

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

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: Tuesday, March 12, 2024

Time: 1:00 p.m.

In-Person Meeting Location: King Kalakaua Conference Room
King Kalakaua Building
335 Merchant Street, First Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Present: David Kamakea III, Industry Member, Vice Chairperson
Robert Barrett, Public Member
Nathan Olanda, Industry Member
Phillip Lucero, Industry Member
Christopher Leong, Deputy Attorney General (“DAG Leong”)
Lei Ana Green, Executive Officer
Candace Ito, Executive Officer
Marc Yoshimura, Secretary

Excused: Sheung Wong, Industry Member, Chairperson

Guests: Ryan Takahashi, Hawaii Electricians Market Enhancement Program
Mimi Sroat, Hawaii Electricians Training Fund
Robert Aquino, Hawaii Electricians Training Fund
Eric Nadrasik, Hawaii Electricians Training Fund
Kika Bukoski, Director of Government Affairs, IBEW 1260
Patrick Sullivan, IBEW 1260
Leroy Chincio, IBEW 1260
Gayna Hashimoto, IBEW 1260
Todd Mayeshiro, IBEW 1260
Jim Alberts, Hawaiian Electric Company
Mike Ryder, Hawaiian Electric Company
Max Hannemann, Hawaiian Electric Company
Andrew Okabe, Public Utilities Commission
Debby Shin, Public Utilities Commission
David Richmond, Public Utilities Commission
Al Itamoto, Electrical Contractors Association

Agenda: The agenda for this meeting was posted on the State electronic calendar as required by HRS section 92-7(b).

Call to Order: There being a quorum present, Vice Chair Kamakea called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.

Vice Chair Kamakea, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Olanda, and Mr. Lucero were present; Chair Wong was excused.

Approval of Minutes: A vote on the approval of the January 23, 2024, Board meeting minutes was deferred.

2024 Legislation: a) H.B. NO. 2523, H.D.1 / S.B. NO. 2917, Relating to Electric Utility Lineman

Vice Chair Kamakea invited representatives of IBEW 1260 to initiate testimony on this bill.

Kika Bukoski requested to provide oral testimony.

Kika Bukoski, Director of Government Affairs, IBEW 1260, referred to the testimony he submitted for the hearing on Monday, March 11, 2024. He asked the Board to take a look at the testimony as it is available online on the Hawaii State Legislature's website. He stated many of the issues he saw in previous testimony by the Board were addressed at the Finance committee hearing. He stated that they believe a lot of the concerns expressed by the Board can and should be addressed in the implementation phase, if the measure is adopted. The law is intended to be general in nature. In the rules process, that is where you start to put more meat on the bone, so to speak. He stated that a large portion of the concerns the Board's testimony are outside of the purview of this Board, which is to enforce HRS chapter 448E. He stated that we shouldn't be talking about jurisdiction, the efficacy of a certified apprenticeship program that is administered under the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR), the standards of the utility industry that falls under the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), or union vs. union, which they saw in the Board's most recent testimony.

Mr. Bukoski said that, as provided in their testimony, the bill that was introduced is not exclusive to any one union or non-union shop or apprenticeship program. They hope the conversation is centered around what the primary intent of this bill is, which is safety of the

public and of the workers. The secondary benefit of a standard licensing requirement is to promote a local workforce and local apprenticeship programs. He said that he wanted to stress that one is not dependent on the other. The licensing requirement is not dependent on an apprenticeship program and vice-versa. They can operate independently from each other.

He continued and stated that this bill is being introduced this year due to the 2.5 to 3.5-year timeframe of implementation on July 1, 2027. This would allow the industry, industry stakeholders, and the Board enough time to implement the law, if adopted. Mr. Bukoski stated that in their discussions with the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs (DCCA), IBEW 1260 understands that 2 years is the standard to implement a statute and they are trying to provide enough of a ramp-up for implementation. During this implementation period, they also realize there is time for further discussion, amending the law, or even repealing it should the Board find that the Board would be unable to implement the law. But doing nothing at this point would shorten that timeframe and the window of opportunity.

Mr. Bukoski concluded his testimony.

Vice Chair Kamakea asked if there were any other members of the public who would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item.

Leroy Chincio, Business Manager and Financial Secretary of IBEW 1260, stated that he strongly supports this bill, as the number one priority is safety. He stated that from his experience, not only as a journeyman lineman but also working at the Hawaiian Electric Company for over 30 years, where he was the Principal RME holding a C-13 Electrical and C-62 Pole and line contractor license, that safety is the most important thing ever. This bill would help standardize what is required for people working on these lines, which are energized. The cable can be felt vibrating as it has 12,000 volts running through it and is imperative that people know what they are doing on the job.

Mr. Chincio concluded his testimony.

Vice Chair Kamakea asked if there were any other members of the public who would like to provide oral testimony on this agenda item.

Ryan Takahashi, Hawaii Electricians Market Enhancement Program, on behalf of IBEW 1186 and signatory contractors, stated

that he is here regarding Act 60 and Act 65, which is essentially an exemption for nothing. It is an exemption for line construction, maintenance, or connection to substations, but that work does not require a license. This bill suggests that requiring a lineman license would increase the local workforce, however, by its nature, a license is restrictive. The Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR) has studied that occupational licenses contribute to the current lack of skilled labor. He stated that he strongly believes that requiring a license will actually make it more difficult to get the qualified workers. Regarding building a local workforce, what should be in question is the availability of training and apprenticeship programs. IBEW 1186 has held a ready position for 11 years with an apprenticeship program for this type of work. What their union lacks is the work; the work is not available and is required in order to train the workforce. Any future commitment to this type of work makes it difficult to run these apprenticeship programs in order to develop a local workforce.

He continued by stating that the codes are often brought up by the supporters of this bill, suggesting there is clear separation between the National Electric Code (NEC) and the National Electrical Safety Code (NESC). It is being implied that the NEC is to a journey worker electrician as the NESC is to a journey worker lineman. This is misleading and there are individuals from the Hawaii Electricians Fund to speak on this further. The other major discussion is around safety. He stated that their union does not believe requiring a license for this type of work will increase safety. It will simply add restrictive regulations; red-tape bureaucracy to add a license. The only people doing the work right now are card carrying linemen and to obtain the card they have to go through the proper training to pass a test. The other people doing work that might fall within the scope of what is being discussed are licensed journey worker electricians. These individuals are skilled and trained in performing underground line installations. Though this may fall outside the property lines, sometimes it is still covered under the NEC.

Mr. Takahashi stated that it is unfortunate that the dispute about jurisdiction is being brought before the Board, as he believes it has no place with the Board or Legislature. He stated that this discussion should not be dealt with publicly, rather directly between the local unions. He stated that they are forced to have to defend work that is performed by journey worker electricians, but it's not their primary purpose.

Mr. Takahashi concluded his testimony.

Andrew Okabe, Utility Analyst with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), reiterated the PUC's testimony submitted for the yesterday's Senate committee hearing. He stated that the PUC is seeking a way to preserve doing the work safely and defers to the expertise of individuals within the field with knowledge of how to get this done in order to provide a robust framework.

Mr. Okabe concluded his testimony.

Robert Aquino, Assistant Training Director for the Hawaii Electricians Training Fund and a licensed electrician in the state of Hawai'i since 1995, stated that he wanted to provide information regarding safety. Regarding safety, they are looking at 2 things: the worker and the public. On the worker's side, OSHA mandates how an employer provides a safe work area for their employees. For the public, the NEC provides the framework to protect the public as an electrician gets into a building, follows the standards, and turns over the building, thus the public is safe, as the code was followed for installation. In looking at the utility side, we ask how the public is affected by their work as the public will not interact with their utility work. Their poles are not meant for the public to access. Substations have fencing and barbed wire. The public will have no interaction. Inside the building, there may be interaction with the public and the electrical work, whether it be through a receptacle or switch.

Mr. Aquino concluded his testimony.

Al Itamoto, Executive Director for the Electrical Contractors Association in Hawai'i and the National Electrical Contractors Association, provided testimony regarding the NEC and NESC. He stated that the NEC, which is followed by electricians, is primarily an installation guide that must be followed and complied with. The NESC is primarily a design code, which electrical engineers use to design the generating and transmission systems. To say that a licensed lineman needs to be qualified and understand the NESC is flawed because their work does not constitute designing. For the IBEW training programs across the country, training involved with a lineman's curriculum is set by the Electrical Training Alliance. Within the lineman curriculum, there are no classes regarding the NESC. In looking at reference material used to support that curriculum, it doesn't list reference material in the NESC.

Mr. Itamoto concluded his testimony.

Mike Ryder, Acting Director of Operations with the Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO), spoke about his experience as a 2nd generation line man. He stated that at HECO, safety is the most important thing. When workers are not safe, that could be the last decision they make. They are supportive of this bill, which ensures the safety of their workforce. He stated further that while listening to everyone speak, one of the things that comes to mind is that professionals carry a license with them. Utility professionals carry a license given to them through the utility. As a lineman through HECO, HECO ensures that. When looking at this bill, the State would have a part in ensuring the success of utility line workers; ensuring they are trained professionals through a State governed program.

Mr. Ryder concluded his testimony.

Jim Alberts, Chief Operations Officer of HECO, stated they are in support of this bill. The reasons are straightforward due to safety and sustainability in the long run. Licensing creates a set of standards, and those standards help people be safe. There are many places across the country that have apprenticeship programs, and each one may be a little different. He stated that being able to create a future here that would help certify the standards that people are trained on, and become repetitive, are essential for long term success and safety to help build a sustainable workforce. He stated further he thinks that by creating a licensing process it could actually begin to attract people, as it would exhibit a standard. If the work potentially grows rapidly, we need to have a safe place and space for people to work.

Mr. Alberts concluded his testimony.

Patrick Sullivan, IBEW 1260 and an electric utility lineman, stated that this bill covers the employees of the contractors, not employees of the utility, and also that this bill is not about apprenticeships. He added that there are unlicensed workers out there and the lines are out there; the public walk and drive under power lines every day, and he believes it is false to state that there are no public safety concerns.

Mr. Sullivan added that powerline workers require specialized skills in climbing utility poles, stringing powerlines, splicing cables, and connecting to overheads. These types of workers also must

possess knowledge of high voltage safety procedures and proper underground installations. He stated that the IBEW has an inside wireman apprenticeship and an outside lineman apprenticeship. There is no merging of these two. If someone wants to go from an inside wireman to an outside lineman, that person must apply through a Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee (JATC) and start off a Step 1 Apprentice Lineman. Similarly, a lineman can't go from an outside lineman apprenticeship graduate and transfer to be an inside wireman. They are two distinct crafts. He stated that this bill is about safety not apprenticeships.

Mr. Sullivan concluded his testimony.

Max Hannemann, Labor Relations Manager for HECO, stated HECO has a long history with IBEW 1260, with the first contract in 1943, and ran a successful apprenticeship program for decades. Unfortunately, there are times that HECO cannot do all the work in house so they are supportive of this bill because it will ensure the safety of their employees who work with contractors and to ensure they are properly licensed and qualified. It is HECO's duty as the employer to ensure this.

Mr. Hannemann concluded his testimony.

Todd Mayeshiro, journey lineman and troubleman with IBEW 1260, stated that linework is dangerous, working with lines up to 138,000 volts, and the margin for error and what can happen is devastating. Individuals have lost limbs, been burned badly, or have died. Mr. Mayeshiro stated there is a problem across the nation with a shortage of linemen, but there is an issue with everyone wanting to be a lineman. Individuals can go through different programs and have worked across the country, but he may not know who they are or has never worked side-by-side with them. Mr. Mayeshiro said that if they want to ensure safety, for both themselves and the public, they have to have some sort of way to know individuals are qualified, which is to be tested and licensed to ensure general knowledge. When doing high voltage work, individuals can be working in a bucket with another individual. If they touch the wrong thing while working, including an energized line, it could kill the other person. This bill would provide another layer of protection. He said the margin of error is small and can be devastating.

Mr. Mayeshiro concluded his testimony.

Vice Chair Kamakea asked if there is any other testimony on this agenda item.

Seeing none, Vice Chair Kamakea asked the Board if they had questions for any of the attendees.

Executive Officer Green had a question for the Hawaii Electricians Training Fund. She prefaced her question by stating that the Board understands that their apprenticeship program ended because there was no field work available for the hands-on component for linemen work. She asked how their enrolled apprentices had access to that work while in the apprenticeship program. For example, did they have to work for a contractor contracted by HECO? Was there an agreement they would be hired to do some of the work that HECO was self-performing?

Mr. Aquino stated that HECO hired line contractors. There was enough work that allowed them to open the apprenticeship program. IBEW 1186's program is the standard 3.5 years, with on-the-job training and schooling. Within the last year of their apprenticeship program, there was no work available for their contractors. Fortunately, they were able to reach out to their sister local unions, which do have an apprenticeship lineman program, and they were able to provide the required training and classroom instruction to complete the program. In addition, before any apprentice can become classified as a journey lineman, they go through a journey lineman test with the JATC.

Vice Chair Kamakea asked if a certification card is received upon completion of the program, rather than a license.

Mr. Aquino answered that a certification card is received.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that much of today's testimony includes safety concerns and the Board is seeking clarity with the varying testimonies regarding safety and the purpose for a lineman license.

Mr. Barrett asked if there are only 4 or 5 states in the nation that issue lineman licenses, then why do the other 45 states not require licensure to ensure safety.

Mr. Bukoski stated that the business model of HECO was changed when decoupling occurred in 2011. Historically, most of this work was done in-house by HECO employees, which is covered by the PUC. After the decoupling in 2011, HECO had to contract out some

of the work that they previously did in-house, which is what created the third-party contractor situation. In 2013, Act 65 was adopted to address concerns in the industry, largely brought up by IBEW 1186, about the lack of licensing, training, and the local workforce. Act 65 extended the exemption temporarily for the utilities, to cover employees of the third-party contractors. Third-party contractors are regulated by the Contractors Licensing Board. The purpose of this bill is to fill the gap that will exist after the sunset date in 2027. This will lead to a group of employees of third-party contractors with no oversight or cross-check to ensure they are properly trained or qualified.

Mr. Takahashi stated that there are 3 states they found that require a lineman license, which are Alaska, Texas, and Minnesota. He stated that if they dig into the requirements by these states, they find the limitations of those licenses, and there are different motivations depending on the individuals they speak with. The motivations may not have just been in safety. Other motivations may have been to keep out-of-state workers out of their state. They think the reason for there not being a nationwide push for lineman licensing is because this type of work requires portability, as these workers need to have the ability to move from state to state as the workflows peak and valley.

Mr. Bukoski stated that Nevada also issues lineman licenses.

Mr. Itamoto stated that Nevada is not a license state, rather they have training requirements that require a journey lineman card for the performance of work, but it doesn't require a license. For example, if an individual gets trained at an IBEW JATC and finishes the program, the individual will obtain an IBEW card which allows them to perform the work. He spoke with a counterpart in San Antonio, Texas, who mentioned that their state has a license requirement, but it is a very limited scope license. The Texas board's website indicates that a lineman license is not comparable to an electrician's inside wireman license. In speaking with his counterpart in Alaska, it was noted that the licensed wireman can work on all new construction on transmission and generating systems but Alaska does not require a license to perform line repair and line maintenance work.

Mr. Lucero asked IBEW 1260 if the card/certification is accepted from out-of-state workers and if these out-of-state workers are tested.

Mr. Bukoski answered yes to both.

Mr. Lucero asked IBEW 1186 if they do the same.

Mr. Aquino stated that when a lineman comes into the state and takes contracted work for HECO, that HECO will test and vet them. HECO will check those workers on splicing and verify they are qualified. When IBEW 1186 has cable splicers who come in from across the country, they also put them through a vetting process to make sure they are qualified.

Mr. Lucero stated if he, as an electrical contractor, hires a licensed journey worker electrician, it is his responsibility as the contractor to ensure qualifications and safety. Similarly, it is the responsibility of the utility, such as HECO, or IBEW 1260, to ensure qualifications by verifying the license or card, and safety. Mr. Lucero asked about the difference between a license and the card.

Mr. Chincio stated the card is the individual's ticket. They can take their ticket and go to another state and unless they're vetting them, they don't know if they're qualified. There was an instance where someone had a ticket and died on the 2nd day of the job.

Mr. Lucero asked if it is the employer's responsibility to check qualifications and ensure the safety measures are met, rather than just allowing someone to come into the state and work just because they hold a card.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the local IBEW in California did test that individual and he was not allowed to work for an IBEW local. The individual was picked up by a utility not covered by the IBEW and the individual convinced the utility that he was qualified.

Executive Officer Green reiterated the point of Mr. Lucero's questions regarding the employer's responsibility to ensure safety measures are met, and asked Mr. Sullivan if the utility tested that individual.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he is unsure, as the information is very sensitive and this is a lawsuit type of situation.

Mr. Bukoski stated that they have been trying to reach out to the Board and IBEW 1186 to have a discussion to address any concerns and to clarify any questions or misunderstandings. He stated that he was a little confused at the setting of this meeting

and that it was portrayed in yesterday's legislative hearing that this was the big meeting to work everything out. He stated further that unfortunately, they are only being provided 5 minutes to provide testimony, as they have questions too, especially based on the testimony provided by the Board.

Executive Officer Green clarified that the Board had no part in Mr. Bukoski's understanding of what was conveyed by the legislative committee's decision and committee chair's statements in yesterday's hearing. She clarified for those in the room who did not attend the hearing that the Board's testimony at yesterday's hearing stated that the Board had a meeting scheduled for today and requested additional time to allow the Board to discuss this matter with industry stakeholders. The Board scheduled this meeting to gain more information and a better understanding of the matter from the various stakeholders in the industry.

Mr. Bukoski stated that he had reached out to the Board to have an open discussion to address mutual concerns. An email was previously sent to Executive Officer Green asking for an informal meeting to attempt to resolve any problems. He asked the Board what they feel the purpose or scope of linemen work consists of.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that this Board is not solely comprised of electricians and there are Board members who do not understand what is being asked.

Mr. Bukoski stated that this isn't the discussion they had hoped for; they wanted a more informal setting to try to work out the Board's concerns. He stated that having the opportunity to ask questions in an open discussion and dialogue will allow individuals, like Mr. Lucero, to educate individuals who may not have the knowledge. He stated that the Board had questions in its testimony requesting clarification but he doesn't have the opportunity to provide clarification through an open discussion. He stated that he provided clarification in his testimony but the Board did not respond to that. The testimony from the Board is regurgitating almost everything that he already addressed in two previous testimonies. He asked if this process is to check a box to let the legislature know that we met.

Mr. Bukoski also addressed the composition of the Board, stating that the Board has seven licenses for electricians versus two licenses for plumbers. The electricians represent a good portion of the licensing, yet there is less than 28% representation on the

Board. He further stated that you don't have the expertise to talk about electric utility work, yet you want to sit there and decide what is electric utility work or not.

Vice Chair Kamakea acknowledged that he himself is not an electrician and stated it is unfair to be singling out any one person on the Board.

Mr. Bukoski stated he is not singling out anybody, but Mr. Lucero was designated as a spokesperson by the Board to speak about this issue and spoke publicly twice during previous hearings.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that the Board has to discuss this measure as a whole Board and not base this decision solely on an individual.

Mr. Bukoski reiterated that the bill is not about apprenticeship programs or jurisdiction, as jurisdiction is not within the Board's purview, yet most of the testimony by the opposition is based on apprenticeship programs and jurisdiction.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that there have been numerous testimonies provided today regarding safety.

Mr. Bukoski stated that he is referring to the testimony from the opponents of the bill.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that all testimony is considered by the Board. He added that there has been discussion about safety versus jurisdiction and safety versus licensing. The Board is looking to understand the importance of each.

Mr. Bukoski stated the Board enforces HRS §448E. The Board does not decide on the apprenticeship programs, whether they are successful or whether they can or cannot exist.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that the Board still has the responsibility to make decisions on items presented to the Board.

Mr. Bukoski stated he understands that but the discussion from the opponents are centered around the success and failure of apprenticeship programs. This is not a primary objective of this bill. It is a secondary objective. He stated that they would have hoped their sister union would be supportive of this but their entire testimony is based on apprenticeship program and how it did not

work for them. The construction industry as a whole goes through ebbs and flows. Every trade has benches that are sometimes full, sometimes empty. This is not exclusive to the electric utility industry, rather the entire trade. This reference about not having enough work is inherent in this line of work.

Executive Officer Green stated that the administrative rules and statutes that the Board follows include minimum requirements for licensure. The Board not only needs to understand the minimum requirements for licensure that have been recommended by this measure, but also what the State's resources can support. For example, do all qualified individuals have access to what is required to qualify for licensure.

She stated that each individual is entitled to their own opinion and their own testimony. The Board must afford the opportunity for everyone to express their opinions, not just select individuals. It is important for the Board to hear from other stakeholders within the industry regarding this matter.

Mr. Bukoski reiterated that he requested an informal meeting for a more in-depth discussion with what is provided within the Board's testimony, rather than a formal meeting with a 5-minute limit for testimony. He stated that time is of the essence for this bill.

Vice Chair Kamakea responded that the Board also needs to be provided the necessary time to consider the contents of this bill.

Mr. Sullivan asked those in attendance who graduated from a lineman program or had performed lineman work and know about the subject matter that is being discussed, to raise their hands. He asked the Board to consider those in attendance who represent the workers and went through the apprenticeship and worked with the lines.

Mr. Aquino provided clarification on his previous statement regarding public safety and the public's interaction with the linework or equipment. He stated that from the responses of other testifiers, it seemed like it was interpreted that he stated public safety doesn't matter, and that was not his intent. He clarified that what he meant is that he knows that the public would not normally interfere with the work performed by a lineman, whether it be on poles, lines, or substations.

Mr. Sullivan stated that there have been situations where an individual who was not qualified to perform work has interfered. As an example, copper theft occurs and, if there is exposed wire, then that wire is carrying high voltage. If wiring is not connected correctly, it is exposed to the public walking down the street.

Mr. Takahashi commented on the discussion of what is the purview of the Board. The Board is being asked to provide an opinion on a bill that is going before the legislature. In order for the Board to obtain as much information as possible, the Board has the right to ask questions of whomever. The individuals attending today's meeting are offering their insight, their research, and their experience. He stated that does not think an individual needs to have been trained as a lineman to evaluate whether a license will build up a local workforce or increase safety. Being a lineman does not preclude anyone from being able to conduct research.

Mr. Alberts stated new ideas need time to develop. He stated that believes the discussion today is helpful for the Board to understand and evaluate the position of a lineman. He stated the legislative process is difficult and insight should be provided to the legislature but asked that the Board think about the future. He added that he forecasts the availability of work to increase, and that licensure ensures standards and increases portability.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated the Board is here for the people of Hawaii and that he understands the issue of safety. He asked if there were additional questions.

There were none.

Vice Chair Kamakea called for a motion to enter into Executive Session to consult with the Board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the Board's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities in accordance with HRS section 92-5(a)(4).

At 2:22 p.m., it was moved by Mr. Barrett, seconded by Mr. Olanda, and unanimously carried to move into Executive Session.

At 4:25 p.m., it was moved by Mr. Barrett, seconded by Mr. Olanda, and unanimously carried to return to the Board's order of business.

Vice Chair Kamakea stated that the Board took into consideration all of the testimony provided. The Board strongly opposes the bill for the following reasons:

- There are OSHA safeguards in place for electrical work;
- Anyone performing work in the scope of a journey worker electrician (EJ) or journey worker industrial electrician (EJI) license is required to hold the appropriate license; and
- Pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) section 26H-2(6), “regulation shall not unreasonably restrict entry into professions and vocations by all qualified persons”.

If the legislature is inclined to require licensure as a lineman, the Board will offer recommended amendments to HRS chapter 448E, which:

- Will propose a definition of lineman work that does not include EJ or EJI work;
- Will provide qualifications for licensure, including an exam;
- Will require update courses for renewal of the license;
- Will not amend the composition of the Board; and
- May include establishment of a lineman advisory committee.

It was moved by Vice Chair Kamakea, seconded by Mr. Barrett, and unanimously carried to accept the Board’s position in strong opposition.

Vice Chair Kamakea thanked all in attendance for their time.

Announcements: a) Next Board Meeting

April 30, 2024
10:30 a.m.
King Kalakaua Conference Room
King Kalakaua Building
335 Merchant Street, First Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Adjournment: There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Reviewed and approved by:

/s/ Lei Ana Green

Lei Ana Green
Executive Officer

Taken by:

/s/ Marc Yoshimura

Marc Yoshimura
Secretary

LG:my

4/17/24

Minutes approved as is.

Minutes approved with changes; see minutes of _____