

Cemetery and Funeral Bureau Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 12, 2014

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 North Market Boulevard, El Dorado Room
Sacramento, CA 95834

Advisory Committee Members:

Darin Drabing
Victoria Emmons
Jolena Grande
Tracy Hughes
Cheryll Moore
John Resich

Guest Attendees:

Gerard Reinert
Damon de la Cruz
Bob Achermann
Laura Pregent
Jerry Desmond
Marjorie Bridges
Robert Caughlan

Cemetery & Funeral Bureau Staff: Lisa M. Moore, Bureau Chief; Linda Kassis, Deputy Chief; Chip Bane, Supervising Governmental Auditor; Cheryl Jenkins, Legislative Analyst

Department of Consumer Affairs Staff: Gary Duke, Staff Counsel; Ryan Arnold, Legislative and Policy Review; Monica Vargas, Office of Public Affairs

1. Introduction and Opening Remarks

Bureau Chief Lisa M. Moore called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. welcoming those in attendance and introducing Bureau staff. Ms. Moore asked Departmental staff in attendance to introduce themselves.

Ms. Moore asked the Advisory Committee Members to introduce themselves. Darin Drabing, President and CEO of Forest Lawn Memorial Parks and Mortuaries in Southern California; John Resich, Chairman of the Board for Green Hills Memorial Park in Rancho Palos Verdes; Jolena Grande, Faculty Member with the Mortuary Science Program at Cypress College; Tracy Hughes, Deputy District Attorney in the Orange County District Attorney Office; Cheryll Moore¹ Professor for Los Rios Community College District and representing the Funeral Consumers Alliance of California; and Terry DeWeese, General Manager at Sunset Lawn in Sacramento introduced themselves. (Victoria Emmons, CEO of HOPE Hospice in Dublin arrived after introductions were made.)

¹ Cheryll Moore is of no relation to Bureau Chief Lisa M. Moore.

Ms. Moore advised those present that the meeting was being Webcast, and that the Bureau will continue to do so for all future meetings as appropriate when the equipment and facilities are available. The Webcast is available to watch in real time and will be available to watch on YouTube after the meeting has concluded.

Ms. Moore indicated that the Bureau is not statutorily mandated to have this committee but does so because it allows us to do business in an open and transparent environment and it is an opportunity for consumers and licensees to provide input to us on issues related to the cemetery and funeral profession. Requests for issues to be placed on the agenda can be e-mailed to Ms. Moore for consideration on future agendas.

2. Update on Bureau Activities / Projects

Ms. Moore shared that field representative Jeff Brown passed away last month. Mr. Brown spent 20 years with the Bureau and contributed a great deal to the success of the Bureau.

The Bureau is working to fill the position, which will now work out of the Sacramento headquarters office. The person in this position will continue to provide direction and guidance to our field staff and conduct inspections if necessary and assist with investigations, but the work will filter through Sacramento instead of a field office.

At the last meeting Ms. Moore reported that we were recruiting for a licensing analyst. The Bureau hired Lita McFaddin in early September. Ms. McFaddin processes all personal applications, while Cat Litral will continue to focus on the business applications, and all the changes of notifications and any additional applications that go along with that.

Ms. Moore reported that the Bureau currently has a vacant General Auditor III position, as the prior employee, Tamer El Saadany left our Audit Unit in September to work for another state agency; recruitment efforts are in process.

While the Bureau has three vacancies, the work continues to be processed so you should not see any backlogs or delays in licensing or audits. If you have a question or issue on anything you do not believe is being handled timely please let Ms. Moore know.

Ms. Moore reported at the last meeting that the Bureau is working on the funeral director examination. There should be a new form of the examination in January 2015. Ms. Moore also discussed examination development and that the Bureau uses licensed subject matter experts to develop those examinations. Licensees who are interested in serving as experts should visit the Bureau's website to obtain additional information and an application.

A reminder was provided to licensees that Report of Apprenticeship forms are due between January 1 and January 15 for any funeral establishments using apprentice embalmers, and the Approval to Train Apprentice Embalmers application and \$100 fee are also due during that time period. The forms can be found on the Bureau's website; questions can be directed to the Licensing Unit.

Ms. Moore asked Mr. Bane to discuss the 2015 Quarterly Report form. Mr. Bane stated the 2015 Quarterly Reports for cemeteries and crematories are now available online. The annual funeral trust report and the funeral declaration on non-reporting are also on the website. Mr. Bane advised that the 2014 Endowment Care and Special Care Fund annual report would be available on the website as well, which has been updated to include an automated format. Mr. Bane urged everyone to read the instructions prior to entering information on the new report.

An audience member asked if this was just for completing the form or submitting it online also. Mr. Bane responded that it was just for completing the form. Mr. Bane stressed that the Bureau will only accept the 2014 report for reporting 2014. In the past, some people have downloaded the report from a prior year and used that form. If anyone has trouble with the automation they should call the Audit Unit.

Ms. Moore stated the Bureau is in the process of updating all of its licensing applications and forms.

3. Update on Sunset Review Report

Ms. Moore stated the Advisory Committee members received a copy of the Sunset Review Report (report) prior to the meeting and two copies of the report were available on the back table for the audience to view. The complete report and all of the attachments are available on our website. Ms. Moore reported that on November 3, 2014, the report was submitted to members of the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee and the Assembly Business, Professions, and Consumer Protection Committee. Ms. Moore stated that she was extremely proud of her staff and all their hard work in putting the report together.

Jolena Grande commented that the report was very well written and she learned more about the Cemetery and Funeral Bureau. Some of the statistics were particularly noteworthy and Ms. Grande shared them with the faculty of her program. Ms. Moore thanked Ms. Grande and stated that the report was created while staff continued with the normal daily work.

Cheryll Moore had a question about an item in the report with regard to a national database relating to disciplinary action. Ms. Moore stated that the Bureau does fingerprint licensees and that gives us state and federal criminal history. As far as discipline, if an applicant has had their license disciplined in another state, applicants are required to disclose it on licensing applications. Failure to do so could result in disciplinary action against the license(s) issued to them by the Bureau. There is no

national database for this information. When Ms. Moore served on the International Conference of Funeral Service Examining Boards (The Conference) there was discussion about a pilot program to create such a database but it would require somebody to manage it and there would be a cost involved to be part of it. Ms. Grande said that The Conference is still discussing it but it would only be available to the regulators who are members of The Conference. Ms. Moore stressed that not every disciplinary action would automatically result in an application being denied but it is something we review as part of our application process.

Cheryll Moore commented that, as stated in the report, she found it interesting that many of the Bureau's requirements for licensure require little or no experience or education.

Mr. Duke stated that the statutory requirements are very minimal in some areas. It is only recently that cemetery managers had to be tested and licensed. The industry does not have a lot of minimum qualifications in terms of experience and education. Cheryll Moore commented that she found this interesting given what they do and how they interact with people.

Terry DeWeese commented that she found the information on endowment care interesting and that it does not seem to be keeping up with the cost of living and the endowment care trusts are underfunded. Ms. Moore stated she believes this is an area that the Bureau needs to look at in the future.

Ms. Moore asked Ryan Arnold, the Bureau's liaison for the Legislative and Regulatory Review Division, to give the audience an overview of the Sunset Review process. Mr. Arnold explained that his office was the contact point for the Legislature with the Department. Currently the Legislature is set to review all boards and bureaus within the Department on a four year schedule. The Sunset Review process is a regular part of doing business as a licensing board or bureau and is not an indication of any wrong doing. It is a process by which the Legislature can review the regulatory boards and bureaus they have created so they can understand what is going on and if there are issues that need to be changed in the statute. A report is generated by the program and submitted to the Legislature in the fall. The Legislature reviews the report and schedules a hearing which will occur in the spring, usually in March. A bill will be generated to extend the Bureau's sunset date to four years in the future.

Ms. Moore stated when the hearing is scheduled the information will be posted on the Bureau's website and sent out to people on its ListServ. If anyone is interested in attending the hearing, there will be an opportunity for public comment.

Ms. Grande had a question in the report concerning the budget and asked how many months in reserve was typical for a budget.

Ms. Moore responded that the Bureau is going to be looking at its current fee structure and a fee increase is something we may look at in the future. Mr. Duke stated that generally the Department's budget office recommends a minimum of three months in reserve for conservative purposes so whenever it goes below that there is cause for concern. Ms. Moore added that conversely you need to achieve a balance to avoid too many months in reserve, which could be an indication that fees are structured too high.

4. Update on Pending Regulation Files

Ms. Moore asked Ms. Jenkins to review the proposed regulations that the Bureau is working on.

Ms. Jenkins began by reminding everyone that the Funeral Enforcement regulations became operative on October 1, 2014. This amended California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 1240, 1241, 1242, and 1246 which removed the fine tables and classes of violations and now instead allows the Bureau to assess an administrative fine ranging from \$100 to \$5,000. The maximum fine for unlicensed activity also increased to \$5,000. In addition, CCR Sections 1280-1291, the Bureau's continuing education, has been repealed. Ms. Jenkins stated that the new regulations could be accessed through the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) website and via a link from the Bureau's Laws & Regs web page to OAL's website.

The Bureau's Limited Liability Companies (LLC) regulatory package (CCR Sections 2326, 2326.1, 2326.2, 2326.3, 2326.5) has been going through the Department's various levels of internal review.

The Bureau's Funeral General regulatory package has not been discussed recently. As a reminder, this will amend CCR Sections 1209, 1214, 1216, 1221, 1255, 1258, 1258.1, 1258.2, 1258.4, and repeal CCR Section 1258.3. These changes include revising the authorization to embalm form, adding refrigeration facilities to appropriate sections, updating the casket disclaimer, and adding definitions for casket, alternative container, and regularly offered for sale. The section being repealed dealt with notifications and was redundant of information already in regulation. This package is currently going through the internal review process for approval.

Once these regulatory packages go to OAL they will be publicly noticed on the Bureau's website and copies will be sent out the interested parties list. If anyone wants to be included on the interested parties list they can send an email to EmailCFB@cfb.ca.gov and request to be added. The request should include the name, company/organization (if any), mailing address, and email address and whether they prefer to receive the notice as a hardcopy by mail or an email with attachments. Each person on the interested parties list will receive a copy of the proposed language and the notice of proposed regulatory action. There will be a 45 day public comment period for anyone who would like to comment on the regulations. At the end of the 45 day public comment period the Bureau will hold a regulatory hearing for members of the public to comment. The Bureau anticipates the above regulatory packages will be noticed in early 2015.

The next regulatory package for discussion is the Cemetery Cite and Fine package. This will amend CCR Sections 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, and 2388. These changes will mirror the Bureau's Funeral Enforcement regulatory package. The Bureau is removing the cite and fine tables, increasing the maximum fine amount to \$5,000, removing the associated fine ranges, increasing the minimum and maximum fine amount for unlicensed activity, and expanding and clarifying the process for appeal and informal office conferences. The Bureau is preparing the regulatory package for this and anticipates submitting it for internal review in the near future.

Ms. Grande asked if in Section 1221 the Bureau is changing any of the categories of people allowed into the preparation room. Ms. Jenkins stated that language is being added to include students from accredited mortuary science programs approved by the Bureau.

Audience member Merrill Mefford asked if in Section 1221 the Bureau is removing the language that states next of kin as described in section 7100 to state who has the right to control disposition. Ms. Jenkins confirmed that change was made.

The Bureau is in the process of updating its forms. Ms. Jenkins stated some of the forms are referenced in regulation and will need to go through the regulatory process.

5. Presentation of 2015-2018 Strategic Plan

Ms. Moore advised the handout for this next item was previously provided to Advisory Committee members and available on the back table for the audience.

Ms. Moore described the process that was used to develop its current Strategic Plan, and thanked those stakeholders who responded to the survey about the Bureau's activities, specifically about what the Bureau did well and what could be improved. Ms. Moore commented that the 2015-2018 Strategic Plan is a roadmap for the Bureau to use over the next four years. The Plan includes our mission, vision, values, and goals which cover six areas including: licensing; enforcement; legislation, regulations, and policy; outreach; organizational effectiveness; and audit processes. The Bureau will now begin to work on the action plans to accomplish those goals.

Ms. Grande commended the Bureau for including a goal focusing on mortuary science colleges and students. Ms. Grande asked that the Bureau strive to visit the mortuary science colleges at least twice a year. Ms. Grande also stated that merging the cemetery and funeral statutes would be beneficial so it is not necessary to search in so many places to find the regulations.

Victoria Emmons commented that she did not realize the Bureau does not issue licenses to religious organizations, cities, and all these entities. Gary Duke responded that the Bureau only regulates approximately 200 cemeteries in the State. This was a policy choice that was made in the 1930s.

6. Presentation of Educational Video

Ms. Moore explained that the Bureau has been working on an educational outreach video, as was discussed at the last meeting. The message targets consumers and provides information from the Bureau's consumer guide on selecting cemetery and funeral goods and services.

Ms. Moore introduced Monica Vargas from the Office of Public who provided a brief overview of the video and then presented the actual draft video to the attendees. Ms. Vargas stated the final version of the video will be posted on the Bureau's website and the Department's YouTube page.

Ms. DeWeese commented that she felt it would be helpful for consumers if we talked about power of attorney for healthcare which is often confusing for consumers.

Darin Drabing commented that the Bureau could consider talking about the control of disposition and the order in which that happens. The Bureau is certainly promoting consumer education and preplanning and with that comes the information about right of control.

Mr. Drabing further commented that the imagery was somewhat depressing as it did not include any people, and the industry focuses on the celebration of life. Ms. Moore suggested that if anybody has idea for different imagery to bring those ideas forward.

John Resich stated the information is good but the imagery is very old and archaic in some respects. Mr. Drabing commented that people are warm and when you do not have people in the imagery it ends up feeling cold. Images of individuals or couples making this decision would add some warmth to it.

Ms. Moore stated that she would work with Ms. Vargas to see what changes could be made. Ms. Moore hopes this will be the first of several videos to come and that eventually once is created to include people.

Ms. Emmons stated, on average, you are talking to a sixth grade education level. As she listened, some of the information presented consumers may not know what you are talking about. Ms. Emmons felt that the information should be simplified so your average consumer understands it because the information is complex.

Ms. DeWeese commented that the beginning the video says to put everything in writing but not everyone is going to prepay for services so it would be nice to provide an example of what they should write down.

Ms. Emmons suggested an introduction about the Bureau at the beginning of the video to avoid confusion about who the Bureau does and does not license, specifically with regard to cemeteries.

Cheryll Moore commented that there may be a need to include a definition for a pay on death account.

Mr. Resich commented that the Bureau's Sunset Review report included information about complaints concerning unlicensed cemeteries and the fact that the Bureau does not regulate all cemeteries and includes a disclosure to that effect. In his area, when non-regulated cemeteries fall into disrepair, consumers contact the county or Department of Parks and Recreation. The general public may be under the impression that all cemeteries are regulated by the State and are unaware of the risks they might encounter at cemeteries that are not licensed by the Bureau. Mr. Resich felt the video should talk about that and at least make the public aware.

Audience member Marjorie Bridges commented that pre-arrangement is equated with pre-planning and the video should include a sentence that it is not necessary to prepay. Just putting your wishes on paper is a great help to relatives.

Ms. Bridges also commented that video should list Department of Consumer Affairs on the first page of the video. She would like to be able to link the video to the Funeral Consumers Alliance of California website as an educational tool.

Ms. Moore commented that this is the first video the Bureau has created, and the Bureau will identify specific areas that may be beneficial for future videos.

Ms. Bridges asked if the print could be made bigger. Ms. Vargas responded that the final version will not have the words printed, you will only hear the voice over and important points will be shown as bulleted text.

Ms. Grande asked if closed caption would be available so they could read the words. Ms. Vargas said she was not sure if that function was available on YouTube but would check.

7. Discussion on Changes to Web Site Regarding Disciplinary Actions

Ms. Moore advised the handout for this item was previously provided to Advisory Committee members and available on the back table for the audience.

This topic was discussed at the last two meeting. The Bureau's website currently provides access to disciplinary actions taken against its licensees through the license verification process. The Bureau is in the process of creating a comprehensive disciplinary list that can be accessed in one area, by licensee name.

Ms. Jenkins explained that the disciplinary actions would be accessible through a stationary link from the home page. When accessed, a disclaimer and a list of definition of terms is first provided. At the bottom of the page, links will be provided by year; after selecting a specific year, a list of all the actions taken by the Bureau during that year will be provided. The list includes: the licensee name, license number, license type, case

number, document(s) filed, decision (if one has been reached), and effective date. Selecting the license number will direct you to the license verification page for that license. The license record will display the current license status and any public documents that are available.

8. Discussion on Posting Administrative Citations to Web Site

Ms. Moore stated this discussion is about whether or not the Bureau should post administrative citations to its website. Ms. Moore discussed the difference between administrative disciplinary action and administrative citations. Ms. Moore asked Gary Duke to provide some background on what other entities within the Department do.

Mr. Duke explained that citations are not considered disciplinary actions, they are considered enforcement actions. The legal authority for citations is pursuant to Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 125.9(b)(4), which states, "If a hearing is not requested pursuant to this section, payment of any fine shall not constitute an admission of violation of the charged", meaning it is not an admission of guilt. It is strictly a mechanism used by the Bureau to achieve compliance. It is used for minor violations that do not rise to the level of license suspension or revocation. Mr. Duke further referenced BPC section 125.9(d) citing language that states that notwithstanding any other provision of law, payment of a fine is considered satisfactory resolution for purposes of public disclosure.

Mr. Duke also cited BPC section 27 with regard to public information that is disclosed on the Internet as it pertains to suspension and revocations of licensure and other related enforcement actions. Regardless of this section, and before this section was enacted, citations have always been considered public records but there is a distinction between a public record requested and provided from the agency as opposed to publishing it on the Internet.

Mr. Duke went on to explain that there are very few entities that do not publish citation information on the Internet and the Bureau is one of them. The entities that do publish their citations may provide the source document or a summary.

Mr. Duke stated the position of the Department's administration is to provide transparency and provide consumers with as much information as possible. Search engines such as Yahoo or Google often display only truncated reports of the information before you click on the link. While the argument can go both ways as to whether or not citations should be published, the preference with the Department is to publish the citations, either a summary or the actual document.

Ms. Emmons asked for an example of what type of citation may be posted. Mr. Duke gave the example of someone failing to notify the Bureau of a change of address. Ms. Emmons asked how that makes her a more informed consumer, and commented that the Internet is very powerful; if someone does a search and finds a citation but does not read it, it can hurt a person. Ms. Emmons has mixed feelings about this.

Tracy Hughes stated she feels very strongly about having the citations posted as a person involved in consumer complaints. If a person is not going to do their due diligence then you are building the system around someone who is not doing a thorough job.

Ms. Moore wanted to ensure that everyone understands the Bureau's practice of progressive discipline. Minor offenses generally result in a warning letter and reminder of the need for compliance. Repeated offenses can progress to a citation and/or a citation with the assessment of a fine with increased fines for subsequent violations.

Ms. Emmons suggested including something that describes the Bureau's progressive discipline process so consumers understand the information they are looking at. Ms. Emmons expressed concern that a minor infraction posted on the Internet could harm a licensee irrevocably.

Ms. Hughes stated that some agencies go a step further and publish their warning letters to businesses before any enforcement action is taken.

Ms. Moore asked Mr. Duke if the Bureau has the ability to decide when citations are posted. For example, post all citations or only citations that result in an administrative fine. Mr. Duke responded that, as a matter of public record, it becomes public upon issuance. As a matter of due process, the Bureau may want to consider waiting until the matter is final, the fine has been paid and/or the appeal process has passed. The Bureau does have that discretion. Ms. Moore's recommendation would be that the Bureau waits until all appeal processes are complete before posting citations.

Mr. Drabing stated, in many cases, citations are issued for minor violations such as an incorrect font size and those things are easily corrected once pointed out. In his experience, the citations were small and easily fixable things that help the licensee stay in compliance. Mr. Drabing believes it would be an onerous effort to list every citation without waiting until after the due process of being able to correct it.

Ms. Moore stated that it would be her preference that all appeal processes were completely finished before anything was posted. During the last calendar year, the Bureau issued about 159 citations, which was less than the year before. If and when the Bureau posts citations, it will begin from that time forward as the Bureau does not have the resources to go back.

Ms. Hughes stated, presumably, in the example of an incorrect font size, it would not rise to the level of a citation.

Ms. Moore responded that minor violations could result in a citation if the same violation was cited repeatedly over a period of time.

Ms. Hughes asked if all of the citations are public records. For example, if you go through the appeal process and the citation is dismissed is there a public record of that process or is that gone. Mr. Duke replied there is a public record of the dismissal. Pursuant to the Bureau's records retention schedule, the document may be kept on site for some time. If it was published on the Internet and was subsequently dismissed the Bureau would remove it.

Mr. Resich stated that the harm is done at that point and it should go to a final determination other than just posting the citation itself. Once you have the final determination it is open game. Even the district attorney's office does not post every arrest you post convictions.

Ms. Hughes replied that arrests are public record. Mr. Resich stated it is public record, you can look it up but you are not putting it on the Internet. The difference is that some of these are very minor instances and it could go to a citation but you have resolution through an informal office conference.

Ms. DeWeese stated an example could be the price ranges of the casket on the General Price List versus the Casket Price List. Depending on whom the inspector was, there could be a different view of it and being cited for it would show a consistent pattern. That could end up as a citation but it is minor and a little bit subjective.

Mr. Duke reiterated that if a citation is dismissed, most agencies will remove any reference to it on the Internet but it still may be a matter of public record for purposes of our records retention schedule and many agencies in the Department will remove that after five years.

Ms. Grande stated looking at the information that is in the Sunset Review report, since Ms. Moore mentioned the 159 citations last year, it states only 11 citations were appealed so that means the other 148 would have been published.

Ms. Moore replied if we were publishing them, yes, even the ones that have been appealed, once there was a final decision, would be published. Sometimes a citation can be modified as a result of an appeal and the final outcome of the appeal process. Ms. Moore recognizes the fact that, if and when citations are posted on its website, the number of appeals is likely to increase. Ms. Moore is trying to manage what we can realistically do to provide relevant information to the public and still ensure we post accurate information at the appropriate time. Ms. Moore does not expect to have a final determination today but does believe the topic warrants further discussion.

Mr. Reisch asked if the posting of a citation, in the mind of a consumer, would be viewed as a conviction or something that is opposed to our current law in the United States where you are innocent until proven guilty. Although a citation is issued, there are still appeal rights to prove yourself innocent. The distance between the two could cause irreparable harm and ruin the reputation of the organization or the individual. Mr.

Resich believes that we have a system that says you are innocent until proven guilty and the Bureau should have a final conclusion before posting anything.

Mr. Duke commented that all the postings of citations by other boards and bureaus in the Department contain a disclaimer emphasizing the fact that it may not be a final decision and the person can exercise their appeal rights.

Mr. Resich stated that is the fine print and most consumers do not look at that.

Mr. Drabing remarked that it would be helpful to have some sense of scale; the Bureau posts accusations from the attorney general because it has risen to that level and the public is aware, though there is no final determination at that point. Mr. Drabing equated that to an arrest versus a speeding ticket. He looks at an accusation as someone is being arrested for a crime and stands accused and a citation is more on the grounds that you received a speeding ticket and you go to court and try to get your ticket overturned or you can pay your fine. If you keep getting speeding tickets you will get your license taken away.

Cheryll Moore stated she agreed that consumers should know what is going on in the industry and if the Bureau has to post this type of information to do that we should do so in some form.

Ms. Moore stated that anything the Bureau posts will have the appropriate disclaimer, but the struggle is when the information should be posted. With regard to an informal office conference, the regulation defines the time frames and that is a fairly quick process. Licensees can still request a formal hearing after the informal office conference, unless the citation is dismissed. Furthermore, they can bypass the informal office conference all together and go straight to a formal hearing and that process does take time. Ms. Moore stated most boards and bureaus are posting their administrative citations and she would like to gather information from them on the number they are posting and when they post them.

Ms. Emmons asked if the Bureau has Web statistics on how many people look at disciplinary actions.

Ms. Moore replied that the Bureau does receive statistics on how many hits we get to our website. Ms. Moore was not sure what specific information the Department captures, specifically if it captures statistics on how many people view disciplinary documents.

Ms. Moore said that between now and the next meeting, the Bureau will look at the number of citations issued in 2014, and what kind of violations they involve, and report back at the next meeting. Perhaps that will assist in further discussion on this issue.

9. Public Comments on Items Not on Agenda

Ms. Moore asked if there was anyone who would like to make public comments about items not on the agenda.

An audience member asked what the Bureau is doing to prepare for the demise of the baby boomers. He states there are eight million baby boomers and wanted to know where to bury them all. He thinks we need environmental cemeteries as he is a big advocate of green cemeteries. He stated it is hard to set up a cemetery and he does not think we will have enough spaces.

Ms. Moore responded that all we can do is monitor the industry; the Bureau cannot advise someone to set up a cemetery. While the licensing process for a cemetery might seem difficult, the laws and regulations are in place for a reason.

10. Future Meetings (March 2015)

Ms. Moore stated that the Bureau will look at a meeting in March 2015; however, we will first need to solidify the Sunset Hearing date. Some committee members will have completed two terms for the Advisory Committee and Ms. Moore is looking at how she will work through that process. Ms. Moore has the ability to reappoint some members and does like to have carryover from one committee to the next for continuity, consistency, and historical knowledge. Ms. Moore will provide information to the committee once the Bureau determines the next step.

11. Adjournment

Ms. Moore thanked everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:35 p.m.