

Business Better (Episode 45): A Roundtable Discussion on Environmental Justice

Speakers: Harry Weiss, Matthew Tejada, Olivia Carpenter Glenn and Sean Moriarty

Harry Weiss:

Hello everyone. My name is Harry Weiss. I am the head of the environmental and natural resources practice at the law firm of Ballard Spahr LLP in Philadelphia. I also am licensed to practice in New Jersey, which is important today because we're going to be talking a lot about New Jersey. Today's topic is, as you heard in the introduction, is environmental justice. What is it? What are we doing about it? What are some of the cutting edge things going on? This is a sort of an educational podcast for those listening. We hope that you hear the message, understand what environmental justice is and how it might impact things, as things like development in the inner city, health of those who live in the city and economic fairness and opportunity as well. All those things get weaved into environmental justice. I just will introduce my panel.

Harry Weiss:

I'm so happy to have with us from the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Matthew Tejada, he's the director of the office of environmental justice for the EPA. He's working closely with the new EPA administrator Michael Regan, as well as the Biden administration all together in coordinating policy and perhaps regulatory or statutory reform in the field of environmental justice. From the state of New Jersey, perhaps the leader in this movement, in other words, New Jersey is the only state that I know of that has passed under Governor Murphy, an environmental justice statute. And the state is now in the regulatory process, trying to draft and implement regulations to implement the statute. And we'll hear about that process today. With us today from New Jersey is Olivia Glenn. She's the deputy commissioner for environmental justice and equity in the New Jersey DEP. And we have another deputy commissioner as well, head of the legal regulatory and legislative affairs division in DEP and that's Sean Moriarty.

Harry Weiss:

I'm really pleased to have you all here and look forward to a very fruitful discussion. I'm just going to start off by reading a definition of environmental justice. It's environmental justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin or income, with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policy. That's a lot to, as they say, one of my favorite words now is unpack but perhaps we can try to start unpacking it and throw it out to my guests. What is environmental justice? Why is it important?

Matthew Tejada:

Well, thanks Harry. Maybe I'll start. This is Matthew Tejada from USEPA. That is the EPA standard definition. And since it has been the most prominent for a couple of decades now, it has kind of become the default definition I think for a lot of the United States. There's two critical terms there, meaningful engagement and fair treatment. We've made quite a bit of progress on meaningful engagement although we still have a lot of progress left to make, but at its core, what environmental justice is trying to achieve through meaningful engagement is that communities should have a say in what happens in their communities. That's not something that any community would not want to have.

Matthew Tejada:

Everyone wants to have some level of control over what happens both the good things that you attract to community and the bad things that you keep out of a community and at its core, I think environmental justice is the recognition that for not just for decades, but for centuries in the United States and even before the United States was a country, there were policies or programs, laws, ways of investing, ways of treating certain communities in this country that prohibited them from the right and removed their power from having a say in what happens in their community. And as a result, their communities, those

communities that had that power diminished or completely eliminated, have been dumped on and have received less of or sometimes none of the benefits of protection of resources, of just benefits in general.

Matthew Tejada:

And in the United States, typically those communities that had that power eviscerated and had their ability to have a say in the future of their communities, were communities of color. Most of that based upon race and whether it was outright environmental racism or segregation or other policies that were maybe a little more obscure from that, that's really the core of what we are looking at when we're dealing with environmental justice is trying to correct for both the policies and programs and laws that were the root causes of that injustice in the first place. And also pursuing equity to try to make up for the gap that has been created through those historic practices. And that is what we start to get at when we think about the definition or the words fair treatment is making sure we're recognizing the historic injustices and inequities and make up for those while also correcting for the root causes.

Matthew Tejada:

It's also important to understand that the environmental justice movement itself, even though it really sprang from a place of reacting to environmental racism, recognized that there was a lot of similarities from a class basis and that low income communities had also faced a lot of the same history and oppression and negative outcomes as a result of them. And that's why typically in environmental justice, we talk about communities of color, indigenous communities and low income communities as the ones that we're really focused on correcting for those historic injustices and inequities.

Harry Weiss:

That's very helpful as we focus our discussion. John or Olivia, you have anything to add to that? Or is it perhaps important to maybe for you two, since New Jersey has a statute in this regard to focus on the policy, to focus on why we're here or how we got here, so to speak.

Olivia Carpenter Glenn:

I think I could take the step of framing some in terms of further, why it's important and then pass it to my esteemed colleague to really dive into the substance of the law and our rulemaking. But just to reinforce what Matthew said, when we look at what has happened around our nation, I would say we can even go back to the 1960s and arguably the last initiative that Dr. King was working on in Memphis could very much be connected to an environmental justice issue in the workplace. These issues have been spoken on since the civil rights movement. And I would say that in the eighties and the nineties, there were lots of publications that came out showing how there was more siting of hazardous facilities in communities of color.

Olivia Carpenter Glenn:

And then when we take a look back even further, we can look at some of the historic practices that were in place within government, things that were considered really positive initiatives that were democratically supported initiatives, looking at the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that dates back to the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt's administration. It received tremendous support in the House of Representatives with a vote of 383 in support and four who were not. Certainly a great level of support for the initiative. And it was great in that it stabilized the housing market in our country but the way by which it proceeded was strongly based on racial segregation and segmenting out communities of color and immigrants and poor communities. And what we find today even is that there's also correlation between the communities even today, where we still see urban heat island effect, where we see more flooding, where we see a lack of tree canopy.

Olivia Carpenter Glenn:

And then moving forward through the decades to see how then, how the federal highway system was built was also built in a complimentary fashion to know, well, which neighborhood could you bifurcate? You could bifurcate where there was not going to be the substantial investment in the housing stock. When we look at people being stuck in communities that had

environmental challenges and then the siting of highways within or bifurcating those communities, you see the systemic issues that just manifest, that remain on the landscape even today, even though our laws have improved.

Olivia Carpenter Glenn:

In looking at what we can do and why it's really important to see that there are those systemic issues that need to be fixed. And so us in New Jersey trying to take that effort to look at it systemically to take on the challenge is really important. And I just wanted to share one resource that has been launched since the start of the Biden administration that I think has been really great. And it's been a series on environmental justice and systemic racism and the inaugural presentation focused on redlining and the connections between redlining and environmental justice issues. I'd be happy to share that with all of your listeners.

Harry Weiss:

I'll just add, I'll add too to that, Olivia too. There's been some articles in the popular press about redlining and how not totally unintentionally I'm sure, how it wound up creating adverse impacts like heat sinks in the neighborhoods that minorities could live in, lack of tree cover, lack of health resources, all sorts of things that can be traced back to what was a very liberal idea and is stabilizing the home market, making it affordable for Americans to buy houses. The impact though, of course, the law on the books looked great but the impact as it was rolled out, didn't quite live up to the egalitarianism of the act. Sean, you want to add something?

Sean Moriarty:

Sure. I think so, as Olivia and Matthew quite perfectly laid out, and I think is evidence by the fact that we're even on a podcast talking about this is step one of this is recognizing it. It's recognizing that our history is one of environmental inequities. And if you look at the correlation between low income, minority status and the level of environmental and public health stress on neighborhoods, the correlation is quite clear. But the next challenge is how do you operationalize and try to address those inequities? And what we're fortunate as the state New Jersey to have and thanks to bill sponsors, including Senator Singleton and Governor Phil Murphy for signing the law is an environmental justice law that recognizes those inequities.

Sean Moriarty:

That recognizes that our environmental standards, which are formulated based on the effect pollution has upon general population spread over wide areas, that those laws really do fail to fully consider the impacts of certain pollution generating facilities on their local communities and that the historic siting inequities associated with those facilities and that what happened here is this failure creates pockets of high pollution across New Jersey, where many of these facilities have become concentrated in predominantly minority and low income communities, often lacking the financial and political power to shape their local landscape, the self-determinism principle of environmental justice. To help themselves to avoid disproportionate adverse impacts on public health. What the environmental justice law, New Jersey's environmental justice law does, is it demands that the department consider those things in its permitting decisions for facilities that are covered by the law.

Sean Moriarty:

And that completely changes our regulatory power. It encourages and requires us to consider the levels of environmental and public health stressors in communities, what a new facility or existing facility might bring in addition to those existing levels and how we can avoid those impacts. And that broadens our authority beyond consideration of a single source of air pollution for example, a stationary source, and requires that we consider facility wide evidence. Requires us to consider things that directly affect the day to day lives of individuals and communities, things like truck traffic, things like odors, things like dust and to work with and within our authority to require that those activities, those things that contribute to those stressors are reduced as a part of our permitting process. And ultimately, our goal being to improve conditions in communities such that there are less communities considered overburdened by operation of the law and that the environmental burden of our economic success is spread more equally across all people and not continue to be concentrated predominantly in communities that have been overlooked and taken advantage of for as Matthew said, centuries.

Harry Weiss:

You're engaged right now in rule making? I believe a rule making process? What's the status of that? Number one. And number two, do you foresee challenges to the rulemaking from other stakeholders?

Sean Moriarty:

Yeah. Let me start by saying absolutely. We certainly expect a challenge and I'll try to take a little bit of time to explain why I think that that challenge is a bit misplaced. But so I think we really tried to live up to the principles we talked about earlier in the EPA definition of meaningful public engagement. As part of this process and beginning pretty close on the heels of the signing of the bill in September of 2020, we began what was an eight month stakeholder process, which we consider, I think Olivia and I, to be the gold standard for departmental stakeholding and we think it was warranted and necessary giving the novelty of the issues at play. This is something new. This isn't something that people have a lot of experience in. It's not a minor change to an air rule or to a land resource protection rule.

Sean Moriarty:

This is a development of a completely new regulatory system and implementation of this first of its nation, environmental justice. We engage in a series of meetings with all stakeholders. Stakeholders from industry, as well as very deep and we hope meaningful and successful engagement with the members of our environmental justice advocacy group, as well as folks in communities. Needing to hear their voices directly, to help us to inform the decisions that will ultimately make in this rule. We concluded that stakeholding in late June of this year and we are already very, very deep in the drafting of our regulations. I reviewed a draft today and our hope is that early in the fall of this year, we're going to put that proposal out in New Jersey register, in the fall, our APA process. And folks are going to see the direction that we intend to set.

Sean Moriarty:

I can give a plug to our environmental justice webpage. It's a great place for folks to go if they want more detail on any of this, including all the PowerPoints and a level of depth that we hope will be useful for folks who want to catch up on the direction New Jersey intends to take. Our last stakeholder meeting, we laid out our direction in where we think we're going to go. We're going to follow that through. I think, as I said, we're definitely going to get challenged but I think that that challenge is it's a concern. It's a fear. And I don't think it's all that well founded. I think people are afraid that this is going to grind to a halt, construction, development. I don't think we've found New Jersey as a land of many, many environmental regulations, one that keep many of us employed.

Sean Moriarty:

We still have a tremendous amount of growth. Harry's raising his hand and I'm raising my hand too. We have a tremendous amount of growth and tremendous amount of opportunity. That opportunity is not going to dry up as a result of the environmental analysis. What we expect to happen is that facilities that are covered by the law will be built better. They may be built in different places, they may be built in my backyard or your backyard or anyone else's backyard, somebody that's not in a defined overburdened community. And that in place of those facilities, we'll see development of things that are more in line with what folks in those communities want to see. Housing, smaller scale retail, things that will bring benefits to communities as well as facilities and there's room within the rules for things that will reduce those stressor levels in communities. That will provide an environmental opportunity to those communities.

Sean Moriarty:

I think overall at the end of the day, the principle that we believe in, principle that the commissioner believes, Olivia and I, the governor, is that, that economic development and our environmental protection, they're not mutually exclusive. They can move forward hand in hand. And if we improve conditions in overburdened communities, which if I'm being honest, cover about half of the state of New Jersey, four and a half million people live within communities that are within our legislatively defined definition of overburdened communities. If we improve conditions in those communities, that's going to lift

everybody up. Rising tide lifts all boats. We improve conditions in half of the communities within our state, that's going to benefit the other half. It's going to benefit us all and we're all going to be better off at the end of the day. That's my pitch for us not being sued but I doubt it will be successful, but I am quite confident we will be able to defend that lawsuit.

Harry Weiss:

Well, that's democracy in action here. The courts often have the final say but you have to get to that point and you're well on your way. On the federal level, Matthew, where are we today? I know it is past the 100 day point for President Biden so I think it's fair for me to put the pressure on you and ask you what's going on at the federal level? How is the federal government thinking about implementing these high ideals? In what form? Similar to New Jersey? Different than New Jersey? And that's question one. And question two always, when we talk about the federal government is, do you expect that to be the floor as we move forward as a nation allowing states like New Jersey to do more if they choose?

Matthew Tejada:

Sure. Well, first, I just want to thank Sean and Olivia and their colleagues in New Jersey. The real creativity and the setting of the frontier for environmental justice across the United States has and continues to be discovered by primarily our state colleagues and the work that folks in New Jersey are doing right now is incredible work, not just for the state of New Jersey, but really opening up some new territory and blazing a trail for a lot of folks, not just at the federal level, but I think a lot of other states and local governments and even tribal governments are watching what is happening in New Jersey with great interest to see how they navigate this very important development and really bringing justice onto the books and into the implementation of environmental and public health protection.

Matthew Tejada:

It is absolutely fair to ask though, a 100 days, more than a 100 days in, because it was on the first day that President Biden very clearly signaled to the entire United States that equity and advancing equity was going to be a core principle for his administration. He signed an executive order on his first day in office, executive order 13985 on advancing racial equity that mandated in all of government effort, in all of government and response and responsibility to looking at all of our business practices, not just at EPA. And that was an important first day change of the paradigm by the Biden Harris administration because for so long EPA had really been put into the leadership amongst all federal agencies to try to blaze a trail on environmental justice and the Biden Harris administration recognized that it's really the job of the White House.

Matthew Tejada:

And it's an all of government mandate to look at everything that we do across the federal government and find the ways to advance equity because the way we have done so and the way we currently do so is not equitable. It does not understand and contemplate and respond to the historic inequities and injustices that must be accounted for in the application of our programs, in the way we give grants, in the way we collect data or pursue scientific research or make incredibly decisions in terms of permits or rules or how we respond to natural disasters. We have been working aggressively for several months now, already on implementing that executive order. Every agency across the federal government. We're actually coming up on in a few days, the first deadline where each agency will be turning in a barriers report to the domestic policy council of the White House. And as soon as we've done that, we're going to turn around and move on from those barriers and start figuring out the solutions to break through those barriers across all of our practices.

Matthew Tejada:

Again, not just at EPA, but across the entire federal government. That's going to be a real, a sea change, not just in terms of the paradigm shifting across all of the agencies at the federal level and the executive branch but really program by program, activity by activity for the coming years, looking at these solutions to ways that we can advance equity and implementing those solutions. That's going to be a huge, it already is a huge amount of work. I know it's tough on the outside to be able to peer in and see what is happening there. But there is a tremendous, an unprecedented level of effort right now at advancing equity across all of the government agencies. And at EPA, I know it is a lot of work already ongoing for that.

Matthew Tejada:

And on top of that work, we're now implementing a significant piece of another executive order, executive order 14008, that President Biden signed not in his first day, but in his first week. I believe he signed it on the 27th of January. That is the executive order on tackling the climate crisis at home and abroad and fully the last third of that executive order is all about environmental justice. Makes again several calls for an all of government response. It elevates responsibility to the council on environmental quality in the White House but the most important part of it perhaps is the establishment of a Justice40 initiative.

Matthew Tejada:

And again, looking to the leadership of states, this is really following along from something that the state of California pioneered. And I think there are a few other states out there that are now following behind California in slightly different ways. But what Justice40 mandates is that 40% of the resources of certain programs across all of the executive branch of the federal government, go to benefit disadvantaged communities. And that's one sentence. And kind of like with the original definition of environmental justice, there's a lot of unpacking to do in that one sentence. We have to figure out which programs are implicated in this because we've got to look at the resources from those programs. We've got to figure out what does benefit mean? How do those resources benefit certain communities? And how are we going to calculate that? How are you going to tabulate that up? And how are we going to be able to stand behind it to make sure that 40% of the resources of those programs actually do provide benefit to disadvantage communities?

Matthew Tejada:

And that perhaps is one of the most important parts of the Justice40 mandate because previously at the federal level, we have not, and at EPA, we have very specifically and thoughtfully declined to join borders around communities and label them as EJ or not EJ. We have very specifically not done so. One, because we haven't had a law or a policy that gave us the clear mandate or reason to do so. And without that, we have really lifted up one of the core rules or principles of environmental justice, which is communities speak for themselves. And we have not wanted to label communities. We feel it is the right of the communities to describe themselves. We've never chosen to label a community as an EJ community or not an EJ community.

Matthew Tejada:

This executive order however, with a lot of consultation from environmental justice leaders and organizations across the United States in recognition of the fact that we need to fundamentally move forward on incorporating EJ into decision making, will actually produce a map that labels communities as disadvantaged or not disadvantaged for receipt of the benefits of 40% of those programs. That's a huge step forward. We have tools such as EJ Screen, which provided national consistent environmental justice screening capability. Again does not actually outline and label communities but allows any user to really look at where are their potential disproportionalities? Where are their exacerbated vulnerabilities from a community perspective? But that's a screening tool. It stops short of actually centrally influencing our major decisions. And what this is Justice40 initiative for the first time is going to do is to, is to shift that sort of data into the middle of the decision making.

Matthew Tejada:

And here in Justice40, we're just looking at resource allocation but as you were asking, I think that sets the floor. I think once we start making decisions about money and at the end of the day, when I used to be an environmental justice advocate down in Houston, I always tried to figure out where's the money? That was always the most important thing with whatever I was trying to work on, who's getting paid? That is a huge first step to take in terms of resource allocation, based upon these sorts of considerations. And I think from there, when we look at the mandate that Administrator Regan very clearly delivered to the agency, his first memorandum that he signed out to the agency was his commitment to environmental justice, where he is very clearly telling the agency that we will center equity and justice in the achievement of our mission across EPA.

Matthew Tejada:

Again, that is a paradigm change but it also means that in things like permitting or rulemaking or prioritization of enforcement actions or how we respond to natural disasters, environmental justice is no longer going to be something that maybe we figure out at the end of the day, after 95% of the work is done. It's going to be one of the first things we think about. Engaging communities is going to be a primary responsibility of everyone at the agency and we are going to carry that through the entire process of thinking and analyzing and making a final decision to make sure that we are actually centering our mission on responding to the unique needs of communities with environmental justice concerns.

Harry Weiss:

I think I hear you say that EPA has programs for air, clean air, clean water, lack of wetlands, preservation of habitat. I think the current view from EPA is that in your decision making and early on in your decision making, when someone comes before you and says, "I want to build this, I want to do that," That environmental justice is going to be elevated. Maybe not elevated beyond any other consideration but it's going to be elevated at the beginning of the process without any need for legislation or a regulatory change. It's just a policy direction from President Biden on down. That's accurate I think.

Matthew Tejada:

That's right. And one of the things that Administrator Regan has said repeatedly very clearly, is that everyone in the United States deserve clean air, clean water and clean land. None of our statutes say, "Well, once 90% of the people breathe clean air, we're good." None of our statutes say, "85% of the people get clean water and the other 15, well, I hope they can buy enough bottles to make it through." All of our statutes are supposed to be protecting the health and environment of everyone in the United States. And EPA, I think historically will be viewed as one of the most successful institutions at achieving its mission since it was founded.

Matthew Tejada:

But very importantly, that mission has only been achieved for some part of the United States. For a largest part of the United States. But the part of the United States that needed us the most has received the least our help, has received the least of the benefit of our activities and of our protection. And I think what I hear when I hear Administrator Regan talk about how he sees delivering clean air and water and land and centering our mission on environmental justice and equity, I hear him pointing to those communities that have been left behind and telling us that EPA, that's your focus now. We are finally going to achieve our mission for those places where we have failed to do so since we were founded.

Harry Weiss:

Thanks. Olivia, you raised your hand. I'm not sure you were just saying, "Good job." You were saying, "I agree." Or did you want to add to Matthew's commentary?

Olivia Carpenter Glenn:

All of the above. Yes, that was spot on, Matthew. I just wanted to also make a note of some of our complimentary efforts in New Jersey to the environmental justice law and rule making. In that Governor Murphy issued an executive order in his first 100 days in office for us to take that holistic approach, the whole of government approach to addressing environmental justice issues. It solidified our previously existing stakeholder group, the environmental justice advisory council for them to be able to continue on. And I have learned from just some interactions from other states that we certainly should not take the very fact that we have an environmental justice advisory council that is comprised of stakeholder groups across the state, we should not take that for granted. We have that group, we have an environmental justice inter-agency council whereby we have representatives from every state department and agency and we have a guidance document that was also issued in the fall that has given us some direction for efforts to employ. One of which very much parallels what it sounds like is the barrier reports that the respective federal agencies are doing.

Olivia Carpenter Glenn:

We're crafting an initial assessment document where we're taking that really manicured, deep look at how we go about doing our business and why but also to identify some things that we can do differently so to get ourselves pointed in that direction, through the initial assessment. And then following that to develop an action plan, whereby the members of the public can hold us accountable to those changes that we know need to be made. And it's not only for us at DEP but also for every department and agency all across state government. It sounds like there's going to be a lot of great movement this coming fall to further environmental justice that really compliments on the federal level and the state level here in New Jersey.

Harry Weiss:

I happen to live in Pennsylvania and we have, unlike any other state in the union, we actually have elevated the right to clean air, clean water, to a constitutional position. Article 1, section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. There's no similar as best I can tell, there's no similar provision in the United States Constitution. There's no similar provision in the New Jersey state Constitution. The question become, but imbued in all Constitutions, especially the United States is this concept of property. And I'd just like you to think about or comment about how you have this clash of people own property, they get to do what they want to do with it and what do we say to them when their expectations about their property development or use of their property or property rights is impacted, how do we bring them around to understanding why this has to be done?

Sean Moriarty:

I think that there's a right to property but that right is informed by the need to ensure that the use of your property doesn't negatively impact others, your neighbors. And we all have I think, illegal, social, moral responsibility to ensure that our activities are not adversely affecting the folks around us. And I think in broad strokes, the development of environmental law over the last 40 to 50 years reflects that, ensuring that from an air pollution perspective that the activities on your property, you're not going to affect the health of your neighbors. And I think what we see and what our environmental justice law stands for is the principle that even when those things are controlled, when those facilities are in abundance and those facilities are put places due to historic inequities, that we're not able to accurately ensure that our neighbors are not being affected by the use of our property if we continue these types of things.

Sean Moriarty:

We need to be better. And if you own a piece of property and you are not thinking about selfishly or unselfish how the use of your property can benefit both yourself and your neighbors, I think we probably need to reflect on that. And I just wanted to add something to what Matthew said before, the states, we're on the frontiers on this but the work that the folks like Matthew do, Administrator Regan and President Biden, that their commitment to environmental justice is so energizing to us, knowing that we're not alone in the work. It emboldens us. It gives us further pride in what we do. And further to Matthew's point, we talk about the general propositions of clean air and clean water for everybody, whether through the federal acts, whether through environmental rights act amendment in Pennsylvania or whether through kind of the department's general position as a steward of our natural resources for all of the people interests, we have more authority than we think we do at times to affect change in these areas.

Sean Moriarty:

We're fortunate at this point to have legislation that makes that very clear. But if us as government officials, as government attorneys in my situation, we're not taking into account environmental justice. If that's not at the front of our mind, we're not doing our jobs. And it's just as simple as that. This is a moral imperative and we need to be thinking about this all the time and upfront and co-equal to all the other things when we're working on projects. If we're thinking about it at the end, when 95% of things are done, it's too late and we have failed in our mission to protect the people that we work for. I just wanted to add that on, even though it's not exactly. Matthew, I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

Matthew Tejada:

Yeah. No, I want to absolutely lift up what you said there, Sean. Nobody's right is limitless and where we've chosen to draw the line on property rights in the United States I think that line is now being reconsidered in light of a lot of what has happened in a monumental moment in our history. The moment that we're living in right now from the last couple of years, where there has been a historic willingness and openness to embracing and understanding the history of injustices and inequities that go far beyond things like economic policies in the 1930s. If you go back to the forced relocation of indigenous peoples and their treatment over generations, I think our society much more so than just our government and its institutions, but our society, our culture in the United States and beyond is starting to appreciate not just that it is the right thing to do that it's a moral imperative for us to reconsider where we draw these lines and how we lift up responding to these historic inequities and injustices. But that it's our responsibility to do it because these are not things that happened by accident.

Matthew Tejada:

People living in places that are over polluted, that don't have resources, that can't get to health clinics and don't have access to healthy food and can't get to a park, those aren't coincidences. Those are products of decisions that have been made over again, generations. And it's our responsibility, whether you're in the government or whether you are private industry or whether you're the council for private industry to figure out how you can live up to correcting for those historic injustices.

Harry Weiss:

After hearing that unless anyone has more to add, what a way to end, Matthew. That was terrific.

Sean Moriarty:

It's perfection.

Harry Weiss:

I think we've been at it for a good 40 minutes and it's quite possible I see two broadcasts coming out of this.

Matthew Tejada:

Give you that much.

Harry Weiss:

I know you're all busy and you have things to return to but on behalf of the firm and myself in particular, thanks for fielding the tough questions and for sharing your insights. This is exactly what our clients want to hear about and it makes it easier for us to make them understand what the situation is. That it's EJ's time and it's long overdue. thank you. As promised, I think Chris will send the recording to everyone so they can hear and if we need to get back on...