

MINUTES
BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY AND CONSUMER SERVICES
VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING
September 2, 2021 - 10:00 A.M.

1. Call to Order, Preliminary Remarks, and Roll Call

Mr. Jody Brandenburg, Chair – Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services’ Videoconference meeting. It’s September 2, 2021. Ms. Simon, now that I have called this meeting to order, would you offer your preliminary remarks and do a roll call, please?

Ms. Ellen Simon – Yes, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ellen Simon. I am the Assistant Director of the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. Today is Thursday, September 2, 2021, as Mr. Chairman indicated. This is a public meeting of the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. This meeting is being held by videoconference and notice of this meeting has been duly published in the Florida Administrative Register. An agenda for this meeting has been made available to interested persons. Both the link and call-in number is on the agenda, which has been made available to the public. The call-in number and other information relating to the Board meeting has also been published on the Division’s website. The Division staff present for this meeting are in their individual offices and maintaining social distance. Ms. LaTonya Bryant is recording the meeting and minutes will be prepared.

As this is a videoconference of the Board, there are some items I need to draw your attention to. For one, as a general rule, please do not utilize your video camera for the meeting unless you are a Board member, Board counsel, or an authorized Division employee. If you have a matter listed on the agenda and intend to appear before the Board to represent yourself, or if you are an attorney that is representing a client, only turn your video camera option on when we have reached the agenda item that you want to be heard on or when you hear your name called. Then turn your video camera option off again as soon as your matter has been addressed by the Board. If you are planning on participating by video, please ensure that you are properly attired for the meeting. In the past, we have had the experience of people not being properly attired and it is detrimental to the meeting process, as it could be disruptive. If you are not planning to participate by video, please ensure that your camera is off.

Additionally, we need everyone that is on the call to place their phone or audio feed on mute, if you are not speaking. The ambient noise coming from someone's phone or audio, which is not muted, causes severe disruption to the meeting. If you are not muted, you may be muted by Division staff. As a result, you will need to call back into the meeting because that may be the only way to unmute your phone. Also, if you are using your computer or smartphone for your audio feed, please remember to speak directly into the microphone on your device. To do otherwise negatively impacts the recording of this meeting. Just as in a live meeting, persons speaking are requested to identify themselves for the record each time they speak. Participants are respectfully reminded that the Board’s Chair, Mr. Brandenburg, runs the meeting. Persons desiring to speak should initially ask the Chair for permission. As a final reminder, Board meetings are public meetings under Florida Law, and anything said via chat is subject to a public records request. As such, this feature should only be used for technological issues you may be experiencing, directing any inquiries in chat to Mary Schwantes, our Executive Director. She is monitoring the chat feature and, as necessary, will forward your inquiry to someone who can assist in resolution of the problem. At this point I will take the roll:

Joseph “Jody” Brandenburg, Chair
Keenan Knopke, Vice Chair
Andrew Clark
Sanjena Clay
Lewis “Lew” Hall
Christian “Chris” Jensen
Ken Jones
Jay Lyons
Darrin Williams (EXCUSED)

Also noted as present:

Mary Schwantes, Executive Director

Rachelle Munson, Board Legal Advisor
Marshawn Griffin, Department Legal Counsel
James Bossart, Department Legal Counsel
LaTonya Bryant, Department Staff

Ms. Simon – Mr. Chairman, there is a quorum of Board members present for the business of the Board.

Chair – Thank you, Ms. Simon.

2. Action on the Minutes
A. July 13, 2021

Chair – Action on the minutes for the July 13, 2021 meeting?

MOTION: Mr. Ken Jones moved to adopt the minutes of the meeting. Mr. Lew Hall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Application(s) for Preneed Sales Agent
A. Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum A

Ms. Simon – This item is informational only. Pursuant to s. 497.466, F.S., the applicants have been issued their licenses and appointments as preneed sales agents.

B. Recommended for Approval with Conditions (Criminal History)
(1) Santiago, Joseph H (Appointing Entity: Neptune Management Corp)

Ms. Simon – On January 8, 2021, an application was received by the Division for the above named for licensure as a preneed sales agent, and no deficiencies were noted on the application. Thus, a temporary preneed sales agent license was issued for Mr. Santiago. However, during the review of Mr. Santiago's background check it was revealed that he did in fact have reportable criminal history that required disclosing. Neptune Management Corp, employer, was notified of Mr. Santiago's temporary preneed sales agent license suspension, and upon request, Mr. Santiago, through his attorney, provided the Division with a written explanation of the relevant criminal history, a completed Criminal History Form, and a copy of court documentation regarding the charges and pending disposition of his case. In 2013, a felony charge for possession of a controlled substance was filed against Mr. Santiago by the Circuit Court of Cook County, Criminal. This criminal offense occurred in Cook County, Illinois. Mr. Santiago pled guilty to all charges and was sentenced to two (2) years' probation and ordered to pay any applicable fines, costs and court fees. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the applicant be placed on twelve (12) full months of probation.

Chair – Is Mr. Santiago on the call, or a representative of Mr. Santiago?

Ms. Wendy Wiener – Mr. Chairman, this is Wendy Wiener. I represent the applicant in this matter.

Chair – Thank you. Do you wish to address the Board, or you're merely here to answer questions?

Ms. Wiener – Simply to answer questions, or provide additional information, if I can.

Chair – Thank you. Board?

MOTION: Mr. Keenan Knopke moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the applicant be placed on twelve (12) full months of probation. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – And please let the record reflect, when the roll was called, I believe Mrs. Clay was off the meeting, but let the record reflect her presence. Thank you.

4. **Application(s) for Continuing Education**

A. **Course Approval - Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum B**

- (1) *Florida Cemetery, Cremation & Funeral Association (75)*
- (2) *Independent Funeral Directors of Florida Inc (135)*
- (3) *International Cemetery, Cremation and Funeral Association (22808)*
- (4) *National Funeral Directors Association (136)*
- (5) *New Jersey Funeral Service Education Corp. (7002)*
- (6) *SCI Management - Dignity University (99)*
- (7) *WebCE (43)*
- (8) *Wilbert Funeral Services (39408)*

Ms. Simon – Pursuant to s. 497.147, F.S., and Board Rule 69K–17.0041, F.A.C., the courses presented on Addendum B have been reviewed by the CE Committee and the Committee, as well as the Division, recommends approval of the applications for the number of hours indicated on Addendum B.

Mr. Knopke – Just a quick question Mr. Chair, to Ms. Simon. When you look at the applications, out to right of the names, and let's do the first one, Florida Cemetery Cremation and Funeral Association. What does the (75) mean?

Ms. LaTonya Bryant – That's the provider number.

Mr. Knopke – Ok. That is the provider number. Very good. Thank you.

Chair – Motion?

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the applications. Mr. Chris Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5. **Consumer Protection Trust Fund Claims**

A. **Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum C**

Ms. Simon – The CPTF claims presented on Addendum C have been reviewed by the Division and the Division recommends approval for the monetary amounts indicated.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve all the claim(s), for the monetary amounts indicated. Mr. Hall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6. **Application(s) for Embalmer Apprentice**

A. **Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum D**

- (1) *Berry, Julie E F113484*
- (2) *Boggs, Kenneth W F523423*
- (3) *Johnson, Hailey L F527527*
- (4) *Ortiz, Alexandra F527263*
- (5) *Rebello, Shannon M F022382*
- (6) *Rodriguez, Catalina F523927*
- (7) *Uriarte, Destiny F524744*

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item. Pursuant to Rule 69K–1.005, F. A. C., the Division has previously approved the applications listed on Addendum D.

7. **Application(s) for Florida Law and Rules Examination**

A. **Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum E**

- (1) **Funeral Director (Endorsement)**
 - (a) *Fenderson, Heather G*
- (2) **Funeral Director and Embalmer (Endorsement)**
 - (a) *Kost, Dionna*

- (b) *Tyrell II, Matthew A*
- (3) *Funeral Director (Internship and Exam)*
 - (a) *Rossy, Amanda L*
- (4) *Funeral Director and Embalmer (Internship and Exam)*
 - (a) *Alvarado, Isayana J*
 - (b) *Benjamin, Shana G*
 - (c) *Segers, Heather C*
 - (d) *Underwood, Stephanie R*

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item. Pursuant to Rule 69K–1.005, F. A. C., the Division has previously approved the applications listed on Addendum E.

- B. *Recommended for Approval without Conditions (Criminal History)***
 - (1) *Direct Disposer***
 - (a) *Borges, Ivelisse*

Ms. Simon – Is the applicant on the call today?

Ivelisse Borges – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. An application for a direct disposer license was received by the Division on July 1, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted and completed on August 4, 2021. In 2018, the applicant pled guilty to misdemeanor Disorderly Conduct and was sentenced to twelve (12) months’ probation, fined \$850, and ordered to attend an anger management course. The Division is recommending approval without conditions.

Chair – Ms. Borges, would you want to address the Board or you’re merely here to answer questions?

Ms. Borges – What does addressing the Board mean, this terminology?

Chair – Well, to tell the Board, perhaps, what happened and anything that you want to say that would increase your likelihood of being approved.

Ms. Simon – And, before you make any presentations, can you please raise your right hand? Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Ms. Borges – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

Ms. Borges – Ivelisse Borges, B O R G E S.

Ms. Simon – Thank you.

Chair – Do you want to address the Board, or are you merely here to answer questions that the Board might have?

Ms. Borges – Yes. How much am I allowed to talk about that case?

Chair – As much as reasonably expected?

Ms. Borges – How far back? I don't know if the letter was received with the addendum. I hate to go through this whole story again, but I could, if you'd like.

Chair – Well, we have your criminal history form attachment that you sent, that starts with, “I’m not a menace to society.” We have that document, and every Board member has that document before them.

Ms. Borges – Would you like for me to go through that again, the story?

Chair – It's not necessary for you to go through it again, just if the Board members have any questions.

Ms. Borges – Ok, yeah, I'm open.

Chair – Board members, any questions, or what's your pleasure here?

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to approve the application. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you, Ms. Borges. Good luck to you.

Ms. Borges – Thank you so much.

(2) Funeral Director and Embalmer (Internship and Exam)
(a) Chandler III, Clyde L

Ms. Simon – Is Mr. Chandler on the call today?

Mr. Clyde Chandler – Yes. Yes, I am.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. An application for a funeral director and embalmer license was received by the Division on July 8, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted and completed on July 23, 2021. In 2019, the applicant pled No Contest to Reckless Driving. was fined \$500 and placed on probation. The Division recommends approval without conditions.

Chair – Mr. Chandler?

Mr. Chandler – Yes, sir?

Chair – Do you want to address the Board or you're merely here to answer questions?

Mr. Chandler – I'm just merely here to answer the questions.

Chair – Thank you. Board, any questions?

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to approve the application. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you for joining the call, Mr. Chandler and best wishes to you.

Mr. Chandler – Thank you to the great Board. Thank you all. Have a great day.

8. Application(s) for Internship

A. Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum F

- (1) Funeral Director**
 - (a) Shaw, Diana E F524825**
- (2) Funeral Director and Embalmer**
 - (a) Holbrook, Lacey J F527702**
 - (b) Long, Caitlin A F199173**
 - (c) Padgett, Jared A F527758**
 - (d) Pasztor, Audrey M F524912**
 - (e) Perry, Dylan R F524826**
 - (f) Rymer, April F091790**

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item. Pursuant to Rule 69K–1.005, F. A. C., the Division has previously approved the applications listed on Addendum F.

- B. Application(s) to Renew Concurrent Internship**
 - (1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions**
 - (a) Clark, Amy F452079**

Ms. Simon – An application to renew the concurrent internship license was received on July 21, 2021. The Applicant has previously been licensed as a concurrent intern. The current license expired on July 27, 2021. Because the application was received timely, the Division is recommending approval without conditions. Is Ms. Clark on the call today? Hearing no response. Mr. Chairman?

Chair – Thank you. Board?

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to approve the application. Mr. Knopke seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

- 9. Application(s) for Monument Establishment Sales Agent**
 - A. Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum G**
 - (1) Wilkes, Brandon D F045338**

Ms. Simon – This is also an informational item. Pursuant to Section 497.554, Florida Statutes, this application has been approved.

- B. Recommended for Approval without Conditions (Criminal History)**
 - (1) Ramgadoo, Naiomi**

Ms. Simon – An application for a monument establishment sales agent license was received by the Division on May 5, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted and completed on July 28, 2021. In 2020, the applicant pled guilty to DUI and was sentenced to two (2) days incarceration, 363 days of probation, driving privileges revoked for 363 days, and fined \$966. The Division is recommending approval without conditions. Is this applicant on the call today? Ms. Ramgadoo? Hearing no response. Mr. Chairman?

Chair – Thank you. Board? I know you’ve had a chance to review this.

MOTION: Ms. Sanjena Clay moved to approve the application. Mr. Jay Lyons seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

- 10. Applications(s) for Registration as a Training Agency**
 - A. Information item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum H**
 - (1) Foundation Partners of Florida LLC d/b/a Loyless Funeral Home (F331136) (Land O’Lakes)**
 - (2) McKinnie Funeral Home (F039990) (Campbellton)**
 - (3) McKinnie Funeral Home (F041177) (Crestview)**
 - (4) Robert M Naugle Mortuaries Inc (F072788) (Jacksonville)**
 - (5) Paradise Memorial Funeral Home LLC (F053090) (Miami)**
 - (6) Patterson Cremation and Funeral Service Inc (F329657) (Jacksonville)**

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item where the Division has reviewed the applications listed on Addendum H and found them to be complete in that the applicants have met the requirements to be a training agency. Specifically, Item (5), Paradise Memorial Funeral Home, is not listed as having an FDIC. However, their FDIC has been named as Latonya Heard. Pursuant to Rules 69K-1.005, Florida Administrative Code, the Division has previously approved these applications.

- 11. Application(s) for Broker of Burial Rights**
 - A. Recommended for Approval without Conditions**
 - (1) Jay/Johnson Funeral Home LLC (Perrine)**

Ms. Simon – The application was received on June 21, 2021. The application was incomplete when received. The application was deemed complete on August 4, 2021. The Division is recommending approval without conditions. Is a representative of Jay/Johnson Funeral Home on the call today? Hearing no response. Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Clark moved to approve the application. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed with one (1) dissenting vote.

12. Application(s) for Funeral Establishment

A. Recommended for Approval *with* Conditions

(1) *Degusipe St Petersburg LLC d/b/a R Lee Williams & Son Funeral Home (St Petersburg)*

Ms. Simon – A change of ownership application for a funeral establishment was received by the Division on July 12, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted and deemed completed on August 11, 2021. The Funeral Director in Charge will be Richard Meagher (F046291). Applicant confirms that if there are currently any unfulfilled preneed contracts sold at these locations, the obligation to fulfill those preneed contracts will be assumed by the new owners. Contrary to the information in the application and document provided by the applicant, both the cremation and refrigeration will be provided by Director Services located in Saint Petersburg, which is within seventy-five (75) miles of this establishment. The Division is recommending approval subject to the following conditions:

- a) That the closing on the transaction to acquire ownership shall occur within 60 days of the date of this Board meeting.
- b) That the closing on the transaction shall be substantially on terms and conditions as represented to the Board at this Board meeting.
- c) That Applicant shall assure receipt by the Division within seventy-five (75) days of the Board meeting, of a letter signed by applicant or applicant's attorney, addressed to the Division, certifying that closing has occurred and stating the date of closing, and stating that closing occurred on terms and conditions not inconsistent with those as represented to the Board at this Board meeting, and providing a copy of the fully executed Bill of Sale, Asset Purchase Agreement, or other document by which the acquisition transaction is consummated, executed by all parties, and any and all amendments, schedules, and other attachments thereto, also fully executed.
- d) That the Director of the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services may extend any deadline set out in these conditions, by up to ninety (90) days, for good cause shown. The Director shall report any such extensions to the Board as an informational item.
- e) That all representations by the applicant in the application and related materials provided to the Board or FCCS Division by the applicant, in support of the application(s), are deemed material to the Board's action herein.
- f) That the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff.

Ms. Simon – Board members?

Mr. Knopke – Mr. Chair, a question?

Chair – Go right ahead,

Mr. Knopke – Ms. Simon, in the write up, you referred to preneed contracts sold at these locations. If my memory serves me well, there's only one (1) location that they're acquiring. Is that correct?

Ms. Simon – That's correct, sir.

Mr. Knopke – Ok. I just wanted to make sure.

Ms. Simon – Scribner's error.

Mr. Knopke – Scribner's error. Very good. Thank you.

Ms. Simon – I believe Ms. Wiener is representing the applicant.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the application subject to the conditions recommended by the Division. Mr. Knopke seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) Emmanuel Funeral Homes Inc (Tamarac)

Ms. Simon – An application for a funeral establishment was received by the Division on June 9, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted and deemed complete on July 21, 2021. The Funeral Director in Charge will be Fritz Duvigneaud (F023251). A background check of the principals revealed no criminal history for its principals. However, the establishment and its principals do have adverse licensing history, which is included. The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff. And this entity will now be using Valles Crematory as their cinerator facility, not Treasure Coast, and the documentation included with this application packet indicates that.

Mr. Knopke – Quick question. Has the fine been paid? It's Page 25 of the electronic version. It shows it's due. I don't see a date on it.

Ms. Simon – Yes, sir.

Mr. Knopke – It has been paid?

Ms. Simon – Yes, sir.

Mr. Knopke – Thank you very much.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff. Mr. Hall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Bryant – Excuse me, Ellie. This is LaTonya. I have a quick question DeGusipe. Was that approval with conditions or just an approval?

Mr. Hall – That was with conditions.

Ms. Bryant – Ok. Because Mr. Hall moved to approve, and Mr. Knopke seconded it, but nobody said with conditions. I'm just making sure for the record.

Mr. Knopke – My second was with conditions.

Ms. Bryant – Ok, thank you.

(3) NCS Marketing Services LLC d/b/a National Cremation Society (Naples)

Ms. Simon – An application for a funeral establishment was received by the Division on July 14, 2021. The application was complete when submitted. The Funeral Director in Charge will be Donald Politano (F042166). A background check of the principals revealed no criminal history. The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff. Ms. Coney is on the line representing NCS.

Chair – Ms. Coney?

Ms. Lisa Coney – Good morning. I did want to point out that there was a clerical error on the application.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Coney, do you swear to tell you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Ms. Coney – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

Ms. Coney – Good morning, Board. It's Lisa Coney, C O N E Y, like Coney Island. I did want to point out that there was an inadvertent clerical error in our application, on Page 6 of 24 in the Board packet. My brand-new administrative person clicked No to (3a), Embalming, and No to (4a), Cremation. Both of which we will be offering. That was just an inadvertent clerical error and the affiliated businesses that are going to provide those services for us were correctly identified in the application.

Chair – Those should be Yes? Both of those items?

Ms. Coney – Yes. National Cremation Service does in fact offer cremation.

Chair – And embalming.

Ms. Coney – I apologize for the inconvenience.

Chair – That's all right. Board?

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you, Ms. Coney.

Ms. Coney – Thank you, Board. Stay well.

13. Application(s) for Preneed Main License
A. Recommended for Approval *without* Conditions
(1) Coney Funeral Home Inc (F498153) (Lakeland)

Ms. Simon – The Department received an application for preneed main licensure on June 2, 2021. While it was incomplete at the time of submission, it was deemed complete on August 4, 2021. A completed background check of all principals was returned without criminal history. Applicant's qualifying funeral establishment license is located at the same address. If approved, this applicant will utilize insurance funded contracts. The Division is recommending approval without conditions.

Chair – I have a question. On the expense part of their document, starting on Page 18. There is no employee expense. Only Officer's Salary expense. I don't see any employee expense. Is there anyone here representing Coney Funeral Home? It's not a big deal, but it's just a mystery to me how you can operate and not have any employee expense.

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the application. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) Paradise Funeral Chapel LLC (F451486) (Miami)

Ms. Simon – The Department received an application for a preneed license on July 16, 2021, which was complete at the time of submission. If approved, this applicant will utilize FSI as their trusting agent. The Division is recommending approval without conditions.

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to approve the application. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

14. Application(s) for Removal Service
A. Recommended for Approval *with* Conditions
(1) C&R Services of NW FL LLC (Ponce De Leon)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response.

Latisha Carswell – It is. This is Latisha Carswell, with C&R Services of NW FL.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am. An application for a removal service license was received by the Division on July 9, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted, but deemed complete on July 27, 2021. A background check of the principals revealed no criminal history for any of its principals. The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the removal service passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff.

Chair – Ms. Carswell, did you want to address the Board?

Ms. Carswell – No, sir. I'll just answer any questions if you have any.

Chair – Board, any questions for Ms. Carswell? Ok.

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the removal service passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you for being on the call, Ms. Carswell, and best wishes to you.

Ms. Carswell – Thank you. I appreciate all your help.

(2) *Lawson Transportation Services LLC (Sanford)*

Ms. Simon – This application was received by the Division on July 19, 2021. It was incomplete at the time of submission, but was deemed completed on August 9, 2021. The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff. Is there a representative of Lawson Transportation Services on the call today?

Ms. Charonne Franisco – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am.

Chair – Did you want to address the Board or you're merely here to answer questions?

Ms. Franisco – Answer questions.

Chair – Thank you. Board?

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the removal service passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Congratulations, ma'am.

Ms. Franisco – Thank you very much.

(3) *Quality Removal Inc (Miami)*

Ms. Simon – This application was received by the Division on June 18, 2021, and was complete when submitted. Fingerprints have been returned with no criminal history as to the principals. The Division recommends approval subject to the conditions that the removal service passes an inspection by a member of Division staff, that the applicant be assessed a fine of \$1500, and that the applicant be placed on probation for one (1) year. Is there a representative of Quality Removal on the call today? Hearing no response.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to approve the application subject to the conditions that the removal service passes an inspection by a member of Division staff, that the applicant be assessed a fine of \$1500, and that the applicant be placed on probation for one (1) year. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Rachelle Munson – Just quickly. I don't know if I heard wrong, but the Division's recommendation was without conditions, although conditions were listed, but we approved with the conditions listed. I was just reading the summary sheet.

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Munson – Ok. Thanks.

15. Collective Application(s)

A. Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(1) Change of Ownership

(a) Northstar Funeral Services of Florida LLC (Miami)

- **Cinerator Facility**
- **Funeral Establishment**

Ms. Simon – NorthStar Funeral Services of Florida LLC, seeks approval of an application for funeral establishment licensure and an application for cinerator facility licensure based upon a change of ownership. More specifically, the entities that are being acquired is as follows:

- 1) Ferdinand Funeral Homes & Crematory, a licensed cinerator facility, license #F041668, physical address: 2546 SW 8th Street, Miami, FL 33135
- 2) Ferdinand Funeral Home, a licensed funeral establishment, license #F041670, physical address: 2546 SW 8th Street, Miami, FL 33135

Included in your Board package are the separate applications for the aforementioned properties. The principals of the corporation have submitted fingerprints which were returned without criminal history. Applicant confirms that if there are currently any unfulfilled preneed contracts sold at these locations, the obligation to fulfill those preneed contracts will be assumed by the new owners. The Division is recommending approval subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the closing on the transaction to acquire ownership shall occur within sixty (60) days of the date of this Board meeting.
- 2) That the closing on the transaction shall be substantially on terms and conditions as represented to the Board at this Board meeting.
- 3) That Applicant shall assure receipt by the Division within 75 days of the Board meeting, of a letter signed by applicant or applicant's attorney, addressed to the Division, certifying that closing has occurred and stating the date of closing, and stating that closing occurred on terms and conditions not inconsistent with those as represented to the Board at this Board meeting, and providing a copy of the fully Bill of Sale, Asset Purchase Agreement, or other document by which the acquisition transaction is consummated, executed by all parties, and any and all amendments, schedules, and other attachments thereto, also fully executed.
- 4) That the Director of the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services may extend any deadline set out in these conditions, by up to 90 days, for good cause shown. The Director shall report any such extensions to the Board as an informational item.
- 5) That all representations by the applicant in the application and related materials provided to the Board or FCCS Division by the applicant, in support of the application(s), are deemed material to the Board's action herein.
- 6) That the establishment(s) under the application(s) herein pass an onsite inspection by a member of Division Staff.
- 7) That the Applicant (new owner or controlling party) shall assume all existing preneed liabilities, (if any), of the location(s) being acquired.

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of Northstar Funeral Services of Florida LLC on this call today?

Ms. Wiener – Yes. Wendy Wiener representing the applicant.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Chair – Ms. Wiener, did you want to address the Board, or you're merely here to answer questions?

Ms. Wiener – The latter, sir.

Chair – Thank you. Board?

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the applications subject to the conditions recommended by the Division. Mr. Knopke seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

- (2) *New Application*
 - (a) *Ocala Funeral and Cremation Care LLC (Ocala)*
 - *Cinerator Facility*
 - *Funeral Establishment*

Ms. Simon – Ocala Funeral and Cremation Care LLC seeks approval of its applications for cinerator facility licensure and funeral establishment license. More specifically, the businesses are as follows:

- 1) Ocala Funeral and Cremation Care LLC, a cinerator facility license, physical address: 720 S Pine Ave, Ocala, FL 34471
- 2) Ocala Funeral and Cremation Care LLC, a funeral establishment license, physical address: 720 S Pine Ave, Ocala, FL 34471.

The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the establishments pass an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff. Is there a representative of this entity on the call today?

Ms. Wiener – I am. Wendy Wiener representing the applicant.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Chair – Ms. Simon? Was this a change of ownership?

Ms. Simon – No, sir.

Chair – Sorry?

Ms. Simon – No, sir. I don't believe so.

Chair – Ok. I thought that you mentioned that it was a change of ownership. Thank you.

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to approve the applications subject to the condition that the establishments pass an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

- (b) *Simple, Easy, Affordable Cremation Inc (Tampa)*
 - *Funeral Establishment*
 - *Preneed Main*

Ms. Simon – Simple, Easy, Affordable Cremation Inc seeks approval of its applications for funeral establishment and preneed main licensure. The entities are located in Tampa, FL. The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the establishments pass an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff. Is there a representative of, Simple, Easy, Affordable Cremation Inc. on the call today?

Ms. Wiener – Wendy Wiener, representing the applicant.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Chair – Ms. Wiener, did you want to address the Board, or you're merely here to answer questions?

Ms. Wiener – No, sir. Just to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair – Thank you.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to approve the applications subject to the condition that the establishments pass an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff. Mr. Knopke seconded the motion.

Ms. Wiener – Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question before you take a vote? Would you mind?

Chair – Please, do.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you. Included within your Board package is also a preneed contract that we submitted for approval. It is included in your Board package somewhere down in, I want to say, the twenties. They are the preneed contracts and the financial accommodation addendum that will be used by this applicant. Does the approval include approval for the use of those documents?

Chair – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Simon – If I may respond.

Ms. Munson – Please.

Ms. Simon – That is not an item that I believe was submitted to the Board for approval. However, the Board may consider taking that up. I am not certain. The motion and the second were not for the contract.

Chair – There's a motion and a second that does not include the agreement. Is it the Board's pleasure to include that in the motion and the second?

Ms. Clay – I have a question. Does that meet the qualifications required for this application, and was it received in a timely fashion?

Chair – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – The contract does not affect the condition or the vote that was taken to approve the applications for licensure. And the contract was submitted perhaps at the time that the original applications were submitted. However, it was not noted that that was for approval, but it is included in your Board package and it was submitted along with everything else.

Chair – Does it appear to be in order?

Ms. Simon – Sir, I'm not able to answer that at this time.

Ms. Munson – So, if I may, Chair Brandenburg?

Chair – Go right ahead.

Ms. Munson – So, the information that Attorney Wiener has just requested, whether or not it was included in your motion, the answer for the record would be no. However, the Board, for good cause shown, if you feel you've had the opportunity to fully review that information on its separate merits, you can possibly do so during this meeting. However, the Department may have just indicated that they did not present it for review, so their summary or presentation of it, in and of itself, may not be complete. So, to keep them separate is my recommendation. However, if you want to have a second motion on the materials

that's not specifically been presented, and the Department is comfortable with the packet as presented, then you can go ahead and vote on it. I would definitely recommend that the two (2) motions be kept separate.

Chair – Mr. Knopke?

Mr. Knopke – Question to Ms. Weiner. Obviously, it's in the package. Is there anything odd about the application that's different than what you would normally present or FSI would present with another buyer, or somebody new?

Ms. Wiener – No, not at all. The changes to this contract, this seller will not actually sell merchandise. They are selling a single cremation package, a direct cremation package that does not include merchandise. So, this is the Type 317 at FSI that has been previously approved, modified only to remove the references to items that would not be sold. The financial accommodations addendum that is presented is identical to that presented for numerous other applicants in the past that have been approved. So, no.

Mr. Knopke – Mr. Chair, can I ask a follow up, please?

Chair – Please do.

Mr. Knopke – Ms. Wiener, you're saying no merchandise. What about the cardboard container or rigid container that the remains would go in to be cremated? Is that in this or not?

Ms. Wiener – That will be included within the direct cremation package. There is no separate merchandise being sold.

Mr. Knopke – Ok.

Ms. Clay – Mr. Chair, may I call for the vote?

Chair – I'm calling on Rabbi Lyons. Rabbi Lyons? If you're speaking, we can't hear you. You had your hand up.

Ms. Munson – I think he hears us, but he's having some audio difficulties on his end.

Chair – Rabbi Lyons, put your hand up if you can hear me. Ok. We can't hear you. So, he wants us to disregard him trying to get our attention. So, is there going to be two (2) separate motions on this? Is that what you recommend, Ms. Munson?

Ms. Simon – Actually, if I may? There was already a motion and approval of the application. No, there was not, Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – There was a motion and a second, and then I interrupted, just to clarify, and I'm glad that I did. Thank you.

Ms. Simon – I apologize, Mr. Chairman.

Chair – There was a motion and a second. There was not a vote on the motion.

Ms. Clay – Mr. Chairman?

Chair – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – No, I was not commenting, sir.

Chair – Thank you. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a question for Ms. Munson. If I remember correctly, she recommended that we break these out into two (2) separate votes. Is that what the Department recommends, Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I'm not speaking on behalf of Department. It is my recommendation, as Board Counsel. So, the motion that you have on the table was just on the materials presented, although Attorney Wiener interjected to possibly make a friendly amendment to it, but the motion that was made was just on this and that's the vote that will be taken. If you want to give any additional consideration, I still suggest that it be under a second motion.

Chair – Ok. Mr. Knopke.

Mr. Knopke – I will withdraw my second then, because my second was based upon the entire package that was there. Because on the agenda it said funeral establishment and preneed main license. And that's what I read in the package. Now, if Ms. Clay wants to change her motion to include that, I will be happy to second again. We've had Ms. Wiener say it's the normal thing. It's nothing out of the ordinary other than what she noted and what the paperwork says. {inaudible} take a second and split it up. It doesn't matter. I mean, I think the agenda speaks to itself, as does the package.

Chair – Ms. Clay, do you want to amend your motion?

Ms. Clay – No, I'd like to call for the vote.

Mr. Knopke – I have withdrawn my second, Mr. Chair.

Chair – So, is there a second? Ms. Clay, I'm sorry. You said you withdraw?

Ms. Clay – I was calling for the vote.

Chair – You're calling for the vote?

Ms. Clay – The motion dies because of the lack of a second at this point.

Chair – Thank you.

Mr. Knopke – Mr. Chair.

Mr. Knopke – I'll make a motion to approve as presented in the package, as well as to the agenda that provides the license, funeral establishments and the preneed license with the representations that Ms. Wiener has made.

Mr. Hall – Second.

Ms. Wiener – Which would include the contracts.

Mr. Knopke – Which would include the contracts, yes, ma'am.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair.

Chair – Mr. Hall, do you understand that?

Mr. Hall – Yes?

Chair – Ok, we're about to vote.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair?

Chair – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes. Again, for Ms. Munson, and I know Ms. Munson and Ms. Wiener do this all the time. And I know it's presented as both in one packet. I'm just curious why Mr. Munson is recommending that we split this up when the agenda clearly states that they were together. So, I'm just curious about that. Is there something we're missing?

Ms. Munson – For clarification, I'm not necessarily saying there's anything that you're missing. It's just that, to Attorney Wiener's points, the preneed contracts themselves are usually independently an item for review. And this collective application that's been presented, if the Board feels that they well understand that this collective application includes the approval of those contracts, and you have thoroughly reviewed them on that basis, because I don't know if normally when you received this package, you would have reviewed it on that level. You may have reviewed it on a more surface level information regarding the parameters of the collective nature that the summary presents. If you identified and looked through the contract, and have no questions, and you feel that this is a holistic understanding, then by all means, you can make the motion and second it. Attorney Wiener's point was probably well taken, because it is not a normal occurrence for those contracts to be reviewed as a part of this. They are normally an independent item for review, and I wanted to make sure that the Board was clear about that. You're not in any jeopardy if you identify that you reviewed everything in that level of detail and you feel comfortable voting on it, to be all inclusive.

Chair – And Mr. Knopke has made the motion and it's been seconded.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Brandenburg.

Chair – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – I just have one follow up.

Mr. Knopke – Ms. Simon is trying to get your attention, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair, I have one follow up question for Ms. Wiener. When you normally submit these, would you normally submit these separate or together?

Ms. Wiener – You know, unfortunately, it's treated somewhat inconsistently over the course of years. We actually submitted the contracts separately, but to go alongside the application. So, we intended that they would be reviewed and approved along with these applications. It just occurred to me when Ms. Simon was reading out the Board package that there hadn't been a specific reference to the contract. So, I was simply trying to clarify that when the Board had reviewed the package that they had included that, which has been the case in the past. But, as Ms. Munson says, sometimes they also get pulled out and put it on a separate item or included as a separate item. So, the inconsistency in the past is what caused me to simply make reference. What I don't want to have happen is some months in the future when the inspector shows up at this location and says, you know, "Where's your stamped approved contracts?", and it turns out that I didn't pay attention to that.

Chair – Ok.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

Chair – Mr. Knopke has made the motion to approve and Mr. Hall seconded it.

Mr. Knopke – Ms. Simon has a question.

Chair – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Yes, sir. As has all been stated, this was not a contract we submitted to the Board for approval. It is fine to continue with that. I'd recommend you do, but I would also recommend that there be a caveat or condition that the contract be approved upon review by the Division and that the Division have the standard two (2) full-sized copies within sixty (60) days.

Chair – Will that be part of your motion, Mr. Knopke?

Mr. Knopke – Yes, sir. It sure will be.

Chair – Mr. Hall, part of your second, sir?

Mr. Hall – Yes, sir.

Chair – And all those in favor, aye?

Board members – Aye.

Chair – And any opposed? And that motion carries. Thank you.

16. Contract(s) or Other Related Form(s)

A. Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(1) Request(s) for Transfer of Trust

(a) FPG Florida LLC d/b/a Farley Funeral Home and Venice Memorial Gardens (F060727) (Bellevue)

Ms. Simon – FPG seeks approval of the below proposed trust asset transfer. As background information, on June 24, 2021, the Board approved acquisitions by FPG of control of a cemetery company, three (3) funeral establishments and a cinerator facility all related to Venice Memorial Gardens, Inc and Farley Funeral Homes Inc, as well as the licensing of those locations as preneed branches under FPG’s main license (F060727). FPG acquired all the assets and liabilities for the funeral and preneed for these locations.

FPG now seeks approval of the transfer of the following: the FSI 1993 Master Trust Agreement, the FSI Master Pre-Construction Trust Agreement, and the FSI Care & Maintenance Master Trust Agreement, under Argent Trust Company to the FPG Florida, LLC Preneed Funeral and Cemetery Merchandise and Services Agreement, the FPG Florida, LLC Master Pre-Construction Trust Agreement, and the FPG Florida, LLC Cemetery Care and Maintenance Trust Agreement, under Regions Bank (Regions). If approved, Regions is or will be trustee. The Division recommends approval of the proposed trust transfers as identified above, subject to the conditions:

- 1) That the representations of FPG, as set forth in Representative's letter dated August 3, 2021 be deemed material to the Board's decisions herein.
- 2) That within 90 days of this Board Meeting Regions provide the FCCS Division (ATTN: LaShonda Morris), the effective date of the transfer and certifications including the following:
 - ⊙ A letter signed and dated by one of its officers, certifying that it meets one or more of the applicable criteria in s. 497.266(1), and s. 497.458(1(b), to act as trustee of the trust to be transferred pursuant to Representative’s letter dated August 3, 2021.
 - ⊙ A letter signed and dated by one of its officers, certifying the dollar amount of trust assets being transferred to the trust as identified in Representative’s attached letter dated August 3, 2021.
 - ⊙ Acknowledgement of receipt of the amount of trust assets being transferred as specified under the former trust, as identified in Representative’s attached letter dated August 3, 2021.
- 3) That the Board's executive director, for good cause shown, may extend the compliance time frame for the above specified conditions, an additional 90 days.

Mr. Clark – Mr. Chairman?

Chair – Mr. Clark, were you're trying to get my attention?

Mr. Clark – Yes, sir. May I proceed.

Chair – Go right ahead.

Mr. Clark – I just wanted to state for the record my affiliation with FPG of Florida, so I'll recuse myself from this matter.

Chair – Thank you. Is there anyone else? Is this represented by Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – I represent Foundation Partners Group. Yes, sir.

Chair – My question is, regarding the proposed trust asset transfer, what is the amount of that transfer?

Ms. Wiener – Well, now that I could not necessarily tell you unless it's included in the application, which I don't think that it was. I will tell you that this is normal course of business. When FPG acquires locations, they move their funds from the various trusts in which they are located into their own master trust at Regions. I couldn't tell you the amount right this moment, sir.

Chair – I understand. So, Board?

MOTION: Mr. Hall moved to approve the agreement subject to the conditions recommended by the Division. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Hall – Question from Mr. Knopke.

Chair – Mr. Knopke?

Mr. Knopke – Mr. Chair, before we end today, it doesn't have to be right here, I would like to go back to Item #11, Application for Burial Rights Broker. I've got a couple of questions that I started to ask, but then I didn't. Now the more I thought about it, I want to, but let's continue. And just before we adjourn or something.

Chair – I would prefer to go back to it now.

Mr. Knopke – Ok, that's fine. I appreciate it very much.

Chair – Let's go back to Item #11, Broker of Burial Rights.

11. Application(s) for Broker of Burial Rights
A. Recommended for Approval without Conditions
(1) Jay/Johnson Funeral Home LLC (Perrine)

Mr. Knopke – Let me get that back up myself. So, the question I got is on the application. It says, Jay/Johnson Funeral Home, LLC. Is the funeral home approved to be the broker, or is it a person named Jay? And I assume it may be Jay Johnson, but I'm not sure. Are they approved to be a broker? I don't recall ever licensing a firm to be a broker or anything other than a funeral home or cemetery, but an individual? It just confused me, the more I thought about it. And if we need a motion to recall it for discussion, I'm happy to make the motion.

Chair – I understand what you're saying. Normally we don't see funeral establishments applying for it, because they're already exempt from the brokers.

Mr. Knopke – Exactly.

Chair – But they chose to do this and be a broker of burial rights.

Mr. Knopke – Is the funeral home the broker? And does that mean everybody in the funeral home that works there becomes a broker underneath the broker license? Or did they get individually licensed as agents for the broker? I'm just curious how this works, because this is a little bit of new territory, at least in my mind.

Chair – It lists the broker. The name on the application is Jay Johnson Funeral Home, LLC.

Mr. Knopke – But look at the application, Mr. Chairman. It says, Jay/Johnson. That to me is two (2) different things, unless his middle name is slash.

Chair – That's the write up. You're looking at the write up?

Mr. Knopke – I'm looking at the write up, as it's presented, the coversheet. Put it that way.

Chair – Right. But the actual application lists Jay Johnson Funeral Home LLC.

Mr. Knopke – Ok, then I still ask the question. Why is the funeral home getting licensed as a broker? I mean, I would have thought. Well, maybe I'm assuming something here. I don't know. It's just confusing.

Ms. Coney – May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chair – Please, Ms. Coney.

Ms. Coney – Is Jay Johnson Funeral Home even a funeral home, because I don't find them as a funeral home at all on the licensee search? Perhaps there's an application pending. Based on the materials that are in your package, it appears that the principal of that DBA is a licensed funeral director and embalmer, but there's no other reference to that funeral home name that I can find.

Ms. Jasmin Richardson – This is Jasmin Richardson. They are a funeral establishment. It is listed a little differently in our system. So, it's Jay-Johnson Funeral Home. However, I will say that upon doing a search, there are several different establishments that have a broker of burial rights license. So, it's not unusual to have an establishment name listed and not an individual, as a broker of burial rights. So, I am not sure if there's a rhyme or reason, but there are establishments, just to let you know, that are listed as brokers of burial rights.

Chair – Thank you for that information. That is very germane to the issue. Any other discussion on this? Ms. Simon, next issue, please.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair?

Mr. Knopke – You got Mr. Jensen.

Chair – I'm Sorry. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Thank you, Chair. Just a quick question here and maybe Ms. Simon can help me with this. I'm sort of the same thought as Mr. Knopke. When I first saw this thought why is a funeral home getting licensed as a broker of burial rights. So, basically what I just heard said was, if a funeral home wants to get that license, they can, but they are not required to. Is that the gist of what I'm hearing? I think that was Jasmin that said that.

Chair – I believe your answer is yes. They can if they want to.

Mr. Jensen – Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair – Ok.

Ms. Simon – May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

Chair – Go right ahead.

17. **Related Items**

A. ***Recommended for Approval with Conditions***

(1) ***Application(s) for Monument Establishment Retailer***

(a) ***Tijuana D Williams d/b/a T's Expert Cleaning & Monument Service (Sanford) (Retailer)***

Ms. Simon – An application for monument establishment retail licensure was submitted on May 17, 2021. The application was incomplete when submitted, but was deemed complete on August 19, 2021. A completed background check revealed no criminal history for its listed principal. If approved, applicant will operate as a monument establishment retailer at the Sanford address. The Division is recommending approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the applications subject to the condition that the establishment passes an onsite inspection by a member of Division staff. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) Monument Retail Sales Agreement(s)
(a) Tijuana D Williams d/b/a T's Expert Cleaning & Monument Service (Sanford) (Sales Agreement)

Ms. Simon – As a related item, Tijuana D. Williams d/b/a T's Expert Cleaning/Monuments submits a monument retail sales agreement for approval. If the form is approved, it will be used for the sale of monuments through its monument retailer establishment license previously approved. The Division recommends approval with the condition that two (2) full sized print-ready copies of the contract are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of this Board meeting.

Chair – Rabbi Lyons, have you had an opportunity to review this monument sales agreement, and does it meet all the requirements that you're aware of? Rabbi Lyons?

Rabbi Lyons – Yes. I rejoined. Can you hear me?

Chair – Yes.

Rabbi Lyons – Wonderful. Ok. I apologize, sir. I did not, but give me a quick moment and I will do it.

Chair – You did receive it in your Board package, correct?

Rabbi Lyons – I believe I did. Yes. This is the standard at-need contract. It's an Excel doc that you get from the Department, if you ask nicely. And they just copied and pasted it, and changed the name at the top.

Chair – Thank you very much. Board, is there a motion?

MOTION: Rabbi Lyons moved to approve the agreement subject to the condition that two (2) full sized print-ready copies are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of this Board meeting. Mr. Hall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

18. Executive Director's Report
A. Operational Report (Verbal)

Ms. Simon – At this point, I will turn the meeting over to our Director, Mary Schwantes.

Ms. Schwantes – If I may, Mr. Chair?

Chair – Go right ahead, please ma'am.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Good morning, Board members. As you know, the Board has five (5) positions with terms expiring on September 30, 2021. We opened the application process for these five (5) positions in early August. Within approximately a three-week application period, ending on August 27th, which was last Friday, we received only a few applications. Much, much fewer than the twenty-six (26), which we received in the 2019 application process. On Monday morning, we received requests from several licensees and one (1) of the associations to re-open the application period to allow more time for those interested to apply. The primary reason given for these requests is the increasing workload, which the recent COVID deaths have put on our licensees. So, taking this and other factors into consideration, it was decided to re-open the application period. The new deadline for receipt of applications is close of business on Thursday, September 30, 2021. The

Division's website will be updated with this information today. The rest of the directions for filing an application remain the same. Also, those who have already applied do not need to re-apply. Their applications will remain in the application pool for the CFO's consideration. This is just to allow more time, particularly given the current COVID situation that we know our licensees are going through. We want to particularly thank all of those who've already applied, and, of course, encourage any who are interested in getting those applications in by the new deadline of September 30th. And, as always, if there are any questions in the application process, please contact LaTonya Bryant or me. Does anyone have any questions? Ok, moving on.

As a result of the COVID death increases, we have received numerous reports of problems with hospital and medical examiner morgues exceeding capacity, and similar problems faced by our licensees. I share all information that is received by me or by our Division on these problems with the Emergency Operations Center for the State. And I know that the Department of Health and AHCA representatives are taking these matters very seriously, and trying all they can to be of assistance. At this time, our licensees are strongly encouraged to keep working with their local emergency management teams on these issues and, of course, their local government representatives. We know that this process can be difficult for our licensees, but it is the best way to coordinate these issues. And also, of course, when possible, we encourage our licensees in the more heavily impacted areas to obtain their own refrigeration trucks for excess storage of remains when they're having problems situations. I have heard that the trucks are becoming difficult to obtain again. And so, we have obtained a list of vendors for the trucks. I'd be happy to provide that list to licensees, if that is of any help to anyone on the phone, any Board members. If you need any of that kind of assistance, please give me a call directly and I'll be happy to get you that list and do whatever else we can to assist. At this time, I do want to point out that we work very closely, both through the EOC, and also separately with Department of Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics. And so, I would like to ask Mr. Jones if he has any updates on any of these related issues that he wants to provide Board.

Mr. Jones – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Couple of things to address. I'll address Mr. Hall's question. When we started, as far as FEMA, we had sent out some directives on April 9th. We sent it to both associations and we sent it to the County Health Departments, our Chief Deputy Registrars, on how directors could help their clients apply for death records, if one, they're family or two, if they're not. We will get that information back out again if it's needed. But what we ask for is when the applicant applies, they get an e-mail back from FEMA stating that they've applied. It gives them an account number. With that account number is the receipt from the funeral establishment showing that that applicant paid for the services. The funeral director can submit it, or they can submit it to the County Health Department to obtain a copy of the death record. So, I will get more information back out on that if it needs to be. And if there's any questions, let me know. We're trying to make it easy, but also to make sure that there's tangible interest, as cause of death is confidential, and being able to help the constituents there. There was also questions on last week and the week before of some system slowdowns. I wanted to address that. We were having several people call us and working through our Helpdesk, issues of logging into our Electronic Death Registration System. We worked with our IT. We work with the Department Digital Center and were able to resolve those issues. We had some Citrix login issues that we were working with the vendor on, and those issues were resolved Friday. We've been monitoring those. We've seen no increase in slowdowns since Friday. We've also made some other changes and added some other hardware that will hopefully keep this from happening in the future. If you or anyone is seeing any slowdowns in that after Friday, please let us know. Call the Helpdesk. We'll be looking at that. We're monitoring that during the day and have been since Friday. I just wanted to give an update there. We apologize for any inconvenience or frustration, but hopefully that now is not an issue. Other than that, Ms. Schwantes, do we want to address the Bodies Handled Reports?

Ms. Schwantes – We can. We are in the process of finalizing instructions. My understanding is that we needed to delay the actual implementation for a brief period of time further because of the system issues that Mr. Jones just referred to. But as soon as some of this settles down, I think {inaudible}.

Mr. Jones – And I can address that, because we were looking at September 1st. With the issues we were having last week, Ms. Schwantes, Ms. Simon and I have discussed it and decided we would wait for the online implementation of the Bodies Handled Reports to October 1st to make sure. And we decided that early last Friday, as we were still working on our system to make sure that everything was working smoothly. We did not want to throw further frustration on the funeral industry. We were able, like I said, to get our system back stable. It is performing well. And so, with that, I think our new date is October 1st for that to go live and be able to use the Electronic Death Registration System for the Bodies Handled Reports. We just wanted to make sure there were no slowdowns or frustrations. Any comments?

Chair – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I'm sorry. Ms. Schwantes has a response to that.

Ms. Schwantes – I just was going to say that that is certainly our goal for October 1st as well. We hope that it will go smoothly from here until then, and that we can go live. And I saw that Mr. Jensen did have a question.

Chair – I was calling on Mr. Jensen.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir.

Mr. Jensen – Thank you, Mr. Chair. A question for Mr. Jones. So, the issues that we ran into last week, with the EDRS system coming up for an hour, and going off for a couple hours, that's all been resolved now?

Mr. Jones – That has, and, again, that was an issue of our Citrix login. We work with Citrix itself. They worked with us to get those resolved. It was also a server that we had that was causing some issues. That Server was pulled. Two (2) new servers were set up. Unfortunately, to set a server up and to get it back in service, configured, and operational is a couple of a process. We were able to do that last week and finalized it on Friday. And just to let you know, we were running five (5) servers the week before. The EDRS system now has seven (7) servers and I am adding another one (1) next week as kind of an overflow, just to make sure that, you know, it spreads users out. And what happens when a server goes down, you have so many users on a server, and at that point, unfortunately, people start getting knocked off or they can't login. There's too many people on it. So, we've gone back and rectified that and I'm adding an additional one (1) in case there are any issues. You should not see a difference. That just goes back to the IT side of it. So, we apologize, but the Citrix started it and then we went from there. But, if you see those again, let us know. But we have not seen that since lunchtime Friday, once we get the new server.

Mr. Jensen – And thank you, Mr. Jones, you and your staff, for keeping everything up to date and moving us along in this process. I know it's been tough, especially on the funeral industry the last couple weeks. So, thank you.

Mr. Jones – You're welcome, thank you all. And again, we apologize for the inconvenience.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, Mr. Jones. I do want to clarify one thing regarding Bodies Handled Reports. As we talked about at the last Board meeting, they will not be completely replaced by the EDRS or the use of the EDRS system, because there are some licenses who just cannot log into the EDRS system, and that's not changing. But, they will significantly reduce the double entry time and such that our licensees are having to experience in now maintaining both EDRS and a paper form. So, we will have more instructions about that and plan to discuss that, again, at the October Board meeting as well. And, again, thank you, Mr. Jones, for that.

There's one other thing that I wanted to bring up during the Operational Report, and that has to do with rulemaking. I know that the Rules Report is coming up on the agenda soon. So, each year around this time, agencies and Boards are requested to submit a plan regarding their anticipated rulemaking efforts over the next year. I just wanted to give kudos and a huge, huge thanks to our Assistant Director, Ellen Simon, to James Ross, and our other Department attorneys who work on rule issues, and of course, to Board Counsel, Rachelle Munson, for their efforts on these matters. Although Board members and the public don't often see it, there's a tremendous amount of background work and coordination efforts, particularly when you're working with both an agency and a Board on these matters. And, of course, that goes all throughout the year, but they do an incredible job, and I just want to personally thank them. So, our next Board meeting is a videoconference meeting on Thursday, October 7th. And that ends the Operational Report for this month. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair – Thank you. Ms. Simon?

B. Report: Payment of Disciplinary Fines and Costs (Informational)

Ms. Simon – This is informational only.

Monthly Report of Fines and Costs Assessed and Paid
 Division of Funeral, Cemetery and Consumer Services
 Date of Board meeting: September 2, 2021
 Date report was prepared: August 20, 2021

Licensee	Board Meeting	Case No.	Total Fine & Cost Due	Date Due	Paid in Full?	Comments
Peavy Funeral Home	8/5/2021	280003-21-FC				
Elliot Maurice Graham	8/5/2021	280740-21-FC	\$4,000			
Morris Funeral Chapel	8/5/2021	278436-21-FC	\$250	9/13/2021		
Marion Graham Mortuary	8/5/2021	265816-20-FC	\$2,000			
Marion Graham Mortuary	8/5/2021	278140-21-FC	\$1,000			
Jackson-McMurray Funeral Services	7/13/2021	280012-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
Jamoll L. Thomas d/b/a Exodus Removal Service:	7/13/2021	243526-19-FC	\$300	8/30/2021	Paid in Full	
Harry T. Reid Funeral Home	7/13/2021	279999-21-FC	\$450	8/30/2021	Full	
James Reid	7/13/2021	280406-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021	Full	
Blackburn-Curry Funeral & Cremation, LLC	7/13/2021	278563-21-FC	\$500	8/30/2021		
Dade & Broward Coaching Service, Inc	7/13/2021	277101-21-FC	\$500	8/30/2021	Full	
Rahming-Poitier Funeral Directors Corp	7/13/2021	265828-20-FC	\$25,000	20-Sep-21		
Joseph Sanitago	7/13/2021	185639-16-FC	\$1,300			
Hubbell Funeral Home	24-Jun-21	276846-21-FC	\$250	9/13/2021		
Jerry Evans Funeral Home	24-Jun-21	280015-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
Phillips Mortuary	24-Jun-21	243521-19-FC	\$300	9/6/2021		
Shane Obert Funeral Home, Inc.:	24-Jun-21	279998-21-FC	\$250	9/6/2021	Full	
Archer Funeral Home, Inc.:	24-Jun-21	278186-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
CL Page Mortuary d/b/a CL Page Funer	24-Jun-21	278183-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
Gause Funeral Home, Inc.	24-Jun-21	278141-21-FC	\$250	9/6/2021	Full	
Metro Crematory Inc.	24-Jun-21	278434-21-FC	\$250	9/6/2021		
Charles Segal	24-Jun-21	229744-18-FC	\$1,500	9/8/2021	Full	
Bay Area Family Funeral Services, Inc.	24-Jun-21	277011-21-FC	\$1,750	9/6/2021	Full	
JMR Service Group, LLC	24-Jun-21	281351-21-FC	\$250	9/6/2021	Full	
Joseph Pinello	24-Jun-21	277027-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
Pinello Funeral Home, Inc.	24-Jun-21	277027-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
Nathan Woody	24-Jun-21	269812-20-FC	\$1,000	8/30/2021		
Woody's Funeral Home	24-Jun-21	269814-20-FC	\$1,000	8/30/2021		
Alphonso West Mortuary	24-Jun-21	278181-21-FC	\$2,000	8/30/2021		
Mid-Florida Crematory	24-Jun-21	278190-21-FC	\$250	8/30/2021		
Apyre National Cremation Services, Inc	6-May-21		\$500	7/12/2021	Full	
Demarien Hawk	5/6/2021	257472-20-FC	\$1,250	7/12/2021	Full	
Ivey Funeral Home	5/6/2021	257469-20-FC	\$1,750	7/12/2021	Full	
Keith Kronish	5/6/2021	268812-20-FC	\$1,000	7/12/2021	Full	
Marie Decker	5/6/2021	243582-19-FC	\$2,250	11/22/2021		
Elliot Maurice Graham	5/6/2021	265818-20-FC	\$2,000	7/12/2021		Sent to OGC
Island Bird	5/6/2021	277099-21-FC	\$250	7/12/2021	Full	
Richard A. Kurtz	4/1/2021	258539-20-FC	\$3,000	5/24/2021	Full	
Roy Mizell and Kurtz Funeral Home, Inc	4/1/2021	258536-20-FC	\$3,000	5/17/2021	Paid in Full	
Merritt Funeral Home, Inc.	5/6/2021	277439-21-FC	\$250	7/12/2021	Full	
Capital Transport Services LLC	3/4/2021		\$1,500	6/30/2021		
Jessica Ingram	3/4/2021	270823-20-FC	\$1,500	4/22/2021	Yes	
Debra Lynn Parrish	3/4/2021	257475-20-FC	\$1,000	4/22/2021	Yes	
Dees-Parrish Family Funeral Home	3/4/2021	257474-20-FC	\$1,000	4/22/2021	Yes	
Richard L. Macon Funeral Home, Inc. d/b/a Freeman Funeral Home	3-Dec-20	243147-19-FC	\$300	18-Jan-21		Sent to the OGC
Marc Brooks	1-Oct-20	255318-19-FC	\$4,000	15-Nov-20		SEND TO OGC

8-20-2021

19. Chairman's Report (Verbal)

Chair – I'd like to recognize Darrin Williams' mother's passing away, and certainly I'd love to see the Board's thoughts go out to Darrin and his family. On a personal note, I have met Mrs. Williams and been around her, and she was a gracious, loving lady that was very spiritual, very religious, and so, so proud of her son, Darrin Williams and all that he's accomplished. So, it's a rather large family and extended family members and church family members. So, I just wanted to acknowledge that they're in our thoughts and prayers. Thank you.

Within the next week or so, I will be appointing a new member to the Continuing Education Committee. So, I wanted you to know that. Other than that, do you have any questions of me?

20. Office of Attorney General's Report

A. Attorney General's Rules Report (Informational)

Chair – Ok. Can we go to Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Thank you, Chair. Of course, I'll be brief. I wanted to just do a quick follow up to Director Schwantes' comments regarding the Annual Regulatory Plan and also thank staff and especially Chair Brandenburg for his review of the documentation and the information presented on the plan. I will note that the plan is not included in this report, but it will be included in the October information for the full Board's review and ratification. It has been reviewed by the Department, and has been approved by the Chair. The requirements and procedures also mandate that the full Board have an opportunity, of course, to see it and provide its ratification. So that is forthcoming at the next meeting.

**BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES RULES REPORT
SEPTEMBER 2021**

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date Rule Language Approved by Board	Date Sent to OFARR	Rule Development Published	Notice Published	Adopted	Effective
69K-5.0024	Remittances to the Regulatory Trust Fund		08/11/21	08/19/21			
69K-10.001	Preneed Funeral Contract Consumer Protection Trust Fund		08/11/21	08/19/21			
69K-10.003	Remittances to the Preneed Funeral Contract Consumer Protection Trust Fund						
69K-17.0041	Continuing Education Provider Requirements		08/11/21	08/19/21			
69K-17.0042	Approval of Continuing Education Courses						
69K-21.008	Notification of Change in Funeral Director in Charge		08/11/21	08/19/21			
69K-21.009	Disinterment Reporting						

Ms. Munson – Regarding the Rules Report that you see listed, there are several rules that the Board, pursuant to the Department's recommendation, voted to open at its June meeting. I think this was supposed to be made available for review at the previous meeting. I've had multiple conversations with staff. And during some of those discussions, I have also discovered that it's been brought to my attention that the Department is also working on the very same rules. So, to avoid any conflict or duplicity, I would like to recommend to the Board, with the Department's oversight and approval, that the rules that we previously recommended that they be open for development, which you now see on your Rules Report for September, that they are removed from the Rules Report and we will allow the Department to proceed with its rulemaking. They primarily consist of forms, updates, and information to the Department's website. And the Department will take the lead on that, because they are responsible for all, if not most of the forms. So, to avoid any confusion or duplicity, I'd just like to note or recommend to the Board that we withdraw our consideration for this time, remove them from consideration from our table, and let them remain properly situated, I guess, with the Department's rulemaking requirements. I will also add, just for complete disclosure, that I think that because we opened them for development, we may have received from my understanding, from the Department, a request for, perhaps a rules' review or workshop by a member of the public or a stakeholder. If the Board is in agreement that we just withdraw our consideration, we will not be moving forward with that. If the Department continues to open it up and place the rules in a technical open for rule development posture, then of course those rule workshops can still take place. It would just be under the Department's oversight and the Department's purview.

So, that's kind of a lot of information. Some of its technical, but I want to keep the Board up to speed and keep you looped in as to everything that's going on regarding rulemaking, as you see indicated on the Rules Report. So, having said all of that, I will now ask the Board if you would consider identifying the rules on the Rules Report and withdraw any future consideration until the Department, meaning Ms. Simon and Ms. Schwantes, gives the Board additional direction as to how they feel we should proceed with it, since the Department is independently doing its own thing.

MOTION: Chair moved to withdraw any future consideration of the rules identified on the Rules Report, until the Board receives additional direction from the Department on how to proceed. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Munson – Thank you, Chair Brandenburg. What you will notice, on the October Rules Report, is that these rules will no longer be listed. They will, however, be listed in the Florida Administrative Register, simply because rules, once opened for development, are open for development for up to one (1) year. So, if the Board so chooses to revisit this, they will already be in an open for development status. We've not produced any language, so there's nothing else we need to do, but they're just going to kind of fall off the books if we don't do anything over the next twelve (12) months, with the information. So, just for clarity purposes, if we see it. I have some Board members who take a little more curiosity in what's really out there, so if you see these rules still listed, it's only because they were technically open, and they're just going to fall off as time passes. But there's nothing that we can do, other than that. We can't necessarily withdraw them, because there's no language that's been presented for us to withdraw. So, that's just another technical clarification. We should see some activity, based on my understanding from the Office of General Counsel, with Mr. Ross. So, there will be some language presented. It will be presented by the Department.

B. Rule 69K-12.011, Florida Administrative Code

Ms. Munson – The other item under the Attorney General's Report is the request for the Board to consider to open officially, for development, with language included, for Rule 69K- 12.011, Florida Administrative Code. And you can see that the language indicated is just an initial draft of what the Department and I have come up with:

69K-12.011 Annual Inspection Fees for Monument Builders.

Each monument builder shall pay an annual inspection fee of \$225 that is payable upon application for licensure and upon each renewal of such license.

Rulemaking Authority 497.103(1)(bb), (5)(a), 497.553(1) FS. Law Implemented 497.103(1)(bb), 497.553(1) FS. History—New 5-16-07, Amended 5-19-09.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES:

The rule currently reads as follows:

69K-12.011 Annual Inspection Fees for Monument Builders.

Each monument builder shall pay an annual inspection fee of \$225 that is payable upon application for licensure and upon each renewal of such license.

Rulemaking Authority 497.103(1)(bb), (5)(a), 497.553(1) FS. Law Implemented 497.103(1)(bb), 497.553(1) FS. History—New 5-16-07, Amended 5-19-09.

The proposed changes are:

69K-12.011 Annual Inspection Fees for Monument ~~Builders~~ Establishments.

Each monument ~~builder~~ establishment shall pay an annual inspection fee of \$225 that is payable upon application for licensure, November 1, 2021 for those licensed between July 1, 2021 and October 31, 2021, and upon each renewal of such license.

Rulemaking Authority 497.103(1)(bb), ~~(5)(a)~~, 497.553(1) FS. Law Implemented 497.103(1)(bb), 497.553(1), 497.550 FS. History—New 5-16-07, Amended 5-19-09.

Ms. Munson – It is led by the Department, and I will tell you that this rulemaking is considered mandatory rulemaking, because during the previous legislative session, as previously reported by Ms. Schwantes, there was a change to statutes s. 497.550, Florida Statutes, and I can allow Ms. Simon to provide a little more background on that, just for clarification purposes, to explain the purpose for the recommended changes to the rule. If you would, Ms. Simon.

Ms. Simon – As the Board is aware, during the 2021 legislative session, the background was that monument retailers never were to be inspected, based on the way the legislation read before this year. However, the 2021 legislative session now requires that monument retailers be inspected, and pay that inspection fee of \$225 per year, or \$450 on the biennial cycle, which is how they are licensed. And it's already in statute, so it's already required of our monument retailers that they will need to pay the \$225 or the \$450 for the next two (2) years, for a monument inspection. However, the rules currently state that they do not need to be inspected, only builders do, and we need to change that.

Chair – Mr. Knopke?

Mr. Knopke – Ms. Simon, just so I understand. So, every monument builder, or establishment, or whatever, out there now, will be inspected going forward and paying the fee?

Ms. Simon – Yes, sir.

Mr. Knopke – Cool.

Chair – Is that your motion, Mr. Knopke?

MOTION: Mr. Knopke moved to reopen Rule 69K- 12.011, Florida Administrative Code. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion.

Chair – Rabbi Lyons?

Rabbi Lyons – I just had a comment before we vote. Is that ok, Mr. Chair?

Chair – Go right ahead.

Rabbi Lyons – Ok, thank you. So, from my understanding, and I might have the specifics wrong a little bit, but there's something like four (4) establishments, 4 or 5 that are licensed as monument builders, and the rest of them in this state, like the other 85 or something like that, are licensed as monument establishment. So, that might have been part of the intent here, that there's some regulation over the majority of the industry. There happens to be that there's (inaudible) that I have on the Board, which I am very grateful to have, is limited to a monument builder. And that doesn't necessarily represent the industry all that well, as far as who's available to apply for the position. So, once we're making another change, which puts a monument establishment and monument builder closer to each other, which is a good change to make, and I intend to vote for it in a moment. Just maybe recommended in whatever legislative workshop, or rule session, or just in general to put it out there for the Board that the position on the Board will be opened to the entire monument industry. Thank you.

Chair – Thank you. So, Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Yes, sir. Before we take the vote, just so the Board is aware, there are approximately sixty-six (66) monument retailer establishments and there are approximately eight (8) monument builder establishments. And, Mr. Chairman, I assume that this motion is to open Rule 69K-12.011? I just wanted to confirm that.

Mr. Knopke – Yes, it is, Ms. Simon. Thank you.

Ms. Munson – Having said that, if so we can do maybe in one clean sweep. When we move to open it, I want to make sure that we understand the language. There's been a small modification to the language, printed in your materials, to the language that is actually being recommended. Just, and I think it's been tweaked for clarity, so if you would indulge me, Board, to just read the update. The new language that's being presented is, we originally said "as of", but it's going to be printed, I believe, properly as effective July 1, 2021, which is the date the statute became effective, each monument establishment shall pay an

annual inspection fee of \$225 that is payable upon application for licensure, and upon each renewal of such license. The rulemaking information that you see remains the same.

Chair – Thank you. So, we have a motion and a second, and all those in favor, aye?

Board members – Aye.

Chair – And any opposed? That motion carries. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Yes, sir. I think it may be appropriate to have a second vote on the approval of the language in the amended rule.

Ms. Munson – Well, hopefully that vote, as I read it, was pertaining to the amended language. That was my understanding.

Ms. Simon – It was to open up the rule for rulemaking. It was not the approval of the language, as indicated.

Ms. Munson – That's fine. It can be all one (1) motion. It doesn't have to be two (2) separate. But if you'd like to do them separately, you may.

MOTION: Rabbi Lyons moved to approve the amended language. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Simon – Next item, I'm sorry. Is that the end of the Rules Report?

Ms. Munson – No. Whenever we open a rule up for development and we have language that's being presented, I do have to ask the SERC question. So, indulge me with the statutory requirement, and the questions are: Will the proposed rule amendment have an adverse impact on small business or be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate, in Florida, within one (1) year after the implementation of the rule? It does not appear on its face that it does, but it's for the Board's consideration?

Chair – It does not. The answer to all the questions is no. Do you need a vote on that?

Ms. Munson – Of course I need a vote. There are two (2) more questions. I can do them all at one time, if you prefer.

Chair – Let's do them all at one time.

Ms. Munson – Should a violation of this rule or any part of this rule be designated a minor violation? On its face, it does not appear that it would. And does the Board feel that this rule would require a sunset provision or a date for the retirement of this language? And it does not appear to be applicable. So, if the answer is in the negative to each of those three (3), the Board may so indicate and vote collectively.

MOTION: Chair moved to answer is in the negative to each of those three (3) SERC questions. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Thank you, Ms. Simon.

Ms. Munson – Thank you. That's it.

21. Public Comments (Verbal)

Ms. Simon – Is there anybody on the call today that has information for public comment?

Chair – Rabbi Lyons?

Rabbi Lyons – Am I allowed to ask a question of the Division during this public comment section?

Ms. Simon – That is not generally what public comment is for. If you have a question, you're more than welcome to give me a call.

Ms. Munson – I agree.

Chair – Thank you. Any public comments?

22. Upcoming Meeting(s)

- A.** October 7th (Videoconference)
- B.** November 4th (Videoconference)
- C.** December 2nd (Videoconference)

23. Adjournment

Chair – Board members? Any comments? Anything happening that we need to be aware of them? Again, I appreciate your service to this Board, and hearing nothing, I'll adjourn this meeting. Thank you.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:34.