

**NEVADA COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF REAL ESTATE  
MEETING  
JANUARY 13, 2026, MINUTES**

**VIA IN PERSON AND TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING  
JANUARY 13, 2026**

Nevada State Business Center  
3300 W. Sahara Avenue  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nevada Room  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

VIDEO CONFERENCE TO:  
Nevada Division of Insurance  
1818 College Parkway, Suite 103  
Carson City, Nevada 89706

**1) Commission/Division Business:**

**A) Call to Order, Introduction of Commissioners in Attendance; and Establish Quorum.**

President O'Brien called the meeting to order at 9:15 A.M.

Introduction of Commissioners in Attendance: Timothy O'Brien, Dallin Morris, Scott Krueger, and Kristen Lowe, a quorum was established.

Commission Counsel: Todd Weiss, Senior Deputy Attorney General.

**B) Introduction of Division Staff in Attendance**

Sharath Chandra, Administrator; Charvez Foger, Deputy Administrator; Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager; Rebecca Bruce, Chief Compliance Investigator; James Silva, Compliance Audit Investigator; Barry Chappell, Appraisal Program Officer; Amy Reveyrand, Commission Coordinator; and Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator.

Phil Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, representing the Division.

**2) Public Comment**

Scott Dugan stated he is a certified general appraiser and has been appraising in Las Vegas since 1969. Mr. Dugan stated a letter was submitted to Maria Gallo regarding continuing education requirements and the letter was based on recently approved continuing education changes for real estate agents, under LCB File No. R060-20.

Mr. Dugan stated reduced continuing education requirements should be available to licensed appraisers who have been licensed in Nevada for 30 years or more and are in good standing. Mr. Dugan proposed that eligible appraisers be allowed to apply for an exemption to complete a reduced number of continuing education credits required for renewal, consisting of 15 hours total, including seven hours of the USPAP update and an additional eight hours of approved continuing education courses.

Mr. Dugan further proposed participation in certain volunteer and professional service activities count toward continuing education requirements to encourage volunteerism. Mr. Dugan stated members of the County or State Board of Equalization, Appraisal Review Committee and Appraisal Commission

Members are awarded a maximum of six continuing education hours per two-year license period, calculated as three hours for each current year of service during the renewal period. Mr. Dugan additionally stated service related to the Appraisal Foundation, including members of AF, ASC, and ASB, be awarded a maximum of six continuing education hours per two-year license period, calculated as three hours for each current year of service during the renewal period.

Mr. Dugan stated the proposal was submitted for the record and requested the Commission consider the recommendations.

Brenda Nichols stated she is a senior management analyst with the City of Reno. Ms. Nichols informed the Commission that the City of Reno will be opening the application period for inclusion on the City's certified general appraiser list in the coming weeks. Ms. Nichols stated the application period will remain open for three weeks and the application will be sent to Division staff for dissemination through official channels. Ms. Nichols stated she was providing this information as advance notice to the Commission.

**3) FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND DECISION REGARDING RESPONDENT'S PETITION TO SEEK CLARIFICATION ON THE DURATION OF THE REVOCATION OF LICENSE:**

**A. NRED v. BRADLEY W. CORN**, for possible action

Case No. 2021-512

License No. A.0005827-CR (REVOKED)

Parties Present:

Phil Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division

Bradley Corn, Respondent, was present virtually

Preliminary Matters:

Mr. Su stated a Commission Order was signed in October of 2024 regarding a settlement reached by the Division with Mr. Corn. Mr. Su explained, under the terms of the settlement agreement, Mr. Corn agreed, among other terms, to surrender his license. Mr. Su noted the draft of the settlement characterized this as a revocation; however, revocation typically occurs only after completion of a full case and is considered a penalty. Mr. Su stated the situation should more properly be classified as a voluntary surrender.

Mr. Su stated, as background, Mr. Corn owed approximately \$19,000 in fines from the Order, which has been paid in full, and he has complied with the other terms of the Order. Mr. Su explained the Division's current position is to amend the terms of the settlement order to reflect a voluntary surrender rather than a revocation. Mr. Su stated additional terms could be included, such as conditions for reapplying for an appraisal license in Nevada. Mr. Su noted Mr. Corn surrendered his license because he did not intend to practice appraisal in Nevada, and the settlement agreement was negotiated with his attorney and vetted by the Division.

Mr. Su stated the Commission could establish a time frame for how long the voluntary surrender would remain in effect if desired, though his recommendation is to classify it as a voluntary surrender with no time frame, this would allow Mr. Corn to apply for a license elsewhere immediately if he chooses. Mr. Su concluded by stating he is available to answer any questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Krueger stated the purpose is not merely to seek clarification on the Order, but to amend it.

Mr. Su stated the Order in question could be amended whether it remained classified as a revocation or not. Mr. Su explained that Mr. Corn was seeking a time frame and, while research into case law regarding revocations under NRS 622A provided a typical range of one to ten years for professional licensing boards in Nevada, that statute does not apply to the Commission for Real Estate Appraisers. Mr. Su stated it provides guidance on potential time frames.

Mr. Su stated the Division's recommendation is to replace the revocation language with a voluntary surrender. Mr. Su stated if the Commission wishes, a time frame could be added, for example, one year, noting he has already complied with the other terms of the settlement, including payment of his fine in full as of November 2024.

Mr. Su further recommended, if Mr. Corn wishes to reapply for a license, he should appear before the Commission to explain the circumstances prior to proceeding. Mr. Su stated these additional terms—classification as a voluntary surrender, a specified time frame, and Commission review for reapplication—would formalize the process and provide clarity.

Commissioner Krueger asked a legal follow-up question, noting NRS 645C.460(3) provides if a certificate, license, or registration card is revoked by the Commission, another certificate, license, or registration card cannot be issued to the same appraiser or intern for at least one year, or thereafter at the sole discretion of the administrator, and only if the individual satisfies all requirements for an original certificate, license, or registration card.

Mr. Weiss responded, if he understands Mr. Su correctly, the proposal to change the classification from revocation to voluntary surrender would mean that NRS 645C.460(3) would not apply. Mr. Weiss stated the guidance provided by NRS 645C.460(3) is still useful and recommended clarifying in the order the specific date on which any applicable time period would begin. Mr. Weiss noted all language in the stipulation points to the effective date of the order, and the one-year period should be backdated to October 9, 2024, the effective date of the order, to ensure compliance.

President O'Brien stated agreement with Commissioner Krueger regarding NRS 645C, noting the statute also identifies grounds for disciplinary action against a certified or licensed appraiser, including suspension, revocation, or voluntary surrender in lieu of discipline. President O'Brien stated that a time frame should be established so the voluntary surrender is not in perpetuity. President O'Brien further stated, if Mr. Corn intends to practice again, he should appear before the Commission to explain any changes in circumstances before reactivating or obtaining a new license. President O'Brien indicated openness to a one-year time frame with the requirement for Commission review upon any attempt to reapply.

Mr. Corn stated he has no intention of returning to appraising. Mr. Corn explained, in his new career as a financial planner, he is pursuing the Certified Financial Planner (CFP) designation. Mr. Corn stated while studying for the program, he learned a previous revocation of a license would prevent him from earning the CFP designation, which prompted the current discussion. Mr. Corn agreed with the Commission's proposal to change the language to reflect a voluntary surrender with a one-year time frame, noting the period has already passed, and stated this change will allow him to proceed with his new career.

Motion:

Commissioner Krueger moved to amend the original Order dated October 9, 2024, item #1 is amended to read the license is voluntary surrendered for a period of 1 year commencing on the original date of the

order, the respondent would be able to reapply for a license after 1 year from the voluntary surrender order date, and the application for license would be contingent on coming before the Commission for approval at its regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Lowe. Motion carried.

**4) DISCIPLINARY ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION BY THE COMMISSION:**

**A. NRED v. BRAYDON C. CRITCHLOW**, for possible action

Case No. 2023-449

License No. A.0003929-CR (ACTIVE)

President O'Brien stated the Respondent requested and received a continuance and this matter will be heard at a later date.

**B. NRED v. GLENN J. HOWARD**, for possible action

Case No. 2024-645

License No. A0007090-RES (SUSPENDED)

Parties Present:

Phil Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Preliminary Matters:

Mr. Su inquired whether Mr. Howard or any counsel representing Mr. Howard is present, either virtually or in the room, and asked staff to confirm.

Mr. Su stated the Division filed a notice of default on January 5, 2026, which was sent via certified mail to Mr. Howard's addresses of record, some of which came back as undeliverable. Mr. Su stated under the circumstances, the Division will proceed with the matter as a default.

Mr. Su explained the matter involves Mr. Howard's failure to provide the work files necessary for the Division's investigation of alleged USPAP violations. Mr. Su noted, because the work files were not provided, the Division has not been able to address additional allegations. Mr. Su stated Mr. Howard has a significant prior disciplinary history before the Commission.

Mr. Su provided a procedural history, noting that the complaint was initially filed for the October meeting, which was canceled, resulting in the matter being brought before the Commission at the current meeting. Mr. Su stated that Mr. Howard has had approximately 4 months to respond to the complaint and has failed to do so.

Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator, testified to the certificate of mailing and proof of service of the documents.

Mr. Su moved to admit State's exhibits 1-72 into the record.

President O'Brien moved to admit State's exhibits 1-72 into the record.

Mr. Su read the complaint into the record.

Motion:

President O'Brien moved that the Respondent is in Default and to move forward with the complaint with disciplinary action. Seconded by Commissioner Morris. Motion carried.

Mr. Su stated the Division's recommendation for discipline is Mr. Howard's license, which is currently suspended, be revoked for a period of ten years. Mr. Su further stated the Division recommends Mr. Howard be assessed a fine of \$10,000 for the single violation alleged in the complaint and be required to pay the Division's costs and fees. Mr. Su stated an additional term of the recommended discipline would require Mr. Howard, if he seeks to reinstate his license or apply for a new license with the Commission after the ten-year revocation period has elapsed, to appear before the Commission and obtain Commission approval prior to licensure.

President O'Brien asked whether the Commission needed to address Mr. Howard's failure to update his address in addition to the primary violation of unprofessional conduct under NRS 645C.480 for failure to produce the work file, and whether such an issue would warrant a separate fine or be handled upon any future reinstatement.

Mr. Su responded the filed complaint does not include an allegation regarding failure to update an address, and the Commission is therefore limited to considering only the violations set forth in the current complaint. Mr. Su noted any additional violations could be addressed by the Division in a separate complaint if pursued.

Mr. Su further stated any other potential complaints or investigations would remain confidential unless and until a formal complaint is filed with the Commission, and Division staff could not comment on such matters.

Ms. Gallo testified that the reasonable, actual, necessary fees and costs of the Division are in the amount of \$4,4968.59

Motion:

President O'Brien moved that Mr. Howard's license be changed from suspended to revoked. President O'Brien further moved that fees in the total amount of \$14,968.59 be imposed, consisting of a \$10,000 fine for the violation of law and \$4,968.59 for Division fees and costs. President O'Brien stated the revocation shall be for a period of ten years and all fees shall be due within sixty days. Seconded by Commissioner Morris.

President O'Brien added an additional term, should Mr. Howard seek to reapply for licensure following the revocation period, Mr. Howard must first appear before the Commission for approval. Seconded by Commissioner Morris. Motions carried.

**5) DISCUSSION REGARDING THE APPRAISAL FOUNDATION STATE HARMONIZATION TASK FORCE:**

Presentation by: Peter Fontana, Chair; Scott DiBiasio and John Russell.

Peter (Pete) Fontana, Chair of the Montana Board of Real Estate Appraisers and Trustee of The Appraisal Foundation, addressed the Commission regarding the State Harmonization Task Force. Mr. Fontana explained the Task Force was established to assist states in aligning statutes and regulations with Appraisal Qualification Board (AQB) minimum criteria and to identify regulatory overlays that may create unnecessary barriers to entry. Mr. Fontana cited nationwide data showing a significant decline in the number of credentialed appraisers and expressed concern regarding additional workforce attrition related to implementation of the new Uniform Appraisal Dataset (UAD 3.6). Mr. Fontana emphasized the Task Force is not seeking to lower standards, but rather to modernize qualification pathways while maintaining compliance with AQB criteria. Mr. Fontana stated Nevada is the nineteenth

state they have engaged through direct outreach. Mr. Fontana introduced John (JD) Russell, Task Force stakeholder member, who appeared virtually to review Nevada statutes and regulations and discuss potential overlays for Commission consideration.

John (JD) Russell, Principal of Value Site Consulting and former Trustee of The Appraisal Foundation, addressed the Commission regarding regulatory overlays in Nevada. Mr. Russell explained overlays are state requirements that exceed the minimum Real Property Appraiser Qualification Criteria and discussed the importance of evaluating whether such overlays continue to provide meaningful public benefit or instead create barriers to entry into the profession. Mr. Russell identified Nevada's primary overlay as experience requirements, noting required hours and minimum timeframes for licensed residential, certified residential, and certified general credentials exceed AQB minimums. Mr. Russell stated extended experience thresholds may contribute to workforce entry challenges. Mr. Russell also identified Nevada's requirement that pre-licensure applicants attend Commission meetings is a technical overlay, while noting the requirement provides educational value and transparency and may serve as a best practice. Mr. Russell encouraged Commission members and stakeholders to review and comment on the current exposure draft of revised AQB criteria, related concept papers on experience and supervision, and proposed Advisory Opinion 41 concerning the use of technology in appraisal assignments.

Mr. Fontana highlighted an additional overlay affecting appraisers, noting seven states do not recognize the licensed residential credential. Mr. Fontana explained this lack of recognition creates barriers for license holders who wish to practice across state lines. Mr. Fontana discussed the potential simplification of credential categories to residential and certified general credentials only but noted such a change would require federal legislative action because the current structure is codified in the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act (FIRREA) and there is currently no congressional appetite to amend it. Mr. Fontana stated, while such a change would be preferable, the existing framework requires retention of the licensed credential, with limited options such as grandfathering license holders into certified residential credentials.

Mr. Russell added licensed residential appraisers, particularly those serving rural areas, lost the ability to perform FHA-related work under the federal Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2009. Mr. Russell explained this limitation reduced the practical utility of the licensed credential but noted there is current congressional movement to potentially restore that authority. Mr. Russell further stated licensed residential appraisers historically served less densely populated areas and often held multiple roles, such as real estate agent or broker, to combine income streams. Mr. Russell suggested, if federal law changes to restore pre-2009 allowances, interest in the licensed residential credential could increase, indicating continued future utility despite restrictions imposed since 2009.

Scott DiBiasio, Director of Government Affairs for the Appraisal Institute, addressed the Commission regarding Nevada's appraisal experience requirements and the Practical Applications of Real Estate Appraisal (PAREA) program. Mr. DiBiasio stated Nevada is currently the only state that does not accept PAREA to satisfy experience requirements. Mr. DiBiasio reported that the licensed residential PAREA program has produced approximately 70 graduates, with 40 individuals obtaining licensed residential credentials, all of whom passed the examination on the first attempt. Mr. DiBiasio emphasized PAREA provides rigorous, high-quality training that addresses supervisory bottlenecks without lowering standards. Mr. DiBiasio stated graduates have successfully obtained employment within appraisal firms, lending institutions, or independent practice. Mr. DiBiasio encouraged the Commission to reconsider adoption of PAREA in Nevada, citing its effectiveness, regulatory safeguards, and workforce development benefits.

Mr. Fontana suggested the Commission evaluate the impact of Nevada's experience overlays by comparing first-time examination pass rates for Nevada candidates with national averages to determine whether additional experience hours and extended timeframes improve outcomes. Mr. Fontana concluded by offering the Task Force and The Appraisal Foundation as ongoing resources for the Commission.

Mr. DiBiasio added many state boards are not fully aware of overlays embedded in existing regulations and stated identifying such overlays can prompt meaningful regulatory review and updates.

President O'Brien raised questions regarding lender adoption of appraisal programs, including PAREA and mass appraisal training. President O'Brien noted challenges faced by program graduates who complete licensure requirements but encounter employment barriers due to lender policies requiring two years of independent experience. President O'Brien inquired about the extent of lender engagement and asked which lenders have formally endorsed these programs, emphasizing the importance of ensuring licensure pathways translate into viable employment opportunities.

Mr. DiBiasio responded graduates of the licensed residential PAREA program typically continue training by working under certified appraisers within appraisal firms. Mr. DiBiasio explained this structure allows graduates to gain practical experience while performing live appraisal work under supervision. Mr. DiBiasio stated many PAREA graduates have followed this path successfully and are producing high-quality appraisal work. Mr. DiBiasio further noted, in other states, trainees are required to submit appraisal reports for board review, and reports submitted by PAREA graduates were described as among the highest-quality work reviewed by those boards.

Mr. Russell added historical reluctance to use trainees in lending-related assignments stems from lender risk perception and concerns regarding compliance with government-sponsored enterprises and internal policies. Mr. Russell explained, although newly licensed appraisers are capable of credible work, lenders often require time to gain confidence in reduced-experience practitioners. Mr. Russell stated industry organizations, including the Appraisal Institute and Mortgage Bankers Association, continue to educate members regarding trainees and newly licensed appraiser capacity. Mr. Russell acknowledged improvement in lender openness and described the issue as an ongoing effort to address the "chicken-and-egg" problem related to experience acquisition. Mr. Russell stated The Appraisal Foundation continues to elevate these concerns through its Industry Advisory Council to promote workforce development and lender engagement.

President O'Brien asked whether any lenders are currently participating on the State Harmonization Task Force.

Mr. Fontana responded that the Task Force regularly engages with the Industry Advisory Council, which includes lender participation, to ensure recommendations align with industry practices. Mr. Fontana stated one Task Force member also serves as a program manager for the Appraisal Subcommittee, ensuring consistency with federal oversight. Mr. Fontana noted the 2026 Task Force includes four state regulatory board members, all of whom serve as board chairs, along with industry advisory experts. Mr. Fontana indicated that discussion would occur with the Task Force chair regarding the inclusion of representatives from the American Bankers Association or the National Bankers Association.

President O'Brien stated formal lender support for programs such as PAREA or mass appraisal, including willingness to waive two-year experience requirements following licensure, would protect new appraisers from entering a circular process that limits employment opportunities. President O'Brien

emphasized lender alignment would strengthen the case for adoption and improve confidence in the practical value of such programs.

Mr. Fontana stated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac actively support the Task Force and participate in most monthly meetings. Mr. Fontana noted Task Force participation by representatives from RIVA, a Foundation partner that engages directly with banks and lending institutions. Mr. Fontana acknowledged the concerns raised and stated further discussion with the Task Force chair would occur.

Mr. Russell stated AQB criteria are designed to establish minimally qualified individuals eligible for licensure and that appraisers bear responsibility for demonstrating competence when accepting assignments. Mr. Russell noted lenders sometimes impose additional overlays for expediency or risk avoidance, even when appraisers meet licensure standards. Mr. Russell emphasized the need to better align regulatory qualifications with market expectations and stated continued engagement with the Industry Advisory Council and AMCs supporting broader acceptance of qualified appraisers over time.

President O'Brien commented on Nevada's geographic challenges, noting that the state is predominantly rural with population centers concentrated in Southern Nevada and Reno. President O'Brien explained that limited appraisal volume in rural communities makes recruitment and retention difficult. President O'Brien expressed interest in mass appraisal as a potential tool to address service gaps, particularly in under-resourced counties with limited technological infrastructure. President O'Brien emphasized the greatest appraisal need exists outside major population centers and encouraged consideration of alternative approaches to support rural communities.

Mr. Fontana stated similar challenges exist in Montana and acknowledged shared rural dynamics. Mr. Fontana explained mass appraisal experience is attractive because assessment professionals exist in nearly every county nationwide. Mr. Fontana reported that, of Montana's 56 counties, 28 lack a licensed or certified appraiser, while every county has an assessor. Mr. Fontana stated the Department of Veterans Affairs currently has more than 200 unassigned appraisal cases in Alaska and must rely on alternative valuation methods, including desktop appraisals. Mr. Fontana identified similar shortages across multiple rural states and recalled that North Dakota previously requested a waiver of appraisal requirements due to severe rural shortages. Mr. Fontana stated the Task Force remains cognizant of these challenges.

Mr. Russell stated similar workforce issues exist in urban areas, citing work with the City of Philadelphia, where appraisers are willing to work but less willing to reside. Mr. Russell emphasized appraisal shortages represent broader banking, finance, and workforce development challenges. Mr. Russell encouraged engagement with statewide banking and workforce agencies to develop ecosystems that support appraisal professionals and local economies beyond major population centers.

President O'Brien thanked the presenters and invited additional questions from Commissioners. President O'Brien encouraged Commissioners to review the mass appraisal materials, noting their quality and potential applicability to licensed residential and pre-licensing pathways.

Mr. Fontana thanked the Nevada Commission and staff on behalf of The Appraisal Foundation for accommodating the presentation and stated the Foundation remains available as a continuing resource and welcomed future engagement.

## **6) COMMISSION/DIVISION BUSINESS**

### **A) Discussion Regarding the Administrators' report.**

Mr. Chandra reported preparation for the next biennium is underway, including work on budgets and a staffing plan. Mr. Chandra stated the Division is pursuing another attempt at self-funding, potentially through a Governor's budget. Mr. Chandra explained self-funding would provide greater fiscal flexibility, allow for increased services, and improve resource allocation, including benefits for the appraisal program.

Mr. Chandra noted satisfaction with current appraisal staffing, identifying James, Barry, and Rebecca as key staff, with Rebecca overseeing the program. Mr. Chandra reported Barry has begun work on a newsletter and that several initiatives are in development.

Mr. Chandra explained goals for the next legislative session include pursuing a larger omnibus bill addressing issues related to NRS 116, as well as potential amendments to NRS 645 and NRS 645C. Mr. Chandra stated Business and Industry has limited Bill Draft Requests, requiring agencies to be selective, but noted that the appointment of a new Director has created additional opportunities to work with lawmakers to sponsor or contribute to legislation. Mr. Chandra indicated the Commission will be kept informed of legislative plans and progress.

Mr. Chandra identified opening a northern licensing office as a longstanding objective. Mr. Chandra also discussed the potential consolidation of the education sections, including HOA, appraisal, and real estate education, into a single structure to improve uniformity in application processing and education approval. Mr. Chandra noted the Division is also engaged in a technology project intended to streamline operations, particularly licensing.

Mr. Chandra reported the technology project is approximately 50 percent complete and that a consultant has been retained to assist with implementation of new licensing software. Mr. Chandra acknowledged ongoing challenges typical of large technology projects but expressed confidence in successful completion. Mr. Chandra stated by the end of 2026, initial licensing features are expected to be rolled out, followed by education-related features.

Mr. Chandra advised no substantive changes are anticipated for the appraisal program at this time. Mr. Chandra confirmed no fee increases are being contemplated and that the existing technology fee remains in place. Mr. Chandra explained current efforts are focused on reallocating resources within the existing fiscal framework to improve services without increasing fees.

Mr. Chandra concluded the update and offered to answer questions from the Commission.

Commissioners raised concerns regarding future Commission vacancies and the need for timely gubernatorial appointments. Commissioners noted if at least one appointment is not made within the next six months, the Commission would be out of compliance with state law and would lack a quorum. Commissioners emphasized the need to actively seek potential candidates to fill upcoming vacancies.

Mr. Chandra stated the statutory composition of the Commission may warrant review and noted that a potential legislative session could provide an opportunity to reconsider whether the current composition continues to be appropriate. Mr. Chandra explained a future omnibus bill could address multiple statutory areas under the Division's jurisdiction, including possible changes to Commission composition. Mr. Chandra encouraged Commissioners to consider these issues and provide feedback to the Division.

Mr. Chandra confirmed President O'Brien and Commissioner Krueger are approaching the end of their terms. Mr. Chandra stated one Commission vacancy currently exists and emphasized the need to strengthen Commission membership. Mr. Chandra referenced a prior period several years ago when multiple vacancies resulted in a significant gap in appointments following a change in administration, noting that the Commission subsequently benefited from several years of full membership and is now entering a similar cycle again.

Mr. Chandra identified recruitment as the primary challenge, citing difficulty in finding individuals willing to volunteer to serve. Mr. Chandra requested Commissioners submit potential candidate names to the Division. Mr. Chandra stated the Division maintains a good working relationship with the Governor's Office and that appointments could be expedited once qualified applicants are identified. Mr. Chandra concluded by emphasizing the need for interested individuals to apply so the Division can coordinate the appointment process.

**B) Discussion regarding the Disciplinary Report.**

Shareece Bates presented the disciplinary report. The Commission was provided with a copy of the report in the meeting packet.

**C) Discussion regarding Chief Compliance Investigator report on compliance caseload.**

Rebecca Bruce presented the Chief Compliance investigator's report on compliance caseload. The Commission was provided with a copy of the report in the meeting packet.

Following the presentation, the Commissioners posed questions to Ms. Bruce regarding the contents of the report.

**D) For possible action: Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes for the July 22, 2025, meeting.**

Motion

Commissioner Krueger moved to approve the meeting minutes from July 22, 2025. Seconded by Commissioner Lowe. Motion carried.

**7) FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON DATE, TIME, PLACE, AND AGENDA ITEMS FOR UPCOMING MEETING(S)**

The next CARE meeting is April 21-23, 2026

**8) PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None

**7) FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 AM

Minutes Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator