

HAWAII STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL MEETING

Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
830 Punchbowl Street, Room 329
Honolulu, HI 96813

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 2023 MEETING

Held In-Person and Videoconference (Zoom)

Members:

Employer Representatives

Gregg Serikaku, Chair
Jeffrey Durham
Gary Iwamoto
Michele Thomas

Employee Representatives

Travis Murakami, Co-Chair
Rick Subiono
Francis Tau'a
Terry Uyehara

Public Representative

Keala Chock

Public Attendees:

Edmund Aczon
Jeff Alameida
Ronlynn Arakaki
Aaron Ashimine
Pat Asuncion
Kelli Braun
Kika Bukoski
Farrah Derla

Evan Fong
Orlando Gante
Breanne Geronimo
Travis Gomez
Sam Gushiken-Baba
Grace Kaiser
Mario Manrique, Jr.
Natalie Millon

Isaiah Nagatani
Debby Nishimura
Joseph O'Donnell
Corinna Pereira (US DOL)
Juanita Reyher-Colon
Guy Shibayama
Mimi Sroat
Patrick Sullivan
Jodie Torres

DLIR/WDD Staff Attendees:

Maricar Pilotin-Freitas
Edgar Fernandez
Jaimee Tabangay
Debra Martinson

Administrator, Workforce Development Division
Program Specialist, WDD
Program Specialist, WDD
Program Specialist, WDD

I. Call to Order

- SAC Chair Gregg Serikaku called the meeting to order at approximately 1:03 pm.
- WDD staff Edgar Fernandez conducted a roll call of the SAC members and informed the Chair that 8 members are present with Jeffrey Durham, Terry Uyehara, and Rick Subiono attending in person.
- Chair Serikaku later acknowledged the presence of Gary Iwamoto who was not able to respond during the during the roll call due internet connection problems. All members were noted as present during the meeting.

II. **Welcome and Introductions**

- WDD staff Maricar Pilotin-Freitas, Edgar Fernandez, Jaimee Tabangay, Debra Martinson introduced themselves.
- Mr. Fernandez acknowledged members of the public who were in attending virtually in the meeting and Mr. Kika Buksski of IBEW 1260 who was attending in person.

III. **Approval of Minutes**

a. Clarification on the minutes of May 30, 2023, SAC Meeting

Mr. Fernandez informed the members that the adjournment time of 12:16 pm in the minutes of the October 4, 2022 meeting was accurate. The meeting began at 9:00 am and ended at 12:16 pm. The clarification was in relation to the comment of Mr. Durham that the adjournment time may not be accurate. meeting began at 9:00 am and ended at 12:16 pm.

Chair Serikaku announced that based on the clarification, the minutes of the October 4, 2022 meeting that was previously approved by the SAC on May 30, 2023 meeting stands.

b. Minutes of May 30, 2023, SAC meeting

Co-chair Travis Murakami clarified that his name was placed under Employer Representatives instead of Employee Representatives. Mr. Fernandez noted the error, and that the appropriate correction will be made on the minutes.

The members approved the minutes subject to the correction as noted.

IV. **Reports/Updates**

A. State of Apprenticeship Council

No updates/reports from the Council members.

B. U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Apprenticeship

Ms. Corinna Pereira, Region 6 Multi-State Navigator presented her report. Highlights of her report include the following:

- i. State Apprenticeship Expansion Formula grant amounting to \$485,000 was awarded to the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations.
- ii. Inflation Reduction Act amended the Internal Revenue Code to add prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements to qualify for increased credit or deduction amounts.
- iii. Office of Apprenticeship Bulletin 2023-14 clarified that Solar occupations are not recognized by USDOL Office of Apprenticeship as apprenticeable occupation.
- iv. Launching of Registered Apprenticeship Academy that was designed to provide first class information, education training, and resources around the work of Registered Apprenticeship.

Ms. Pereira congratulated DLIR/WDD staff and all participants for the success of Hawaii Apprenticeship Week and National Apprenticeship Week celebrations.

C. WDD Report

- Ms. Marica Pilotin-Frietas, WDD Administrator shared that Hawaii Apprenticeship Week (HAW) was a success. There were over 300 individuals who participated in the virtual presentations of the various programs. She thanked all who participated and supported HAW celebration. She emphasized importance of Apprenticeship as a training model that can be replicated in different occupations to help individuals become successful.
- Ms. Pilotin-Freitas clarified that Hawaii currently do not have registered apprenticeship programs in the solar industry.

V. New Business

A. Review and Recommendation on the Request of Ironworkers Training Trust Fund For Extension of 2 Apprentices to 1 Journeyworker Temporary Ratio for Reinforcing Apprenticeship Program Ending on December 31, 2023 to December 31, 2024.

Mr. Joseph O'Donnell of Hawaii Ironworkers Training Trust Fund presented the request for extension of 2:1 temporary ratio.

Highlights of his presentation and discussions include the following:

- Mr. O'Donnell introduced himself and shared that he was appointed interim coordinator by the trustees to oversee the apprenticeship training due to the sudden passing of Glenn Eugenio who was the Training Coordinator. The Trustees will meet in the beginning of next year to interview/hire his replacement. Mr. O'Donnell's also shared that he was the former Apprenticeship Coordinator and is the Safety Coordinator.

According to him, their baseline safety report shows that their 77 apprentices who were working had no work-related injuries. Safety is everybody's job, and they are responsible for the safety of their members. He mentioned that they are entering into a contract with Larson and Associates to have all their members, apprentices, journeyman, and foreman fully certified on OSHA requirements. and employers believe that the journeyman and general foreman can supervise apprentices based on the 2:1 ratio safely and efficiently.

He informed the body that a letter dated June 13, 2022, signed by Ms. Anne Perreira-Eustaquio approving the 2 apprentices to 1 journeyworker ratio is precedent setting.

- SAC member Rick Subiono commented that there are 2 requests (for extension of the temporary ratio of the 2 programs) and was just wondering if these can be combined. He also asked Mr. O'Donnell to explain the difference between Reinforcing and Structural work.

Mr. O'Donnell described the work for Ironworker Reinforcing as installing, reinforcing steel slab-on-grade, high rises, and water tanks. Structural work involves welding,

erection of steel in high-rise buildings and other structures. He added that they do joint training on a lot of their classes.

Mr. Fernandez believes that for purposes of discussion, the requests for extension of the temporary ratio for the 2 programs can be combined. However, with regard to voting on the recommendation of the Council, it should be done separately. Chair Serikaku collaborated with Mr. Fernandez.

- SAC member Jeffery Durham asked the reason for the temporary ratio and how this will benefit the apprentices. He also commented that the union has come to the council five times in the past nine years requesting a temporary change in ratio; therefore, it is recommended to rescind the request for extension of temporary ratio and change the ratio permanently pointing out that 6 ½ years temporary ratio in 9 years is not temporary.

Mr. O'Donnell responded that the industry has many small companies (kind of mom-and-pop stores) that are not financially able to bid on large projects because of the expenses so it helps them. He added that there's a lot of work coming up in the next few years from Pearl Harbor, federal projects, housing, and military and they have basically a shortage of workers. They are a small union with about 477 members working in the next 2 years which they probably will double up. He explained that their employers requested for extension of the apprentices to 1 journeyworker ratio who firmly believe that their journeyman, foreman, and general foreman can supervise apprentices based on the 2:1 ratio safely and efficiently.

- Mr. Durham commented that the union has come before the Council five times in the past nine years requesting a temporary ratio. He added that temporary in the dictionary means a short duration or a limited time. He further addressed to Mr. O'Donnell that if their members and their apprenticeship counsel feels that the 2:1 ratio is a safe and good operating ratio, his recommendation to him was to rescind the request and change the standards and come back before the Council for a permanent change of the ratio. He reiterated that 6 ½ years in 9 years is not temporary.

Mr. O'Donnell replied that their employers are the ones that are responsible and pay the workman's compensation for any accidents. He added that the report of injuries that occurred which he shared earlier shows that the ratio is a safe and a workable ratio that assist their employers and members.

Mr. Durham agreed that ratio assist the employers but not the apprentices. He then asked if there are any other jurisdictions that allow this sort of ratio for both Ironworker Structural and Reinforcing.

Mr. O'Donnell replied that he has permission from their international (union) to adjust the ratio based on the need of the apprentice to journeyman ratio.

- SAC member Michele Thomas mentioned that in the supporting documentation there were 77 apprentices and asked Mr. O'Donnell if he has the numbers for each group. Mr. O'Donnell responded that ballpark figure is 60% are in the Reinforcement program but will check and provide a more detailed breakdown. Later at the conclusion of the

meeting, Mr. O'Donnell informed the members that they have 52 apprentices in Reinforcing and 46 apprentices in Structural. He added that in 2017, they used a 1:1 ratio during the construction of the first 10 miles of the rail.

Mr. Subiono moved to recommend approval of the request to extend the 2:1 temporary ratio for Reinforcing Apprenticeship Program. Mr. Murakami seconded the motion.

During the roll call vote, an inquiry was made if the SAC can make a recommendation to have the temporary request be made permanent and to rescind the previous motion to recommend for approval.

Ms. Pilotin-Freitas clarified that the recommendation to approve the request for extension was moved and seconded and the roll call vote already started with 2 members voting in the affirmative. If the SAC decides to rescind the motion, the movant must withdraw the motion to recommend approval. However, considering that the motion was not withdrawn, the voting of the motion to recommend for approval should continue.

Chair Serikaku acknowledged the viewpoints of the members, however, he emphasized that the current temporary ratio ends on December 31, 2023 and it is incumbent on the Council to address the sponsor's request to extend the ratio as presented.

The Council members proceeded to vote on the motion as follows:

- Francis Tau'a – Yes
- Terry Uyehara – Yes
- Rick Subiono – Yes
- Travis Murakami – Yes
- Jeffrey Durham – No
- Michelle Thomas – No
- Keala Chock – Yes
- Gary Iwamoto – Yes
- Gregg Serikaku – Yes

SAC members Jeffrey Durham and Michell Thomas who voted no to the motion to recommend approval reasoned out that Hawaii Ironworkers Training Trust Fund has been asking for several extensions of the 2:1 ratio and because of this, they should consider changing the 2 apprentices to 1 journeyworker ratio from temporary to permanent.

The Council voted to recommend for approval of the extension of the 2 apprentices to 1 journeyworker ratio for Ironworker Reinforcing Apprenticeship Program up to December 31, 2024.

- B. Review and Recommendation on the Request of Ironworkers Training Trust Fund For Extension of 2 Apprentices to 1 Journeyworker Temporary Ratio for Structural Reinforcing Apprenticeship Program Ending on December 31, 2023 to December 31, 2024.
- The same issues that were raised during the previous discussion of the request for extension of the 2:1 ratio for Reinforcing were reiterated particularly changing the

temporary ratio to permanent. It was also suggested that the Ironworker's request should be 2 years interval instead of one year.

- Co-chair Travis Murakami
- Mr. Fernandez shared that the recommended ratio is 1 apprentice to 1 journeyworker although some construction programs such as Carpenter and Painter have 2:1 ratio. Mr. Durham stated that the Ironworker is a dangerous job as compared to the other trades.

Mr. Subiono moved to recommend approval of the extension of the 2:1 temporary ratio for Ironworker Structural Apprenticeship Program. Mr. Chock seconded the motion. The members voted as follows:

- Francis Tau'a – Yes
- Terry Uyehara – Yes
- Rick Subiono – Yes
- Travis Murakami – Yes
- Jeffrey Durham – No
- Michelle Thomas – No
- Keala Chock – Yes
- Gary Iwamoto – Yes
- Gregg Serikaku – Yes

SAC members Jeffrey Durham and Michele Thomas provided the same reason for their "no" vote.

The Council voted to recommend for approval of the extension of the 2 apprentices to 1 journeyworker ratio for Ironworker Structural Apprenticeship Program up to December 31, 2024.

C. Review and Recommendation on the Revised Standards of Apprenticeship for Wireperson Apprenticeship Program of Hawaii Electricians Training Fund HETF).

- SAC member Terry Uyehara informed the Chair that he is recusing himself. SAC member Jeffrey Durham informed the Chair that ABC have an Electrician program and is also recusing himself. Chair Serikaku asked if anyone else have an electrical program component in their apprenticeship program that are voting members.

Ms. Michele Thomas replied that Honolulu Board of Water Supply which she represents also has an electrical program and recuses as well. Mr. Fernandez interjected that by having a similar program does not automatically mean that the member has a conflict of interest and is prohibited. Ms. Thomas explained that she was answering to the question that they do have an electrical program. However, with that clarification, she manifested that she was not recusing because she believes that there was no conflict of interest between their Electrical Program and the Wireperson which are totally separate programs.

- Chair Serikaku asked Ms. Sroat to introduce herself and proceed with her report.

Ms. Mimi Sroat from Hawaii Electricians Training Fund introduced herself and proceeded with her presentation. She was however interrupted after Mr. Fernandez asked the Chair for a point of clarification. Mr. Fernandez stated that earlier Mr. Durham and Mr. Uyehara recused themselves for the reason that Mr. Durham has a similar program and Mr. Uyehara is the Training Director of the Wiperperson Program. Usually, when members recused, they go out of the meeting room if they were attending in person, and if attending virtually, they were put on waiting room. But now that Ms. Thomas reconsidered her earlier position about recusing, he does not know if Mr. Uyehara and Mr. Durham were also reconsidering their earlier position to recuse themselves.

Mr. Durham replied that he should still be allowed to listen to the discussion even though he recused based on the discussions during the last SAC meeting where members felt they should be able to sit in, listen, and participate but maybe cannot vote. Mr. Fernandez explained that was his reason for seeking clarification that when members recuse, they should state for the record that they are only recusing on the voting but participates in the discussion so that it will be reflected in the minutes. Mr. Durham then categorically stated that he is recusing from voting on the agenda item only but will listen to the discussions and if he has any talking points to offer, he will do that as well. Mr. Uyehara manifested that he is also recusing from voting only.

- Chair Serikaku commented that he thinks that it was a change from before where if they have any kind of program that was related to the program that was being discussed, they completely recused themselves. This was what happened when in the last meeting when ABC presented their proposal where they all recused themselves completely. He then asked if the WDD's determination was for each individually assess their own conflict of interest but do not have to completely recuse and can stay for discussion.

Ms. Pilotin-Freitas clarified that we follow the Robert's Rules of Order, and at the beginning, it was her understanding that the question on the floor was whether or not they have a program and not that they have a conflict of interest. For recusal, we cannot tell who has a conflict and it is only up to the members to determine if there is a conflict of interest. If at the beginning there is any discussion that could impact that decision to be made and for transparency, they have to disclose that there is a possible conflict of interest. The question was whether or not they have a program and having a program does not necessarily equate to a conflict of interest whether its financial benefit to the member.

Chair Serikaku apologized that he mischaracterized Michelle's questions and when she said they have a program, he just assumed that meant a conflict of interest because previously if it was determined that they have a program, that was a conflict of interest, and they have to completely recuse. He then asked if it is correct that even if there is a program that is related and have a conflict of interest, the member do not have to completely recuse can still stay for the discussion.

Ms. Pilotin-Freitas replied that is correct. According to her, the members are relied upon as experts on their field. During the last SAC meeting, she indicated that it is up to the member to determine if he/she has a conflict of interest and if a conflict exists, it is up

for the member to decide whether to participate in the discussion. However, when the vote on the motion is on the floor, the member can abstain from voting because there is a conflict.

Mr. Subiono suggested to Mr. Serikaku that as Chairman, he can make a determination whether the members who recused can stay or not. Chair Serikaku replied that he honestly feels that the industry experts need to be in the discussion and just recuse themselves in voting. He added that he wants to hear from the industry experts but if they have a conflict, they should recuse themselves from voting. Chair Serikaku further stated that by just having another program is not necessarily a conflict of interest, but the member must financially benefit from a certain decision. Ms. Pilotin-Freitas corroborated with the Chair that that there must be a financial gain in that decision in that decision to approve or disapprove a program not only to the member but family members as well. She however clarified that WDD do not determine the conflict.

Mr. Subiono agreed with the Chair's pronouncements that the members should remain in the discussions but recuse in the voting.

SAC member Keala Chock commented that the issue about recusals had a been a contentious issue in the past where individuals had to fully recused themselves from participating in the discussion and to be consistent for future meetings, there should be guidelines so that people know where they stand and what they can and cannot do.

Chair Serikaku confirmed the manifestation of Mr. Durham and Mr. Uyehara that they will remain in the discussion but will recuse in the voting. She then asks if there were other discussions and hearing none, he told Ms. Sroat to continue with her presentation.

Highlights of the presentation and discussion on the revised Standards of Apprenticeship for Wireperson Apprenticeship Program.

- Ms. Sroat summarized the revisions to the Wireperson Apprenticeship Program particularly the minimum qualifications under Section 6 of the Standards of Apprenticeship. She explained that biggest thing that they added in their minimum qualifications was to accept the Waipahu School for Adults tech math course which is like an applied mathematics course to meet the requirements for math to apply to their program. This math course would be acceptable aside from the one-year algebra and the NJATC online tech math course which is an online course the University of Tennessee.

Ms. Sroat also giving emphasis on item D which added completion of equivalent mathematics course recognized by the Joint Apprenticeship Committee. According to Ms. Sroat, this will allow students who complete math courses through organizations like Waipahu School for Adults iCAN Transition Program to meet the minimum requirements of the program.

SAC member Keala Chock asked Ms. Sroat if they are experiencing a high number of individuals requesting some kind of equivalency like the iCAN curriculum through adult learning programs. Ms. Sroat responded that it is only a handful who are outside

applicants or some of their members who don't have the math background making it problematic or challenging for them to pass the aptitude test. This option would expand the pool of qualified people who can work with their hands, but not excel in math. Mr. Chock concurred that it was a good thing that they included equivalent math courses as a pathway to enter the program.

- Mr. Jeffrey Alameida, President of Associated Builders and Contractors Hawaii Chapter commented that the JAC (Joint Apprenticeship Committee) does not have the qualifications to determine a math program equivalency. ~~He also asked if there are subject matters who are part of the JAC who are willing to stand behind their recommendation, otherwise, it's a potential liability to the JAC.~~

According to Mr. Alameida, the only equivalent to Algebra is Algebra and if the equivalency is basically a reduction in the requirements in order to provide more opportunities for people to advance through the apprenticeship program, why not consider removing Algebra all together? He also asked if there has been an equivalency test based on the Department of Education Algebra standards to make sure that it meets those standards, at minimum?

Ms. Sroat responded that there is an entrance exam that iCAN requires to people who enroll in this class because they need to see where they stand when they start the course. As to whether it meets DOE standards, she has to clarify with Christine Park.

Regarding Mr. Alameida's comment that the JATC do not have the authority to review the math courses equivalency that they accept, Ms. Sroat explained that their committee has authority to review and determines whether the math course is acceptable or not. It is not her or Mr. Uyehara as individuals who makes the determination. When they review the course as acceptable, they take into consideration the following: 1) Is the math class going to help them pass the aptitude test; and 2) is it going to be sufficient for them to get through the curriculum.

- Mr. Alameida followed up if there are subject matter experts who are part of the JAC that are willing to stand behind the recommendation, otherwise, it's a potential liability to the JAC. He stressed that Algebra is very important for the trade and for the participants that they don't want to dump down the process.

Ms. Sroat asked Mr. Alameida for clarification on what is considered to be a subject matter expert, for example DOE representative. Mr. Alameida replied that he wants to know if there is a subject matter expert that can verify that the curriculum is equivalent to what is being taught in high school.

- Mr. Subion asked if the apprentices must go through the Union or the training program and pass the test? Ms. Sroat's response to this was "yes." Mr. Durham followed up if the this course was equal to or better than what is required? Mr. Uyehara, responded that iCAN is equal to and meet minimum requirements for Algebra I. Ms. Sroat clarified that Techmath and iCAN are considered a technical math course and has never been called an Algebra course. As far as liability for the JATC accepting a Techmath course it

has never been an issue to say that we would get sued or be liable for accepting a course. She then asked Mr. Fernandez is this something to be concerned about.

Mr. Alameida interjected that the SAC has the responsibility to the industries, and they need to be comfortable with this; he is not promoting suing but only suggesting due diligence and the SAC is comfortable with this.

- Mr. Fernandez clarified that he and other WDD staff are not tradespeople or industry experts and do not have technical knowledge or expertise to determine whether the mathematics course that is recognized by the JAC meets the requirements to enter the program. Apprenticeship program is structured based on the training needs of the employers or sponsors and it is for them to determine what are the minimum qualifications, including equivalent courses or programs. The role of WDD/DLIR as State Apprenticeship Agency is to ensure that programs meet the minimum requirements for registration and approval and that is why we have the Council who are experts in these field.

Mr. Fernandez believes that the revisions were presented and approved by the JAC whose members are experts and will not be approving or recommending that is not equivalent to the current requirements in the standards. Ms. Sroat collaborated his statements that JAC is composed of experts in their field and have carefully reviewed the revisions before recommending for approval and presenting to the SAC.

- Ms. Sroat read the current language and proposed language of Item D of the minimum qualification and explained that the equivalent mathematics course recognized by the Joint Apprenticeship Committee that was added pertains to the NJATC math course that has been used for years. As such, she is not sure why there is a need to provide a letter from DOE or Community College unless the SAC feels it is necessary.

Mr. Chock moved to recommend for approval of the revised Standards of Apprenticeship for Wireperson Apprenticeship Program. Ms. Thomas seconded the motion.

The members voted as follows:

- Francis Tau'a – Yes
- Terry Uyehara – Recused
- Rick Subiono - Yes
- Travis Murakami – Yes
- Jeffrey Durham – Recused
- Michelle Thomas – Yes
- Keala Chock – Yes
- Gary Iwamoto – Yes
- Gregg Serikaku - Yes

D. Review and Recommendation on the Revised Standards of Apprenticeship of Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.

Ms. Kelli Braun introduced herself as Labor Relations Consultant at Hawaiian Electric and also assists the JAC. She believed that the members have a copy of the summary of the proposed changes and explained that the standards were being revised because these were outdated and have not been updated since 1999.

Ms. Braun highlighted the following revisions:

- Updated the Affirmative Action Plan to align with terminologies required by the Federal regulations as well as incorporate the current qualification and selection procedures.
- Wage progression for the Lineman program that is based on completion of work process hours identified in each step was changed for consistency with the wage progression for other occupations which is based on completion of every 1,000 hours.
- Approximate hours for some work processed of the Lineman program were updated to meet training needs of the occupation. The total work process hours remain unchanged.
- Minor changes, e.g. course title on the Red Vector curriculum that they use for their generation programs.

Mr. Subiono moved to recommend for approval of the revised Standards of Apprenticeship. Mr. Tau'a seconded the motion. Chair Serikaku asked the members if there are any discussions.

- Mr. Durham suggested that it would have been very helpful if the changes in their standards were highlighted. Chair Serikaku agreed and asked WDD to advise sponsors to highlight proposed changes when they submit request approval of revisions to their program.
- Before proceeding with the roll call vote, Chair Serikaku, asked WDD staff if he will ask if there is any recusal. Mr. Fernandez replied that he thinks that after the Chair reads the agenda item, it is incumbent upon members to inform the Chair if they are recusing in the discussion and/or voting.
- The members voted on the motion to recommend for approval as follows:
 - Francis Tau'a – Yes
 - Terry Uyehara – Recused
 - Rick Subiono - Yes
 - Travis Murakami – Yes
 - Jeffrey Durham – No
 - Michelle Thomas – Recused
 - Keala Chock – Yes
 - Gary Iwamoto – Yes
 - Gregg Serikaku - Yes

The SAC approved to recommend for approval of the revised Standards of Apprenticeship for Hawaiian Electric Company Apprenticeship Program.

E. Review and Recommendation on the Revised Work Process Schedule (OJT) and Related Training Instruction (Course Curriculum/Outline) for Electrician Apprenticeship Program of Hawaii Electric Light Company (HELCO).

- Ms. Kelly Braun and Mr. Aaron Ashimine, Technical Training Supervisor at HELCO made their presentation. and highlighted the following revisions:
 - a. Revised approximate hours within work processes by removing 900 hours from Work Process 9 (Maintenance) that were added to Work Process 1 (Installation). There was no change in the total 6,000 hours of on-the- job learning.
 - b. Course curriculum for the related training instruction component of program was changed. The program previously utilized Penn Foster as vendor but was changed to Northwest Lineman College.
- Mr. Ashimine explained that the difference between the two curriculum is that the Northwest Lyman College curriculum addresses safety better having three sections of substations OSHA, two sections of NESC and four sections of substation safety. It also brings consistency with other Lineman programs regarding safety rigging, locks and splices, the electrical theory and they have the same core basics. The change will bring consistency across our companies.
- Mr. Durham asked if it was a good idea to reduce the hours on maintenance and move to installation in light of the Maui wildfire. Mr. Ajimine replied that the apprenticeship focus is maintenance, new installations. There are many different pieces of equipment from transformers to breakers to circuit switches to cat banks. To give ample time for each piece of equipment we need to expand the time on the installation for the apprentices.

Mr. Murakami moved to recommend for approval of the revised work process schedule and course curriculum. Mr. Chock seconded the motion.

The members voted on the motion to recommend for approval as follows:

- Francis Tau'a – Yes
- Terry Uyehara – Recused
- Rick Subiono - Yes
- Travis Murakami – Yes
- Jeffrey Durham – yes
- Michelle Thomas – Recused
- Keala Chock – Yes
- Gary Iwamoto – Yes
- Gregg Serikaku - Yes

The SAC approved to recommend for approval of the revised work process schedule and course curriculum for Electrician Standards of Apprenticeship for Hawaiian Electric Company Apprenticeship Program.

F. Review and Recommendation on the Revised Related Training Instruction (Course Curriculum) for Electrical Mechanic Apprenticeship Program of Maui Electric Company.

Ms. Kelly Braun made the presentation and explained that the revision is similar to the Hawaii Electric Light Company where they are requesting to change of the course curriculum of the program from Penn Foster to Northwest Lyman College, for the same reason that she stated previously.

Mr. Murakami moved to recommend for approval of the revised work process schedule and course curriculum. Mr. Durham seconded the motion.

The members voted on the motion to recommend for approval as follows:

- Francis Tau'a – Yes
- Terry Uyehara – Recused
- Rick Subiono - Yes
- Travis Murakami – Yes
- Jeffrey Durham – yes
- Michelle Thomas – Recused
- Keala Chock – Yes
- Gary Iwamoto – Yes
- Gregg Serikaku - Yes

The SAC approved to recommend for approval of the course curriculum for Electrical Mechanic Apprenticeship Program of Maui Electric Company

VI. Unfinished Business

None

VII. Announcements

- The application form for membership with the SAC was sent to various stakeholders and due on January 5, 2024. All applications and nominations will be submitted to the Director for his consideration.
- There are no guidelines or rules regarding serving consecutive term or term limit. or rule about serving consecutive terms.
- Chair Serikaku commended WDD staff for doing an outstanding job for apprenticeship and program sponsors for their presentation. He stressed the importance of apprenticeship as an alternate pathway with the labor shortage.

VIII. Meeting adjourned at 2:52 pm.