

**MINUTES**  
**ALABAMA REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BOARD**  
**RSA UNION STREET**  
**SUITE 370**  
**MONTGOMERY, AL 36104**  
**November 6, 2025**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Chad Anderson (Chairman)  
Mrs. Melanie Housh (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr. Timothy Mills  
Mr. Randall Kyles  
Mr. Mark Palmer  
Mr. Roger Ball  
Mr. A.J. Smith

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Mr. Bill Mackey  
Mr. Drew Watson

**STAFF PRESENT:**

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

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

None

- 1.0 Mr. Chad Anderson, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Mrs. Carolyn Greene, Executive Secretary, recorded the minutes. The meeting was held in Suite 300 Conference Room of the RSA Union Building, 100 N. Union Street, Montgomery, Alabama. Prior notice of the meeting was posted on the Secretary of State's website on December 31, 2024, and updated on July 10, 2025, in accordance with the Alabama Open Meetings Act.
- 2.0 The meeting was opened with prayer by Mr. Smith and the Pledge of Allegiance led by Mrs. Housh.
- 3.0 Mr. Anderson asked for a voice roll to establish a quorum. Board members present were Mr. Chad Anderson, Mr. Randall Kyles, Mr. Tim Mills, Mrs. Melanie Housh, Mr. Roger Ball, Mr. Mark Palmer, and Mr. A. J. Smith. Members absent were Mr. Bill Mackey, and Mr. Drew Watson. A quorum was established.
- 4.0 On motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Palmer, the regular minutes for September 10, 2025, were approved as written. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.0 There was no pending litigation, however, Ms. Conway reported that a Notice of Electronic Filing in the Circuit Court of Limestone County, Alabama and Order in the Cleabron E. Pullum V. Alabama Real Estate Appraisers Board were included for Board information. Due to the omission of Mr. Pullum's disciplinary history from the record, the case has been remanded back to the Board to rehear the case.

6.0 Ms. Conway presented proposed amendments to the Administrative Code 780-X-3-.03-Qualifying Education; 780-X-5-.02–Board Approval of Courses; 780-X-12-.02 – Expirations, Renewals and Continuing Education; and 780-X-18 – Appraisal Management Company Forms for final adoption. On motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted to have Ms. Conway submit the changes to Legislative Services Agency for final adoption. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Conway presented proposed amendments to the Administrative Code 780-X-3-.03-Qualifying Education; 780-X-5-.02–Board Approval of Courses; 780-X-12-.02 – Expirations, Renewals and Continuing Education for emergency adoption so that the Board can comply with the deadlines for the effective date of these requirements. On motion by Mr. Kyles and second by Mr. Palmer, the Board voted to approve emergency adoption of these amendments. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Conway discussed proposed legislation, submitted by Mr. Mandell Tillman, which addresses existing law not expressly providing a statute of limitations on the Board investigation of complaints and a statute of limitations for civil actions against real estate appraisers based upon a real estate appraisal completed by a licensed real estate appraiser. Ms. Conway reminded the Board that complaints on appraisals older than five years are not investigated already. Mrs. Brooks will forward the email she received from Ms. Maria Brown, the Board's ASC Policy Manager, to board members. Ms. Conway will ask Mr. Tillman to remove the statute of limitations on the Board investigation of complaints.

Ms. Conway informed the Board that the Regular Legislative Session will begin in January 2026.

7.0 On motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Kyles, the following applications were voted on as listed. Motion carried.

7.1 **Trainee Real Property Appraiser application approved:** Julia Berry, Terry Baine, Jessica Griggs, Dalton Moore, Jon Pendegraph and Heather Treadaway. **Application deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.2 **State Registered Real Property Appraiser applications approved:** None. **Applications deferred:** None. **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: Stephen Maxwell Eady (Recip)(TN), Olivia Shea Pope, Sanedria Potter (Recip)(GA), Robert R. Swank (Recip)(GA), and Anna Weekly. **Application deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.5      **Certified General Real Property Appraiser** application approved: Matthew Daggett Anderson (Recip)(GA), Brett Allen Campbell (Recip)(NY), Dominic Gallardi (Recip)(FL), Kamryn Handley (Recip)(TN), Charles Haase (Recip)(NE), John Patrick McCullough (Recip)(TN), Michael J. Matte (Recip)(LA), Randall Rex (Recip)(FL), Donna Sutherland, and Travis Welch (Recip)(TX). **Applications deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.6      **Mentor** applications approved: Janet Forester and Matt Woods. **Application deferred:** None. **Applications denied:** None.

7.7      **Trainee Real Property Appraiser Experience Log Review:** Logs reviewed: Maurice David Bell, Joseph Gall, and Anna Weekly. **Log Review deferred:** Evan Higgins.

8.0      Mrs. Brooks presented the Finance report for September 2024-2025, reported that the Board was 100% into Fiscal Year 2025 and 56% into budget expenditures and that there were no negative trends that could not be reconciled at this time, and the Finance report for October 2025-2026, reported that the Board was 8% into Fiscal Year 2026 and 9% into budget expenditures and that there were no negative trends that could not be reconciled at this time.

On motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Smith, the Board voted to approve the Finance Reports. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Brooks also presented the 2027 Budget Request for Board approval. On motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Smith, the Board voted to approve the proposed budget. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Brooks informed the Board that certified renewal reminder letters would be mailed soon to appraisers who have not renewed for license year 2025-2026.

9.0      On motion by Mr. Kyles and second by Mr. Palmer, the following education courses and instructor recommendations on the November Education agenda were approved, deferred, or denied as indicated. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

#### **APPRAISER ELEARNING LLC**

##### **New Applications:**

(CE)    Measuring Square Footage with ANSI Z7765-2021 – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: David Hampton)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

(CE) Valuation Bias and Fair Housing Laws and Regulations – with Appraiser eLearning – 7 Hours - Classroom  
(Instructor: Peter Christensen)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**APPRAISAL INSTITUTE CHICAGO**

**New Applications:**

(CE) 2026-2027 7-Hour National USPAP Course – 7 Hours - Classroom  
(Instructors: Bonnie Roerig, Brian Flynn, Jared Preisler, John Urubek, Mark Smeltzer and Maureen Sweeney)  
**Both Course and Instructors Approved**

(CE) Analyzing Defects, Damages, and Deficiencies in the URAR – 3 Hours - Classroom  
(Instructors: Sean Sargeant and Sandra Adomatis)  
**Both Course and Instructors Approved**

(LIC) Online Valuation Bias and Fair Housing Laws and Regulations – 8 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Mark Freitag)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**CALYPSO CONTINUING EDUCATION**

**New Application:**

(CE) The New URAR/UAD Appraiser's Guide – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Francis Finigan)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**DENNIS BADGER & ASSOCIATES, INC.**

**New Applications:**

(CE) 2026-2027 7-Hour National USPAP Course – 7 Hours - Classroom  
(Instructor: Dennis Badger)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**MCKISSOCK LP**

**New Applications:**

(CE) A Paradigm Shift in Real Estate Appraisal Adjustments - 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Jo Traut)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

(CE) 2026-2027 7-Hour National USPAP Course - 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Dan Bradley)  
**Both Course and Instructor Approved**

**INSTRUCTOR APPROVAL ONLY**

(CE) Live Webinar: Appraising Complex and Stigmatized Residential Properties – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Kelly Yeatts)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Land and Site Valuation – 5 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Kelly Yeatts)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Residential Property Inspections: An Appraiser's Perspective – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Kelly Yeatts)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Scope of Work and the New URAR – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Kelly Yeatts)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Supporting Adjustments: The Journey from Analysis to Adjusting – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Kelly Yeatts)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: The Appraiser's Guide to the New URAR – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Kelly Yeatts)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Appraising Complex and Stigmatized Residential Properties – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Michelle Bradley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Land and Site Valuation – 5 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Michelle Bradley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Residential Property Inspections: An Appraiser's Perspective – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Michelle Bradley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Scope of Work and the New URAR – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Michelle Bradley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Supporting Adjustments: The Journey from Analysis to Adjusting – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Michelle Bradley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: The Appraiser's Guide to the New URAR – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Michelle Bradley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Appraising Complex and Stigmatized Residential Properties – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Land and Site Valuation – 5 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Residential Property Inspections: An Appraiser's Perspective – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Sales Comparison and the New URAR – 3 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Scope of Work and the New URAR – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: Supporting Adjustments: The Journey from Analysis to Adjusting – 4 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

(CE) Live Webinar: The Appraiser's Guide to the New URAR – 7 Hours - Online  
(Instructor: Stephanie Tuley)  
**Instructor Approved**

10.0      **AB 23-51**    On September 9, 2025, the Board entered an order, issuing a public reprimand, ordering completion of a 15-hour USPAP course and assessing an administrative fine of \$3,000 to Certified General Real Property Appraiser James E. Lester, Jr., G01286. Lester testified and was recognized as a certified general real estate appraiser before the Court and Jury in a circuit court condemnation trial but deliberately skirted the applicable rules in determining a Before and After Fair Market Value for the property taken in the Klassy Realty case and failed to comply with the Alabama Eminent Domain Act provisions that govern it. From the preponderance of the available credible evidence admitted, Mr. Lester violated the 2020-21 Edition of the USPAP with regard to its Ethics, Conduct, Competency and workfile requirements. Mr. Lester's work file in this case was deficient as charged and that he failed to timely file an accurate, complete and understandable work file. Lester testified that he appeared and testified in the trial as an advocate for the property owner at the same time that he was qualified in the case as a certified general real property appraiser.

**AB 24-10**    On September 9, 2025, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with Certified General Real Property Appraiser Anthony H. Allison, G00004 for the payment of a \$1250 Administrative fine and completion of a 15-hour USPAP course with exam. The violations in that case were:

There is no support or explanation for quality of construction adjustment; age adjustment; for the room count adjustment; for GLA adjustment; for the basement adjustment; for the garage/carport adjustments; for the pool adjustment.

The subject is a brick veneer structure containing approximately 2,488 square feet with a 2,488 square foot basement. The appraiser utilized comparable sale ranging from 3,608 square feet to 6,800 square feet. It appears that these sales are not the best comparables given the extreme adjustments required for size. Two appraisals submitted with the complaint utilized sales which are nearer the size of the subject. Further, the subsequent information furnished by the appraiser concerning the paired sales analysis included a number of sales closer in size to the subject. Given the fact that the appraiser utilized these sales as the alleged basis of the paired sales analysis, they should be comparable to the subject. It is questionable at best if the comparables utilized in the appraisal are the best comparables with which to estimate the value of the subject.

The sales utilized in the appraisal ranged from \$308.80 to \$474.12 per square foot including basement area, prior to adjustments. Subsequent to adjustments, the sales range from \$289.17 to \$439.19. The adjusted unit value of the subject is \$803.86 per GLA. The adjusted unit value including the basement square footage is \$401.93 per square foot.

The report indicates that a number of the adjustments, including the basement adjustment, are based on lump sum adjustments with no support.

To appropriately analyze the comparables and employ the correct methodology in the Sales Comparison Approach, the appraiser must correctly apply adjustments indicated by the market. The appraisal indicated that the adjustments utilized paired sales analysis. The information furnished by the appraiser concerning the

paired sales analysis included a number of sales closer in size to the subject for GLA and at lower sales prices. Given the fact that the appraiser utilized these sales as the alleged basis of the paired sales analysis, they should be comparable to the subject. It is questionable at best if the comparables utilized in the appraisal are the best comparables with which to estimate the value of the subject. The appraisal indicates that the cost utilized are from MVS and Builders estimates. There is no workfile data to support this. **Violations: STANDARDS RULE 1-4(a), 1-4(b), 2-2(a)(x)(1), 2-2 (a)(x)(5), USPAP, 2020-2021 Edition.**

**AB 24-19, AB 25-02** On September 9, 2025, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order with a Certified Residential Real Property Appraiser for a private reprimand and a 15-hour USPAP course with exam, a 7-hour course on the appraisal of multifamily properties and a 7-hour course on the cost approach. The violations in this case were: the subject was a duplex. The appraiser identified the property as a single-family residential property utilizing the FNMA 1004 forms and utilizing this single family residential comparables. This ultimately affects credibility and does not yield a credible appraisal. The subject is located within B-2 zoning. Investigation revealed that a variance was granted for two executive suites.

The Licensee appraised the subject property as a single-family residential structure when it is a duplex. All three approaches to value should have been completed, especially since the subject is new construction and is an income producing property. It should be noted that the listing indicates that the First floor is rented. Although sales were included in the appraisal, these are not comparables to the subject property. The appraiser has not appropriately researched and analyzed the market.

The comparables utilized were not comparable even by the appraiser's admission. There is no support or explanation for the land value estimate, nor the adjustments made to the comparables in the report or workfile.

The subject is new construction, a Cost Approach should have been included. Likewise, this is an income producing property and as such the Income Approach is an excellent indicator of value and should have been utilized. As indicated above there is a deficient workfile.

The property was mis-identified and resulting in an appraisal which is not credible. The appraisal lacks discussion and explanation of the opinion of value. The appraiser mis-identified the subject property as a single-family residence when it is obviously a duplex. The selection of comparables were those of single-family residential structures which are not comparable.

**Violations: Standards Rule 1-1(a) & 1-1(b), Rule 1-3(a), 1-3(b), Rule 1-4(a), 1-4(b), and 1-4(c), RECORD KEEPING RULE, Rule 2-1(a), 2-1(b), and 2-1(c), Rule 2-2(a)(x), 202(a)(xii), 2-2(a)(xiii), ETHICS RULE-CONDUCT, COMPETENCY RULE, USPAP, 20-21 Edition.**

**AB 24-21, AB 24-22, AB 24-23, AB 24-24** On September 9, 2025, the Board approved a Consent Settlement Order from Certified Residential Real Property Appraiser R01280, Nathan Wallace where the appraiser agreed to pay an administrative fine of \$750 and complete a 15-hour USPAP course with exam. The Violations in one or more of the appraisals are as follows:

The appraisal indicated that the adjustments utilized were based on regression analysis and paired sales analysis. During the interview I asked the appraiser where the regression analysis or paired sales analysis was because it was not in the workfile. The appraiser's response was that the statement should not have been in the report because it was not performed. The appraiser utilized 3 sales with Sale 3 being an office building in Dothan formally utilized as the Dothan Eagle marketing office. There are additional church sales available which should have been used. There is no support or explanation for the size adjustments; location adjustments; for the condition's adjustments.

To appropriately analyze the comparables and employ the correct methodology in the Sales Comparison Approach, the appraiser must correctly apply adjustments indicated by the market. As previously indicated, the appraisal indicated that the adjustments utilized were based on regression analysis and paired sales analysis. However, during the interview the appraiser indicated that neither a regression analysis nor paired sales analysis was done. There is no support for the adjustments.

As indicated above there is a deficient workfile. The appraisal lacks discussion and explanation for adjustments.

The appraiser has not appropriately analyzed the comparables and there is no support in the work file for adjustments. As indicated above there is a deficient workfile.

The appraiser has utilized 3 sales with the only adjustment considered being size. No other adjustments were made. There are improvements, timber, cropland, and ponds that should be considered. There is no support for the adjustments or lack of adjustments.

To appropriately analyze the comparables and employ the correct methodology in the Sales Comparison Approach, the appraiser must correctly apply adjustments indicated by the market. As indicated above there is a deficient workfile.

The current contract has not been analyzed.

Based on the appraisal report and the appraiser's responses during the interview, it is questionable if the appraiser has the competency to appraise the subject property. The appraiser utilized a third comparable which was a townhouse. The reasoning behind this was the limited sales activity of quadraplex comparables. It is not inappropriate methodology to utilize small complexes for appraisal purposes to establish market value. The fact that there are only two multi-unit comparables undermines the credibility of the appraisal. Further, it should be noted that the comment contained in the appraisal indicates that the Income Approach was included at the request of the client. This approach is imperative to the valuation of properties similar to the subject because they are true income producing properties and are typically purchased for one reason which is the income stream. The appraiser has not appropriately analyzed the comparables and there is no support in the work file for adjustments, there is a deficient workfile. There is no support or explanation for the condition's adjustment in the appraisal or workfile. There is no support or explanation for the unit adjustments in the appraisal or

workfile. There is no support or explanation for the parking adjustment. To appropriately analyze the comparables and employ the correct methodology in the Sales Comparison Approach, the appraiser must correctly apply adjustments indicated by the market. There is no support for the adjustments either in the appraisal or workfile. There is no support for the site value or cost in the workfile. There is no explanation, and the rental information is minimal at best. There should be an explanation for the estimate of market rent. It should be noted that the appraiser utilizes two comparables in the appraisal for the estimate of the GRM. There is some additional GRM information contained in the workfile. If these were used to support GRM, why would they not be appropriate comparables? As previously stated, the comment contained in the appraisal indicates that the Income Approach was included at the request of the client. This approach is imperative to the valuation of properties similar to the subject because they are true income producing properties. The current contract is \$589,999 which includes two properties. There is no analysis of the current contract. The appraisal should have more analysis given this unique contract. analyzed. **Violations: Competency Rule, Standards Rule 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-1(c), : Standards Rule 1-4(a), Record Keeping Rule, Rule 1-4(a), 1-4(b)(1), 1-4(b)(ii), 1-4(b)(iii), 1-4(c)(i), 1-4(c)(ii), 1-4(c)(iii), 1-4(c)(iv), 1-4(c)(v), Rule 1-5(a), 1-5(b), Rule 2-2(a)(xii)(xiii), Rule 2-2(a)(x)(1), 2-2(a)(x)(2), 2-2(a)(x)(3), 2-2(a)(x)(4), 2-2(a)(x)(5), 2-2(b)(ix), USPAP, 2020-21 Edition and USPAP 2024 Edition.**

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 24-09** To an appraiser for a residential report where:

- The appraiser has made numerous adjustments to the comparable sales without market support or explanation either in the report or work file. Violation: SR1-4 (a), Record Keeping Rule. USPAP, 2024 Ed.
- There is no discussion or analysis of the current contract. Violation SR 1-5(a), USPAP, 2024 Ed.
- The appraisal lacks discussion and explanation for adjustments as well as support and reasoning for the reconciled final opinion of value. Violation: SR 2-2 (a) (x) (3), USPAP, 2024 Edition.

Ms. Conway discussed with the Board the investigative status charts. Ms. Conway reported that 5 new Appraiser complaints and no new Appraisal Management Company (AMC) complaints were received since the September 2025 Board meeting, no complaints were dismissed, and 8 complaints were settled, leaving a total of 30 open complaints.

11.0 The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-24-29**. With Mr. Anderson and Mr. Ball recusing, on motion by Mrs. Housh and second by Mr. Smith, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-24-30**. With Mr. Anderson recusing, on motion by Mrs. Housh and second by Mr. Palmer, the Board voted 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-24-31**. With Mr. Anderson recusing, on motion by Mrs. Housh and second by Mr. Smith, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to negotiate a conditional dismissal or bring it back to the Board for a hearing. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-24-34**. With Mrs. Housh recusing, on motion by Mr. Ball and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted 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-25-07**. With Mrs. Housh recusing, on motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Ball, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-08**. With Mrs. Housh recusing, on motion by Mr. Palmer and second by Mr. Mills, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-10**. With Mr. Ball recusing, on motion by Mrs. Housh and second by Mr. Smith, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-12**. With Mr. Ball recusing, on motion by Mr. Smith and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-13**. With Mr. Smith recusing, on motion by Mr. Palmer and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted 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-25-14**. With Mr. Anderson recusing, on motion by Mrs. Housh and second by Mr. Palmer, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-15**. With Mr. Anderson recusing, on motion by Mr. Kyles and second by Mr. Palmer, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-16**. With Mr. Anderson recusing, on motion by Mr. Smith and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **AB-25-17**. With Mrs. Housh recusing, on motion by Mr. Ball and second by Mr. Palmer, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **MC-25-01**. On motion by Mr. Palmer and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board reviewed Probable Cause Report **MC-25-02**. On motion by Mr. Palmer and second by Mr. Kyles, the Board voted that probable cause does not exist and to dismiss this case. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

- 12.0 There were no Consent Settlement Orders to review at this time.
- 13.0 The following reciprocal license was issued since the September Board meeting: Matthew Daggett Anderson (G)(GA), Brett Allen Campbell (G)(NY), Stephen Maxwell Eady (R)(TN), Dominic Gallardi (G)(FL), Kamryn Handley (G)(TN), Charles Haase (G)(NE), John Patrick McCullough (G)(TN), Michael J. Matte (G)(LA), Sanedria Potter (R)(GA), Randall Rex (G)(FL), Robert R. Swank (R)(GA) and Travis Welch (G)(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 Ms. Conway discussed the Executive Director search with the Board. Ms. Conway informed the Board members that the search committee had narrowed the list of candidates and interviews will begin in December. The final applicants will be interviewed by the full Board at the January 8, 2026, board meeting.  
Ms. Conway stated that she is waiting on Contract Review form changes to be complete before drawing up the new contracts for the Review Appraisers.  
Ms. Conway asked the Board to set caps for the Review Appraiser contracts. The Board set the cap for each contract, which will be for one year, at \$25,000.  
Mr. Anderson informed the Board that Mrs. Brooks had agreed to stay on as Executive Director until March 31<sup>st</sup> to allow time for the interview and hiring process, and presented a letter to State Personnel authorizing a 2-step or 5% pay increase for Mrs. Brooks. On motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Smith, the Board voted to authorize this pay increase. Motion carried by unanimous vote.  
Mrs. Brooks informed the Board that the Fall 2025 newsletter had been emailed to all licensees.
- 17.0 There was no unfinished business to discuss at this time.
- 18.0 Mr. Ball discussed the 2026 board meeting dates. Due to a conflict with the second Thursday of November, he asked that the November 12<sup>th</sup> board meeting be changed to November 5<sup>th</sup>. The Board agreed to this change.

19.0 At 10:31 a.m., on motion by Mr. Mills and second by Mr. Palmer, the Board voted to adjourn the regular Board meeting. Motion carried by unanimous vote. The Board's tentative meeting schedule for 2026 is January 8, 2026, March 12, 2026, May 14, 2026, July 9, 2026, September 10, 2026, and November 5, 2026, held in the RSA Union 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room, 100 Union Street, Montgomery, AL 36104.

Sincerely,



Carolyn Greene Executive Secretary  
/cg

APPROVED:

Chad Anderson, Chairman

