U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Administrative Law Judges
90 Seventh Street, Suite 4-800
San Francisco, CA 94103-1516

(415) 625-2200
(415) 625-2201 (FAX)

Issue Date: 09 July 2019

BALCA CASE NO.: 2019-TLN-00139

ETA CASE NO.: H-400-19102-564425

In the Matter of:

TECHNICAL AMERICA, INC.,
Employer.

DECISION AND ORDER AFFIRMING DENIAL OF CERTIFICATION

This matter arises under the labor certification process for temporary non-agricultural employment in the U.S. under the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*, and the associated regulations promulgated by the Department of Labor at 20 C.F.R. Part 655, Subpart A.[1] The H-2B program permits employers to hire foreign workers to perform temporary nonagricultural work within the United States on a one-time occurrence, seasonal, peakload, or intermittent basis, as defined by the Department of Homeland Security. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b); 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B).[2]

On May 30, 2019, the Certifying Officer ("CO") for the Office of Foreign Labor Certification denied the H-2B Application for Temporary Employment Certification ("Application") of Technical America, Inc. ("Employer") because the Application failed to establish the job opportunity as temporary in nature and failed to establish a temporary need for the number of workers requested. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.6(a) and (b); 20 C.F.R. § 655.11(e)(3) and (4). Employer timely requested administrative review on June 11, 2019, and the Appeal File ("AF") was provided on June 24, 2019. Both Employer and the CO were allowed an opportunity to file a brief by July 3, 2019, but neither party filed an appellate brief.

This proceeding is before the Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals ("the Board") pursuant to § 655.61(a).[3] As explained below, this Decision and Order affirms the denial of certification and denies Employer's request for relief.

---

[1] On April 29, 2015, the Department of Labor ("DOL") and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") jointly published an Interim Final Rule amending the regulations at 20 C.F.R. Part 655, Subpart A. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. 24042, 24109 (Apr. 29, 2015) ("2015 IFR"). The H-2B program currently operates under the 2015 IFR.

[2] The definition of temporary need is governed by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B). *See* Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019, Pub. L. No. 115-245, Division B, Title I, § 112 (2018).

[3] The Chief ALJ may designate a single member or a three member panel of the Board to consider a particular case. 20 C.F.R. § 655.61(d).

Background

Employer's Application

Employer is an engineering and equipment fabrication company that fabricates several types of oil field equipment and performs upgrades on that equipment as required. AF at 252. On April 16, 2019, Employer filed its Application for 85 welders based on an asserted peakload need from June 30, 2019, to February 29, 2020. AF at 238-311. The welders would perform various welding duties for structural and pipe applications and would work in the areas of Corpus Christi, Texas, Victoria, Texas, and Calhoun County, Texas. AF at 240-241, 246.

Employer explained that it "periodically experienced increased workloads in specific months of the year," and that its "current busy season, due to industry practice and onshore and offshore oil & gas plant module and platform fabrication and construction needs, is June through February," during which time it needs to supplement its welder staffing. AF at 252. Employer also stated that "[o]ccasionally, our peakload period shifts slightly based on client contractual needs in a particular year." AF at 253. Employer stated that it "is expected to experience a shortage of U.S. workers in the welder field." *Id.* Due to "an influx of a significant amount of new business demand . . . expected due to continued land-based oil production in South Texas and various other parts of the country," Employer contends it is required to hire welders through the H-2B program to meet its clients' needs. *Id.* Employer asserted its non-peak times are March through May. AF at 252. During such times, Employer "focuses on projects outside its region, performs routine engineering, and equipment fabrication." *Id.*

Employer cited to letters of intent and a Master Service Agreement with two companies in support of its request. AF at 253-254, 262-284. The general manager of a company named OTOG International ("OTOG") authored two letters that affirmed OTOG's need for Employer's services. AF at 281-282. The general manger stated that between the second quarter of 2019 through the first quarter of 2020, OTOG "will require the services of several welders employed by [Employer]" and that the projects are not ongoing. AF at 281. Employer also included a Master Service Agreement with Bay Ltd., as well as a letter from Bay Ltd. AF at 283-284. The letter indicated that Bay Ltd.'s "combined additional manpower requirements indicate the need for 85 qualified and experienced pipefitters, 50 structural/tank fitters, 95 pipe welders, and 65 structural/tank welders." AF at 284.

Employer stated that "[u]pon meeting these clients' demands, [Employer] will obtain additional projects and work from these and other clients which will increase the number of jobs for other positions in which we are able to fill with U.S. workers." AF at 253. However, Employer also stated that the demand created by these two clients is short-term in nature because these companies are engaging Employer to provide welders for definitive projects for the June 2019 through February 2020 period. AF at 254.

Regarding the number of workers requested, Employer stated the following:

> [Employer's] current known work load for the remainder of 2019 and early 2020 is undoubtedly enough to support the requested number of workers, 85 in total. Our need is obviously greater than 85 workers to service the above-described projects; however, we believe we can staff many of the welder positions with U.S. workers but

> will have approximately 85 positions that will need to be supplemented through the H-2B program this year.

AF at 253. Employer submitted payroll records for welders for 2017, 2018 and January through March 2019. AF at 259-261. The records showed no welders, either temporary or permanent, for 2017. For 2018, permanent welders varied between 4 and 7 from April 2018 to December 2018. There were no temporary workers listed for 2018. For the months of January, February, and March 2019, there were 4, 7, and 11 permanent workers, respectively, and no temporary workers.

Notice of Deficiency and Employer's Response

On April 24, 2019, the CO issued a Notice of Deficiency ("NOD") which identified four deficiencies, two of which are at issue on appeal. AF at 229-237. These two deficiencies were that Employer had: 1) failed to establish the job opportunity as temporary in nature in violation of 20 C.F.R. § 655.6(a) and (b); and 2) failed to justify its need for 85 workers in violation of 20 C.F.R. § 655.11(e)(3) and (4). AF at 233-236.

Regarding the first deficiency, the CO noted that its asserted period of need is June through February, but its previous application, H-400-18088-890329, indicated its period of need is August 9 through March 15. AF at 234. Further, the CO noted, Employer received an extension of its previous application through May 9, 2019. Therefore, the CO found that the indicated period of need is inconsistent with Employer's statements. *Id.* The CO also contended that Employer did not provide a sufficient explanation for the increase in work limited to its asserted peak need. AF at 234. The CO stated Employer did not sufficiently explain its operations during the indicated nonpeak period. *Id.* Additionally, the CO noted Employer's statement that once it completes the projects cited, it will obtain additional projects from the same and other clients indicated that "[t]he nature of the employer's business and that of its clients is to secure contracts on an ongoing basis." *Id.* The CO requested further information to address this deficiency.

Regarding the second deficiency of failing to demonstrate that the number of workers requested accurately represented bona fide job opportunities, the CO stated that Employer did not indicate how it determined that it needs 85 welders during the requested period of need. AF at 235-236. The CO requested various further information to address this deficiency.

On May 7, 2019, Employer responded to the NOD. AF at 158-228. Employer submitted the requested documents and responses to the asserted deficiencies.[4] Specifically, Employer submitted an updated statement of need, a schedule of projects, a summary of invoices, as well as copies of previously submitted documents. AF at 181-228.

In its updated statement of need, Employer stated that it "is expanding [its] project services beyond California to a new geographic area in Texas where there is temporary need to fabricate and upgrade equipment for new clients as specified." AF at 172. Employer asserted that the letters of intent from Bay Ltd. and OTOG established the short-term nature of its need and that its projects with these companies "are not ongoing and indefinite." AF at 184. Employer also stated "its

[4] Employer noted that the "previous application" cited by the CO was for Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc., which is a "separate and distinct" entity with different ownership, a separate EIN, and "separate and distinct workload[] and needs." AF at 173.

permanent workers are maxed out working on other projects at its manufacturing facilities in Corona, California," and due to the agreement with Bay Ltd. and the intent to do business with OTOG, it needs the additional temporary workers. *Id.* Employer cited *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.*, 2018-TLN-00147, -00148 (July 13, 2018), wherein the Board reversed the CO's denial and found that the employer established a short-term need where its permanent workers were "maxed out" and the employer had a pending contract requiring additional, temporary workers. AF at 173, 184. Employer stated that during its non-peak time, it "focuses and will focus on its typical projects for its customers performing routine engineering and equipment fabrication in California." AF at 183.

Employer provided a schedule of projects that listed current and recent projects, including the location and delivery date, although the delivery date listed either "in progress" or simply "2019." AF 187-188. The schedule listed the "manufacturing location" of each project as Corona, California, and did not indicate the number of welders employed on each project. Employer's summary of invoices listed clients, the invoiced amount, and the amounts paid. AF at 189. It contained no dates or information about employees. Bay Ltd. provided an additional letter stating that it anticipated a need for "approximately . . . 160 welders." AF at 210.

CO's Non Acceptance Denial

On May 30, 2019, the CO issued a Non Acceptance Denial Letter ("Denial") because Employer did not sufficiently address two deficiencies identified in the NOD. AF at 146-155. First, the CO concluded that Employer's explanation and documentation of its temporary need did not establish the job opportunity as temporary. The CO stated that Employer's statements established that its year-round operations and permanent workers are in Corona, California, and not in the requested worksite in the Corpus Christi area of Texas. AF at 152. Therefore, Employer did not establish that it regularly employs permanent workers at the place of employment, a requirement for establishing a peakload need. The CO also concluded that Employer will continue to pursue contracts in the area, from its current and new clients. Therefore, "[Employer's] operations are centered on soliciting, securing, and implementing projects . . . it is not clear how one or two contracts creates a peakload need for the employer." *Id.*

Second, the CO found that Employer had not established a need for the number of workers requested. The CO noted Employer's assertion that it had a need "greater than 85 workers" and would staff "many of the welder positions with U.S. workers." AF at 154. The CO stated:

> The employer did not explain the true number of temporary workers required to complete the referenced projects. Additionally, the list of projects does not specify the number of workers required for each project.

Id. The letters of intent stated that Bay Ltd. requires 95 pipe welders and 65 structural/tank welders, and that OTOG requires "several" welders. The CO noted that Employer "did not explain whether the welders it requires would perform the services of the pipe welders and/or the structural/tank welders." AF at 155. The CO concluded that the letters of intent did not "clearly support the request for 85 welders." *Id.*

Given Employer's failure to remedy these two deficiencies, the CO denied the Application.

Employer's Request for Administrative Review

In its Motion for Administrative Review, Employer argues that it fully complied with the regulations and established both the nature of its temporary need and the need for the number of workers requested. AF at 3.

In response to the CO's determination that Employer did not establish it employs permanent workers at the requested worksites of Corpus Christi, Texas, Employer asserts that it seeks foreign workers to work in multiple worksites, which is contemplated by the Form 9142. AF at 4-5. Employer cited the definition of area of intended employment in support of its contention that the regulations "anticipate[] multiple places of employment and worksites." AF at 5, citing 29 C.F.R. § 503.4 (regulations governing enforcement of employers' obligations under the H-2B program); *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 655.5. Employer notes that it intends to utilize a permanent worker as a safety coordinator and will hire any other qualified and available U.S. workers at the proposed worksites. AF at 5-6. Employer argues that its need arises from the fact that its current permanent workers have a full project schedule in Corona, California and cannot perform the work in Texas specified in the proposed contract and letters of intent. AF at 6. Regarding the CO's conclusion that Employer's operations are centered on soliciting, securing, and implementing projects, and it therefore does not have a temporary need, Employer again cites to *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.*, 2018-TLN-00147, -00148 (July 13, 2018) wherein the ALJ concluded the employer established it had a peakload need by showing its permanent workers could not work on a pending contract in Texas. AF 6-7. Employer asserts that it has shown a short-term demand because both of its cited projects have scheduled completion dates for first quarter of 2020. AF at 7.

In response to the CO's contention that Employer did not establish the need for the number of workers requested, Employer responds that it established the need for 85 workers through the letters of intent and the proposed contract. AF at 7-8. It argues that the letters of intent are from professionals who have expertise in managing projects and workforce needs. AF at 8. Employer cited to *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.*, for support. There, the Board found that Employer sufficiently established the number of workers needed where the employer's client indicated it needed 80 pipe fitters and 90 welders. 2018-TLN-00147, -00148, slip op. at 7.

Scope and Standard of Review

The scope of the Board's review in the H-2B program is limited. When an employer requests a review by the Board under section 655.61(a), the Board may consider only "the Appeal File, the request for review, and any legal briefs submitted." 20 C.F.R. § 655.61(e). The request for review may contain only legal arguments and evidence which was actually submitted to the CO prior to issuance of the final determination. 20 C.F.R. § 655.61(a)(5).

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act nor the applicable regulations specify a standard of review of the CO's denial of certification, but the Board has fairly consistently applied the arbitrary and capricious standard in reviewing the CO's determinations. *Brook Ledge Inc.*, 2016-TLN-00033, slip op. at 5 (May 10, 2016)[5]; *The Yard Experts, Inc.*, 2017-TLN-00024, slip op. at 6 (Mar. 14, 2017).

[5] A three-judge panel of the Board adopted the "arbitrary and capricious" standard in *Brook Ledge* after referencing *J and V Farms, LLC*, 2016-TLC-00022 (Mar. 4, 2015), a case reviewing the denial of labor certification under the H-2A

Discussion

An employer seeking certification under the H-2B program must show that it has a temporary need for workers. Temporary service or labor "refers to any job in which the petitioner's need for the duties to be performed by the employee(s) is temporary, whether or not the underlying job can be described as permanent or temporary." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(A); 20 C.F.R. § 655.6(a). Employment "is of a temporary nature when the employer needs a worker for a limited period of time. The employer must establish that the need for the employee will end in the near, definable future." 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B). An employer's need is temporary if it qualifies under one of the four temporary need standards: one-time occurrence, seasonal, peakload, or intermittent basis, as defined by DHS. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B); 20 C.F.R. § 655.6(a), (b). The employer bears the burden of establishing why the job opportunity reflects a temporary need within the meaning of the H-2B program. *Alter and Son Gen. Eng'g*, 2013-TLN-00003, slip op. at 4 (Nov. 9, 2012); *BMGR Harvesting*, 2017-TLN-00015, slip op. at 4 (Jan. 23, 2017). Bare assertions without supporting evidence are insufficient to carry the employer's burden of proof. *AB Controls & Technology*, 2013-TLN-00022 (Jan. 17, 2013).

Failure to Justify the Number of Workers Requested

The employer must demonstrate that the number of worker positions is justified and that the request represents a bona fide job opportunity. 20 C.F.R. § 655.11(e)(3) and (4). Employer requested 85 welders from June 20, 2019, to February 29, 2020. Employer justified this request by pointing to the letters of intent from Bay Ltd. and OTOG that, according to Employer, demonstrated an "obvious" need of more than 85 welders. However, while Employer may have established that there is a bona fide job opportunity for welders in general, it has not demonstrated that the number of temporary workers requested is justified.

In its first letter, Bay Ltd. stated it would need "95 pipe welders[] and 65 structural/tank welders." AF at 284. In the second letter provided in response to the NOD, Bay Ltd. stated it would need "approximately . . . 160 welders." AF at 210. OTOG merely stated it needed "several" welders. AF at 281. Further, Employer simply asserted that it "believ[ed] [it] can staff many of the welder positions with U.S. workers but will have approximately 85 positions that will need to be supplanted through the H-2B program." AF at 253.

---

program. *Brook Ledge Inc.*, slip op. at 5-6. After noting that the CO argued that the Board should defer to the OFLC's interpretation of a regulation unless it is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or not in accordance with law, the panel stated, "Generally speaking we do not disagree with the CO's characterization of its role vis a vis OFLC. We have previously acknowledged that BALCA reviews decisions under an arbitrary and capricious standard. *See J and V Farms, LLC*, 2016-TLC-00022 (Mar. 4, 2015). We take no issue with the assertion that BALCA should defer to OFLC's rational and reasonable interpretation of an ambiguous regulatory term." *Id.* at 5. However, some opinions have not discussed a standard of review, and others issued by the Board have suggested that the CO's determinations should be reviewed, at least at times, *de novo*. *See, e.g.*, *Best Solutions USA, LLC*, 2018-TLN-117, slip o. at 3, n.2 (May 22, 2018) citing *Albert Einstein Medical Center*, 2009-PER-00379 (Nov. 21, 2011) (*en banc*)); *Roadrunner Drywall Corp.*, 2017-TLN-00035, slip op. at 3, n.11 (May 4, 2017) (citing *Albert Einstein Medical Center*); *Sands Drywall, Inc.*, 2018-TLN-00007, slip op. at 3. (Nov. 28, 2017), *Zeta Worldforce, Inc.*, 2018-TLN-00015, slip op. at 4 (Dec. 15, 2017) (suggesting an approach where a CO's policy-based determinations would not be overturned unless arbitrary, capricious, or inconsistent with the established policy interpretation, but absent such an established policy-based interpretation of the regulations, reviewing the CO's denials *de novo*). In this case I would affirm the CO's decision whether I afforded it deference or not.

Employer cites to *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.* for support of its argument that it has justified the number of temporary welders needed. In *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.*, the Board found that the employer presented evidence sufficient to support its requested need for 80 pipefitters and 90 welders. The ALJ noted that the companies with which the employer contracted stated they needed 80 pipefitters and 90 welders. The ALJ found that the employer established that its permanent workers were committed elsewhere, and the companies' statements of need were sufficient. The CO's citation to the lack of evidence of such a need in prior payroll reports was unconvincing as it did not "take into account the upcoming pending contract." *Id.*

Employer's citation to *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.* is unpersuasive as the statements made here are distinguishable.[6] First, OTOG's statement of need is vague, merely referencing a need for "several" welders. Employer has not established how many welders it would need to fulfill its commitment to OTOG. Second, while Bay Ltd. stated it would need 160 welders, Employer provided no explanation for why it sought 85 temporary workers beyond its "belief" that it could find U.S. workers to hire. Without any kind of information, evidence, or explanation substantiating its statement that it believed it could hire a specific number of U.S. workers, Employer failed to justify its need for 85 temporary welders. *See AB Controls & Technology*, 2013-TLN-00022 (Jan. 17, 2013); *North Country Wreaths*, 2012-TLN00043 (Aug. 9, 2012) ("[I]t is the Employer's burden to prove that the requested positions represent bona fide job opportunities, and the CO is not required to take the employer at its word."). The regulations do not require that the employer simply establish that it would need "at least" the amount of workers requested, but instead that it justify the number of worker positions requested.[7] Employer has the burden of proof to establish its requested need within the meaning of the regulations and after a review of the record, I find it failed to meet that burden.

Because Employer failed to demonstrate that the number of workers requested is justified, the CO's denial is affirmed.

Failure to Establish the Nature of Temporary Need

In the alternative, Employer also failed to establish that it had a temporary peakload need for the requested workers. Employer asserts it has a peakload need for 85 welders from June 30, 2019, to February 29, 2020. To establish a peakload need, Employer "must establish that it regularly employs permanent workers to perform the services or labor at the place of employment and that it needs to supplement its permanent staff at the place of employment on a temporary basis due to a seasonal or short-term demand in that the temporary additions to staff will not become a part of the petitioner's regular operation." 20 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B)(3).

Employer has not met the requirements for establishing a peakload need because it does not "*regularly* employ permanent workers to perform the serves or labor *at the place of employment*." 20 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(B)(3) (emphasis added); *see also Technical America, Inc.*, 2019-TLN-00138, slip

[6] Additionally, the decision in *Industrial Equipment Solutions, Inc.* is not binding authority.

[7] Despite its argument that its need is "obviously greater than 85 workers," Employer also failed to establish that it would need at least 85 *temporary foreign* workers. Employer asserted it can hire an unspecified number of U.S. workers as welders. Putting aside the OTOG project, the Bay Ltd. project requires 160 welders. If Employer can hire at least 75 U.S. workers, why not 100 or 150? Employer provided little insight to answer such a question.

op. at 8-9 (July 3, 2019) (rejecting Employer's identical argument regarding a different application for temporary labor certification). Employer argues that the prevailing wage form and the Form 9142 contemplate that H-2B workers may work at multiple worksites, and that the regulations specifically anticipate multiple places of employment and worksites. AF at 4-5.

However, the issue here is not whether an H-2B worker may work in multiple worksites or what is the scope of the area of intended employment. Instead, the issue is whether Employer has established that it regularly employs permanent workers at the place of employment intended for the requested H-2B workers in conformance with the definition of peakload need. "Place of employment" has been interpreted to mean the worksite. *GT Trans Inc.*, 2016-TLN-00029, at 5 (Apr. 15, 2016) (looking to the H-1B definition of "place of employment" because it is interchangeable with "worksite," 20 C.F.R. § 655.715). The record demonstrates that Employer's permanent workers are regularly employed in Corona, California. There is no evidence it "regularly" employs permanent workers in the areas in Texas referenced in the Application. That Employer anticipates it will use a permanent worker as a safety coordinator at the Texas worksites once the work begins does not satisfy the regulatory requirement.

Further, Employer has not shown that it has a temporary need for the requested workers. A job opportunity is considered temporary under the H-2B classification if the employer's need for the duties to be performed is temporary whether or not the underlying job is permanent or temporary. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii)(A); 20 C.F.R. § 655.6(a). It is the nature of the employer's need, not the nature of the duties, that is controlling. *Matter of Artee Corp.*, 18 I & N 366 (Comm. 1982). In the context of establishing a one-time occurrence, the Board has held that an employer that by the nature of its business works on a project until completion and then moves on to another has a permanent rather than a temporary need. *Cajun Constructors, Inc.*, 2009-TLN-00096, slip op. at 11 (Oct. 9, 2009).[8] The Board held that the employer's need for temporary workers on a single contract was not a temporary event when viewed in the "context of the Employer's business" but rather "just one of a series of projects." *Id.*, slip op. at 11. In the second *Cajun Constructors* case, the Board rejected the employer's argument that every contract was a temporary event of short duration which created a discrete temporary need, instead holding that "[e]very project cannot possibly be a temporary event; at some point, the combination of temporary projects create[s] a permanent need for the Employer." *Cajun Constructors, Inc.*, 2010-TLN-00079, slip op. at 5 (Oct. 5, 2010).

Employer has not established that it has a temporary need as its statements in its Application suggest instead that it has an ongoing need. Employer stated in its original statement of need that "[u]pon meeting [Bay Ltd. and OTOG's] demands, [Employer] will obtain additional projects and work from these and other clients . . . ." AF at 253. Employer also stated that it "is expanding [its] project services beyond California to a new geographic area in Texas where there is temporary need to fabricate and upgrade equipment for new clients as specified." AF at 172. While the specific projects referenced by Employer may not be "ongoing and indefinite," Employer has not established that its need for such labor is temporary. Instead, Employer's stated goal is to obtain additional projects from these clients and it is "expanding" its services beyond California. Therefore, similar to the reasoning espoused in the *Cajun Constructors, Inc.* cases, I find that Employer has not established that its need is limited to a short-term demand as its statements demonstrate it is engaged in obtaining additional projects such as those at issue here. *See also, KBR, Inc.*, 2016-TLN-

[8] Because the definition of temporary need derives from DHS regulations that have not changed, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(6)(ii), pre-2015 decisions of the Board on this issue remain relevant.

00038, -00042, slip op. at 7-8 (May 16, 2016) (affirming denial where employer frequently engaged in the types of projects similar to that for which it sought workers and did not establish that it has no need to seek workers to provide these services in the future).

For the forgoing reasons, the CO's denial of Employer's Application is affirmed.

SO ORDERED.

For the Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals:

RICHARD M. CLARK
Administrative Law Judge