

NEES Consortium, Inc.

MEETING MINUTES – Approved 11/17/2006
Meeting of the Board of Directors
Valley River Inn, Eugene OR



Friday, August 25, 2006: 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
Saturday, August 26, 2006: 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by Sara Moody and Lori Campbell

Notice of meeting date provided at Board Meetings of February 3-4, 2006 and June 23-24, 2006.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 2006

1. Roll Call and Welcome

Leon

- 1.1. Introduce TGoGovernance Consultant Observers
- 1.2. Review Agenda & Strategy Focus of Meeting
- 1.3. Issue Ballots for 2006-07 Vice President and ExCom Member-At-Large
 - President opened meeting at 8:05 a.m.
 - All Board Members were present except Jill Andrews, Sarah Billington, and Chris Rojahn; each who participated during the meeting via teleconference. Chris Rojahn participated in person on August 26.
 - Participation of Guests:
Clifford Roblee, NEESinc Executive Director (ED)
Sara Moody, NEESinc Executive Administrator
Lori Campbell, NEESinc Administrative Consultant
Carole Adell, TGoGovernance Consultant, e-ventexe
Cynthia Steimle, NEESinc Chief Operations Officer
Jay Berger, NEESinc Experimental Site Operations Manager
Ian Buckle, Chair, TGoGovernance”
Marc Eberhard, Chair, Site Operations Committee (SOC)
Glenn Rix, Vice-Chair, SOC
Jerome Hajjar, Vice-Chair, IT Strategy Committee (ITSC)
John Van De Lindt, Vice-Chair, Education, Outreach, and Training Committee (EOTC)
 - Leon expressed the need to move quickly through the agenda as there were a many important issues to cover.
 - Roblee briefly introduced to the Board Carole Adell of e-Ventex, TGoGovernance Consultant. Buckle will give a more detailed introduction later in the meeting.
 - Bobbitt informed the Board that he brought examples of research journals for Board Members to review, due to past discussion of offering an online journal.
 - Leon explained that due to vacations during the summer, the election process was slowed. As informed by the agenda, the election for Vice President and ExCom Member-at-Large was conducted during this meeting. Roblee distributed election ballots to the Board Members explaining the process and that they would be due back to Sara Moody or Lori Campbell by 5:00 p.m. Sara Moody e-mailed electronic ballots to Jill Andrews, Sarah Billington, and Chris Rojahn(who were participating via teleconference).

2. Approve Minutes

Leon

2.1. Meeting of June 23-24 in Washington DC Metro Area

- Leon explained that the minutes were sent to the Board approximately one month after the June 2006 meeting. He requested a motion to approve the minutes.
- Roeder requested that the minutes be distributed within two weeks of a Board of Directors meeting. Roblee indicated that this was not possible. Leon said that the Board Action Items would be distributed within 2 weeks of a meeting; however, the goal is for the minutes to be distributed within one month.
- Reinhorn had questions regarding the statement in the minutes referring to Equipment Sites keeping an auditable daily activity log for GPRA. Berger replied that this has been a request to the sites and also discussed by the SOC. Roblee added that NSF has required an audible daily log. Stokoe suggested clarification of the meaning of the term "daily log." Leon agreed to add this discussion to the Presidents Report under Agenda Item 14.

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to distribute Board Action Items to the Board of Directors within 2 weeks following a Board Meeting. Board Meeting Minutes will be targeted for distribution within one month following a Board Meeting.

MOTION: The Board approves the minutes of the June 23-24, 2006 Board of Directors Meeting.
<<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

3. Consent Agenda

Leon

Note 1: The "Informational Items" section of the Consent Agenda provides background materials intended for Board review, but not deliberation. ExCom has recommended which items to appear under this heading. Any item in the consent agenda may be removed for in-depth discussion.

Note 2: Items not removed from the Consent Agenda will be acted upon with a single vote. Approval of the Consent Agenda means that informational items listed below will be considered "received by the Board", and approval items (none this time) will be considered "approved by the Board".

Note 3: Informational materials below are grouped and cross-referenced to associated agenda items by tab number.

3.1. Review of Items for Potential Removal

Informational Items to be "Received by the Board":

- 3.1.1. Membership Report
- 3.1.2. CA Items from Site Operations Committee Report (also see Tab 4)
 - 3.1.2.1. Summary of NEESR Project Distribution at Facilities
 - 3.1.2.2. Overview of FY06 Supplements to Equipment Sites
- 3.1.3. CA Items from EOT Committee Report (also see Tab 5)
 - 3.1.3.1. NEESreu Program Update
 - 3.1.3.2. Approved CCLI-2 Proposal
- 3.1.4. CA Items from Executive Director's Report (also see Tab 13)
 - 3.1.4.1. (Item Removed)
- 3.1.5. CA Items from President's Report (also see Tab 14)
 - 3.1.5.1. NEES Delegation to September 2006 E-Defense Trip
 - 3.1.5.2. (Item removed)
 - 3.1.5.3. Recommendation for NEHRP Advisory Panel Member

3.2. BOARD DISCUSSION and VOTE ON CONSENT AGENDA

- Roblee requested and the Board agreed to the removal of Items 3.1.4.1-Revised Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms and 3.1.5.2-Updated Committee Assignments (Board Liaisons and Members) from the Consent Agenda.

- Bobbitt requested that in the future items on the Consent Agenda be distributed to the Board of Directors at least two weeks prior to the meeting to allow sufficient time for review.

MOTION: The Board received the Consent Agenda Informational Items as provided with the exception of Items 3.1.4.1 and 3.1.5.2. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to distribute Consent Agenda items at least two weeks prior to the Board of Directors meeting.
- ED to complete revised Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms per changes to the Ethics Policy and disseminate as necessary.
- President and ED to work with ExCom to select a replacement Chair-Elect for the ITSC to accommodate the early retirement of Bielak.
- ED to contact proposed appointees for EOTC, SOC, and ITSC suggested by ExCom to verify willingness to serve.

4. Site Operations Committee Report

Eberhard/Berger

4.1. Update and Final Report on Equipment Site Review

4.1.1. Site Response to SOC Assessment & SOC Follow-Up

- Eberhard gave a brief overview of the recent activities of the Site Operations Committee and the process for formulating the budget recommendation report. There were no changes to the budget amounts presented at the June BOD meeting; however, some minor changes were made to the report itself. The changes were the result of recommendations at the June meeting and requests by the equipment sites. All of the sites were given the opportunity to respond to the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threat (SWOT) analysis and to the report itself; 9 sites responded – 6 did not respond.

4.1.2. Final Recommendations re: Budget-Neutral Site Budget Redistribution

- Eberhard indicated that in the final budget report, SOC was recommending an increase in budget to four sites including Colorado (10%), Illinois (5%), RPI (5%), and Texas (5%); and cuts to both San Diego (15%) and Santa Barbara (5%). San Diego did not respond to the report recommendations; and Santa Barbara requested a decrease of 9%. These adjustments are to the FY07 MOM Budgets.

4.1.3. Final Recommendations re: Policy and Process Revisions for FY2008 Review

- Eberhard reported that one of the high priorities of the committee as a result of TGoSuccess is to switch to a Task Based Budget. This will entail a review of the Equipment Site annual work plans before the beginning of the fiscal year. Part of the annual work plan will be that the Sites are to recommend metrics on how they would like to be judged. There is also a subcommittee in the Equipment Site Forum that is working on this process. Eberhard said it will be important to make sure that the reporting requirements link with metrics and are reasonable. In summary Eberhard reported that SOC have a lot of things they need to work on. They are seeking guidance on prioritizing the activities for the upcoming year.

4.1.4. Proposed Outline for 'Best Practices Report for Sites' (for November, 2006 BOD)

4.2. Other SOC Activities

4.2.1. Status of Performance Metrics Development

- Leon stated that the key item is performance metrics. He referenced Item 14.2, an email from Joy Pauschke which stated "NSF does not intend to approve any new scope/scope changes until NEESinc can demonstrate that for the scope it has and

the funding provided, NEESinc has performance metrics in place that are actively being implemented/monitored.” Leon added that when he visited the House of Science staff, they also wanted to know what the performance metrics were and how NEES was measuring them.

- Leon said that due to time constraints a set of interim performance metrics needs to be developed, this will need to be done quickly, and mostly by staff to meet necessary deadlines. There is not a lot of time for committee and community input. This is across everything that NEESinc does, not just related to the equipment sites.

4.3. BOARD DISCUSSION

- Board discussion included strategies for developing metrics; NEESinc staff develop metrics, Sites/Equipment Site Forum developing their own metrics, and using the current metrics suggested in the FUG.
- Leon stated the Annual Work Plans are due on Sept 15th. As part of this process, the sites are required to give some metrics. Leon suggested using these as a start, adding to them with staff input, and generating a version 0.2 and then continues to modify them from there.
- Eberhard indicated that the metrics have not been a high priority item for the SOC.
- Reinhorn expressed his concern; in particular, the recent changes to the reporting requirements of the sites. Wallace echoed the same concerns stating that the form is too complex and the level of detail is too high.
- Berger explained that the level of detail came from the SOC. Last year they asked for a percentage range and there was a need to dig deep into the budget distribution so the information can be placed into a database which will show where the most activity is and provides the ability for network-wide reporting.
- Reinhorn stated that it is not the details that are unreasonable, but the process.
- Roblee indicated that NSF wants NEESinc to switch over to a work breakdown structure and is pressuring NEESinc to get very detailed. Roblee said that a solution to the problem could be a time coding system using three components: 1) resource; 2) project; 3) activity code (the five flavors of safety).

MOTION: Site reporting requirements disseminated by NEESinc Headquarters need to be discussed with Equipment Site Forum before being implemented. <<MOTION FAILED -- 4 YES; 8 NO>>

- Berger thanked Reinhorn for his motion and input. He indicated that the Board’s comments and suggestions would be taken into consideration by staff and the Equipment Site Forum. Roblee also thanked Reinhorn, adding that not everyone takes the reporting requirements as seriously as Buffalo which tends to cause mixed results.
- Leon suggested that the SOC prioritize their work in the following order: 1) Performance Metrics; 2) Review of Annual Work Plans; 3) Best Practices Document; 4) Reporting Requirements; 5) Major Repair Policy.

DIRECTIVE – LEON: Site Operations Committee (SOC) to prioritize work tasks as follows: 1) Review Sites Performance Metrics; 2) Review FY07 Equipment Sites Annual Work Plans; 3) Develop a Best Practices Document; 4) Review Site Reporting Requirements; 5) Review Major Repair Policy; 6) Complete FY07 Equipment Site Performance Review. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ESO Staff to establish continuous improvement process to streamline the current reporting requirements of Equipment Sites with input from Sites, Equipment Site Forum, and SOC.

- Equipment sites to send in quarterly activity reports by September 15th which should also include performance metrics.
- Site Operations Committee (SOC) to review performance metrics received by Equipment Sites.

5. EOT Committee Report

Van de Lindt/Steimle

Leon introduced John Van De Lindt, Chair-Elect of the EOT Committee, who would give the report on the EOT Committee activities on behalf of Shirley Dyke.

5.1. Updated Execution Plan and Status of Activities

- Van De Lindt gave a brief overview on the status of current EOTC activities including the EOT Strategic Plan Goals and updated Execution Plan that has an added Appendix B which includes a timeline and milestone dates for ongoing and future activities.
- Roblee reported that NEESinc has lost their EOT Manager, which has impacted a few of the EOTC items. Until a replacement can be found, NEESinc has contracted with Jim Doward to help develop assessment guidelines.

5.2. Other EOTC Activities

5.2.1. 5th Annual Meeting Planning

- Kutter asked for clarification of the makeup of the Annual Meeting Steering Committee. Roblee indicated that it was a combination of Board Members and EOTC Members.
- Leon suggested that the AM Steering Committee needs to begin meeting right away to come up with a theme and publicize the event much earlier than in the past.

5.2.2. Status of Performance Metrics Development

- This item was not discussed.

5.3. BOARD DISCUSSION

- Bobbitt stated that NEESinc needs to decide whether practitioners are considered a part of NEES or part of outreach. Van de Lindt indicated that currently they are considered outreach, but the plan is to bring them in.
- Comartin responded that the Board needs to think in terms that an earthquake community consisting of academics, practitioners, and policy exists; but NEES should know that there are other groups who also represent the community. The unwritten motivation by NSF is that NEES should be the “community” and this is offensive to the other earthquake-related organizations.
- Other Board discussion included conversation regarding what practitioners would get out of the Annual Meeting and how to engage them in NEES activities. Suggestions included bringing them to the meeting to meet the Young Researchers; thinking of practitioners as partners; and showing practitioners what is happening in the lab and how it relates to their day to day activities.

DIRECTIVE – COMARTIN: NEESinc governance and management needs to recognize that the earthquake engineering “community” (of academics, practitioners, policy makers, etc.) exists either with or without NEES; that it is offensive to the community to have NEES identify itself as representing that community or “reaching out” to that community; and that NEES must diligently undertake “inreach” initiatives to assure that NEES becomes better integrated into the community. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to finalize membership of the 5th Annual Meeting Steering Committee (5AMSC) including contacting the Board appointees suggested by ExCom. The 5AMSC needs to get underway immediately to develop a theme and publicize the meeting much earlier than in the past.
- Annual Meeting Steering Committee to immediately begin working on planning the Annual Meeting, i.e., sending out announcements and outreach to practitioners.
- President and ED to work with TGoGovernance, TGoSuccess, TGoITVision, and Board to clearly define the “**NEES Community**” and clearly identify and strengthen the **programs and services** that NEESinc offers to the “Community” (e.g. MOM, Shared-Use Partnering, International, Cyber, EOT, etc.).

6. IT Strategy Committee (ITSC) Report

Hajjar/Lea

6.1. Summary Presentation on Progress on DataPlus Plan

6.1.1. NEESit Activities: Data Management & Telepresence

- Hajjar reported on the history and status of the ITSC’s recommendation that NEESit adopt a “data centric” work plan with emphasis on end-to-end data flow, NEESit’s FY06 Expenditures, and NEESit’s level of effort based on total dollars spent in FY06.
- Hajjar reviewed the current status of data management and reported that Sharon Wood’s SFSI project is being used as a “Use Case Project” to drive the data requirements for NEEScentral. They have been holding bi-weekly WebEx meetings with the Site PI’s and others to drive the development of the NEES Data Model. The data model is continuing to be developed and scheduled to be enhanced in FY07 to address all experimental and simulation domains, in addition to complete capabilities for data curation and archiving, including querying.
- Hajjar also reported that NEESit is planning to hire a Data Modeler to formalize the development and management of the data model; the recently hired Data Curator at NEESinc, who has a strong background in data modeling, will work closely with the data modeler.
- Hajjar explained that Laura Lowe’s project is being used as the “Use Case Project” for Telepresence to drive user requirements. Bi-weekly WebEx meetings have been held and extensive test bed activity was conducted during two tests at the MAST facility with several participants using interactive live and in playback mode to provide detailed feedback to NEESit. Hajjar also reported that NEESinc has contracted with Create to make NEES specific enhancements and for technical support.
- Hajjar affirmed that NEESit has been very responsible and is making direct and measurable success in development of user features in RDV and RBNB. For the upcoming year, there is interest in expanding from the current focus which is primarily on detailed drill-down features to a broader view of implementing a collaborative environment.

6.1.2. HQ-Driven Initiative: Hybrid Simulation Working Group

Hajjar explained that the stakeholders of the Hybrid Simulation Working Group, which include UIUC, UCB, ITSC, NEESit, and NEESinc met at the NEES Annual Meeting to discuss how to best meet the needs of the NEES Hybrid Simulation Community. During this meeting, they decided on a two-phased approach: Phase I to prepare final user/system documentation for Open Fresco and SIMCOR and install on each other’s testing equipment; and Phase II for FY07 to start developing plans for a “NEES Hybrid Simulation Framework that all non-real time Hybrid Simulation sites could use and extend. Two meetings have been held since the Annual Meeting.

6.2. ITSC Recommendations Regarding FY07 IT Budget

- Hajjar reported that the ITSC gives a generally positive review of NEESit services: Their personnel have been responsive to needs of sites and researchers; their website is useful; and WebEx is seeing excellent use.
- Hajjar reviewed the NEESit Budget process for FY07 including ITSC recommendations previously made to NEESit at the June Committee meeting. ITSC recommendations included that NEESit provide similar FTE distributions as FY06 for the first 6 months of FY07; and that they present a full year Scope of Work and budget, but to focus on a six month work plan. They also recommended that they provide a more descriptive executive summary in the work plan to tie everything together.
- Hajjar explained that in response to these recommendations NEESit, NEESinc, ITSC, and leadership worked together to develop Work Plan v0.95, which includes an emphasis on data, NEEScentral, uploading tools, searching, using data, and End-to-End process, publication of data.
- Hajjar reported the ITSC recommendations to the Board which include a recommendation that the Board approve the current work plan for the first six months of FY2007 operation; and recommends that the Board ask the NEESit PI to deliver a final FY2007 work plan to the ITSC no later than October 1, 2006. The ITSC will then deliver to the Board a recommendation on that work plan in time for the November 17-18, 2006 Board meeting.
- Hajjar explained that the ITSC believes the proposed IT budget for NEESit is reasonably aligned with work plan priorities and does not expect the overall budget to change as a result of any modifications that may be made at the November 2006 Board Meeting. Therefore, the ITSC recommends approval of the overall 12-month IT budget.
- Hajjar also indicated that the ITSC agrees that the NEESit subaward amount of approximately \$3.9 million is reasonable, and recommends Board approval of that amount.

6.3. Other ITSC Activities

6.3.1. Status of Performance Metrics Development

- Hajjar reported that the "TGoSuccess" met in Chicago on July 29th where they identified needs, ideas, and metrics for IT.
- Hajjar said the "TGoITVision" held teleconferences on August 9th and 23rd and held a meeting in Chicago on August 31st and have developed a draft Vision Document.
- Hajjar indicated that an "IT Metrics Subcommittee" of the ITSC has been formed, but has not yet met. This Subcommittee is composed of ITSC members, NEESit, and NEESinc staff. The Subcommittee will seek to identify metrics that are uniform, fair, achievable, and aligned with the long-term interests of advancing earthquake engineering research.

6.4. BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments for the ITSC.

7. NEESit Director's Report

Elgamal/Van Den Einde

7.1. NEES Cyberinfrastructure Center Year-3 Statement of Work

7.2. FY07 Plans & Priorities for NEES' "IT Vision Elements"

- 7.2.1. Collaboration
- 7.2.2. Data
- 7.2.3. Simulation
- 7.2.4. Visualization
- 7.2.5. Hybrid Simulation
- 7.2.6. IT for Expanding EOT

- 7.2.7. Advanced Cyberinfrastructure
- 7.2.8. Integration

7.3. BOARD DISCUSSION

Elgamal gave a thorough report on the NEESit Statement of Work v.095; it was well received by the Board.

8. FY2007 Budget – Part 1: NEESinc Budget Package

Roblee

8.1. Background Information

Roblee introduced the budget package and explained that the NEESinc budget information and recommendations shall be treated as confidential and sensitive.

8.1.1. FY05 Carryover Summary

Roblee reviewed the FY2005 Carryover Summary which summarized the background and status of FY2005 carryover including information regarding the sources of funds and their ultimate usage.

8.1.2. FY06 Projected Carryover Estimates

Roblee reviewed the FY2006 Projected Carryover estimates which were developed by using: The monthly average of invoiced billings to date to project forward for months where no invoice has been received; using a summary of carryover projections provided to NEESinc by Subawardees in mid-July; and NEESinc's interpretation of data provided.

8.2. Recommended FY07 Budgets

8.2.1. Background

- Roblee stated that the information contained in the budget package was considered sensitive and should be kept and treated as confidential.
- Roblee reviewed the NEESinc Headquarters recommendations regarding three overall FY07 NEESinc budgets to be considered for approval by the BOD.

8.2.2. Overview of NEESinc Budget – Introduction

Roblee explained that the overall NEESinc budget was presented as consisting of five primary components including HQ-Basic Operations; HQ-Community Support; MTS Subaward; aggregate of the 15 ES Subawards; and the NEESit Subaward.

8.2.3. Basis for Budget Recommendations

- 8.2.3.1. Begin Budget Neutral with 2007 MOM
- 8.2.3.2. Macro Adjustments (SOC, Targeted, HQ Staff Needs)
- 8.2.3.3. Annualized Equipment Maintenance and Risk Management
- 8.2.3.4. Component Distributions
- 8.2.3.5. New Special Initiatives

Roblee reviewed the basis for the NEESinc Budget recommendations and provided information regarding additional staffing needs at NEESinc Headquarters.

8.2.4. Miscellaneous Awards (NEESreu, Tsunami Supplement, Other)

Roblee explained that with the exception of the NEESreu project and the Tsunami Supplement to NEESit, the inherited small NSF awards were not considered in the budget narrative because they represent independent awards from the NSF and funds cannot be commingled with the MOM award.

8.2.5. Proposed Board Motions

Roblee reviewed the NEESinc proposed motions to the BOD explaining that because of uncertainties outlined in Section A of his report, NEESinc recommends that the FY07 budget be considered by the Board as a series of several independent motions.

- 8.3. BOARD QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS (Deliberations to be held until Item 10)
Stokoe requested clarification regarding whether the request by NEESinc to increase staff at Headquarters was truly budget neutral, or if some of the money was coming from Equipment Sites. Roblee confirmed that the item was budget neutral and that \$200k in funds was being rebudgeted within the system and the other \$200k would come from a risk management funds remaining from FY06.

9. FY2007 Budget – Part 2: Treasurer’s Report

Rojahn

- 9.1. Approve Quarterly Financial Report
Rojahn presented the Third Quarter Financial Report indicating that the report starting on page three is a new format based on NSF recommendations. This report will be submitted to NSF on a quarterly basis.
- 9.2. Finance Committee Recommendations re: NEESinc-Recommended FY07 Budgets
Rojahn reviewed the following recommendations of Finance Committee to the Board:
- That the base budget be approved as submitted;
 - That the enhanced budget be approved in principle;
 - That the full budget be approved in principle; and
 - That the full Board develop priorities for use of FY2006 carryover funds, recognizing that actual carryover fund amounts may be substantially different than currently projected;
 - That NEESinc Staff be authorized to conduct final budget negotiations based on priorities set by the Board for the use of FY2006 carryover funds, and with the approval of the Executive Committee; and
 - That the full Board ratify the FY2007 budget after it has been negotiated with NSF.
- 9.3. Other Business
Leon thanked the Finance Committee and Rojahn for the good job in putting the reports in an easy fashion to understand.

10. FY2007 Budget – Part 3: BOARD DELIBERATION and Budget(s) Vote

Leon

Note: For purposes of the budget vote, NEESinc Equipment Site Directors are viewed as “Interested Directors” and will be recused from at least a portion of the deliberations as well as the votes.

- 10.1. ‘Base’ FY2007 Budget (Without FY-06 Carryover)
10.2. Authority To Finalize Budget Distributions Within Each Subaward
10.3. ‘Enhanced’ 2007 Budget (With Category 2 & 3 Carryover)
10.4. ‘Full’ 2007 Budget (With Category 4 Carryover)

MOTION: The Board approves the “FY07 Base Budget” as provided in the binder; which fully incorporates budget recommendations of both SOC and ITSC. <<ES Directors recused; APPROVED – unanimous voice vote of 9 non-recused Directors>>

MOTION: The Board approves in principle the “FY07 Enhanced Budget” as provided in the binder. Individual priorities and amounts may change based upon final carryover amounts and further deliberations. <<ES Directors recused; APPROVED – unanimous voice vote of 9 non-recused Directors>>

MOTION: The Board approves in principle the “FY07 Full Budget” as provided in the binder. Individual priorities and amounts may change based upon final carryover amounts and further deliberations. <<ES Directors recused; APPROVED – unanimous voice vote of 9 non-recused Directors>>

DIRECTIVE – LEON: NEESinc ED is authorized to develop carryover report/request to NSF and conduct final budget negotiations based on general concepts outlined in “enhanced” and “full” budgets with Category-4 priorities as established by later Board deliberations. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

DIRECTIVE – LEON: Final FY07 budgets shall be ratified by either the ExCom or the Board once final carryover amounts are known and budget negotiations with NSF are complete. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to prepare final FY07 budget for ratification by Board that incorporates 'actual' carryover based on FY06 year-end financials and NSF approved funding.

11. Strategy Session A – Preliminary Reports From Task Groups

11.1. "TGoSuccess" to Define NEESinc Mission and Strategic Success Metrics **Roeder**
Roeder reviewed the progress of the TGoSuccess group which recently met for the first time in Chicago in July. The purpose of this initial meeting was to define the following:

- goals and operational methods of TGoSuccess;
- realistic goals and objectives for NEES;
- possible measures for each goal and objective; and
- individual responsibilities and schedule for proceeding

During the meeting, TGoSuccess divided the topics into major subheadings and defined the needs, ideas, and metrics for each. They then established working groups which will each prepare a 1 to 2 page document by mid- to late September. Another meeting will be convened for iterations with a full report available to the Board before the November 2006 BOD meeting.

11.2. "TGoITVision" to Define Community-Endorsed Vision for NEES' IT **Hajjar**
Hajjar gave an overview of the history and progress of the TGoITVision indicating that the group was initiated on August 1st and had already held two teleconferences and would be meeting in person on August 31st in Chicago.

- Hajjar reported that TGOITVision will have a draft report by October 1st which will be sent out for review with comments due by October 10th. A final draft will be presented to the Board at the November meeting.
- Hajjar reviewed the task group's implementation strategy for the report, including that it will be as brief as possible, but will include solid recommendations and details, and will include summaries suitable for posting nuggets. The final report implementation themes include: Balancing robust technologies with cutting-edge opportunities; Reinforcing and building off of NSF goals of IT within NEES; and Highlighting goals of making NEES an outstanding example of integration of IT within an engineering/science community.
- Hajjar reported that in conclusion the task group is on its way and working well. He indicated that there was a good balance of ideas and the general consensus seems relatively quick on issues. He also reported that interaction with TGoSuccess, ITSC, and NEESit will be ongoing.
- Board discussion included that it may be better to target use scenarios not tied to a research project, but more generic that allows more fluid interaction with the IT Team. Board members also suggested the committee should focus more on goals for 2 and 7 years, not 8 plus years, and that for future presentations to use pictures for a better visual.

ACTION ITEMS:

- TGoITVision to focus on goals for 2 and 7 years, not 8 plus years.
- TGoITVision to incorporate pictures and graphics into their description of vision.

11.3. "TGoGovernance" to Explore/Refine Roles & Responsibilities of Governance **Buckle**
Buckle referred the Board attachment in the binder for an overview of the purpose and authority of TGoGovernance, as well as a membership list.

- Buckle indicated that a RFP was sent out in early July for an organizational consultant to conduct a performance assessment which would identify opportunities for improvement to NEESinc governance. Interviews were conducted on July 25th at NEESinc Headquarters , and it was determined that e-Ventexe was the most qualified for the job.
- Buckle reported that the Task Group will have an interim report for the Board in November, and a final report in December.

12. TGoGovernance Consultant – Part 1

Carole Adell

12.1. Introduction to Adell and e-VentExe

Buckle informed the Board that Carole Adell, who has 15 years of experience as an HR/Organizational Consultant, will take the lead for the NEESinc project. e-VentExe will have five others also working on the project.

12.2. Overview Role in NEESinc Governance Review

- Adell thanked the Board for inviting her to the meeting. She indicated that it has been helpful to meet the group face to face and be able to observe the dialogue at the Board meeting.
- Adell provided a background overview of the e-VentExe Company which is located in Roseville, California and was incorporated in 2000. Adell indicated that e-Ventexe is a full service consulting firm which provides organization development and human resources consulting, and each of their consultants have more than 10 years of experience working with boards, associations, and commissions.
- Adell reviewed the technical approach, timeline, and deliverables their firm will provide to NEESinc. She reviewed the resources that will be used for analysis (lists of both were included in the Board binder under Item 12.2). Adell indicated that the first deliverable, which was to perform the initial analysis and identify resources for further research was already completed. And the second task, which was to observe a BOD meeting, was underway at this meeting. The next step will be to provide a preliminary online survey analysis. This will include conducting follow-up interviews with selected survey participants.
- Roeder suggested the need for the survey to reach other research sites that are part of the earthquake field, but not part of NEES. He indicated that there are a lot of universities that feel that NEES is causing them more pain than is reality. Roblee should work with Roeder, Leon, Ramirez, and others to expand the survey pool to include representatives who operate labs, but who do not receive NEES funding. Adell suggested that if Board Members had any additional documents or contacts, to please forward them to Cliff or Ian.
- Adell stated that they would be looking at NEES Governance, how the Board operates, and how the organization is run. One of the main purposes of the study is to identify the consistencies and inconsistencies of each area of analysis which play out in the decision making process.
- Leon requested the Board's dedication in the process and that they take the time to complete the survey when they receive it.
- Buckle suggested that Roblee provide Adell with the Annual Meeting Tracking Survey.

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to work with Roeder, Leon, Ramirez, and others to expand TGoGovernance survey pool to include representatives who operate labs but who do not receive NEES MOM funds.
- ED to provide NEESinc Annual Tracking Survey information to TGoGovernance consultant.
- TGoSuccess, TGoGovernance, and TGoITVision to submit preliminary reports to NEESinc by November 1 for inclusion in Board Meeting distribution.

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to prepare final draft policy for Common Interest Groups (CIGs).

13. Executive Director's Report

Roblee

13.1. Potential for NEESinc-ATC Collaboration

13.2. Status of 'Common Interest Groups'

Roblee postponed this report to the November Board of Directors meeting.

14. President's Report

Leon

14.1. Report from July 6, 2006 Visit with House Science Committee Staff

- Leon reviewed his report on his recent visit with Joy Pauschke to talk to the House Science Committee Staff on July 6, 2006. He stated they spent a fair amount of time with questions and answers about metrics and the continuity between the amount of MOM funds and the amount of research funds.
- Leon indicated that Jack Hayes from NEHRP should be brought to a BOD meeting in the near future.
- Leon also stressed that it was imperative that at next years visit to the House Science Committee, nuggets will need to be presented. He commented they really liked the one page color flyers from the sites that give an overview/summary of what the site does.

14.2. NSF Urgency for NEES Performance Metrics

Leon referred to an e-mail from Joy Pauschke to Cliff Roblee, which stated "NSF does not intend to approve any new scope/scope changes until NEESinc can demonstrate that for the scope it has and the funding provided, NEESinc has performance metrics in place that are actively being implemented/monitored."

ACTION ITEMS:

- President and ED to emphasize to Equipment Site Forum, SOC, other NEES units, and users the need to promptly develop meaningful metrics to track the progress of the organization. Sites should include recommended metrics with AWP and QAR submittals on September 15.

14.3. Bylaws Issues re: 'Representative' Requirements

14.3.1. Equipment Site Directors

14.3.2. Institutional Directors

- Leon reported that in accordance with the current Bylaws, some of the Directors are not in compliance. With the current wording of the Bylaws, only the Chair of the School or the Dean could be an Institutional Member, and only the PI of an Equipment Site is eligible to serve on the BOD.
- Leon indicated that after the Legal Counsel work is done, they will be presenting the changes to the Bylaws to the Board for approval.
- Leon said that he would also like to investigate whether the Bylaws can be changed so that the Board can vote via e-mail.
- Roblee reviewed the Bylaws current wording regarding Institutional Members and Equipment Site Members and requested a motion to change the qualifications of an Institutional Member.

MOTION: In accordance with the NEESinc Bylaws, the Board establishes the qualifications of an Institutional Representative as follows:

"shall be (i) if an academic institution, a Department Chair or such other designated representative; (ii) if a research institute or non-profit organization, an executive-level representative of the organization or member of the Board of Directors or such other designated representative; (iii) if a government agency, the head administrator of the branch of the agency relevant to NEES or such other designated representative."

The Bylaws should be revised to reflect this change. <<APPROVED – voice vote; 1 abstention>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to implement approved revisions to Bylaws pertaining to definitions of Institutional and Equipment Site 'Representatives.'
- ED to investigate legality of potential Bylaws changes that would enable electronic voting of the Board on items without requiring unanimous consent of all members.

14.4. Affiliate Sites Proposal

- Leon introduced the Affiliate Sites Proposal idea to bring in other Universities, and asked the Board to set aside 10 minutes on the following day to give feedback.

ACTION ITEMS:

- President and ED to continue to develop concepts for Affiliate Sites Program and investigate interest at NSF and among potential affiliates. Issues remaining to be addressed include whether there are sufficient incentives for participation (initial and long-term) and establishing criteria for evaluating proposals.

14.5. Response to June SUPP Requests for More Information

14.5.1. RPI

Roblee reviewed the history of the RPI request for Shared-Use Partnering Policy (SUPP) from the previous meeting, in which the Board requested they resubmit their request with further information including how it is related to earthquake engineering, and how the funds will be used. Roblee indicated that they submitted a letter of response (see attachment). The letter stated that it was not earthquake related, however, it is a natural disaster, and they are not requesting any money.

After discussion by the Board about release of funds, language in the SUPP outlining the requirements for earthquake engineering related research, and changing the time to green time, the Board again denied the application. They, however, discussed an invitation to RPI to resubmit the request and address the issue of the research being related to earthquake engineering, as well as possible upload of the data to NEEScentral.

DIRECTIVE – LEON: The RPI request for approval of shared-use status for its New Orleans levee failure study is considered insufficient to warrant approval as it does not satisfactorily address the Shared-Use Partnering Policy requirements that work must be earthquake related. RPI is welcome to resubmit the request if it can demonstrate the research is earthquake related. Note that the Board does recognize the value of the levee study and invites RPI and its research sponsor to upload these data into NEEScentral. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- ED to notify RPI of outcome of SUPP request.

14.6. Other Business

- Board of Directors Meeting Package: Leon asked the Board if they were satisfied with the way the Board Binder has been distributed, and requested that members who would like to receive it in electronic format should let Sara Moody know. Spencer indicated that he prefers the electronic format.

ACTION ITEM:

- Moody to poll Directors for those interested in only receiving electronic versions of Board of Directors Meeting packages.

- Equipment Site Year End Close: Reinhorn reported that Equipment Sites are not able to function due to a 90 day end of year close. Roblee clarified that there are multiple kinds of carryover including: Encumbered, but not yet paid; Possible unexpended; and unencumbered.
- Funding Obligations: Reinhorn discussed the issues associated with a letter of intent to fund the project at the beginning of the year. He indicated that his University will not for project expenses until the funds are actually obligated. Further, of the 12 months, the university can only operate 6 months. Roblee suggested that we take this scenario to NSF and notify them that Equipment Sites are stopping work because they can not operate without funding. Buckle suggested putting together some examples where a research project is being delayed and the University is going to absorb a risk. Comartin indicated that this is a problem of capitalization, and perhaps the Finance Committee should make a recommendation to the Board on this business practice. Roblee replied that NSF does recognize that NEESinc is not capitalized, however the University does have capital.

ACTION ITEM:

- ESO staff to work with Equipment Site Forum to compile examples of adverse impacts of fiscal-year-end funding discontinuity provided by Sites for consideration by governance and NSF.
- GPRA and Daily Log: Reinhorn discussed issues with the daily log – GPRA – for major equipment. There are several sites that have assemblies for actuators and other equipment such as Lehigh, Illinois, etc. Roblee clarified that NEESinc is only asking for the shake table days.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:50 PM PDT

AGENDA – SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 2006

15. EXECUTIVE SESSION - BOARD MEMBERS ONLY (TGoGovernance Consultant to Observe)

15.1. Compensation Committee Update

Kutter

15.2. Other Business

15.3. BOARD DISCUSSION

- During it's Executive Session, the Board (*minutes provided by Leon*):
 - Received the report of the Compensation Committee (CC) on the goals and duties of the Executive Director (ED). The committee discussed and prioritized the goals for the next year; Goals 1, 2, 3 and 5 from the CC document were considered as key goals for the ED and the organization. The Board gave extensive feedback to the CC, which will draft a final version of the document. The CC and the President will convey to the ED the sense of the Board discussions. Goals will change with time as the organization develops.
 - Discussed the request for increased staff at HQ. The Board recognizes the needs and supports the request, but would like to see detailed job descriptions for the new positions as those do not yet exist. It would be particularly helpful to understand how the duties currently handled by the ED will be split between the ED and the new deputy director.
 - Discussed the need to streamline the information gathering from the sites by HQ. The sites are not clear on why certain metrics were selected (GPRA, for example), how is all the information used, and whether HQ is collecting the minimum needed or more. In the future it will be helpful to the sites if preliminary can see drafts of upcoming request and provide input. The sites are clear that often the request come with a very short lead time and will try to respond promptly.
 - Agreed to emphasize to the sites and other NEES units and users the need to promptly develop meaningful metrics to track the progress of the organization.
 - Conducted the elections for members of the Executive Committee. Ken Stoke was elected Vice-President and John Wallace as an at-large representative.

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to provide the Board with detailed job descriptions for new proposed positions and show how current duties of the ED will be split with a Deputy Director.
- Compensation Committee to complete a final report including prioritized goals and duties of the ED. Teleconference to be held with ED to review final versions.

16. TGoGovernance Consultant – Part 2

Carole Adell

16.1. Review Best Practices of Boards of Directors

Adell reviewed the best practices for primary responsibilities of the Board and gave examples of each of the following:

- Determining mission and purpose;
- Selecting the Chief Executive;
- Support the Chief Executive and assess work performance;
- Ensure effective organizational planning;
- Ensure adequate resources;
- Manage resources effectively;
- Determine, monitor, and strengthen the organization's programs and services;
- Enhance the organization's public standing;
- Ensure legal and ethical integrity and maintain accountability; and
- Recruit and orient board members and assess board performance.

Adell reported that some of the questions e-Ventex would like to answer through their work are:

- How effective is the Board and the organization in developing and executing the mission, and strategic plans?
- Which enhancements to organization policies, procedures and operational practices would help to clarify roles, responsibilities and accountabilities for the Board, Executive Director, Staff and Committees?
- What reports and/or information are provided to the Board, Committees and staff that measure performance?
- What is the process of the Board and NEESinc utilize to analyze information and take corrective action?
- Which practices create potential conflicts of interest according to the organization's by-laws, policies, State or Federal guidelines?
- What do members and the community served by the organization perceive to be valuable and invaluable regarding their time and participation in the organization?

16.2. BOARD DISCUSSION of NEESinc Perspectives and Needs (*Facilitated during presentation*)

- Roblee indicated that at the most recent NSF Site Visit the Team was unhappy with the Mission Statement in the current Bylaws.
- Roeder asked for clarification regarding the difference between a COO and a CEO. Adell explained that there are different types of Chief Executives; they can range from being an Executive Secretary, to a Chief Operations Officer, or a Chief Executive Officer. Each of these hold different ranges of duties. For example: An Executive Secretary would do primarily secretarial/administrative type of work; a Chief Operations Officer would handle primarily daily operations of the organization; and a Chief Executive Officer would oversee the overall company operations.
- Leon inquired to Adell that since NEES is a different type of Board, if she thought there would be merit to bringing in other professions to the Board. Adell replied that this is something that her organization will be looking into.
- Roblee asked Adell to comment on whether NEESinc was unique in the fact that it is solely dependant on NSF. Adell responded that it is not entirely unique, but how it does impact the organization, other organizations that have more than one funding source have more flexibility, because they know that if one funding source goes away, they have the option of expanding another funding source.
- Roblee indicated that NEES has never clearly defined its programs precisely (MOM, International, EOT). Adell replied that you can not solicit other funding sources unless you are clear what you are marketing.
- Comartin expressed his concern with EOT. He also said that the perception of what people think NEES is may not really be what it is; a lot of people don't know what NEES really is.
- Rojahn said we should think big and independently of NSF, NEES is a legal entity.
- Buckle suggested going to get other funding, separate from NSF.
- Adell replied that by defining NEES and how large or small the community is and coming up with marketing materials for NEES will come in handy. Will it end in 10 years because we rely on NSF, or phase out of NSF funds and move on to other things?
- Adell indicated that a great deal of the documentation she has received from NEES works toward the topic "ensure that the legal and ethical integrity and maintain accountability." Adell said that this is a big area of progress for NEES. She also indicated that another

observation is the evolutionary process of the Bylaws; there are some things that will strengthen this.

- Adell reported that the survey will go out at the end of the week, or the beginning of the following week, and should take approximately 30-60 minutes to complete. Adell indicated there will be a short turn around for the report.
- Comartin suggested that the Board President personally contact or send an email to the community and tell them how important it is to NEES for them to complete the survey.
- Leon thanked Carole for her presentation.

ACTION ITEMS:

- **President and ED to send an e-mail to community informing them about the TGoGovernance Survey and its importance to NEES. Once the survey is sent out, Board Members will be asked to contact those participants who have not returned surveys.**
- **President and ED to work with Board members to explore opportunities to augment funding from other sources. Investigate support for unified program to market Site (both "green" and "red" time) and Cyber capabilities of NEESinc to other sponsors.**

17. Strategy Session B – Breakout Sessions

Breakout Groups

Leon introduced the four topics to the working groups, asking them to spend an hour and a half discussing the topics and then return to review/report the ideas.

17.1. Group 1: Outreach to Federal and State Agencies

Chair: Leon

Board Members: Andrews, Billington, Stokoe

Other Participants: Eberhard

NEESinc Staff: Roblee

17.2. Group 2: Outreach to Practitioners and Members

Chair: Comartin

Board Members: Ramirez, Rojahn, Wallace

Other Participants: Rix

NEESinc Staff: Steimle

17.3. Group 3: International Relationships

Chair: Buckle

Board Members: Kutter, Spencer, Roeder

Other Participants: Van de Lindt

NEESinc Staff: Berger

17.4. Group 4: IT Progress and Direction

Chair: Bobbitt

Board Members: Elgamil, Myers, Reinhorn

Other Participants: Hajjar, Van Den Einde

NEESinc Staff: Lea

18. Strategic Session C - Outreach to Federal and State Agencies

Leon

18.1. Group 1 Recommendations

Roblee reported that the group framed the conversation in two ways to make sure that some conversation was spent on Engineering and some on EOT. They also wanted to identify what services NEES provides, who benefits, and what mechanisms/processes there are to make them happen.

Engineering Recommendations:

- Get NEES Products/Services into National Solicitations (NCHRP & FHWA Pooled)
 - Possibly provide reduced rates
 - Wider scope of expertise and capabilities
 - Unlink facility and research investigator
- Stipends/Honoraria for Industry Advisors on NEESR Projects
 - Write 'brief/nugget' on project implementation
 - NEESinc contract – get input from PI's regarding desired consultants

- Public Policy Initiative
 - Multiple meetings with stakeholders (e.g. LA City & County)
 - Capture needs – add projects that translate research into practical
- Other Stakeholder Organizations
 - NEHRP Agencies
 - DOT's/FHWA
 - Insurance
 - Emergency response?
- International Development
 - USAID
 - World Bank
 - NATO
 - Specific Countries: Indonesia, Pakistan, Turkey

EOT Recommendations

Roblee indicated that while looking into the EOT arena, we have to be careful not to recreate the Execution Plan.

- Summer Institute – Connect to RET Program
- CENIC – Distance Learning
- Future STEM Engineering Workforce
- Coordinating NEESR EOT Projects
- National Design Competition (e.g. Westpoint Bridge Designer; Cracking Dams; Webquests) – connect to OpenSees

18.2. BOARD DISCUSSION

- Andrews suggested that at the next Board meeting, the EOTC could review the Executive Plan and how they came up with the ideas on it. Roblee agreed that this was a good idea, especially since a new EOT Manager will be on staff. It would be good to hear the presentation, and also to get feedback from the Board.
- Other discussion included discussing ways to implement the recommendations. A metric that the Equipment Sites should have is to get on the program of organizations (such as ASHTO) to advertise more.
- Roeder indicated that the mechanism isn't there for the practitioners to use the facilities; NEES places emphasis on the facility and not enough on the people. Roeder also doesn't feel that NEES keeps good enough tabs on the membership; who they are, and what they are doing.
- Stokoe replied that if NEES could let researchers use the Equipment Sites with NSF's approval it would be green time and it could lead to cost savings. He also indicated that NEES would have to be careful so it isn't competitive.

19. Strategic Session D - Outreach to Practitioners and Members

Comartin

19.1. Group 2 Recommendations

Comartin reported that their group decided to change their name to "Outreach to the Broader Earthquake Community." They focused on five key strategies which included partnering with other groups; getting more data sets; linking data sets to documents; co-producing practical seminars/workshops, and encouraging NEES branding. Comartin indicated that most of their time was spent discussing what message is trying to be conveyed, and what do people think of NEES at this point. Comartin included that practitioners are not data oriented (they are results oriented) and when they think about NEES they tend to think about NEES as being a bunch of geeks gathering data and "what can they do for me?" Comartin said that NEES needs to think about changing that attitude.

Comartin stated that one way to catch up very fast would be to partner with existing groups. There is a bit of backlash with NEES, and if NEES could develop good relationships with other organizations, they would go a long way.

Outreach to the Broader Earthquake Community Recommendations

- Partnering with Other Groups
 - EERI: Seminars; Journal; Public Policy; Reconnaissance
 - ATC: Guidelines for Practice; Training Products and Workshops
- Getting More Data Sets
 - Short Term (Category 4): EERI Reconnaissance Data; Prior Research
 - Longer Term: Operating Budget Line Item; Annual RFP's
- Linking Data Sets to Documents
 - Short Term Pilot Projects: Technical Article from Spectra; ATC Guideline Documents (FEMA 440)
- Co-Producing Practical Seminars/Workshop
 - Examples: Project-Related Testing; Simulation
- Encouraging NEES "Branding"
 - Concrete Coalition
 - "Green Time" Reports

19.2. BOARD DISCUSSION

- Data Sets could be the focus of the Affiliate Program.
 - Bobbitt reported that in order to get more data sets there will be a need for a different data model, and there will be costs involved in that process.
 - Comartin replied that there would need to be an RFP and NEES could provide funding for the data.
 - Wallace replied that he is all for getting more data, and believes that is how you get more people interested.
 - Roblee said that in lieu of having affiliate sites, this could be a way to obtain data sets.
 - Elgamal stated that he is prepared to work immediately with EERI to start this process.
 - Bobbitt reiterated that there is a cost to store data, but it is an asset if you use it.
 - Reinhorn mentioned that the NEES Data Archiving Policies have precise descriptions for use by whoever is using the data; however the tools for implementation need to be included by NEESit.
- Report Covers: All NEESinc report covers should be uniform and the same.
- Policies: A bookshelf at NEESinc Headquarters should be created which contain all of the Policies as a library or reference area.
- Joint Meetings with other organizations.

20. Strategic Session E - International Relationships

Buckle

20.1. Group 4 Recommendations

Buckle reported that the group spent time discussing the needs, ideas, and mechanics (strategy).

International Relationships Recommendations

- NEEDS . . . Why should NEESinc have an International Strategy?
 - Cooperative Agreement
 - 2005 Site Visit Report: “. . . NEES shall take action to assure a leadership role in the international earthquake engineering community in collaborative research . . . ”
 - NEES-type activities underway elsewhere in world (KOCED, SAMCO, EDNET, UK-NEES, NCREE, etc.)
 - 13WCEE and 2006 World Forum (and follow-up survey) demonstrate worldwide interest in collaboration.
 - World is looking to NEES to take the lead.

- IDEAS . . . What could be done?
 - National Level
 - o Establish NEES International Program that develops and facilitates research relationships at the researcher level (one on one relationships), such as those already in place with Japan, funded by NSF initiatives such as PIRE (Partnership for International Research and Education) and other grants for planning workshops.
 - Global Level
 - o Support the establishment of a World Body (an umbrella organization, say the International Council for Collaborative Earthquake Engineering Research, ICCEER) to:
 - Provide oversight and coordination
 - Implement recommendations from World Forum on simulation, cyber environments and data.
 - o Support establishment of a World Body to:
 - Identify collaborative research projects (e.g. international research station).
 - Publish international e-journal.
 - Organize future World Forums.

- MECHANICS
 - Establish an International Membership Class (*done*).
 - Elect/assign one of the existing Directors to hold international portfolio (in the future might have a 16th Director elected by the International Membership Class).
 - Assign part-time NEESinc Staff Member to support international activities.
 - Follow-up on MOUs with Taiwan, Korea, China, UK.
 - Apply for NSF support for international planning meetings for small groups in high priority areas.
 - Hold “World Forum 2” as kick-off meeting of ICCEER.
 - Organize special session at 14 WCEE Beijing, 2008.

20.2. BOARD DISCUSSION

- Stokoe questioned the reason NEES is being expected to take the lead? Buckle replied that the reason was because it was the most advanced.
- Leon reported that the European’s have already agreed to host the World Forum next year. This is included as part of the Category 4 carry forward. Buckle indicated that the group was not aware of that fact.
- Comartin mentioned that an alliance has been formed to with IAEE and IASPE to foster activities; EERI is the representative for the United States.
- Roblee requested the Board identify a Task Group, Subcommittee, or one person (Board Member) that could be a contact for the international activities. Comartin said he would be interested in serving in this role.
- Board discussion took place that for a MOU to be successful, there needs to be two types,; collaborative and funding.

- Leon said that of the groups listed that China is the closest to having an equivalent of JTCC and they would be going to China in December to talk about it. Italy also has a large program.
- Roblee reiterated from earlier discussion that NEES needs to identify its products and services for this purpose as well.

21. Strategic Session F - IT Progress and Direction

Bobbitt

21.1. Group 4 Recommendations

Bobbitt reported that the group considered two questions: What do we do now that we would like to do better? What do we want to do now we know we can't do?

IT Progress and Direction Recommendations

- Quick Report Summary from Experiments
 - A template for quick report and/or a tool for report generation for the sites and researchers.
 - Be able to disseminate results quickly to other stakeholders.
 - Include Test Protocol/Core results.
 - Shortcut research-to-code-to-practice.
- E-notebook/E-logbook (take 2)
 - Records all aspects of a project.
 - Collaboration: E-mails; Telecons.
 - Planning: Text/Drawings; perhaps linked to Telepresence/Visualization Tools.
 - Results: Linked to Telepresence/Visualization Tools.
- On www.nees.org: project summaries for allowing a wide range of stakeholders to piece together presentations to discuss/teach NEES.
 - Researchers/Educators (e.g., outreach/proposals)
 - Practitioners
 - K-12 Teachers
 - Board Members
- Work Flow/Design Pattern
 - Flexible way of specifying processes, input and output.
 - How the data is transformed along the way.
 - Automated Provenance: Indicate where data in repository is with respect to data sausage plan (plan, acquire, analyze, etc.)
- Data Analysis and Next-Generation Visualization – sites currently using basic tools (Excel, Matlab, etc.).
 - Third Party Visualization Software (for simulation, experimental, field)
 - BMI
 - Commercial product by DSP Corporation.
 - Collaborative visualization/data analysis.
 - Tools for populating NEES Data Repository
 - Tailored Data Analysis
 - Part of Repository Tools.
 - Seamless integration from the physical, to the model, to the experiment
 - Need to be able to slow the action down to be able to see what is going on.
 - Need to be able to synchronize all events (Data Turbine).
 - Expansion of Simulation
 - Presume the simulation relates directly to NEESR Research.
 - Third Party and Academic Research
 - Computational Mechanics (nano on up) or discrete element modeling (collapse, etc).
 - Regional Loss Modeling.
 - GIS/Google Earth.
 - Emergency Response.

- How close do MOM funds get to research assistance type tools (e.g., code repository, single site license, etc.)

21.2. BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Leon

22.1. From Consent Agenda

22.2. Other

DIRECTIVE – LEON: The Board prioritized potential Category-4 program initiatives (with cost estimates) through a weighted and normalized voting process (high priority = 3 points; medium priority = 2 points; and low priority = 1 point: total divided by number of votes). The Boards priorities identified through this process are listed below and should be used as the basis for requesting changes-of-scope to the NSF and subsequently pursued to the extent allowed by funds made available. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

- 1.) \$50k Travel Support for World Forum 2 Workshop in Europe
- 2.) \$25k Development of Pilot “Smart Document”
- 3.) \$200k EOT “Jump Start” Initiatives
- 4.) \$100k Partnership with EERI for Incorporating LFE Recon Data in NEEScentral
- 5.) \$50k Development of Video Game EQ Design Competition (e.g. WestPoint Bridge Designer)
- 6.) \$50k Travel Support for International Meetings with Partners (e.g. E-Defense, China, etc.)
- 7.) \$50k Consultant for Site Safety Plan Review
- 8.) \$500k Affiliate Sites Program
- 9.) \$100k Upload of other Valuable Data Sets (New or Legacy) into NEEScentral
- 10.) \$50k Hosting of “Facilities R&D” Workshop in Fall 2007
- 11.) \$50k Creation of NEES Displays in Science Museums
- 12.) \$100k Implementation of Pilot Products Identified in World Forum I Workshop
- 13.) \$150k Implementation of Portal-Based OpenSees Interface
- 14.) \$20k Continuation of NEESinc Blind Prediction Exercise

DIRECTIVE - LEON: Craig Comartin is designated as the “International Director” to serve as a liaison between the Board and the numerous international activities that NEES is beginning to undertake, including but not limited to nurturing contacts with other international organizations (IAEE, IASPE, etc.) and providing guidance to NEESinc staff in the development of MOU's. <<General concurrence of Board expressed without formal motion or vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to prepare FY06 carryover report/request to NSF incorporating Category 4 priorities identified by the Board.

ACTION ITEMS:

- ED to work with Comartin to have NEES become a member of the NEHRP Coalition
- ED to work with EERI to co-produce seminar series with both research and practice topics.
- ED to explore having NEESinc become member of “Concrete Coalition”.
- ED to explore development of a branded report series including all NEESR reports using NEESinc facilities.
- President and ED to work with International Director to explore opportunities for development of a world body to coordinate data standards, education, etc. and serve as clearinghouse for collaboration MOU's.

- Sara to distribute ABA Director Book to new Board Members (also poll existing if need another copy).
- EOT staff to develop coordination plan and branded templates for compilation of 1-page "Implementation Brief's" series for marketing NEES research to practice.
- ESO staff to revise RPA/OMSA to incorporate requirements for NEESinc co-branding elements and acknowledgements for all research supported with MOM funds.

Leon announced Stokoe as new Vice President and John Wallace as the ExCom Member- at-Large.

23. Next Meetings

- 23.1. Fall 2006: November 17-18, Davis, CA (IT - Progress & Direction)
- 23.2. Winter 2007: February 2-3, Atlanta Georgia (Sites - FY06 Performance & FY07 Work Plans)
- 23.3. 5th AM: June 21-22, 2007, Snowbird, UT (EOT – Progress, Prelim FY08 Budgets)
- 23.4. Summer 2007: August 24-25, Monterey or Tahoe, CA? (FY08 Budgets, Strategy, Renewal Proposal)
- 23.5. Fall 2007: November 16-17, Davis, CA (IT - Progress & Direction)
- 23.6. Winter 2007: early February, Hawaii? (Sites - FY06 Performance & FY07 Work Plans)
- 23.7. 6th AM: late June, 2008, Squaw Valley, CA? (EOT – Progress, Prelim FY08 Budgets)

ADJOURN

Leon

Leon thanked the Board for their participation. With no further business, the meeting adjourned the meeting at 5:17 p.m.