

Cemetery and Funeral Bureau
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 17, 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	Merrill Mefford
Daniel Villa	Jerry Desmond
Anne Schillig	Sharon Ponciano
Chris Micheli	Marjorie Bridges
Suzette Sherman	Jane Hillhorns
Jerrigrace Lyons	Mark Hill
Royce Ann Ruhkala Burke	

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

Department of Consumer Affairs Staff: Corrine Fishman, Board and Bureau Relations; Gary Duke, Senior Staff Counsel; Greg Pruden, 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. Ms. Moore introduced herself as the Bureau Chief of the Cemetery and Funeral Bureau (Bureau). Next she asked Bureau staff to introduce their self. Chip Bane, Supervising Auditor; Linda Kassis, Deputy Chief; Gary Duke, Staff Counsel with the Department of Consumer Affairs (Department); and Cheryl Steurer, Legislative Analyst introduced themselves. Ms. Moore then asked the Department staff in attendance to introduce their self. Greg Pruden, Legislative Analyst with the Legislative and Policy Review Division; Corrine Fishman with Board and Bureau Relations; and Monica Vargas with the Office of Public Affairs introduced themselves.

Ms. Moore advised those present that the meeting was being Webcast and the Bureau would be doing 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 at your leisure after the meeting has concluded.

Ms. Moore announced that the Department has a new Director. Denise Brown, the former Director, has retired and Awet Kidane, the former Chief Deputy Director, has been appointed as Director. Tracy Rhine, formerly in the Legislative and Policy Review Division, has been appointed as the new Chief Deputy Director. Ms. Moore stated we are happy to have them, they are a great team, and the executive staff is supportive, helpful, and informed.

Ms. Moore asked the Advisory Committee Members to introduce themselves. Darin Drabing, President and CEO of Forest Lawn Memorial Parks and Mortuaries in the Los Angeles; Victoria Emmons, CEO of HOPE Hospice in Dublin; Jolena Grande, Faculty Member at Cypress College in the Mortuary Science Department; Tracy Hughes, Deputy District Attorney in the Consumer Protection Unit of the Orange County District Attorney Office; Cheryll Moore¹ Professor of Gerontology for Los Rios Community College District and representing the Funeral Consumers Alliance of California; and John Resich, Chairman of the Board for Green Hills Memorial Park in Rancho Palos Verdes.

Ms. Moore indicated that we are not statutorily mandated to have this committee and all members volunteer on their own time at their own expense. She expressed her appreciation that they were here as it allows the Bureau to get their input and guidance on industry related issues and helps the Bureau do business in a very open and transparent environment. The Advisory Committee is viewed as a working committee, so Ms. Moore encouraged everyone to participate, communicate, and give any ideas they have as we move through the agenda.

2. Update on Bureau Activities / Projects

Ms. Moore stated the Bureau recently hired a part-time Auditor I, Joshua Wilcox. Mr. Wilcox came from the Department of Health Care Services where he was a Student Assistant and he is two classes away from getting his accounting degree. The Bureau has also hired a full-time General Auditor III, David Edwards. Mr. Edwards came from the Bureau of State Audits and has been an asset since joining the Bureau. At our last meeting in February, Ms. Moore stated the Bureau had hired a licensing analyst, Lisa Rangel. Since the meeting, Ms. Rangel has accepted a promotional opportunity with the Department and left the Bureau. In the interim, Cat Litral, lead licensing analyst, is working hard to keep work moving and we have cross-trained other staff to assist Ms. Litral. Ms. Kassis will be holding interviews in the near future and hopes to have the position filled soon.

The Bureau continuously works on examination development for the five exams it gives: funeral director, embalmer, cemetery manager, crematory manager, and cemetery broker. We just finished development of the embalmer law examination and there is now a new examination plan. The new examination plan will go live on August 1, 2014, and is the result of the occupational analysis that was recently completed. The new

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

examination plan will be available in the candidate handbook posted on our Web site (www.cfb.ca.gov). The next examination the Bureau will work on is the funeral director examination. As many may be aware, licensees are used for examination development, referred to as subject matter experts, and are paid for their travel costs and an honorarium. The Bureau cannot do examination development without the participation of licensees. Ms. Moore asked that if anybody is interested in serving as a subject matter expert to please take a look at the application on the Bureau's Web site (www.cfb.ca.gov) and consider applying.

At the last meeting, Ms. Moore discussed annual trust reports. The endowment care fund and special care fund reports were due on June 1 and are now late if you have not submitted them for calendar year 2013, unless you had an extension. The funeral trust fund reports were due May 1, if those were not turned in they are now late. The declaration of non-reporting status for funeral establishments was due May 1. If any of these reports have not been turned in Ms. Moore encouraged licensees to do so as soon as possible.

Ms. Moore stated the big project the Bureau has been working on is our Sunset Review Report. At the last meeting Ms. Moore mentioned the Bureau was scheduled for the Sunset Review Oversight process this year. The Bureau has been busy working on a massive report which includes an extensive amount of statistical information on our licensing and enforcement activities. Staff has completed a first draft report which will go through several levels of review and the final report is due to the Legislature on November 1. Ms. Moore thanked Bureau staff for their hard work on the report. A hearing will be held in early 2015, when the hearing is scheduled the Bureau will announce the date and provide information on our Web site. The hearing is a public hearing and any one may attend.

The Bureau has also been working on developing a new Strategic Plan for 2015-2018. The Bureau is working with the Department's Training Division to help facilitate and develop the plan. Some of the industry and consumer groups received an e-mail from Ms. Moore with an online survey to complete regarding what the Bureau is doing well and what can be improved upon. The survey is an environmental scan that will become a roadmap to guide and direct the Bureau as we move forward. Ms. Moore stated the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan was a very aggressive plan that was developed under a prior Bureau Chief, some dates had to be modified but by the end of this year the Bureau will have completed 85-90 percent of the plan. Bureau staff meets on this every other month to evaluate what is being done to meet the goals and action plan. It is a living document we use to guide us and sometimes the dates had to be adjusted depending on other priorities. Ms. Moore expressed her gratitude to staff for being committed and their diligence in working towards meeting the Bureau's goals.

Ms. Steurer provided an update on the Limited Liability Company regulations, which were discussed at the previous meeting after some new edits were incorporated. The completed regulatory package has been moved forward for internal review and

approval. After the package is approved it will be filed with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and the notice will be published. There will be a public comment period for anyone who would like to submit a comment on the proposed regulations.

3. Status of Funeral Enforcement Regulations (Title 16, CCR Sections 1240, 1241, 1242, 1246, and 1280-1291)

Ms. Steurer stated on last meeting (February 12, 2014), the Bureau held a regulatory hearing for the funeral enforcement regulations. The proposed regulations were approved by OAL on June 11, 2014, and will become operative on October 1, (2014). These regulations amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 1240, 1241, 1242, and 1246 which are part of the funeral cite and fine, and repeal CCR Sections 1280-1291, the continuing education regulations which were inoperative because the authorizing statute was previously repealed. The Bureau will no longer have classes of violations but will continue to use the factors to be given consideration when assessing a citation and/or fine. The maximum fine amount will increase from \$2,500 to \$5,000 as authorized in Business and Professions Code section 125.9.

Ms. Moore expanded that the table of fines is gone; we will no longer have range A, range B, or range C with set fine amounts for each range. Ms. Moore assured everyone that this does not mean the Bureau will be blindly assessing fine amounts for citations. There will be internal procedures and guidelines developed with our staff to help implement these changes. Ms. Moore stressed she believes the change will be beneficial. For instance on the funeral side with Unprofessional Conduct, which is Business and Professions Code section 7707, the minimum fine amount started at \$1,001 and there have been times where the fine amount was higher than the violation warranted but the Bureau did not have the ability to assess less. The Bureau will now have the flexibility to assess fine amounts within the set minimum and maximum. The recommendation for fine assessment comes from the Bureau's enforcement analyst whose full-time job is reviewing all the inspection reports the Bureau receives each year. She looks at the inspection report and takes all the factors into consideration, she looks at prior citations or warnings and inspection history, it is a very well thought out and meaningful process before we issue a citation or assess a fine amount. Ms. Moore wanted to assure everyone that it will not be a haphazard manner in which fines are assessed. Some training and procedures will be put in place for staff.

4. Discussion of Proposed Changes to Cemetery Cite and Fine Regulations

Ms. Moore asked Ms. Steurer to review the proposed changes for the Cemetery Cite and Fine regulations (CCR Sections 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, and 2388). The proposed language was provided to the Advisory Committee Members in advance of the meeting for review and copies were available at the meeting for all attendees. Ms. Steurer explained that the Bureau was proposing changes to better align the cite and fine language between the funeral and cemetery regulations.

Under Section 2382 the proposed changes clean up existing language and increase the maximum fine amount from \$2,500 to \$5,000 in accordance with our authorizing statute

Business and Professions Code section 125.9. Reference to Government Code (section 11505(c)) has been added which governs how citations will be served. Subsection d is added to clarify that paying a fine does not mean you are admitting to the violation.

Under Section 2383 the fine tables are being removed allowing the Bureau flexibility to issue a citation for any violation of a statute or regulation. The maximum fine is being increased from \$2,500 to \$5,000 in accordance with our authorizing statute (Business and Professions Code section 125.9).

Under Section 2384 “department” is changed to “Bureau”, since the Bureau is responsible for investigations of its licensees.

Under Section 2385 the title and language are changed to mirror funeral regulations. Clarifies (who a request for) extension of time is submitted to and that failure to pay an uncontested citation (may result in disciplinary action).

Section 2386 has the most changes as the current language only discusses informal office conference. We have added in language on the appeal of a citation.

Under Section 2387 the maximum fine for unlicensed activity has been increased to a maximum fine to \$5,000 and we have also increased minimum fine of \$1,001. The minimum fine was \$250 but is being increased to mirror the funeral regulations for unlicensed activity and to discourage unlicensed practice or activity.

In Section 2388 we are making a technical change to clarify “the bureau chief or his or her designee”.

Ms. Steurer asked if anyone on the Committee or in the audience had any questions about the proposed language.

A member of the audience, Merrill Mefford, asked how far the Bureau can go to discipline repeat offenders of unlicensed activity. Ms. Moore responded that it depends, some district attorneys want to help us and some others have “bigger fish to fry.” The Bureau does issue citations to unlicensed people however it is difficult to make them pay when they do not have a license. The Bureau can also utilize the Department’s Division of Investigation. They are sworn peace officers and have arrest authority so we can utilize them when it gets to that point. Gary Duke stated that unlicensed activity is a criminal act, it is a misdemeanor.

Another member in the audience asked if it was normal for a failure to appear to be deemed a withdrawal of their appeal. Mr. Duke responded yes, it is considered a default. The same audience member commented that we struck the language stating a citation will be served by personal service or certified mail and asked what it was replaced with. Ms. Steurer clarified that the information on service was moved to subsection d (of Section 2386 and is also listed in subsection b of Section 2382) which

states the Bureau will serve in accordance with Government Code section 11505(c). Currently Government Code section 11505(c) requires the respondent to be served personally or by registered mail. By referencing the Government Code section in regulation the Bureau can continue to serve in the manner prescribed by Government Code without having to make future amendments to the regulations. Ms. Moore stated the Bureau serves by certified mail with return receipt requested and that will not change.

Committee Member Tracy Hughes asked if we can issue a citation for abatement without a fine. Ms. Moore responded yes, the Bureau can and Ms. Steurer added if the Bureau issues a fine it must be a minimum of one hundred dollars.

Mr. Duke commented that the proposed regulations will be noticed by the OAL and there will be additional time for the public to comment. This is not an end product, this is still a draft. Ms. Moore stated the formal process has not yet started. We run the language by our committee members as we develop it so we can fine tune the language and address as many issues as we can before we start the formal process. This helps the formal process go smoother and faster.

5. Update to Web Site Regarding Disciplinary Actions

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

This topic was also discussed at our last meeting. Our Web site currently provides information about disciplinary actions against licensees through our license verification page. If you are looking for a licensee and know their license number or name, you can bring up the licensee record and if there are any public documents there will be a link to them. We wanted a way where someone can look at our Web site under disciplinary actions and see everything in one place. The handout is a draft of what we are proposing to change our disciplinary Web page to look like. If you take the first page where the red circle is we would add a spot that says disciplinary actions. Once you click on that it would take you to the next page which is a list of the disciplinary action definitions. Next you would click on which year you were looking for. For example if you click on 2012 it would take you to a page (which is the third page in the handout) that shows you all the actions we have taken for 2012. Then if you click on the case number it will take you to the license record on the license verification page where you can see the licensing information and the documents that are public record. Ms. Moore asked if there were any questions about the proposal.

Committee Member Jolena Grande asked if when they bring up the record will it be hyperlinked back to the definitions or do they have to click back to the previous page to get the definitions. Ms. Moore said you would have to look at the definitions and know it before because this will take you to the actual license record.

A member of the audience, Marjorie Bridges, asked if disciplinary citations will be reflected on the license verification page and stated that on the license verification page under Disciplinary Actions it says "No information available from this agency" but there are public records listed which is not very clear. Ms. Bridges also questioned who would read the Disclaimer for Disciplinary Action Summary and stated all you need is what the disciplinary action was for and then a link to the rules or definitions that are involved with that.

In response, Ms. Moore stated this will not replace the license verification process in place now. You can still look up a license just like you normally would. If you look on the last page of the handout where it says revoked, next to that it says definition which is a hyperlink you can click on and it will tell you the definition of what revoked means. Currently we do not have administrative citations posted only formal disciplinary action is posted.

Ms. Bridges asked if we intend to give provide more information since it could affect somebody's decision on whether to use that funeral home. Ms. Moore said we have had discussions about this in the past; we do not have an answer. It is something that warrants further discussion.

Gary Duke stated most of the boards and bureaus of the department do publish administrative citations, they are a matter of public record. Technically speaking a citation is not a formal disciplinary action; it is considered an enforcement action because if a person pays the citation it is not considered an admission of any violation of the act so we do make a distinction between enforcement versus discipline. Discipline is a result of an accusation or a denial which results in a statement of issues.

Committee Member Cheryl Moore asked how often the Web site is updated. Ms. Moore stated the Web site is updated as soon as the decision becomes effective.

Committee Member Victoria Emmons asked what happens to a cemetery when their license is revoked. Ms. Moore responded that was a good question but should be an agenda item for another meeting. There have been numerous discussions on it before. Once a license is revoked we do not have jurisdiction over it. With cemeteries it is a double edged sword because it is unlike any other business. If the Department revokes a license for a business you can shut it down and it stops. With a cemetery, while you can take a license away you still have a piece of land with bodies in it. This is an issue that there is not an easy answer to. Ms. Moore was glad the question was brought up because she wondered if the committee would like to see it as an item on the agenda for a future meeting.

Mr. Duke stated ultimately it becomes a land use issue and is really a local issue. In fact we have one cemetery in Manteca which has essentially been abandoned. Sometimes local citizens may form some type of a group but there really is not much we can do. There are still interment rights that consumers have in that cemetery and we do have

the authority to approve burials on a case by case basis. The Bureau does not have authority to run any cemeteries and the Department is not interested in taking that on. These are really difficult cases to deal with because even though you do not have a license you still have a cemetery, you still have a piece of land that should be respected and maintained.

Ms. Moore asked if there was anything else on the disciplinary action Web site. We believe the proposed changes will make it much easier for people to look for information in one spot than to look all over the Web site.

Ms. Emmons asked when someone files a complaint and it is being investigated, is that publicized that they have been accused of something? Ms. Moore responded no it is not until after it has been investigated; our disclosure policy is such that if an investigation or complaint is closed without any merit there was no violation and that does not become a matter of public record.

Ms. Emmons asked if something changes hands to new ownership, for example if someone purchases a cemetery that is on the disciplinary list, are they on the list forever and a consumer looking it up will think it is not in good standing. Ms. Moore stated if it is under new ownership they will go through the licensing process from the beginning and there is a long list of requirements that need to be met for all our licensing categories but cemeteries are particularly complex. If a license is issued it is issued under a new number so they would be looking at a completely new licensee record and most change their name. There is not a large turnover of people selling and buying cemeteries. We only license a total of, at last count, 196 cemeteries in the State of California.

A member of the audience, Royce Ann Ruhkala, asked how long it takes to look into a complaint once it is filed, do we have a certain period of months we do it in or how does that work. Ms. Moore stated we have established target timeframes for our field representatives. Complaints are not always worked in the order received depending on what the nature of the issue is, some are more urgent. Some complaints can be resolved within just a couple of weeks and sometimes it goes beyond our target timeframe. It depends upon the complexity of the issue and the people we need to get ahold of and the documents involved. Sometimes complainants will file a complaint and we will call them for additional information. We may not get a call back or it may be weeks later so sometimes we are at the mercy of the people we are trying to interview. We have a target timeframe of between three to four months from the time it is assigned to our field staff.

6. Update on Educational Video / Outreach Efforts

Ms. Moore stated we briefly discussed this at our last meeting and what the Bureau had hoped to do for an educational video. The Department's Public Affairs Office assists boards and bureaus with doing this type of outreach. Ms. Moore asked Russ Heimerich of the Public Affairs Office to come talk about how we are going about developing the

video and what they have done for other boards and bureaus along with showing some of the videos they have produced. Ms. Moore has been extremely impressed with the work they have done and is very excited to work with them to develop something for the Bureau.

Mr. Heimerich stated he is the Deputy Director of Communications for the Department. The Communications Division consists of: the Office of Public Affairs, the Office of Publications, Design, and Editing, and the Consumer Information Center where they take phone calls for several of the boards and bureaus. The task of the Office of Public Affairs and the Office of Publications, Design, and Editing is to essentially handle the communication needs of boards and bureaus within the Department. When the Department gets media calls they come to Public Affairs and they will work with the Bureau to answer the reporter's questions. In a larger sense what they do is create a communications plan for the Bureau so that consumers will know first of all that the Bureau exists and second of all how they can protect themselves when they go to buy pre-needs and who to complain to if they have a problem. We have updated some of the Bureau's publications, the *Consumer Guide to Funeral & Cemetery Purchases*, a *Preneed Q&A* brochure, and paired down version of another (*For Peace of Mind*) pamphlet. These are available at the front desk; we take these with us to our Scam Stopper events and generally try to distribute these as widely as we can. They are also up online so people can read them there.

Mr. Heimerich said they also try to come up with integrated communications campaigns. This is a communications plan to help the Bureau establish a presence out there. One of the things that we decided was to put out an informational video. That informational video will essentially be taking information that is in the *Consumer Guide to Funeral & Cemetery Purchases* and put it into a two or three minute video. A script has been drafted and now they will work on getting this produced which will be happening in the next several months. He offered examples of some of the work they've have done.

The first video shared with the committee was for the Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind. Monica Vargas stated the purpose of the video was to share it with the Restaurant Association to give an idea of tips and best practices for when a guide dog team enters a restaurant. (The video can be viewed from this link <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbyKWsqkU8>.)

The next video shared was for the Board of Pharmacy and it was created for prescription drug awareness month. (The video can be viewed from this link <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lw95thBpA5E>.)

The next video was more of a technical video for the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education. (The video can be viewed from this link https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B_Zftf56yql#t=20.)

Mr. Heimerich stated the videos show that with our resources we have been able to use live action and animation. The video for the Bureau will be a mix of that as we figure out what looks best to convey the information of the consumer guide.

Mr. Heimerich stated if anyone would like to view other videos the Department has done you can go to YouTube and look for CA Dept. of Consumer Affairs. There are also a lot of Webcasts available because the Department Webcasts all the board meetings.

Ms. Emmons asked who the video will be geared towards and what the major message will be. Mr. Heimerich responded that the video will be geared toward consumers and the main message will be a high level guide to pre-need purchases, some of your options, what you should look for, and some of the questions consumers should ask.

Ms. Emmons asked if the video will be translated into any other languages. Mr. Heimerich stated they have not thought about that yet they have been trying to get them cranked out but at some point they can look at possibly dubbing narration in Spanish. On YouTube there is also the option to do close captioning.

An audience member, Jerry Desmond, had a question about the video with guide dogs. In the credits at the end it thanked a list of people and the Restaurant Association. Mr. Desmond was curious as to the role of the Restaurant Association. Mr. Heimerich stated the Restaurant Association developed a partnership with the Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind about two years ago to get the word out about service dogs in restaurants. There were some ongoing issues with some restaurants so the Restaurant Association asked to work together to try to get this message out there. For that type of direct education campaign we are more than happy to work with someone.

Ms. Moore stated she is impressed with what the Office of Public Affairs has done and cannot wait to see what they do for the Bureau. Ms. Emmons expressed she believes having it easily available on YouTube will be good because she works with patients and families all the time on the decision making process since they are in hospice.

7. 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.

Suzette Sherman from Seven Ponds stated she had a concern with language that the Cremation Association of North America (CANA) was using. Ms. Moore stated that the Bureau does not regulate or have jurisdiction over them. Ms. Sherman stated on their Web site they are redefining cremation. Ms. Moore stated there is a definition of cremation in the Health and Safety Code which is what the Bureau utilizes and if Ms. Sherman had concerns with what CANA was representing she should address it with them.

Mr. Duke asked how CANA had changed the definition. Ms. Sherman stated they are including alkaline hydrolysis and redefining cremation. Ms. Moore stated that they are a National organization and there are states that utilize alkaline hydrolysis and some of those states have done so by folding alkaline hydrolysis into the cremation practice so that is probably where the change is coming from.

Jerrigrace Lyons from Final Passages stated the new consumer guide talks about home death care and she knows some families that have gone to the Office of Vital Records to get help with filing their own paperwork. Some of them are wonderful and helpful in assisting families. Other offices have not been so helpful and have resisted providing assistance by telling families to have a funeral director help them. Ms. Lyons wondered if in the future we would consider having guides online on how to fill out and file the paperwork. Ms. Lyons stated the State of Vermont and Massachusetts both have guidelines on their Web sites on how family members can get the paperwork completed, what steps to go through, what rules to follow. Ms. Lyons asked if this might be a consideration for the State of California to have something on the Bureau's Web site.

Ms. Moore responded that it is something the Bureau could look at. Since the jurisdiction belongs to the Department of Public Health Ms. Moore suggested approaching them about guidelines. Ms. Moore stated we may consider including steps but since it was outside our jurisdiction she was not sure we would be able to do guidelines for completing the forms.

Ms. Lyons stated she is often asked by consumers what steps they can take if they have a large piece of property and want to create a family plot on their own land so they can bury relatives there. Ms. Lyons was not sure what the first step they should take was.

Mr. Duke responded that this would require a legislative change so they should contact their legislator because you are not allowed to inter remains on private property unless they are cremated remains. In the meantime they would need to create a cemetery. Ms. Lyons asked if they would need to create a family cemetery. Ms. Steurer responded that yes, they would need to go through the licensing process and designate a piece of the land as a cemetery. Mr. Duke expanded that it could be an exempt cemetery. For instance when Cesar Chavez passed away they wanted to bury him on land the United Farm Workers had in the Central Valley. The only way to do that was to form a cemetery or become associated with a religious denomination, in that case the Catholic Church consecrated the land and they were able to get a land use permit.

Marjorie Bridges asked when we do revisions to the Bureau's Web site can we expand identifying the owners of cemeteries to identifying the owners of funeral homes. Ms. Moore stated cemeteries are owned by corporations and the name of the corporation is listed. Funeral law allows an individual, a partnership, or a corporation to own a funeral establishment. Ms. Moore said the Bureau would note her concerns and look into this.

Ms. Bridges also asked if we could note adding a phone number to the record. Ms. Moore stated the license verification is something that belongs to the entire Department; everyone uses it so if you change it for one program you change it for everybody. Because we are transitioning from the current system we have to BreEZe the changes we can make to the current system are very limited as our resource are focused on implementing BreEZe.

Ms. Bridges stated she was invited to a conference and a question came up about cooperative funeral homes. Ms. Bridges asked if we have any cooperative funeral homes in California. Ms. Moore responded she was not familiar with that and was not sure what that means. Ms. Moore stated it could just be an organization that a group of licensees created.

Ms. Bridges asked about families taking bodies to crematories. Ms. Bridges visited some cemeteries and crematories and found out that they were only taking bodies from funeral homes. If a family wanted to have home death care this puts them back in the hands of funeral homes if they want cremation. Ms. Moore stated there was not anything that requires crematories to accept bodies directly from families if they choose to only do business with a licensed funeral establishment. That is an independent business decision on the part of the crematory. Mr. Duke stated it was his understanding that it was a common practice to only do business with a licensed funeral establishment.

8. Future Meetings (November 2014)

Ms. Moore stated she was looking at having the next meeting in November. The Bureau typically holds a meeting in June and November. We held this meeting in July because we were in the middle of our Sunset Review Report in June. Ms. Moore asked that if there are items any one believes should be on future agendas please send her an email and she will take them into consideration.

9. Adjournment

Ms. Moore thanked everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.