

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

October 22, 2010

Agenda:

- Approve previous meeting minutes
- Additions to agenda
- Framework Initiative – next steps
- Government Outreach Initiative – draft letter and presentation
- Election process – schedule and steps for potential change to Bylaws, nominations, and elections
- Goals and objectives for 2011
- Proposed Communications Policy
- Committee Reports
  - Meetings
    - SURF 16, 17, and 18 planning update
  - Membership
    - Student Chapter guidance and update
    - New student chapters: Syracuse University, CSU Chico
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Potential opportunities for collaboration with Air and Waste Management Association (AWMA)
    - Exhibit space at Battelle bioremediation conference
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
  - Finance
    - Economic model review, based on 2010 data
  - Nominations
    - Election process (covered above)
- Other business
  - US: new developments, policies, or conferences
  - International: new developments, policies, or conferences
- Next meeting

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	✓
Karin Holland (non-voting attendee)	✓	Todd Martin (non-voting attendee)	✓

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

Voting Items:

1. Approve the meeting minutes from 10/8/10
  - a. Dan – motion to approve the previous meeting minutes
  - b. Dave W. – motion seconded
    - Aye – 7 (Dick not on the call for this vote)
    - Nay – 0

Business Discussed:

- 1. Framework Document** – Karin updated the Trustees on the status of the Framework document. Anticipates having a draft document for review around Thanksgiving (same approximate timeframe for the LCA document; Metrics will have their draft document available for review around Christmas). The Initiative members are going through a second round of internal review on the draft document right now. After internal reviewer comments are received, the Initiative will hold a conference call to discuss if the document is ready to go out for the next phase of review, and if so, will send it out. Karin asks for Trustee feedback on who should perform the broader review (e.g., how would reviewers be selected). She would also like some feedback regarding how and where the document might be published, keeping in mind that there will be the two other documents. Paul updates everyone on the discussion at SURF 15 regarding the technical initiative review process. Paul would like to send out an email asking for volunteers to be on the Technical Reviewer subcommittee. Stephanie agrees with the idea to send out an email to the membership for technical reviewers, but suggests that given the short timeframe and multiple documents, the solicitation for volunteers may need to go out multiple times to get enough manpower. Carol concurs. Karin has a concern that the timeframe for review will be short, perhaps two weeks, and already has some particular recommendations for reviewers. Paul adds that he thinks recruiting specific, targeted reviewers (such as those with desirable areas of expertise) to augment the volunteer technical review team would be fine. Paul will forward his proposed solicitation for volunteers to Maile to distribute to the SURF membership. Stephanie mentions that the target publication plays a large role in the schedule, and asks if the publication options are driving the two-week reviewer turn-around time or something else. Karin mentions that on a previous call with Paul and Brandt, they've discussed the option of publishing separately or as a group, and also discussed that John Simon has been very helpful facilitating publishing work in Remediation. Dave Dzomback also suggested the option of publishing abbreviated versions in some journals, and then the complete version(s) in Remediation. Dick asked what other journals besides Remediation are Dave D. and Karin considering for submission, and what chances these documents have of getting published. Karin does not know yet, but anticipates that the abbreviated versions might be more challenging, e.g., lower chance for acceptance and/or longer lead-time for publishing. Paul adds that research-focused articles in many journals are timely and recent, and thinks SURF's technical documents would be handled in a similar way. Karin says that she'll look more closely into the publishing options and prospective journals. Stephanie suggests reviewing guidelines and restrictions of each prospective journal to see if there are limitations or deal-breakers. Paul recommends talking to John Simon about options and variables for publishing in Remediation. Karin will set up a call to have a discussion with John. Paul will follow up with Dave D. Dick brings up the issue of timing with the upcoming publications from ITRC and ASTM, and wants to be sure that SURF is aware of the parallel publishing schedules. Karin describes the various authorship options for the technical papers (e.g., the SURF White Paper model, which lists authors by section and highlights key editors in the main citation; the ITRC model, which recognizes the entire committee alphabetically; or some other format that would recognize the various, distinct levels of effort). Karin is looking for feedback on how to best recognize those who have contributed the most substantially to the document. Dave W. prefers that authorship is assessed and assigned on a case-by-case basis. Maile agrees, although prefers an option that recognizes individuals as opposed to a blanket "SURF" authorship, and also asks if this has to be established now. Paul doesn't think so, and agrees that the finished product can inform the authorship. Karin generally agrees, but wants the group to begin thinking about the issue now so that it doesn't surprise anyone at the end. She adds that she is sensitive about acknowledging those who have substantively contributed to the work product. Paul and Karin mention that they are envisioning a training opportunity that partners with these documents, and they are communicating with Mohit about opportunities at upcoming Battelle conferences. Karin adds that this effort could be coordinated through

the Communications/Outreach Committee. Paul brings up the idea of a webinar, which could be brief and extended to those beyond SURF. Paul and the Trustees thank Karin for her extensive work on the document, as well as her other sustainable remediation volunteer efforts.

2. **Government Outreach Initiative** – Carol distributed the draft presentation and letter to the Trustees. There are minor edits still to be made on the presentation, primarily involved with updating the case studies. Carol requests comments, questions, or concerns on the draft presentation and letter by next week. The Initiative’s approach is that they are trying to get in front of large audiences, and have identified presentation opportunities with ITRC, ASTSWMO, and National Brownfields Association, and approximately 10 state regulatory agencies. Carol asks if the Board needs to make a decision about who actually makes the presentation. Carol and Todd would train those individuals and keep the Board informed as the schedule progresses. Dave W. mentions that he can revise his case study (which is included in the presentation) by next week. Dave W. thinks that the emphasis should be on HOW the presentation should be given, not WHO. There should be a common message and theme. Carol mentions that the group would follow the Mike R. model for meeting facilitation by asking presenters to focus on key points, not be adversarial, etc. Carol suggests having a call to discuss and train potential presenters. Maile asks if this one call would be the extent of the training or if the group has anything else planned. Carol thinks that between now and SURF 16 the call would be one opportunity, and then an in-person training exercise at SURF 16 would be a second. Stephanie asks about the strategy for presentations. Carol explains that the Initiative is going after large meetings and audiences, for example, ITRC’s semi-annual meeting, perhaps to their remediation and risk management team, and the annual ASTSWMO meeting (the presentation there to be delivered by Paul Hadley). They would start with these meetings and the state regulatory agencies where SURF members have good established relationships. Stephanie asks if we could identify and train speakers as needed, as an ongoing effort. Carol concurs that training would be ongoing. The next steps involve contacting the Initiative members, identifying potential presenters, coordinating a meeting time with Mike’s assistance, and scheduling a call to train potential presenters on the approach and discuss the next steps. Maile, Stephanie, and Jake would be invited to participate as chairs of the Communications/Outreach committee, should they wish to do so.
3. **SURF Election Process** – Dick hopes to get the proposed Bylaw changes out to the Trustees by Monday morning. Comments would be solicited from the Trustees, the proposed changes forwarded to K&L Gates for review, and then to the membership for voting, generally per Mike’s proposed outline and schedule.
4. **SURF Goals and Objectives for 2011** – There is some general discussion about the next steps and action items for the 2011 goals and objectives, as well as Mike’s proposed road map. Maile asks if the road map considered the Trustee’s rankings, as previously compiled by Paul. Mike confirms that the Trustee’s preferences are not part of the map, and that the map focuses on the inter-dependence of the individual goals/objectives with disregard to personal preference. Maile asks if there was a specific objective for the membership feedback identified at SURF 15. Paul responds that he doesn’t think so. Dick asks if there is a particular number of short-term (i.e., 2011) or stretch goals (e.g., 5-year period) that SURF should identify. Maile mentions that it seems that inter-related objectives identified on Mike’s road map, plus the Trustee’s priority rankings, would probably inform that number. Given that it is somewhat unclear to the best approach for moving forward, Paul suggests that some Trustees team up with Mike to reorganize the Goals and Objectives map, considering if anything should be removed or rearranged based on Paul’s previous analysis of Trustee preferences, and plan the next steps (including how, when, and purpose of membership feedback). Dan, Maile, Dick, and Dave W. offer to work with Mike R. on this task. Dick offers to coordinate the subgroup’s next conference call. The subgroup will aim to have the next steps outlined and ready for discussion at the next Board meeting.
5. **Communication Guidelines** – Stephanie distributed a draft Communications policy to the Board on 9/22/10 for their review and discussion. The draft policy contained some comments that the Committee had received that

warranted some Board discussion and resolution. Maile adds that the objective of the document is to provide some guidance for internal and external SURF communications (so we need to distribute it soon to appropriate individuals), and that it will also tie into the review process for technical initiative documents. Paul asks the Trustees to provide any final input on the policy to Stephanie by next Friday. A vote on adoption will be scheduled for the next Board meeting.

## 6. Committee Reports

1. **Meetings** – Mike mentions that the Communications/Outreach Committee is talking with Bob Armstead in early November to discuss potential outreach and communications ideas for SURF 16 (scheduled for 11/4/10). Mike has nine volunteers so far for the SURF 16 meeting planning team, and plans to schedule the first planning call soon. Dick asked if some SURF members would consider sponsoring a CSU student member to come to SURF 16 (clarifying that he means a few individual benefactors, not the SURF organization). Sponsorship would include airfare, hotel, ground transportation, meals, etc., perhaps totally somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1,200. Paul asks if the student would be asked to help recruit for a student chapter or new members. Paul asks if students will be at SURF 16, noting that no CMU students attended SURF 15. Maile mentions that the topic of how to interface with students and generate student interest can be discussed during the call with Bob Armstead on 11/4/10. Maile asks how the student will be selected. Dick will call Tom Sale and discuss options. Carol asks if we'll outreach to other students. Dave W. adds that it would be good to provide a similar opportunity for other students at future SURF meetings.
2. **Membership** – Dan is still waiting to hear from CSU on their approval for SURF's draft Student Chapter guidelines. He will follow up with another phone call. Meanwhile, Dan has provided the draft to Syracuse University, and a student chapter is in the works there. There are 14 potential students and an academic advisor lined up. Carol met a professor from CSU Chico, and Dan has followed up and is waiting for a call back. Paul is meeting with Curt Hatfield at the University of Florida to discuss the opportunity for a student chapter there as well. Dan will also revisit the other potential student chapter locations (e.g., Chicago-Kent), and see if there has been any new developments.
3. **Communications/Outreach** – Brandt has been discussing potential opportunities for collaboration with the AWMA. The AWMA has a membership of about 10,000. While the AWMA primarily focuses on carbon accounting, they recognize the broader issues of sustainability and like the work that SURF is doing. They would like to carry the message of SURF's work and mission into the AWMA. Brandt, Stephanie, and Maile spoke with the AWMA earlier this week about presenting at the AWMA annual conference in Orlando, which happens to be the week before the June Battelle meeting. Another potential opportunity is to have a local Florida AWMA member present at SURF 16, or to have a joint platform or session at SURF 17 in Chicago. Paul might be interested in making a presentation at their annual conference, as Orlando is a day trip for him. Dick asks for additional details on the benefits of collaborating with AWMA. Brandt mentions that SURF would be reaching out to a broad group, which is a new audience for SURF's work, and for AWMA, they are impressed with the intellectual and scientific rigor of SURF's membership community. There would be cross-pollination of ideas, training, and education. Stephanie concurs and hasn't yet identified any downsides. Dick asks if this would be a model for reaching out and interfacing with other organizations, or if there a "grand plan". Brandt, Stephanie, and Maile respond that there isn't a grand plan yet, that it was mainly a positive opportunity that presented itself to SURF, and that the ideas for a "grand plan" may congeal as discussions move forward. Maile asks if there is anything the Trustees need to do to follow up on the emails regarding SURF purchasing exhibit space at the Battelle bioremediation conference. Mike Miller had sent an email to Dave E. on 10/14/10 letting him know of the deadline to reserve exhibit space, which costs

approximately \$3,000. Dave E. offered to contact Russ Sirabian about the possibility of a reduced rate, and emailed the Trustees asking for their input on paying for a space at Battelle. There was some email traffic regarding the costs and benefits. Dick had also suggested that perhaps some SURF members would be willing to provide SURF outreach brochures in their corporate booths. Paul suggests that we wait to hear back from Dave E. regarding whether or not he heard back from Russ, and go from there.

4. **Technical Initiatives** – Karin, Brandt, and Paul had a call earlier this week to discuss timing and schedules for review and publication of the three technical documents. Paul will prepare a volunteer solicitation to help with the review process, as described above.
5. **Finance** – Brandt thanked Paul for stepping in and acting as Treasurer during SURF 15. Brandt forwarded his review of the financial model to the Trustees immediately before the call. Brandt explained the table presented in his email to the Trustees. Paul asks if there is anything that we need to consider revisiting, such as the meeting registration fees (thinks that the original model assumed \$250 and we've typically been charging \$150). Paul also mentioned that the plan was to remain solvent overall, but increasing revenues would allow SURF to do additional things. Dick asks what the next steps should be. Maile thinks that we need to identify the critical path; perhaps increasing meeting revenue isn't it, and if it is, raising meeting registration fees and increasing attendance would both accomplish that. There could be potential downsides on our outreach efforts to increasing fees. Paul adds that increasing sponsorship by a Gold Sponsor or two would provide a significant benefit. Maile asks if there is a plan for "renewing" sponsors, or for that matter, members. Dan offers that he and Maile have a planning discussion to draft a process for doing so. Dave W. adds that AECOM is renewing its sponsorship, and Dick, Brandt, and Paul offer that their companies are as well.
6. **Nominations** – See SURF Election Process discussion above.

Draft Agenda for Next Meeting (11/05/10):

- Approve previous meeting minutes (9/24/10 and 10/22/10)
- Additions to agenda
- Election process and potential changes to Bylaws
- Goals and objectives for 2011: proposed next steps
- Committee Reports
  - Meetings
    - SURF 16 planning update
    - SURF 17 and 18 planning updates
  - Membership
    - Student Chapter guidance and update
    - Proposed Membership and Sponsorship renewal process
  - Communications/Outreach
    - Communications policy
    - Government Outreach update
  - Technical Initiatives
    - Draft review process for technical initiative documents
  - Finance
  - Nominations
    - Schedule/plan for 2011 elections
- Other business
  - US: new developments, policies, or conferences
  - International: new developments, policies, or conferences

*SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION FORUM  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING SUMMARY*

- Next meeting

Meeting adjourned, 11:53 pm PDT / 2:53 pm EDT.

Respectfully submitted by,  
L. Maile Smith, Secretary