

Washington State Real Estate Commission meeting transcript – February 15, 2024

Jennifer Clawson (00:00:00):

It's now 10:00 AM on Thursday, February 15th, 2024, and I'm calling this meeting to order. This meeting is open to the public. We will take time at the end of the meeting for a brief public comment period. Participants will have no more than three minutes to address the commission. As a reminder, commissioners are not to engage in conversation during public comment. As a courtesy, I ask that participants keep themselves on mute to reduce some background noise. When commissioners would like to comment on a topic, please use the raise hand features in Teams. I will call on you, unmute yourself, state your name before sharing comments, and then remember to mute back after you finish speaking.

(00:00:45):

At this time, Sandra, will you please start with roll call?

Sandra (00:00:52):

Yeah. Thank you, Chair Clawson, and I'll start with you. Chair Clawson.

Jennifer Clawson (00:00:58):

Here.

Sandra (00:00:59):

Thank you. Vice Chair Chang?

Eddie Chang (00:01:01):

Here.

Sandra (00:01:02):

Thank you. Commissioner Bruce Jones?

Bruce Jones (00:01:05):

Here.

Sandra (00:01:06):

Thank you. Commissioner Fabiola Macias?

Ruth Fabiola Macias (00:01:08):

Here.

Sandra (00:01:09):

Thank you. Commissioner Schmitz?

Shelly Schmitz (00:01:12):

Here.

Sandra (00:01:13):

Thank you. And Commissioner Jones-Schroeder?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:01:16):

Here.

Sandra (00:01:16):

Thank you again. And Commissioner Brazil has an accused absence today. So, back to you Chair Clawson.

Jennifer Clawson (00:01:24):

Great, thank you. We'll move to agenda item number three, approval of the agenda. I request a motion to approve the agenda.

Eddie Chang (00:01:33):

So moved.

Ruth Fabiola Macias (00:01:34):

Second.

Jennifer Clawson (00:01:36):

Okay. I ask if there's any discussion?

(00:01:42):

Okay. All in favor?

Group (00:01:43):

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:01:43):

All those opposed?

(00:01:44):

Are there any abstentions?

(00:01:44):

Okay, the motion has been approved. We'll move on to agenda item number four, approval of the minutes. Approval of the November 16th, 2023 minutes.

(00:01:44):

I request a motion.

Eddie Chang (00:01:44):

So moved.

Bruce Jones (00:01:44):

Second.

Jennifer Clawson (00:01:44):

Okay. All those in favor?

Group (00:01:44):

Aye. Aye. Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:01:47):

All those oppose? Are there any abstentions?

(00:01:57):

Okay. Our meeting minutes have been approved. The motion has been approved. We'll now move on to agenda item number five, awards and recognition.

Sandy (00:02:45):

Thank you, Chair Clawson. We're very excited to announce that we have a new team member who joined us in January. I'd like to turn the floor over to Taylor Hughes so she can introduce herself and tell a little bit more about her position.

Taylor Hughes (00:03:01):

Thanks, Sandy. Hi everyone. My name is Taylor Hughes. I'm the new Management Analyst III with the Board submissions and outreach unit in the business and professions division at DOL. Just a couple of quick things about me. I've lived in Washington for almost three years now, it's actually going to be three years this summer. I was in California for a few weeks before that, but I'm actually from West Virginia. My educational background is in psychology, so I have a bachelor's in psychology and a master's in counseling. Despite that, I decided to pursue a professional career in political consulting and campaign work.

(00:03:36):

So, once I finished grad school, I got involved in that and I did that for about seven years up until last year when I decided to make the switch to working with State government. So, with this position, I'm going to be working on SB 5399 and other legislative implementation work that may come up that might include conducting research, gathering data, running analysis on those data to find target points and trend points. I will also be involved in any potential official rule writing that may be required for this bill. I will also be holding working sessions with the subcommittee as well

as stakeholders and then participating in the actual drafting of the report. That'll be due to the legislature in December. So it's great to meet you all and I'm really excited to get started.

Ruth Fabiola Macias (00:04:23):

Welcome Taylor.

Taylor Hughes (00:04:29):

Thank you.

Sandra (00:04:29):

Thank you Taylor. Back to you Chair Clawson.

Jennifer Clawson (00:04:32):

Great. Yes, and welcome to the team Taylor. We're excited to have you. So, this next agenda, item six, we'll start our old business and 6.1 is the professional service industry or PSI update and I have the privilege of giving that update today for our team. We have been working, well for quite a while. I would say the last several months we've been intensely working with PSI on a couple of issues. The first issue that I believe was talked about at the last commission meeting was around, we were made aware that they were sharing PII or Personal Identification Information. We stopped that immediately with them and stayed on track to ensure that they stopped sending anyone's personal identification information out, and that has stopped to all of our knowledge. There are some other really big customer service issues that we continue to work with them. I have a team that meets with PSI weekly at least, and then I meet with them at least once a month talking about customer service issues, everything from how their data is transferred to us.

(00:05:52):

So, we've struggled with having some exam scores come forward and the only way that we can get them is to then reach back out to PSI for them then to give us the test scores so that we can get folks licensed, or they can learn that they didn't pass the test and they need to reschedule. So either way it's a huge impact on folks trying to come into the industry. We've kept that on our forefront, we continue to work with them and reconcile everything from, they share risk where they think how many issues they have outstanding with us. We share tables with them of how much that they have outstanding with us. So, we continue to work through that with our customers as they call in and with PSI. So, we don't take what's been happening lightly. We also are in the process of looking at our requirements because we will be going out for a new bid for testing vendor. That takes us about 12 months to gear up for.

(00:06:50):

We look at different requirements that they need to meet. We'll go out for a request for proposal from the industry. We do not believe there are very many options, but we will put it out there to see who's eligible to put a bid in for that testing vendor and then we will continue to work through that process, keeping the commission up to date. But we're probably six or seven months out from that proposal actually being sent out. Right now we're on a short term extension with PSI to continue to

offer exams in our different professions that they do perform the exams for, but we continue to look at ensuring that we have the best vendor available for us. And that's all I have on the PSI update.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:07:46):

Jen, can I ask you a question?

Jennifer Clawson (00:07:47):

Absolutely, yes.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:07:48):

This is Commissioner Joan Schroeder. Do we have any idea just about numbers wise... I know that staff has been working hand in hand with PSI really more diligently here in the last I'd say few months, right?

Jennifer Clawson (00:08:06):

Yes.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:08:06):

Several months. So, do we have any sense that the weekly communication with staff, the monthly communication with you is helping, working, are we getting fewer of these customer service issue calls? Is it getting better is the first question, and then the second question is, do we have any sense of how many of our licensees are being affected by this?

Jennifer Clawson (00:08:34):

Those are such good questions and I wish I could say that I thought it was helping. We are very assertively working with them. In fact, I have between myself and my deputy and other upper leaders within the division, we're all hands on deck trying to get this moving forward. We don't feel like we're getting the responses that we want, so we're continuing to move up their chain, up the PSI chain. We understand that PSI recently sold to another business and so we're trying to figure out who those contacts are. It's been extremely frustrating. I don't think it's getting better as far as reducing the number of customers that are impacted. Something's happening with their system that's showing people as not showing up for their exams when the person that's taken the exam actually has an email with their exam results. So something is not right in the data that comes through to us.

(00:09:41):

It's been really challenging for us to reconcile data. I think we have a couple hundred people that it's still impacting that we're working through those spreadsheets. So, I just received an update yesterday about a spreadsheet with a couple hundred people on it that we're going through and verifying one by one and asking PSI to verify for us. It's a slow process, it's very tedious. I probably have anywhere from five or six people working almost full-time on this issue. It's pretty ridiculous. But it's important to us to solve the problem and to get these folks licensed as quickly as we can. That's our goal on our end.

(00:10:20):

And unfortunately the customer service that they receive from PSI is so terrible that the only outlet people have is to come to us for us to help solve their problem. So we are working really hard on it and I was hopeful when I started working on it, I thought, oh, maybe I can get involved. I can put some pressure on them, I can help with this and quite frankly, they respond to me the same way they respond to my team for the last 12 months or longer that we've been working on this.

(00:10:49):

So, we are continuing to try to figure out how to escalate it. We've gotten some very firm language that we've sent to them from my contract managers. We're starting to escalate on that piece too. Unfortunately the contract wasn't really strong in some of these areas. That will be fixed when we move forward to our next procurement.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:11:09):

This is Commissioner Joan Schroeder again and do we have any idea how many vendors? When you put out the RFP, you mentioned there doesn't seem to be a lot of players in this arena. Is it really literally just the two or are there more?

Jennifer Clawson (00:11:26):

That is what we're aware of right now. In fact, I had reached out to LNI, so LNI does a lot of exams also for different professions. When we first started having problems with the PII information going out and LNI had just moved to a new vendor because they had had their fill, but they don't have to be certified by ARELLO, that's our issue. Is the national certification that someone has to be able to give these exams.

(00:11:59):

My understanding, the last time my team was able to look into this, there were two vendors out there and we've used both of them and we've had problems with both. So, that was kind of one of our next plans also is to check in with ARELLO and see if we can get some support there too. It's really disheartening, it's not a great place to be in. But it is high on our list, it's getting a lot of attention from several in my office to try to work through this. Any other questions?

(00:12:44):

Okay, so let's go to our next agenda item, which is 6.2 Senate Bill 5191 update and Kathy Negley will be providing us an update.

Kathy Negley (00:12:56):

Good morning. My name is Kathy Negley. I'm an administrator for the Department of Licensing Business and Professions and I oversee the centralized investigations and audits team. First of all, I would like to say thank you to the subcommittee for helping us look at and work through the rulemaking for 5191. I wanted to let you know at this time we're resuming the rulemaking. This is to define the language as proposed in the WAC 308- 124 defining as soon as reasonably practical. We also are looking at WAC 308-124C-105, which is adding existing verbiage for required records. With

this, we have some listening sessions that are coming up. The first one is going to be on February 27th at nine o'clock. This will be a Zoom listening session and this is going to discuss impacts of changes and increased costs to your business as we set the rulemaking language.

(00:14:19):

The second one will be March 19th at ten o'clock, and this will be to discuss how DOL can help reduce impacts to your business. This afternoon we'll be sending out an email through our real estate listserv with the information and a survey link will be provided at that time. The survey link and the survey, it should only take about five minutes, but it's really to understand what the impact of the proposed language would be on businesses and it will help us with our meeting on March 19th to discuss how we can reduce some of those impacts and to get that feedback on there. So, right now we are resuming with that rule change or defining that language and hope that we can get everything solidified and wrapped up. The earliest would be in June.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:15:23):

Kathy, could you just repeat those two WACs that we're working on?

Kathy Negley (00:15:29):

Absolutely. The first one is going to be for, let me see here. The first one is going to be the WAC 308-124. It's going to be paragraph five, which would be defining as soon as reasonably practical. The second is WAC 308-124C-105 and that's adding to existing verbiage of required records.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:16:05):

Thank you.

Kathy Negley (00:16:06):

You bet.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:16:11):

Commissioner Jones Schroeder again. So when you mentioned resuming the rule making, will this involve the same subcommittees that we met earlier when the rule making was suspended? Is this the same subcommittee of real estate commissioners, the same industry attorneys? Who will be involved in the resumed meetings?

Kathy Negley (00:16:32):

Certainly we have a proposed language, which is as soon as reasonably practical. With that, as soon as reasonably practical, where means within five business days of the firm's appointed broker providing real estate brokerage services as defined in chapter 18.85 RCW, but no later than firm broker drafting documents or records identified in chapter 308-124C WAC on behalf of the principal, whichever soonest. We're proposing that language. That is part of the reason why we are having those impact listening sessions to see how that would impact.

(00:17:24):

As far as the subcommittee goes, we went ahead and as you know, we really tried hard to come up with what that language looks like. We came up with several different meanings and several different scenarios. This is the language that we are proposing. So, where then decided we need to see what the impact to business holders are. Since when we did put that on hold, we've been giving a lot of feedback from licensees and stakeholders of wanting to have that defined. So, we're taking that information and we've then come up with this proposed language.

Jennifer Clawson (00:18:09):

Maybe I can help a little bit here, Sabrina. The work that the subcommittee has done, we took that work as well as other information that we'd received from industry and now we're heading down the rulemaking part of the process. Then public comment and different, we'll set up different listening questions that way and then that's how we'll move through the rulemaking process with this one now. I think the subcommittee work is resolved, is that right Kathy?

Kathy Negley (00:18:36):

Yes, that is correct.

Jennifer Clawson (00:18:37):

We've gotten that work done?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:18:40):

So I guess, Commissioner Jones Schroeder, I guess just for the record, the proposed language was not acceptable to the subcommittee, was not acceptable to the industry attorneys. It will be acceptable if you go out to the general licensees. This is great. I don't know who's not muted.

Speaker 1 (00:19:07):

Yeah. I'm on a meeting. So sweetie, You didn't say one word about feeling sick until you're...

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:19:09):

Within five business days of providing brokerage services, but no later than drafting the contract. I just want to go on public record, and I know this has been really, really difficult. I know that staff really wants to put guard rails around the very squishy as soon as reasonably practical as we discussed over and over again in all those committee meetings but I believe trying to place this rule just goes against the spirit of the legislative intent of the law and presenting and having a buyer sign a written brokerage services agreement right before you're drafting a contract is, I don't believe that was a legislative intent, I think this is a mistake. But we'll see what you hear in the listening sessions and I guess we'll from there, so just my feedback.

Kathy Negley (00:19:59):

Thank you.

Jennifer Clawson (00:20:08):

Any other feedback from commissioners?

Shelly Schmitz (00:20:14):

Sorry I'm slow to unmute. This is Commissioner Schmitz and I do agree with Commissioner Sabrina and I would believe that if that language was passed, you are going to see brokers pretty much waiting until they write an offer, is going to probably be where majority will go. And that is not the intent of why this was ever brought to the legislature or voted on. It would be a concern and it would be good to hear what is all said in these listening sessions so that we can also get a perspective of where many people are looking at this also. But I do have some reservation regarding the later part of that language.

Jennifer Clawson (00:21:12):

Thank you. I appreciate hearing from both Shelly and Sabrina on this, I think that is helpful for us.

Eddie Chang (00:21:29):

So, the language that was just proposed was a little bit different than what we had heard in the subcommittee. There was an added section to it. So, I still need to consider how the change in the language would affect things. But, I'm relatively unhappy that we were appointed by the governor to bring industry leadership and insight into these things and understand that the DOL's audit work is hard and this is a difficult and very nuanced topic when we're trying not to create unintended consequences.

(00:22:11):

But I'm frustrated that we spent all this time working on this and the audit department, the staff, whoever's doing this, just decides that we have this governor appointed of commission to help with this rulemaking, and after all the work that we put in, just say we don't care what you say and we're just going to do what we want to do. And I personally find that extremely frustrating.

Jennifer Clawson (00:22:47):

So, I've heard you also, Eddie, I will be talking with my team and there may be a need to pull the subcommittee back together. So, I just want to make sure that I have all the information in front of me as well.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:23:03):

This is Commissioner Jones Schroeder. Can I just clarify, and maybe Kathy can answer this, because I don't have the notes from the subcommittee. So, can we just play a scenario so that I tried to take notes as we went. The proposed language is, within five business days of providing brokerage services, but no later than drafting a contract. So, in an audit scenario, are we saying if I meet a buyer and I start showing them houses, I would have to have that signed... Because showing houses is a brokerage service right under the licensing law. I just want to make sure I understand the proposed language. So within five days of doing that, I would have to have it signed, or if we're making an offer before the five days, then I would have to have it signed potentially earlier than five days? Am I understanding the intent of that language correctly?

Kathy Negley (00:24:06):

So, within here, as soon as reasonably practical, we're saying means within five days of the firm's appointed broker providing real estate brokerage services. So, it would be as they provide brokerage services. As it's defined in the 18.85 RCW. So we're looking at the 18.5 RCW as the definition. But no later than the firm broker's drafting documents or records identified in the 308-124C WAC on behalf of the principal, whichever is the soonest. So, looking at those two, whichever would be the soonest of those two, those are the parameters that we're looking into.

Jennifer Clawson (00:24:59):

I'm going to step in here for a second. Bill Dutra, will you join us and walk through the scenario for me please?

Bill Dutra (00:25:07):

Sure. Good morning commissioners. Commissioner Jones-Schroeder, to talk about your scenario and thank you for identifying that showing property is a real estate brokerage service as defined in the statute. So, the intent of this rule making is, if you start showing individuals property within five days, send them the brokerage service agreement. Obviously you cannot force them to sign it. Our audit team, well look, did you make the attempt to do this? Did you send them something? Or within five days or signing of agreements or whichever is sooner.

(00:25:46):

So, if you are showing them property, you've showed them two or three days worth of property, you've sent them that brokerage service agreement, and now you're starting to draft a purchase and sale agreement. Let's say that you're going to sign it then if it's within the second day that you're showing them property. So, what we're trying to do is put a guardrail around this for both consumers of real estate brokers and licensees to show that you've made the attempt to have your client sign a brokerage service agreement. Does that help a little bit with your scenario?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:26:18):

Yeah, I think so. So, in an audit, in other words, you would be satisfied if I could produce an email with... I'll call it the BBSA, if I'm using the form, the Form 41 buyer brokerage services agreement. The auditor would be satisfied with an email with the BBSA attached, even if the consumer did not sign it.

Bill Dutra (00:26:46):

Absolutely. We cannot force anybody to sign an agreement. We are looking to see, did you meet your statutory obligation by providing this for them. You know as well as I do that many licensees throughout your career probably sent somebody something for them to sign, whether it be a listing agreement or something, and they decided not to sign it. You moved on from somebody else. We're looking to see that you did that. Our auditors are not going to go that in depth to go out and track down your client to say, when did we start this? Was it within that timeframe? That we'll find out in an investigation, if someone files a complaint in that investigation.

(00:27:27):

Here the guardrails are, we would like to have some, we've taken a lot of input from the industry. I've spoken to many different industry members as well and industry attorneys who have adopted some of these practices prior to 2024 as well. Going down this pathway, that's why we're holding these informations, it's not that we did not appreciate all of the work that was done by the subcommittee. Again, we take all of that advice, we bring this forward just because we go down this process of the rulemaking process and listening sessions and receiving feedback does not mean it is going to pass or it will go in that direction, but we need to go through this process to show that we went through this process and this is where we're at.

(00:28:16):

Does that answer your question? Commissioner Schroeder? Joan-Schroeder?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:28:20):

Yeah, thank you.

Bill Dutra (00:28:22):

Okay. You bet.

Jennifer Clawson (00:28:25):

Vice Chair Chang.

Eddie Chang (00:28:28):

So given that scenario, and just want to be clear that I think that most brokers are going to be doing this correctly and will honor what was intended with the legislation. But there are also some, within our industry and every industry, there are some bad apples. So, in that situation, I can completely see some brokers basically saying, hey, I'm required by law to send this to you, not via email, but just verbally. I'm required by law to send this to you for buyer's agency. That's the requirement. I just have to send it to you. You don't actually have to sign it, but I'm going to send it to you.

(00:29:12):

And then they don't actually talk about how they're going to get paid, how the industry works, how all of these things were... The reason for this legislation was because of confusions around commissions and things like that. I can easily see a scenario in which the broker just tells the client that I'm going to send this to you, you don't actually have to sign it because you don't actually have to sign it, and as long as I've delivered it to you and then we'll continue doing what we've done before without actually having the conversation of how everything is going to work, agency and everything else, which was the intent of the legislation.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:29:52):

And I think I would just tack onto that, that my understanding of the legislation is, if you do not have a signed agreement, you are not entitled to compensation. So I would...

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:30:03):

You are not entitled to compensation. So I would caution anything coming out from DOL that would indicate that simply providing... It's not like providing the pamphlet. It's not like providing the real estate brokerage in Washington pamphlet, which is informational. My understanding of the legislation is if you don't have a signed brokerage services agreement, you are not entitled to compensation, which then is maybe outside the purview of investigation and audit at DOL. This now becomes really a more civil action between the client, but I'm a hundred percent with Commissioner Chang. I would really, really dislike something like that coming from the commission saying, "oh, you're good as long as you've sent it." The objective here is that the conversation happens and that the buyer and the buyer brokerage sign that agreement, not dissimilar from what we've done for the ages between listing brokers and sellers. We're just trying to get buyers and buyer brokers on the same page as listing and listing brokers have been on for years.

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:30:04]

Bill Dutra (00:31:06):

No, I appreciate that and we definitely do appreciate that. And you're right, that may be the intent that you had. Again, we do not have a statute that requires or that we can force someone to sign any agreement that is out there. I was referencing what are we looking for in our audits and our investigations are a little bit different. The audits are looking, "did you deliver something that is required?" Yes, we'd love for everybody to sign something, but we cannot force someone to sign an agreement.

(00:31:36):

And you're right, commissioner Jones-Schroeder, it is going to go down, in using Commissioner Chang's example, if people are just going to mail it in as a lack of a better word, those are the bad actors. That's what keeps us in business for investigating things, are the bad actors. There's no amount of rules or statutes that we can put in place that it's going to overcome people's morals and ethics to do something right or wrong. Our job is to set minimum guidelines and guide rails, which are the statutes and rules. We do think that people should be having those conversations to understand that. And when those complaints come in is when we're going to start recognizing who some of these individuals and firms are that are not meeting the requirements and the expectations of the statutes and rules as we move forward on this.

Jennifer Clawson (00:32:35):

Any other questions for our DOL team?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:32:42):

Not questions? Just a comment. Commissioner Jones-Schroeder, again, just an appreciation. I don't want my comments to be taken out of context that I don't really appreciate the staff's efforts here because I do understand that the difficult task at hand to define something that is really not definable. So please don't take my comments as anything other than I appreciate the work you've done. I'm not sure we're there yet.

Jennifer Clawson (00:33:11):

That's completely fair. This has been a really challenging piece of legislation that we have been working to implement for sure. And I think we will continue to learn before we have finalized language potentially, but we've been given pretty strong guidance that we need to move forward on rulemaking. It was part of the legislation when we were working through the legislative process, and so we'll continue to move forward. We'll continue to hear from the industry and we value all of your input. Absolutely.

(00:33:54):

Okay, so it looks like we'll move on to our next. Thank you Kathy and Bill for sharing information there. We'll move on to our next agenda item, which is number seven, new business, and this is 7.1 where we elect a vice chair. So the commission will elect a vice chair to serve for one year. We will open up nominations for vice chair and you may nominate someone or you may also nominate yourself. We'll open it up for Discussion. Yes, Shelly.

Schmitz (00:34:34):

I'm quick to nominate Commissioner Chang. I think he's been doing a great job.

Jennifer Clawson (00:34:41):

Great. Did you have an-

Speaker 7 (00:34:48):

I'm sorry, I would like to second that.

Jennifer Clawson (00:34:52):

Okay. Is there any other nominations before we vote? Okay, so it looks like we have a motion for Vice Chair Chang to be the vice chair again and a second. Is there any discussion? Vice Chair Chang, are you open to another year? You're quiet.

Speaker 2 (00:35:25):

Sure.

Jennifer Clawson (00:35:26):

Okay.

Speaker 2 (00:35:27):

I'm here to serve.

Jennifer Clawson (00:35:28):

Okay, great. So I guess we'll move to a vote if you're all ready. All those in favor say aye.

Speaker 2 (00:35:38):

Aye.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:35:39):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:35:40):

All those opposed Nay. Are there any abstentions? Okay, well congratulations Vice Chair Chang. You will serve as the vice chair again for another year. And now we can move on to 7.2, the composition of subcommittees for 2024. So it is at the start of every new year, we revisit our subcommittees and we want everyone to have an opportunity to participate in this work. But we'll start with the education committee. And Sandy, can you tell us who's on those committees? Or Sandra?

Speaker 3 (00:36:28):

Yeah, so there's going to be a slide for each one. The current subcommittee for education. Yeah, it might take a minute. I apologize. [inaudible 00:36:38] On a bit of a delay, but we currently have Casey Brazil, Sabrina Jones-Schroeder, and Shelly Schmitz on the education subcommittee.

Jennifer Clawson (00:36:49):

Okay. So we just need to determine if these commissioners are going to stay on this subcommittee or if there's any changes we want to make here. Is that right?

Sandy (00:37:01):

Yes, that's correct, Chair Clawson. We also want to acknowledge that Commissioner Sabrina Jones-Schroeder, may not be with us the entire year. Her term is due to expire in August. So that's one thing that you may want to consider when asking for membership of the subcommittees.

Jennifer Clawson (00:37:26):

Okay, great. So it looks like we're looking for three members for each of our subcommittees. Is that also correct? Yes? Okay. Yes, Shelly.

Schmitz (00:37:43):

So this is Commissioner Schmitz and I would love to continue to stay on and I would just like to put out that if Commissioner Sabrina chooses not to continue after August, I would like to. Even if she would like to stay on the committee until then, I'm very open for that as she has played such a big role in it.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:38:19):

Yeah, I'm happy to continue to serve on all this. I see that I'm on all of them, but one. Yeah, I'm happy to continue to serve on all the subcommittees. I don't know if you want to appoint someone now who will slot into that place when I come off the commission or just want to make [inaudible 00:38:50] August meeting.

Sandy (00:38:50):

We can revisit in the August meeting.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:38:56):

So I can't speak for Casey, but I think he's willing to continue to serve. So unless someone else wants to take my spot on education, I think all three of us are still good serving on this subcommittee.

Jennifer Clawson (00:39:11):

Okay. Is there, I think-

Eddie (00:39:12):

Casey needs to be on just purely from the commercial standpoint. You need the commercial voice from him.

Sandy (00:39:19):

Agreed.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:39:20):

Do any of the other commissioners, Eddie, Keith, Ruth, do any of you want to come onto this committee?

Speaker 4 (00:39:33):

Right now, I really love listening with Sabrina, puts her input. So I think it's very important to have her stay on it for now.

Speaker 5 (00:39:45):

I'm happy to shadow if I may. I don't know if I can, but I'm happy to step in where needed.

Sandy (00:39:52):

We can only have three commissioners on each subcommittee in order to avoid having a quorum.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:40:01):

So I think education stays the same.

Jennifer Clawson (00:40:05):

Okay. Do we want to make a motion? I think we need to make a motion on each of these, right Sandy?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:40:10):

That's correct, yes. Can we go through all of them and make a motion at the end? Can we just go through and discuss? Or do we have to make a motion for each subcommittee?

Eddie (00:40:19):

Apparently we have to make the motion for each subcommittee.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:40:22):

Oh, all right. Well I move the education subcommittee remain Casey, Sabrina, and Shelly for 2024.

Jennifer Clawson (00:40:30):

We have a second. All in favor?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:40:33):

Aye.

Eddie (00:40:33):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:40:36):

Any oppose? Any abstentions? Okay, we have our subcommittee for education, will stay Casey, Sabrina, and Shelly. Next subcommittee is the licensed transaction coordinator. so that is Dan's right now. It was Shelly, Keith, and Sabrina. Do we have new commissioners that would like to step in this space?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:41:09):

So the printed materials had Casey, but it is Shelly, right? Shelly's been serving on that? Okay. Again, happy to serve. So I move that the licensed transaction coordinators remain the same. Shelly, Keith, and Sabrina.

Jennifer Clawson (00:41:26):

Do I have a second?

Sandy (00:41:28):

I second.

Jennifer Clawson (00:41:29):

Great, thanks Shelly. All in favor?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:41:33):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:41:35):

Any oppose? And are there any abstentions? Okay, great. So we have our license transaction coordinator subcommittee, Shelly, Keith, and Sabrina. Next subcommittee is our record keeping definition. The current members, Casey, Keith and Sabrina.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:42:02):

Ruth, do you want to jump into this one?

Speaker 8 (00:42:08):

Happy to.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:42:11):

Okay. I'd love to come off that one please.

Jennifer Clawson (00:42:17):

Okay, so Ruth is willing to step in. So we have Ruth so far. Keith, are you wanting to stay in this subcommittee?

Keith (00:42:25):

Yep, definitely.

Jennifer Clawson (00:42:27):

Okay, great. And Casey?

Sandy (00:42:32):

Casey has an excused absence, so I would suggest that he stay on this for the commercial real estate perspective.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:42:41):

Agreed. I move that the record keeping subcommittee is Casey, Keith and Ruth.

Eddie (00:42:47):

Second.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:42:48):

Great. We have a second. So all in favor?

(00:42:51):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:42:53):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, great. So we have our record keeping definition committee set. Next subcommittee team names currently, Eddie, Ruth, and Shelly.

Speaker 6 (00:43:17):

This meeting is being recorded-

Jennifer Clawson (00:43:17):

Can we go ahead and mute? Thank you.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:43:21):

So again, the printed materials say Eddie, Shelly, and Keith. Is it correct on the slide?

Sandy (00:43:26):

Is correct on the slide? The printed materials we had flip-flopped.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:43:32):

Oh, gotcha. Okay. So that's Ruth instead of Keith on that one. Okay.

Sandy (00:43:34):

Correct.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:43:35):

I apologize for that. You're human? What? All right, I move that the team name subcommittee remain Eddie, Shelly and Ruth.

Sandy (00:43:48):

I second that.

Jennifer Clawson (00:43:51):

Great. All in favor?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:43:53):

Aye.

Sandy (00:43:54):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:43:55):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, great. We have the team name subcommittee set. The next subcommittee, the subcommittee for house bill 5191. I think we need to mute. There we go.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:44:27):

It sounds like this subcommittee is done, sunset from-

Jennifer Clawson (00:44:32):

I do believe.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:44:33):

Unless they're recalled. So I guess I would make the motion that if needed, Eddie, Sabrina, Shelley could be reconvened if there's the need to reconvene the subcommittee, but it sounds like there probably won't be any meetings.

Jennifer Clawson (00:44:51):

So I have a motion to keep this committee intact of Eddie, Sabrina, and Shelly in case there is a need to reconvene. Do I have a second?

Eddie (00:45:02):

Second.

Jennifer Clawson (00:45:03):

All in favor?

Eddie (00:45:05):

Aye.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:45:06):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:45:07):

Any opposed? And any abstentions? Okay, I think this is our final subcommittee. Is that accurate? Yeah. Senate committee for Senate bill 5399, we currently have Eddie, Ruth, and Sabrina.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:45:30):

So this is the one we have to report on in December, is that correct, Eddie?

Eddie (00:45:36):

That's correct. This is for the Mark Mullet senate bill regarding future listing contracts. And I'd be happy to step off. One of us actually needs to step off for Casey so that we can bring a commercial perspective onto this.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:45:57):

And I feel like because there will be work done after my... I feel like I should step off for sure.

Eddie (00:46:06):

Okay.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:46:08):

So why don't we put Casey in my place, but if you want to come off as well, does someone else want to step on?

Eddie (00:46:16):

I'm indifferent about it. I'm more than happy to step off for somebody else, but if nobody else wants to do it, I'll do it.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:46:23):

I think you actually have a pretty good handle on the legislation and what's going on there. So if you're willing to continue to serve, I move that the Senate bill 53 99 subcommittee would be Eddie, Ruth and Casey moving into 2024.

Eddie (00:46:45):

Second.

Jennifer Clawson (00:46:47):

Okay, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:46:52):

Aye.

Eddie (00:46:52):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (00:46:53):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. It sounds like we have all of our subcommittee members set so we can move on to our next agenda item, which is 7.3 and we'll be looking at our meeting schedule with Sandy.

Sandy (00:47:19):

Hello and good morning. We are very excited to announce that we are planning an in-person meeting for our August 15th commission meeting. We are looking for facilities that can accommodate both the commission and numerous public members that might want to attend. We will continue to have a virtual option for anyone who isn't able to attend this meeting though. We are requesting that the commission vote on participating in this in-person meeting. By voting yes, you will be saying the expectation is, "yes, I plan to attend this August 15th meeting in person." And it will be in Olympia.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:48:07):

I think you did it on purpose. My term expires on August 14th.

Sandy (00:48:12):

You are required to be there.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:48:14):

No, seriously, I just looked at my certificate. My term expires on August 14th, so I don't know how that works. I would assume that I'm actually not even eligible. I would come as a guest potentially. I don't know that I actually would or not, but I'm not actually a commissioner on August 15th.

Speaker 2 (00:48:35):

Are we assuming that you're not reapplying then because you're welcome to continue serving, I think.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:48:48):

Jury is still out on that one, Vice Commissioner Chang.

Speaker 3 (00:48:53):

And depending on how fast we are at filling the position, if you do decide not to reapply, if we have not filled the position yet, you can still serve until we do. That's part of how we try to avoid having a no quorum.

Schmitz (00:49:20):

This is Commissioner Schmitz and I plan on being there in person.

Sandy (00:49:25):

Great. Can we get a motion for the commission to participate in this meeting in person?

Eddie (00:49:34):

So moved.

Speaker 4 (00:49:36):

Second.

Sandy (00:49:38):

Great. Can we get a vote?

Schmitz (00:49:43):

I will be there. This is Commissioner Schmitz.

Eddie (00:49:46):

I will be there.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:49:50):

I plan to be there.

Speaker 4 (00:49:50):

I will be there.

Sandy (00:49:56):

Perfect. Thank you so much everyone.

Jennifer Clawson (00:50:06):

Okay, thank you Sandy. I look forward to seeing you all in person. It's been a long time. For some people, I think the whole time that they've served on the commission. Yeah. Okay, our next agenda item is 7.4 and this is your agenda item, Sabrina.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:50:29):

It is. So I think we just wanted to have some discussion amongst the commissioners and staff whether there should be an option for instructors to receive continuing education credits for specialized curriculum topics they teach. We discussed it in the education subcommittee and the decision was to bring it forward to a general commission meeting and just have some conversation just by way of background, I also have a law degree and the Bar Association, if you write a course for CLE for continuing legal education to other members of the Bar, you get as many credits for teaching the class as those who take the class. And I think the concept is that if you write a course and submit it to the governing authority, whether that's the Bar Association or Department of Licensing education division, if you write a class and it is approved in theory, you have a mastery of that information.

(00:51:42):

And it would sort of make sense that if you are also a licensee in addition to a real estate instructor, that maybe you could get credit for that. And the example I have given in the past is I am a licensed instructor. I'm also a licensed real estate designated broker, and I write the core curriculum for Spokane Realtors, teach it through their school. But as a designated broker, as a real estate licensee, I have to take the core curriculum. So I teach it. I obviously have written a course that's been approved by the DOL and then I teach it 12 times over the course of two years.

(00:52:24):

So likely have a mastery of the information, but I have to go pay to take it through a different school to submit with my license renewal. So that has always seemed a little ridiculous to me that I couldn't get credit for a class that I've written. So that's the topic and throw it out there for discussion.

Schmitz (00:52:49):

This is Commissioner Schmitz. It makes total sense that if you teach the class, you should be able to get the credits for that class versus having to then go take it from somebody else. So I'm very much in favor however that works with DOL and that I'm very much in favor that the instructor gets the hours.

Speaker 2 (00:53:15):

So on a clarification, commissioner Shelly had just mentioned when they teach the course, commissioner Sabrina Jones-Schroeder mentioned when they write the course, are we talking about those who have written the course, are the ones that are considered to have taken it? Or is it just as an instructor? And if it's written the course, then how would that interact with, let's say the core curriculum where most of the guidelines are written by the DOL would somebody get credit for teaching core?

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:54:02):

Yeah, great question. I want to say I wrote a CLE for the Bar when I was still an active member. And I think you get credit when you go give the presentation. So just like if I go to a core curriculum class and attend it, I get my three hours of continuing ed. So if I go teach it... so I maybe misspoke when I said you'd get continuing ed for just writing the course. It would be a decision that would need to be made, I would think it's probably, if you go teach it, you get the credit, not just if you write it for submission. That would make sense, right.

(00:54:48):

And honestly, it could just be as easy, I don't think we need to overthink this. It could just be as easy as when I go teach the core curriculum for the first time this month, that Spokane Realtors issues me a certificate for the class. I taught it, they issue me a certificate for it. It could just be as easy as that and that that would be acceptable to the DOL in a license renewal audit if it came down to it. I don't know that we need to terribly overthink this or think that it's going to put a tremendous strain on DOL staff, on the education department staff.

Speaker 2 (00:55:31):

I wasn't trying to overthink it. I was just trying to clarify so we would make sure we're all on the same page.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:55:35):

No, no, no. I wasn't thinking you were overthinking it. I was thinking how could we make this easy? How do we make it easy that as an instructor I get my CLE, I would just tell the administrator of the school, Spokane Realtors, or if I'm teaching it for my own school or whatever, I just issue myself a certificate that I taught it. Maybe that's oversimplifying it. I don't know.

Speaker 2 (00:56:00):

I see your head shaking there. Keith, did you have thoughts?

Keith (00:56:03):

I don't have many thoughts, but I agree with you. I think not overthinking, it's the way to go and it makes sense to me.

Speaker 2 (00:56:13):

So just to play devil's advocate, overall, I agree. I agree that it should be done this way. I know other industries do it and it makes sense, especially given the fact that we seem to lack real estate instructors in the state and maybe this will be a way to get more qualified real estate instructors. The only thing that popped in my head when I saw this on the agenda was that I teach the code of ethics sometimes in my firm and I still have to go out and take it. So I do go out and take it and sometimes a different instructor will bring a different point of view that I have not thought of and hopefully it makes me a better instructor for that. But I think that for most of the courses that are being taught, excluding code of the ethics, if you're part of the National Associate Realtors or Core,

most people aren't going to go and take the same class that they have. They're going to go take the same class that they're teaching.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (00:57:26):

And that's an excellent point. I teach purchase and sale agreement, but that doesn't mean I couldn't learn something from going and taking one of the other purchase and sale agreement courses from one of the other local instructors. So excellent point.

(00:57:48):

And maybe it's restricted to core curriculum. It's the core curriculum class that just really, really bothers me because I just spend hours researching it and then hours writing it, submitting it, it's approved clearly. I mean, yes, the DOL gives us the topics, but you still have to research the curriculum itself, and write the class and then I go teach it and there is mastery in teaching. So it just seems silly to me that I've literally got to go pay for that, especially that class, which there isn't going to be a whole lot of difference when it's a mandatory core curriculum. I want to say, and I don't know... is Tim on the call? There was some discussion in the education subcommittee and Shelly, help me with this, but about maybe it is just core classes or the core that an instructor... So maybe it's not every clock hour class that an instructor can get CE credit towards their license renewal. Because I suppose to play devil's advocate to my own position, let's say I teach because I have three clock hour classes, three hours each, so nine hours that I teach through my own school here in my office. And then I teach purchase and sale through Spokane Realtors and an addenda class and the core curriculum, that's seven and a half and six and nine. That's 25 and a half hours right there. So if we don't like the idea that in theory an instructor could, if they're actively instructing and teaching a lot of classes, that they could satisfy their education credits in just teaching their own classes, if that's offensive in some way. I could literally meet 25 and a half of my 30 hours just in the classes I teach.

Schmitz (01:00:02):

So this is commissioner-

Shelly Schmitz (01:00:03):

This is Commissioner Schmitz. Maybe if the instructor is like Sabrina who can pretty much fill the requirements just by what they teach themselves, and if that's not really what DOL would like to see, maybe it's, at least, core and fair housing. Because those two courses take so much prep for the instructor. I am totally with Sabrina, just give them the credit for those mandatory ones. And then the others are not so tied to as much anything outside of that. But the two big ones, those instructors have put so much time. I don't know that it's necessary for them to teach the course and take the course.

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [01:00:04]

Sandy (01:01:01):

This is a really great discussion. And if I'm not mistaken, and Mr. Allen, please, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe there is rulemaking involved in allowing instructors to receive credit for the courses that they teach. Am I correct in saying that, Mr. Chinole?

Mr. Chinole (01:01:31):

You're correct. You're absolutely right. So, I mean, in theory, what you guys are discussing is great. But until there's some rulemaking involved to allow that to happen, this is where we are right now.

Sandy (01:01:47):

Vice Chair Chang?

Eddie Chang (01:01:49):

So, two things. First off, there's another avenue besides limiting on which courses do it. Right now in our licensing, we've got 15 hours you can push to the next cycle. You could also cap it by hours. Say, for hours you get for doing the instruction, that's limited at 15 out of the 30 or something like that. So you could do a time gate like that. I personally think this is a good idea to explore. I would recommend that we kick this with the approval of the commissioners, we kick this back to the education subcommittee and they can come up with the framework of what they would want and then go through the rulemaking process.

Speaker 9 (01:02:45):

All right. Well, I'll make a motion that this kicks back to the education subcommittee with what appears to be-

Eddie Chang (01:02:58):

Consensus?

Speaker 9 (01:02:59):

... consensus of support for this concept to figure out what that looks like for rulemaking. And I appreciate that it's not currently a rule, but maybe that we need to create a rule to allow for this. And I am probably naive to what all is involved in rulemaking, but I think there's a way to do this that's maybe not overly complicated, but maybe, I don't know. So anyway, sorry that was a long motion. My motion is to kick this back to education subcommittee to continue to explore the necessary rulemaking with the consensus of the support from commissioners.

Shelly Schmitz (01:03:41):

I second.

Speaker 9 (01:03:43):

Great. All in favor?

Audience (01:03:45):

Aye.

Speaker 9 (01:03:46):

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, great. We'll move it into a topic for education subcommittee. Now we're going to move into the report. Oh no, we have other subcommittee reports. That's what we're headed into. So I think we start with our first subcommittee on the education report out.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:04:19):

I think that's me again, Commissioner Jones-Roder. Again, exploring trainers, receiving continuing ed, we brought that to you. We continue discussion about the low pass rates on the managing broker test, gathering data to accurately determine the causes, and we intend to review, sorry to back up. So the question is, why are we seeing low pass rates on the managing broker test? Is it the discussion points are surrounding, is it the test or is it the prep? Is it PSI? Is it the test? Is it the change of the test, et cetera? Is this a problem in other states? We're looking at gathering the data so that we can make that determination. If in fact it's not the test, the test is working in other states, perhaps it is our curriculum, that our curriculum is not preparing our candidates for the test. So we just continue to gather information to accurately determine the causes. And along those lines, we do intend to review the managing broker curriculum. That's pretty long overdue. It hasn't really been revamped or updated in a while, so we intend to, now that we're past the core curriculum, we're in a sort of down year. I think this is the year to really tackle that managing broker curriculum and also reviewing current statute to determine whether the curriculum is broad enough. And we're talking about pre-licensing curriculum as well as post-licensing to cover the changes to the agency law or do those pre-licensing curricula also need to change. So reviewing current curricula against the current statute is what we are requiring to be taught to incoming licensees, broad enough for the schools to know that they've got to update what they're teaching to make sure they're teaching these latest changes to the agency law. So that's what we're working on in the education subcommittee.

Speaker 9 (01:06:43):

Great. Thank you, Sabrina. Any questions? Okay, we'll move on to 8.1.2. Record-keeping definition. And Sandy, that's yours.

Sandy (01:06:55):

Yes. So this is a brand new subcommittee that we just started at the last meeting of the year last year. We first met in December. We began with introductions and then we discussed the scope of work that this subcommittee wanted to work on for 2024. They plan to clarify the definition of record-keeping as it is listed in WAC 308-124C-105. In specific, they're going to be focusing on section two. We'll continue our monthly meetings and we'll have a lot more information to report out on at the next commission meeting. Are there any questions? All right, thank you.

Speaker 9 (01:07:45):

Okay. Now, down to our next subcommittee report out 8.1.3, license transaction coordinator.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:07:54):

Commissioner Jones-Schroeder reporting out on this again. So we've only had one meeting on this subcommittee and in developing the scope of work, looking at really three different things, defining what transaction coordinator is and what they do, determine how, if at all, department of Licensing can regulate transaction coordinators who are licensed agents and brokers. As we all know, there is no such thing as a licensed transaction coordinator that is not a licensed category currently. And so therefore, a licensed transaction coordinator is not a licensee over which the Department of Licensing has any purview. However, a licensee, a broker or a managing broker who is offering transaction coordinating services would fall under the Department of Licensing's purview. So really, starting to delve a little bit into how, if at all, should the DOL regulate transaction coordinators who are also licensees and what they're doing.

(01:09:06):

Then the third idea or concept we're looking at is determining whether transaction coordinating businesses would need to be licensed just as a totally sub issue to that. With, again, just for the record, the ongoing concern that transaction coordinators who are licensed are licensed to a specific firm. And if they are providing transaction coordinating services to licensees from other firms, that this should raise issues for the department specifically to whom is that transaction coordinator as a licensee licensed firm A. But if they're providing brokerage services to clients for firm B, who is responsible for record keeping? Who does that transaction coordinator actually represent? And under the changes to the agency laws, should there be assigned by a brokerage services agreement between transaction coordinator and clients that they are serving via the broker that they're providing those transaction coordinating services to?

(01:10:18):

So that's why we created the committee. We feel there's some pretty significant issues here. And it's a new way of doing business and it's difficult, I think, sometimes for the Department of Licensing to be nimble and be responsive to new industry practices that enter our industry. And we're left sort of scratching our heads wondering what should we be doing, if anything, to oversee that. And so I believe the concerns are legitimate and we're just really starting to dig into this. And that's it. Any questions? Thank you.

Speaker 9 (01:11:10):

Okay. Our next subcommittee report out is 8.1.4 with the team names. And Shelly?

Shelly Schmitz (01:11:19):

This is Commissioner Schmitz and I'll be reporting on this one. So this is regarding teams, team or group names, assume names, things related all around that. And so we're kind of the beginning of our discussion on all this, but some of the things that we are looking to clarify is, what is a team? What are the guidelines around team names, guidelines around assumed names, people's roles and responsibilities in regards to a team? In regards to the advertising of a team, what are the guidelines around that? What has to be in there? The difference between team names and assumed designated names. I think that's where we're seeing just a lot of confusion on that in regards to the existing rules regarding teams and their names. And right now, they are considered an assumed name which falls under the firm. And then with the advertising, I think the public and

even other brokers are getting confused as, am I working with a team or am I working really with the firm?

(01:12:56):

Like is this name a firm name or is this a team name? And so trying to get some clarification around all that. DOL will be hosting three listening sessions to get stakeholder feedback and they are March 22nd at 9:00, and this will be for Washington Realtors, MLSs and basically that group. And then on March 29th at 11:00k, that will be for all brokers. So anyone holding a real estate license to give any input on that. And then on April 19th at 9:00, there is a listening session for the public and really anyone who would like to join in on that one. After all of the listening sessions, then the subcommittee will consolidate the feedback and develop a plan from there.

(01:13:56):

And DOL will be sending all of the listening session information out. And I think these listening sessions are going to give us really great information as to the main things for us to focus on. And I think I can speak on behalf of all the commissioners in this subcommittee that we are really looking forward to all the feedback that we get from these listening sessions. That's pretty much all I have.

Speaker 9 (01:14:32):

Great, thank you. Our next one is 8.1.5 Senate Bill 5191. I know we've had quite a conversation on this earlier on the agenda, so I'm not sure, Eddie, if you had anything in addition to add.

Eddie Chang (01:14:47):

I think we've covered this quite extensively, this meeting.

Speaker 9 (01:14:51):

Okay, great. Then we'll move on to the next one, which is 8.1.6 Senate Bill 5399, and that is Sandy. I'm sorry. It is not. It is Ruth.

Speaker 10 (01:15:07):

Commissioner Fabiola Macias.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:15:14):

Commissioner Fabiola Macias, you're muted.

Ruth Fabiola Macias (01:15:20):

Sorry, I'll start it all over. So in January, the subcommittee met with Taylor Hughes who was hired as the management analyst to help the committee write the upcoming report. The subcommittee members and staff introduced themselves and provided a brief history in the context of the subcommittee work. The subcommittee also discussed the scope of the work for 2024 and we talked about examining the practices used by real estate brokerage companies to market, establish, and enforce future listing right to purchase contract. We also talked about providing recommendations in the form of a report regarding consumer protections, potential regulations,

including potential licensing requirements. We talked about findings and recommendations and when the report is due. The first one is due to the department by October 14th, 2024 and then to Washington State legislator by December 1st, 2024, which is a Sunday. So we will have it to the legislator by the business day prior, which will be Friday, November 29th, 2024.

(01:16:35):

The subcommittee also discussed data gathering options, surveys to brokerages on whether they utilize future listing contracts and if so, what for. Taylor Hughes is working on questions and the subcommittee will review them at the next subcommittee meeting. We're reaching out to the Northwest MLS for complaint data. We're also conducting listening sessions regarding any issues on the consumer and brokerage sites and future meetings. So as the Bill also applies to the commercial brokers, we may need Commissioner Brazil on the subcommittee for additional perspective, and future meeting schedules will be determined once the subcommittee membership has updated after today's commissions meetings. This is the end of my report at this time. If anybody would like to chime in on that, please do so. Thank you.

Speaker 9 (01:17:36):

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you all for your subcommittee updates. We'll move to 8.2 Central Investigations and Audit. And I believe, Sandy, you'll be giving some data to everyone.

Sandy (01:17:54):

Yes, that's correct. So we have had a total of 52 cases that have been received. 12 are currently in investigation, 182 have been completed, 182 closed. There are 9 in the complaint intake unit and there are 208 open in the investigation unit. 32 have been forwarded to legal compliance. And in 2023, we closed a total of 860 cases. That's very exciting. We do have a little bit of a backlog. There are 110 cases pending assignment and the oldest date that we have is from June of 2023. Are there any questions about complaint cases? All right.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:18:55):

Sorry. Oh, go ahead, Eddie. You're raising your hand. I'm not even raising my hand up. Fine that. There you go.

Eddie Chang (01:19:03):

Are we able to get categories of what the complaints have been so that we can understand what issues that we need to deal with if we're seeing a trend in certain types of complaints?

Sandy (01:19:19):

That's a good question, and we are requesting that information. We should be able to have that shortly for our next meeting.

Eddie Chang (01:19:29):

Thank you.

Sandy (01:19:33):

Commissioner Jones-Schroeder.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:19:34):

Yeah. Sorry, just putting these numbers in context. So 52 cases received in what period?

Sandy (01:19:42):

In this quarter so far.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:19:44):

Okay. Q1 2024?

Sandy (01:19:48):

So far.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:19:49):

And so 12 of those sent for investigation, meaning 40 of those were deemed to not rise to the level of investigation? What happens to the other 40 if only 12%-

Sandy (01:20:04):

I'm not exactly sure where those other 40 are. They could be pending in assignment.

Speaker 9 (01:20:11):

Can we hold on just a second, Sandy, and let's ask Casey to share information behind these numbers?

Kathy Negley (01:20:19):

Yeah, absolutely. We receive many complaints. And within those complaints, we take a look at if they rise the level of meeting our jurisdiction. So if they fall within our means of what jurisdiction falls under us, we can receive complaints that have nothing to do with what we can oversee or investigate. So as they're triaged through complaint intake, 12 of those were sent over, 12 out of the 52 were sent over to our investigations because they met with or fell within our jurisdiction.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:20:56):

So 40 then did not?

Kathy Negley (01:20:59):

Correct.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:20:59):

And something would not meet jurisdiction because you would deem it not to be a licensing issue, but like a civil complaint or...

Kathy Negley (01:21:07):

Yes, or they don't fall under our authority. If they fall under another agency's authority such as the Human Rights Commission or anything like that, we would then afford those cases over.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:21:24):

Gotcha.

Kathy Negley (01:21:25):

Yes.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:21:27):

So then the total investigations completed, that's for the 182 is for what time period?

Kathy Negley (01:21:36):

So that would be in any of the time period previous. So we received 52 of cases just within that quarter. The 182 are cases that are completed within that quarter, but the actual complaints may have come in previously to that quarter. That's why the number is higher.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:21:58):

Got it. Open in complaint. So there's 208 that are open investigation, meaning you're somewhere in the midst of those investigations which are requests for information, you're waiting, you're just anywhere in the midst of those investigations?

Kathy Negley (01:22:23):

That's correct. Our investigators have a variety of caseload, right? So they may be waiting for some information from licensees or during the case of their investigation waiting on data. They still have to continue to work their cases. So that's why they're assigned multiple cases at one time.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:22:43):

And again, I dig these numbers, so I just want to make sure I understand what they are.

Kathy Negley (01:22:48):

Sure.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:22:48):

So thank you for explaining the open and legal compliance 32. What's that?

Kathy Negley (01:22:54):

So those cases rose to a level of possible higher administrative action. So we have a separation between investigations and a compliance unit. We're two different units. And when they rise to an action needing to take place, it steps outside of the investigation mode and goes to another area where then they look at the actual investigation paperwork and what action needs to be taken.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:23:25):

So open and compliance, meaning the investigation is complete. The investigator has said, "Based on what I'm seeing, I deem there's been a violation of licensing law or whatever, and now sends it to compliance unit for the compliance unit to decide what the potential ramifications for that are."

Kathy Negley (01:23:48):

Yes, that is correct.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:23:50):

Gotcha. Okay, cool. Thank you.

Kathy Negley (01:23:55):

You're welcome.

Sandy (01:23:59):

Thank you so much for that clarification. I really appreciate it. Are there any other questions for the complete case count? Okay, let's go ahead and move on. Next up, we have our licensee counts for active real estate brokers, there are over 34,000. For active real estate managing brokers, there are over 8,000 active. If we want to combine active, canceled, expired, our grand total for both managing and real estate brokers is 53,507. Next slide please. All right. Here we have our licensee counts, and specifically we're talking about firms and firm names. So real estate firms active, we have 3,756. For real estate branches active, we have 479, and that's a grand total of 4,235. Now I'm also going to concentrate on active numbers for assumed names. 3,687 DBA names, which is doing business as 3,465. And then equity or entity names are 3,739. There are a blank category with 353. So that's a grand total of 11,244. So this is something that our team's names subcommittee might find very interesting. Are there any questions about the firm name counts that we have? Yes, Commissioner Jones-Schroeder.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:26:06):

You're talking about me. You wanting me to re-up and I question why you would want me to do that.

Eddie Chang (01:26:15):

Because you asked the questions.

Sandy (01:26:16):

Exactly.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:26:17):

Well, thank you. So I'm reading this correctly. We've got 42,135 firms and branches, and then we've got almost triple that in assumed names. So that's literally again, for the team name subcommittee, right? There's 11,000 possible names floating out there that the consumers think are representative of real estate firms and there's really not. There's a third of that many licensed real estate firms and branch offices. And I think that is very telling as to why this is a concern, right? And then comment, now question. Entity name, what is that? Do we know?

Sandy (01:27:12):

I'm not sure what category that falls under. Is there anyone from the licensing team in attendance that might be able to give some clarification on that?

Tanya (01:27:23):

Hi, this is Tanya with the licensing team. The entity name should be the corporate or LLC name.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:27:32):

Oh, corporate name. Got it. Yeah.

Eddie Chang (01:27:35):

So to go the other direction on what Sabrina was saying, 11,000 firm names and you've got 4,235 branch names of actual firms. That's about what, 2.6, 2.65 per office. And I can pretty much guess that every firm has at least three teams in them on average or more. And I know some firms have way more than three. So that also shows you that even under the assumed name stuff, which we were talking about, a lot of firms having done team names under assumed names, there's way more that are not under assumed names either and might be doing stuff that we should not be doing.

Speaker 9 (01:28:33):

I agree, Eddie, and I'm just even thinking about my own firm. Well, two things. I think you've got a ton of firms out there, mom and pop firms, small firms that don't have any teams at all. And I'm actually a relatively larger firm or medium-sized firm, I guess, with 60 agents. I don't have any teams in my office, not that have assumed names. So maybe that's a little bit different on the other side of the mountains. But even in my office, I probably comprise two of those because we do have an entity, a corporate entity, and then we have a DBA. So a lot of those 11,000 are probably not teams who have applied for an assumed name. Well, in fact that is only 3,600. But a lot of those are just the corporate setup of that firm in that branch.

(01:29:24):

So it would be interesting, and I don't know how the team name subcommittee could gather this data, but how many teams are out there that are advertising under a team name and they have not applied for the assumed name? They don't have to as long as the team name and the firm name is clear and conspicuous in the advertising. But I think there's a whole lot more than 3,687 teams out there advertising that maybe don't have the assumed name. I think you're right about that.

Sandy (01:29:59):

All great points for that subcommittee to dig into. Thank you.

Sandy (01:30:03):

Great points for that subcommittee to dig into. Thank you. Are there any other questions? All right, let's go ahead and move on to issues and renewals. As you can see, both the issues and the renewals have held fairly steady throughout the entire year last year. We had a slight uptake in both

January and March for the renewals, but our new issue licenses have remained relatively steady. Are there any questions on that? Okay, let's go ahead and move on.

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:30:04]

Speaker 11 (01:30:42):

Do we have a comparison for previous years? Because this is one year. I'm just curious what the long-term trend has been, if we have comparisons to previous years.

Sandy (01:30:53):

We can absolutely add that to our next meeting and we can probably pull up probably four or five years worth of data for you to see a comparison chart for.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:31:06):

It just would be interesting to see what the overall trend in the number of licensees is and how it ties to market activity and what have you.

Sandy (01:31:16):

Yeah, we can totally do that for the next meeting. Thank you. All right, let's go ahead and move on to a new report out. This will be added to each report out from now on. We have had a request to get our call center data. So for December 2023 our call center answered 1,956 calls and our average wait time is now between three to four minutes. For emails, the average wait time to get your email answered is about 14 days or two weeks. And in the month of January, we have answered 207 emails. Are there any questions on that? We've come a long way in the last year. All right.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:32:19):

I'm sorry. I actually do have... So I assume that there are times when hold periods are longer, so this is how many calls were actually answered by DOL staff?

Sandy (01:32:37):

Correct.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:32:39):

Is there a voicemail? Are people leaving messages or is it just the calls are either answered or people hang up?

Sandy (01:32:48):

It is either answered or hang up.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:32:50):

Okay. So there's no voicemail.

Sandy (01:32:53):

Right. And that is the average wait time. Sometimes when people call in they might experience a little bit longer than that. At other times, they will get shorter than that. This also doesn't include if someone pushes the wrong prompt button and got veered off to a different section. This just accounts for the calls for the real estate department

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:33:23):

And again, neither here nor there, but just curious of these 1,956 calls and that's a lot and I do applaud DOL staff because I know you guys are working feverishly to serve the licensees, is there a sense of an average call takes five minutes to resolve the issue or that an average call... Is there a way to compartmentalize the calls and say, "20% of the calls are about this?" And I ask that question from the perspective of if a lot of the calls or the majority of the calls are coming in about a specific issue or some issues, is there something more we need to be doing as a commission to educate licensees so that they can figure these things out on their own? Or even educate designated brokers and managing brokers? Because I know sometimes I feel like I have to just give up and say, "You just have to call DOL, sorry, you're going to have to be on hold or whatever." Whereas if I could better serve the people, maybe you wouldn't have to get the call.

Sandy (01:34:35):

Those are great questions and I can totally dig into that data and see if I can't figure something out for you. I know as of right now, we have a really hard time getting what the majority of the calls are about. Asking our frontline operators to answer the call and then document the call before they can answer another call is pretty cumbersome. We want them to be able to answer those calls as quickly as possible. There might be some other avenues that we can look into at this point. I don't have any of that data.

Speaker 11 (01:35:20):

This information is fun and it's great to see the progress that we've made and I know it's a lot of work on staff and there's a lot of budget implications, stuff like that. Are there targets for average wait time and long list email times? What are the goals, basically? What are the targets and how can we help get there?

Sandy (01:35:43):

That's another great question and I know the industry standard in general is about a six to eight minute wait time. So we're technically below the national industry standard for wait times. I'm not sure what the longest hold time for emails would be, but that's something I can dig into and get back to you at the next commission meeting.

Speaker 11 (01:36:15):

Thank you.

Jennifer Clawson (01:36:16):

Maybe, Sandy, it would be great to bring Chantelle in to talk about some of that the next commission meeting. Chantelle's a newer administrator that's joined us that's over all of our licensing programs and she can talk about what we've been working towards and some of our goals

that we have set for the next 12 months, part of which is bringing on a brand new phone system that will help give us some of the data that, Sabrina, you were asking for about why calls are coming in and break down that data a little bit better for us so that we can then turn it into some more education moments to be able to help our folks self-serve a little bit better.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:37:00):

And again, I don't want to bog commission staff down with research stats for the sake of researching stats, but how does this compare to other states? Are we still seeing a backlog of SAW is still creating a lot of problems? Is the DLL interface with SAW still a problem such that the Idaho Real Estate Commission answers, again, I know their licensee count is probably totally different as well, but that they're answering 500 calls in a month. Do you know what I mean? I don't want to waste DOL staff time, like I said, digging for data that doesn't help, but are we still fighting this uphill battle of systems that just frankly don't work and like Eddie was just saying for budgetary purposes, good Lord, how long are we going to battle these systems that don't work together that just creates this call backlog and frustration.

Jennifer Clawson (01:38:04):

So I think there's a couple of big things that we are dealing with for your particular licensing group right now. SAW is definitely a barrier that we've been working through. PSI is a barrier that we've been working through that definitely drives phone calls at this time and they need to talk to us. There isn't a way for them to resolve it on their own. So there's a couple of things that we are currently doing in those two areas. The SAW issue, the WaTech who basically is over SAW has recognized that there's issues and they're working on solving that with a different solution. That's all I know about that right now. We are currently bringing on a team of folks that is just going to be able to answer some of those password reset questions or SAW issue questions so that the more complicated real estate type questions or cosmo type questions can get to those subject matter experts.

(01:39:12):

So we're hoping to pull some of this routine phone call type calls into a particular group that can handle them for all of our professions so that one, those can get handled quickly and we can actually get a really clear data set point on that. How many SAW calls are coming in every day that we're having to handle on our own? So that I can take that information and go back to WaTech and explain the impact that they're having on us with SAW not working correctly. And then we have really getting into that place of that subject matter expertise because sometimes people need to talk to us about very specific issues that, like you said Sabrina, you just need to call DOL to work through what is going on. But we want to make sure that the lines are a little bit clearer and easier to get to us for those types of phone calls.

(01:40:08):

That's why really tiering the way that we're going to support our licensees has been a goal that we've had and it's taken us a little bit. We have a new administrator on board. These new team members start on Friday, so we'll get them onboarded so they can start to take some of that lift. And then I think we can get a little bit clearer about what are our goals of being able to handle

response time. Quite frankly, that two weeks to answer an email is too long. When people email us, they're expecting... When I send an email, I'm expecting a response within probably a day or so. So we recognize that's not fast enough because what that does is if I send an email in and a day later I haven't heard a response, I'm actually going to call. So then we're touching that customer a couple of different times and then when we respond to the email, now we're irritated because they've moved on. So we've already taken care of that situation.

(01:41:05):

So it's a couple of tier approach that we're taking. But that's really looking at that team of being able to answer those calls, those routine type calls to give us a huge clarity on what that is and what the number of those types of calls are that are coming in, plus clearing the way of the team members that are really those subject matter experts on different license types to be able to process the work quicker and be able to take those higher level calls. So that's what we're working on right now. I'm assuming by our next commission meeting we'll have some clarity on that because it will have been implemented for at least a couple of months at that point. So we'll start to see if it's making a difference and then we can also learn where we are with some of the SAW work that's been going on to fix that.

(01:41:59):

The other thing that we have recently done is we did a usability and accessibility study on our system on Polaris and they were able to identify some issues that we anecdotally knew, but then we had an outside vendor come in and tell us where we were having some of our struggles with our transactions. So we're working on getting some of those costed out to figure out how we can start to move forward on making some of those changes, as well as we have a really large project going on at the statewide level that's our R1 Washington work that is really about moving all of our systems through the way that we deal with payments through the state AFRs into one system. So we'll have some more over the next year, some work that's going on there that I think is also going to clear some of the work that we've been struggling with with our system and how it interacts with the state treasurer and moves money into the different accounts.

(01:43:01):

So we have quite a bit of work going in several of these different areas that I think are going to hopefully continue to improve our customer experience with us. And to the other part of your question about other states and what's appropriate there, the biggest struggle that we have with our professions is that each state handles where their professions are licensed differently. And so it's just really gathering that information up and understanding the industry across all the different states and where we can find that information. So [inaudible 01:43:40] and Arrow, they help us on the real estate side of things, but we do have several other professions that's a little bit of a struggle to come up with that industry standard. So I think we can provide some additional more in depth data on this at our next commissioner meeting and ask Chantelle to come present that, Sandy, if we can put that as an action item.

Sandy (01:44:05):

Sure thing. Thank you so much. And that concludes this report out.

Jennifer Clawson (01:44:14):

Great. Thank you for all of that information. Oh, it looks like we have some outreach.

Speaker 3 (01:44:23):

Yeah, this is me. So this is just a review of the master action items from last meeting and even a little bit further back. So Sandy already covered scheduling an in-person meeting, so that piece will be removed from the action item list as we are going to be scheduling... And Commissioner Jones-Schroeder, it really, really was not a personal thing. We're going for summer for all of our boards and commissions just because of travel. We don't want folks having to try to figure out a way to cross the mountains and I know you were just messing with us, but rest assured we really want you to be there. So that is something that we're working on.

(01:45:09):

We've got a lot of people moving stuff behind the scenes to get folks here who want to be here. And then we provide detailed information on the average incoming hold times, so phone calls, email backlog, et cetera. And that is something, thank you vice Chair Chang, you asked about it again, we've been working on it. It is something that we've been actively trying to get and now we're starting to get some meaningful data and we will provide that going forward. So yes, Commissioner Jones-Schroeder.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:45:45):

And I should have asked that when we were talking about the in-person meeting, but is the intention to run that as a hybrid meeting? Because I think it's really important and I've been beating this drum for quite some time where I think it's really important for the commissioners and staff to be able to meet in-person. I've really missed that since COVID and I'm sad it's taken us this long to get together in-person. I do also recognize how wonderful it has been in the Zoom and Google Teams world to have so many people able to participate. Well, not really, I wouldn't say participation is a stretch, but be able to be a part of these commission meetings. So is there a plan that these will be hybrid, there will be a Google set up?

Sandy (01:46:40):

I can take this one, Sandra. That's one thing that COVID has really opened up for us. We are now statutorily required by OPMA requirements to have a hybrid meeting, a virtual option from here on out. So every single public meeting that we have, we'll have a hybrid option for that. Thank you. Okay. Any other questions about our master action items list? Thank you.

Jennifer Clawson (01:47:22):

Okay, great. So now we'll move into item number nine, our public comments. So I'll open the floor for the public to address the commission and share their thoughts, concerns, and requests. Written comments may be submitted to the department two days prior to the meeting by emailing our at dol.law.gov. So now I guess I'll open the floor. We have the three-minute clock and I will let... Sandy, is this your space to call on our public?

Sandy (01:47:59):

Yes. First hand up is Natalie Danielson. Feel free to unmute yourself.

Speaker 12 (01:48:10):

I unmuted myself but it doesn't let me do video, whatever. Okay, I have just three comments. One is that the curriculum that, I think it was written in 2009 for managing brokers is outdated, but it doesn't match the exam. The exam will ask questions about, for example, land use. If you look at the outline of the exam, it'll ask questions about land use and stuff that's pre-license. It's not on the managing broker's curriculum. So the two do not match and that's one of the problems with people failing. The other thing is that PSI constantly says that they have a proprietary software. So when people retake the test, it shouldn't be retaken over and over again. It's not technically. And I think there's problems with the questions. I'm wondering, there's been no announcement, but is the agency law, the new changes to the agency law going to be on the exam? Because when I'm doing my workshop to study guides, people are saying that when they come back, no, it wasn't. So I don't know if the state test has been updated. And the third thing is that you just avoided a lot. But most education, I believe in the state of Washington for real estate brokers continuing ed, well, probably even pre-licensed too, comes from out of state and it comes online. And so discussions of having instructors getting clock hours for the classes that they teach, yes, we need as much as we can for people teaching classes. Most of them are also in other fields. So this is a small group of agents that would be teaching classes. They have to study whether they wrote them or not. I've trained most of the instructors in the state of Washington for the past 30 years and work with all of them before they teach. So I really believe that real estate brokers that teach classes should get clock hours. There's also issues if you write a class going to other classes, somebody might claim that you've copied their information. That was always a concern that I used to have. I don't think it should be limited to fair housing and core because not everybody... So brokers should teach those. And people take them online. So I still think all agents that teach classes should get the number of clock hours for the class that they're teaching and I just really feel strongly about that. So it's very few classes that are even taught live or taught by real estate brokers. So those are my three comments.

Sandy (01:50:43):

Great, thank you so much. Next up, we have Tara Pease. Did I say that correctly?

Speaker 13 (01:50:52):

It's Tara Pease.

Sandy (01:50:54):

Tara Pease.

Speaker 13 (01:50:56):

Yeah. I work for operation support for our firm and we wanted to make sure that you guys are aware, we're having a lot of issues around the scores not getting to the DOL for our new brokers and lining up with their SAW account so they can actually get onboarded. The other issue that we're having around that is all of our brokers who are having to renew the fingerprints are becoming a real issue right now. Some of them, they're not connecting with you guys or they're having to redo them

or they're just more delays than normal. So we wanted to make sure you guys are aware of that. That goes with your guys' call customers because a lot of them are calling and they're either not getting anybody to help them or they're calling us because they're frustrated. But we wanted to make sure you guys are aware, but this is a great meeting. Thanks.

Sandy (01:52:00):

Thank you so much for those comments. We really appreciate it. Next up we have George Lasseter. Feel free to come off mute, Mr. Lasseter. Mr. Lasseter, you're on mute. Mr. Lasseter, you're still on mute. I don't have the ability to unmute you.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:52:49):

Does he know that he needs to go in the upper right corner of Google Teams if he sees the red leave button, two little clicks to the left is the microphone and there should be a slash through it and if you click on it should unmute you.

Sandy (01:53:03):

Okay, I see that you're unmuted. Mr. Lasseter, go ahead. Mr. Lasseter, we can't hear you. Mr. Lasseter, I see that you are off mute but we can't hear you. Okay, Mr. Lasseter, if you could please email your comments that you're trying to make at the meeting today, if you could email those comments to DOLboards@dol.wa.gov, we can make sure to read these comments at our next meeting. Are there any other comments for today?

Jennifer Clawson (01:54:36):

Okay, are we closing the floor, Sandy?

Sandy (01:54:38):

All right, back to you to close the floor Chair Clawson.

Jennifer Clawson (01:54:42):

Okay, the floor is now closed. We'll move on to agenda item number 10.1 announcements. So are there any commissioners that have any announcements or staff that have announcements?

Sandy (01:55:01):

The staff do not have any announcements at this time.

Jennifer Clawson (01:55:12):

Okay, no announcements. We'll move forward to 10.2. The request for future agenda items. Sabrina?

Speaker 3 (01:55:23):

Oh, that's me. Do any commissioners have any requests for the next meeting agenda? Sabrina, you're muted.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:55:39):

Thank you. I thought at one point we had requested and eons ago at some point there were some budget figures shared with us. Is that something that we can expect to see at some point during the year? We will see? Should we request it for the next meeting just in terms of collected licensing fees and expenses to the department?

Sandy (01:56:09):

I think, and please correct me if I'm wrong, I think it was decided that the commission wanted to see that on an annual basis at the end of the year.

Jennifer Clawson (01:56:22):

That was what we had talked about, Sandy. But I'm happy for us to bring it sooner if we would like to take a look at it prior to the end of the year.

Sabrina Jones-Schroeder (01:56:36):

Did we look at it at the December meeting? Am I totally losing my mind?

Speaker 3 (01:56:41):

I believe so. I can double check.

Speaker 11 (01:56:43):

I think we did.

Sandy (01:56:46):

Then nevermind.

Jennifer Clawson (01:56:49):

I just want to make sure that-

Speaker 11 (01:56:49):

We have nobody that can control anyways.

Jennifer Clawson (01:56:52):

Yeah, I want to make sure that we're sharing it with you as often as you would like to see it. And as Eddie pointed out, it's just an information sharing and so that's why I think it was decided that once a year, but if we need it more often.

Sandy (01:57:06):

And I believe it was the November 14th meeting that we shared that, but I could be wrong.

Speaker 3 (01:57:14):

All right, any other agenda items for next meeting? None. The next item is me as well. The action items that I captured from this meeting, or rather the one agenda item that I have is Chantelle Petrone Marker to attend the next commission meeting and provide more detailed information on

the customer call data. That will depend on her schedule, but we'll do what we can to try to get her at the next meeting, if not the following. And then for action items, I have staff to send team names listening session information out via ListServe today, staff to provide breakdown on types of complaints that are coming in, the team name subcommittee to gather data on how many teams are operating under team name versus assumed name, staff to provide comparison data for licensees, new issues and renewals year over year and staff to provide data on the average length of customer call conversations and to look into ways that we can track call subject types if possible. Did I miss anything? All right, it looks like we are good to move on to adjournment.

Jennifer Clawson (01:58:42):

Great, thank you. So it is now 11:59 AM on February 15th and this meeting is adjourned. Our next meeting will be via Teams on May 16, 2024 at 10:00 AM. Thank you all for a great commission meeting.

Sandy (01:59:03):

Thank you.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:59:06]