

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

October 8, 2010

Agenda:

1. Additions to agenda
2. SURF 15 recap
3. Proposed election process for 2011 – update, survey results
4. Goals and objectives for 2011 – update
5. Committee Reports
  - Meetings
    - 2011 SURF meetings
  - Membership
    - Update on Student Chapter guidance
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Proposed communications guidelines
    - SURF 14 survey summary
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
  - Finance
  - Nominations
6. Other potential topics:
  - Battelle 2011 sessions – requests to email SURF membership: coordinated announcement?
  - Outreach at upcoming conferences: LCA X, UMass Green Remediation
  - SURF policy statement regarding 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
7. Other business
8. Next meeting (10/22/10)

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 10:08 am PDT / 1:08 pm EDT.

Voting Items:

1. Membership dues and classifications will remain in effect for the full annual membership term even if a member changes their affiliation in the middle of the term.
  - a. Dan – motion to establish the membership policy stated above
  - b. Brandt – motion seconded
    - Aye – 8
    - Nay – 0

Business Discussed:

1. **SURF 15 summary** – Mike quickly reviewed the SURF 15 satisfaction survey results before handing the surveys off to Kathy for compiling. Mike shared a few highlights of the feedback with the Board. Positives: venue was good, hosts were great, CMU speakers were entertaining, a positive relationship seems to be developing with the Steinbrenner Institute, committee and initiative break-outs were focused, and the meeting had good energy and openness. Suggestions for improvement = SURF meetings need a value statement (e.g., “what’s in it for me?”), the agenda was developed/distributed late, need more relevant presentations. Dave W. added that it seems likely that CMU will form a student chapter. There were a few glitches with the call-in opportunities for the committee breakouts (a few committees forgot to initiate their teleconferences), and one problem with the main call-in line, but otherwise the A/V situation was good. Dave W. suggested that during future meetings Mike should remind committee/initiative leads to initiate their calls when he sends them off to their break-out sessions. Maile noted that when she called in to the general sessions that she could hear the presenters and the audience very well. The meeting planning team will take all survey responses into consideration after the Communications/Outreach Committee and the Board of Trustees have had time to review and parse the information.
2. **Proposed election process** – Dick provided an overview of the comments received at SURF 15. He did not think that there appeared to be much interest in requiring the Trustees to serve in ex officio roles for three months following the expiration of their terms. One person suggested that we extend the Treasurer’s term in office to two years. Carol mentioned that people wanted more of an opportunity to provide comments, or to select more than one option. Dick is going to review the survey results and see what was most preferred. Dave W. thought that the ex officio Trustee roles for three months following the expiration of their terms actually did get a positive response, and Brandt doesn’t think that adding an option for a two-year Treasurer term is necessary or warranted based on one comment. The other options seemed to have multiple supporters. Maile will send the link for accessing the survey results to all Trustees. After reviewing the compiled responses, Dick will prepare an email by the end of next week that will request that members cast their official vote by email. The voting period will be open for approximately 30 days, closing in mid-November. Dick will compile the official results, and report the results and changes to our Bylaws, if any, prior to SURF 16.
3. **SURF Goals and Objectives for 2011** – Dave E. noted that he was expecting more input during SURF 15, but there seemed to be little discussion. His interpretation was that the goals and objectives identified by the Board probably covered most of the issues that people were already thinking about. Carol heard that the proposed goals and objectives were spot-on. When SURF next solicits feedback, Carol wondered if the comments section could emphasize volunteering, asking people to identify which of the organization’s goals and objectives they are willing to actively work on. Mike offers to organize the goals and objectives in such a way to identify the order of activities and/or road blocks. Mike will distribute his proposed reorganization to the Board next week and the Trustees can discuss next steps during the Board meeting.
4. **Committee Reports**
  1. **Meetings/Finance** – The dates and locations for the 2011 SURF meetings seem to now be in place. SURF 16: February 3-4, 2011 at the University of South Florida in Tampa (SURF liaisons: Bob Armstead and Ben Foster); SURF 17: May 17-18, 2011 at Chicago-Kent College of Law in Chicago, IL (SURF liaison: Steve Murawski); SURF 18: September 21-22, 2011 at Boeing’s facility in Seattle, WA (SURF liaison: Nick Garson). Brandt reports on the finances of our recent SURF meetings. For SURF 14, SURF received about \$4,800 in registration fees. Since SURF 14, contractor invoices have totaled about \$12,000 (for July and August efforts; there is a September invoice outstanding). Therefore, it appears that we are collecting about 50% of our meeting costs in registration revenue. Even if we back out costs for

supporting Board meetings from the contractor invoices, we'd still be operating meetings in the red. Brandt anticipates that SURF 15 revenue and expenses will be similar. SURF has reserves from membership dues and sponsorships to pay for our contractors and subsidize our meeting expenses. We may need to make changes if the plan is to break even with our meeting expenses and revenues. Dave E. wonders if SURF should revisit the economic model prepared by Paul F. Brandt offers to do that and see if there are any assumptions that we initially made that haven't held true, and if there are any new data that could be used to refine the model and better understand our financial planning for 2011. Dave W. commented that he's not sure that raising the meeting fees would be positive for our outreach efforts. Dave E. comments that the evaluation of the economic model should provide additional details for continuing this conversation and identifying potential changes, if any.

2. **Membership** – No update on the student chapter guidance. SURF now has 125 members. We have a new student member from Syracuse University. Dave E. summarized a conversation he had at SURF 15: Some professional societies organize annual job fairs for their student members. It doesn't appear that there is a large jobs fair for the remediation industry. Perhaps SURF could provide such a service, for example, taking place at or in conjunction with Battelle or some other large conference. Dan thinks this is a good idea and would be a real benefit to our student chapters. It would also be a benefit to our SURF members who are hiring. Dave E. will reach out to Russ Sirabian with Battelle to get his thoughts on the idea. Dan will explore how other organizations (e.g., ACS) do this. Dave E. thinks that implementation of this initiative might be too ambitious for 2011, but could be a stretch goal for 2012. Maile reminds the Board of the situation recently when a member changed their status mid-term. The Board needs to decide if anything more formal than changing the member's contact information needs to occur. In this example, the member changed from government membership to regular membership. There would be a small additional charge if the Board decides to pro-rate dues based on the new membership category. There is some discussion regarding whether or not to change membership categories and calculate pro-rated dues charges/refunds if/when this situation occurs. There is general consensus that membership dues and classifications should remain unchanged for the full annual membership term even if a member changes their affiliation in the middle of the term. The Board voted to establish this as an official policy. Maile will follow-up with the member who changed status.
3. **Communications/Outreach** – Stephanie distributed a draft Communications policy to the Board on 9/22/10 for their review and discussion during the 9/24/10 Board meeting. The draft policy contained some comments that the Committee had received that warranted some Board discussion and resolution. Most Board members haven't had a chance to review the draft policy yet. The Committee will distribute the draft policy document again, and the Board can comment by email. Maile adds that the objective of the document is to provide some guidance for SURF Trustees and Committee/Initiative leads for their internal and external communications, and that it will also tie into the review process for technical initiative documents. Additional discussion and a vote on adoption will be scheduled for the next Board meeting. Maile mentioned that the Committee is going to meet in early November to discuss potential outreach and communications ideas for SURF 16. Bob Armstead and committee and initiative leads will attend the call. Mike asks that he be included as well. Maile will send out an appointment soon. Maile mentioned that she had received and reviewed Mike's summary responses to the SURF 14 satisfaction survey results, which he had forwarded to the Board for consideration. Now that we have drafted responses, most of which relate to the meetings and programs committee using the suggestions to improve future meetings, and given that there are no other concerns with providing the summarized results, Maile is going to post the information to the SURF website in the members-only area.

4. **Technical Initiatives** – No report. The draft review process for technical initiative documents was presented at SURF 15. Will add the topic to the agenda for the next Board meeting, when Paul will be in attendance.
5. **Finance** – See Meetings/Finance discussion above.
6. **Nominations** – See Proposed Election Process discussion above.
5. **Battelle 2011 sessions and call for abstracts** – Carol understands that all proposed hosts have accepted. She will connect with Russell and Stephanie for the final list and then distribute it to the Board. Carol mentioned that they haven't gotten back to those who volunteered but were not selected, but that the intention was to provide a range of expertise and backgrounds and give new/different people a chance at chairing or moderating a session. Dave W. mentions that Battelle typically goes to sponsors first to ask for volunteers; Dave E. mentions that Battelle has received negative feedback on that practice because it tends to result in fewer academic chairs and moderators, and Battelle has been making changes to improve that situation. Maile shared that she has been asked by a session chair to send an email to the SURF membership soliciting abstracts, and that perhaps it might be more efficient and effective to send one general email on behalf of all of the green/sustainable remediation sessions once we've received the final list. There is general consensus that that should be the plan.
6. **Outreach at upcoming conferences** – Angela Fisher has offered to take some outreach flyers with her to LCA X. Dave E. heard that Mike Miller will be at the UMass conference, perhaps he can do some informal outreach. Maile will follow up with these two members to ensure that they have SURF outreach flyers.
7. **SURF Policy Statement on international affiliates** – Most think that SURF can't and shouldn't attempt to control the actions or organizations of international affiliates, but that there should be a SURF liaison to provide guidance and leadership if necessary. Mike had previously suggested that the Board draft a general policy statement, such as "The Board of Trustees will, at its 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." The Board had some further discussion during the 9/24/10 Board meeting, and there was also a brief discussion at SURF 15. Dave W. suggests we discuss the topic further. Stephanie thinks that SURF should try to maintain a presence at international conferences and in the international remediation arena in general, and look to the future for other opportunities where SURF can have a presence. Maile will add a standing item to future Board meeting agendas as a reminder for Trustees to discuss any new developments, policies, or conferences that are on their radar.
8. **Other Business** – The Board should provide feedback on Stew Abrams' draft research support policy, but Maile heard from Mike Miller recently that Stew is working on a revised draft. The Board will wait for Stew to present his proposal. Maile summarized an idea raised during the Communications/Outreach Committee's break-out session at SURF 14 to augment the SURF distribution list by combining the Battelle registration listing. Scott Denson also suggested using Constant Contact (an email marketing service) to send out email communications to our augmented distribution list. Maile noted that there are both negatives and positives to expanding SURF's email list in this way, and asked how the Trustees individually feel when they receive unsolicited marketing emails. Most responded that they don't read the emails and direct them to their trash or spam folders. Carol noted that she frequently gets positive (and quick) responses when she makes personal connections by phone and email. Carol and Dave W. suggest reaching out this way, even if the method is slower and more time-consuming. Dave W. suggests that when we contact people who might be affected by travel restrictions that we highlight that we're doing a much better job at remote meeting connections. Carol mentioned that even organizations that already have one member should be approached because having more than one member allows the organization to participate in and influence the many technical and outreach initiatives underway. Mike suggests that we ask the potential members what mechanisms they would like to have to keep them engaged if they have travel restrictions (webinars, newsletters, etc.). Maile and Stephanie will take the feedback into consideration during their future outreach discussions with the Communications/Outreach Committee members.

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

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (10/22/10):

- Approve previous meeting minutes (9/24/10 and 10/8/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Election process – membership vote update
- Goals and objectives for 2011
- Committee Reports
  - Meetings
    - SURF 16, 17, and 18 planning update
  - Membership
    - Student Chapter guidance and update
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Proposed communications policy
    - SURF 15 survey results
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
  - Finance
    - Economic model review, based on 2010 data
  - Nominations
    - Schedule/plan for 2011 elections
- Other business
  - US: new developments, policies, or conferences
  - International: new developments, policies, or conferences
- Next meeting

Meeting adjourned, 11:50 pm PDT / 2:50 pm EDT.

Respectfully submitted by,  
L. Maile Smith, Secretary