

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

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: 10:30 A.M.

Held at

**PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

2525 North 7th Street

CoPA HUB, Eaton Conference Room

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Thursday, October 24, 2024

State Board of Certified  
Real Estate Appraisers  
October 24, 2024

BOARD MEMBERS:

Mark V. Smeltzer Sr., Chairman, Professional Member - Absent  
 William T. Stoerrle Jr., Vice Chairman, Professional Member  
 Michael McFarlane, Secretary, Professional Member - Absent  
 John D. Ausherman, Professional Member - Absent  
 Chandra Mast, Professional Member  
 Jonathan B. Schuck, Professional Member  
 R. Scott Hartman, Professional Member  
 Martha H. Brown, Esquire, Secretary of the Commonwealth designee  
 Laura Pittini, Consumer Protection Agent, Office of Attorney General designee  
 Paul H. Wentzel Jr., Senior Legislative Director, Department of Banking and Securities designee

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel  
 Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
 Ashley P. Murphy, Esquire, Board Prosecutor  
 Andrew LaFratte, MPA, Deputy Policy Director, Department of State  
 Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator  
 Deon Bowers, Real Estate Commission Administrator

ALSO PRESENT:

Scott DiBiasio, Manager, State and Industry Affairs, Appraisal Institute  
 Marcus Huertas, Advocacy Manager, Pennsylvania Association of Realtors  
 Sarah Whyler, Certified Residential Appraiser & Realtor/Appraisal Coordinator, Charles E. Brown Real Estate, LLC & Brown Appraisers, LLC  
 Teresa Cochran, Executive Director, Assessors' Association of Pennsylvania  
 Tracy Matroni, Education & Member Services at Lancaster County Association of Realtors/Keystone Chapter of the Appraisal Institute

State Board of Certified  
Real Estate Appraisers  
October 24, 2024

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.)

Tyler Satterfield, SRA, R/W-AC, President, Vista  
Realty Services Inc., Certified General Real Estate  
Appraiser  
Owen Dombert, North Penn Legal Services  
Randy  
Derek Richmond, Sargent's Court Reporting Service,  
Inc.

1 \*\*\*

2 State Board of Certified

3 Real Estate Appraisers

4 October 24, 2024

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 noted the meeting was being recorded  
21 and voluntary participation constituted consent to be  
22 recorded.

23 Mr. Rouse also noted the Board entered into  
24 Executive Session with Board Counsel to have  
25 attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of

1 conducting quasi-judicial deliberations.]

2 \*\*\*

3 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State  
4 Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was held on  
5 Thursday, October 24, 2024. William T. Stoerrle Jr.,  
6 Vice Chairman, Professional Member, officially called  
7 the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

8 \*\*\*

9 Roll Call

10 [William T. Stoerrle Jr., Vice Chairman, Professional  
11 Member, requested a roll call of Board members. A  
12 quorum of Board members was present.

13 Ms. Hennessy Hemler noted Chair Smeltzer is not  
14 in attendance for public session but was present  
15 during Executive Session.]

16 \*\*\*

17 Introduction of Attendees

18 [Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator,  
19 provided an introduction of attendees.]

20 \*\*\*

21 Approval of minutes of the September 12, 2024 meeting

22 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

23 Next item would be approval of the  
24 minutes of our meeting on September 12,  
25 2024.

1 Do I have a motion to approve?

2 MR. WENTZEL:

3 So moved.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

5 Second?

6 MR. HARTMAN:

7 Second.

8 MS. HENNESSY HEMLER:

9 Roll call.

10

11 William Stoerrle, aye; Chandra Mast,  
12 aye; Jonathan Schuck, aye; Scott  
13 Hartman, aye; Martha Brown, abstain;  
14 Laura Pittini, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

15 [The motion carried. Martha Brown abstained from  
16 voting on the motion.]

17

\*\*\*

18 Report of Prosecutorial Division

19 [Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor, on  
20 behalf of Ray Michalowski, Esquire, Senior Board  
21 Prosecutor, presented the amended Consent Agreement  
22 for Case Nos. 23-70-001851, 23-70-002005, & 23-70-  
23 002006.]

24 MR. ROUSE:

25 Regarding the Consent Agreement at item

1                   2 on the agenda, Case Nos. 23-70-  
2                   001851, 23-70-002005, & 23-70-002006,  
3                   after discussion in Executive Session,  
4                   I believe the Chair would entertain a  
5                   motion to adopt the amended Consent  
6                   Agreement.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

8                   Do I have a motion?

9 MR. HARTMAN:

10                  So moved.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

12                  Second?

13 MS. BROWN:

14                  Second.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

16                  Any discussion?

17

18                  William Stoerrle, aye; Chandra Mast,  
19                  aye; Jonathan Schuck, aye; Scott  
20                  Hartman, aye; Martha Brown, aye; Laura  
21                  Pittini, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

22 [The motion carried unanimously. That is the Matter  
23 of BPOA v. Raymond Reile Redner, Case Nos. 23-70-  
24 001851, 23-70-002005, & 23-70-002006.]

25

\*\*\*

1 Report of Board Counsel - No Report

2 \*\*\*

3 Regulations/Statute - Regulatory Report

4 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided a  
5 Regulatory Status Report for the Board's review. He  
6 noted 16A-7029 regarding the Practical Applications  
7 of Real Estate Appraisal (PAREA) was in the final  
8 rulemaking stage. He mentioned that a package would  
9 be brought before the Board that incorporates the  
10 comments from the Independent Regulatory Review  
11 Commission (IRRC).

12 Mr. Hartman asked whether 16A-7029 would be  
13 ready for December, and Mr. Rouse noted December to  
14 be the goal.

15 Mr. Hartman mentioned that they have 10  
16 graduates from the Appraisal Institute's PAREA  
17 program and this would continue every month, noting  
18 there is pressure now from people from Pennsylvania  
19 who want to get into the PAREA program but are afraid  
20 because the regulation is not approved.

21 Mr. Rouse explained that final rulemaking  
22 brought before the Board to vote on has to go back to  
23 IRRC. He noted the Board has two years to get a  
24 final rulemaking package in place, and the final  
25 rulemaking would be submitted when the General



1 Assembly reconvenes.]

2

\*\*\*

3 Regulations/Statute - Regulation 16A-7025 Fees

4 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed  
5 Regulation 16A-7025 regarding fees. He noted the  
6 Board adopted the proposed annex for the regulation  
7 on September 12, 2024. He provided a copy of the  
8 proposed preamble and explained that the preamble  
9 states the statutory authority for establishing fees,  
10 the basis for increasing fees by regulatory  
11 amendment, and the description of the proposed  
12 regulatory changes to the fees, including how the  
13 cost of application fees is determined and how  
14 biennial renewal fee increases were determined.

15 Mr. Rouse explained that the next step would be  
16 for Board Counsel to complete the proposed regulatory  
17 package to include drafting of the Regulatory  
18 Analysis Form if the Board votes to approve the  
19 preamble.]

20 MR. ROUSE:

21 Would the Vice Chair entertain a motion  
22 to adopt the proposed preamble and  
23 direct Board Counsel to continue with  
24 the regulatory process?

25 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

1 Do I have a motion?

2 MR. HARTMAN:

3 So moved.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

5 Second?

6 MS. MAST:

7 I second.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

9 Any discussion?

10

11 William Stoerrle, yes; Chandra Mast,  
12 aye; Jonathan Schuck, aye; Scott  
13 Hartman, aye; Martha Brown, aye; Laura  
14 Pittini, aye; Paul Wentzel, aye.

15 [The motion carried unanimously.]

16 \*\*\*

17 Report of Board Chairman - No Report

18 \*\*\*

19 Report of Committees

20 [Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator, noted  
21 the Applications Committee met to discuss revisions  
22 to the experience log.

23 Mr. Hartman reported Board members are  
24 frequently asked about the process and the paperwork  
25 that has to be submitted for a trainee to be allowed

1 to take the national examination to become a  
2 certified appraiser.

3 Mr. Hartman reported some areas of the  
4 experience log form have consistently caused  
5 confusion and that the committee went through the  
6 whole package required to be submitted for someone to  
7 move from a trainee, to be able to take the exam, and  
8 then be certified. He mentioned that clarifications  
9 were made to make all of the forms align with each  
10 other and not be in opposition of each other, which  
11 creates a huge area of confusion for an applicant.

12 Mr. Hartman mentioned that one of the things  
13 that lacked consistency was the number of hours  
14 claimed on the experience log and whether the number  
15 of hours are reasonably equal to the amount of time  
16 the appraiser's peers were spending on those types of  
17 assignments. He noted (e) on the Appraiser  
18 Experience Logs Instructions was modified to show  
19 whether it was a residential or commercial property  
20 type, requires that hours are directly related to the  
21 time spent on the assignment, and requires that hours  
22 spent on the assignment are relatively equal to the  
23 appraiser's peers.

24 Mr. Hartman stated the Board has the right to  
25 ask for the workfile if it feels that any of the

1 appraisals listed on the log are excessive so the  
2 Board can verify whether there was a rationale reason  
3 for the hours. He noted supervisors need to be made  
4 aware that they can be held responsible, including  
5 disciplinary action, if the experience hours are not  
6 supported by the workfile and provided an example.

7 Mr. Hartman addressed the supervisor's level of  
8 involvement on each assignment and referred to (h),  
9 where they changed "P" to the supervisor developed  
10 and reported that section of the report and all the  
11 trainee did was observe. He noted "C" changed to the  
12 property was co-appraised, meaning the trainee and  
13 the supervisor developed that specific section of the  
14 report together. He noted "R" changed to the trainee  
15 independently developed and reported that section of  
16 the report and all the supervisor did was review and  
17 approve.

18 Mr. Hartman stated it should make logical sense.  
19 More "Ts" would be seen early on in the training  
20 career than anything else on the log because the  
21 trainee is learning and watching the supervisor, and  
22 the supervisor is showing them how to do it.

23 Mr. Hartman explained that they would then move  
24 to a "C," where the property is co-appraised, and the  
25 trainee and supervisor would work on it together. He

1 noted they would eventually move to "R" and expect to  
2 see mostly "Rs" at the end of the training period,  
3 where the trainee developed it and then was reviewed  
4 and approved by the supervisor.

5 Ms. Hennessy Hemler reported receiving many  
6 questions under (f) regarding the "client" and  
7 referred to the P, C, and R section of the experience  
8 log, which is filled out by the supervisor for each  
9 assignment. She referred to the column before that,  
10 where it has "yes" or "no". She explained that it  
11 was the property they were on, and whether it was  
12 used for training purposes or an actual client. She  
13 clarified that if it was used for training purposes  
14 for the client that it would be "no" but an appraisal  
15 done with a supervisor would be "yes."

16 Mr. Hartman stated most supervisors do not  
17 actually do the training on a vacant property or  
18 somewhere they have access but are done mostly for  
19 clients. He mentioned that trainees can earn hours  
20 by working on a property that is not being done for a  
21 client as an assignment but are developing an  
22 appraisal with a conclusion of value in a training  
23 mode.

24 Mr. Hartman stated it also corresponds to PAREA  
25 because the student is not appraising an actual

1 property for an assignment for an actual client in  
2 PAREA but are doing a theoretical property for a  
3 client who does not exist.

4 Mr. Rouse asked where the language was derived  
5 under (e), "and must be relatively equal to the  
6 amount of time submitted by the appraiser's peers."  
7 He mentioned that people may not understand that  
8 language.

9 Mr. Hartman explained that the language came  
10 from the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraiser  
11 Practice (USPAP), and one of the primary tenets of  
12 USPAP is they do what their peers do. He noted it  
13 was put in there specifically to say if their peers  
14 are asking for "x" hours that it is equal to "x", and  
15 someone asking for hours equal to "5x" should be  
16 prepared to explain why all of their assignments take  
17 five times longer than their peers.

18 Mr. Rouse commented that the language coming  
19 from USPAP is providing flexibility and basically  
20 setting the parameters for looking at outliers, where  
21 most people are submitting "x" amount of time for  
22 this particular assignment and someone is outside of  
23 the bounds of that, which may be cause for the Board  
24 to request to see the workfile.

25 Mr. Hartman noted that they are expecting it to

1 be way out of bounds, where it may be 5 hours versus  
2 20 hours. He mentioned there needs to be some  
3 flexibility because not everybody works at the same  
4 speed and want to make it equitable for everybody.

5 Mr. Rouse mentioned that it would apply when the  
6 number of hours look inflated or the number of hours  
7 are below other peers.

8 Mr. Hartman explained that they are not saying  
9 the individual is wrong, but the Board may ask to see  
10 their workfile for that job if it is substantially  
11 different. He noted it would be approved if the  
12 workfile substantiates the number of hours but would  
13 not be approved if they cannot substantiate the  
14 number of hours.

15 Mr. Rouse suggested having a public discussion  
16 concerning the page.

17 Mr. Hart commented that the form has been there  
18 for a long time, and the Board continues to make it  
19 better. He welcomed comments from the appraiser  
20 members of the public and suggested having an  
21 exposure draft available at the December 5 meeting,  
22 where comments could be received, and the Board could  
23 then vote on any changes.

24 Mr. Rouse again referred to (e), "supervisor  
25 appraisers may be held responsible, including the

1 potential for disciplinary action, if the request for  
2 experience hours for a specific appraisal is not  
3 supported by the workfile." He noted that the Real  
4 Estate Appraisers Certification Act under Section 11  
5 has 17 possible methods for discipline, where the  
6 potential for discipline of a supervisor would have  
7 to fall into one of those 17 bases for disciplines.

8 Mr. Hartman explained that the issue primarily  
9 is when a trainee tries to claim a lot of hours for  
10 an assignment that does not seem to make sense,  
11 remembering that the supervisor and the trainee both  
12 signed the trainee form submitted in the report.

13 Mr. Hartman noted they now have an appraisal  
14 report governed by USPAP, and it is a violation of  
15 USPAP to submit a report that is false or misleading.

16 He explained that the Board could then hold the  
17 supervisor responsible because the supervisor is the  
18 appraiser on everything the trainee works on and they  
19 signed a report that they should have known was false  
20 or misleading.

21 Mr. Rouse referred to Section 11(a)5 of the Real  
22 Estate Appraisers Certification Act, where performing  
23 an act or omitting an act when such performance or  
24 omission involves dishonesty, fraud, or  
25 misrepresentation with intent to substantially



1 benefit the certificate holder or licensee in this  
2 profession or with the intent to substantially injure  
3 another person.

4 Mr. Hartman commented that the trainee is  
5 signing and the supervisor is letting the individual  
6 sign. He mentioned that they could refer an  
7 application that is clearly false to prosecution.

8 Mr. Rouse mentioned that the Board does not do  
9 investigations and has a separate role.

10 Ms. Brown commented that Mr. Rouse is trying to  
11 point out the underlying authority in the act for any  
12 possible disciplinary matter.

13 Mr. Rouse explained that he is trying to make  
14 sure it could really be done if they make a statement  
15 like that because it has to be attached to the  
16 Board's authority under the act.

17 Mr. Fritsch offered to have a conversation with  
18 Mr. Rouse regarding that authority, noting  
19 prosecution deals with the statute and the  
20 regulations. He reported bringing cases against the  
21 applicant for filing an application that was false or  
22 fraudulent but was not aware of a supervisor being  
23 charged in that situation. He mentioned that they  
24 could look at the law and confirm if there is  
25 authority there.

1 Mr. Rouse stated it is an issue nationally in  
2 terms of when the supervisor can be held responsible  
3 in cases where an experience log is submitted to the  
4 Board and believed there should be further discussion  
5 on that issue.

6 Mr. Hartman mentioned that Pennsylvania is  
7 unique among many states because they have a trainee  
8 form that is attached to the appraisal, which becomes  
9 part of the appraisal signed by the supervisor and  
10 the trainee. He noted the supervisor should know  
11 what is there and violates USPAP if they create a  
12 false or misleading appraisal.

13 Ms. Hennessy Hemler addressed the Registry for  
14 Supervisor of Licensed Appraiser Trainee  
15 Instructions. She reported the language is changing  
16 until page 4, "the certification of the supervisory  
17 appraiser."

18 She noted the Applications Committee wanted the  
19 addition of having the supervisor certify the  
20 following statement: "I certify that as part of my  
21 supervision of any trainee that I shall supervisor  
22 supervise the completion of the Appraiser Experience  
23 Log, and experience hours claimed must be directly  
24 equal to actual time spent on the assignment, and  
25 hours are relatively equal to the trainee's peers.

1 I further certify that the Board may request the  
2 workfile for any and all appraisals that may be  
3 deemed in excess of experience hours. I further  
4 understand that I may be held responsible, including  
5 the potential for disciplinary action, if the request  
6 for experience hours for a specific appraisal is not  
7 supported by the workfile."

8 Mr. Hartman again mentioned that they are trying  
9 to make all of the forms as aligned as possible, and  
10 any future changes will be reflected on all of the  
11 forms.

12 Ms. Mast asked whether there would be a schedule  
13 for trainees to understand what an expected peer  
14 equivalency would be or whether they would be  
15 expected to just understand that because most  
16 trainees would not have a good idea of how much time  
17 to spend on a new type of report that they have never  
18 done.

19 Mr. Hartman explained that trainees are supposed  
20 to be truthful from the very beginning as far as how  
21 many hours were spent on the job. He explained that  
22 every appraisal would be to the schedule if they  
23 publish a schedule, and it is not the intention to  
24 have every residential report to have the same number  
25 of hours. He mentioned a progression should be seen

1 from the trainee over time by seeing a report  
2 reflecting a decrease in the normal 8 hours due to  
3 being more proficient over time.

4 Vice Chair Stoerrle mentioned that this form has  
5 trainee's peers but in the other forms only use  
6 peers.

7 Mr. Hartman noted that should be changed for  
8 consistency.

9 Mr. Hartman addressed the Pennsylvania State  
10 Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers Required  
11 Checklist for Licensed Appraisal Trainee. He  
12 reported adding the number of hours spent on the  
13 appraisal for a link between the appraisal and the  
14 trainee log, because the trainee does not currently  
15 notate in the trainee form how many hours were spent  
16 on it and then it gets confusing when they go to the  
17 log.

18 Ms. Brown referred to the prior document and  
19 suggested it read, "may request the workfile for any  
20 and all appraisals that are deemed to contain  
21 deficient or excessive hours," and Board members  
22 agreed.

23 Mr. Hartman also mentioned that residential  
24 appraisers sometimes need assistance from certified  
25 general appraisers, but the workfile would contain

1 all of the necessary information if they are doing  
2 everything correctly. He noted they are trying to  
3 avoid someone claiming unreasonable levels of hours  
4 for the assignment to shortcut the experience time.

5 Mr. Rouse suggested placing revisions to  
6 experience logs and the supervisor application and  
7 training checklist on the next Board agenda to notify  
8 people of what will be discussed at the meeting.]

9 \*\*\*

10 Report of Board Administrator - No Report

11 \*\*\*

12 Next Board Meeting Date

13 [Kristel Hennessy Hemler, Board Administrator, noted  
14 the next scheduled Board meeting is December 5.]

15 \*\*\*

16 Adjournment

17 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

18 Motion to adjourn.

19 MR. WENTZEL:

20 So moved.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN STOERRLE:

22 Second?

23 MS. BROWN:

24 Second.

25 \*\*\*

1 [There being no further business, the State Board of  
2 Certified Real Estate Appraisers Meeting adjourned at  
3 11:22 a.m.]

4 \*\*\*

5  
6 CERTIFICATE

7  
8 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary  
9 minutes of the State Board of Certified Real Estate  
10 Appraisers meeting, was reduced to writing by me or  
11 under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately  
12 summarize the substance of the State Board of  
13 Certified Real Estate Appraisers meeting.

14  
15  
16 

17 Derek Richmond,  
18 Minute Clerk  
19 Sargent's Court Reporting  
20 Service, Inc.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

STATE BOARD OF CERTIFIED  
REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS  
REFERENCE INDEX

October 24, 2024

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

TIME	AGENDA
9:00	Executive Session
10:30	Return to Open Session
10:30	Official Call to Order
10:32	Roll Call
10:32	Introduction of Attendees
10:34	Approval of Minutes
10:34	Report of Prosecutorial Division
10:38	Regulations/Statute
10:44	Report of Committees
11:22	Adjournment