

MINUTES
BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES
VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING
AUGUST 7, 2025 - 10:00 A.M.

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

Ms. Jill Peeples – Good morning, this is Jill Peeples, Chair of the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. It is 10:00 A.M. on August 7, 2025. I'd like to call this meeting to order and turn it over to Ms. Simon.

Ms. Ellen Simon – Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning. My name is Ellen Simon. I am the Assistant Director for the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. Today is August 7, 2025, and it is approximately 10:00 AM. This is a public meeting of the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. This meeting is being held by videoconference. Notice of this meeting has been duly published in the Florida Administrative Register. An agenda for this meeting has been made available to interested persons. Both the link and call-in number are on the agenda, which has been made available to the public. The link and call-in number and other information relating to this Board meeting has also been published on the Division's website. Ms. LaTonya Bryant is recording the meeting and minutes will be prepared.

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

As always, we need everyone that is on the call to place their phone or audio feed on mute, if you are not speaking. The ambient noise coming from someone's phone or audio, which is not muted, causes severe disruption to the meeting. If you are not muted, you may be muted by Division staff. As a result, you may need to call back into the meeting because that may be the only way to unmute your phone. Also, if you are using your computer or smartphone for your audio feed, please remember to speak directly into the microphone on your device. To do so otherwise negatively impacts the recording of this meeting. Just as in a live meeting, persons speaking are requested to identify themselves for the record each time they speak. Participants are respectfully reminded that the Board Chair, Ms. Peeples, runs the meeting. Persons desiring to speak should initially ask the Chair for permission.

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

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

As a final reminder, Board meetings are public meetings under Florida Law, and anything said via chat is subject to a public records request. This feature should only be used for technological issues you may be experiencing, and all inquiries in chat should be directed to Mary Schwantes, Executive Director. She is monitoring the chat feature and, as necessary, will forward your inquiry to someone who can assist in resolution of the problem. At this point I will 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:

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

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

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon.

Mr. Bill Quinn – Madam Chair, may I add something on the record, please?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. Please, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. Quinn – As a Board member affiliated with SCL, 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 facts and the information presented. Thank you.

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

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am.

B. Action on the Minutes

(1) *May 29, 2025*

(2) *June 26, 2025*

Chair Peeples – Ms. Clay?

Ms. Sanjena Clay – Madam Chair there are two (2) sets of minutes, right?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Clay – May I go ahead and put both in a motion?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I don't see why not, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Clay?

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to adopt the minutes of both meetings. Mr. Darrin Williams seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

C. Old Business

(1) *Application(s) for Preneed Main License Renewals*

(a) *Recommended for Approval without Conditions*

1. *Neshama JFS LLC (F357480) (Pompano Bch)*

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of Neshama JFS LLC on the call today? Hearing no response. The licensee reports an adequate net worth. As a result, the licensee has met all requirements for renewal. They have paid their late fee. As a result, the Division recommends approval without conditions.

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

2. Ponte Vedra Valley Inc (F39646) (Ponte Vedra Bch)

Ms. Simon – The entity paid their \$1,000 late fee, and they have met the required net worth. As a result, the Division recommends approval without conditions.

Chair Peebles – Is there a representative of Ponte Vedra Valley Inc on the call today? Hearing no response.

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

D. Disciplinary Proceeding(s)

(1) Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Probable Cause Panel A)

(a) Gibson, Travis: DFS Case No. 316203-23-FC; Division No. ATN-41364 (F076145)

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

Mr. Travis Gibson – Yes, I'm here.

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

Ms. Greg Caracci – Thank you. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Travis Gibson ("Respondent"). The Department conducted an inspection of Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations herein, Respondent was licensed as a funeral director. Respondent failed to issue payment for contracted removal services. The disciplinary guidelines for these violations are as follows:

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

At this time, it would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that the Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond and has thus waived the right to elect a method of resolution in this matter.

Chair Peebles – Mr. Jones?

Mr. Ken Jones – Yes. I'd like to recuse myself as I served on Probable Cause Panel A, regarding the issues before us today.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, sir. Board members?

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

Chair Peebles – Mr. Gibson, we'll be able to give you a moment to speak in just a moment. Okay, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Okay. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Caracci?

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

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

Mr. Caracci – Now that the Board has determined 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. Williams moved to adopt the allegations of the facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Ferreira – I got a question on the matter.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – So with this motion, can you explain this to me, Mr. Caracci, what this part is? What this part of the motion is.

Mr. Caracci – What part?

Mr. Ferreira – The one we're voting on.

Mr. Caracci – It was just to adopt the allegations of fact that set forth herein that there are no material facts in dispute because we've already been over that.

Mr. Ferreira – Okay.

Chair Peeples – Does that complete your question, Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. I thought we voted on that a moment ago, the material facts.

Chair Peeples – No, sir. In a discipline case for a motion for determination of waiver and request for informal hearing, this is kind of the third motion in a series of motions. So, after this motion, we'll kind of go into the fourth area and we'll allow Mr. Gibson to kind of have a moment to address the Board.

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Board members, we have a motion by Mr. Williams, and we have a second by Mr. Liotta. Is there any other discussion? Hearing none. All in favor of the motion, say yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples – All opposed say no. Motion carries. Mr. Caracci, would this be our time to swear in Mr. Gibson to see if he has anything he'd like to address the Board?

Mr. Caracci – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, if you'll allow Ms. Simon to swear you in, please, sir.

Mr. Gibson – Yes.

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

Mr. Gibson – Yes.

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

Mr. Gibson – My name is Travis Gibson. Last name spelled G-I-B-S-O-N.

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

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Mr. Gibson, would you like to address the Board, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes, I would.

Chair Peeples – Please, sir.

Mr. Gibson – All right. Good morning, Board, and I thank you for the opportunity for allowing me to address this matter. Regarding this first case, again, like I stated before on the last call, I did forget to change my address, and I never really received those documents. However, I did get an opportunity. It was late, but I sent them this morning. I sent them over to Attorney Caracci, the court documents showing that that case was closed back in, I believe, 2023. So basically, it was just a miscommunication on getting the information [audio cuts out].

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, we have lost your communication and didn't get all of your conversation. Could you kind of repeat please, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. Can you hear me now?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Gibson – Yes. I was saying that like I stated on the last Board meeting, I didn't receive the documents because I had moved from that location. Actually, I closed down. So as far as me receiving those documents on time, I didn't get them. But I did receive the email afterwards. I did send in the case information from the courts showing that it was closed, and the amounts that were paid. I sent that to Attorney Caracci. It was late, but he did receive them.

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

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. Madam Chair, this question is from maybe Mr. Caracci, and I'm trying to get an understanding. So, there's three (3) cases, and I know we have not heard the other two (2). However, the recommendations from your office, they all seem to be the same. So, would this be consecutive, or would it be collective? I'm trying to understand of how we will proceed in this matter.

Mr. Caracci – Insofar as the Department is asking for a probation, we would consider that, you know, one (1) year is running concurrently. There are different monetary penalties the Department will be recommending for each case. The latter two (2) cases have the same monetary penalty, but this one has a different one (1).

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair, may I have a follow up?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Williams – The only reason I'm asking because if there's a probation for one (1) case, there's not a need to have a probation for cases two (2) and three (3). I'm just trying to understand of how we will determine and things like that, when we make a counter recommendation if one is so needed. I'm just asking.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson, would you like to assist Mr. Williams?

Ms. Rachelle Munson – Sure. I don't want to step in front of Mr. Caracci, but I think I heard him say that the probation can possibly run concurrently, but they would probably, and I can't speak for the Department. I think they may be suggesting that on each case it shows a penalty of probation, but it's not like it'll have to run on three separate date situations. They'll run concurrently, but I think they would want it recorded as a penalty for each.

Mr. Caracci – That's correct, Ms. Munson.

Mr. Williams – Thank you so much, Ms. Munson. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – You are welcome, sir. Do we have any other? Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – Yes, I have questions for Mr. Gibson. You indicated that comments that were made during the last time that you were before this Board, and you also indicated that you did not receive the documentation because you had closed your business. Was your mail forwarded when you closed your business?

Mr. Gibson – At the time, to be honest with you, I was going through so much that I totally forgot to change my mail address with the Department. And again, this happened I believe way back in {inaudible} this case with myself and the removal company, this happened way back in 2023, and it was settled way before then. I just received the documents in February, I believe, it was supposedly sent out March of 2025. I was long gone from the previous address. And like I said, this is just a matter of me forgetting to change my address.

Ms. Clay – Madam Chair, may I?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Clay – I'm trying to understand, Mr. Gibson, where your accountability comes, when it is associated with what you forgot to do and your last-minute presentation of what was needed to the staff.

Mr. Gibson – May I speak, Board? Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. You can have a conversation with Ms. Clay. She's directing these to you. Thank you.

Mr. Gibson – Thank you. I mean, my accountability will come in to me forgetting to change my address because I do understand in Chapter 497, it is my responsibility to make sure I update my address and that's where I failed at.

Ms. Clay – I guess I'm trying to understand what you are expecting the Board to do as a result of your not being accountable for what you're supposed to do.

Mr. Gibson – I mean, preferably, I hope this case could be thrown out because it is just a matter of me not, at the time, changing my address. And I sent over the information earlier this morning showing, and I do apologize that it was so late, I sent over the information showing that that case had been closed. It was stipulated, I paid it, and it was closed through Miami-Dade County Courts.

Ms. Clay – And Mr. Gibson, this is your primary source of employment?

Mr. Gibson – Well, at the time it was, but now I'm the FDIC with another firm. That's my primary source of income, yes.

Ms. Clay – Thank you.

Mr. Gibson – You are welcome.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Yes. Again, not stepping in the lane of the Department. I'm just listening to the comments and I'm wondering if Mr. Gibson is asking for some type of mitigating consideration, and I don't know if Mr. Caracci is acknowledging receipt of whatever Mr. Gibson said he sent over. So, I'm just trying to make the record kind of make sense.

Mr. Caracci – Yes. I was willing to stipulate with Mr. Gibson as to the documents he sent over showing that the case had been dismissed. There was, I believe, a payment plan entered into from Righteous Way. And I don't -- and Mr. Gibson could correct me if I'm wrong. I don't know that we have any documentation stating that [inaudible] to this settlement had been entered into.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Caracci, are you referring to the information Mr. Gibson supplied to your office? And that would be a question to Mr. Gibson regarding that case. I think Mr. Gibson, you stated it was completed in 2023. Have you completed the payment aspect, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes, back in 2023, it was \$1,523 that was settled on, and I paid for it. I sent over the Cash App screenshot as well.

Chair Peeples – Okay. So, Mr. Gibson, you did not supply to the Department paperwork from the court showing that that obligation had been completed.

Mr. Gibson – At the time, I sent it over to inspector Jessica Cordero because she was handling it at the time. And I sent all that information over to her. Now, what happened to it, I couldn't tell you. I do recall sending it over to her. Because she said, "As soon as the matter is taken care of, let me know." And that's what I did.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Caracci, can you confirm that that information was received?

Mr. Caracci – The information sent over to Ms. Cordero?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Caracci – I can't confirm that.

Chair Peeples – Okay. Thank you. Mr. Williams, did I see your hand, or Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. I have a question, and this may be what Attorney Caracci is talking about. So, the affidavit that we received in our packet on Page 11, signed February 24, 2025, but in the affidavit, it states that on Page 9, that as of April 28, 2023, that the balances were still outstanding and not paid. So, if information was sent before the February 24th date, this should have been updated, correct? Or am I not looking at it correctly?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Caracci?

Mr. Caracci – It might have been on the Department to include that in an investigative report. I don't know when the report was issued. I don't know if it was two (2) ships passing in a night.

Mr. Williams – And Madam Chair, I guess my question would be with that, and Ms. Munson may be able to assist me with this. Is it permissible to move this case to next month since we have a situation of facts being verified based on what we're asked to vote on today?

Chair Peeples – Before Ms. Munson, I see Ms. Simon's hand is up. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Williams, this matter has already been moved from the June Board. While it can be moved again, if the Board would go forward on this today, they can order -- if they're interested in ordering restitution, if it has not been paid. The amount of restitution that's required as a result of this action. There does not need to be a dollar figure. It can simply be said that this money is to be paid back if it has not already been paid back.

Mr. Williams – So, Madam Chair, if I may?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Williams – With all due respect, Ms. Simon, so what we're asked to do is vote on information that's been provided to us, and it seems like the information provided to us is not accurate, based on what Ms. Caracci is saying and based on what Mr. Gibson is saying. So, my asking to move this case to next month is so that both parties can get together to make sure they're on the same page before casting the vote. I get what you're saying about the restitution part, but based on the document itself that's been submitted to us in the affidavit, it's stating that nothing has been paid. But I just want to get clarity. I mean, I think it's best for both parties to come together to make sure we're on the same page versus not being on the same page.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon, did you have a follow up?

Ms. Simon – I see that Mr. Caracci has his hand up. I'm not sure exactly where the discrepancy lies because what's in the Administrative Complaint, the Administrative Complaint was filed a while ago. I can't tell you the actions that have occurred since the Administrative Complaint, but we're looking at the allegations that are actually in the Administrative Complaint today. And Mr. Caracci?

Mr. Caracci – The timeframe set out in the Administrative Complaint, the delinquent payments therein and the Department's posture is that that constitutes a violation. Looking back at the Administrative Complaint, the last date was April 28, 2023, that balances that were due to Righteous Way on four (4) different invoices were not paid. On the documentation Mr. Gibson supplied to me earlier today, that stipulation for payment was only approved in August of 2023. So, in the Department's opinion, that is not relevant to the Administrative Complaint, but by the time we got to April 2023, the violations had already occurred.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson, did you have any comment?

Ms. Munson – No, I'm just going to let the Department present the case the way they feel they need to present it. I'm trying to stay in my lane. It sounds like there's this outstanding payment that at the time this AC was not paid, and it's since been paid. Or I'm not even clear by recordkeeping if he's saying it had been paid, but just the Department wasn't aware of payment. Those facts are just kind of blurred for me. So, I'm just hopeful I can hear in this discourse what the actual facts are, so the Board can know what they're actually voting on. And if in fact, this is for a violation for a nonpayment that has since paid, I'm thinking Mr. Gibson is thinking about some type of mitigation. His mitigation, I think his statement was dismissal, which is like a complete -- that's the highest level, right? But maybe there's some other mitigation in consideration. So, I'm just allowing the Department to present their case. I'm just hopeful that the facts presented are clear for Board members so that they at least know what they're voting on.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Mr. Gibson, you had your hand up, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. When I first received it, it was sometime back in April, but the same particular case that we are talking about, that one went to court, and we settled out of court with a lower amount. And I thought that that whole case was over with because at the end of the day, I never used them again.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, I saw your hand was up, sir.

Mr. Ferreira – Just a few comments. This went on for six (6) months. In my opinion, I don't feel like we need to be debt collectors for companies who worked for a man for six (6) months and wasn't paid. So, I personally don't see this as a rule that was broken in 497, personally. Again, I don't think we should get between two (2) companies that have an issue. I don't see where this hurts the consumer at all. I mean, this is an issue between two (2) companies and Righteous Way should have said, "Listen, man, I'm not working for you." It's that simple. So, my motion would be just to get rid of this.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to dismiss the case. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Caracci – The Department would still hold that a licensee has a responsibility to the people who they do business with, but nothing further from that.

Mr. Ferreira – So, are you going to hold a funeral home who owns a casket company or a vault company, or opening and closing company or urn company, you're going to go after them too?

Mr. Caracci – I can't state what the {inaudible}. I think it's very possible, yes.

Chair Peeples – Do we have any other discussion on this motion for dismissal of this case? Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Chris Jensen – Just to comment. While I do agree with Mr. Ferreira, I think here there is something in the statutes that talks about doing business with another licensee. You know, with a removal company, they are licensed under this Department, and so is the funeral home. But a casket company and, you know, someone else may not actually have a license to the Department. And maybe Ms. Simon can clear that up for me. That's really my only question is, is it something to do with another licensee or is Mr. Ferreira correct, you know, we're going to go after anybody that owes anybody money?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I believe that when we do proceed against the licensees, we look at a lack of payment to other licensees. Mr. Jensen is correct. I do not think that we would go after non-licensed people like casket companies.

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

Mr. Jensen – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – We've had cases like this come before us. Dade County, are they licensee, where, you know, people that aren't paying the medical examiner their cremation fees? We've had two (2) cases in the last six (6) months, I think, where they've asked us to go after the licensee.

Ms. Simon – That's a very good question, Mr. Ferreira. And I did not include that in my response. Not only would we go after an individual who has not paid another licensee, but we would most certainly proceed against a state agency that has not been paid or an agency working for the state that it's not been paid. I mean, that's what we have done that Ms. Marshall can speak to that.

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

Ms. Kimberly Marshall – Yes. The medical examiner fees are a different matter because a lot of them are prescribed by local municipal ordinances. So, in the instance of unpaid medical examiner fees, that's actually a law that they have violated.

Chair Peeples – So we have a motion, and we have a second. Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I want to amend my motion.

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – I make a motion that we put this matter on probation.

Chair Peeples – So, you're amending your motion from dismissal to probation. How long, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – For one (1) year.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Quinn, do you accept that amendment?

Mr. Quinn – No.

Ms. Liotta – I'll second it.

Chair Peeples – We have an amended motion by Mr. Ferreira for probation of one (1) year. We have a second by Ms. Liotta. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Williams – Discussion?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Mr. Ferreira, would you accept a friendly amendment of a fine?

Mr. Ferreira – What type of fine?

Mr. Williams – \$1000?

Mr. Ferreira – \$500?

Mr. Williams – I'll go with that. Well, the statute says \$1,000 to \$2,500.

Mr. Ferreira – I'll accept the \$1,000.

Ms. Munson – Again, I just want to make sure the Board understands what they're doing because this discussion it's not making me nervous, but I want to make sure you understand what you're doing. If you are feeling there is an opportunity for mitigation, you don't have to stick within the guidelines as presented, you just have to justify why you're going outside those guidelines. So, if someone says \$500, if that's going to be a part of a penalty, then you're going to have to say, we're going beneath by guidelines because we found the discussion to support mitigating considerations. That's why we've gone less than \$1,000. If you go over \$2,500, you are going to have to explain what was so aggravating that you went outside above the \$2,500. It's just important for me to know that you know exactly what you're doing and why you're doing it. No other comment, Madam Chair. Thank you.

Mr. Ferreira – So I'll go back to my \$500 and the purpose for that is there's not much to this case, in my opinion.

Chair Peeples – Okay. So, Mr. Ferreira, we're on our third amendment of the motion for one-year probation and a \$500 fine. Is that correct?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, ma'am.

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

Ms. Liotta – Yes, I do.

Chair Peeples – So, Board members, we have an amended third motion for a fine of \$500 and a one-year probation with a second by Ms. Liotta. Is there any discussion before we take our voice vote? Hearing none. Mr. Gibson?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. So just a question. So, as far as the probation, that will mean that I will have to find another location to work at, or hopefully someone will hire me, go through it at the probation?

Chair Peeples – Okay. I'm not exactly following your question. And let me turn this over to Ms. Munson. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I'm going to flip it in a moment to Ms. Simon, if it's okay. So, first of all, we kind of don't need the interruption during the vote itself of the Board. And if they vote for probation with the fine here, when that vote is actually complete, if your question then, once we secure that vote, is what does probation or the terms of probation mean, the Department has

specific language that they wanting to reinforce as far as probationary terms. I don't know if it would require any changes on your part, except that your license will be noted that it's under one-year probation. But Ms. Simon can speak more directly to what probation means from the Department's perspective.

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

Ms. Simon – In terms of probation, there are standard conditions that apply to any term of probation that's issued by this Board. None of them refer to a requirement that no work be done at a licensee. None of them refer to your current work except to stay in line with your responsibilities under the statute.

Mr. Gibson – Will I still continue to be at the FDIC is basically what I'm trying to understand?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, that's an item that you can kind of speak to the Division office, but we are in the middle of a vote. We currently have a motion and a second. So, is there any other discussion by a Board member regarding the motion and the second? Hearing none. All in favor of the motion, say yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

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

(b) Gibson, Travis: DFS Case No. 318823-23-FC; Division No. ATN-41476 (F076145)

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

Ms. Caracci – Thank you. The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Travis Gibson (“Respondent”). The Department conducted an inspection of Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations herein, Respondent was licensed as a funeral director. Respondent failed to refund the total life insurance funds due to a consumer. The disciplinary guidelines for these violations are as follows:

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

At this time, it would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that Mr. Gibson was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond and thus waive the right to elect a method of resolution in this matter.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Board members?

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

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, we'll be with you in just a moment, sir. We have a couple of motions to go through first. Mr. Caracci?

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

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

Chair Peeples – Mr. Caracci?

Mr. Caracci – Now that the Board has determined 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 facts as set forth in the Administrative Complaint. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, did you leave our meeting, sir? We saw that your camera is not on.

Mr. Gibson – Yes, I'm still here. I don't know, but I'm just seeing that all camera spaces are currently being used, but I'm here.

Chair Peeples – Okay. Sir, would you like to address the Board, sir, at this time?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. Regarding this particular case, I did send them a check through Square Checking and with Square, the way how they work is, it's basically like a money order, where as soon as you create the check, the money automatically comes out of the account. So, I sent that over to them. As far as following up, seeing if it was cashed, I didn't follow up with it, only because, like I said, with Square Checking, as soon as you create the check, it automatically comes out.

Chair Peeples – Did you have any other comments, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. Gibson – No. That was my only comment. Besides basically -- because I supposedly received all these at the same time at that mail address, but like I stated previously, I have moved from that address, and I only received it after the deadlines had been completed. That's how I found out through Attorney Caracci.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Mr. Gibson, I'd just like to make a comment. As you are, I am a licensee under this Division. I am an FDIC under this Division. And when you become not only a licensee but also an FDIC, there's a lot of things that you have to be on top of, when it comes to payments, everyday operations, things of that nature. And I appreciate you participating today. I appreciate you being on here. But sir, this is something that you should have been doing some follow up with and you didn't, as well as there are such dates that you have to reply to the Division to let them know when your address changes. So, I greatly appreciate you participating, but I'd like us to see if we can kind of get this case and the next case since, we've had a lot of discussion on these and we've also had it at several Board meetings. So, what is the Board's pleasure on case number ATN-41476? Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I'll make a motion, but first, I have a comment. This is unacceptable behavior. Unacceptable. I work in this business every day. And if there's a dime that's paid to this business over what my funeral is, we'd write a check for a dime. Okay? This is unacceptable.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved for a fine of \$5,000 and Respondent's license shall be placed on suspension up to two (2) years. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Williams – And Madam Chair, I would want to make another comment, if I may.

Chair Peeples – Yes, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams – Again, this repeats my previous comment about the first case in reference to Mr. Gibson stating that he's paid it. However, in the ATN that we receive, it's still showing outstanding. I agree with Mr. Ferreira; this is unacceptable if this is actually true. So, I do want to go on the record saying that we need to make sure, one, what we're receiving is true and accurate because what we're hearing that persons are turning information in and is not being properly recorded. So, I want to just go on the record and state that.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Williams. And Mr. Gibson, we are in a motion and a second, so I can't have any other comments by you right now, sir. So, is there any other Board members that have any other discussion on this motion and

second? We have Mr. Jones, who is recused. Ms. Simon, will you take a roll call vote on this item, please? Ms. Marshall, did you have a comment, ma'am?

Ms. Marshall – There was a suspension on the table?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Marshall – I just wanted to clarify. Does the Board have any preference with how that suspension interacts with the probation that was imposed in the last case?

Chair Peeples – What would be your suggestion, Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – My suggestion would be for the term of probation to pick up upon the completion of the suspension.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, do you agree with that?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, I do.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams, do you agree with that?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Marshall, does that complete your question?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Simon, can you take a roll call vote please, ma'am?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am. All of those agreeing with the motion, please respond by saying yay. Mr. Clark?

Mr. Andrew Clark – Yay.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – No.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jones?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Jones is recused.

Ms. Simon – Oh, excuse me. Ms. Liotta?

Ms. Liotta – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Chapman?

Mr. David Chapman – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair?

Chair Peebles – Yes.

Ms. Simon – The motion passes.

Chair Peebles – Thank you. Mr. Caracci?

Ms. Munson – I'm sorry.

Chair Peebles – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I didn't know, but I thought I heard someone say that the Gibson had a question or something. I don't know if we're just bypassing it or, again, I'm only concerned about record for retention.

Chair Peebles – Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Ms. Munson. Mr. Gibson, did you want to make a comment, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. So, I'm just trying to understand, again. I understand that you all put a suspension on the record, or you just voted for a suspension. My question then becomes with the information that I submitted, although, like I said in the previous case, I do take accountability for not changing, for not staying on top of changing my address at the time I was going through different things, so that is my fault. But as far as submitting the information when I did receive it, the way the language was stated, the information was saying that I couldn't submit it. So that's why I submitted what I had to attorney Caracci.

Ms. Munson – I didn't hear your question. I didn't know. I was just noting that for the record, I thought he may have not understood what this penalty meant. So, Madam Chair, that was my reason for the allowance.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, Ms. Munson. And thank you Mr. Gibson. And we kind of already had that conversation, which is recorded in the minutes. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Munson – I'm sorry. I do apologize.

Chair Peebles – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I apologize. What I did want to clarify is because it did exceed the \$2,500, that would be aggravating circumstances, and I would just need the Board to identify what the aggravating conditions were that led you to go outside the guidelines.

Chair Peebles – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – So, I would say it's unacceptable behavior for any funeral home to do this type of act. I mean, it's, you know, it's exactly what 497 says, so I don't understand. I can really make it really big, but I mean, you don't need any more information, do you?

Ms. Munson – Well, I don't know if really unacceptable is enough language for the aggravating tone. I mean, you could, I don't know if far exceeded or I will put -- I'm just trying to protect the order if it were ever under review.

Mr. Ferreira – Well, you know I would say this is borderline theft for not paying a family back for insurance proceeds that were paid to the funeral home, and they didn't pay the difference back to the family.

Mr. Gibson – It was paid back.

Mr. Ferreira – I'm not a lawyer, so I don't have big words, but --

Ms. Munson – You don't need big words. So, thank you. I believe Mr. Jensen may have wanted to add something, but I wasn't sure, and I also saw Mr. Clark's hand. I appreciate you both.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Munson. Mr. Ferreira I'd like to maybe refer back to Florida Statute 497.152(1)(a)(b), where it talks about a funeral establishment and not handling themselves. The exact wording from our document on Page 8 of our PDF document, 497.152(1)(a) provides that a funeral establishment is subject to discipline for violating any provision of this chapter, in unlawful order of the Board or Department, or of the statutory predecessor to the Board or Department. And then 497.152(1)(b) provides that a funeral establishment is subject to discipline for committing fraud, deceit, negligence, and competency or misconduct in the practice of any of the activities regulated. So, I think 497.152(1)(b) kind of sums up the unacceptable behavior comment. Do you agree?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. And I have that by Mr. Ferreira. Mr. Williams, do you agree with that item?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. So, Mr. Jensen, you had a comment, sir?

Mr. Jensen – I will just echo what you said. I was just trying to help Mr. Ferreira out to get some big words.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. Mr. Clark, did you have a comment, sir?

Mr. Clark – I agree with you Madam Chair I was just going to add the fact that the family reached out multiple times, with no response from the licensee also is aggravating.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, sir. I saw Ms. Marshall had come on with the camera. Ms. Marshall, did you have any comment, ma'am?

Ms. Marshall – I was going to add the aggravating and mitigating factors that are outlined in the disciplinary guidelines, if that would be instructed for the Board? Madam Chair, would that be something that would be helpful for the Board?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am. Mr. Ferreira, do we need to address that item or are you okay with the aggravating from 497.152(1)(b)?

Mr. Ferreira – What you read Madam Chair. Yes.

Chair Peeples – Okay, perfect. And why don't we just, if you agree with this, why don't we just add the aggravating mitigating factors as Ms. Marshall stated. They're listed in the Administrative Complaint.

Ms. Marshall – Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. This is actually in Rule 69K-30.001 with the disciplinary guidelines. Based on consideration of the following aggravating and mitigating factors, the Board may impose discipline action other than the penalties recommended herein. Those factors are a danger to the public length of time, and since the date of the violation, the number of complaints filed against the licensee, the length of time licensee has practiced, the actual damage, physical or

otherwise caused by the violation, the deterrent effect of the penalty imposed, the effect of a penalty upon the licensee's livelihood, the efforts for rehabilitation, the actual knowledge of the licensee pertaining to the violation, attempts by the licensee to correct or stop violations or refusal to correct or stop violations, related violations against a licensee in another state, including finding its guilt or innocence, penalties imposed and penalties served and penalties imposed for related offense from these guidelines. So those are the aggravating factors the Board could be looking at if you are seeking to deviate from the guidelines.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Munson – If you'll recite that rule again. 69K-30.001?

Ms. Marshall – Yes ma'am. It's 69K-30.001.

Ms. Munson – All of those options don't apply. But are you suggesting they choose from those options that do apply?

Ms. Marshall – Yes. That would be my suggestion that the Board include at least one (1) of those in their justification for aggravating penalty in this case.

Ms. Munson – Does the Board want to identify?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, from what Ms. Marshall read is there one (1) of those factors that you and Mr. Williams would like to identify, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – Ms. Marshall, could you read those again?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, sir. Those factors are the danger to the public, the length of time, and since the date of the violation, the number of complaints filed against the licensee, the length of time the licensee has practiced, the actual damage physical, whether it caused by the violation, the deterrent effect of the penalty imposed, the effect of the penalty upon the licensee's livelihood, any of rehabilitation, the actual knowledge of license violation, attempts by the licensee to stop or correct violations or refusal to stop or correct violations, related violation licensee in another state. And penalties imposed for related offenses under those guidelines.

Mr. Ferreira – Danger to the public is number one.

Chair Peeples – Is that a correct numbering, Ms. Marshall?

Mr. Ferreira – No, ma'am. That was the first one she said.

Ms. Marshall – Yes. That is the first item on the list.

Chair Peeples – Okay, perfect. So, Mr. Ferreira, you add that to your amended motion?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams, you accept that?

Mr. Williams – Yes.

Chair Peeples – So, Ms. Munson and Ms. Marshall, does that complete this item?

Ms. Munson – For me, the order will still reflect those reasons that were passed in the original motion with the amendment of danger to the public being an additional aggravating factor. The order will reflect that. Thank you.

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

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

Ms. Caracci – The above-referenced matter is presented to the Board for consideration of the Motion for Determination of Waiver and Request for Informal Hearing and for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact (Motion) in the matter of Travis Gibson (“Respondent”). The Department conducted an inspection of Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations herein, Respondent was licensed as a funeral director. Respondent aided and abetted unlicensed activity. The disciplinary guidelines for these violations are as follows:

Counts I-VII: Aiding, assisting, procuring, employing, or advising any person to practice a profession or occupation regulated by this chapter without required licensure: Reprimand, fine of \$1,000-\$2,500 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.

It would be appropriate for the Chair to entertain a motion determining that the Respondent was properly served with the Administrative Complaint and has failed to timely respond, as thus waive the right to elect the method of resolution in this matter.

Chair Peeples – Board members?

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir?

Mr. Williams – Mr. Caracci said up to two (2) years, but the reading says up to one (1). I just want to be sure which one it is.

Ms. Caracci – One (1) year.

Mr. Williams – Okay.

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

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

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

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, we have one more motion to go through, sir, and then we'll come to you. Mr. Caracci?

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

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

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, this would be appropriate time for you to address the Board if you'd like to, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. I had my hand raised for the previous item as well, but you all didn't give me the opportunity on that once you all finished. But as far as this particular case, Again, I didn't receive it on time, but this complaint that was written was actually from someone that was from another state. And I couldn't tell you what it was about. No one was aiding and abetting unlicensed activity because I went and saw all of my families with my assistant. And according to Chapter 497, as long as I'm there whether my assistant is writing down the information, she's there helping me, the law says that it wasn't no problem,

but because I didn't respond in a timely manner because I didn't receive it, then that's what trickled down all of these allegations. I don't feel like this particular case it was just another licensed friend or director from another state. They all were a part of this group, and she got mad because the person was still using the name. So, she came after me as well as the funeral home. So, that's more so what that's about. Like I said, I didn't get an opportunity to respond to that. Well, I did respond to it previously when it first came about two (2) years ago, and then just in February or March is when I received this updated complaint. So, I'm just baffled by these different complaints.

Chair Peeples – And if I may, Mr. Gibson, again, I am a licensee under this Division. I am an FDIC under this Division, and you did not complete an Election of Proceedings, sir. You had an opportunity on each of these three (3) cases, and you elected not to complete that, sir. So, a lot of this sir rests on you. So, I feel like that we have given you ample opportunity to kind of speak. I want to make sure that you have that opportunity, but I think that we have been very upfront with you and given you those opportunities. So, do you have any other comments to the Board before we call for a motion and a second, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Like I previous stated when I received it, it was after the time where I was able to respond, and that was one of the questions that I asked attorney Caracci. And he said because it is late and you're basically just receiving it, it may not help you sending the response. So that's why I waited till I got in front of you all to really explain it, and if you all give me the opportunity on another hearing or what have you, I could pull up everything that you need.

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. And Mr. Gibson, we have tabled this from the June meeting. We are now in the August meeting, sir. So, you've had ample time to present your information for consideration, sir. Mr. Williams, do you have your hand up, sir?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. Madam Chair, thank you. Ms. Simon, this question's maybe for you. I know the count is aiding and abetting an unlicensed funeral home. Is there any record of this Funeral Diva SJ in record that you know of? Were they once a funeral home or licensed funeral home and now they're not? I'm just trying to understand because I know Mr. Gibson has not mentioned that particular of these counts that we're talking about today.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – In this matter Mr. Caracci might be able to speak to it more, but allegations in this case involve an individual who is unlicensed that they are offering funeral services at this establishment. It is an unlicensed individual that has been listed on this Administrative Complaint as the one that is providing the funeral experience.

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

Mr. Williams – Kind of. If I may have a follow-up, Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Williams – So, I guess, Ms. Simon, in addition to Mr. Gibson, does the Division have plans to go after this entity or something, or is that in our purview? I'm just -- I don't know.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Mr. Gibson – Can I speak?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, if you will, real quick, sir, if you'll put your phone on mute until I acknowledge you, sir, with the background noise, please.

Mr. Gibson – Will I be able to speak afterwards?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, give me a moment, sir, if you'll put your phone on mute because there's a lot of background noise. Please, sir. Thank you, sir. Ms. Simon, if you'll reply to Mr. Williams' question, sir?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am. We cannot discuss any potential ongoing investigations during this Board meeting. So, I hear what you're saying, sir. That's not up for discussion at this point about proceeding forward against an unlicensed individual.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess my question is not to go about an investigation. I'm just asking is this on the Division's radar when we have unlicensed practices going on in the state? So, is that something that Division is looking at, or is that not in our purview? That's all I just wanted to know.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you Madam Chair. When there is unlicensed activity that is in the Department's purview, and that is something that the Department takes action against.

Mr. Williams – Okay, thank you.

Ms. Simon – Pursuing this action on.

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

Mr. Ferreira – So, what piqued my interest in this whole matter, guys, is the advertisements never mentioned a funeral home. It just mentioned Diva. So that was kind of the issue there in my opinion.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Is there any other discussion by the Board members? And Ms. Munson I think we just lost you, ma'am. Are you still connected?

Ms. Munson – I'm very much connected.

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

Mr. Gibson – Can I respond?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson give me a moment, sir, please. Board members, is there any other comment before I go to Mr. Gibson? Hearing none, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. Thank you. In regard to that advertisement, we did bring that up to Jessica Cordero. So, we had been in communication with her because I wanted to know, and we all basically wanted to know if that was okay. So, after speaking with investigator Cordero and we spoke with her several times that's when that situation was fixed. But as far as her doing any unlicensed activity, I sat with the families at every meeting. She sat with me as far as my assistant. And she did have a funeral home before, to answer Mr. Williams' question, she did have a funeral home. So basically, how I looked at it as because she still had a big clientele, we were able to, you know, work together. And that's why like I stated before, we consulted with the investigator, Cordero, to make sure or to find out what was the correct way of doing that, and then that's when it got corrected.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Gibson. Board members, what is your pleasure on this item? Mr. Caracci, do you have your hand up, sir?

Mr. Caracci – I just wanted to state that it appears Mr. Gibson saying that Shawn Johnson had her own funeral home, but she has never been licensed with the Department.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Caracci. Board members? Mr. Ferreira?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved for a fine of \$2,500. Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Is there any discussion by the Board members on this motion? Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. Madam Chair. So, Mr. Ferreira or Mr. Clark, would you all entertain any kind of probation or suspension, because I think this is a higher level of situation because as we been presented with the information and exhibits, we just want to say a fine, no kind of suspension, probation? I'm just curious.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I wasn't sure. In my notes here, I certainly have a suspension listed but I wasn't sure how that would work with the last case.

Mr. Williams – Got it.

Mr. Ferreira – That's part of, you know, my weakness on this.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Ferreira. Mr. Caracci, would you like to reply to Mr. Ferreira's question, sir?

Mr. Caracci – I believe the suspension would run... I don't have a response.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – If it's the pleasure of this body that he also has a suspension served on this particular case, the guidelines allow for a suspension up to one (1) year. You can add that, and it could run concurrently with the suspension that I believe was two (2) years on the previous case, after which there is a probation that will run on the first case. So, if you want to do it like that, it would just be documented that the penalty for this case will include a one-year suspension and the \$2,500 fine. That suspension to run concurrently with the suspension tagged with the previous case.

Chair Peeples – Would you like to amend your motion, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – I would.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Clark, you accept that? Would you accept that amended \$2,500 fine and a one-year suspension to run concurrently with the previous case suspension?

Mr. Clark – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Thank you.

Mr. Gibson – I have a question.

Chair Peeples – One second, sir. Mr. Williams, does that complete your question, sir?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. Thank you so much.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. Mr. Gibson?

Mr. Gibson – All right. My question is, well, I hear there's suspension. Now, let's say we go through with the suspension. And because this is my only source of income, how would I then be able to, you know, take care of those financial obligations?

Chair Peeples – Sir, that will be an item that you can address the Division after the meeting, sir. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I'm waiting for this final vote to go because then I'm going to have just questions that I think might be helpful in how this body wants to proceed with all of these three (3) cases. I know they're separate, but because they're so tied, and I don't know, we've not yet discussed any type of -- all of these normally become thirty (30) days after the Final Order has been

filed. I know this body is familiar with payment plans. I don't know if that's a consideration. The suspension information I just discussed in my previous comment that I shared I am going to want to clarify because everything that we do is going to become final once that order is filed. We should have thirty (30) days, unless this body chooses to extend it or provide any other type of opportunities for this Respondent regarding the payment of these fines, so that at the close of whatever period that is, he does not incur another violation because he failed to make the payments timely. So, I'm putting that all out there, but I just want to finally hear what each of these penalties are. And then I was going to go back and make sure that the body understood and that the Respondent understood well, what each had deemed and what the Respondent was missing. And that was my only comment because I heard his comment about how I am supposed to pay it, and I don't know if there's a consideration for a payment plan, especially regarding the \$5,000.

Chair Peeples – Okay. Thank you, Ms. Munson. We have an amended motion, and a second on the table. So, Ms. Simon, will you do a roll call vote on this one, please, ma'am?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am. The motion is for one-year suspension and \$2,000, is that what I heard?

Mr. Ferreira – \$2,500.

Ms. Simon – \$2,500. Thank you, sir. All those in favor of the motion, please respond by saying yay. Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – No.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones – Recused.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. Ms. Liotta?

Ms. Liotta – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Chapman?

Mr. Chapman – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Clark – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes.

Ms. Simon – And that motion passes.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. So as Ms. Munson mentioned there are considerations by this Board regarding possible payment plan, no payment plan. We know that the suspensions will run concurrently and then the probation will be after the suspension. Correct Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Correct.

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am. So, what is the pleasure of the Board regarding the penalties and payment?

Ms. Munson – And if I may, as a reminder, there's a \$500 fine on the first one, a \$5,000 fine on the second, and a \$2,500 fine on the third. A total of \$8,000.

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Clay – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – Would the staff kind of give us an idea of how a payment plan can be imposed and what has been done in the past to assist people with being able to meet those obligations?

Ms. Simon – Candidly, we have found often that payment plans are ineffective. However, you're able to make a payment plan of, let's say, \$2,000 a month or \$1,500 a month or payment over a year, you're able to do that as well. However, the Board wishes to do it, it would go into place, but if you are going to go in a payment plan, I would appreciate if the Board would make a specific date that payment is due. And if it isn't paid then further administrative action could be taken or something of that nature. I say by the 15th of each month, or, you know. Ms. Clay, does that answer your question?

Ms. Clay – It does. I do have a follow up question, however. If a payment plan is not imposed, is this person obligated to make that payment within say, thirty (30) days? So, are we talking thirty (30) days versus a payment schedule?

Ms. Simon – Yes. Or we're talking thirty (30) days. However, a payment plan could also be, he is responsible for making this full payment within ninety (90) days. However the Board wishes to structure it if a payment plan is put in place.

Ms. Clay – Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I don't care for payment plans. It's too much to keep up with. I say pay in full in ninety (90) days.

Chair Peeples – Would you like to make that a motion, sir?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, ma'am.

Mr. Chapman – Second.

Chair Peeples – Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Williams – Discussion?

Mr. Gibson – Can I proceed?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes. So, because I know we read out the suspension, is there a possibility by that they're suspended, that a possibility of the fine being paid at the conclusion of suspension?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams, if I may. I concur with Mr. Ferreira that I don't like payment plans. So, I would maybe, my comment would be that we might have it for the two (2) years for the suspension, because then we're looking at time after that. If he doesn't pay it, then we're, you know, down the road we could be two and a half, three years. So, I just would like to make that comment for the record.

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair, if I may? The only reason why I said that, because I'm thinking they would need to come before the Board again, if I'm correct upon the completion of the suspension. Would that be accurate?

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson, would you like to address that item?

Ms. Munson – So this depends on the Board, right? You can give staff the authority to clear them at the close of the suspension if there have been no other inferences or they can come before the Board, or this particular Respondent come before the Board with request to lift the suspension early if everything else has been done. So those options are in play. If you want this gentleman to come before the Board again, then that will be a part of the order for him to report to the Board after the close of the suspension period.

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair, if I may?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Williams – I guess I was going with this is some more time outside the ninety (90) days. That's all I was going. I'm fine with not having a payment plan, but I'm just saying, you know, maybe at the conclusion of the suspension, the payment must have been made in full. I guess that's where I was going. More so not necessarily payment plan. I was just trying to think around that. I completely understand what you're saying Madam Chair.

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

Ms. Munson – I don't know if this is helpful or not, but it is not uncommon for Boards to determine a date specific as to when monies may be due, or fines may be repaid. Given the amount of this fine, I don't know the Respondent's financial situation, but the \$500, if you want that to be paid within, I don't know, ninety (90) days or thirty (30) days, the \$5,000 and the \$2,500, you can extend it to six (6) months. He's going to be suspended anyway, so he can't work, but he's going to have a little more time to make the payment. It is, again, up to you. I mean, you just want the money paid by a date certain, and you can do the ninety (90) days for the \$500 and the 180 days for the other two (2). Again, that's just an option. You can break it down. You can require that all of it's paid within ninety (90) days. That's \$8,000 in ninety (90) days, as opposed to giving him an extra three (3) months to get the bulk of it in. He's going to be suspended and not going to be able to work.

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

Mr. Ferreira – Could we keep the ninety (90) days paid in full. If he doesn't pay it, let's charge him interest and if he doesn't then at that point --

Ms. Munson – If he doesn't pay it, sir, he is going to get another violation. You're going to have to do another Administrative Complaint so there's no interest.

Mr. Ferreira – Oh, no interest. Okay. So then --

Ms. Munson – We are not a debt collector.

Mr. Ferreira – Well, that's why I don't like payments.

Ms. Munson – I know. So, it's not uncommon if the amounts are larger, depending on an individual circumstance to give them longer to pay it, but there'd just be a date certain to pay it.

Mr. Ferreira – What about if he doesn't pay it, revocation of his license?

Ms. Munson – That's not it, sir. He's going to have to come back with an Administrative Complaint before you, showing that he failed to follow through on a final order. And now you're going to have new penalties, which may or may not include revocation, which may be outside the penalty guideline. Probably is, but if you find that it's mitigating or aggravating, you can offer that.

Mr. Gibson – Can I ask a question?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Gibson, give me a moment, sir, until I recognize you. Okay?

Mr. Ferreira – Madam Chair, this is my problem. We've asked this guy to do something, and he continues not to listen.

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir, and Mr. Ferreira, you have a motion for pay in full, with ninety (90) days with Mr. Chapman second. So, we had the discussion by Mr. Williams. I'd like to go back to Mr. Williams, sir.

Mr. Williams – Yes ma'am. Madam Chair, if I may offer a friendly amendment to Mr. Ferreira's motion. Ninety (90) days for the \$500 and the remaining balance of the \$7,500 paid at the conclusion of the suspension.

Mr. Ferreira – That's too long.

Mr. Williams – So my thing is this, I'm fine with what we did today, however, with us suspending the individual, they would not be working. And as it was mentioned during the earlier conversation, this is the only source of income. I completely understand how egregious everything is. However, we'll have another case, as Ms. Munson mentioned in terms of if the Respondent does not pay, we'll have something else we would have to discuss at that time. So, I'm thinking proactively if we allow more time to pay it, that may help in terms of getting the money back or would be right back at the situation in terms of him not paying.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – I would go six (6) months, but that's about it. Listen, he signed up for this. This is what happens.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – Just some comments. Initially, when I first spoke on this matter, I asked Mr. Gibson if this was his sole source of income. My reason for that is I believe that if it is your sole source of income, you would take it very seriously and not put yourself into a position in which he is now in. I don't think it's our place to determine how he's going to pay and if he's going to pay. I believe that we've given him grace by the number of times that this has come before the Board. And so, I would like to call for a vote at this point.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Clay. So, Mr. Ferreira, you had made an amendment, but we did not go to Mr. Chapman to see where you had made an amendment of the \$8,000 paid in six (6) months. Do you want to use that amendment or go back to your original motion of \$8,000 in ninety (90) days?

Mr. Ferreira – I'll go to six (6) months after listening to Mr. Williams.

Chair Peeples – Okay. Mr. Chapman, do you accept that amendment?

Mr. Chapman – No, I don't.

Chair Peeples – Okay.

Mr. Williams – I'll second the motion, Madam Chair.

Chair Peeples – Okay, so we have Mr. Ferreira with a motion of the \$8,000 paid within six (6) months. Seconded by Mr. Williams. Mr. Gibson, do you have any comment before we take a vote, sir?

Mr. Gibson – Yes. I understand Ms. Clay and Mr. Ferreira's frustration. I understand that. But again, my only thing is if I'm suspended, how am I'm supposed to come up these \$8,000 then we'll be back in this same situation like it was just said. I mean, I can try my best, but it's not guaranteed that once I'm suspended that I could easily come up with these \$8,000.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I just want to make a couple comments, and this is for the benefit of the Respondent. So normally when an individual is faced with a fine, they're giving thirty (30) days to pay. The Board is offering an option to give 180 days to pay, which is a six-month period. How that payment is made, whether it's by independent loan or borrowing from a friend or whatever, that's not really in the Board's discretion. I would like to add one other comment. The statement has been made that this case has come before this Board a number of times. I just wanted to acknowledge that the previous time this came before the Board, it was removed from the agenda because there was a defective notice issue, which had nothing to do with the Respondent, it was more on the Department's end, and that's why they pulled it. So, I don't want there, if there's any review of this, to give the impression that there was not an opportunity to present information because clearly there is, and with regard to the length of the time of payment that the Board is going beyond what is considered a normal period of time for payment, which is thirty (30) days and extending it to 180 days. I just wanted those statements made on this record. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Munson. And Mr. Gibson, I think we've had plenty of opportunity to talk. We're calling a vote. We have an amended motion for the \$8,000 fine to be paid in six (6) months. It's a motion by Mr. Ferreira and a second by Mr. Williams. Will you do a roll call vote Ms. Simon, please?

Ms. Simon – Yes, ma'am. All those who agree to this motion, please respond by saying yay. Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Quinn?

Mr. Quinn – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Clay?

Ms. Clay – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Ms. Liotta?

Ms. Liotta – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Chapman?

Mr. Chapman – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Motion carries.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. It is 11:36. Let's take a 10-minute restroom break please. Thank you, Mr. Gibson.

*****BREAK*****

Chair Peeples – It is 11:47. We'll call the meeting back to order. Ms. Simon?

(2) Settlement Stipulation(s) (No Probable Cause)

(a) Mengeling, Richard D.; DFS Case No. 258609-20-FC; Division No. ATN-33876 (F043892)

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

Ms. Wendy Wiener – Yes. Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Wiener and presenting for the Department is Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Richard D. Mengeling (“Respondent”) is a funeral director and embalmer, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F043892. The Department conducted an inspection of Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations herein, Respondent was the funeral director in charge of Gallaher Mortuary Services of Florida, a formerly licensed funeral establishment which held license number F090427 and did business in Ft. Myers, Florida. This establishment permitted an unlicensed person to engage in the practice of funeral directing. As funeral director in charge, Respondent failed to ensure that the establishment and all of its employees complied with all applicable laws and rules. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a fine of \$500. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation in resolution of this matter and I'm available to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to accept the stipulation which provides that Respondent's license shall pay a fine of \$500. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Wiener, are you here for just questions only, ma'am?

Ms. Wiener – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Thank you. So, we have a motion and a second. Any discussion on the motion? Ms. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am. So, I guess I'm trying to get clarity to be more consistent. We're not offering any suspension or probation being that we have a similar case with unlicensed activity, but we're not doing that here. I just need some clarity, Ms. Marshall.

Ms. Marshall – No, sir. And one of the reasons we did go a little lower on the penalty in this case is one of the factors that I had read out previously in my presentation concerning mitigating evidence is age of the violations. It's referencing the Administrative Complaint in this case. This happened back in 2019. It was a single incident that [audio cuts out], and the

Respondent has not had any further violations in the six years since then. So that's why we went a little lower than we otherwise have on a violation.

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair, a follow-up?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Williams – Well, if it was in 2019, I'm just curious, over the last six (6) years, why did it take six (6) years for this to come before us?

Ms. Marshall – I have not been here that entire six (6) years. I could not say what happened prior to that, but we are moving it along now and we're attempting to get all of our older cases cleaned up to that effort.

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. Please, Mr. Williams, continue.

Mr. Williams – The only reason why I ask is because I know you mentioned because of the length of this case been going on so long. So, I mean, I'm just trying to figure out does that impact what the penalty will be or is that just a statement in general?

Ms. Marshall – It's a mitigating factor to consider in imposing the discipline.

Mr. Williams – Okay. I just have some concern, you know, because a violation is a violation regardless of the time. And I just want to go on record to say that because, you know, you know, we just had a case as similar, I mean, that was almost three (3) years ago or two (2) years ago. So, I'm just trying to be more consistent in terms of how we penalize and how we fine for violations and things like that. That's my only statement for the record, because it seems like this is moving quickly versus we had deep conversation with the other cases and there's not much conversation about this. That's my only concern.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Williams. Does that complete your comments, sir?

Mr. Williams – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – Thank you.

Ms. Wiener – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am, Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – Might I just briefly address Mr. Williams' comments? Mr. Williams, this was a disputed issue of material fact. There is no admission by this licensee that there was any unlicensed practice. This is a settlement of a disputed matter, settlement intended to avoid both parties having to go to hearing. Much time has passed since this alleged violation occurred. There is a significant dispute about whether there was unlicensed activity at all associated with this matter. And so, a Settlement Stipulation is brought to you here. This is not an informal hearing where a violation has been admitted. This is a disputed violation, and the parties have come together to find a way to resolve the matter to avoid further litigation.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Williams, does Ms. Wiener's comment assist you, sir?

Mr. Williams – May I respond? Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir.

Mr. Williams – So, thank you so much for that, Ms. Wiener. I completely understand that, you know, this is a settlement. My question more so will be for Ms. Marshall. Did the Division find that there were some significant situations going on and because of the length of time you all have decided to settle? For historical purposes when we go back through minutes and

cases and things like that when people want to reference things, and I know many times Ms. Wiener has referenced many cases, I just want to make sure we are not set at any type of unprecedented situation. That's all I'm going with this.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Marshall?

Ms. Marshall – Yes, and to the point I'd like to add, I don't think we're creating any precedent here. The Board has to take every case as it comes. Every case has its own unique set of facts and circumstances and, you know, I think we've attempted to explain here the, you know, the unique considerations in this particular case. But, you know, the next one will have a different set of circumstances, and we'll have to take that as it is.

Mr. Williams – Okay. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Board members, we have a motion, and we have a second. Is there any other discussion before we take a vote? Hearing none. All in favor of the motion, say yes.

Board members [Unison] – Yes.

Chair Peeples – All opposed say no. Motion carries. Thank you, Ms. Wiener.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

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

(a) Chestnut, Charles Sumner IV: DFS Case Nos. 334936-24-FC and 346917-25-FC; Division Nos. ATN-42161 and ATN-44583 (F043410)

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

Ms. Marshall – Thank you, Ms. Simon. There are two (2) case numbers we're presenting here. Charles Sumner Chestnut IV ("Respondent") is a funeral director and embalmer, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F043410. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found as follows: At all times material to the allegations pertinent to this case, Respondent was the funeral director in charge of Chestnut Funeral Home, Inc., a licensed funeral establishment, apprentice/intern training agency, and preneed main holding license number F040669. This establishment permitted an unlicensed employee to engage in the practice of funeral directing, failed to release a body upon the request of the legally authorized person, provided seven consumers with incomplete contracts, failed to provide six consumers with complete written contracts, failed to retain copies of four contracts, and operated on an expired license for approximately six weeks. As funeral director in charge, Respondent failed to ensure that this establishment complied with all applicable laws and rules and is therefore subject to discipline. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a fine of \$4,000, and the Respondent's license shall be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years, subject to particular terms and conditions. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation in resolution of this matter and I'm available to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Peeples – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Yes, Madam Chair. I also wanted to mention that Mr. Butler is on the call today.

Mr. Christopher Butler – Yes, good morning. Thank you, Ms. Simon. Good morning, Board. I'm here.

Ms. Simon – I only mentioned that because he is representing Mr. Chestnut in this matter.

Mr. Butler – That is correct. Thank you, Ms. Simon.

Chair Peeples – And Mr. Butler, are you here for questions only, sir?

Mr. Butler – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Board members?

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to accept the stipulation which provides that Respondent shall pay a fine of \$4,000, and the Respondent's license shall be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years, subject to particular terms and conditions. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Butler – Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. May I be excused?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Butler.

Mr. Butler – Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

(a) Related Cases - Division No. ATN-45137

1. Bowden, Michael Wayne: DFS Case No. 344259-25-FC; Division No. ATN-45137 (F043391)

Ms. Simon – Is Mr. Bowden or a representative on the call today? Hearing no response. Mr. Caracci?

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. Michael Wayne Bowden ("Respondent") is a funeral director and embalmer, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F043391. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent operated a crematory that had an inactive/expired license. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,000 fine and be subject to one (1) year of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation

Mr. Williams – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir. Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – I need to recuse myself as I served on Probable Cause Panel B, for all cases under 4(a) and 4(b).

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Williams. I'm having a little technical difficulty with my microphone. So, Mr. Clark, will you take over as Vice Chair please while I disconnect my microphone? I'm going to dial in please, sir.

Mr. Clark – Sure, no problem.

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

2. Scobee-Combs Crematory: DFS Case No. 344257-25-FC; Division No. ATN-45137 (F039763)

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

Mr. Caracci – Scobee-Combs Crematory ("Respondent") is a cinerator facility, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F039763. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent operated as a crematory while having an inactive/expired license. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,000 fine and be subject to one (1) year of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation

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

(b) Related Cases - Division No. ATN-42863

1. Westside Funeral Home Inc: DFS Case No.: 328217-24-FC; Division No. ATN-42863 (F040644)

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

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. Westside Funeral Home Inc (“Respondent”) is a funeral establishment, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F040644. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent delivered incorrect cremains to consumers. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,500 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Ms. Pettine, I see you’ve come on camera. Are you representing the licensee?

Ms. Lauren Pettine – I am. And I’m just here to answer any questions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to accept the stipulation which provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,500 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2. Woodie, George: DFS Case No. 328221-24-FC; Division No. ATN-42863 (F045347)

Ms. Simon – Ms. Pettine is representing the subject in this matter and Mr. Caracci is representing the Department.

Mr. Caracci – Thank you. George Woodie (“Respondent”) is a funeral director and embalmer, licensed under Chapter 497, Florida Statutes, license number F045347. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent and found that Respondent delivered incorrect cremains to consumers. Respondent has entered into a proposed Settlement Stipulation. The proposed stipulation provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,500 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. The Department requests that the Board accept this Settlement Stipulation.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to accept the stipulation which provides that Respondent shall pay a \$1,500 fine and be subject to twelve (12) months of probation. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Pettine – Thank you very much, Board.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you.

E. Application(s) for Preneed Sales Agent

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

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

F. Application(s) for Continuing Education

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

- (a) Apex Continuing Education Solutions (4201)**
- (b) Everstory University (56408)**
- (c) Florida Cemetery, Cremation & Funeral Association (75)**
- (d) International Order of the Golden Rule (2201)**
- (e) National Funeral Directors Association (49609)**
- (f) SCI Management - Dignity University (99)**
- (g) The Independent Funeral Group (55808)**
- (h) Wilbert Funeral Services (39408)**

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

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

- (2) *Provider Approval - Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum C*
 - (a) *Jeffrey Holcomb (58008)*
 - (b) *New Jersey Funeral Service Education Corp. (58208)*

Ms. Simon – The application presented on Addendum C has been reviewed by the CE Committee, and the Committee as well as the Division recommends approval.

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

G. Consumer Protection Trust Fund Claims

- (1) *Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum D*

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

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

H. Application(s) for Embalmer Apprentice

- (1) *Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum E*
 - (a) *DiJoseph, Laura F873466*
 - (b) *Harris, Victoria L F868113*

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

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

- (1) *Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum F*
 - (a) *Funeral Director (Internship)*
 - 1. *Langel, Brianna N*
 - 2. *Lee, Nalani A*
 - (b) *Funeral Director and Embalmer (Endorsement)*
 - 1. *Staat, Felicia L Blackshear, GA*
 - (c) *Funeral Director and Embalmer (Internship and Exam)*
 - 1. *Cherizard, Nadjeda*
 - 2. *Cross, Natasha*
 - 3. *Fox, Natalie L*
 - 4. *Harres, Joshua R*
 - 5. *Hollis, Vanessa M*
 - 6. *Keller, Jordan E*
 - 7. *Kenny, Amaris S*
 - 8. *Perrault, Eric*
 - 9. *Oberg, Kami R*
 - 10. *Sharp, Nicole A*

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

J. Application(s) for Internship

- (1) *Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum G*
 - (a) *Funeral Director Intern*
 - 1. *Blanco-Chamberland, Beatrice F858844*

2. *Clements, Scott C F287488*
3. *Crawford, Robin L F572640*
4. *Moore, Kaneisha F784955*
- (b) *Funeral Director & Embalmer (Concurrent)*
 1. *Abeles, Elizabeth M F867171*
 2. *Brooks, Kaylah G F865869*
 3. *Copenhaver, Rebekah A F867722*
 4. *Gatto, Heather M F738066*
 5. *Gurrola, Astrid A F738634*
 6. *Herrera, Kristeena A F877307*
 7. *Johnson, Hailey L F527527*
 8. *Rivers, Aaron D F865914*

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

- (2) *Request to Renew Funeral Director and Embalmer License*
 - (a) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions (Criminal History)*
 1. *Fields, Michael F397366*

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

Mr. Michael Fields – Yes.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. Mr. Fields submitted a license renewal application and payment on July 23, 2025, and answered “yes” to the criminal history question. A criminal history form with court documents was received by the Division on July 23, 2025. On or around September 18, 2024, Mr. Fields entered a plea of nolo contendere to “reckless driving when reduced from DUI” a misdemeanor in the 2nd degree. On October 16, 2024, a judgement and sentence with adjudication of guilt withheld and Mr. Fields was sentenced to jail for one (1) day; credit for one (1) day, order terminating scam monitoring, and court cost which is paid in full. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition of one (1) year probation.

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

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. I will mention that Madam Chair is back on the call, however, she is calling in. She's on the call. So, Mr. Clark, if you can continue with the Board presentations for now reading off the agenda.

- (b) *Recommended for Denial (Adverse Licensing History)*
 1. *Garfield, Todd Preston F042410*

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

Mr. Todd Garfield – Yes, I am.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. Mr. Garfield submitted a license renewal application and payment on June 6, 2025, and answered “yes” to the criminal history question. A deficiency letter was issued on June 10, 2025. Mr. Garfield submitted the criminal history form and court documents received by the Division on criminal history form with court documents was received by the Division on July 23, 2025. On or around February 19, 2025, Mr. Garfield entered a plea of nolo contendere to petit theft, a first-degree misdemeanor. This petit theft occurred at Fountainhead Funeral Home in 2022. Adjudication of guilt was withheld. Mr. Garfield was sentenced to one (1) year probation, court cost and restitution to Fountainhead Funeral Home for \$401.78 to be paid in full within thirty-seven (37) days which has been paid timely. Additional special conditions of probation are as followed:

- No contact with the victim, Fountainhead Funeral Home
- Early termination for the defendant may apply after six (6) months if all conditions are met and there are no violations.
- Enroll in shoplifter/theft course within sixty (60) days

- Successfully completion of shoplifters/thief course to be completed in-person

In March 2009, in Collier County, the licensee pled nolo contendere to one (1) count of Organized Fraud under \$20,000. The offense occurred while the licensee was employed by Fuller Funeral Home in Naples, Florida, and it involved using a business credit card for personal purchases over the course of a year. The offense that occurred on February 19, 2025, the petit theft occurred at Fountainhead Funeral Home. The personal purchases totaled just under \$7,000. Based upon these criminal charges, in 2015, a Consent Order was issued against the licensee. The Division recommends denial based upon criminal record from 2014 and 2025.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon. And I'd just like to state for the record that I have a prior affiliation with Mr. Garfield, but that affiliation will not prevent me from rendering a fair and impartial decision. Mr. Garfield, are you here to answer questions or address the Board?

Mr. Garfield – Hi there, Andrew. Thank you. I'm happy to explain the circumstances to provide any context or help the Board perhaps consider probation or a fine in lieu of denial of the license. This involves previous employers; no consumers were harmed.

Vice Chair Clark – Give me one second. Mr. Garfield, hold on one second. Ms. Simon, would you swear in Mr. Garfield?

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

Mr. Garfield – I do.

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

Mr. Garfield – Todd Garfield. Last name spelled G-A-R-F-I-E-L-D.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Thank you, Mr. Garfield. Just because you were talking about possible actions for the Board, you can continue now that you've been sworn in.

Mr. Garfield – Of course. I'll just say that, yes, to address the Board, I would like to answer any questions that would help anyone, and all feel comfortable with me continuing to be a funeral director and answer any questions about specific circumstances that led to the most recent offense.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones – Mr. Garfield. looking at your February 2025 and your 2009 offense, I'm not comfortable with what I'm seeing. How can you relay what happened and why you are not a threat to the industry today?

Mr. Garfield – Sir, I appreciate the question and the reluctance, frankly. In both instances, I had taken liberties with a company credit card and had a restitution or paid back what were a combination of honest mistakes and certainly some that were, you know, mixing personal purchases with the company purchases. Again, made those situations right the moment that they were brought up. And, you know, in the past two (2) years, thought that we had parted ways with having, you know, certain charges refunded to the card and that we parted ways amicably and then became an issue a couple of years later. All that being said, you know, since then have, again, carried on my career being a stellar funeral director and contributing to the industry positively. And about a 15-year difference between those two (2) offenses. Again, happy to answer any specific questions that would help anyone feel comfortable knowing what I'm doing. I'm currently sitting with my current employer, and I certainly wish to continue doing the good work I've been doing, these one-off scenarios aside.

Mr. Jones – Give me a little more detail about your 2025 offense.

Mr. Garfield – While a manager at Fountainhead, I had a P-Card, something all managers had to make purchases, and there were accusations made of personal purchases made. I'll be specific enough to tell you that some were like personal purchases mixed in with company purchases at say Publix. There were a couple instances where I had my own personal credit card on file with the P-Card at a couple of businesses where we were intending to make purchases, and payments came off of them. Those were refunded right away as honest mistakes and had admitted to that almost immediately. That's what happened in 2022, and then in 2025 or late 2024 is when those accusations resurfaced.

Mr. Jones – Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. In relation to this case, I just want to mention to the Board that the Board may have previously heard of the conviction in March of 2009. That being said, the reason it was put on the cover sheet for today is to show the similarity with the offense that just occurred earlier this year.

Mr. Garfield – If I may add one (1) detail to the circumstances of 2009. It was specifically a company gas card where I was filling my gas tank with gas being an intern and just me showing poor judgment.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Yes. I just want to just factually for to be clear on the 2022 and 2025, was the applicant indicating there were multiple incidents resulting from poor judgment or mistaken incidents? I just didn't know what the facts were.

Mr. Garfield – If that's a question for me specifically, can I answer?

Ms. Munson – Yes, sir. I'm sorry.

Mr. Garfield – Thank you. No, I want just to be clear. Certainly, in both cases, poor judgment made. The amount of transactions in 2009, amount of times I was buying a sandwich in the gas station or filling up my own gas tank, for example, happened multiple times throughout the course of a year of serving my internship. The most recent offense was, I think less than a handful of purchases that were, again, I thought rectified before becoming any escalated issue. But then certainly became an issue two (2) years later.

Ms. Munson – Poor judgment or mistake. I just factually trying to gauge.

Mr. Garfield – A combination of both.

Ms. Munson – A combination. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Garfield – I appreciate the question.

Mr. Williams – Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – Is Ms. Wiener still representing you or does she no longer represent you?

Mr. Garfield – No, sir.

Mr. Williams – Okay.

Mr. Garfield – No, sir. She did in 2009. Good observation. She did it in 2009, or I believe it was a couple years later that actually there was disciplinary action of the year probation and \$500 fine from the 2009 offense. I don't think that actually surfaced until a couple of years later. If I recall right, I blew the whistle on myself to report the offense and then nothing kind

of came of it. And then a couple of years later, I think a competitor had brought it up again and then it finally came across the Board's attention to then address disciplinary, you know, proceedings at that point. That's when Ms. Wiener had represented me, but not this time.

Mr. Williams – I just didn't want to overlook counsel if you had counsel. Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Mr. Garfield – Thank you.

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

Mr. Jones – If I may, how long have you been at your current job?

Mr. Garfield – Currently since mid-February at Island Cremations in Merritt Island. In case you were asking since parting ways with Fountainhead and since that occurred, I was with Foundation Partners from almost a couple weeks after that, so roughly July or August of 2022 through November of 2024. So gainful employment, positive contribution to the industry ever since.

Mr. Jones – And your current employer is there with you, you said?

Mr. Garfield – They are. It's a family run company where the principal owner and his son, who's also a minority partner in the business, are both here by my side.

Mr. Jones – Mr. Chair, can we swear him in for a question as far as asking concerns about current employment?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I just want to note that you can, if the gentleman is calling him as a witness.

Mr. Jones – And only reason I'm asking is he said he was there with him. So as Ms. Munson said, if he's there as a witness. If not, that's fine.

Ms. Munson – You're willing to call him as a witness, Mr. Garfield?

Mr. Garfield – I'd be happy to.

Ms. Munson – Okay. Well then, yes, sure.

Mr. Garfield – If we may, we'll just switch seats.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

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

Mr. Paul Mazzoni – I do.

Mr. Dillon Mazzoni – I do.

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

Mr. P. Mazzoni – Paul Mazzoni, M-A-Z-Z-O-N-I.

Mr. D. Mazzoni – Dillon Mazzoni, M-A-Z-Z-O-N-I.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sirs.

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

Mr. Jones – Yes. Mr. Mazzoni, my question is basically you know the history of Mr. Garfield, he's currently employed with you. Any reservations or concerns moving forward?

Mr. P. Mazzoni – None at all.

Ms. Munson – Did the gentleman who's answering give his title?

Mr. Jones – Mr. Mazzoni, your title?

Mr. P. Mazzoni – Island Cremations LLC, owner and general manager.

Mr. Jones – Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

Mr. Williams – Thanks so much, Mr. Chair. Am I reading this correctly that you're still on probation until February of 2026? Is that accurate?

Mr. Garfield – Sorry, just a moment while we play musical chairs. Thank you for your patience with that. Technically yes, it was a year. I'm eligible for early termination the 18th of this month. So, while that's not set in stone yet, I've met all the requirements for that to be completed and off probation by the 18th of this month. So, after six (6) months, eligible for early termination, should, you know, court costs be paid, and all those kinds of things be paid. So that is completed, the 18th of this month. So, I have no reason to believe that that would not be over by then. You're correct that it was technically a year probation.

Mr. Williams – Mr. Vice Chair, may I have a follow-up?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Mr. Williams – Ms. Simon, is that part of the denial from your office in reference to this case, because of the probation?

Ms. Simon – Absolutely, sir.

Mr. Williams – Okay.

Ms. Simon – Absolutely.

Mr. Williams – So maybe Ms. Munson, if you can assist me with this. What are our options in terms of, since probation is coming up and he'll be eligible, is this something that we could hear next month and then everything will be clear? I'm just trying to figure out options to proceed moving forward.

Ms. Munson – So the options are the full gambit, right? You can just approve it the way it is, even with the outstanding sanctions and probation on his record. You can approve it with the condition that he successfully complete this probationary period, which he indicates will be cleared by the 18th of this month and leave that for staff to clear. You can deny it because you think the history, despite the existing probation or even clearance of probation is so egregious that you do not think this applicant is eligible for approval.

Mr. Williams – Okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Anything else, Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams – No, sir. Thank you, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – I actually have a question for you Mr. Chair, if it's appropriate. What was your experience with this person? Is that sketchy ground?

Ms. Munson – Sketchy ground, sir, as Board member and witness. So yes, that's kind of inappropriate. He indicated that he is not recusing himself from the matter, but I don't know if you're asking him to speak on his behalf or speak against him, which would be a surprise. And for the Board member's sake, I would be really concerned about that participation. And of course, Mr. Garfield would need to give permission for Mr. Clark to speak as his witness because we can't just call witnesses independently. I would be very careful, Mr. Clark, in that response if you respond.

Vice Chair Clark – And I will be. Thank you.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair, I'll withdraw that question. I don't want to put you on the spot there. I'm trying to get an unbiased opinion.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Jensen – I mean, the big problem here is the money with another licensee, and they obviously, I mean, I've seen this happen time and time again with people. It's actually happened to me personally as an owner and so he really must have made them mad for them to follow through with everything that they've done. So, I just wondered if he's on the straight and narrow now or, maybe this question is for Mr. Garfield. Mr. Garfield, are you still handling the firm's money or are you just a funeral director?

Mr. Garfield – Yes, just a funeral director. Being a manager had a lot of great, you know, perks to leading people. But honestly, just funeral directing 101 has been really rewarding for the past seven (7) months. Not the way I would've designed being with this company now, but certainly very happy to have been. And I would certainly welcome, not necessarily a character witness from Andrew Clark, but I'll just say it was wonderful working with him. It was a great experience working with Foundation Partners. It was really special stuff.

Mr. Jensen – All right. Thank you. Thank you for that, Mr. Chair. And Mr. Chair wasn't shaking his head, so I assume he's agreeing with that. So, I would make a motion that we let this gentleman keep working and let's have a year of probation just to kind of keep an eye to make sure that his other probation runs out and he does get his early release, Mr. Chair.

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to approve the application with one (1) year of probation.

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

Mr. Jones – Mr. Jensen, I will agree with you, but I would ask for two (2) years' probation just based on the severity of what I'm seeing. I want to feel very comfortable. If you would agree to a two-year probation, I will second that.

Mr. Jensen – Agreed.

Mr. Jones – Second.

Chair Peeples – If I may, Mr. Chair. I'd like to also add an amendment to Mr. Jensen's motion that Mr. Garfield come back to the Board at the September meeting to let us know what is the outcome of his possible early probation. And if that is an item that he stated may be completed this month in the month of August, that he also presents that information to the Division office. Mr. Jensen, is that agreeable?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, ma'am. I'll go along with that.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones – I agree. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Chair Peeples. Ms. Munson, did you have a question?

Ms. Munson – I did. I just wanted to know if it is this Board's pleasure that in his return at the September meeting, is it just to confirm whether or not that outstanding probation from the outside item is completed? Or is it at all the impact this two-year probation that's on this? I mean, is that subject to additional review? If you bring him back before you, I guess it's subject to additional review. I just want to make sure the purpose of that [Inaudible].

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am. My request is that he comes back in September, and we look at the situation with the probation to see, because I'm just very concerned after reading the documents that being a business proprietor, it's very concerning to me when someone has an involvement with monetary items, and they abuse that privilege. So, I'm really concerned about this approval of this license.

Ms. Munson – Again, then, just to be clear, if he comes back with everything done as far as that outside probation is concerned, is this Board thinking that they're going to look at this application again with these concerns that exist in the materials today? Or is it just to check off that this outside probation is complete? Because I don't want there to be like a situation where this Board is creating -- we're going to review this same thing twice because this is his opportunity for this review. But if you feel that you want to wait until that probation is complete and then approve, I just want it to be clear because I don't want him to come back or he needs to know when he comes back, if he's coming back to sit for the same review he has today outside of the completion of that probation. I just wanted that to be clear.

Chair Peeples – Yes, ma'am. If I may, Mr. Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Chair Peeples – I would feel more comfortable if the motion and the second, Mr. Jensen and Mr. Jones, if we would wait to see if this early probation aspect that Mr. Garfield mentioned is approved. I'm just really concerned about approving this license with past history.

Ms. Munson – If I may? I don't know if I'm addressing Ms. Peeples or Mr. Clark. Who do I need to address?

Vice Chair Clark – I guess, Ms. Peeples, since this is in response to her question.

Ms. Munson – Madam Chair, so are you suggesting that the body not act on this application?

Chair Peeples – I would prefer to have the motion withdrawn and the second withdrawn to wait and see at the September meeting if this comes into fruition with the comment that he made, and then let's kind of review it back at the September meeting. But that's just my comment.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen, I saw you had your hand up. Chair Peeples, go ahead. I'm sorry.

Chair Peeples – I think it goes back to Mr. Jensen and Mr. Jones. They are the ones that made the motion and the second. After the discussion, what are their thoughts?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Who are we talking to? Ms. Peeples or Mr. Clark?

Ms. Munson – Ms. Peeples.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Peeples.

Mr. Jensen – Madam Chair, I completely understand where you're going and I think, you know, I may be out of turn here, but I think me and Mr. Jones kind of have the same idea as well. We want to make sure that's taken care of. So, what my question to the Department is, can this gentleman still earn a living while we're waiting for the September meeting? I mean, is he okay right now? Or we going to impede him from losing his job? And, if he's got everything rectified and he truly made a mistake and he's moving forward with a new foot, then I want to give him a chance to earn a living. But how do we do that, Ms. Munson or Ms. Simon? I understand what Madam Chair is saying.

Mr. Williams – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. What has happened is that Mr. Garfield appears has been working at this establishment in an unlicensed capacity. Wait a minute. No. I apologize. I'm thinking this through like you asked. If I could just have one moment, please. Mr. Garfield is currently in a licensed status. I just wanted to make sure we were on the same page. However, if you were going to continue this on the thought that his probation will be taking off early termination before the next meeting, I would only request that you ask for a waiver because I do not want the ninety (90) days to elapse on this. You can have this matter continued with that waiver. I would request otherwise; you can put conditions on his license. Now, I, like Ms. Munson, I'm concerned what if you [audio cuts out] this matter and Mr. Garfield comes back next month, his probation is not terminated. I mean, the probation is for a year. Early termination does not always happen. It's nice that that is an option. It doesn't always happen. So, what if we come back next month and his probation isn't terminated because he has it for a year? Like I said, my main concern is if you are going to continue this matter that he waives his right to come back within a certain period of time. That's my only concern.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Ms. Munson, I saw your hand go up.

Ms. Munson – Yes. It was just going to be a notation that, and I don't know what the body feels open to doing, but if you wanted to act on the application today, if your intention was to approve with a two-year probation, you can do so subject to the completion of this exterior probationary period being completed. And you can leave that for staff to clear, and it would be an action today. But if you really want to see this applicant again, then I would suggest that you table it and then bring it back. Because I mean, I don't want there to be any confusion into what you're doing. So, if you want to act on it, you can approve it. You can give him a two-year probation, and you can say that the license is not effective until proof of completion is provided to the Department. I mean, the opportunity to do that is there. This, again, is however the Board members choose to proceed.

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

Mr. Jones – Yes. The current probation he's under, what is the termination date currently?

Ms. Simon – If I may, that the probation was for one (1) year, and he pled nolo contendere on February 19th. It would be February 19, 2026.

Mr. Jones – At the latest.

Ms. Simon – That is the term of probation. If it's early terminated, it's early terminated. But that is the term of probation for one (1) year.

Mr. Jones – Thank you. And I stand by my second for a two-year probation to move forward.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. Jones. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes. Question for Mr. Garfield. Mr. Garfield, what is your feeling on this probation? I assume you have to report to a probation officer or something. Are you get any indication that -- and I think what Ms. Peeples is getting at is she wants to make sure you're legit when you're saying you think you might get early termination. Do you really have a good indication of that? Because if it comes back and you didn't get it, it's probably not going to look too good.

Mr. Garfield – Understood. So, the representation that I had for this case, the attorney, is where I'm gaining the confidence from, from what they've seen. So much so that I would be willing to offer a contingency to say that, you know, I said the 18th

before, but you're right, the 19th is actually the end date that say by August 20th, you'd have paperwork emailed to Crystal Grant at the Division to say this is now early terminated. That it happens that quickly from my understanding. You're right that it's not guaranteed. So, I don't want to put all my eggs in one basket. But, again, save the Board time coming back to this, you know, make contingency that I'm on probation before my license is approved till I get to you would be fair. Any version of this where I have the ability to move forward as a funeral director is fine by me. And so I trust your discretion.

Mr. Jensen – Madam Chair?

Chair Peeples – Yes, sir?

Mr. Jensen – So I made the original motion. So according to what Mr. Garfield is stating, and following along the lines of what you stated, I would like to amend my motion to say that, like Mr. Jones said, we go ahead and approve him with a two-year probation subject to him getting off the legal probation. Does that make sense? Anybody?

Chair Peeples – And if I may, Mr. Vice Chair?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Chair Peeples – If I may. I think as Ms. Munson stated, but where do we go from here? Does it come back at the September meeting? Do we rehear it again? You know, kind of where we are as Ms. Munson stated, and Ms. Simon stated maybe if he would agree to a waiver and let's table it until the September meeting, and then he has the opportunity, if this does go into the positive for him, he can present the information, then we can come back on the agenda item and address it then. I'm just real concerned. And thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Madam Chair. Ms. Munson, I saw your hand go up. I understood Mr. Jensen's motion to be suspended subject to completing probation, then the license would go active. Ms. Munson, do you want to clarify that?

Ms. Munson – If that was in fact the motion, that would be how the order would be written, and it would be then for staff to clear it. My only concern is if you guys felt you needed to see this gentleman again, if you don't that's a different story. But there is an order that can be written that says that this applicant is approved with a two-year probation that will begin only after completion of this legal probation for the criminal history. My question though would be understanding that the next Board meeting is September 4th and today is August 7th, so it is around the corner. If you feel that you just want to put this back on the agenda, by August 20th, all paperwork would've been submitted. So, there's a difference of whether or not this gentleman will provide paperwork to the Department that would be acceptable to this body by August 20th, and then having the opportunity to clear it that day, or him coming back ten (10) days later for the meeting on September 4th and present that paperwork to this body, per se. That's kind of what this is looking like. You just got to determine how you want to proceed. If you table it, and if he provides this completion paperwork at the September 4th meeting, then it will be right then and there concluded, or you can make that decision today and staff will have the opportunity to clear it effective August 20th or whenever he provides that paperwork. I'm hearing from the chair that she kind of wants to see something herself, so I'm not certain where this body is going.

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

Mr. Jensen – Ms. Simon had her hand up. I'd like to hear what she has to say about keeping track of this, because in the interest of saving time, I mean, we're going to go through this again. Why do that? You know, if the Department can clear him, you know, my main thing is that his legal issues are solved and we're moving forward on a new foot and give the gentleman a chance to make a living.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – The way I understand it, like I said, Mr. Garfield is currently licensed. If what you're saying is you would like his license suspended until such time as he is terminated from his probation. Otherwise, if you are actually saying you would like him to keep his license, and I don't know how you can make the condition. You are licensed, however, if your probation isn't terminated by next month, you have lost your license. I'm not sure how to do that order, Ms. Munson. I'm not sure. I think that

the Board is effectively saying that you don't care if you see Mr. Garfield again, that isn't the issue. You just want to make sure that his probation is terminated. You know that is [audio cuts out] you want.

Ms. Munson – I don't know if that was the Board said. I think some of the Board members are saying some things and others are saying others. I sense that Ms. Peebles wants to see the gentleman again, but I don't know if everyone wants to see the gentleman again, and I can't speak for any individual Board member how to proceed. I just wanted to present the options. An order can be written either way.

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

Mr. Jones – Yes, just to clarify, my second of Mr. Jensen's motion was two-year probation. I did not consider an early termination, whether it went to February or whether it went in August. I was seconding the two-year probation. If that's not what's on the table, then I'll retract my second for something else. Mine was strictly two-year probation. He comes off probation whenever the court takes him off probation based on the facts that his current employer trusts him and he's doing funeral directing 101 and not handling any monies. Thank you.

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

Mr. Jensen – Yes. Actually, I think I'll withdraw my motion and yield to maybe Madam Chair, who would like to make a different motion or someone else because it's getting too convoluted for my taste. I just don't know why we need to waste time to go through all this again when we can make a decision now.

Chair Peebles – Mr. Vice Chair, may I speak?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Chair Peebles – Thank you, sir. Mr. Jensen, I respect your comment. I am just concerned when we're putting probation for all of these Respondents, unless it's in the final order, they don't have to come back and see us, speak with us, and there's really no accountability for probation. That's what I'm really concerned about. And this gentleman has had issues monetarily with his employer that came to a case outside of our jurisdiction. I'm just really concerned and he made the comment, I appreciate he and his current employers being on the call today, but I'm just really concerned that we are not dotting our i's and crossing our t's to make sure that we check these different things and kind of kind of go from there. So that's just my comment. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Clark, may I?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Mr. Jensen – I'm still confused just a little bit. So, we not only are considering this individual, but I think what I'm hearing from Madam Chair is she would like to see him suspended until he comes back and proves his thing. But, you know, that's going to put a problem with the business owner as well. So, Ms. Simon or Ms. Munson, the way I understood Ms. Simon is he is okay right now, and then he is got to come back and prove in September that he's off probation and we would look at it again. Is that what I'm understanding?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – That was not what I said actually, Mr. Jensen. It sounds like you have a couple of options right now. You want to make sure that he is off probation. You can ask that this matter be continued. Of course, he'd have to waive the deemer if you ask that this matter be continued till next month to find out if he is off probation. But as Ms. Munson said, there is one thing to consider. If the next Board meeting is September 4th, we need to have the materials by the 20th, and today is the 7th. So that would mean in thirteen (13) days his probation would have to be terminated. And I think that might be setting up Mr. Garfield for failure because within fourteen (14) days, his attorney would have to go to court and get this early terminated, as it has to happen in court. Mr. Jones wanted to make the motion; he made the motion to simply grant approval with probation. If the whole guise, is you want to see him off probation before this license is renewed, then do you want him to continue to

have a license until such time? Let's say you do that. Let's say you say with a condition that his probation is terminated. Then what happens, is he continues his license status and then his probation is terminated. Nothing really happens except that he's on probation for two (2) years. I'm not sure how the Board wants to see this. As Ms. Munson stated, there are a lot of options here. Does the Board want to see his license suspended until such time as his probation is terminated? If so that needs to be what's said. If the Board wants him to have his license regardless of anything, then as Mr. Jones said, it would be on probation for two (2) years. Or, if you want to go, as Madam Chair has suggested, then you would continue this matter for a month and see what happens next month. But as I said, I'm not sure that his probation will be terminated by the time of August 20th, which is when all paperwork would have to be in. So, I don't want you to set this gentleman up for failure to come back with his probation terminated because I'm not sure that's going to happen. It's not as easy as one might think to schedule this to go to hearing in criminal court and get his probation terminated.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon and Mr. Jensen, hopefully that's clarified. If I understood Ms. Simon correctly, the license is valid. This is a renewal, so it will be valid until some action is taken. So, Mr. Jones, I saw your hand up and then I'll get to Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Jones – Yes, if Mr. Jensen has retracted his proposal, I will ask Mr. Garfield to waive this and ask him to come back in October to the Board meeting and provide an updated status of his probation. His license is valid. He is operating as he is to date. The Board can review this in October to give sufficient time. That's my motion.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to table the application until the October meeting. Ms. Liotta seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – We have a motion to table until the October Board meeting and it's been seconded. Mr. Chapman, did you have a question?

Mr. Chapman – No, I was going to make a motion to go back and to do what the State recommended from the very first time because we're just kicking the can down the road.

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

Ms. Munson – I wanted to identify for the benefit of the applicant, that he's not a Respondent, he's an applicant, that the October meeting is October 9th. And if it is the pleasure of this body to table this, if that's what this vote is, until the October meeting, everything continues as it has been and October 9th, our Board is asking that you produce that paperwork, and if not, their decision will be based on whatever is made available for the October 9th meeting. But you can understand, because you don't do this every day, so I always like to make sure our applicants and Respondents understand.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Garfield?

Mr. Garfield – Very, very quickly. So then, just so I'm clear, my license will be active for that time until October to then show that's been renewed? That's something I can send ahead of time, say to Crystal or LaTonya, so I can send that information as soon as I have it, and then it can just be reviewed at that meeting in October?

Ms. Munson – Well, depending on how early it gets there.

Mr. Garfield – Understood.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – It seems to me that what has been motioned for is that this application for renewal be continued until the October Board meeting and we can hear it then. If that is the case, I would request that that be conditional upon Mr. Garfield's waiver of the deemer.

Mr. Jones – Correct.

Ms. Liotta – Correct.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Mr. Garfield, what she's referring to is you must waive what's called deemer. There's a certain amount of time we must take action on your application. Do you waive that 90-day period so that we can take this up in October?

Mr. Garfield – Yes, I do.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Any other questions? We have a motion and a second to table until the October meeting. Any other questions or comments? Hearing none. All those in favor say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – Any opposed?

Mr. Chapman – No.

Vice Chair Clark – Let the record reflect Mr. Chapman is a No. That motion carries. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Mr. Garfield. We will see you in October.

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

- (1) *Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum H*
 - (a) *Bay Area Family Funeral Services d/b/a Segal Funeral Home (Tampa)*
 - (b) *SCI Funeral Services of Florida LLC (Davie)*
 - (c) *Williams -Thomas Funeral Home, Inc. (Gainesville)*

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

L. Notification(s) of a Change in Location

- (1) *Informational Item (Licenses Issued without Conditions) – Addendum I*
 - (a) *D A Jackson Funeral Home Inc. (Pompano Beach)*

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

M. Application(s) for Funeral Establishment

- (1) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions*
 - (a) *Anderson-Hence Funeral Home, LLC (Wildwood)*

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. An application for funeral establishment licensure was received on May 16, 2025. The application was based upon a change in ownership. While the application was incomplete when received, it was completed as of July 16, 2025. The FDIC in charge is Mr. Al J. Carnegie, Jr. A background check of principals revealed no relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

MOTION: Chair Peebles moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff. Mr. Ferreira seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Any comments or questions on the motion?

Mr. Jensen – I do have a question on Page 5 of our packet, it talks about a visitation chapel, and it says no, but then they say attached to the funeral home, so I assume this is just a mistake and it's in a different area because it's a different address. So, I'm just a little confused. Is there a visitation chapel at a separate address or was that just, they misunderstood the question?

Ms. Simon – May I?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I assume Mr. Jensen, the answer to that is no, they did not have a visitation chapel as the area that they are denoting and that is actually attached to the funeral home. I would go with the no answer on that.

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

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Any other questions? Again, we have a motion to approve with conditions and it's been seconded. All those in favor say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – And all opposed? And that motion carries.

(b) Directors Service Incorporated d/b/a Florida Direct Cremation (St. Petersburg)

Ms. Simon – An application for funeral establishment licensure was received on June 27, 2025. The application was complete when received. A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

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

(c) Millennium Funeral Home and Crematory Okeechobee, LLC (Okeechobee)

Ms. Simon – A new application for funeral establishment licensure based upon a change of ownership was received on May 14, 2025, and was incomplete at that time. On July 11, 2025, the application was considered complete. A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

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

Vice Chair Clark – Any questions or discussion on the motion? Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Thank you. I did not ask if there was a representative of Millennium Funeral Home on the call today. Is there one?

Ms. Wiener – I'm here. My camera wouldn't turn on. Sorry.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. Any other questions?

Mr. Jensen – Mr. Chair, I noticed here they said they do have a license, but then they checked they don't have another license. So, does this applicant currently have another license, Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – The parent above this entity does, but this one does not. Tell me the page you're referring to. That might simply be a typo.

Mr. Jensen – On Page 4 of the packet, (a) is checked No, that there's no other license. I know it's a new funeral establishment, but then another area I saw here where it says something about, they do hold another license. So, I was just curious why the discrepancy.

Ms. Wiener – It seems that that was a deficiency that was incorrectly noted by the Division and had been previously cleared.

Mr. Jensen – Okay. All right. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Any other questions? We have a motion to approve with conditions and it's been seconded. All those in favor say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

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

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

N. Application(s) for Preneed Main
(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions
(a) Clearview Cremation LLC (Sarasota)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. The Department received an application for a new preneed license on June 19, 2025, and no deficiencies were noted on the application. A completed background check of all principals was returned to the Division without criminal history. Applicant obtained its qualifying funeral establishment license under license # F838759 at the address listed on the coversheet. If approved, Applicant will sell trust-funded preneed through Funeral Services Inc (FSI), utilizing their approved pre-arranged funeral agreement forms. The Division recommends approval without conditions.

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

O. Application(s) for Preneed Branch Office
(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions – Addendum J
(a) Millennium Funeral Home and Crematory Okeechobee, LLC (Okeechobee)

Ms. Simon – The entity referenced on Addendum J has applied for preneed branch licensure. The application was complete without reportable criminal or disciplinary history and accompanied by the required fee. The record indicates the applicant qualifies for preneed branch licensure. As a result, the Division recommends the entity referenced on Addendum J be approved for the branch licensure applied for.

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

P. Application(s) for Removal Service
(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions
(a) Integrity Removals (Jacksonville)

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

Mr. Terry Hill – Yes. I'm sorry, I couldn't get off mute on time. I'm Terry Hill with Integrity Removals.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. An application for removal service licensure was received on June 9, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The application was determined to be complete on July 1, 2025. A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the removal service passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon, let the record reflect that Mr. Darrin Williams has stepped away from the meeting. I think he anticipates being back soon, but he is not on the call currently. Mr. Hill, are you here to address the Board or answer questions?

Mr. Hill – I'm here to answer any questions that there may have been. Thank you.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, sir.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the application subject to the condition that the removal service passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff. Ms. Clay seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes. Do we need to swear him in?

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

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

Mr. Hill – I do.

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

Mr. Hill – Terry L. Hill, Jr. H-I-L-L.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ferreira – So, Mr. Hill is, I noticed you had the word storage in your name. So, just kind of just want to know a little bit about that.

Mr. Hill – It is the goal to include storage, although we're not initially doing storage at this time, just the removal portion. But because we're working to have that as a part of what we are able to offer within the next year we just need to secure the cooler and the alternate location.

Mr. Ferreira – That's it.

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

Chair Peeples – To the comment that Mr. Ferreira just made, I'm concerned that that is the name of the company, and they are not prepared to offer that service right now. So that's a big concern for me, that they're going to be Integrity Removals and Storage. So, if we grant this license with that name, this application, that's going to tell the public that and other industry folks that they have storage available. So where do we go from here?

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Hill, do you want to respond to that?

Mr. Hill – All I would be able to say is that we could amend the name until such time as we have secured the capacity to provide the actual storage, and then resubmit for the name change.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Hill. Madam Chair, anything further?

Chair Peeples – I'm just not comfortable where they're going, which I know most transfer removal companies don't have to have a "physical location" unless they're providing refrigeration services and things of that nature. So, where do we go with

this amended name? Is he going to have to go back through the process, through the state with Sunbiz to get the name amended? The application needs to be amended. I just would like to voice those concerns.

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

Mr. Ferreira – Could he contract with a cooler or a funeral home for that service? Could that happen just so he didn't have to go back and go through the state with all the different changes? Would that work?

Chair Peeples – Mr. Vice Chair, may I reply?

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Ferreira, that is an option, but we would have to make that a condition of the approval that he would get that information and submit it to the Division and go from there. I'm just real concerned, and I don't want to put any kind of hardship on the entity for them to have to go back to Sunbiz and things of that nature, but I'm concerned about having that name without having the ability to utilize that function.

Mr. Ferreira – Okay.

Mr. Hill – If I may?

Vice Chair Clark – Hold on one second, Mr. Hill. Mr. Ferreira, was there anything else?

Mr. Ferreira – No, I share the same concern. If we can make it easier, if he could just contract with a funeral home that's got storage, easy, you know, one paragraph and get it to the Division within fifteen (15) or ten (10) days, something like that.

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

Mr. Hill – I was just going to say we are looking into those contracts into partnering with someone with a storage so that we could utilize theirs until we secured one of our own. So that wouldn't be an undue ask or an unreasonable request.

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

Ms. Munson – I just want to make sure that I understand that it could possibly be the pleasure of this body to approve this application conditioned upon the applicant providing proof of a storage contract with a funeral home prior to licensure. Is that what I am hearing?

Chair Peeples – Yes, Ms. Munson.

Ms. Munson – Okay. If that is the motion that's so noted for this record.

Chair Peeples – I believe we already have a motion. We would need to amend the motion.

Ms. Munson – Okay, then please. Do we know who made the motion?

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Ms. Clay – I seconded the motion.

Mr. Jones – I made the motion, and I'll amend it.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you so much. I apologize for that. Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Just a technical question. So, I understand that Mr. Hill is not offering his services to the public and when a death call comes in, would it not be the funeral home that got called that would be on the hook for not storing a body properly, not making sure it was stored properly? So just a technical question.

Vice Chair Clark – I believe Mr. Jensen, and Mr. Ferreira, Ms. Peebles, please correct me, but I think it's because the name of the entity includes "and Storage" that in the event they were contacted just for storage type of work, they would need to have a relationship with a funeral home that could. Is that right, Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Yes, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Does that make sense, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Well, yes and no. In my mind, the funeral home is responsible for making sure the body is stored. This gentleman's not offering services to the public. So, he is not going to get a call and if he does, he'll have to say no. I don't offer my services to the public, but I understand where they're going with the point. It was just more of a technical question I had, so that's fine. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Vice Chair Clark – Yes sir. Mr. Ferreira?

Mr. Ferreira – Not every funeral home has a cooler.

Mr. Jensen – Understood.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – I just want to make sure that Mr. Jones' current motion is that the application be approved subject to the Division receiving a contract from Mr. Hill for a contract with a funeral establishment regarding his storage?

Mr. Jones – Yes ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Is that it?

Vice Chair Clark – As well as passing an on onsite inspection, I believe?

Ms. Munson – Correct.

Ms. Simon – Yes.

Mr. Jones – That is correct.

Vice Chair Clark – Any other questions or discussion on the current motion? Hearing none. All those in favor of say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – And any opposed? And that motion carries. Good luck Mr. Hill.

Mr. Hill – Thank you so much. Thank you all.

(b) MowJoe LLC (Port Charlotte)

Ms. Simon – An application for removal service licensure was received on May 5, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division received the required information to complete the application on June 29, 2025. A background check of the principal(s) did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that

the removal service passes an inspection by a member of Division Staff. Is there a representative of this entity on the call today?

Mr. Joseph Perrine – Yes. Joseph Perrine.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Mr. Perrine, are you here to answer questions or would you like to address the Board?

Mr. Perrine – Answer questions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Board?

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

(2) Recommended for Denial (Adverse Licensing History)
(a) All Points Removal Service LLC

Ms. Simon – The application was withdrawn from the agenda.

Q. Collective Application(s)
(1) Recommended for Approval with Conditions
(a) Charlow Funeral Home, LLC (Plant City)

- *Funeral Establishment*
- *Preneed Main*

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

Ms. Wiener – Wendy Wiener.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am. Charlow Funeral Home LLC (Charlow), a limited liability company, has submitted the following: an application for a funeral establishment, and an application for a new preneed main license at the below listed location. Charlow Funeral Home LLC, a licensed funeral establishment, license # F041810, physical address: 1010 E Laura St, Plant City, FL 33563. Attached are the applications regarding the above listed property. The change of ownership is the result of Ms. Jonnye C. Butler (owner) relinquishing Charlow Funeral Home via a Revocable Family Trust to her daughter, Ms. Rhonda C. Davis and her husband, Mr. Reginald L. Davis: they have assumed 100 % ownership combined of the funeral establishment (please see attached Revocable Family Trust). The funeral director in charge will be Mr. Jaquasious D. Johnson (F622317). A background check of the principal(s) did not reveal any relevant criminal history. A change of ownership inspection has been completed on June 27, 2025, with no deficiencies noted. If approved, Applicant will sell trust-funded preneed through Funeral Services Inc (FSI) 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 fully Bill of Sale, Asset Purchase Agreement, or other document by which the acquisition transaction is consummated, executed by all parties, and any and all amendments, schedules, and other attachments thereto, also fully executed.

- 4) That the Director of the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services may extend any deadline set out in these conditions, by up to 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.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon. Ms. Wiener, are you here to address the Board or just answer questions?

Ms. Wiener – Just answer questions.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you.

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

(b) *Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc (Gainesville)*

- *Cinerator Facility (2)*
- *Direct Disposal Establishment (4)*
- *Preneed Main Transfer*

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

Ms. Julie Bishop – Yes. Julie Bishop on the line for Crevasse's.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc (Crevasse's), a corporation, has submitted the following: four (4) applications for direct disposal establishment licensure, two (2) applications for cinerator facility licensure, and an application for transfer of a preneed main license, for the below listed locations. More specifically, the entities being acquired are as follows:

- 1) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc, a licensed direct disposal establishment, license # F526171, physical address: 1740 Tree Blvd, Ste 117, St. Augustine, FL 32084
- 2) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc, a licensed direct disposal establishment, license # F080579, physical address: 7651 SW Hwy 200 Ste 208, Ocala, FL 34476
- 3) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc, a licensed direct disposal establishment, license # F076160, physical address: 4127 NW 27th Ln, Ste B, Gainesville, FL 32606
- 4) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc, a licensed direct disposal establishment, license # F226306, physical address: 8789 San Jose Blvd, Ste 302, Jacksonville, FL 32217
- 5) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc d/b/a Jacksonville Regency Crematory, a licensed cinerator facility, license # F233084, physical address: 4314 St Augustine Rd, Ste 2, Jacksonville, FL 32207
- 6) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc d/b/a Gainesville Regency Crematory, a licensed cinerator facility, license # F076161, physical address: 6352 NW 18th Dr, Ste 2, Gainesville, FL 32653
- 7) Crevasse's Simple Cremations Inc, a licensed preneed main establishment, license # F076160, physical address: 4127 NW 27th Ln, Ste B, Gainesville, FL 32606

Included in your Board package are the applications regarding the above listed properties. The change of ownership is the result of an asset purchase where 100% of all interests are being acquired by Julie Bishop, applicant's principal. A background check of the principal(s) did not reveal any criminal history. If approved, Applicant will continue to sell trust and insurance-funded preneed through Funeral Services Inc (FSI) and Homesteaders Life Company, respectively, 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 fully Bill of Sale, Asset Purchase Agreement, or other document by which the acquisition transaction is consummated, executed by all parties, and any and all amendments, schedules, and other attachments thereto, also fully executed.

- 4) That the Director of the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services may extend any deadline set out in these conditions, by up to 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.

MOTION: Mr. Ferreira moved to approve the applications subject to the conditions recommended by the Division. Mr. Chapman seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Any questions or discussions on the motion?

Mr. Jensen – One question.

Vice Chair Clark – Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, on Page 8 I'm noticing here, and I assume this is covered by the other applications that they're saying there's no refrigeration for bodies and there's no cinerator facilities in the application, but yet it's a direct disposal establishment. I don't see anything. So, are they contracting with themselves at another location, I guess?

Ms. Bishop – Yes. We have cinerator facilities in town.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Bishop, we need to swear you in. Ms. Simon?

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

Ms. Bishop – I do.

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

Ms. Bishop – Julie Bishop, B-I-S-H-O-P.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Bishop – So, we have refrigeration and cinerator facilities at our Jacksonville and Gainesville locations and those service our St. Augustine and Ocala locations also.

Mr. Jensen – Okay, thank you. I assumed as such. I just wanted to make sure.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Any other questions? All right, we have a motion to approve with conditions and it's been seconded. All those in favor say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

Vice Chair Clark – Any opposed? And that motion carries.

- (2) *Recommended for Approval without Conditions*
 - (a) *Leon A. White Cremations & Funeral Home LLC (Jacksonville)*
 - *Funeral Establishment*
 - *Preneed Main*

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

Mr. Leon White – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, sir. Is this Mr. White?

Mr. White – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. Applications for funeral establishment and preneed main licensure were received on May 25, 2025. The applications were incomplete when received. Applicant has resolved all deficiencies for these applications. A background check of principal did not reveal any criminal history. A new inspection was completed on July 15, 2025 with no deficiencies noted. It should be noted that Applicant's principal, Mr. White, disclosed previous adverse license history taken against Leon A. White Mortuary Transport Services LLC, a removal service (License #F490975). As of November 2023, licensee was placed on six (6) months' probation and fined \$500. All conditions were satisfied by the licensee and fines paid as of to date. If approved, applicant will sell insurance-funded preneed through Unity Financial Life Insurance Company (UFLIC) and utilize their approved pre-arranged funeral agreement forms. The Division recommends approval without conditions.

Chair Peeples – Mr. Vice Chair, if we can swear in Mr. White, I'd like to ask a couple of questions please before we get a motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Of course. Ms. Simon?

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

Mr. White – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – Please state your name for the record?

Mr. White – Leon White.

Ms. Simon – And if you'll spell your last name, please, sir.

Mr. White – W-H-I-T-E.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Mr. White. I have questions for you. Under your preneed main license request in the financial statement, you had stated that you had, I think it was on the balance sheet, a \$10,000 net worth, but then on your income statement you said you had \$10,000, but then you had expenses, I think one was for rent and one was for another item. And kind of not only presented to Mr. White, but Ms. Liotta, as our CPA representative, should that have been adjusted on the income statement, then he would not have \$10,000 net worth? So, Ms. Liotta, if you wouldn't mind giving us your thoughts on that item, please.

Ms. Liotta – Yes, I actually noticed that a few days ago and had been working with Ms. Simon to get that rectified, and I'll let Ms. Simon explain that. I believe we've gotten it rectified and she's received updated statements that state that he has the \$10,000.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – That is correct. The Division received those updated pages yesterday afternoon.

Chair Peeples – And Ms. Simon, does it show that he has \$10,000 net worth?

Ms. Simon – What the papers show is that he has \$11,700 and \$1,700 is based upon payments for rent and telephone. So, he has a \$10,000 net worth. That's in the paperwork.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, Ms. Simon. You had already addressed, Ms. Simon, about his previous violation in November of 2023 that the six (6) months' probation and the fine has been paid. Kind of another item I had going through the application Mr. White is in your agreement with crematory, you listed two (2) crematories. One was River City Crematory and the other was C.L. Page. And I don't recall because I don't have my computer in front of me, her crematory name at Ms. Page's location. But River City Crematory, and this is probably not an item that we can withhold approval of this application request for licensure, but they recently had Board discipline against River City Crematory as well as the funeral director in charge for that facility. And so, I just want that for the record also. But Mr. White in your application and you stated, and I'm sorry I don't have the page number for reference, that you were going to have two (2) visitation chapels. One I think was on a Redpoll Avenue and I think the other was on West Kennett. Is that a part of your funeral home entity building, sir?

Mr. White – No ma'am. Am I allowed to speak?

Chair Peeples – Yes, go ahead, Mr. White.

Mr. White – The one on 5508 it's literally right next door to my facility and so I just put that on there just in case if we had more than two (2) visitations just to show what other locations approved us, you know, to bring the cases there if needed or type thing.

Chair Peeples – Do you own those two (2) facilities or are you renting or leasing them?

Mr. White – No ma'am.

Chair Peeples – So why would those be listed as visitation chapels, is my concern?

Mr. White – I was just putting two (2) other locations just to show, you know, if a family wanted a north side location, a church that I was affiliated with, and then the church that's right literally right next door to me.

Chair Peeples – So technically those are churches that's not visitation chapels, which probably didn't have to be listed on the application.

Mr. White – Yes, ma'am.

Chair Peeples – That was a concern I had also from there. So, thank you Mr. Vice Chair. That kind of completes my question, sir.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Madam Chair. Ms. Simon, I know I see your hand, but since it is listed as a visitation chapel, wouldn't you have to inspect it? So that should be amended to say no, I believe, but Ms. Simon, I'll let you respond.

Ms. Simon – Okay. A couple of things. Thank you, Mr. Chair. In addition to the revised financial statements I've received, I also received the letters that are in your packet for the agreements by River City Crematory and C.L. Page. I received signed documentation that shows that those services are being offered. Additionally, I did speak with Mr. White about the visitation chapels, and I think we determined that the visitation chapels were unneeded especially because as Madam Chair pointed out he does not own these buildings, and he does not rent these buildings, so it wouldn't be appropriate for those to be considered visitation chapels. Is that correct, Mr. White?

Mr. White – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Simon – As a result, I guess the application can be amended at this point to say that there are no visitation chapels. Is that correct Mr. White?

Mr. White – Correct. Besides my two (2) locations, that's in my facility, correct, those two (2) buildings are churches.

Ms. Simon – Thank you. Mr. Clark?

Vice Chair Clark – I just want to make sure Madam Chair you didn't have any other questions, correct?

Chair Peeples – No, sir. Thank you, Mr. Clark.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you. Board members?

MOTION: Ms. Liotta moved to approve the applications. Ms. Clay seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Clark – Any other questions or discussions on the motion?

Ms. Munson – Is that motion subject to the application being amended or it's just an outright approval?

Ms. Liotta – Yes, I guess if it needs to be amended, it's subject to amendment.

Ms. Munson – [Inaudible] or not. Listen, do I need to do this work or not? So, thank you for your indulgence for it. Subject to application being amended.

Vice Chair Clark – Ms. Simon?

Ms. Simon – Actually, if possible, Ms. Munson, can we accept an oral amendment that there are no visitation chapels, or it has to be written?

Ms. Munson – Absolutely, its whatever the Board wants. I mean if you could have him follow up. You don't have to hold this up because of that. I just needed to know what I was writing.

Ms. Simon – Thank you.

Ms. Munson – If the Board accepts the oral amendment, I'm putting it in a different file.

Vice Chair Clark – So, Ms. Munson, are we okay to proceed? We have a motion and a second. Are we okay?

Ms. Munson – A flat out approval? That's fine with me.

Vice Chair Clark – All those in favor say aye.

Board members [Unison] – Aye.

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

Mr. White – Thank you so much, Board.

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

(1) Recommended for Approval without Conditions

(a) Cemetery Care & Maintenance Trust Agreement

1. Independent Funeral Directors of Florida Inc (IFDF) (Tallahassee)

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. IFDF hereby submits the above revised trust agreement under Argent Trust Company (Argent) for approval. This restated trust agreement is for the trusting of care and maintenance cemetery funds to be utilized by various licensed cemeteries. The Division recommends approval of the aforementioned cemetery care & maintenance trust agreement without conditions.

MOTION: Mr. Jones moved to approve the cemetery care & maintenance trust agreement. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions*

(a) *Request for Transfer(s) of Trust*

1. *FPG Florida LLC d/b/a Sun City Funeral Home (F060727) (Sun City Center)*

Ms. Simon – FPG seeks approval of the below proposed trust asset transfers as more specifically set forth in correspondence from Summer Bokhary, representative, dated July 15, 2025.

Proposed Trust Transfer

FPG seeks approval of the transfer of the following trust: the Clearpoint Florida Preneed Master Trust Agreement (dated January 1, 2017) (70/30 trust) under Clearpoint Federal Bank & Trust (Clearpoint) to the FPG Florida LLC Preneed Funeral and Cemetery Merchandise and Services Trust Agreement (dated 9/5/13) (70/30 trust) under Regions Bank, N.A. (Regions). If approved, Regions will be the trustee, all as more specifically set out in attached correspondence. The Division recommends approval subject to the following conditions set forth below, the FCCS Division recommends approval of the proposed trust transfers as identified above; and

- 1) That the representations of Regions as set forth in the representative's correspondence dated July 15, 2025, be deemed material to the Board's decisions herein.
- 2) That within ninety (90) days of this Board Meeting Argent provide the FCCS Division (ATTN: LaShonda Morris), the effective date of the transfer and certifications including the following:
 - A letter signed and dated by one of its officers, certifying that it meets one or more of the applicable criteria in s. 497.266(1), and s. 497.458(1(b)), to act as trustee of the trust to be transferred pursuant to the representative's correspondence, dated July 15, 2025.
 - A letter signed and dated by one of its officers, certifying the dollar amount of trust assets being transferred to the trust as identified in the representative's attached correspondence, dated July 15, 2025.
 - Acknowledgement of receipt of the amount of trust assets being transferred as specified under the former trust, as identified in the representative's attached correspondence, dated July 15, 2025.
- 3) That the Board's executive director, for good cause shown, may extend the compliance time frame for the above specified conditions, an additional ninety (90) days.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Simon. And let the record reflect that I have an affiliation with FPG, but that affiliation will not prevent me from rendering a fair and impartial decision. Is there anyone representing FPG on this matter? Hearing none.

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

S. *Related Items*

(1) *Recommended for Approval with Conditions*

(a) *Monument Establishment Retailer*

1. *D & L Divine Monuments, LLC (St. Petersburg)*

Ms. Simon – Is there a representative of this entity on the call today? Hearing no response. An application for monument retail establishment licensure was received on May 28, 2025. The application was incomplete when received. The Division has considered the application complete on July 17, 2025. A background check of the principals did not reveal any relevant criminal history. The Division recommends approval subject to the condition that the establishment must pass an inspection conducted by a member of the Division staff.

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

(b) *Monument Sales Agreement*

1. *D & L Divine Monuments, LLC (St. Petersburg)*

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

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

T. Executive Director's Report
(1) Operational Report (Verbal)

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

Ms. Mary Schwantes – Mr. Vice Chair, may I go ahead.

Vice Chair Clark – Yes.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. Good afternoon, Board members and everybody on the call with us. The first thing I want to report is not new news to anyone on this call because I know everybody attending already knows that Blaise Ingoglia is our new Chief Financial Officer. Division directors met with the new CFO for the first time towards the end of July. It was a very productive meeting, and I thought very well received by everybody. He was already very familiar with what the divisions do, including ours, and he expressed particular interest in getting to know even more about several divisions and what they handle, including Funeral and Cemetery. He's also indicated that he plans to tour the divisions and meet individually with directors and staff in the near future. I think right now he's pretty busy touring the state and working with the Governor on some tasks with him. We look forward to those meetings and to working with him on many important issues going forward and to sharing more of our concerns and the industry's concerns with him.

The Rules Committee is in the first stages of dealing with the rules review requirements that were set out in recently approved SB108. The first of what will probably be quite a few committee meetings took place on July 9th and 10th, and I want to thank the Committee members in particular for their participation in that. The report and recommendations from that Committee meeting is expected to be presented to the Board at its September meeting. And that is going to be necessary in order for us to have information that we need to file in accordance with SB108 by October 1st, and we look forward to that.

In the meantime, we have another Rules Committee meeting scheduled for August 19th. It will be an in-person meeting in Tallahassee beginning at 10:00 AM and it is in our offices again. The purpose of the meeting will be to revisit fifty (50) of the eighty-seven (87) rules that were reviewed and were initially discussed at the July meetings. We'll be revisiting those fifty (50) rules or at least beginning the revisit of those rules. And as always, all Board members are encouraged to attend.

There is going to be a lot more information on the rules review process shared at the Committee meetings and with the full Board at future meetings throughout this next year. There are a number of reports that will be due during the course of the year, and I think we may even have to add a special section to the agenda just on rules review issues going forward, but we'll see.

The next full Board meeting will take place by video conference on September 4th at 10:00 AM. And as always, additional details on all Board meetings and any scheduled Rules Committee meetings are found on our website. This ends this portion of the Executive Director's Report. And again, thank you all.

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

Ms. Simon – This is informational only. However, there is a change. On the report, it states that Leon White has not paid his fine and that was incorrect. He has paid his fine.

	Licensee	Board Meeting	Case No.	Total Fine	Date Due	Paid in Full?	Comments
	Jerry Nackashi	26-Jun-25	311622-23-FC	\$1,500			
	Sarah Noble	26-Jun-25	334752-24-FC	\$2,000			
	Glوريا Castillo	26-Jun-25	333147-24-FC & 333151-24-FC	\$1,250			
	Integrity Funeral Services of Tampa FL, Inc.	26-Jun-25	333146-24-FC & 333149-24-FC	\$1,250			
	Roderick Stevens	29-May-25	338272-25-FC	\$1,750	18-Aug-25		
	D A Jackson Funeral Home	29-May-25	338271-25-FC	\$3,500	18-Aug-25		
	Michael O'Brien	29-May-25	320333-23-FC	\$5,500	18-Aug-25		
	Jeb Stuart Turner	29-May-25	309706-23-FC & 334886-24-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25		
	Jarrod Theodore Campbell	29-May-25	320816-23-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25		
	JT Campbell Funeral Home and Cremation Services Macedonia Chapel LLC	29-May-25	320813-23-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25		
	Albert Morrison	29-May-25	320814-23-FC	\$1,500	18-Aug-25		
	Paradise Funeral Chapel, LLC	5/1/2025	292042-22-FC	\$2,000	18-Aug-25		
	Melinda Mezeline Jackson	5/1/2025	316674-23-FC & 316677-23-FC	\$4,000 + \$2,500	18-Aug-25		
	Donna Summerour McRae	5/1/2025	325260-24-FC	\$2,000	18-Aug-25		
	Joyce Wynelle Williams	5/1/2025	316197-23-FC	\$3,000	18-Aug-25		
	River City Crematory Inc.	5/1/2025	312544-23-FC	\$3,000	18-Aug-25		
	SCI Funeral Services of Florida LLC - Manasota d/b/a Manasota Memorial Park	5/1/2025	303160-22-FC	\$2,000	18-Aug-25	Paid in Full	
	Douglas Eric Hasley	5/1/2025	330950-24-FC	\$1,750	18-Aug-25		
	Stonemor Florida Subsidiary, LLC d/b/a Forrest Hills-Palm City Chapel	5/1/2025	300643-22-FC	\$750	18-Aug-25		
	Stonemor Florida Subsidiary, LLC d/b/a Forrest Hills-Palm City Chapel	5/1/2025	293062-22-FC & 300644-22-FC	\$24,000	18-Aug-25		
	Ruben Rojas	6-03-25	320710-23-FC	\$8,000	5-05-25		
	Nadine Ingred Maignan	6-03-25	325323-24-FC	\$1,250	5-05-25	Paid in Full	
	Geronimo Mena Jr.	2/6/2025	311851-23-FC	\$2,000	3/31/2025		
	Ronald Dolinar	1/2/2025	325255-24-FC	\$1,500	13-03-25		
	Donna Mullins-Prince	11/7/2024	315262-23-FC	\$1,000	20-01-25	Sent to OGC	
	Leon White Transport Service	18-06-24	315262-23-FC	\$500	2-09-24		

ES 7-29-25

U. Chair's Report (Verbal)

Ms. Simon – Madam Chair?

Chair Peebles – Thank you, Ms. Simon. I want to say I greatly appreciate Mr. Clark stepping in to chair the meeting when technology and my computer crashed. So, I appreciate that Mr. Clark. And I also want to thank the Board members for their due diligence, but also, I just want to do a shout out to the Division office and the staff there under Ms. Schwantes and Ms. Simon's leadership. It seems that everyone is kind of doing their due diligence to make sure that applications have all the information that's presented. So, when that comes to the Board meeting, we don't have a lot of questions of was this or that presented. So, I really want to give a shout out to those folks there in the Division office, and I appreciate everybody's attendance today. Thank you.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Madam Chair.

V. Office of Attorney General's Report (1) Attorney General's Rules Report (Informational)

Ms. Simon – Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Presented for informational purposes only. I anticipate rulemaking to exist in the future. Thank you.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, Ms. Munson.

**BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES RULES REPORT
AUGUST 2025**

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

There are currently no rules in the rulemaking process.

W. Public Comments (Verbal)

Ms. Simon – Is there any public comment to be made during this Board meeting? Hearing no response. Madam Chair?

X. Administrative Report as April 21, 2025

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	2
	Active Preneed Licenses	300
	Presented to the Board at this Meeting	3
	Pending	2
D.	Preneed License Branch Applications	10
	Active Preneed License Branches	386
	Recommended for Approval	1
	Pending	10
E.	Preneed Sales Agent Applications	46
	Active Sales Agents	3,566
	Recommended for Approval	32
	Temporary Licenses Issued Pending Permanent	20
F.	Monument Establishment Applications	3
	Active Monument Establishments	89
	Pending	3
G.	Broker of Burial Rights Applications	1
	Active Brokers of Burial Rights	24
	Pending	0
H.	Exempt Cemetery Reports	0
	Active Exempt Cemeteries	49

	Pending	0
I.	New Establishment Applications	16
	Pending	14
	Completed	2
J.	New Individual Applications	25
	Pending	11
	Completed	14
K.	Request for Training Facility Applications	2
	Pending	0
	Completed	2
L.	Request for Continuing Education Providers and Courses	42
	Pending	0
	Completed	42
M.	Initial Inspections	10
	Completed	10
N.	Inspections	239
	Completed	239
O.	Initial Licenses Issued	16
	Renewal Licenses	12

Y. Disciplinary Report

Notices of Non-Compliance Issued Since Last Meeting (June 26, 2025)	0
--	---

Z. Upcoming Meeting(s)

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

AA. Adjournment

Chair Peeples – Well, we'll turn it back to Mr. Clark to let him finish the meeting and adjourn it, please.

Vice Chair Clark – Thank you, Madam Chair. It was a pleasure. Anytime I can help you, just let me know. Thank you everyone for your attendance, and the meeting is adjourned.

Chair Peeples – Thank you, folks.

Ms. Simon – Thank you, everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:41.