**Present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Councilmembers** | **Title/Affiliation** |
| **Brian S. Cavey** | **- Chairman/Employee Representative**  |
| **Shaunta Chapple****Ryan Sackett** | **- Public Representative****- Public Representative** |
|  |  |
| **Allen B. Clinedinst III** | **- Employee Representative** |
| **Norbert R. Klusmann, Sr.** | **- Employee Representative** |
| **Neil E. Wilford, Jr.** | **- Employee Representative** |
|  |  |
| **David J. Wilson, Sr.** | **- Employee** |
|  |  |
| **Stephanie Anderson** | **- Employer Representative** |
| **Michelle L. Butt** | **- Employer Representative** |
| **Grant Shmelzer** | **- Employer Representative** |
| **David Smarte** | **- Employer Representative** |
|  |  |
| **Ronald Leonard** | **-** **USDOL/OA Consultant to the Council** |

***\*\*Employer Representative Leon W. Bromley did not attend the meeting. Assistant Secretary for Workforce Development and Adult Learning James Rzepkowski notified Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program Director Chris MacLarion that he would not attend prior to the meeting. Ronald Leonard had a prior engagement and left the meeting early.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Other Attendees** | **Title/Affiliation** |
| **Tiffany P. Robinson** | **- Secretary, Maryland Department of Labor** |
| **Erin Roth** | **- Deputy Assistant Secretary, DWDAL** |
| **Lloyd Day** | **- Director Office of Workforce Development, DWDAL** |
| **Leza Griffith** | **- Maryland Assistant Attorney General** |
| **Christopher D. MacLarion** |  **- Director, Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program (MATP)** |
| **Jeffrey W. Smith** | **- Program Manager, MATP** |
| **Kelton Addison** | **- MATP** |
| **Ginamarie Best** | **- MATP** |
| **Coral Crawford** | **- MATP** |
| **Kevin L. Hunt** | **- MATP** |
| **Sheila Jackson** | **- MATP** |
| **Charles Marquette** | **- MATP** |
| **Faith Ramsburg** | **- MATP** |
| **Jennifer D. Runkles** | **- MATP** |
| **Wayne Salter** | **- MATP** |
| **Jane Sinclair** | **- MATP** |
| **John P. Taylor** | **- MATP** |
| **Robert J. Zimberoff** | **- MATP** |
| **Charles Wallace** | **- Md. State Dept. of Education** |
| **Jennifer Griffin** | **- Md. State Dept. of Education** |
| **John Feaster** | **- DWDAL** |
| **Angella Moon** | **- DWDAL** |
| **Ann Gunning** | **- DWDAL** |
| **Francisco J. Vega** | **- DWDAL** |
| **Roseanne Fish** | **- DWDAL** |
| **Casey Tiefenwerth** | **- Md. Dept. of Labor** |
| **Alan Crawley** | **- Md. Dept. of Labor** |
| **Kimberly Lewis** | **- ERJ Transportation Services, LLC** |
| **Mitch Mitchell**  | **- ERJ Transportation Services, LLC** |
| **Eric Germain** | **- Germain HVAC, LLC** |
| **Shannon Germain** | **- Germain HVAC, LLC** |
| **Donna Kopf** | **- Chaney Enterprises** |
| **Bruce Arvand** | **- IBSS Corporation** |
| **Morgan Long** | **- IBSS Corporation** |
| **Francesca Urrutia** | **- IBSS Corporation** |
| **Tom Lentz** | **- The Johns Hopkins Hospital** |
| **Angelica Sigurdsen** | **- The Johns Hopkins Hospital** |
| **Shane Beattie** | **- Franklin Apprenticeships** |
| **Andy Smyth** | **- Franklin Apprenticeships** |
| **Melissa Boutwell** | **- Emerging Technology Apprenticeship Program** |
| **JeanMarie Makres** | **- Harford County Electrical Contractors Association & Apprenticeship Program** |
| **Carl Edgecombe** | **- AAWDC** |
| **Carl Kushinsky** | **- AAWDC** |
| **Georgeta Wainwright** | **- Delaware Elevator** |
| **Jim Hoos** | **- Apprenticeship and Training Director, Insulators Allied Local # 24** |
| **Leighton McPhaull** | **- Baltimore County Department of Economic and Workforce Development** |
| **Michael Oliver** | **- Vice President of Field Operations and Instructor, Colt Insulation, Inc.** |
| **Dr. Robert Bupp** | **- Nu-Tek Precision Optical Corporation** |
| **Ross Micali** | **- Monroe Community College** |
| **Devin Sims** | **- Modest Technologies Solution, Inc.** |
| **Romina Byrd** | **- Miller & Long Company, Inc.** |
| **Julia Yearian** | **- Bauguess Electrical Services, Inc.** |
| **Marissa Bankert** |  |
| **Janice Walker-Emeogo** |  |
| **Andre Keyser** |  |
| **Jessica Raba** |  |
| **Kari Pompilii** |  |
| **Charles Hunt** |  |
| **Cynthia Etheridge** |  |
| **Denise Carey** |  |
| **Tonya Sweat** |  |
| **Julie Givens** |  |
| **Katie Ciarrocchi** |  |

**Chairman Cavey called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. The meeting was held virtually because of a spike in COVID-19 cases in Maryland.**

**I. ROLL CALL**

Mr. MacLarion called the roll and stated a quorum was present.

Chairman Cavey welcomed Ryan Sackett as a new member of the Council and said he looked forward to working with Mr. Sackett. Mr. Sackett said he was happy to join the Council.

Chairman Cavey said he would usually direct the Council to review the minutes, but asked Maryland Department of Labor Secretary Tiffany Robinson to speak as an honored guest. Secretary Robinson thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to speak.

Secretary Robinson thanked everyone who attended. Secretary Robinson said she had hoped the meeting could be held in person but the New Year started with difficulties related to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Secretary Robinson said Maryland was experiencing another COVID surge, and wished attendees a Happy New Year. Secretary Robinson said she was glad the Council and staff were able to adjust swiftly to a virtual meeting just like they did in the past, and she offered thanks. Secretary Robinson reflected on the accomplishments of the Council in 2021. Secretary Robinson said 2021 ended with 11,404 registered apprentices in Maryland, the highest number of registered apprentices ever to close a year. Secretary Robinson said she was proud of the Council for this accomplishment. Secretary Robinson said in 2021, 23 new apprenticeship programs were registered in Maryland, and another four programs were reactivated. Secretary Robinson said she was “amazed” by the amount of work the Council accomplished through the challenges that came with 2021, including the pandemic. Secretary Robinson said the Council heard 40 reviews of sponsors in 2021. Secretary Robinson said 2021 closed with 181 active registered apprenticeship programs, and that was the highest number of active apprenticeship programs in Maryland in well more than a decade. Secretary Robinson said it was important to take a moment to reflect on the highlights of 2021 which included a dramatic scaling of apprenticeship that was in line with the past few years despite the challenges of the pandemic. Secretary applauded the Council, employers and apprentices for finding safe ways to continue on-the-job training and related instruction. Secretary Robinson said the work ensured that the registered apprenticeship system in Maryland continued to grow and maintain the highest quality of standards that create skilled journeyworkers that employers and industry demand.

Secretary Robinson recognized the apprenticeship community in Maryland for making National Apprenticeship Week in November 2021 one of the busiest weeks of her year. Secretary Robinson said she enjoyed the opportunity to highlight many programs during that week. Maryland became one of the leaders in the region by hosting more than 30 diverse events related to National Apprenticeship Week. This included Maryland’s first Apprenticeship Awards ceremony which recognized the Council and made other awards. Secretary Robinson thanked the Council and staff for the passion they brought to the work. Secretary Robinson said she intended to stay for the duration of the meeting though she was multitasking. Secretary Robinson wished everyone a happy New Year and thanked the Chairman for allowing her to join.

Chairman Cavey thanked Secretary Robinson for sharing the 2021 highlights.

Mr. Shmelzer thanked Secretary Robinson and the entire administration for the resources that were provided for Apprenticeship. Mr. Shmelzer said the resources were “phenomenal” by his measure as a Council member of 17 years. Mr. Shmelzer said growth in apprenticeship in Maryland was a result of those resources. Mr. Shmelzer thanked Lloyd Day and James Rzepkowski, and members of the apprenticeship team. Secretary Robinson thanked Mr. Shmelzer. Secretary Robinson said Mr. Rzepkowski was on a “much deserved” vacation but she would share the message with him. Secretary Robinson said resources were key, but the Council was the real key.

Chairman Cavey thanked Secretary Robinson and Mr. Shmelzer then asked the Council to consider the minutes of the November Council meeting.

**II. Minutes of the November 16, 2021 Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council meeting.**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**III. OPENING REMARKS**

Chairman Cavey invited Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Division of Workforce Development and Adult Learning Erin Roth to speak. Ms. Roth said Mr. Rzepkowski was on vacation in Utah and was unable to attend the meeting, but she offered his regards. Ms. Roth said DWDAL ran advertising on busses in the Baltimore Metro Area as an extension of National Apprenticeship Week. Ms. Roth said ads also ran and continued to run at Maryland Vehicle Administration locations throughout the state. Ms. Roth said she received a lot of positive feedback about the ads. Ms. Roth said DWDAL was tracking data related to the ads and she planned to share a report at the March 2022 Council meeting. Ms. Roth said the Maryland Legislative Session was set to start the week of this Council meeting. Ms. Roth said Maryland Senate Bill 205 focused on Apprenticeship. Ms. Roth said if passed, SB205 would reauthorize the Council as a State Apprenticeship Agency. Ms. Roth said it was a normal practice to reauthorize this statute roughly every 10 years. If passed, SB205 would reauthorize the Council through July 1, 2034. Ms. Roth said a hearing related to the bill was scheduled for the Thursday after this meeting was held. Ms. Roth said she expected the hearing to go well. Ms. Roth thanked Chairman Cavey for the opportunity to speak.

Chairman Cavey said the Council usually waits until the end of the meeting to offer U.S. Department of Labor Office of Apprenticeship Consultant to the Council Ronald Leonard an opportunity to speak, but Mr. Leonard had to leave the meeting early. Chairman Cavey invited Mr. Leonard to speak. Mr. Leonard wished everyone a happy New Year and thanked the Council and staff for a successful National Apprenticeship Week. Mr. Leonard said a report was recently published on apprenticeship.gov that covered nationwide National Apprenticeship Week events. Mr. Leonard said there were other items of interest available at apprenticeship.gov including an apprenticeship ambassador initiative. Mr. Leonard thanked Chairman Cavey for the opportunity to speak. Chairman Cavey thanked Mr. Leonard and asked Mr. MacLarion to present the Director’s Report.

**IV. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**A.** Mr. MacLarion wished everyone a happy New Year and said this meeting was recorded to produce minutes. This recording could also be provided to the public as a result of a Public Information request.

**B.**  Mr. MacLarion asked everyone who attended virtually to remain on mute unless they were speaking.

**C.** Apprenticeship Training Fund update:

* Total Fund Balance as of December 31, 2021 was $1,160,484.02
* November contributions: $10,084.58
* December contributions: $5,735.88

**D.** Mr. MacLarion thanked the Council and the entire Registered Apprenticeship Community for its work during National Apprenticeship Week. Mr. MacLarion said the more than 30 events really highlighted much of the great work related to Apprenticeship in Maryland.

**E.** Mr. MacLarion said as 2022 was beginning, Apprenticeship Program staff were undertaking a massive outreach to registered active and inactive apprenticeship programs. Mr. MacLarion said for inactive sponsors this would include phone calls and site visits, and an opportunity for staff to offer technical assistance to any inactive sponsors that were interested in reactivating. Mr. MacLarion said this would also help to remove defunct programs from the rolls.

**F.** Mr. MacLarion said in previous meetings, the Council recommended further follow up and monitoring of two apprenticeship programs, and he offered updates. Mr. MacLarion said following the review of CroppMetcalfe, the Council recommended that staff collect monthly updates and monitor the program for six months, then staff would present its findings to the Council to determine if the sponsor was in compliance. Mr. MacLarion said since the meeting when the Council made its recommendation, staff met with CroppMetcalfe representatives once a month for the prior three months. Mr. MacLarion said the January meeting with CroppMetcalfe was postponed because of a snowstorm and COVID concerns. Mr. MacLarion said CroppMetcalfe recently hired a new manager of education specifically for its apprenticeship program, and that manager Gina Schmitt met with staff individually. Mr. MacLarion said CroppMetcalfe representatives declined options to meet with staff virtually in order to meet in person which created a three-hour round trip for these representatives. Mr. MacLarion said this was a testament to CroppMetcalfe’s dedication to turning the program around. Mr. MacLarion said, as a sidenote, Chairman Cavey and other Council members were attending a subcommittee meeting at the same time apprenticeship staff was meeting with CroppMetcalfe, and the Chairman and members were able to stop by the meeting and offer technical assistance. Mr. MacLarion said CroppMetcalfe representatives appreciated the Chairman’s and Council member’s visit and advice. Mr. MacLarion said CroppMetcalfe’s files and records were updated with “tremendous progress.” Mr. MacLarion said all CroppMetcalfe’s apprentices had obtained required apprentice licenses, the sponsor was supplying proof of wages and on-the-job training, and proof of grades and related instruction progress. Mr. MacLarion said CroppMetcalfe corrected all ratio deficiencies and continued to respond to apprenticeship staff in a timely manner. Mr. MacLarion said staff anticipated presenting a full compliance review to the Council at its March or May meeting, with no further reservations about the work the sponsor was conducting.

**G.** Mr. MacLarion said the second program staff was monitoring was the Laborers Joint Apprenticeship Committee. Mr. MacLarion said he and Coral Crawford met with this sponsor on October 27, 2021, at its facility in Lanham, Maryland. Mr. MacLarion said the meeting included the entire Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee for the Laborers Union JATC and their management team. Mr. MacLarion said staff explained what the deficiencies were, what actions needed to be taken and how the sponsor needed to move forward to correct its program in the next 12 months. Mr. MacLarion said the JATC was “extremely engaged.” Mr. MacLarion said the meeting lasted two-hours and the program was covered in depth. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor acknowledged there was a need to reset its entire program including items such as record keeping, apprentice registration, and most importantly the graduation rate of the apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said it appeared the sponsor needed to modify its standards to address all aspects of apprenticeship including a change of location of its related instruction, as well as eliminating documents that don’t need to be collected such as birth certificates and high school diplomas. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor also needed to revisit its probationary period and possibly adjust its wage progression to link it with the sponsor’s collective bargaining agreements. Mr. MacLarion said that since the October 2021 meeting, the sponsor’s trustees met in December and another meeting was scheduled for March. Mr. MacLarion said he planned to attend the March meeting with Ms. Crawford to assist the JATC with its revision of standards with plans to present the revisions to Council in May or July. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor began making positive changes that included moving the related instruction location to Cumberland, Maryland, from Lanham, Maryland, so the apprentices in western Maryland would not have to travel to Lanham. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor was also making the related instruction more flexible, with plans for apprentices to travel once a month to attend classes for an entire week. Mr. MacLarion said these changes would be presented to Council for approval if the JATC was to commit to the changes.

**H.** Mr. MacLarion said he reported in the November 2021 Council meeting that the USDOL Office of Apprenticeship was reviewing the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program’s 29 CFR Part 30 Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship submission. Mr. MacLarion said USDOL offered provisional approval to move forward with implementation of the new Maryland State Plan for Equal Employment Opportunity in Registered Apprenticeship Programs. Mr. MacLarion said in a previous update he said staff would work with the Council to update regulations as required and the Maryland Department of Labor started to work on a draft of these regulations to facilitate the work so the Council wouldn’t have to start from scratch. Mr. MacLarion asked the Chairman and Council to consider forming a small subcommittee to assist with this work. Mr. MacLarion said staff envisioned a need for two, possibly three meetings to complete a final set of revised regulations. Mr. MacLarion requested a motion for this item at the end of his Director’s Report.

**I.** Mr. MacLarion said adjusted packets from the November 2021 Council meeting would be sent to Council members via email for their review. Mr. MacLarion said shifting the meeting from in-person to a virtual platform caused a need to email the adjusted packets. Mr. MacLarion said he was happy to answer any questions the Council members might have.

Chairman Cavey thanked Mr. MacLarion and asked if the Council had already created a subcommittee to address the new regulations related to 29 CFR Part 30. Mr. MacLarion said no such subcommittee was previously created. Chairman Cavey requested a motion to accept the Director’s Report then he said the Council would consider the subcommittee.

Mr. Shmelzer asked Mr. MacLarion for an update on the RAPIDS system integration in Maryland. Mr. MacLarion said staff was negotiating with RAPIDS administrators about who owns the data once it is entered into the system. Mr. MacLarion said there was a nuance within the RAPIDS system that required a memorandum of understanding to be completed by the Maryland Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Labor. Mr. MacLarion said at the time of the meeting, RAPIDS did not allow MATP to share data from RAPIDS for items such as a Public Information Act request, or sharing with other entities. Mr. MacLarion said staff was attempting to work through the issue related to data, but a final decision had not been reached. Mr. MacLarion said he expected to bring a final decision before the Council at the March or May meeting.

Chairman Cavey asked the Council for any other questions.

Mr. Smarte made a motion to accept the Director’s Report that was seconded by Mr. Clinedinst, and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey asked the Council to consider forming a subcommittee to address new Maryland regulations related to 29 CFR Part 30.

Mr. Shmelzer made a motion to establish a subcommittee to address new Maryland regulations related to 29 CFR Part 30, Mr. Wilford seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey asked if the members of this committee would be considered at a future date. Mr. MacLarion asked the Chairman to consider soliciting volunteers presently. Chairman Cavey asked Mr. MacLarion if he would like one employer representative, one employee representative and one public representative. Mr. MacLarion said this would be ideal. Mr. Wilson volunteered as an employee representative. Mr. Shmelzer volunteered as an employer representative and Mr. Sackett volunteered as a public representative. Chairman Cavey accepted the offers to volunteer and thanked the Council members. Mr. MacLarion thanked the Chairman and volunteers.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

 **A. PROGRAM REVISIONS:**

**1.** Franklin Apprenticeships (Faith Ramsburg) – Revision to change the related instruction for the occupation of Computer User Support Specialist (Cloud Support Associate) to in-house with a virtual classroom format using CompTIA and Microsoft Curriculum. (item 1)

This request was tabled at the November 16, 2021 Council meeting in order for a representative of the sponsor to be in attendance at the January 11, 2022 Council meeting.

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Andy Smyth, Vice President of Apprenticeship Services, and Shane Beattie, Director of Operations, for Franklin Apprenticeships.

Mr. Wilford asked how many different contractors participated within the sponsor’s program. Ms. Ramsburg said the sponsor worked with 16 employers.

A motion to approve this modification of Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**2.** Franklin Apprenticeships (Faith Ramsburg) – Revision to change the related instruction for the occupation of Network Support Specialist to in-house. (item 2)

This request was tabled at the November 16, 2021 Council meeting in order for a representative of the sponsor to be in attendance at the January 11, 2022 Council meeting.

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Andy Smyth, Vice President of Apprenticeship Services, and Shane Beattie, Director of Operations, for Franklin Apprenticeships.

A motion to approve this modification of Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**3.** Franklin Apprenticeships (Faith Ramsburg) – Revision to add the occupation of Software Engineer. Related instruction to be provided in-house by Franklin Apprenticeships. (item 3)

This request was tabled at the November 16, 2021 Council meeting in order for a representative of the sponsor to be in attendance at the January 11, 2022 Council meeting.

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Andy Smyth, Vice President of Apprenticeship Services, and Shane Beattie, Director of Operations, for Franklin Apprenticeships.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

 **A. NEW PROGRAMS:**

**1.** Chaney Enterprises (Jane Sinclair) – Occupation of Concrete Driver Professional. Related instruction to be provided by Chaney Enterprises Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration approved school. Request for registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices. (item 4)

Ms. Sinclair said she was joined by Donna Kopf, Training Manager for Chaney Enterprises.

Mr. Smarte said Ms. Sinclair stated in her presentation that the sponsor would accept a high school degree or equivalent as a qualification but the standards listed only a diploma and did not include an equivalent. Mr. Smarte asked if the standards could be adjusted to include an equivalent. Ms. Sinclair said the standards would be adjusted and thanked Mr. Smarte for catching that detail.

Mr. Klusmann asked about the qualification of having a Maryland State CDL learner’s permit. Mr. Klusmann asked if this learner’s permit was needed to apply or if this would be necessary once an apprentice was accepted. Ms. Sinclair said the CDL learner’s permit was required to apply. Mr. Klusmann asked what the criteria was for satisfactory job references. Ms. Sinclair said this would be a report from an associate testifying to an applicant’s proficiency in a work-based relationship, perhaps a manager or a co-worker. Mr. Klusmann asked what was meant by satisfactory. Ms. Sinclair asked Ms. Kopf to speak to Mr. Klusmann’s question. Ms. Kopf said the prospective sponsor was requiring a satisfactory job recommendation, much like many other employers, by calling past references or calling a past employer. Ms. Kopf said this was a standard human resources’ function. Mr. Klusmann asked Ms. Kopf if there was a cost associated with obtaining a CDL learner’s permit in order to be considered for apprenticeship. Ms. Kopf said Mr. Klusmann was correct, a cost would be associated with obtaining a CDL learner’s permit in order to apply.

Mr. Shmelzer said in the selection procedure, an applicant must be able to read, write and speak English proficiently. Mr. Shmelzer asked if there was a metric or evaluation performed to determine the proficiencies. Ms. Kopf said the prospective sponsor would follow the same procedure as it would to hire any individuals through the application process, and the interview process. Ms. Kopf said the prospective sponsor planned to make use of a smartphone application to help its employees speak both English and Spanish proficiently.

Mr. Shmelzer said, thinking long term about the Maryland program, not specifically this specific sponsor, he thought it would be helpful to have a standardized metric for measuring English proficiency. Mr. Shmelzer said that he perceived current practices to measuring English proficiency to be “very subjective.”

A motion to approve the Registration of Standards and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey congratulated Ms. Kopf. Ms. Kopf and Ms. Sinclair thanked the Chairman and the Council.

**2.** Emerging Technology Apprenticeship Program (Jeffrey W. Smith) – Occupation of Information Assurance Specialist. This occupation is a 3-year 6000-hour Competency-based work processes and related instruction curriculum that meets industry standards provided by the sponsor. (item 5)

Mr. Smith said he was joined by Melissa Boutwell, President and CEO of the prospective sponsor. Mr. Smith said there was a typographical error in the standards presented to Council that had since been corrected, and the probationary period was the typical 25 percent of the full term of the apprenticeship, or 1,500 hours in this case.

A motion to approve the Registration of Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey wished Ms. Boutwell good luck and Ms. Boutwell thanked the Council.

**3.** ERJ Transportation Services, LLC (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Occupation of Automotive Body Repairer. Related instruction to be provided by Hagerstown Community College and in-house by the sponsor using the NCCER curriculum, in-house safety training and in-house lab time each year with more than 144 hours per year for each year of the program. (item 6)

Ms. Runkles said she was joined by Kimberly Lewis, HR director, and Mitch Mitchell, director of mechanics for the prospective sponsor.

Mr. Smarte asked about details of the related instruction. Mr. Smarte said 105 hours of related instruction was listed for the first year of the apprenticeship, and every year after was 145 hours. Mr. Smarte asked if the 105 hours in the first year was a typographical error. Ms. Runkles said more than 144 hours of related instruction were included in each year of the program, and she said she would make sure that gets corrected.

Mr. Clinedinst asked about the qualifications which listed abilities needed to perform the job under physical condition. Mr. Clinedinst asked if this was further detailed somewhere else in the standards. Ms. Runkles said no. Mr. Clinedinst said he was concerned about the “wide open” nature of this qualification. Mr. Clinedinst asked if the qualification should be more specific. Mr. Clinedinst asked who would make this determination and if a survey would be conducted. Ms. Runkles said abilities needed to perform the job was a common qualification in other registered standards of apprenticeship. Ms. Runkles said this was commonly addressed during the interview process.

Ms. Anderson clarified the details of the 105 hours of related instruction in the first year that concerned Mr. Smarte; Ms. Anderson said the 105 hours in question were provided in Hagerstown, but these hours were in addition to in-house instruction that would provide more than 144 hours of related instruction in the first year in total. Ms. Anderson asked if apprentices would receive only 12 hours per year of related instruction in a lab or if hands-on related instruction would be offered at the community college as well. Ms. Runkles said apprentices would receive hands-on instruction at the community college as well. Ms. Runkles said the 12 hours of in-house hands-on related instruction would be supplemental to the education received at the community college. Ms. Runkles said Hagerstown Community College offers a number of hands-on activities as part of the related instruction.

Mr. Wilford asked if the prospective sponsor would be at the mercy of the college if classes were unavailable because of lack of participation or enrollment. Ms. Runkles said college representatives were not concerned about a lack of participation, and that participation was not an issue.

A motion to approve the Registration of Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Smarte, and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey congratulated the sponsor’s representatives.

**4.** Germain HVAC, LLC (Jennifer D. Runkles) – Occupations of HVACR Technician and Plumber. Related instruction to be provided by Penn-Foster and in-house. (item 7)

Ms. Runkles said she was joined by company owners, Eric and Shannon Germain. Ms. Runkles said if approved by the Council, this would be the first apprenticeship program registered in Garrett County, Maryland in several decades.

Mr. Shmelzer asked if the employer would create a schedule for apprentices in terms of how much related instruction would be expected to be completed within a certain timeframe, considering the related instruction was through an Internet-based provider. Ms. Runkles said the related instruction provider provided outlines that were built into the program for the employer.

Ms. Anderson said the standards stated 150 hours of online instruction would be provided in addition to 48 lab hours. Ms. Anderson asked if 198 hours of related instruction per year was accurate. Ms. Anderson said this was a lot of hours in addition to a full-time job. Ms. Runkles said 48 hours was the total for the four-year program, and 12 hours of lab was included per year (two hours per month of lab). Ms. Anderson then asked if apprentices would receive only 12 hours of lab time per year. Ms. Runkles said this would be in addition to on-the-job training, and the lab time was considered by the sponsor to be an opportunity to offer one-on-one instruction to apprentices individually to serve as a sort of check point. Ms. Anderson said she was concerned, generally, that as more online providers offered related instruction, sponsors were offering less and less lab time. Mr. Wilford asked Ms. Runkles to double check the hours calculation and said in his opinion 198 hours of instruction per year was “not that bad.”

Mr. MacLarion apologized for the confusion. Mr. MacLarion pointed to Page 244 of the Council’s packet. Mr. MacLarion said the hours would be 198 hours per year, and that this would be 48 hours per year, not 12 hours per year as Ms. Runkles stated earlier. Mr. MacLarion said if 198 hours was too much, it would be addressed during review and could be adjusted.

 A motion to approve the Registration of Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

 Chairman Cavey wished Ms. Germain good luck and Ms. Germain thanked the Chairman. Ms. Runkles thanked the Chairman and Council.

**5.** IBSS Corporation (Ginamarie Best) – Occupation of Information Security Analyst. Request for registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices. (item 8)

Ms. Best said she was joined by the prospective sponsor’s president, Bruce Arvand, as well as Morgan Long and Francesca Urrutia.

Mr. Shmelzer asked if the sponsor would consider posting a sample exam so applicants could prepare for the exam. Ms. Best asked Mr. Arvand or Ms. Long to comment. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor’s intention was to find applicants with some background working in the occupation and to attract the right talent. Mr. Arvand said if the test was provided then the prospective sponsor wouldn’t be able to attract the right talent. Mr. Arvand said the test had two parts including social skills. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor was trying to reach underserved communities with a goal of love and compassion. Mr. Arvand said the technical component of the test was meant to determine if a prospective apprentice was committed to the aggressive program. Mr. Arvand said “the short answer is no,” and these were the reasons for that answer.

Ms. Chapple asked if the prospective sponsor was unwilling to provide an example test, if a test blueprint would be considered so applicants were aware of at least a portion of what would be expected. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor advertises the basic requirements needed to qualify. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor’s recruiting team also covered what was expected of apprentice candidates. Mr. Arvand said the curriculum was very clear. Mr. Arvand said the test changed frequently so the questions couldn’t be shared among candidates.

Mr. Shmelzer said since the prospective sponsor was seeking approval of a small, under-five program, he would acquiesce, but if the sponsor were to come back before Council to be approved as a large program, he would push back on posting a sample of the test.

Chuck Wallace, of the Maryland State Department of Education, said a compromise that might be considered would be to provide just a few sample questions.

Mr. Shmelzer double checked the packet that was provided to Council and determined the prospective sponsor was seeking approval as a large employer with an Affirmative Action Plan. Mr. Shmelzer said he believed it was incumbent upon the prospective sponsor to provide a sample of the test especially as the prospective sponsor intended to reach disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor intended to begin a second group of 10 students on January 18. Mr. Shmelzer said the prospective sponsor listed only five journeyworkers but Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor intended to apprentice 10 individuals. Mr. Shmelzer asked for details on the ratio of journeyworkers to apprentices which was typically one to one. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor started the program a year before this meeting and 10 more people planned to join January 18. Mr. Arvand said the program was very expense, hard to maintain, and required a lot of resources. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor was seeking outside funding, but would begin the new class January 18 regardless of new funding opportunities. Mr. Arvand said the Department of Commerce was one of the prospective sponsor’s largest customers, as well as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Silver Spring office, and more than 120 engineers and scientists supported NOAA. Mr. Shmelzer said he understood and he understood the expenses the employer beared, and there were funding mechanisms available through the State the prospective sponsor might use to its advantage. Mr. Shmelzer said the expenses and potential funding had no bearing. Mr. Shmelzer said his concerns were providing an example test and the journeyworker to apprentice ratio. Mr. Shmelzer asked Ms. Best to work with the prospective sponsor to update the number of journeyworkers if the prospective sponsor intended to register 10 apprentices. Ms. Best said she would work with the prospective sponsor’s staff to bring the program within compliance. Ms. Best also said Mr. Arvand was willing to provide a sample of the test. Mr. Shmelzer said he thought providing a sample of the test would help the program’s candidate selection process in the long term. Mr. Shmelzer said in his experience, the application process was the most-time consuming part of maintaining a program, and providing a sample test would help reduce the number of applications. Mr. Arvand thanked Mr. Shmelzer.

Mr. Wilford asked for clarification on how the sample test would be provided. Mr. Wilford asked if it would just be a limited selection from the whole test rather than a complete sample test. Mr. Shmelzer, and other Council members spoke at the same time and affirmed this would only be a limited number of samples from the test rather than a cohesive sample test.

Ms. Anderson said there were more than enough hours associated with the program, but she was surprised to see the new member orientation listed as on-the-job training hours. Mr. Arvand said the intention was for apprentices to understand the company’s mission of giving back to the community. Mr. Arvand said the company came from small, humble beginnings and now has 300 employees. Mr. Arvand said he wanted apprentices to understand that serving the community and giving back to the community was important. Mr. Arvand said he was very excited about the potential of the prospective sponsor’s apprenticeship program.

Mr. Shmelzer told Ms. Anderson in the past few meetings, new sponsors that were approved were including new member orientations or similar onboarding processes in their on-the-job training hours. Mr. Shmelzer said he personally agreed with Ms. Anderson’s concerns, but this was becoming a typical practice. Ms. Anderson said she was less concerned with the particular standards being considered in this item because there were plenty of hours, but she would be more concerned with a program that was short on hours.

Ms. Urrutia said another reason the new hire orientation was included in the on-the-job training hours was because it “backed up against” the organization’s ISO quality standards. Ms. Urrutia said the prospective sponsor provided quality management system training to apprentices so that they understand the many facets of the prospective sponsor’s business and how they all tied to quality processes.

Chairman Cavey thanked Ms. Urrutia and asked Council members if they had any other questions. Mr. Cavey said he didn’t want to neglect the ratio issue previously raised by Mr. Shmelzer. Chairman Cavey asked if it was correct that there were only five journeyworkers. Mr. Arvand said there were currently five employees who were close to achieving journeyworker status and another four who would soon receive security clearances. Mr. Arvand said he was confused by what the Council meant by “ratios.” Mr. Arvand then cited examples of who in the company might be considered a journeyworker. Mr. Arvand said it would be challenging to provide a one-to-one journeyworker to apprentice ratio. Chairman Cavey agreed this was a challenge, but said according to the prospective sponsor’s standards, the ratio was necessary. Chairman Cavey said the ratio issue would need to be corrected before he would entertain a motion.

Mr. MacLarion addressed Ms. Urrutia and said he thought some language needed to be clarified. Mr. MacLarion asked how many employees worked for IBSS. Ms. Urrutia said IBSS had roughly 225 full time employees. Mr. MacLarion asked of those employees, how many would Ms. Urrutia classify as experts or proficient journeyworkers in the Information Security Analyst occupation. Ms. Urrutia said roughly six to nine or perhaps 10 individuals were experts. Mr. MacLarion said six to nine experts in the occupation would allow the program to have six to nine apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said this did not mean an individual expert in the occupations would be permanently assigned to one apprentice. All journeyworkers could work with all apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said that if nine apprentices were to graduate and increase the number of journeyworkers from nine to 18, then the sponsor could take on 18 apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said if Ms. Urrutia were to analyze the company’s ranks and found the company employed 15 to 20 Information Security Analyst journeyworkers, then the prospective sponsor could sign on 15 to 20 apprentices. Mr. MacLarion said the related instruction component of apprenticeship was not limited to a one-to-one ratio. Mr. MacLarion said the one-to-one ratio was for the on-the-job work portion of apprenticeship. After hearing Mr. MacLarion’s explanation, Ms. Urrutia said the prospective sponsor had more than six to nine journeyworkers.

Chairman Cavey said Ms. Best would simply have to update the form to include more journeyworkers once Ms. Urrutia determined the new number. Ms. Urrutia said Mr. MacLarion’s explanation was very helpful and she understood the definition of journeyworker and how journeyworkers impacted the ratio.

Ms. Best said she would update the form with a larger number of journeyworkers. Ms. Urrutia said she would work with Mr. Arvand to determine a new number.

Ms. Anderson said it sounded like apprentices would be sent to other organizations to work. Ms. Anderson asked how apprentices would be sent to other organizations to work while still receiving one-to-one mentorship from a journeyworker. Mr. Arvand said the prospective sponsor was a federal contractor. Mr. Arvand said 70 employees were working that contract and apprentices would join that team. Mr. Arvand said this would create a ratio of more than one journeyworker to one apprentice. Mr. Arvand said this team included a program manager, team leader, and other senior staff.

Mr. Shmelzer asked if the journeyworkers were all full-time employees and Mr. Arvand answered yes.

A motion to approve the Registration of Standards and registration of an Affirmative Action Plan with apprentice selection procedures and goals and timetables for minority and female apprentices was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer, and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey congratulated Mr. Arvand and Ms. Urrutia, and said he was glad to clarify some issues. Chairman Cavey encouraged the sponsor’s representatives to contact Ms. Best for assistance. Mr. Arvand and Ms. Urrutia thanked the Chairman and Council.

**6.** Modest Technologies Solution, Inc. (Ginamarie Best) – Occupation of Training & Development Specialist. Related instruction to be provided by the sponsor. (item 9)

Ms. Best said she was joined by Devin Sims, the prospective sponsor’s representative.

Mr. Shmelzer said he was very interested to see the results of the provisional review since there were no requirements. Mr. Shmelzer said a lack of qualifications could present challenges in selecting candidates for apprenticeship. Ms. Best said this was a small program that did not require an Affirmative Action Plan. Mr. Shmelzer said he understood, but he was curious and intrigued to see how the program would be marketed and how candidates for apprenticeship would be selected.

A motion to approve the Registration of Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Smarte and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey congratulated Ms. Sims and Ms. Sims thanked the Chairman. Chairman Cavey then called for a 10-minute comfort break.

**7.** Nu-Tek Precision Optical Corporation (Kelton Addison) – Occupation of Precision Optics Manufacturing Technician. Related instruction to be provided by Monroe Community College and Harford Community College. (item 10)

Mr. Addison said he was joined by Dr. Robert Bupp, President, and Ross Micali, National Workforce Learning Coordinator for Monroe Community College.

Mr. Shmelzer said Monroe Community College was new and asked Mr. Addison for assurance that all proper documentation would be collected from the college by the sponsor. Mr. Addison said that the college’s offerings are utilized by other apprenticeship programs in New York and throughout the country. Mr. Shmelzer said he understood.

Ms. Anderson asked if hands-on applications were included in the related instruction. Mr. Addison said the related instruction was provided strictly online.

A motion to approve the Standards of Apprenticeship was made by Mr. Smarte and seconded by Mr. Wilson. Chairman Cavey asked for questions on the motion and Mr. Wilford asked if the instruction was going to be strictly virtual, what was being offered at Harford Community College. Mr. Addison said Harford Community College would offer courses to an apprentice who received a certificate of completion who would like to continue his or her education to earn an Associate Degree. Ms. Anderson asked if virtual classes for CPR, first aid and proper lifting techniques were commonly approved. Chairman Cavey said Red Cross offered virtual classes that became very popular during the pandemic. Mr. Smarte said OSHA offered lifting courses online as well, and more virtual instruction in these subjects was becoming acceptable.

The motion was unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

Chairman Cavey wished Dr. Bupp and Mr. Micali good luck. Dr. Bupp thanked the Chairman.

 **B. PROGRAM REVISIONS:**

**1.** Franklin Apprenticeships (Faith Ramsburg) – Revision to add the occupation of Information Security Analyst. Related instruction to be provided in-house in a self-directed virtual format. (item 11)

Ms. Ramsburg said she was joined by Andy Smyth, Vice President of Apprenticeship Services, and Shane Beattie, Director of Operations, for Franklin Apprenticeships.

Mr. Shmelzer said this would be the sponsor’s fourth occupation and asked if the sponsor had full time staff that were dedicated to outreach efforts to bring more employers onboard. Mr. Shmelzer said the number of apprentices was low. Mr. Smyth said the sponsor had an ongoing process using social media channels for outreach where employers were operating. Mr. Smyth said the sponsor served 600 people in career readiness training in the past year. Mr. Smyth said the sponsor was confident in its ability to attract the needed range of candidates, and also offered a very thorough support process for the chosen candidates. Mr. Smyth said all of the sponsor’s apprenticeship programs were already nationally recognized by USDOL and this item was meant to help bring Maryland into the fold, where the sponsor was focusing on a number of large employers.

Mr. Shmelzer asked what the sponsor was doing differently to expand apprenticeship to more companies. Mr. Smyth said the sponsor had two very specific processes including outreach from its business development and sales team, as well as communicating with employers with which the sponsor is already working to expand opportunities in apprenticeship.

A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

 Chairman Cavey said good luck and Mr. Smyth said thanks. Ms. Ramsburg thanked the Chairman.

**2.** The Johns Hopkins Hospital (Charles Marquette) – Revision to add the occupation of HVACR Technician. Related instruction to be provided by the Baltimore Metropolitan Chapter of Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (item 12)

Mr. Marquette said he was joined by Tom Lentz, senior director of Johns Hopkins Health Systems Facilities Management Operations.

Mr. Clinedinst said training included evacuation, recovery and charging of refrigerant. Mr. Clinedinst said he didn’t see anything in the standards that covered related licensing requirements related to refrigerant work. Mr. Clinedinst said a CFC license was required to work with refrigerants, including a license in the State of Maryland. Mr. Lentz said the sponsor had employees with CFC licenses on staff who were responsible for that process. Mr. Lentz asked if the CFC license was a necessary part of the sponsor’s apprenticeship program. Mr. Clinedinst said if apprentices were to transport refrigerant, a license would be necessary. Mr. Lentz said he understood. Mr. Clinedinst then asked specifically about the State of Maryland license. Mr. Lentz said he would have to look into Maryland licenses. Mr. Lentz said he was pretty sure the staff he had in mind had all necessary licenses, and these staffers included master refrigeration mechanics as well. Mr. Clinedinst said there was a State of Maryland license, and also a CFC license that enabled handling of refrigerants.

Mr. Marquette said licensing requirements could possibly be added to the requirements in the Standards of Apprenticeship. Mr. Clinedinst asked how to proceed. Mr. MacLarion said Section 12 of the standards stated that whenever a license or certification was a required practice, the sponsor would provide the Council with written evidence that these certifications or licenses were obtained. Mr. MacLarion said when licenses or certificates were required by other regulations, staff would ensure these requirements were met as well. Mr. MacLarion said he deferred to Mr. Clinedinst, or perhaps Ms. Anderson, as to whether the licensing requirements mentioned by Mr. Clinedinst should be specifically added to the sponsor’s standards. Ms. Anderson said CFC licensing and training should definitely be included in the program. Ms. Anderson said she saw the sponsor was using ABC as a partner and it might be included in the curriculum. Ms. Butt said CFC certification was included through ABC if the apprentice wasn’t already certified.

Mr. Clinedinst noted a typographically error that should be corrected to read “heat pump.”

Ms. Anderson asked for details about CPR and safety training. Ms. Butt said these trainings were included in the first year of apprenticeship. Mr. Clinedinst thanked the Chairman and said he had no more questions.

 A motion to approve this revision was made by Mr. Wilson first, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

 **C. PROGRAM REVIEWS [Five (5) or More Apprentices]:**

**1.** Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Chesapeake Shores Chapter (Coral Crawford). (item 13)

 Mr. Clinedinst noted P. 356 on the wage records. Mr. Clinedinst said the wage doubled since 2019. Mr. Clinedinst asked for clarification and if that was correct. Ms. Crawford said according to her information, that was correct.

 Mr. Klusmann asked why there was a decline in registered apprenticeship among minorities. Mr. Klusmann also said there was a retention issue and asked if this could be addressed. Mr. Klusmann said this appeared to be a big issue, with many apprentices being registered but very few remaining active. Ms. Crawford acknowledged this was an issue but stated the sponsor’s outreach efforts were robust and well documented. Mr. Klusmann said this appeared to be an example of a sponsor using apprenticeship for cheap labor then terminating them.

 Ms. Anderson suggested it would be important to have a sponsor representative present for reviews to answer questions such as these.

 Mr. MacLarion detailed how completion rates were calculated, including apprentices who were cancelled during their probationary period. Mr. Klusmann thanked Mr. MacLarion but said he was well aware of how graduation rates were calculated. Mr. Klusmann said of the completion rates, “in real life, this is terrible.”

 Mr. Shmelzer asked if the sponsor suggested that it would take on new approaches to recruiting considering the low minority registrations and completion rates. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor received technical assistance in 2019 and the notes related to that assistance detailed new approaches to recruitment. Ms. Crawford said the notes stated staff saw significant improvement.

 Mr. Clinedinst said he was waiting for an answer on the 100 percent increase in the journeyworker rate. Chairman Cavey said Ms. Crawford said this was accurate. Mr. MacLarion requested 24 hours for staff to verify this detail.

 Mr. MacLarion said Council members were correct to state diversity numbers were moving in the wrong direction. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor’s EEO plan clearly detailed the actions the sponsor should take to address equal employment opportunities. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor did a lot of recruitment but was hampered by COVID, but when diversity numbers trend downward, outreach efforts should increase. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor experienced “massive staff turnover” four or five months before this meeting. Mr. MacLarion said a new leadership team was recently put in place, and the new leadership team was very responsive. Mr. MacLarion said staff would continue to guide the sponsor concerning its EEO plan.

 A motion to accept this review was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Smarte and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**2.** Colt Insulation, Inc. (Coral Crawford). (item 14)

 Ms. Crawford said she thought she was joined by Michael Oliver, vice president of field operations and instructor (the virtual platform created challenges with verifying attendance). Ms. Crawford said this family business was founded in 1969 and worked in mechanical insulation, asbestos abatement and mold remediation, primarily in Maryland. The review was conducted by Apprenticeship Navigator Sheila Jackson and Ms. Crawford in person in December 2021. The standards of apprenticeship were approved in January 1976 for the occupation of insulation worker with 8,000 hours of on-the-job training.

 Ms. Crawford said numerous deficiencies were found, primarily the sponsor’s inability to provide records in an organized manner, during a review conducted in 2020 as well as the December 2021 review recorded in this item. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor failed to utilize assistance offered by Apprenticeship Program staff. The sponsor attributed the majority of deficiencies found during the December 2021 review to the recent loss of the sponsor’s apprenticeship coordinator who worked for the sponsor for 20 years prior to leaving, as well as the loss of the related instruction provider who offered instruction in house. Ms. Crawford said deficiencies included freezing all related instruction classes for nearly two years without notifying the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program, and freezing the apprentices’ wages and progress for the duration despite advancement in on-the-job training. Ms. Crawford said two apprentices were behind on related instruction. One apprentice, “Apprentice A,” was registered and worked for five years and five months and was frozen at the final progression for a fourth-year apprentice with less than 60 hours of related instruction needed to complete; this apprentice was initially projected to complete the apprenticeship in July 2020. Ms. Crawford said another apprentice, “Apprentice B,” was registered, worked for three years and five months, and was frozen at the progression of a second-year apprentice and was initially projected to complete in July 2022. Ms. Crawford said she was also informed the sponsor shifted blame for Apprentice B’s lack of progression on the fact that this apprentice took maternity leave for two months, though the maternity leave occurred after the related instruction had already ceased, so the maternity leave had no bearing on the apprentice’s progression.

 Ms. Crawford said during the December 2021, staff discussed the importance of the sponsor’s responsibility to provide related instruction and properly maintain records. The sponsor expressed concern about the tenuous situation and welcomed more guidance from staff to improve the sponsor’s program. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor recently agreed to pay Apprentice A the full journeyworker rate on scale jobs, and Apprentice B’s wages would be adjusted to the equivalent of the third-year progression. Ms. Crawford said these wage adjustments were to take effect in January 2022.

 Ms. Crawford said the sponsor attempted to prepare in advance of the December 2021 review, but record keeping was found to have ceased, including documentation of progress in related instruction.

Ms. Crawford said the sponsor demonstrated its commitment to Equal Opportunity Employment. She said during the review period related to the December 2021 review, two of the three apprentices registered were females and ethnic minorities.

Ms. Crawford said, considering the sponsor’s deficiencies, staff took the time to speak with an apprentice at the apprentice’s workplace. Ms. Crawford said the apprentice was looking forward to completing the apprenticeship and appreciated the support of the sponsor to continue learning despite the freeze in related instruction.

Ms. Crawford said that staff requested the Council approve this review with several caveats: the sponsor must adjust the apprentices’ wages and fringe benefits as applicable to include prevailing wage projects as noted in the report; the sponsor would supply evidence to staff and the prevailing wage unit manager once the wage adjustment occurred, and this must occur within 45 days; the sponsor would provide a full schedule of related instruction dates and staff would monitor the related instruction by occasionally attending and/or conducting unannounced visits; the sponsor would meet monthly with the appropriate Apprenticeship Navigator for six months to verify attendance and quality of the related instruction, enable completion of apprentices, and assist and guide the sponsor. Ms. Crawford said after six months, staff would conduct a compliance review and report back to the Council with further recommendations. Ms. Crawford said should the sponsor not comply, a recommendation for formal deregistration may occur as cited in Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 09.12.43.16 Formal Deregistration.

Chairman Cavey said the 2016 portion of the statistical summary had two apprentices registered with two cancelled and one active and asked if this was “a typo.” Ms. Crawford said an incorrect statistical summary was accidentally included in the packet in place of the version which was intended. Ms. Crawford said the Chairman was correct and the cited document was incorrect.

Mr. Wilford said six months of monitoring the sponsor and the related caveats recommended by Ms. Crawford were “too generous.” Mr. Wilford said the Council and staff offered the sponsor numerous opportunities to remedy program violations in recent years. Mr. Wilford said staff dedicated a lot of effort toward contacting, reviewing, and offering guidance to the generally unresponsive sponsor. Mr. Wilford said, “at this point, three strikes and you’re out.” Mr. Wilford said giving the sponsor six more months was “overly generous.” Mr. Wilford suggested the Council begin the deregistration process immediately and offered to make a motion.

Chairman Cavey asked Mr. Wilford if questions and concerns from other Council members could be addressed before making a motion. Mr. Wilford said he would hold his motion for further discussion.

Mr. Klusmann said the journeyworker rate was $21 but the first progression was below minimum wage. Ms. Crawford said the first progression was indeed below minimum wage and this would be adjusted if the sponsor was to remain active. Mr. Smarte asked if the minimum wage issue should be addressed by the wage and labor board. Chairman Cavey said the minimum wage issue was addressed in the staff recommendations following the December 2021 review. Mr. Klusmann asked if the wages would be adjusted for all work, rather than solely scale work. Ms. Crawford said the majority of the work during the review period was scale work, but wages would be adjusted accordingly for all work.

Mr. Shmelzer said he generally agreed with Mr. Wilford on Council action on this item. Mr. Shmelzer asked for details of the sponsor’s response following the 2020 review. Mr. Shmelzer asked Ms. Crawford to estimate how the sponsor’s response would differ between the 2020 and 2021 reviews. Mr. Shmelzer said the sponsor didn’t address violations related to the 2020 review. Ms. Crawford said staff offered assistance related to the 2020 review and it was “fair to say” the sponsor refused this assistance at the time. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor became responsive when the more recent review was initiated. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor expressed gratitude for staff assistance. Mr. Shmelzer said he was “having a hard time believing,” the sponsor would remedy violations discovered by staff and determined by Council. Mr. Shmelzer stated the sponsor was performing prevailing wage work and needed an apprenticeship program to continue prevailing wage work. Mr. Shmelzer said the sponsor was incapable of managing a program, and suggested the sponsor consider another apprenticeship model such as a joining a group non-joint or group joint program. Mr. Shmelzer said the sponsor was performing prevailing wage work with an unfair advantage in violation of its apprenticeship program.

Ms. Griffith, Maryland Assistant Attorney General and Advisor to the Council, offered guidance to the Council pertaining to COMAR 09.12.43.16. She said the Council must serve notice to the sponsor of the violations and remedies. The sponsor would then have 30 days to correct the violations and could request a 30-day extension. Ms. Griffith said if the Council determined there were violations, to keep these regulations in mind when crafting a motion.

Mr. Shmelzer asked if 30-days’ notice was necessary considering deficiencies were found in 2020 and many of those deficiencies continued upon review in December 2021. Ms. Griffith asked Mr. MacLarion if a notice of violations was issued to the sponsor following the 2020 review. Mr. MacLarion said no such notice was issued following the 2020 review, but a corrective action plan was issued at the time. Ms. Griffith then informed Mr. Shmelzer that issuing a notice of violation would be necessary according to COMAR 09.12.43.16.

Mr. Sackett asked what would become of the registered apprentices if the sponsorship was rescinded. Mr. MacLarion said the apprentices would be deregistered with the program. Ideally, Mr. MacLarion said, the program would affiliate with a group program, so the apprentices could complete. Mr. MacLarion said, to clarify, that the apprentices were essentially frozen in place for two years at low wages, with one apprentice being less than 50 hours away from completing. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor did not advance the apprentice at all until the Council and staff contacted the sponsor and “forced that forward.” Mr. MacLarion said that while deregistering the sponsor’s apprenticeship program would be unfortunate for the apprentices, “that apprenticeship is a two-way street,” with an implied promise given to fairly assist apprentices in progressing through programs while earning progressive wages. Mr. MacLarion said in the case of this sponsor, an apprentice was reaching the sixth year of apprenticeship in a four-year program according to the sponsor’s standards. Mr. MacLarion estimated the apprentice with six years of experience, in essence, had reached the journeyworker level but was not paid as such.

Mr. Wilford said allowing the sponsor 30 days to remedy violations per COMAR 09.12.43.16 would be a better outcome than allowing the sponsor another six months to underpay the apprentices. Mr. Wilford suggested he would make a motion to serve notice of violations to the sponsor. Mr. Klusmann said if Mr. Wilford didn’t make the motion, he would.

Mr. Wilford made a motion to begin deregistration proceedings according to COMAR 09.12.43.16 by sending a certified letter to the sponsor to remedy wage violations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smarte.

Mr. MacLarion asked for clarification of the motion. Mr. MacLarion asked if the wage violations were related to prevailing wage work or all work. Mr. Wilford said the wage violations were related to all work performed by the apprentices. Mr. Klusmann said he agreed with Mr. Wilford.

Mr. Wilford said the sponsor was “doing nothing but holding these apprentices hostage and making them work for lower wages, and not progressing them.”

Chairman Cavey said in the past, when the Council heard similar items, the Council and program staff monitored programs on a monthly basis. Chairman Cavey asked if monthly monitoring was part of the recommendations and if Mr. Wilford would consider adding monthly monitoring to his motion. Chairman Cavey said if the sponsor were to remedy the violations within 30 days as required, should the Council and staff continue to monitor the sponsor for a year. Chairman Cavey said the Council had taken similar actions with sponsors that were mentioned earlier in this meeting.

Mr. MacLarion asked Chairman Cavey if it would be helpful to reiterate the initial staff recommendations one by one. Chairman Cavey thanked Mr. MacLarion and asked him to proceed. Mr. MacLarion said the recommendations were that within 30 days, to provide corrective action to adjust wages and fringe benefits for all wages for the apprentices as noted in the review; the sponsor would provide evidence to staff and the prevailing wage unit manager upon delivery of this item; the sponsor would meet monthly with the appropriate Apprenticeship Navigator for the next six months; the sponsor would provide a full schedule of all related instruction classes with staff monitoring these classes by occasionally attending or conducting unannounced checks; after six months, staff would conduct a full compliance review and report back to the Council; should the sponsor not comply, the formal deregistration process would occur. Mr. MacLarion said, according to the motion, a deregistration notice would be sent to the sponsor following this meeting rather than in six months, and the deregistration process would continue if the sponsor did not comply within 30 days.

Chairman Cavey asked for clarification as to what would happen after the deregistration notice was served. Mr. MacLarion said this was essentially a two-part process: if the sponsor complied with the deregistration noticed and remedied the violations within 30 days, staff would then intensely monitor the sponsor for six months and conduct another formal review.

Chairman Cavey asked if the sponsor did not remedy violations after six months, could the Council then deregister the program? Ms. Griffith said if the sponsor remedied the violations noted in the deregistration letter within 30 days but did not meet further staff recommendations within the six-month time period, the Council could serve a notice of a failure to correct and the sponsor would have 15 days to request a hearing. Ms. Griffith said this would be the potential continuation of the process to deregister the sponsor.

Chairman Cavey asked Mr. Wilford if he was comfortable with the details of the 30-day and potential six-month deregistration process as part of Mr. Wilford’s motion. Mr. Wilford said this was acceptable. The motion was amended to include the violations and recommended remedies listed by Mr. MacLarion. Chairman Cavey asked if Mr. Smarte intended to second and Mr. Smarte said, “yes sir.”

The motion carried unanimously (Mr. Bromley absent).

**3.** Howard County Government Joint Apprenticeship Committee (Sheila Jackson). (item 15)

 Mr. Klusmann said it looked like the sponsor had female applicants but they didn’t make it into the program. Ms. Jackson said this was the result of an unbiased skills assessment.

 Mr. Sackett asked if the sponsor had considered making changes to its selection process since it had many applications but only one registration. Ms. Jackson said the sponsor’s consideration of changing its application process was not part of the review. Ms. Jackson said she was monitoring the sponsor on a quarterly basis. Mr. MacLarion said the reason only one apprentice was recruited was because there was only one position to fill. Mr. MacLarion said to prepare for future recruitments, the sponsor’s director contacted organizations that specialize in bolstering outreach to females.

 Mr. Shmelzer suggested connecting the sponsor with a specific person who could help with female applicants. Mr. Shmelzer said Ms. Jackson was already working with this person.

 A motion to accept this review was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Mr. Shmelzer and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**4.** Lywood Electric, Incorporated (Coral Crawford). (item 16)

 Mr. Klusmann said the qualifications state that an apprentice must reside in the State of Maryland and he would like to see that qualification removed. Mr. MacLarion said a notification would be sent to the sponsor to revise the standards and this would be brought to the Council in the March 2022 meeting.

 A motion to approve the review to include Mr. Klusmann’s recommendation to update the standards to remove the residency qualification was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Ms. Anderson and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**5.** Maryland Natural Resources Police (Coral Crawford). (item 17)

 Ms. Crawford said staff recommended approval of this review to be approved contingent upon another review to be conducted in 12 months from the date of this meeting to allow staff to assist the sponsor in streamlining its process.

 A motion was made by Mr. Wilson to approve this review including staff recommendations, seconded by Mr. Wilford and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**6.** Monocacy Valley Electric, Inc. (Coral Crawford). (item 18)

 Ms. Crawford said the sponsor provided electrical installation and services to commercial entities and customers with government contracts. The sponsor was based in Littlestown, Pennsylvania. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor maintained an 8000-hour apprenticeship program for the occupation of electrician. Ms. Crawford said she conducted the review by herself and onsite in October 2021.

 Ms. Crawford said it was discovered during the review that the sponsor changed its related instruction to an online platform with Penn Foster. Ms. Crawford said the journeyworker wage rate increased to $26.

Ms. Crawford said staff reviewed wage records for all three apprentices and found that two of the three apprentices’ wages were not properly in line with wage progressions according to the sponsor’s Standards of Apprenticeship. Ms. Crawford said “Apprentice A” was an apprentice for four years and accumulated sufficient related instruction and on-the-job training to be a fourth year apprentice, but was being paid at a percentage lower than a third-year apprentice, with the difference being $4.90 per hour.

Ms. Crawford said “Apprentice B” was an apprentice for six years with sufficient on-the-job training for six years, but was only in the third year of related instruction. Ms. Crawford said Apprentice B was being paid 75 percent of the journeyworker rate, and staff calculated this apprentice was eligible to receive at least 90 percent of the journeyworker rate for at least the year leading to the review date in October; Ms. Crawford calculated this was a difference of $3.90 per hour. Ms. Crawford said in addition to the wage discrepancies, the sponsor was using Apprentice B on Prevailing Wage projects in which he was identified as a journeyworker, yet Apprentice B’s wages aligned with the 75 percent progression and not the 90 percent progression of the fourth year of apprenticeship.

 Ms. Crawford said the sponsor had an Affirmative Action Plan in place and the minimum requirements included being of legal age to handle the tools of the trade, to provide proof of age, the apprentice must be a high school graduate or equivalent, have reliable transportation, complete an employment application and pass an electrical experience questionnaire. Ms. Crawford said applicants were selected using a points-based system.

 Ms. Crawford said the sponsor had not yet met the diversity goals for the review period. The sponsor also completed no apprentices during the review period. Ms. Crawford said these were deficiencies that added to the wage deficiencies already noted. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor’s outreach activities were limited to using the Indeed online employment platform and walk ins.

 Ms. Crawford said staff recommended the program be provided with 30 days to remedy the deficiencies outlined in the report related to this review. Ms. Crawford summarized the deficiencies to include a lack of outreach according to the sponsor’s Affirmative Action Plan, no records reflecting the sponsor’s hiring and selection processes, underutilization of females and minorities, inadequate tracking of related instruction, inadequate tracking of on-the-job training, disorganized files and record keeping, wage progression issues for two of three apprentices included in the review period, an apprentice who worked as a journeyworker on Prevailing Wage jobs, and being out of ratio. Ms. Crawford said the sponsor’s remedy to deficiencies should include correcting any and all wage deficiencies for the two apprentices, establishing a filing system and providing an update on how the sponsor would immediately begin to comply with its Affirmative Action Plan. Ms. Crawford said staff also recommended that the sponsor provide a report to Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Program staff every 30 days for the 12 months that followed this meeting. Ms. Crawford said these reports should detail all aspects of the sponsor’s program to include on-the-job training, related instruction, apprentice wages, and outreach conducted. Ms. Crawford said staff recommended that after the 12-month period, a compliance review would be conducted and provided to the Council to determine if the deficiencies were corrected.

 Chairman Cavey opened the floor to questions from the Council.

Mr. Wilford said, “here we go again.” Mr. Wilford said this was the sponsor’s “third strike.” Mr. Wilford said he would like to begin deregistration proceedings according to COMAR 09.12.43.16 by sending a certified letter to the sponsor to remedy wage violations and other deficiencies detailed in the review. Mr. Wilford said he agreed with staff recommendations to monitor the sponsor and require reports every 30 days, but only if the sponsor were notified of deregistration proceedings as well. Mr. Wilford said he thought the sponsor would have continued to hold Apprentice A and Apprentice B at low apprentice wages for years if this deficiency was not discovered by staff. “I would put them on notice,” Mr. Wilford said, “no more chances.”

 Mr. Smarte also asked the Council to consider beginning deregistration proceedings according to COMAR 09.12.43.16 by sending a certified letter to the sponsor to remedy wage violations and other deficiencies detailed in the review. Mr. Smarte said the wage deficiencies were very serious.

Mr. MacLarion and Ms. Griffith offered technical advice as to how to include the beginning of the deregistration process in the motion.

Mr. Klusmann asked about the electrical experience questionnaire, and said electrical experience accounted for 35 percent. Mr. Klusmann said apprenticeship was meant to allow someone with no experience to become proficient in a trade. Mr. Klusmann said this experience questionnaire was a lofty expectation. Chairman Cavey asked Mr. Taylor if he knew of any other programs that required such experience. Chairman Cavey said he thought the highest percentage of related experience that could be required was 25 percent. Chairman Cavey also asked Mr. MacLarion if he had any insight. Mr. MacLarion said staff contacted the U.S. Department of Labor, and that USDOL staff’s understanding was that 25 percent was the highest percentage for any one category, but USDOL staff was unable to find regulations or policy that specified that 25 percent mark. Mr. MacLarion said there was an elevator program sponsored in Maryland with an entry test that included recognition of tools of the trade that he considered to be difficult and onerous. Mr. MacLarion said the electrical experience questionnaire was not unprecedented, but considering other deficiencies noted in the review, addressing the electrical experience questionnaire could be included in the Council’s motion.

Mr. MacLarion said staff provided a copy of the Standards of Apprenticeship back to the sponsor because the sponsor did not have its standards on file before the review began. Mr. MacLarion said this was additional evidence to suggest that Mr. Klusmann’s attention to the electrical experience questionnaire, and possible changes to the questionnaire could become a reasonable part of the process to address deficiencies as well as update the sponsor’s standards.

Mr. Shmelzer said the difference between this review and the review detailed in a previous item (item 14 as reflected in these minutes) was that there were multiple group programs within a reasonable distance of this sponsor’s business place with which the sponsor could affiliate. Mr. Shmelzer listed three group sponsors with which this sponsor could possibly affiliate. Mr. Shmelzer suggested the sponsor might cancel its own program and join a group apprenticeship program instead.

Mr. Sackett said there was an error in the report, and that Littlestown was in Pennsylvania, not Maryland as the report stated erroneously. Ms. Crawford said this error would be addressed and Pennsylvania would be changed to Maryland.

Mr. Smarte said he wanted to again express the seriousness of the wage deficiencies discovered by review, and he suggested adding the deregistration process in addition to all other staff recommendations.

 Mr. Smarte made a motion to begin deregistration proceedings according to COMAR 09.12.43.16 by sending a certified letter to the sponsor in addition to approving all staff recommended remedies to address program violations (recorded in Ms. Crawford’s summary recommendations in this item), to change the weight of the electrical experience questionnaire to a maximum of 25 percent, and to change the error of Littlestown, Maryland, to Littlestown, Pennsylvania, in the report. Mr. Wilford seconded Mr. Smarte’s motion and the Council unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

 **D. PROGRAM REVIEWS [Fewer Than Five (5) Apprentices]:**

**1.** The following program reviews were performed and the programs were found to be conducted in a satisfactory manner. [No Council Action Required]:

a. Crist Instrument Company, Inc. – Occupation of Machinist (Coral Crawford).

 (item 19)

b. JESCO, Inc. – Occupation of Construction Equipment Mechanic (Heavy) (Faith

 Ramsburg). (item 20)

c. Shore Power Electric, Inc. – Occupation of Electrician. (Coral Crawford). (item 21)

 **E. PROVISIONAL REVIEWS:**

**1.** Bob Breeding General Contractors, LLC (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 22)

Mr. Wilford said he was glad to see this sponsor was in compliance with its standards.

A motion to accept this review was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

 **2.** Thompson Automotive, Inc. (Kelton Addison). (item 23)

Mr. Addison said that because of the increase in the minimum wage that came with the new year, wage progressions associated with a number of occupations fell below the new minimum wage. Mr. Addison said this was noted by staff and would soon be addressed by the sponsor. Mr. Addison that all apprentices were paid more than minimum wage, including the new minimum wage, so no apprentices were injured by the wage progression issue.

Mr. Klusmann said he noticed the automotive technician journeyworker rate decreased from $32 to $29. Mr. MacLarion said the sponsor would be held to the wage rate on apprenticeship agreements with individual apprentices.

 A motion to accept this review was made by Mr. Klusmann, seconded by Ms.

Anderson and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

 **3.** Willard Agri-Services, Inc. (Coral Crawford). (item 24)

 Ms. Crawford experienced technical difficulties and Mr. MacLarion presented on her behalf.

Mr. Klusmann asked for clarification of the journeyworker rate. Mr. MacLarion said the journeyworker rate was established at $17 per hour, but the apprentice was already earning $20 per hour which would likely cause the journeyworker rate to increase in the next review.

A motion to accept this review was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**F. VOLUNTARY REQUESTS FOR CANCELLATION OF STANDARDS OF APPRENTICESHIP:**

**1.** Deck Plate Home Inspections effective July 13, 2021. (item 25)

 Chairman Cavey entertained a motion to group the voluntary cancellations together.

Mr. Smarte made a motion to group the voluntary cancellations (represented in these minutes as items 25, 26 and 27) in one vote, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Butt.

Following the motion to group items 25 to 27 together, Mr. Shmelzer asked what became of the National Restaurant Association program (item 27). Mr. MacLarion said, just to clarify, Humanim (item 26) was cancelling its individual program in order to join a group program. Mr. MacLarion said the National Restaurant Association was not performing all functions of its program, and because of staff turnover, they were unaware they had to establish an apprenticeship committee. Mr. MacLarion said the program in Maryland was deferring to its national program and chose to cancel its Maryland program in order to continue its national program.

Chairman Cavey asked if Deck Plate (item 25) was recently approved as well. Mr. MacLarion said Deck Plate was approved in July 2021. He said Ms. Ramsburg engaged the sponsor but “they went silent” and when Ms. Ramsburg was finally contacted by the sponsor, they said they decided not to pursue apprenticeship.

The motion to group items 25 to 27 together was unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

A motion to cancel the programs represented in these minutes as items 25, 26 and 27 was made by Mr. Smarte, seconded by Ms. Butt and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**2.** Humanim, Inc. effective January 11, 2022. (item 26)

 *See item 25.*

**3.** National Restaurant Association Educational Foundation December 1, 2021. (item 27)

 *See item 25.*

**G. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**1.** Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Metropolitan Washington Chapter (Christopher D. MacLarion) – Request to award a posthumous Certificate of Completion of Apprenticeship. (item 28)

 A motion to approve this posthumous award was made by Mr. Wilford, seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**2.** Recommendation for deregistration of Apprenticeship Standards for the defunct apprenticeship program of Allision Transmission Division – Baltimore Operations (MATC No. 2116) (Christopher D. MacLarion). (item 29)

A motion to accept deregistration of standards was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Klusmann and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**3.** Recommendation for deregistration of Apprenticeship Standards for the defunct apprenticeship program of Faith Polishing and Plating, Inc. (MATC No. 2112) (Christopher D. MacLarion). (item 30)

A motion to accept deregistration of standards was made by Mr. Shmelzer, seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**4.** Request for the approval of M.R. Electricians to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Ginamarie Best). (item 31)

 Chairman Cavey invited Mr. Shmelzer to speak as chairman of the youth apprenticeship committee. Mr. Shmelzer said he didn’t necessarily view all the occupations on the agenda as apprenticeable. Chairman Cavey asked Mr. Shmelzer if he was interested in grouping the youth apprenticeship items together (represented in these minutes as items 31 through 43).

 Mr. Shmelzer made a motion to approve items 31 to 43 together in one vote. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klusmann.

 Mr. Wilford asked if it would be prudent, through work in youth apprenticeship subcommittees, to use occupational codes such as O\*NET to screen youth apprenticeship occupations. Mr. MacLarion said youth apprenticeship was guided by the original regulations as well as youth apprenticeship policy. Mr. MacLarion said the standards for youth apprenticeship were different than adult registered apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said youth apprenticeship was often leveraged to create a school-to-apprenticeship model and/or to transition into adult registered apprenticeship. Mr. MacLarion said staff did its best to screen out occupations that didn’t meet minimum criteria of youth apprenticeship.

 The motion to approve items 31 to 43 was unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent).

**5.** Request for the approval of Rich Moe Enterprises, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Ginamarie Best). (item 32)

*See item 31.*

**6.** Request for the approval of Efficiency Enterprises, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Charles Marquette). (item 33)

*See item 31.*

**7.** Request for the approval of AIR, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg). (item 34)

*See item 31.*

**8.** Request for the approval of Miller Construction Services, Inc. to be an eligible employer for

Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg). (item 35)

*See item 31.*

**9.** Request for the approval of Miller Refrigeration, Inc. to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Faith Ramsburg). (item 36)

*See item 31.*

**10.** Request for the approval of Elite Card Processing, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jennifer D. Runkles). (item 37)

*See item 31.*

**11.** Request for the Approval of ERJ Transportation Services, LLC to be an eligible employer for

Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jennifer D. Runkles). (item 38)

*See item 31.*

**12.**  Request for the approval of Sterling Care Frostburg Village to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jennifer D. Runkles). (item 39)

*See item 31.*

**13.** Request for the approval of Bayside Fire Protection, LLC to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 40)

*See item 31.*

**14.** Request for the approval of Nancy Arias State Farm Agency to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Jane Sinclair). (item 41)

*See item 31.*

**15.** Request for the approval of Itaberco, Inc. to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 42)

 *See item 31.*

**16.** Request for the approval of Kent Manor FBS to be an eligible employer for Apprenticeship Maryland (Youth) (Robert J. Zimberoff). (item 43)

 *See item 31.*

**VII. CLOSING COMMENTS**

Mr. MacLarion complimented Ms. Crawford for her work as a relatively new staff member, and her commitment to review programs throughout the state. Mr. MacLarion thanked the Council for its dedication as well.

Chairman Cavey invited Mr. Wallace to speak. Mr. Wallace wished everyone a happy new year. Mr. Wallace thanked staff and the Council for its attention to detail.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Cavey entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. Smarte made a motion to adjourn that was seconded by Mr. Clinedinst and unanimously approved (Mr. Bromley absent). The meeting adjourned at 12:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher D. MacLarion

Secretary

Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council