

WORK SESSION OF THE TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION

DATE

SEPTEMBER 11, 2024

Wednesday, September 11, 2024

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Good afternoon, everyone. This work session is called to order. We need to check on public comments.

MR. TROBMAN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: No public commenters.

Let's jump right in then. We're here today to talk specifically about 40 TAC Chapter 815.134 which is the marketplace contractor platform. We met in June on this. We took a good look at the issue. I thought we had a good conversation. Everybody went on the record with what was some exceptional information. It asked staff to go back and take a look at this to parse our statements, try to find some commonalities of policy in there and look to see if any type of communication needed to go out to the offices here at TWC at large. It is my understanding staff has a document to present. I've actually seen it. It's good. Mr. Trobman, I'll just hand it over to you and present the document, any context you want to give. Obviously, there will be some discussion.

MR. TROBMAN: Yes, sir. Well, you know, over the summer we have developed a draft tax department's guidance documents. It's in the form a UI tax letter. It's primarily designed to guide our tax staff and other staff who touch the evaluation process when evaluating business models and applying our agency marketplace platform rules. This document will be

disseminated across that audience. They will also be trained specifically on the application of this guidance to ensure both uniformity and consistency in all of the decision making that's going on with these types of applications. We're confident that the issuance of this document and the associated training will yield the positive results you all are looking for to help align our rules with this critical segment of our state's economy. So with that I'll turn it over to Sergio who can walk through some of the nuts and bolts here.

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

SERGIO LOPEZ: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. For the record, Sergio Lopez, director of unemployment insurance tax department. Presented for your consideration and approval is Unemployment Insurance Tax Letter 3-24. The letter will provide revised guidance to staff who are evaluating and determining on a business entity meets the conditions of the marketplace platform. Texas Administrative Code 815.134 was amended in 2019 to create an exception to employment for marketplace platform and contractors. At the time we issued a UI Tax Letter 3-19, which provided guidance to staff on [inaudible]. As the marketplace platform and contractor landscape evolved it became necessary, basically, to provide revised guidance to staff. The letter expands on a few areas especially three of the nine marketplace platform divisions, specifically A, G, and H. A reads that all or substantially all of the payments made to the contractor shall be on a per-job or

transaction basis. Revised quidance is that hourly wage may translate to a per-job or transaction basis. G reads the marketplace contractor is responsible for providing the necessary tools, materials, and equipment. The tax letter clarifies that tools and equipment may be provided by the client who engaged the marketplace contractor. H reads the marketplace platform does not control the details or methods for the services performed by a marketplace contractor. Like G, the revised quidance makes it clear that it is acceptable for the client who engaged the marketplace contractor to provide instructions and direction. The UI letter, UI tax letter, also provides a high-level decision flow for the staff and emphasizes that the initial investigation and draft determination must be submitted to our UI tax operations team for a quick review, sorry, for a quality review and approval for that final determination. The Tax Letter 3-24, if approved, will proceed with training UI tax accounts examiners on the revised guidance. So that concludes my presentation. I'm available for questions. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Any comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: My comment would be that I'd like to thank staff first of all for the work in developing guidance and applying Texas Workforce Commission rule 815.314 to unemployment insurance tax investigations. It's

crucial that staff continue to ensure that online marketplace contracting conditions are fully met to determine the existence of an independent contractor relationship. I believe that the proposed UI tax letter will provide valuable assistance in evaluating these cases and help the commission to adapt to the evolving digital marketplace. However, I'm concerned that some of the businesses might misrepresent themselves as marketplace platform to avoid full employment, which could impact the state's economy. Therefore, it's essential for the commission to provide clear internal guidance on applying marketplace platform rules. Additionally, these matters should be assessed on a caseby-case basis and I support the guidance outlined in the tax letter to aid staff in evaluating marketplace exemptions effectively.

information I want to add to the record. Obviously, thank you very much staff, Eric, you guys, for catching me up especially the first work session was on the marketplace issue here and along with that and our team here led by Tommy Simmons on the tax cases that we go through [inaudible]. So, thank you all very much for that. Also, I'd like to thank Michael Britt for showing up in the meeting here too. I appreciate, always appreciate his support and his presence. So we got that. Ideally, and one more thing. The remarks and the items we have a lot of work has been done to get to where we're at. I think where I'm going to end

here is one minor concern that we want to address. Maybe we can have that conversation. Definitely, I thank Tommy for his experience, his guidance, but it's also his birthday. If I could take a moment of personal privilege thanking Tommy and happy birthday, Tommy. I'd love to nominate him for the nicest, most helpful person in the state. I get to answer a phone call, it's an employer with an issue, transfer over to him and I'll sit in with that conversation and listen to him. At the end of the conversation the employer or the person having the problem always says great things about Texas because of the information they get from Tommy, so thank you for that. My remarks are as follows. Would like to thank TWC staff, obviously, especially our General Counsel's office. Definitely appreciate the work that we're going into that. Specifically, after the analysis of the marketplace contractor case and the work that they did preparing the tax letter, we would like to identify the attention that was following clarifications. Point one, the analysis that we're talking about in this letter will start out with whether an entity with a digital platform meets three conditions before-for being a marketplace contractor. I think I would love to work with Commissioner Treviño ensuring that the right businesses are using this for that concern. In the next step, point two, analysis of whether the worker satisfied the nine-point test in the rule for being a marketplace contractor, the first point in the tax letter properly distinguishes between

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

employees who apply for an hourly position of indefinite duration on an ongoing basis and the marketplace contractors who are looking for individual gigs, i.e., discrete shifts or blocks of time that result in specific and limited amount of compensation. Item three, the tax letter's explanation for the tools, materials, and equipment factor is very useful in that it sets the unique expensive fixed and often regulated equipment at client locations apart from the kind of tools that workers use to work on equipment or perform ordinary tasks so we want to make sure that we're looking at the big equipment that just can't be moved and plugged in at any of the other fashion, medical equipment that needs to be certified. Point four, the explanation for instructions from the client is reasonable and in line with our discussion during the last work session on the rule. The only reservation to, and we'll conclude with this, is the letter-in the letter is that the explanation for the ninth factor, i.e., a requirement to attend mandatory meetings of training could use some clarification. Specifically during a particular client engagement, a need could arise for clients to call a special meeting for safety or other critical purpose. In such a situation it would not be unreasonable for the client to expect all workers physically located at the workplace to attend the meeting in order to receive instructions related to a particular safety or emergency need. Other than that, I believe that the draft tax letter is a good starting point for that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

discussion but again, I think we want to make room for the ability to call people in again to adjust to the environment, to adjust to safety issues in and around workplace, and I think that's something that maybe we can get language to allow for something like that to take place.

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

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So I'm hearing a lot of agreement that the tax letter that's been prepared and that you would issue does go a long way toward clarifying I think just some changes that have happened in the marketplace since that original rule was passed in 2019. I think these types of evolution on the marketplace are just something that we're going to have to contend with. Technology makes everything move faster and I think we probably, as a commission, the three of us need to probably convene work sessions more often to discuss changing marketplace conditions. I don't think you put something in place and just anticipate that that will be the rule that we want to operate under for the rest of time. I just don't think that's reality. I don't think it works like that. You know, I think that what I saw in the draft letter and the one that likely would be the bulk of what goes out, I think that's very helpful in getting some clarification for some things that we've targeted right now. I would ask Mr. Serna to help make sure that the concepts that we see in that paper are fully operationalized across the whole agency. It's not really just the tax department. There are other people that are working on issues

like this and I think we need to do that. I think about in June some of the legal rationale that was laid out by Commissioner Esparza at our first work session, and then I've seen incorporated into this tax letter, I think again the equal application of that to any type of employment status question that comes under TWC's jurisdiction, I think this information goes a long way to answering those types of questions. I don't think we should just probably blindly apply any kind of technical interpretation of regulation without considering the realities of business operations and relationships. Just in the time I've been here, just in the few tax cases that make it to the commission that we see, I saw a case where the state required training, not the employer, not the marketplace platform. It was the state of Texas that required the training. Our staff, in my opinion, was confused as to this fact. I think this letter goes a long way toward clarifying that. I think the way people get paid has changed. We say payment on a transactional basis in the original rule. That is going to be hourly. Think about all the lawyers, Mr. Trobman, that are running around making hourly wages. My daughter's a lawyer. I know what her hourly wage is. It's pretty high at some firms and so it's one of those things that if transactional is kind of like the basis of what business you're doing, what kind of shift it is or what kind of job it is or what kind of total conclusion there is, and I think that just because it's an hourly wage,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it's really not necessarily [inaudible] employment and I think that the clarification given in the proposed tax letter I think goes a long way toward us admitting the realities of the marketplace which is people get paid a lot of different ways, and when it's a set job for a set time but the wage is calculated hourly, that might not be in employment or it might be, and our professionals have to make that decision. They need the tools that they need to make that decision. It's already been mentioned but I've seen a couple cases over the years of tools, materials, equipment on site, and sometimes the law requires that only a certain person can own that. Sometimes the cost of that equipment dictates that somebody else is going to own it. There's a lot of leased equipment in this world. This is not a simple question anymore. I think you guys probably nailed it on giving some flexibility on what it is to own that equipment, and then supervisory relationships was actually a big sticking point for me. When the state of Texas requires a supervision, that's not the same as occupational supervision. It's just not, and I'm not sure five years ago when this rule went into effect, I'm not sure that was as pertinent a point as it is today. A lot of things have changed about the workplace, and I think we probably are wise to acknowledge that. And then we've already talked about the training issue. I don't think I need to bring that up. I will also say that I'm pretty open to bringing the full rule back up for discussion and revision,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

probably not right now, probably not until next summer would be the earliest we would want to do that. I still think it's prudent we give the legislature time to work on this. There are still dissatisfied marketplace contractors. There are still dissatisfied contractors who work via those platforms. There are still dissatisfied businesses who use the services of those, and consumers that use the services of those, and I think they do deserve an opportunity to talk to their legislative member, House member, Senate member, and give the legislature an opportunity to weigh in on that but by next summer we may want to bring up this section again. We may even want to think about our 20-factor test. That poster was put in there a long, long time ago. Perhaps it's still germane in its current form. Perhaps it deserves some discussion. Perhaps we should take a look at it so I think our look at this might even move past marketplace contractors and just move into what is the commission's view of employment since the statute vests us with deciding that but we also have to really get that policy laid out so staff can execute on that policy in a way that's fair to the people of Texas but also to the employers, also to the employees and the folks that will be using that. So maybe by next summer we'll certainly know what the legislature will have done relative to this. We may want to bring all this back up for discussion. The only other thing I'd say is the Open Meetings Act places some restrictions on the time I spend with Tommy but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the time I have spent with him, he is a quite personable individual and I do wish him a happy birthday as well. Anything else anybody want to add at this time? I would just say I would have had Michael Britt bring a presentation but his tie is way too subdued today and I don't feel like that-I think it signifies some lack of preparation for this meeting. Eric will be declared the tie winner of the day. Any other order of business? Oh, one other thing. Sergio, I do want to address this. The commission does not need to approve this letter. That's up to the executive director. We made our policy position known. This is a purely operational matter. This is the executive director's opportunity to inform his staff as to how he wants the commission's policies carried out. I would say that based on what I saw in the letter that the executive director I think intends for the division director and the UI division to approve this letter, and so at this point I've heard no objections from the commissioners, only points for future discussion. I would say to you, Mr. Serna, please proceed with due haste. I think this is a good clarification. It's a good way for our staff to have all the facts at hand, and we'll move forward into the spring, and then the potential to pick this back up next summer I think is pretty high but I think this is a real good intermediary step to make sure we stay on the right road. If there's nothing else, I'd entertain a motion to adjourn.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I move to adjourn.
2	COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: I second.
3	CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
4	seconded to adjourn and we're adjourned. Thank you.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	