Matthew Tejada: Communities to organize--

What those, what is seen and what is shared and who is participating,

that in and of itself is a pretty powerful thing.

These are not photo ops, we're very clear about that,

it was up to the community whenever, wherever they felt comfortable,

these were not drive by photo ops, these are not exercises and extracting information.
We're going to be responsive to what we heard, it helps focus us,

it helps focus our regional colleagues, it helps focus our program colleagues,

it helps them in turn bring in our other federal agencies,

our state colleagues, our local government folks,

the congressional delegation on the Hill.
It helps bring all those things in to focus on note

this is what we heard from the community.

What are we doing about it? What can we do about it?

Especially in this time, when for the first time in my career,

first time in most of our lives I think,

unless you've been around for a long time that we actually are getting some resources
to really attack some problems

19
00:01:11,439 --> 00:01:16,005
that none of these problems are
unexpected or new to us

20
00:01:16,029 --> 00:01:21,368
but we haven't necessarily had
the dollars or the tools or the support

21
00:01:21,392 --> 00:01:25,439
or the leadership mandate
very clearly from the White House

22
00:01:25,439 --> 00:01:27,840
to go attack these issues.

23
00:01:27,840 --> 00:01:33,468
So these tours are really powerful
at focusing the government,
not just EPA in on these issues.

I can tell you a lot of the stops, I was there for the second half,

the latter part of the tour last week and the amount of time-- the number of times

when we heard issues from the community and it was like

"Well, you're actually talking about a HUD issue

but the administrator is talking to Secretary Fudge
or you're actually talking about a transportation and a planning issue but I'm already--"

and I'm speaking out of his voice, he brought up his conversations with secretary

[UNINTELLIGIBLE]

So having that level of focus and intention right on the ground

with the community face to face, I'm very hopeful for will help us focus

in this incredibly hopeful time of having some tools
and some resources to really get in and fix some of these very challenging issues.

Victoria Robinson: Before we read the next question, I just want to encourage anybody if you want to ask your question or make a comment out loud, please raise your hand.

If you are on the phone, press *9 and we will then call on you to be able to ask your questions, thank you.
I think the next question is up in the--

Matthew Tejada: Yep and I think somebody thinks the next one is a really tough one

but I'm willing to take it anyway, Christina.

Christina Motilall: All right, Matt.

I know you will.

This is from Patricia and they ask,
in the WHEJAC meetings last week, several council members expressed concern that 60% which is the non-EJ allocation of benefits may be used to sustain harms to their communities.

Matthew Tejada: Yeah, I think-- even outside of the Justice40, 40% or 60%, I think that is a more global issue than just the 60%
because even the 40%, even if we think we're gonna make--

we're going to try to drive 40% of the benefit to actually benefit communities

with EJ concerns, right now for the most part,

we still have tools and financing vehicles and relationships

that we're all part of not benefiting communities.
So that is— I think you're asking a more fundamental question than even the 60% like how do we make sure that government overall doesn't harm communities anymore, that all of these new resources coming down from the Hill, not only do they are worried, that not only do they not help communities but do they actually turn around
and just exacerbate the
same sorts of issues that we all

and that communities have very clearly
been highlighting for a very long time,

whether that's things like
access to housing, or transit

or economic development or health and
healthy food or environmental cleanups,

like how environmental cleanups
and displacement, gentrification,

climate displacement, how do we make
sure that these resources and our focus
does not lead to those negative outcomes for the most impacted communities anymore.

So I think it's more than just the 40-60%,

I think the 40% looking at trying to focus on 40%--

The 40% isn't the thing I think that's the most important thing there, it's the exercise of going through who benefits, how do they benefit,
way we think about things,

00:05:23,199 --> 00:05:29,698
how can we prioritize things like capacity
building assistance for communities,

00:05:29,722 --> 00:05:35,172
for local entities like utilities or
planning departments or cities or tribes,

00:05:35,196 --> 00:05:41,874
how do we need to change the way
that the government of the United States
governs to have equitable
and just outcomes.

00:05:41,898 --> 00:05:46,231
That's why it's not just Justice40.
If it was just the Justice40 mandate I think that would be a pretty--

that would still be historic in and of itself.

We haven't had anything like Justice40.

Justice40 is one initiative in one executive order, there's a bunch of these things that the president lined up and pushed out,

most of them in the first couple of weeks
because of the very clear, I think,

the very clear commitment

and focus and leadership

that the president

signaled right out of the gate

in terms of what he was going to do with

an all of government response

to advancing equity and justice.

That's what a lot of folks

are focused on Justice40,
we have already spent since January 20th, we have spent more hours at EPA

frankly implementing Executive Order 13985 on racial equity

because we started working on that in February,

we didn't really start getting going on Justice40 stuff until this summer.

There's been an incredible amount of work on an olive government response to equity and justice.
We haven't figured out--

we don't have all the answers to all these things yet

by no stretch of the imagination.

So again just to get back to the question of the 40% and 60% split,

that to me is-- that's a way to kind of look at how we're doing perhaps,

but that's not what me personally and a lot of folks are focused on
is that 40% versus 60%, it's looking at how the government of the United States
governs and how do we change that entire thing,
how do we re-steer that ship,
to make sure that not only are we not exacerbating inequities and perpetuating historic injustices but actually starting to
practice equity and seek justice

so that we can help those communities
that have been left behind for generations.

Christina Motilall: Thank you, Matt.

Are you ready for another question?

Matthew Tejada: Sure.

Christina Motilall: All right.

The question is,
EPA is currently reconsidering the 2020 rule that loosened limitations on toxic water pollution from power plants.

Is NEJAC involved in bringing an environmental justice framework to this important reconsideration and how can members and affected communities uplift environmental justice concerns in this process?

Matthew Tejada: Boy you know that--
NEJAC has developed a number of work groups to look at some of the biggest EJ priorities out there.

There's no way that NEJAC is going to be able to cover all of the issues that are priorities.

We have had to work with the NEJAC leadership to make some choices.

I'm not sure exactly, I don't know if you're talking about the waters of the US Rule, SOCM
or if it's one-- I know there's a number of rules--

I guess what I'd say in addition to that,

I'm not sure if the NEJAC is focused specifically on the rule you're pointing to,

they do have a water quality work group that is one of the big things.

I think they're more focused on still water infrastructure.

I believe I could be wrong though,
there's just things my brain
can't hold on to all the stuff,

but in addition to NEJAC I will say
I am incredibly hopeful and excited

by the leadership of the Assistant
Administrator for the Office of Water

Radhika Fox, she has already come
out with some with some new guidance

that she's pushed out to
states, to really start making sure
that the regulatory effort
over water in the United States
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00:09:47,360 --> 00:09:51,120
is very much centered
on equity and justice.

143

00:09:51,120 --> 00:09:56,688
I think that's going to be one of the
toughest parts of this administration,
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00:09:56,712 --> 00:10:06,736
is the water world, it is a part of this
that I am still very much learning about

145

00:10:06,760 --> 00:10:10,142
and I've been here for nine years, I
didn't come from a water background,

146

00:10:10,166 --> 00:10:15,440
I came from an air quality, air
toxics, particulate matter background.
And if you think air quality is tough, if you're asking this question you're probably in the water world.

Water is even tougher I think, but I am encouraged that water is a huge issue.

The NEJAC has a working group, I'm not sure if it's exactly this but I am hopeful that Radhika Fox and other folks that she's brought in with her
and the response from our colleagues in the Water Office who are finally able to do the hard work of figuring out how equity and justice fits into these very fundamental policy issues and rules and programs.

I'm hopeful we're going to make some real substantive progress on that in this administration.
And again, that's part of why like the SRF programs,

the State Revolving Funds for drinking water and wastewater,

plus another one of our water funds for removing lead from drinking water.

Those are three of the six pilot programs that EPA has in Justice40.

It's half, half of what EPA is already implementing on Justice40 is the water world.
So I think that's going to continue
to be a real driver for everything we do

in this administration
in the water world,

is going to be looking out for
equity and justice

and having those tough
conversations and doing the tough work

of really finally bringing
EJ into water.

Christina Motilall: Thanks, Matt.
We do have one question left in the chat, right now no hands raised.

This question is more focused for Region 3.

I do know that we have Samantha Beers who is appearing, and so we were wondering if maybe she would be able to assist in this.

but I'm going to go ahead and read the question and see if we can answer it.

So the question is in from Rachel and it says,
to what extent are you with EPA taking into account the New Jersey landmark law that is approaching implementation sooner than later?

Western Pennsylvania is the subject of multiple health studies from the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of emissions from undisclosed chemicals released
during unconventional fracking operations.

Are you looking at these studies?

Matthew Tejada: So yes, we have been following the New Jersey law since it was an idea before a bill.

One of the people that-- you can't give them all the credit

but he deserves the biggest slice potentially
or one of the biggest slices as a former NEJAC member, Nikki Sheets.

So we have very much kept up with and are in regular communication with the state of New Jersey as they tussle with the implementation of that law,

it features in our regular communications and conversations with the Environmental Council of States, it is publicly known that ECOS,

that is the main representative organization for EPA
to engage with all of the environmental agencies across the United States, at least at the state level.

ECOS, the Environmental Council of States, perfect acronym, so they have developed an environmental justice leadership group, New Jersey is part of that leadership group, so we're having regular conversations with them,
specifically about New Jersey with New Jersey and other folks

about what that means for the rest of the United States and every other state is watching what New Jersey is up to.

So everyone is very much looking at that.

To your question about western Pennsylvania though,
my good friend and even
better colleague Samantha Beers

who has been doing this on this
beat for a lot far longer than I have been,

although that's an age clue
which I didn't intend

but can we unmute Samantha and
see if Samantha has something to say

about what's doing in western PA.

Victoria Robinson: Samantha has the
ability to unmute herself if she wants.
Matthew Tejada: Let's see if she was--

might be signed in
but not paying attention.

Samantha, can you unmute yourself
and did you hear that last question?

Maybe not.

She might have been pulled off screen
but whoever that question came from,

if you wouldn't mind, if you
want us to put you in touch with
the Region 3 EJ office, Samantha Beers is one of our best most expert

and most successful, most effective EJ leaders in all of EPA

and you have the good fortune of asking a question that is in her stomping ground

of Region 3 which is-- well not New Jersey but Delaware, Maryland

Pennsylvania, West Virginia.

So I'm sure Samantha would love to engage with you if you would give us
a clue as to how she
can get in touch with you.

Victoria Robinson: Also Matthew, the
person Rachel who asked the question,
she has her hand raised.

Matthew Tejada: Oh, okay do
we want to have Rachel speak?

Victoria Robinson: Yes, I'll
go ahead and allow her to talk.

Matthew Tejada: Awesome.
Victoria Robinson: Go ahead.

Rachel: Can you hear me?

Matthew Tejada: Yes, hey Rachel.

Rachel: Hi thank you so much.

Yeah, as we're going through and working on towards implementation of this law,

I actually sat on a panel
with Nikki Sheets last Friday
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00:15:49,371 --> 00:15:52,639
to discuss the costs of compliance and--

236
00:15:52,639 --> 00:15:55,360
the compliance and
cost recovery of mitigation

237
00:15:55,384 --> 00:15:57,166
potentially for greenhouse gas emissions.

238
00:15:57,190 --> 00:16:00,560
And it just became very clear,
my background is in economics,

239
00:16:00,560 --> 00:16:04,175
that the social costs
are not really right in front

240
00:16:04,199 --> 00:16:09,708
of the federal energy regulatory
commissions purview specifically.

00:16:09,732 --> 00:16:15,360
So you mentioned that economics and
sister agency that focuses on economics,

00:16:15,360 --> 00:16:18,828
I'd be very interested in being
in touch and learning more

00:16:18,852 --> 00:16:21,120
about what they're
actually measuring and how,

00:16:21,144 --> 00:16:26,162
because as you can see and from your
background you stated as in air emissions

00:16:26,186 --> 00:16:29,748
you know the real hard
costs of healthcare that result
and actually [UNINTELLIGIBLE] Friday this environmental health network publication

who's been covering the body burden of fracking for the last several years

for demonstrating that children are getting cancer and actually dying from their proximity to these operations [CLEARING THROAT]

that are not like they've been done 50 years ago, they're very different.

And it just seems that these studies are not getting enough attention.
So whenever I'm able to speak in a room like this or that, I really want to make sure that people are looking at the studies that are there, that are really available for everyone to see around the world.

The Delaware River is under threat right now for fracking waste to be transported in and out and then of course fresh water to be taken out.
And this has been going on for a
decade, everyone says last 10 years,

so if the intent was always to just ravage
this piece of beautiful pristine creation,

then that's the intent, right?

There's been a concerted effort to
that effect, there's cooperation in that

and so where
we see the opportunity--

and when I say we I mean myself
and the organizations that
I work with and coalesce with,

there is this opportunity for
coordinated cooperation the other way.

So we're glad to see this is happening,

I'm really grateful to be
able to tune in my drive home

and I really appreciate the deep
breaths and focus on gratitude,

but we see it as New Jersey [UNINTELLIGIBLE]
the nation, we want to go really far
more quickly and stop fossil fuels completely, so we stop the emissions.

That has to happen but the industry is still saying "Hey, we're just going to focus on the last cost, which is the amount of money the energy consumer has to pay."

But why are they poor? Why is anyone poor?

Because they have to pay for their kids cancer bills,
they have to have missed days off work,

these are the things that we're identifying in New Jersey.

We consider what should be considered before projects get passed through,

our permits are given and I just see such an opportunity for future generations through work like this, but at the state and regional level as you said 96%

is not in your control and it's left to the wildlife what west--
where we are
frankly and it's scary.

And so thank you.

Matthew Tejada: Oh,
thank you for that, Rachel.

I wanna--

I still wanna make sure that
you're in touch with Samantha

and since you're
also speaking of New Jersey
I want to make sure you're in touch,

I'm probably our best-- our best person,

well we have Tawanna Joseph and as well as Ameesha Mehta Simpath, in our New York office

which is for Region 2 which is where New Jersey falls.

So if-- I know you're driving, so please don't do it while you're driving

but if there's a way you can
get us an email or something,

we'll make sure that you're in touch with our colleagues in those two places.

I don't want you to say it out loud since we have the public on--

But if you could get that to us, we'll make sure you're in touch with them.

And then also, you brought up a great point about things like in benefit cost analysis and really capturing the social cost,
that's something I know just enough
about to know that I shouldn't try
to speak to it because
I'm not an economist,
but for Victoria, maybe one of the things
we should look at in January or February
when we come back
is to have our colleagues
in the National Center on
Environmental Economics come on
and do a piece on where we're
at and what they're thinking about
in terms of cost benefit analysis and capturing social cost.

And again, one thing I said earlier is Justice40 is just one thing that the president has mandated to advance equity and justice.

He has-- I think in at least three other places he mandated advancing our understanding of social costs of things like greenhouse gas calculations
and methane and I think I
saw at least a handful of those.

So our National Center on
Environmental Economics,

they really look out for us on EJ a lot.

Going back to the other thing
I said, there's only like 37 of us

so we rely on a lot of other brain power
across the agency to look out for EJ.

Our economics friends are some of the
brains that we rely on the most
to look out for us,

so I think it would be a very engaging and informative session

if we had them on in one of these future ones,

to have a specific conversation about that.

Rachel Davis: Thank you so much and again my name is Rachel Davis and I work at an organization called water spirit
and I will be in touch.

We work actually in mental health support for people who are experiencing eco grief and that study on Friday was speaking of the cumulative effects but specifically with respect to the mental piece of it, thank you.

Matthew Tejada: Awesome, okay awesome, we look forward to hearing from you.

What else have we got?
Victoria Robinson: We have one more comment from John.

Matthew Tejada: Okay.

Oh I believe John and I have communicated by email, I think.

So I'll read John's question unless you want to, Christina.

Christina Motilall: No, go ahead, Matt.

Okay, so John is saying he's been on or has been listening in
on the inaugural WHEJAC,

White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council public meeting,

also the NEJAC that—so that WHEJAC is an environmental justice advisory council that points at the White House and is primarily focused on things like implementation of Executive Order 14008, though they're in the works of figuring out what else they want to look at.
So that's a new body--
at EPA for almost 30 years

we have had the National Environmental
Justice Advisory Council the NEJAC,

it just looks at EPA, the
NEJAC can't go talking about FERC,

the NEJAC can't go
talking to the White House,

it just talks to us and
the EPA administrator.
So John has been listening to WHEJAC meetings,

he's been listening to the NEJAC meetings,
he's asking a question about fluoridation.

Fluoridation is a national crisis,
the entire fluoridated US comprises the EJ community.

Can't this issue be addressed in these community calls?

CDC is responding, why not EPA?
Adding fluoride exposure is contributing to classroom chemical brain drain and it is clearly an EJ issue.

Sweeping it under the rug and this meeting is quite simply more of the same, please advise, thank you Christina.

Well John, we weren't planning on talking about fluoridation in this meeting, we were planning on talking about the things that people brought up.
and so here we are, we're talking about fluoridation.

I think it's you, I'm not sure if it's you or not,
somebody else has been emailing me quite a bit about fluoridation recently and looking at the environmental justice aspect of the issue.

This is another issue that I don't know enough about yet to really want to speak about it, publicly especially,
but since you're saying CDC is responding, I would love to know how

and what the CDC is responding with.

If you're the person who's been communicating with me,

if you could send that to me and I hope you didn't already and I haven't read it,

if not I have a flag but I got a billion things flagged to read,

not to give myself an excuse,
but if you could send me, it'll
be easier than me trying to find it

if you could just pop it to me potentially.

So tejada.matthew@epa.gov,
I would love to see that

and again just like we're
doing with our colleagues

from Department of Energy and
Health and Human Services, in December,

if this is an issue that a lot
of folks want to hear about,

and if we can help support
the conversation and bring in

some of our other colleagues from CDC,

we frankly haven't talked to them
in a few years in a dedicated way,

so we could absolutely reach out to them,
see where they are on fluoridation

and see if there is an interest in having
a more dedicated conversation about this.
Okay so we don't have any other questions and the question and answer--
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00:25:17,274 --> 00:25:20,240
I don't see other any other hands up.

381
00:25:21,440 --> 00:25:25,039
Victoria Robinson: No we don't have any at this time.

382
00:25:25,039 --> 00:25:26,240
Matthew Tejada: There's one.

383
00:25:26,240 --> 00:25:28,720
Naira [UNINTELLIGIBLE].

384
00:25:32,320 --> 00:25:35,919
So Naira just gave us a question.

385
00:25:35,919 --> 00:25:38,848
Her state, I hope I
used the right pronoun,

00:25:38,872 --> 00:25:44,400
her state Michigan doesn't use
EJSCREEN in the permitting process.

00:25:44,400 --> 00:25:49,308
How can EJSCREEN be used as a tool
beyond an acknowledgment

00:25:49,332 --> 00:25:53,200
that a community is
exposed to toxic pollutants?

00:25:53,200 --> 00:25:55,120
That is a great question.

00:25:55,120 --> 00:26:00,240
That is one of the big ticket items
that we are working on at present.
There's several parts to it.

EJSCREEN was not initially designed to be a decision support tool,

it was designed to be a pre-decisional screening tool,

though that was the mandate and the marching order given when the EJ screen was first created.

Even though it was created to be a pre-decisional screening tool,
that doesn't mean EJSCREEN cannot be used in a decisional context,

it does not mean that EJSCREEN does not have capacity or potential capacities beyond what it was initially intended to serve.

So we are very much looking at and part of the conversation we are having with states is how to use environmental justice and equity tools such as EJSCREEN, but also other tools including
risk based tools, including tools that states themselves are deriving that have much more locally specific information from their states.

How do we start to use those and start having a more cumulative view of the impacts qualitative and quantitative faced by a community, and then what is the implication of an individual permit
and what is permitted in that permit to
add to potentially that cumulative load

00:27:52,640 --> 00:27:54,960
faced by a community.

00:27:54,960 --> 00:28:00,720
We're not there yet, this
is the first administration

00:28:00,720 --> 00:28:09,868
that is not just supporting but has
put a huge priority on making progress

00:28:09,892 --> 00:28:16,218
on using tools like EJSCREEN
and others to really come to a place

00:28:16,242 --> 00:28:21,628
where we have a robust ability to
analyze for environmental justice
which would very much center on issues of disproportionality and cumulative impacts

and not only how do you analyze for those things which is one piece,

but then how do you take the results of that analysis with our existing statutes, our environmental statutes and our civil rights statutes

and make sure that we are using our statutes in ways that comply with the spirit of the law

and provide adequate protection for the health and environments
of the most impacted communities.

If there's any single priority amongst the many priorities we have floating around on EJ at EPA and beyond EPA right now, that very well might be the biggest one, it also might be the toughest one.

So we don't have awesome answers for you yet.

I see Charles Lee, my good
friend and colleague is on the line.

I don't know if we want
to elevate on Charles real quick

and see if Charles has
anything to add to this.

Charles is actually--
he's the Senior Advisor for EJ

within the Office of
Environmental Justice at present,

and he has really been leading that
lookout almost totally dedicated
in this administration to
just focusing on that issue.

Charles, I don't know if
you can come off mute.

There you are.

Is there anything additionally
you want to say about that, Charles?

He might not be, it's
it says you're off mute

but I can't hear you if
you're talking, Charles.
Oh wow.

Victoria Robinson: He might be in the process,

I tried promoting him to panelists he might be,

in the process of maybe being switched out but this is kind of slow

and I know we've been having wonky times today.

Matthew Tejada: Yeah, yeah Zoom, Zoom.
I don't know, I mean most kids are out of school already,

it's a short week for most folks

but for some reason Zoom is really having a tough day.

Victoria Robinson: No, I think it's because just the last couple days it updated.

Matthew Tejada: Oh!

Victoria Robinson: Yeah updated and I know mine did yesterday
so there might be some--

Matthew Tejada: Oh!

Victoria Robinson: Yeah.

So Charles, I don't know if you are-- if you can speak or hear.

You've got permission to talk if you want.

He may not.
Matthew Tejada: No, it's not.

All right, well.

We'll have to move on but I'm sure he would have a lot deeper insight than I do,

I gave you kind of the surface,

he'd actually be able to go under the surface a little bit more.

but that's--I don't know.

Is it any indication
of the serious of it

00:31:14,054 --> 00:31:16,048
that we're taking
an individual like Charles Lee

00:31:16,072 --> 00:31:21,048
and pretty much fully dedicating
his efforts and brain to that issue.

00:31:21,760 --> 00:31:26,419
This is one of the biggest issues that
we're wrestling with in this administration

00:31:26,443 --> 00:31:32,000
and it's because this is--

00:31:32,000 --> 00:31:34,150
this issue isn't going to
solve all the EJ problems,
but from my perspective the
issue of cumulative impacts

and how does that translate
into things like permitting

is a linchpin, it's a keystone issue that

if we're really going to make
environmental regulation work

for communities with EJ concerns,
that has got to be figured out
and this is the first administration that I think understands the implications of that and has signed itself up for doing the very hard work of doing the figuring out and really making the environmental regulatory effort of the United States finally wrap its hands around the realities of communities with cumulative disproportionate impacts.

Right.
So we're starting to lose folks, I think we're starting to wind down potentially.

If anybody has anything else raise your hand real quick or pop us a note,

otherwise I think we might be coming to close out a little bit early this afternoon.

Victoria Robinson: Yeah, so we've got the-- I forgot to update this, my apologies.

The next call is set for December 7th at 2 PM eastern time,
engagement call.

Matthew Tejada: Okay.

Oh yeah that's the old one, so the next one's December 7th.

Victoria Robinson: Correct.

Matthew Tejada: But it is still at 2 PM eastern,

you can still find all of the same information on that URL that Victoria has pulled up.
And beyond that, please stay in touch with us through joining our listserv, all information about these meetings, other meetings, grants, any other financial stuff, big doings, we send out through the listserv.

We also now have our own Twitter handle @EPAEnvjustice.

We're able to push out even more different information through that Twitter handle.
I did something earlier today, I'm gonna send it to you, Christina

for a fun little tweet out,

but we send out uplifting stuff as well as just information

and we try to really make sure that we're curating stuff that is meaningful

and important to EJ leaders and EJ communities and their partners.

And if you have any follow-up questions,
again if you know any of our names, you can email us, it's lastname.firstname@EPA.gov

or we have our standing environmental-justice@EPA.gov email address

that we have that staffed with a dedicated person

just to handle the incoming through that to make sure

that we're responsive to every single thing that we get.

So we look forward to hearing from everyone.
I know a few folks are going to follow up with us.

Otherwise again, please take some time to show some gratitude to those you love, to your family, to your neighbors, please be kind to folks this week.

There's a lot of anxiety and there's a lot of ugliness in the world right now.
I think environmental justice has always been about lifting up love and respect for one another, for your fellow human beings.

This is a great week to just remind ourselves to practice that. Whoever you are, wherever you are, this is my favorite holiday, please take some time just to take off.

I hope everyone is in a place and has the ability to do that.
I know not everyone has
the privilege of doing so.

I hope everyone can find at
least some time in this week though
to take some time off for yourself,
take some time off for your loved ones,
spend some time, having some
good food in a safer way as you can

and we look forward to talking
to folks again on December 7th.
run of the holidays into 2022.

So thank you everyone. I look forward to talking to you all again.

Thank you Victoria and Christina and Jazz and thank you to our interpreters,

I didn't thank you at the very beginning, Michelle and Julie,

thank you all so much for interpreting for us today.

Victoria Robinson: Thank you everyone.