SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY

August 13, 2010

Agenda:

- Approve previous meeting minutes (7/30/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Improving communication with the membership
- Setting goals and objectives for 2011
    - Draft 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
        - Process for approving SURF meeting minutes
        - 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
        - New nomination process and balloting for 2011
        - Staggering Board terms
- Other business
- Next meeting (8/27/10)

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 10:04 am PDT / 1:04 pm EDT.

Voting Items:

1. Approve 7/30/10 meeting minutes
    a. Dan – motion to approve previous meeting minutes
    b. Dick – motion seconded
        - Aye – 6 (Stephanie and Carol not on the call for this vote.)
        - Nay – 0

2. For the purposes of reviewing and paying bills and invoices for SURF, two trustees—the Treasurer and one other—will review the invoices prior to payment and to the extent possible, the second reviewer would be a person who has knowledge of the actual activity or expenditure.
    a. Brandt – motion to approve the above policy for invoice review and approval
    b. Dan – motion seconded
        • Aye – 6 (Stephanie and Carol not on the call for this vote.)
        • Nay – 0

Business Discussed:

1. **Committee Reports**
    1. **Membership** – Dan has been working compiling the CSU student chapter materials into a package to make available to other universities. He's not quite done, but hopes to have it available prior to the next Board meeting. Maile reports that we now have 117 members, including nine student members, and that the Communications/Outreach Committee is following up with previous SURF participants to try to spur them to formally join. Chicago-Kent College of Law and Armour School of Engineering (both at Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago), University of South Florida, CMU, and CSU Fullerton are potential universities to reach out to. Dan will follow up with contacts for each of them. Dick suggests also reaching out to the University of Central Florida, and will try to locate a contact.
    2. **Meetings** – SURF 15 planning update: the Meeting Committee has a call scheduled for today. The committee needed to determine the number of participants before finalizing the location at CMU, which they have now estimated via a membership survey (~42 "probables"). The Meeting Committee will be taking the feedback from SURF 14 to use for planning for SURF 15. It will likely be a few weeks before the agenda is distributed. Paul suggests that the meeting team provide a communication to the membership with key information as soon as possible so that attendees have adequate time to make arrangements for their attendance and make travel arrangements. The final agenda should follow afterwards.
    3. **Communications/Outreach** – The Communications/Outreach Committee is following up with previous SURF participants to try to spur them to formally join the organization. Committee members have identified people that they will personally call or email, update them on what SURF is working on, and attempt to re-engage them in the organization. During the SURF 14 breakout session there was a suggestion from Scott Denson to use Constant Contact for email communications and expansion of email distribution list. Constant Contact is a marketing tool that provides information on who has read the email and what links they click, etc. Scott has volunteered to lead this effort. Curt Stanley offered a suggestion that SURF might want to hold a joint webinar with another organization (e.g., RTM) that has a large email distribution list, as an outreaching and marketing effort to expand SURF. The Committee would like to get feedback from the Board prior to moving forward with these ideas, since privacy and perceived partnership issues might arise. The satisfaction survey prepared for SURF 14 generated a lot of useful feedback and it seems like a worthwhile endeavor to conduct this survey at each general meeting going forward.
    4. **Finance** – SURF currently has $52,785.92 in the bank. From that amount, we have known expenses of $500.20 (Tom Sale contributed $1,000 to the facility cost for SURF 14, and SURF is paying the remainder), $500 to the CSU Student Chapter, and a $4,704 invoice from Kathy Adams, Writing Unlimited. Brandt is expecting another $190 in receivables from SURF 14 registrations, and expects another invoice from Writing Unlimited and an invoice from Mike Rominger. There is some discussion

about the invoice review and approval process and whether or not multiple Trustees should review and approve all expenditures. There is general consensus that it would be prudent to have a second set of eyes on each expenditure, regardless of dollar amount, and a vote is taken to formalize the decision. Brandt has received a "Terms of Engagement" letter from our selected accountants that basically describes their services to SURF. Brandt would like the Board and/or K&L Gates to review the letter. Mike received a gift card from the restaurant where we had our SURF 14 dinner. The Trustees agree that the gift card should be forwarded to Tom Sale.

5. **Technical Initiatives –** Framework, Metrics, and LCA initiative chairs had a meeting earlier this week to discuss where everyone is progress-wise. Agreed that the release of the initiatives will be staggered, instead of coordinating as a single release. The initiatives are working to make sure that their efforts are complimentary, however. The initiative chairs also discussed how to release the information. All like the idea of the Remediation Journal. Peer review process for technical initiative documents: Paul asked for feedback from the Board about how this process should work. Should draft documents go to the full membership? Potentially adjudicating 115 sets of comments could prove extremely onerous. Should draft documents go to the Board? Ensures that the documents appropriately and accurately represent the organization. Should draft documents go to the Communications/Outreach Committee? The committee could improve the packaging and standardize the messaging. Should we form a sub-group that would serve the Technical Initiatives Committee in reviewing these types of documents? Should it be a combination of the above, e.g. Trustees + Communications/Outreach + Technical Initiatives Review Group? Paul suggests that we use the LCA document as a beta test because it will be ready for review soon. He will produce a straw man proposal for how the review process would work, as well as a draft communication for asking for Technical Initiative Review Group volunteers, for Trustee review and approval at the next the Board meeting. The idea would be to get initial feedback and volunteers within a week, and then roll out this process prior to SURF 15. Brandt asked if Kathy would play a role as a technical editor? There is general agreement that Kathy would be extremely useful in this role, however, it would be an extra-scope-of-work to her current contract and she would need to submit a budget proposal for Board review and approval before undertaking this work. (Stephanie joined at this point, 10:57 PDT.)

6. **Nominations –** Dick reiterated that there are several issues with the current set up of Board terms, as the Trustees have previously recognized and discussed. When terms all run concurrently for the same length of time, we risk a discontinuity of leadership. If we stagger Board terms, which would necessitate expanding the term as well, there is some ongoing continuity of leadership each year. Brandt mentions, and Dan concurs, that regardless if the Board proposes to stagger the terms in the future, all current terms should expire in January 2011. The next set of all nine Trustees would be nominated/elected at that time, potentially some for one-year and some for two-year terms. Dan offered that during the first US Congress, all senators were nominated/elected at once, and then they drew straws amongst the elected to determine which of them would serve two, four, or six years for the first six years of the congress. SURF could adopt a model like that for the 2011 elections, if the membership approves changing the Bylaws for staggering terms. (Carol joined at this point, 11:08 PDT.) Mike suggests that whatever we propose for SURF's nomination process, that is simple and easy to implement, and perhaps consider a School Board model in which Trustees are elected to the Board but assign particular Board positions (e.g., president, treasurer, etc.) amongst themselves. Maile and Brandt suggest that the membership may not want to relinquish their role in selecting the organization's leadership (e.g., president). Dick will take these comments into consideration and draft a potential nomination process for review and discussion during the next Board meeting.

2. **Improving Communications with the Membership –** Maile reviewed the process by which Kathy compiled the satisfaction survey results. Mike has reviewed the results and discussed them at length with Dave, and somewhat with Paul. Mike thinks a few things standout. Specific to SURF 14, he interprets that the Academic Initiative report-out wasn't delivered well (missing their scribe, their breakout session was derailed from their mission and purpose, didn't fully engage participants), and then they got landed on fairly heavily by Maile. As a follow-up to the survey feedback on this issue, Mike will work with the committees to set their mission statements that will better keep a focus their activities. Some members reported that it was unclear who was leading the meeting. As a follow-up to this issue, Mike will take a stronger role in facilitating the meeting, and essentially keep the Board out of the meeting leadership. Some members reported that we need to set a clear theme and keep to it, and several stated that the preparations that we make regarding lodging, transportation, and remote connections don't work for everyone and need improvement. Paul had some suggestions for further discussion: (a) Should we have a breakout group that works to more effectively engage with people on the phone? Should we always have a live delivery platform (e.g. Live Meeting, Go To Meeting, WebEx)? Each meeting facility is different, and that in itself poses a challenge. Mike suggests that we ask for volunteers to deal with A/V issues at SURF 15. Maile suggests that the group Paul is proposing works towards a more general solution, not just specific to SURF 15. Paul offers that we take a two-pronged approach, and initiate the group for SURF 15 to work with the specifics of this already-established meeting facility, but that they stay on to work on a long-term solution to meeting A/V and remote participation. Mike will bring up this topic during today's SURF 15 meeting planning call and get some initial feedback. (b) Do we need some guidelines for Board communications during general meetings? Paul suggests that we set some overarching objectives that should govern Trustee communications, such as every idea and initiative will be treated with respect, no idea is a bad idea, etc. Dan suggests that if we develop a list of communication objectives that we communicate it to the membership. Dick reminds us that we need to "close the loop" when a member brings an idea to the membership's or Board's review and approval. There is some discussion about if and how the Board should follow up on each and every idea or suggestion that is presented by a member. Maile agrees with Dick that every idea or suggestion needs some type of follow-up, although the response or action will likely be very idea- or suggestion-specific. She reminds the Board that there are issues that are already on our plate that we still have not responded to. Paul asks if the Communications/Outreach Committee could take the lead in drafting some communications guidelines for the Board, with the hope that the Trustees could review and discuss them between now and SURF 15, and they could be presented to the general membership at SURF 15. There is general consensus that this can be done. Maile reminds the Trustees that she sent an email asking if the Board should be sharing survey responses directly with the membership (e.g., posting the summarized/compiled responses to the SURF website in the member resources section). Dick responded to the email that he thought it would be a good idea, although he heard from Dave E. that he wonders if raw results could be taken out of context. Dan suggests that if we provide direct results to the membership, that we might put a disclaimer or explanation with it regarding how the Board or Committee is following up. Paul mentions that names/positions should be expunged. Maile asks if we can provide a synopsis that summarizes the responses without providing each and every raw response? Paul suggests that the Communications/Outreach Committee include this in their recommendations for the Board re: communication guidelines.

3. **Setting Goals and Objectives for 2011** – Paul recommends that each Trustee provide three goals or objectives, return them to Paul, who will consolidate and provide back to the Trustees for consideration prior to the next meeting, during which we'll more fully discuss the topic. He'll send out an email with this request this afternoon.

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (8/27/10):
- Approve previous meeting minutes (8/13/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Setting goals and objectives for 2011
  - Additions and modifications to the draft list of objectives for 2011 (e.g., membership targets, documents published, number of student chapters, financial goals, anticipated expenditures/investments, new committees or initiatives, short-course curriculum)
- A/V and remote meeting improvement
- Committee Reports
  - Membership
    - Student chapter materials
  - Meetings
    - Process for approving SURF meeting minutes
    - SURF 15 planning update
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Proposed Board communications guidelines
    - Closing the loop: (a) Board feedback and/or action on Stew Abrams' draft research support policy, (b) Scott Denson's suggestion to use Constant Contact for email communications, and outreach via co-hosted webinar, necessitating sharing of SURF distribution list
  - Finance
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Proposed review process for technical initiative documents
  - Nominations
    - Proposed nomination/election process for 2011 and beyond
- Other business
- Next meeting (9/10/10)

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

Respectfully submitted by,
L. Maile Smith, Secretary