

**SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY**

July 30, 2010

Agenda:

- Approve previous meeting minutes (7/14/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Communications amongst Trustees and members: suggestions for improvement
- New initiatives: process for approval, structuring, and leadership
- SR Clearinghouse: exploration of viability as SURF initiative
- Information repository and sharing (philosophy re: what we want to have protected/members-only and un-protected/available to anyone on the website)
- Requests from SURF website: (1) “Top Ten” sustainable remediation projects, (2) data for Golder marketing plan
- Committee Reports
 - Membership
 - CSU student chapter materials: compile package and make available to other universities
 - Meetings
 - Discuss objectives for 2011
 - SURF 15 planning update
 - Suggestion to identify routine meeting locations
 - Communications/Outreach
 - Academic Outreach: (1) Battelle student paper award, (2) Discipline Diversity will be incorporated, (3) SR Clearinghouse as student outreach initiative, (4) Board feedback and/or action on Stew Abrams’ draft research support policy
 - Satisfaction survey results (compiled by Kathy Adams)
 - Outreach to previous participants
 - Suggestion to use Constant Contact for email communications
 - expansion of email distribution list
 - Finance
 - SURF 14
 - Technical Initiatives
 - Peer review process for technical initiative documents
 - Nominations
 - Staggering Board terms
- Other business
- Next meeting (8/13/10)

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	✓

Quorum confirmed.

Meeting (teleconference) called to order, approximately 10:06 am PDT / 1:06 pm EDT.

Voting Items:

1. Approve 7/14/10 meeting minutes
 - a. Paul – motion to approve previous meeting minutes

*SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY*

- b. Dave W. – motion seconded
 - Aye – 8
 - Nay – 0
- 2. Approve the Academic Outreach Initiative’s student paper proposal and commit \$1500 towards the award
 - a. Dan – motion to approve the student paper proposal
 - b. Dick – motion seconded
 - Aye – 8
 - Nay – 0

Business Discussed:

1. **Communications amongst Trustees and members** – Dave E. has gotten two suggestions (as examples to begin the discussion): (1) give each of the initiative chairs some time to participate in each call to get direct feedback from the Trustees, (2) publish time and call-in information and invite any member to call in and participate. Paul asks what the objective is: encourage member participation or transparency? Dan points out that some topics would probably need to be closed (e.g., personnel issues). Dave W. asks us to weigh transparency versus efficiency. As membership grows, we could be faced with a situation where the Board cannot accomplish the necessary work it needs to do. Is there a way to limit participation, so that the time for general input is limited or restricted in some way? Would we need to set some time parameters to the agenda? Brandt suggests that we post notices on the website regarding decisions on the Board and once a month we allow a time during the Board meeting for members to call in and ask questions and voice concerns. Stephanie and Maile think this is a good approach. Board meeting minutes are posted to the website already (yet no members have downloaded them). Dave E. suggests perhaps we send an email to the membership notifying them that the meeting minutes have been posted. Maile points out that the majority of initiative and committee chairs are also Trustees (exceptions: Mike Miller, Karen Holland), and that perhaps they might play a liaison-like role and provide a benefit by increasing their communications with the membership.
2. **New initiatives: process for approval, structuring, and leadership** – The Board should address how to harness enthusiasm and motivation of the membership to pursue new ideas yet balance that with continuing focus on SURF’s mission and ongoing objectives (e.g., not get completely distracted by a “new shiny object”). Using the Sustainable Remediation (SR) Clearinghouse as an example: a member proposed a new idea within a committee, and then suggested to make a presentation at a SURF meeting. However, it was a bit ad hoc from that point regarding if/how the idea becomes a formal initiative. Paul suggests that we create a streamlined proposal process that involves the members giving us a few lines on their idea’s objective and mission, outlining the benefits to membership and industry, proposing the team lead, and listing the initial team members. Dave E. asks if the Board should vet these ideas before the general meetings? Dan mentions that this might not be practical, because new ideas are often generated during meetings. Stephanie doesn’t see these as mutually exclusive. Discussions could occur at meetings, but ultimately the Board would need to be engaged in order to not spread SURF too thin and to accomplish our key objectives and mission. The estimated timeline and level of effort would factor into a decision to adopt the idea as a formal initiative. Dick suggests that the ideas might be presented and incubated within the committees first. Maile concurs. Stephanie brings up that some initiatives will require resources beyond what SURF can provide. At what point do we decide and how would it be accomplished if the initiative needs external funding? Dave W. thinks this is going to be initiative-specific, and we might just have to wait to see what ideas get raised. Dave E. mentions that we don’t currently have a research committee and perhaps we need to establish one. There is general consensus that we try out the

proto “new initiative proposal policy” with the SR Clearinghouse, and iteratively develop an administrative process that doesn’t squelch enthusiasm or overextend SURF’s capacities.

3. **SR Clearinghouse: exploration of viability as SURF initiative** – Dave E. will ask Mike Miller and Steven Murawski to provide further information consistent with our proto “new initiative proposal policy” (i.e., summarize the idea’s objective and mission, outline the benefits to membership and industry, propose the team lead, list the initial team members, estimate a timeline or level of effort).
4. **Information repository and sharing (what should be protected/members-only and what should be un-protected/available to anyone via the website)** – Our value and recognition to the industry is really going to depend on what we develop and share, so Paul suggests that we put the SR Clearinghouse in the public domain. Dave E. asks if we can develop a generic policy. Dick points out that participation in the initiative and committee is a member benefit, up and beyond access to the finished product of any initiative and committee. Dan brings up the topic of free versus paid access; Stephanie continues the idea with immediate versus delayed access. Paul brings up ITRC and ASTM as analogies; ITRC provides free and timely documents, whereas ASTM, while still a revered organization, is less timely and charges for their materials. That may be part of the reason that ITRC products are more widely used in our industry. Dave E. asks what exactly is the objective and benefit of the SR Clearinghouse? If the objective and benefit is education and advocating incorporation of sustainability principles in remediation practices, then having the widest audience for our products should be a goal. Maile agrees, and advocates that the product (e.g., SR Clearinghouse, papers, etc.) be served/hosted by SURF (not third parties). There is general consensus on that we should share as many work products and as much information as possible.
5. **Requests from SURF website: (1) “Top Ten” sustainable remediation projects, (2) data for Golder marketing plan** – (1) Harsco has contacted SURF asking what other companies and entities are undertaking large SR projects, and which of those projects could be considered the “top ten” in order to determine how Harsco’s projects compare. SURF doesn’t have such a list, although there is a case study list in the White Paper. Dave W. is willing to get back to Harsco. A request for information will also be forwarded to the SURF membership to allow individual members to respond. (2) Golder has requested information regarding SURF demographics (e.g., readership volume and profiles, membership’s volumes and profiles, annual circulation or print copies, etc.) to use in their internal marketing plan. It is unclear how this information would be used. There is general consensus that generic statistics/demographics could be compiled and used for SURF outreach efforts, and once available, could be provided in response to requests. However, for this particular request, the trustees would need more information about how the data would be used before providing it. Maile will contact Golder and ask for additional details.
6. **Committee Reports**
 1. **Membership**
 - i. **CSU student chapter materials: compile package and make available to other universities** – Dan will put a student chapter package together and SURF will make this available on the website for other schools to use. Maile has spoken to Steve Koenigsberg, who has a connection at CSU Fullerton and would like to use these materials when available. Dave E. mentions that Dave Nakles at CMU is interested in starting a student chapter as well. Dave W. mentions that University of Pittsburgh is also potentially interested, and will forward contact information to Dan. Dan mentions that universities that operate symbiotically have the option of forming a single, unified chapter. University of South Florida might also be interested (per Bob Armistead), and possibly Chicago-Kent/IIT.
 2. **Meetings**

- i. **Discuss objectives for 2011** – Dave E. asks if we can set specific objectives to accomplish by the end of 2011 (e.g., membership targets, documents published, number of student chapters, financial goals, anticipated expenditures/investments, new committees or initiatives, short-course curriculum). We should have a discussion as an open forum during SURF 15 to allow full member participation. Dan mentions that we (trustees and members) should be clear about what each of these objectives will accomplish. Maile asks if this would be the theme for SURF 15? Dave E. thinks this would be only a partial focus at SURF 15, perhaps devoting a few hours. Stephanie suggests that we provide an opportunity to members to weigh in electronically, in advance of the meeting, so that members who won't be at the meeting also have input. Maile suggests that we use an initial list, distributed in advance, as a starting point for an open forum-style discussion during the meeting (as opposed to a more structured process). Dave E. asks that we continue to touch on this topic during the upcoming Board meetings so that we compile a list to be used as a basis for the discussion.
- ii. **SURF 15 planning update** – A survey has been prepared and distributed so that the meeting planning team can provide adequate meeting space. Based on responses, the meeting location may change slightly, but there are no red flags to moving forward. The meeting planning team will be talking on August 13 to finalize the venue.
- iii. **Suggestion to identify routine meeting locations** – Several meeting locations have been identified as “favored” locations (e.g., Chicago-Kent, DTSC Sacramento). If we have standard meeting locations, and three meetings per year, we might be circulating amongst a small number of venues. Dan asks if the “favored” locations are willing to host SURF on a continuing basis. Stephanie recognizes that Chicago-Kent clearly stands out as an ideal location, but if we don't have meetings that make it incredibly easy for regulators to attend, regulators won't attend. Paul suggests examining the relationship between meeting location and regulator participation, and whether or not the location plays a key role in regulators' decisions to participate (this might not be the only factor, or even key factor). Dan suggests a middle-ground, where we have favored locations that rotate, and we also rotate in new locations. Dave E. reminds us that outreach to student chapters plays a role in meeting locations as well.

3. Communications/Outreach

- i. **Academic Outreach: Battelle student paper award** – Mike Miller joined the call to discuss the student paper award. Papers would be on some aspect of sustainable remediation. Objective would be to introduce SURF to a larger audience, and provide an opportunity for students to get involved in SURF and the industry. Battelle contributes free registration for the student and their advisor. The Academic Outreach initiative is proposing that the accompanying \$1500 cash award (to cover expenses such as airfare, accommodations, etc.) be awarded by SURF. The competition announcement provides suggestions for topics, and the initiative would also be asking for input on the suggestion list. The deadline for the announcement is 8/30/10, and SURF would need to provide materials to Battelle a week or so before that. The \$1500 would be awarded some time in 2011. Brandt confirms that SURF finances are adequate for such an expenditure. The Trustees vote to fund the award. Dan, Brandt, and Maile volunteer to provide feedback on the topic list and will send suggestions to Mike M.

7. Items tabled until next Board meeting:

1. Communications/Outreach
 - i. Academic Outreach Initiative: Discipline Diversity will be incorporated; Board feedback and/or action on Stew Abrams' draft research support policy

SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY

- ii. Satisfaction survey results (compiled by Kathy Adams)
 - iii. Outreach to previous participants
 - iv. Suggestion to use Constant Contact for email communications and expansion of email distribution list
2. Finance
 - i. SURF 14
 3. Technical Initiatives
 - i. Peer review process for technical initiative documents
 4. Nominations
 - i. Staggering Board terms

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (8/13/10):

- Approve previous meeting minutes (7/30/10)
- Additions to agenda
- List of objectives for 2011
 - membership targets, documents published, number of student chapters, financial goals, anticipated expenditures/investments, new committees or initiatives, short-course curriculum
- Committee Reports
 - Membership
 - Student chapter materials
 - Meetings
 - SURF 15 planning update
 - Communications/Outreach
 - Academic Outreach Initiative: Discipline Diversity will be incorporated; Board feedback and/or action on Stew Abrams' draft research support policy
 - Satisfaction survey results (compiled by Kathy Adams)
 - Outreach to previous participants
 - Suggestion to use Constant Contact for email communications and expansion of email distribution list
 - Finance
 - SURF 14
 - Technical Initiatives
 - Peer review process for technical initiative documents
 - Nominations
 - Staggering Board terms
- Other business
- Next meeting

Meeting adjourned, 12:07 pm PDT / 3:07 pm EDT.

Respectfully submitted by,
L. Maile Smith, Secretary