

From: [Richard Romano](#)
To: [Teralyn Lewis](#)
Cc: [Greg Stephens](#); richard.romano57@hotmail.com
Subject: Fw:
Date: Monday, May 13, 2019 1:34:22 PM
Importance: High

From: Richard Romano <rromano@metrowestappr.com>

Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 2:53 PM
To: Greg Stephens <gstephens@metrowestappr.com>
Subject:
Importance: High

05/10/2019

7469 Parnell Ave.

Las Vegas, NV 89147

702.301.9650

Good Afternoon Teralyn,

I am requesting a Continuance from the appointed Hearing before the Commission of Appraisers of Real Estate, the week of 05/20/2019.

The current date does not allow for sufficient preparation by myself, nor the preparation/presence of legal counsel and/or expert witnesses.

In addition, i have provided responses to the 33 Factual Allegations, noted in the COMPLAINT AND NOTICE OF HEARING dated 04/18/2019.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS # 1 - 33:

1. Information is accurate.
2. Allegation is inaccurate. The sales were verified with information available within the normal course of business and the 1004MC Market Conditions Addendum was developed consistent with the guidelines in effect as of the date of appraisal.
3. No exception noted

4. The allegation contains a statement “with the expectation of compensation. “ Such expectation is consistent with fee appraisal assignments and in no way impacted the independence or objectivity in developing the appraisal.

- 5 - 8. All appear to be addressed correctly. In the original appraisal report I did mislabel a bath photo, which was corrected in response to the revision request.

9. As previously stated, the 1004MC was developed in compliance with guidelines in effect as of the date of appraisal. The complainant referenced Zillow trend information, which contains properties within a given market, rather than properties that are directly competitive to the subject. This was addressed in my initial response which showed via a directional arrow, the instructions within the 1004MC specifically containing that reference. Comparable sales one and two were built by the subject builder and therefore directly competitive to the subject. The contract dates were not available, which did not negate my research and inclusion of those sales in the appraisal report. It should be noted the Complainant refers to providing the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which was not relevant to the market research and not included in appraisal report neighborhood data.

10. No exceptions noted.

11. After receiving the third revision request, I expanded my search criteria which produced a different market trending from my initial search. It should be noted, I utilize a analytical software program developed by DataMaster, which utilizes my MLS search information to fill in the data elements within the 1004MC addendum – specific to the market identified for the subject property. This is why there is no copy in my workfile. Based upon this new market trending information I did amend my original appraisal report.

12. Comparables 1 and 2 Sales Dates and Clark Co. Doc # numbers are confirmed through the Clark County Assessor and Recorder websites. The Builder had completed construction in the subject community, in which these Comparables are located, and as such, no HUD-1 statements were available to indicate the contract dates. I did complete my due diligence consistent with recognized methods and techniques.

13. The date/time adjustments were extracted from the MLS searches and the 1004MC data. The date/time adjustments applied to sales 1 and 2 are consistent with that data.

The subject area has increased 0.45% per month over the last twelve months. All 1 story dwellings between 2,435 - 3,645/Sq.Ft. GLA, constructed after 2005, with a site area over 10,000/sq. ft., were considered to develop the trending data.

14 - 15. Analysis for View Adjustments is noted in the report, developed from the differences of Comparables 1 and 2. Both are located in the subject community, similar in GLA, site area, etc.

- Per previous appraisals in the subject neighborhood that were considered, the Market Acceptance for differences in garages, baths, etc are applied, particularly for new and recently constructed dwellings from 2015 - 2017.

16. The additional Comparable 5 is addressed in the above Point #13.

17. Site improvements and landscaping values are addressed. The Opinion of Site Value is provided in the attached Corelogic Tax *Record Details, as stated in the report:*

The opinion of Site Value is established by utilizing the extraction method of similar properties in the subject's market area, or from CORELOGIC TAX RECORD DETAILS (A RELIABLE SOURCE FOR PROVIDING OPINION OF SITE VALUE), utilizing the Land Assessed Value. This approach has minimal impact on the final conclusions for the subject.

18. The change was based upon the new information reflected in the 1004MC Addendum in the revised report.

19. The subject is a new construction purchase from the Builder: D R Horton. It was purchased by its' then owner, 04/2017. It never had previous occupancy and the current occupancy was less than 8 months so there was no observable depreciation.

20. The Comparable 5 has been incorrectly reported as being on the golf course. But, no view adjustment is utilized. The following was noted in the report:

Comparable 5 was utilized for its similar views and age. The quality adjustment reflects the superior building components because it was a model home. Car storage is superior. Bedroom contributory values are reflected in the living area adjustments.

It was constructed in 2016, never occupied.

21. As previously noted, no Accrued Depreciation was observed. The subject was new construction and had only been occupied for eight months.

22. I dispute this allegation. The subject was purchased eight months prior to the effective date of my appraisal, which was reported in the appraisal report. The sales price was consistent with market data at that time so there was nothing to report. Had I noted an exception it would have been discussed.

23 - 24. The subject is a New Construction. Verbiage of the **cost approach had "a minimal impact on the final conclusions for the subject"** not being included, is due to the Actual/Effective Ages of the subject and has Does Not support, and is Not necessary.

The Final Reconciliation notes:

THE HIGH QUALITY OF THE DATA USED IN THE SALES COMPARISON APPROACH DEMONSTRATES ITS VIABILITY AS THE BEST VALUE INDICATOR.

THE COST APPROACH IS DEVELOPED.

AS INDICATED ON PAGE THREE, THE INCOME APPROACH TO VALUE WAS NOT DEVELOPED.

- The Opinion of Site Value is acquired by research of similar and lesser sized sites within the subject Neighborhood Boundaries.

25. The comments in the Sales Comparison are as noted to support adjustments and/or non-adjustments:

IT SHOULD BE NOTED LOCAL REALTORS MAY NOT UPDATE THE DAYS ON MARKET FROM THE MOST RECENT CHANGE, BUT, CONTINUE TO INCLUDE DOM FROM THE COMPARABLES ORIGINAL LISTING DATE.

The appraiser has utilized properties that sold in the last 90 days, 3 - 6 and more than 6 months from the subject inspection date. The appraiser has utilized traditional sales as comparables.

DUE TO A LACK OF SIMILAR PROPERTIES THE APPRAISER DEEMED IT NECESSARY TO UTILIZE COMPARABLES OVER A MAIN/MAJOR THOROUGHFARES and OVER ONE MILE FROM THE SUBJECT.

The subject area is increasing 0.45% per month. An adjustment is utilized from the comparables CONTRACT DATE, unless noted.

NO ADJUSTMENT FOR DIFFERENCES IN THE NUMBER OF TOTAL ROOMS. THIS IS NOTED IN THE GLA.

NO BEDROOMS ARE ADJUSTED. THIS IS NOTED IN THE GLA.

DWELLINGS CONSIDERED ARE WITHIN 15 - 20% OF THE SUBJECTS' GLA. AN ADJUSTMENT OVER A DIFFERENCE OF 100/SQ.FT. OF THE SUBJECT'S GLA IS UTILIZED, AT \$47 PER FOOT.

ADJUSTMENTS UTILIZED ARE DEVELOPED EITHER BY PAIRED SALES ANALYSIS OR MARKET ACCEPTANCE.

An adjustment is utilized for site area differences more than 20% of the subject's site area. An adjustment of \$2.80 per foot is utilized, where necessary.

Bath and garage adjustments are noted at \$6,000 per, considered typical in the market area.

NO age adjustment is utilized.

Comparables 1 and 2 are utilized to develop a market adjustment for views.

- Per previous appraisals in the subject neighborhood that were considered, the Market Acceptance for differences in garages, baths, etc are applied, particularly for new and

recently constructed dwellings from 2015 - 2017.

26. Per the Revised Report, the appraiser has referenced the subject GLVAR MLS AREA #102 The Median Marketing Time in the addendum and 1004MC WILL DIFFER due to the additional research conducted after receiving the request for REVISION, changing the results from the Original and revised report.

27. It is clearly noted in the report: **ADJUSTMENTS UTILIZED ARE DEVELOPED EITHER BY PAIRED SALES ANALYSIS OR MARKET ACCEPTANCE.**

- Market Acceptance is established for the criteria of a typical buyer for similar age, size, location; from previous appraisals of properties within the subject neighborhood boundaries.

28. I refute this allegation. It is clearly noted in the Highest and Best Use in the Site Section: **Analysis of the subject legal, physical and feasible uses resulted in the conclusion the subject's current use as a single family residential property, is the subject's highest and best use.**

29. The Appraiser did not allow the AMC to influence the results of the appraisal report. After revisiting the appraisal and market data, the appraisal was revised based upon the data. I would suggest that the communications from the complainant are indicative of an attempt to influence the value opinion.

30. The appraiser concurs the request for the entire appraisal workfile and all supporting documentation. The certified letter was not received due to appraiser moving in November 2017, from 8112 Imperial Lakes St to 4113 Glenfield Circle. The correct address was confirmed via email and changed by Jaye-Alta V.Lindsey as attached:

Jaye-Alta V. Lindsay <jvlindsay@red.nv.gov>Wed 1/24/2018 10:56 AM

You; Michael Shores; Steven Gasso; Greg Stephens; Richard Romano

Good Morning Richard,

I will update your address information today.

Thank you for your time,

Jaye Lindsay

Appraisal Compliance/Audit Investigator

Department of Business & Industry

State of Nevada Real Estate Division

1818 E. College Parkway, Suite 110

Carson City, NV 89706

Phone: (775) 684-1905

Email: jylindsay@red.nv.gov

Website: www.red.nv.gov

31. The copies of both the Original and Revised reports have been provided.

32 - 33. All appear to be factual.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

Sincerely,

Richard Romano