PROPOSED RULE MAKING



⋈ Original Notice

Agency: Employment Security Department

with Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 41-98.

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: January 14, 2020

TIME: 5:26 PM

WSR 20-03-102

| □ Supplemental Not | ice to WSR | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| □ Continuance of W | SR | | | | | | |
| | ment of Inc | uiry was filed as WSR <u>19-18-</u> | <u>021</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 | | | | | | | |
| Title of rule and othe | r identifyin | g information: (describe subje | ct) Hours of Availability and Suitable Work: Adjusting | | | | |
| the hours unemploy | ment clain | nants must be available for w | vork in order to be eligible for unemployment benefits | | | | |
| and updating factors | s used to d | etermine suitable work. | . , | | | | |
| 1 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hearing location(s): | | | | | | | |
| Date: | Time: | Location: (be specific) | Comment: | | | | |
| March 24, 2020 | 9:00 am | John L. O'Brien Building | House Hearing Room C | | | | |
| | | 504 15 th AVE SE | | | | | |
| Date of intended ado | ntion: Mar | Olympia, WA 98501 ch 27, 2020 (Note: This is NO 1 | The affective date) | | | | |
| Submit written comm | - | (Note: 11115 IS 140) | tille ellective date) | | | | |
| | ients to. | | | | | | |
| Name: Joshua Dye Address: P.O. Box 90 | 46 Olympia | N/A 08507 0046 | | | | | |
| Email: rules@esd.wa. | | a, WA 96507-9046 | | | | | |
| Fax: 844-652-7096 | | | | | | | |
| Other: | | | | | | | |
| By (date) March 23, 2020 | | | | | | | |
| Assistance for perso | | abilities: | | | | | |
| Contact Teresa Eckste | | | | | | | |
| Phone: 360-507-9890 | | | | | | | |
| Fax: 360-586-4600 | | | | | | | |
| TTY: Relay 711 | | | | | | | |
| Email: teckstein@es.w | va.gov | | | | | | |
| Other: | | | | | | | |
| By (date) March 16, 20 | | | | | | | |
| unemployment claima occupation. This requi | nts must be rement can | available for work during all the be unobtainable for some claim | g any changes in existing rules: Under current rules, e usual hours and days of the week customary for their nants who work in 24/7 professions, especially those g is necessary to set a more obtainable standard. | | | | |

Additionally, rulemaking is necessary to include shifts of employment as a factor used to determine suitable work, consistent

Reasons supporting proposal: Current availability requirements force many Washington workers to make difficult choices between providing care necessary for family members and being available for work during unattainable days and hours. Approximately forty percent of industries in Washington are classified as having customary hours of twenty-four hours a day. seven days a week. This forces claimants to be available morning, afternoons, and overnight, even if the claimant had not previously worked shifts during those time frames. Many claimants are unable to accept work different from previous work schedules due to obligations for providing care for a child or vulnerable adult, which precludes the claimant from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. By removing the requirement that claimants be available for "all of" the customary hours of the industry, claimants are provided flexibility to receive UI benefits while the claimant searches for new suitable employment while meeting obligations for providing care to family members. Clarifying the definition of suitable work to include previous shifts of employment provides a level of protection for workers. The amended definition of suitable work removes hardships on claimants while protecting charged employers by preventing claimants from imposing undue restrictions on availability. 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 provides specific rulemaking authority regarding the requirement that unemployment claimants be able to work, available for work, and actively seek work. RCW 50.20.100 provides rulemaking authority to determine what factors are used to determine suitable work. Statute being implemented: RCW 20.12.042 Is rule necessary because of a: Federal Law? ☐ Yes \boxtimes No □ Yes ⊠ No Federal Court Decision? State Court Decision? ☐ Yes ⊠ No If yes, CITATION: 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 Scott Michael Drafting: Olympia 360-890-3448 Implementation: Julie Lord Olympia 360-890-3635 Enforcement: Olympia Julie Lord 360-890-3635 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:

| Т | ГҮ: | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Email: Rules@esd.wa.gov | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Other: https://esd.wa.gov/newsroom/ui-rule-making/ | | | | | | | |
| ☐ No: | Please explain: | | | | | | | |
| Regulatory | Fairness Act Cost Considerations for a Small Bu | usine | 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): | | | | | | | | |
| ☐ 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 adopted. | | | | | | | | |
| • | description: | | | | | | | |
| | e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt bed | | | | | | | |
| _ | RCW 34.05.313 before filing the notice of this propos | | | | | | | |
| | e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt und a referendum. | der th | e provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was | | | | | |
| | e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt und | der R | CW 19.85.025(3). Check all that apply: | | | | | |
| | | _ | RCW 34.05.310 (4)(e) | | | | | |
| | (Internal government operations) | | (Dictated by statute) | | | | | |
| П | 500000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 7 | RCW 34.05.310 (4)(f) | | | | | |
| | (Incorporation by reference) | | (Set or adjust fees) | | | | | |
| | | | RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g) | | | | | |
| | (Correct or clarify language) | | ((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process | | | | | |
| | (Soffeet of Glamy language) | | requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit) | | | | | |
| ☐ This rule | e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt und | der R | CW | | | | | |
| Explanation | of exemptions, if necessary: | | | | | | | |
| | COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONL | Y IF | NO EXEMPTION APPLIES | | | | | |
| If the propos | sed rule is not exempt , does it impose more-than-m | inor (| costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? | | | | | |
| ⊠ No | Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing h | ow c | osts were calculated. | | | | | |
| From July 1, 2017 through July 1, 2019, the Department denied 22,105 claims for claimants who were not available during the work hours and days usual for their type of work. Each claim, on average, represents \$7,285 in charged benefits to an employer. When considering the total denied claims spread across the state-wide employer base, the proposed rule would increase each employers' average charged benefits by \$130.48 per year. An increase of this size is unlikely to increase the tax liability for many employers. | | | | | | | | |
| ☐ 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: | | | | | | | | |
| conta Na Ad PI Fa | acting: ame: ddress: hone: ax: | omic | impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by | | | | | |
| | TY: | | | | | | | |
| Email: Other: | | | | | | | | |

| Date: January 14, 2020 | Signature: |
|--|------------|
| Name: Dan Zeitlin | |
| Title: Employment Security Policy Director | Pul C- |