

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2026-EAB-0366**

*Affirmed*  
*Wages Earned from Employer were Wages Earned in Subject Employment*  
*Claim Determination Correct*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On February 3, 2026, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was monetarily eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits and that the employer was subject to being charged a percentage of the benefits paid because claimant had worked 477 hours and earned \$7,000 from the employer in subject employment during claimant's base year (decision # L0015989212). The employer filed a timely request for hearing. On March 16, 2026, ALJ Griffith conducted a hearing, at which claimant failed to appear, and on April 13, 2026, issued Order No. 26-UI-326837, affirming decision # L0015989212. On April 17, 2026, the employer filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

**WRITTEN ARGUMENT:** The employer submitted written arguments on April 17, 2026 and April 28, 2026. EAB did not consider the employer's April 17, 2026 argument because they did not state that they provided a copy of the argument to claimant as required by OAR 471-041-0080(2)(a) (May 13, 2019).

The employer's April 28, 2026 argument contained information that was not part of the hearing record and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond the employer's reasonable control prevented them from offering the information during the hearing. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019), EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing. EAB considered any parts of the employer's April 28, 2026 argument that were based on the hearing record.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) WutzNxt, Inc., was a business that provided goods or services to clients in the fitness industry.

(2) In November 2024, WutzNxt and claimant discussed claimant providing WutzNxt with services related to a customer relationship management (CRM) software program WutzNxt used on a project with a client. During these discussions, WutzNxt told claimant that she should form a business

organization for the purpose of performing the work. Thereafter, claimant formed a business organization by registering a business entity with the Oregon Secretary of State.

(3) On November 25, 2024, claimant, doing business as her business entity, entered into a contract to work for WutzNxt for a term running from the remainder of November 2024 to May 31, 2025. The nature of claimant's work was to implement the CRM software program and integrate data into the program. The contract phrased the work arrangement as an "independent contractor agreement." Transcript at 32.

(4) From late November 2024 through mid-April 2025, claimant performed the work implementing the CRM software program. Claimant used her own equipment, most likely her own computer, to do the work. WutzNxt did not generally tell claimant how to do the work. However, a specific person who worked for WutzNxt reviewed claimant's work. Claimant worked on WutzNxt's property at times, and at other times worked elsewhere, but did not have a dedicated business location to perform the work. Claimant did not obtain or pay for any licenses or specialized training required to provide the services. Claimant did not have the authority to hire other persons to assist in providing the services to WutzNxt or to fire such persons.

(5) Claimant's contract called for WutzNxt to pay her at a rate of \$2,000 per month. Claimant did not negotiate the amount of her pay. Claimant did not engage in advertising to solicit business while performing work for WutzNxt, though, during that time, she may have performed similar work for an entity called BODY20 Lake Oswego.

(6) Claimant's contract, which was supposed to continue until May 31, 2025, was ended early by WutzNxt on April 15, 2025, due to WutzNxt's contract with their client ending early. WutzNxt paid claimant \$7,000 for 477 hours of work from late November 2024 to April 15, 2025

(7) On December 27, 2025, claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits. The base year of the claim consisted of the third quarter 2024, the fourth quarter 2024, the first quarter 2025, and the second quarter 2025. To determine claimant's initial claim, the Department reviewed the hours claimant worked and the wages claimant earned from employment subject to the unemployment insurance program during her base year. The Department did not initially recognize the wages claimant earned from WutzNxt to have been earned in subject employment. Claimant requested the Department redetermine her claim by adding the remuneration she earned in her base year from WutzNxt and use that higher figure to calculate her weekly and maximum benefit amounts.

(8) The Department began an investigation to determine whether WutzNxt and claimant should have been regarded as in an employer/employee relationship and therefore the wages earned from WutzNxt to have been earned in subject employment which was appropriate to consider in determining claimant's claim. If instead claimant's relationship with WutzNxt was one of an independent contractor, her earnings would not be considered wages earned in subject employment, and would not be appropriate to consider in determining claimant's claim.

(9) As part of the investigation, a Department investigator interviewed claimant and an agent of WutzNxt. Following the interviews, the Department determined that claimant had been misclassified as

an independent contractor, that WutzNxt and claimant had been in an employer/employee relationship, and that the base year wages claimant earned from WutzNxt were earned in subject employment.

(10) Claimant's total base year wages consisted of: 303 hours worked and \$6,659.69 earned during the third quarter 2024; 424 hours worked and \$8,209.16 earned during the fourth quarter 2024; 590 hours worked and \$8,976.02 earned during the first quarter 2025; and 568 hours worked and \$11,233.76 earned during the second quarter of 2025. Claimant's base year wages attributable to WutzNxt consisted of no hours or earnings in the third quarter 2024; 143 hours worked and \$2,100 earned during the fourth quarter 2024; 286 hours worked and \$4,200 earned during the first quarter 2025; and 48 hours worked and \$700 earned during the second quarter of 2025.

(11) After concluding that claimant's wages from WutzNxt were earned in subject employment, the Department included those wages in claimant's base year and redetermined the claim, determining that claimant had a monetarily valid claim for benefits, with a \$438 weekly benefit amount, and an \$11,388 maximum benefit amount.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** The remuneration claimant received from WutzNxt constituted wages earned in employment subject to Oregon's Unemployment Insurance program. It is appropriate to consider the wages claimant earned from WutzNxt when determining the monetary eligibility of claimant's initial claim. Claimant has a valid initial claim for benefits with a weekly benefit amount of \$438 and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,388.

ORS 657.150 states, in relevant part, and with emphasis added:

(1) An individual shall be paid benefits for weeks during the benefit year in an amount that is to be determined by taking into account the individual's work in *subject employment* in the base year as provided in this section.

(2)(a) To qualify for benefits an individual must have:

(A) Worked in *subject employment* in the base year with total base year wages of \$1,000 or more and have total base year wages equal to or in excess of one and one-half times the wages in the highest quarter of the base year[.]

In this case, the Department included the remuneration claimant received from WutzNxt as part of the total wages claimant earned in subject employment during her base year, which was used to determine claimant's initial claim and calculate claimant's weekly benefit amount. WutzNxt argued that the remuneration they paid claimant was not earned in subject employment because claimant was an independent contractor, and therefore the amount they paid claimant should not have been included in claimant's base year.

Therefore, the first step in the analysis is to determine if the remuneration claimant received in their base year from WutzNxt, Inc. was earned in subject employment, which requires an assessment of whether claimant was an independent contractor.

ORS 657.040(1) provides that services performed by an individual for remuneration are deemed to be employment subject to this chapter unless and until it is shown to the satisfaction of the Director of the Employment Department that the individual is an independent contractor, as that term is defined in ORS 670.600. ORS 670.600(2) defines “independent contractor” as follows:

As used in ORS [chapter] \* \* \* 657 \* \* \*, “independent contractor” means a person who provides services for remuneration and who, in the provision of the services:

- (a) Is free from direction and control over the means and manner of providing the services, subject only to the right of the person for whom the services are provided to specify the desired results;
- (b) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, is customarily engaged in an independently established business;
- (c) Is licensed under ORS chapter 671 or 701 if the person provides services for which a license is required under ORS chapter 671 or 701; and
- (d) Is responsible for obtaining other licenses or certificates necessary to provide the services.

With respect to ORS 670.600(2)(a), whether claimant was free from direction and control over the means and manner of providing the services to WutzNxt, the record weighs against concluding that claimant was an independent contractor. As to means, claimant provided her own equipment to perform the work, most likely her own computer, and thus appeared to control the resources used to perform services.

As to manner, WutzNxt’s owner testified that he “did not control how, when, and where the work was completed as long as the deliverables in the contract were met.” Transcript at 28. However, the owner also testified that he held claimant “accountable for” whether “the work g[ot] completed at a level sufficient to meet our client’s needs[,]” which the owner described as a “review.” Transcript at 31. The owner explained that WutzNxt’s client defined standards and that claimant’s work was reviewed for whether it met those standards. Transcript at 35-36.

The Department’s witness also testified that WutzNxt reviewed claimant’s work. Transcript at 19, 37. The witness was an investigator who had interviewed claimant and an agent of WutzNxt who shared the owner’s last name, likely the owner’s spouse. Transcript at 18. The Department’s witness testified that both claimant and the owner’s spouse stated that claimant’s work was reviewed, with claimant specifying the name of the WutzNxt employee who conducted the review. Transcript at 19, 37.

Considering these facts together, while claimant controlled the means, WutzNxt controlled the manner of providing the services because subjecting claimant’s work to review naturally meant that WutzNxt could compel claimant to change how she was performing the work, if they were displeased with it. How claimant did the work was therefore subject to WutzNxt’s direction and control, even if their right

to control went unexercised. *See* OAR 471-031-0181(3)(a)(C) (February 1, 2007) (“If the person for whom services are provided has the right to control the means or manner of providing the services, it does not matter whether that person actually exercises the right of control.”). For these reasons, ORS 670.600(2)(a) favors concluding that claimant was *not* an independent contractor.

With respect to ORS 670.600(2)(b), whether claimant was customarily engaged in an independently established business, the evidence also weighs against concluding that claimant was an independent contractor. A person is considered to be customarily engaged in an independently established business if any three of the following requirements are met:

(a) The person maintains a business location:

(A) That is separate from the business or work location of the person for whom the services are provided; or

(B) That is in a portion of the person’s residence and that portion is used primarily for the business.

(b) The person bears the risk of loss related to the business or the provision of services as shown by factors such as:

(A) The person enters into fixed-price contracts;

(B) The person is required to correct defective work;

(C) The person warrants the services provided; or

(D) The person negotiates indemnification agreements or purchases liability insurance, performance bonds or errors and omissions insurance.

(c) The person provides contracted services for two or more different persons within a 12-month period, or the person routinely engages in business advertising, solicitation or other marketing efforts reasonably calculated to obtain new contracts to provide similar services.

(d) The person makes a significant investment in the business, through means such as:

(A) Purchasing tools or equipment necessary to provide the services;

(B) Paying for the premises or facilities where the services are provided; or

(C) Paying for licenses, certificates or specialized training required to provide the services.

(e) The person has the authority to hire other persons to provide or to assist in providing the services and has the authority to fire those persons.

ORS 670.600(3).

As to ORS 670.600(3)(a), which calls for consideration of whether the person has a business location separate from the work location of the person for whom the services are provided, the owner conceded that claimant worked on his property at times. Transcript at 29. However, the owner further stated that claimant worked off-property most of the time, at a location that was unknown to him. Transcript at 29. The Department's witness testified that, during her interview, claimant reported that she did not have a separate business location, and worked mostly from WutzNxt's property. Transcript at 20. The Department witness stated that the owner's spouse had told him that she saw claimant working on WutzNxt's property. Transcript at 37.

Weighing the above, the evidence points to the owner's property as the only concrete location at which claimant was known to have worked, and is devoid of any showing that claimant might have had a dedicated business location or a specific location within her residence set aside for the work. ORS 670.600(3)(a) therefore does *not* weigh in favor of concluding that claimant was customarily engaged in an independently established business.

As to ORS 670.600(3)(b), which calls for one to apply several factors to evaluate whether the person bears the risk of loss related to the provision of services, several of the enumerated factors are plainly inapplicable. There is no evidence, for example, that claimant ever negotiated indemnification or bought liability insurance. Nor is there any evidence that claimant warranted the services she provided or was required to correct defective work.

The record shows that claimant did not negotiate her pay, which was attested to by both the owner and the Department's witness, based on his interviews of claimant and the owner's spouse. Transcript at 20, 29. WutzNxt paid claimant \$7,000 for 477 hours of work from late November 2024 to April 15, 2025. The owner testified that this pay was set by the contract at \$2,000 per month "based upon the scope of the work that was presented to her." Transcript at 33. This testimony implies that the \$2,000 per month remuneration might have been subject to change if the scope of the work changed. In any event, the record does not show that claimant entered into a fixed-price contract of the nature that claimant was to bear any increase in the costs of inputs or raw materials as might suggest that she bore the risk of loss related to the provision of services. ORS 670.600(3)(b) therefore does *not* weigh in favor of concluding that claimant was customarily engaged in an independently established business.

As to ORS 670.600(3)(c), which calls for consideration of whether the person had provided services for two or more different persons within a 12-month period or engaged in business advertising, the owner of WutzNxt stated that he believed claimant had another client at the time she provided services to WutzNxt, an entity called BODY20 Lake Oswego. Transcript at 30. In contrast, the Department's witness testified that claimant told him that she had not solicited similar work or engaged in any advertising, and that the owner's spouse reported that she did not know. Transcript at 21, 39.

Thus, though the owner named an additional entity to which claimant was purported to have provided services, no other information about BODY20 Lake Oswego was elicited. Some doubt is cast on the likelihood that claimant provided services to this entity within the same 12-month period as WutzNxt, given the Department witness's conflicting testimony based on his interview of claimant, as well as the fact that claimant formed her business entity for the purpose of working for WutzNxt and only after

WutzNxt prompted her to do so. ORS 670.600(3)(c) therefore is inconclusive or weighs only weakly in favor of concluding that claimant was customarily engaged in an independently established business.

As to ORS 670.600(3)(d), which calls for consideration of whether the person had made a significant investment in the business, several of the listed factors are not applicable. There is no evidence, for example, that claimant paid for the premises or facilities where she provided services to WutzNxt, or that she paid for any licenses or specialized training required to provide the services. Claimant did provide her own equipment to perform the work, most likely her own computer, but there is no evidence that claimant purchased the computer for the purpose of providing the services, as opposed to simply owning the computer already. ORS 670.600(3)(d) therefore does *not* weigh in favor of concluding that claimant was customarily engaged in an independently established business.

ORS 670.600(3)(e) calls for consideration of whether the person had the authority to hire or fire other persons to provide or assist in providing the services. There is no evidence that claimant ever hired or fired anyone or had the authority to do either. ORS 670.600(3)(e) therefore does *not* weigh in favor of concluding that claimant was customarily engaged in an independently established business.

Considering all of the ORS 670.600(3) factors together, ORS 670.600(3)(a), (b), (d), and (e) each weigh in favor of concluding that claimant was *not* customarily engaged in an independently established business, with only ORS 670.600(3)(c) offering an inconclusive or weak factor that cuts the other way. It is therefore warranted to conclude that claimant was not customarily engaged in an independently established business. Note that while claimant's contract with WutzNxt was phrased as an "independent contractor agreement," the self-serving description used by the agreement is not dispositive. Transcript at 32. Further, although claimant created a business entity with the Oregon Secretary of State, this is of limited relevance because she did so specifically for the purpose of working for WutzNxt and only after WutzNxt prompted her to do so. *See* ORS 670.600(5)(a) ("For purposes of determining whether an individual provides services as an independent contractor: (a) The creation or use of a business entity, such as a corporation or a limited liability company, by an individual for the purpose of providing services does not, by itself, establish that the individual provides services as an independent contractor."). For these reasons, claimant was *not* customarily engaged in an independently established business and ORS 670.600(2)(b) therefore favors concluding that claimant was *not* an independent contractor.

Finally, analyzing ORS 670.600(2)(c) and (d), these factors are largely inapplicable and do not favor concluding that claimant was an independent contractor. ORS 670.600(2)(c) requires that the person purporting to be an independent contractor be licensed as an architect (ORS chapter 671) or construction contractor (ORS chapter 701) if the services provided relate to those fields. Similarly, ORS 670.600(2)(d) requires that the person be responsible for obtaining any other licenses or certificates necessary to provide the services. Claimant's work for WutzNxt involved integrating data into a CRM software program, and there is no indication in the record that a license or certificate was required to carry out that task.

Accordingly, after weighing the factors set forth under ORS 670.600(2), the record shows that claimant was not an independent contractor. As such, pursuant to ORS 657.040(1), the services claimant performed for remuneration for WutzNxt was subject employment. It is therefore appropriate to consider

the wages claimant earned from WutzNxt during her base year when determining the monetary eligibility of claimant's initial claim.

Having concluded that all the wages claimant received during her base year, including the \$7,000 for 477 hours of work for WutzNxt, were earned in subject employment, the next step is to apply ORS 657.150(2)(a)(A) using the total base year wages. Claimant's total base year wages were \$35,077.94, which is more than \$1,000. The \$35,077.94 total base year wages are also in excess of one and one-half times the wages in the highest quarter of the base year. Claimant's highest base year quarter was the second quarter of 2025, in which she earned \$11,233.76. One and one-half times \$11,233.76 is \$16,850.64, which is less than \$35,077.94.

ORS 657.150 also states, in relevant part:

\* \* \*

- (4) (a) An eligible individual's weekly benefit amount shall be 1.25 percent of the total wages paid in the individual's base year. However, such amount shall not be less than the minimum, nor more than the maximum weekly benefit amount.

\* \* \*

- (d) All weekly benefit amounts, if not a multiple of \$1, shall be computed to the next lower multiple of \$1.

\* \* \*

- (5) Benefits paid to an eligible individual in a benefit year shall not exceed 26 times the individual's weekly benefit amount, or one-third of the base year's wages paid, whichever is the lesser. If such amount is not a multiple of \$1, it shall be computed to the next lower multiple of \$1.

Applying ORS 657.150(4), the claim's weekly benefit amount is \$438, since 1.25 percent of \$35,077.94 is \$438.47, which, rounded down per ORS 657.150(4)(d) is \$438. Claimant's maximum benefit amount is \$11,388, which is the lesser of 26 times the \$438 weekly benefit amount figure or one-third of claimant's total base year's wages paid.

In summary, the remuneration claimant received from WutzNxt constituted wages earned in employment subject to Oregon's Unemployment Insurance program. It is appropriate to consider the wages claimant earned from WutzNxt when determining the monetary eligibility of claimant's initial claim. Claimant has a valid initial claim for benefits with a weekly benefit amount of \$438 and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,388.

**DECISION:** Order No. 26-UI-326837 is affirmed.

D. Hettle and A. Steger-Bentz;  
S. Serres, not participating.

**DATE of Service: May 29, 2026**

**NOTE:** You may appeal this decision by filing a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals **within 30 days of the date of service stated above**. *See* ORS 657.282. For forms and information, visit <https://www.courts.oregon.gov/courts/appellate/forms/Pages/appeal.aspx> and choose the appropriate form under “File a Petition for Judicial Review.” You may also contact the Court of Appeals by telephone at (503) 986-5555, by fax at (503) 986-5560, or by mail at 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97301.

**Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey.** To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. If you are unable to complete the survey online and wish to have a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



# Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

## English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

## Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

## Traditional Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

## Tagalog

Paalala – Nakakaapekto ang desisyong ito sa iyong mga benepisyo sa pagkawala ng trabaho. Kung hindi mo naiintindihan ang desisyong ito, makipag-ugnayan kaagad sa Lupon ng mga Apela sa Trabaho (Employment Appeals Board). Kung hindi ka sumasang-ayon sa desisyong ito, maaari kang maghain ng isang Petisyon sa Pagsusuri ng Hukuman (Petition for Judicial Review) sa Hukuman sa Paghahabol (Court of Appeals) ng Oregon na sinusunod ang mga tagubilin na nakasulat sa dulo ng desisyon.

## Vietnamese

Chú ý - Quyết định này ảnh hưởng đến trợ cấp thất nghiệp của quý vị. Nếu quý vị không hiểu quyết định này, hãy liên lạc với Ban Kháng Cáo Việc Làm ngay lập tức. Nếu quý vị không đồng ý với quyết định này, quý vị có thể nộp Đơn Xin Tái Xét Tư Pháp với Tòa Kháng Cáo Oregon theo các hướng dẫn được viết ra ở cuối quyết định này.

## Spanish

Atención – Esta decisión afecta sus beneficios de desempleo. Si no entiende esta decisión, comuníquese inmediatamente con la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo. Si no está de acuerdo con esta decisión, puede presentar una Aplicación de Revisión Judicial ante el Tribunal de Apelaciones de Oregon siguiendo las instrucciones escritas al final de la decisión.

## Russian

Внимание – Данное решение влияет на ваше пособие по безработице. Если решение Вам непонятно – немедленно обратитесь в Апелляционный Комитет по Трудоустройству. Если Вы не согласны с принятым решением, вы можете подать Ходатайство о Пересмотре Судебного Решения в Апелляционный Суд штата Орегон, следуя инструкциям, описанным в конце решения.

**Khmer**

ចំណុចសំខាន់ – សេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះមានផលប៉ះពាល់ដល់អត្ថប្រយោជន៍គ្មានការងារធ្វើរបស់លោកអ្នក។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់អំពីសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ សូមទាក់ទងគណៈកម្មការឧទ្ធរណ៍ការងារភ្លាមៗ។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់ស្របចំពោះសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះទេ លោកអ្នកអាចដាក់ពាក្យប្តឹងសុំឲ្យមានការពិនិត្យរឿងក្តីឡើងវិញជាមួយតុលាការឧទ្ធរណ៍រដ្ឋ Oregon ដោយអនុវត្តតាមសេចក្តីណែនាំដែលសរសេរនៅខាងចុងបញ្ចប់នៃសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ។

**Laotian**

ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ – ຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້ມີຜົນກະທົບຕໍ່ກັບເງິນຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອການຫວ່າງງານຂອງທ່ານ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້, ກະລຸນາຕິດຕໍ່ຫາຄະນະກຳມະການອຸທອນການຈ້າງງານໃນທັນທີ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຫັນດີນໍາຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້, ທ່ານສາມາດຍື່ນຄໍາຮ້ອງຂໍການທົບທວນຄໍາຕັດສິນນໍາສານອຸທອນລັດ Oregon ໄດ້ ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄໍາແນະນໍາທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້.

**Arabic**

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فوراً، و إذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار.

**Farsi**

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از دستور العمل موجود در پایان آن، از دادگاه تجدید نظر اورگان درخواست تجدید نظر کنید.

**Employment Appeals Board - 875 Union Street NE | Salem, OR 97311**  
 Phone: (503) 378-2077 | 1-800-734-6949 | Fax: (503) 378-2129 | TDD: 711  
 Email: [appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov](mailto:appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov)  
 Website: [www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx](http://www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx)

The Oregon Employment Department is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. Language assistance is available to persons with limited English proficiency at no cost.

El Departamento de Empleo de Oregon es un programa que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades. Disponemos de servicios o ayudas auxiliares, formatos alternos y asistencia de idiomas para personas con discapacidades o conocimiento limitado del inglés, a pedido y sin costo.