4	
1	CTATE OF ALAQUA
2	STATE OF ALASKA
3	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
4	DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING
5	DOADD OF CERTIFIED REAL FOTATE ARREST
6 7	BOARD OF CERTIFIED REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
8	MEETING MINUTES
9	A muil 40, 2000
10	April 12, 2022 Board Meeting
11	board weeting
12	By authority of AS 08.01.070(2), and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, a
13	scheduled meeting of the Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers was held April 12, 2022, at
14	the State of Alaska Atwood Building, 550 W. 7 th Avenue, Suite 1550, via Zoom, Anchorage,
15	Alaska.
16	
17	
18	Tuesday, April 12, 2022
19	Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order
20	Chairperson Ashlee Stetson called the meeting to order at 10:13 a.m., at which time a quorum
21	was established.
22	
23	Roll Call
24	Members Present via Zoom
25	Ashlee Stetson, Public Member, Chairperson
26	Val Kudryn, Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser
27	Leon McKean, Mortgage Industry Executive
28	Mae Hayes, Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser
29	
30	Members Absent:
31	None
32	
33	Staff Present:
34	Sara Sather, CBPL APR Licensing Examiner
35	Erika Prieksat, CBPL Investigator
36	Anna Gabriel, CBPL Investigator, via Zoom
37	Melissa Dumas, CBPL Administrative Operations Manager, via Zoom
38	Marilyn Zimmerman, CBPL Paralegal
39	Brian Suprise, CBPL Paralegal
40	
41	Public in Attendance-via Zoom:
42	Stuart Burns, via Zoom
43	Erin Ingle, via Zoom
44 45	Ben Hartlieb, via Zoom
45 46	
46 47	Peview/Approve Agonda
47 40	Review/Approve Agenda Reard Members reviewed the meeting agenda and meyed to approve
48 49	Board Members reviewed the meeting agenda and moved to approve.
50	
51	On a motion made duly by Mr. Kudryn, seconded by Ms. Hayes, it was
JT	On a motion made duty by wit. Rudiyii, seconded by wis. Hayes, it was

RESOLVED to approve the meeting agenda for April 12, 2022.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ethics Report

There were no ethics reports to be made.

Continuing Education Statement

Stuart Burns requests to obtain continuing education for attendance of the meeting. Mr. Kudryn and Ms. Hayes also request to obtain continuing education for attendance if they have not reached their max hours. Ms. Sather will confirm how many hours may be obtained and email the Continuing Education Statement to the appropriate individuals.

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Approve Past Meeting Minutes

January 11, 2022

The January Board Meeting meeting minutes were reviewed with no discrepancies. The Board moved to approve the meeting minutes as written. Mae Hayes abstained from voting as she was not present at the January 11, 2022 meeting.

On a motion duly made by Mr. McKean, seconded by Mr. Kudryn, it was

RESOLVED to approve the meeting minutes for January 11, 2022.

The motion passed.

March 9, 2022

The March Teleconference meeting minutes were reviewed with no discrepancies. The Board moved to approve the meeting minutes as written. Ashlee Stetson abstained from voting as she was not present at the March 9, 2022 meeting

On a motion duly made by Ms. Hayes, seconded by Mr. Kudryn, it was

RESOLVED to approve the meeting minutes for March 9, 2022.

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 3 – Public Comment

Stuart Burns, certified appraiser representing Stan Sayers Appraisal in Anchorage, spoke on behalf of the company's Supervisor Appraiser Paul Christian Andrews who was unable to attend today. Speaking on behalf of the company's two Trainees Mr. Burns expressed they are running into difficulty with a less than desirable training experience with the Appraisal Institute. They are reaching out to the Board to potentially assist in getting their training experience completed in a timely manner. Due to Covid Appraisal Institute is not holding in person courses. In regards to the Sales and Income Approach Course specifically, there is currently no approved online

course for qualifying education. Due to this the Trainees are facing a 6 month to 1 year delay in applying as an appraiser just because they cannot obtain prerequisite courses required for the application. The request to the Board is to consider approving the online Sales and Income Approach Course as a qualifying education course.

Ms. Stetson asked if this specific course was discussed during the March Teleconference. Ms. Hayes explained the March 9th meeting was focused on how to amend the regulations to recognize that online platforms are an acceptable method of education. That specific course was not discussed, however, the topic of online courses was being addressed. Mr. Kudryn confirmed this and went into further explanation of the course approval process. Ms. Stetson provided further explanation that with synchronous courses her priority is reviewing the attendance policy. She explained that the Board, as a whole, has held consistent importance with approval of online courses, especially with Covid.

Ben Hartlieb asked if there was a potential timeline of when an online course would be approved.

 Ms. Stetson explained that the Board does not reach out to education providers for them to submit courses for approval. That burden is on the education provider to submit applications. Ms. Sather explained the timeline for state processing application for Board review; for a complete application roughly about a week to get in front of the Board. Once received the application is received, mail sorted, payment processed, scanned and delivered to each department, once in the examiner's inbox it is the time of the examiner reviewing. If it is not complete it can take longer depending on how long it takes the education provider to communicate back and provide the needed documentation.

Mr. Hartlieb asked for clarification if this specific course is up for discussion today.

Ms. Hayes clarified that this specific course has not been discussed nor is on the agenda. It is the topic of online courses and updating regulation that will be discussed. There have previously been emergency regulations in place to accept online education which have since expired, however, this Board has operated as a policy to acknowledge online synchronous learning as synchronous classroom learning. She explained if it was an application that was not approved there must not have been sufficient supporting details in regards to attendance policy or class content, however, she can't speak in detail without the application in front of her.

Mr. Hartlieb asked for clarification on asynchronous courses; what he is hearing that the safest course of action would be to attend in person in September? Ms. Hayes explained it is scheduled for later in this meeting to continue to address the regulation so there is no ambiguity with online learning.

Ms. Hayes asked Ms. Sather when the online education regulation project should be effective. Ms. Sather explained on the agenda is to review the edits that were approved during the March teleconference, pending the Board's decision today more edits can be made or if the Board moves to approve them we can proceed with moving towards the 30 day Public Comment period.

Ms. Hayes expressed that the Board recognizes this is a concern for many people and it is the Board's intent to address this as quickly as possible ensuring that appropriate steps and timelines are followed.

- 152 Ms. Stetson asked if there have been any applications that have been denied due to current
- regulation, as her understanding was this regulation project was to clean up the language so
- 154 there is no ambiguity.
- Ms. Sather shared in the time that she has been with the department there has not been any denied applications.
- Ms. Hayes explained the way the regulations are currently written we will not accept online education.
- Ms. Stetson asked if there was a way that current licensees could encourage Appraisal Institute to submit an application so the Board could have the opportunity to review it.
- 161 Ms. Hayes expressed that the concern they would most likely hold with submitting an
- application is the great expense and effort in submitting an application with not knowing for sure
- if it would be accepted or not, and therefore, are not submitting applications for online education.

165 166

167

168

169

- Erin Ingle asked for clarification on the three platforms for online courses as to what will be accepted; in person, online live synchronous, and online asynchronous. Right now some classes are approved for only certain platforms.
- Mr. Kudryn clarified that the definition is being changed to include all platforms with the regulation project.

170 171 172

173

174

175

176177

- Mr. Burns respectfully asked for clarification in regarding to the application form for Real Estate Appraisers Residential Certification Instruction pg 3, section 4 Work Experience. He expressed it appears the paragraph contradicts itself and is wondering if this might be a clerical error from when the trainee experience was just two years. The second line references an applicant can receive no more than 1,250 hours in no less than one year. Where the prior sentence says it is 1,500 hours in no less than 12 months.
- Ms. Stetson requested the form be discussed during Board Business.

178179180

181

- Erin Ingle asked for clarification in regards to the Competency Form within the application; what is the Board's expectation of competency before the form can be signed?
- Mr. Kudryn expressed his opinion, through experience, would be to consider a trainee competent when they can complete an inspection and majority of the report with review.
- Additionally, Ms. Stetson provided regulation regarding competency; 12 AAC 70.935
- Supervision of Trainee Appraisers paragraph 3 references USPAP complying with competence rules of uniform standards and geographical standards.

187 188 189

190 191

Agenda Item 4 – Investigations

Anna Gabriel provided a review of the investigative report; 6 open cases, 4 of which are still in the investigative stage, 2 in the complaint stage, and 1 has been closed as an incomplete complaint.

192 193 194

Erika Prieksat provided a consent agreement to discuss. The Board moved into executive session at 10:50 am.

195 196 197

On a motion duly made by Mr. McKean, seconded by Ms. Hayes, it was

198 199

RESOLVED to move into executive session at 10:50 am for review of the

200 201

consent agreement.

203 204	The motion passed unanimously.
205	
206 207	10:57 the Board moved back onto the Record with a quorum present.
208	On a motion duly made by Ms. Hayes, seconded by Mr. McKean, it was
209 210	RESOLVED to approve the Consent Agreement for case number 2018-
211 212	001318.
213	- 1
214	The motion passed unanimously.
215	
216	
217	Agenda Item 5 – Division Update
218	Mrs. Dumas provided the Division Update for the FY22 2nd quarter Board financials.
219	Through December the program brought in \$11,065 in revenue. Non investigative direct
220	expenditures directly related to the program in a total of \$46,038. No travel. \$59 in services
221	related to advertising/public notices. Total non investigative direct related expenditures for first
222	half of year were \$46,097. Investigative related direct expenditures were \$7,789 with only
223	personal services time. Total direct expenditures were \$53,886 for first half of the year, which is
224	in line with previous years. Indirect cost; internal cost, department indirect services, and state
225	wide indirect July – August is currently a place holder of ½ previous indirect, as it was explained
226	this is typically gone over in greater detail in fall meetings. Total expenditures for first half was
227 228	\$71,989. The program will carry forward previous surplus.
229	The program has seen a 70/ increase of licensees from EVOO to EVOA
230	The program has seen a 7% increase of licensees from FY20 to FY21.
231	Mr. Kudryn asked for clarification, do they typically see more activity in 3 rd and 4 th quarter in
232	regards to revenue?
233	Ms. Dumas explained the program renews in 2023, this is a nonrenewal year, so revenue does
234	look a little low. She has noted this and will revisit after reviewing 3 rd quarter. Nonrenewal years
235	it should trickle in all year, however, a renewal year the revenue is mostly collected in a single
236	quarter when you are renewing.
237	quanto in the following.
238	Agenda Item 6 – Regulation Project
239	Online Education Update
240	Ms. Stetson reviewed the edits from the March 9, 2022 Teleconference for regulations 12 AAC
241	70.125, 12 AAC 70.220, 12 AAC 70.140, 12 AAC 70.210, 12 AAC 70.990. The Board is in
242	agreement with the proposed edits from the March Teleconference and moved to proceed with
243	public comment.
244	
245	On a motion duly made by Ms. Hayes, seconded by Mr. Kudryn, it was
246	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
247	RESOLVED to approve the following amended regulations 12 AAC 70.215,
248	
249	12 AAC 70.220, 12 AAC 70.140, 12 AAC 70.210, 12 AAC 70.990 and to
250	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
251	proceed with public comment.
252	
253	The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Stetson will proceed with completing the FAQs, send to Ms. Sather, and the Board will complete review through OnBoard vote.

The Board would like to proceed with oral and written comment. Additionally, they would like to hold a special Teleconference when the 30 day public comment period ends to hear oral comment. The Board expressed again the importance of processing these regulation updates in a timely manner and recognize the importance of this topic to licensees, as there has been an increase in public attendance and communication.

Notification should be sent to all licensees.

Ms. Sather asked for time to share some additional information that was shared at 9 am this morning. The regulation specialist has reached out in regards to the previously discussed Military regulations. The Department of Law has updated verbiage on the template the department has been using; there was no change to content just changes to verbiage. The Board reviewed the amended regulation and is in favor of accepting the proposed edits from the Department of Law.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Kudryn, seconded by Ms. Hayes, it was RESOLVED to accept the proposed changes to 12 AAC 70.135 as suggested by the Department of Law.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Sather shared that the regulation specialist has not received any public comment regarding the Military Regulations.

Agenda Item 8 - Board Business

Agenda Item 8 was discussed prior to the lunch break due to available time in the schedule.

 Ms. Sather asked if the Board would consider taking time to clarify their interpretation of 12 AAC 70.105 (B). Specifically, regarding the end of the sentence stating "(c) or (d)" and if this is intended as or, or if it should read as and.

 12 AAC 70.115 was reviewed in reference to 12 AAC 70.105. (d) is addressing the AQB examination and (c) addresses academic requirements. The Board recognizes it is written (c) or (d), however, they recognize that the Board and Professional Licensing have been operating that both are required. Mr. Kudryn states the regulation does reference 70.140 requiring the 200 hours, but understands how it could potentially be written clearer. The Board is requesting additional time to review these regulations and would like to have this topic on the next meeting agenda for further review and discussion.

The Board discussed scheduling a Teleconference for public comment for the online regulation project. Public comment is open for 30 days. Ms. Sather asked for the state staff to have time to complete the required paperwork to be sent off to the regulation specialist and tentatively starting the 30 days on Monday. The Board was in favor of this with tentatively scheduling a

Teleconference for May 17 at 10 am. The Board clarified this Teleconference is specifically relating to the online regulation project and hearing public comment.

305 306 307

304

Ms. Hayes asked for Board permission to be excused from the afternoon session of the Board meeting. There Board was in agreement with this.

308 309 310

- Lunch Break 12:14 pm
- 311 Back on the record at 1:04 pm
- Roll call was taken to reestablish a quorum. Ms. Stetson, Mr. Kudryn, and Mr. McKean present. 312
- 313 Mae Hayes absent.

314

315 316

Agenda Item 7 – Audit Training

Ms. Zimmerman provided review of regulations reference continuing education audits.

317 318 319

320

321

322 323

324 325

Boards who have continuing education are required under 12 AAC 02.960 to audit a certain percentage of licensees to ensure they are in compliance with continuing competency/continuing education. The licensee is required to meet AS 08, as a license is subject to audit and shall complete and submit a statement of continuing education compliance. In renewal applications, the applicant is required to do a statement of compliance stating they have met the continuing education that is set in statute and regulation. If they are audited and they are not able to comply then it is considered a falsification of the renewal of the application, which is a violation of statute and regulation.

326 327 328

329 330 Additionally, Ms. Zimmerman explained it is not just the licensee/applicant that needs to comply with statute and regulation, but the Board also needs to comply with statute and regulation. 12 AAC 02.960 speaks to the audit requirements set for the division.

02.965 provides an idea of what can happen if a license has not met the requirements. 331 332

Ms. Zimmerman spoke to centralized regulations being used as well if program regulations do not specifically address an item in detail.

333 334 335

336

337

338

339 340

341

The continuing education disciplinary matrix was reviewed. If an audit is failed and the Board approves forwarding it to investigation additional steps are taken. The licensee is approached with a consent agreement including making up the continuing education they did not complete, which are Board approved hours. After which the licensee has a license action, which requires two mandatory audits (the next two times they renew their license they provide their continuing education and the Board must approve before they can renew), there is no reprimand with this Board but a letter of advisement is issued, and a fine of \$100 per hour deficient. Ms. Zimmerman explains the licensee has the option to request a hearing if they feel the filed

342 343 acquisition is not fair.

344 345

346

347

Ms. Stetson asked for clarification if the mandatory two year audit would be clearly identified separate from the random audits. Ms. Zimmerman clarified that, yes, they will be as it will be coming from the paralegal. Additionally, they require the licensee to submit their continuing education 60-90 days prior to their license expiring.

348 349 350

Additional statues and regulations were reviewed.

AS 08.87.020 the Board adopts rules of professional conduct to maintain integrity. The Board 351 352 has adopted and will continue to adopt regulations to comply with the USC code.

AS 08.87.120 statute for continue education requirement for renewal of certificate. On the renewal application the licensee completes a statement of compliance, if they were or were not able to complete continuing education as required by regulation. If they do mark it and are audited and aren't in compliance with statue and regulation they have falsified their application.

Ms. Zimmerman stated she has reviewed some recently completed audit reviews and spoke to some not meeting the requirement for the 7 hour USPAP course, a trainee who has not completed required 14 hours of continuing education, and hours not all being completed in the concluding licensing period. Ms. Zimmerman stated she is not questioning the Board but sharing what she has found in her review and offered to discuss these in detail or answer specific questions if the Board would like to go into executive session.

Mr. Kudryn asked if any of these situations have been resolved. Ms. Sather stated that these audits have been resolved/approved with yes votes.

Ms. Zimmerman spoke to the importance of setting precedence. Paralegals are often asked to look at license action history of the Board. It is very important that the Board provides very clear specifics if it does not follow precedence. Ms. Zimmerman shared that with Covid she has seen some Boards precedence being changed, not a lot but a little bit, however, the importance of ensuing the Board is very specific with explaining why precedence wasn't followed. If new precedence are wanting to be placed then the Board may want to readdress their disciplinary matrix.

Ms. Stetson asked for clarification on one of her votes, which was a denial and she sent in her statutory reasoning, she asked if this information goes to other Board members. Ms. Sather stated that the state has received her vote and clarification, which has been placed in that licensee's record. Voting on OnBoard is set up so that Board members cannot see how others are voting so it does not influence other votes. Ms. Stetson suggested discussing in a future meeting the potential of reviewing audits, or any in questions, where discussion can occur between members.

Ms. Sather provided clarification that the regulation specialist may not be able to review and process the proposed online education amendments in time for the 30 days to start next week. There is still a high volume of military regulations being processed for the department. Ms. Sather explained it is the regulation specialist that will be setting that timeline once he is able to reach these proposed regulations within his que. Ms. Sather stated she can reach out to him and express the importance this holds to the program and the Board's hope to work towards a May 17th meeting date. The Board is in agreement to schedule a Teleconference for the concluding of public comment as soon as that date is determined and following the Open Meetings Act.

Adjourn

On a motion duly made by Mr. McKean, seconded by Mr. Kudryn, it was RESOLVED to adjourn.

The motion passed unanimously.

405 Meeting adjourned at 1:33 pm.
406
407
408

409 410

Ashlee Stetson, Chair

Date