Stephanie Otts:

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you so much for joining us for our June webinar as part of the 2023 National Sea Grant Law Center Webinar series. My name is Stephanie Otts. I'm the director of the National Sea Grant Law Center, and I'm excited to feature in today's webinar two of the Water Science Policy Fellows at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Center for Water Policy, Andrian Lee and Anya Janssen. And I'm going to allow the two fellows to introduce themselves a little more during their presentations. But before we get started, just want to do a few introductory slides and some housekeeping.

So, for those of you who don't know us, the National Sea Grant Law Center was founded in 2002. We're housed at the University of Mississippi School of Law. We are one of 34 sea grant programs around the country, but we are set up kind of uniquely to provide legal research, education, and outreach for the entire sea grant network and their stakeholders. And so, the National Sea Grant Law Center works on a wide range of issues from aquaculture to fisheries to water quality to coastal resilience. And so, the best way to stay informed about our work and learn more, including about upcoming webinars, is to follow us on social media and to check out our website.

So, just real quick before we get into the presentations, we have everyone muted to reduce background noise. Please keep yourself on mute during the presentation to help with that. You are encouraged to use the chat box at any time to ask questions. If the presenters see the questions and can answer them in real time, they will. If not, we'll save them and circle back to them for the Q&A session. If we have a small group and sound is working okay, then we will allow participants to come off of mute to ask a question verbally during the Q&A session at the end. So if you would like to do that, please use the raise your hand function.

If you have any technical difficulties during the webinar, we're not sure that we can help. But you are encouraged to private chat with Lauren Fremin, who is the National Sea Grant Law Center's project coordinator and logistical host for the webinar. The webinar is being recorded for future viewing, and we will post it on the National Sea Grant Law Center's website as soon as we can following the webinar. It usually takes several days to a week, because we also order transcripts and do closed captioning for the webinar, so that takes a little time. But all participants for the webinar will get an email letting you all know when the recording is available.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to our first presenter today to get started on all of these great projects that the Water Policy Fellows have been working on. Thanks.

Anya Janssen:

Great, thanks, Stephanie and Lauren, and any others at the National Sea Grant Law Center for hosting us and offering this opportunity to share some of our postdoc experiences and highlights. So my name is Anya Janssen. I'm originally from Wisconsin. I studied sociology and social justice up at Northland College in Ashland, Wisconsin before moving to San Diego, where I pursued this dual law and master's degree. And then I moved back home to Wisconsin to practice law, which I will be doing come September as a new staff attorney for the Midwest Environmental Advocates, which is an environmental nonprofit law firm in Madison.

And for me, really, my position as a postdoc at the Center for Water Policy has been this perfect transition between a student in the academic world to a soon-to-be attorney practicing law. And here at the center, I was able to really orient myself to Wisconsin-specific law and policy, with a special emphasis, of course, on issues related to water. And during my year at the center, I have had the

pleasure and privilege of working with a really dynamic team, where I've made some extraordinary connections that I really hope will be lifelong. So if you could advance please to the next slide.

Today, I will just share with you a few project highlights and work product samples from my year as a water policy specialist, Sea Grant Water Science Policy Fellow with the Center for Water Policy. And here, the bulk of my work has been focused on the phosphorus pollution issue in Wisconsin waters and the rules and regulations that we have in place here to address this issue. I also dabbled a bit in issues related to water quantity when I researched the Mississippi River drought of last fall. And additionally, I gained some experience guest lecturing a water law course, as well as co-supervising a law student intern with my fellow water policy specialist, Andrian. Next slide, thank you.

So when I started my year back last summer, I was researching this phosphorus issue. And the problem is that we have high levels of nutrient runoff, and they're impairing our water quality, causing nuisance and harmful algal blooms, beach closures, fish kills, damage to property values, threats to public health, and more. And, on a federal level, phosphorus is regulated under the Clean Water Act by the EPA when it's a point source, so these are those discrete discharges of nutrient runoff. When phosphorus is in its nonpoint form, like urban or especially agricultural runoff, which is the leading cause of water impairment, that kind of management is left to the states.

And in 2010, Wisconsin created some of the nation's earliest and most stringent nutrient numeric criteria for surface waters. So this established numeric phosphorus limits for lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and streams. And so, right now, I'm in the process of completing a law review article that assesses these approaches to nutrient management and Wisconsin's phosphorus rules specifically and whether they've had any kind of impact on water quality. And, sadly, the moral of the story is that water quality is actually increasingly impaired by nutrient pollution, despite these regulations. And I just put up a chart here so you can see in the past years of how waters impaired with phosphorus have been increasing. So it's a little bit frustrating, despite the fact that we have these regulations. But if you could advance, please, to the next slide.

While I was researching these phosphorus issues and working on this law review article, I was also simultaneously the lead coordinator and facilitator for the statewide conference focused on the same issue. And last February, the Center for Water Policy co-hosted and convened a very diverse group of stakeholders from academics researching the issue to policymakers, agency representatives, nonprofit groups, farmers, and other water professionals. And during the planning process of this conference, I gained some really invaluable experience leading the steering committees and subcommittees, organizing the panels, running the ticket sales, and of course, facilitating the actual event. Next slide.

I also got to try my hand at website development when I created the pconference website, and it was actually a pretty fun and creative experience after I got the hang of it. We also promoted the conference to the legal community through this blog post that I co-authored with our center director, Melissa Scanlan, and we published with the Wisconsin State Bar Environmental Law Section. So these are just two different examples of the tangible experiences that I gained through this planning process.

Now, this conference was driven by two discrete goals. The first was to examine the effectiveness of Wisconsin's phosphorus regulations and their impact on water quality over the past decade. And we had a room full of experts on this topic doing just that. And then the other goal was to take what we learned from these experts at the conference and try to help shape and inform the next decade of phosphorus-related research and policy.

And, in the end, I'm happy to report that the conference was very well-received and well-attended, and we were able to accomplish both of those goals. So, we have some key takeaways from the conference. I'm going to give you just a few so that you get a taste of the breadth of this event. And then, in the end,

we did work as a group, and we identified academic gaps and regulatory gaps to fill. And I'll talk about a work product that came from that goal later on.

So, one of the things that we learned was how phosphorus pollution and runoff is interacting with climate change. So, in this region, our climate is getting warmer and wetter, and that means longer growing seasons, which studies project will have increased phosphorus loads to our local watersheds. So as rain events intensify and become more frequent, we'll have increased phosphorous loads run off into our surface waters, and that means that it's increasingly important for phosphorous management strategies to take into account these climatic patterns and forecasted weather events in order for them to be effective and successful. Next slide, please.

We also learned about farmers and how they are one of the key players leading some innovative efforts to manage nutrient runoff from agricultural lands, which I mentioned was really the primary source of impairment right now. So a lot of farmers do this through what's called producer-led watershed groups, and together, they implement best management practices like no-till farming and cover cropping. So we heard from some former panelists at the conference about how crucial it is to build partnerships, local partnerships within watersheds so that they can effectively lead these types of local efforts to reduce nutrient runoff. But as I mentioned earlier, we have found that the speed and the scale of the progress tied to these farmer initiatives is just not quite enough to match the problem, where we have phosphorus-impaired waterways actually on the rise, and it really means that our water quality goals are not being met.

So, aside from our changing climate and increased rainfall, we also have this issue of legacy phosphorus. And legacy phosphorus is phosphorus that has accumulated over time due to the overapplication of phosphorus fertilizers. And so what happens is, this phosphorus becomes stored in river sediment and lake bed and is slowly released over time. And it's this slow ongoing release of legacy phosphorus that contributes to the problem, and it's actually hindering phosphorus reduction strategies.

So, what is a potential solution to this seemingly intractable problem? And that's something that we asked our conference participants to really wrestle with. And one of the key solutions here to meet our water quality goals and achieve these numeric water quality criteria is that we need transformative systemic agricultural change that takes a more holistic approach to nutrient management. And the current agricultural system that we're all familiar with, it depends on maximizing output with maybe an unintended, but definitely a real cost to our environment and water quality.

So, a transformative change would include things like rediversifying our ecosystems and restoring that biodiversity that so much of this land has lost. It would look like adding perennial grasslands for grazing that act as a natural buffer to nutrient runoff onto surface waters. And it could also look like cutting back on animal units, but done really intentionally in ways that won't harm farmers' profits, because of course, they are responsible for feeding communities across the country and beyond. Next slide, please.

So despite these ongoing problems and the solutions that we're trying to fill and solve, we learned that Wisconsin still is a leader among the Great Lakes states in our approach to phosphorus regulation and management. And we learned about how the state departments worked hand in hand and tirelessly with the EPA in passing these regulations and adopting some market-based compliance options which are considered pretty creative and innovative. And, to this day, the agencies continue working together and with local county departments to implement these standards. Next slide, please.

So, like I mentioned, we did identify some regulatory and research gaps. And so, the major work product that came out of this conference is the 2023 Phosphorus Conference Report. And this report contains an academic research agenda for the next decade of phosphorus-related research, and it also contains a few policy recommendations to reduce phosphorus pollution and improve water quality in Wisconsin.

So this report was a product of an ongoing collaboration between UW System researchers, policy experts, state agencies, and nonprofits. We circulated this report widely to recipients like legislators in the state, farmer groups, policy experts, academics, and more. And my role in crafting this report was to lead this collaborative effort. Part of that included analyzing this post-conference survey that we sent out to all attendees. And so, I drafted the final products, and I'm very happy to share them with all of you if you'd like to read more.

So, the conference was really successful in bringing together stakeholders to talk about this issue, but it also helped the Center for Water Policy and our team to build our reputation, strengthen that reputation for water policy work and collaboration across the state. So it just increased the awareness for the center and the important work that we do on water issues. And then, for me, personally and professionally, it helps to develop some relationships with professionals in a pretty wide variety of fields, all of whom I hope I have the chance to work with again in the near future.

So, switching gears, yeah, please, next slide, switching gears a bit here, another way that the center contributed to public discussion this past year on water issues, though on a much smaller scale, was by accepting an invitation to present at the Milwaukee Chapter of the Institute for Supply Management. So, in March, I turned my attention to issues of water quantity with the Mississippi River drought, and I presented a keynote discussion on how this drought was impacting the American supply chain. So, next slide, please.

Through my research, I learned how the drought was impacting the American supply chain from the producers, with drought conditions, of course, impacting farmers and growing seasons, to transportation, which was really the main driver of the impact. So barges were carrying about a 30 to 45% reduction in volume of goods, and this was causing major backups on the river, like you can sort of see in the picture. And also, I learned about impacts on the consumer, which mostly ties to increased cost of goods. Next slide, please.

So, on average, $130 billion of commodities are moved through the Mississippi River each year. It's cheaper and more efficient to ship goods this way through inland waterways, and it normally saves the nation between 7 to $9 billion per year. But with the drought last fall, shipping costs were on the rise for barges carrying loads at reduced capacity, so this totaled about a $20 billion loss for the American supply chain, just from one season of drought. Next slide, please.

So, my presentation here for the Institute for Supply Management led to a pretty lively discussion on climate change and the future of the Mississippi River with... We're seeing extreme drought followed by these extreme flooding events. And so we talked about how the American supply chain can prepare to avoid future crises. And, for me, this was a very fulfilling experience. I was able to interact with and give back to my community in a really important way and on something that affects water issues, but also, the supply chain and life of many Americans.

So now, I'm going to turn to my final reflection on supervising and teaching experience. Before I go into that, I just want to pause and express my gratitude here for all of the support that I received from my Center for Water Policy team, from peer reviewing work products to helping prep presentation materials, and especially the all-hands-on-deck mentality that was taken during the Phosphorous Conference. My year would not have been so successful without my team, so I'm very grateful for them. In addition to our staff at the center, I also had research assistance from the center's law student intern, and she completed legal research on a variety of topics, including, for me, phosphorus and the Mississippi River drought.

And, last summer, when I started my time at the center, Andrian and I were both fresh out of law school, and we were asked to step up to supervise this law student intern. And it was a really rewarding

experience to grow in this supervisory capacity and to help a law student improve her legal research and writing skills, like many supervisors had done for us not so long ago. And similar to this kind of experience that I gained supervising the law student was actually being able to teach a law course taught by our center director and professor Melissa Scanlan.

So this is a water law course, but it's taught through UW Milwaukee School of Freshwater Sciences for scientists and policymakers. And in a similar fashion, to my supervising experience, being able to teach a water law course to law students after I just recently learned about this at law school was sort of at first intimidating, but ultimately, very rewarding. And hopefully, the students had the same experience, but I think they did. So, next slide.

So, all in all, I think one of the most valuable aspects from this past year has really been the connections that I made, both within the Center for Water Policies team, but also externally through all the projects that I led and participated in. And I'm just truly grateful for the growth that I was able to have personally and professionally. And I'm really excited for the next chapter of my life as a new lawyer in Wisconsin, for which I feel very prepared, thanks to my time here. So, thank you all for listening and tuning in, and I will hand it off to Andrian.

Stephanie Otts:

Thank you.

Andrian Lee:

All right, thanks, Anya. Hi, everyone. My name is Andrian Lee. I am the other Water Science Policy Fellow here at the Center for Water Policy. I got my start in water issues in college when I was studying civil engineering, which I chose because I was very interested in infrastructure issues, particularly in developing countries. I went to law school because I wanted to gain advocacy skills for those communities that had critical infrastructure needs unmet. And so, I graduated from Boston College Law School last year and began my time here at the Center for Water Policy, where I've been very fortunate to be able to dedicate my time to researching important water issues, water policy issues. Next slide, please.

So, I'll be focusing my time on two projects that I worked on this year, lead service lines and offshore wind. The bulk of my time has been focused on researching lead service line issues. So, service lines are the underground pipes that feed drinking water from the water main connected to the treatment facility into your home, or a school, or a private business, where people ultimately drink it. Some service lines, or many service lines, actually, are made out of lead. And lead service lines are the leading source of lead contamination in drinking water. Next slide, please.

So this is important, because there is no safe level of lead exposure for humans. It's particularly dangerous for children because it attacks every organ system in their body. It attacks brain development, which can lead to decreased intelligence, behavioral disorders, and learning problems. And in adults, at even low levels of exposure, lead contamination can cause high blood pressure and kidney problems.

So, in our research, we examined the scope of the problem and the cost to replace lead service lines, particularly in the Great Lakes. We have an interest in the Great Lakes region because of where we're situated, here in Wisconsin. So, we examined two main levers to spur lead line replacement. We looked at litigation, and we looked at federal funding. So this graphic you see here is one from the Natural Resources Defense Council, or the NRDC, and it shows the number of lead service lines per state. And you can see that the darkest red is centered around the Great Lakes region. So, seven out of the top 10

US states with the most lead service lines are Great Lakes states. And Chicago, Illinois has the most lead service lines of any US city. Many Great Lakes cities have relatively high poverty rates, ranging from 24 to 32%, which makes it difficult to finance water infrastructure improvements such as lead service line replacement through just user rate increases. Next slide, please.

So this table is a comparison of the estimates of lead service lines in each of the Great Lakes states. The first column is the most recent estimate from the EPA, which is the most up-to-date and accurate. The next columns are estimates from the American Water Works Association, the NRDC, and the state. And we wanted to compile all these different sources to show just how difficult it is to get an accurate picture of the scope of the problem.

So, in response to this, the EPA promulgated the Lead and Copper Rule Revisions in 2021, which, amongst other requirements, it requires that every water system report inventories of their service lines to the state by October 2024, and that inventory has to include the number of service lines they have and the materials that comprise those service lines. So, by 2024, we should have a pretty good idea of how many lead service lines are in each community.

The final column you see in this table is the estimated cost to replace. So, to find this figure, we used an EPA estimate from its 2020 economic analysis for the Lead and Copper Rule Revisions of $5,066 to replace each lead service line. We have to caveat that, though, because, in 2022, a joint report between AWWA, the American Water Works Association, and an engineering consulting firm called CDM Smith estimated that it would actually cost an average of $12,500 to replace each lead service line. We're using the government figures for our research, but it's just a big caveat that the number may actually be a lot larger than what we found here. Next slide, please.

This table shows the amount of federal funding that is available through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, which was enacted in 2021. The bipartisan infrastructure law commits $15 billion to identifying and replacing lead service lines over five years, which is an unprecedented amount of money. The bipartisan infrastructure law in general was just a huge commitment to improving the nation's infrastructure.

The EPA allocates the $15 billion to the states each year, in each of the five years of funding. In order to access that money, each state has to submit an intended use plan to the EPA that details how it's going to distribute those funds. So, in the first column, we have the estimated lead service lines in each Great lake state, and those are the EPA numbers. The next column is the estimated cost that we showed in the previous table. The third is the total five-year grant from the bipartisan infrastructure law that is allocated to each state. And then, there's also a condition on this funding that 49% of the funds have to go to what are called disadvantaged communities, which the states have the discretion to define. So, how the money is distributed is, once the state receives their funding from the EPA, they distribute the funds as loans to local communities through what's called a State Revolving Fund.

So the majority of this federal funding will be distributed as loans, but the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law mandates that 49% of the funding go to disadvantaged communities as additional subsidy in the form of principle forgiveness, which is essentially a grant. It's money that the community doesn't have to pay back. So, it's important how the state defines what a disadvantaged community is. It's even more crucial because these numbers show that federal funding will cover less than a fifth of the costs to replace all lead service lines in the Great Lakes states. So, states are put... They need to be very strategic about how they distribute those funds, and especially so to disadvantaged communities, who are in a less strong position to raise water user rates. So that was the first lever that we researched in [inaudible 00:28:29] the replacement of lead service lines. The next lever is litigation, if we go to the next slide.

In order to investigate how litigation is used on this issue, we examined three communities, the first of which was Newark, New Jersey. This was a case that was pretty successful in replacing lead service lines.

So, in 2016, very high lead levels were found in the drinking water of New York schools. In 2018, the NRDC, jointly with the New York Education Workers Caucus, filed a lawsuit against the city. After legal action was started, the city actually began a pretty aggressive program to identify and replace lead service lines, which led to the approval of a settlement in which the city committed to continue its aggressive rate of replacing lead service lines, and eventually replacing all lead service lines in the city, which it completed by February 2022.

There were three key legal changes that led to this success. One was the state of New Jersey passed this statute that allowed the use of public funds to replace private-side lead service lines. So the owners of the properties didn't have to bear the cost of replacing those lead service lines. Another key change was the city ordinance provided complete cost of private line replacement. So the city itself was able to find funding to bear the cost of the replacements. And then, thirdly, the city passed an ordinance that mandated private line replacement, even without a property owner's consent. So, for example, a renter didn't need to get their landlord's permission in order to get a lead service line replaced, and the city didn't have to chase owners in order to get permission. So they were able to make these replacements at a relatively rapid pace. Next slide, please.

Next, we looked at Flint, Michigan, quite an infamous case. So the NRDC once again joined with a local organization called Concerned Pastors for Social Action and filed suit against the city in January 2016. They were able to reach a settlement in March 2016, which required the city to replace lead service lines by January 2020. There have been five amendments to the settlement since then, and we are now in June 2023, and the city has still not finished those replacements. But with the dogged advocacy of NRDC and Concerned Pastors, the city has replaced about 95%, which is still a big milestone. It still hasn't met its commitment in the settlement and to the citizens, but it has been a great improvement. Next slide, please.

The final community we looked at was Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. So this proceeding wasn't spurred by any litigation necessarily. It was kind of a run-of-the-mill state administrative law proceeding. A 2017 Pennsylvania law required local water authorities to file a compliance plan with the...

Stephanie Otts:

Oh no. I wonder if... Andrian froze up.

Andrian Lee:

... submitted its compliance plan.

Stephanie Otts:

Oh, she's there.

Andrian Lee:

I'm sorry, was there...?

Stephanie Otts:

Oh, sorry, you froze up for a little bit. You're back now.

Andrian Lee:

Okay. Okay, great. So, the Pittsburgh authority submitted its compliance plan and received some comments from various government entities. And in order to resolve those comments, I had entered into a settlement, in which it committed to replace all residential, public, and private-side lead service lines in its system by 2026. It committed to replacing those lines at no cost to property owners when it was simultaneously replacing a public sideline at the same time.

So, these three cases show the various results that can come out of litigation and how it can be used to spur action amongst government officials. It's a useful tool, for certain, but it hasn't been able to achieve the scale of transformation needed, as we demonstrated when we're talking about the scope of the problem. So, all of this research has resulted in a law review article, which is in final citation checks, and it should be published in the Michigan Journal of Environmental Administrative Law later this fall. Next, slide please.

So, more recently, I've turned my attention to offshore wind and how we can implement policies for the development of offshore wind projects in the Great Lakes. Next slide, please.

So we began by looking at the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, which is a federal agency under the Department of Interior which is in charge of leasing submerged lands in the ocean for offshore wind projects. It has jurisdiction in what is called the Outer Continental Shelf, which begins three miles offshore in the ocean and extends beyond into international boundaries. I think it cuts off at 200 miles offshore. And it's created what is the called the Outer Continental Shelf Renewable Energy Program. And through this program, it will solicit bids to lease wind energy areas that it has designated in the ocean and basically auctions off land for companies to develop into offshore wind turbines. Next slide, please.

So, the Great Lakes, BOEM, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, doesn't have jurisdiction to lease submerged lands in the Great Lakes. That jurisdiction lies with each of the Great Lakes states. Their jurisdiction extends to the international boundary with Canada and to the boundaries like to interstate boundaries. So this graphic shows you where those boundaries are. So it's up to each state to develop a leasing and permitting program for offshore wind projects in the Great Lakes. Next slide, please.

So far, there's only one project in the Great Lakes. That is the Icebreaker Wind Project, which lies eight to 10 miles off the coast of Ohio, in Lake Erie. Its original lease went into effect back in 2014, but it's been stalled by legal challenges that went all the way up to the Ohio Supreme Court. There was a challenge filed that disputed the Ohio Power Siting Board granting the project a certificate of environmental compatibility and public needs, saying that there wasn't enough information on the effect it would have on birds and bats and that it violated the Public Trust Doctrine in Ohio. The Ohio Supreme Court ultimately held that the siting board had appropriately granted the permit, that there was enough information, that it had attached conditions to the permit for the project to continue collecting information. And this removed a major legal hurdle for the project, and that was in August of last year, August 2022.

So, we've done a survey of the current state of leasing for offshore wind projects. We've started looking at ways that the Great Lakes states can promote the protection of environmental quality in its leasing programs, especially since those values seem to be put aside when it comes to energy resource development. So, one tool in order to do this is called non-price criteria. Next slide, please.

We found that Maryland is actually a leader in the US for using non-price criteria. Non-price criteria are any criteria other than price that are used in evaluating a bid or proposal for an offshore wind development lease. So, when you think of an auction, you think of a bid, highest price wins. But states and other countries have used non-price criteria to weigh non-financial factors in determining who wins a bid to develop an offshore wind project. So in the US, Maryland has explicitly stated that not just the

mitigation of negative environmental impact, but the net positive environmental benefits are an important factor in evaluating those bids. So, by state statute and regulation, the Maryland Public Service Commission, which evaluates these bids, must consider an applicant's analysis of the net environmental and health impacts, including impacts on the affected marine environment, and it must demonstrate positive net environmental benefits to the state. Next slide, please.

Perhaps a global leader in the use of non-price criteria in this way as the Netherlands. In general, the EU is more advanced in this area than the US. European countries tend to explicitly seek to maximize ecological gains from the way offshore wind facilities are both constructed and operated. The Netherlands are a forerunner even within the EU in implementing non-price criteria to promote net positive environmental benefits in Europe.

For example, the Dutch minister for climate and energy policy has explicitly stated that the Dutch government prioritizes nature-inclusive design and the protection of the environment in its offshore wind energy development. In 2022, in announcing the winner for an offshore energy permit tender, the minister cited that the applicant's placement of natural reef structures on the seabed to boost marine biodiversity and the construction of those wind turbines was a factor in its success. So this is an example of how the Dutch government is explicitly promoting not just the mitigation of negative environmental impacts, but the actual net positive environmental benefits, in its solicitation of offshore wind development.

So that's the current state of our research now. We'll continue to explore the potential use for non-price criteria in the Great Lakes and how the Great Lakes might want to use a interstate regional framework to promote net positive environmental benefits for offshore wind development.

This project, I won't be able to complete this project during my time here. This will be something that is handed off to our next water policy specialist, our next fellow. But in the fall, I will be joining BCM Environmental in Concord, New Hampshire. I would like to take this time to echo Anya's gratitude for my time here at the center. I've benefitted enormously from the mentorship that I've received from the support and collaboration from my teammates. I've especially enjoyed working with Anya, not just with supervising the law student, but in also more community-oriented ways. And thank you all for joining us for this webinar and listening to the work that we've been able to contribute to the center.

Stephanie Otts:

Great. All right, thank you. Thank you, Andrian, sorry, and Anya for your presentations. We really appreciate you taking the time to share your work with us and the friends of the National Sea Grant Law Center that joined us during our webinar series. And it's great to see the range of projects. And there may be attendees who are interested in law policy fellowship programs, and so I think this helps give a little snapshot of what types of projects that fellows can work on. So, feel free... The participants, if you have any questions, feel free to type them in the chat. We do have a small group right now, so if you would like to ask your question directly, you can raise your hand. But we will give it just a minute or two to see if we do have any questions coming in.

While we're waiting for questions, we do want to let you know that we have several more webinars planned for the rest of the year. Our next webinar will be in July, where we will be featuring presentations by the law students and undergraduate student who are working with the National Sea Grant Law Center this summer during their internship programs on a range of projects. So, as I mentioned at the beginning, the best way to find out about upcoming webinars and work of the National Sea Grant Law Center is to follow us on social media.

So, I don't see any questions coming into the chat, so, I just want to take another opportunity to thank our presenters for being here today for sharing their work. Thanks to all of the attendees for joining us. We will share a link to the recording when it becomes available, and we hope to see everybody next month. Thank you.