

BOARD OF ELECTRICIANS AND PLUMBERS
Professional and Vocational Licensing Division
Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs
State of Hawaii

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Place: Virtual Videoconference Meeting – Zoom Webinar
(use link below)
<https://dcca-hawaii-gov.zoom.us/j/98248382616>

Present: Phillip Lucero, Industry Member, Chairperson
Sheung Wong, Industry Member, Vice Chairperson
Charles Tanabe, Industry Member
David Kamakea III, Industry Member
Robert Barrett, Public Member
Jason Takara, Public Member
Christopher Leong, Deputy Attorney General (“DAG”)
Lei Ana Green, Executive Officer
Candace Ito, Executive Officer
Kellie Teraoka, Secretary
Sandra Matsushima, Executive Officer (technical support)

Excused: None

Guests: 687 (Andrew Gonzalez)
Christian Baligad
Jeff D
John Moore
Lauren Spencer
Malcolm Barcarse
Mike Swanson
Mkonia
Ronlynn Arakaki
Ryan Takahashi
Shannon Alivado

Agenda: The agenda for this meeting was filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, as required by section 92-7(b), Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”).

A brief video regarding the virtual board meeting, including meeting procedures and helpful information regarding how members of the

public can participate and interact with the board during the meeting, was played.

Call to Order: There being a quorum present, Chair Lucero called the meeting to order at 10:39 a.m.

Chair Lucero, Vice Chair Wong, Mr. Tanabe, Mr. Kamakea, Mr. Takara, and Mr. Barrett confirmed that they were present.

Chair Lucero provided verbal instructions to attendees on how to connect to the meeting via internet or through phone access. He reminded attendees that all microphones will be muted. If anyone would like to speak, they should raise their hand and when called upon they will be limited to five minutes of testimony per agenda item.

Approval of Minutes:

Chair Lucero asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item.

Mr. Gonzalez was promoted to a panelist at 10:41 a.m.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that his name was not called during the roll call. It was clarified that the roll call was to confirm the presence of Board members and did not include applicants or attendees.

Mr. Gonzalez returned to an attendee at 10:42 a.m.

It was moved by Mr. Barrett, seconded by Mr. Kamakea, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the open session and the minutes of the executive session of the December 7, 2021, Board meeting as distributed.

Executive Officer's Report:

Chair Lucero asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

a) Exam Results for Electricians and Plumbers:

Ms. Green reviewed the following results of the Electricians' and Plumbers' examinations:

Plumbers' Exam (administered January 2022)

	PJ	PM
Exams Administered	24	0
Successful	8	0

Unsuccessful 16 0

Electricians' Exam (administered January 2022)

	EJ	ES	EM	EJI	EJS	ESS	ESI
Exams Administered	18	1	0	0	2	0	1
Successful	16	1	0	0	1	0	1
Unsuccessful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0

Applications:

Chair Lucero asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

It was moved by Mr. Kamakea, seconded by Mr. Takara, and unanimously carried, to approve/defer/deny/ratify the following applications and exam waiver, as noted.

a) Electricians

Journey Worker Electrician (EJ)

- BARSATAN, MATTHEW – APPROVED
- CALMA, BLAZEN – APPROVED
- CIPRO, STEPHEN – APPROVED
- FERNANDEZ, ROLAND – APPROVED
- FOLK, JULIAN – APPROVED
- ICHISHITA, TRAVIS – APPROVED
- IGE, IVAN – DEFERRED
- LINCOLN, DREW – APPROVED
- LONGBOY, JIRYN – APPROVED
- MARTINEZ, NOLAN – DEFERRED
- PAOA, JASON – APPROVED
- PASCUA, MICHAEL – APPROVED
- PASION, MARK – APPROVED
- PRATT-BAPTISTA, WILLIAM – APPROVED
- SCHWARZKOPF, JEREMY – APPROVED
- SHUMAKER, JOSHUA – APPROVED
- SIMENTAL, LEVI – DEFERRED
- SONIDO, YVETTE – APPROVED
- SPENCER, LAUREN – DEFERRED
- TATEMACHI, BRANDON – APPROVED
- TIA, LAU – APPROVED
- TOYOFUKU, BRENDEN – APPROVED
- VENDIOLA, KAHLER – APPROVED

Journey Worker Industrial Electrician (EJI)

NONE

Journey Worker Specialty Electrician (EJS)
NONE

Supervising Electrician (ES)
PHILLIPS, DOUGLAS – APPROVED
POSEY, BRIAN – APPROVED

Supervising Industrial Electrician (ESI)
NONE

Supervising Specialty Electrician (ESS)
NONE

Maintenance Electrician (EM)
LAWSON, FRANK – APPROVED

b) Plumbers

Journey Worker Plumber (PJ)
AGUINALDO, STEVEN – APPROVED
BRASWELL, ALEXANDER – APPROVED
CAMARA, WILLIAM – APPROVED
CAMLIN, JONAH – APPROVED
CORPUZ, DARIAN – APPROVED
DUROPAN, JOSEPH – APPROVED
MIYASAKI, JASON – APPROVED
NIEYA, MYLES – APPROVED
PAAAINA, SHAUN – DEFERRED
PICO, EVERETT – APPROVED
RITA, ERIK – APPROVED
RIVERA, JASON – APPROVED
RONDAL, CHRISTIAN – APPROVED
SISTOZA, ZACHARY – APPROVED
TAPADO, REMELITO – APPROVED
VIDAL, DESMOND – APPROVED
WILHELM III, FRANK – APPROVED

Master Plumber (PM)
NONE

Act 35, SLH 2010 a)
Update Regarding
Electrical Academic
Coursework:

Chair Lucero asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item. There were none.

University of Hawaii Honolulu Community College
Approved Curricula

- Advanced Training Institute
- Vatterott College

2022 Legislation: a) S.B. 170, Relating to Electricians and Plumbers
Establishes license requirements for electrician apprentices
and plumber apprentices.

Chair Lucero asked if any members of the public would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item.

Ryan Takahashi, Hawaii Electricians Market Enhancement Program (“HEMEP”), was promoted to a panelist at 10:51 a.m.

Mr. Takahashi provided comments on S.B. 170, which is a carryover bill. HEMEP will not be pursuing this bill but will continue to work with its partners in the plumbing industry as they see value in establishing requirements to identify apprentices on the job.

He also provided comments on S.B. 2644 and H.B. 1597. HEMEP has been opposed to this exemption request since it was introduced approximately 10 years ago. HEMEP is asking the Board to oppose this bill, as it previously did in 2018, although there was a timing issue with formally submitting its written testimony.

Mr. Takahashi explained that this exemption will allow the public utility companies to hire a licensed high voltage contractor and the contractor’s employees are exempt from the requirement of being licensed electricians when performing high voltage work. HEMEP has always had a problem with how broadly this exemption defines high voltage work. HEMEP concurs with the Board that all licensed EJs are qualified to perform high voltage work based on that broad definition of high voltage work being over 600 volts, as the EJ license is not limited by voltage and can perform work on everything within the scope of the NEC. There is no shortage of electricians able to perform high voltage work, however there may be a shortage of electricians trained to perform line work for the public utility companies. The original intent of this bill was to prepare for a

storm or emergency situation where pole and line work is needed and would allow linemen from other states to assist. HEMEP has always argued that pole and line work is not usually within the EJ's scope of work so this exemption wouldn't be necessary and, in the event of an emergency, emergency orders often suspend licensing requirements.

Overall, HEMEP's position is that the language in the S.B. 2644 and H.B. 1597 is too broad as it's exempting employees of contractors hired by public utility companies from the requirements of licensure as electricians to perform all high voltage work.

Ms. Green asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Takahashi. There were none.

Mr. Takahashi returned to an attendee at 10:56 a.m.

The following agenda item was taken out of order:

- b) S.B. 2644, Relating to Electrical Contractors
Makes permanent Act 65, Session Laws of Hawaii 2013, which provides a limited exemption to the licensing requirements for certain individuals in situations when an electric utility must retain qualified individuals to work with high voltage (600 volts or higher) who are not licensed in the State but are otherwise deemed qualified by the electric utility. Also makes permanent the requirement for the Board of Electricians and Plumbers to submit to the Legislature reports regarding high voltage electrical contractors.

Mike Swanson, Hawaiian Electric Company ("HECO"), was promoted to a panelist at 10:58 a.m.

Mr. Swanson provided comments in support of S.B. 2644 and H.B. 1597. He explained that there is a limited number of qualified individuals who are trained and licensed as electricians to perform high voltage work in Hawaii. He agreed with Mr. Takahashi that there is a lack of clarity regarding classifications or job titles that are covered in this bill, however his main concern is about the linemen. As a public utility company, if an out-of-state contractor is hired to perform line work, and the workers are required to hold a Hawaii EJ license, the number of IBEW represented linemen available would be very limited. With 37 years of experience

in the utility industry, Mr. Swanson advised that he does not know of any other state that requires an EJ license to perform high voltage line work. Generally, qualified individuals live out-of-state but will travel to Hawaii when work is available and should not be required to obtain an EJ license as long as HECO or its subsidiaries determine that these individuals are qualified. The exemption allows contractors to utilize qualified out-of-state high voltage electrical workers who are qualified to perform the work safely in the areas of storm restoration, complex maintenance, and emergency situations when there is a shortage of local expertise. Mr. Swanson stated that HECO strongly supports S.B. 2644 and H.B. 1597 and is requesting the Board's support of these measures.

Ms. Ito asked if HECO's electrical sub-contractors are responsible for the qualifications of their employees.

Mr. Swanson replied that the electrical contractors are responsible for the qualifications of their employees, which is in HECO's contract with the sub-contractors. Most of those companies are IBEW represented and all their linemen have completed union or state approved apprenticeships.

Ms. Ito asked if having completed the high voltage training course is a requirement for subcontracted work.

Mr. Swanson responded that yes, in addition to the training course, electrical workers are required to hold a journeyman lineman's card with the local IBEW. Linemen apprenticeships are 3+ years and, upon completion, they are typically not licensed as electricians throughout the industry.

Ms. Ito asked how many of the apprenticeship years are practical experience and how many are coursework.

Mr. Swanson explained that HECO requires about 1-month of coursework for every 6 months in their apprenticeship where they are in the field practicing what they are being taught.

Ms. Green stated that she confirmed with IBEW that their apprenticeship program is 3 years long with 480 hours of related instruction and 7,000 hours of on-the-job training.

Chair Lucero asked Mr. Swanson if they are mainly concerned about pole and line work. High voltage work may include vault to vault, PV work, underground work, or substations. HECO seems to be looking specifically at linemen and not high voltage workers.

Mr. Swanson responded that he's including all of that high voltage work. The substation electricians, for example, are typically not licensed electricians at a utility. They go through a state approved apprenticeship to be an electrician in a substation. The language in the bill is very broad and that he spoke mainly about linemen since that is the group that he is responsible for. However, it does not encompass the other work groups that perform high voltage work within HECO. There are times when they need to contract out substation work and would typically go to an IBEW represented contractor and they would provide electricians that have gone through an apprenticeship either through IBEW or a state sanctioned program

Chair Lucero asked if they are being provided these types of workers now.

Mr. Swanson answered in the affirmative, however assured the Board that they seek availability of workers in Hawaii first but if no one is available, they look out-of-state for workers.

Ms. Green asked how often this occurs.

Mr. Swanson explained that on the transmission and distribution side, he currently has 3 construction crews contracted on Maui and needs another crew once they can obtain additional resources. However, there are peaks and valleys and the work is not always consistent. HECO has hired more employees and is looking to train and employ future linemen and apprentices in Hawaii, starting them out as helpers, to "grow their own", so they don't need to reach out to the mainland for their resources. Mr. Swanson noted that HECO has its own apprenticeship program which is sanctioned by the State Apprenticeship Committee ("SAC").

Regarding Mr. Swanson's previous response, Ms. Ito asked if the individuals on the 3 contracted crews on Maui hold Hawaii EJ licenses.

Mr. Swanson confirmed that the linemen are unlicensed and are utilizing the exemption to work in Hawaii.

Ms. Ito added that it is our understanding that the IBEW currently has qualified individuals who are qualified to perform high voltage work.

Mr. Swanson replied that although they may be qualified as electricians, they do not have the training to climb poles and work in elevated positions.

Ms. Green asked if the decision to hire out-of-state workers was made after the IBEW confirmed that they did not have qualified workers available.

Mr. Swanson explained that this occurred before he was hired by HECO, but it is his understanding that their resources in Hawaii were exhausted before they went to other unions on the mainland to attract resources to Hawaii.

Mr. Wong asked if the IBEW offered training for pole or high elevation work, would HECO reach out to them.

Mr. Swanson stated that HECO would hire a contractor and ask them to get the resources they need. They would have to go to the local IBEW before they go outside, then they have to be represented by one of the two Hawaii IBEWs before they move forward.

Ms. Green asked for clarification if it is their intent to train more employees and eventually use fewer contractors.

Mr. Swanson responded that is his intent, however the need for contractors varies and has its peaks and valleys, especially in disaster situations. In the event of an emergency, HECO would call for support from other utility agencies and/or contractors since they can utilize both in major emergency situations.

Ms. Green asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Swanson. There were none.

Mr. Swanson returned to an attendee at 11:17 a.m.

Ryan Takahashi was promoted to a panelist at 11:18 a.m.

Mr. Takahashi stated that it is very important recognize what the language in the bill says. He does not disagree with Mr. Swanson that there probably is a lack of linemen who do the transmission line work in the mountains or on roadways. The issue is that the exemption covers much more than that. HECO defines high/low voltage work differently from the state. HECO defines low voltage work as what EJs do, which is different from the state definition of low voltage. HECO wants this exemption to be broad to cover things such as renewable energy projects or PV systems, and that is where the issue lies as there are licensed EJs in Hawaii who are available and qualified to perform many aspects of high voltage work. However, if HECO is specifically addressing pole and line workers then that is a different issue. He added that the Board may not even have jurisdiction over pole and line work that is in the mountains and falls outside of the property lines. There is truth that many linemen are not licensed and travel for work, however, the exemption in this bill is far reaching.

Ms. Takashi noted that he has worked with various representatives at the utility to carve out what they need and develop language, and determine if the exemption is necessary if the transmission line work they need falls outside of the EJ's jurisdiction, but he hasn't been able to get anywhere. HEMEP is strongly opposed to these bills, as they are all-encompassing in that if the public utility hires a contractor, that contractors employees do not have to have an EJ license to perform any electrical work over 600 volts. He added that HEMEP would be happy to work together with HECO regarding the linemen issue, to ensure training is available to meet the needs of that type of work, however, he does not want to put local high voltage contractors and their employed EJs at a disadvantage if HECO continues to bring in out-of-state workers.

Ms. Green asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Takahashi. There were none.

Mr. Takahashi returned to an attendee at 11:22 a.m.

Shannon Alivado, HECO, was promoted to a panelist at 11:23 a.m.

Ms. Alivado provided background on S.B. 2644 and H.B. 1597. She shared that the reason why they are bringing this to the Legislature's attention now is because of its importance and that it expires in 2023. Every year the Board publishes a report that indicates how this law has been impacting licensed high voltage contracting work. In her review of the report, there is no difference with respect to the trained out-of-state contractors coming in to work and does not appear to affect Hawaii's workforce. She hopes that the Board would continue their support from the last hearing in 2018. She also noted that HECO has requested verification that any type of work has been taken from the local workforce by out-of-state high voltage workers but has not been able to get back any information that shows that is so.

Ms. Green clarified that in 2018, although the Board initially testified in support, they changed their position at a subsequent Board meeting due to concerns and voted in opposition of the measure, but did not have the opportunity to formally testify as there were no further public hearings on the matter. Ms. Green addressed Ms. Alivado's previous statement about the Board's report that indicated no difference in training. She asked Ms. Alivado if she thinks that this could be due to the exemption, since an electrician license is not required for employees of contractors who are retained by the utilities to perform high voltage work above 600 volts.

Ms. Alivado responded that the exemption does not disallow anyone interested in the field and does not think the existence of an exemption would deter any local interest. She added that Mr. Swanson may have further insight.

Mike Swanson was promoted to a panelist at 11:29 a.m.

Mr. Swanson stated that HECO does not have a steady workflow for a bench, for a contract labor force of high voltage workers, so the exemption allows them to deal with peak situations.

Ms. Green ask for clarification if the deficit or need for workers in Hawaii is specifically for linemen or for all high voltage work.

Mr. Swanson responded that he is not familiar with PV work, but can confirm that there will be an increase in substation work in the next 1-2 years but will taper off after that. Typically, if there is not a steady workflow, many workers will travel elsewhere for work.

Ms. Green asked if only linemen perform substation work or if electricians trained in high voltage can perform that type of work.

Mr. Swanson was hesitant to use the word “licensed electricians,” because there are state or IBEW sanctioned apprenticeships that electricians go through to be qualified to do high voltage work in substations. He also noted that HECO does not classify high voltage differently than the State; they classify high voltage as anything above 600 volts.

Ms. Green asked if the substation apprenticeship training is as extensive as the linemen apprenticeship training.

Mr. Swanson replied that he unsure but thinks it’s similar. HECO has a state sanctioned apprenticeship program for substation electrical work. He also noted that the recently hired linemen he mentioned earlier will be apprentice linemen within the next year.

Ms. Green asked if there were any further questions for Ms. Alivado or Mr. Swanson. There were none.

Mr. Swanson and Ms. Alivado returned to attendees at 11:35 a.m.

Chair Lucero stated that the language in the bill needs to be revised because it’s too broad. He recognizes that the linemen are in a specialty area, however there is high voltage training and certifications that are being conducted locally. High voltage work is within an EJ’s scope of practice and the license allows them to stay in Hawaii and perform other types of electrical work when high voltage work is not available. EJs can work for an electrical contractor here and work on residential and commercial projects while still being

certified to work on other high voltage projects when they arise.

Ms. Green reiterated that there is a concern with the language in the bill as it does not differentiate between the high voltage electrical work that all EJ's are trained to perform and the lineman work that requires additional extensive training. Hawaii has licensed contractors in the state who have certified licensed electricians to handle lineman work and other high voltage work, such as substation work. However according to the last report, there is no one currently enrolled in the lineman apprenticeship program with the Hawaii Electricians Training Fund.

Ms. Ito asked for clarification on Chair Lucero's statement that all EJ's are trained to do high voltage work, and if that includes splicing and pole and line work.

Chair Lucero explained that the NEC code book addresses high voltage work, and that an EJ could perform the work but would require additional training and/or certification to ensure the safety of the electrician and the public. There is no license for high voltage work, there are only additional certifications. There are also certifications for specific products.

DAG Leong entered the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

Mr. Barrett asked for the background of what occurred in 2018 for the Board to change their position from support to oppose.

Ms. Green explained that the Board initially supported the exemption, but then changed their position after additional discussion about the all-encompassing high voltage language, as well as the reporting requirement. The Board does not license electricians to perform specifically high voltage work and the 4 questions in the reporting requirement do not fall under the Board's purview. However, there were no further opportunities to testify in opposition, so the Board recorded their position in the meeting minutes.

Mike Swanson was promoted to a panelist at 11:45 a.m.

Mr. Swanson expressed concerns regarding the amount of high voltage training that EJ's receive. He confirmed that substation electricians complete a 3-year apprenticeship strictly focusing on high voltage electrician work, which is much more extensive than what EJ's receive.

Mr. Swanson returned to an attendee at 11:47 a.m.

Ms. Ito asked Chair Lucero if he thinks there is enough work available for EJ's to complete their apprenticeship program. Ms. Ito stated in the past there was a shortage of work in Hawaii, so individuals could not complete the program. If there is more work available now, she asked if it would appear that the exemption may not be warranted.

Chair Lucero stated that there is enough high voltage work, including solar farms, available in the state of Hawaii. Apprentice programs are in place to train individuals as future projects develop and HECO could use these trained and licensed workers.

Ms. Green reiterated for the Board that S.B. 2644 seeks to make the exemption permanent and requires the Board to submit an annual report to the Legislature. H.B. 1597 seeks to extend the exemption for 10 years and also requires the Board to submit an annual report to the Legislature, when the information required in the report does not fall within the purview of the Board.

Ryan Takahashi was promoted to a panelist at 11:55 a.m.

Mr. Takahashi noted that the Contractors License Board voted to oppose these bills at its February 25, 2022, meeting due to the same issues that the Board is currently discussing. Mainly, the broad language of the all-encompassing high voltage work, which will affect the work that licensed EJ's currently do.

Mr. Takahashi returned to an attendee at 11:57 a.m.

Mr. Wong stated that he does not feel comfortable providing a position. He recommended amending the language and to continue the discussion at a later time.

Ms. Green stated that the Board should provide its position if it will be supporting, opposing, or providing comments on the language in these bills, as written. If the Board would like to continue discussion with the public utilities regarding an exemption for a specific portion of high voltage work, the Board could oppose these bills as written and continue discussions to carve out the work and more defined language.

Ms. Ito clarified that the Board could take a position on the bill and provide comments in the testimony that they are willing to address the concerns with the interested parties at a later time.

Upon a motion by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Takara, it was voted on and unanimously carried to oppose S.B. 2644. The exemption for all high voltage electrical work is too broad; and the Board would welcome an opportunity to work with the various parties involved to clarify and delineate the specific high voltage electrical work for which the public utilities are seeking to hire unlicensed workers, such as line work. In addition, the Board believes that the DLIR may be the more appropriate reporting entity.

- c) H.B. 1597, Relating to Electrical Contractors
Extends until 2033 the sunset date of Act 65, SLH 2013, which provides a limited exemption to the licensing requirements for certain individuals in situations when an electric utility must retain qualified individuals to work with high voltage (600 volts or higher) who are not licensed in the State but are otherwise deemed qualified by the electric utility. Extends until 2033 the reporting requirements under Act 60, SLH 2018, regarding high voltage electrical contractors.

Upon a motion by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Barrett, it was voted on and unanimously carried to oppose H.B. 1597. The exemption for all high-voltage work is too broad; and the Board would welcome an opportunity to work with the various parties involved to clarify and delineate the specific high voltage electrical work for which the public utilities are seeking to hire unlicensed workers, such as line work. In addition, the Board believes that the DLIR may be the more appropriate reporting entity.

a) S.B. 170, Relating to Electricians and Plumbers

Ms. Green noted Mr. Takahashi previously explained that HEMEP will not be pursuing S.B. 170 this legislative session. The Board's position last year was to oppose this bill in its current form to allow additional time for discussion with the industry partners. She added that the Board has not received complaints regarding the non-identification of apprentices. All apprentices are registered with the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations ("DLIR") and, pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS") section 444-9.5, license electricians and plumbers are required to have their licenses displayed on their person while on-site. In addition, contractors are required to have a 1-to-1 ratio on-site of licensed electricians or plumbers to unlicensed apprentices, trainees, or helpers. Regardless if an apprentice is licensed or registered, they still cannot work unsupervised and will still need to have a licensee on site to supervise their work. If the Board requires licensure or registration of an apprentice, that will incur an added cost for the apprentice to pay, or possibly be a cost that is passed on to the consumer.

Mr. Barrett asked what the benefit of licensure or registration would be other than additional paperwork and more cost to the licensee and/or consumer, and noted that if the Board hasn't discussed it with all industry partners, it sounds like something the Board should oppose

Ryan Takahashi was promoted to a panelist at 12:15 p.m.

Mr. Takahashi explained that this bill originated from a discussion between the 2 industries, to better identify who the apprentices are on the job. This is modeled after the elevator mechanics, whose apprentices are registered, as a safety measure to be clearly identified on the job site. However, there needs to be further discussion with the industry to determine if the apprentices should be licensed or registered so that they can carry a registration card. This is also similar to the beauty operator apprentices who carry an apprenticeship card. Mr. Takahashi shared that the bill will be held and reintroduced at a later time as they are not prepared to move forward at this time.

Ms. Green clarified that all electrician and plumber apprentices are currently registered with the DLIR and asked what the benefit would be to having them registered in two state departments.

Mr. Takahashi stated that with the current requirements for licensees to display their licenses on their person while on-site, licensed or registered apprentices would do the same to increase the safety for apprentices. They do think there's a difference between an apprentice and a helper as an apprentice may be involved with more dangerous electrical work. While there may be a registration for apprentices with the DLIR, that's not something that's readily available for people to check on. It is difficult for the general contractor to know who's an apprentice on-site and the contractor can't assume that if there are ten licensees on-site then the other ten are apprentices, because that may not be true.

Ms. Green asked about those individuals who are performing their on-the-job training who aren't registered but are still on site. For example, there are those who are training to become licensed electricians, who have completed their required 240 hours of electrical coursework and are working on their 10,000 hours of on-the-job electrical work as the apprentices do.

Mr. Takahashi stated that for those unlicensed workers on-site who are doing on-the-job training, then the process of elimination would be clear at this point, as the licensees and apprentices would all be identified, and that the individual is an unlicensed worker. They believe it's important to have clarity between an unlicensed electrician and an apprentice electrician.

Ms. Green clarified that an apprentice electrician is still an unlicensed electrician.

Mr. Takahashi returned to an attendee at 12:24 p.m.

Upon a motion by the Mr. Barrett, seconded by Vice Chair Wong, it was voted on and unanimously carried to oppose S.B. 170, to allow time for discussion with the industry partners.

Announcements: a) Next Board Meeting

Tuesday, March 29, 2022
10:30 a.m.
Location: To Be Determined

Adjournment: There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:27 p.m.

Reviewed and approved by:

Taken by:

/s/ Lei Ana Green

/s/ Kellie Teraoka

Lei Ana Green
Executive Officer

Kellie Teraoka
Secretary

LG:kt
3/8/22

- Minutes approved as is.
 Minutes approved with changes; see minutes of _____