REAL ESTATE APPRAISER COMMISSION
500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243
615-741-1831

Meeting Minutes for July 21, 2025
First Floor Conference Room 1B
Davy Crockett Tower

The Tennessee Real Estate Appraiser Commission met on July 21, 2025, and the following business was transacted:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Brett Mansfield, William Haisten, Francie Mello, Sandra Tuck, Taylor Vandever, Nelson Pratt, Alexander Bynum

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Mark Sunderman

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Glenn Kopchak, Anna Matlock, William Best, Taylor Hilton, Alexandria Griffey, Melanie Holcomb

BOARD MEETING

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / NOTICE OF MEETING
Brett Mansfield called the meeting to order at 9:00 am and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

AGENDA
William Haisten made a motion to adopt the agenda. This was seconded by Sandra Tuck. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

APRIL MINUTES
William Haisten made a motion to adopt the April minutes with an amended that included Nelson Pratt being listed as present. This was seconded by Taylor Vandever. The motion passed by unanimous voice.

EXPERIENCE INTERVIEWS

Mr. Nelson Pratt

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Ruth Lichterman	Certified Residential	Yes	Yes

Ms. Sandra Tuck

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Sara Bowers	Certified Residential	Yes	Yes

Mr. Taylor Vandever

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Kirk Winberry	Certified General	Yes	Yes

Ms. Francie Mello

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Robert Hamilton	Certified General	Yes	Yes

Nelson Pratt made a motion to approve the above interview recommendations. This was seconded by Brett Mansfield. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

EDUCATION REPORT

Course Provider	Course Number	Course Name	Instructor(s)	Type	Hours	Recommendation
Appraisal Institute	2915	Supporting Adjustments & Reporting the Sales Comparison Approach in the New URAR	Multiple	CE	3	Approve
Appraisal Institute	2916	Reporting Market Analysis and Better Understanding the New URAR	Multiple	CE	4	Approve
Appraiser eLearning	2917	Professionalism, Partnership & Performance: Evaluating the Appraiser Experience	Michael Carroll	CE	3	Approve
Calypso	1676	Online Mold a Growing Concern	Francis Finigan	CE	4	Approve

Calypso	2918	Online Victorian Architecture for Real Estate Professionals	Francis Finigan	CE	4	Approve
Appraisal Institute	2921	Essentials of Effective Communication	Nicholas Pilz	CE	3	Approve
Appraisal Institute	2922	Residential Upzoning: New Challenges and Opportunities for Residential Appraiser	Denis DeSaix	CE	4	Approve
Appraisal Institute	2923	Online Practical Applications in Appraising Green Commercial Properties	Stacey Thoyre	CE	15	Approve
Appraiser eLearning	2924	Advanced Solar Panel Valuation for Appraisers	Mark Buhler	CE	7	Approve
Green Mountain eLearning	2928	Online Understanding Data Analysis Concepts	David Thomas	CE	5	Approve
OPREP	2927	Online Basic Market Analysis: The Key to Credible Results	Jason Tiellema	CE	7	Approve
American Society of Appraisers	2930	2025 ASA International Conference	Multiple	CE	15	Approve
Green Mountain eLearning	2931	Online Interagency Appraisal and Evaluation Guidelines, What You Need to Know	Bill Caudell	CE	7	Approve
Melissa Bond	2933	Adjustments With Supporting Commentary	Melissa Bond	CE	7	Approve
American Soc of Farm Mgrs & Rural App	2936	Valuing Livestock Facilities: Dairy Farms Seminar	Rebecca Stone	CE	8	Approve

Individual Course Approvals

Licensee	Course Provider	Course Name	Hours	Type	Recommendation
Tracy Lindsey	IAAO	400 – Assessment Administration	30	CE	Approve

Sandra Tuck made a motion to approve the education report. This was seconded by Nelson Pratt. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Budget Report

Director Kopchak provided the budget report summarizing months of record, noting a spike in expenditure for the months of March and April. Both were determined to be the result of ASC registry fees and administrative cost backs due to technology expenses.

ASC Compliance Review Update

Director Kopchak provided an update on the ASC Compliance Review and highlighted that TN retained its good ratings for both the Appraiser and AMC programs on the biennial audit.

RFP- EXPERT REVIEWS

Kevin McGuigan (President of the TN Appraiser Coalition) and Randy Button (Former Chairman of the TN Real Estate Appraiser Commission and member of the Appraisal Institute) proposed reviewing the assignment conditions for state expert reviewers to determine if opportunities for additional standardization may exist. Randy Button indicated that implementation of an official training manual, review worksheet, quality controls that establish minimum documentation for findings, consistent monitoring via audits for the established standard, and providing a framework to communicate USPAP or regulatory changes could enhance the review process and help provide consistency.

William Haisten made a motion to form a committee to further review the proposal and current expert review process. The motion included the nomination of Taylor Vandever for chairman of the committee with Nelson Pratt and William Haisten serving as fellow committee members. This was seconded by Brett Mansfield. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

LEGAL

(Presented by Taylor Hilton)

Legal Report

1. 2025021331
Opened: 5/19/2025
First Licensed: 6/18/1998
Expires: 7/31/2027
License Type: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser
History: None

Complainant is the homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant alleges that Respondent included inaccurate information in the report and violated multiple USPAP Standards.

Complainant requested that Respondent's appraisal report be reviewed for any violations. Counsel referred this matter for expert review. The expert did not observe any violations of the 2025 USPAP Standard Rules within their review of the report. As such, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept Counsel's recommendation.

2. 2025021881
Opened: 5/19/2025
First Licensed: 8/31/2016
Expires: 11/25/2026
License Type: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser
History: None

Complainant is the purchaser of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant alleges that Respondent included inaccurate information in the report and violated multiple USPAP Standards. Complainant states Respondent's errors caused both parties involved in the sale to lose money.

Complainant states that Respondent incorrectly described the subject lot size in the appraisal indicating it to reflect a .81-acre site when in fact the subject site contained .41 acres. Respondent explains this was an error that occurred due to a reference of the subject's MLS sheet. Respondent states upon becoming aware of this discrepancy, the report was corrected, and a revised version was submitted two (2) weeks prior to the scheduled closing date.

Counsel referred this matter for expert review. The expert reviewer concluded, based on the information and timeline provided, that there were no violations of the 2025 USPAP Standards found. As such, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

3. 2025020251
Opened: 5/5/2025
First Licensed: 8/12/2011
Expires: 8/11/2025
Type of License: Appraisal Management Company

History: None

This complaint was opened internally after Respondent failed to file their 2024 Annual Transaction Report for the National Registry. However, Respondent has closed all operations. As such, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

4. 2025019011
Opened: 5/12/2025
First Licensed: 3/4/2015
Type of License: Appraisal Management Company
History: None

Complainant was a potential purchaser of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant alleges Respondent was untimely in submitting the final report. Respondent believes they acted in a manner that was both professional and procedurally appropriate. Respondent explains from the order intake to report delivery, they consistently followed internal protocols, exercised due diligence in response to emerging complexities, and maintained full transparency with their client at every stage. Respondent explains Complainant was not their client, and that there were no issues with the submission date with their client. Respondent states any delays in submitting the report was due to ensure accuracy of the information in the report. As such, Counsel recommends close.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

5. 2025020211
Opened: 5/12/2025
First Licensed: 6/15/2023
Expires: 6/14/2025, Closed, Bonded
Type of License: Appraisal Management Company
History: None

This complaint was opened internally after Respondent failed to file their 2024 Annual Transaction Report for the National Registry. However, Respondent has closed all operations. As such, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

6. 2025020221
Opened: 5/12/2025
First Licensed: 10/1/2024
Expires: 9/30/2026
Type of License: Appraisal Management Company
History: 2013 Letter of Warning

This complaint was opened internally after Respondent failed to file their 2024 Annual Transaction Report for the National Registry. However, Respondent has since submitted their 2024 Annual Report. As such, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

7. 2025020231
Opened: 5/12/2025
First Licensed: 4/26/2019
Expires: 4/25/2027
Type of License: Appraisal Management Company
History: None

This complaint was opened internally after Respondent failed to file their 2024 Annual Transaction Report for the National Registry. Accordingly, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Caution, allowing Respondent thirty (30) days to complete their Tennessee AMC National Registry Panel Report. However, if Respondent does not comply within thirty (30) days, Counsel recommends the Commission authorize issuing a Consent Order assessing a Two Hundred and Fifty Dollar ($250.00) civil penalty and requiring Respondent to provide proof of registration within thirty (30) days.

Recommendation: Authorize issuing a Letter of Caution, allowing Respondent thirty (30) days to complete their Tennessee AMC National Registry Panel Report. However, if Respondent does not comply within thirty (30) days, Counsel recommends authorizing a Consent Order with a Two Hundred and Fifty Dollar ($250.00) civil penalty and requiring Respondent to provide proof of registration within thirty (30) days.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

8. 2025020241
Opened: 5/12/2025
First Licensed: 7/30/2013
Expires: 7/29/2025
Type of License: Appraisal Management Company
History: None

This complaint was opened internally after Respondent failed to file their 2024 Annual Transaction Report for the National Registry. Accordingly, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Caution, allowing Respondent thirty (30) days to complete their Tennessee AMC National Registry Panel Report. However, if Respondent does not comply within thirty (30) days, Counsel recommends the Commission authorize issuing a Consent Order assessing a Two Hundred and Fifty Dollar ($250.00) civil penalty and requiring Respondent to provide proof of registration within thirty (30) days.

Recommendation: Authorize issuing a Letter of Caution, allowing Respondent thirty (30) days to complete their Tennessee AMC National Registry Panel Report. However, if Respondent does not comply within thirty (30) days, Counsel recommends authorizing a Consent Order with a Two Hundred and Fifty Dollar ($250.00) civil penalty and requiring Respondent to provide proof of registration within thirty (30) days.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

9. 2025016691
Opened: 4/28/2025
First Licensed: 11/5/2003
Expires: 11/30/2025
Type of License: Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
History: None

Complainant is the homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant alleges Respondent included inaccurate information in the report and violated multiple USPAP Standards. Complainant alleges Respondent acted unprofessionally throughout the appraisal process.

Counsel referred this matter for expert review. The expert found the following violations:
1. Violation:
a. Contract Section: The subject property was reported by the appraiser to be under contract as of the effective valuation date at a price of $449,900, while the appraised value was $430,000.
b. USPAP requires an appraiser report and analyze the subject property's sales history.

However, such analysis was missing from the appraisal.
c. While (purchase) price does not necessarily equal value and indeed are each defined differently, material variance between the two, merit an analysis to help ensure the intended user(s) of the appraisal and understand the report properly.
d. While the variance was small in this report (2.69% difference between the cash equivalent purchase price), this omission reflects an example of non-compliance with USPAP Standard Rule 1-S(a) which requires analysis of all agreements of sale, options, and listings of the subject property current as of the effective date of the appraisal.
e. While the appraiser indicates they reviewed the sales contract, there was no analysis summarized in the appraisal report addressing the disparity between the pending sales price and the appraised value.
f. Additionally, USPAP Standard Rule 2-2(a)(x)(S) requires the appraisal report to include sufficient information to indicate the appraiser complied with the requirements of Standard 1 by summarizing the information analyzed and the reasoning that supports the appraiser's analysis, opinions, and conclusions.
g. The appraiser's omission of such analysis reflects an example of non-compliance with the two aforementioned Standards

Based on the findings of the expert, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Instruction referencing USPAP Standard Rule 1-S(a) and USPAP Standard Rule 2-2(a)(x)(S).

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel’s recommendation.

10. 2025018251
Opened: 5/5/2025
First Licensed: 11/5/2003
Expires: 11/30/2025
Type of License: Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
History: None

This complaint is related to Complainant No. 2025016691. This complaint was filed by the potential purchaser of the property referencing the same appraisal report in Complainant No. 2025016691. As such, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel’s recommendation.

11. 2024062251
Opened: 12/16/2024
First Licensed: 10/31/1991
Expires: 10/31/2025
Type of License: Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
History: 2005 Letter of Warning; 2010 Letter of Caution; 2010 Letter of Warning

Counsel referred this matter for expert review. After thoroughly reviewing the information and evidence contained in the complaint, the expert reviewer does not believe disciplinary action is warranted. However, the expert reviewer did state there may be an issue if Complainant provided Respondent with details of a pending contract and Respondent failed to disclose this information in Respondent's report. If Respondent received this information, the report should have included the contract terms and an analysis of whether the contractual terms reflect market value. Alternatively, the expert reviewer stated if Respondent knew of an offer, but not the specific terms of the offer, this information should also be included in Respondent's report. However, based upon the information provided in the complaint, response, and the report, the expert reviewer could not definitively determine if either scenario occurred in this transaction.

Therefore, based on the information provided, Counsel and the expert reviewer recommend a Letter of Instruction to Respondent informing Respondent of the proper documentation related to the ownership history section of an appraisal report. Specifically, the Letter of Instruction should reference USPAP Standard 1-5(a) as well as Advisory Opinion 1 (AO-1) for appropriate guidance.

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

12. 2025013861
Opened: 4/21/2025 5/12/2025
First Licensed: 6/18/2015
Expires: 6/30/2027
Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser
History: 2025 Consent Order for USPAP violations

This complaint was a referral from the Tennessee Office of the Attorney General Division of Consumer Affairs. The homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent initially filed their complaint with Consumer Affairs, who referred the matter to the Commission. The complaint alleges Respondent had multiple USPP violations within their submitted report.

Counsel referred this matter for expert review. The expert found the following violations:
1. Violation:

a. The cost approach value and the income approach to value are noted in the report as zero ($0). According to the appraisal report, the cost approach was not performed as it was not necessary for a credible report and the income approach was not valid due to the lack of data.
b. The expert notes these ($0) entrees are likely to be an error as, in this software, this number auto-populates from the cost/income approaches on the 3rd page. c. The expert determined this finding violated USPAP Standards Rule (1-4) (b & c).
2. Violation:
a. Plat map is noted in report to be attached, but no such map is found within the report provided.
b. The fireplace number is noted as (1) on the front page but correctly noted on the grid and in the comments.
c. According to the complainant, the roof is new, however, the appraisal report notes the condition as average.
d. Bedroom count on page 1/grid is 4 bedrooms above grade, but sketch only notes 3 bedrooms.
e. The bath adjustments do not appear to be consistent, and no explanation is noted as to why they would vary.
f. The expert determined these findings violated USPAP Standard Rule Standard Rule 1-1 (c).
3. Violation:
a. The report only identifies the client. No intended user(s) or intended use is identified.
b. The expert determined this finding violated USPAP Standard Rule (1-2) (a & b).
4. Violation: a. The report notes a definition is embedded in the report, but the review appraiser found no such definition. b. Normally, the definition is embedded in one of the pages that appears to be missing. c. The expert determined this finding violated USPAP Standard Rule (1-2) (c).
5. Violation:
a. No signed certification was found in the report provided.
b. The expert determined this finding violated USPAP Standard Rules (2-3) & (2- 1).

The Respondent recently executed a Consent Order in connection with a prior Complainant (Complainant No. 2024054101). The appraisal report at issue in this complaint was completed at a similar time as the report associated with Complainant No. 2024054101. A review of both reports revealed similar violations of USPAP. Pursuant to the Consent Order for Complainant No. 2024054101, the Commission required the Respondent to complete two corrective education courses: the Four-Hour course “Missing Explanations,” and the Four-Hour course “Residential Report Writing vs. Form Filling.” Accordingly, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Instruction pertaining to the abovementioned USPAP violations.

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

13. 2025016551
Opened: 4/21/2025
Unlicensed
History: None

Complainant alleges Respondent, a licensed real estate agent, was advertising for unlicensed appraisal services.

Respondent clarifies that it was not their intention to offer appraisal services to consumers. Rather, Respondent explains that the intent was to offer a Comparable Market Analysis aimed to provide a potential seller with a rough estimate of a price point that their home could be advertised for to maximize the marketing of the property. Respondent states they did not advertise ascribing value to any property, nor did they complete an appraisal on any property. Respondent documented on the advertisement that they were a licensed real estate agent not a licensed appraiser. Respondent states upon receipt of the complaint, they removed the advertisement from all platforms. Therefore, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Instruction reminding Respondent of the regulations pertaining to unlicensed activity.

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

14. 2025022271
Opened: 5/19/2025
First Licensed: 3/15/2023
Expires: 3/14/2027
Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser
History: None

Complainant is the homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent. The property was appraised for a potential sale by Complainant. Complainant alleges that Respondent included inaccurate information in the report and violated multiple USPAP Standards. Complainant states Respondent's errors caused both parties involved in the sale to lose money.

Counsel referred this matter for expert review. The expert found the following violation:
1. Violation:
a. There appears to be a few factual discrepancies that were corrected in a final report.
b. There was more than one report issued with some corrections including mistakes in the

original report such as design, storm window explanation offered, sump pump, flooring condition, electric heat, condition rating, driveway surface type.
c. The initial discrepancies caused the following USPAP violation: i. Standard Rule 1-1(c). However, in the opinion of the review appraiser, this violation has not caused the overall report to be misleading and not meaningful. Accordingly, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Instruction referencing USPAP Standard Rule 1-1(c).

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

15. 2025005761
Opened: 3/10/2025
First Licensed: 11/10/1992
Expires: 11/10/2026
Type of License: Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
History: None

Complainant is the homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant alleges Respondent included inaccurate information in the report and violated multiple USPAP Standards. Complainant further alleges Respondent acted unprofessionally throughout the process of the appraisal.

Counsel referred this matter for expert review. The review appraiser reviewed the original appraisal report and found minimal areas where the minimum requirements of USPAP were not met.

The review appraiser found the following:
1. Violation:
a. There were a few areas where the reported information appears incorrect including the following:
i. The subject property does not meet the quality rating of Q3 as defined in the UAD definitions.
ii. The property is a converted metal shop to a dwelling. The complaint response notes the cost information requested as it is "beneficial for unique properties and/or properties with unusual features" appearing to indicate the appraiser believes the property to be atypical.
iii. The property is noted at the bottom of page 1 to generally conform to the neighborhood (functionality, style, condition, use, construction, etc.) This is incorrect. iv. A photo was incorrectly labeled, and the prior services notation was not noted (there were prior services) in the original report but was subsequently corrected in a corrected report.
i. The expert determined these findings violated USPAP Standard Rule Standard Rule 1-1 (c).

However, in the opinion of the review appraiser, these items have not caused the overall report to be misleading or not meaningful. Accordingly, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Instruction referring to USPAP Standard Rule Standard Rule 1-1 (c).

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to accept counsel's recommendation.

NEW BUSINESS

Francie Mello expressed concerns with the value limits set for certified residentials. Director Kopchak indicated that state limits are in alignment with federal requirements.

Sandra Tuck inquired about the new AQB criteria requiring a "Valuation Bias and Fair Housing" (VB-FH) course, effective January 1, 2026. Attorney Anna Matlock stated that a notice to TN licensees is pending additional clarification and updates from the Appraisal Qualifications Board (AQB), as well as the availability of an 8-hour version of the course for those that would eventually be seeking an upgrade.

Taylor Vandever thanked William Best for his dedication, hard work, and helpfulness to the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD RELATED TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:33 a.m.