

MINUTES
ALABAMA REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BOARD
RSA UNION STREET
SUITE 370
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA
November 21, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Kenneth D. Wallis, III
Mr. Joseph Lundy (Acting Chairman)
Mr. Fred Crochen
Mr. Chester Mallory
Mr. Dennis Key

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mrs. Dot Wood (Chairman)
Mr. Christopher Baker (Vice-Chairman)
Mr. Edmond G. Eslava, III
Mr. Mark Moody

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:

Ms. Penny Nichols, Certified Residential Real Property Appraiser, Deatsville, AL

1.0 With quorum present Mrs. Lisa Brooks, Executive Director, called the meeting to order at 8:30 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 December 21, 2012 in accordance with the Alabama Open Meetings Act. The location of the meeting was updated on the Secretary of State's website on September 20, 2013 in accordance with the Alabama Open Meetings Act.

2.0 The meeting was opened with prayer, led by Mr. Crochen, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Mr. Wallis.

On motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Key, the Board voted Mr. Lundy Acting Chairman for the meeting in the absence of Mrs. Wood and Mr. Baker. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

3.0 Members present were Mr. Kenneth Wallis, III, Mr. Joseph Lundy, Mr. Fred Crochen, Mr. Dennis Key and Mr. Chester Mallory. Members absent were Mrs. Dot Wood, Mr. Mark Moody, Mr. Edmond G. Eslava, III and Mr. Chris Baker.

Mr. Lundy welcomed the guest present and asked Board Members to introduce themselves.

4.0 On motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Crochen, the regular minutes for September 19, 2013 were approved as written. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.0 Ms. Conway discussed 56-CV-2011-900009.00 (Joshua M. Smith V. Alabama Real Estate Appraisers Board) with the Board. Ms. Conway stated that this case is on appeal for the second time and that she has no news to report on it at this time.

6.0 Mr. Wallis discussed pre-filing a Bill in both the House and Senate in the next Legislative Session to add language to the law requiring background checks on all applicants for licensure. Ms. Conway is working on amendments to the language to the Bill that was introduced, but did not pass, in the last Legislative Session. Mr. Wallis has contacted Senator Dick Brewbaker for sponsorship of the Bill in the Senate. Mr. Key can contact a Legislator if necessary. Mr. Mallory and Mr. Wallis will work together to find sponsors for the Bill in the House.

Administrative Rule 780-X-6 (Qualifying Experience) was presented for permanent adoption by the Board and Ms. Conway asked the Board to approve filing for final adoption of the rules as published in the Administrative Monthly. Mr. Wallis moved for final adoption of the rules as published. Mr. Crochen seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

7.0 On motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Wallis the following applications were voted on as listed. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

7.1 **Trainee Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** John F. Blaha, Michael Bayne Dunaway, William Thaddeus Ivey, Paul Christopher Jones, John Scott Lightfoot, Sarah Frances Paulk, Nathan Joshua Wallace and Kristine Burns Williams. **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

Trainee Real Property Appraiser Experience Logs for Review: **Logs approved:** Robert McGough, Larry Moses, Richard Muller, James O'Neil and Randy Smyth. **Logs deferred:** Jonathan Entrekin, Brent Franklin, Ashley Joseph, John Kenneth Lewis and Leah Pryor. **Logs denied:** None.

7.2 **State Registered Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** None. **Application deferred:** None. **Application denied:** None.

7.3 **Licensed Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** Patrick C. Richardson (Recip.)(GA). **Application deferred:** Paul Shiver. **Applications denied:** None.

7.4 **Certified Residential Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** Ann Christine Carol (Recip.)(OH), Julie Frazier (Recip.)(MS), Joshua Chet Kuhn (Recip.)(OH), Robert MacArthur Paschal (Recip.)(LA), Gloria Ann Truemper (Recip.)(IL). **Application deferred:** Susan Darlene Daugherty. **Applications denied:** None.

7.5 **Certified General Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** Mary Ann Barnett (Recip.)(TX), Nicholas Alexander Barwig (Recip.)(GA), Amy Lynn Blackman (Recip.)(GA), Daniel Patrick Carlson (Recip.)(GA), Stephen Frederic Crane (Recip.)(LA), Philip Joseph Cusmano (Recip.)(FL), Marie Shumway Gasner (Recip.)(GA), Benjamin Wray Gregg (Recip.)(NV), Bradford Lynn Johnson (Recip.)(FL), Aaron Keith Kennedy (Recip.)(TN), Daniel A. Lincoln, Joseph Neil Parker (Recip.)(MS), Kenneth Paul Riggs, Jr. (Recip.)(IA), Cheryl Lynn Scott (Recip.)(FL), Tommy E. Thompson, Jr. (Recip.)(GA), Scott L. Twillmann (Recip.)(NC) and Raymond E. Veal (Recip.)(FL). **Application deferred:** Richard Smith. **Applications denied:** None.

7.6 **Mentor applications approved:** Joel Beasley, Lori Kaiser, Randall Kyles, Christopher D. Looney, Joseph T. Lundy and Summer Maples. **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

8.0 Mr. Lundy presented the Finance report and stated that the Board was 8% into Fiscal Year 2014 and 10% into budget expenditures. Mr. Lundy stated that there were no negative trends that could not be reconciled at this time.

On motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Key, 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. Crochen, the following education courses and instructor recommendations were approved, deferred, or denied as indicated. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

APPRAISAL INSTITUTE – ALABAMA CHAPTER

(CE) 2014-2015 7 Hour National USPAP Update Course – 7 hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Mark Smeltzer)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

(CE) UAD Aftereffects: Efficiency vs. Obligation – 7 hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Mark Smeltzer)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

APPRAISAL INSTITUTE – CHICAGO CHAPTER

- (CE) 2014-2015 7 Hour National USPAP Update Course – 7 hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Thomas Kirby)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (LIC) 2014-2015 15 Hour National USPAP Course - 15 hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Thomas Kirby)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) Unraveling the Mystery of Fannie Mae Appraisal – 4 hours – Classroom
(Instructor: John Underwood)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

DWELLWORKS RESIDENTIAL SERVICES, LLC

- (CE) Fundamentals of Relocation Appraising – 7 Hours – Online
(Instructors: Jody Scannell and Alvin Wagner)
Both Course and Instructors Approved

MCKISSOCK, LP

- (CE) 2014-2015 7-Hour National USPAP Update Course – 7 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Dan Bradley)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) The Income Approach – 6 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Alan Simmons)
Both Course and Instructor Approved
- (CE) National USPAP Update 2014-2015 – 7 Hours – Classroom
(Instructors: Dan Bradley, Wally Czekalski, Chuck Huntoon, Tracy Martin, John Smithmyer, Amelia Brown, Ken Guilfoyle, Larry McMillen, Steve Vehmeier, Susanne Barkalow and Paul Lorenzen)
Both Course and Instructors Approved
- (CE) The Green Guide to Appraising – Live Webinar – 7 Hours – Online
(Instructors: Dan Bradley, Tracey Martin and Rob McClelland)
Both Course and Instructors Approved
- (CE) Introduction to Complex Appraisal Assignments – Live Webinar – 5 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Robert McClelland)
Instructor Approved

(CE) Deriving and Supporting Adjustments – Live Webinar – 3 Hours – Online
(Instructor: Robert McClelland)
Instructor Approved

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF FARM MANAGERS AND RURAL APPRAISERS

(CE) 2014-2015 7 Hour National USPAP Update Course – 7 hours – Classroom
(Instructor: Mark Lewis)
Both Course and Instructor Approved

REQUEST FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION CREDIT

Mrs. Brooks discussed a request from Mr. Chris Jones for credit for attending the International Association of Accessing Officers course Income Approach to Valuation from January 28, 2013 through February 1, 2013. On motion by Mr. Crochen and second by Mr. Key, the Board voted to grant 7 hours continuing education credit to Mr. Jones. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Education Approval Process discussion was deferred until the January, 2014 meeting.

10.0

The Board reviewed the following disciplinary reports.

AB-10-12 – On September 19, 2013, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with a Certified Residential Appraiser where the Licensee agreed to a private reprimand, an administrative fine of \$2835 to the Board, completion a 15 hour USPAP course and a 15 hour sales comparison course and six months probation. The Licensee surrendered his Mentor status. The violations in the report are as follow: Licensee used and analyzed comparable sales from superior subdivisions/developments without analyzing the differences in elements of comparison between the Subject and the sales used as comparables within the appraisal report. Licensee failed to report or analyze sales available from within the subdivision/ development where the Subject is located in the Sales Comparison Analysis Approach of the appraisal report. Licensee failed to state a reason for the exclusion. Licensee failed to state the analysis (market adjustment) for the difference in the actual age of the Subject and comparables or state a reason for the lack of an adjustment for actual age in the Sales Comparison Analysis Approach. Licensee made a +\$12,500 adjustment for the absence of a fence and pool for Comparable #1 in the Sales Comparison Analysis and according to the stated data source (MLS), the Comparable is fenced and has a pool. The adjustment for the pool and fence was not supported. Licensee failed to report and analyze a lake view, water frontage and

private pier for Comparable #3 in the Sales Comparison Analysis. Licensee adjusted Comparable #3 for a fence, which was not supported by the stated data source (MLS). Licensee analyzed sales from superior priced subdivisions/developments as comparable sales in the Sales Comparison Analysis Approach. Licensee failed to state the analysis of the different elements of comparison between the Subject and the comparable sales used within the appraisal report. Licensee indicated in the Subject section of the appraisal report, the Subject had not been offered for sale or sold within the twelve months prior to the effective date of the appraisal. The Subject property was offered and sold within the prior twelve months. Licensee stated the Zoning and Zoning Description as SR-1 Single Family, when the Subject is located in an unincorporated area with no zoning. Licensee stated "None" for gutters and downspouts in the Improvements section of the appraisal report, when the home had partial gutters and downspouts. Licensee failed to accurately state the address of Comparable #1 in the Sales Comparison Analysis and Comparable Photo Addendum. An accurate address would have been obtained by a diligent inspection of the comparable. Licensee stated the city/zip code for the Subject and Comparable #3 as the same city/zip code, when Comparable #3 was located within a different city/zip code. Licensee stated a prior date of sale for the Subject that was not accurate and also stated one amount for the sale price in the grid of prior sale information with a different amount for the sale price in the analysis of the prior sale. Licensee stated the data source for Comparable #4 as MLS Closed and then stated the comparable was a pending sale. The accurate data source would be MLS Pending or MLS. Licensee stated a date of sale of Comparable #4 as 02/01/2007, when the comparable had not sold (pending sale). Licensee indicated the research **did not** reveal any prior sales or transfers of the subject property for the three years prior to the effective date of the appraisal and then stated a prior sale in the prior sales history grid.

Licensee failed to provide sufficient information, for the intended user to understand the effective age of an average condition home built in 1996 and appraised in 2007 would have an effective age of 3-5 years. Licensee failed to provide the complete list of verification sources in the grid of the Sales Comparison Analysis. Licensee failed to state the complete address of Comparable #2, within the appraisal report. Licensee failed to provide information about the sunroom's square footage being included in the GLA of Comparable #4. Comparable #1 & #3 were less than 1/3 of the Subject's actual age. Comparable #2 was 1/10 of the actual age of the Subject. Licensee failed to state a reason for the lack of an adjustment for the difference in actual age between the Subject and comparables. Licensee stated a comment in the Summary of Sales Comparison Approach, "Comparable 3 previously had an incorrect fence/pool adjustment. The correct \$10,000 adjustment amount is applied to this report." The appraiser did not provide a reason or information, within the appraisal report, to explain why the comment was stated in the summary. Licensee failed to provide support/information (actual method used) for the opinion of site value used in the Cost Approach. Licensee failed to include the Alabama certification as

required by the Alabama Real Estate Appraisers Act.

Violation: Standards Rules 1-1(b), 1-2(h), 1-4(a), 2-1(a), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(vii), USPAP, 2006 Edition.

AB 12-05 On September 19, 2013, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with a Certified Residential Appraiser where the Licensee agreed to a private reprimand and an administrative fine of \$600 to the Board. The violations in the report are as follows: The subject condition is reported and analyzed as C4, "The improvements feature some minor deferred maintenance and physical deterioration due to normal wear and tear. The dwelling has been adequately maintained and requires only minimal repairs to building components/mechanical systems and cosmetic repairs. All major building components have been adequately maintained and are functionally adequate." Physical inspection of the subject thirteen (13) days after the date of the appraisal show several areas of rotted wood and peeling paint. It is unknown if the rotted wood is a result of water damage or termite infestation. It is impossible to determine if repair would be cosmetic only without further inspection. The house was built in 1940 according to tax records. Licensee estimated an effective age of 13-15 years. The physical deficiencies of the rotted wood, peeling paint and poor condition of a portion of the metal roof do not support the effective age. Licensee's estimate of accrued depreciation is not credible because remaining economic life based on an effective age of 13-15 years. Considering the condition of the multiple areas of rotted wood of unknown origin and other unreported items of deferred maintenance, the accrued depreciation applied is not credible. Licensee made numerous references to the house having a concrete slab foundation when a crawl space was reported on page 1 of the URAR. The photos in the Photo Addendum were mislabeled. A photo of the rear of the home is labeled as the front of the home and a photo of the workshop is labeled the rear of the home.
Violation: Standards Rules 1-1(c), 2-1(a), USPAP, 2010-2011 Edition.

AB 12-26 On September 19, 2013, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with Certified Residential Appraiser Reuben Bullock, R01155, where the Licensee agreed to pay an administrative fine of \$875 to the Board. The violations in the report are as follows: In the Sales Comparison Approach, Licensee failed to list and analyze the sales concessions reported by the data source. In the Cost Approach, Licensee failed to analyze the cost of the appliances reported in the Improvement section in the total estimate of cost-new. Licensee chose a mortgage lending report form for a report the client intended to use in divorce litigation. Licensee stated the intended use for divorce litigation but did not strike out all the references in the preprinted form to mortgage lending. Licensee did not strike the mortgage lending terminology and provisions from the preprinted form. Licensee provided comments that insinuated membership in the Appraisal Institute when Licensee was not a member. Licensee did not analyze the sales concessions for Comparable #1, Comparable #2 and Comparable #3. In the Neighborhood/Neighborhood Boundaries section, Licensee described a neighborhood that failed to include the subject location. In the Summary

of Sales Comparison Approach comments, Licensee stated Comparable #1 was the closest in size to the Subject when Comparable #3 was the closest. In the Additional Comments section, Licensee stated the summary appraisal report was prepared under Standard Rule 2-2(a) instead of 2-2(b). In the Present Land Use %/Other section, Licensee failed to provide information as to what the 15% other land use was. In the Sales Comparison Approach/Comparable #1, Comparable #2 and Comparable #3/Concessions sections, Licensee failed to state the concessions and analyze the concessions. Licensee failed to provide support/data of the information used to develop the opinion of site value in the Cost Approach. **Violation: Standards Rules 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-2(b), 1-4(a), 2-1(a), 2-1(b), USPAP, 2012-2013 Edition.**

AB 12-55 On September 19, 2013, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with a Certified Residential Appraiser where the Licensee agreed to a private reprimand, an administrative fine of \$2,500 to the Board. Licensee surrendered his Mentor status. The violations in the report are as follows: Licensee certified that he performed a complete visual inspection of the interior of the Subject property, when Licensee did not perform the interior inspection. Licensee provided a Scope of Work, which included a complete visual inspection of the interior of the Subject property that Licensee did not perform. Licensee certified that he did not knowingly withhold any significant information from the appraisal report and to the best of Licensee's knowledge, all statements and information provided within the appraisal report were true and correct. Licensee withheld significant information from the lender/client in reporting that he performed the interior inspection when Licensee knowingly did not perform an interior inspection of the Subject property. Subject property is located within a planned development and comparables were located inside and outside of planned developments. Licensee failed to analyze the developments and all the amenities for the Subject and comparables. Licensee failed to completely identify all the characteristics and attributes of subject property located within a planned development. Licensee reported the streets were public, when the streets were private. Licensee failed to identify the restrictive covenants associated with the planned development. In the Additional Comments sections, the trainee appraiser's contributions to the appraisal assignment were not clear. Licensee used the term "and/or" several times in the contributions, which resulted in the comment being unclear what the trainee appraiser contributed. Licensee failed to provide the complete dimensions of the Subject property; failed to provide an analysis of the HOA fees and development amenities of the Subject and comparables that were located within a PUD; provided information the site value is based on recent land sales in and/or near the subject market area and failed to provide the supporting data/information used to arrive at the opinion of site value; provided a comment explaining exposure time with a reference to 2010-2011 USPAP, when the report was in 2012; provided comparable photos that were MLS photos and not photos actually taken by Licensee and failed to disclose the source of the comparable photos. Licensee failed to explain the reason the Income Approach was not applicable and excluded from the appraisal assignment. **Violation: Ethics Rule Conduct,**

Standards Rules 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-2(e), 1-6(a), 1-6(b), 2-1(a), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(vii), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP, 2012-2013 Edition.

AB 12-68 On September 19, 2013, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with a Michael L. Murphree, Licensed Real Property Appraiser L00121 where the Licensee agreed an administrative fine of \$875 to the Board. The violations in the report are as follows: Licensee had no data to support adjustments made in the sales comparison approach to value. Licensee failed to perform the research for comparable sales that were needed to produce a credible assignment. Licensee bypassed sales of potential comparable more proximate to the subject that would produce a different value opinion than the sales selected. Licensee failed to utilize more comparable sales that were available that would produce a more credible opinion of value. Licensee reported that the subject neighborhood was in balance with average demand and that values were stable. The Licensee includes a Market Condition Addendum that was generated utilizing a 5 mile radius. This 5 mile radius takes into consideration a number of neighborhoods with higher priced properties and water front properties. On this addendum, the Licensee repeats that the subject neighborhood was in balance with average demand and that values were stable. The Licensee does not discuss the number of foreclosures and REO sales in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. For the year preceding the effective date of the appraisal there were eight sales within one mile of the subject and of those eight sales, four were REO sales. Three of the REO sales were the most proximate sales to the subject property. Licensee made an unsupported assumption that the subject 25 year old home had an effective age of 5 years. Licensee used MLS as his verification source for comparable sales. Consequently, he did not verify the sales the used as comparables. MLS is a data source, not a verification source. Verification is with a party to the transaction. The Licensee failed to utilize sales that were available that were more comparable to the subject and would produce a more credible opinion of value. Licensee reported a prior sale of the subject but failed to analyze the prior sale, only listing the date of sale and the sales price. The Licensee reported that the subject neighborhood was in balance with average demand and that values were stable. The Licensee includes a Market Condition Addendum that was generated utilizing a 5 mile radius. This 5 mile radius takes into consideration a number of neighborhoods with higher priced properties and water front properties. On this addendum, the Licensee repeats that the subject neighborhood was in balance with average demand and that values were stable. The Licensee does not discuss the number of foreclosures and REO sales in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. For the year preceding the effective date of the appraisal there were eight sales within one mile of the subject and of those eight sales, four were REO sales. Three of the REO sales were the most proximate sales to the subject property. Licensee failed to utilize more comparable sales that were available that would produce a more credible opinion of value. Licensee failed to provide sufficient information to support that the effective age was 5 years when actual age was 25 years. **Violation: Record Keeping Rule, Scope of Work Rule, Standards Rules 1-1(b),**

1-4, 1-5(b), 2-1(a), 2-1(b), USPAP, 2012-2013 Edition.

AB 12-69 On September 19, 2013, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with a Certified Residential Appraiser where the Licensee agreed to a private reprimand and an administrative fine of \$1400 to the Board. The violations in the report are as follows: The Licensee stated that the site value in the cost approach was developed from "Data was used from County Records and MLS, to estimate site value. Opinion of site value is based upon recent vacant land sales for the market area." There was no data or reference to the data found in the work file to support this statement. Included in the special instructions from the client to the Licensee were: "Do Not Proceed if a clear unobstructed photo of the front of the subject property cannot be obtained" and "Subject property information cannot be verified through public records." The Licensee did not attempt a current photo of the front of the property and since the subject was recently remodeled and Licensee's exterior inspection in heavy rain prevented Licensee from noticing that the current appearance of the subject and the MLS photo were not the same. The subject is a one story residence according to property tax records and MLS and the remodeling added a second story so that subject was as two story house at the time of the assignment. This resulted in appraisal results that are not credible. The Licensee's exterior only inspection was so deficient that Licensee did not realize that the subject property was a two story residence instead of the one story residence indicated by MLS and property tax records. Licensee did not inspect the subject property significantly to recognize that the public tax records and MLS info was no longer correct and therefore the Licensee did not produce credible assignment results. Licensee used a photo of the subject property from MLS without identifying that it was an MLS photo and without realizing that the photo no longer accurately depicted the subject since remodeling added a second level to the residence. Licensee also utilized out dated public tax records that did not have the correct square footage and room count since remodeling added a second story to the residence. Assignment instructions had informed Licensee that County records did not contain reliable information about the subject. **Violation: Record Keeping Rule, Scope of Work Rule, Standards Rules 1-1(b), 1-2(h), 2-1(a), USPAP, 2012-2013 Edition.**

AB 13-14; AB 13-16 On September 19, 2013, the Board approved the voluntary surrender of license from Certified Residential appraiser Dennis R Price, R00840. Licensee elected to surrender his license rather than have an investigation of the two appraisals.

Letters of Warning were issued on the following investigations for the discrepancies indicated. This disciplinary action will be considered in any future discipline proceedings:

AB 13-22 A Letter of Warning was issued and Licensee was assessed a \$250 administrative fine for the appraisal of a single family dwelling where Licensee failed to verify, with a party to the transaction, the comparable sales utilized by the licensee in the Sales Comparison Approach_Licensee

failed to verify the comparable sales and failed to report this information in the appraisal report. Licensee failed to report the results of the analyses made on the contract on the subject property, instead listing some facts such as contract price and such and reporting the contract was "Typical" but not summarizing the actual analysis of the contract. **Violation: 1-4(a), 2-1(b), 2-2(b)(viii), USPAP , 2008-2009 Ed.**

Ms. Conway discussed with the Board the investigative status charts. Ms. Conway informed the Board 9 new complaints were received since the September 2013 Board meeting, 4 complaints were dismissed, and 9 complaints were settled, leaving a total of 43 open complaints.

11.0 The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-13-06**: On motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Key, the Board voted probable cause does not exist and to issue a Letter of Counsel. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-13-13**: With Mr. Crochen recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis 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 a hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-13-17**: With Mr. Key and Mr. Crochen recusing, on motion by Mr. Wallis 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-13-25**: With Mr. Crochen recusing, on motion by Mr. Mallory 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 the Consent Settlement Order on **AB-11-29 (Hubert J. Chapman, R00732)**. With Mr. Wallis recusing, on motion by Mr. Mallory and second by Mr. Key, 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: Mary Ann Barnett ('G' TX), Nicholas Alexander Barwig ('G' GA), Amy Lynn Blackman ('G' GA), Daniel Patrick Carlson ('G' GA), Ann Christine Carol ('R' OH), Stephen Frederic Crane ('G' LA), Philip Joseph Cusmano ('G' FL), Julie Frazier ('R' MS), Marie Shumway Gasner ('G' GA), Benjamin Wray Gregg ('G' NV), Bradford Lynn Johnson ('G' FL), Aaron Keith Kennedy ('G' TN), Joshua Chet Kuhn ('R' OH), Joseph Neil Parker ('G' MS), Robert MacArthur Paschal ('R' LA), Patrick C. Richardson ('L' GA), Kenneth Paul Riggs, Jr. ('G' IA), Cheryl Lynn Scott ('G' FL), Tommy E. Thompson, Jr. ('G' GA), Gloria Ann Truemper ('R' IL), Scott L. Twillmann ('G' NC) and Raymond E. Veal ('G' FL).

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 an email from Ms. Gloria Truemper regarding AMC compliance review requirements. Ms. Truemper is not licensed in Alabama; therefore, there is no issue to discuss.

Mrs. Brooks discussed the Appraisal Subcommittee Staff Follow-Up Review findings of the January 17-19, 2012 ASC Compliance Review of the Alabama appraiser regulatory program. Mrs. Brooks informed the Board that two of the three concerns identified during the 2012 Compliance Review had been resolved and that significant progress had been made toward addressing timely resolution of complaints.

17.0 There was no unfinished business to discuss at this time.

18.0 Mr. Wallis discussed experience credit for review appraisals with the Board.

At this time Ms. Conway opened the Public Hearing on Administrative Rule 780-X-6, Qualifying Experience. There was no one present to speak on the proposed amendment. On motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Key, the Board voted to adopt the rule as written. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

19.0 At 9:46 a.m., on motion by Mr. Wallis and second by Mr. Key, the Board voted to adjourn the regular Board meeting. Motion carried by unanimous vote. The Board's tentative meeting schedule for 2014 is January 16, 2014, March 20, 2014, May 15, 2014, July 17, 2014, September 18, 2014 and November 20, 2014 in the 3rd Floor Conference Room, both in the RSA Union Building, 100 North Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Greene
Executive Secretary
/cg

APPROVED: _____
Joseph T. Lundy, Acting Chairman