PROPOSED RULE MAKING



CR-102 (December 2017) (Implements RCW 34.05.320)

Do **NOT** use for expedited rule making

CODE REVISER USE ONLY

OFFICE OF THE CODE REVISER STATE OF WASHINGTON FILED

DATE: November 06, 2019

TIME: 8:10 AM

WSR 19-22-081

Agency: Employment Security Department							
□ Original Notice □ Original No							
□ Supplemental Notice to WSR							
□ Continuance of WSR							
□ Preproposal Statement of Inquiry was filed as WSR 19-07-041; or							
□ Expedited Rule MakingProposed notice was filed as WSR; or							
□ Proposal is exempt under RCW 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); or							
□ Proposal is exempt under RCW							
Title of rule and other identifying information: (describe subject) WAC 192-170-010 – "Availability for work—RCW 50.20.010." Setting requirements for when claimants are eligible for unemployment benefits while physically located outside of the United States							
Hearing location(s):							
Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:				
December 12, 2019	9 am	Employment Security Department, 212 Maple Park Avenue, Olympia, WA 98501	Commissioner's Conference Room				
Date of intended adoption: January 10, 2020 (Note: This is NOT the effective date)							
Submit written comments to:							
Name: Joshua Dye							
Address: P.O. Box 90		, WA 98507-9046					
Email: rules@esd.wa.g	JOV						
Fax: 844-652-7096							
Other:							
By (date) December 11, 2019 Assistance for persons with disabilities:							
-		abilities:					
Contact Teresa Eckstein Phone: 360-507-9890							
Fax: 360-586-4600							
TTY: Relay 711							
Email: teckstein@esd.wa.gov							
Other:							
By (date) December 5, 2019							
Purpose of the proposal and its anticipated effects, including any changes in existing rules: The amended rule sets requirements for when claimants are eligible for unemployment benefits while physically located outside of the United States by amending WAC 192-170-010.							

Reasons supporting proposal: The Commissioner issued a precedential decision (In re McConnell, Empl. Sec. Comm'r Dec.2d 1005 (2016)) that holds that claimants can still be eligible for unemployment benefits even when they are physically located outside of the United States. Rulemaking is needed to set clear standards for when claimants are or are not eligible for unemployment benefits while physically located in another country. Amending rules regarding eligibility for benefits when physically located outside of the United States will provide benefits for certain claimants and expand options for claimants to look for opportunities to return to work in industries with trans global footprints. This supports the Department's mission to develop the nation's best and most future ready workforce with opportunities for all. Statutory authority for adoption: RCW 50.12.010 and RCW 50.12.040 provide general rulemaking authority to the Employment Security Department. RCW 50.12.042 and RCW 50.20.010 provide specific rulemaking authority regarding the requirement that unemployment claimants register for work, be able to work, be available for work, and actively seek work. Statute being implemented: RCW 50.20.010 Is rule necessary because of a: Federal Law? □ Yes □ No Federal Court Decision? ☐ Yes □ No State Court Decision? □ No If yes, CITATION: In re McConnell, Empl. Sec. Comm'r Dec.2d 1005 (2016) Agency comments or recommendations, if any, as to statutory language, implementation, enforcement, and fiscal matters: None. Name of proponent: (person or organization) Employment Security Department ☐ Private ☐ Public Name of agency personnel responsible for: Name Office Location Phone Drafting: Scott Michael Olympia 360-890-3448 Implementation: Julie Lord Olympia 360-890-9579 Enforcement: Julie Lord Olympia 360-890-9579 Is a school district fiscal impact statement required under RCW 28A.305.135? □ Yes □ No If yes, insert statement here: The public may obtain a copy of the school district fiscal impact statement by contacting: Name: Address: Phone: Fax: TTY: Email: Other: Is a cost-benefit analysis required under RCW 34.05.328? ☑ Yes: A preliminary cost-benefit analysis may be obtained by contacting: Name: Joshua Dye Address: P.O. Box 9046, Olympia, WA 98507-9046 Phone: 360-890-3472 Fax: TTY: Email: Rules@esd.wa.gov Other: https://esd.wa.gov/newsroom/ui-rule-making/

☐ No:	Please explain:		
Regulatory	/ Fairness Act Cost Considerations for	a Small Busin	ess Economic Impact Statement:
	oposal, or portions of the proposal, may k 85 RCW). Please check the box for any a		requirements of the Regulatory Fairness Act (see ption(s):
adopted so	lely to conform and/or comply with federal	statute or regu	RCW 19.85.061 because this rule making is being lations. Please cite the specific federal statute or describe the consequences to the state if the rule is not
	d description:		
	•	exempt becaus	e the agency has completed the pilot rule process
_	RCW 34.05.313 before filing the notice of		
		exempt under t	he provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was
	a referendum.		20W 40.05.005(0). Oh a de all that anales
	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is	exempt under F	.,,
	RCW 34.05.310 (4)(b)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(e)
	(Internal government operations)		(Dictated by statute)
	RCW 34.05.310 (4)(c)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(f)
	(Incorporation by reference)		(Set or adjust fees)
	RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g)
	(Correct or clarify language)		((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit)
 □ This rul	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is	exempt under F	. ,
	n of exemptions, if necessary:	oxompt andor i	
	COMPLETE THIS SEC	TION ONLY IF	NO EXEMPTION APPLIES
If the propo	sed rule is not exempt , does it impose m	ore-than-minor	costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?
⊠ No	Briefly summarize the agency's analysis	showing how	costs were calculated.
The followi	ng analysis assumes that all previous une	mployment cla	ims that were denied because the claimant was out of
	•		e does not state that all persons who file unemployment
	·	-	employment benefits, and it is likely that at least some of
•			under the proposed rule. Therefore, the following
analysis pre	esents a "worst-case scenario" and likely (overstates the _l	potential economic impacts of the proposed rule.
Francisco	2017 the sough August 2010, those was	. 102 alaima da	
			nied for being out of the country. With the proposed rule, n average weekly benefit amount of \$531 over 26 weeks.
	e weekly benefit amount represents \$13,		
iiiis averag	e weekly beliefit amount represents \$13,	,800 iii additioi	iai chaiged benefits per claim.
When cons	idering the total claims spread across th	e state-wide er	mployer base, the proposed rule would have a negligible
			uld increase each employers' average charged benefits by
•	rear. An increase of this size is not likely to		
, ,	•		, , , ,
_			
	·	•	e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business
econom	ic impact statement is required. Insert sta-	tement nere:	
	public may obtain a copy of the small busi acting:	iness economic	impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by
	ame:		
	ddress:		
	hone:		
	ax:		
	TY:		

Email: Other:	
	Signature:
Date: November 6, 2019	
Name: Dan Zeitlin	
Title: Employment Security Policy Director	Dul C-