

NEES Consortium Inc.



MEETING MINUTES – Approved 08/25/2006

Meeting of the Board of Directors

Doubletree Hotel – Crystal City, Washington, D.C. Metro Area

Friday, June 23, 2006: 1:30 pm to 5:45 pm

Saturday, June 24, 2006: 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by Sara Moody and Cliff Roblee

(A) = Attachment (Included in Board of Directors Binder or Distributed at Meeting)

1. Roll Call and Welcome

Buckle

- President opened meeting at 1:40 p.m.
- President welcomed guests which included the new incoming Board of Directors.
- All Board Members were present except Stepp.
- Participation of Guests: All agenda items
 - Cliff Roblee, NEESinc Executive Director (ED)
 - Sara Moody, NEESinc Executive Administrator
 - Lori Campbell, NEESinc Administrative Consultant (via teleconference)
- Participation of Guests: Selected Sessions
 - Sarah Billington, Incoming Board Member
 - Ahmed Elgamal, Incoming Board Member
 - Julio Ramirez, Incoming Board Member
 - Jay Berger, NEESinc Manager, Experimental Site Operations
 - Parshaw Vaziri, NEESinc Manager, Education, Outreach, and Training
 - Jacobo Bielak, Chair, NEESinc Information Technology Strategy Committee (ITSC)
 - Shirley Dyke, Chair, Education Outreach, and Training Committee (EOTC)
 - Mark Eberhard, Chair, Site Operations Committee (SOC)
 - Jerry Hajjar, Chair-Elect, IT Strategy Committee (ITSC)
 - Jaime Steidl, Site Operations Manager, University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)
 - Joy Pauschke, National Science Foundation (NSF)

2. Approve Minutes

- 2.1. Meeting of February 3-4, 2006 in Austin, TX
- 2.2. Teleconference of May 4, 2006
- 2.3. Teleconference of May 12, 2006
- 2.4. Teleconference of June 6, 2006

MOTION: The Board approves the minutes of each of the meetings as provided in the Board binder with the incorporation of modifications provided to the ED in writing by Ian Buckle and Sharon Wood.
<<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- ED to revise minutes from February 3-4 Board meeting and June 6 Board teleconference to reflect minor changes requested by Ian Buckle and Sharon Wood.

3. Consent Agenda

Buckle

- 3.1. Background
- 3.2. Items to Remove for Additional Discussion (Place in Agenda Item 18)
- 3.3. Approve Remaining Items

Informational Items:

- 3.3.1. Receive Membership Report

Approval Items:

- 3.3.2. Approve New Members
 - 3.3.3. Approve Minor Correction to Bylaws – Article IV, Section 1C
 - 3.3.4. Approve NEESinc Operating Policies
 - 3.3.5. Approve Fiscal Control Document FCD-01: Subawardee Program and Budget Revisions
 - 3.3.6. Approve FY2006 NEESinc Annual Report (No Board comments; Addressed NSF requests)
- Buckle explained the purpose of the consent agenda is to speed up the work of the Board to pass non-controversial items as one block without discussion of individual items. Buckle included that any Board Member could request individual items on the consent agenda be moved to the full agenda for further discussion.
 - Bobbitt requested that items 3.3.4 and 3.3.5 be moved for discussion.
 - Re item 3.3.2, Wood requested that 2 member applications identified as “Pending Board Action” be made contingent upon Board action regarding extension of membership classes (item 13.1), and that these members be separately approved (see item 18.3).
 - Leon requested that a letter of support for a proposal for funding of research in Canada similar to NEES be added to the consent agenda. This was denied since consent agenda items must be provided well in advance of meeting. This matter added as item 18.4.

MOTION: The Board has reviewed each of the items shown on the consent agenda and has moved items 3.3.4, and 3.3.5 to Agenda Item 18 for further discussion. The Board considers the items remaining to be non-controversial business items on which the Board needs to vote. The Board approves each of the items remaining on the consent agenda. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

4. Site Operations Committee Report

Eberhard

- 4.1. Status of Pilot Implementation of Equipment Site Review
 - 4.1.1. Process Overview
 - 4.1.2. General Findings for NEES Network
 - 4.1.3. Site-Specific Findings
 - 4.1.4. Status of Budget Recommendations
 - 4.1.5. Policy Needs
 - 4.1.6. Discussion

- Eberhard reviewed the background and process of the SOC’s annual assessment of NEES Equipment Site shared-use and budget reviews.
- Eberhard reported that, during the review process, Sites were separated into three subgroups essentially involving: Structural, Geotechnical, and Shake Table. Subcommittees were formed based on these three subgroups and performed initial assessments based on activity information synthesized by NEESinc ESO group. Subcommittee membership was selected to prevent COI (i.e. no member could review own Site).
- Eberhard indicated that the SOC met prior to the Annual Meeting on June 20, 2006 where they reviewed the initial assessments of the subcommittees and agreed on a consensus budget distribution.
- Eberhard reported that recommendations are being made by the SOC as a whole, not the individual subcommittees, and will be sent to the Sites on Friday, June 30th along with a summary which will explain SOC recommendations. Sites will then have an opportunity to respond.
- Eberhard reviewed key budget distribution recommendations with the Board that will be sent to the Sites.

- Leon thanked Eberhard, Berger, and the entire Committee stating that he is very happy with the way the SOC Site review proceeded; noting that it was a tremendous amount of work accomplished in a short amount of time.
- Buckle asked Eberhard to have SOC generate “best practices” for operation of Sites based on experience gained in this pilot review. The report is intended to provide guidance to Sites.

ACTION ITEMS:

- SOC to develop “best practices” document based on its experience in piloting the Site review process. Report to be completed by November Board Meeting.

4.2. Other SOC Activities

- 4.2.1. Major Repairs
- 4.2.2. Status of Performance Metrics Development
- 4.2.3. SOC Input on SDSC SUPP Request (see item 17.1)

- Eberhard briefly discussed that major repair requests have been reviewed by subgroup of SOC, and that policies are being considered.
- Eberhard discussed status of development of performance metrics and described difficulties recognized in all metrics. Indicated that work would continue, especially given emphasis of SVT on developing such metrics.
- Eberhard reported on Issue Forum discussion regarding addition of affiliate Sites. The merits of the idea include increasing inclusiveness. Indicated that SCEC used similar concept. A related issue is that of adding other parts of labs not considered part of the MREFC phase. Indicated that participating Sites would need to commit to adherence to data policies and to EOT objectives.
- Eberhard indicated SOC had no official recommendation re: SDSC request to include 7-story frame as “shared use” project, but did discuss the larger issues. Larger issues include whether it is really shared use, and separating out charges that are applicable to MOM.

MOTION: The Board receives the report prepared by the Site Operations Committee (SOC) and extends its sincere appreciation to SOC participants and associated NEESinc staff for their diligent efforts to execute the prototype process for annual review of Equipment Sites in a thoughtful, fair, and efficient manner and looks forward to their final report at the August Board of Director’s meeting in Eugene, OR. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- NSF has identified the lack of adequate performance metrics for NEESinc and its subawardees as a “threat”. SOC should continue to work with NEESinc staff and the “Task Group on Success (TGoSuccess)” to develop performance metrics for Equipment Sites that are uniform, fair, achievable, and aligned with the long-term interests of advancing earthquake engineering research.

NOTE: President made the following revisions to the Agenda:

- Delete item 6, because the report was already given at the Annual Meeting.
- ITSC report would be next;
- followed by comments from Joy Pauschke;
- following with item 12.4.3 which is the request from Ahmed Elgamal;
- if time permits the Executive Session would then begin for the rest of the afternoon/ early evening until dinner and continue the next morning beginning at 8:00 a.m.

5. IT Strategy Committee Report

Bielak

- 5.1. Progress on DataPlus Plan Approved February 2006
 - 5.1.1. Data Management – Feedback from Case Study Project Participants
 - 5.1.2. Telepresence – Feedback from Case Study Project Participants
 - 5.1.3. Hybrid Simulation – Strategy Forward
- 5.2. ITSC Recommendations re: NEESinc Draft Response to NEESit Site Visit
 - 5.2.1. Board Discussion (Approval During ED Report)
- 5.3. Progress on Review of FY07 IT Budget & Work Scope
 - 5.3.1. Board Discussion and Recommendations to ITSC
- 5.4. Other ITSC Activities
 - 5.4.1. TGoITVision Formation
 - 5.4.2. Visualization Demonstration Project (Deferred)
 - 5.4.3. Performance Metrics

- Bielak reported to the Board on ITSC activities including feedback received from Case Study Project Participants on Data Management and Telepresence, in which he reported the reaction from project participants has been uniformly positive and case scenarios have been extremely helpful in supporting development process.
- Bielak recognized that the involvement of NEESinc's new IT Engineer Jon Lea has been extremely helpful; and reported that NEESit will be interviewing the following week for a "Data Modeler" and NEESinc would be starting a new round of interviews for a "Data Librarian."
- Bielak reported that the Hybrid Simulation is an issue because different sites have different software and methodologies. Dialogue has been initiated between several Sites and NEESit on how to move forward. They plan to start work this summer, and have their next meeting scheduled for mid July.
- Bielak gave an overview of how NEESinc and NEESit have responded to recommendations made by NSF at the recent Site Visit Review.
- Bielak noted that during NEESit's report to the ITSC on June 20th they presented a more detailed budget & work scope document which provided a better account of how funds have been spent than in the past. Activities were split into two categories: logical extension of current activities and new activities. ITSC would like to see FY07 budget broken down into tasks, deliverables, and levels of functionality with FTEs assigned to accomplish these.
- ITSC recommendations to NEESit include:
 - ITSC recognizes that NEESit is working to refine their project management process, including the development of a formal reporting process, and ITSC encourages NEESit to continue these efforts. NEESinc will continue to work to articulate reporting requirements and to work with NEESit to establish a reporting template.
 - NEESit should resubmit a budget and work plan for the first 6 months of FY07 by July 4th that continues the direction of the FY06 Data Plus work plan with respect to Data Modeling and Telepresence and Collaboration activities.
 - It is necessary that NEESit have a fully functional data model and set of Telepresence tools that have been vetted by the community and have some level of community approval by December 2006. Completion of these tools must address the criticisms of the site review team, including leverage of other CI tools. Additionally, it is essential that NEESit have a plan for the future.
- Bielak reported that composition of a Task Group (TGoITVision) charged with developing an overarching vision for IT is almost completely defined, one or two additional members from IT community need to be identified; Jerry Hajjar will lead the group.
- Bielak indicated that performance metrics are an urgent need for all members of NEES including: NEESinc, NEESit and Sites because they address both short term as well as long term goals that will define the success of NEES. Bielak will assemble a small working group within ITSC to identify metrics for reviewing NEESit. This will likely include a representative of NEESit, but will be composed primarily of researchers who are users.

MOTION: The Board receives the report prepared by the IT Strategy Committee (ITSC) and extends its sincere appreciation to ITSC participants and associated NEESinc staff for their continuing efforts to guide NEES' IT capabilities toward greater achievements on behalf of the entire community. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- NSF has identified the lack of adequate performance metrics for NEESinc and its subawardees as a “threat”. ITSC should continue to work with NEESinc staff and the “Task Group on Success (TGoSuccess)” to develop performance metrics for NEESit and related IT efforts that are uniform, fair, achievable, and aligned with the long-term interests of advancing earthquake engineering research.
- NEESinc and ITSC should continue initiatives to accelerate advances in hybrid simulation through use of FY05 carry-forward funds to support both the creation of a common framework for use by all Sites on the network and for the development of Site-specific software designed to link into the common framework.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA ITEM: Comments from Joy Pauschke:

- Joy Pauschke thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak to them while in D.C. Pauschke said she would like to give her heartfelt thanks to Ian Buckle and other Members leaving the Board due to their terms ending. She said everyone has done a marvelous job and she appreciates their pioneering efforts, and leadership. Pauschke extends her thanks to the committees who have been very active in the community.
- Pauschke described the reorganization of NSF Engineering Directorate including the merger of CMS with Design and Manufacturing Innovation Divisions into the new “Civil, Mechanical, and Manufacturing Innovation (CMMI) Division”. She further emphasized the importance of ‘nuggets’ to explain the merits of NEES to incoming management. She also introduced the new crosscutting Office of Emerging Frontiers in Research and Innovations (EFRI) that is focused on transformative opportunities.
- Pauschke informed the Board that the NSF Total Business System Review (TBSR) team that visited NEESinc in May has not finished their report, but has briefed her. Pauschke explained that she understands that the funding from NSF can be an issue, especially the timing. She said NSF recognizes the issue, and are working on another process; however they can not guarantee a resolution. She said that from the TBSR, it was clear that the Board is very active as far as decision making and in day-to-day operations. She said that lack of performance metrics is also an issue.
- Pauschke expressed concern that NEESinc has not hired a Data Librarian, because this is important for defining data curation needs. She said that NSF will be putting a lot into IT infrastructure in the future through the Office of Cyberinfrastructure (OCI), and encourages NEESinc to seek other funding opportunities. NEES needs to stay on top of what’s going on and leverage what is already out there, and not reinvent the wheel.
- Pauschke is also concerned about a lack of leadership in EOT. She suggested that NEES should use cyber infrastructure to get information through the pipeline. However she is pleased with what has been done with the NEESreu program in a short amount of time.
- Pauschke identified need for NEES briefing to the House Science Committee in the first week of July. She expressed disappointment with how NEESinc has presented itself to NSF, and other agencies. She indicated that NEES needs to be showcased to other agencies.
- Board Members asked Pauschke for clarifications on comments regarding her disappointment and she identified specific concerns as: 1) the “D” grades reported to NSF management for NEESR funding and for alignment of NSF-NEESinc-Board management processes in the first year, 2) a confrontational tone noted in the FY06 NEESinc Annual Report, and 3)

communications with NEHRP agencies regarding the need to identify mechanisms to better coordinate research (both at the selection and during execution) so as to achieve legacy products for practice.

- Board Members asked Pauschke for clarifications on comments and for ideas of what NSF would like to see done for EOT. Pauschke pointed to NanoHub as a good on-line resource for educational materials. Board discussion included overcoming EOT fragmentation among Sites and NEESR projects and the importance of getting research into practice.
- Buckle thanked Joy on behalf of the Board for coming to share her thoughts with the Board.

6. EOT Part 1: Report on NEESreu Program

Brown/Vaziri

6.1. Student Placements

- Buckle deleted this item from the agenda because it was presented during the Annual Meeting.

12.4.3 Director-Elect Elgamal Response to Board Recommendation

- Buckle gave an overview of the background regarding BOD encouragement for Ahmed Elgamal to consider stepping down as a Director due to perception of a conflict of interest with participation as an Equipment Site Director and serving as PI of NEESit.
- Ahmed Elgamal addressed the BOD with his request to remain on the Board of Directors. Ahmed expressed that his participation on the Board will not be a conflict of interest, but could be a solution to a problem.
- The Board recused Elgamal and all guests from the room except Roblee and Moody.
- Board discussion of views and options continued during the private session.

MOTION: The Board thanks Dr. Elgamal his response, and welcomes him to the Board of Directors.
<<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- Buckle to notify Elgamal of outcome.

The Board adjourned at 6:00 PM.

SATURDAY, June 24, 2006

7. ED Compensation Committee Report (EXEC SESSION - BOARD MEMBERS ONLY) Kutter

- 7.1. Package Submitted by ED
- 7.2. Recommendations of Compensation Committee
- 7.3. Board Discussion

- (Note: Exec Session Minutes prepared by Ian Buckle) The Board received the report from the ad hoc Compensation Committee containing the results of the annual review of the Executive Director and recommendation regarding compensation. Following discussion of the report the Board agreed to increase the annual salary of the Executive Director by 4%, effective July 1, 2006. In addition the Board requested the Chair of the Compensation Committee to meet with the Executive Director in the near future to review the Committee's findings and recommendations. The Board also agreed to provide a prioritized set of duties and goals for the Executive Director by the time of the August Board Meeting, and charged the incoming President with this task. The President thanked the Committee for its comprehensive report and in particular the chair, Bruce Kutter, for his efforts leading the review and compiling the report.

8. EOT Part 2: Board Discussion of 4th Annual Meeting Buckle

- 8.1. Successes to Repeat
- 8.2. Weaknesses to Improve
- 8.3. Assign Board Representatives for 5AM Committee

- Board Members discussed the successes and weaknesses of the NEES 4th Annual Meeting.
- The following Successes were identified:
 - Overall, far better than last year. Ran smoothly.
 - Good attendance. Having the NEESreu Students and Young Researchers there was very positive.
 - Presentations were of high level and results were compelling. Live demos from UIUC and Colorado and NEESit were great.
 - Feedback received from participants was positive.
- The following weaknesses were identified:
 - Would like to see more practitioners. Include session of results specifically for practitioners. Also solicit research needs.
 - Need to send out flyers for notice, e-mail alone is not effective. Circulate to all ATC and EERI members as well as NEESinc members.
 - Need more break time for interaction. Consider more concurrent sessions, especially for technical projects.
 - Technical sessions, though good, need to be shorter. Need to get a handle on session timing, all technical sessions ran over with no time for questions. Speaker guidelines need to be revised to enforce 15-min max talks.
- Buckle expressed his appreciation on behalf of the Board to the Annual Meeting Planning Committee and Parshaw and all NEESinc staff for a successful NEES 4th Annual Meeting.
- Buckle deferred assigning Board representatives for the 5AM Committee to the incoming President.

MOTION: The Board commends the 4th Annual Meeting Planning Group and NEESinc staff for a successful 4th Annual Meeting. The Board is pleased with the increased attendance, the initiative to engage young researchers, and both the breadth and strength of the technical programs. The Board encourages NEESinc to expand upon this year's success by commencing immediately to plan for an excellent 5th Annual Meeting in Snowbird, Utah on June 20-22, 2007. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- NEESinc staff to send future Annual Meeting announcements and Call for Abstracts out much earlier. In addition to email announcements, should use other forms of non-electronic based advertising.
- Other considerations for future Annual Meeting include providing more time for breaks between sessions for interaction, revising speaker guidelines, and trying to get presentations from practitioners.
- President to assign two Board representatives to participate in the planning committee for the 2007 NEES 5th Annual Meeting.

9. EOT Part 3: The NEESinc Diversity Strategic Plan v2.0

Vaziri

- 9.1. Background & Need
- 9.2. Goals, Strategies, and Activities
- 9.3. Role and Responsibilities
- 9.4. Proposed Milestones for June 2007
- 9.5. Board Discussion and Approval

- Vaziri gave a brief background overview of the NEES EOT Diversity Strategic Plan, including the changes from the previous interim version approved in July 2005.
- Goals of the Diversity Strategic Plan include the following:
 - Optimize NEES resources to attract diverse participants.
 - Build productive relationships with organizations that have similar groups.
 - Provide leadership in broadening participation.
 - Use assessment tools to improve diversity programs.
- Vaziri described the EOTC's review and recommendation for approval of the plan by the Board.
- Board members discussed ideas for implementing EOT at the Equipment Sites.
- Vaziri stressed that "Broadening Participation" is critical for each Site; the EOT Committee wants to help everyone get pointed in one common direction.
- Andrews explained that there has been a fundamental shift in the last five to ten years to EOT. Incentives are being provided by the Universities, and they are offering assistance to achieve EOT goals.
- Reinhorn said he would like to see more substance and documentation on how NEESinc will accomplish goal 3, on page 10 of the Plan.
- Kutter expressed concern that in the interim goals on page 16, concrete projects will not be met until January 2008.

MOTION: The Board adopts the revised NEES Diversity Strategic Plan (v2.0) to supersede the interim version (v1.5), and directs NEESinc and each of its Subawardees to continue effective actions toward achieving the goals outlined in that plan. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- NEESinc to post DSP, v2.0.

10. EOT Part 4: The EOTC Execution Plan

Dyke/Vaziri

- 10.1. Background and Process
- 10.2. Top EOT Priorities and Proposed Milestones for June 2007
- 10.3. Board Discussion and Approval

- Shirley Dyke reported that the EOT Committee has been working on the “NEES EOT Execution Plan” and finalized a version at Tuesday’s EOTC meeting to be presented to the Board for approval (revised version to replace earlier version distributed in Board binder).
- Dyke explained that the Execution Plan is complementary to the EOT Strategic Plan and intended to be a short-intermediate roadmap for achieving specific goals in the next few years. The Plan will need to be pursued by NEESinc staff and updated annually.
- Dyke mentioned that a high priority identified by the EOTC is for NEESinc to hire an assessment/evaluation expert to assist with development of assessment/evaluation tools for the community. This would be done using funds remaining in Anagnos’ EOT Strategic Plan development project pending approval by NSF.
- Dyke said NEESinc staff and EOT partners would need to get together to seek external funding in order to accomplish the goals; NEESinc staff is working on obtaining partners now.
- Bobbitt shared his interest in having a speaker’s bureau, and was encouraged to pass additional information on to Parshaw.
- Dyke suggested that anyone with an interest in doing activities and/or partnering with NEESinc in getting funding should contact the NEESinc EOT Staff for coordination.
- Vaziri said that the EOT Activities Database is used internally to track EOT activities of Sites. The NEESinc website is being restructured and reorganized, and will include more capabilities and specific area groups. They are setting up an EOT Forum (similar to Site Managers Forum) to determine the best way to coordinate EOT and technology transfer activities.
- Reinhorn expressed his concern with Equipment Sites having to dedicate spread Site resources to both research and EOT.
- Vaziri explained that there are common activities of the Sites where NEESinc can help with coordination; however, there is a big gap in funding.
- Roblee stated that EOT is an essential part of MOM; \$2 million was allocated in FY05 to the Equipment Sites for EOT based on the Sites Assessments; and there is a need to get more efficient. He said when research work plans are submitted each year; there is a commitment to the organization to identify the amount of research and EOT you are planning. It is up to the Site to carry out these commitments. If more research is planned, then it is assumed that less EOT activities will be planned.
- Andrews said leveraging takes collaboration; some sort of educational tour at all the sites would be very useful. There is a desire to do EOT, but a lack of understanding from the Sites.

MOTION: The Board approves the “NEES EOT Execution Plan” prepared by the Education, Outreach, and Training Committee (EOTC) on an interim basis. Additional comments and revisions will be received by the EOT Committee and a revised version including product deliverables and a timeline should be submitted for review at the August 2006 Board of Directors meeting. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- EOTC to add product deliverables and a timeline in the next version of the EOT Execution Plan to be submitted to the BOD for approval in August.

11. Executive Director’s Report

Roblee

- 11.1. Approval of Site Visit Responses
 - 11.1.1. NEESinc HQ
 - 11.1.2. NEESit
 - 11.1.3. Sites: Cornell and RPI
- 11.2. Informational Items
 - 11.2.1. GPRA Estimates for Sites
 - 11.2.2. NEESR Strategic Plan Proposal – NSF Denial & Review Comments

11.2.3. Report on International Collaboration Interest Survey

11.2.4. NEESinc Staff Needs

- Roblee explained the process for developing the combined response to NSF for the Site Visits. Each SVT visitee provided an initial draft response; Roblee combined and edited into a uniform (format and voice) response; visitee provided opportunity to review. Final draft of combined response provided in binder.
- Spencer suggested that before approving the responses, the Board would need to see complete versions of all of the Site Visit Reports, not just the recommendations and SWOT. ExCom had reviewed these, but they were not provided to the entire Board. Roblee offered to post complete SVT reports on NEEScentral for Board review.
- Buckle requested Board Members to send their comments to Roblee and delegates ExCom to do the final review at the next ExCom meeting. He also noted that Pauschke wanted to be sure that the response was Board approved.

MOTION: The Board has reviewed the joint response to the four NSF Site Visit Team reports pertaining to operations of NEES Consortium, Inc. Headquarters (NEESinc), NEES Cyberinfrastructure Center (NEESit), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) and Cornell University. The Board approves the joint response pending incorporation of final comments and review by ExCom at the July 6 teleconference. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to post complete versions of SVT reports on NEEScentral for review by the BOD; BOD to send comments to ED by July 3, 2006; ED will submit revised version with proposed changes to ExCom for review and approval during the July 6, 2006 ExCom conference call.
- Roblee reviewed the process for GPRA Estimates for the Equipment Sites and the changes made from the past year, which include introducing a site-specific proxy to measure “functional” days that is based on availability and operational status of primary pieces of equipment at each Site. Equipment Sites will need to keep a daily equipment log that is easily auditable. Roblee indicated this process had already been reviewed by Pauschke and she thought good progress had been made with it.
- Roblee explained that in order for NEESinc to be effective, he needs to restructure and add staff, and he is looking for additional funding. Currently NEESinc receives 13% of total funding; Roblee is looking to increase this amount to 15%; the dollar value is approximately \$400,000.
- Board discussion included current staff and needs. The Board requests the ED to present an org chart with a list of current staff including their duties and operations.

ACTION ITEMS:

- NEESinc ESO Staff to contact Equipment Sites to be sure they are keeping an auditable log of daily activity to support GPRA numbers.
- ED to prepare a comprehensive proposal with NEESinc staffing plans for consideration at the August BOD meeting. This document should include an organization chart of the existing employees and a complete list of their current duties.

12. President’s Report

Buckle

- 12.1. Create “TGoSuccess” to Define NEESinc Success and Metrics
- 12.2. Create “TGoGovernance” on Roles & Responsibilities of Governance
- 12.3. Follow-Up on Approved NEESinc Ethics Policy
 - 12.3.1. Clarifications Regarding Interested Directors Budget Vote
 - 12.3.2. Clarification of Definition, Requirements, & Consequences for Interested Director
 - 12.3.3. Revised Disclosure Forms

- 12.4. Follow-Up on Election Issues
 - 12.4.1. Role of Practitioners/Stakeholders as Individual/Institutional Directors
 - 12.4.2. Revisions to Officer Election Process
 - 12.4.3. Director-Elect Elgamal Response to Board Recommendation (moved see above)
- 12.5. Fill Vacancies
 - 12.5.1. Board-Elected Director
 - 12.5.2. Vice President
 - 12.5.3. At-Large Member of ExCom
- 12.6. Concepts for Advanced R&D Program for Site Development
 - Ian Buckle reported that both the “TGoSuccess” and “TGoGovernance” were driven by the NSF Site Visit Reviews, and their establishment is in response to their requests. Roblee explained that the goal for both would be discussion of preliminary ideas at the August meeting with a final report by the November Board meeting. Board discussion included adding a simulation person as a member on the “TGoSuccess” group.
 - Buckle explained that an outside consultant will likely need to join the “TGoGovernance” group. Leon stated that the consultant needs to be started very soon so they can have something in time for the August meeting. Board suggestions included moving the consultant over to a resource and minor editorial revisions.

MOTION: The Board recognizes that NSF Site Visit Teams routinely inquire how NEES will define success over various time periods, and what are NEESinc’s vision, mission and role in achieving this success. Therefore, the Board approves the establishment of a Task Group on Success (TGoSuccess) to develop a policy-level document that carefully defines/refines the current vision and mission of NEESinc and develops specific performance targets for various time frames as the basis for future evaluations. A preliminary report should be presented at the August 2006 Board meeting with final recommendations presented to the Board for approval at the November 2006 Board meeting. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board is aware that the 2006 NSF Site Visit Team (SVT) report identifies as threats “unclear lines of authority and decision making between NEESinc and the Board” and “too much reliance on decision making by committee process”. Therefore, the Board approves the establishment of a Task Group on Governance (TGoGovernance) to develop a policy-level document that explores alternative governance models of comparable organizations, and seeks to refine and streamline NEESinc’s governance model for more efficient operation as NEES moves toward mature long-term operation. A preliminary report as well as a consultant-facilitated discussion of governance roles and responsibilities should be presented to the Board at the August strategy retreat with follow up and final recommendations presented to the Board for approval at the November 2006 Board meeting. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- President to form “TGoSuccess.”
 - President to form “TGoGovernance.”
 - NEESinc to facilitate selection of a consultant to serve as a resource to TGoGovernance.
 - ITSC and SOC to work with NEESinc staff and TGoSuccess to develop performance metrics per earlier action items.
- Roblee reviewed comments received on the document “NEES Policy and Procedures for Ethical Conduct” (Ethics Policy), that was originally presented to the Board in February. Specifically, suggested edits based on input from Buckle and comments from Legal were described. Roblee indicated that COI Disclosure forms still need to be revised per input received at the February Board meeting.

- Roblee also reviewed responses obtained from legal counsel to questions raised in February regarding the definition of an “interested director” beyond the Equipment Site Directors. Example cases were presented that provide interpretations to concerns raised in February. Key lessons from these responses are as follows:
 - 1) General guidance from Legal is: A Director would be considered “Interested” (i.e. have a conflict of interest) if they have a financial, personal, or professional interest which has the potential to influence a person’s perspective of a business or professional transaction with a potential to adversely affect or conflict with NEESinc’s best interests. Each potential situation must consider situation-specific facts and be guided by the additional criteria in the policy (Section 3.A.2) to determine if the situation/transaction/relationship:
 - a. Creates the appearance of personal gain at NEESinc expense;
 - b. Creates the appearance of preferential treatment or lack of impartiality;
 - c. Impedes NEESinc economy or efficiency;
 - d. Results in a loss of independence and objectivity;
 - e. Reflects poorly on NEESinc; or
 - f. Has the effect of diminishing the trust and confidence of the public, the government, the stakeholders or individuals within NEESinc.
 - 2) For the posed example case of a Director that does not receive funds directly from NEESinc, but who does use (and possibly even prefers) certain facilities for the performance of their research projects (say “friend of Site x”). Legal’s interpretation was that one would need to look into the reasons for such preference and the effect that the preference has on the Director. If the preference was simply because the facility offers services in their field, this would not constitute COI. However, if it appears that the facility plays a very significant role in the Director’s research, and without such facility, the Director’s research may not proceed; the Director may have an interest in making sure that the facility gets preferential treatment over and above what would normally be afforded that facility, the situation may be deemed to be a COI.
 - 3) For the posed example case of a Director who is located within the same Department (say CE) at the same University as an Equipment Site PI, but who is not directly involved with the operation of the Site nor directly benefit from its funding stream (though the University and Department do. Legal’s interpretation was that if the Director’s only connection to the transaction between NEESinc and the University/Department is that he/she is a member of the University/Department, this situation would not appear to compromise the Director’s objectivity and loyalty to NEESinc.
 - 4) For the posed example case similar to #3 but where the Director is in a different Department, but works closely on an interdisciplinary basis with the Equipment Site PI. Legal’s interpretation was similar to #3 and indicated that the fact that a Director is working with an Equipment Site PI would not, in the absence of additional facts, result in a COI. One should look into the underlying facts and see if there are other layers to the relationship that would put in question a Director’s objectivity and independence.
 - 5) In summary, Legal indicated that no clear rule can unerringly describe and distinguish independent Director’s. However the independence of the Director depends on all the relationships the Director has, including the relationships between Directors, which may compromise the Director’s objectivity and loyalty to NEESinc’s members. It is the obligation of the Directors to consider all relevant facts and circumstances to determine whether a Director is to be considered independent.
- Roblee indicated that he has requested an increase in the NEESinc Director’s and Officer’s liability insurance from \$1 million to \$2 million.

MOTION: The Board adopts as policy the document titled “NEES Consortium, Inc. (NEESinc) Policy and Procedures for Ethical Conduct” pending incorporation of final revisions presented to the Board and review by ExCom. The Board further directs the ED to complete revised conflict of interest disclosure

forms per changes to the Ethics Policy, and disseminate as necessary for completion by “Covered Individuals”. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to incorporate revisions into Ethics Policy, have reviewed by ExCom, and posted.
 - ED to revise Conflict of Interest Disclosure forms and disseminate as necessary for completion by “Covered Individuals”.
- On the Director election process, Buckle provided background regarding whether the BOD has the legal right to overrule a recommendation provided by the Nominations Committee. Roblee reviewed the Legal interpretation that was included in the Board binder. In essence, the interpretation indicated that the Nominations Committee is a committee of the Board, derives its authority from the Board, is accountable to the Board, and reports to the Board. Any disagreement between the Nominations Committee members and the Board should be resolved at the Board level. Specifically, in regards to the Board’s request to expand the slate provided to include non-academic nominees was viewed as “in line with the Nominations Committee charter”.
 - On Officer elections, Buckle indicated that there were questions raised regarding how NONC arrived at a slate and whether all nominees were contacted. To remedy this for future elections, Roblee presented two alternate revisions to the Policy for Election of NEESinc Officers by the Board of Directors: 1) proposed changes per Nominations Committee input (Alternate N); and 2) proposed changes per ExCom input (Alternate E). Spencer recommended that step 6 in Alternate E be revised to indicate that the NONC representative “will offer to provide” rather than “if requested ... will provide” information potentially relevant to a nominee’s decision to be included on the slate.

MOTION: The Board adopts changes to items 3 and 6 in the “Policy for Election of NEESinc Officers by the Board of Directors” document as shown in the distributed board binder as “Alternate E” with the proposed modification to step 6. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

- Buckle reviewed the history of the current election for the Board-Appointed Director. Three candidates had been identified, they were ranked numerically 1-3, and Buckle was to call the candidates. The Board discussed process, COI, and needed-expertise issues raised during and subsequent to the election in light of both the new information regarding “Interested Directors” provided by Legal (discussed above) and with Dr. Elgamal serving on the Board.

MOTION: The Board directs Ian Buckle to contact Jim Myers to ask him to serve as a Board-Appointed Director on the NEESinc Board. If he declines, the Board directs the incoming President to initiate a new Officer election process. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- Buckle to contact Jim Myers to ask him to serve as a Board-Appointed Director on the NEESinc Board.
- Buckle recapped the need to have an election for the Vice President position due to an oversight in recognizing his term had expired. At the May 4 Board teleconference, Kutter’s term has been extended for three months to allow for orderly completion the process using input on Officer Election Policy from this meeting. Buckle also identified the need to elect the Member-At-Large for the Executive Committee to replace Sharon Wood, whose term as Director has expired.
 - Buckle delegated the responsibility of contacting NONC for elections process to incoming President.

MOTION: Incoming President to convene NONC to begin election process for the open Vice-President and At Large ExCom positions on the BOD. President to instruct NONC that they need to adhere to the instructions provided in the revised (June, 2006) Policy for Election of NEESinc Officers. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- Leon to convene NONC to begin election process for the open Vice-President and At Large ExCom positions on the BOD and to provide instruction regarding revised Officer Election policy.

- Buckle gave a presentation on concepts for an Advanced R&D Program for Equipment Site Development. Buckle said that he recently attended a meeting of the Facilities Subcommittee of the NSF Business and Operations Advisory Committee, chaired by Tom Kirk (Brookhaven National Lab) and organized by Tom Coles (Deputy Director Large-Facilities). This meeting was attended by several PIs and Directors from existing facilities constructed under the MREFC program or earlier. The importance of dedicated R&D funds to enable MREFC facilities to evolve with their scientific programs and be able to meet the future needs of their respective research communities, was strongly emphasized. One of the five recommendations made by the Subcommittee to the Operations Committee specifically addresses the importance of Advanced R&D. However, NEESinc does not have funds for this purpose under its present MOM Cooperative Agreement with NSF, but discussions with Joy Pauschke have indicated a willingness by NSF (Pauschke) to consider adding a new category to the NEESR awards, similar to the payload awards. This category would fund the development and/or refinement of advanced experimental techniques and tools, such as hybrid simulation and wireless sensors. Currently some of this work is being funded under NEESR II, SG, and GC Awards. If this new category of award was established, this work could be funded independently of a research project which should encourage more high risk, high pay-off proposals. Unlike payload awards, these proposals would be panel-reviewed. A workshop to determine needs and priorities
- The Board questioned Buckle regarding what is intended by “R&D” and about the importance of having community input in the workshop (in addition to the Sites). Buckle recommended that NEESinc take the lead and offer to organize this meeting. Pauschke has asked Buckle to draft language announcing this new category of award for possible inclusion in the NEESR-07 solicitation.

13. Secretary’s Report

Roeder

13.1. Bylaws Changes to Add New Membership Classes

- Roeder reviewed the background and logic behind proposed modifications to the Bylaws to allow for students, internationals, and corporations to become members of NEESinc.
- The Board suggested that NEESinc check to see if there are any legal implications with the bylaws changes.

MOTION: The Board adopts the amendments to the bylaws to introduce changes to membership, which include removing the requirement of US Residency from the Individual Membership, adding a Student Membership category, and adding a Corporate Membership category as shown in the June 2006 distributed BOD binder; subject to legal review. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc FBO Staff/Manager to have legal review of proposed Bylaws changes and amend accordingly if there are no significant issues.

14. Treasurer's Report

Rojahn

14.1. Review New Format for Routine Quarterly Financial Reporting

- Rojahn explained that he has been working with the NEESinc Controller and COO to make sure financial reports are briefer and provide the right type of information for the quarterly reports to the Board.
- Rojahn reviewed and explained the "Balance Sheet" which is a representation of assets, liabilities, and equity (the net worth of the organization). Rojahn explained that there are two components to the equity: unrestricted, which is comprised of fixed assets (furniture, equipment, etc.) that will depreciate over time; and net income, which is the excess of downloaded money from NSF at that point in time.
- Rojahn referred to the "Income & Expense Statement by Project" sheet provided for the quarter for each of the projects of the organization. Rojahn explained that accrued invoices may not be posted to this report. This report shows the Board at a single glance how much activity has taken place in the quarter. Rojahn indicated that on the bottom of the page, Net Income should be titled Net Income/Advance Balance. In the past, we have reported the projects on project-to-date basis. Page 3 of the report includes a financial summary for MOM as of March 31.
- It was noted that there was a lack of payments to Subawardees as of March 31st. The Board encourages the staff to make every attempt to enter all invoices received in the system in future Board reports.
- The Board suggested including other project reports similar to the page 3 summary. Buckle suggested it would be very helpful if project reports could automatically be sent to the PI quarterly. He said that currently he has to request a copy of the E-Defense budget.

MOTION: The Board receives the second quarter financial summary of NEESinc accounts and requests that Treasurer work with NEESinc FBO Staff to modify future financial reports to the Board by adding a page similar to page 3 of the current report for each of the other projects (separate pages for each project) which shows the cumulative totals since inception. The Board also thanks Chris Rojahn for his report. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc FBO staff to modify future financial reports to the Board by:
 - On page 2, change "Net Income" to "Advance Balance/Net Income"
 - On page 2, delete line "gross profit"
 - Add a page similar to page 3 of the current report for each of the other projects (separate pages for each project) which shows the cumulative totals since inception.

15. Formation of NEESinc Special Interest Groups

Bobbitt

15.1. Concept and Potential Applications for NEESinc

15.2. Proposed Policies for Formation

- Bobbitt introduced the idea of Special Interests Groups to the Board suggesting that NEES develop a guideline or policy for establishing such groups.
- Roblee indicated that this had been helpful in the past with COSMOS where a common interest project can be supported by multiple interest groups. Andrews said this could be done with EOT as well, i.e. working with teachers group, etc.
- Board discussion included changing the name to "Common Interest Group" or "Focused Interest Groups" because "Special Interest" connotes a lobbying term.

MOTION: The Board requests the ED to further explore establishing “Common Interest Groups” including development of guidelines and/or policies for presentation to the Board for review at an upcoming Board of Director’s meeting. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc ED and FBO Staff/Manager to explore requirements for establishing Common Interest Groups including guidelines and/or policies for presentation to the Board.

16. UCSB Proposal to Expand Facilities

Steidl

- 16.1. ANSS Collaboration & Cost Considerations
- 16.2. Board Discussion and Approval

- Jamie Steidl gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Board regarding the development of an MOU between UCSB, NEESinc, and ANSS for the purposes of expanding the portfolio of permanently-instrumented dense array sites operated by UCSB and for broader opportunities related to USGS-NEES collaboration.
- The short-term request including asking the Board for approval for NEES@UCSB to use NEES cyberinfrastructure and project staff for GSMA data integration, quality control, and dissemination at no additional cost to NEESinc.
- The intermediate request would be to develop a broad based MOU between USGS-ANSS and NEESinc to cover several issues.
- Buckle asked Steidl for clarification on whether he could do this project with no additional funding even with the proposed 5% decrease in his current budget. Steidl confirmed they have the budget capacity, and by the end of the fiscal year they will have an automated system which will send the data to the different agencies involved. He also expressed interest in development of a Common Interest Group under NEES to do coordination of array data.

MOTION: The Board authorizes the expansion, at no additional cost to NEESinc, of the portfolio of permanently-instrumented dense geotechnical array sites operated by UCSB-NEES to include arrays at Borrego, Hollister, and Anchorage that were recently upgraded through a grant from the Advanced National Seismic System (ANSS). The Board also authorizes NEESinc to pursue the development of an MOU between the NEESinc and the USGS to enable several classes of collaborative joint research activities as presented by Steidl. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- ED to notify Steidl of Board approval of no-cost facility expansion.
- ED to work with UCSB and ANSS to develop MOU for broader partnership.

17. UCSD SUPP Application for 7-Story Building Slice Project

Buckle

- 17.1. Compliance with SUPP Guidelines
- 17.2. Board Discussion and Approval

- Buckle provided background regarding UCSD’s SUPP request for their 7-Story Blind Prediction Project.
- Roblee reviewed NEESinc recommendation included in the Board binder to deny funds and shared-use status for work performed in FY05, but provisional acceptance of shared-use status and well-justified MOM support for work performed in FY06.
- Board discussion included concerns of how much will be charged to NEES, what will happen with the money that is released? Concern was also expressed about being double charged, what would be done with the savings from the MOM support, and whether the savings would be used for something of benefit to NEES. The Board decided to decline the application for now, and allow for resubmission with additional documentation for the August BOD meeting.

MOTION: The Board currently declines UCSD's SUPP application for the "7-Story Building Slice Project". However, it is willing to reconsider the application for FY2006 work only at the next Board meeting if adequate financial data is provided, including how much will be charged to MOM, how much money will be released, and what will happen to the funds released. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- ED to notify UCSD of the Board decision.

18. Other Business (Including Items Removed From Consent Agenda)

Buckle

- 18.1. From Consent Agenda
 - 18.1.1. Approve NEESinc Operating Policies
 - 18.1.2. Approve Fiscal Control Document FCD-01: Subawardee Program and Budget Revisions
 - 18.1.3. Approve Members Subject to Bylaws Changes re: New Membership Classes (item 13)
- 18.2. Policy for NEESinc Endorsement of EOT Proposals (from Feb)
- 18.3. Approve New Membership (3.3.2)
- 18.4. Canadian Proposal
- 18.5. RPI Request for Funds
- 18.6. User Forum

- The Board briefly discussed the NEESinc Operating Policies as revised on June 16th.

MOTION: The Board approves the NEESinc Operating Policies as revised on June 16th. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc FBO Staff/Manager to post approved Operating Policies.

- Bobbitt indicated that he moved item 3.3.5 from the consent agenda because he had not had time to review the document since Board binders distributed at hotel on Monday. He requested that in the future items on the consent agenda need to be distributed earlier.
- Board discussion included concern regarding limiting unplanned purchases over \$5,000 without prior approval citing concerns over potential delays that could impact the progress of an experiment. Roblee offered to add an emergency clause stating that 25k would be pre-approved for emergency situations; and that NEESinc staff will respond within 5 business days for approval on all others.
- Reinhorn expressed concerns that the Equipment Site Forum did not get the chance to contribute to policy development. Roblee indicated concern over conflict of interest in having subawardees having too much influence on subawardee monitoring policies given NSF's concern that NEESinc must strengthen its management of subawards. However, Roblee agreed that Sites should be invited to comment in the future.
- The Board reassured itself that it can revisit any policy it approves at future meetings should the need arise.
- The Board requests that NEESinc staff send out a notice of this document and all future documents with a link to the policy on the website.

MOTION: The Board approves the NEESinc Fiscal Control Document "FCD-01" as shown in the distributed June 2006 BOD binder with the exception of item 9 which should be revised to allow for a five-

day turn around time for approval of purchases over \$5,000 and pre-approval of emergency items up to \$25,000 with proper documentation to be provided by the Equipment Site afterward. <<APPROVED – 1 abstention>>

ACTION ITEM:

- ED to make changes to FCD-01 described above and have ExCom review.
- Buckle requested approval of the 2 applications for new membership for the student and international applicants that could not be considered earlier due to the need for approval of Bylaws changes which was now complete.

MOTION: The Board approves the applications for new membership for the student and international applications for membership. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

- Leon presented a draft letter of support requested for the formation of the Canadian Seismic Research Network (CSRN) and its NSERC proposal entitled “Reducing Urban Seismic Risk.”
- Upon discussion the Board agreed to the send the letter of support providing that it was on a non-exclusive basis. Buckle requested that Leon work with Roblee on editing the letter and formatting onto NEESinc Board letterhead.

ACTION ITEM:

- Leon to work with Roblee to generate a non-exclusive letter of support for the formation of the Canadian Seismic Research Network (CSRN) and its NSERC proposal.
- Buckle provided background on a retroactive RPI request for Shared Use status for a project involving levee investigations stemming from failures in New Orleans during Katrina. Board discussion included whether or not this is an actual request for funding, and whether investigation of static levee failures could be considered ‘earthquake related’. The Board would like to see a cost proposal and for them to make a case for why it is earthquake related.

MOTION: The Board currently declines RPI’s SUPP application for the New Orleans Levee investigation project. However it is willing to reconsider the application for FY2006 work at the next Board meeting if RPI can explain how this project is earthquake related, and if adequate financial data is provided, including how much will be charged to MOM, how much money will be released, and what will happen to the funds released. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- ED to notify RPI of Board decision.
- Roblee raised the issue of how long retroactive SUPP requests should be considered and recommended that only prior requests be accepted beginning in FY07

MOTION: Because the NEESinc Shared Use Partnering Policy “SUPP” was just enacted, the Board will consider retroactive requests for shared use through September 1, 2006 for work completed in FY06 only, provided that the request provides proper background and financial data. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc ESO Staff/Manager to announce window of opportunity for retroactive SUPP requests to Equipment Site Forum.

- Reinhorn requested that NEESinc establish a User Forum for issues related to NEES facility users similar to the existing Equipment Site Forum.

MOTION: The Board directs NEESinc to establish a user forum similar to the current Equipment Site Forum. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc ESO Staff/Manager to establish a Facility User Forum similar to the existing Equipment Site Forum.

19. Next Meetings

- 19.1. Summer 2006 Retreat: Aug 25-26, Eugene, OR (FY07 Budgets; Strategy; Org. Consultant)
- 19.2. Fall 2006: November 17-18, Davis, CA (Sites - FY06 Performance & FY07 Work Plans)
- 19.3. Winter 2007: February 2-3, Atlanta Georgia (IT - Progress & Direction)
- 19.4. 5th AM: late June 19-23, 2007, Snowbird, UT (EOT – Progress, Prelim FY08 Budgets)
- 19.5. TBD Summer 2007: late Aug, Monterey, CA? (FY08 Budgets, Strategy, Renewal Proposal)

20. Board & Officer Transition

- 20.1. Recognition of Outgoing Directors Buckle
- 20.2. Installation of New Directors and President Roeder

- Roeder asked the Board to recognize that Roberto Leon will be the next President of the Board of Directors, asked the Board to join him in welcoming Roberto as the new President.

MOTION: The Board recognizes the four outgoing Board of Directors, Ian Buckle, Helmut Krawinkler, Carl Stepp, and Sharon Wood for their outstanding service over the past years, and especially during the start up phases of NEESinc. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board recognizes Ian Buckle, for his truly outstanding service on the NEESinc Board of Directors as the first President. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

21. Closing Comments

Leon

- Leon addressed the Board stating that he appreciates all of their trust and looks forward to working with the new Board. He added that the NEES organization owes a great deal of gratitude to Ian Buckle for his commitment over the years and for his work with not only on the Board, but also as a member of the Equipment Site Council during the construction of the NEES Equipment Sites.
- Buckle gave recognition to the Executive Committee, including Bruce Kutter for his cheerful willing participation, devotion, and never complaining; Charles Roeder for being a great secretary and being the voice of people who are not on the Board; Rojahn as Treasurer, who is wise beyond his years; and for Sharon Wood because of her clear and unequivocal views, ability to nail the issues instantly, and for working with the timing schedule of the Executive Committee Meetings.
- Buckle stated that he appreciates his work with Cliff Roblee, and has learned a lot from working with him, and lastly he would like to share his appreciation for the great company and great love for each other and gives his best wishes for the future and a thriving organization.

The Meeting Adjourned at 5:45 PM