

SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY

November 11, 2011

Agenda:

- Additions to agenda
- Approve previous meeting minutes
- 501(c)3 application
- Committee Reports
 - Meetings
 - SURF 19 planning update
 - future SURF meetings
 - Finance
 - Technical Initiatives
 - Communications/Outreach
 - Membership
 - Nominations
- Other business
 - US: new developments, policies, or conferences
 - ASTM meeting overview
 - International: new developments, policies, or conferences
 - ADVOCATE project
- Next meeting

Attendees:

Paul Favara, President	✓	Stephanie Fiorenza	✓
Dave Woodward, Vice President	✓	Karin Holland	✓
Maile Smith, Secretary	✓	Steve Murawski	✓
Brandt Butler, Treasurer	✓	Curt Stanley	
Dave Ellis, Past President (non-voting attendee)	✓	Dan Watts	
Mike Rominger (non-voting attendee)	✓		

Quorum confirmed. Meeting (teleconference) called to order, approximately 11:05 am PST / 2:05 pm EST.

Voting Items:

1. Approve the meeting minutes from 10/28/11
 - a. Stephanie – motion to approve the previous meeting minutes
 - b. Dave W. – motion seconded
 - Aye – 6
 - Nay – 0
 - Abstain – 1

Business Discussed:

1. **501(c)3 Application** – Several Trustee addresses are incorrect (Dave W., Steve, Stephanie). Steve mentions that 501(c)3 applications typically represent what the organization currently does and what the organization aspires to do. It should be inclusive of planned and likely future activities. Our responses in the draft application seem

modest in comparison to what Steve has seen on other applications, in particular regarding what we plan to do. In Part 6, where we talk about benefits, our description says that certain programs are going to be limited to SURF members. That may weigh against us in the application approval process. Steve also wonders what we as a Board envision we'll do with a tax-exempt status. We also state that we won't be doing any fundraising (Part 8), but that might be in opposition our planned future activities in conjunction with academic outreach. We also state that we won't make grants or loans to other organizations, and that we won't issue scholarships and fellowships. Steve thinks that the application is pretty close ("on the 80 yard line"), but that the Board needs to be very cognizant of the organizations future goals and objectives when reviewing and ultimately voting to approve this application. Dave W. wonders if we can schedule a call with K&L Gates to get their opinion regarding some of these responses (and the implication of such). Steve thinks this is a good idea. The Board should also be able to clearly express our aspirations reflected on this application to our membership. Paul suggests that the Board review Steve's comments (which Steve will write-up and share with the Trustees today or early next week) and he will then schedule follow-up with K&L Gates. Dave W. asks how the change-over in Trustees will affect the process. Steve recommends getting the application in with the current Board, and supplementing the application later with the new Board. Brandt agrees that we should continue to move forward now, rather than wait after a new Board is installed in 2012, noting that the application process is holding up our tax filing.

2. **ASTM Fall Meeting Update** – Paul provided an overview of the ASTM GSR working group and the changes voted in at the recent fall meeting. The ASTM GSR group has split in two; green remediation and sustainability. The EPA representatives were consistently in favor for splitting the group in two. This was a change from the informal polling in advance of the formal vote to split. The issues associated with the break might have a lot to do with the EPA feeling uncomfortable with the sustainability components of the guide. The green components are more common and accepted, and a green-only guide could be more specific in their application. Some people were alarmed with the amount of effort required to do things (i.e. sustainable practices) that the industry doesn't have as much experience and tools to address. The sustainability side was seen as perhaps too visionary or theoretical. The fact that the group has split now doesn't mean that the group will stay split forever. Potentially the group could come together again, as both groups will work in parallel and will keep each other informed of their progress. There were many individuals in favor of the split; not just the EPA representatives. The ASTM leaders felt that the working group numbers needed to be reduced if they would ever be successful in reaching consensus (the initial GSR working group was very large). Paul mentioned that he met with the "green" group, whose work at the meeting focused on BMPs. The group has developed two Excel worksheets with dropdown menus. There is a menu for standard management activities (e.g., reduce, reuse, recycle), and a technology matrix that is activity-dependent, providing multiple BMPs for each specific activity. They are filtered by project phase (e.g., design, construction, FS, etc.), and also specify which of the five EPA core elements that the BMP applies to. Paul thinks it's a very nice tool. The purpose of the guide is that if you follow the practice, you can state that you have applied a green remedy in accordance with the guidance. Paul thinks that there is a loophole in the guide that could potentially lead to a "green remedy" when all one has done is go through an analysis, but hasn't actually employed any "green" practices. Dave E. heard a more cynical take on the meeting, which he did not personally attend, than the neutral perspective that Paul is presenting. Paul does agree that there is a contingent of the group that has no interest or intention to reach consensus if sustainability is broadly considered in the guide. Karin adds that she thinks that there is a greatly diminished value in the sustainability half of this process if in the end regulators are only supporting or endorsing the green half. Dave W. mentions that he added some comments (regarding the recent National Academies report on sustainability and the EPA) during the informal straw poll prior to the meeting, and asked if his comments were discussed during the meeting. Paul and Karin confirm that they were not, but that the same points have been brought to the EPA participants in the past and they were not receptive. Dave W. wonders if Administrator Lisa Jackson's public response to the report is consistent with her internal directives to the agency. The ASTM leads (Helen and Leslie) intend to participate in both groups to facilitate consistency and cooperation.

3. Committee Reports

1. **Meetings:** Mike R. reports that SURF 19 registration is open and the draft agenda is out. Karin is continuing to reach out to universities to encourage student participation. Mike R. reports that SURF 20 is tentatively going to be held at the Colorado School of Mines in Summer 2012. SURF 21 may be held in Philadelphia or perhaps in Washington DC.
 2. **Finance** – No report.
 3. **Technical Initiatives** – The SR/SR integration TI is moving forward. The group is aiming to have rough drafted the sections of a fact sheet by the end of November and a draft fact sheet ready for review at SURF 19. The SR rating TI is making steps forward. Battelle has accepted the Framework, Metrics, and LCA short courses for the 2012 conference.
 4. **Communications and Outreach** – Stephanie and Maile are working on an outreach communication to the SURF membership that will go out around the end of the month. The SURF Newsletter was distributed earlier this week.
 5. **Membership** – Maile processed the memberships that came in during October, which numbered around a dozen. Membership is around 200, with about 30 inactive members that will be dropped from the rolls by the end of the month if no response is received. Seems that our outreach efforts are improving and showing results.
 6. **Nominations** – Paul has begun reviewing and updating the nomination process for 2012. He will begin by confirming which Board slots are up for vote.
4. **Other business** – (1) International developments, policies, or conferences: Dave W. and Maile have received an outreach solicitation for the ADVOCATE project, which appears to be associated with CL:AIRE (which hosts and is affiliated with SuRF UK). ADVOCATE reached out to SURF Canada as well. Per the solicitation, the ADVOCATE network will undertake advanced research on a range of in-situ remediation concepts and technologies for soil and groundwater, and train young scientists in this field through a program of fellowships supported by a consortium of 20 academic and industry partners in Europe. Maile suggests that we proceed in a step-wise fashion, providing a link on the SURF website and getting on their communications distribution list, and get more involved (or not) as their work develops. (2) US developments, policies, or conferences: Stephanie reports that the TechReg document will be ready at the end of November, and will be followed by internet training via Clu-In. The training incorporates both green and sustainable remediation components. Dave W. reports that Oregon has finalized its GSR policy.
5. **Next meeting** – The next meeting was scheduled for 11/25/11, which is the Friday after Thanksgiving. Paul suggests that we bump the meetings back a week for the remainder of the year. Instead of the 11/25/11, 12/9/11, and 12/23/11 meetings, the Board will meet on 12/2/11 and 12/16/11.

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting:

- Additions to agenda
- Approve previous meeting minutes
- 501(c)3 application
- Committee Reports
 - Meetings
 - SURF 19 planning update
 - Future SURF meetings
 - Finance
 - Technical Initiatives
 - Communications/Outreach
 - Membership
 - Nominations
- Other business
 - US: new developments, policies, or conferences

- International: new developments, policies, or conferences
- Next meeting

Meeting adjourned, 12:15 pm PST / 3:15 pm EST.

Respectfully submitted by,
L. Maile Smith, Secretary