

Meeting started at 9:07 a.m.

Mr. Gouker was late so that agenda items were taken out of order.

ITEM 16 – REPORT OF STAFF

175 total programs, 8823 total apprenticeships registered in Nevada 98 program have zero apprentices registered.

ITEM 17 – REPORT OF OFFICE OF APPRENTICESHIP

Mr. Wiggins, will the tribal nations accept registered apprentices that our outside of their program.

Ms. Henry said it would depend on the bid specifications. They don't have any jurisdiction.

Mr. Wiggins asked NSAC had jurisdiction of that. He asked about disciplinary actions.

Ms. Henry said that NSAC does have some jurisdiction.

ITEM 18 – REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Ms. Arguello said she had no report at this time.

ITEM 19 – PUBLIC COMMENTS

ROLL CALL: GS CA DW, KC DG

ITEM 1 – APPROVAL OF JUNE 2009 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

ITEM 2 – APPROVAL OF AUGUST MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

ITEM 3 - CONSENT ITEMS A) NO. ELECTRICIAN'S JATC (INSIDE WIREMAN) WAGE INCREASE B) NO. ELECTRICIAN'S JATC (RESIDENTIAL WIREMAN) WAGE INCREASE C) NO. ELECTRICIAN'S JATC (TELECOM. TECH) WAGE INCREASE D) NO. PLUMBERS JATC (RESIDENTIAL PLUMBER) WAGE INCREASE E) NO. PLUMBERS JATC (PLUMBER/PIPEFITTER) WAGE INCREASE F) SO. ASBESTOS WORKERS LOCAL 135 JATC WAGE INCREASE G) SO. LABORER'S TRAINING WAGE INCREASE G) SO. OPERATING & MAINTENANCE ENGINEERS JATC WAGE INCREASE H)

SO. PLUMBERS JATC (PIPEFITTER) WAGE INCREASE

Ms. Andriola motioned to approve.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

Mr. Smith called for a question on the motion. He asked if Item 3D was in violation of the construction minimum wage.

Ms. Brown stated that the new minimum wage was approved at \$11.72. She said according to the regulation the program was under collective bargaining agreement, so they had until the renewal of the agreement to adjust the wage.

Ch. Christensen asked Ms. Brown if she knew when that would be happening.

Ms. Brown answered no.

Ch. Christensen said in other instances the Council has requested the program take action immediately after the construction minimum wage has been approved.

Ms. Andriola amended the motion. The new motion was to approve items 3A through 3C and 3E through 3I.

Mr. Wiggins seconded that motion.

(M/S/C TO APPROVE ITEMS 3A THROUGH 3C AND 3E THROUGH 3I)

Ms. Andriola motioned to table Item 3D until next meeting.

Mr. Wiggins seconded.

(M/C/S TO TABLE ITEM 3D)

ITEM 4 - DE-REGISTRATION OF PROGRAMS A) UNR RESIDENTIAL PLUMBER CANCELLATION OF PROGRAM B) UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA RENO CANCELLATION OF PROGRAM

Ms. Brown advised the Council that due to budget cuts UNR could no longer afford to train. She said any person that was registered in the program is still employed by UNR but they were canceled from the program.

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve the cancellations of the two programs.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO DE-REGISTRATION OF PROGRAMS A) UNR RESIDENTIAL PLUMBER CANCELLATION OF PROGRAM B) UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA RENO CANCELLATION OF PROGRAM)

Mr. Gouker motioned to change the order of the agenda items taking Item 6 before Item 5.out of order.

ITEM 6 REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION RE “APPRENTICE ROOFERS”

Patrick Davis, Apprentice Coordinator, Claudia Margarucci, Administrative Assistant, Andrew Kahn Attorney with McCracken, Stemerman and Holsberry, was there representing the Sheet Metal Workers Local 88 and the apprentices who filed complaints, and Bill Brooks Sheet Metal Workers JATC.

Mr. Kahn said the question came before the School District, who was investigating wage complaints, was presented with the following question: where you have workers who are enrolled in an apprenticeship program on paper but they are not given any classroom training and they don't meet the Council's requirement can they be truly called bona fide apprentices. He said that is what the regulation said must exist to be given a wage break. The district came to Ms. Brown and she added to the issues that were presented in June. It wasn't on the public agenda. When he approached to speak on the matter, the Council has already considered the item without any input. He said legally there was a problem with the public notice. But more importantly the council has the authority to reconsider an issue where they haven't been given full public input. They were asking the Council to hear that matter today.

Ch. Christensen asked the Council member if there was any objection to them reconsidering the matter at that time.

Mr. Wiggins asked what was being reconsidered.

Mr. Kahn said there was a resolution passed at the June meeting stating that those workers would be considered apprentices for purposes of that regulation because they had been signed up by their employer. He said that was not a direct quote from the resolution.

Ch. Christensen asked staff to advise them about that decision.

Ms. Brown said there was a ruling made, she read that section into the minutes.

Ch. Christensen said he recalled some of that meeting. He said the discussion was what would be the minimum to consider someone an apprentice under the statute.

Mr. Kahn said bona fide is there issue. He said they understood that there was a question of jurisdiction that the Chairman raised at the last meeting as to whether or not this was really a prevailing wage issue or an NSAC issue. He said it was their position that it was really an issue for both agencies and officials to look at. He said this is the area where prevailing wage and apprenticeship law intersect. The apprentice

NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL
December 21, 2009
Quarterly Meeting

wage break is designed to encourage high quality training by providing some financial assistance to those employers who are really providing it. Their position is that it wasn't really being provided so there is not policy rational or justification for allowing a wage break in that situation. He believed the declarations that had been previously submitted, that in five areas that Noorda didn't meet the normal standards for apprenticeship. There was no selection process, the individuals were hired off the street by the employer, there was no contact with the apprenticeship committee. There were numerous examples where there ratio violations on the jobsite, including instances where there was no journeyman at all. There was no classroom training and worst than that; there were supervisors who told the people that they were not required attending class. He said that basically thrown out the window all of the requirements that NSAC had imposed regarding related and supplemental instruction. His final point was that the work that was being done on the projects was not work that is in the recognized standards for the roofers. The workers were not being trained in an area that would have them out in future career endeavors.

Mr. Brooks said they have submitted to staff five sworn affidavits from individuals that were classified as apprentices. All of those apprentices have been before the Council prior to this meeting to testify but they were not given the opportunity to testify. All five were available to testify at a later date if needed.

Mr. Davis said that at no time were the individuals told that they were not to attend classes. When they come in they sign forms as they are suppose to do, but they chose not come to class. At no time were they ever told not to come to classes.

Ch. Christensen asked Ms. Brown about her investigative findings.

Ms. Brown said she had prepared a memo to the Council with her findings. She said at the last meeting she was directed by Council to specifically review the files of the individuals that were in question. She said the memo had specific information including the name, the date of indenture, the cancellation date, their current status with the program and record of any classes the person would have attended. The program did still have a few people that were registered and are attending classroom training.

Ch. Christensen pointed out that there were ten cancellations. He asked if that cancellation were a due to action from the committee.

Ms. Brown answered yes.

Ms. Andriola asked Ms. Brown if the apprentices were selected in accordance with the approved selection procedure outlined in the standards.

Ms. Brown stated said that those apprentices were being registered after the employer was organized. She said she had noted in the findings from the investigation was that some of those apprentices were registered after the organization period, but they were allowed to register and possibly jump the ranking list.

Mr. Davis said he believed the program was using previous standards.

Ms. Brown said the employer in question was organized in 2007, on the second page of her report most of the apprentices were registered well into 2008. She said she raised the question as to what was a reasonable amount of time to register an apprentice after an employer has been organized. She said according to some of the written statement, the person would go apply and they were directed to go apply with the Roofer and then come back and be registered.

Mr. Gouker addressed the issue of organization. He said according to Appendix D from the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. It was related to qualification and selection procedures. He said there was no gray area in the appendix. He read it into the record.

Mr. Kahn said that according to the compliance reviews there were several violations of regulations and laws. He said the apprentices were working outside of their training guidelines.

Mr. Brooks said that five apprentices were not required and told that they did not have to attend any classroom training by the other employees at Noorda. There are written statements from those men.

Mr. Gouker read into the appendix D, qualification of federal codes. He said that codes are clear. If the people were not apprentices if they were not employed on the date of the organization.

Mr. Wiggins said there was a question of if a job is redlined, what happened to those people.

Ch. Christensen said the program should be evaluating the apprentices. They should not be relying on the employer, the union, or any outside source.

Mr. Gouker motioned that any apprentice not employed on the date that the employer was organized, that any apprentice must have been employed on that date. Any one else would not be considered an apprentice.

Ch. Christensen clarified that the date that Mr. Gouker was assigning was the date that Noorda signed the date of organization.

Mr. Gouker said yes, that was correct.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

M/S/C ANY APPRENTICE NOT EMPLOYED ON THE DATE THAT THE EMPLOYER WAS ORGANIZED IS NOT AN APPRENTICE)

Mr. Wiggins asked for an AG opinion. HE IN an instance when an employer has been performing jobs and he becomes signatory, the trainees that the employer has, if the union and the employer agree to waive those projects, are those people allowed to be brought into the union under organizing as those jobs terminate.

Ch. Christensen asked Mr. Wiggins was talking about the apprentice.

Mr. Wiggins said yes.

Ms. Arguello asked what the time frame was.

Mr. Wiggins said it could be six months to a year, depending on the size of the job and whether it's a general contractor or subcontractor.

Ch. Christensen said according to Mr. Gouker's motion, it would be governed at the point of signature of the collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. Gouker said that was correct, that the Council doesn't have the latitude to allow for those instances. He said that language is available to them.

Mr. Wiggins said he understood but he wanted to get an AG opinion.

Mr. Wiggins motioned to ask for an AG opinion on the matter.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO REQUEST AN AG OPINION REGARDING THE REGISTRATION OF APPRENTICES AFTER THE EMPLOYER AND THE UNION SIGN A WAIVER TO EXCLUDE A PARTICULAR PROJECT UNTIL AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THAT PROJECT)

ITEM 5 – NEVADA ROOFERS JATC – PROBATION REVIEW

Ms. Brown said that she had provided the Council with the finding from the last probation compliance review. She reported that the program was still in violation of the related instruction portion of their standards and NAC. She said that at the time of the review the program had not taken any action against the apprentice for failing to attend classroom training. After the review, at the request of Mr. Gouker, she contacted the program and requested their current classroom rooster. The program provided a clean list after they had taken appropriate action against those apprentices who were in violation of the standards. The program provided their current numbers the morning of the Council meeting. She said they had 100 apprentices and 378 journeymen. The program also provided her the grades for those apprentices still registered in the program. She met with Doug Howell and several of the committee members during that compliance review. They reviewed each apprentice file individually. She also directed the Council to the letter from the program dated December 9th.

Ch. Christensen asked Ms. Brown if she had any recommendations.

Ms. Brown said she recommended that the probation continue. There would be another compliance review and she would bring her findings back to the Council.

NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL

December 21, 2009

Quarterly Meeting

Mr. Howell said that the program has changed their policies and procedures regarding the attendance. The program does have a three strike rule. If they have attendance issues, they will be brought before the committee. He agreed that the continuing the probation for another follow-up review.

Ch. Christensen asked Mr. Howell what was his opinion of the program.

Mr. Howell said the program has been moving forward. They have had a change in coordinators so they have been making progress. He said he has been attending some of the committee meetings, and they have committed to becoming a better program.

Mr. Davis said he believed the program has fixed all the problems and is moving forward.

Ch. Christensen asked Mr. Brooks if he had any comments.

Mr. Brooks asked for clarification of the standards the program was operating under. It was his understanding that as of the date of the Council meeting the program was still using the standards from May 2007.

Mr. Wiggins motioned that the program remain on probation for six months probation after they have been found in compliance.

Mr. Gouker asked about the two rosters that the program provided. He asked for explanation of the codes used on the rooster. He said there were several names marked as employer "unknown" and on the new rooster it was marked "unemployed" and why the rooster changed.

Ms. Maragucci said when she contacts the employers and they advise her if the apprentice is still employed at that company. Depending on what she finds out, she makes the adjustment on the list.

Mr. Gouker said one of the reasons why the program was placed on was for fiduciary training which is financial huge because it has personal and program impact. The second part was operation of the program. He thinks something has slipped into the crack where it appears that contractor has more authority than they should. The program is responsible for the program's operation. The apprentices are supposed to receive a training assignment to go to a contractor. He said the program sending a letter to the contractors to see if they are working is not acceptable. They need to know everyday where their apprentices are assigned to verify that they are in fact on a job where they are receiving journey level supervision. The program should be verifying that the apprentices are being trained under the work processes that are outlined in the standards. He said there were some questions to how an apprentice on the two rosters had been revised. On the first rooster, ending in October the fourth person on the second period list had nine absences. On the second rooster the same person had an almost perfect record. He said these are the types of things that brought the program in front of the Council. He said he is not seeing the classroom components. They have apprentices that have missed up to 80% of the classes, which means they are not being trained in the processes. Just going to work doesn't make them a journey level

worker when they top out. The program is obligated to have a signed contract from each contractor stating they will abide by the program standards. He asked if the program had those. He said if they don't they are obligated to remove the apprentices from those contractors sign that agreement. He said there were apprentices that were told by the contractor or their journeyman that they could forget school, they don't have to go. He stated that is not the way that is going to be. He said there is no continuity between the rosters. They have gone from 177 apprentices, 88 have been canceled, leaving 89 apprentices. They look like they may be making progress, but it is not enough.

Mr. Wiggins said Mr. Gaxiola's letter was addressing his complaints that the program had been subjected to several complaints by the Sheet Metal program. He said he complimented the programs for bringing those issues to the Council. He also compliments the program when they correct the problems. But a program should not be non-compliant when a complaint is filed and it is right. He said the program was in trouble and were not benefitting the apprentices at all. He hoped that the program could bring themselves back in line.

Motion restated:

Mr. Wiggins motioned that the program remain on probation for six months probation after they have been found in compliance.

Mr. Gaxiola stated that he submitted a letter dated December 9, 2009. He requested that the program be removed from suspension. He said he understood what Mr. Wiggins was saying. He said that they have made leaps and bounds from where they were. He agreed that there have been a lot of issues. They have addressed all of the issues. If he remembered correctly the only outstanding issue was the fiduciary training. They have since passed that. They have gone through just about every compliance review in front of the Council. He did not recall having been before the Council without side input from another competing union. He said all they are asking is that they be allowed to speak to the council and not have to address another competing union to address what they are going through. He said as far as he knew they have complied. They are working to both the state and the fed. But they were asking to have their chance to work with the Council without interference from others.

Ch. Christensen said it was important not to mix that two terms up. He said the program was under probation, not a suspension. The program is able to function under all aspects. They are just subject to ongoing reviews and reports to the Council.

Mr. Glen Greener, NV Roofers JATC member, said that he has attended almost every audit or meeting. . They have had fiduciary training, directors and officer training and everything they could think of to be in compliance with the new standards. He said he had strong concerns with other union that are stepping into the fray, way beyond the concern of another brotherhood. He said he received a phone call from Mr. Brooks and that phone call was inappropriate. He said he said Mr. Brooks was trying to meet with him. He

said he explained that every time they had tried to receive guidance from Local 88 they have met with demands. Not suggestions that they could go forward as two unions should do.

Mr. Wiggins said he was not concerned with the relationship between to the two unions. He cared about the apprentices. He said if someone brought a complaint to the Council, and that complaint is valid, the Council will deal with it.

Mr. Greener said he appreciated that the fact that Mr. Wiggins did not care.

Mr. Gouker clarified that the program would remain on probation until February 2010 if they are found in compliance at the August 2010 meeting.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO EXTEND THE PROBATION OF THE NEVADA ROOFERS JATC UNTIL FEBRUARY 2010)

Mr. Gouker recommended that they roofers check with some of the other program coordinators and get some advice on the program operation.

ITEM 7 - SO. LABORER'S TRAINING WEATHERIZATION INSTALL TECH – NEW PROGRAM

Mr. Wiggins recused himself on this matter.

Ms. Andriola recused herself.

Mark Edgel, training director presented the standards. Mr. Edgel said they have been a few changes made since the standards were submitted. He said the name of the program will be changed to Weatherization Energy Retro Fit Technician Installer. On page 9 of the probation period should be changed to 500 hours. On Item 8 there was a typo. There was an error on the probation period should be 900 hours. On page 10 under discipline, there were removing language that stated that the apprentice coordinator had the authority to remove apprentices. They wanted to make OSHA 10 a standalone course. They believed it was not unique because of SB 152. He said the bill required that the 50% of the people in the workforce be trainees. The wages were mandated by the SB152. They did not believe it was a construction trade. He read a portion of SB 152 into the record.

Mr. Gouker asked if there were people working right.

Mr. Edge said they do.

Mr. Gouker asked how many people would be considered apprentices.

Mr. Edgel said there weren't any since the program has not been approved yet.

NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL
December 21, 2009
Quarterly Meeting

Mr. Gouker said he didn't believe it was construction occupation either, so he was ok with the ratio. He was concerned with the low wage.

Mr. Edgel said the contractors are even concerned with the low wage. They are hoping to have it increased within a year.

Ms. Andriola disclosed that she has been working on SB 152. She said it was determined that several of the programs were already training in these fields. She asked if there was a code by department of labor yet.

Ms. Henry said in the last two months ONET has place a code on weatherization technician. The complete job description task areas and specific vocation skill levels have not been established because it's still under construction. The applicant has submitted the standards to the department of labor to request it be listed as an apprenticable occupation.

Ms. Andriola asked if the Council has ever approved a program that was not recognized by DOL.

Ms. Brown said they had.

Ch. Christensen asked what was the purpose of the \$15.00 that was listed on summary page on the prevailing wage, if the program was not trying to meet what the industry is supporting.

Mr. Edgel said the \$15.00 was total package allowed by the Dept. of Labor. SB152 requires health care coverage. In order for that to happen it had to be taken out of that amount. He said there was also \$.25 for training subtracted, along with a vacation fund that they can draw from.

Mr. Gouker said the training fee cannot be taken from the apprentice's wages.

Mr. Edgel said the employer is paying the cost of training.

Ms. Andriola said the wages are based on the task that is performed. She asked Ms. Henry if the program was considered construction.

Ms. Henry said no, this was not considered construction; it mirrors that old building maintenance occupation.

Ms. Andriola said the prevailing wage rates depend on the task that is performed. They have been determined and posted. She said she thought that wage rate was a base rate, but would stand corrected if that is different.

Mr. Gouker said there were sections in the classroom objectives that are construction. He said maybe the program needed to expand on the classroom topics. If they are awareness classes that needs to be clearly stated.

Mr. Edgel said those classes are electives. In the field they will not be doing any of that type of work. That was placed there for individuals who wanted to advance.

Ms. Andriola said the rates should be reflected on the 5910 form.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve. Correct ratio on page 11. The 5910 form needs to be updated to the \$11.40.

Mr. Smith seconded.

**(M/S/C TO SO. LABORER'S TRAINING WEATHERIZATION INSTALL TECH – NEW PROGRAM
APPROVE ONE YEAR PROBATION**

ITEM 8 – YOUNG ELECTRIC SIGN COMPANY RENO – NEW PROGRAM

Deedee Canac was present. She presented the new program.

Mr. Smith page 3 # 5, change “may” to “will.”

Ms. Canac agreed.

Mr. Smith asked that Page 4 E be deleted.

Ms. Canac agreed to make the changes.

Mr. Smith said he was concerned ratio. He said the sentence following the ratio would allow the program to use an alternate ratio.

Ch. Christensen said the policy of the Council has always been that the ratio must be followed by in the entire workforce and on the jobsite.

Ms. Canac said they will strike that language.

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve with changes.

Ch. Christensen advised Ms. Canac that the committee should have equal representation from both management and labor.

Ms. Canac said there is an ex-officio officer that will eventually have a vote.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO APPROVE YOUNG ELECTRIC SIGN COMPANY RENO – NEW PROGRAM)

**ITEM 9 – ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS SIERRA NV CHAPTER – NEW PROGRAM
TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECH**

Ms. Andriola recused herself from this matter and presented.

Mr. Smith asked if the program saw a shortage of work.

Ms. Andriola said no, they were approached with the task of starting this new program.

Mr. Smith asked how many apprentices they thought they would have in a year.

Ms. Andriola said she hoped for at least 15, but she couldn't really predict it.

Mr. Smith asked how many related training hours would be.

Ms. Andriola said there were 165 hours.

Public comment:

Mr. Alan Darney, Director of No. Electrical JATC said his program was not provided with a copy of the form 5910.

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO APPROVE ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS SIERRA NV CHAPTER – NEW PROGRAM TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECH WITH A ONE PROBATION)

ITEM 10 – ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS LAS VEGAS CHAPTER – NEW PROGRAM TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECH

Ms. Andriola recused herself.

Michelle Cates, Vice President of Education, presented her program. She said on page 4(B) should be reworded. Page 6, the words should be changed change to southern Nevada. On page 14(C) the zip code should be changed.

Public comments:

None.

Mr. Wiggin motioned to approve with changes and one year probation.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO APPROVE ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS LAS VEGAS CHAPTER – NEW PROGRAM TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECH WITH CHANGES AND A ONE YEAR PROBATION)

ITEM 11 SO. CEMENT MASONS JATC – REVISION OF STANDARDS

Marvin Gebers, program coordinator, presented the changes. He said that standards were last revised in 2004. The major changes to the standard provided general job description, lowering minimum age, increased term of apprentice term to 4 year, 7200 OJL program. They have standardized the curriculum

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve.

Mr. Smith seconded.

(M/S/C SO. CEMENT MASONS JATC – REVISION OF STANDARDS)

ITEM 12 – LOCAL 669 JATC REVISIONS OF STANDARDS

This item was tabled.

ITEM 13 – SO. ELECTRICAL JATC REVISION OF STANDARDS

Mr. Gouker recused himself.

Mr. Madison Burnett, Training Director, represented the revision of standards. Program is requesting a ratio change. The new language was read into the record. The program as also requesting approval of the new goals and timetables under the affirmative action plan. The last change was to Section XXII that would allow the program to request completion certificates from the Office of Apprenticeship.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TO APPROVE SO. ELECTRICAL JATC REVISION OF STANDARDS)

ITEM 14 – NV ENERGY- POWER LINEMAN REVISION OF STANDARDS

Peter Easler, NV Energy Consultant for Human Resources and Training and Development, Greg Moore Apprentice Lineman Trainer, and Todd Waymiere, Apprentice Lineman Trainer, were all present to answer questions on the revision of standards.

Mr. Easler explained that the program is requesting that the term of apprenticeship and classroom training hours be reduced. He pointed out that on page 8 the definition of the ratio has been outlined. On page 5 Section IV (a) the EEO Pledge was updated. He said on page 6 Section VII (f) has been revised.

Ch. Christensen said that section A was missing.

Mr. Easler read that portion into the record and stated that there was a typographical error.

Mr. Wiggins asked why they were reducing the program.

Greg Moore said the program was originally a four year program, which was revised to a five year program. They have coving the curriculum in four years. The fifth year was added at the beginning of the program and not the end. That was for a groundman program that is no longer being filled.

Mr. Smith asked how many committee representative did the program have.

Mr. Easler said there were four labor representatives, four management representatives and one is an ex-officio without a vote.

Mr. Smith asked what a major fraction thereof was as noted on page 8 ratio.

Mr. Wiggins asked if major fraction thereof be deleted.

Mr. Easler said "major fraction thereof" would be removed.

Mr. Smith asked that page 13 C be changed from 144 hours to 202 hours.

Mr. Easler agreed to correct the RTI hours to be consistent with the 5910 form.

Mr. Gouker motioned the revision of standards with changes.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion

(M/S/C TO APPROVE NV ENERGY POWER LINEMAN REVISION OF STANDARDS WITH CHANGES)

ITEM 15 TEAMSTERS TRAINING REVISION OF STANDARDS

Dana recused himself

Crystal Allen, Training Director, was present. She said the program changed their condo class from 24 hours to 40 hours and their reading class from 8 hours to 16 hours.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

(M/S/C TEAMSTERS TRAINING REVISION OF STANDARDS)

ITEM 16 – ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gouker motioned to adjourn.

Mr. Wiggins seconded.

(M/S/C TO ADJOURN)7