

MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL TRANSIT TRAINING CONSORTIUM

May 14, 2008
Los Angeles Trade Technical College
Building A---Room A-111
400 W. Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA. 90015

The Board of Directors of the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (the “consortium”, or “SCR TTC”) held its annual general meeting on May 14, 2008, at L.A. Trade Technical College, 400 W. Washington Blvd., Los Angeles, CA. 90015.

The following directors were present for the meeting:

Patrick Astredo	Jess Guerra
Tom Barrio	Ralph Merced, Chair
Rolando Cruz	Pete Sparks

Directors Steven Donley, Greg Newhouse, Mike Slavich, and Dayle Withers were absent.

Also present were the following individuals:

Nina Babiarz (Training Facilitator and Coordinator, SCR TTC)
Steve Berklite (Cerritos College)
Laurie Bianchi (Consultant, SCR TTC Sponsorships)
Marion Colston (Los Angeles Metro) [by phone]
Marcy Drummond (L.A. Trade Technical College)
Alan L. Fox (Secretary, SCR TTC)
John Frala (Rio Hondo College) [by phone]
Elke Hohls (City of Santa Monica)
George Karbowski (Foothill Transit) [by phone]
Cal Macy (Long Beach City College)
Kevin Preciado (Cerritos College)
Diana Tharavej (Santa Monica Big Blue Bus)
Steve Tomory (Rio Hondo College)
Robert Tostado (Norwalk Transit)

I. Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions

Ralph Merced, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m., and welcomed everyone to the Annual General Meeting of the SCRTTC. Chair Merced proceeded to request each meeting participant to introduce himself or herself, and each of those present in person and by phone in turn provided his/her name, affiliation, and in some instances additional comments or explanation regarding his/her presence and interests.

Chair Merced explained that SCRTTC Program Manager David Stumpo was currently traveling to Washington, D.C. to attend a Federal Transportation Administration budget workshop in connection with the Earmark funds being made available to the consortium, and accordingly would not be able to attend the Board meeting.

II. Approval of Minutes

Chair Merced requested comments or discussion regarding the proposed minutes of the February 12, 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 Jess Guerra, and seconded by Pete Sparks, the minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2008, were unanimously approved.

III. Secretary Report

Alan Fox, Secretary, reported that there were few to no recent activities or information concerning organization secretarial functions worthy of discussion at the meeting. Fox commented favorably on the succinct summary of the Board's February 12th regular meeting in the consortium's Second Quarter FY07 Quarterly Report to the FTA in connection with the FTA Earmark, and suggested that perhaps more brevity in the Board's formal minutes as posted on the consortium website may be beneficial. Brief discussion ensued, with general consensus appearing to emerge that the formal and more comprehensive minutes posted on the website, and the meeting summary contained in the Quarterly Report to the FTA, serve different purposes, and that each for the foreseeable future should continue in the style and format currently being utilized.

IV. Management Report

A. Salient Activities Report

i]. Monthly Management Report. Nina Babiarz on behalf of the SCRTTC program management summarized the total hours of training provided to date by the consortium, as well as the financial status of the consortium and current assets in the bank. She remarked that the consortium is nearly precisely on target to finish the

current FTA fiscal year having utilized all authorized funding for such period. Nina referred the Board and meeting participants to further details as set forth in the written Monthly Management Report, attached to and furnished with the written materials in advance of the meeting.

Nina in turn summarized the unresolved consortium membership status of Gardena Transit and Santa Clarita Transit, and Nina's and Dave Stumpo's plans to resolve such uncertainty. Rolando Cruz commented that the uncertainties surrounding Gardena Transit involve ongoing leadership issues, and suggested that a delegation consisting of one or more Board members and consortium leadership visit Gardena Transit and reemphasize the importance and value of consortium membership. Nina raised similar membership uncertainty issues involving San Diego MTS. Chair Merced and Jess Guerra in turn and after discussion both agreed with the suggestion that additional visits be made to Gardena Transit, Santa Clarita Transit, and San Diego MTS, with the intention of reevaluating the membership status of each such transit organization after such visits, and making decisions as appropriate at such time. Chair Merced summarized the membership discussions by stating that the membership status of each referenced organization will be tabled until the next Board meeting, and that, as convenient and appropriate within the available time periods and before such August Board meeting, visits and/or related communication would be made with Gardena Transit by Rolando Cruz and Dave Stumpo, with Santa Clarita Transit by a combination of Dave Stumpo and Ralph Merced, and in all likelihood with San Diego MTS by a combination of Nina and Greg Newhouse of San Diego Miramar College.

ii]. FTA Earmark Status. Nina Babiarz referred the Board to the written FTA Earmark Second Quarter FY07 Quarterly Report, also submitted to Board members and meeting participants in advance of the meeting. Nina explained, as had Ralph Merced previously, that SCR TTC Program Manager Dave Stumpo was currently traveling to Washington, D.C. to attend mandatory FTA budget workshops involved with the Earmark and similar funding, and thus was unable to attend the Board meeting. Nina reiterated previous recent reports provided by Dave Stumpo to the effect that Earmark funding for the consortium for the FTA's October, 2008-September, 2009 fiscal year, in the amount of \$380,000, has been approved by the FTA.

B. Mentor Program Update

Nina Babiarz reported on developments in the consortium's Mentor Program by describing initial presentations offered at three colleges, namely Long Beach City College, Cerritos College, and Golden West College, to a total of approximately 150 students, by groups led by Rick Operchuck of Long Beach Transit. Nina reported that of the initial presentations, approximately 80 students followed through with tours of transit facilities, from which to date four students have been made mentorship offers and three other students are being considered, all of whom must still be screened for drug-free status and clean driving records. Rolando Cruz further explained the screening process for potential students, remarking that one objective among others in the initial presentations and screenings has been to formalize a previously informal student review

and educational process into a packaged format for identifying future transit maintenance personnel from among interested students.

Steve Berklite of Cerritos College remarked that he and Cerritos College personnel have been disappointed at what has initially appeared to be the relative lack of interest from students, and Pete Sparks in turn remarked that there may be apathy present at some of the colleges. Rolando Cruz commented that the initial presentations and approaches could have been better developed in terms of selling the programs. Discussion ensued regarding the benefits of working in the public versus the private sector, the importance of selling the mentor program and in general the benefits of working for municipal transit agencies as significant career choices, and the significance of marketing in general, to parents as well as students. Pete Sparks emphasized the importance of the “tool box” as a selling instrument. Rolando Cruz urged that a mentorship marketing and instructional package be developed within the next several months, possibly with an explanatory video and testimonials from former students. Chair Merced agreed with Cruz, and requested that in preparation for the August Board meeting Rolando Cruz provide mentorship program numbers and Nina will discuss a possible video or IPod with Peter Davis, ATTEi Statewide Director to see if available AV resources could be tapped for this effort, with an eventual goal of having an actual template for a developed mentor program by October or November of the current year.

C. APTA Bus Conference Update

Chair Merced described the recent APTA Bus Conference in Austin, TX., which he attended along with Dave Stumpo. He reported that there was considerable interest shown among conference participants in the development of the consortium, and that there was little secret about the positive benefits and organizational growth and improvements on the part of the SCR TTC. He characterized the conference as beneficial and valuable, and he reported that from a political perspective there is and will be an increasing interest in and emphasis on career development and the creation of career opportunities in the transit field.

D. Final Report on the NCR TTC Contract

Nina Babiarz provided a brief report on the development and performance of what she characterized a small APTREX contract with ITS America in relation to transit agencies in northern California to prepare a business plan for a consortium structure similar to that of the SCR TTC. She reported that there had been a number of teleconferences, and that there was tremendous apparent interest in replicating in northern California the SCR TTC business model. She further reported that a meeting had been hosted in February by Monterey-Salinas Transit, and that West Valley Community College ATTEi Center Director, David Esmaili, had offered to underwrite DVOM and Electrical I training. She indicated that DVOM training will take place in San Francisco and Fresno in May and June, and that follow up courses in Electrical I are being planned for June, also in such respective locations..

Rolando Cruz inquired of the Board's position concerning and the extent of the authority it has undertaken in relation to possible consortiums in other geographic areas such as northern California and Oregon. He asked generally about the consortium's goals in connection with involvement with other areas, and where the consortium draws the line in terms of cooperation, including involvement beyond the sharing of information. He reminded the Board that the FTA's Earmark is designated for training development in southern California, repeated his assumption that such Earmark funds are not being used to conduct training in northern California, and inquired what actual commitments have been undertaken by the consortium. Chair Merced in turn questioned whether at some point the consortium must necessarily compete for funding with other geographic areas such as Oregon, northern California, and Florida, and whether at some point in the future it would be strategic for the consortium to pool itself with other groups for available funding sources. Cal Macy commented that the consortium model developed to date can perhaps be taken to a national level, and that the funding opportunity provided by the Earmark may well constitute an appropriate time to focus the consortium's vision and determine whether, as presumably the FTA is reviewing, the consortium can become a "national potential learning model".

Chair Merced summarized the discussions by commenting that the consortium currently shares considerable information and experience with other areas, and that there may be beneficial reasons in the future, including funding, for considering a consolidation of efforts among various areas and interest groups. He suggested that the consortium's focus on third party sponsorships is a logical progression in the development of funding efforts, and that the consortium accordingly will consider possible consolidation and cooperation activities as a logical and potentially beneficial goal of its current training efforts.

E. Interest in Oregon to Form a Consortium

Nina Babiarz and Chair Merced reported that Oregon has expressed an interest in contracting with the SCR TTC to start a training program in Oregon similar to what has been developed by the consortium, in return for a fee to the consortium. Jess Guerra suggested that the Board brainstorm about such consulting arrangements at the next Board meeting. Laurie Bianchi, commenting from the perspective of what she described as that of a business person and sponsorship supporter, advised that such arrangements constituted virtually total upside to the consortium in terms of sponsorship potential, and might become similar to a licensing program. Marion Colston remarked in response to the news of the interest from Oregon that it is important that the consortium develop a marketing program, articulate its vision, and proceed to market its training skills and organizational experience once they have been fully developed.

V. Board and Committee Reports

A. Economic Development and Workforce Committee Activities

Nina Babiarz announced a proposed reorganization of the Economic Development and Workforce Committee along the lines discussed in previous Board meetings and in light of Dana Lee's request to step down from the Committee Chair position. Nina reiterated the purposes and principal goal of the Committee, namely to pursue and secure as possible additional funding for the SCR TTC. Nina then identified Peter Davis, currently the statewide director of the Advanced Transportation and Technology Initiative, as proposed new Committee Chair, with Marion Colston, head of training for L.A. Metro; Gail Schwandner of Long Beach City College; and Dana Lee of Long Beach Transit as committee members, with the anticipated additional assistance and participation of John Frala of Rio Hondo College, David Feinberg of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Ann McKinney, lobbyist for the community college Chancellor's office in Sacramento, Mike Kushner of APTREX in Washington, D.C., and lobbyist Pat Jordan in Washington, D.C., among others. Rolando Cruz responded in part to Nina's suggestions by supporting the emphasis on a marketing plan for the consortium, as well as for positioning the consortium for future funding efforts.

Chair Merced announced a meeting recess for a lunch break.

Upon resumption of the meeting, Rolando Cruz moved the Board to form a subcommittee to review a plan which APTREX would develop covering 1) future possible FTA funding; 2) sponsorship funding; and 3) relationships with organizations and start up groups similar to the consortium in other geographic areas. Jess Guerra in turn suggested that it might make most sense to schedule a special Board meeting to consider such issues, and he offered a "friendly amendment" to Cruz's motion to such effect. After discussion, including discussion regarding the procedural requirements for an amended motion, Jess Guerra's amended motion was seconded, discussed, and unanimously approved. It was agreed that Chair Merced, working with APTREX, would choose an appropriate date and venue for such a special meeting. Rolando Cruz offered to host such a meeting at Long Beach Transit.

Nina Babiarz continued her description of and suggestions for the newly constituted Economic Development and Workforce Committee, reporting that Peter Davis has agreed to Chair the Committee. Alan Fox inquired whether Peter Davis in his role as Chair will attend the consortium Board meetings, commenting that meeting attendance and participation would be important to Board communication and knowledge as well as the future success of the Committee. Chair Merced and Rolando Cruz agreed that Peter Davis should be asked to attend the consortium Board meetings, and Cal Macy added that he needs to understand through his presence the flavor of the meetings. Chair Merced concluded the discussion by stating that the Board will ask Peter Davis to attend the August Board meeting.

B. Planning and Curriculum Committee

Nina Babiarz reported that the Planning and Curriculum Committee is on

track with its scheduled activities, and that it had conducted a meeting by teleconference in the previous month. Nina advised that the Committee will meet again, by teleconference, on June 6th at 1:00 p.m. Note: This meeting date has since been rescheduled for July 10th at 10:00 a.m. at the 4th Floor conference room of Los Angeles Metro.

C. Organizational Committee Activities

Co-Chair Alan Fox reported that an updated list of active Committee members would be presented at the next Board meeting. He indicated that, although not crucial, a reconstituted Committee with currently active consortium members would be beneficial, and that the Committee should generally reflect a balance between transit agency and college representatives. Patrick Astredo suggested putting the list of committee members for each consortium committee on the consortium's website. Tom Barrio agreed that it would be appropriate to revisit the composition of the Committee, and to determine who among consortium board members and active participants would want to volunteer.

VI. New Business/Open Discussion/Questions/Answers

A. Sponsorship Program

Nina Babiarz formally introduced Laurie Bianchi as a consultant engaged to develop and present a proposal or proposals for third party and vendor sponsorships for the benefit of the consortium. Laurie Bianchi in turn provided a power point presentation concerning a proposed sponsorship program for the consortium, explaining the general projected benefits to the consortium as being a broadening of the support base of the consortium to include private industry sponsors in designated capacities, and the creation of a new revenue stream for the SCRTTC. Laurie explained various details of the proposed program, including four primary levels of sponsorship based on financial contribution, sponsor participation as donors and supporters as opposed to consortium members, and sponsorship participation based on contractual understandings through formal documents prepared and presented to the Board as sample agreements.

Laurie Bianchi further introduced herself and her experience and qualifications for offering such proposals, describing numerous successful third party sponsorship arrangements in which she has been involved. She outlined projected phases of the program, explained the various documents involved in any such projected program, and described sponsorship revenue projections for the ensuing few years. Tom Barrio commented that Laurie's proposals and explanations are exactly what the Board had asked for, and Rolando Cruz added that the structure of the proposals appears to be sound and that the Board likes what it sees. Patrick Astredo complimented the idea for the program as well as its presentation. Nina Babiarz reaffirmed that Dave Stumpo's

intention with the sponsorship proposal is to move the consortium forward in its private industry sponsorship efforts as well as its relationships with various third parties.

For overall clarity, Nina read Dave Stumpo's final paragraph from the Sponsorship Program Report Summary, as follows: "Therefore, this request is made to the Board for review, editing (if needed), and adoption as stated. Whereas, the Sponsorship Program shall be made part of the deliverables through the existing management contract and within the guidelines of the FTA Earmark." Nina also indicated that the program's resolution, approval and adoption would enable Phase II of the implementation outlined in Bianchi's Power Point presentation to move forward.

Patrick Astredo recommended with enthusiasm that the Board proceed to review the sponsorship proposals as presented, not necessarily with the immediate idea of adopting the specific proposals provided but in the spirit of recognizing that progress and development of the consortium is essential and that the sponsorship concept is part of a greater and necessary vision for the consortium. Patrick moved that the Board accept the sponsorship proposals as working documents for further review, and as a "jumping off point" for further discussion. Without acting on the motion per se, the Board agreed to accept the proposed sponsorship documents and presentation as made, to be incorporated into its anticipated consideration of its vision for its near and immediate term future.

B. Final Board Comments.

Chair Merced asked the meeting participants to go around the table, and offer any final comments which anyone and everyone felt appropriate. Jess Guerra in turn offered special thanks to Santa Monica Big Blue Bus and Long Beach Transit for encouraging and allowing its personnel to attend a special job fair at L.A. Trade Technical College that day. Rolando Cruz asked concerning the consortium's policy, if any, regarding charging for individuals and groups ("no shows") who sign up for but do not attend consortium training sessions. Cruz suggested that the consortium must discuss and maintain a policy for billing no shows.

Patrick Astredo thanked Jess Guerra and L.A. Trade Tech College for hosting the Board meeting, and for the lunch provided to all meeting participants. Steve Tomory of Rio Hondo College indicated that he would report the meeting and its discussions to Board member Mike Slavich, and he further indicated that, in light of Mike Slavich's recent promotion to dean of his department at Rio Hondo College, it was currently uncertain whether Slavich would have the time and ability to remain as a Board member. Tomory discussed certain scheduled training classes at Rio Hondo College.

Chair Merced announced that the special Board meeting discussed and agreed upon earlier in the meeting would take place commencing at noon on Thursday, July 10th, at the Long Beach Transit facility at Cherry Avenue and 68th Street in Long Beach. He stated that he would work with Dave Stumpo and Nina in putting together an appropriate agenda for such July meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan L. Fox, Secretary