

**CEMETERY SYSTEM BOARD OF TRUSTEES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL 8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2012
3:30 P.M.**

<u>Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance</u> <u>2/2012 through 1/2013</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ruddy, Chair	A	0	1
Patricia Hayes, Vice Chair	P	1	0
Damon Adams	P	1	0
Larry Ott	P	1	0
Jonathan Pearson	A	0	1
Dolores Sallette	P	1	0
John Sykes	P	1	0
Susan Telli	P	1	0
Mark Van Rees	P	1	0
Jimmy Witherspoon	A	0	1

City Staff

Julius Delisio, Cemetery Board Liaison
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Lisa Slagle, Parks and Recreation
Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary

Guests

John Banas, Carriage Services
Trevor Jackson, Carriage Services
Kim Krause, SunTrust Bank

Communication to the City Commission

None

The meeting was called to order 3:30 pm and it was determined a quorum was present.

1. Minutes Approval

A. January 2012 Meeting

[This item was discussed out of order]

Motion made by Mr. Adams, seconded by Ms. Salette, to approve the minutes of the Board's January 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

2. New Business

A. City Ordinance No. C-09-05, Quorum Requirement

The Board currently has ten members, so six members constitute a quorum.

B. Sun Trust Bank/Trust Quarterly Review

Ms. Krause referred to the portfolio composition, and stated cash that had built up due to capital gains, and the cash had been reallocated to balance the portfolio. They had added a Pimco Foreign Bond fund and a large-cap index fund.

Ms. Krause drew the Board's attention to the portfolio performance, and stated in February the portfolio was up 2.24%; in three months it was up 6.72% and since the inception date it was up 4.3%. The current market value of the portfolio was \$20.8 million.

Board members and guests introduced themselves in turn.

C. Approval of Bronze Markers

Mr. Delisio explained that a City ordinance provided rules and regulations regarding monuments, and part of these regulations was the stipulation that the Board would approve all monuments. He said the concern was with monuments installed by outside vendors in Lauderdale Memorial and Sunset. Per City ordinance, everyone must pay for perpetual care that covered markers in the cemetery. Mr. Delisio stated anyone was free to purchase monuments from outside vendors, provided the monuments fit the standards in the rules and regulations.

Mr. Delisio produced a typical example of a cast bronze memorial that met the standards and explained that the metal composition of bronze could vary very slightly, but the main concern was that the memorials would last in perpetuity.

Mr. Delisio said a question had arisen regarding painted markers, and distributed a brochure showing these products. He explained that the painted memorials were cast bronze slabs and included photographic elements painted on the bronze. Mr. Delisio said the usual cast bronze had a painted finish that eventually wore off, and the bronze developed a patina.

Mr. Delisio said a few of these painted markers had been installed at Sunset after applications had been submitted stating they were made of bronze. The monuments were bronze, but had painted pictures instead of cast or etched images and they were guaranteed for only 15 years. Mr. Delisio said the question was whether they wanted to permit these painted markers.

Mr. Banas said fewer than 10 of this type of marker had been installed. Mr. Delisio said the markers had been approved as bronze markers. He stated there was not a question about the bronze, but about the finished product. He drew the Board's

attention to one example in which nothing was cast on top of the bronze slab. When the paint eroded away, even the deceased's name would be gone.

Mr. Delisio stated the issue was that once the painted images were gone, the families might assume that the cemetery was responsible for returning the monument to its original state under perpetual care. He said this would not be possible, since the cemetery had not ordered the original monument.

Gina Hankerson, Angelic Monument Company, said this was a personal choice for the families. She asked for proof that the monument would degrade after 15 years. Mr. Delisio said this it was implicit in the product warranty; it did not have a lifetime warranty. Ms. Hayes stated the monuments would be there in perpetuity and people purchasing these monuments were grieving and not looking 15 years in the future. Ms. Hankerson said the families were grieving, but they were still capable of making a decision. She stated there were several all-bronze monuments in Sunset that had corroded.

Mr. Delisio said every outside provider had completed an application for every marker they had installed. Mr. Van Rees said he would like to see physical proof that there were inferior bronze markers installed in Sunset as Ms. Hankerson had alleged. He remarked that the painted markers were not suitable for cemeteries in South Florida, but he thought they would look wonderful on a crypt front.

Ms. Hankerson stated on November 30, 2010, she had gone through the procedures and applied for one of these markers and it had been approved, so she had continued to sell them. She said a problem had arisen when Mr. Banas had asked her about the markers.

Mr. Spence requested the discussion return to the agenda item. He said the agenda item applied to bronze markers, not one product from a particular company.

Ms. Telli referred to the ordinance that contained rules for the cemeteries and stated they must adhere to the ordinance. She suggested Ms. Hankerson could come back at a later date and make a presentation regarding the painted markers.

Ms. Sallette felt they might need to review the ordinance and invite vendors to make presentations. She added that most people wanted to know if their monument would be intact after 20 or 30 years.

Mr. Delisio said the markers had been approved for their bronze content. He said they must address the fact that the markers were not etched but painted. Mr. Van Rees pointed out that the ordinance specified that all marker manufacturers must be approved, and he did not believe Tri-Guard had been approved. The ordinance also stated that markers must be "similar to those markers previously installed..." Mr. Van

Rees said while the existing painted markers may have been approved, they did not comply with the ordinance. He pointed out the painted markers did not match in uniformity with existing bronze markers.

Motion made by Ms. Telli to invite different vendors to make a presentation to the Board in the future regarding this new type of monument. [Later withdrawn]

Mr. Spence pointed out that Carriage operated under rules set by the Board. Carriage did not have discretion to allow new products that had not yet been approved. Mr. Spence said vendors had expanded their product lines to include products that had not been anticipated and the installations had been approved based on the manufacturer, even though the new product did not meet the intent of the existing rules. Ms. Hayes agreed that the monuments had probably been approved based on their bronze content, but the paint was an addition to the bronze.

Ms. Hankerson asked who would tell the families to whom she had already sold these markers that they were not permitted. She said she had three customers who had ordered these and were awaiting proofs.

Mr. Delisio said when looking at the photo of the proposed monument with the application, it was not possible to tell, nor was it indicated, that the images would be painted, not etched or cast.

Ms. Hankerson asked who the families could appeal to who could override the Board's decision. Ms. Sallette suggested allowing the three markers Ms. Hankerson said had been ordered and that all future marker requests be presented to the Board.

Ms. Telli withdrew her previous motion.

Motion made by Ms. Sallette, seconded by Ms. Telli to approve the three pending markers and to state that all future requests for markers should be presented to the Board.

Ms. Hayes felt they should see the markers that had already been ordered before approving them. Mr. Sykes felt approving them without seeing them would be "righting a wrong with a wrong." He noted that Ms. Hankerson had not been denied any application yet and she should come back before the Board when an application was denied. Ms. Hankerson stated she had one application that had already been approved and three for which she had proofs but had not been submitted for approval. Ms. Hayes said the Board would not approve the three markers for which applications had not yet been submitted.

Mr. Delisio instructed Ms. Hankerson that per the rules and regulations the protocol for resolving an issue, Cemetery Manager, City Department, City Manager, Cemetery Board and then the City Commission.

Ms. Hankerson said this product had been installed in a Davie Cemetery; Southern Memorial; Forest Lawn Central and Sunset Memorial as well as others. She stated no cemetery had denied her application for this type of monument.

Mr. Banas said he would not approve any future applications for this type of marker because they did not conform to the rules and regulations.

D. Cemetery Space Availability

Mr. Delisio referred to a Sun-Sentinel article cautioning about the imminent scarcity of cemetery space in Fort Lauderdale City cemeteries. He explained that none of the existing cemeteries could be expanded because of the surrounding properties so if they wished to expand they would need to find new property. Mr. Delisio did not believe they could use Perpetual Care Funds since it is for the Cemeteries currently operating. Funding for the purchase of additional land would be the issue. Ms. Hayes said this was not a Board decision; the City Commission must approve the purchase of land.

E. Quarterly Maintenance Reimbursement

Mr. Delisio explained that the amount of interest and dividends exceeded the quarterly reimbursement. He stated because of the way the money was invested, they took larger hits twice per year. Mr. Adams suggested staying within the fiscal year instead of the calendar year.

Motion made by Mr. Adams, seconded by Mr. Van Rees, to operate on a fiscal year basis from now on. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Van Rees, seconded by Mr. Sykes, to approve the quarterly maintenance reimbursement. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

F. General Price List – Annual Review

Mr. Delisio reminded the Board that the prices had not increased the previous year. In this proposal, a resident's price would increase \$75 and a non-resident's price would increase \$100. Mr. Sykes noted that prices for veterans were increasing disproportionately with the \$100 increase because their prices were lower. Mr. Delisio explained that veterans still paid less than anyone else.

Mr. Van Rees pointed out that Interment Services prices would be same every day of the week. Mr. Banas explained that their competition was doing this so they were trying to stay competitive. They had adjusted staffing to accommodate the need.

Motion made by Mr. Adams, seconded by Mr. Van Rees to approve the General Price List. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

G. Capital Project Updates

Mr. Banas gave a Power Point presentation describing the capital improvement projects.

Mr. Banas stated they had allocated \$10,000 at the Lauderdale Cemetery to develop the Jewish section but the conversation with Mr. Levy had completely stopped. He wished to use that \$10,000 to create a garden in section 8 for burial spaces and cremation spaces. He showed a drawing of the proposed garden area. Mr. Banas estimated this would cost a total of \$70,000 and said Carriage would make up the difference.

Motion made by Ms. Telli, seconded by Ms. Sallette, to approve the use of the \$10,000 previously set aside to develop the Jewish section to create the Garden 8 project. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Banas said he also wanted to use \$5,000 originally set aside for trash cans to install security cameras.

Motion made by Mr. Sykes, seconded by Mr. Van Rees, to use the \$5,000 originally set aside for trash cans to install security cameras. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

H. City Commission Action Items

None.

Other Discussion Items

This item was heard out of order.

Mr. Delisio said there were currently 1,400 vases missing in the cemeteries. He noted that vase thefts were not covered by perpetual care. Mr. Delisio said they were considering two options: covers for the vase holes or temporary plastic vases.

Mr. Delisio said the Cemetery would purchase the plastic vases to improve the aesthetics of the markers and give the family a vase to use until they decided to replace the stolen bronze one. He agreed to bring in a sample of the plastic vases to the Board's next meeting. Mr. Delisio assured the Board that the plastic vases looked very similar to the bronze ones and were very sturdy.

Mr. Delisio reported the Sunset fence request would be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board on March 21 at 6:30 and invited Board members to attend the meeting to speak in support of the project.

3. Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.

The Board's next meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2012.

[Minutes prepared by: J. Opperlee, Prototype Inc.]