

BOARD OF ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY
OFFICE OF OPEN GOVERNMENT



April 9, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ms. LaRuby May
Chair, Not-For-Profit Hospital
Board of Directors
1310 Southern Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20032
laruby.may@dcbc.dc.gov

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Peter Jamison
peter.jamison@washpost.com

RE: #OOG-0001_1.30.18-AO_UMC Board

Dear Chairperson May:

The Director of the Office of Open Government (OOG), pursuant to authority set forth in section 503(a)(2) of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, effective March 31, 2011 (D.C. Law 18-350; D.C. Official Code § 2-593(a)(2)) and 3 DCMR § 10400 *et seq.*, has investigated an Open Meetings Act (OMA) (D.C. Official Code § 2-571 *et seq.*) complaint alleging that the Board of Directors (Board) for the Not-For-Profit Hospital Corporation (a.k.a. United Medical Center) (UMC) failed to make available to the public an electronic recording of its February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee meeting.

The Office of Open Government (OOG) is in receipt of the Board's electronic submission consisting of copies of the following: (1) the Board's January 31, 2018, response to the complaint; (2) the roll call sheets the Board uses to establish the presence of a committee quorum; (3) electronic meeting recording vendor contracts; (4) document retention policy materials; (5) minutes for the January 17, 2017, February 21, 2017, April 8, 2017 and May 5, 2017, committee meetings; and (6) the March 30, 2018, electronic correspondence of Board Chairperson LaRuby Z. May to the Council of the District of Columbia and the Director of OOG. In addition, the OOG undertook a comprehensive review of all of UMC Board Books,¹ which contain meeting materials, including committee meeting minutes the Board references during its General Board Meetings.

The purpose of the OMA is to provide the public with full and complete information regarding the affairs of government and the official actions of government officials (D.C. Official Code § 2-

¹ <http://www.united-medicalcenter.com/media-center-2/board-meetings/item/515-general-board-meeting-may-24-2017.html> (May 24, 2017 Board Book which contains Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Minutes for April 18, 2017, the general Board Meeting was May 24, 2017). Last visited on April 3, 2018.

572). For that reason, the OMA requires that public bodies preserve accurate records of meetings that are timely made available to the public. (D.C. Official Code § 2-578).

The OOG's findings regarding the instant complaint are: (1) the Board's February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee meeting was a quorum² of the members of the Board gathered for the purpose of considering, conducting or advising on public business and therefore, subject to the OMA (D.C. Official Code § 2-574(1));³ (2) the Board's practice of posting committee meeting minutes of meetings subject to the OMA solely in its Board Books is untimely and violates the OMA's "Recording of meeting" provisions (D.C. Official Code § 2-578(1)); (3) the Board is in violation of the OMA's "Recording of meeting" provisions for not making available to the public upon request the electronic recording of the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee meeting (D.C. Official Code § 2-578(2)); and (4) the Board currently does not adhere to the District of Columbia General Records Schedule (DCGRS) electronic recording document retention policy.

Background

The Board's status as a public body that is subject to the OMA was established previously in OOG-0014 and 0015_12.14.17_UMC Board_AO.⁴ For this reason it is unnecessary to revisit that finding herein.

The Board utilizes General Board Meetings to carry out its statutory mandate, which consists of the entire 14 member Board. Additionally, members of the Board serve on the following committees: (1) Audit; (2) Governance; (3) Patient Safety and Quality; (4) Strategic Planning; and (5) Finance. While the OMA specifically excludes meetings of subcommittees⁵ from its coverage, the OMA stipulates, and the Board concedes, that a when a quorum of its voting members meet on these committees and takes official action, the committee meetings are subject to the OMA.⁶

On November 9, 2017,⁷ Peter Jamison, Washington Post staff writer and the complainant herein submitted a FOIA to the UMC Board requesting the following records:

² The presence of five voting members constitutes a quorum of the Board (D.C. Official Code § 44-951.05(b)(1).

³ In a February 21, 2017 electronic correspondence to the complainant, Michael S. Austin, the Board's Secretary admits that the February 21, 2017 Strategic Planning Committee Meeting was subject to the OMA. In a January 31, 2018 electronic correspondence to the OOG, Emil Hirsch states: "We have determined that with the sole exception of the February 21, 2017 meeting, there was no required quorum of directors present. As a result, with the exception of the February 21, 2017 meeting, the other Committee gatherings do not qualify as a "meeting" within the meaning of D.C. Code § 2-574(1)."

⁴ You may view these advisory opinions at: <https://www.open-dc.gov/documents/oog-0014-and-0015121417umc-boardao-complaint-resolving-whether-board-violated-open>.

⁵ The OMA's legislative history states: "[I]n addition, the Committee has intentionally removed language that would include subcommittees... [O]nly when a quorum of the full body meets would the meeting fall under the requirements of the act." Report on the Committee on Government Operations and the Environment on Bill 18-716, the Open Meetings Act of 2010, at p.5 (Council of the District of Columbia December 2, 2010)(hereinafter OMA Comm. Rpt.).

⁶ This is inconsistent with the Board's by-laws. Article 6.1(c) of the Board's by-laws states: "[T]he purpose of each committee is to make recommendations to the Board. No committee is authorized to take any official action on behalf of the Board or the Corporation."

“Any reports, memoranda or other documentation of the findings of an investigation commissioned by the board of directors of the Not-For-Profit Hospital Corporation or by the staff of United Medical Center into UMC Chief Medical Officer Julian Craig’s allegations earlier this year of efforts by hospital managers-including but not limited to former UMC CEO and Veritas of Washington employee Luis Hernandez-to pressure UMC employees to increase hospital admissions numbers by admitting patients for inpatient stays who did not meet admissions criteria. This investigation is described in a letter from Veritas Owner Chrystie Boucree to UMC Board Chairwoman LaRuby May on November 5, 2017, in which Ms. Boucree states that the ‘*Board hired an independent legal team to investigate [Dr. Craig’s] allegation...while Veritas has not seen the report of the results of the investigation, Mr. Hernandez was informed by the hospital’s counsel in June 2017 that the findings indicated no wrongdoing on his part.*’ ”

Subsequent to Mr. Jamison’s FOIA submission to the Board, in a series of telephone and email communications in late December 2017, Director Hughes advised him that the OMA requires the Board to make available to the public upon request copies of the electronic recording of the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee meeting (D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b)(2)). After waiting more than two weeks with no further communication from Mr. Austin, Mr. Jamison sent him an electronic communication inquiring when the electronic recording would be made available. In response, Mr. Austin states in a December 29, 2017, electronic correspondence to Mr. Jamison that, “I’m actively working to get the recording to you.” Mr. Jamison sent an electronic communication to Mr. Austin on January 8, 2018, to follow up on the request but did not receive a response. On January 25, 2018, Washington Post Deputy General Counsel James McLaughlin sent an electronic communication to UMC outside counsel Emil Hirsch regarding the matter. Mr. Hirsch’s first response to Mr. McLaughlin was a blank electronic communication, and then a second electronic correspondence requesting that Mr. McLaughlin disregard the blank email. On January 30, 2018, Mr. Jamison filed the instant complaint with the OOG.

In response to the Complaint Mr. Hirsch in a January 31, 2018, electronic communication to the OOG states in part:

UMC does not in the normal course of business retain these recordings for more than six (6) months. As to the February 21, 2017 meeting, the Request involves {sic} to a date which is more than six (6) months prior to the date of the Request. Furthermore, UMC has made significant and repeated efforts to retrieve the recording of this meeting. Unfortunately, for reasons beyond its control this recording is not retrievable.

Mr. Hirsch’s response includes a January 10, 2018, letter from Luis A. Hernandez, UMC’s Chief Executive Officer to Tracy Kearney and Angela Ohanian of Mitel Cloud Services, the vendor who records and stores Board meetings, in which Mr. Hernandez requests access to the electronic recording. The correspondence reads in relevant part:

In my capacity as Chief Executive Officer of the Not-For-Profit Hospital Corporation *cka* United Medical Center (UMC), I am requesting immediate access to the recording of the February 21, 2017 Strategic Planning Committee

Meeting. A request of this recording has been made from an outside source and based on the Open Meetings Act, we are required to provide it. It is understood that there is a one-time fee of \$250 for requests or archived recordings.

OOG Attorney Advisor Johnnie Barton in a February 27, 2018, electronic communication to Mr. Hirsch, requested a copy of the Board's contract with Mitel, the vendor contractually responsible for electronically recording the Board's meetings. During a March 2, 2018, telephone conversation Mr. Hirsch stated to Mr. Barton that the Board will provide a copy of the vendor recording contract no later than March 5, 2018. On March 5, 2018, Mr. Hirsch's office sent by electronic correspondence to the OOG copies of the following: (1) the Letter Contract for Dial Tone service for the telephone system, Contract No.: NFPHC-15(1) (Letter Contract); (2) Support Plan, Scope of Definition of Support Services; (3) Determination and Finding for Exercise of An Option and Contract Option Funding Request (Determination and Finding); and (4) January 11, 2018 electronic communication from Tracey Kearney, Customer Service Representative, Mitel Cloud Services to Louann Greene of the UMC. The Letter Contract and the Determination and Finding do not contain any details regarding the archiving and retention of the Board's electronic meeting records by Mitel. The January 11, 2018, electronic communication from Mitel's Tracey Kearney to UMC's Louann Greene regarding the February 21, 2017, electronic meeting recording states in relevant part:

“...[C]alls older than approximately 6 months are no longer archived and available. Unfortunately, we do not have access to this call any longer.”

On March 6, 2018, the Council of the District of Columbia enacted Act 22-0310, the “Preservation of Electronic Recordings of Meetings Emergency Act of 2018” (PERMA).⁸ This measure requires that the Board: (1) retain electronic recordings of its meetings for a minimum of 5 years; (2) immediately undertake efforts reasonably necessary to recover and retain electronic recordings of all meetings of the Board that have occurred as of April 1, 2013; (3) utilize an alternate means to electronically record its meetings and retain such meetings for five years, if the current provider of electronic recordings is unable to do so; and (4) provide to the Council and the Director of OOG a written update by April 1, 2018, of its efforts to retain electronic recordings for five years and to retrieve the requested recordings.

To comply with the requirements of the PERMA, by electronic correspondence on March 31, 2018, Board Chairperson LaRuby Z. May, Esq., transmitted the Board's update to Councilmember Vincent Gray and OOG Director Traci L. Hughes. In relevant part the correspondence reads:

“To preserve Board records, we follow the laws of the District of Columbia, Comprehensive Record Retention Schedule, and UMC's Board By-laws. In addition to the Open Meetings Act requirements, section 4.10(a) of our Board By-laws requires us to record all Board meetings and have recordings available for public inspection.

⁸ This measure was signed by the Mayor on April 4, 2018 and expires July 3, 2018. You may view the act here <http://lims.dccouncil.us/Download/39828/B22-0733-SignedAct.pdf>. The Council also passed on first reading, Bill 22-0734, a temporary version of the bill which is to receive a second reading on April 10, 2018. The purpose of the temporary measure is to remain in place for 225 days until adoption of the permanent bill. The temporary bill may be viewed here: <http://lims.dccouncil.us/Download/39829/B22-0734-Engrossment.pdf>. Bill 0743, the permanent version of the bill was also introduced on March 6, 2018, and is currently under Council review. View Bill 22-0743 here: <http://lims.dccouncil.us/Download/39841/B22-0743-Introduction.pdf>.

To remain compliant with these requirements, the Board hired a recording company, Mitel, who records our meetings and maintains the recordings for six (6) months. *During that 6-month window, the Corporate Secretary downloads the recordings in order to draft Board minutes and to maintain the recordings permanently.* It is the responsibility of the UMC Corporate Secretary to maintain custody of all Board records.

UMC's current Corporate Secretary, Michael Austin, began his employment on October 24, 2017. He has every recording from the beginning of his employment, but only has a few recordings prior to his tenure. After the departure of his predecessor, Mitel could not deliver the recordings of the previous Board meetings, although they were recorded. UMC Executive Leadership, the UMC IT department and Mitel are attempting to recover the recording, but have been unsuccessful to date.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that UMC has, and is, making every effort to retrieve the Board recordings so that we can be compliant with the law to which we are bound. UMC is also taking steps to prevent this issue from occurring again by creating a designated storage space on its server.” (Emphasis added).

THE BOARD FAILED TO STRICTLY ADHERE TO THE OMA'S "RECORD OF MEETING" PROVISIONS.

D.C. Official Code § 2-578 contains the OMA's "Recording of meetings" provisions. Germane to the determination in this matter are the requirements of D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b) which state:

- (b) Copies of records shall be made available for public inspection according to the following schedule; provided, that a record, or a portion of a record, may be withheld under the standard established for closed meetings pursuant to section 405(b):
 - (1) A copy of the minutes of the meetings shall be available for public inspection as soon as practicable, but no later than 3 business days after the meeting.
 - (2) A copy of the full record, including *any recording* or transcript, shall be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable, but no later than 7 business days after the meeting. (Emphasis added).

The Board's Failure to Publish Detailed Meeting Minutes Within 3-business Days of the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Violates D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b)(1).

The OOG construes the requirements of D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b)(1) as follows: “[A]s the majority of boards and commissions are unable to post meeting minutes within the (3) business days required under the Open Meetings Act, draft meeting minutes must be posted within three (3) business days upon the conclusion of the meeting, with a notation at the top of the document that full meeting minutes will be posted to the website on the next meeting date of the board or

commission.”⁹ The OOG’s findings below reveal the Board failure to comply with this requirement.

The Board publishes on its website a “Board Book” that contains the detailed meeting minutes of the General Board and Board committee meetings. The detailed meeting minutes from the previous committee meeting are usually found in the next month’s Board Book. The draft detailed meeting minutes of the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee meeting appear in the April 29, 2017¹⁰ Board Book. The UMC website shows April 21, 2017 as the publishing date for this Board Book,¹¹ which is two months after the Strategic Planning Committee meeting occurred. A review of the UMC website does not reveal a posting of the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee detailed meeting minutes independently of the April 21, 2017¹² posting. From all information available to the OOG, the Board’s practice of posting detailed meeting minutes is untimely and does not comport with the D.C. Official Code § 2-578 (b)(1).

The Board’s Failure to Make the Electronic Recording of the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Available to Mr. Jamison on November 9, 2017, and Thereafter is a Violation of D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b)(2).

It is clear from D.C. Official Code § 2-578 (b)(2) that a public body has seven business days from the date of the meeting to make a copy of the full record available to the public. The full record includes any electronic recording of the meeting. The Strategic Planning Committee meeting took place on February 21, 2017. Therefore, pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b)(2), the electronic recording of this meeting was to be made available to the public no later than March 2, 2017. It is evident that the February 21, 2017, Strategic Planning Committee meeting electronic recording was not available upon request to Mr. Jamison on November 9, 2017.¹³ This is because according to the Board and Mitel, the electronic recording was no longer available as of July 21, 2017 at the earliest. The failure of the Board to make available the electronic recording of the meeting upon request by Mr. Jamison is a violation of D.C. Official Code § 2-578(b)(2).

The Board’s Failure to Retain the Strategic Planning Committee’s February 21, 2017, Electronic Meeting Recording Beyond 6-month’s Violates the DCGRS.

The DCGRS provides the record retention schedules that District government entities must follow. Each schedule has three separately labeled columns; “Item,”¹⁴ “Description” and “Authorized Disposition.” DCGRS 24 “relates mainly to the program records that are most often created by a board, commission, committee, conference, task force, or similar organization. This schedule

⁹ See OMA Advisory Opinion-Posting of Meeting Minutes, Transcripts, Electronic Recordings at https://www.open-dc.gov/sites/default/files/12.12.13%20OOG%20Opinion_HPTF_Meeting%20Record_Minutes%20Audio%20Video%20Transcripts.pdf.

¹⁰ The UMC Board notice on its website on March 9, 2017, was timely notice of cancellation to the public of the March 22, 2017, General Board meeting.

¹¹ View this posting at <http://www.united-medicalcenter.com/media-center-2/board-meetings/item/506-general-board-meeting-april-29-2017.html>.

¹² The April 29, 2017, Board Book contains an April 18, 2017 agenda of the “Strategic Planning Committee” that lists as item for approval, the Committee Meeting Minutes of February 21, 2017. This agenda appears just before the “Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Minutes” which bears the same date.

¹³ See OMA Advisory Opinion-Posting of Meeting Minutes, Transcripts, Electronic Recordings at https://www.open-dc.gov/sites/default/files/12.12.13%20OOG%20Opinion_HPTF_Meeting%20Record_Minutes%20Audio%20Video%20Transcripts.pdf.

¹⁴ Each item has a corresponding number.

includes records “produced by contractors and consultants for the agency.”¹⁵ The Board clearly falls within the entities whose records retention this schedule regulates. The Board’s electronic meeting recordings fall under DCGRS 24, “Audiovisual Files,”¹⁶ which the schedule designates as item 11. The authorized disposition of audiovisual files reads:

Submit request for disposition authority to D.C. Archives (See DCGRS 21, Audiovisual Records, for guidelines).

The “Recording of Public Meetings” appears as items 32 and 37 on DCGRS 21 which reads in both places:

Included are all meetings or speeches, agency-sponsored conferences, guest speakers, and testimony of agency officials before Congress, the City Council, or other hearings.

The authorized disposition which this schedule provides for each item is also identical, “[S]ubmit request for disposition authority to D.C. Archives.” DCGRS 21 requires the submission of a request for disposition authority to the D.C. Archives, prior to disposing of the electronic recordings of a public body meeting. Without the mention of a time-frame for retention, it appears that the records have a permanent retention absent the granting of a request of disposition from the D.C. Archives.

In the instant case, the UMC Board is unable to provide to the public the February 21, 2017, electronic recording of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting. This is because of the recording was irretrievable and not available 6 months after the meeting occurred. In a January 11, 2018, electronic response to Louann Greene of the UMC, Tracey Kearney of Mitel confirms that the recording is no longer available, she states:

“I apologize, calls older than 6 months are no longer archived and available. Unfortunately, we do not have access to this call any longer.”

Ms. Kearney’s statement is at odds with information “Tom” of Mitel discloses to OOG Attorney Johnnie Barton on March 6, 2018. While Attorney Barton was undertaking a review of Mitel’s website a chat window appears and asks “[A]re you looking for more information?” During the ensuing chat Attorney Barton asks, “[I]s there a time limit on obtaining archived meetings?”¹⁷ Tom asks, “[A]re you meaning the recording of a telephone meeting.” In response to the inquiry Tom replies, “I just found out it is archived for 7 years.” (See, ATTACHMENT). On March 5, 2018, Mr. Hirsch’s office sent by electronic correspondence to the OOG copies of the following: (1) the Letter Contract for the Dial Tone part of its services, Contract No.: NFPHC-15(1) (Letter Contract); (2) Support Plan, Scope of Definition of Support Services; (3) Determination and Finding for Exercise of An Option and Contract Option Funding Request (Determination and Finding); and (4) January 11, 2018 electronic communication from Tracey Kearney, Customer Service Representative, Mitel Cloud Services, to Louann Greene of the UMC. The OOG’s review of the Letter Contract and the Determination and Finding did not reveal any details regarding the

¹⁵ DCGRS 24, page one. DGRS 24 bears an issuance date of April 1989. View DCGRS 24 at: https://os.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/os/publication/attachments/OS_General_Records_24_Boards_and_Commissions.pdf.

¹⁶ Audiovisual files under DCGRS 24, “[C]onsist of still pictures, motion picture films, sound recordings, video recordings, and related documentation produced by or for the board.”

¹⁷ A copy of the March 6, 2018, chat log is attached to this opinion. View Mitel’s website here: <https://www.mitel.com/>.

archiving and retention of UMC's records by Mitel. However, the Letter Contract references a definitized contract. The latest date that these contracts bear is 2012. Therefore, the OOG by electronic communication on March 6, 2018, requested from the Board through its counsel, copies of the definitized contract and all contract extension documents. In a March 7, 2018, electronic correspondence, the OOG requested from Mr. Hirsch a copy of the Board's document retention policy. In a March 9, 2018 electronic correspondence to Attorney Barton, Mr. Hirsch said he would contact the OOG later that day to discuss the matter and provide an update. On March 16, 2018, Mr. Hirsch, in an electronic email said he was in possession of the documents, was reviewing them and would provide the OOG with the documents by Monday, March 19, 2018. On that date in two electronic correspondences, Mr. Hirsch transmitted to the OOG the Board's most recent contract with Mitel and three documents concerning UMC's document retention policy. The vast majority of the document retention materials are applicable to hospital medical records and not to Board meeting records. The additional materials for the Mitel contract do not reflect Mitel's document retention policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To ensure all future Board meetings strictly adhere to the OMA, the OOG recommends that the Board : (1) separately and timely publish draft committee¹⁸ meeting minutes it places in Board Books within 3 business days after the meeting occurs; (2) strictly abide by the DCGRS schedules or law in effect governing document retention and disposal; (3) take all necessary steps to ensure the Board retains the ability to make timely available electronic recordings of its public meetings; and (4) make timely available to the public electronic recordings of public meetings. The Board is requesting training on the OMA by the OOG, therefore, it is unnecessary to include this requirement as a binding recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Board's failure to comply with the OMA's "Recording of meetings" provisions (D.C. Official Code § 2-578) is laid bare in this advisory opinion. Mr. Jamison's request for a copy of an electronic recording of the meeting within 10 months of its occurrence, the inability of the Board to provide the electronic recording upon request, and the Board's discovery of the deletion of the recording only upon a filing of the Complaint with the OOG, underscores the importance of a public body's strict compliance with the District's document retention policy and the OMA's "Recording of meeting" provisions. The OOG's investigation does note two major inconsistencies concerning the time-frame mentioned for retaining electronic recordings by Mitel. First there is the 6-month retention period for electronic recordings which Mitel's January 11, 2018, letter states, and the 7-year retention period communicated with the OOG in a chat online with a Mitel representative on March 6, 2018. Additionally, outside counsel for the Board states in the January 31, 2018, electronic response to the complaint that "UMC does not in the normal course of business retain these recordings for more than six (6) months." This statement is opposite to the Board's Chair electronic communication on March 31, 2018, which provides "[D]uring that 6-month window, the Corporate Secretary downloads the recordings in order to draft Board minutes and to maintain the recordings permanently." The OOG is unable to reconcile these conflicting statements on the documentation and information on hand, but finds it necessary that the Board immediately take all statutorily required actions to: (1) timely post meeting minutes; (2) retain all electronic recordings of both open and closed meetings in compliance with the OMA and the District's

¹⁸ This applies to committee meetings where a quorum of members is present.

document retention laws; and (3) make available to the public recordings of all public meetings immediately upon request by any member of the public.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Traci L. Hughes". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

TRACI L. HUGHES, ESQ.

Director, Office of Open Government

Board of Ethics and Government Accountability

cc: Emil Hirsch, Esq.

ehirsch@polsinelli.com

ATTACHMENT (March 6, 2018 Chat log with Mitel)

Chat

Hello! Are you looking for more information? Type a question below to chat with a Sales Representative.

For technical support please visit mitel.com/techsupport

Tom

Yes, is there a time limit on obtaining archived meetings?

Me

Let me see if I can find that out

Tom

Are you meaning the recording of a phone meeting?

Tom

Yes.

Me

Okay, I am not sure but I think I can get he correct person to reach out to you. Are you a current customer?

Tom

No. Just making inquiries and comparisons.

Me

Would you like me to have someone reach out to you to discuss?

Tom

If so I just need your company information and your contact information. Also how many users.

Tom

Just need to know the length of time telephone meetings are archived.

Me

Okay, we have an archiving service

Tom

That is separate

Tom

I just found out it is archived for 7 years.

Tom

Does this help?

Tom

yes

Me

Okay great

Tom

Sorry I did not know off hand

Tom

Do you need to speak to someone to go into more detail?

Tom

No. You provided the information I need. Thanks so much.

Me

Thank you! Have a nice day.

Tom

Thank you for contacting us.

Chat session disconnected.