

MODIFICATION REQUEST COVER SHEET

Name of Filer	SUZAN LEVINE
Reporting Period	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report – Covering Year 2019 <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate report
Type of Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal with No Change <input type="checkbox"/> Full Commission Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal with Change
Office Held/Sought & Term	Agency Director, Employment Security Department
Application Rule(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Income & Ownership Interest: WAC 390-28-100(b) <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Residence: WAC 390-28-100(d) <input type="checkbox"/> Attorney: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(i) <input type="checkbox"/> Judge / Judicial Candidate: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(ii) <input type="checkbox"/> Spousal: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(iv) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: WAC 390-28-100 (1)(e)
Explanation of Rule(s)	<p>Income and ownership interests: WAC 390-28-100(1)(b)</p> <p>(1) Under RCW 42.17A.120, the commission or presiding officer may modify reporting requirements, including the statement of financial affairs, if literal application of the requirement would work a manifestly unreasonable hardship and the suspension or modification would not frustrate the purpose of the law. One or more of the following may be considered by the commission or presiding officer as possible qualifications for a reporting modification with respect to the statement of financial affairs, when such standard is met:</p> <p>(b) Income and ownership interests. An applicant may be exempted from reporting the information otherwise required by RCW 42.17A.710 (1)(f) and (g), if:</p> <p>(i) Public disclosure would violate any legally recognized confidential relationship that serves a legitimate business interest;</p> <p>(ii) The information does not relate to a business entity which would be subject to the regulatory authority of the office sought or held by the applicant in whole or in part;</p> <p>(iii) Such reporting would present a manifestly unreasonable hardship to the applicant including but not limited to adversely affecting the competitive position of an entity in which the applicant had an interest of ten percent or more as described in RCW 42.17A.120; and</p> <p>(iv) The interest in question would present no actual or potential conflict with the performance of the duties of the office sought or held.</p>

Supporting Documents (attached)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Current F-1 (filed April 1, 2020) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo of Position Description (dated April 2, 2020) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Modification Request Application (Received April 1, 2020)
Reason(s) for Modification (as stated by filer)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. LeVine is requesting a reporting modification that would exempt her from disclosing the business customers that paid \$12,000 or more during 2019 to Publicis Groupe. • Ms. LeVine states that Publicis Groupe, a global leader in media and communications, sharing their customer list would put them at a competitive disadvantage. • Ms. LeVine states that with Publicis Groupe has thousands of customers who pay them more than \$12,000 that are spread through many branches of this international company and that she has no interactions or control with any customers. She states it would be an unreasonable hardship to assemble the list. • Ms. LeVine states that Publicis Groupe’s revenue is almost \$10 billion in revenue 84 000 employees, thousands of customers and nearly 250,000,000 outstanding shares. • Ms. LeVine states that Publicis Groupe has two boards: a supervisory board and a management board. She is an independent director on the former which, unlike a traditional board of directors, does not have any decision-making role n or any management oversight of the organization. Thus - I do not have any direct influence at Publicis. • Ms. LeVine states that Publicis Groupe is in the very competitive industry of media, advertising and digital transformation. Revealing their customer list would be a profound competitive disadvantage. Also, given the distribution of their customers across brands (such as Leo Burnett, Saatchi and Saatch, Epsilon and more) and across the globe, assembling that list is impossible. • Ms. LeVine states she is the Commissioner for the Employment Security Department and have jurisdiction over all functions of the agency, including overseeing rulemaking, HR, contracts, etc. Since she is an independent director on the Supervisory and not the Management board, she has no connection on behalf of Publicis with their customers and no involvement or decision making in day to day activities of the business. Therefore, their customers and their customer list will not have an influence on her decision-making at ESD and will not pose an actual or potential conflict of interest. • Ms. LeVine states she is not involved in any day to day decisions nor is she she pivy to customer interactions nor decisions.

Other Issues

- Ms. LeVine states that she holds 500 shares of stock (out of a total of 240 Million outstanding shares) and that this is “barely even a fraction of a fraction.”
- Ms. LeVine joined the board in May of 2019.
- Ms. LeVine has agreed to recuse herself if any matter was to come before her as an Agency Director.