

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

	Page No.
August 7, 2013	
Welcome and Introductions	3
Review EHB 1396	5
Discuss Proposed Rule Changes	7
Rule-Making Process: What's Next	26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

Welcome and Introductions

MS. MYERS: My name is Juanita Myers. I'm the rules manager for the Unemployment Insurance Division. And we're going to -- just a reminder for those of you who are on the phone, we do have a court reporter here so your comments will be recorded and be part of a transcript of this hearing.

Can I ask that those of you on the phone mute your phones when you're not speaking so we don't hear your comments or dog barking?

I'm going to go ahead and start around the room and ask people to introduce themselves and then I'll ask for you on the phone. And please spell your last name -- well, spell your first and last -- spell your last name, your first name if you have an unusual name or an unusual spelling so our court reporter has those.

Let's go ahead and get started. Larry?

MR. SHEAHAN: Larry Sheahan, S-H-E-A-H-A-N, and I work for the Employment Security Department. I'm the UI legislative and regulatory process manager.

MR. MANTE: George Mante, M-A-N-T-E, analyst, UI legislation and rules.

1 MS. WELLS: My name is Robyn Wells. Last name is
2 W-E-L-L-S. I am the manager of the experience rating and
3 benefit charging unit with Employment Security.

4 MS. GLACKEN: My name is Donna Glacken,
5 G-L-A-C-K-E-N. And I'm a lead worker in the shared work
6 unit.

7 MS. JOHNSON: My name is Judy Johnson. I'm the
8 Unemployment Insurance legislator coordinator.

9 MS. BROWN: I'm Cheryl Brown. I'm the shared work
10 supervisor with Employment Security Department. Last name
11 Brown, B-R-O-W-N.

12 MS. MYERS: Can we go ahead and have those people on
13 the phone introduce themselves again?

14 MS. DECKER: My name is Miwa Decker, M-I-W-A,
15 D-E-C-K-E-R. I'm from Gavco Industries. I'm the
16 corporate accountant.

17 MS. MYERS: And that was Gavco Industries?

18 MR. DECKER: Yes.

19 MS. MYERS: Okay. I know there are others on the
20 phone.

21 MR. ENGEBRETSON: Jim Engebretson,
22 E-N-G-E-B-R-E-T-S-O-N. Inland Lighting, Yakima,
23 Washington.

24 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. And I believe there
25 was one more person on the phone.

1 go through the rules. There are two types of changes in
2 the rules we're making: Some mostly technical changes
3 just to comply with the changes in state law and then
4 there are some policy questions we want to look at. We're
5 not advocating either way on any of these policy questions
6 but we wanted -- because we're opening the rules up for
7 possible amendment, we wanted to get your input as to
8 whether these policy changes should be implemented.

9 Okay. Any questions? Okay. Let's go ahead and get
10 started.

11 I don't know if you have a copy of the legislation in
12 front of you. The changes are not significant -- or not
13 hugely significant.

14 For the changes from our previous law, we -- the bill
15 now allows individuals who are part-time workers to
16 participate in the program. Previously they had to be
17 full-time. It requires that the plan has at least two
18 workers affected. Our law was changed a couple years ago
19 to allow plans for workers -- plans with only one worker
20 affected. We've had to change that to two.

21 The employer has to notify us on their application
22 how many positions are being saved as a result of the
23 shared work plan and then there are some other more minor
24 changes to the rule as far as -- and there are also some
25 changes to the funding mechanism of the bill. There's

1 going to be a period of time back to June -- what is it --
2 July 1st of 2012 where employers who are participating
3 will be reimbursed by the federal government -- or the
4 State will be reimbursed by the federal government, so
5 companies participating in the plan will not be charged
6 their cost for participating.

7 The employees have to be employed on a permanent
8 basis. Temporary employees cannot participate. They
9 added some language to the legislation that says employers
10 have to retain certain benefits: health benefits,
11 retirement benefits, vacation, holidays and sick leave.
12 That was in there, the old law, but it also specifies now
13 that if they reduce those benefits for people who are not
14 in the plan, that they can also now reduce benefits
15 equally for people who do participate so they don't have a
16 two-tier -- they don't have to keep a two-tier where
17 they've reduced benefits for other employees but had to
18 maintain higher benefits for shared work employees. So
19 that is a change also.

20

21 Discuss Proposed Rule Changes

22

23 MS. MYERS: I'm going to go ahead now and walk
24 through the rule-making changes. You should have a copy.
25 It's called Chapter 192-250 WAC. And most of the changes

1 as I -- well, the changes that I'm going to go through
2 briefly are required by the legislation. And then we're
3 going to come back, you see a couple sections in there, I
4 think there are three where we've got -- where it says
5 review policy, and we'll come back and discuss those
6 because I think that will be where we spend the majority
7 of our time.

8 Under the first section where it says "definitions,"
9 we've eliminated the definition of full-time employment
10 because now part-time employees can participate in the
11 plan. We've added a placeholder for what we mean by
12 "permanent basis" and what we mean by "regular number of
13 hours of work" because we -- well, we wanted your input on
14 what you think "permanent" might be. Is it somebody who
15 worked X number of hours? Do they work particularly --
16 well, we can't have seasonal employees, but is it somebody
17 who works regularly one month on and one month off? And
18 is that their regular hours of work? Well, it would be
19 both. Is that permanent? Is that regular number of hours
20 of work? So I'd be interested in any of your thoughts on
21 those.

22 MS. KRUGER: At this time?

23 MS. MYERS: Yes.

24 MS. KRUGER: We are a remodeling and design firm, and
25 permanent to us could mean somebody that has been with the

1 company, well, for a number of years. And remodeling, you
2 may have ten jobs at once and then one job and then three
3 jobs and then six jobs. So a regular employee kind of
4 flows with the work at hand. So they could be kind of
5 coming and going and working more hours and less hours,
6 but they're always there for it.

7 MS. MYERS: But they're not on a seasonal basis. It
8 depends on the number of contracts you have.

9 MS. KRUGER: That's correct.

10 MS. MYERS: Okay. Any thoughts on what "regular
11 number of hours of work" means or should mean? Because
12 that could -- I know that can fluctuate in certain
13 companies. They might work 10 hours one week, 45 or 50
14 the next week. Do you have any suggestions as what we
15 should put in there as a definition? No? Okay.

16 Well, then we'll go ahead and see what we come up
17 with, and when we send these draft rules out for you to
18 look at, you'll have an opportunity to review them, to
19 review the definitions and then comment on. Sometimes
20 it's easier to comment on something that's already there.

21 The second section, WAC 192-250-010, we're only
22 making one change in paragraph 2. Where it says the
23 employer may reduce an employee's full-time work, that's
24 stricken and we put "usual," but actually we think it
25 should be "regular" because that's what we're defining in

1 the WAC, the regular hours of work. So we'll take another
2 look at that. But we have no additional changes for that
3 particular rule.

4 The next one, 192-250-015, is just a technical
5 change. The number that's assigned to the employer is now
6 going to be called an Employment Security Department
7 number as opposed to an ESD reference number. So that's
8 just a technical change just to -- it's not required by
9 the legislation. It's required by in-house policy changes
10 or procedure changes.

11 The next rule, 192-250-020, in paragraph 1 we made a
12 minor change on that one because an employer may have an
13 approved deferred payment contract on file, but what we're
14 looking at is that they need to be current on the plan.
15 So it does no -- it has no meaning to have them -- to say
16 that they have to have a plan on file if we're also not
17 requiring that they be current in their payments on that
18 deferred payment plan. So that's just kind of a cleanup
19 to clarify what our policy is. And again, in Subsection
20 (2) we just changed the name to ESD number as opposed to
21 reference number.

22 The next rule, 192-250-025, talks about the fringe
23 benefits. The employers have to maintain their health
24 benefits as though their weekly benefits had not been
25 reduced. Again, in the statute it allows them to reduce

1 those benefits for their shared work employees if they
2 also reduce them for the people who are not in the shared
3 work plan. They have to continue to provide employees
4 with defined contribution and defined benefit pension
5 plans if they do that before the plan is approved, and
6 those defined contribution and benefit pension plans are
7 those now covered by the Internal Revenue Service code
8 rather than the ERISA.

9 Subsection (2)(c) is just cleanup of the language and
10 adding sick leave under the same terms and conditions as
11 opposed to on the same basis. Because again, under the
12 same terms and conditions allows them to reduce if they
13 reduce them for the non-shared work employees. And the
14 other benefits that are offered to your employees like
15 long-term disability, life insurance, et cetera, they're
16 optional. They don't have to continue -- you as employers
17 do not have to continue to provide these benefits.
18 They're voluntary if you do.

19 Subsection (5), again, is just a cleanup of language
20 as opposed to trying to -- answering yes to plan
21 modifications, et cetera. We just are answering the
22 question with a yes, you may modify your application to
23 add additional employees. It's just, again, trying to
24 make the language a little more clear for -- to make --
25 well, we have a goal of trying to make our rules as

1 readable as possible. So I don't know if we've achieved
2 that, but I hope we have with these rules.

3 (6), again, we're just changing it to "usual hours of
4 work."

5 (7) refers to the shared work payments report as
6 opposed to report of shared work payments. Again, just
7 language cleanup.

8 I'm going to come back to Subsection (8) because
9 that's a review of policy and we'll have that as soon as
10 we complete our review of the remaining sections.

11 On page 6 of these rules, again, we just have a
12 change. The newly (2), again, to ESD number and taking
13 out the word "reference."

14 The changes to section 192-250-030 are, again, our
15 policy changes we'll come back and discuss in just a few
16 minutes.

17 The Section 192-250-035, we've stricken the language
18 about what are the requirements for participating in the
19 employer plan. Where it says that you have to have worked
20 at least 460 hours of work with this employer in the
21 calendar quarter, that's no longer a requirement because
22 part-time -- that referred to full-time employees, and
23 because part-time employees can now participate, we struck
24 that section.

25 And then the remaining sections are just renumbered.

1 On the next page, 9, we've stricken what is there as
2 (7): Is there a minimum or maximum number of hours I can
3 work in a week? Again, we've deleted that because both
4 full-time and part-time workers can participate.

5 And the next two rule-makings are more policy
6 changes.

7 So let me know if you have any changes on the more
8 technical changes that we've already gone through. And if
9 not, we'll go back and start talking about the policy
10 proposed -- not necessarily proposed. We haven't made a
11 decision as to we want these or not. We are simply
12 putting them out there for discussion by employers or
13 input from employers or planned participants to see what
14 your thoughts are.

15 So if you can go back to page 5, it's the
16 continuation of 192-250-025 where it says "review policy."
17 "What criteria will be used to evaluate a subsequent
18 shared work plan application?" And the question is,
19 should employers be limited to two plans within a
20 three-year period? That has been the policy for quite
21 some time.

22 Has somebody joined us on the phone?

23 MS. GRUWELL: This is LeeAnn Gruwell.

24 MS. MYERS: LeeAnn Gruwell. Can you spell your last
25 name, please.

1 MS. GRUWELL: G-R-U-W-E-L-L.

2 MS. MYERS: Thank you. And who do you represent?

3 MS. GRUWELL: Employer Barclay Dean Architectural
4 Products.

5 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. We finished our review
6 of the technical changes in the rules and you've joined us
7 just in time to discuss the proposed policy changes.

8 MS. GRUWELL: Thank you.

9 MS. MYERS: And just a reminder that the call is
10 being recorded. We have a court reporter here and so your
11 comments or your input can be -- will be transcribed and
12 form part of the permanent record so we can go back and
13 refer to the input we received when drafting the rules.

14 MS. GRUWELL: Okay.

15 MS. MYERS: Okay. And each time you speak, if you
16 could just say your name again. You don't have to spell
17 it again. But just say your name so that we here know
18 who's speaking. Obviously, we can't tell who's on the
19 phone unless you introduce yourselves again.

20 MS. KRUGER: I would like to comment on that policy.

21 MS. MYERS: Okay.

22 MS. KRUGER: I'm not exactly sure why the employers
23 are limited to two plans in a three-year period, but I
24 know that it was a great hardship to our company to lose
25 our shared work after two periods -- two plans and not

1 being eligible for the third one during the four- or
2 five-year recession.

3 We're in the construction industry. We used to have
4 45 people at the office. We're down to about 6. And at
5 times even those 6 people were on reduced hours. And it
6 was really a lifesaver for our company, this program, to
7 retain our key employees that have been with us a number
8 of years that were highly competent. And this program
9 helped them and it helped us.

10 I don't -- like I said, I'm not sure why, what the
11 reasoning is, but -- and I know there are other factors
12 because we used to have 45 people and then we only had 6
13 people paying into unemployment. Well, they, in the end,
14 got the raw end of the deal, those 6 people left because
15 they were paying for all those other -- other people and
16 we didn't qualify for some unemployment.

17 So I would just say there are certain industries
18 during a recession that get hit extremely hard, and to
19 have, gosh, unlimited during a recession for construction
20 workers or whatever would be helpful to us and to not be
21 limited to two plans.

22 MS. MYERS: Right. The rules were changed quite some
23 time ago that limited it to two plans just because we had
24 some employers who had been on the plans for years. So
25 after some internal discussions, we thought, Well, let's

1 limit it to two with a year break. But as you said, that
2 hasn't worked out during this long recession.

3 And I'm sorry if the phone is staticky. We're
4 getting static on our end and I think it's our phone.

5 MS. KRUGER: That's okay.

6 MS. MYERS: But, yeah, we are interested in people's
7 input on that. Our thought had been that if they meet the
8 other criteria of the law, that they are saving positions.
9 They're not -- it's due to a general economic downturn,
10 that type of thing, that there may not be any reason to
11 limit it to two as long as they continue to meet the other
12 requirements of the statute and of the regulations.

13 MS. GRUWELL: I concur. We are also in the
14 construction industry, and what we've found was the shared
15 work program was punitive to the office personnel because
16 they are not under a bargaining agreement. Those hourly
17 employees were able to -- basically, that's their version
18 of a shared work program. They are able to be compensated
19 differently than those employees that were in the office
20 and had been working the whole time. When it got slow we
21 were unable to accommodate them on a shared work program
22 because by that point, our rate was so high because of
23 trying to accommodate the field labor.

24 MS. MYERS: Right. And that's a point we're going to
25 discuss a little later on is their rate class. Because

1 that's in a separate rule. And so we'll be discussing
2 that in just a few minutes.

3 Any other input on limiting the number of plans to
4 two -- or eliminating the requirement that employers are
5 limited to two plans in a three-year period?

6 MS. HANDELAND: We would request that that limit be
7 removed.

8 MS. MYERS: Thank you.

9 MR. ENGBRETSON: Again, I concur. We are related --
10 directly related to the construction industry, and in 2012
11 there were 115 residential building permits issued in the
12 entire county of Yakima.

13 MS. MYERS: Wow.

14 MR. ENGBRETSON: Yeah.

15 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you for your input on that
16 particular one.

17 The next page, page 7, we have a couple of policy
18 changes there related to the requirement that employers
19 must have at least two employees participating in the
20 shared work plan. One, for example, that an employee --
21 excuse me -- an employer has two employees in the plan and
22 then drops one mid-plan, do we revoke the plan or allow
23 the employer to continue on the plan for the duration of
24 the approval of that particular plan? The second question
25 is, we have a number of plans out there where individuals

1 -- employers have only one person on the plan. Should we
2 basically grandfather them in and allow them to continue
3 their plan until it expires? So we'd be interested in
4 your thoughts on that.

5 MR. ENGEBRETSON: We fall into that category where we
6 had two employees on the work-share program -- shared work
7 program. There were limited employment opportunities in
8 Yakima over the last four years, and in March, our one
9 employee was able to find a job down in Tri-Cities and for
10 some other personal reasons wanted to move there anyway.
11 And so of his own volition he left and so we now have one
12 employee on that shared work program, and that expired on
13 July 31st.

14 MS. MYERS: Right. And unfortunately, we can't
15 change that one because the new law went into effect
16 July 28th and it requires that an employer has at least
17 two employees. And that's a law change.

18 MR. ENGEBRETSON: So we will not -- regardless, we
19 will not qualify for any participation in the shared work
20 program?

21 MS. MYERS: Not unless you have two employees.

22 MR. ENGEBRETSON: Well, but that takes care of that,
23 doesn't it?

24 MS. MYERS: Unfortunately, that was a change in state
25 law required by the federal law that the employer has to

1 -- we used to have -- allow it for one, and now it
2 requires that they have at least two.

3 MR. ENGBRETSON: So that's not going to change?
4 That's not under review?

5 MS. MYERS: That's not under review. What we're
6 talking about is people already have -- an employer gets a
7 new plan approved at two employees and midway through
8 their plan they drop one, should we allow them to
9 continue? Because now they only have one person on the
10 plan, do we allow them to continue for the duration of the
11 approval?

12 MR. ENGBRETSON: And because of the expiration,
13 we're out of that, correct?

14 MS. MYERS: Yes, you are. Yes, you are, I'm sorry to
15 say.

16 MR. ENGBRETSON: Well, thank you. It did us a lot
17 of good and our employees. We'll just have to figure out
18 what's going on. Thank you.

19 MS. MYERS: Okay.

20 MS. KRUGER: I guess I would say that they be
21 grandfathered in. If they have two employees, they would
22 qualify. It would be hard to -- or I don't know if that's
23 fair to take it away from someone that qualified at a
24 point. That's a very tough question, but I guess I would
25 go for they get grandfathered in if they start with two.

1 MS. MYERS: Okay.

2 MS. HANDELAND: I concur.

3 MS. MYERS: Okay. All right. Any other comments?

4 MS. GRUWELL: I just have a question. I understand
5 that shared work means there are two people, but is there
6 a reason to exclude a single employee that has reduced
7 hours?

8 MS. MYERS: I don't have a reason other than that's
9 what the federal law was changed to say. I don't know
10 what Congress' reasoning was behind that.

11 MS. GRUWELL: Well, I think they should be allowed to
12 continue.

13 MS. MYERS: Yeah. For those who already have an
14 approved plan.

15 MS. GRUWELL: Correct.

16 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. Any other input in
17 that section? Okay.

18 On page 10, Subsection (1)(a), right now we allow
19 benefits to -- we allow participation to individuals who
20 are paid on an hourly basis only unless we can determine a
21 -- take their rate of pay and establish an hourly wage
22 based on that. For example, we have -- there's people
23 employed on a piece rate, mileage rate, job rate,
24 commission basis and we've also run into cases where we
25 have salaried employees eligible for paid overtime. Those

1 people can be converted to an hourly rate. But the
2 discussion had been -- and again, we are not advocating
3 any of this, we're just asking for input -- should the
4 eligibility be limited to regular hourly employees? Any
5 input or questions?

6 MS. GRUWELL: No. It should not be limited to only
7 hourly employees.

8 MS. MYERS: Okay.

9 MS. KRUGER: I concur. No, it should not be limited
10 to regular hourly employees. Thank you.

11 MS. HANDELAND: I've heard the same thing from my
12 folks that they would like to see it expanded.

13 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you.

14 And now under (2) (a) we're going to get to the
15 section that will probably cause the most discussion here.
16 Right now businesses with a tax rate of 5.4 percent or
17 more are not permitted to participate in the program. And
18 we understand, particularly for small employers who add
19 just a couple employees to the plan, they can quickly go
20 from the lowest rate class up to the highest rate class
21 and then they're not allowed to participate in the plan
22 any longer.

23 So the questions are, should businesses with a tax
24 rate of 5.4 or more or in Rate Class 40, not including the
25 social cost factor, be eligible for participation in the

1 program? And if they're allowed to participate, should it
2 only be for the period that the State is being reimbursed
3 for the cost of the program by the federal government?

4 And I know this has impacted a number of employers
5 who have been cut off from shared work plan participation
6 because they move into the highest tax rate. So I would
7 be very much interested in your input on this.

8 MS. KRUGER: We were cut off because of our cost
9 factor. We went above 5.4, and it was because during the
10 recession we had to lay off so many people. We laid off
11 40 people, and the people left didn't qualify for shared
12 work. So it hurt us. And so no. I don't think that
13 businesses with a tax rate higher than 5.4 should be
14 ineligible.

15 MS. GRUWELL: I concur. We -- our office employees
16 were all denied shared work because we had, again, in
17 construction -- I think this depends on the industry
18 somewhat. Some things, some business mixes are, as you
19 said, some of the rate classes, et cetera, cause the
20 numbers to -- I think we did all we could to manage our
21 unemployment and keep people working and our -- when it
22 came time for us to look to try to keep project managers,
23 we were unable to do that because the field employees had
24 already -- with that we had already run up our rate by
25 then.

1 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. What about the thought
2 that -- the reason we put this in originally into the rule
3 was that after a period of time once you move into rate
4 class -- the top rate class or the top tax rate, the cost
5 that you incur in the program are socialized across all
6 employers. So that's why we originally put it in is to
7 reduce the amount of socialized cost.

8 So one of the thoughts -- again, it's just a thought,
9 we're not advocating yes or no -- is that if we allow
10 participation by individuals -- or employers in the top
11 tax rate, should it be for a limited period of time from
12 the period -- for the period from July 1, 2012, up to 2015
13 where our costs -- the cost of the program are reimbursed
14 to the State or should this be an indefinite change?

15 MS. KRUGER: Basically, what the people in the higher
16 tax rate have are those are the people that got hurt the
17 worst and they are the people, unfortunately, that are
18 getting penalized by this. And I don't think it was set
19 up to work that way. I think this program is set up to
20 help the people most in need. And unfortunately, for the
21 cost of the program, the people with the most cost are in
22 the most need. I cannot stress enough that those are the
23 people that need it the most.

24 And we felt pretty bad that we were the small
25 businesses, the one in the industry that has gotten worse

1 by the recession, and we were the ones that were kicked
2 out while the other businesses that were doing well, you
3 know, could participate. It did not make any sense to us.

4 As far as the limiting, I just think, like I said
5 before, with the two-year versus three-year plan or
6 indefinite, you know, maybe there is a longer four- or
7 five-year recession cut-off thing. But I don't think it
8 should be restricted too tight in these long recessions.
9 Things have picked up and we're coming out of it and we're
10 going to be better now, but during those times, help is
11 needed. I would not restrict it.

12 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments?

13 MS. GRUWELL: I concur with what was said. We were
14 denied during the time we really needed it, and it only
15 impacted office employees. So I think it's punitive that
16 it's not able to be taken advantage of when this is
17 exactly what it was designed for.

18 MS. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay.

19 Well, that concludes our review of the rules. Does
20 anybody else have any comments or other suggestions for
21 rule changes that they've identified that we did not? No?
22 Okay.

23 What we're going to do is go back and take your
24 comments, make some decisions based on the policy comments
25 we received and come up with some definitions of

1 "permanent basis" and "regular number of hours of work,"
2 and we'll send these back out for you to take a look and
3 the draft rules that we will be sending to the larger
4 stakeholder group. But because you asked for
5 participation, you'll get the first chance to review them,
6 and you can comment then at that time. You'll see what
7 the decision was. But we will certainly take your input
8 into consideration.

9 It's very important to us that the public participate
10 in this rule-making effort because we don't -- we aren't
11 out there in the public trying to manage businesses and we
12 need to know how our rules impact the regulated community.
13 So unless you have additional comments we're going to --
14 oh, I'm sorry. There is one.

15 MS. HANDELAND: It isn't in regards to the
16 rule-making but it is a question about the process. We're
17 trying to reduce our paper costs and I'm not too familiar
18 with this. I'm new to it. But I understand it's pretty
19 paper intensive. And is there a way that we could do the
20 application process online or have -- I think there's
21 something about downloading the employee list in an Excel
22 format or something like that. I haven't seen it but --
23 and I apologize, but can somebody speak to that?

24 MS. BROWN: I'll go ahead and speak to that. We do
25 have an application and participant list that is in both

1 PDF and Excel, and that is available for us to either
2 e-mail to you or you can get that on our Web site. And
3 its interactive and it is like a form-fill so you're able
4 to input that, print it off, go ahead and sign it and then
5 you can upload that right back onto -- scan it back in
6 your machine and upload it right back in.

7 MS. HANDELAND: Thanks very much.

8 MS. BROWN: So I know that's one of the things that
9 we had heard from a lot of employers and so that's why we
10 went ahead and put that in place, and also to save the
11 cost of paper as well.

12 MS. HANDELAND: Thank you.

13

14 Rule-making Process: What's Next

15

16 MS. MYERS: Anyone else? All right.

17 As I said, we'll go back, draft the rules based on
18 the input we received from you and from our management
19 here at the Department, and we will send you out a revised
20 copy showing the changes that we are going -- that we are
21 proposing. You'll have an opportunity again at that point
22 to see what we've put in there and provide your comments
23 again. And, again, we are most interested in hearing from
24 you. We are kind of on a fast track to get these
25 implemented, and so hopefully maybe within a couple of

1 weeks we can get these drafted and out to you to take a
2 look at.

3 So that being said, we'll go ahead and end the
4 hearing. And I thank you all for your participation.
5 Thank you.

6 (Whereupon, proceedings
7 concluded at 9:55 a.m.)

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

