# BEFORE THE COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF NEVADA

SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator, REAL ESTATE DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, STATE OF NEVADA,

Petitioner,

VS.

KRISTEN N. ASTE, (License No. A.0007406-CR),

Respondent.

Case No. 2020-676, AP21.009.S

STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR SETTLEMENT OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION



NEVADA COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS

This Stipulation and Order for Settlement of Disciplinary Action (the "Stipulation") is entered into by and between the State of Nevada, Department of Business and Industry, Real Estate Division ("the Division"), through its Administrator Sharath Chandra ("Petitioner"), by and through their attorney of record, Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, and Respondent Kristen N. Aste, ("RESPONDENT"), by and through her attorney of record, Janeen Isaacson, Esq.

The RESPONDENT, at all relevant times mentioned in the Complaint, was licensed by the Division as a Certified Residential Appraiser and, therefore, is subject to the Jurisdiction of the Division and the Commission and the provisions of NRS 645C and NAC Chapter 645C.

#### JURISDICTION

The Respondent is a Certified Residential Appraiser licensed by the Division, and therefore, is subject to the Jurisdiction of the Division and the provisions of NRS and NAC Chapter 645C. By availing herself of the benefits and protections of the laws of the State of Nevada, the Respondent has submitted to the jurisdiction of the Division.

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

#### 

### 

# 

### 

### 

## 

#### 

# 

# 

## 

# 

## 

### 

# 

### 

# 

#### SUMMARY OF PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

The Complaint filed by the Division alleges the following Procedural and Factual Allegations against RESPONDENT:

- 1. On or about August 5, 2020, the Division received a complaint regarding the subject Appraisal Report prepared by RESPONDENT ("Appraisal Report").
- 2. On August 5, 2020, the Division opened an investigation into the complaint and issued an open investigation letter to RESPONDENT requesting a copy of the digital appraisal report, entire work file and supporting documentation, with a deadline of August 17, 2020.
- 3. The Respondent complied with the Division's August 5, 2020, request by providing a digital copy of her Appraisal Report and work file, totaling 777 pages.
- 4. The Division commissioned a Standard 3 Review of the Appraisal Report, which was completed on June 13, 2021.
- 5. Following the investigation and Standard 3 Review, on October 18, 2021, the investigator recommended the case be heard by the Appraisal Advisory Review Committee ("AARC").
- 6. On March 17, 2022, the Appraisal Program Manager sent Respondent a letter requesting that she provide a response to the allegations originally sent to her on August 5, 2020.
- 7. This case was heard by the AARC on May 24, 2022, and the Committee recommended that this case 2020-676 be forwarded to the Commission.
- 8. The Respondent prepared an Appraisal Report for a three-story, 13,846 sq. ft. (Gross Living Area), 6 br/6.1 bath residence located at 608 St. Croix St., Henderson, NV 89012, APN # 178-27-216-015 ("Property").
- 9. Construction on the home started in 2009 and remained ongoing as of the date of the Standard 3 Review, June 13, 2021.
- 10. The Appraisal Report's assignment type was noted as "Refinance Transaction" and indicated a value conclusion of \$13,000,000.00 by Sales Comparison

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 11. The effective date of the report was indicated as June 2, 2020, and the date of signature of the report was June 18, 2020.
- 12. The work file lacked proof, analysis or testing to support the following statements and/or assumptions found in the Appraisal Report:
  - a. Location adjustment, since several of the comparables featured similar city views or a long golf course view.
  - b. Size of site adjustment;
  - Statement that some comparables were in C1 condition;
  - Bath count adjustment;
  - e. GLA adjustment;
  - f. Garage adjustment;
  - g. The inclusion in cost approach analysis of \$3,488,000 in on-site improvements;
  - h. Condition adjustments and 10% entrepreneurial adjustments for comparables 7, 8, and 9;
  - i. Statement that adjustments are market derived and supported by multivariate regression; and
  - j. Statement that adjustments in the grid were derived from matched pair analysis.
- 13. The Appraisal Report and work file did not consider the possible superadequacy of a 13,386 sq. ft. basement.
- Comparable sales photos in the Appraisal Report are cropped photos from MLS and/or other online sources, rather than from inspection from street-level or closer, contrary to the stated Scope of Work.
- 15. The Appraisal Report reports "highest and best use" is "present use," but does not provide analysis in support of the contention.

28

- 16. The Appraisal Report and work file does not provide information on relevant sales data for larger GLA comparables within the immediate market.
- 17. In the "final reconciliation" found within the supplemental addendum, "quantity and quality" of data is not discussed, and cost approach is not mentioned.
- 18. Respondent's work file references an email from an Intern named "Renzo," yet the Appraisal Report contains no disclosure of intern assistance.
- 19. On or about May 24, 2022, the Division mailed to the Respondent a follow-up letter pursuant to NRS 233B, indicating that the Division's investigation had uncovered sufficient evidence to recommend the filing of a formal complaint by the Division with the Commission of Appraisers of Real Estate.

#### SUMMARY OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF LAW

The Complaint filed by the Division alleges that RESPONDENT committed the following violations of law:

- 20. RESPONDENT violated the USPAP ETHICS RULE by lacking support of neighborhood and comparable analysis, as well as calculations for paired sales and regression as claimed.
- 21. RESPONDENT violated USPAP RECORD KEEPING RULE by failing to include computations regarding multivariable regression or matched pairs analysis that allegedly support the Appraisal Report's adjustments; the work file contains four appraisal reports, with the same and/or no signature date, making it unclear how many reports were actually sent to the client.
- 22. RESPONDENT violated USPAP SCOPE OF WORK RULE by failing to explain the extent of analyses used to arrive at opinions and conclusions in her report and/or work file, and by failing to comply with the Scope of Work section of the Appraisal Report stating "The appraiser must, at minimum... (3)inspect each of the comparable sales from at least the street."
- 23. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 1-1(a) by overlooking as many as ten (10) recent, proximate sales, by failing to consider or address the possible super-

adequacy of the basement; and by including numerous adjustments not supported by the work file, and violated Standards Rule 1-1(a) by overlooking ten (10) recent, proximate sales.

- 24. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 1-2(h) by failing to explain the extent of analyses used to arrive at opinions and conclusions in her report and/or work file, and by failing to comply with the stated Scope of Work regarding at least street-level inspection of all comparable sales.
- 25. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 1-3(b) by reporting "highest and best use" as "present use," but failing to provide support and evidence of that analysis in the work file.
- 26. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 1-4(a) by failing to consider all larger Gross Living Area homes found in the immediate market.
- 27. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 1-6(a) by failing to discuss the quality and quantity of data in the reconciliation section of the supplemental addendum of the Appraisal Report, and violated Standards Rule 1-6(b) by failing to mention cost approach in the reconciliation section of the supplemental addendum of the Appraisal Report.
- 28. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 2-1(a) the Respondent's Appraisal Report by using comparable sales that appear to be specifically chosen, yet very dated or distant, leading to misleading results, while simultaneously overlooking more similar and proximate comparables, and violated Standards Rule 2-1(b) by using specific comparable sales that appear to be specifically chosen, yet very dated or distant, leading to misleading results that leaves the reader unable to understand the report properly.
- 29. RESPONDENT violated Standards Rule 2-2(a)(b)(c)(xii) as the Respondent's Appraisal Report gives an opinion as to "highest and best use" but does not fully analyze the support and rationale for that opinion.

#### PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

By entering into this Stipulation, the RESPONDENT does not admit the above

- 1. The RESPONDENT agrees to take a minimum of twelve (12) hours of Continuing Education Credits ("CEC") in the each of the following areas:
  - a. Not less than four (4) hours on Ethics, Competency, and Negligence;
  - b. Not less than (4) hours on Missing Explanations; and

c. Not less (4) hours on Appraiser Self Protection: Documentation and Record Keeping.

These courses shall be completed within six (6) months of the effective date of the Commission's order approving this Stipulation. These courses will not count toward the RESPONDENT's continuing education requirements. Proof of completion must be submitted to the Division upon completion of all the required education.

- 2. RESPONDENT agrees to pay the Division a total amount of SEVEN THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED TWENTY NINE DOLLARS and 95/100 cents (\$7,329.95) ("Amount Due"), consisting of THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS AND NO CENTS (\$3,000.00) in administrative fines imposed by the Division and the Division's pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of THREE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED FORTY FOUR DOLLARS and 95/100 cents (\$3,344.95), and investigative costs incurred in the total amount of NINE HUNDRED EIGHTY FIVE DOLLARS and no cents (\$985.00).
- 3. The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division in eighteen (18) monthly installments of FOUR HUNDRED SEVEN DOLLARS and 21/100 cents (\$407.21), with the first payment due thirty (30) days after approval of this Stipulation by the Commission. Lump sums can be made in pre-payment with no penalties.
  - 4. RESPONDENT and the Division agree that once this Agreement is approved

and fully performed, the Division will close its file in this matter and the Division agrees not to pursue any other or greater remedies or fines in connection with RESPONDENT alleged conduct referenced herein. The Division further agrees that unless RESPONDENT fails to make timely payment, the Division will not bring any claim or cause directly or indirectly based upon any of the facts, circumstances, or allegations discovered during the Division's investigation and prosecution of this case.

- 5. RESPONDENT agrees and understands that by entering into this Stipulation, RESPONDENT is waiving her right to a hearing in each matter at which RESPONDENT may present evidence in her defense, her right to a written decision on the merits of the complaint, her rights to reconsideration and/or rehearing, appeal and/or judicial review, and all other rights which may be accorded by the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act, the Nevada Real Estate Appraisers statutes and accompanying regulations, and the federal and state Constitutions.
- 6. RESPONDENT understands that this Agreement and other documentation may be subject to public records laws. The Commission members who review this matter for approval of this Stipulation may be the same members who ultimately hear, consider, and decide the Complaints if this Stipulation is either not approved by the Commission or is not timely performed by RESPONDENT.
- 7. RESPONDENT fully understands that she has the right to be represented by legal counsel in these matters at her own expense.
- 8. Each party shall bear their own attorney's fees and costs, except as provided above.
- 9. Approval of Stipulation. Once executed, this Stipulation will be filed with the Commission and will be placed on the agenda for approval at its next public meeting. The Division will recommend to the Commission approval of the Stipulation. RESPONDENT agrees that the Commission may approve, reject, or suggest amendments to this Stipulation that must be accepted or rejected by RESPONDENT before any amendment is effective.

against either party.

- 10. Withdrawal of Stipulation. If the Commission rejects this Stipulation or suggests amendments unacceptable to RESPONDENT, RESPONDENT may withdraw from this Stipulation, and the Division may pursue its Complaint before the Commission. This Stipulation then shall become null and void and unenforceable in any manner
- 11. Release. In consideration of the execution of this Stipulation, RESPONDENT for herself, her heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns, hereby releases, remises, and forever discharges the State of Nevada, the Department of Business and Industry, and the Division, and each of their respective members, agents, employees, and counsel in their individual and representative capacities, from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims, and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that RESPONDENT ever had, now has, may have, or claim to have against any or all of the persons or entities named in this section, arising out of or by reason of the Division's investigations, these disciplinary actions, and all other matters relating thereto.
- 12. Indemnification. RESPONDENT hereby agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the State of Nevada, the Department of Business and Industry, Petitioner, the Division, and each of their respective members, agents, employees, and counsel, in their individual and representative capacities, against any and all claims, suits, and actions brought against said persons and/or entities by reason of the Division's investigations, these disciplinary actions, and all other matters relating thereto, and against any and all expenses, damages, and costs, including court costs and attorney fees, which may be sustained by the persons and/or entities named in this section as a result of said claims, suits, and actions.
- 13. Default. In the event of default under this Stipulation, RESPONDENT agrees that her license shall be immediately suspended, and the unpaid balance of the administrative fine and costs, together with any attorneys' fees and costs that may have been assessed, shall be due in full to the Division within ten calendar days of the date of

1	default. Debt collection actions for unpaid	d monetary assessments in this case may be
2	instituted by the Division or its assignee.	
3	14. RESPONDENT has signed and dated this Stipulation only after reading and	
4	understanding all terms herein.	
5	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
6	Tayana	
7	Dated: <u>January</u> , <u>lb</u> , 2024.	NEVADA REAL ESTATE DIVISION Department of Business and Industry State of Nevada
8 9		State of Neyada
10		By: SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator
11		3300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 350
12		Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
13		Kriten aste
14	Dated:,	KRISTEN N. ASTE
15		(License No. A.0007406-CR)
16	Approved as to form:	
17		
18	LIPSON NEILSON	AARON D. FORD Attorney General
19		
20	JANEEN SAACSON (Bar No. 6429)	By: <u>/s/ Phil W. Su</u> PHIL W. SU (Bar No. 10450)
21	9900 Covington Cross Dr., Suite 120	Senior Deputy Attorney General
22	Las Vegas, NV 89144 (702) 382-1500	555 E. Washington Ave. #3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
23	Attorneys for Respondent Kristen N. Aste	(702) 486-3420 Attorneys for Real Estate Division
24	11/10/07/11/11/07/	Thiorneys for fieur Brute Division
25	ORDER	
26	IT IS ORDERED that the foregoing Stipulation for Settlement of Disciplinar	
27	Action, submitted by Petitioner and Respondent, is approved in full.	
28	Dated: this 18 day of January, 2024.	

**ORDER** IT IS ORDERED that the foregoing Stipulation for Settlement of Disciplinary Action, submitted by Petitioner and Respondent, is approved in full. Dated: this 18 day of January, 2024. COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF REAL ESTATE President, Commission of Appraisers of Real Estate