

**MINUTES**  
**ALABAMA REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BOARD**  
**RSA UNION STREET**  
**SUITE 370**  
**MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA**  
**May 17, 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  
Mr. Christopher Baker  
Mr. Dennis Key

**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  
Mr. Joe Dixon, Investigator

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Mr. Tom Layfield, Alabama Bankers Association

- 1.0 With quorum present Mr. Joseph Lundy, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 8:18 a.m. Mrs. Carolyn Greene, Executive Secretary, recorded the minutes. The meeting was held in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room, 100 North Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama. Prior notice of the meeting was posted on the Secretary of State's website on February 6, 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 Pettey.
- 4.0 On motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Moody, the regular minutes

for March 15, 2012 were approved as written. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

At this time Mr. Lundy presented Mr. Lambert with a Proclamation of Appreciation from Governor Bentley for his service to the Board. Mrs. Brooks expressed her gratitude to Mr. Lambert for his service and her pleasure in working with him during his tenure.

Ms. Conway conducted the swearing in ceremonies of new Board members Mr. Christopher Baker, replacing Mr. Dot Wood in District 6, Mr. Dennis Key, replacing Mr. Chris Pettey in District 4, and re-appointed Board members Mrs. Dot Wood, District 3, Mr. Chester Mallory, State-At-Large and Mr. Kenneth Wallis, III, District 2. Mrs. Brooks welcomed Mr. Baker and Mr. Key and told them that she looked forward to working with them.

5.0 Ms. Conway included the following for Board information:

- An Order in the Circuit Court of Jefferson County, in the judicial review in the case of “In the Matter of Donald W. Manuel, AB-08-131”. That Order dismisses Mr. Manuel’s claims for damages against the Real Estate Appraisers Board and against Mrs. Cornelia Tisher, Mr. Kenneth D. Wallis, III, Mr. Joseph Lambert, Mr. Christopher A. Pettey, Sr., Mr. Joseph T. Lundy, Mrs. Dot H. Wood, Mr. Frederick Crochen, and Mr. Samuel Davis, individually and in their official capacities, and remands AB-08-131 to the Alabama Real Estate Appraisers Board to enter an Order for a Private Reprimand and a \$600 Administrative Fine against Mr. Manuel.
- The Final Order from the Circuit Court of Randolph County, in Mr. Joshua Smith’s (AB-08-100) petition for judicial review. The Order dismisses the case against Mr. Smith. Ms. Conway informed the Board that an appeal has been filed to the Court of Civil Appeals.

6.0 Mr. Wallis discussed holding the Bill to eliminate the State Registered Real Property Appraiser and Licensed Real Property Appraiser classifications over to the next Legislative Session due to issues in the Legislature.

7.0 On motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Moody the following applications were voted on as listed. Mrs. Wood recused. Motion carried.

7.1 **Trainee Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** Thomas R. Chase, Crystal B. Daw and John K. Lewis. **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

**Trainee Real Property Appraiser Experience Logs for Review:** **Log approved:** Benjamin Carpenter, Windy Dobbs and Jason Roberts. **Logs deferred:** Russell Bagwell, Thomas F. Bradley, Leigh Anne Way and J.

W. Weatherly. **Logs denied:** None.

7.2 **State Registered Real Property Appraiser application approved:** Benjamin Carpenter, Jason Roberts and Greg Thompson. **Applications deferred:** Thomas F. Bradley. **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:** Philip Brantley, Evan T. Richardson (Recip.)(VA), and Jonathan M. Seither (Recip.)(FL). **Application deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.5 **Certified General Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** Greg W. Adams (Recip.)(GA), Amy Lynn Blackman (Recip.)(GA), Brian Lee Chandler (Recip.)(TX), Scott Wayne Hopewell (Recip.)(TX), Patrick Guy Laflamme (Recip.)(GA), H. Clarke Lewis (Recip.)(NY/GA), Jason Corey Lindsey (Recip.)(NC), and Jerome W. Witte, Jr., (Recip.)(TX). **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

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

At this time, Mr. Tom Layfield, Alabama Bankers Association, presented a letter to and addressed the Board regarding AMC Legislation issues that are of concern to the banking industry.

8.0 Mr. Mallory presented the Finance report and stated that the Board was 58% into Fiscal Year 2012 and 44% into budget expenditures. Mr. Mallory stated that there were no negative trends that could not be reconciled at this time.

On motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to approve the Financial Report. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Investment report was included for Board information.

At this time Mr. Lundy expressed the Board's condolences to Mr. Joe Dixon on the passing of his father. Mrs. Brooks stated that a donation to the American Cancer Society had been made in Mr. Dixon's father's name.

Mr. Lundy discussed purchasing iPads for the Board members and asked Mrs. Brooks to research the feasibility of such a purchase.

9.0 On motion by Mrs. Wood and second by Mr. Baker, the following education courses and instructor recommendations were approved, deferred, or denied as indicated. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

**AMERICAN SOCIETY OF FARM MANAGERS AND RURAL APPRAISERS**

- (LIC) Cost Approach for General Appraisers – Online – 30 – Online  
(Instructor: Howard Audsley)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**APPRAISAL INSTITUTE - CHICAGO**

- (LIC) Online 15 Hour National USPAP Equivalent Course - 15 Hours – Online  
(Instructor: Tom Kirby)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**
- (CE) Appraising the Appraisal: Appraisal Review – Residential - 7 Hours – Classroom  
(Instructor: Craig Harrington)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**
- (CE) Practical Regression Using Microsoft Excel - 14 Hours – Classroom  
(Instructor: John Urubeck)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**
- (CE) Marketability Studies: The Six-Step Process & Basic Applications - 7 Hours – Classroom  
(Instructor: Richard Parli)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**MCKISSOCK, LP**

- (CE) 2012-2013 National USPAP Update Equivalent – 7 Hours – Classroom  
(Instructors: Dan Bradley, Wally Czekalski, Ken Guilfoyle, Chuck Huntoon, Tracy Martin, Richard McKissock, Larry McMillen, Steve Vehmeier, John Willey, Susanne Barkalow and Paul Lorenzen)  
**Both Course and Instructors Approved**
- (LIC) Residential Report Writing and Case Studies – 15 Hours – Online  
(Instructor: Dan Bradley)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**
- (CE) Deriving and Supporting Adjustments – Live Webinar – 3 Hours – Online  
(Instructors: Dan Bradley, Tracy Martin, and Charles Huntoon)  
**Both Course and Instructors Approved**
- (CE) Intro to Complex Appraisal Assignments – Live Webinar – 5 Hours – Online  
(Instructors: Dan Bradley, Tracy Martin, and Charles Huntoon)  
**Both Course and Instructors Approved**

## **THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE**

(CE) Interactive Valuation Modeling & Case Studies #226 - 16 Hours –  
Classroom  
(Instructor: John Smithmyer)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

## **REQUESTS FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION CREDIT**

Kirk Epstein – AL IIb: Appraisal Manual (Commercial) – Auburn University  
Center for Governmental Services – 7 Hours  
**Credit Approved**

10.0 The Board reviewed the following disciplinary reports.

**AB 09-63; AB 09-64; AB 09-65; AB 09-66** On March 15, 2012, the Board adopted the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge and revoked the Certified Residential License R00282 of Silas N. Williams. Williams was also assessed an administrative fine of \$10,000. Williams did not attend the administrative hearing on the cases and had a prior discipline history.

**AB 10-51** On March 15, 2012, the Board entered an order after an administrative hearing and publicly reprimanded Alan Vincent Bennett, Certified Residential Appraiser R01148. Bennett was also assessed an administrative fine of \$6000, ordered to complete additional education and is on probation for one year. The violations are as follows: The market conditions of the subject property market area were not stable, contrary to the report. Statements included in the Respondent's report on page 1 under Neighborhood, in the Market Conditions section, were not true and were misleading. The Market Conditions Addendum generated by the investigator for the area within 0.5 mile proximity of the subject indicates a decreasing overall trend to the market instead of increasing as Respondent reported. The Respondent's work file was incomplete. It did not contain data, information, or documentation necessary to support the opinion of site value reported in the written report or the adjustments for site and gross living area in the sales comparison approach. Respondent failed to use the best comparable sales that were available at the time of the appraisal. Respondent used sales he obtained from Courthouse Retrieval System where the terms and conditions of the sale were not available. There were other sales available to the Respondent, through the local MLS that Respondent had access to, that would have resulted in a substantially different result. Respondent utilized an effective age of 25 years for a house that had been actual age of 56 years. Respondent had no support for this estimate of effective age other than the following statement: "The subject is of average construction and in average condition. Recent repairs include plumbing, HVAC and electrical upgrade, new paint & floor covering." The Respondent did not go into detail

in the report about these repairs. There nothing in the work file that explains what was done or how much was spent on the repairs. The Respondent does not state when these repairs were completed and if they were completed before the sale date 6/1/2009. Respondent did not verify the comparable sales utilized in the sales comparison approach with a party to the transaction. Respondent had no support for the opinion of site value set out in the report. County assessment values were used, which is not an appropriate appraisal method or technique to determine lot value. The Respondent did not analyze the agreement of sale, but only listed facts that were in the contract such as sales price, date of the contract, and sales concessions. There was not analysis as to the motivation of buyer or seller, no consideration of whether both parties were well informed or advised, no analysis of whether there was reasonable exposure to the open market or whether the price was influenced by special or creative financing. Respondent's report contained misleading information about the market conditions in the subject neighborhood that could not be supported with market data. The Respondent's written appraisal report did not contain a summary of the information analyzed or the reasoning that supports the Respondent's opinion and conclusion of site value. The Respondent's report did not contain information analyzed or the reasoning that supports the Respondent's opinion and conclusion for adjustments for site or gross living area in the sales comparison approach. **Violations: Ethics Rule of Conduct, Ethics Rule of Record Keeping, Standard Rule 1-1(a), 1-3(a), 1-4(a), 1-4(b)(I), 1-5(a), 2-1(a), 2-1(b), and 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP 2008-2009 Ed.**

**AB 10-16; AB 10-119; AB 11-36** On March 15, 2012 the Board accepted the voluntary surrender of Certified General License G00392 of Rankin R. Rossell in lieu of a hearing before the Board.

**AB 10-42** On March 15, 2012, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order and issued a private reprimand to a Certified Residential Appraiser. The licensee also agreed to complete a continuing education course on the appraisal of historic properties and pay a \$300 administrative fine. Licensee may not claim Continuing Education credit for the education course. The violations are as follows: Licensee fails to use the best comparable sales that were available at the time of the appraisal. Licensee used homes that were located in a historical district when the subject property was not located in such a district. The comparable sales had a wide dissimilar range of ages and dissimilar design. There were other sales available to the licensee that would have resulted in a substantially different result. Using comparable sales that were located in a historical district and not adjusting for that fact when other comparable sales were available is a substantial error of omission or commission that significantly affected the appraisal. Licensee utilized an effective age of one year for a residence with an actual age of 68 years. Licensee had no justification for this effective age estimate. It may be noted that the licensee did included photos of the interior of the residence that could indicate some remodeling and updates had taken place but no explanation as to what was done. The licensee adjusted

\$9,500.00 for absence of an in ground pool. The licensee has no support for the adjustment nor did the licensee offer any discussion the source of this adjustment. The licensee made no adjustment for age even though it was noted that comparable 1 was built in 1885, comparable 2 was built in 1872, comparable 3 was built in 2005 comparable 4 was built in 1904 and comparable 5 was built in 1958. The subject was reportedly built in 1940. Licensee's justification was "No adjustment were given to comps age difference used due to the opinion of the appraiser their effective age being similar to subjects effective age due to comps 1, 2 and 5 being total remodeled. Comps 3 is newer in age but effective age would also be similar to subject." The main structure of all the properties, the foundation, the framing, the roof rafters, floor joists, and exterior siding are all original and contribute a significant part to the replacement cost of each structure, therefore the effective ages of these properties can not be similar. The licensee valued the "As is" Value of site improvements at \$7,500. This value does not correspond with the \$9,500 adjustment in the sales comparison approach for just the swimming pool. It appears the swimming pool was not considered in the Cost Approach. 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: Standard Rules 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-3(a), 1-4(a), 1-4(b)(ii), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP, 2008 Ed.**

**AB 10-59** On March 15, 2012, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order for Edgar S. Reeves, T01588. Reeves agreed to pay a \$1000 administrative fine for appraising beyond the scope of his Mentor's license. The violations are: Licensee stated the 50-year site index for loblolly pine as 9-95 feet. The figure for the 50-year site index was 90-95 feet. Licensee included a comment between the charts on Table 2 that did not apply to the sales used in the charts. Licensee stated the contract date (mm/yy) as the date of sale in Comparable Sale #3 on Table #1 of the Sales Comparison Approach.

Licensee omitted the intended use of the appraisal report. Licensee failed to include Sale #3 in the comment that Sales 1, 2, 3 and 4 were involved with a Type A timber contract. Licensee stated the Cost Approach was not applicable and did not explain why. **Violations: Competency Rule, Standard Rule 2-1(a), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP, 2008 Ed.**

**AB 10-102** On March 15, 2012, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order for Michael A. Noble, R00743. Licensee agreed to complete a Board approved course on residential income producing property, which may not be used for CE credit. Licensee also agreed to pay a \$1750 administrative fine. The violations are: Licensee failed to prepare, develop and communicate an appraisal with sufficient research and analysis and failed to use develop the income approach necessary for credible assignment results for an income producing property.

Licensee's appraisal report failed to contain sufficient information, to allow the intended user to understand the work performed or not performed. Licensee prepared, developed and communicated a small residential (duplex) income property appraisal assignment on a Fannie Mae 1004/Freddie Mac 72 form, which the form was not designed for the reporting of a duplex rental property appraisal assignment. Licensee, in the Sales Comparison Approach, analyzed misstated elements of comparison and failed to state and analyze other elements of comparison. Licensee excluded the Income Approach, when sufficient information was available within the real estate market. Licensee failed to develop the Income Approach, Comparable Rental Data and Subject Rent Schedule. Licensee failed to provide and analyze sufficient information, within the Operating Income Statement, for the Operating Income Statement to be credible. Licensee failed to analyze the Subject's negative net cash flow from the Operating Income Statement as an adverse market condition for the Subject property. Licensee prepared, developed and communicated a small residential (duplex) income property appraisal assignment on a Fannie Mae 1004/Freddie Mac 72 form, which the form was not designed for the reporting of a duplex residential rental property appraisal assignment. Licensee excluded the Income Approach, when sufficient information was available within the real estate market. Licensee failed to develop the Income Approach, Comparable Rental Data and Subject Rent Schedule. Licensee failed to provide and analyze sufficient information, within the Operating Income Statement, for the Operating Income Statement to be credible. Licensee failed to analyze the Subject's negative net cash flow from the Operating Income Statement as an adverse market condition for the Subject property. Licensee stated the effective date of the appraisal as 7/24/2007 on URAR page 2 of 6 and then stated the effective date of the appraisal as 7/25/2007 on URAR page 6 of 6. In the Improvements/General Description section, Licensee indicated the Subject duplex was one (1) unit construction, when the Subject was two (2) unit construction. Licensee failed to report and analyze the leases/rental agreements of the tenant occupied property that was the subject of the assignment. Licensee failed to analyze the comparable rental data and potential earning capacity of the Subject property to estimate the gross income potential of the property or provide a reason for the lack of an analysis. Licensee failed to analyze comparable operating expense data to estimate the operating expenses of the property or provide a reason for the lack of an analysis. Licensee failed to analyze comparable data to estimate capitalization/ discount rates that may apply to the Subject property or provide a reason for the lack of an analysis. Licensee failed to analyze some of the expenses and reserves associated with the ownership of the Subject property or provide a reason for the lack of an analysis. Licensee failed to consider that the seller was a licensed real estate agent in Alabama and one of the purchasers (a broker) was a 50% equity purchaser. Licensee failed to reconcile the quality and quantity of data available and analyzed or not analyzed within the Sales Comparison Approach. The Income Approach was not employed when sufficient information was available. Licensee failed to include available data and use it to reach credible results. In the Subject/Neighborhood Name



section, Licensee stated the name of the recorded subdivision where the Subject is located. In the Neighborhood/Neighborhood Boundaries section, Licensee stated the boundaries of the actual neighborhood where the Subject is located. The neighborhood boundaries, as stated in the appraisal report, failed to reflect the neighborhood named in the appraisal report. *(The subdivision was a small section within the neighborhood described.)* In the Improvements/General Description/Units section, Licensee indicated the Subject was a one-unit in the check box when the Subject contained two units. In the Cost Approach/Amenities section of the dwelling cost, Licensee stated the amenities of Kitchen Equipment, Fireplace, Fans, Patio, Porch, and Deck. The comment was canned language that was not the actual list of amenities for the Subject. There was no fireplace, patio and deck as listed. Licensee provided the address of one unit of the duplex but failed to provide the address of the other unit of the duplex within the appraisal report. Licensee stated the effective date of the appraisal as 7/24/2007 on URAR page 2 of 6 and then stated the effective date of the appraisal as 7/25/2007 on URAR page 6 of 6. In the Subject/Owner of Public Record section, Licensee failed to provide the name of the owner of public record. In the Subject/Map Reference section, Licensee stated a map reference number but failed to provide the source of the map reference number that was stated. In the Subject/Offering information section, Licensee failed to provide the offering/list price. In the Neighborhood/Present Land Use %, Licensee reported a 5% other land use without a description of other. In the Site/Zoning Description section, Licensee reported the zoning description as Residential instead of Multi-Family Residential. In the Improvements/Exterior Description/Materials/Condition section, Licensee failed to provide the condition rating of the windows, storm sash and screens. In the Sales Comparison Approach-Garage/Carport section, Licensee stated Driveway as the elements of comparison for the garage/carport of the Subject and comparables. The term "driveway" is not descriptive of garage or carport. Licensee failed to provide an analysis of the garage/carport elements of comparison. Licensee reported the appraisal assignment on a URAR 1004 form, which did not provide the sufficient information needed to analyze a duplex property. Information for the Subject and comparables were not stated and analyzed such as the gross monthly rent, gross rent multiplier, price per unit, price per room, price per bedroom, unit breakdown (total rooms, bedrooms, baths) adjusted price per unit, adjusted price per room, adjusted price per bedroom, value per unit, value per room, value per gross building area, value per bedroom and square feet of gross living area per unit. In the Sales Comparison Approach/Prior Sale-Transfer section, Licensee failed to provide the data source used to verify the sale and transfer history of the comparables. In the Cost Approach/Support for the opinion of site value section, Licensee failed to provide support for the method used to develop the opinion of site value. In the Cost Approach/Comments section, Licensee made a comment, "Subject conforms to minimum acceptable property standards for HUD/VA." and failed to explain why the comment was in the appraisal report, when the assignment was not a HUD (FHA)/VA assignment. In the FIRREA/USPAP Addendum/Exposure Time/Marketing Time section,

Licensee indicated the Exposure Time and Marketing Time was shown on the URAR when only the Marketing Time was provided. Licensee failed to provide and analyze sufficient information, within the Operating Income Statement, for the Operating Income Statement to be credible. Licensee failed to provide the: Utilities Expense-Fuel oil & Fuel(other) (*no indication of owner or tenant paid*); Annual Income and Expense Projection for Next 12 months not provided: Less Vacancy/Rent Loss (*no information as to why no rent loss or vacancy*); Pest Control (*no pest control cost or reason for no allowance cost to owner*); Other Taxes or Licenses (*no information on no allowance cost for taxes, license to owner*); Casual Labor (*no information on no casual labor allowance cost to owner*); Interior Painting/Decoration (*no information on no painting/decoration cost allowance to owner*); Management Expenses (*no information on no management expense allowance to owner*); Supplies (*no information on no supplies allowance cost to owner*); Replacement Reserve Schedule; Water Heater(s) (*no reserve replacement cost provided*); Furnace(s) (*no reserve replacement cost provided*); Floor Covering (*no reserve replacement cost provided*); Operating Income Reconciliation; Negative Net Cash Flow (*A monthly negative cash flow of \$321 with no reconciliation of being an adverse market condition for the Subject or a reason provide of not being an adverse market condition for the Subject.*) Licensee failed to summarize sufficient information to identify the Subject property as a small residential (duplex) income property.

Licensee stated the effective date of the appraisal as 7/24/2007 on URAR page 2 of 6 and then stated the effective date of the appraisal as 7/25/2007 on URAR page 6 of 6.

Licensee failed to completely summarize the Scope of Work in preparing and developing an appraisal of a small residential (duplex) income property. Licensee failed to explain the reason for the exclusion of the Income Approach. Licensee indicated the highest and best use of the subject property as improved was the present use and was tenant occupied. Licensee failed to explain the present use was a two unit rental property and not a one unit as indicated in the appraisal report. **Violations: Scope of Work Rule, Standard Rules 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-2, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 2-1(a), 2-1(b), 2-2(b), USPAP, 2006 Ed.**

Ms. Conway discussed with the Board the investigative status charts. She informed the Board 11 new complaints were received since the January 2012 Board meeting, 30 complaints were dismissed, and 14 complaints were settled, leaving a total of 71 open complaints.

6.2.1 The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-01**: 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 issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-02**: With Mrs. Wood and Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Baker, 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-11-19**: With Mrs. Tisher and Mr. Lundy recusing, on motion by Mr. Moody and second by Mr. Mallory, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-29**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-31**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-32**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-37 companion to AB-11-55**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Moody and second by Mr. Baker, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-55 companion to AB-11-37**: With Mrs. Wood and Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Moody and second by Mr. Baker, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-44**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Moody and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-51**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-66**: On motion by Mr. Baker and second by Mr. Crochen, 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-11-67**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-68**: With Mrs. Wood 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 complaint. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-11-73**: With Mrs. Tisher recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to accept the Disciplinary Committee's recommendation that probable cause does exist and to set this case for hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-12-01**: 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 dismiss this complaint. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-12-04**: With Mrs. Wood 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 complaint. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-08-47, AB-08-104 and AB-11-10**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Moody, the Board voted to dismiss this complaint because the license has been revoked. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Request for Board Initiated Complaint **AB-12-16**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mrs. Tisher and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to open a formal investigation. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Request for Board Initiated Complaint **AB-12-17**: With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mrs. Tisher and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to open a formal investigation. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Request for Board Initiated Complaint **AB-12-18**:

With Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mrs. Tisher and second by Mr. Wallis, the Board voted to open a formal investigation. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

- 12.0 The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-53 (David Andrew Farmer) companion to AB-10-54**. With Mr. Lundy and Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Moody and second by Mr. Baker, the Board voted to approve this Consent Settlement Order. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Consent Settlement Order on **AB-10-54 (Donald W. Manuel) companion to AB-10-53**. With Mr. Lundy and Mrs. Wood recusing, on motion by Mr. Moody and second by Mr. Baker, 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: Greg W. Adams (Recip.)(GA), Amy Lynn Blackman (Recip.)(GA), Brian Lee Chandler (Recip.)(TX), Scott Wayne Hopewell (Recip.)(TX), Patrick Guy Laflamme (Recip.)(GA), H. Clarke Lewis (Recip.)(NY/GA), Jason Corey Lindsey (Recip.)(NC), Evan T. Richardson (Recip.)(VA), Jonathan Miles Seither (Recip.)(FL), and Jerome Wayne Witte, Jr. (Recip.)(TX).

- 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 Mrs. Brooks discussed the following:

- A request from Ms. Melanie Housh for an experience point determination. On motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to grant experience credit as follows: 5 points for the mobile home park in Oxford (SUBLOT); and 5 points for the RV resort on Smith Lake (SUBLOT). Motion carried by unanimous vote.
- A request from Mr. Phillip Parmer for an experience point determination. On motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mrs. Wood, the Board voted to grant experience credit as follows: 3 points (SPEC) for the Appraisal Studio, Hale County Road #16 catfish pond appraisal; and 4 points (ACRE3 – 3 points and RES1 – 1 point for the Appraisal Studio, 571 Duncan Loop Road appraisal. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

- 17.0 Mr. Wallis discussed experience points granted for review appraisals.

- 18.0 There was no new business to discuss.

- 19.0 At 10:59 a.m., on motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Baker, the

Board voted to adjourn. Motion carried by unanimous vote. The Board's tentative meeting schedule for the remainder of 2012 is July 12, September 20 and November 15, 2012 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room of the RSA Union Building, 100 North Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Greene  
Executive Secretary

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Joseph Lundy, Chairman**