

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

F I N A L M I N U T E S

MEETING OF:

**STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED
REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS**

TIME: 10:34 A.M.

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

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Thursday, June 22, 2023

State Board of Certified
Real Estate Appraisers
June 22, 2023

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

ALSO PRESENT: (cont.)

Emme Reiser, Political Programs Manager, Pennsylvania
Association of Realtors
Sarah Whyler, Certified Residential Appraiser &
Realtor/Appraisal Coordinator, Charles E. Brown
Real Estate, LLC & Brown Appraisers, LLC
Jennifer Smeltz, Republican Executive Director,
Senate
Consumer Protection & Professional Licensure
Nathan White
Matthew Ford

1 ***

2 State Board of Certified

3 Real Estate Appraisers

4 June 22, 2023

5 ***

6 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act,
7 at 9:00 a.m. the Board entered into executive session
8 with Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, to have
9 attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of
10 conducting quasi-judicial deliberations. The Board
11 returned to open session at 10:30 a.m.]

12 ***

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

20 Mr. Rouse also noted that the Board entered into
21 executive session with Board counsel to have
22 attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of
23 conducting quasi-judicial deliberations.]

24 ***

25 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State

1 Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was held on
2 Thursday, June 22, 2023. Joseph D. Pasquarella,
3 Chairman, Professional Member, officially called the
4 meeting to order at 10:34 a.m.

5 ***

6 Roll Call

7 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional
8 Member, requested a roll call of Board members.
9 There was a quorum.]

10 ***

11 Approval of minutes of the May 18, 2023 meeting

12 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

13 I would like to have a motion to
14 approve the minutes of the meeting on
15 May 18, 2023.

16 Would someone make that motion?

17 MR. STOERRLE:

18 I make the motion.

19 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

20 Do I have a second?

21 MR. AUSHERMAN:

22 Second.

23 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

24 Any discussion relative to the minutes
25 of the meeting? Hearing none. Call

1 the vote, Ms. Hemler.

2

3 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Mark Smeltzer,
4 abstain; John Ausherman, aye; William
5 Stoerrle, aye; Michael McFarlane, aye;
6 Randy Waggoner, abstain; Martha Brown,
7 aye; Paul Edger, aye; Paul Wentzel,
8 aye.

9 [The motion carried. Mark Smeltzer and Randy
10 Waggoner abstained from voting on the motion.]

11 ***

12 Introduction of Attendees

13 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, Professional
14 Member, requested an introduction of attendees.]

15 ***

16 Report of Prosecutorial Division

17 [Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,
18 presented the Consent Agreement and Order for Case
19 Nos. 21-70-004112, 22-70-005373, 22-70-005557, and
20 22-70-005558.]

21 MR. ROUSE:

22 Regarding the Consent Agreement at item
23 2 on the agenda, Case Nos. 21-70-
24 004112, 22-70-005373, 22-70-005557, and
25 22-70-005558, I believe the Chair would

1 Chair Pasquarella thanked Mr. Michalowski for the
2 outstanding job in King of Prussia and everything he
3 has done for the Board and real estate profession.

4 Mr. Michalowski addressed observations from
5 attendees. He stated the first two-thirds of the
6 presentations dealt with how they intake cases and
7 investigate. He noted appraisal bias was one of the
8 hot topics discussed, along with reporting issues.
9 He mentioned that he tried to do a representation of
10 appraisal bias with all of the historical and
11 systemic things. He also asked how many people in
12 the room had done an appraisal that was affected by
13 appraisal bias and pretty much nearly everybody
14 raised their hand because appraisal bias is not all
15 about appraisers doing the things improperly.

16 Mr. Michalowski noted redlining and other
17 systemic forms of discrimination in areas over the
18 years carries forward. He stated issues that they do
19 not have control over on their side do need to be
20 addressed in a systemic way by a concerted response
21 across government and other agencies.

22 Mr. Michalowski also discussed how to avoid
23 giving an appraiser themselves a charge of
24 discrimination when they did not discriminate, where
25 the tone and manner of the appraiser dealing with the

1 consumer leads the person who is in a protected
2 class, and naturally sensitive to such things,
3 thinking that they are being discriminated against,
4 when in fact, in many of those cases, the appraisals
5 came back just fine as far as their reviews go.

6 Mr. Michalowski addressed cases in Maryland and
7 California, where the houses were appraised once with
8 a minority living in the house and then appraised
9 again after the house had been "whitewashed" and with
10 a white person answering the door. He mentioned that
11 there were many variables, but the reason a law firm
12 took those cases was because they were looking at
13 comparables in areas where they were not just
14 matching the property but were matching the area
15 where the person who owned the house's race would be
16 more predominant.

17 Mr. Michalowski informed everyone that Fannie Mae
18 is sending out letters, where they are searching
19 through appraisals that they receive, looking for
20 potentially discriminatory language and words and
21 sharing it with appraiser boards across the United
22 States. He mentioned seeing some of those come
23 through that were completely innocent. He explained
24 that they would also have an expert look at them just
25 to be on the safe side and have attorney and

1 appraiser review.

2 Mr. Michalowski commented that appraisers and
3 anyone representing the institutes or other
4 professional organizations can document and support
5 appraisals based on the data but do not need to give
6 a commentary as to why the data looks like it does.
7 He

8 cautioned against social commentary in an appraisal
9 or assessment that a lender does not need to know.

10 Mr. Michalowski noted explaining at every place
11 he presented that redlining is not something done by
12 appraisers but is done by banks and affects
13 appraisals because of its ongoing effects on
14 neighborhoods and places that were affected by it.
15 He mentioned that it still persists to this day in
16 the banking industry and people are conflating the
17 banking and credit side. He explained that
18 appraisers do not provide that information to the
19 lender or client because they cannot be responsible
20 for improper use.]

21

22 Report of Board Counsel - Miscellaneous

23 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided an
24 update regarding the second exposure draft of
25 proposed changes to the Appraiser Qualifications

1 Board (AQB) criteria. He noted AQB released its
2 second exposure draft on May 17, 2023, and received
3 written comments through June 17, 2023.

4 Mr. Rouse informed everyone that AQB would be
5 having a public meeting today at 1 p.m. to further
6 discuss the second exposure draft and vote on whether
7 to adopt it. He noted that anyone could register to
8 attend the meeting at appraisalfoundation.org.

9 Mr. Rouse explained that the second exposure
10 draft would require credentialed appraisers to
11 initially complete a 7-hour course on valuation bias
12 and fair housing laws and regulations and then a 4-
13 hour course every two years.

14 Mr. Rouse stated appraiser candidates would have
15 to take qualifying education, which would be the 8-
16 hour valuation bias and fair housing law and
17 regulations course, which is the 7-hour course plus a
18 1-hour examination. He noted the second exposure
19 draft recommends changing the name of the 7-hour
20 National Uniform Standards of Professional Appraiser
21 Practice (USPAP) course to the 7-hour National
22 Uniform Standards of Professional Appraiser Practice
23 (USPAP) Continuing Education Course and also changing
24 the 7-Hour Instructor Recertification Course to the
25 Instructor Certification Course.

1 Mr. Rouse stated valuation bias, fair housing
2 and/or equity would be changed to valuation bias and
3 fair housing laws and regulations as an acceptable
4 continuing education topic. He informed everyone
5 that it would go into effect on January 1, 2026 if
6 adopted to allow states time to adopted the course
7 through their rulemaking processes.

8 Mr. Smeltzer suggested putting it into play for
9 the renewal cycle ending in 2027 if adopted because
10 it would not be required until 2029 if they do not
11 adopt it until 2026.

12 Mr. Rouse informed Board members that they could
13 be presented with an Annex at the next Board meeting
14 if the second exposure draft is adopted today.

15 Mr. Rouse addressed the Property Appraisal and
16 Valuation Equity (PAVE) Task Force, which wants to
17 reduce barriers to entry to the appraisal profession.
18 He noted the PAVE Task Force created a dashboard on
19 their website showing where each state meets or
20 exceeds AQB minimum standards in the areas of
21 qualifying education, qualifying experience,
22 supervisory appraiser/appraiser trainee requirements,
23 qualifying examination, and a section called "other."

24 Mr. Rouse noted the dashboard could be found at
25 <https://pave.hud.gov/reducebarriers>. He reported

1 that Pennsylvania exceeds AQB requirements in a
2 number of areas, including supervisory appraiser and
3 appraiser trainee requirements because their state
4 statute requires that supervisory appraisers must
5 have five years' experience as a certified
6 residential or certified general real estate
7 appraiser, while the AQB requirement is three years'
8 experience.

9 Mr. Rouse also noted the dashboard identifies
10 Pennsylvania as not having a licensed appraiser
11 category and excludes or limits some AQB allowable
12 experience in terms of qualifying education,
13 particularly mass appraisal. He stated The Appraisal
14 Foundation is trying to see what can be done about
15 allowing mass appraisal as an acceptable form of
16 complying with the experience requirement because the
17 AQB criteria allows it.

18 Mr. Smeltzer explained that the reason the Board
19 has five years' experience versus three years'
20 experience is because their requirement came out
21 before the AQB's requirement but believed it should
22 be changed to three years' experience to lower that
23 entry barrier, noting it would have to be passed on
24 to legislation.

25 Mr. McFarlane commented that the Board should

1 consider mass appraisal as qualifying experience
2 moving forward, especially to increase the potential
3 number of candidates who would be licensed as either
4 a residential certified appraiser or a certified
5 general appraiser.]

6

7 MR. ROUSE:

8 Item 5 on the agenda is the Petition to
9 Modify the Final Order in the matter of
10 BPOA v. John Bonaventure Sylvester,
11 Case No. 23-70-008523.

12 This was a matter that was
13 discussed in executive session.
14 Regarding that matter, I believe the
15 Chair would entertain a motion to deny
16 the Petition to Modify the Final Order
17 of John Bonaventure Sylvester, Case No.
18 23-70-008523 at item 5 on the agenda.

19

20 MR. STOERRLE:

21 I make the motion.

22 MR. AUSHERMAN:

23 I Second.

24 MS. HENNESSY HEMLER:

25 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Mark Smeltzer,

1 aye; John Ausherman, aye; William
2 Stoerrle, aye; Michael McFarlane, aye;
3 Randy Waggoner, aye; Martha Brown, aye;
4 Paul Edger, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

5 [The motion carried unanimously.]

6 ***

7 MR. ROUSE:

8 Also regarding this matter, I believe
9 the Chair would entertain a motion to
10 grant a modification of the payment
11 plan of John Bonaventure Sylvester,
12 Case No. 23-70-008523.

13 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

14 Would someone make that motion, please?

15 MR. MCFARLANE:

16 So moved.

17 MR. SMELTZER:

18 I'll second.

19 MS. HENNESSY HEMLER:

20 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Mark Smeltzer,
21 aye; John Ausherman, aye; William
22 Stoerrle, aye; Michael McFarlane, aye;
23 Randy Waggoner, aye; Martha Brown, aye;
24 Paul Edger, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

25 [The motion carried unanimously.]

1 ***

2 Report of Board Counsel

3 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted the
4 2022 Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs
5 (BPOA) Annual Report regarding statistical
6 information about the Board's cases and 2022
7 Appraisal Subcommittee Annual Report for the Board's
8 review. He informed Board members that 14 states
9 represent over 50 percent of the credentialed
10 appraisers on the National Appraiser Registry, noting
11 Pennsylvania is one of those 14 states.

12 Chair Pasquarella pointed out that the
13 Pennsylvania State Board of Certified Real Estate
14 Appraisers has the fewest number of days to close a
15 case and thanked the prosecutorial division for their
16 fine work.]

17 ***

18 Regulations/Statute

19 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided a
20 Regulatory Report for the Board's review. He
21 referred to Regulation 16A-7024 regarding licensure
22 by endorsement, noting the proposed regulatory
23 package is under internal review.

24 Mr. Rouse addressed Regulation 16A-7025
25 regarding the schedule of fees, noting the regulatory

1 package would be reevaluated after the close of the
2 biennial renewal period on June 30, 2023. He
3 explained that reevaluation is needed to determine
4 the current licensee population and whether an
5 adjustment is necessary based on financial numbers.

6 Mr. Rouse referred to 16A-7026 regarding general
7 revisions for certified Pennsylvania evaluators to
8 comply with Act 88 of 2020 amendments to the
9 Assessors Certification Act. He informed Board
10 members that the Regulatory Analysis Form is being
11 drafted for that regulatory package.

12 Mr. Rouse noted 16A-7027 regarding the broker
13 price opinion (BPO) and surety bond revisions is
14 currently on hold for further research on the surety
15 bond portion to be presented to the Board.

16 Mr. Rouse addressed 16A-7029 regarding distance
17 education and the Practical Applications of Real
18 Estate Appraisal (PAREA), noting Board counsel
19 resubmitted the rulemaking package for review with
20 responses to comments from regulatory counsel and
21 would keep the Board apprised.

22 Mr. Rouse noted Board counsel is drafting the
23 preamble and Regulatory Analysis Form for 16A-7031
24 regarding appraisal management company (AMC)
25 revisions, which would be a final-omitted regulatory

1 package.]

2

3 Matters for Discussion - Hybrid Inspections

4 [Mark V. Smeltzer Sr., Professional Member, addressed
5 hybrid inspections, noting there are different levels
6 of appraiser inspections. He mentioned that there
7 has been Appraisal Standards Board (ASB) discussion
8 regarding how to address the issue and say whether or
9 not someone did a personal inspection and in the
10 regulation of who does the inspection.

11 Mr. Smeltzer noted the traditional appraisal is
12 where an appraiser goes out, inspects the property,
13 and does all the analysis. He also noted there is a
14 desktop appraisal, where the appraiser stays in their
15 office and gets all the data from third-party
16 sources, assessment records, Multiple Listing Service
17 (MLS) data, aerials, and information that comes from
18 the owner.

19 Mr. Smeltzer addressed hybrid appraisals, where
20 they send a property data collector out to collect
21 the data on the subject property. He asked whether
22 the Board requires that the person doing the
23 inspection be licensed or certified because one of
24 the options is to have an appraiser or trainee go out
25 and do this or whether it can be anyone from the

1 public.

2 Mr. Smeltzer mentioned that some states have
3 taken the position that it has to be somebody who was
4 licensed or certified to collect the data because
5 certain things included in the report are analytical
6 in nature and should be done by an appraiser. He
7 mentioned that other states take the position that it
8 does not have to be someone who is licensed or
9 certified.

10 Mr. Rouse commented that Pennsylvania is a
11 mandatory state, where anyone who does an appraisal
12 or tries to hold themselves out as an appraiser must
13 be certified as an appraiser or licensed as a trainee
14 in this state.

15 Mr. Ausherman stated the Veterans Administration
16 recently made a decision that they would not accept
17 hybrid appraisals because it puts veterans at risk.
18 He expressed concern with Fannie Mae trying to
19 streamline the process. He noted they are screening
20 individuals they are sending out to homes but
21 actually sent a felon out to look at a property to be
22 a data collector and is concerned about putting risk
23 on the public by allowing this to happen.

24 Chair Pasquarella commented that he did not want
25 them to confuse appraisal and appraiser with a

1 property inspection because the property inspection
2 in not an appraisal and is a function that could be
3 done by a someone who was not an appraiser. He
4 mentioned that USPAP does not require an inspection.

5 Mr. Ausherman stated he is concerned about
6 public trust and whether the general public realizes
7 the difference between a data collector and an
8 appraiser.

9 Mr. Rouse referred to the Real Estate Appraisers
10 Certification Act (REACA), Section 2 under
11 definitions, where an appraisal is a written
12 analysis, opinion, or conclusion relating to the
13 nature, quality, value, or utility of specified
14 interest in or aspects of identified real property
15 for or in expectation of compensation.

16 Mr. Smeltzer asked whether what a property data
17 collector does falls under that definition because
18 they have the broadest definition and is not the same
19 as USPAP. He noted they are not just talking about
20 product value but are talking about the nature,
21 condition, and the quality of inspection expectation.
22 He believed they needed to decide whether or not this
23 falls under their jurisdiction as it goes forward and
24 does it fall on the Board if someone has a complaint
25 about what a data collector does.

1 Mr. Rouse explained that there are two separate
2 functions with a hybrid or bifurcated inspection,
3 where the data collection person is not doing the
4 second part, which is the analysis, which would
5 require an appraiser. He further explained that the
6 first part could be done by someone who is not an
7 appraiser because they are not doing the analysis
8 part.

9 Mr. Smeltzer commented that he understands the
10 two separate functions but was concerned with the
11 definition as to whether the data collector could
12 comment on the condition or quality.

13 Mr. Rouse noted the Board is questioning how
14 that is explained to the homeowner as far as whether
15 the person going into the property or the data
16 collector is either holding themselves out or being
17 viewed as an appraiser.

18 Mr. Michalowski stated this was something he
19 raised when it was a big issue in a few states years
20 ago before it became more prevalent in Pennsylvania.

21 He agreed with Mr. Rouse that an appraiser is the
22 person who performs the appraisal, signs their name,
23 and certifies the value. He mentioned that many
24 things have to happen if using any other sources.

25 Mr. Michalowski noted that anybody holding an

1 individual out as an appraiser would be very
2 problematic and they would prosecute that person and
3 the appraiser if the appraiser was aware of them
4 doing that.

5 Mr. Michalowski addressed reliability of the
6 data, noting many individuals in the early days of
7 hybrid appraisals were typically real estate
8 licensees. He expressed concern with bias when using
9 a real estate licensee because of a question of
10 objectivity and whether or not they are the listing
11 agent, related to the listing agent brokerage, or a
12 competitor of the person listing it. He stated there
13 are many issues that come up as far as explaining it,
14 noting it, noting where the data came from, and
15 noting who provided any kind of assistance.

16 Mr. Michalowski mentioned that they have not had
17 any cases where a person was instructed by somebody
18 that the person coming to their house was an
19 appraiser. He noted claims with trainees all the
20 time, where someone believed the trainee was an
21 appraiser, but there was no claim by the trainee that
22 they were the appraiser and those matters were able
23 to be resolved.

24 Mr. Michalowski commented that any changes made
25 beyond all the things they look at now and search for

1 as issues that may be prosecuted or not that he is
2 not sure whether there is a standard set that would
3 be legislative or regulatory requirements. He
4 mentioned they are usually told to look at what other
5 states are doing and see if they have come up with
6 any qualifications of that sort.

7 Mr. Michalowski commented that movement is going
8 to want to be seen from other states, especially in
9 states of near regional peers or the 14 states that
10 have more than half of the licensed or credentialed
11 appraisers. He noted the importance of the appraiser
12 knowing where their data is coming from and their
13 qualifications.

14 Chair Pasquarella pointed out that a Property
15 Condition Report is more comprehensive than a real
16 estate appraiser's inspection and usually done by a
17 professional engineer or an architect. He noted that
18 it really depends on who is doing the inspection and
19 the appraiser signing the report is fully liable for
20 all the information that they are assuming is
21 correct. He mentioned that it is one thing if the
22 client is okay with the appraiser not doing an
23 inspection but some clients insist that the engaged
24 appraiser actually inspect the property.

25 Michelle Czekalski Bradley, Chair, Appraisal

1 Standards Board; CGA, AQB-certified USPAP Instructor,
2 noted much discussion at The Appraisal Foundation and
3 National Association of Realtors. She stated the
4 consumer is not told that the individual coming into
5 their home is not an appraiser and it is a
6 significant public trust issue. She mentioned
7 lobbying for a trainee license, so the public would
8 know that the individual coming into their home and
9 seeing the private areas of their home had some level
10 of licensure with the state.

11 Ms. Czekalski Bradley addressed her attendance
12 at the National Association of Realtors Meeting in
13 Washington, D.C., where the issue was discussed with
14 federal regulators and the Federal Housing Finance
15 Agency representatives stated consumers are educated
16 from the loan originator. She noted she disagreed,
17 stating that they are not and even if they are told
18 by the loan originator that somebody coming into
19 their home might be a property data collector, the
20 consumer is not fully aware that there is no license
21 or background check.

22 Ms. Czekalski Bradley also noted that the
23 consumer applied for the loan because they need
24 money, so even if they knew that somebody was coming
25 into their home unlicensed, they are in a position of

1 need.

2 Chair Pasquarella thanked Ms. Czekalski Bradley,
3 noting her comments are in line with Mr. Ausherman's
4 public trust comments. He stated it is critically
5 important, especially on the residential side, and a
6 very important element of this discussion.

7 Mr. McFarlane referred to the recent
8 modification on the certified Pennsylvania evaluator
9 side within the last few years, where third-party
10 company personnel must be licensed to conduct
11 valuation analysis-based work but does not say
12 anything about needing to be licensed in order to
13 complete the inspection. He mentioned that they
14 could maybe glean something from the Board's action
15 for third-party company personnel from the assessment
16 side.

17 Mr. Ausherman expressed concern that the AMC is
18 hiring the individual and could be bias if
19 representing the lender that may want to make the
20 loan. He noted the importance of making sure the
21 inspector or individual who goes through that
22 property is not biased with the information they send
23 to the appraiser because someone could take
24 photographs and ignore certain things in the inside
25 of a property.

1 Mr. Ausherman also mentioned that the property
2 may not be listed and may be a refinance, so there
3 would not be a public record the appraiser could look
4 at and compare the information the inspector is
5 sending.

6 Chair Pasquarella commented that it would make
7 more sense if the appraiser hired the inspectors
8 because they sign the appraisal instead of AMC hiring
9 the inspectors and the appraiser relying on that
10 inspection.

11 Mr. Ausherman commented that Fannie Mae has
12 identified around five AMCs, noting Class Valuation
13 to be one of them, to hire data collectors. He
14 mentioned that a property listed through the MLS
15 would provide a recourse for the appraiser to compare
16 the photos the data collector sends but what about a
17 home being refinanced that has not sold for 20 years.

18 Mr. Smeltzer stated that not seeing photographs
19 of deferred maintenance in an MLS does not raise his
20 confidence because an agent's job is to sell the
21 property.

22 Mr. Michalowski referred to a presentation by
23 Mr. Smeltzer, along with Ms. Czekalski Bradley, where
24 many places are not using AMCs now, and the bank
25 itself is doing the bifurcation between their

1 underwriting and their loan origination department
2 and finding its own way around Dodd-Frank. He
3 mentioned that national standards or standards from
4 the Appraisal Standards Board would be very helpful.

5 Mr. Smeltzer noted the importance of checking to
6 see how other states are handling this issue because
7 those people may not be under anybody's jurisdiction
8 if they are not under the Board's jurisdiction.

9 Ms. Czekalski Bradley asked why the appraisal
10 profession would be allowing an unlicensed individual
11 who nobody has jurisdiction over to go into
12 consumers' homes when they are working to bring
13 diversity and new entrants into the profession,
14 noting the new trainees could be the property data
15 collectors. She noted a discussion at the National
16 Association of Realtors (NAR) Meeting with Melody
17 Taylor from the PAVE Task Force welcoming and
18 encouraging diversity in the profession but also
19 discussing property data collection and the concern
20 of bringing someone in and set them up for failure by
21 not having work for them.

22 Mr. Ausherman suggested looking at the end of
23 this cycle to see how many trainees actually renew
24 their license because they may feel there is no work
25 and why continue to be a trainee.

1 Ms. Brown referred to prior discussion
2 concerning the VA and asked whether the VA permits
3 trainees.

4 Mr. Smeltzer explained that the VA has an
5 Assisted Appraisal Processing Program (AAPP), but it
6 is not a hybrid appraisal. He stated lenders have a
7 choice of allowing their appraisal to be done using
8 the assisted program, where the trainee can actually
9 be the data collector.

10 Mr. Waggoner commented that the Assessors'
11 Association some years ago adopted and pretty much
12 piggybacked what the International Association of
13 Assessing Officers (IAAO) created as suggested data
14 collection standards. He noted that one of the
15 standards is that the assessor does not need to go
16 into the interior of the dwelling and can get the
17 information from the property owner.

18 Mr. Waggoner stated they were looking at it
19 strictly from a safety standpoint, so when there is
20 talk about how can an appraiser who has not seen the
21 property develop or confirm the information that was
22 collected. He noted assessment records are often
23 quoted on sales grids, where the information comes
24 from, but as far as the interior, usually not
25 available because of that safety concern.

1 Item 11 is the Application of Brendan
2 Grube. I believe the Chair would
3 entertain a motion to provisionally
4 deny the Application for a Certified
5 Residential Real Estate Appraiser of
6 Brendan Grube at item 11 on the agenda.

7 MR. AUSERMAN:

8 I so move.

9 MR. STOERRLE:

10 Second.

11 MS. HENNESSY HEMLER:

12 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Mark Smeltzer,
13 aye; John Auserman, aye; William
14 Stoerrle, aye; Michael McFarlane, aye;
15 Randy Waggoner, aye; Martha Brown, aye;
16 Paul Edger, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

17 [The motion carried unanimously.]

18 ***

19 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, exited the meeting
20 at 11:42 a.m. for recusal purposes.]

21 ***

22 VICE CHAIR SMELTZER ASSUMED THE CHAIR

23 ***

24 MR. ROUSE:

25 Item 12 on the agenda is the

1 Application for a Certified General
2 Real Estate Appraiser by Reciprocity.

3 I believe the Chair would entertain
4 a motion to grant the Application for a
5 Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
6 by Reciprocity of Chris Williams.

7 VICE CHAIR SMELTZER:

8 The Chair would entertain that motion.

9 MS. BROWN:

10 So moved.

11 MR. WENTZEL:

12 Second.

13 MS. HENNESSY HEMLER:

14 Mark Smeltzer, aye; John Ausherman,
15 aye; William Stoerrle, aye; Michael
16 McFarlane, aye; Randy Waggoner, aye;
17 Martha Brown, aye; Paul Edger, aye;
18 Paul Wentzel, aye.

19 [The motion carried. Joseph Pasquarella recused
20 himself from deliberations and voting on the motion.]

21 ***

22 [Joseph D. Pasquarella, Chairman, reentered the
23 meeting at 11:44 a.m.]

24 ***

25 CHAIR PASQUARELLA RESUMED THE CHAIR

1 ***

2 Review of Requests - Licensed Appraiser Trainee -
3 2023

4 Renewal Extension Requests

5 MR. ROUSE:

6 Items 13, 14, and 15 are Review of the
7 Licensed Appraiser Trainee Renewal
8 Requests.

9 Regarding these matters, I believe
10 the Chair would entertain a motion to
11 grant the Licensed Appraiser Trainee
12 Renewal Extensions for item 13, Elwyn
13 Laud-Hammond; item 14, Patricia
14 Carmody; and item 15, Svetlana Frolenko
15 on the agenda.

16 MR. AUSERMAN:

17 I so move.

18 MR. EDGER:

19 Second.

20 MS. HENNESSY HEMLER:

21 Joe Pasquarella, aye; Mark Smeltzer,
22 aye; John Ausherman, aye; William
23 Stoerrle, aye; Michael McFarlane, aye;
24 Randy Waggoner, aye; Martha Brown, aye;
25 Paul Edger, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

1 [The motion carried unanimously.]

2 ***

3 Public Comment/Discussion

4 [Randy L. Waggoner, Professional Member, announced
5 today was his last meeting with the Board and thanked
6 everyone for the patience and tutelage. He also
7 noted having a renewed respect for the way the Board
8 conducts business.]

9 Chair Pasquarella thanked Mr. Waggoner, on behalf
10 of the Board, for all of his contributions and
11 service to the Board.]

12 ***

13 Report of Board Chairman - No Report

14 ***

15 Report of Board Administrator

16 [Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator,
17 reminded everyone that renewals are due June 30. She
18 noted there is no grace period and there would be a
19 late fee for reactivation. She reported appraisal
20 AMCs at 78 percent, certified broker appraisers, 74
21 percent; certified general appraisers, 72 percent;
22 certified Pennsylvania evaluators, 68 percent; and
23 certified residential appraisers, 80 percent.]

24 Ms. Hennessy Hemler noted concern with licensed
25 appraiser trainees only being at 38 percent and

1 encouraged everyone who knows someone who has not
2 renewed to log into the Pennsylvania Licensing System
3 (PALS) at www.pals.pa.gov to renew. She recommended
4 everyone check to make sure the renewal went through
5 and shows a 2025 expiration date because they are
6 going through automatically and not being reviewed.

7 Mr. Smeltzer asked whether someone would still be
8 on that list if they change from a licensed trainee
9 to certified appraiser.

10 Ms. Hennessy Hemler explained that the system
11 should make their licensed appraiser trainee null and
12 void once they become a residential or a general
13 appraiser. She noted the system does not always work
14 and would be writing a report to find out why the
15 percentage is so low.

16 Chair Pasquarella commented that 38 percent is
17 low and may be something to do with the numbers, or
18 they still may renew by June 30. He also noted being
19 surprised about certification at 72 percent for
20 general and 80 percent for residential and wondered
21 if age has something to do with it.

22 Ms. Hennessy Hemler noted they do not ask that
23 information but would be running numbers in July for
24 Mr. Rouse regarding the fee package to get a true
25 number. She stated there could be a large percentage

1 of certificate holders who are retiring and not
2 renewing.

3 Ms. Hennessy Hemler informed Board members that
4 AMC renewals are done differently, noting she
5 recently sent an email blast notifying them that
6 there were 10 days left and reported currently being
7 down to 19, which would make the percentage higher.

8 Chair Pasquarella commented that it may be due to
9 smaller AMCs joining larger AMCs.

10 Mr. Smeltzer mentioned that it also may be due to
11 the lack of work and putting off paying that until
12 the end.

13 Ms. Hennessy Hemler offered to provide
14 percentages from the last renewal for comparison.

15 Ms. Hennessy Hemler informed Board members that
16 it is a system issue because Sarah Whyler, who is
17 attending the meeting, said that she received her
18 residential certification and her trainee license is
19 still active.]

20 ***

21 Adjournment

22 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

23 Do I have a motion to adjourn today's
24 meeting?

25 MR. STOERRLE:

1 I make that motion.

2 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

3 Second?

4 MR. AUSERMAN:

5 I second.

6 CHAIRMAN PASQUARELLA:

7 All in favor, say aye. Okay, thank you
8 very much. See you next month.

9 ***

10 [There being no further business, the State Board of
11 Certified Real Estate Appraisers Meeting adjourned at
12 11:54 a.m.]

13 ***

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE

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



Matthew Ford,
Minute Clerk
Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED
REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
REFERENCE INDEX

June 22, 2023

	TIME	AGENDA
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	9:00	Executive Session
11	10:30	Return to Open Session
12		
13	10:34	Official Call to Order
14		
15	10:34	Roll Call
16		
17	10:35	Approval of Minutes
18		
19	10:36	Introduction of Public Attendees
20		
21	10:35	Report of Prosecutorial Division
22		
23	10:52	Report of Board Counsel
24		
25	11:07	Regulations/Statute
26		
27	11:10	Matters for Discussion
28		
29	11:38	Exploratory Committee
30		
31	11:41	Applications for Review
32		
33	11:43	Review of Requests
34		
35	11:45	Public Comment/Discussion
36		
37	11:48	Report of Board Administrator
38		
39	11:54	Adjournment
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		