UNNUMBERED LETTERS ISSUED FOR THE MAY OF 2015

Dated	Subject	Distribution
05-05-15	Use of Food and Nutrition Service Programs at Multi-Family Housing Properties	S/D
05-07-15	Determining Student Loan Payments for the Total Debt Ratio Single Family Housing Direct Loan Program	S/D
05-08-15	Establishing the Fiscal Year 2015 Area Loan Limits for the Single Family Housing Direct Programs and Implementation of a Pilot Program Using an Alternative Method	S/D
05-15-15	Interest Rate Changes for Housing Programs and Credit Sales (Nonprogram)	S/D
05-21-15	Extensions and De-Obligations of Multi-Family Housing Section 515, Section 514, and Section 516 Unliquidated Obligations	S/D
05-28-15	Updating Employee E-Mail Signature Stamps	S/D
05-28-15	Rural Development Appraisal Review Reporting Format Appraisal Review Assignment Elements	S/D

May 5, 2015

TO: State Directors
Rural Development

FROM: Tony Hernandez /s/ ***Tony Hernandez***
Administrator
Housing and Community Facilities Programs

SUBJECT: Use of Food and Nutrition Service Programs at Multi-Family Housing Properties

This Unnumbered Letter (UL) is issued to express support for utilizing community spaces at Multi-Family Housing (MFH) properties financed by Rural Development for food programs operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). Many borrowers and management companies are already working with local community organizations and non-profit groups to take advantage of this valuable resource.

Rural Development MFH has been tasked with a goal this fiscal year 2015, to increase its current level of participation of 144 Rural Development properties by 50 percent. The attached spreadsheet list the number of states currently participating and serving as summer food program sites, along with the number of MFH Rural Development properties, serving as summer food program sites, as of January 1, 2015. Beginning this calendar year, we would like to begin compiling this information in one database location. Therefore, we have developed a SharePoint site (https://ems-team.usda.gov/sites/RD_HCFP/mfh/Lists/FNS/AllItems.aspx) and provided you with the link, to enter the information needed relating to the Rural Development MFH summer food programs.

As you are aware, USDA strongly supports local food production, including community gardens, as a strategy to increase healthy food access. FNS programs such as the Supplementary Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Summer Food Service Programs (SFSP), and the Child and Adult Care Food Program assist residents of MFH communities. MFH has been working with FNS to develop the following webinar which features Rural Development property Alamosa Farm Labor Housing and TM Management Associates.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LyXpfubP_oo&list=PLBccton6gOdqPwQvPfO_wwPEPNa7EeQ-m&index=3.

EXPIRATION DATE:
April 30, 2016

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Housing Programs

Rural Development MFH has been very hands-on in our support of the SFSP by providing public spaces in housing communities as summer meal sites, in order to fill the summer meal gap for children who depend on the National School Lunch Program for their nutrition. Rural Development staff should encourage borrowers and management companies to reach out to local organizations that may be interested in such programs, or may already be involved and looking for work space, to deliver the programs.

We ask that you consider placing a promotional statement for the SFSP on the homepage of your State MFH websites, so that more communities will be aware of the opportunity to become summer meal sites. If you are interested in learning more about the SFSP, please contact your State Agency at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Contacts/StateDirectory.htm.

Also, a complete listing of food assistance programs available through FNS can be found at http://www.fns.usda.gov/.

If you have any questions regarding this UL, please contact the Multi-Family Housing Portfolio Management Division at (202) 720-1604. Contact information for FNS' Regional Offices can be found at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns-regional-offices.

Attachment

Attachment A

NUMBER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT MFH PROPERTIES
PARTICIPATING IN THE FNS SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM
As of December 31, 2014

States	**# of RD Properties Participating**
AR	1
CA	1
CO	1
DE	24
MD	2
ID	2
KY	13
MO	4
NM	2
NV	8
OR	6
PA	2
PR	32
SC	9
TN	17
TX	13
VA	2
WV	4
Total	**144**

May 7, 2015

TO: State Directors
Rural Development

ATTENTION: Program Directors
Single Family Housing

FROM: Tony Hernandez /s/ ***Tony Hernandez***
Administrator
Housing and Community Facilities Programs

SUBJECT: Determining Student Loan Payments for the Total Debt Ratio
Single Family Housing Direct Loan Program

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance on how to determine the amount of the student loan payments when calculating the total debt ratio. This guidance acknowledges the availability of improved student loan repayment options upon leaving college and the possible fluctuations with the student loan payments every year while balancing the need to manage risk when making a single family housing direct loan.

BACKGROUND:

A number of changes have occurred over the last several years regarding student loans made in the private and public arenas. Student loan borrowers now have more varied repayment plan options. For example, Federal student loan borrowers may, if eligible, take advantage of repayment plans that use their adjusted gross income and family size to determine their monthly payment.

EXPIRATION DATE:
May 31, 2016

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Housing Programs

Under certain student loan repayment plan options, a student loan borrower could have a $0 monthly payment and be considered in repayment status. The $0 monthly payment is considered a payment and each $0 monthly payment counts towards the repayment terms.

Qualifying and remaining qualified for some repayment plan options is quite complex and requires an annual review by the loan holder.

IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES:

Due to the uncertainty in some of the student loan repayment plan options, the higher of the monthly student loan payment listed on the credit report or one percent (1%) of the student loan balance must be used in the calculation of the total debt ratio. This applies to all student loans regardless of status (deferred, in repayment, etc.).

The Loan Approval Official may grant an exception and use the actual monthly payment under the existing repayment plan if:

- Lender documentation is obtained confirming that the loan status is "repayment" and the repayment plan is something other than the standard 10-year repayment plan;
- Using the higher of the monthly student loan payment listed on the credit report or one percent (1%) of the student loan balance results in a qualification amount that is insufficient to obtain modest, decent, safe and sanitary housing;
- No additional risk layering (e.g. adverse credit waivers, use of compensating factors, etc.) is allowed without strong justification; and
- The Loan Approval Official thoroughly documents their rationale for allowing the exception in the running case record.

Please note that this guidance will expire on the memorandum's expiration date unless revisions specific to this subject are made in Handbook-1-3550, Chapter 4, via a Procedure Notice (PN) between now and then. In which case, the PN date announcing the related handbook revisions will serve of this memorandum's expiration date.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact Brooke Baumann of the Single Family Housing Direct Loan Division at (202) 690-4250.

Sent by Electronic Mail on May 6, 2015 at 12:50 p.m. by the Single Family Housing Direct Loan Division. The State Director should advise other personnel as appropriate..

May 08, 2015

TO: State Directors
Rural Development

ATTENTION: Program Directors
Single Family Housing

FROM: Tony Hernandez /s/ ***David Lipsetz*** ***for***
Administrator
Housing and Community Facilities Programs

SUBJECT: Establishing the Fiscal Year 2015 Area Loan Limits for the Single Family Housing Direct Programs and Implementation of a Pilot Program Using an Alternative Method

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 review of the area loan limits and to implement a pilot program that uses an alternative method to update the limits. **For both pilot and non-pilot states, updated area loan limits will be effective on June 15, 2015.**

BACKGROUND:

Since FY 2003, the area loan limits have been determined using one of the following two methods.

Option 1: The cost to construct a modest home as provided by a nationally recognized residential cost provider, plus the market value of an improved lot based on recent sales data.

Option 2: The State Housing Authority (SHA) limits as long as this limit is within ten percent of the cost data plus the market value of an improved lot.

EXPIRATION DATE:
May 31, 2016

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Housing Programs

Regardless of the option used, the area loan limit may not exceed the applicable local Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Forward One-Family mortgage limit. The FHA mortgage limit is referred to as the HUD 203(b) limit in 7 CFR 3550.63 (a)(1), which outlines the requirements for this annual process.

IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES:

Beginning in FY 2015, a third method will be implemented under a pilot program. The third method, which is subject to the pilot conditions outlined below, will determine the area loan limits using a National Office defined percentage of the FHA Forward One-Family mortgage limits.

Pilot conditions:

- The pilot will run for two consecutive review cycles. In other words, the pilot will run for the annual reviews occurring in FY 2015 and FY 2016. This will allow the Agency sufficient time to gauge this alternative method from an execution standpoint (e.g. staff time saved and ease of implementation) and to determine if the alternative method substantially impacts the average loan amount.
- In FY 2015, the National Office defined percentage is 80 percent of the FHA Forward One-Family mortgage limits.
- The pilot states are California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.
- Pilot states may request the use of a percentage higher than the National Office defined percentage for their entire state or for specific high cost counties if they believe the 80 percent results in an amount that is insufficient to acquire modest housing for that area. Requests to use a lower percentage will not be considered since that would be contrary to one of the pilot program's objective, which is to streamline the process.
- All other regulatory and guidance requirements pertaining to the site and the dwelling remain the same.

Unless a pilot state needs to request the use of a higher percentage, no action is needed on their part. On the effective date for the updated limits, the National Office will update the "Rural Development Single Family Housing – Area Loan Limits" map on the Agency's website. The updated map will serve as notice to the Agency staff and to the public (i.e. a state supplement is not required).

If a pilot state needs to request the use of a higher percentage, they must complete and email an Area Loan Limit Review Pilot - Form RD 2006-3* to the Single Family Housing Direct Loan Division mailbox at RA.dcwashing2.RD-SFHDP by May 15, 2015. In the comments section, outline each county that warrants a higher percentage, what percentage should be used for each county, and provide an explanation for the requested percentage. The pilot state should also email relevant documentation that supports the request.

For the non-pilot states, which are Arizona, Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Virginia, and the Western Pacific, **the process remains unchanged (i.e. you can consider Option 1 or Option 2 discussed in the background)**.

By May 15, 2015, non-pilot states must email their area loan limit package to RA.dcwashing2.RD-SFHDP. The package must include:

1. Form RD 2006-3, Instruction and Form Justification*.

2. Their state supplement establishing which option was selected. The supplement must include the proposed area loan limit for each county. States may elect to keep their FY 2014 limits provided the limits were based on the residential cost figures plus the market value of an improved site and the limits still accurately reflect market conditions.

3. If changes to the area loan limits are being proposed:

   - The completed residential cost submission spreadsheet*.
   - A written explanation as to how the typical market value of an improved site was derived.
   - Verification of the SHA’s non-targeted limits (if Option 2 was selected).
   - The completed UniFi upload spreadsheet* for updated limits only.

* Items marked with an asterisk will be emailed to the Program Directors shortly after issuance of this memorandum. Though the FY 2015 Marshall and Swift residential cost figures were emailed to the Program Directors on February 11, 2015, they will also be provided.

Questions regarding this memorandum may be directed to Chris Ketner, Finance and Loan Analyst, at 202-690-1530.

May 15, 2015

TO: State Directors

ATTN: Area Directors
Area Specialist
Rural Housing Program Directors

FROM: Tony Hernandez **/s/ *David Lipsetz*** ***for***
Administrator
Housing and Community Facilities Programs

SUBJECT: Interest Rate Changes for Housing Programs
and Credit Sales (Nonprogram)

The following interest rates, effective June 1, 2015, are reported as follows:

Loan Type	Existing Rate	New Rate
ALL LOAN TYPES		
Treasury Judgment Rate	0.260%	0.240%

The new rate shown above is as of the week ending April 24, 2015. The actual judgment rate that will be used will be the rate for the calendar week preceding the date the defendant becomes liable for interest. This rate may be found by going to the Federal Reserve website for the weekly average 1-year Constant Maturity Treasury Yield *

RURAL HOUSING LOANS

Loan Type	Existing Rate	New Rate
Rural Housing (RH) 502 Very-Low or Low	3.125%	3.125%
Single Family Housing (SFH) Nonprogram	3. 625%	3.625%
Rural Housing Site (RH-524), Non-Self-Help	3.125%	3.125%
Rural Rental Housing and Rural Cooperative Housing	3.125%	3.125%

EXPIRATION DATE:
June 30, 2015

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Administrative/Other Programs

* (http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/h15/data/Weekly_Friday_/H15_TCMNOM_Y1.txt).

Sent by Electronic Mail on 05-18-15, at 11:30 am by Credit Reform Staff.
State Directors should advise other personnel as appropriate.

Please notify appropriate personnel of these rates.

May 21, 2015

TO: State Directors
Rural Development

ATTN: Program Directors and Coordinators
Multi-Family Housing

FROM: Tony Hernandez /s/ ***Tony Hernandez***
Administrator
Housing and Community Facilities Programs

SUBJECT: Extensions and De-Obligations of Multi-Family Housing
Section 515, Section 514, and Section 516 Unliquidated Obligations

This Unnumbered Letter (UL) provides guidance on when and how to extend and/or de-obligate Section 515, Section 514, and Section 516 unliquidated loan and grant obligations. This guidance was developed in response to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled "March 2011 GAO Report 10-329, Rural Housing Service – Opportunities Exist to Strengthen Farm Labor Housing Program Management and Oversight", that recommended the Rural Housing Service (RHS) issue guidance on this subject to all RHS staff in the State Office and local offices.

Although Section 515 loan obligations were not mentioned in the GAO report, the requirements of this UL will also apply to Section 515 unliquidated funds.

The Evaluation, Extension and/or Deobligation Process

Semi-annually, RHS staff in each State Office will carefully evaluate the status of all unliquidated Multi-Family Housing (MFH) obligations to ensure the proper and efficient use of these funds. The process for reviewing unliquidated obligations is as follows:

EXPIRATION DATE:
May 31, 2016

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Housing Programs

STEP 1: STATE OFFICE REVIEW

Identify the unliquidated obligations in the semi-annual certification of reports. The National Financial and Accounting Operations Center (NFAOC) mails hardcopy reports to each State Office. MFH reports are the following:

- Report Code 743, Report of Prior Years Unliquidated Obligations for the Automated Multi-housing Accounting System (AMAS).
- Report Code 743, Report of Prior Year Unliquidated Obligations for rural housing grant programs maintained in the Program Loan Accounting System (PLAS).
- Report Code 743, Report of Inactive Prior Years Unliquidated Obligations for Non-Automated Loan and Grant Programs.

Review the unliquidated MFH obligations on the reports and provide an explanation for each. The following are the timelines to full closure of obligations:

- On-farm Farm Labor Housing (FLH) loans must be fully liquidated not more than 2 years from the date the loan funds were obligated.
- Off-farm FLH loans and grants must be fully liquidated not more than 3 years from the date the loan funds were obligated.
- Rural Rental Housing (RRH) loans that are not Multi-Family Housing Preservation and Revitalization (MPR) related must be fully liquidated not more than 3 years from the date the loan funds were obligated.
- RRH loans that are MPR related must be obligated and liquidated as per closing conditions stipulated by the MPR Loan Review Committee.

The State Director certifies unliquidated obligations.

Scan and save all Code 743 reports and the State Director certification as PDF files. Upload the files to the ULO Certification Sharepoint site by State. (You'll find specific instructions for these activities in an e-mail from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer Program Reporting Branch dated April 4, 2010, titled "ULO SharePoint Instructions" and an October 6, 2011, UL titled "Report of Prior Year Unliquidated Obligations Due October 31, 2011".)

<u>State Office Special Reporting of Obligation Extensions</u>: In an e-mail, submit a request for an extension for the following situations to the State's MFH National Office Review Underwriter (NORU) for review and concurrence and National Office approval;

- Request for time extension for an unliquidated obligation due to extenuating circumstances - an additional one-year extension may be permitted with the State Director's recommendation, the review and concurrence of the NORU and the approval of the National Office. No more than two one-year extensions may be granted on any unliquidated obligation.

- The NORUs and the National Office may evaluate obligations that have unusual approval and obligation dates due to funding limitations imposed by budgetary and/or Notice of Funding Availability constraints on a case-by-case basis. No more than two one-year extensions may be granted on any unliquidated obligation.

<u>STEP 2: TEAM LEADER REVIEW AND CONCURRANCE</u>

- The NORU reviews the Sharepoint site uploads of the ULO PDF files.
- The NORU contacts the State and requests documentation for those obligations noted as valid that verifies the continued need of the project at the location, current construction costs, and availability of all original award funding sources (and/or extensions) as necessary to complete the project as initially planned. (State Offices must keep an updated development plan with a revised closing/completion date concurred with the applicant/borrower and authorized State Rural Development approval official in its files.)
- The NORU e-mails their recommendation for extension or de-obligation of unliquidated obligations to the National Office program leads (courtesy copies the State Office, the Deputy Director and the Director, MFH PDLD). The National Office RRH program lead is Bonnie Edwards-Jackson and the National Office FLH program lead is Mirna Reyes-Bible.

<u>STEP 3: NATIONAL OFFICE APPROVAL</u>

- Individually, the program leads and the Deputy Director MFH PDLD, are authorized to approve [or reject] via e-mail the first and second extension requests. No more than two one-year extensions may be granted on any unliquidated obligation.

- The Director, MFH PDLD, is authorized to approve [or reject] via e-mail de-obligations and to approve [or reject] any extension request.

After five (5) years, we will process any outstanding unliquidated obligation in accordance with Congressional guidance and/or 31 U.S.C. section 1552(a) procedure for appropriation accounts available for definite periods: On September 30th of the fifth fiscal year after the period of availability for obligation of a fixed appropriation account ends, the account shall be closed and any remaining balance (whether obligated or unobligated) in the account shall be canceled and thereafter shall not be available for obligation or expenditure for any purpose.

Questions regarding FLH Section 514 and Section 516 unliquidated obligations should be directed to Mirna Reyes-Bible at (202) 720-1753 or e-mail mirna.reysbible@wdc.usda.gov.

Questions regarding Section 515 unliquidated obligations should be directed to Bonnie Edwards-Jackson at (202) 690-0759 or e-mail bonnie.edwards@wdc.usda.gov.

May 28, 2015

TO: All Rural Development Employees

ATTN: Public Affairs Specialists, IT Administrators and Specialists

FROM: David Sandretti /s/ ***David Sandretti***
Director
Legislative and Public Affairs Staff

SUBJECT: Updating Employee E-Mail Signature Stamps

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the unnumbered letter is to provide guidance to employees to update the e-mail signature stamp used at the close of e-mail correspondence with internal and external customers.

BACKGROUND:

In April 2013, Rural Development began using a standard e-mail signature stamp in accordance with guidance published by the Department in its January 2013 Visual Standards Guide. Updates are needed to the signature stamp to revise the web address and for better usability in the field.

PROCEDURE:

1. New Web Address. In February 2015, Rural Development launched its new re-designed website, including a new address for the site: www.rd.usda.gov (http://www.rd.usda.gov). E-mail signature stamps should be updated to provide the new web address and remove references to the old site at www.rurdev.usda.gov.

Employees in the field who want to reference their State web address may do so. The address is www.rd.usda.gov followed by a forward slash and the State's two-letter abbreviation — for example: www.rd.usda.gov/ca. Employees may also include links to other specific web content as desired. However, we recommend that all links in the signature stamp be tested to ensure they work properly.

EXPIRATION DATE:
May 31, 2016

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Administrative/Other

2. E-Mail Signature Stamp Formats. Employees may copy and customize these with personal and local office information.

Example One

[Name]
[Title] | [Division/Office]
Rural Development
United States Department of Agriculture
Phone: (XXX) XXX-XXXX | Fax: (XXX) XXX-XXXX
www.rd.usda.gov | “Committed to the future of rural communities”

Stay Connected with USDA:
(Social media icons can be placed here.)
USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Example Two (Without Social Media Icon Block)

[Name]
[Title] | [Division/Office]
Rural Development
United States Department of Agriculture
Phone: (XXX) XXX-XXXX | Fax: (XXX) XXX-XXXX
www.rd.usda.gov | “Committed to the future of rural communities”

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

3. General E-Mail Usability. As a reminder, signature blocks are intended for use as a method of providing the sender’s contact information to the message recipients. Employees should never send messages that use e-mail stationary, apply e-mail themes, or otherwise include graphics or backgrounds such as notebook paper, wallpaper, etc. These highly graphic elements can interfere with readability for customers with limited vision and people with visual disabilities who use assistive technology to access electronic information. Additionally, signature blocks must not include quotes, sayings, or slogans that express any personal opinions, views, or religious themes.

For technical guidance regarding the e-mail signature stamp or use of social media icons, contact Anne Todd of LAPAS at (202) 720-1021 or anne.todd@wdc.usda.gov.

Sent by Electronic Mail on May 28, 2015 at 2:00 PM by the Legislative and Public Affairs Staff.

May 28, 2015

TO: State Directors
Housing Program Directors
Rural Business Program Directors
RD Staff Appraisers
Regional Program Support Managers

FROM: Tony Hernandez /s/ ***David Lipsetz*** ***for***
Administrator
Housing and Community Facilities Programs

SUBJECT: Rural Development Appraisal Review Reporting Format
Appraisal Review Assignment Elements

Purpose:

The purpose of this Unnumbered Letter (UL) is to set forth guidance on the appraisal review reporting format and the review appraisers assignment elements which provide specific instructions for the development of their appraisal reviews. The review appraisers require clear guidance so they can comply with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) and meet the requirements for appraisal reviews as established by Rural Development (RD). With the regionalization of the appraisal services, appraisers now support all of the States within their region which necessitated a need for a standardized reporting format. With a standardized reporting format, the information will be provided in a consistent manner, and RD users of the report will have a better understanding of the conclusion of the review.

EXPIRATION DATE:
May 31, 2016

FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
Housing Programs

Introduction:

- USDA-RD has identified a need for a review report to provide a consistent reporting format throughout all four regions that will produce a credible review report for the intended use.

- USDA-RD is a knowledgeable and informed user of appraisal services and agrees that their needs, at a minimum, will be met by the Appraisal Review Assignment Elements contained in this notice and the Reviewer's Scope of Work in the ***Appraisal Review Report*** which can produce a credible appraisal review for its intended use by USDA-RD and understands that this reporting format;
    - Was developed by USDA-RD for use only by USDA-RD.
    - Contains sufficient information that is meaningful for USDA-RD to understand the report properly.
    - Is not misleading for its intended use by USDA-RD.

- USDA-RD recognizes that the review process is fluid, and the Reviewer's Scope of Work may need to be changed based on various or unforeseen circumstances, such as the need for a different intended use which causes changes for compliance with USPAP. Changing the Reviewer's Scope of Work and the determination of the appropriate review assignment elements must be approved by the National Office after discussion with the Reviewer, the Regional Program Support Managers (RPSM), the customer (Housing Director, attorney, etc.), and the National Office, or if authorized by USDA-RD.

Appraisal Review Assignment Elements:

1. The client and only intended user of the review report is USDA-RD.
2. The intended use of the review report is for collateral risk management and quality control of the USDA-RD portfolio.
3. The purpose is for the Reviewer to provide an opinion about the appraisers' opinions and/or conclusions in the report under review and whether they are, or are not acceptable according to these appraisal review assignment elements.
4. The Reviewer is not expected to develop or include their own opinion of value, or concurrence (or non-concurrence) of value unless determined necessary by the National Office after discussion with the Reviewer, RPSM, the customer (Housing Director, attorney, etc.), and the National Office, or if authorized by USDA-RD.

5. The Reviewer is expected to complete a technical desk review based on the information presented in the appraisal report. Considering the level of review needed by USDA-RD, it is not necessary to confirm or verify any of the information presented in the report.
6. If a change of the Reviewer's Scope of Work is determined necessary by the National Office after discussion with the Reviewer, RPSM, the customer (Housing Director, attorney, etc.), and the National Office, or if authorized by USDA-RD, and the new Reviewer's Scope of Work no longer fits within the parameters found within the *Appraisal Review Report*, the Reviewer should complete either the appropriate form or a narrative review that conforms to USPAP. Discussion between the Reviewer, the RPSM, and the USDA-RD customer (Housing Director, attorney, etc.) should ensue to determine the appropriate content and level of communication of the review report.
7. The Reviewer must use the *Appraisal Review Report* as provided and approved by USDA-RD for all reviews that can be completed in compliance with USPAP and within the scope of work contained within the report, with notations, and the Reviewer must attach the appropriate addendum of the acceptable values as concluded by the appraiser to the review report.
8. The values types and definitions accepted by the Reviewer must be in accordance with USDA-RD regulations and/or requirements.
9. The Reviewer must comply with USDA-RD regulations, requirements, and USPAP.
10. The Reviewer must review all parts of the appraisal report which pertain to the requirements of USDA-RD. If the appraiser has provided multiple values for more than one intended user, then those additional values and analyses that are not intended for USDA-RD are not to be included in the review. The Reviewer must comment as to which parts, values, and analysis of the appraisal report have and have not been included in the review.
11. The Reviewer must check the accuracy of the mathematics.
12. The Reviewer must ensure that the appraisal report is summarized to the extent that it can be understood when undergoing a desk review with reliance on the descriptions, data, and information presented in the report.
13. The Reviewer must develop and state an opinion of whether the appraisal report is complete based on the requirements of USDA-RD.
14. The Reviewer must develop and state an opinion of whether the appraisal report is in compliance with USDA-RD requirements, which includes the edition of USPAP in effect on the date of the appraisal report under review.

15. The Reviewer must develop and state an opinion of the methods and techniques used.
16. The Reviewer must determine and state if the opinions and conclusions are supported, credible, and clearly-reasoned based on the data and analysis presented in the appraisal report.
17. The Reviewer must determine and state whether the appraisal report under review is acceptable or not for use by USDA-RD.
18. The Reviewer must develop and state any reasons for disagreement with the appraisal under review.
19. The Reviewer must complete, sign, and date the certification statement and provide additional information if necessary in the comments.

Implementation:

Requests to have Agency Appraisers perform an appraisal review will be processed within the RD Regionalization Hub. The Standard Operating Procedure for the appraisal review process can also be found within the Appraiser Service Request tab via the link below: https://ems-team.usda.gov/sites/RD_rHUB/pss/assign/default.aspx

Questions regarding this UL should be directed to Thomas Ale, National Office Appraiser, at (202) 720-1620.