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Gut check: The outlook on fixed income

With nearly two months of the year behind us, we thought now would be a good time to see how the fixed-income market is faring in 2014 and assess our outlook. We asked our investment team five questions to help capture our view on the market today.

Are we still concerned about rising interest rates?

Yes. Looking at the big picture, we are still in the early stages of the Federal Reserve’s (the Fed) exit process. Tapering, or the reduction in asset purchases by the central bank, will likely continue at a steady pace over the course of the year, unless the economy experiences a dramatic shift from its current path.

Tapering was the story of 2013 and largely explains the significant rise in intermediate- and long-term rates last summer. The next big move in rates may be triggered by concerns about possible future Fed rate hikes. We aren’t there, yet — and a move by the Fed before 2015 seems highly unlikely — but similar to the tapering trade, expect bonds to re-price well in advance of any Fed action. An important difference in the next big move in rates is that it will likely take place in shorter maturities rather than long maturities. In bond jargon, we expect the yield curve to flatten.

Has the outlook for high quality bonds improved?

Modestly. 2013 was the second worst calendar year on record for the Barclays Aggregate Index with a negative return of 2.9% and only the third negative total return for the Index (data going back to 1976). The other negative return years — 1994 and 1999 — were followed by healthy double digit gains.

Why not a similar bounce in 2014? First, the starting point (yield) is much lower today than at the beginning of 1995 and 2000, even after last year’s rate move. Also, the Fed is just starting the exit process by turning down/off quantitative easing and the market hasn’t priced in any significant future rate hikes, yet. Finally, risk premiums, or the extra yield spread that investors command for non-Treasury sectors, are at or near the tight end of recent range. In other words, mortgage and investment-grade corporate risk premiums may not be able to tighten enough to offset the effect of rising rates. High-quality bonds may struggle to generate coupon-like returns, which is better than last year but nothing to brag about.

Do we prefer high-yield bonds or bank loans?

High-yield bonds. High-yield bonds and bank loans were the only two winning sectors in fixed income in 2013 with returns of 7% and 5%, respectively. We are comfortable holding our current positions in high yield and bank loans, but not adding. Corporate fundamentals remain strong, which is supportive of both asset classes. Some credit metrics have deteriorated modestly — leverage and shareholder activism on the rise — but defaults remain very low by
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historical standards at less than 2%. Valuations are pricing in low default rates to persist at or near current levels.

The reason we pick high-yield bonds over loans may seem counter intuitive, but it is mostly about technicals. Both sectors experienced strong inflows in 2013, but the pace of flows into bank loans has been extreme. Given our own rate concerns, we sympathize with investors who are attracted to loans based on decent fundamentals and no interest rate risk, but this appears fully reflected in current prices. We doubt these two sectors will perform as well as they did in 2013, but we think they will fare better than most other fixed income choices in 2014.

Will emerging market bonds finish first or last?

First. In 2012, emerging market (EM) bonds generated the highest total return in fixed income (18%). Last year, EM bond returns ranked near the bottom, losing more than 4%. Recent poor performance can be explained as payback (reversal of strong inflows when the sector was in favor), concerns about tapering, China slowing and deteriorating growth prospects more broadly in EM countries. Countries in the EM debt market that suffered the most last year were those that ran large current account deficits and faced potential funding challenges when the Fed tapered (i.e., the so-called “Fragile Five” countries of India, Indonesia, Turkey, Brazil and South Africa).

These risks warrant caution for sure, but the broad sell-off may be creating opportunities in countries that make prudent policy decisions regarding fiscal policy, interest rate management, etc. Moreover, the next big theme for the EM debt market may be less about current account deficits and more about overall level of growth. To that end, while some countries continue to disappoint in this area, we think emerging markets will ultimately benefit from the synchronized uptick in growth in global developed markets. To qualify our answer to the question, we have a fairly high conviction that EM bonds will perform well in 2014, and a very high conviction the sector will perform well over the next three years.

Same question for municipal bonds?

Maybe not first, but should win a medal. Municipal bonds suffered with most other high-quality fixed-income sectors in 2013. The asset class tends to have longer durations so rising rates can be challenging. Munis also suffered from negative headlines (such as Detroit, Puerto Rico) and persistent outflows. But the underperformance of the sector appeared excessive to us. Any fixed income asset class that has duration warrants some caution, but intermediate- and high-yield muni funds may be attractive alternatives with less rate sensitivity. The headlines are not trivial — especially Puerto Rico — but we do not think the issues are widespread as most state and local finances appear on the upswing. Finally, we would agree with the prevailing view that tax rates are not moving lower anytime soon and the tax advantage of municipal bonds is compelling.
Finding the sweet spots in corporate spending

Cash balances at U.S. non-financials corporations have exploded in the post-crisis era, up 75% since the end of 2007. This is despite a rising return of cash to shareholders in the form of dividends and share repurchases. However, capital expenditures and reinvestment in businesses has been quite restrained by historical standards. We believe that the discipline on reinvestment will continue and are not assuming a sweeping loosening of corporate purse strings. However, within the steadily (if not spectacularly) growing bucket of capital expenditures, we do see some hot spots gaining share of spending and think that investors would be wise to seek exposure to those areas.

A primary driver in the recovery of the U.S. equity market post the financial crisis has been shareholder friendly discipline regarding spending and the usage of free cash. Margins have expanded to historic highs, an expanding commitment towards feeding steadily rising dividends has taken hold, and massive share repurchases have returns cash to shareholders. As Exhibit 1 demonstrates, returning cash to shareholders has been rewarded handsomely, while reinvestment in the business has been viewed with a very skeptical eye.

Exhibit 1
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Source: Lombard Street Research, February 2014

Despite ongoing pressure to grow margins farther from here and pressures from increasingly emboldened activist investors to return cash at an accelerated pace, there is an inevitable need to reinvest in one’s business. Driving earnings growth solely through cost control and shrinking the share base has some natural limits. Businesses that fail to keep pace with change, risk market share loss and revenue declines. Conversely, with borrowing costs low and many businesses still dragging their feet on reinvestment, hoping to squeeze higher profits out of an aging asset base (see Exhibit 2), the time may be ripe for wise tactical investment in innovation in order to steal a march on the competition.
Again, we do not see a vast acceleration of capital spending on pent-up demand. CFO’s are still anxious to protect the margin gains they have made in recent years and are not going to go on a wild spending spree in what remains a modest growth recovery. Therefore, we do not believe in positioning for a uniformly rising capex tide that will benefit any old seller of widgets. We feel that positioning more strategically in certain areas that can offer one or more of the following value propositions to the corporate spender:

1. Areas experiencing a super-normal growth surge due to disruptive innovation
2. Products/services that offer clear productivity enhancement
3. Products that significantly enhance the customer experience leading to share gains

In the first category, we cite a couple of prominent examples. One would be the downstream impacts of the U.S. shale gas revolution. The dramatically advantaged cost structure of U.S. natural gas production today has created a broad raft of opportunities for investments around the transport (pipelines) and uses (chemical feedstock), as well as for further exploration in new geographies. Another example is the surge in investments deriving from disruptive innovation surrounding biotechnology advancements. Aaron Reames touches on these downstream growth opportunities (research labs and tools) in his related piece this week.

In the productivity category, we cite industrial automation as a prime example. There is an accelerating global pace of implementation around this theme as increasingly, the level of automation determines competitive cost advantage rather than location in lower human labor cost geographies. This trend has now extended well beyond robotics in factory production. In mining, for example, where general capex has plunged on falling demand from China, spending is moving forward on items such as increasingly autonomous trucks, trains and even drilling machinery. Large scale agriculture is following a similar path where networked machines can plant, irrigate and harvest crops with less human assistance. The next frontier being conquered lies in similar trends in formally white collar functions as artificial intelligence systems begin to perform deep analysis that was formerly reserved for fairly highly educated and compensated professionals.

Finally, we would point to investments that clearly deliver strong customer experiences with greater speed, fewer errors and greater freedom of implementation. Daniel Spelman touched on how some of those sorts of development are affecting market shares in the restaurant business in his piece this week. When you’re a pizzeria owner losing significant share to the major chains that can execute seamless ordering online from mobile devices, how would you not follow suit?
**Biotech's beneficiaries: How outsourcing is improving the sector and spreading the wealth**

As biotech indices continue to surpass all-time highs, one must contemplate if there is additional room to run. We continue to believe the sector will outperform the broader markets for at least a few more quarters. In our opinion, this is warranted given the current success of high-profile drug launches backed by a pipeline of highly innovative medicines that address large markets. In addition, the industry continues to benefit from a favorable regulatory, reimbursement and pricing environment, as well as a consolidation theme.

These solid fundamentals have created a strong financing environment over the past few years, with flows of capital to the sector accelerating recently. This offers unique stability for beneficiaries of a robust biotech balance sheet, creating derivative investment alternatives. Companies supporting the industry will benefit from the capital raised by drug developers. Specifically, we see opportunities in dedicated specialty labs, healthcare systems, contract research organizations (CROs) and select tool providers such as those offering clinical trial management software.

Although the majority of capital raised is dedicated to trial funding, specialty real estate investment trusts (REITs) enjoy a high barrier to entry given the unique requirements of the highly technical and heavily regulated biotech sector. As an example, lab space requires state-of-the-art air control, waste and wastewater handling; all of which are regulated and scrutinized by the FDA and EMEA under strict facility guidelines if the space is used in the drug development process. The expertise required to meet the needs of drug developers creates a high barrier to entry into this market. Further, prime geographical locations adjacent to leading academic centers are finite. Drug developers require locations adjacent to centers of excellence for cross pollination of ideas and to better manage interaction with clinical trial sites. This leads to long occupancy times, as facility moves for drug developers are not trivial due to the coordination of an amalgam of preclinical assay cycle timelines with the physical move.

CROs have enjoyed strong growth in the past few years following a retrenchment by their larger clients due to large mergers, patent expirations and economic uncertainty. As the regulatory demands on clinical trials have increased, so has trial complexity, and the stakes to design and execute trials effectively have only gotten higher. In addition, big pharma is seeking to reduce costs and is inclined to shed under-utilized internal resources, let alone make the necessary technological investments (following years of neglect) required to be world class. For all these reasons, more research is being outsourced to CROs who can do a better job, faster and at lower cost. Smaller biotechs do not have the resources to begin with so they outsource from the start, and they want the credibility of a leading CRO standing behind their trial in the event a larger player wants to acquire them. Hence it is likely CROs can continue to grow faster than research spending given an outsourcing tailwind, with reputable scale providers taking increasing share.

The increasing sophistication of research and clinical trials is also aiding the tools market. If overall spending on research is not growing dramatically, the capabilities of research tools is increasing dramatically. Be it for safety or efficacy, an increasing amount of data is being collected during trials. Most noteworthy, genetic data can enable biotech companies to target drugs for specific sub-populations and ensure high efficacy for the drug when used with a companion diagnostic. As the number of trials is increasing, the complexity of each rising, and the value of manufacturing the drugs going up, tools companies are also providing more services to the industry. Tools companies are helping biotechs manufacture the drugs for both trials and commercialization at lower cost while achieving higher quality. Tools companies and CROs are also helping manage the logistics of trials by handling the distribution of candidates / placebos to patients. They are also distributing lab kits, collecting samples, running lab tests in efficient central labs and providing results using software developed for managing clinical trials.
Digital dining: How restaurants are applying technology to drive sales

In a $680 billion industry that is notoriously low margin, competitive and high touch, restaurants are increasingly using technology to differentiate themselves from the crowd. Advancements in digital ordering, loyalty, payments and convenience are improving the consumer experience, leading to higher revenue and increased market share for successful brands. With almost one million restaurant locations in the United States and thousands of transactions needed to drive sales, the slightest incremental edge can have an outsized impact on the bottom line. Technology is also being used, particularly by the larger publicly traded concepts, to capitalize on their scale and improve back-end operations and efficiency. Investors would be wise to pay attention to which companies are investing to be on the front of the innovation curve.

The large national pizza chains are leaders when it comes to digital ordering. Papa John’s and Domino’s Pizza now derive more than 45% and 40%, respectively, of domestic sales from online channels. Domino’s U.S. digital orders have reached a $1.4 billion run rate ($3 billion globally), $459 million of which is from mobile. The company’s smartphone app has been downloaded 7.4 million times and provides consumers the ability to reorder favorite items in just five clicks or 30 seconds. Gone are the days of waiting to get through to someone on the phone or having an order misunderstood due to a bad connection. Because orders are more accurate, food waste is dramatically reduced. The large national brands are using digital as a competitive advantage to enhance convenience and drive frequency, since regional chains and independents cannot keep up technologically. In fact, while only 12%-14% of domestic pizza category sales are digital, the big three (Papa John’s, Domino’s, and Pizza Hut) account for 80% of this spending.

Starbucks has been incredibly innovative in using technology to enable loyalty and payments. The company has over 7.3 million active domestic members in its My Starbucks Rewards program and 10 million customers using its mobile payment app (contributing to five million weekly mobile in-store transactions). Over $1.4 billion is currently loaded on Starbucks Cards globally, and together, mobile and Starbucks card payments represent over 30% of total U.S. tender for the company. In a sign of his commitment to technological advancements, CEO Howard Schultz recently announced he will be stepping away from day-to-day management of the business to focus on “innovation and next generation retailing and payments initiatives.” Starbucks is one of the few retailers that will soon have a digitally enabled loyalty program shared across brands and channels, from owned stores to purchases of packaged coffee made at grocery stores. In August of 2012, the company formed a partnership with mobile payments startup Square that will likely result in even more seamless mobile transactions in the future.

Casual dining has been slower to embrace technology, but this is starting to change. Brinker International, the owner of Chili’s, will have Ziosk tablets installed at all company owned locations by the end of this fiscal year. These tabletop devices allow customers to order their food and drinks, reducing human error and ensuring that meals are made as desired. The software is designed to suggest additional items, which sometimes servers forget to do, leading to higher average checks. Ziosk tablets also have entertainment options such as games to help children pass the time. Importantly, the tablets let customers check out and pay their bills quickly, so tables turn faster. Since credit cards never leave their owner’s hands, the risk of fraud drops significantly. Brinker will likely be able to leverage labor expense over time, and servers do not mind the tablets because tips tend to be higher. Lastly, the Ziosks help capture important customer data such as email addresses, so patrons can be targeted for future marketing messages. To date, 80% of guests have interacted with the tablets at Chili’s locations with the offering, and 50% of guests have used them to pay at the table. For many consumer industries, technology can be friend or foe. A number of publicly traded restaurant
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companies are spending on digital innovation to drive traffic, average check and market share. While firms such as Olo and Grubhub Seamless are helping independents and smaller chains with their consumer-facing technology, large national brands appear to have a head start. In addition to driving sales, these investments also help on the back end by reducing food waste, improving labor management and broadly capitalizing on scale. By combining loyalty, payments, convenience and efficiency gains, restaurants are learning that not all successful innovation has to come from the kitchen.


The securities listed are for illustrative purposes only, subject to change and should not be construed as a recommendation to buy or sell. Securities discussed may or may not prove profitable.

**Slow growth: Why is it here and will it stay?**

The idea that economies may be undergoing a long period of slow growth has been attracting an increasing amount of attention. While primarily a developed market phenomenon, this should have more than a passing interest for all investors. True, the global financial crisis unleashed particularly strong deflationary forces, but the drivers of slower growth and lower inflation have largely been in place for some time. Some point to growing income inequality, while others lay blame on a liquidity trap for monetary policy. Still others see the unrelenting swing of demographics as the culprit, or globalization and technological advances that have slowed inflation and at the same time displaced workers. Many choose not to believe it at all, underscoring a historic output gap that is only slowly receding. If it is real, is there anything government policymakers can do to cushion or reverse its effects? We believe there are important investment implications here and plan to explore these issues through a series of articles.

In the short-run, central banks set interest rates largely with reference to where they understand an economy to be in its business cycle and when they expect inflationary pressures to emerge. But in the long run they expect that “real” rates — that is to say interest rates over and above inflation — will fluctuate around some “neutral” level, and this neutral level tends to be described in terms of estimated long-run productivity growth.

And so when Larry Summers, prominent economist and ex-policy maker, suggested that we may have entered a period of secular stagnation and that the neutral real rate in a number of advanced economies has fallen and may even be negative to the tune of -2% to -3%, the world took notice. Secular stagnation is not a new idea. During the 1930s and 1940s it gained currency in academic circles before being beaten back by wave upon wave of strong post-war economic growth. But despite all of this evidence it never quite died a death: economists have observed time and again that all the easy inventions had already been made despite new technological breakthroughs emerging. And so it might be easy to dismiss the latest wave of interest in secular stagnation as just more evidence that you can’t keep a bad idea down.
But Summers had a deeper point: that even at the peak of the booms of the past 20 years, there has been no real inflation to speak of in the United States. And so, by inference, the equilibrium real rate may well have fallen meaningfully. Exhibit 1 shows the three-year rolling real fed funds rate and three-year rolling core personal consumption expenditure deflation (the Fed’s preferred measure of inflation) over the past 30 years. Each cycle has experienced lower peaks and troughs in real rates but, despite this, inflation has been on a long-term declining trend. What has caused this disinflationary shock, and has the United States really entered a liquidity trap where even a zero-interest rate may be too high for the economy?

Over the next few weeks we will explore the nature of this disinflationary shock, looking at the patterns of domestic income and spending inequality in the United States that not only contributed to the global financial crisis, but also help define the options for policymakers on the monetary and fiscal fronts. Government policies can both help and aggravate these trends and need to be delicately balanced from a risk/reward perspective. We will then take a global perspective, examining the effects of globalization on domestic inflation and on U.S. and global industries and earnings. Following this we will analyze the impact of demographics and technological change on the U.S. economy, as well as the consequences of deregulation and reregulation. These are tectonic issues with meaningful investment implications, but we seek to bring them together and integrate them in relation to Summers’ secular stagnation hypothesis.

We are unclear as to whether the neutral real rate has truly become negative, but do believe the evidence that the neutral real rate has fallen is strong, highlighting the “low for long” inclination of U.S. rate policy. Part of this fall is due to domestic structural reasons, some of which might be addressed through policy actions while others are harder to legislate away. Part of it may relate to a global adjustment and rebalancing period lasting a century that we are but 20–30 years of the way through. Political risks will be elevated and protectionist policies will only delay the inevitable. As a result, it will be critical to assess policies across markets, as disparate outcomes are likely. Structurally lower real rates do not eradicate the possibility of bouts of inflation along the way, but when investing for the long term we do not expect long-dated real rates to revert to levels seen in the 1980s or 1990s.

* The real funds rate may be said to be neutral (“neutral real rate”) when it is at a level that, if maintained, would keep the economy at its production potential over time.
Gain insight into market conditions, trends and investment opportunities through our thought leadership publications. Please visit the Market Insights section of our website: columbiamanagement.com/market-insights or visit our blog for our latest commentary on the economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Type</th>
<th>Last Year Ago</th>
<th>Month Ago</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Year Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2-year</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 10-year</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays U.S. Aggregate</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays U.S. Agg Corporate</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoFA Merrill Lynch High Yield Master II</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA Muni 10-year</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Last Week Ago</th>
<th>Week Ago</th>
<th>Month Ago</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Year Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Index</td>
<td>1,836.3</td>
<td>1,843.8</td>
<td>1,848.4</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>1,502.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 1000 Growth Index</td>
<td>867.9</td>
<td>864.8</td>
<td>863.8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>685.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 1000 Value Index</td>
<td>919.3</td>
<td>925.1</td>
<td>937.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>759.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000 Growth Index</td>
<td>699.8</td>
<td>702.1</td>
<td>688.1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>516.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000 Value Index</td>
<td>1,467.4</td>
<td>1,491.4</td>
<td>1,491.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,202.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCI EAFE Index</td>
<td>1,924.8</td>
<td>1,918.6</td>
<td>1,915.6</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,503.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCI EM Index</td>
<td>959.3</td>
<td>970.8</td>
<td>1,002.7</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>1,053.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commodities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Last Week Ago</th>
<th>Week Ago</th>
<th>Month Ago</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Year Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>1,324.3</td>
<td>1,318.7</td>
<td>1,241.4</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1,205.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Oil</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Dollar</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Columbia Management Investment Advisers, LLC
Past performance does not guarantee future results.

**DESCRIPTION OF INDICES**

The Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index is a market value-weighted index that tracks the daily price, coupon, pay-downs, and total return performance of fixed-rate, publicly placed, dollar-denominated, and non-convertible investment grade debt issues with at least $250 million par amount outstanding and with at least one year to final maturity.

The Barclays U.S. Corporate Investment Grade Index is an unmanaged index consisting of publicly issued U.S. Corporate and specified foreign debentures and secured notes that are rated investment grade (Baa3/BBB- or higher) by at least two ratings agencies, have at least one year to final maturity and have at least $250 million par amount outstanding. To qualify, bonds must be SEC-registered.

The BoFA Merrill Lynch High-Yield Bond Master II Index is an unmanaged index that tracks the performance of below investment grade U.S. dollar-denominated corporate bonds publicly issued in the U.S. domestic market.

The Standard & Poor’s (S&P) 500 Index tracks the performance of 500 widely held, large-capitalization U.S. stocks.

The Russell 1000 Growth Index measures the performance of those Russell 1000 Index companies with higher price-to-book ratios and higher forecasted growth values.

The Russell 1000 Value Index measures the performance of those Russell 1000 Index companies with lower price-to-book ratios and lower forecasted growth values.

The Russell 2000 Growth Index measures the performance of those Russell 2000 Index companies with higher price-to-book ratios and higher forecasted growth values.


The MSCI EAFE Index is a capitalization-weighted index that tracks the total return of common stocks in 21 developed-market countries within Europe, Australia and the Far East.

The MSCI EM Index is a free float-adjusted market capitalization index that is designed to measure equity market performance in the global emerging markets.

Investment products are not federally or FDIC-insured, are not deposits or obligations of, or guaranteed by any financial institution, and involve investment risks including possible loss of principal and fluctuation in value.

Securities products offered through Columbia Management Investment Distributors, Inc., member FINRA. Advisory services provided by Columbia Management Investment Advisers, LLC.
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