NAC 610Apprenticeship Stakeholder Meeting-20261013_090039-Meeting Recording

October 13, 2026, 4:00PM

43m 11s

Eileen Woltz started transcription

BH **Brett K. Harris** 0:04

Please be advised that this is recorded, so you don't need your own personal AI note taker.

Please be considerate of the bandwidth of the meeting.

Okay, I'm going to go ahead and call this meeting to order. It is 901 A.m. on October 13th, 2026. This is a stakeholder meeting regarding NAC 610, which is the regulations chapter for apprenticeship. We are having this meeting in furtherance of the Governor's Executive Order 2026-003.

As I mentioned before, the meeting is being recorded, so you do not need to take up increased bandwidth in this meeting by having AI note takers.

Please be cognizant of that. I see more and more coming in. Sometimes it's an automatic. If it's you, please turn those off. We have a recording of this meeting. For the record, this agenda was posted and the notice was posted and provided by e-mail to stakeholders and persons on the Office of the Labor Commissioner's e-mail list.

for noticing of administrative regulations by e-mail for posting by the Nevada State Library Archives and Public Records Administrator. It was published to the Office of the Labor Commissioner's website, published to the State of Nevada Public Notice website, published to the Nevada Legislature website. The meeting is being held by Teams or telephone?

No action will be taken during this meeting as there's one, it was for to garner comment from stakeholders only, but also because I do not believe we're going to have a quorum of Nevada State Apprenticeship Council members present. Again, pursuant to NRS 241, this public meeting is being recorded and transcribed and will be available

at no charge for inspection by the public within 30 days after this meeting. So please consider using that recording instead of flooding this meeting with AI bots because they take up a lot of bandwidth. Again, the purpose of the stakeholder meeting is to

solicit comments and recommendations from stakeholders and interested persons.
Regarding NAC 610, as directed in the Governor's Executive Order of 2026-003.
At this time, this is the first public comment period. Comments will be limited to 3 minutes per stakeholder. If you wish to provide comment, please use the raise hand feature or the chat feature, and we will call on you in order in which we see the request to make public comment. When your name is called, please make sure to unmute your microphone.
and begin by saying and then spelling your first and last name.
Once you finish speaking, please lower your hand by using the raise hand feature and mute your microphone or mute your telephone so we know to move on to the next stakeholder.
Would anyone like to make public comment at this time?
Les Patu.
That's Leslie for two, I'm sure.

LP **Les Patu** 3:48
Yes, thank you. Leslie Partu, for the record, L.E.S.L.I.E. Last name is Partu, P.A.T.U.
Um, pretty much, uh...
The only statement I wanted to make is regarding like some type of direct entry language regarding...
organize workers into the estate apprenticeship program. I know it's touched on a little bit on the NAC 610s, but I believe there should be more clear language in regards to the actual them getting the pathway like the Harmon's Hard Hat and a couple other organizations that have that.
direct entry pathway into the apprenticeship. I mean, we go through verification of their hands-on ability and also verification of ours, but the state language doesn't give them a clear pathway into it to where they can still be rejected by an apprenticeship program. So I definitely would like to see some type of revision in regards to that.
language there for organized hands. Thank you.

BH **Brett K. Harris** 4:54
Thank you, Mister Patu, and is there a specific?
regulation that your comment goes with or are you suggesting creating a new regulation just for our record?

Les Patu 5:05
I'm looking for, I'm not sure like if these regulations would work like the NAC 610 2.245, the NAC 610.660, and the NAC 610.860. You know, those kind of touch upon, you know, the different aspects of
bringing in, you know, apprentices, but I think that, you know, we could also include language into that also regarding organized non-union hands.

Brett K. Harris 5:37
Thank you, sir.
All right, the next one I see is Jimmy with the iron workers.

jimmy@ironworkers433.org 5:51
Hi, good morning. Jimmy Schwarz, JIMMYSCHWARZ with Iron Workers Local 433. Currently, Local 433 for Southern Nevada is the only registered apprenticeship program.
Speaking with Skip Daly, I guess the intended purpose or the idea behind the apprentice utilization was that for those contractors on these apprenticeship utilization projects, those contractors for those members of ours, for those projects specifically,

Miguel sanchez 6:11
Yeah.

jimmy@ironworkers433.org 6:32
They are signatory contractors. However, there's nowhere that says that in the NAC or NRS or anything like that. So there seems to be some confusion as to what's required to be upheld, what laws or rules or what have you. So if there's some way we can clear that up,
and make that enforceable, I think would help for those trades that are the only registered apprenticeship programs.

Brett K. Harris 7:06
Thank you, Mr. Schwartz. Is that now does that go with a specific existing regulation or are you proposing adding a regulation?

Miguel sanchez 7:09
And.
Oh.

jimmy@ironworkers433.org 7:20
Um...
I don't know that there's a regulation that, so I guess it would be proposing new regulation or at least new language to add to that.

Brett K. Harris 7:35
Thank you, sir.
We will go to John Grego.

Grygo, John D 7:43
My name is John Greggo, JOHNGRYGL. I don't know if there's any other teachers on here, but I'm a teacher at Central Technical Training Academy in Las Vegas. We have a construction program. I think it's a very strong program.
The thing that we're missing is some structure from the state as far as a pre-apprentice program or more pathways for our students who are graduating to get into the trades. I think there needs to be some incentive system.
with contractors when they are doing projects that may be a certain percentage of students who recent graduates can come into the apprentice programs and they can get some kind of tax break or something because
I'm finding that our students are graduating and struggling to get into the trades because the competition of guys who are applying to unions and other entities, they have five, six years experience and our kids are left in the dust. And what's happening is they're not getting into the jobs. They're not
getting work, they're not working right out of high school, and then they end up going to Starbucks or going to the grocery store or finding jobs or whatever. So just something at the state level that could maybe at least make a framework for a pre-apprentice program that would make things easier or give

Joshua Steffen 9:09

Yeah.
No.

Grygo, John D 9:21
Give all the schools a structure where we can say to the unions, to the contractors, to ABC, whoever it is, that our students have done this and they qualify for this. If you hire them, maybe there's an incentive program for the contractors to bring in these younger students.
These, they're new to the trades and everybody wins. You get good workers, young workers who will be in the field for 20, 30 years.
So I just, if we could come together with something like that, I'd be all in on it. I would do everything I can. Our school would be behind it. I know all the other schools, at least speaking for Southern Nevada, we need something like this, a more direct pathway.
more unions coming in, more contractors coming in, talking to the students, meeting students. And I just kind of wanted to get that out there to everybody. Thank you for your time.

Brett K. Harris 10:23
Thank you, Mr. Grego. Our state apprenticeship director is working really hard on setting up the framework for pre-apprenticeship in Nevada. And so please feel free to reach out to her. I know she's been, that is a multi,

Joshua Steffen 10:41
Okay, Kelly.

Brett K. Harris 10:42
step process. So, but we would love your input and some input from educators. So thank you very much. Mr. Torres, Jose Torres, we'll go with you next.

Joshua Steffen 10:45
Okay, sounds good. Thank you.

Jose Torres 10:58
Unmute. All right. Hi, good morning. My name is Jose Torres, J-O-S-T-O-R-E-S, and

I'm a representative of the IBW Local 357 and our apprenticeship here down in Southern Nevada. Basically, I just wanted to make a statement with the, you know, the governor's executive order.
having all the agencies touch back and see where they can find some efficiency. Obviously, we're not opposed to unnecessary administrative burdens, but we strongly believe that the modernization or streamlining should not come at the expense of the apprenticeship standards, worker competency, or developing Nevada's skilled workforce.
My primary concern right now is other agencies. The state contractors board has been petitioned with coming up with a new classification of a contractors license for temporary agencies. And I believe, and I want to make a statement, is that we believe that the apprenticeship council should hold high standards.
especially if their temporary workers are allowed to come in, not to dilute any of these standards, any of the training. We, you know, obviously these apprenticeships have set ratios so that apprentices are being taught by trained and skilled individuals in the business, and primarily
and most concerning would be safety standards. At least in the electrical business, we know it's extremely dangerous and having qualified and competent people instruct the new workforce here in Nevada is of most essence to us. So please consider that when you guys are reviewing any of these rules or policies.
And that's my statement. Thank you.

BH **Brett K. Harris** 12:46
Thank you, Mr. Torres. We will go to Taylor Andrews, which I think is, oh, you just disappeared.

TA **Taylor andrews** 12:55
It's Lou. We're using Taylor's computer. Lou de Salvio, D-E-S-A-L-V-I-O. A couple of things, as you know, we've talked, and I think this is a great opportunity to kind of get this on the record, is we have to fix the problem that we have with contractors calling up and saying that they need an apprentice for an hour or two just to try to receive a waiver, knowing that sending an apprentice out

BH **Brett K. Harris** 12:58
Okay.

Taylor andrews 13:18

for an hour is not going to happen. So, and we talked about maybe changing some type of standard that there is a denomination amount on the contract where apprentices are required. I don't know if the project's over 100,000, 200,000, then they're required to have an apprentice regardless because you know, and I know there's some players out there that are using the

Oh, I don't have enough work. But then when I pull certified payroll, I see 10s of thousands of labor hours. And but yet they say they don't have enough hours to get an apprentice. So they'll call out for an hour, knowing that an apprentice coordinator is going to have a very difficult time filling that job for an hour. So that's one thing I want to fix. And to John,

the counselor.

I totally agree with you, but to the point to where, you know, we created our own nightmare. We don't have a pipeline for these young people that are graduating that want to be in the trades. That's why they're attending these trade schools. If we had something maybe language-wise that said,

any graduates, you know, 2%, 3% of that workforce needs to be a CCSD trade school graduate with immediate indentureship. I could definitely wrap my head around that because now we created a pipeline. And if not, at the very least, I would imagine that any training director,

or apprentice coordinator for any craft would give previous credits towards the education they received towards their curriculum. Let's just say you have a school that has to have, you know, 400 class hours and maybe 80 of those class hours were stuff they received while they were going through.

the trade school, you can then apply that credit towards that young lady or man and help them through their apprenticeship. Maybe not start at a 50%, maybe it might be enough to start them at 60 or whatever, but I don't know if it's something that we would want to put in statute, but I'm sure that's why I miss old wacker. We'd all meet with these counselors and we'd sit around and we'd

We'd work this stuff out to try to figure out how to get them into our apprenticeship programs, but we need that pipeline. And to get the municipalities to maybe require these apprenticeships on these RFPs would help out tremendously too. But my main thing is, like we talked about, is trying to fix this loophole where contractors just call

up knowing that they're not going to get somebody for an hour only to get a waiver. Thank you.

Brett K. Harris 15:49
Thank you, Mr. DeSalvio. Please also bring those comments to the NAC 338 stakeholder meeting, because we'll have to do AUA regulations under NAC 338. But it is good for us to be cognizant of over here on the 610 side too.

Taylor andrews 15:56
Mhm.

Brett K. Harris 16:09
We're going to go to Robert Diaz.

Robert Diaz 16:13
Thank you, Robert Diaz, ROBERTDIAZ, sheet metal workers. Good points there, Lou. Thanks for bringing those up. And I wanted to touch on a few things. I haven't read all of the code and federal regulations as a reference quite a bit in the 610.
And it may be an AUA thing in the 338 section that I'm thinking, but I'm never sure where it lands. So hopefully some of the industry professionals can help here. The residential markets, they've received millions upon millions of dollars through federal and local municipalities building some of these Nevada hand ovation projects for affordable, attainable living.
Um...
We have no way of putting into pipelines for apprenticeships any of our apprentices the same way we do in any of the other public projects. What I've noticed is there's no regulations, it seems. It's just kind of the Wild West. What they'll do is include a private partnership into all those public dollars and
somehow wash their hands of any public regulations. So looking at how to get some of our apprentices to work on some of those publicly funded projects in the residential market would be a goal of ours.

Brett K. Harris 17:36
Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Let's go to Benny Wilson.

Benny Wilson 17:42

Good morning, my name is Benny Wilson and I'm the coordinator for the Northern Nevada Sheet Metal and HVAC apprenticeship. At this time, we haven't identified any specific NEC 610 regulations that are creating significant difficulty for our program. I do recognize some of the
frustration with the AUA request for four hours or less. I totally get that with the other programs. But I do believe that we have a responsibility to maintain those high standards for our registered apprenticeship programs. These standards are
are going to ensure that quality training, skilled workers, workplace safety and accountability. So while I understand the need for streamlining some of these administrative requirements.
I really would caution against anything that would weaken the apprenticeship standards, reduce the oversight, or compromise the quality of the training. And that being said, I look forward to reviewing anything you guys have.

Brett K. Harris 18:48

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. And just be assured that NRS 610 and the federal law both require pretty high standards for registered apprenticeship programs and the council and our office are very intentional about applying those. And we're just doing reg review. But thank you so much for your comments.
Mister Ronald Young.

Ronald Young 19:15

All right, I'm on now. Ronald Young, for the record, I'm a trustee for the Electrical Training Institute, and I just wanted to go on the record, kind of highlighting the important work that the Apprenticeship Council does, maintaining high standards for apprenticeships across the board, and in ensuring that parallel programs aren't created to dilute the system and dilute the training that is provided for the apprentices.
You know, we see a lot of alternative like programs try to be implemented that are very niche, that try to make things job specific and then claim that their apprenticeship, which not only diminishes the integrity of the apprenticeship programs as a whole, but also does a disservice to the person that's trying to just have a career.

by teaching them a niche scope of work and claiming it to be an industry standard wherein it's actually just kind of pigeonholes them into a path to nowhere. So we think that this work that the Apprenticeship Council does is incredibly important and we want to maintain that level of training and integrity for apprenticeships across Nevada.
Thank you.

BH **Brett K. Harris** 20:27
Thank you, Mr. Young. Miss Julianne Peoples.

JP **Julie-Ann Peeples** 20:32
Hi, Julie Ann Peoples, as JULIE hyphen ANNPEEPLES. As Nevada considers changes to NEC Chapter 610, I believe it is important to protect the stability of existing apprenticeship programs. Sponsors, contractors, and apprentices need clear guidance as how revised regulations will affect current
Registrations are approved standards, program responsibilities, and ongoing compliance. Unclear or abruptly implemented changes could create unnecessary uncertainty, administrative costs, which I'm particularly concerned about, and interruptions to our training and workforce planning.
So I encourage the state to provide advance notice of these proposed changes, communicate clearly with sponsors, and establish a transition process for us to comply with. Existing programs should understand what is changing and when new requirements take effect, what actions we have to take,
and whether any existing approvals or standards need to be updated. So where possible, of course, we should avoid any unnecessary duplications, delays, or costs while programs adjust to the new requirements. That's my statement. Thank you.

BH **Brett K. Harris** 21:55
Thank you, Ms. Peoples. And just to assure you, we would have workshops regarding any new language that was drafted for the regulations.

JP **Julie-Ann Peeples** 22:05
Thank you.

BH **Brett K. Harris** 22:07

I don't see any other hands up.
Does anyone else have public comment at this time during the first public comment period?
And I do not see any requests to make public comment in the chat.
So I'm going to close out this first period of public comment. We're going to go ahead and talk about specifically the Executive Order 2026-003, which asked agencies to do another regulation review and hold stakeholder meetings like the one we're having.
Today, prior to October 29th. So as you know, or as I hope has been sort of laid out here, this is a preliminary discussion regarding the regulations that fall under NAC 610. This is not about the Nevada revised statutes. We, the count will.
The council has jurisdiction over Nevada Administrative Code 610, but the legislature has jurisdiction over Nevada Revised Statutes, Chapter 610. So just to be clear that we are talking about code and regulation here and not statute. We
got one comment in response to our notice regarding this particular chapter and its regulations. The associated general contractors of Nevada requested that
NAC 610.438 be deleted. The reason being they indicate the language is not consistent with negotiated master labor agreements for a variety of crafts, nor is it consistent with NRS 610.190 and does not
contemplate the Apprenticeship Utilization Act. Just for everybody's frame of reference, I will tell you the actual regulation language.
Oops, wrong way.
So NAC 610.438 is regarding the ratio of apprentices to journeymen. And I can tell you, just for your information, where this sometimes causes problems is generally a collective bargaining agreement will allow for those ratios to exist contractor-wide. So if the contractor is on multiple projects,
Where we do not allow that for apprentices is if the apprentice ends up unsupervised on a project because there's enough supervisors on other projects, but they're not actually present supervising the apprentice. So we can have the council look at that language and examine that language.
The other one I want to put on everyone's radar is NAC. Tony, where's the one? That's just not compliant.

TG **Toni Giddens** 25:29
It is an AC610485.

Brett K. Harris 25:33

Thank you. NAC 610.485 talks about minimum reasonable and profitable wage for apprentices in the construction industry. Subsection 4 says that the minimum reasonable and profitable wage for an apprentice in the construction industry is on a project other than a public work, not less than $11.72 per hour.
the wages must be in cash and must not include any benefits. This number is lower than Nevada minimum wage and does not comply with the current minimum wage set by the council. And so we're going to explore language on this that doesn't, I think that doesn't pin to a particular number.
because that barrier to entry, that minimum wage is going to naturally go up, I think, faster than we can keep up regs with it. So we'll probably work on something that says on a project other than a public work, not less than.
referencing what the council sets is the minimum construction wage for apprentices.
Those were the two, well, the one comment that we received ahead of time and the one that was really on my radar.
So at this time, we'll go ahead and do our second period for public comment if anyone else has comment to make.
I don't see any hands and I don't see any activity in the chat.

Taylor andrews 27:18

I got a quick question. It's Lou Di Salvio. Just on your last comment, so is it going to be no less than the state's minimum wage or are we just going to stay away from a denomination amount number and just what language did you want to put in there for that?

Brett K. Harris 27:21

Sure.
Well, it has to be reflective of what the council sets as the minimum. Mr. Walden, maybe you are our chair, Archie Walden is on and raising his hand. So maybe he has some input into that.

Taylor andrews 27:36

The.

A Walden 27:47
Actually, I was going to speak on something else. If you want to repeat your question, Lou.

Taylor andrews 27:52
The question was, is that it was brought up that they wanted to dress up a.485 of the NAC 338, specifically #4, where it had $11.72. My question was, are we going to remove a total denomination number and like not even use that and just come up with like language that says no less than the state minimum wage or?
no less than what instead of putting a number because we know it's going to change all the time. So I'm just trying to...

A Walden 28:19
Well, personally, I think, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Brett K. Harris 28:19
I think.

Taylor andrews 28:22
Just looking for clarification on that, that's all.

Brett K. Harris 28:25
That number is set by the council, so I think we could reference back to the number set by the council.

A Walden 28:26
Archie.
Yeah, this is Archie Walden. I agree with Labor Commissioner Harris on that, that it just needs to be set by what the council says for the minimum wage each year when it's reset. So it doesn't have to be a number, just what is the minimum wage amount that's allowed.

Chase Hoskins 28:45

Are you OK?
OK, Andrea, nothing to do with this injury.

Brett K. Harris 28:56
Mr. Walden, did you have additional public comment to make? Sorry, I pulled you into that.

A Walden 28:58
Yes.
No worries, no worries. Thank you. On NAC on 438.
Is the concern from ABC just that they don't want the ratio in there of three to one, or are they looking to take that out completely? Because most places, the apprenticeship programs themselves have the ability to change their ratio of apprentice and journeymen just based on past history of safety, etiquette, and things such as that.
they can present their standards in front of the council and ask for a change of ratio of apprentices from 3 to 1 to 2 to 1 or whatever the case may be and have the council approve it. And that goes outside of the collective bargaining agreement of the union. The union just has a set standard, whereas the apprenticeship sets the direct standard of it.

Brett K. Harris 29:50
Yeah, the comment simply said delete it because it conflicts with some master labor agreements and thought it could be addressed under NAC338 in regards to the Apprenticeship Utilization Act.

A Walden 30:04
Personally, I think it needs to stay because that will give people the ability to just put whatever amount of apprentices they want on the job site and completely circumvent having to use journeymen on there. And, you know, once again, that race to the bottom where you have more apprentices on a job site than journeymen, and there's no code to enforce it after that point.

Brett K. Harris 30:26
Well, and I think we do have to address ratios.

because this is the only place to address them. I don't think you can address ratios properly under NAC 338. I think it has to be done in conjunction with NRS 610 because it is directly related to apprentices.

A Walden 30:33
Yeah.
I agree.

Brett K. Harris 30:48
Mister Patu, I see you with your hands up.

Les Patu 30:52
Yes, thank you. Les Patu, LESLIEPATU. I wanted to speak in direct to 610.438.
I mean, that there was created to protect the apprenticeship. I mean, it's pretty much a way to develop skilled trades people by simply not supplying, you know, inexpensive labor. So the established ratio of 1 apprentice for a journeyman and additional apprentice for every three is the correct way of ensuring people are getting trained properly on the job and ensuring
you know, that they're being watched by professionals that can help them out with, you know, in regards to their trade. So the ratio helps, you know, ensures apprentices receive adequate, like hands-on instruction, proper supervision, and opportunity to learn to trade safely instead of, you know, being unsupervised.
Thank you.

Brett K. Harris 31:50
Thank you, Mister Patu. Mister Mike Kinney.
Oh, you're muted, sir. Sorry.

mike kinney 32:01
Mike Kenny for the record, MIKEKINNEY, Northern Nevada Laborers training director.
I did want to speak on the same 610-438. Where we're seeing some of these problems too, I don't think we should take it out completely.
The non-union contractors will go ahead and request an apprentice, will send an apprentice out, and then they will not supervise that apprentice. And a lot of the time our apprentices are there by themselves and not getting the training that they

should be getting. So I believe that the 610-438 is more important than what we're just seeing on the surface here.
And that's my comment. Thank you.

Brett K. Harris 32:48
Thank you, Mr. Kinney. I would tend to agree it's important that the apprentices have meaningful supervision. Mr. Patu, you have your hand up again, or is it just up from last time?

Les Patu 33:02
It was just up from last, I'm sorry about that.

Brett K. Harris 33:05
No, you're good.
Any additional public comment?
I don't see any hands up.
and I do not see any requests to speak in the chat.
So with that, that will conclude our meeting. I want to thank everybody for being here today. Your feedback during the stakeholder meeting was extremely valuable to the Apprenticeship Council and the Office of the Labor Commissioner. We will take these recommendations under advisement, see
If there's good language changes to propose, and of course, let you know of any workshops we have regarding NAC 610. We are also just for your reference, because a lot of you would also be interested in this, holding workshops on NAC 611, which is just licensing.
That doesn't have a lot to do with a lot of you. But also NAC 338, NAC 607, NAC 608, 609, and 613. So please check our website in case you want to be present for any of those to provide comment. And again, thank you so much for being here today, and we really appreciate you.
And have a good rest of your day.
Bye.

Evangelina Diaz 34:39
And Daniel couldn't because he was sick.

◉ **Eileen Woltz** stopped transcription