

De-Identified Comment

Rule

The term "Cemeteries" as used in these rules and regulations shall mean cemeteries owned and operated by the City of Austin.

Comment

Rule

The term "Superintendent" shall mean the person duly appointed by the City of Austin for the purpose of supervising and administering cemetery functions.

Comment

Rule

The term "Owner" shall mean the owner as indicated by the deed.

Comment

Rule

The term "Interment" shall mean entombment or burial of the remains of a deceased person.

Comment

Rule

The term "Memorial" shall mean any marker, monument, headstone, tablet, or other structure, upon or in any lot or niche, placed thereupon or partially therein for identification or in memory of the interred.

Comment

Rule

The term "Space" shall mean the area normally designated for a single Interment.

Comment

Rule

No person shall be permitted to enter or leave the cemeteries except by the public access gates. The cemeteries will be open to the public during reasonable hours as established by the Superintendent.

Comment

Rule

The admission of motorcycles to the cemeteries may be refused on the basis of noise or disruption of services.

Comment

Rule

Any unauthorized person found on the cemetery grounds after dark will be considered a trespasser.

Comment

Rule

The use of any cemetery equipment or facilities may be refused at any time to any person or persons as the rules, judgment and custom may indicate.

Comment

Rule

Written authorization from the owner of record of a burial space, or his designated representative or successor in interest, or other proper legal authority, will be required for interment.

Comment

Rule

The Superintendent shall have the right to schedule the time when interments or disinterment may be conducted.

Comment

Rule

A minimum of twelve (12) working hours before the announced times of the funeral will be required for the preparation of the grave.

Comment

Rule

In making a request for interment, the casket or vault, if of unusual size, must be particularly indicated.

Comment

Rule

The Superintendent shall not be responsible when an error occurs from an order placed by telephone regarding a grave location or container size to be used. The Superintendent reserves the right to make an equitable additional charge whenever additional labor costs result from such mistakes. The Superintendent shall not be liable for any delay in the interment of a body when a protest to the interment has been made, or where the rules and regulations have not been complied with.

Comment

Rule

Proper authorization as required by local government or public authority having jurisdiction in the matter must be presented to the Cemetery office at the time of interment or disinterment is affected. The Superintendent shall not be liable for the accuracy of the data contained in said authorization or for the identity of the person to be interred or disinterred.

Comment

Rule

All interments, disinterments and re-interments shall be performed by a funeral director or other person as provided for by the State and local laws. The Cemetery staff will only be responsible for the opening and closing of the grave.

Comment

Rule

Burial vaults, either partially or entirely above ground, are prohibited.

Comment

Rule

A permanent type of container, such as a concrete liner or burial vault, is required for all adult interments. Sections 9, 9A and 10 at Austin Memorial Park Cemetery and Sections D and E at Evergreen Cemetery are exempt from this provision.

Comment

Rule

Construction or installation of slabs, curbing, steps, fencing, hedging, or enclosures of any kind will not be permitted on or around any space or lot. Cement, iron, wooden, glass, plastic, paper, or other miscellaneous statues or objects, as well as objects of a temporary nature, will not be permitted. The City of Austin reserves the right to remove any objects which are erected, planted, or placed in violation of this rule.

Comment

I heartily disagree. I would limit the restrictions to unapproved fencing and paper and glass items.

I feel that this is probably a good rule within reason. It also could be stated that any installations will need to have approval of the manager of the cemetery or a citizen committee that would approve or disapprove. On a personal note, my family has 8 plots in Section 8. My grandparents, my uncle and aunt, my parents and my husband are buried there and it is where I will reside when the time comes. After my husband was buried, my grandson went to King Ranch Grass Co and purchased enough grass to totally sod all of the plots. As a gift to my deceased husband, our oldest son has taken on the responsibility of keeping our plots weedeated, trimmed, and cleaned up at all times. With permission, we placed wrought iron pieces around the circumference of our plots to keep the crew's mowers from hitting our tombstones as I know they do. I also know that rarely will anyone take responsibility when a tombstone is damaged. The cemetery crew does not have to have any maintenance on our 8 plots in Section 8.

Leave rule as is

No change

Construction or installation of slabs, curbing, steps, fencing, hedging, or enclosures of any kind is not permitted on or around any specific gravesite. [This is an absolute statement, but he believes that there are exceptions to many of these. Consider saying without the written permission of the Cemetery Area. Ex: in his area, they have planted hedges and trees with the permission of the City, payed the City employees to plant them. He feels that he is legal because he paid the City and the City did it. He feels that someplace in here, there should be some flexibility relative to planting trees, shrubs, and improving the area. May want to consider allowing some of these things – but we recognize there there are exceptions when the Cemetery Manager consideres it an enhancement to the Cemetery as a whole. Permitted with his approval or discretion. He feels that according to this rule he was in violation even though he had permission from the City. A lot of these rules address the individual gravesite. May want to think about what could be allowed with the permission of the superintendent] Cement, iron, wooden, glass, plastic, paper, or other miscellaneous statues or objects, as well as objects of a temporary nature, will not be permitted. [What happens if he comes and asks if he can put up a Cross at my family member’s headstone. This rule says you can’t put those there, he thinks this is worded poorly because there are exceptions. Objects of a religious nature may be allowed with the discretion of the Cemetery Director.] The City of Austin reserves the right to remove any objects which are erected, planted, or placed in violation of this rule. [what about the crosses, or other items, if they are in good taste.]

There should be something in here that states that if you are going to do something with your gravesite, it has to be ONLY in your gravesite. If someone plants a tree, where would you propose that someone would plant a tree. Consider the root issue with trees – roots can be obtrusive. He has a space next to his wife that is already buried there. Temple Beth Shalom has it’s own rules and regulations. All of them are fully compliant with PARD rules – they are more strict. Their rules say no landscaping or flowers w/o approval of the Beth Shalom committee. They also approve every headstone. They allow certain sizes – they are smaller than typically found in the cemetery.

I agree with this rule. I think the simplicity, which is currently outlined in the current R&R is appropriate. It starts to look junky with all kinds of knick-knacks sitting around and blowing about. I do respect each families different way of honoring their loved ones, but I feel that the current guidelines are appropriate.

Agree. Keeps it neat and tidy, provides symmetry

Disagree. The objects are not tacky if they are placed there with love an maintained. They give personality and sometimes humor to an impersonal space. It is a shame that modern cemeteries are such forgotten places.

develop a written policy on what concrete items are acceptable, with specifics in writing. If you don't put it down in writing, then assumptions will be made that deviate from what was intended

Disagree. Burials are very personal to the family and the wishes of the deceased. If the ornamentation is of a durable nature, it should be allowed. If it is plastic or short-term, you could say that displays could be limited to the period of one month and may be removed afterwards by park staff.

small religious statues give people solace.

No enclosures, glass, plastic etc should be allowed except plastic flowers.

The rule should be broken up into sensible items regarding compassion and a rule regarding trashing the site.

Agree for the most part. I understand people wanting to have a place to sit, such as a memorial bench.

what is meant by slabs. this should not preclude tombstones or grave markers.

I agree with this rule. Cemeteries should not be turned into amusement gardens!

Totally inappropriate.

If it is limited, as opposed to excessive, I believe space ornamentation to be the choice of the family members. Everyone grieves differently. If one individual finds comfort in the fact that a small statue of a favorite saint is sitting next to their headstone of their late mother, they should be granted that comfort. Only when their decoration begins to interfere with others should be an issue.

Disagree.

With so many trees dying, Oakwood Cemetery is too sunny and hot. I would love to have a tree and bench near my grandparents and parents graves in the annex.

Agree.

no, I want to be able to put flowers for my late husband, I will pick them up and put fresh ones from time to time.

In plastic or not.

DISAGREE.

Disagree. If a "family" owns two or more adjacent places, they should be able to have a bench, and outline of brick or rock. A child's teddy bear is fine. Personal mementos of the deceased, photographs, etc should be permitted and add to the character of the place.

I disagree with this rule, especially as it has not been enforced for many years. Enforcing it ex post facto would result in the destruction and desecration of many gravesites. Further, the past failure of PARD to enforce this rule may be deemed a type of waiver and legally the rule may already be unenforceable. Also, this enforcing this rule would violate the religious traditions of certain groups (for example, the Jewish tradition of leaving a stone when visiting a gravesite). I agree there should be reasonable limits on the type, size, weight, number, and materials of items to be placed within a space or on a grave, such as barring non-weather resistant items or offensive or political messages. I have submitted previously a very rough draft proposing certain such restrictions. Current gravesite memorials that are maintained and do not represent an imminent danger to PARD employees or the public should be grandfathered.

Disagree. If you've paid for the plot, you get to pay tribute to your deceased relatives how you please.

I agree in general. Austin has 5 very distinctive cemeteries. These rules can apply more to Memorial Park, but should be amended as to historic Oakwood and others.

Fine if it's with in reason. Sometime people my want to place a temporary item on a headstone. That should be permitted.

I agree

"Construction or installation of slabs" slabs should be permitted. Slabs would reduce ground heaving.

I would allow family members to put it temporary objects, plant flowers, I do not think they should be allowed to put fences, hedges , etc around plots

Agree, crews and visitors need to be able to walk the rows withoput obstructions

Agree

Agree. This rule is imperative for the safety of visitors and employees as well as for efficient groundskeeping.

There are times, because of expense, that one might not purchase a vase/vases for flowers, but in the future would desire to do so. In this sense, I would seek to allow for this type of item to be added. Many markers have space for the vase/s and could easily be added without damaging or adding to the existing marker.

Agree

We agree with this rule if its the same as current rules.

I disagree with this rule. Expression of grief is important in the healing process. If the items do not present a safety hazard and families keep the grave site clean and remove worn items.

Yes but the condition of the headstones is inconsistent with this approach. You have an uncluttered cemetery but headstones that are topsy turvy. I am told the cemetery was originally perpetual care but changed when the City assumed it.

I disagree with this rule. Some graves are already encased with concrete, many have concrete, wooden, or iron benches. Many statues are included with the monument. As long as these items aren't deteriorating and not an eyesore, I think they should be permitted.

I disagree. Vehemently. We paid for the plots. We should be able to put what we want to pay homage to our loved ones.

I DISAGREE! Who are you to come along at this date and destroy the wonderful ambience at my last resting place-to-be. If I wanted to be buried at Ft. Hood, or some cold mechanical looking place, I would go there. Instead, I chose to be buried 40 miles from my home because I fell in love with the grounds. Wind chimes hanging from a tree? Love it! I did see some things that could be "tidied up"...but you are recommending wholesale wiping out of the charm of this beautiful cemetery. I might mention that it is a historical place. I'm proud that it is going to be my last home.

Disagree. Currently the City is not allowing plantings of any type. The City is allowing for potted plants, which are more difficult to maintain and keep alive, especially in our harsh weather conditions. It is a ridiculous rule and unbearable to not allow friends and family to plant rose bushes or other appropriate blooming plants which have a greater chance of survival, as other cemeteries do.

I agree.

I think slabs, fencing, hedging or enclosures can be controlled. I think a permanent statue could be permitted if it is in place of a tomb stone.

Rule generally sounds adequate, however it prohibits almost anything. He understands banning mausoleums and such, but wants a vase with flowers. Feels the rule is overreaching. Possibly implement a board or committee that would approve or disapprove with consent.

OK with all except for steps. Some may be needed for ADA. Access to all graves should be ADA compliant. No hedging is particularly important since some people like to enclose the graves (mostly when they own several plots) for privacy, but this creates a separation within the cemetery.

Decorations (statues or objects made off any type of material and objects of a temporary nature) should be allowed for a certain period of time because that is part of the grieving process. It's therapeutic. It helps some people grieve by putting decorations, wind chimes, mementos and flowers (plastic or real) for a certain time after the death of a relative, and on holidays such as birthdays, death anniversaries, wedding anniversaries, Christmas, Mother and Father's day, Veteran and Memorial day and July 4th, ethnic holidays, etc.. Decorations should be allowed at these dates in controlled manner, such as with a permit issued automatically for 30 days after burial, automatic for 3 days prior and the day after the holidays listed above, and for the day of the personal celebrations if asked via web site in an easy form. Small wind chimes should be allowed all year long. They are not intrusive and provide soothing sounds in cemeteries that often are either too silent or have too much road noise. Artificial flowers should be allowed. It is elitist and very inconvenient to require only fresh flowers because some people can't afford fresh flowers or some live out of town and can't replace fresh flowers.

Nothing should be removed without a weeks prior notice to a confirmed valid address. Objects should be kept in storage for 6 months in case the owner didn't receive notice. We know that many of the plot owners don't have current addresses and have not been getting notices.

A public cemetery should not be a place of abuse and tyranny. Instead it should have a Cemetery manager that knows how to flexibly manage a place of activity and diversity (age, race, beliefs, attitudes towards death).

Maintenance is important...I know some additions are hard to mow and edge around. However, expressions of grief are as storied as those who inhabit the grounds. Does the enforcement of this rule mean the remove of things previously allowed? Do some of the families have to grieve again as they find memorials changed, plants removed? That seems harsh.

Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at steak here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.

XXX constructed a slab at his wife's gravesite. He did this with the permission from Trey Walden and the slab provided a clean and respectful apperance. Previously, the gravesite was muddy, had no grass and was not dignified. XXX would like the slab to remain.

The sites that typically have these adornments are recent losses. Everyone needs to have a way to grieve. Some folks do this by visiting often and leaving items that are special to that person. To take this grieving avenue away would be tragic. Especially for young children. Perhaps as items become dilapidated they could be removed. Maybe a set bi-annual clearing of old-faded items. I would suggest perhaps a 30 day staging area for items to be stored in case family members want to reclaim them. This rule needs to be carefully examined. I would guess at least 30 to 50% of the current sites are in violation of this rule. The artciles however is what makes Austin Memorial Park so special. The grave sites tell stories and share memories. It makes each site special & not sterile. It is part of the "small town" atmosphere that Austin wants so much to hang on too.

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

Do not agree

Families often take extra care of a loved one's grave. This is markedly true of Hispanic families and to a somewhat lesser extent black families. This can include homemade markers and borders, flowers, even cactus. Evergreen has quite a few of these and they add considerably to the positive ambiance of the cemetery. These hands on alterations are the result of both caring and a lack of funds. I would strongly encourage a bow in the direction of cultural diversity (and keeping Austin weird) by continuing to allow these personal expressions of love, grief, and care. A desire to mow grass more efficiently should not outweigh the passionate reasons we have cemeteries in the first place. (And this from someone who was paid to mow rural cemeteries as a young man). Evergreen is a treasure for historic Black Austin. Please don't sterilize it. And water it more - we miss the trees.

Yes

Yes

Disagree - Items placed by families should be left in place as long as they are not dilapidated, rotting, of that nature. The cemetery staff should remove items that are decaying. If they pose a safety concern, remove them. If they aren't harming anything and are just inconvenient for maintenance, they should be left alone. Use reasonable judgment on this.

Disagree, let people do things different from what I would do. There is not one grave in Austin Cemeteries that is a problem. The city should correct slabs, curbing, steps and headstones that are a hazard.

I say, get rid of extraneous stuff. Allow folks to put flowers, etc. in pots or other containers that rest upon the monument, only.
I most certainly disagree with this rule as most grave plots have some type of these items. They represent the memorial desires of the living, friends, and relatives.
Agree
I agree with this rule.
Disagree. These families purchased these plots and should be able to decorate them as they wish as long as they don't present a hazard.
I think this is only reasonable insofar as the added items directly effect the lot of another. Otherwise, these activities allow connection with the deceased, and should be respected. Thus, I do not agree with the rule as stated. I would add some criteria by which to judge harmful constructions (such as physical encroachment on another space). (All this being said, objects of a temporary nature become trashed (with time), and thus contribute to unsightliness, so I can understand that part of the rule. Maybe it could be changed to be similar to the rule described in question no. 9-- that it will be removed once deteriorated).
Agree
I agree, these temporary additions eventually decay and become trash.
Agree, in general
I agree that spaces should be kept open and not closed in.
what do you want by keeping this rule? sounds like you want something very sterile and a homogenous look. the veterans unknown soldier section of any cemetery is necessary, but we don't need the cemetery to look this way throughout. human beings with individuality are laid to rest there. the families and individuals have wishes an requests.
Definitely agree with the first sentence. I think it would be okay if people want to but something small on their loved ones grave.
Disagree. Families should be permitted to place any object on an individual grave (within the grave's space and not beyond it).. The cemetery should reflect the individuality of the families honoring a sacred space.
I disagree. That only leaves available to us who long to respect our loved ones the option of laying live flowers on the grave that die and wilt within an hour or so in the hot heat of Texas. Could we not place a semi permanent silk or plastic flower holder near the gravestone?
agree as the decorations clutter the gravesites and become unsightly. also increases maintenance

I agree except for small flower arrangements or small pot/urn/planter that may hold a flower arrangement.

Agree

I think that is ridiculous. If it gets in the way of your mowing, then don't mow around that particular grave. Why would it bother anyone if somebody decides to put a statue of an angel? Why would anyone be bothered when the parents of a child put toys on his/her grave? There's one like that near my father and it touches my heart. If there is something that is rotting, decaying, a health hazard or a safety hazard (broken glass for example), sure, remove it. Otherwise, why?

Yes, I agree with this rule

agree People have very differing ideas of what looks good in a front yard. Austin Memorial looks like one of my tacky neighbors' front yard.

This rule, like others below, needs to be re-written in simple, concise form. It combines some specifics with some vague generalities and would be difficult to enforce if challenged. And while it prohibits curbing, # 12 suggests curbing may nevertheless exist by excluding the repair or replacement of curbing from the definition of "care" to be rendered by city employees.

Disagree. Unless they pose a safety hazard, there should not be a restriction on these.

I totally disagree. Only if it is a "safety violation" should it be removed. Otherwise, please leave as is as it may be an expression of someone's love for their dead.

Disagree. Allow objects that are not hazardous. Remove if broken only.

I think putting plants and in some cases of deceased children toys are fine.

Absolutely not. I challenge any person with the City of Austin to go through the cemetery and show a location where these additions are in bad taste and do not pay respect to the deceased.

Strongly disagree. While I see a need to have some regulations, plants, benches etc. is very important to me as I visit the burial place of my family and loved ones. especially object to the city already taking action without warning or notice by pulling a plant I had placed for a loved one.

Disagree. Expressions of individuality should be encouraged.

Disagree.

Disagree. If people would like to place a bench near or on lots they own so they can sit down while visiting their loved ones they should be allowed to do so. If some erects an object that is not obviously/openly offensive, and is on their lot(s) it should be allowed to remain.

I disagree. The plots are privately owned. Within broad limits (truly dangerous items), the owner of the plot should be allowed to place items as they wish.

Disagree - statues or more permanent objects should be allowed.

See answer to Question #1
I agree. People who visit to remember loved ones should not be distracted by others graveside embellishments.
I agree. However, I would allow stone or iron benches which give family members a place to rest
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. While I would not deny anyone the opportunity to express themselves artistically or to remember a loved one in their own way, the city cemetery is not the place for such expressions.
although I see why you may not allow permanent construction, not sure why statues and objects are not ok. they can be very meaningful.
Agree. By keeping the rule, the cemetery will be well maintained, and serenity and peacefulness will be the result.
I agree, but you should include a penalty if the city has to remove prohibited items with the penalty increasing substantially for repeat offenders
I agree. Often these 'extras' are added without respect to the graves of those nearby and to the access needed to reach these graves.
I disagree. I think these personal items are what give a cemetery character, and more important, they give the bereaved some comfort in personalizing their loved one's grave.
Yes, I agree
Perhaps there is some sound reason to limit the types of enclosures permitted at each gravesite, but an outright ban on enclosures of any kind is probably taking it too far. I see no reason why statues or small objects should be prohibited. I can understand if the cemetery wants to ensure that headstones are visible, but surely some compromise is possible to achieve the desired cemetery aesthetic while allowing the bereaved to include tokens of affection to their loved ones, including statuary, small objects and plants, as long as the gravesite owner agrees to assume responsibility for maintenance.
I disagree. I would change the rule to state that any objects that present a public safety hazard or a hazard to park maintenance workers or an impediment to foot traffic will be removed.
Disagree, as the diverse expressions of grief and mourning in our society may call for temporary (seasonal) decorations or statuary that reflects the loved one. One cultural preference for agrief to be reflected in a certain way (ie grass only, or subtle floral tributes) should not be imposed on everyone.
Disagree. Goodness gracious. Loved ones should be able to remember with personal items. Plants (particularly native plants) are a tribute to our heritage.

I disagree with this rule. As long as these items are not creating a danger, they should be allowed to be there, within the plot loved ones have paid for. Benches should absolutely be allowed.
disagree with this rule
Completely disagree! Certain restrictions such as cement I understand...but plants? Statues? Mementoes of the loved one? Why is that a problem?
I understand there have to be some limits perhaps to size to an object, but again I think loved ones should be able to customize the plot.
I disagree with this rule. I would change the rule to allow people to remember their loved ones in any way they see fit that does not endanger visitors. For example, broken glass on walkways should probably be prohibited. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.
Disagree.
Disagree. Should be with approval of city prior and city NOT to be allowed to remove anything without notification.
disagree - it is all a matter of taste
Disagree. Unless it disturbs the maintenance of the park, it should be allowed.
Construction of slabs, fences, or other enclosures--that's ok with me. Statues or objects made of cement, iron, wood, or other hard substances seem ok. Perhaps some parameters about size would be ok.
I do not think it is right to ignore this rule for years and then suddenly start enforcing it. I think as long as people do not violate anyone else's space, they should be able to do what they please.
I disagree. Since the grave sites are privately owned, the owners should be able to construct or install any type of decoration or memorials they desire, as long as it is not obscene or pornographic, and is constructed safely.
I strongly disagree with this heartless plan. I have a loved one buried in Memorial Park and I chose it because it reflected the creativity of the city of Austin. That creativity is shown in the lively and personal decorations used to mark the place where a loved one is buried. It also gives one a sense of the personality of the loved one, which allows their memory to live on beyond death.
Completely DISagree. Too sterile and, basically, ridiculous.
Disagree
I disagree. Especially the statement about not allowing temporary objects. Small stones are placed on grave stone as a sign that a friend or relative has visited. Figurines and vases are sentimental to those that visit.
parada ! Encuesta en espanol ? [Survey in spanish?]

Disagree. What is the purpose of this rule? If the area "inside" of the enclosure is maintained, there should not be any restrictions of this nature. If the grave becomes overgrown and not tended, then their removal would be in order.
Disagree; I would remove the rule.
Ok, with the rule except as it applies to existing modifications already in place assuming they create no hazard.
Disagree. I think it is ok to have height or access restrictions placed but think it completely unnecessary to limit family participation in grave upkeep. I find this especially grievous to those who have not signed on for this when purchasing their plots.
I disagree with the rule. I would change the rule by consulting with the owners of the grave plots to come up with something that everyone can live with.
Disagree. Why is this not permitted? I don't understand.
I would disagree with this rule. As long as the statuary does not malign or disrespect groups of people based on race, creed, sexual orientation it should be allowed. A size limit may be in order but to ban it altogether seems insensitive.
I think anybody should have the right to personalize the grave site of their loved one, not only should they have the right but it should be encouraged. The only thing that might be suggested is to not use light things that could easily fly away (e.g. paper/plastic) - or to make sure that they are properly attached or fastened.
Does that include cement, iron, or wooden benches? (see#7) What about chimes? Offenders should be given enough notice to take care of the problem
What's the purpose of this rule. To make it easier for the City to mow? Or to prevent trash from accumulating. If the latter, I think you should narrow this rule. Perhaps you should make clear that objects that are paper and dilapidated and broken need to be removed. Then you need to define what is considered broken.
Hard and fast rules are not good.. Need to be flexible and judged case by case
Disagree. I would allow planting of drought resistant plants and flowers, the erection of bird houses, the additions of flags on special days, the placing of rocks (Jewish tradition) and the temporary placing of other materials, such as for Day of the Dead.
I disagree. This is far to broad and appears to permit know modifications. A small rubber duck or a beautiful planting of Zinnias would not be allowed under this rule. Surely you can craft wording that disallows buidling something like a pergola while allowing a grieving person to remember their loved one with planted flowers or toys.

<p>My family encourages planting(s) of hedging, shrubs, flowers or trees at the gravesite, IF, they are maintained by the family members and bring an astetic nature to the gravesite. It should not have to be maintained by the city. As long as a family member maintains the location in a positive and environmental nature, it should be encouraged.</p>
<p>Outdoor pots should be allowed, as well as outdoor edging to keep the grass and weeds at bay.</p>
<p>Strongly disagree! I would delete this rule! Not even temporary objects? Even the national cemetery regulations are not that strict! http://www.cem.va.gov/cems/nchp/ftsamhouston.asp</p>
<p>Please! Allow mementos-make the gravesite comforting and a blessing for the community and the bereaved.</p>
<p>I disagree. I think the families should be allowed to erect edging around the grave site of their loved ones, as long as it's not a material like plastic edging which would deteriorate over time. I think stone or rock is proper and attractive.</p>
<p>Completely disagree because the statement is far too vague and gives the The City of Austin far too much leverage to interpret as they see fit. If something is falling apart or creates a safety hazard I agree, but if you see fit to remove a small wooden bear I left for my mother I would have to say what is wrong with you. I know that something small like that probably would not be removed, but the fact you give yourself the right to do that if you wish, I can agree with. Reword it and I'll see what I think.</p>
<p>Disagree- not everyone is as uptight as the city of Austin.</p>
<p>Yes, I agree with this rule.</p>
<p>Although I agree that fencing and curbing would make maintenance more difficult, slabs or wide-based statues or mementos should be ok. Low hedges and plants with clear mowing paths are nice. Trees are essential.</p>
<p>Totally disagree with this rule. Are you saying a vase of flowers would not be permitted ?</p>
<p>Disagree. Without anything beyond the tombstone, the graveyard becomes a lifeless and sterile place. By being allowed to items, particularly plantings and statues in a space you have bought to memorialize the person buried there is a long honored tradition in memorializing those you love.</p>
<p>I disagree - I suggest it should read Construction or installation of slabs, curbing, steps, fencing, hedging, Cement, iron, wooden, glass, plastic, paper, or other miscellaneous statue or enclosures of any kind will not be permitted to extend beyond the bounds of the individual lot</p>

I understand the rule, but I also believe that it's almost a freedom of speech that people are using when they leave things there to soothe their own souls when they visit. It might not be "pretty" the way you think it should be, but these people bought and paid for the land where their loved one is buried and they should be able to put mementoes there.

Disagree. Discard this rule completely and concentrate on health and safety issues. Pickup the dilapidated articles on a regular basis.

I disagree with this rule because it impedes individual expression at the private grave sites of loved ones. Anything obstructive, dangerous, or unsightly is understandable and should be prohibited. Something temporary should be allowed on a grave site at least on the memorial day of a relative. Specific items should be decided on by all stakeholders involved in a fair manner, respecting cultural diversity.

I agree. I am on the cemetery committee for the Agudas Achim Cemetery which is in the Austin Memorial Park and this rule will help us enforce many requests we have made to families of departed loved ones regarding just such enclosures.

I disagree strongly with this proposal.

I agree. I sympathize with grieving families who wish to mark the passing of their loved one with mementos, but these displays are disrespectful to all the other very special people who share the cemetery and to their families.

Agree to some extent. There are some specific rituals that require a temporary indication that someone has visited a grave site - for example a flag or decoration for certain holidays, and also a stone on top of a tombstone for those of the Jewish faith - - these traditions should be respected and permitted.

I disagree, strenuously. This has nothing to do with "respect" and everything to do with making it easier for the cemetery maintenance guys to mow.

We disagree! Small items should be allowed on grave sites as well as planted flowers. In the past the City has failed to maintain our grave site properly.

Disagree. My parents' grave site plan was run by the person on site and was deemed appropriate. It is tasteful, respectful of others nearby and peaceful.

I disagree. I think people should be allowed to fence in their private plots or define them in some way, as long as it's not a safety hazard.

Too vague. Also, removal without notice and opportunity to dispute? Whatever happened to due process?

Agree.

I strongly disagree with the rule. Individual small statues or momentos could help the people left behind to feel better. They do no harm.

I disagree.

I would delete "objects of a temporary nature" because this would exclude flowers or flags or stones.

Sections which already contain slabs, curbing, steps, etc. should be allowed to maintain and/or construct new to create continuity.

Agree: Safety is of utmost importance. Items need to be limited to preserve a neat, orderly, and attractive, safe area that can be maintained by the employees.

there are religious injunctions or at least suggestions for example for jews to have a fence around a burial place. and jews must ritually wash our hands when we leave a cemetery. im not sure how to rule on those kinds of issues.

disagree - too many 'details'

agree with wording...the key word here is enclosure

allowances for permanent structures and if private family plots some curbing or other statuary with tombstones should be allowed. markers such as stones to show visitation should be allowed as these do not deteriorate nor blow away or become unsightly. no plastic nor vegetation that can become unsightly such as pin wheels, pictures, candles.

I disagree. I believe this rule is too stringent. It does not affect me directly, but I would suggest that accommodations be made in two ways: a) some temporary placements should be allowed, provided that they are limited in time and do not interfere with a specified schedule of mowing and other gravesite care; and, b) the Department should consider whether certain permanent placements--with reasonable restrictions--should be allowed, provided that the affected family agrees that certain types of maintenance (e.g., lawn mowing inside a concrete edging) can no longer be performed (and, if applicable, that the family will be responsible for maintaining the enclosed area).

disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries - Longview Code of Ordinances - Section 22-14, Exhibit A

Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

Disagree. I see lots where families have planted native shrubs to remember their loved ones and I think that is a respectful way to remember. It seems as if this rule/regulation would not allow for this to happen

DISAGREE! Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle.

I would like personal items, statues, and objects to be allowed to remain on an individual's grave since these represent their spirit.

I disagree. A plot should reflect the person buried therein. If benches, statues, or hedges show how the family remembers the dead, they should be allowed. Stones or coins that show someone visited should not be disturbed.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Agree however some plantings would be nice though they would require special care which places an unmanaged burden on the maintainers.

With the cemetery being so old, some people have put things that are sentimental to them, and that should be considered when looking at what has already been there for years and may cause a problem with the families that have put in a planter or angel or something like that. He knows some of that stuff is worn out and rotten and should be addressed.

Honestly, I believe that what people do with the gravesites of their loved ones is their business, not the city's. I would strike the rule.

Support enclosures or fencing, but could allow concrete curbs to show where City maintains up to, and the family would care for their own plot. Absolutely don't agree with the rest of the rule, scratch entirely. Selected section 6 for it's eclectic nature with temporary/seasonal memorials. Owns 8-10 burial spaces. Iron cross put up for her grandson. Doesn't think people should be required to get the standard granite memorials. City should remove dilapidated, rain soggy items.

Rule

Only one casket will be permitted in each grave. In the event cremation is utilized, a maximum of four (4) interments will be permitted in one (1) space.

Comment

Rule

The use of a space is for the owner or such other person as the owner may designate.

Comment

Rule

In the event of the death of an owner, any and all privileges of the owner shall pass according to the laws of the State of Texas.

Comment

Rule

The City of Austin shall have the right to establish a charge and time of payment for each interment and disinterment.

Comment

City is charging people extra \$350 if they don't give the City 12 working hours notice of burial. I think this wrong.

Rule

The City of Austin reserves the right to specify the amounts and terms of purchase of all spaces to the original purchaser.

Comment

Rule

In the event an owner sells or conveys a space or spaces, a record of such sale or conveyance must be provided to the City of Austin.

Comment

Rule

When a disinterment is accomplished for the purpose of re-interment within the same cemetery, the current price of the vacated space, less 25%, shall be allowed as payment toward the new purchase. The established charge for opening and closing each space will be in addition to the price of the new space.

Comment

Rule

All memorials shall be installed and maintained at the expense of the owner.

Comment

State law says that city is responsible for straightening memorial stones (Tx Hlth and Safety Code 713.011 – municipalities responsibilities for cemeteries). Main concern, aside from aesthetics, is leveling and straightening of the stones (not the owner's responsibility, it is the city's responsibility). Poor condition of stone (leaning, unsupported) is a bigger issue than the ornamentation with dilapidated materials.

Rule

Only one memorial will be permitted on one grave space. A companion or family memorial may be placed upon two or more grave spaces. Memorials will be placed in alignment with adjacent memorials and centered at the head of the grave space. The actual location for memorials will be determined by cemetery personnel.

Comment

Rule

Space or lot corner markers will be set flush with the turf.

Comment

Rule

Flush type Memorials—

-The marking of each space or grave in areas designated for flush type memorials is restricted and limited to memorials set flush with the turf, and of such dimensions, materials, design, finish and construction as indicated in this section.

-Flush type memorials shall be made of granite marble or cast bronze installed on granite, marble or concrete base. Granite and marble memorials and bases shall have smooth sides and bottoms and a minimum thickness of four inches (4").

-Concrete bases shall have a minimum thickness of six inches (6") and shall be smooth on all sides.

-All flush memorials shall be set on a minimum of two inches (2") of sand for cushioning and leveling.

-The length of flush type memorials shall be at least ten inches (10") less than the grave space width.

Comment

Rule

Above Ground Materials

-In areas of the cemetery not specifically designated for flush type memorials, either an above ground or flush type memorial may be used.

-All above ground memorials shall be of marble, granite or similar permanent type stone.

-Memorials used above the ground level to mark a grave shall not exceed the following dimensions:

--The base shall not exceed 18 inches (18") in width

--The overall height shall not exceed 42 inches (42").

--The length shall be at least ten inches less than the grave space width.

Comment

Rule

Should any existing memorial or mausoleum become unsightly, dilapidated, or a hazard to the safety of persons within the cemeteries, the Superintendent shall have the right to correct the condition or to remove same. The expense of such removal or repair may be charged to the space owner.

Comment

The rule is OK in principle but too vague and broad. I would remove "unsightly" as totally subjective. I would like to see some notice to the families, but understand that is impractical. I would include a provision that the rule should be enforced conservatively.

I agree with this without suggestion.

Leave rule as is

This is against State law. It is the City's obligation to pay for this. (Change the last sentence as such).

No change

This is tricky. Right now this guideline is handled leniently. However, any Superintendent in the future could enforce this with a heavy hand. When the correction is due to a safety issue, this would be reasonable. In the case of the memorial becoming "unsightly or dilapidated" might cause problems. I have seen beautiful, ancient memorials (Europe, St. Paul's Churchyard in New York, etc.) which could be considered 'dilapidated', but are part of our collective history, and most importantly, honors the deceased for which it marks. This decision is too subjective for one person (the Superintendent) to decide. I would rather see a panel of people determine if a memorial is considered 'dilapidated or unsightly'. If we adhere to the current R&R of monuments being made of granite, marble, etc., then "dilapidation and unsightliness" should not be an issue. In this case, the appearance could be considered "antiquated charm!"

Agree. It is a public place and safety should be everyone's concern who visits.

Disagree. The owner should be contacted to make amends/repair before cost is incurred to make the change.

I would notify the heirs to correct first, as a courtesy, then if there is no timely response (also consider safety issues) or they defer back to the superintendent, then proceed.

Agree, if the space owner could even be determined. If not, what happens? I favor repair over removal - unmarked memorials are problematic. Is there additional language that specifies a replacement?

The City should first notify the next of kin with a 60 day moratorium. After 60 days the city has a right to correct the issue.

Agree

the rule is fine so long as family can be found. if not, the grave should be cleaned and made neat without payment.

Lot owners should be responsible for removing all items that are old and dilapidated. It's costs us to remove other peoples junk!

I agree that the Superintendent should have the right to correct or remove any unsightly memorial, but only when the family is also notified.

Agree but plot owner should be contacted first to see if they'll take care of it on their own.

Many mausoleums develop a "patina" over time. What is wrong with this?

There should be a short window for a warranty provided by the contractor who installs the stones. After that I believe it should be up to the family to pay for removal or repair of stones.

no, you should not charge us if you disagree with the unsightly site. shame on you.

Only after contacting the family.

Disagree, the City should not be allowed to retroactively change rules that would cost an owner.

There should be a set procedure requiring PARD, if any space is not in compliance, to give the space owner written notice specifically setting out the nature of the violation and how the violation may be brought into compliance and the space owner should have 30 days from receipt of such notice to remove or correct the said violation. Only if the space holder fails to remove or correct the violation, should PARD employees be authorized to do so in a manner that, within the reasonable discretion of the Superintendent, is the least invasive and disruptive to the space. PARD should also have the right (and already does) to remove or correct any violation without notice if the violation presents an immediate and serious danger to the safety and welfare of PARD employees or the public, as well as to remove any broken or deteriorated items and dead plants or flowers.

Disagree. You can't charge dead people money.

A agree in part. But what about cemeteries like Oakwood where the space owner's family line has died out, or after several generations is unknown? This also comes with restrictions as to changes to nationally recognized designations. Rules should reflect the other city cemeteries and not just Memorial Park.

True. Unless it was damaged by humans, machines or was poorly constructed.

I wouldn't change it..

I agree however, how would you deal with the owner if the owner is interred or no family can be found,

I agree that if the items become unsightly, dilapidated or a hazard, that they should be removed.

Disagree - All of our cemeteries are historic in nature (50 years or Older). while I agree in principle that All monuments are the property of the families, getting descendants to pay for a repair or removal is not backed up by any law that could be enforced. the city has no idea who the descendants are in the first generation little own 6 or 7 generations removed as with the older burials at Oakwood.. the fact that monuments are historic by state law when they reach 50 years or older , they are protected by state law so you can not just remove them. the key here is to determine when or How a monument can be classified as abandoned property then allow preservation groups work with COA staff to stabilize / restore historic monuments

Agree

Agree. Unsightly and dilapidated memorials demonstrate neglect, and hazardous conditions invite injury and lawsuits.

In the case of my mother and father and aunt, they purchased "perpetual care" spaces; therefore, if repairs are to be made or any other unforeseen expense is required, the Cemetery should incur the expense, not the space owner.

I feel that the headstones should be maintained by the city. I'm sure there will be many times that the space owner or family cannot be contacted for collection.

Agree

I agree with a notification to the family first. If the family doesn't remove the item in a timely fashion then a charge would be applicable.

Repair the headstone. Never remove it.

I think the Superintendent should notify the space owner and give them 30 days to address the situation. I am sure, most owners would be happy to repair, replace or have items removed...Give them the option first.

I believe the superintendent should get in touch with the owner first. Rose bushes that were over 50 years old were removed without our permission. And a tree.

agree

I DISAGREE! Who is making the judgment that a site is "unsightly, dilapidated or a hazard"? What if the Super. is having a bad day? This is judgemental, arbitrary and could be used cruelly.

Agree.

I agree.

I think this is fair but I would make sure the owner had been notified and given 30 days to make adjustments before he is charged an expense. A shifting of the land should be handled at the cost of the cemetery.

Appropriate rule. Appears the soil where the cemetery was originally plotted has a lot of Del Rio clay causing headstones to tilt. Somebody needs to do something with soil stabilization...a shared expense.

Nothing should be removed without at least 2 weeks prior notice to a confirmed valid address. We know that many of the plot owners don't have current addresses and have not been getting notices. Stones are a big issue of controversy. Almost all stones are leaning due to lack of irrigation of the grounds. The clay soils shifts significantly when dry. This has been going on for decades. The public has asked for the stones to be reset, but the city doesn't want to pay for this. It's not OK to ask for the public to pay for resetting of the stones if the City continue to not maintain the ground at a proper moisture level so that they don't lean so fast. The other issue is that the contractor resets the stones with a different process, not as good as that of others. The public can hire their own contractor to reset the stones, but the Cemetery management office always recommends the same contractor with the lowest quality. They should at least provide a list of various contractors or none at all. Unsightly is on the eye of the beholder. Define unsightly in the rules, or expect a lawsuit when a memorial or mausoleum is removed (even if the City pays for the removal) and the owner doesn't agree with the removal. This situation will be aggravated if no removal notification is sent, or if it is sent to an invalid address, which we know occurs often. Safety hazard caused by the stones leaning can be defined with an angle (Stones should not lean more than a specified angle). Use standard specifications.

Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.

Circled YES

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

Yes

No

If the family is actively alive and still participating, that's one thing, but if you have families that are long inactive...not sure. It's a tough call.
Disagree, tag the grave informing the people who care what the hazard is. It will cost more money to find the person to bill. The worst cemetery is Oakwood, too old to bill the grandchild. The city needs to correct hazards as regular maintenance.
Just do it!
I disagree. Any repair work on cemetery monuments or mausoleums should be done sensitively and respectfully.
Disagree. Existing memorials should not be removed, without family approval first. If there is family still living they should be consulted about the expense before being billed. If there is no one the cost of repair must be born by the city.
I agree.
Give the family the opportunity to correct the condition, first.
Seems reasonable.
All efforts should be made to contact the space owners first, and rather than remove a memorial it should be restored.
Have reservations on this. A memorial stone should not be removed if the person does not have surviving family members to rectify the issue.
I disagree. Dilapidated mausoleums add character to cemeteries. And some families go extinct, but their memories should not be removed. What if all the Zilkers moved away and did not pay for the upkeep of the family plot? Should they be removed? I think not.
Owner shall be notified of property condition non-compliance and be given a time period for correction, before Superintendent incurs expenses to repair.
I think the owner should be told and given time to correct the problem first. I do agree that if it becomes unsightly then it should be removed.
responsibilities of the superintendent and plot owners should be outlined and shared. the grounds do not need to be as meticulous as the stat cemetery but maintained and neat. supervisor or committee should not have more say than locals and plot owners. some owners no longer live in austn and cannot be expected to maintain as well as local families seniors cannot do this work either. services could be provided at low cost.
I agree except with the additional language being that the Superintendent shall have the right after the space owner had been notified and not corrected the problem.

Vital to let families have a say in this via a townhall type meeting to determine exactly what is permitted, and what is considered a question of safety. Listen to the voices of the families involved.

there would need to be criteria of what constitutes dilapidated. And the cemetery should attempt to contact the sites responsible person prior to incurring repair cost.

agree

I agree only so much as you contact the family first, giving them a reasonable time to correct the problem themselves and THEN proceed to the above mentioned. I only make it into the cemetery about 2x a year and would be very upset if I was not aware of a problem and it was fixed without my input.

If it due to safety hazard the situation should be corrected. If it is due to dilapidation or unsightliness, the space owner should be contact and attempt made to work with them to correct the situation.

Define unsightly for me? That could mean anything depending on who judges it. Delapidated and a safety hazard are understandable and I agree.

The family should be notified first and not be surprised by some bill..

Agree, however, what happens if there is no next of kin to correct a dilapidated headstone?

Removal or alteration of memorials and mausoleums, if done by the Superintendent without notice and accompanied by a demand for payment of costs, could result in litigation.

yes for dilapidated, hazardous. unsightly is a judgement call and that would not be a good thing to put down as a "rule"

Again, if safety issue, yes. But who is defining unsightly. What may be unsightly for someone may be OK for someone else.

Agree.

i agree.

Apparently, the people writing these rules have not been to a cemetery lately. The vandalism is rampant disrespecting the citizens of Austin who have chosen to remain here after life. The City has a less than stellar record in maintaining these sites and the rules are wrong for saying the deceased will be charged for any work done to their plot. This is the most ludicrous rule of all, and disrespectful to families.

How interesting that it is to the discretion of the city on what is unsightly and then to charge the plot holder for the removal. I would make every effort to contact the owner of the plot (family etc.) to correct the problem.

Yes.

Agree. keeps it looking good.
Disagree. Numerous notices should be sent requesting a part correct an issue that may arise and only after several attempts should PARD take action to change a memorial or mausoleum.
The only time the "superintendent" should remove questionable items is after efforts made to contact the owner. This should be in writing and filed so that others (media, legal representatives of "stakeholders), can review attempts to contact.
Agree
See answer to Question #1
I agree, within certain boundaries. Time changes perceptions and cultural expressions. A winged cherubim might appear unsightly now, but 50 years ago differently.
I agree
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
I disagree with this (except for a safety hazard). Cemeteries do have some dilapidated parts and within reason this is to be expected.
Agree. Cemeteries are not meant to be used as altars to the memories of loved ones. Altars can be constructed in homes and on private property, but not on city owned property.
agree
This rule is more difficult because much of the change in condition is the effects of time, weather, and subsidence of soil. Much of that would fall into the category of maintenance which is what was paid for when the plot was purchased.
That seems reasonable so long as we're talking dilapidated or hazardous. Unsightly is a matter of opinion, however, and is a slippery slope.
Yes, I agree
The space owner should be notified well in advance of removal or repair of any of their property, along with the rationale for doing so, and offered the opportunity to remedy the situation themselves first.
I disagree. "Unsightly" is a subjective term. Safety hazards must be addressed but the issue of upkeep must involve a notification process and allow space owners time to respond before the Superintendent or staff become involved.
There should be a mediating process. Not fair for super to make decisions that could prove more costly than surviving family can afford.

Disagree. Personal mementos are not dilapidated or hazardous items. Who decides what is dilapidated or hazardous? Does a small American flag with a pointy end on the grave of a veteran qualify? Does a bench mean that someone could potentially trip on it? Or interfere with mowing water thirsty grass?.

REmoval of a mausoleum or memorial? That is horrible! A hazard should be fixed, but do we really call old cemeteries, unsightly? Memorials should weather just the way they are.

disagree with this rule

Agree...especially for safety issues.

I agree that dilapidated or hazardous conditions need to be dealt with and yes it should be at the expense of the space owner. Unsightly is a little harder to judge. It's objective and what is unsightly to you may not be to others.

I disagree with this rule. "Unsightly or dilapidated" is vague and should be clarified. The Superintendent should have the right to contact the family and require true hazards to others to be corrected. Perhaps a list of what the Superintendent would consider a safety hazard would help. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.

If something becomes dangerous to others, of course. Beloved plants and mementos should be retained.

Disagree. Who gets to decide "dilapidated" or "unsightly"? Again family should be notified and given chance to correct or respond. What if unable to pay?

yes

I agree with this but it is quite subjective.

... the Superintendent shall contact the owner and request repair or removal. If owner is unable or refuses to repair or remove, the Superintendent shall have the right to correct the condition after a minimum of 3 attempts to contact the owner.

If it's a hazard or is unsightly, then the condition should be corrected. If there is a disagreement as to whether it's unsightly or just not to the taste of others, there should be a fair way for people to argue their case for keeping the memorial.

A board of at least 3 people should oversee the safety and appropriateness of memorials and mausoleums. If 2 of the 3 board members feel a construction is unsafe, the owner should be notified and given a reasonable length of time to correct the problem. If the owner does not correct the problem then the board should direct the Superintendent to take care of the problem.

If a memorial becomes a hazard to safety, then yes, the owner should mitigate the situation. Otherwise, leave the memorial as is, even if it dilapidated.

Only after contacting the family there should be a board of owners' families to evaluate, not one person who might have bad taste or a personal agenda.

Disagree

Safety has got to be a priority. I do have to question the phrase "unsightly". Hopefully this is not a judgement call on different peoples customs or style.

parada !

Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish]

Should NOT be up to one person. Individuals can have personal agendas, vendettas, or just plain bad taste. A board should be formed of families with loved ones buried in the cemetery to decide such matters, as they have the most at stake as owners and, generally, most frequent visitors.

Disagree; I would remove the rule.

You're going to remove a headstone? There's no opportunity for the family to fix it? Families should be able to register contact information with the Superintendent and even to put monies in trust for the necessary repair and maintenance of their headstone... a fund from which the Superintendent could draw. The rule should be changed to prioritize repair before removal. This draft you have is written in such a way that it could be very offensive to families of those buried at a city cemetery. Where did you get this draft? Originally written for City of Austin or is it language that's taken out of some other cemetery policy? Bet it's the latter as this does not sound respectful and I'm sure City staff did not intend this.

Disagree. I think this may very well become a place for abuse of power. If there is a safety concern, the Superintendent should address that with the space owner.

I would change it to say the Superintendent shall first consult with the space owner.

Agree with all but unsightly. Who is to determine what is unsightly. Safety yes, but unsightly, no.

Safety hazards should be dealt with in any public place and I would support that. I wouldn't change this rule.

This sounds reasonable, however it depends on the definition of "unsightly". I think it should be changed to "the Superintendent will NOT have the right to correct the condition but will CONTACT the space owner who then will correct the condition.

agree - but, again, the offenders should be given enough notice to take care of the problem

<p>What is considered to be unsightly to some is beautiful to another. For instance, a nice expanse of green lawn is beautiful for some and a garden full of native plants is beautiful to others. This is very hard to legislate and should not be.</p>
<p>Yes, after attempting to contact owner reasonably</p>
<p>This rule is problematic because who defines "unsightly or dilapidated"? However I generally agree that dead flowers or dead plants, torn or soiled flags, things that are visibly falling apart should be removed.</p>
<p>I tend to agree with this but the word "unsightly" is a problem. I don't have a better phrasing but more thought needs to go into this.</p>
<p>"Unsightly to whom?" Obviously if the grave sight is not maintained, it should be addressed. 1st in writing to the owners, then with a face to face meeting to resolve (3rd party if needed).</p>
<p>Disagree. The owner should be contacted and given appropriate time to correct it. But who decides what is unsightly? I don't like agaves, but I respect your right to plant them.</p>
<p>Agree, Add that the owner should be notified in advance.</p>
<p>Agree, all personal mementoes and plantings need to be kept in a presentable (and in the case of plantings) weed-free.</p>
<p>Yes, in theory, but I think some of the words are subjective and could be argued, i.e. "unsightly" can be interpreted differently by different people / cultures. Certainly, if something was a hazard, it should be removed (but the family should be notified first, out of courtesy). If something hasn't been maintained, it should be removed.</p>
<p>dilapidated and hazard to the safety of persons I agree with. Unsightly however is an opinion that again is far to open to interpretation. Expand on what you mean by unsightly.</p>
<p>If it presents a hazard it should be corrected.</p>
<p>Yes, I agree with this rule.</p>
<p>Only with advance notice to the owner. And what if the owner is not the originator of the problem? I don't think I've ever seen anything in a cemetery that was a "hazard to the safety of persons within the cemetery"</p>
<p>A safety hazard should be dealt with.</p>
<p>Disagree. The problem is the definition of unsightly and dilapidated. Some traditions expect memorials to fade and weather as part of the fading and weathering of the pain of loss. I agree that any structure which becomes a hazard to the safety of visitors or workers can and should be removed.</p>

I agree with the rule except that warning notice of at least 90 days should be sent to the owner of the danger to the general public

If a mausoleum were to begin crumbling and it's very nature become a danger to those around it, then yes, I believe it should be fixed. But I don't believe that teddy bears or wind chimes are a hazard.

Disagree. This rule is in contradiction to the current Texas Health and Safety Code Â§713.011 which states "A municipality that operates or has jurisdiction over a public cemetery shall maintain the cemetery in a condition that does not endanger the public health, safety, comfort, or welfare.

(b) A municipality's responsibility to maintain a cemetery under this section includes:

- (1) repairing and maintaining any fences, walls, buildings, roads, or other improvements;
- (2) leveling or straightening markers or memorials;
- (3) properly maintaining lawns, shrubbery, and other plants;
- (4) removing debris, including dead flowers and deteriorated plastic ornaments; and
- (5) promptly restoring gravesites following an interment."

I wrote this section of the law and maintain does not mean just ignoring the fallen stones or laying them on the ground.

The City is responsible for maintaining the cemeteries and its not the owners responsibility to pay for such maintenance.

I would change the rule by contacting the space owner and explaining the perceived problem to explain the complaint and allow a time limit for removal before the city removes it and charges this to the space owner.

I agree. As Congregation Agudas Achim owns our two cemeteries, we will see to it that all memorials are in acceptable condition.

This sounds reasonable, but I imagine collection from the space owners might present practical challenges.

I agree with this rule. But I can imagine that problems might arise from different interpretations of "unsightly" and "dilapidated."

Agree

I have grave doubts about this one, since "unsightly" is an extremely subjective term. This needs to be rewritten to cover memorials that truly may become hazardous, but as it is, this is just verbal cover.

We disagree. The owner of the grave site should be contacted first and be given a chance to remedy the situation.

Generally agree. However, the city installs headstones but does not maintain them. It's not up to me to pay for neglect in maintenance.
Sounds fine to me.
Notice to owner and opportunity to dispute/refute/cure
Agree. So long as the space owner has an option beyond paying an exorbitant figure handed to him or her by the Superintendent with no prior discussion.
I agree with this rule. The expense of maintenance should be planned for ahead of time. If not, then they should be responsible, not the taxpayers.
agree
I disagree. What if the dilapidated grave belongs to someone from the 1800's?
Identifying the "space owner" seems unworkable. The cemetery should budget for such costs and include them in the initial cost of a plot.
Space owner must be notified and allowed to self-correct before the city takes over.
Agree: Safety is very important. Should anything become a hazard or unsightly it needs to be repaired or removed.
unsightly and dilapidated are slippery concepts to enforce. and if one thinks of the old cemeteries in Europe for example, the old memorials are among the most beautiful or interesting aspects.
disagree
need to find other revenue stream
disagree to the "remove" bc that is not up to the Superintendent to decide this unilaterally...especially if there is still family alive.but rather the family should be given a timeframe to make the repairs before any decision to remove is made.
the space owner is dead.. should not go after relatives . is responsibility of the city/community
I would modify this rule so that the Superintendent alone does not have the final say in issuing such a judgment. The basis of this rule is reasonable, but a decision should be subject to appeal (perhaps to a special committee or to the City Council, if such issues are relatively infrequent).
disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries Longview Code of Ordinances - Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas
It depends on what is deemed unsightly and I think that families should have an opportunity to respond first.
DISAGREE! Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle
OK with rule as long as the space owner is notified in advance.
I agree, but the "space owner" may be dead, and their estate disbursed.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Agree. Need to ensure warnings and notifications precede any action.

If the person is dead, how can a charge be given to them. May not be possible. Like I was saying at the meeting, some people have done the best they can to make a marker for the family and some of them have died. It's hard to go back and find a family member. Might be a problem if someone were to come into town and be unable to find their loved one's marker. That would be a big problem. Evergreen is a very old cemetery and out in the country when it was put in there, there was not too much interest put on what the rules were more than burying 6 feet deep. According to the video at the meeting, some people have a long history of going to their loved ones sites and putting in stuff that looks like no one has taken care of. This man in Houston, he doesn't want to sell his house – it's a big problem between two people. Like cemetery spaces. Its' a lot of family involvement. The more stuff around the grave, the more people are going to be hurt. Need to inform people about what should be taken out. Be hard to bring in rules that haven't been in place at the old cemetery. Hasn't been kept up since the man lived on the property, he has been gone for years and the cemetery has gone down. Has been neglected for a number of years. So has the one off 35. It's kind of embarrassing. People have paid their dues and should be respected. Recommends that new rules will go against what people have been doing, if we get new rules, will be a problem. Might be able to enforce rules in new sections. People will find out that the rules that are brought up are from an existing rule book. Has been neglected since the 70's. Grass was always so green and soft when the guy lived on site.

"Unightly" is in the eyes of the beholder. Dilapidated and hazardous are another matter. I would retain that language and delete "unightly."

Agree. Wonder about the freedom the cemetery has to decree something a safety hazard. Add a qualifier because she does not trust their judgment.

Rule

The size of concrete foundations for all above ground memorials shall be 1" larger in length and width than the size of the base.

Comment

Rule

The top of concrete foundations shall be from 1" to 2" below the top of the ground to allow for adding cement grout to level the memorial base.

Comment

Rule

Concrete foundations shall be a minimum of 8" thick and have perpendicular sides and flat bottom.

Comment

Rule

Excavations for foundations for above ground memorials shall be a minimum of 10" deep from the top of the ground. If the memorial base is two feet (2') or more in length, there shall be one 6" diameter round hole dug 18" deep (or to rock) below the bottom of the excavation at each end of the excavation.

Comment

Rule

Concrete for all memorial foundations shall be 1 part cement, 2 parts sand and 4 parts gravel.

Comment

Rule

Memorial dealers shall abide by all the rules and regulations of the Cemeteries.

Comment

Rule

The Superintendent reserves the right to approve the size, craftsmanship, quality, inscriptions, and foundations of memorials placed or to be placed in the cemeteries.

Comment

Rule

Memorial dealers engaged in placing or erecting memorials or other structures are prohibited from scattering their material over adjoining spaces, or from blocking roads or walks, or from leaving their material on the grounds longer than is necessary. Damage done to spaces, walks, drives, trees, shrubs or other property shall be repaired at the expense of the memorial dealer, to the satisfaction of the Superintendent.

Comment

Rule

Work of any nature may be stopped if proper preparations have not been made; or when work is being done in such a manner as to endanger life or property; or when there is evidence of misrepresentation; or when work is not being executed according to specifications; or when any reasonable request on the part of the Superintendent is disregarded; or when any person employed in the monument work violates any rule of the cemeteries.

Comment

Rule

Visitors or workers shall use only the avenues, walkways, and roads, unless it becomes necessary to walk across other spaces or graves to gain access to a space or grave.

Comment

Rule

Automobiles, trucks and other vehicles shall not be driven through the cemetery grounds at a speed greater than fifteen (15) miles per hour. Unauthorized vehicles may not be driven or parked off the designated roadways or parking areas.

Comment

Rule

Pets shall not be allowed in the cemetery.

Comment

Rule

The use of intoxicating beverages within the cemeteries is strictly forbidden.

Comment

Rule

No person will be permitted to use profane or boisterous language or in any way disturb the quiet and good order of the cemetery.

Comment

Rule

No boxes, shells, toys, discarded glassware, sprinkler cans, water hoses, or similar articles will be permitted to remain on any grave, walkway or street.

Comment

I am totally confused what this even means or is intended to do. Boxes??? What kind? "Similar items" to what? Shells and toys and other mementos should be encouraged and tolerated on the grave site itself. Limits for safety issues only. I agree that tools and hoses should not be left.

I think this will be an emotional issue. I understand that items distributed over a grave make it a maintenance problem and can be unsightly. But explaining that to a grieving parent or to anyone in the grief mode will be very difficult to do.

Space owner or holder may decorate or memorialize the space only as provided herein.

☒ All items must be placed wholly within the confines of the space owned or held.

☒ All items must be weather- and water-resistant and suitable for outdoor display. Non-weather and non-water resistant items, such as paper materials, plush or stuffed animals or toys, clothing or fabric, or wood or plaster ornaments, may be placed within a space only on a temporary basis and must be removed by the space owner or holder within seven days from placement or when the item begins to deteriorate, fade, or decay, whichever is earlier.

☒ All items must be firmly anchored within the space in a manner to secure and prevent the item or any parts of that item from leaning, falling over, breaking, or blowing outside of the confines of the space.

☒ Items on any grave within the space may not exceed 36 inches in height and may not weigh more than 25 pounds. Items within the space, but not on any grave, may not exceed 60 inches in height and may not weigh more than 50 pounds.

☒ Items containing political messages or offensive language are not permitted. Items, including flags or banners, representing the United States of America, any state within the United States, any nation, or any branch of the federal or state armed forces or services may be placed within the space or on the grave, provided that such item is made of weather-resistant materials. Flags or banners must be promptly removed when the item begins to fade, deteriorate, or fray. Space owners or holders and family members or visitors to a specific space may place items related to a religious practice or tradition on the grave or memorial within that space.

Hanging items such as wind chimes, spinners, and other ornaments (ornaments) may not exceed 12 inches in length, exclusive of the hanging cord or chain, and may not weight more than 16 ounces. Only one wind chime per space is permitted. An ornament may be suspended or hung on a pole within the space, provided that the pole is firmly and securely anchored and does not exceed 60 inches in height. Items may not be hung on trees within or adjoining the space using nails or spikes, but must be suspended from a weather-proof chain or cord. Such items must be:

☒ be at least 72 inches from the ground;

☒ cannot be hung over streets, sidewalks, paths, or roadways;

☒ suspended in a way that will not scar or inhibit growth of the tree or its branches; and

☒ secured in a manner to prevent the ornament from falling from the tree or tangling within the tree.

To prevent the breeding of mosquitos or other noxious insects, no items that hold or retain water, such as bird baths or decorative fountains, are permitted.

☒ To prevent the attraction of rats or other animal pests, birdfeeders and similar feeding stations are not permitted.

Space owner or holder is responsible for complying with these regulations and maintaining any and all items placed in space. The owner or holder must promptly replace, repair, or remove any item that is deteriorated or damaged. Failure by the owner or holder to do so will result in the item being subject to removal by the City of Austin Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) employees pursuant to these regulations. Owner or holder may be liable for any damages or injuries caused by items placed in the space that do not comply with these regulations.

Leave rule as is

It is appropriate to have water hoses. City won't do it and sprinklers don't always reach. Hoses can be left hooked up to the water spigots.

No boxes [define this], shells[define it], toys, glassware [all glassware is dangerous], sprinkler cans, water hoses, or similar articles will be permitted to remain on any grave, walkway or street.

Where should they be? If you don't allow any of those things – where can they be? Specifically water hoses? The Cemetery does a very poor job doing watering, understanding the water restrictions. They have water hoses out there connected to spigots, that's where they leave them. He would think that's okay – but not according to this. Does this mean they are not permitted at all? Some of them belong to the city, and they leave them there.

I agree with the intent to keep things cleaned up. The exception to this could be to retain the occasional trash receptacle and hose for use. I would think the staff of the park would maintain these and keep them in the appropriate spot.
Agree. Too much stuff to remain tidy looking plus it's difficult to mow and weedeat properly. I've seen flower vases left behind that are broken and scattered glass.
Disagree. It is understandable that those things would be disallowed in a street or walkway but not on a grave.
It causes a problem when mowing is scheduled. I suggest making the mow days/schedule available to the public ahead of time and if items are not removed, then the superintendent has the right to remove.
I agree but would update to say "for more than 30 days, and families are encouraged to remove the items for safe keeping after the 30 days"
People often use shells to symbolize life and nature. All the rest should not be permitted. Do you guys know anything about death and grief at all???
Agree with all but the shells. The reason being is it is Jewish custom to leave a rock or a stone in honor of the deceased. Sometimes the shell can represent the same meaning.
agree
Toys should only be allowed on the graves of infants and removed within 30 days or until old and faded.
I agree with this rule. If everyone was allowed to leave non-memorial type things, the cemeteries would look awfully cluttered.
Agree assuming the rule is describing trash left behind.
Some parents may want to leave a toy on a child's grave. It could be discarded when it becomes unsightly.
I would keep it. It can make for a very unsightly cemetery when small items are left on cemetery spaces, and never cared for after that.
agree
No boxes, shells, toys, discarded glassware Only. Hoses have always been allowed.
Disagree. The City should keep public rights of way clear, but a cemetery lot owner should be able to adorn as they wish.
See my response to #3.
Disagree. *ALL* boxes, shells, toys, discarded glassware, sprinkler cans, water hoses, or similar articles will be permitted to remain on any grave, walkway or street.

I agree. But again, these rules apply more to Memorial Park Cemetery. I would like to see rules from the city as to the standard of care the city will hold its self to as regards to cemetery up keep. Its only fair that city let grave owners now what they can be held responsible to. It makes it appear that the burden of compliance is placed wholly on the citizen, while city in not accountable.

Disagree. People should be allowed to place a couple small items on a stone. This should not be excessive.

I agree and would not think it needs changing.

I would add that the cemeteries should provide hose outlets at a reasonable distance apart. Hoses can be used but must be removed from the cemetery. Any hoses left over 12 hours will be collected and disposed of.

If the item is a toy or glassware that has a sentimental reason, I think it should be permitted at graveside. but certainly not thrown about

Agree, these small items get lost in the grass and when mowed over become missiles / flying objects that can injure staff and visitors. A 72 hr post inturnment service rule will allow items placed at the time of inturnment. then all items will be tossed.

If the item is a toy or glassware that has a sentimental reason, I think it should be permitted at graveside. but certainly not thrown about

Agree

Agree. Cemeteries are shared, public spaces. It is the superintendent's obligation to provide and enforce regulations that forbid the placement of undignified, unsightly, and objectionable cemetery ornamentation. These are detrimental to other plot owners and visitors and they interfere with efficient grounds maintenance. Individuals whose expressions of grief require ornamentation beyond that which is allowed in publicly regulated cemeteries are free to assemble such memorials within the safety and privacy of their own homes.

This is clear and reasonable. I would not change this at all.

Agree

Agree

I disagree . Removal only if it's a safety hazard or in poor shape.

A Jewish tradition requires the placement of a stone on a headstone when visited.

Thank God, I have not experience the loss of a child. I can see where placing items on a grave can give comfort and peace to the person. Of course, if they appear to be deteriorating, notify the owner first and they will deal with the issue.

Disagree. If there is something placed on the grave, let it stay. If in the street or walkway it should be placed on the grave again.

one small item does not bother me.

NOTE: I can see that sprinkler cans, water hoses could be unsightly. Are you aware that in the Jewish tradition, it is encouraged for visitors aka mourners, to leave pebbles, rocks and/or shells on the headstones at a burial site? This rule could be very tricky and I know (because I am Jewish), that there would be an uproar. Do you really want to go there?

I agree, however, I wonder why the wind chimes are allowed in this cemetery. Not everyone "enjoys" the sound of wind chimes. On the day I held the service, two wind chimes nearby nearly ruined the graveside service because the wind was blowing hard and the wind chimes were EXTREMELY DISTURBING AND NOISY. In fact, they disturb me EVERY time I visit this cemetery.

I agree.

I think water hoses should be allowed if they are attached to a water faucet system. Individual watering can be beneficial and save money if it is used in select areas.

Appropriate rule

No boxes or shells (from the ocean?), OK. Toys left on a grave are left there because the person is hurting a lot and needs to provide some care to the departed child. It's a gesture of love and trying to cope. Stuffed toys may deteriorate faster than other objects, so the same rules that I propose in (A) above should apply with shorter terms.

It really should be a flexible rule, of good management walking the site and seeing what objects are deteriorating, send a notification and remove them 2 weeks after. All objects should be kept in storage for 6 months in case the owner wants them back. A stuffed toy may be left on a grave at first because it was the child's favorite toy, but after a few weeks, the parent may want that precious stuffed toy back as a memory of their child. What looks like discarded glassware may have some significance to the owner in some cases. See (A) above for process.

Sprinkler cans, sprinklers and water hoses are a whole different issue. These should be allowed to water private plots and trees, provided that the hoses are neatly stored, so that there is no danger of tripping. In fact, these are badly needed so that the public can water the grass and trees since PARD (inheriting the extremely deficient grounds care from the previous grounds contractor InterCare) doesn't water the grounds sufficiently. The supplemental watering helps the trees survive the drought and the soil stay less dry so that the stones lean less. In many cases, the owner waters the tree that the owner planted in memory of the deceased and the grass in his/her plot. Most of the plot owners who frequent the cemeteries are elderly and/or disabled and they can't carry water hoses and sprinklers back and forth on each trip. It would be a complete lack of compassion and disrespect, and a very unwise rule to not allow water hoses and sprinklers to be left on site.

Watering also helps the elderly with the grieving process and it gives them something to do, a reason to go out of the house, walk, exercise and go visit their deceased relative. The City is committed to provide exercising opportunities to all for health reasons, and watering should be seeing as part of that effort.

The rule to accommodate this should be that hoses are to be round up neatly and left on the ground around the water spigot or hung from the spigot if the person is able to do it. It's not OK to require that all hang the hoses from the spigot because some elderly persons can't lift the heavy hoses.

Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.

The property is owned by a private citizen. Honor family/cultural traditions.

Agree with removing broken glass or safety hazards or boxes. Toys, watering cans should be left alone.

Circled NO

This is not a problem if it's a hazard, move it! No rule needed!

I really like access to hoses so that I can water grass and plants.
I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.
Yes
I do not agree. Please remove the rule
No
Disagree – Items should be allowed if they are reusable, but realizes this is difficult to define. If they are dilapidated or pose a safety risk, remove them.
Disagree, this is not a problem, if it is a street move it. You do not need a rule for this.
No change needed. Assuming that the City maintains the grounds, that enumerated stuff is unnecessary.
I disagree.
Agree.
I agree.
They should be permitted as long as they don't interfere with others.
Seems reasonable.
Agree
I agree, these things can break, or blow away and become trash.
Agree
I agree. While I can see why people would want to leave a favorite item in memory of the person who died. The items get blown away and clutter the grounds.
I can see if someone wants to put something small on the grave that is meaningful to them but that does not include water hoses, sprinkler cans, glassware or boxes.
Disagree - this should be left to the families to decide
If the shells or stones are left on the foot of the gravesite, how does this cause danger or a safety issue to one. Some people respect their loved ones in this manner.
if the articles can be placed ON the monument, I don't have a problem with it. However, when the articles are placed on the grave itself or around the gravesite, this becomes an issue.

I do very much agree! It begins to look junky because everyone has their own idea of what is acceptable. Create an "alter" at your own home for the person. Not everyone shares the same beliefs and it is best to keep it "uniform" with the majority. If we were in Greece, we'd have totally different rules that as Americans, we may not understand but would have to live by.

Disagree, momentums are meaningful to the loved ones and help them heal for losing a loved one. As for watering devises, they are necessary to keep the grass alive on our loved ones grave.

No boxes or discarded glassware. Agreed. But small toys, shells, sprinkler cans or water hoses are reasonable if they are not a danger to others. I keep a vase by my father's grave so I always have one when I take roses to him. It's not in the way and not a danger to anyone.

Keep the Rule

Sometimes water hoses are necessary for watering new plantings (trees).

As in #2, here's a recitation of some specific items paired with a prohibition of "similar articles." There's little similarity between "shells," "discarded glassware," and "water hoses," for example. It would be more understandable simply to specify what is permitted to be placed, and for how long, instead of trying to name everything that's not permitted.

Disagree unless they're broken or a safety hazard.

If you are a parent of a small child that passed away, having a toy on their tomb may be your way of grieving. Do not put these stern laws in place. Put youelf in grieving parent place. Don't see the harm of having water hoses near the grave.

Disagree. Unless the objects cited are broken or set so that someone could trip over them.

I agree, except toys.

This rule is ambiguous in that the city does not maintain the plots other than to satisfy themselves on certain issues. Families, in my observation, have come together to assist each other in maintenance of other graves in order to be respectful of the cemetery.

If you do not permit water hoses or sprinkler cans how do you suggest we water the plants (which you seem to want to remove). I have no suggestion or comments regarding boxes, shells etc.

No, unless they are broken/unsafe for others to trip on and get hurt. These are necessary. Toys definitely should be allowed for grieving parents.

Disagree.

Disagree, some of the prohibited items ma have special significance to the departed and their loved ones. If there is an issue with regard to unslightliness then maybe there should be a time limitation or a rule that if it creates a hazard the party wil be notified and if not corrected within 14 days of notification then PARD can take steps to remove the hazard.

I disagree. As long as those items are placed on the graves (which are private property), there should be no removal without the written consent of the "stakeholders".
Agree
See answer to Question #1
I agree.
I agree
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
well if people are leaving these things around in a big mess, sounds ok to remove, but if it's while they are watering or there are some shells places on a gravestone, see no problem.
Agree. Cemeteries are not to be used as places to store items of any kind. Such items should be stored at homes or on private property, but not on city owned property.
I agree and again suggest fines be instituted especially for repeat offenders
Agree. The above listed items can prove to be hazards to the rest of us. The rule could be that if they are not removed by Fridays, they will be disposed of.
I disagree. I think people should be allowed to leave items like hoses and sprinkler cans that allow them to maintain plants. Personal items like toys, vases for flowers, and the like should be left alone.
Yes, I agree
I can understand banning "discarded glassware", or anything that might pose a threat to health and safety. I don't understand the need to ban boxes, shells, toys, or sprinkler cans. Would you really take a treasured teddy bear off of a child's grave and throw it away? What is the justification for this policy?
I would suggest the CofA provide a storage facility where owners may leave water hoses, cans, etc. for the upkeep of their spaces. "Boxes" is too nebulous a term - paper trash ought not be allowed.
You can do better in writing a policy.
Disagree. In the Jewish tradition, a stone or (sometimes) shell is place on a grave to indicate a visit. Are we now limited to a stone? Water hoses, sprinkler hoses, save the city money. Maybe not on the street -- is this an issue looking for a problem?.
No glassware allowed. This makes sense. It can break and get in the grass causing a hazard. Nothing left on a walkway or street is good, as that is for general use. What is left on the grave is up to the grave owner.
disagree with this rule
Agree

I disagree with the rules. Items to maintain the site should be removed, but items that represent the deceased should be allowed to remain.

I disagree with this rule. I would change this rule to prohibit items on walkways or streets but not prohibit them on graves. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.

I disagree, except for water hoses that aren't in use. They should be put away. Discarded glassware, too.

I somewhat agree; however people grieve differently and if a favorite trinket left on the grave helps with the process what is the harm? As long as not piles on piles of these. Agree with hoses and glass.

What is on the grave is the owners right to have there. there should be nothing left on paths and other public parts of the cemetery

Disagree

this one is ok with me to keep things from becoming cluttered, although organic items are ok--rocks, shells, stones.

I basically think that people should be able to decorate the graves the way they have for years. Why is it suddenly an issue? That's my answer to this and all the other questions.

The rule should be amended to limit such items to the actual grave site, while banning such items from walkways and streets.

It depends on the situation for each grave.

Walkway and street are fine. Don't understand why grave applies.

Disagree except to the extent that said articles could be wind blown and hazardous to others.

Again Safety has got to play a part in this ruling. Glassware can be dangerous especially if broken, but how short a period is "remains" for those that visit regularly and bring at times a vase of flowers to put by their loved one's stone. By definition the stone and slab that the stone(marker) rests is on the grave. I think a little boy should be able to put a matchbox car on his mother's grave marker and expect it to be there the next time he visits.

parada !

Encuesta en español ? [survey in spanish?]

Who would come up with such a ridiculous rule regarding a grave? I can see restricting from walkways or streets, as they could be a hazard. But regarding the grave, if it's not creating a hazard - leave it alone. And if someone hurts themselves walking on the grave, that's good as they shouldn't be walking on a grave anyway.

Disagree, I would remove the bit about shells, toys.

I really don't disagree with this. It's unfortunate that a person can't leave a hose out there, but I can see how a hose could be a tripping hazard.
Disagree. While I can see the water hose as a potential hazard, I cannot understand why it is considered wrong to keep plants and flowers watered or why shells or toys should not be allowed to remember a loved one.
Toys? You wouldn't allow parents and friends of children to place a toy? Shells? What harm do they do? They're a simple, natural thing in a memorial. Similar articles seems too broad and open to a wide interpretation that could be extended to just about anything.
Disagree. Again, why is this rule necessary?
I don't wholly agree or disagree with this rule. It is a slippery slope to eliminating self expression. Walkways and streets should be clear but the grave itself should be adorned as the family sees fit.
I disagree. Again, I think the personalization of a grave site should be encouraged. After all, the entire purpose of a grave site is to remember a loved one. Like I have said above, the only rule might be to make sure than anything placed by the grave site is securely attached or weight down so it won't be blown away.
agree
This rule is too broad. What purpose does it serve? If the items are personally meaningful why are they not permitted? If they are not broken why can't they stay?
Agree
I don't see a problem with shells if you mean seashells. Otherwise, this seems reasonable.
This ok when referring discarded items, sprinker cans, and hoses. Its also ok when referring to the non-grave site area. But people should be allowed to leave objects on the gravesite.
Items of remembrance should be allowed if placed on the gravestone (not on the ground). What about placing rocks (Jewish tradition of respect). Does that not apply in this rule?
Agree
Strongly disagree. "Discarded glassware" might mean someone has celebrated an anniversary and left the glass as a memory.
Really? Let's be human here--individuals have purchased these graves as a final resting place--please allow mementoes it gives the family comfort.
Yes, and no. If the items are mementos for the memory of the departed, they should be allowed. Sprinkler cans (unless metal or ornamental), hoses are other maintenance items should be removed and stowed away. If families are watering living wildflowers on the graves, I think it would be nice to have a place for them to store watering hoses, etc.

Disagree. Sure keep the out of the street and walkway, but next to the grave or on it. Austin Memorial is a community where people are allowed to express their love for those that have past and you are censoring that. Walkway or street I'm fine with but the graves are non of your business unless it poses a safety hazard, but honestly, workers should not be stepping over my mother's grave in the first place.

Disagree Too open ended. Who defines 'similar articles'.

I agree with this rule.

agree

Surely a teddy bear or toy left at the gravesite of a child would be acceptable.

Disagree. In the Jewish tradition leaving stones on the grave at each visit is practiced. Some military units have the practice of leaving coins on the grave as a remembrance. We have to respect that many people, either through tradition or personal feeling, often leave personal items as a connection to their lost loved one. Particularly shells and Toys are often items left by loved ones to unite them with their losses. Many people (totally unconnected to my family) have left toys, shells and other trinkets on the grave of my daughter . One person (I know not whom) left a serenity coin, a very personal trinket, probably as a show of having overcome the pain of his/her loss.

I agree with the rule except that warning notice of at least 90 days should be sent to the owner

Some of these items seem a bit odd to be left on a grave, but maybe they have been for some reason. I can understand "toys" but not the other items. I think I would leave this rule as is, but leave toys to be allowed. Parents want to give their child toys, so let them, even in death, since they were not able to do so in life.

Disagree. Water hoses are allowed. Dilapidated articles must be picked up regularly to maintain the cemeteries.

I would include this rule with Question 3, and mention the criteria that I suggested, with a reasonable case study approach.

I agree. All that 'stuff' takes away from the dignity of this sacred place.

I disagree with this proposal. Perhaps a reasonable middle ground would be to allow such items for a limited time. As for hoses, over the past decade, I have purchased and left attached to the spigot, several good hoses that have made it easier for me and for others to water flowers and gardens planted on graves. It might be reasonable to require everyone to coil the hoses at the spigot when they are not in use.

I strongly agree. Before my family and my friends' families purchased lots at Austin Memorial Park, we read the rules. We bought lots with the expectation that trinkets and trash would be removed.

Disagree - not sure the harm with allowing some small token to be left on a grave, so long as it does not hinder lawn mowing or landscaping.
Disagree, strenuously. So, if you're going to forbid shells, why not rocks, which are the traditional Jewish form of paying respect to the dead? This is a terrible rule.
We disagree. Small mementos should be allowed. Water hoses are necessary at faucet sites because the City does not always water properly.
Agree
I disagree if that means you're removing mementos. And many religious and cultural traditions involve leaving stones at gravesights, so I think removing them is offensive on the City's part. Plus, plots are technically private property. If it's not hurting anyone or a safety hazard, leave it be. It's therapeutic for families and loved ones.
Yes
Agree.
agree
I disagree. Let the toys stay.
This also seems too broad. Jewish mourners leave a small rock or stone on the grave stone. It sounds like these would be prohibited. I would say any temporary items will be discarded after a certain period.
Agree.
Agree: Cooking containers, pots, pans should not be used as floral containers. Rocks should be added to the list of items that should not be in walkways or on graves. Toys, balloons, rocks, and others items need to be removed.
not clear what 'similar articles' includes. and does discarded mean unintentionally left as opposed to left as a sign of reverence?
disagree need to work with the stakeholders
agree
agreed
This rule includes too many disparate items and should be modified. For example, water hoses may be needed on occasion but should not be left at the site. However, small toys may be an appropriate memento to leave at the grave of a young child (within the confines of other rules governing such items).

disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries - Longview Code of Ordinances - Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

It seems harsh that a family member could not leave a moment to remember a lost child or loved one.

DISAGREE! Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle

I would like personal items to be allowed to remain on an individual's grave since these represent their spirit. I agree with no discarded glassware and sprinkler cans. The hoses are OK on the spigots.

I agree.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

If someone has a small toy on their baby's headstone, that maybe should be allowed. Big stuff that takes up more space than the gravesite itself would be encroaching on someone else's space. Has not seen talk on the news about this, but thinks the community needs to know before they are enforced. Word is not getting out in the right way. Suggested paying for spots on Gospel 1060. Don't want to get the neighborhood mad at the city about things that they hold dear.

For the reasons expressed in Question #1, I would do away with this rule.

Disagree. Family should be able to leave items to memorialize their loved ones. Sprinkled a broken glass bowl among their family's flowers. Would want to take a beer bottle if they loved beer.

Rule

The Superintendent has the authority to enter upon any space and to remove any objectionable thing that may have been placed there contrary to the regulations, and may remove any dead or damaged flowers, trees, shrubs or vines.

Comment

Rule

All persons are strictly forbidden to break or injure any tree or shrub, or mar any landmark, marker or memorial, or in any way deface the grounds of the cemetery.

Comment

Rule

No person or persons (except peace officers or a military guard of honor) shall be permitted to bring or carry firearms within the Cemetery.

Comment

Rule
<i>No signs, other than those installed by City personnel, will be permitted on the cemetery grounds.</i>
Comment
Totally disagree. Signs and placards of a permanent nature should be encouraged. OK to limit to permanent or semipermanent materials (no paper or cardboard) and to allow for removal of offensive stuff.
I totally agree.
Leave rule as is
No change
No change
I agree. I particularly enjoy the historical marker that is present at the front of Austin Memorial Park. It lists some of the "notable residents" of the park! I would love to see this updated from time to time. Other necessary signage should be installed only by City personnel. There should be no additional need for any signage.
Agree, with the exception of temporary marker signs provided by funeral homes. No "personal" signs.
Disagree. The rule is too broad. What other signs could there be? A child's drawing taped to a grave that says "We love you Grandpa!" should certainly be allowed.
Recommend defining "sign" in the policy. Does a sign mean a small plaque, a poster board on a stick, a greeting card? When we write policies at work, we include definitions at the beginning, to clarify our intentions.
Agree. Although it is unclear what is a sign? Better language needed.
Directional signs and placement should be allowed e.g. " Agudas Achim - plus arrow"
Agree
signs from individual churches or synagogues or temples should be allowed with the approval of the city to denote sections.
I agree, no one should install any type signage.
Agreed.
Agree
No signs except for headstones and other gravestones.
I agree.
I am not sure what you mean by signs.

NO. There are signs with historical reference and significance at Oakwood that should be permitted. As well as at other libraries.
Agree
See my response to #3.
Disagree. How else do we get to protest the burial of dead pedophiles?
Again, as applied to Memorial Park, yes. Temporary signs, markers and other education/informative signage installation at historic Oakwood should be allowed. with approval of city. Installation not limited to city personnel, but allows those groups given consent to put up signs and take them down.
Agree. Unless they are temporary markers.
I agree.
I agree. This rule needs no change.
what is cosidered a sign?
Yes, this is city property. the Cemetery manager needs to approve all signage. there will be times when Non Profits who are working with the city will want / need to post temp notices or edu. material, all of which should have approval of the cemetery manager, but may be installed.
Agree
Agree. Only aesthetically pleasing informational and directional signs provided by management are necessary.
No change recommended.
Agree
Agree
It depends on what kind of sign it is.
Agree
Of course, no political signs or adverstisment should be permitted but I think it needs to be on a case by case basis. Has this been a problem in the past?
Depends on what kind so signs.
agree
You don't go into detail about what signs you're referring to? If you're referring to directions, etc. I don't see a problem.

I agree, however, signs placed by the City regarding upcoming meetings regarding City cemeteries are frequently very difficult to read, sometimes difficult to see, and may even be inaccurate or incomplete.

I agree.

Agree

Temporary signs such as directional signs for temporary purposes should be allowed. Signs should be placed and removed by the people having the service.

OK, except for rare occasions that get a permit from the cemetery manager for temporary signs. Have flexible rules. Manage, not dictate.

Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.

I understand it could eliminate unsightly signs, but not clear as to signs, plaques, etc. that designate that gravesite as historic - example - State Historic Marker (in Oakwood) from THC, Lamen's or Texas Rangers marker in AMP. Also - somewhat related - memorial markers erected for the wishes of the plot's owner. Will those be allowed? Example - there is a memorial that passed through ALL levels and was approved, but then the Cemetery Superintendent denied them erecting it AFTER it had been approved by all the proper channels, including the City Landmark KComm. No offensive marketings, flags or sayings are on this memorial. It is the Sons of the Confederate Veterans Memorial commemorating the final resting place of over 100 citizens of Texas interred there. It shouldn't be up to just 1 person to decide what HE thinks should be in the cemetery. Its Gettysberg considered offensive?

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

No

Agree - Ok with this rule, but should get approval from Superintendent to install signs. Approval shouldn't be withheld for arbitrary reasons – should have some guidelines.

Disagree, there are so few signs as it is, that this is not a problem. This signs that are there are interesting

I would allow signage on headstones!

I disagree.
Agree.
I agree.
This infringes on free speech, doesn't it?
I think it seems reasonable, but I'd like to see examples of signs people have placed in cemeteries.
Agree
I agree.
Agree
I agree that signs not be erected that would unsightly. I do think that small well made plaques that have information about the life of the person should be permitted.
I agree.
Only appropriate signs should be allowed...and placed (for direction purposes) at appropriate corners by the city.
Agree
agree, unless for temporary installation such as notification of an event by a group.
I agree with no signs if it is what I'm dreaming up in my head (banners, pieces of paper flapping about)...but signs as in tombstone markers and large family name markers...I don't agree at all.
Agree
That's ok.
Keep the Rule
Agree, no signs.
Does this prohibit only the installation of signs? As written, it's broad enough to be interpreted to ban someone from carrying a sign onto the premises for purposes of a service or ceremony.
Disagree. People can use those to show hobbies or other passions of their loved ones. It's individualized and beautiful.
Sometimes, signs of people's passion are on their tomb, such as if they were a sports fan etc... A way for some people to help heal. Please put yourself in the grieving person's shoes.
Disagree.
i agree.
No signs period except traffic control should be anywhere.
What signs are you referring to? Temporary signs like the ones we placed to direct loved ones to the burial we had or some other obscure rule. What about a sign that is on a grave with special religious significance or cultural importance? This is wrong.

No, disagree. If the signs are not inappropriate (for example political signs), there's no harm being done. They further serve to individualize gravesites.
Disagree. There's not that many signs so it's not a problem. We like to read about other people when we are going there.
There needs to be more clarification as to what specifically the city is attempting to prohibit that has created an issue that necessitated creating this rule.
I disagree. As long as those items are placed on the graves (which are private property), there should be no removal without the written consent of the "stakeholders". There should be no personal signs in the walking areas or along the roads.
Agree
See answer to Question #1
I agree
I agree
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. While I would not deny anyone the opportunity to express themselves artistically or to remember a loved one in their own way, the city cemetery is not the place for such expressions.
well no I don't think people should stick signs in the ground, but if they have some writing on a vase or something or lettering on a memorial box, don't see a problem
shouldn't be something so people are having to read large letters though
Agree. Cemeteries are not billboards. If private individuals want to convey messages they can post them online and in the newspaper.
agree and institute fines for repeat offenders
Agree. Any cemetery can be difficult to navigate. Signs placed by the city are helpful, other signs are only helpful to a small group of individuals.
I think this is reasonable.
Yes, I agree
As long as signs aren't so large or otherwise obtrusive as to interfere with the visibility of City signs, or block grave markers or headstones, I don't see any reason to ban them.
Disagree. The size of signage can be regulated but small signs on individual sites ought not be disallowed.
Again, define sign. This leaves the policy open to hugely arbitrary interpretation..

Disagree. What signs are a problem? I haven't seen any that are at issue. Is the City creating a problem?
Signs on a grave should be permitted.
disagree with this rule
Disagree....personal crosses and such should be allowed
It should depend on the sign. A sign that shows the deceased was a cheerleader as those that you see outside of homes should be fine. An advertisement should not.
I would allow signs at gravesites but not elsewhere. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.
Why not?
Agree.
yes
Disagree.
No signs is ok.
The owners should be allowed to place signs on the grave sites, but not on walkways or streets.
I disagree with this rule. Again, enforcing this rule, would strip the mourners from installing a physical eulogy for the loved one that expresses the personality of the deceased.
What purpose does this serve?
Disagree- signs should have size constraints, but not entirely be restricted.
Yes, to the extent that if a group as in a church or synagogue might be able to work with the city to have a sign put up to identify or direct loved ones to their area.
parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish]
Why would one make this rule? I can see no billboards or something silly, but what exactly are you trying to prevent? What is the purpose? Seems like another silly sterilization proposal.
Would be nice if the City could explain the rationale for each of these rules so we could better envision the problem you're trying to fix and then be better able to address our concerns while also attempting to correct the problem you've identified. Cemeteries need rules that help keep the place looking nice and minimize the cost of the property owner in maintaining it. However, while these rules surely must make sense to the drafter, the ordinary citizen doesn't know the problems you face.
Agree. This seems a reasonable rule.

I think this sounds good, but couldn't a flag or a medal be considered a sign? Those are appropriate. Depends on the sign. This one might be the only one I could agree with.

Disagree.

I wouldn't change the rule. There should be some standard signage for visitors.

I disagree. Without any further explanation I don't understand what this reason for this rule is or what it is trying to accomplish.

agree

I disagree. You should more narrowly define this rule to state for each sign what size, material, and lettering is permissible to install.

Yes

This is too general. A family or loved one can't temporarily place a card or a poem at the loved one's grave?

The family of the departed should have control over what signage exists on the gravesite.

Signs if they reflect the idea or memory of the person lost should be allowed.

Agree

Disagree. There should be additional language with more detail regarding what should be allowed.

Aren't gravemarkers considered "signs"?

I disagree, if that means a family can't place nice, permanent markers, signs etc. in memory of their loved one. If you mean paper or poster board signs, I do agree. Anything that would decay and / or blow away, shouldn't be allowed.

Disagree. If people complain that something is disrespectful, talk to the owners of the signs and put it to a vote, look for a middle ground.

Yes, I agree with this rule. I have witnessed, from one grave I visit frequently, offensive items placed at the XXX grave, specifically yard art designed as a gravestone with a ghost peeking from behind it with the word Boo. I cannot fathom someone placing such a thing at their son's grave, and I and other family members visiting nearby graves are offended by this fall display. Likewise, the Christmas ornamentation placed at theXXX gravesite it excess, gaudy and left far too long.

agree

Agree.

Disagree. Again, depending on the definition of sign. Many graves have faith plaques laying on them placed by loved ones. Even a tombstone might be a sign. If you mean signs for sports or politics, there are several tombstones with these on them too. A slippery slope.

I agree if this applies to permanent signs. Temporary sign to celebrate an occasion could be placed for a predetermined period subject to a permit issuance by the Superintendent
depends on what you mean by "signs". If they are smaller than a loaf of bread then I believe they should be allowed, as they are freedom of speech by those who were left behind when their loved one died.
Disagree. Personal signs should be allowed on a personal grave site as long it is not offensive and is maintained appropriately.
I agree and have no issue with this rule.
On its face, this rule would seem to preclude tombstones and grave markers. I have seen many notes, written or hand painted on small rocks, or small signs expressing love for the departed that I believe should not be prohibited.
Keep this rule. Why would someone erect a sign? To call attention to a particular grave?
Agree.
Disagree. I don't think signs are a huge problem.
This rule should be changed to allow small flags or insignias installed. For example my son is a Marine buried at the cemetery and we have a small Marine Corps and US flags at the site.
Agree
Disagree. If it's on the private plot and not offensive, I don't see why it's a problem.
No, although other signs that people want to put up should be subject to an expedited review
Agree.
Signs designating certain areas of the cemetery could help people to locate certain graves.
agree
I agree with this rule, except during a funeral or other service, when temporary signs should be allowed.
I agree.
Agree.
Agree: All items should be approved before being added to the cemetery.
what about religious injunctions etc?
disagree
need to work with the stakeholders
agree
agree
I can't think of any exceptions at this time, but it would be more reasonable to stipulate: "Exceptions must be approved by [cemetery officials.]"

disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries - Longview Code of Ordinances - Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

DISAGREE! Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle

I would amend this rule so that inspirational signs or sports signs with athletes name and number may be included.

I agree.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Agree

Does not know what type of sign people would want to put into a cemetery. If people put one out, it should be taken out after a set amount of time. Any sports sign should just be for a limited time. It would help if everyone used the space that has been paid for by the person that owns the spot and not extend out beyond that. Would be hard to put the rules in place this late in the game – but if there was a new section, this would be ideal. You will have more leeway on something that never existed before. If you are going to put in rules, you need to have a starting place where the rules are going to be implemented. If someone sues the city about something, that would be a problem – would have to back it up with documentation.

Totally disagree. Family near them that has their son's high school banner on display, very tastefully done.

Rule

The City of Austin is not responsible for vandalism or theft of any memorial or other personal property.

Comment

Rule

The construction, installation or placing of any wooden, concrete or cast iron bench, chair or table, or any wooden or wire trellis, shall not be permitted on the cemetery grounds.

Comment

I would completely abandon this rule. These items, especially benches, make the cemeteries real places to visit and reflect.

We paid \$2,000 to have a granite bench placed on our plots. I don't see granite listed above so assume it would not be affected. I can understand banning wooden benches as they deteriorate rapidly but concrete and cast iron would withstand the elements. I imagine that this rule is for easier maintenance by the cemetery crews.

Benches add to visits by family if they are placed properly.

The construction, installation or placing of any wooden, concrete or cast iron bench, chair or table, or any wooden or wire trellis, shall be permitted only within any space. Any such item must be weather-resistant and firmly anchored within the space.

The construction, installation or placing of any wooden, concrete or cast iron bench, chair or table, or any wooden or wire trellis, shall be permitted only within any space. Any such item must meet standards set out by the City of Austin Parks and Recreation Department (PARAD). Such standards shall be provided to each space owner or holder and must be readily available at each cemetery and easily accessible through the PARAD web site.

The construction, installation or placing of any wooden, concrete or cast iron bench, chair or table, or any wooden or wire trellis, shall be permitted only within any space. The City of Austin Parks and Recreation Department (PARAD) shall develop a list of recommended models or types of benches, chairs, or tables, and the space holder or owner may only install an item that complies with that list. Such list shall be provided to each space owner or holder and must be readily available at each cemetery and easily accessible through the PARAD web site.

The construction, installation or placing of any wooden, concrete or cast iron bench, chair or table, or any wooden or wire trellis, shall not be permitted on cemetery grounds. The City of Austin Parks and Recreation Department (PARAD) shall, as part of its Adopt-A-Bench program, install a bench on or near any space at the request of the space holder or owner. PARAD shall publicize the Adopt-A-Bench program at each cemetery and on the PARAD web site and shall make applications readily available to space owners or holders. For the comfort of visitors to the cemeteries, many of which many be elderly or disabled, PARAD shall develop and implement a plan to place benches in public and common areas at each cemetery.

Allow for cemetery to approve one bench per plot. Benches must be approved by cemetery staff to ensure quality, but not all benches must be the same.

There are people concerned about cement benches being removed – if they're in good shape, no reason to remove them. If a plot is well maintained, people have the right to do anything they want. Problem is if they become dilapidated or encroach on someone else's plot.

I don't want to see dilapidated benches. Wooden will deteriorate over time – don't allow. Cast iron, concrete if done professionally,

Section 6 – a non-dilapidated bench that is in a public place – should be placed on his property.

Why in the world would you want to describe materials. Take out materials to make it more general. Every time you add more words, you are digging yourself a hole.

I do agree with this. While many families install these things in order to improve the resting grounds of their family member, it begins to look sloppy and messy with so many styles and items. Many of the trellises and benches are in disrepair because family is no longer caring for them.
Agree mostly. I think concrete benches are okay since they are durable, but no wood or metal, no painted benches, nothing like that.
Disagree. A cemetery should be a place to visit and sit. If visitors to a grave want to place a bench they should be allowed to do so.
I think some items can be a nice addition to the property if done correctly. It should be done with the consent of the city.
Agree with the trellis part - that is difficult to maintain. But benches have always been a part of cemeteries, especially to mark plots with children or with cremation ashes.
Solace benches modestly and quietly designed should be allowed so mourners can visit their loved ones and sit and meditate. Modest tables for bibles tastefully placed should be allowed within a group not for every gravesite.
Disagree for reasons mentioned above. A memorial bench that is approved is a nice option to sit while you are visiting your loved ones gravesite.
benches should be strategically placed throughout the cemetery for people visiting.
I agree. Only permanent approved benches should be allowed. All metal and wood slat, read Home Depot should be removed. Look like hell!
I agree. Any bench or chair erected should be made of a permanent-type stone, such as granite.
Disagree. People need a place to sit and read/reflect. Elderly people can't stand for long periods.
What is wrong with a bench for seating by loved ones graves?
I agree. they become insightly quickly as as a result of weather.
a bench of concert should be permitted so if a person wants to visit they will have a place to sit .
There are some items that can be done with good taste.
DISAGREE. Look at the character and peacefulness of a cemetery with wooden, concrete or cast iron benches, chairs or tables, add.
See my response to #1 and #3. This is a city park and benches are an important amenity, especially for elderly visitors. On the other had, PARD has an interest in ensuring that any benches are sturdy, maintained, and do not trespass on other gravesites. I have submitted proposed rules that suggest several methods of providing and regulating benches, from PARD issuing guidelines regarding the type of permitted benches to a program similar to the city's current Adopt-A-Bench Program.
disagree. We're just trying to class up the joint.

I agree as to Memorial Park. I would change it as applicable to the individual four other city cemeteries.
Disagree. The superintendant needs to use his own discretion on this matter.
I agree
Trellis and tables should not be permitted. Any items that extend into the park easements or other plots shall be removed and disposed of after 45 of notification to the last known address of the owner or family
I believe owners should be able to put a bench that is durable on their grave, or on easement near grave. not on someone elses
Agree, the 50 year (historic) rule applies to some items at Oakwood cemetery. staff will need to have flexibility, but be firm if the benches become unstable. perhaps in the future if someone places an approved memorial bench an endowment fee could be charged and placed in an account.
Agree
Agree. Individuals should be prohibited from installing such items because they pose a physical hazard and are often visually unappealing. Instead, individuals should contribute to a fund that enables management to provide a uniform and tasteful style of bench seating carefully and strategically placed throughout our public cemeteries.
No change recommended.
Agree
Agree
Disagree. bench is a place to sit and contemplate. Removal only if its a safety hazard.
Pick a cast iron and a stone bench to allow in the cemetery. Some people need to sit when visiting a grave. Control uniformity thru planned selection.
Disagree. I have a concrete bench that has been at my parent's grave since 1971. I also placed a concrete bench at my husband's grave in 2012. It is a blessing and comfort for me to sit and visit with them.
Again, disagree. This is our property. If we want to put a trellis, bench or whatever, that is our right. This cemetery is chosen because do its ambience.
a few of these items, a bench for instance ,is not offensive.
I DISAGREE! Like it or not, you live in the South. Placing of benches is part of the charm. I am not crazy about trellis', but I see no harm in small cozy settings.
Agree.

I agree.
If these items are permitted, there needs to be standards and rules in place. Benches can be helpful for older visitors but other items need to be controlled.
Reasonable requirement, but City should have some nice metal benches placed throughout the cemetery; i.e. park benches and trash containers. No proper place for trash right now.
Benches should be allowed because the elderly, disabled or people in poor health need to sit down and this is legally necessary to comply with federal ADA accommodations. Benches of a cheaper price (wooden, iron) other than concrete or stone should be allowed because not everyone can afford those. All benches should be maintained by the owner and removed by PARD if needed, provided that a 2 week notice is sent to the owner. Tables are not needed but should be allowed only for the day (temporary use). For instance during It's My Park Day or other events, it is very helpful to have a table for volunteers to sign in and to put water and snacks. No wooden or wire trellises. They divide the space.
Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.
We have a teak bench which we maintain. We use it to sit and meditate, reflect, etc. We are a family of 7, ranging from age 11-70 - <u>Strong</u> objection
Disagree
Wooden/metal/mixed materials are what add beauty to the cemetery. It's beautiful to see the different expressions of love, grief, etc. In additiona, concrete benches are the first to tip over and are cold and unsightly.
Circled NO
Granite permanent benches - ok
There are benches at Austin Memorial Cemetery. This is one of the best features. It seems to say - stop, sit, remember. Surely that is a good dynamic for a cemetery. ** circled NO**

I know when my dad passed we put a bench for mom. She was physically incapable of standing for very long. I'm sure this is the case for a lot of visitors. On a recent loss someone might need to sit to regain themselves. **Circled NO**
I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.
Agree
Really disagree
No
Disagree - Benches and chairs should be allowed within reason and be made of sound constructed material. Other items should be at the Superintendent's discretion.
Disagree, are you kidding me, benches are good. If they are a hazard fix it or remove it after tagging it
Just do it!
I agree. I understand the maintenance issues. If someone wants to commune with a deceased loved one they should bring a folding lawn chair.
Agree
I agree.
Again the City is overreaching. Families should be able to sit on a bench at the grave site if they desire,
Disagree. See response to question # 3.
A bench which provides a place to rest, contemplate, perhaps as a memorial should be allowed providing it is well made and fits with the artistic design of the cemetery. If in a historic cemetery, it should be appropriate to the period (eg Victorian, etc)
I feel small benches should be allowed.
I would change this rule, because it is nice to have a place to sit, especially a shady place, if you are old and tired. And trellises can support flowers, which have a place in any cemetery.
Temporary seating should be allowed, but removed after use.
I don't have a problem with the small concrete bench with the person name or special message on it being there if it does not cause a problem with the upkeep of the grounds and there is room for it and it looks nice. All other things would over time cause problems.

I don't agree. Perhaps there can be a site committee of staff and site owners who could approve or disapprove.

Agree...unless those objects are donated as memorial sites through the city. No random chairs or seats should be permitted between the graves - except in those instances where an entire plot belongs to an individual family and there is a space for a meditation bench between existing graves.

Agree

depends. If the bench is of good quality and is in good condition, not on someone else's grave or public right of way, then I think it's fine. If the bench should become dilapidated, then it should be removed.

I believe standards and guidelines might be agreed upon to allow this. Benches for sure should be allowed but only in stone, heavy metal, or other material that does not break down easily. Same goes for "SMALL" table near a bench to be used for contemplation, writing in journals, etc. I would not agree to just anything goes or trellis...there is no need to have vines growing everywhere.

Disagree. As long as it is not a safety hazard, I think these items make visits to the grave nicer.

That's ridiculous. One of the beauties of the cemetery is the variety of benches that are there. If they are falling apart, rotting, a safety hazard, ok, remove them. Otherwise, who does it cause a problem for? Most of the people who go visit their loved ones need a place to sit and having benches that are of varied shapes, materials, colors, etc.. adds beauty to the cemetery.

Keep the Rule. Granite or marble benches only.

Agree! No benches or chairs unless they're marble and in keeping with their surroundings.

The attempt to be all-encompassing by specifying prohibited materials leaves it open to install or place otherwise prohibited articles if they're made, for example, of rock, tile, aluminum or plastic.

Disagree. Benches add beauty to the cemetery and are practical for people who want to visit their loved ones, especially elderly people. Unless they are dilapidated, broken, rotten, do not remove them. There's beauty in the different wood, metal and stone styles. It makes it more like a park and it's not depressing and cold. If the only allowed benches were stone, it would look cold and depressing. In addition with the movement of the soil at the cemetery, those are the first structures to start tipping over and looking unsightly.

Totally disagree. What if you have an elderly going to visit their spouse's grave. Where are they supposed to sit?

Partially disagree. Please no trellis or table but chair, bench allowable.

I disagree. I think wooden benches or cast iron bench or concrete benches adds to the personality of the grave side also makes the mourner comfortable.

Bad idea. Peaceful reflection sometimes requires loved ones to sit. Until the cemetery is ADA compliant, this rule should be removed. As far as the trellis', anything to beautify an otherwise solemn place should be looked upon as "welcome".

Ridiculous rule. The cemetery is NOT overrun with such structures and does not threaten to be that way. It seems quite draconian to pursue these measures on something we have come to welcome and use for years. Do not pass this rule.

Absolutely not in agreement. These are nice additions and there are currently many of them. Are you proposing removing existing ones? That would not be right.

Disagree. Nice details in the cemetery to have.

DISAGREE. benches and other things should be allowed. If PARD has a particular issue with the types of items installed then set guidelines for what types of benches, chairs or tables can be installed. These should absolutely be allowed!!!

I disagree. As long as the "stakeholders" own the property, they should be allowed to place a bench.

Agree

Disagree. So the idea is, let's not give people anywhere to sit at our cemeteries so that they are empty, sad, lifeless places 90% of the time? Invite people in to the cemeteries with benches and other amenities.

I agree with constraints. I think a stone bench is ok, but only if another plot site is purchased to put it on. Any item allowed must be made in such a way to last a long, long time - like maybe 100 years.

I disagree. Cemeteries are big places. They are also places for peaceful contemplation. It would be nice to have a place to sit down. Benches are OK. Tables are not OK.

Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. While I would not deny anyone the opportunity to express themselves artistically or to remember a loved one in their own way, the city cemetery is not the place for such expressions.

well, normally I would expect people to bring folding chairs or something but I hope you do have some benches situated through the cemetery. don't see a problem with a trellis.

Agree. However, it would be nice if the city would place approved benches throughout city owned cemeteries.

agree
If benches cannot be placed by individuals, then there should be multiple benches placed for the public. I find myself sitting on the ground over my late husband's grave. I'm not sure how many more years I will be able to do this and still get up. Benches already placed may have to stay.
I strongly disagree. Benches are necessary for those who want to come visit their loved one's graves. Trellises are for plants, and I believe that's OK too.
Would be nice if the cemetery placed by design some concrete benches.
I don't see a problem with allowing seating areas or trellises, provided they don't cross gravesite boundaries, are maintained by the gravesite owners, and don't otherwise pose a reasonable threat to health and safety of workers or visitors.
Disagree. So long as walkways and streets are not blocked these should be allowed. There should be size and height restrictions to prevent line of sight issues but that is all.
I agree with this rule but ONLY if it is enforced fairly and not arbitrarily.
Disagree. Benches, chairs, tables -- all important. A very large majority of the visitors are of an age where these items are crucial.
I absolutely disagree. there must be places for loved ones to sit and be with there departed. An older person should not be required to stand or sit on the grass.
disagree with this rule
Disagree...why? If it's on the plot they bought and not encroaching on others.
Disagree. I think a bench is charming.
I would allow these structures on gravesites but not elsewhere. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.
Disagree.
Disagree. As long as bench is maintained and not an eye sore. When that happens, contact family and ask to remove.
yes, families only own the graves, not the public space
Definitely SHOULD be permitted to allow the mourners to sit.
Disagree. Places to sit and remember/contemplate enhance the cemetery. I would allow concrete or cast iron bench/chair. No tables, trellis, or wood because of the difficulty keeping it from rotting.
These items should be allowed on the grave sites.
I disagree with removing any chair, table, etc. on a wooden grave. The grave serves as a place where the grieving can come find solace and the mourners should place items that affirm life, not a dull, monotonous theme.
Only if not maintained. If it is, leave it alone. Again, a board should decide.

Disagree, again it should be based on the object's dimensions.
I have to disagree because of the non forgiving nature of the statement. As the city does not place or maintain benches near graves, private benches provide a place where relatives especially those that are physically in need can sit and visit. The ground is not really level and stable for one to bring a light chair and not have it tip over. If such an area were to exist, then the need for more permanent structures, like benches would not be needed.
parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish?]
This is starting to be ridiculous. People want to sit down to spend time remembering or grieving or just resting. Why in the world would one want to prevent this? And a trellis to train a vine on to remember someone - I can't imagine what that hurts.
If it's already there, can't it stay unless it's creating a hazard. And, if it is creating a hazard, can't citizens be allowed to register a contact name as someone whom the Superintendent could contact to get it repaired quickly or perhaps that someone would be willing to pay to correct any hazardous condition presented by chair, table, bench, etc.?
Disagree. I especially disagree regarding a chair or bench for grieving family members to sit and remember for a spell.
No benches, chairs or tables is ok as long as the cemetery provides enough in each area. Wooden or wire trellis' could be restricted in height.
Disagree.
It seems like constructing benches or tables would impede on a walkway. It would be better to have several small sitting areas or benches throughout the cemetery rather than having them erected by individuals. It all goes back to maintaining a safe environment.
I completely disagree. A cemetery should be a place that invites people to sit and contemplate and spend time remembering their loved ones, to pray and to mourn. This is hard to do standing or squatting. Benches are so crucial. How could those be forbidden?
disagree - I am both elderly and handicapped, so a place to sit is important to me. A bench is not unattractive, as long as it is in good condition.
I really disagree with this rule. These types of structures are historically appropriate and enable people to enjoy the grave site of their loved one. This rule seems to be for the mow and blow crew of the city.
Hard and fast rules are not good.. Need to be flexible and judged case by case
I disagree. I think this should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

<p>There should be a permitting process that approves or denies these projects. I don't think there would be very many requests.</p>
<p>We strongly disagree with this rule! When we visit our son, we like to sit and reflect. The concrete bench, is an integral part of the time we spend at the gravesite. It also serves as a resting place for older family members that cannot stand for long periods.</p>
<p>If this item is located within the gravesite bounds, there is no reason to prevent them. They are lovely in outdoor scenes.</p>
<p>Disagree, delete this or allow benches at gravesites.</p>
<p>Loosen up---a graveyard planted with trees, shrubs and flowers is comforting and gives added "green space" to the community.</p>
<p>I disagree. I think it's wonderful when families bring in benches or chairs to provide a place to sit and contemplate, especially if the cemetery doesn't provide these things. Again, I think plastic chairs shouldn't be allowed because of their temporary and usually unsightly nature.</p>
<p>If you guys would provide better benches and chairs this wouldn't be a problem. I think as long as the benches are safe and are not blocking someone from their own graves its fine.</p>
<p>Disagree If a person places the bench on their own plot. Some people like to sit and pay their respect. Elderly people often need to sit down.</p>
<p>I would allow placement of benches and chairs for the use of family and friends when visiting the cemetery to meditate, pray and/or pay their respects.</p>
<p>disagree. Sturdy benches are a positive feature. An attractive trellis with flowering vines would be restful and calming.</p>
<p>Agree.</p>
<p>Disagree. There are no benches provided by cemetery in a location you would expect people to come, sit, contemplate and remember, Benches are an asset. I agree a standard on where benches can be placed (your plots or the common strip) and reasonable quality requirements are fine.</p>
<p>I agree because it is the responsibility of the City to provide suitable seating</p>
<p>I have seen lovely benches beside graves, and I agree that they should be left for those visiting. It's not always easy to stay there if you cannot sit down. Some people want to spend more time and if they cannot stand that long, then they should be able to sit on something. Other items get a little iffy.</p>
<p>Disagree. As long as the benches are not in the public right-of-way and in good condition they should not be removed.</p>

I agree with reservation. I think this rule needs to be dealt with in an individual and personal manner regarding benches. If the bench is placed by a child's grave so a parent can visit, I feel an exception can be made.

I disagree with this rule. I own the plot next to my deceased wife, and have considered placing a bench there to make it easier for elder visitors.

I think it would be reasonable to require such structures to be limited to the plots owned by individuals and to require that they be kept in a reasonable state of repair.

I agree with the spirit of this rule. But I'll admit that some of the benches placed by families are attractive. If the Superintendent were to purchase and place a few benches on the grounds, those might be a welcome rest spot for visitors.

Agree.

Disagree. Again, not a problem.

We disagree. Benches are necessary for those visiting the grave site. They could be of stone or wood if well maintained.

Totally disagree. The benches on my parents' grave are appropriate to the setting.

Disagree. People need a place to sit when they visit plots, and if it's within the boundaries of their private plot and not a safety hazard, I don't see why it's an issue.

Disagree. Some of us are mobility impaired. Benches are a blessing, not a curse.

Disagree. I feel having benches is appropriate "and possibly necessary for the elderly and those with disabilities (or even those in a state of abject grief).

I disagree. A safe bench would not be bad. An agreement process should be possible.

I think benches should be allowed but according to a code

I love the benches!

I agree. Benches should be part of the cemetery's overall plan. Maybe people can be invited to contribute to those.

Benches should be allowed for respectful contemplation.

Agree on wooden or wire trellis, tables, and chairs. Disagree on benches: Many people spend extended time visiting graves and the elderly need to be able to sit down. Limits do need to be made on the type of benches approved (concrete & granite are durable; wooden & cast iron not durable). The placement of benches should not block walkways, be placed on other's property, or be placed outside the grave area. For safety reasons the walkways should be open for walking and not have benches, pots, planters, statues, memorials placed in the walkways.

is there no way to build something as a honor or memorial, something that might benefit all (e.g. a bench)?

disagree

need to work with the stakeholders

if there is a tree, it would be nice to have a bench underneath so a person may sit to ponder and think of their loved ones. This creates a tranquil place to remember...

Additionally and especially in the heat a person may need to sit or if their emotion takes over---before they collapse and EMS is called in.

disagree.. should allow in certain areas family plots or part of headstone/marker. can add with trees to improve the area through donations for said to help with upkeep

I'm not aware of the need for other items, but an occasional bench may be a welcome addition for elderly mourners and visitors. A reasonable limitation could be specified: no more than one bench no wider that x feet per every y number of graves.

disagree;

keep rules simple...Such as:

Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries

Longview Code of Ordinances

Section 22-14, Exhibit "A"

Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery

in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

DISAGREE!

Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle

Disagree. I think these items add a bit of character to the park. I especially enjoy sitting on the benches to enjoy the peace and quiet not found in other parks (no dogs barking or children yelling/crying). The memorial park and benches are the best place to relax and read! Shhhh... don't tell anyone ;-)

I disagree. It may well be that a visitor is infirm and needs to sit while visiting the grave of a loved one.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Disagree. These would be nice elements of the space.

People have already done that, so it would be hard to come up with a rule now. I would think that the main thing that I do believe needs to be stressed is that the only space the person has is the grave itself and the headstone space. If you go past that space in an area that someone else needs to be buried, the grave diggers will have to deal with that. It will be cumbersome to put in a new grave without going through a lot of changes.

I would delete this rule for the reasons expressed in Question #1.

I am 86 and when I visit my husband's grave, I must be able to sit. I have placed an iron bench at our grave site, and hope that sturdy attractive benches will still be allowed.

It is my recall that the recent but ignored "Rules and Regulations" did allow concrete benches. I have no problem with this if it is allowed with the approval of the Superintendent.

Totally disagree. Love the individual benches. They have a former City of Austin park bench that they painted and placed in their family area. Does not like the sanctioned marble benches. Likes personalization.

Rule

The construction of additional mounds over graves shall not be permitted.

Comment

Not sure I know what the problem is. Probably OK as is if enforced conservatively.

I agree.

The construction of gardens over graves is permitted only as provided herein. All plantings must be drought- and freeze-resistant, native or adapted, low- or no-maintenance, and be selected from plants recommended by the City of Austin's Grow Green Native and Adapted Landscape Plants guide. Such plants, at maturity, may not grow higher than 24 inches or spread more than 36 inches. All such gardens must be contained within a rock, brick, or other border or container. Borders may not exceed eight inches in height, and shall be securely anchored in the soil. Plants with thorns or spines, invasive or non-adapted plants, or plants that can spread through a rhizome or root system outside of the grave site are not permitted. Space owner or holder must maintain the garden, including weeding, trimming or pruning, and promptly removing any dead or dying plants or any plants spreading outside of the garden

Leave rule as is

No change

No change

I'm not sure what this means. I have seen one plot that seems to have a raised rock/flower garden over it. It was kind of pretty when it was first installed, so it was fine, but now it has lots of weeds.

Agree. Uniformity and consistency of gravesites adds to the appearance of it being tidy and clean.
What are "additional mounds"? Piling on of additional dirt? Flowers?
I can understand this because some traditions do this practice. It interferes with the mowing. While new inters will have a mound, it is only temporary in nature. I am okay with this policy as is.
No opinion.
no additional mounds should be allowed.
Agree
agree.
Agreed.
Uncertain what this refers to.
There are some old customs such as a mound with shells added to it. What is wrong with this?
I Agree. Everything should be at grade, and performed by Cemetery Staff.
agree
Agree.
Disagree. I put a cross over my son's grave, it was my right.
See my response to #3.
Agree. It angers the spirits.
I agree as to Memorial Park, which is not the only city cemetery. These rules cannot be applied across the board to all five city cemeteries.
If the cemetery has a policy to use vaults there is no need for a mound.
I agree
I agree. Would create problems for maintenance. Over time the mound would level out from rains.
I do not know what this means. I planted flowers, and have mulched. I only did this when the city did nothing for the grave other than leave the dirt.
yes. flat and easy mow surfaces
Agree
Agree. Again, cemeteries are shared, public spaces where no individual should be allowed to modify the grounds in ways that pose impediments to visitors and maintenance.
No change recommended.
Agree
Agree
Disagree if the mound is a small garden.

agree
I am not sure what is meant by this question....additional mounds? Please elaborate?
Don't know what that means. Will have to look into this.
agree
Forgive me on this one, I didn't see that practice when I visited. What is the purpose of the extra mounds?
Agree.
I agree.
I think there should be rules that govern the size, construction, and material if these mounds are used in place of a tomb stone marker.
Concur
OK, provided that the cemetery management ensures that the graves are leveled adequately and promptly covered with grass. I don't see another reason for people to add more mounds over the graves. If PARD knows of some instances, then address the root cause for this to eliminate the need to have this rule.
Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.
Circled YES
I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.
Agree
Agree with this. No sense in changing landscape up and down.
Have never seen this?
I agree with the rule, assuming that concrete grave covers are allowed.
I agree.
Agree
I agree.
No opinion on this.

I think it seems reasonable, but... why would people do this? I do not understand.
Agree
Why is this rule even necessary?
Agree
I agree with this rule. I don't know why you would want to mound over graves anyway. It would make grounds keeping very difficult.
I don't totally understand the rule.
Depends on the mound and the religious significance.
Agree
agree
I'm not sure what this means. Dirt? Ivy? Stone? If it is stone...it may be okay..but I'm not sure why it is needed? Dirt and Ivy? No.
Unsure, I have not seen this so don't know how I feel.
Again, why is this a problem?
Agree with rule. All graves should be uniform
Agree
Agree.
Agree.
I agree.
No problem with this. Since the city maintenance is basic, anything else would be hard for them to handle.
I can't imagine why this would be a problem to have a mound or not. I think it is another rule for the sake of a rule. Personally I do not care.
No, sometimes, that's part of the landscaping a person has done and should be respected.
Don't know.
What is the definition of "mounds"? that will determine whether this is reasonable
I disagree. As long as those items are placed on the graves (which are private property), there should be no removal without the written consent of the "stakeholders".
Agree
See answer to question #1.
I agree
I agree

Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. While I would not deny anyone the opportunity to express themselves artistically or to remember a loved one in their own way, the city cemetery is not the place for such expressions.

agree with the rule

Agree. A uniform look is more pleasing, and additional mounds over graves would hinder maintenance workers by making it harder, or impossible, to mow over the area.

agree

Agree..again a hazard to the rest of us.

I'm not sure what this is referring to. If it's the addition of garden soil for planting on, then I think it's fine. Therefore I disagree with this rule.

Yes, I agree

This is another rule that merits review. What constitutes a mound? Is there a certain height that poses a problem?

Disagree. This is a personal issue and unless an additional mound created water runoff issues it ought to be allowed.

Unclear policy. Would this prevent planting?

Disagree. Mounds? Could the rule specify the size? One-two foot mounds are not a problem.

As long as tasteful, there should not be a problem with this.

disagree with this rule

Agree

Not sure I understand this one.

Disagree. I would allow additional mounds over graves. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.

That depends on the mound. If it's to plant flowers that remember the deceased, why not?

Agree

yes

Keep

This should be allowed also.

I do not understand this rule. If you mean allowing a person to plant a field of flowers over the grave, then, yes, the mourner should be able to do so.

Disagree if those mounds are used solely for planting purposes.

I agree. This also means that the city will keep the ground level.

parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish?]
Why would you make this rule? Like so many of the others, this doesn't seem to make any sense. What problem are you trying to solve with this rule?
Similar comment as before: Agree as it applies to new improvements; as to existing, agree as long as the existing improvements don't create a hazard.
Disagree, within bounds. I believe people should be able to plant flowers or a shrub over a grave and such mound as is necessary for that is reasonable in my opinion.
I'd have to say disagree because I don't know what "construction of additional mounds" would look like. If it's to landscape the grave for plants, I see no problem.
Disagree.
I would change it to allow for mounds to grow certain plants and flowers for the deceased. Especially if it is directly on the grave. I just don't understand what the harm is.
I disagree. City of Austin should be happy if there are families who care for the grave site. This means less maintenance for the city. Instead it should worry about neglected grave sites or neglected cemeteries in general. Encourage involvement and ownership by families, do NOT discourage it with unreasonable and petty rules and regulations.
agree - but sunken spots should be filled in by the cemetery (there may not be survivors to tend to it)
Hard and fast rules are not good.. Need to be flexible and judged case by case. Some are attractive and fit the area
If the "additional mounds" are used to plant something and they don't exceed 6 inches, I would want some flexibility.
I would put in a height limitation. I would like to see people be able to plant flowers over the grave and add some much etc.
Againâ€¦if maintained by the family members it should be allowed.
?
Disagree, define "additional mounds"?
It depends on the size of the mound. I think anything over 12-18 inches is probably excessive. If someone wants to bring in some good soil in which to plant wildflowers and perennials, I think that's ok.
neutral
I agree with this rule.

yes
Agree .
Disagree. In what way does a mound contained in a grave site impede the operations of the cemetery except to mar the sterile esthetics of the person proposing this rule.
I disagree - as long as the mounds do not exceed the lot area
I do not understand why someone would mound any more than already is there. But if it is not unsightly, and there is a reason, then each individual should be given a chance to make his case.
Agree.
I agree. Mounds create a hazard and would make it difficult for maintenance.
I disagree with this rule, to the extent it effectively prohibits plants and gardens.
I agree with this rule which promotes a uniform, level landscape.
Agree.
I have no idea what this means, and again, I doubt there are myriad "additional mounds" popping up all over Austin cemeteries.
We agree.
Agree
Disagree. I'm a gardener and Austin soil sucks, and you have to add soil if you want to grow anything. And I like to see small gardens over graves. It's a good way to remember a loved one.
No opinion
Agree.
agree
I don't care one way or the other.
I agree.
Agree.
Agree: The construction of mounds should not be permitted. Rocks or other items should not be allowed.... only grass.
disagree
pls define "additional mounds"...what do you refer to here, I don't understand..pls be ,more specific or give an example.
yes to be allowed a gravestone of some sort.
agreed
No opinion.

<p>disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries Longview Code of Ordinances Section 22-14, Exhibit "A"</p> <p>Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery</p> <p>in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas</p>
DISAGREE!
Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle
I agree.
no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]
Agree
That is something that was done years ago, people have been accustomed to doing that. On Mother's day people get together and put mound back in place. The word has to get out. They should be handed what is permitted at a funeral home from now on. No one is going to try to contact the city to see what they can do as far as a family member's plot, but if it's something that the funeral home hands out – that would give you a point of contact.
I have no opinion on this one.
Probably agree with this, but could see exceptions. A woman near her has a mound less than 2 feet with broken flagstone. Actually disagree with that if it's tastefully done.
Rule
<i>Holders such as clay or plastic pots, wire, frames, etc., containing flowers or other decorations may be removed as soon as the flowers fade or wither, and the right is reserved by the Cemetery to make that determination and such removal.</i>
Comment
I would limit this rule to plastic or other disposable planters and to flower pots. Clay or metal urns or vases should be left alone unless they decay or break.
I agree.
I do not approve graves being covered with artificial flowers, they should be placed in a confined container and be kept fresh looking and not faded.

Keep current rule, but add: Cemetery does not have to specifically notify each family they will be removing items from their plot, there should be a set schedule that removal happens and families are given that schedule for notification. Suggests a removal schedule of once a month or after big holidays.

No change

May means that it can or can't – should be specific. Determine who is doing it. If you say that they will be removed – the City is going to do it. If it says must –the plot owner is responsible. Define who is doing what. "May" indicates that it can stay

Plastic flowers never fade or wither. How do you handle that?

I think this is very reasonable, but this policy could be improved upon. The R&R state that if a family wishes to keep these items, they have 72 hours to pick them up. You might want to give people a week or maybe even two to come retrieve items from a new burial. These families are grieving and might not remember to come claim items in the first three days of the funeral. Families with new burials should receive some grace on the timeframe.

Agree. Unsightly.

Disagree. Remove the flowers, not the vases.

Yes, I think it has to be done. As long as the removal isn't premature, which happens a lot at cemeteries, I think it is acceptable to do so to prevent the further breakdown of material.

Agree. Flowers can be removed when decayed.

Communicate with a sign at the entrance that old flowers and pots will be removed otherwise its desecration of a burial site.

Agree

agree

I think the rule is fine as is. All flowers should be removed monthly by cemetery staff.

Agreed. Unless the family will be back that same week to remove their flowers, then the right should be left with the superintendent or cemetery personnel.

Agree

Yes, they can be removed so the cemetery is "kept up".

Agree. People bring flowers and leave them never to return. If it becomes unsightly cemetery staff should be allowed to remove them.

disagree, a person should be allowed to bring clay pots or containers for their loved ones.

They can be removed after posting a date removal will be made.

Agree.

See my response to #3 and #4.
Slightly agree. The flowers may be removed. The pots must stay.
I agree. Again the four other city cemeteries plot owners need to be informed. It seems that all the emphasis of these rules are to conditions at Memorial Park. Oakwood, Oakwood Annex, Plummers and Evergreen Cemeteries aren't acknowledged and their special needs no always a fit to rules that seem to apply only to Memorial Park.
Agree. Keep it clean and fresh looking.
I agree
I agree. The rule should not be changed.
Yes unless it is a silk flower and it is not faded.
yes
Agree
Agree. These are undignified and disrespectful signs of neglect.
No change recommended.
Agree
Agree
Removal only if it's unsightly .
Agree
If the clay pot is expensive, I would leave at gravesite. I agree if the flowers fade or wither (same as decorations), they should be removed.
Disagree. Reasons given.
agree
If the flowers are faded and/or withered, they should be removed....however, I don't think it is up to the Cemetery staff to remove the pots.....If the staff can be discrete (I don't know what went before), I would say the rule should be kept.
Disagree. I think it should be up to the families and friends of the deceased to remove their pots and flowers.
I agree.

I have used a clay pot with artificial flowers on my grave for over eight years. The pot is anchored in a shallow space to keep it from turning over and the wind blowing it. It does not interfere with mowing, and I keep it maintained.
I think there should be a set date each year that the withered flowers are removed so owners have the opportunity to do this for you and prevent any special loss of a meaningful arrangement or vase.
Good rule. No objection to imitation flowers. Subjective judgment is difficult, but they need to be maintained/removed when faded.
Some holders (fancy clay pots?) may have a special meaning to the owner and the Cemetery should not remove anything without prior notice and should hold everything in storage for 6 months. This sentence is written in a very disrespectful manner: "the right is reserved by the Cemetery to make that determination and such removal". Who is the Cemetery? Is it the Superintendent?
Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.
Circled YES
I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.
Disagree
Agree
Yes
Agree
Agree, remove the flowers, not pots unless they are broken.
Just do it!
I agree.
Agree
I agree.

I don't object to this.
Yes! This is more like it.
Agree
Agree
Agree, same as above: this stuff can degrade and become trash.
Agree
I agree.
That is fine as long as the owners have the opportunity to retrieve them.
Disagree. Only remove the wilting or dead flowers. Let the pots await fresh flowers!!
The dead flowers should be allowed to remain. They at least represent that their loved one had someone who cared enough to bring flowers. I live in Dallas and can only come every few months. And I am my son's mother. His father and wife never bring him any flowers. I want my flowers to remain there so he knows he is always remembered and love by me.
agree
I do agree for the most part because families must keep up with their stuff and not leave it to wither into nothing as we see each Christmas where people with good intentions decorate public trees but rarely return to un-decorate them and the items blow off and break and add to our trash issue on public roads! However, I again would like to see guidelines set up to offer a CHOICE.....perhaps urn(s) on the side of markers/stones/benches that may hold flowers (fake or real) and are thus contained and somewhat protected. I don't see anything wrong with laminated photos being taped to the marker/stone or something else that would allow a photo...but only on the marker/stone.
Agree, however if they are clay and out of the way, they should be left to plant future plants.
Removing dead flowers, decorations is ok. Removing the containers they came in is not. People spent money for those and will come to remove them.
Agree with the rule.
Agree, get rid of the junky stuff, it gets weathered and ultimately looks like refuse.
#s 9, 10 and 11 should be combined and simplified. Unless removed sooner by the persons to whom they belong, natural flowers and potted plants will be removed by city employees when they become wilted, and artificial flowers will be removed thirty days after placement. Holes may not be dug for placement of flowers or other plants. In sections designated for flush type memorials, plants and flowers shall be placed only in the bronze vases provided for that purpose.
Do not remove the holders. They are the property of others who will collect them at their next visit. Removing dead flowers is ok but do not toss the containers.

Disagree. People have paid for these and when flowers fade, their will remove it themselves.
Disagree unless broken or hazardous. Throw dead flowers out, keep holders.
I disagree, since they do not look bad. It should be the owners to remove it if they want
We maintain clay planters on 5 plots currently. When the plants or flowers wilt, then we replace or replant new ones. Sometimes we cannot meet your proposed time frame and the destruction of private property is not acceptable. The plots are not owned by he city any more. Just like real estate, appurtenances such as personal property, including personal property, are belonging to the owner of the land.
No. How is it that someone else decides when a flower, so lovingly placed by a family member, should be removed. Ridiculous.
Not unless they're broken or hazardous.
Agree. Remove dead stuff is ok.
Disagree, should notify owner first as they may want to replant flowers or items, should give owner 10 days to remedy alleged issue prior to cemetary taking action.
I disagree. As long as those items are placed on the graves (which are private property), there should be no removal without the written consent of the "stakeholders".
Agree
See answer to question #1.
I agree
I agree
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
Well I think a better rule would be to encourage use of paper flowers which look rather gay even when faded. I think it is usually disrespectful to remove flowers or vases.
Agree. Why would anyone want old, dilapidated containers and faded and withered flowers to remain on their loved one's graves? Isn't that showing neglect?
agree
Agree.This rul
Agree
Yes, I agree
This rule needs a more nuanced review as well. The owners should have some oppportunity to remove flower/decoration holders themselves. Removed and then what? Returned to the owners? Discarded?

Disagree. Faded flowers or other decorations ought only be removed after owners have been notified (this could be done easily via text or email) and given time to attend to them personally. If they are given the option to approve staff removal that is fine.

What if dried flowers are symbolically important to someone? Who are the aesthetic police on this front?

Disagree. Having holders of plants and flowers that may have withered are indicators that the grave has been visited. Is someone is required to come back to clean this up immediately? This is creating a problem that does not exist.

The flowers should be removed, but why create more for a landfill. Leave the pot, wire, frame, so it can be reused.

disagree with this rule

Agree

I agree with this one.

Disagree. I would allow flower/decoration holders on gravesites. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.

Agree.

Strongly disagree. Since city took over I have had expensive silk flowers removed several times when they were less than six weeks old. Obviously city can't be trusted to make that determination.

yes, as long as the owner of such items can retrieve them

Agree

Flowers and other decorations should remain until the family changes them. If a paper item is disintegrating and blowing into other areas of the cemetery, it can be removed by the Cemetery.

I had two dove at my loved one's grave site, sitting very close to the marker. I came one day and they were gone. I was devastated. At first I thought someone had stolen them, but then I thought a weed eater must have broken them. The dove pair symbolized our devotion to each other and I had searched a long time to get ones that had the faces turned to each other. I am still hurt. So, I agree with the proposed removal rule.

Disagree. Cemetery could be allowed to remove items after X number of weeks vs. what is currently a subjective standard.

Needs some wordsmithing. I agree that withered flowers should be removed. I question the removal of the containers, especially those that has a value to the ones that placed it there. Some grave markers have a hole designed into them especially for flower containers.

parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish?]
This is now starting to be ridiculous. Even the military cemeteries allow for holders containing flowers to be there more or less permanently. What problem are you trying to solve with this rule? Again, if implemented, it would need to be a board determining, not a person.
Disagree, remove the rule.
Agree.
Disagree. While I think it is ok to remove dead flowers, it is not the right of the cemetery to remove pots or vases.
I'd agree EXCEPT the grave owner should be notified first because they may have other plans for those clay or plastic pots, etc.
Agree.
I disagree with this rule. It should be the families discretion how long to keep holders. Especially ones that are durable and can be re-used.
No, they should be removed by the owner. However, the cemetery might contact the owner to remove these items if it thinks the grave site has become unsightly.
The rule SOUNDS fine but we have had newly placed artificial flowers removed.
Yes
This sounds reasonable, except if the "other decorations" area not flowers and cannot fade and wither, can they remain?
With this rule I forsee objects being removed against family wishes. This should only apply to "holders" that are temporary for cut flowers. I think in general, for other objects, their should be some criteria that says once the object has been obviously abandoned and left uncared for it can be removed.
Agreed
Disagree. Some flowers are actually pretty when dried, such as yarrow. Perhaps you could limit your list of plants to those in the austin grow green guide, published by the city.
Disagree, set up a removal date similar to other cemeteries.
Agree
I think only plastic pots should be removed and should be recycled, not thrown away. The others should remain, but the dead, cut flowers should be removed.

Take the flowers sure, but don't touch the holders. I'm sorry but why is this even on the table. What is wrong with you? I refuse to believe that FLOWER HOLDERS are becoming a widespread nuisance.
disagree Flower holders of a permanent nature should be left alone.
Yes, I agree with this rule.
agree
Only removal of dead flowers and not their container unless plastic.
While I agree with this rule, because of the arbitrary nature of the other rules I have little faith in the "the right is reserved by the Cemetery to make that determination and such removal" will be done with discretion.
I agree, but allow individual lot owners to request an extension of time due to unusual circumstances - a valuable vase being used
As a gardener I do not like dead plants, and I think this should be okay with everyone that dead flowers be thrown away.
Disagree. The cemetery personal should work with the owners to make a determination of removal. All dilapidated articles should be removed.
I agree; have no problem with this rule.
This is a reasonable restriction.
I agree with this rule. Withered flowers and their containers are unattractive. They may also interfere with mowing and maintenance.
Agree.
For plastic and wire, fine. Clay pots are meant to be permanent and are not cheap, so no, they do not need to be removed.
We agree.
Agree
I agree that if there's a vase standing water and wilted/dead flowers, that's gonna encourage mosquito breeding, so removing that is fine with me. But pots with plants in them that are alive and no standing water should be fine.
Agree
Agree.
agree
I agree, but only if the flower pot stays more than a week after the flowers die.
I agree.
Agree.

Agree: The seasonal floral arrangement should be removed after an appropriate amount of time. The times should be made available to all families. Dead plants should be removed weekly. Limits should be made on the number of planters, bird baths, statues, and other memorials on one grave.

disagree

agree

agree.. see above

No opinion.

disagree;

keep rules simple...Such as:

Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries

Longview Code of Ordinances

Section 22-14, Exhibit "A"

Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery

in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

DISAGREE!

Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle

Agree. However for decorative ceramic pots, the space owner should be notified in advance.

I agree.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Agree

That has been in place already, those things are things that can rust and get stuck in someone's foot and cause problems. When the flowers begin to wither, they should be removed. It just doesn't look good.

I agree with this rule as long as the phrase "and other decorations" is struck.

Ok. Exempt clay memorials for this.

Rule

Placement of potted plants, cut flowers, or baskets is permitted on graves in all cemeteries; however, to improve the appearance and to aid in maintenance, all potted plants, cut flowers, and baskets may be removed each month. Funeral designs or floral pieces will be removed from the graves when they become wilted or unsightly. Persons desiring to retain same must remove them within 72 hours of funeral service. Artificial flowers may be placed on graves for holidays with the understanding that they will be removed thirty days after the holiday. The digging of holes for placement of plants or flowers is strictly prohibited.

Comment
Totally OK as to real plants and flowers. Artificial flowers and plants should be left until they begin to decay or fall apart or badly fade.
I agree.
Add: Specific time frame for removal of funeral designs or floral pieces, suggested 2 weeks after funeral. Add: No hanging plants permitted.
180 days (vice 30 days in line 6). Great concern about, in the rules, flowers will be removed after 30 days (too soon).

Placement of potted plants, cut flowers, or baskets is permitted on graves in all cemeteries; however, to improve the appearance and to aid in maintenance, all potted plants, cut flowers, and baskets may[who is going to remove them every month, first of month, end of month, etc. the way this is written is meaningless. What is expected of the public in this? He believes these rules are written poorly.] be removed each month. Funeral designs or floral pieces will be removed from the graves when they become wilted or unsightly. Persons desiring to retain same must remove them within 72 hours of funeral service [doesn't know how you can enforce this, no one is going to count.]. Artificial flowers may be placed on graves for holidays with the understanding that they will be removed thirty days after the holiday [what about real flowers? Can they be there forever? What holiday? All holidays? Every culture has their own holidays – how will you keep track of/enforce this? Write the rules that you intend to enforce, too open to interpretation.]. The digging of holes for placement of plants or flowers is strictly prohibited. This overlaps with the previous rule. Rules should be written clearly so that everyone knows what's expected. He does not like the other stuff – whirly things and extra décor are an abomination. Items that are hanging are distracting. Thinks this needs to be combined in a crisper document. Chimes are distracting, you are driving by and see them. The key to enforcement is to keep it simple. The more rules you have, the more interpretations you have. Decide what's important and keep it simple. Relative to all the flowers – real, artificial, plastic, etc – too specific, should have exemptions with approval of cemetery director.

Oops. I see the 72 hour rule applies to these items; not the items listed in Question #9! I would still give these families longer than 72 hours to retrieve these items. There are only a few plots that have new burials in them at any given time, so if items are wilting on those few plots, I think we could extend grace to those few families to have a week or two to come retrieve the items. All other plots should be clear of wilting things.

Agree, seems reasonable.

Disagree. The rule is too inclusive. Allow artificial flowers throughout the year, not just holidays. After all, the deceased had a birthday, a wedding anniversary, and may have commemorated events that were significant but are not holidays like Pearl Harbor day, Juneteenth, etc.

I agree. However, I know other cemeteries remove the flowers the day after burial and trash them. I think that is where the complaints may be coming from, by over zealous workers who do not care because most grieving relatives come back the next day.

Agree. Do not allow holes to be dug outside of burials. This policy is great - everyone can have flowers with the understanding they will be removed.
Artificial flowers are fine - they don't wither! Many families may not live in the area or they may not be able to face coming to the cemetery after a loss so 72 hours is ridiculous. You need a psychiatrist and social workers on this team. City personnel should certainly remove withered real flowers and garbage - this is totally obvious. Anything that is a ritual and harmless should be left alone.
Agree
agree
I agree. All flowers should be removed monthly or 30 days from a major floral holiday
Digging of any kind - by the public - should not be allowed in the cemetery. This can only lead to problems. However, it would be nice if artificial flowers (with the exception of holiday oriented bouquets) could be left up for longer than 30 days. Maybe 60 or 90?
Agree
I agree. Cemeteries are parklike, need to be attractive.
Agreed as long as there is a set schedule to the clean ups. It helps maintain a clean look.
This is a ridiculous to do such a thing while in mourning. Shame on you.
One month is not a practical time period especially for families who place flowers only when they visit Austin.
Agree
See my response to #3 and #4.
I disagree with the prohibition of digging holes. How else am I going to stuff coins in Grandpa's casket?
I agree. But keep lot owners of the other four cemeteries informed as well. This won't be easy as active, inactive and unknown lot owners.
The superintendant needs to use his own discretion on this matter.
I agree
I agree. No changes need to be made.
I believe planted flowers should be allowed. if potted plants are dead, remove
Agree
Agree
Agree. Again, these are signs of neglect.
No change recommended.

Agree
Agree
Disagree. After my 4 year old son's death, I planted flowers on his grave. Tending the little garden was very healing for me. horticulture therapy, garden therapy, and healing with nature are becoming main stream alternative healing practices. I now am installing a healing garden at a grief support non profit. Not being able to express grief including plantings , as long as they are keot up, is behind the times.
Agree
I placed a large agave cement urn on my spouse's grave. It does not take any mainteance and looks natural.
I agree with the dead flowers. That's all. But, again, the owners should do this.
agree
This rule seems to be reasonable. I think it is pretty standard practice.
DISAGREE. See above.
I agree.
A limit of 30 days for an artificial arrangement to be removed can be very expensive. I think most owners are reasonable and responsible for keeping them maintained. Quality artificial plants last much longer.
I keep my ceramic vase with artificial flowers slightly buried in the dirt to keep it from turning over or being stolen. I do not feel I have damaged or impacted the space in any way because I am not digging a substantial hole.
Good rule

This seems to be contradictory of G above. What if the potted plant has withered? When will the clay pot with the withered flowers be removed, each month or when the Cemetery decides? Is the clay pot for a potted plant not considered a clay pot holder? How come cut flowers may be removed each month, but the containers of withered flowers in pots, wire frames, etc. may be removed as determined by Cemetery?

Simplify these by stating that flowers, plants and containers will be removed when withered, and pots and holders will be kept for 6 months after notifying the owner.

OK as long as it means floral pieces provided by a funeral home, not by the owner as a grave decoration. It doesn't matter what the object is, what matters is the significance of the object to the owner, so if the owner provided it, then it is personal and significant. If the funeral home delivered it, then it is not personal but the owner may want to keep it, so next sentence is OK.

Persons desiring to retain same must remove them within 72 hours of funeral service is ok.

OK for holidays. Also include special personal occasions such as anniversaries, deceased birthday or death, ethnic celebrations, etc. Have a simple online process that grants a permit to have flowers of any kind (live or artificial) for a period of time.

The digging of holes for placement of plants or flowers is strictly prohibited is ok.

Makes no sense whatsoever - Removing dead plants, flowers is ok, but not allowing folks to plant bushes, flowers in ground is ridiculous. That is what makes the cemetery unique and beautiful!

Allow plants in ground, makes it parklike

At Austin Memorial- we were told in 2000 that the row where my father was buried did not allow for tree planting - that was every other row - but - bushes could be planted. There are different plants along his row. It reminds me that the people buried there are not "uniform", they are different. Austin Memorial seems to celebrate those differences.

Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.

Circled NO

I support the current bi-annual clean up. Quarterly would be fine too. I appreciate the notice given when these clean ups are scheduled.

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

A hole to be able to place artificial flowers should be premisable

No

Disagree - It's hard to consolidate people's feelings into a policy, may have to revisit this one. In general he is more prone to allow people to grieve in the way that works best for them. Should allow plants to be planted as long as they are within the confines of the person's gravesite and don't interfere with neighbors.

Question #9 answers this. Plant what you want on your space.

Just do it!

I agree.

Agree

I agree.

Agree

72 hours seems like a short amount of time, to me.

My family has always been able to place plants in our family plot at Oakwood Cemetery. There are several shrubs planted by my great grandmother 100 years ago. I think it should be permissible for us to replace those that have died because the city did not water Oakwood during the 2011 drought.

Agree - however: I feel artificial flowers/flower arrangements should be allowed at any time whether it is a holiday or not.

I agree in general, but think the planting flowers and other plants should be allowed.

Agree

I agree. It keeps the ground looking neat and kept.

That seems fine.

Digging of holes for appropriate drought resistant plants should be permitted as a way of beautifying the graves and cemetery. Wilted or dead flowers can be removed.

I disagree. The grass at my sons gravesite has been dead. There is nothing pretty at this gravesite. I want to plant some native ground cover or a crape myrtle or something there so his gravesite doesn't look like no one cares about it.

agree

I do agree with this entire statement.

Only when they are unsightly.
It makes no sense whatsoever that plants and flowers cannot be planted in the ground. Why????? The cemetery looks like a pretty garden. Flowers and other plants do much better in the ground than in pots. I think both should be allowed. Potted plants and in-ground plants/flowers. If they are dead, and nobody is caring for them, remove them. Otherwise, let them be!
We had AMP approve the trees and shrubs and the cemetery planted them for us. I really do agree with the above rule.
Agree.
Disagree. There is no sense in not allowing flowers or plants to be planted in the ground. They last longer, are more drought and freeze protected. If they are overgrown or hazardous, feel free to trim them. It makes no sense that you cannot have flowers in the ground when you can have them in pots because either way, you can mow and trim around them. Funeral designs/flowers being removed after they are wilted is ok.
Disagree. Not sure what difference it would make to you to have potted versus planted flowers. If it is to mow, you have to mow around either.
Disagree partially. Funeral arrangements that have rotted or dried should be removed. Holiday flowers should be allowed with no 30-day restriction. No removal of potted plants every month. Some are permanently good looking. If they are rotten, that would be ok. Allow plants and flowers in ground.
I disagree, planting flowers adds to the beauty of the cemetery. This cemetery is so unique and beautiful, because it is so individual and different.
Partially agree, but the decision should always remain with the family.
NO! Really. Now we are talking of planting plants. I think that any such desire on the part of the city to remove such things should be done in consultation with the plot holder/family. If there is cause, then let it be shown.
No, disagree. Let people plant what they want. Funeral wreaths that have gone past their prime should be removed by families, not the cemetery. That's more respectful of the grief people feel. If weeks pass without action, then cemetery workers should remove. Also plantings in ground should be allowed. Artificial flowers should also be allowed at any time given the hot conditions in Austin.
Disagree. Cemeteries need to have nice decorations so they are not dead looking. Flowers and baskets and plants and decorations are good. They are there now already and looking good.

<p>Why is digging hole over lot prohibited? what ill side effect is caused by people planting flowers on their lot? Disagree to the extent that cemetery has the ability to arbitrarily decide (without notice to owner) to remove items. Why does the funeral designs or floral pieces have to be removed within 72 hours? there seems to be several rules that are unjustified.</p>
<p>I disagree. As long as those items are placed on the graves (which are private property), there should be no removal without the written consent of the "stakeholders".</p>
<p>Agree</p>
<p>See answer to question #1.</p>
<p>Agree</p>
<p>I agree</p>
<p>Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.</p>
<p>I think artificial flowers should remain indefinitely as a rule and should not need to be associated with holidays. we try to keep artificial flowers on my parents' graves.</p>
<p>Agree. These regulations are necessary to maintain the property. The planting of plants would eventually result in an over-grown appearance. And who would maintain these plants? Who would water them, trim them, dispose of the trimmings, etc.? Not to mention the problems that these plants would pose for the maintenance crews.</p>
<p>agree</p>
<p>This rule seems reasonable. I have often left cut flowers on the grave at significant dates, but I expect them to disappear in a short time.</p>
<p>Agree with all except the last sentence. I think planting on graves is perfectly fine, and it's silly to disallow that.</p>
<p>I agree.</p>
<p>Removing plants monthly doesn't allow for tasteful and water-conserving perennial gardens to commemorate loved ones. Owners could be required to maintain perennials. This is a wasteful and over-reaching policy as currently written.</p>
<p>Disagree. Small gardens on sites are appropriate when maintained and conserve water and other resources. 72 hours is too short a turnaround time for grieving families. Again, "unsightly" is too subjective a term.</p>
<p>Who decides what is unsightly? Who thinks more than 30 days is an appropriate length of time for certain decor? For example, an artificial Memorial Day wreath that honors military service and does not look "unsightly" to those paying tribute: why should that be removed in 30 days? This is not an HOA.</p>

Disagree. These rules are unnecessary. Furthermore, no plants? Has PARD visited gracious current and ancient European cemeteries where plants (ranging from ivy to small shrubs) enhance the experience?

Planting on a grave is an honor toward the deceased. This should be allowed. In Austin, to choose a plant that requires less water than grass should be celebrated.

disagree with this rule

Disagree on planting....I don't understand why they can't plant a pretty bush.

I agree the digging holes should be restricted. Perhaps a specific part of a plot could be designated for this purpose. Personally, I'd love to have someone maintain a small flower plot for me as I am a gardener.

Disagree. Let families honor loved ones by planting plants and flowers. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.

Agree.

This rule needs clarification. Is this first part pertaining to recent funerals? If not then NO you can't remove after one month.

no - again, the owner of the plot can do what they want. After all this is America, we have freedom of expression

Disagree. Plants should be allowed to be planted on the grave themselves.

Disagree. Let plants and flowers remain--who cares if they wilt. It's a cemetery for goodness sake.

Owners should be allowed to set potted plants or floral arrangements on the graves, and should also be allowed to plant flowers or shrubs on the grave.

I disagree with this rule as those of us who see the withering flowers and aging floral pieces know that the mourner is still dealing with painful loss. Some mourners just cannot bear the thought of returning to the grave soon after the burial because it is still a raw loss. By enforcing a "you must come and clean up your grave site" at a certain period is adding an additional burden on the mourner. Patience and time should be the rule.

Disagree.

parada !

Encuesta en español ? [survey in spanish?]

Disagree. Sounds like someone making up these rules has some control issues he or she needs help to get under control. I don't like artificial flowers, but some people do and they could be quite meaningful to some families.

Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

Disagree, remove the rule.

Completely agree.
Strongly disagree with prohibition on digging holes for placement of plants or flowers. This is gross injustice if there is a parent mourning a lost child or such. The cemetery has a responsibility to aid in the grieving process, not just to maintain country club-like lawns.
Denying someone the right to plant something on their loved ones' grave is despicable. People need to be allowed to place artificial flowers on their loved one's birthday, anniversary, anniversary of death, too.
Disagree.
Live and well maintained plants should be allowed. The 72 hour and 30 day removal of floral arrangements seems reasonable for ground keeping.
I would agree until the last sentence. I think real flowers who grow there are much more sightly than any artificial flowers.
disagree - artificial flowers should not be limited to holidays and should be removed only when faded. A shallow hole secures the pot and benefits the workers.
Yes
I disagree only with the last part, which says that flowers and plants cannot actually be planted (by digging shallow holes). I have seen lovely plants and flowers growing in the cemetery that add to its beauty and to the personal nature of the tombs.
I agree with the removal of withered plants but I think plastic flowers should be left alone, along with plastic toys, for longer. I am not sure how long because I don't know how big a problem it is. My experience is that very few graves have anything plastic on them.
Againâ€¦ if maintained by the family members they should be allowed.
Agree
Disagree, allow digging of holes for secure placement of items on the grave.
agree
I think any plastic flowers, pots or funeral arrangements should be removed, as stated. I disagree with the statement at the end about "holes for placement of plants" I think living plants should be allowed, as long as they're maintained by the family.
This one is fine.
disagree To broad.
I agree with this rule.
agree with the proviso that 72 hours is much too short. One week is closer to reasonable.
72. Hours?

Disagree. While untended potted plants, cut flowers, etc. will fade and can be removed by the previous rule, many traditions allow remembrance gardens on graves and this rule would totally negate that tradition.

I agree

same as above, I believe that dead flowers should go. Artificial flowers after 30 days look bad, too. I understand why you wouldn't want plants growing there, as some could be quite large.

Disagree. This requirement is too stricked that artificial flowers may be placed on graves for holidays with the understanding that they will be removed thirty days after the holiday. The removal should be every 6 months.

I agree; have no problem with this rule.

I disagree with the prohibition on planting flowers and gardens. The removal of pots, baskets, and dead cut flowers is a reasonable request.

I agree with this rule. Withered flowers and plants are unattractive, and they may interfere with mowing and maintenance. I like Portland's seasonal restriction on artificial flowers/plants. [See Question #15]

Agree.

Rule is fine until the last sentence. Seriously, people cannot plant the flora of their choice on their loved one's final resting place? This is ludicrous. And do you want to waste city worker's time requiring them to go around digging up beautiful flowers?

We agree with all except for planting of flowers or small shrubs should be allowed if well maintained.

Generally agree with everything except planting.

I agree with the removal of spent flowers, but I don't see why plastic flowers can't stay. And digging holes on private plots shouldn't be a problem unless it becomes an actual safety hazard.

What is wrong with digging a hole to plant something? Rest is okay but very wordy

Agree. I disagree with those who do not own a grave to put flowers without the permission of the owner. Putting dead flowers on a grave is forbidden in some religions and cultures and the general Christian types enjoy helping everyone out by placing them, in their well intentioned ignorance.

agree

agree

I agree.

Agree.

<p>Agree: Potted plants, cut flowers should be removed when the plants are wilted or dead. The pots, planters should also be removed after the families have been notified of the removal. Artificial flowers have a longer life and may last longer than 30 days. Holes should not be allowed because of the safety hazard of falls caused by holes.</p>
<p>disagree need to work with the stakeholders</p>
<p>agree</p>
<p>agree</p>
<p>No opinion.</p>
<p>disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries Longview Code of Ordinances Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas</p>
<p>I would think that planting a native shrub would be more eco-friendly and take less maintenance than fake or real potted plants. It looks as if this rule would disallow that option.</p>
<p>DISAGREE!</p>
<p>Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle</p>
<p>Disagree. If the artificial flowers are not in disrepair or not holiday-specific, I believe that they should remain. Holes should be allowed if the holes are within the owner's space.</p>
<p>I agree with the rule for cut or artificial flowers, but believe that living plants should be allowed to remain.</p>
<p>no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]</p>
<p>Agree</p>
<p>That sounds good, but the only problem is that the people that put the flowers in may just be in town for the funeral and may not have access to come down. There needs to be a common sense rule, the flowers need to be removed. If people have stationary pots that they can put love flowers in, it really should be up to the family. Let the family know that flowers will be taken out when they wither. They aren't serving a purpose anymore.</p>

As long as the flowers are wilted, I agree with this rule.
Agree, but who determines when “each month” is. How do they know how long something is out there? Add a standard cleanup day. Disagree if the family is coming out quite often. One month is too soon, 2-3 months is a better time frame.
Funeral service flowers: agree
Don’t agree with artificial flowers portion. As long as they still look attractive.
Disagree with digging holes being prohibited. Paid a small fee to have cemetery dig hole for a bush.
Rule

In sections designated for flush type memorials, plants, or cut flowers shall be placed only in the approved type bronze vases provided for that purpose.

Comment
Disagree. Too restrictive.
I agree.
Add: Only one urn (vase) allowed per plot
No change
No change
I would agree with this, however we do not own this type of plot, so my opinion might not be important here!
Disagree. I think approved permanent type vases that monument companies sell, such as marble or granite, should also be allowed. But no store-bought vases that people bring in.
Disagree. What is to keep the city from declaring that all future graves be flush-type just to prevent grave owners from placing vases and benches and such?
I think I have to agree with this, for safety reasons. A temporary vase could be glass, and cause a safety issue if it breaks. So I think this is a reasonable rule.
Agree, unless there is a cultural objection to the bronze vases?
some religions do not allow for vases! Bronze vases also discolor - cemeteries should have flowers and be parklike.
Agree
agree
I agree. No change is necessary
Agreed.
Disagree

Yes, I agree.
agreed.
disagree, you charge too much money, the city is money hungry.
I do not believe that these flush memorials exist anywhere except AMP. I do agree if that is the rule at the time of burial..
Disagree -- who wants a cemetery with only bronze vases????????????????
See my response to #3 and #4.
disagree! Bronze? oh come on. plastic is perfectly acceptable.
I agree, but this seems to apply more to Memorial Park.
Agree
I agree I agree
Agree
with the increasing theft of bronze vases, I would like to see a standard placement of a PVC tube that is flush or just below grade. these could be installed by staff for a small fee to cover the cost of material + labor +20% makeup. no theft of Bronze Vases and uniform placement
Agree
Agree. This uniform style is tasteful.
No change recommended.
Agree
Agree
Disagree, again expression of grief is personal.
Agree
Sometimes an easel will be delivered to the flush type memorials.....I don't think it should be restricted to only bronze vases.
Disagree. "Approved" containers will not work. We have our own age appropriate ones. Thank you.
agree
This seems reasonable.
DISAGREE.
I agree.
I think whenever you limit an item to one type of bronze vase; you are asking for division. I think you should have alternatives and substitutes.

Who provides vase...didn't see any of them. When you buy a plot, they should be offered a vase to buy as well. No idea what size or where to put it or how it's fixed or attached. He has taken flowers out and dug a little dirt recess by marker 6" wide and 4" deep and set potted plant. They pick up and throw away when it dies.

OK.

Keep the cemetery beautiful

Enforcement (rigid structure) of the above rules rob me of personally memorializing my child. The idea that I cannot plant flowers, place a bench, special objects, breaks my heart. Austin Memorial Park is a beautiful place with pockets of whimsical JOY. Please do not deprive me of this. The rules should be public safety driven. Each cemetery is unique to the community it serves. One size does not fit all. Please, there is none at stake here than saving \$ on lawn maintenance or appeasing people who have no vested interest - no loved one buried. I'm too upset to continue.

Circled NO and commented 'Ugly'

No rule on vases only

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

No

Disagree - Doesn't like these type of memorials. Flowers/plants should be allowed to be planted within burial space.

Disagree, there is no problem now. Question #9 answers this.

Just don't designate an area for only flush type memorials, and then make exceptions for City favorites.

I agree.

Agree

I agree.

Agree

Disagree - seems like a stupid rule.

I agree, otherwise the grave monument could be overgrown.

Agree

I agree. It makes it easier to keep the ground uniform and clean.

I don't know where they exist.
Disagree. Let families choose their own appropriate vases.
How do you find out if your is designated as such?
agree
See answer above about urns/vases to allow flowers/plants. I have put holiday type fake flowers with stiff stems directly in the ground...I don't see that as a problem.
N/A
Disagree. Why not let people express their individuality??
I agree
Agree
Disagree. Those are unsightly and are a gathering place for mosquitoes when rain accumulates inside.
This would make the cemetery look so impersonal. I have seen cemeteries that have this in other cities and ours look 1000 times more respectful. Otherwise, it is like a cemetery for robots where everything is standard.
Disagree.
I do not understand the question, I do not know what flush type memorial is..
Approved? I did not see anything in the rules about the approval process except that the Superintendent make decisions. There was no decision making criteria outlined anywhere. This about families and respect!
No
I do not believe that it is appropriate for the city to dictated when and where to place plants. This is not a fast food restaurant where everything is uniform and the same.
Disagree. They're unsightly.
Agree.
Disagree. why only bronze vases? if valid reason for only having bronze, then the vases should be readily obtainable, which they are not.
The "stakeholders" should be allowed leeway to place holders of their choice on the plots they purchased.
Agree
See answer to question #1.
Agree
I agree. It is impossible to find vases satisfactory for every taste. A standard prototype is best.

Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
Disagree. I think you should be able to place a flowering plant, in it's pot, on the grave of loved ones, but that these should be thrown away when the plants are wilted.
agree
As stated above, I leave cut flowers occasionally on the grave which has a flush marker. I don't have a vase, as that is difficult to mow around.
Disagree. Why make all these rules? Let people express themselves if it brings them a little peace and reminds them of their loved one.
What does it mean "sections designated for flush type memorials" Do u mean flush type headstones? Where does one acquire the approved type bronze vases? I might or might not agree depending on answers.
Do gravesite owners know about this policy before purchasing the site? Why is this restriction necessary?
This is fine - I presume these owners have chosen this option.
Do not agree.
Disagree. "Approved" bronze vases? We live in a city that is supports the arts -- local potter and sculptors -- and PARD wants imported bronze vases? Is PARD looking for conformity in a this creative city?
Disagree. Laying something on the grave should be fine.
disagree with this rule
Disagree. Those are stolen often. Also other flowers do not take away from the containers if removed when withered.
Agreed, assuming this understood at the time of purchase for this specific kind of plot.
Disagree. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.
Disagree.
DISAGREE!! Not all graves have the flower holders. I did not think of it when grieving so too late now. I have checked into cost and can't afford! So you will deny those of us who can't afford BRONZE to have flowers on our loved ones grave? Outrageous!
don't know
ok with this one since people who bought plots on those sections knew the rules when they purchased.

Any type of vase or other memorial items should be allowed on the graves in this section.
I don't agree with this rule. The vase itself does not reflect the location of the deceased's body. Often, one wants to place a memento or flower over the place where the person is actually buried. It's an attempt to touch what can no longer be touched, ever.
Disagree. Design a set of standards that permit people to have options.
I agree. Grave owners need to understand this rule up front. If not it may cause some unhappiness between them and the city.
parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish?]
Too restrictive. Let people tend to the graves of those they love in the way that brings them peace.
Agree generally, but why bronze? With thefts of metal objects becoming ever more comment, why do you need to regular composition of the container as long as it fits reasonable size requirements?
I think if this is agreed upon in the initial purchase of the plot, this is reasonable, but not as a retroactive rule.
Have you contacted all the plot owner's and sought out their input, and then listened to it? They are the ones to be listened to here. This is too restrictive.
Agree.
I agree. The flush type grave areas should be easy to mow and keep up.
I am sorry, I am not familiar with "flush type memorials".
disagree - not everyone can afford the bronze vase, nor to have someone place it.
Remove this rule. The most beautiful cemeteries and memorials are the ones with beautiful gardens. You can't legislate beauty.
Yes
See number 10 above.
No I think people should be able to adorn their family plot as they see fit with plantings.
Too many rules! Come on! we purchased this property. Has been in our family for nearly 10 years. It is maintained weekly by our family.
Agree
Agree
agree

I disagree. I think the family has the right to place mementos or living flowers on the graves. If they choose to use the bronze vase for cut or plastic flowers, I think those should be removed according to the rules in question 10.
Sure
neutral
Not all flush type memorials have the bronze vases. Graves I visit in Austin Memorial Park do not have the bronze vases, requiring me to utilize green plastic vases designed specifically for placement in a grave.
agree
Agree. For people who have chosen the esthetic of being buried flush type monument area, tight regulation of flowers and decoration is allowable.
I agree on condition these rules are made clear to prospective new owners
You cannot always get plants or flowers the size of those small bronze vases, so I believe that others should be allowed.
Disagree. Not all flush type memorials have bronze vases. There should be tolerance here.
I agree; sounds good and helps keep a dignified appearance.
I disagree with this rule.
This seems like a good rule, as it promotes a consistent, attractive appearance.
Agree.
I hate those sections, but if you get a plot there, I suppose you'd best abide by that rule, so I'm okay with this one.
We agree.
Agree. We particularly chose a cemetery without this requirement.
As long as it's not a safety hazard and remains on the private plot, I don't see why people can't decorate.
Agree
Agree.
Disagree.
agree
OK, except during a service.
I would apply the policy in Question 10 to these graves too.
Agree.
Disagree. If the memorial does not have a vase there should be provisions for additional approved containers for floral arrangements.

disagree
need to work with the stakeholders
agree
agreed
No opinion.
disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries Longview Code of Ordinances Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas
DISAGREE!
Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle
I agree.
no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]
Agree
Does not think Evergreen has flush memorials with containers provided. Some cemeteries provide a holder for flowers for a uniform look. Evergreen doesn't have these. Doesn't think any cemetery in Austin has this.
I don't see the reason for having uniform styled vases, so I would strike this rule.
Disagree. Don't want to lose the character of Austin.
Rule
<i>In the interest of maintenance, planting of ivy, flowers, shrubs, or bushes is prohibited. Long lived hardwood trees such as Live Oak, Spanish Oak, American Elm, and Cedar Elm may be planted with the approval of the Superintendent.</i>
Comment
OK, but I would allow planting of hardy bushes as well as trees.
I agree.

Long lived hardwood trees such as live oak, Spanish oak, American elm, and cedar elm, and hardy native small trees or large shrubs, such as mountain laurel, yaupon holly, or crape myrtle, may be planted with the approval of the Superintendent, which shall not be unreasonably withheld.

Leave rule as is

No change

Planting of anything is prohibited without the approval of the Cemetery Director. [this is a BS statement, if it's prohibited, then say so] Long lived hardwood trees such as Live Oak, Spanish Oak, American Elm, and Cedar Elm may be planted [planted where? On the gravesite? Next to a loved one?] with the approval of the Superintendent in a place designated by Super...

Are you saying in the interest of maintenance because the City is not going to maintain them? The City of Austin planted the items in their area at the expense of the Temple. XXX expects the City to maintain them.

Gravesite is 40 inches with an 8 feet long in his section . if you are going to plant a tree, where are you allowed to put it? In writing this rule, need to be specific.

I agree. While I love the different textures of successful plantings, a lot of these plants don't get maintained by the families and end up growing out of control.

Disagree with language. Approval should come from Cemetery Manager, not Superintendent, and should be for all tree or shrub. Flowers, ivy, etc. plantings should not be allowed at all.

Disagree. Cemeteries can be botanical spaces, calming spaces. No maintenance is required to take care of crinum and flag irises and similar drought-tolerant bulbs.

Yes, any plantings that are of a permanent nature, not an annual nature, should be approved by the superintendent.

Agree. Shrubbery needs special maintenance and would take longer for workers to manage. Trees provide shade and are longer growing. Planting a rose bush on a grave may sound nice, but it might grow or die oddly without routine watering.

Ivy, flowers and shrubs use less water than trees - the City should thank people for helping keep the site beautiful. Just take care of it.

Agree

agree

I agree. Only trees in approved locations should be allowed. No more crepe myrtles.

Agreed.

Disagree as long as gardens are maintained by the plot owner.

I agree.
agreed, as long as plantings do not encroach on other peoples spaces.
no trees planted
There are other trees that should be acceptable such as crape myrtles.
Agree and the SUPERINTENDENT needs to do all in its power to keep the LIVE OAKS, SPANISH OAKS, and others healthy and alive.
With the continuing drought and the need to preserve water, PARD should be encouraging the use of drought-resistant, water-wise, native, low-maintenance plants, shrubs, and trees. During the summer, when the grass was largely dead, often the only green areas were the gravesite plantings and gardens. I have submitted proposed rules regarding plantings on gravesites, including requiring that any plantings be selected from plants recommended by the City of Austin's Grow Green Native and Adapted Landscape Plants guide and placing limits on the size and types of plants (for example no thorny or spiny plants). I also suggested that in addition to the hardwood trees, the rule should be expanded to include hardy native small trees or large shrubs, such as mountain laurel, yaupon holly, or crape myrtle.
Agree. The world needs fewer trees.
Yes, I agree. Especially as to historic Oakwood. The fabric of the whole should be vigorously maintained.
Agree
Possibly in my family's case, this trellis could have roses with written permission from the superintendent's office.
Only in certain areas where tree growth will not intrude or grow in to plots.
I would allow planting of such items with permission
yes. it all boils down to long term maintenance. you want to plant a tree an endowment fee needs to be established to help cover the cost of the additional water and trimming in the future. the drip line of the tree is a no use zone, over time the roots expand then someone wants to use a space and they cut major roots and the tree dies.
Agree
Agree. Again, it is the superintendent's responsibility to allow only plantings that will not interfere with burial plots, other trees, or damage walkways and roadways, and to prohibit all invasive species.
Agree.

Agree
Agree
Disagree, as long as the grave site is kept up.
Agree
I think ivy over a grave looks nice...and doesn't require mowing. I agree on the trees; except blooming trees like crepe myrtle, mountain laurel.....add color and beauty to the grounds. And they don't require a lot of maintenance.
Again, our bushes were torn out as was a tree. Shame on whoever did that. This was long ago.
agree
Personally, I like the idea of a small plant being dug close to the grave. I like the idea of being able to plant a tree. This seems reasonable.
Disagree regarding the planting of appropriate flowers at the grave site. This should be allowed.
I agree.
I do not think the cemetery should have the authority to limit the exact type of tree planted if the space is owned by someone and they are paying for it. I do think it is helpful to have a suggested list of what grows easily but if the owner is willing to take care of it then I think there should be allowances.
Agree. Definitely allow trees with approval
Agree, but does not want Superintendent making decisions. Agree that bushes and other plants can't be planted.

Who is the “Superintendent”? The Cemetery Manager? Define this.

Add “native” and “shade” to the description: “Native long lived shade trees such as Plateau Live oak...” The type of live oak that is not from this area is not as good as the one that is (plateau live oak). Delete Spanish Oak because that name is used for several oak species. Delete American Elm because they drop a lot of branches when older, causing a safety issue in high use places.

Add “Plateau Live/fusiformis/, Red, Shumard, Bur and Monterrey oaks. Native long lived shorter trees such as Lacey and Chinquapin oaks, Cedar Elm, Texas Ash, and Texas Pistache.”

Planting a tree should be allowed provided that it’s of an acceptable native species. Most everyone wants to plant a tree as part of the grieving process. We recommend a long lived large shade trees with no tendency for large long roots that will damage graves and pavement (no Bald or Montezuma cypress), or that need lots of water (tropicals, non-natives, Sycamores, Willows, Maples, or Walnuts), or that tend to drop branches (Pecans or American elm).

Don’t regulate tree species for cemeteries to include only Crape Myrtles and short lived understories (Redbuds and others), in order to minimize maintenance. We need shade from trees in the public cemeteries. We need the next generation of heritage trees and the best places to grow these are the cemeteries provided that a little care is given (mulch and water during periods of insufficient rainfall).

Planting a tree in a private lot should come with a commitment from the owner to adequately mulch (2 inches deep and 3 inches from the trunk) and water the tree as needed, not too much and not too little water, per instructions provided by PARD.

Planting in the ground should be encouraged. Plants, flowers and bushes will dry up in pots and they really add to the character, history, personality and diversity Austin is so uniquely known for. Let grieving families express their love and tender care that way.

agree

Some cemeteries are flat - ground level stones - uninteresting - no stories to tell. Some cemeteries (Austin Memorial Cemetery) are less uniform with different plants, shrubs, trees. They tell stories and reflect a diverse clientele. Diversity even in death.

There is no logic in not allowing plants/flowers in the ground when you can put them in pots. Either way you can mow, edge around them. It's just too rigid to enforce this rule by pulling up plants that are not in anybody's way or don't pose a safety hazard.

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

agree
No
Disagree - Planting should be allowed within burial space as long as it doesn't interfere with neighbors. Agree - Trees should be approved by Superintendent, provided Superintendent isn't unreasonably denying people just because they can. Maybe every 4th or 5th grave would be allowed to do it?
Agree with the tree part. If planting of Ivy, Flowers , Shrubs or Bushes is a problem, mow and trim around problem.
Just do it.
I agree.
Agree
I agree.
this seems fair
See question #10. Our family plot , which we have owned since 1908 has several shrubs planted by my great grandmother over 100 years ago, which should be permitted.
Agree. However, when trees are planted, I want to make sure surrounding burials will not be impaired from the tree's roots.
I agree, shade is wonderful.
Agree
I agree. Plants and trees become over grown and hard to maintain ground around them.
I agree
planting on individual graves should be permitted, or in the plots owned by families. But care should be taken to plant drought friendly and local trees, flowers and shrubs.
Please give me approval to plant one of these trees at my son's gravesite.
I agree.
I think an approved list of plants should be allowed in keeping with plants that were traditionally used as cemetery plants (iris, lilies, etc); plants that won't overgrow the graves or damage the monuments.

I completely agree!! I have had the displeasure of burying my mother next to the XXX family, who in disgust of not being allowed to be the only ones in the area, proceeded to get special permission (and so set a precedence!) to plant boxwood hedges around her entire plot of graves. She had a yard service tend to it but did not have the manners to keep her hedges from literally growing nearly halfway onto my mother's grave and headstone!! It took me and the manager of the cemetery at the time, exactly ONE YEAR to get her to remedy the problem! I am not really sorry to "Good Riddance!"

Disagree

I disagree. Again, planting flowers, bushes, shrubs is what makes the cemetery a park and a beautiful place to come visit to see your loved ones.

We planted 3 Italian cedars, 2 crepe myrtles and one oak tree. I've seen alot of boxwoods that look nice too,so i would think that it would depend on where the family wanted to plant something else besides the oaks and elms.

Disagree. There are a multitude of beautiful trees that thrive in our climate which could enhance the beauty of the cemetery.

Disagree. Planting of flowers/shrubs/bushes, etc. in the ground should totally be allowed. They add beauty and people are doing a good job. Why fix what is not broken? Tree planting control would be ok if there are too many and their root systems are going to cause problems to the graves.

disagree. Planting of flowers, shrubs adds the uniqueness of each person/family.

Disagree partially. Should allow planting of flowers, plants, shrubs and bushes. No ivy because it can take over. Trees should be allowed.

No I do not agree. This is up to individual what they want to plant. No rules should apply on what to plat.

See response to Question #9.

This rule is asinine. Really, no rose bushes but an Oak tree is OK?

No, I think that the planting of a bush/flower/shrub is something that the person is doing out of love and, from what I have seen, in good taste.

No. These should be allowed. They add beauty and ambiance.

Disagree. Good vegetation planted makes cemetery pretty.

Disagree. If someone wants to put ivy over their lot then they should be able to do so. Of course there needs to be limitations as to where the ivy is permitted to grow, as in the owner needs to keep it maintained to the lots they own and/or if not pruned/maintained correctly, cemetery can remove (after giving notice of issue and adequate time for the issue to be remedied).

I disagree. It would not make sense to plant on a grave the hardwood trees mentioned above--they grow too large. Smaller perennials, flowers, and the like are more appropriate.
Agree
Change. Allow any trees that are native and drought tolerant, some examples: Redbud, Mexican plum, Mountain Laurel. Also, why ban the planting of shrubs or bushes? As long as they're native, drought-tolerant, and not aggressive spreaders I don't see the problem.
Agree
I agree
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
Agree. I think allowing the planting of trees is adequate, and that allowing this practice is very thoughtful. The more trees, the better.
agree
Agree. I want the city employees to be able to do their job.
Disagree. People who want to plant a few flowers and shrubs to beautify their loved one's grave should be allowed to do so, so long as the plants are maintained by the owner.
Yes, I agree
This doesn't seem reasonable. As long as owners demonstrate that they can maintain these plants, I see no reason why they should be banned outright. I can understand banning species designated as invasive/toxic by local agricultural authorities, but beyond that, grave owners should have the right to plant whatever they are willing and able to maintain.
Disagree. A list of allowed native shrubs, bushes and flowers ought to be developed within size/height limits.
Disagree. There are many xeriscaped approved plants that would enhance the local natural beauty and reduce water use.
If the plant is on a grave, owned by an individual, and maintained by that individual, it should be allowed. Perhaps a list of low maintenance shrubs, etc. would be a happy medium in this.
disagree with this rule
Disagree
Disagree. I think flowers should be acceptable as long as the plot owners maintains them.
Disagree. Allow plants and require they be maintained. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.
Good question. Perhaps something can be worked out on this issue.
Agree

yes
Xeriscape plants should be allowed.
Disagree. Planting native/hardy plants is preferable to continuing to water and mow. Perhaps the cemetery should encourage people to plant these kinds of plants, including trees.
All types of plants should be allowed on the grave sites, if planted by the owner.
I disagree with this proposed rule. Again, the mourner should be allowed to plant a flower, tree, shrub, different than the ones you propose etc, That's how nature does it. Memorial Park is a gem due to the various plantings.
If
Agree. Because these are plants that have long and extensive root systems and ultimately affect more than just the plot they are intended to enhance.
I agree with the intent of not having the city responsible for additional maintenance. My concern is with the prohibition of planting other things besides the identified hardwood trees.
parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish?]
Any non-invasive plants should be allowed. Any long-lived hardwood trees need oversight as the roots and branches will ultimately affect many graves. The oversight needs to be by a board of the families of those buried in the cemetery.
Disagree, change to only prohibit all invasives listed by City of Austin.
Agree.
Agree except in cases of native plants and shrubs.
Maybe
Disagree. Anything to replace water greedy grass.
I agree
I do not agree. I think planting flowers, shrubs or ivy should be welcomed and encouraged. I agree that before planting large shrubs or trees, the cemetery maintenance should be contacted to discuss possible issues.
agree

Absolutely disagree. The most beloved and visited cemeteries are the ones with antique roses, shrubs and bulbs. These rules are meant for the city's mow and blow crew and will destroy the character of this cemetery. It's ironic that the city encourages planting native flowers, shrubs and bushes in our homes but this rule will prevent this type of environmentally friendly environment for our loved ones. This rule absolutely should be deleted.

Shrubs and bushes should be included in the approval loop

See number 10 above. I do not agree.

I agree.

The owners of the gravesides should be able to plant shrubs/flowers on their plots. If it enhances the gravesite that should not be an issue.

Disagree. I do agree with not planting reseeding plants that can take over, or vines that can eat the world, like trumpet vine or Asian jasmine. But butterfly attracting plants would be delightful. Perhaps you can devise a long list of approved native plants that are drought tolerant and would add to the beauty. Again, I refer you to the city's grow green guide, available free at local nurseries. You also should request the advice of our Ag County Agent, Daphne Richards. That's why she has a job, for situations like this.

Disagree with the prohibition of flowers agree that trees should be preapproved.

Allow planting of shrubs and perennial flowers. Agree that hardwood trees should be approved by the superintendent.

I only agree about the planting of ivy or other plants that could creep and become an eyesore or maintenance issue. I love the idea of planting trees. I think smaller plants, maybe under 2' tall should be allowed on the graves without asking for permission. Shrubs and trees, I think should require permission, as placement for mature size is an issue.

I can see how this could get out of control. Amend it so that people can at least submit a request for planting with the understanding that their shrubs might have to be dug up but they will be NOTIFIED when this happens. Just use respect for stuff like this and it should be fine.

neutral

I agree with this rule.

Very much disagree. A variety of greenery keeps the cemetery attractive and interesting.

Disagree. As long as plantings are maintained by grave holders, no objection can be made to any planting on a grave site.

I agree because the items mentioned will grow to exceed the boundaries of the lot

I agree. I think anything that will be perennial must have permission/approval.

Disagree. As long as the vegetation is maintained on private plots their planting should be allowed.

There are many feasible options for plants that are both beautiful, perennial, neat looking and drought tolerant. There should be an acceptable list of plants to choose.

I agree and this will help us enforce our requests at the Agudas Achim Cemetery.

Disagree. As for for the ivy, shrubs, and bushes, these should be permitted. For the larger species that extend beyond plots at are privately owned, I agree that the Superintendent or, more generally, the city, should have approval power.

I agree with this rule. Trees are great, providing welcome shade. Plantings require special maintenance and interfere with mowing. But I wonder about the list of approved trees. With Live Oaks at risk for disease, are there other species that are good candidates? An arborist would know.

Agree.

Disagree.

We disagree. If flowers or shrubs are properly maintained they should be allowed.

Disagree. Again, we chose this cemetery because we didn't want the flat mow over grave.

If you're already prohibited from maintaining this stuff, why is this even an issue? My only concern is that people don't plant invasives. Other than that, I think they should be able to plant what they want as long as it stays in their plot.

Disagree.

Agree.

If planted, then the maintenance should be discussed and followed.

agree

Agree

Would this allow owners to do the planting themselves? Or would they consult with a city worker over planting, watering, feeding? This seems inconsistent with the policy in Question 12.

Agree.

Agree

agree

disagree

work with the stakeholders

I believe some native planets such as Crape Myrtles can and should be allowed to be planted. Perhaps a "donation fee" be required to cover additional maintenance cost/water.

agreed

No opinion.

disagree;
keep rules simple...Such as:
Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries
Longview Code of Ordinances
Section 22-14, Exhibit "A"

Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery
in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

DISAGREE!

Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle

Agree.

I agree that spreading plants like ivies and some shrubs should be blocked, but planting flowers should be allowed.
no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Agree

That should be something that definitely needs to be in place. When trees get big, the roots break headstones, sidewalks, etc. When a person buys a plot, that is probably an old-school way of marking the spot. But they do damage the headstones.

I would strike "flowers." They are small and from my experience, confined to the grave itself. Because ivy spreads and bushes can grow large and obscure other gravesites, I believe they should be prohibited.

Did not plant a bush per Gilbert's request. Disagree with. Did not plant anything taller than a 3 feet tall bush. Disagree with tree rule. What will the superintendent agree to? Too much or too little. Roots cause more maintenance. Trees must be approved by nearby spaceholders.

Rule

If any trees or shrubs situated on any space shall become detrimental, unsightly, or impede access to adjacent spaces, walks, or roads, they may be pruned or removed in whole or in part as determined necessary by the Superintendent.

Comment

Agree.

I agree.
Leave rule as is
No change
If any trees or shrubs situated on any space shall become detrimental, unsightly, or impede access to adjacent spaces, walks, or roads, they may be pruned or removed [by who? This implies the Cemetery] in whole or in part as determined necessary by the Superintendent. Again – not clear, where can they plant a tree or a shrub? You can do some stuff, but it better stay in your space. The older sites are more than 40 inches. Some people may have purchased more space to bury loved ones and put a bench and shrubs.
I do agree with this, but a strict Superintendent might overuse this. Some families may have planted a beautiful, ornamental tree in honor of their child or something sensitive like this. I would be sad to see it removed by staff - especially without conference with the family.
Agree except for language - Superintendent should be Cemetery Manager.
Disagree. Pruned, maybe. Removed, not without contacting the owner first. An exception could be made for dead branches.
Unfortunately, plantings done in the past that were for a person may have to be removed. Perhaps a replacement tree or shrub could be replaced in a nearby area as a gesture of good will to the family.
Agree. But the removal of plants could be referred to the superintendent and a panel of 3 public citizens.
Notice should be served to various managers for input before anything is removed, especially trees and plants and shrubs. 60 days Notice in writing.
Agree
agree
I agree. All trees should be maintained by the City and pruned as necessary.
Agree but plot owner should be contacted first to see if they'll take care of it on their own.
agreed, it is important to maintain a clean look to the cemetery.
agree
Trimming should be done in the proper manner. This year shrubs at Oakwood were butchered and are now in horrible condition.
agree
Agree, but in the least invasive manner.
Agree. The world needs fewer trees.

Yes, at Memorial Park. Care should be taken at Oakwood to maintain its integrity
The superintendant needs to use his own discretion on this matter.
I agree, but it would be kind to inform a member of the family if possible. Cemeteries are where dear people are buried not just a work place for others. I believe a kind balance should be remembered when dealing with other's deceased.
Agree. Maintain the appearance of the cemetery.
yes
agree
Agree
Agree. It is the superintendent's responsibility to control and maintain the landscape.
Agree.
Agree
If the trees or shrubs are on a grave site, notify the owners....same as above.
Disagree. Again, the owners have this right.
agree
I agree to a point. Who makes the determination that the shrub, etc. should be removed? Will the cemetery notify you so that you can make the decision? I would be upset if I came to visit, and discovered a bush had been removed. I think the rule needs tweaking. Prune first, remove last.
Agree.
I agree.
I think if a shrub or tree is removed, the owner should be notified and given the opportunity to correct it before removal.
I also ASK FOR THE MOSS IN ALL THE TREES BE REMOVED YEARLY. BEAUTIFUL OLD TREES ARE DYING BECAUSE OF THE MOSS.. WHEN IT IS NOT REMOVED, IT MOVES FROM TREE TO TREE.
Good rule

For private tree removal: Not without 2 weeks notice if they are privately owned trees.

For public tree removal, including invasives: Not without an approved COA tree permit for protected and heritage trees, regardless of tree ownership and regardless of the site specific tree permit given to public cemeteries.

For public tree removal due to "Detrimental" or "Safety issue" : This requires a certified arborist determination (PARD Forester) for any public tree size.

For pruning protected and heritage size tree: No more than 25% of the canopy can be pruned, regardless of tree ownership.

For pruning oaks: follow COA Oak Wilt policy at all times, regardless of tree ownership. This means avoid pruning oaks from Feb 1st to June 30th . Plan maintenance accordingly.

agree

I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.

agree

OK

Agree

Agree, but try to work with the people.

Just do it.

I agree.

Agree

I agree.

Agree

Many trees in historic Oakwood cemetery have died due to the fact that the city of Austin did not water during the 2011 drought. The city should give attention to saving historic trees and watering to prevent the necessity of removing them.

Agree. I don't know why you mention shrubs since they are prohibited (see Question #13)

I agree, this seems like common sense to me.

Agree

I agree.

I agree but again I think the owner should be notified

agree
Agree
agree
YES!! see above.
Agree
I agree.
Yes, but I believe if the family can be notified first, that would be best, so they don't get angry if they go to the cemetery and their shrubs are gone.
agree
?? Shrubs are prohibited, according to #13.
Agree.
Agree
Agree.
Yes i agree.
Partially agree. The trees surrounding the family plot have become un-pruned and unsightly and full of ball moss which are killing the trees. With this rule in place, I cannot prune or remove any detrimental growth to the tree or shrub within the area owned by the family. Again, see the reference to ownership in response to Question #9.
No. Pruned for equal access, fine. Removed at the discretion of the staff, no.
yes. that's reasonable.
Agree. Cleanup is good.
Agree
I agree that the city workers would have the right to prune judiciously if there was a case of a tree or shrub impeding a walkway or roadway.
Agree
Too much latitude. What do "unsightly" and "detrimental" mean? Any heritage trees should only be pruned or removed with the express consent of the City Arborist.
Agree
I agree
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
The rule is fine, but it should be a rare instance that this would happen with maybe some occasional pruning for better appearance.

Agree. How could anyone disagree with this provision? Decisions should be made by a reasonable Supervisor, who would make due note why such action was taken. Photos to accompany the written record would also help to document the reasoning for such action.
agree
Agree
Agree
Yes, I agree
Detrimental or impeding access--yes. Unsightly is too subjective a term.
With the addition of a provision that owners are notified of the problems and given a time span to respond first, this rule should stand.
Agree
Disagree. Seriously, if a plant impedes access to a road, it is already addressed. This is an unnecessary addendum.
Yes
disagree with this rule
Agree
Agreed.
I agree with this rule.
Agree.
Agree
yes
Agree
Keep... except pruned, not removed, unless diseased or dead.
the same board that I mentioned in Question 4, should also monitor the plants in the cemetery. If 2 of the board members feels a tree or shrub needs to be pruned or removed, the owner should be notified and given a reasonable length of time to do so. If the owner does not do so in the specified time, the Superintendent should prune or remove the plants as necessary.
The superintendent should request the owner to remove or relocate the impediment to access. Just use common sense when making this judgment.
Agree if there is a criteria that stipulates what size plants you are targeting with this rule.
agree
parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish]

It should be by a board, not a person, and the family should be given the opportunity to correct before employees making changes.
Agree.
Agree.
As long as the plot owners are consulted before it's pruned or removed.
Disagree to removal. Agree to trimmed if impeding walks or roads.
I agree
I agree with the condition that the owner of the space is contacted and a solution or alternative is discussed and agreed upon. A tree covering a street or entrance way is different from a flower that the Superintendent happens to dislike.
agree
Delete detrimental and unsightly unless you are prepared to define them. You cannot legislate beauty.
Yes
I think the family who planted the offending plant should be contacted once and advised that the plants are detrimental or impeding access, and be allowed to come prune them.
I agree but have concerns about how unsightly will be determined.
Trees should be maintained (if planted by the grave owners). If not, they should be maintained by the cemetery employees, and billed to the owners (only after written notice give to the owners).
Disagree with removed.
Agree on the part about impeding walkways and roads.
Disagree. First consult with the owner of the grave and let them hire a competent arborist to prune.
I agree, but I think the family should be notified first, and if they want to come in and prune, they should be allowed.
Agree
neutral
I agree with this rule.
agree
Disagree. I agree "any trees [sic] or shrubs situated on any space shall impede [sic - impede] access to adjacent spaces, walks, or roads," it may be pruned or removed, But the definition of detrimental is not defined and unsightly is an esthetic. We need to be careful about writing rules around such easy terms to make a broad definition of.
I agree because any area outside of the lot is demed public and the City is responsible

I agree. As a gardener, I know how things can grow into something you don't expect.
Disagree. The Superintendent powers are too broad. Proper maintenance should be performed according to State Law.
I would recommend contacting the space owner first and allow them to comply.
I agree. The cemetery needs to look good.
Agree.
I would keep this rule in the interest of appearance and public safety.
Agree.
Again, "unsightly" is a terribly vague and subjective term. If you want to regulate plants that impede access, that's fine. otherwise, the rule needs to be rewritten. One man's "unsightly" is another man's "beautiful native plant".
We agree.
Agree
Yes, but I think families need to be notified first so they have time to prune themselves, if they want to. I don't trust city employees to not completely butcher the job, sorry.
Agree
Agree.
A group decision should be possible.
agree
agree
I agree.
Space or section owner must be notified and allowed to self-correct first.
Agree: Safety should be the top priority. Branches become damaged or weak and can be a hazard and cause death if they break and crush someone. Trees need to be checked often for hazards.
again the question of unsightly
disagree
work with tree experts
trees should not be removed because having shade is essential...in addition to the tranquil atmosphere they provide... and it takes sooo many years for them to grow...ok for shrubs to be removed
agreed
No opinion.

disagree;
keep rules simple...Such as:
Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries
Longview Code of Ordinances
Section 22-14, Exhibit "A"

Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery

in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

DISAGREE!

Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle

Agree.

I agree.

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Agree

Some of the trees he's seen have taken over the headstones and you have to do something with the tree or the marker that is supposed to be there. A tree, if it does damage to the headstone, needs to be adjusted and possibly moved to a space with no graves. It should not be a place for families to plant trees, trees have to be maintained. If they are just put in haphazardly, it can encroach on someone's gravesite. They do not want tree limbs on their gravesite.

Again, I would strike "unsightly" as being too vague.

Agree

Rule

Personnel employed by the cemeteries are not permitted to solicit or accept money or other compensation from any person or persons for maintenance performed within the Cemetery.

Comment

Rule

All inquiries or complaints shall be submitted to the main Cemetery office.

Comment

Rule

The grounds are sacredly devoted to the burial of the dead and the provisions and penalties of the law, as provided by statute, will be strictly enforced in all cases of wanton inquiry, disturbance, and disregard of the rules.

Comment

Rule

There shall be a strict observance of all the properties due the Cemetery, whether embraced in the foregoing regulations or not, as no impropriety will be tolerated.

Comment

If any space is not in compliance with these regulations, PARD shall give the space owner or holder written notice specifically setting out the nature of the violation and how the violation may be brought into compliance. Notice shall be sent to the space owner's or holder's last known address by certified mail, return receipt requested. The space owner or holder shall have 30 days from receipt of such notice to remove or correct the said violation. If the space owner or holder fails to remove or correct the violation, PARD employees are authorized to do so in a manner that, within the reasonable discretion of the Superintendent, is the least invasive and disruptive to the space. PARD has the right to remove or correct any violation without notice if the violation presents an immediate and serious danger to the safety and welfare of PARD employees or the public, as well as to remove any broken or deteriorated items and dead plants or flowers.

Rule

Care shall be furnished for all cemeteries owned and operated by the City of Austin. Care shall mean the maintenance of buildings and grounds required to preserve the pleasing appearance of the Cemetery.

Comment

Rule

Special care by cemetery employees of any grave or space located within the cemetery is prohibited. The term "care" shall in no case mean the maintenance, repair, or replacement of any memorial or curbing placed or erected upon any grave or space; nor the placement of flowers or ornamental plants or shrubs or trees; nor the performing of any special or unusual work for any individual owners.

Comment

Strangely worded and makes no sense. Is the definition of "care" intended to define "special care"? Does "in no case mean(s)" suggest that the staff CAN provide such care? I understand a rule limiting what the staff is expected to maintain or do. This rule does not clearly do so.

I agree.

Leave rule as is
No change
Not worded well – there is a double negative. What does care mean? Needs to be completely reworded.
This is supposed to mean that the cemetery workers will not do work on an individual gravesite. Trying to say, once we see the gravesite and put up the headstone, the City is not responsible do do anything on that gravesite. Once the person is buried, the City is not going to do any maintenance, repair, or curbing, etc. Not going to put in flowers, shrubs, or anything with a grave once someone is buried there. He believes that is the intent. Just say “Cemetery employees are not going to perform any....on and gravesite or space.” Maybe add “unless directed by the cemetery superintendent...”
I agree with the rule in that it states the cemetery employees should not give special care to any one space. However, I recently received permission by the Superintendent of Austin Memorial Park to have some old shrubs removed from our plots. Cemetery staff removed them. I thought this was reasonable and very much appreciated.
Agree. City employees work for all taxpaying citizens, not for individuals.
Agree.
I agree, if you have something extra decorations that requires work, then the family has to attend to it. If heirs don't fix, then it becomes a problem requiring extra work on the workers part. Perhaps a solution would be to have a common area tree, bush or shrub not specific to one grave but for a general section.
Agree, but do you allow private maintenance? How does that work?
I think if people want to hire someone to care for their loved ones gravesite they can do so - especially if they cannot do so themselves . They will feel consoled that the gravesite is being cared for. Do NOT ban this - it just makes sense if a family can afford it.
Agree
agree. all graves should be special.
I agree. I costs more to maintain graves that impact normal maintenance. If you want to have a special grave, you should have to pay for special maintenance
Agreed.
Agree except that tilted / sinking headstones should be leveled by cemetery personnel.
The entire cemetery shall be maintained.

agreed.
agree
OK
I have no issue with this rule.
I disagree. If I slip the guy \$20 here and there, I expect to see my dead given just a little extra attention.
Yes, for Memorial Park. But the term 'care' with regards to the four other city cemeteries should be amended. There are responsibilities due them that are not the same as Memorial Park.
Disagree. Some places need special attention.
The plot where my Father is buried has an old trellis which needs something growing on it or it looks stark and out of place. I think if there is a long-standing trellis, family should be allowed to maintain it at their own expense.
Agree. They are cemetery employees not private contractors.
yes/ if the owner wants special planting, flowers, etc, they should maintain.
Agree - we can not have staff accepting \$\$ from families for services while on the clock for the city. this does not address others who may be hired to come in on a daily basis and waver for others. there are people who provide services that can be found on the internet.
Agree
Agree. All plots are to be maintained with the same high level of care and must adhere to uniform standards as stipulated by the superintendent to maintain best practices.
Agree.
Agree
Agree
Agree, care should be the families responsibility.
Agree
I do not expect any special care by any cemetery employees. I would like to see the grass maintained and trimmed; however, many times when I am there, I see them driving up and down the streets in their "golf like carts" or not performing any of the maintenance that is needed and required.
The owners should do their own work.
agree
This seems reasonable.

Agree.
I agree.
I think cemetery employees should be allowed to suggest and assist if it is going to be a problem for the cemetery if the individual is allowed to proceed on their own. Good will and kindness is always a good policy.
In favor of as written
Not OK. All should be treated equally. However, there are special circumstances, like when the plot owner plants a tree in his/her plot and is away and needs help watering it. Also, when a plot owner notices that his/her plot or section is very dry and the grass or trees are dying, or the recently installed grass needs more water, etc. Also, when a tree has a dead branch that is a safety issue but pruning will not be done for that section for a while. What should be clear is that cemetery employees or the cemetery burial contractor (XXX) will not ask or accept any money for providing special care.
Surely there is something in place for the care of the "older" memorials in our cemeteries. Sometimes they need to be repaired - after family is gone. In Hillsboro, there is a cemetery association that cares for and repairs headstones.
In the case of sites where family members are gone, I think the city should straighten fallen or leaning headstones. It's really sad to go in and see the ones that have fallen or leaning. Out of respect we should find a way to correct these issues.
agree
agree
I'm sure the rules are intended to make the cemetery more orderly and more easily cared for.
agree
Agree
Not a problem, do not need this rule, if the city gives special care to some graves sites it is OK
I still don't know what "special care" encompasses.
I agree.
Agree
I agree.
Owners should be able to pay extra for this.

Agree
I agree, we all are equal after death.
Agree
I agree that all grave should get the same care.
I agree.
Agree
agree
I don't know. If it is their family they can do what they like as we do..shouldn't matter they work there. If it is for a dear friend with family there...I don't see why not...that person is there all the time. If it is to impress a well known member of our society...absolutely not!
Agree
Agree. Nobody should have special care. Treat everyone the same.
We appreciated the cemetery planting our trees so we knew they were in the correct location.
?
Simplify. Cemetery employees are limited to performing the care and maintenance functions provided in their job descriptions and may not provide additional services for any owner with respect to any cemetery lot or space.
Agree.
Agree
Agree.
I agree.
This is the most egregious rule of all. This needs to be removed from the rules. This is disrespectful to the deceased and the families and to Austin as a whole.
I have no idea why this rule should even be mentioned. I care for the graves of my family and friends and do not need someone else to do it above and beyond their normal job description.
Don't think this is being done. If the families agreed to pay the city for it then special care might be ok but otherwise, everyone should get the same treatment.
Don't know.
Disagree to the extent that the rule is written in an unclear manner. If there are certain actions that staff cannot take list those as opposed to the use of double negatives.
I don't think the cemetery employees should be required to maintenance a grave that has a garden or like upon it. They should be required to maintenance the area surrounding.
Agree
See answer to question #1.

Agree
I agree. Slippery slope.
Agree with the rule. The city cemetery should be a place where mourners and loved ones can contemplate in peace. The Superintendent must have the authority to maintain it appropriately.
Agree. Cemetery employees are just that.
agree
Agree.
I do not understand this. So an owner could request special work be done or unusual work....like what? Work could be consumed by special requests leaving no time for necessary maintenance. This rule seems too open ended.
This sounds reasonable. Owners should assume responsibility for any special care of items on their gravesites.
This is fine. Owners must be responsible for the care of their sites.
Agree
Disagree. I do not think that loved ones are asking for special care of the grave site.
I think it is reasonable not to ask maintenance workers to go above and beyond for one grave over another... unless it means mowing around a bench or something.
disagree with this rule
Agree
Agree
No problem with this rule. Maintenance of gravesites should be up to families. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.
Agree. Families who want to maintain special grave memorials should do so.
Agree
sure
Agree
Agree, within reasonability. People shouldn't erect curbs or other enclosures because they're hard to maintain and must be given special care. But items and plants placed directly over mulched plots should not cause issues.
Leave this rule as is.
The owner of the grave site should bear all the responsibility of its care and the cemetery staff should not be responsible for special care.
Agree.

agree
parada !
Encuesta en espanol ? [survey in spanish?]
This is the first one so far that DOES make sense! It would be completely unfair to expect or pay a city employee to tend a private plot would be a poor use of resources.
Disagree, remove the rule.
This is a rule that's regulating the conduct of your employees. Why do you need to impose a rule on us that really attempts to regulate your employees? Why can't you just instruct your employees on what it is they can and cannot do and then, when they are asked to do something they can't do, it's their job to say so?
Agree. If a plot owner decides to plant something, it should be their responsibility to maintain it.
Agree
Agree.
If the families want to create grave markers with items that require special care then the family should maintain it - not the cemetery employees so yes, I agree
Well, first of all, the wording is contradictory. Care by an employee is prohibited. But care does NOT mean "maintenance, repair, placing flowers, etc."? So since this is not care, they are allowed to do all these things? And what exactly would you consider "care", since you only defined what it is not?
disagree - If it is on the personal time of the employee, I see no problem.
Yes, however, our family has arranged with the city and the contractors before to do our own mowing and edging weekly. It is something we like to do and helps us give back and maintain a personal feeling.
Agree.
I agree.
Remove the rule.
Agree
Agree
What exactly do these employees do? If they only cut grass, then let's keep their business to cutting grass.

I agree, as long as the family members are permitted to maintain the plantings on the graves. If the plantings aren't being maintained, I think the families should be notified. I think it should be clearly stated somewhere who is responsible for what. There should be a schedule of quarterly maintenance which is clearly stated. If the families want to plant flowers on the graves, they should be required to come and maintain them at least quarterly.

Cemetery employees supposed to maintain the cemetery itself. My family can take care of our plots just fine. We never expect or look for special care, in fact we'd rather be left alone.

disagree- Cemetery employees, on their own time, should be permitted to contract with individual owners for special care. I do not know the hourly rate paid workers however I am confident it is not that great.

I agree with this rule.

don't understand it. The second sentence is not at all clear.

Disagree, because the rule doesn't parse :-). As long as 'care' is defined as active action I agree with you, but if 'special care' is interpreted as including passive action such as avoiding or not touching or handling those monuments, gardens, statues, etc. placed by the grave holder, then this rule can be a force to uniformity.

I agree because it is the responsibility of the lot owner to care for their lot

I don't understand why an employee would be giving special care to any one grave, but I agree that they should not, unless they perform the same task for all of them.

Disagree. Too confusing to understand.

I agree. The cemetery employees take care of the entire cemetery and are directed by the management of the cemetery.

The double negative makes this question confusing. I'm not sure why we need to have a rule prohibiting any special care by employees, but it has always been my understanding that city budgets for the cemetery are limited.

I agree with the spirit of this rule, but the wording of the 2nd sentence is confusing. The term "care" in the 1st sentence does indeed mean "the maintenance, repair or replacement..." This needs a rewrite.

Agree.

Disagree.

We agree except if cemetery workers disturb a grave site they need to fix it.

If this means the maintenance of memorial headstones the city set, I totally disagree. We requested that the memorial company set the stone and were told no. It is no longer level..

What is wrong with special care if done after hours and people are willing to pay?

Agree.
Special care should be allowed.
I don't understand what this means.
It's hard to understand because of all the negatives. I would revise it to: An employee may not make any special arrangements with an individual owner to maintain, repair, replace...
Agree.
Agree: All maintenance should be approved by the cemetery officials. If something needs to be done the families should notify the employees and it should be taken care of after receiving approval. The individual owners should go through the proper method for approval of items needing to be done.
disagree use reasonable sense to care
agree
agreed
Agree.
disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries Longview Code of Ordinances Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas
DISAGREE!
Use the K.I.S.S. rule/principle
Agree.
I agree.
no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]
Agree

That should be something that the workers should be told when they begin working there. Some people do stuff for money and don't report it. That is something that the workers can be told. Nothing other than normal maintenance. There should be something that the attendants should be able to get ahead of. If no one is doing it, someone needs to do it.

I agree with this rule. Owners should be required to maintain any special plants and features they install themselves.

Agree, but Gilbert told her they would help take care of a bush she had in a pot in her area

Rule

The City of Austin reserves the right to correct errors made by staff that is associated with interments or conveyance of property. In the event such error shall involve interment, the City reserves the right to remove and re-inter the remains to such other property of equal value and similar location as may be substituted and conveyed in lieu thereof. Should an error develop in the conveyance of property, the City may correct such error by conveying property of equal value in a similar location insofar as possible.

Comment

Rule

The right to revise and/or add to Cemeteries (a section of sections) from time to time, including the right to modify or change the location of or any part thereof or remove or regrade roads, drives and walks is expressly reserved. The right to lay, maintain and operate, or alter or change pipe lines or gutters for water sprinkling systems and drainage, is also expressly reserved, as is the right to use cemetery property, not sold to individual owners, for cemetery purposes, including the interring and preparation for interment, or for anything necessary, incidental or convenient thereto. The cemetery reserves to itself and to those lawfully entitled thereto, a perpetual right of ingress and egress over spaces for the purpose of passage to and from other spaces.

Comment

Rule

No easement is granted to any owner in any road, drive or walk within the cemeteries, but such road, drive or walk may be used as a means of access to the cemeteries and its buildings as long as the City of Austin devotes such road, drive or walk to that purpose.

Comment

Rule

The City of Austin disclaims responsibility to owners, their personal representatives or successors in interest for the loss or damage to cemetery spaces or memorials by any cause, natural or otherwise, direct or indirect, beyond reasonable control of the City of Austin.

Comment

Rule

The statement of any employee of the cemeteries shall not be binding upon the City of Austin except as such statement agrees with the document conveying the right of interment and these rules and regulations.

Comment

Rule

The City of Austin reserves the right at any time and from time to time to change, amend, alter, repeal, rescind, or add to these rules and regulations or any part thereof to adopt any new rule or regulation or any temporary exception with respect to said cemetery or anything pertaining thereto.

Comment

Rule

In all matters not specifically covered by these rules and regulations, the City of Austin reserves the right to do anything which in its judgment is deemed reasonable pertaining to the cemeteries and such determination shall be binding upon the space owner and all parties concerned.

Comment

Rule

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Comment

I would very much like to see in the Rules and Regulations a section that states emphatically that there shall not be any encroachment on cemetery property by any entity wanting to open the cemetery up to all sorts of problems by putting in any type of walking, jogging, biking trails. There have been attempts to do this and every once in a while there is an attempt to do an "end run" and accomplish such a feat. There is state law backing the prohibition of such endeavors yet they still keep trying. Once and for all, there needs to be a statement and notification that this type of desecration of the cemetery will not be tolerated. They need to cease and desist.

I think the name of the cemetery needs to be changed as Austin Memorial PARK Cemetery is a misnomer. A park by definition is a large public green area in a town used for recreation. The cemetery is not a recreational area but a sacred and designated area to bury the dead. Do you have a suggestion about how to go about changing the name to AUSTIN MEMORIAL CEMETERY?

These regulations shall be posted on the Internet through the PARD web site on a publically-accessible web page. Notice of these regulations shall be clearly and prominently posted at each cemetery, including the URL of the web page at which the regulations may be accessed by the public. Written copies shall be readily available at each cemetery or from PARD upon the request of a space owner or holder. A written copy of these regulations must be provided to each space owner or holder at the time of the purchase of any space. At the request of any memorial dealer, PARD shall provide a reasonable number of written copies of these regulations for distribution to persons purchasing memorials for installation within a City of Austin cemetery.

Any items or plantings not in compliance with these regulations prior to the effective date of these regulations are grandfathered and not subject to removal. Provided however, PARD may remove any item or planting that is outside of the allotted space, presents an immediate and serious danger to the safety and welfare of PARD employees or the public, or is broken, deteriorated, or dead. PARD and its employees may notify and encourage such space owners or holders to bring items or plantings into compliance, and may work with that owner or holder to bring the item or planting closer to or within compliance with these regulations.

This might be cumbersome, but in the event that the Superintendent chooses to exercise the current R&Rs and intends to remove an item that seems to have been permanent for some time (tree, shrub, "dilapidated or unsightly" monument, etc.) I would suggest that the family be given sufficient notice so as to be respectful.

I believe that the current staff has been very respectful towards families and I would like to see this continue.

might want to consider policies on the placement of unopened soda cans, beer, liquor bottles, santa hats on angels (in Feb), balloons & tinsel decorations related to holidays. Also, have seen simple wood crosses, among monuments oft granite. The memorials were actually tastefully done, but I can also see problems if there wasn't a time limit on when they should be removed. Also seen Garden fencing and rock borders, shells on top of grave, wildflowers covering the whole cemetery, etc.

since it is the custom in many religions to leave something on the grave marker when you visit, please publish a list of allowable items. i.e., pebbles, stones, flowers, etc when can be removed after a month by staff.

The city should actively establish a maintenance plan to keep current shade trees healthy.

Headstones that have become tilted, etc. should be straitened.

I think the city should maintain the trees it has. all of the trees near my sons grave are covered with the horrible moss balls that kill the trees. they fall all over the graves. please take care of this.

I feel that the city should be responsible for keeping headstones leveled. We just paid \$369.00 to have our headstone installed. For that price, I don't think it would hurt for them to maintain the position, not the condition, of every headstone in order to enhance the visual appearance of the cemetery.

Allow dogs in cars and to visit a specific grave provided they are leashed and waste is picked up

Cameras need to be installed for security. While visiting my husband's grave @ 2:30 on July 8th, the driver's window was smashed and my purse was taken. I was not more than 50 feet from my truck. I have not felt safe visiting his grave, alone, since then.

Possibly implement a board or committee that would approve or disapprove with consent.

Somebody needs to do something with soil stabilization...a shared expense.

Question he has: wondering if they can place a bench. Suggest space for a bench to be allowed if you own at least 3 adjacent plots or more.

I think that couples should have the option to both be buried in the same grave site. Saves land. Ft Sam Houston in San Antonio does that.

I would like to see the hours of operation expanded from the current times; I propose that the city cemeteries are open from 7 am until sunset

The city will mow and trim the grass every two weeks all year along. (mowing leaves in the winter). The city will fix all headstones that are on the ground.

The cemeteries wil close 15 minutes after sundown and open at 6:00 am each day.

I don't know if this is a rule, but after a funeral there should no less than 2 people from the cemetery to finish placing the dirt on the grave. I know that some religious leaders do not leave until that is completed and it can take a long time with only one person to take down the tent, put away chairs, finished placing dirt. etc.

I propose we expand the use of this space by allowing leashed dogs on the premises.

a system of fines should be instituted to ensure compliance with the rules with the fines escalating for repeat offenders.

I suggest a new rule:

The wishes of the plot owners will be followed respectfully whenever possible. Cultural heritage (placing stones on graves, for instance) must be honored.

That needs to be the primary rule under which every other rule operates. Unfortunately for these people, homogeneity from birth to grave may rule out, and then everyone loses out. Keep it Austin.

Any action on removal of art, memorials or planting should be made with first contacting the owning grave holder and getting their permission. Only once sufficient attempt to contact fails and sufficient time passes (120 days?), should items or planting be removed without permission.

I did not see the following addressed directly: There is a long-standing custom for a Jewish mourner to place a small stone on the headstone of grave he/she has visited. At one local cemetery (and perhaps others), a small birdbath containing stones for this purpose has been placed among the Jewish graves. Mourners seem to take care not to scatter these stones where they would become a hazard to visitors or caretakers, and this practice should be permitted to continue.

Jews traditionally place stones on graves. We'd need to have a container holding stones and the ability to place them on graves when visiting.

We also wash our hands and need to have a fountain to do so.

I agree that the personalizing of graves inhibits efficient maintenance, but it is essential to the purposes of a grave or cemetery to allow for individualized expressions and memorials. The city needs to budget accordingly and the staff needs to embrace the concept or find more routine work. Do the best you can to leave people's stuff alone and allow the cemeteries to be real places for people not just stones. Items placed with love should be left until they are truly deteriorated.

I would like to state that I understand that there need to be rules in order to maintain the beauty of the cemetery plus to make it more easily accessible for the crew's mowers and equipment. With that said, I think that it needs to be taken into consideration that plots are bought and are owned by the purchaser and thus they have rights too.

Last week when I was there, 2 graves were added in open spaces and see that much improvement has been done with the new installations. Seems that more care was taken in the digging and covering recently. In the past the trucks have been driven over the graves leaving ruts.

I do not agree with putting in recreational activities.

I tried to preserve the long-established tradition of individualizing grave sites, as well as balance the right of certain religious groups to practice their traditions and the need for families to mourn and memorialize their loved ones with PARD's need to maintain the cemeteries. To that end, I have proposed limits on the type, size, weight, number, and materials of items to be placed within a space or on a grave. Certain items, such as items with political statements or offensive language, non-weather resistant items, and bird baths and bird feeders, are barred. The regulations make it clear that the space holder is responsible for maintaining any items or plantings within the space. However, the regulations also provide a simple process that would allow PARD to remove noncompliant items. I also clarify that PARD has the right to remove any dangerous or neglected materials without notification. Although the regulations grandfather in existing grave site memorials within their allotted space, the regulations also encourage PARD to work with space holders to bring such sites within compliance. I have proposed specific regulations regarding plantings, limiting the type and sizes of plants that may be used within a space. There are also several alternate proposals regarding benches. Finally, there are provisions requiring the publication and distribution of the regulations to avoid future conflicts.

My group is Austin RAMP (Tx non-profit corporation) – Rescue Austin Memorial Park – formed in 1991 when a church was going to take 5 acres. My group did the research and placed the plaque; we did that, not the City. I have been engaged in this for 25 years. I have been dealing with rules since 1991. Contractor did not pick up anything until 2007. Austin Memorial became a junkyard. In 2008, we convinced city to have the contractor start picking up junk twice a year. Had everything working fine when picked up just junkie stuff twice a year. 2008 semi-annual removal of dilapidated items worked fine. Put out signs to notify people. Twice a year removal of dilapidated items works. There should be no stuffed animals, etc. It is wrong that the City has not cleaned up dilapidated items since last fall. City already has the right to do so. Nothing that can deteriorate should be left (stuffed animals, ball caps). Should be able to place non-dilapidated items anywhere on your plot. Last year the cemetery manager announced that he would enforce rules – sweep everything off the cemetery. Wrong to sweep cemetery clear of everything.

City doesn't realize that the plot owners should have more weight than just regular members of the public. The stakeholders are the plot owners. Influence should be weighted toward plot owners (as compared to other stakeholders).

City should establish a subcommittee of the Parks Board or its own Board for Cemeteries to get public input. Need to establish a citizen's board for cemeteries (primarily plot owners). City has people they could be talking to on policy changes but they don't do it.

Scrap the rules and start from scratch. These rules were originated a long time ago. The cemetery manager added to them without public comment. Should not have put up that fence around the construction site without public comment. The cemetery manager decided what the cemetery boundaries are (doesn't include all the land) – this is against State Law. Too much turnover at City. Every time someone new came in we would have to start over (in regard to rules, maintenance, upkeep, encroachment).

He may have some negative comments, but he thinks that one of the issues is that the cemetery manager is charged with the responsibility to react and implement. He does not consider the cemetery manager as management – he is who is doing the work. It seems that any recommendations for change should go to the cemetery manager's boss, because the cemetery manager may not like them. It's going to make his job harder. He asked, who is going to be looking over the cemetery manager's shoulder to make sure things are getting done. Who makes sure the best interest is being served. Always want to make sure that one level of management. He doesn't agree with most of the feedback he's heard in the media so far.

Some of this is the rules that people are unhappy with. Another whole issue that bugs people are when you go to the Cemeteries and a lot of the headstones are tilted and cockeyed. It doesn't look like a respectful, well maintained cemetery – it doesn't look like a nice cemetery. Who is responsible for them? Who makes those corrections? The cemetery manager's answer is that they are not responsible but he can't say who is responsible. Half of these deceased people have been dead for a long time.

Another issue is – what are the City's responsibilities. Are they responsible for weed control? Make the appearance of the cemetery look a little bit better. Last year and the year before, he put down weed and seed himself – he shouldn't have to do that. Define what the city is supposed to do. Would make him a lot happier to follow rules if he knew what the city is going to do. Would help the relationship with the citizenry.

Once sod is down, who is responsible for maintaining it? XXX is the one that keeps going out there to keep it looking decent. The sinkholes – casket gets buried, dirt goes on top and fill in the holes, wait a few months to let dirt settle. At least a few times a year a sink hole is created. A few times he could put his arm in past his elbow. Maintenance people go by there and don't do anything; they should at least report it. They are creating a situation that could get worse – leaving things exposed like that. Once it's pointed out to the cemetery manager, it's usually fixed within 24 hours but they should be required to fix them before people have to complain. Define perpetual care vs. special care.

They put down the sod, don't water it, then it dies. For several months, it's just dirt. He sees footprints and tire tracks that go right through the grave. At least have some respect for the families of the loved ones that come out to the cemeteries. They don't want to see a tire track over a loved one's face. Cemetery staff needs training, or refresher training, to be more sensitive that they are working in a gravesite/cemetery to maintain the serene setting. Once grass is in, it's different – not as obvious.

I would like to suggest that most of the rules are the wrong rules - you have to realize that these are places for grief, solace, faith, hope and not just a tract of land. The Rules are also badly written by any grade school standard, including long lists of contradictory items.

Just enforce the current rules. Enough is enough.

The cemetery is used for dog walking and bike riding. I find this much more distracting and disrespectful than the violations addressed in this survey.

ALL CEMETERIES SHOULD BE CARE FOR EQUALLY. THIS INCLUDES WATERING.

Rules to reflect the needs and issues at all five city cemeteries and not just Memorial Park. Commitment of City to actively and equally address the individually five cemeteries.

ownership history is the key to most of your issues. the owners receive the rules but friends and relatives are clueless and decorate at will. this needs a good quality video to explain why.

This cemetery has been a favorite because of the beautiful trees, the ambiance and ability to place things there. It should not change.

My input is simple. Leave these cemeteries be. If you know Austin, you know one of the favorite sayings is "Keep Austin Weird". I loved the cemetery I selected...Austin Memorial. I love the beauty, the originality and I was willing to pay good money to be buried there. If you remove all of the "wierd", you are destroying something wild and wonderful. If you want a military-style cemetery, go to Ft. Hood, Ft. Rosecrans, anyplace you want....but leave our cemetery alone!

The friends and families who have loved ones buried in this cemetery have already suffered an enormous loss. It is additionally painful and unfair that they be subjected to management rules which do not allow for plantings at the grave sites or to incidents where their plot has been nearly destroyed by the lawnmowing. Please treat these cemeteries and the families with the respect they deserve. Also, please do something about the wind chimes. Had I realized this cemetery allows wind chimes EVERYWHERE, I would have definitely chosen another location. It is extremely disturbing.

I sincerely appreciate the work the City of Austin has done to improve the cemetery. It is part of our history and it reflects how much you care. It is a partnership with City and owners. The cemetery staff has an opportunity to be ambassadors for the city of Austin and should be building relationships. This is an opportunity for the community to feel goodwill.

City should have some nice metal benches placed throughout the cemetery; i.e. park benches and trash containers. No proper place for trash right now.

Sees some of the points that are being made. Does not want some type of military type feel to the cemetery. Don't willy nilly remove items. Did notice that some items are excessive. Love the idea of wind chimes in trees. Benches ok. Remove dilapidated items, i.e. crappy plastic bench cushions. Understand need for cleaning up some items. Encourage us not to destroy the ambiance. Make sure dilapidated items are removed. Own judgment can be used, not a committee.

Many of these rules should be changed because they are excessively strict and some violate federal requirements for ADA accommodations and are against the City's commitment to provide access to all. This is ironic since cemeteries are places with a high number of disabled and elderly visiting the graves. These are the places where accommodations should be provided instead of making it much more difficult for the elderly and disabled with these rules, all for the convenience of not having to deal with these issues. Many of these rules lean towards reducing the need to manage the cemetery, but a cemetery is a place of activity and day to day operations need to be managed.

All Cemetery employees and contractors shall treat the public with respect, without verbal or physical abuse, without making insulting gestures.

The Cemetery management shall apply these rules equally to all, without favoritism or prejudice.

The public shall not be prevented from entering or remaining in the public sections of the cemetery during posted hours, except for special circumstances posted a week in advance at the front office.

The public has the right to expect silence and respect while at the cemetery, specially during burials, from all, including cemetery employees and contractors. Bands, loudspeakers, and other type of amplified noise will not be allowed. Mechanical noise (vehicles and equipment) will be kept to a minimum.

No special event that lowers the dignity of the cemetery shall be held within cemetery boundaries, including Halloween, weddings, and fund raisers.

Exempt Section 6 from all rules at Austin Memorial Park

Please exempt section 6 of Memorial Park from these rules. It's beautiful and well kept. Consider having new sections that open up with the rules so people can buy those. Please leave our section as-is. It's cared for and if there are safety hazards/dilapidated stuff, remove those but please leave what's there as-is.

Please water the trees and grass - drought or no drought.

Parents that lost children are the one's that over and want to still give to their kid. This is the group that ud will hurt with these rules.

I am not happy with this very compressed process PARD staff sat on this issue for 6 months and now we are being pushed through process in less than one month. Only one meeting, June 5th, is for the initial presentation of the recommended rules, and the final rules are issued on June 18th. There is absolutely no opportunity for the public to review the proposals prior to the June 5th meeting and comment. At the very least, all stakeholders should received a copy of the proposed rules prior to the June 5th meeting, and there needs to be at least one or two other meetings prior to the final presentation for the public to review and comment on any changes. Right now, I feel like this process is being pushed through with as little input from the public as possible.

We drove around the cemetery to pick a good section. Loved Section 6. Please leave it as is. Open up new sections with rules for more rigidity. If you see a safety hazard (broken benches, broken glass, broken clay pots, graves tipping over), please address it. Otherwise, why mess with what is an oasis of comfort and love for families? Please when you enforce rules, do it in the spirit of the rules, not the letter of the rule! Why pull up flowers someone lovingly put in the ground? Who are they bothering? If you're saying you can put the same one in a pot, where's the logic of that? Cards, signs, toys, expressions of love - why remove them? Who are they hurting? If they are a safety hazard ok, but if someone's kid played basketball, let him have his sign. If someone played an instrument, why not display it? If you believe in angels, who is it hurting?

A truly interactive process with real discussing and registration should be as follows. 1.) Prior to June 5th meeting, all stakeholders receive a copy of the recommended Rules & Regulations (RRR) 2.) At the June 5th meeting, a full discussion of the RRR including suggestions regarding revisions 3.) 2nd Meeting (June 10?), do review and discuss revised RRR and take further input. 4.) June 18th Final RRR

RE: Chimes There is an area where families have chosen to add to the chimes "Music of the Spheres" - there about 7 of these black chimes that are high and hanging from the trees - all different lengths producing different tones. All are musically tuned by professional musicians. This area of the cemetery is very special and peaceful. Please let these chimes be.

Many family members of the previous two generations of my family are buried at Austin Memorial Park. The first burial I was aware of as a child was Roland Roebuck, who died at an early age. My aunt Antoinette, his young widow kept a bed of pansies planted over his grave for many years. She would ask some of us children to accompany her as she attended this bed of pansies, so she would not be alone. It was a labor of love to remember him in this way. She is now buried adjacent to his plot, having lived a long life.

Items placed by families should be left in place as long as they are not dilapidated, rotting, of that nature. The cemetery staff should remove items that are decaying. If they pose a safety concern, remove them. If they aren't harming anything and are just inconvenient for maintenance, they should be left alone.

Because there is a pre-existing pattern established by the fact that many of these things have been allowed over time and because of this, the cemeteries should grandfather in ornamentations already in place providing there is no safety or health concern.

There should be some mechanism in place for the public to revisit these issues from time to time and potentially revise based on responses at that time. The bottom line is this is a graveyard and things change over time.

<p>I suggest that the City actually enforce any and all such rules.</p>
<p>Our historic cemeteries should be preserved and cared for, including watering during times of drought to preserve the trees. Although they are no longer a source of income for the city, they preserve our city's history, and if properly cared for and maintained as has been done in other cities, could be a beautiful place for all to enjoy for walks and learning about history.</p>
<p>I have 2 plots in Block 1 under an oak tree. I want to be assured that my future burial in these plots will not be refused as it is very possible the tree roots will be cut to bury me.</p>
<p>I don't live in Austin but I do have family buried in the cemeteries there. I like the Idea of upgrading and fixing the problems in the cemeteries that have came up over the years. I don't mind the things people leave to remember family like a bench to sit on while they are there or a chime left in a nearby tree if they are small and do not look unsightly.</p>
<p>seems like a lot of these rules eliminate human interest issues</p>
<p>How about mending the rusted fence surrounding the cemetery??</p>
<p>I'm afraid it is May and a very busy time for parents and have barely enough time to finish this...it has taken three days. I'm sure I will think of something later unfortunately.</p>
<p>Please think about what you're trying to achieve. If it's a safety concern, add a new rule. Otherwise, let things be. The cemetery at Memorial Park is beautiful. Do NOT destroy its uniqueness and beauty.</p>
<p>I think every thing is covered</p>
<p>Exempt existing sections from these rules. People don't like having different restrictions based on when they bought the plot. If someone wants a restrictive set of rules for the burial of their loved ones, they can buy at other cemeteries or buy in a more restrictive new section of the cemetery. I would suggest also doing exemptions by section. If a section has no problems, don't fix it. Please exempt section 6.</p>
<p>Memorial Park is a cemetery with a lot of dignity and respect while preserving each person's way of grieving. Please do not change how things are or at least for the people that already paid for the graves of their loved ones. People made a choice to go there based on how it is at present. If you want to change the rules, you can do it for the new sections people have not bought graves on.</p>
<p>Cemeteries look mostly good right now. Just fix the gravesites whose stones have moved. Those need maintenance and it's not being done. Otherwise, estetically pleasing and reflective of the city of Austin.</p>
<p>I love this cemetery, because is so different and so individual from other cemeteries. Please do not force all the rules that you have, leave people alone to do their individual mourning.</p>

Create or allow the creation of a foundation to enhance the respectfulness of these special places. Obviously, the City of Austin only cares about the income it derives from the sale of plots and not the long term condition of the cemeteries. With family members dating back to the 1870's buried in both public and private cemeteries, special days have provided an opportunity to re-unite with other family members to remember those who have gone on and pay respect to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice among those whose remains are placed on sacred ground. These rules need to be about the lost, the families and Austin heritage. I don't see that here.

I have two points. The first one is that we selected this cemetery for various reasons. At this time you are proposing that things will change making this cemetery a cookie cutter place. I do not believe that the people affected by these rule changes are being cared for. Stop messing with something that has worked and brought great love and joy to countless people.

The second point is that this should never be considered retroactive. If you proceed with what you intend, and you do historically ignore those affected by taking your own course of action, then under no circumstances should this be retroactive.

Gravesites whose stones are no longer sitting right in the ground should be fixed by the owners/funeral homes/city?

Don't know.

The city of Austin should not be enforcing draconian rules which have never been advertised or enforced. The graves should be left to the care of the "stakeholders" and the city employees should be responsible for for roadways and areas between graves.

Though cemeteries bring a sense of peacefulness and reflection upon the user, not many people use them, except for the recently bereaved. And, while that certainly is their chief usage (use for the recently deceased and bereaved), the benefits of cemeteries could be expanded by creative ways to encourage non-impactful uses of the space. The least impactful use of the space is walking. But, beyond visiting the deceased, again, there are not many users of this space. I propose we expand the use of this space by allowing leashed dogs on the premises. This gives a reason for people beyond the bereaved to visit cemeteries. This will encourage a greater appreciation for our ancestors our shared past. I am sure I am not the only citizen who would appreciate such a change. I look forward to the planning team's response.

Stone only headstones and benches should be allowed. My parents grave is next to one with a homemade wooden cross that has flaking paint and leans. I feel it lessens the memory of my parents.

The State Cemetery in Austin is an inspiration. It is beautiful. There are no tacky artifacts. Everyone who goes there is comforted. The State Cemetery has a bigger budget, but its philosophy is sound.

What a lot of rules! I agree that occasionally someone who is mega-messy may need to be reined in, but a completely orderly cemetery is a dead cemetery, not an alive one where people show their love for their loved ones. The focus should be on LENIENT (and hopefully, tactul and kind) enforcement to make it a nice cemetery like for instance Assumption Cemetery. People should be encouraged to tend any graves they care too, not get the idea that it would be better to abandon them.

I wonder if this is the "Anglo cemetery preservation" movement. I am an Anglo myself but I really like the warmth created when others pay more attention to their graves than I usually do and I think it makes me happier about my parents' resting place.

Even though the rules were not enforced for several years, they did, in fact, exist. They are not new rules. I agree that the rules must be enforced, even though there will be push-back, and even anger.

I will use this as an opportunity to thank the city for reclaiming the maintenance and operation of the cemeteries. At Austin Memorial, there was an immediate & observable improvement in conditions. I don't know if there will be any improvement in administration (like those in the office).

This entire policy seems more suited to an HOA or private cemetery than it does a public space with diverse and varied cultures and classes.

Many users of this site see no problem with the existing situation. PARD is creating a problem and issue.

OPEN RULE MAKING UP TO THE STAKEHOLDERS...

I am not understanding why this level of control over gravesites is necessary. Remember, families own these gravesites - not the City.

Work with those who have loved ones buried here. This is no time for arbitrary enforcement of ridiculous rules.

Remember this is Austin and we value individuality. There are limites, but the people buried in the cemetery lived and were loved here. They existed. Most people do not want antiseptic grass, sprayed, watered, and mowed. It's a waste of resources and not what Austin is about.

none.

none.

No rule shall be made that prohibits customs of differing cultures to be performed.
¿Dónde está mi encuesta en Español? [where is my survey in spanish?]
Fundamentally, these kinds of rules need to be on a cemetery by cemetery basis and at the discretion of a board of interested parties, NOT city employees.
None.
I am not sure who came up with these rules. The clear goal seems to be a depersonalization and "uglification" of our local cemeteries. I was hoping for a more balanced questionnaire or set of regulations. Is not the purpose of cemeteries to provide a welcoming space to remember a loved one? An individual, unique person who should be allowed to be remembered with all of their uniqueness? Not anonymous mass graves!
Please remember this is Austin, a very special and unique place. City government is making tremendous strides to accommodate wishes of all citizens all over town. Cemeteries are extremely personal and sometimes emotional places. All care should be given to compromise in individual cases. This is not a place to put down hard, unbendable rules. Some families like myself have been enjoyed and been comforted by our cemeteries as they are for decades....let's not swing the pendulum too far....Thanks
Plot owners must be included in these decisions and must be respected. Remember, your clients in many cases are people who are living out lives in grief and one way to manage that is by tending to the grave of their loved one.
In general I would give family members significant control over the gravesites, where no obstruction or dangerous, or obviously offensive modifications are made. If visitors to the cemetery or family members with persons in other plots find any modifications meeting the above criteria distasteful, they should be more accommodating.
I would be interested to know who is behind this initiative? If there is an outside source that the city of Austin is using (paying for with our taxes) to provide this enforcement policy.
These rules are too general and lack specific definitions leaving all the discretion in the hands of the city. There should be an open process so that stakeholders are allowed to give input.
I have no other rules, but these are my closing thoughts: I think a pleasing compromise can be reached, as long as both sides attempt to understand and be respectful of each others' feelings and requirements. I think too often, cemeteries are sterile, boring places which don't honor the memory of our loved ones or bring peace to their survivors. When families are allowed to bring tokens of memory to the graves and plant flowers, and the space draws in birds and butterflies, it can create a sacred space of healing and not just a repository for the forgotten.

Less rules please.
n/a
We need a truly public process and not asked questions on the internet. This process is completely inappropriate and behind closed doors.
Maybe the Master Naturalists and Master Gardening groups could help to make a suitable plant list of permi
I have no issue with rules not included.
I would like to see more done to trim the trees and to periodically (perhaps every five-to-ten years) have moss cleared so as to extend their longevity.
I like Portland's seasonal restriction on artificial flowers/plants. Seems like this would facilitate summertime mowing in Austin. I also like the look and the formatting of Portland's cemetery webpage. Their lists of do's and don'ts make rules clear, so noone can say "I didn't know..."
Not at this time.
To close, I cannot believe that we are wasting city time on this very unpopular and unnecessary rule when there are so many more pressing issues for our community to deal with.
Do these policies allow wind-chimes? I'm OK with those. Do they disallow electric lights? I'm NOT ok with those.
Limit number of items on any one grave to avoid clutter and unsightly appearance.
quite making 'rules' without getting the input from the stakeholders...
WORK WITH THE PEOPLE INVOLVED.
disagree; keep rules simple...Such as: Rules and Regulations Governing City Owned Cemeteries Longview Code of Ordinances Section 22-14, Exhibit "A" Rules and Regulations Governing Grace Hill, Greenwood & White Cemetery in the City of Longview, Gregg County, Texas

KISS principle...

https://www.princeton.edu/.../KISS_principle.html

Princeton University

KISS is an acronym for the design principle "Keep it simple, Stupid!". Other variations include "keep it short and simple" or "keep it simple and straightforward".

no, de acuerdo a lo complicado [no, according to the issue]

Some people dug into Plummer's Graveyard and disturbed the grave, that shouldn't have been done. They should have found out beforehand. They shouldn't have been digging up remains. No burying on top of other graves, that's not good. Think existing gravesites that are not marked, a marker should be put in place. If the graves are scattered, that whole section should be marked off by some means, a concrete border so that people know. Have a plaque with the people that are buried in that section "This section dates from....and holds the remains of...." That way no one will go in and dig by mistake.

Our marker is beginning to shift a bit. How do I go about having this corrected? I have not seen this problem addressed in any of the information presented.

The drought has caused the grass that was present to be completely gone, and weeds growing instead. With the present restrictions on watering, what is the best solution?

we chose section 6 in march of 2006 when we had a grandson, still born, full term. his ashes are buried there. he was joined 2 years later by the ashes of our beloved daughter-in-law XXX. this spring we buried the ashes of our dear

'mama XXX' in our garden plot. (XXX's mom). we have enough room in our 'garden' for our entire family.

we chose section 6 in austin memorial park because of its heartfelt eclectic nature. there is such love and personality & deep connection shown in this section 6 (and other areas but perhaps to a lesser degree). i hope that these few photographs will show what we so appreciate in this area. we often experience families visiting their loved ones, sitting on a bench & visiting & drawing other visitors to them because of the nature of the memorials. we love strolling through the area & 'reading' the gifts left on individual plots. enjoying so much what families leave to manifest their love. i can't imagine this being a sterile 'by the rules' area. horrible to even contemplate.

we look forward to continued dialog & a sensitive outcome that allows families individual expression.

Question

Keeping in mind that cemeteries are intended to be respectful and sacred places, can you please describe the environment and ambiance you want to experience at City of Austin cemeteries?

Comment

I want the cemeteries to be welcoming, dynamic places where surviving friends and families and other visitors feel free to express their emotions and create personalized memorials for their departed loved ones. I detest the dry stone deserts that the cemeteries have become now that the rules have been enforced. All the life has been sucked out of them.

One of peace, nature, beauty and serenity. It is important to me, with family members buried at Austin Memorial Park, that we adhere to the current Rules & Regs in order to keep these aesthetics.

Quiet, peaceful, serene, uncluttered (clean) surroundings - cluttered environment clutters the brain, which doesn't allow for quiet reflection.

I see cemeteries as an extension of a city's green space and as potential botanical gardens. They offer space for quiet walking paths and reflection.

I like it when the grave stones tell me something about the person who is under it. The flags, the statues, the football memorabilia add to the personality of a cemetery that may otherwise appear to be a forgotten place.

<p>a compromise between formal and from memorials that have gone too rogue. I've seen all sorts of cemeteries from fancy to country, and I believe I know what works and what doesn't work.</p>
<p>Safety: safe parking, well-lit, and wheelchair access. Mowed grass or longer native grasses - visual maintenance must match landscaping plan. Drought-tolerant plants are ok. Should have picnic tables, restrooms, and other amenities suitable to mourning and to burial services. Park-like.</p>
<p>clean, quiet, good roads for access, well maintained consistently by City. Plant more trees!!</p>
<p>Peaceful, serene and consistent.</p>
<p>clean, neat, well manicured without trash or acts of desecration</p>
<p>A respectful and contemplative space that reflects the historical nature and purpose of cemeteries.</p>
<p>A cemetery should be peaceful, serene, calming; a place that pays respect to those buried within its gates, as well as those coming to visit.</p>
<p>I do not mind grave ornamentation - it shows that someone still cares about the deceased. I do mind forgotten graves, those with dead grass and tilted headstones - this sadly suggests that there's no one left to care.</p>
<p>I love to visit historic cemeteries. Respectful and solemn places to sit, walk, contemplate.</p>
<p>Less clutter and more natural look to the cemetery. Nothing is more beautiful than clean, well maintained grass.</p>
<p>simple and quiet, safe place for my loved one along with my safety while visiting the grave site</p>
<p>They should look respectful and serene.</p>
<p>Not as simple grave marker with vase of fake flowers. Windchimes, benches, personal touches, large trees, well tended grounds.</p>
<p>I think the Austin Memorial Park already balances the long-established tradition of individualizing grave sites, the right of certain religious groups to practice their traditions, the need for families to mourn and memorialize their loved ones, and PARD's need to maintain the cemeteries. I visit the park every week, and have not seen any items left on the gravesites that are not in keeping with respect to those who have passed or the peace and beauty of the Park. If anything, the memorials lend a warm and individual touch to the Park and add to its special atmosphere of contemplation. The memorial gardens and plants add a touch of green to the Park, especially during the dry summer. The benches give visitors a place to rest and meditate. Plus, many of these memorials have been in place for years, and removing them would desecrate gravesites and add nothing to the Park. On the other hand, the rusted and sagging chain link fence, deteriorated roads, and neglected trees seriously detract from the appearance of the Park and are disrespectful for those who rest there.</p>
<p>Basically everything I've come to expect from Happy Hour at TGIFriday's would be great.</p>

Cemeteries intent can grow and be added too. Respectful can also be not neglected, protected from not only vandals and thefts, but physical care and upkeep. Sacred means also respect, does death mean that citizens are to be forgotten. Educational programs and events insure that the dead or recognized as honored citizens of Austin.

I expect the grounds to be well taken care of. The monuments straight and things looking orderly.

Respect and the ambiance of a sacred place...just as it should be.

Serenity and respect. Plot decorations should be tasteful and not extend outside of the plot. Austin maybe 'weird' but cemeteries should not.

peaceful but with people able to decoate their loved ones graves with personal items.

well maintained with maintenance cost considered when it comes to tree plantings and ornimantation

Peaceful and quiet places to reflect upon the dead and appreciate the living.

As noted, they are intended to be respectful and sacred places, and this is what I would hope would be provided at all.

Clean, organized, well-kept grounds.

We do not thank the rules should be changed. When we purchased our lots we expected this to be inforced. Its not fair to change the rules that were in effect for current owners.

I would like Hancock Memorial stay as it is, where we can express our grief. Maybe have quarterly clean up days, removing tattered decorations and dead plants.

Nice environment, quiet

Everyone grieves differently....Usually women visit grave sites and take pride on maintaining them. Of course we all want a place that is respectful, peaceful, safe and sacred!

I want it to be homey. A place to come, sit on a bench, decorate my son's Christmas tree, have his toys out. This is the way it has been for years and years. No change please.

peaceful and quiet.....

I recently purchased a plot at Austin Memorial Cemetary. I loved this park the minute I drove in. I purchased my plet based on what I saw. I love the lack of military precision on the grounds. I love the freedom people have used to "warm up" a beautiful setting. I bought my plot based on the good feelings I had when I entered the grounds. I don't regret my decision.

Peaceful environment; well-maintained cemetery.

Calm and dignified. My favorite cemeteries are the military cemeteries at Arlington, San Antonio, and Fort Leavenworth. The Texas State Cemetery is also very nice.

Trees, green grass and flowering shrubs provide a beautiful, peaceful, refreshing environment.

Water, Cut and trim the grass, correct headstones that on the ground.
Headstones erect and repaired.
Cemeteries are for honoring the deceased and for the living. CoA cemeteries should be places that welcome the living. The landscaping should be cared for and maintenance should be careful.
Oakwood particularly has many faded and broken grave stones. Often those buried here have no family left to maintain the sites. The city has an obligation to preserve the graves. The cemetery is a historical site as well as a burial site, and must be preserved as such.
Peaceful and serene. A beautiful, natural final resting place.
They are a place for the families to find solace and comfort and to display whatever expression of grief that might ease their pain.
This question presupposes an experience being had which, by asking the question, you anticipate the respondent having had (that is, having had experience at City of Austin cemeteries).
Though cemeteries bring a sense of peacefulness and reflection upon the user, not many people use them, except for the recently bereaved. And, while that certainly is their chief usage (use for the recently deceased and bereaved), the benefits of cemeteries could be expanded by creative ways to encourage non-impactful uses of the space.
The least impactful use of the space is walking. But, beyond visiting the deceased, again, there are not many users of this space.
I propose we expand the use of this space by allowing leashed dogs on the premises. This gives a reason for people beyond the bereaved to visit cemeteries. This will encourage a greater appreciation for our ancestors our shared past.
I am sure I am not the only citizen who would appreciate such a change. I look forward to the planning team's response.
Thank you,
XXX
A beautiful, peaceful place to for famiies to visit and remember their loved ones, and where community can use as well- for walking, learning about Austin's history, perhaps see landscaping that uses appropriate drought tolerant trees and plants.

trees, green grass, landscaped, paved roads
The presence of shade trees is welcoming. Visiting deceased relatives should not mean standing in the hot sun.
Clean, clear of clutter, neatly kept grounds, and quiet.
well-kempt landscaping, native flowering plants, maintained trees and plots, buildings in repair, attractive fencing and gates, maintained roads and pathways
Healthy trees and grass; to contrast the sadness of death
To honor Austin's unusual and eclectic ambiance - individual grave owners should be allowed to adorn private grave sites as they wish - with religious symbols if necessary or appropriate items honoring the human being or child buried there.
I'd like the environment to be beautiful and green with colorful native crape myrtle trees, dogwood, magnolias and orchid trees planted near our loved ones' resting places. Also, proper watering options. I have offered and am willing to pay for a crape myrtle by my son's gravesite.
a safe place to go to contemplate family and appreciate history
Beauty. Serenity. Peace. Quite. Shade Trees. Benches. I don't like tons of yard art and wind chimes.
I love the personal touches that people add to their loved ones' final resting place. It makes me feel that they are not forgotten and people still care.
Austin cemeteries should reflect what Austin and Austinites are: unique. If I wanted to bury my father in a plain vanilla cemetery I would not have chosen Memorial Park. Memorial Park is beautiful because it allows the expression of love, grief and culture. Please DO NOT mess with it!!! I love that young parents can put toys on the grave of their 11 day old child, that I can plant flowers for my father, that someone can put a little rock garden for their loved one. If I wanted uniformity and a boring cemetery, I would have gone to Cook Walden on I35!! I love the benches of different colors and styles and types. I love the diversity of the trees/flowers/bushes/decorations. Why are you trying to mess it?????
Clean, well kept, uniform, not a lot of cheap benches, windchimes and folksie memorabilia.
Cemeteries should be peaceful and void of yard "art." I have plots at Austin Memorial and will sell them and buy somewhere else if the grounds are not cleared of junk.
To "respectful" and "sacred," I would add "peaceful," "orderly," "well-kept" and "dignified." As to Oakwood, specifically, "historic" is especially applicable, and it is a bit disconcerting to see leaning and fallen monuments and other evidence of neglect.
Beauty, serenity, respect for cultural diversity and expressions of grief.
I love Memorial Park where my family and some friends are buried. It is a place which exemplifies respect and sacredness, but is not as lifeless as Cook Walden on 35 North.

A place of serenity, peace and beauty.
respectful and and sacred.
A place of respect for those who have passed and the families.
A place to feel the warmth, atmosphere that I have come to expect from a very peaceful cemetery.
Keeping it the same, park-like setting, beauty and serenity.
different from other, corporately owned cemeteries. historically preserved. beautiful. green and tranquil zone.
Peaceful and calm
I would like the city to allow "stakeholders", those who have purchased plots and own them in full to respect that those "stakeholders" be allowed to keep personal mementos on those graves. The city should only be responsible for enforcing the removal of items which are potentially dangerous--like the fence which surrounds the cemetery.
Well maintained with no broken headstones.
I don't want to talk about little plastic flags on tombstones. There's a waste of time. Let's talk about the deteriorating condition of our cemeteries, the dying trees, the crumbling buildings, the defunct irrigation systems. The City and it's contractor gives no regard to Oakwood cemetery. Please don't waste my time on meaningless distractions about dead flowers.
My parents are buried there, and I will be too. I wish for the cemetery to be a quiet, beautiful, reflective space that my kids will want to come and remember their family.
Serene, beautiful and uncluttered. A place for contemplation.
A cemetery should be a place for quiet reflection and remembrance. Anything that detracts from that should be prohibited. While it's understandable that some people might want elaborate or extensive memorials to loved ones, a city cemetery is not the place for such things.
I want City of Austin cemeteries to look like places where people care about their loved ones. My parents are buried in El Paso and I am always pleased that the cemetery there with many Hispanic graves looks like people care about their loved ones (especially on holidays when people visit and picnic and play music, but also because of the artificial flowers and other decorations).
An uncluttered environment lends itself to allowing all to experience feelings of serenity and peace when visiting the resting places of their loved ones.
quiet, peaceful, pleasing to the eye
While I don't expect uniformity, I want quiet, serene surroundings. I remember Austin Memorial Park from my childhood and it was well maintained and appropriate. More recently it has some graves decorated like those markers on the side of a road, lots of signs, wind chimes, and silk flowers.

I think people should be allowed to express themselves with personal items at City of Austin cemeteries so long as those items do not create a hazard for maintenance workers and are appropriately scaled. Certainly plants, flowers, toys, wind chimes, benches, and the like are additions that harm no one and give pleasure to the bereaved.

Cemeteries should promote the healing and peace of the bereaved, and the bereaved should have the right to include any plant, token of affection and remembrance, cultural artifact or seating area for rest and reflection that doesn't cross the boundaries of other gravesites or pose a threat to the safety of workers or visitors. Austinites cherish our individuality and our stories; a public cemetery should honor and uphold personal expression.

I believe CofA cemeteries should be places where differing cultures can express and experience their reaction to the deaths of loved ones in their own ways as long as there is no boisterous noise involved.

It should allow expressions of grief that reflect the plot owner's culture, belief system and faith. Just as our city and country are strengthened by diversity, so should the expressions of grief in a PUBLIC space.

Restful, contemplative, appreciative of the thoughts of the relatives of loved ones. Individuals' grave sites should reflect the loss and thoughts of loved ones.

I want them to be a place to celebrate the life of an individual. This often means plants on a grave, or a toy of a child, or a flag, or rocks on the stone. They should NOT be sterile places of just manicured grass and grave stones.

respectful and sacred places

Personal expression!!

I want the cemetery to be for the families. If the plot are owned by the family than they should be able do as they want with it. I like seeing the individualism of the publics. It gives you a sense of who the person was that is buried there.

I would like you to stay out of the business of policing gravesites. Period. End of discussion.

It's not about what environment and ambiance I want to experience at CoA cemeteries, or you, or the Mayor or City Council - it's what people whose loved ones are buried at CoA cemeteries want to experience.

Remembrance of any personal sort by the families.

A place to pay respect in peace.

They should be orderly, but individualized according to the belives and tastes of the persons who own the grave

Respectful yet personalized environments are important for those who are grieving. I believe that barring dangerous situations, that mourners be allowed to decorate their loved ones' resting places
Respectful and remembering. I like seeing mementos of those who came before us, bits of their personality, evidence that they existed and were loved. As long as the mementos don't interfere with others, they make me smile.
I think people should be able to leave mementos at graves and plant flowers on them or do whatever they want to pay tribute in a respectful manner.
I would like to see an area that is clean with no trash, such as paper or other debris. I do not consider sentimental items as trash. It should be peaceful and comfortable, with benches and even, tables, to accommodate the families and friends who visit the graves. It should include plants, from wildflowers to trees, and other landscaping items, such as birdhouses and bird baths. It should not be a sterile, bland area that is depressing and boring.
I want to see that mourners are allowed to place mementos that represent the love they feel for their lost ones. I like seeing Christmas trees, Easter motifs, baby toys, etc. which allow the mourner to deal with the tremendous loss of the loved one.
Tasteful individualism. Individuals should have latitude with their graves.
one that is personal, and reflects the love that people have for those who are deceased.
Clean and maintained, allowing me to visit with out being distracted by the look of neglect.
Encuesta en espanol? [survey in Spanish?]
The environment should reflect the city and those interred. If a cemetery is not a military one, it should not be ordered and consistent. Austin is diverse, and the graves in an Austin cemetery should reflect that.
A personalized environment! This is a place to honor our loved ones, not turn over to someone else for sterile homogenization.
The cemetery should be well cared for but existing garden improvements to plots should be grandfathered and not affected by any rule changes... at least unless or until they create some hazard.
Peace and tranquility where people can keep the memories of their loved ones alive in a manner they choose at their gravesites.
I want diversity, not homogeneity. I prefer memorials decorated by the families and friends, with symbols of their love and remembrances of the person buried there. But then it's not about the ambiance I want, it's about the environment and ambiance the grave owners want. THIS IS AUSTIN. KEEP IT AUSTIN. Private cemeteries can have their boring, severe, cold look, but public cemeteries need to be an expression of those buried there and their families.

<p>Whatever the bereaved need to honor their loved one so long as it does not pose potential harm to a cemetery worker.</p>
<p>I'd like the environment to be well kept - free of litter and greenery not overgrown. I think the grave markers should be the decision of the family and not homogenized.</p>
<p>It should be a serene and beautiful place, somewhat like a park with lots of trees, bushes, flowers and benches to sit and contemplate and remember loved ones. It should NOT be a sterile all-lawn no-personality place.</p>
<p>Reasonably quiet and well tended, but not sterile. Should reflect different cultural traditions of honoring loved ones. A place to sit and remember. No runners (it is not a track or public park)</p>
<p>Freedom to express how you would like to remember your loved one. Especially planting personal gardens at the gravesite. Gardens at grave sites are a historically appropriate way to remember a loved one.</p>
<p>Calm, peaceful, personal</p>
<p>Beauty and tranquility, but I expect and appreciate individuality in the graves, such as plants, flowers, flags when appropriate, and other tokens that can be an expression of a family's feelings for their dead loved one.</p>
<p>I would like to know that those with loved ones buried in the cemetery are allowed to express their remembrance of their loved one with reasonable modifications, to the gravesite, such as plantings, special objects, etc. It is moving to see the occasional gravesite with beautiful flowers or some precious plastic toy. Seeing these items tells you that someone has drawn comfort by placing those objects or plants there.</p>
<p>A place to reflect remembrance and solitude of those lost. Personal artifacts are part of the process to remember. As long as it is maintained by the family member, it should be allowed.</p>
<p>Peaceful, and also acknowledging our green initiatives and water emergencies. Planting grass is completely against city policies, at least that's what one department would say. But I know that departments don't talk to each other. Let people plant native plants, plant flowers that were favorites of their loved ones, and customize the memorials. Austin is unique, after all, and cemeteries shouldn't be one size fits all.</p>
<p>I would like people to have the opportunity to engage in remembrances that are in keeping with their ideas of "respectful and sacred". That would include following such sacred and respectful traditions as placing flags and celebrating Dia de los Muertos.</p>
<p>I want to see the deceased honored in a way deemed appropriate by their survivors.</p>

<p>Native flowers and grasses, wind chimes, pretty benches and bird houses, and personal mementos should be allowed, as long as they're maintained by the families / appointees of the families. It shouldn't look like a golf course.</p>
<p>I want a peaceful place where I can sit and reflect with my loved ones that have passed and share with them what I have been up to.</p>
<p>A place for personal reflection and remembering loved ones in a manner of a personal nature and in keeping with family customs.</p>
<p>I want to experience an environment that dignifies those buried in the cemetery and is respectful of those family and friends who visit the graves to pray and pay their respects.</p>
<p>Quiet, green, and attractive.</p>
<p>Focal points a plus.</p>
<p>Expanses of grass are a minus.</p>
<p>A cemetery is a place for remembering and therefore I am happy when I see that someone buried there has not been forgotten. Whether it be flowers or a favorite plant or even some special memento tells me this.</p>
<p>I want to go to a site where people who have died are properly loved and memorialized by their families. The cemetery should not be a sterile wasteland, but a vibrant locale where people can represent the love and respect they have for the people they have buried there and vistors can feel and witness it.</p>
<p>a peaceful place where I can sit on a bench and contemplate surrounded by the blessed dead and vibrant nature.</p>
<p>Knowing that each person buried there is very individual, I expect to see all sorts of things on graves, out of the respect for those that died. They are very sacred to those whose loved ones are buried there. we should respect their wishes as well.</p>
<p>Markers and stones straightened and leveled per State Law. Trees well maintained with no ball moss or dead branches, regular watering of trees which will help prevent future marker settlement. Pickup the dilapidated articles and flowers on a regular schedule. Repair the buildings and roads. Respect the cemeteries for their historical significance including the historical boundaries.</p>
<p>At City of Austin cemeteries, I would like to see maintained green spaces with plants that are water conservation with low water plant requirements. Families should be allowed to provide these conditions at their personal grave sites.</p>

The environment and ambiance I want to experience at COA cemeteries is one of peacefulness and comfort so I can reflect upon the memory of the departed.
I believe that the City of Austin's practice of allowing families to plant gardens and place objects that allow the families and friends of those they have lost to express their grief and respect believes of the departed is extremely important.
I have personally spent a considerable amount of money to care for trees at the cemetary. Rather than spend city resources removing gardens, bird houses, benches, rock piles, wind chimes, and the like, I wish the city would do more to protect the trees.
Peaceful, quiet, respectful of those who are interred and their loved ones. A natural landscape. Trees are great; trinkets belong in the trash. Wind chimes are particulary annoying.
Peaceful and Reflective
I want a peaceful environment which is flexible enough to accommodate each family's choice of memorabilia.
A place that has well maintained grounds that allows meaningful momentous to be placed on grave sites by family members.
Reverent, respectful, peaceful
I want lots of peaceful green space.
Peaceful. Quiet. Tasteful (no plastic windmills and colorfully tacky objects).
I don't much care.
Clean, quiet, simple.
Peaceful. Nicely maintained landscape...like a quiet park. Occasional benches.
Peaceful, restful, neat & uncluttered, well groomed and maintained, with improvements & repairs made as needed.
quiet but with environment for people to enjoy
respectful
sacred
clean, no garbage, with plants and trees
devoid of plastic ornaments, flowers - which are not religious
should be kept clean with no dead plants

Relatively quiet; respectful to a reasonable degree of the various cultures and religions of the family members of those interred; and demonstrating concern for those responsible for the care and upkeep of the cemetery.

respect; sacred place

A place where families can remember their loved ones in the way they feel best captures the deceased's personality

cemeteries are intended to be respectful and sacred

I would like that the space owner and the individual's spirit to prevail! The addition of personal items helps the healing process and provides others with an insight to the life once lived. These items give life to the park! I personally spend more time in the memorial park (quite the undiscovered resource) than in other city parks.

I want to see a place where people of all ages can walk and sit and reflect.

si-, respetuoso y sagrado [Yes, respectful and sacred]

Open, serene, natural setting. Uncluttered, maintained and tidy.

First of all, cemeteries are places for the families and friends of the deceased to visit. They are not "environments" to be "experienced" by visitors. The use of the term "ambiance" is in itself disrespectful. My own father and grandparents are buried in a cemetery in another town in Texas, a place where people leave flags, footballs, toys, plants, mementoes at the graves of their loved ones. I find all of these to be incredibly touching whenever I visit. They are expressions of heartfelt love.

Items placed by families should be left in place as long as they are not dilapidated, rotting, of that nature. The cemetery staff should remove items that are decaying. If they pose a safety concern, remove them. If they aren't harming anything and are just inconvenient for maintenance, they should be left alone.

Peacefulness. Not constant bickering with the City. Not having the City take heavy handed approach.

RELAXED ENVIRONMENT FOR REFLECTION. RESPECTFUL AND QUIET, WITH TWO PURPOSES: 1) HOME TO LOVED ONES 2) HISTORICAL PLACE. NO TRAILS, NO COMMUNITY GARDENS, NO NOISE, NO DISTRACTIONS: A relaxed, low key, but respectful quiet environment of reflection. Absolutely NOT "a celebration of life" environment that has community gardens or trails going through the cemetery. A COA public cemeteries should be a calm place where people can visit their loved one, remember them, and find peace for their aching hearts. It should be place of respect where the public can expect silence and calm.

A PLACE WHERE THE PUBLIC IS TREATED WITH RESPECT: It should be a place where people are NOT afraid to go because of the hassle they fear they will get from the Cemetery manager, who is very moody and treats some people in a very disrespectful manner when he is in a bad mood. It also should be a place where people are NOT reluctant to go because of the cemetery contractor that performs burials (InterCare) and his workers. I have personally observed how these workers are rude to some of the public without provocation.

A PLACE THAT ABIDES BY ITS RULES: It should be a place that people can count will be open per posted hours, not a place where people are hurried to leave 10 minutes prior to closing time, or that is not open on a holiday just because the Cemetery Manager felt like not opening that day.

WHERE ALL ARE TREATED EQUALLY WITHOUT PREJUDICE: It should also be a place where the same rules apply to all in the same manner, without favoritism or prejudice against some people. There should be no retaliation from the cemetery manager when people bring up concerns.

A PLACE THAT IS CARED FOR: It should be a place that is taken care of, where all of the older trees are watered during periods of insufficient rainfall so that they don't die, where fresh graves are topped with grass soon after burials so relatives don't have to add to their heartache by seeing an ugly pile of dirt instead of a grave covered with grass, a place where the stones are straight and leveled, and if they are not, a place where no one is afraid to point out because of the retaliations and lack of action from the Cemetery manager.