

Washington State Funeral and Cemetery Advisory Board meeting transcript

May 25, 2023

Rick Little (00:00:02):

...the Washington State Funeral and Cemetery Board. The time is now 9:00 AM on Thursday, May 25th, 2023. And I'm calling this special board meeting to order. We will be providing an opportunity for public comment later in this meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage everyone to mute their mics or your phones if you called in when you're not speaking, to reduce the background noise when others are speaking. Also for board members to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when you're making comments. Thank you. Item two, roll call. Susan, could you please call roll?

Susan (00:00:47):

Yeah. Chair Little.

Rick Little (00:00:50):

Yes, I'm here. This Rick.

Susan (00:00:52):

Vice Chair Itner?

David Itner (00:00:55):

Present.

Susan (00:00:56):

Board member Cameron?

P. Cameron (00:01:01):

This is P, I'm here.

Susan (00:01:03):

Board member Gutierrez Zamora.

Dante (00:01:06):

This is Dante, and I'm here.

Susan (00:01:09):

Board member Lesorde.

Constance (00:01:11):

This is Constance and present.

Susan (00:01:14):

Board member Smock.

Cameron Smock (00:01:17):

This is the other Cameron. And I'm present

Susan (00:01:20):

And board member Ward.

Angie Ward (00:01:23):

This is Angie. I'm present.

Susan (00:01:25):

Thank you.

Rick Little (00:01:27):

Okay, thank you. We've all received your agenda. Okay. Item four, approval of minutes. Minutes from February 23rd, 2022.

Sidney (00:01:43):

Mr. Chair?

Rick Little (00:01:44):

Yes.

Sidney (00:01:45):

This is Sydney.

Rick Little (00:01:46):

Oh, sorry.

Sidney (00:01:46):

But before we move on from the agenda, staff would like to request that we pull item 7.12-

Rick Little (00:01:55):

Yes.

Sidney (00:01:55):

...as that item is not ready to be considered, we found an administrative glitch on the backside and we want to get that squared away before board action. And then we would also request that the board consider moving item 5.1 until after item eight so that we can get through all of the cases that the board has to discuss and that item can be adjusted for time as needed.

Rick Little (00:02:19):

Okay. We don't need a motion, do we?

Cameron Smock (00:02:26):

I move that we approve the amended agenda.

Susan (00:02:30):

Okay.

Dante (00:02:30):

This is Dante. I second.

Rick Little (00:02:32):

This has been moved and seconded. Any other questions? All those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:02:39):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:02:44):

Opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, thank you. Sorry about that. All right. Item four, approval of minutes from February 23rd, 2022.

Pete (00:03:00):

This is Pete. I move that we accept the minutes as presented.

Rick Little (00:03:04):

Okay. Do we have a-

David Itner (00:03:06):

This is Dave, I second.

Rick Little (00:03:07):

Okay. Is there any questions at all? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:03:15):

Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:03:19):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. All right. Let's move on to item 5.2 of the International Conference of Funeral Servicing and Examining Boards Conference Report. I would refer to Dante to give that report.

Dante (00:03:41):

Sure. This is Dante. So we met in Chandler, Arizona. The meeting days were March 1st and the 2nd for those that haven't been, this was my first time. It was pretty eyeopening that we had board members and regulators from all over the place. From Washington DC, Arizona. We had place people from all sorts of different places. Also, quite a few educators, people involved in funeral service education. There was a lot of programs presented and you could attend every... Most of them were for the whole groups of them, you were breakout by your role or by your district?

(00:04:34):

Probably the one that stood out to me the most was on the second day, one of the regulators from Michigan had a presentation called Babies in the Ceiling and it didn't disappoint. And kind of a real good example of what happens when business or a facility just goes down the drain without anybody supervising. For those people that don't that want to sunset boards and sunset regulations and people looking over this, that was a nice nightmare scenario that was happening in Detroit. That was my 2 cents. I know Pete and Rick were there as well. Anything from you guys?

Rick Little (00:05:23):

Anything Pete you'd like to add?

Pete (00:05:27):

No, I would just concur with everything that Dante said. I think this is my eighth year going to the conference and you'll always learn something new. It is always good to hear what other states are going through as new regulations come up. I know we took questions about natural organic reduction as always from a lot of folks and it's good to make those connections and have those relationships with the leadership of the conference. As the administrators of our board exams here in Washington, it's always good to be on a personal level with those folks and really enjoyed the trip. And Dante, I'm glad you went.

Rick Little (00:06:11):

Yeah.

Dante (00:06:11):

Sure. Enjoyed it.

Rick Little (00:06:13):

Very good event. Thank you for the report. We got item number six under new business. This is the time when we elect officers for this coming year. And at this time I'd like to open the floor for nominations for chair for this coming year.

Pete (00:06:38):

Mr. Chairman, this is Pete and I would like to nominate Mr. David Itner for chair of the Washington State Field Cemetery Board for the upcoming term.

Rick Little (00:06:48):

Okay. Do we have a second?

Cameron Smock (00:06:51):

This is Cameron Smock. I second.

Rick Little (00:06:54):

Okay. Is there any other nominations that would like to be presented for chair of the board? Okay, if not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:07:12):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye

Rick Little (00:07:15):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Congratulations David. Now we need the need a motion for vice chair.

Cameron Smock (00:07:28):

Mr. Chair, this is Cameron Smock and I would like to nominate Dante Gutierrez Zamora for the vice chair position.

Rick Little (00:07:36):

Okay, thank you. Cameron, do we have a second?

Pete (00:07:42):

This is Pete and I'll second.

Rick Little (00:07:44):

Okay, thank you. Do we have any other nominations that would like to be presented at this time? Okay, if not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:08:01):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:08:06):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Congratulations Dante.

Dante (00:08:14):

Thank you.

Rick Little (00:08:15):

Good team. [inaudible 00:08:16]. Item 6.2, a consideration of an intern license extension request. Gracie, do we have anything to talk about with that?

Gracie (00:08:44):

I don't know if this is a request that was brought to Pam regarding an intern license that she'd already done the five years and is now going into a funeral service education program and needs that intern license in order to obtain licensure and is requesting to have to have the ability to have her intern license again. So there's a letter from the intern and her sponsor that you guys had to review and you're able to make that decision on whether to extend that license out to her.

Cameron Smock (00:09:28):

Mr. Chair this is Cameron, I have two questions.

Rick Little (00:09:31):

Yes.

Cameron Smock (00:09:33):

And one is maybe more historical and that is, have there been situations in the past that anyone is aware of in which we've granted exceptions or extensions? And then the second question is specific to her request, is there a length of time that she's specifically asking for to complete her educational requirements?

Rick Little (00:09:59):

I have not heard since even pre-COVID if we've extended any interns because I believe we've stuck to the rule and that's why we are having these separate meetings just to see if that's something that's still doable or we need to look at other options. So I guess this, unless someone else knows different, I think this is the first time that we're actually looking at this. I don't know if there's anybody, there's probably other people that have requested extensions in the past but I think the board's staff would know that more. This is the first time that we've actually, as the board are considering this, unless someone else can chime up here.

Cameron Smock (00:11:04):

Am going to second. Go ahead Pam.

Pam (00:11:08):

This is Pam. Sorry I lost the meeting for a minute. Sorry about that. And so maybe this has already been addressed. I don't recall any other instances but in the wax you do have the authority to make exceptions to the internship. But she is needing to do the online, she has a little child and cannot go to in person. So one of the requirements for the online is that the person is a registered intern embalmer so they can do their labs. So I believe that she just needs it long enough to get through her year of school at the college.

Rick Little (00:12:09):

Okay.

Cameron Smock (00:12:10):

Thank you Pam. So this relates to some topics we'll be discussing a little bit later in terms of trying to find qualified licensed staff, it clearly sounds like she's committed to the profession, she's been involved in the state associations, her employer has indicated how important she is to his firm and funeral service. So I would certainly support the request and make a motion to approve the extension. I don't know if we need to do it for a defined period of time or leave it open-ended, but I move that we approve.

David Itner (00:13:10):

I'll second that motion.

Rick Little (00:13:14):

Cameron made the motion and who did the second, was that David?

David Itner (00:13:19):

Yeah.

Rick Little (00:13:19):

Okay. So moved and seconded. Do we have any other discussion? My question would be, we may just of course, have it end when she's done with the schooling, but I don't know how long she has... I don't remember how long she has left if it's stated in her schooling.

Cameron Smock (00:13:42):

Well, this is Cameron. Pam suggested a year. I think we should give her a reasonable period of time but I would say we shouldn't do it open-ended. So five years from now we're still dealing with this issue. So I would maybe give her if it's reasonable to give her a two year extension?

Rick Little (00:14:04):

Sure. Okay. I think that's fair. And this will open things up for other individuals in the future that would want to look into extending their internship. So we just need to be mindful to take each one as an individual case and circumstances. So until we look into other options in the future. So is there any other comments at all? If not all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:14:44):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:14:47):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, let's go ahead and complaint cases for review. I will turn this over to future chair to preside over the first one cause this is my case so.

David Itner (00:15:15):

All right. Thank you Chairman Little. First case for review is case number 2020-04-0197-00FDE. Mr. Little.

Rick Little (00:15:28):

All right. The complainant stated that the funeral home took two months to complete her mother's cremation, then sent the cremator remains in the wrong urn. The facts are, arrangements were made to have cremated remains of the decedent shipped to another state due to the delay of the signing of the death certificate. The family asked to have the cremated remains shipped a week to 10 days later since they were going to be out of town. The funeral director then took the cremated remains to the funeral home care center to have them mailed the cremated remains with the death certificates.

(00:16:09):

The next of kin called three weeks later wondering if the cremated remains were lost, which prompted the funeral director to make sure that they were mailed but neglected to place the cremated remains in the urn purchased. The next of kin did not feel comfortable having the urn mailed separately, which left the funeral director unsure what to do. The complainant has received a refund check and a corrected urn from the funeral home. And I recommend that this case be closed with a letter of education to ensure that this does not occur again. And I have previewed the letter of education that would be sent out.

David Itner (00:16:55):

All right, thank you Mr. Little. Is there a motion to that effect?

Cameron Smock (00:17:03):

This is Cameron. I make the motion.

David Itner (00:17:05):

All right. Motion by Cameron. Is there a second?

Dante (00:17:10):

Dante, I'll second.

David Itner (00:17:12):

I heard Dante there. All right. Any discussion, comments, questions? All right, all in favor say aye.

Board members (00:17:27):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

David Itner (00:17:30):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? All right, the motion passes. And I turn it back over to Mr. Little.

Rick Little (00:17:43):

Okay, thank you. And 7.2. Mr. Cameron.

P. Cameron (00:17:54):

This is case number 2020-01-0009-00FDE. The complainant alleges that the respondent funeral home of using bait and switch tactics by using referrals from an unlicensed foreign language speaking funeral director representing herself as currently working at a funeral home that actually closed in 2016. Complainant also alleges that respondent funeral home sent a person who is not a licensed funeral director or licensed intern to the residence to make the funeral arrangements. No general price list was presented as required and that the initial quoted price of \$600 had jumped the \$2,400.

(00:18:40):

The facts are three year old girl passed away at a local hospital and the social worker called a Spanish-speaking funeral home listed on the internet. The location had closed three years prior, but the woman who answered identified herself as a funeral director, quoted a price and the family agreed. An unlicensed staff member from respondent funeral home then showed up at the family residence to make the arrangements with the initial Spanish-speaking woman acting as an interpreter over the

phone. The family was confused why a second funeral home was involved and why they were told and were told that they didn't have any other option.

(00:19:18):

Respondent's staff failed to provide a general price list and an itemized statement of goods and services as required. After being told the initial quote by the first funeral home's representative of \$600 for both funeral home and cemetery charges had jumped to \$2,400 for respondent funeral home charges only without cemetery costs. The family became upset and they felt they were being taken advantage of. Eventually the respondent funeral home reduced their charges to \$1,360 and the services were carried out. During the investigation, respondent funeral home staff told investigative staff that their firm as well as others do take referrals from this currently unlicensed funeral director. Normally these findings would rise to the level of some sort of formal action or sanction be levied against this funeral establishment license. But the respondent funeral home has been closed and their establishment license revoked. So I recommend closing this case with a letter of education.

Rick Little (00:20:18):

Okay, thank you. Pete, do we have a motion to that?

Cameron Smock (00:20:26):

This is Cameron and I make the motion.

Rick Little (00:20:29):

Okay. Do we have a second?

David Itner (00:20:34):

Dave, I'll second.

Rick Little (00:20:35):

Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Is there any other discussion on this? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:20:45):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:20:50):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, let's move on to 7.3. Mr Smock.

Cameron Smock (00:21:03):

This is in regards to case number 2022-10-1520-00FDE. The complaint summary. The complainant alleges that the respondent funeral director continued to sell graves at a city owned cemetery after

being told not to conduct cemetery business and that the respondent funeral director failed to update records for cemetery transactions which resulted in problems for the city's cemetery in the community of the cemetery is located in. Facts of the case. When the complainant contacted the funeral home where the respondent funeral director works, the funeral home owner took immediate steps to make sure that the respondent funeral director ceased selling graves at the city owned cemetery and further agreed to work with the city to verify the accuracy of the cemetery records on file at the funeral home where the respondent funeral director works.

(00:22:08):

In a follow-up conversation with the complainant, they indicated that there have not been any new problems since the actions of the funeral home were taken in response to the complaint and that the plan on completing a full audit to ensure the cemetery records are accurate. Recommendations since the facts indicate that the concerns from the original complaint have been addressed. I recommend that this case be closed with no further action.

Rick Little (00:22:39):

Okay. Thank you. Do we have a motion?

Dante (00:22:39):

This is Dante. So moved.

Rick Little (00:22:39):

Thank you Dante. Do we have a second

Pete (00:22:39):

This Pete, I'll second.

Rick Little (00:22:39):

Okay. So moved and seconded. Are there any questions? Not-

Pete (00:22:39):

Just one. This is, this is Pete. Do we know if any families or burials were affected by this or was this caught before any services were carried out by the cemetery?

Cameron Smock (00:22:39):

To my knowledge, there was no adverse impact on any burials or arrangements.

Pete (00:22:39):

Okay. Thank you.

Rick Little (00:22:39):

Okay. Any other questions? If not all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:22:39):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:22:39):

Opposed? Any abstentions? All right. Item 7.4, Mr. Smock

Cameron Smock (00:22:39):

Now, this is in regards to case number 2022-03-0374-00FDE. The complaint summary. The complainant alleges that the respondent funeral home released her portion of the cremated remains of her father to a relative without the complainant's permission and that she had to "fight" to get her father's ashes. Facts of the case, the deceased had six surviving children and the cremated remains were divided into six equal portions. The respondent funeral home tried to contact the complainant to schedule the release of her portion but was unable to speak with her. The respondent funeral home then contacted the person who completed the arrangements on behalf of the family and released the portion intended for the complainant. When the complainant contacted the respondent funeral home two months after the original arrangements were completed, the respondent funeral home explained the situation and offered to contact the person who received the remains.

(00:22:39):

The respondent funeral home contacted the person who completed the arrangements and that person returned the complainant's portion to the respondent funeral home. The respondent funeral home in turn contacted the complainant and arranged to have the cremated remains mailed to her. My recommendation, while the respondent funeral home should have made more than one attempt to contact the complainant to schedule the release of her portion of her father's cremated remains, as soon as the complainant contacted the respondent funeral home, they acted promptly to correct the situation. Contrary to the complainant's statement, she did not have to fight to get her father's ashes. Therefore, I recommend this case be closed with no further action.

Rick Little (00:22:43):

Thank you. Do we have a motion

David Itner (00:26:00):

This is Dave. So move.

Rick Little (00:26:07):

What's that? Sorry.

David Itner (00:26:09):

This is Dave, I... The recommendation, oh, sorry. This is Dave, I move that we except the recommendation. Just having mic issues here.

Rick Little (00:26:24):

Do we have a second?

Connie (00:26:26):

This is Connie. I second it.

Rick Little (00:26:32):

Okay. It's been moved to seconded. Are there any other discussions on this? Yes. If not all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:26:40):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:26:47):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Well, I'm going to be really glad when we meet live in the future. Okay. Item 7.5. Mr. Cameron.

P. Cameron (00:27:09):

This is regarding case number 2023-02-0213-00CEM. The complainant alleges that respondent's cemetery has her grandmother's date of death listed incorrectly and that they are intentionally lying to her about it. The facts are that the complainant states that she remembers attending her grandmother's funeral in burial sometime in either 1965 or 1966. Respondent's cemetery lists the date of death as April 12th, 1970 and has a burial contract signed by the decedent's son. The decedent's son also signed the outside servicing funeral home contract on April 13th, 1970. Respondent's cemetery records indicate no other person by that name is buried there and a separate internet search revealed no other results for any other cemetery in that city or area. As the complainant offered no proof or evidence to back up her accusation other than what she claims to remember. I can find no violation of rule or law and recommended this case be closed with no further action.

Rick Little (00:28:24):

Thank you. Do we have a motion?

Cameron Smock (00:28:28):

This is Cameron, so move.

Dante (00:28:29):

Dante, so move.

Cameron Smock (00:28:31):

Second.

Rick Little (00:28:34):

Okay, it's moved by Dante, seconded by Cameron. Is there any other discussion on this? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:28:44):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:28:48):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. To note. Item 7.6. Mr. Cameron.

P. Cameron (00:29:04):

This is complaint case number 2023-01-0035-00FDE. The complaint summary is an anonymous complaint was filed with the board accusing respondent funeral director of having multiple character and personality flaws and issues including lack of empathy and professionalism, harassing families online, being exploitive and sensational and unfit to lead or run a business. The facts are that the complaint received was filled with personal opinions and feelings of the complainant with no specific proof or evidence to back up their accusations. And as such on its own, the complaint does not fall under the purview of the board. However, during the course of the investigation it was discovered that the respondent had reached out directly and publicly to a family being already served by another funeral home and asked them to call her instead, which constitutes solicitation.

(00:30:08):

Respondent also had a picture of a casket on her website for sale that was taken within a competitor's funeral home which constitutes false advertising. That picture has since been removed. Therefore, I'm recommending a letter of education be drafted by the board staff and delivered to the respondent field director to acknowledge and ensure she understands the reasoning and purpose behind RCW 1829 410 regarding solicitation and RCW 18235 130 regarding false advertising so that these violations do not happen again. I'm recommending that this be closed with the letter of education, that letter has been drafted up and reviewed by me and it's ready to go.

Rick Little (00:30:54):

Okay, thank you. Do we have a motion?

Cameron Smock (00:31:01):

This is Cameron, so move.

Rick Little (00:31:03):

Do we have a second?

David Itner (00:31:07):

Second. This is Dave.

Rick Little (00:31:08):

Okay. A motion by Cameron, seconded by Dave. Do we have any other discussion? If not all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:31:22):

Aye. Aye. Aye Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:31:22):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Item 7.7. Mr. Gutierrez Zamora.

Dante (00:31:35):

Very good. This one will be case number 2022-12-1782-00FDE. The summary. The complainant filed the complaint with the board after applying for internment of cremated remains for her father who died and was cremated in 1997. Arlington National Cemetery was requesting a cremation ID tag number and a certificate of cremation. The respondent acquired the crematory where the cremation took place after 1997 and records from that area were damaged and destroyed in storage. As per the board investigation, there was not a requirement in 1997 for cremation ID tags for cremation. Initially the respondent was unable or unwilling to assist the complainant in resolving this matter. The facts though, after the complaint was filed with follow through from the board investigator, the respondent provided a detailed response regarding the change of ownership and why they did not have a cremation number. The complainant sent that response to the Arlington National Cemetery and the cemetery was able to approve the complainant's father for internment. So because of the happy ending there, I'm recommending that this case be closed with no further action.

Rick Little (00:33:01):

Okay. Do we have a motion?

Pete (00:33:01):

This is Pete, so move.

Rick Little (00:33:11):

Okay. Do we have a second?

Cameron Smock (00:33:16):

This is Cameron. I will second.

Rick Little (00:33:18):

Okay. Moved and seconded. Do we have any questions? If not all of those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:33:27):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:33:32):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Thank you. Item 7.8 Mrs Desord.

Connie (00:33:44):

This is Connie and this is case number 2022-12-1756-00FDE. And the complainant summary is, the complainant filed a complaint that the funeral home dropped the remains while making the residence removal. The complainant was also upset at the funeral home because they would not allow viewing prior to the disposition. And the facts were found that the respondent stated that the complainant fabricated this complaint. The staircase was cluttered and difficult to maneuver. The first call person at the head of the backboard sat down on the stairs with a backboard on his knees to get a better grip on the backboard while going down the stairs. Regarding not being able to view before the disposition was done, this was made by a person that was not the person that had the right to control per RCW 68.50.160 and I found that no laws have been broken, so my recommendations are to close with no further action.

Rick Little (00:35:00):

Okay. Thank you. Do we have a motion?

Dante (00:35:04):

This is Dante. I'll move that.

Rick Little (00:35:07):

Do we have a second?

Pete (00:35:08):

This is Pete. I'll second.

Rick Little (00:35:09):

Okay, then moved and second it. Do we have any questions at all?

Cameron Smock (00:35:20):

Yeah, this is Cameron. Connie, just the last sentence in your facts throws me a little bit. So regarding not being able to view before the disposition was done, this was made by a person that was not the person

that had the right to control disposition. Did the person with the right to control disposition decide that there was not going to be any viewing?

Connie (00:35:45):

I'd have to look back on my notes, but I believe that's what the original plan was for this decedent by the person with the right to control. But I could look back for you if you wish for me to do that.

Cameron Smock (00:36:03):

No, that's fine. Like I said, I was a little confused by the wording there if it was [inaudible 00:36:13]

Pam (00:36:15):

This is Pam. I can verify Cameron, the person with the right to control disposition did not allow viewing by the complainant.

Cameron Smock (00:36:30):

Perfect. Thank you Pam. Okay. And thank you Connie.

Connie (00:36:33):

Yeah, thank you Pam.

Rick Little (00:36:36):

Okay. Great discussion. Any other questions at all? Okay. If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:36:45):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:36:50):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. All right. Item 7.9. Mr. Cameron.

P. Cameron (00:37:03):

This is in regarding case number 2023-03-0362-00CEM. And the complainant father alleges that respondent cemetery will not allow the disinterment and release of his deceased son's cremated remains to him without a court order. The facts are that the decedent's son's mother and stepfather purchased a plot in respondent cemetery in 1994 with a total of three rights of internment for it. Stepfather passed away, was cremated and was placed in 1994 with the mother signing the cemetery contract. The son passed away, was cremated and was placed in 2003, again with only the mother signing the cemetery contract. Mother passed away, was cremated and was placed in 2018 and a different son signed the cemetery contract.

(00:38:09):

What complicates this issue is that the complainant did not pay for the plot nor for any of the three placements that are in it. So he has no claim as an heir at law to the space. Also, the deceased son shares the same last name as the stepfather and mother and only the mother signed for placement of the son. The complainant was not involved in any of it, which may indicate some prior family situation or issues before the death occurred. The respondent's cemetery rules and regulations state "No disinterment shall be made except upon court order or by cemetery employees with the consent of the cemetery management upon the written consent of the lot owner, the surviving spouse, or if none, then all members of the immediate family." This falls in line with RCW 68.50.020 and if the cemetery authority believes that the situation is complex enough to ask for a court order to proceed, then they are within their legal rights to do so. Therefore, I can find no violation of rule or law and recommend this case be closed with no further action.

Rick Little (00:39:20):

Okay. Thank you. Pete, do we have a motion to this?

Cameron Smock (00:39:28):

This is Cameron, so move.

Rick Little (00:39:29):

Move a motion. Do we have a second? Again? Do we have a second?

Dante (00:39:43):

This is Dante. I'll go ahead and second.

Rick Little (00:39:46):

Okay. Moved and seconded. Do we have any discussion on this?

Dante (00:39:51):

Just one brief question. Was there anything in the report or anything that you have, Pam, that would've shown that the young man or son was adopted by the stepdad and that's why the name was different or did it get that deep as far as the investigation?

Pam (00:40:09):

I didn't address that question with the complainant.

Dante (00:40:14):

Okay.

Rick Little (00:40:17):

Okay. Any other questions? If not all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:40:26):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:40:30):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Item 7.10. Mr. Itner.

David Itner (00:40:47):

Thank you Mr. Little. This is case number 2023-03-0300-00CEM The complainant sent a complaint to the Department of Licensing on February 17th, 2023 alleging poor customer service at the respondent location. The complainant and his brother went to the cemetery to visit their father's grave in June of 2022. Cemetery staff had a difficult time locating the grave and were reluctant to provide cemetery records regarding their father's grave. The complainant then attempted to communicate with the cemetery through certified mail and telephone calls, but the cemetery failed to respond. The investigator received a telephone call from the complainant on December 30th, 2022, requesting assistance in obtaining a copy of the burial records for his father who died in 1974 and was buried at the respondent location. The complainant requested the information directly from the cemetery but could not get the information. The investigator contacted the respondent location and received a copy of the burial records on January 5th, 2023. The Department of Licensing received two complaints against the respondent in 2023 that appeared to be customer service issues where cemetery staff refused to provide information about burials.

(00:41:55):

The investigator contacted the respondent to discuss the cemetery's policies regarding burial information and asked about the refusal to provide information about burials by staff to consumers who have a relationship to a decedent. The respondent said the company policy allows staff to only share burial information with the purchaser or their legal next of kin. Regarding the specific complaint, the respondent general manager said she thought the family service staff had been working with him to provide the information he requested. Respondent said it was difficult to understand the nature of the complainant's complaint.

(00:42:28):

The complainant expressed frustration that the information he requested of the cemetery was not provided as readily as the Department of Licensing was able to obtain it from the cemetery. The respondent's written response to the complaint dated March 18th, 2023 indicated the family service manager had provided information to the complaint complainant in August of 2022. A copy of the family service manager's letter was included with the complaint, which indicated some information was provided via letter a couple of months after the complainant's visit to the cemetery. I'm recommending that we close with a letter of education given suggested violation of RCW 18.235.130 unprofessional conduct.

Rick Little (00:43:14):

Okay. Do we have a motion?

Cameron Smock (00:43:20):

This is Cameron, I move.

Rick Little (00:43:21):

Okay. Do we have a second?

Pete (00:43:26):

This is Pete. I'll second.

Rick Little (00:43:29):

Okay. Moved and seconded. Are there any further questions? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:43:39):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:43:43):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Items 7.11. Mr. Itner.

David Itner (00:43:57):

Thank you Mr. Little. This is case number 2023-01-0061-00CEM. Complaint summary is as follows. The complainant filed a complaint with the Funeral and Cemetery Board on January 26th, 2023 alleging the respondent refuses to provide information regarding interment rights owned by a decedent. The complainant has the cremated remains of the decedent along with the cremated remains of the decedent's son. The complainant has the deeds for two grave locations and was upset to find someone else buried in the grave she claims was intended for the decedent. The facts are as follows. The complainant is the decedent's son's half-sister and is not related to the decedent directly. Before his own passing, the decedent's son asked the complainant to take his and the decedent's cremated remains to the respondent's cemetery location for burial and the graves owned by the decedent.

(00:44:50):

The complainant made a trip across the country to the respondent location in April of 2021 with the purpose of burying the cremated remains of the decedent and the decedent's son, her half brother. Respondent staff showed the complainant the location of the two graves owned by the decedent and the complainant was shocked to find someone buried in the decedent's grave. The complainant asked for additional information to explain why this person, the decedent's brother, was buried in the grave but the respondent refused to provide additional information.

(00:45:17):

Respondent's cemetery staff did not recognize the complainant as having authorization to bury the decedent and the decedent's son in the remaining graves owned by the decedent, which was a double

depth grave. The respondent's records have information that would've helped explain the decedent's brother's burial in the decedent's grave, but staff did not provide the information to the complainant. Respondent's cemetery staff also refused to provide information from the records that indicate grave number four, the double depth, was intended for the burial of the decedent and her son. Complainant left the cemetery without being able to follow through with the burial on the cremated remains.

(00:45:53):

In the written response to the complainant, the respondent indicated that the person having the right to authorize burial of decedents in this in son's cremated remains is the decedent's grandson. The respondent also provided the cemetery records concerning both graves owned by the decedent. In the records at the respondent location, it did indicate a pre-arrangement and in terms of the decedent and the decedent's son being placed in their spaces. And so I recommend again based on the suggested violation of RCW 68. 5160 and 18.235.130, we send a letter of education to the respondent.

Rick Little (00:46:42):

Okay. Do we have a motion?

Cameron Smock (00:46:48):

This is Cameron. I move.

Rick Little (00:46:50):

Do we have a second?

Pete (00:46:50):

This is Pete. I'll second.

Rick Little (00:46:57):

Has been moved and seconded. Do we have any further questions? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:47:07):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:47:10):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Item 7.13, 13. Mrs Desord.

Connie (00:47:25):

This is Connie and this is case number 2022-12-1757-00FDE. And the complainant's summary is, the complainant claims that the respondent that is the operator of a funeral home and cemetery are incompetent, untrustworthy and lack managerial experience to continue servicing a prearrangement funeral contracts to purchasers, beneficiaries or the public. The complainant also stated that the

respondent sites past criminal convictions against the respondent along with claims of demonstrated moral to purdue by the respondent. But the facts were found that the case is in an active court proceeding, the courts need to decide on the allegations made by the complainant and it is not appropriate for the board to decide on this case. I recommend closing this case with the letter of education.

Rick Little (00:48:33):

Okay. Do we have a motion?

Dante (00:48:38):

This is Dante. I'll go ahead and move that.

Rick Little (00:48:39):

Do we have a second?

Pete (00:48:45):

This is Pete. I'll second.

Rick Little (00:48:49):

Thank you. Do we have any questions at all?

Cameron Smock (00:48:54):

I guess-

Pete (00:48:55):

This- go ahead Cameron.

Cameron Smock (00:48:58):

No, you go ahead.

Pete (00:49:04):

This is Pete. Just wondering if after the active court case is settled, will that letter of recommendation also include the option of reopening this complaint or investigation further depending on the outcome of the court case?

Connie (00:49:20):

This is Connie. Pam, can you help with that question?

Pam (00:49:25):

Yes. So actually the court case involves a struggle between family. This is a family owned business and the owner of the business died. And this is a squabble between the children of the deceased, former owner of the cemetery. And so the court is hearing all kinds of allegations to try to determine who can operate these businesses. So yeah, I don't know if there would be anything in the outcome that would be under the board's authority.

Cameron Smock (00:50:25):

So this is Cameron. So Pam, it sounds to me like the legal proceeding isn't specific to this complaint, but-

Pam (00:50:36):

No.

Cameron Smock (00:50:37):

Okay.

Pam (00:50:38):

No, and the past criminal activity is more than 10 years old and the person that did the criminal activity has served time and has done everything that was required of him.

Rick Little (00:51:09):

Okay. Any other questions? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Board members (00:51:17):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (00:51:23):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, thank you. Item 8. We'll go to 8.1.

Pete (00:51:45):

Mr. Chair, this is Pete. I am going to announce that I have a conflict of interest due to private employment in this case and I'm going to recuse myself from all discussion and consideration and voting on this.

Rick Little (00:52:01):

Okay, thank you, Pete. I will turn this over to the AG.

Nick Kehos (00:52:15):

Good morning members of the board. This is Nick Kehos, assistant Attorney General. This is an agreed order that is being presented to the board this morning involving the noted matter. And I don't have a

lot to add here, I believe that this has been signed by all parties other than the board. It is an agreed order that came forward. Frankly, without even settlement discussions, the funeral establishment has indicated that they would like to take accountability here and signed off on this agreed order. And so it is being presented for the board's consideration.

Rick Little (00:52:59):

Do we have any other... The situation here is it was agreed to before it was presented to the board. And just to acknowledge that. So what we need to do is have a motion to accept the agreed order.

Dante (00:53:21):

This is Dante. I'll go ahead and move that we accept this agreed order.

Rick Little (00:53:27):

And do we have a second?

Cameron Smock (00:53:32):

This is Cameron. I second it but I have a question.

Rick Little (00:53:36):

Yes, please. Let's continue on with some questions. Thank you for doing the motion and seconding this. Go ahead Cameron.

Cameron Smock (00:53:45):

Yes. Robert's rules of order serves a functional purpose.

Rick Little (00:53:49):

Yes.

Cameron Smock (00:53:53):

So in the agreed order, the one thing that I don't see that normally we see in agreed order is some sort of impact on the establishment license. It's usually either suspended or the suspension has stayed for a period of time. And I don't see any reference to the funeral establishment license. Was that not considered? Because if my memory is correct, that's generally also part of an agreed order.

Nick Kehos (00:54:32):

And I'd be happy to answer that. I don't believe that that was ever recommended in this particular case. There was a, at no point once our office involved that was not included in the recommendations for the statement of charges and that's when we proceeded to an agreement. It was not part of that agreement

Cameron Smock (00:55:00):

Okay.

Rick Little (00:55:02):

That was actually the case manager on this. And it just kind of the staff being new took it over after the initial conversation that I had.

Cameron Smock (00:55:24):

Just so I'm clear, was it our AAG representatives that drafted the order or was it drafted by the respondent and presented to us?

Nick Kehos (00:55:44):

This was drafted, essentially it was a combination of our office and the business and professions division of the Department of Licensing worked together on this putting it together.

Cameron Smock (00:56:02):

Thank you. I have no further questions.

Rick Little (00:56:04):

Okay.

David Itner (00:56:08):

This is Dave. Just a question with regards to process. Is there... I think my recollection is the process for these agreed orders has changed somewhat, given some adjustments with the agency. Can somebody speak briefly to how the process works at this point?

Nick Kehos (00:56:34):

And I'd be happy to answer that. I just wanted clarity, were you asking about the process of putting together the statement of charges, that whole process of how we got here from once the board had assigned this?

David Itner (00:56:48):

Yes.

Nick Kehos (00:56:50):

Sure, I can. So the way that I can say this particular case works and how it usually works is that our office works with the Department of Licensing to put together a statement of charges. We will usually start with somewhat of... We'll put together the statement of charges, our office reviews it, makes sure that we agree that it's well-supported and is ready to move forward. And once we have finalized that statement of charges, it is served on the respondent. They have 20 days to answer either contesting, agreeing, seeking settlement, and then we move forward from there. In this case, the respondent did

not contest and once I made contact with their attorney, it was made very clear that they did not wish to contest and in fact were willing to agree and to the recommendation, to essentially the facts and the recommendation. So that was the particular process here. And at that point then we worked on turning that statement of charges into an agreed order that could be presented to the board.

David Itner (00:58:03):

Thank you. So my understanding just the board's role is post in terms of producing the actual agreed upon order and then it's reviewed, approved by the board and then typically it's submitted then to the respondent. Is that correct?

Nick Kehos (00:58:28):

It just skipped the step here.

David Itner (00:58:30):

Yeah, I understand that. So historically, has the board been involved with the creation of the agreed order? I thought that was kind of the way that we had done it in the past, at least in a few cases that I was involved with. Not to say that that's the way it needs to be. I'm just trying to clarify.

Debra Allen (00:58:50):

Chair Little if I may.

Rick Little (00:58:51):

Yes, please.

Debra Allen (00:58:51):

This is Debra Allen. Bob, may I help provide a little clarity on this?

Rick Little (00:58:56):

Yes, thank you.

Debra Allen (00:58:57):

Okay, thank you. So great question. What has happened in the past is exactly how you outlined it, Mr. Itner. It was working with the board to come up with the statement of charges in the agreed order. In this case in particular, I think we had a misunderstanding of the process. We have new staff that have not worked with our boards in the past, and I think this is the first of the cases that we have put forward with formal charges since our restructuring in this past two years. And it's also post pandemic with the first case that's gone through similarly. So it was a misunderstanding of the process that did not include the board in the negotiation, the settlement agreement. So going forward that will not happen. It will be more of a collaborative, but it will not be the entire board, it will be with the case manager. And then

once that that draft is complete, then it will be presented to the board similarly to how we're proceeding today. Does that help clarify?

David Itner (01:00:14):

Yes. Thank you so much. Appreciate it.

Debra Allen (01:00:15):

Absolutely.

Rick Little (01:00:15):

Okay.

Cameron Smock (01:00:19):

Can I just have a follow-up to that? This is Cameron Smock.

Rick Little (01:00:23):

Yes.

Cameron Smock (01:00:25):

In the past when we've had legal proceedings and at the end of the legal proceedings, the board has in essence drafted the agreed order, will that also change? Will the board not have a role in those any further? Will it be the case manager and the attorney general's office or will that remain the same?

Nick Kehos (01:01:06):

And I believe that is the answer to that question is I believe probably somewhat up to the board as we are moving forward with Daisy, we would follow the process that the board wishes to follow. If the board would like to be involved, I think that would be up to the board's discretion.

Rick Little (01:01:26):

Yeah, we are a regulatory board, so I would strongly recommend that we are part of that discussion in the future.

Cameron Smock (01:01:42):

Yeah. The only thing I'll add is that again, with the legal proceedings, the board is, in essence the jury. And so they are hearing all of the testimony and considering any evidence that's presented. So I think the board does have a role to play in how the final legal documents are drafted.

Rick Little (01:02:16):

Okay. All right. So-

Angie Ward (01:02:22):

This is Angie. I have just one other question.

Rick Little (01:02:25):

Please.

Angie Ward (01:02:30):

So if we're saying that part of the cause of the, this not being handled the same as in the past was due to new staff, I just want to make sure that we have implemented, and maybe you covered this procedure that would allow for better understanding in the future by any staff that are new, as we know, reorganizations are quite common. And if that's what we're saying was a part of this misunderstanding, I just want to make sure that we've got something in policy and procedure that would prevent it from happening in future.

Debra Allen (01:03:14):

I can answer that Chair Little if you'd like.

Rick Little (01:03:18):

Go ahead.

Debra Allen (01:03:19):

Yes. Internally, that was just a misunderstanding of how the board process happens. There has been no changes to the delegated authority of this board or any of our boards. It really was just a misunderstanding of the process. Our other licensing units and our advisory boards and commissions don't have the same process as a regulatory board. So following that same process as we were going forward, unfortunately it was just a misunderstanding of how this process has proceeded. It will now we have been informed the unit will not be making those, it will be handled exactly the way it had been before. So the board will be involved working with our prosecuting attorney, our advising attorney, to make sure that we're drafting those up and then presenting them to the board for decision. Does that help answer it?

Angie Ward (01:04:25):

Yeah. Thank you.

Rick Little (01:04:26):

Okay.

Debra Allen (01:04:26):

Thank you.

Rick Little (01:04:30):

Any other discussion on this? All right. We'll need a motion to accept the agreed order.

Cameron Smock (01:04:36):

Point of order. It's already been moved and seconded.

Rick Little (01:04:38):

Okay. Sorry, we've had a lot of discussion. All right, then move, second, we had discussion. Sorry. All those in favor say aye.

Board members (01:04:51):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Rick Little (01:04:55):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Moving forward to 9. Reports. Turn this over to Sydney.

Sidney (01:05:18):

All right. So we do not have any committee or task force reports for this quarter. Unfortunately, the two committees that this board has set, we haven't been able to find a common time for either group to meet. So we are working on getting additional meetings scheduled for them. Susan, if you want to go to the complaint status. So as of April 14th, we have had 74 cases closed. One new intake, 11 that are under investigation, six that are in legal review, 25 that are in management review for a grand total of 117 cases. And on our licensee count this report we will be updating to include the natural organic reduction facilities and alkaline hydrolysis facilities for the next go around. But currently we have total of 229 cemetery facilities and 1,556 funeral facilities for a total of 1,785. And then we also have four natural organic reduction facilities in the state as well as one alkaline hydrolysis facility. And as I said that the report will be updated to include those before the next meeting.

Cameron Smock (01:06:49):

Sydney question?

Sidney (01:06:51):

Yeah.

Cameron Smock (01:06:54):

Given one of the things we're working on in terms of licensing requirements, et cetera, it'd be really nice to see a historical, I don't want to overwhelm you, but I'd be curious, especially under the funeral side, how these numbers compare with five years ago, specifically in terms of funeral directors embalmers. I'd be curious whether the number has changed dramatically, either increased or decreased. I don't know if it's possible to, I'm sure it's possible to call that data, but I'd be interested in seeing, like I said, a five

year comparative, just how those numbers may have changed over the last five years or five years ago and then today.

Sidney (01:07:50):

Okay. We can put that together.

Cameron Smock (01:07:51):

Thank you.

Sidney (01:07:59):

Absolutely. So before we jump into the action items with Susan, for our unit board commission and outreach support unit, I did want to provide an update. We are going to get to have an in-person meeting. The next meeting for this board on August 24th will be happening in person in Tumwater at the Capitol Events Center. So we will get more information out to the board as we have that available. But I did want to put that on your calendars and staff will be reaching out to those not located in the immediate Olympia area to start making travel arrangements and all of that. But wanted to get that on your calendar for everybody. We're very excited to get to meet everybody in person.

(01:08:50):

I also wanted to provide a very quick legislative update. After a quick start to the year, we ended up with only three bills that will impact this board. The biggest one being bill number 5261, changing the cemetery authority deadlines. So the expiration dates for cemetery certificates, pre-arrangement sale licenses, and crematory facilities will all move to March 31st. And the funeral director and embalmer licenses will now expire on January 31st. There was also an additional one that doesn't directly impact the board's work or the Department of Licensing, but I did want to make sure the board was aware of it because there is industry impact is the disposition of remains for indigent county residents.

(01:09:42):

And that is bill number 1100. And then one final one that will be impacting all of our boards and commissions was Bill 1009 and that is the military spouse bill, which is going to create additional mandatory training that will be coming to all of the boards later this year or early next year. So we'll be working that into our annual training process and providing additional support for active duty service members and in particular military spouses as they relocate to the state with their active duty service members, creating easier pathways to licensure for them and better reciprocity across the different states.

(01:10:33):

In addition to that, it's also created a military liaison position within the Department of Licensing that will be an additional resource for all of our businesses and professions. So as we have a clearer picture of what that position is going to look like, we will bring more information to the board and hopefully be able to present that person in the near future. So I'll put all of that in an email to all of you as well, and that way you all have the links and can see all of the legislative changes that happened this year.

(01:11:04):

And then one final update is we do have an active recruitment for a board member. We do have a term expiring this summer. Board member Lesorde has indicated that she will not be seeking an additional term with us, so we have already began advertising for her position. So if you know of anybody who you think would be a good fit or if you have any resources that you would like to share that recruitment out to please let us know and we'll work with you on getting that information out so that we can begin getting those applications in. And then I will let Susan cover the action items.

Susan (01:11:46):

So we have two items on the action item list for two of our committees. The review complaint process and delegation, and the licensing future task force committee. I've just recently been able to get everybody all pinned down for meetings, so hopefully we'll get to see some great progress.

Rick Little (01:12:11):

Okay. Thank you. Do we want to refer back to the board goals now? Is that, Sydney?

Sidney (01:12:21):

Yes.

Rick Little (01:12:22):

Okay. This is item 5.1

Sidney (01:12:27):

Over sharing. Okay. So as the board will remember previously, you will set top priorities of looking at licensing requirements, licensing future, and allowances and considerations for pet cemeteries. So before we moved on from that, I didn't know if there were any other priorities that the board wanted to focus on. I know these are three very large areas to undertake, but if there's anything that you all have seen coming up that you wanted to add to this list before we drill it down to those goals.

Rick Little (01:13:21):

Sounds like we're good. We can carry on.

Sidney (01:13:27):

Okay. All right. So pull that over here just so we have it handy. So looking at the goals to drill down on each of those, we do have the licensing future task force in place that is also looking at licensing requirements. I don't know if there are any additional goals that the board would like to drill down on those priorities for, or anything that you guys would like to see or if you want to see what comes out of that task force for now?

Rick Little (01:14:03):

I'd say once the task force meets again or first meet that we can update that this next meeting.

Sidney (01:14:21):

Okay.

David Itner (01:14:22):

Yeah, this is Dave. One thought that came to mind is as I was looking at the, or just thinking about the pet cemetery issue is, it would be interesting to understand, and I know that there's one locally, but active pet cemeteries that are in practice, in turn human remains, I think that would be a... I mean, that's something the task force could certainly discuss I guess. But just wondering if there's any sort of active record or process that may be able to find that information, because I think it's relevant to the importance of this board reviewing pet cemetery, pet human interments commingling.

Sidney (01:15:13):

Okay.

Rick Little (01:15:28):

Anything else?

David Itner (01:15:35):

I think adding to Cameron's point relative to the number of licensees over time, I think that's significant to the licensing future portion of our goals.

Sidney (01:15:57):

Okay. And we can bring that back at the next meeting.

Rick Little (01:15:59):

Okay.

Sidney (01:16:11):

Well, if there isn't anything else, I think that gives staff a good direction on the areas that the board wants to focus on over the next year and helps provide us with some direction as we bring these items back for all of you.

Rick Little (01:16:24):

Okay.

Sidney (01:16:29):

Okay, thank you.

Rick Little (01:16:34):

All righty. Okay. Public comments. The public may address the board on manners within the board's jurisdiction, either verbally during the meeting or by submitting written comments. The board is limited to directing staff to study the matter further or requesting that the matter be rescheduled or discussion and consideration at a later time. Members of the public who address the board verbally are limited to one three minute comment. In lieu of a verbal comment, individuals may submit their comment in writing at least two days prior to the meeting by emailing. Dolboards@dool.wa.gov. Written comments are limited to no more than 500 words and will be read by staff during this portion of the meeting. Do we have any public individuals here that would like to make a comment? Okay, let's move on to 11. And item 11.1, announcements.

Sidney (01:18:12):

And Chair Little?

Rick Little (01:18:13):

Yes.

Sidney (01:18:14):

I did have an announcement that I just wanted to put on the board's radar. We have had an application come in from an international applicant and because of where they're coming from and the translation to our educational requirements, it's not proving to be an easy one-to-one comparison. So we are looking into all of the different implications and the different avenues that we can take with this applicant and maybe bringing some recommendations to the licensing future task force as a result. But I did want to put it on the board's radar just in case an applicant or the applicant decided to reach out to you that staff is working on it behind the scenes.

Rick Little (01:18:58):

Okay. Thank you. Any other announcements? Item 11.2, request for future agenda items? Okay. 11.3, review of action items and items for next meeting.

Susan (01:19:29):

So the action items that I have got down are staff to work on the historical numbers for five years for the licensing count to show funeral directors and embalmers. And staff will send out information for the hybrid meeting and make travel arrangements. And staff will send out the legislative changes and updates in an email and the goals discussion for the licensing on the next agenda.

Rick Little (01:20:04):

Okay. Thank you. Before we get into the adjournment, I'd like to just congratulate David for becoming the incoming chair. It's just been doing it for a couple of years. I know Cameron's did it for a couple of years before me, or three years or however long it's been. And it'll be nice to actually get into a position where we can meet in person. Because I think that makes the meetings definitely more fulfilling and I

believe that's a lot better in person. And I also like to congratulate Dante for stepping up and becoming vice chair and I think he'll do a wonderful job. It's been a pleasure being part of a chair in the board. I've thoroughly enjoyed it. And I'll just sit back like Cameron in the future and be the board member. All right. Item 12. The time is now 10:21 and this meeting is adjourned. Just reminder, the next board meeting will be August 24th at nine o'clock in the morning. And then we talked about where that's going to be at the Tumwater area. So thank you again. Thank you

Susan (01:21:39):

Thank you everyone.