

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of December 29, 2003

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 1:00 PM EDT on December 29, 2003. 7 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler (Secretary)
- Zema Chowdhuri
- Joanna Krueger (Chair)
- Paul Sokol (Vice chair)
- John Tranquada (Past chair)
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

The meeting began with a review by John Tranquada of the Brookhaven meeting on user access to facility. John gave an overview at the Nov 10 meeting, but there was some confusion that surfaced at the Dec 9 meeting, for which John was absent, when trying to understand the purpose of the letter being signed by the user groups. John reiterated his previous summary and took questions. Asked about the priority screening program, he indicated that it addresses only foreigners going to national labs and does not apply to foreign scientists going to universities, and is essentially a recognition of the fact that DOE clearance procedures are a good pre-screening. He was unsure whether it applied only to scientists taking positions at national labs or also to people visiting the labs. He also indicated that he thought it went into effect this summer but that he has not noticed any appreciable reduction of time so far and is thus not yet convinced about the program's effectiveness. On the issue of whether clearance at one lab might carry over to other labs, Bill Nay and the Office of Science are aware of the problem, and there are intentions to address this eventually. Concerning access for foreign nationals, the time required to provide clearance before a lab visit will largely be controlled by the DOE security order. To what extent those suggestions get incorporated into the final draft is unclear, but the purpose of the letter from the user groups is precisely to express our support of Mr. Nay's ideas. A second letter from the UEC chairs has been prepared, addressed to Mr. Nay, voicing strong support for the priority visa

screening for scientists by the Departments of State and of Homeland Security and requesting that Secretary Abraham communicate this view to the Secretaries of State and of Homeland Security. Given the importance of these issues being resolved reasonably, Joanna asked to what extent was there a sense at the meeting that we could effect change and how would we go about that. John suggested that it was not clear how quickly change can be effected, but that clearly these kinds of letters are important.

Paul Sokol updated the group on the ACNS activities. He has formed a small committee consisting of Ray Teller at Argone, Audrey Archuletta of LANSE, himself for NIST and SHUG/SNS and David Vaknin for SHUG/HFIR. Paul S. will try to set up the first meeting by conference call in January. His current idea is to set up 4 themes covering four corners of the room addressing Source issues, Instrumentation issues, User support issues, and Administrative issues. Paul also noted that he had not yet been successful in contacting Bill Hamilton, current LUG chair, but would continue to try and hopefully involve them more directly. Paul B. asked if Shenda Baker or Jeff Lynn (ACNS program co-chairs) had been contacted about these ideas. Paul S. said that Jeff had been contacted and is entirely "on board."

Next the election results were discussed. Paul Butler had forwarded the email from Judy Zager at SNS giving the winners (Paul Butler –ORNL, Lynn Walker – Carnegie Mellon, Angus Wilkinson – Georgia Tech, John Turner – The University of Tennessee, and David Bowman – Los Alamos National Laboratory) and the total number voting (183) to the committee immediately prior to the meeting. Joanna asked how the 183 compared to last year. Paul B. indicated his information from Judy was that last year's total was 228 but pointed out that last year didn't run into the holiday season so much. Paul B. suggested that last year he sent a note to the candidates indicating the winners. This was followed by an email announcement of the results sent to all those who'd voted. He recommended a similar procedure be employed but that it would be inappropriate for him to send them. Paul S. indicated he'd be willing to do that and Paul B. promised to send a copy of the two emails sent out last year to Paul S. and Joanna. Paul B. said he also had JPEG graphics showing number of votes for each candidate and agreed to forward them to the committee. The sense of the committee however seemed to be that those numbers are important for verification of the winners, but should not be publicized. Finally Joanna pointed out that there was no mention anywhere on the

SHUG website of the elections. This was noted as an important omission that we should avoid next year.

An open, wide ranging discussion ensued on several related topics, a flavor of which is given below:

We are currently using the SNS mailing list as our "membership roster." However, as with last year, the idea that perhaps the list of those voting constitutes a subset that is at least clearly interested arose. Just as last year however, restricting future message to those alone was felt to still be too restrictive at this time. Paul B. pointed out that he often encounters the attitude that SHUG has no real purpose yet since the facilities aren't really operating. While he can (and has) explained one on one why, on the contrary, this time is particularly important, it is clear that we are not getting this message out generally. It was pointed out that our bylaws do require "biennial renewal" of membership, which of course we currently have no way of doing. How do we remove people from our mailing list who should stay on the general SNS list? How do we add people to our list who ask us to be added? If we maintain our own list how and who does it? Several suggestions were offered but ultimately this clearly will need more discussion by the new committee. In the meantime, Joanna and Paul S. agreed to add wording to the email announcement of winners indicating the importance of participating now even though the facilities are not yet fully operational, with maybe some examples, the fact that there is a renewal requirement which will begin to be enforced soon, and provide a means for people to respond to the email asking to be removed from the SHUG list. This announcement then, unlike last year, would go to the entire SNS list.

This led to the question of how to sustainably maintain a membership list/ mailing list and web presence. Having it run by a member of the executive committee is appealing, but not a long term solution without creating a "permanent member" which we want to avoid. Currently we use SNS to do this, which would appear to be a perfect long term solution (though so far they are not maintaining a separate SHUG members list). However it is unclear what happens when we begin to take a more active advocacy role and start/encourage what effectively are lobbying efforts. As a government lab there are definite restrictions in this area. As an independent organization of users those restrictions do not apply to us, and in fact, as "customers," we probably should lobby both the facility and the government regularly. However, our ability to do so could be severely hampered by having the facility perform our administrative tasks (maintain rosters, web servers etc.). Both Paul B. and Paul S. currently serve on the NIST User's Group Committee

which is in the middle of dealing with just this problem. Granted that NIST, which is run directly by the DOC, faces stronger restrictions, but the fundamental issues remain the same. Again a number of suggestions were offered and again it is clear that more discussion by the new committee will be necessary. John Tranquada offered perhaps the most promising lead to a solution by suggesting UT, or perhaps JINS (or UT through JINS) as the entity that manages our electronic needs. There being no other business, Joanna thanked each of the outgoing members for their services and the meeting adjourned at 2:15PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of December 9, 2003

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 1:00 PM EDT on December 9, 2003. 6 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler (Secretary)
- Joanna Krueger (Chair)
- Scott Mixture
- Nancy Ross
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

Joanna began the meeting with a couple of announcements. First, as discussed at last meeting, an email with our input regarding the proposed plan of using August as one of the two, four month, SNS shutdowns a year was sent to Al Ekkebus along with our request that future requests for such input be directed through the chair. He has thanked us for our prompt input. Second, the heads of the various user groups have been circulating a letter to be signed by each chair regarding user access policies. After some discussion it became clear that there was some confusion regarding which of the topics John Tranquada discussed at the last SHUG meeting were meant to be addressed/supported with this letter. Unfortunately John Tranquada was not present so Joanna suggested she should contact John and get a written clarification. Also she would send a copy of the letter to the rest of the committee.

Joanna turned over the floor to Paul Butler for an update on the elections. Paul indicated that the electronic ballots had gone out Friday, Dec 5, with a total of 71 individuals having currently voted. Paul said that last year there were 228 voters with a fair number coming at the very end immediately following the final reminder notice. Due to the late date at which we got this out, the deadline for voting was put at Dec 23, a Tuesday, rather than Wednesday the 17th. Paul said he decided that while Wednesday was probably the better day of the week, having the deadline be Christmas eve would probably not be the best. Hopefully in the future the process will be started earlier. Paul also suggested it might be a good idea to have one final meeting after the elections to wrap up the year.

Next on the agenda was the issue of possible bylaw changes to address issues such as term lengths, term limits, annual meeting requirements etc. Joanna asked for input on what changes might be needed and how we should proceed. Paul Butler stated that he's put quite a deal of thought into these questions and sees no clear cut answers, suggesting that this is really a complicated issue which might best begin by email before starting an oral debate at this meeting. Joanna asked Paul to take the lead of commencing such an email discussion. Paul agreed to do so "after the elections."

Finally Joanna raised the question of the SHUG chair's membership on various advisory boards discussed at the previous meeting (Nov. 10, 2003). While in principle a good idea, the question of how much extra work this would entail for the chair was raised. The effort could be spread out by either appointing the subcommittee chairs or other alternates to the different committees. After a brief discussion, it was suggested that given our current knowledge of the number of such committees, their role and impact on user issues, the frequency and duration of their meetings, and the amount of effort they might require, it would be best for someone to first make some inquiries before determining the appropriate course of action. As chair, Joanna agreed to do this.

Greg Smith and Al Ekkebus joined the call a little after 10:30. Joanna asked Angus as principle author of the document to begin the discussion. After Angus' presentation of the motivation, Greg asked some questions, with the amount of time requested in the document (10%) being the most important. Some discussion ensued during which several points were made. First of course, Angus indicated the 10% was not meant to be a hard number and that the intent was not to remove a significant fraction of beam time from the regular user program. Along those lines it was also mentioned that the intent of the SHUG document was to indicate the need/desire for such a program and to provide suggestions and guidance for HFIR (and SNS) in the development of such a program which can then be further discussed. The committee also understands tweaking and adjusting of any new program is always needed. The point was also made that the program would be expected to be reviewed as a whole on some regular basis to determine its usefulness. The suggestion was made that a brief report be required of users of such a program. Some concern was expressed about the burden this program might place on scheduling with a fixed amount of time being set aside each cycle prior to knowing how much would actually be needed. The suggestion was made that in terms of a mail-in program the effect on scheduling could be the opposite,

providing a number of short duration samples that could be slipped into the inevitable small chunks of beam time that open up at the last minute usually causing a flurry of activity to fill. On the other hand, even a relatively small mail in program could place an additional burden on the technical staff. Also it was suggested that a look at other facilities that provide similar programs would be useful in developing one at HFIR with IPNS mentioned in particular. Greg, indicated he'd already talked to Bryan Chakoumakos, HFIR powder diffractometer instrument scientist. Bryan is very enthusiastic about the idea and Greg agreed that it made sense to use that machine as a testbed for this concept. Greg said that he would draft a document with help from AI and circulate it to the SHUG Executive Committee. With the current schedule indicating that the HFIR powder machine will be coming on-line at the end of 2004 there should be time to get this worked out before its startup.

Having no further business the committee adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of November 10, 2003

Minutes of SHUG executive committee meeting of November 10, 2003. The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 1:30 PM EDT on November 10, 2003. 10 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler (Secretary)
- Zema Chowdhuri
- Takeshi Egami (Immediate past chair)
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger (Chair)
- Nancy Ross
- Paul Sokol (Vice chair)
- John Tranquada (Past chair)
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

The meeting began with the approval of the September minutes as well as the notes from the on-site meeting. Paul Butler noted that on the web we have minutes for early 2000 followed by the 2003 minutes given the impression of a large hiatus in the group's activities. Paul B. indicated that he had some more publishable minutes, though by no means all, from intervening meetings and suggested posting them. The committee agreed.

Next Joanna reported on the HFIR review meeting. One of the primary outcomes for SHUG was the idea that the user committee should take a more active role in guiding the direction of the facilities. A discussion ensued with some mention of the differences between the X-ray and neutron communities as well as some specific proposals for more input such as having SHUG Executive Committee members actively participating in various decision making committees as well as advisory committees. For example Paul Sokol pointed out that issues related to computer access and radiation training, which are directly relevant to the users, are being discussed now but the SHUG is not a part of the process. It would be much

better to have input in the formulation stage of the policy rather than only being presented with final results and being asked for possible minor revisions.

Joanna reported that the fast access proposal had been submitted and that the response so far was that it was being looked at. Joanna suggested that we should invite Greg Smith to the next meeting to discuss this issue as HFIR will be the first to do any implementation.

John Tranquada briefed the group on the Brookhaven meeting on users access to facility issues. It was apparently a day and a half event. The highlight was the address by Bill Nay, from the Office of Science discussing security. The DOE has been operating under a 1992 DOE security order. A draft of a new order has been circulated for comment and a number of suggested revisions sent back. The final revision may be out sometime soon and the labs will then have only 5 days to respond. John indicated that the revisions proposed by Bill Nay are relatively reasonable, particularly given the first draft. A letter from the user groups to the Secretary of Energy in support of Bill Nay's efforts was being drafted and Joanna as chair should be receiving a copy soon. The other issue which is much more difficult is the foreign national situation as it involves many more departments than just DOE. While the State Department has said that they will begin a priority screening of visa applications for scientists going to National Laboratories, the bottom line for the foreseeable future seems to be that there will be long lead times for foreigners and that they need to make very sure they get their I94 forms stamped with at least a B1 visa. It was suggested that at least the facilities should place as much information of this nature as possible in obvious places on their web sites. In particular HFIR's website should post this.

Paul Sokol announced that he had now contacted all the facilities (he is on the NIST user group and talked to Ray Teller at IPNS and Allen Hurd at LANSCE) and everyone is on board. The way he would proceed is to form a small committee with reps from each facility to work out the details of how to organize this reception in order to be able to extract the necessary input. Paul Butler asked if he had contacted the actual user group of LANSCE (the LUG) whose chair is currently Bill Hamilton. Paul S. indicated he had not but would do so soon. Paul S. suggested he would be willing to represent SHUG on this committee and asked for input. The suggestion was made that David Vaknin represent the HFIR side of the SHUG. Moving to the elections, Paul Butler led the discussion on finalizing the slate of candidates. The first item of business was to agree on appropriate numbers of candidates. It was agreed that for the single postdoc/graduate student position

two to three candidates would be appropriate and given the number of interested parties we should go with three (seven suggestions were received). For the five 2 year positions 10–15 was thought reasonable. Paul Butler agreed to create a new table with the final slate and circulate for final approval. Joanna asked that the potential candidates be contacted to ensure their willingness to run before distributing the final table.

As for the candidates themselves, Kim Tait of the University of Arizona, Tadanori Koga of Stony Brook, and Andy Christianson of Irvine were selected from the suggestions for postdoc/graduate student candidates as giving the best breadth in representation. In order to simplify the process, two suggested nominations from ORNL whose position (postdoc or staff) was still uncertain were removed. They did not appear to represent any major new area, and some concern was expressed about the number of people from government labs. Paul Butler then suggested adding 4 names (all from universities) to round out the representation. In particular since polymer people form a large fraction of the user base and complained last time about lack of representation in the candidates, two polymer or polymer/complex fluids people were suggested. These were agreed to for a total of 10 regular candidates.

Joanna asked about the possibility of people standing for re-election and Paul Butler indicated that the bylaws do not prohibit such and that in fact the first time out, in 2002, all the members leaving stood for re-election. That year they ran unopposed and were all “re-elected.” It was deemed a reasonable means of ensuring continuity so early in the life of the organization. The following year nobody stood for re-election. Several members then nominated Paul Butler and Angus Wilkinson to stand for re-election. Paul Butler said he wanted to think about it a bit as he understood the need for continuity but expressed concern over the precedent of quasi-permanent memberships. This would also raise the number of candidates to 12. A brief discussion ensued on the need for better continuity in the long term, how best to achieve it and whether amendments to the bylaws, such as increasing the normal term to 3 years might be appropriate.

Next, the SNS summer shutdown proposal was discussed, Al Ekkebus at SNS having sent an email to the members of the executive committee requesting input. At issue is the SNS power contract which is currently being negotiated. Agreeing not to run the accelerator during peak season, such as August, can lead to substantial savings. Closing down a \$1.4 billion dollar facility during summer (a prime time for academic people to go do experiments) seems ludicrous on the face of it. However

Al points out that the operating schedule for SNS calls for two 4 week outages every year (along with some other shorter outages). Placing one of those four week outages during the peak month would save money. Furthermore, most Universities start up in August so that it may not be that much of an imposition. Some faculty members on the committee also indicated that in many cases they would send grad students or postdocs so that the summer “prime” time is not necessarily that big an issue anyway. After some discussion, the committee agreed that the 2nd half of August would not be a particularly bad time any more than any other 4 week outage. Including all of August might be a slight imposition but probably not so bad as to negate the savings. However, if the beginning of the shutdown were to move into the end of July, it was felt that the impact would no longer be negligible and the committee would like to be consulted again if that becomes a possibility. A discussion then ensued as to the proper way for SNS or HFIR to solicit input from the executive committee. Paul Butler noted that this was the second time the input was solicited on an individual basis, the need for a speedy response being the primary driver. He also noted that this presumably was exactly what Dave Moncton was looking for when requesting two separate executive committees (one for HFIR and one for SNS) so that he would know whom to call when he needed rapid feedback on SNS specific issues. The SHUG response was to form two standing special committees. After a brief discussion it was agreed that given that a healthy discussion often will alter the response, it seems appropriate that input, even with a rapid turnaround should be addressed either to the chair or to the chair of the appropriate special committee. The chair contacted should be the one to make the decision as to whether a simple email vote, an email discussion, or a special session of the committee is the appropriate way to provide the necessary response. Joanna said she would make that request in responding to the summer shutdown proposal.

Given the time the other two items on the agenda were postponed and the meeting adjourned at 2:30PM EDT

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of September 8, 2003

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 12:00 PM EDT on September 8, 2003. 9 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler (Secretary)
- Zema Chowdhuri
- Takeshi Egami (Immediate past chair)
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger (Chair)
- Nancy Ross
- Paul Sokol
- John Tranquada (Past chair)
- Angus Wilkinson

The meeting began with the question of the May minutes which were accepted as distributed. With respect to the June 30 on site meeting, Paul suggested that what he'd like to do is circulate a document called "notes" rather than minutes properly which briefly covered the salient points, in his mind, of the day long event and then circulate for input from the rest of the committee present so that the final notes reflect the main points of interest of all the members. This was agreed to be a reasonable way to proceed.

Joanna noted that the web site still lagged far behind on posting of the minutes. Also other items could use some updating and she asked who she should talk to about that. Paul said he'd work on getting the minutes up. As for other changes to the pages Paul said that in the past he'd worked with Charlie Horak and Judy Benton, but that normally we should go through Al Ekkebus first. Christina pointed out that she is becoming involved in web page development at SNS in a small way and could perhaps arrange to take care of some things. Joanna promised to contact Christina.

Next the state of the Fast Access proposal was raised. It was agreed that Joanna would email the final draft to SNS and HFIR along with a brief explanation and the

statement that after they have time to “digest” the proposal they would be invited to discuss it at one of the SHUG meetings.

Fall elections were then addressed. Paul briefed the committee on the process, the experience from last year, and the steps needed. The bylaws suggest that any person with 3 nominations should be on the ballot. This presumably is mainly to prevent a non-responsive executive committee from locking people out since the bylaws also indicate that the executive committee has a duty to prepare a slate which represents the diversity in the community. The first task is to send an email out to the constituency asking for nominations (including self nominations). This should be out for about a month to give people time to think about it and respond. Next the names so received need to be collected and the process of adding names to achieve the requisite diversity begins. At this point potential candidates need to be individually contacted to ensure their willingness to stand (assuming it is not a self nomination) and to ask for a brief (1–2 paragraph with web page pointer if available). Finally this information goes to SNS and a web based voting program is set up with emails sent to everyone on the SNS mailing list to ask them to vote. This should be open for 3 weeks to a month.

At this point the committee discussed a timeline as follows: Send out the same email call for nominations as last year (with appropriate date changes etc) ASAP with a deadline for nominations on October 15, a Wednesday, with a reminder going out Monday Oct 13. Tentatively set a Nov 3 date for the next conference call to hammer out details of the slate with a target of opening up the voting web site on Nov 17. Dec 10 was suggested as the tentative date then for closing the polls, with another reminder on Monday December 8. This allows people to get over Thanksgiving and/or the Boston MRS meeting and still have time to vote.

The question of what SHUG should do for the ACNS in summer 2004 in MD was discussed. The experience of the previous year was discussed and the problem of how to get input from the community as a whole without being too overbearing was examined. It was noted that most people left the sessions at the previous meeting, but that Shenda Baker of Los Alamos seemed to be the only one to really get substantial interest from the remaining people. It was suggested that the interest stemmed from the fact that she brought questions of direct and immediate relevance to the group which stimulated some discussion. The suggestion was made to move away from the formal session to a sponsored evening poster/reception. Paul Butler pointed out that Los Alamos wanted to do something like that last time and encountered some resistance mainly because there was only

one free time for a reception and allowing only one group to officially sponsor it was viewed as unfair and it would be likely that such a proposal would meet with resistance again. Paul Sokol pointed out that the NIST user group executive committee would be addressing the issue soon and that perhaps a joint session with various user groups would be appropriate. The idea then would be for the members of the executive committee to use the opportunity to gather information informally from the user constituency.

The next item on the agenda was the DANSE software. Since Paul Butler had just returned from a workshop on that topic he was going to brief the committee. However the hour being late, Joanna suggested that perhaps this could be postponed to the following meeting. Paul agreed but felt it important to point out that an SNS sponsored workshop to lay the groundwork for what the software needs are (e.g. define what DANSE or a competitor must provide) was being planned in a few weeks time (well before next meeting) and that it seems like SHUG should somehow be involved as software is clearly one of the major user issues. Hopefully several of the executive committee members will be able to participate despite the short notice.

Finally, Takeshi had asked that the executive committee consider his proposal that a new category of participation, below IDT, be created to allow people who cannot afford 10 million dollars for an instrument but can afford 1 million for some special equipment to get some smaller discretionary beam time allocation. This equipment would then be left at the facility for use by the general user community providing a mechanism for giving the user community access to more equipment than otherwise possible. Again in view of the time, Takeshi suggested that since everyone had received his email with the proposal they could just send him any comments directly. Paul Butler suggested that would be OK, but that he felt he had to point out that after some thought he believes this to be a rather bad idea as he believe it serves more the facilities needs than those of the general user, and that while this may well become a necessary evil if the facilities cannot provide all the necessary equipment, it seems nonsensical for the user community to try to push for a policy up front to cover such an eventuality. A good discussion ensued among several members with no clear consensus ensuing.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:30PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of June 30, 2003

The Executive Committee met at the SNS building in Oak Ridge TN, at 8:15AM for an all day on site visit. 9 of the 11 members were able to attend. They were:

- Paul Butler (Secretary)
- Takeshi Egami (immediate past Chair)
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger (Chair)
- Misture
- Nancy Ross
- Paul Sokol
- John Tranquada (past chair)
- David Vaknin

The group departed for HFIR where we were given a tour of the facility and shown the new triple axis machines running on their new software. This was followed by a brief presentation/introduction by Greg Smith on the instruments (both running and planned) including time lines, instrument scientists and handouts with specifications. Coffee was then served and the committee was able to view posters and mingle with the instrument scientists to discuss particular areas of interest. Next the group traveled to the SNS construction site where the central lab and office (CLO) building had its steel structure complete and the linac was already buried. The site was quite impressive as was the pace of work and the committee could look forward to the day soon when the on site visit would take place in the CLO.

From the construction site the meeting moved to the SNS temporary offices in Oak Ridge where SNS instrument scientists joined us, and Ian Anderson gave us an overview of the status of the instrumentation. He showed that 16 of the potentially 24 instruments are already accepted with several others in the works. The tables indicated that only one moderator remained with ports unspoken for, underscoring the need for the second target station sooner rather than later.

The committee also heard from Lou Santodonato and Greg Smith with regards to existing (at HFIR) and planned sample environment issues. Lou indicated the need

for testing new equipment and discussed some collaborative effort in that regard with other parts of ORNL. The committee brought up issues of maintenance and accuracy, particularly as regards temperature, as key areas of concern.

Standardization of sample environment interfaces across instruments and perhaps even between HFIR and SNS were mentioned. Lou mentioned that the first piece of equipment being bought by SNS is going to be available at HFIR soon and will remain there as a testing site until SNS is ready. Mention was also made of sharing equipment which is expensive and not a “workhouse” piece between the two sites, though issues of transportation would have to be resolved. Staffing levels were raised in particular as regards maintenance of equipment and availability over weekends.

The committee heard from Lee Robertson about the new HFIR acquisition software and Doug Abernathy about the DANSE software project. Doug is instrument scientist on the ARCS instrument which is developing the DANSE concept but noted that he was not really an expert on the software side. The committee was certainly intrigued by DANSE but would like to know more. In particular issues of cost and standalone operation were discussed.

Herb Mook director of the neutron scattering center at HFIR and Thom Mason, SNS director addressed the committee briefly. Several issues were discussed. In particular, the desire by management for the committee to poll its membership on a variety of issues – beginning with feedback from the first round of users at HFIR. Finally the committee met briefly on its own. Paul Butler brought up the fact that the committee needs to start work soon on the next SHUG elections, indicating that a variety of things have to happen in series making the time much shorter than one would think. Further discussion was tabled till next meeting. Takeshi urged that we not meet in August but rather meet next in September and this was generally accepted. David Vaknin as HFIR special committee chair agreed to prepare a survey for review by the committee to be sent out to those who went through the first round of proposals and if necessary have a meeting of the special committee.

The meeting ended shortly after 5PM

The committee is grateful to all the staff at HFIR and SNS for making this a pleasant and very informative session despite the short notice.

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of May 9, 2003

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 1:00 PM EDT on May 9, 2003. 9 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler (Secretary)
- Zema Chowdhuri
- Takeshi Egami (Chair)
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger (Chair Elect)
- Nancy Ross
- Paul Sokol
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

Thom Mason, director of the SNS project, was invited to join this meeting to discuss the status of the SNS project. Thom began by informing us that SNS had just completed a review the day before which had gone very well. The project is now 60% complete and still on track to be on time and on budget. The 20% contingency on the remaining work is tight but acceptable. With regards to physical facilities, the accelerator and accumulator ring buildings are finished, the target and CLO (central lab and office) buildings are progressing rapidly, the front end has been recommissioned up to 51 mA, and the linac hardware is now working well. Development of the mercury target is going well, with the latest tests indicating that the lifetime of the target vessel will be acceptable even without any of several improvements currently being studied. Finally the CNMS (center for nanophase material science) building which is not part of SNS but will be built contiguous to the CLO and have strong reciprocal links with SNS will begin construction this summer.

On the instrumentation side, 16 of a potential 24 instruments have now been approved and 13 have funding in place. As for the mix of IDT vs IAT instruments, Thom pointed out that so far all instruments, regardless of funding model, will make 75% of the time available to the general user program and that all instruments will be staffed by SNS thus providing a seamless integration across

instruments. Asked about staffing levels, Thom expects to have 5–6 FTE's per instrument by the time the user program starts. That is contingent on obtaining the full \$150–160M/year in operating funds as a large number of fixed costs will necessarily squeeze the personnel budget if that target is not met. Asked about the status of data acquisition and analysis software development, Thom indicated that there have been a couple of recent hires on the data acquisition side, while on the data analysis side Caltech, which is building one of the IDT instruments, is working on a framework, DANSE (white paper available through SNS website) and that all the North American neutron facilities have agreed to work together on data analysis. Even though SNS will likely be the largest neutron scattering center in the country, it cannot hope to achieve alone what the combined efforts can. Queried about the current view of when full scale user operation would commence, Thom said middle of 2008, as stated in the white paper distributed to the committee last year, is still the target, but that relatively intense beams, capable of doing lots of good science would be available much earlier and that some kind of informal program would be in place to utilize it as much as possible with those users who are willing to accept the risks associated with beta testing an instrument and a facility.

Other developments include NSF offering a new grant program with up to \$2 million/year for instrumentation at SNS. Avenues for private funding of the lodging facility such as is being done at Brookhaven for example are being pursued. If successful, that would free up the state JINS (joint institute for neutron sciences) money to build more office, conference and meeting facilities, probably adjacent to the lodging facilities. Finally, the proposal to include a doubling of the beam power and building the second target station in the BES 20 year plan got very good review from the advisory committee.

Takeshi asked Thom to keep the committee informed as to the state of the operational funding as it will be extremely important to the user community that the instruments be adequately staffed. He also asked Thom if there was any input from the committee that SNS is looking for in the near future to which Thom suggested that the exact nature of the lodging facility is an issue that will be coming up soon and on which input from the community would in fact be much appreciated.

Next Takeshi asked that the date for the on sight visit be finalized. Of the two possible dates, Monday June 30 and Tuesday July 1, Takeshi suggested that Monday would probably be better. There being no dissent, the visit was set for June

30. Takeshi asked for suggestions of specific topics to bring up the meeting. Topics/suggestions should be e-mailed to Joanna and Takeshi. Zema suggested sample environment as an important relevant topic.

Discussion then turned to the Fast Access draft proposal. Paul Butler and Paul Sokol had had a number of email exchanges on the last draft culminating in an off line phone discussion. Paul Butler summarized the main issue as being the line suggesting that the decision on allocating fast access time would be primarily left to the instrument scientist. Given the sensitivity of the community to conflicts of interest, it was felt inappropriate for SHUG to be suggesting this. Angus pointed out that his main concern and intent was to ensure that "fast" is truly "fast." A definition of fast was then discussed with a consensus being that a decision should be made in less than 10 days. It was suggested that this definition rather than how to implement it should be quoted in the proposal. In the end this is a proposal to HFIR to institute a pilot program which should ultimately be tweaked with input from the community through SHUG as it develops. Angus agreed to edit that section to reflect the concerns and then circulate the final draft for approval. Finally, with Takeshi moving to UT/ORNL June 1, Joanna will be taking over as chair, leaving the vice chair position vacant. Pursuant to the bylaws, a new vice chair should be selected. As this position is not also chair elect (i.e. the vice chair will only serve out the remainder of Joanna's term as vice chair, with a new vice-chair/chair elect being elected from next year's incoming members), Takeshi suggested that it be open to new and old members alike. Paul Sokol was nominated and accepted the nomination. There being no other nominations or volunteers, Paul was unanimously accepted as the new vice chair.

Paul Butler suggested that he could forward a copy of the white paper referred to be Thom Mason regarding the SNS schedule sent to the committee last year for the benefit of those new members who have not seen it.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:00PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of March 21, 2003

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 1:00 PM EDT on March 21, 2003. 9 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami (Chair)
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger
- Scott Mixture
- Paul Sokol
- John Tranquada
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

Takeshi began the meeting by bringing up two informational points. The first item was that because there are no real users of SNS (and with HFIR down not any current users of that either), the membership definition has been pretty broad to include anyone who is interested in neutron scattering. Thus the SNS mailing list is used as the SHUG membership “roster.” This mailing list was originally put together from several neutron scattering mailing lists and is continually updated by SNS staff by adding everyone who attends any SNS or JINS meetings or who otherwise identify themselves as being interested. That list has currently over a thousand names. However, 208 people voted in the last SHUG election and the list of those people has been kept as well. Presumably this represents a core group of “users” with a more active interest. It is not clear if and when use of such a restricted list would be appropriate, but if such a use does become obvious the committee should be aware of its existence. Next Takeshi mentioned that from the point of view of the bylaws the only distinction between “regular” committee members and the postdoctoral member is the length of tenure. Thus, the postdoctoral member is a full member with all rights and obligations and should participate actively at all levels. In particular they should be encouraged to participate fully in discussions. The current postdoc member not being present Takeshi indicated he would talk to her separately.

Next, Takeshi informed the new members that in the past minutes have been circulated via email and after a two week comment period were deemed accepted. He suggested the practice continue unless someone had strong objections. There being none, acceptance of the minutes will continue in this manner.

At this point Jim Roberto and Herb Mook from ORNL/HFIR joined the call to discuss the state of HFIR with the committee. Jim began by stating that HFIR was still in shut down status. While he is not happy with the delays he pointed out that the impact on the user program has thankfully been minimal due to the gradual approach to implementing the user program (only 2 instruments are currently available).

The shutdown occurred after a scheduled outage during which substantial maintenance and repair work took place. On startup the reactor power began dropping so, according to procedure, the reactor was shut down. The problem was traced to an improperly wired servo motor. While this error never posed any danger to personnel or the reactor, in the spirit of putting safety first, an extensive review of all work performed during the outage was undertaken in order to ascertain that no other errors existed. That is mostly complete. The good news is that nothing else has been found and the hope is to restart the reactor by early next week. The outage has unfortunately had some schedule impact on a variety of other parts of the upgrade. Thus it will now be summer before the first HB-2 instruments are ready and fall before the powder machine is ready. On the cold instrument side, the window for guide installation has been missed (CILAS, the manufacturer has other obligations) and the cold source project has also been set back. The bottom line is that the cold source is now scheduled for installation in late 2004. Asked whether that was conservative or optimistic estimate, Jim declined to answer until having time to further study how that schedule was arrived at as he had only been briefed on it the day before. Asked about how this would impact the next call for proposals, Herb Mook indicated he didn't think it would have any effect as HFIR's available instrument time would be ramping up and the backlog from the current cycle could be accommodated in that extra time.

Next the committee discussed the Fast Access proposal draft submitted by Angus following the last meeting. It quickly became evident that there was some confusion about what type of need was being addressed in this document (i.e short duration experiments such as sample characterization and feasibility measurements, rather than "hot topic" experiments). Another issue was the wording about how to handle the review process to which there was some

objection. It was also pointed out that not all instruments would benefit from such a program and those that did might not all benefit equally. For example powder diffraction would benefit strongly from both the characterization and the feasibility aspects of the proposal while SANS would probably benefit mostly from the feasibility aspect. The suggestion was then made that Angus revise the draft to incorporate a better distinction at the front end of what need is being addressed (not “hot topic”), a mention of the fact that this proposal would not necessarily be appropriate for all instruments, and a softening of the wording about how the proposal is reviewed. Finally the point that the process (even if implemented beyond the test stage of this proposal) should be periodically reviewed to ensure it remains a productive use of the time was unanimously recognized to be key to any implementation. How the metrics should be defined was unclear but it was agreed that for the purposes of this proposal it was not necessary to completely define them.

In other business, Paul Butler brought up the need to complete the special committees and elect a chair for the SNS special committee. Paul noted that historically the idea (and practice) was that every member of the committee would serve on at least one of the two special committees of HFIR and SNS. However on re-reading the bylaws, there does not seem to be such a requirement spelled out. Nonetheless, the full membership of the committees should be posted on the website soon and it would be nice to know for sure who will be on what committee. Paul noted that 3 people had yet to voice an opinion: Zema, Christina, and Paul Sokol. Paul Sokol offered to serve on the SNS committee, while Christina offered to serve on both. Paul Sokol and Angus accepted to stand for chair of the special committee and given the time it was agreed that votes would be sent to Paul Butler for later announcement.

Finally in other business, Paul Butler brought up the fact that originally the committee had agreed to publish the accepted minutes on the SHUG website. A few of the early minutes were posted, but the site has not been updated since. Paul suggested he'd like to restart that practice and asked for comments. Angus pointed out that the minutes should be a matter of public record. There being no objections it was agreed that the minutes would be so posted.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:00PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

Note 1: Angus distributed a revised copy of the writeup for a proposed “short duration” fast access to the group via email after the meeting.

Note 2: HFIR re-started up on March 30th, 2003

Note 3: Following the meeting, Zema Chowdhuri offered to serve on the HFIR special committee, while Angus Wilkinson was voted as chair of the SNS special committee Thus the committees stand as follows:

SNS

- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami
- Christina Hoffmann
- Scott Misture
- Paul Sokol
- John Tranquada
- Angus Wilkinson (Chair)

HFIR

- Paul Butler
- Zema Chowdhuri
- Takeshi Egami
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger
- Nancy Ross
- David Vaknin (Chair)

Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of February 7, 2003

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 1:00 PM EDT on February 7, 2003. 10 of the 11 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Paul Butler
- Zema Chowdhuri
- Takeshi Egami (Chair)
- Christina Hoffmann
- Joanna Krueger
- Scott Mixture
- Nancy Ross
- John Tranquada
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

This being the first meeting of the committee with the newly elected members, the meeting began with each member introducing themselves to the group. Following this, the business of selecting a Vice-chair (and chair elect) and Secretary was addressed. Takeshi pointed out that according to the bylaws, the vice chair should be elected from the new members and that no ORNL employee is eligible to be either chair or vice-chair. Thus, excepting the postdoc member, only Nancy Ross, Joanna Krueger, and Paul Sokol are eligible. Furthermore, Takeshi noted that he will be leaving the university of Pennsylvania for a joint appointment at UT and ORNL in the summer, so that the vice-chair will be taking over in mid-year and serve one and a half years as chair making this a particularly important choice. Takeshi suggested that the three eligible candidates all be nominated and that election be via email to Paul Butler. There being no objection, Takeshi next suggested that Paul Butler be nominated to continue as Secretary and asked for any other nominations. There being none, Paul Butler was appointed Secretary for 2003.

Takeshi then indicated that he had invited Jim Roberto to address the committee at the next meeting. In the meantime Takeshi briefed the group on the state of HFIR, noting the progress on the various instrument fronts (one fully operational triple

axis and two others getting close). The reactor however did not come up as scheduled for the latest cycle, which was to have been the first cycle with user proposal beam time allocations (the start of the user program). He indicated that no technical problems exist at this time, but that HFIR is undergoing DOE review and awaiting signature for restart. If all goes well, the reactor could be back up in a few weeks though at this point that is not guaranteed.

SNS is progressing well also, though a problem at Los Alamos with work on the Linac caused a several month delay. The problem is fixed, but it now appears that the early finish of late 2005 that had been hoped for will no longer be possible. SNS will come online in early 2006 as originally scheduled. The construction is on the order of 70% complete with the foundation and concrete framework for several floors of the CLO (central lab and office building) already up.

The CNMS (center for nanophase material science) building is believed to be on hold pending a final budget for FY- 2003.

Next Takeshi informed the group that Jim Roberto would like SHUG to sample the community's view on the success of the initial user program. Obviously this would not be until sometime mid year. However, Takeshi suggested this might ideally be something for the HFIR special committee which so far has never been activated. The bylaws requiring the two special committees of HFIR and SNS anyway, Takshi asked Paul Butler for the names of the members on each sub committee from last year. These are:

for SNS

- Robert McQueeney, Chair (no longer member)
- Meigan Aronson (no longer member)
- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami
- Scott Misture
- John Tranquada
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkonson

for HFIR

- Costas Stassis, chair (no longer member)

- David Belanger (no longer member)
- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami
- Andrei Zheludev (no longer member)

the new members were asked to think about which committee they might serve on, and in particular, consider serving on the HFIR committee as it is particularly lacking members (and may have the first task to deal with). No new members for the SNS committee immediately came forth. For the HFIR committee David Vaknin, Joanna Krueger, and Nancy Ross agreed to join and David was elected chair. The remaining new members will choose at a later date. The selection of the new chair of the SNS committee is likewise postponed.

Last year saw much discussion of “fast access” with two different varieties being identified. The “hot topic” version is already addressed in the SNS white paper.

Angus Wilkinson had accepted at the last meeting of last year to prepare a proposal for using the powder machine at HFIR as a test of the “short duration” experiment model. Takeshi asked Angus to brief us on his progress. Angus indicated he had contacted Bryan Chakoumakos, the powder diffractometer instrument scientist, had received good positive feedback, and was in the process of writing something up.

A brief discussion of how to increase the user base occurred next. The question of how to bring new practitioners into the community was raised. It was noted that workshops and “schools” (such as the JINS workshops in Oak Ridge or the summer schools sponsored by the various neutron sources) are very useful in this regard. It was agreed that we should remain on the lookout for opportunities in this area. Takeshi indicated that while most of our work would be done via conference calling and emails, we were planning one face to face meeting in Oak Ridge. A discussion about appropriate times ensued with a clear interest in making it after the end of semester (late May early June). A question arose about other meetings taking place in Knoxville with which such a visit could be combined, but the NICEST workshop is too soon (March 12) and the next one appears to be in the fall. A suggestion was made to get together then, but it was agreed that sooner would be best. It was decided that people would check their schedules and come back later to choose a time in the end of May early June time frame.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:45PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

Note 1: Angus distributed a copy of the writeup for a proposed “short duration” fast access to the group via email after the meeting.

Note 2: In subsequent balloting, Joanna Krueger was elected vice chair.

