

MINUTES
ALABAMA REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BOARD
RSA UNION STREET
SUITE 370
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA
March 15, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Joseph Lundy (Chairman)
Mr. Kenneth D. Wallis, III (Vice-Chairman)
Mr. Fred Crochen
Mr. Joseph Lambert
Mrs. Dot Wood
Mrs. Cornelia Tisher
Mr. Mark Moody
Mr. Chester Mallory (departing at 11:20 a.m.)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Chris Pettey

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Lisa Brooks, Executive Director
Ms. Neva Conway, Legal Counsel
Mrs. Carolyn Greene, Executive Secretary
Mr. Sam Davis, Investigator

GUESTS PRESENT:

Mr. Vince Bennett, Certified Residential Appraiser, Birmingham, Alabama
Mr. Bill Frazer, Certified General Appraiser, LaFayette, Alabama
Mr. Todd Slyman, 2012 President of the Home Builders Association of Alabama
Mr. W. Russell Davis, Executive Vice President of the Home Builders Association of Alabama
Mr. Jason R. Reid, Regulatory Affairs Director of the Home Builders Association of Alabama

- 1.0 With quorum present Mr. Joseph Lundy, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m. Mrs. Carolyn Greene, Executive Secretary, recorded the minutes. The meeting was held in the 3rd Floor Conference Room, 100 North Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama. Prior notice of the meeting was posted on the Secretary of State's website on January 31, 2012 in accordance with the Alabama Open Meetings Act.
- 2.0 The meeting was opened with prayer by Mr. Crochen and followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Mr. Wallis.
- 3.0 Members present were Mr. Joseph Lundy, Mr. Fred Crochen, Mrs. Dot Wood, Mr. Kenneth Wallis III, Mrs. Cornelia Tisher, Mr. Joseph Lambert, Mr. Mark Moody and Mr. Chester Mallory. Member absent was Mr. Chris

Petty.

4.0 On motion by Mr. Lambert and second by Mr. Crochen, the regular minutes for January 19, 2011 were approved as written. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.0 Ms. Conway included the following for Board information:

- An Order and Motion to Continue in the case of Cleabron E. Pullum, AB-10-61, AB-10-62, AB-10-63 and AB-11-09. The case is being continued due to the illness of Mr. Joe Dixon's father. Mr. Dixon is a witness in the case.
- The Notice of Appearance of Ms. Kira Fonteneau, the new attorney for Mr. Don Manuel (AB-10-54) and Mr. David Farmer (AB-10-53).
- A Renewed Motion to Alter, Vacate or Amend Order in the case of Joshua Smith (CV-11-900009).
- The Motion to Dismiss Respondent's Renewed Motion to Alter, Vacate, or Amend Order in the case of Joshua Smith (CV-11-900009).
- The Voluntary Surrender of Mr. Ray Rossell.
- The Recommendation of the Hearing Officer in the case of Mr. Silas N. Williams (AB-09-63, AB-09-64, AB-09-65 and AB-09-66).

At this time Ms. Conway was excused for the Board to consider the recommendation.

At 8:40 a.m., on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to enter executive session. Those in favor were Mr. Lundy, Mr. Wallis, Mr. Crochen, Mrs. Tisher, Mrs. Wood, Mr. Moody, Mr. Mallory, and Mr. Lambert.

At 8:50 a.m., on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to re-enter regular session. Those in favor were Mr. Lundy, Mr. Wallis, Mr. Crochen, Mrs. Tisher, Mrs. Wood, Mr. Moody, Mr. Mallory, and Mr. Lambert.

With Mr. Wallis and Mr. Lundy recusing, on motion by Mrs. Wood and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to accept the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge in the case of Mr. Silas N. Williams (AB-09-63, AB-09-64, AB-09-65 and AB-09-66). Those in favor were Mr. Crochen, Mrs. Tisher, Mrs. Wood, Mr. Moody, Mr. Mallory and Mr. Lambert.

Ms. Conway discussed the following items:

- The Don Manuel lawsuit.
- The hearing scheduled for April 2, 2012, in AB-10-54, Mr. Don Manuel. Mr. Manuel's new attorney is requesting a continuance due to a previously scheduled jury trial on that date.

Mr. Vince Bennett addressed the Board regarding Complaint AB-10-51.

At 9:40 a.m. on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Lambert, the Board voted to enter Executive Session to deliberate on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law of the Administrative Law Judge on Complaint No. AB-10-51 (Alan Vincent Bennett). Those in favor were Mr. Lundy, Mr. Crochen, Mrs. Tisher, Mrs. Wood, Mr. Moody, Mr. Mallory, Mr. Wallis and Mr. Lambert. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

At 9:50 a.m. on motion by Mr. Lambert and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to re-enter Regular Session. Those in favor were Mr. Lundy, Mr. Crochen, Mrs. Tisher, Mrs. Wood, Mr. Moody, Mr. Mallory, Mr. Wallis and Mr. Lambert. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to adopt those Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law of the Administrative Law Judge, but to issue a Public Reprimand, require a 30-hour Basic Appraisal course with exam and 15-hour USPAP with exam to be completed within 12 months, an administrative fine of \$6000 to be paid within 3 years in equal quarterly increments by the 10th of the month the payment is due in, with the first payment due by July 10th, and to submit a monthly log, due by the 10th of the month, for 12 months. Any violations of this agreement will result in the re-instatement of the Administrative Law Judge's Recommendation. Those in favor were Mr. Lundy, Mr. Crochen, Mrs. Tisher, Mr. Moody, Mr. Lambert and Mr. Mallory. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

6.0 Mr. Wallis discussed the Board's Sunset Bill, which came out of committee with changes to allow a maximum of two private reprimands to be issued on an appraiser in his/her career.

Mr. Wallis discussed the Bill to eliminate the State Registered Real Property Appraiser and Licensed Real Property Appraiser classifications.

7.0 On motion by Mrs. Wood and second by Mrs. Tisher the following applications were voted on as listed. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

7.1 **Trainee Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** None.
Applications deferred: None. **Applications denied:** None.

Trainee Real Property Appraiser Experience Logs for Review: **Log approved:** Jason Finley, John Gibson, Amanda McDaniel and Nathan Smoker. **Logs deferred:** Russell Bagwell, Windy Briggs and Benjamin

Carpenter. **Logs denied:** None.

A letter will be mailed to all Trainee Real Property Appraisers requiring them to submit their experience logs when they have reached half of the points required for the classification they want to upgrade to.

7.2 **State Registered Real Property Appraiser application approved:** Marvin List Underwood. **Applications deferred:** Benjamin Carpenter and Greg Thompson. **Applications denied:** None.

7.3 **Licensed Real Property Appraiser application approved:** None. **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.4 **Certified Residential Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** John Gibson, Adam Lee Smith (Recip.)(GA), Nathan Smoker, and Jeremy Alan Williams (Recip.)(GA). **Application deferred:** Philip Brantley. **Applications denied:** None.

7.5 **Certified General Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** Gordia Ammons, Jr. (Recip.)(GA), Raphael Ammons (Recip.)(GA), Gary Charles Bratton (Recip.)(SC), Eric Glenn Durden (Recip.)(GA), Daniel T. Enslin, Jonathan D. Filson (Recip.)(GA), Michael A. Gibbs (Recip.)(GA), Jonathan C. Hurt (Recip.)(FL), Amanda McDaniel, Michael McDaniel, Gerard H. McDonough (Recip.)(GA), Fredric C. Minnich (Recip.)(GA), John Barrett Solomon (Recip.)(VA) and Phillip Daniel Wade (Recip.)(GA). **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.6 **Mentor applications approved:** None. **Application deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

The Board discussed the Certified Residential application of Mr. Philip Brantley. The Board will review all appraisals submitted for review and will ask Mr. Brantley and his Mentor, Mrs. Andrews to come before the Board at the May meeting to discuss the appraisals.

At this time, Mr. Todd Slyman, 2012 president of the Home Builders Association of Alabama, presented a letter to the Board and spoke to the Board regarding issues with property appraisers and appraisal practices as they relate to state licensing.

8.0 Mr. Mallory presented the Finance report and stated that the Board was 41% into Fiscal Year 2012 and 34% into budget expenditures. Mr. Mallory stated that there were no negative trends that could not be reconciled at this time.

On motion by Mr. Lambert and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to approve the Financial Report. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Investment report was included for Board information.

9.0 On motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Lambert, the following

education courses and instructor recommendations were approved, deferred, or denied as indicated. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

APPRAISAL INSTITUTE - CHICAGO

- (LIC) Quantitative Analysis - 33 Hours – Classroom
(Instructors: Ken Foltz and Marv Wolverton)
Both Course and Instructors Approved

- (CE) 2012-2013 7-hour National USPAP Update Equivalent Course - 7 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Craig Harrington)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

- (LIC) Advanced Income Capitalization - 33 Hours – Classroom
(Instructors: Harry Holzhauer and Steve Roach)
Both Course and Instructors Approved

- (LIC) Advanced Concepts & Case Studies - 38 Hours – Classroom
(Instructors: Kerry Jorgensen and Larry Wright)
Both Course and Instructors Approved

- (LIC) Advanced Market Analysis and Highest & Best Use - 33 Hours – Classroom
(Instructors: David Lennhoff and Robert Dunham)
Both Course and Instructors Approved

ALLIED BUSINESS SCHOOLS, INC.

- (CE) 2012-13 Equivalent 7-Hour National USPAP Update Course – 7 Hours – Online
(Instructors: Roy Bottger, Sam Martin)
Both Course and Instructors Approved

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF FARM MANAGERS AND RURAL APPRAISERS

- (CE) Appraisal Through the Eyes of the Reviewer – 7 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Mark Lewis)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

- (CE) 2012-2013 7-Hour National USPAP Course – 7 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Mark Lewis)
Instructor Approved

APPRAISAL UNIVERSITY

- (CE) 2012-2013 7-Hour USPAP Update Course – 7 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Timothy Detty)

Both Course and Instructor Approved

CAREER WEBSCHOOL

- (LIC) 2012-2013 15-Hour Equivalent USPAP Course – 15 Hours – Online
(Instructor: AM ‘Bud’ Black)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

INTERNATIONAL RIGHT OF WAY ASSOCIATION

- (CE) 104 – Standards of Practice for the ROW Professional – 8 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Ted Williams)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) 200 – Principles of Real Estate Negotiation – 16 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Ted Williams)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) 105 – Uniform Act Executive Summary – 8 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Clyde Johnson)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) 209 – Negotiating Effectively with a Diverse Clientele – 16 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Ted Williams)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) 803 – Eminent Domain Law Basics – 16 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Ted Williams)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) 205 – Bargaining Negotiations – 16 Hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Ted Williams)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

MCKISSOCK, LP

- (CE) Systems Built Housing: Advances in Housing for the New Millennium – 7 Hours – Classroom
(Instructors: Dan Bradley, Wally Czekalski, Ken Guilfoyle, Chuck Huntoon, Tracy Martin Richard McKissock, Larry McMillen, Steve Vehmeier, John Willey, Susanne Barlow and Paul Lorenzen)
Both Course and Instructors Approved
- (CE) Appraisal Applications of Regression Analysis – 7 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Dan Bradley)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

NAIFA

(CE) Fannie Mae Selling Guide-Appraisal Guidelines - 7 Hours – Classroom

(Instructor: Mike Orman)

Both Course and Instructor Approved

The motion carried by unanimous vote.

10.0

The Board reviewed the following disciplinary reports.

AB 10-48, 10-49, 10-50 On January 19, 2012, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order and issued a private reprimand to a Certified Residential Appraiser. The Licensee also agreed to pay an administrative fine of \$1375, surrendered his Mentor status and will take a 40 hour appraisal course which may not be claimed for continuing education status. **AB 10-48:** The violations in the commercial appraisal were: Licensee's work file contained little documentation and did not support the licensee's opinions and conclusions. Licensee did not research comparable information to the extent that the information was verified and a determination as to the comparable sales included anything more than real property. Licensee did not demonstrate any analyses that were applied to arrive at the opinion or conclusions expressed in this assignment. Licensee's failure to verify the comparable information and to determine to what extent if any that the comparable sale was for more than just the real property would not be in keeping with what the appraiser's peer's actions would be. By licensee failing to verify the comparable sales utilized in the Sales Comparison Approach resulted in the inclusion of the value of personal property in these sales prices and therefore resulted in the overstatement of the value of the subject properties real property value. By the licensee failing to properly analyze, document and apply a proper technique to estimate the accrued depreciation of the subject improvements in the Cost Approach resulted in a flawed estimate of value from this approach. Licensee did not research comparable information to the extent that the information was verified and a determination as to the comparable sales included anything more than real property. Licensee did not demonstrate any analyses that were applied to arrive at the opinion or conclusions expressed in this assignment. Licensee failed to verify and analyze the comparable land sales, and comparable improve sales, therefore the assignment results were not credible. Licensee failed to demonstrate an analyzes of the comparable sales to indicate a value conclusion, instead licensee just makes an unsupported statement of value. Licensee failed to demonstrate an analyzes of the comparable land sales to indicate a value conclusion, instead licensee just makes an unsupported statement of value. Licensee failed to demonstrate an analyzes of any recognized methods of estimating accrued depreciation, instead just makes an unsupported statement of the amount. The licensee did not provide sufficient information to enable the client and intended users to understand the rationale for the opinions and conclusions expressed in the report. Licensee failed to fully disclose his research and analyses of

comparable sales information but more important was not disclosing the lack of research and analyses into the verification of the comparables and what was included in those sales prices. The report contained no analysis reasoning to support his opinions and conclusions. **Violations: Ethics Rule-Record Keeping, Scope of Work Rule, Standard Rule 1-1(b), 1-2(h), 1-4(a), 1-4(b)(i), 1-4(b)(iii), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(vii), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP 2010-2011 Ed. AB 10-49** The violations in this commercial appraisal were that Licensee's work file contained very little and there was no support located in the work file for the licensee's opinions and conclusions. Licensee did not research comparable information to the extent that the information was verified and a determination as to the comparable sales included anything more than real property. Licensee did not demonstrate any analysis that was applied to arrive at the opinion or conclusions expressed in this assignment. Licensee's failure to verify the comparable information and to determine to what extent if any that the comparable sale was for more than just the real property would not be keeping with what the appraiser's peer's actions would be. By licensee failing to verify the comparable sales utilized in the Sales Comparison Approach resulted in the inclusion of the value of personal property in these sales prices and therefore resulted in the overstatement of the value of the subject properties real property value. By the licensee failing to properly analyze, document and apply a proper technique to estimate the accrued depreciation of the subject improvements in the Cost Approach resulted in a flawed estimate of value from this approach. Licensee did not research comparable information to the extent that the information was verified and a determination as to the comparable sales included anything more than real property. Licensee did not demonstrate any analyses that were applied to arrive at the opinion or conclusions expressed in this assignment. Licensee failed to verify and analyze the comparable land sales, and comparable improve sales, therefore the assignment results were not credible. Licensee failed to demonstrate an analyzes of the comparable sales to indicate a value conclusion, instead licensee just makes an unsupported statement of value. Licensee failed to demonstrate an analyzes of the comparable land sales to indicate a value conclusion, instead licensee just makes an unsupported statement of value. Licensee failed to demonstrate an analyzes of any recognized methods of estimating accrued depreciation, instead just makes an unsupported statement of the amount. The licensee did not provide sufficient information to enable the client and intended users to understand the rationale for the opinions and conclusions expressed in the report. Licensee failed to fully disclose his research and analyses of comparable sales information but more important was not disclosing the lack of research and analyses into the verification of the comparables and what was included in those sales prices. The licensee did not provide sufficient information to enable the client and intended users to understand the rationale for the opinions and conclusions expressed in the report. The report contained no analyses reasoning to support the licensee's opinions and conclusions. **Violations: Ethics Rule-Record Keeping, Scope of Work Rule, Standard Rule 1-1(b), 1-2(h), 1-4(a), 1-4(b)(i), 1-4(b)(iii), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(vii), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP 2010-2011 Ed. AB 10-50** The violations in this residential appraisal are that Licensee's

work file contained very little, there was no data on the comparable sales utilized and there was no support located in the work file for the licensee's opinions and conclusions. Comparable number 2 had 35 plus or minus acres of land according to the MLS and Tax records, yet the licensee stated it contained 28 acres. It was also noted on comparable 2 that the MLS did not report the square footage of the residence but the Tax records indicate the residence contained 1,428 square feet. The licensee reported the residence contained 1,700 square feet. It was also noted that comparable 2 was listed for sale on the MLS for \$184,500 but sold for \$189,300 or \$4,800 more than the list price, yet licensee made no adjustment or mention of this fact. Licensee did not demonstrate any analyses that were applied to arrive at the opinion of value. During the review of the report it was noted that the licensee states the house was built in 1955 or 51 years of age. The licensee states the house has an effective age of 20 years without any support or discussion for his estimate. The licensee utilized a price of \$15.00 per square foot to calculate the adjustment for differences in square footage of the subject compared to the comparables. This figure seems low and there was no support or discussion as to why or where this adjustment came from. The licensee made an adjustment on comparable 1 for finished basement based on \$10.00 per square foot. This adjustment seems low and the licensee has no support for this adjustment and there was no discussion of the adjustment. It was also noted that comparable 3 contained 1,200 square feet of unfinished basement and the licensee made no adjustment to this comparable for this difference. Licensee failed to develop an opinion of site value by an appropriate appraisal method or technique; instead licensee just makes an unsupported statement of value. Licensee failed to include significant storage/out buildings in the estimate of replacement cost of the improvements. The licensee did not provide sufficient information to enable the client and intended users to understand the rationale for the opinions and conclusions expressed in the report. The licensee did not provide sufficient information to enable the client and intended users to understand the rationale for the opinions and conclusions expressed in the report. The report contained no analyses reasoning to support the licensee's opinions and conclusions. **Violations: Ethics Rule-Record Keeping, Standard Rule 1-1(b), 1-2(h), 1-3(a), 1-4(a), 1-4(b)(i), 1-4(b)(iii), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP 2006-2007 Ed.**

AB 10-110, 10-111, 10-112 On January 19, 2012, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order from Robert J. Dow, R00085. Licensee surrendered his Mentor status. The violations in the three reports completed by the Dow's trainee were: AB 10-110 Licensee failed to demonstrate an understanding and correctly employ the sales comparison approach to value. Licensee utilized un-supported adjustments to the comparable sales and therefore did not produce a credible appraisal. Licensee failed to identify the intended use of the appraisal. The licensee's only notation was to state, "to establish value". The licensee utilized a preprinted form that stated the intended use of the appraisal "for a mortgage finance transaction". No other statements could be found as to the intended use of the appraisal. Subject property was in

the process of having an addition made and being renovated at the time of the assignment. Licensee did not include a hypothetical condition that the property was being appraised as completed but instead stated the property was appraised “as is”. Licensee estimated the effective age of a 72-year-old residence at 35 years. There was not enough detail in the description of the renovations to justify taking house from an actual age of 72 year to an effective age of 35 years. In the sales comparison approach to value, adjustments were made to comparable sales without any justification or explanation. There was not enough detail in the description of the renovations to justify taking this home from a 72-year-old home to an effective age of 35 years. There was no explication as to why the Cost and Income approaches to value were excluded. Subject property was in the process of having an addition made and being renovated at the time of the assignment. Licensee did not include a hypothetical condition that the property was being appraised as completed but instead stated the property was appraised “as is”. Licensee did not summarize the research and analyses performed nor the research and analysis not performed. The licensee used a preprinted form statement for his scope of work. **Violations: 1-1(a), 1-2(b), 1-2(g), 1-3(a), 2-1(a), 2-1(c), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP, 2008-2009 Ed.** AB 10-111 Licensee failed to demonstrate an understanding and correctly employ the sales comparison approach to value. Licensee utilized un-supported adjustments to the comparable sales and therefore did not produce a credible appraisal. In the sales comparison approach to value, adjustments were made to comparable sales without any justification or explanation. There was no explication as to why the Income approaches to value were excluded. Licensee did not summarize the research and analyses performed nor the research and analysis not performed. The licensee used a preprinted form statement for his scope of work. **Violations: 2-1(a), 2-1(c), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP, 2008-2009 Ed.** AB 10-112 Licensee failed to demonstrate an understanding and correctly employ the sales comparison approach to value. Licensee utilized un-supported adjustments to the comparable sales and therefore did not produce a credible appraisal. In the sales comparison approach to value, adjustments were made to comparable sales without any justification or explanation. There was no explication as to why the Income Approach is not used. Licensee did not summarize the research and analyses performed nor the research and analysis not performed. The licensee used a preprinted form statement for his scope of work. **Violations: 1-1(a), 2-1(a), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP, 2008-2009 Ed.**

Ms. Conway discussed with the Board the investigative status charts. She informed the Board 8 new complaints were received since the January 2012 Board meeting, 4 complaints were dismissed, and 6 complaints were settled, leaving a total of 111 open complaints.

- 6.2.1 The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-64**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee’s recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-66**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-68**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-70**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-72**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-74**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-82**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-84**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-88**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-97**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr.

Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this complaint. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-98**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-99**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-100**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this complaint. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-107**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-108**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-113**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-116**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-10-123**: With Mr. Lambert and Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-20**: With Mr. Wallis and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-21**: With Mr. Lundy and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-48**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-49**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-50**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-52 companion to AB-11-53**: With Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-53 companion to AB-11-52**: With Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-54**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-64**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board

voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-65**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-69**: With Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-70**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

12.0 The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-42**. With Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Lambert and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to approve this Consent Settlement Order. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-59 (Edgar Stewart McNeill Reeves)**. With Mr. Wallis recusing and Mr. Lambert, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to approve this Consent Settlement Order. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-102 (Michael A. Noble)**. With Mr. Wallis and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to approve this Consent Settlement Order. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-118 (Howard Thomas Richardson III)**. With Mr. Lundy and Mr. Lambert recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Crochen, the Board voted to approve this Consent Settlement Order. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-16, AB-10-119 and AB-11-36**. With Mr. Wallis, Mr. Lambert and Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mrs. Tisher, the Board voted to approve this Consent Settlement Order. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

13.0 The following reciprocal licenses were issued since last meeting: Gordia

Ammons, Jr. (Recip.)(GA), Raphael Ammons (Recip.)(GA), Gary Charley Bratton (Recip.)(SC), Eric Glenn Durden (Recip.)(GA), Jonathan D. Filson (Recip.)(GA), Michael A. Gibbs (Recip.)(GA), Jonathan C. Hurt (Recip.)(FL), Gerard H. McDonough (Recip.)(MO), Fredric Calhoun Minnich (Recip.)(GA), Adam Lee Smith (Recip.)(GA), John Bartlett Solomon (Recip.)(VA), Phillip Daniel Wade (Recip.)(GA) and Jeremy Alan Williams (Recip.)(GA).

14.0 The Temporary Permit report was provided to the Board for their information.

15.0 The Appraisal Management report was provided to the Board for their information.

16.0 The Board discussed the possibility of holding a make-up Trainee/Mentor Orientation at the July Board meeting.

Mrs. Brooks discussed the Statements of Economic Interest forms, included along with the instructions in the Board books, which are due by April 30, 2012.

17.0 Mr. Lundy discussed Board appointments and annual elections.

18.0 Mr. Wallis discussed an email from bank review appraiser Michael Kerr Arnold regarding upgrading his license. The Board tabled this issue until the May Board meeting.

Mr. Bill Frazer addressed the Board.

19.0 At 11:33 a.m., on motion by Mr. Lambert and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to adjourn. Motion carried by unanimous vote. The Board's tentative meeting schedule for the remainder of 2012 is May 17, July 19, September 20 and November 15, 2012 in the 3rd Floor Conference Room of the RSA Union Building, 100 North Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Greene
Executive Secretary

APPROVED: _____
Joseph Lundy, Chairman

