

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

September 10, 2010

Agenda:

- Approve previous meeting minutes (8/27/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Sustainable Remediation Site Database proposal (*see Dave E.'s 8/27/10 email*)
- Proposed election process for 2011 and beyond (*see Dick's 9/8/10 email*)
- Meeting registration fees for non-members (*see Maile's 9/1/10 email*)
- Goals and objectives for 2011 (*see Paul's 8/27/10 email*)
- Committee Reports
 - Meetings
 - SURF 15 planning update
 - Membership
 - Update on Student Chapter guidance
 - Communications/Outreach
 - Update on government outreach initiative
 - Proposed communications guidelines
 - Technical Initiatives
 - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
 - Finance
 - Nominations
- Topics held over from last meeting:
 - Suggestions for Battelle 2011 sessions titles, co-chairs, and panel discussion (*see Dave E.'s 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)

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	✓
Steve Murawski (non-voting attendee)	✓	Mike Miller (non-voting attendee)	✓

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

Voting Items:

1. Authorize the Sustainable Remediation Site Database team (Steve and Mike M., and their volunteers) to move forward with Steps A and B of their draft proposal and report back to the Board after having done so to discuss their progress before moving further forward.
 - a. Dave E. – motion to authorize the above task

*SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY*

- b. Dick – motion seconded
 - Aye – 6
 - Nay – 0
2. Approve 8/27/10 meeting minutes
 - a. Carol – motion to approve previous meeting minutes
 - b. Dick – motion seconded
 - Aye – 6
 - Nay – 0
3. The SURF Board of Trustees adopted a policy for waiving SURF meeting registration fees for the following categories: (A) first-time, non-member attendees, (B) invited guests who make a presentation, (C) students of the host organization who provide assistance with onsite meeting organization (students are not required to be SURF members). *Note: this vote was conducted by email prior to the 9/10/10 meeting. Additional details are provided in the notes below.*

Business Discussed:

1. **Sustainable Remediation Site Database proposal** – Steve and Mike M. provided an overview of their draft proposal, which Dave E. circulated to the Trustees for their review on 8/27/10. Steve provided a summary of the proposed initiative, which is to create a formal and informative database of sustainable remediation case studies and improve upon what can currently be found on the EPA Green Remediation website. The studies and solutions would support SURF’s mission, as well as the EPA’s green and sustainable remediation guidance and policies. The proposers are giving themselves one year to develop a prototype. An initial special committee would be formed of SURF members to come up with the actual plan, and the special committee would periodically report back to the Board on their progress. The special committee would solicit volunteers for a larger working group within the SURF organization to look for funding, refine the database criteria, figure out who would collect information (and how), and define the data entry and long-term maintenance process. The volunteers would explore the pros (cheap, lots of labor) and cons (quality, high turnover) of using an academic institution to do the bulk of the “manual labor”. Another idea for exploration contracting a data entry company for initial entry and maintenance. At some point an approved plan would be developed and then the remainder of the year would be spent on developing the prototype. The written plan would go to the Board consideration. Board recommendations would go back to the committee before going forward. Currently, the proposers do not intend the database to be comprehensive, but they do intend it to be representative (e.g., there would be significant consideration given to navigating what projects are sustainable or not). The proposers point out that this is an initial proposal and not overly detailed. Details will be added in stages as the proposal is deemed worthwhile for progression, and if there are things in the plan so far that don’t appeal to the Board, there is opportunity for revisions. Carol mentioned that government employees (e.g., regulators) want to know what has worked and what hasn’t with sustainable remediation projects, and thinks that this effort would do quite a lot to satisfy their needs. Paul asked if there would be any lack of endorsement or suspicion from regulators because this is developed by SURF (which some may see as “industry” focused). Carol thinks that the regulators have already identified a need for a resource such as this, and if we involved regulators/government representatives in the design or selection process, we would maintain transparency, and hopefully increase their level of comfort, if not endorsement. Mike M. would like to build in impartiality into the development process itself; perhaps the more academic involvement we have, the higher degree of impartiality. If we can manage to have regulators on the volunteer committee, that would also provide some degree of impartiality. Paul agreed that the more diversified our volunteer team is, the greater chance that the resource will be accepted. Steve

added that the more objectively we present the data (based on sustainable remediation criteria, yet to be defined), the more it will be accepted. Also, if we don't have buy-in from the government, this project will be very difficult to gather the necessary data. Paul thinks that DoD will be very happy to provide data and information, so not all federal entities will be difficult to gather data from. Dave E. mentions that there are a number of SERDP projects in the works that are gathering remediation site data. He knows one PI from Clarkson University who might be willing to share info that they've collected for ~250 sites. Mike M. mentions that we might want to seek SERDP funding, although he acknowledged that it has a very long lead time. Paul mentions that this is the window for the time that Phase 1 proposals (~5 pages) go in. Dave W. thinks that might be in November. Dave W. adds that although he recognizes that the draft proposal was supposed to be general, he would like to see more details before any significant motion forward, given that it's such a large effort and sweat equity and money are in short supply within SURF at the current time. He speculated that SURF could not do this unless we double or perhaps triple in size. Dave W. mentioned that we might need some partners and some money in order to get this done, including the academic connections, and that there are lots of grants that go unused, which might provide some opportunities for funding. Dave W. asked, above/beyond EPA reviewing, should we approach them for partnership and funding? EPA keeps complaining "there's no data", so let's approach them about a partnership strategy. Steve mentioned that the goal of the special committee would be to explore funding and partnership opportunities and information gathered during that exploratory process would be put into a comprehensive plan for Board consideration in the first 120 days of the initiative. Dave W. suggests having informal discussions with SURF participants affiliated with funding sources to test the waters in the next 30 days. Steve is wary about putting unfinished or rough drafts out for review. Dave W. suggests contacting USACE, AFCEE, the Navy, EPA just to put the idea to them and see what interest they have and if they know of any potential funding opportunities. Mike M. is concerned that SURF doesn't have enough people to populate the special committees. Dave E. is concerned that we're focusing too much on how to go forward as opposed to IF the initiative should go forward. Dave W. says that he's in favor with the caveat of proceeding in a phased way. Maile also thinks that a phased process would be best, and would be in favor of endorsing the proposal in a phased approach as well. Mike M. and Steve envision proceeding in a phased way regardless, and that the Board could revoke their support at any phase. Steve plans to gather the right people to pursue the first phase of work during SURF 15. Dave E. suggests that we give Steve and Mike M. approval to move forward with Steps A and B of their draft proposal and report back after they have done so. Steve thinks that they can make a good start by SURF 15 and report back about a week after SURF 15. Steve and Mike M. would look to the Board to devote stand-alone time in SURF 15 to discussion of this proposal. Dick mentions that the IPCC has a task force on national greenhouse gas inventories that looks to have a good documentation process, and suggests that Steve and Mike M. explore it as a model. The Board voted (see "voting items" above). Steve and Mike M. dropped off after this discussion.

- 2. Proposed election process for 2011 and beyond** – Dick distributed a draft of proposed options for modifying the election process to the Board on 9/8/10. Carol and Stephanie provided written comments. Maile asked for clarification on #7 (changing the officer term limits). Dick and Dave E. explained that #7 is to increase member opportunity for organization governance. Dave W. is concerned that capping officer term limits at 1 term might be too limiting. Mike R. cautions that we need to have a well-crafted proposal to present at SURF 15 to focus the discussion. Dave W. is concerned with continuity in a transitional sense. Expanding terms to 2-years is not necessary; a couple of months of transitional continuity would likely be adequate. (Paul dropped off at this point.) Maile mentions that she favors the approaches that accomplish two objectives: continuity during a transitional period and maintaining opportunities for members to be involved in governance of the organization. Dave W. thinks that the voting process should already accomplish what some of these proposed items intend to insure (e.g., that the president knows enough about SURF to lead the group). Mike R. asks if we can put forth

different proposals or scenarios, or a list of questions to solicit support to different concepts (e.g., “How concerned are you about term limits? Or Continuity?”) and refine an official proposal for voting upon after the meeting. Carol and Maile agree that sending out a solicitation for input prior to SURF 15 is a good idea. Dick would like to consolidate and review the input at SURF 15, and avoid “shotgun spray” responses. There is general consensus that a survey with the proposed options built into questions would be a good tool. Dave E. suggests that the past president role be ex officio. Mike R. clarifies that SURF 15 would be used to firm up the proposal(s). A vote for changing the Bylaws, if necessary, would follow SURF 15. Dick agrees to revise the format of the draft proposal and will work with Maile and Mike R. to put it into a survey format for membership input prior to SURF 15.

3. **Suggestions for Battelle 2011 sessions titles, co-chairs, and panel discussion** – Carol and Stephanie are working with Russ Sirabian to firm up session titles, chairs, and a potential panel discussion for the next Battelle meeting. They have a call scheduled for next Tuesday to wrap up the ideas, and will then send to the Board for review, with the objective of resolving the questions via email prior to the next Board meeting.
4. **Meeting registration fee** – The Board, via an email vote, decided to adopt a first-time, non-member registration fee waiver. There is general consensus that this is a good outreach incentive. (Email votes are summarized as follows: 5 votes in favor of waiving the SURF meeting registration fee for first-time, non-member attendees, 3 votes in favor of charging a 1/3 premium on top of the member registration fee for first-time, non-member attendees (and one Trustee did not vote); 8 votes in favor of not requiring students of the host organization to be SURF members in order to receive a fee waiver for SURF meeting attendance at meetings hosted by their university if they assist with meeting organization.
5. **SURF Goals and Objectives for 2011** – Paul circulated a ranked summary of the proposed 2011 Goals and Objectives to the Board via email on 9/10/10. Dave E. suggests that we postpone discussion until Paul is with us, and aim to distribute the proposed list to the membership prior to SURF 15.
6. **Committee Reports**
 1. **Meetings** – Mike has been holding weekly planning calls. “Building Bridges” is currently leading the theme options. Presentations are being reviewed and suggested, focusing on decision-making and building bridges with stakeholders. We have our main conference room and five breakout rooms reserved. The hotel deal is valid until 9/14/10 (it can likely be extended if need be). Mike had proposed to take some initiative to gather missions and tasks from the individual committees prior to SURF 15. Mike asked for Board endorsement to do this. He would like to improve the production and effectiveness of the breakout sessions. The general consensus is that Mike should move forward with this effort.
 2. **Membership** – No report.
 3. **Communications/Outreach** – Battelle discussion above. Other discussions skipped.
 4. **Finance** – No report.
 5. **Technical Initiatives** – No report.
 6. **Nominations** – See previous discussion about the election process proposal.
7. **SURF Brazil** – SURF has an opportunity to participate and provide input to the formation of SURF Brazil. Dave W. is currently providing a liaison role for this, but mentions that there are several questions that the Board should discuss in general about international affiliates: What role if any should SURF play in the formation of international affiliates? Should there be actual involvement or simply awareness? Should we try to establish any advisory role? Dave W. can put a notice out on the website, with a request to contact Dave Woodward with any questions or input on SURF Brazil. Mike R. suggests that the Board draft a general policy statement, circulate it for review, and adopt it during the next meeting (and share this and other policy and practice documents with the SURF membership). An example policy could be, “The Board of Trustees will, at its

*SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY*

discretion, appoint a SURF member to serve as a liaison with international sustainable remediation organizations for the purpose of exchanging ideas and fostering cooperation and communication.”

- 8. Other Business** – Dave W. suggests that we explore having an outreach table at the UMASS Green and Sustainable Remediation conference. Dick volunteers to look into the idea.

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (9/24/10):

- Approve previous meeting minutes (9/10/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Proposed election process for 2011 and beyond
- Goals and objectives for 2011
- International SURF affiliate policy statement
- Committee Reports
 - Meetings
 - SURF 15 planning update
 - Membership
 - Update on Student Chapter guidance
 - Communications/Outreach
 - Update on government outreach initiative
 - Proposed communications guidelines
 - Technical Initiatives
 - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
 - Finance
 - Nominations
- Other topics held over from last meeting:
 - Consoil 2010 and SURF representation
 - 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 (10/8/10; perhaps meet during SURF 15 instead?)

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

Respectfully submitted by,
L. Maile Smith, Secretary