



## ARIZONA BOARD OF APPRAISAL

1400 West Washington, Suite 360  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
(602) 542-1539 Fax (602) 542-1598  
Email: appraisal@appraisal.state.az.us  
Website: www.appraisal.state.az.us

### MINUTES REGULAR BOARD MEETING Friday, April 22, 2011 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.

#### Call to Order and Roll Call

Regular Board meeting called to order by Les Abrams, Chairman.

Board members Present at Roll Call:

Les Abrams  
Debbie Rudd  
Myra Jefferson  
James Heaslet  
Michael Petrus  
Joe Stroud  
Mike Trueba  
Kevin Yeanoplos

Staff Attendance:

Dan Pietropaulo – Executive Director  
Jeanne Galvin – Assistant Attorney General  
Rebecca Loar - Staff  
Amanda Benally - Staff

#### Pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America

#### Approval of Minutes

Myra Jefferson made a motion to approve the March 16, 2011 minutes. The motion was seconded by Debbie Rudd and passed, Joe Stroud and James Heaslet recused themselves.

Les Abrams introduced Joe Stroud as the new Board member and that he replaced the public Board member position of Cynthia Henry.

#### Call to the Public

A call to the public was made with no responses.

#### Review and Action concerning 2828 Luis Llanos

Respondent appeared. There was discussion between the respondent and the Board regarding how to determine the difference between a condo and a townhome. The Board found no other problems. Debbie Rudd made a motion to terminate probation. James Heaslet seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Review and Action concerning 3231 Walter Reed

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read Complaint Alleges: It is my opinion that the entire tenor of this appraisal is to prove that the property is worth less than it should be, indeed, rather than providing the property's value it seems to make an effort to prove its lack of such. Respondent Replies: The basis of this complaint is the subject owner's disappointment with the final estimate of value, it being lower than what she had expected. There was some discussion regarding the zoning description, highest and best use. Michael Petrus made a motion that the Board find no violations and dismiss the complaint. Mike Trueba seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, and James Heaslet recused himself, the motion passed.

#### Review and Action concerning 3227 Jason K. Moss

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read, Complaint Alleges: The appraiser made numerous mistakes in the report. Respondent Replies: I believe that the report was completed in a manner that would provide an accurate and unbiased opinion of market value. Debbie Rudd mentioned the majority of these violations appear to be small but together make a misleading report. There was some discussion regarding the cost approach, all photos were MLS, pools and patios should be on the sketch per HUD guidelines. James Heaslet made a motion that the Board find a Level 2 and offer a due diligence consent letter citing violations; 1-1(c) for numerous typos; 1-4(b) for the cost approach not being credible; 2-1(a) for the report being misleading; scope of work for not complying with HUD guidelines. In addition to the disciplinary education requirements the Board also requested respondent to submit his plan of quality control regarding how he will change his practice. Myra Jefferson seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Informal Hearing concerning 2926/2927/2928/2929/2930 Scott A. Gary

Respondent appeared. Board and staff introduced themselves, respondent signed consent to waive introduction of informal hearing to be read on the record. Chairperson swore respondent in. Respondent gave an opening statement: There was discussion on comparable selection and choosing superior comparables from the subject property. There was some discussion on what the respondent changed in his appraisal practice, classes he has taken, and if he is networking with anyone or organizations, and if he has signed up to receive the Board email blasts, FHA newsletters, and other current issues. The respondent gave a final statement, mentioned there were mistakes made, has improved geographical competency, and totally changed his business practices. And he mentioned that this was his first set of complaints. Michael Petrus made the motion that the Board combine all complaints and find a Level 3, citing violations in the investigative reports and offer a consent agreement and order for probation without a mentor and requiring disciplinary education. James Heaslet seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Informal Hearing concerning 2975-2982, inclusive John S. Colman

Respondent appeared. Board and staff introduced themselves, respondent signed consent to waive introduction of informal hearing to be read on the record. Chairperson swore respondent in. Respondent gave an opening statement: mentioned that these reports were not his best work and that he had changed his methods and procedures considerably.

Respondent gave a closing statement: Myra Jefferson made the motion that the Board combine all complaints and find a Level 4, citing violations found in the investigative reports to include conduct, and offer a consent agreement and order for a 30-day

suspension with 6 months probation w/ mentor, requiring disciplinary education. Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General requested that the Board would allow her to negotiate with the respondent for a time to begin the suspension, the Board agreed. Debbie Rudd requested from staff that the respondent's appraiser logs he turns in during his probationary period include whether the client is a lender or other. James Heaslet seconded the motion, Kevin Yeanoplos voted no, and Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Informal Hearing concerning 3188 Kevin P. Dowling

Respondent appeared. Board and staff introduced themselves, respondent signed consent to waive introduction of informal hearing to be read on the record. Chairperson swore respondent in. Respondent gave an opening statement: I stand by the report and feel the value was well supported. There was some discussion regarding the comparable selections and adjustments. Respondent made a closing statement and said that he stands by his appraisal. James Heaslet made the motion that the Board refer this to investigation. Michael Petrus seconded the motion, Debbie Rudd recused herself, and Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Informal Hearing concerning 3191 Stephen M. Steitz

Respondent appeared. Board and staff introduced themselves, respondent signed consent to waive introduction of informal hearing to be read on the record. Chairperson swore respondent in. Respondent did not give an opening statement. The Board discussed the respondent's comparables used in his report, the price difference between a 2 story and a single story property, and how the respondent researches his comparables. The respondent explained that the subject property is at the higher end of the lower market and was looking for comparables at the high end of that market. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board find a Level 3 citing violations: scope of work acceptability; conduct, 1-1(a), 2-2(a); 2-2(b); 1-3(a) for declining values and the marketing values were not addressed correctly and offer a consent agreement and order with probation with a mentor, providing disciplinary education. James Heaslet seconded the motion. Michael Petrus voted no, he thought the mentorship was way overboard for someone with a first complaint, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Prior Board Member Recognition for Cynthia Henry

Les Abrams mentioned that Cynthia Henry was an excellent Board member and has added a lot of great insight especially of the Tucson area and that she will be missed. Cynthia Henry gave a short statement regarding her 51 years of her life in Arizona and how much she loves this state with her heart and soul. She mentioned that when she started on the Board the real estate market was rosy, and that the Board has made a lot of good changes and how very proud she is of the majority of appraisers in this state.

#### Prior Board Member Recognition for Michael Marquess

Les Abrams mentioned that Michael Marquess was unable to appear and that he did one heck of a job as a Board member. Debbie Rudd accepted the plaque on Michael Marquess' behalf. The Executive Director, Dan Pietropaulo mentioned that the staff will send an audio recording of this meeting to Michael Marquess for his own acknowledgement.

#### Review and Action concerning 3228 Jay A. Josephs

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read, Complaint Alleges: I believe this appraiser artificially inflated the value for this property. The comps used are nearly all in superior subdivisions and the appraiser has appeared to have made significant errors in both site size adjustments and market condition adjustments. Respondent Replies: I believe the report was prepared to high standards and in conformity to USPAP. Les Abrams discussed that normal Board procedure when a Board member is involved in a complaint, it goes directly to investigation. Since this matter involved the Executive Director, Dan Pietropaulo at a peripheral level, the Board staff followed the same procedure. However, the respondent requested that the Board proceed with the initial first file review without sending it to investigation. James Heaslet made the motion that the Board find no violations and dismiss. Debbie Rudd seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Review and Action concerning 3225 Scott Tennyson

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read, Complaint Alleges: The appraiser stated in his report that he inspected the attic, when in fact he didn't. The appraiser omitted that the client took the pictures because his back was hurt. Respondent Replies: I made no comment, whatsoever, as to the attic in the report I sent my client. This is admittedly an omission on my part. This is a complex appraisal and the omission of any comment referring to the attic is simply an oversight for which I take full responsibility. Respondent gave an explanation to why he allowed the homeowner to take pictures in the attic on his behalf and that during the "in-house" review he was unaware of the narrative changes made in his report where his explanation was removed without him knowing. Respondent also mentioned that since this error the appraisal company he works for has changed how they managed appraisals and that they will not change a thing without checking with the appraiser first. Michael Petrus made the motion that the Board find no violations and dismiss. James Heaslet seconded the motion; Debbie Rudd recused herself, the motion passed.

#### Review and Action concerning 3216 Steve Hardman

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read, Complaint Alleges: Following a review, potential USPAP violations were found. Respondent Replies: Comps selected are considered good indicators of value for the subject property. The appraisal was completed with no collusion, inappropriate or other fraudulent influences with the borrower or any other person involved with the loan. There was discussion regarding the comparable choices from the appraiser, and how the respondent does his cost approach. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board find a Level 2 citing violations; 1-1(a); 1-4 (a); 2-1(a) for the comparables were further away and the cost approach 1-4 (b)(i) and 1-4 (b)(ii) offering a nondisciplinary remedial action letter requiring remedial education. Mike Trueba seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

#### Review and Action concerning 3201 Ken L. Simmons II & 3202 David P. Morris

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read; 3201 is against co-appraiser and complaint 3202 is against the supervisory appraiser. Complaint Alleges: It is unethical for this appraiser to issue an opinion of value for a market he has worked so little in and did not take time to become familiar with the local market. Respondent Replies: I do not feel that I was outside of my geographical area, as I have performed/assisted on enough appraisals, to understand the area. Michael Petrus made the motion that the Board find

no violations and dismiss. There was discussion of the appraiser's choice and location of comparables selected. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board refer this to investigation. James Heaslet seconded the motion. Michael Petrus thought that would be a waste. 4 yes' and 4 no's, the motion failed. Michael Petrus made the motion that the Board find no violations and dismiss. Michael Trueba seconded the motion, James Heaslet voted no, the motion passed.

#### Review and Action concerning 3173 Eric R. Ranta

Respondent did not appear. Debbie Rudd moved that because Respondents 90-day grace period to renew had expired, the complaint be closed without prejudice and be reopened and considered in the event Respondent reapplies. Myra Jefferson seconded the motion, the Board voted unanimously.

#### Review and Action concerning 3184 Sheri L. Farrell

Respondent appeared. Staff summary was read. Complaint Alleges: Following an appraisal review, several USPAP errors were found. Respondent Replies: I have thoroughly reviewed the appraisal in detail and found no supporting data to suggest that the appraisal value was elevated. It is my opinion that the review appraisal was incorrect in not including the additional sq feet as G.L.A. and in doing so, would have arrived at the correct and more accurate opinion of value. Debbie Rudd found the following violations: 1-1(a); 1-4 (a); 1-4 (b (ii) and mentioned that this report was done prior to her current probation and mentorship. Rebecca Loar confirmed that she and her mentor is current and in compliance. There was some discussion among the Board members regarding FHA standards, building permits and lender's requirements versus the markets requirements. Debbie Rudd made the motion for the Board find a Level 2 citing the violations and offer a nondisciplinary remedial action letter without education. James Heaslet seconded the motion, the Board voted unanimously.

#### Issues Dealing with Formal Hearing concerning 11F-3071-BOA/11F-3085-BOA/11F-3195-BOA/11F-3199-BOA/11F-3226-BOA James R. Nelson present with attorney Michael Orcutt, Assistant Attorney General, Jeanne Galvin

Jeanne Galvin gave an overview of the respondent's counteroffer and the terms. Respondent's attorney Michael Orcutt informed the Board of respondent's appraisal background and his agreement to do whatever is necessary to continue his appraisal profession. There was discussion that the respondent has agreed to offer restitution to the complainants and can pay it off in a time framed allowed. Respondent informed the Board that he is working with his phone provider and he purchased a new phone with more capabilities. There was some discussion about the phone services available and what differences the respondent is planning on making to better his communication to his clients and the public. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board accept the respondent's counteroffer to include the respondent to pay full restitution to the complainants within the 12 month probationary period and to vacate the referral to formal hearing before the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). James Heaslet seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion

#### Review and Action concerning 3078 Adele D. Lindquist

Respondent did not appear. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board rescind the referral to investigation based upon research she has done and with the available Pima County MLS. Myra Jefferson seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

Review and Action concerning 3037/3038/3039 Adele D. Lindquist

Respondent did not appear. Debbie Rudd found the following violations for complaint 3037; 1-1(a); 1-2 (h); scope of work acceptability; 1-1(b); 1-4 (b) (iii). Complaint 3038 ; 1-1(c); 1-4 (a); 1-2 (h); 1-5 (a); 1-4 (b) (iii); and 3039; 1-1(a); 1-2 (h) scope of work acceptability. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board combine all three complaints and find a Level 2 and offer a due diligence consent letter, James Heaslet seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

Review and Action concerning 2830 Bryan S. Speelman

Respondent did not appear. Rebecca Loar informed the Board that the respondent signed the proposed nondisciplinary letter of concern. The Board took no action and closed the complaint.

Review and Action concerning 2883 Paul J. Dickinson

Respondent did not appear. Debbie Rudd moved that because Respondents 90-day grace period to renew had expired, the complaint be closed without prejudice and be reopened and considered in the event Respondent reapplies. James Heaslet seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

Review and Action concerning 3057 Geoffrey C. Brady

Respondent did not appear. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board refer this matter to a formal hearing before the Office of Administrative Hearing (OAH) for revocation. James Heaslet seconded the motion, Joe Stroud abstained, the motion passed.

Review and Action concerning 3230 Ryan J. Lowe

Respondent did not appear. Staff summary was read Complaint Alleges: Many errors, lack of data, inaccurate data, and misleading analysis. Respondent Replies: In retrospect, I would say that I never should have signed a report when it was not compliant to USPAP standards even though it was what my client requested. I do realize these items should have been accounted for before the signed report was delivered. Mike Petrus made the motion that the Board invite the respondent to an informal hearing. Mike Trueba seconded the motion, the Board voted unanimously.

Review and Action concerning 3233 James J. Graham

Respondent did not appear. Staff summary was read Complaint Alleges: Critical omissions in the appraisal, numerous errors both which led to an under valuation of the subject property. Respondent Replies: The review appraiser has 13 separate USPAP violations or more and that the review report was completed incompetently. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board invite the respondent to an informal hearing. Mike Petrus seconded the motion, the Board voted unanimously.

12-month File Review

The Board noted the status of complaints was listed on the agenda.

AMCs (Appraisal Management Companies) Ratification: Discussion, consideration, and possible ratification of AMC's approved for registration:

Les Abrams read into the record each AMC listed on the consent agenda. All of these AMC's are currently on the approved AMC list posted on the Board's website and are already authorized to do business in Arizona. Debbie Rudd moved that the Board ratify all of the AMC's on the consent agenda. James Heaslet seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously.

Les Abrams announced and welcomed the new Board member Joe Stroud and informed the Board that it has been a year since the Executive Director; Dan Pietropaulo came to work for the Board. He stated there has been an extraordinary turnaround and on behalf of the Board, the regulated community and the public I thank you.

Executive Director Report

The Executive Director, Dan Pietropaulo mentioned that this is a great Board; it is balanced with a give and take. The quality of this Board and the amount of work and unpaid hours the Board puts in, and thanked the Board for their services. He also welcomed Joe Stroud as the new Board member. Very level headed, reasonable, fair and very knowledgeable.

Debbie Rudd gave a summary of the Association of Appraiser Regulatory Officials (AARO) conference she and the Executive Director, Dan Pietropaulo attended. The conference primarily focused on the Dodd Frank Act and how the boards are to proceed with its compliance. At the conference Jim Park gave a presentation saying the two big issues around the Dodd Frank Act are the mandatory reporting; and though they are not seeing a big increase yet, they are concerned. Even if 1% all of the properties were turned in, the state boards would be flooded across the states. The second big issue is customary & reasonable fees.

Debbie Rudd reported that while it is fairly clear to her that Dodd Frank stated fees should be set by surveys, the Appraisal Management Companies (AMC's) lobbied to the Federal Reserve, (who are the ones in charge of the Truth and Lending Act provision) that they had not been heard. This lobbying resulted in Presumptive #1 which states that if an appraiser states that they are being paid reasonable & customary fees then the AMC will be in compliance. Later in the conference Virginia Gibbs of the Federal Reserve Board stated that the AMC's should not rely on this presumption as a "safe harbor". It was several attendees' opinion that customary & reasonable fees will probably ultimately decided in court. We are hoping for more guidance from the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau (CFPB) once it takes over this issue in July, but not sure if we are going to see anything soon.

David Bunton with the Appraisal Foundation gave an update on the newest board. The Appraisal Practice Board is the third board and unlike Appraisal Qualification Board and the Appraisal Standards Board, the Appraisal Practice Board is voluntary, thus you do not have to comply with it. It is like a best practices type situation. Our board will not be enforcing anything that comes from the Appraisal Practice Board at this point.

The Appraisal Foundation is developing a guide of USPAP for non-appraisers. On the Appraisal Foundation website there is an e-library that talks about the responsibilities for state regulators. The foundation recommends that Board members check it out to make

sure we know what it is we are supposed to be doing. Jim Park gave a talk about the Appraisal Sub Committee and their compliance reviews. We will be audited again in January and they will look at the 12 month file review and budgeting and staffing to make sure the boards have enough funds and staffing to handle the compliance requirements. Currently there are 19 states that have issues with their compliance. This is up from 2009 when they only had 15 states out of compliance and 2008 when only 16 states were out of compliance. The Appraisal Sub Committee believe these audits will take longer then in the past. Appraisal licenses & certifications are trending down to 110,026 from 2009 numbers of 121,407. They expect it to go down to the mid 80's to 85's. That is based on the number of mortgage applications. So far there is a 16% decline in revenue in the last 3 years for the Appraisal Sub Committee. Carl Schultz, the current Chairperson of the Appraisal Standards Board talked about the board adopting all the changes in the 5<sup>th</sup> Exposure Draft, except they will not require hypothetical conditions to be labeled and they are still keeping standards 4 and 5 for right now. So that will be in the new 2012-2013 Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP). Rick Baumgardner, current Chairperson of the Appraisal Qualification Board gave a report stating that in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Exposure Draft the 4-year college degree is still required, but they removed the associate degree for a residential certification and in place there will be a 30-hour college work criteria. It also includes background checks based on the Safe Act. They are still seeking input on doing background checks on appraisers. We already do that here, but some states do not.

I listened to the session on Appraisal Management Companies (AMC's) implementation. I heard from Bob Keith from the Oregon Appraisal Board Rod Sternum from the Oklahoma Appraisal Board, and Jim Martin from the Arkansas' Appraisal Board and all of them stated that it is very difficult getting the rules written and regulating AMC's.

Virginia Gibbs, current member of The Federal Reserve Board, spoke about reasonable & customary fees. She pointed out that this is part of the Truth and Lending Act which is regarding the consumer's principle dwelling, or primary residence. The way that Debbie Rudd is interpreting this is that Customary and Reasonable fees may not be able to be enforced if it is on investment property. Consumer Finance Protection Bureau is coming into play as of July 21, 2011.

Ms. Gibbs also talked about evaluations, that de minimus levels have not changed, therefore if the loan is under \$250,000, for residential properties and a million dollars for a commercial loan (unless the payment of the commercial loan is from the income or sale of the real estate) then they do not have to have an appraisal. Although if it is a Government Sponsored Enterprise (GSE) they are still requiring an appraisal. Automated Valuation Models (AVM's) and Broker Price Opinions (BPO's) are not evaluations but may be used in conjunction to develop an evaluation; an evaluation is not an appraisal.

In a Board Member breakout session, they talked a little bit about how Oklahoma has a committee that screens grievances not complaints. Their committee is made up of 6 appraisers that were picked from the 42 panel recommended by each of their 7 board members at the beginning of the year (each board member recommends 6 appraisers to sit on this panel each year). Then when the Oklahoma Board office receives a complaint they copy it and send it out to the 6 appraisers that they believe would be the best subject matter experts for that grievance. When the committee has about 10 grievances they assemble the committee to discuss behind close doors each case. When the

committee reaches a consensus of what USPAP violations (if any), have been violated, the committee presents this to the board. The board then decides if they agree with the committee. The board doesn't know who the grievance is against. The board then based on the committees presentation of the grievance, decides whether or not it should be a complaint. If the board does decide to make the grievance into a complaint then it goes to another 6 member committee to decide what discipline the complaint should be. Then that committee presents the discipline recommendation and the board either adopts it or modifies it. The Oklahoma Board only acts as a judge.

Mark Simpson with Freddie Mac and Robert Murphy with FannieMae gave a talk about the Uniform Appraisal Data (UAD) that the loan applications taken after December 1, 2011 will require the use of UAD. Also HUD and VA have adopted the same thing. The UAD is a coding that will be used in the appraisal unlike what we have known before. The software companies will have this new UAD coding by the end of April.

The pass rate of the appraisal examinations are going up, but that is what they expected now that the new Appraisal Qualification Board requirements have been in place for three years. It was 44% in the first year and now we are up to 51% for first time test takers.

The next Association of Appraiser Regulatory Officials (AARO) conference will be October 16, 2011 in Washington DC, and will be the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of AARO. Debbie Rudd concluded her report on the (AARO) conference.

The Executive Director, Dan Pietropaulo asked the Board to approve \$3,500 in funds to reimburse Debbie Rudd and himself for the last AARO Conference. Les Abrams made the motion and James Heaslet seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

The Executive Director, Dan Pietropaulo gave an update on the changes in Board staff. Angenique Castaneda is no longer with the Board staff and Amanda Benally has been hired as the new accountant in replace of Angenique. Amanda is doing an outstanding job. We also now have a new temporary employee Cody Quinn who is also doing an outstanding job. Amanda is very very competent and after going through an in depth audit of the budget the Board is well under appropriation so we are in good shape, I intend to start sending out investigations.

Senate Bill 1180, the disciplinary bill was signed by the governor and will be going into effect as of July 20, 2011.

We have already collected fees on two new AMC applications. The Governor's Regulatory Rule Committee (GRRC) approved the fee rule so we can collect the AMC application fees. The Board's 12-month file review list is dwindling. He stated that his goal is to get back in compliance with the Appraisal Sub Committee (ASC) by December 31, 2011. This was the first time this Board was out of compliance with the ASC. Board staff compiled a new Complaint Statistics Report, see attached below.

	Jan.	%	Feb.	%	Mar.	%	Total	Total %
<b>Complaints Received by Board</b>	0		0		0		0	
<b>Number of Respondents (of complaints received)</b>	0		0		0		0	
<b>Number of Agenda Items</b>	0		0		0		0	
<b>Board Actions</b>								
<b>Dismissed</b>	3	15.79%	6	30.00%	9	69.23%	18	34.62%
<b>Nondisciplinary Letter of Concern</b>	3	15.79%	2	10.00%	0	0.00%	5	9.62%
<b>Nondisciplinary Remedial Action</b>	4	21.05%	0	0.00%	2	15.38%	6	11.54%
<b>Due Diligence</b>	0	0.00%	1	5.00%	2	15.38%	3	5.77%
<b>Probation</b>	4	21.05%	5	25.00%	0	0.00%	9	17.31%
<b>Suspension</b>	0	0.00%	5	25.00%	0	0.00%	5	9.62%
<b>Surrender</b>	5	26.32%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	9.62%
<b>Revocation</b>	0	0.00%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.92%
<b>Cease &amp; Desist</b>	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total Board Actions</b>	19	100.00%	20	100.00%	13	100.00%	52	100.00%
<b>Other Board Actions</b>								
<b>Ref. to Investigation</b>	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	3	60.00%	5	20.83%
<b>Informal Hearing</b>	0	0.00%	16	100.00%	0	0.00%	16	66.67%
<b>Formal Hearing</b>	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%	3	12.50%
<b>Total Other Board Actions</b>	3	100.00%	16	100.00%	5	100.00%	24	100.00%
<b>Violation Levels</b>								
<b>I</b>	3	30.00%	2	22.22%	9	69.23%	14	43.75%
<b>II</b>	4	40.00%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	5	15.63%
<b>III</b>	2	20.00%	5	55.56%	4	30.77%	11	34.38%
<b>IV</b>	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	3.13%
<b>V</b>	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	1	3.13%
<b>Total Violations</b>	10	100.00%	9	100.00%	13	100.00%	32	100.00%
<b>Complaints Closed as of 2011</b>								
<b>Closed due to Expiration</b>	8		5		0		13	
<b>Closed - Other</b>	0		0		0		0	
<b>Total Closed Complaints</b>	8		5		0		13	

This report will be available on the Board's website as well as in the minutes. The Board finally has the funds to begin with the data merge into a new database. Ultimately I would like to have a database that all this information automatically populates and can be posted on the website. There has been an increase of public records requests from AMCs for disciplinary history. Assistant Attorney General, Jeanne Galvin's assignments are up to date and there were no complaints extended by staff.

Application Review Committee

The following Arizona appraiser and property tax agent information as of April 12, 2011:

A. Report on number of Arizona Appraisers and Property Tax Agents:						
	<u>2/09</u>		<u>2/10</u>		<u>2/11</u>	
Licensed Residential	840		607		476	
Certified Residential	1244		1203		1184	
Certified General	828	Total 2912	816	Total 2626	805	Total 2465
Nonresident Temporary	40		52		65	
Property Tax Agents	298		347		353	

James Heaslet recommended that the Board approve all items on the application review committee. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board accept the committee's recommendations. Mike Trueba seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Education Review Committee

James Heaslet recommended to the Board that they approve all items on the education review committee agenda. Debbie Rudd made the motion that the Board accept the committee's recommendations. Myra Jefferson seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. There was discussion and recommendation that the Board remove the Remedial & Disciplinary Education list and to combine all three education lists into one education list to include the Remedial and Disciplinary Education categories.

Confirmation of Meeting Dates, Times, Locations, and Purposes

At this time there will not be a need for a Rules Committee meeting. The next committee and board meetings are posted on the Board's website.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

---

Lester G. Abrams, Chairperson