

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
 COMMISSIONERS OF THE
 CITY OF ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY

The Commissioners of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority met for a regular session on Monday, January 23, 2017, in the offices of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority, 2624 Salem Turnpike, NW, in the City of Roanoke, Virginia.

I. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Chair Karnes called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. and declared that a quorum was present.

PRESENT:	Commissioners Anguiano, Burruss, Butler, Garner, Karnes, Smith
ABSENT:	Commissioner Witten
OFFICER PRESENT:	Mrs. Glenda Edwards Goh, Secretary-Treasurer
ALSO PRESENT:	Jackie Austin, VP of Finance/CFO; Kathy Beveridge, Compliance and Quality Assurance Manager; David Bustamante, VP of Housing; Betsy Crow, VP of Human Resources and Administration; Jessica Farmer, HCV Manager; John Garland, Roanoke City Council Liaison; Frederick Gusler, Director of Redevelopment and Revitalization; Crystal Hall, Community Support Services Director; Mike Jones, President, Major Security Consulting & Design; Mark Loftis, Legal Counsel; Suzzette McCoy, Site Manager; Joel Shank, VP of Operations; Melissa Wills, Executive Assistant

Chair Karnes welcomed everyone to today's meeting.

II. REPORTS

1. Financial Report

Chair Karnes stated that Mrs. Austin provided a Financial Narrative along with a Financial Report.

Chair Karnes asked if there were any comments or questions. There were none.

2. Executive Director's Report

Chair Karnes asked for the Executive Director's report.

Mrs. Goh gave an update on the recent meeting at the City of Roanoke with Chair Karnes, Vice Chair Burruss, Mr. Gusler, Council Member Garland, the City Manager and other City of Roanoke staff. She stated that several things were discussed at this meeting, including efforts to work with the Western Virginia Water Authority (Water Authority) regarding fee adjustments that would allow for some housing development, particularly at some sites in Northeast Roanoke where water is not available and the cost to get water to those sites is prohibitive. She explained that discussion topics also included the redevelopment role of RRHA in the future given the state law changes that restrict large scale redevelopment areas.

Mrs. Goh stated that another item of discussion was the City Council liaison role and how RRHA can best work together with the City to have the liaison function as a bridge of communication and support. She explained that, at the direction of Chair Karnes, the item "City Council Liaison Comments or Discussion" was added to the monthly agenda to serve as a placeholder to allow for either Council Member Garland or any of the Commissioners to raise subjects for comment or discussion that

may need to be communicated between the Board and City Council. She shared that RRHA and the City will continue working together to define RRHA's redevelopment role going forward.

Mrs. Goh mentioned to Commissioners that the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) Legislative Conference in Washington, DC will be held March 26 through March 28, which conflicts with the date of the March Board meeting. She stated that if enough Commissioners are interested in attending the conference, the date of the Board meeting may need to be changed to ensure that a quorum will be present.

Mrs. Goh stated that the process of developing the 2017 Annual Update to the 2015-2019 Agency Plan will begin in February. Mrs. Goh noted that she recently emailed the schedule of Community Meetings that would be taking place at each housing site and with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) participants and landlords. She encouraged Commissioners to attend as their schedules allow. Mrs. Goh reported that, in addition to gathering input for the Annual Plan, this year's meetings will include discussions with residents regarding implementation of the Smoke-Free Housing Rule. She said that RRHA staff plan to gather input and identify residents who are interested in working with RRHA staff in the development of the policy. Mrs. Goh stated that, shortly after the Community meetings, a formal process will begin to develop a plan to implement smoke-free housing by the deadline of August 2018.

Mrs. Goh shared that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has announced the first cohort of the expansion of the Moving to Work (MTW) program, which includes housing authorities that have less than 1,000 units. She

explained that an announcement for the second cohort, which will include housing authorities of RRHA's size, should be made soon. Mrs. Goh stated that this will allow RRHA to compete for the opportunity to join the MTW demonstration program, which allows for some flexibility with regard to some of HUD's regulatory requirements in return for trying different approaches that allow more people to be served with no additional money. She stated that with the flexibility of having some of the regulatory requirements waived, serving more people with the same amount of funding is quite feasible, and staff is looking forward to the opportunity.

She explained that one of the MTW application requirements is having a High Performer designation in both the Public Housing and Section 8 programs and that while the Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) score has not been released yet, it is expected that RRHA should maintain High Performer status this year.

Mrs. Goh attributed this in large part to Mr. Bustamante's determined work in the appeal process that resulted in reinstatement of a significant number of points in the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) inspection scores. She went on to explain that RRHA received a Standard Performer designation in the previous year from the Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) due to budget utilization as more funds were received and the expenses could increase quickly enough to meet the ninety eight percent utilization rate standard for that year. Mrs. Goh stated that she does not believe that this will be an issue this year and that both programs should be in High Performer status, which will allow RRHA to compete in the MTW expansion program when the opportunity becomes available.

Mrs. Goh updated the Board on a notification that she received earlier in the

day from the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association (PHADA) stating that the U.S. Court of Federal Claims found in favor of the nearly 350 housing authorities that sued HUD because of the offset of operating reserves from a few years back. She noted that the judge has asked both sides to submit recommendations on how to implement the judgment. She stated that most people did not think the judge would rule in favor of the housing authorities and that, while RRHA was not a part of the lawsuit, all housing authorities stand to benefit from the ruling, which should make HUD less likely to move forward with the possible offset that had been mentioned for this year.

Commissioner Garner, in reference to the minutes from the December Board meeting, inquired about the status of the request from the Virginia Community Development Corporation (VCDC) for RRHA to assume part of the responsibilities that the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization (NNEO) is now performing. Mrs. Goh explained that the Roanoke Valley Housing Corporation (RVHC) Board, for which Commissioner Butler serves as President, met earlier this month and reviewed the request. She explained that in order to take ownership and assume debt for that property, RVHC would have to form a limited partnership to serve as the ownership entity. She stated that the RVHC Board determined that this was not something RVHC would pursue at this time.

Commissioner Garner thanked Mrs. Goh for the update as he was unsure what would have been the benefit. Mrs. Goh stated that when approaching RRHA with the request, VCDC explained that that the benefit would be stability for those who lived at the properties and that part of the discussion at the RVHC Board meeting was that the

Virginia Housing Development Authority (VHDA) is the debt holder and they are likely to look out for resident stability in how they manage the situation, even if the property should go into foreclosure.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Garner, Mrs. Goh confirmed that RRHA is the management agent for the properties, and Mrs. Austin stated that all management fees for McCray Court and Gilmer Housing are up to date.

Recalling previous REAC inspections where difficulties arose due to new inspectors, Commissioner Garner inquired about what happened with this year's inspections. Mr. Bustamante responded that during the recent appeal process, more than nineteen points were reinstated, and Mrs. Goh added that pursuing the appeals process is not as easy as it might sound. She provided an example regarding points deducted for erosion for which HUD would not accept RRHA's appeal even with pictures showing no erosion. She explained that RRHA brought in a civil engineer, who provided a letter stating that no erosion was present; when this was submitted, RRHA's appeal was successful in getting the points restored. Mrs. Goh went on to explain that HUD procures inspectors through a bidding process so some come from companies that do many inspections and some are individuals. She stated that housing authorities across the country have long complained to HUD regarding the lack of consistency in application of Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS) by REAC inspectors. She explained that the only alternative is to take the inspection reports and go through the appeal process which is administratively burdensome and quite costly. She stated that RRHA felt that this particular inspector was outside the norm in application of the standards and the number of points reinstated upon appeal would support that

conclusion.

Responding to a question from Vice Chair Burruss, Mrs. Goh stated that RRHA has filed a formal written complaint with HUD regarding this particular inspector. Mrs. Goh agreed with Vice Chair Burruss' comment that while it is a delicate situation it can also be costly to the organization to have to devote resources to the appeal.

Commissioner Anguiano stated that in past inspections, some things can be attributed to failure to meet standards resulting in a loss of points and questioned if the process of managing inspections should be reconsidered or if any type of preparation can be done in anticipation. Mrs. Goh stated that RRHA has made many changes over the years regarding the inspection process and that while some citations have certainly been legitimate, this round of inspections was different in that the inspector did not seem inclined to apply the standards correctly and that a large number of points were lost as a result. She explained that RRHA goes through a process that begins weeks before the REAC inspections where staff inspect units and site conditions and try to identify any potential problems that can be corrected before the scheduled inspection.

Responding to a question by Commissioner Garner regarding the disproportionate effect that a lower score at Lansdowne has versus the other sites, Mrs. Goh explained that because Lansdowne has 300 units and the total score is weighted by number of units at each site, the impact of the Lansdowne score is greater.

Mr. Bustamante went on to further explain that while there is much preparation completed prior to a REAC inspection, there are many things that can happen. He stated that, for example, staff can inspect a unit and find no problems, but then a child who lives in the unit may break a lamp, which would be cited as a deficiency during the

inspection. He stated that he has been through many REAC inspections in the past and knows from experience that if a property scores a 52 or 53 on the inspection, that property is most likely boarded up and vacant. He explained that Lansdowne with 300 units and an average of 99% occupancy rate throughout the year is not in the condition that a score of 52 would reflect. Mr. Bustamante stated that this particular inspector would not take pictures and would label citations as "Health and Safety" so he did not have to explain it to the Site Manager and the citation would not be known to RRHA until the report was received and the loss of points was listed. Mr. Bustamante described a scenario that if he asked four different auditors to calculate the rent for any particular tenant's file, he was certain that he would get the same calculation from each; however, when four different inspectors walk around Lansdowne, he would get four different scores, which is an indication of a flawed system. He stated that until HUD fixes the problem, the burden is on the housing authority to fight for what the staff believes is correct. Mr. Bustamante stated that he appreciated Mrs. Goh's support in allowing him to protest the inspections. He said that with the points being reinstated, he believed that RRHA would maintain its status as a High Performer again this year.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Garner, Mr. Bustamante confirmed that the Lansdowne score was raised from 52 to a 73 after the appeal resulted in reinstatement of the points lost due to the inspector incorrectly applying the standards.

When asked by Commissioner Butler about the chance of getting the same inspector in the future, Mrs. Goh explained that one reason the complaint was lodged was so that if RRHA found out that he would be assigned to RRHA inspections again, RRHA could request a different inspector, noting the complaint that was filed.

Mr. Bustamante stated he believed that when the complaint was lodged, it was with the person who supervised the inspector so that, as the appeals were being read by this person, they were all being denied. He went on to explain that this is why Mrs. Goh advised having people with licenses submit the supporting documents for appeal because the HUD reviewer was not a civil engineer and could not debate conclusions from a credentialed civil engineer. Mr. Bustamante stated that the appeals process is costly and that the burden is on the housing authority to prove the inspector wrong, which should not be how the process works.

Mrs. Goh shared that at last year's legislative conference, HUD staff spoke during a panel discussion regarding Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS-V), which will mirror this same inspection protocol as closely as possible for the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. She stated that HUD staff made the statement in a room full of housing authority people that one of the reasons HUD felt the need to move to the UPCS-V was so that the scoring could be done at HUD, as they were concerned about the consistency in scoring across housing authority inspectors. Mrs. Goh reported that the reaction from the people in the audience was overwhelmingly negative because housing authorities do not view UPCS as a good example of consistency in applying scoring standards. She stated that the problems in one program are not likely to be fixed by replacing with another program known to have similar issues. Mrs. Goh said that for a site's inspection score to increase or decrease by 30 points from one year to the next should be a red flag to the staff who review inspections at HUD because, unless maintenance is completely eliminated, it should take longer than a year for a property to deteriorate enough to affect the score that significantly. She stated that she

believes that HUD is aware of the problem as it is communicated frequently and vigorously, but she has not seen much change in that process in the years in which she has been involved.

Commissioner Garner inquired about the status of the Operating Fund Financing Program (OFFP) application and whether the second phase of the application process has been completed. Mr. Gusler explained that in the two-step process, phase one is submitting the initial application outlining the plan of what is to be done. He stated that this has been submitted and approved by HUD and that the second phase of submitting documents can now be completed. He confirmed that he is working with Mr. Loftis on some of the needed documents to submit and move towards the closing on the loan.

After an inquiry from Commissioner Garner regarding the escalation of the interest rate of the loan and whether that was related to a change in the prime rate, Mr. Gusler confirmed that the loan rate was initially 1.75 percent and that because of HUD requirements, Virginia Community Capital (VCC) raised the rate to two percent. Mr. Gusler explained the rate increase is related to VCC preferring to have regular interest payments over the term of the loan. He stated that HUD will not allow interest to be paid in the OFFP program on a regular basis and that all of the payments are done in a lump sum at the end of the loan period. He went on to explain that VCC will hold the money in an account and, when the project is completed, all of the principal and interest of the loan will be paid at one time. He said that HUD's rationale for this is that it will make the program more attractive for lenders; however, VCC was uncomfortable having a loan that they would not get paid interest on a monthly basis.

Commissioner Garner inquired as to whether the purchase of the Melrose library

was still being considered as well as the status of the Goodwill proposal. Mrs. Goh stated that RRHA's interest of purchasing the building was made known to the City, but she did not believe that they were at a final decision point.

Mr. Gusler updated the Board on work with a group called Emerging Leaders in Architecture that is through the American Institute of Architects (AIA). He explained that this group of young architects typically does a community service project that will give them a broader view of community development as opposed to just designing buildings. He said that they worked with the City on a branding and streetscape project for 13th Street SW which resulted in the City using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to complete that project. He went on to explain that they are currently working together with RRHA, the City and others to look at four potential projects in the Loudon-Melrose area, the overall HUD target area. He said that one of the potential projects would be the street connection from Forest Park Boulevard to Salem Turnpike that includes the library building. He stated that the library had their first public meeting in December where they announced preliminary plans to move into the Goodwill, with construction beginning in August or September. He explained that if the public meetings do not go well, there is a possibility that they could still decide to renovate the current location. He noted that, since RRHA is interested in acquiring the building, the library decision is an important one for RRHA.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Anguiano, Mrs. Goh confirmed that HUD has not provided any additional guidance regarding how to introduce and implement the smoke-free regulations; however, HUD has a toolkit available to housing authorities on the HUD website. She explained that the final rule basically states that all

housing authorities have to be in compliance within 18 months of the effective date and it is up to the housing authorities to figure out how to come into full compliance.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Garner about the repercussions of someone who chooses to smoke in defiance of the rule, Mrs. Goh stated that it would become a lease provision and failure to comply would be a lease violation.

Commissioner Anguiano stated that, at the same time, HUD has said that it is not a priority to move anyone out, to which Mrs. Goh agreed and said that it is also not intended to deter people who smoke from applying to live in public housing. She went on to explain that the only information that has been received from HUD since the final ruling is regarding some housing authorities that have successfully made the transition to becoming smoke free. She said that, in talking to people at some of those housing authorities, some have made new buildings smoke free and some have made their entire portfolios smoke free, but not without encountering issues. Mrs. Goh stated that there has been no meaningful guidance given regarding enforcement, except for the broad statements made about not evicting residents. She explained that fees can be imposed on those who break the smoke free rules; however, this is not the preferred enforcement tool for residents with limited resources who live in low income housing. She said that eviction is also not preferred as RRHA is interested in housing people, not making them homeless. She stated that it appears that working with residents to focus on smoking cessation and helping them move toward being smoke free is the best option.

Responding to a question by Commissioner Anguiano about the percentage of residents who are smokers, Mrs. Goh responded that this kind of information is not

collected; however, there was a survey of Morningside Manor residents several years ago regarding interest in making that property smoke free. She recalled that approximately 50 percent of survey respondents were smokers. Responding to a comment from Vice Chair Burruss that this percentage was much higher than the population average of smokers, Mrs. Goh stated that because many residents of Morningside Manor are elderly, it could be that they are from an earlier generation that have never stopped or possibly the rate of survey response was higher among smokers. She recalled that even among the non-smoking residents, there was not universal support for making the facility non-smoking since many people had friends who lived there and were smokers. Mrs. Goh noted that only a small percentage of survey respondents were in favor of the building going smoke free. She explained that at last year's community meetings, the newly released proposed rule was discussed, and there was strong opposition expressed at a couple of the meetings. She said that now that the final rule has been released and there is a need for residents to work together with RRHA to develop a plan, the discussions at this year's community meetings could be very interesting and informative.

Responding to a comment from Vice Chair Burruss that she imagined most private housing options are smoke free at the present time, Council Member Garland replied that he has 200 units and they are all smoke free housing. Vice Chair Burruss stated that she believed smokers have become accustomed to smoking outside and that it is an anachronism to have units where residents can still smoke, although she recognizes that there is a population of people who have lived there for a long time.

Mrs. Goh stated that because the majority of the population is comprised of

extremely low income households, they would not have the same range of choices available to them as smokers who do have the option of moving to other locations that would still allow smoking. She said that while she did not think that anyone would dispute the health and property maintenance benefits of having smoke free housing, the implementation considerations are challenging.

Chair Karnes asked if there were any other comments or questions. There were none.

3. Staff Reports

Ms. Crow updated the Board on the most recent Section 3 summary report for the period of October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 and reviewed the goals and results for this time period.

She stated that the first goal was for contractors and subcontractors to hire qualifying Section 3 residents for at least thirty percent of the new positions created as a result of contracts with RRHA. She reported that last year this goal was firmly exceeded in the Operating Fund, Capital Fund and Resident Opportunity and Self Sufficiency (ROSS) grants with a total of 41 hires. She explained that the increase in percentage over prior years was largely due to an increased focus on Section 3 reporting and efforts to identify Section 3 hires with contractors and subcontractors.

Ms. Crow stated that the second goal was to have ten percent of the total dollar amount of Section 3 covered contracts for building trades work for maintenance, repair, modernization or development to be awarded to qualifying Section 3 business concerns or resident owned business firms; and that this goal was far exceeded with over 71 percent of construction contracts awarded in the Operating Fund and over 98

percent in the Capital Fund awarded to Section 3 business concerns.

Ms. Crow stated that the last goal is three percent of the total dollar amount of all other contracts that are non-construction awarded to Section 3 business concerns. She explained that while this goal was exceeded in the Operating Fund at over forty percent, it was not met in the Capital Fund or ROSS grant largely due to the limited contracts in ROSS and the fact that there were no Section 3 businesses or non-construction projects for the 2015-2016 fiscal period. She explained that future recommendations will be to look for opportunities to find Section 3 qualified business concerns for these contracts and to look more closely at Section 3 plans of businesses that do not qualify as a Section 3 business concern but may be able to provide other services such as offering training to residents.

She went on to explain that other future opportunities include educating residents on how to start a business and what is needed to bid on future RRHA projects, along with continued education to those bidding on projects regarding how to become self-certified as a Section 3 business. She said that efforts have improved to advertise employment opportunities and the new applicant tracking tool is being looked at to help expand those efforts throughout the community.

Chair Karnes asked if there were any other Staff reports, comments or questions. There were none.

4. Committee Reports

Chair Karnes asked if there were any Committee reports, comments or questions. There were none.

5. Commissioner Comments

Chair Karnes asked if there were any Commissioner comments.

Vice Chair Burruss stated that she attended the meeting with the City that Mrs. Goh had referred to earlier and that it was interesting and educational in terms of content. She commented that she was impressed with the degree of collegiality and trust that clearly exists between RRHA and the City Manager's staff; that there is a large amount of communication that takes place and that it takes time to develop and nurture that degree of collegiality. She expressed that she was very impressed and pleased with that and did not want it to go unsaid.

Chair Karnes asked if there were any other Commissioner comments. There were none.

6. City Council Liaison Comments or Discussion

Council Member Garland reported to the Board that he also felt the meeting between members of the City and RRHA went well and that both are stronger when working together, which is evidenced by projects such as the Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine and Research Institute and all that is taking place in that area. He stated that the development is a phenomenal thing for the City of Roanoke.

He stated that he desires to foster communication whenever possible and dialogue both ways at the Board meeting will help. He said that he believes he can inform the Board on things that are taking place with the City that they may not know about and report back to City Council members any information that the Board would like to communicate with them, especially with all that is planned with redevelopment. He said he would like to be able to share with the Council any projects that RRHA desires to work with the City on such as the library. He explained that he was unaware

of RRHA's desire to acquire the library building and feels that other Council members are unaware as well. He said that since Council would ultimately have to vote to approve RRHA obtaining the library, if dialogue can begin about it early with the reasons clearly communicated, he can report that back to Council and perhaps expedite the process of that or other items in which the Board may have interest. He went on to say that if communication can happen on a monthly basis, neither will have to wait on an annual report for updates. He reiterated that the meeting at the City Manager's office was a good start in the process.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Anguiano about what things he felt were a priority based on that meeting, Council Member Garland said that both RRHA and the City felt that it was a good idea to pursue either lower fees or no fees from the Water Authority on projects that RRHA is involved in as it was a hindrance because of HUD development cost requirements. He said that with Council and RRHA working together with the Water Authority, it is more apt to be approved. He said everyone was in agreement to pursue this discussion with the Water Authority.

He updated the Board on recent City Council activities that included going to the state legislature last week with a bill to ban guns and ammunition in the council chamber during meetings, which was defeated nine to seven in a party line vote. He stated that the other big item that Council is working on is the broadband bill that is probably the most controversial bill in legislature right now. He said that, if passed, the bill introduced by Delegate Kathy Byron would have a tremendous negative effect on the capacity of localities to provide higher speed internet at a better price but that it will most likely be defeated. He stated that Council was returning to the state

legislature again on Wednesday to talk further about these issues.

Chair Karnes stated that his delegate talked about things in Delegate Byron's bill that he liked and things that he did not like, although the delegate did not detail those items.

7. Residents or other community members to address the Board

Chair Karnes asked if there were any residents or community members who would like to address the Board. There were none.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

C-1 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Commissioners held Monday, December 19, 2016.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Dispense with the reading thereof and approve as recorded.

C-2 Monthly Operations Report for the month of December 2016.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: File as submitted

Vice Chair Burruss introduced a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garner and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Anguiano, Burruss, Butler, Garner, Karnes, Smith

NAYS: None

Chair Karnes thereupon declared said motion carried as introduced.

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

1. Executive Session

Vice Chair Burruss moved that the Commissioners enter into Executive

Session for the purpose of discussion of reports or plans related to the security of RRHA facilities, buildings or structures, and the safety of persons using RRHA facilities, buildings or structures in accordance with Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711 (A)(19); and for the purpose of discussion of specific personnel matters of the RRHA in accordance with Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1).

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smith and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Anguiano, Burruss, Butler, Garner, Karnes, Smith

NAYS: None

The Board of Commissioners entered into Executive Session at 3:45 p.m.

The Board reconvened into open session at 4:10 p.m.

Commissioner Garner introduced a motion stating that the members of the Board of Commissioners hereby certify to the best of their knowledge that only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by the Board in the immediately preceding Executive Session.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Burruss and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Anguiano, Burruss, Butler, Garner, Karnes, Smith

NAYS: None

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, Commissioner

Butler moved that the meeting be adjourned.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garner and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Anguiano, Burruss, Butler, Garner, Karnes, Smith

NAYS: None

Chair Karnes declared the meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.



Glenda Edwards Goh, Secretary-Treasurer


Daniel Karnes, Chair