SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY

April 23, 2010

Agenda:
- Approve previous meeting minutes (4/9/10)
- Additions to agenda
    - SURF logo and language terms of use for sponsors
    - Trademark update
    - Academic Outreach Initiative topics of interest
        - Dues level for faculty
        - Recommendations for proposals
- Meeting recaps
    - SURF 13
    - ITRC
    - ASTM
- Draft Conflict of Interest Policy
- Insurance proposal
- Committee staffing/volunteers
- Committee Reports
    - Membership
        - Student chapter update
    - Meetings
    - Communications/Outreach
        - Procedure for handling requests for SURF presenters/presentations
        - Planning for outreach efforts at Battelle
    - Finance
        - Sponsorship update
    - Technical Initiatives
    - Nominations
- Other business
- Next meeting

Attendees:

David Ellis, President	✓	Carol Baker	✓
Paul Favara, Vice President	✓	Stephanie Fiorenza	✓
Maile Smith, Secretary	✓	Dick Raymond	✓
Brandt Butler, Treasurer	✓	Dan Watts	✓
Mike Rominger (non-voting attendee)	✓	Dave Woodward	✓

Meeting (teleconference) called to order, approximately 10:03 am PDT / 1:03 pm EDT.

Quorum confirmed.

Voting Items:
1. Approve 4/9/10 meeting minutes
    a. Dave Woodward – motion to approve previous meeting minutes
    b. Dan Watts – motion seconded
        - Aye – 7 (Brandt, Dick not on call for this vote)
        - Nay – 0

2. Approve adoption of draft Conflict of Interest Policy with amendment proposed by Paul Favara
    a. Dave Ellis – motion to adopt draft Conflict of Interest Policy
    b. Dan Watts – motion seconded
        - Aye – 8 (Dick not on call for this vote)
        - Nay – 0

Business Discussed:

1. **Meeting Recaps** – *SURF 13:* it was a fruitful meeting and lots of work got done. Everyone felt very positive about the meeting and thinks there is a great deal of momentum, particularly on technical and outreach initiatives. *ITRC:* The meeting can be summed up by one EPA comment: "One leg is enough for us". Despite that comment, the ITRC group still appears headed for a triple-bottom line approach. Stephanie was impressed by the level of participation during the meeting, and left energized and optimistic that the framework will be both useable by regulators and comprehensive of the three sustainability tenants. ITRC is still getting comments on the draft. Tom O'Neill and Rebecca Borden from MN will co-lead the group going forward. *ASTM:* No one on the call attended, but Carol heard that a few EPA regulators stated emphatically that their organizations are only interested in and willing to address the environmental aspects of green and sustainable remediation, and that they will not consider any social or economic factors. Their efforts on Sections 1-4 (scope) during the working group portion of the meeting were focused on removing language related to balance, social aspects, and economic aspects. When the entire group reconvened, the larger group was not in favor of restricting the guide to environmental aspects, however, and it seems like social and economic considerations will remain for the time being. Several regulators suggested that the group try to include more NGOs, environmental justice groups, municipalities, and other under-represented stakeholders. The draft document will go back to the collaboration groups by 5/1/10, who will do further revisions and return the draft back to ASTM by 8/1/10. A draft will be released for full review again on 9/1/10, with the intention of discussing and considering comments on that draft at the October committee meeting.
2. **Draft Conflict of Interest Policy** – Paul F. drafted a sentence to add to the Conflict of Interest Policy. The general consensus is that with this addition, the policy is acceptable. Dave E. will contact K&L Gates to ask them to prepare the final language for Board review and adoption.
3. **Committee Staffing and Volunteers** – Dave E. wants the Trustees work out a mechanism to identify and appoint members of the committees. He suggests we devote a portion of time during the next meeting. Trustees should review the Bylaws pertinent to the discussion.
4. **Limitations of Use Policy** – Reviewed Dave Woodward's draft limitations of use policy. General consensus that it's a good policy. Dave Ellis will forward to K&L Gates for their review before formal adoption.
5. **Trademark Update** – Maile reported that Grant Geckler, who prepared and submitted our Trademark application, hasn't yet received any correspondence from the USPTO. He expects the process to take another 2 to 4 months. In the meantime, SURF may place the TM superscript with the SURF logo/name in order to identify our common law mark, but may not place a "registered" superscript until we receive our formal registration. The general consensus is that we should adopt the TM superscript when referring to SURF in text, but that modification of the logo is not warranted.
6. **Academic Outreach Initiative Topics of Interest** – Dan provided an overview of two topics of interest to the Academic Outreach working group. (1) SURF has a Government rate, which only covers academics that work for a public institution. Academic Outreach initiative members feel that this is an inequity that needs to be addressed. Dan did some research and found another group that gives a distinct status to university employees, regardless of whether the institution is public or private. Stephanie asks about research staff; Dave E. asks about adjunct faculty; Brandt asks about part-time faculty: is the working group proposing that these categories would also fall under the umbrella of "government" or are they advocating an expanded "government + academic" classification? There is some discussion about what might be incentives to expand academic members and whether or not $150 (vs $100) is a barrier to membership. Dave E. asks what the potential increase in

membership might be if our outreach efforts are successful. Seems like the monetary issue is minor, but there is a greater concern with the perception of inequality. Maile suggests that if we create a new category for "academics" that it be limited to full-time positions. Dan offers to draft some potential options for the working group's and the Board's future consideration. (2) The working group wonders if SURF would consider exploring a mechanism by which letters of support for research proposals could be generated. The working group had a phone call this morning, and they are currently drafting an outline detailing a potential process. For example, it might entail a generic "SURF letter of support" for such proposals, signed by as many SURF members who are in favor of the proposal. Example: A faculty member wishing to write or who has written a proposal would contact someone at SURF with their request (e.g., Academic Outreach Initiative Chair or a SURF Trustee), the appropriate group reviews the proposal (e.g., Academic Outreach Initiative or SURF Board), and the appropriate group says yes or no to support, or the proposal could be extended to the membership who would say yes or no to support. Dan researched how this might interact with our lobbying restriction; he read the IRS regulations and interprets them as saying anything that is administrative and non-judicial would not be considered lobbying. Dave E. wonders how SURF would be viewed for their approval or non-approval. Stephanie asks the Trustees if they are aware of any organizations similar to SURF that perform this kind of service, and mentions that she is concerned that we could open a door to a flood of requests. Paul thinks there could be an opportunity to advocate for sustainable remediation. Dan mentions that we could consider restricting this to academics who are SURF members. Stephanie, Dave E., Carol, and Paul are concerned about the time and effort to provide this service; it could overwhelm our volunteer capabilities. The topic is tabled until the working group provides their outline detailing the potential process.

7. **Insurance Proposal** – Dick Raymond joined the call at this time. He reports that our potential insurance brokers are examining the removal of several of the exclusions that were attached to the proposal (as suggested by K&L Gates). Dick thinks that by the end of next week this phase of research will be completed and by the next meeting we will have a proposal to vote on.

8. **Committee Reports**:
   a. **Finance** – Came out even at SURF 13 dinner; we have ~$37K in the account at this time. Recent sponsors are CH2MHILL and Boeing (both Gold). There are several companies who have proposed to become sponsors, but we don't know where they are at the moment.
   b. **Technical Initiatives** – There are no updates since SURF 13. Framework and metrics plan to have a teleconference next week. There has been some feedback that we should expand back out into three groups: Framework, metrics, and LCA. Paul views these groups as distinct, but thinks arguments could be made either way about dividing and conquering these topics. Dave E. thinks we can get more mileage with our impact if we split out and focus on individual topics. Maile and Dick agree. Paul suggests that he and Brandt attend each other's calls in order to keep abreast of each other's progress. Dave E. was approached by a member about being exhaustive about researching and referencing work done to date, and notes that we did this with the White Paper. From now on, we should be forward-looking and keep ourselves informed of efforts similar or overlapping with SURF's.
   c. **Membership** – We currently have 78 on our membership roster. Dan reminds the group that 90 days after ratifying the Bylaws we need to have a membership process that is either approved by Board or by the membership committee. Dan will head up this effort, but is concerned with the small committee interest. Maile notes that about a half-dozen survey respondents are interested in serving on the membership committee. Dan and Maile will reach out to the survey respondents to begin this process. There is no update regarding the student chapters because Dan has not received much in the way of feedback from those he approached with questions.
   d. **Meetings** – The meetings committee is working with CSU to design SURF 14. Dave E. and Dave W. are beginning the process of planning SURF 15 with CMU for a potential meeting in October. Carol reminds the Board that there was much previous feedback that SURF needs to start cutting back meeting frequency. Dave W. recalls a discussion that during SURF's first formal year that we may have the need to stick with quarterly. Dave E. says that the meeting committee is aware of these concerns and intends

to address this issue. Stephanie mentions that there are a large number of meetings occurring in October and therefore a potential that we could see a similar turnout as SURF 13 (e.g., lower than typical). The meetings committee will keep this in mind when finalizing the meeting date.

e. **Communications and Outreach** – SURF receives somewhat frequent requests for presentations on SURF. The communications committee feels that there is an urgent need to come up with a procedure for approving presentations on SURF so that there is a coherent and consistent message. As a first step, the committee has prepared short and long versions of a "We Are SURF" presentation that can be used by our membership. There has been a loose and not consistently enforced policy to approve, or at least know about, these events in advance, but this doesn't always happen. There has been some discussion about the need for a SURF "Speakers Bureau" or group of authorized SURF presenters. The Academic Outreach Initiative would like to form something similar for academic outreach. Maile is concerned that it might appear that the same key SURFers always field speaking engagements, and that instead of saying no to a request because one of the Trustees isn't available, we should give the opportunity to the SURF membership in general (noting that speaking in front of some groups could be viewed as a benefit to SURF membership). Stephanie and Maile suggest that in addition to the standard presentation, that some guidelines or informal training is provided to help ensure that SURF's mission is supported and that a consistent message is delivered. Battelle outreach planning is moving forward and going very well. Carol is picking up the SURF banner today (sponsored by Chevron), the draft flyer is prepared (sponsored by Northgate), Rick and a small team are preparing posters (sponsored by WSP), the pins have been ordered (SURF funded), a draft staffing matrix has been prepared, and we'll have a laptop to handle membership applications on the spot. The committee still needs to figure out the table setup and breakdown teams. We should aim to have the logo terms of use decided before Battelle so that sponsors can use the sponsorship logo at their individual booths. Dave E. suggests that the committee look into how we can recognize the donations of our members' companies for outreach materials.

f. **Nominations** – No report.

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (5/7/10):
- Approve previous meeting minutes (4/23/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Final Conflict of Interest Policy
- Insurance proposal
- Committee chairs and members
- Committee Reports
  - Membership
    - Student chapter update
    - Draft membership approval process
  - Meetings
    - SURF 14 and 15 planning update
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Academic Outreach Initiative update
    - Battelle outreach planning update
  - Finance
    - Sponsorship update
  - Technical Initiatives
  - Nominations
- Other business
- Next meeting

Meeting adjourned, 12:00 pm PDT / 3:00 pm EDT.

Respectfully submitted by,

L. Maile Smith, Secretary