

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

F I N A L M I N U T E S

MEETING OF:

**STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED
REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
VIA TELECONFERENCE**

TIME: 9:13 A.M.

Thursday, June 25, 2020

1 State Board of Certified
2 Real Estate Appraisers
3 June 25, 2020
4
5

6 BOARD MEMBERS:
7

8 Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional
9 Member
10 Jeffrey L. Walters, Vice Chairman, Professional
11 Member
12 Eric M. Lehmayr, Secretary, Professional
13 Member
14 John Ausherman, Professional Member
15 Martha H. Brown, Esquire, Secretary of the
16 Commonwealth designee
17 Merna T. Hoffman, Esquire, Deputy Attorney General,
18 Office of Attorney General Designee
19 Mark Smeltzer, Professional Member
20 Paul H. Wentzel Jr., Senior Legislative Director,
21 Department of Banking and Securities designee
22
23

24 BUREAU PERSONNEL:
25

26 Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel
27 Ray Michalowski, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison
28 Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor
29 Caroline A. Bailey, Esquire, Board Prosecutor
30 Dean F. Picarella, Esquire, Senior Counsel
31 Heidi M. Weirich, Board Administrator
32 Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department of
33 State
34 Andrew LaFratte, MPA, Policy Office, Department of
35 State
36 Caleb Acker, Intern, Department of State
37 Elliott Zucker, Intern, Department of State
38
39

40 ALSO PRESENT:
41

42 Steve Howe, CPE, Assessors' Association of
43 Pennsylvania
44 Daniel A. Bradley, Chief Appraisal Officer,
45 McKissock LP
46 Michelle Czekalski Bradley, Appraisal Standards Board
47 Robert Moore, Esquire, Mette, Evans, & Woodside
48 R. Scott Hartman, SRA, Vice President, Valuation &
49 Consulting Services/Appraisal Institute
50

State Board of Certified
Real Estate Appraisers
June 25, 2020

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

ALSO PRESENT: (Continued)

Wayne C. Crawford, Esquire, Public Policy Manager,
Pennsylvania Association of Realtors
Randy L. Waggoner, CPE, Assessors' Association of
Pennsylvania

1 ***

2 State Board of Certified

3 Real Estate Appraisers

4 June 25, 2020

5 ***

6 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State
7 Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was held on
8 Thursday, June 25, 2020. Joseph D. Pasquarella,
9 Chairman, Professional Member, officially called the
10 meeting to order at 9:13 a.m. A roll call was taken.

11 ***

12 Introduction of Public Members

13 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional Member,
14 requested public members introduce themselves.]

15 ***

16 Approval of Minutes

17 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional Member,
18 noted the minutes for the February 13, 2020 meeting
19 were not posted for Board members to review,
20 therefore, approval of the minutes was deferred until
21 the next meeting.]

22 ***

23 Report of Prosecutorial Division

24 [Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,
25 presented the Consent Agreements for Case No. 19-70-

1 013722 and Case No. 18-70-000394.]

2 ***

3 [Caroline A. Bailey, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,
4 presented the Consent Agreements for Case No. 19-70-
5 016250, Case No. 19-70-015810, Case No. 19-70-017476,
6 Case No. 20-70-000037, and Case No. 19-70-015514.]

7 ***

8 Report of Board Counsel

9 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed
10 the Real Estate Commission's broker price opinions
11 temporary regulations. He stated Act 75 of 2018 made
12 two major changes to the Real Estate Licensing and
13 Registration Act by increasing the minimum education
14 necessary for licensure as a salesperson and allowing
15 broker price opinions to be performed by licensed
16 brokers, associate brokers, and salespersons.

17 Mr. Rouse referred to Section 201 of the Real
18 Estate Licensing and Registration Act that defines
19 broker price opinion. He noted broker price opinions
20 (BPOs) are most frequently used by banks to determine
21 an approximate value of the bank's real estate
22 inventory. He stated Act 75 of 2018 authorized the
23 Real Estate Commission to promulgate temporary
24 regulations to implement the practice of broker price
25 opinions by brokers, associate brokers, and

1 salespersons.

2 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.402(a) of the
3 temporary regulations relating to BPOs, where a broker
4 price opinion was required to have a specific
5 statement displayed indicating that the broker price
6 opinion was not prepared in accordance with Uniform
7 Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP)
8 and is not to be construed as an appraisal.

9 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.402(b) of the
10 temporary regulations, which requires the signature of
11 the person who prepares the BPO and lists all the
12 information that must be on every broker price
13 opinion, including the real estate license number of
14 preparer and, if applicable, the reviewing broker or
15 associate broker.

16 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.402(c) of the
17 temporary regulations requiring the compensation for
18 preparing the BPO to be paid directly to the employing
19 broker of the licensee who prepared the BPO; an
20 associate broker or a salesperson cannot accept
21 compensation or other valuable compensation from
22 anyone other than the employing broker.

23 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.402(d) and § 35.402(e)
24 of the temporary regulations, which sets the minimum
25 requirements for a salesperson to prepare a BPO,

1 including their experience, education, requirement to
2 review, and signature by employee broker or designated
3 associate broker.

4 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.403 of the temporary
5 regulations, which lists permissible uses of broker
6 price opinion. He noted permissible uses include a
7 property owned by a lender after an unsuccessful sale
8 at a foreclosure auction, a modification of a first or
9 junior mortgage or equity line of credit, or an
10 evaluation or monitoring of a portfolio of properties.

11 Mr. Rouse referred to 35.403(a) of the temporary
12 regulations, which lists the prohibited uses for a
13 broker price opinion, where a broker price opinion may
14 not be used as the basis to determine the value of a
15 parcel of real property or a mortgage loan
16 origination, including a first or junior mortgage,
17 refinancing, or equity line of credit.

18 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.403(b), where a broker
19 price opinion may not be used in connection with an
20 eminent domain proceeding; a federal, state, or local
21 tax appeal; bankruptcy or insolvency proceeding; an
22 action or proceeding involving divorce or equitable
23 distribution of property; and any action or proceeding
24 before a court of record.

25 Mr. Rouse referred to § 35.404, which sets forth

1 the educational requirements of a licensee that must
2 be completed prior to completing a broker price
3 opinion, including completion of an initial education
4 course and at least 3 hours of Real Estate
5 Commission-approved continuing education in broker
6 price opinion topics.

7 Mr. Rouse explained that the temporary
8 regulations would expire no later than August 28,
9 2021. He noted the Real Estate Commission would assess
10 the effectiveness of the temporary regulations in
11 formulating its proposed and final-form rulemaking on
12 the topic of broker price opinion.

13 Mr. Smeltzer questioned whether individuals
14 providing a BPO for a service that is prohibited would
15 be handled by the Board for violating their practice
16 act or handled through the Real Estate Act.

17 Mr. Michalowski stated that previously, when the
18 Commission was only allowed to do comparative market
19 analysis (CMA), prosecution received the complaints
20 and analyzed them as to whether or not it was a
21 deficient comparative market analysis (CMA) or the
22 products delivered to the consumer or client was an
23 unauthorized appraisal.

24 Mr. Michalowski mentioned all of the Board
25 prosecutors prosecute for both the Board and

1 Commission and are capable of evaluating these. He
2 stated BPOs would be handled the same way to determine
3 whether or not it was close enough to a BPO but lacked
4 some specific part, where they would be penalized
5 under the State Real Estate Commission's Act.

6 Mr. Michalowski noted those going past all the
7 disclaimers, where it looked like an appraisal, was
8 being ordered like an appraisal, and treated like an
9 appraisal, would be charged under the Board as
10 performing as an uncertified appraiser.

11 Mr. Michalowski commented that this moves the
12 line from CMA versus appraisal to they are now allowed
13 to do both CMAs and BPOs versus appraisals, but each
14 one is taken on a case-by-case basis and evaluated.

15 Mr. Michalowski mentioned the advantage of
16 penalizing them under their own practice act is
17 individuals get hit with a civil penalty and have a
18 permanent mark on their record under the Board for
19 which they actually practiced and can be as severe as
20 a suspension.

21 Mr. Walters noted his concern of realtors inching
22 their way into the appraisal profession by offering
23 broker price opinions. He stated broker price opinion
24 was a very misleading term and commented that BPOs
25 were being done by realtors for the purposes of

1 establishing a listing. He thought it was awkward
2 that the Board is not able to govern their own
3 business models because they are under a different
4 governing body.

5 Chairman Pasquarella stated Mr. Michalowski
6 explained the process of how it would land in the
7 Board's bailiwick and what the advantages are, where
8 there was a record of it at the Board level.

9 Mr. Rouse noted the proposed adjudication and
10 order for discussion during executive session.

11 Mr. Rouse addressed House Bill 21 of 2019
12 regarding licensing of home inspectors. He noted
13 prior discussion at the December 2019 Board meeting,
14 where it passed the House and was an amendment to the
15 Real Estate Appraisers Certification Act. He also
16 noted prior discussion at the last meeting, where the
17 bill was deferred to the Senate Consumer Protection
18 and Professional Licensure Committee on October 31,
19 2019.

20 Mr. Rouse updated the Board, stating an amendment
21 was made to House Bill 21 of 2019 to increase the
22 number of Board members to 17 instead of 15. He
23 stated on June 9, 2020, the Consumer Protection and
24 Professional Licensure Committee of the State Senate
25 met and gave first consideration to the bill. He also

1 stated, upon second consideration of the bill on June
2 10, 2020, the committee referred House Bill 21 of 2019
3 to the Appropriations Committee of the State Senate.

4 Mr. Rouse addressed House Bill 1032 of 2019,
5 which provides additional definitions in the Real
6 Estate Appraisers Certification Act and would provide
7 a definition of Certified Pennsylvania Evaluator, home
8 inspector, and home inspection as well as increasing
9 the number of Board members for the State Board of
10 Certified Real Estate Appraisers from 11 to 17. He
11 noted the bill currently remains in the Consumer
12 Protection and Professional Licensure Committee of the
13 State Senate.

14 Chairman Pasquarella mentioned prior discussion
15 with many Board members sending letters to the
16 governor. He commented that the issue does not seem
17 to be resolved. He stated the Board is valuation
18 centered and does not have skills with respect to home
19 inspections, engineering, and architecture. He noted
20 his concern of having two home inspectors as Board
21 members who would not understand the position of a
22 real estate appraiser.

23 Chairman Pasquarella commented that real estate
24 appraisers previously had a very high percentage of
25 around 55% of the vote concerning the valuation

1 process and was now 47% at 8 out of 17.

2 Chairman Pasquarella brought to the Board's
3 attention that this excludes five disciplines that
4 easily would accommodate the home inspectors who would
5 be in the position to understand physicalities of a
6 residential property as opposed to real estate
7 appraisers.

8 Mr. Lehmayr questioned how many complaints the
9 state receives regarding home inspectors, noting that
10 there are no standards for home inspectors and would
11 be up to the Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers
12 to set standards. He stated USPAP is followed to
13 regulate or administer justice on complaints that come
14 before the Board, but there is nothing for home
15 inspectors.

16 Mr. Lehmayr commented that there was nobody on
17 the Board even close to being an expert in home
18 inspection and thought it should be under the Real
19 Estate Commission because home inspectors were
20 inspecting homes for deficiencies.

21 Chairman Pasquarella stated it was kept out of
22 the Real Estate Commission because they felt
23 incorporating home inspectors into the Real Estate
24 Commission somehow could lead to unethical behavior.

25 Mr. Smeltzer agreed with Mr. Lehmayr, where a

1 17-member Board would only have two members who
2 understand what an inspector is supposed to do and the
3 other 15, who are not familiar, would also be deciding
4 on what types of education they need.

5 Mr. Smeltzer mentioned that home inspectors have
6 groups like the American Society of Home Inspectors
7 (ASHI) regarding requirements, but nobody on the Board
8 knows anything about them. He believed engineers and
9 architects would have a better understanding of their
10 requirements.

11 Mr. Ausherman referred back to the December
12 meeting, where the Board was totally opposed to this
13 idea. He believed it to be complaint-driven because
14 of the large amount of complaints against home
15 inspectors by realtors and homeowners. He noted
16 concern of not having the level of expertise to set
17 judgement of a home inspection or home inspector or
18 anyone else on the Board with that level of expertise
19 either.

20 R. Scott Hartman, SRA, Vice President, Valuation
21 & Consulting Services/Appraisal Institute, commented
22 that the bill started to move while in the COVID-19
23 lockdown period. He stated there seems to be a strong
24 push from the legislators who are the prime sponsors
25 to get something done because the three prime sponsors

1 had a number of constituents who complained directly
2 to them.

3 Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department
4 of State, noted continued opposition to this bill but
5 being only one branch of government. He noted
6 continuing to point out the deficiencies and flaws,
7 particularly with regard to it being assigned to the
8 Board.

9 Mr. Hart stated the bill was referred to the
10 Appropriations Committee about two weeks ago and had
11 not moved, which means perhaps the governor's and
12 administration's objections were being heard. He
13 commented that there was not much else the Appraisal
14 Institute and the Coalition of Pennsylvania Real
15 Estate Appraisers (CPREA) can do at this point. He
16 stated they have not been able to meet face-to-face
17 with specific senators or representatives.

18 Mr. Smeltzer questioned whether the Board as a
19 Board voice of opposition would be able to send it to
20 the people who are making the decision that the Board
21 was opposed to this going to the Board of Certified
22 Real Estate Appraisers.

23 Theodore Stauffer, Executive Assistant, Bureau of
24 Professional and Occupational Affairs, commented that
25 the Boards get their power through legislative acts

1 and act as the judge for the practice act. He stated
2 the Board is not supposed to be speaking out against
3 modification to the act as an individual Board but is
4 able to have an opinion. He noted the issue was in
5 terms of writing a letter.

6 Chairman Pasquarella mentioned the importance of
7 getting the Board's opposition in front of the Senate
8 or committee that may approve this legislation so they
9 hear firsthand from the Board that we lack the skill
10 set to address the tsunami of issues that may be
11 facing us going forward.

12 Mr. Farrell commented that Victor Wills from the
13 Office of Legislative Affairs had also communicated
14 the same message to the House and Senate Professional
15 Licensure Committees.

16 Chairman Pasquarella suggested the professional
17 members reissue letters and send them to their state
18 Senator and Governor Wolf's Office. Mr. Rouse
19 recommended that the letters should be sent in their
20 individual capacity, mentioning they are a Board
21 member but speaking as a citizen and experienced
22 appraiser of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

23 Mr. Rouse noted a matter for deliberation for
24 discussion during executive session.

25 Mr. Rouse noted the Appraisal Subcommittee (ASC)

1 was inviting public comments requesting the Office of
2 Management and Budget to approve the renewal of an
3 information approval request entitled, "Collection and
4 Transmission of Annual Appraisal Management Company
5 (AMC) Registry Fees." He stated they are requesting
6 extension of the existing regulation with written
7 comments due by August 4, 2020.

8 Mr. Rouse noted 12 CFR § 1102.402 establishes the
9 annual AMC registry fee for states that register and
10 supervise AMCs.

11 Mr. Rouse noted 12 CFR § 1102.403 requires AMC
12 registry fees to be collected and transmitted to the
13 ASC on an annual basis by states that register and
14 supervise AMCs.

15 Mr. Rouse referred to the second exposure draft
16 of proposed changes for the 2022-2023 edition of
17 USPAP.

18 Mr. Smeltzer discussed changes being proposed for
19 reporting standards for Standards Rules 2, 8, and 10.
20 He noted the proposal was to allow an appraiser to
21 label the appraisal an Appraisal Report or can say it
22 complies with Standards Rule 2-2(a) or it is a
23 Restricted Appraisal Report or complies with Standards
24 Rule 2-2(b).

25 Mr. Smeltzer noted an issue when people were

1 doing evaluations, especially with a Restricted
2 Appraisal Report, where it causes issues with some of
3 the clients who have different redo requirements and
4 underwriting requirements responsibility when there is
5 an Appraisal Report label on a report.

6 Mr. Smeltzer stated this circumvents the whole
7 thing because a label would not be added that says
8 Appraisal Report, but it would possibly comply with
9 the requirement of an Appraisal Report without ever
10 using the word Appraisal Report.

11 Mr. Smeltzer suggested taking the Restricted
12 Appraisal Report label off and putting on 2-2(b),
13 which says this would comply with all of the
14 requirements for a Restrictive Appraisal Report.

15 Mr. Smeltzer discussed issues with banks even
16 though it is an evaluation written to comply with the
17 Interagency and Appraisal and Evaluation Guidelines
18 and being presented in a Restricted Appraisal Report
19 format. He stated, as soon as Restricted Appraisal
20 Report was put on the report, the bank had a whole
21 different set of requirements depending on however
22 their auditors are looking at it.

23 Mr. Smeltzer noted banks want appraisers to be
24 able to provide evaluations and mentioned another
25 option by creating 2 new standards, 11 and 12,

1 developing an evaluation and reporting the results of
2 the evaluation to allow appraisers to comply with all
3 of the standards.

4 Chairman Pasquarella addressed his attendance at
5 the Appraisal Subcommittee Meeting and presentation
6 about a year ago. He mentioned a lot of the major
7 banks are accepting this terminology, where it was an
8 evaluation in the Restricted Report, but it seems not
9 all banks are and that was the problem.

10 Chairman Pasquarella noted difficulty with the
11 terminology in trying to accommodate the issues of
12 some banks that have this different set of standards
13 or guidelines they have to follow when the report is
14 labeled Appraisal Report.

15 Mr. Smeltzer noted the addition of verbiage to
16 the signature requirement by using an accepted method
17 of attestation signature (hand-written, electronic,
18 digital, et al.) or password.

19 Mr. Smeltzer discussed disclosure obligations in
20 the Scope of Work Rule, where the term "level of
21 inspection" may be added.

22 Mr. Smeltzer noted a few changes regarding
23 definitions and also noted small edits to improve
24 clarity of USPAP.

25

1 Report of Board Chairman - No Report

2 ***

3 [Martha H. Brown, Esquire, Secretary of the
4 Commonwealth designee, exited the meeting at
5 10:58 a.m.]

6 ***

7 [The Board recessed from 11:00 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.]

8 ***

9 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at
10 11:15 a.m. the Board entered into Executive Session
11 with Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, to have
12 attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of
13 conducting quasi-judicial deliberations. The Board
14 returned to open session at 12:20 p.m.]

15 ***

16 [John Ausherman, Professional Member, exited the
17 meeting at 12:18 p.m.]

18 ***

19 [Martha H. Brown, Esquire, Secretary of the
20 Commonwealth designee, reentered the meeting at
21 12:20 p.m.]

22 ***

23 MOTIONS

24 MR. ROUSE:

25 Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the

1 Sunshine Act, the Board entered into
2 executive session with Board counsel to
3 have attorney-client consultations and
4 for the purpose of conducting
5 quasi-judicial deliberations.

6 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

7 In executive session, we discussed
8 several cases. Item No. 1 is Case No.
9 19-70-013722.

10 MR. ROUSE:

11 I believe the Board would entertain a
12 motion to adopt the Consent Agreement at
13 19-70-013722.

14 Is there such a motion?

15 MR. SMELTZER:

16 I'll make the motion.

17 MR. LEHMAYER:

18 I'll second.

19 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

20 Any discussion? All in favor? Any
21 oppose?

22 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
23 name is Thomas Anthony Schatzman, Case No. 19-70-
24 013722.]

25

1 MR. ROUSE:

2 Regarding the Consent Agreement at Item
3 No. 2 of the agenda, Case No. 18-70-
4 000394, I believe the Board would
5 entertain a motion to adopt the
6 agreement.

7 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

8 I make that motion.

9 MR. ROUSE:

10 Is there a second?

11 MR. LEHMAYER:

12 I'll second.

13 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

14 Is there any discussion? All in favor?
15 Anyone oppose?

16 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
17 name is Jack Muehlhan, Case No. 18-70-000394.]

18 ***

19 MR. ROUSE:

20 The Consent Agreement at Item No. 3 on
21 the agenda at Case No. 19-70-016250, I
22 believe the Board would entertain a
23 motion to adopt the Consent Agreement.

24 Is there such a motion?

25 MR. WENTZEL:

1 So moved.

2 MR. LEHMAYER:

3 I second it.

4 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

5 Any discussion? All in favor? Any
6 oppose?

7 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
8 name is Jill R. Goodwin, Case No. 19-70-016250.]

9 ***

10 MR. ROUSE:

11 Regarding the Consent Agreement at Item
12 No. 4 on the agenda at Case No. 19-70-
13 015810, I believe the Board would
14 entertain a motion to adopt the Consent
15 Agreement.

16 Is there such a motion?

17 MR. SMELTZER:

18 So moved.

19 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

20 Second. Any discussion? All in favor
21 of this motion? Any oppose?

22 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
23 name is John R. Adams, Case No. 19-70-015810.]

24 ***

25 MR. ROUSE:

1 Regarding the Consent Agreement at Item
2 No. 5 on the agenda at Case No. 19-70-
3 017476, I believe the Board would
4 entertain a motion to adopt the Consent
5 Agreement.

6 Is there such a motion?

7 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

8 I'll make that motion.

9 MR. WENTZEL:

10 I'll second it.

11 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

12 Any discussion? All in favor? Anyone
13 oppose this motion?

14 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
15 name is Lyle Joseph Biddle, Case No. 19-70-017476.]

16 ***

17 MR. ROUSE:

18 Regarding the Consent Agreement at Item
19 No. 6 on the agenda at Case No. 20-70-
20 000037, I believe the Board would
21 entertain a motion to adopt the Consent
22 Agreement.

23 Is there such a motion?

24 MR. SMELTZER:

25 I'll make the motion.

1 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

2 I'll second it. Any discussion? All in
3 favor? Anyone oppose this motion?

4 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
5 name is Brian K. Davis, Case No. 20-70-000037.]

6 ***

7 MR. ROUSE:

8 The Consent Agreement at Item No. 7 on
9 the agenda is Case No. 19-70-01554, I
10 believe the Board would entertain a
11 motion to adopt the Consent Agreement.

12 Is there such a motion?

13 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

14 Jeff, that was you.

15 MR. WALTERS:

16 I'll make that motion.

17 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

18 Do I have a second?

19 MS. BROWN:

20 I'll second it.

21

22 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

23 Thank you Martha. Any discussion of
24 this motion? All in favor? Anyone
25 oppose?

1 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
2 name is Daniel Jon McVicker, Case No. 19-70-01554.]

3 ***

4 MR. ROUSE:

5 Regarding the proposed Adjudication and
6 Order in the matter of BPOA v. Steven J.
7 Artz dba Assessment Appeal Co.;
8 Assessment Appeal; and Lancaster
9 Assessment Appeal, Case No. 17-70-04438,
10 I believe the Board will entertain a
11 motion to direct Board counsel to
12 prepare and Adjudication and Order
13 consistent with the discussion in
14 executive session.

15 Is there such a motion?

16 MS. BROWN:

17 So moved.

18 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

19 Second. Any discussion? All in favor
20 of this motion? Anyone oppose?

21 [The motion carried unanimously.]

22 ***

23 MR. ROUSE:

24 Regarding the Reinstatement Petition in
25 the Matter of Juliette Angelique George,

1 Case No. 16-60-13041, at Item No. 12 on
2 the agenda, I believe the Board will
3 entertain a motion to direct Board
4 counsel to prepare an order consistent
5 with the discussion in executive
6 session.

7 Is there such a motion?

8 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

9 Mark, that was going to be yours.

10 MR. SMELTZER:

11 So moved.

12 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

13 Jeff, you going to second it?

14 MR. WALTERS:

15 Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

17 Is there any discussion of Mark's
18 motion? All in favor? Anyone oppose?

19 [The motion carried unanimously.]

20 ***

21 Report of Board Administrator - No Report

22 ***

23 Continuing Education Committee

24 [Mark Smeltzer, Professional Member, questioned
25 whether continuing education would be through virtual

1 education beyond June 30.

2 Ms. Weirich explained that providers would need
3 to send in a request because they are not
4 automatically being changed beyond June 30.

5 Ms. Weirich informed the Education Committee they
6 may be receiving approval requests in the future from
7 programs that have not been preapproved.]

8 ***

9 Correspondence

10 [Ronald Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed an
11 email from Bob Zogorski sent to the Board staff office
12 on June 22, 2020, informing the Board of general
13 appraiser scheduling problems concerning his daughter,
14 Katie. He stated PSI contacted Katie and was able to
15 schedule an exam for August with the assistance of
16 Ms. Weirich.

17 Mr. Rouse also commented that PSI was trying to
18 find an earlier date for her, possibly at another
19 site.

20 Ms. Weirich noted that PSI just opened an exam
21 site this week and are inundated with people wanting
22 to take the exam. She also noted they can take the
23 exam anywhere in Pennsylvania if individuals are
24 willing to travel.]

25 ***

1 Public Comment/Discussion

2 [Randy L. Waggoner, CPE, Assessors' Association of
3 Pennsylvania, referred to his email regarding concern
4 at the Assessors' Association, where several meetings
5 and opportunities to receive as many as 15 continuing
6 education hours have been canceled. He questioned
7 whether there had been any consideration of extending
8 the deadline from June 30, 2021, for folks to obtain
9 certification hours.

10 Mr. Smeltzer suggested checking with the
11 Appraiser Qualifications Board (AQB). He mentioned
12 the need to stay within their guidelines of a two-year
13 cycle. He stated AQB granted some state extensions
14 during this period but was uncertain of next year. He
15 agreed with the need for further discussion at the
16 next meeting but would contact AQB and the Appraisal
17 Subcommittee (ASB) to make sure the Board was staying
18 in line.

19 Mr. Smeltzer also suggested looking into virtual
20 education, possibly for assessors since they are not
21 going to have their in-person meeting and could have
22 that for their people as well.

23 Mr. Waggoner commented that he was not aware that
24 virtual education had been approved and would consider
25 that.

1 Ms. Weirich addressed virtual education
2 requirements, where programs previously approved for
3 the classroom would be approved for virtual. She
4 noted programs that have not been approved for the
5 classroom would need to be reviewed by the Board.]

6 ***

7 [Chairman Pasquarella thanked everyone for their
8 participation and service. He noted the next
9 scheduled Board meeting is August 6.]

10 ***

11 Adjournment

12 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

13 Do we have a motion to adjourn?

14 MR. SMELTZER:

15 I'll make the motion to adjourn.

16 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

17 Second?

18 MR. WALTERS:

19 Second.

20 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

21 Thank you very much. All in favor?

22 [The motion carried unanimously.]

23 ***

24 [There being no further business, the State Board of
25 Certified Real Estate Appraisers Meeting adjourned at

1 12:47 p.m.]

2

3

4

CERTIFICATE

5

6 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary
7 minutes of the State Board of Certified Real Estate
8 Appraisers meeting, was reduced to writing by me or
9 under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately
10 summarize the substance of the State Board of
11 Certified Real Estate Appraisers meeting.

12

13

14

15

Evan Bingaman,

16

Minute Clerk

17

Sargent's Court Reporting

18

Service, Inc.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED
REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
REFERENCE INDEX

June 25, 2020

	TIME	AGENDA
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	9:13	Official Call to Order
11		
12	9:14	Roll Call
13		
14	9:15	Introduction of Public Members
15		
16	9:18	Report of Prosecutorial Division
17		
18	9:40	Report of Board Counsel
19		
20	11:00	Recess
21	11:15	Return to Open Session
22		
23	11:15	Executive Session
24	12:20	Return to Open Session
25		
26	12:20	Motions
27		
28	12:21	Continuing Education Committee
29		
30	12:33	Correspondence
31		
32	12:35	Public Comment/Discussion
33		
34	12:47	Adjournment
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		