

MINUTES
BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES
VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 4, 2025 - 10:00 A.M.

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

Ms. Jill Peeples – Good morning, this is Jill Peeples, Chair of the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. It is 10:02 A.M, on September 4, 2025. I'd like to call this meeting to order and turn it over to Ms. Simon.

Ms. Ellen Simon – Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning. My name is Ellen Simon. I am the Assistant Director for the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. Today is September 4, 2025, and it is approximately 10:00 AM. This is a public meeting of the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. This meeting is being held by videoconference. 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 are on the agenda, which has been made available to the public. The link and call-in number and other information relating to this Board meeting has also been published on the Division's website. 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.

As always, 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 may 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 so 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 Chair, Ms. Peeples, runs the meeting. Persons desiring to speak should initially ask the Chair for permission.

As a reminder to Board members, you are to refrain from commenting on facts not included within your Board packages and instead base your decision solely on the information in your Board packages, as well as testimony provided at this meeting. Additionally, ongoing investigations are private and confidential and are not to be discussed, even for the purposes of confirming there is an investigation.

Just a few words about Item U on your agenda, which is Public Comment. Public Comment is reserved for general comments by the public and not for re litigation of any matter before the Board. Please be aware that if Public Comment is used as an attempt to re litigate a matter that has been heard on this agenda, the Board will be instructed that the comment is not appropriate for Public Comment, and it should not be considered for further discussion.

As a final reminder, Board meetings are public meetings under Florida Law, and anything said via chat is subject to a public records request. This feature should only be used for technological issues you may be experiencing, and all inquiries in chat should be directed to Mary Schwantes. 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 call the roll:

Jill Peeples, Chair
Andrew Clark, Vice Chair
David Chapman
Sanjena Clay
Vincent "Todd" Ferreira
Christian "Chris" Jensen

Kenneth “Ken” Jones
Janis Liotta
William “Bill” Quinn
Darrin Williams {EXCUSED}

Also noted as present:

Rachelle Munson, Board Legal Advisor
Kimberly Marshall, Department Legal Counsel
Greg Caracci, Department Legal Counsel
Nicole Eldeb, Department Legal Counsel
LaTonya Bryant, Department Staff

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair, we have a quorum for the business of the Board.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, Ms. Simon.

B. Action on the Minutes
(1) August 7, 2025

Ms. Simon – At this time, it may be appropriate for a Board member to move that the minutes be accepted.

MOTION: Ms. Sanjena Clay moved to adopt the minutes. Mr. Bill Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Quinn – Madam Chair?

Chair Peebles – Yes, Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – May I add something to the record?

Chair Peebles – Yes, sir.

Mr. Quinn – As a Board member affiliated with SCI, I want to assure this Board that my approach to decision-making will be guided by impartiality, fairness, and objectivity. After thoroughly reviewing the agenda, I will make my decisions based on the facts and the information presented. Thank you.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, Mr. Quinn. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma’am.

C. Rules Committee Items

Ms. Simon – For these items, I will turn this meeting over to Ms. Schwantes, our Executive Director.

Ms. Mary Schwantes – Madam Chair?

Chair Peebles – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you. Good morning. For many months now, we've been talking about the impact of Senate Bill 108, which became effective on July 1st, and made numerous changes to the rulemaking process. Among those changes, each agency is required to review all of its rules prior to July 1, 2030. For this purpose, this Board is considered an agency. As a result of the bill, we've been preparing information for three (3) reports. The first report is due on October 1st. This report must list all of the rules which are being reviewed this year and a five-year plan for the review of all rules in Chapter 69K prior to July 1, 2030. On January 1st, we will have to file a report on the results from the review of the rules this year. This report sets out what the plan is with regard to each of the rules reviewed, whether each rule reviewed needs to be changed, repealed or

left alone. By April 1st, for the rules in which changes are needed, the agency must begin the actual rulemaking process. So, there's a lot of work between when the bill went into effect and April. The Board's Rules Committee has been meeting to go through the review process, and I'm very pleased at this time to present the minutes and report and recommendations from the Committee's meeting, which took place in person in Tallahassee on July 9th to 10th.

(1) Action on the Minutes

(a) July 9, 2025

(b) July 10, 2025

Ms. Schwantes – These are the minutes from the Rules Committee meeting which occurred on July 9th and 10th. The Committee has previously approved these minutes and recommends them to the Board for approval. Board action is needed on these minutes. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Schwantes. Board members, it would be appropriate to go forward with a motion on the minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Todd Ferreira moved to adopt the minutes. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

(2) Report and Recommendations from Meeting on July 9-10, 2025

Ms. Schwantes – The first few pages set out the purpose of the meeting and the Committee's recommendations regarding the eighty-seven (87) rules which were reviewed during those two (2) days. Detail is provided as to how the eighty-seven (87) rules were chosen for review this year. After the recommendations, additional detail is provided on the process and results of the Committee's review of each rule.

The Rules Committee consists of four (4) Board members, Andrew Clark, who is our Chair, Sanjena Clay, Darrin Williams, and Chris Jensen. Additionally, present at the Rules Committee meetings were Jill Peoples and Todd Ferreira. I know most of the Board members are already familiar with the process used by the Committee in its review, but before going into the Committee's recommendations, I'd like to ask if any Board members have any questions on these issues so far. Hearing none.

The first recommendation from the Committee is found on the second page of the report, as part of the SB108 review found on Page 1. As part of the SB108 review, agencies are charged with reviewing the effective date, rulemaking authority, and law implemented for each rule. This information was pre-populated for the Committee by the Board's Executive Director, based upon information compiled by Board counsel and the Department's Office of the General Counsel. It is very probable that this information will need to be changed or updated as matters are more fully reviewed during the various steps in the rulemaking process. For this reason, the Committee recommends that the Board delegate authority to Board Counsel and the Executive Director to make changes to information in these categories as needed at any time during the rule review and future rulemaking processes. Board action is needed on this recommendation. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Schwantes. It would be appropriate Board members for us approve the delegation request.

MOTION: Mr. Ken Jones moved that the Board delegate authority to Board Counsel and the Executive Director to make changes to information in these categories as needed at any time during the review and future rulemaking processes. Mr. Ferreira seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you. The second recommendation from the Board is found on Page 2 of the report. The Committee determined that no substantive changes are needed to thirty-seven (37) of the eighty-seven (87) rules reviewed. Those thirty-seven (37) rules are listed on Pages 2 - 3 of the report. The Committee therefore recommends that the Board approve the Committee's review results on the thirty-seven (37) total shared rules and Board rules which are listed on these pages. Please note that this action will not impact the Department's ability to take action as needed on issues in the shared rules that are within its purview, for example, issues relating to forms or processes. Assuming Board approval, the Committee's response on these rules as set out in the report will be incorporated into the reports that are due by January 1st from the Board and the

Department under SB108. Board action is needed on this recommendation. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Schwantes. It would be appropriate Board members for a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the Committee's review results on the thirty-seven (37) total Shared Rules and Board Rules. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Finally, with regard to the report, Board action is required to approve the report and recommendations in its entirety. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Schwantes. It would be appropriate Board members for us to make a motion.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to approve the report and recommendations in its entirety. Mr. Ferreira seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, Board. The remaining fifty (50) rules were revisited by the Committee on August 19th. A report and recommendations from that meeting will be submitted to the Board for full review in the upcoming months.

(3) Proposed Plan for Review of Board Rules from July 1, 2025, until July 1, 2030

Ms. Schwantes – This is the five-year plan. As part of the report, which is due to the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee (JAPC), the Committee which oversees the rulemaking processes in Florida, the Board will need to submit a five-year plan for the review of all of the Chapter 69K rules prior to July 1, 2030. The proposed five-year review plan, which has been approved by the Rules Committee, is included in your packets. The rules, which are being reviewed this fiscal year are highlighted in green. While the format for the plan as it is reported on October 1st may need to change to fit JAPC's requirements, the Rules Committee recommends approval of this plan. If there are no questions, Board action is needed on this recommendation. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Schwantes. It would be appropriate Board members for a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approval of the five-year plan. Mr. Chris Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, Board members, and again much thanks to the Committee members for their hard work in these matters. Madam Chair, that ends the Rules Committee issues, and I'll turn the meeting back over to Ms. Simon.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am.

D. Disciplinary Proceeding(s)

(1) Department's Request for Qualified Representative Status

Ms. Simon – Presenting for the Department is Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Kimberly Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Good morning, Board members. Ms. Nicole Eldeb is an employee in our office, a staff attorney on my team. She is a graduate of FSU Law School and is on bar exam results and we are asking that the Board grant her the authority to appear before the Board and handle some cases today.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. It will be appropriate for a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the request to allow Ms. Eldeb to appear before the Board today as a qualified representative. Ms. Janis Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) Department's Motion for an Order Dismissing Petition Without Prejudice (No Probable Cause)

(a) Related Cases - Division No. ATN-44718

1. Rivero, Jorge: DFS Case No. 344124-25-FC; Division No. ATN-44718 (F045199)

Ms. Simon – Presenting for the Department is Mr. Caracci.

Mr. Greg Caracci – Thank you. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Department's Motion for an Order Dismissing Petition Without Prejudice ("Motion"). On or about July 15, 2025, the Department filed an Administrative Complaint against Jorge E. Rivero ("Respondent") alleging violations of Chapter 497, Florida Statutes. On or about July 31, 2024, Respondent timely submitted a petition requesting a formal hearing pursuant to section 120.57(1), Florida Statutes; however, the petition failed to identify any disputed issues of material fact. As such Respondent's petition failed to meet the requirements for a formal hearing as outlined in Rule 28-106.2015, *Florida Administrative Code*. Accordingly, this Motion requests that the Board dismiss Respondent's petition without prejudice and enter an order providing Respondent with an additional twenty-one (21) days in which to file a facially sufficient petition for formal hearing or to request an informal hearing. Furthermore, the Department requests that the order provide that if Respondent fails to provide a timely response that Respondent will have waived its right to a hearing in this matter. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Caracci. Ms. Munson, I noticed that Mr. Rivero is a part of this Board video meeting today. Would it be appropriate for us to swear him in to see if he would like to address the Board or should the Board go forward with a motion as counsel has just requested?

Ms. Rachelle Munson – This kind of is a disciplinary matter, but you can go ahead and see if he has something that he would like to say. I don't know if it's going to change the outcome in benefit to him.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Mr. Rivero, if you would like to address the Board, Ms. Simon will swear you in, please, sir.

Mr. Jorge Rivero – Yes.

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

Mr. Rivero – I do.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Rivero, please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

Mr. Rivero – Jorge Rivero.

Ms. Simon – And spell your last name for the record.

Mr. Rivero – R-I-V-E-R-O.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. If you'd like to address the Board members, please.

Mr. Rivero – Yes, I helped this family out three (3) or four (4) times through the years. Someone passed away, the son came in to make the arrangements with his sister, and while we were making the arrangements he called the wife, and the wife gave them permission in front of me, verbal permission to do anything they needed, whatever service they wanted. The children signed the paperwork, but I did explain to the wife she needed to sign the cremation authorization. So, she came in the night of the viewing to sign that. So, during the arrangements, the kids chose everything, signed all the paperwork, signed the approval of the death certificate. The next day, the son came in with his father's clothes. The day after that, he came in, he's the one that made the payment. So, it was a cremation. So, when we did the cremation a couple of days later, the wife calls us and she said she lives two (2) hours away and would be the one to pick up the ashes, but if she can't make it, she'll let her son know. No one in my office ever called the son to pick up the ashes. So, the next day the son shows up to pick up the ashes. So,

I spoke to him, and told him I spoke to the wife, and she said she was going to pick up. And then he said, she called him to pick up. So how am I not supposed to believe that, since he's the son? He made all the arrangements, made the payment, brought the clothes. The wife was nowhere making these arrangements. So, we gave him the ashes. I've been doing this for thirty-seven (37) years. I've always done it the same way. Never had a problem. And then, you know, after we gave him the ashes, the problems began. I asked him if he could give it to me in writing that the wife gave him permission to pick up the ashes. The son gave it to me in writing, which I have here. That's basically the story.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Board members, before us is a request to give Mr. Rivero twenty-one (21) additional days to submit his petition for a formal hearing or request an informal hearing. What is the Board's pleasure?

MOTION: Mr. Ken Jones moved to dismiss Respondent's petition without prejudice and enter an order providing Respondent with an additional twenty-one (21) days in which to file a facially sufficient petition for formal hearing or to request an informal hearing. Furthermore, the order will provide that if Respondent fails to provide a timely response that Respondent will have waived its right to a hearing in this matter. Mr. Ferreira seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Rivero, you can contact Division office following the meeting. They will be glad to give you guidance on your next step, sir.

Mr. Rivero – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair, may I call the companion case?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

2. Vior Funeral Home: DFS Case No. 344123-25-FC; Division No. ATN-44718 (F041403)

Ms. Simon – Presenting again for the Department is Mr. Caracci.

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Department's Motion for an Order Dismissing Petition Without Prejudice ("Motion"). On or about July 15, 2025, the Department filed an Administrative Complaint against Vior Funeral Home ("Respondent") alleging violations of Chapter 497, Florida Statutes. On or about July 31, 2024, Respondent timely submitted a petition requesting a formal hearing pursuant to section 120.57(1), Florida Statutes; however, the petition failed to identify any disputed issues of material fact. As such Respondent's petition failed to meet the requirements for a formal hearing as outlined in Rule 28-106.2015, *Florida Administrative Code*. Accordingly, this Motion requests that the Board dismiss Respondent's petition without prejudice and enter an order providing Respondent with an additional twenty-one (21) days in which to file a facially sufficient petition for formal hearing or to request an informal hearing. Furthermore, the Department requests that the order provide that if Respondent fails to provide a timely response that Respondent will have waived its right to a hearing in this matter. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Rivero, this is the case against the funeral home establishment, so it's similar to the previous case where if the Board seems fit to do a motion, a second and approval, you'll have twenty-one (21) days to submit your information. What is the pleasure of the Board?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to dismiss Respondent's petition without prejudice and enter an order providing Respondent with an additional twenty-one (21) days in which to file a facially sufficient petition for formal hearing or to request an informal hearing. Furthermore, the order will provide that if Respondent fails to provide a timely response that Respondent will have waived its right to a hearing in this matter. Mr. David Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Rivero. You can contact the Division office following the meeting, sir.

Mr. Rivero – Okay, thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Simon?

- (3) *Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Probable Cause Panel A)*
(a) *Related Cases - Division Nos. ATN-43809 and ATN-45531*
1. *Johnson & Family Life Celebration Center LLC: DFS Case Nos. 334714-24-FC and 343278-25-FC; Division Nos. ATN-43809 and ATN-45531 (F566325)*

Ms. Simon – Presenting for the Department is Ms. Eldeb.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Eldeb, if you would, please let Mr. Jones make a statement.

Mr. Jones – Yes, I was on Probable Cause Panel A for (3) (a) 1 and 2, so I need to recuse myself from those.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Jones. Ms. Eldeb?

Ms. Nicole Eldeb – Thank you. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Johnson & Family Life Celebration Center LLC (“Respondent”). The Department conducted an inspection of Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations herein, Respondent was licensed as a funeral establishment. Respondent practiced with an inactive license and advertised preneed services on its website without a preneed license. The disciplinary guidelines for these violations are as follows:

- *Count I: advertising preneed services without a license: Reprimand, fine of \$1,000 to \$2,500 plus costs. In addition, probation for six (6) months to one (1) year, suspension up to two (2) years, permanent revocation of license, and/or restitution may be imposed.*
- *Counts II-III: practicing with an inactive license: If delinquent, \$250 per month. If other, fine of \$2,000-\$3,500 plus costs. In addition, reprimand probation for six (6) months to two (2) years with conditions, suspension up to two (2) years, permanent revocation of license and/or restitution may be imposed.*

The Motion demonstrates that Respondent failed to timely file a responsive pleading contesting the factual allegations in the Administrative Complaint, requests that the Board adopt the factual allegations in the Administrative Complaint, and requests that the Board issue an appropriate penalty in this matter. At this time, it would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that the Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond and has thus waived the right to elect a method of resolution in this matter.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Eldeb. Board members?

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond, thus waiving the right to elective method of resolution in this matter. Mr. Andrew Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – The Department asks that the Chair entertain a motion determining that there are no material facts in dispute in this case.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that there are no material facts in dispute in this case. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – Now that the Board has determined that there are no material facts in dispute in this matter, the Department asks the Chair to entertain a motion to adopt the allegations of fact as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to adopt the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Clay seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, I do have a question. One of the counts here talks about an exact date and time for the cremation. We don't have to give an exact date and time for the cremation, so I'm a little confused. If we're approving all that, is that going to have

any bearing on the end result?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon, I don't know if you'd like to address this or Ms. Munson or Ms. Eldeb?

Ms. Simon – I believe it would be appropriate for Ms. Elda to address that.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Eldeb?

Ms. Eldeb – I'll admit I'm not sure how to answer the question. I'm not sure if maybe I'm just not understanding the question.

Mr. Jensen – May I clarify, Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Jensen – Yes, so in reading in reading the counts, one (1) says that they did specify in writing a date and time for cremation of the decedent.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Jensen, what page are you referring to in the PDF document, please?

Mr. Jensen – I'm on Page 1. We're on Glover, right?

Ms. Simon – No, we are not.

Chair Peeples – No, we are on agenda item D(3)(a)1.

Ms. Munson – Johnson.

Chair Peeples – Johnson.

Mr. Jensen – My apologies, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – That's okay, sir. Thank you for your insertion. So, we have a motion by Ms. Liotta, a second by Ms. Clay. Is there any discussion on this motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say Yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Opposed say No. Motion carries. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Before we go further, may I ascertain whether a representative of Johnson & Family life Celebration Center LLC is present during today's meeting?

Mr. Efren Johnson – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Eldeb?

Ms. Eldeb – Now would be an appropriate time to hear from the Respondent, if they would like to speak.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Johnson, if you will have Ms. Simon swear you in, please.

Mr. Johnson – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Please raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Johnson – Yes.

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

Mr. Johnson – Efren Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Johnson. If you'd like to address the Board, please.

Mr. Johnson – Yes, ma'am. Thank you so much. During this time, I'll go in order: for Count 1, I did speak to an investigator when they reached out to me with the first Administrative Complaint. I did then inform them at the time that there was a free website that was advertised by Batesville, where the information came pre-generated and at that time, I was not aware of said information that it would be misleading to so on and so forth and that the complaint would be resolved if we had it removed immediately. Which we did. We gave Batesville a call, their technology team removed that information immediately, and I'm well aware of the fact that we did not, nor have we had in the past advertised for any preneed or accepted any preneed cases from our funeral home. That is something that I just have personally as a funeral director don't wish to delve in as far as what we provide for my business. Being that we are a newer funeral home, I just didn't see the longevity for that. As far as Count 2 and Count 3, I was under the impression that our license had been renewed, but due to some financial issues and some issues with our building as well, we were forced to close down our funeral home very abruptly. So, after that matter in January, we shut down our funeral home and then we then processed our paperwork to go ahead and turn our license back in.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Board members, do you have any questions for Mr. Johnson? Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Mr. Johnson, during the time that the advertising was going on, has there ever been any funds exchanged between a family and your funeral home?

Mr. Johnson – No, sir. I only provided advice. Families would come in and ask if they were to prepare anything as far as what items would they need for cremation, what items would they need for burial, or what would be the range price of an average funeral in today's society. That would be strictly just solely informational. But no monies were exchanged at any point in time or contracts were written.

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Ferreira – You know, one of the things that I think we get kind of bogged down in at times with this whole preneed idea is we do have families that call us after someone is placed in hospice and ask can they come in and talk to us about making arrangements. They're going to use insurance, this has nothing to do with exchanging money, it's just coming in, sitting with us, talking to us, to get a handle on how things are going to work, you know, and we ought to be able to do that. Any funeral director should be able to sit down with the family at any time, as long as money is not being exchanged. Every funeral home in America has a file that they call unfunded. We all have an unfunded file. Right? Folks come in and talk with us. Then we have another file cabinet. It is a funded cabinet where families came in and they prepaid and set up to make the financial side of those arrangements. There are two (2) sides. There's making a financial obligation and one just talking about funerals and getting information like Mr. Johnson's saying. So, I think we need to look at this a little different. And that's really all I got to say. For those of you that work day-to-day in the funeral home, this is the truth, this is the real, this is what happens, And I believe that we ought to be able to sit down and talk to a family about their loved one's situation, and discuss if the funeral is going to be at the church or, you know, those details without getting all bogged down with breaking the law for preneed sales. I don't get it. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Any other Board members have any questions for Mr. Johnson? Hearing none, what is the pleasure of the Board?

Mr. Ferreira – What's the motion that we are making right now?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Eldeb, would this be appropriate for you to discuss the disciplinary guidelines at this time?

Ms. Eldeb – I have a couple more motions before that. The Department offers into evidence the investigative report with exhibits, a copy of which has previously been furnished to the Board to establish a prima facie case for the violations alleged in the Administrative Complaint.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Eldeb, would you like the Board to make a motion regarding the investigative report?

Ms. Eldeb – Yes to adopt these into the record of the case.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to adopt the investigative report with exhibits. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon, I saw your hand up a minute ago.

Ms. Simon – I'd like to wait till after the disciplinary recommendations are made. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Eldeb?

Ms. Eldeb – Now that the Board has adopted the findings of fact, in this case, the Department asks the Chair to entertain a motion finding that these facts constitute a violation of Florida statutes as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent is in violation of Florida Statutes as charged in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – As for the penalty recommendation, the Department is recommending a fine of \$2,750 and one (1) year of probation.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Eldeb, can you please update us for which counts, what is the composition of that fine total for Count 1, Count 2, and Count 3, please?

Ms. Eldeb – I do not presently have that breakdown, but I came to this number while talking to Ms. Schwantes. Ms. Schwantes, would you be able to mention what the breakdown of that was?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair, two (2) items. Thank you so much. The first item is typically when we look at these cases, while the Board has discussed these previously individual counts, what we are looking at is a composite discipline arrangement that covers all three (3) counts. It would be difficult to break them all down individually. It's looking at the facts of the case and taking those into account. And if I may address Mr. Ferreira's comments. While it may be wise and there may be a time for there to be a funeral home discussing preplanning with a consumer, what is not appropriate is to discuss the costs and finalizing a plan and setting aside funds for your plan. And that's what this website alluded to. It isn't simply that you can come in and talk about your plans. It was setting money aside and that's where the prearrangements become complex.

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – And as I was reading these cases, I never saw anything about money. It never mentioned that and that's where the rub is with me.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – For the previous cases, Mr. Ferrera, I believe that we have had on websites when the OGC makes this allegation, it is typically because costs are involved. Preplanning is not the only language we look at. It's when it comes to costs, and please rest assured that those are the type of cases that brought in front of the Board. It is not meant to stymie the conversations that the funeral home has with the consumers. However, prearrangements is a problem and it is violative of the statute. And this website, as in all websites when we bring this forward, discusses the costs involved in making prearrangements. And that's all I have to say on the subject. Thank you.

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – What happens if a family picks up the phone and calls me about pricing while their loved ones under hospice? Is that considered prearranging? I mean, it happens multiple times a day. These are just things I think that we ought to talk about. That's all.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Ms. Munson, I saw your hand up, ma'am.

Ms. Munson – I just wanted to clarify for the record that as Ms. Simon indicated at the beginning of these proceedings, we are not looking at what the Board may have previously done with other cases. Just focus on the facts that have been presented before you in the materials. If costs are not reflected, then that's a part of the case. You can't assume that they are. If there's a question for the Department regarding that item, this is an opportunity to do so. There may be a need for an amendment to the information submitted. But again, I want to just keep the information before you as the information that's actually given consideration to regarding your determination as to whether you want to move forward with the penalty, dismiss the Administrative Complaint, reduce something with regard to any of the counts. That is completely up to this particular Board. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Marshall, I see you're on camera. Did you need to address the Board?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, I just wanted to put out there, in response to Mr. Ferreira's last comment, and certainly I think this is something that is worth discussion from the Board. I would like to point out to the Board that the definition of a preneed contract hinges on the guarantee of a price at a time in the future. So, that's why when we're looking at these preneed advertising in these website cases, that's why we are looking at the financial end of things. So that's the difference between simply a family calling up saying, my loved one is in hospice, so how much would it cost if I wanted X, Y, and Z versus can you guarantee me a price today for X, Y, and Z? It's two (2) different discussions.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – No one ever calls and asks for a guarantee. I've never ever had anyone say that to me. So, the only time anything is guaranteed is if money changes hands. That's the only time. And we all know it's wrong to accept funds if we're not licensed to accept funds. But to simply talk, I think, is the prerogative of our consumer to be able to talk about arrangements. And let's go back again, I didn't see anything as I read through this, I saw nothing, no advertising at all about funds. It was come in and talk, but it never says anything about guaranteeing anything, in what I have.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – So on Page 29 of the materials for this case, the page titled Why Plan Ahead, it does discuss locking in today's prices. And that's where this advertisement crossed the line into what the Department feels is preneed advertising.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, I was reading Page 29. Also, if you look under lower costs right there, the second sentence says you do not have to set aside funds for your plan. So, Ms. Marshall, you know, and the adage in our industry, if money's given, it's preneed. If money's not given, no preneed. We tell families that all the time. They come in and say, oh, I know Mama made her plans. Yes, ma'am, but mama didn't fund her plans. So, nothing's guaranteed.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Yes, I'm dovetailing on what Miss Marshall said. And Mr. Ferreira, Mr. Jensen, we can discuss these issues after today's Board meeting. But in this particular case, on Page 29, there is a statement that "by locking in today's funeral costs and ensuring that the necessary funds are set aside, relieve yourself of future worry." That is the definition of preneed, and that is what is being done in this case. I understand that both of these Board members have questions relating to preneed and their individual practices and we can discuss them after the Board meeting. But today, we're just looking at this individual case, if I may be so bold to suggest.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – What Ms. Simon said is pretty much what we're saying. It says if money's given, there's a preneed. You do have the option to lock it in, but if there's nothing given, there's no contract. There's just no contract. It's just talking.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Board members, Ms. Eldeb mention that the recommendation is a fine of \$2,750 and one-year probation. Is there any discussion, Board members? Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Is this establishment currently open? Because I know Mr. Johnson mentioned that the reason for not reestablishing his establishment license was because they had to close down. So, is this business still going and was it going when during this non-license time?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I am looking at our database and it shows that on June 11th, the license was canceled voluntarily. However, at the time that the arrangements were made, there was an active license, and if I may speak for Ms. Marshall, it is the Department's position that this occurs at the time that the arrangements are made and if this establishment ever comes in to apply for another license we would need to have this discipline on the record for the Board's consideration should this come up again. I understand that they might not be currently active, but they have an opportunity to be active again for, I believe, for two (2) more years. And because of that, that's why this discipline is coming before the Board. If I may, I'm looking at the documentation associated in this case, and the only information I have, like I said, is that it was voluntarily canceled. There was no language about permanent relinquishment of licensure, that they cannot apply for the Board again or any of their principles without this being brought up before the Board and that is what we are trying to assure does not happen because funeral homes tend to come back.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Simon. Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – So, I know in one (1) of these counts we're saying that the establishment did not have a license. And so, I didn't know if that was a period of time that they were closed. That's all I was asking, and I don't know if Mr. Johnson's available to answer that.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, if I may? If you'll refer back to Page 8 of 85 of our PDF packets, number 14, it states that on December 1, 2024, the Respondent's license expired. And then number 15 says, as of May 8, 2025, Respondent had not renewed its license. And then as Ms. Simon just mentioned, on June 11, 2025, the license, I'm sorry, Ms. Simon, I did not capture the wording that you said was voluntarily surrendered.

Ms. Simon – That was the case, however, these allegations were based on an event on June 18, 2024. These events were not after the voluntary cancellation was made. And again, I apologize for continuing to address this, and this may be an issue

where I need to talk with some of the Board members offline to address their concerns about other practices. But in this particular case, I have brought up the pertinent facts from the Division's standpoint.

Chair Peeples – And Mr. Ferreira, if I may, I had in my notes that kind of what has been from the disciplinary guidelines is when someone has an expired license, it's usually \$250 a month. So, this was six (6) months, so that would be \$1250, just for this particular count of an expired license and then we have two (2) other counts that kind of coincide with that. So, just for consideration of the Board, it has been suggested a fine of \$2,750 and probation. So, Mr. Ferreira, would you like to make a motion?

Mr. Ferreira – So, yes, my notes line up with what you are saying. So, basically, we're looking at this all as one, right? Is that right? We're looking at it one, we're not separating the counts. So, I would make a motion for \$1,000.

Chair Peeples – And would that \$1,000 penalty fine discipline be for Counts 1 through 3 or specific to one particular account?

Mr. Ferreira – For me, it would be for operating without the license. All the whole \$1000 would be for that, if we can break it down.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson, Count 1 is regarding the listing of preneed availability on their website and then Counts 2 and 3 are together regarding the unlicensed activity and other items as listed through numbers 13 through 19. So, would we have to address each count, Ms. Munson, or could we just go with Mr. Ferreira's motion as stated?

Ms. Munson – This is what I would recommend. I know that Ms. Simon said the Department looks at all of this collectively. I just want the Board to understand you have the authority to address each of these counts separately because you have to be able to respond to each of these counts separately. If you want to dismiss a count, you can dismiss a count. You can reduce it below whatever the minimums are because you may find that they are mitigating circumstances or increase above because of aggravating. So, this concept of we look at everything collectively, it does not negate the opportunity for you to look at each of them individually and assign where you want to put your weight and your costs for any type of penalties you may associate. So, in answer to your question, Chair Peeples, I would just recommend that you look at these counts individually and determine what you think should be appropriate for a penalty, if one applies, and then we can total those up at the end to get the final amount, if that's what this Board is thinking.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Munson. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I'd just ask Ms. Marshall's opinion on how we proceed, as this is an Office of the General Counsel's case.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Well, the Office of General Counsel stands by the counts we have put in the Administrative Complaint. The guidelines are there for your reference, and I think it's worth the Board having a discussion if you are interested in dropping one or more counts, but we stand by the counts charged in the guidelines that are in the memo.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Marshall. Mr. Ferreira would you like to amend your motion to be specific on Counts 1 through 3?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes ma'am.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to dismiss Count 1, and Respondent shall pay a \$1,000 fine on Counts 2 and 3. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, I notice on the counts, they're asking for probation also. I would like to ask Mr. Ferreira if he is considering the six-month probation also?

Mr. Ferreira – No.

Mr. Jensen – If these people are inactive, you don't want to see them under probation if they do come back online?

Mr. Ferreira – Well, the word is if they come back online. So, we don't know where they currently sit.

Mr. Jensen – Madam Chair, I thought they were inactive at this particular juncture, but they have the option to come back.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon, is that correct?

Ms. Simon – The Office of the General Counsel {inaudible} be able to get their license back by paying \$250 for each month {inaudible}. I'm not sure about that. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Do you mean as far as having been voluntarily cancel, whether it could be reinstated? My understanding was that a delinquent license can be reinstated, but once a license has been cancelled, it's, that's it. They'd have to apply for a new one, was my understanding, but I may be wrong.

Ms. Simon – And bearing in mind that I would just go back, that was an issue regarding probation only. But entering discipline, imposing discipline ensures that that discipline will be revealed if there is any future application.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I just wanted to clarify. I think the question was to identify, I think Mr. Jensen was asking the status of the license currently, and I'm not sure if we heard an answer for that for the record to move forward. If the license is inactive, it could be reactivated. If it's delinquent, it could be made current. If it's null and void, then if that's when we say cancel, if that's equivalent to null and void, because it's gone so far past the delinquency timeframe. And yes, most requirements would be that you have to is reapplied with the entire process for licensure, right? So, I just wanted to clarify and make sure the Board and the thing with the status of the {inaudible} is putting a probation on a license that no longer exists. I don't know the benefit of that, but again, it's up to the purview of this Board.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Ms. Marshall corrected me. I wasn't sure what happened when the license was canceled. For the purposes of Mr. Jensen's question, putting probation on this license may not be appropriate because they're not going to get their license back. However, any sort of discipline that would be imposed would show in case this licensee applies for licensure again. And that is what we are trying to stop today.

Ms. Munson – Including the payment of the fine. That is a discipline. But again, the status of the license, canceled is not a term. Are we saying the license is null and void?

Ms. Marshall – Cancel is the term that our system uses. Voluntarily canceled is what it would say.

Ms. Munson – So that is equivalent to null and void, past the delinquency phase?

Ms. Marshall – No, that is the licensee has surrendered their license.

Ms. Munson – Voluntarily.

Mr. Johnson – Yes ma'am. To the Board, if I may help clear up any ambiguity. During the time we had an inspector to come out, and at that point I was informed that there was a form that needed to be filled out. So, during that period, as of January 1st, our building was closed, and then we were no longer doing any funeral operations. We were no longer at said establishment. We had removed the phone number. We have removed our artifacts containing anything towards that. I then was informed by an investigator that I needed to submit said form to voluntarily relinquish the license, which, after the fact, we did so. I did speak with the investigator. I did sign the official state paperwork saying that we voluntarily canceled out this

license from that point on. So as of January 31, 2025, we were no longer at any point occupying that space, using the name Johnson and Family Life Celebration Center, its phone numbers, or advertising for anything further from that point.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Just for the Board's information, a part of our packet on Page 8 of 85 of the PDF, it states in item 14, under Counts 2 and 3 that on or about December 1, 2024, the Respondent's license expired. Number 15 states as of May 8, 2025, Respondent had not renewed its license. We appreciate the information Mr. Johnson has submitted to us, but from an aspect of the Division office, investigations, whatever took place, we have between December 1, 2024, and May 8, 2025. So that's the timeframe we need to consider. So, circling back, Mr. Jensen, you had asked a question about probation. And Mr. Ferreira mentioned he did not want to include that in his motion, which we have a motion by Mr. Ferreira for \$1,000 for Counts 2 and 3, dismiss Count 1. We have a second by Ms. Liotta. Is there any other discussion on the motion?

Mr. Quinn – Yes, a question on the motion?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – I can get my head around reducing the fine, but I have a challenge with dismissing Count 1.

Chair Peeples – And Mr. Quinn, would you like to make a recommendation to Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Quinn – Do not dismiss Count 1. Do Counts 1, 2, 3, and the fine be \$1 ,000.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – We have this coming up in the next case, too.

Chair Peeples – But, Mr. Ferreira, we're are specifically on case D(3)(a)1, Johnson and Family Life Celebration. And Mr. Ferreira, if I may, kind of in my comment I made earlier and kind of going on what Mr. Quinn said, for six (6) months at \$250, that's \$1,250. Would you consider amending your motion to a fine of \$1,250 for Counts 1-3? Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Sorry, I don't mean to correct your arithmetic there. Six (6) months of \$250 is about \$1,500.

Chair Peeples – I'm sorry. Thank you, Ms. Marshall. I appreciate that. So, we're at \$1,500 for six (6) months, which is \$250, which is what the penalty guidelines are. Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I'll accept that.

Ms. Liotta – I accept as well.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. So, we have an amended motion of \$1,500 fine, which is \$250 times six (6) months for Counts 1-3. It's a motion by Mr. Ferreira, second by Ms. Liotta. Any further discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say Yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples – All opposed, say No. Motion carries. Ms. Simon?

2. Johnson, Efren Lamar II: DFS Case Nos. 334748-24-FC and 343499-25-FC; Division Nos. ATN-43809 and ATN-45531 (F183656)

Ms. Simon – Mr. Johnson remains on the line and presenting for this case is Ms. Eldeb.

Ms. Eldeb – Thank you. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Efren Lamar Johnson II ("Respondent"). The Department conducted an inspection of

Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations herein, Respondent was licensed as a funeral director and embalmer employed at Johnson & Family Life Center LLC ("JFL"). JFL practiced with an inactive license and advertised preneed services on its website without a preneed license. As funeral director in charge for JFL, Respondent failed to ensure that the establishment complied with all applicable laws and rules and is therefore subject to discipline. The disciplinary guidelines for these violations are as follows:

- *Counts I-III: engaging in fraud, deceit, negligence, incompetency, or misconduct in the practice of a regulated activity: Reprimand, fine of \$1,000 to \$2,500 plus costs. In addition, probation for 6 months to 1 year, suspension up to 2 years, permanent revocation of license, and/or restitution may be imposed.*

The Motion demonstrates that Respondent failed to timely file a responsive pleading contesting the factual allegations in the Administrative Complaint, requests that the Board adopt the factual allegations in the Administrative Complaint, and requests that the Board issue an appropriate penalty in this matter. At this time, it would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that the Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond and has thus waived the right to elect a method of resolution in this matter.

Chair Peeples – Board members?

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond, thus waiving the right to elect a method of resolution in this matter. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – The Department asks that the Chair entertain a motion determining that there are no material facts in dispute in this case.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that there are no material facts in dispute in this case. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – Now that the Board has determined that there are no material facts in dispute in this matter, the Department believes it is appropriate at this time for the Chair to entertain a motion adopting the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to adopt the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – Now would be an appropriate time to hear from the Respondent if they would like to speak.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Johnson would you like to address the Board sir?

Mr. Johnson – Yes ma'am. Just all of the facts within that do follow. It was under my impression that Count 1 at the time prior to becoming served was already dismissed, so I was and aware that there would be any following counts that would come. So that explains my lack of response. I do take accountability for not submitting during the allotted time period. But however, I thought I was not under the impression that any Administrative Complaints were forthcoming beyond the discussion that I had with the investigators regarding Count 1 and then regarding the closing that would have revealed Counts 2 or 3 for that matter. So, I was completely unaware again until I received notice, but it was my delinquency after that point.

Chair Peeples – Thank you sir. Ms. Eldeb?

Ms. Eldeb – The Department offers into evidence the investigative report with exhibits a copy of which has been previously furnished to the Board to establish a prima facie case for the violations alleged in the Administrative Complaint and now would be an appropriate time for a motion to accept this into the record.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to accept the investigative report with exhibits into the record. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – Now that the Board has adopted the findings of fact in this case, the Department asks the Chair to entertain a motion finding that these facts constitute a violation of Florida statutes as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent is in violation of Florida Statutes as charged in the Administrative Complaint. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Eldeb – The Department is recommending a penalty of a \$2,750 fine and one (1) year of probation.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved for a reprimand and fine of \$500. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – If I may, just to add to the deliberations of the Board. We're talking about these two (2) distinct licensees. While I have not looked it up yet on my books, if I did, I am assuming that Mr. Johnson is still licensed. So, this would affect him today. I just wanted to bring that up in front of the Board members, when it comes to the discipline.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon. We have a motion, and we have a second. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say Yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Opposed? Please let the record reflect that I'm opposed. Is there any other opposition?

Mr. Chapman – Opposed.

Ms. Clay – Opposed.

Chair Peeples – Okay, thank you. So, we have three (3) that are opposed. Making sure, give me one second please.

Ms. Simon – We do have a majority.

Chair Peeples – Okay. Thank you, Ms. Simon. That's what I was checking. So, the motion does carry. Thank you. Ms. Simon?

- (4) Motion for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Probable Cause Panel B)*
- (a) Related Cases - Division No. ATN-41262*
 - 1. Glover, Valerie Peterson: DFS Case No. 316186-23-FC; Division No. ATN-41262 (F082761)*

Ms. Simon – This matter is being withdrawn from today's agenda. I expect they will be back in the October Board meeting.

- 2. Patterson Cremation and Funeral Service Inc.: DFS Case No. 316183-23-FC; Division No. ATN-41262 (F329657)*

Ms. Simon – This matter is being withdrawn from today's agenda. I expect they will be back in the October Board meeting.

- (b) Related Cases - Division No. ATN-45139*
 - 1. Straghn & Son Tri-City: DFS Case No. 343605-25-FC; Division No. ATN-45139 (F040782)*

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. Presenting for the Department is Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Simon. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Straghn & Son Tri-City (Respondent). The Division alleges conducted an investigation of Respondent and alleges as follows: Respondent is a licensed

funeral establishment and apprentice/intern training agency, holding license number F040782. Respondent's funeral establishment license expired on December 1, 2024, due to non-renewal. Respondent did not renew the license until March 11, 2025. In the intervening time, Respondent handled funeral arrangements for one or more individuals. The disciplinary guideline for this violation is as follows:

- *Count I: practicing or attempting to practice with a delinquent license: \$250 fine per month.*

The Motion demonstrates Respondent has alleged that there are no material facts in dispute and for this matter to proceed as an informal hearing before the Board, and requests the Board adopt the factual allegations in the Administrative Complaint and issue an appropriate penalty. At this time, it would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that the Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has timely submitted a request for an informal hearing.

Chair Peebles – Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Chapman moved that Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has timely submitted a request for an informal hearing. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – The Department asks that the Chair entertain a motion determining that there are no material facts in dispute in this case.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that there are no material facts in dispute in this case. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Now that the Board has determined that there are no material facts in dispute in this matter, the Department believes it is appropriate at this time for the Chair to entertain a motion adopting the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to adopt the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Is anyone here on behalf of this entity. Not hearing anything. The Department offers into evidence the investigative report with exhibits, a copy of which has previously been furnished to the Board to establish a prima facie case for the violations alleged in the Administrative Complaint. Now that the Board has adopted the findings of fact in this case, the Department asks the Chair to entertain a motion finding that these facts constitute a violation of Florida Statutes, as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved that Respondent is in violation of Florida Statutes as charged in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Now we're on to the penalty. In this case the guidelines call for a fine of \$250 per month while delinquent so that would be \$1000 for four (4) months, in this case.

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair?

Chair Peebles – Yes, Mr. Ferreira.

Mr. Ferreira – Is that four (4) months or three (3) months?

Ms. Marshall – Well, it was like three (3) and a half.

Mr. Ferreira – So you're going to round up? Ok.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved that Respondent shall pay a fine of \$1000. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which passed with one (1) dissenting vote.

2. Straghn, Randy D.: DFS Case No. 343612-25-FC; Division No. ATN-45139 (F046685)

Ms. Simon – Is Mr. Straghn or a representative of Mr. Straghn on the call? Hearing no response. Presenting again for the Department is Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Simon. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Randy D. Straghn (Respondent). The Division alleges conducted an investigation of Respondent and alleges as follows: Respondent is a licensed funeral director and embalmer, holding license number F046685. At all times material to the allegations in this case, Respondent was designated as the funeral director in charge of Straghn & Son Tri-City, a licensed funeral establishment holding license number F040782. Straghn & Son's funeral establishment license was in an expired status for approximately three and a half months due to a failure to renew the license. During this time, the establishment handled funeral arrangements for one or more individuals. As funeral director in charge, Respondent failed to ensure that the establishment complied with all applicable laws and rules and is therefore subject to discipline. The disciplinary guideline for this violation is as follows:

- *Count I: engaging in fraud, deceit, negligence, incompetency, or misconduct in the practice of a regulated activity: Reprimand, fine of \$1,000 to \$2,500 plus costs. In addition, probation for six (6) months to one (1) year, suspension up to two (2) years, permanent revocation of license, and/or restitution may be imposed.*

The Motion demonstrates Respondent has alleged that there are no material facts in dispute and for this matter to proceed as an informal hearing before the Board, and requests the Board adopt the factual allegations in the Administrative Complaint and issue an appropriate penalty. At this time, it would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that the Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has timely submitted a request for an informal hearing.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has timely submitted a request for an informal hearing. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – The Department asks that the Chair entertain a motion determining that there are no material facts in dispute in this case.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved that there are no material facts in dispute in this case. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Now that the Board has determined that there are no material facts in dispute in this matter, the Department believes it is appropriate at this time for the Chair to entertain a motion adopting the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to adopt the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Is Mr. Straghn or a representative on the call? Hearing nothing. The Department offers into evidence the investigative report with exhibits, a copy of which has previously been furnished to the Board to establish a prima facie case for the violations alleged in the Administrative Complaint. Now that the Board has adopted the findings of fact in this case, the Department asks the Chair to entertain a motion finding that these facts constitute a violation of Florida Statutes, as set forth in the Administrative Complaint.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent is in violation of Florida Statutes as charged in the Administrative Complaint. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Now as to penalty, the guidelines are set forth in your memo. This was charged differently than the related case that you just heard. As the funeral director in charge, he was not personally practicing on an expired license. He was negligently operating the establishment while the license was expired, hence the difference guidelines, but I will sort of leave that to the Board to determine how to handle that matter.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I really believe this was an honest oversight.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved for a reprimand and a \$500 fine.

Chair Peeples – We have a motion, Board.

Mr. Chapman – What was counsel's recommendation for the fine on this matter?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Well, the lowest the guidelines go is \$1000. I think that's the lowest I could recommend.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Chapman does that complete your question, sir?

Mr. Chapman – Madam Chair it does. I make a motion that we go ahead and accept the counsel's fine.

Chair Peeples – Well, Mr. Ferreira has a motion, and we don't have a second yet. So, we have a motion on the table.

Mr. Quinn – I'll second it.

Chair Peeples – We have a motion by Mr. Ferreira and a second by Mr. Quinn. So, Mr. Chapman, would you like to make an amended motion suggestion to Mr. Ferreira and Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Chapman – Yes, Madam Chair. I'd like to make a motion to just follow what the counsel's guidelines are. That would be my recommendation.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Chapman is your suggested penalty amount \$1000 instead of \$500?

Mr. Chapman – My suggested penalty amount is \$1000 just like counsel recommended. Yes ma'am.

Chair Peeples – And would you include a reprimand with that also? That's what Mr. Ferreira had in his original was a reprimand of \$500.

Mr. Chapman – So he wants to reprimand by \$500, but the fine would only be \$500 instead of \$1000? Is that what you meant by reprimand?

Chair Peeples – Well, his original motion was a reprimand and \$500. Then you are now making a suggested of an amended motion to Mr. Ferreira and I'm asking if your suggested motion amendment would be \$1,000 and a reprimand.

Mr. Chapman – Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry. I didn't understand. Yes, I follow what you're asking.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Mr. Ferreira, would you accept that amendment?

Mr. Ferreira – I honestly think it was an honest mistake, an oversight.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, would you like to maintain your motion and not amend it as suggested by Mr. Chapman?

Mr. Ferreira – We've got a second, right?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. Mr. Quinn has seconded your most motion. So, you can either amend it or we can maintain it as you originally requested.

Mr. Ferreira – Let's maintain it.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Mr. Quinn, do you agree with that second, sir?

Mr. Quinn – Yes, I do. In my opinion, the reprimand would address the facts and compliance requirements without doubling down on him as the FDIC.

Chair Peeples – So we have a motion of \$500 and a reprimand, by Mr. Ferreira with a second from Mr. Quinn. Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – I'd like for Ms. Marshall to repeat the staff's recommendation in its entirety.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Our recommendation would be that the fine be \$1,000. We also would not be opposed to a reprimand.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Clay, does that complete your question?

Ms. Clay – Just to clarify, there was no recommendation initially from the staff of a reprimand, right?

Ms. Marshall – That's correct.

Ms. Clay – Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I was just noting that what staff presented was their guidelines. I think Ms. Marshall is saying what she suggests would be appropriate for the case. And if you go beneath them, you just have to identify mitigating circumstances. If you go beyond them, you have to identify aggravating circumstances. So, if the motion before the Board is for \$500 and a reprimand, the mitigation would be, I guess, a discussion that the body felt that the error was {inaudible}. You would just need to clarify that for the record.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes. I noticed Ms. Marshall was asking for probation or suspension of something of that nature. So, you're basically coming back off that, Ms. Marshall, and saying you're okay with a reprimand? Is that what I'm understanding?

Ms. Munson – That's not a suggestion but go ahead. I'm sorry, Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – What is in the memo is simply the disciplinary guidelines for this violation from the rule. That was not part of our recommendation.

Mr. Jensen – Okay.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Jensen, does that complete your comment, sir?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – I just would like further clarification that the Respondent received notification of this, and they are not present. {Inaudible} stating that.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Clay, you were spotty on your comment, but I think what your comment is, and please correct me, is that you wanted to make sure that they were properly served, and that there has not been a response that there is anyone

associated with this particular case. Is that your questions, ma'am?

Ms. Clay – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. As Ms. Marshall stated, our first motion was that they were properly served. Is that correct, Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. So, they were properly served. And then in this particular case between motions three (3) and four (4), Ms. Marshall asked if the Respondent was a part of the call and there was no response.

Ms. Clay – Thank you. And in asking that question, I'd like to give the rationale for my asking, if I may.

Chair Peeples – Yes, please.

Ms. Clay – This is a livelihood, and if accused of something that was an honest mistake, I would think that it would be important enough for those individuals to be here in as much as they have been advised of that. And so that's the reason for my asking, and it will be the reason for my voting this down.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Clay. We do have a motion, and we do have a second. Is there any other discussion before we take a vote? Ms. Simon, if you don't mind, can we do a roll call vote on this one, please?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am. All those in favor of the motion by Mr. Ferreira, please signify by responding Yay. Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – No.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jones – No.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jones?

Ms. Simon – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Liotta?

Ms. Liotta – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Chapman?

Mr. Chapman – No.

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – I am a No. I have five (5) Yes and four (4) No, so the motion carries. Thank you, Ms. Simon.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. May I continue on in the agenda?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

(5) Settlement Stipulation(s) (Probable Cause Panel B)

(a) Related Cases - Division No. ATN-43990

1. Cremations of Tampa LLC: DFS Case No. 344117-25-FC; Division No. ATN-43990 (F606844)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today?

Mr. Alan Orr – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Please state your name.

Mr. Orr – Alan Orr.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. And presenting for the Department is Mr. Caracci.

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. Cremations of Tampa LLC (“Respondent”) is a direct disposal establishment, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F606844. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent operated and advertised as a direct disposal establishment with an inactive/expired license. Respondent has entered into a proposed settlement stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a \$2,500 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to accept the Settlement Stipulation which provides that Respondent shall pay a \$2,500 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2. Orr, Alan Gregory: DFS Case No. 344120-25-FC; Division No. ATN-43990 (F051681)

Ms. Simon – Mr. Orr is on the line. Presenting again for the Department is Mr. Caracci.

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. Alan Gregory Orr (“Respondent”) is a funeral director and embalmer, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F051681. Respondent was the funeral director in charge of Cremations of Tampa LLC, a direct disposal establishment, license number F606844. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Cremations of Tampa operated and advertised as a direct disposal establishment with an inactive/expired license. Respondent has entered into a proposed settlement stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,750 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation.

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to accept the Settlement Stipulation which provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,750 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Let's plan to take a restroom break. It's 11.39. Let's come back at 11.55, please. Thank you.

*****BREAK*****

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – May I continue with the agenda?

Chair Peeples – Yes, please.

E. Application(s) for Preneed Sales Agent

(1) Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum A

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item. Pursuant to Section 497.466, Florida Statutes, the applicants on Addendum A have been issued their licenses and appointments as preneed sales agents.

F. Application(s) for Continuing Education

(1) Course Approval - Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum B

(a) National Funeral Directors Association (49609)

(b) New Jersey Funeral Service Education Corp. (58208)

(c) Wilbert Funeral Services (39408)

Ms. Simon – The course presented on Addendum B has been reviewed by the CE Committee, and the Committee as well as the Division recommends approval for the number of hours so indicated.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to approve the applications. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

G. Consumer Protection Trust Fund Claims

(1) 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. Jensen moved to approve all the claim(s), for the monetary amounts indicated. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

H. Application(s) for Embalmer Apprentice

(1) Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum D

(a) Dodson, Adrienne L F884982

(b) Ransom, Bethel B F881662

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

I. Application(s) for Florida Laws and Rules Examination

(1) Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum E

(a) Funeral Director (Internship)

1. Bradwell, La-kicca

2. Harper, Kiera

3. Vinci, Laura

(b) Funeral Director and Embalmer (Endorsement)

1. Flye, David L

2. Hankins, Danny W

(c) Funeral Director and Embalmer (Internship and Exam)

1. Burgoyne, Ruth

2. Ryder, Jessica L

3. Young, Jarvis L

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.

(2) Request to Renew Individual License

(a) Recommended for Approval with Conditions (Criminal History)

1. Funeral Director and Embalmer

a. Keller, Anna L F044345

Ms. Simon – Is Ms. Keller or a representative of Ms. Keller on the call?

Ms. Anna Keller – Yes, I'm present.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Keller submitted a license renewal application and payment on August 18, 2025, and answered "Yes" to the criminal history question. A completed criminal history form with supporting court documents was received by the Division on August 25, 2025. On or about November 21, 2024, Ms. Keller entered a plea of nolo contendere to the misdemeanor offense of "DUI/BAL .15 or Above or Minor in Vehicle." A judgment of guilt was entered, and Ms. Keller was placed on probation for twelve (12) months under the supervision of the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office and its probation supervisors. As part of her sentence, Ms. Keller was ordered to: *Pay fines, court costs, and investigative costs; Complete fifty (50) hours of community service; Serve a 6-month driver's license revocation; Enroll in DUI School within forty-five (45) days and successfully complete it; Attend a victim impact educational seminar within six (6) months; Undergo an alcohol evaluation within forty-five (45) days; Submit to random urinalysis testing; and Complete all conditions within ten (10) months.* Additional conditions included attending two (2) Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings per week for the first two (2) months of probation. Vehicle impoundment was waived, provided the defendant did not own a vehicle during the probationary period. The division recommends approval subject to the condition of one (1) year probation.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Keller, would you like to address the Board? If so, we would need to swear you in, please.

Ms. Keller – Yes, I can be sworn in.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Keller, 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. Keller – Yes.

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

Ms. Keller – My name is Anna Keller, K-E-L-L-E-R.

Ms. Simon – Thank you ma'am. Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Simon. Ms. Keller, would you like to address the Board members?

Ms. Keller – Yes. I just wanted to say that this was the first and only time ever been in trouble. I made a very bad judgment call while I was on vacation. I apologize and I've done all the things that they needed me to do, and I would really like to have my you know director license reinstated.

Chair Peeples – Thank You Ms. Keller. Board members?

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – Ms. Keller have you completed all the things you were ordered to do?

Ms. Keller – Yes, I've done everything except for two (2) more probation meetings.

Mr. Ferreira – And when are those meetings?

Ms. Keller – Once a month.

Mr. Ferreira – So, you have two (2) months left?

Ms. Keller – Yes. I'm done with probation on December 7th.

Mr. Ferreira – Okay, that's it, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Board members, any questions for Ms. Keller or what would be the Board's recommendation?

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the application with the condition of one (1) year probation. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Keller. Good luck.

Ms. Keller – Thank you.

J. Application(s) for Internship

(1) Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum F

(a) Funeral Director

1. Johnston, Christopher E F075975
2. Lamour, Adriana F884939

(b) Funeral Director & Embalmer (Concurrent)

1. Kurtz-McFadden, Tracy F886385
2. McNeal Jr., Arnold M F882858
3. Sanchez, Mario T F886384
4. Spieldenner, Kelsey M F881167
5. Xtutrilla, Mayday I F879622

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.

(2) Funeral Director Intern

(a) Recommended for Denial (Criminal History)

1. Ward, Jerry Jr

Ms. Simon – Is Mr. Ward or a representative of Mr. Ward on the call today? Hearing no response. An application for a funeral director intern license was received by the Division on May 19, 2025. The application was incomplete when submitted, and a deficiency letter was issued. The applicant answered “yes” to the criminal history questions on the application, and the fingerprint results revealed reportable criminal history. Ongoing email communication with the applicant continued over the following weeks regarding the deficiency items and requirements to move the application forward. Ms. Ward has an official transcript forthcoming to the Division which would deem his application complete. On or about July 3, 2014, Mr. Ward entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to “Grand Theft,” a felony of the third degree. Mr. Ward was sentenced to twenty-four (24) months of probation. Based on that criminal charge, the Division is recommending denial.

Chair Peeples – Board members.

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – Is this individual in mortuary school or anything like that, Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I would need to look in the Board package, Mr. Ferreira. Mr. Ward is indeed an applicant for funeral director internship licensure, and he has stated on his application that he does have a college degree, and that is on Page 3. Well, it says that the degree was awarded on, I believe it's July 26, 2025. So, it does not appear as if this applicant is currently in school. Well, wait a minute. If I move on to Page 5, it reflects that the applicant is currently enrolled in the course study at Miami-Dade, although unfortunately the rest of the application indicates that {inaudible} in the application

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – So, this incident happened in 2024.

Ms. Simon – Actually Mr. Ferreira I believe it says on the cover sheet that it was in 2014 that Mr. Ward entered a plea and that is also on Page 14 of your application.

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, that's all my questions.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – Do we know the details of the charge and was this person notified to appear today?

Ms. Simon – If I may? The applicant failed to submit information relating to the details of the charge. I do not believe that he was required to do so, and all of our applicants are notified that their item will appear on a Board agenda and the date.

Mr. Quinn – Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Board members what is your pleasure? Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark – I may have just missed it, but did they provide the transcript? I know we were just talking about school and he says he's going to graduate but it says that an official transcript is forthcoming to Division. Did the Division get that?

Ms. Simon – I believe that the Division did.

Ms. Crystal Grant – Yes, we did.

Ms. Simon – Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Clark, please let the record reflect that Ms. Crystal Grant replied in the affirmative to your question.

Mr. Clark – Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Board members, your pleasure?

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to approve the application with the probation. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – And how much probation, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – I would say six (6) months. I mean, this was eleven (11) years ago, so let's do a six (6) month probation, please.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Liotta, do you agree with that?

Ms. Liotta – Yes, that's fine.

Chair Peeples – So we have a motion by Mr. Jensen of approval with probation of six (6) months. We have a second by Ms. Liotta. Is there a discussion on the motion? Hearing none. All in favor the motion, say Yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples –Opposed, say No.

Mr. Chapman – No.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Motion carries. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am.

- (3) Request to Renew Internship*
- (a) Recommended for Approval without Conditions*
- 1. Funeral Director*
- a. Wilson, Audrey*

Ms. Simon – Is Ms. Wilson on the call today or a representative of Ms. Wilson?

Ms. Audrey Wilson – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Wilson. An application to renew the funeral director internship to continue course of study was received by the Division on August 21, 2025. Upon review and processing, the application was deemed complete. The applicant was previously licensed as a funeral director intern pursuant to Rule 69K-18.002 (10), Florida Administrative Code, which allows only one internship per individual. Ms. Wilson's funeral director intern license expired on August 22, 2025, and her renewal application was received timely. The Division recommends approval. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Wilson, would you like to address the Board? If so, may we swear you in, please?

Ms. Wilson – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Please raise your right hand to be sworn in. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Ms. Wilson – Yes, ma'am.

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

Ms. Wilson – Audrey Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Simon. Ms. Wilson, would you like to address the Board, ma'am?

Ms. Wilson – Yes, I would just like to say thank you to renewing my license and giving me an opportunity to extend my knowledge and growth within the community industry.

Chair Peeples – Thank you ma'am. Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the application. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Thank you for attending. Good luck, Ms. Wilson.

Ms. Wilson – Thank you and thank you, Board.

- 2. Funeral Director and Embalmer (Concurrent)*

a. White, Shauma A

Ms. Simon – Is Ms. White or a representative of Ms. White on the call today? Hearing no response. An application to renew the concurrent internship license due to illness, hardship, or awaiting results was received by the division on August 5, 2025. The application was deemed completed once reviewed and processed. The applicant was licensed as a concurrent intern pursuant to 69K-18.003 (6), Florida Administrative Code, which only permits one internship in a lifetime. Ms. Woods concurrent intern license expired on August 6, 2025, and the application to renew was received timely. The Division recommends approval.

Chair Peeples – Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the application. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. Woods, Christie J

Ms. Simon – Is Ms. Woods or a representative of Ms. Woods on the call today? Hearing no response. An application to renew Ms. Wood's concurrent internship license due to illness, hardship or awaiting results was received by the division on July 30, 2025. The application was deemed completed once reviewed and processed. The applicant was licensed as a concurrent intern pursuant to 69K-18.003 (6), Florida Administrative Code, which only permits one internship in a lifetime. Ms. Woods concurrent intern license expired on August 12, 2025, and the application to renew was received timely. The Division recommends approval.

MOTION: Mr. Quinn moved to approve the application. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(b) Recommended for Denial

1. Funeral Director

a. Arthur, Jimmy L

Ms. Simon – Is Mr. Arthur or a representative of Mr. Arthur on the call today?

Ms. Lauren Pettine – Yes, Lauren Pettine here for Jimmy Arthur. He is also on the call as well as his supervisor, Mary Dennard.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Pettine. An application to renew Mr. Arthur's funeral director internship to continue course of study was received by the Division on August 4, 2025. Upon review and processing, the application was deemed complete. The applicant was previously licensed as a funeral director intern pursuant to Rule 69K-18.002 (10), Florida Administrative Code, which allows only one internship per individual allowed. Mr. Arthur's Funeral Director Intern license expired on July 30, 2025, and his renewal application was not received timely. The Division recommends denial pursuant to Rule 69K-18.002(7)(c), Florida Administrative Code which requires the application to be filed before the initial internship ends. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Ms. Pettine, before you address the Board, can we swear Mr. Arthur in? And also, who else did you mention was on the call, please?

Ms. Pettine – His supervisor is here as well. The two (2) of them are here just to answer any questions, Chair Peeples. If you would like to swear him in at that point, or if you would like to swear him in now, that's fine with me.

Chair Peeples – I prefer to do it now if we may, please. So, Mr. Arthur, if you let Ms. Simon swear you in, please.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Arthur, Ms. Pettine indicated your manager is on the call, too. Who is your manager?

Mr. Jimmy L. Arthur – Yes, ma'am. My manager is Ms. Mary Dennard. She is on the line as well.

Ms. Simon – Is she with you or is she simply on the phone?

Ms. Mary Dennard – I'm at another office.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. I just see Ms. Dennard. Would you both please raise your right hands to be sworn in? Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Arthur – I do.

Ms. Dennard – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Arthur, please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

Mr. Arthur – Yes ma'am. My name is Jimmy Arthur Jr, A-R-T-H-U-R, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – And thank you. Ms. Dennard, please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

Ms. Dennard – Mary Dennard, D-E-N-N-A-R-D.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon, Ms. Pettine.

Ms. Pettine – Thank you. Good morning, Chair Peeples, Board members. I'm here on behalf of Mr. Arthur, who is requesting renewal of his internship. As noted in the Board packet, it stated that his application for renewal was received on August 4th. I believe there is a stamp on that indicating that it was received on August 1st. Only two (2) days after and sent before the termination of his internship. I want to talk about first, why this application was sent in so close to the conclusion of the internship, and then second, about the applicable regulations and laws that would allow this Board to permit Mr. Arthur renewal of his license today. Mr. Arthur is a 20-year Army veteran who served in mortuary operation support for deceased soldiers. He was deployed six (6) times, and he's working towards a second career. He has an associate's degree in business management. His supervisor reports that he is an exceptional employee. He's worked with multiple funeral establishments after his time with the Army as a driver, a funeral attendant, field service associate, and now as an apprentice with his supervisor at Hardage-Gidden's Funeral Home. His internship was an informational item without any issues on the September 24th Board meeting, and he is here today if you'd like to ask him any questions. Now let's talk about why this was sent in. Mr. Arthur knew early on that he was going to be required to take pathology again as part of his degree. He is currently enrolled in that course and his final is set for September 19th, and he knew that he would have to apply for renewal. As you can see in the Board packet, he reached out in June to request information on how to apply for that renewal and received no response. Uncertain, he still did the research. He located the form, figured out the fee himself, and sent the application in. It was not received the first time it was sent, and he sent it in again, very close to the deadline of the expiration of his internship, but as you'll note by the signature on the 28th, prior to the date. So, he has been proactive in asking for help with this complicated process and exhausted his avenues available to file this application.

Second, there is a legal interpretation that would allow this Board to renew his internship today. The rule states the application to renew internship must be filed before the initial internship period ends, not received by the Division, but filed. Here we would argue that filed should be interpreted to include the mailbox rule, which is a rule that's used in federal tax law, so as long as it's postmarked prior to the date, it can be considered filed. This is also used in Florida contract law, Florida criminal law. I recognize that the Board has heard this argument before, and the previous concerns of the Board about this argument had been that this would open some sort of floodgate for other applicants. This is not the case. The Board's interpretation of the rule today would not be precedential. The Board's decisions do not create precedent in the way that courts do. Instead, this is a reasonable one-time interpretation that could apply to Mr. Arthur to allow him to renew this application since it was sent in prior to the expiration of his internship. He's been a credit to the industry. As a veteran and a worker in the industry for almost three (3) decades, he only seeks to continue with this licensure process just through the duration of completing his final course. Any denial of applications before you today will hinder him if he continues with his licensure process. So, in the alternative, if the Board does not find sufficient reason to go with this definition of filing to permit

this applicant Board today, we would ask this Board to allow us to petition for waiver and tabling this for next Board meeting. Thank you very much for your consideration. Please renew Mr. Arthur's application for internship.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Pettine. Mr. Arthur, I have a question. Ms. Pettine, please correct me if I am incorrect. Did you mention that he has a final that will be taken on September 19th of this year? Is that correct?

Ms. Pettine – Yes, he is currently enrolled in his Pathology course, and I believe the date of his final is September 19th. So, he is coming up on it quickly.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. So, Mr. Arthur, if I may ask, we've had a lot of situations come up regarding internship and I'm just going to state for the record, I'm old school. When I went to Mortuary College and I served my internship, it was just a year that I had, and then I could only take my state Board laws and rules test in January and July. I finished my internship in August, so I had to wait until January to take my state Board. Now technology allows you to do it any day. So modern technology is great, and we are appreciative of that, but one of the things that I did notice in the packet that you had reached out to Division office, and I don't know kind of what occurred between the time you sent your email, but also I'd like it for the record to note, in this industry as a licensed professional, as well as if you decide to become an FDIC, there's a lot of things you've got to follow up with, you've got to make sure that you have completed. And I think from your years in the military, you understand that and can appreciate that. So, I'd just like that for the record also. So, if we maybe grant you a less than one (1) year timeframe to complete, would that be applicable, because you have a September 19th test that you're going to take? So, I would like to suggest maybe a six-month extension of your probation. Would you please comment on that, sir?

Mr. Arthur – Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. Ultimately, you know, when I sat in this and I decided to continue on with my professional career in funeral services, I made the choice because. I ultimately wanted to look at my “why”: Why I wanted to do this; and Why I wanted to be a funeral director; and Why I wanted to continue the care and compassion for helping those who are going through the most difficult time. And my answer to myself was because I wanted to be that beacon of hope for those families who come through my door. The husband that is mourning the loss of a wife that he's been married to for forty (40) years. Also, the young family that was celebrating just a couple of days ago the potential birth of a new child and is drastically taken away from them. And they sit across from us with the uncertainty of what their future holds. Ultimately for me, it is a point where I am coming to the Board members, and I'm ultimately asking for some grace in the situation. One of the things that I have learned in the military and one of the things that we stand at as a staple is to seek responsibility and Accept responsibility for our actions. I do take accountability for the package not being in a timely manner, but I'm asking the Board members for grace to continue to let me learn, to continue to let me grow and learn not only from this situation but learn as you all have done in years past. As far as the extension. I would accept the six-month extension, but I ultimately want to have that year to have time to continue to study, to learn under Ms. Dennard and to get the information so that I am fully prepared when it is time for me to take my Board examinations, and to try to get this done right the first time. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Ms. Dennard, would you like to address the Board members?

Ms. Dennard – Yes, thank you so much, Madam Chair. I just ask that if you could give him the grace. He has been an exceptional employee for me. He has done Race Across America outside of his job titles. He does a lot of stuff with the VA in our community, and he truly is an asset to our business.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – Yes. A question, please. Mr. Arthur, first, let me start by saying, sir, thank you for your service to our country and thank you for caring for people and being dedicated to our profession. Do you have any other prior disciplinary items on your record?

Ms. Pettine – I can answer that.

Mr. Arthur – No, sir.

Mr. Quinn – Thank you.

Ms. Pettine – He does not have any previous discipline, any issues. As I stated in my earlier discussion, his previous application came early as an informational item. There was nothing else holding up his internship.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Quinn, does that complete your question, sir?

Mr. Quinn – I just have one other question. I see that the application was signed both by Mr. Arthur and Ms. Dennard on the 28th, and it's my understanding that it was overnighted. Did you overnight it out on the 28th, the day that it was signed?

Mr. Arthur – No, sir.

Ms. Pettine – You overnighted it the next day. Is that correct?

Mr. Arthur – The next morning. Yes, because it was it was late in the evening as we were working with families, we got that completed and we sent that out as quickly as we could.

Mr. Quinn – Thank you. So, it should have been received by the state in the month of July. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. Mr. Ferreira.

Mr. Ferreira – May I make a motion?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Ferreira – I think we need more guys like Mr. Arthur in our profession.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the application. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, is there a timeframe associated with this?

Mr. Ferreira – So, the internship is for a year?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. He's already had a year internship, so he's asking for a renewal of his current internship. I'm just asking if there would be any kind of timeframe associated.

Mr. Ferreira – Eight (8) months.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Liotta, do you agree with that amendment?

Ms. Liotta – Yes, I do.

Chair Peeples – So we have a motion by Mr. Ferreira, a second by Ms. Liotta for approval with an eight-month extension to his internship. Are there any other questions? Ms. Pettine?

Ms. Pettine – I simply wanted to state the traditional renewal application is for a year and that is what was originally applied for. I recognize that the Board today is making a definitional change in the definition of filing for just this applicant due to the mitigating circumstances that I've described, but I would encourage to allow the full year for the application. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – And Ms. Pettine, we're having a lot of this come and I think it needs to be noted that we've had a year already that Mr. Arthur has completed and I do not feel that he needs an additional year because that's dragging it out in my estimation and he needs to kind of follow things and kind of get to where he takes his National Board and then the State Laws and Rules, but thank you for your comment. So, we have a motion, we have a second is there any other discussion. Hearing

none, all in favor of the motion say Yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples – All opposed say No. Motion carries. Good luck Mr. Arthur. Thank you, Ms. Dennard, and thank you Ms. Pettine.

Mr. Arthur – Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. Pettine – Thank you, Board members.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

K. Applications(s) for Registration as a Training Facility

- (1) Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum G**
(a) Clearview Cremation, LLC (Sarasota)

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item. The Division has reviewed the applications on addendum G and have found them to be complete and that the applicants have met the requirements to be a training agency. Pursuant to Rule 69K-1.005, Florida Administrative Code, the Division has previously approved these applications.

L. Notification(s) of a Change in Location

- (1) Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum H**
(a) Gratitude And Compassion LLC d/b/a Coast to Coast Cremations (Ocala)
(b) Lasting Impressions of Central Florida, LLC (Altamonte Springs)
(c) Lynn-Hadley Mortuary Inc. (Quincy)

Ms. Simon – This is an informational item. The establishment listed on Addendum H has applied for a change of location of their business. The only criterion for approval is that the new location pass inspection by the Division of Funeral Cemetery and Consumer Services.

M. Application(s) for Funeral Establishment

- (1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions**
(a) A&R Funeral & Cremation Services LLC (Deerfield Beach)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today?

Mr. Maurice Dixon –Yes.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Mr. Dixon. An application for funeral establishment licensure was received on July 1, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on July 25, 2025. The funeral director in charge will be Mr. Maurice H. Dixon (F046688). A background check of principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff. If I may make note, on Page 5 of the application, Mr. Dixon originally indicated, or who filled out the application originally, indicated that there was a visitation chapel. That Page 5 has been amended. The Division is in receipt of this amended copy, which was received after the agenda was published. The application is amended to provide that there is no visitation chapel. Additionally, while the establishment offers cremation and refrigeration and embalming services, such services are maintained off-site, and the agreements for those services are included within your Board package.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Dixon, if you would like to address the Board, sir, we need to swear you in.

Mr. Dixon – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Please raise your right hand to be sworn in. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Dixon – I do.

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

Mr. Dixon – Maurice H. Dixon, D-I-X-O-N.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Mr. Dixon, would you like to address the Board or are you here just for questions?

Mr. Dixon – I have no questions.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Board members?

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

Chair Peeples – Good luck Mr. Dixon. Thank you for participating today.

Mr. Dixon – Thank you, and you all be blessed.

(b) Eden Funeral Fl LLC d/b/a Eden Funeral Services (Pompano Beach)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today?

Ms. Pettine – Yes, Lauren Pettine.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Pettine. A change in ownership application for Funeral Establishment licensure was received on July 10, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on July 28, 2025. The funeral Director in charge will be Mr. Lawrence M. Schuval (F024258). A background check of the principal did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Pettine would you like to address the Board or just here for questions?

Ms. Pettine – Just here for any questions this time.

Chair Peeples – Thank you ma'am. Board members?

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

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Pettine.

Ms. Pettine – Thank you, Board.

(c) McFadden and Kurtz Family Funeral Home Inc d/b/a/ Kurtz and McFadden Family Funeral Home Inc. (Margate)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative this entity on the call today?

Ms. Tracy McFadden – Yes ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. Who is this? The name of the representative?

Ms. McFadden – Tracy Kurtz McFadden.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. McFadden. An application for funeral establishment licensure was received on July 15, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on July 30, 2025. The funeral Director in charge will be Mr. Richard A. Kurtz (F046309). A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Simon. Ms. McFadden, would you like to address the Board? If so, we need to swear you in please.

Ms. McFadden – No, Madam Chair. I'm just here if you had any questions.

Chair Peeples – Thank you ma'am. Board members?

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

Chair Peeples – Thank you for participating Ms. McFadden. Good luck.

Ms. McFadden – Thank you so much.

(d) Peavy Funeral Home Inc. d/b/a Omega Crematory (Blountstown)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. A change of ownership application for funeral establishment licensure was received on July 25, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on August 18, 2025. The funeral Director in charge will be Mr. Charlie M. Peavy (F043961). A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

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

N. Application(s) for Preneed Main

(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions

(a) Gates Funeral Home LLC (Clermont)

Ms. Simon – The Department received an application for a new preneed license on August 4, 2025, and deficiencies were noted on the application. All deficiencies were resolved as of August 22, 2025. The sole owner and member of the LLC is Everett Gates. A completed background check of the principal was returned to the Division without criminal history. Applicant obtained its qualifying funeral establishment license as of May 9, 2025, under license # F857826 at the above listed location. If approved, Applicant will sell insurance-funded preneed through National Guardian Life Insurance Company (NGL) and utilize their approved prearranged funeral agreement forms. The Division recommends approval without conditions. Is there a representative of Gates Funeral Home LLC on the call today? Hearing no response. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Board members?

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

(2) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions*

(a) *Williams Funeral Home of Bartow LLC d/b/a Williams Funeral Home (Bartow)*

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of on the call today? Hearing no response. The Department received an application for a new preneed license on May 1, 2025, and deficiencies were noted on the application. All deficiencies were resolved as of July 28, 2025. A completed background check of the principal was returned to the Division without criminal history. Applicant obtained its qualifying funeral establishment license as of August 1984 under license #F041883. It should be noted that a Consent Order was issued by the Division against the funeral establishment license in October 2022, where Applicant was ordered to pay a fine in the amount of \$750.00. The fine was received by the Division as of December 13, 2022. If approved, Applicant will sell insurance-funded preneed through Great Western Insurance Company (GWIC) and utilize their approved pre-arranged funeral agreement forms. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the Applicant be placed on twelve (12) months' probation due to failure to disclose adverse licensing history on its application.

Chair Peoples – Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the application subject to the condition that Applicant be placed on twelve (12) months' probation. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

O. *Collective Application(s)*

(1) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions*

(a) *Carriage Funeral Holdings Inc and Carriage Cemetery Services Inc (Houston)*

1. *Change in Ownership*

- *Application to Acquire Control of an Existing Cemetery Company (1)*
- *Centralized Embalming Facility (1)*
- *Cinerator Facility (2)*
- *Direct Disposal License (1)*
- *Funeral establishments (8)*

Ms. Simon – Carriage, a corporation, has submitted the following: an application to acquire control of a cemetery company, seven (7) applications for funeral establishment licensure, two (2) applications for a cinerator facility licensure, an application for centralized embalming facility licensure, an application for direct disposal establishment licensure, and ten (10) applications for preneed branch office licensure which will operate under Carriage's preneed main license (please see preneed branch addendum), if approved, at the below listed locations. More specifically, the entities that are being acquired is as follows:

- 1) Osceola Memory Gardens LLC d/b/a Osceola Memory Gardens Cemetery, Funeral Homes & Crematory, a licensed cemetery company, license # F039522, physical address: 1690 Old Boggy Creek Rd, Kissimmee, FL 34744
- 2) Osceola Memory Gardens II LLC d/b/a Osceola Memory Gardens Cemetery, Funeral Homes & Crematory, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F041370, physical address: 2000 13th St, St Cloud, FL 34769
- 3) Osceola Memory Gardens II LLC d/b/a Osceola Memory Gardens Cemetery, Funeral Homes & Crematory, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F041097, physical address: 1717 Old Boggy Creek Rd, Kissimmee, FL 34744
- 4) Funeraria Porta Coeli LLC d/b/a Porta Coeli Funeraria y Crematorio, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F041776, physical address: 2801 E Osceola Pkwy, Kissimmee, FL 34743
- 5) Funeraria Borinquen LLC d/b/a Funeraria Borinquen, a licensed funeral establishment, license #F498640, physical address: 2360 Michigan Ave, Kissimmee, FL 34744
- 6) Faith Chapel Funeral Services LLC d/b/a Faith Chapel Funeral Homes & Crematory, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F091583, physical address: 1000 S Hwy 29, Cantonment, FL 32533
- 7) Faith Chapel Funeral Services LLC d/b/a Faith Chapel Funeral Homes & Crematory, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F091585, physical address: 100 Beverly Pkwy, Pensacola, FL 32505
- 8) Fisk Funeral Home Acquisition LLC d/b/a Fisk Funeral Home & Crematory, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F041498, physical address: 1107 Massachusetts Ave, St Cloud, FL 34769
- 9) Osceola Crematory LLC, a licensed cinerator facility, (license # F077954), physical address: 1650 Old Boggy Creek Rd, Kissimmee, FL 34744
- 10) Faith Chapel Funeral Services LLC d/b/a Faith Chapel North Funeral Home, a licensed cinerator facility, license # F091584, physical address: 1000 S Hwy 29, Cantonment, FL 32533

- 11) Osceola Memory Gardens II LLC, a licensed centralized embalming facility, license # F725710, physical address: 1650 Old Boggy Creek Rd, Kissimmee, FL 34744
- 12) Cremation Care Providers of Central Florida LLC, a licensed direct disposal establishment, license # F163616, physical address: 922 Brack St, Kissimmee, FL 34744

Included in your packet are the separate applications regarding the above listed properties. The change of ownership is the result of an asset purchase where Carriage is acquiring the assets and liabilities as specified in the attached letter from Attorney, Sam Mazzu, dated 6-30-2025. The officers of the corporation will be Shawn R. Phillips, Kathryn Shanley, Steven D. Metzger, and Carlos R. Quezada. All fingerprints for the principals were returned without criminal history. It should be noted that Applicant reported adverse licensing history which occurred in 2016 by the Nevada Board of Funeral & Cemetery Services. Applicant has met all conditions of this disciplinary action and there are no other current actions or issues in relation to the Applicant. 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 owner, Carriage. The Division recommends 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 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 Bill of Sale, Stock 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 ninety (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 this entity on the call today?

Mr. Sam Mazzu – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Is Mr. Mazzu?

Mr. Mazzu – That's correct, Ms. Simon.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Mr. Mazzu, would you like to address the Board or are you here for questions, sir?

Mr. Mazzu – I'll make just a brief statement, Madam Chair, and that's only to extend our gratitude to the staff at the Division for helping us process these applications, but otherwise I'm here to answer any questions the Board may have.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Board members?

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

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir, for participating today.

Mr. Mazzu – Thank you very much.

(2) *Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum I*
(a) Carriage Florida Holdings Inc (F058284) (multiple locations)

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair, these are the preneed branch applications that were mentioned in the previous collective applications, submitted by Carriage Florida Holdings, Incorporated. The applications were complete without reportable criminal history and accompanied by the required fee. The record indicates that the applicant qualifies for branch licensure. The recommendation is that the applicants be approved for the branch licensures applied for and the previously noted adverse licensing history may also apply to these applications.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma’am. Board members?

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

P. *Contract(s) or Other Related Form(s)*
(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions
(a) Preconstruction Performance Bond
1. Osiris Holdings of Florida, Inc d/b/a Fairway Memorial Gardens (Deerfield Beach)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. Osiris Holdings of Florida Incorporated d/b/a Fairway Memorial Gardens intends to build a mausoleum consisting of approximately 354 casket spaces, 200 niches. Pursuant to s. 497.272, F.S., while typically a preconstruction trust is put in place, the sales are looking to occur prior to completion. The statute provides that in lieu of the preconstruction trust fund, the cemetery company may provide a performance bond in an amount and by a surety company acceptable to the regulator. The licensee has submitted for approval of a performance bond in lieu of a preconstruction trust. The details of that performance bond are outlined within your Board package. The cemetery agrees that construction in accordance with the terms of the construction agreement included within your Board package with Mausoleum USA Construction Company, Incorporated. The Division recommends approval of the aforementioned preconstruction performance bond without conditions.

Chair Peeples – I see Ms. Coney is on the meeting via camera. Are you here for questions only, ma’am?

Ms. Lisa Coney – Questions only. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma’am.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to approve the preconstruction performance bond. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Ms. Coney.

Ms. Coney – Thank you Board.

(2) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions*
(a) Request for Approval of Cemetery and Preneed Trust Agreement(s) and Transfer of Trust
1. Faithful Heritage Holdings Inc d/b/a Resthaven Memorial Park (F872262 and F019269) (Tampa)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. Faithful Heritage Holdings Inc. (FHHI), through its representative, Summer Bokhary of Regions Bank, N.A., seeks approval of a preneed trust agreement and cemetery care and maintenance trust agreement, and proposed transfer of trust accounts, all as more specifically set forth in Ms. Bokhary’s correspondence dated August 6, 2025. The entity seeks approval of a preneed trust agreement, entitled “Faithful Heritage Holdings, Inc. Preneed Funeral and Cemetery Merchandise and Services Trust Agreement” (dated August 5, 2025) and a

preneed trust agreement, entitled “Faithful Heritage Holdings, Inc. Cemetery Care and Maintenance Trust Agreement” (dated August 5, 2025).

Due to an acquisition of the cemetery and preneed licenses for Resthaven Memorial Park by FHHI, FHHI seeks approval of the transfer of the following trust accounts: the Resthaven Memorial Park Inc Cemetery Merchandise and Services Trust Agreement (dated 4-7-89) (70/30 trust) under Regions Bank, N.A. (Regions) to the “Faithful Heritage Holdings, Inc. Preneed Funeral and Cemetery Merchandise and Services Trust Agreement” (dated 8-5-25) (70/30 trust); and transfer of the Resthaven Memorial Park Inc Cemetery Care and Maintenance Trust Agreement to the “Faithful Heritage Holdings, Inc. Cemetery Care and Maintenance Trust Agreement” (dated 8-5-25); under Regions. If approved, Regions will continue to be the trustee, all as more specifically set out in attached correspondence from Ms. Bokhary. The Division recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the representations of FHHI through its representative as set forth in letter dated August 6, 2025, copy attached hereto, be deemed material to the Board's decisions herein.
- 2) That fully executed copies of the trust documents as identified above be provided to the Division within 60 days of this board meeting.
- 3) That within ninety (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 the representative's correspondence, dated 8/6/25.
 - ⦿ 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 the representative's attached correspondence, dated August 6, 2025.
 - ⦿ Acknowledgement of receipt of the amount of trust assets being transferred as specified under the former trust, as identified in the representative's attached correspondence, dated August 6, 2025.
- 3) That the Board's executive director, for good cause shown, may extend the compliance time frame for the above specified conditions, an additional ninety (90) days.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Did we happen to ask if there was a representative here?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, ma'am. Appreciate it. Board members?

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

Q. Related Items

(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(a) Monument Establishment Retailer

1. Tim White's Vault Company of Crestview LLC (Crestview)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. A change of ownership application for a monument establishment licensure was received on June 18, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on July 22, 2025. A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. Adverse licensing history from 2024 for Tim White's Vault Company of Crestview is included in this packet. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment must pass an inspection conducted by a member of the Division staff.

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

(b) Monument Sales Agreement

1. Tim White's Vault Company of Crestview LLC (Crestview)

Ms. Simon – The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that two (2) full-sized print-ready copies of the revised monument sales agreement are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of the Final Order executed in this matter.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the agreement subject to the condition that two (2) full-sized print-ready copies of the revised monument sales agreement are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of the Final Order executed in this matter. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

R. Executive Director's Report
(1) Operational Report (Verbal)

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

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you. Madam Chair?

Chair Peebles – Yes, ma'am?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, ma'am. Only two (2) announcements at this point. The next Rules Committee meeting is set to take place by videoconference beginning at 10 a.m. on September 30th. The purpose of the meeting will be to revisit sixteen (16) of the shared rules in more depth, possibly arriving at proposed language for each of these rules, which the Committee finally determines require changes. As always, all Board members are encouraged to attend, if possible.

The next Board meeting will take place by videoconference on October 9th. Additional details on all Board meetings and any scheduled meetings, Rules Committee meetings are found on our website. Thank you. That ends this portion of the Executive Director's Report.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes.

(2) Report on Payment of Disciplinary Fines and Costs (Informational)

Ms. Simon – This is informational only. However, to update the report that is included within your Board package, as to two (2) of the fines that have not been paid, Melinda Jackson and Ruben Rojas, those licenses have been suspended {inaudible} have paid.

Monthly Report of Fines and Costs Assessed and Paid Division of Funeral, Cemetery and Consumer Services Date of Board meeting: May 29, 2025
Date of Board meeting: September 4, 2025
Date report was prepared: August 25, 2025

	Licensee	Board Meeting	Case No.	Total Fine	Date Due	Paid in Full?	Comments
	Travis Gibson	7-Aug-25	316203-23-FC	\$500			
	Travis Gibson	7-Aug-25	316823-23-FC	\$5,000			
	Travis Gibson	7-Aug-25	316756-23-FC	\$2,500			
	Richard Mengeling	8/7/2025	258609-20-FC	\$500			
	Charles Chestnut IV	8/7/2025	334936-24-FC & 346917-25-FC	\$4,000			
	Michael Bowden	8/7/2025	344259-25-FC	\$1,000		Paid in Full	
	Scobee-Combs Crematory	8/7/2025	344257-25-FC	\$1,000		Paid in Full	
	Westside Funeral Home Inc.	8/7/2025	328217-24-FC	\$1,500			
	George Woodie	8/7/2025	328221-24-FC	\$1,500			
	Jerry Nackashi	26-Jun-25	311622-23-FC	\$1,500			
	Sarah Noble	26-Jun-25	334752-24-FC	\$2,000			
	Glorida Castillo	26-Jun-25	333147-24-FC & 333151-24-FC	\$1,250			
	Integrity Funeral Services of Tampa FL, Inc.	26-Jun-25	333146-24-FC & 333149-24-FC	\$1,250			
	Roderick Stevens	29-May-25	338272-25-FC	\$1,750	18-Aug-25		
	D A Jackson Funeral Home	29-May-25	338271-25-FC	\$3,500	18-Aug-25		

Michael O'Brien	29-May-25	320333-23-FC	\$5,500	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Jeb Stuart Turner	29-May-25	309706-23-FC & 334886-24-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Jarrod Theodore Campbell	29-May-25	320816-23-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
JT Campbell Funeral Home and Cremation Services Macedonia Chapel LLC	29-May-25	320813-23-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Albert Morrison	29-May-25	320814-23-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Paradise Funeral Chapel, LLC	5/1/2025	292042-22-FC	\$2,000	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Melinda Mezeline Jackson	5/1/2025	316674-23-FC & 316677-23-FC	\$4,000 + \$2,500	18-Aug-25		
Donna Summerour McRae	5/1/2025	325260-24-FC	\$2,000	18-Aug-25		
Joyce Wynelle Williams	5/1/2025	316197-23-FC	\$3,000	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
River City Crematory Inc.	5/1/2025	312544-23-FC	\$3,000	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
SCI Funeral Services of Florida LLC - Manasota db/a Manasota Memorial Park	5/1/2025	303160-22-FC	\$2,000	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Douglas Eric Hasley	5/1/2025	330950-24-FC	\$1,750	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Stonemor Florida Subsidiary, LLC db/a Forrest Hills- Memorial Park	5/1/2025	300643-22-FC	\$750	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Stonemor Florida Subsidiary, LLC db/a Forrest Hills- Palm City Chapel	5/1/2025	293062-22-FC & 300644-22-FC	\$24,000	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
Ruben Rojas	6-03-25	320710-23-FC	\$8,000	5-05-25		
Nadine Ingeed Maignan	6-03-25	325323-24-FC	\$1,250	5-05-25	Paid in Full	
Geronimo Mena Jr.	2/6/2025	311851-23-FC	\$2,000	3/01/2025		
Ronald Dolinar	1/2/2025	325255-24-FC	\$1,500	13-03-25		

ES 8-25-25

S. Chair's Report (Verbal)

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Three (3) items. First, Rules Committee. Mr. Clark, thank you for chairing. Thank you for participating. Ms. Clay, Mr. Williams, Mr. Jensen, thank you for your work on this Committee. You are doing excellent. We appreciate that. Board members, I appreciate the due diligence that everyone's doing, and I appreciate the Division staff. We just went through funeral director license renewal, and it was a challenge, but as always, they came through. So, Division staff thank you very much being led by Ms. Schwantes and Ms. Simon. So, thank you that concludes my report.

Ms. Simon – Thank you Madam Chair.

T. Office of Attorney General's Report (1) Attorney General's Rules Report (Informational)

Ms. Simon – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Presented for informational purposes only. Thank you.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am.

BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES RULES REPORT SEPTEMBER 2025

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date Rule Language Approved by Board	Date Sent to OFARR	Rule Development Published	Notice Published	Adopted	Effective

U. Public Comments (Verbal)

Ms. Simon – Are there any public comments to be shared during today's Board meeting?

Mr. Christopher Chestnut – I'd like to make a comment.

Chair Peeples – Okay, who is this, please? If you'll please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

Mr. Chestnut – Christopher Chestnut, C-H-E-S-T-N-U-T.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Ms. Simon, would we need to swear him in or allow him just to make his public comments?

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair, I believe you would be entitled to allow him just to make his public comments.

Ms. Munson – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma'am and I see Ms. Munson is in the affirmative. Thank you, Ms. Munson. Mr. Chestnut?

Mr. Chestnut – Thank you, ma'am. Thank you for this time and thank you to the Board. You seem to be very thorough. I would just like to first as an aside, just perhaps encourage the Board to really embrace funeral homes and funeral director. It seems like we're getting very aggressive on funeral directors. For instance, I heard earlier the issue with the Batesville website, which was Batesville is advertising preneed for funeral homes that don't have preneed. This has been going on for a while, and a number of funeral homes have been cited for it. A number of funeral homes who have older members. I think my dad was brought up on this at seventy-seven (77) years old. He didn't even log on to the computer. And maybe at some point we could address Batesville. And maybe ask them in their inquiry for website design, to inquire to the funeral home if they have a preneed license in Florida. And if not, then they're offered a different format. But perhaps the fix here is Batesville and not continuing to cite the funeral directors.

Which brings me to my second point, which is kind of a greater concern, just an overall concern with the investigation and prosecution under the Department. Specifically, Mr. Brimmer and Mr. Carr, I've had significant issue, not only with our firm, but with me personally. They have engaged in what is considered "state action" under 1983, in prosecuting cases. In habitually bringing cases, it's at the level of harassment. It is also commensurate with disparate treatment. The statistics on prosecution, along with cases that are brought under them, are not very compelling for the benefit of the Department in terms of similarly situated individuals. So, this may be for the Office of the Attorney General, but I'm just asking someone to please look into what is happening out here day-to-day in this state. It seems like these folks, they come into our establishments, are not familiar with the rules, prosecuting or attempting to prosecute complaints. They're picking and choosing the complaints that they prosecute. Since I have a complaint filed against us, I will hire private investigators to go out. We find the actual facts to incriminate or indict someone else, and they won't prosecute the case but yet we have case after case coming against us, even if the case law analysis demonstrates otherwise. And I just want to clarify "state action".

You know, Mr. Brimmer has been responsible in running away about three (3) of my funeral directors. And then he's said {inaudible} as a rumor, that he's going to get me locked up for unlicensed practice of funeral directing. And yet every time I get a funeral director; he runs them off. I just don't think this is fair. I think there has to be some oversight and it would be great if someone could hear our complaints, right, our {inaudible}. Even with the Department here, I now see an Administrative Complaint against me for my apprenticeship license, yet for failing to disclose a disbarment. But it fails to highlight or acknowledge that in 2023, I submitted a motion, an application for a preneed application, attached a 76-page document of the disbarment in that application, then I was told to withdraw my application for preneed for criminal history, even though that was an adverse licensing issue. It just seems not to be consistent. Mr. Brimmer was investigating a case, comes into our funeral home, we give him affidavits demonstrating that we're innocent of the charge and moreover that there is no charge under law.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Chestnut, if I may?

Mr. Chestnut – I'm sorry.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Chestnut. I have Ms. Munson and Ms. Schwantes that have raised their hands. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – My comment would be, first of all, the opportunity for public comment is open for whatever comment that may be helpful to some extent to the public and also to the Department. It just appears to me, Mr. Chestnut, that you have a very specific complaint about the Department, and I don't want to leave the impression that your comment on this record is going to further any additional investigation of your complaint. It's on the record, but if you want to officially contact the Department, I would recommend that you do so in writing, because it seems to be that that may be your primary concern, is that this known, what you may feel is a travesty of justice, is known to the Department where you may feel it is otherwise unknown to the Department. So, this is an opportunity for you to please understand that your information should be submitted to the Department in writing. It will not be necessarily fully investigated by the comments made during this meeting. And I don't want to leave the impression that it would be.

Mr. Chestnut – I'm familiar with the legal process. I'm just saying as well, and I'm sorry if it seems personal, it's not. The reason I'm bringing this up and offering the detail is because this is not an isolated incident. If it were, I would have just filed a lawsuit, but it's not an isolated incident. There are a number of funeral homes with similar complaints, and so all I'm asking is for just some fairness and equity in, or at least a platform for funeral directors who may feel the similar grievance to be heard, and I thank you for your time.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Chestnut. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I believe Ms. Schwantes is on the call and she might need more to make a comment.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – I did. Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Chestnut, we do not discuss open investigations here and so would not get into specific details. It did appear to me, as Ms. Munson indicated, that you had some specific complaints that might relate to something, but we cannot get into open investigations or anything of that matter. If you have complaints about any of our Division staff, and this goes for anybody, I encourage people to reach out to me directly, and I very much appreciate it when you do, and then we will look at that. I think that's all I needed to say for right now. Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Chestnut – And if I may just for the record. I have reached out to Ms. Simon, and I believe you as well, Ms. Schwantes, but I've made effort to reach out before, which was responded with more complaints against our funeral home.

Ms. Schwantes – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Ms. Schwantes.

Ms. Schwantes – Again, Mr. Chestnut, just reach out to me if you have further complaints about this process, and I do want to assure the Board that we do investigate every complaint that is received.

Ms. Simon – Moving on, if I may, Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Are there any additional public comments to be made in today's meeting? Hearing no response. Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon.

V. Administrative Report as August 21, 2025

A.	New Cemetery Applications	0
	Recommended for Approval	0
	Pending	0

B.	Cemetery Acquisition Applications	1
	Recommended for Approval	1
	Pending	0
C.	Preneed License Applications	3
	Active Preneed Licenses	300
	Presented to the Board at this Meeting	2
	Pending	1
D.	Preneed License Branch Applications	10
	Active Preneed License Branches	386
	Recommended for Approval	10
	Pending	0
E.	Preneed Sales Agent Applications	40
	Active Sales Agents	3573
	Recommended for Approval	26
	Temporary Licenses Issued Pending Permanent	14
F.	Monument Establishment Applications	0
	Active Monument Establishments	79
	Pending	0
G.	Broker of Burial Rights Applications	0
	Active Brokers of Burial Rights	30
	Pending	0
H.	Exempt Cemetery Reports	1
	Active Exempt Cemeteries	50
	Pending	0
I.	New Establishment Applications	19
	Pending	19
	Completed	0
J.	New Individual Applications	26
	Pending	26
	Completed	0
K.	Request for Training Facility Applications	3
	Pending	0
	Completed	3
L.	Request for Continuing Education Providers and Courses	13
	Pending	0
	Completed	13
M.	Initial Inspections	10
	Completed	10
N.	Inspections	62
	Completed	62

O.	Initial Licenses Issued	17
	Renewal Licenses	723

W. **Disciplinary Report**

Notices of Non-Compliance Issued Since Last Meeting (August 7, 2025)	0
---	---

X. **Upcoming Meeting(s)**

- (1) *October 9th (Videoconference)*
- (2) *November 6th (Videoconference)*
- (3) *December 4th (Videoconference)*

Y. **Adjournment**

Chair Peeples – It is 1:07 and we will adjourn this meeting. Thank you, Board members, Ms. Munson and staff. Thank you.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:07.