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: March 24, 2020

TIME: 9:40 AM

WSR 20-08-035

Agency: Employment	Security Dep	partment						
☐ Original Notice								
□ Supplemental Noti	ce to WSR							
□ Continuance of WS	SR 20-05-03	57						
□ Preproposal State	ment of Inq	uiry was filed as WSR 19-20-053	; or					
☐ Expedited Rule Ma	kingProp	osed notice was filed as WSR	; or					
☐ Proposal is exemp	t under RC	W 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); or	r					
□ Proposal is exemp								
			/AC 192-04-180 and a new section – Decisions-					
			d Orders of default-Motion to vacate-Petition for review.					
The public hearing is b	eing resched	duled as a remote hearing due to C	OVID-19 concerns.					
Hearing location(s):								
Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:					
May 7, 2020	10:00 am		When prompted for the Conference ID number, press 51750					
		407-3790	and then the # key					
	•	9, 2020 (Note: This is NOT the effe	ective date)					
Submit written comm	ents to:							
Name: Joshua Dye	40.01	WA 00507 0040						
Address: P.O. Box 90		, WA 98507-9046						
Email: rules@esd.wa.g Fax: 844-652-7096	jov							
Other:								
By (date) May 6, 2020								
Assistance for person	ns with disa	abilities:						
Contact Teresa Eckste								
Phone: 360-507-9890	<u></u>							
Fax: 360-586-4600								
TTY: Relay 711								
Email: teckstein@esd.	wa.gov							
Other:								
By (date) April 30, 202	0							
			rchanges in existing rules: To permit appellants who f default directly with the Office of Administrative					

order of default di	rectly with the Office of A	opellants who received an order of default the option to administrative Hearings will allow for more timely review ead to more timely resolution of the merits of the unde	w of orders of default, which,
Employment Secu	urity Department. RCW 5	50.12.010 and RCW 50.12.040 provide general rulema 0.32.060 provides authority for rulemaking for hearing or establishing time limits for filing motions to vacate de	s and appeals. RCW
Statute being im	plemented: RCW 34.05	.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 recommendations	s, 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	for:	
	Name	Office Location	Phone
Drafting:	Scott Michael	Olympia	360-890-3448
Implementation:	Brendon Tukey	Spokane Valley	509-742-5729
Enforcement:	Don Westfall	Lacey	360-507-9709
Is a school distri	•	ent required under RCW 28A.305.135?	□ Yes ⊠ No
Name: Address Phone: Fax: TTY: Email: Other:	s:	hool district fiscal impact statement by contacting:	
	analysis required unde		
□ Yes: A pro Name:	eiiminary cost-benefit ana	alysis may be obtained by contacting:	
Address	S:		
Phone:			
Fax:			
TTY:			
Email:			
Other:			
	se explain: The proposed RCW 34.05.328(5).	d rules are "procedural rules" and not "significant legisl	ative rules," as those terms

Regulator	y Fairness Act Cost Considerations for a S	Small Busine	ess 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 so	☐ This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.061 because this rule making is being adopted solely to conform and/or comply with federal statute or regulations. Please cite the specific federal statute or regulation this rule is being adopted to conform or comply with, and describe the consequences to the state if the rule is not							
	RCW 34.05.313 before filing the notice of this							
	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exertion α a referendum.	empt under th	ne provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was					
	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exe	empt under R	CW 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)					
П	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)					
│ □ This rul	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exe	empt under R	• •					
	n of exemptions, if necessary:							
	COMPLETE THE SECTION		NO EVENDTION ADDITE					
If the propo			NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?					
ii tilo prope	soca raio io not exempt , aces it impose more		10.00.020(2)) 011 Businesses.					
□ No	Briefly summarize the agency's analysis sh	owing how c	costs were calculated					
☐ Yes econom	Calculations show the rule proposal likely in nic impact statement is required. Insert statem	•	e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business					
	public may obtain a copy of the small busines acting:	ss economic	impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by					
N	lame:							
Д	Address:							
	Phone:							
	āx: TY:							
	ir. Email:							
	Other:							
Date: March 24, 2020			ure:					
Name: Dan Zeitlin								
Title: Employment Security Policy Director			Pul C-					