State Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers April 14, 2022

4 5 6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

BOARD MEMBERS:

8 Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional 9 Member

Jeffrey L. Walters, Vice Chairman, Professional Member - Absent

Mark V. Smeltzer Sr., Secretary, Professional Member

John D. Ausherman, Professional Member

William T. Stoerrle Jr., Professional Member

Michael McFarlane, Professional Member

Randy L. Waggoner, Professional Member

Martha H. Brown, Esquire, Secretary of the Commonwealth designee

Merna T. Hoffman, Esquire, Deputy Attorney General, Office of Attorney General Designee

Paul H. Wentzel Jr., Senior Legislative Director, Department of Banking and Securities Designee - Absent

24 25 26

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

27 28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel Dean F. Picarella, Esquire, Senior Board Counsel Ray Michalowski, Esquire, Senior Board Prosecution Liaison

Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison

Amanda Li, Board Administrator, on behalf of Kristel Hennessy Hemler

36 37 38

ALSO PRESENT:

39 40 41

42

43

44

45

46

Scott DiBiasio, Manager of State and Industry Affairs, Appraisal Institute

Teresa Cochran, Executive Director, Assessors' Association of Pennsylvania

Jeff Dempsey, Public Policy Manager, Pennsylvania Association of Realtors

47 48

49 50

1 ***
2 State Board of

2.4

State Board of Certified

Real Estate Appraisers

April 14, 2022

* * *

6 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at
7 9:00 a.m. the Board entered into Executive Session
8 with Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, to have
9 attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of
10 conducting quasi-judicial deliberations. The Board
11 returned to open session at 10:30 a.m.]

[Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, informed everyone that the meeting of the State Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was being held in a hybrid format both in person and by livestreaming teleconference, pursuant to Act 100 of 2021, which allows boards to use a virtual platform to conduct business when a public meeting is held.

Mr. Rouse also noted that the Board met in Executive Session to have attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations.]

The regularly scheduled meeting of the State

```
Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was held on
1
   Thursday, April 14, 2022. Joseph D. Pasquarella,
2
3
   Chairman, Professional Member, officially called the
   meeting to order at 10:36 a.m.
                              * * *
5
6
   Roll Call
   [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional Member,
   requested a roll call of Board members.]
10
   Approval of minutes of the March 2, 2022 meeting
11
   CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:
12
                  Do I have a motion to approve the
13
                  minutes of the meeting on March 2, 2022?
14
   MR. AUSHERMAN:
15
                  So moved.
   MR. WAGGONER:
16
17
                  Second.
18
   CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:
19
                  Any discussion of the Board minutes of
2.0
                  March 2? Hearing none.
2.1
2.2
                  Mr. Joseph Pasquarella, aye; Mr. Mark
2.3
                  Smeltzer, aye; Mr. John Ausherman, aye;
2.4
                  Mr. William Stoerrle, aye; Mr. Michael
25
                  McFarlane, aye; Mr. Randy Waggoner, aye;
```

```
5
                  Martha Brown, abstain; Merna Hoffman,
1
2
                  aye.
3
   MR. ROUSE:
 4
                  Are there any nays? We have one
5
                  abstention. Are there any recusals?
6
   [The motion carried. Martha Brown abstained from
   voting on the motion.]
                              * * *
   Report of Prosecutorial Division
10
   [Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,
11
   presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 21-70-
   009465.1
12
13
   MR. ROUSE:
14
                  Regarding the Consent Agreement at item
15
                  2 on the Board's agenda at Case No. 21-
                  70-009465, I believe the Board would
16
17
                  entertain a motion to adopt the Consent
18
                  Agreement.
                       Is there such a motion?
19
20
   MR. SMELTZER:
21
                  I'll make the motion.
22
   MR. ROUSE:
2.3
                  Is there a second?
2.4
   MR. STOERRLE:
25
                  Second.
```

6 1 MR. ROUSE: 2 Any discussion? Roll call of the vote. 3 4 Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark 5 Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye; William Stoerrle, aye; Michael 6 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye; Martha Brown, aye; Merna Hoffman, aye. 9 Are there any abstentions? 10 11 recusals? Hearing none. 12 [The motion carried unanimously. This is the matter of BPOA v. William T. Shipley Sr., Case No. 21-70-13 009465.1 14 * * * 15 16 Report of Board Counsel - Proposed Adjudication and 17 Order MR. ROUSE: 18 19 Item 3 on the agenda, which is a 2.0 Proposed Adjudication and Order in the 2.1 Matter of BPOA v. Russell Bruce Davison, Case No. 19-70-011345. 2.2 2.3 Regarding that Proposed 2.4 Adjudication at item 3 on the agenda, I believe the Board would entertain a 25

```
motion to direct Board counsel to
1
2
                  prepare a Final Adjudication and Order
3
                  consistent with the discussion in
                  Executive Session.
 4
5
                       Is there such a motion?
6
   MR. AUSHERMAN:
                  I so move.
   MR. ROUSE:
9
                  Is there a second?
10
   MR. MCFARLANE:
11
                  Second.
12
   MR. ROUSE:
13
                  Any discussion? Roll call of the vote.
14
15
                  Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark
16
                  Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye;
17
                  William Stoerrle, aye; Michael
18
                  McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye;
19
                  Martha Brown, aye; Merna Hoffman, aye.
2.0
21
                  I did not hear any nays. No abstentions
22
                  and no recusals.
23
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
2.4
25
   Report of Board Counsel - Final Adjudication and
```

8 Order 1 2 MR. ROUSE: 3 Item 4 on the agenda is the Final Adjudication and Order in the Matter of 4 5 BPOA v. Ernest Fredrick Del Guercio Jr., Case No. 20-70-001589. 6 Regarding this matter, which is item 4 on the agenda, I believe the 9 Board would entertain a motion to adopt 10 the Adjudication and Order as presented 11 by Board counsel and to direct Board 12 counsel to prepare the Board's Final 13 Order. Is there such a motion? 14 15 MR. STOERRLE: I make a motion. 16 17 MR. ROUSE: 18 Is there a second? 19 MR. AUSHERMAN: 20 I second. 21 MR. ROUSE: 22 Any discussion? Roll call of the vote. 2.3 2.4 Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark 25 Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye;

William Stoerrle, aye; Michael

McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye;

Martha Brown, aye; Merna Hoffman, aye.

Hearing no abstentions and no recusals.

6 [The motion carried unanimously.]

2.4

* * *

Regulations/Statute - Regulation 16A-7025 Fees

[Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, referred to
Regulation 16A-7025 regarding fees. He noted the
Board voted to release Regulation 16A-7025 as an
exposure draft at the January meeting, which was
released to stakeholders on January 21, 2022.

Mr. Rouse stated the Board received no comments, and it was released again on March 9, 2022, and again the Board received no written comments. He provided an annex showing the fee increases for appraisers, assessors, and appraisal management companies (AMCs), noting no changes since the last meeting.

Mr. McFarlane referred to pages 5 and 6 of the annex, noting effective year 2025 and 2027, where AMCs were currently listed at \$2,000 for the initial application and requested confirmation of the increase.

Mr. Rouse noted Mr. McFarlane to be correct,

10 where the initial application would have to be amended 1 to \$2,338 for June 1, 2025 and \$2,553 for June 1, 2 3 2027.1 MR. ROUSE: 5 Would the Board entertain a motion to 6 adopt the amended proposed annex and direct Board counsel to draft the 8 preamble of this regulation package? 9 MS. BROWN: 10 So moved. 11 MR. STOERRLE: 12 Second. MR. ROUSE: 13 14 Any discussion? Roll call of the vote. 15 16 Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark 17 Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye; 18 William Stoerrle, aye; Michael 19 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye; 20 Martha Brown, aye; Merna Hoffman, aye. 2.1 22 Hearing no nays and no abstentions or 2.3 recusals. 24 [The motion carried unanimously.] * * * 25

- Regulations/Statute Regulation 16A-7029 Distance
 Education
- Regulation 16A-7029 regarding distance education. He mentioned the regulation was sent to stakeholders and was reissued. He informed the Board of a comment from a certified AQB USPAP instructor who found nothing to offer to enhance or clarify the document as written.
 - Mr. Rouse also mentioned Teresa Cochran from the Assessors' Association of Pennsylvania also submitted comments on two different occasions and read her written comments. She had concerns regarding § 36.201 definitions, where the term assessors is being deleted. She commented that the full definition of certified Pennsylvania evaluator in § 36.201 makes no reference to assessors.

Mr. Rouse also noted Ms. Cochran commented that assessors are responsible for valuation of real property for ad valorem taxation purposes, which the assessor definition did previously and most notably the revaluation company personnel definition does. She also noted it only states that a certified Pennsylvania evaluator is an individual, who has completed a minimum of 90 hours of basic courses of study covering the appraisal assessing profession and

- has successfully completed a comprehensive examination covering all phases of the appraisal process and the assessment function established by the assessment statutes of the Commonwealth.
- Mr. Rouse noted Ms. Cochran's comments regarding

 § 36.204 under scope of practice, where assessor is no

 longer defined and § 36.221 qualifications for

 certification as a Pennsylvania evaluator, where the

 assessor shall meet the requirements, noting the

 definition of assessor has been removed from the

 proposed annex.

2.0

- Mr. Rouse stated that Ms. Cochran noted there may be other items in Title 49 that still refer to assessor, but it is no longer defined and questioned who would this apply to if the assessor definition is deleted. Ms Cochran also commented on § 36.4(f) hybrid distance learning under (2) and (3), where it is not clear that it is related to hybrid distance learning.
- Mr. Rouse stated Ms. Cochran had comments regarding § 36.201, where the definition of assessor is being deleted, where assessors are listed as being able to value property for ad valorem taxation purposes. She noted that to be an important distinction for the counties in the assessment

profession in Pennsylvania.

2.1

2.2

2.4

Mr. Rouse also noted Ms. Cochran's comments, where the definition of the revaluation company personnel includes a reference of being directly responsible for the valuation of property but someone appraising does not appear as part of the definition of the CPE and that is very alarming to the Assessors' Association of Pennsylvania (AAP).

Mr. Rouse noted the AAP strongly recommends amending the definitions of certified Pennsylvania evaluator as defined in the section to add that they are responsible for the valuation of real property for ad valorem tax purposes.

Mr. Rouse noted Ms. Cochran also commented that if the definition of assessor is deleted, there are no references to it in Title 49 and would need to be amended in § 36.201, § 36.204, and § 36.221. She commented that it is important to the State Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers to compare Act 88 and Title 49 as it pertains to assessor/fees to make sure both laws are consistent with each other.

Mr. Rouse also noted Ms. Cochran commented that the Assessors' Association of Pennsylvania (AAP) believes the areas should be consistent and would work with the State Board of Real Estate Appraisers to

compare both the laws and proposed amendments.

1.3

2.0

2.2

Teresa Cochran, Executive Director, Assessors'
Association of Pennsylvania, presented to the Board,
stating the new distance learning regulations are
great and seem to coincide with previous discussions.
She addressed AAP's main concern, where assessors for
counties do provide an extremely important job being
able to value properties for taxes and the definition
no longer being in the proposed regulation. She asked
why that was taken out and amended and why the
definition of CPE has changed.

Mr. Rouse commented that Act 88 actually amended the Assessors Certification Act and is what added the definition of certified Pennsylvania evaluator and deleted the definition for assessor. He mentioned also adding the same definition that is part of the amended statute and deleting the definition of assessor when changes were made to the proposed regulation.

Mr. Rouse stated the amended statute leaves the term "assessor" in the statute but deletes the definition, noting the need to incorporate the word "assessor" back into the proposed regulation.

Ms. Cochran stated the word "assessor" means a lot of things to a lot of different people and needs

to be a focused definition. She mentioned the term
"assessor" not only applies for Act 88 and Title 49
but is peppered throughout many laws and statues and
regulations in Pennsylvania. She noted the importance
of having one definition that defines what that is,
especially in relationship to counties.

Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.201 definitions, noting that the term "assessor" and the definition out of the proposed regulation, which actually would be incorrect because the amended statute the term "assessor." He noted the importance of figuring out how to address an "assessor" and what to consider an assessor to be versus a certified Pennsylvania evaluator if the statute takes out the definition of "assessor."

2.0

2.2

2.3

Mr. Rouse mentioned the importance of being consistent with the Assessors Certification Act, which is why the definition of certified Pennsylvania evaluator is the same as the statute. He commented that the term "assessor" is going to have to go back in the proposed regulation because the term is in the statute.

Mr. McFarlane commented that the correlation of being a certified Pennsylvania evaluator is essentially a licensed assessor as long as a

relationship is established.

2.0

2.3

Mr. Smeltzer stated the definition of appraiser is in their act separate from certified residential because that is different and believed they should be consistent and have a term for assessor.

Mr. Rouse referred to the definition section, where there is a definition for appraisal in the Real Estate Appraisers Certification Act and then there is also in Section 6 the classifications of certification with (1) being a certified residential appraiser.

Mr. Smeltzer stated there is no definition of an appraiser anywhere and they do use that term throughout that. He commented that it works there, does it not also work in the act for evaluators, where they use the word assessor, but it is a general meaning without having a specific definition for it.

Mr. Smeltzer further explained that the requirement is if someone is an assessor they are required to be a certified property evaluator. He stated an assessor has a number of months before they have to become a CPE, so they are still an assessor, just not a certified property evaluator.

Mr. Smeltzer suggested language to read, an assessor is someone employed by a company for ad valorem purposes.

Ms. Cochran noted the importance of the words "for ad valorem purposes" to stay in the statute because it pertains to counties but also acknowledging it also applies to revaluation companies. She stated those individuals also do that and also need their CPEs just like county staff. She further explained that the individuals who work for revaluation companies and work for counties who are assessing properties for tax purposes are equal and have to have the same qualifications.

2.4

Mr. Waggoner commented that a mass appraisal company or reassessment company does not call them assessors, whereas most counties have that as the job title or job description, but they are both valuing properties for ad valorem purposes.

Mr. Smeltzer also commented that the word assessment in the act applies to those employed by the county and those employed by a revaluation company.

Mr. Rouse suggested the definition of assessor to read, someone employed by the county to perform valuations of real property for ad valorem purposes or, for a revaluation company, that it is an appraisal company that conducts appraisals operating within this Commonwealth for ad valorem purposes.

Ms. Cochran approved the language and thanked the

- 1 Board for taking her comments into consideration.
- 2 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.224 under distance 3 education courses.
- Ms. Cochran noted § 36.224(3) to be confusing and not being sure of the numbers before that.
- Mr. Rouse explained that (1) is "the course is presented by one of the following," (2) is "the applicant successfully completes a written examination," and (3) is "the content and length of the course must meet the requirements of § 36.222 (relating to required courses of study)."
 - Ms. Cochran mentioned being confused with the letters in the middle.

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

- Mr. Rouse thanked Ms. Cochran for catching that error and provided corrections to other numbering errors. He informed her that the Board would be amending the definition of assessor, amending the definition of revaluation company, and also amending the numbering and lettering areas in the distance education courses section.
- Mr. Stoerrle requested an update on the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraiser Practice (USPAP) 15-hour course for assessors.
- Mr. Rouse noted the preamble is complete, and the package is being put together and would be going forth

```
19
   through the regulatory process, which takes about 18
1
2
   months to 2 years or longer.
3
        Chairman Pasquarella thanked Ms. Cochran for
   bringing those issues to the Board's attention. He
4
   also thanked Mr. Rouse. 1
5
6
   MR. ROUSE:
                  Regarding item 6 on the agenda, would
                  the Board entertain a motion to direct
9
                  Board counsel to make amendments to
10
                  Regulation 16A-7029 consistent with
11
                  discussion in today's public session and
                  to send out to stakeholders as a second
12
13
                  exposure draft?
   MR. AUSHERMAN:
14
15
                  So moved.
   MR. STOERRLE:
16
                  Second.
17
   MR. SMELTZER:
18
                  I'll second.
19
2.0
   MR. ROUSE:
2.1
                  Any discussion? Roll call of the vote.
2.2
2.3
                  Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark
2.4
                  Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye;
25
                  William Stoerrle, aye; Michael
```

20 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye; 1 2 Merna Hoffman, aye. 3 Hearing no nays or abstentions or 4 5 recusals. 6 [The motion carried unanimously.] * * * 7 8 Regulations/Statute - Regulation 16A-7030 PAREA [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed 10 Regulation 16A-7030 regarding the Practical 11 Applications of Real Estate Appraisal (PAREA). 12 referred to § 36.1 and is including a definition for "PAREA" and "mentor" in the regulations. 13 14 Mr. Rouse discussed adding information to § 36.11 15 and § 36.12 regarding the qualifications for 16 certification as a residential or general real estate 17 appraiser. He noted there is some reference to PAREA 18 that needs to be in those sections of the regulations. 19 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.12a regarding 20 qualifications for licensure as an appraiser trainee 21 and mentioned the need to work through some issues. 22 Mr. Rouse noted imagining creating a new section 23 § 36.54(a) regarding PAREA and § 36.54(b) regarding 2.4 duties of a mentor.] 25 * * *

```
21
   Applications for Review - Application for Certified
1
2
     Residential Appraiser by Examination
   MR. ROUSE:
3
                  This is a matter that was discussed in
 4
5
                  Executive Session regarding the
 6
                  Application to Sit for the Certified
                  Residential Real Estate Appraiser
                  Examination of Melissa Pettit at item 8
9
                  on the agenda, Application No.
10
                  AA0003629086.
                       I believe the Board would entertain
11
12
                  a motion to provisionally deny the
13
                  Application to sit for the exam.
                       Is there such a motion?
14
15
   MR. AUSHERMAN:
16
                  I so move.
17
   MR. ROUSE:
18
                  Is there a second?
19
   MR. STOERRLE:
20
                  Second.
21
   MR. ROUSE:
22
                  Any discussion? Roll call on the vote.
2.3
2.4
                  Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark
25
                  Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye;
```

22 William Stoerrle, aye; Michael 1 2 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye; 3 Merna Hoffman, aye. 4 5 We do have a quorum for this matter. 6 Hearing no nays, no abstentions, and no recusals. The ayes have it, and the 8 motion carries. [The motion carried unanimously.] * * * 10 Matters for Discussion 11 MR. ROUSE: 12 13 Regarding the Petition for Reinstatement of the Certified Residential Real Estate 14 15 Appraiser License of John Taylor, Case 16 No. 09-70-10540 at item 9 on the agenda, 17 I believe the Board would entertain a motion to take no action on this 18 19 Petition. 20 Is there such a motion? 21 MR. MCFARLANE: 22 So moved. 2.3 MR. ROUSE: 24 Is there a second? MR. AUSHERMAN: 25

23 1 I second. 2 MR. ROUSE: 3 Is there any discussion? Hearing none. Roll call on the vote. 4 5 6 Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye; William Stoerrle, aye; Michael 9 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye; 10 Merna Hoffman, aye. 11 12 Hearing no nays, no abstentions, and no 1.3 recusals. The ayes have it. The motion carries. 14 15 [The motion carried unanimously.] 16 17 MR. ROUSE: 18 Item 10 on the agenda is the Request to Sit for the Certified Residential Real 19 2.0 Estate Appraiser Examination of John 2.1 Taylor, Case No. 09-70-10540 at item 10 2.2 on the agenda, I believe the Board would 2.3 entertain a motion to take grant the Request to Sit for the Examination. 2.4 Is there such a motion? 25

24 MR. SMELTZER: 1 2 So moved. 3 MR. ROUSE: 4 Is there a second? 5 MR. AUSHERMAN: I second. 6 7 MR. ROUSE: Is there any discussion? Roll call on 9 the vote. 10 11 Chairman Pasquarella, aye; Mark 12 Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman, aye; 13 William Stoerrle, aye; Michael 14 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye; 15 Merna Hoffman, aye. 16 17 We do have a quorum on this matter. 18 Hearing no abstentions or recusals. 19 ayes have it, and the motion carries. 20 [The motion carried unanimously.] * * * 21 2.2 Miscellaneous 23 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed 24 the Sunshine Act, noting anytime an agency holds a 25 meeting that the meeting must be open to the public

after public notice has been provided. He discussed deliberation, public notice, voting, and minutes.

Mr. Rouse stated Senate Bill 554 amended the Pennsylvania Sunshine Act to include the requirement that agencies post the agenda for all public meetings at least 24 hours in advance effective August 29, 2021.

Mr. Rouse explained that the agenda requirement applies to all regular and special public meetings but does not include work sessions, conferences, and Executive Session. He noted the agenda should include all issues to be deliberated on and any planned official action.

Mr. Rouse commented that an agency can change the agenda within the 24-hour threshold provided the changes are de minimis, involve no expenditure of funds, and do not entail entering into a contract. He provided a copy of the Sunshine Act for the Board's review.

Mr. Rouse also provided a copy of Recusal Guidelines explaining mandatory, strongly suggested, and discretionary recusals.]

23 **

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

24 Report of Board Chairman - No Report

25 ***

1 Report of Board Administrator - No Report

*

3 Applications Committee - No Report

4 ***

5 | Continuing Education Committee - No Report

7 | Correspondence

2

8 | [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed a

9 letter from the Association of Appraiser Officials

10 (AARO) stating that AARO has committed resources to

11 | the effort of investigating incidents of racism in the

12 appraisal profession.

Mr. Rouse noted that when a state appraiser

14 regulatory agency receives a complaint involving an

15 appraiser or appraisal management company relating to

16 racial issues, AARO encourages the state appraiser

17 regulatory agencies to refer the matter to the

18 Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office

19 of Fair Housing and/or the appropriate state housing

20 agency or both.

21 Mr. Rouse noted another step taken by ARRO in

22 | January 2022 was to compile statistics relating to

23 allegations and/or complaints regarding appraisal bias

24 and discrimination. He reported racial discrimination

25 and bias issues will be at the forefront of the agenda

1 at ARRO's upcoming spring conference held in San 2 Antonio.

Mr. Rouse noted the Board had discussions in the past and talked about PAREA and opening up the profession so more people are able to become certified appraisers. He mentioned Mr. Michalowski also had a discussion regarding referring bias complaints to the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.

Mr. Smeltzer discussed his attendance at a North Dakota appraiser organization meeting in Bismarck, where they are putting together programs that help fund education to bring new appraisers in with an eye on diversity. He mentioned there are funds available from the Appraisal Subcommittee but that it has to go through the Board. He noted the funding could go to education, universities of color, and community colleges. He commented that the profession needs some diversity and is something the Board can look into with the universities.

Chairman Pasquarella commented that the funds are available and asked Mr. Rouse to look into how to begin that process to move this along for the benefit of the public.]

* * *

25 | Public Comment/Discussion

2.0

2.4

[Randy L. Waggoner, Professional Member, requested information concerning a question asked by a CPE who was scheduled to take an AAP-sponsored 7-hour USPAP update class but canceled for personal reasons and asked whether a CPE can just take a 7-hour USPAP update class anywhere.

Mr. Rouse offered to provide the answer after reviewing the statute and the regulations.

Mr. Waggoner mentioned the concern was that a CPE just took any one of the 7-hour AQB-certified update classes only to find out that there was something that required part of that 7-hour update class had discussed standards dealing with mass appraisal, and they did not want continuing education applying at the end of this cycle.

Mr. Smeltzer commented that it should not be an issue with the current course, but it does include mass appraising in the 7-hour update.

Mr. Waggoner commented that the question is going to come up frequently and suggested AAP send a blanket statement out. He also mentioned AAP has two conferences a year and offers the 7-hour USPAP at each conference, so by the time the cycle is over, AAP has done everything they can to provide enough continuing education.

1 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.261(a) regarding Mr.

- 2 | Waggoner's question, where effective with renewal of
- 3 certification for the 2007-2009 biennial renewal
- 4 period, the USPAP requirement shall be the 7-hour
- 5 National USPAP Update Course or an equivalent 7-hour
- 6 course approved by the Board.]
- 7
- 8 Adjournment
- 9 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:
- Do we have a motion to adjourn the
- 11 meeting?
- 12 MR. AUSHERMAN:
- 13 So moved.
- 14 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:
- 15 Second?
- 16 MR. MCFARLANE:
- 17 I second.
- 18 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:
- 19 All in favor, say aye. Thank you very
- 20 much everyone. This meeting is
- 21 adjourned officially.
- 22 [The motion carried unanimously.]
- 23 ***
- 24 [There being no further business, the State Board of
- 25 | Certified Real Estate Appraisers Meeting adjourned at

			31
1 2 3		STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS REFERENCE INDEX	
2 3 4 5 6 7		April 14, 2022	
7 8 9	TIME	AGENDA	
.0	9:00 10:30	Executive Session Return to Open Session	
.3	10:36	Official Call to Order	
.5	10:36	Roll Call	
.6	10:38	Approval of Minutes	
.8	10:39	Report of Prosecutorial Division	
0 1	10:44	Report of Board Counsel	
2 3	10:47	Regulations/Statute	
24 25 26	11:44	Applications for Review	
7 8	11:46	Matters for Discussion	
30	11:48	Miscellaneous	
1 2	11:51	Correspondence	
33	11:58	Public Comment/Discussion	
5	12:00	Adjournment	
37 38			
39 10			
11			
13			
15 16			
17 18			
19			