



## Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee

### Meeting details

**Date:** Tuesday, September 27, 2022

**Time:** 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

**Location:** Zoom

#### Committee members present

- Robert Battles
- Julia Gorton
- Anne Paxton
- Josh Swanson
- Jerry VanderWood
- Brenda Wiest
- Courtney Williams

#### Committee members absent

- Cindy Richardson
- William Westmoreland

#### ESD staff

- Drew Cassidy
- Wendy Goldmark
- Mariana Hernandez
- Caitlyn Jekel
- Matt Klein
- Scott Michael
- JR Richards
- Jill Will
- Dan Zeitlin

## Summary

### Meeting Recorded

This meeting was [recorded](#) and also [livestreamed](#) by TVW.

### Welcome and Opening Remarks

Employment Security Department (ESD) Policy Director, Dan Zeitlin, welcomed everyone and asked Wendy Goldmark to take roll call. All committee members were present except Cindy Richardson and William Westmoreland.

### Agenda

Dan Zeitlin reviewed the meeting agenda and asked if anyone had any questions. (See Addendum I.)

### Meeting Minutes

Dan Zeitlin requested that everyone review the meeting minutes for March 25, 2022 and provide their feedback. Josh Swanson made a motion to approve the minutes and Brenda Wiest seconded the motion. Dan asked for all members in favor to say, "Aye." All members responded, "Aye". Dan asked members that oppose to say, "Nay." No one responded. The March 25, 2022 meeting minutes were approved.

Dan Zeitlin requested that everyone review the meeting minutes for August 30, 2022 and provide their feedback. Brenda Wiest made a motion to approve the minutes and Josh Swanson seconded the motion. Dan asked for all members in favor to say, "Aye." All members responded, "Aye". Dan asked members that oppose to say, "Nay." No one responded. The August 30, 2022 meeting minutes were approved.

### Opening Discussion

Dan Zeitlin opened the meeting discussion with a slide presentation and highlighted the below topics to be covered.

- UIAC Charter
- Agency Request Legislation
- Minimum Weekly Benefit Amount Report
- UI Overpayment Project
- October Meeting Topics

### UIAC Charter: Decision Making Structure

The members agree that the preferred method for decision-making on matters before the UIAC shall be consensus, when possible. If consensus cannot be reached, the members agree to use the Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised to propose and agree upon decisions before the committee.

***Bob Battles:** I still have concerns with the decision making. So how we do pay for medical leave if you don't have consensus? Then the committee doesn't have a position on what you're asking of it. The committee is slanted at this point and we'd in the past had*

equal representation. We don't have that anymore. And so, therefore, we raise this concern. Then if you don't have consensus, you don't have a position of the committee.

**Dan Zeitlin:** That sounds like a position that says you, presumably speaking on at least half of the employer side, would like the language to just be the first part. "The members agree that the preferred method for decision-making on matters before the ULAC shall be consensus."

**Bob Battles:** Shall be consensus is correct.

**Brenda Wiest:** I certainly appreciate Bob's position although I'm unclear on what he means exactly by slanted. I think that it is preferred that we'd be consensus. But if there is a majority decision and the minority are included on the report, which I shared at the previous meeting, then I think it's possible for a committee to take a position and everyone's views be heard.

**Josh Swanson:** I would just echo what Brenda had to say, and I think the diversity of the committee has changed a bit and now it is a bit larger. The objective is to certainly shoot towards consensus if at all possible. If it's not attainable then we've still got to be able to function as a working policy making, or at least policy advising, body.

**Courtney Williams:** Consensus could hinder the potential to get more work done if we're constantly focused on consensus because doesn't Robert's Rule of order mean majority rule? I just worry that if we're focused on consensus, it could hinder the need to get really important work done with policy.

**Julia Gorton:** I wanted to echo Bob's comments that the committee is no longer an equal representation of business and worker interests, and I think for that reason it's really critical to maintain the governance by consensus which worked really well for ULAC. We were able to pass almost unanimously, landmark, historic relief that worked for both business and workers. So, I think in practice consensus has worked really well. I also want to echo the portion of Bob's comments where not having a consensus or endorsement of a certain policy by the ULAC does not bar the department, or any organization individually, from taking their own position or advancing legislation or policy.

**Jerry VanderWood:** Our concern was the old ULAC [committee] was balanced between employer and worker interests and so this makes us a little nervous if I'm not mistaken. Two of the general public representatives today introduced themselves as representing worker interests and so that does give us a little pause that we've lost that sense of collaboration that kind of forced us to get to consensus. I do support the comments by Bob and Julia.

**Anne Paxton:** I would support not excluding consensus. Obviously that's a goal, but just not making it the only format for airing and getting a decision. I think that having only a consensus does push towards a very narrow spectrum of subjects; that on which people can get consensus and like a lot of the meatier subjects do need more discussions. So, in the interest of fuller discussion of the issues, I would support having a vote on the issues.

**Courtney Williams:** How are we making efforts to regain balance? The concern from, I think Bob and others is the balance and equity of the two sides.

**Dan Zeitlin:** We structured as four business representatives, four labor representatives and one workforce representative, and with the disbanding of ESAC we're back to being tied to the statute, and ultimately in doing outreach we were looking to identify individuals who both have an interest in these issues and a commitment and desire to work proactively. We identified three general public members Courtney Williams, Ann Paxton and William Westmoreland who now represents local areas. So that's where we are in terms of committee membership and reflection of the statute.

**Bob Battles:** We're not against the robust conversation. In fact, I think the ULAC over the last year and a half have had very robust conversations. It's a matter of what can be represented outside as a position of the board. If you don't have a consensus of the group then you don't really have a position of the board and that's the concern – to have the balanced group again. Not against anybody that's been added or changed, but with a balanced group.

**Brenda Wiest:** You can say that a majority of the members agreed to this. You can tell the vote which would tell its own story. You could include a minority report, and it isn't to say that we wouldn't all agree generally. But I think that the length of this conversation over consensus versus non-consensus is a little bit emblematic of how difficult it will be to move forward on issues.

**Dan Zeitlin:** Well, I think at this point it would be bad form by the chair to call a vote on the issue of consensus. So, we're not going to do that. I think it would be helpful here if members have ideas on language for this section, the charter or thoughts on this to please send them my way, and I think we'll otherwise find time to engage with committee members on this topic between this meeting and the next. We're not going to vote on anything today. So, we can proceed and continue this discussion and, hopefully, get to an agreement on this and a charter at the next meeting.

**Julia Gorton:** In the absence of this charter are we operating under the previous ULAC charter?

**Dan Zeitlin:** *There seems to be consensus on the rest of the charter, which mirrors the old charter, so we just won't call a vote on anything while we work through this issue.*

Dan Zeitlin handed the meeting over to Caitlyn Jekel, Government Relations Director for ESD to continue the discussion.

### **UI Agency Request Legislation**

Remove required review of availability issues during appeal (Benefit Appeal Procedures)

- [RCW 50.32.040](#) requires the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) to consider availability issues on each case it reviews, even when availability is not an issue addressed by ESD in the determination letter
- Proposed removal of this provision to reduce time and confusion for individuals and employers engaged in appeals
- Increase OAH efficiency

Extend flexibility of job search monitoring requirements (Job Search Requirements)

- ESD's legal ability to pursue alternate ways for claimants to fulfill job search requirements is set to sunset in 2023
- Proposed removal of the sunset to make these provisions permanent, adding reporting requirement

**Bob Battles:** *If nobody's raising this issue and department has already reviewed it, we agree that requiring that second step with a huge backlog and the number of cases you've got that it makes sense to allow it. It does not bar them from bringing this up if they see something. It just doesn't mandate them having to do it. And so, we agree with this [Benefit Appeal Procedures] legislation.*

**Caitlyn Jekel:** *We're not going to ask for a vote today, just bringing you up to speed on where we are. And checking if folks have any additional needs before the next meeting, when we will engage a formal vote.*

Caitlyn Jekel handed the meeting back to Dan Zeitlin. Dan Zeitlin introduced Matt Klein, Operations Research Specialist, ESD and handed the meeting over to him to continue the discussion.

### **Minimum Weekly Benefit Amount Report**

[RCW 50.12.355](#) (ESSB 5061):

By December 1, 2021, and annually thereafter until December 1, 2025, the department must report to the governor and the appropriate committees of the legislature:

An analysis of the impact of the minimum weekly benefit amount increase, including comparing wages earned and benefits claimed for those individuals receiving the minimum weekly benefit amount and the average claim duration for those individuals.

- The department must use an existing unemployment insurance advisory committee comprising of members of business and members of labor to consult in the development of this report, including any evidentiary assumptions underlying the report.
- The report must be specifically discussed in a minimum of two meetings of the committee each year prior to submitting the report.
- The report must also include a section for committee members to respond directly to the contents of the report.

We estimate that that, on average, for claimants who:

- Got the Minimum Weekly Benefit Amount
- Registered for UI during the weeks from July 4 to August 8, 2021
- The MWBA increase caused an increase of \$1,760.20 in average earnings in the quarter after the claim
- The MWBA increase caused a decrease of 1.9 weeks in average claim duration
- The MWBA increase caused a slight decrease in total dollars claimed in UI compensation

**Note:** Results based on still limited data, future studies through 2025 will give more information.

#### Question: Controlling for Economic Trends

Explain how, in general, we can control for economy-wide trends

- “Fixed Effects”
- Examples in our context:
  - The min and max WBA in the week that a benefit year begins
  - Work search requirements being reinstated on July 4, 2021
  - Covid business restrictions ending on June 30, 2021
  - Covid-19 disrupting labor markets
  - Inflation

#### Appendix A: Example Model

- Income (Y) and college major choice (X)

$$Y_i = \beta_1 X_i + \epsilon_i$$

$$\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial X_i} = \beta_1$$

- The error term contains everything correlated with Y *except* for college major choice
  - gender, race, age, experience, parent's majors, college choice, socio-economic background, anything that explains earnings

#### Appendix A: More Controls

- Adding a variable removes it from the error term:

$$Y_i = \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 age_i + \epsilon_i$$

- Now  $\epsilon_i$  contains everything except for college major choice and age
- Appendix A covers why removing things from the error term is helpful

#### Fixed Effects Definition

Fixed effects are a type of control variable that we can include in the model, which capture a broad range of factors that influence  $Y_i$  – they are a specific type of catch-all control variable.

A fixed effect is simply an indicator variable for each of the values a variable can take.

#### Fixed Effects Example

- Suppose we have data on everyone who graduated college from 2000 to 2010 in Washington State for our model

- Then, including fixed effects for year of graduation:

$$Y_i = \beta_1 X_i + \gamma_i + \epsilon_i, \text{ where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i &= \mathbb{I}(A_{2000}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2001}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2002}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2003}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2004}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2005}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2006}) \\ &+ \mathbb{I}(A_{2007}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2008}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2009}) + \mathbb{I}(A_{2010}) \end{aligned}$$

What does this remove from the error?

- Everything *common to all people that graduated college in a specific year*
- This includes a huge range of factors:
  - Prevailing labor market conditions in the year they graduated
  - Inflation in the year they graduated
  - Many specific things like:
    - Number of nursing job openings in WA in the year they graduated
    - Average price of gasoline in WA in the year they graduated

MWBA Study Fixed Effects

- Examples in our context:
  - The min and max WBA in the week that a benefit year begins
  - Work search requirements being reinstated on July 4, 2021
  - Covid business restrictions ending on June 30, 2021
  - Covid-19 disrupting labor markets
  - Inflation
- **Red Font:** ensures that the Conditional Independence Assumption holds (Appendix A)
- **Black Font:** also nicely captured

*Julia Gorton:* Does this mean for future reports you'll be able to control for economic circumstances or is this going to be included in the current report.

*Matt Klein:* Yes, to both. It's included in the current report and we'll use the same modeling techniques in the future to control for changes in economic conditions.

## Break

Dan Zeitlin announced a 10-minute break and asked everyone to return at 11:10 a.m.

Dan Zeitlin welcomed everyone back and handed the meeting over to JR Richards, UI Customer Support Director for ESD, to continue the discussion. JR Richards gave an overview of the Overpayment Project and stressed that this is a top project in UI, meaning that the staff on the project are prioritizing this work over all other work. JR then handed the meeting over to UI policy team members Mariana Hernandez, Lead UI Policy Analyst and Drew Cassidy, UI Policy Analyst to continue the discussion.

## Overpayment Waiver Policy

Which overpayments are we talking about?

- Regular state overpayments
- Federally funded overpayments:
  - Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA)
  - Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC)
  - Federally funded waiting week (WW) benefits
  - Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC)
  - Lost Wages Assistance (LWA)
  - Mixed Earner Unemployment Compensation (MEUC)
- Benefits overpaid for the following weeks:
  - Starting with the week ending March 7, 2020
    - The first full week after Gov. Inslee's emergency declaration on Feb. 29, 2020
  - Ending with the week ending September 4, 2021
    - The last full week of federal benefits under CARES Act, Continued Assistance Act, American Rescue Plan Act
  - Call this the "pandemic period"

### Baseline rules for individualized waivers

- Waiver *cannot* be granted if:
  - Claimant engaged in fraud, misrepresentation or nondisclosure (RCW 50.20.070(4), 50.20.190(2))
  - Claimant was discharged due to misconduct (RCW 50.20.066(5))
  - Claimant was paid conditionally while an issue was investigated (WAC 192-220-017(3)(c))
- Waiver *can* be granted if:
  - Claimant is not "at fault" and collection of the overpayment is contrary to "equity and good conscience." (RCW 50.20.190(2))

### Policy changes for individualized waivers

- As matter of policy, expanding what "other personal factors" the Department will look at when assessing whether claimant is "at fault"
  - Limited English proficiency
  - Physical and mental health disabilities
  - Experiencing homelessness
  - Confusing/conflicting information from the Department
  - Confusing/conflicting information from the claimant's employer
  - Living with or escaping threats to physical safety, e.g., domestic violence
  - Level of education
  - Lack of digital literacy or reliable access to digital tools
  - Medical or health emergencies
  - Living in conditions resulting in delayed communication, e.g., rural area with longer than typical mail delivery
- As matter of policy, expanding what "other factors" the Department will look at when assessing "equity and good conscience" aka "fairness"



- Detrimental reliance on the continued receipt of unemployment benefits
- Tried to get clarifying information from the Department, but unable to get through
- Substantial delay between when benefits are received and the denial letter issued
- Health problem or disability of claimant or someone in claimant's care
- Criminal or civil action will result if claimant is unable to maintain a financial obligation
- Reliance upon wrong information from an official source (Department, employer, newspaper)

### Planned emergency rules

- Conditional payments for weeks in the pandemic period can also be eligible for waiver (WAC 192-220-017(3)(c))
- Individuals who were denied an overpayment waiver can re-apply based on updated fault and equity and good conscience factors (WAC 192-220-080)
- Adoption of approved federal blanket waivers (WAC 192-220-018)

### Federal blanket waivers approved by USDOL

- Claimant answered “no” to being able and available to work but PUA, FPUC, WW or PEUC were paid anyways and then denied later causing an overpayment.
- Eligible for payment under state unemployment for a given week, but through no fault of claimant, they were incorrectly paid under either the PUA or PEUC program at a higher weekly benefit amount (WBA).
- Claimant answered “no” to being unemployed, partially unemployed, or unable or unavailable to work because of approved COVID-19 reason(s) and we paid PUA anyways resulting in an overpayment.
- Complied with instructions from state to submit proof of earnings for calculating PUA WBA or MEUC WBA, but at no fault of claimant, we used self-employment gross income instead of net income or documents from the wrong tax year resulting in higher WBA. Overpayment was established for the difference.

### Additional federal blanket waiver requests to USDOL

- Claimant received PUA benefits during the weeks between when the CAA passed (week ending Jan. 2, 2021) and when we sent notices to PUA claimants to provide proof of employment/self-employment. Claimant didn't submit proof and was denied PUA.
- Claimant answered no to work search, when it was required under state law, but received PUA, PEUC, or WW benefits anyways, and then was disqualified causing an overpayment.
- Claimant answered yes to refusing an offer of work, but received PUA, PEUC, or WW benefits anyways, and then was disqualified causing an overpayment.
- Employer did not respond to notice of separation until 30 or more days after deadline and claimant was denied based on employer's untimely response which caused PEUC overpayment. No finding of fault, nondisclosure or misrepresentation by the claimant.
- Claimant identifies as LEP or as having primary language other than English, and claimant received correspondence, forms or other documentation in a language not their primary language as indicated by ESD records.



The meeting was handed over to Scott Michael, Legal Services Manager, ESD, to continue the discussion.

### Impacts on Employers

#### *Employer Rates*

- All federally funded benefits are not charged to employer tax rates, experience or social
- State benefits paid to individuals who are later found not eligible for those benefits are not charged to individual employer experience rates
- Overpaid state benefits that are not recovered are socialized
- Because state benefits subject to overpayment have been paid, they are already factored into UI trust fund/tax projections

#### *Reimbursable Employers*

- Overpaid state benefits need to be returned to the state trust fund, either from the claimant or employer
- If overpayment is waived, employer gets notified and an opportunity to appeal

**Julia Gorton:** *Do you have an estimate or a sense of what percentage were federal benefits and what were state benefits?*

**Dan Zeitlin:** *The pandemic was majority Federal payments. That's not to say it would work out this way for overpayments, but by and large about two-thirds were federal, one-third state. We are still working to get our arms around the amount here, the total amount, and then how it's broken down by each program. We do submit reports to the Department of Labor on a quarterly basis, and that information is also contained in quarterly reports we send to the legislature as required by a Senate bill, SB 5193. Once we have our arms around each entitlement amount and as we're going through this project, we'll keep the committee updated on total amount of waivers, total individuals, total dollars and each entitlement.*

**Julia Gorton:** *The social cost factor of the rate? I'm just trying to figure out how this impacts the calculator.*

**Scott Michael:** *For the social tax, it's pretty much a factor of how much money is left in the trust fund. How much benefits have been paid, and also how much money is coming in as far as employer taxes. So, those are the biggest three components, as far as how we calculate the social tax. The benefits have already been paid out, so it's already part of the social tax calculation, because they've already been paid out.*

### **Potential October Meeting Topics**

- OPMA Training
- September UI Trust Fund Report
- UI Overpayments Continued
- Appeals Backlog
- ESSB 5193 (2021) Implementation
- CARES Act Program Close-Out
- State Quality Service Plan

**Josh Swanson:** *I think one of our priorities is going to be the appeals backlog. We're seeing a lot of that right now, but your list of topics are certainly on par with what we are interested in.*

**Bob Battles:** *I agree with Josh. I would also echo the appeals. The backlog, I think, is a huge issue for employers as well because of the fact that it just delays everything across the board.*

**Julia Gorton:** *We're starting to get questions from businesses who've got appeals in the queue on what happens if they prevail or if they don't – what happens with their rate – so that could also fit into the appeals backlog conversation.*

**Public Comments**

None

**Adjourned**

Dan Zeitlin thanked everyone for their continued active participation and for their commitment to this work, then ended the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

**Next meeting**

October 19, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to noon via Zoom.

Addendum I

Agenda

Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee (UIAC)

Tuesday, September 27, 2022 | 10:00 am - 12:00 pm | Via Zoom | 212 Maple Park Ave SE, Olympia, WA 98501

Time	Topic
10:00 am	Welcome from Dan Zeitlin, Employment System Policy and Integrity (ESPI) Director, Employment Security Department (ESD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Agenda Overview</li> </ul>
10:05 am	Approval of March 25, 2022 and August 30, 2022 Meeting Minutes
10:10 am	General Administration - Dan Zeitlin, ESPI Director, ESD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O UIAC Charter Vote</li> </ul>
10:20 am	UI Agency Request Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Caitlyn Jekel, Government Relations Director, ESD</li> <li>o Benefit Appeal Procedures</li> <li>o Job Search Requirement</li> </ul>
10:30 am	Minimum Weekly Benefit Amount Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Dan Zeitlin, ESPI Director, ESD</li> <li>-Matt Klein, PhD, Operations Research Specialist, ESD</li> </ul>
11:00 am	Break
11:10 am	UI Overpayment Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-JR Richards, Unemployment Insurance Customer Service Director, ESD</li> <li>-Scott Michael, Legal Services Manager, ESD</li> <li>-Mariana Hernandez, Lead UI Policy Analyst, ESD</li> <li>-Drew Cassidy, UI Policy Analyst, ESD</li> </ul>
11:40 am	October Meeting Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Dan Zeitlin, ESPI Director, ESD</li> </ul>
11:50 am	Public Comment
12:00 am	Adjourn

For more information, please visit the UIAC website at <https://esd.wa.gov/newsroom/UIAC>

RECORDING DISCLAIMER:

*This meeting is being recorded and will be live streamed by TVW. Please be advised that your image and voice will be captured and recorded during the videoconference. Your participation in this videoconference equals consent to be recorded as required by law.*

**Addendum II****DRAFT - Revised**

# UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARTER

**Purpose**

The Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee (UIAC) shall aid the commissioner in formulating policies and discussing problems related to the administration of the Unemployment Insurance (UI) program and assuring impartiality and freedom from political influence in the solution of such problems: RCW 50.12.200. In doing so, the Committee will provide comment on unemployment insurance policy, operations, and performance management, as well as other issues the Committee determines to require its consideration. The Committee will provide a forum for listening to concerns of stakeholders and seeking input to improve the program to best serve workers and business.

**Goals**

The UI program provides critical financial support for workers while bolstering the broader economy. Identifying avenues to improve the UI program so that it better supports workers and businesses, including in times of economic crisis, is a vital endeavor.

The Committee will play a critical role in considering and providing recommendations to the Employment Security Department (ESD) to aid the department in meeting two agency strategic goals:

- Our most complex processes (pertaining to the UI program) are made simple and easy for staff and customers (workers and employers).
- People receive accessible, safe, and equitable services (UI) at the right time in the way they need it.

In aiding ESD in meeting these goals, the Committee will seek to advise the department on improvements to the unemployment benefits and tax system by deliberating and providing recommendations on:

- Policy matters, including changes to state law and rules.
- Operational issues, including communications and direct interactions with customers.
- Performance management, including provide quality and timely benefits and tax services.

The Committee also maintains goals to:

- Foster community and stakeholder engagement in considering improvements.
- Commit to timely, robust, and open communication to the public, and to engaged stakeholder communities.

## Membership

The Committee is made up of nine individuals appointed by the Commissioner. Three members appointed to represent employers. Three members appointed to represent employees. Three members appointed to represent the general public: RCW 50.12. 200. The Commissioner also delegates a representative from ESD to serve as Chair of the Committee. At the time of this Charter's creation, the following members have been appointed by the Commissioner:

**Employer Representative:** Bob Battles, Association of Washington Business

**Employer Representative:** Julia Gorton, Washington Hospitality Association

**Employer Representative:** Jerry Vanderwood, Association of General Contractors

**Employee Representative:** Cindy Richardson, UNITE HERE Local 8

**Employee Representative:** Josh Swanson, Operating Engineers 302

**Employee Representative:** Brenda Wiest, Teamsters 117

**General Public:** Anne Paxton, Unemployment Law Project

**General Public:** William Westmoreland, Pacific Mountain Workforce Development Council

**General Public:** Courtney Williams, Community Employment Alliance

## Member Appointment

### TERMS

Members are appointed by the Commissioner to serve an initial term through the end of calendar year 2023. Following the initial term, the Commissioner will determine future terms for the Committee.

### MEMBER REPLACEMENT

Should a member resign from the Committee during their term, the Commissioner will appoint a replacement member.

## Member Expectations

### MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS WITH ONE ANOTHER OUTSIDE OF MEETINGS

Members may communicate outside of the Committee meetings. Member communications outside of the Committee are not on *behalf* of the advisory committee and individual members are not authorized by the Committee to make decisions for the Committee.

### MEMBERS COMPENSATION

The members shall serve without compensation but are entitled to reimbursement for travel expenses as provided in RCW 43.03.050 and 43.03.060. The committee may utilize such personnel and facilities of the department as it needs, without charge.

## **Council Meetings**

### **MEMBER MEETING – CADENCE**

Members will meet once a month or as otherwise needed through the end of calendar year 2022 and will determine the meeting schedule thereafter.

### **MEMBER MEETINGS - PROXY**

Members may, after giving notice via email or telephone of at least 24 hours to the Chair, send a proxy member to the meeting. The proxy member will have full authority to act on behalf of the appointed member. If a proxy member attends and participates in the meeting as a member, the appointed member for whom a proxy was sent may not attend the meeting in his or her capacity as an appointed member.

### **MEMBER MEETINGS- QUORUM**

The members agree that a quorum constitutes a simple majority of the total number of members excluding the Chair.

### **MEMBER MEETINGS- DISCUSSION**

The Chair may, with consent from a majority of Committee members, allow individuals that do not serve on the Committee to participate in Committee discussions. Such individuals shall not vote on matters in front of the Committee members. The public shall have the opportunity to provide comment at all Committee meetings.

### **DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE**

The members agree that the preferred method for decision-making on matters before the UIAC shall be consensus, when possible. If consensus cannot be reached, the members agree to use the *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* to propose and agree upon decisions before the committee.