SUMMARY NOTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2018 MEETING OF THE OAK CREEK WATERSHED RESTORATION PLAN ADVISORY GROUP

INTRODUCTION

The February 7, 2018 meeting of the Oak Creek Watershed Restoration Plan Advisory Group was convened at the Oak Creek Civic Center at 9:07 a.m. The meeting was called to order by Laura Herrick, Chief Environmental Engineer, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). Attendance was taken by circulating a sign-in sheet.

In attendance at the meeting were the following individuals:

Members Present

Advisory Group Members

Bob Anderson	Professor of Biological Sciences, Wisconsin Lutheran College
Phil Beiermeister	Environmental Engineer, City of Oak Creek
Greg Failey	Environmental Manager, General Mitchell International Airport
Dave Giordano	Executive Director, Root-Pike Watershed Initiative Network
Craig Helker	Water Resources Management Specialist, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Laura Herrick, Secr	etary Chief Environmental Engineer, SEWRPC
Steve Keith	Environmental Services Unit Leader, Milwaukee County Environmental Services
Julie Kinzelman]	Director, Laboratory Division & Research Scientist, City of Racine Health Department
Janette Marsh	Nonpoint Source Technical Program Manager,
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5
Cheryl Nenn	
Linda Reid	Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc.
Brian Russart	Natural Areas Coordinator, Milwaukee County Parks
Tom Slawski	
Kyle Vandercar	City Engineer, City of South Milwaukee
Jennifer Wright	Watercourse Section Manager, Engineering Department,
	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District

Guests and Staff Present

Megan Beauchaine	
Joseph Boxhorn	Senior Planner, SEWRPC
Aaron Owens	
Katlyn Pluer	
Mark Mittag	Senior Project Manager, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District
Allison Thielen	Program Manager, Root-Pike Watershed Initiative Network

Ms. Herrick welcomed all attendees to the meeting. She stated that this was the kickoff meeting of the Advisory Group for the Oak Creek Watershed Restoration Plan (Plan). Ms. Herrick informed attendees that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Advisory Group's role for the Plan, to review draft Plan presentations for the public meeting March 8, 2018, and to discuss the Plan report outline and upcoming schedule.

ADVISORY GROUP'S ROLE FOR THE PLAN

Ms. Herrick briefly discussed the Advisory Group's role for the Plan. The primary roles for the Advisory Group members are to review draft Plan report sections and provide comments and data relevant to the Plan as appropriate. Draft report sections will be available on the project website (www.sewrpc.org/OakCreekWRP) approximately two weeks before an Advisory Group meeting.

Relevant municipal data that would be useful for the Plan include the following:

- Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list and costs
- Green Infrastructure construction and maintenance costs
- Road salting costs and volumes
- Stormwater plans
- Stormwater MS4 WinSLAMM data
- Stormwater flooding concerns
- Agriculture (leased land, public gardens) location, long term plans, conservation practices
- Municipal park and trail plans

Ms. Herrick indicated that the data above can be submitted to her via email (lherrick@sewrpc.org). Transmittal of relevant non-digital information can be coordinated through her as well. She noted that the requested road salting information will also be used for the SEWRPC Regional Chloride Impact Study that is getting underway. No questions or comments were offered on the Advisory Group's role for the Plan.

REVIEW OF DRAFT PRESENTATIONS FOR STAKEHOLDER MEETING ON MARCH 8, 2018

Ms. Herrick began the review of the draft presentations for the March 8, 2018, Plan stakeholder meeting. She noted that the final presentations will be available on the project website noted above. Ms. Herrick briefly discussed the results of the Plan online survey completed in fall 2017 (Exhibit A). No questions or comments were offered on the online survey summary.

Ms. Herrick introduced SEWRPC staff members Aaron Owens and Megan Beauchaine to present the Oak Creek instream survey summary (Exhibit B). The presentation included an introduction of the watershed assessment areas that will be used in the Plan, a summary of data types that were collected in the field, and a photo tour of each of the assessment areas visited by the SEWRPC staff in 2016 and 2017. Mr. Anderson asked if the data collected in the field will be used to evaluate recommended improvements. Mr. Slawski responded that the same stream locations could be evaluated in the future to quantify changes in stream quality, along with future fish, macroinvertebrate, and water quality data. Ms. Marsh inquired if any algal blooms were observed and if the Plan would address cyanotoxins. Mr. Owens responded that algal blooms were observed and noted during the field survey, but no chemical data were being collected for cyanotoxins as part of the Plan.

Mr. Owens noted in the Lower Oak Creek – Mill Pond assessment area that a section of the stream has moved closer to the Oak Creek Parkway road. Mr. Keith asked if any prior morphology studies have been completed for the Oak Creek mainstem. Mr. Owens indicated that SEWRPC staff are still gathering relevant data and reports and he asked the Advisory Group to provide any relevant reports for the Plan. He further noted that SEWRPC completed a comprehensive watershed plan in 1986 that may touch on some morphology in the watershed, but he was unaware of a specific morphology study. Mr. Vandercar thought the stream migration occurred during the 2008 and 2010 floods. Mr. Vandercar asked if the storm sewer outfall data collected as part of the survey could be shared with the municipalities. Mr. Owens responded that the data can be made available electronically once SEWRPC staff have consolidated the information.

Ms. Beauchaine noted that several reaches of significant sediment deposition were observed in the Middle and Upper Oak Creek assessment areas in 2017. Mr. Beiermeister noted that a beaver dam was removed in the Upper Oak Creek assessment area that may account for the sediment accumulation in that reach. Mr. Mittag inquired about the number of drain tiles observed during the field survey. Mr. Owens responded that not many were observed along the Oak Creek mainstem or the two main tributaries.

Ms. Herrick introduced Wisconsin DNR water resource management specialist Craig Helker to present the Department's Water Quality Management Plan completed in 2017 (Exhibit C). Mr. Helker's presentation included a summary of the Targeted Watershed Assessment (TWA) completed for nine sites in the watershed which included sampling for water chemistry, fish assemblages, macroinvertebrates, and habitat conditions. Mr. Anderson asked if the fish Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) was completed. Mr. Helker indicated that the fish IBI is included in the TWA report. Mr. Mittag noted that few fish tabulated in the survey were sport fish. He asked how sport fishing can be improved as desired by the watershed stakeholders. Mr. Helker indicated that downstream of the Mill Pond dam the Creek supports larger sport fish. He noted that upstream of the Mill Pond dam the Creek supports a warm water forage fish community. He added that there is potential to improve the trophic chain in fish communities in these upstream areas, but fragmentation of habitat limits the establishment of top predator species in those areas. Mr. Mittag inquired what top predator fish could be sustained in this watershed. Mr. Helker indicated that largemouth bass and, if adequate access to the floodplain were available during spawning, northern pike.

Mr. Giordano asked if the round goby numbers observed downstream of the dam were typical and what impact dam removal may have on their numbers farther upstream. Mr. Helker said that the round goby numbers found in the Oak Creek survey were consistent with other Lake Michigan tributary outlet sites. He also noted that removing the dam may allow round gobies to move upstream and potentially replace some darter species.

Mr. Giordano inquired about what the level of effort was to complete a fish and macroinvertebrate IBI survey for one location. Mr. Helker responded that it takes about an hour to establish the station, approximately a half hour to do the fish shocking, and two hours to identify and count the fish. The macroinvertebrates can be collected fairly quickly. The samples are sent to UW-Stevens Point for identification. The cost for the nine Oak Creek watershed sites for WDNR field work was about \$7,000.

DRAFT REPORT OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE

Ms. Herrick introduced the draft Plan outline included below. The intent is to have Advisory Group meetings for one to two chapters of the Plan when drafts are complete. Tentatively Advisory Group meetings will be held about twice a year until the Plan is complete. A tentative project schedule is located on the right side of the Plan website noted above. No questions or comments were offered on the report outline or schedule.

DRAFT REPORT OUTLINE

Plan Chapter	Chapter Title
1	Introduction
2	Prior and Ongoing Studies, Plans, Projects, and Programs
3	Characterization of the Watershed
4	Inventory Findings
5	Watershed Goals and Management Objectives
6	Plan Recommendations

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 11:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Herrick Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A Online survey presentation (242014) Attachment B – Instream survey presentation (242010)
- Attachment C WDNR presentation (242011)



OAK

















- Common themes of open-ended responses:
- Habitat
 - Common concerns:
 - Plant invasive species and fallen trees concerns along corridor
 - Sediment accumulation issues in stream, predominantly in
 - downstream reaches and at mouth
 - Suggested solutions:
 - Increase native plant areas and remove invasives and downed trees – volunteer and governmental
 - Remove sediment, improve flow carrying capacity of stream, reduce sediment to stream



- Common themes of open-ended responses:
- Fishing
 - Common concerns:
 - Fewer fish coming to spawn, and only most tolerant fish surviving
 - Mill Pond is too shallow for fish to thrive
 - Suggested solutions:
 - Removing barriers such as fallen trees/debris, and deepening the mouth of the creek
 - Generally improve water quality







Report Outline



- I. Introduction
- 2. Prior and Ongoing Studies, Plans, Projects, and Programs
- 3. Characterization of the Watershed
- 4. Inventory Findings
- 5. Watershed Goals and Management Objectives
- 6. Plan Recommendations



We anticipate the next Stakeholder meeting to take place by the end of 2018 to review completed Plan Chapter work.



Website and Contact Information

Communication



• SEWRPC website for Draft documents and comments

www.sewrpc.org/OakCreekWRP

- Contact
 - Laura Herrick Chief Environmental Engineer 262-953-3224 or <u>Iherrick@sewrpc.org</u>





- Explanation of Assessment Areas
- What's Involved in an Instream Survey
- Photo Tour of Assessment Areas



















Ecological Stream Heath

ECOLOGICAL STREAM HEALTH



Instream Survey and Inventory

- Instream Survey Includes:
 - Habitat Assessment
 - -Cross Section Survey
 - -Identify Locations of Deep Pool and Riffle Habitats
 - Stream Inventory
 - -Locate and Assess Infrastructure
 - > Road Crossings, Stormwater Outfalls, Drain Tiles
 - -Locate Areas of Bank Erosion
 - -Locate Large Woody Debris Jams
 - -Locate Large Trash Items in the Channel
 - -Locate Important Biological, Hydrological, and Geomorphic Features





Stream Crossing Surveys / Fish Passage Assessment

Type of Crossing

- Number of Cells
- Shape
- Material
- Structure Measurements
- General Condition
- Stream Flow Characteristics
- Cell Blockage? Plugged with Sediment?
- Preliminary Recommendations







Locate/Assess Stormwater Outfalls & Drain Tiles





Important Biological, Hydrologic, and Geomorphic Features











- Lower Oak Creek-Grant Park Ravine Assessment Area
- 0.8 Stream Miles
- Steep Channel Slopes Compared to other Assessment Areas
- Well Buffered
- One of the Most "Recreationally Used" Reaches of Stream within Watershed
- Fishing, Hiking, Biking is Prevalent









Lower Oak Creek—Mill Pond Assessment Area

- 2.25 Stream Miles
- Mill Pond and Dam
- High Density Residential and Industrial Land Use
- Stream is Well Buffered— Milwaukee County Parkway System
- Includes USGS Gaging Station at 15th Avenue
- Fairly Visible Reach to Public— Heavily Used Oak Creek
 Parkway for Biking/Run/Walking







Lower Oak Creek-Mill Pond Assessment Area









Lower Oak Creek Assessment Area

2.4 River Miles

÷.

- High Density Residential Land Use
- Stream is Well Buffered— Milwaukee County Parkway • System
- Riparian Buffers Are More Confined Due to the Dense Residential Area
- Channelization More Pronounced
- Disconnected From Floodplain Areas of Concrete Lined Channel
- Mitchell Field Drainage Ditch Flows Into this Assessment Area at Upstream End













Middle Oak Creek Assessment Area

- 4.6 Stream Miles
- Low Gradient Stream
- Less Pool/Riffle Structure
- Less Urbanized than Downstream Areas
- Some Agricultural Land Uses, Mostly Residential
- More Silt and Sand Substrates/Increased Sediment Depths
- Channelized and Disconnected Floodplain
- Fragmented Riparian Buffer







<text>





Upper Oak Creek Assessment Area

- 2.8 Stream Miles
- Mix of Agricultural, Industrial, and Residential Land Uses
- Areas of Deep Silt Accumulation
- Smaller Stream Widths





Upper Oak Creek Assessment Area





Oak Creek Headwaters Assessment Area

- 2.3 River Miles
- Stream Becomes Intermittent at Woodward Drive
- Several Drop Structures Create Barrier to Fish Passage









Oak Creek Headwaters Assessment Area







Lower North Branch Oak Creek Assessment Area

- 2.8 River Miles
- Mostly Residential Land Use and Industrial Land Use
- Downstream Areas Have Good Pool/Riffle Structure and Habitat
- Frequent Stretches with Little or No Riparian Buffer Protection
- Increased Channelization As We Moved Upstream















Upper North Branch Oak Creek

- 3.5 River Miles
- Industrial and Residential Land Uses
- Very Channelized
- Lower Stretches with Little Riparian Buffer Protection
- Stagnant Slow Moving Water
- Little Defined Pool/Riffle Structures





Upper North Branch Oak Creek









Lower Mitchell Field Drainage Ditch Assessment Area

- I.8 River Miles
- Very Channelized
- Some Areas of Riparian Buffer Protection with Some Encroachment













our vey out

HUGE THANKS TO STAFF!

 Megan Beauchaine, Ron Scerbicke, Emma Weiss-Burns, Zijia Li, Julia Orlowski, and Anna Cisar





- Have Begun to "Crunch" Data Collected
- Characterize the "Health" of Stream Reaches and Assessment Areas
- Identify Potential Projects and Strategies to Improve Stream and Watershed Health





Oak Creek Craig Helker Water Resources Biologist WDNR















DNR Planning







Purpose

The Oak Creek – Frontal Lake Michigan Watershed was monitored to provide information for the Restoration Plan for the Oak Creek Watershed.

Fish assemblage, macroinvertebrates, chemistry, and habitat were monitored at nine sites and phosphorus at the pour point of the watershed.



Study Results – Water Chemistry

- * Total phosphorus concentrations ranged from 0.03mg/l at OC-06 to 0.172 mg/L at OC-05.
- Dissolved oxygen was taken once at each of the monitoring stations during 2015 and ranged from 4.1mg/L (OC-09) to 13.0mg/L (OC-04) (Table 5)

Station Code	Total Phosphorus (TP) (mg/L)	Dissolved Oxygen (DO) (mg/l)		
00-01	0.051	7.29		
	0.065			
	0.123			
	0.089			
	0.042			
OC-02	0.106	5.9		
OC-03	0.097	6.0		
OC-04	0.066	13.0		
00-05	0.172	8.0		
00-06	0.03	5.71		
00-07	0,160	4.6		
00-08	0.089	12.21		
OC-09	0.160	4.1		

Study Results -

Macroinvertebrates and Habitat

- The Hilsenhoff Biotic Index ranged Poor with a score 7.98 (OC-09) to Good with a score of 5.304 (SC-01).
- The Macroinvertebrate IBI (MIBI) score ranged from 1.358 to 5.26. The MIBI scores in this watershed suggest challenging conditions resulting from watershed inputs and overall degraded channel conditions.



Oak Creek Front Lake Michigan T	al NA			. Senar		104:00			
	1		変要	Max as	1		R. AF	19-1-	and a for
CORD - AND	The second	1	15 - Al-				Star - T	1 750	STR &
Prayin - File -		1.34		1990		100	100	100	SXX
CARANTE LE SH	the second	and the	and the set		- T.	306	10		No. 1
记程型			0	U.S.	-		6	-	ALASSES.
THE I				1	20		5	-	1
A BLOW PR	CE MAR				1200	F	1	And I	0 34
	0	0 May	D Code Station 10		-	E		100	Service.
ALE P	The P	T	00.01 40.953	100	Aller	1	A. A.	19	Sec.
TAL THE AL	1 Parton	1	00.04 415074	100		115		10	1000
	T and the		00.06 38014247	Sec.	-				072
Non Land In	Bahr-	41 1	OC/08 20039495						
	The second		00.08 1004177						
Control And	1.11		00.08 33044177						
Fish	00-1	OC-2	0C-3	0C-4	OC-5	OC-6	OC-7	OC-8	OC-9
Fish Black Bullhead Bluepill	0C-1 2	0C-2	0C-3 1	00-4	OC-5	OC-6	OC-7	OC-8	OC-9
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback	0C-1 2	0C-2	0C-3 1 1 3	0C-4	0C-5 2	0C-6 7	0C-7 7	OC-8	00-9
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow	0C-1 2	0C-2	0C-3 0C-3 1 1 3 15	0C-4 69 523	0C-5 2	OC-6 7 7	0C-7 7 1	OC-8 152	0 C-9 12
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub	0C-1 2 21	0C-2 14 21 157	0C-8 3884577 0C-3 1 1 3 15 103	0C-4 69 523 28	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25	7 1 29	0C-8 152 732	0C-9 12 26
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegall Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp	0C-1 2 21	14 21 157 1	OC-3 1 1 3 15 103	0C-4 69 523 28	0 C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25	7 1 29	0C-8 152 732	0C-9 12 26
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow	00-1 2 21 3	14 21 157 1 7	OCC# 3884477 OC-3 1 1 3 15 103 4	0C-4 69 523 28 12	2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4	7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80	0C-9 12 26 5
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish	00-1 2 21 3	14 21 157 1 7	OCC# 3884477 OC-3 1 1 1 3 15 103 4 3	0C-4 69 523 28 12	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4	7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80	0C-9 12 26 5
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish Green Sunfish	0C-1 2 21 3 12	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21	OC-3 1 1 3 15 103 4 3 20	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4 3	7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	0C-9 12 26 5 8
Fish Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickleback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish Green Sunfish Iowa Darter	0C-1 2 21 3 12	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21	0000 3884477 000-3 1 1 3 103 4 3 20 40	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3 49	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4 3 3	OC-7 7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	0C-9 12 26 5 8
Fish Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish Green Sunfish Iowa Darter Johnny Darter	0C-1 2 21 3 12	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21 2	000 3894477 000-3 1 1 3 15 103 4 3 20 40 23	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3 49 32	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4 3 3 14	7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	0C-9 12 26 5 8
Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish Green Sunfish Iowa Darter Johnny Dater Jumkinseed Sunfish	0C-1 2 21 3 12	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21 21 2 1	000 389417 00-3 1 1 1 3 103 4 3 20 40 23	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3 49 32	0C-5 2 5	OC-6 7 7 25 4 3 3 14	7 7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	00-9 12 26 5 8
Fish Fish Black Bullhead Bluegill Brook Stickback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish Green Sunfish Iowa Darter Johnny Darter Pumkinseed Sunfish Rainbow Trout	0C-1 2 21 3 12 4	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21 2 1	0C-3 1 1 1 3 15 103 4 3 20 40 23	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3 49 32	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4 3 3 14	7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	0C-9 12 26 5 8
Fish Black Bullhead Bhagill Brook Stickback Central Mudminnow Creek Chub Common Carp Fathead Minnow Goldfish Green Sunfish Iowa Dater Johnny Datter Pumkinseed Sunfish Rainbow Trout Round Goty	0C-1 2 21 3 12 4 62	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21 2 1	000 389417 00-3 1 1 1 1 3 103 4 3 20 40 23	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3 49 32	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 7 25 4 3 3 14	7 7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	0C-9 12 26 5 8
Fish Black Bullhead Blaggill Brook Stickleback Central Mudeninnow Oreke Chub Common Carb Cathead Minnow Oolditah Green Sunfish Iowa Darter Johnny Datrer Pumkinseed Sunfish Rainbow Trout Round Göby White Craspie	00-1 2 21 3 12 4 62 4	0C-2 14 21 157 1 7 21 2 1	000 389407 000-3 1 1 1 3 15 103 4 3 20 40 23	0C-4 69 523 28 12 3 49 32	0C-5 2 5	0C-6 7 25 4 3 3 14	7 1 29 12	0C-8 152 732 80 3	0C-9 12 26 5 8

Study Results - Natural Community

In the study the thermal composition of species (cold, warm, or transitional) indicated the sampled stream sites resemble cool-warm systems, with the exception of Mitchell Field Drainage Ditch.

Fish species I this drainage ditch indicated a cool-warm community but historical manipulations may have changed this to a warmer community from a previously coolcold community.



Overall Watershed Condition

Overall, the water quality of Oak Creek and tributaries ranges from good to poor.

Across the watershed, stream habitat is a limiting factor.

Stream channelization, along with associated sedimentation from runoff and bank erosion impairs fish & macroinvertebrate populations.



Recommendations

Management Priorities

- nanazement Priorities Undertify areas thoughout the watershed where stream habitat can be restored and connectivity improved. Seek funds and programs to support these efforts. I dentify the primary sources of phosphorus and defortides in the watershed and pursue local nunoff management and river/stream grants to reduce phosphorous and chloride inputs into local water resources.
- .
- resources. Identify potential partners and stakeholders to participate in an overall awareness and behavioral change program in the watershed that could result in reduced erosion and phosphorus inputs.
- Restoration Goals

 Work with partners and through grant programs to reduce overall nutrient loads to the watershed to protect exiting conditions and reduce impacts to impaired or nearly impaired waters.

 Expand aquate life passage within the watershed.

 Improve that and aquate life habitat.

 Expand and migrate existing wetlands.

Recommendations Continued

- Mininger narroll from agricultural areas in the natersheel. Gavis should include relaxing soil envolve, model, and meeting nativeter manipulation areas in the natersheel. Gavis should be house to be a strained by the should be should be a strained b

- Rover westerwater and stormwater discharges in the water-held for compliance.

 Massacrest Recommendentian for Surveral January

 Massacrest Recommendentian for Surveral January

 The waterhood communities shadd controls efficiently employmentations of their stormwater
 program.
 The automatic communities shadd controls efficiently employmentations of their stormwater
 program.
 Rectars and provide incommunities houdd controls efficiently provide individences, organizations,
 Sandtas and provide incommations individentiates to monitor and controls the massacrest operative specifies in
 the waterhood.
 Rectars and manage westerists, avoid that, and the second their automation
 Rectars and manage westerists, avoid that, and the second their to avoid their to be reached and the second term of the second

Questions?