# SHUG EC minutes, meeting 12/11/24

**Attendees (online):**

External: Allen Scheie, Amy Xu, Katie Weigandt, Mingda Li, Hillary Smith, Weiwei Xie, Ben Frandsen, Izabela Kruk, Igor Zaliznyak, Yulia Zaikina

ORNL Attendees: Naresh Osti, Janell Thomson, Jon Taylor, Michelle Dolgos

**Discussion items:**

1. (11:30) Some newly elected members joined the meeting, introductions made.
2. (11:41): Reviewing and approving the on-site visit report. Edits have been done, Mingda will finalize the document and put it into a word file. We need to finalize before the end of the year so the outgoing members can approve.
3. (11:46): Describe the elected positions, and let the two new members that elections will be held on January for vice-chair and secretary.
4. (11:50) Mingda asks Jon about the neutron ambassador program, and how SHUG can help with this. There is a website up, and applications are due mid-February. Michelle was hoping to have one member of the SHUG-EC involved. The plan is to have three-year terms, with three new ambassadors per year. Discussion of what kind of literature or information the ambassadors can hand out to others to advertise capabilities.
5. (11:57): Jon Taylor gives details of neutron nexus, have started with paying summer salary of a faculty at FSU. In discussion with LSU and Duke.
6. (11:59): Discussion about grand challenges report, and whether the input from the survey will be shared with the committee writing the report. Jon’s opinion is that the document is a great science case for neutron scattering, but less about what STS can do specifically that are killer applications. Jon requests that if we know people who have these in mind, contact Jon Taylor directly.
Discussion about the output of the town hall, and what will be done with it. SHUG-EC has permission to share the results.
Recent ORNL communication with DOE headquarters has shown they are happy with the performance of the first target station.
7. (12:12): Existing members stay on to discuss the on-site review document. The safety section needs to be softened so it does not seem like we are suggesting relaxing safety standards. Discussion about the overall tone of the document, given the on-site meeting. Suggest changing “recommendation” to “feedback”, and being careful to restrict our feedback to the domain of user experience, which is SHUG’s purview.