

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

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**

TIME: 10:30 A.M.

Held at
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
2601 North Third Street
One Penn Center, Board Room C
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Thursday, July 7, 2022

1 State Board of Certified
2 Real Estate Appraisers
3 July 7, 2022
4
5

6 BOARD MEMBERS:
7

8 Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional
9 Member
10 Jeffrey L. Walters, Vice Chairman, Professional
11 Member
12 Mark V. Smeltzer Sr., Secretary, Professional
13 Member
14 John D. Ausherman, Professional Member
15 William T. Stoerrle Jr., Professional Member
16 Michael McFarlane, Professional Member
17 Randy L. Waggoner, Professional Member
18 Martha H. Brown, Esquire, Secretary of the
19 Commonwealth designee - Absent
20 Merna T. Hoffman, Esquire, Deputy Attorney General,
21 Office of Attorney General Designee
22 Paul H. Wentzel Jr., Senior Legislative Director,
23 Department of Banking and Securities
24 Designee
25

26
27 BUREAU PERSONNEL:
28

29 Cynthia K. Montgomery, Esquire, Deputy Chief
30 Counsel, Counsel Division, Department of State
31 Dean F. Picarella, Esquire, Senior Board Counsel
32 Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel
33 Tyesha C. Miley, Esquire, Board Counsel
34 Ray Michalowski, Esquire, Senior Board Prosecution
35 Liaison
36 Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor
37 Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator
38 Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department of
39 State
40 Eli Yemzow, Legal Intern, Department of State
41

42
43 ALSO PRESENT:
44

45 Teresa Cochran, Executive Director, Assessors'
46 Association of Pennsylvania
47 Mark Kellerman, President, Assessors' Association
48 of Pennsylvania
49
50

1 ***

2 State Board of Certified

3 Real Estate Appraisers

4 July 7, 2022

5 ***

6 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act,
7 at 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.]

12 ***

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

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

24 ***

25 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State

1 Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was held on
2 Thursday, July 7, 2022. Joseph D. Pasquarella,
3 Chairman, Professional Member, officially called the
4 meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

5 ***

6 [Paul Wentzel, Paul H. Wentzel Jr., Senior
7 Legislative Director, Department of Banking and
8 Securities Designee, experienced technical
9 difficulties.]

10 ***

11 Roll Call

12 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional
13 Member, requested a roll call of Board members.]

14 ***

15 Approval of minutes of the May 26, 2022 meeting

16 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

17 The next item on the agenda is approval
18 of the minutes of the May 26, 2022
19 Board meeting. Any discussion?

20 MR. STOERRLE:

21 I make a motion to accept the minutes.

22 MR. AUSHERMAN:

23 I second the motion.

24 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

25 Any opposed? Roll call.

1

2

Joe Pasquarella, aye; Jeffrey Walters,

3

aye; Mark Smeltzer, aye; John

4

Ausherman, aye; William Stoerrle, aye;

5

Michael McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner,

6

aye; Merna Hoffman, aye.

7

[The motion carried unanimously.]

8

9

Report of Prosecutorial Division

10

[Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,

11

presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 20-70-

12

012413.

13

Chairman Pasquarella stated the Board members had

14

questions regarding the consent agreement and would

15

like to have a discussion concerning the educational

16

topic raised at the last meeting.

17

Mr. Ausherman requested information regarding how

18

prosecution arrived to the terms of the consent

19

agreement and whether there was a rebuttal from the

20

respondent related to the charges.

21

Mr. Fritsch explained that the terms are not

22

typical for Uniform Standards of Professional

23

Appraiser Practice (USPAP) violations. He stated the

24

appraiser's license is expired, and the suspension

25

reflects the fact that the appraiser may not have an

1 active license in the future, in which case the
2 suspension would last indefinitely, but that the
3 appraiser would also have the opportunity to work
4 again if they take the education and is why there is
5 no financial penalty. He noted there is nothing
6 attached in terms of a mitigation statement or
7 response and stands solely on the expert report.

8 Mr. Ausherman commented that the two-year
9 suspension seemed rather harsh and asked why no fine
10 was associated with the case.

11 Mr. Fritsch explained that the suspension is
12 really only six months because the appraiser would be
13 able to work if they take the courses, and a
14 financial penalty would be harsher for their
15 particular situation.

16 Mr. Smeltzer requested information as to why
17 there were references to the Appraisal Institute
18 requirements when they are not enforcing Appraisal
19 Institute requirements, especially if the person is
20 not associated with the Appraisal Institute. He
21 noted it was done on a Fannie Mae Form and understood
22 references to Fannie Mae requirements but felt USPAP
23 requirements should have been utilized.

24 Mr. Fritsch explained that the expert used more
25 of a global view of the negligence in preparing a

1 report and included USPAP, along with other
2 resources, and falls within the Real Estate
3 Appraisers Certification Act. He stated the Board
4 does not have to agree with everything in the expert
5 report but does to the extent that they support the
6 violations.

7 Mr. Smeltzer addressed the adjustments and agreed
8 with a lot of other things after looking over the
9 report but felt that the reason for disagreeing with
10 the \$5,000 air conditioning adjustment should have
11 been provided to support that because it is a
12 requirement in USPAP.

13 Mr. Fritsch informed Board members that the
14 issues would be brought to the attention of the
15 expert, along with review of their work. He
16 commented that the expert is relatively new and had
17 not produced a lot of work for the Board. He noted
18 always looking for new experts to cover new
19 geographic areas and not all of the expert reports
20 look the same.

21 Chairman Pasquarella commented that it would have
22 been satisfactory if the review appraiser would have
23 simply said there is no support for the specific
24 adjustment.

25 Mr. Smeltzer expressed concern, noting there is

1 no such thing as a typical adjustment because
2 adjustments are derived from the market. He noted
3 the appraiser should have supported their adjustment
4 of \$5,000 due to the extensive cost possibly of
5 changing a property that has hot water heat and no
6 ductwork to accommodate air conditioning.

7 Mr. Michalowski commented that the Board prefers
8 seeing consent agreements with the entire report from
9 the expert attached. He stated respondents do not
10 fully admit everything in the report is correct but
11 admit there was sufficient material in the report
12 that would cause the violations to be found or they
13 could go to a case where they had to file an order to
14 show cause.

15 Mr. Michalowski mentioned that some appraiser
16 experts go into great detail and others do not give
17 enough. He noted they provide each other with
18 feedback, but there is also a point where they are
19 crafting the expert report, which is inappropriate
20 and violates rules.

21 Mr. Michalowski noted trying to stay away from
22 permanent voluntary surrenders given the lack of
23 appraisers and the fact that people do change their
24 minds. He stated the penalty as negotiated takes
25 into account the fact that this respondent is not

1 working in the field but may want to come back in the
2 future and gives them an opportunity through remedial
3 education, where they are trading off a civil penalty
4 for suspension.

5 Mr. Michalowski explained that suspension and
6 probation may sound harsh but may be for the
7 appraiser's purposes. He stated all matters are
8 negotiated and mitigation statements are always
9 allowed in the document if they request those to be
10 there. He explained that negotiations are considered
11 outside the scope of the four corners of the
12 agreement and confidential and cannot go over every
13 point.

14 Mr. Michalowski mentioned things happen during
15 negotiations that are molded to what the Board has
16 accepted, along with utilizing the disciplinary
17 matrix the Appraisal Foundation created as a guide.
18 He also noted the importance of looking at the needs
19 and abilities of respondents to pay a penalty and
20 mold that penalty to their current life situation.
21 He stated the terms are odd in this case but is the
22 person's preference as to their penalty.

23 Mr. Michalowski further explained that the case
24 is actually a minimum six-month suspension, where the
25 appraiser could complete their remedial education,

1 provide proof, and within six months apply to the
2 Board for probationary status.]

3 MR. ROUSE:

4 Regarding the Consent Agreement at item
5 2 on the agenda at Case No. 20-70-
6 012413, I believe the Board would
7 entertain a motion to reject the
8 Consent Agreement.

9 Is there such a motion?

10 MR. AUSHERMAN:

11 I so move.

12 MR. ROUSE:

13 Is there a second?

14 MR. SMELTZER:

15 I'll second.

16 MR. ROUSE:

17 Any discussion? Roll call on the vote.

18

19 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Jeffrey Walters,
20 aye; Mark Smeltzer, aye; John
21 Ausherman, aye; William Stoerrle, aye;
22 Michael McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner,
23 aye; Merna Hoffman, aye; Paul Wentzel,
24 aye.

25 [The motion carried unanimously.]

1 ***

2 Report of Prosecutorial Division

3 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional
4 Member, noted prior Board discussion regarding
5 courses and requested prosecution address how the
6 courses are selected and whether multiple
7 organizations offer those courses as titled.

8 Mr. Michalowski stated the Appraisal Foundation
9 started developing corrective education courses about
10 six to eight years ago and currently have eight
11 courses. He noted they are strongly suggested to use
12 those courses when audited by the Appraisal
13 Subcommittee because they are courses specifically
14 designed by the foundation in connection with input
15 from state regulators and not for state continuing
16 education or qualifying credit.

17 Mr. Michalowski noted the Appraisal Foundation
18 contracted with one of the large education providers
19 and all of the courses are listed on their website.
20 He also noted qualifying courses are pretty much
21 offered by almost every provider offering appraisal
22 education.

23 Mr. Michalowski stated they try to work with the
24 respondents themselves when dealing with continuing
25 education courses, noting that some of those are now

1 being covered by corrective education courses.

2 Mr. Michalowski mentioned the importance of
3 covering the correct areas, course availability, and
4 looking at the syllabus, along with having a specific
5 course designation once agreed upon between both
6 parties.

7 Mr. Michalowski stated the details in a consent
8 agreement were negotiated, and a preferred provider
9 could be utilized if the courses offered cover the
10 specific subject matter areas. He noted that
11 coursework is typically suggested when an individual
12 receives a warning letter by utilizing specific
13 subject matter areas because that is not negotiated.

14 Mr. Michalowski noted taking the Board's
15 feedback into account and altering their warning
16 letter policy to not refer to a specific course other
17 than corrective action courses that are approved by
18 the Appraisal Foundation because they are
19 specifically designed to be corrective, rather than
20 qualifying or remedial.

21 Mr. Michalowski noted the eight Appraisal
22 Foundation corrective education courses, which are
23 not offered for state credit by the Appraisal
24 Foundation and are not continuing education (CE)
25 courses. He mentioned the ability to utilize a

1 provider an individual may like to use as long as the
2 course covers the subject area.

3 Chairman Pasquarella expressed a concern with
4 only giving a choice to use one provider, where an
5 individual may tend to just accept the courses
6 offered to just move on, rather than attempting to
7 find alternatives.

8 Mr. Michalowski stated courses are not forced on
9 anyone but sometimes individuals disagree that an
10 area in the report was violated and may want to do
11 less or more coursework. He noted not being tied to
12 any specific provider but that the field has been
13 narrowing with providers offering more than just the
14 very basics.

15 Mr. Michalowski mentioned trying to get away
16 from going back to just telling people to take the
17 15-hour USPAP because almost everybody has taken that
18 course but some people need it as a refresher. He
19 noted the Appraisal Foundation courses are offered
20 through a specific provider on the Appraisal
21 Foundation's website and offered to provide Mr. Rouse
22 with the link. He noted the Appraisal Foundation was
23 not doing a great job of providing and keeping track
24 of the courses and felt it would be more efficient
25 with a large provider.

1 Mr. Fritsch also mentioned that the courses are
2 not listed on the provider's website and can be
3 accessed by going to the Appraisal Foundation. He
4 noted that anyone who contacts them asking how to get
5 a particular course would be directed to the
6 Appraisal Foundation's website.

7 Mr. Smeltzer asked whether an individual who
8 does not have a preferred provider is given the list
9 of programs that are approved through the state that
10 would meet the requirements or whether a provider is
11 suggested.

12 Mr. Michalowski explained that they suggest
13 specific courses by looking at available and
14 qualifying courses and that nobody is pushed toward a
15 specific course or provider. He commented that the
16 Appraisal Foundation and some of the large providers
17 are providing smaller courses that are more targeted
18 because of pushback from people who did not like
19 taking a course that included things they did not
20 need.

21 Mr. Smeltzer asked whether Mr. Michalowski
22 received a list of all of the providers and courses
23 from Ms. Hemler and whether there are options for
24 people to take to meet the criteria.

25 Mr. Michalowski stated they have already

1 adjusted the warning letters and would talk with Ms.
2 Hemler about the list of available providers and
3 offer that with the consent agreement, along with
4 something that says if they have an equivalent course
5 to suggest it to them.

6 Mr. Michalowski addressed the difficulties in
7 going back and forth with a lot of negotiations,
8 where they are under the Appraisal Subcommittee's
9 requirement to have it done within a year, and
10 negotiation back and forth is going to potentially
11 cause them to be more noncompliant.

12 Chair Pasquarella requested Ms. Hemler send the
13 link to all of the Board members and thanked Mr.
14 Smeltzer for the topic. He also thanked Mr.
15 Michalowski for his thorough discussion of the topic.

16 Mr. Michalowski thanked the Board and believed
17 the concerns were legitimate. He mentioned being
18 more than appreciative of the subject matter and that
19 prosecution would do their best to address them.]

20 ***

21 Report of Board Counsel

22 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, informed
23 everyone that there have been recent scams and read a
24 scam alert statement, where the Bureau of
25 Professional and Occupational Affairs (BPOA) received

1 reports that persons pretending to be from a health-
2 related board are contacting licensees by phone and
3 mail about the status of their licenses.

4 Mr. Rouse noted scammers are altering information
5 on caller ID to appear to be from the Commonwealth of
6 Pennsylvania and threatening license suspension for
7 failure to act and falsely claiming involvement with
8 agencies, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation
9 (FBI) and the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA).

10 Mr. Rouse stated scammers are known to threaten
11 license suspension for failure to provide personal
12 information and provided reminders from BPOA
13 concerning contact and personal information for
14 licensees.

15 Mr. Rouse noted licensees would never be
16 contacted by BPOA by phone for payment. He reminded
17 everyone to not give personal or financial
18 information over the phone. He mentioned that those
19 who are the subject of an investigation or
20 disciplinary action will receive notice by certified
21 mail and/or personal service and are provided with a
22 contact name and phone number. He informed everyone
23 to contact their local police department or the
24 Pennsylvania State Police if they have been a victim
25 of the scam.

1 Chairman Pasquarella encouraged everyone to take
2 the scam seriously and to forward the scam alert
3 notice from the state to friends and colleagues.]

4

5 Regulations/Statute - Regulation 16A-7025 Fees
6 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, referred to
7 Regulation 16A-7025 regarding fees. He noted the
8 Board voted to release the regulation as an exposure
9 draft at the January meeting, which was released to
10 stakeholders on January 21, 2022.

11 Mr. Rouse stated the Board received no comments,
12 and it was rereleased again in March to extend time
13 for written comments and again the Board received no
14 comments.

15 Mr. Rouse noted the Board discussed making a
16 correction to the fee increases for initial AMC
17 applications to be consistent with the report
18 presented by the Bureau of Finance and Operations
19 (BFO), and the annex was corrected in the Appraisal
20 Management Company (AMC) increase area.

21 Mr. Rouse provided a copy of the annex and
22 preamble. He noted the preamble states the statutory
23 authority for establishing fees, basis for increasing
24 fees by a regulatory amendment, and a description of
25 the proposed regulatory amendment, including how the

1 cost of the application and biennial renewal fee
2 increases were determined. He noted a 16 percent
3 increase in biennial renewal fees would be enough to
4 stop the downward turn of Board expenses.

5 Mr. Rouse noted the next step would be for Board
6 counsel to complete the proposed regulatory packet by
7 drafting the Regulatory Analysis Form (RAF) after
8 approval of the annex and preamble.]

9

10 MR. ROUSE:

11 Regarding Regulation 16A-7025 at item 4
12 on the agenda, would the Board
13 entertain a motion to adopt the annex
14 and preamble and direct Board counsel
15 to continue with the regulatory
16 process?

17 Is there such a motion?

18 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

19 I'll make that motion.

20 MR. ROUSE:

21 Is there a second?

22 MR. STOERRLE:

23 Second.

24 MR. ROUSE:

25 Any discussion? Roll call on the vote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

[The motion carried unanimously.]

9

10 Regulations/Statute - Regulation 16A-7029 Distance

11 Education (Appraisers & CPEs)

12 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided an

13 update for Regulation 16A-7029 regarding distance

14 education. He noted discussion at the last meeting

15 regarding education providers and the Board member

16 request of additional amendments regarding education

17 providers.

18 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.31, provider

19 registration/appraisal courses, noting the addition

20 of subsection (a) and the words "classroom hour" are

21 deleted and replaced with "qualified education." He

22 also noted adding subsection (b), which states

23 education providers must obtain Board approval for

24 each course they wish to offer for qualifying

25 education or continuing education credit and pay the

1 applicable provider course application fee.

2 Mr. Rouse noted subsection (c) was added,
3 "Notwithstanding the course approval requirement in
4 subsection (d), the Board will accept course credit
5 hours from the Pennsylvania Board-approved education
6 provider if the appraiser course was approved by
7 another state appraiser regulatory agency. The
8 course must meet the requirements for qualifying
9 education under § 36.31.11(a)(1), (2), or (3);
10 § 36.12(e)(1), (2), and (3) regarding appraisal
11 classroom hours for certification as a general real
12 estate appraiser; § 36.12a(a)(1), (2), (3) regarding
13 licensure as an appraiser trainee; or § 36.42
14 regarding subject matter and sources of continuing
15 education and § 36.43 regarding distance education,
16 if applicable. "

17 Mr. Rouse noted all of the sections mean that
18 other state appraiser regulatory agencies are going
19 to have to comply with the Appraiser Qualifications
20 Board (AQB) requirements for course approval.

21 Mr. Rouse asked whether the Board wanted to vote
22 to release the regulation as an exposure draft to
23 stakeholders to review the document and provide
24 written comments. He mentioned the full process
25 would take about 18 months.]

1 MR. ROUSE:

2 Regarding Regulation 16A-7029 at item 5
3 on the agenda, would the Board
4 entertain a motion to release the
5 proposed annex as an exposure draft to
6 the stakeholders and place this matter
7 on the next Board agenda?

8 Is there such a motion?

9 MR. SMELTZER:

10 I so move.

11 MR. AUSERMAN:

12 I second.

13 MR. ROUSE:

14 Any other discussion on this matter?

15 [The Board discussed the motion.]

16 Roll call on the vote.

17

18 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Jeffrey Walters,
19 aye; Mark Smeltzer, aye; John
20 Auserman, aye; William Stoerrle, aye;
21 Michael McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner,
22 aye; Merna Hoffman, aye; Paul Wentzel,
23 aye.

24 [The motion carried unanimously.]

25

1 Regulations/Statute - Regulation 16A-7030 PAREA
2 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, referred to
3 Regulation 16A-7030 regarding the Practical
4 Applications of Real Estate Appraisal (PAREA) and
5 addressed amendments discussed at the last Board
6 meeting. He referred to § 36.1 definitions, noting
7 the definition of "mentor" was amended to state that
8 a mentor may be certified as a residential or general
9 real estate appraiser in any jurisdiction in the
10 United States and is consistent with the AQB. He
11 noted the definition of "PAREA" was also amended to
12 include computer-based learning, video gaming, video
13 tutorial, virtual assistant, and virtual reality
14 training. He mentioned it includes PAREA
15 participants have access to more than one mentor.

16 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.13 experience options
17 for preparation of appraisal reports/experience logs.
18 He stated the language regarding licensure as an
19 appraiser trainee was removed for PAREA participants
20 seeking certification as a residential real estate
21 appraiser. Since PAREA will count for 100% of the
22 experience requirement for certified residential real
23 estate appraiser candidates, such PAREA participants
24 do not need to be a licensed appraiser trainee.

25 Mr. Rouse referred to subsection (c), clarifying

1 that a PAREA participant seeking certification as a
2 residential real estate appraiser would have to
3 submit a certificate of PAREA program completion,
4 obtain licensure as an appraiser trainee, and meeting
5 the regular experience requirements in subsection (c)
6 and (d) of the regulation.

7 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.54(a) under the PAREA
8 section, where language regarding licensure as an
9 appraiser trainee again was removed from a PAREA
10 participant seeking certification as a residential
11 real estate appraiser and again corresponds with
12 clarification regarding the requirements for a
13 general real estate appraiser.

14 Mr. Rouse referred to § 36.54(b), which was
15 amended to clarify that a mentor may be state
16 certified in any jurisdiction as a residential or
17 general real estate appraiser.]

18 MR. ROUSE:

19 Regarding Regulation 16A-7030 PAREA at
20 item 6 on the agenda, I believe the
21 Board entertain a motion to release the
22 proposed annex as an exposure draft to
23 stakeholders and place this matter on
24 the next Board agenda.

25 Is there such a motion?

1 MR. AUSHERMAN:

2 I so move.

3 MR. ROUSE:

4 Is there a second?

5 MR. SMELTZER:

6 Second.

7 MR. ROUSE:

8 Any discussion? Roll call on the vote.

9

10 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Jeffrey Walters,
11 aye; Mark Smeltzer, aye; John
12 Ausherman, aye; William Stoerrle, aye;
13 Michael McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner,
14 aye; Merna Hoffman, aye; Paul Wentzel,
15 aye.

16 [The motion carried unanimously.]

17

18 Matters for Discussion - Tips

19 [Mark Smeltzer, Professional Member, addressed
20 discussion at the Association of Appraiser Regulatory
21 Officials (AARO) Conference regarding tips. He
22 explained that tips are referrals made to the Board
23 from Fannie Mae that are not registered as a formal
24 complaint but sent as a tip. He noted discussion at
25 the AARO Conference related to how states handle tips

1 and was asked by Lyle Radke from Fannie Mae about the
2 process in Pennsylvania.

3 Mr. Michalowski stated historically every
4 government or lending association has come up with
5 something similar, including what the Federal Housing
6 Association (FHA) was doing a couple of years ago,
7 where they would report things they thought were
8 problematic but redacted the appraiser's name and
9 address of the property.

10 Mr. Michalowski addressed the complaint process,
11 where complaints need to be written and can be taken
12 by the hotline if it is a consumer complaint but then
13 reduced to a writing. He noted that a complaint goes
14 through the Professional Compliance Office and is
15 reviewed as to whether or not a file should be
16 opened.

17 Mr. Michalowski explained that anything received
18 within their jurisdiction, including Fannie Mae, is
19 reviewed by him before anything is sent out for
20 investigation or review. He noted complaints are
21 looked at on a case-by-case basis and then open a
22 file if something is problematic and do an early
23 review. He mentioned receiving more consumer
24 complaints concerning valuation, which they are not
25 required to look at under the Appraisal Subcommittee

1 (ASC).

2 Mr. Michalowski mentioned looking at information
3 from Fannie Mae to see it if it was an ASC Standard 7
4 requirement for enforcement and then opens a file and
5 requests the appraiser file.

6 Mr. Smeltzer referred to discussion at the AARO
7 Conference from ASC, where documentation regarding
8 how complaints are handled is required even if a
9 formal complaint was not filed. He mentioned that
10 some of the other states did not process the
11 complaints any further than to say there was no
12 formal complaint filed and believed the Board to be
13 in a better position by reviewing those
14 individually.]

15 ***
16 Report of Board Chairman - No Report

17 ***
18 Report of Board Administrator - No Report

19 ***
20 Applications Committee - No Report

21 ***
22 Continuing Education Committee - No Report

23 ***
24 Public Comment/Discussion
25 [Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator,

1 provided an introduction of attendees.]

2 ***

3 Adjournment

4 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

5 Do I have a motion to adjourn today's
6 meeting?

7 MR. WENTZEL:

8 So moved.

9 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

10 Do I have a second?

11 MR. WALTERS:

12 I'll second.

13 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

14 All in favor of adjourning today's
15 meeting?

16 [The motion carried unanimously.]

17 ***

18 [There being no further business, the State Board of
19 Certified Real Estate Appraisers Meeting adjourned at
20 12:18 p.m.]

21 ***

22

23

24

25

26

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

CERTIFICATE

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



Cory Ruda,

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED
REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
REFERENCE INDEX

July 7, 2022

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