

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION'S
LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON THE 7th DAY OF JANUARY 2022

The Caddo Parish Long Range Planning Committee met in legal session on the above date, at 11:00 a.m., in the Government Plaza Chambers, with Mr. Chavez, Chairman, presiding, and the following members in attendance: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson and Young (5). ABSENT: None (0).

The Chair requested that the new Commission President serve on the Committee and be counted in attendance as the ex-officio. The Clerk confirmed.

Dr. Wilson gave the invocation, and Mr. Jackson led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ADDITIONS

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to expand the agenda and add discuss E Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund and the ARP (American Rescue Plan) process under New Business.*

At this time, the Chair opened the floor for anyone to speak for or against adding this item to the agenda.

John Settle came before the Committee and gave the following statement:

John Settle, 4 Tealwood. My only question is, is this a violation of the open meetings law when you change and add a substantial addition to the agenda that has not been published?

The Chair requested that Attorney Bernstein address the concern. Attorney Bernstein responded that the open meetings law allows amendments to an agenda with a public hearing and by unanimous vote to amend the agenda.

The Clerk notified the Committee that an electronic comment was received from Jon Glover to clarify the agenda item. The Chair stated that there was enough clarification. At this time, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Point of Clarification by Mr. Jackson, that the agenda addition was advertised on the agenda. The Clerk responded that the potential agenda addition did not meet the 24-hour notice period and that it was electronically attached to the agenda and compliant with Open Meetings Law with a public hearing and upcoming vote.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion passed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, and Young (5). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: None (0). ABSTAIN: None (0).

NEW BUSINESS

- The Chair then moved to the first New Business item, *Discussion of Ordinance No. 6169 of 2022 Including A Comparison Contrast with Ford Street.*

Mr. Chavez requested that Dr. Wilson provide a report on the comparison of Ford Street and the proposed toll bridge.

Point of information by Mr. Jackson, that he did not request for a discussion on the topic, but a document. He said that he had not received a document at this time. Dr. Wilson explained that they have documentation but are still gathering facts and do not have a formal report to provide the Committee, and that Administration will provide a simple explanation.

Dr. Wilson explained that the comparison with the Ford Street Right-Sizing Program and the proposed expressway will be difficult be it is "hard to compare something that is given to you for free". Dr. Wilson also said that they are including in the comparison the future value of the repair costs and the cost to do the overlay on Ford Street. Dr. Wilson also mentioned that there is utility work that needs to be done under Ford Street prior to the overlay. Administration will provide those statements in a document and distribute it to the Committee.

Dr. Wilson also mentioned that Tim James, Inc. will do an overlay on the proposed expressway in Year 13, which will push out the maintenance requirement for an additional fifteen years.

Mr. Jackson reiterated that he did not ask for a discussion and restated they provide a compare and contrast document of the Ford Street Right-Sizing Project and the proposed expressway. He stated that he has advocated for the Ford Street project for the past four years. Mr. Jackson added that he would provide the Administration with a sample of how he wants the document to be done. He said that the project is "not a simple overlay of Ford Street". Mr. Jackson said that he was told by the Parish Administration they did not want to accept additional roadways. He also wanted to know the difference between accepting the proposed expressway and any other roadway. He expressed that a short statement is insufficient and that the document be prepared before final adoption.

Mr. Chavez commented that he did not specify to have a written comparison report ready for their committee meeting.

Mr. Atkins stated that the proposed Red River Express Tollway will inject \$80M to \$100M private dollars of new capital investment into our local community without exhausting state dollars. He also said that those monies could be used for other projects. Mr. Atkins stated that this project would stimulate the economy and open up parts of the Parish that was previously closed to commerce. He added that Tim James, Inc. would handle the maintenance on the expressway for 15 years. On year 13, they will complete another overlay on the expressway, which would push back the need for maintenance another 15 years.

Mr. Young suggested that they request the State for assistance to improve Ford Street.

Answering a question from Mr. Chavez regarding if Ford Street is a city street, Dr. Wilson responded that Ford Street is a state road.

Dr. Wilson informed the Committee that the Parish accepts roads often and gave an example of the Parish accepting the roads in a New Territory Subdivision, which was approved by the Commission during yesterday's Regular Session. Dr. Wilson also explained that when a developer gets a permit from the Commission to build a subdivision, they list on the application if they will be donating the roads to the Parish or not. If they are donating the roads to the Parish, they have to be built to Parish standards. He further stated that they "take in roads all the time, just not state roads".

Dr. Wilson also said that the State is willing to do Ford Street, but there are other issues that have to take place first, i.e. repairing the utilities under the street.

Mr. Jackson stated that he was told, as well as Mr. Epperson and Mrs. Gage-Watts, that the Parish did not want to adopt any more road ways. He also mentioned that the Commission adopted a resolution last year for the Commission to take the necessary steps to make LA-173 a part of the right sizing program. Mr. Jackson asked the Clerk to provide a copy of the resolution to Administration and all the Commissioners. He understands there are issues with the utilities under Ford Street, however, the City of Shreveport has opened bids to correct those problems. He would like to know "how can we say that we are ok with taking in the road that leads up to the Red River Expressway, and not be ok with taking in a portion of LA-173". Mr. Jackson also requested that Administration add updates on Ford Street to their admin report. He added that Kevin Lawrence advised him there were funds set aside for right sizing. Mr. Jackson stated that the tax paying citizens of that area should also have their needs met.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that there is a road tax for everywhere outside the city limits of Shreveport and Vivian, and those monies have to be spent in those areas. He stated that there is also money for bridges that the Parish can use inside or outside the city limits. Dr. Wilson responded that LA-173 is a state highway and the Parish would have to accept it first and the state is responsible to repair a state road. He advised that the right sizing program is used when it benefits the Parish.

Mr. Hopkins expressed his concerns in trusting the DOTD after an instance of closing bridges during emergency evacuation.

Mr. Jackson explained that the right sizing program has a matched dollar capital outlay credit which could be used for capital outlay projects. He added that DOTD has a list of municipalities who utilizes the Right Sizing Program. The State will adopt a road and build it to state standards. Dr. Wilson disagreed, and said that the road will be built to "fair standards". Mr. Jackson disagreed and said that the State will build the road to state standard. He further explained that the State will then apply the matched dollar credit towards a capital project in the Parish or those funds can be dedicated to maintaining the road. Mr. Jackson requested that a comparison be drafted for Ford Street and the Red River Expressway, as well as an explanation of the Right-Sizing Program.

Mr. Young read the DOTD website regarding the right sizing program and that the Parish must contact their DOTD Representative. He suggested that their District DOTD Administrator meet with the Committee and Administration.

Mr. Chavez read an excerpt of the Executive Summary from the Louisiana Department of Transportation's Right Sizing the State Highway System: A Voluntary Road Transfer Program report, then requested Dr. Wilson to invite the District DOTD Administrator to provide the full body a report on the right sizing program. He also asked if there were any potential blockages in moving forward with Ordinance No. 6169 of 2022. Dr. Wilson responded that Administration is in favor of the Red River Expressway. It will also solve NLCOG's issue of expanding 3132. Dr. Wilson stated that the Parish has not built many new roads, and the Red River Expressway is a major infrastructure project that will be low maintenance. They are estimating an annual cost of \$18,000 for road maintenance on Year 36 of the project.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know whether they should "green light" Ordinance No. 6169 of 2022 and pass a resolution of support for Ford Street. Dr. Wilson stated that they could move forward with the right sizing issue as well as move forward with a no-cost to the Parish build of the expressway. Mr. Chavez agreed.

Mr. Jackson asked for clarification on the maintenance of the expressway and the estimated annual cost of maintenance. Dr. Wilson responded that there will be a maintenance warranty effective for 15 years and an overlay will be applied on the 13th year, which will extend the road for 15 years. He explained that the Parish overlays 40 miles of roads per year on a 15-year repair cycle.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know if they have completed an analysis on Highway 173 when brought to state standards. Dr. Wilson responded that the life expectancy is 15 years and is based on practical experience that they have every year.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know why Administration supports the Red River Expressway and how it was determined to be a no-cost project for the Parish. Dr. Wilson responded that it serves the interest in that part of that community, as well as the connectivity to 3132. He also mentioned that private dollars are being used to pay for the project.

Mr. Jackson also asked the cost to bring LA-173 up to state standards before the Parish adopting it. Dr. Wilson stated that there are no up-front costs, and expenses would occur after year 15. depending on the traffic load. Mr. Jackson also pointed out that there is a 40-year capital maintenance credit with the Right Sizing Program.

Mr. Jackson expressed concern that he does not see a difference between handling the Expressway and Ford Street.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know whether the tolls will be shared with the Parish after Year 15. Attorney Bradford responded that the tolls are not going to be split and that is how Tim James, Inc. will gain a return on their investment. Attorney Bradford also mentioned that the only place a citizen would pay a toll is on the bridge, which Tim James, Inc. retains ownership of in perpetuity.

Mr. Jackson pointed out that traffic will have to pass LA-173 to get to the bridge and asked what the traffic count of the Expressway would be. Attorney Bradford responded that they do not have traffic studies yet. He also explained by state statute they are unable to move forward with a traffic study until this ordinance is passed. He stated that they will keep the Parish updated with design, studies and any other issues related to the Expressway.

Mr. Jackson asked who will complete the traffic study on the Expressway. Attorney Bradford responded that the developer would do a traffic study, but the Parish and the State will have input. He explained that in order for Tim James, Inc to set tolls they must know the traffic load.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know what will happen if they do not meet their investment return and whether the Parish or the City would have to adopt the tollway or recover the losses if the company defaults. Attorney Bradford responded that they would handle the expressway as a business would if it defaults on its investment and that the CEA (Cooperative Endeavor Agreement) would state there is no obligation for the Parish to adopt the tollway in the event the company defaults.

Mr. Jackson asked if the CEA is ready. Attorney Bradford responded that there are some updates on the maintenance language that he needs to correct, but they were waiting for the conclusion of this meeting

before proceeding. The CEA should be ready in the next few days and will be forwarded to the Parish Attorney's Office.

Mr. Chavez reminded the Committee that they are under a time limit and the live stream was down.

Mr. Young inquired whether Tim James, Inc. Hires local contractors. Mr. Attorney Bradford acknowledged that hiring local contractors is part of their plan and it is indicated in the CEA.

It was **moved by Mr. Atkins**, seconded to Mr. Young, *that Ordinance No. 6169 of 2022 be moved favorably and in full support to the full body.*

Mr. Atkins expressed that the project is a significant capital investment in the community with a positive impact and will simultaneously free up dollars to address other issues, such as Ford Street, that need capital investment from the State.

Mr. Hopkins reminded the committee that they have introduced the ordinance and that it will be up for a public hearing and final vote on the next session.

At this time, Mr. Atkins' motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson and Young (5). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: None (0). ABSTAIN: None (0).

The Chair moved for a brief recess.

- The Chair then moved to the next New Business item, *Discussion and Recommendations Regarding Caddo Parish Zoning.*

Mr. Chavez wanted to know if the 5-mile buffer was still in effect. Attorney Bernstein responded that the zoning that was in place by January 2022 will continue, because the ordinance was adopted by the Parish and is still in place.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know what the Parish must do regarding the application that was in process at the MPC (Metropolitan Planning Commission). Attorney Bernstein explained that the MPC, as it currently exists, was created and directed by State statute. That statute determines the jurisdiction and composition of the MPC, which is nine members appointed by the City Council. As of today, there are not nine members appointed by the City Council, and the jurisdiction of the MPC stops at the city limits of Shreveport. Attorney Bernstein also said that the City's attorney has not rendered an opinion, nor has there been a status update at the MPC. Attorney Bernstein said that "it is the City's issue at this point". He also cautioned if the MPC took up a case now outside of the city limits, it would be up for challenge because it is out of their jurisdiction.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know if the Commission could intercept those cases from the MPC and vote on them. Attorney Bernstein responded that the state statute provides that before a zoning case is changed, a zoning commission would have to recommend the action to the governing authority, which is the Commission. Attorney Bernstein explained that by statute, until the zoning commission takes final action on such change, the Commission is unable to review zoning cases.

Mr. Chavez stated that they are in a conundrum without a zoning board. Attorney Bernstein responded that the Commission has created a zoning commission by ordinance, but there is no one appointed.

Mr. Chavez asked if they could contract the MPC to work on Parish zoning cases. Attorney Bernstein responded that the Parish currently has a contract with the MPC to provide a staff function in support of the anticipated Parish zoning commission, which is where citizen's cases can be presented and heard.

Mr. Chavez stated that citizens of North Caddo expressed they did not want zoning. He asked whether the Parish could request the MPC to submit a recommendation to not have zoning in the Parish. Attorney Bernstein responded that a local services law allows two political subdivisions to enter into an agreement to jointly engage in an endeavor if one of the entities has the authority to do so. Attorney Bernstein stated that he reviewed the possibility with the MPC but is still researching and is worth looking into.

Mr. Jackson commented that the Home Rule Charter could act as a zoning board, but the Commission might not enjoy hearing zoning cases. Attorney Bernstein responded that he referenced the local services law as a general conduit for the Commission to act as a zoning board.

Mr. Jackson asked if the current contract with the MPC could be amended to allow the Commission to hear zoning cases. Attorney Bernstein responded it could not. He explained that the contract with the MPC is simply a contract for services. To engage in a local services law agreement, "it would be a completely different animal". It is the Parish Attorney and Assistant Parish Attorney's opinion that the Parish Commission cannot act as the zoning commission due to the Constitution stating that a governing authority appoints a zoning commission. He added that should answer Mr. Young's previous question, requesting the Attorney General to evaluate the law for an option. Attorney Bernstein reminded that an Attorney General's opinion "is advise it is not binding".

Mr. Jackson asked if they could set up a board within the Commission similar to the Property Standards Board. Attorney Bernstein stated that would not suffice.

Mr. Chavez asked what the Commission could do to streamline the cases that are in process. Attorney Bernstein responded that the simplest and easiest route is to appoint a planning commission. Attorney Bernstein added that even repealing zoning is making a change to zoning. By appointing a zoning commission, it would increase the chance of the Parish winning a lawsuit because the recommendation came from that planning commission. To have a planning commission meet, consider the issue, and make the recommendation by means of an ordinance to this body to repeal the zoning and subdivision ordinance that is currently incorporated in the UDC (Unified Development Code), then the Commission would be able to consider it.

Mr. Atkins mentioned that some citizens prefer elected officials to serve on the board as opposed to appointed members. He also understands that the law states the Caddo Commissioners cannot serve on that board. Mr. Atkins wanted more clarification regarding this. Attorney Bernstein responded that any change the planning and zoning commission recommend in zoning has to come before the full body as elected officials, so the elected officials are going to be considering it. The fact that there is a planning and zoning commission does not mean that elected officials are not considering it, and anything that affects the zoning ordinances will go full body for consideration. He also mentioned that the Commission could add a right of appeal to the Caddo Commission instead of the planning and zoning commission.

Mr. Atkins asked for Attorney Bernstein's opinion on Mr. Young's assessment of the ordinance. Attorney Bernstein said he did not agree with it. Mr. Atkins looks forward to the Attorney General's opinion as a "possible tie breaker". Attorney Bernstein also mentioned that he is looking into whether an individual Commissioner can request an opinion from the Attorney General or if it has to come from the full body via resolution or from a State Legislature.

Mr. Hopkins expressed that he is not going to support having the MPC, that is comprised of members who reside in the city limits, making decisions for the residents of rural Caddo Parish. He added that LA.R.S. 31:103, the Parish may regulate zoning, but the Parish does not have to. He said that there are already zoning maps and ordinances on the books, so they have to look at LA.R.S. 33:4780.425, which says that a planning commission has to make a recommendation to the governing authority to make any changes to zoning, whether it be the map, repeal, etc. He mentioned that Act 294 removes the Caddo Parish Commission from the MPC, but that 5-mile radius is still in effect.

Mr. Hopkins also said that some people in the rural parts of the Parish, i.e., the Caddo Alliance for Freedom, would like a zoning board comprised of elected officials, but as he understands the way the law is written, it has to be appointed members. He also said that if they feel that they are correct, then they could get a petition and follow the process to overturn that ordinance. Mr. Hopkins suggested modeling zoning in the Parish similar to Ouachita, TX, where there is no zoning, but ordinances to regulate property standards, sexually oriented businesses, liquor, etc. He also stated that there is no zoning whatsoever outside of the 5-mile radius.

Mr. Chavez suggested that they have a sit down with State Representative McCormick and the Caddo Alliance for Freedom to discuss zoning in the Parish.

Mr. Hopkins commented that he will not support a planning board at this moment because his constituents do not want one.

Mr. Atkins wanted to know what the Commission can do without a zoning commission. Attorney Bernstein referred to Mr. Jackson's constituent who is requesting a change in the zoning on their property to engage in business activity, but there is no route for her to take "if she wants to follow the rules" because there is no zoning commission for her to submit her application.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know how to reprimand citizens who have zoning violations in the 5-mile radius. Attorney Bernstein stated that it is an open question and said that he will not answer it because it would "be pre-judging".

Mr. Chavez explained that the Parish does not have an ordinance against a VRBO and that a citizen could use a VRBO to operate a business in the Parish. Attorney Bernstein responded that he has not had a chance to review it.

Dr. Wilson commented that appeals could overflow district court. He also mentioned that the Commissioner would have to get special training to deal with planning and zoning matters.

It was **moved by Mr. Young**, seconded to Mr. Jackson, *to recommend to the full body an Attorney General's opinion regarding whether the Commission can sit as the planning and zoning board for the Parish of Caddo..*

Mr. Young was conducting research on planning and zoning in the Parish and came across an exception that would allow Home Rule Charter parishes that could function as planning and zoning boards if they meet certain requirements. The argument is not the strongest argument in the world, but it does exist, he said.

Mr. Jackson suggested researching case laws regarding political bodies getting involved in planning and zoning. He wanted to know who would prepare the request to the Attorney General. Attorney Bernstein responded that legal would prepare a resolution for the full body. Mr. Jackson also wanted to know if the case law would be cited in that resolution. Attorney Bernstein said that they would, and it has been his practice over the years to provide the Attorney General with the benefit of the research that has already been done.

Mr. Jackson asked Attorney Bernstein to explain who would sue the Parish. Attorney Bernstein responded that it could be either and a landowner or a resident of a property could file a lawsuit against the Parish Commission whether it followed the law. He added that a citizen could raise the question of whether the Commission acted appropriately in adopting legislation.

Mr. Jackson inquired about the referendum process. Attorney Bernstein explained that the Charter if citizens present a petition to the Commission to reconsider an ordinance, then the Commission has to take a vote on that ordinance. If the Commission does not adopt the ordinance, then it goes into parish-wide referendum on adopting that ordinance.

Substitute motion by Mr. Chavez, seconded to Mr. Young, *to request a Constitutional Attorney for an alternative opinion be recommended to the full body.*

Mr. Atkins expressed that too many opinions could be too much. Mr. Chavez withdrew his motion.

At this time, Mr. Young's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson and Young (5). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: None (0). ABSTAIN: None (0).

• The Chair then moved to the next New Business item, *Discuss MPC Contract and Payment Schedule.*

Mr. Hopkins commented that there is nothing for them to discuss, because they do not have a board. Mr. Chavez pointed out that the Parish pays the MPC quarterly.

Mr. Young wanted this item on the agenda to discuss the Parish's contract with the MPC and the payment schedule.

Mr. Chavez agreed with Mr. Young and wanted to know the details of the contract. Attorney Bernstein explained that Parish does not pay the MPC to hear cases but pays them to perform the staff functions, such as accepting and reviewing applications and other functions in support of zoning and planning in the Parish.

Mr. Young wanted to know if the Parish is paying the MPC to perform enforcement as well. Attorney Bernstein responded that the contract does not speak directly about enforcement. Attorney Bernstein added that the MPC can investigate and send violation letters but may not levy a penalty. Mr. Young asked about certificates of occupancy violations. Mr. Bernstein explained that citizens would be in violation of the ordinance and penalty for that is up to \$500 per violation. Mr. Young asked who levies those penalties. Attorney Bernstein said the court will levy the penalty when a prosecution is initiated.

Mr. Hopkins asked since the Parish does not have board would the MPC accept applications on its behalf. Attorney Bernstein responded that when they entered into a contract with the MPC, a zoning commission was created but not populated. He further explained that if the Commission does not have a zoning commission, then there would be no need for the MPC.

Mr. Jackson also wanted to know whether permits and variances would be managed by the MPC. Attorney Bernstein responded that variances are handled under the zoning ordinance and that permits are handled separately. Mr. Jackson pointed out that he asked the Parish Attorney's office to prepare an ordinance to repeal juvenile curfews, pets, and sexually oriented businesses on private property.

Mr. Young pointed out that zoning in the rural parts of the Parish could cause citizens to move outside of the city, which has the constant effect of bleeding population to the outskirts. He further stated that this has occurred in his district. Mr. Young wanted to know if the zoning board were repealed would they need to pay the MPC. Attorney Bernstein responded that if they repealed the planning commission the Parish would not need MPC services. Attorney Bernstein explained that the Parish has a binding contract with the MPC and would take necessary steps to terminate the contract.

Mr. Chavez commented that he presented a sunset clause to the zoning board to appease rural Parish citizens and they responded amicably. He also mentioned that the easiest process is to assign a zoning commission, accept their recommendation and disband the zoning commission once they do what the rural citizens request that they do.

- The Chair then moved to the next New Business item, *Discuss Comprehensive Parish Plan*.

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded to Mr. Young, *to recommend to the full body to amend the 2030 Master Plan to create a comprehensive plan to accommodate rural area*.

Attorney Bernstein explained that a comprehensive plan could be drafted to meet the desires of the Parish, including the rural aspects of the Parish. He also explained that the state statute regarding master plans says that if the City and the Parish have separate zoning boards, and the Parish adopts a master plan, it is up to the City Planning Commission to coordinate with the Parish Planning Commission and the Parish's Master Plan. Mr. Jackson clarified that they could revisit the Master Plan and redraft it to engage rural residents. He also pointed out that the Master Plan is a "living breathing document". Mr. Jackson requested that Administration draft a resolution to get the process started on amending the Master Plan.

Dr. Wilson reminded the Committee that the north Caddo residents were against planning. Mr. Hopkins responded that the citizens did not want zoning in a sense of the UDC and that the Parish would need a comprehensive plan that is progressive for the future.

Attorney Bernstein explained that the comprehensive/Master Plan is informative zoning and where roads are located and that economic development entities and organizations such as the NLCOG (Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments) must take notice of it. Mr. Hopkins also pointed out "that plan holds no letter of the law it is a road map. That is all."

Mr. Jackson clarified that the Master Plan is a reference for suggestions for developers who are building in rural areas.

Mr. Hopkins stated that they need to repeal the 2030 Master Plan and that they should produce their own comprehensive plan that has more of an agricultural perspective. He also mentioned that their own comprehensive that is separate from zoning and focuses on water, sewer, schools, and roads.

Substitute motion by Mr. Atkins, seconded to Mr. Chavez, *to repeal the existing 2030 Master Plan and replace it with a revised Master Plan*.

Mr. Jackson pointed out that Commissioner Gage-Watts' district includes area in the city limits and the Parish and questioned why she should support repealing the current master plan. Mr. Atkins withdrew his motion. Mr. Chavez withdrew his second on the motion.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Jackson and Young (4). NAYS: Commissioner Hopkins (1). ABSENT: None (0). ABSTAIN: None (0).

- The Committee then moved onto the next New Business item, *Discussion related to the E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund*.

Mr. Jackson said that he will remove this discussion from the agenda but would like to speak with Administration following the adjournment of this meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.



Linda J. Montgomery
Administrative Clerk III

