

A Data Center at the Former Crystal Geyser Site?

A balanced briefing for the Mt. Shasta community

What we know, what we don't, the case for and against, the positions you might take, and how to make your voice heard. Sources are footnoted throughout and listed in full at the end.

Why this briefing exists

The former Crystal Geyser plant, the big industrial building just outside town that most of us know from the long fight over water bottling, is back on the market, and its for-sale listing markets it for heavy industrial uses that include a data center. Separately, word has gone around that a company made an early, exploratory inquiry to City of Mt. Shasta staff about siting a data center there. The listing is a matter of public record; the inquiry is not, so treat it as unconfirmed until the City or County says otherwise. Either way, there is still no formal application, no named data-center company, and no technical detail on the table, which fits how early this is.

That early stage is the whole reason for this briefing. The best time to get informed is before a proposal is fully formed, while the community still has room to ask questions and shape what happens, if anything. So this document walks through the history of the site, what a data center actually is and why these projects draw scrutiny, an honest look at the potential benefits and the real concerns, a menu of reasonable positions, and the contacts you'll need to weigh in. It doesn't tell you what to think. The point is an informed community, not a predetermined answer.

The site and its history

The building sits in unincorporated Siskiyou County, right at the northern edge of Mt. Shasta, at **210 Ski Village Drive**, about 1,000 feet west of the North Mt. Shasta Boulevard and Ski Village Drive intersection. The developed part of the site runs to roughly 118 acres.¹ The building itself is a big former bottling plant, around 145,000 square feet, on land the county zones for heavy industry. The wider property of about 260 acres takes in the production wells, and the water rights run with the land.²

It started as a Dannon water-bottling plant in 2001, passed to Coca-Cola, then sat shut and mostly empty after about 2010, when the bottled-water business slumped. All through those years, neighbors kept complaining about wells running low, plus noise, vibration, night lighting, and truck traffic.³

¹Siskiyou County and Mt. Shasta Area Newspapers, "Notice of Public Hearing and Availability of a Final Environmental Impact Report for Crystal Geyser Bottling Plant," Sept. 7, 2017. The site is at 210 Ski Village Drive, a roughly 118-acre former bottling-plant site in unincorporated Siskiyou County next to the city's northern limits. <https://www.mtshastanews.com/story/news/2017/09/07/notice-public-hearing-availability-final/18878065007/>

²"Environmental studies not required for Crystal Geyser," Mount Shasta Herald, Nov. 2013. A roughly 145,000-square-foot former Dannon/Coca-Cola facility. Bottling was treated as a permitted "by-right" use under the county's heavy-industrial zoning, water rights ran with the land, and effluent went to the city's wastewater plant. <https://www.mtshastanews.com/article/20131120/News/131129995>

³"History," We Advocate Thorough Environmental Review (W.A.T.E.R.). The plant was built by Dannon in 2001, later run by Coca-Cola, then closed and emptied around 2010, with long-running neighbor complaints about well drawdown, noise, vibration, night lighting, and traffic. <https://www.cawater.net/history>

Crystal Geyser bought the place in 2013 for about \$5.2 million, and what came next is familiar to anyone who lived here. It set off roughly seven years of conflict over a plan to bottle Mt. Shasta water and truck it away. The community pushed for a full environmental review. An Environmental Impact Report running to tens of thousands of pages eventually got produced, lawsuits followed, and a coalition that included the grassroots group WATER (We Advocate Thorough Environmental Review) and the Winnemem Wintu Tribe kept up the pressure. Crystal Geyser had been paying around \$400,000 a year in county property taxes, but in 2021 it announced it was giving up, and in 2022 it sold the property to One Shasta LLC for about \$7.1 million. City officials said then that the new owner was looking at commercial and industrial uses, and the sale deed included a stipulation barring the property from being used for water bottling or distribution.⁴

It is worth stating plainly what that deed restriction does and does not do: it permanently rules out the specific use the community fought hardest against, pulling water from the ground and shipping it away by the truckload, but it places no limit on other industrial uses, a data center included. The deed settles the bottling question; it leaves the water and power questions a data center would raise entirely open.

As of 2026, the property is on the market again, with an asking price of about \$7.6 million. The listing markets it for heavy industrial uses that include a data center, and highlights two features in particular: substantial electrical capacity, with two services rated at 5,000 and 3,200 amps, and an included water right, a spring permitted for up to 500,000 gallons a day. Those are the features that make the site attractive for a power- and water-intensive tenant, and they are the same water and power this briefing examines below.

Where it is. The site is at 210 Ski Village Drive, about a mile north of downtown. [Open the location in Google Maps](#)

Two pieces of history that matter for any new user

First, the wells. Neighbors have said for years that the earlier operations here pulled down nearby residential wells and brought noise and traffic with them.⁵ Whatever moves in next, that history is the lens a lot of residents will judge it through, and fairly so.

Second, why water is the heart of this at all. Mt. Shasta's cold spring water isn't just a local point of pride. The aquifer feeds the municipal supply and the headwaters of the Upper Sacramento, McCloud, and Shasta rivers, which hold trout and salmon, and the mountain itself is sacred to the Winnemem Wintu and meaningful to many others. Nobody has solid baseline data on how

⁴Skye Kinkade, "Crystal Geyser pulls out of Mount Shasta water bottling plant," Mt. Shasta Area Newspapers / Siskiyou Daily News, May 17, 2021 (<https://www.mtshastanews.com/story/news/2021/05/17/crystal-geyser-water-company-pulls-out-mount-shasta-plant/5133916001/>); and "Crystal Geyser sells Mt. Shasta plant to Bay Area company; no plans for water bottling," KRCR News, Apr. 2022 (<https://krcrtv.com/news/local/crystal-geyser-sells-mt-shasta-plant-to-bay-area-company-no-plans-for-water-bottling/>). A \$5.2M purchase in 2013, about \$400,000 a year in county property taxes, withdrawal in 2021, and a 2022 sale to One Shasta LLC for about \$7.1M, with the buyer pointing to commercial/industrial use, not bottling. The deed's no-bottling-or-distribution stipulation is reported by Jefferson Public Radio, March 21 and April 22, 2022.

⁵"Crystal Geyser a hot topic at Mount Shasta council meeting," Mt. Shasta Area Newspapers, Nov. 26, 2013. Residents raised concerns over aquifer impacts, truck traffic, noise, and the mountain's sacred waters, including a neighbor's account of well changes during Coca-Cola's pumping. <https://eu.mtshastanews.com/story/business/2013/11/26/crystal-geyser-hot-topic-at/41773763007/>

much water the aquifer holds or how it moves underground, and that gap is a big part of why the community has pushed for real scientific study before anyone pulls large amounts out.⁶

What a data center is, and why these projects draw scrutiny

A data center is a building, sometimes a whole campus, packed with computer servers that run around the clock. Two things drive its footprint. It needs a lot of electricity to run the servers, and plenty of cooling to keep them from overheating. The AI boom has set off a wave of new data centers across the country, and with it a wave of local fights over water, power, and noise.

On the electricity side, these are some of the most power-hungry buildings going. A federal analysis found data centers used about 4.4% of all U.S. electricity in 2023, and that share could climb to somewhere between 6.7% and 12% by 2028.⁷ About half or more of that power runs the servers, and much of the rest goes to cooling. Backup power usually means diesel and natural-gas generators, and the biggest “hyperscale” sites can pull 100 to 1,000 megawatts, on par with the electricity use of tens to hundreds of thousands of homes. By one Department of Energy comparison, a data center can burn through 10 to 50 times the energy of an office building the same size.⁸

On water, the honest answer is that it depends entirely on the cooling design, and that’s the one thing nobody knows about any Mt. Shasta inquiry yet. Evaporative cooling, the water-based kind, can run through millions of gallons a year. A closed-loop or air-cooled design uses very little water on site, but it pulls more electricity to do it, and making that electricity uses water somewhere else. So water and power aren’t separate questions. They’re a trade-off, and the engineering choices decide how heavy the local footprint actually is. The other things that come with these buildings are round-the-clock fans and chillers that make noise, plus waste heat and a lot of construction traffic while it’s going up.

Towns across the West have handled this in different ways. Reno, Nevada paused new data centers with a moratorium. Oregon passed a law in 2025 to keep regular ratepayers from footing the bill for powering these facilities. Counties like Missoula, Montana have written their own local rules.⁹ None of that makes a data center automatically good or bad. It just means other places decided it was worth setting clear rules first.

⁶California Trout, “Mount Shasta Spring Water Management” (<https://caltrout.org/our-work/blue-ribbon-waters/mount-shasta-spring-water-management/>); and Jane Braxton Little, “Below Mount Shasta, a fight bubbles over bottled water,” High Country News, May 28, 2018 (<https://www.hcn.org/issues/50-9/communities-challenge-companies-over-bottling-mount-shastas-water/>). Mt. Shasta spring water feeds the municipal supply and the headwaters of the Upper Sacramento, McCloud, and Shasta rivers, and public baseline data on the aquifer has been limited.

⁷Arman Shehabi et al., “2024 United States Data Center Energy Usage Report,” Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, LBNL-2001637, Dec. 2024 (<https://eta-publications.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/2024-12/lbnl-2024-united-states-data-center-energy-usage-report.pdf>); and U.S. Department of Energy press release, Dec. 20, 2024 (<https://www.energy.gov/articles/doe-releases-new-report-evaluating-increase-electricity-demand-data-centers>). Data centers used about 4.4% of U.S. electricity in 2023 (176 TWh), projected to reach roughly 6.7 to 12% by 2028.

⁸Congressional Research Service, “Data Centers and Their Energy Consumption: Frequently Asked Questions,” Report R48646, May 12, 2026 (<https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R48646>). About half or more of a data center’s power runs the IT equipment, and much of the rest is cooling. Backup power often includes diesel and natural-gas generators, and hyperscale facilities draw 100 to 1,000 MW, “roughly equivalent to the load from 80,000 to 800,000 homes.” See also Associated Press (via KCUR), “Water and energy use is growing as data centers are built...,” Aug. 2025 (<https://www.kcur.org/news/2025-07-21/data-centers-water-electricity-growing-usage>). A data center can use 10 to 50 times the energy of a comparable office building, and closed-loop cooling cuts on-site water use but raises electricity use.

The case in favor

There's a real, reasonable case that a data center could be a better fit for this site than what came before. Here it is at its strongest.

- **Reuse of a building that's just sitting there.** The plant is a big industrial structure that's sat mostly idle, and fought over, for about fifteen years. A working tenant puts an existing building back to use instead of carving up open land.
- **It doesn't truck the water away.** This is the strongest point in its favor. Bottling exists to pull water out of the ground and ship it elsewhere. A data center's water use depends on cooling instead, and a closed-loop or air-cooled one could use far less of the aquifer than a bottling plant ever did. For a town whose deepest worry has been water leaving, that difference is a big deal.
- **Tax base.** Back when Crystal Geyser held it, the property threw off around \$400,000 a year in county property taxes. A working facility brings that money back, and maybe more, to help pay for county services.
- **Jobs and a wider economy.** Building it would bring temporary construction work, and running it would add some permanent skilled jobs in maintenance, security, and plant operations. The number is modest, but in an economy leaning hard on tourism and timber, a little variety helps. A project like this can also bring broadband or grid investment along with it.
- **Leverage to negotiate.** Any project this size needs local approvals, which gives the community real bargaining power to demand enforceable conditions and benefits up front. That power mostly vanishes once a project is approved.

The concerns

There's an equally real case for caution, or for flat opposition, rooted both in this particular site and in how these facilities have played out elsewhere.

- **Water, the unanswered question.** Depending on how it's cooled, a data center could put steady, serious demand on the same aquifer the community fought to protect. Given the well problems this site already has on record, neighbors have every reason to want hard, metered limits and independent monitoring instead of promises. Until someone discloses the cooling design and the projected draw, the core risk stays unknown.
- **Electricity and the grid.** A big facility needs a big, steady supply of power out in a rural area. That brings up whether the grid can even handle it, who pays for any upgrades, and whether everyone else's utility bills go up because of it. That last worry is exactly what drove Oregon's ratepayer law. On-site gas generation is sometimes part of the deal too.
- **Air and noise.** Backup diesel generators and cooling gear that never shuts off don't sit well in an airshed this clean, and noise was already a logged complaint against the earlier operations here.

⁹Nevada Current, Feb. 9, 2026, on Reno's data-center moratorium (<https://nevadacurrent.com/2026/02/09/data-center-water-power-needs-regulatory-challenges-strain-rural-communities/>); The Oregonian / Lincoln Chronicle, Mar. 2026, on Oregon's 2025 ratepayer-protection law and tax-break moratorium (<https://lincolinchronicle.org/oregon-communities-envision-9100-acres-for-new-data-centers-quadrupling-the-industrys-footprint/>); and Montana Free Press, May 21, 2026, on Missoula County's local data-center regulations (<https://montanafreepress.org/2026/05/21/missoula-panel-highlights-data-center-concerns/>).

- **Not many jobs for the footprint.** Once a data center is up and running, it doesn't take many people. The permanent headcount tends to be small next to the size of the building and the resources it uses, so the jobs payoff can be thinner than it first sounds.
- **Tax breaks can eat the benefit.** Data center developers often ask for property-tax breaks and other incentives. If those get granted, they can shrink the very tax revenue everyone's counting as a plus, so the real fiscal gain is worth a hard look.
- **Character and brand.** Mt. Shasta's whole economy and identity rest on a clean, even sacred, mountain. A heavy industrial use rubs against that, and against the tourism economy built on it.
- **Process and transparency.** Last time, the community got blindsided, finding out about a major project from a photo in the local paper. A lot of residents will want full disclosure, independent review, and public hearings before any decision gets made, not after.

Who actually decides, and the question that drives everything

The plant sits on unincorporated county land, so Siskiyou County is the lead land-use authority, working through its Board of Supervisors and Planning Division. How much public review a data center would actually get is its own open question. During the bottling fight, the County first decided the operation was a "by-right" use of land that's already zoned heavy-industrial, and that no Environmental Impact Report was legally required. A full EIR only happened after years of community pressure and lawsuits.¹⁰ So one of the first things to nail down is whether a data center counts as by-right, or instead needs discretionary permits, a use permit, or rezoning. That second path is what triggers review under the California Environmental Quality Act, known as CEQA, along with public hearings. The City of Mt. Shasta is an affected neighbor too, with its own levers, including city utilities and the kind of industrial waste-discharge permit the Council had to weigh during the Crystal Geyser years. That shared stake is why it's worth contacting both your county supervisor and the city council.

Under all of it sits one deciding factor, the cooling design and the water and power demand that follow from it. Almost every point above, for and against, hangs on that one set of facts, and it's exactly what nobody outside the company knows yet. Getting it onto the public record is the most important early move.

A menu of positions you might take

Reasonable neighbors are landing all over the map on this. None of the options below is the "right" answer. They're the main legitimate stances, laid out so you can find the one that fits your own values. And they don't all cancel each other out. Several pair up naturally.

1. **Support.** Put the weight on reusing a vacant industrial building, bringing back the tax base, and broadening the economy, and let the project move ahead through normal review.
2. **Conditional, a "yes, if."** Open to it, but only with conditions that are actually enforceable. That means a closed-loop or air-cooled design, hard metered caps on groundwater, real-time monitoring that explicitly protects neighboring wells, strict noise limits at the property line, tight limits on generator emissions and run-hours, a decommissioning bond, and a written community benefit agreement.

¹⁰

3. **Information first.** Hold off on any position until there's a formal application, the technical details are out in the open, an independent CEQA review is underway, and public hearings are on the calendar. Demand transparency before judgment.
4. **Policy first.** Push the County, and the City, to adopt clear data-center standards or an ordinance now, the way other communities have, so any project gets judged against known rules instead of haggled over one at a time.
5. **Opposition.** Given how sensitive the aquifer is, the site's track record of draining wells, and how much this community prioritizes protecting its water, oppose putting a big industrial water-and-energy user here at all.

Good questions to ask

Whatever way you lean, these are the questions worth putting to officials and to any applicant. Clear answers are what turn guesswork into real debate.

1. Is a data center a "by-right" use under the site's heavy-industrial zoning, or would it need discretionary permits, a use permit, or rezoning, and with that, CEQA review and public hearings?
2. What cooling technology would it use, and what's the projected water draw, both average and peak, in gallons per day? And would that water come from the municipal supply or an on-site well?
3. How much electricity would it need, in megawatts, where would that power come from, who pays for any grid upgrades, and what happens to everyone else's rates?
4. How many backup generators, burning what fuel, with what emissions, and how many run-hours a year?
5. What are the noise levels at the property line, and what are the hours of operation?
6. How many permanent jobs, of what kind, and what local-hiring commitments come with them?
7. Are they asking for any property-tax breaks or other public incentives?
8. What enforceable caps, monitoring, well protections for the neighbors, and decommissioning guarantees are actually on offer?

How to make your voice heard

Two bodies are worth contacting. The first is the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, the lead authority for this unincorporated site. The second is the Mt. Shasta City Council, as the neighboring city that's affected. A short, specific message carries more weight than a vague one, so name the site, ask the questions above, and ask that any proposal go through full public review. Showing up to comment at a meeting, or putting written comments on the record, carries more weight still.

Next scheduled meetings, as of June 2026. The Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors meets July 7 at 9 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers at 311 Fourth Street in Yreka, and the Mt. Shasta City Council meets July 13 at 5:30 p.m. at 1315 Nixon Road, the Upper Lodge at Mt. Shasta City Park. You don't need an item to be on the agenda to speak during the public-comment period, but it's worth checking each posted agenda ahead of time, both for the

remote-attendance link and to see whether the site is formally listed. Dates and times change, so confirm with the County and City before you go.

Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors

Mt. Shasta is in District 2, so Supervisor **Ed Valenzuela** is your direct representative. The whole five-member Board votes on county matters, so the other supervisors' contacts are here too.

Office	Supervisor	Phone	Email
District 2 (includes Mt. Shasta)	Ed Valenzuela	530-926-1733	evalenzuela@co.siskiyou.ca.us
District 1	Jess W. Harris	530-643-9084	jharris@co.siskiyou.ca.us
District 3	Michael N. Kobseff	530-842-8397	mkobseff@co.siskiyou.ca.us
District 4	Nancy Ogren	530-643-3503	nogren@co.siskiyou.ca.us
District 5 (Board Chair)	Ray A. Haupt	530-925-0444	rhaupt@co.siskiyou.ca.us

County offices are at 311 Fourth Street, Yreka, CA 96097.

Mt. Shasta City Council

The Council meets on the second and fourth Monday evenings at 5:30 p.m. at the Recreation and Parks District Lodge, 1315 Nixon Road. City Hall is at 305 N. Mt. Shasta Blvd., and the main line is **(530) 926-7510**. The roster below is the most recent we have. Membership changes, so check the current council and email contacts on the city website before you write.

Role	Council member
Mayor (2026 term)	Casey Glaubman
Mayor Pro Tem	Tessa Clure
Council member	John Stackfleth
Council member	Jeffrey Collings
Council member	John Redmond

Find the current roster and agendas on the [City Council page](#). Agendas go up at least 72 hours before regular meetings and include instructions for public comment.

How to get involved

Sending one comment is a fine start, but a community that wants real answers usually needs more than that, and it needs people early, while the questions are still open. Nothing here assumes a position: a full, well-informed public process serves everyone, whether you would welcome a project at this site, want strict conditions placed on one, or oppose it outright. If you have time or relevant skills, here is how to plug in and what tends to help.

A few practical first steps: watch the Siskiyou County Planning Division and Mt. Shasta City Council agendas, and sign up for notifications so nothing moves without notice; follow the for-sale listing and any application, use permit, or rezoning request tied to the site; show up to comment at meetings, or put written comments on the record; and pass along verified information to neighbors rather than rumor. Residents have organized around land-use

questions at this site before, the grassroots group W.A.T.E.R. (We Advocate Thorough Environmental Review) among them, and connecting with people already paying attention saves everyone time.

The kinds of help that make community participation effective:

- **Zoning, permits, and land-use process.** Including the pivotal question of whether a data center would be “by-right” here or need discretionary review.
- **CEQA and environmental review.** Knowing what triggers a review, and what a thorough one should cover.
- **Water rights and hydrology.** The aquifer, the wells, and what the permitted water right actually allows.
- **Legal experience.** Reading deeds, permits, and the rules that govern the approval process.
- **Research.** Property records, public records, and county planning files.
- **Tracking meetings.** Watching agendas and deadlines so nothing slips through unnoticed.
- **Writing and public speaking.** Turning concerns into clear, specific comments for the record.
- **Organizing and outreach.** Coordinating volunteers and connecting with neighbors, journalists, environmental groups, business owners, and tribal contacts.

If you can contribute any of these, the most useful move is to connect with neighbors and existing groups now and start following the public process, rather than waiting for an application to appear. The community’s leverage to ask for studies, conditions, and protections is widest before a project is approved, and it narrows quickly once one is.

A note on balance, and on what’s still unknown

To be clear about where things stand, there’s no formal data-center proposal for the former Crystal Geyser site right now. What is on the record is that the property is for sale and openly marketed for industrial uses that include a data center; a specific project, a named company, or an application is not. This briefing is here to help the community get ready and ask good questions, not to raise an alarm or pick a side. If a real proposal does show up, the details it puts on the table, above all the cooling design and the water and power it would need, should steer the conversation more than any general take on data centers.

References

Links are live, and details are current as of June 2026. Check the time-sensitive items like officials, meeting dates, and project specifics directly with the County and City.

The site and the bottling history

[Crystal Geyser pulls out of Mount Shasta water bottling plant.](#) Skye Kinkade, Mt. Shasta Area Newspapers / Siskiyou Daily News, May 17, 2021.

[Crystal Geyser sells Mt. Shasta plant to Bay Area company; no plans for water bottling.](#) KRCR News, April 2022.

[Commercial sale listing, 210 Ski Village Drive](#). Brevitas / LoopNet, 2026. For-sale status; marketed for industrial uses including a data center; heavy electrical capacity; an included water right permitted for up to 500,000 gallons a day.

[One Shasta LLC acquires industrial property on Ski Village Drive](#). Traded.co, 2022. Records the 2022 sale: about \$7.1 million, buyer One Shasta LLC.

[Crystal Geyser sells scrapped bottling facility in Siskiyou County](#). Roman Battaglia, Jefferson Public Radio, March 21, 2022. (The deed stipulation barring water bottling or distribution.)

[Notice of Final Environmental Impact Report for Crystal Geyser Bottling Plant](#). Siskiyou County / Mt. Shasta Area Newspapers, Sept. 7, 2017 (site address and acreage).

[Environmental studies not required for Crystal Geyser](#). Mount Shasta Herald, Nov. 2013 (building size and the heavy-industrial “by-right” zoning).

[Crystal Geyser a hot topic at Mount Shasta council meeting](#). Mt. Shasta Area Newspapers, Nov. 26, 2013 (community concerns).

[History](#). We Advocate Thorough Environmental Review (W.A.T.E.R.), on the Dannon and Coca-Cola timeline and neighbor complaints.

[Below Mount Shasta, a fight bubbles over bottled water](#). Jane Braxton Little, High Country News, May 28, 2018.

[Mount Shasta Spring Water Management](#). California Trout, on the aquifer, the rivers, and baseline data.

Data centers, water and energy

[2024 United States Data Center Energy Usage Report \(PDF\)](#). Shehabi et al., Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, LBNL-2001637, Dec. 2024.

[DOE Releases New Report Evaluating Increase in Electricity Demand from Data Centers](#). U.S. Department of Energy, Dec. 20, 2024.

[Data Centers and Their Energy Consumption: Frequently Asked Questions \(R48646\)](#). Congressional Research Service, May 12, 2026.

[Water and energy use is growing as data centers are built across the Midwest and Great Plains](#). Associated Press (via KCUR), Aug. 2025.

[Can you build data centers in a desert without draining the water supply? Utah is finding out](#). Grist / The Salt Lake Tribune, Jan. 2026, with real-world per-facility water figures.

How other communities are responding

[Data center water/power needs, regulatory challenges strain rural communities](#). Nevada Current, Feb. 9, 2026, on the Reno moratorium.

[Oregon communities envision 9,100 acres for new data centers](#). The Oregonian / Lincoln Chronicle, March 2026, on the ratepayer law and tax-break moratorium.

[Missoula panel highlights data center concerns as county reviews nearby facility](#). Montana Free Press, May 21, 2026, on the county regulations.

Officials and meetings

[Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors](#). Members, districts, and contact information.

[City of Mt. Shasta, City Council page](#). Council roster, meeting schedule, and agendas.

Prepared as a neutral community resource. Facts are current as of June 2026, so please double-check anything time-sensitive.