GREEN OR GRAY: WHAT'S NEXT FOR TRANSPORTATION?

Announcer 00:00

Please welcome the panel on “Green or Gray: What's Next For Transportation,” moderated by Susan Li, anchor and correspondent at Fox News.

Susan Li 00:11

Good afternoon. Thank you so much for joining us for the transportation panel on this first day of the Milken Institute 2025. And currently, today, we are at an inflection point. Disruption, not only in technology, but also in policy, as we have a new administration in place, and transportation has been, shall we say, the focal point for a lot of rollbacks when it comes to government policy. And to talk about the future transportation, green or gray at this inflection point, do you adopt or do you draw back? We have a great panel to discuss this point today. Let me introduce them directly to my left, somebody who I've been wanting to talk to for some time, Adam Goldstein, who is a founder, CEO of Archer Aviation. I think you're worth over $6 billion, that last valuation. Great to finally have you here. And next to us, we have Nina Hachigian, who's a former deputy mayor of Los Angeles, the former US ambassador to ASEAN. And then Alex Israel, who I've spoken to a few times, and your co-founder at Metropolis, which I think operates some of the largest number of parking lots across the country for the software technology. Mark Morelli is next to you—Vontier Group, some, I guess, a company that we don't hear enough of, since it's pretty recognized. Well you're at Circle K, convenience stores, gas stations all across the country, and we interact with your technology and your software almost each and every day. So welcome to Milken and thank you for joining us today. And at the end, we have Will Thompson, who is the Head of Thematic Research at Barclays, and here to give us some insights on what you're seeing when it comes to going green or grey. Do we opt for pollution or do we opt for green strategies, but of course, at a reasonable cost? So I have to start with policy, first of all, since we have passed a 100 days now with this new administration, but it's caused so much disruption, and just today, we heard from Ford, who says they're going to take a one and a half billion dollar hit from the tariffs. Also, GM says it's going to cost them $5 billion. So why don't we start, Adam, with you, because you are disruptive new technology. Where do you think we go with this new administration? And what does this mean for your business if, let's say, there are tariffs at minimum 10 percent around the world?

Adam Goldstein 02:34

One of the core elements at Archer was really trying to help reindustrialize and manufacture here in America. And so from the very beginning, we set up manufacturing in the US, specifically in Georgia. And that was really important to me. That was really important to the company. And it happens to, you know, be now where we have little impact from tariffs, but I think it's important for companies in my space, companies across all broader manufacturing industries, to look at some of the advantages that you can have from building in America. So for one, for us, the access to talent here is pretty unmatched, and so we're building a high technology machine, and so that requires very skilled labor. And so the US has that to offer. And then two, the supply base here is actually pretty good, but it's very important that it will need to be significantly invested in in order to be able to scale manufacturing. So we had to make sure we built a really solid base here, but then enable the company to be able to scale as we go from building just a few hundreds of planes to ultimately building thousands and hundreds of thousands.

Susan Li 03:40

Right, Georgia could produce two thousand aircraft in the future per year. So we'll get back to manufacturing, but I just want to talk more about policy and tariffs. And Mark, you made a very interesting point, because you said that you faced tariffs before in Trump 1. But doesn't it impact your business significantly in Trump 2?

Mark Morelli 04:00

Well it certainly does. We're a global company, and so we make products for companies around the world. It's about the mobility ecosystem. So we make gas pumps, dispensers, EV charging software, car wash systems in most of the United States. So we're really responsible for the infrastructure that supports everybody along the roadway, whether it be cars, trucks, and also fleet vehicles. But we've moved to this critical infrastructure where countries really want to be secure in their supply. So we manufacture in region for region. So about 75 percent of all of what we manufacture is actually source. So Brazil, we manufacture for Latin America; India, we've installed two-thirds of all the gas pumps in India. So you can imagine that. I think in Trump 1.0 we recognized that as part of the critical infrastructure, people want to be really secure about their supply chain. So we took a lot of, you know, actions based on that, and so we disclosed in our earnings call last week that had this been Trump 1.0 we would have been three times more exposed to those tariffs. So we really worked them down. I think the bigger issue that is out there is some of the things the new administration is rolling back, some of the incentives, because when we've seen electrification move forward, and we've served—we're the number two plugs under management for the electric charging network, and we serve a lot to the Nordics and UK and governments have been really behind this incentive. And so you can see the administration sort of scaling back there, and—

Susan Li 05:41

Well you took a $50 million hit, that was disclosed.

Mark Morelli 05:44

No, we said it was $50 million exposure.

Susan Li 05:47

Right.

Mark Morelli 05:47

And that we're going to mitigate that exposure, half of it through price and the other half through continued mitigation.

Susan Li 05:53

But if they're rolling back these incentives and rebates, like the national EV infrastructure program, $5 billion is being erased, and today they're even talking about a $250 tax on electric vehicles. What does that mean for a company like you that has already built out this pipeline supply chain for charging stations?

Mark Morelli 06:12

So we believe that the right technology that is needed is dependent upon a trilemma. So three things have to come together. People, of course, want the energy transition to be about sustainability. You want it to be about affordability, and you want it to be about energy security. And anywhere you're dealing in the world, you have to manage that trilemma, and the right technologies come to the forefront. And so what the Trump administration is doing is dialing back some of the incentives that would make some of the things around electrification a little bit harder to reach. But I think we are in the United States, very committed to electrification as part of the carpark. Only about 2 percent of the carpark in the US is electrified, so we're still at its infancy, if you will, and it will still continue to electrify, but it won't continue at that rate that - you know, the Biden administration had put in place a lot more incentives to accelerate that.

Susan Li 07:09

Yeah. Well, speaking of carparks, we have to bring in Alex. I think that's a great transition right there, since you are the operator of some of the, I think the largest number of parking lot technology. Now, I was talking to your co-founder, Courtney, who said that actually she was bullish heading into Trump 2.0 because some of the policies would actually help your business. For instance, no tax on tips, right? I mean, a lot of the operators would benefit from that. But with these tariffs and this uncertainty, market disruption, what about now?

Alex Israel 07:37

Listen, it's an interesting question. I was thinking as the rest of the panel was talking about tariffs, and humbly, I'm probably not the right person to talk about the impact of tariffs. We spend a lot of our time—I mean, at this point, we're probably the fastest growing payments company in the United States. We spend a lot of our time less focused on, I would say, Wall Street, more focused on Main Street. We are touching at this point 29,000 Americans are signing up on our platform every single day. A new, probably, American is interacting with our platform. Four Americans are probably interacting with our platform every second, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Susan Li 08:12

But let's say we already have negative growth in the first quarter of this year. If we head into a recession, consumers will be impacted. So I assume you're bracing for some sort of disruption.

Alex Israel 08:21

You know what's interesting? If you look at the parking ecosystem—so the demand for parking across the United States over the last 100 years has basically been one disruption, COVID. People weren't leaving the homes. The natural inclination, even in an economic downturn, is for people to still leave their homes. They still go to the office. They still go to recreational activities. So no, I mean, candidly, we're not seeing to date—we've seen no impact. As a matter of fact, we're seeing more people get out of their homes and go to venues. Go to amusement parks. Go to stadiums. So in our perspective, the America that we see, the America that's interacting and getting out of their homes is on a growth curve.

Susan Li 09:03

Will, with the numbers that you see in the research, do you think we're still on this growth curve?

Will Thompson 09:46

Yeah I think—look, we had the pace of fast adoption with the early adopters. I think the challenge is getting those later adopters, you know, I use myself as a test case where, you know, my wife—we're trying to replace a car, and her understanding , you know, what's the mile range? How do I charge it? There's comfortability with the existing ICE fleet of vehicles in the marketplace. So, you know, to Alex's point, right, well a lot of charging is done at home. It's the most affordable option, it's the most convenient option. And therefore it has to get—people need to understand, you know, what is required to get a level 2 charger at home, what does it do to my mile range, and a big thing that is overlooked in terms of policy perspective is the implications it has for the electric grid. On road

transportation is about 20 percent of energy use. It's only 1 percent of electricity demand today, and therefore with adoption, we have to consider what's going to happen, the implications, particularly among other inflections of low growth. Particularly what comes with AI.

Susan Li 09:53

And adoption. Because, you know, we're rolling back the EPA rules for California as well, which mandated that 43 percent of all sales had to be electric cars for a lot of these carmakers, like Ford and GM. So if you're rolling back the rebates, you're rolling back NEVI, $5 billion for charging infrastructure, what does that mean for EV adoption then?

Mark Morelli 10:22

Well, you know, look at the number of chargers that are in place today. There's about 50,000 electric high speed chargers on the road in North America. And a lot of that, almost all of that, showed up without incentive structures around it. And so that's experienced a pretty strong growth, right? And so if you look at how you need about 200,000 chargers on the American road by 2030, and I think that the same forces at play that brought those chargers to existence are still at play. So you're still going to see a growth rate of probably around 20 percent in electric chargers. You're just not going to see acceleration of it. But to what Will is talking about is a lot of what has led to what people do today is all about early adopters. And you've only seen countries like the Nordics, UK, you saw Germany, saw China heavily incent or, you know, carrot and stick for electrification to get it into the mass market, to get the penetration amount. But look what happened in Germany when they ran into some economic troubles. Recently, they scaled back on their incentives, and you started seeing some electric rate, electric vehicle adoption drop. So I think it is still very dependent. And if you look at the EV infrastructure, less than 2 percent of the carpark worldwide—there's about a billion cars on the road worldwide, that's called the carpark—less than two, about 2 percent of that is electrified. So we're still really at the infancy of it, and many countries like the US has not cracked into them.

Susan Li 11:56

Okay, well, let's bring Nina in on policy, because I'm just curious what you think of, you know, some of the changes that are being proposed, including that $250 tax, as I mentioned to you, that's being proposed by GOP congressional, you know, politicians. That's to replenish the Highway Trust, right? Because, according to them, because of the adoption of EVs, that means the Highway Trust is going to be bankrupt by 2028 so you're trying to tax the adopters, the electric adopters, because you're losing revenue from the gas-powered vehicles. Does that make sense?

Nina Hachigian 12:31

Well, I mean, I'm sure it makes **sense** to somebody, not necessarily to me. I mean, I'm really bullish globally about the EV industry. I think the products are exciting. You know, the prices are coming down. The new Slate truck at 20 grand. Like, I'm, that's great.

Susan Li 12:49

You're all in?

Nina Hachigian 12:50

I'm all in. I'm getting one. I was one of the early adopters these guys are talking about. I mean, I've had my EV for six years or so, but anyway, I think, and you can't beat, you know, air taxis. I mean, it's exciting stuff, and I think eventually consumers will go for it. But obviously it's, you know, we're hitting major headwinds. I mean, I worked for the Biden administration. I thought that that investment that we were making would make sense, not only for greenhouse gases, not only for air pollution, but also so that we could actually compete with China, which is investing massively in EVs, in cars and everything else, and in charging infrastructure. So I'm dismayed to see the changes. But you know, I also believe in these guys and other entrepreneurs like them, that they'll be able to overcome the headwinds. I don't know that we know yet whether that Congress has been able to roll back California's goal to have no gasoline powered engines, or no, you know, no purchase of new gasoline powered engines by 2035. That seems like a state's rights thing to me, but, you know, in this case, it doesn't quite apply.

Susan Li 14:09

I think it was the 43 percent mandate for carmakers to be selling - 43 percent of their cars sold had to be electric vehicles, which 12 states also signed on to. I think that's being rolled back, which seems kind of unrealistic, but especially when Tesla is the only one meeting that goal right now. But you brought up air taxis, so let's talk to Adam. Because how long have you been talking about Archer operating in what, New York? I need that in New York, Los Angeles, Miami. I mean, are you getting the government help to finally start operations at some point?

Alex Israel 14:43

Yeah. I mean, if I can on the just—even on the previous point, a lot of the stuff that you know, everyone's talking about, you know, these different tax credits being rolled back, and it's negative for EVs. The reason why I think people started, you know, buying Teslas, which really drove the EV revolution, was the product was cool. It's a fun, fast car. It's like it was a very cool thing to own, and I think it still predominantly is. I mean, Elon talks about all things will go electric, outside of rockets, and, you know, I think that makes sense for, you know, we're building electric airplanes effectively, but that's boats, that's helicopters, that's planes, that's submarines, that's so much different stuff. So if you believe that EVs are going to drive a positive kind of green effect, I think there's still a very rosy outlook that lots of other products—because electric products make really cool, fun products. So in my space, the reason why aircraft are able to go electric is because the energy density and power density of batteries has

gotten so good. That enabled us to build an aircraft that's way safer than helicopters, way quieter than helicopters, and a much lower cost point.

Susan Li 14:44

Love to see it. When is it operating?

Alex Israel 15:17

So we will launch—the goal is to launch this year, first internationally. We'll launch in Abu Dhabi, but the goal is to quickly launch here in the US after that.

Susan Li 15:59

But what is holding it up? Because it's been five, almost five, six years I've been hearing about this.

Alex Israel 16:04

It's not that it's a hold up. It's that you have to certify these aircraft to be—show that they're incredibly safe. And so we're just going through that process. There are some states that have been incredibly supportive, and so Texas is probably the most supportive state in the US, where there is potential to launch early, there's potential to build a corridor where we can almost think like a sandbox, where we can start to show that these aircraft make sense. There's lots of great people out there in the world that have been very supportive of this.

Susan Li 16:30

So give me a timeline then. Do we have anything specific? I have to ask for my own benefit and convenience.

Adam Goldstein 16:35

Sure. So my job is to build a safe aircraft, and then the regulators tell me we're going to allow it to fly. But I'd be hoping it could be as soon as soon as next year.

Susan Li 16:43

Wow, there you go. Okay, I'm going to hold you to that, but you know, I'm just wondering, though, as you brought up the geopolitical risk that we're in right now, and you mentioned that maybe we're at a standstill here in the US, but other countries—Mark, you mentioned the Nordics are 93 percent electrified already. We know that Chinese EV technology is very impressive. I mean, if you look at some of these self-driving functions that they have. So if we don't incentivize here, does the US fall back compared to other countries? And does that matter?

Mark Morelli 17:18

Well, first of all, the US is already well behind many other countries. European countries also have, like the UK has stepped out, Germany has stepped out. So there's a lot of countries well ahead of the US and their electrification efforts. Does it matter, is the real question. I think you know the path to a greener future and sustainability has to be multifaceted. I think electrification plays a role in it, and will play a role in California and in Colorado and areas around New York. But I do think that you know, the the equation for sustainability is, requires—look at fleets. I mean, less than, well less than 1 percent of fleets is electrified or uses any other alternative energy. And you know, they're all, they're all diesel, and we sell a lot of high-flow diesel gas pumps as well. But in order to make a stepping stone, there's other technologies that have to be a bridge too, like compressed natural gas, going to renewable natural gas to bio gas and hydrogen will play a role there too. So I think there's lots of other technologies that can bridge that. And I don't think that it's just electrification is the end all. I think that in part of the - when you look at the spectrum of all vehicles on the road there, clearly there's a value proposition there, where can it can own that almost fully at some point, but it's going to take a long time for us to get there.

Adam Goldstein 18:52

Yeah. I mean, the—a lot of the premise of these questions is almost—it's like, can we adopt electric products without government incentive? And I personally don't believe that the government is going to be the driver of product adoption. I personally believe it's good products drive adoption. That's why people bought Teslas. It's because it's a good product.

Will Thompson 19:11

Can I - Yeah, can I add on some—there's a generation of young people, my son, eight-year olds included, who will only drive electric vehicles. He talks about Tesla all day long. And then when you open up this option for autonomous driving, right? That's being led by the EV fleets, I mean, that's going to be a huge growth, I think a driver for EV adoption, once you feel, you know, you're self driving, right? The smart technologies that's going into these cars, and again, to your point, around China, right? The total cost of ownership is a major factor into EV adoption. So as long as we continue to get the upfront cost down, make sure that the home charging experience is affordable and convenient, I do think you'll see continued adoption.

Nina Hachigian 19:53

I have a question about autonomous driving, I just - I've just been wondering, like, does that mean that people just won't need to buy a car, they'll just be like running around, and—

Will Thompson 19:53

It depends—

Susan Li 19:53

Right.

Nina Hachigian 19:58

It'll be Waymo-ed. You know, the question.

Will Thompson 20:05

That is a view that Elon has, is that, right—the power wall should be used for essentially powering your home, in terms of backup charging, that your car becomes this autonomous vehicle to actually earn income throughout the day when you're not using it, right. Cars are on the road less than 5 percent of the day. Yeah, right. They're sitting in a parking lot. They're sitting in your house. And therefore that is an obviously income generating opportunity, and would reduce the amount of cars that are on the road, and therefore make the economics for total cost of ownership much more compelling.

Susan Li 20:36

And what about - so I wanted to talk to you, Alex, about Chinese technology, because you deal with software and just this competition of, you know, promoting and protecting US advancement when it comes to tech, I'm just wondering, is there—do you feel that there needs to be certain limits and protectionist, I guess, orders in effect, in order to protect the US from, say, an advancing country like China?

Alex Israel 21:03

Look, I—you know, a fellow CEO of another AI company was pulling out ads and effectively said, we must win this war on AI. And I actually fundamentally think that's a really interesting stance. You know, I think that—I was listening to Ted Cruz at a dinner last night, and he was talking about, you know, no one wanting to be in a hot war, but I think we are fundamentally—as we think about a trade war, and as we think about moving past a trade war

into the construct of AI and which organizations and which countries will own this technology, if it can be owned, and where is the innovation driven, I think what you do see in American excellence, and where you do see a differentiation, is our ability to innovate. I think that this idea of how artificial intelligence will evolve, I think we need to be on the cutting edge, and I think it's something that we need to be very sensitive as to where data is hosted, where those partnerships lie, and what the export policies are specifically tied to next generation chip technology.

Susan Li 22:04

But in terms of technology, Nina, is it a kind of a winner take all, global geopolitical situation we're in, where we have to advance first, otherwise we fall behind and we lose?

Nina Hachigian 22:15

I wouldn't say that it doesn't have to be that way. I mean, I do think for anything that has military applications, for sure, we want to be really careful about our exports, and in general, like whoever's on top of this technology is going to just have a huge, you know, efficiency advantage. And so we want our companies to have that. So in that sense, we, you know, we want to do that, because these are Americans and, you know, the government is supposed to be, you know, helping us. But you know, that doesn't mean necessarily that it has to be winner take all. There's plenty of ways, you know, we have partners and allies that we share with and you know that makes us stronger, and should be the way it stays.

Alex Israel 23:00

I think there's also—look, I think that we have a natural inclination to talk about the international community. We spend time talking about Europe and their adoption of EV technology. But I think if we distill this down, and I agree with Nina, I don't necessarily think this needs to be a winner take all, but we're really talking about two countries. We're talking about the United States, and we're talking about China, and we're talking about a war on artificial intelligence. We're talking about a race on defense like we're talking about two fundamental nations, and we are in a constant race.

Susan Li 23:30

Well, I'm glad you brought up defense, and I'll go to Adam on that quickly. But I just want to remind our audience as well that this is an interactive session. So I got my iPad, and that means that you have the QR code for this panel in this session. So if you want to send in your questions, I will get them here on my iPad and then, like this, throw it out to the panel later on in the last 15 minutes or so. Or we can just do it the old school way. You can just raise your hand. How about that? But speaking of defense, I just want to get back to Adam and Archer, because you have a very interesting bifurcation in your business, because it's civil and defense, and you have a partnership, I

think, with Anduril, Palmer, Luckey, also Palantir. Doesn't that depend on government incentives, though, and funding?

Adam Goldstein 24:17

There has been a clear need to build, let's call it a new generation of systems, to deal with modern day conflicts. And so I think we've seen that they called it asymmetric warfare, where the US has built a lot of very expensive, centralized systems, and there's a lot of low cost systems that have been very disruptive, that you can see in the Ukraine conflict, in the Israel conflict. And so there's a whole new set of solutions that need to get built. Today, because we have such a, you know, large, promising civil business in rotorcraft, so vertical lift aircraft, there's a very kind of obvious move for us to have a, you know, large defense business, because you can take the same aircraft that we build, which are very performative and much lower cost than helicopters today, and you can build defense applications. And so there's a whole suite of solutions that we have the ability to go build. So Anduril is effectively like a new prime that's been built. They have many different programs that they've been working on. And so their relationship with the government is very, very strong. So we partnered with them to build hybrid vertical lift aircraft. So think, you know, the same type of aircraft but can go much further, that can augment the existing fleet that we have today, and really start to think about what future conflicts look like. And so future conflicts will again likely be unmanned, and you know, the robots will likely be the ones that are out there on the front lines, rather than having people out there on the front lines. So we sit in a very favorable position to go build that. We have in-house expertise and how to build those aircraft. We have massive manufacturing capabilities to make them at much lower costs, and the technology to do it where the kind of existing primes don't really have that.

Susan Li 25:55

From a selfish perspective, can we focus on the air taxis first, and hopefully in New York to the airports from Manhattan. That's my first request before we focus on anything else. But I just want to talk about autonomy, autonomous driving, and technology. And just to get back to you, Mark, and again, you know, there is, I would say there is a technological warfare underway. I mean, who has the best tech? And obviously the US wants to be at the forefront of that. And I'm just wondering, if you think there is enough support, is it moving fast enough to ensure that that happens?

Mark Morelli 26:29

Well, I think the US has a lot of technological leadership and capabilities, and I would say that when you look at autonomous driving and how that gets rolled out, and the infrastructure needed to support that—a lot of that is what's going in place for, you know, electric vehicles already. I mean, it can leverage that. Today, I was talking to the President of EVgo this morning, which is a charge point operator. And you know, they work also with, you know, autonomous driving vehicles, as well as other vehicles. And when you look at just that whole—the areas that are going to advance the fastest are around folks that do deliveries. And whether it be deliver people or goods, you know, it's the Ubers, it's the Lyfts, and those are going to go autonomous before anything else. And I think the same infrastructure that we're building out and modernizing that infrastructure and be more sustainable—all that

technology is considered critical technology. Folks don't want an adversary in your critical infrastructure. And I think you know, governments are going to make sure they feel secure that people are building that infrastructure, that it's not going to be somehow compromised in a way that could be used against them.

Susan Li 27:55

And I'm just wondering, from your perspective, in your research, Will, I mean, where are we in that advancement in technology?

Will Thompson 28:04

I mean -

Susan Li 28:05

How much does that matter, really, sector wise?

Will Thompson 28:08

I think it matters a ton. Look, a lot of this comes down to AI right into advancing the autonomous vehicle. I would agree that we are in a arms race against China. Matter of fact, you know, Jensen, on the video, said that—yeah, said that explicitly. Last week, there was a congressional US—House congressional hearing on that exact topic. Two weeks ago, Eric Schmidt said, look, we are behind them on ARA data. They're catching up on computing and infrastructure, AI infrastructure, and they're probably on par in terms of DeepSeek now, in terms of model architecture.

Susan Li 28:48

Yeah, but, okay, so—but do we need to make sure that no China-made electric cars enter the US market? In your view?

Will Thompson 28:58

No, I think there's a—there's a bifurcation between the software stack and the actual EV vehicle itself.

Susan Li 29:05

Didn't Elon say that if there is a Chinese-made EV that enters this market, there would be—

Will Thompson 29:09

There would be—I mean, there's clearly threats, and that's a big part of like—looking at our electric grid supply chain, we prefer not to use Chinese-supplied equipment because of that weak, weak point into the grid infrastructure. So there is a consideration there. I think there is a consideration when it comes to the EV market and bringing Chinese imports to the US. But it's clear that they are making far advancements with the government support in adoption, and that gives them, again, from a energy security standpoint, a leg up versus us in continually relying on fossil fuels, right? And so, yes, we are relatively independent in terms of our own shale production, but there is a mismatch between the light and heavy oil, and that creates dependence, is still on many of the major oil states. But also, Nina, correct me if I'm wrong, but the electrification of the power grid itself in the US has been upgraded very much in the last few years and decades, and some people say that maybe there's a $400 billion gap in order to get it brought up to modern standards, in order to facilitate the power that we need to power. AI research electrification in the future. Whose fault is that?

Nina Hachigian 30:23

I don't know -

Susan Li 30:24

Pick a party. How about that?

Nina Hachigian 30:25

I don't know whose fault that is. I know that the last administration was definitely, you know, investing in the grid. I would say, though, that we are, not only is it, you know, not up to par—although, I will say, if you live in a developing country like you would be, you know, the—our electric grid is delightful, in comparison -

Susan Li 30:48

Ours as in the US?

Nina Hachigian 30:49

Ours as in the US.

Susan Li 30:50

Okay.

Nina Hachigian 30:52

Yeah, of course, it needs, it needs investment, but it is also vulnerable to cyber attacks. So, I mean, at—currently, so that's a, you know, a problem that we need to—

Alex Israel 31:05

Okay I think it makes an interesting question, whose fault is it? It's our fault, right? It's also the baby boomer generation's fault. I mean, I think we should—

Susan Li 31:13

Okay.

Alex Israel 31:13

I think we should -

Susan Li 31:13

Are you a Generation X or millennial yourself?

Alex Israel 31:17

Probably technically, a millennial. But that sets other implications, but -

Susan Li 31:21

Explains a lot.

Alex Israel 31:22

Thank you. But I think, I think the truth of the matter is, you look at certain states, you look at energy independence, you look at how we invested in nuclear technology, the push against nuclear proliferation, especially in the leveraging of nuclear technology in our country, which has left us behind. You look at countries like China. Look how they're investing in nuclear technology. Look how they're investing in next generation energy. There's a number of people in this room that I know that are invested in energy, have spent a lot of time investing in energy, like, if we—if we want to have that type of, you know, AI independence and energy independence, first and foremost, we have to be investing into our energy infrastructure. And if we're not doing that, we can't power AI, we can't power the independent chip generation. We can't power these large language models that require significant training. We don't have the power infrastructure. And I think it's fine for us to say it's our fault. Now, what are we going to do about it?

Mark Morelli 32:12

Well, I can say one thing that really helps is, if you look what's being put in place with the critical infrastructure today, a big piece of that is the energy management software, and there's a lot of great technological advances, and also the use of AI. And so I think there's a lot that can be done to also curtail some of the investments in capacity that's needed and to be able to shed load appropriately. And I think you know what you were talking about—vehicle to grid, you know, where you can start taking energy back from the fleet of all vehicles and all the batteries there. So I think there's a lot of innovation. I think the biggest area though, with investment, is about the transmission and distribution, because you can't really get around that. And if you look at the requirements on that, like utilities are going to have to make a massive investment in in transmission and distribution, and so that's an area that is still, you know, it needs a lot of infrastructure investment.

Will Thompson 33:14

We added 100 million—100 miles of transmission wire in 2023. 100 miles

Susan Li 33:21

That doesn't sound very much—

Will Thompson 33:22

Massive—yes, it's nothing. There's a massive need for permanent infrastructure reform in the United States. There is bipartisan support for it. The far progressive left doesn't want to include gas. The right wants more control over

our—wants to reduce barriers on environmental controls, but we still have issues on permitting at the state, federal and local level to get any of these interstate transmission wires. And again, we can add—supply new nuclear plants, but if you can't move the electrons where the demand is, you have a fundamental issue, and then on the distribution network, right, if we're adding a heat pump and two EVs, and any one person's driving—

Susan Li 33:58

Who's going to pay for this? I mean, let's talk about the 6% -

Will Thompson 34:01

It's ratepayers. And that's—it's utilities. And so there's - there needs to be new models in terms of government partnerships with the utilities, and understanding how to make that anticipatory investment, because right now, we've essentially maxed out the electric grid, but through the regular—

Susan Li 34:16

But there is no money left. Do you understand, from the federal perspective, right?

Adam Goldstein 34:21

How about this different perspective? Instead of trying to figure out ways on how to pay for all the new stuff and cut all the new stuff, how about use government to cut regulation and allow for newer technologies to adopt that don't require as much energy. So, autonomous vehicles. So if they would loosen the regulation around, you know, Teslas, and let them actually get autonomous vehicles on the road, then maybe we'd have to use less cars. Maybe there'd be a less need, maybe burning less hydrocarbons. Maybe we would need less electric cars, because 95 percent of the time the cars are parked. So there's other ways to do it. Instead of having government add more regulation to it, they could take regulation away and actually make it easier for innovations to solve problems.

Nina Hachigian 34:41

There's a safety issue, so that they, you have to, you have to get that under control. I think regulations around that is fine. I mean, Waymos are all over LA now, so there's, you know, obviously it can be done.

Adam Goldstein 35:11

40,000 people a year die in cars. We could today mandate that cars take FSD and they will not rear end each other. It's a guarantee enough that your car will not rear end or sideswipe anybody. There's definitely edge cases that will prevent all of the, you know, autonomous solutions to be solved, but it's definitely better than what exists today. Like my 75 year old father took my Tesla, and I put it on auto pilot for him, and it's definitely a way better driver than he could ever be. So there's definitely ways.

Nina Hachigian 35:37

I don't disagree with that. I'm just saying that there, you know, there are—the autonomous vehicles are out there on the roads. So it's happening. It's just—

Adam Goldstein 35:45

Very slowly. Very slowly.

Will Thompson 35:47

Pragmatic, pragmatic policies, right? That, you know, incentivize the use of technology. I mean, 80 percent of the grid's dark. You don't have information from it. 50 percent of transmission wires aren't utilized, right? So there's efficiencies that we are able to optimize through the use of technology that we're not using today, just because there has been—there's been barriers to be able to implement those technologies.

Susan Li 36:10

But there's been a lot of doubt about whether or not government is a solution, as you mentioned. I was looking at some of the chargers—the type of money that we're putting into just minimal amount of electric car chargers, 48 chargers in Kentucky cost $32 million that's been doled out already. You have four chargers for $700,000 in Vermont. I mean, this is the type of program spending— Well, I mean, that's - but that's when a big business has to step in. I don't think it's over, per se, but at least spend responsibly.

Nina Hachigian 36:32

Now, that's not going to happen now, so we don't have to worry about it.

Alex Israel 36:33

Someone's walking around with $32 million.

Susan Li 36:53

That's right. So there's a reason why DOGE exists. Whether or not you actually believe in their methods and practice, but there is no money left, and do you trust the government to incentivize and spend responsibly in order to electrify the grid or get more electric issues on the right—

Mark Morelli 37:05

First of the kind's always expensive, right? And so you have to get to the end of the kinds. There needs to be efficiencies with scale you're seeing. I mean, Tesla has been very efficient, modular, designing their DC fast charging stations, right? And so that needs to be implemented across different corporations. So look, I think, I think you're going to see inefficiencies when we first stand up these technologies, but we get better with each iteration, and part of it is just the infrastructure upgrades to connect these DC fast-charging stations to the grid. I don't—I don't know that government is needed, per se, to get there. Government can facilitate getting there faster, if done right. I mean, you see this in other governments, where they have, no question, accelerated the adoption of the EV infrastructure and adoption of EVs. But I don't think that it's absolutely required. I think innovation plays a role. I think standard setting bodies are super important, because you need standards to be set around open charge protocols or plug-in charge and these kind of things, so that OEMs making vehicles and people making chargers. So, I mean, think about it, maybe in an old fashioned sense, you would go to an ATM and you would put your card in and it miraculously knows who the heck you are, and you get cash out of it. Think about all of the handshakes required with banks. You can pretty much be anywhere in the world and have that occur. So think about all of that is figured out from a standard setting and a security setting, and so that kind of thing is absolutely needed. And there are these standard-setting bodies that are out there, but people have been also slow to kind of move to those you know. The OEMs play a role. Everybody in the industry needs to play a role. So it is happening. It is working. It's not that it's not working. The government in the United States, is not necessarily accelerating it. It's not going to stop it. I think innovation—I think what Adam was saying is good products, and innovation, is going to ultimately prevail. And I think people are on it, but I don't think that the US is going to lead in this adoption on worldwide. I think that ship is has already sailed.

Susan Li 39:27

But is it a bad business? Alex. Maybe you can answer this because remember? Ford and GM said that they want most of their sales to be—100 percent of their sales to be—electric by 2035, and now you hear Ford saying they're going to take a $5 billion charge and loss on their electric business. So can we just say it is a failure then?

Alex Israel 39:27

Well, I think, you're turning to the provocative person to ask.

Susan Li 39:34

Why not?

Alex Israel 39:34

Look, I don't think it's a factor of whether or not it's a failure. I think what you're looking at is a failure to reach economic sustainability. And what I mean by this is you think about why there are so many fuel stations across the United States. Makes economic sense to build a fuel station. Like why do you build pumps? Because the fuel cost - There's demand, but there's an economic model, you can actually make money doing it. What we haven't seen is the kind of proliferation of electrification infrastructure in the United States for charging because there isn't that economic model. Why you've seen proliferate on a Tesla front is because it was a loss leader. It made sense because it allowed them to sell vehicles and then allowed them to create a charging model to generate revenue from the charging infrastructure. But if you don't have the economic model, if you don't have the fundamental baseline, the ones and zeros, the dollars, which they don't have from an electrification standpoint, you hit a ceiling.

Susan Li 40:42

Demand.

Mark Morelli 40:44

Well, I think that's changing, and the reason why it's changing is a function of utilization. So think about if you're an electric charging operator and you're below 10 percent utilization, then if what you're saying is true, you can't make money. It's the cost of that infrastructure, and you don't have the utilization. But now you look at some of these well-run charge point operators in the United States. Some of those are our best customers, and they're now reaching 30 percent utilization rates. And so, you know, in certain areas—

Susan Li 40:50

You're confident in the near term? Like two to three years? What timeline are we looking at? That's good? 30 percent? That sounds terrible.

Mark Morelli 41:01

Thirty percent is a lot better than 10, and 30 percent means you're making money. And so these folks are starting to begin to reach the phase of recovering that investment. And by the way, it's not the government numbers you were talking about, because we know how much electric charges should cost, and I don't know how that math adds up, but it is expensive to put in. But if you get that utilization rates, and then smart people with really good

business models, and you start seeing these folks emerge right now, and they're going to flip to profitability in the very near future, and that's what the industry needs. It's not just you're always going to lose money and you're not going to get a return on your investment. You're starting to see that flip. And you saw this in other countries, when that utilization rate begins to take off is when they start making money. There's people—charge point operators, folks that you know what area they're in business, just doing electric charging. Or you see convenience stores in Europe, or destination places where you stop and charge. These folks are making money in Europe. There's no question about it. Some of our customers, we definitely know, can see it's profitable.

Susan Li 42:33

Adam, are you shaking your head?

Adam Goldstein 42:34

I just don't know if any of that matters. I mean, why not do it the American way? Make good products. People buy your good products, and then you make money. It's what Tesla did. It works. They make good products. Or the world is saying, America's saying, doesn't make good EV products, so nobody buys them, so they don't make any money. It's very easy.

Susan Li 42:49

But Tesla's stock is down about 45 percent.

Adam Goldstein 42:53

Tesla is worth more than every other auto company combined. I mean, it's still created immense amounts of value. I mean, he makes good products. And he's done it across industry after industry. The reality of the big automakers, they've struggled with EV products, they're not great products, which is why people don't buy them.

Nina Hachigian 43:08

I mean, there is the, you know, we shouldn't leave out the climate change piece of this. I know it's not, you know, where our current government is, but it is a reality. I think we're, you know, maybe one of very few governments in the world that doesn't recognize that, that it's an issue, and EVs are part of the solution. So from that point of view, I mean, I agree with you, of course, you know, it's about the good product at the end of the day. But there is also that motivation, from a government point of view, to invest in, you know, in charging infrastructure, or in, you know, incentives, or so.

Mark Morelli 43:47

I think it's not just a good product, though. I think if you are going to reach the mass market, people are not just looking at a good product. They're looking at something to be provided for them, like transportation at a very low cost. And if you look what China has done, is you know, they—and you see this out of the Shanghai auto show this past week, where the prices are just remarkable, and probably—

Susan Li 43:52

Remarkably low.

Mark Morelli 43:55

And, I mean, it's shocking, and—

Susan Li 44:02

But there are government subsidies at play.

Mark Morelli 44:19

Well, their government has subsidized their whole supply chain, you know, to create it, and the infrastructure behind it, and so if you were to drive these vehicles, and we ran into these vehicles a couple years ago in the Nordics, we spent a lot of time in the Nordics because it's been a leader of adoption of electric vehicle technology and infrastructure. And, you know, a couple years ago, you were kind of blown away with the quality of these vehicles and the luxury that's provided. But to get to the mass market, you have to hit a pretty low price point. And you know, it is a little bit of an unfair playing field that, you know, the American OEMs are up against to be able to address that.

Adam Goldstein 44:59

But isn't—Slate's doing it. I mean, there's new companies that are coming out. You know, Jeff Wilkie, that's a company you know that—that they built. That's, you know, it'sof course, the products are new. We'll see what happens. But that's a new startup. They're trying to offer EVs in the $20,000 range. So the question is, geez, if you can offer an EV for 20,000 what could you get for 50,000 right? And the answer should be, I would assume a lot more luxuries, but it would take a good set of entrepreneurs to do that. So I mean, my whole thesis around all of this is deregulate, let the entrepreneurs build, and ultimately let people vote with their wallets.

Will Thompson 45:34

It's arguably easier to start from scratch. I know the upfront capital cost that Tesla required to get to where it is today. But the dual path that the Detroit OEMs have had to go to has been quite challenging. They obviously have balance sheet liabilities that they have to deal with. So I think they are, you know, operating with a hand behind their back in terms of the EV outlook, and that's where you've seen the benefits some of these startups have gotten. Don't have those legacy issues, and hopefully that does continue to lead to innovation. But again, I think we are being short-sighted to say, all right, look, EV adoption has slowed. Again, we got to this first part of early adopters.

Susan Li 46:13

They're still under 20 percent at this point, and it's been more than a decade.

Will Thompson 46:17

You turn over 7 percent of the fleet a year, so it's gonna take time, right? Not —even if you sold 50 percent EVs next year, it can take a decade plus to get really high adoption, just because of the fact that you have a brand—if I bought a car yet last year, that's nice, probably not gonna get out of it for another five, seven years. But can we say 2035 is unrealistic then?

Mark Morelli 46:38

Yeah, I believe so.

Susan Li 46:39

Can we say that across the board? Yes, okay, we have agreeance then. Finally. Now, I have a few questions that have come in, and we have about 13 minutes left, and I will, after we answer these questions -

Adam Goldstein 46:52

I don't agree with that.

Susan Li 46:54

Oh you don't agree.

Adam Goldstein 46:55

If Tesla becomes autonomous, and, you know, they let it all happen, and they can crank up production, and then people can be driving a lot of autonomous cars around, maybe the fleet we have today augments in a way we can't quite understand. And so there's other variations of just the existing track moving forward. First, maybe we all take autonomous cars here by 2035, and all those cars are Tesla or maybe Waymo, and both will likely be electric. And so all of a sudden, the market share changes in a very different way. And the question becomes not about adoption, but production. How many cars can people produce, and how many can they produce here? And then all of a sudden, the conversation could shift drastically.

Susan Li 47:35

An optimist, we like that on the panel. So let me get to these questions, and then we'll throw it out here to the audience, if anybody has a question for our panelists. But one for Archer and for Adam. This is not me, but this is a question for you. So how did Archer manage to raise $3 billion for an idea which has still not earned revenue?

Adam Goldstein 47:58

And come out swinging!

Nina Hachigian 48:01

Not the first time that—

Alex Israel 48:02

I put that one in, Adam, yeah.

Adam Goldstein 48:05

Why? Because this is America, and that's what it's about. We have the best capital markets in the world. We really do. We have access to capital. We have a supportive government in the context of what I'm building, and we have a really great talent base that's built off, you know, 100 years of aviation. I mean, we have, you know, the FAA for as much you know, flak that it gets, it has an incredible wealth of knowledge of building really safe aircraft, you know. You know, a deeper set of knowledge than anybody else. And so when you have a new technology that has the ability to be so transformative, people see giant TAMs, total addressable markets. And when credible teams come together and start to show proof, it gives you the ability to go do these kind of things. So Archer didn't raise

$3 billion day one. We did it over time, and we showed proof points that this concept is real. As the competition has thinned, there's barely any competition at this point, it's pretty clear that it's a—it can be a massive market. It's pretty clear it'll be very important in the defense world. And so a lot of investors have been willing to take that bet.

Alex Israel 49:09

It's also personally visceral, right? Everyone can imagine this idea of not sitting in traffic, not waiting to get to their next—next destination. You could just get in a vertical takeoff and landing vehicle, and a few minutes later, show up at your destination, get back to what matters in life. I think we're so consumed by wasting time—this idea that you could get into an Archer and just fly somewhere, anywhere, be with your family, spend time with friends. That's a dream. That's an American dream, right? We think about the sexiness of the automobile. It was the same level of freedom that was provided. I think Adam's company is doing the same thing.

Susan Li 49:43

Okay, supportive. I like that.

Nina Hachigian 49:45

The video is super cool. So if anybody —it's on your website?

Adam Goldstein 49:49

Yeah, it's on the website.

Nina Hachigian 49:50

Yeah, check it out. I mean, you know, I can imagine - I can imagine those that—why the 3 billion came your way? It's like, it's just -

Susan Li 49:58

But why haven't they been authorized, to operate in Los Angeles, then? I'm just curious.

Adam Goldstein 50:02

Well, it's not - it's a, it's a federal thing, not a local thing. So it's more of a - you have to get what's called a Type Certificate from the FAA, which is showing you can pass these tests to make these, you know, aircraft, the safest forms of transportation in the world. It's a very, very high standard. And so it just takes years to go through that. And so we're deep into that process, and that process is coming to an end, and then eventually we'll build a launch.

Susan Li 50:24

And the traffic is terrible in LA these days. Another question, spoke briefly in infrastructure, can panel comment on the charging infrastructure? Majority don't have O/M spend to maintain. Who wants to take that?

Mark Morelli 50:39

OEM spend.

Susan Li 50:39

I think they meant OEM spend.

Mark Morelli 50:41

OEM spend?

Susan Li 50:42

Yes, but they misspelled it with a slash in the middle, so.

Mark Morelli 50:45

So, yeah, I don't think that OEMs are really responsible for that infrastructure. I mean, you saw Tesla do it out of necessity. I mean, Tesla only wanted to build an EV infrastructure for charging because they wanted to sell vehicles, and it didn't really exist. But if you go to areas where that EV infrastructure is already in place, you can see Tesla is being charged in non-Tesla equipment. And I think you know, probably OEMs really love that, because they want the range anxiety not to be an issue. And by the way, you know, you look at other examples of other areas where people have their own garages and they charge in their own garages, you see there is also a need for that infrastructure of EV charging. EV charging is different than filling up your car with gas, and if you've ever sort of experienced that, and if it's your only vehicle. So I think that it's not the OEMs responsibility. I think it's just the infrastructure build out, and it's good business models that need to take effect, and you see them emerging around

the world. And I think that that ship has already sailed, and you're seeing that take off. So I don't think that OEMs bear that responsibility. They bear responsibility to make sure it's interoperable and that they comply with standards. And they make those kind of investments, and they make really great vehicles, and they reduce the cost, and they offer a lot of choice. You know, in big part too, where the mass market has been really reached is because there's not been a lot of choice on electric vehicles. So they, I think they bear a lot of responsibility, but I don't think they bear the responsibility for the infrastructure.

Susan Li 52:30

Seven minutes left, and I just want to make sure we have time for our last thoughts. How about that? So just a question to Alex on Metropolis from the audience. They want to ask, how will Metropolis change their business model? Because you talked about autonomous driving, how will Metropolis change their business model when people don't need to park anymore?

Alex Israel 52:52

Adam, you want to take this one?

Adam Goldstein 52:53

Where are you going to park the autonomous cars?

Alex Israel 52:55

Look, I think there's—I think there are some questions that are coming out in this panel, and the questions should be temporal, and instead they're binary, which is the questions we're asking is if this will happen, if autonomous vehicles will happen, if electrification will happen, if vertical takeoff—

Susan Li 53:12

Well as a CEO, don't you have to plan for the future and how things might change? And modify your business plan?

Alex Israel 53:17

I think, you do, but you also have to understand what is the inevitability. These technologies are an inevitability. As a society, we will bring these technologies. We will bring these products to market. It's a question of when. So as

you think about the evolution of parking, I think there's this, this natural inclination or hope or delusion that vehicles will just circle the block endlessly waiting for their next ride or next job. You talked about the future Adam was describing. And I hope we see that deregulation. I hope we see an adoption of autonomous vehicles at a much faster rate. But what I will tell you is those vehicles will not circle the block endlessly. We will not see mass congestion on our roads. What we will see is vehicles need to be —need to go somewhere to be cleaned, serviced, charged and deployed. You will see the natural evolution from parking to mobility. All of the charging infrastructure we're talking about, all of the charging infrastructure required to facilitate Adam's technology. Where do you think these vehicles are going to land? Top of parking facilities. That's what facilitates that next generation of infrastructure and mobility, is you have to provide the infrastructure to enable that inevitable change. I think you just answered the question. Then that is changing your business plan in anticipation of autonomous and maybe more service-based - I would argue it's not changing our business plan. The reason we've invested so much in artificial intelligence and computer vision is our original thesis was, how do you connect Old World infrastructure with next generation technology, and you have to be able to understand occupancy in real time, and you need to be able to provision occupancy.

Will Thompson 54:47

I want to say one thing we haven't talked about is vehicle grid integration. So this is the—the policies, the market structure, and the technologies that will allow us to, again, effectively charge these vehicles when we need them, how we need them. And that's gonna be very important, in terms of, again, maximizing the use of solar energy, right? Workplace charging. And the tendency to start off is going to be, we're going to be charged at home most often, because it's the most convenient and affordable way to do it. But if you're going to maximize the grid infrastructure that is underutilized during midday and take advantage of solar energy, the obvious case is to use workplace charging.

Susan Li 55:22

Okay.

Will Thompson 55:22

And so there's gonna be a whole smart charging, bi-directional charging, workplace charging. There's a lot of different innovation technologies that we require, again to, again, get the high levels of EV adoption.

Susan Li 55:33

So we're in the final five minutes. I would just like our audience—yes, go ahead.

Audience Member 55:37

Yeah. I guess one comment and one question, I disagree with the fact that coolness factor will drive adoption. I think it's a cost-profitability decision. In India, 54 percent of three-wheelers—new three wheelers—they are EV and that's just cost. It's not about coolness factor—my question is, what do you the impact of critical mineral constraints by China, that's 97 percent I believe, will have on this vision of the future.

Mark Morelli 56:06

I think it's a problem because, you know, April 5th, China said there are seven rare earth elements that were going to be restricted on its export. And, you know, there, there is not enough availability of that, or it's very expensive to get out of the ground and look at the deal the US was making with Ukraine. That's all about getting mineral rights and —but it's very expensive to get that out. So there has to be some solution to that for everything that we're talking about to work, because you think about just running an electric motor require some of these elements, and it's a - it's a big issue.

Susan Li 56:45

Great question. Thank you for asking that.

Adam Goldstein 56:47

Not just cool products, good products. I agree.

Susan Li 56:50

All right. Final three minutes. So final thoughts from our panelists, unless there are any more questions from our audience here, okay, so final thoughts here, and we'll go in order, is tell me things you're bearish on over the next five years, say two to five years, and tell me the things you're bullish on for the next two to five years. Adam.

Adam Goldstein 57:14

I am optimistic that innovation and technology will drive the right outcomes. And I do think we will lead to a, you know, a greener future. I do think the products that are in the pipeline, like autonomous driving, as an example, will lead to a cleaner Earth. And I think we have to let that naturally happen. And I think the new administration is lined up that way. And so I think that like makes sense to the way that we're, we're adopting. So I am very happy with that. I am actually, I would say, more bearish against, surprisingly, a lot of the actual, from what I've seen in my business, the climate activists have actually been what I feel are, in a way, anti-change and anti some of these

growth movements. And I think that's a mistake, because I do think technology adoption is the thing that will drive, actually, a cleaner, better, brighter future.

Susan Li 58:06

Nina.

Nina Hachigian 58:08

I am worried about the un-investment in basic R&D that's going on now, and because a lot of—China's massively investing in R&D. We are pulling back. And I think ultimately, for the next generation of technologies, we're going to end up being behind if we don't, if we don't change that. I'm optimistic—related to something that the question - the audience member said, which is the adoption of electric scooters in many parts of the world, are going to vastly improve the air quality and reduce millions and millions of deaths, and I think we can do that at a good price point.

Susan Li 58:52

Alex.

Alex Israel 58:53

I'll keep this short and sweet. I'm bullish, embarrassed, about the exact same thing, which is artificial intelligence. I think on one side, we can't conceptualize the value that it's going to drive. And on the other side, I don't think we can conceptualize the negative externalities and impact on our society. And I think we're not talking about it enough.

Susan Li 59:11

Mark.

Mark Morelli 59:12

I'm bearish about us talking about platitudes, where it's just binary, it's, you know, all electric or not electric or, you know, you can pick a whole bunch of technologies that you say they're going to be there or not. Look what happened the last couple years, where people thought everybody would be driving electric vehicles by now. I think that there —what I am bullish about is that it is a multi-fuel future. We can achieve climate change goals, and we

can also have very successful business models making money with smart business people putting this in place with a stepping stone approach to getting there.

Susan Li 59:50

Will.

Will Thompson 59:52

I am—I'm going to share with Alex, I'm bullish on AI, I'm bearish on our competitive advantage versus China, and also, bearish on our ability to meet the incremental power demands and to come with broader electrification, industrial decarb and AI without infrastructure permit reform.

Susan Li 1:00:09

Well, we are out of time, and I want to thank our panelists for sharing their thoughts and insights today, and thank you for joining us. Have a great Milken conference. Thank you guys. Thank you.

Disclaimer: This transcript was generated by AI and has been reviewed by individuals for accuracy. However, it may still contain errors or omissions. Please verify any critical information independently.