

APPRAISER CERTIFICATION BOARD  
MINUTES

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION  
1550 COLLEGE PARKWAY  
LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM  
CARSON CITY NEVADA

DECEMBER 13, 2018

**Board Members Present:**

Sorin Popa, Department of Taxation, Chair  
Chris Sarman, Washoe County Assessor's Office, Member  
Shannon Silva, Department of Taxation, Member  
Jana Seddon, Storey County Assessor's Office, Member  
Jeff Payson, Clark County Assessor's Office, Member (present via Teleconference)  
Kelson Powell, Department of Taxation, Member

**Staff Present:**

Jeffrey Mitchell, Deputy Director, Department of Taxation  
Denesa Johnston, Department of Taxation

**Guests Present:**

John Evpak, Department of Taxation  
Kimberly Adams, Carson City Assessor's Office (via Teleconference)  
Michael Bauwens, Clark County Assessor's Office (via Teleconference)

**1. Roll Call and Opening Remarks**

Chair Popa proceeded with Roll Call. Quorum was verified.  
Deputy Director Mitchell explained to the Members how the Consent Agenda Items Section (Agenda Item 6) works. The Consent Agenda consists of the courses that staff has reviewed. This will allow the Chair to call the agenda item, it also allows for Members to identify courses that they would like to "pull" from the Consent Agenda and discuss further. The courses remaining on the Consent Agenda can all be approved without discussion.  
Deputy Director Mitchell took this opportunity to welcome the new Appraiser's Certification Board Members, Chris Sarman and Kelson Powell.

**2. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**3. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approval of Minutes for April 5, 2018 and August 27, 2018.

Member Silva motioned to approve minutes as submitted.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

All members present voted in favor of approving the April 5, 2018 and August 27, 2018 Minutes as submitted.

**4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:** Election of a Vice-Chairperson.

Member Seddon motioned to elect Member Payson for the position of Vice-Chair.

Member Sarman seconded the motion.

All Members present voted in favor of electing Member Payson as the Vice-Chair.

Deputy Director Mitchell was asked if he knew how long the terms for Chair and Vice-Chair are held for.

Deputy Director Mitchell said he would forward the information regarding terms to the members.

5. **Discussion:** Per NRS 361.224, Department report regarding appraisers failing to meet requirements for continuing education.

Deputy Director Mitchell reported there was one employee, Matthew Tomich, at the Department of Taxation, who had not met the required continuing education hours. Mr. Tomich had received all the proper notifications and the Department would be deactivating his certifications upon Board approval at this meeting.

Member Silva motioned to deactivate Mr. Tomich's certifications.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

All Members present voted in favor of deactivating Mr. Tomich's certifications.

6. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:**

CONSENT AGEND ITEMS\*: Approval of continuing education credit hours reviewed and submitted by the Department of Taxation Local Government Services Executive Director:

Member Silva asked that items: **a, o, p, q, r, t, u, v, s, w, x,** and **z** be pulled from the Consent Agenda for discussion by Members.

Member Sarman asked for items: **aa, bb** and **cc** be pulled from the Consent Agenda also for discussion by Members.

Member Payson asked that items **e** and **y** also be pulled for discussion.

Member Silva motioned to approve items: **b, c, d, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m** and **n** (listed below) on the Consent Agenda for the number of hours on the certificates.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

All Members present voted to approve the following:

b.	IAAO	Critical Issues Series: Commercial Big Box Retail	Hours on Certificate
c.	IAAO	Critical Issues Series: Understanding Intangible Assets	Hours on Certificate
d.	IAAO	Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About Spatial Modeling	Hours on Certificate
f.	IAAO	Personal Property Auditing—Basic to Advanced (Course 501)	Hours on Certificate
g.	IAAO *Previous approved by ACB for 8 hours	650 Cadastral Mapping	Hours on Certificate
h.	IAAO	651 GIS for Assessors	Hours on Certificate
i.	IAAO	331 Mass Appraisal Practices & Procedures	Hours on Certificate
j.	IAAO (Clark County Assessor's	The Secrets of Hotel Casino Valuation	Hours on

	Office Hosting)	Workshop	Certificate
k.	McKissock	General Appraiser Site Valuation and Cost Approach	Hours on Certificate
l.	McKissock	General Appraiser Income Approach	Hours on Certificate
m.	McKissock	General Appraiser Sales Comparison Approach	Hours on Certificate
n.	McKissock	General Appraiser Market Analysis & Highest and Best Use	Hours on Certificate

Member Silva also motioned to approve all courses on the agenda for “certificate hours” (which is reflected on the above list) instead of the hours reflected on the Agenda.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

All Members present voted to approve the motion.

The following courses were discussed:

a.	IAAO	Using the Census Bureau’s ACS for Assessment Officials	2 Hours
----	------	--	---------

Member Silva asked if this course had information that would be useful to appraisers.

Member Payson shared he always refers to the NAC that addresses what the board is supposed to be looking at when approving courses. He felt this course did address assessment; therefore he was leaning towards approval.

Member Sarman stated he was in agreement with Member Payson; IAAO is the standard and felt the material was relevant to appraisers.

Member Silva shared she had reviewed the content of the course and not specifically who the provider was.

Chair Popa said he felt this course focused on economic market conditions and demographics.

Member Payson motioned to approve this course.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

All members voted to approve IAAO - Using the Census Bureau’s ACS for Assessment Officials for the number of hours on the certificate.

e.	IAAO	1,000 County Indicators and More-NACO’s County Explorer Tool	2 Hours
----	------	--	---------

Member Payson said even though this is an IAAO course, he did not see any relevance for it in the State of Nevada.

Member Sarman agreed with Member Payson’s statement and motioned to deny this course.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

All members present voted to deny IAAO - 1,000 County Indicators and More-NACO’s County Explorer Tool.

o.	McKissock	General Report Writing & Case Studies	30 Hours
----	-----------	---------------------------------------	----------

Member Silva said after reviewing this course, it was her recommendation to deny this course.

Member Payson stated this course had come before the Board in the past and he, after reading the course description, wanted to recommend the course be approved because during the appeals process, they receive a lot of reports and need to know how to read them, what they

are supposed to say and if they are violating any USPAP. He personally was leaning toward recommending this course for approval.

Member Silva asked Member Payson if he felt this was different enough from the actual report writing form course so the board would not be setting precedence for any other form writing courses submitted in the future.

Member Payson said he supported anything to do with reading and understanding an appraisal but he was not saying the Board has always approved them.

Member Sarman stated his department always does a conclusion page after their reappraisals and felt this course would be helpful.

Member Payson motioned to approve this course.

Member Sarman seconded the motion.

Those in favor of approving the course were Members Payson, Sarman and Popa.

Members Silva, Seddon and Powell voted against the course approval.

Chair Popa asked for further discussion.

Member Seddon shared her problem is the class hours, not the course content.

Member Payson asked if the 30 hours was reflected on the certificate.

Chair Popa suggested if the course is approved, it be approved for "hours on certificate".

Member Payson shared the only other option would be to go through the course and determine which topics apply and give credit hours for only those topics and no credit hours for the portions of the course that did not apply.

Member Seddon asked if this item could be continued to the next meeting.

Deputy Director Mitchell said there were two options available to the Board. One is the Board could take it to the end of the Agenda or the Board could table this item to a later meeting, allowing staff time to gather more information.

Chair Popa requested this item be placed on the future agenda pending additional information.

p.	McKissock	The FHA Handbook 4000.1	7 Hours
----	-----------	-------------------------	---------

Member Silva stated after reviewing all the material, this course appeared to be related to Federal Forms for fee appraisers, she would like to hear from other members.

Members Sarman and Payson both agreed with Member Silva's statement.

Member Payson share this course seemed for specific to FHA regulations.

Member Silva motioned to deny this course.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

All members present voted to deny McKissock – The FHA Handbook 4000.1.

q.	California State University	MGMT – 133 Business Finance	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------

Member Silva shared that after reviewing this course, she felt it was more related business management verses appraisal related.

Member Payson agreed with Member Silva's statement and stated that he felt inclined to deny this course.

Chair Popa stated business finance basically establishes the core tools and core principles being used by an appraiser.

Mr. Evpak explained this business finance course was an introduction to reading and understanding business financial statements and further explained valuation of a mine is based on cash flows and business financial statements so, because of that, this class is very integral to valuing mines and utilities which is what Mr. Popa's team does.

Chair Popa added this is used extensively by his team.

Member Silva shared the board had, in the past, denied several college finance classes which appeared to be business related.

Chair Popa stated this course is business finance so basically in order to be able to read income statements and understand the finance of a business, this course is beneficial.

Member Silva said in reviewing the approved and denied courses, there seemed to be a 50/50 split between finance classes being approved and denied. She felt this had been due to the course content descriptions provided to the Board at the time of review.

Mr. Evpak explained that one could also differentiate between business finance classes and other types of finance classes. This course typically has an emphasis on business financial statements and how they are used.

Member Silva stated it appeared to be more on the internal business finance verses somebody looking at it from an external view, which is how she viewed this course.

Member Seddon said as appraisers, they have to look at these statements internally and the appraiser has to extrapolate the information. She also shared one of the biggest issues she has had on this board has been the college courses because she compares what is done in Storey County and the other counties throughout the state.

Member Silva shared she liked hearing the perspective of the assessors because they dealt with county boards whereas, as a department, we don't, with the exception of the Centrally Assessed Section, who gets into utilities and mining but the Locally Assessed Section doesn't.

Member Payson shared he has to be reminded of the same thing when he reviews the financial courses; he forgets to look at the aspect of what is done throughout the state. He also said he would be willing to support approving this course based on the support provided by the Centrally Assessed Section and what they do involving mining.

Mr. Evpak said another aspect to look at is when staff is trying to learn more about their job, continuing with their education, writing better or learning how to calculate math to improve their job function.

Member Silva stated that statute would have to be followed because it is specific to what types of courses are to be approved. Finance and management courses are not addressed in statute. It is specific to mapping, GIS and appraisal. It is very specific which is why she has a hard time with some of the courses submitted.

Member Payson stated this is why he reads the NAC's prior to the board meetings because NAC 361.565.1.(d) states:

"(d) The subject matter of the course is relevant to understanding the concepts and applications of the appraisal of centrally assessed properties, including, without limitation, principles of accounting and finance."

Chair Popa said he believes this course is relevant in its entirety.

Member Sarman motioned to approve this course.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

All members voted to approve California State University MGMT-133 Business Finance for 36 Hours (3 credits).

r.	California State University	MGMT – 137 Financial Institutions and Markets	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	---	----------------------

Member Silva shared her concern about this course. She felt the course was more about banking than financial analysis.

Chair Popa had the same concern.

Member Payson asked how others felt about this course.

Member Seddon stated that the Board would have to establish a fine line that pertains to what the appraiser/assessors do and just because it may help in one instance, it may or may not pertain to what is done as appraisers.

Mr. Evpak stated, in his opinion, the banking world is directly correlated to what is going on in the business world and as appraisers; they would need to know what is going on demographically and economically because this affects the value of property.

Member Silva said this course was a little too much of a stretch and she would possibly approve it if we were on a market system but we're not. A lot of this doesn't come into place.

Member Sarman pointed out this is true until there is an appeal and then we go to more of a fee appraisal.

Member Seddon asked how much of this course pertained to what appraisers do. When a person is sitting in a 36 hour class and only 2 hours pertains to what appraisers do, this is what she has a problem with.

Member Silva said she has an easier time with courses when a course description is provided verses a catalog description. She also said there are a lot of courses required to receive a degree that have nothing to do with appraisal and just because they're required for a degree doesn't make them relevant to the job.

Member Silva motioned to deny this course.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

All members present voted to deny University of California MGMT – 137 Financial Institutions and Markets for 36 hours (3 credits).

s.	California State University	MIS – 101 Data Analysis for Managers	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------

Member Silva stated she had no problem with this course because it heavily weighted towards statistical and modeling techniques and statistical analysis.

Member Payson said his concern was the course appeared to be a higher level statistical course designed specifically for managers. He shared that he is usually in favor of statistical courses.

Chair Popa stated the course was relevant and was a 101 course and not a graduate level course.

Member Silva explained it was a second level course, above the basic. She has a harder time with graduate level courses than undergrad courses when it comes to statistic and accounting.

Member Silva motioned to approve this course.

Member Sarman seconded the motion.

Member Payson opposed the motion.

The motion to approve California State University MIS – 101 Data Analysis for Managers for 36 Hours (3 credits) passed, 5 Members voting in favor of approval, 1 Member opposed.

t.	California State University	OBE – 140 Managerial Real Estate	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------

Member Silva felt this course and the following two courses fell more into the realm of management and purchasing for real-estate agents verses appraisal.

Member Seddon added she was not sure how the board previously handled real estate classes, how real estate classes were denied or approved. Is it the same as everything else, for example, the accounting classes have been automatically approved.

Member Silva shared she felt this course fell more into purchasing verses the 'back side of it'.

Member Sarman agreed the course was purchasing but added that to understand why an investor is purchasing the property is an important aspect of understanding what the value is, site selection and what makes one site more valuable than the other.

Chair Popa agreed with Member Sarman.

Member Sarman motioned to approve this course.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

Member Silva opposed the motion.

The motion to approve California State University OBE – 140 Managerial Real Estate for 36 hours (3 credits) passed, 5 Members voting in favor of approval, 1 Member opposed.

u.	California State University	OBE – 141 Managerial Real Estate Law	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------

Member Payson said the one concern he had was this course might be relevant to California law but the description did not state that. In the past, when it comes to the legal part of the course, it has to have some relevance to Nevada. Since the description did not state the relevance, he was okay with the course.

Member Silva shared, as stated in Agenda item 6(t), she felt this course was more relevant to real estate purchasing and not enough information was provided.

Member Sarman said he felt this course was more litigation through the transaction process.

Member Powell stated this course would be beneficial when it came to coding of sales verses a trust transaction.

Member Seddon, after reading the course description, said the description did not state whether it was California or Nevada law.

Mr. Evpak shared this course addressed how to research laws and the skills needed and could be applicable to any state.

Chair Popa stated he felt this course was beneficial.

Deputy Director Mitchell asked Mr. Evpak to explain why he felt these courses merited consideration and Member Silva asked Mr. Evpak to explain the content of the course.

Mr. Evpak shared items q through cc were submitted by him and he appreciated the Board allowing him to speak. He shared it had been over 20 years since he'd taken the courses, therefore he did not have the narratives/explanations for these courses. He stated Land Use, Real Estate Transactions and the legal environment they are in is a big decision making factor for business making people when they're buying land to develop. He thinks it goes back to when they are valuing real property, one of the first things they are looking at is the economic and market conditions and the interactions between the buyers and sellers in the market place. Certainly legal aspects of the market place come into play in a big way, therefore he would argue the managerial real estate law is integral from the very beginning of the appraisal process. Member Payson asked if this was specific to any jurisdiction.

Mr. Evpak stated that he has a 20 year career in the state of California in addition to being a real estate broker. When researching state law, he felt that California was a good state to learn researching because it is much more complex than Nevada since California is the sixth largest economy in the nation. If you learn how to research real-estate law as it applies to real estate land development in California, you can apply it to any state including Nevada. This course was not specific to California; it was more of a nationwide aspect as far as the curriculum went.

Member Seddon shared the part of the course description that she questioned was where it stated "transactions relative to the minimization of risks of legal confrontation". She thought it was pertinent to someone who wanted to buy and make a transaction or brokering a transaction to minimize risk.

Mr. Evpak asked if there was any revision in the NRS that allows for partial credit for some of the classes if it is determined that part of the course is applicable.

Member Silva explained only if it is an approved class and the person taking the course fails or if the course description is specific and the members determine how much of the course was related to the topic, which can be determined if you have the course syllabus. In past cases where partial credit is approved, there has been a syllabus provided.

Member Sarman motioned to deny this course. He does think that law is an important aspect of real estate but he could not determine how much of this course is applicable.

Member Silva seconded the motion.

All members voted to deny California State University OBE -141 Managerial Real Estate Law for 36 Hours (3 credits).

v.	California State University	OBE – 142 Real Estate Finance	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

Member Silva shared she felt this course was more related to the purchasing of property, sources of funds and mortgage risk analysis verses assessment and appraisal.

Members Payson and Sarman both stated that they would approve this course.

Member Payson explained when he taught appraisal courses at the College of Southern Nevada, they discussed this topic quite a bit.

Member Silva stated that not having a syllabus for college courses is a problem.

Member Payson motioned to approve this course.

Member Sarman seconded the motion.

Member Silva opposed the motion.

Member Seddon abstained.

The motion to approve California State University OBE – 1442 Real Estate Finance for 36 hours (3 credits) passed, 4 Members voting in favor of approval, 1 Member opposed and 1 Member abstained.

w.	California State University	OBE – 143 Real Estate Investment and Valuation	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	--	----------------------

Members Silva and Payson both said they would like to have seen more information regarding this course.

Members Sarman and Seddon both supported approving this course.

Member Sarman motioned to approve this course.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

All Members present voted to approve OBE – 143 Real Estate Investment and Valuation for 36 hours (3 credits).

x.	California State University	OBE – 145 The Land Use Regulatory and Entitlement Process	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	---	----------------------

Member Silva stated this course was California specific and she felt it fell under ownership and development.

Member Silva motioned to deny this course.

Member Payson seconded the motion.

All members present voted to deny California State University OBE – 145 The Land Use Regulatory and Entitlement Process for 36 hours (3 credits).



y.	California State University	MATH - 009 Essentials of Algebra and Trigonometry	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	---	----------------------

Member Silva stated she would vote to approve this course because it has been previously approved through Perdue and Southwestern Oregon Community College (SWOCC). Member Payson stated he did not want to approve this course because he considered it a “non-basic math class”.

Member Seddon stated she agreed with Member Payson and seconded the motion but added the course had been previously approved. This is where she has issues, since a lot of these classes have been previously approved, how could the board deny it when there are basically the same classes were previously approved. She also stated she would not have originally approved this course.

Member Silva agreed with Member Seddon, the Board has already set precedence. Chair Popa added that appraisers could not do appraising without math knowledge or trigonometry, which is crucial in calculating land shapes.

Member Sarman asked if any of the Board Members knew why this course was previously approved.

Member Silva shared that math, in the past, was considered essential. Deputy Director Mitchell said he could have staff could go back to previous minutes and provide the board at a future meeting any backup as to why math courses were approved or that the Board could proceed with the motion made by Member Payson.

Member Payson shared that it could be dangerous if the board started approving courses just because they were approved in the past. He stated that he has been on this board for a long time and there have been a lot of courses that are being approved now but were not approved in the past. He asked the other board members how they felt about approving this course.

Member Sarman said it was his opinion this course was essential to what appraisers do.

Member Payson, as previously stated, motioned to deny this course.

Member Seddon, as previously stated, seconded the motion to deny this course.

Members Sarman, Silva, Powell and Popa opposed the motion to deny this course.

Member Sarman motioned to approve this course.

Member Silva seconded the motion.

Members Payson and Seddon opposed the motion to approve.

The motion to approve California State University MATH - 009 Essentials of Algebra and Trigonometry for 36 hours (3 credits) passed, 4 Members voting in favor of approval, 2 Members opposed.

z.	California State University	MATH – 023 Business Calculus	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------

Mr. Evpak explained this course was used to reinforce basic math principles.

Member Silva asked if this course was considered upper level.

Chair Popa shared that calculus impacts both the appraising world and the centrally assessed world.

Member Seddon shared she felt calculus was more of what appraisers do than the basic trigonometry and algebra courses. She thought these two courses were more out of the appraiser realm than calculus.

Member Sarman also shared that in order to advance into calculus; you have to take trigonometry and algebra.

Member Payson stated he is against approval of this course based on NAC.

Member Sarman motioned to approve this course.

There was no seconded motion for approval, therefore the motion died.

Member Payson motioned to deny this course.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

Chair Popa opposed the motion.

The motion to deny California State University MATH – 023 Business Calculus for 36 hours (3 credits) passed, 5 Member voted to deny, 1 Member opposed.

aa.	Lumbleau Real Estate School	Real Estate Ethics	3 Hours
bb.	Lumbleau Real Estate School	Ethics 3e	3 Hours
cc.	Chamberlin Real Estate School	Ethics 2e	3 Hours.

Member Silva asked Mr. Evpak to explain to the Board Members the two different schools and courses.

Mr. Evpak stated Lumbleau Real Estate School and Chamberlin Real Estate School were basically the same provider but different names and that Real Estate Ethics, Ethics 3e and Ethics 2e were all the same class and added because he is a real estate broker in the State of California, he is required every 4 years to take ongoing education similar to the requirements of the appraisers in the State of Nevada. California requires 3 hours of ethics training verses 4 hours in Nevada and the Ethics courses that were taken are not USPAP classes.

Member Sarman shared he has a license in Nevada and it is his opinion these courses are not applicable to what appraisers do. These are for agents and brokers and the course addresses duties owed to your clients and brokerage. He motioned to deny these courses but asked if any members would like to make an argument for why they would be applicable.

Mr. Evpak explained that learning to be ethical is all the same, you want to be ethical in your dealings and transactions. A person would be learning about ethics in business transactions and real estate valuation transactions, which is all applicable.

Member Sarman shared it is ethics but more tied to you and your brokerage and you and your client but he thought that as a board, we would want to push our appraisers to take USPAP.

Member Silva shared there was an ethics course sponsored by the Department years ago. This course went before the board for approval and the same argument occurred. There was ethics and learning to be ethical but it did not fall into the appraisal ethics category therefore, it was denied.

Member Payson agreed with Member Sarman’s statement and seconded the motion to deny these courses.

All Members present voted to deny Lumbleau Real Estate School – Real Estate Ethics and Ethics 3e and Chamberlin Real Estate School – Ethics 2e, all for 3 hours.

7. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:** Review and approval of continuing education credit hours for the following courses:

a.	California State University	OBE – 149 Capstone Seminar in Real Estate and Land Use	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	-----------------------------	--	----------------------

Member Silva asked Mr. Evpak if this course allowed him to choose his own topic in a subject matter or was it a designated subject matter that fell within the description and how the course was designed.

Mr. Evpak explained this was the last course taken and tied all the concepts from all his other courses together. This was a team class project allowing them to choose within the parameters of all the previous courses taken.

Member Payson stated that he felt this course was relevant.

Member Sarman motioned to approve this course.

Member Silva seconded the motion.

All Members voted to approve California State University OBE – 149 Capstone Seminar in Real Estate and Land Use for 36 hours (3 credits).

Member Sarman asked the Board Members for clarification regarding the Board approving courses that were taken 20 years ago, as in Mr. Evpak’s case.

Member Silva explained courses taken in the past can only be approved for the first 180 hour milestone. She also stated there is no time limit reflected in the statute pertaining to the 180 hours but there is once a person is into the 3 year cycle (milestone). She added that everyone has had issues with it but statute does not address it. One thing that is addressed in statute is appraisers are not allowed, for example, to take a course in 2003, hold onto the certificate and submit it in 2010 for credit during the 2010 time frame.

Member Seddon agreed and thought this needed to be addressed with the Association and possibly changed.

Member Silva explained when an appraiser comes in on day one and submits the 180 hour requirement; the remainder goes on to their transcript but does not carry over into the next three years. Appraisers are required, during the three year cycle, to take current classes.

Member Payson shared this discussion has been brought up on several occasions over the years, he thinks if an appraiser has a Bachelors or Associates degree, they should immediately go into the three year cycle especially when it only takes the Board approving five of the college courses to put the appraiser at the 180 hours.

Member Seddon agreed with Member Payson and added it would save the Board time.

Member Silva shared this would take a statutory change.

Member Payson asked if it would just take changing the NAC.

Deputy Director Mitchell stated his preference is to get the current regulations that are pending through. To start the permanent regulation process, we could open up anything after July 1, 2019. Possibly after the July 1, 2019 meeting, he asked Denesa to make a note to discuss both the bylaws and possible regulatory changes.

Member Silva shared the Bylaw process needs to be addressed by the current Board Members.

Member Payson mentioned to Member Seddon that they possibly put this topic on the Agenda for the Nevada Assessor’s Association. Member Seddon agreed.

b.	McKissock	Laws & Regulations for California Appraisers	4 Hours
----	-----------	--	---------

Member Sarman stated when he reviewed the chapters for this course, two of the chapters were relevant and two of them weren’t.

Member Payson read the NAC and its relevance and motioned to deny this course.

Member Sarman seconded the motion.

All members present voted to deny McKissock – Laws & Regulations for California Appraisers for 4 hours.

c.	Great Basin College	Composition II	36 Hours (3 credits)
----	---------------------	----------------	----------------------

Denesa Johnston stated the appraiser requested this course be withdrawn from the Agenda.

d.	IAAO	Everything You Wanted to Know About Modeling	2 Hours
----	------	--	---------

Member Payson motioned to approve this course.

Member Seddon seconded the motion.

All Members present voted to approve IAAO – Everything You Wanted to Know About Modeling for the number of hours on the certificate.

**8. Briefing to and from Appraiser Certification Board and Department Staff.**

Deputy Director Mitchell shared the most recent regulations regarding continuing education were approved during the recent Nevada Tax Commission meeting and should be on the agenda for approval by the Legislative Committee, hopefully December 19, 2018 but he had not yet received confirmation. If they are not approved at the December meeting, they will be on the agenda for the January agenda for approval and after that, they become law. Staff has made note to bring forward regulation discussion at the July meeting pending discussion at the upcoming Assessors Association meeting of other possible regulatory changes. Staff has also made note of one or two courses that will be placed on the next agenda. He asked Board Members if they had anything they would like to add.

Member Silva had a question regarding Bylaws. Was the Board going to start addressing them at the July meeting?

Deputy Director Mitchell asked what the Board's discretion was.

Member Silva shared that the Board has been trying to get the Bylaws updated for 2 – 2 1/2 years and due to board changes, this hasn't been accomplished. She felt that the previous proposed changes would be a good starting point for the Board.

Member Sarman would like copies of the document sent out so the Members could review the old document and the suggested changes.

Members Silva and Payson asked if it was possible to place the Bylaws on the upcoming Agenda.

Member Silva also shared that the Board was awaiting the regulations to become final before proceeding with changes to the Bylaws because the Board didn't want to put something in place and later have it be in conflict with the regulation.

Member Payson shared that Member Silva had done the most work on the Bylaws and it was close to being completed.

Member Silva added there were suggestions for the Bylaws from Mark Stafford that involved being a fee appraiser and understanding the background.

Member Payson suggested to Member Seddon they possibly meet with some of the inspectors during the Nevada Assessor's Conference to get their input or possibly put it forth to the NAA Regulation Committee.

Deputy Director Mitchell said the Bylaws would be placed on the next Agenda. He also shared that after January 1<sup>st</sup>, the Division would be sending out the appraiser transcripts.

Member Payson discussed the approval of the courses. He stated on this agenda, he noticed a lot of the IAAO courses. It was his impression that if an IAAO course was previously approved, the board would not have to reapprove it every time it was submitted.

He also shared it was his understanding the IAAO courses would be approved but it seems like they have had to review a lot of the IAAO courses.

Deputy Director Mitchell shared these were placed on the Consent Agenda and that the Department did not have the authority to automatically approve courses.

**9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:** Schedule Date and Review Agenda topics for the next Appraiser's Certification Board Meeting.

Member Silva asked if any of the Board Members knew if there was going to be any courses from the spring conference or for the May week long association class that are going to have to be approved?

Member Seddon stated this was unknown at this point.

The next meeting date should be scheduled the last week of March or the first week of April. Deputy Director Mitchell stated the staff will send out tentative dates for the next meeting.

**10. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.

DRAFT