

**The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey**  
**Board Meeting Transcripts**  
**June 26, 2013**

[Chair D. Samson] —and the Committee on Finance met in executive session. Their reports will be filed with the official minutes of today's Board Meeting. The commissioners also met in executive session earlier today to discuss matters in which the release of information could impair a right to receive funds from the United States or other grantor and matters rendered confidential, privileged, or private by federal or state law or regulations or rules or decisions of court. First, before we get to anything else, sitting down on the end here on my extreme right is our newest commissioner, appointed by Governor Cuomo, Ken Lipper. I want to welcome you, Commissioner Lipper. We all know about the great work you've done in the past. We look forward to continuing to work with you. I congratulate you on your appointment, and I thank Governor Cuomo for considering your appointment. It will be great working together.

>>[Comm. K. Lipper] Thank you. I'm looking forward to it. [Chair D. Samson] Thanks. We will provide an opportunity for members of the public to comment on Port Authority matters. This public comment period, which may be limited to 30 minutes in total, provides an opportunity for members of the public to present their views directly to the Board but does not provide for a dialogue. Members of the public wishing to discuss a specific matter with the Port Authority staff are advised to contact our Public Affairs Department. Speakers are asked to comply with the fixed time limit of 3 minutes. Our first speaker is Stuart Appelbaum, President, Retail, Wholesale, Department Store Union.

[S. Appelbaum] Thank you. I'm Stuart Applebaum, President of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, and also a board member of the Global Gateway Alliance. I'm presenting this statement, which has been signed by alliance members Joseph Sitt, the CEO of Thor Equities, Jennifer Hensley, Executive Director of the Association for a Better New York, Mitchell Moss, the Henry Hart Rice Professor of Urban Policy and Planning, Kathryn Wylde, President and CEO, Partnership for New York City, and Stephen Sigmund, Executive Director of the Global Gateway Alliance. The alliance supports the demolition of the Worldport Building at JFK because nothing is more critical to New York City metropolitan airport improvements than reducing delays for passengers. Passenger experience is suffering. The 3 major New York area airports lead the nation in flight delays. The New York region's airspace handles nearly 1/3 of the entire country's flights, and as a result, nearly 3/4 of nationwide delays are ultimately attributable to problems originated in the New York area. These delays hamstringing our economy, make for a terrible traveler experience, and damage our environment with loss of productivity, wasted fuel, and pollution. The delays stem from the space-constrained nature of the airports. JFK is a curiosity in the modern aviation world because the facility is built on water and located in the middle of a bustling Queens neighborhood. There is little room to expand. We cannot afford to convert a functioning and overtaxed airport into an architectural park while passengers are forced to spend more and more time sitting on the tarmac waiting for gates to be opened. It is for this space that the Worldport, which is now closed and has not been used in months, should be torn down. In addition to helping alleviate delays, the demolition and expansion plan will bring the added benefit of critical new jobs to Queens and to our city. As proud New Yorkers, history buffs, and aviation enthusiasts, we too care about historic structures. It is a tremendous challenge to balance our history with our needs for the future. But

we must think of the future because the delay problems are only projected to get worse. As we continue to recover from the recent recession, New York City's status as a thriving center of international business and finance will continue to put even greater strains on its airports, exacerbating the projected levels of congestion, which are already beyond what we can or should tolerate. There is also an absolute limit on the number of flights that can arrive and depart each day. This results not only in lost tourism dollars but an inability to add jobs as well. If there is no material improvement in the area's congestion, the year 2030 will see 30 million air passengers unserved each year, costing the region the ability to create 120,000 jobs each year. We are not against preservation; however, difficult decisions need to be made, and we feel strongly that the same spirit of innovation and concern for the customer experience that inspired the construction of the Worldport more than a half century ago now dictates that we make way for the improvements necessary to keep passengers moving through the airport efficiently. We urge the Port Authority and Delta to move forward as planned. Thank you very much.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Margaret Donovan. [M. Donovan - inaudible] [Chair D. Samson] Margaret Donovan is not quite ready. Okay. How about Anthony Stramaglia?

[A. Stramaglia] Thank you, Chairman Samson. It's going to be a little tough to follow that one up. Good afternoon, commissioners, staff, and guests. As you will hear, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has selected the Worldport for the 11 Most Endangered Historic Places in America. This accolade speaks immeasurable volumes about its historic, architectural, and cultural significance. Immediately after the listing announcement, we received and continue to receive an incredible outpouring of support and media coverage. People around the globe love the Worldport, I trust more than the Port Authority or Delta Airlines could ever have imagined. Hopefully, the constant mocking of T3 as one of the world's worst airport terminals will finally be laid to rest. When I joined this campaign, the Facebook page had only a few hundred members. Today we count over 7300. The petition we signed urging the Port Authority and Delta to reconsider their plans started with a couple signatures per week. In the last week alone we have exceeded 4000. We met with several Port Authority officials on June 13 in good faith in the hope of fostering continued trust and communication towards a sensible and financially sound plan to restore and reuse the iconic rotunda. We had hoped Delta Airlines would hear us out as well, but so far we have heard nothing but silence. Instead, demolition crews, on a Sunday morning no less, began tearing away at the iconic front elevated roadway. In fact, they were in such a hurry to get rid of it that a worker suffered a minor injury due to falling debris. Despite the demolition of the roadway, the saucer structure remains intact, and further demolition activity seems to have stopped. We are very grateful and hope this is a good sign. During that same meeting on June 13th, we were advised that we, Save the Worldport group, would need to attract private investors to even consider a potential reuse plan. In fact, that brings me to my most important point today. We are pleased to announce that just last night we may have identified a potential developer who is interested in repurposing the flying saucer part and rotunda section of the terminal. In recent news coverage of the Worldport struggle, the Port Authority spokespeople repeat the same 3 points: the terminal is obsolete for aviation use; the airport is land-constrained; and the current redevelopment project will drive job creation and growth. But frankly, we're not sure how a parking lot will drive any of these. However, if this potential new project bears fruit, the building will be creatively and responsibly repurposed for non-aviation use, it will drive significant job creation and economic growth, it will provide

much-needed services at the airport, and the Port Authority will receive more lease revenue from it than the 3 or so hardstands it will lose by keeping the building in place. Consider that the saucer takes up a mere 4 acres out of a total of 48 on which T3 is situated, about 8%. Not a bad deal, I would say, for such a land-constrained space considering the potential revenue. We respectfully hope that we can arrange another meeting with Port Authority officials, including Delta Airlines, and begin planning for a renewed future for this historic building. In the meantime, we respectfully ask that you please continue the stoppage of any further demolition of the saucer section so that we can continue these discussions as soon as possible. Thank you.

>>[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Roberta Lane.

[R. Lane] Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm Roberta Lane from the National Trust for Historic Preservation's New York office. As you may be aware, our organization included JFK Terminal 3, the Pan Am Worldport, on our 2013 list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places. I'm asking the Board to use its authority to delay demolition of the Worldport and to work with Delta Airlines to seriously consider the alternatives advanced by those who seek to save it. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private nonprofit organization chartered by Congress in 1949 that leads the preservation movement in America. We work to save the country's historic places, and we strongly believe that the Worldport should be preserved and can be reused. We've seen these kinds of places reused across the country over and over. You've just heard that the Worldport takes up very little space on the Terminal 3 area, and there's no reason at all that very much of the programming that has been proposed for that site could still go forward and this building could be preserved. And jobs would be created in that case as well. Opened in 1960, the Worldport symbolizes America's entry into the Jet Age. It is significant for its architectural design and also for its place in aviation heritage. Its dynamic flying saucer shape was a distinctive gateway for travelers and has been featured in several feature films. It evokes a bold and important moment in the modernist movement in design and it's historically important too, as the first commercial flights of the Boeing 707, the first modern jetliner, departed from the terminal. In May 2013, Delta Airlines ceased operations from the Worldport, and current plans call for the demolition of this iconic structure. This threat has created a groundswell of popular support for preservation of the building in a way that we've taken great notice of. This is really a groundswell like we don't typically see across the country. It's beloved and we feel that the loss of the Worldport is unnecessary. Alternatives to demolishing it include demolishing the south concourse instead and using Worldport as a connecting facility between Terminals 2 and 4, as a dedicated or premier terminal, or as an independent building open to the public containing a mix of uses. It could also be creatively adapted and incorporated into a larger terminal. Several years ago, the Port Authority worked closely with our organization and with JetBlue to save and restore Eero Saarinen's TWA Flight Center. That effort also began when the terminal was included on our list of 11 Most Endangered Places. The Port Authority is to be commended for preserving important buildings on its property. But that work at the TWA Flight Center proves that with commitment and ingenuity it is possible to give the Worldport a new life. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Marcus Babzien.

[M. Babzien] Commissioners, I've been here for the second time now. Last month I spoke to you, and I appreciate this time that you receive public input. I believe it is significant. I believe it is important that you listen to the public. And we just heard from the National Trust for Historic

Preservation. I was here last time trying to clarify, justify the reasons for preservation. I think that's just been done again, much better than I could do. So I'd like to focus actually on something a little bit different, and that's the process going forward. It's clear that there's a need for preservation here, and I'd like to address how this can go forward. The halt to the demolition which has occurred, it's not clear actually where that came from. There's been no statement from Delta or the Port Authority why that's happened. If the Port Authority was responsible, I'd like to say thank you. And I'd also like to say that the statements of the Port Authority should be much more clear to the public. There's been no statement about what's going on at Terminal 3. Asbestos abatement, demolition, pause to the demolition. There's no need for these things to be secret. Simple press announcements, statements on the web page, these would help tremendously. Communication with the public is important. There's a New York Times article, a recent article, and I think the comments of readers that were submitted are telling. If you look at those comments, the majority of them are in favor of preservation. Even the comments that were for demolition, many of those readers would probably feel differently if they knew of the hasty demolition plans that have been occurring. The success of this plan appears questionable on first review. For example, how is it that temporary demolition and repaving jobs last maybe a year, 2 years? How is it that those are better jobs than long-term employment at a functioning facility of any type—terminal, museum, retail? Another example: We're hearing that efficiency is driven by aircraft hardstands, that larger aircraft can be accommodated. Boeing 747 and Airbus 380 aircraft can seat upwards of 500-600 passengers. How long does it take to enplane or disembark passengers on a single jetway from those aircraft? Close to an hour. Dual jetways are present at the existing Terminal 3. Not so at the expansion of the Terminal 4 concourse. So again, this seems very questionable. I'm not a planner and I could be wrong on these issues. I'm the first to admit that. But this is exactly why we need to have transparency and the plans need to be laid out, all of the issues need to be made public. If Delta has these plans and if they paid for them, that's no longer an excuse to keep them secret. Preservation is important and the plans need to be made public and we need to have transparency. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Patricia Lewis.

[P. Lewis] Thank you, commissioners, and once again, we appreciate the opportunity to come to talk to you about our concerns. According to today's—I'm Patricia Lewis. I've been with Delta Airlines for 22 years, and I have a lot of experience with Delta and Pan Am flying out of JFK. According to today's Daily News, Delta's 2 compelling reasons for demolishing the iconic JFK Terminal 3 Worldport are that (1) it would create jobs; (2) it's not functional. I think Marcus did a good job talking about how it's functional and how destroying something, it does create jobs for people who want to make a living destroying things, but it won't continue to create jobs. And by saving the Worldport, you would be saving it for those like Jackson Scott, our 11-year-old sixth grader who's spoken to the Port Authority several times about why it's so important to save American history and historic American landmarks and why someone from Texas and Indiana should not be allowed to destroy iconic New York treasures. The World Trade Center was blown up in 1993 by a man who requested political asylum. The terminal was so crowded and there were not enough beds at the— Immigration beds were full, so he was just asked to report to an immigration hearing a month later. Instead, he rented a U-Haul, filled it with explosives, and blew up the World Trade Center. We now have a similar situation at Terminal 4 where we have immigration lines 4000 passengers and 2 miles long. And it's very likely that undesirables may be being waived into the country, like Ramzi Yousef, because we have

thousands of passengers coming through every hour on the hour. Now, I have had some horrendous security situations caused by this chaos going on at Terminal 4. I think it's better for— I mean, I don't know if I have the time to get into all this, but we would like to bring it to the attention of Gail Grimmett and Richard Anderson at tomorrow's Delta board meeting. The jetways don't match the airplanes. So we're waiting. We have passengers being held hostage on planes for hours. This happened on my friend's flight, who spoke at the private meeting of the Port Authority last time, and it happened on my flight just yesterday. We waited an hour to get off the plane. We had to have people movers come because the doors don't match the airplanes at this new, great, \$1.4 billion terminal, whereas at Terminal 3, designed by Charles Lindbergh and Juan Trippe, those planes, we had doors to board first class passengers and you have a door where you can board the economy passengers. So we don't have chaos up at the first class door. And we're trying to do catering, and you won't have passengers hitting their bags— first class passengers being hit by the bags from the passengers who are going through the first class section. We also had an abandoned bag. Our flight came in. We were going out to Nice. A flight came in from London. At the Terminal 3 the gate agents could just go to the door. It would take them 30 seconds to go and say, "It hasn't been cleaned, it hasn't been catered, hasn't had a security sweep yet." Now at Terminal 4 it takes them 5 minutes to get down there, to get back, and they told us that it was cleaned, that it had had a security sweep. The plane was trashed. They sent wheelchair passengers into the jetway, it was sweltering hot, and there was an abandoned suitcase on that plane that had not been removed. And so the captain called and said, "Please have it removed." The gate agent brought it out, put it into the jetway where the baggage handler is now carrying down all of the children's strollers, and it could have been reloaded. There's 2 ways where that bag that could possibly have contained an explosive device would have been either left on that plane and not discovered or it could have been loaded by a baggage handler into the hold because it was just left there. We did not have a security sweep. The cleaners did it, and I think that's an FAA violation. And I think that there are many reasons to save Terminal 3. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Robert Genna.

[R. Genna] Close enough. Good afternoon, members. I'd like to read a letter by the president of the Pan Am Historical Foundation, Peter Runnette. "Port Authority of New York and New Jersey: "Dear Sirs, This is a request to stay the planned demolition of Terminal 3 "at Kennedy Airport, the Pan American Worldport, in its original or elliptical parasol form." "Although admittedly in poor repair and ill-suited as a standalone terminal "to serve today's aircraft parking and passenger and baggage processing, it is an icon of the opening of the Jet Age." "It should not be necessary to lose the unique roof design, "glass walls, outdoor viewing walks, and nearly 5000 square foot windscreen, "a windscreen with great bronzes in bas relief of the 12 signs of the Zodiac sculpted by Milton Heald, which we believe you hold in storage to this day." "Given Delta's apparent intention to expand Terminal 4 "through the current footprint of the Worldport, "might it not be feasible for them, at your behest, to incorporate the original portion of the Worldport into their Terminal 4 extension?" "Surely the opportunity to preserve such an icon "while incorporating its unique design into the planned renovation of Terminal 4 deserves serious consideration." "Moreover, the cost of rehabilitating the Worldport "and integrating it into a Terminal 4 expansion "is sure to be exceeded by that of a commensurate amount "of completely new Terminal 4 space, "which would of course lack the added distinction and customer appeal of space that was a storied part of the airport's history." "With due regard for

your challenge to modernize Kennedy Airport, "we ask that you consider seriously the possibility of retaining "the original Worldport structure as part of, and a potential anchor for, the planned expansion of Terminal 4." "With sincere thanks for your consideration, Pete Runnette, President, Pan Am Historical Foundation." I just want to address one other point if I have a few seconds left. Terminal 3 can be used as a pre-boarding for flight crew and flight attendants prior to bringing the plane or having the plane towed to Terminal 4. If we could use Terminal 3 as a pre-boarding facility, it would actually improve the crowding at Terminal 4. Now, obviously, the planes go to Terminal 4, they're deplaned, they're cleaned and everything is done right there, but if they could be prepared at Terminal 3 prior to that, then they would arrive at Terminal 4 completely ready to disembark. And that would save a lot of time and would really relieve the crowding conditions at Terminal 4. Also, the parasol cantilever would protect the planes from excessive snow and ice, which de-icing material is very expensive, so it would actually reduce maintenance on the aircraft as well by having them parked—probably at least 10 aircraft—around the parasol roof. It's a perfect parking lot. We should preserve that because sometimes the most obvious things that are more beneficial we don't see. They're right under our noses but we miss them. And I think in this case that's the case. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Richard Hughes.

[R. Hughes] Good afternoon, commissioners. First of all, I'd like to mention that Murray Bodin is not able to be here today. He's meeting with the Federal Highway Administration team to discuss road lines. I'm sure he'll be talking about that at the next Board Meeting. We at the Twin Towers Alliance were not surprised to hear the news recently that Navigant, the consulting firm, was under investigation for its cozy political relationships and exorbitant fees. You may remember that when the Navigant report on the Port Authority's finances was released last year, we questioned the validity of that report as well as the millions of dollars that were spent on it. The Navigant report certified that the Port Authority had identified its problems and was taking care of them. But then it went on to say that the report was only based on the information the Port Authority had released to Navigant. This was a little like certifying the number of chickens in the hen house based on the figures the fox gives you. In other words, the report was not what it appeared to be. Now we come to learn that Mr. Rechler here has a close relationship with Navigant. I'm not suggesting that Mr. Rechler has done anything wrong any more than I am suggesting that Mr. Samson has done anything wrong as Chairman, even though he represented Larry Silverstein for many years when Mr. Silverstein was anything but a friend to the Port Authority and was operating very much against the public interest. Nor am I suggesting that Mr. Sartor here has done anything wrong either, though he had to recuse himself from voting 106 times since 2011, according to Shawn Boberg in yesterday's Record. But did he recuse himself from discussions before those meetings— before those votes rather? We don't know. Sometimes where there is smoke, there is just the appearance of smoke. But sometimes where there is smoke, there is fire. A prudent householder investigates the smoke immediately; a prudent citizenry, through its representatives in the press, should do likewise. People in positions of authority need to be like Caesar's wife—above suspicion. Perhaps we at the Twin Towers Alliance would not be so suspicious of these apparent conflicts of interest if our Freedom of Information requests to the Port Authority produce certain documents we have long asked for. For all your talk about openness, you still operate in secrecy. And by the way, in my experience, where there's smoke, there usually is fire. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Our next speaker is Gilbert Palacios.

[G. Palacios] Good evening, commissioners. My name is Gilbert Palacios and I am an Organizing Director of Unite Here Local 100. We are the union that represents the concession area workers at Newark International Airport, also at JFK and LaGuardia. I came to the Port Authority Board Meeting today to update all the commissioners and the staff that last week we submitted a request to Paradise, a retail company, to get recognized the union. Because of the Port Authority Labor Harmony Policy, we expect to get the union recognition within a matter of days. I would like to thank the Port Authority for helping create a positive environment for workers at all the airports in New York and New Jersey to join the union. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Bowen Kyle.

[B. Kyle] Hello. It's good right here, maybe right here. All right. My name is Bowen Kyle. I live in North New Jersey. I work for a company called HBF doing food and beverages. For those who don't know, it's at the Newark Airport. Earlier this year, my coworker and I joined Unite Here Local 100. For the last 3 months we have been negotiating a contract. I am here to announce that after several negotiation sessions, we feel we are nearly in agreement with this company. As a New Jersey resident, I am proud to say that we are part of the effort to create good, stable jobs at the Newark Airport, jobs that can be support for families and they'll boost up New Jersey economy. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Our next speaker is Neile Weissman.

[N. Weissman] Chairman Samson, Board members, thank you again for the opportunity to speak on expanding bicycle access on the George Washington Bridge. As previously argued, the benefit of a robust facility vastly outweighs the costs: sustained growth in regional cyclotourism, currently a billion dollars per year; validating \$2 billion worth of connected infrastructure in North Jersey and New York City; saving cyclocommuters tens of millions each year in fuel costs; reducing carbon emissions by hundreds of thousands of tons for the rest of the century; and strengthening regional resilience to recover from weather or man-made disaster. Respectfully, I would add the opportunity to correct a fatal flaw in the bridge's design. Referring to the photos before you or in the gallery at the website, CompleteGeorge.org, the first image is the path on the George Washington Bridge, 8 feet wide, guardrails just over 4 feet high, no wind protection. That day, the cyclist pictured in the poncho was subject to gusts of 30 miles per hour. The lower photo is the proposed path for the replacements at Tappan Zee. Sixteen feet wide, barriers well over head height, and if you look closely at the barrier's mesh, you'll see that it is fine enough to see through yet dense enough to minimize wind impact. And critically, to address the same problem on the old Tappan Zee, the barriers are spec'ed to be non-climbable to deny the finger and footholds needed to ladder oneself over. Leading mental health advocates, including Harvard School for Public Health, the Glendon Association, the National Prevention Lifeline, and the Mental Health Association of New York City, all reached the same conclusion. Means matter. Deny them and you save lives. And installation of physical barriers at high-risk sites have repeatedly been shown to be the most effective deterrent. One example: Toronto's Prince Edward Viaduct had been the scene of some 500 fatalities since it opened in 1918. For years it was the world's second most fatal standing structure behind the Golden Gate. In 2003, the city added a safety barrier, which it termed a luminous veil. There have been no

recorded deaths on the viaduct since. To paraphrase the New York Times, by integrating a veil of deterrence into the design of a widened path, the Authority will not only engender the economic, environmental, and resiliency benefits; it will also realize a once-in-a-lifespan opportunity to forever mitigate the bridge's dark side. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. Is Margaret Donovan ready now?

[M. Donovan] Yes, I am. I'm sorry. I left my statement at home today, and then I couldn't read my own writing. [Chair D. Samson] All right.

[M. Donovan] Okay. Good afternoon. The latest Durst efforts to get the Freedom Tower name discredited are failing judging by the comments that followed the press releases dressed up like news reports. The name One World Trade Center doesn't work for obvious reasons. But the ironically named Freedom Tower is a fitting memorial to a process that marked the total breakdown in the democratic process at the place where it deserved the greatest respect. Instead, a high-handed governor, willful mayor, and a cunning developer thwarted the, in this case, sacred will of the people. But that's over and done with, right? Not right. Some of you think your progress actually validates the shady process, which many of you weren't involved in but you perpetuate. But all it validates is that you can have all the public's money to spend and still not, if you do it behind closed doors, succeed. Colored lights are great but can't hide the fact that the skyline is disfigured and tenants don't seem interested in any part of the site. Your lack of transparency is, as you know, what disturbs us. Grand Central Station and Pennsylvania Station were not built with public money, and we don't believe the Hub would have ever passed the public's muster. And the Silverstein giveaway never would have either. The public interest is, with few exceptions, what the public is interested in. You can't pick our pocket and refuse to explain. Executive sessions that hide political imperatives are improper. And given the information that bond investors are regularly deprived of could be illegal, which makes the Navigant audit anything but forensic. They just left the whole Silverstein fiasco out of it. At some point the facts will be widely known. Another word for accountability is answerability. There are some good reporters covering the Port Authority, but it was telling that the very meeting last year that you unveiled your new transparency initiative you stopped holding the gaggles at the back of the room. Steve Coleman assured me they'd be back, for what it's worth. Imagine Jay Carney herding journalists into a private briefing room or the papers that wouldn't attend the Attorney General's private briefing. They would have to get into line here. What puts the Port Authority above the rest of us? Nothing at all. And what I would like to add is that the people who are talking about Terminal 3, there's a real parallel to what happened at Ground Zero. Nobody in authority cared what we had to say, and look where it left you. These people know what they're talking about, and I don't understand why we never hear anything back. It just doesn't— It's just so disrespectful. And the names that signed that letter are the very people who ruined the World Trade Center— Kathryn Wylde and Mitchell Moss and who knows who. Thank you.

[Chair D. Samson] Thank you. May I have a motion to move the consent calendar for approval? [unidentified commissioner] So moved. [Chair D. Samson] And a second? [multiple commissioners] Second. [Chair D. Samson] All in favor? [all] Aye. [Chair D. Samson] So moved. There being no further business, I move to adjourn the meeting. May I have a second?

[multiple commissioners] Second. [Chair D. Samson] All in favor? [all] Aye. [Chair D. Samson] Meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.