

**CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 8, 2021**

The City of Lake Wales Code Enforcement Board held a hybrid virtual and in person meeting on February 8, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Chamber located in the City Administration Building.

ATTENDANCE

**Code Enforcement Board Members
(Shaded area indicates absence):**

Chairperson Ralph Marino	Vice-Chair Wilena Vreeland	Sara Jones	Dwight Wilson	Rodney Cannon	Bruce Austell	Julia Paul
-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	---------------

Albert (Chuck) Galloway, Jr. – City Attorney Appeared Remotely - Virtually

City Staff: Development Services Department
Jose Lozada– Code Compliance Officer Fany Lozano – Recording Secretary Cheryl Baksh – Administrative Assistant Mark J. Bennett – Development Services Director

City Staff: Information Technology Department
Kevin Sunderland – IT Manager Daniel Gonzalez– IT Technician II Johnny Ramirez – IT Technician I

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER** – Meeting called to order at 5:30 pm
- 2) **ROLL CALL** – A quorum was present. All members present attended in person.
- 3) **COVID STATEMENT/HYBRID MEETINGS** – Chairperson

Mr. Marino read into the record the hybrid meeting statement for virtual meetings.

Mr. Galloway read into the record the instructions on how to participate in the virtual meetings.

Mr. Marino explained the procedures for the meeting and his statement was as follows:

“Good Morning, welcome to the February 8, 2021 Code Enforcement Board Meeting for the City of Lake Wales. This meeting is an evidentiary hearing. During this evidentiary hearing, we will hear testimony from property owners and the city’s Code Compliance Division about whether a property is in violation of the city code. We will hear testimony from the City’s Code Compliance Division even if a property owner who has received notice of this hearing fails to appear. A property owner, who arrives late after his or her case has been called, heard, and decided by this board, will not have a right to be heard.

This hearing will be conducted as follows:

The city shall present its case first. After each witness has testified, the property owner may, through the chairperson of the board, cross-examine or ask questions of the witnesses. When the city has presented all of its case, the property owner may present his or her case. An attorney or some other representative may represent you. You can present evidence under defense either through witnesses or your own testimony. If you present photographs or written documents as evidence, they must be submitted to the board’s recording secretary for the case file. The city will be able to cross-examine you and each of your witnesses. You have the right to remain silent and your silence will not be held against you. You have the right to testify and your testimony considered under the same standards as that of other witnesses. The board may ask questions of the witnesses on both sides as the evidence is presented. This is not a criminal proceeding. Strict rules of evidence are not applied in the proceedings. After the board has heard all testimony from both sides, the board will entertain a motion and may enter a closed discussion at this time. During the closed discussion among the board, no additional testimony from the city or the property owner may be heard. Based upon the testimony and the evidence presented, the board will decide whether or not a violation exists and whether the violation as been corrected. If the board finds that there is a violation that has not been corrected, the board will order the property owner to correct the violation in a specific time period and a daily fine to accrue there or after for failure to comply. Failure to correct the violation within the specified time will result in a fine for each day the property is not in compliance after that time period. After the board has made its decision, a copy of the board’s finding and order will be mailed to the property owner of record. The correction of violations must occur before midnight of the deadline set for compliance. If the corrections are not made by the deadline, the fine will be imposed for each day any uncorrected violation continues after that deadline.

PLEDGE OF CIVILITY as posted on the Podium

We will be respectful of one another even when we disagree.

We will direct all comments to the issues.

We will avoid personal attacks.”

4) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Regular Meeting – January 11th, 2021**

Mr. Marino made two corrections to the minutes. Ms. Jones made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections. Mr. Austell seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5) ADMINISTER OATH/MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

5.1 Administer Oath:

Board secretary administered the oath to staff and respondents.

6) REVISIONS

Mr. Marino stated that in this portion of the agenda we will discuss changes, additions or deletions from the agenda and asked Ms. Lozano if there were any changes. Ms. Lozano stated that the only change to the agenda is that the standard operation procedures discussion will now happen at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Marino stated that there was one item that he would like to discuss now and he made the following statement: "As the Chairperson I have exactly the same rights and privileges as all other members have, including the right to make motions, speak in debate and to vote on all questions."

7) CASE(s) NEW BUSINESS

- 7.1** Case # 2011-00001 CEB 2011-007
City of Lake Wales VS Rosilyn Copeland
206 C Street
PID: 27-29-35-879000-003110
Violation(s): N/A Administrative Fine Foreclosure

Property Owner/Respondent was not present to provide testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented the case and its history. He stated that this case is being brought before the Board for consideration of foreclosure actions on the outstanding administrative fine. The city has abated numerous violations at this premises for which the service fines total as of today is \$10,005.69. There is also another administrative fine attached to this premises, but we are seeking foreclosure on the fine which has an amount due of \$560,500. He stated that:

STAFF REQUESTS THE BOARD:

- 1) Find that all cited violations were allowed to exist past the date for correction and
- 2) Find that Proper Notice has been afforded to the Property Owner and,
- 3) Find that all Procedural requirements have been met.

AND STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD:

- 1) Authorize the Code Compliance Division to start the foreclosure process.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Lozada if contact has been made with the property owner. Mr. Lozada responded that the property owner has contacted us but that she has stated that she does not own the property. He stated that there was contact a couple of months ago about an interested buyer but the sale probably did not go through because all of the existing liens. Mr. Wilson asked if there had been a structure on the lot and also stated that if when these cases get refereed to the County, the County is not as lenient to forgive the liens. Mr. Lozada responded that the structures appeared to have been demolished in 2002 and that the foreclosure process may clean up the title. Ms. Vreeland made a motion to accept staff recommendations to authorize for the foreclosure process to start. Ms. Jones seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7.2 Case # 2018-00413
City of Lake Wales VS Mercedes Jusino
839 Brentwood Dr
PID: 28-29-31-937690-001050
Violation(s): Multiple Violations
Cost of Enforcement: \$106.80

Mercedes Jusino, Property Owner/Respondent was present to provide testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented the case and its history. He stated that this premises has multiple violations which include the need for a building permit for a garage that was enclosed without permits. There is junk and trash, derelict vehicles, exterior of the home needs protective coating and most violations still exist today. He stated that:

STAFF REQUESTS THE BOARD:

- 1) Find that all cited violations were allowed to exist past the date for correction and
- 2) Find that Proper Notice has been afforded to the Property Owner and,
- 3) Find that all Procedural requirements have been met.

AND STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD:

- 1) Impose a fine in the amount of \$ 150.00 (per day), every day the violation exists effective 10 days from today's date (02/18/2021) and
- 2) Authorize an Administrative Lien be placed against the property until such time as all violations are corrected, and an Affidavit of Compliance is issued by a representative

acting for the city and restitution is made for all fines and costs incurred by the city to present this case.

Ms. Jusino was present and addressed the Board. She stated that she has applied for Florida Rebuild program and that she has received a letter that she will provide to the Board. She stated that she is being paired with a contractor to work on the home. She stated that the garage door was damaged by the hurricane and that is why the garage was enclosed because the garage door no longer existed. Mr. Marino stated that he has been by the property and he is not happy with how the property looks. Ms. Jusino agreed and stated that help is coming but everything is held back because of the Corona Virus. Ms. Jones asked for the Florida Rebuild Letter and read it into the record. Per the letter Ms. Jusino completed the application to the program but is not yet approved as she is in the qualification process of the review. Ms. Vreeland asked that if there were permits for the work done to the garage. Mr. Lozada responded that no permit was obtained for the work to the garage but there was a permit obtained for air conditioning work. Ms. Jusino stated that its just plywood on the garage and no door. Ms. Vreeland stressed that it needs to be understood that anytime that you do something here in the City a permit is required for the work to be done. Ms. Vreeland also stated that the Florida Rebuild program is just an application and expressed concern as to what will happen if Ms. Jusino does not get approved for the program. Mr. Wilson asked that if the garage panel that is currently there were to be removed, would there be additional violation. Mr. Lozada responded that it depends on what is on the other side, and that if it is just a garage where she stores her vehicle it may serve as a carport. Ms. Jusino stated that its not a garage and that it is a bedroom. Ms. Jones asked for clarification as to what the premises currently looks like aside from the garage violation. Mr. Marino saw the air conditioning truck parked on the premises, a red vehicle, and another truck parked on the grass and he did not see the pile of debris but he focused on the garage. There is a covered boat. Ms. Jones asked if those things are part of the violations. Mr. Lozada stated yes, and that there are derelict vehicles. Ms. Jones asked if Ms. Jusino has any plans other than the rebuild program. Ms. Jusino said no and that she is sure that the program will go through and that she has to wait because there is no insurance. Ms. Vreeland asked what if you get turned down for not having insurance on the house. Ms. Jusino stated that they know she does not have insurance and that not having insurance is one of the eligibility items. Mr. Marino asked about the red vehicle. Ms. Jusino stated she has lost the keys to that vehicle. Mr. Marino stated he does not want to place a financial burden on this but the City needs to recoup costs associated with this case. Mr. Marino asked how long Ms. Jusino needs to come into compliance. Ms. Jusino could not commit to a time limit. Mr. Marino asked if they removed the plywood from the garage would they be in compliance. Mr. Lozada stated yes, if it is a carport. Ms. Jusino stated it is not a carport and that it is bedroom and it has never been a garage. Ms. Jones stated if the plywood is removed then a bedroom would be exposed. Mr. Marino made a motion to allow for 30 days to come into compliance and if not in compliance then the fine will start. Ms. Vreeland seconded the motion. Ms. Jones asked for clarification if the motion is for all violations or just some things. Mr. Marino stated everything in general. Mr. Wilson asked Ms. Lozano to re-state the motion on the floor. Ms. Lozano stated that the motion on the floor is to allow for 30 days to come into compliance otherwise a fine in the amount of \$150 per day will start. Ms. Lozano also clarified for the Board that compliance means full compliance with the entire

Notice of Violation and that individual items cannot be selected or removed from the notice. There was voting on the motion and nays were heard. A roll call vote was requested and the results are as follows:

1st Marino – Yes
2nd Vreeland – Yes
Cannon – Yes
Austell– No
Wilson – No
Jones - No
The Motion Failed 3 yay to 3 nay

Ms. Jones made a motion to allow for 60 days to come into compliance otherwise a fine in the amount of \$150 would start for non-compliance in addition to the costs of enforcement. There was voting on the motion and nays were heard. A roll call vote was requested and the results are as follows:

1st Jones – Yes
2nd Cannon – Yes
Austell – Yes
Wilson– Yes
Vreeland – No
Marino - No
The Motion Passed 4 yay to 2 nay

Mr. Wilson addressed Ms. Jusino and stated that as soon as she gets her approval letter she should contact staff. Ms. Jones also suggested that Ms. Jusino provide a copy of the order to Florida Rebuild. Mr. Cannon stated that although 60 days (4/6/2021) were granted she should take care of other violations that can be handled quickly. Ms. Jones clarified that she should get the grass and the vehicles corrected immediately. Ms. Jones also stated that there is a process for reduction and that how she handles things will be considered if she makes that request. Ms. Vreeland stated that she should keep her yard clean.

7.3 Case # 2020-00415
City of Lake Wales VS Antonious L. White & Jean M. White
520 3rd Street South
PID: 27-30-11-914000-002010
Violation(s): 12-233-1 Sanitation and Storage Materials
23-521 Garaging and Parking of Vehicles, trailers, recreational and non-commercial vehicles and boats.
Cost of Enforcement: \$106.80

Antonious L. White, Property Owner/Respondent was present to provide testimony. Ms. Lozano administered the Oath to all persons above who provided testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented the case and its history. He stated that there are sanitation and storage violations, as well as derelict vehicles and lots of equipment. There are garaging and parking violations as there are two boats and this is a corner lot with two frontages. He stated that there have been previous cases with kennels and that the costs of enforcement total \$121.80 He stated that:

STAFF REQUESTS THE BOARD:

- 1) Find that all cited violations were allowed to exist past the date for correction and
- 2) Find that Proper Notice has been afforded to the Property Owner and,
- 3) Find that all Procedural requirements have been met.

AND STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD:

- 1) Impose a fine in the amount of \$ 100.00 (per day), every day the violation exists effective 10 days from today's date (02/18/2021) and
- 2) Authorize an Administrative Lien be placed against the property until such time as all violations are corrected, and an Affidavit of Compliance is issued by a representative acting for the city and restitution is made for all fines and costs incurred by the city to present this case and

Mr. White was present and provided testimony to the Board. He stated the front of the house is the front of the house, and that the side yard is the side yard. He stated that the boat is on the side of the house, so how can it be on the front of the house. Mr. Lozada stated that it fronts the road and that corner lots have two frontages. Mr. White stated that his address is 3rd street and that one of boats was in the driveway and the other boat is inside the chain link fence. Ms. Jones asked if where the boat behind the chain link fence is, is that considered the front yard? Mr. Lozada stated yes, he cannot have the boat there and that there is also open storage in this area. Mr. Marino stated that he believe that there was a car wash at this premises and that there may be a business being run illegally. Ms. Jones asked if he can have a privacy fence? Mr. Lozada stated that yes he can have a privacy fence. Mr. White stated that he should be able to do anything since it is his property. Ms. Jones responded to a certain extent yes, there are laws how you can use your property. Ms. Jones also stated that what they are trying to do is determine if there is something that can be done so that he can be in compliance. Mr. White stated that when the notice was delivered he was incarcerated. Ms. Jones asked when was he incarcerated? Mr. White stated December 24. There was open discussion about possible solutions to address the violations which included a privacy fence and possible hedges. Mr. White stated that he cannot put up hedges because the City comes and trims them down. Mr. Bennett stated that corner lots require a clear visibility triangle and that is why the hedges would have been trimmed. Ms. Jones asked if there is anywhere on the premises where the vehicles can be legally stored? Mr. Lozada responded that vehicles have to be properly registered and the boat cannot be in the front. Mr. White stated that at the corner there is a camper. Ms. Jones stated to Mr. White that they should focus on his issue. Mr. White stated that he cannot move the boat. Mr. Marino asked if the Bar B Q pit has been moved inside of the fence. Mr. White responded No. Mr. Cannon asked if the Bar B Q pit was inside the fence would that be the same problem as the boat where they would have

the same violation. Mr. Lozada stated yes, and that currently it is blocking the right of way. Open discussion continued about possible solutions to be in compliance. Ms. Lozano projected the map of the premises and there was discussion about placing the boat right behind the house but Mr. White stated that he cannot maneuver the boat behind the house as there is no space. Ms. Jones stated that they are trying to come up with a creative solution that works for both him and the City. Mr. Marino asked what it would take to get this property into compliance. Mr. Lozada responded to clean up all of the items that are creating the open storage situation. Mr. Marino asked Mr. White if he would consider storing the boat in a storage facility. Mr. White responded that that solution means money. Mr. Cannon stated that if the Board orders fines it also means money. Ms. Jones asked Mr. White if 30 days would be a good amount of time to come into compliance. Mr. White responded that he would like 45 days. Ms. Vreeland made a motion to accept staff recommendation but amended the recommendation to allow for 60 days (4/9/2021) to come into compliance. Mr. Marino seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7.4 Case # 2020-00421
City of Lake Wales VS Estate of Betty Jo Smith
403 Wetmore Street North
PID: 27-30-02-900500-001081
Violation(s): Multiple Violations
Cost of Enforcement: \$179.30

Mary Kathrine Jarell, Representative/Respondent was present to provide testimony.
Ms. Lozano administered the Oath to all persons above who provided testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented this case and its history. He stated that violations of sanitation and storage exist as well as appliances, sidewalks, and driveways and protective treatments. He stated that:

STAFF REQUESTS THE BOARD:

- 1) Find that all cited violations were allowed to exist past the date for correction and
- 2) Find that Proper Notice has been afforded to the Property Owner and,
- 3) Find that all Procedural requirements have been met.

*AND STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD:

- 1) Impose a fine in the amount of \$ 250.00 (per day), every day the violation exists effective 10 days from today's date (2/18/2021) and
- 2) Authorize an Administrative Lien be placed against the property until such time as all violations are corrected, and an Affidavit of Compliance is issued by a representative acting for the city and restitution is made for all fines and costs incurred by the city to present this case and

Ms. Jarell was present and provided testimony to the Board. She stated that her brother has moved out of the property and gave her the house. She stated that she knows that it is a mess but she cannot do anything. She stated that there are a lot of people living in the house who are unwilling to help and that she has asked them to leave the home because they refuse to help. She is asking for more time and she would like for someone to do a walk through with her to explain what needs to be corrected so that she can be in compliance. She stated that he has lots of expenses and that her husband is afraid to do any work on the house because people keep telling him that he needs a permit and he doesn't want to do any work on the home and then get in trouble with the City for not having permits. Ms. Jones asked if the people giving the advice that permits are needed are the same people who are not helping with the bills? Ms. Jarell responded yes. Mr. Wilson suggested that Ms. Jarell reach out to the Care Center for assistance. Ms. Jarell stated that she has tried to go to the Care Center but has been unsuccessful in getting assistance. Mr. Cannon asked Ms. Jarell how much time she needs? Ms. Jarell responded a month. Mr. Wilson stated that a permit is not needed to cut the grass and that she should attempt to continue to work with the Care Center. Ms. Jones stated that a permit is not required for protective treatments, which is painting the home. Mr. Cannon stated that Ms. Jarell is asking for 30 days but the violations cannot be separated and that 30 days may not be enough time to address all violations. Mr. Marino suggested 60 days. Ms. Jones asked staff if Ms. Jarell will incur a trip fee if someone goes out to show her what she needs to do. Mr. Lozada stated that a courtesy trip can be arranged and Ms. Jarell should contact Ms. Lozano to schedule an appointment. Ms. Jones made a motion to accept staff recommendations but amended the recommendation to allow for 60 days (4/9/2021) to come into compliance. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

8) COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS/OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Marino opened the floor for public comments.

Ms. Lozano asked Ms. Baksh if anyone is online. Ms. Baksh responded no one is online.

Ms. Lozano stated that there is no one in the Chambers that would like to address the Board.

Mr. Marino stated that he has done a lot of time study, but that when you do a time study if you decide to average all of the costs you go back to what you originally started with. He stated that \$250 a day is ridiculous and that at times we end up charging properties way more than what they are worth.

Mr. Marino requested a 10 minute break. Break started at 7:02pm and meeting resumed at 7:04pm.

Ms. Lozano talked about the standard operating procedures that she emailed to the Board Members. One was about Costs of Enforcement and Standard motions that will be discussed first. She asked if the Board had any questions. Ms. Jones asked if the costs need to be included in their motions. Mr. Galloway responded that they do not need to part of their motion. Ms. Lozano also stated that staff recommendations were worded in

way as to mention the costs and they will see future forms worded that way. Ms. Lozano also stated that this Standard Operating procedure is more for staff but that we would like for the Board to be aware of the procedure and how it works in the background, and that this is not something that they need to vote on. Mr. Marino asked how is time spent is being used to determine the cost. Ms. Jones responded that it is a flat fee per trip.

Ms. Lozano talked about the standard motions sheet. She stated that the intent is to make the motions more standard and more clear and easier to define. She stated that these motions may be included with future forms so that they can have them handy and they can select their motions. Mr. Bennet stated that this does not prevent the Board from not making any other motion that they would like to make. Ms. Jones asked if the findings language can be included with the standard motions. Ms. Lozano stated that those are usually automatic but that she will add them to the form so they can have them.

Ms. Lozano talked about SOP number 3 which talks about staff recommending 5% on all reductions. She reminded the Board that although this is what staff is recommending the Board still has the authority to reduce to any other amount. Mr. Bennet asked Ms. Lozano provide the Board with the examples that she has come across when it pertains to reductions. Ms. Lozano stated that staff has attended the Polk County Magistrate meeting and other meetings online and that at the County meeting one of the reductions was to \$30,000 and that on another reduction it was \$10,000. She stated that although numbers seem very unrealistic this is what is happening at other jurisdictions. Ms. Jones asked if we have seen a procedure where they differentiate between an owner who causes the violation and one that doesn't. Ms. Lozano stated that the item she has come across is the Amnesty Program which takes into account that the current property owner may not have caused the violation. She made mention that the Amnesty Program for Winter Haven, their lowest reduction is \$1,000 and that they will not reduce lower than that. Ms. Jones stated that she would like for the Board to come up with their own standard system to help them determine what to reduce to and that she is willing to prepare this procedure for the Board as she understands that this SOP is for staff and not the Board as she wants to treat people the same. Mr. Marino agreed. Mr. Marino stated that we are in hard times with COVID and that we should be more lenient through these hard times. Ms. Jones asked how staff came up with the recommendations because each case today suggested a different amount. Mr. Lozada responded that staff has a fee scheduled which is a tiered system and that we can charge per violation but that we max out at \$250 and \$500 on repeat violators. He stated that depending on the degree of severity and amount of violations he determines what to charge. Mr. Marino stated that he feels that \$250 is outrageous. Ms. Jones stated that she would like to see a range of \$50-\$150, as these numbers are more reasonable. Ms. Lozano stated that the Board can change staff recommendation if they think it should be changed just like they grant extra time. Mr. Cannon stated that he knows that they have the authority to change the fees when they come before them, but he asked if the Board has the authority to dictate staff policy. The response to his question is No.

Ms. Vreeland stated that she almost felt like the Board was telling the gentleman how to sneak around and do things illegally. She stated that she felt they were dabbling in something that they should not be telling people to hide things so they can get away with

it. Mr. Wilson stated that where he was going with his line of questioning was that there is a type of mesh that he can put on the fence. He stated that they were trying to be supportive of him. Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to see going forward for Mr. Bennett to take a corner on the ongoing newsletter, a section where residents can be educated. Ms. Lozano stated that one of the take aways for her was that they kept giving solutions to the gentleman but all she kept hearing was No, I can't, I can't and that this was sending a message to the Board that the respondent is unwilling to cooperate.

Mr. Wilson stated that at one point there was support for another officer. He asked if there is something that this Board can do for 2 persons instead of one? Mr. Bennett stated that he has lived in the city for 23 years now and that he feels that the City needed two Code Officers. He stated that he will talk with the City Manager to see what options this Board has to make a recommendation but that essentially it comes down to money. He also stated that the Building Inspector will start to help the Code Compliance staff for an hour a day. He stated that it is hard to balance the rights of the individuals based on the interest of the community.

Ms. Vreeland stated that when she was invited to the Commission Workshop there was a statement made by one of the Commissioners. She stated that Commissioner said that the Board goes after the African American community. Ms. Vreeland stated that as long as she has been on the Board they have never gone after any particular race and that she is offended that the Commissioner would say that. When you say things like that it divides the community and that should have never been said. She stated that she would invite her to attend one of the Code Board Meetings so she can see how the Board works. She stated that her comment was very hurtful. Mr. Bennett stated that he cannot speak for the Commission and that as a citizen everyone has a right to address the Commission. Mr. Wilson stated that he was involved in the meeting in which they were discussing the magistrate and that he is against the magistrate and that he thinks the confusion is that they think that the Board is giving everything away when they reduce fines. He stated that he thinks the Board is doing a good job at understanding this now. He stated that this may also be a perception issue when people talk to Commissioners and make their own comments. Mr. Bennett stated that the cases heard today were all over the City. Mr. Marino stated that Mr. Goldstein gives him a hard time, but that he has explained that when they make their orders such as the Seminole and the Estes property, the issue is now out of their hands. They have made their ruling. Mr. Wilson stated that we should just keep moving forward. He stated that he appreciates the work Mr. Lozada does and that it is a hard job and that they will stand behind him. Mr. Bennett wanted to publicly acknowledge that 95 to 99 percent of this stuff is coming from Ms. Lozano and Mr. Lozada and they bounce the ideas off him.

9) **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was then adjourned at 7:37pm.

Ralph Marino

Ralph Marino, Chairperson or
Wilena Vreeland, Vice Chairperson

Attest:

Fany Lozano

Fany Lozano, Recording Secretary