

Missoula Cemetery Board Meeting
Thursday, June 4, 2020
12:00pm
Missoula City Cemetery **Chapel**

Minutes

1. **Call to Order**

Board members present: Mary Lou Cordis, Paul Filicetti, Neil Carson

Board members absent: Kim Seeberger, Pat McHugh

Staff: Ron Regan, Ashley Strayer

Public: Michelle Jordan (Garden City Monument Services)

2. **Roll Call**

3. **Approval of Minutes.** February minutes unanimously approved with two corrections.

4. **Public Comment on items not listed on the agenda.** None.

5. **Staff Report.** Mr. Regan said that it was time to look at the Board reappointments. **MOTION: Mr. Filicetti made a motion that Mr. Carson remains on as President and Mrs. Cordis seconded. MOTION: Mrs. Cordis made a motion that Mr. Filicetti remains on as Vice President, and Mr. Carson seconded the motion.**

Mr. Regan reported that Memorial Day went well with many people visiting the grounds and only a few complaints. Mr. Regan also explained that we met people at the door this year instead of opening the office due to COVID-19. Some discussion followed.

6. **Financials.** Reviewed with some discussion.

FY21 Budget. Mr. Regan talked about the carryover mower that was not purchased in FY20 but will be purchased this year. Mr. Carson asked what fund would be paying for this. Mr. Regan said that would be Capital Reserve Fund. He also presented the new request of a 1-ton dump truck from the Capital Reserve Fund. Mr. Regan stated that the current one is 19 years old and falling apart. Mr. Filicetti asked if they were planning on purchasing a 2020 dump truck. Mr. Regan said that the surplus equipment goes to auction and is not available anymore. **MOTION: Mr. Filicetti made a motion to purchase both the dump truck and the mower with Capital Reserve Funds. Mrs. Cordis seconded the motion, and Mr. Carson approved it.**

Mr. Regan presented the financial numbers for possibly getting the Cemetery set up to hold zoom meetings. Mr. Filicetti said he thinks we should hold off for now, and Mrs. Cordis agreed. However, Mr. Filicetti and Mr. Carson felt we should look into getting Wi-Fi to the Chapel for meetings and getting a laptop for taking minutes. Mr. Regan said the previous laptop was removed for licensing reasons.

7. **New Business.** Mr. Filicetti would like to review the 50/50 split between Capital Reserve Fund and the General Fund. He would like to have someone join our next meeting who can discuss the reason and history of the split.

8. Continuing Business

a. **Strategic Plan.** Mr. Carson said the next steps of this process would be to send the Board comments to Mr. Keene and The Sloan Group. The comments are attached. **MOTION: Mr. Filicetti made a motion to approve Board comments and forward them to Jeremy and The Sloan Group. Mrs. Cordis seconded, and Mr. Carson approved.** Mr. Carson said he would forward the document to Mr. Keene and The Sloan Group.

9. Informational Items

10. Communication

11. Adjournment at 12:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ashley Strayer, Administrative Assistant III

The following is a summary of the Missoula City Cemetery Board's review comments for *L.F. Sloane Consulting Group, Missoula City Cemetery Master Plan, Initial Recommendations, March 2020*

General Remarks regarding this Report

- 1) Cemetery Board review comments are based on the *Request for Proposal for the FY 20 Missoula City Cemetery Strategic Plan* that outlines the scope of services the Board requested from the Consultant, who is L.F. Sloane
- 2) Nothing in the report is citing research or professional publications or footnoted for the reader to learn more about the item discuss. There is no appendix of documents that support the claims made in the report, the Missoula community is an educated community and expects more. Without supplemental information, this is all conjecture.
- 3) There is a lot of information about how to spend money, increase services, and decrease staff however there is not a lot of information on how to generate money and bring people to the Cemetery.
- 4) The document includes several contradictory statements, they are pointed out in comments below. Please make these clarifications and corrections.
- 5) The consultant uses/use of of the term "City" it is confusing to know when they refer to the City Cemetery, the Missoula City Cemetery Board, or the City of Missoula. "City" is used interchangeably and inconsistently which may be the cause for confusion in the report.
- 6) The City of Missoula is not L.F. Sloane's client, the Missoula City Cemetery is. It is the intent of the Missoula City Cemetery and the Board of Directors to develop a Strategic Plan for the City Cemetery first and foremost not a Master Plan. A Master Plan, Marketing Plan, Feasibility Plan etc. are what we expected to be in the list of recommendations in this Strategic Plan.
- 7) The RFP/RFQ L.F. Sloane responded to requested a Strategic Plan and L.F. Slaone provided a Master Plan not a Strategic Plan.
- 8) Provide an executive summary.

- 9) Provide a purpose statement that includes items outlined in the RFP / RFQ – what keeps the cemetery relevant, usable, and sustainable for future generations?
- 10) There is no mention on how the general public uses the Cemetery. When we met with Council, they were interested in the public 's recreational use of the Cemetery land , trails and public access. We expressed this to Sloane when we met with them.
- 11) Too fancy for us. Need to keep a good fence and does agree with bushes. The important thing is to keep land. Look what we are going through with COVID-19. Make the land more square and the land not in use should be a baseball park or soccer field, then when we need it we will have it.
- 12) We do not need a huge office building when the city does not even want to staff the one we have. We are not supposed to be in competition with Sunset and a big office and some of these other suggestions would do that. We are here to serve the Missoula people.
- 13) The fence is fine. Do not like any fence recommendations. Keep things simple.
- 14) People like the roads. So nice that older people don ' t have to walk too far.

Page 3. Infrastructure

The is no mention of the land exchange between the City Cemetery and Hutton Precast as discussed with L.F. Sloane at the City Cemetery Board meeting held Thursday February 6, 2020. The Board has taken the position that any land exchanges / sale etc. will include improvements to the south entrance of the Cemetery and Hutton.

The report makes no recommendation for moving the Cemetery entrance and coordinate with land exchange that could include Hutton that the Board requested in February 2020.

Figure #s are missing

Page 4. Fencing

The report has no visual examples for several recommendations one of which is the fencing. Several types of fencing materials are discussed based on the needs they serve. Provide multiple examples of each that include ornamental fencing, solid fencing, and soft edge fencing. Include precedent examples that include pedestrian gates that allow access to trails while providing security, which, for the Board, remains a priority.

The tem "headwinds" is used throughout the report without explanation. Rather than use that term, clearly outline what the issues are L.F. Sloane identified and go on to provide a means to resolve each.

The report states, the Cemetery needs a nice entrance then suggest later to move the storage and equipment building at the entrance! Additional explaining is necessary to resolve this contradiction.

Even with new fencing the industrial area around the Cemetery will be visible. The written descriptions provided for fencing suggest the fence will not block out everything, provide examples of fence designs L.F. Sloane has in mind for conditions they are attempting to resolve. In written word. The Board feels the industrial areas are an issue and a solution, in part, can be had by fencing types and that includes fencing along south edge of Cemetery.

Fencing alone will not resolve the sound/noise issue and the report makes no mention of noise, traffic, or industrial sounds as an issue, which they are.

New fencing – and that cost - is not going to bring more people here.

Residents? Who is this?

Shield the cemetery? Is that to say shield views from the cemetery to industrial areas? We already shield the Cemetery.

What about noise?

Revise recommendations

Page 5. Structures

What happens to the residence in the office when we have the new building? There is no mention of the loss of this income or security person/grounds person. Who will man the gate to see that the cemetery is secure and/or open during operating hours?

The report seems to talk as if several building on the grounds and is interchangeable with descriptions. For instance it really becomes confusing in the discussion of 'structures' where the descriptions provided differ from the historic description of the buildings being discussed. Will Sloane coordinate with Cemetery Staff on the names for existing buildings used in the report?

Include a site map and legend with each building and the name they use so it can be easily followed in the context for the report.

The maintenance garage is actually a shop. That inconsistency suggests the consultant did not have a clear understanding of the building function. There room for clarity in the document in the discussion of which specific buildings Sloane is writing about.

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CEPTED) principles at the buildings and on the grounds is a priority and yet not mentioned in the report, why?

Provide a needs assessment that justifies the new building or at a minimum provide recommendations needed for further evaluation necessary to justify the new building vs. the financial feasibility of renovating the existing office building.

There ' s no mention of National Register Listing? Why?

Revise recommendations

Page 7. Irrigation

This is an area the Board specifically asked for information on and the response in the report is, the system is good. Define good and address the age of the system the well capacity in relation to modifications proposed in your thoughts for land exchanges vs the Boards. How many wells are there? What is their age? Do they pull sand seasonally? How deep are they? Do they need to be deeper? is there sufficient power to accommodate a change to the well that would provide a better pump, lower operational costs and increase efficiency?

The report contains no suggestions or recommendations on how to upgrade this old manual irrigation system. There is no indication of ways to save energy, or any information on the life and capacity of the pumps, cycle

for repair, yearly repair costs, etc. This is an important topic as the well keeps the grounds green. Why is there no information included?

There was a lot of discussion with staff about changing to an automated irrigation system, yet nothing is in the report. Sloane will you review and discuss this with staff? What is your recommendation for automating the system? Then again what is the cost and return on the investment?

The Board needs to see a needs assessment on well and irrigation system which Sloane makes no mention of nor do they provide any water capacity, wells status, irrigation system options or possible designs solutions for systems they work with that will limit impacts to graves, headstones, trees, and water / energy efficiency.

What about water the public uses? Is there any? Is it adequate in the developed areas? Is it accessible to our clients, wheel chair accessible? Close to where they need it?

Revise the list of recommendations.

Page 7. Roads

When we have less roads there is less parking for Funerals, how do resolve that?

Removal of roads is discourages regardless of the potential (short lived) financial gain. The roads are key to the setting and significance of the Cemetery. Their removal will have a significant impact to the character of the Cemetery and will endanger the possibility of National Register Listing.

People bought plots to be close to roads, removing roads decreases accessibility.

The irrigation system is designed around the roads their removal impacts trees, mapping, recording, lighting, landscaping and staff hours to coordinate this effort. What are your recommendations?

Several people would have to walk farther instead of drive. The roads provide a means for maintenance access, trash collection, graves access, tree servicing, etc. which would be limited or prohibitive without them.

Maintenance costs on existing roads is nominal, sealing and costs related to that work are budgeted and nominal.

Why are we getting rid of open land if we need to use the road space as valuable inventory and access? Why are we not developing vacant land to look like the character of the historic property if that 's what people want to buy? Sloane make a poor argument for one and ignores the other.

Some people may get closer to relatives but others would be cheated out of road access.

Some of the streets Sloan wants to keep are too narrow for two cars which will cause problems not considered in their report.

Meeting Notes

Following is a summary of Board review comments compiled by Neil Carson, Board Chair, and Paul Filicetti based on Sloane 's report "Missoula City Cemetery Master Plan" dated March 2020.

Page 1.

To be clear, the RFP / FRQ is for a Strategic Plan and we've been given a document that is called a master plan.

The Board wants a Strategic Plan, which will provide analysis and justifiable recommendations. The depth of the current report is insufficient to qualify as a Master Plan.

Page 2. Purpose page

As one looks at this document without the knowledge of the Cemetery, there's no introduction, nothing to say who we are or what the history of the Cemetery is.

Ideally, this will go out to clients and the general public as a means to introduce them to the Cemetery and an introduction to the report, the process of the report, who was involved, what groups were solicited for input who from the groups were involved etc is missing.

There is nothing to suggest this was a community involved effort which Sloane described to the Board that it was. Include a copy of the original RFP and points to be addressed in the report. What is provided, does not speak to a purpose.

Page 3. Infrastructure

Include figure numbers on every image so the report is easier to follow. Again, this is a public document – write to a level everyone can understand especially someone not familiar with the Cemetery.

Page 4. Fencing

The term "headwinds" is mentioned a lot and this not explained and this is not good wording for this document, List the issues you consider headwinds and then go on to say how / what we can do, what your professional recommendations are to make improvement to those issues.

There is no discussion of trading land with Hutton which impacts the fence discussion. Chain link like we have now makes a poor impression and using it in the future will not make a difference on impression. We have options, the Board has discussed them and the report should include examples.

It's important to see there is a cemetery here as well as having security. The Board objects to the idea of no fencing and the other options proposed are unclear. There has to be a barrier to maintain security of cemetery. Westside fence - can costs be shared if we replace a joint fence with the neighbor? Did Sloane talk with the neighbors?

Fence replacement needs to define a purpose of what we are investing money on, what is the reason, what is the expectation? Privacy? Looks? Sound and noise issues?

There's a lot to be said about the fact that when you are on the Cemetery, you don't perceive yourself surrounded by industry. That says a lot about the efforts staff places on maintain the existing landscaping and relationships with our neighbors.

Page 5. Structures

As noted above there, the terminology Sloane uses to describes the buildings is inconsistent/poor. Lots of room for improvement.

Seems everyone had to read this section several times to figure out what structures and names they use vs what we know the building by, including their operation use. They should coordinate with Ron on both.

It is clear that Sloane did not spend time with staff to work through and understand how the buildings serve the grounds.

CEPTED used by Parks, no mention of it. It needs to be a part of any landscaping discussion especially when they/Sloane seem to recommend, against the Board ' s judgment, fence removal.

The positions for staff seem to vary in many forms. Whom are they referring to when they use the term "management" in this portion of the repor?

Chapel – nothing is mentioned on its role or usage, cost to use, income from use. Why not? There is no mention of improvement to the building or ground that include public WIFI, why not? Is this building worth investing in to make it better? Is there a need? Who uses it? Can the Board or other community organizations / City departments use it?

What about those restrooms?

There ' s a lot of interest in tearing buildings down rather than reusing them? We have an investment on the grounds and nothing is so bad that it can ' t be used, repurposed, improved upon including the existing office building.

Update and revise the recommendations to coordinate with ' headwinds ' list.

Page 7. Irrigation

The Strategic Plan should inform us about the remaining life expectancy of irrigation. The Board knows the systems is old, 60 plus years, receives constant maintenance and should be automated. The system is built upon what water we have available rather than the other way around (what water do we need to water the grounds). How deep the wells and what are the condition. How long will the wells last. How much well water capacity to we have vs what we use? How may wells do we have? Should we be pumping to a cistern or storage pond (landscape feature surrounded by columbarium in the ' new ' part of the cemetery) and pump to landscaping from there? We know graves / niches around ponds / water features sell.

The document did not look at the increased sales seen at graves that are adjacent ponds and landscaping features vs those that are not.

Page 7. Roads

Removing roads prevents access and the people who come to visit those graves and the most likely clients to have mobility issues. We did our own polling and found asking them to walk farther is a bad thought.

Existing roads are narrow that slows traffic, creates intimacy within the site vs "industrial standards" suggest. No idea what an industrial standard is, but we have a historic cemetery not based on industrial standards.

Question industrial standard, something well beyond the needs. National Register Listing would be limited if we did this and we would not get listed. National Register Listing, the grant we have is because of the design and conditions that make it Historic.

Sloan, the report should include the referenced on "the industrial standard" footnote, appendix or reference specifics for Board to investigate what this means.

Include figure #s

Based on their information, there is no Board support for removing roads.

The report does not include information on maintenance cost for existing roads and how that works. What those costs are?

Revise recommendations based on comments and importance.

Page 8. Above-Ground Burial Structures

There is a lot of confusion regarding language and various different words that seem to suggest the same thing i.e. Niche and Columbarium and Columbarium Plaza, Three Columbaria, Newer Columbarium Wall, Original Columbarium, 64 granite columbarium and then "the other columbarium" - can you include a map showing locations first before the discussion? Sloan, please clarify for the public who will read this document that the Columbarium / Columbarium Wall is the stand that holds individual Niches.

Bronze Walls are starting to fail and leak and need attention which is a significant effort to replace – Sloan can you estimate time and materials involved? Staff hours? What that process entails in Montana State law? Or mention that that process and provide some "go-to" references in the report? What would have to happen to replace these? Note that the plastic containers for the ashes are decaying which is a cause for alarm that is not otherwise discussed in the report. Did they discuss this with staff? What process does the Board / Staff / City Council have to go through to correct this and how many staff hours do you anticipate should be set aside to make this happen. Their recommendations fail to note that this is an urgent need.

The Bronze Walls are nice given their proximity to the office and easy access for people. The comments on the Mausoleum was not vetted properly, more explanation is needed. What sources / resources / data back up your comment?

Revise recommendations based on comments and importance.

Page 9. Crematory

Where did the information stated in the report come from? What's the source? Include a footnote or reference for the document from the CANA. Which funeral homes were interviewed? Only those in Missoula or did you go further out?

This idea is new and the Board has no information. Outline more detail, recommendations for a location and proforma regarding this idea i.e. construction, utility and staffing costs, long term payback. The single paragraph does not provide enough information. With 80% cremations this may be worth looking at. Why did this come up?

I want more information.

Revise recommendations based on comments and importance.

Page 10. Historical Signage

The grant was awarded to the Cemetery after cemetery staff spent many hours working through the application process and submitting an application.

The signs have nothing to do with the 'unique greenspace(sfp)' they were given to us because of the historic and cultural landscape. We would not have been awarded based on 'greenspace'.

Include a list, in a footnote of appendix, who you know provides other grants – even if they are something like 'for example we have had great success with Audubon...'

The Board is proud of staff's work on the Historic Sign Program and will, if staff hours allow, continue to seek this grant and others. If Sloane was not aware of that from reading Board meeting minutes, they are now.

Page 10. Pet Program

sentence "... cemetery operation a concept..." what is missing from this sentence?

"Pet burial" has not been discussed, there is no interest in that from the Board.

Why does it say we are going to bury the pets, we will set up a pet cemetery for cremated pet remain. The Board is moving forward with this as a means to engage the Missoula community we serve and increase our audience/client base/services.

The pet program is for cremated pets only and will increase staffing time and services.

Not sure what the sentence "... would not be a pet cemetery with the larger City Cemetery.." means, explain.

Revise recommendations based on comments and importance.

Page 11. Annual Maintenance

Strategic Plan would provide us a future look. Our community deserves to see the grounds maintained at the exception level they have been. It's also the way we as a community show our respect for those intruded on the grounds. As such, it is imperative to planning the future of the Cemetery and a primary focus of this Strategic

Plan effort. The Board needs to know where we are at this time, based on Sloane's professional analysis of our situation, and what / where we should anticipate to be in the future.

The Master Plan process does not provide that but the Strategic Plan process we issues, does. The outlook should for a minimum of 20-years.

Sloane – will you address how we coordinate with other City / County plans (and a list of which ones those are)?

In terms of annual maintenance, there's no mention of ongoing infrastructure improvements. What we need to do to continue to be ADA accessible? What are our cyclical equipment replacement cost predictions and options? Will staffing need to increase to meet demands especially in increased services provided? Are there other annual maintenance issues that we should be investigating to save money or increase revenue – such as lighting and electrical cost savings ideas, irrigation systems, headstone cleaning and repair, remove fencing = increased public access and increase surveillance needs?

Why is there no list of recommendations?

Page 11. Land Reserve Analysis

Figure #

Needs clarity in the image what areas they're talking about.

The information shown does not coordinate with the North Reserve Street (NSR) Master Plan and there no explanation for the deviation. The Board participated in and is following NRS Master Plan. Explain why the Cemetery Strategic Plan should not coordinate with it . Explain suggest unnecessary changes.

Be clear here, this implies the Board is suggesting modifications to the City approved Master Plan, I do not support that.

In the end, the Board feels the "bullpin" area has to stay and not sell that part.

This portion of the report is an ideal time to address the industrial entrance of the Cemetery and needs to be re-looked at by Sloan.

Given increasing population in Montana and Western Montana, and now the Covid 19 pandemic the information seems short sighted. Can you update to reflect what's happening now?

Where are your / what are your recommendations?

Page 12. Excess Land Evaluation

Similar comments as above regarding entrance and south portion of the grounds, North Reserve St.

Huttun is not mentioned as mentioned earlier in this document. The bullpen is a priority and must be kept. Provide recommendations for screening.

The report is written to suggest Sloan has seen some development of land to the east of the cemetery that the Board has not seen as Sloane describes a "...residential development and terminating near the entrance..." and "...ensure that a cul-de-sac type..." Where is this plan? What are they looking at? Sloan - provide a reference to your source here. Include information in this Strategic Plan.

Regarding the "new facility" and location, text suggests an idea the Board will has not considered – that is, a relationship with Missoula Parks and Recs. The Cemetery historically partners with other city departments and agencies perhaps they were not aware of that. What Sloan suggests seems to indicate they had a further discussion or other information the Board should be considering. What is the intent of this statement? Is to save our labor and maintenance costs or is it to move the Cemetery into Parks and Rec Department?

The report is written as if the City is a key player in the decision making process (city requires the whole of the excess land) and Sloane is neglecting the Board's role in terms of economics of redevelopment, land acquisition and decommissioning. The Board is the first priority.

Figure #s

Clearly indicate on figures the areas under discussion here. A legend would help.

Park department mentioned again, why?

If Sloane needs meeting minutes where the Board discussed land acquisition with them, we can provide that, coordinate with staff.

Funding of projects recommended by Sloan, selling land to fund Sloan recommended projects, has not been vetted through the Board. The list of recommendations needs to coordinate with other recommendations and Board comments.

Revise recommendations based on comments and importance.

Page 14. Land Development Proceeds

The Cemetery and Board are the process, not the City.

Historically, the land the Board purchased in the past was for the benefit and expansion of the Cemetery rather than as suggested in the report. Ask Sloane to include or reference documents in our records for this information, staff can assist.

Where the development benefits financial interests? The Board feels the land is irreplaceable and an asset to the public in terms of open space, public space – there 's no mention of that.

There 's a link missing that connects land use specific to the Cemetery use and needs – that includes or at least is based on thoughtful predictions for the future and a sound marketing or public service strategy – and what land is needed for the Cemetery as our community grows and our needs in the future change to accommodate growth vs what is suggested b to be lost or sold. There 's no getting the land back.

In this discussion, the report should be written to the Cemetery Board rather than the City. The land assessment does not reflect land needs by the Cemetery for a significant need such as a global pandemic.

Revise your recommendations based on this feedback. If anything, more investigation is needed before any decision is made. That investigation should include, at a minimum, a market analysis, needs analysis, Master Plan that includes public participation. None of that is noted in this report.

Page 15. Relevancy (Marketing)

Again with "headwinds" I want to see a list of what Sloane considers to be at issue and how /what their recommendations are for change / improvement.

What is the recommendation for a marketing plan? Are we including social media, education of the public, PSAs, etc. how do we market in this day and age?

Their comment on our page on the City 's website is fine, but how to we reach out to people planning end of life? There 's nothing suggesting a growth of change to marketing, can we market? Can we market to city employees, county employees, low income/sliding scale/ end of life care planning, hospice, residential care homes, etc?

Does Sloane recommend we hire a marketing consultant or hire staff with marketing / social media experience? Sloane – is there marketing available through the City of Missoula?

Stories and Stones is our fundraiser and our major community engagement / community building event. It is also our marketing effort. In the future, other marketing strategies could include – Sloane, can you include a list? – the National Register of Historic Places Listing and cultural heritage tourism opportunities, Audubon and Bird Watching (I think they use the tem 'birding '), the pet cemetery, our historic sign program, a more inviting entrance and open space for the public to enjoy, our trails and connections with others being considered in the NRS Master Plan and other City plans, our headstone cleaning and restoration program, etc.

The report mentions a 'university' which university are you referencing? Is Sloan aware that UM and the Cemetery have ongoing relationships? They should list what those are if they know or coordinate with staff to include those relationships in the report and other relationships they recommend.

The report suggest reaching out to 'local organizations' can you provide examples? To be clear there is no Fort Museum but there is the Historical Museum of Fort Missoula who we have a working relationship with. Others include the Missoula Historic Preservation Commission, the Missoula Historic Preservation Officer, City Parks & Rec., Preserve Historic Missoula, City Public Works, Missoula Public Art Committee... other Board members and staff can fill in more.

There is not list of recommendations here... is that to suggest they make no recommendations?

Page 17. Prices

Rework the last sentence of the paragraph, something about "Cemetery well and provide..."

We have the annual fee escalator which we worked though City Council – does Sloane know the year? That we us, is the text suggesting our fee structure is insufficient? There's no comparison to understand what would make us "self-sufficient" to guide how to proceed in the future and no list of recommendations to suggest otherwise. What is their target for 'self-sufficiency'?

Do we need a Board Policy regarding how the Cemetery is to plan revenue generating goals and what that burden will be to the population we serve?

Historically, the Cemetery is revenue neutral based on maintenance, staff, equipment, and etc. that we use to operate which allows us to keep pricing low as our costs are low.

Page 17. Prepaid Services and Merchandise

Prepay is a great idea curious about merch, shall be develop hats or masks for sale?

Regarding pre-pay the City has hesitated to allow us to move forward with this. How do you recommend we go about setting this up and services.

Do we need more staff to move this forward with this? Given everything else suggested in the report, this will be more work for staff, no mention of that in recommendations.

Page 18. Markers and Monuments

Cemetery Board and Staff are involved in this effort and discussion as has Council. At this time there is no interest in making monuments that would put us in competition with local monument companies that provide those services. Board records support that position.

Page 18. Engraving

We do not support the idea of expanding engraving services and especially do not support the idea of including final dating. As our policies state, the headstones are not the property of the Cemetery.

This is a discussion the Board had and caused nothing but ire in the community and do not support expanding services.

Can you include recommendation on how to improve relationships between the Cemetery and the engraving companies we deal with? That would be helpful, especially given you reached out them.

The recommendations make no mention of policy changes, impact to insurance, liability to the Cemetery and consequently the City, coordination efforts between funeral homes, engraving companies, and staff, staff time to research, investigate and coordinate this effort, and ensure the information is correct, etc.

Do not support expanding to include final dating.

Page 18. Cremation Burial Options

Explain "common burial vault" and what that would be, I need more definition on this idea and examples. Is this the pet cemetery? What does this actually look like? Has Sloane done this before, examples are needed?

Clearly the "City" mentioned throughout this text is the "Cemetery Board".

Has there been a change in casket burials with Covid 19? Locally or in the State? Pacific NW? Not sure what geographic region Sloane used in their document but would be good to include.

Figure 2.3 is something we purchase or build? Are there companies that provide this and how would the cost of doing this impact the cost of the new Office Building? What's the cost of the office building with it? Without it? How does this change the use of the building over time, i.e. when the building has outlived it's life/use? Would our clients really like to go down into a basement to see this?

Is there an analysis that suggests we need this? Is there a growing need? What demographic is purchasing this product? Can these be presold? Does this require Policy/Ordinance changes?

Figure 2.4 These could go anywhere in the Cemetery? Have any recommendations? What protects them? Is there a building around them? Name of companies that you can include in the Appendix that much these?

The question is of sales – is it the Cemetery or is it others, who is doing engraving? There's a lot of policy changes that go around this which need clarification. What's the marketing analysis that support the sale of this type of that in Fig 2.3? How many do we start with? What's the analysis that justifies this cost?

Cenotaph? Definition? We have several of these already, don't we? How many? Where? What would be the purpose of more?

No recommendation that mentions this increased services comes with additional staffing hours? Where do they recommend locating these? What do they recommend we start out with, quantity?

Page 20. Ordinance 3594

Again, it's not the 'City' but the Cemetery Board also while they are city employees, they are the City Cemetery staff.

List of recommendations differs from everywhere else in the report.

Maintaining the historic record of obits is a priority for the Board and Cemetery, it's our historic document and we feel it is important to continue to be maintained. There's no justification included to suggest we stop.

There is a solid demand for Niche, especially those facing water or landscape features, and Columbarium walls. The Cemetery will continue to grow to meet that demand which requires the Reserve Fund. No sense or justification for getting rid of it.

The Board is interested in changing the Ordinance to recapture the 50% the city currently takes from every one of our sales. Having that money back would change our financial numbers by 50% and put us in the revenue neutral position recommended previously. Will you look into that and make recommendations? If not, explain why.

All the headstone, Cenotaph, fig 2.4 and 2.5 above graves etc. mentioned above should be included.

Revise recommendations based on comments and importance.

21. Budget

"Headwinds" again – list what you see they are and the recommendations to improve them.

The Board with staff set the FY budget, we're a Judicial Board with a competent, talented staff.

Staffing positions discuss in this section are unclear. You mention a "director," the "grounds foreman," an "administrator" etc. in addition to other staffing descriptions I mentioned earlier. Can you provide a table that gives the staff title, job description, number of staffing currently filling that/those positions, number of people predicted to fill that position based on this report, name of the person who is currently in that position, and the number of hours they work each month? The Board would like to see that to assist in the evaluation of this discussion which, without it is conjecture.

We need definition of who is in what role given the information - what we have currently compared to what changes you recommend and justification for the operational plan based on suggested improvement, expanded services etc. included in the report.

Where is the justification for "...staffing levels have been higher than expected..."? I've not heard that, rather the opposite! Where did they come up with this reasoning?

Lots of disagreement with the list of recommendations.

22. Organization

See the comments above under the heading "Budget" they are all the same for this section.

What service would Parks provide we currently do not and how do they improve the Cemetery over what we do now? If we had 100% of our sales/income going to us, our income, revenue generating numbers would look better than Parks. They would fall under Public Works and the City Cemetery.

Is this simply a push to move the City Cemetery under the thumb of Parks? I feel that is an underlying theme of the report.

Admin staff is necessary for clients and daily communications with clients and drops-ins. The inclusion of Parks into the Cemetery conflicts with operational needs of the Cemetery and this report provides nothing to suggest otherwise.