

MINUTES
Region 1
REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, December 8, 2020

The Region 1 Regional Steering Committee (RSC) Meeting was held at the Warrior Network in Bossier City, LA at 10:05 a.m., on Tuesday December 8, 2020, pursuant to notice duly mailed.

Welcome/Call to Order/ Invocation/ Pledge

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Matt Johns at 10:05 a.m., who welcomed the attendees. The invocation was held by Mr. Kent Rogers and Chairman Matt Johns led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

At the Chairman's request, Mrs. Heidi Stewart called the roll of members present or by proxy. Those present were: Chairman Matt Johns, Vice Chairman Butch Ford, Ms. Lindsay Gouedy, Mr. Rodney Warren, Mr. Nick Cox, Mr. Ali Mustapha, Mr. Morgan Briggs, and Ms. Zazell Dudley. Proxies held were: Mr. Tom Fontcuberta for Mr. Steve Brown, Mr. John Richmond for Mr. Rick Nowlin, and Mr. Kenneth Ebarb for Mr. William Ruffin. Others in attendance were: Mr. Ben Wicker, Mr. Austin Vaughn, Ms. Jenae Arceneaux, Mrs. Randel Elliott, Mrs. Heidi Stewart, Mrs. Alexandra Carter, Dr. Ehab Meselhe, Dr. Liz Skilton, Mr. Brian Miles, Mrs. Nicolette Jones, Ms. Evelyn Campo, Ms. Gina Campo, Ms. Dori Turner, Mr. Kent Rogers, Mr. Clinton Patrick, Ms. Carolyn Hayes, Jack Skaggs and Mr. Pearson Harbour. A quorum was present.

NEW BUSINESS

- Chairman Johns stated that the first order of business was approving an item being added to the agenda.
- Chairman Johns stated that the item to be added to the agenda was a discussion on and a recommendation on how to handle members who have not been present at the RSC meetings this year.
- Chairman Johns called for the motion to add the item to the agenda. Vice Chairman Butch Ford motioned with a second by Ms. Zazell Dudley. With no further discussion, the item was unanimously added to the agenda.
- Chairman Johns asked Mr. Austin Vaughn to give the committee members a rundown of the membership.
- Mr. Vaughn stated that Red River's representative, Mr. Shane Hubbard, had not attended any meetings and due to his full-time job, he would not be able to attend any of the meetings.
- Mr. Vaughn stated that he reached out to Mr. Jessie Davis, the parish manager, and he agreed to remove Mr. Hubbard from the RSC and that Red River Police Jury would discuss who they would like to recommend replacing him at their next meeting.
- Mr. Vaughn stated that Mr. Mike Carpenter from Winn Parish had missed the last six meetings and Mr. Dennis Butcher from Claiborne Parish had missed the last four meetings.

- Chairman Johns asked if there were any other recommendations from the staff on member replacement and Mr. Vaughn stated no.
- Vice Chairman Ford motioned to send a letter to the Parish Presidents of Winn Parish, Claiborne Parish, and Red River Parish and ask them to fill the RSC member position with someone who would be able to attend.
- Mr. Kenneth Ebarb seconded the motion and with no further discussion, the motion to send a letter to the Parish Presidents of Winn Parish, Claiborne Parish, and Red River Parish and ask them to fill the RSC member position with someone who would be able to attend was unanimously passed.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Chairman Johns called for the adoption of the official minutes for the September 25, 2020 meeting the adoption of the informal summaries for the October 13, 2020 and the November 17, 2020 meetings. Ms. Lindsay Goudey motioned with a second by Mr. Ali Mustapha. With no further discussion, the meeting minutes for September and the informal summaries for October and November, were unanimously adopted as presented.

Presentation on Model Use, Storage, and Maintenance led by Brian Miles

- Chairman Johns introduced Mr. Brian Miles.
- Mr. Brian Miles stated that he worked at the Watershed Flood Center at UL Lafayette.
- Mr. Miles stated that his team had been working on a set of recommendations for model use, storage, and maintenance, with an emphasis on storage and maintenance.
- Dr. Ehab Meselhe stated that he was from Tulane University and was a civil engineer by training with an emphasis on water resources and H&H modeling.
- Dr. Liz Skilton introduced herself and stated that she was from UL Lafayette and was an Environmental Historian.
- Dr. Meselhe stated the state was divided into seven regions and the model group for each region would develop a H&H model centered around the HUC8 scale and be consistent with the watershed boundaries.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that his team developed a modeling guidance and had given that guidance to all the modeling teams in order to create a consistency in the models statewide which would enable evaluation of projects.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that the models would be developed with a set of primary and added value objectives.
- Dr. Meselhe stated the primary objectives of the LWI models were the following:
 1. Flood mitigation feasibility studies.
 2. No adverse-impact assessments, consequence, and risk assessment.
 3. Management of future developments and community growth.
 4. Support evaluation of proposed projects, watershed management strategies and policy development.
- Dr. Meselhe stated the Added-Value Objectives of the LWI Models were the following:
 1. Inform assessment of habitat suitability and impacts on water quality.
 2. Inform assessment of ecological consequences.
 3. Support development and update of FEMA flood risk maps.

4. Support future development of flood forecasting warning systems.
- Dr. Meselhe stated his team would be using models that were already familiar to local engineers and would use the Corps of Engineers latest available version of their accessible software.
 - Dr. Meselhe stated that there might be a possibility in the future to develop local models focused on specific features.
 - Mr. Miles stated that the primary question was, “what was the most effective and feasible strategy to use, house, and maintain the LWI models?”
 - Mr. Miles stated that the overarching goal of the plan was “to make sure all the LWI stakeholders (local, regional, and state) had the capacity to use the LWI models.
 - Mr. Miles stated that each watershed model was made up of multiple datasets that defined the model domain, inputs, and outputs and those resources needed to be stored in a way that facilitated model retrieval, model use, and model modification over time.
 - Mr. Miles stated that the plan would include recommended system architecture and high-level implementation principles.
 - Mr. Miles stated that building regional and local capacity and buy in was a primary objective and for the LWI models to be useful over the long term by local and regional entities.
 - Mr. Miles stated that for the model to be sustainable it must include both regional and local sources of funding to support model maintenances.
 - Mr. Miles stated that his team looked at the Harris County Flood control models and it allowed users to discover and download watershed-based HEC-HMS and HEC-RAS models, to view changes made to the models, allowed users to sign up for model update notifications, but does not appear to allow models to be checked out and checked back in.
 - Dr. Skilton stated that during the focus group there was one overarching question being asked and it was, what level of interest and capacity do local and regional stakeholders have for storing and maintaining LWI models?
 - Dr. Skilton asked the following three questions:
 1. Thinking regionally, are organization(s) in your region interested in storing LWI models and enabling model users to access, use, and modify these models?
 2. To the best of knowledge, did the organizations have the capacity to do that?
 3. If such organizations did not have the capacity, were they interested in building capacity?
 - Mr. Kent Rogers stated that organizations in the region would be very interested having access to us and modify the models.
 - Mr. Rogers stated that both NLCOG and The Coordinating and Development Corporation signed MOUs to move forward with the merger.
 - Mr. John Richmond stated that in Natchitoches parishes there was a need for the parish engineer to have access to the models, along with the surrounding cities.
 - Ms. Lindsay Goudey stated that there were several universities in the stated that were interested in housing the models.
 - Dr. Meselhe asked Mr. Richmond if foresaw using the models to support permitting to the Parish Government?
 - Mr. Richmond stated that he did foresee that because he would like to push permitting that was more responsible than there was at that time.
 - Dr. Skilton asked if anyone had anything else, they wanted to add.

- Ms. Dudley stated in her opinion she thought it would be useful from an economic standpoint because there were some bigger companies that would ask questions about the region and if the city has access to current and correct information that would add to what the city had to offer from an economic standpoint.
- Mr. Miles asked Ms. Dudley if the Port of Shreveport was directed interested in the model or interested in the information that would go into the model?
- Ms. Dudley stated that her comment was about the companies that come and access the area and sometimes they have deep questions that are a basket array of different types of questions and not for the Port of Shreveport use directly.
- Dr. Skilton asked if there were any other comments related to the first questions and there were none.
- Mr. Rogers stated that NLCOG and CDC did have some capacity but would like to expand on the current capacity and that there was no problem in terms of data handling and storage.
- Mr. Rogers stated that he thought Louisiana Tech would most likely have the capacity but whether they would be interested would be the question.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that his team was engaging with facility and staff from both Louisiana Tech and LSU so that they were aware of the Watershed Initiative.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that his team was also working on providing the details on what staff and hardware it would take to support a program like the modeling program.
- Mrs. Alexandra Carter stated that the LWI was also trying to come up with a solution that would meet the needs of the region and not something that was not in line with that the region would think appropriate.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that his team was in the process of surveying existing systems that were like what they were trying to build.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that his team was also engaging with entities in Texas, North Carolina, Iowa, as well as international entities, to gather information from organizations who attempted this task before and see what it took in terms of resources, financials, hardware, personnel and capture the lessons they learned during their process.
- Vice Chairman Ford asked if the modeling program would be updated periodically once it had been created.
- Dr. Meselhe stated that there were two types of model review processes because the main goal was to always keep the model updated.
- Mr. Rogers stated that at NLCOG they do an intense aerial survey about every two years and then about every third flight they do contour work to go along with the survey and will be expanding the boundaries of that survey to match the boundaries of the CDC since the merger is happening.
- Mr. Rogers asked Dr. Meselhe to elaborate on the process on how the modeling would be used and update and Dr. Meselhe explained that he was not describing the process on how Region 1 would use the model but rather the process on how Texas uses their model.
- Mr. Miles stated that each region would need decide on what process they wanted to follow once the model is completed.
- Dr. Skilton stated that the members would each receive a follow up survey and urged each member to complete the survey on their opinions in their region specifically.
- Mr. Miles stated that he would send the slide document, from the meeting, with the survey link.

Existing Governance Entities & Roles Presentation plus Discussion Part 3

- Mr. Ben Wicker recapped the Governance Exercise No.1, that answered the question, “What work needed to be done,” and it included a root cause analysis that was conducted, and that analysis identified the need for regional roles, responsibilities, and authorities.
- Mr. Wicker recapped the Governance Exercise No. 2, that answered the question, “Who could do the work that needed to be done,” and that exercise included a discussion on what entities were in Region 1 and what authorities those entities had.
- Mrs. Carter stated that current meeting would focus on how to move forward with the exercise outcomes.
- Mrs. Carter stated that a template document was sent out to help with the RSC submitting the provisional recommendations for Region 1.
- Mrs. Carter stated that there would be a period of outreach and engagement both regional and local level from January 2021 to April 2021 to gather feedback from the public to ensure that the local leadership and stakeholders are given an opportunity to give their opinion.
- Mrs. Carter stated that after the outreach period is completed then the RSC would decide if they needed to refine their provisional recommendations or not.
- Mr. Wicker gave a summary of what the Regional Coalition responsibilities would be and they were the following:
 1. Planning and development regulations
 - a) Conduct regional planning to preserve some areas, retain water and coordinate and prioritize operation and maintenance of river systems in region.
 - b) Potentially update NFIP maps and encourage consistent building standards.
 2. Project implementation
 - a) Support, encourage and develop passive projects (low O&M).
 - b) Encourage or require natural channel design to prevent further silting processes and allow for natural channel meanders and retention areas.
 - c) Coordinate with upstream states to improve channel health.
 3. Data and modeling
 - a) To be determined because it would be discussed during the current meeting.
 4. Outreach and engagement
 - a) Provide public outreach and education (re: Nature-Based Solutions, NFIP, and Flood Risk Solutions).
- Mrs. Carter summarized the required authorizations, and they included the following:
 1. Authority to cooperate or contract with other governmental agencies.
 2. Authority to finance, fund, plan, establish, acquire, construct, or reconstruct, enlarge, or extend, equip, operate, and maintain systems and infrastructure.
 3. Authority to generate revenue (e.g., issue/sell bonds, borrow money, accept grants, collect fees and/or levy taxes/special assessments).
 4. Authority to adopt and enforce development codes, operations and maintenance plans and related standards.
- Mrs. Carter asked if the RSC committee agreed that the previous summary was an accurate description of the responsibilities and authorizations needed in Region 1?
- Chairman Johns took a poll and stated that the answer to the question was unanimous, “yes.”

- Mrs. Carter gave the following recap on who had the authority to do the work in Region 1:
 1. Region 1 had several entities with some authority related to water management, including the Cane River Waterway Commission, Red River Waterway Commission, three planning and development districts, two water conservation districts and 11 parish/municipal governing authorities.
 2. Much of the authority to execute watershed management plans, enforce development regulations and implement projects lies with the parish/municipal governing authorities in Region 1. However, these entities are limited in authority by their jurisdictional boundaries.
 3. The entity with the broadest combination of jurisdiction, authority, and function best suited to fulfill long term regional watershed management roles and responsibilities is the Coordinating and Development Corporation/Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments.
- Mrs. Carter asked the question; Did the RSC agree that CDC/NLCOG should do the work of Regional Watershed Management in Region 1?
- Vice Chairman Ford asked if the CDC/NLCOG was going to be able to stand up and fill all the long-term management goals of watershed and levee goals of the parishes?
- Mr. Roger stated that yes, the organization would be able to fill all the needs.
- Vice Chairman Ford stated that his only concern was that he did not think that NLCOG and CDC would want to be responsible for the lock and dam so he suggested putting in that the Corps of Engineers would be responsible for the parish system lock and dams.
- Mr. Bump Skaggs stated that it needed to be outlined that the committee does not supersede federal authorities and would not manage the Red River so that anyone down the road that might take over would understand who was managing what.
- Mr. Rogers stated that The Corps of Engineers be added to the first bullet point on the “Who has the authority to do the work?” slide.
- Chairman Johns asked if anyone on the phone or on the Zoom call had any comments and there were none.
- Mrs. Carter asked if the committee agreed that CDC/NLCOG should do the Watershed Management in Region 1?
- Chairman Johns polled the committee and stated that the RSC was in face, in agreement that CDC/NLCOG should do the Regional Watershed Management in Region 1.
- Mrs. Carter reviewed the following key considerations:
 1. The Regional Capacity Building Grant Program represents a unique opportunity in which human capital, social capital, policy, and financial frameworks come together to support long term regional watershed management activities.
 2. RSCs need to ensure that their regional challenges and institutions are reflected in their future coalitions’ organizational scopes and capacities.
 3. RSCs should consider the components of governance (optional webinar held Oct. 14) and the four R’s: Rules, relationships, resources, and reporting.
 4. Rules are central to how regional watershed management activities move forward.
 5. Relationships, resources, and reporting will be further explored once provisional coalition recommendations are made and the necessary context is provided for these considerations.

- Mrs. Carter stated that a State Charter could potentially do the following:
 1. Provide broad authority for public entities (including the authorities discussed) to conduct regional watershed management activities based on watershed boundaries.
 2. Establish minimum requirements for coalition membership.
 3. Identify a public process to amend provisional watershed boundaries based on changing risk and land use conditions.
 4. Identify a public process for establishing and collecting special assessments in support of watershed management activities, including project funding and O&M.
- Mrs. Carter stated that when the RSC would think about the regional level coalition charter that they needed to add a little more detail because each region is unique, and the RSC needed to incorporate the provisional recommendations.
- Mrs. Carter stated that a Regional Coalition Charter could do the following:
 1. Establish the mission, membership and regional watershed management priorities of the coalition based on the findings of the RSC.
 2. Draft and adopt a regional watershed management plan that includes capital improvement projects consistent with the statewide plan and outputs of the statewide modeling program.
 3. Identify regional watershed management activities that need to be performed in the region (and are authorized in state law).
- Mrs. Carter stated that the Local Ordinances could potentially do the following:
 1. Govern and financially support the watershed coalition as a cooperative endeavor.
 2. Aggregate existing authority to enforce a regional plan at the local level and implement regional projects.
- Vice Chairman Ford asked what did LWI ultimately want to accomplish and was LWI going to pass legislation or did LWI want the parishes to enforce the ordinances on their own?
- Chairman Johns stated that it was a combination of the two because there would be some state legislation passed but the main question LWI wanted answered was how much of the authority did Region 1 want to ask from the state level and how much did Region 1 want to try and do at the local level.
- Mrs. Carter asked question 3, with the potential following answers:
 1. How could the coalition be chartered? Is there a preferred method?
 - a) By legislation via a state commission, board, or agency.
 - b) Locally in accordance with the state charter.
 - c) As a citizen driven membership organization or a 501(c)(3).
 - d) A combination of the above.
 - e) Whatever works best to accomplish the outcomes of regional recommendations.
 - f) Undecided
- Chairman Johns asked the room if they had a strong opinion one way or the other?
- Chairman Johns stated that in his opinion, when something was chartered by state legislation it seemed to move the fastest and had great participation.
- Chairman Johns stated that in instances where the state set up the framework but the regional buy in was done on a contractual basis, and that was the slowest to set up.

- Chairman Johns stated that he felt strongly about having the coalition be chartered by legislation via a state commission, board, or agency.
- Ms. Goudey stated that the committee needed to be very cautious on how things are developed by legislation and she gave an example of two ground water districts in the state that had opposite abilities based on how they were developed in legislation, so while they were tasked with the same things one had authority and ability to raise funds, put fees into play, and manage the resources and other did not.
- Mr. Rogers stated that whatever the underlining government is, it should be the same across the board.
- Mrs. Carter asked if the RSC wanted to vote on answers or just discuss the questions and vote later.
- Chairman Johns stated that due to the trouble of getting a quorum he wanted to go ahead and vote on answers.
- Mrs. Carter stated that the consensus was having the coalition chartered by legislation via a state commission, board, or agency and she asked if there was any committee member that was opposed to that and there were none.
- Mrs. Carter asked question 4, with the potential following answers:
 1. How consistent should the regions be in their coalition charters?
 - a) All should be authorized by a single charter that includes a list of standards and authorities identified by all regions. Each region can choose which standard or authority to implement and to what degree within individual coalition bylaws/regional charters.
 - b) Each region should be considered separately and be independently chartered. Each charter should list the specific authorities and degrees of responsibility.
 - c) Other
 - d) Undecided
- Vice Chairman Ford stated that the RSC wanted answer b, because the committee did not want the state to tell the committee what to do.
- Mr. Skaggs stated that if the committee went that route then there could be trouble with there not being any consistency across the board and every region just doing what they want.
- Mr. Rogers stated that the way he understood a, was that all regions would have the same underlying authority and then if each region wanted to enforce something stricter then they would have the authority to do so.
- Ms. Dudley asked where the list of standards would come from.
- Chairman Johns stated that the list of standards would be recommendations from the committee to be put into legislation.
- Chairman Johns stated that the members in the room voted on a, (All should be authorized by a single charter that includes a list of standards and authorities identified by all regions. Each region can choose which standard or authority to implement and to what degree within individual coalition bylaws/regional charters.) and he asked if there were any oppositions on the phone or online and there were none.
- Mrs. Heidi Stewart stated that the staff has seen some answers from the other regions, and they were all going in the same direction that Region 1 was deciding on.
- Mrs. Carter asked question 5 with the following potential answers:

1. What should the makeup of the coalition be?
 - a) Citizen structure: Primarily composed of private citizens.
 - b) Agency: Primarily composed of public representatives.
 - c) Mixed: Composed of an equal mix of public and private representatives.
 - d) Whatever works best to accomplish the outcomes of regional recommendations.
 - e) Undecided.
- Mr. Skaggs recommended selecting b; Agency: Primarily composed of public representative, because the heads of every parish should know what was going on in their parish and should be accountable to the citizens, so that selection would ease not having to create a huge board.
 - Vice Chairman Ford asked if those figures would include the levee boards as well.
 - Chairman Johns stated that it could possibly include them on the technical advisory part.
 - Chairman Johns stated that the members in the room voted on choosing the b, (Agency: Primarily composed of public representative that would include a technical committee) and asked if there any oppositions on the phone or online and there were none.
 - Mrs. Carter asked question 6 with the following potential answers:
 1. How established should the regional watershed boundaries be?
 - a) They should be formally set in a state or regional charter, including a map and written description of the boundaries.
 - b) They should be recognized or approved by a state agency, board, or program (current situation).
 - c) They should be recognized by a legislatively authorized state agency board or commission that has the authority to amend the boundaries at the request of the coalitions through a public process.
 - d) They should be established however works best to accomplish the outcomes of regional recommendations.
 - e) Undecided
 - f) Other
 - Ms. Dudley asked if Mrs. Carter could speak to the pros and cons of either the traditional ways boundaries are set up and/or the current situation of how the watershed boundaries are set up?
 - Mrs. Carter stated the pros of the traditional is that everyone knows how they are, and they carry gravity.
 - Mrs. Carter stated that with the current situation you would have a more difficult time attributing a boundary, like a program boundary.
 - Ms. Goudey stated that in her opinion answer C gave the best of both worlds because in 20 years when there is an adjustment that needed to be made, it would be difficult to go back to the legislation and ask for that change.
 - Chairman Johns stated that his MPO has the local authority to work with the DOTD and agree upon the new boundaries and answer b would be the closest to that if it stated it had to be agreed upon to be changed by the regional coalition.
 - Mr. Rogers stated that answer c was stating what Chairman Johns suggested.
 - Ms. Goudey stated that if the modeling and data information were to stay current then most of the decisions would be no brainers for a state legislative agency.

- Chairman Johns stated that the members in the room voted on choosing the c, (They should be recognized by a legislatively authorized state agency board or commission that had the authority to amend the boundaries at the request of the coalitions through a public process) and asked if there any oppositions on the phone or online and there were none.
- Mrs. Carter asked question 7 with the following potential answers:
 1. What funding abilities should the coalition have?
 - a) Obtain external funding.
 - b) Maintain stable local funding
 - c) Collect special assessments
 - d) Both A and B
 - e) Other
 - f) Undecided
- Chairman Johns stated that in his opinion it should be all the above and then anything extra that may come along.
- Chairman Johns stated that fees alone would not fund a project because those would-be massive undertakings.
- Ms. Goudey stated that everyone in the room has considered or had with the legislator to consider what other states were doing with having a revolving water fund.
- Ms. Goudey stated that Texas has done that for many years and that was how they were able to fund those types of water projects and beyond.
- Mrs. Carter stated the state was looking at how the state could fund these projects at a statewide scale.
- Mr. Rogers stated that to go along with what was previously decided on then all the options should be put in there and it would be up to the local authority to decide on what to implement and use.
- Ms. Goudey stated that some parishes do not have the resources and that as projects and mandates are put down, whatever goes through legislation needs to be done cautiously because some of the rural parishes do not have the tax space that other larger parishes have and a lot of time that is lost in legislative mandates.
- Mrs. Carter stated that the state was trying to think more diverse in the portfolio in the way they subsidize the areas that they cannot use funding sources that may work elsewhere.
- Mrs. Carter stated there was not a one size fit all solution for watershed regions so the conclusion that LWI came to was "Option," where there is a potential to do a lot of things, but the regions may choose to use all the authorities enabled as a result of this process or not.
- Mrs. Carter stated that this way would give much more flexibility to adapt over time.
- Mrs. Carter summarized the next step which was that while the RSCs are making the regional recommendations, the State Agencies are finalizing their operational guidance.
- Mrs. Carter stated that the regions would be doing Outreach and engagement from January 2021 to April 2021 and the LWI would be working with the fiscal agents to present some options on how to present this to the public.
- Mrs. Carter stated that from May 2021 to June 2021 the RSCs would revisit and refine recommendations and that from January 2021 to June 2021 the State would be in the process of passing legislation to adopt higher standards statewide.

- Mrs. Carter stated that what the vertical alignment looked like was the state agency is working and thinking about their role was in the process, the regional recommendations and coalition charters are being formed, and then once locals are reached out to there will be a better understanding of what is most realistic in terms of the expectations of the initiative.
- Mrs. Carter stated that Region 1 was the first group to complete the Governance Exercise No. 3, The "How" Exercise.
- Chairman Johns thank Mrs. Carter and Mr. Wicker for their time and asked if there were any questions and there were none.
- Chairman Johns asked if there were any public comments and there were none.

Adjourn

Chairman Johns asked if there was any further business to come before the Board, and with there being none, on a motion by Ms. Zazell Dudley and a second by Vice Chairman Butch Ford, and being put to a vote, the December 8, 2020 meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, Secretary to the Corporation, certifies that the above and foregoing are the true and correct minutes of the meeting of the Members of the Region 1 Regional Steering Committee held on December 8, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.



Jack "Bump" Skaggs, Secretary