

MUNICIPAL DISTRICT OF BIGHORN NO. 8

MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

HELD FEBRUARY 17, 2010 AT THE MUNICIPAL OFFICE IN EXSHAW

PRESENT: CAROLYN MONTGOMERY CHAIRPERSON
PAUL ADAMS MPC MEMBER (Council)
MARIA DUNKI MPC MEMBER (Council)
JOHN HAASEN MPC MEMBER
RHODY LITSCHKE MPC MEMBER

STAFF: JANICE THOMPSON DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
ULRIKA GILLESPIE MANAGEMENT ASSISTANT, PLANNING &
DEVELOPMENT

GUESTS: Richard Bittner, Karl Eve, and Jedd Rappel. Attendance varied throughout the meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Discussion on Site Inspections

The MPC members acknowledged that no site inspections had been arranged.

Chairperson Montgomery asked if the legal opinion regarding site inspections had been received from the municipality's solicitor. Janice Thompson reported that no opinion had been received as yet but staff is still working on obtaining it. She added that the MD's Solicitor has been away and only recently returned so she expects this is part of the delay.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Chair asked if there were any additions or deletions to the agenda. Ms. Thompson stated that there was one addition if MPC chose to accept it under item VIII New Business. She said it would be a number 2, and titled March MPC meeting for a discussion.

MOTION 01.02.10 HAASEN THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission approve the agenda with the following addition:

VIII.2 – March MPC meeting DISCUSSION

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. January 19, 2010 - Regular

The Chair asked if there were any errors or omissions to the January 19, 2010 MPC minutes. No errors or omissions were noted by either the MPC members or by staff.

MOTION 02.02.10 LITSCHKE THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission approve the minutes of the January 19, 2010 Municipal Planning Commission meeting as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

V. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

A. Applications Referred to the Municipal Planning Commission

1. DP Application No. 01/10 - Bittner

Richard Bittner was present and joined MPC at the table. The Chair introduced the MPC members and staff to the applicant and then asked Ms. Thompson to outline the background information of the application. Ms. Thompson began by outlining that the Bittners are the owners of Howling Dog Tours. She said the application is to renew a Commercial Kennel that houses sled dogs. She said the operation is located on Crown land near Gap Lake Hill and has been in existence for approximately 12 years. She said at the last renewal in 2004 the approval was for 240 dogs. She said that the permit was amended in 2008 to increase the number of dogs by 85, for a total of 325. She said the lease was added to at that time as well. She said that there was a second amendment as to size of buffer areas that were required in the 2004 decision and that this was further explained in the MPC package. She said that the Province of Alberta was involved in both of the former amendment applications. Ms. Thompson stated, though, that the additional 85 dogs have not been brought to the site as yet. She continued to explain that the subject renewal application is for 325 dogs and then explained how each dog is tethered and the entire perimeter is fenced so no dog could escape even if a tether broke. Ms. Thompson continued to explain that part of the subject renewal application involves the approval of a site plan. She said that when the application was previously amended in 2008 that part of that approval included a revised site plan. She said that this older site plan has been included in the agenda material for information and comparison and that the new, clearer site plan was also in the agenda material. She drew MPC members' attention to each of them. She said the one dated February 5, 2010 is the new one. She assured the MPC members that the new map is the same as the older one, just clearer and outlines everything on the site, including how and where the dogs are staked. She ended with stating that there are some photos of the kennel site that were submitted in 2008 and that the previous conditions of approval in the original plus the two amendments have been incorporated into the staff recommendation for the subject renewal.

Maria Dunki asked if there had been any complaints regarding the operation. Ms. Thompson responded that none have been recorded that she is aware of.

Chairperson Montgomery asked Mr. Bittner if he had anything further to add. Mr. Bittner stated that the MD and the Province worked very hard to work out the buffer areas, noting that they have given up a lot of land for buffers which they pay for but cannot use. He confirmed that they have been operating for about 12 years.

Paul Adams asked for clarification that each dog is tethered. Mr. Bittner stated they were. Mr. Adams asked if they ever get tangled up? Mr. Bittner explained that the tether that they have chosen is a Swedish model and there is a swivel at both the post and at the collar so there is very little chance of a dog getting tangled. He said this model will last up to one and a half years, much longer than regular tethers. He said that once a month a tether check is done on each dog. He said that it is very important that dogs never get off a tether because there are costly

veterinarian bills if they do. Mr. Litschke asked if that is because the dogs fight. Mr. Bittner responded yes, that they would.

John Haasen asked for clarification as to which site plan was new and which one is older. Mr. Bittner responded that both plans have been approved but the more recent one submitted shows the buffer areas more clearly adding that there was a great deal of discussions between himself, Mad Dogs and Englishmen and the Province regarding these buffers.

MOTION 03.02.10 LITSCHKE THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission APPROVE Development Permit Application No. 01/10 for the renewal of a commercial kennel subject to the following conditions:

1. The maximum number of dogs to be held at the site (MLL 940065) shall be 325, excluding pups less than 16 weeks of age, and all dogs shall be owned by the applicants. This total of 325 dogs includes the 85 additional dogs referenced in Condition No. 2 below.
2. The additional fencing required to house the additional 85 dogs approved through Amendment #1 to DP 67/04 shall be installed in the same manner as the existing fencing on the site; that is, a 1.83 m (6 foot) high chain link fence that has its lower portion below ground, in order to ensure that the dogs are restrained at the site. Such fencing shall be completed prior to the 85 additional dogs being brought to the site.
3. The dogs shall be chained, leashed or otherwise securely restrained at all times they are on the subject site or nearby lands (which are known to be critical to wildlife) and this Development Permit is subject to cancellation if the applicant's dogs are found to be frequently at large or to be harassing indigenous animals.
4. There shall be no kennelling at this site of dogs owned by other parties.
5. The revised site plan submitted and date stamped by the MD of Bighorn February 5, 2010 is hereby accepted as the approved site plan representing the site layout for the subject kennel site and thus replaces the site plan approved and date stamped July 11, 2008.
6. There shall be no residential occupancy of the subject lease area by any persons.
7. There shall be no on-site commercial operation, such as dog sales or shows that would bring persons not normally and directly associated with the applicants to the site.
8. All dog excrement shall be removed from the area where the dogs are kept at least on a weekly basis and disposed of at a location, and in a manner, deemed appropriate by Alberta Health Services.
9. The applicants shall maintain the existing signage, which are posted around the site warning of the sled dog holding operation, on a regular basis.
10. The buffer on the east side of the lease area (on the west side of Mad Dogs & Englishmen kennel site) shall be 15 m in depth, **AND** the buffer area on the southeast side of the lease area (north of the Mad Dogs and Englishmen lease) shall be 7.5 m in depth; and within this 7.5 m buffer area a 3.0 m wide roadway may be constructed to allow access within the kennel site provided that the southernmost 4.5 m of the buffer is left to re-vegetate naturally with trees, shrubs, grass and other species.
11. A 15 m buffer shall be maintained on the easternmost lease boundary (adjacent to the Lafarge Grotto Creek Plant) and a 20 m buffer shall be maintained along the northern lease boundary (adjacent to the Critical Wildlife Zone) unless otherwise approved by the landowner (the Province of Alberta) through any lease amendment process.
12. All dog food shall be stored securely in an enclosed bear proof structure in order to discourage wildlife from visiting the site.

13. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining any necessary approvals from Public Lands and Lafarge Construction Materials for use of the adjacent L.O.C. for access to the site area.
14. The developer shall make an effort to control on-site dust, and the MD reserves the right to require dust control measures as necessary.
15. The Development Permit shall have effect only so long as the applicant maintains a legal lease agreement with the property owner, and shall not be considered to be vested in the land.
16. This Permit is subject to consideration for renewal but shall otherwise expire on **June 1, 2014**.
17. The applicants shall agree to the amendment of the existing Development Agreement with the MD of Bighorn to recognize this new five-year approval.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. DP Application No. 03/10 – Donnelly

The Chair asked Ms. Thompson if there was a representative for this application present. Ms. Thompson stated that there was not but she said there is a representative here with respect to item V.A.3. The Chair then requested that Ms. Thompson proceed with the background as it should not take long. Ms. Thompson then outlined that the subject application is to renew an existing home occupation for a bed and breakfast operation in West Jumpingpound. She said that the operation has been in existence for approximately 12 years with no complaints. She said the staff recommendation reflects the same conditions as the previous approval had. She added that the MD is still working with the applicants with respect to compliance with Policy T-16 (a condition of development approval).

John Haasen asked for clarification that this was outstanding from the last approval in 2006. Ms. Thompson answered yes and explained that there appeared to be a difference of opinion on the need for compliance. Ms. Thompson stated that the landowners feel that they have legal access to the property based on an agreement with Shell who gave them permission to travel the roads. Ms. Thompson stated that opinions the MD has received are that Shell may not have authority to give third parties permission to cross those same private properties. The private land owner agreement gives authority for only Shell to cross the land. Ms. Thompson stated that Bighorn's CAO is now involved and it has been determined that all the applicants need to do in order to comply with Policy T-16 is to sign the Release and Hold Harmless Agreement that forms part of the policy.

Rhody Litschke asked why this is taking so long? Ms. Thompson stated that she did not really know but apparently the applicants are not happy with some of the wording in the agreement so will not sign it. She said that the applicants have been in contact with a lawyer and apparently they are working on some alternate wording. Mr. Litschke commented that perhaps the MPC should consider tabling the application and wondered how long this matter has been going on. Ms. Thompson stated that the requirement that the policy be complied with has been placed on each renewal since inception but has never been complied with. She stated in answer to Mr. Litschke's question about tabling the application that the MPC has the ability to decide whether to approve, refuse, or table the application.

There was a discussion regarding the access issues in West Jumpingpound, the work done to date to try to resolve these issues, and current road development underway. Maria Dunki commented that the matter is very complicated and that Policy T-16 is to protect the MD from liability. She said that substantial progress has been made, but that the MPC has two choices in her mind and that is to either refuse the application or approve it with a shorter approval period.

Rhody Litschke wondered if the MPC could require that the agreement be signed prior to the MPC dealing with the renewal. There was a discussion about the non compliance for the past 12 years and how much longer this should continue.

Paul Adams commented that he would consider a three year renewal with a condition that the compliance with Policy T-16 be met within three months (June 1st) or the approval is revoked. It was noted that this had been a condition of a previous approval but had no effect.

Rhody Litschke asked if Bighorn's CAO was in the office today as he is wondering if a resolution is close. Ms. Thompson stated that she would go and see if the CAO is available. She returned a few minutes later stating that the CAO was on the telephone but that he is in the office.

There was a discussion regarding staff recommendation No. 4 and MPC wanted the CAO's name removed from any decision. Ms. Thompson agreed to do this.

The MPC members then decided that in terms of efficiency for guests that they would table discussions on this matter to later on the agenda.

MOTION 04.02.10 ADAMS THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission table Development Permit Application No. 03/10 to later on the agenda.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. DP Application No. 05/10 – Eve

Karl Eve was present and joined MPC at the table. The Chair introduced the applicant to the MPC members and staff and then asked the Development Officer to outline the proposal. Ms. Thompson then explained that Karl and Michelle Eve are the owners of the property and have submitted an application for a new home occupation for an office for their plumbing and gas fitting business. She said that the property is located in the Hamlet of Exshaw on Mount MacGillivray Drive. She said that Mr. Eve's work would involve things such as new furnace installation or repair, work on water heaters, boilers and general plumbing work. She said that all of the work is performed off site. She said that there may be deliveries of material to the property and that all of the storage of any material would be within the existing accessory buildings (a garage and a shed) on the property. She said that most deliveries would be to the rear from the laneway unless there was too much snow and then deliveries would be made to the front. She described some of the material that might be stored, those being: ABS pipe, flexible tubing, copper lines, etc. She said, however, that the application outlines that most of the material would be delivered directly to the work site. Ms. Thompson continued to explain that the applicants have previously spoken to neighbours and provided a form letter with a stamped, addressed envelope to the MD office for which neighbours could respond directly to the municipality confidentially. She said that eight of them were delivered and of those eight, six had responded with no objection. She said that a seventh no objection letter was received after the agenda package had been sent to members and she verbally stated the street address of the property. In all, she said seven of eight circulated had responded with no objection. She drew the MPC members' attention to a map in the agenda package which had been prepared showing the location of the neighbours circulated. Ms. Thompson continued to explain that the applicant would drive

home a company vehicle (van) each night. She ended with stating that staff are recommending a one year approval subject to the five conditions outlined.

Chairperson Montgomery asked the applicant if he had anything further to add. Mr. Eve responded that he did not.

Maria Dunki stated that she was confused with the staff recommendation and felt there should be clauses dealing with the storage of material and with deliveries. She asked Mr. Eve if the shed was an existing building. Mr. Eve responded that it was. There was a discussion regarding the existing accessory buildings (garage and shed) and if they were conforming in terms of the MD's Land Use Bylaw and that this be addressed in any approval. Ms. Thompson then read out loud the two clauses to be added to any approval with respect to storage being within the existing accessory buildings (garage and shed), including a statement as to whether these are conforming buildings or not, and continued to read out loud a condition to acknowledge that there will be deliveries associated with the home office. There was acceptance of these clauses as read by Ms. Thompson.

MOTION 05.02.10 ADAMS THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission **APPROVE** Development Permit Application No. 05/10 subject to the following conditions:

1. The home occupation shall be limited to a plumbing and gas fitting business, and may also include office-type uses that generally take place at a desk and include telephone, computer, mail, scheduling, book-keeping or similar activities.
2. The home occupation shall be operated in accordance with Section 12.13.0 of MD of Bighorn Land Use Bylaw.
3. Any future signage shall be the subject of a separate development permit application.
4. This approval is valid only so long as the applicants reside at the subject property.
5. This approval acknowledges that there will be deliveries of material to the subject property and, associated with this, the MD of Bighorn reserves the right to limit the number of deliveries to the property for business purposes if the volume of traffic becomes an issue in the area.
6. All storage associated with the home occupation shall be inside of the existing accessory building (garage) and within the existing, non-conforming shed on the property.
7. This Development Permit is subject to consideration for renewal but shall otherwise expire on **March 11, 2011**.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. DP Application No. 06/10 – Nickel/Rappel Excavating

Jedd Rappel was present and joined MPC at the table. The Chair introduced the applicant to the MPC members and staff and then asked Ms. Thompson to provide the background information. Ms. Thompson then began by reminding MPC members that at the last MPC meeting the Commission had approved a single family dwelling and accessory building for Denise Nickel. She said that during that meeting Ms. Nickel had stated that the MD would be receiving an application for a gravel pit on the property as they need to build a road and associated driveway to the new home being built. She said that the subject application by Rappel Excavating was this gravel pit application. She then reminded MPC of the location of the property near Highway #40

and that gravel pits are listed as Discretionary Uses in the AC District. She said that given the size of the pit being less than 1.6 ha (4.0 acres) in size then Alberta Environment is not involved in the approval and no reclamation plan is required to be submitted to Province for approval. She said, however, given that part of the road development to the property involves an intermittent creek then Alberta Environment would be involved in that aspect and a condition has been placed in the staff recommendation to deal with that element. She continued to explain that there are drawings in the MPC's agenda package showing the pit location, including a cross section. She said that also provided as information is part of the engineered road plan and associated route. Ms. Thompson stated that the pit is of an irregular shape and to be located in the south eastern part of the property. She outlined that there will be heavy equipment and a crusher at the site and a pit plan attached shows where the stock piles would be. She ended with stating that the pit will be in existence for several years because, once constructed, the road will need to be maintained. She said that in terms of reclamation, the applicant has outlined that the pit would become a dug out for the proposed agricultural operation on the property and accordingly there is no reclamation plan provided.

Chairperson Montgomery asked the applicant if he had anything further to add. Mr. Rappel stated that the reason the pit is an irregular shape is because its location near the property line. He said that there would be approximately 8,000 tonnes of gravel crushed and then that is it. He said four of these tones is for the road and driveway construction and then the remaining four tones is for maintenance. He said 1000 tonnes of the remaining four tones would be screened.

John Haasen asked if they have found decent pit run on the property and in terms of reclamation to a dug out, would it hold water? Jedd Rappel responded that the landowner would have to line the pit. He added that no water has been encountered and the site is dry. He said that the Nickels drilled a 200 m deep well approximately 15 m from the creek and about 40 m from the pit and got water. He said that the two other attempts at well drilling up near the house site came up dry. He said both of these two wells were drilled some 500 feet deep.

There was a discussion by members regarding the contour map submitted, stability of the pit slopes and whether engineering had been done. Mr. Rappel commented that side slopes of the pit would be 3:1 except on the entrance side (ramp) where it would be approximately 6:1 so that they can drive equipment into the pit. He said that they do not want the sides sloped any steeper than 2:1 and that he brought some photos with him today showing the pit location. These pictures were passed around to MPC members. There was a short discussion on the type of equipment that would be used. Mr. Rappel stated there would be a rubber-tired front end loader.

MOTION 06.02.10 HAASEN THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission **APPROVE** Development Permit Application No. 06/10 subject to the following conditions:

1. The gravel pit shall be operated by the landowner and her family only, and not by a third party.
2. The gravel pit shall be less than 1.6 ha (4.0 acres) in total area, and any expansion or additional development shall be the subject of a separate development permit application and may fall under Alberta Environment's reclamation requirements.
3. The developer shall obtain any necessary approvals from Alberta Environment regarding operation of this pit in terms of the Water Act or any other applicable legislation.
4. If groundwater is encountered during excavation, the developer shall contact the MD of Bighorn

and Alberta Environment immediately and cease all excavation until further approvals are obtained.

5. Extreme care shall be taken to ensure that any nearby water courses are protected from the effects of the gravel pit operation, the stockpiles, and any excavation. The pit shall be set back from the water course, to prevent any seepage of silt or other gravel pit materials from entering the water course, in accordance with Alberta Environment regulations.
6. Prior to disturbing any water course in terms of the driveway construction and culvert installation, the developer shall contact Alberta Environment and/or Alberta Sustainable Resource Development and obtain any approvals required.
7. The developer shall control the amount of dust produced from the gravel pit and any crushing operation, including roads in the immediate vicinity of the site, and shall mitigate any adverse effects to the satisfaction of the MD of Bighorn if concerns arise regarding the amount of dust being generated as a result of the development.
8. Similarly, the developer shall be aware of the possible adverse impacts the development may have on nearby residents due to noise or traffic and the developer shall make all necessary efforts to minimize such impacts. If noise or traffic concerns related to this development become an issue, the MD of Bighorn reserves the right to impose additional conditions on the developer in order to mitigate those concerns.
9. All stockpiles shall be arranged and maintained in an orderly fashion. The stockpiling shall generally be limited to the gravel pit area. In the event that the gravel is stockpiled away from the pit, the developer shall take care to place these piles in locations that do not adversely affect neighbouring properties.
10. If the gravel pit is not utilized as a dugout following its closure then it shall be reclaimed, with reclamation comprising: the adjustment or stabilization of any excavation faces; the spreading of indigenous or imported top soil to a depth adequate to support re-vegetation; re-vegetation with native grasses; and control of weeds until the native grasses are well established.
11. Any exterior lighting for the project shall be designed to be low glare in nature and compatible with "dark sky" lighting principles. Additionally, all light fixtures shall be located, aimed or shielded so as to minimize stray light passing across property boundaries.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Following the motion and prior to leaving, Mr. Rappel asked about who at Alberta Environment he should contact. Ms. Thompson responded that she will email the contact information to him. Mr. Rappel then asked if he could commence. Again Ms. Thompson responded that he should not commence until after the 14-day appeal period has lapsed which begins the date the notice of the decision is advertised in the Cochrane Eagle newspaper, likely to be February 24th.

MOTION 07.02.10 LITSCHKE THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission recess at 9:58 a.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Chairperson called the meeting back to order at 10:06 a.m. and returned to item V.A.2. on the agenda. Martin Buckley joined the meeting.

Ms. Thompson explained to Mr. Buckley why he had been requested to speak with MPC. She said that the MPC are currently reviewing a renewal application for a Bed and Breakfast operation (B & B) in West Jumpingpound. She said that the Donnellys are the applicants. She said that part of the previous approvals for the B & B required compliance with Policy T-16. She said that the applicants have never complied with that condition and that the Planning Commission is becoming frustrated with the lack of compliance. She explained to Mr. Buckley that she had explained to the MPC that he had gotten involved to try to obtain compliance and was working with the Donnellys and that apparently there was some wording being worked on for the Release and Hold Harmless agreement. She said that MPC member Rhody Litschke had a question, wondering how close the MD was to coming to an agreement on the wording. Rhody Litschke then stated that he was considering a refusal because the non-compliance has been going on far too long. He said that the MPC has renewed the B & B each term while still the condition remains unmet. He asked Mr. Buckley if he was getting close to an agreement. Mr. Buckley responded that he would like to say yes and has just gotten off the phone with Mr. Donnelly. He said they had a discussion on the matter and received confirmation that the Donnellys will work with their lawyer right away to come up with acceptable wording. Mr. Buckley stated that Mr. Donnelly has said that he would agree with a tabling motion of his application to allow time to work on the agreement wording.

There was a discussion about how a tabling motion would affect the on-going B & B operation. Ms. Thompson stated that the current approval lapsed December 31, 2009 and the applicants submitted their renewal on January 22, 2010. She said that because MPC has received the application and is dealing with it there is not a huge risk. There was a discussion about refusing the application and then a discussion prompted by Paul Adams about approving with a deadline date that Policy T-16 must be met by. Rhody Litschke said that type of condition was imposed at the last renewal and still there was non-compliance. Mr. Buckley added that there are many things going on in West Jumpingpound including problems with access, but the matter is moving forward and there has been improvement.

There was a discussion about private vs. public access, liability to owners of land that is being crossed, and that it is the applicants responsibility to comply with Council policy.

MOTION 08.02.10 ADAMS THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission table Development Permit Application No. 03/10 to the next Municipal Planning Commission meeting on March 17, 2010.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The MPC members thanked Mr. Buckley for meeting with them and then agreed to move to item V.B.1 on the agenda and continue with the normal flow of the agenda.

V. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

B. Applications Processed by Development Officers

1. Notice of Decision No. 51/09

Ms. Thompson described the above approval processed by the Development Officer. There was a question as to why the name had been removed from the decision. Ms. Thompson stated due to Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Ms. Dunki asked why that application had not been brought before the MPC. Ms. Thompson explained that in the Agriculture Conservation District

grazing is a permitted use, but in a Small Holdings District grazing is discretionary. Permitted Uses are processed by the development officer and Discretionary Uses are dealt with by the MPC. She said the subject decision was designated as Agriculture Conservation District. This prompted a discussion initiated by Maria Dunki on other 40 acre parcels in Jamieson Road. She said she thought they were all automatically small holdings designation. Ms. Thompson said that this was not the case currently, the subject property has an agricultural designation but the land falls within the Small Holdings Policy Area. She said that in the new draft LUB this will be corrected and these types of parcels will be designated as Small Holdings District.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Council Minutes – Regular – January 12, 2010

The MPC members accepted the submitted Council minutes as information.

2. March MPC meeting

Ms. Thompson reminded MPC members that this item had been added to ensure that there is a quorum for the March 17th MPC meeting as Council members Dunki and Adams will not be in attendance. The members discussed this and it was ultimately decided that there would be a quorum and there was no need to change the March 17th meeting date.

IX. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

MOTION 9.02.10 ADAMS THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission go in camera at 10:32 a.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION 10.02.10 ADAMS THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission come out of camera at 10:47 a.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

X. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION 11.02.10 ADAMS THAT

the Municipal Planning Commission meeting adjourn at 10:48 a.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Montgomery
CHAIR

[Signature]
DESIGNATED OFFICER