

**TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS**

**MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING**

**MARCH 13, 2018**

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

Board members present: Charles Rahm, President; Jeff Duffer, Vice President; Mark Cochran, Robert Davis, Clark McKinney, and Robert Shackelford, III.

Board Member(s) absent: Dennis Bridges

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

---

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA:**

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to approve the Agenda as printed.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

---

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion was made by Robert Shackelford to approve the Minutes of the January 9, 2018 Board Meeting.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

---

**LEGAL REPORT:**

**ANTHONY GLANDORF, CHIEF COUNSEL AND  
CHERRELLE HOOPER, 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.: 2017069391 – Establishment**

The spouse of the decedent filed a complaint stating that the funeral establishment failed to change the death certificate to reflect that her husband was pregnant at the time of his death. The funeral establishment responded to the complaint and indicated its intent to work to satisfy the complainant's request. No additional information has been provided to the Board office.

**Recommendation:**

- Close. The portion of the death certificate that relates to pregnancy is not completed by the funeral establishment and/or the funeral director.

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

Seconded by Mark Cochran

Adopted by voice vote

---

**2. Case No.: 2017072281 – Establishment**

Complainant alleges a number of errors were committed by the funeral home in connection with her mother's funeral services. She alleges the following:

1. Interior of casket was not inscribed with the word "Mother".
  - a. Respondent indicates complainant never informed him of her final decision on the cap panel.
2. The afghan was not inscribed and did not have the pictures on it as requested.
  - a. Respondent indicates that the afghan was a gift from the establishment and it was at no charge. Complainant was not pleased with the outcome and respondent believed this was due to trying to fit so many pictures on the afghan. Respondent re-ordered the afghan, but complainant was still not pleased with the product.
3. Obituary had misspelled names and listed the incorrect age of the deceased.
  - a. Respondent indicates complainant was informed of the deadline for placement of the obituary. When complainant missed the deadline provided by the respondent, the respondent had to call the complainant the next day and obtain the information over the

- phone. Respondent states complainant was not sure how to spell several names, but requested that the information be included as she dictated. Complainant acknowledged to respondent that she missed the deadline because of family and friends coming to her home to visit.
4. Program had errors such as incorrect font and did not use the pictures that were requested.
    - a. Respondent indicates that the family was late providing the information to them. The night before the funeral at around 11:00 p.m., complainant emailed edits to the program along with approximately 25 additional photographs that she wanted to be placed in the program. Respondent printed the eight page program free of charge for the family.
  5. Driver arrived late to transport family to the funeral services.
    - a. Respondent indicates that the driver was late because complainant requested an additional limousine at the last minute. Respondent offered to have the first limousine arrive in time to take the first group to the church, but complainant wanted to wait on the second limousine so the family would arrive together.
  6. Video quality was poor and unprofessional.
    - a. Respondent indicates that complainant was made aware that the funeral home needed the photographs, but the funeral home still had not received them by the time of the viewing. Because of time constraints, the photos were emailed from complainant's cell phone to the funeral home, so the quality was poor. Because complainant was not satisfied with the video, the respondent made a second video. Respondent did not charge complainant for either video.
  7. There were no flowers on her mother's casket at the wake.
    - a. Respondent indicates this was agreed upon because complainant wanted the flowers to appear fresh for the funeral. The flowers were on the casket for the funeral.
  8. The death certificate was filed late.
    - a. Respondent states this was because of the new VRISM program that had just been implemented by the Department of Health as well as the doctor's delay in signing the document. Evidence confirms that within 20 days of death, respondent followed up with the doctor on the status and shortly thereafter the death certificate was filed.
  9. The statement of goods and services selected was amended after execution to include several additional charges.

- a. Respondent indicates that the family was made aware that some of the cash advances would be added to the funeral bill as the charges were incurred. These amounts were for the musician, the obituary newspaper notice, and cemetery charges which added approximately \$1,100.00 to the bill. No additional charges were added for funeral services or merchandise. Respondent further indicates that because complainant was so upset, he decided to write off the amount of \$1623.09 for a funeral that cost a total of \$8,123.09.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

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

Seconded by Mark Cochran

Adopted by voice vote

---

**3. Case No.: 2017072921 – Establishment**

This complaint was filed by a casket supplier due to a funeral establishment's failure to pay for goods received. The alleged outstanding balance is \$21,241.60. Respondent indicates that the failure to pay was caused by a sudden physical disability lasting for months. Following the owner's hospitalization, the decision was made to close the establishment; the owner remains unable to work. Respondent has offered on two occasions to return the unused items, which he indicates are still sealed in the box to the casket supplier. However, respondent alleges that complainant would not accept them back because they were special order items.

**Recommendation:**

- Close with a Letter of Warning.

A motion was made by Mark Cochran to Close the complaint with a Letter of Warning and that the owner execute a proper closure form and file with the Board Office within thirty (30) days provided the decision remains to close the establishment.

Seconded by Robert Shackelford

Adopted by voice vote

---

**4. Case No.: 2017073821 – Establishment**

Complainant alleges there was a dispute related to the cremation of her husband's remains. She alleges that the location manager yelled at her in connection with this dispute. Respondent advises that the deceased was found unresponsive on the couch and later pronounced dead. The physician of record would not sign the cremation permit or death certificate because he had not seen the patient in the past two years. Complainant was upset because the process was not moving as quick as she anticipated. Six days following the death of her husband, she called the funeral establishment to let them know she was upset and that she wanted an autopsy completed. The medical examiner refused to perform an autopsy and stated that complainant would need to obtain a private autopsy. Sixteen days following the death of the deceased, complainant called to find out if the cremation had been performed, and the funeral establishment responded that the cremation could not be performed until the autopsy was done. This upset the complainant, and she requested that her husband's remains be released to another funeral home. This request was honored and complainant received a full refund of \$5,411.08 the same day. Respondent indicates the request for an autopsy stopped the cremation.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

A motion was made by Robert Shackelford to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by voice vote

---

**5. Case No.: 2017075031 – Establishment**

The executor of an estate contacted a funeral establishment by phone for a copy of the death certificate approximately six weeks after his grandmother's funeral. The executor alleges that the county health department did not have a copy of the death certificate because it was not yet in their system. The funeral establishment admits it refused to provide the executor with a copy of the death certificate. It states that the executor is not the legal next of kin (does not have the right of disposition), and he is estranged from the family such that he was not at the funeral. The executorship is being challenged by the deceased's children.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

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

Seconded by Robert Davis

Adopted by voice vote

---

**6. Case No.: 2017075871 – Establishment**

A complaint was filed by an individual regarding two grave sites that her mother allegedly owned. Her mother is buried in one of the spots, and the other spot was empty. The funeral establishment recently buried another individual in the second grave spot. Complainant submitted a copy of a document purporting to show the sale of the two grave sites to her mother. Assuming the transfer/sale is valid, it was the result of a contract between two private individuals. Neither the funeral establishment nor cemetery company was involved in the transaction. The funeral establishment's response indicates that the gravesite at issue appears to have been transferred/sold twice by the same individual who may suffer from early stage dementia. A determination will need to be made by a court of competent jurisdiction as to the legal owner of the grave site at issue and any appropriate remedy.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

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

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

---

**7. Case No.: 2017078291 – Establishment**

Complainant alleges she just wanted a basic cremation package for her brother, but the body was not cremated for approximately three weeks without explanation. Also, complainant alleges that the body was embalmed without her

consent. Complainant alleges that respondent did not return phone calls and forced her to deal with an unlicensed individual at the establishment.

Respondent alleges that another family member (niece) authorized the embalming and served as the point of contact. This family member signed a document indicating she had the right of disposition before the complainant ever contacted the establishment, which is evidenced by the documentation. Respondent alleges that the unlicensed individual handled the removal and handled some phone calls, but never met with any individuals to make arrangements. Respondent and the unlicensed employee indicate that the complainant was very difficult to deal with – it is alleged she would engage in behaviors such as yelling and proclaiming that she was a prophet each time she came to the establishment.

The medical examiner's office indicates that the funeral home was incorrectly informed of the treating physician's identity. Approximately two weeks after the death, the medical records of the deceased were received, which showed the correct treating physician. This physician submitted the signed cremation permit approximately one week after being contacted. The medical examiner's office indicates that the delay in approving the cremation was due to waiting on the proper physician to sign the cremation request form.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

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

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

---

**8. Case No.: 2017078311 – Unlicensed Individual**

Complainant alleges she just wanted a basic cremation package for her brother, but the body was not cremated for approximately three weeks without explanation. Also, complainant alleges that the body was embalmed without her consent. Complainant alleges that respondent did not return phone calls and forced her to deal with an unlicensed individual at the establishment.

Respondent alleges that another family member (niece) authorized the embalming and served as the point of contact. This family member signed a document indicating she had the right of disposition before the complainant ever contacted the establishment, which is evidenced by the documentation.

Respondent alleges that the unlicensed individual handled the removal and handled some phone calls, but never met with any individuals to make arrangements. Respondent and the unlicensed employee indicate that the complainant was very difficult to deal with – it is alleged she would engage in behaviors such as yelling and proclaiming that she was a prophet each time she came to the establishment.

The medical examiner's office indicates that the funeral home was incorrectly informed of the treating physician's identity. Approximately two weeks after the death, the medical records of the deceased were received, which showed the correct treating physician. This physician submitted the signed cremation permit approximately one week after being contacted. The medical examiner's office indicates that the delay in approving the cremation was due to waiting on the proper physician to sign the cremation request form.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

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

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

---

**9. Case No.: 2017078881 – Establishment**

Complainant states she was charged for an obituary that did not run on time, which resulted in less than 50 people attending the funeral service on November 25, 2017. Complainant also states she was charged \$150 for facility viewing, but the body was not ready until hours after the viewing was over. Complainant states she was charged for unnecessary items such as \$400 for a limousine and complains of the program charges, which were \$250 for 200 programs. She further avers that she was not charged for any death certificates, which will now cost her much more to order individually. The contract shows that the limousine

charge for the amount of \$400 was approved by the complainant as well as the charge for the programs.

The establishment indicates that it verbally agreed to prepare the body prior to getting a written contract. The decedent passed away on November 18, 2017. Complainant had an appointment on November 22, 2017, at 8:30 a.m., which was the day before Thanksgiving. She did not arrive until 4:30 p.m. without providing any advance notice that she would be late. Complainant chose a casket that was not in inventory and was advised that there could be a problem with timely delivery on the Friday following Thanksgiving. Complainant ordered the casket despite warnings.

Respondent states that the clothes were not provided to the establishment until 3:30 a.m. on Friday, November 24, 2017. The embalmer came to the establishment around 2:00 a.m. to embalm the decedent. He could not finish preparing her until the clothes arrived and wanted to do so to make sure the family could view her as soon as possible once the casket arrived. The casket arrived around 1:00 p.m. The decedent was promptly made ready for viewing, but complainant did not arrive until 3:30 p.m. for the scheduled 1:00 p.m. viewing. She gave verbal permission at 2:00 p.m. to begin the visitation and demanded an additional hour past closing to stay with the decedent.

Respondent states that upon making arrangements on the afternoon of November 22, 2017, complainant was provided with a schedule of the holiday deadlines for The Tennessean, which specifically stated that obituaries would not be accepted on Thanksgiving Day, which was the following day. The establishment states that the complainant refused to purchase the death certificates for \$15.00 and stated she has a classmate who works in the Office of Vital Records that could get it faster. Respondent provided us with a copy of the deadlines provided by The Tennessean, which show that the deadline for publication from November 22-24 was November 21 at 2 p.m. CST. The obituary office was scheduled to be closed on November 22 beginning at 5:00 p.m. central standard time and on Thanksgiving Day. Nevertheless, information was provided to show the obituary was published on November 24, 2017, followed by a more detailed version on November 25, 2017.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

A motion was made by Mark Cochran to accept the Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Robert Davis

Adopted by voice vote

---

**10. Case No.: 2017080221 – Establishment**

A complaint was internally opened upon inspection due to the Respondent funeral home failing to renew its license within the requisite time period. The Respondent was unlicensed from November 1 – November 13, 2017 and completed one funeral service during this unlicensed period. Respondent replied indicating they had difficulty attempting to renew through the online module and indicate they emailed Board staff during this period indicating such.

**Recommendation:**

- Close with a Letter of Warning.

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

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

---

**11. Case No.: 2017082151 – Establishment**

A complaint was internally opened after an inspection of the Respondent's funeral establishment. The inspector found the following deficiencies:

- The Respondent did not have a Casket Price List available for review. The Respondent was given an opportunity to find one but could not during the inspection.
- A review of the General Price List found that there was a discrepancy regarding the "B" services in that it did not agree with the beginning price for caskets shown on the GPL Range of prices. Immediate Burial offering "B" lists price of \$3,300.00 for Immediate Burial (\$2,800.00) to include within the price a New Point Brown or Triton Grey 20 gauge casket. The price of \$3,300.00 minus \$2,800.00 (for services listed as included in Immediate Burial) equals \$500.00 for the casket. The GPL lists the beginning price for caskets as \$1,450.00; therefore the pricing structure is not in agreement.

- Direct Cremation offering “B” does not agree with the price for a “cardboard container” (alternative container). The Direct Cremation listing shows a price of \$995.00 for services included within the Direct Cremation required listing. Offering “B” lists a price of \$1,300.00 for Direct Cremation with cardboard container. This is a price difference of \$305.00. (\$1,300.00 minus \$995.00 = \$305.00). However, the price listed on the GPL for a Cardboard Container is \$105.00. The two prices are not in agreement.

**Recommendation:**

- Authorization for a formal hearing. Authorize a consent order in an amount of Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$750.00) for the three violations listed above to be settled by Consent Order.

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

Seconded by Robert Shackelford

Adopted by voice vote

---

**12. Case No.: 2018000091 – Establishment**

Complainant alleged that Respondent funeral home failed to complete a death certificate. Respondent was the initial funeral home that received the remains from the VA Medical Center in Murfreesboro. Soon after, the deceased family asked that the remains be released to a second funeral home. The Board staff contacted the Vital Records Section at the Department of Health and found that the physician does not yet use an electronic signature for signing the death certificate. In mid-January, Board office received notification that the death certificate was signed and available. Board staff immediately communicated this to the Complainant. The Respondent was not found to be responsible for the delay in the processing of the death certificate.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

A motion was made by Mark Cochran to accept the Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Robert Davis

Adopted by voice vote

---

**13. Case No.: 2018000151 – Establishment**

Complainant states that his mother passed away in November 2017 and was buried soon after. The family representative was complainant's sister and she signed the Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected. Complainant was present at the time the services were made. Complainant states that he was made aware, after the funeral, of a will that supposedly indicated he would be the co-executor of the estate. The complainant alleged that he requested a meeting with the respondent to review all documents including a life insurance policy he had questions about in relation to the actual cost of the services rendered by the funeral establishment. Complainant stated that respondent funeral home would not contact or meet with him regarding this matter. Respondent replied indicating that it did not have copies of any further life insurance policies other than one Guardian Life Insurance policy which they provided a copy of with a copy of the Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected signed by the sister. Respondent stated that it had responded to the complainant at least three times, that his sister handled the funeral matters, and that complainant had threatened the establishment. A document signed by the sister states that the funeral establishment does not have a copy of the will or any other insurance documents other than those given to them by the deceased mother in 2012.

This office never received a copy of a will. It is uncertain as to whether any of the parties have a will. The Respondent states the complainant never stated he had a copy of a will, only that he was made aware of a will. There is not sufficient information to show that the respondent is in violation of any duty as to the treatment of customers or relatives of the deceased.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure.

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

Seconded by Mark Cochran

Adopted by voice vote

---

**14. Case No.: 201800131 – Establishment**

Complainant alleged that Respondent failed to make payment on a contractual obligation to an embalmer. Respondent disputes the contracted amount.

**Recommendation:**

- Authorization for a Formal Hearing. Authorize a consent order for \$250 to be reduced to a Letter of Warning if Respondent provides documentation reflecting total payment of the charges by the complainant within 30 days.

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

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**  
**ROBERT B. GRIBBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:**

**SB1517\*/HB1611** Funeral Directors and Embalmers –  
Sunset Laws - As enacted, extends the board of funeral directors and embalmers for six years to June 30, 2024. - Amends TCA Title 4, Chapter 29 and Title 62, Chapter 5, Part 2.

**Public Chapter 500**

**SB2046/HB1979\*** Funeral Directors and Embalmers –  
As introduced, extends registration period for apprentice funeral directors, apprentice embalmers, and mortuary school students, from two to three years, or until the registrant has completed the apprenticeship requirements, whichever occurs first. - Amends TCA Section 62-5-312.

**SB2458\*/HB2537** Professions and Occupations –  
Professions and Occupations - As introduced, establishes apprenticeship programs for professions regulated by entities administratively attached to the division of professional regulatory boards. - Amends TCA Title 62, Chapter 76, Part 2.

**SB1876\*/HB2305** Taxes, Sales –  
Taxes, Sales - As introduced, exempts sales of caskets from sales and use tax. - Amends TCA Title 67, Chapter 6, Part 3.

**SB1948/HB1891\*** Preneed Funeral Trusts

Trusts - As introduced, authorizes a trustee to establish a single trust fund for all pre-need funeral contracts issued by multiple pre-need sellers, instead of having to establish a trust fund for each pre-need seller. - Amends TCA Title 62, Chapter 5, Part 4.

**SB2091/HB1889\*** Preneed Funeral Contracts

Funeral Directors and Embalmers - As introduced, lessens the amount of time that a seller of a pre-need funeral contract has to retain records concerning the pre-need funeral contract and information relating to the sale from five years after the death of the beneficiary to three years. - Amends TCA Title 62, Chapter 5, Part 4.

**SB1973\*/HB2179** Preneed Funeral Contracts

Insurance Companies, Agents, Brokers, Policies - As introduced, provides that a contract between a purchaser of a pre-need funeral contract and a travel protection service provider is not a contract of insurance. - Amends TCA Title 56 and Title 62, Chapter 5, Part 4.

**Website for Legislative Bill Searches:**

<http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/billsearch/BillSearchAdvanced.aspx>

**LICENSEE REPORT:**

**REPORT OF LICENSES ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE  
DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO BOARD AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD OF  
JANUARY 9, 2018 – MARCH 12, 2018**

<b><u>Establishment(s)</u></b>	<b><u>Type of Action(s)/Change(s)</u></b>
Cremation Care of Tennessee, LLC Union City, TN	New Establishment
Gibson Funeral Home Gibson, TN	Change of Ownership
Johnson & Coleman Funeral Home Gallatin, TN	Change of Ownership
Medina Funeral Home and Cremation Service Medina, TN	Change of Ownership
Serenity Funeral Home Springfield, TN	Change of Ownership
The Cremation Center Medina, TN	Change of Ownership

TLC Mortuary Services, LLC  
Greenbrier, TN

Change of Location

**Individual(s)**

**Type of License(s)**

James Garrett Byrd  
White Bluff, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Brittany Elise Dennis  
Gainesboro, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Ashlee Jean Gordon  
Taft, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Christina Nicole Hosley  
Clarksville, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Chad Scott Keel  
Hermitage, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Joshua Lawrence Kidd  
Harriman, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Leonard Houston Kirkland  
Madisonville, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Allyson Michelle Ledford  
Nashville, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Margaret Elizabeth Lusk  
Newland, NC

Funeral Director and Embalmer  
Reciprocity – North Carolina

Brian Michael Van Heck  
Nashville, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer  
Reciprocity – Michigan and  
North Carolina

Eugene Newton Burroughs  
Bristol, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer  
Reapplication

Anastasia Marie Davis  
Memphis, TN

Funeral Director

Brittney Michelle Owens  
Lake City, TN

Funeral Director

Emily Nicole Burnett

Funeral Director

West Memphis, AR

Reciprocity – Arkansas

**CLOSED ESTABLISHMENTS:**

No funeral establishments have reported closing since the last board meeting.

**DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT:**

**These are Consent Orders that have been administratively accepted / approved by the Executive Director pursuant to Board authority and as reported on the December 2017 and January 2018 Regulatory Boards Disciplinary Action Reports:**

Respondent: N. J. Ford & Sons Funeral Home, Memphis, TN  
Violation: Aiding and abetting an unlicensed person to practice within the funeral establishment  
Action: \$500 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Farrar Funeral Home, Dandridge, TN  
Violation: Engaging in deceptive acts or practices  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Smith-Reagan Funeral Home, Rutledge, TN  
Violation: Charged a consumer more for a casket than the price listed on the Casket Price List; failure to maintain a copy of the current license of the crematory utilized by the establishment; discrepancies on the General Price List and Casket Price List  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Tullahoma Funeral Home, Tullahoma, TN  
Violation: Engaging in deceptive acts or practices  
Action: \$1,000 Civil Penalty

Respondent: R. Bernard Funeral Services, Memphis, TN  
Violation: False or misleading advertising; failed to have a current copy of the results of the last regularly scheduled inspection of the crematory used by the funeral establishment  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Signature Funeral Home by Premier, Memphis, TN  
Violation: Engaging in misleading, deceptive or unfair acts or practices  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Nashville Funeral and Cremation, Nashville, TN

Violation: Funeral establishment failed to include an itemized price list on its advertisements  
 Action: \$750 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Tavarán D. Ridley, Nashville, TN  
 Violation: Failure to disclose a previous conviction of a felony or crime involving moral turpitude to an application for apprentice funeral director and apprentice embalmer registrations  
 Action: Revocation of registrations and no credit for time served as an apprentice

**OPEN COMPLAINT REPORT:**

As of March 13, 2018 there were 80 open complaints.

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

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

**RULEMAKING:**

The Board reviewed the latest draft of the rules that it has been working on at multiple public meetings over the past several months.

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to adopt the rules as drafted.

Seconded by Mark Cochran

<b>Roll Call Vote</b>			
<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Dennis Bridges</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>Mark Cochran</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Robert Davis</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Jeff Duffer</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Clark McKinney</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Charles Rahm</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Robert Shackelford, III</b>	<b>X</b>		

Adopted by Roll Call Vote

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to allow Cherrelle Hooper, Assistant General Counsel, to set a rulemaking hearing date as soon as practicable.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

<b>Roll Call Vote</b>			
<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Dennis Bridges</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>Mark Cochran</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Robert Davis</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Jeff Duffer</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Clark McKinney</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Charles Rahm</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Robert Shackelford, III</b>	<b>X</b>		

Adopted by Roll Call Vote

**INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION(S):**

**Jackson Nave Hunter**  
**Watertown, TN**

**Embalmer**

Clark McKinney recused himself from participation in this matter.

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

**ADJOURN:**

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to adjourn.

Seconded by Jeff Duffer

Adopted by voice vote

The meeting was adjourned by President Charles Rahm at 10:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert B. Gribble*

Robert B. Gribble, CFSP  
Executive Director