense of

the provisions of AB 1418, let's
apply them to a couple of
existing crime-free policies a
little difficult to wrap your
head around how this applies
given to how much these policies
vary from jurisdiction to
jurisdiction. I will start with
the city of Fresno.
Which has a crime-free nuisance
ordinance. It defines nuance as
ambiguous terms. Any
interpretations like unnecessary
or unusual noise. Causing noise
or discomfort to a normal person
with normal sensitivity.
Habitually engaging in criminal
conduct. And the order
ordinance
punishes residents to frequent
police calls to the adjacent
area. Tenant don't have control of what happens around their apartment complex. And under threat of heavy fines the owners have five-days when the city issues a notice of violation to abate alleged nuisance. And the standard in the has suggested methods of you a bait
You need to evict this person in order to avoid fines and penalties. Going back to the prohibition the state's general nuisance law that statute defines nuisance as anything that is injury just to health. And to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life.
Terms like unnecessary or unusual noise or anything that causes noise or discomfort to a person of usual sensitivities those may not include things that -- those may include things that are neither injury to hit or indecent or interfere or obstruct property. It's a
violation against defining

nuisance in a way that goes beyond civil Code section 3479.

And the violation of nuisance and the prohibition of defining nuisance emergency service

calls.

Defining responsible parties to include all occupants may

violate the prohibition on penalizing persons and another tenant or household member or who has had contact with law enforcement or a criminal conviction.

The person that has committed the violation should be evicted not the entire household? And the abatement notice that
suggest that evict the tenant

violates the prohibition of

encouraging the prohibition of

the important for alleged misconduct. These notices are

sent out well before there is a conviction and sometimes or

often they are centre out when

there is no formal arrest or

charge. So moving on to krill
crime

free programs.

These are a little tricky

trickier.

The city of Fremont has a crime

free housing program. The city

public lists public properties

on it's website and declare they

are crime free and safe.
If you are not on the list your property is not crime free or safe. And it forces property owners to participate in this program. As part of the program to be fully certified property an owner has to complete all three phases of the program. In the case of Fremont this include
training for property managers

and applicant screening and

criminal background checks and

drug and crime Retail & Consumer

recognition. A

police scene of resident and

using the property manage he

manager as a

tool for law enforcement.

Additionally owners must use the
city suggested lease you a den

acontinue

addendum.

And a list of non-criminal behavior and it makes these action imma material and it fast tracks conviction and levels the tenant little defense in the eviction situation. What are
the AB 1418 violations.

00:34:47.000 -- 00:34:50.000
Together with the training on

00:34:50.000 -- 00:34:56.000
tenant surveillance and the

00:34:56.000 -- 00:34:59.000
racial any persons with

00:34:59.000 -- 00:35:03.000
association with tenant or house

00:35:03.000 -- 00:35:05.000
household member has come into

00:35:05.000 -- 00:35:07.000
contact with prohibition.

00:35:07.000 -- 00:35:09.000
The program violates the

00:35:09.000 -- 00:35:16.000
prohibition of not using the use

00:35:16.000 -- 00:35:23.000
of police for evictions for
state and federal law. And to have background checks on existing tenants.

So, you know, that is sort of a snapshot of you know, sort of how this law will likely work in practice and so we hope that most jurisdictions if not all of them will comply with the law.

Again we have the example of
riverside public housing

authority who just -- it was

brought to their attention that

doubledly there will be

jurisdictions that either inl

tentionally or unintentionally

will continue to enforce their
crime-free policies and in order to make sure that the law accomplishes it's intended purpose we want to monitor in every jurisdiction as possible.

We just came up with basic steps that advocates can take in terms of monitoring not an exhaustive list. Advocates may have additional ideas based on their
jurisdiction or service area.

I want to go over a basic list.

The first basic step that

advocates can take in terms

monitoring compliance which

jurisdictions in your service

area has a crime-free policy.

This map out jurisdictions with

nuisance ordinances with a crime

free program. And hopefully you
will have a program that are useful to advocates. There is an organization that works on this issue of crime free policies that has gathered a bunch of data. Amazing group and amazing work. That will be health full and it will be out as soon as it is `ready.
Review county and municipal code

00:37:47.000 --> 00:37:50.000
and see if there 13 an ordinance

00:37:50.000 --> 00:37:52.000
or policy that is not titled

00:37:52.000 --> 00:37:56.000
crime free policy or something

00:37:56.000 --> 00:37:58.000
to that effect and the substance

00:37:58.000 --> 00:38:01.000
is very much in line with what

00:38:01.000 --> 00:38:02.000
we would consider a crime free

00:38:02.000 --> 00:38:04.000
policy. You can ask the police

00:38:04.000 --> 00:38:07.000
department or the appropriate

00:38:07.000 --> 00:38:11.000
agency would be, asking for any
and all documents related to a crime free policy. If you are trying to figure out if something exists you may not be able to cite a crime free policy and your request may have to be a little more general. So something to the effect of any and all documents related to any policy or program, whether
formally adopted or not that

penalizes a tenant for nuisance

behavior something that would

capture a crime free policy but

it doesn't seem to be one.

. You

can also track crime free policy

evictions that will give you a

sense of what is out this in
your service area for example if

you are assisting someone in an

eviction situation see if the

ordinance or some other policy

is cited in the eviction flts.

notice.

And if this is nothing any

notice that stand out.

Find out if they have had

contact with the police on the
property or off the property or some other county agency like code enforcement. And if the answer is yes the eviction could be driven by the owner's come compliance with a crime free policy that is no longer enforceable under AB 1418. You can request
enforcement data, this include things like how many violations have been reported to property owners. And that is part and parcel of these policies. There is law enforcement contact and then reporting to the landlord or the property manager and then additional steps are taken to
either displace the tenants of
the household.

You can also ask how many fines
have been issued under a city or
county crime free policy. How
many evictions have been
effected. Whether the city is
maintaining the data base of
tenants of rental housing. You
want to make these requests
broad so you can capture anything that can fall within a crime free policy and if you are looking for information for nuisance ordinances and you might be weeding out some other policy that on the surface doesn't look like a crime free policy. So litigation AB
1418 p does not require a local jurisdiction to amend or appeal a crime free policy. There is no violation for having a noon non-compliance in the books. So things like issuing notice of violation and reporting violations there being fines and tracking violations for the
purpose of tracking and

maintaining a registry or data

base and marketing volunteer

crime free programs that promote

prohibited actions including a

crime free use addendum. Anyone

of those things is an indication

that the jurisdiction is in part

promoting and enforcing the

effecting the crime free policy
even though that is no longer allowed through AB 1418.

Look for that that is a potential for liability and litigation.

Potential plaintiffs and very, very broad that include residents and tenants and landlords and or persons. It include 501 C-3 non-profit
organizations. When we agreed to that we had Legal Aid organizations in mind.

In terms of remedies.

It include injunctive relief.

And you can ask for declaratory relief. Defining the crime free policy unenforceable. You can
request any relief that the court may find appropriate depending on the circumstances of that case. You are entitled to attorney fees and costs. And these remedies are cumulative and not exclusive and compensatory damages and pain and suffering that kind of such can be pursued if the facts
support it.

You are not limited to the remedies that are listed in AB 1418.

So that covers it for you know key provisions, you know applying the law, applying AB 1418 to existing non-compliant crime free policies and a little on monitoring and a little on
litigation.

And now we're going to talk about additional claims if you decide to pursue litigation that you can add to the complaint.

And so the reason for this is AB 1418 is you know obviously new and untested and you know you don't want to rely exclusively
on the law if you can avoid it.

If that is your only viable claim the law is strong enough and the litigation should be successful and you can add on these additional claims. We'll start with the Fed fair Housing Act..

it's based on a person's protected class. Race ethnicity
and so on. And disability and

things of that nature. The

crime free policy may violate

the fair housing act on several

ground.

s there is a number of

different provisions in the fair

housing act. So some more

salient and relevant provisions

is making unavailable or denying
a dwelling.

For example, encouraging or requiring landlords or owners to not just conduct criminal background checks but requiring that those people not be extended occupancy or get rid of them as tenants.

Discrimination. Terms and
conditions and intimidation and

ininterference of a person's

exercising a fair housing right.

Under the Fairly Housing Act.

It can be an unintentional
discriminatory effect. And

we'll cover each discrimination

briefly this can manifest in

several ways. You have

discriminatory motivation or
statements. And just a couple of examples of statements that evidences discriminatory motive.

You have a statement by a mayor in a jurisdiction of Ohio states to the effect we believe that neighborhoods are not hoods and African-American kids bring in the inner city that was a gang related thing by staking their
turf. Another example from California. Statements from a city council member who said a crime free policy was needed to correct a demographic problem and to improve the demographic and added these people are no addition and no value to this community period and you want to
get them the hell out of town.

Those sort of statements are part of the legislative history of crime free policy that evidence discrimination which is violation of the fair housing act. Another example, discriminatory that is expressed not by public officials but by public members and public
officials acquiesce to that

motive that is being stated and

manifested by the public. In

one case for example the

adoption of a crime free policy

was evidence based complaints by

the city Somali populations and

the negative views about the

population that were expressed

over a sustained peeferld of
a really easy example when an ordinance is overwhelmingly forced against a protected glass against racial minorities or things of that nature.

You also have desperate impact under the fair housing act. So
again it may have an

impact on black tenants. People

with disabilities have a more

frequent contact with law

enforcement and emergency

personnel.

Ordinances that require the

eviction of a household, it may

have an impact on women who are

the overwhelming majority of
violence. And ordinances that
target subsidized housing and
tenants of such housing are
overwhelmingly or a good pore
proportion of them are a
protected class of some sort.
I'm going to go over
constitutional claims I'm going
to try to run thank you this
really really quick
We're almost at the end here.

I want to leave five minutes for questions. We will move on to constitutional claims.

The equal protection class of the 14 amendment. It provides that no state shall deny to any person the equal protection.
Laws. The broad purpose of this

particular provision is to

eliminate racial discrimination

Desbiens

discrimination.

Even if the law itself is not

discriminatory on its face.

For equal protection liability.

This motive doesn't have to be
the sole purpose but the
motivating factor in enacting

the law. There are several

factors that can be considered

in order to get a sense of

whether this motive exists.

Looking at the slide these are

well-known factors based on the

case cited.

Supreme Court precedence and we

won't go over because of time
purpose.

It goes over statements made by public officials and by the public.

Going around the usual process and coming up with conclusions that are not supported by the facts things of that nature.

It's important to note that the
14th amendment equal protection clause claim.

Gives the jurisdiction the opportunity to prove that the challenged law has a discriminatory motive or basis.

And they have a reason to rebut that as discrimination. You also have potentially adieu a due
process claim under the 14th amendment.

That provision states that no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty and property without due process of law.

This requires notice and an opportunity to be heard in a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner when there is
a constitutionally protected interest at stake.

A lease hold interest is considered a constitutionally protected property interest.

And so some crime free property policies then lease hold interest.

Policies that allow for the
combination of an entire

property and policies that we

send landlords licences and

occupancy permits those could

resolve in the displacement of

the tenant and that is subject

to process protections under the 14th amendment. And so, the other thing I will mention

under
those policies and that type of enforcement action the landlord is the one that has the opportunity to, that gets notice and has an opportunity to appeal decisions and enforcement actions and I have never seen a situation where the tenants have that right. Obviously they are robbed of basic to you process
protections. The first

amendment is also a viable

claim. The law must give a

person of ordinary intelligence

a reasonable opportunity to know

what is prohibited and act

accordingly. Going back to the

Fresno example. The crime free

policies fail to define key
terms and instead use ambiguous terms that describe misconduct in very broad vague terms that are open to interpretations. Some of the definitions of a nuisance under the Fresno order ordinance are a good example of what I consider constitutionally vague under the crime free provisions.
And we're at the end. With five
minutes to spare.

Quickly.

So, I'm sure some of you have
heard of these pilot programs
that are in a few juster
jurisdictions

this goes back to 1998.

It's a long standing program
that has been renewed time and
time again it allows to arntion

attorneys

to initiate evisions on tenants

that under drug and firearms

charge. As part of the statute

that created the program, there

was supposed to be a report to

the judiciary committee and

every handful of years. The
final report in 2023, found that 70 percent of eviction notices issued under these programs or against racial minorities these policies are used to conduct demographic change and are enforced against renters of color. Report did not find such evidence to show that it reduced crime. The city attorneys claim
that these ordinances were valuable crime fighting tool.

Even though they couldn't cite any data or any information that is concrete, or that is subjective. And luckily the program expired and for the first time since 1998 it wasn't renewed. And that is it for the
presentation. And so that leaves us three minutes.

Tina

before we get to the questions I don't know if you had anything to add. No questions in the chat. And if you have a question or not even a question if there is something in there
that doesn't make sense are

00:57:25.000 --> 00:57:30.000
sensor

00:57:30.000 --> 00:57:32.000
sense or need

00:57:32.000 --> 00:57:34.000
information chime in?

00:57:34.000 --> 00:57:37.000
.

00:57:37.000 --> 00:57:44.000
I wanted to correct something

00:57:44.000 --> 00:57:45.000
advocacy was done in san

00:57:45.000 --> 00:57:48.000
Bernardino.

00:57:48.000 --> 00:57:50.000
And we were able to get them to

00:57:50.000 --> 00:57:53.000
eliminate their crime free
addendum and in the city of

Riverside it was the ACLU and

other advocates that had the

crime free repeal.

I got it mixed up.

Advocates in Riverside reaped

reached

out a couple of days ago. They

repealed their ordinance and

their bright idea was they will
come up with program that is voluntary. And so now I think that the battle is going to turn to, you know convincing them to likewise get rid of their crime free program that they’re trying to institute. But thanks for the correction and great job on that advocacy in san Bernardino.
Well we're a minute away from

00:58:51.000 --> 00:58:52.000
time.

00:58:52.000 --> 00:58:55.000
Got through everything. I had

00:58:55.000 --> 00:58:56.000
to rush through the

00:58:56.000 --> 00:58:59.000
constitutional claims. But

00:58:59.000 --> 00:59:01.000
again you have the slides, we're

00:59:01.000 --> 00:59:03.000
going to send out a follow-up

00:59:03.000 --> 00:59:04.000
e-mail and include the slides

00:59:04.000 --> 00:59:08.000
and recording and a couple of

00:59:08.000 --> 00:59:10.000
helpful links and materials.
And again if you guys have any questions or if you guys are looking to put together a monitoring strategy or looking toward litigation.

Reach out to myself or Tina so we can talk through that and help you plan and answering any questions you may have.
So yeah.

If there are no other questions

I will let everyone go thank you

very much for joining us and be

on the look out for that e-mail.

e-mail..

Thank you everybody. Thank you

for your advocacy.