

Will Huntsberry ([00:00:16](#)):

Thank you all for being here. Thank you for this awesome turnout. I think this is one of the coolest panels here and one of the biggest issues that Southern California and the rest of the Southwest faces. How on earth are we all gonna share the Colorado River? My name's Will Hunts Berry. I'm a senior investigative reporter with Voice of San Diego. We put this thing on. We do our best to hold public officials accountable and to try to help you understand how to interact with your government in ways that will make a difference and an impact. And that's what today is all about. Also we really love it when you give us money too.

Will Huntsberry ([00:12:31](#)):

I have a very long list of sponsors and we love them all equally for supporting civic affairs. They are the College of Arts and Sciences at U U S D A A R P, Burnham Center for Community Advancement, the San Diego County Water Authority, the San Diego Foundation, Atlantis, California American Water, Cox. I don't know who some of these are, but I do love them. San Diego Housing Federation, Burna Moore Center for Real Estate at USD's Now School of Business, planned Parenthood Hit Ski Development, climate Action Campaign, Novo Brewing and K P B S. I saw Andrew Bowen out there somewhere. What's up? Yeah, so take it away.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:13:17](#)):

Thanks very much, will. Good morning everyone. Welcome to Politic 2023. I'm Mackenzie Elmer. I'm the Environment reporter for Voice of San Diego. I cover water in the Colorado River. And if you were here for the previous discussion, you learned about California's biggest water deal, which all had to do with San Diego securing more Colorado River Water in order to grow into our sprawling metropolis that we are today. And I think that's the first point to make here for this particular panel, the future of the Colorado River. If you haven't noticed, the United States kind of turns into a desert west of the Rocky Mountains, yet we have these huge cities like Las Vegas, Phoenix Los Angeles, and not to mention multi-billion dollar agricultural industries in Arizona and California. We're in all kinds of produce year round using the Desert Sun. So none of this would exist today without the Colorado River.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:14:08](#)):

And if you don't know how it works, basically the Colorado River is fed by snowpack in the Rocky Mountains and it flows, or it used to flow all the way to the Gulf of California and Mexico. And we've engineered these massive pipes and canals and pump water over mountain ranges to get it where it needs to go. And it took years of legal and political battles to get states and Mexico to agree on how to divvy up that river water because water equals development, growth, and expansion. Except there's this big sticking point everyone needs to know about. The original dudes that, and yes, they were all dudes that split up the river, gave everyone the right to draw more water than the river actually contains. So we started this whole westward expansion on some kind of bad math. And then in the late 1990s, we started really experiencing some massive long grueling droughts.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:14:57](#)):

And we made a bunch of hard fought deals especially between Arizona and California. And that was using more water than its Share California was. And we tried to get them to use less. And so we got we had to make all these agreements and how we were gonna get through all of these different droughts. And so now basically all of those deals that we made during that time, they sort of expire in 2026. This is this big scary date that we're facing, and somehow the federal government is hoping that all seven

states and Mexico eventually will voluntarily compromise, voluntarily compromise on how to use much less water than we're using now. So here today, we have some very important people who are in charge of making these decisions representing California the panel today we have Adel Hagekhalil.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:15:44](#)):

He's the general manager of the Metropolitan Water Authority of Southern California. And he joined us today and well, we actually have two replacing one of our other panelists that you may have seen on the schedule. We also have JB Hamby, who is the chair, what is it, the chairman of the Colorado River Board is what we're saying. That's right. Okay. Yes. And, and also a district representative from the Imperial Irrigation District. Not wearing that hat, but yeah. <Laugh>. Right. and then we also have Jeff Kittinger, who is the retired general manager of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. And he he also is here today, sort of representing the Imperial Irrigation team. He really now works for, it's kind of spicy that you're here today, but represents Qui Consulting and he's a consultant for Imperial Irrigation District.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:16:33](#)):

And we also have Brenda Berman, the general manager of the Central Arizona Project. And she was appointed in January. And I'm also really stoked to have you here because you formerly served as a commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and you're the first woman to do so, I think since they were all men since 1894 until you, so that is pretty 1902. 1902, okay. So that was pretty cool. Yeah, yeah. Snaps for women on, on water. So we, I would like to start with like, let's, let's look at the task ahead of all, all of you guys who are, you know, at the table a lot for negotiating Colorado River Water. So the federal government has asked us all to use less. Colorado River Water. Can, you could maybe Jeff start off and can put that into perspective for me. Like, how much less water do we actually need to use? We started off with some bad math. What, how much less do we need to use now to keep the river going?

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:17:31](#)):

Happy to do it. And thank you McKenzie and I for any of you who got up close to see McKenzie's badge. Oh, it says Catastrophe reporter. And I was going

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:17:40](#)):

Unofficially, but officially

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:17:42](#)):

I don't think what's really a catastrophe on the Colorado River. We, we are working to solve the problem, but it is a tremendous problem. When she mentioned it was over allocated in the very beginning from the outset the states divided up 15 million acre feet, thinking that was about right. Later on, we gave another million and a half acre feet to Mexico as part of it treaty we didn't take into account evaporation. So you basically spoke for dividing up somewhere around 18 million acre feet on a river that back then was producing 14 million acre feet. And right now is producing about 11 or 12 thanks to climate change and it's shrinking. And Jeff,

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:18:27](#)):

Could I ask, could you also stop and what's an acre? Feet or

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:18:30](#)):

Foot? Yeah, it's,

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:18:31](#)):

How much water

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:18:32](#)):

Is that an acre foot? You know, we don't use gallons in our business. When I was at Metropolitan, we served 2 billion gallons a day. So when people start talking gallons, we go, well, X trillion. So we use acre foot. An acre foot is a farming reference to water. It's an acre of land, one foot deep in water. And this part's a little odd. It's about 326,000 gallons. So when we talk about millions of acre feet, you'd multiply that by 326,000 gallons, and you get that many trillion gallons. It, it serves One acre foot serves about three households for an entire year. So you're talking big amounts of water. The Colorado River we're, is producing though less than it used to. And that's thanks to climate change. And we're using more than it. We are using probably about a million and a half acre feet more than is coming in every year.

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:19:31](#)):

Well, obviously not sustainable. We've been drawing down the reservoirs and now Brenda's old department, the Bureau of Reclamation is basically telling us, the states figure it out. How are you going to stop using a million and a half acre feet? That's a massive amount of water to cut. Look at su the whole of Nevada gets 330,000 acre feet a year. Arizona gets 2.8 million acre feet a year, and we're gonna find one and a half million acre feet to reduce that's hundreds of thousands of acres of farming. That's millions of people's water that we have to figure out a way to collaboratively somehow make that reduction and make it stick. So it's a monumental task. We need to come up with it, as you said, by 2026. So all the states are working, they're negotiating, they're trying to figure this out, and, and it's gonna be the hardest. There's been a lot of hard negotiations on the river. This is gonna be the hardest one that's ever happened. Thank

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:20:33](#)):

You very much. And so, why is 2026 such an important year on the Colorado River? Brenda, maybe could you jump in and explain, like, this is, it seems like not that far away, especially in terms of how long it usually takes to make water deals on the Colorado River, which is like what decades, often.

Brenda Burman ([00:20:49](#)):

Thanks, Mackenzie. I I think you did a good job of setting us up in the beginning. I, so back in the year 2000, our major infrastructure and on the Colorado River our forebearers had the vision to put in major infrastructure. So we have Hoover Dam and Lake Mead. We have Glen Canyon and Lake Powell, and together, along with all the other reservoirs, they hold more than four times the average flow of the river. Now maybe getting closer to five times the average flow. If you look at any other river in the system, say the Sacramento or either the Columbia, Rio Grande, they just, they don't come even close. Most of them don't even have storage for one year. So we've had this great system that can hold water when it's wet and I, and then deliver it when it's dry. But what we did is back in the year 2000, we were basically full like 19 nine, the nineties had been fairly wet.

Brenda Burman ([00:21:45](#)):

We had a, we had full reservoirs, and then it started to do something we hadn't really seen before. Like there had been dry periods on the river in the recorded record, like particularly back in the 1950s. But it

went really dry. 2002 was the driest year any of us had ever seen in our lives or in the recorded record. And it kept getting drier. And we lost half, half the reservoirs, like 50%. We, none of us had ever seen 50%. You know, that was back when they were filling, they were 50%. And it's scared everyone, like they realized like, we are in drought. And so the seven basin states came together and a number of other interests. Some who I see in this room and put together a plan with the United States to say we need to have shortage criteria. We didn't have any rules for shortage at the time.

Brenda Burman (00:22:34):

And that was the 2007 guidelines. And, but the problem with the 2007 guidelines, one, they'd never done it before. So they said, we're gonna do this for 20 years. This is not an experiment, but it's, we're gonna learn from it. It's about looking at operations between Lake Powell and Lake Mead, how we if the reservoirs drop, how do we take reductions between our states. But at that point, we were in a 2007 year drought and we thought that was the worst we'd ever seen. We were talking about climate change, but we didn't really have all the science behind it. But here we are, 23. In 2023, we are in 23 years of drought. We exacerbated by climate change. The river has dropped, the average of the river has dropped, but those rules run out at the end of 2026. And so we need a whole new scheme of how to run the river.

Brenda Burman (00:23:24):

Or some people might say, no, just do the same thing. You know, just tweak it a little bit. But that's the big question in front of us. So we do wish we'd started earlier, <laugh> but we've been working together very closely, you know, through the teens into the twenties, we've all been working on how do we shore up Lake Mead because we've realized we need more and more water to do that. Right? And as I started three years ago, trying to report on this massive issue that's very complicated with lots of history I learned that Lake Mead is kind of like this thermometer on the, on the river, right? And that's kind of what's been baked into these agreements you just talked about. To kind of recap that, you know, the level of Lake Mead kind of determines like oh, the level, the reservoir is drops to X amount.

Brenda Burman (00:24:09):

And that literally triggers, you know, different states or like whole cities have to use less water and, and even Mexico. And I think, wasn't it last year that the drought got so bad that it was the first time you really had to trigger these like rules you guys all agree to on how people would cut their water use during drought. I mean, Mexico had to reduce its use, which is, I just wanted to side sideline on that. We don't have Mexico or the American Indian tribes represented on this panel. Let me just make note of that. Or Nevada, or Yes. Or Nevada <laugh>. Thanks. Thanks to Southwest, Southwest doing what it does best. It delayed our John Ensminger from Las Las Vegas and Southern Nevada Water Authority from being with us today. But so anyway, back to this sort of like thermometer situation.

Brenda Burman (00:24:54):

And so that's what expires in 2026. These agree, you guys all agreed to how you're gonna use less water and now you're gonna have to kind of do it again, basically. Yes. I mean, I, I think there's a lot of creative ideas out there. There's a lot of people trying to work together because in some ways the, the current guidelines rules worked in that, while we haven't gone into crisis, but a year ago we were really close and we've been realizing really since around 2013 that all the modeling and future looking and prognostications we made in 2007, they just weren't good enough. The river keeps getting smaller. And

so right now we do look at the elevation. We look at the elevation of Lake Powell and Lake Mead, what will it be on January 1st of every year? And that's what the rule is for the whole year.

Brenda Burman ([00:25:45](#)):

So in 2023, we're in a tier two a drought in Arizona. What that has meant is we took 592,000 acre foot reduction. No one paid us any money for that. We took that hit, we shut down water to agriculture in an entire county. That's over a hundred thousand acres. They, some of them had groundwater somewhere over to make some deals with cities to move some water around, but we cut off water to agriculture in 2023. And that's not an easy thing to do. These are not easy decisions we're facing whether it's the future or how we're handling it right now. But what's incredible about 2023 is we have known, we've made significant steps, whether it was in 2019 drought contingency plans 20 this last year. We have all come together and put forward really massive amounts of water

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:26:43](#)):

To help protect Lake Mead and to help protect really our future because we all depend on Lake Mead and the Colorado River. Right? And that's where this kind of got really interesting in the last year is we had this huge, massive drought that everybody was freaking out. We had you know, everybody was already taking cuts, Arizona taking huge cuts. And that's, and another really important piece of this, how this all functions on the Colorado River is the law of the river, right? The compact that back in 1922 to then eventually Arizona, like, what, like 17 years later or something. 22 years later, everybody signed on to this agreement that said, you know, you, you know who gets cut or sorry, who has rights to water for the longest period of time. Maybe, maybe JB you can jump in and explain.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:27:30](#)):

'Cause Imperial Irrigation District, for instance, or Imperial Valley, they have some of the senior rider water rights in the Colorado River. So Arizona has to take a huge cut. When there's a drought, their farmers may have to suffer, but Imperial Valley for the way this law is set up their farmers do not. And so we had this huge drought and states had to come together to try to like make some sort of voluntary plan right on how to, how to deal with the, can someone jump in and talk about what happened there and maybe the Imperial Valley? That'd be a good one for you.

JB Hamby ([00:28:02](#)):

Yeah, happy to bring my California hat as the representative for the state. So last June the Reclamation commissioner, Camille Tootin met with the lower basin states here in San Diego and said, we have a problem. We need the lower basin or the basin as a whole to cut one and a half to 3 million acre feet basically in 60 days. Come up with a plan.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:28:25](#)):

That's easy. Yeah, easy enough.

JB Hamby ([00:28:27](#)):

As you heard from the prior panel, coming up with 800,000 acre feet a year of practically in perpetuity reductions for California was a huge deal. Now, trying to do that on an interstate basis between the seven basin states and do it basically in less than two months, that was a tall task. So the states at that point were not able to come up with that. A few weeks later after that meeting, there was testimony in Congress, you said, we need two to 4 million acre feet, which is a little bit of a jump. And so the states

worked feverishly trying to hammer out some agreements. There was obviously some difference of views and perspectives on how to come up with that. And the states were not able to make an agreement at that time. She still said, we really do need a deal.

JB Hamby ([00:29:10](#)):

California and California's agencies being the Imperial Irrigation District, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Coachella Valley Water District and the Palo Verde Irrigation District all came together and said, Hey, this really is important. If we don't have a plan between the lower basin states, we are on a crash course to a point where you get to something called Deadpool at Lake Mead, where you draw down the reservoir to such a low elevation that you physically cannot pass water through the dam. That means agricultural communities like the Yuma Valley or the Imperial Valley, no water, the Mexicali Valley, or the pipe that goes up to Tijuana, no water at all, metropolitans aqueduct empty. And the c a p empty as well, that is, was a non-starter. So California's agencies came together and said, we're willing to step up 400,000 acre feet for the end of these, for the duration of these current guidelines.

JB Hamby ([00:30:06](#)):

Our hope was that would spur the other states to step up with some of these efforts as well. The Congress last year, due to Sinema Senator S's efforts and leveraging that 50 50 position in the Senate and her, you know, sort of tie-breaking thing there, was able to get \$4 billion for Western drought really targeted for the Colorado River Basin. Unfortunately we only were able to count to one out of the seven basin states at that time. And so the commissioner said, we really are serious about this. The hydrology's not getting any better. So she set forward this ss e i s process, supplemental environmental impact statement to basically take those rules from 2007 that are set to go until 2026, open them up and revise them, and said, we would really like a consensus between the states and

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:30:54](#)):

Basically just because there's a lot of terminology here that I, I almost tried to create a key so we could follow along with different acronyms, but that the

JB Hamby ([00:31:01](#)):

New ones are being made every day.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:31:02](#)):

It looked messy. Yeah. So S D I s basically what they said, right, was this, the federal government was like, okay, drought's really bad. We have, you know, we have 2026 coming up where we're gonna all make new rules, but to get us through because there's literally not enough water for everybody. Let's come up with a temporary plan. And that's what this s c I s situation is, right? Yeah.

JB Hamby ([00:31:22](#)):

That was, that was the intent to really tell the states we're serious and we're, we're coming up with it. We'd like to have that consensus framework. And this is the way the Colorado River has been managed for the last 20 years. Starting in 2001, there was a plan to divvy up the surplus, and then 2007 it was shortage, 2019 D C P, it was even worse situation. And this was even worse. Even worse. So she asked basically from December through January to come up with a plan. And unfortunately where we ended up at at that point is we had the other six basin states come up with a consensus approach, which we disagreed that the idea of consensus is not having one included in that. Yeah.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:32:00](#)):

That was a pretty spicy moment, right. Where the six basin states, there's seven of them, right? There's Colorado, Wyoming, six, six, yeah. Okay. Six against Cal, four upper basin states. Right? I, I shouldn't have tried to list 'em up, but yes, six, seven basin states. But everybody kind of teamed up against California in one hot moment at, at one point. And then was it, I i, was it Imperial Valley that's kind of stepped up and offered some water at one point? Maybe even Lin or Jeff can step in if you want, since you're sort of maybe also ripper. I

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:32:26](#)):

Mean, what we did is actually offered 400,000 acre feet as California, right?

JB Hamby ([00:32:31](#)):

Yeah. And so basically at, at that point we had the six states versus California. But fortunately once the press went wild, there was a lot of ink spilled over that period of time in January, which was —

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:32:41](#)):

I think I contributed to that.

JB Hamby ([00:32:42](#)):

Which was less than pleasant. We were able to come back together after the newspapers started, stopped churning out the, the front page headlines, and we were able to let cooler heads prevail in over this late winter, this year and spring, we had a couple of positive developments. We had the states actually talking to each other, small groups, actually having frank open dialogue. And then it rained and snowed and snowed. It rained, and we had one pineapple express after the other. So by basically the end of May, we were able to come up with an agreement between Arizona, California, and Nevada what we call the lower basin plan that pledged 3 million acre feet of water from 2023 until 2026. And unprecedented historic amount of water that's going to be left at Lake Mead, part of it's uncompensated and part of it is compensated. And that takes into account agricultural, urban, and tribal interests throughout the lower basin. Yeah.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:33:38](#)):

So to recap, we had this terrible drought leading up and everybody was getting a little tense. And then we had this miracle rain, this miracle winter, which brought unprecedented, you know, record breaking, record shattering rains that sort of cooled the tension perhaps on the Colorado River. Oh, no, it's, Jeff, wanna jump in and offer a thought there. The,

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:33:57](#)):

The only thing is we, We had a respite.

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:34:00](#)):

And a respites good. But the trend is going down. Yeah. And we have to reverse the trend. And the states, particularly

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:34:07](#)):

The lower basin states, as JB said, I have really worked, are working really hard to come up with a plan that would be sustainable for the future. But, you know, it's gonna be incredibly hard. The people that have to live with this plan moving forward are going to be the Central Arizona project, the Metropolitan Water District. They're Imperial Valley. They're going to have to come up with a way to get reductions in water use that are gonna be permanent in long term.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:34:33](#)):

We got, we got a lifeline and we got a break, but doesn't take the responsibility. I think we have a little more time to really develop the plan and, and, and what we need to figure that out. What does that mean? And I, I said it also, it's not about just future use cuts, cuts, cuts. We all have to collaborate on building the infrastructure. For example, in metropolitan, we are in a great place because Metropolitan is actually at joins two watersheds, right? We have the, in, in the Sierras. We have the Sacramento area and state water project. We have the Colorado, and sometimes we have surplus. And right now there is some water. We can't even move into our area 'cause the conveyance system is not there. Imagine if we have the conveyance system and have the other states partner with us on building the infrastructure to the future to move water.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:35:22](#)):

It may help us put and park more water in Lake Mead. I think part of the negotiations expanding the, the storage and the, the intentionally creative storage in Lake Mead, we cannot just cap it. We have to be able to, when we have water available to us, we need to be able to store it and not lose it. There is a lot of creative idea that have to happen to help us really shore up what we need to do. But the bottom line, we all have to go on diets. We all have to tighten. But it's not just the lower basins. Everybody should also be part of it. You know, smart, responsible water management should be everywhere. Urban communities also need to be protected as ag communities and using efficiency in both and how we invest is gonna be critical. And I use the term right now with the Inflation reduction Act.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:36:11](#)):

We are applying for large money that will transform how we the landscaping in Southern California as we have done in the past. But this is gonna move nonfunctional through from a different place. And I use the 300,000 acre feet of water that we can save. We are building the largest recycled water project in partnership with our Arizona and Nevada. We're talking to Los Angeles City about partnering and joining their project with our project and making it 300,000 acre feet of recycled water and how we can increase that. So there is a potential, but it can't be on the backs of the rate payers in our region. It has to be part of a shared responsibility. So

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:36:51](#)):

Yeah, I think we can unpack that in a little bit here. What you're, because you mentioned a lot of different points there, and I think just bringing us back to kind of the timeline of how we're moving along in this process. So again, we had the drought, we had the rain, and then in the middle of all that, the federal government, you said the Inflation reduction act, Biden administration put billions of dollars on the table and said, okay, here's a chunk of money. We're gonna pay for conservation, we're gonna pay to use less. We're gonna pay you guys to use less water. Like, please submit applications and let us know how you would like to use this money. And so that's kind of like where, where we were at with the drought, where that money was maybe like a really good negotiation point, right?

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:37:31](#)):

For working with farmers, working with the urban centers, because that's this constant tension on the Colorado River, right? Growing cities need the water, but we also have our farming communities. And so then, but then it rained and we still have this money on the table. And so maybe you guys could talk about kind of like maybe we could start with Brenda. What, like, how are, how are you preparing to make some of these cuts or like what kinds of ways has Arizona offered to the federal government so far, and how to conserve water, you know, kind of going forward? So I'm not sure how many people are familiar with the Central Arizona project. Very good. <Laugh>. We got one. We've got one, two. I appreciate it. Let me share a little bit. So the Central Arizona project was the product of just decades of work by Arizonans to get a project built to use our cal, use our Colorado River water inside Arizona. So we have on river communities who have been using the water for a long time, some more recent

Brenda Burman ([00:38:36](#)):

But that project was authorized in 1968, and it's really an engineering marvel. And in some ways, you know, almost similar, if you know, the metropolitan system, we have a large aqueduct that brings water across the entire state, 336 miles. We raise water 3000 feet in different areas to get the water to Phoenix area through the Pinal County down to the Tucson area. And so we deliver to the major cities of Arizona, over 80% of the population, about 6.1 million people. A lot of, we used to deliver to a lot of agriculture, not so much anymore. But I, when you look at our system, so we have so many different interests, and I know you face similar situations probably with your own water district. What we've been looking at is, one, we have taken the first cuts. We've taken that without anyone handing us a dollar bill to do it.

Brenda Burman ([00:39:31](#)):

But we know we have this future issue. We also knew we had this interim problem, what we were, what were we going to do until 2026? We've been very lucky to have a wet year wet, not amazing, wet and it was a good year. But what we also put on the table is this 3 million acre feet. And so that federal money has allowed our cities, our tribes, overwhelmingly our tribes to step up some of our agriculture and to accept payment for water to leave behind in Lake Mead compensated conservation. And what that does is it allows them to take that funding and invest in their own infrastructure, invest in their own conservation programs. And it's about building resiliency, like getting ready for how to live with less water. And that means different things to different communities. I know that's the same in California.

Brenda Burman ([00:40:23](#)):

You know, LA might probably has different resources than otai, you know, I mean, it just, it's completely different depending where you live. So some cities have lots of different resources, groundwater, maybe local rivers others don't and rely completely on the Colorado River. So our job is to make sure that everyone can be more resilient, that we can live to, we can learn to live with less water. And this year just within the communities that are served by my project we have I think about 300,000 acre feet on the table of new conservation this year. So it's an incredible start. A lot of that water will go away if there are deeper cuts. So it won't be there to conserve in a couple years perhaps. So we're talking about a temporary cut, right? Like you're temporarily offering this big chunk of water, and how much is 300,000 acre feet to what Arizona gets normally from the Colorado River?

Brenda Burman ([00:41:23](#)):

Just put into context for everyone. I, so between, I probably don't have all the numbers. Our cut this year, which was 592,000 acre feet, our reduction was about 24%, I think. And you just had to take that, right? Because that's what the law river says. We just took, that was uncompensated, right? Then you throw in the compensated. So that's 900,000 divided by 2.8 million. Okay, well, I'm not a calculator. I wish I could do that in my head, but, but, so, but now the, the point is that the federal government is able to like, help pay for some of this conservation instead of just you taking it on for free.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:41:56](#)):

It's two buckets. I mean, the first one is conservation, but there is a second, but which a permanent reduction. I mean, the first one was a, you know, what's called bucket one, let's

Brenda Burman ([00:42:05](#)):

Call it long term.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:42:06](#)):

You know, there is long-term investments and short term investment. <Laugh> one is like stop the hemorrhaging quick. The other one is how are we gonna save the patient, right? And, and I think to me, in metropolitan, we submitted a, I think it's very robust application on, on this bucket too, which is a long term. That includes basically converting our non-functional turf, doing direct install in communities that are disadvantage. What is

Brenda Burman ([00:42:31](#)):

Non, what is non-functional

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:42:32](#)):

Function, non-functional turf is actually decorative grass. Our, our friends, if John was here, he will tell you how much they've done in, in Nevada, in Vegas. But really it's taken this effort. There's assembly bill 1572 that's on the governance desk to sign for us to mandate that we don't water non-functional turfs. So if a turf, it's only for decorative purposes only to be just, you know, mowed by a gardener, not to be used by animals or kids that's non-functional. And we want to convert that. So we think by our investments that we can actually create 300,000 acre feet permanently in, in savings. We're looking at direct install for disadvantaged communities where there's some communities in our region that haven't been able to access rebates and we want to go and do it. We're creating more local water supply, storm water efforts. There's communities, I'll give you an example of, of a community in central basin.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:43:27](#)):

Five cities have access to groundwater rights, but they don't have the infrastructure to extract water and use it. We are actually, as part of this offer, is we gonna go in and, and build the infrastructure to give them access to their groundwater rights, and that would now allow us to save that water they use from doing it. But also just the recycled water program and some of the stuff. So what we put on the table, a a robust effort, I think in asco, \$400 million, four 20, it's, it's also very holistic and, and doing it. I want to add to, I think what Brenda said is Southern California, and you guys can take pride in it. We actually were able to put 2 million acre feet of water in Lake Mead over the years, about 20 feet of additional elevation that deferred a lot of these cuts.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:44:17](#)):

I mean, I think we deferred the, a lot of this pain that we're going through by our actions through conservation. So without being compensated for it, we put it in and almost, you know, it's, it's part of our storage and what we put in to use. So to me, I think we need to think differently. And, and in this collaborative effort building the infrastructure to move water and provide flexibility, we're doing a storage system in Antelope Valley that we do in the ribbon cutting this month that can put 300,000 acre feet in storage and do 70 thousand acre feet of take. That is a huge benefit to everyone in the region. So we're gonna be doing a lot of that stuff and we need to talk about how we can all partner in it. Right?

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:44:59](#)):

So this this money from Biden kind of helped spur some innovative ideas that haven't yet been granted the funding, right? We're still an appli. We're you guys are still waiting to hear what the federal government will agree to help pay for in order to conserve water? Correct. I mean, so the, there's, there's the short term and the long-term investment, the short-term investment, those have mostly been signed in Arizona. So that water's being saved in 2023. And some of our some of our deals are more straightforward than the ones in California, so they're still negotiating. But the long-term deals, yes, we're waiting, people put in their applications in August, and we're waiting to see kind of what happens with the federal government. Yeah, I wanted to touch on Imperial Irrigation District, Imperial Valley here, and, and also the uniqueness of this panel.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:45:44](#)):

We have, you know, Jeff Kler, the former metropolitan gm, and we have the current gm, which I appreciate you both being here and in your retirement. You're now sort of consulting or working with Imperial Valley. And Imperial Valley is, as we know, if you've stuck around for the last panel, very powerful in the Colorado River, very, very powerful agricultural community that has rights, senior rights are basically like they're the last, one of the last to get cut if there's a drought, you know, whereas Arizona has to take on shoulder a lot of cuts. It's just how the way the law works. So if you could talk about either, yeah, if you could talk about kind of like what Imperial Valley is working with the federal government on in terms of conservation in this short term, or as there may be some more long-term conservation on the table.

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:46:29](#)):

You know, the, the basic premise of Western water law was always first in time, first in, right? And the farmers got here first, and they were farming first before the cities began to grow. So they had the senior water rights, and that's the, you know, 1 0 1 principle. And so as we work through this principle of reducing water typically the junior water rights, which, you know, historically have been the cities and urban interests have been the ones on the reduction line. And then they have turned around and sort of said, well, we've got millions of people here. We think the farmers should give more. And you have this tension that's been going on for quite a while. What you heard the last panel really talked about was how the whole Q ss A in California was to work out agriculture, to urban transfers with the urban SEC sectors, paying money for the agriculture sectors to grow more efficiently and move that water.

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:47:25](#)):

Obviously a lot of friction, a lot of pain. But eventually a market type solution was able to be effectuated. And we've had 20 years of implementation that has worked pretty well for California. We reduced our water usage by 800,000 acre feet ag to urban moving that water. And the biggest mover of that water was the Imperial Valley. They've, they are moving about half a million acre feet of water.

Some, you know if you look at their math, they were using about 3 million acre feet. They're using half a million less and still remarkably growing the same amount of produce all through efficiency. That water's coming to San Diego, it's coming to la, it's and that is a success story. Now we're being asked to repeat it. Well, they picked all the low hanging fruit, they picked all the obvious things, you know, we lined the canals, we built the systems, and now the idea of repeating it is now gonna get really hard.

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:48:26](#)):

Really have to really drill down into it. And so, you know, the people of Imperial Valley are looking at how much more can we do? And again, and the urban sectors, how much more can we pay for? But it has to get done. And so that's why we're out here working it. And that's what the Imperial folks are taking a hard look at. So the kind of things they're looking at in these bucket two processes are the really next tier of really getting into smaller, you know, not the easy things of just lining a quick earth canal, but now getting into very sophisticated, capturing water at the end of the farm, pumping it back up, using it, a lot of infrastructure built on farms a lot more effort into it, laser leveling, all the, all the equipment that you want to do with a very high tech farming, they've been doing a lot of it, you know, moving, shifting to drip irrigation on every inch. All of that's been happening and now it's gonna have to happen even more and on steroids, so to speak.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:49:24](#)):

Yeah, right. So, and we're still only talking about this temporary fix. We're, we've just spent the last like 15 minutes talking about getting us through these next two years. And that's what that federal money's on the table for. And now, I mean, we haven't even gotten to the 2026 negotiations, which

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:49:40](#)):

Some of it will be permanent, which will help the 26, but the 26 negotiate, it'll, they'll move on. But the 26 negotiations are gonna have to just do that much more. Yeah. And that, that's the hard part.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:49:50](#)):

Can somebody put into context, like how do we know how much water the federal government's asking us to really cut

JB Hamby ([00:49:56](#)):

For

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:49:57](#)):

20, 26 and beyond? Yeah. Yeah.

JB Hamby ([00:49:59](#)):

So, right. So the, the Fed certainly last year when we were looking like we're going to reach critical elevations at, at Lake Mead and Lake Powell, they put

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:50:06](#)):

Like, so that everybody's in trouble. That's what you

JB Hamby ([00:50:08](#)):

Mean. Yeah. They put specific numbers out at the time. At this point, we're in the early stages for our post 2026 process. So the seven basin states, the respective lower and upper basins and individual states put in their comments to help guide this process. So reclamation at this point, the feds are largely being a facilitator. They'll come out with what they're looking at a consensus view about what this process should be and what problems we're supposed to solve. But at least at this point, the states are largely taking the lead and identifying a few issues that we're largely in consensus about. And one of the core ones is achieving supply and demand balance within the basin. And that number is pretty large, at least the numbers we've been kicking around in the lower basin to be able to solve the amount of use we have between Arizona, Nevada California and Mexico, versus the amount of a supply that we have available to us. It's probably in the neighborhood of somewhere around 1.2 to 1.5 million acre feet per year, just under these current circumstances. Looking over the last 20 years, looking into the future, is that

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:51:14](#)):

A permanent reduction? 1.5 million? I

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:51:16](#)):

Think Jeff hit it in the beginning where we're over. I mean, we're looking, talking about 11 million acre foot river. And the question is, how can you ensure that you are actually not over spending? Like you're getting your paycheck, but, but you're overspending, <laugh> and eventually you're gonna go bankrupt. And I think that's the thing is how can we live within our means? What is that number that we need to shoot for and how we either we have to make up supply or we have to reduce consumption. Just this is the only solution. I mean, that's

JB Hamby ([00:51:50](#)):

Basically

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:51:51](#)):

It. And when we have rain and we have more water, how we can store it. So when we have dry conditions and at 10, 11 million acre feet in the river, we're able to make up the difference through storage everywhere. So yeah, I mean, we have to cut. I mean that's the reality. And it's not just cut. My whole discussion is not just cuts, it's also solutions of new water supply storage options, flexible to move water. That's the future also to help us. Yeah,

JB Hamby ([00:52:20](#)):

That's kind

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:52:21](#)):

Of a, oh, go ahead. Yeah.

JB Hamby ([00:52:21](#)):

Yeah. And I think another thing to put on there that complicates matters a little bit is trying to, these are the numbers that we know that we've been dealing with for the, the last 20 or so years, but trying to look into a future where the conditions we've been seeing in the Colorado River Basin are very erratic and constantly changing. And so there are some things that we can have some certainty about. It's

largely going to be a lot hotter and drier into the future, and we should be anticipating that. But there's a lot of uncertainty in the future. So we know within a certain range of some certain, there's no knowns, but there's a lot of unknown unknowns to use some Donald Rumsfeld phrasing that we have to be anticipating. Yeah.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:53:01](#)):

I wanna talk about this, this, this data collaborative discussion we just had recently. We are actually mapping and getting, 'cause every time you have a snowpack, the question is how much water in this snowpack that's critical. We need to use data to know. 'cause You can't use the history to predict the future. We need to use data and also we need to know how dry the condition of the earth. Or there is. San Diego here is doing some putting monitors to know how dry the soil is in the watershed. So when we have runoff, we know how much is gonna get into our rivers and and lakes. So data is gonna be also something that we all have to invest in to help us model the future and know what's coming down. Right.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:53:42](#)):

You got scientists up trying to measure the snowpack with like instruments. I understand. Yeah. It's, we still don't know exactly like how much water's coming into the system from the snowpack that we have all the time. So you mentioned supply, 'cause we, you said it's not all about cuts, cuts, cuts. You mentioned supply. So I wanted to ask you all, are you out shopping for water and where from maybe anyone?

JB Hamby ([00:54:05](#)):

So I think, you know, one thing back historically speaking, so in 1968 when the Central Arizona project was authorized also among, among a lot of other things that were put into that legislation was the, the federal government was given this obligation to go and generate a lot

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:54:20](#)):

Of water

JB Hamby ([00:54:21](#)):

To help cover for Mexico and to, to generate augmentation. So 2023 now 1968 has been a while. There has not been a, a whole lot of augmentation that's been developed. But certainly I think through this process more recently there's been efforts to identify some reuse, recycling opportunities. And I think folks are trying to get creative. There were, back in the past, big ideas about importing water from the Columbia basin into the Colorado River Basin, which there were at least another part of that legislation at the time was a ban on even talking about it for years, 10

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:54:54](#)):

Years. And Mississippi River. Wasn't that also on the table? Like someone brought up can we, the Great

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:54:58](#)):

Lakes?

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:54:58](#)):

The Great Lakes was, was a big target at

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:55:00](#)):

One point, which I, as a Wisconsinite would be very not happy about. Probably

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:55:03](#)):

They're big we can share. Yeah,

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:55:05](#)):

I guess they are great. Yeah, they're maybe we can share. And then they passed legislation that you can't go near them or talk about them. Oh, okay. That's already happened. Okay. Well, okay. Well the other thing I was gonna, well

JB Hamby ([00:55:14](#)):

You, I didn't know if you

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:55:14](#)):

Wanted to talk about the interstate recycling

JB Hamby ([00:55:17](#)):

Project that guys

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:55:18](#)):

Are working on

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:55:18](#)):

Right now. I mean, to me is, is that's where the future is and, and we need to find where is the best place to do it. You know, we're doing this pure water Southern California and cars in recycling 150 million gallons a day, which is 150,000 acre feet. We're talking about also partnering with Los Angeles to join the two and get it up to 300,000 acre feet. We're looking at potentially desal in do Heen in South Orange County and how we can expand this. There's a lot of opportunities for us to do a lot of it, but who should carry the cost of this? And that's why we started this partnership. Jeff was there when we started the partnership with Arizona and Nevada. And, and I think what we need to open our blinders. I mean, I mean, some people say, why should I give 'em good water and take the bad water? I mean, there's a lot of things that we have to deal with. But the technology is so good now that we know it's proven. Orange County in our area has done amazing work with their program. In, in, in 130 million gallons a day is being recycled and put into the ground for the area

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:56:26](#)):

Where I live

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:56:26](#)):

Getting water out, can we now partner across the

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:56:30](#)):

Watershed and

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:56:32](#)):

Now we're talking Arizona and Nevada.

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:56:34](#)):

But

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:56:34](#)):

That can be applied across

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:56:35](#)):

The board to do that

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:56:37](#)):

And, and how we can do it to build and maybe Mexico

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:56:40](#)):

Can build de cell or

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:56:42](#)):

Some treatment of recycled water in Tijuana or along the New River or something that we can benefit from it to

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:56:48](#)):

Put water in lake meat and Lake Powell.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:56:49](#)):

Right. Well, so is that allowed right now in the way that the law of the river works and Jeff's Yeah. Jump in Jeff and kind of maybe, 'cause you guys are basically Arizona, Nevada are investing in your water recycling project in Los Angeles. That's like one form of kind of interstate col collaboration, but like, is it allowed to do water

Jeff Kightlinger ([00:57:11](#)):

Training? Well, interstate transfers are not really allowed, but exchanges, which, so this is why, what's the difference? US lawyers like to use, US lawyers are very good at using our words. Exchanges on the other hand have been allowed. So what we will seek to be doing as a group is to ensure that the waters po the waters, the agreement post 2026 builds more flexibility into it. That's something we're going to have to do. What, what Adele was saying is the era of the big augmentation projects where we rerouted whole lakes and rivers and moved them across multiple states. That's an era of the past. I mean, they did a remarkable things last century. They're not going to be doing it the next century, just politically and legally they're just not going to happen. But we can do exchanges between urban sectors in Arizona and metropolitan and Las Vegas smaller, but, you know, but valuable. And we can do that. And, but we're

gonna have to do some of the broadening of the rules that we live by. And, and there's gonna be acceptance to do that.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:58:16](#)):

Okay. and I also, I mean, I can't help myself, but there was some big news about Arizona and there are some foreign investors along the Colorado River. And recently the governor of Arizona basically ended some leases that I think some Saudi investors had in some farming land. And then I just wondered if, are there others shopping in other states for Colorado River Water? And what do you think the future is of that? I, what I, first, I'll say they that farming enterprise was on groundwater. And so not, not a part of who we deliver to or how that works but I think that's been an issue kinda across our states where groundwater

Brenda Burman ([00:59:03](#)):

Is unregulated.

MacKenzie Elmer ([00:59:05](#)):

It allows larger industrial interests to come in and sink very deep wells that can affect local communities. I will say everything that's been happening in the desert in that area has been completely legal. There's

Brenda Burman ([00:59:19](#)):

Been a lot of great investment in the, the local community so that, it's not an easy question but it, but it, that water in particular is not on the, it's not on Colorado River Water.

Adel Hagekhalil ([00:59:31](#)):

O one thing I would add to that is a lot of alfalfa that's grown gets shipped to places like China, Japan, where they use it for feed and livestock. And a lot of people say, well, you're exporting water. And I think a, a fair thing to look at is this device here that was made in China, took a lot of water into its manufacturing and then got shipped here. So we live in a very complicated world of, of geo commerce going around the world. And water is a component of it. We are going to have to rethink how we use water if it's shrinking in a climate change world. But the idea that it's somehow inappropriate to ship one product overseas, but not, but accept those in exchange different products here doesn't really work. So we're gonna have to find some sort of balance on them.

Adel Hagekhalil ([01:00:24](#)):

But I think the type of crops that we farm and what we do and the timing of it's gonna be something to be discussed. I mean, that's, that's something that's important for all of us in, in our partnership with Bard and the Kitan tribe. We talked about seasonal farming or some people call it seasonal fallow, we call it seasonal farming, where they farm during the time and during the summer they're not gonna farm because it takes the most water. And that water now it's saved and we basically pay for it and it's put back in lake meat. So there's some smart ideas of what crops we use and how we do it in a smart way. And there's some, some things that can be done that way too.

Brenda Burman ([01:01:06](#)):

Could I? Sure. I just wanted to add, 'cause you, you brought up some tribes we've mentioned but haven't really gone into that. So the seven states who rely on the Colorado River, there's 30 tribes across

the basin. 22 of them are in Arizona. So tribes have been a very large part of the water discussion in Arizona for Central Arizona project, we deliver to 12 tribes, or we serve 12 tribes. And they have been at the table and really a part of this discussion. So when we talk about, you know, resiliency and future in our urban areas in Arizona, you have to have a hundred year water supply if you wanna put in new housing new growth. And that's not an easy thing to find. A lot of those communities have worked with the tribes and signed leases either for a hundred years or for less than that. And we've traded groundwater credits. There's been a lot of innovation going on. When I look at our future for how are we going to deal with a smaller river, I think it's all tools are on the table. You know, it's looking at how can you trade water back and forth, how can we have smarter rules so we can be more flexible with each other. I think major investments

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:02:19](#)):

In, in infrastructure are definitely part of this. But I think there's, there's a lot more tools than maybe we thought we had 20 years ago and we're gonna have to use all of them, right? Because the history is that a lot of these tribes were given rights to water in in a very short summary, but maybe weren't supported in being able to invest and build and develop the way, any way to use this water. And so now we're at a point where finally the federal government and the states are maybe noticed, like saying, okay, yeah, we need to take, we need to work with you guys and actually be fair about this and, and, and have the tribes at the table. And, and, and we haven't even talked about Mexico. Our, our neighbor to the South, and I've done a lot of reporting on that. Tijuana relies a hundred percent on the Colorado River, and its aqueduct is not in the best shape also. So Mexico, Northern Mexico, and Mexico farmers over there as well also rely on the Colorado River. So there's a whole other conversation to be had about how the United States is going to be able to negotiate with Mexico in 2026 as well. Right. Because a lot of those treaties that we've already made are going to also expire in 2026. Well, sorry, elements, please correct me. <Laugh>. Yeah. Scott, do we have some questions for the We

Speaker 8 ([01:03:32](#)):

Do audience.

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:03:32](#)):

Okay, great. Why don't you

Speaker 8 ([01:03:34](#)):

Well, I, the reason I thought they were good is there's a lot of just basic facts that people were interested in. Can anybody explain how much percentage of the water from the Colorado River is used for agriculture versus urban use? Anybody have any idea?

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:03:48](#)):

It depends on what state you're living in. When they report on the seven states, they usually say about 80%. I can answer. For Arizona and Arizona, it's 70% agricultural.

Speaker 8 ([01:04:00](#)):

Got it. Another one was, does, is there any idea who the biggest waster of water is? Or is there any idea of, of who wastes the water the most? So

JB Hamby ([01:04:09](#)):

I'm sure all users in the Colorado River Basin, the, the test and the Reclamation Act is reasonable and beneficial use. I think everyone would claim that they're all using that water reasonably and beneficially. And moving forward post 2026, the finger pointing is not necessarily constructive. So I think we're all looking for ways to enhance our use of the water to move forward.

Speaker 8 ([01:04:32](#)):

So Nevada, then <laugh>, John's not here

JB Hamby ([01:04:36](#)):

To defend himself. <Laugh> casinos and fountains in the desert.

Speaker 8 ([01:04:41](#)):

This is related. I think this was really interesting to me. We talked about in the previous panel about urban areas that had really become more efficient with their water use. Are we seeing that through the Colorado River Basin? Are, are all places using the same sort of proportionally less water as as California? I think

JB Hamby ([01:05:01](#)):

What I had a little bit, but I think there's an agreement that we signed on and there was an M O U with all these cities and urban cities and signed on to implement practices of conservation, including, you know, removing 30% of non-functional turf as part of it, and all,

Jeff Kightlinger ([01:05:17](#)):

All this stuff. So there's a common understanding and there's more people signing on to, to really do what we need to do. But, you know

Jeff Kightlinger ([01:05:25](#)):

But also we need everybody to use water efficiently.

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:05:29](#)):

Am I You had another question?

Speaker 8 ([01:05:30](#)):

Yeah. It was a, there's this one's, this one's really interesting to me. So we talk about the law of the river, and it's basically who got there first, right? Is that, no, there's

JB Hamby ([01:05:40](#)):

A lot of things.

Speaker 8 ([01:05:41](#)):

There's a lot of things. But it is, it is this foundational law. And, and how does it hold up if tensions really get high? Is there any worry that a court or, you know, some kind of violence or something could shake up the, the law that, that governs how the water is used? How, how sacrosanct and protected is that law? You

JB Hamby ([01:06:04](#)):

Really wanna

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:06:04](#)):

Know when the guns are gonna be drawn, Scott, that's what you're

JB Hamby ([01:06:07](#)):

<Laugh> asking. So the law of the river is not like Moses and the tent commandments. Somebody went up on top of a mountain and then they came down on, you know, stone tablets. The law of the river is basically a compendium of Supreme Court decrees, compacts, contracts, agreements, unspoken customs of the way we behave. And they've been built layer upon layer over time. I think the development essentially after Arizona versus California, which was the longest case in the entire history of the United States Supreme Court, the states decided that conflict is not a great path moving forward. And this tradition of collaboration, especially within the last 25 years or so, has taken to the, for here. So the law of the river, which is, has many different components of it, and there's may equally many interpretations of, of what all that means. But what it provides us is the flexibility to continue to add, provide another layer, interpret things in new ways, or maybe set things aside and come up with another agreement. Says, well, all that put aside we're here's how we're going to operate because this is how we've achieved consensus for this at least next interim period of time. But

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:07:13](#)):

Isn't it true that, oh, I'm sorry if this, if the states disagree, it goes straight to the Supreme Court. If there's some kind of an argument,

Jeff Kightlinger ([01:07:20](#)):

Some issues would go straight to the Supreme Court, but the, I think a great case study and something we should all think about is what happened in Australia when Australia had their millennium drought of 10 years. It basically, they hit a wall and they nationalized the issue. The, the United, the Australian government came in and said, we're taking over and we're changing water rights wholesale. We're changing the endangered species laws wholesale, and we're pumping in roughly 25% of their entire national, you know, g n p into water as an issue. The whole government changed based on water. So nothing sacrosanct. We have found ability to compromise and work things through, but at some point, if you hit a wall, the rules are gonna change.

Speaker 8 ([01:08:08](#)):

Thank you. Yeah.

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:08:09](#)):

Well, just to kind of finish I wasn't sure if I was gonna do this or not, but you know, mark Twain may or may not have said that, ha ha whiskey, whiskey is for drinking water is for fighting or you drink whiskey when the fighting is over. So I brought little whiskeys for you guys, <laugh>. Wow. Just to maybe, maybe you guys don't have to fight and you can just drink whiskey right now. It's

Speaker 8 ([01:08:30](#)):

After 12. Yeah.

MacKenzie Elmer ([01:08:30](#)):

And I thought you and you and JB somewhere I only brought three because we were gonna have to, but you and JB can share because Yeah. There, yeah. You guys are kind of working on the same team now. Short sharing. Yeah. So anyway, thank you everyone for coming and I really appreciate you guys so much for flying out for just being here and working together on the stage with me. It's been really, really wonderful experience. So thank you.

Speaker 8 ([01:08:56](#)):

Thank you all. So right now it's lunchtime if you, there should be trucks if you don't have a lunch through us. If you are interested in what McKenzie does get her environment report@voicesandiego.org slash newsletters. That's voice san diego.org/newsletters. And we still got another half day. Thank you so much. Can I ask for favor? Yeah, sure.