

# ***Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of December 19, 2002***

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 2:30 PM EDT on December 19, 2002. 7 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Dave Belanger
- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami
- Scott Misture
- John Tranquada
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson

The first item on the agenda was the Results of the election. A total of 218 people voted with 207 of those also voting for the postdoc/graduate student position. 40 votes were registered within an hour of the original email going out the afternoon of Nov 26. Another 100 or so votes were registered during the ensuing 2 weeks of holidays and MRS meetings. The remaining 80 or so votes came in during the last 3 days of voting. A reminder email was sent out Monday the 16 only to those who had not voted. The SNS mailing list has a little over 1000 names. Of 60 bounces a little over 1/3 were spelling errors which were able to be corrected. The final Results for the 4 regular positions are:

Christina Hoffmann SNS 123 votes or 56%

Paul Sokol Penn. State 122 votes or 56%

Joanna Kruger Uni NC 109 votes or 50%

Nancy Ross VA Tech 109 votes or 50%

For PostDoc/Grad Student the winner is:

Zema Chowdhuri NIST/UMd 113 votes or 56%

Two sets of comments were received. Two people complained about the lack of soft matter/polymer representation, while two others complained about the fact that they were not allowed to vote for fewer than 4 regular candidates (though they were able to not vote for the PostDoc position). All were responded to and thanked

for their comments and participation. The soft matter people were encouraged to actively participate in next year's nomination process. Paul Butler suggested that the issue of not being able to vote for less than the required number be dealt with next year by adding an intermediate screen if a person "casts" their ballot without voting for the required number OR without voting for the postdoc position. This screen would warn them of the omission, the fact that they will not be able to come back later and "fix" the omission and encourage them to read the bios and vote even if they do not personally know a candidate. They would then have the option to go back, exit without voting, or going ahead and finalizing their incomplete vote. This seemed reasonable to the committee.

Paul next suggested that for announcing the results we not send a mass email out but simply place the results on the website. Also he suggested he would craft a letter to the candidates thanking all of them for participation and announcing the "winners." It was suggested that an emphasis be placed on thanking those who did not win for their participation and making this a truly meaningful election. A draft will be circulated to the committee before it goes out.

John Tranquada suggested that we should capture the list of names of those who voted since it represents a subset of the SNS list which has clearly demonstrated an active interest. This led to a discussion of the fact that at some point we need to define an "active member" and also a discussion of whether capturing the list of voters would violate any privacy issues. It was generally agreed that at some point defining a subset of the SNS list as actual SHUG members would be appropriate, but that that time was not now. Differences remain as to when would be an appropriate time. The idea of requiring membership renewal was thought to be appropriate (eventually) and even perhaps using the election web page as a forum for doing so, much as Los Alamos does, but no consensus was reached on the idea of implementing such during the next election round. In the end it was agreed that Paul would talk to Judy about ensuring that the current list remain available while discussions continue as to how, if, or when to use it.

Next John asked Angus to lead off a discussion on Fast Access. Angus pointed out that there are essentially two different types of "fast access" that can be discussed. In one case a really hot topic drives the need for rapid access to beam time. Provisions for this type of access are already made in the SNS white paper and the joint SNS/HFIR user program document. The second type of "fast access" or "short turnaround" time addresses a need for people with very short duration experiments (say 10 min to a few hours of beam time). Powder diffraction is envisaged as the

place where this would be used the most, but a few other instruments might also benefit. The reasoning for this is that it is unreasonable to go through all the paperwork and then wait for six months to get 10 min worth of data. Also in this mode the neutron scattering measurement would be one of many tools in a much larger program and often the data are needed before proceeding to the next step. Stopping an experimental program 6 months for 10 minutes of data is prohibitive. Finally, the thought is that this would open up neutron scattering to a whole new set of users. The need for a non PhD level scientific technician for this kind of operation was discussed as was the fact that there exists working models at other facilities such as IPNS. It was suggested that Angus contact Bryan Chakoumakos as well as instrument scientists at facilities currently providing a similar service and prepare a proposal indicating how this might work on the powder machine at HFIR. It was suggested that this proposal should also include names of groups/people who would be potential users of such a system and if at all possible identify some who would not otherwise consider neutrons. Since the powder machine should be coming on line in 6 months or so and HFIR is supposed to be a "test bed" for user program ideas, it seems reasonable to suggest that HFIR should test this idea if a well conceived proposal can be presented. Angus agreed to proceed with that. Finally as member of the first proposal committee, John Tranquada gave a brief overview of the first round of proposals. He indicated that 43 proposals were received with an oversubscription factor of 2. Overall things went quite well given this is the first time HFIR has operated in this fashion. However, as expected, John noted that the system would need many refinements and that he would be sending his suggestions to Greg Smith shortly. In particular John thinks that the high percentage of beam time being allocated through the proposal system (he noted that the 75% being driven by SNS is higher than most instruments at NIST for example) places a particularly heavy burden on the program.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

# ***Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of October 1, 2002***

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 2 PM EDT on October 1, 2002. 10 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Meigan Aronson
- Dave Belanger
- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami
- Scott Mixture
- Costas Stassis
- John Tranquada
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson
- Wouter Montfrooij

The first item on the agenda was the draft Plan for the User Program. At the ACNS meeting the committee asked about the plan for implementing the user program, and when that implementation might begin. It was agreed then that Greg Smith(HFIR) and Al Ekkebus (SNS) would prepare a draft plan of how to implement the user program to present to SHUG by September for comment and review and Jim Roberto set January of 2003 as the start of user program allocated beam time. John Tranquada indicated that, as of mid September, the document was undergoing internal review. Some concern was expressed over whether SHUG can have any meaningful input if the first experiments are to start January 1 of 2003. The feeling of the committee was that it would like to review the document as soon as possible, but that some slippage of the January start was not a grave concern at this point. Some other discussion ensued before it was agreed that further discussion should be tabled until a copy becomes available for review. John Tranquada as chair will inquire as to the status of the document and whether we can view an early draft if necessary.

Next on the agenda was the issue of how to deal with the chair becoming 50% an ORNL employee. The bylaws state that: "Neither the Chair nor Vice Chair shall be an

employee of ORNL". Takeshi Egami, current vice-chair and therefore chair for 2003 has recently accepted a joint appointment with the University of Tennessee and ORNL (50/50) which will commence in May of 2003. An option consistent with the bylaws would be for Takeshi to serve until May and then resign in favor of the then current vice-chair. No objections were raised to this course of action, although there was some uncertainty as to the length of time that the replacement chair should serve. Since officers are selected by the committee ("the Executive Committee in its first meeting shall select a Vice Chair from one of the new members of the Committee."), it was noted that there is a fair amount of flexibility. It was further noted that no conflict will exist in January when the new committee convenes for the first time (with potentially over 50% new members) so that perhaps the final decision should be left up to the new body.\*\*

A discussion about the upcoming elections came next. John Tranquada noted that we currently had 7 names of people willing to serve and 6 positions to fill. We however have no names to run as the graduate student or postdoc representative. John also asked if any of the members whose terms are coming to an end would like to stand for re-election. So far none have volunteered. Several new names, including student/postdoc names were put forth. A suggestion was made that ORNL and UT would be a likely place to find student/postdocs who would be interested in HFIR/SNS. While postdocs at other universities/facilities are welcome it was not clear to everyone on the committee that they would be that interested/motivated. It was noted that the bylaws not only task the executive committee with preparing a slate of candidates but that: "In preparing a slate of candidates, the Executive Committee shall attempt to provide appropriate representation on the Executive Committee of the principal activities at the SNS and HFIR. In addition, the Executive Committee shall strive to have scientific and institutional diversity reflected in the slate of candidates. Less than half of the members of the Executive Committee shall be employees of the SNS, HFIR, or JINS." The need for a short biographical sketch/statement of interest for each candidate and to verify that each potential candidate is willing to stand was also noted. David Vaknin and Paul Butler agreed to co-ordinate the effort. Paul suggested a timeline of late October for a final committee review of the slate, early November emailing of ballots and a deadline for receipt of votes towards the end of November. Finally the committee discussed the white paper on the SNS timeline and priorities in moving from commissioning to fully committed user operation. Many on the committee felt that they did not have enough knowledge/information to comment

on the document in any specific way particularly as regards the time required to ramp up the power and do testing. Three primary parameters are being balanced: total available time, beam current, and reliability. The committee felt that the document as a whole was very reasonable and the choice of optimizing around a reliability of 90% before full user mode operation is important. The extra two years from first operation to user mode operation is a bit disappointing, but it was felt that as the major new neutron facility it is important to not rush things so much that future performance is sacrificed. John will write a brief statement of support, emphasizing the users concerns, to be circulated and iterated by the members before submittal to SNS.

This being the first time that the conference call went through MCI in order to have toll free call-in capability, Paul Butler asked for comments. The response being positive, we will continue to use this service in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55PM EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary

\*\*NOTE: In email correspondence with the officers following the meeting, Dave Belanger, a co-author of the by-laws and past chair, explained that it was originally intended that, should a vice-chair accede to the office of chair early, this person would still serve as chair for the year beginning the following January (i.e. the term for which they were originally elected to serve as chair). This perspective should be taken into account when the final decision is made. The term for the vice-chair elected in mid-year then becomes an issue. The intent here is much less clear, but Dave Belanger suggests that his view would be that said vice-chair would be elected KNOWING that they are only to serve as vice-chair for the remainder of the term and would neither accede to chair nor continue as vice-chair the following year. This should be an item for further discussion at the next meeting.

# ***Minutes of SHUG Executive Committee Meeting of May 1, 2002***

The Executive Committee convened by conference call at 11 AM EDT on May 1, 2002. 10 members were present. The members in attendance were:

- Meigan Aronson
- Dave Belanger
- Paul Butler
- Takeshi Egami
- Costas Stassis
- John Tranquada
- David Vaknin
- Angus Wilkinson
- Andrey Zheludev
- Wouter Montfrooij

Paul opened with a summary of the status of the ACNS conference organization and answered some questions. The meeting is shaping up well with over 250 abstracts submitted. The [website](#) is regularly updated and is a good way to keep up with what is going on. Some sessions have had to be expanded to 4 parallel sessions and we've gone from 2 to 3 poster session. The CNMS (center for nanophase materials science) workshop was mentioned. It is having its second planning workshop to refine the original focus areas of the center. Given that obviously it is hoped that the center will leverage the proximity of the SNS and emphasize the use of neutrons in nanoscience, they decided to have a symposium with tutorials and example lectures on the Sunday prior to the ACNS meeting taking advantage of having the large number of neutron "experts" gathered for the ACNS. Some concern was voiced with the overlap of the workshop with the meeting. That overlap will be Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning (they are encouraging their people to attend the opening plenary sessions of the ACNS Monday morning). It was judged that this was not a real issue.

Every one was encouraged to register before the early registration deadline of May 15. Also Dave Belanger encouraged people to have students apply for travel grants to come to the meeting. The application is on the web.

A discussion about an executive committee meeting at the ACNS but prior to the 20 minute Tuesday session ensued. It was decided that John and Paul would try to organize a room and times with the plan being to attempt to meet from 5–5:30PM Sunday the 23rd prior to the reception to develop an “agenda” of questions/issues to bring to HFIR and SNS. Following the reception at 7:00 we would try to get Herb Mook, Jim Roberto, Thom Mason, and Greg Smith to join the executive committee for discussions.

A discussion of what to present to the community at the ACNS user meeting was had. Meigan made the point that perhaps we should inform people by email ahead of time to come with their concerns and use the 20 min of open meeting for the community to talk to us rather than the other way around. While there was some doubt as to how effective that might be, it was agreed that in principle that was a good idea and John will craft an email informing people of the session at the ACNS and asking them to bring their concerns to us there, while also emphasizing our availability via email and encourage input through any venue. We would ask Al Ekkebus to distribute this to the SNS mailing list. Also John suggested that it would be good to use this meeting to generate interest in others willing to serve on the committee who might stand for elections in the fall.

A discussion of the role SHUG should play in the development of the user program at HFIR was had. Issues discussed include:

- The need for realistic estimates of when instruments will be available to general users and the lead time required for general users from such an announcement to actual experiments.
- Helping HFIR and SNS find the funding to properly instrument the facilities
- Concern that if instruments are pushed too fast into the general user program they will not be optimized or ready possibly causing a lot of bad publicity which is good for nobody.
- Helping HFIR in particular find adequate funding for user program infrastructure
- The need to develop the infrastructure for requesting, receiving, and evaluating user proposals, for initial use at HFIR and later at SNS
- The lead time required between a call for proposals and the arrival of the first user



Costas Stassis agreed to call a meeting of the HFIR subcommittee soon to discuss some of these issues.

There was general agreement that a meeting at ORNL involving visiting some of the people on the ground was a good idea. The suggestion was made that before the ACNS would be good, but that appears to be too difficult. Maybe at a later date. Mentioned as people to visit were Al Ekkebus and Greg Smith on user program development, Lou Santodonato on sample environment, some software people covering plans from acquisition and instrument control, to online data access, to reduction, visualization and analysis tools, to web interfaces for access to the facility in general and access to computational resources in general.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15PM EDT

Respectfully

submitted,

Paul Butler

SHUG Secretary