Habitat Work Group

Lewis County Conservation District

**Chehalis, WA**

**August 13, 2010**

**9:30 AM**

**Meeting Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PRESENT |  |
| Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County | Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service |
| Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District | Lonnie Crumley, StreamWorks Consulting |
| Miles Batchelder, WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership | Eric Beach, Green Diamond Resource Company Jamie Glasgow, Wild Fish Conservancy |
| Brett DeMond, StreamWorks Consulting | Janel Spaulding, Chehalis Basin Partnership |
| Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) | Chris Conklin, Quinault Indian Tribe |

**Welcome & Introductions**

Chair Bob Amrine called the August 13, 2010 meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG) to order at 9:35 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) 2010 Grant Cycle Update

Lee Napier reported the recommendation was taking the top three projects and moving the Miller Creek Fish Passage project as an alternative if more funds become available. The SRFB has more funding than anticipated and consequently, the Lead Entity allocation has increased. There are sufficient funds available to fund the Miller Creek Fish Passage project with a remaining positive balance of $39,000. She asked members for input on removing the project as an alternative as the project received funding and consider moving Frase Creek forward recognizing that there will be a shortage of $154,000.

Members agreed to move the Frase Creek project forward as the alternative project.

Miranda Plumb referred to some issues associated with the project. Bob Burkle expressed concerns that the project wouldn’t meet WDFW guidelines but that the project sponsor will find out once the habitat biologist visits the site. WDFW doesn’t, at this time, conduct site visits of preliminary projects. There are some problems with the elevation and grade that will likely require a stream and the proposed width will be insufficient.

Ms. Napier offered that it could likely mean that the funds are returned to the region or some other project sponsor might not use their entire allocation and those funds could be redirected to the region. Those are several scenarios to consider when moving Frase Creek forward. The project sponsor at this time doesn’t have sufficient money to fund the entire project.

Members agreed to move Frase Creek forward as an alternative project. Ms. Napier advised that all projects will be entered into PRISM. Miles Batchelder shared that the total funding allocation is $723,600 for the region.

Mr. Amrine asked about any follow up work necessary by him for any projects included in PRISM. Ms. Napier said she is verifying needed information for PRISM. She asked to be advised of any additional changes.

Mr. Amrine commented that originally he entered the project as two alternatives consisting of one project with the bridge and one project without the bridge. Since one of the alternatives has been removed, there have been some negative comments based on the region’s plan to save the $59,000 from the original alternative. He asked if he should reenter the original alternative in PRISM to demonstrate to everyone that the alternative was considered. Ms. Napier shared that she conveyed the feedback to Mr. Amrine from the review panel about installing a driveway instead of a bridge. Mr. Burkle said the driveway would be better than the bridge.

Chris Conklin asked about the armoring and the other concerns regarding removal of the bridge. Ms. Napier affirmed that there would still be armoring when the bridge is removed, and the stream may be problematic when the driveway is added. However, one cross drain is planned. Mr. Burkle asked if another alternative was considered of moving the road away from the creek and moving it toward the other property line. Mr. Amrine said the entire area was considered, however, the creek hasn’t meandered and there is no erosion occurring. When it flows high it flows over the top of the bar and across the field. The goal is not having the creek wash out the driveway.

Ms. Plumb asked if the driveway will be paved or a gravel driveway. Mr. Amrine said the driveway will be gravel. Much of the cost was associated with relocating the utilities.

Mr. Conklin said most of the comments were concerns about creating other unnecessary impacts rather than not considering the second alternative.

Mr. Amrine suggested that during the SRFB project presentation it’s important to let the panel know that the initial alternative was considered as an option.

Mr. Burkle said Lewis County would also have to agree that they are going to proceed with the Frase Creek project with $39,000. If the county indicates it’s insufficient, then the funds can go to another project within the region.

Jamie Glasgow asked about other projects for the next funding round. Ms. Napier said the SRFB provides the region with a funding allocation that the region divides between the region’s lead entities. Whatever is unspent is returned to the state. The goal of the lead entities is to expend all funds, and if some funds remain, share the funds within the region. Mr. Glasgow said it’s important that members make the right decision to ensure funds are not lost from the region. Three options for spending the funds include spending them within the Lead Entity area, within the region, or having the funds returned to the state.

Mr. Amrine commented that it’s fortunate that Ms. Napier is the area’s lead entity coordinator because of her good work.

**Input on the Family Forest Fish Passage Program Project Recommendations**

Ms. Napier reported on the request received from the Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP). Statewide, the program invites small and eligible landowners to submit projects for corrections. The WDFW and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) work with the land owners to evaluate and rank the projects. After the projects are ranked, which includes projects beyond the Chehalis basin, the Lead Entities are contacted for input on the projects within the lead entity boundary. The proposal was forwarded to HWG members and there was no feedback. There are approximately 10 project sites recommended for funding.

Mr. Amrine referred to the Murphy project, which has been partially funded through the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program of $10,000. The Alexander Family project has been signed up to receive some funding from a new program under the Natural Resources Conservation Service called the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI) program for up to $50,000 to augment funds.

Mr. Burkle referred to the Scheuber Ditch project and indicated WDFW and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are looking at Scheuber Ditch as a mitigation site for the dike project.

Lonnie Crumley responded to some questions on barrier projects along Polson Creek. The projects involve no bridges and include culverts and punch outs. He described some of the existing barriers that are slated for removal. The Atkins Tree Farm project will open .48 mile of stream.

Ms. Napier responded to questions on the ranking of the projects, which are likely not in any ranked order. Brett DeMond said all the projects are ranked high. Many of the projects are small and don’t involve extensive time. Ms. Napier indicated she forwarded the list of projects that are not moving forward and didn’t receive any feedback or concerns on those projects.

Ms. Plumb asked whether the projects were ranked within the basin. Ms. DeMond said because it is a separate program that only qualifies landowners, it’s considered separately from the basin. Ms. Plumb said she would like to see how the projects rank overall within the basin priorities. Ms. Napier asked if the projects were evaluated in the barrier assessments. Mr. Conklin advised that some were ranked. Mr. Amrine said Mr. Alexander wouldn’t allow access but is now cooperating because of funding opportunities. Mr. Conklin suggested comparing the barrier assessments with the FFFPP projects as the basis for providing comments. Mr. Burkle commented that there are narrow requirements for qualifying for FFFPP funds. There are limited choices and county roads and other private and timber interests are eliminated from consideration. It essentially is the best of a very narrow number of projects. Mr. Glasgow said when WFC finds a barrier on a private crossing with trees on site; it’s worth bringing to the attention of the FFFPP. Mr. Amrine said his frustration is with inconsistencies in interpretation when field visits are conducted of sites.

Mr. Amrine offered that it’s possible to rank the projects against the basin formula to ascertain ranking order. Ms. Napier commented that although the projects may not open up much habitat in comparison to other projects, it may be sufficient for this particular program in terms of fish, habitat, and passability. Ms. DeMond said there is no reason not to endorse the recommendation.

There was consensus by members to endorse the FFFPP project list for barrier repair projects in WRIAs 22 and 23 for 2011.

**Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership** **(WCSSP)**

***Formation of a Technical Team***

Ms. Napier referred to a July 30 email pertaining to the formation of a technical team within WCSSP. The email requested submission of potential membership names for the team. The proposal was developed by Mr. Batchelder based on feedback from the WCSSP Board. The team would assist with QAQC as regional information and data is collected as well as the matrix for the suballocation of the lead entities in terms of determining the value of any proposed matrix. The WCSSP is producing a regional plan and the team may be asked to provide technical input. It's possible basin projects may be evaluated at a regional scale, which may involve the team. The purpose is to recruit science and technical expertise for the regional work with representatives from each Lead Entity. She asked for feedback on possible membership. The proposal at this point is one member from each Lead Entity and three to five representatives from state and federal agencies.

Mr. Batchelder said the intent of forming a team was mirroring the lead entity citizen group process, similar to the HWG where the region has a technical team that can be used for technical review and input. Final membership of the team will be determined by the WCSSP Board. Mr. Amrine advocated for assigning an alternative in case the representative from a lead entity is unable to attend. He suggested adding a representative from the Department of Ecology (DOE) as well.

Mr. Glasgow asked about potential funding for the positions. Mr. Batchelder said funding has not been discussed. Mr. Glasgow asked about tribal involvement. Mr. Batchelder said the tribes are involved at the lead entity level. In the North Pacific Coast there are three tribes and the Quinault Indian Nation is a Lead Entity. At this time, it’s unknown how the tribes will react to the idea of forming a technical team. Both the Hoh and the Mckah Tribes have indicated that they have a level of comfort with Quileute representing their interests on the coast in the planning forum. However, it’s not known how they would consider that same representation for the technical team.

Mr. Burkle suggested considering Lewis County and Grays Harbor County representatives because of the size of the basin and the difficulty of finding representatives within WDFW because of limited resources. It’s important to have representatives that are familiar with Regions 5 and 6.

Ms. Napier referred to qualifications of the team that is involves education and experience. The education is a graduate degree in natural sciences or work history demonstrating knowledge and understanding of salmon recovery. Mr. Batchelder said there has been opposition to the requirement of a graduate degree.

Members agreed that the work history of demonstrated knowledge and understanding of salmon recovery is important.

Ms. Napier asked for some feedback on names to consider. It could be possible that there are interested and qualified individuals but because of funding cannot participate. She asked if that input should be provided to WCSSP to consider whether some form of funding should be considered. Mr. Batchelder affirmed that information would be helpful to the Board to determine whether funding is necessary to implement a technical team.

Members discussed the need for each member to have demonstrated objectivity in terms of salmon restoration.

Mr. Glasgow said WFC is interested but the organization is not experts in WRIAs 22 and 23 but could contribute 10,000-foot objective science-based input that would be valuable. Mr. Conklin agreed it’s important to have a member that doesn’t have the local knowledge but does have the scientific background to provide overall guidance to a regional team. Mr. Glasgow shared that the organization is primarily grant funded and there is no funding available for involvement in groups. That is a limiting factor for his involvement. Mr. Amrine said the same situation applies for the Conservation District.

Ms. Napier suggested submitting Mr. Glasgow’s name and the limiting factor for participation. Mr. Burkle’s name will be submitted representing WDFW. Mr. Glasgow inquired about the potential for WRIA capacity funding that is available in other WRIAs to fund organizational involvement. He asked if it’s possible to submit a proposal to the State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) for funding participation.

Mr. Batchelder acknowledged that similar comments have been offered by others. The notion of supporting the team financially hasn’t been addressed but it’s important to bring to the discussion. Ms. Napier said it may be possible to submit a cost increase to the region’s grant. Mr. Amrine agreed that there is justification for seeking the funding because of the consistency of ranking and discussions and having the same people involved. Mr. Batchelder replied that the SRFB did support the planning effort with funds with some funds specifically designated for technical support.

Ms. Napier said she will provide the input to WCSSP and update members at the next meeting.

***Participation in the Threats Workshop on September 14***

Ms. Napier reported WCSSP is hosting a workshop on September 14 on identifying threats to salmon within the region. She asked members to contact her if interested in attending.

**Presentation and Progress Report on the Chehalis Water Type Assessment – *Jamie Glasgow***

Mr. Glasgow reported the Wild Fish Conservancy (WFC) is a non-profit organization dedicated to the preservation, protection, and restoration of fish and their habitat. Protecting existing habitat and processes from further degradation is important, and in some cases, more important than other actions. Protection of habitat includes effective and responsible resource management through forest practice regulations, the Growth Management Act (GMA), and critical areas ordinances by local governments. There are significant implications for the ecology of watersheds as water flows downstream and issues are not necessarily point or reach specific and have impacts further downstream as well.

He displayed pictures of what can happen to watersheds when regulations in place to protect streams are ineffective. A system in place to protect streams and habitat is water tying, which is a classification system that tries to identify fish and habitat to ensure protections are implemented. The process was developed by DNR in the mid-1970s for forest practices. It is also spelled out in WAC 222.16.030 and .031 and in Section 13 of the Forest Practice Board Manual. There are essentially four main types of classifications of “S” for shorelines, “F” for fish bearing reaches, “N” for non-fish bearing reaches, and “U” for unclassified stream reaches. Buffers for each of the reaches vary dependent on a number of variables. Generally, shorelines receive more protection than non-fish bearing reaches.

Mr. Glasgow displayed a water type map of McLane Creek in Olympia with stream reaches color coded based on classification. The process implemented by DNR was for state forest lands but has subsequently been adopted by most local governments in the state to help identify critical areas that are required through the GMA to have critical areas ordinances to identify the location and how jurisdictions will protect them.

The state maintains the GIS map of streams and stream classifications. However, the map maintained by the state is inaccurate. The map was developed using a fairly coarse digital elevation model that inherently missed streams and misrepresents gradients, which is how the state used the model to predict the location of fish and habitat. On-the-ground surveys have discovered that the maps consistently underestimate the distribution of fish and fish habitat. Typically, fish and fish habitat are found upstream of where model maps indicate they are located. Additionally, many of streams are not included in the maps that the state and local governments use to protect fish and fish habitat. Many misidentified fish habitats are not receiving protection under existing laws and regulations.

Mr. Glasgow displayed two types of typical areas discovered during field stream surveys. The state has classified the stream as non-fish bearing. The surveyors found fish and fish habitat within the reach, which is an example of the upstream location with fish and fish habitat that was misrepresented on the state regulatory map. Another example is small streams that contain fish habitat that are not included on the regulatory map.

Mr. Glasgow displayed a map of the Cooper Point area that is a part of a water type assessment underway by the WFC in Puget Sound located northwest of Olympia. Surveyors are finding significant discrepancies between regulatory maps that local governments are using and what is actually found on the ground.

Mr. Conklin asked whether the determination is based on the physical characteristics or the actual presence of fish. Mr. Glasgow indicated that established physical criteria are applied to determine the presence of fish or fish habitat.

Mr. Glasgow commented that DNR acknowledges that its model maps fall short and the department requires DNR foresters use official model maps as starting points for on-the-ground surveys. Timber companies are also required to use the model maps. That message, although fairly consistent with DNR, hasn’t been received by local governments. Local governments understand that the maps are the best tool available at this time. Additionally, local governments do not have the resources to ground truth or question the maps.

The Department of Fish and Wildlife previously provided support to local governments on water type classifications for critical areas ordinances. With the advent of the recession and significant budget reductions in the department, there are limitations for the department to assist local governments in correctly identifying stream classifications for planning purposes. Over the last 12 years, WFC has been working with federal, state, tribes, and local agencies to accurately map streams so they can be adequately protected under existing regulations.

Mr. Glasgow displayed a map of areas of Puget Sound where systematic water type assessments have been completed through on-the-ground surveys to accurately map the distribution of streams and fish habitat within the streams. The emphasis for the work has been outside of forest practices and through local governments. WFC tries to target areas where there is development pressure occurring and is looking for areas where the agency has information on fish composition or there are listed species that may be affected by development pressure.

Mr. Glasgow displayed a photo of the field work that is comprised of state protocols included in the WAC and the Forest Practice Board Manual to characterize channel and riparian condition, water temperatures, and instream features that may affect fish distribution. The information is documented through photographs and GPS. When fish are discovered, they are photographed, measured, and identified. The information is submitted to local governments and to DNR to officially update the regulatory maps. WFC develops GIS for all information documented in the field and is building an interactive web-based site for the GIS so that local governments and the community can use the information to identify streams in local areas as well as identifying fish species. Public presentations are provided on the results of the work to local communities and governments.

Results of the projects includes improved regulatory protection of stream habitats, prioritized list of riparian and protection opportunities, and strengthening of salmon recovery strategies and plans, which is fundamental information.

Mr. Glasgow provided a demonstration of the interactive GIS website.

In 2009, a contract was executed for WFC to continue water type assessment in the Chehalis basin. He provided an update on preliminary results, which is mid-way completed. Much work remains to be completed. The contract is effective until 2012. There may be a request for an extension. WFC is limited in what is accomplished each year as there is a window limiting water type assessments, which is typically from March 1 through July. WFC prefers to work in the middle of the window for a variety of reasons. Surveying too far into the window risks the loss of water and those areas that have absence of water can be incorrectly classified.

Mr. Glasgow reported that with input from the Habitat Work Group, WFC focused efforts in the Wild Cat drainage area. He displayed a map of the area. The first step included a mailing to streamside landowners. Because the DNR maps are inaccurate, WFC developed more complete maps to identify all streamside landowners. The letter identified the agency and the work to be completed and why. He identified the various GIS layers that also included a landowner permission color-coded layer. The GIS layer was used to generate field maps that crews used when working in the field to identify those landowners providing access to private property. The crews used the information to develop field maps for on-the-ground surveys. Some landowners wanted to be contacted prior to crews visiting the property. In the Wild Cat watershed many parcels are in timber production where access wasn’t granted. Mr. Glasgow said he is contacting two timber companies to see if the companies will share any data the companies might have.

Mr. Glasgow pointed out some major landmarks within the Wild Cat watershed. The primary objective is to accurately portray water type outside of forest practices in local governmental jurisdictions where local development pressures are highest. He displayed a map of best available science available for water typing that includes WFC water typing truth data and DNR’s water type where access was not available to WFC. Some specific examples include finding upstream fish and fish habitat, stream lengths underrepresented, and tributaries that were unmapped. While also correcting water type maps, the goal of the work includes looking for habitat restoration opportunities and habitat protection opportunities. Because of the miles of stream that are walked, the crews often find undocumented barriers to fish passage previously missed by other inventories. They tend to be related to roads. He displayed several photographs of fish barriers discovered by survey crews and described some of the meetings held with local, state, and tribal officials to address some of the situations. One example included a hydraulic violation in McCleary involving a 20-acre exempt harvest that harvested within some of the buffer to include some salvage of logs within the stream, which resulted in a hydraulics violation.

The next steps include continuing the GIS work, data entry from the field work, building two databases to house the information and the photograph, integrating all information into the interactive online GIS site, and submit proposed water type modifications to DNR and to affected counties and local governments. Given the initial objective to focus outside forest practices in areas that are facing development, the team covered much ground. The teams found significant discrepancies where DNR had streams mapped and where they actually existed. In several situations the extent of fish habitat was significantly underestimated. When the discussion first began on where the work should begin in the Chehalis basin, two other watersheds were mentioned as priorities. He asked members to consider where efforts should be focused, such as in areas where there are many smaller streams as those areas tend to be overlooked.

Mr. Burkle suggested several areas are above two proposed dam locations on the main stem Chehalis and South Fork Chehalis. There is a fish study proposed that is legislatively mandated that likely will be ineffective because of the unrealistic timeframe of one year. It will cost $1 million and Anchor Environmental was selected to complete the study. The areas are likely not correctly mapped as well. Another area suggested is in the south fork Chehalis in an area owned by Sierra Pacific, which will provide access.

Mr. Glasgow suggested deferring any decisions until a future meeting in the fall. His GIS contacts can develop some maps of the areas to compare the DNR models to the stream layer.

Mr. Burkle suggested contacting Bruce Treichler with Northwest Salmon Conservation Society, as the organization may be seeking expertise in stream typing and detailed fish assessment to develop a database.

Mr. Conklin asked whether prior to conducting watershed type analysis for stream typing the WFC reviews DNR’s data to determine how much data has been updated or protocol surveyed to focus efforts. Mr. Glasgow said it’s not difficult to find watersheds that have never been ground truthed especially outside of forest practices. Usually, it is possible to tell by examining the hydro layer, as there are more streams on the map that has been ground truthed.

Mr. Amrine referred to development and noted the Scatter and Black Lake areas are areas of concern. Mr. Conklin suggested focusing upstream of Littlerock. Mr. Glasgow said based on remaining funding, the system to be added would need to be half the size of Wild Cat.

Discussion followed on the remaining funds and specific needs. Ms. Napier suggested her objective as the coordinator is focusing on an area that may lead to a project. Mr. Conklin suggested the Scatter Creek area because of agricultural impacts because of the lack of riparian functions. It is a smaller area. Some projects include habitat improvements, pipe replacements, and riparian function enhancement projects. Mr. Burkle said the basin often receives project applications frequently from Ms. Holbrook-Shaw. To better support those projects of acquisitions and restoration, that area of focus might be beneficial.

Ms. Plumb asked why the Satsop area wasn’t considered. Mr. Amrine said Wild Cat was selected because of development. Ms. Napier added that Wild Cat was selected because the county was working with the City of McCleary to give them some tools to work with for protection of the aquifer. She added that she was surprised to learn about the hydraulics violation.

**Begin Discussion on 2011 SRFB Grant Cycle**

***Suggestions to Improve Process Next Year***

Ms. Napier asked for feedback on the 2010 process and ways to improve the 2011 process. Mr. Burkle commented that it’s difficult to know if state furloughs are going to continue. If so, it will be important to plan meetings and field visits around the state furlough schedule.

Ms. Napier said the STC discussed comments from some people who wanted to be involved in the process but didn’t receive any information. She will convey more information during Partnership meetings and when projects are submitted to solicit participation. If there is increased participation from the Partnership, she suggested completing a joint technical citizens review that is submitted to the Lead Entity without involving the Partnership. She asked for feedback.

Mr. Burkle said it apparent the citizen involvement process has been fulfilled through the ranking process by offering opportunities to citizens to participate in the ranking.

Ms. Napier referred to a goal to develop a three-year work plan with the assistance of John Kleim and Debbie Holden for review by the work group in October. As the work group moves forward she encouraged members to consider a modeling process that will include an exercise for recommending some projects based on criteria and boundaries. However, sometimes when put into practice, they often don’t move forward. She asked members to consider that aspect when discussing potential projects. Additionally, each year at the Watershed Festival, a display featuring the Lead Entity includes maps of the subbasins with an invitation to attendees to complete surveys on what they believe is important to their community. Incentives are offered for returning the survey. This year, the exhibit will be asking citizens to provide more specifics for projects. The festival is on September 26.

***Discussion on Potential Projects – Eric Beach***

Eric Beach reported he works for Green Diamond Resource Company, a forest landowner in western Washington with 350,000 acres in Lewis, Mason, Thurston, and Grays Harbor Counties. The Simpson Timber Company is the company’s predecessor. There is significant history associated with the land since Simpson has been in existence since the last part of the 19th century. There are a number of regulatory programs regulating forestry operations in fish passage. The majority of the ownership of approximately 220,000 acres is under a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), which is an incidental take permit for listed species. The company has a good reputation of environmental stewardship.

Currently, there are no regulatory requirements for removing legacy structures. Mr. Beach displayed a picture of the project area. The area is in the upper Wynoochee approximately 5 miles downstream of the dam. The area has Coho and resident cutthroat. There are other salmonid species in the basin. The company has a comprehensive fish survey program and good data on resident species. He clarified that it is the same project proposed by Galvin Glore. The project sites involve an abandoned railroad grade with culverts. Most important is reestablishing transport sediment. In another project, the company was able to secure SRFB funding. He asked for consideration of the project with a construction crew that would be used for an in-kind match. The railroad line was constructed in 1943 and is considered an historical site. The project would cost approximately $600,000 with a $210,000 match from Green Diamond. The costs are related to the depth of fill and the cost to pull the railroad line.

Mr. Burkle advised that several of the projects are upstream of substandard culverts installed by the US Forest Service along Wynoochee Road.

Mr. Conklin commented that the HWG needs to evaluate which projects qualify for SRFB funding as some of the projects have resident trout and no salmon. The other four would need to be evaluated for downstream barriers as some have bridges and some have open bottom marshes. Mr. Amrine suggested taking the top four and submitting them separately each year.

Ms. Napier suggested defining the project scope and calling out the project components.

Mr. Burkle commented on the need to have adequate gravel sources to allow any spawning in the upper Wynoochee. Mr. Conklin said he’s visited the sites and each of the sites has potential.

Members offered suggestions on what to include in the project application.

Discussion followed on the historical aspect of the facility and the steps necessary to document historical significance.

## Other Business

Ms. Plumb reminded members that applications are due on August 27 for several funding programs through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Ms. Napier reviewed the September meeting agenda, which will include a field trip. Members were asked to meet in Montesano at the Grays Harbor Forestry building.

## Adjournment

With there being no further business, Ms. Napier adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President
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