

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
OF
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL TRANSIT TRAINING CONSORTIUM

November 12, 2008
Cypress College Campus, Room 214
9200 Valley View
Cypress, CA.

The Board of Directors of the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (the “consortium”) held a regular general meeting on November 12, 2008, at the Cypress College Campus, Room 414, 9200 Valley View, Cypress, CA.

The following directors were present for the meeting:

Rolando Cruz	Greg Newhouse [by phone]
Steve Donley	Pete Sparks
Jess Guerra [by phone]	Mike Slavich
Ralph Merced, Chair	

Directors Patrick Astredo, Tom Barrio, and Dayle Withers were absent.

Also present were the following individuals:

Nina Babiarz (Training Facilitator and Coordinator, SCR TTC)
Peter Davis (Statewide Director, Advanced Transportation
Technologies and Energy)
Alan L. Fox (Secretary, SCR TTC)
Cal Macy (Long Beach City College)
Dave Stumpo (Program Manager, SCR TTC)
Steve Tomory (Rio Hondo College)

I. Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions

Ralph Merced, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m. Chair Merced thanked all meeting participants for their presence, and thanked Steve Donley and Cypress College for their hospitality in hosting the meeting, arranging various logistical details including parking and meeting room directions, and providing lunch for those attending the meeting. Chair Merced then requested each meeting participant to introduce himself or herself. Directors Jess Guerra and Greg Newhouse participated in the meeting by phone, and in turn introduced themselves over the phone.

II. Approval of Minutes

Chair Merced requested comments or discussion regarding the proposed minutes of the August 20, 2008, regular Board meeting of the consortium, copies of which had been posted on the consortium website in advance of the meeting. Upon motion by Steve Donley, and seconded by Mike Slavich, the minutes of the meeting of August 20, 2008, were unanimously approved.

III. Secretary Report

Alan Fox, Secretary, indicated there was no corporate secretarial information which was new to the consortium, but reminded the Board of previous meeting discussions regarding updating the consortium's By-laws and generally streamlining its housekeeping. Specifically, Fox noted that the By-laws had not been changed to reflect the changes in the Annual General Meeting to May from July of each year [Section 7.6], and to reflect the number of Board meetings at "not less than four (4) times per year..." from the current six. Upon motion by Steve Donley, and seconded by Mike Slavich, the Board unanimously approved the above recommended By-law changes.

IV. Management Report

A. Salient Activities Report Dave Stumpo provided a brief oral summary of the Fourth Quarter FY07 FTA Earmark Quarterly Report, referring the meeting participants to the previously distributed Report itself for additional details. Stumpo confirmed that the consortium is currently commencing the third fiscal year of the Earmark, and that the FTA has approved expenditures of \$380,000 by the consortium for the forthcoming fiscal year. Stumpo reported that the consortium had ended the second fiscal year of the Earmark with a surplus from its annual budget of \$4.58, drawing considerable discussion in addition to numerous compliments from the Board for the careful monitoring by Stumpo and Aptrex of consortium expenses in relation to revenues. Stumpo reiterated the goals and objectives of the consortium as conveyed to the FTA, and generally summarized his report by referring back to the consortium's Quarterly Report.

B. Financial Report Dave Stumpo proceeded to describe, in the context of discussing his Monthly Management Report for October, 2008, an incident involving the separate filing of two required, identical federal forms in connection with the Earmark, both of which go to the FTA but which are forwarded, electronically and by priority mail, to different locations in Washington, D.C. and Oklahoma. Stumpo reported that the September reimbursement form forwarded to the FTA location in Oklahoma was temporarily lost, resulting in a momentarily serious potential reimbursement problem affecting the consortium's cash flow. As described by Stumpo, the problem with the lost

form was resolved, and the consortium is again current with its reimbursements pursuant to the Earmark, but the incident demonstrates the fine balance and financial sensitivity with the consortium's budget and the timing with its payments and revenues. Stumpo noted that without the anticipated reimbursements, the consortium would have been unable to reimburse the colleges for their training classes, and that Board members are again and accordingly reminded that the consortium must live within its financial means. The consortium currently has no outstanding or anticipated grants on which to rely other than the Earmark revenues, and is accordingly delivering training solely on the basis of what its budget allows.

Stumpo summarized by explaining that the consortium is financially healthy and in good shape, but that as of October, 2008, the consortium will not be able to deliver more than 3-4 classes per quarter simply because of the current absence of grants or sources of revenue outstanding other than the Earmark. Stumpo added that the consortium is currently 27 months into the designated period coverage of the Earmark, and that in such time no comment has been received by the consortium from the FTA in response to its reports. He humorously suggested ignorance as to whether such silence is good, or negative, or possibly indicative of other realities.

C. Training and Development Report Dave Stumpo announced that the recent Planning Committee meetings took place as scheduled. He commented that the consortium has now developed enough history and experience concerning the presentation of training course work, and that its current focus is and should be in trying to build an annual course catalog in advance, to enable consortium members and participants to plan appropriately. He reminded meeting participants that, as mentioned earlier, in building the consortium's capability for advance planning there can currently be anticipation of hosting no more than 3-4 courses per quarter. He described the current efforts to build a course catalog, emphasizing a continuing focus on maintaining simplicity and on developing a request for quotes (RFQ) process intended to enable all colleges the opportunity to bid for the work. Finally, he described the results to date of the RFQ process, characterizing the responses to date as slightly disappointing based on the currently budgeted \$3200 per course cost. Peter Davis suggested re-sending the request for proposal communications. Jess Guerra suggested sending a new set of requests utilizing a set cost per course. Following discussion, including consideration of certain Earmark restrictions on proposal requests, it was generally agreed that the consortium would seek new proposals covering the next few months with a course cost ceiling established by wording such as "...not to exceed \$3,800." Stumpo indicated that in the absence of a successful resolution of the course costs and catalog development, the issue will be referred back to the Board for further discussion.

With regard to course costs, Cal Macy inquired whether the consortium has gone outside its own networks for comparative analyses of what others in the industry are charging. Nina Babiarz responded that director Greg Newhouse has done so, and Newhouse by phone in turn commented by way of example that he is aware of charges of \$750 per person for generally similar training, such cost being considerably higher than the consortium's current \$3200 per course. Various suggestions were offered by Peter

Davis, Rolando Cruz, and Cal Macy for other ways of charging training costs, including negotiating hours as well as mileage and reimbursement, considering specific quotes in addition or as an alternative to requests for proposals, and clarifying in the current requests that the designated costs are offered as examples rather than set proposals. Dave Stumpo explained again that the consortium's current RFQ procedures stipulate that a course must be delivered within a given month but without further designation as to dates or venues, and that it is difficult to change proposal requests from the currently designated course costs to numbers and costs outside the consortium's present comfort levels.

Nina Babiarz summarized the most recent Planning Commission meeting discussions regarding the responses to the requests for quotes. She reported that currently scheduled classes for DVOM, Electrical I, and Brakes I are currently filled, and that the more specialized classes in the third, fourth, and even fifth levels of specialization are simply more difficult to fill because of the smaller pools of technicians qualified to and interested in attending. Stumpo and Nina agreed that the course cost discussion and procedures for requests for proposal would provide appropriate subjects for healthy discussion at the next Planning Committee meeting in early December, and Stumpo summarized generally by commenting that it was good to have the discussions which transpired.

V. Committee Reports

A. Economic Workforce Committee Activities Peter Davis, Committee Chair, presented a full report on the Committee's recent activities, including a conference call meeting of the Committee on October 28th. Davis described unsuccessful efforts to insert language involving the consortium into an APTA re-authorization effort, specifically through an APTA workforce development subcommittee, and Davis in turn explained a variety of reasons for the lack of success in such initial efforts. Nina Babiarz described ongoing efforts to develop a one-page face sheet covering the consortium's accomplishments and justification for continued financing support, in part intended for presentation to U.S. Senator Boxer, and subsequent discussions concerning adjustments in such proposed face sheet with lobbyist Pat Jordan. Nina indicated advice from Pat Jordan to the effect that current financing efforts should also commence with U.S. Senator Feinstein's office.

Davis then described possible grant funding through the Department of Labor, the potential for which he has been exploring with the assistance of Gail Schwander of Long Beach City College. After discussion, it was decided that funding through the Department of Labor should not be pursued at the present time because of various restrictions and limitations on the funding.

Dave Stumpo related various recent consortium outreach efforts, all of which are and have been indirectly connected with funding efforts in the sense of increasing the consortium's profile and exposure within affected industries and funding

organizations and agencies. He described the consortium's presence through a booth at the recent APTA Annual Expo and Conferences in San Diego, and he reported that he had made a presentation on behalf of the consortium in Denver, CO at the National Transit Institute Trainer Workshop. He further reported that he and Nina had participated in the recent CTA meetings in Monterey through a consortium booth at the meetings, and had as well participated in a conference panel at the meetings. Nina in turn described ongoing communications with lobbyist Pat Jordan in Washington, D.C., in which Ms. Jordan on behalf of the consortium has provided advice regarding the consortium's one-page fact sheet and the development of a power point presentation, and has additionally advised the consortium to focus its fact sheet talking points on its various partners, particularly including the importance of the colleges to the success of the consortium, and on its training and technical assistance completed to date.

Peter Davis proceeded to describe ongoing efforts in conjunction with director Greg Newhouse to pursue funding opportunities through the current AB 118, in part through continuing communications with and potential assistance from the California Energy Commission. He described ongoing communications with Barbara Halsey of the State Workforce Investment Administration regarding career paths, and the potential applicability of future jobs creation to the efforts and goals of the consortium. He described communications with Karen Schors of the Department of Education regarding the possible development of educational academies for high school juniors and seniors for apprenticeship programs, which discussions he characterized as establishing favorable "green" positions. Rolando Cruz supported Davis's and the committee's efforts as described, commenting that "green" has to be emphasized in the consortium's pursuit of funding opportunities at the possible expense of "sustainability."

Peter Davis further reported an approach to the consortium made by Apple Computer, offering substantial gigabytes on Apple's "College in the Sky" program website. Davis commented that the consortium's "pitch" in participation in Apple's program would be encouragement to viewers to build a career path to transit maintenance, and generally to expand and as necessary to change the public perception of the transit maintenance industry.

Rolando Cruz, as a result of general and divergent discussions regarding funding opportunities, provided a brief review and history of the consortium's mentoring program to date, which he generally characterized both as successful and also as resulting in one firm hire to date from what was an initial group of 186 students who had expressed potential interest. It was generally agreed among meeting participants in the discussion which followed that more support to the colleges in aiding students with program applications, and more support in turn from the colleges to potentially interested students, is necessary and appropriate.

Chair Merced announced a brief meeting recess for lunch.

B. Planning and Curriculum Committee Nina Babiarz reported that the

Planning Committee had had a conference call meeting on October 31st, that a further meeting is scheduled for early December, and that the consortium is on track with its scheduled classes. She mentioned that a DVOM class or classes should be scheduled and held in December, and she reported on the status of classes in Brakes II, Electrical I, II, and III, and the progress with Electrical IV and V, the latter of which she characterized as ready for a Train the Trainer class. Nina further summarized the status of courses involving HVAC, and Greg Newhouse provided an update on the Cummins Engine, and Hybrids. Cal Macy inquired about the possible existence of a library for reference materials for the classes, and asked whether there is a source for written materials for various classes when instructors become certified. Nina and Dave Stumpo referred to themselves and Aptrex as the current repository for reference and related “library” sources, and Stumpo gave assurance that every certified instructor will receive the necessary written materials, while indicating that in some instances the required materials have not yet been completed and prepared for distribution. Stumpo briefly explained the 608 certification status for certain Long Beach and Montebello students in connection with HVAC systems and refrigerant use.

C. Organization Committee Activities Alan Fox, Co-Chair, reported that there were no new information or developments regarding the Organizational Committee. He advised that necessary and appropriate preparations would be required in connection with the consortium annual general meeting in May, but that further discussion or focus on such subject would be premature. Rolando Cruz suggested that the Organization Committee might become more pro-actively involved in membership development, including participation in member visits.

VI. New Business

Chair Merced requested the meeting participants go around the table for comments and contributions from individual meeting participants and board members as appropriate. Dave Stumpo initiated comments by describing the membership status of Santa Clarita Transit, which he generally characterized as confused based on a series of leadership and ownership changes at the transit agency; Stumpo accordingly suggested leaving the current membership status of Santa Clarita Transit as unresolved. Stumpo reported that the leadership of Riverside Transit simply did not seem interested in joining the consortium at the current time. He additionally commented on various changes occurring both in the leadership and also in the kinds of buses being used in San Diego, and implied that the timing may accordingly not be appropriate for forcing a membership decision in San Diego. Rolando Cruz suggested extending the time for membership decisions for all transit agencies.

Chair Merced mentioned a planned APTA transit agency general managers meeting scheduled for Santa Monica for late January/early February, 2009, and Nina Babiarez inquired whether the consortium should plan on a booth at registration at the meetings. Dave Stumpo cautioned against over-saturation or exposure of the consortium, particularly in light of the recent booths maintained by the consortium at the

APTA and CTA conferences, and it was left that further consideration would be given concerning the consortium's formal presence at such meetings. Nina described the consortium's booth and experience at the previous week's CTA conference in Monterey, including presentations given both by Dave Stumpo and also by Nina, the latter on mentoring training. Rolando Cruz, who was mentioned as pro-actively chatting with numerous conference participants on behalf of the consortium, commented that key northern California transit agency representatives sit on the state Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and he encouraged support for and cultivation of such representatives as appropriate, as well as further consideration for Dave Stumpo's and Nina's continued involvement in northern California training organization. Cruz described the enthusiastic support for the consortium on the part of the CTA itself. Cruz reiterated his previous recommendation for the Organizational Committee's pro-active contact of every consortium member, perhaps on an annual basis. He as well raised a subject from the previous Board meeting regarding a possible financial workshop, for a possible maximum of four hours, at some time prior to the next Board meeting in February.

Peter Davis remarked that the lunch was fabulous, and much appreciated. Steve Tomory of Rio Hondo College reported that consortium logos would be applied to training materials and related written distribution documents on behalf of the consortium. Mike Slavich added to Steve Tomory's comments with the advice that the logos would be appropriately affixed by the end of January. Alan Fox added to his previous comments about potential By-law changes by mentioning possible changes required to reflect the consortium's fiscal year, to which Dave Stumpo pointed out that the consortium had retained its current fiscal year while adjusting the date of its annual general meeting and thus that no new additional changes would be necessary in connection with the consortium's fiscal year. Chair Merced reported having had a pleasant and potentially productive conversation at the CTA conference with a Westport Cummins Engine vice president, in which it appeared that Westport Cummins would like to get more involved in the consortium; he raised questions for the Board's consideration concerning how such involvement might be fostered, including directly through training, or assistance in preparation of training materials, or in software.

Chair Merced thanked hosts Steve Donley and Cypress College for their hospitality in hosting and providing lunch for the meeting.

VII. Adjourn and 2009 Meeting Planner

Chair Merced announced that 2009 Board meeting dates and venues should be established. Following full discussion, it was agreed that Norwalk or Montebello, or Long Beach Transit as back up, would be potentially appropriate venues for the February 18, 2009, Board meeting, and that consultation with those agencies and follow up communication with the Board would ensue. Santa Monica Big Blue Bus was discussed as a potential venue for the Board Retreat scheduled for March 18, 2009, and Chair Merced indicated that he would check with the transit agency and be back in touch

with the Board. Suggestions were offered concerning Gardena Transit as the venue for the May 20, 2009, Annual General Meeting, and similar assurances were made that appropriate communications with Gardena Transit would take place.

Chair Merced adjourned the Board meeting at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan L. Fox
Secretary