



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

APPROVED
CEMETERY SYSTEM BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINUTES OF MEETING
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL 8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2022 – 3:30 P.M.

Members	Attendance	Cumulative Attendance	
		03/2022 through 02/2023	
		Present	Absent
Richard Kurtz, Chair	P	1	0
Benjamin Dowers	A	0	1
Paul Gitnik	A	0	1
Chelsea Krebs	P	1	0
Fred Nesbitt	P	1	0
Mark Van Rees	P	1	0
Michael Watson	P	1	0
Pamela Beasley-Pittman	P	1	0
Patricia Zeiler, Vice Chair	A	0	1

City Staff

Stacy Spates, Parks and Recreation
Trevor Jackson, Parks and Recreation
D'Wayne Spence, City Attorney
Carla Blair, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Guests

Mark Binnion, Truist
Dylan Smith, Truist
Dennis Ulmer

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kurtz called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

Communication to the City Commission:

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Mr. Van Rees, to send a Communication to the Commission to endorse or support the addition of two Family Service Coordinators and one Administrative position to the cemetery system and that the recommendation be forwarded to the Director of Parks and Recreation. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

A. Roll Call

Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

B. City Ordinance No. C-09-05, Quorum Requirement (Discussion)

No discussion.

C. Nominations for the Election of Chair and Vice Chair (Nominations/Motion)

Chair Kurtz called for nominations for the election of Chair and Vice Chair.

Motion made by Ms. Beasley-Pittman, seconded by Mr. Nesbitt, to nominate Richard Kurtz as Chair. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously, (6-0)

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Ms. Beasley-Pittman, to nominate Patricia Zeiler as Vice Chair. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

2. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. Cemetery Master Plan Project Updates:

- Sunset Memorial Gardens Community Mausoleums (Discussion)

Ms. Spates advised she did not make it clear at the last meeting, but the RFP solicitation is out for three Community Garden Mausoleums; however, it had to be extended due to the fact no bids were received. The feedback is they do not have the resources and do not want to deal with the red tape of the bid solicitation. Public Works thought it was necessary to revise the requirements of someone not having experience in mausoleum development, but turnkey construction.

Mr. Nesbitt questioned how long the RFP was extended.

Ms. Spates did not know if the extension was due to a casualty of labor shortages, resources, etc. Public Works took it upon themselves to source about 15 more companies and there was no response.

- Cemetery Management Software (Discussion)

Ms. Spates reported there are still discussions with the vendor and IT is going to be the mediator and assist in determining whether the system will be fixed for functionality to deliver the system. Currently, this is being handled by IT and Parks Management. Their next meeting is March 30, 2022.

Dennis Ulmer commented in reviewing the minutes, he noticed discussion about staff, and he agreed, they need staff. They were supposed to get staff in the landscape budget.

Ms. Spates stated they have an Administrative Aide.

Mr. Ulmer suggested the Board recommend to the Director that they want staff. Usually, the Departments make a presentation to the Budget Advisory Board, and they should ask if part of their presentation could include something about the cemeteries since they are making a profit. Since a profit was mentioned and staff is needed, they might say yes.

Mr. Nesbitt commented three positions are needed.

Ms. Spates indicated she would like to have two Family Service Coordinators, three at each location. They go by appointments and calls from funeral homes come in on Monday and Tuesdays, it is overwhelming.

Mr. Nesbitt asked if they could make a motion to the City Commission.

Chair Kurtz replied yes.

B. Cemetery Investment Policy Review (Discussion/Motion)

Mark Binnion, and Dylan Smith, with Truist, were present.

Mr. Binnion provided a brief overview of the Investment Policy from January 21, 2021, as follows:

- Currently there is an allocation of Equity Stocks at 50% and the recommendation is to take 55%, which is +5%.
- Fixed Income is currently 50% and the recommendation is to make that number 44% and 1% Cash.
- The net effects on the Income level are about +3% because Equities are higher in income than the Fixed Income portion of the portfolio.
- The policy benchmark changes a little to reflect the recommendations.
- The S&P500 is 38%.
- Bonds are 50%.
- The recommendation is S&P500 going to 28%, which is Large Cap U.S., Dow Jones Selective Dividend, EFA 12%, and Bloomberg Barclay's Aggregate Bond Index, which is all the U.S. Bonds at 45%, which would be used as the policy benchmark if this was signed into effect.

Mr. Smith reviewed modeling with charts and showed what is called the Monte Carlo Analysis, which takes the Return and Risk profile.

- Based on the proposed 55% Equity/45% Fixed Income allocation recommended, it will run at 4.94% expected return over a ten-year period with a 9.44% risk of standard deviation over the ten-year period.
- They are looking to see the amount of risk they are taking on the return they are getting from the risk and if it is garnering or if it is taking care of the distributions paid out. Every year, they are taking about 2.5%, which is roughly equal to \$700,000, which is normally seen from the Cemetery Portfolio.
- There are five different lines; 90th percentile down to 10th percentile, and the one they want to pay attention to is the 50th percentile which can be looked at as the median.
- There would be a \$6 million appreciation over ten years for the 50th percentile and if they get up to the 90th percentile, it could be \$56 million.
- The recommendation is to go to 55% Equity, which are estimations.

Mr. Van Rees asked if the 55% is the average annual return for the next ten years going forward.

Mr. Binnion indicated the number is quite a bit lower than in the past. It is important to note that Capital Market Returns are about 6.5% to 7% and Fixed Income is about 2% to 5%. They are taking where they are starting now and moving out ten years.

Mr. Nesbitt mentioned the 1% Cash in the Investment Policy Statement.

Mr. Binnion stated that is target, but they have a 20% range. The ranges are flexible and if there is a lot of Cash coming in, they do not want to trigger events, so they put a fair leeway around that.

Mr. Nesbitt likes the idea of 55%/45% because they are taking a very small amount of additional risk, but the potential for a substantial gain. He thinks this is a good policy and that they should adopt it.

Mr. Binnion advised the way this is structured, there would be an addendum to the existing Investment Policy Statement, which would require a signature on the second page, and then they would sign and sent it back, at which time it would become effective.

Ms. Spates stated she would send it to Finance for review and then it would go to the City Commission.

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Ms. Beasley-Pittman, that the Asset Allocation for the Cemetery Trust Fund be 55% Equity and 45% Fixed Income. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Board Member Attendance Requires per Resolution No. 08-12.

D'Wayne Spence, City Attorney, referenced Page 7 of the packet, which is a copy of Resolution No. 08-12, focusing on Section 1 regarding attendance. Members absent for three consecutive meetings or for four or more regular meetings are considered unexcused absences and is an automatic resignation for that member. Reinstatement can be sought through the City Commission on the event these provisions are triggered. The way it is written it should go through the Chair or Board, who would then move it forward to the City Clerk's Office, who would forward it to the City Commission; however, in practice, it seems that members have gone directly to their nominating Commissioner and have been reinstated in that way as well.

In response to Chair Kurtz, City Attorney Spence stated there are no provisions listed in the Resolution, but in practice, they allow for excused absences in keeping with the Resolution regarding attendance via telephonic communication or extraordinary circumstances. He advised approval is through the Board with notice provided prior to the absence.

Ms. Spates commented that she has to comply, so when she sends a letter, it is not personal.

Chair Kurtz asked who should be notified if someone is seeking an excused absence.

City Attorney Spence clarified an absence itself would not be excused. If someone is going to be out and needs to attend a meeting remotely, a notification should be sent to the City Clerk's Office. If the absence is beyond this threshold, a request for a reinstatement would be made to the Board after the fact.

Ms. Krebs advised she would not be at the September meeting. She did not know if she would be able to attend the meeting remotely because she might be on an airplane.

City Attorney Spence directed Ms. Krebs to provide a notification to the City Clerk's Office and copy the Board Liaison regarding the date and time and submit it as a request to attend remotely.

In response to Ms. Spates, City Attorney Spence indicated telephonic participation must be agreed upon if there is failure to provide notice as the Resolution provides, then the circumstance must come to this body before the meeting to determine whether it is an emergency circumstance warranting remote attendance.

Ms. Beasley-Pittman clarified that a request for telephonic remotely is notification to the City Clerk and the Board Liaison. She questioned the timeframe the notification should be submitted.

Mr. Nesbitt understood the telephonic could only be done once per year.

City Attorney Spence stated that was incorrect, there are certain circumstances that are limited to once a year like business out of town, illness with no limitation, and other extraordinary circumstances. He advised that Resolution 20-214 provides that written notification from a Board or Committee member who will be absent from the meeting must be given to the City Clerk at least seven days prior to the meeting and included and posted on the Notice for the meeting. If an emergency makes it impossible to provide notice at least seven days prior to the meeting, written notice shall be provided to the City Clerk at least 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting and at the beginning of such meeting, the Board or Committee shall determine whether the event constitutes an emergency that allows the member to participate remotely. Emergency circumstances such as vacation and out of town for business purposes can be exercised once per year.

Ms. Krebs questioned when the Board must approve whether a request can be remotely approved.

City Attorney Spence advised the Board only needs to approve a request if notice is not provided seven days prior to the meeting. If a request did not meet the window, then the Board would have to approve the request at the beginning of the meeting and a physical quorum must be present for a member to attend remotely.

B. Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 13, 2022 (Discussion/Motion)

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, and seconded by Ms. Krebs, to approve the January 13, 2022 minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

C. Perpetual Care Trust Fund Investment Review/Truist Bank (Discussion)

Mark Binnion, and Dylan Smith, with Truist, were present.

Mr. Binnion provided a brief overview of the Markets Year to Date as follows:

- S&P500 are up 28%.
- Bonds are down.
- This year inflation picks up, and there is a combination of risk off in 2020, risk on in 2021, and the current risk off in 2022.
- Page 3 has an Activity Summary Markets have volatility.
- The biggest draw down last year was about 4% to 5% and Year to Date, they are about 24% depending on the Asset Class.
- Volatility has shown to be a feature of the Market.
- The average drawn down for average is about 14%, but after that, the Markets tend to be up six to 12 months from now.
- Inflation is a concern.
- Geopolitical risks are a large concern and that is what is moving the Market day to day.
- There was a loss on a withdrawal of about \$1.5 million at the end of the month, February 28, 2022, of \$31,872,688.
- The Portfolio composition favors U.S. Large Cap; they favor Equity in general over Fixed Income based upon interest rates.
- The ten-year Bond at the end of December was 1.5% and today it closed at 2%.
- Neutral has been 50% and they have been favorable towards Equity for a while.
- Their expectation for the next ten years is in the 6.5% to 7% range. Of that 54%, 36% is Large Cap, and about 7.5% International.
- The two International Equities do not own any direct Russian Equity exposure and the Equity ownership in one of the Russian Equity funds is 1.3% of 6.4%, which is a small amount.
- They have a meeting with Western Asset on March 18, 2022 and have sent them a list of questions.
- They have been at the owner end of the Fixed Income range for a while, 41%, and if Cash is included it is about 5.6% or \$28 million. This would most likely be brought down over time depending on Cashflow needs.
- The Bond portfolio has foreign Bonds.
- The focus is on high quality, investment grade, and higher than Index Yields.
- The portfolio Yield is 2.2% and the estimated annual income is \$706,000. In running numbers given in the new Investment Policy Statement, the estimated annual income could go up to \$724,000.
- The ten-year U.S. Bond is 2% Yielding, and the Dow Jones Select Dividend is 3.1%, so there is a good incremental increase in current Income and participation in the Equity Markets.
- Page 5; Investment Performance through February 28, 2022, has been a volatile timeframe.

- Over the one-year timeframe, a net of all fees 3.6% going out to inception 6.7% is a solid return.
- Dow Jones Select is up 1.12%.
- S&P500 is down 9.99%, a big outperformance.
- International Markets were about 7.5%.
- There is no direct ownership in Emerging Markets; they participate in Van Guard funds, which is one of the strongest over the last three years.
- Rates have come up on the Fixed Income side.
- Cash is a good place to be for the most recent timeframe.
- GDP is seen at about 4.4%, which is solid.
- The U.S. is expected to be between 3.5% and 4%. They are still gaining growth cycle, but it is being tampered by above average inflation.

Mr. Van Rees questioned what was spent on OPEC.

Mr. Binnion indicated U.S. imports from Russia oil is fairly deminimis. It has about 4% impact as far as spending. It is a big indicator, but there is an election year, a possible recession in Europe, high interest rates and high gas prices, and a lot of pressure to keep prices down. Everyone wants concessions and they are not sure where they stand. The #1 producer is Madura and #2 is Russia by reserves. There is currently a supply demand in balance. They need to go after faster reserves; the Market does not like volatility.

D. Maintenance Reimbursement Request for December 2021
(Discussion/Motion)

Mr. Nesbitt requested this be done with a comparative chart, so they could review it line by line.

Ms. Spates commented that anyone can call her and tell her what they are looking for.

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Mr. Van Rees, to approve the maintenance reimbursement request for December 2021 in the amount of \$181,267.80. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

E. General Price List Review (Discussion/Motion)

Ms. Spates stated the General Price List is up for discussion. There have not been any plot increases since 2015. They have gotten two or three price increases from vendors and cannot continually absorb the costs. At one time they had an emergency getting vaults because of cement and a lack of truck drivers. She noted there is also overtime costs with maintenance. In looking at some of the other local competitors, she thinks they are in line.

In response to Mr. Nesbitt, Ms. Spates indicated there has not been a price increase on plots since 2015. There was a slight increase on interment services, which was for 3:00 p.m. and after. She noted the fees increased between 3% and 5%.

Mr. Watson mentioned the ratio of increase and questioned their mark-up for merchandise.

Ms. Spates advised there was a 2% to 2.5% increase ratio for merchandise. She stated adjustments have been made based on the market. It has been different the past year and a half; they are getting notices saying fees are going up every six months, which they have been trying to absorb, so the families do not go to their competitors.

Mr. Van Rees commented that merchandise was not on the list. He asked if anything was done with the vaults.

Ms. Spates stated they have ranges for merchandise and noted that vaults were referenced on the second page.

Mr. Van Rees mentioned the \$55 increase.

Mr. Nesbitt asked if the list was supposed to be reviewed annually.

Ms. Spates reiterated there have not been any increases since 2015. She stated the list is supposed to be reviewed annually.

Mr. Ulmer thought each cemetery was previously listed separately when he was on the Board.

Ms. Spates indicated she only did the range and Evergreen is the highest range. There was no change in 2016, which was recommended by the Contractor, so a No Change Memo was sent to the Commission. In 2017 and 2018, the Board did not want to entertain, and in 2019, there were some slight increases to overtime costs. She did not have anything for 2021.

Mr. Van Rees advised he has no issue with burial rights. Regarding interment services, ground and mausoleum, and asked if it would be easier between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. instead of incremental times. He thought fees should be averaged between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. and if clients come in at 4:00 p.m. there would be an extra charge. He thought Saturdays should be from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Spates advised she would review the Rules and Regulations. They let people come in and the Rules and Regulations say they can turn someone away after 4:00 p.m. She read information from the Rules and Regulations to the Board members. She clarified there is a set price for 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, an additional

\$300 for 3:01 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., and 4:01 to 5:00 p.m. is another \$300. Competitors charge a premium fee for Saturdays, which is sometimes \$1,000.

Mr. Van Rees commented that some like to say the cutoff is 3:00 p.m. and they will allow it until 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Spates stated that is not tolerated in Miami-Dade. They are City and public servants, and the abuse staff endures, even just enforcing the General Price List is an issue.

Mr. Van Rees reiterated the hours should be 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Spates advised the office is open until 4:00 p.m., but Mr. Jackson's crew gets off at 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and during the week they get off at 3:30 p.m. That is the issue when they incur overtime Monday through Friday. Because of cemetery operations on Saturdays, they might have to look at this differently since they get off at 5:00 p.m.

Chair Kurtz questioned why overtime is charged after 3:00 p.m. if they get off at 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Spates stated families linger and the closure and internment activities take a while to do, so there are some issues during weekdays. These are Union positions, and overtime cannot be mandated.

Mr. Van Rees commented that Monday through Friday is 3:30 p.m. and that is Union.

Ms. Spates clarified that is the schedule for Mr. Jackson's crew; they start at 7:00 a.m. and that is why they have to be careful with 2:00 p.m. burials.

Mr. Ulmer questioned how money is collected for burials Monday through Friday after 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Spates indicated when they know a family member has a 2:00 p.m. or 2:30 p.m. burial, they are asked to put a credit card on file. Sometimes their Funeral Director tells them not to do that, so they get pushback, which leaves them in an awkward moment with the family at the gravesite and it looks like staff is being insensitive.

Mr. Van Rees suggested a flat rate be charged between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. He commented that it would average out and questioned if Saturday burials are \$400.

Ms. Spates advised their competitors charge \$1,000 on Saturdays.

Mr. Van Rees suggested a flat \$1,000 for Saturday burials and almost \$4,000 for Sundays.

Mr. Ulmer commented there was a big discussion about this. He did not know if the rates changed, but the time was changed.

Ms. Spates did not recall any changes.

Chair Kurtz indicated they are a City cemetery, not a private cemetery.

Mr. Van Rees commented that cemeteries are incurring expenses that must be covered. They are taking money out of the Trust Fund and paying it out. The last year has not been easy on price increases and this year is worse.

Ms. Spates advised they do not have anymore \$2,495's, they are sold out of those Gardens. They cannot get the cemetery surveyor to come out, so they are still without plots in Evergreen Cemetery. He says he is busy and there are labor shortages.

Mr. Nesbitt suggested approving the recommended General Price List and then they can look at making alternations next year or down the road.

Chair Kurtz questioned if they were talking about \$400.

Ms. Spates advised it is \$375 on the low end for residents; the high end is Evergreen Cemetery.

Mr. Van Rees commented that as much as he would like to see this simplified, he understands the internment portion.

Motion made by Mr. Van Rees, seconded by Mr. Nesbitt, to proceed with the recommendations in terms of increasing the General Price List at all the cemeteries. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

F. Cemetery P&L Statement (Discussion)

Mr. Nesbitt questioned if they are ever going to get out from under Carriage and merchandise.

City Attorney Spence indicated they are still negotiating with Carriage regarding the agreement for their Trust Management Services. They have taken that posture because when they first broke their relationship with them, the State entered into discussion and told them they could not use those services for themselves. They are still investigating and there are some rumblings they may be able to license and pull that inhouse, but until there is clarity, they are still tied to them. Maybe there will be some consideration in the future seeking another vendor who deals with those types of Trusts to manage it on the City's behalf if they are not able to bring those services inhouse.

Ms. Spates advised the Trust amount was \$4.2 million in 2018. She stated they are not being reimbursed. They have delivered merchandise and services on behalf of the former Contractor and have not received any money, which is another cost they must absorb because they have to deliver.

Ms. Beasley-Pittman questioned how many outstanding contracts are with them.

Ms. Spates advised they did not get a straight answer, but it is substantial. They have delivered interment services and merchandise for the last three years and a spreadsheet is kept of the people they serviced. She noted there were some contracts that had caskets.

Chair Kurtz commented that the caskets were sold to the Funeral Home in Jacksonville. He asked if they would be responsible.

Ms. Spates mentioned Beaches.

Chair Kurtz stated Beaches are responsible for the caskets.

Ms. Spates commended the former Contractor. She had a couple of recent instances where they could not find the file and upon sending an email, she received a response providing all the information.

Mr. Van Rees questioned if they are collecting outstanding payments on any contracts they have.

Ms. Spates replied they are not. Somehow there was some confusion during the transition and as of today, they have been collecting those payments, which are kept in a separate pool of funds. Once they come to some type of agreement, they need to remit those funds to the former cemetery contractor, and they need to remit funds to us.

Mr. Van Rees questioned how they are doing on automation.

Ms. Spates advised the Cemetery Management Software is going slowly. They are trying to work out issues with the vendor. No one wanted to bid on it, but they were willing to do it without going through a formal process.

G. Other Business

Chair Kurtz mentioned the 3:00 p.m. cutoff and questioned if there is any provision when someone gets to the gate and cannot get in.

Ms. Spates indicated there is not a perfect internment scheduling; Funeral Homes are given slots. Overtime is not charged if someone is there.

Chair Kurtz commented that at some point they need to look at higher fees for their time as residents. He asked if there is some way their cemeteries are being used to take care of Dade County.

Mr. Van Rees mentioned that non-residents pay more and noted it is not just Miami Dade.

Chair Kurtz thinks Broward County residents should have a higher fee.

Ms. Spates stated the City of Deerfield has a resident rate and almost a triple non-resident rate to deter because they want those benefits for taxpayers and residents.

Ms. Krebs advised the City of Fort Lauderdale Parks and Recreation charges resident and non-resident fees just for the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Ms. Spates could not say any specific population. She noted that Pompano runs a tight ship too.

Mr. Van Rees stated if someone in Pompano arrives 15 minutes early, they will wait, but if they are 15 minutes late beyond their time slot, they might have to reschedule. They also send a form that must be signed.

Ms. Spates stated they do 15 minutes early and 15 minutes late at Forest Lawn.

Chair Kurtz commented that they have to be flexible.

Ms. Spates indicated they know there are extenuating circumstances and all someone must do is call and communicate.

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, to send a Communication to the Commission regarding a recommendation regarding staffing. There was no second to the motion.

Chair Kurtz asked Ms. Spates about equipment and asked if that could be put in the motion too.

Ms. Spates replied yes.

Mr. Van Rees questioned where they are regarding acquiring and how they get caskets on the lowering device.

Ms. Spates stated not every funeral service wants to see rollers.

Trevor Jackson, Parks and Recreation, advised rollers are good, but sometimes they are dangerous.

Mr. Van Rees commented that setups are being done wrong. He has seen devices modified to meet the needs of staff. The devices are manufactured certain ways to assist with internment services, but Fort Lauderdale does not have enough. Some years ago, \$700,000 was appropriated from the Board for new equipment.

Ms. Spates indicated they have a City Auditor.

Mr. Van Rees wants an audit by the City Auditor to say where they are now with City operated cemeteries, what equipment there is, and where it is.

Ms. Spates stated there is also wear and tear, so they purchase mowers. Purchasing all the equipment at one time is not necessarily the best thing to do because they all age at the same time and start breaking down. They did not have a choice because of the situation they were in.

Chair Kurtz thinks the roller is more dangerous and there is a way to do it, but the people who work there do not want to accept advice we try to give them.

Mr. Van Rees commented that the equipment is there, minus the parts. It creates issues one way or the other; safety issues for people attending services and for staff.

Chair Kurtz stated they need to have a serious meeting to discuss these things and the tents with Mr. Jackson.

Ms. Spates indicated in the meantime, they can call Mr. Jackson or her and let them know what is happening. She advised they have to do three bids; one vendor was six to eight months for production, and then money had to be moved around. Currently, they are waiting delivery of the tents.

Mr. Van Rees stated those are ongoing issues; they are trying to buy equipment and it is not available. He looks at some of this as being more maintenance and repair.

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Mr. Van Rees, to send a Communication to the Commission to endorse or support the addition of two Family Service Coordinators and one Administrative position to the cemetery system and that the recommendation be forwarded to the Director of Parks and Recreation. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

H. Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Mr. Van Rees, to send a Communication to the Commission to endorse or support the addition of two Family Service Coordinators and one Administrative position to the cemetery system and that the recommendation

be forwarded to the Director of Parks and Recreation. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (6-0)

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

The next scheduled meeting is Thursday, May 12, 2022, at 5:04 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by C. Guifarro, Prototype, Inc.]