



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

**Meeting Minutes for February 23, 2026
First Floor Conference Room 1A**

Davy Crockett Tower

The Tennessee Real Estate Appraiser Commission met on February 23, 2026, and the following business was transacted:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Brett Mansfield, William Haisten, Francie Mello, Sandra Tuck, Nelson Pratt, Eric Robinson, Dr. Mark Sunderman, Taylor Vandever, Alexander Bynum (Virtual)

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Glenn Kopchak, Anna Matlock, Taylor Hilton William Best, 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 Nelson Pratt. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

OCTOBER MINUTES

Sandra Tuck made a motion to adopt the October minutes. This was seconded by Taylor Vandever. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

EXPERIENCE INTERVIEWS

Mr. Will Haisten

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Matthew Rhoton	CR	Yes	Yes
Hunter Holt	CR	Yes	Yes
Troy Sadler	CG	Yes	Yes

Mr. Brett Mansfield

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Colton McClellan	CG	Yes	Yes

Ms. Francie Mello

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Gil Erwin	CG	Yes	Yes
Andrew Fillers	CR	Yes	Yes

Mr. Nelson Pratt

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Nikita Westfield	CR	Yes	Yes
Clay Talkington	CR	Yes	Yes

Ms. Sandra Tuck

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Christy Badacour	CR	Yes	Yes
Taylor Calhoun	Licensed	Yes	Yes
Isaac German	CR	Yes	Yes

Mr. Taylor Vandever

Name	Upgrade Type	Recommend	Board Vote
Nicholas Vest	CR	Yes	Yes
Kayla McKenzie	CR	Yes	Yes
Nicholas Vest	CR	Yes	Yes

William Haisten made a motion to approve the above interview recommendations. This was seconded by Taylor Vandever. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

EDUCATION REPORT

Course Provider	Course Number	Course Name	Instructor(s)	Type	Hours	Recommendation
Green Mountain eLearning	2969	Online USPAP Advisory Opinions 18 and 37, Market Condition Data Analysis: Storytelling	David Hampton Thomas	CE	5	Yes
Appraisal Institute	2984	2026 Annual Conference Day 1 - AM	Multiple	CE	3	Yes
Appraisal Institute	2985	2026 Annual Conference Day 1 - PM	Multiple	CE	4	Yes
Appraisal Institute	2986	2026 Annual Conference Day 2 - AM	Multiple	CE	4	Yes
Appraisal Institute	2987	2026 Annual Conference Day 2 - PM	Multiple	CE	3	Yes

Individual Course Approvals

Licensee	Course Provider	Course Name	Hours	Type	Recommendation
Jonathan Downs	GA Appraiser School	Successful Tax Appeals and the Appraiser	7	CE	Yes

Dr. Mark Sunderman made a motion to approve the education report. This was seconded by Nelson Pratt. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

William Haisten made a motion to nominate Brett Mansfield for Chairman and Sandra Tuck as Vice Chairman. This was seconded by Eric Robinson. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Budget Report

Director Kopchak provided the budget report, noting a spike in expenditure for the month of August. This was determined to be the result of annual Zendesk account subscriptions.

LEGAL

Legal Report (Presented by Taylor Hilton)

1. 2025064891

Opened: 12/1/2025

First Licensed: 7/20/2020

Expires: 10/5/2027

Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser

History: None

The complaint alleges that the Respondent applied unsupported condition adjustments in the appraisal report and failed to provide the market data underlying the "methodology" used for those adjustments. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacked "credible substantiation" for the conclusions included in the report.

The Respondent provided their appraisal report and corresponding work file. Counsel referred the matter to an expert reviewer for evaluation. The expert determined that the Respondent adequately addressed the Complainant's allegations and concluded that the appraisal report was overall credible. As a result, the reviewer did not recommend disciplinary action.

Accordingly, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

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

2. 2025050241

Opened: 9/22/2025

First Licensed: 2/4/1993

License Expires: 2/4/2027

Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser

History: None

The Complainant, a financial institution involved in the appraisal of the subject property, filed Complaint No. 2025050241. Complainant alleges Respondent had deficiencies in the report, which appear to be USPAP violations that materially affected the report.

The Respondent provided their appraisal report and corresponding work file. Counsel referred the matter to an expert reviewer for evaluation. The expert determined that the appraisal report is consistent with USPAP requirements and secondary-market guidelines governing the property type. Accordingly, the investigator concluded that the appraisal report was overall credible. As a result, the reviewer did not recommend disciplinary action. Accordingly, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

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

3. 2025060021

Opened: 10/27/2025

First Licensed: 5/13/2014

License Expires: 5/12/2026

Type of License: Appraisal Management Company

History: 2010 Letter of Warning regarding Sales Comparison

Respondent is an Appraisal Management Company. Complainant alleges Respondent "repeatedly defers payment beyond the stated required [thirty] 30 days." Complainant states Respondent owes them over Three Thousand Dollars (\$3,000.00). Nevertheless, this matter appears to be a contractual issue and falls outside the Commission's jurisdiction.

Accordingly, Counsel recommends closure.

Recommendation: Close.

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

4. 2025061471

Opened: 11/10/2025

First Licensed: 12/18/1998

License Expires: 1/31/2026

Type of License: Certified Residential Appraiser

History: 2012 Consent Order for alleged bias of a manufactured home and inappropriate comparable sales.

The Complainant is the purchaser of the subject property. The Complainant filed Complaint No. 2025061471, alleging that the Respondent was negligent in the performance of their appraisal. Specifically, the Complainant claimed that improper comparable properties were utilized in the report.

The Respondent provided their appraisal report and corresponding work file for the appraised property. Counsel referred the matter to an expert reviewer for evaluation. The review appraiser determined that the minimum requirements of USPAP were satisfied, with the exception noted below:

Violation: The appraiser did not provide a full analysis of the listing in violation of USPAP Standards Rule (1-5) (a) and Standards Rule (2-2) (a)(x)(3).

However, in the review appraiser's opinion, the violations were minor and did not render the overall report misleading or meaningless. Accordingly, Counsel recommends closing the matter with a Letter of Instruction pertaining to the referenced USPAP violations.

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

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

5. 2025062821

Opened: 11/17/2025

First Licensed: 11/17/2014

License Expires: 4/22/2026

Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser

History: 2020 Consent Order for incorrect assessment of appraisal; 2020 Consent Order for incorrect assessment of appraisal; 2022 Letter of Warning for failing to complete CE after being issued an extension

The Complainant is the seller of the subject property. The Complainant filed Complaint No. 2025062821, alleging that the Respondent's report contained erroneous information about the property and utilized improper comparables.

The Respondent provided their appraisal report and corresponding work file for the appraised property. Counsel referred the matter to an expert reviewer for evaluation. The expert explained that USPAP Standards Rule 2-2(a)(xi) requires an appraiser who develops an opinion of Highest and Best Use to summarize the rationale and support for that opinion within the report. The expert concluded that the appraisal report of the subject property did not include the required summary analysis.

Nevertheless, the expert concluded this did not constitute an egregious instance of noncompliance with USPAP. Further, the expert determined that, when viewed objectively, the issues raised in the complaint do not constitute USPAP violations; rather, they are better characterized as routine appraisal-review matters and minor differences in professional judgment. The expert further concluded that the Respondent's appraisal report is fundamentally consistent with USPAP's development and reporting requirements and is supported by a reasonable rationale. Accordingly, Counsel recommends closing the matter with a Letter of Instruction pertaining to the referenced USPAP violation.

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

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

6. 2025050571

Opened: 9/22/2025

First Licensed: 11/15/1991

License Expires: 11/30/2025

Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser

History: 2015 Consent Order for allegedly undervaluing a property

Complainant is the homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant

alleges the appraisal “was conducted in a manner that reflects discriminatory undervaluing practices, improper application of the C3 condition rating, and failure to account for significant documented renovations[.]”

The Respondent denies the allegations set forth in the complaint and asserts that the appraisal was performed objectively and in accordance with relevant market factors. The Respondent provided their appraisal report and corresponding work file. Counsel referred the matter to an expert reviewer for evaluation. After reviewing the report, the expert determined that the appraisal met the minimum USPAP requirements. Although the review appraiser identified minor errors, they concluded that these issues were not material and did not render the report misleading or impair its overall reliability or usefulness.

Below are the experts’ findings:

1. Site size is noted as Nine Thousand Four Hundred and Eighty-Two (9,482) square feet, but Maardata notes the area to be either .22 acres or Nine Thousand Nine Hundred and eleven (9,911) square feet.
2. The grid notes a patio, but the prior page notes no patio. The review appraiser found the subject appears to have no patio.
3. There is a note “sale 2 has not transferred in the past 36 months,” but according to the report, the sale had transferred on September 14, 2023.

Given the expert’s conclusion that the report is overall credible, Counsel recommends closing the complaint with a Letter of Instruction addressing the aforementioned findings.

Recommendation: Letter of Instruction.

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

7. 2025060671

Opened: 10/20/2025

First Licensed: 7/1/2011

License Expires: 7/31/2027

Type of License: Appraisal Management Company

History: None

This complaint is related to Complainant No. 2025060501, and arises from a dispute between the Respondent, an Appraisal Management Company, and the Complainant, an appraiser retained by the Respondent. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent engaged in workplace harassment and requested the use of “fraudulent sales” in the

appraisal. The Respondent denies these allegations and states that the Complainant signed and certified an FHA appraisal report without personally inspecting the subject property. The Respondent further states that they believe this complaint resulted from their mandatory reporting of the Complainant. This matter appears to involve an internal dispute that falls outside the Commission's jurisdiction. Accordingly, Counsel recommends closure of the complaint.

Recommendation: Close.

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

8. 2025060501

Opened: 10/20/2025

First Licensed: 2/8/2017

License Expires: 2/7/2027

Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser

History: None

This complaint is related to Complaint No. 2025060671. The Complainant, an Appraisal Management Company, explains that it is submitting its complaint pursuant to mandatory reporting requirements. The Respondent asserts that the alleged violations involve both FHA appraisal requirements and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP). Specifically, the Respondent asserts that the Complainant signed and certified an FHA appraisal report without personally inspecting the subject property.

The Respondent denies the allegations in the complaint. The Respondent alleges that the Complainant engaged in workplace harassment and requested the use of "fraudulent sales" in the appraisal. The Respondent provided their appraisal report and corresponding work file. Counsel referred the matter to an expert reviewer for evaluation. The expert found the following:

1. The appraisal is materially non-compliant with FHA policy.
2. USPAP Compliance Analysis:
 - a. USPAP Standards Rule 1-l(b) requires that an appraiser must not commit a substantial error of omission or commission that significantly affects an appraisal. Indicating a personal inspection was completed by the signing appraiser is an example of a substantial error of omission or commission.
 - b. USPAP Standards Rule 2-l(a) requires that an appraisal report set forth the appraisal clearly and accurately and in a manner that will not be misleading.
 - c. USPAP Standards Rule 2-l(b) requires that an appraisal report contain sufficient information to enable the intended user(s) of the appraisal to understand the

report properly.

- d. USPAP Standards Rule 2-2(a)(vii) requires that an appraiser summarizes the scope of work used to develop the appraisal.
- e. Inherent in USPAP Standards Rule 2-3(a) is that an appraiser signing a certification must certify truthfully whether they personally inspected the property.
 - i. By certifying to an inspection they did not perform, Respondent violated the Ethics Rule and Standards Rule 2- 3(a).
 - ii. From an FHA appraisal guideline perspective, disclosure of another appraiser's assistance does not cure this violation, as the inspection responsibility cannot be reassigned under FHA policy.
3. Scope of Work Rule: an appraiser is required to identify assignment elements including assignment conditions (such as the engagement requirements for HUD).
 - a. By inserting language in the report that shifts portions of the inspection and certification responsibility to another appraiser, the Respondent materially altered the standard FHA/Fannie Mae form certifications, in violation of both FHA policy and USPAP.
4. In addition, the preprinted Scope of Work on the Uniform Residential Appraisal Report (URAR) defines the Appraiser's minimum required actions.
 - a. It mandates that the Appraiser must (among other things): perform a complete visual inspection of the interior and exterior areas of the subject property.

In a follow-up, the Complainant explains that they recommended the Respondent consult a USPAP Instructor for guidance. According to the Complainant, the Respondent did reachout to the instructor and was advised to review specific educational materials. The Complainant states that the Respondent was provided with "The Hazards of Signing a URAR When Another Person Conducts the Inspection" by McKissock Learning and "Don't Do Dumb Things!" by Appraiser eLearning.

Recommendation: Discuss.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to issue a Consent Order requiring Respondent to complete the four (4) hour Corrective Education Course "Scope of Work: Appraisals and Inspections," as well as the four (4) hour Corrective Education Course "Ethics, Competency, and Negligence." These courses are to be completed within ninety (90) days of the execution of the Consent Order and in addition to the continuing education requirements for licensure renewal.

CASES TO BE REPRESENTED:

9. 2025029441

Opened: 6/9/2025

First Licensed: 9/6/2000

License Expires: 12/31/2025

Type of License: Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser

History: None

Complainant is the homeowner of the property appraised by Respondent. Complainant alleges Respondent's appraisal included "numerous oversights, errors, omissions, and inaccurate information."

Respondent states the report has been revised to correct some of the errors. Respondent explains subsequent to the submission of the report to Respondent's client, the bank, Complainant left Respondent a detailed voicemail with complaints. Respondent states, however, that they did not think it would be appropriate to speak directly with the homeowner, as that was not Respondent's client.

Counsel referred this matter to an expert reviewer for further evaluation. The expert found the following:

Site/Highest and Best Use:

- Respondent failed to report and analyze the subject property, which is located in a county with a lower tax rate.
- The expert determined this reflected non-compliance with USPAP Standard Rules 1-2(i), 1-3(i), 2-1(a), and 2-1(b).

Sales Comparison Approach:

- The complaint stated that four (4) of the five (5) comparables included in the appraisal are in another county with lower land prices and less proximate community amenities.
- The expert found since no locational analysis was summarized in the appraisal addressing the need (or lack thereof) for any location adjustments, that there was non-compliance with USPAP Standard Rules 1-1(a), 1-4(a), 1-6(a), 2-1(b), and 2-2(a)(x)(S).

The expert made the following comments:

- The appraiser provided a revised report reflecting a One Hundred Thousand Dollar (\$100,000) increase in value (citing the addition of two additional sales).
- However, no explanation was provided addressing why a revision to the value (or replacement of sales data) was merited.
- The revised appraisal report appears to have been submitted several weeks after

the original report was completed and transmitted to the client.

- The submission of a materially higher value in a revised appraisal report, particularly in the absence of significant market changes or new compelling evidence, raises concerns regarding compliance with the USPAP.
- The significant upward revision in value, without clear evidence of why the new data is more comparable than the data in the original report, creates the appearance that the revised report may have violated Standard Rule 1-I (a)-(c).

Based on the expert reviewer's findings, Counsel recommends the Commission authorize a Consent Order requiring continuing education to be completed within 180 days of the execution of the Consent Order and for these classes to be completed in addition to the continuing education minimum requirements for license renewal. Counsel also recommends that the Commission discuss and decide on the appropriate continuing education classes in the Consent Order.

Recommendation: Authorize a Consent Order requiring continuing education to be completed within one hundred and eighty (180) days of the execution of the Consent Order, and for these classes to be completed in addition to the continuing education minimum requirements for license renewal.

Commission Decision: The Commission voted to defer this matter to the next meeting and to have the report reviewed by a designated Commission member prior to that meeting.

New Information: This matter was re-reviewed by a Commission member. The following was determined:

- 1. Deficient Highest and Best Use Analysis (Violations of Standards Rules 1-3 and 2- 2(b)(x)).**
 - a. Location in Report:** Highest and Best Use Section.
 - b. What the Report States:** The report appears to contain a brief highest and best statement but provides minimal analysis.
 - c. Deficiency:**
 - i.** Standards Rule 1-3 requires "the appraiser to identify and analyze the effect on use and value of existing land use regulations, economic supply and demand, physical adaptability of the real estate, and market area trends."
 - ii.** Standards Rule 2-2(b)(x) requires "the report to summarize the information analyzed and the reasoning that supports the analyses, opinions, and conclusions."
 - iii.** SR 2-2(a)(xii) requires "when an opinion of highest and best use was

developed by the appraiser, state that opinion and summarize the support and rationale for that opinion." iv. The appraiser checked "Yes" that the present use is the highest and best use but:

1. Never explicitly stated what the present use is.
2. Provided no support or rationale for the H&BU conclusion.
3. For a 40+ acre rural property with an atypical, converted barn/log structure, this minimal treatment fails to demonstrate adequate analysis.

2. Unsupported Cost Approach – Land Value (Violations of Standards Rules 1-4(b)(i), 2-1, and 2-2(b)(x)).

a. Location in Report: Cost Approach Section.

b. What the Report States: The report indicates a land value estimate of approximately \$7,500/AC or \$304,200 but provides no comparable land sales to support this value.

c. Deficiency:

i. Standards Rule 1-4(b)(i) requires “that when a cost approach is necessary for credible assignment results, an appraiser must develop an opinion of site value by an appropriate appraisal method or technique, which requires analysis of comparable land sales data.”

ii. The cost approach section states a land value on a per-acre basis without presenting any vacant land sales to support this rate. There is no discussion of comparable land sales, no analysis of land sale prices in the subject's market area, and no explanation of the methodology used to arrive at the per-acre value.

iii. This violates the development requirement to use an appropriate method based on market evidence (SR 1-4(b)(i)) and the reporting requirements that the report be clear and contain sufficient information (SR 2-1(a) and 2-1(b)).

3. Unsupported Sales Comparison Approach Adjustments (Violations of Standards Rules 1-4(a), 2-1, and 2-2(b)(x)).

a. Location in Report: Summary of Sales Comparison Approach Section.

b. What the Report States: The sales comparison grid shows adjustments for various features including gross living area, condition, quality, and other physical characteristics.

c. Deficiency:

i. Standards Rule 1-4(a) requires “the appraiser to analyze comparable sales data to indicate a value conclusion.”

ii. Standards Rule 2-2(b)(x)(1) requires “the report to summarize the

appraisal methods and techniques employed.”

iii. The adjustment grid shows dollar amounts applied to each comparable sale, but the report provides no support, analysis, or explanation for how these adjustment amounts were derived. Adjustments show specific dollar amounts without any supporting analysis. The appraiser provides no information about the methodology used to derive these adjustments, making it impossible to determine whether they reflect actual market behavior or are unsupported opinion.

1. This violates the requirement to analyze comparable data (SR 1-4(a)) and the requirement to summarize methods and techniques (SR 2-2(b)(x)(1)).

4. Deficient Reconciliation (Violations of Standards Rules 1-6, 2-1, and 2-2(b)(x)).

a. Location in Report: Reconciliation Section.

b. What the Report States: The cost approach indicated a value of approximately \$537,703 while the sales comparison approach indicated approximately \$400,000, a difference of approximately \$137,703, or 26%. The reconciliation section states that the final value of \$400,000 is supported by the value determined in the Cost Approach.

c. Deficiency:

i. Standards Rule 1-6 requires “the appraiser to reconcile the quality and quantity of data available within the approaches used and reconcile the applicability and relevance of the approaches.”

ii. Standards Rule 2-2(b)(x)(5) requires “the report to summarize the reasoning that supports the value conclusion.”

iii. The reconciliation section fails to address the substantial difference between the two approaches.

iv. The cost approach and sales comparison approach differ by approximately \$137,703, or 26%, yet there is no discussion of why this discrepancy exists, which approach is more reliable for this property type, or how the appraiser resolved this difference in reaching the final value conclusion.

v. The report appears to simply present a final value without the analytical framework required by USPAP. vi. A proper reconciliation must discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, the quality and quantity of data available, and the reasoning for the final value conclusion.

vii. This reconciliation section violates both the development requirement (SR 1-6) and the reporting requirement to summarize the reasoning (SR 2-2(b)(x)(5)).

Conclusion: These deficiencies represent material violations of USPAP Standards 1 and 2 that affect the reliability of the appraisal. The lack of highest and best use analysis, unsupported land value in the cost approach, unsupported sales

comparison adjustments, and deficient reconciliation render the report non-compliant with USPAP requirements.

New Recommendation: Discuss.

New Commission Decision: The Commission voted to issue a Consent Order assessing a civil penalty of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00), as well as requiring Respondent to complete the following Corrective Education Courses: "Residential Report Writing vs. Form Filling" (four (4) hours); "Scope of Work: Appraisals and Inspections" (four (4) hours); "Missing Explanations" (four (4) hours); "Sales Comparison Approach Reconciliation" (four (4) hours); and "Ethics, Competency, and Negligence" (four (4) hours). These courses are to be completed within ninety (90) days of the execution of the Consent Order and in addition to the continuing education requirements for licensure renewal.

NEW BUSINESS

Anna Matlock provided a legislative update by summarizing SB1692/HB1677, entitled ""Military Families Licensing Recognition Act."

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD RELATED TO
ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

None

ADJOURNMENT