File No. 1598

		FIIE IVO.	1390
	RESIDENTIAL APP FOR SINGLE FAM		
County Office Mailing Address     E-Mail - jash@liuna.org		5. Appraiser Name FmHA Staff Contractor David E. Stone, IFAS	Guaranteed
2. Borrower / Former Borrower / Applicant		6. Date of Appraisal	
Lilian & James E. Gooden		September 14, 2006	
		•	
3. Subject Property Street Address		7. Abbreviated Legal Description	
25666 W. Linda Ln		Buckeye 320 MCR 673-34 Lot 280	
4. City State	ZIP Code	8. Property Rights Appraised (from URAR)	
Buckeye AZ	85326	Fee Simple	
	ANALYSIS OF RESIDE		
SCOPE: TECHNICAL REVIEW (Complete S	ections A & C)	IELD REVIEW (Complete Sections A, B & C)	
A. TECHNICAL REVIEW SECTION	YES NO		YES NO
Are dwelling dimensions properly calculated?	(Check one)	Was physical depreciation estimated	(Check one)
		in accordance with accepted practices?	
2. Are photographs of the front and rear, including	$\mathbf{X}$	Enter method used to determine, e.g.,M&S,	
the "street appeal" of the property		depreciation tables, age / life method, etc.	
attached to the Uniform Residential Appraisal			
Report (URAR)?			
report (orday).			
2. Are photographs of the comparable calculated	$\mathbf{X}$		
3. Are photographs of the comparable sales attached		10.0	
included as part of the appraisal report?		10. Does the appraisal identify functional	
		depreciation and / or external obsolescence,	
4. Are comparable sales less than one year old?	X	in addition to physical depreciation?	
5. If the answer to #4 is no, were other comparable		11. Do gross adjustments exceed 25% of the	
sales available that were less than 12 months old?		comparable sales price?	
		·	
6. Are FmHA comparable sales being used?	$\square$ $X$	12. Do net adjustments exceed 15% of the	
orrace ramine comparable called boing accur.		comparable sales price?	
7. If the answer to #6 is yes, has the appropriate		comparable sales price.	
		12 Dans guardle completion of the compressed reflect	$\Box$ $\Box$
authorization been obtained?		13. Does overall completion of the appraisal reflect	
		consistent, uniform logic throughout the	
8. Are comparable sales similar to and within	X	preparation of the cost approach and the market	
reasonable proximity of the subject and considered		approach on the URAR?	
to be in the same market?			
Comment:		14. Does the room count on the front of the URAR	X
		agree with the room count on the reverse?	
This is a retrospective desk review based on a d			
property under review was a new home constru		15. Are there math errors?	$\square$
the original appraisal was performed. The origin	al appraiser used	13. Are there muth errors.	
sales from the builder's files that were not part o	f the MLS	14 Are there executive adjustments when little	
inventory (except Morning Dew Ln) and therefore	e could not be	16. Are there excessive adjustments when little	
verified with additional comments and information		difference between the comparable and the	
MLS listing sheets. The responses cited above	-	subject is apparent?	
this desk review are based on the county tax for			
information the review appraiser could gather fro	om sources		
available in 2009.			

NOTE: Form 1007 is required only for proposed or existing property less than one year of age, or when the estimated market value of a property is based on the cost approach. The Marshall and Swift RE-2 Residential Cost program (electronically produced version) maybe used in lieu of Form 1007. A generic Uniform Residential Appraisal Report (URAR) may be used, including electronically produced versions. Guaranteed lender appraisals (GLA) are not required to use Form FmHA 1922-8 Forms Manual Insert Instructions. The appraisal should be logical and consistent throughout, whether the appraisal is for GRH or direct loans.

File No. 1598

B. FIELD REVIEW SECTION (If no field review is being conducted, skip to Section C, below)  1. Are dwelling dimensions properly measured  2. Is the appraiser's overall description of the neighborhood complete and accurate (location, general market conditions, property values, demand / supply, marketing time, general appearance of properties, appeal to market, etc.)?	YES NO (Check one)	C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE APPRAISAL REVIEWER:  a. FmHA Staff Appraisals  1. Provide additional FmHA residential appraisal training to the employee to improve appraisal skills?	YES NO (Check one)
3. Is the appraiser's overall description of the site complete and accurate (zoning compliance apparent adverse conditions, size, flood hazard, etc.?		2. Revocation of residential appraisal authority of the employee until such time as additional FmHA training can be provided and the employee can demonstrate and perform residential appraisal knowledge and skills, in accordance with this instruction?  3. Reinstate the employee's residential appraisal authority, which was previously revoked and / or modified by the State Director?	
4. Is the appraiser's overall description of the improvements complete and accurate (property description, depreciation, and condition)?  If not, explain.		b. Contract Appraisals:  4. Recommend payment authorization to the Contract Appraiser? (If not already paid) If not, then explain in #7 below and take one of the following actions:	
5. Are the design and appeal, quality of construction, and size of the subject property similar to others in the area? If not, how is the subject different?		Request more information Give notice to terminate  c. Guaranteed Loan Appraisals:  5. Recommend acceptance of the appraisal submitted by Guaranteed Lender?  d. All Appraisals:	
6. Are the comparables used in the analysis truly comparable to the subject property, and representative of the best ones available as of the effective date of the appraisal? If not, explain and provide an adjustment grid with the appropriate comparables and adjustments on an addendum.		6. Overall Quality of appraisal (Explain)  Acceptable Unacceptable X  Comments  See Attached Addendum	
7. Can the date of sale (contract date and / or closing / settlement date), sales price, and sales or financing concessions for the comparables be confirmed through the data source the appraiser indicated? If not explain.		7. Explanations: See Attached Addendum	
8. Were the comparables actual closed or settled sales as of the effective date of the original appraisal?			

## ASSUMPTIONS & LIMITING CONDITIONS

- 1. This review is based on information and data contained in the appraisal report or observed in the field review. Data and information from other sources may be considered. If so, they are identified and noted as such.
- 2. It is assumed that such data and information are factual and accurate unless otherwise noted.
- 3. The Reviewer reserves the right to consider any new or additional data or information which may subsequently become available.
- 4. Unless otherwise stated, all assumptions and limiting conditions contained in the appraisal report, which is the subject of this appraisal review are also conditions of this review.

I CERTIFY THAT, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF:

- The facts and data reported by the review appraiser and used in the review process are true and correct.
- The analyses, opinions and calculations in this review report are limited only by the assumptions and limiting conditions stated in this review report, and are my personal, unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
- I have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report, and I have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.
- My compensation is not contingent on an action or event resulting from the analyses, opinions or conclusions in, or, the use of, this review report.
- My analyses, opinions and conclusions were developed, and the review report was prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices.
- I personally inspected the subject property of the report under review.

YES X NO

- No one, other than those parties identified in this review, provided significant professional assistance to the person signing this review report.

SIGNATURE OF APPRAISAL REVIEWER

TITLE OF APPRAISAL REVIEWER

DATE OF APPRAISAL

David E. Stone, IFAS

President / Certified General License #30853

09/14/2006

MCS Form FRR

## **ADDENDUM**

Borrower: Lilian & James E. Gooden	File No.:	1598	
Property Address: 25666 W. Linda Ln	Case No.:		
City: Buckeye	State: AZ	Zip: 85326	
Londor: Jordan Ach			

## **Acceptability Comments**

The original appraiser has made several adjustments that are questionable. The adjustment for GLA of the 3ed sale (Morning Dew) is inconsistent with the MLS records and the County Assessor. The appraiser has the property listed at 1410 SF whereas the county and MLS have it at 1274 SF. Using the appraiser's GLA factor this would indicate an error of \$4,886. The adjusted value would be \$9,888 higher than indicated. This would likely have affected the outcome of the appraisal as the appraiser used this sale as a conclusion of value and the appraiser put a 4th sale (Cocopah) in the report to bracket the value.

The appraiser also has suggested that sale #3 has more upgrades than the subject, but has not provided the reader with adequate evidence that there is a difference and what the difference in value would be.

## **Reviewer Comments**

The review appraiser believes that this appraisal lacks support for the value estimate based on sale/comp #3s error in GLA and the unsupported adjustment for upgrades. It further appears that the appraiser used sale/comp #4 for the purpose of using the sale/comp #3 to support the value conclusion. If the correct GLA was used and the upgrade adjustment was eliminated the value would have been much higher and likely forced the appraiser to estimate a lower valued sale.

Due to what appears to be an excessive adjustment the value could be overstated. A new retro appraisal is recommended.

The review appraiser's review of this appraisal does not include performance of services beyond this desk review. Services such as testimony via depositions or court are a separate service and not included herein.