

**Big Sky Sustainable Water Solutions Forum**  
**Agenda**  
**August Theme: Physical and Legal Water Availability**

September 28, 2016  
1:00-4:00pm  
Big Sky Water & Sewer District  
561 Little Coyote Road

**1:00-1:10pm: Welcome and Introductions**

**1:10-1:15pm: Public Comment**

**1:15-2:45: Presentation of Information on Physical and Legal Water Availability**

Panel Presentations

Overview – Jeff Dunn, Watershed Hydrologist, RESPEC

Water Rights and Legal Availability, Kerri Strasheim, Regional Water Manager, DNRC

In-Stream Flows and Water Policy Considerations, Pat Byorth, Trout Unlimited

Drought Resiliency and Community-Based Planning – Ann Schwend, Watershed Planner, DNRC

Geology of Ground Water Resources, James Rose, Hydrogeologist with the Ground Water Investigations Program (GWIP)), Mike Richter, Research Specialist: Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology

Water Quality and Supply in Big Sky Outlying Aquifers – Peter Manka, Principal, Alpine Water

**2:45-2:55pm: Break**

**2:55-3:25pm: Panel Presenter Q & A and Discussion**

**3:25-3:55pm: Discussion**

Examples: Community Models for Water Supply

Discussion:

- 1) If Big Sky strives to be a model community in this focus area, what elements does this include?
- 2) Given what you heard, what are the most important things to address in this area?
- 3) What else would we like to know before we start thinking about alternatives to address concerns in this area?

**3:55-4:00pm: Public & Committee Stakeholder Comment**

**4:00pm: Adjourn**

# Big Sky Sustainable Water Solutions Forum Stakeholder Meeting

## DRAFT Notes

August Theme: Ecological Health of the River Systems

August 31, 2016

1:00-4:00pm

Big Sky Water & Sewer District

### Attending:

**Stakeholder Committee Members:** Guy Alzentzer, Upper Missouri Riverkeeper; Brad Bauer, Greater Gallatin Watershed Council; Scott Bosse, American Rivers; Pat Byorth, Trout Unlimited; Rich Chandler, Yellowstone Club & GRTF; Mike DuCuennois; Yellowstone Club, BSWSD; Susan Duncan, Association of Gallatin Agricultural Irrigators; Ron Edwards, Big Sky Water and Sewer District, GRTF; Kristin Gardner, Gallatin River Task Force; Kevin Germain, Lone Mountain Land Company & Big Sky Chamber of Commerce & Resort Tax Board; Torie Haraldson, Gallatin Local Water Quality District; Jim Hart, Madison County; Matt Kelley, Gallatin City-County Health Department; Ethan Kunard, Madison Conservation District & Madison County Planning Board; Peter Manka, Alpine Water; Thomas Moore, Gallatin City-County Health Department; David O'Conner, Buck's T-4 Lodge & Big Sky Chamber of Commerce Board, Mike Richter, MT Bureau of Mines and Geology & GRTF; Ann Schwend, Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC); Suzan Scott; Big Sky Owners Association; Bill Simkins, Big Sky Town Center; Kerri Strasheim, DNRC; Eric Urban, Department of Environmental Quality; Wendi Urie, Custer-Gallatin National Forest; Darcie Warden, Greater Yellowstone Coalition; Brian Wheeler, Big Sky Resort, BSWSD; Steve White, Gallatin County; Jessie Wiese, Montana Land Reliance; Ennion Williams, Big Sky Trout & Big Sky Vacation Rentals; Ciara Wolfe, Big Sky Community Organization; Bob Zimmer, Greater Yellowstone Coalition.

**Members of the Public:** Steve Johnson, Parks; Packy Cronin, BSWSD 363; Carla Gorman; Tana Sholly; Margo Magnant, Big Sky Chamber; Madison Boove, OneMontana; Britt Ide, Ide Energy; Emily Casey, GRTF; JeNelle Johnson.

**Meeting, Notes and Facilitation:** Karen Filipovich, Jeff Dunn

## Notes

### Welcome and Introductions

All public and stakeholder members were asked to introduce themselves and state how they felt about being at the meeting. Thirty-one stakeholder representatives and nine members of the public attended the meeting.

Expressed interest and feelings about being at the meeting included happiness to be there, excited to talk about water quality standards, excited to talk about Wild & Scenic Rivers, interested in seeing presentations and discussion, and liked strong turn-out.

There was a question about what a “designated stakeholder” is. Designated or member stakeholders are those that have agreed to represent perspectives in the community and associated zone of influence and had signified their willingness to participate through 2017 by signing a letter of commitment. The public is critical to the process and input is welcome. The December 6 meeting is specifically a time to hear more from the public.

## **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

## **Roles/Process Follow-up**

In the June meeting, stakeholders discussed a clarification that stakeholders recognized existing laws and regulations. The facilitator and advisory committee were tasked with coming up with an addition to the group roles and processes. The change (underlined) brought back was:

- Provide a process to identify common ground, mindful of existing laws, ordinances and regulations, resolve differences and identify effective solutions.

If any stakeholders had questions or comments, they were asked to talk to Karen Filipovich.

## **Presentation of Information on Ecological Health of the River Systems**

This meeting was the first of three meetings designed to provide all stakeholders with common information about priority topics that the group has identified as priorities. This meeting focused on the ecological health of the river systems.

### **Panel Presentations**

#### **Overview – Jeff Dunn, Watershed Hydrologist, RESPEC**

Jeff Dunn provided an overview of the big Sky community and river system. He highlighted the project area, delineated as the resort tax boundaries, and the larger zone of influence of the Gallatin and Madison watersheds.

First, he summarized information and projections of population, build-out and visitation. Population projections, based on US Census data, range from 4,500-14,000 by 2040 for the Big Sky area. A 2011 estimate stated that full build-out is about 7,400 residential units. Based on the analysis in that study, peak residential population could be 16,000. A 2013 Community Profile stated that 15,000+ visitors/day are present at peak events. Resort tax revenue and Chamber visitor center visits also show that summer-time visits have been rising.

Watersheds include Porcupine, Portal, Moose, Deer, West Fork, Jack Creek, Cedar Creek and river systems in the area of development. The South Fork West Fork is a high energy stream with high bed load transport capacity. In the Canyon section, naturally erosive, dynamic river, with algae growth at low

flow. Upper West Fork (Middle and North Fork) drains ski resort and national forest land, Lake Lavinsky dam, and is a mix of meadow and mountain channels. The West Fork Gallatin River is a short, high velocity mountain channel with historic impoundments, and restoration work on the West Fork. BSOA is taking ponds off the channel. Jack Creek is the major drainage to the Madison. Three streams were identified as impaired: The West Fork, Middle Fork and South Fork.

Permitting requirements for work with streams and wetlands include the 310 permits the Conservation Districts oversees, short term water quality standard for turbidity (318 permit), Federal Clean Water Act (404 permit) for dredging and filling in waters of the United States, the Gallatin County floodplain permit, and stormwater discharge general permit if construction activity that will disturb one or more total acres.

### **Water Quality Standards & Impaired Stream Segments – Eric Urban, Bureau Chief, Water Quality Planning Bureau, DEQ**

Water Quality standards apply to everyone and are meant to inform the decision-making process. Permits are required to discharge. This includes industrial application, publicly owned entities, CAFO's, and storm water. No discharge is required for agriculture, forestry, septic systems and many other activities.

Three pieces work together in thinking about water quality: beneficial use (fishable, swimmable, drinking water, agriculture, wildlife), criteria (free form, DEQ 7, and DEQ 12A), and anti-degradation (Tier 1 – existing, Tier 2 - high quality, Tier 3 – ORC) The DEQ 12A has numerical standards for nutrient Criteria to maintain aesthetics TN: 105 ug/L; TP: 250 ug/L. Sediment criteria is narrative, for trout.

Finally, when thinking about streams, Urban noted it is important to keep in mind the streams and tributaries that are not listed as impaired. Monitoring is extensive along impaired streams, but there is a relative absence of information on tributaries of impaired streams.

### **Monitoring and Trends – Kristin Gardner, Executive Director, Gallatin River Task Force**

The Gallatin River Task Force (GRTF) has had a monitoring program since 2016. Over time, the program has expanded with water quality monitoring at the center. GRTF was the local liaison for TMDL in 2005 – 2010 and added sites to program & streamflow stations because of TMDL and started the golf course nitrogen study. In 2012, more sites were added, looking at chloride & sediment. Further sites were added in 2016. Monitoring is seasonal, with many parameters and is primarily focused on the upper river.

In summary, there are no significant long-term trends and healthy levels exist for most constituents. Spatially, there is elevated nitrogen in the Middle Fork and West Fork and Chloride is present. Sediment is also elevated in the Middle Fork and the West Fork. Aquatic invertebrates have also been monitored. Elevated nutrients and impaired riparian function both affect these insects.

In the upper Gallatin, TMDLs (for streams that do not meet all their beneficial uses) are listed for nutrients, sediment, and e. coli.

The Big Sky Golf Course is the site of an in depth study to fill in gaps and better understand the increasing nitrate & chloride through the stretch. Wastewater irrigation is affecting the stream in this

section. Monitoring after the wastewater effluent spill has show no immediate human health or aquatic life standards impacts (acute ammonia, turbidity), but any long term impacts are yet to be determined.

The GRTF has a conservation program. Its nitrogen reduction plan included the West Fork restoration project, educational workshops, septic system brochure and outreach, and a dog waste station. It is also working with the Forest Service on Gallatin River Access Restoration Projects.

### **Wetland and Riparian Resources – Jessie Wiese, Southwest Manager, Montana Land Reliance**

Wetlands are the most important ecological component of the Montana environment. Nationwide, 50% of wetlands have been lost and approximately 60,000 acres are lost each year. Montana has lost roughly 30% of its wetlands. Wetlands perform functions including storing floodwater, filtration and provides habitat for many species. Since 70% of U.S. is private land, most wetland conservation and restoration efforts are undertaken by private landowners.

Common wetland types in the Big Sky are the fen, wet meadow, spring, and inter-montane pothole. Maps of the Big Sky area are incomplete. The Forest Service has a map and private areas tend to be mapped as development occurs when permits are needed. 310 permits are needed when streambank and stream projects are undertaken and 404 permits are required when dredging or filling in US waters occurs.

Conservation easements are a useful tool for conserving wetland and riparian areas. Montana Land Reliance (MLR) prioritizes those areas and sees the Big Sky area as part of a larger landscape and connects projects whenever possible. The MLR has developed a tool for prioritizing conservation land. Several other resources and further information were also highlighted.

### **Fisheries – Joe Naughton, Fisheries Biologist, RESPEC**

The Gallatin has the highest angler pressure in the state. Half are non-resident and only 2/3 are using flies. There is less guide pressure than some of the other major rivers in Montana. Native salmonids such as whitefish, westslope cutthroat, grayling are not doing well. Grayling have been extirpated. Westslope cutthroat inhabit about 25% of the system, but only 3% are considered non-hybridized, with over 90% cutthroat genes. In the Gallatin, there are two sample sites with long-term data: the Porcupine section and the Jack Smith section. There is almost a doubling of rainbow trout downstream of the West Fork. There are many possible explanations and Gallatin trout population was less affected by drought in the '90s. Winter flows below the West Fork could higher and help. Research in other areas yields some ideas about nutrient inputs. In Calgary, the rainbow trout population jumped with mild nutrient enrichment, but the whitefish population declines. In Silver Bow Creek, severe nutrient enrichment leads to hypoxia and no trout.

### **Recreation and Scenic Values, Wild and Scenic Designation – Scott Bosse, Director, Northern Rockies, American Rivers**

In order for a river to be considered for Wild and Scenic designation, it has to be free-flowing and have one or more outstanding river values. The Gallatin has native salmonids, though relatively few streams with westslope cutthroat trout. Wildlife values include grizzly, elk, and big horn sheep. Recreational values contribute substantial economic benefits. Fishing (100,000 angler days/year, worth 40-52 million

dollars a year), rafting (30,000 rafting/days, 4.6 million dollars), and hiking all contribute. Scenic values are also an important aspect of the river.

The citizen's proposal includes the mainstem of the Gallatin River from Yellowstone National Park to Spanish Creek, the Taylor Fork, and Porcupine Creek. A package of rivers is being proposed that includes 700 river miles in 13 river systems. To make it an official Wild and Scenic River, it takes an act of Congress. If this is finalized, this designation protects free-flowing character, safeguards water quality, ensures sufficient flows, protects outstanding values, and requires development of comprehensive river management plan (on federal land and federally-permitted activities).

## **Panel Presenter Q & A and Discussion**

After the presentations, the panelists answered questions and stakeholders added information.

Ethan Kunard (MCD community water quality monitoring program) briefly presented the monitoring program on Jack Creek that has been conducted since 2006. They sample water quality and streamflow parameters, maximum streamflows are decreasing, need to increase maximum storage capacity. He handed out information that will also go on the project website.

Questions:

Q: What is the timeline for the Wild & Scenic designation process?

A: Scott Bosse: One Wild and Scenic bill is currently up for Congressional consideration (East Rosebud). It is hoped that will pass before any bigger bill is introduced. The current timeline is that the Gallatin will be introduced in 2017, as one of a several Montana river reaches. The current citizen's proposal on website, but more vetting and review would take place as it became a Congressional delegation proposal.

Q: You suggested that water quality standards are recommendations. Aren't standards what define what the ecological health of a river is? When I think about TMDLs I think of the maximum amount of a pollutant that can be added without impairing the beneficial use.

A: Eric Urban: Water quality standards are a recommendation. It gets applied to regulations when people apply for a discharge permit. That's not necessarily an end of the pipe recommendation for a discharge permit. The permit is the vehicle to put standards on the ground. The standard isn't enforced, the permit is. A TMDL looks at the entire watershed, sums up contributions, and then states how many pounds less do we need to meet those standards. We meet that in regulatory form (permit) or non regulatory (voluntary).

Q: Within the context of build-out, what is the impact if Big Sky is fully developed? In terms of wastewater treatment and discharge, is the current system at its capacity? Where does that leave us in terms of necessary decisions?

A: Eric Urban: From the DEQ's perspective, we are sitting at the table and holding the bar of our common understanding of the health of the rivers. From the engineering side, we tend to encourage

decisions to come from the ground up. We won't dictate which approach the community takes, and keep an active role and make sure we don't miss the bar.

Q: What is the source of the chloride?

A: Kristin Gardner: A combination of wastewater and chloride that is applied to the roads is probably. We've just started monitoring, but we're not certain of the proportion from different contributions and need to do more work.

Q: Is the Big Sky golf course a primary source of nutrients to the West Fork? What about contributions from other golf courses?

A: Kristin Gardner: Yes, that is correct. The other golf courses have not been studied.

Q: How would we go about refining understanding of the species composition for fisheries? And how nutrients will affect them?

A: Joe Naughton: Generally speaking, when you add nutrient you get increasing biomass in these types of rivers, but it shows up in unexpected ways. An overall increase is likely, but that isn't always the case. You see it first with periphyton, macroinvertebrates, and then trout. Calgary's stream study is similar in that it is moving through a nutrient-poor system; although the impacts of Calgary are more significant. In Silver Bow, more nutrients shifted from mostly brook trout to cutthroat trout. Cutthroats are more nutrient tolerant than brook trout, so the effects are different.

Q: Is there a Big Sky level graph for nutrient levels and fisheries?

A: Eric Urban: We have a graph with the water quality needs for fish, which is generally a higher nutrient level than for other beneficial uses. When you add other beneficial uses the number goes down.

Q: When monitoring on the mainstem of the Gallatin, have you seen nutrient increases in areas in the canyon with a lot of septic?

A: Kristin Gardner: We haven't seen increases in chemistry. But there have been visual increases in algae.

Q: In the wetland figure of the wetlands on federal land, have they been delineated or remotely sensed?

A: Jessie Weise: I don't know the method. Wendi Urie: Those were remotely sensed. Brad Bauer: From my experience, those are about 50% accurate.

Q: Do you have more information about wetland monitoring?

A: Brad Bauer: Information is limited. My program is county-wide. We could expand the effort in Big Sky, but I would need money and volunteers.

Q: What about riparian wetlands as a wetland type?

A: Jessie Weise: I didn't add that one in, but they are here in Big Sky. This type of wetland is really important from a filtering perspective.

Q: What is the estimated ideal width of a functioning, mature riparian buffer zone? Is the 75 foot recommended on the Lower Gallatin a good standard?

A: Jessie Weise: That's pretty case dependent. There's not a single standard. Scott Bosse: Montana Audubon has a pretty good document that includes a summary of the literature on buffer width. Buffer width varies depending on what you are trying to protect. For wildlife, it would be larger than 75 feet. Jeff Dunn: 75 feet is a standard approach, but slope really matters. For a flat site, 20 feet could be good, but a steep slope would need a much bigger buffer.

## Discussion: Models for the Big Sky

### Examples: Community Models for Ecological Health

Karen Filipovich presented five community models of approaches for protecting and/or restoring the ecological health of the ecosystems. Towns and areas that had some commonalities with Big Sky were chosen. She noted that all models discussed have further links on the project resources page.

- **Telluride Valley Floor Preservation:** 572 acres of open space outside the municipal boundaries were bought and put into conservation easement. The project was initially highly controversial because the first approach was to acquire it through eminent domain, but now it is becoming a beloved part of the community since its finalization in 2009. Wetlands, stream restoration, habitat, recreation, scenic and historical values were all reasons this project was completed.
- **Santa Fe Watershed Investment:** The City of Santa Fe partners with the Santa Fe Forest, the Nature Conservancy and local watershed group to use part of water supply rates to pay for controlled burns that mimic the natural pattern, in an effort to avoid catastrophic fires that would destroy the forest and heavily impact water supply. This approach will also save money. This tool may be a useful way to pay for ecological services in the Upper Missouri basin.
- **Town of Vail Gore Creek Restoration:** Gore Creek is a creek that does not meet water quality standards, due to nonpoint source pollution associated with development and removal of riparian vegetation. The fishery is being impacted. The town has appropriated \$2 million to start working on a prioritized list of activities that employ many tools and may spend up to \$9 million.
- **Bozeman Story Mill Stream and Wetland Restoration:** The wetland and stream restoration on and near the East Gallatin river will yield ecological benefits while also enhancing community open space with new parkland.
- **Truckee and Carson Rivers: Watershed Restoration as Art:** Artists, scientists, landowners, community members, and The Natural Conservancy have worked together to build willow sculptures that also provide flood control and riparian habitat restoration.
- **Take Home Messages:** The ecological values are typically only one of several things successful approaches address. Recreation, aesthetics, historic, community and recreational values were some of the other values that were important. Partners also used a wide variety of tools, including rules and regulations, restoration methods, education and community involvement.

**Discussion:**

Participants then discussed three questions. The purpose of this discussion is to begin to identify common areas of interest and possible priorities.

**4) If Big Sky strives to be a model community in this focus area, what elements does this include?**

- Scientific baseline, understanding where we were originally and where we are now. Defining the desired condition, scientifically, and in terms of values.
- Historical perspective is really important. Before this was a Big Sky, this area was a liquidated logging area. If we accept current and future conditions, we have to look back and see what has been regained.
- Regulatory framework. What was water quality in 1974 at the time of the Clean Water Act?
- Sustainability, don't want to exceed the capacity of the environment that you're in
- Resource conservation, water, and using it wisely.
- Community awareness, starting in the Big Sky area, and a general understanding of why this is important.
- Clearly defining our community values as a way to help identify our goals.
- Ensuring that the "river comes first" includes downstream.
- If you look at these examples, they are reactive. We need a proactive plan. How do we recognize our goals and make sure they are maintained?
- Include Madison, Gallatin, and the West Fork.
- The proximity of the highway and the confined space along the Gallatin leads to a lot of problems. Need to include MDOT in this discussion.
- Scenic and recreational impacts need to be included.
- Need to include water quantity and figure out minimum flows for streams.
- Regarding the zone of influence, we have an arbitrary rectangle. What we do here should benefit those outside of our zone of influence.
- We need to recognize as many winners and as few losers as possible.
- Need to think about what doubling the population would look be in terms of impact with additional housing (up and downstream), well and septic, transportation and how it affects housing.
- Let the river come first. Understanding our economic interests, but acknowledging that the river is the golden goose.
- Need to balance with economy and impact of Big Sky.
- Need to remember the river comes first. The economy is tied to the river.

**5) Given what you heard, what are the most important things to address in this area?**

- Economic impacts of a healthy river – both direct and indirect benefits.
- Ensuring that the Gallatin valley is considered, not just Big Sky.
- Identifying tipping point. What are our values and when is too much going to run the river and other things we value? (For instance, when will development affect the experience of being at Big Sky, as opposed to an urban area?)
- Holistic approach – ensure we look at the ecosystem as a whole and tie together natural and human dimensions.

- Wetlands and ties between land and water.
- Understanding our reference condition – both what was and what is desired.
- Ensuring that our reference state also is informed by the possibility of future change (climate change, invasive species, and people). We don't want to set a goal for a future state we can't achieve.

**6) What else would we like to know before we start thinking about alternatives to address concerns in this area?**

- Get Big Sky wetlands mapped.
- More detailed summary of build out.
- Information on critical wildlife habitats. Where is the big horn winter range? Where does wildlife congregate?
- Condition of surrounding upland forest (vegetative changes, wildfire risk).
- Accurate big picture on the hydrology. Where are we gaining, where we losing, etc?
- List of species of concern for the area (wildlife and plants).
- Research such as a new University of Montana paper about gravel rivers as the most important wildlife habitat in the west.

**Public Comment**

- Thank you. I like what I'm seeing.
- The facilitator reminded participants that the website is [gallatinrivertaskforce.org/big-sky-sustainable-water-solutions-forum](http://gallatinrivertaskforce.org/big-sky-sustainable-water-solutions-forum) and resources will continue to be added.
- DNRC is hosting a public drought forum in Bozeman on September 8 at the Public Library. We'll be updating our state drought plan.

**Closing Question**

Participants were asked how they felt about the meeting and going forward, given what they had heard and discussed at the meeting today.

Answers included:

- Thanks to the panelists. Lots of knowledge from this high altitude look that we'll bring forward as we move forward. Website will be a great tool over time.
- Great to see so many people, new faces. Amazed all came up.
- Good questions
- I feel good about it. The breadth of knowledge expertise and passion is encouraging.
- I'm happy to be here and learn. I love living in Big Sky and I think we all want what's best.
- This is important in light of the whitefish crisis in the Yellowstone. This is of concern to the fishing industry. Looking at where we're going with build out. Lots of information coming out. And if we can get our arms around it and get ahead of it this is important.
- Very informative, and I'm impressed
- Started with doubts and more and more encouraged. Think it's going well.
- I think this is going well. I feel like this process and the outcomes will be looked at and learned form.

- My sense of Big Sky is that we're all here from somewhere else because it's special. And we want to keep it special.
- Best opportunity for a comprehensive plan for the area.
- Great challenges ahead. This group and the community have their work cut out for them. Failure is not an option.
- In laymen's terms, where are we at and where do we need to be? I hope the end result that whatever rate growth, we define proactive steps along the way.
- Great to think that we live in Big Sky, and we can resolve our issues on our own.
- Great to see the diverse interests move towards a common solution.
- Appreciating the depth of inquiry. Different viewpoints and experiences are really honing in and looking at things from different angles.
- Wondering where the teeth come into this? After you start with your data, how do you contend with development?
- Trying to learn how to help.
- Cautiously optimistic.
- I sense real progress. I appreciate the panel. A lot good information.
- Ecological health - there is no impending cliff. We're all looking forward to a collective solution. That's not what I expected to hear. Thanks for not saying we're doomed. Looking forward to a solution.
- It's going to be people that are going to create the biggest impact. Particularly, with the construction. It's imperative that we don't let it slip off the radar.
- Appreciate the collaborative proactive effort. Working in government, the reactive is tough.
- Extremely optimistic. A lot of communities ruined their rivers when they started. We haven't done that yet, we have the opportunity to maintain and enhance.
- Whatever the problem, there is a lot to be learned from sharing ideas, information, and research. Having common ground is really valuable.
- Really thorough discussion. Thanks. Great questions. Most important that everyone is comfortable asking everything.
- Excited about the creative energy. Based on experiences with other cities, I don't think Big Sky has to quadruple development and quadruple water use.
- Encouraged by the big picture. Not only Big Sky, but valley, and Ennis.
- I am hopeful for the process. The right people in the room to figure out how to balance economics, environment, etc. to keep Montana the last best place.
- Honestly with the collaborative approach, 20 years from now, we'll look back and say "I was part of that."
- Any time I get to look at fish data I'm a happy.
- Encouraged by the big picture. We can't pull rivers and streams from the rest of what's going on.
- This is an extremely complex issue, and no complex issue gets solved through rancor. I didn't hear anyone say they just care about their stuff. We have common interests and that trump all.
- Encouraged by the passion and interest to make this process successful. I really want to see this work.