

MINUTES
BOARD OF FUNERAL, CEMETERY, AND CONSUMER SERVICES
RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
(ANDREW CLARK, CHAIR – SANJENA CLAY – CHRIS JENSEN – DARRIN WILLIAMS)
VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING
MARCH 11, 2026 – 10:00 A.M.

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

Mr. Andrew Clark – Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here this morning. I'd like to call the meeting to order, and I'll turn it over to Ms. Schwantes.

Ms. Mary Schwantes – Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a few opening statements as usual. Good morning. My name is Mary Schwantes. I'm the Division Director for the Division of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. Today is Monday, March 11, 2026, and it's approximately 10:00 AM. This is a public meeting of the Rules Committee for the Board of Funeral, Cemetery, and Consumer Services. This meeting is being held via videoconference. Notice of this meeting has been duly published in the Florida Administrative Register. An agenda for this meeting as well as the meeting materials have been made available to all interested persons. Both the link and the call-in number are on the agenda, which has also been published on the Division's website and made available to the public. Ms. LaTonya Bryant is recording the meeting and minutes will be prepared.

The purpose of the meeting is to conduct the business of the Rules Committee. Specifically, the Committee will continue its revisit of seven (7) of the eighty-seven (87) rules contained in Chapter 69K, Florida Administrative Code, that it previously reviewed in October 2025. The Committee previously recommended that these seven (7) Board rules should be open for development, with the Board subsequently confirming that at its December 2025 meeting. By April 1st, all rules which the agency determines should be open for development must be open and in the rulemaking process.

As previously approved by the Board, there are the twenty (20) rules which will be open for development. Five (5) of these rules involve repeals. Those rules were presented to the Board earlier this month to begin the rulemaking process. For eight (8) of the twenty (20) rules, the Committee has already agreed upon proposed changes to the rules with subsequent Board approval. Those eight (8) rules will be presented to the Board in April to open them for rulemaking. The remaining seven (7) of the twenty (20) rules are the subject of today's meeting. They are the ones which the Committee wanted to revisit to finalize recommendations on the language to be proposed in the rulemaking process.

As a general rule, please do not utilize your video camera for the meeting unless you are a Committee member, Board counsel, or an authorized Division employee. At this meeting, public comments will be taken during the review of each rule. Comments should be limited only to that particular rule at that time and ultimately only to the rules which are listed in the agenda, which are the seven (7) Board Rules which the Committee will be revisiting today. This is the way we're going to handle public comment on each rule. Turn your video camera option on when we have reached the agenda item on which you want to be heard and raise your hand. Then turn your video camera option off again as soon as your matter has been addressed by the Committee. After comments have been received from those attending with video cameras, we will ask if there are any public comments from those attending by phone. In this way, we hope that all who want to be heard on any issue can be recognized by the Chair to express their concerns.

As always, we need everyone on the call who is not speaking to place their phone or audio feed on mute. 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 and as a result, you may need to call back into the meeting because that may be the only way to unmute your phone. Also, if you are using your computer or smartphone for your audio feed, please remember to speak directly into the microphone on your device. To do otherwise negatively impacts the recording of this meeting.

Just as in a live meeting, persons speaking are requested to identify themselves for the record each time they speak and participants are respectfully reminded that the Committee Chair, Andrew Clark, runs the meeting. Persons desiring to speak should initially ask the Chair for permission and make sure that they are recognized or acknowledged by Chair Clark before they speak. At this time, I'll call the roll. Committee Chair Andrew Clark?

Chair Clark – Present.

Ms. Schwantes – Committee member Sanjena Clay?

Ms. Sanjena Clay – Present.

Ms. Schwantes – Committee member Chris Jensen?

Mr. Christian Jensen – Present.

Ms. Schwantes – And Committee member Darrin Williams had sent something indicating that he’s not going to be to make this meeting or part of the meeting, so he would be excused. Is that not correct?

Chair Clark – That's correct.

Ms. Schwantes – Mr. Chair, there's quorum for the business of the Committee. For our records, I also need to do a roll call or ask which other members of the Board are present and attending the meeting in the audience. Jill Peeples, Board Chair? Hearing none. Janis Liotta? Hearing none. David Chapman? Hearing none. Todd Ferreira? I'm sorry, Mr. Ferreira, did I hear you say yes? Thank you, sir. Ken Jones? That was a yes for Mr. Jones? Okay. Mr. Quinn? Hearing none. Mr. Chair, I'm done with the roll call. I appreciate your patience on that. Would you like me to go ahead and continue with the next item on the agenda?

Chair Clark – Yes, please. Thank you.

B. Provided For Committee Use During Meeting
(1) 120.5435, F.S. – Agency Review of Rules

Ms. Schwantes – In your meeting materials you'll find a copy of section 120.5435 Florida statutes which codifies SB108 and under which the Board has conducted its review of these rules. That is for your use during the meeting. And I would just ask, are there any questions about this? Ms. Munson, do you have anything you wanted to say about this statute?

Ms. Rachelle Munson – No. Well, actually just to remind the body that we are entering to a phase to be compliant with (6) of the particular Florida statute that you see before you. So, I just like to keep everyone informed regarding the timelines.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, ma’am.

C. Board Rules – For Revisit (7 TOTAL)

Ms. Schwantes – There are seven (7) total Board rules. For each of the rules, the meeting materials include a marked-up version of the rule as well as the clean version, which shows what the proposed rule would look like with the adoption of the proposed changes. This language is provided as a starting point for discussion, but it is based upon the prior Committee meetings on these rules and the Committee's requested input from Attorney Wendy Wiener.

(1) 69K-6.0016 – Definition of Developed Area

Ms. Schwantes – Again, you will see that it is marked up and highlighted where the changes are suggested. So, from that, it's time to move to discussion.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Mr. Jensen, Ms. Clay, are there any questions or comments on the markup?

Mr. Jensen – I’m good.

Ms. Clay – I don't have any.

Chair Clark – Thank you. Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wendy Wiener – Mr. Chairman, I'm simply here for any questions that the Committee may have. Just so that you know, I did, as promised in the last Rules Committee meeting, provide these documents to Ms. Munson. We did have some communication about them prior to this meeting. So, if there are questions for me or for her about the capacity of these, to get through the process, we're here for that ability.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener, and I think I commented at the last meeting, I appreciate all of your help and support through this process, so thank you.

Ms. Wiener – My pleasure.

Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes, would it be appropriate at this time to entertain a motion to accept these markups?

Ms. Schwantes – Yes, sir, without any further public comment. You want to make sure that there is nobody else that wants to say anything.

Chair Clark – Thank you for that.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to accept the proposed changes with regards to this rule. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(2) 69K-6.004 – Safekeeping of Records

Ms. Schwantes – Again, your materials will show a marked-up version and a clean version. And I would turn it back over to Mr. Chair for discussions.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. For the Committee, any discussion? Hearing none, is there any public comments? Hearing none, it would be appropriate to entertain a motion regarding this rule.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to accept the proposed changes with regards to this rule. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(3) 69K-6.0054 – Written Contracts Required

Ms. Schwantes – You are provided with a marked-up version and a clean version.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Committee members, any questions or discussion on this rule? Hearing none. Any of those in attendance, any public comments on Written Contracts Required 59K-6.0054? Hearing none and seeing no hands raised. Yes, Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I just wanted the body to confirm that the statutory references under “law implemented” are indeed applicable. I believe they reference the Care and Maintenance Trust Funds, 497.268. I just want to confirm that that statute is still applicable to this consideration of this rule. Section 497.268 actually states the title of it is “Care and Maintenance Trust Fund Percentage of Payments for Burial. Rights to be Deposited,” and I think it was included because contracts are involved, but in reading the full statute, I don't know if it's applicable fully. So, I just wanted to confirm. It's just a technical point, because I know when we submit this for rulemaking, the review will include whether or not our statutory references. Thank you, Ms. Wiener. I see you have a point, so please.

Chair Clark – Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – I think it's included, Ms. Munson, because of paragraphs five (5) and six (6). It does make reference to the correct way to contract for the purchase of an internment right, whether it's on an installment basis or paid at one time. So, I think it would be appropriate for a law to be implemented. Of course, if JAPC comes back and says, no, I mean, it could certainly be

removed, but I believe that's why it was there in the first place and that it would continue to apply.

Ms. Munson – Thank you.

Ms. Schwantes –Mr. Chair?

Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you, sir. I just wanted to confirm that the written contracts are indeed items that we are looking for when we do trust account compliance examinations. And so, in my opinion, it would still apply.

Ms. Munson – Thank you for that. If a JAPC letter comes out of it y'all remind me.

Chair Clark – Thank you Ms. Munson. It's time to entertain a motion.

Mr. Jensen – Question, Mr. Chair?

Chair Clark – Yes sir, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Jensen – Yeah just to be sure, in this year the only changes were the highlighted areas, correct?

Ms. Schwantes – Correct.

Mr. Jensen – Thank you.

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to accept the proposed changes with regards to this rule. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

(4) 69K-6.007 – Criteria for Burial; Disinterment; Reinterment

Ms. Schwantes – Again, you're provided with a marked-up version and a clean version.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. For the Committee, any discussion?

Ms. Clay – I don't have a discussion point per se, just wanted some clarification. And so, on the mock-up version, we say a completed burial transit permit rather than the original. Did we take original out because it's an electronic process now?

Ms. Wiener – Correct.

Ms. Munson – Which subsection, Ms. Clay, just to be clear?

Ms. Wiener – (1)(a).

Chair Clark – Ms. Wiener, wasn't it also because sometimes you may not have the original permit?

Ms. Wiener – Absolutely. Especially in certain circumstances, you would not have something that looks like an original. So, this rule makes it unnecessarily difficult.

Ms. Clay – Is that currently a practice {inaudible} an original?

Ms. Wiener – I doubt that there is compliance with this rule because frankly, especially in the situation of a disinterment and maybe a reinterment, a disinterment can occur decades after the original. Having an original burial transit permit from an

interment that might have occurred many years before and maybe the funeral establishment that arranged the original interment doesn't even exist or the cemetery ownership has changed, I would doubt, and that is a reason we're making changes to these rules. There's simply not either compliance with them or the capacity to comply with them.

Ms. Clay – Thank you. That being the case, Mr. Chair, are you ready to entertain a motion?

Ms. Munson – I do have a question though. 69K-6.007(7), you see that I highlighted it. It's not a change, but I want to make sure that the information is accurate. I mean, it's in caps, so it lets me know that every cemetery has a price disclosure sheet. So, it's a proper noun. So, I don't know if they do or not. So, I just wanted to confirm if we're leaving the language that that's a reference that there is a specific price disclosure sheet recognized by title, or if they should just be small caps.

Chair Clark – Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – Honestly, I'm glad you caught that. We should have caught that before. I would make those small letters. Not every cemetery, it's just like not every cemetery has bylaws, not every cemetery has a "formal" required price disclosure sheet. Most do, they call it something, usually not that. But I would suggest that we make that a small P, a small D and a small S.

Ms. Munson – Thank you for that clarification. That would be my only other recommended change that those letters then become lowercase.

Ms. Clay – Mr. Chair, just for my clarification?

Chair Clark – Yes?

Ms. Clay – Ms. Wiener, everyone is doing the practice, but it just may not be called that. Is that what you're saying?

Ms. Wiener – Yes. Cemeteries do provide their prices, but they provide them in all kinds of different ways. I think that this language hearkens to what we think of as a general price list at the funeral establishment, which is a requirement of Florida law, but more importantly, a requirement of the FTC Funeral Rule. The FTC Funeral Rule does not apply to cemeteries. There is no consistent universal requirement for the pricing, the way that you set out your pricing at a cemetery. So yes, cemeteries are required to provide their pricing by other portions of Florida law, but they're not required to have any kind of specific price disclosure sheet.

Ms. Clay – Thank you.

Ms. Wiener – Thank you.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Clay. Do we have any public comments on 69K-6.007? Hearing none. I'm going to make a motion to accept the marked-up changes on 69K-6.007(1)(a). Keep that change as well as the recommended change for (4)(a), but (4)(7), uncapitalize the term Price Disclosure Sheet.

MOTION: Chair Clark moved to accept the proposed changes with the additional recommended changes provided at today's meeting, with regards to this rule. Ms. Clay seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

(5) 69K-6.008 – Minimum Standards for Interment

Ms. Schwantes – Again, you're provided with a marked-up version and a clean version.

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

Ms. Munson – I included that I noted that there may not be any changes necessary to this rule, but I wanted to clarify because I think the title, the way it's written is the way it's written and the way it was presented had a strikeout of language that was

never a part of the title. So, it was a little confusing. So 69K-6.008 is in your rules, as Minimum Standards for Internment. The suggested, I believe, and please correct me, the suggested change was to strike out additional words, but those additional words were not a part of the rule title, I don't think.

Chair Clark – Thank you. Ms. Munson

Ms. Munson – Ms. Wiener, your input is definitely welcome here.

Ms. Wiener – I don't think I have substantive comments to make here. I do note that we didn't make substantive changes but cleared off the parentheticals from the rulemaking authority and the law implemented. I remember at one point we talked about did we need to change the title of this because was it actually minimum standards for interment? I think the concept was this title could be slightly misleading, but frankly, this does cover standards for interment of human remains in the ground and how much coverage there has to be. So, I think it could be approved or just noted that there is no substantive change on this.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – Thank you, Chair. This would revert, I guess, Director Schwantes to a no change rule. So, there must've been some confusion in the title of it, but I just wanted to confirm that before the Rules Committee moves forward.

Ms. Schwantes – So, I have to give this one a little bit of thought. We've already submitted this on the report saying we would be changing it. It was put through in December. And I don't know if that matters prior to the April 1st deadline. I think it can be changed to a no change. Or we could go ahead and go through with it anyway because you're changing some of the statutory authority.

Ms. Munson – We aren't. We're not. Okay. When you look at statutory authority, are you referring to the rulemaking and law implemented?

Ms. Schwantes – Yes.

Ms. Munson – We only make changes to those. You can note the changes to those are just removing the subsection or the subparagraphs or the paragraphs. I get the nomenclature crossed up sometimes. But if there are no changes to a rule, we don't interfere with those particular references, because it costs money to go through rulemaking. And that's the only reason you're going through because you can do every rule like that. Every rule has those subsections in it. So, unless we're opening it for other changes, we don't introduce the rule for rulemaking at a cost just to pick those up. So, I'm saying all that to say is that even though we presented this originally in the January 1st report that this would have some changes, and we identify there were substantive changes. I think with the April 1st report, we can simply correct that with an asterisk and just identify it as a no change rule. Unless the Department wants to pay for opening it up just to take those subsections off, which you would need to do, and they'll ask why you're not doing it for every other rule with no change.

Ms. Schwantes – I understood that. I think my concern was whether or not there was any further discussion that needed to be had regarding the title or whether the title would be better if we took the word minimum out. I really don't have any strong opinions on this one, so I'm fine with whatever the Committee decides. Of course, we'll need to go back before the Board again when we submit these. Especially [inaudible] April.

Ms. Munson – If you want to strike it to say standards, then that's a change, right? But that's up to you guys.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

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

Ms. Wiener – I think the confusion came in because at some point in my notes of what I submitted back to the State, the title of the rule was Minimum Standards, Soil Coverage for Internment. I don't think that was ever in the title. That was a note to me that we were thinking of changing the title to reference soil coverage. But then when we looked at it further, it just didn't seem

to be a necessary change. So, I think we could go the way that everyone just agreed and leave it be. Or if people are really hot to make reference to soil coverage in the title, we could change it to reference soil coverage. But that was my bad or I must have had a note in my notes, and by the time they translated the paper, they were confusing.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. Do we have any public comments? Hearing none. So, what is the pleasure of the Committee?

Ms. Clay – I personally think we should just leave it alone and have no changes.

Chair Clark – Would you like to make that as a motion, Ms. Clay?

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved that there be no changes. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(6) 69K-6.009 – Identification Tags - Acceptable Materials, Locations, and Methods of Affixing

Ms. Schwantes – Again, you're provided with a marked-up version and a clean version of this rule.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Any discussion or questions from the Committee?

Mr. Jensen – Yes, sir. Question?

Chair Clark – Yes, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. Jensen – So on number six (6) here, it just says, we're basically eliminating the need for plastic with a marker on a piece of paper inside, in favor of an electronic identification system, but we're not defining what that system is. Is that correct? Any old electronic system?

Chair Clark – Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – Yes. Mr. Jensen, as you will recall, we made an effort on the first go-round of this rule to really bring the whole rule down into a condensed rule that would be less unwieldy, but we really determined it's not possible. But the only thing that we can do, because the point was during the in-person meetings, more options for identification are going to come along in the future. So, we broadened that, we struck marker encased in classic, which uses passive radio signal, blah, blah, blah, in favor of system so that there is some flexibility going into the future for other kinds of identification systems that are reliable and that will work. So, you'll see that change is made throughout, and I think that's the only change that was actually proposed.

Mr. Jensen – Okay.

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

Ms. Munson – And just in follow-up, I cannot guarantee this is going to flow through a review process because it is kind of broad. So, I don't want you to get overly excited. But it seems to be the best way to approach it with the hope that it won't be disturbed again. My only other comment is that the last highlight that you see on that rule says that acceptable location for a tag or permanent marker for certain determined containers shall include and it has one item. And that's why I put the question, is there anything else that should be included? Because I wanted that to be clear. Normally, include has a list of things. So, if it doesn't include anything but one, it would just be that sentence, right? So, you guys just help me with that because it raised a red herring for me.

Chair Clark – So I don't think anything needs to be added. I brought it up at a previous meeting about being more specific on like caskets and it'd be affixed to the handle, but the reality of the cremation, I think there's so many options. I think it's acceptable to just say on the exterior of the container itself, but Mr. Jensen, what are your thoughts? I think you were about to speak.

Mr. Jensen – My only thought is on the internment, you know, most all those things that are affixed on the outside are paper. I mean, they're going to be gone in a very short period of time. So, I was just, and I understand there's a metal tag in all the cremations, so I don't even know if we need the paper. It needs to be marked that in essence, the funeral home and Ms. Wiener can correct me if I'm wrong, but I would think the funeral home bears a responsibility to make sure or the crematory to make sure that's the right person. And I think that's what we're trying to achieve, but the paper will be gone in no time.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – This reference in (b) is to cremation interment containers. So, I'm thinking urn vaults, not the urns themselves, and you'll see, because that tracks along with the rest of this rule. The only acceptable materials for the tag or permanent marker are non-corrosive metal, plastic, written directly on the container by paint, indelible ink, etching or engraving or an electronic identification system. So, when we refer to a cremation interment container, I think in the profession we would refer to that as an urn vault. And I believe that's what the law is getting at. And I would agree with Mr. Clark that the only place that would be acceptable for that in keeping with the rest of the rules above are on the exterior of that container somewhere.

Chair Clark – Right. Thank you, Ms. Wiener. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – If we leave it with that singular item, is the body amenable to it just being a sentence then acceptable locations for a tag or permanent marker for cremation instrument container shall include and lowercase exterior of a cremation in term and content?

Ms. Clay – Yes.

Ms. Munson – It reads like it's; it doesn't pull itself out with any, doesn't draw attraction to it if it's just a sentence.

Ms. Clay – Yes.

Chair Clark – I would agree with that, Ms. Munson.

Ms. Munson – Include an, lowercase e, exterior of cremation interment container, if that sentence is accurate {inaudible}.

Ms. Wiener – I think it would be (b).

Chair Clark – I think it would be (b) as well.

Ms. Munson – Include (b), exterior of cremation interment container. Okay. Thank you very much.

Chair Clark – No, thank you Ms. Munson. That was a great question. Any public comments for 69K-6.009? Hearing none.

MOTION: Mr. Jensen moved to accept the proposed changes with the additional recommended changes provided at today's meeting, with regards to this rule. Ms. Clay seconded the motion.

Chair Clark – We have a motion and I'm going to make sure the motion is clear, Mr. Jensen. The markup and the changes that we just talked about to (5)(b), correct?

Mr. Jensen – That's correct. The markup and the change that Ms. Munson just mentioned.

Chair Clark – I just wanted to make the record clear. Thank you, Mr. Jensen. Ms. Clay, did you second that motion?

Ms. Clay – Yes.

Chair Clark – Thank you. We have a motion to accept the mark-up changes as well as the edit to (5)(b) that was previously discussed. All those in favor say aye.

Committee members [Unison] – Aye.

Chair Clark – Any opposed? And that motion carries.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.

(7) 69K-33.001 – Requirements Regarding Handling and Storing of Human Remains

Ms. Schwantes – Again, you're provided with a marked-up version and a clean version.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Schwantes. Any discussion or questions from the Committee?

Mr. Jensen – I'm just curious. So, the only thing I see here is (i). I mean, that's kind of been the rule all along, has it not? What are we changing?

Ms. Munson – Let me clarify. I sent a revised copy. I don't know if it was sent out, but it should say (2)(g) through (j) not (i) because we added we added in here.

Ms. Schwantes – Mr. Chair?

Chair Clark – Ms. Schwantes?

Ms. Schwantes – The updated version that you're talking about Ms. Munson is included but I think what Mr. Jensen is talking about is further on down.

Ms. Munson – Oh okay.

Ms. Schwantes – The changes that were made to (i) and to (j).

Ms. Munson – Item (i) is a new (i).

Ms. Schwantes – Right.

Chair Clark – Item (i) did not exist before, Mr. Jensen. If I remember correctly, you and I had some discussion about it, that we need to adapt some parameters around dignity and how the decedents should be stacked. Ms. Wiener?

Ms. Wiener – Mr. Jensen, that was your requested change, that we add that, but it was not actually in the rule prior. It is the policy of many licensees to only stack in rigid containers, but others have not. And I think as the result of some disciplinary cases and photographs that you all have seen, this was a concern of yours. And so, this is new.

Mr. Jensen – Absolutely. Thank you.

Chair Clark – Thank you, Ms. Wiener. Any public comments on 69K-33.001? Hearing none.

MOTION: Ms. Clay moved to accept the proposed changes with regards to this rule. Mr. Jensen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Schwantes – That was the last of the rules to be discussed today.

D. Summary Regarding Meeting Results and Future Plans

Ms. Schwantes – So as we've talked about, we plan to provide the Board at its April meeting with proposed language on the eight (8) rules that did not require the Committee to revisit them and were not part of today's meeting. We already have the proposed language that is needed for those rules to go before the Board to begin the rulemaking process itself. And by the

Board's May meeting, I expect that we will be able to present the minutes and report from this Committee meeting, as well as proposed language on the rules discussed today, which you all have approved to begin the rulemaking process for those rules. In the meantime, Board Counsel and the Division will prepare and submit the April 1st report that is due to JAPC, under s. 120.5435. And I just wanted to bring that up before the Committee, as to the next steps that we are aware of at this point.

E. Chair's Remarks

Ms. Schwantes – Mr. Chair, did you have anything that you wanted to add?

Chair Clark – I just wanted to once again thank everyone as we're kind of coming to an end. I know that we have some Board action that needs to be taken, but the first phase of all this rule review as it comes to an end. I just wanted to say thank you to the Committee members, Ms. Schwantes, for your leadership and the amazing attorneys and those in the industry that are contributing to this process. I just appreciate all the work that's gone into phase one and we're looking forward to phase two. So, thank you.

Ms. Schwantes – Mr. Chair one more thing before we adjourn, please sir?

Chair Clark – Yes?

Ms. Schwantes – I called roll earlier, and I was asking if there were other Board members here and we heard a “yes” from Mr. Ferreira and Mr. Jones. Honestly, we think that probably was a caller that was not on mute. So, I just want to ask again, is Mr. Ferreira on the phone? Hearing none. Is Mr. Jones on the phone? Again, hearing none. And that makes a difference for our records. I'm sorry. Ms. Munson?

Ms. Munson – I was just going to clarify are there any other Board members that are present just so we could confirm, because I'm thinking not? Okay. So, no. Only three (3) members are present. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Clark – Correct.

Ms. Schwantes – It makes a difference for our records and also in terms of compensation for the Board members. Thank you all very much. And Mr. Clark, I turn it back over to you again.

Chair Clark – Thank you.

F. Adjournment

Chair Clark – It is 10:41 and this meeting is adjourned. Have a great day.

Ms. Munson – Thank you all.

Ms. Schwantes – Thank you.