

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

August 27, 2010

Agenda:

- 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 (*see Paul F. 8/25/10 email*)
- Committee Reports
  - Membership
    - Student chapter how-to guidance (*see Dan W. 8/16/10 email*)
  - Meetings
    - Process for approving SURF meeting minutes (*see Kathy A./Dave E. 8/12/10 emails*)
    - SURF 15 planning update (*see Mike R. 8/26/10 email*)
    - A/V and remote connection improvement; plan for soliciting volunteers to work on long-term solution
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Government outreach initiative (*see Carol B. 8/20/10 and Dave E. 8/24/10 emails*)
    - Proposed communications guidelines (*tentative*)
    - Survey summaries for posting to website (*see Maile S. 8/25/10 email*)
  - Finance
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Proposed review process for technical initiative documents (*see Paul F. 8/24/10 email*)
  - Nominations
    - Proposed nomination/election process for 2011 and beyond
- Suggestions for Battelle 2011 sessions titles, co-chairs, and panel discussion (*see Dave E. 8/25/10 email*)
- Reflections from SURF Facilitator, Mike Rominger (*see Mike R. 8/26/10 email*)
- Consoil 2010 and SURF representation
- SURF Brazil and protocols and procedures for forming international affiliates
- 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, using Battelle registration listing to augment SURF distribution list, co-hosting a webinar necessitating sharing of SURF distribution list
- Other business
- Next meeting (9/10/10)

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 10:03 am PDT / 1:03 pm EDT.

Voting Items:

1. Approve 8/13/10 meeting minutes
  - a. Paul – motion to approve previous meeting minutes
  - b. Dick – motion seconded
    - Aye – 9

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

- Nay – 0
- 2. Members of each SURF meeting planning committee will be responsible for reviewing the respective meeting minutes.
  - a. Stephanie – motion to request that each SURF meeting planning committee also review and approve meeting minutes
  - b. Dan – motion seconded
    - Aye – 9
    - Nay – 0

Business Discussed:

1. **SURF Goals and Objectives for 2011** – During our last meeting, Paul asked if the Trustees could outline their top three or so goals or objectives to start off the process. Paul circulated an initial list on 8/25/10, which Maile reorganized and recirculated for review later the same day. Some Board members mention that they didn't get the revised document or that it was corrupted, so the topic was tabled until those Trustees have time to review (Maile sent out another email with the document attached during the meeting).
2. **Committee Reports**
  1. **Membership** – Dan has been working compiling the CSU student chapter materials into a package to make available to other universities. Dan sent the draft materials to Western Michigan, Chicago-Kent, and Stephen Koenigsberg, who has a contact at CSU Fullerton. Western Michigan is not interested at this time, and Dan hasn't received any other responses yet. Dan is looking for suggestions of additional universities to approach. Paul suggests going to the list of previous SURF participants and contacting academic participants. Maile suggests reaching out to the Academic Outreach Initiative and getting their input. Dave W. suggests approaching Dave Nakles at CMU, and when Dan does so, asking about the University of Pittsburgh. Dan suggests waiting to post the materials on the website until he receives explicit approval from CSU for using their constitution as a template.
  2. **Meetings** – Kathy Adams requested that the Board establish a process for approving general SURF meeting notes. Dave E. suggests assigning two Trustees to review meeting minutes. Stephanie suggests that each meeting planning committee also serve as the meeting minutes reviewers. Dave E. asks if the entire committee would need to review the minutes. Stephanie thinks that a subset of the committee would be adequate. The general consensus is that this would be a great way to get more members involved with SURF procedures and organization (and a vote was taken). Dave E. asks about the A/V and remote connectivity plan. Mike has scheduled a SURF 15 meeting planning call for 8/30/10 and will initiate a conversation about this issue, both for the short- and long-term. Dave E. asked if SURF should continue to provide an audio link to the meetings, because many professional societies do not do so. Mike mentions that there is a subset of the membership that can only attend meetings remotely due to travel restrictions. Paul mentions that if we can get this figured out, we can expand how many people can participate in our meetings and discussions. Mike thinks the weak link is hearing people in the room during general discussions. Dave W. adds that we need to be diligent in handing around the microphone during discussions. There is general discussion about the meeting formats and planning, and negative feedback received on the satisfaction survey. Carol mentions that she's heard from people who can't travel to meetings that they no longer even try to call in because the connection has been so poor in the past. Mike mentions that the survey feedback will be taken into consideration during future planning, for example, to better define meeting themes. Paul mentions that perspectives are going to be very different depending on the attendee's familiarity with SURF and other sustainability disciplines. Dick

suggests that we send the “We Are SURF” presentation to new meeting attendees. Carol suggests that the Trustees identify new attendees and try to reach out to them during the meeting. Dave E. suggests that we add a “first meeting” check box on the registration form to help identify those who might need additional background on SURF. The SURF 15 planning team has confirmed the meeting location and dates, and currently looking for themes and ideas. Based on survey feedback, the meeting introduction will be expedited. There will be slots for Board reports and committee breakouts. The hosts have asked if the Steinbrenner Institute partners could attend the meeting, free of charge. Dave W. suggests that attendance of non-students from the host university pay the registration fee; as previously agreed, fees for students of the host university are waived. Dave W. asks if the policy about one-time non-member “trial” attendance at SURF meetings and host university student fee waivers has been memorialized in a document yet, and if not it would be good to do so, so that the meeting planning team can revisit the document and agreed-upon policies each time a meeting rolls around.

3. **Facilitator Reflections** – In order to enable Mike and Kathy to be more effective ambassadors for SURF, they should have a presence on the website. In order that all members, prospective members and interested parties can fully understand the activities of the committees, post a 1-sentence mission statement from each committee and a bulleted list of the three main issues and associated tasks from each committee, in a public area of the site. In order to make SURF presentations more accessible and useful, group and post meeting presentations in categories like social, economic, environmental, implementation, and provide more information for each presentation so that readers can easily determine whether to read on. In order to more effectively expose SURF to a broad audience, provide a public listing of members and their affiliations, perhaps via a rotating list of 10 people each month with a quote from each. Mike suggests that we encourage members to ask associates (both familiar and unfamiliar with remediation) to review the website critically so that we determine what is effective in our messaging and what is not, gain additional perspectives, and identify potential supporters of SURF. Mike also asks, in order to better manage his tasks for SURF, that the Board decide how active/passive the Facilitator should be regarding committee activity, Board tasks, goals and objectives, etc. He also suggests that we maintain an evergreen list of tasks for the Board to address, along with deadlines and accomplishments.

4. **Committee Reports ( Continued)**

1. **Communications/Outreach** – Carol distributed a proposal on 8/20/10 for reaching out to government and regulatory participants. The proposal was forwarded to K&L Gates to get their perspective on the conflict of interest issue. Carol suggests that she re-tool the outreach, taking K&L Gates comments into consideration. Carol is also reaching out as part of the Communications/Outreach Committee task to reach out to past participants who used to be quite active but haven’t attended a SURF meeting in a long time. Stephanie thinks reaching out to individuals will be valuable and will result in receiving some additional feedback that could inform a more formal government outreach initiative. Dave E. and Dave W. both mention that we need to decide if we will make any special considerations for government employee attendance at SURF meetings in exchange for their active contribution at a meeting, such as a presentation, poster, etc. Dave W. asks that whatever we decide, we memorialize it in a meeting attendance policy document so that all previous discussions and agreements are in one place. Dan offers to go through our past meeting minutes and compile a document. Carol will go back through the contact list and claim any unclaimed government employees for outreach. The government Outreach Initiative will continue to prepare an outreach plan in preparation for SURF 15. Maile summarized her and Stephanie’s interpretation of the task to develop communications guidelines. Maile had taken the task, suggested by Paul during the last Board meeting, to mean the development of guidelines or ideals for internal communications, primarily between the Board and the Membership. Maile’s portion of the

draft guidelines focused on Board communications, Membership communications, Meetings, and Publications, more from a visioning or ethical perspective. Stephanie had taken the task to mean the development of a how-to guide for communications, such as the process and procedures for Committees and Initiatives that wish to distribute communications outside of SURF, presentations made on SURF's behalf, or publication of technical documents endorsed by SURF. Paul mentions that he didn't have a concrete idea of what he wanted, but wanted to have "a guiding light" for SURF communications, and his request probably entailed all parts of what Maile and Stephanie prepared. Brandt and Dick were leaning towards the how-to side of things. Dave W. mentions that both Maile's and Stephanie's perspectives are essentially complimentary. Maile and Stephanie suggest that they beef up their draft guidelines, incorporate Jake's comments (who has been on vacation), and circulate for Board review prior to the next meeting, with the aim that draft guidance can be ready for distribution at/prior to SURF 15. Maile circulated recent survey summaries to the Trustees on 8/25/10 with a request that the Board consider the manner in which they could be provided to the membership. Dan, Carol, and Dick think that the survey summaries are fine, but should be accompanied by recommendations, next steps, and/or initial responses. Maile suggests that the Board needs to act more promptly and transparently by returning this information to the membership quickly. Carol and Stephanie suggest that we solicit detailed feedback and encourage more SURF volunteerism when the responses are provided/posted to the website. Maile asks if we can identify a person to whom feedback and volunteer offers are directed, such as Mike. Mike is willing to be the contact for feedback, and also offers to quickly prepare a menu of possible courses of action for each of the survey elements. He'll distribute his menu of options to the Board for review early next week, with a request that the Trustees review and select the course(s) of action by the end of the week. Survey response summaries and the selected course(s) of action would be distributed at that point.

2. **Finance** – SURF has approximately \$47K in the bank. Brandt has received a few new membership dues payments in the last week, as well as an invoice from Mike through July (Kathy's already received). Brandt has finalized a letter of engagement with our accountants, and K&L Gates is finalizing the contract.
3. **Technical Initiatives** – Paul sent out a streamlined 4-step review process for technical initiative documents on 8/24/10. Paul identified some previously unidentified roles in the review process, including a Board Technical Initiative (TI) team leader who maintains the connection and communication between the Technical Initiative and the Board (which is currently Paul), a Focused TI leader, who can be anyone of the membership who keeps the process moving forward within a specific technical initiative, the TI review team and TI review team leader, who is a non-Board member and provides another opportunity for leadership opportunities within SURF, and a TI work product editor to work on a fairly mature version of the internal draft to ensure consistency and technical excellence. Currently missing is how to form these teams. Carol asks if there should be any legal review in the process, or if a legal disclaimer is warranted. There is some general discussion about keeping the process simple and maintaining motivation (e.g., not overly bureaucratic), the need for more description about how the process with work (actions and general schedule), and whether or not the role now called "Board TI leader" has to be a Trustee (or if any roles must be fulfilled by Board members). Paul suggests that we add this to the agenda for discussion at SURF 15, and will work on revising the draft for another round of Board review prior to the meeting.
4. **Nominations** – Dick is working on developing a plan for revising the election process. Ideas include the creation of a past president position or automatically moving the vice president into the president position, such that perhaps there is not a need for two-year terms for all officers. Dick would like to

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

announce a plan for any necessary Bylaw changes during SURF 15, and shortly follow up with an email to all members after the meeting. He proposes to assimilate changes and recommendations and revise the Bylaws in November. Voting would begin in December or January and install new officers at SURF 16. During the last Board meeting, Dan suggested that the at-large Trustees draw straws for a 1-year or 2-year term in 2011 to stagger those positions. The Bylaws currently state that Trustees are limited to two consecutive terms. Another option includes obligating Board members to participate in ex officio roles for a number of months after their terms expire. Another option is that there are no changes. There is general consensus that Dick should prepare a proposal to distribute to the membership shortly before SURF 15, one that incorporates at least a few options for consideration, and then during the meeting the membership can discuss the options presented. Dick will distribute a draft to the Board next week so that the Board can select the options to present during the next Board meeting.

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (9/10/10):

- Approve previous meeting minutes (8/27/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Goals and objectives for 2011
- Committee Reports
  - Membership
    - Update on Student Chapter how-to guidance
  - Meetings
    - SURF 15 planning update
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Update on government outreach initiative
    - Proposed communications guidelines
  - Finance
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
  - Nominations
    - Draft election process for 2011 and beyond
- Topics held over from last meeting:
  - Suggestions for Battelle 2011 sessions titles, co-chairs, and panel discussion (*see Dave E. 8/25/10 email*)
  - Consoil 2010 and SURF representation
  - SURF Brazil and protocols and procedures for forming international affiliates
  - 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, using Battelle registration listing to augment SURF distribution list, co-hosting a webinar necessitating sharing of SURF distribution list
- Other business
- Next meeting (9/24/10)

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

Respectfully submitted by,  
L. Maile Smith, Secretary