## PROPOSED RULE MAKING



remain in effect.

**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: May 04, 2020

TIME: 8:12 AM

WSR 20-10-072

Agency: Employment Security Department														
□ Original Notice     □ Original No														
□ Supplemental Notice to WSR														
<ul> <li>□ Continuance of WSR</li> <li>☑ Preproposal Statement of Inquiry was filed as WSR 19-21-043; or</li> <li>□ Expedited Rule MakingProposed notice was filed as WSR; or</li> <li>□ Proposal is exempt under RCW 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); or</li> </ul>														
								□ Proposal is exempt under RCW						
								Title of rule and othe	r identifying	g information: (describe subject	Leave of Absence – WAC 192-170-080(1)(a).			
Hearing location(s):														
Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:											
June 11, 2020	9:00 am		0) When prompted for the Conference ID number, press 51750											
	<u> </u>	407-3790	and then the # key											
	•	15, 2020 (Note: This is <b>NOT</b> the	effective date)											
Submit written comm	ients 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) <u>June 10, 202</u>														
Assistance for persons with disabilities:														
Contact <u>Teresa Eckstein</u>														
Phone: 360-507-9890														
Fax: 360-586-4600														
TTY: Relay 711														
Email: teckstein@esd.	wa.gov													
Other:														
By (date) June 3, 2020	<u> </u>													
was determined to be Sec. Comm'r Dec.2d 9	"invalid" by t 971 (2011).	the Commissioner of the Employr In that decision, the Commission	ment Security Department under <i>In re Ausburn</i> , Empl. er determined the rule was in "direct conflict" with RCW 70-080(1)(a). The remainder of WAC 192-170-080 will											

Reasons suppor invalid rule.	ting proposal: WAC	192-170-080(1)(a) should be repealed so the public do	oes not mistakenly rely on an		
		V 50.12.010 and RCW 50.12.040 provide general rule ding the authority to repeal rules.	making authority to the		
Statute being im	plemented: RCW 50.	04.310(1)			
Is rule necessary	/ because of a:				
Federal Lav	□ Yes ⊠ No				
Federal Co	urt Decision?		□ Yes ⊠ No		
State Court			⊠ Yes □ No		
		Sec. Comm'r Dec.2d 971 (2011)			
matters: None		ons, if any, as to statutory language, implementation	on, omoroomoni, and nood		
Name of propone	<ul><li>□ Private</li><li>□ Public</li><li>⊠ Governmental</li></ul>				
Name of agency	personnel responsib	ple 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 distri If yes, insert state	· ·	ement required under RCW 28A.305.135?	☐ Yes ⊠ No		
Name: Address Phone: Fax: TTY: Email: Other:	s:	school district fiscal impact statement by contacting:			
	•	der 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					
		sroom/ui-rule-making/			
☐ No: Pleas	se explain:				

Regulatory	Fairness Act Cost Considerations for a Sm	all Busin	ess Economic Impact Statement:			
This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, <b>may be exempt</b> from requirements of the Regulatory Fairness Act (see chapter 19.85 RCW). Please check the box for any applicable exemption(s):						
adopted solvegulation the adopted. Citation and This rule defined by F	ely to conform and/or comply with federal staturals rule is being adopted to conform or comply videscription:  a proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempted the status of the proposal of this proposal.	te or regu with, and o ot becaus roposed r	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 e the agency has completed the pilot rule process ule.  The provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was			
	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exemp	ot 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)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g)			
	(Correct or clarify language)		((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process			
	(construction) language,		requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit)			
☐ This rule	proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exemp	ot under F	• •			
	of exemptions, if necessary:					
COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES  If the proposed rule is <b>not exempt</b> , does it impose more-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. When considering the total claims spread across the state-wide employer base, the proposed rule would have a negligible impact on total costs for each employer.						
☐ 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:						
The public may obtain a copy of the small business economic impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by contacting:						
Ad	ame: ddress:					
	none: ax:					
	ιχ. ΓΥ:					
	mail:					
	ther:					
Date: May 4	ł, 2020	Signat	ure:			
Name: Dan Zeitlin						
Title: Employment Security Policy Director			Pul C-			