

Friday, February 2, 2007
Saturday, February 3, 2007

Notice of meeting date provided at Board Meetings on August 25-26, 2006 and November 17-18, 2006.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2007

1. Roll Call and Welcome

Leon

1.1. Review Agenda

1.2. Updated Board & Committees Rosters

- President called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.
- All Board members were present except Craig Comartin, and Chris Rojahn. Rojahn participated during a portion of the Friday sessions via teleconference.
- Participation of Guests in person:
 - Clifford Roblee, NEESinc Executive Director (ED)
 - Sara Moody, NEESinc Executive Administrator
 - Lori Campbell, NEESinc Administrative Consultant
 - Jay Berger, NEESinc Director of Experimental Site Operations
 - Jacobo Bielak, Chair, ITSC Committee
 - Ian Buckle, Chair, TGoGovernance Committee
 - Jerome Hajjar, Chair, TGoITVision Committee
 - Glenn Rix, Vice Chair, Site Operations Committee (SOC)
 - Joy Pauschke, Program Director, National Science Foundation (NSF)
- Participation of Guests via teleconference:
 - Marc Eberhard, Chair, SOC
 - Jon Lea, NEESinc Director of IT Operations
 - Claude Trottier, NEESinc Data Librarian
 - John Whitmer, NEESinc Director of EOT Operations

2. Approve Minutes

Leon

2.1. Meeting of November 17-18, 2006 Davis, CA

MOTION: The Board approves the minutes of the November 17-18, 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".

3.1. Request for Items to be Removed from Consent Agenda

No items were removed from the Consent Agenda.

3.2. Approval of Remaining Items on Consent Agenda

Leon reviewed items on the Consent Agenda to be received by the Board.

Informational Items to be "Received by the Board"

- CA-I1 Membership Report
- CA-I2 Insurance Coverage
- CA-I3 Status of Business Management Systems Operations Manuals
- CA-I4 NSF Site Visit Responses from Buffalo & Lehigh
- CA-I5 Headquarters Re-Organization
 - New Organizational Chart
 - "Director of Programs" Draft Position Description (Kutter requested the word "Draft" be added to the position description.)
- CA-I6 Salary & Benefits Survey Report

MOTION: The Board receives Consent Informational Item CA-I1, Membership Report, as provided, and approves the application for membership. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board receives Consent Informational Items listed as CA-I2 through CA-I6. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

Approval Items to be "Approved by the Board"

- CA-A1 Resolution to Approve Revision to 401k Retirement Plan

MOTION: The Board approves Consent Approval Item CA-A1, Resolution to Approve Revision to 401k Retirement Plan. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

- CA-A2 Updated FCD-01 to Incorporate New Terms of Cooperative Agreement

- The Board removed Consent Approval Item CA-A2. It will be discussed as Item 21.1.1.

4. Executive Director Report

Roblee

4.1. Status of FY06 Carryover

- Roblee provided an overview on the status of the FY06 Carryover, indicating that there will be between 3 to 3.5 million carried over annually of capital replacement funds for repairs that are unavoidable.
- The Board discussed current carryover requests and Leon reported that he and Stokoe went to NSF to meet with Joy regarding the status of NEES. Leon indicated that Paushke realizes that the carryover will never be zero, but ideally it would be zero. Leon also indicated that there were questions in regards to what is carryover.

4.2. NEESinc HQ FY07 Annual Work Plan

- Roblee reviewed the status of the NEESinc FY07 Annual Work Plan. During the November 2006 Board meeting, the Board requested that Roblee revise the Work Plan to show what tasks would be done, rather than what was wanted done.
- Roblee indicated in the new plan, each quarter identifies specific deliverables which allows documentation of what was accomplished. Roblee reported that Headquarters had completed 100% of the first quarter deliverables.
- Leon reported that the Work Plan schedule reflects NSF discussions and that it took a lot of time to arrive at the end result. In future years, there should be a relatively small amount of changes. Leon requested that the Board read the Work Plan carefully to look for ways it could be changed in future years and to provide feedback to Roblee in the next two to three months before the FY08 AWP is developed.
- Ramirez stated that he liked the presentation of the AWP, but would like something to compare against that shows how it fits into the bigger strategic plan, i.e., in terms of the entire 10-year plan. Roblee reported that the larger strategic plan is part of TGoSuccess.
- Leon indicated that NEES is beginning to get traction on items in every area including development of data and planning.

- Board discussion included moving from operational development over to strategic development, including growing membership and strategic planning.

ACTION ITEM:

- Board of Directors to review FY07 AWP carefully and provide recommendations to Roblee for suggested changes to the FY08 AWP before it is completed.

4.3. Performance Metrics

- Roblee provided an overview of the background, strategy, and status of the Site Performance Metrics, indicating that the sites contributed a variety of ideas for operational metrics individually and collectively as part of their October AWP submission. Roblee reported that these were incorporated into the current plan and that the remaining tasks needed to finalize the site metrics were to complete internal and external reviews and final integration.
- Roblee indicated that strategic site metrics had been proposed, but needed to be reviewed by the TGoSuccess Working Group. Roblee reported that NEESinc Staff is currently reviewing operational metrics and aims to reconcile the remaining inconsistencies between the metrics system and the accomplishments/financial reporting systems.
- Board discussion included sending the draft metrics to the sites and relevant constituencies for review and input. Leon requested that Roblee give all relevant constituencies one month for feedback and then close. Leon stated that SOC would have authority for strategic and operational methods with the Boards approval.
- Dyke suggested that the metrics need to be integrated with the EOT metrics. Roblee indicated that John Whitmer was providing language for this task.
- Leon stated that the document should be kept at two levels; but when NEESinc hands the document off to NSF, it needs to be in final. When NEESinc is requesting input, it shouldn't give the impression that it is a done deal; it's an evolutionary community-wide process.
- Reinhorn requested that the Board hold a discussion regarding the complication of RPA's. Board discussion included who should review the details. The Board requests that NEESinc Staff take the initiative to simplify the RPA process and submit a recommendation to the Sites for input.

ACTION ITEM:

- Roblee to send draft Performance Metrics to sites.
- NEESinc Staff to recommend a simplified RPA process for distribution to the Sites for review and input.

5. Board Discussion & Approval of HQ AWP

Leon

- Leon moved the Approval of the NEESinc Headquarters (HQ) FY07 Annual Work Plan (AWP) to Agenda Item 16 for further discussion and approval during the Board's Executive Session.

6. Site Operations Report

Rix/Berger

6.1. Revised AWP FY07 AWP's and NEESinc/SOC Recommendations

- Rix thanked the Board for coming to Atlanta and gave recognition for their hard work to Marc Eberhard, Chair of SOC, who could not attend, and Dan Kuchma, SOC Member, who also was not able to attend in person.
- Rix reviewed the background of the NEES Equipment Sites FY07 Annual Work Plans (AWP) reporting that NEES Sites were directed to provide FY07 AWP's with a scope of work fitting within FY07 budgets that were approved in August 2006. SOC reviewed the first set of AWP's at the November 2006 BOD meeting with a recommendation for partial approval and to resubmit to the sites for revisions.
- Rix reported that there was vast improvement in the overall quality of the FY07 AWP's after Sites completed their revisions. Activities were better defined, deliverables and schedules identified, non-personnel and personnel costs described, and better alignment was

accomplished between activity and placement within the AWP. Responsiveness to the SWOT analysis and required follow-up was good across the network with only a few exceptions.

- Rix reported that the Sites indicated that clearer guidance and direction from NEESinc on where and how to improve the AWP's was valuable and allowed them to focus more intently on areas that needed the most effort. Sites spent considerable time in the revision process and their effort was recognized.
- Rix reviewed the SOC recommendation to approve the revised FY07 AWP's for 11 sites; and the recommendation to not approve, reduce funding or attach conditions to portions of the AWP's for four Sites including: UC Berkeley, University at Buffalo, University of Colorado at Buffalo, and UC San Diego.
- Rix reported that these recommendations were approved by the SOC unanimously.
- Rix reported that the planned activities for SOC include:
 - Performance Metrics
 - Integrated review of FY08 Annual Work Plans and Budgets
 - Major Repair Policy
 - Metrology
- Leon thanked Glenn Rix, Marc Eberhard, and the entire SOC committee and suggested that the Board should be pleased that it is at 96%; indicating that the following year should be more streamlined.
- Berger recognized the SOC for their hard work, reporting that it was a long seven month process. Additionally, Berger reported that all of the sites did a fantastic job on revising their AWP's and thanked Joy Pauschke for providing feedback with Sponsor expectations.
- Leon opened the floor to the Board for discussion and questions.
- Kutter asked Rix if the SOC had reviewed the responses sent in from the Sites, and if any of the responses would change their mind.
- Rix and Eberhard both indicated that they had reviewed responses, but didn't see anything that would be cause for a change in their recommendations. Rix indicated that some activities are suitable, but are unusual without justification. Eberhard responded that a 3rd chance for the Sites would need to come from a Board decision and not from the committee.
- Further discussion included implications of Site recommendations.

MOTION: The Board thanks Marc Eberhard, Glenn Rix, Jay Berger and other Site Operations Committee (SOC) members for their hard work and for providing the Board with the SOC Recommendations Report. The Board also recognizes the volunteer efforts of the SOC. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board thanks Marc Eberhard, Glenn Rix, Jay Berger and other Site Operations Committee (SOC) members for their hard work and for providing the Board with the SOC Recommendations Report. The Board also recognizes the volunteer efforts of the SOC. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

6.2. Safety: A Core Value for NEESinc

- Due to time constraints Berger requested that the Board review the white paper written by Thomas L. Anderson titled, "Safety: A Core Value for NEES Consortium, Inc.," and provide comments. Berger reported that they would follow up with a report at the next BOD meeting with an Execution Plan.

ACTION ITEM:

- Board of Directors to review Safety white paper provided in Board Binder and send comments to Jay Berger.

7. Board Discussion & Approval of Revised FY07 AWP's for Sites

Leon

- Leon moved the Approval of the NEES Experimental Site FY07 Annual Work Plans to Agenda Item 16 for further discussion and approval during the Board's Executive Session.

8. Treasurer's Report

Rojahn

8.1. NEESinc Headquarters Q1 Financial Report

- Rojahn reviewed the NEES FY07 First Quarter Financial Report.

MOTION: The Board receives the NEESinc Headquarters Quarter One Financial Report. <<APPROVED – voice vote – 1 abstention>>

8.2. FY06 A-133 Audit Report

- Rojahn reported that during their February 1 conference call, the Finance Committee discussed the content of the draft 2006 NEES Audit Report, which had been distributed to the committee electronically on January 24, 2007, focusing on those aspects of the report dealing with material weaknesses and reportable conditions. On these matters the Audit Report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 indicates that (1) there were no material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting; (2) NEES Consortium, Inc., complied in all material respects with the requirements of its major federal programs for the year ended September 30, 2006; (3) there were no material weaknesses in internal control over compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, and contracts (noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts); (4) there were no reportable conditions in the Summary of Auditors' Results for the year ended September 30, 2006; and (5) NEES is qualified as a low-risk auditee. The Committee also discussed the restatement of Net Assets at the beginning of the fiscal year, which resulted in a reduction of Net Assets by \$104,121 due to a change in the threshold for depreciating equipment and furniture (from a \$500 threshold which all equipment/furniture is to be depreciated to a \$5,000 threshold). On this topic, the Committee agreed that this was a reasonable and prudent restatement.
- Based on the above review, the Audit Committee unanimously agreed (moved and carried) that (1) the Finance Committee recommends to the NEES Board that the Audit Report for the NEES Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2006 be accepted; and (2) the NEES Staff is to be heartily congratulated for achieving such a glowing Audit Report, given the startup nature of the NEES operation and the strict audit environment now faced by U.S. businesses and non-profit organizations.

MOTION: The Board accepts the A-133 Audit Report for the NEES Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2006 and congratulates the NEESinc staff for achieving a glowing Audit Report, given the start-up nature of the NEES operation and the strict audit environment now faced by U.S. businesses and non-profit organizations. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- NEESinc needs to file an extension with NSF for World Forum.

9. Board Discussion

Leon

10. TGoSuccess Status Report

Roeder

10.1. Draft TGoSuccess Report

- Roeder reviewed the history of Task Group on Success (TGoSuccess) reporting that their goal is to define metrics where the success of NEES can be evaluated. The group originally met on July 29, 2006, where they divided into seven basic groups, and assigned subcommittees for each group. Each subgroup was asked to prepare a one or two page document further developing their issue by mid-September. Roeder reported that he received several of the summary papers, in which he put together in a similar format and sent out for review by the full task group. Roeder reported that no one responded, so in November he went back through the document and put down things that might measure for metrics and redistributed. Roeder conveyed that there hasn't been a lot of enthusiasm

and asked the Board for guidance on what they would like to see achieved from the process.

11. Board Discussion

Leon

- Bobbitt responded that he thinks of metrics as a timeline, in which you have certain things completed by a certain time.
- Myers replied that the idea is to provide requirements for traceability.
- Board discussion included whether metrics should be included as part of the report and the need for an executive summary that can be remembered as a success and explains what NEES activities and accomplishments.
- Leon stated that ideally it's where "we" would like to go, not to measure. Leon expressed his feeling that this is a good start whether or not metrics are incorporated. This will become the strawman for people to say which items are more important than others, or provide other achievements that should be pursued.
- Kutter stated that people have different views of NEES, and the Board should look at the mission first and then determine the objective.
- Roblee expressed that in order to develop a community consensus, the Board as a group needs to set a common mission.
- Stokoe replied that the Board needs to broaden the scope-not just the seven categories.

12. Vision Setting: Define "Community" & Refine Mission and Goals

Leon

12.1. Sample Mission Statements from Related Organizations

- Kutter introduced the mission statements proposed by TGoGovernance Committee. Board discussion included comparisons of the proposed mission statements with those of other organizations. Additional discussion took place regarding broadening beyond Earthquake Engineering and adding international.
- Roeder will distribute to the Board a revised version of Mission Statement C.
- Within two weeks, the Board will spend at least one hour to provide review and comments back to Roeder.
- Roeder will meet with TGoSuccess to synthesis the comments and develop three or four possible mission statements to be sent to the Board for a vote.
- Leon will send before the Annual Meeting, a "Letter from the President" to the Membership which requests a vote of membership.
- The Mission Statement will also be passed to colleagues for review and comment.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Roeder to distribute a revised version of Mission Statement to the Board.
- The Board to spend at least one hour to provide review and comments back to Roeder within two weeks.
- Roeder to meet with TGoSuccess to synthesize the comments and develop three or four possible mission statements to be sent to the BOD for a vote.
- Leon to send before the Annual Meeting, "A Letter from the President" to Membership, which requests a vote of membership.
- The Mission Statement to be distributed to colleagues for review as well.

13. IT Report

Bielak

13.1. Status on ITSC Recommendations

- Bielak reported that this would be his last meeting as the Chair of ITSC.
- Lea said that he is coming up on his one-year anniversary with NEES and has enjoyed working with Bielak. He also looks forward to working with Hajjar.
- Lea reviewed the status of IT activities both at NEESit and NEESinc since the last Board meeting, when the FY07 Work Plan for NEESit was approved.

- Lea referred to Section 13.1 which provided the status of the ITSC recommendations for NEESit previously approved by the Board. Lea reported that all work items were behind schedule, but not too badly considering the following:
 - NEESit had to unexpectedly deal with the migration of the Site Specification Database (SSDB) from OSU to NEEScentral, which was “completed” last September. However, it was not done to completion and included errors so repairs were needed. During this repair time, OSU put the old version of the SSDB back online in a read-only mode.
 - NEESit has put a considerable amount of effort into getting data out of NEEScentral and into the UCD and RPI data viewers. This was originally requested by Kutter to show at the November BOD meeting but was unsuccessful; NEESit is working closely with Kutter, Rojas, and Hassan at RPI so that an End-to-End solution can be demonstrated.
 - The web services API had issues which were a cascading effect with people who were trying to read/write data in NEEScentral, such as UCD and RPI.
- Lea reported that there have been staffing changes at NEESit including: four new hires started on January 22, 2007; Shannon Whitmore and Adam Birnbaum are no longer with NEESit; and Larry Miller and Paul Hubbard are 40% at NEESit and 60% with NEON.

13.2. Data Curation Update

- Lea provided an update on NEESinc’s Data Curation efforts, reporting that Claude Trottier, who started at NEESinc on August 1, 2006 as the Data Curator, was in the process of reviewing all projects in NEEScentral.
- Lea reported that Trottier prepared a detailed set of specifications for Data Curation Management that were delivered to NEESit in October 2006. The specifications called for the creation of ten new database tables and 21 new user interface (UI) web-pages. At that time NEESit informed NEESinc that they were unable to include this effort into their immediate work schedule.
- Lea reported that because data curation is an immediate need and separate from the existing NEESit data model and UI, with the agreement of NEESit, NEESinc looked for and contracted with a commercial developer. The contract was signed in December 2006 with a group in Sacramento, CA, and they began working in January 2007.
- Lea reported that Trottier continued his data curation effort (concurrent with the third-party development) and recorded all information in a local Microsoft Access database. Lea reported that this data will be moved to NEEScentral once the data curation development has been merged with NEEScentral. Lea stated that NEESit has been very helpful in providing information to the third-party developers which will aid in making the merging process as smooth as possible.

MOTION: The Board thanks Jacobo Bielak for his leadership role as outgoing Chair and for all of his hard work on the IT Strategy Committee. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEM:

- Claude Trottier and Jon Lea to hold teleconference with Jim Myers to discuss alternative options for data curation including opensource options.

14. TGoITVision Status Report

Hajjar

14.1. A Vision for an Integrated Community

- Hajjar provided a brief review of the history of the Task Group on IT Vision (TGoITVision) and its timeline. Hajjar reported that a complete draft of the report was sent to several people at NSF, NEESinc Staff, the BOD, SOC, ITSC, EOTC, TGoSuccess, Equipment Site PI’s, NEESit top personnel, and several other experts. Hajjar conveyed that task group was picking up final changes and planned to submit the final document to NEESinc in February to request Board approval.
- Hajjar recommended posting the report in an open web forum upon approval of the Board.

- Hajjar reviewed the report outline and identified the following key points:
 - Vision is meant to be bold and encompassing, but tied tightly to the original ideas of why NEES was created and how the task group feels NEES has evolved relative to IT.
 - NSF envisioned that the creation of NEES would “shift the emphasis of earthquake engineering research *from* current reliance on physical testing to integrated experimentation, computation, theory, databases, and model-based simulation.”
 - This is a vision and strategic plan for IT in all of NEES, not just NEESit: NEES, Inc., NEESit, ES, NEESR, NEES stakeholders and partners.
 - The report is intended to establish that IT is important to the earthquake engineering community within NEES; and to help harness new opportunities for growth, development, funding, and partnerships: other branches of NSF, other branches of the federal and state governments, industry, and internationally.
 - The report is not an execution or implementation plan, neither for software development, nor for partner or community engagement.
 - Resulting strategic plan is aggressive but pragmatic: timeline for strategic elements ranges from 1-2 years to 3-4 years to 5+ years, with not too many in the latter category.
- Hajjar reviewed the following goals of the report:
 - Seeks to engage the NEES community of researchers, practitioners, and students regarding the powerful capabilities achievable through synergistic activities between earthquake engineering and IT;
 - Motivates researchers and practitioners involved in other engineering domains, such as wind, blast, and infrastructure management, to use, adapt, and contribute to applications and services coming from the NEES community;
 - Indicates approaches for using IT to integrate education and training with research and practice in earthquake engineering;
 - Provides recommendations for partnerships with stakeholders from earthquake engineering communities worldwide, and from other science and engineering communities within the United States that benefit from coordinated activities with NEES;
 - Conveys the IT technology and process needs for earthquake engineering to IT professionals and those involved in developing the national cyberinfrastructure.
- Hajjar reported that the Vision for IT in NEES is as follows:

*The vision of NEES Information Technology is to **drive innovation** in earthquake engineering through **transformative technologies** that will enable the **creation and integration of knowledge** leading to **pioneering solutions** for **protecting society from the catastrophic effects of earthquakes**.*
- Hajjar reviewed the following strategic prioritization for IT noting that there are several strategic components identified and prioritized with associated timelines within each:
 1. Community Data Sharing
 2. Computational Modeling and Simulation
 3. Visualization
 4. Integrated Computational, Experimental, and Field Simulations
 5. Collaboration
 6. Knowledge Capture and Dissemination
 7. Integrated Teaching and Learning Environment
- Roblee indicated that there has been a change in emphasis in ITSC initiatives; Simulation and Visualization have been pushed up.
- Hajjar responded that with more experience, the ITSC realized that those items needed to be pushed up as they are evolving toward a grander vision.
- Hajjar requested comments from the Board regarding the TGoITVision Report be sent to him as soon as possible, and requested the Boards input on where to go from now. How can earthquake engineering be part of the new transformation to improve the way we do research, education, and practice and lead new solutions in earthquake engineering.
- Hajjar reviewed the following recommendations related to vision for board consideration, noting that they had been discussed by the TGoITVision; however, not formally:

- The prime objective of the Vision to provide encouragement and monitoring of NEESinc, NEESit, Equipment Sites, and current and future NEESR projects related to IT in NEES.
- Form one or more board task groups, or charge the ITSC, NEESinc, or NEESit to consider the following:
 1. Develop methods for engaging the NEES community more fully in IT
 2. Take the message of IT in NEES to a broader community to show them what we are doing, learn what they are doing, and seek partnerships and funding.
- Hajjar provided the following examples:
 - Continue to broaden the IT base, with strategic coordination by NEES, Inc. and NEESit: e.g., provide *seed funding* for IT activities within the NEES community, or funding for targeted third-party development, and try to harness results and facilitate engagement in future projects : data sharing, simulation software, visualization tools, collaboration tools, centralized IT related to EOT.
 - Increase activation of existing IT products across earthquake engineering (NEESforge, etc.).
 - Aid in discovery of relevant RFP's and encourage teams to form to bring in new IT-related projects to NEES (NEES funding provides leverage).
 - Highlight IT success stories in NEESR projects for: the NEES community, NSF, other federal agencies, industry, Congress, etc.
 - Encourage cybertool development and simulation within NEESR RFP.
 - Provide contiguous funding for IT development, within NEESit, at the sites, and perhaps in other entities that form and offer value.
 - Dedicate annual meeting speakers to partners who can speak to expanding IT in NEES.
 - Encourage creative thinking and research and embracing of IT within NEES: *General aura and spirit . . .*
- Hajjar thanked the Board on behalf of the committee for the opportunity to participate in the TGoITVision for NEES.
- The Board thanked Hajjar for the tremendous drive to push this effort forward. Lea commented that he has never seen such work by a volunteer committee. Leon pointed out that it is a very high level report.

MOTION: The Board thanks Jerome Hajjar for his tremendous drive to push the TGoITVision effort forward. The Board further recognized the volunteer effort of the Committee and gratitude for developing such a high level report. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

15. Board Discussion

Leon

- Leon opened the floor for discussion by asking what it was that could be done to lead to lead the TGoITVision report to fruition.
- Board discussion included who should be in charge of driving/executing the vision of IT. Suggestions also included forming a Board level task group, having ITSC work on it, or NEESinc staff.
- Bielak expressed the urgent need to go out to the community, stating that people from outside of the ITSC community need to become involved. There needs to be a story with successes, with how things work, etc., and an active effort needs to be expended with a lot of exposure.
- Hajjar stressed that this is a BOD-level/BOD-driven implementation.
- Roblee shared that the IT arena has been the most difficult to understand with regard to operational, strategy, and implementation issues. Roblee indicated that clear goals for the FY08 AWP are due and fits into this vision – driving the implementation with the strategic objectives. Roblee recommended staying with the ITSC to accomplish this. Leon encouraged bringing in additional members if necessary.
- Pauschke questioned who is providing the IT guidance, stating that it is not clear how this is being executed and integrated in the NEESit subaward. Leon replied that Lea is going to have to be ultimately responsible for working with Elgamal on this. Roblee responded that the problem is

that NEES doesn't have real authority. Pauschke said that NEES can monitor and take corrective action if necessary.

- Leon said that Lea needs to work closely with Elgamal to implement into the FY08 AWP.
- Myers observed that the responsibility and authority is being split if it is placed on NEESinc staff, unlike what was went through with the SOC and budgets, etc.
- In response to Myers observation, Leon said the process model should be as follows:
 - NEES IT Manager will work closely with the ITSC
 - NEES ESO Manager will work closely with the SOC
 - NEES EOT Manager will work closely with the EOTC
 - Board will set the vision of the goals.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Board to send comments regarding the TGoITVision Report to Hajjar as soon possible.
- Hajjar to finish making final revisions to report based on feedback received from Board.
- NEESinc to post report on website for further review and comments.
- TGoITVision to work with NEESit to put together story to get out to community.

16. EOT Report & 5th Annual Meeting Status Report

Whitmer

16.1. EOTC Report

- Whitmer provided an update on the progress of goals as outlined in the EOT Execution Plan. Whitmer reported recent changes to the EOTC following Andrews resignation from the Board including: Shirley Dyke is now the Board Liaison, John Van de Lindt has taken over as Chair, and Judy Liu is the Vice Chair. Whitmer indicated that vacant positions were being filled on an interim basis with the following: Pedro Silva, Facility User Representative; Sara Wadia-Fascetti, Earthquake Researcher Representative; and Alicia Lyman-Holt, Equipment Site Representative. These positions were suggested by NEESinc and the EOTC, and approved by ExCom, and will be served through June 2007.
- Whitmer reviewed the following EOTC activities:
 - EOTC Reviews of the ES Annual Work Plans
 - Assessment Working Group – Meeting February 19 in Colorado
 - Submitted Multi-Site Junior High School EOT ITEST Proposal to NSF
 - Working Groups within NEES EOTC
 - TGoITVision – helped develop EOT Component

16.2. NEESinc EOT Report

- Whitmer provided an update on the 5th Annual Meeting, reporting that a theme had been decided, "NEES Research & Earthquake Engineering Practice: Strengthening the Connections." At the 5th Annual Meeting, a two-hour mini workshop on EOT proposal writing is being coordinated by members of the EOTC. These members are also serving on the Annual Meeting Working Group.

16.3. Equipment Site 1-Page Marketing Flyers

- Whitmer provided the Board with samples of Equipment Site marketing flyers for review. The briefs will be produced at two levels: one for researchers and one for practices so they can be mixed and matched for different audiences.
- Ramirez conveyed that Lehigh shows actuators with no people; he suggested using real tests, and suggested that illustrations and photos should be consistent – producing a more dynamic product.
- Whitmer reported that they have begun working on creating a PowerPoint for Earthquake Awareness Month and a video, for which they have requested footage from all the sites in the network.
- Whitmer reported that the EOT Staff have been working on a joint project with EERI and NEES – an E-Brownback Webinar, which will air in April.

- Whitmer announced that there would be a NEESinc booth at the EERI AM, AISC, AAAS (Jamie Steidl)-live presentation from the Garner Valley site to the conference floor, as well as several other outreach efforts which are in process. Structures Congress in May – there are six different sessions and a tremendous presence. Whitmer requested the Board's input on any other possibilities or contacts.
- Whitmer to send Pauschke an electronic version of the briefs – printed versions were given to her at the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Board to send Whitmer input on any other possibilities or contacts.
- Whitmer to send Pauschke an electronic version of the briefs – printed versions were given to her at the meeting

17. Board Discussion

Leon

MOTION: The Board thanks John Whitmer and the EOT Committee for their hard work and for the report to the Board. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

18. Sponsor Perspective

Pauschke

- Leon introduced Joy Pauschke, National Science Foundation (NSF). He indicated that there is great interest by the Board as they look toward renewal.
- Pauschke thanked the Board for all of their hard work, and stated that NSF does realize the time and effort that has been expended to make NEES successful. She discussed some exciting accomplishments: Site Visits are progressing well; the NEESwood Experiment (which NSF videotaped) was very impressive; and it is exciting to see the projects as they are executed. She also mentioned that the National Science Board is holding their meeting next week at Oregon State University and will be visiting the Tsunami Wave Basin. By and large, she feels that things are progressing very well.
- Pauschke briefed the Board on the reorganization at the National Science Foundation and the funding process, noting that the FY08 budget will be released on Monday, February 5, 2007. She spoke of George E. Brown's vision of NEES and the network. The project needs to think of the 'whole being greater than the sum of the parts' – It is in integrative product whereby you leverage and integrate all of the parts. Think of NEES and the network as the "whole" having the responsibility and organization to oversee. As "parts", simulation was viewed as a resource (multi-site simulation and hybrid simulation). This can be leveraged from having the network and cyberinfrastructure. How the whole is bigger than the sum of the parts is how the project can integrate across to the sites to have a bigger impact. You also need leadership at the top to make sure the integration is happening, because you cannot have the sites and EOT doing their own thing. They all need to be communicating with each other as an integrated project, not three separate parts.
- Pauschke expressed concerns with IT. Currently, there are no high level user requirements or traceability metrics, and the leadership unclear. Integration of all of the parts needs to happen. We need a document on what is being developed, when a project is going to be rolled out, and what is the organization's vision for hybrid simulation. There needs to be a vision and mission statement that addresses the value-added concept of having NEESinc as the central organization, as well as a roadmap, timeline, and strategy for how all of the pieces fit together into one project. She also suggested partnering with other groups (Earthscope, IRIS, and others) to bring in new tools and ideas. NEES needs to think seriously about the issues raised about IT in the Site Visit and make an immediate adjustment or change.
- Pauschke said that EOT should be implemented as a network; and NEES is on the right trajectory.
- Pauschke reported that with regard to renewal, the third year is the when you need to focus, be working on progress, and moving forward. Performance Metrics need to be in place. She mentioned that when NEES was originally funded, there were no new funds from NSF. NEES operations were supported by every Division in NSF. For the Year-3 Site Visit and July 2008 5-

Year Renewal, you will need to have a really good site visit report. If the project has deficiencies, it will be difficult to support. NEES is one of the first distributed projects of its kind and is paving the way for others. The renewal will go all the way to the National Science Board who relies on the Merit Review Process.

- Roblee and Pauschke outlined the steps for the renewal process. The renewal proposal will be due June 2008 with a final decision by the National Science Board in the March to May 2009 timeframe. The question was asked if the Board could form a team of leaders from the community who would be compensated to develop a report. Pauschke replied that she sees no problem with the request as long as funding came from existing sources and are not too excessive.
- The Board asked about NEESR funding decisions? Pauschke replied she will not know until dusts settles one way or the other on the budget.
- It was noted we need to capture "Highlights" (new term for "Nuggets") having 'outcomes'. NEES needs to show outcomes, not just activities. An example was the EOT activity by Stacy Kline, Vanderbilt University, who is active in the K-12 community and the AP Engineering Program. She worked over several summers to refine modules that were adaptable on a National basis. They resulted in an outcome of products that were able to be used multiple times and adopted and used by others (rather than used just once). Pauschke recommended looking at the Highlights on the NSF website to get ideas of things NSF considers highlights and outcomes.
- Pauschke again thanked the Board for their tremendous effort. Leon thanked Pauschke for making it all possible and championing NEES.

MOTION: The Board thanks Joy Pauschke for attending the BOD Meeting and for her continuing support of NEES. <APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>

ACTION ITEMS:

- NEESinc to focus on building up IT and getting data uploaded into repository, continue to build EOT, and get Performance Metrics in place before the next Site Visit.
- NEESinc and BOD to review "Highlights" (formerly Nuggets) on the NSF website for ideas of what NSF is looking for with regard to highlights with outcomes.
- Board to form a Renewal Proposal Committee to work on renewal proposal for NEESinc.
- NEESinc to be sure to address all concerns from prior years Site Visits, and to position itself to have an extremely good July 2008 Site Visit for 5-Year Renewal.

ADJOURN – 5:45 PM

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2007

19. EXECUTIVE SESSION - BOARD MEMBERS ONLY

Leon

MOTION: The Board approves the HQ Work Plan subject to the addition of at least four site visits per quarter by director level employees to Experimental Sites and one visit per quarter by the Executive Director, Deputy Director, or designee to NSF and other stakeholders in Washington, D.C. This revision to be fully implemented by third Quarter in FY2007. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: Approve the Site Work Plans and revised Site Budgets as proposed by SOC <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote by non-Site Directors; Site Directors recused>>

MOTION: The budget balance of \$456,828 will be reallocated by NEESinc and rebudgeted into the seven items outlined in the SOC report to the Board of Directors, FY07 Annual Work Plan (AWP) Review and Recommendations for Approval, dated January 30, 2007. <<APPROVED – voice vote 10 yes; 1 No (Reinhorn); 1 abstention (Stokoe)>>

MOTION: The Board approves the proposed new NEESinc position subject to the following three stipulations: 1) The position title should be changed to "Deputy Director and Director of Programs;" and this person should be placed between the Executive Director and the other Directors in the organization chart; 2) Desirable qualification item two should be changed to: "Ten or more years of experience with engineering research. Large-scale experimental research background is a plus. Earthquake engineering experience is a plus. University experience is strongly encouraged;" and 3) Desirable qualification item six should be changed to: "Demonstrated experience and ability to work effectively with the National Science Foundation and other funding agencies." The Board also expresses a strong preference to hire a veteran earthquake engineering academic to fill this position. Strong commitment/experience with IT matters would be very helpful. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

DIRECTIVE: The Compensation Committee will be chaired by John Bobbitt and will include Sarah Billington and Julio Ramirez from the Board. <<General Concurrence of Board without formal motion or vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- SOC to name a small group to visit the Buffalo Site to better understand Site constraints with regards to business operations.
- Board President, Executive Director, and Director of Site Operations to visit UC-San Diego to (1) assess progress on urgent administrative matters and (2) develop strategies/plans to better utilize the facility.
- NEESinc staff and Board to work collaboratively with NEESit to achieve BOD established goal to upload as many as 12 data sets to the NEES Repository by the next BOD meeting in June 2007.
- Roblee to provide a detailed budget for approval by the Executive Committee or Board.

20. TGoGovernance Status Report

Buckle

20.1. Board Survey Results

- Buckle provided an overview of the survey results from the TGoGovernance Survey of the Board.

20.2. TGoGovernance Recommendations

- Buckle presented the confidential TGoGovernance Recommendations dated to the Board.

MOTION: The Board accepts the following TGoGovernance Recommendations dated January 2007: Recommendation 5., Recommendation 7., Recommendation 8., Recommendation 9., Recommendation 10., and Recommendation 11. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board accepts TGoGovernance Recommendation 1., to change the NEESinc Mission Statement. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board accepts TGoGovernance Recommendation 4., modified as follows: The NSF Program Director to be routinely invited to participate in Board Meetings. In such case, he/she must expect to be recused for at least one session of each Board meeting." <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board will make pages one through seventeen only of the TGoGovernance Report unconfidential. <<APPROVED – 1 opposed>>

MOTION: The Board changes the wording on the following TGoGovernance Recommendations to: Consider for Possible Implementation Recommendation #2., Consider for Possible Implementation Recommendation #3., and Consider for Possible Implementation Recommendation #6. <<APPROVED - 2 opposed>>

MOTION: The Board thanks Buckle and TGoGovernance Committee for their hard work in re-examining the NEES governance issues. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

MOTION: The Board gave authority to Stokoe to form an Implementation Task Group who will develop a plan and report back to the Board. <<APPROVED – unanimous voice vote>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- Stokoe to form Implementation Task Group to develop an plan and report back to the Board.
- Recommendation 4: Roblee to send Pauschke a formal letter informing her of the TGoGovernance Recommendation and asking for possible obstacles and/or consideration of other alternatives.
- Board Members were requested to think about the NEES Mission Statement and goals for NEES for next year.

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

Leon

21.1. From Consent Agenda

21.1.1. FCD-01

MOTION: The Board accepts the Fiscal Control Document-01 (FCD-01) as is. <<APPROVED – affirmative voice vote; Reinhorn abstained>>

ACTION ITEMS:

- Reinhorn and Kutter to work with Equipment Site Forum to review and propose changes to the FCD if needed.

22. Next Meetings

Roblee

- 22.1. 5th AM: June 21-22, 2007 – Cliff Lodge, Snowbird, UT
- 22.2. August 17-18, 2007 – Doubletree, Rohnert Park, CA
- 22.3. November 16-17, 2007 – Davis, CA
- 22.4. February 8-9, 2008 – Albuquerque/Taos, NM or New Orleans, LA?
- 22.5. 6th AM: late June 2008, Portland, OR

ADJOURN – 3:35 PM