

TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING

JUNE 13, 2017

President Robert Helms called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. in Conference Room 1-B, Davy Crockett Tower, Nashville, Tennessee.

Board members present: Robert Helms, President; Charles Rahm, Vice President; Dennis Bridges, Mark Cochran, Jeff Duffer and Clark McKinney.

Board member(s) absent: Robert Davis

Staff present: Robert Gribble, Executive Director; Cherrelle Hooper, Assistant General Counsel; and Lisa Mosby, Administrative Manager.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

A motion was made by Jeff Duffer to approve the Agenda as printed.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to approve the Minutes of the May 9, 2017 Board Meeting.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

LEGAL REPORT:

ALLISON RENFRO, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

Abbreviations:

GPL – General Price List

CPL – Casket Price List

OBCPL – Outer Burial Container Price List

SFGSS – Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected

-
- 1. Case No.: 2017004521**
 - 2. Case No.: 2017004532**
 - 3. Case No.: 2017004533**

This complaint was filed by a former employee of the establishment and stated used hospital body bags were being used as casket liners so that the casket could be reused and not damaged and that Complainant took 20+ remains out of the same burial casket since July of 2016. The complaint also stated that the funeral director/embalmer would instruct Complainant and his co-workers to take the remains out of the casket, lay remains on a table, zip up the body bag, and write the deceased's name on the outside with a permanent marker. The remains would then be placed in a storage room by the chapel until the remains would be transported to the crematory. The Complainant further stated remains stay in the storage room over two weeks and if space is limited, employees are instructed to stack the remains on the same table, on top of one another.

Upon investigation, the Complainant stated that when he began his employment with the establishment in 2012, the funeral director/embalmer instructed him to wrap the remains in plastic prior to dressing and placing the remains in a casket, and after the visitation and/or services, the remains were removed from the casket and placed on a dressing table prior to being taken to the crematory. If the casket's interior was soiled, funeral director/embalmer had instructed Complainant to clean it and use Febreze. Complainant stated that the procedure had changed in 2016 where a white vinyl hospital body bag was placed in the casket prior to placing the remains in the casket and the remains were wrapped in plastic prior to dressing and casketing. Complainant stated that after services and/or visitation the remains and bags were removed from the casket, zipped up, and placed on a dressing table, the name of the decedent was written on the bag, and placed in a storage room with no ventilation, and stacked on tables. Complainant states that he was instructed by funeral director/embalmer to reuse the casket on numerous occasions as indicated by the photos in the complaint he provided.

The owner of the cremation company that performs the cremations for the establishment stated that bodies are usually delivered in a fiberboard container, cremation tray, casket, casket insert, or stretcher, and are usually not delivered in a body bag. The owner stated if the body is brought in on a stretcher, the body is placed in to an alternative container; in the file, 31 of the cremations were noted as being in an alternative container and only one was in a body bag for the remains of an infant. An employee for the crematory stated she does not recall bodies arriving from the establishment in plastic bags.

The funeral director/embalmer stated that when a family requests cremation, the casket is lined with a white hospital body bag prior to placing the body in a casket. He further stated that the storage room that stores the bodies prior to transportation to the crematory is usually cool but does not need ventilation because the bodies placed in the room are embalmed and dressed. He stated the room is locked and only accessible by staff with a key kept in his office. He stated the bodies are stored in the room either in a casket, alternate container, and if they are in a body bag, each body bag is on a separate table. During the investigation the storage area had one body in a shipping container ready to be sent to the airport. He expressed concern that Complainant would photograph the remains without permission and make false allegations. The Funeral Director/Embalmer did not have invoices for hospital body bags because these bags are often complimentary from local hospitals the funeral home works with and does not have invoices for a rental casket and explained the charge for cremation includes cost of using the casket to provided families of limited means with a dignified service.

The investigation concluded that it was undisputed that the funeral director/embalmer and establishment used the same metal casket, without a new interior or interior insert being installed, prior to each usage of the casket shell.

Recommendation:

- Establishment: Consent Order with a \$2,000 civil penalty and authorization of a hearing.
- Funeral Director / Embalmer: Consent Order with a \$1,500 civil penalty and authorization of a hearing.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

4. Case No.: 2017007111

5. Case No.: 2017007112

This complaint was filed by a consumer that stated after the complainant's mother died, he contacted Respondents, advised them that he would be performing the embalming, and the remains were transported to the establishment where Complainant, a licensed embalmer, completed the embalming. The complaint states that Complainant realized he had forgotten to

provide his embalming license number and called Respondent to see if he had the number and Respondent was short with him on the phone. Then, the death certificate was received by the family and it had the wrong embalmer's name and number on it. Included with the complaint is the death certificate and it does not contain complainant's name or license number. Complainant states that the family should not have been charged for embalming, preparation of remains, casketing, makeup, and hair.

Response: Complainant expressed his desire to embalm his mother's remains. We informed him this was inadvisable and were unsuccessful in our attempts to dissuade him. While licensed, Complainant had not embalmed anyone in recent years and had to solicit our embalmer's assistance in completing the procedure. Upon completing the embalming, Complainant made no mention of his desire to be the embalmer of record at that time, and the death certificate was submitted prior to his provision of his embalmer license number. As the registered embalmer for the establishment, and the responsible party, the establishment's embalmer endorses all death certificates for the establishment.

Recommendation:

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

6. Case No.: 2017008081

Upon inspection on January 17, 2017, of establishment files, it was determined that four files had cremation authorization forms that were not signed and dated by a licensed funeral director as required by law. Also, the reason for embalming is required on contracts, but of the files reviewed, one statement of funeral goods and services selected contract did not have this information completed.

Response: The contract has been corrected so that it now states a reason for embalming. The four forms are now signed and dated. Included with the response was proof of the corrections.

Recommendation:

- Consent Order with a \$250 civil penalty and authorization for a hearing.

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept Board's recommendation.

Seconded by Mark Cochran

Adopted by voice vote

7. Case No.: 2017008841

This establishment was issued a Notice of Violation (NOV) on March 16, 2016, from a Regulatory Board Field Representative. The NOV stated the order must be complied with on or before 20 calendar days, yet over 5 months passed with no response from the establishment. The violations listed on the NOV are as follows:

1. The General Price List fails to list basic services of funeral director and staff as an included item under direct cremation, as required by the Funeral Rule.
2. Three of the 16 required items on the General Price List (GPL) included a \$95 charge listed as an archive fee, which the funeral director stated was a fee for maintaining records. This fee was non-declinable, as it was itemized into the charges listed for three required items. The Funeral Rule states that the fee for basic services of funeral director and staff is the only non-declinable fee allowed for services, facilities, or unallocated overhead, and other than a basic services fee, a separate fee cannot be charged for overhead.

Response: The Establishment manager corrected the GPL so that basic services are included with the direct cremation price. The archive fee has been removed from the GPL. Included with the response was the corrected GPL.

Recommendation:

- Civil penalty of \$500 and authorization for a hearing.

A motion was made by Jeff Duffer to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Dennis Bridges

Adopted by voice vote

8. Case No.: 2017013051

This complaint was filed by a consumer who states her husband had prearranged his funeral and paid for his cremation with a specific funeral home. The complaint states an employee of that funeral home told Complainant that the Respondent contacted him to inquire if the obituary was going to appear in the newspaper and the employee advised the establishment that the newspaper had been contacted, he was waiting to hear back, and that he was not the next of kin of the deceased. Complainant received a text from a family member that there was an obituary on social media and it wasn't the obituary Complainant approved, as the obituary posted had her husband's name spelled wrong and words deleted, as someone had tagged this incorrect obituary to her husband's social media page. Complainant then received a call asking her what was going on because the posted obituary stated a service time and date, whereas she had not determined the day and time yet since her children were out of the country. Complainant states that she is emotionally distressed from dealing with the obituary that was released without her permission. Complainant spoke to an individual at the establishment and asked why did they release an obituary without her permission, as this establishment was not handling her husband's arrangements, yet it still appears if you google her husband's name.

Response: The establishment states it was contacted by the decedent's mother to conduct a memorial service for the decedent, where there would be no physical body or cremains present, only a photograph, as she wanted local family and friends to attend a service in the city where her son grew up, understanding that his wife would be having a celebration of life for him at a later date. The establishment announced the service on its website as was their standard protocol. Decedent's mother called the funeral home that was working with Decedent's wife to see if they were going to run an obituary in their local paper and was advised the local paper had been contacted, but did not advise that we were not dealing with the next of kin, as was stated in the complaint. The Respondent was later contacted by Complainant who they stated was disrespectful in her request for us to remove information from our website, which we did immediately after she called and made her demand.

Recommendation:

- Close

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept the Board's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

9. Case No.: 2017015521

10. Case No.: 2017015522

11. Case No.: 2017015523

This complaint was filed by a consumer who states her grandfather had a funeral service at the establishment on January 17, 2016. Complainant alleges the funeral director treated her grandmother like she was a stranger to her grandfather, yet they had been happily married for 45 years. Complainant states she took care of her grandparents in Tennessee for six years then moved to Colorado with her grandmother; her grandfather elected to remain in Tennessee for a little while and was put in a hospital without her consent by his brother. When he passed away, Complainant's grandmother was notified the funeral would be in one week. The grandfather's possessions were given to the brother by the establishment staff and the funeral director treated the grandmother rudely.

Response: Complainant was the decedent's wife's granddaughter, but not a blood relative of the decedent. The decedent was married to Complainant's grandmother for 45 years but they were separated for 20 or so of those years. The brother furnished a home to decedent and his girlfriend rent-free for some time. At some point, the girlfriend left, and his wife and her granddaughter came to live with him for a period of time. Decedent had health problems and when he was in the hospital his wife visited him one time, took money out of his bank account, then cleaned out his house and sold its contents. The funeral director did not know who decedent's wife was but extended to her warm greetings as is his policy and pushed her in a wheelchair without knowledge of her identity. After the funeral service, the funeral director gave a bag of acknowledgement cards, sympathy cards, and thank you cards to the brother who paid the funeral expenses and was the only family member of whom he was aware was present for the funeral service. There were no personal belongings in the bag. The funeral director has been in the business for 25 years and this is the first complaint against him.

Recommendation:

- Close

A motion was made by Jeff Duffer to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

12. Case No.: 2017015551

This complaint was filed by a consumer who states he found out through social media that his mother-in-law had passed away on February 27, 2017, so his wife contacted the establishment to see if the body was ready for viewing and was told by the establishment that her family was not allowed to come to the establishment due to an order that had been filed by an attorney. The funeral director advised Complainant, that his wife, his step-daughter and her husband, and his step-daughter were listed in the order and that he would mail a copy of the order, the funeral program, and obituary to Complainant. After contacting a sheriff, Complainant found out the order may be a restraining order, so he contacted the county sheriff's office where the funeral home is located to see the papers but was told there was not an order with those names. Complainant contacted the county clerk's office, chancery court, and general sessions court to no avail. As of the filing of the complaint on March 6, 2017, Complainant had not received any of the information he was told he would receive.

Response: The decedent passed away on February 27, 2017. The following day her daughter, Complainant's wife, contacted the funeral home to inquire about coming to the viewing when she was told about a directive her mother had left which was enclosed with the response to the complaint. The notarized directive states that her daughter, daughter's husband, daughter's daughter and her husband and their daughter shall not be allowed on the premises during her funeral or at any other time while her remains are at the funeral home. Complainant's wife asked if the establishment could mail her a copy of the directive and it said it would. She called on March 6, 2017, to see if it had been mailed and was told it had not been mailed yet but would be mailed the next day, and she said to keep the copies at the establishment and she would come by the next day to pick them up, which she did.

Recommendation:

- Close

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by voice vote

13. Case No.: 2017018681

After routine inspection on March 8, 2017, the Regulatory Board Field Representative issued the establishment a citation for the following violations:

1. The General Price List (GPL) lists some of the required items starting on page 7, but then lists package offerings, and does not list the remainder of the required items until page 16. The custom package sheet lists a selected premium casket and the value package sheet lists a selected premium casket, but the casket price list and a separate sheet listing packages does not indicate a premium casket definition and price that consumers can view. The GPL contains caskets available in packages but does not reference premium caskets, prices are not referenced for each casket. Caskets listed under each package name do not coincide with the casket listed on the individual package sheet for economy package and basic package.
2. The Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected for two decedents does not disclose, as required by the funeral rule, that the price charged by the establishment for cremation process is higher than the price the establishment paid to a third party crematory. The establishment further violated the funeral rule by failing to list the crematory fee in the cash advances section of the statement of funeral goods and services selected.

Response: We changed the prices we had used for the past 10 years and included required wording but not in the order the field representative told us it needed to be in. The manager accidentally put the items of two contracts in a cash advance section which has been corrected.

Recommendation:

- Close with a Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept the Board's recommendation.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

14. Case No.: 2017021391

This complaint was filed by a consumer who stated multiple issues with the services she received from the establishment.

1. Pricing/packages. Complainant states the funeral director never offered her anything but package deals and never showed her a price list.
2. Food. Complainant states the food was not what she ordered; the food was a ham, cheese, and vegetable tray when she had ordered barbeque. The establishment got barbeque and buns upon learning of their mistake.
3. Music. Complainant states when she went into the chapel for the funeral service an employee told her they did not know what the music was supposed to be.
4. Embalming. Complainant states her husband looked white, his hair was not cut, and he looked disheveled. Her husband's hand was soft and she could move his fingers and she wondered if he was even embalmed. She was so embarrassed by the way he looked. His hair was subsequently trimmed and makeup applied.
5. Vault engraving. Complainant states she told the funeral director she wanted her husband's name, date of birth, and date of death engraved, and was told that was no problem and it would have either a cross or praying hands. Instead of being engraved, it had peel-and-stick letters.
6. Plot. Complainant asked an employee if she could hold the plot for her from Friday to Wednesday but was told no, and that hopefully no one will buy it before she can come purchase it.
7. Services received. Complainant states that the funeral director told her he would be off work during her husband's funeral service. She was upset at her husband's appearance but no one came to check on her to see if his appearance was ok.
8. Obituary. Complainant states when she got home she read the obituary and it was wrong so it had to be changed.

Response:

- Pricing/packages. We did present the merchandise in packages to make the selection process easier but at no time told her she had to select a package. The funeral director did give her a price list and reviewed the contract with Complainant prior to her signing it. If the family had asked for

options other than packages, those options would have been made available.

- Food and Music. The Establishment admits it made two mistakes in handling the funeral service: it did not communicate the change Complainant made to the catering order and the wrong food was delivered, but it was corrected within an hour and Complainant was provided free catering, and a staff member accidentally deleted the song selection but they were able to obtain the correct song selection in time for the service. The funeral director presented the details of the catering order to the family as he understood their order to be and never heard the family request barbeque; they just told him they wanted to upgrade their package after being shown the basic light reception package. The menu selected was not noted on the contract. The only item that was incorrect was the "main" dish (cold meats were ordered though barbeque sliders were what was wanted) as the side items were correct.
- Embalming. Upon hearing Complainant's issues with her husband's appearance, adjustments, were made to his hair and cosmetics were applied immediately.
Vault. The vault that the Complainant selected did not offer the option to include full dates. The vault itself could not be engraved, but the nameplate could. Complainant was advised that there were fewer options with the vault she chose.
- Plot. Their family service counselor follows the procedure of holding adjoining plot spaces for family members and imagines Complainant mistook what was said about holding additional spaces. It was never said that the plot would not be saved.
- Obituary. The draft had one grammatical error but was not put in the paper with the error.
- We have determined that we will refund 110% of the service charges, which is approximately \$7,441.50.

Rebuttal to Respondent's Response: Complainant states that she was only told that the plot could be held after Complainant complained about the situation, so the explanation provided in the response is a lie.

Recommendation:

- Consent Order with a \$250 Civil Penalty, authorization for a hearing and proof of refund to the family.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

-
- 15. Case No.: 2017008131**
 - 16. Case No.: 2017008132**
 - 17. Case No.: 2017008133**
 - 18. Case No.: 2017008134**

Pursuant to inspection in October 2016, the Respondent funeral establishment and the funeral director/ embalmer were cited for allowing an unlicensed person known as Respondent No. 4 to engage in funeral directing and embalming without first obtaining a license. Further, Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, the funeral director and embalmer, who are the same person, allowed the unlicensed individual to perform said services and execute documents on behalf of the funeral director and embalmer. Specifically, according to the inspector the unlicensed person was meeting with families and conducting services at the cemetery without a licensed funeral director being present. The funeral home's website lists Respondent No. 4 as a funeral arranger, which has since been removed from the website due to this complaint.

The funeral establishment and funeral director responded and state that Respondent No. 4 has completed his apprenticeship and has been employed with the Respondent funeral establishment since 2008. However, Respondent No. 4 has not taken the examinations as of February 2017. The funeral director states in response to the inspection that the apprentice has never worked outside the direction and supervision of the funeral director. The Respondent cites to certain legal authority to substantiate their position with regard to the term under "direction and supervision" of a funeral director. The Respondent's position is that "direction and supervision" does not mean that the funeral director must be "present."

The Respondents provided affidavits and work schedules as proof that Respondent No. 4 never took a family to a cemetery without being under the direction and supervision of the funeral director. The response further provides that Respondent No. 4 was acting under the direction and supervision of the funeral director when he was attending arrangement conferences or attending funeral services. The inspector refers in the report to an internal chart used by the funeral home which appears to list Respondent No. 4 as a funeral director,

but the Respondent refutes using that as the basis for stating that Respondent No. 4 is acting as a funeral director stating that the chart is for internal purposed only. The inspector also made note of the name tags and group photograph for the funeral home which appears to be generic in nature. The law states that a person must not give the "impression" that a person is licensed if they are not. In response to the complaint, the title funeral arranger has been removed from Respondent No. 4's job title.

The remaining issue is that Respondent No. 4 did execute a cremation authorization form and the Respondent admits to signing the name of the funeral director. However, in response to the inspection, the Respondent asks the Board to consider the factors outlined in the rules when considering a civil penalty such as the economic benefit gained by the violator, risk of harm to the public, severity of the violation, whether there have been similar violations, and the interest to the public. The Respondents ask this Board to consider that the primary goal of the funeral statutes and regulations is to protect the public; and that even if a violation has occurred, the public may still have been rendered a valuable service.

Recommendation:

- Funeral Director – Consent order with a \$250 Civil Penalty and authorization for hearing.
- Establishment – Consent order with a \$500 Civil Penalty and authorization for hearing.
- Unlicensed Respondent – Consent Order with a \$250 civil penalty and authorization for hearing.

A motion was made by Clark McKinney as follows:

- Funeral Director – Consent order with a \$250 civil penalty and authorization for hearing.
- Establishment – Consent order with a \$750 civil penalty and authorization for hearing.
- Unlicensed Respondent – Consent Order with a \$250 Civil Penalty and authorization for a hearing.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by voice vote

This is a consumer complaint which alleges that the Respondent did not file the death certificate in a timely manner. The date of death was July 20, 2016 and the certificate was not filed until March 16, 2017, but it was signed by the Medical Examiner on February 22, 2017. The Respondent filed a Response stating that immediately upon receiving the complaint on March 17, 2017; the funeral home contacted the Vital Records Section of the Department of Health and confirmed that the death certificate had been filed.

Recommendation:

- Consent order with a \$250.00 civil penalty and authorization for hearing.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:
ROBERT B. GRIBBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PERFORMANCE AUDIT UPDATE:

The Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury, Division of State Audit, continues in the process of conducting a Performance and Compliance Audit for the Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers and other regulatory boards within the Department of Commerce and Insurance.

As the board members may recall, Executive Director Robert Gribble initially met with auditors from the Comptroller of the Treasury on August 22, 2016 for an entrance conference (initial interview) regarding the Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers.

Since the last board meeting on May 9, 2017, there has not been any requests for information or documents from the auditors of the Division of State Audit that are conducting the Performance and Compliance Audit.

The Performance and Compliance Section of the Comptroller's Office conducts performance audits based on identification of risks in statewide processes and programs or agency-specific operations and activities. This section also conducts performance audits to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs in accordance with the Governmental Entity Review Law.

In coordination with the financial and compliance audit section, this section is responsible for auditing functional areas of departments, agencies, and institutions of state government as well as federally sponsored programs in accordance with the Single Audit Act.

We will continue to update the Board regarding the audit.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:

Public Chapter 154, effective July 1, 2017, requires that five of the ten hours of continuing education obtained by a funeral director or embalmer to renew a license must be attended “in person”, which “means the continuing education coursework is completed by the licensee in the physical presence of the provider of the coursework or is completed by the licensee through an interactive virtual program that requires participants to confirm their presence during the program.”

This requirement applies to all renewals on or after July 1, 2017.

<http://publications.tnsosfiles.com/acts/110/pub/pc0154.pdf>

Public Chapter 144, effective April 17, 2017, provides that licensed funeral establishments may be used for providing “commemorative services” (defined as a “ceremony for the dead prior to burial, cremation, or any other legal form of final disposition”).

<http://publications.tnsosfiles.com/acts/110/pub/pc0144.pdf>

Public Chapter 158, effective July 1, 2017, sets out requirements regarding the release of the remains of a deceased person from a funeral establishment with custody to a second funeral establishment upon request, as well as the responsibility of the receiving funeral home for the cost of the merchandise and services provided by the first establishment.

<http://publications.tnsosfiles.com/acts/110/pub/pc0158.pdf>

Public Chapter 139, effective April 17, 2017, removes the requirement that the decedent’s social security number be included on the permanent identification device affixed to the remains of a deceased person or placed in a crematory urn.

<http://publications.tnsosfiles.com/acts/110/pub/pc0139.pdf>

EXAM TESTING CONTRACT:

The exam administration contract between the Tennessee Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers and the International Conference of Funeral Service Examining Boards, Inc., expires June 30, 2017.

Representatives of the Department of Commerce and Insurance are working with The Conference on a new contract regarding: 1) the State Board Examination (SBE) which is comprised of two (2) parts, a funeral service arts section (funeral

director exam) and a funeral service sciences section (embalmer exam) and 2) a Laws, Rules, and Regulations Examination (LRR).

A new exam administration contract is expected to be in place by the expiration of the current contract.

LICENSEE REPORT:

REPORT OF LICENSES ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO BOARD AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD OF MAY 9, 2017 – JUNE 12, 2017

<u>Establishment(s)</u>	<u>Type of Action(s)</u>
Barlow Funeral Home Covington, TN	Ownership
Bills-McGaugh & Hamilton Funeral Home & Crematory Lewisburg, TN	Name
Dockery-Senter Funeral Home, Inc. Morristown, TN	Name
Neighbors Life Celebration Services Nashville, TN	Name
Serenity of Cleveland Funeral Home & Cremation Services Cleveland, TN	Name
Memorial Funeral Home, LLC Maryville, TN	Location
<u>Individual(s)</u>	<u>Type of License(s)</u>
Emma Leigh Davis Englewood, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
Bradley Wayne Hinson Centerville, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
Shane Eugene Younce Erwin, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
Shaun Andrew-Benjamin Luyk Hendersonville, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Florida

Aaron Lee Meroniuk
Dayton, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer
Reciprocity – Washington

CLOSED ESTABLISHMENT:

One (1) establishment has reported closing since the last board meeting:

- Simply Unique Cremation & Funeral Service, 5226 Main Street, Suite D1, Spring Hill, TN.

DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT:

Because of the recent transition regarding Centralized Complaints and the new process of preparing the monthly Regulatory Boards Disciplinary Action Report, there were no Consent Orders to be reported for this board meeting.

OPEN COMPLAINT REPORT:

As of June 13, 2017 there were 51 open complaints.

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept the Executive Director's Report.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION:

James Byron Collins
Memphis, TN

Funeral Director/Embalmer

Upon motion by Clark McKinney and seconded by Mark Cochran, based upon application record, this individual was approved for licensure.

Adopted by voice vote

NEW BUSINESS:

Any proposed legislative ideas that members of the Board have should be transmitted to and received by the Executive Director no later than the close of business on Wednesday, June 21, 2017.

ADJOURN:

A motion was made by Jeff Duffer to adjourn.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

The meeting was adjourned by President Robert Helms at 11:28 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Gribble

Robert B. Gribble, CFSP
Executive Director