

# Toxic Exposures in Your Community: Strategies and Successes

## PART I

*Moderator: Chloe Winnett\**

*Panelists: Kerry Guerin,\*\* Sarah Chen Small,\*\*\* & Margaret Gordan\*\*\*\**

**Chloe:** I'll go ahead and introduce the speakers of this event. Kerry Guerin, pronouns she/her, is the Richmond Staff Attorney at Communities for a Better Environment, supporting the Richmond team's ongoing efforts to amplify community power and achieve a local-driven vision of environmental justice. She served as the legal and co-governance leads for the Make Polluters Pay campaign in Richmond that generated a \$550 million settlement from the city's oil refinery to pave the way for a just transition in 2024.

Kerry was previously at Self-Help Enterprises, where she worked with farmworker communities in the San Joaquin Valley to address contaminated and depleted drinking water sources and energy equity issues. Kerry holds a law degree from Stanford, an MSc in Water Science Policy and Management from Oxford University, and a BA from Georgetown, and is admitted to practice law in California.

Sarah [Chen Small], pronouns she/they, is an Associate Attorney with Communities for a Better Environment in East Oakland, a working-class community of color that has been impacted by heavy industrial pollution for decades. Her work focuses on the right to clean air and reducing toxic air exposure. Sarah graduated from UC Davis School of Law with certificates in Environmental and Public Interest Law. Sarah came to the law from local government and public health, including emergency food security work in the early months of COVID-19 and tobacco control research on industry advertising strategies. Through this work and growing up in a period of rapid gentrification in San Francisco, Sarah decided to pursue a law degree to help fight to put community health before corporate greed.

---

<https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38TH8BQ40>

Copyright © 2025 Regents of the University of California.

\* Symposium Director, 2024-2025, *Ecology Law Quarterly*.

\*\* Staff Attorney, Communities for a Better Environment.

\*\*\* Associate Attorney, Communities for a Better Environment.

\*\*\*\* Co-Executive Director, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project.

**Kerry Guerin:** Hi everybody, my name's Kerry. I'm with Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), and we organize in four California communities, in Richmond and East Oakland, where Sarah and I work, and down in Los Angeles in Wilmington and Southeast LA. Thanks to our last panelist for all the shout-outs for Richmond and East Oakland and for the power of local work. That's really what our stories today are meant to convey as well. In our four environmental justice communities, including in East Oakland and in Richmond, we've been rooted there now for decades.

All of our work, while focusing on some of our recent stories for today, has been moved by these decades of organizing and deep relationships with community members across our communities. In talking a little bit about Richmond, I'll situate us in that history there. Now, we'll do a show of hands first. Folks, are we familiar with, as we drive out maybe to Santa Rosa or Mendocino, we cross the Richmond Bridge, and we see those big orange terracotta tanks right off the highway. Can I get a show of hands? It looks like a lot of folks in the room know where the Chevron Richmond Refinery is. That's what it is.

Growing up, I thought, "Oh, those are some beautiful water tanks," just as we were going out to go see my Aunt Mary. Not quite. It's one of the biggest oil refineries here on the West Coast. Behind me is a picture of a really tragic event that took place in August of 2012, when the refinery had a leak, explosion, and fire that sent fifteen thousand people to seek medical treatment in the week following. Now, when the refinery is not on fire, it's still just as much of an environmental justice scourge for the local community, where it's estimated that there are at least eleven-to-twelve premature deaths each year in the city of Richmond alone from just one type of pollution.

We're not talking all the pollution from the refinery, just the particulate matter, taking twelve folks away from the community too soon. Think about how the communities closest to the fence line of the refinery are in the 97th and 99th percentile for asthma. You think about how the kids at Harris Elementary, where you can see the refinery from the school play yard, know that they have to run inside when they see a little flare of fire at the refinery. Growing up in a place like that, working and living in a place like that, it takes a toll on folks. As much as Richmond is a place of resilience and strength, it's one of these unequal burdens that motivates so much of the environmental justice movement.

Now, in Richmond, we've been organizing for a just transition, as I say, for decades. This term I keep using, what does that mean? A just transition, broadly, is a vision to move us from an extractive, pollutive economy to a community-rooted and regenerative society. As soon as you start to apply that question, it gets really tough. Doesn't mean we shouldn't do it, it just gets really tough. Let's use Richmond as an example for that.

As you start to imagine, what would it take to close this refinery, and what would the impacts of closing this refinery on the community be, lots of smaller, subsidiary questions come up. You quickly realize, for example, how deeply enmeshed the city is with the refinery. Some of that's just on a practical level,

including the city's tax base, and where a lot of the city's municipal revenue stream comes from. When you think about a just transition, you want to make sure that the city is able to continue to pay its workers and provide the city services that everybody in the community relies on, including for fire safety, including for public health measures.

Just broadly speaking, a just transition costs money. How do you ensure that there's environmental remediation of toxic sites? How do you ensure that impacted workers are protected, so that way they can continue to provide a livelihood for themselves and for their families? How do you address a century of public health impacts? How do you do the economic development work that's needed to ensure that the city has the funds to find a future alternative to oil refining?

Here at CBE and with our partners at the Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN), we came up with a pretty good start to answer that question. How do you pay for all of that? How do you pay for a just transition? You make the polluter pay. At CBE and APEN, along with partners at the Richmond Progressive Alliance, which have organized also for decades and won a majority on the city council in Richmond, and the city's public employee union, SEIU Local 1021, we came together and last year we proposed the Richmond Refining Tax.

It's a measure that we researched, wrote, and brought to the city council and won city council approval to place it on the November ballot last year. What did it do? It was a general tax that could be used in any way that the city spends money. At the top of the slide here, you've got an example of things that cities spend money on. It was an excise tax, meaning that the more oil that was refined, the more revenue that it would generate. It would be estimated to provide about \$4 billion over the next fifty years.

We saw this as the type of investment needed to ensure that for as long as this refinery is here, the city ought to be able to recoup revenue from it, especially given all of these negative public health impacts, to pave the way for what's next. With that, there were some twists and turns in the road, and there was a last-minute lawsuit by Big Oil against the ballot measure, critiquing, which is a familiar narrative now throughout the day, a well-settled area of law that instead they were able to find a judge to agree with their take on it.

This scared up a last-minute settlement agreement, pulling the measure off the ballot on the very last day possible. In exchange for pulling it off the ballot, the city won a \$550 million settlement over the next ten years. What's exciting about that is that it is half a billion dollars, and it means that the city has the money now to start planning for and implementing a just transition, rather than waiting through years of litigation with the cost piling up and the uncertainty behind it.

We're excited at CBE and APEN both to be working out with the city to find ways to spend this money, to enact that just transition, to ensure that even though it's been a refinery town for the last one hundred years, one hundred years from now, it's not the same story. Refineries, of course, are not an island. They

make products that go other places. I say all that to say our struggles are connected. From here in California to Palestine, of course, where Chevron extracts oil and gas off the coast of Gaza, where weapons are being used, developed by aerospace companies that also make plans of flying to our airports here in the United States, these struggles are connected.

Even in the communities that Sarah and I both work in, that Communities for a Better Environment is in, the struggle is connected. Physically, of course, by pipelines where jet fuel from the refiners is taken to airports for use, but also in the sense that lessons learned at both are being applied in both, whether it's local work or, in the case of Sarah's work, litigation as well. I'll turn it over to her for the rest.

**Sarah Chen Small:** Thank you, Kerry. Yes, as Kerry mentioned, I am working on our East Oakland Community's Oakland Airport campaign. I'm an attorney in our CBE East Oakland office. Some of what Kerry was talking about is, sort of, how do you enact just transition principles? There's a common phrase, catchphrase in just transition of "Stop the bad, build the good." A lot of what litigation is stopping the bad. I would be happy on another day to talk about more of what we're looking towards of building the good, but, unfortunately, right now, our community is on the defensive.

The Port of Oakland has proposed a massive airport expansion at the Oakland International Airport, which, as discussed, is directly connected via pipeline to the Chevron refinery and other major refineries in the Bay Area. I'm going to try to rocket through some airport 101. I've become a really weird, like—I'm like the plane guy now that people hear from. Everybody's weird airport uncle. I'm going to try to rocket through some of the background, but there is a report, we have out that if you want to learn a lot more about the impacts of airports at large, you can take a look at it.<sup>1</sup>

I've been working with CBE members opposing the proposed expansion for about a year and a half, but our community has been involved since roughly 2021 when the port first announced their intentions. By way of background, the Oakland International Airport, or OAK, is owned and operated by the Port of Oakland, which, if you're familiar with the seaport in West Oakland, you might be more familiar with that, but they do run the airport as well. There are, of course, major tenant companies that operate out of the airport and have a lot of vested interests in the Oakland Airport, including Southwest, UPS, FedEx, and others.

More towards the challenges of what comes next or building the good or regulating more: Regulation of airports is a mess. It's got international law all the way down to hyper-specific local port rules. People are scared of preemption.

---

1. COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENV'T & SERV. EMP'S. INT'L UNION, POLLUTION FOR AIRLINE PROFIT: PROPOSED EXPANSION OF OAKLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WOULD WORSEN TOXIC POLLUTION OF WORKERS, COMMUNITIES OF COLOR, & THE PLANET (2024), [https://www.cbecal.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Final\\_Pollution-for-Airline-Profit-Report\\_English.pdf](https://www.cbecal.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Final_Pollution-for-Airline-Profit-Report_English.pdf) [<https://perma.cc/NK9M-B226>].

Everybody passes the buck. It's a conversation for another day, but it adds to the fun of this work. A little bit more about why our community is so concerned about the airport impacts. Studies have shown that airports cause really severe, far-reaching air quality pollution.

Just some top-level findings: Airport workers on the tarmac experience ultrafine particle concentrations equivalent to breathing the air in an enclosed smoking room at an airport. When you think about how many hours people are exposed to that, and then go home to their fenceline communities, many airport workers are also immigrants, people of color living in heavily polluted communities and breathing in more of that same pollution. That pollution has been shown to travel as far as ten miles downwind of airports, so it is certainly impacting large portions of the Bay Area.

The prevailing wind pattern is west to east. As you can see, the gray area there is the airport. That, of course, blows directly into Deep East Oakland and San Leandro. Those blue flags are all schools. Those are pre-K through high school. That's probably not all of them. Those are just the ones that were really easy to grab. Of course, all of these really intense health effects are right in people's backyards. We also think a lot about the interconnection, right?

It is not just the airport. It's, as we stated, the connection to pipelines. It's also connections to trucking routes that, due to a legacy of racist land use policy, run directly through our communities and avoid wealthier, whiter communities, connected to a large network of warehouse operations, trucking, fueling, and more. Of course, all of that pollution has really severe health impacts. This is just to show that the census tract, including the Oakland International Airport, is in the 100th percentile of asthma rates in California.

If you expand out to that sort of red and orange halo around the airport, that's 36,000 people who are in the 99th percentile of asthma rates in California, which, of course, is just one indicator of more severe progressive lung disease. All of this being said, this is now, right? This is the current status quo with the airport operating as it is right now. Unfortunately, the port has proposed a dramatic expansion, seeking to roughly double airport operations by 2038, including "up to sixteen new gates." That "up to" is quite literally a quote, so we don't know how much is being proposed, which is one of the problems, as well as major expansion and relocation of fossil fuel storage and delivery systems, among many other things. I won't get into the weeds too much. The spoiler of this all is we did end up bringing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) litigation. That is ongoing, so stay tuned for a lot more fun reading and litigation if you want to know more about all of the many problems throughout the environmental impact report process.

We're seeing major undisclosed components of the project, health impacts not being studied, not taking into account the existing health and racial health equity disparities, and not looking at alternatives, and quite literally proposing zero air quality or greenhouse gas mitigation for the project, despite finding significant impacts. This is of course all really concerning to our community, and

our community has done an incredible job of fighting these issues both inside and outside of litigation.

A little bit outside of the CEQA world of things, one of the common issues we see between both of our communities is this pivot towards false solutions that we see from the airline industry, from the fossil fuel industry, and from government partners with those industries. One of those that I would say definitely watch this space is sustainable aviation fuel, or SAF, which has been pushed pretty hard through federal, state, and state government initiatives, throwing a lot of funding at the development of SAF, as well as collaborations with Bay Area refineries with airline industry to produce more SAF.

The tagline for SAF, why people like it, or propose it, is it is less carbon intensive than fossil jet fuel at the point of combustion. However, like many biofuels, the process of gathering feedstocks, which are often biofuel crops, and the process of refining that, are more often equal or more carbon intensive than jet fuel refining. At the point of combustion, SAF actually does not reduce key air pollutants like nitrous oxides or toxic air contaminants that cause disease in the immediate surrounding communities. While this is floated as a great public relations move, it is used to greenwash operations and to hand wave at our community's concerns. "We might be expanding the airport, but don't worry, there's cleaner fuel coming."

Experts show, unfortunately, that aviation is just a really hard industry to transition off of fossil fuel, and it's really unlikely that we'll see genuinely less impactful alternative fuels for aviation prior to 2050, which of course is far too late for the climate consequences. I could say a lot more about SAF, but I will leave it there. All this to say that our community has done an incredible job of fighting this expansion through a variety of means, and as a quick plug for law students, this is why I love community lawyering so much. The work that I've gotten to do on this campaign has actually majority not been litigation up until recent months.

That's an image of some of our organizers with youth that we work with who went to Oakland City Council to raise their concerns. We did a banner drop over Highway 880 prior to the vote, and this was the vote to certify the final environmental impact report. In November 2024, I think there were about four or five hours of public comment. There are overflow rooms you don't see here, which is pretty good turnout for an unelected board that is used to operating in the dark.

However, the Port Board of Commissioners did vote to certify the final environmental impact report, and so we are in ongoing litigation. But beyond that as well, we're committed to working with our community to find alternatives, to build that good, to work on legislation, on regulation, and then of course to fight this out in court and hold the court accountable for the impacts it'll have, not only to our immediate communities, but thinking more broadly and strategically by creating demand on our upstream pipeline connected refinery communities.

**Chloe:** All right, at this point, I'm going to invite Ms. Margaret Gordon up to speak. We'll transition to our second presentation in this three-part presentation series, and I'll go ahead and welcome Ms. Gordon. We're tremendously honored to be joined here today by Ms. Margaret. She is the co-founder and co-executive director of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project. She is a widely respected leader and elder of the environmental justice movement in California and across the country. She is a lifetime community activist. She is a pioneer in community science for environmental justice and was the community representative on the California Goods Movement Action Plan Task Force.

In 2013, Ms. Gordon received the prestigious White House Champion of Change Award for her dedication to increasing public engagement in science and science literacy. In 2021, Ms. Gordon became a board member of the Climate Advisory Board to guide the development of science and technology that supports emissions reduction, public health, and environmental justice policy for communities such as West Oakland. She is also a member of the Oakland General Plan for community engagement. In 2023, Ms. Margaret became a community scholar with the Dellums Institute at UC Berkeley. Please join me in welcoming Ms. Margaret.

**Margaret:** Hello, everyone. I am a native of the Bay Area. I'm born in Richmond, California, raised in Bayview-Hunters Point. I've been living in West Oakland since 1992. I went to a meeting in 1994, and I never left. I came in as a community volunteer. I live at 7th and Willow. Everybody knows 7th and Willow is where the post office is. The BART train runs eighteen hours over our head, and we are two blocks from the 880 freeway. There are an exit and entrance into the Port of Oakland.

The Port of Oakland has been a target of West Oakland in my thirty-plus years of being in here since 1992. They have done very minimal amount of emission reduction. But when they talk about it, that they have done this great, fantastic reduction in the last five years with, AB 617, the emission reduction plan on the State of California by 31 percent, but 31 percent, looking at the emission inventory, and the health perspectives, and everything in between is a different trail of understanding.

How bureaucracy does these things really does not really fine-tune, saying that this is really a health reduction to residents in that particular zip code or census tract. All right. This is an old community participatory document that was done, I think in 2007, but it still relates to there. We still try to clean up the air in West Oakland.

This is a snapshot of West Oakland. Now it's less than 65 percent African Americans live there, maybe 27 percent, because of gentrification and reduction of public housing. We have lost a lot of families. A lot of families. We are an industrial neighborhood, surrounded by three freeways, Highways 880, 580, and 980, still today. Even though there's a study to add trucks to 580, which has been prohibited since the '60s, and that, yes, 580 does not allow trucks. If you want to get a truck to go on 580, it has to go over to San Leandro and cross Highway 28

to be applied to go south or north to destination. We still have x-amount of ships, trains, trucks, trains, cargo handling equipment.

We still have, the trucks are the closest thing to the residents, 24/7. Also, right in the middle of the neighborhood is the post office distribution center which has trucks run 24/7. If anything happens in relationship to a truck, or anything, after 5:00PM, you can't find anybody in before 5:00 AM as part of enforcement. We are always at a risk of truck accidents within that corridor of 7th Street and the freeway exit.

We still are five times more likely to have asthma-related hospitalizations within West Oakland, between the zip codes 94607, 94608, and 94612. These are mostly children between the ages of zero and five. We also know that our five-year study, for which I didn't bring the report but is online, that we still have x-amount of emergency service needs of asthma from the five, seven schools within West Oakland. They still have emergency services to kids or children having asthma attacks within at the school.

We also know there are hotspots because wherever the trucks' destinations, in and out of the port, are all within the neighborhood. There's no real isolation except a barrier between where the trucks go in and out of West Oakland, deep into the neighborhood, because what you see from the freeway is not the same as you see in reality every day, like I do for trucks. All the trucks come into West Oakland for services. They don't get them at the port. The port don't even have a service station. They just put out some porta-potties, so the truckers have to come inside of West Oakland to get services, unless for the way stations or something like that. Everything else is inside West Oakland.

Also, with one of our community participatory research documents that we did, called *Clearing the Air*,<sup>2</sup> we estimated that the diesel particulates were so high in a square mile level, of the chart this here, in comparison to other parts of Alameda County. If you look at it at the county and the state, there's much difference in the level of pollution that we inhale. When I first moved to West Oakland over thirty years ago, because I left my windows open, my ceiling was black, smudgy. The partition lines, black and smudgy. You had to wash them every week to just get the stuff out so it looked clean.

Now, it's a dark gray. That's my measurement. That's my reality measurement about the emissions from the trucks, the trains, and the cargo handling equipment of West Oakland. Here is the estimated sources of pollution from within West Oakland. You see over the highway, diesel pollution is, at that time, still high. It still probably is, because one of the things about the City of Oakland, you cannot put an air monitor on utility poles. No, you have to do it. You put air monitors. We deploy air monitors. We have to put them in people's homes. You cannot put devices such as air sensors, air monitors on utility poles in the City of Oakland.

---

2. PACIFIC INST., *CLEARING THE AIR, REDUCING DIESEL POLLUTION IN WEST OAKLAND* (2003), [https://pacinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/clearing\\_the\\_air\\_final1.pdf](https://pacinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/clearing_the_air_final1.pdf) [https://perma.cc/JZ4N-958T].

When we do air monitor of any kind, you have to get permission from a homeowner to be able to put the monitor on the outside of where there's a thoroughfare where trucks are. In Port of Oakland right now, even though they plan on producing air monitors out there, don't have air monitors. All the air monitors are regulatory air monitors that are five or six stories off the ground into the air. It's nothing real close to where people are.

We were the ones who pushed the process about having air monitors close to the ground where people live, work, play, and pray. You see here that we have all these storage peaks and leaks throughout West Oakland. This is an old map. You can see this level of the pollution between the port area and the railroad. One more snapshot is that we have been working towards, if you see the last bullet, the health impacts of these pollutions include health impacts of the premature death, you heard that already, we still have cancer, low-weight babies, and cardiovascular disease.

We got that study from Kaiser Hospital within the last five years. We still have a high rate of people having heart attacks, heart disease in West Oakland in relationship to pollution. We know that the freight movement, moving these trucks and goods and services, we still need places to have walkable communities, pushing the trucks parking out into the port area, and also strengthening the need for more filtration on the rail lines. Still those trains [have not all been] upgraded to have the needed filters for pollution, and also they are not electric trains. We may have, may have, a total of two hundred electric trucks maybe at the Port of Oakland.

Even though up to 95 percent of the port area on the docks, all the ships do plug in, they do still have to release a certain level of exhaust, and they do it in the middle of the night, so you really can't detect it. That's what I thought, that enforcement after 5:00 PM, before 5:00 AM, they're still doing some things that still cause impacts to West Oakland. There's a cost of death, productivity, family life, children going to school within the state of California and West Oakland. East Oakland, Richmond. There's still a cost.

You can see here, the pollution and the environmental justice, we have been at this for so long that we know our income levels are, maybe in some parts of California, have increased but not necessarily, even with the gentrification of new white people moving in and whoever else will have disposable cash, we still have poor people, lots of poor people. You can see here we have had high cancer risk, but also, we also have had lots of data that shows what OSHA has done for us, or should be doing, but the data does not support the data of OSHA. We can never get the data on how the workers on the docks are being impacted from the pollution.

We know in the last five years, a worker had an asthma attack and fell into the water. I know workers who have had asthma had to retire before they were fifty because of the pollution level at the port area. These are some of the things that we can do. Also, one of the things that's not mentioned here is that transportation planning has not been at the table as one of the centerpieces in the conversation about health. That is one of our problems. Planners are not

necessarily being trained when they design freeway, streets, and so forth, that they should be accommodating to what is happening to the people that you design a process for transportation.

One of the problems that we have not really figured out: All planners—housing, transportation, engineer, planner, whoever—you need to have some background and understand the health protections that you should be providing for the people when you come in the most impacted and vulnerable communities, which is not happening. We still are in this argument with planners, especially around rulemaking and permitting. We're still in this argument with the air district, just the same thing with the environmental impact report for the expansion. We still have these arguments because most of those people are from a planning background.

We still have a problem with planning at all junctions and understanding land use, zoning, and proximity that is not being applied to these projects and programs. We have done a lot of work around the rebuilding of the former army base, which was relocated trucks there, truck parking there. Then we had to go back and fight with them about now the no coal terminal, we're still in litigation behind that, and that most of the money that has been for upgrading any infrastructure at the port, the public paid for it.

It's not the polluters who are really paying for it. We didn't have the idea like y'all had in Richmond to really charge the port the way y'all did Chevron, but we do need to have those type of things, container feed, pollution feed, something that needs to be happening. As we look ahead, we're still thriving and working really hard to make West Oakland as viable with resiliency skills and advocacy skills around clean air. Thank you very much.

**Shree Mehrota:** I'm Shree Mehrota. Thank you so much for coming. This is super interesting. I'm from New Jersey, and so I've been looking a lot at New Jersey's environmental justice law that's about permitting reform and ensuring there's more community participation. I was wondering why California doesn't seem to have a similar law and if there's advocacy around that or interest or if better policies are being developed that are more beneficial rather than the New Jersey model, would be interesting to hear your thoughts.

**Margaret:** That's true we do not have that level of policy that making the state be more proactive because we have all these layers. State of California has the California Air Resources Department and a board of directors. Then we have all the other boards of directors like Toxic Substance Control. We have CalEPA. We have all these other layers that are supposed to be protecting us. Having a real joint effort of all these agencies come together and the legislation come together has not been as advantageous as it could be, but we do have AB 617 and we do have the cap and trade. Now everybody don't like the cap and trade, but sometimes you can't win everything but you can win what you can and to do this work.

**Dexter Lim:** Hi, there, I'm Dexter Lim. Thank you so much for speaking. That was so inspirational. Thank you for all your work. My question to you is for us here at Berkeley Law, some of us are Bay Area locals, some of us plan to

stay here after graduation, but many of us are quite transient and only here for the three years that law school is for. That said, this is a community that's nourishing us and supporting us during that time here. I wanted to ask what are your recommendations within that relatively short amount of time, how can Berkeley Law students help contribute back to the Bay Area community?

**Margaret:** Come in with one focus. Don't try to do everything at one time. Stay in your lane and come in with one focus. Not try to be all over everything. As the other professors here, do deep listening. Don't make a lot of assumptions and also make the best of to build relationships and trust. Don't be just sitting at your computer thinking that that's how you're going to get all your information. You've got to walk through the neighborhood. You've got to go through the events. You got to go shake hands with people.

I know you have to work hard to get through law school, but if you want to come into the impacting community, there's a certain type of behavior expectations of you, and don't try to do it by yourself. You have to make those relationships and trust, because if we don't, that's going to be a problem. You're going to have a problem, and we have enough problems, but I'll try to save somebody because they were so dumb, they did some dumb stuff, and we had to go back and clean it up. I don't like wasting my time like that. I got children and grandchildren. They waste my time with them doing some dumb stuff. Not the twenty-five-year-old adult. Okay?

All right. Simultaneously, yes, you are welcome, but stick to one thing. Don't try to do everything at once in the two or three years that you're here because you going to be a problem.

