



Chairman Christensen called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. inviting participation from all.

Roll call was taken to ensure a quorum.

He stated that he had been informed that Item 4 had been withdrawn from the agenda by staff.

Mr. Gouker motioned to amend the agenda to withdraw Item 4.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO AMEND THE AGENDA AND WITHDRAW ITEM 4)**

**ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2008 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2008 MEETING MINUTES)**

**ITEM 2 – BILL DRAFT REQUEST**

Chairman Christensen explained the Bill Draft Request. He reminded the Council that due to the financial state the State of Nevada is experiencing that at the last meeting there was discussion about possible statutes and regulations that would allow the apprenticeship program to fund the function of the State Director for apprentice and the Council. He said there have been a few comments made relating to the sufficiency of the proposed registration, indenture certification and audit fees. There has also been discussion of a sunset provision and whether there should be an additional funding mechanism possibly the enforcement of penalties on public works projects.

Mr. Wiggins said he sat down and ran the numbers and the fees would be half of what is needed. He said most of the programs with no apprentices would most likely be canceling their program so they won't be able to be considered.

Ms. Andriola was also asking if the proposal would meet the needs of the Labor Commissioner's office. She asked if the Labor Commission had run the numbers. She asked if there had been any consideration in having an apprentice pay for the indenture fee, so that they would have a stake in their own apprenticeship. She said she was just asking for that to be considered.

Mr. Gouker said he agreed with that. The apprentice should have some sort of responsibility as well. He said he thought the numbers for the fees being requested may be to low.

Mr. Wiggins also agreed.

Ch. Christensen said that would require a change in regulation.

NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL

November 7, 2008

Mr. Campbell said if the apprentice was to be responsible for a small portion of this; it should be tied in to having a registration card for the registered apprentice. The apprentice could pay for that registration card and that might also help.

Mr. Tanchek said that the Bill Draft Request that he had submitted for the repeal of N.R.S 610 was not forwarded to LCB. He said he also made the assumption that any of the programs that have less than 10 apprentices would be inclined to simply cancel their programs. Using the proposed numbers he came up with that generating roughly \$110,000 to \$115,000. Since that repeal is no longer on the table, his underlying concerns are lack of staff and the ability to really be able to support the program. He said there are no man hours available because of other office duties. He said the new 29.29 is going to put more requirements on the States. One of his concerns is that they have a new concurrence law that is now in place. What he is looking at is an additional burden with no additional resources to handle that burden. He said one possibility is that his office would go forward with what they already have in terms of the budget recognizing that there are not a lot of man hours.

Ch. Christensen asked the Commissioner if it would be his suggestion that they go forward with the BDR as a partial funding mechanism.

Mr. Tanchek said if it is something that they agree on across the board, and it would help keep the program sustainable and functioning he would agree that it was worth looking at.

Ms. Andriola said she thought they should still move forward. She asked how the BDR came about. She asked she be involved in any new information about this BDR.

Mr. Campbell said he wanted to hear from the programs present.

Mr. Wiggins asked the Commissioner to expand on the audit that the DOL had conducted and the findings.

Mr. Tanchek said there was an audit conducted a few years before. One of the findings was that NSAC was understaffed. There was a suggestion that a State Director position be created. He said it was added in his budget and shot down. He said Ms. Brown has done a great job but she has not received the proper training for some of the duties that she has.

Bob Benedict, Executive Director of PHCC, said this was definitely worth considering as long as the programs had notice so that they could prepare.

Ch. Christensen asked if the members of the Council would like to form a subcommittee. He said because of the rules about quorums, there could only be one member for both sides. He said because of the interest, there might need to be a formal workshop.

Mr. Wiggins motioned to have a formal workshop.

Ms. Gouker seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO HOLD A FORMAL WORKSHOP REGARDING THE PROPOSED BDR)**

Mr. Glen Greener said one of the things missing was a budget analysis of where that money would be going specifically and how those funds would be applied. He said he agreed that there would need to be a sunset clause. He asked if at least one representative of each program could be involved in the BDR process.

Ch. Christensen asked Mr. Greener if he had any ideas of a possible sunset clause.

Mr. Greener said he wasn't sure of all of the aspects, but he would suggest at least a three-year sunset clause. He said he would happy to be a part of any workshops or drafts.

Mr. Wiggins said they needed to act swiftly.

Mr. Tanchek said he doesn't have any BRDs in but he will contact LCB.

Mr. Wiggins said they might want to submit the draft to DOL now and revise it later.

Ch. Christensen asked Mr. Tanchek if he thought that would be a good idea.

Mr. Howell said the draft had been presented to their regional office and is now in Washington.

**ITEM 3 CONSENT ITEMS/CHANGES TO STANDARDS: A) SO. ASBESTOS WORKERS LOCAL 135 JATC B) NO. NEVADA CARPENTERS JATC C) SO. OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE ENGINEERS JATC D) IRONWORKERS LOCAL 433 JATC E) IRONWORKERS LOCAL 416 JATC**

Mr. Wiggins motioned to approve.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE CONSENT ITEMS/CHANGES TO STANDARDS: A) SO. ASBESTOS WORKERS LOCAL 135 JATC B) NO. NEVADA CARPENTERS JATC C) SO. OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE ENGINEERS JATC D) IRONWORKERS LOCAL 433 JATC E) IRONWORKERS LOCAL 416 JATC)**

**ITEM 4 – WILLIAM PHILLIPS VS. SO. GLAZIERS JATC APPEAL FROM TERMINATION OF APPRENTICESHIP**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**ITEM 5 – SHEET METAL WORKERS LOCAL 88 JATC – REVISION OF STANDARDS**

Mr. Dan Rose, Training Director, was present to answer questions regarding his revisions. He explained to the Council that there were five changes requested. He said the first change was to page 5, this change would allow the applicant to access the applications online. The second change was to change the wording of "receiving" to "accepting". The third change was to page 8 add language to require the applicants to contact the JATC every six months in order to remain on the active reserve list. The fourth change was to allow the applicant to be advised in writing or

**NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL**

**November 7, 2008**

telephone call for acceptance into the program and response in a timely manner as to their desire to participate in the program. The final revision was to page 11 to allow the direct entry from apprentices registered in a non-union program. He stated that the last revision was approved by the NSAC at the February 2008 meeting. There has been no revision to the curriculum.

Mr. Campbell asked if the revised language in selection procedures would be acceptable to the Office of Apprenticeship.

Mr. Howell said that the applicants would have to remain on the list of eligible applicants for two years.

Mr. Campbell said he thought that was the case. He said he believed the program was still required to keep the list.

Mr. Rose asked if it were possible to leave the names on the list, but keep a section that shows which people have kept in contact with the program.

Mr. Wiggins asked about the program requiring proof of legal residency. He asked Mr. Howell if the program could require that.

Mr. Howell said that is the requirement of the employers.

Mr. Rose said it was his understanding that because of the worker's compensation laws the JATC's are considered an employer.

Ch. Christensen said that in the State of Nevada that is even murkier. He said that typically what happens is that an apprentice is accepted into a program with the documentation that they provided, and is sent on a job assignment. Once the information is checked in the National database the apprentice is sent back to the hall or program. The program has unknowingly accepted someone who does not have appropriate documentation. His suggestion was to hold that one item until they received an Attorney General Opinion.

Mr. Gouker asked if the applications that were available on the web were pre-numbered.

Mr. Rose said the program numbers the application once they have been accepted.

Ms. Andriola said the minimum qualification in standards did not match the minimum qualification in the selection procedure. She asked if the people who would be accepted by direct entry would be required to meet the same minimum qualifications. She said that throughout the body of the standards there is language missing.

Mr. Rose said that all programs did not have the same minimum qualifications. When an apprentice is transferring between programs they may not meet the requirements of the new program they are trying to transfer into.

Ms. Andriola said not having the consistency in the standards is a problem.

**NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL**

**November 7, 2008**

Mr. Campbell said the language is standard language. During organizing if an employer calls an employee an apprentice, the program has to accept them into the program as an apprentice with or without the minimum qualifications.

Ms. Andriola asked if there was a law, and if so, which law was it.

Mr. Campbell said he did not have the specific information on the particular law.

Ms. Andriola said she was not trying to keep there from being a disparity in the standards.

Mr. Howell read C.F.R 29.29.5(13) the transfer of apprenticeship requirements. He said it did not state that the apprentices had to meet the minimum qualification of the new program.

Ch. Christensen asked if the program had an education requirement in the standards.

Mr. Rose said he did not have a program inserting a line that states that the apprentice must receive their high school or GED before they complete the program.

Mr. Campbell said that extra language might violate the laws regarding to organizing.

Mr. Rose asked about the status of the standards as they are written.

Public Comment:

Mr. Greener said his comment was to suggest that whoever does the research have a heavy background in Worker's Compensation field. Deliberately, the State of Nevada has made determinations those nonresident aliens cannot be entitled to rehabilitation. They are entitled to all medical care and treatment, but because they can not work legally under federal statutes they can not be provided rehabilitation. There is time, under federal laws, that if their documentation is found to be incorrect, to resolve the matter.

Ch. Christensen clarified with Mr. Greener that his opinion was that no applicant without proper documentation could be referred for training.

Mr. Greener said if an applicant was sent out and the paperwork was found to be improper or in question, that the applicant has approximately seven days to correct.

Mr. Wiggins said the unions do not have the authority to check citizenship.

Mr. Alan Darney said that their standards have several methods of direct entry, which do not require the applicants to meet the minimum qualifications under a different method of entry. In addition, they have provisions for applicants with previous training, where they would bypass some of those minimum requirements.

Mr. Rose asked to table his standards until the items could be reviewed.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve the standards with the exception of item 2, the residency requirement, and getting a letter of clarification of item 3 with a letter from the Office of Apprenticeship.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

Mr. Campbell asked if the motion included changing any portion of the minimum qualification of direct entry.

Mr. Gouker said no.

Roll Call Vote: CA AYE, GS AYE, PC AYE, DW AYE, DG AYE

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE SO. SHEET METAL WORKERS LOCAL 88 REVISION OF STANDARDS WIT THE EXCEPTION OF ITEM # 2)**

**ITEM 6 – PLUMBING HEATING COOLING CONTRACTORS OF NEVADA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION – REVISION OF STANDARDS**

Mr. Bob Benedict, Executive Director, and Crystal Caywood were present to answer questions.

Mr. Benedict said that the majority of the changes made to the standards were required by their name change, new regulations, or errors or corrections. The most significant change is to the sponsor name change. They have established an education foundation to house the education program. The program is a nonprofit corporation and they have applied for an IRS tax exemption under 501C3.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve as submitted.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE THE PLUMBING HEATING COOLING CONTRACTORS OF NEVADA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION – REVISION OF STANDARDS)**

**ITEM 7 – SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY REVISION OF STANDARDS**

**Tabled**

**ITEM 8 – NEVADA ROOFERS JATC - REVISION OF STANDARDS**

Mr. Patrick Davis, Program Coordinator, was present to answer questions regarding the revision. He said the changes to the standards to change the jurisdiction of the program from statewide to southern Nevada only, to change the number of trustees to two, to add OSHA safety training, CPR and first aid to the standards, the signature pages have been updated, they have deleted references to the Reno in the selection procedure and to modify qualifications for selection of apprentices requiring ESL classes.

Public comment:

Mr. Rose read a letter into the record that he had sent to the Council. (That letter has not been recorded into the minutes, but is available for review for any interested party.)

Modesto Gaxiola, Business Manager for Roofers and Waterproofers Union, said he had reviewed the minutes from the previous Council meeting. He was concerned that the Council allowed for testimony that was off topic and brings up jurisdiction and OSHA violations. He said that present at this November meeting were other trust members, representatives from the union, their northern Nevada counterparts, to add their support to the program. He said that they would not tolerate the direction that the September meeting was allowed to go in.

Ch. Christensen explained that while the Council did understand their concerns, the Council could ask all pertaining to a compliant.

Mr. Gaxiola said the direction that the complaints were going in were pertaining to OSHA violations of a participating contractors and possible jurisdictional issues. He said the Labor Commissioner should handle jurisdictional issues.

Ch. Christensen agreed that the Council does not handle jurisdictional issues, but did explain that safety matters were very important to the Council.

Mr. Gaxiola read into the record a special notice that was put out by the North Carolina Occupational (inaudible) (This item was not left for the record). He said that basically what he read was stating that the DOT codes were to be used as a reference, not for jurisdictional issues.

Mr. Campbell said the biggest problem at the September meeting was that Noorda was going to be used for a portion of the classroom training. He said they asked that the Labor Commissioner investigate. He asked if Noorda was still a trainer.

Mr. Gaxiola said Noorda Sheet Metal is a part of the curriculum (inaudible). He said that sheet metal is just the material. The entire roofing system is composed of many other elements that are addressed in all the apprenticeship. When they get into step six they get into the basics of making cuts for anything that has to do with sheet metal. But that is not their curriculum. Their curriculum is covered in the standards of all semesters and all steps.

Mr. Campbell asked who would be doing the training.

Mr. Gaxiola said an instructor paid by the JATC. Noorda Sheet Metal is a signatory contractor. He said the contractor has opened up their facility for training use. The program will be paying for the instruction.

Mr. Campbell said that the Council concerns were that if the contractor were providing that for the program and the Labor Commissioner found that there were serious violations, there would be a problem with them being used.

**NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL**

**November 7, 2008**

Mr. Gaxiola said that the issues of OSHA were only the contractor issues. Mr. Campbell said that the Council is very concerned by OSHA violations that a participating contractor may have.

Ms. Brown said she had a copy of a settlement agreement between Noorda and the Labor Commissioner's office for work performed on some Clark County School District projects. She said the company agreed to pay some wages in the settlement. She stated that in accordance with NAC 610.360 the Council does have jurisdiction to review OSHA safety matters.

Mr. Wiggins asked if Ms. Brown knew when and where the violations occurred.

Ms. Brown said she only knew that the violations concerning ratio were on Clark County School District Projects. She did not have the specifics on the OSHA violations either.

Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Gaxiola if he was aware of those violations.

Mr. Gaxiola said he was.

Mr. Campbell asked what action did the JATC take against Noorda knowing that there were violations knowingly out-of-ratio.

Mr. Gaxiola said he wasn't aware that there were ratio violations. He was only aware of OSHA violations. He said the OSHA violations were prior to Noorda becoming signatory to their union.

Mr. Campbell asked if nothing was done by the JATC.

Ch. Christensen asked that the Labor Commissioner's office send a copy of the resolution to the Council. He said the Council has spent many years discussing the issues of ratio. It is the JATC's responsibility to monitor their participating employers. Any actions that are called in question of violating the approved standards should be addressed.

Mark Waite, Noorda Sheet Metal, said there was an audit conducted by the School District. He said it was not a matter of ratio, but of prevailing wage rate. Five percent of the work that was done was under roofing rate instead of sheet metal. Because of a previous decision of the Labor Commissioner that is what was done. They found out through a Supreme Court Ruling that was overturned and the work was Sheet metal rate. So they met with the Labor Commissioner and other parties. They now understood, and corrected the error. He said at that time, they were a non-union company and everyone was being paid journeymen rates.

Mr. Wiggins said he had a concern with the program having a one apprentice to one journeyman ratio. He said if a journeyman has to leave work, the company is out of ratio on that project.

Mr. Bill Brooks, Sheet Metal Workers, said that under TAB 4 of their response, it shows the settlement agreement. He said the ratio problem has continued. Under every TAB there shows a ratio violation with apprentices even working alone. He said there have been instances where there have been seven apprentices to three journeymen.

**NEVADA STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL**

**November 7, 2008**

Ch. Christensen said the appropriate thing for the program to do is take appropriate action. If nothing is done, it could be brought to the Council. He said he was not sure what remedy the Sheet Metal Workers were seeking. But he asked that they allow the Labor Commissioner's office and staff to investigate and report at the next meeting.

Ms. Brown said in the past when a program had a participating employer who violated a portion of the standards, the Council required the participating employer to sign a statement acknowledging that they would abide by the approved standards.

Mr. Campbell said he was concerned that if these accusations are true there may be a problem with using the company to provide any aspect of related instruction training.

Mr. Lamar Noorda, Noorda Sheet Metal, said their agreement said the past issue with the Labor Commissioner has nothing to do with ratio. All of the schools that they did, they were not signatory with any union. It was purely a jurisdictional dispute they are still waiting on the Labor Commissioner to issue an opinion on. In over 17,000 hours of work on a total of seven schools, they agreed to pay some who had been paid as a roofer prevailing wage rate, to make up the difference between sheet metal and roofer prevailing wage rate. They have also received a notice from the Labor Commissioner that they were all fine; that there was nothing there. They haven't heard one word about being out-of-ratio on any school. They will keep the ratios that they have agreed. He said that if a journeyman didn't show up and the apprentice does, he's not sure that they have sent anyone home. They have only been signatory for a few months.

Ch. Christensen asked that Mr. Brooks provide a copy of the complaint to the company and the program. He also advised that if the apprentices are working without supervision that is a violation of the standards.

Mr. Noorda said he wasn't sure that that has ever happened.

Mr. Wiggins reiterated the one apprentice to one journeyman ratio. If the journeyman has to leave, the apprentice would have to go home.

Local 81 has jurisdiction of Northern Nevada. They will be submitting standards for that area.

Mr. Rose said the standards state that at the time of selection, they must have an understanding of reading, writing, and the communication ability of the English language. His question was how do they determine that. His second question was if the program does determine that, what is the purpose of the ESL and teaching the classes in Spanish.

Mr. Davis said they offer ESL to the students, but that doesn't mean that they can't understand English.

Mr. Gaxiola said there are instances where, through organizing, they may have an apprentice who needs ESL.

Mr. Gouker asked if the classes were taught in English or Spanish.

Mr. Davis said the classes are taught in English but they have an English and Spanish instructor depending on the size of the class.

Mr. Gouker asked how the OSHA being was taught.

Mr. Davis said both.

Mr. Rose said he had a letter from a former apprentice who stated that the majority of the classes were taught in Spanish. He said he talked to numerous people who did not speak Spanish, but were required to sit in the class anyway.

Mr. Davis said Mr. Cruz graduated second in his class, so he didn't understand his complaint.

Mr. Rose said that Mr. Cruz was bi-lingual.

Mr. Campbell said he didn't have a problem with the classes being taught in Spanish.

Mr. Greener said that it is mandatory that by year three the apprentice be able to take the tests in English. They have also been vigorous on the OSHA requirements that the apprentice has a clear understanding in case of an emergency.

Mr. Rose said he was concerned with OSHA being taught on the jobsite but not in the classroom. He said he was also concerned with the selection procedure. He read a letter from David Cameron, who said that he was simply told to go down and sign up and he was in.

Ch. Christensen said the audit staff would include any violations of the selection procedure.

Mr. Greener asked that they have the opportunity to talk to the people making the statements against the program. He said the OSHA classes are given in the classroom. There may be an error in the standards.

Ms. Brown said there was an initial compliance review, but Ms. Henry asked her to conduct a full investigation regarding the issues raised in the complaint.

Mr. Wiggins motioned to table the revision until after the findings of the review.

Mr. Campbell said since the program has already been approved, he believed that the revision should be approved, and that the program should come back to answer the complaint issues at the next meeting.

Mr. Gouker said he agreed with Mr. Campbell. He suggested that the index and the body of the standards be fixed so that they match. He said the one thing that causes him distress is that the numbers on the 5910 between journeymen and apprentices are so close. He said there is the potential of being out-of-ratio. If it continues, sanctions can be issued.

Mr. Greener said the ratio is something that can be reviewed. He asked the Council if they had any recommendations for what should be considered. He said they will also be happy to entertain

for special emergencies any type of notification procedure for a variance given certain circumstances.

Mr. Gouker said if there was an instance where there were 20 journeymen and 20 brand new apprentices and 19 journeymen take off on some convention, the company has one journeyman supervising 20 brand new apprentices. There are no variances allowed. He said the program should follow the ratio in NAC 610.438.

Mr. Greener said they would take it under advisement.

Mr. Campbell asked if all of the contacts that the program has with participating employers is one apprentice to one journeyman.

Mr. Gaxiola said that there is a one apprentice to one journeyman on the public works projects and one journeyman, one apprentice, and one pre-apprentice on non-public works projects.

Ms. Andriola said the numbers from 5910 concerned her. There was also no discussion on the language of the standards superseding the collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. Davis said currently there were 269 journeymen and 263 apprentices registered.

Ch. Christensen asked him to revise the 5910 form to show that. He asked if there were portions that superseded the standards that haven't been disclosed.

Mr. Gaxiola said there was one that makes reference in pre-apprentices.

Ch. Christensen said that the Council has no jurisdiction on pre-apprentices.

Mr. Wiggins reiterated his motion.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO TABLE NEVADA ROOFERS JATC - REVISION OF STANDARDS)**

**ITEM 9 CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Greg Franklin, Assistant Director of the Development Services Department, and Wesley Walters, Inspection Specialist, were present to answer question regarding their new program.

Mr. Franklin said there were modifications made from the previous meeting.

Mr. Campbell asked there be a small change to Section 5 to include "See Attached".

Mr. Franklin agreed.

Mr. Smith asked if all of the items at the previous meeting have been corrected.

Mr. Franklin said they took the advice of the Council and went back and incorporated them into the body of the standards.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve the program with the change requested.

Mr. Wiggins seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES)**

**ITEM 10 – REPORT OF STAFF**

**ITEM 10A**

Ms. Brown said there was a problem with the report for this meeting. She was concerned that there was some computer error and that the statistics were not accurate. She had provided the Council with a memo of 220 programs. Northern Nevada had 118 programs, 74 had no apprentices, 24 with between one and four apprentices and 20 programs with five or more apprentices. Southern Nevada had 90 programs, 39 programs had no apprentices, 20 had between one and four apprentices, and 31 programs had five or more apprentices. There were 13 programs that are under the jurisdiction of the Office of Apprentices.

**ITEM 10B**

Ms. Brown provided the Council with a revised form 5910 for approval. She said the changes were to add a space for the program's EIN and email address. She said, at the request of Council, she removed the number of minority and female journeymen question.

Mr. Gouker said that new form does simplify the issues.

Mr. Smith asked if the Council could determine which of the programs were under federal jurisdiction.

Ms. Brown said the programs considered Federal are those programs that are either on Federal or Native American property.

Mr. Gouker asked Ms. Brown if she could contact Mr. Raponi and invite him to the February 20<sup>th</sup> meeting in hopes of getting information on what a curriculum check consisted of.

Ms. Andriola advised the Council and members of the public that Mr. Raponi was going to have a workshop with all of the interested apprenticeship programs to discuss the budget apprenticeship funding.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve the new Form 5910.

Ms. Andriola seconded.

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE THE NEW FORM 5910)**

**ITEM 11 – REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF APPRENTICESHIP**

Mr. Howell reported that the new C.F.R 29.29 is posted on the Federal registry as of October 29, 2008. There have been some changes that now include hybrid and correspondence courses. He said the Preamble is lengthy but it does cover all of the changes. If there are any questions pertaining to the revision, they should be made to the national office email at [regs.apprenticeship@dol.gov](mailto:regs.apprenticeship@dol.gov). The questions are going to be posted along with the answers. There are going to be action clinics per region that will include their office staff, state staff and the WIB, and the One Stops.

OSHA awarded \$6.7 million from the Susan Hardwood training grant and ABC's program did receive that grant.

He reported that there was a new Office of Apprenticeship Bulletin 2008-18. The bulletin revises the Affirmative Action Plan Workforce Analysis Worksheet. The revision will be used to calculate the goals and timetables. The revision will reduce the goals for female and minorities using specific occupation information rather than just using the entire regional workforce.

Mr. Gouker motioned to approve the use of the new Workforce Analysis Worksheet.

Mr. Campbell seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO APPROVE THE WORKFORCE ANALYSIS WORKSHEET)**

**ITEM 12 – REPORT OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL**

No report.

**ITEM 13 – REPORT OF SECRETARY DIRECTOR**

Mr. Tanchek said he had nothing additional to report.

**ITEMS 14 – PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Rose said that he will work with Mr. Howell regarding the items from his standards. He said his program's RTI is provided at their training center.

**ITEM 15 – ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Wiggins motioned to adjourn.

Mr. Gouker seconded the motion.

**(M/S/C TO ADJOURN)**