Eve Austin: I'm here with Sarah Taylor-Rogers, this is Eve Austin and we're at Sarah's home in Baltimore.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Baltimore has been my home since 1970, '71. I'm not currently working, I am pleased to say I'm retired after 45 years of being involved in natural resources management, natural resources administration, and water supply. And I came into that field through my master's degree when I was at Syracuse University, and had the opportunity through the Maxwell School to also take courses at the adjacent New York State College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry. Actually, I had started out wanting to be an international lawyer in natural resources, and picked that up through my bachelor's degree at Thiel College in Greenville, Pennsylvania, which is a very small Lutheran college about 54 miles northwest of Pittsburgh. And I had an extremely influential professor who was with the Tuft School of Law and International Diplomacy, and influenced me to go into that arena.

But, it didn't pan out, and I'm very proud of that because I've been able to apply not only science, but law, engineering, public administration, and other kinds of approaches to look at natural resources from as wholistic a perspective as possible. What brought me to Baltimore? A job. Actually, before I came to Baltimore I did attain my PhD in natural resources management and administration, also from the Maxwell School of Syracuse University. And the Army Corps of Engineers offered me a position because my PhD thesis criticized their planning approach that they took to the Susquehanna River Basin and hence also to the Potomac River Basin. Too many dams to be able to provide water to the population. I basically felt but couldn't prove at the time that there might be other ways of dealing with this that you didn't have to put dams up and down fresh flowing river bodies, but rather could do some other things, and had the opportunity to do that with a group of engineers and economists with the Corps of Engineers for particularly the Potomac River.

Eve Austin: So you criticize them and then they hired you?

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Yes, indeed. And that became really a very interesting learning time for me because I had not worked as a team member before. And working with engineers gave me a different perspective on engineers. I sort of thought, well, they're in the box thinkers. And I probably [inaudible 00:03:01] but I worked with a lot of out of the box thinkers and so we were able to put interconnections together between tributaries. We were able to design an increase of the existing dams for water supply to increase the water but not on the main stem except for Bloomington Dam and Lake. And then we were able to negotiate a water supply agreement, one of the first on the Potomac River where everyone had a certain allocation and everyone could deal with that.

And then if a drought came along, say over on the Occoquan, you would maybe be able to draw more from the Potomac. If a drought occurred affecting the Patuxent and Triadelphia, you might be able to then pull from another water body just to keep things separate but stable. And also something else was put in at the time through the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and the Fairfax County Water Authority and the Washington Aqueduct. And that was a full blown out first conservation of water supply use in the entire watershed. And one of the contracts that was led by the Corps was to have an engineering firm design those water conservation measures along with the water suppliers to see what we could do to cut back. And in my mind, when you have a drought and you put in these measures and they do have an effect, it's good.

But I also believe that we should not drop those measures, but should continue them because that makes it ever present in people's minds that water is precious and that water is really without it, you can't do anything. And you could also ask me Eve to think about some recommendations which I will pepper into this. I really honestly believe that the things that we put into place when an emergency arises ought to be still used and be at the forefront so that we are able to conserve and not have to go emergency, non-emergency, emergency, non-emergency, but keep a steady state and educate the public as you go along. I think that's very important, if that makes sense.

Eve Austin: Oh, it does. It seems like, I don't know if it's human nature or Americans, but it seems like we respond more to crises and emergencies though.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: We do. And I think that that approach and mindset needs to change and hopefully it will, but that I think would be a marker for what we need to do.

Eve Austin: Well, I'm curious about your experience when you help me kind of piece together what year it was and I'm thinking about you as a female in the field, getting your PhD and being recruited by Army Corps of Engineers. I'm picturing it as a pretty male organization at that time, so could you-

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Very much.

Eve Austin: Okay.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: But what is interesting is I had sort of prep for this with the summers that I had between attaining my bachelor's and master's. I worked for the Delaware River Basin Commission in Trenton, New Jersey. And I think there were maybe two or three women. They were administrative and librarian and I was the only professional woman, so to speak, in a group of commission staff. But I can tell you this, it was very interesting. I worked with many older men and I worked with men who wanted to see you succeed and help you understand. There was

not a discrimination sense of being somewhere and not feeling welcomed. I've never felt that. And if I have, it's only been once or twice throughout my entire career. I have had the ability to work with the men in many different sectors, many different ages, and have been able to contribute my knowledge, recognizing their knowledge and putting it together to make it work.

And I think in their lives, I hope that's changing in the workplace. I hope that there's more of that occurring in the workplace. I do know there's a trend now more with women being in the professional field of helping other women succeed in the professional field. But when I was doing it, there weren't many. And so I relied more on those with whom I worked, my male counterparts, helping me succeed. And that's really how I learned, and they learned from me. So there wasn't any sense of threat or you're going to take my job or what have you. None of that.

Eve Austin: And you're bringing up the importance of mentorship I guess, and supporting others behind you.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Very important. And I've enjoyed doing that, I really have. Whether it be male or female, I have enjoyed watching interns come in, watching interns ... you give them something, you give them an issue. You give them something that if you had the time to work on it, you would, but you don't. So you give them that nugget, which is not stupid stuff. And you give them something they really have to look at and examine from different perspectives. And what is so nice is I've never been disappointed with the work product that has come out and they have in turn learned from what they've had to look at as well. And I think that there in lies some good value, and that would be another marker.

And the other marker would be that we keep on increasing the ability to bring up our younger and even our older who are coming back into the workforce, who want to be able to use that which they have learned, bring it up to date and apply it. So to me, our markers are for this, as you've mentioned, Eve; mentoring, increasing mentorship to all ages and to all genders in that field so that we're able to keep the momentum forward from an environmental perspective. And that would be my second marker and recommendation that I would make.

Well, I started off with the Corp and then someone said to me, "Did you know that the director of coastal zone in the Department of Natural Resources position is available?" I said, no. And they said, "You really ought to apply for it." And the reason why I decided to apply was really, I wasn't an engineer. My next step to increase my salary or do anything, I would have had to go to DC to work at the office of the chief of engineers to do that. And I thought, no, I really don't want to do that. So I applied for the director of the Coastal Zone Program in 1979 and didn't get it. So I stayed with the Corps for a year, found out it was available

again, applied and got it and proceeded to work with a staff of 18 people with a federal grant of over $3 million under the Coastal Zone Management Program to begin to look at issues affecting the Chesapeake Bay.

And they included of course, fisheries to transportation to economic development in areas that needed it along the shoreline, particularly small towns to coastal energy impact projects such as energy plants that were at the time going to be coming in to the Bay area. So what we did with the money that we had was we focused it to give Maryland the best database possible for tidal wetlands, non-tidal wetlands, for fisheries assessment and analysis for improving small towns such as Betterton with a pier and some area for economic development to improving over cross here in Brooklyn by putting fishing piers in. Because most of the population in order to get food, we'd fish from the bridge and they still do. But even so there was no place for them. And so we would work on that near the Fairfield homes area.

We helped plant wetlands near down here at Locke Manufacturing and just did a number of things analyzing the Masonville site for wildlife, analyzing parts of the Eastern Shore, looking at the potential for creating estuarine research sanctuaries around the bay, such as Monie Bay, over in Somerset County, Rhode River down here in Anne Arundel County. Just a whole lot of opportunity to bring things together, but not just from an environmental do not touch, but from an environmental, this is what's here and from an economic, here's what's valuable about the environmental aspects that you have in the bay. And why it's important to balance the economic with the environment because sometimes the economic can drive your environment and help you improve it. And sometimes the environment helps drive your economic because of a unique feature you might have that you can highlight.

I think of Calvert County and I think of the freshwater ponds that have come in off the Patuxent in Calvert County, very unique. I think of the Cypress Swamps that are around, very unique. I think of the local government wildlife areas, the local government parks, local government environmental centers that are now all around the bay, very important. And so these are things that all have come about and all have been able to sustain themselves because they recognize the balance of the environment and the economy.

And that's another marker that I make. And that marker is I believe the environmental movement and rightfully so, started out with conservation, but then it moved to protection. And the protection became such that it was you can't do, you shouldn't do, and that provides a wall, if you will, to the general public that thinks of the environment as been something maybe to enjoy. But when they hear hands off and do not touch and do not go, it's an impediment to understanding. I believe that conservation with preservation in areas that are

needed, old-growth forests for example, with the ability to enjoy and to understand is paramount. And that is what I think is going to continue to strengthen the environmental movement into the future. That's my perspective and marker there.

Eve Austin: Can you think of a time, I don't know, a story or an experience, a challenge maybe you had in people pushing back, like you're describing, feeling like they're being told that they can't do something that they want to do?

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Oh, yes. Actually, I certainly can.

Eve Austin: Okay.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: When I was with the Coastal Zone Program, we ventured forth at the suggestion of the committee to preserve Assateague Judy Johnson at the time, way before Karen Phillips, but Judy Johnson and Ilia Fehrer and they were the two along with Ed Phillips who was a planner in Wicomico County. It was toward the latter part of my tenure as a coastal zone director. So that would make a 1978 ish. There was a public meeting and this is a program that was funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration through their Federal Coastal Zone Management Act. You could establish research "sanctuaries."

Eve Austin: You're putting that in air quotes.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Yes, they're in lies the key for you, the word sanctuary, which is how the program was titled. So I remember going to Ed Phillips's house, had dinner and off we went. And then on the way he said, "Well, we were going to have it in the library here in Berlin and the meeting is going to be a little bit larger than that." He said, "It's now in the gymnasium at the high school." I said, okay. And he said, "So there'll be a crowd." I said, okay. And off we went. And I said, "I'm glad you fed me because I have a feeling it's my latest meal."

So the County Commissioners were all there and every waterman, every environmentalist, every business operator and owner, you name it, they were there. I'd say there were several hundred. And so I was there with the federal representative and we both described what the project meant if they were amenable. And they couldn't get around the word sanctuary. Sanctuary to them implied, leave it alone, won't be able to fish, won't be able to hunt, won't be able to do this, won't be able to boat, won't be able to do that and yet you could under the program. But explaining to someone that they could when they hadn't had the ability to experience and hearing the word sanctuary there in, I would say, was probably one of the most critical times when it was difficult to convey to the public what actually could be done and couldn't.

And so by the time the night was over, which was around ... it started at 7:00, I think it ended 11:30, 12:00. By the time it was over, there were three votes in favor of creating the sanctuary and the rest of them all were no way, Jose. And the commissioners all looked at me and they said, "Well, what are you going to do?" And I remember looking at them and I said, "Well, nobody wants it. I'm not going to force it on anyone. And maybe someday there will be some protective measures and using measures, but it's not now and someday there probably will be." I know that even with the Monie Bay and creating that sanctuary, that took a lot of to do, but it's there.

And I think what is an indicator now to people is if they see something being degraded, if they see something they were used to being able to do but they can't, because environmentally there's a change, there's a difference, which there is, then you might see some rethinking. But until then, the approach that you take has to be something that is at the same time that people recognize that something has to be done and that doesn't always drive ... At least in my experience, sometimes you've missed opportunity because of that, but in my experience, sometimes the opportunity comes around again.

Eve Austin: Looking back on that, and I'm sure you've had many other examples similar-

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: I'll tell you about critical areas when that one comes.

Eve Austin: Okay, but I'm just wondering if you could ... what was your takeaway? With hindsight, what would you have done differently?

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Nothing.

Eve Austin: Okay.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Nothing. They say if you hit your head against a brick wall and keep on doing it and expect different results, you won't get them. That's about how I could describe that particular time. So in other words, you could have tried to tweak this, that whatever, tweaked it to death, you would have wound up with the same result.

Eve Austin: Okay.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: You just have to be right there upfront, be able to say I'm scrapping it when you have to.

Eve Austin: If there's any advice to be shared with younger people is don't get too defeated, the time will come. It will come back and its not always the right time for things.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: And that's true. And yes, I would agree, Eve. Thank you. That's a good summarization. And I think that makes eminent sense because if you get too caught up in having failed, which I did, which we did, it happens, will you then be able to recognize the opportunity when it comes? And there in I think, that's very important. Always go back, always rethink, see what you have now and see if there is a momentum or an energy or an inclination or what have you.

Eve Austin: You mentioned some about critical errors.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Oh, I really want to pay tribute to Governor Hughes because back in the '70s as you have heard I'm sure, EPA was studying the Chesapeake Bay and millions upon millions, still millions upon millions of dollars are being spent to try to find out what is wrong with the bay, what happens? What do we need to do and how do we need to get there? And that will always be, and the bay will always present itself with different challenges because the environment is changing, because people still want to live here, because we have pressure on limited resources because people want to live here. And there are a lot of becauses. I'm going through divest a little bit, something personal.

Having had this uveal melanoma that I have and working with the clinical trial, I know that they are using certain things to prolong my life. Well, my body is like the Chesapeake Bay and my approach to the Chesapeake Bay has always been what can we do to prolong its life? What can we do to enhance its life? It's very much like you and I with our health. What can we do to improve our health? What can we do to prolong our lives? So I've found it to be a very interesting parallel. And so the scientists and researchers with whom I speak about me, I'm able to converse with them because of the experience I've had with dealing with the bay.

But back to Governor Hughes. Back in 1984 and mind you, he was the first governor to pull together the other governors and the mayor of the District of Columbia to sign the first Bay Agreement. And it was his initiative and it was done so effectively. The agreement wasn't exactly as goal oriented, watching numbers and things like that that we're doing today to keep track of what's happening across jurisdictions. But rather it was a series of statements that for the first time everybody around the bay recognized as being important statements. And out of that came I think it was 20, 23 initiatives that Governor Hughes put forth with his cabinet on land use, on improving water quality, on improving understanding of natural resources, on improving the economy around the bay, a whole agriculture, a number of things that then made it through the general assembly, all with budgets.

And out of that came one program that I know was dear to his heart. It was called Critical Areas and it was the first land use growth management program

ever that was to have teeth in it with regards to what could happen along the shoreline. And he put a judge in charge of the commission, Judge Solomon Liss who was just ... He was retired. His mind was unbelievable. The governor appointed commissioners to serve on this commission and the whole thing was under the law that was passed by the general assembly that within nine months, this commission had to come up with guidelines for local jurisdictions to use, to develop their own plans for their own 1,000 foot of shoreline.

Now, you would've thought the British were coming again and taking the territory because everybody was ... you name it, they were there. Press, Tom Horton, you name it, all of the environmental reporters. As we were doing our job, they were there. So I fortunately obtained the job for being the first executive director of the Critical Area Program and hired two or three people to help me out and off we went. And we designed the regulations, we promoted them in front of the general assembly. It was tooth and nail, just trying to get things passed, especially the growth allocation and where you could put the growth, but we made it through. And then all of the counties that had tidal waters, it doesn't go beyond the tidal waters. It's a 1,000 feet landward of the mean high water line of tidal waters or the mean high water line of tidal wetlands.

And that was the area upon which one had to determine what one could do; from forest reef to agriculture to building to preservation of environmental areas to, you name it. And all of the counties that were affected, 54 municipalities I think were affected, all then had to do something. Well, you deal with a small town that has one person running it to a Salisbury to a Baltimore City and it becomes almost mandatory that money be provided for these small towns to be able to do what they were required to under the law, and so money was provided for them to develop their plans. The commission had to approve every one of those plans. There were public hearings at night, but the bottom line is the program made it through and it still exists. And I can truly tell you that the public hearings and meetings that we had were phenomenal.

We are so caught up in technology, and that's fine. Looking at ArcView and maps and what have you that are so convenient to be able to use online that sometimes we forget that it is very important to touch base with whoever it is we need to touch base with to see how things are working. Direct contact, eye-to-eye, local jurisdictions, people with different interests, all the way from farmers to foresters to, you name it. It's important to periodically pull those groups together and say what's good? What's still good? What's not working? What do we need to follow up with? What do we need to change to make it better? We don't do that very often. We need to do that because all of these laws that Maryland has in place, which are significant and which put Maryland on the map need to be effective and need to be examined.

And therein I think is something that we need to remember now and into the future. Case in point, plant trees. Trees are really great, they are. I know they are. I had some courses in forestry. I know they're important. I know they also have a shelf life of what they can do to sequester carbon and what they can do to take nutrient uptake to improve our water quality. And they're both divergent goals and they both affect the trees at various stages in life. So we plant the trees, I think it's good. But do we ever go back to where we planted the trees to see if A, they're still there, the deer have eaten them. The undergrowth has gotten so that it stunts the life. Do we ever examine the investments that we've made with the dollars to make sure those investments are still operating like they ought to? No.

And so my other marker is this, go back, look, correct and make it as best as possible because you prolong your investment and you prolong the environmental effect. And I say that in particular around our reservoirs where trees are extremely important. I look at the reservoir system here of Baltimore City, which I know something about and the trees planted around those. There needs to be management and maintaining and so that's an example there. Another marker.

Eve Austin: Because you did some homework for me so I want to make sure you get the chance to say all that you wanted to say and kind of just a long view, I guess, if for someone who ... since you brought it up, you're trying to prolong your own life. You have more than just the typical kind of hindsight and life experience to look back on. You're also, I would imagine, dealing with a life threatening illness, it probably makes you do a whole lot more introspection and looking back and thinking and I guess it just-

Sarah Taylor-Rogers Well, it does and it doesn't. I have a rare form, five out of a million people get it. It's a called uveal melanoma and it starts in the eye. And seven years ago I had a plaque radiation therapy in my right eye and they thought they got it all. And then I had just been called back by the Dean of the College of Ag and Natural Resources to be the acting director for the Hughes Center till they selected someone. And I noticed in April of this past year that my eyesight, something was funny about it. And so I went to see the surgeon who is now at Hopkins, who was my surgeon at Cincinnati seven years ago. And she looked and she said, "Oh, it's returned." So I had a second plaque radiation therapy in my eye and it's successful but unfortunately this time a cell had learned how to migrate. And its favorite spot is the liver. So it wound up in the liver. I have one liver lesion.

And so Hopkins referred me to Jefferson Hospital in Philadelphia for this clinical trial. And I asked Hopkins oncologist, I said, "Okay, so how long do I have to live?" This is the elephant in the room. Let's feed the elephant a peanut. Now,

you tell me what's my life expectancy? And he said, "Two to seven months." My husband's knees crumbled. I just sat there and I said, "Well, what are we going to do about it?" And he referred me to Jefferson, provided my gene expressions would permit me to get into this clinical trial, which they did. No one can predict, as you know they all give you this little life expectancy thing, which I would have been perhaps not here in November, but here I am and I'm succeeding and everything's stable and it looks like it's working out and I might be that 6% person that goes on for a long period of time.

So my introspection, Eve is not so much, but rather it's more a forward projection. And that's how I choose to think about things with a forward projection as opposed to an introspection. And I find that it is a stronger way of looking at things than would be otherwise, if that makes sense. So I've tried to do that with regard to everything that I've been involved with, whether one of those bay initiatives for 10 years with the Critical Area Commission and then on to being an assistant secretary in the Department of Natural Resources for, I'll call it, all the unruly things in the department, to being then secretary for a couple of years of the department and then going to the Hughes Center for agroecology, which gave me some really good 501(c)(3) experience with the board.

And I was there for a good period of time. I retired in 2017 and in 2002 I started with the Hughes Center. It's been a great experience where I've been able to apply law, regulations, understand engineering, look at science, review proposals, see what needs to be done based on what people are saying and where the gaps are and then seeing what can we do to provide information to fill those gaps to help various groups better manage the resources that they have around the bay. That to me has been really one of the pinnacles of being able to be in the field that I've been in. The other pinnacle, I'd say there has been no other experience ever that I've had that was so challenging but so rewarding as getting that Critical Area Program through.

Eve Austin: Yeah.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Really. And I remember back when I was with the Corps, I was out in a boat with then secretary, Calder from the Department of Natural Resources and he said to me, "Sarah, what do you want to do?" I said, "Well, really Jim, sometime I'd like to be secretary of your department." And he said, why? And I said, "Because what you and your staff have been able to do has put Maryland on the map. And I think it would be a great experience to be able to continue that kind of thing at the department."

And I wound up, had the opportunity. There you go. But I have, I've really enjoyed every single moment, never said, Oh gosh, I have to get up. I have to go to work. The people with whom I have worked have all been stellar, have all had

talents and perspectives, no matter what their background, all the way from my secretary that I had for many years, all the way to someone who headed up a corporation that I needed to meet and talk with, has been stellar. It makes it worthwhile, really does.

Eve Austin: I've heard that from a lot of the people I've talked to just about loving their jobs no matter how difficult they got. So maybe to wrap up, if you could think about then, so in 2020, with all the challenges facing us and facing the planet, what would you say to young people coming up and thinking about the challenges and how to go into this field?

Sarah Taylor-Rogers To me practicality rides the dawn. You have a lot of research out there. I don't know if I would be all that excited with the technologies that we have now to try to be able to winnow my way through what is valid and what isn't. But that being said, let's assume I can do that. I would make sure that the science that was funded was practical applied science. Now, I realize there's room for science because you need to have certain answers for certain things that applied science may not give you at the moment. In other words, there are two types of science in my mind, science for science sake and science for applicability. I'm an applicability person.

And so if I had to make a recommendation it would be to take that which you know it may not be complete, and may not be quite accurate. It may not be where you want to see but take it and run with it and see what you can do from a practical applied perspective to deal with a crisis. Let's take climate change for example. I mean, I'll tell you talk about Don Quixote and windmills. Climate change is a big issue. It's international, it's affecting the globe in various ways .It's affecting the United States in various ways and it's affecting the Spain in various ways. Now do we see trends? We try to. Do we see what's going to be happening? We think we know that we're going to lose a lot of land. Well, then what do you do about it? Do you then study to see what's going to happen and when it's going to occur? Well, that's already been done.

So to me, focus on what can small towns do? What can farmers do? What can foresters do? What can the change with Southern birds coming up North. Just everything. What can we do to maintain as much as possible that which we have and what aid can we give to small towns and communities to enable them to survive. And I think that's where the money needs to be spent, if we have the money to do it at all. Not, should we save this and that? I think we need to be very particular and we need to be very, very strategic and then see what can happen.

And therein to me would be another marker I would recommend to our youth and to those that aren't so young that are in the field still trying to paddle the

canoe and make sure that they're still in the water. That's important. And I think we need to learn from others. I think we need to learn from other countries who quite frankly are ahead of the game of the United States and who are doing things about it. And what can we do to parlay some of their knowledge over here and not be embarrassed about it and not think that, oh well, we should know this and so therefore ... Mm-mm (negative). I think we need to do that.

Eve Austin: Is there anything else that you want to make sure to say or anything before we wrap up?

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: I think I pretty much blew my way through this interview.

Eve Austin: Not at all. Thank you so much. Thank you so much also for just sharing the personal piece too.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Well, there's such distinct parallel there. And I've talked with the clinical. I have two clinical people. One is a Japanese. And Japanese men have their own particular culture, shall we say, and way of doing things even though they've been in the United States. Dr. Takami Sato and then the other researcher is Marlana Orloff who's a Russian. And so they're the two that are guiding me through all of this. And I'll sit there and I'll say, "Okay, so I worked on the Chesapeake Bay for 45 years. I just received my honorary doctorate of letters of science from my college. And I'm thrilled with that. But I also know what research is like. And I also know what science is like." So I say, "So tell me, what's going on here? What about my recumbent T cells? What about this and that?" And they're going, "Oh, well we haven't looked at that." I mean, they have, but they didn't think, I would think that I would ask.

And I said, "It's very similar here and I'll describe for you what I've done. And so when I asked these questions, it comes from the perspective of having had the experience with another body that is having some difficulties and seeing what can be done about it." And they'll look, and I'll say, "Our language is different." I said, "I'm Secchi discs and I'm this eutrophication and anoxic areas and all of this, your T cells and maybe stem-cell research at some point and something else. But there are parallels here. We're all looking to improve something, there in it lies."

Eve Austin: Well, it's a beautiful and powerful parallel. Really, it's amazing. I think it's helping you.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers: Oh, I know so.

Eve Austin: Yeah.

Sarah Taylor-Rogers	Plus I'm deeply faithful in God. And I know that prayers just do it. And so there it is.
Eve Austin:	That could be a whole other interview, science and religion-
Sarah Taylor-Rogers	Indeed it could.
Eve Austin:	... but we don't have time. So thank you so much.
Sarah Taylor-Rogers	Oh Eve, you're most welcome.
Eve Austin:	Yeah. And I'll sign us out. Again, it's February 1st, 2020. This is Eve Austin and I'm speaking with Sarah Taylor Rogers and we're in her Otterbein, Baltimore, Maryland home.
Sarah Taylor-Rogers	Yes.
Eve Austin:	Yes.
Sarah Taylor-Rogers	What a delight. Thank you.