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**Board of Directors Special Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Flag Salute**

Board President Nancy Gibson called the special meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and the group recited the pledge of allegiance.

1. **Call for Public Comment**

Joseph Edge, local resident of River Forest Lake watershed and NCUWC Board Member, encouraged the District to be out ahead of the coming regulations, including the Endangered Species Act and regulations that protect sensitive populations including salmon. He recommended pursuing fees and charges as necessary to support a robust Surface Water Program, to reduce the toxics going into local waterways and the Willamette River. He mentioned charges that could include System Development Charges and other fees for new development and redevelopment in the District.

Neil Schulman, Executive Director of NCUWC, commented, echoing the statements of Joseph Edge. He believes that in addition to the regulatory requirements there are a number of changes going on in Clackamas County including increased population, increased impervious surface, and this should magnify the need to go beyond the minimum to support fish and wildlife needs. He pointed out many innovative surface/storm water treatment projects to learn from. He encouraged a higher level of service from the District.

Jim Martin, local resident and former OLWS Board Chair, commented on Section 9 – Post-Construction Site Runoff, pointing out the group has heard comments on this topic (flows of water in people’s yards, etc.) at previous meetings from Jennings Lodge residents. He suggested OLWS does not have a program to recognize when additional flows are entering people’s yards and suggested we should consider a program that somehow detects this in innovative ways, and then deals with it effectively.

Terry Gibson, Board Member of NCUWC, commented on the return of beavers to Boardman Creek, Stringfield Park, and downstream. He encouraged the District to entertain a policy on monitoring and dealing with this keystone species, and to work in partnership with Clackamas County to enforce this policy.

Tonia Williamson, NCUWC Board Member, NCPRD Staff, commented NCPRD has similar goals on surface water with regards to improving habitat and water quality and has successfully partnered with Oak Lodge on a variety of projects over many years. She hopes that successful partnerships continue, and she suggested NCPRD wants to continue to understand the compounding issues and mitigate and resolve the issues. She mentioned Parks located in the District and stated that even though they don’t have an MS4 Permit, they still want to partner to explore options and opportunities, address issues and improve water quality.

President Gibson mentioned the public could submit more comments later in the meeting.

1. **Watershed Protection Program Update**

Facilitator Libby Barg, Principal from Barney and Worth, asked the members of the entire group to introduce and identify themselves, which they did (see Board, staff, visitors and speakers present). Jason Rice, District Engineer, pointed out the rest of the Surface Water Staff team as listed on the power point presentation. Libby provided the context of the meeting, suggesting the group would be helping to provide input to start a surface water/storm water master plan and possibly to suggest 6 program changes (see power point). The goal for the day is to decide if the suggested changes would be worth exploring more, and if so, what public input would you need to pursue the change.

Libby Barg asked the Board to share what they believe are the District’s most recent accomplishments in the watershed program. Treasurer Lynn Fisher shared he appreciated the former OLSD Board under Jim Martin’s leadership and the SWM Committee engaged the public, in particular the Walta Vista Project and the issue around the cleanout of the outflow of River Forest Lake.

Vice President Susan Keil suggested the OLWS Board, and in the recent past the OLSD Board has become much clearer about the District’s role in surface water/storm water, on both public and guidelines for private entities. She appreciated the clarity on our guidelines and that the District is looking broadly at the topic and listening to public concerns (particularly about) flooding.

President Nancy Gibson stated her role in the Boards, both OLWD and now OLWS, and appreciated the stronger cohesiveness of staff in the field, improved clarity with regards to asset management, and public support for the combination of the two Districts. She appreciated the newly updated IGAs with both Sunrise District and the City of Gladstone. She stated how excited she is about the first park, wetland restoration and education project in Jennings Lodge (Boardman Wetland). She encouraged the District to pursue surface water/storm water System Development Charges.

Director Paul Gornick shared he was proud of the start of the Boardman Wetland Project, and the positive impact outreach and education has on the public, and on students through OLWS staff Lara Christensen. He pointed out the importance of the recent conversations with Clackamas County, OLWS’s primary MS4 partner, in prompting the focus of this meeting, being that “we want to do more and they want to meet the minimum”.

Director Kevin Williams stated he was proud OLWS meets the permit requirements. As a former OLSD Budget Committee and Board member, he believes the District should increase their investment in surface and storm water management. He is very supportive of the Boardman Wetland development and appreciates the District’s partnership with the High School students and hearing them present to the Board each year.

Jason highlighted the slide about service levels and public outreach and reiterated that the goal for this meeting was to capture feedback on what to ask the public about in coming months. Then he highlighted the main parts of the watershed protection program and how they fit together, including providing an overview of the current Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit.

He shared the importance of partnering with co-permittees with regards to biological monitoring, outreach, and other factors of the permit. Jason illustrated the original challenge within the relationship between the District and Clackamas County – OLWS is responsible for water quality and Clackamas County for quality and physical repair and maintenance of the storm system. Conversation ensued around the County’s responsibility for the roads and whether they are private roads, p-roads, or public roads. Private roads are privately owned, whereas p-roads are developed to County standards but have not been accepted into the County’s infrastructure. Both of these roads may not be cleaned or maintained by either the District or by Clackamas County, but the District is often called to help with the situation.

Angela Wieland, the OLWS project manager and Water Resource Engineer with Brown and Caldwell, shared information about the industrial storm water inputs. Angela referenced documents from the Board Packet, including the MS4 Permit Schedule.

Jason stated the biggest challenges OLWS has is as a water quality management agency and in getting Clackamas County, Oregon Department of Transportation, and other partners to take additional responsibility for water quality, including surface and storm water. Rick Pauker illustrated the example of ODOT State Highway 99 running through the OLWS District and contributing pollution to the District’s water quality but not sharing information about how ODOT cleans and maintains the catch basins or monitors water quality in those basins. Runoff from Hwy 99 enters the OLWS waterways and contributes to our levels of monitored pollution. Included in those pollutants are brake pads, oils, metals, bacteria, and others.

Education and outreach requirements include eight education and outreach goals, and whole water messaging can be used reinforce messages to the public and work with partners to leverage outreach requirements. Partners include schools, non-profit partners, and other community partners. An effectiveness evaluation is regularly conducted in partnership with co-permittees to find out how well messaging gets out. Another great outreach program is the Stormdrain Cleaning Assistance Program to help private drain owners/businesses keep their drains clean at an affordable price. Partnerships make the work more accessible to the general public and broaden the reach of the OLWS District.

Permit requirements for water quality are provided through OLWS, including permits for 1000 square feet and larger for new and replaced impervious surface for erosion control, as well as sewer and water connections. Education for contractors and homeowners includes talking with landowners, sending messages in newsletters and adding information to the website. OLWS is supported in permitting by Clackamas County.

Vegetated water quality facilities like swales, ponds, and other infiltration catchment systems are often installed as a requirement of development in the District. The MS4 Permit recommends vegetated facilities as part of the requirements. Jason recommends that OLWS should maintain these systems as part of a comprehensive surface and storm water program, but at this point we do not maintain the facilities. Because they are left to the owners, the maintenance is not systematized. This can negatively affect water quality and District experiences challenges with regards to making sure permits are obtained when they are required. Staff recommended the District purchase and maintain detention ponds and vegetated facilities to account for water quality. Funds would be generated through water quality fees.

The 2012 MS4 Permit required technical evaluations including Hydromodification Assessment and the District’s Retrofit Strategy. Angela illustrated the Hydromodification Assessment that co-permittees did in partnership, which looked at OLWS streams and evaluated how susceptible they are to erosion. Erosion can change habitat and exacerbate water quality both instream and for the receiving waters. This could affect detention standards and stream buffers to support water quality for Post-Construction Design Standards. The Retrofit strategy required jurisdictions to identify water quality projects with the goal of increasing the amount of impervious surface that funnels water into treatment facilities. This could include prioritizing Capital Improvement Projects (CIP).

Monitoring is required and scheduled by the MS4 Permit and is performed in partnership with co-permittees and annually reported to DEQ. OLWS samples three sites four times per year, one site three times per year (storm water sampling), and one site four times per year (1200 Z Permit for the Water Reclamation Facility). This often takes two people, and we do not have extra people in the program to support the sampling.

Staffing is a necessary part of our budgeting and since staffing resources need to be allocated appropriately the importance of this must be communicated clearly to the public in order to generate support for resources. Staff commented they are needing additional resources to conduct even the basic services required by the program.

Annual reporting documents get posted for public comment and then submitted to DEQ each year. This year DEQ requested completion of an electronic 5-year survey as part of reporting requirements. Monitoring and reporting are covered by the reports, which the Board asked to review.

The current permit is in an administrative hold due to DEQ being reorganized. There are administrative changes going on at DEQ as well as FTE being added so that permit writers can be assigned to jurisdictions. Smaller jurisdictions are also waiting on an updated Phase II permit and have pushed back on changing Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) language.

The group took a 5-minute break and returned to discuss six proposed changes.

1. **Future Watershed Service Conversation**

Facilitator Libby Barg requested conversation and input on the six options for change and what they think would be useful to discuss with the public in each instance.

Jason introduced six proposed changes in the slides. Changes included improvement of how we require development of surface/storm water facilities and who assumes responsibility for them after they are built. Right now, as part of their deed the private landowner is responsible for managing the facility and the District is responsible for inspecting (and in some cases for maintaining) the facilities for an additional fee. In the past this program has been managed in a variety of ways and needs to be reorganized.

OLWS requires for surface/storm facilities to be developed, and Clackamas County’s preference that the facility is not in the right-of-way but instead on private property because then they are not responsible for managing them. They want catch basins because them OLWS will be responsible for managing the basins.

Staff recommends consistency for the program, and since we require for the facilities to be built, OLWS should take responsibility for maintaining the facilities and build management of the facilities into the rates.

The Board asked if subdivisions require Homeowner’s Associations (HOA), and staff thought it might be a requirement of the size of the subdivision. Conversation ensued about how to make sure the standards are met for all impervious areas including subdivisions and also how to channel funds to support the standards (ODOT, County, rates, HOA’s, etc.). The Board restated the importance of the baseline to meet the state water quality standards for all jurisdictions operating in our area and that Clackamas County should be meeting that standard with funding. Clackamas is the only Metro county with no local funding going into transportation funding. The Board is open to having facilities in the right of way and OLWS rates to cover maintenance for them.

Staff commented the District does not have the resources to maintain the facilities yet, but staff recommends conditioning the developer to build the facilities in or near the right of way and then turning responsibility for maintenance over to the District. The District would then reorganize the base rate to include all existing and future facilities. The Board emphasized without the development, there would be no need for the facility to treat the additional surface/storm water. The Board pushed back on having ratepayers cover the costs of something that the County owns and should maintain them.

Maintenance of catch basins is a requirement of the MS4 Permit. Staff asked if we should become the enforcement authority instead, to stand up for the water quality in the system and to spend energy requiring the County to maintain facilities and catch basins. There is a difference between private and public facilities, and OLWS could provide a range of services based on the different needs and requirements of these facilities. Unfortunately, the County has not allocated funding to the facilities at this point. The Board pointed out Clackamas County needs to be taking care of these issues county wide and should fund it through both dedicated transportation funds as well as from the property tax base.

General Manager Sarah Jo Chaplen pointed out looking at current practices and thinking about what might change in the future. Currently the County requires HOA’s to maintain facilities but HOA’s are not maintaining facilities. If we changed the program to anticipate OLWS may be maintaining it, or a fee may be put into place, it is easier for the District to deal with facilities if they are in the public right of way. She encouraged the discussion to separate out what the Board wants the service level to be from the costs associated. She recommended we will need to be taking care of the water quality from these facilities at some point in the future because of changing requirements, and we need to consider how we want to deal with the requirements within a range of service levels.

She mentioned at a staff to staff level OLWS can redo the OLWS memorandum of understanding and focus on enforcement, but without Board to Board engagement larger changes to the program will not happen. The Board pushed back on building the facilities but suggested they would feel comfortable maintaining it, and they asked about cost analysis of maintaining within the fees charged. Staff shared the history of the program, illustrated the database of facilities, and recommended cleanup and reorganization. Our permit requires inspection of the facilities regardless of the fee.

Libby suggested this topic needs to be explored more and asked for input within the realm of what feedback would look like from the public. The Board pointed out in order to charge for maintenance of the already built facilities we would need to show progress on building new facilities in problem areas (flood prone locations). Otherwise the District could appear to be subsidizing facilities that were originally supposed to be maintained by the HOA’s. The Board commented that the public does not easily digest the message of water quality separated out from flooding (water quantity). They are concerned with flooding.

Staff outlined the idea to address localized flooding by building facilities in flood prone areas and asked who would manage the facility. The Board did not want to add fees for building the flood facilities but were somewhat more comfortable with maintaining the facilities if it was clear that they alleviated flooding. If linked to public road maintenance within 30 years everything will be required to be treated.

Libby clarified that if we tie these issues in with broader issues like regional flooding then ratepayers might be more comfortable paying the additional fee for treatment and maintenance. If we spread the facilities throughout the District and focus on flood prone areas that would help. Drainage issues may be due to infrastructure issues such as undersized pipes, lack of catch basins, wrong-sized facilities, ponds and detention systems, road grading, etc. Infrastructure in the right of way can be maintained by OLWS or the County.

The Board asked Libby to ask the public what they want to be in it for them, and what are they willing to pay for that infrastructure. The Board suggested to add surface water System Development Charges (SDCs) and a Capital Improvement Program more focused on flooding issues in our District. The Board suggested people need to understand the education layer that these investments are for the future as well as today.

Libby outlined a public outreach campaign showing a variety of levels of service with costs associated to each service level in order to get feedback. Staff clarified the focus of the conversation is on deficiencies in a system that the District does not own but that the Board’s feedback is that it is ok with supplementing the County’s program to enhance it because asking the County to fix it has not worked. The Board stated it preferred first to ask the County to fix the issue with the idea that it might not work and then we would negotiate.

General Manager Chaplen pointed out we are in the process of developing the 5-year surface water plan and we need more input to clarify what level of service the County will provide and what level of service the customers want. Staff stated OLWS has met with DTD several times and they are stretched thin to the point they are not concerned with the OLWS area. We have tried to hold them accountable and they are not coming through. The Board pushed back by stressing the regulatory hook as being the driver of getting them to maintain their responsibilities. Staff reminded the group that in 2012 the customer survey provided feedback that flooding was a number one issue. Libby pointed out that even without building a project-based CIP rate structure, one snapshot to present to the public would be status quo.

The Board asked staff to estimate the percentage of inadequate or undersized drainage facilities owned by Clackamas County and staff responded about 60%. Right sizing these catchment facilities would be very expensive. The Board reminded the group that charging more for the OLWS surface water program has been a goal for many years. The Board asked for the prioritization of projects that would bring the most benefit District residents, businesses and customers in terms of water quality and flooding.

Staff commented that the responsibility OLWS has under the MS4 Permit is the same as any nearby jurisdiction, but the level of programmatic funding within other jurisdictions is much higher. General Manager Chaplen summarized this section: OLWS will go to the public with scenarios of what our current service levels put together with future service levels outlined and the costs associated with monitoring and managing new facilities. The big question continues to be flood management with regards to rates and fees, in relation to other responsible jurisdictions (DTD, Clackamas County), and in a realistic timeframe.

The Board reiterated the importance of having the conversation with ODOT about the transportation system pollutants being the worst pollutants of concern entering local waterways, and how to get ODOT to address the issue. Clackamas County worries they lack the funds to keep up with the issue. Flooding is the visible issue of concern to the public and smaller projects should help fix the problem. The master plan should focus on correcting the flooding at the development level, as well as to ensure right sizing surface water facilities.

The Board mentioned Clackamas County may implement transportation funding fees, like a vehicle registration fee. The Board also asked if people with large lots or more impervious surface (like commercial grade driveways) should have a higher watershed protection fee or a variable surface/storm water rate, and OLWS should implement SDC’s. The issue becomes one of equity.

Staff commented perhaps the first step is to draft the MOU with Clackamas County, and public input could help with the draft. The public input and illustration of a variety of service levels will be presented as part of the input process. Jim Martin was asked to comment, and he added the conversation is going too deep at some points. He encouraged the Board to make the District’s high-level preferences known and then have Jason and Libby flesh out the scenarios and bringing them back to the group. After those scenarios are reviewed by the Board, they should be reviewed by a citizens committee and then structured before being shared with the public.

The group took a break at 12:12 p.m. and reconvened the Special Meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Public comment from James Stotler, 2620 SE Risley Ave. and is part of an 11-house homeowners association backing up on Green Heron Ponds. The development was built in 1977 and drainage and springs go into the ponds. There is a drainage culvert going over to the park and has filled up with sediment over the years. In addition, this year a beaver has dammed the culvert and in major rainstorms 5 of the houses are flooded, with two of the homes being flooded into their living areas. Because multiple jurisdictions have not cleared up the culvert a local resident took it upon himself to work on the clog. A local work crew looked at it but haven’t been back to conduct any work. The sections of cement drainage pipes have broken apart over time and the water pressure differential causes water to flood over the street and floods the homes. He is asking the Board to consider helping the situation even though we do not own the system. The Board thanked him and asked for input about what he would want from OLWS and how much he would want to pay for those services. He commented he would like the drainage areas to be maintained and the HOA is working hard on maintaining their portion of the wetland and pond area.

The next topic put forward for change is plan review at the level of OLWS having more control over development in the District. The Board asked how this might be envisioned in our District and staff suggested we would consider taking on more of a land use regulation position in relation to Clackamas County. This could include a variety of land use like regulations that stop short of an authority. The Board suggested thinking about an overlay zone established legislatively, which Clackamas County would still oversee. General Manager Chaplen asked where code would come in, for example with regards to adding incentives or prescriptions to support water quality. This could have rate or SDC implications, but in general the question is whether we want to explore elevating the standard of development in this area like a watershed protection overlay zone.

The Board recommended not taking on too much and that this might not be at the top of their priority list. While the idea of an overlay zone is nice, the enforcement aspects of this type of work is very challenging. OLWS does not currently have the mechanism to enforce the rules that we currently have, so we should not add more. The Board agreed that this idea should stay on the list for the future, but at this point should not be developed further because of the current resource level for enforcement.

Inspections are another idea to consider. This could include regular inspections of current commercial areas to verify sewer SDCs and surface/storm water compliance. The Board mentioned there might be enough money in the fines to support the staff time for enforcement. They were supportive about contracting out inspection but keeping enforcement within staff resources. The District does not currently have the resources for this level of service.

Inefficiencies were found in plan review and inspection in the District’s partnership with Clackamas County, and the MOU with the County needs to contain more detail. This is not something that needs to be explored more with the public, but the MOU needs to be clarified so that commitments can be kept. The Board commented at the Community Planning Organization (CPO) level people are very concerned with Post Construction Runoff design and enforcement of facilities that support the amount of runoff new development creates. Another issue for the public heard at the CPO level is development that encroaches on the wetlands when public perception is wetlands were protected. Staff clarified some of the challenge is the District would need to lobby to change Clackamas County’s code for more environmental protection, and then achieve enforcement of the added protection. There are many layers of complexity, which make it difficult to clarify who is supposed to do what and at what point in time.

The goal for today is to create information that allows you to take the next step towards defining future goals. We have an MOU to update to clarify the boundaries, we have code that should be looked at, shored up and enforced upon, and we have the umbrella topic to be looked at which is should the District be in the flood management business as compared with the business of water quality. The Board agreed it seemed easier to manage rates to support a surface water program that includes a focus on flooding. They asked for feedback from the facilitator about how the District could do this work differently as compared with other districts. Libby responded how complicated this topic is in general and commented it is even more difficult and complex in OLWS due to the nature of the relationships. There are federal and state laws, county regulations, and District code. She reinforced the importance of this meeting and Jason’s goal to clarify what pieces are currently in place and then to approach the public for feedback in developing the next master plan.

The Board stressed on the importance of partnerships and framing issues clearly. The General Manager commented on the challenge of the timeline and making sure we move forward while respecting the needs of customers. Tonia from NCPRD commented on the lack of research about a comprehensive watershed look at what will help flooding most. Risley Park is a good example of a park providing increased floodplain capacity but with the compounded issue of a blocked drainage catchment facility. The facility was owned by Clackamas County and was later transferred to NCPRD to be maintained long term.

Libby mentioned staying with a larger perspective and moved the agenda onto education and outreach. Neil from NCUWC reminded the group ultimately the fish and the local residents both do not care about jurisdictional boundaries, what matters is who has the best tool to help move the projects forward. Rick reinforced OLWS should have the authority to address problems and Jason questioned when Clackamas County does not address issues that are their responsibility, how much should OLWS take on these problems? The Board supported staff on clarifying the line that OLWS will hold regarding timelines for flooding and maintenance issues. General Manager Chaplen noted the delta difference around Clackamas County’s level of service and the OLWS goals and level of service for water quality and quantity in our District. The Board reiterated this will require looking at the rate models and asking the public what they expect and would want to pay for. Libby pulled the group back to getting a pulse on the topic of education and outreach.

Currently, OLWS invests in about 0.5 FTE outreach and education and could consider shifting that allocation. The investment includes website maintenance, newsletters, partnerships on outreach and education, and could involve greater investment of time and resources. The Board asked if the outreach is mostly toward students and staff responded mostly, although some efforts are towards adult populations. The Board asked if more adult outreach might be important, staff responded adult education is where outreach can approach code enforcement and suggested Rick does adult education when he approaches them around enforcement. The Board suggested going to adult groups like CPOs but most adult community groups might be considered “preaching to the choir”, so maybe the best way to broaden adult outreach is to meet adults where they are. We must tell the people why we want issues taken care of, not only because of regulations, but because the end result goes into biosolids and clean drinking water and recycled water. The Board is interested in exploring expansion to a bigger audience.

The next topic is Construction and Capital Improvement Projects, and staff suggested addressing flood management and water quality through capital projects after the MOU with Clackamas County has been clarified. Is this something we want to take out to the public to ask about? The Board agreed OLWS will talk about flood management and water quality as part of the master plan, and we should take this question to the public. Staff commented on establishing a baseline of service in order to go out to the public in case you need to ask for more resources for greater levels of service.

IGAs and MOUs with other jurisdictions is the next topic. OLWS staff reiterated clarifying the MOU with Clackamas County and proposed possibly updating the relationship with ODOT. The Board supported this suggestion and added this work is necessary internal work and does not need to be commented on by the public.

Jason asked if there are any other items the Board thought should be commented on by the public. The Board believes the public wants to so the right thing and asked if there were items the public could assist with through increased understanding, for example in the automotive trades area. Programs would look like Backyard Habitat and low pesticide use programs but for District businesses and commercial trades (eg: car dealerships). The Board also suggested enlisting the public’s support when we are working with some of our partner agencies (Clackamas County) and getting others to speak out to their County Commissioners on behalf of the District.

Staff asked about considering reduction of services and the Board said, yes, that could be part of what we ask the public along a spectrum of service levels. Libby asked if the group wanted to meet again before going out to the public and the Board agreed they wanted to meet again to hear synthesis and review options. The Board also reminded staff about reforming the public utility committee to advise the District on a variety of issues. General Manager Chaplen mentioned our Field Operations Manager, Todd Knapp, would like street sweeping to be a part of the future discussion, especially if the OLWS logo were on the street sweeper. OLWS could focus on some or all streets, including ones Clackamas County does not sweep. OLWS could supplement or replace services.

1. **Call for Public Comment**

 Neil from NCUWC commented on the difficulty of separating flood management from water quality both on the natural resources side as well as on the political side. He was supportive of the conversation and volunteered to have NCUWC be part of an advisory committee. Tonia from NCPRD commented on the concept of a research/survey/plan to help prioritize issues like flooding, meandering, ponding, water quality, etc. Partners could negotiate and mobilize on how to work together in relation to the prioritized list of issues.

1. **Business from the Board**

Staff will refocus and come back to the Board in about a month, with the first issue to be tackled being the clarification of the MOU and discussion of commitment with Clackamas County. The Board suggested making sure the Budget implications are organized for the coming year. General Manager Chaplen stressed getting a good Surface Water Master Plan onto the District’s plate in a timely fashion and with public input, and how important that will be for the longer-term timeline of the future Board and Staff. She thanked Libby and Jason and all the staff for putting together a successful meeting. The Board also reminded staff of communication with the newspaper and keeping a public conversation going through that avenue. The Board thanked staff and all other participants for their work on this issue and ended the meeting by stating the end goal of serving the ratepayers well, and our next steps will involve finding out how much they are willing to let us do for them.

1. **Adjourn Special Board Meeting**

 President Gibson ended the special meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Gibson Susan Keil

President, Board of Directors Secretary, Board of Directors

Date: Date: