Talk by Governor Christie Whitman at 2016 EPA AA Annual Meeting: May 5, 2016

Governor Christie Whitman: Thanks, Bob, very much. And I want to just start by thanking all of you, not just for being flexible, I appreciate that. I'm not sure, after the interview maybe I won't quite so much. It might have been nice to have a good excuse, but in any event-- But, no, for your service. I really do thank you for the dedication that you've given to this country through your service at EPA. It's one of the most underrated agencies that I think I know. Of course, now it's not so underrated, which we might do better if it were. It's sort of the center of the bullseye, which is a bit of a problem. And I don't envy any of them that are there now, trying to weave their way through this toxic political environment that we have. But it was privilege and pleasure to be able to serve there and to work with many of you who are here, and many of you who went before, working on your legacy and what you've left behind.

I was asked to talk a little bit about what surprised me when I got to the agency because, you know, as a governor I had dealt with environmental issues, and I had dealt with EPA. But I did not appreciate, I have to say, I did not appreciate how constrained EPA is by the enabling legislation. And it's a message that I try to get to people as often as I can, that when they blame the agency for taking action on something, particularly the air issues when we talk about carbon, there are certain regulations that require that they take on certain things in a specific time period, and they don't have a choice. And they don't have the ability to be as flexible as many people would like to be. One look at the Clean Power Plan, and what I continuously say is I think the agency went as far as it possibly could in providing some flexibility within that plan. You may not like it, you may argue over how it was structured and whether the particular subset they used, 111(d), was the right one, but as far as recognizing the differences that different states face in trying to meet those standards, I think they went as far as they could go. And yet, constantly you hear-- I mean, my judgement, and everybody who was with me will say that the judgement of whether I was doing well or not was when we were being sued by both sides. Because it didn't matter. I mean, you're going to get sued.

And that's the other thing that I try to explain to people. It's very hard when you're in a regulatory agency. Every time you promulgate a regulation you're telling people to change behavior or spend a lot of money for an issue they might not think is important. And that's a very hard message to get across to people. But when we talk about climate change, because it is one of the biggest issues that we face in this country, in the world, today. I happen to think, and I've said for quite a while, that I thought water was the number one in quantity and quality. Water was the number one environmental issue of the 21st century, and that's inexorably linked to climate change. And the need to take on this issue, to me, is paramount.

But I've almost given up talking about that now. I don't talk in terms of climate change. I talk in terms of clean air. I don't care why people do the right thing, I just want them to do the right thing. And to me, when you talk about clean air, it's much more directly relevant to the public.

When you talk about a change in climate, they're getting it now every time we see another storm, another flood, another drought. We all know credible scientists won't say that this particular storm, flood, drought, earthquake, whatever, is due to climate change. They will say, "Hey, what you can expect from climate change is ever-increasing frequency in severity of these kinds of outbreaks." But when you talk about it from a clean air point of view, and one of the statistics that I use now a lot is the data from 2013, which is the most recent data that we have, that around the world some five-and-a-half million people died from diseases related to dirty air. In this country, it was 91,000 people, and that's almost three times as many people as were killed in car crashes in 2013. And yet when you think of the amount of time and effort we spend on making our roads safer and our cars safer, and yet we don't even talk about clean air. It's still the number one cause of children's missed school days, because of asthma. We don't know what causes asthma, but we know it can trigger an attack or exacerbate it.

And I think where we've always tried to adhere to the science and recognize, for instance, it is global warming, ultimately, that is causing the ice caps, the ice sheets to melt. The difference and the impact in different places is not going to be consistent, and so that gives the naysayers a big opening when you have somebody like Jimmy Inhofe -- I won't characterize him any further than that -- taking a snowball to the floor of the Senate and throwing it at somebody, "Tell me about this global warming." You say, "First of all, that's conduct unbecoming a senator, I would have thought. But the fact that he did it, you have to understand how that played into the hands, the cold winter-- When we have cold winters they say, "Well, tell me about this global warming." So, I talk about climate change, but again, as I said, I moved from even talking about climate change to trying to get people to understand this is about clean air. "Don't you just want clean air? Wouldn't it be nice if we had clean air?" And that's where people respond. That's where they say, "Yes." And, "Oh, by the way, guess what? What's in the air comes down. And that gets into the water supply, and so it affects our water." Different from what we're seeing in Flint, and that's another issue of major import, and we're going to see that all around the country. We already are. But it's still something with which people can relate, and I do think if you look in this country, probably true in most countries, but in this country more than anything else we first of all respond very much to price points, but we also respond to crisis.

Nobody does better than the Americans when it comes to a crisis. Flint is a crisis, and it's time to use that opportunity to say, "We need to do something about our water overall," because as the various government localities are now starting to take a look at what their infrastructure looks like, they're seeing the same thing. What's going to be interesting is to see who pays the price on this, because the lawyers are ready. I mean, there are a lot of lawyers in this room, and god bless you, I think it's wonderful. But the trial lawyers are ready, and they've already started in cities like Newark, which the state took over. The question is, "Who do you sue?" Do you sue Newark, do you sue the state because

they've taken over the schools. How much is that tab going to be? Who's going to pay for it? And that's even before you get to trying to improve the infrastructure, trying it make it all work. Those kinds of challenges that EPA and those working in the environment face every day are so complicated and so difficult that finding the right language is the real challenge. To make people understand how it makes difference to them and in their lives.

And that's why I applaud so many of you who have worked so hard and so long in trying to do that. And also just trying to address those issues and say, "What is safe?" It's hard when you get banged around when something that you thought was the newest, best thing to do turns out, in fact, not to have been so great. I mean, asbestos was a lifesaver in a lot of places. Asbestos was a great thing. It was only after a long period of time that we discovered that no, in fact, we have to be very careful with it, how it's handled, and what kind of asbestos it is. There are all these kinds of issues that keep bubbling up because science is not exact. Scientists are always finding new challenges. They're always finding new things that they didn't know before. And I've talked to some very intelligent people that will say that, "You know, science is, evolution is, a theory." I say, "Well, that's kind of what science usually is. It's based on theories, but they're always finding other things that are proving it more and more, so when do you start to believe?" I like some of the naysayers on climate change who say, "I'm not a scientist, so I don't believe them." Which, they don't seem to have that problem-- They're not doctors, most of them, but they seem to be able to find all sorts of knowledge about how they can regulate people's medical treatment, and what they can or can't get. Consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, and we don't accuse any of those in the position to make decisions of having small minds. We don't want to do that.

But it's been a, to me, environmental protection is one of the most important building blocks to providing a good quality of life for our citizens, and that's the whole range of it. From protecting open space to letting mother nature do what she does best, cleaning water, things like that. Smart growth, which is part of that, that will help improve the environment, to get us to clean air and clean water. One of the things that I always remind people when they look with despair and say, "Oh, gosh, how terrible this political season is, and how did we get here? How terrible it all is." And I always say, "Just remember, it's the people in a democracy that make the difference." The EPA was started in 1970, not because Congress suddenly woke up one day and said, "Gee, we have nothing else to do. We've got cities that are burning down with race riots. We've got college campuses that are burning up because of anti-Vietnam riots. We've got the women's movement. We have nothing better to do, let's go and take on the environment." It wasn't that. It was because the American people stood up and said, "We're tired of dirty air. We're tired of watching the land turn into a garbage dump. We don't like the fact that rivers spontaneously combust. It's just not a good thing." And then Rachel Carson wrote "Silent Spring," and that's what got a Republican

president to work with a Democrat Congress to give us the laws that now protect us.

And the other fight that I think all of us have shared in for so long is this idea that somehow the environment is a zero-sum game. That it's impossible to have a clean and green environment and a healthy, thriving economy. Well, from 1985 to 2012, our economy was growing. Our economy was doing all right. We increased our population by over 25 percent. We increased our electricity use, our power use, by over 35 percent. And our GDP more than doubled, in real dollars, and yet we reduced the six criteria pollutants by over 67 percent. So, if anybody ever says, we know that this is not a zero-sum game. We know, if done right, we can have a thriving and growing economy and a clean and green environment. And, again, it's up to everybody who has been part of EPA, who is currently there now, and cares about these issues going forward, to continue to remind people of that, because the average person doesn't know it. That's something that's an inside baseball statistic, but once they hear it, then they start to think, "Okay, we can do this. There are smart ways to reduce our carbon emission, smart ways that are not going to crater the economy, that can create jobs. There are smart ways of dealing with water quality in ways that are not going to force people to lose their homes or lose their water--" But we have got to be able to address that.

The problem the agency has is how restricted it is because of the enabling legislation, the requirements, the inability to be as creative as I know many of you want it to be, and have wanted it to be. Every time you do that, you know you get hauled into court, and usually that's by the environmentalists when you're trying to be a little bit creative, because they think you're giving big business a freebie. And it takes patience, it takes dedication, it takes commitment. And that's what everybody, I believe, who has worked at that agency has and have had. And I just want to say, again, I want to thank you for having been willing to make that commitment. And it's been a real privilege for me to have been part of it. Tough, didn't always like it. I wasn't always happy, but that wasn't what the job was supposed to be. But it was a privilege of working with people who were dedicated, and smart, and caring, more than anything else. With that, I'll stop because I'd really like to do Q&A. I think that's much more interesting than just going on and talking.

Questions and Answers

Bob Wayland: Gordon Binder.

Gordon Binder: Could you say a little bit more about the language? Could you say a little bit more about the language? I mean, clean air, yes, we get it, but do people make the connection between carbon and clean air when you speak to different audiences?

Governor Whitman: You have to explain it to them, but as my husband said after I came back from the first few months at EPA, I can ruin any dinner party because I'd tell them, "See how beautiful that sunset is? Guess what, that's PM2.5, that's pollution." Or, "Don't eat the strawberries or

the grapes, because they put nasty things in the ground to protect from the bugs." It was not a happy time. But, you know, they do, if you explain it to them. And, frankly, that is an analogy I often use, that when you look at that sunset-- I also say to them, "When you look at the sunset you're looking at pollutants." Which, you know, they kind of like a beautiful sunset. The other thing when people say, "But everything's so clean," I say, "When was the last time you went outside after a rain and wiped anything down and didn't come away with a dirty cloth?" And then they say, "Oh, yeah. Yeah. No, my car gets dirty." If you have porch or anything outside, that's dirty. And then they start to make the connection. It's not always easy, and lord knows, I haven't found all of the right language to use. I keep trying out different things. There are, I'm sure some focus groups have come up with even more, but the important thing is to try and relate it to real-time, real-life experiences. And that's why I said, as much as anything I've moved away-- I mean, I do talk about climate change, but I always try to then relate it to clean air and morph into clean air because that's something they can really get. And say, "Guess what? That problem, you can solve that problem with climate change, with reducing those pollutants as well as a host of other things, oh, by the way."

Randy Benn: You talked about the bullseye on the agency's back. I was shocked last fall when I was meeting with a Tea Party member who looked me in the eye and asked me if I thought that EPA should be abolished. What do you think EPA can do, or should do, to repair its relationship with the congress?

Governor Whitman: This is a toughie. A lot is going to depend on how this election cycle turns out. That's going to change attitudes, depending on who's elected. You have one candidate who is going to abolish the agency and another one who is fairly cognizant of the issues that we face and is willing to work with the agency. And that is going to depend on what kind of coattails they have, what happens in the congress, whether Republicans keep control. There are a lot -- not a lot -- but there are significant number of Republicans who actually do believe in climate change and do believe that we can do something to address the issue, but they're afraid to come out, as it were. We need to provide a little bit more of the backing for them. We need to let them know that we're there, we can give them the statistics they need, we can give them the backup data that they need, how to translate this into their constituents why it makes a difference, and how important it is. And the agency needs to do that.

Unfortunately, you know, we've seen it every time. At the end of every administration you push out all of the ugly babies and rules. And so EPA gets left with a lot of ugly babies. And with the poisonous attitude we have on the Hill now, that anything that's coming from Democrats is bad and vice versa, it's very hard to get over that. So to the degree that the agency can keep its head down for now is the best way to go. Because what they're going to do, if they don't-- I mean, you can't do away with the agency, there happen to be things called laws and statute that make that a little difficult. But they can starve the agency to death, which

they have done in the past, and they're doing quite a good job of it right now. And that, then, gets back to the public. You have to get the public to finally decide that this is important. We don't want to lose this agency. This is what has given us cleaner air and less polluted water. We've seen we could do it and increase our economic output, so it's getting back to the public. But that, to me that's the whole issue surrounding where we are publicly and our political process is people just haven't been voting. They don't vote in primaries. They haven't been voting until this cycle. Now they're turning out, but they didn't. We kind of left it to "somebody else would do it." We get complacent in our democracy, especially one that's been as successful and as long-lived as ours has been, but we've got to be careful of that.

Scott Bush: I worked in the water program and have done work on climate change at CSIS and other places. Senator Moynihan was a great senator with a wonderful sense of humor. And he has said, "You're entitled to your own opinions, but not your own facts." And it seems that with environmental policy, the facts get in the way of bringing consensus together. The congress on either side has their own facts, people in the community, business and other communities, have their own facts. From your experience, is there a way that-- What would you suggest is how we can get the people to understand better the facts involved, and then focus on the policy issues as opposed to putting it vice versa.

Governor Whitman: Well, it's a chicken and egg because, quite frankly, until we get over looking at every single issue through the partisan political prism, and look at it through the policy prism, it's pretty tough to get them to accept what the facts are. Because every issue now is, "Is it going to get me another vote in my caucus, or another percentage on my re-elect?" And I would argue, again, it's because we, the people, haven't been making enough noise and saying, "This just isn't acceptable." That's one thing I've got to give both Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders, is if nothing else, they have reminded people that the way to make change is through the ballot box, that they need to be involved. Trying to get people to accept facts when you have 97 percent of scientists who are saying climate change is real and man has a role to play in it, and they still won't believe it, I don't know how you get around that one.

Again, it has to come back to their constituents saying, "Hey, no, we don't think you're in the right place." I mean, we haven't had an energy policy in decades in this country, and that's all inter-related with air quality and everything else. And so, we need to stand up and say and ask our candidates, "How do you think we're going to meet our electricity demands? If it's a 24 percent increase in electricity demand by 2040, how are we going to get there? What kind of green power is acceptable? What kind of clean power will you go for? What can we do to get to the end of the day?" But when facts are as stark as they are, and still people are able to delude themselves into not believing them, it's pretty hard to see how you get around. So what you have to do is what you do with most of these kinds of issues that are very contentious. You recognize that

there are parts of each side that you're just never going to get together, and find those ones in the middle with whom you could work. That's why I argue with groups such as No Labels, which is trying to find its way through that. We're up to 92 members now, Republicans and Democrats in the House who have accepted and signed onto their resolution. And those resolutions call for a bipartisan approach to government as well as some various specifics within that as far as addressing the budget and the challenges we face in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, the entitlement programs. And they're willing to work on other issues as well, but they have got to get, crazily enough, they have got to get Republicans and Democrats comfortable with the fact that they can work with one another. The other side isn't the enemy. And that's, unfortunately, taking baby steps right now, but it's happening.

Questioner: Good evening. I'm wondering, everybody in this room, of course, is very concerned about the environment and environmental issues, but in public polls the general public is not interested in the environment. What can we do to make it more relevant and a higher priority to the American people, besides jobs and security and all of those other things?

Governor Whitman: I don't think it's not important to the American people, it's just what's more important is, "Am I going to have a job next week? Am I going to have a roof over my head? Can I afford to send my kids to camp or get them what they want?" If you ask them, if you did down a little bit deeper and put environment on a list, then it pops up much higher if it's listed. If you give them an open-ended, "What are your top ten issues?" they tend to focus on the issues where they feel they might have some impact. And what you have to do is start explaining to them. It's what we tried to do when we entered into that, we had that tentative plan, pilot program, that we did with meteorologists trying to educate people to the fact on watersheds, when we were dealing with watersheds, that people lived on the watershed. A lot of people thought, "Well, I don't live anywhere near a stream, so what difference does it make if I dump the oil from my car on the driveway? Big Deal." Or, "If I put a lot of fertilizer on the lawn, what's it going to do?" And when we looked, we found that the time when people pay the most attention when watching the news is during the weather, because it's got neat maps and it shows you all sorts of things happening. But it also means, "Can you have the picnic tomorrow?" Or, you know, "Do you need to wear a raincoat?" So they're really paying attention then.

So what we tried, and ran a pilot program—Tracy [Mehan], how long did that go for? Do you remember? Yeah, it ran on The Weather Channel. We were trying to get them to say-- Okay, now is the time, when you say there is going to be a big weather event -- there's a lot of rain coming -- tell people that this is not a good time, probably, to fertilize your lawn, or to put down pesticides, because it's all going to wash away and it's going to end up in this storm drain down the road from you. And that feeds into a stream that ends up in the ocean, and it's why you have -- I'm sure the statistic is still valid -- every eight months as much oil deposited along the coastline of the United States from non-point source

pollution as was released during the Exxon Valdez. That, of course, now is an old statistic because nobody knows what the Exxon Valdez was, they're all Deepwater Horizon, and I'm not sure we were quite at Deepwater Horizon, which is good, fortunately.

But, you know, you have to sort of break it down into those kinds of events with which people can relate or something that really grabs them. You can say, "Oh, by the way, you're also wasting money if you do it now than if you were-- But it's over-fertilizing, putting too much pesticide on, too." And that's one of the issues that you have with farmers, as they have a bunch, they have some left over. It's not a huge amount, but enough to make a difference, and they say, "Okay, I'm just going to put it on the field," even though they don't need to put that much on. And that's when you start to run into trouble.

Devra Davis: With all due respect, I would like to disagree with you.

Governor Whitman: Sure.

Devra Davis: That the public is the problem.

Governor Whitman: You're not alone, by the way.

Questioner #5: Okay, no, no. But, respectfully. I don't think it's really reasonable at this point to expect the public to be able to know enough to respond. What we've had here, and I speak as a scientist who was on the IPCC, science is under attack. And when you stand up as a scientist and talk about public health impact of fossil fuels, you've got such a well-developed denial industry where they've got other scientists who work as a form of public relations, that the public is very confused. And the generation of confusion and doubt is exactly what these big PR agencies are paid to do. As long as we can get one hand versus the other hand, people will say, "Well, we don't know anything. We've got uncertainty. Since we have uncertainty, let's do nothing." When, in fact, doing nothing, as you know, is a continuation of old policies.

So, I'm wondering whether you would think something like a revival of the Office of Technology Assessment for Congress might be appropriate. And I think the CBO, generally, the Congressional Budget Office, has been regarded as a success, although there's, you know, always mixed views. But, in fact, it's maintained a pretty non-partisan view as a source of information about economic analysis. Administrations don't always like it, nor does Congress, but it plays to the middle. And what's missing for science right now is a credible institution of that sort that has the mandate and, frankly, the money, to provide that kind of insight and wisdom. And so, without it, you're left with this media sound bite of science, one against another, and of course the public is confused. And when it comes to things like The Weather Channel, that was a brilliant trial. Mexico City, they have daily reports about whether or not your child can go out and play, with asthma, okay? And they've got a serious problem, of course. Some cities in the United States have played around with this. It might be the kind of thing that would work because there's

a science behind this. We know about asthma and fine particulates and SOx and NOx and ozone and how those can exacerbate it. And I'm wondering whether, again, a more credible institution is needed. Of course, calling for a new institution now is probably not very realistic either, but it might be if someone of your standing were to say, "Look, we need credible, independent evaluations." That might give some impetus to this idea. I just want to throw it out.

Governor Whitman: Sure. Well, first of all, I don't disagree with you. When I talk about I blame people, I blame people for the Congress we have and the kinds of people we have because they haven't been voting. But when I said that scientists disagree and that the people have to-- You can always find somebody who is an outlier, and so it does confuse people when it's not your major issue. When you are not the one, that it doesn't consume you every day, you're not following it every day. Then, clearly, you can get easily confused when you have a scientist that will say, "Yes, it's happening," and "No, it's not happening." And, "Humans cause it, humans have a role to play," "Humans have nothing to do with it." It does get confusing if this isn't what you focus on every day, day in and day out. And so I don't disagree with you that getting a credible-- But what-- What will they accept as credible? And I'm talking about the political people. I mean, if you can get the news media to step up and start to do more as far as promoting some of these things, because lord knows they don't step back from taking positions just by what they put on in their tweets and their blogs and what they put up on the television or on the radio when they're talking. They can bring up issues, they can start talking about something like this. But I don't think that's a bad idea at all.

I always thought that our science advisory boards were pretty much that way. Yes, we did put a whole lot of people together because that's the way you got things done. It was the diesel rule that happened because we sat down, the NRDC along with the engine makers, along with OMB and our people, and whacked out that rule. So, we do need to have the public have more confidence in what they're hearing, and what the vehicle is that will give them that confidence, I'm not sure. If they don't have their political representatives who are the ones, particularly here in Washington because the press is here, the press is lazy, they'll take what they are fed from here, and until we get those people to promote that kind of thing and to say, "This is what we need or this is a credible organization. I'm going to listen to this. This is where I'm going to get my facts as I move forward." It's going to be a lot harder to get there. Again, a lot will depend, I think, on what happens in this election cycle.

Devra Davis: Let me just add that the budget and staffing for science reporting at the New York Times, the Washington Post, is the lowest it's ever been, across the board.

Governor Whitman: I'm sure.

Devra Davis: NPR, as well, Center for Public Integrity has just let go one of their premier science reporters. It goes to the equation, we've got political science, but we don't have real science reporting at these times.

Bob Wayland: I think we have time for one or two more questions or short

Carl Reeverts: Hi. Thank you, I'm so glad you're here, and it's a very, very great talk. I wanted to mention one thing in my own personal experience. I retired from EPA three years ago, after almost 40 years at EPA, and very proud of what I had done, thinking that what I did made a lasting difference to the environment, public health, and people's lives. I almost immediately shifted to local government at that point. I live in Washington, D.C., which is a state and local government at the same time, and discovered what I thought was great, they did not think was so great. And so after working with them for a few years, I have no concluded the cutting-edge failure of EPA is not in setting the standards, not in communicating, even, the risk of all that which we've been talking about here, but in implementation. In general, we're very poor implementers. We have a headquarters region environment, and a matrix management-type approach, and we sit here not really giving enough respect to the regions to actually implement the programs. And immediately after something as very hard as lead, for instance. Lead in drinking water, it was very hard, I thought we did a remarkable job. Lo and behold, 10, 15 years later, we have something like Flint, Michigan coming up.

So, my question really is, a question to everybody, is EPA is a poor implementer, is there some way-- And implementer means the real success, the outcome of why you were setting the standards, not writing regulations, but actually improving public health or coming up with clean water and drinking water, that's why we're there, but we do a very poor job of measuring it. So, an orientation by EPA to implement what we've already done over 30 to 35 years seems a lot more valuable. So, I just preached a lot, and I apologize.

Governor Whitman: No, that's fine. It's true that one of the biggest challenges that I think the agency and the regions face is their relationship with the states and local governments. You have to give them respect, you have to depend on them. You have to get them to buy in, and you have to work with them. And it becomes a challenge, at times, but in general I think a lot of the regions do have pretty good relationships. And I would challenge everyone here who has had the experience of working at EPA to get involved, either in your municipality or your state, and start to work with people and to educate them about what EPA does do, and what it does bring, and the advantage in what it does for human health, what it does for making people's lives healthier. A better quality of life. Those are all important, and everybody sitting in here, in this room, and all of the others who have retired or those who are at the agency today have the ability to influence that. We should never think that we don't have that kind of ability. And it's by talking about it, by talking about it with the people who are on the ground who are going to be working very directly with those who are impacted, and understanding.

I mean, one of the things that we've got to remember is that what looks right in a lab doesn't necessarily translate in the real world. And I know what we went through on the Hudson, getting the cleanup standards done and taking that dredging and desalting, dewatering-- What looked right initially, when we started to do it, and I put in a proviso that the environmentalists hated that said we were going to start it, and then we were going to take a look and make sure it worked. Because it looked like it would work in the lab, it wasn't really going to work in the real world, and we found out, in fact, at some points we were creating more pollution than we had cleaned up, and we had to revise slightly and redo it.

It didn't mean we stopped, it didn't mean we didn't do it. It meant you've got to be willing to admit if there is a mistake, and you've got to be willing to understand that implementing things is very different than just coming up with what science tells you is the right thing. Scientists may tell you this is the thing to do, and when you try to apply it to the real world, there's a big disconnect. And so, it's hard, because you're being told this is what's right, this is the safety standard, so you've got to figure out how do you figure out how do you implement this in a way that makes it real? The nutrient trading program on water quality was another way to do that is to say, "Look, we recognize if you're downstream from a cattle ranch and your utility has a real problem, and they're going to have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to clean up to the standard that they have to reach. But they can spend maybe a couple of thousand with a rancher to help him put in a water system and a fence for his cattle, and your water quality is the same where you need it to be clean, that makes some sense." But you have to take that look, and have to see. Okay, thank you all very much.