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 21, 2019

TIME: 10:05 AM

WSR 19-24-006

Agency: Employment Security Department								
□ Original Notice □								
□ Supplemental Noti	ce to WSR							
□ Continuance of WSR								
	ment of Inq	uiry was filed as WSR 19-20-05	<u>}</u> ; 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								
			WAC 192-04-180 and a new section – Decisions- nd Orders of default-Motion to vacate-Petition for review					
Hearing location(s):								
Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:					
January 10, 2020	9:00 am	Employment Security Department, 212 Maple Park Avenue, Olympia, WA 98501	Commissioner's Conference Room					
Date of intended adop	ption: Janua	ary 17, 2020 (Note: This is NOT t	ne effective date)					
Submit written comments to:								
Name: Joshua Dye								
Address: P.O. Box 904		, WA 98507-9046						
Email: rules@esd.wa.g	gov							
Fax: 844-652-7096								
Other:								
By (date) January 9, 2020								
Assistance for person		abilities:						
Contact Teresa Eckstein								
Phone: 360-507-9890								
Fax: 360-586-4600 TTY: Relay 711								
Email: teckstein@esd.v	wa dov							
Other:	wa.gov							
By (date) January 2, 20	020							
Purpose of the proposal and its anticipated effects, including any changes in existing rules: To permit appellants who have received an order of default to file a motion to vacate the order of default directly with the Office of Administrative Hearings.								

order of default di	irectly with the Office of	appellants who received an order of default the option to Administrative Hearings will allow for more timely review lead to more timely resolution of the merits of the unde	w of orders of default, which,
Employment Sec	urity Department. RCW	50.12.010 and RCW 50.12.040 provide general rulema 50.32.060 provides authority for rulemaking for hearing for establishing time limits for filing motions to vacate de	s and appeals. RCW
Statute being im	plemented: RCW 34.0	5.440; RCW 50.32.070; RCW 50.32.080	
Is rule necessary	v because of a:		
Federal La	□ Yes ⊠ No		
Federal Co	□ Yes ⊠ No		
State Cour	□ Yes ⊠ No		
If yes, CITATION			
Agency commer matters: None.	nts or recommendation	ns, if any, as to statutory language, implementation,	enforcement, and fiscal
Name of proponent: (person or organization) Employment Security Department; Office of Administrative Hearings			□ Private□ Public⊠ Governmental
Name of agency	personnel responsible	e for:	
	Name	Office Location	Phone
Drafting:	Scott Michael	Olympia	360-890-3448
Implementation:	Donald Capp	Olympia	360-407-2713
Enforcement:	Don Westfall	Lacey	360-507-9709
Is a school distr If yes, insert state	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nent required under RCW 28A.305.135?	□ Yes ⊠ No
Name: Address Phone: Fax: TTY: Email: Other:	s:	chool district fiscal impact statement by contacting:	
	analysis required und		
□ Yes: A pro Name:	emmary cost-benefit af	nalysis may be obtained by contacting:	
Address	S:		
Phone:			
Fax:			
TTY:			
Email:			
Other:			
	use explain: The propose RCW 34.05.328(5).	ed rules are "procedural rules" and not "significant legisl	ative rules," as those terms

Regulatory Fairness Act Cost Considerations for a Small Business Economic Impact Statement:						
This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, may be exempt from requirements of the Regulatory Fairness Act (see chapter 19.85 RCW). Please check the box for any applicable exemption(s):						
adopted s regulatior adopted. Citation a	olely to conform and/or comply with feder this rule is being adopted to conform or and description:	eral statute or regu comply with, and	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			
	ale proposal, or portions of the proposal, ARCW 34.05.313 before filing the notice		e the agency has completed the pilot rule process			
	_		ne provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was			
	y a referendum.	, , , , , , , ,	()			
⊠ This r	ule proposal, or portions of the proposal,	is exempt under F	RCW 19.85.025(3). Check all that apply:			
	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)	\boxtimes	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)			
	ule proposal, or portions of the proposal, on of exemptions, if necessary:	is exempt under F	RCW			
	COMPLETE THIS S	ECTION ONLY IF	NO EXEMPTION APPLIES			
If the prop	posed rule is not exempt , does it impose	e more-than-minor	costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?			
□ No	Briefly summarize the agency's analy	sis showing how	costs were calculated			
☐ Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business economic impact statement is required. Insert statement here:						
	e public may obtain a copy of the small batacting:	ousiness economic	impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by			
	Name:					
	Address:					
	Phone:					
	Fax: TTY:					
	111:					
	Email:					
		Signat	cure:			
Date: No	Email:	Signat	ure:			
Date: No	Email: Other: /ember 21, 2019	Signat	eure:			
Name: D	Email: Other: /ember 21, 2019	Signat	eure:			