MINUTES
BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES
VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2026 - 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 Funerals, Cemetery and Consumer Services. This is Thursday, October 8th. It's 10 o'clock a.m. and I'm going to call the meeting to order. I'd like to turn it over to Ms. Marshall for an initial comment, please.

Ms. Kimberly Marshall – Good morning, everyone. My name is Kimberly Marshall, and I am the Assistant Director for the Division of Funeral Cemetery and Consumer Services. Today is October 8, 2026, and it is approximately 10 a.m. This is a public meeting of the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. This meeting is being held by video conference. Notice of this meeting has been duly published in the Florida Administrative Register. The link and call in number are on the agenda, which has been made available to the public. The link and call in number, as well as other information relating to this Board meeting, have 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 otherwise negatively impacts the recording of this meeting. Just as in a live meeting, persons speaking are requested to identify themselves for the record each time they speak. Participants are respectfully reminded that the Board's Chair, 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 X 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 relitigate 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. A Division employee is monitoring the chat feature and, as necessary, will forward your inquiry to someone who can assist in resolution of the problem. Madam Chair, 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

Also noted as present:
Mary Schwantes, Executive Director
Rachelle Munson, Board Legal Advisor
Greg Caracci, Department Legal Counsel
Alice Nesterova, Department Legal Counsel
LaTonya Bryant, Department Staff

Ms. Marshall – Madam Chair, there is a quorum for the business of the Board.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Bill Quinn – Madam Chair, this is Mr. Quinn. Could I make a comment, please?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, sir. Please.

Mr. Quinn – Just want to add to the record, as an appointed 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 Peeples – Thank you, sir. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Madam Chair.

B. Action on Minutes
(1) September 3, 2026

Ms. Marshall – The minutes that are presented are from September 3rd. It would be appropriate for a Board Member to make a motion regarding this item.

MOTION: Mr. Darrin Williams moved to adopt the minutes of the September 3rd Board meeting. Mr. Ken Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – My Surface Pro has some background noise, so Mr. Clark, will you take over and let me change to another computer, please, sir?

Mr. Andrew Clark – Of course. No problem.

Chair Peeples – Thank you.

C. Old Business
(1) Department's Motion for an Order Dismissing Petition Without Prejudice
(a) Brown Memorial Funeral Home & Cremation Service LLC: DFS Case No. 357268-26-FC; Division No. ATN-46116 (F041798)

Ms. Marshall – This matter had previously been brought before the Board last month and the Board voted to approve the motion. However, in preparing the minutes, it was discovered that a recused Board member inadvertently made a motion in

this matter. Therefore, it is being brought back today in order to re-hear the motion and have a clean vote. Is there a representative of Brown Memorial Funeral Home on the call today?

Ms. Nicole Gillisey – Yes, I'm the secretary. Mr. Brown is having chemotherapy today.

Ms. Marshall – Okay. Thank you. And who is this?

Ms. Gillisey – Nicole Gillisey.

Ms. Marshall – Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Gillisey. So, 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 May 22, 2026, the Department filed an Administrative Complaint against Brown Memorial Funeral Home & Cremation Service LLC ("Respondent") alleging violations of Chapter 497, Florida Statutes. On or about June 19, 2026, Respondent submitted a timely 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.

Mr. Williams – Mr. Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams – I have a question. So, my concerns are several, but we're giving this person another twenty-one (21) days to respond to the order to dispute claims that said they did not dispute initially. So, they're getting another twenty-one (21) days to do the same thing. I'm not following, based on your outline, Mr. Caracci.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Caracci, do you want to respond?

Mr. Caracci – Are you saying regardless of sending the matter back to the Board that they should have provided a response anyway? In twenty-one (21) days?

Mr. Williams – Yes, that's what I'm just asking. I mean, is that customary that we give the person another twenty-one (21) days to do the same thing of what initially the first twenty-one (21) days did not accomplish?

Mr. Caracci – I can't say whether it's customary. This is the first time I believe I've had something sent back for this reason. I'm personally inclined to, especially with Ms. Gillisey saying that Mr. Brown, who I'm assuming stands in the shoes of Brown Memorial, is undergoing some health issues right now. I'm inclined to give them an extra twenty-one (21) days.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Caracci. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Thank you. So, this is standard for Office of General Counsel to if somebody files a disputed election of proceeding, but doesn't identify any facts that are in dispute, a standard procedure to bring it before the Board, dismiss the petition, and give them another opportunity to respond. That's just as a matter of course. The reason it's being brought back today is simply a procedural defect in the way this was handled at the last meeting. So, we just want to make the record clean on that.

Mr. Griffin – And if I may? Marshawn Griffin for the Department. Pursuant to section 128.569, Florida Statute, if a petition is submitted that is spatially insufficient, we are required to dismiss them once and give them one more additional bite at the apple to submit a facially sufficient petition.

Mr. Williams – Okay.

Vice Chair Clark – Any other questions, Mr. Williams? Is that helpful?

Mr. Williams – Yes, Mr. Clark. And so, would this come back before the Board at the conclusion of twenty-one (21) days?

Mr. Caracci – If we don't get a response, we would be filing a motion for waiver.

Mr. Williams – Okay. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr. Jones?

Ms. Rachelle Munson – I'm sorry. This is the same thing happening. Sorry. I'm sorry.

Ms. Marshall – Sorry. Mr. Jones is recused from this case, because he's on the Probable Cause Panel. This is why we're back here.

MOTION: Ms. Janis Liotta 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 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. Mr. David Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Jones – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes, Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones – Ms. Marshall, I guess to make these simpler in the future, if it was a probable cause case and we're doing this, could we list it so that when I look at it, I would know not to make a motion on this?

Ms. Marshall – Certainly.

Mr. Jones – That would prevent this in the future. Thank you.

Ms. Marshall – Yes, absolutely. We'll make sure to make that clearer in the materials.

Mr. Jones – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jones. Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Mary Schwantes – Thank you, sir.

D. Rules Committee Items

(1) August 6, 2026, Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Ms. Schwantes – The Committee met on August 6th. These minutes were approved by the Committee at its latest meeting on September 25th, and Board action is required on the minutes.

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

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

(2) Report and Recommendations for Rules Committee Meeting August 6, 2026

Ms. Schwantes – There were seven (7) rules that the Committee decided needed to be changed as a result of Senate Bill 598. In August, we discussed three (3) of those, in particular, that we would discuss the proposed language on. Assuming Board approval of the Report And Recommendations, the actual proposed language will be brought back to the Board again separately for decisions regarding each individual rule, and that will be at a subsequent meeting. We are still discussing four (4) of the seven (7) rules during these Committee meetings. Again, this Report and Recommendations was approved by the Committee at its September 25th meeting. Board action is needed.

MOTION: Mr. Todd Ferreira moved to approve the Report and Recommendations. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thanks, Board members. Turning it back over to Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes.

E. Office of General Counsel's Presentation

(1) Moral Turpitude Crimes (Verbal)

Ms. Marshall – So, with the passage of this new section 497.1411, the Board has new guidelines on how to handle criminal history. Section 2(c) of this statute provides for a permanent bar on licensure for individuals who have been found guilty of or pled guilty or nolo contendere to any felony involving moral turpitude. And you all have seen a couple of these matters before you since the statute came into effect. However, because the definition of moral turpitude crimes is less than straightforward, Mr. Marshawn Griffin from the Office of General Counsel has graciously volunteered to provide an educational presentation on the topic. So, I will turn the meeting over to him.

Mr. Marshawn Griffin – So, to start off with, what is moral turpitude? In the 11th Circuit, it's defined as an act of baseness, vileness, or depravity in the private and social duties which a man owes to his fellow man or society in general. Another case is stated, and that's from Keungne v. U.S. Attorney General (*Chretien Keungne v. U.S. Attorney General*, 561 F.3d 1281). It's also been determined or called a crime involves moral turpitude if it involves reprehensible conduct in a culpable state. That's from Lauture v. U.S. Attorney General, (*Emmanuel Lauture v. U.S. Attorney General, 28 F.4th 1169*). And so, in order to determine whether or not a crime involves moral turpitude, you don't look at the underlying facts of the crime, you look at the statutory elements of the crime. So, like, what are the elements required to prove this crime in the statute? In the 11th Circuit, we use what's called the modified categorical approach. And so, what that does is, when we're looking to see whether or not a crime is moral turpitude, the analysis is, is it categorically, which means in every possible way, can you commit this crime does the crime involve moral turpitude? So, in order to start that analysis, what we do is start by looking at the elements of the statute, and in certain cases under the modified categorical approach, normally you just look at the elements of the crime. In some cases where the elements are what are called divisible, then you can look beyond the elements of the crime to look toward a small set of documents called the records of conviction in order to see kind of what specific subsection that person pled to in order to determine whether or not the crime categorically involves moral turpitude.

So where do we look to find whether or not a crime involves moral turpitude? We rely on decisions by the United States courts of appeals, as well as decisions from administrative tribunals, such as the Division of Administrative Hearings, the Bureau of Immigration Appeals. So, when we're looking at the elements of a crime to determine whether or not it's divisible, we have to look at whether or not it's -- an easy way to look at it is a statute is divisible if the difference in the elements kind of creates new crimes or increases penalties. So to give you an example, a statute that says whoever knowingly in, for example, section 843.01, which is the statute that criminalizes obstructing a police officer with violence says, whoever knowingly and willfully resists, obstructs or opposes any officer is defined in section 943.10, subsections (1), (2), (3), (6), (7), (8) or (9), or a member of the Florida Commission or an offender review or any administrative aide or supervisor employed by the commission, parole and probation supervisor, county probation officer, personnel or representative of the Department of Law Enforcement, or other person legally authorized to execute process in the execution of legal process or engage in the performance of his or her official duties, as described in section 943.10, by offering or doing violence to the person of such officer or legally authorized person commits a felony of the third degree. So, in that statute, that statute says basically there's three (3) or four (4) different ways that you can violate the statute. You can willfully resist with violence, obstruct with violence or oppose with violence. But if you listen to the wording of the statute, there's no distinction between whether you resist, oppose or obstruct, it's all the same crime. So that statute would be what's called not divisible, which means that

whenever we're looking at the determining the analysis, we're just look at the elements of the statute, look to the case law and see, does the court say that it's moral turpitude?

Now, sometimes you'll have a crime like burglary, for example, where the burglary statute basically states -- or sorry, it doesn't basically state -- it states, burglary is entering a dwelling structure of conveyance with the intent to commit offense therein, unless the premises are open to the public, or the defendant is licensed or invited to enter. And it also lists a couple other ways to kind of be inside of a place. So, at the end of the day, burglary is entering into a place with the intent to commit a crime. However, burglary is very divisible because what ends up happening is, is that it starts off and the statute creates different levels of punishment if you break into, for example, a house, if you break into an occupied house, if you break into a house or if you break into a place and commit a burglary or a battery. And for each one of those distinctions, you end up increasing or it changes the penalty that the crime could be charged by. So, in a situation like that, where somebody is charged with burglary, what we do is look to the record of conviction, which is the court documents, such as the charging document or information, the plea colloquy which is basically the speech that's given where the person enters a plea. Is there a factual basis for this? Tell me what you did. So, we can look to those documents to kind of figure out which specific subsection.

Now whenever we're looking at whether or not a crime involves moral turpitude, you're kind of looking at, is there a way that this crime can be committed in a non-morally turpitudinous way? So, burglary is unique because the crime is breaking into the house to commit a crime, right? So as a general rule, for example, some crimes are always not moral turpitude. So, for example, simple possession of drugs is not moral turpitude. However, possession with intent to sell, manufacture, or deliver is moral turpitude. So, burglary, the reason why I bring that up is we're going to use the example of burglary. If I break into a house with the intent to possess drugs, that burglary, unless it's an occupied home, that burglary is not going to be moral turpitude because the crime I broke in the house to commit wasn't moral turpitude. And because I can commit burglary in at least one way without it being morally turpitudinous, then the crime does not categorically involve moral turpitude.

So really this analysis is very driven by case law, and it is very driven by court decisions. That's pretty much the first and foremost thing we're looking at. And the persons relevant, you know, their story about what happened, that's not material and that's not even relevant to whether or not the crime is moral turpitude. The analysis is really constrained to just the elements of the crime. At least that's how it is done in the 11th Circuit, which is where we are, which is where we reside. Yes, ma'am?

Ms. Munson – I'm sorry. I believe member Jones had a question. I'll defer to members before I make a comment.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones – Thanks. Just for clarification, examples you gave, when the court levies a sentence, do they go ahead and determine whether it's moral turpitude?

Mr. Griffin – No. The court does not address moral turpitude. Like moral turpitude only comes up basically in an immigration context. It's not something that normally the courts or -- some states have rules of impeachment or rules of evidence that allow you to impeach people based on crimes involving moral turpitude. Florida does not have that. So, it is not something that comes up unless the whole issue of the case is whether or not moral turpitude, which is generally primarily in an immigration context.

Mr. Jones – So the Department will determine whether it is or not and then present it to the Board. Is that correct?

Mr. Griffin – Yes. And in order to do that, they're going to look to case law in order to determine what the case law says as to whether or not it's moral turpitude or not.

Mr. Jones – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – My only comment is a follow-up to member Jones is that because the Department is presenting the information for the Board to review, in that summary that's presented for cases before it, licensure case or whatever, regarding a moral turpitude issue, that that type of analysis is included in the summary. I think it's high expectation for the Board to go through

that type of legal analysis for every moral turpitude case. So, if the Department is feeling it is moral turpitude, it's a moral turpitude issue, that analysis would be included so the Board will be able to follow the basis for that presentation. That is just a recommendation as I look to the Board members as to making a fact-by-fact determination for any of these cases that may come before them. Laying some type of foundation is probably going to be the best way to explaining why the Department is presenting it as a moral turpitude issue.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Ms. Weiner?

Ms. Wendy Wiener – Just a follow-up question, I think, to the question Mr. Jones asked, and maybe getting at what Ms. Munson answered, the Division will determine if the crime is one of moral turpitude for purposes of presenting it to the Board, but that does not constrain the Board to a determination that it is a crime of moral turpitude. So, a licensee or a prospective licensee could argue to the Board successfully, perhaps, that the crime was not actually one of moral turpitude. Is that correct?

Ms. Munson – If I may answer?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Griffin?

Mr. Griffin – I'll let Board counsel respond.

Ms. Munson – The only comment I was going to make, because if an application comes before the Board, they have to make an independent determination. So that's for every application, right? The Department also recommend denial, but they do a lot. But it's the ultimate decision of the Board. I think that should be clear for the record, no matter what. But in developing that type of analysis, I think the clearest and most detailed foundation the Division or Department can bring would be very helpful.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Thank you, Ms. Wiener. Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes. Just for a point of clarity, I think going to what Board member Jones was stating, the Division, when they bring it to the Board, have kind of almost checked the boxes in terms of determining if it's moral turpitude, and then it's still up to us for independent review and things like that. But it has met the burden of proof. Is that safe to say?

Ms. Munson – I don't -- and please, I'm going to let Mr. Griffin fully respond to this or any other Department staff member. You talk about burden of proof. I think it's the Department's argument to present to the Board, this is why this application fits the criteria for moral turpitude. And then the Board has the ability to take that information into consideration. But with every summary that you receive from the Department, it works in the same way. I think that if it was -- any potential denials have to come before the Board. So, one may ask, if the Department already feels it should not be approved, it should be denied, they should not even bring it before the Board. There are no denials that can pass muster but for Board approval. So, in the Board approval process, these types of considerations, deliberations, and analyses would take place.

Mr. Williams – Follow up, Mr. Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams – So, Ms. Munson, is it asking for too much if we have a case that comes before us, if the Division or someone can bring that statute so that we can look and read it for ourselves to determine, you know, all the factors to make sure it does moral turpitude, like is it possible they can include that statute so we'll have something to reference to it or is that not permissible?

Ms. Munson – I would think in their summary, the argument would be laid out as to how this situation applies to the moral turpitude requirements of 497.1411 and include any language or case law that they feel may support it.
Mr. Williams – Okay, thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Williams. Any other questions? Hearing none. Chair Peeples, can I turn the meeting back over to you?

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. I appreciate your help. Ms. Marshall?

F. Disciplinary Proceeding(s)

(1) Motion for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Probable Cause Panel B)

(a) Crucet, Keila Kesia: DFS Case No. 349179-26-FC; Division No. ATN-46458 (F052106)

Ms. Marshall – Is Ms. Crucet or a representative on the call today?

Mr. Luke Grabowski – Good morning, Madam Chair. Luke Grabowski on behalf of Ms. Crucet.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Mr. Grabowski. And presenting for the Department is Mr. Caracci.

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – I need to recuse myself as I served on Probable Cause Panel B.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr. Caracci?

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. 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 Keila Kesia Crucet ("Respondent"). The Division alleges conducted an investigation of Respondent and alleges that Respondent is licensed as a funeral director and embalmer license number F052106. Respondent is the funeral director in charge of Serenity Funeral Home & Cremation LLC ("Serenity"), a funeral establishment, apprentice/intern training agency, and preneed main license number F071434. The establishment failed to obtain the legally authorized person's declaration of intent with respect to the disposition of the cremated remains of the deceased as required. This is a one-count administrative complaint, and the relevant statutory violations are as follows:

- Section 497.152(1)(a), Florida Statutes: Violating any provision of this chapter or any lawful order of the Board or Department or the statutory predecessors to the Board or Department.
- Section 497.152(1)(b), Florida Statutes: Committing fraud, deceit, negligence, incompetency, or misconduct in the practice of any of the activities regulated under this chapter.
- Section 497.152(4)(h), Florida Statutes: Failing to perform and statutory or legal obligation placed on a licensee.
- Section 497.380(7), Florida Statutes: Each licensed funeral establishment shall have a funeral director in charge and shall have a licensed funeral director reasonably available to the public during normal business hours for the establishment. The funeral director in charge is responsible for ensuring that the facility, its operation, and all persons employed in the facility comply with all applicable state and federal laws and rules.
- Section 497.607(1), Florida Statutes: at the time of the arrangement for a cremation performed by any person licensed pursuant to this chapter, the legally authorized person contracting for cremation services shall be required to designate her or his intentions with respect to disposition of the cremated remains of the deceased in a signed declaration of intent which shall be provided by and retained by the funeral or direct disposal establishment. A cremation may not be performed until a legally authorized person gives written authorization, which may include the declaration of intent to dispose of the cremated remains, for such cremation.
- Rule 69K-21.007(3), *Florida Administrative Code*: Each full-time funeral director in charge shall be responsible for making sure the funeral establishment and all persons employed in the establishment comply with all applicable laws and rules of the Board. This subsection shall not be construed to absolve funeral establishments or other persons from liability for their violations of such laws and rules.

The disciplinary guidelines for these violations are as follows:

- *Count I: Failing to perform and statutory or legal obligation placed on a licensee: Reprimand, fine of $250-$2,000 plus costs. In addition, probation for six (6) months to one (1) year with conditions, suspension up to one (1) year, or permanent revocation of license 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 submitted a timely request for an informal hearing.

Chair Peeples – Board Members?

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

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. The Department asks that the Chair entertain a motion determining that there are no material facts in dispute in this matter.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved that there are no material facts in dispute in this matter. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Caracci – 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: Mr. Ferreira moved to adopt the allegations of the fact, as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Mr. Chris Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Caracci – Now will be an appropriate time to hear from counsel for Respondent if she would like to speak.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Grabowski?

Mr. Grabowski – Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Good morning. I just want to briefly address this case. As you all may recall, this is a companion case to a matter that was heard by the Board at the last meeting against the Serenity Funeral Home. This is the complaint against the FDIC for the same substantive allegations that we are not disputing. There was a technical violation here. If you recall, this was a very difficult family for the funeral establishment. They didn't want to make up their mind at the time, and that resulted in a technical violation where there was no signature on the declaration of intent. The Board previously approved discipline against the establishment. There was a fine and probation that will be implemented. This is the same allegation against Ms. Crucet as the FDIC. She has a clear record with no prior disciplinary history. This was a very minor technical violation, and we believe that because the establishment is already subject to discipline, it's really not necessary in this case. And so, we would just ask the Board if they would consider discipline for this because of the minor nature of the allegation, the Board consider a reprimand rather than any additional financial penalty or probation.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Mr. Caracci?

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. 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. 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. Ferreira moved that Respondent is in violation of Florida Statutes as charged in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Caracci – And we would, like with the companion case, Serenity Funeral Home, we would be asking for a $500 fine and six (6) months of probation as, you know, statutorily and by the rule, the FDIC is responsible for whatever goes under that roof.

Chair Peeples – Board members, any discussion?

MOTION: Mr. Chapman moved that Respondent shall pay a $500 fine and six (6) months of probation. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) Settlement Stipulation(s) (Probable Cause Panel A)

(a) Stonemor Florida LLC d/b/a Fountains Memorial Park: DFS Case No. 320266-23-FC; Division No. ATN-41957 (F078097)

Ms. Marshall – Is there a representative of Fountains Memorial Park on the call today?

Ms. Wiener – Yes. Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Marshall, if you will, Mr. Jones needs to make a statement, please.

Mr. Jones – Yes, I'd like to recuse myself from Probable Cause Panel A items on this agenda as I serve on Probable Cause Panel A. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Madam Chair. So, presenting for the Department today is Office of General Counsel's newest attorney. We have not seen her before. This is Alice Nesterova.

Chair Peeples – Welcome.

Ms. Alice Nesterova – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. And thank you, Board. Stonemor Florida LLC, d/b/a Fountains Memorial Park ("Respondent") is a cemetery, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F078097. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent had relocated their office, including the location of their records, without prior authorization from the Board. The relevant statutory violations are as follows:

- Section 497.152(1)(a), Florida Statutes: Violating any provision of this chapter or any lawful order of the Board or Department or the statutory predecessors to the Board or Department.
- Section 497.152(1)(b), Florida Statutes: Committing fraud, deceit, negligence, incompetency, or misconduct in the practice of any of the activities regulated under this chapter.
- Section 497.276(1), Florida Statutes: A record shall be kept of every burial in the cemetery of a cemetery company, showing the date of burial and the name of the person buried, together with lot, plot, and space in which the burial was made. All financial records of the cemetery company shall be available at its principal place of business in this state and shall be readily available at all reasonable times for examination by the Department.
- Section 497.276(2), Florida Statutes: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1), the licensing authority may, upon request, authorize a cemetery company to maintain its financial records at a location other than its principal place of business and may, if necessary, require the company to make its books, accounts, records, and documents available at a reasonable and convenient location in this state.
- Rule 69K-6.005(8), *Florida Administrative Code:* Burial records shall be made available to the Department for the purposes of examination or inspections, and only at an alternative site of the cemetery company if approved by the Board.

Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a $1,500 fine. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation. Thank you. And I'm available for any questions.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Wiener, do you have any comment?

Ms. Wiener – No, ma'am. Just here to answer questions if there are any.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved that Respondent shall pay a $1,500 fine. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Nesterova – Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, ma'am.

(b) Related Cases – ATN-42285

1. Dallas, Theodore Roosevelt IV: DFS Case No. 330835-24-FC; Division No. ATN-42285 (F045327)

Ms. Marshall – I think I saw Mr. Dallas on the call a little bit ago. Mr. Dallas?

Mr. Theodore Dallas IV – I'm here.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you. And presenting for the Department is Mr. Caracci.

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. Theodore Roosevelt Dallas IV ("Respondent") is a funeral director and embalmer, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F045327. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent's funeral establishment entered into a preneed arrangement without a valid preneed license, allowed an at-need contract to be executed for preneed funeral arrangements, allowed an unapproved at-need contract to be executed for the preneed funeral arrangement, the contract provided did not include the required information, failed to provide a general price list at the time preneed funeral arrangements were discussed, failed to ensure payments to the Consumer Protection Trust Fund and Regulatory Trust Fund were made for a preneed contract executed, and failed to provide a general price list at the time at-need funeral arrangements were discussed. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a $5,000 fine and be subject to two (2) years of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation, and I'm available for questions.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question, Mr. Caracci. Is this the first or second offense?

Mr. Caracci – Mr. Dallas has been investigated for this same violation before. We came to a Settlement Stipulation that he apparently was unaware that there was an agent, an entity that was representing that they were working for his then funeral establishment, which is different from the funeral establishment in this case. He agreed to testify against that agent if the matter came up.

Mr. Williams – Okay. And so, this Settlement Stipulations is in line with having already had another infraction?

Mr. Caracci – Yes.

Mr. Williams – Okay. I just, you know, caution my colleagues. There's a lot -- I mean, I'm not sure -- there's a lot, Mr. Caracci, that I looked at that has some grave concerns that it doesn't seem like we're addressing the issue in terms of having preneed contract, not having the license to do preneed, no date on contracts, no payment to the Consumer Protection Fund. There's a lot going on in this whole case, and it just seems very minimum. But I'm not sure what my other colleagues may have seen in this but just want to highlight those things to the Board.

Chair Peeples – Does that complete your question?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Mr. Clay, did you have your hand up?

Ms. Clay – I did. I also had some concerns regarding what Mr. Williams has just mentioned. My question now would be what measures are in place to prevent this from the future, and also the period of time of which the $5,000 payment is to be made.

Chair Peeples – And Ms. Clay, I think your question may need to be directed to Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – Would you mind repeating your question, Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – My question was what is in place in this agreement to ensure, because this is a repeat offense, to ensure that this is taken care of in the future? And then my second question had to do more with how we are receiving the payment. Is there a period of time in which the $5,000 is to be paid?

Ms. Marshall – Yes. So as with any case that comes to a final order in a disciplinary matter, the Department has the authority to enforce the final order if it were not complied with in whatever respect, we would open another investigation, whether that be into an unpaid fine or noncompliance with any other term. And they would potentially face discipline for not complying with this. So that's essentially how we make sure that this order is complied with. And again, the enhanced penalty because of a repeat violation is another consideration in what was presented to you today. And as far as the second part of your question has to do with payment of the fine. So according to the terms of the consent order here, or sorry, the stipulation here, they usually have thirty (30) days to make the payment.

Ms. Clay – Just as a follow-up, my question wasn't so much as the amount of time, but how is it enforced?

Ms. Marshall – Again, the same as with any other disciplinary order. If the fine is not paid, that would open their license up to suspension and another case, and they would come back before you.

Ms. Clay – Thank you.

Ms. Marshall – You're welcome.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Caracci, in the documents that we had in our packet, the complaint was in November of 2023 when the complaint was issued. I'm on page number 20 of the PDF. It says date of complaint November 7, 2023. Could you give us a little bit of information why it's taken so long?

Mr. Caracci – I know initially that this administrative complaint was issued in 2025, and it took us a while because initially Mr. Dallas moved for a formal hearing, and we just had to negotiate our way into a settlement. So that took a little bit of time. As far as how long from the date of the complaint to when it reached me, I can't say.

Chair Peeples – Well, that's a question I have because we're almost at three (3) years, so it kind of concerns me that it's taken this long to kind of process things. And I don't know if that would be an item, maybe Ms. Marshall could kind of give us a little bit of information or should we take that into account? Ms. Marshall, what would be your suggestion?

Ms. Marshall – Well, certainly time elapsed since the violation, especially if there's been no offending conduct in the meantime, it would be a mitigating factor that the Board is allowed to consider. But again, this is a Settlement Stipulation. They have agreed to the amounts to resolve this case. And as far as time, it's a matter of, you know, I know you get tired of hearing this, but it's staffing issues, especially in Office of General Counsel. You know, they only have so much manpower and they get the cases made as fast as they can, but sometimes there are issues as far as getting evidence, as far as service of the complaint, as far as negotiating a settlement, litigation process. All of that can add up to, you know, some time before, between the filing of an Administrative Complaint and the time that it makes it before you all.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Board members? Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair, thank you so much. So, Ms. Marshall, this may be a question for you. Being that this is part of a companion case and going back to Ms. Clay's point, between the two (2) cases, it's proposed of almost $8,000 to be paid within thirty (30) days. Many times, we end up seeing these cases come back just because the Respondent is not able to pay. So, going to Ms. Clay's point, what are the provisions to make sure when we're doing these Settlement Stipulations that we're truly doing them, and they can be paid versus them coming wrapped back to the Board to relitigate in terms of trying to figure out an extension plan and things like that?

Ms. Marshall – Well, in a Settlement Stipulation, the nice part is, as opposed to a case where the Board is imposing a fine on a licensee, in this case he has agreed to these terms and obviously we don't have a crystal ball into somebody's finances, but presumably they would not have agreed to terms that they don't have the resources to comply with. And again, it's in his best interest to pay this fine timely because if he doesn't, his license would be open to suspension and another disciplinary case and another fine. And that question may also be directed to Mr. Dallas if you're concerned about his ability to pay here.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams, if you have a question for Mr. Dallas, we will need to swear him in. Would we need to go through that process?

Mr. Williams – I think Ms. Marshall handled it. I'm fine with her response, but I know Mr. Jensen may have had a question.

Chair Peeples – Okay,

Mr. Williams – Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, just to kind of piggyback on what's been said, I have a two-part question, one for Mr. Caracci. How do you arrive at the $5,000 and two (2) years' probation?

Mr. Caracci – Hold on one second, I have the disciplinary guidelines right in front of me. I can say the two-year probation and the elevated fine was again as a result of the prior allegations against him for unlicensed preneed activity. So just entering into a pre-need arrangement without a valid pre-need license, its ceiling is at $2,500 plus costs, and we also have another $2,500 for an at-need contract to be executed for pre-need funeral arrangements, and that's not counting several other allegations we have on the complaint. So, it was with the prior discipline and the aggregate of the offenses, that's how we arrived at that number.

Mr. Jensen – Thank you, Mr. Caracci. Madam Chair, I do have one other question.

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Jensen – The next question, and maybe Mr. Caracci can answer this as well. To Mr. Williams' point, is it within our purview to maybe suspend the license until the fine is paid?

Mr. Caracci – That would be unusual as far as I know. Ms. Marshall would probably be better equipped to answer that question.

Ms. Marshall – Yes. So, at this point, the Board's options are you have this Settlement Stipulation before you. You can accept it, you can reject it, and if you reject it, you can make Mr. Dallas a counteroffer if you would like. Those are your options.

Mr. Jensen – Okay, so that's not one of the options. All right, that's good. Madam Chair, I too would like to hear from Mr. Dallas whenever you get to that point. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Ms. Marshall, even though we have a Settlement Stipulation, is that okay if we swear in Mr. Dallas for questions?

Ms. Marshall – Certainly. Mr. Dallas, could you raise your right hand, please? Do you promise to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to help you, God?

Mr. Dallas – I do.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Dallas, if you'll state your name and spell your last name for the record, please.

Mr. Dallas – Theodore Roosevelt Dallas IV. My last name is D-A-L-L-A-S.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Thank you for being here on the call today. We have a couple of questions possibly for you. Mr. Jensen, would you like to begin?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, ma'am. Mr. Dallas, as has been stated here, and you've heard, you kind of have a cornucopia of big offenses here, and I'm always interested to hear what do you have to say for yourself?

Mr. Dallas – As described in the case, it was basically his word against my word. As far as the general price list, I did provide the customer with a general price list, and as far as receiving any money for a preneed, I never received any money from the customer for a preneed. So basically, I just gave him a quote on a funeral, and then he took that quote and gave it to the insurance company. They wrote it up for that amount. So, when the customer's mother died, he initially said it was a service with the cremation, agreeable. Then when she passed away, he changed the service from service with the cremation to a service with the burial. Of course, a burial, you will have to pay for the casket for one, and then it's a vault that you'll have to pay for as well. The customer never corresponded with the cemetery, so basically, he put all the blame on us for his mother not getting buried that day. And originally, the sister came in to talk to me probably like a year or two (2) prior to, just trying to get some figures on what the service would be across the service with the cremation. The paperwork that she provided for me was a preneed contract with Serenity Memorial Gardens for internment with the inurnment, not a burial. So, it's basically like everything that didn't go his way, he found some way to say that it was a funeral home's fault.

Mr. Jensen – Thank you. And to Mr. William's point, how do you intend on paying these fines if both of them go through? They are a little high.

Mr. Dallas – I mean, I would need like at least sixty (60) days. Thirty (30) days is not sufficient for me.

Mr. Jensen – Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Do we have any other questions for Mr. Dallas? Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – So what you've said is you basically just wrote out an estimate?

Mr. Dallas – Right. And being from the previous case, I mean, because families come in all the time, they can say, well, my mom's about to pass away. How much is this going to cost? Well, if I write the contract, that's an at-need, and they're just getting a quote. And I made sure that it was a quote that I quoted him for what he asked for.

Mr. Ferreira – What do you write the estimate on, Mr. Dallas? Do you have like an estimated call sheet?

Mr. Dallas – No, I just put it in our system, as far as like the system that we have for the funeral services, and I just put it in there, because it gives me the total figures without making a mistake. And if I see something that a mistake is made, basically before I hand it to them, I can go back and readjust it for the clientele.

Mr. Ferreira – Okay, so I've got a question. Also, this type of thing is going on all over. And what I mean by that is this idea that you can go to an insurance agent with a quote and they'll write it. It's happening a lot. I mean, I'm hearing more and more about it. So, do you honor that cost, that pricing when that individual die, or how do you handle that?

Mr. Dallas – Well, families are aware that the prices are subject to change. It's on the general price list. So, I mean, if we just give them a typical quote and then they see the prices change, it's up to the family to pay the difference from the quote. But, I

mean, the general price list for us, for myself, that usually don't change very often. So basically, the prices that I quoted them is pretty much still the same.

Mr. Ferreira – So you are not quote unquote saying preneed arrangements or anything like that?

Mr. Dallas – No. I let them out the door. I do not handle preneeds. I do not hold a COA by the state of Florida, so I cannot write a preneed. So that's explained up front to him from the get-go.

Mr. Ferreira – But, obviously, you have some type of relationship with the insurance agent.

Mr. Dallas – Well, certain agencies I have a relationship with, you know.

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. Does that agent come into your facility and write?

Mr. Dallas – No, they do not.

Mr. Ferreira – That's all. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Any other questions for Mr. Dallas? What would be the pleasure of the Board?

Mr. Jensen – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Dallas, I know it's an expensive lesson and that is just but one part. Mr. Ferreira is right. This does go on, but that is just one part of this.

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved that Respondent shall pay a $5,000 fine and be subject to two (2) years of probation. Mr. Williams seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Thank you Mr. Dallas and I think we have the next companion case. Ms. Marhsall?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, Madam Chair.

2. TR Dallas Funeral and Cremation Services LLC: DFS Case No. 330831-24-FC; Division No. ATN-42285 (F339895)

Ms. Marshall – Is Mr. Dallas still online? Mr. Dallas, are you still there?

Ms. Munson – You dismissed him.

Ms. Marshall – Okay do we need to get him back?

Chair Peeples – I mentioned to him he was on the next companion case.

Ms. Munson – I think he was gone before you said that.

Mr. Caracci – Would you like me to give him a call?

Ms. Marshall – Yes. Let's table this for now and Mr. Caracci will try and get in touch with Mr. Dallas, get him back.

G. Application(s) for Preneed Sales Agent

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

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

H. Application(s) for Continuing Education

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

(a) Everstory University (56408)

(b) International Cemetery, Crematory and Funeral Association (51609)

(c) National Funeral Directors Association (49609)

(d) Wilbert Funeral Services (39408)

Ms. Marshall – 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: Mr. Williams moved to approve the applications. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

I. Consumer Protection Trust Fund Claims

(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum C

Ms. Marshall – 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. Clark moved to approve all the claim(s), for the monetary amounts indicated. Mr. Williams seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

J. Application(s) for Embalmer Apprenticeship

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

(a) Adams, John A F979445

Ms. Marshall – 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. And with that, Madam Chair, I believe we're going to take a break.

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

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

(a) Direct Disposer

1. Beck, Pamela

2. Pein, Kelly M

(b) Funeral Director (Internship)

1. Alexander-Aziz, Regina

2. Rahn, Susan G

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

1. Simon, Jordan D

2. Spieldenner, Kelsey

3. Wong, Najhma A

4. Young, Stacy M

Ms. Marshall – This is an informational item. Pursuant to Rule 69K–1.005, F. A. C., the Division has previously approved the application listed on Addendum E. And with that, Madam Chair, we're returning to T.R. Dallas Funeral and Cremation Services, LLC. Mr. Caracci?

2. TR Dallas Funeral and Cremation Services LLC: DFS Case No. 330831-24-FC; Division No. ATN-42285 (F339895)

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. TR Dallas Funeral and Cremation Services LLC ("Respondent") is a funeral establishment, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F339895. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent entered into a preneed arrangement without a valid preneed license, allowed an at-need contract to be

executed for preneed funeral arrangements, allowed an unapproved at-need contract to be executed for the preneed funeral arrangement, the contract provided did not include the required information, failed to provide a general price list at the time preneed funeral arrangements were discussed, failed to ensure payments to the Consumer Protection Trust Fund and Regulatory Trust Fund were made for a preneed contract executed, and failed to provide a general price list at the time at-need funeral arrangements were discussed. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a $3,000 fine and be subject to one (1) year of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation, and I'm available for questions.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved that Respondent shall pay a $3,000 fine and be subject to one (1) year of probation. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall – Ms. Peeples is having some technical issues. So, I'll hand it over to Vice Chair Clark.

Vice Chair Clark – Are we going to take our break now?

Ms. Marshall – It's currently 11:04. What time would you like to come back?

Vice Chair Clark – 11:15. Ten minutes.

Ms. Marshall – All right.

**************************************BREAK**************************************

Ms. Marshall – Chair Peeples is attempting to get back on the call. She is still having some technological issues.

Vice Chair Clark – Okay. We'll call the meeting back to order, and I'll turn it over to Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – All right. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

L. Application(s) for Internship

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

(a) Funeral Director

1. ***Bryan, Chelsey M F980614***
2. ***Foytik, Laura L F873466***
3. ***Mompoint, Marilyn F862461***
4. ***Spiker, Callista F980374***

(b) Funeral Director & Embalmer (Concurrent)

1. ***Bonnett, Annastaysia L F980601***
2. ***Carter, Erika L F980856***
3. ***Hall, Jordan F975391***
4. ***Hand, Rhianna C F980675***
5. ***Lawrence, Deidra-Antoinette F052232***
6. ***Morris, Shanetelle N F974313***
7. ***Thomas, Francis E F978930***
8. ***Vigh, Josephine M F980600***
9. ***Williams, Jordan O F974365***

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

(2) Request to Renew Internship

Ms. Marshall – There are two (2) of these applications before you today, and I have to advise the Board that these two (2) individuals were only informed today of this meeting due to an oversight in our office. So, from what I understand, they are

on the call. However, if they are not prepared to present today, the Board should probably give them the option to continue this until the November meeting.

(a) Recommended for Approval <u>without</u> Conditions

1. Funeral Director & Embalmer, Concurrent Intern

a. Bostic, Jerome M F135349

Ms. Marshall – Is Mr. Bostic or a representative on the call today?

Mr. Jerome Bostic – Yes, I am here.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you. An application to renew the concurrent internship license due to illness, hardship, or awaiting results was received by the Department on September 15, 2026. The application was reviewed and processed and has been deemed complete. The applicant is currently licensed as a concurrent intern pursuant to Rule 69K-18.003(6), Florida Administrative Code, which limits an individual to one concurrent internship in a lifetime. Mr. Bostic's concurrent internship license expires on September 15, 2026, and the request for renewal was received timely. Based on the timely receipt of the renewal request, the explanation of the hardship provided, and the applicant's awaiting examination results, the request is being presented to the Board for consideration. Given the explanation of his hardship, the Division recommends approval of this application.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Marshall, I'm finally connected back again.

Ms. Marshall – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you.

Ms. Munson – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Munson – I just wanted to note that because the applicant is on but did not receive timely notice, before anything is stated, that we have an affirmative statement from the applicant, that he waives the notice requirement and is able and willing to move forward with this discussion today.

Chair Peeples – [Inaudible]

Ms. Munson – You're breaking up.

Ms. Marshall – Madam Chair, you're breaking up really badly.

Chair Peeples – Evidently, I have a connection issue here at the office, so I'm going to have to depart. Mr. Clark, can you take it from here, please, sir?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes. Ms. Munson, would we have to swear him in first?

Ms. Marshall – Mr. Bostic, are you available?

Mr. Bostic – I am.

Ms. Marshall – All right. Before we proceed, are you waiving the notice requirements? Do you want to go ahead today, or would you prefer to continue this matter until November?

Mr. Bostic – We should go ahead today.

Ms. Marshall – All right. Very well. Can you please raise your right hand? Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in these proceedings?

Mr. Bostic – Yes.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Bostic. Board, what is the pleasure?

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

(b) Recommended for Denial
1. Funeral Director & Embalmer, Concurrent Intern
a. Woods, Christie J F735383

Ms. Marshall – Is Ms. Woods or a representative on the call today?

Ms. Christie Woods – I'm here on the call.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you. And as stated earlier, we understand you only received notice of this meeting today. You are entitled to more notice than that. You can waive that requirement if you want, and we can hear this matter today, or we can postpone this until November, so you have more time to prepare. It's your choice.

Ms. Woods – We can move forward today.

Ms. Marshall – All right, great. So, an application to renew a concurrent internship due to illness, hardship, or awaiting results was received by the Department on September 17th, 2026, and was considered complete when received. This applicant was licensed as a concurrent intern pursuant rule 69K-18.003 subsection 6 Florida Administrative Code, which permits only one internship in a lifetime. Ms. Woods' concurrent intern license expired on September 5, 2026; therefore, it was not timely received. And additionally, Ms. Woods has already been granted one extension of her internship back in September of 2025. Because Ms. Woods is barred by rule from a second extension of her internship, the Division recommends that this application be denied.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Can you swear in Ms. Woods?

Ms. Marshall – Sure. Ms. Woods, can you please raise your right hand?

Ms. Woods – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Marshall – Okay. Do you promise to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to help you God?

Ms. Woods – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Marshall – All right. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

Vice Chair Clark – Would you like to address the Board? The only thing we have is a letter from over a year ago that said you were going to take the test in September. It was thirteen (13) months ago. Would you like to address the Board?

Ms. Woods – Yes, sir. So, I did take the test again, and I was one (1) point off from passing the test. Here recently when I was getting ready to reapply to take the test again, I got COVID, and after COVID, I got into a car accident. So, dealing with all of that. I have to have neck surgery, back surgery right now, but my job has, you know, still been trying to work with me to

allow me to work a minimum of four (4) hours a day. So basically, just those couple things have come up, but I am studying and preparing to retake the test again.

Vice Chair Clark – Board, any questions for Ms. Woods? Mr. Ferriera?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. Ms. Woods, have you done your internship, your year of internship?

Ms. Woods – Yes, sir.

Mr. Ferreira – Okay. So, this concurrent license basically doesn't mean anything to her in regards, she just can't work as a concurrent licensed person, but she can still take her test and pass it and all those things. So, thank you. Good.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen, go ahead.

Mr. Jensen – Yes. Yes, just to expand on that, what Mr. Ferreira just said a little bit, I kind of have the same question. If she's already done her year of internship, then what is this about? I guess that's a question for Ms. Marshall. I know you recommended denial, but then, you know, what are the ramifications of that? She can't work or what?

Ms. Marshall – I mean, she wouldn't be able to, you know, do anything that required a license. So, if she's completed her hours, that may be, you know, a moot point as far as approaching licensure, but she also, in the meantime would not be able to be employed in an intern capacity. So again, every application, you know, even if we're recommending denial on a, you know, statutory or rule basis is heard by the Board and you have an opportunity to ask her, you know, any questions, concerns she has about this extension.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Jensen – Yes, so just to be clear, so what would prevent her from -- I mean, I hate to -- if she's already done her internship, so she's already done it, it's complete. She says that she's passed the Arts part of the test, but not the Science part. So, couldn't she just take the Florida Laws and Rules test and apply to be a funeral director only for the time being until she gets the science part done? That would solve the whole issue for her. I mean, I hate for her to lose the value of all her schooling and everything she's done up until now. But I understand the Department's position too, you know, hey, this is just dragging on, dragging on, but there is another avenue, correct?

Ms. Marshall – I might have to defer to Ms. Munson on that one as far as the interpretation, or perhaps Ms. Schwantes. Are we able to -- would she be able to do that?

Ms. Munson – I don't know if you're directing this to Ms. Schwantus, but the rules are the rules. I mean, this doesn't have a petition attached to it or anything like that. That's another whole issue. If the Board feels that there was some type of mitigating information presented that would allow her to do this, I mean, it's the discretion of the Board, because the rule is the rule, but these applications come before you because circumstances sometimes fall outside of the rule. Normally, petitions are attached.

Mr. Jensen – I guess my question is, Ms. Marshall -- Chair, if I may?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead.

Mr. Jensen – The short and simple question is, why does she need to be a concurrent intern anymore? I understand if she's already done her internship, then she just hadn't passed the test, she could apply to be a funeral director, keep her job, and, you know, take the Florida Laws and Rules test, and she's good. So, what does she actually need this for?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Mr. Jensen, we hear from most of these applicants, and I don't know if this is the case here, that they are concerned they're not going to be able to continue to make a living serving as a funeral director/embalmer if they don't have the internship, because they're not fully licensed yet, and they do not know how long it's going to take to pass their exams. That is one reason why we have people come back in these kinds of situations. I do not know if that's the case here. I've not talked with this applicant or reviewed the situation with our staff. But it's not unusual that they have that concern, and the way to ensure that they are able to continue to have the salary or hourly rates, however they're paid, that they have as a funeral director and embalmer is to continue the internship.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. So, I'm lost with the packet, and I've read this a couple times. We're in 2026, and both letters state, and maybe I'm looking at it incorrectly, on Page 4, it says 9-5-2025, they need additional time. The same letter with maybe one or two words changed on page eight is the same thing, and that's 7-23-2025. This is 2026 now, so since then, a whole year later, they still have not been able to pass? So, in 2025, they asked for an extension. One year later, they still have not passed. So, we're going to give them additional time to pass or to attempt to pass. I mean, so, we're just lingering on and on. Am I missing something of what's, or are the letters dated incorrectly?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – That may be a question directed to Ms. Woods as far as the content. We provide to you what the applicants give us. So, if that's your concern…

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Just to note, and I'm not sure if Mr. Williams caught this or not, the application, although it is dated in 2025 by Ms. Woods, it was not received by the Department September 15, 2026, and you can see that in the stamp, the very top right-hand of the letter. I do not know about the letter attached to it, whether that was an incorrect date or whether it was also just not sent in and received the at Department until then.

Mr. Williams – Mr. Vice Chair, if I may?

Vice Chair Clark – Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Williams – To Ms. Schwantes's point, thank you for capitalizing my point. That's my point. I mean, we're talking about a whole other year later, and we're asking for an extension. I mean, I agree with the recommendation to deny, but I'll wait to that point.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Ferreira.

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. Just kind of following up on Mr. Williams, I'm with him. I think if we don't take the advice of the Department, we're just kicking this thing down the road.- I agree with Mr. Williams.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Quinn and then Mr. Jones. Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – Yes, thank you. Is there a career path of becoming a funeral director only, and then coming back maybe for the embalming part later on?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Ms. Schwantes.

Ms. Schwantes – In order to do what you're suggesting, they would have to come back and meet the separate requirements of the embalmer as well as they've already gotten a funeral intern. It could lead to an additional internship, certainly more cost for the applicant because they have to reapply. Again, I've not talked with Ms. Woods, so I'm not sure what her situation is, but that is also a common concern when we hear from these applicants like this.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones – Yes, question for Ms. Woods. When does she intend to take the exam again?

Ms. Woods – My intent to take the Science portion of the exam is in November of this year, 2026. Also, I've been hearing the discussion of me just doing the funeral directing part and then coming back to the Board once I've passed the test for the embalming portion. I'm fine with that and I don't have a problem with it and that would allow me to keep my job. My job is in agreeance with that as well.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes?

Mr. Jensen – Just for what Ms. Woods said, the reason I said that is that a playbook for you, Ms. Woods? That's a workaround because it seems the appetite of this Board is going to be to deny your internship, but you've already done it. So, if I were you, just a way around it is to apply for a funeral director only, take the Florida Laws and Rules test and then worry about the embalming part down the road. Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's just my two cents.

Ms. Woods – Thank you.

Ms. Clay – I just wanted to know, Ms. Woods, what are you doing now? I know you're still working in the industry, but what are you doing?

Ms. Woods – So right now, just meeting with families, helping to assist the funeral directors getting their services set up and attending services here at the funeral home and assisting the cemetery when needed.

Ms. Clay – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Ferreira, go ahead.

Mr. Ferreira – Ms. Woods, have you taken the Laws and Rules test of Florida?

Ms. Woods – No, sir. The only test that I've taken is the Arts, which I've passed, and the Science portion, you have to have a 75 and I missed it with a 74.

Mr. Ferreira – That's it. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Any other questions or discussion?

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair, I did see Mr. Quinn's hand. Did he have something to add? I'd like to hear it if he does.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – No, I spoke my comments and agreed with your suggestion as well. Just thinking through it, I mean, if she does submit her application and checks off the box for provisional license, wouldn't she have ninety (90) days then to take the Florida Laws and Rules?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you. Mr. Quinn, I would not like to give those kinds of details at this point because I'd like to see what she actually submits and have our staff evaluate it first if she decides to go that route.

Mr. Quinn – My apologies. Just trying to be helpful.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Understand.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I just wanted to remind the Board that the application before them to renew the internship based on illness, hardship, or waiting results requires either an approval, approval with conditions, a denial, or perhaps giving the applicant an opportunity to withdraw it.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Munson.

Mr. Williams – Mr. Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams – To Ms. Munson's point, I'd like to ask if the applicant would like to withdraw the application to work with Ms. Schwantes' office on other avenues, if that's the desire.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Woods, that is a question really to you.

Ms. Woods – Yes. I can withdraw my application for now and try to resubmit it for funeral director only.

Mr. Williams – Does that take a motion, Mr. Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – I don't believe so. Ms. Munson, we're good if she said she'd like to withdraw?

Ms. Munson – Yes. I mean, it's fine. I would do a withdrawal order. So, because I do an order, I always like a vote attached to it. So, if it would be an order of withdrawal, Ms. Schwantes may have something to say about that. But I mean, her withdrawal request on the record, it's not even a request. It's a statement to withdraw her application. I firm it up with a vote. But then again, Ms. Schwantes may have a different comment.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Actually, it's just kind of a comment. Procedurally, I think you already had a motion and a second for denial.

Ms. Munson – No. I don't think so.

Ms. Schwantes – My apologies. I thought I heard that.

MOTION: Mr. Williams moved to accept the Applicant's withdrawal of the application. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

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

- ***(a) Clearview Cremation, LLC (F933476) (Miami)***
- ***(b) Family Owned Funeral Group, LLC d/b/a Forest Meadows Funeral Home (F846825) (Gainesville)***
- ***(c) Family Owned Funeral Group, LLC d/b/a Jones-Gallagher Funeral Home – F846603 (Starke)***
- ***(d) Family Owned Funeral Group, LLC d/b/a Moloney-Hewell Funeral Home & Cremation Services (F846622) (Jacksonville)***

Ms. Marshall – 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.

N. Notification(s) of a Change in Location

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

(a) All Veterans-All Families Burials & Cremations, LLC d/b/a All Veterans-All Families Funerals & Cremations, LLC (F648666) (Sarasota)

(b) Pax Villa USA Funeral Home, Inc. (F041720) (Oakland Park)

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

O. Application(s) for Direct Disposal Establishment

(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(a) A Affordable Cremations, LLC (Crestview)

Ms. Marshall – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing none. A new application for a direct disposal establishment licensure was received on August 18, 2026. The application was considered incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on August 26, 2026. The FDIC will be Timothy S. Frank (F044678). A background check of the principal, Timothy S. Frank, 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 the Divisions staff.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of the Divisions staff. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – If you'll look in your packet on Page 7, question number E(4), it says, do you understand that the DDIC may not be in charge of any other direct disposal establishment or funeral establishment? Both yes and no are checked. And I did notice that Mr. Frank is also the DDIC of a location in Milton, Florida, so that would make two (2) locations.

Ms. Marshall – So which page was that Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Page 7 of our packet, question E(4).

Ms. Marshall – Let me ask again, is anybody on the call from A Affordable Cremations?

Vice Chair Clark – There is someone named Timothy Frank on the call, the list.

Ms. Marshall – There he is. We can't hear you. Why don't we table this for now to let Mr. Frank work out his technical issues and move on to the next one, if that's okay, Mr. Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes, Ms. Marshall. Go ahead.

(b) Orlando Direct Cremation Services, LLC (Altamonte Springs)

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

Ms. Kelley Ruiz – Yes. Good afternoon. My name is Kelley Ruiz.

Ms. Marshall – Perfect. Thank you, Ms. Ruiz. A new application for a direct disposal establishment licensure was received on September 23, 2026. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required intonation to complete the application on September 26, 2026. The FDIC will be Mr. James P. Martin, Jr. (F046554). A background check of the principal(s), Ms. Ann R. Desjardins and Ms. Kelley Ruiz, did not reveal any relevant c1iminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of the Divisions staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Ms. Ruiz, are you here to address the Board or just available to answer any questions?

Ms. Ruiz – Available to answer any question. I know that we did have our opening inspection already.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Ruiz.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of the Divisions staff. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Ferreira, go ahead.

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. On Page 7 of packet letter F. So according to this, you're supposed to have 625 interior feet, right? F is checked no, and I want to know why it is checked no.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Marshall, it may be appropriate to swear in Ms. Ruiz so that she can answer that question.

Ms. Marshall – Yes. Ms. Ruiz, can you please raise your right hand?

Ms. Ruiz – Yes, absolutely.

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

Ms. Ruiz – I do. Yes.

Ms. Marshall – Okay. Can you please state your name and spell your last name for the record?

Ms. Ruiz – Sure. My name is Kelley Ruiz. Last name is spelled R-U-I-Z.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – On your application, there's a question regarding will the establishment have 625 square feet at a fixed location, and the application is marked no.

Ms. Ruiz – That must have been a mistake on my end. We have already had our opening inspection.

Vice Chair Clark – Is it a fixed location with at least 625 square feet?

Ms. Ruiz – Yes, it is.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Ferreira, any other questions?

Mr. Ferreira – Well, how quick after an inspection would we know if what we're talking about is true?

Vice Chair Clark – I might suggest, even though Ms. Ruiz has stated that she's passed an inspection, the motion we have is to approve with the condition of passing an on-site inspection. And Ms. Schwantes or Ms. Marshall can correct me. If we continue with the motion and the second that's on the table, as they do the inspection, they'll be able to validate that. Is that correct, Ms. Schwantes? Ms. Marshall, sorry.

Ms. Schwantes – It is.

Ms. Marshall – It is, and I don't have any information about the inspection being done, but certainly we would reach out to the inspector to get those results. And, you know, if they didn't have the required square footage, that would have been noted in the inspection report. So, they wouldn't be able to get the license. So that's why it's a conditional acceptance.

Mr. Ferreira – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira.

Ms. Ruiz – Is there something I need to do on my end?

Vice Chair Clark – No, ma'am, not at this time.

Ms. Ruiz – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Any other discussions?

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Just to be sure, I thought I heard Ms. Marshall and also the person here for Orlando Direct Cremation Service state that the inspection has already been done.

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Ms. Schwantes.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, Mr. Chair. So that is not uncommon as well. When we know that there's a new facility opening up or a change of location or any of these types of operations and we have people in the area, we will make sure to go ahead and try to do an inspection even before it comes before the Board. The order would still need to say that it is subject to an on-site inspection, even if the inspection has occurred before, because we do not yet necessarily have the report of that inspection in this office. And that's part of what Ms. Marshall was talking about. I cannot verify right now whether or not they passed the inspection. So that is why any order would still need to say subject to an on-site inspection. Does that help?

Mr. Jensen – Not really. If an inspection has been done, we should have the answer.

Ms. Schwantes – It may have been done yesterday, sir, and we would not have the report from that. I don't know when it was done. I can't tell you that right now. Most of them do not occur until after the Board has voted on it.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen, did you have anything further?

Mr. Jensen – I mean, the person on the call stated the inspection was done. And Ms. Marshall, in our opening monologue, mentioned the inspection was done. So, I'm just wondering why we don't -- if the inspection is done, I mean, something as simple as square foot should have been pointed out. That's all. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – Yes. I was not aware that the inspection had been done, and that was why it was a conditional recommendation of approval. But again, if it has already been completed, we, in the near future, should have those results available to us and would be able to grant the license if you all approve the application today.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Ferreira, go ahead.

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. I've been through many, many inspections, and they're all done on an iPad or a computer. It seems like, you know, it'd be right there.

Ms. Schwantes – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Mr. Ferreira, they do use different methods. Each of the inspectors does use a different method for that, but remember, it goes through management review first before it comes to the front office. So even though the inspector is saying something, it still has to be reviewed by that inspector's supervisor, and then it's reported officially to us. So that's the process for that. It does no harm to have a condition in an order that says subject to an on-site inspection, even if the inspection has already been done. If the inspection has already been done and they pass the inspection, then it just means that they will be licensed that much quicker.

Vice Chair Clark – Any other questions or discussion?

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, may I offer a friendly amendment to, I think it was Ms. Liotta that made the motion that we request that question F on Page 7, be fixed by the applicant, because this application will go into file for ever and ever?

Ms. Liotta – I'm fine with that.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Williams, I believe you with a second. Are you okay with adding a condition that the applicant correct the application?

Mr. Williams – Yes, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Anything further, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – That's it. Thank you, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. We have an amended motion by Ms. Liotta to approve, subject to passing an on-site inspection, and requiring the applicant to resubmit their application, correcting item F. Second by Mr. Williams. All in favor, say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – Any opposed? And that move carries. Ms. Marshall, would you like to try to go back to O(1)(a)?

Ms. Marshall – Yes.

(a) A Affordable Cremations, LLC (Crestview)

Ms. Marshall – Is Mr. Frank still there?

Mr. Timothy Frank – I am here. Can you hear me?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, we can. Thank you.

Mr. Frank – Good.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Frank, we need to swear you in, please.

Ms. Marshall – Yes, and would you like me to re-present the application, Mr. Vice Chair, or are we okay on that?

Vice Chair Clark – I'm okay.

Ms. Marshall – Okay.

Vice Chair Clark – We already had a motion and a second. We just had a question, so if we can swear to Mr. Frank.

Ms. Marshall – Sure. And before we even do that, I forgot to note, Ms. Peeples is having too many technical issues. She got off the call during item L, during the discussion of the interns. So, she is not here for the rest of the meeting. Mr. Frank, could you please raise your right hand?

Mr. Frank – Yes, ma'am.

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

Mr. Frank – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Marshall – Could you please state your name and spell your last name for the record?

Mr. Frank – First name is Timothy. Last name is Frank, F-R-A-N-K.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Frank, a question came up during your application regarding, in your application that asks if you understand that the DDIC may not be in charge of any other direct disposal establishment or funeral establishment. You indicated, yes. Is that correct?

Mr. Frank – Yes. I'm actually a licensed director and embalmer. So, when I talked to staff about this before I did the application. She said as a licensed female director embalmer, you're actually allowed to be over a DDIC of two different locations. And as far as the no being clicked, it's probably just a typo.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen, I know that was your question. Do you have any follow-up?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, no. I mean, my biggest question was why. It looks to me like both boxes were checked. So, I just wanted to make sure there was an understanding of what was going on here.

Mr. Frank – Mr. Jensen, I believe that's just a typo where I'm by my end. That's just a mistake on my end.

Mr. Jensen – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Wiener, do you represent Mr. Frank?

Ms. Wiener – I don't. I just want to call to the Board's attention that the applications are all out of date. You can be licensed over two (2) locations.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. We do have a motion. Mr. Jensen, I was going to ask, we have a motion to approve passing on-site inspection. Would you like to see if Mr. Jones and Ms. Liotta would like to amend so that the application can be corrected?

Mr. Jensen – Well, you know, I do have one other question maybe for the Department. And I may be a little lost on this. But my understanding was you could be a DDIC over one location and also work at another. It's just like the funeral director in charge. You're only allowed to be a FDIC of one location. But you can certainly -- or did that change?

Ms. Marshall – No, sir. These applications are -- like Ms. Wiener said, some of these forms are based on outdated statutes. So, yes, he, as a funeral director, would be permitted to be over two (2) locations.

Mr. Jensen – Okay. Very good. Yes. I'll make that motion, Mr. Chair. Approval is subject to the conditions.

Vice Chair Clark – We have a motion. Do you want the application corrected since both boxes are marked?

Mr. Jensen – I would since it's -- yes, sir. I would since it's going to be part of the record for a long time to come, if I may, please.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – So, I have a question for the Department. I mean, this is an easy change, isn't it? I guess what I'm trying to say is why is it out of date? Why is the application wrong?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes, Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Mr. Ferreira, if you recall, a lot of the forms are currently being revised by the Department. This may be one of them. I cannot say right off the top of my head because there's so many of them, frankly. It's probably in process now. But that's one of the big changes and projects that we've been working on, both the Department and the Board, as part of the rules review process for the last several years. And the other thing I wanted to ask, if I might, could we clarify in the motion and the second which question needs to be changed on the application?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes, I'll take care of that when -- I was going to ask Mr. Jones and Ms. Liotta. I will clarify that. Ms. Munson, I saw your hand.

Ms. Munson – Yes, if the question that we're changing is E(4), I'd also like clarification as to what the change is supposed to be if the question itself is wrong.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair, if I may, I could probably clarify that. I think Mr. Frank answered that. What is the change if it's outdated? I mean, under the way it's written, I guess he would need to check yes, but with the outdated form, then he would need to check no. Both of them are checked, so I can see where the confusion may lie, and it's confusing to me too, so I don't know. I don't know which one needs to be changed to mark. Maybe the Department could answer that.

Mr. Frank – I would check whatever one you guys want.

Ms. Munson – I don't think a yes or a no will be an accurate reflection. So, I think changing his application may not be the condition the Board wants to submit.

Ms. Marshall – I think we would be satisfied with a clarification just on the record like he has today.

Ms. Schwantes – Agreed.

Vice Chair Clark – Are you okay with that, Mr. Jensen? So, we'll keep the original motion. Approving subject to passing an on-site inspection?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, sir. I'm fine with that. I'll make that motion.

Vice Chair Clark – We have a motion already, but Mr. Ferriera, go ahead.

Mr. Ferreira – I just want to make a comment. We're not sitting here bashing anybody or whatever, but I can tell you that if I don't change my form quickly, who's going to come down on me? Follow me? So, I just want to make a comment. As a funeral director and owner, if we don't stay on top of this stuff, if we don't stay on top of these forms and your inspectors come in, they bust our butt for not changing a form.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Ferriera, I agree. Honestly, if these were our forms to be able to control, we would have made changes, like immediately. They have to go through the rulemaking process, and because of that, there is always a significant delay between when statutes change and when the forms change. Now, this particular change was made quite a while ago, but it also came up about the same time as we started some of the rule review process where we're looking at so

many rules and so many forms now. It does happen. But currently, for example, Senate Bill 598, which changed in July, we're in the process, as the Rules Committee knows, we're in the process now of changing rules that have to do with that, and it can take up to a year for rules to get changed from statutory changes, and that's because of the rulemaking process.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. We do have a motion by Mr. Jones, which has been seconded by Ms. Liotta to approve, subject to passing an on-site inspection. Any other discussion? All in favor say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – And any opposed? That motion carries.

Mr. Frank – Thank you, Board.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you.

P. Application(s) for Preneed Main

(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions

(a) Mortuary Solutions LLC d/b/a The Good Earth Crematory (Bradenton)

Ms. Marshall – Is there a representative of this applicant on call today?

Ms. Wiener – Yes, Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. The Department received an application for a new preneed license on August 20, 2026, and no deficiencies were noted on the application. The sole owner and member of the LLC is Samuel White. A completed background check of the principal was returned to the Division without criminal history. Applicant obtained its qualifying direct disposal establishment license as of March 20, 2026, under license # F941204 at the above listed location. If approved, Applicant will sell trust-funded preneed through Funeral Services, Inc. (FSI) and utilize their approved pre-funded funeral agreement forms. The Division recommends approval of this application without conditions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Ms. Wiener, would you like to address the Board?

Ms. Wiener – No, sir. I'm here only for questions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you.

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

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

Q. Application(s) for Removal Service

(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(a) Destination Transportation Solutions, LLC (Tampa)

Ms. Marshall – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Asking again, Destination Transportation Solutions, is anybody here? Hearing none. A new application for removal service licensure was received on June 25, 2026. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on August 27, 2026. A background check of the principal, Mr. Marques Gundy, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval of this application subject to the condition that the establishment passes inspection by a member of Division staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

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

(b) Mahoney Funeral Services, LLC (Parrish)

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

Mr. Tom Mahoney – Yes, I am here.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Mr. Mahoney. A new application for removal service licensure was received on August 25, 2026. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on September 9, 2026. A background check of the principal, Mr. Thomas J. Mahoney, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval of this application subject to the condition that the establishment passes inspection by a member of Division staff.

MOTION: Mr. Williams moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the removal service pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Mahoney.

R. Collective Coversheet

(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(a) Family Owned Funeral Group LLC (Jacksonville)

- ***Funeral Establishment***
- ***Cinerator Establishment***
- ***Preneed Branch Office (See Addendum)***

Ms. Marshall – Is there a representative of this establishment on the call today?

Ms. Wiener – Wendy Weiner, yes. Thank you.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you. The applicant submitted the following applications: a new application for a change in ownership for a cinerator, a new application for a funeral establishment license, and an application for preneed branch office license, which will be addressed shortly in Addendum I. If approved, applicant(s) will be operating from the below locations:

A) Family Owned Funeral Group, LLC d/b/a Affordable Cremation Solutions (funeral establishment), 8560 Arlington Expressway Ste. 1, Jacksonville FL 32211

B) Family Owned Funeral Group, LLC d/b/a River City Crematory (cinerator facility), 8560 Arlington Expressway Ste. 3, Jacksonville FL 32211

The applications were received by the Division on August 17, 2026. Each of the applications was considered complete by the Division on the same date. The FDIC for both establishments will be Scott F. Myers (F047212). A background check of the principal(s), Connor M. Moloney and Abbie G. Moloney, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Ms. Wiener, are you here for questions?

Ms. Wiener – Yes, and just to note that these are both change of ownership applications.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

MOTION: Mr. Williams moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(b) Haisley Funeral Home Inc (Port St Lucie)

- ***Funeral Establishment***
- ***Cinerator Establishment***
- ***Preneed Branch Office (See Addendum)***

Ms. Marshall – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Asking again, anybody on behalf of Haisley Funeral Home? Hearing none. "Haisley", the applicant submitted the following: three (3) new applications for a funeral establishment license and an application for preneed branch office license, which will be addressed shortly in Addendum I. If approved, applicant(s) will be operating from the below locations:

A) Haisley Funeral Home, Inc., d/b/a Haisley Crematorium, 3015 Okeechobee Rd, Fort Pierce, Fl. 349647
B) Haisley Funeral Home, Inc., d/b/a Haisley Funeral & Cremation, Service, 3015 Okeechobee Rd, Fort Pierce, Fl. 349647
C) Haisley Funeral Home, Inc., d/b/a Haisley Funeral & Cremation Service and Tribute Center, 2041 SW Bayshore Blvd, Port St. Lucie, Fl. 34984

The applications for a change of ownership for funeral establishment licensure were received by the Division on August 11, 2026, and one (1) new application for a change of ownership for a cinerator establishment was received the same date. Each of the applications was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete all three (3) applications on the same date, August 28, 2026. The FDICs for each establishment will be as follows: Priscilla M. Johnson (F043009) - Haisley Funeral & Cremation Service and Tribute Center; Richard F. Haisley (F046266) - Haisley Funeral & Cremation Service; and B. Quinn Haisley (F051196) – Haisley Crematorium. A background check of the principals, Richard F. Haisley, Leeanne Haisley-Bolonka, Jimmie A. Haisley, and Beatrice Q. Haisley, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – Just as a review, what are the conditions?

Vice Chair Clark –That the three (3) establishments pass an on-site inspection.

Mr. Quinn – Question. On the next one, I believe there are seven conditions in the package. Why is Haisley just one? Should we at least get a purchase agreement as part of the condition?

Ms. Marshall – So the change in ownership issue with ICS, which makes it more complicated, was the fact that they have a preneed license and the outstanding pre-need contracts. Haisley is not transferring a preneed license or any existing liabilities.

Mr. Quinn – Okay, and as you also review the paperwork, you referred to, I think it was B. Quinn Haisley. As I review the paperwork, it appears to be her name down three (3) different ways throughout the paperwork: B. Quinn Haisley, Beatrice Q. Haisley, B. Quinn Haisley Wheeler. Does that matter, or are we just assuming it's all the same person?

Ms. Marshall – Would you mind pointing out where that inconsistency is?

Mr. Quinn – I'm sorry, I don't have the pages pulled up in front of me. I just have some notes here from reviewing them.

Ms. Marshall – I mean, so as far as the background checks that were run, the information that was submitted, everything came back with no concerns. Are you concerned that they're concealing the identity of someone involved, or what is the issue?

Mr. Quinn – No, I'm just concerned why on the same paperwork that's being submitted, she puts her name down three (3) different ways.

Ms. Marshall – I couldn't explain that decision. Ms. Schwantes, do you have any input here?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes, go ahead, Ms. Schwantes.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. I did notice that on the very first page of the applications, at the very top, it is listed as B. Quinn. But at the very top where it says applicant print name here, it says B. Quinn Haisley. But on every other page, it says Haisley Funeral Home. And when you look at Section 1, for example, of the first application, it does say Haisley Funeral Home, Inc. as being the name of the applicant. I don't know why they put B. Quinn Haisley on the very first page. If it's something of concern, it can always be added as a condition to be corrected.

Mr. Quinn – It was just a question.

Ms. Schwantes – Okay. That is the only place that I saw when I was going through on your question, where I saw the difference. And as Ms. Marshall pointed out, all of the background checks came out okay.

Mr. Quinn – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Quinn. Any other discussion? Again, we do have a motion by Ms. Liotta to approve, subject to passing onsite inspection. And it was seconded by Mr. Chapman. All in favor, say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – Any opposed? That motion carries.

(c) ICS Cremation & Funeral Home Inc (Lake City)

- **Funeral Establishment**
- **Transfer of Preneed Main License**

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

Ms. Wiener – Yes. Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. ICS, a corporation, has submitted the following: a new application for a funeral establishment license, and an application for transfer of a preneed main license. If approved, applicant(s) will be operating from: 357 NW Wilks Lane, Ste B, Lake City, FL 32055

Included in your packets are the applications regarding the above listed location. The change of ownership is the result of the acquisition of 100% of the ownership interests to Emily Bowen and Amy Williams. All assets and liabilities will be assumed by the new owners, as specified in the attached letter from Attorney, Wendy Wiener, dated August 13, 2026. The applications are being filed for a new license, and the owners of the corporation will be Amy Williams and Emily Bowen. A background check of the principals was returned without criminal history. Applicant confirms if there are currently any unfulfilled preneed contracts, the obligation to fulfill those preneed contracts will be assumed by the new owners. If approved, Applicant will sell trust-funded preneed through Independent Funeral Directors of Florida, Inc. (IFDF) and utilize their approved pre-arranged funeral agreement forms. 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 full 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.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Ms. Wiener, are you just here for questions?

Ms. Wiener – I just would offer one clarification to Mr. Quinn's question on the last item. He asked why, in this situation, it called for the stock purchase agreement. It doesn't call for the stock purchase agreement. The only time that the transactional document is called for is in the change of ownership of a cemetery. In this case, item (3) simply says that a bill of sale or the stock purchase agreement or another document could be proof of the change of ownership of the stock in this situation. So, I just didn't want there to be created an understanding that transaction documents are ever required for change of ownership for funeral establishments, incinerator facility, preneed license, or anything of that nature. So otherwise, I'm here for any questions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair, I got a question for Ms. Wiener.

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Jensen – Yes, Ms. Wiener, so I noticed on the consumer protection claims, this ICS cremation comes up a lot of claims against. Is this the same entity or is this something totally different?

Ms. Wiener – No, this is the same entity. They are the ones that are fulfilling contracts though and making claims against the CPTF. They took over twenty (20) plus years ago for a defunct direct disposal establishment and are still continuing to fulfill those pre-need contracts.

Mr. Jensen – Okay. So, may I, Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes. On the claims, it says that ICS Cremation Society is the defaulting seller for most of these. That was my question. Is this one in the same or did they change the name?

Ms. Wiener – No, this is not the same entity.

Mr. Jensen – Okay. Very good. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen.

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

(d) Me Daughter Industries LLC d/b/a MD Vaults & Monuments (Tampa and St Petersburg)

- ***Monument Establishment Builder (2)***
- ***Preneed Branch Office (See Addendum)***

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

Ms. Wiener – Yes. Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. "MDI", the applicant submitted the following: two (2) new applications for monument establishment builder license, and an application for preneed branch office license, which will be addressed shortly in Addendum I. If approved, this applicant will be operating from the below locations:

A) Me Daughter Industries, LLC d/b/a MD Vaults & Monuments, 4615 East Hanna Ave., Tampa, FL 33610
B) Me Daughter Industries, LLC d/b/a MD Vaults & Monuments, 2600 Gandy Blvd. North, St. Petersburg, FL 33702

The applications for a monument establishment builder licensure were received by the Division on August 26, 2026. Each of the applications was considered complete by the Division on the same date. A background check of the principal(s), Mr. Quintin Graciano and Ms. Ruth A. Thornquest, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Ms. Weiner?

Ms. Wiener – Questions only.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

S. Application(s) for Preneed Branch

(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum I

(a) Faithful Heritage Holdings Inc (F019269) (Tampa)

(b) Family Owned Funeral Group LLC (F651593) (Jacksonville)

(c) Haisley Funeral Home Inc (F038713) (Ft Pierce)

Ms. Marshall – Pursuant to s. 497.453, Florida Statutes, the entities referenced on Addendum I have applied for preneed branch licensure. The applications were complete without reportable criminal or disciplinary history and accompanied by the required fee. It is recommended that the entities referenced on Addendum I be approved for the branch licensure applied for.

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

T. Related Items

(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions

(a) Real Stone & Granite Corporation (Fort Pierce)

1. Monument Establishment Builder

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

Mr. Jose DUbilla – Yes, ma'am. Jose Ubilla here. I'm trying to get on camera.

Ms. Marshall – Great. Thank you. A new application for monument establishment builder licensure was received on July 29, 2026. The application was considered incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on August 26, 2026. A background check of the principals, Jose Ubilla and Alejandro Ubilla, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishments pass an inspection by a member of the Division staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall. Mr. Ubilla, are you here to address the Board, or just answer questions if we have any?

Mr. Ubilla – No, I'm just here in case of any questions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, sir. Board?

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

Ms. Marshall – Mr. Ubilla, please stay on the call. The next item concerns you as well.

2. Monument Sales Agreement

Ms. Marshall – Again, is a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing none. Real Stone & Granite Corporation submits a monument establishment sales agreement for the Board's review and approval. The Division recommends approval with the condition that two (2) full-size print-ready copies are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of this Board meeting.

Chair Peeples – Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the preneed sales agreement subject to the condition that two (2) full-size, print-ready copies of the revised monument sales agreement are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of this Board meeting. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Ubilla – I do have a quick question, please, when I can.

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead.

Mr. Ubilla – The conditions on both items, the communication broke up, and I couldn't really hear what the conditions were. Is that something that you're going to notify us in writing, if so, and when?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, I can repeat them right now. So, for the monument establishment builder license, the condition is that you have to pass an inspection. For the sales agreement --

Mr. Ubilla – We have passed the inspection two days ago.

Ms. Marshall – Okay, great. So, when we get the results of that, we will be able to approve it. For the sales agreement, the condition is that we need to receive two full-size print-ready copies of the agreement within sixty (60) days.

Mr. Ubilla – Yes. I still didn't hear very well, but I hope Vera Pajares (sp) is on the line. Are we clear? Vera, are you listening?

Ms. Vera Pajares (sp) – So, yes, I'm listening. So just one quick question. Can we email the copies, or do they have to be hard copies?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Hi. I'm sorry. I did not catch your name. However, just to let you know, the Division staff will be in touch with you about this, okay?

Ms. Pajares (sp) – Okay.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Mr. Clark. The next two (2) items are amended agenda items that were only sent out yesterday. So, we appreciate the Board members' patience in reviewing those on short notice.

U. AMENDED AGENDA ITEMS

(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions

(a) Application for Cinerator Facility

1. ICS Crematory Corporation (Lake City)

Ms. Marshall – I believe Ms. Wiener was representing this entity.

Ms. Wiener – I am. And I also have a question about the Me Daughter packet when we finish these two (2) items.

Ms. Marshall – Certainly. A new application for a change in ownership for cinerator facility licensure was received on August 13, 2026. The application was considered completed on this same date. The FDIC will be Ms. Janine Marie Craig Chenault (F058801). A background check of the principal(s), Ms. Emily A. Bowen and Ms. Amy M. Williams, did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division completed the required inspection on September 9, 2026, with no deficiencies noted. The Division recommends approval.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

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

(b) Pre-Construction Trust Agreement

1. Legacy Funeral Holdings of Florida, LLC (F079526) (Apopka)

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

Ms. Wiener – Yes, Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you. In accordance with ss. 497.272, Florida Statutes, Legacy Funeral Holdings of Florida, LLC (Legacy), License # F079526, submits a request for approval of a master pre-construction trust agreement to be utilized in conjunction with various construction projects at Legacy's cemetery locations. The Division recommends approval of this agreement without conditions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

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

Mr. Jensen – Question, Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Go ahead, sir. I didn't see your hand. I'm sorry.

Mr. Jensen – Yes, one question for Ms. Wiener. I noticed on the pre-construction draw schedule; it says everything's going to be paid at completion. Is that correct? There's nothing up front or anything on this?

Ms. Wiener – Correct. Their draw schedule is set forth therein.

Mr. Jensen – All right. Very good. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. And Ms. Wiener, did you have a question about the Me Daughter Industries?

Ms. Wiener – I did. Thank you.

(d) Me Daughter Industries LLC d/b/a MD Vaults & Monuments (Tampa and St Petersburg)

- *Monument Establishment Builder (2)*
- *Preneed Branch Office (See Addendum)*

Ms. Wiener – It didn't occur to me until we got to the next item that an omission from the cover sheet was to approve the monument establishment contracts. They are included in your Board packet. They begin on Page 13. So, they were included, but it looks like there was just an omission from the cover sheet.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Marshall, do we need to take any action there?

Ms. Marshall – I think it would be prudent to have another vote to approve those forms. Those forms will be subject to the condition that we receive to print-size ready copies of those within sixty (60) days.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Clay – So are we requesting an amendment to the motion that was already taken, or are we requesting a separate motion?

Ms. Wiener – Either would probably work.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to approve the monument sales agreement subject to the condition that two (2) full-size, print-ready copies of the revised monument sales agreement are received by the Department within sixty (60) days of this Board meeting. Mr. Ferreira seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes, go ahead.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir.

V. Executive Director's Report

(1) Operational Report (Verbal)

Ms. Schwantes – I'm going to try to keep this so quick. I want to talk about the PALM implementation. I'm going to be talking about this every month. We are quickly approaching the statewide transition from the current statewide accounting system called FLAIR to a new accounting system that's called PALM, a new accounting system for all Florida agencies. I cannot overstate that enough. The transition cutoff, cutover period, excuse me, cutover period will take place from mid-December to mid-January. Dates are still not quite firm. Because it impacts the financial data that is used by numerous processes and systems, this implementation is going to have far-reaching impact beyond just accounting systems. It's going to impact our licensing processes, and we've talked about this last month. It's going to have a huge impact on the licensing processes, including renewals that are due the last several months of the year. We have to receive proof of payment of the renewal from our accounting offices before we can process the license for renewal. And the proof of payment comes from our Department's accounting offices, which will not be processing payment at all during the transition cutover period because they're going to be testing the new system, implementing it, and testing it again. You get the idea. If the payment is not received and posted in our licensing systems as timely, then the renewal will not go through, and the licensing may be subject to late fees. We have already sent out a notice to our 170 approximate licensed cemeteries. And I'm also advising any others who have upcoming renewal deadlines in November or December to please pay the fees early. Not on time, but early. So preferably no later than December 1st for the cemeteries. They're not due until the end of the year, but please pay them earlier than that. And, again, we're additionally recommending that any licensees with renewals due at the end of November also pay early just to avoid any potential for any late fees.

Our Rules Committee will meet on Monday, October 19th at 10 a.m. by video conference. The purpose of that meeting will be to continue discussion on the rules that were discussed at the September meeting. And then the next Board meeting will be on Thursday, November 5th at 10 a.m., again, by video conference. And that ends the Executive Director's Report. Thank you all.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes.

W. Chair's Report (Verbal)

Ms. Schwantes – Vice Chair Clark?

Vice Chair Clark – I have nothing prepared. However, because we had such robust conversation around some matters today, around 69K-18.003, Concurrent Internships, just for the Board and the attendees, just so everyone's aware, I think everyone is, the Rules Committee is really looking at all of the internships' rules. So, if you have opinions and thoughts, please attend the next rules committee. That's all I have. Ms. Marshall?

X. Office of Attorney General's Report

(1) Attorney General's Rules Report (Informational)

Ms. Marshall – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Informational. Just highlighting the information shared by the Chair and Director. 18.002 and 18.003 have already been open for development, and I know 18.001 is going to be on the books for discussion as well.

BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES RULES REPORT
OCTOBER 2026
Rachelle Munson – Board Counsel
Tracy Smith – Paralegal Specialist I

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date Rule Language Approved by Board	Date Sent to OFARR	Rule Development Published	Notice Published	Adopted	Effective
69K-1.009	Effect of Law Enforcement Records on Applications for Licensure	09/03/2026	*	07/22/2026			
69K-2.003	Other Official Board Business	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/05/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026
69K-5.0025	Inactive Preneed Licenses	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/05/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026
69K-5.009	Regulatory Standards for Evaluating Applications by the Board		*	07/21/2026			
69K-5.012	Application and Renewal Procedures for Broker of Burial Rights License	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026			
69K-6.0016 69K-6.004 69K-6.0054 69K-6.007 69K-6.009	Definition of Developed Area Safekeeping of Records Written Contracts Required Criteria for Burial; Disinterment; Reinterment Identification Tags – Acceptable Materials, Locations, and Methods of Affixing	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/05/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026
69K-9.001	Advertising	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/04/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026
69K-17.0036	Course Required for Initial Licensure	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/04/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date Rule Language Approved by Board	Date Sent to OFARR	Rule Development Published	Notice Published	Adopted	Effective
69K-18.002 69K-18.003	Funeral Director Intern Training Program Concurrent Internships		*	07/21/2026			
69k-20.001	Report of Cases Embalmed or Bodies Handled	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026			
69K-21.009	Disinterment Reporting	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/04/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026
69K-22.007	Standard Uniform Procedures for Removal of Cremated Remains and Postcremation Procedures		*	07/21/2026			
69K-25.001 69K-25.002	Licensure by Endorsement; Embalmers Licensure by Endorsement; Funeral Directors		*	07/22/2026			
69K-31.001	Procedure Required	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/05/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026
69K-31.001	Procedure Required		*	07/21/2026			
69K-33.001	Requirements Regarding Handling and Storing of Human Remains	04/02/2026	3/21/2026	03/31/2026	06/05/2026	08/20/2026	09/09/2026

*"OFARR is not required for review"

Y. Public Comments (Verbal)

Ms. Marshall – Are there any public comments? Last call, public comments? Hearing none.

Z. Administrative Report as September 28, 2026

A.	New Cemetery Applications	**0**
	Recommended for Approval	**0**
	Pending	**0**
B.	Cemetery Acquisition Applications	**0**
	Recommended for Approval	**0**
	Pending	**0**
C.	Preneed License Applications	**1**
	Active Preneed Licenses	**304**
	Presented to the Board at this Meeting	**1**
	Pending	**4**
D.	Preneed License Branch Applications	**3**
	Active Preneed License Branches	**383**
	Recommended for Approval	**3**
	Pending	**0**
E.	Preneed Sales Agent Applications	**42**
	Active Sales Agents	**3816**
	Recommended for Approval	**47**
	Temporary Licenses Issued Pending Permanent	**14**

F.	Monument Establishment Applications	**1**
	Active Monument Establishments	**89**
	Pending	**1**
G.	Broker of Burial Rights Applications	**1**
	Active Brokers of Burial Rights	**24**
	Pending	**0**
H.	Exempt Cemetery Reports	**0**
	Active Exempt Cemeteries	**59**
	Pending	**0**
I.	New Establishment Applications	**6**
	Pending	**1**
	Completed	**21**
J.	New Individual Applications	**9**
	Pending	**0**
	Completed	**0**
K.	Request for Training Facility Applications	**0**
	Pending	**0**
	Completed	**1**
L.	Request for Continuing Education Providers and Courses	**12**
	Pending	**0**
	Completed	**12**
M.	Initial Inspections	**4**
	Completed	**4**
N.	Inspections	**91**
	Completed	**91**
O.	Initial Licenses Issued	**20**
	Renewal Licenses	**17**

AA. Disciplinary Report

Notices of Non-Compliance Issued Since Last Meeting : **September 3, 2026**	**0**

BB. Upcoming Meeting(s)

(1) November 5th (Videoconference)
(2) December 3rd (Videoconference)
(3) January 7th (Videoconference)
(4) February 4th (Videoconference)
(5) March 4th (In-Person – Tallahassee TBD)
(6) April 1st (Videoconference)
(7) May 6th (Videoconference)
(8) June (In-Person – Date and Location TBD – FMA Annual Convention)
(9) August 5th (Videoconference)
(10) September 2nd (Videoconference)
(11) October 7th (Videoconference)

(12) November 4th (Videoconference)
(13) December 2nd (Videoconference)

CC. Adjournment

Ms. Marshall – Mr. Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Clark – We are adjourned. Thank you, everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35.