

awards, estimated trial costs, or valuation problems”) in favor of requesting “what available information, including trial risks, supports the settlement.”

Section 24.102(n) Conflict of Interest

The NPRM proposed expansion of this section to include all persons making waiver valuations under § 24.102(c)(2). This change would bring equal conflict of interest standards to all individuals valuing real property, whether their work is waiver valuations, appraisal, or appraisal review, and would clarify who is covered.

We received 24 comments on the proposed revision to this section. The majority of comments referenced the proposal that any person functioning as a negotiator shall not supervise or formally evaluate the appraiser, review appraiser or person making waiver valuations.

Comments received focused on the impacts on Agency operations. A major concern was how an Agency could comply with the requirement that an appraiser, review appraiser or anyone making a waiver valuation not be supervised or evaluated by anyone negotiating for the property since currently most, if not all, managers frequently become involved in negotiations.

This is a difficult issue, but we, as well as the other affected Federal Agencies, continue to support the provision providing independence for appraisers from officials negotiating to acquire the property.

One commenter recommended that no Agencies be exempted from appraiser independence provisions and suggested that streamlined appraisals and reports could be used to meet budgetary needs.

The exemption is not based on financial considerations, but rather on recognition that some small Agencies, especially Federal-assistance recipients such as local public Agencies, do not have the staffing levels that are needed to support the separation of functions.

One commenter wondered about the impact on consultants of providing independence for appraisers from officials negotiating to acquire the property, and suggested the ethical controls in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP)¹ are sufficient.

¹ Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP). Published by The Appraisal Foundation, a nonprofit educational organization. Copies may be ordered from The Appraisal Foundation at the following URL: <http://www.appraisalfoundation.org/html/USPAP2004/toc.htm>.

We note that USPAP controls apply to the appraiser, whose only recourse to inappropriate pressure from a manager or supervisor is refusal to do the assigned task. We believe that this does not adequately address conflict of interest concerns. Policing conflict of interest should not be the appraiser's responsibility. The impact on a consultant will ultimately be up to the funding Agency, which may waive this provision if it believes it appropriate to do so. Again, the responsibility to prevent undue pressure on an appraiser is on the Agency.

One commenter suggested the same (Agency) person should be able to procure contract appraisal services and serve as a negotiator.

This comment was from a local public Agency, which, as such, would be eligible for a waiver if granted by the Federal funding Agency, therefore we did not incorporate such a change.

One commenter expressed a concern that a Federal Agency could give itself a waiver from the requirement that negotiators may not supervise appraisers.

We believe the regulation is clear that the waiver is only for “a program or project receiving Federal financial assistance.” This precludes the Federal Agency from granting itself a waiver.

One commenter supported the exception in the last paragraph, which allows the appraiser, the review appraiser and preparer of a waiver valuation to also act as negotiator when the offer to acquire is \$10,000 or less. However, another commenter objected to this exception, stating the issue was too important to allow a waiver.

Another commenter suggested the \$10,000 threshold be raised to match the appraisal waiver threshold.

One commenter objected to allowing appraisers to act as negotiators in acquisitions under \$10,000.

We did not change the threshold amount because the participating Federal Agencies continue to believe that the \$10,000 limit provides a reasonable and appropriate exception for low value transactions. The rule adopts the conflict of interest language proposed in the NPRM.

Section 24.103 Criteria for Appraisals

One commenter asked if there is some way we could require that all appraisals prepared for use under the Uniform Act meet appraisal requirements in this rule. The commenter was referring to appraisals made other than for the Agency, such as for property owners.

Many jurisdictions grant broad authority to property owners to express their opinions about their property, and

some even compensate them for the costs of an independent appraisal. We see no way we can require appraisal requirements in this rule for property owners' appraisals or other valuation opinions. We suggest Agencies make available their appraisal requirements to property owners so at the least they will know what the requirements are for the Agency's appraisal(s).

The revisions relating to appraisals in §§ 24.103 and 24.104 are the first since The Appraisal Foundation published the USPAP in 1989. Considerable confusion and misunderstanding as to the applicability of the USPAP provisions to Uniform Act real property acquisitions have existed ever since USPAP was first published. The Uniform Act and 49 CFR part 24 set the requirements for appraisal and appraisal review in support of Federal and federally-assisted acquisition of real property for government projects. Many of the revised provisions of §§ 24.103 and 24.104 are intended to assist the appraiser, the Agency and others in understanding the requirements of these subparts in light of the USPAP.

We changed the terminology throughout this section from “standards” to “requirements” to avoid confusion with USPAP standards rules. We also added the phrase “Federal and federally-assisted program” to more accurately identify the type of appraisal practices that are to be referenced, and to differentiate them from private sector, especially mortgage lending, appraisal practice.

One commenter suggested we use USPAP Standards 1, 2 and 3 for several reasons. Certified and licensed appraisers in most States are required to comply with USPAP, and although the Jurisdictional Exception may be used where the USPAP is contrary to law or public policy, that complicates matters unnecessarily. Also, USPAP standards are already in place, and this would assure the Federal government, taxpayers and property owners that appraisals and appraisal reports comply with certain minimum standards.

Uniform Act appraisal requirements have been in place for some time and actually predate USPAP. They were put in place to do what the commenter suggests: provide assurance that when an Agency needs real property, all the parties involved are treated fairly. That is the primary purpose of the Uniform Act. As for the USPAP Jurisdictional Exception, we believe any “complication” is mostly based in misunderstanding of how it works. In any case, USPAP Jurisdictional Exceptions are by definition based in law or public policy and the Agency has

very little, if any, flexibility for optional compliance with the Uniform Act.

Section 24.103(a) Appraisal Requirements

In the NPRM we proposed stating that these regulations set forth the requirements for real property acquisition appraisals for Federal and federally-assisted programs to make it clear that other performance standards, such as USPAP and those issued by professional appraisal societies, do not directly govern programs covered by the Uniform Act. Based on the comments we received, this proposed language clarified the relationship between the appraisal requirements in this rule and USPAP and we have included that language in the final rule. Additionally, we have added further explanatory language in appendix A.

The NPRM proposed adding a requirement for a scope of work statement in each appraisal. The scope of work replaces the former appraisal problem statement. It also renders obsolete the former "minimum standards" and "detailed" appraisals, replacing them with an infinitely variable standard driven by the circumstances of each acquisition. We have included in appendix A a discussion on preparing the scope of work.

We received several comments supporting the adoption of the scope of work. One commenter suggested that the scope of work for Uniform Act purposes needs to be clearly differentiated from the scope of work required by USPAP.

As the publication of this regulation, the Appraisal Standards Board has not finalized the scope of work in USPAP, so it would be premature to attempt to differentiate. It is our hope that the two concepts will be consistent and that a scope of work written in compliance with this rule will be compatible with any future scope of work requirement in USPAP.

One commenter said that the appraiser should not be able to unilaterally determine the scope of the assignment or what the appraiser will provide the Agency. However, another commenter suggested that the appraiser should decide the scope of work, perhaps in consultation with the client (Agency). This comment was made as part of a discussion about the Agency instructing the appraiser that in certain circumstances, the sales comparison approach would be the only approach to value to be used.

We point out that Agencies have had input to the appraisal process under the old rule. First, the "sales comparison

approach only" option has been available to Agencies for many years and has, to our knowledge, caused no problems. Second, these requirements are written on the basis that the Agency is a "knowledgeable user" of appraisal services. That is, the Agency is familiar with both the appraisal process and its own needs, and is capable of participating in a legitimate statement of work to solve the appraisal problem. Accordingly, we believe that appraisers should not be given final authority over the appraisal process for an Agency. We believe it is appropriate that this option continue to be retained by the Agency.

One commenter said it believes the purpose and/or function of the appraisal, a definition of the estate being appraised, and if it is market value, its applicable definition, and the assumptions and limiting conditions should be stated separately, and not be in the scope of work.

We believe the scope of work, as a vehicle of agreement between the appraiser and the Agency, is the appropriate place to include these items. They should also be included in the appraisal report, as part of the scope of work statement.

One commenter questioned the meaning of "the extent appropriate" for application of the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition (UASFLA).²

The UASFLA is a publication that summarizes Federal eminent domain appraisal case and statute law. So, to the extent that an Agency either follows Federal eminent domain practices, or voluntarily adopts UASFLA as its appraisal guidelines, it may be applicable.

Another commenter recommended that the appraisal clearly define and list which items are considered as real property and which are considered as personal property.

We agree and the regulation and appendix A have been revised to reflect this suggestion.

Still another commenter suggested the five-year sales history be changed to ten years since the property may not have changed hands in the last five years.

Although we did not change the requirement in the regulation, we point out that its requirements are minimums. If the appraiser or the Agency believes

² The "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions" is published by the Interagency Land Acquisition Conference. It is a compendium of Federal eminent domain appraisal law, both case and statute, regulations and practices. It is available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/land-ack/toc.htm> or in soft cover format from the Appraisal Institute at <http://www.appraisalinstitute.org/ecom/publications/default.asp> and select "Legal/Regulatory" or call 888-570-4545.

higher levels of performance are necessary, then the appraisal scope of work should reflect that.

Section 24.103(a)(2)(ii) Appraisal Requirements

A commenter suggested that USPAP compliance would require appraisers to invoke the USPAP Departure Provision to use only the sales comparison approach.

We disagree with this evaluation. At the present time, a State certified or licensed appraiser who is requested by an Agency to provide only the sales comparison approach would, in our opinion, be doing so under the USPAP Jurisdictional Exception Rule, since the Agency's request would be pursuant to the authority granted it under its law and public policy, which is the basis for a USPAP Jurisdictional Exception.

Section 24.103(d) Qualifications of Appraisers and Review Appraisers

One commenter suggested the rule should recognize that appraisal professional organizations' designations provide an indication of an appraiser's abilities.

We have added language to § 24.103(d)(1) and corresponding text to appendix A to emphasize the need for appraisers and review appraisers to be qualified and competent, and that State licensing or certification, and professional designations can help provide an indication of an appraiser's abilities.

Section 24.103(d)(1)

While the majority of the comments on the proposed changes to this section were positive, we did receive several comments that recommended that appraisers and review appraisers be required to be State certified.

Although we have not adopted that suggestion, we recognize the need for appraisers and review appraisers to be qualified and competent, and that State licensing or certification, and professional designations can help provide an indication of an appraiser's abilities. Therefore, we have added certification and licensing to the list of items to be considered by an Agency in determining the qualification of an appraiser (or review appraiser). We also note that some States have specifically excluded certain State Agency appraisers from State licensing/certification requirements.

Section 24.104 Review of Appraisals

For consistency, the term review appraiser is used throughout this rule to refer to the person performing appraisal reviews. We also added language that

will clarify and specify the responsibilities, authorities and expectations associated with appraisal review.

One commenter stated that the NPRM significantly expands appraisal review responsibilities and requirements.

We believe the final rule more accurately elucidates what was commonly assumed to be appraisal review responsibilities and requirements.

A commenter suggested that the final rule should allow administrative reviews performed by appraisers or non-appraisers where the values are less than \$50,000.

We disagree because only a technical review can provide the basis for approving an appraisal for valuation purposes.

There was an objection to the discussion in the first two paragraphs of appendix A as being promotional and self-serving.

This discussion provides information on the concept of appraisal review as it is used by public Agencies and we believe it is necessary.

One commenter said the proposed change to allow the review appraiser to support and approve a different value without any oversight or review is not a good policy. This could result in the review appraiser being pressured to increase or reduce appraised values without oversight.

First, the policy allowing the review appraiser to support and approve a value different from that of the appraisal being reviewed has been part of the preceding rule and is not new. Second, at the Agency's option, the Agency official who establishes the amount believed to be just compensation to be offered to the property owner may be someone other than the review appraiser.

Section 24.104(a) Review Appraisers

Several commenters responded to the three options available for the appraisal review.

One commenter expressed concern for using the term "rejected."

We agree and replaced the term "rejected" proposed in the NPRM with "not accepted." This more clearly reflects that such appraisals, while they may meet others' standards or requirements, do not meet the requirements of this rule and the Agency.

One commenter suggested that the type and level of review should be left to the discretion of the acquiring client Agency.

We agree that the Agency should have some discretion as to the review, and we

believe that is included in the appraisal review provisions. However, we also believe the amount of appraisal review discipline specified in this rule is necessary to assure compliance with the Uniform Act requirement that the offer believed to be just compensation be based on an approved appraisal.

The same commenter also suggested that the rule delete the requirement that all appraisals must be reviewed.

We do not believe we have flexibility under the Uniform Act to make appraisal review optional. The Uniform Act calls for an approved appraisal, which this rule interprets and implements as requiring a technically reviewed appraisal. We note that while the Uniform Act specifically grants authority for waiver of the appraisal, it does not do so for approving an appraisal.

There were two comments saying the appraisal review provisions should be consistent with USPAP. One specifically cited that having the review appraiser approve the appraisal was not consistent with USPAP, and should be changed unless there is a compelling reason to be different.

We believe, first of all, that it is not inconsistent with USPAP for the review appraiser to be requested to approve the appraisal. We believe the requirement for approving the appraisal is within the bounds of USPAP's Standard Rule 3-1(c) where identification of the scope of the (review appraisal) work to be performed is discussed. Second, if there is any question as to consistency, we point out that the requirement for an "approved appraisal" is in the Uniform Act and would appear to qualify as a USPAP Jurisdictional Exception, based on being "law or public policy."

One commenter suggested that the phrase "accepted (but not used)" could raise questions in condemnation litigation as to why a report met "government standards" was not used, perhaps implying the Agency shopped for the value it wanted to get.

The appraisal review report should discuss why one of two or more reports was selected as approved for best supporting an offer believed to be just compensation.

Another commenter stated that references to the review appraiser setting just compensation is inaccurate and should be deleted.

The language in § 24.104 was carefully written to follow the Uniform Act. A staff review appraiser may be authorized to "develop and report the amount believed to be just compensation," not "set" just compensation, which we acknowledge is the purview of the courts.

One commenter raised a concern that the review appraiser should be required to develop an opinion on whether or not the report complies with Standards 1, 2 and 3 of USPAP as well as an opinion of market value.

As we have noted, while this regulation is intended to be consistent with USPAP, it implements the Uniform Act and its requirements only; it is not a vehicle for implementing USPAP.

A commenter suggested that the owner be offered the opportunity to accompany the review appraiser on the inspection of the property.

An on-site inspection by the review appraiser is not a specific requirement of these regulations, so inviting the property owner would be inappropriate. The necessity of an onsite inspection by the review appraiser depends on the appraisal problem, the appraisal(s), and Agency policy.

One commenter asked what was the background of accepted, approved and rejected.

The three appraisal review results options specified reflect the results that were always needed, but never specifically cited. They are directly related to the needs of the acquisition process specified in the Uniform Act. Additional language has been added to appendix A to further clarify that process.

Section 24.104(b) Review of Appraisals

One commenter expressed the position that it is not good policy to allow the review appraiser, as part of the appraisal review process, to develop independent valuation information if he/she could not approve any submitted appraisal. Concern was expressed that there was potential for undue coercion to be exerted on the review appraiser without oversight.

We believe that newly introduced provisions to enhance appraiser and review appraiser independence will mitigate this risk. We point out that the provisions allowing the review appraiser to develop an independent valuation are carried over from the previous rule.

Section 24.104(c) Written Report

One commenter requested clarification that only a duly authorized Agency staff person can make the approved appraisal decision, because Agencies sometimes mistakenly believe they have no choice but to accept the review appraiser's conclusion.

This is clarified in the final rule.

Another commenter asked if an appraisal report which has had its value conclusion modified in some fashion