Washington State Real Estate Commission meeting transcript

November 13, 2025

Jennifer Clawson (00:02):

... Chair of the Washington State Real Estate Commission. And it is now 10:00 AM on Thursday, November 13th, 2025. And I'm calling this meeting to order. This meeting is open to the public and we'll be providing an opportunity for public comment at the end of the meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage participants to mute themselves when they are not speaking, to reduce the background noise.

(00:23):

One challenge is remembering to unmute yourself when you are speaking. Also for Commissioners to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments.

(00:32):

And at this point, we'll turn it over to our roll call. So Sandy, will you now call roll?

Sandy Baur (00:41):

Certainly. I will start with you. Chair Clawson?

Jennifer Clawson (00:45):

Here.

Sandy Baur (00:46):

Commissioner Balles?

Meg Balles (00:48):

Here.

Sandy Baur (00:49):

Commissioner Brazil?

Casey Brazil (00:51):

Here.

Sandy Baur (00:52):

Commissioner Bruce Jones.

Keith Bruce-Jones (00:55):
Here.

Sandy Baur (00:56):
Commissioner Galano?

Sam Gallano (00:58):
Here.

Sandy Baur (00:59):
And Commissioner Schmitz.

Shelly Schmitz (01:01):
Here.

Sandy Baur (01:02):
All present. Back to you, Chair.

Jennifer Clawson (01:06):
Great. It's great to see all of you. We'll head on to approval of our Agenda. So is there a motion to approve today's Agenda as presented?

Shelly Schmitz (01:17):
I make a motion to approve the Agenda.

Keith Bruce-Jones (01:21):
Commissioner Bruce Jones, second.

Jennifer Clawson (01:24):
Thank you. Is there any discussion?
(01:32):
All those in favor say aye.

Commissioners (01:33):
Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (01:36):
All those opposed, say nay.
(01:40):
Are there any abstentions?

(01:44):

Great. The motion has been approved. The Agenda is as presented. Sandy or team, did you all get the motions and the second, Mary forgot this [inaudible 00:01:55]?

Sandy Baur (01:55):

Yes we did. Yes, we did.

Jennifer Clawson (01:58):

Okay, great.

(01:58):

We'll move on to approval of our minutes. So approval of our August 21st, 2025 minutes. Is there a motion to approve those minutes as presented?

Meg Balles (02:08):

Commissioner Balles moves to approve those minutes.

Jennifer Clawson (02:08):

Do I have a second?

Shelly Schmitz (02:18):

Commissioner Schmitz, I second.

Jennifer Clawson (02:21):

The motion has been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion?

(02:30):

Okay, then I'll go ahead and call for a vote. All those in favor say aye.

Commissioners (02:33):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (02:37):

All those opposed, say nay.

(02:40):

And are there any abstentions?

(02:45):

Great, our meeting minutes for the August 21st, 2025 have been approved.

(02:55):

So we'll move right through the Agenda to Item Number Five, Awards and Recognition. I don't have any awards and recognition for discussion today.

(03:03):

So I guess we'll just move on to our number six item of old business. And at this time, I believe, Sandy, am I turning over to the Real Estate Research Center?

Sandy Baur (03:20):

Yes. Today we have Mr. Steven Bourassa, Director of the Washington Center for the Real Estate Research. He's here to give us an update pertaining to the reports that the center provides us. So Mr. Bourassa, take it away.

Steven Bourassa (03:40):

Thank you, Sandy. Can you see my screen?

Sandy Baur (03:44):

Yes, we can. Thank you.

Steven Bourassa (03:46):

WCRER Update? Okay.

Sandy Baur (03:48):

Yes.

Steven Bourassa (03:49):

Great.

(03:53):

So thank you Commissioners for allowing me some time on your Agenda. I would like to talk about two things today, if I can get my slideshow to advance. There we go. One is some revisions to the housing market reports that we produce with funding from the Department of Licensing. As you know, these housing market reports are one of the core products that the Washington Center for Real Estate Research produces. And we've been planning for some time to make some major changes to the way we produce these reports. And I wanted to inform you about what we're planning to do and also get some feedback from you, if you have any. And also wanted to give you a brief overview of some aspects of our recently-published, The State of the State's Housing 2025 Report. So let me get right into it.

(05:00):

So the housing market reports that Washington Center for Real Estate Research has been producing for over 20 years now have relied mainly on multiple lists.

(05:17):

I think someone's microphone is turned on. Sorry about that.

(05:24):

So we've relied mainly on reports that we receive from multiple listing services around the state. For a couple of counties that are not well-served by multiple listing services, we go directly to the county property assessors to get data. But this has never been entirely satisfactory because what we're doing is we're taking summaries of data and then we're summarizing them.

(05:58):

So for example, we would get, let's say for King County, for example, we would get a set of monthly reports each quarter from NWMLS. And we would calculate a weighted average of the median prices for the months in the quarter to produce the median price that we publish. That is not the most accurate way to go about producing the median house prices. We should be calculating the median prices directly from the actual property-by-property transactions data instead of relying on summary reports.

(06:48):

And over the past couple of years, we experimented with trying to obtain the line item transactions data from the multiple listing services. Initially, we used this to calculate median house prices for cities, as we started a couple years ago reporting data for cities in addition to counties. But we were never successful in obtaining the transactions data from all of the multiple listing services in the state. So we couldn't get anything near complete coverage in this way. So we were hoping that maybe that would be the way to resolve the problem with using the summary data, but it has not proven to be the solution to the problem.

(07:41):

So there's some other issues involved in using the MLS data. One is that the MLS doesn't include all of the transactions that we are interested in. There are other transactions that never pass through the multiple listing services. For example, for sale by owner transactions don't appear there.

(08:05):

Another issue that we've discovered is that some counties' transactions appear in more than one MLS. We don't know if these are duplicates, but if a county's transaction appears in an MLS where it doesn't normally appear, that we have no way to capture that information, or no good way to capture that information.

(08:30):

Another thing, we've been wanting to produce separate statistics on manufactured housing, for the counties in which there is a significant amount of manufactured housing, because this is of interest from an affordability perspective. But we haven't been able to do that.

(08:49):

And we would also like to include information in our reports about condominium markets for those counties where there are enough condo transactions. Now we have been getting condo data from the multiple listing services, so we could have done that prior to now, but

we've decided to hold off until we make these bigger changes that I'm going to tell you about in a moment.

(09:16):

And also, we'd like to completely redesign and update the report. We've been making some minor changes over the past couple of years, but we want to make some bigger changes.

(09:28):

So it turns out that now is a good time for us to make these changes for various reasons that I won't go into. But like I say, we've been planning this for a couple of years. And the main change is we're going to, for most counties, stop relying on the multiple listing services for house price data. Instead, we're going to obtain the actual transactions data from a company called Totality, which was formerly known as CoreLogic, who, themselves, collect the data from the county assessor's office. And of course, the county assessor's office maintain the complete list of transactions for a county. So in theory at least, we should be getting complete data at the transactions level for most counties, not every county, not every county provides its data to Totality, but the vast majority of them do. For those that don't, we're still going to have to either rely on the multiple listing service data or go directly to the county assessor's office.

(10:42):

We're still planning to report data on listings and sales from the MLS data because we don't have other, obviously, we don't have any other source of data about listings. And we want to report sales data that are consistent with the listings data. So we'll continue to collect that and report it. And we will continue to report separate data for single family houses, which is what we have been reporting for all counties. And we will report information about condominiums, which we haven't been reporting for selected counties and information about manufactured housing for selected counties, and we haven't been reporting that.

(11:27):

So the main advantages are we're going to have more accurate, complete information for most counties. We're going to be able to break out the manufactured housing, as well as the condominiums, and single family houses, and provide separate information for those three categories.

(11:47):

And as we have been doing for single family houses, we'll continue to provide a breakdown by number of bedrooms for the main bedroom types. And the historical data that we've published in the past for single family houses will not change. We're not planning to revise any of that, that's going to stay the same. We're just going to start publishing data that comes from a different source.

(12:15):

And we've done some comparisons using the second quarter data from this year. And for the most part, we don't see, it doesn't look like we're going to see any big differences when we shift to the CoreLogic data. The only counties for which we see large differences are the

smallest counties. And the smallest counties tend to be very volatile in any case because of the small numbers of transactions. So we don't see that as a problem. And eventually over time, we'll have more and more of this data from the new source.

(13:00):

Based on our analysis, we've decided that we can provide good information on condominiums for 15 counties, the ones shown here. And for manufactured housing, we can provide good data for at least 19 counties. I say at least because at some point we may be able to add counties to these lists, these two lists. So this is going to be all new information that we haven't provided before.

(13:35):

In addition to the information that we'll provide in the quarterly house price reports, we will provide historical quarterly median price data for condominiums and manufactured housing going back 10 years for the counties that I just showed you. So we're going to have, in addition to the current data, we're going to provide 10 years of historical data for anyone who's looking, interested in tracking what's been going on with condos or manufactured housing.

(14:09):

The only drawback we found with using the Totality data is that the data come out a bit later than the MLS data. For the most complete picture, we need to rely on data that's provided about two months after the end of the quarter. So we're going to have to produce the housing market report a little bit later than we used to, a few weeks later. But we think it's worth it to get the better data and the expanded coverage.

(14:46):

We're going to continue to provide median price data for selected cities, this is a large list of cities, of the largest cities. But we're going to break that down by housing types, so single-family condo and manufactured, where that information is available. Manufactured housing data, there's rarely enough manufactured housing transactions in cities to make it worthwhile to publish it, but there may be a few cities, we're still sorting that out. But certainly, the condo data will be of interest at the city level. And for single-family, we're going to break it down by two, three, and four bedrooms, as well as all bedrooms combined.

(15:40):

We're going to continue to provide the county and city single family median prices on our city and county dashboards. And we're planning to add additional series as soon as we can along with other data, such as the building permit data we have on our website.

(15:58):

So I think that's a quick summary of what we're planning to do with the housing market reports. Like I said, we've been planning this for a couple of years now. For various reasons, now seems to be the time to do it. And of course, I would welcome any feedback

you might have regarding the changes we're planning to make. But the whole goal is to make the report better, more reliable, more complete, and more informative.

(16:32):

And I could take questions now or I can wait until the end, until I get to the very end of the presentation.

Shelly Schmitz (16:42):

I have a question, and I don't know, maybe if you'll answer it maybe later, but you mentioned, oh, by the way, sorry, this is Commissioner Schmitz. You mentioned tracking the building permits.

Steven Bourassa (16:57):

Mm-hmm.

Shelly Schmitz (16:58):

Will that be the different types of building permits? And where my brain is going on this is with all of the new housing bills that have passed, will we be able to see the permits that are falling under maybe the middle housing, or multifamily, or things like that, will we be able to see that out of these reports?

Steven Bourassa (17:23):

Well, we already track building permits. And it's not on our dashboard, but we have the spreadsheets on our website. And the data are broken down into single-family and multifamily buildings and units. The building permit data don't really allow you to separate out, say middle housing.

(17:51):

But separately, we are working with the Department of Commerce to try to track that kind of information. In fact, we've been told by the legislature that we are, we meaning WCRER, are required to prepare a report for them every two years starting next year on how well counties are producing or how well they're meeting their specified housing needs at different income levels. And we're still working out, in fact, I've got another meeting with the people at Commerce later today. We're still talking about the methodology. It's harder than you might think it would be to do this. So we'll have a separate set of reports that will hopefully address what you're specifically interested in, I think.

Shelly Schmitz (18:49):

Okay, great. Thank you.

Keith Bruce-Jones (18:50):

Any other questions?

Steven Bourassa (18:50):

Yes.

Keith Bruce-Jones (18:54):

I'm sorry, go ahead.

Steven Bourassa (18:56):

No, go ahead.

Keith Bruce-Jones (18:58):

Yeah, Commissioner Bruce Jones. I just wanted to follow up what she was talking about earlier regarding the building permits.

Steven Bourassa (19:07):

Mm-hmm.

Keith Bruce-Jones (19:07):

Will this involve, let's say timelines, how in depth or deep in the weeds are you going to go? So would this involve a cost study, and timeline, and things like that?

Steven Bourassa (19:20):

Well, for the building permits, the building permits are, we provide them back, I don't know, off the top of my head, maybe 10 years or so. So you can see what's happened over a 10-year period at the county level, and also at the city level, and statewide.

(19:42):

But for the other information that I was talking about, like I said, we're still working out the methodology, but we're basically, Commerce set some baseline affordability statistics back in 2020. And since then, the counties have been asked to plan to meet housing needs based on, they can choose among different population projections that have been set by OFM. But based on those projections, let's say like for example, King County is projecting forward to 2044. So they completed a draft of their comprehensive plan update at the end of last year, they're planning for a 20-year horizon. So the idea is they've got to provide a certain amount of housing within the various different affordability categories over that time period. And the baseline is the 2020 numbers that I referred to earlier.

(20:59):

So what we've been asked to do is compare achievement starting in 2026, it's actually going to be for an earlier year given the data issues, but our first report will be next year. But we'll probably be talking about 2024 data at that time.

(21:21):

So the question is, if you divide up all of the housing that the county has been asked to produce at different income levels over that time period from 2020 to 2044, how well are they doing within each income category? So that's what we're going to try to do. We've been asked to do it every other year for the Legislature, but we have an understanding with Commerce that we're actually going to do it every year because we think people are interested in it every year, not just every other year. So we will have a series of annual reports starting next year that we'll be always looking back to these 2020 numbers.

(22:16):

Does that help?

Keith Bruce-Jones (22:18):

Yes, sir. Thank you. I just think it would be really helpful to be able to see how each local jurisdiction is performing and the cost that they're looking at for price range of construction type they're building. Because I guess the other stuff, but I'll keep it to this. Thank you.

Steven Bourassa (22:37):

Yeah, yeah, no, I understand. That's what we're trying to get at, both on the rental side in terms of rents and on the ownership side in terms of prices.

Casey Brazil (22:50):

So I have a question, this is Commissioner Brazil.

Steven Bourassa (22:54):

Sure.

Casey Brazil (22:54):

To get a good understanding of the full picture for manufactured housing, are you able to show what the space rental is costing also?

Steven Bourassa (23:09):

We don't have that information. My understanding is that most of the, and I'm still playing around with the manufactured housing data because it's a little bit tricky. But my understanding is that the data that we have is for units that are on their own lots. Not units in a park where they lease land. But I'm still verifying that.

Casey Brazil (23:44):

Yeah, because when I think of Spokane County, most of our parks where we have manufactured housing are leased spaces.

Steven Bourassa (23:53):

Yeah. Yeah, we recognize that as an issue and we're still trying to sort it out.

Casey Brazil (23:59):

Okay, thank you.

Steven Bourassa (24:03):

It's challenging to get a good handle on manufactured housing for a variety of reasons.

Casey Brazil (24:08):

Yeah.

Steven Bourassa (24:11):

Okay. So that's where we are with the housing market reports.

(24:15):

And I just wanted to give you a quick update on just some elements of the state of the state's housing report that we published online recently. This is the second annual report. Initially, part of the reason we published this is for the Legislature, we're required to prepare a report for them every other year, in the even-numbered years. But again, we decided that we would do it every year and we use data that is produced thanks to the funding we get from commerce and also data that we get thanks to the funding we get from licensing. So we're attributing both the Department of Commerce and the Department of Licensing for support for these reports.

(25:16):

Now, I'm just going to give you, we talk about a variety of things in this report. We talk about recent legislation, we talk about demographics and economics, we talk about the rental sector, we talk about homelessness.

(25:35):

But today, I'm just going to focus on home ownership, because it's a particularly interesting topic at the moment because affordability in the home ownership sector has really declined in recent years. And I know it's affecting the real estate industry quite a bit. So I thought you might be interested in seeing some of the slides that we produced for the report today.

(26:04):

So this is probably the most interesting slide where we graph mortgage interest rates and affordability for the median home buyer on the same graph. And this affordability measure relates to the median-income buyer purchasing the median-priced house statewide. And for a long time, the median price house was affordable in Washington to the median buyer. This changed in 2021 around the time that interest rates started to rise. And the median home has become unaffordable to the median buyer and has remained unaffordable since then.

(26:58):

And the interesting thing about this graph is you can see that the mortgage interest rate, the green line is pretty much a mirror image of the affordability line. And it's really interest rates that are driving this.

(27:17):

And as you can see from looking at the Median Buyer Affordability Index, it was trending down even before the sharp drop in 2021. And that was largely due to rising house prices. But what's happened since then, we haven't really seen a whole lot of movement in house prices. We've just seen this big increase in interest rates.

(27:44):

And just to put this in context, I thought it would be interesting to look at what interest rates have been historically. Of course, you could start this graph in different years and you'd get a different average. But if you go back to 1990, the average 30-year fixed rate mortgage rate was about 6%. And so the low interest rates that we had been experiencing since the Great Recession up until 2021, were definitely below average when viewed in the long run.

(28:20):

So what do we expect in the future? Well, it's hard to predict interest rates. Of course, we expect the Federal Reserve Bank to cut their overnight rate again, but whether this will filter its way into longer-term rates remains to be seen. But we probably shouldn't expect anything as low as what we were experiencing during the Pandemic and maybe not even in the years before that. So historically, we're close to the average right now.

(29:04):

House prices, pretty steady increases from 2015 up until about 2021. Then, although there's seasonal fluctuation, the rate of growth tapered off. We think that is largely due to interest rates which have put a real damper on both the seller side of the market and the buyer side of the market, less so on the seller side. Lately, we've seen an increase in listings. But we haven't seen a big corresponding increase in transactions. So prices are relatively flat compared to what they used to be.

(29:53):

If we look at the largest cities in the state just over the past few years, you can see, if you ignore the minor fluctuations, they're fairly steady. Not much happening in terms of house prices in the main cities in Washington State.

(30:15):

In terms of buyer affordability, however, a lot's been going on. If we compare prior to the increase in interest rates with the most recent data we have, we can see that Bellingham and Seattle were both unaffordable below 100 even in 2020. The other four cities shown here where the median-income buyer in that city could afford the median-priced house in that city. No problems.

(30:55):

Not true today. Not true in any of those cities. The affordability levels have dropped dramatically across the board in the largest cities in the state.

(31:09):

And then so some people are probably are starting to wonder, "Well, is this going to affect the home ownership rate?"

(31:16):

Well, we haven't really seen a big impact yet. Washington is the green line here, which is sometimes covered by Oregon, but there has been a slight drop-off over the past couple of years. But nothing huge. And it'd be interesting to see if this continues in future years.

(31:42):

One other interesting, but otherwise, the home ownership rate in the state has been fairly level over the time period shown here. A bit of fluctuation, but it pretty much ends up where it started out.

(31:58):

And I thought it would be interesting just to, actually, this was an idea from somebody at the Department of Commerce to include Texas in this graph because you often think of Texas as the policy and regulatory opposite of Washington. So you would think, "Well, they must have a really high home ownership rate there. You can build houses anywhere and not much regulation houses must be relatively inexpensive."

(32:32):

Well no, it turns out that Texas has the lower home ownership rate by about one percentage point than Washington. So in spite of that different policy and regulatory environment, Texas doesn't seem to make out any better than Washington in terms of home ownership rates. Idaho does. Of course California does not. Oregon's about the same as Washington.

Casey Brazil (33:03):

So, sorry to interrupt.

Steven Bourassa (33:05):

Yeah, sure.

Casey Brazil (33:06):

Commissioner Brazil. As I look through these graphs that you're showing, it looks like interest rates are really what you're, you're pegging...

Steven Bourassa (33:14):

Yes, mm-hmm.

Casey Brazil (33:15):

... a lot of the affordability on, but what else goes into this? What else is causing the affordability issues outside of interest rates? Because it's not just the interest rates, I

guess, in my view, but inflation from, across the board, everything's gotten just more expensive.

Steven Bourassa (33:34):

Yeah. I'm going to talk about that in a moment.

Casey Brazil (33:36):

Yeah.

Steven Bourassa (33:36):

Just a couple more slides. I've got one that, I think, relates to what you're probably getting at.

(33:42):

And just quickly, single-family permits and completions in the state have been declining in recent years, consistent with the reduced activity in terms of sales in the single-family market.

(33:59):

And here's the slide I was just referring to. There's been a lot of talk about construction costs going up. And in particular, about how tariffs are affecting a wide range of, or potentially affecting a wide range of construction materials including timber, different types of metal products, gypsum drywall, plus kitchen and bathroom cabinets have been affected. In addition, the more rigorous enforcement of immigration laws may be making construction labor more expensive. And we hear some anecdotal evidence about that, but not a lot.

(34:51):

And if we look at the actual construction cost data, we don't really see a big impact yet. I say yet. Part of the issue is there hasn't been a whole lot of construction going on. And it's not just single-family but commercial. So there really hasn't been as much demand as there has been in recent years for construction materials and labor. So this has helped to moderate whatever impact tariffs and immigration law enforcement might be having on construction costs. But if for various reasons these markets pick up, we may see some large increases in construction costs.

(35:45):

And of course, to some extent this may be a chicken and egg thing, builders may not be building because they think construction costs are too high, so it's not profitable to build, so they don't. So those potentially high construction costs never manifest themselves or haven't, to a great extent yet.

(36:05):

So if you see costs out there that are high and you decide not to do anything, well, they're not going to be reflected in the data because no one is actually spending that much money

to build buildings. But in the future, I think we're going to see some larger increases. And of course, what we saw at the beginning of the Pandemic was a big uptick in construction costs, largely due to supply chain issues. But there was also a lot of demand at the time. But subsequently, the Construction Cost Index went back to where it would've been had it followed a straight line since the year 2000. So we made up, to some extent you could say we made up for that big uptick in construction costs in the early 2020s.

Casey Brazil (37:08):

Yeah, just to throw a note from the commercial aspect, I have to have doubled the rent that I did in 2020 to make a project penciled today. And our developers are not willing to take the risk because we don't have the tenants that are willing to pay the phrase...

Steven Bourassa (37:28):

Exactly

Casey Brazil (37:29):

... in order to do so. That's our big issue.

Steven Bourassa (37:33):

Yeah. So you're seeing the high construction costs, but you're not actually going into effect because you're not buying the construction materials, you're not hiring the labor.

Casey Brazil (37:48):

Right. So it's not happening, but it's construction costs, it's the cost of the land.

Steven Bourassa (37:51):

Yeah.

Casey Brazil (37:52):

And then the permit fees across the board, traffic impact fees, everything are way too high.

Steven Bourassa (37:58):

Yeah.

(38:00):

So that was just a quick overview of one part of the report. I think you may have been given the link to the page where the report resides, if you want to look at the rest of the report. And I'd be happy to answer any questions if you have any.

Shelly Schmitz (38:28):

This is Commissioner Schmitz, back to the beginning of your presentation where you're talking about CoreLogic, and the MLSs, and a property showing up maybe in two MLSs, so

data not being as accurate. With CoreLogic, are they able to decipher when that happens, that one property is in two MLSs? Because they're not pulling from the MLS, they're pulling county record, right?

Steven Bourassa (39:00):

They're pulling directly from the counties. So they have arrangements with almost all of the counties in the state to get a monthly update of all transactions and an annual update of their tax roll, all the property characteristics, list of all properties, whether they transact or not. So the MLS doesn't figure into it.

Shelly Schmitz (39:23):

Okay, perfect.

Steven Bourassa (39:25):

Yeah. Any other questions or comments?

Keith Bruce-Jones (39:32):

Hey, good morning, sir. Sorry to talk so much today. It's Commissioner Bruce Jones again.

Steven Bourassa (39:37):

I want to get feedback.

Keith Bruce-Jones (39:39):

Excellent. Regarding the condominium reports, are you going to find a way to include the homeowner dues, the monthly dues in that also, that research?

Steven Bourassa (39:50):

We don't have data about the dues. We have the sale price for the condo, but we don't have the condo fees.

Keith Bruce-Jones (40:11):

Yeah.

Steven Bourassa (40:11):

There are ways of getting a sense of what condo fees are like on average. But getting the actual fees for each unit that sells is probably not feasible.

Keith Bruce-Jones (40:30):

Excellent. Thank you.

Steven Bourassa (40:34):

There's lots of data that we would love to report if only we could get it.

Keith Bruce-Jones (40:43):

I think most multiple listing services would have that data.

Steven Bourassa (40:48):

They might, but they don't, well, at least, to date, they haven't given it to us. It's not part of the information. Yes, I see a hand up, Commissioner?

Meg Balles (41:01):

Yes this is Commissioner Balles. When you were reporting on, when you mentioned the manufactured housing, is there any way you could clarify in your reports that that is for manufactured homes on deeded land? Because I do know that we do deal with manufactured home on leased land as well. If that information is not being input into those numbers, it'd be nice to just have the clarification that it is for deeded land only.

Steven Bourassa (41:30):

Yeah, yeah, we will be clear about that in the report.

Meg Balles (41:34):

Oh, that would be great.

Steven Bourassa (41:36):

We'll make it clear what we are reporting. But my understanding, as I said, is that that is what we're going to be reporting, not units on leased land.

Meg Balles (41:50):

Perfect, thank you.

Sandy Baur (41:56):

Thank you. Are there any other questions for Mr. Bourassa?

(42:02):

Okay, well thank you so much for joining us today, sir. We really appreciate your time. And loved the housing reports that you give us.

Steven Bourassa (42:10):

Okay.

Sandy Baur (42:10):

Back to you, Chair Clawson.

Steven Bourassa (42:11):

Thank you.

Jennifer Clawson (42:12):

Yeah, great. Thank you so much. I think your report was really helpful. And you can tell by the questions and the engagement with it, it was helpful for us. And hopefully, we can provide that feedback in a helpful way.

(42:24):

Let's go ahead and move on to our Agenda Number Seven, our new business. And that is our calendar review and approval. So Sandy, I'm going to hand it over to you.

Sandy Baur (42:37):

Perfect. So at the end of the year, the staff presents the proposed meeting dates for the following year. Our team supports nine boards and Commissions. So board meetings or Commission meetings occur nearly every week. As you can see, the calendar on the right is what our meeting schedule looks like for 2026 for all nine boards and Commissions.

(43:02):

For the Real estate Commission, we propose similar meeting cadence to what we used for the 2025 schedule. We propose Thursday, February 26; Thursday, May 21st; Thursday, August 27th; and Thursday, November 19th as our 2026 meeting dates. We want to pencil in August 27th as a possible in-person option, but that is all contingent upon the current spending freeze.

Jennifer Clawson (43:39):

Thank you, Sandy. Is there a motion to approve our 2026 calendar as presented?

Meg Balles (43:56):

I move that we approve the calendar as presented.

Jennifer Clawson (44:00):

Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Balles, do we have a second?

Keith Bruce-Jones (44:03):

Commissioner Bruce Jones, second.

Jennifer Clawson (44:06):

Thank you Commissioner Bruce Jones. Are there any discussion on this topic?

(44:15):

Okay, then let's go ahead and take a vote. All those in favor say, aye.

Commissioners (44:19):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (44:21):

All those opposed, say nay.

(44:25):

Any abstentions?

(44:29):

Okay, well it looks like we have our Agenda or our schedule set for our 2026 calendar year. And hopefully we'll get to see you all in August. Hopefully our spending freeze will be lifted by then.

(44:43):

Okay, we'll head into our Agenda Item 7.2, the annual election of a Vice Chair. Sandy, would you please present this next Agenda item?

Sandy Baur (44:55):

Certainly. Again, at the end of every year, the Commission elects the Vice Chair to serve for a term of one calendar year to be effective. January 1st, 2026, Commissioners can either nominate themselves or their fellow Commissioners. There is no limit to the number of times an active Commissioner can serve as the Vice Chair. All right, back to you to open the floor for a discussion.

Jennifer Clawson (45:22):

So do we have any nominations, a motion to nominate?

Shelly Schmitz (45:32):

I'm Commissioner Schmitz. And I would like to self nominate myself.

Jennifer Clawson (45:39):

Awesome. Well thank you, Commissioner Schmitz.

Keith Bruce-Jones (45:42):

You didn't need to do that because I was going to nominate you so.

Shelly Schmitz (45:45):

Oh.

Casey Brazil (45:48):

[inaudible 00:45:49] got one.

Keith Bruce-Jones (45:49):

Yeah.

Jennifer Clawson (45:51):

Do we have any other nominations?

(45:58):

This is where everyone else gets really quiet.

(46:01):

Okay. Okay, so it appears that we have one nomination. Commissioner Schmitz is there, let's see, now I need to call for a motion, is that right, Sandy?

Sandy Baur (46:15):

Yes, that's correct. Is there a motion to nominate Commissioner Schmitz for the office of Vice Chair?

Keith Bruce-Jones (46:24):

Commissioner Bruce Jones here, so moved

Jennifer Clawson (46:28):

And is there a second?

Shelly Schmitz (46:32):

Commissioner Schmitz, I second, I don't know, can I second? I don't know how this works. It feels weird.

Jennifer Clawson (46:41):

Is there any discussion? We have a motion and a second. Any discussion on this topic?

(46:51):

Okay, let's go ahead and take a vote so that the awkwardness can stop for you, Commissioner Schmitz. Okay. All in favor of Commissioner Schmitz as our Vice Chair for this next year, say aye.

Commissioners (47:04):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (47:08):

All those opposed, say nay.

(47:09):

And any abstentions?

(47:16):

Okay, well, Commissioner Schmitz, you'll now be our Vice Chair for the 2026 calendar year.

Shelly Schmitz (47:23):

Thank you.

Jennifer Clawson (47:25):

And it looks like we'll schedule some training. Is that right, Sandy? Okay.

Shelly Schmitz (47:29):

Yes, that's correct.

Jennifer Clawson (47:30):

All trained up.

Sandy Baur (47:32):

I'll be sure to schedule that before the end of the year.

Jennifer Clawson (47:35):

Great.

Shelly Schmitz (47:35):

Thank you.

Jennifer Clawson (47:36):

Thank you so much.

(47:38):

Okay, we'll now move on to 7.3, which is our annual review of subcommittee composition. And Sandy, I turn it over to you.

Sandy Baur (47:48):

Sure thing. At the end of each year, again, this is one of our annual processes, the Commission revisits its subcommittees to determine whether the work is still relevant. In addition to, it revisits the membership of the subcommittees in order to allow opportunities for everyone to participate in the work that they're interested in. In order to keep membership below a quorum, the subcommittee can have a maximum of three members.

(48:17):

We only have one subcommittee up for today's discussion and that is the Education Subcommittee. The current members are Commissioner, as you were, Vice Chair Schmitz, Commissioner Brazil, and Commissioner Balles. This subcommittee meets on a monthly basis for about an hour. And it also participates in additional projects as required. The total time commitment is approximately two to four hours and that slides either left or right, depending on what kind of projects the subcommittee is working on.

(48:54):

As a special note, I will say that Commissioner Balles will report out on what the current work is that the Commission is doing later in this meeting.

(49:05):

So I'll turn it back over to you Chair Clawson to begin this discussion.

Jennifer Clawson (49:10):

Great, thank you so much. So I'd like to open the floor for a discussion and nominations for the Education Subcommittee.

(49:18):

So we're looking for three candidates.

(49:22):

Commissioner Balles?

Meg Balles (49:22):

I would like to nominate myself for this subcommittee. I've been on it for the last, or so far this year. And I really have enjoyed it a lot. I'm learning a lot, hopefully contributing good feedback on the projects that we've been working on. So I'd like to-nominate myself.

Jennifer Clawson (49:46):

Great, thank you. Other nominations?

Shelly Schmitz (49:52):

This is now, what do I call myself, Vice Chair?

Sandy Baur (49:55):

Vice Chair, yes.

Jennifer Clawson (49:57):

Yes.

Sandy Baur (49:58):

That's how you say? I would like to self-nominate myself for the Education Committee, very much for what Meg had said. We have done quite a lot, as you will hear in a bit. And I feel

like right now we're also in the middle advancing into one more project. And I would love to stay with that as we have already started it.

Jennifer Clawson (50:28):

Great, thank you. So we have two, so far. Is there a third person who would like to nominate themselves or another Commissioner?

Casey Brazil (50:38):

I'd like to nominate Sam Galano.

Jennifer Clawson (50:45):

Commissioner Galano, are you good with the nomination?

Sam Gallano (50:48):

Yeah, I would accept that nomination.

Jennifer Clawson (50:50):

Okay, great. Are there any other nominations for this Education Subcommittee?

(51:02):

Okay, so do we have a motion to nominate Commissioner Balles, Commissioner Galano, and Vice Chair Schmitz to the Education Subcommittee.

Keith Bruce-Jones (51:20):

Commissioner Bruce Jones, so moved.

Jennifer Clawson (51:24):

Thank you. So we have it moved. Do I have a second?

Meg Balles (51:28):

Commissioner Balles seconds.

Jennifer Clawson (51:31):

Thank you Commissioner Balles. So is there any discussion on the topic before we vote?

(51:40):

Okay, I'll go ahead and call the vote. All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners (51:44):

Aye.

Jennifer Clawson (51:47):

All those opposed, say nay.

(51:49):

And are there any abstentions?

(51:55):

Okay, great. So we have our Education Subcommittee, we have Commissioner Balles, we have Commissioner Galano, and we have Vice Chair Schmitz. So thank you all so much for your continued contributions to this subcommittee.

(52:10):

And Sandy, I believe you'll be adding them to the next subcommittee?

Sandy Baur (52:16):

That's correct.

Jennifer Clawson (52:16):

Great.

Sandy Baur (52:17):

And I'll be sure that they get invites to the 2026 subcommittee meetings. And I'll arrange for their training as well.

Jennifer Clawson (52:24):

Great.

(52:25):

So now we'll move on to our Agenda Number Eight, our report out. And we're going to get to hear about all the great work that the Subcommittee has been working on.

(52:33):

So Commissioner Balles, it looks like I'm going to turn it over to you for this report out?

Meg Balles (52:37):

All right, Commissioner Balles here reporting on the Education Subcommittee.

(52:42):

So since our last meeting, we have now completed review and revision updates for the Core Curriculum Outline, including recommendations that were submitted to DOL from real estate industry professionals.

(52:55):

In September, the Subcommittee met in person with PSI, which is the licensing testing company used to review all questions used in the Washington State portion of the testing for new broker and managing broker licensees. Scoring rates for each question were reviewed and changes were made as needed to have more continuity across the manner in

which the questions were crafted. Some additional time in early December via web meetings will be scheduled, adding 15 additional questions for both the broker and managing broker exams. Questions will be focused around RCW chapter 18.85 and WAC, chapter 308-124.

(53:39):

The Education Subcommittee is starting a review of the Managing Broker Curriculum from 2009. Tentative listening sessions may be scheduled for April and May 2026 specific dates will be announced later. That's it for the Subcommittee report.

Jennifer Clawson (54:03):

Thank you so much. Are there any questions for the Subcommittee before we move on?

(54:13):

Okay, we'll move on to Agenda 8.2, staff reports. Sandy, is there a ledge updates?

Sandy Baur (54:21):

We currently do not have a ledge update at this time. However, this will be an ongoing Agenda item as we move into the 2026 legislative session.

Jennifer Clawson (54:31):

Great, thank you so much. And now we'll move into reviewing our Master Action Item List.

Sandy Baur (54:38):

All right, so the only item we had from our last meeting was to include the Washington Center for Real Estate Research information on our next meeting Agenda. And that is complete. We invited Mr. Bourassa to come to the meeting and give us an update.

Jennifer Clawson (54:54):

Great, thank you so much.

(54:57):

We will now move to our Agenda Item Number Nine, which is our public comment. So I'll now open the floor for public comment. Written comments must have been submitted at least two days prior to the meetings by email. Did we receive any comments in writing?

Sandy Baur (55:13):

We have not received any written comments.

Jennifer Clawson (55:16):

Okay, great. So members of the public, while you're addressing the Commission, please remember each member of the public is limited to one three-minute comment. Comments submitted in writing count as your three minutes. Comments must be on matters within

the Commission's jurisdiction. And Commissioners are limited to directing staff to study the matter further or requesting the matter to be scheduled for a later discussion.

(55:38):

So with that, I will open up the floor for public comment.

Sandy Baur (55:50):

First up, we have Mary Hall-Drury, go ahead and come off mute and let us know what you're thinking.

Mary Hall-Drury (55:57):

Good afternoon or good morning, I apologize. Mary Hall-Drury, on behalf of Washington Realtors. I wanted to flag for all of your edification that we became aware of an issue as it relates to a piece of legislation that we worked this past session, as it relates to funding for WCRER. And that there might be some additional fixes as to the funding flow. And we've been in conversation with the University of Washington, specifically WCRER, as well as the Office of Financial Management. Presumably, we have a simple fix. Hopefully, it will remain simple throughout the six-day session. And I'm happy to provide any updates as we get to January 12th and beyond. Thank you.

Sandy Baur (56:44):

Thank you very much. Do we have any other comments?

(56:56):

Okay, I don't see any hands. So if you called in and you're not able to raise hand, go ahead and come off mute and let us know what you're thinking. \.

(57:20):

Well, I think that concludes our public comments. Back to you, Chair Clawson.

Jennifer Clawson (57:28):

Great, thanks for your comment, Mary. I appreciate hearing that update. Now the floor is closed for comments. So we'll move on to our Agenda Number 10.1. Are there any announcements to share from any of the Commissioners or our DLL team?

Sandy Baur (57:52):

The staff does not have any announcements at this time.

Jennifer Clawson (58:04):

And I'm not hearing anything from our Commissioners.

(58:07):

We'll move on to 10.2. Is there any future Agenda items you would like to make sure that we get added to our next Commission Agenda?

(58:27):

Okay. Well, as always, if you think of something you can get a hold of Sandy and we will work through getting them added to the Agenda for one of our future meetings.

(58:39):

Sandy, let's go ahead and review our Action Items.

Sandy Baur (58:43):

Perfect. So I didn't capture very many Action Items. Action Item Number One is to schedule the Vice Chair training for Vice Chair Schmitz. And second Action Item was to include our new Commissioners to the meeting invitations for the Education Subcommittee and also to schedule meeting training for them before the end of the year. Did I capture everything?

Jennifer Clawson (59:16):

Everything that I had.

(59:17):

Okay.

(59:18):

Anyone else have anything in addition to?

(59:19):

Okay, nice job, Sandy. So it is now 10:59 A.M. on November 13th, 2025 and this meeting is adjourned. Our next meeting will be via Teams on February 26th, 2026 at 10:00 A.M. Thank you all for joining. Have a great holiday season. And we'll see you early next year.

Sandy Baur (59:46):

Thank you so much, everyone.

Commissioners (59:48):

Thank you.