

UEC Meeting, Minutes 2/18/2009

(Nasta recording minutes for Jordan-Sweet who is out)

Attendees: Kao, Flynn, Sanchez-Hanke, Parise, Ravel, Alamgir, Mitchell, Dudley, Nasta, Strey, Vaughan, Heroux, Leskojvan, Widener, Tu.

(1) Different format for UEC Meeting/Town Meeting this year: listen to Kao and Dierker at Town Meeting, then use UEC meeting as Q & A afterward.

(2) Review of Minutes from November 2008 meeting: motion to approve by Parise, seconded by Ravel.

(3) Next UEC meeting scheduled for about 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 19th at Users' Meeting.

(4) Ravel: Users' Meeting update: reviewed speaker list, structure of day changed this year by interspersing talks throughout the main day, registration fee changed by not restricting to one workshop (only offer unlimited fee regular vs. student) with plenary session free, gift is calendar with 30 years' worth of photos.

(4) Kao: Question whether NSLS Division Heads are wanted as part of UEC meeting? Parise thought this would be helpful, Ravel and Sanchez-Hanke agreed. In charter, add "invite representation from NSLS management ..." and UEC will extend invitation to whomever they feel is necessary. Lead into charter discussion next.

(5) Parise: UEC Charter: sent document to Dierker to propose that this group act also as "Light Source Directorate" UEC; proposed that NSLS II be named NSLS as the "brand;" propose to change the UEC charter to make it more open as a light sources document.

Discussion: Ravel was encouraged by Dierker all-hands talk yesterday and spirit of cooperative identity and assuring overlap. Kao said he spoke to Dierker regarding the UEC overlap and it was supposed to come up at retreat, but did not yet. Parise wants it to be more inclusive and open to people that might not be represented on the UEC or by a SpIG. Parise would like to change membership to include those with BNL appointment and those who are interested by indicating via a web page. Parise suggests those interested have a pin number. Association is redefined in this way. Concern came up about being to open and inviting inappropriate people to sign up and/or threats to come through the list, and that maybe people should be required to register for site access even if they don't plan to physically come here. Ravel mentioned that he doesn't understand the concern that this group is too NSLS-centric. Discussion about APS situation (not a replacement facility) versus the NSLS situation. Discussion that it's not that difficult to obtain a BNL guest number so that should not be a deterrent (can have guest number without doing all the rest necessary for site access like training). Ravel suggested maybe someone can have a goal to suggest 2 new SpIG groups that are more applicable to a technique that is not represented here but would be in NSLS II (inelastic scattering, nano-scale focusing). Parise said we need to maintain identity as NSLS UEC because that's the first priority. Flynn suggested next Users'

Meeting can include NSLS II specific workshop; Sanchez-Hanke said she's been trying to do that but no interest. Vaughan proposed change to charter to state NSLS and NSLS II. Strey said we should think about the fact that there might be two UECs for a certain period of time. Kao said Dierker said there could be one UEC to represent both; he's receptive; but Parise proposed something and has not heard. Parise wants to go ahead and have this Charter applicable to both so that Dierker can decide to use this group. Parise suggested that we accept the Charter as is now with the option that we will continue to work on it. Specific changes:

- Name: 1st paragraph, 2nd line "...interests of BNL synchrotron light source users ..."
- Membership: "All BNL light source users who hold BNL appointments are..."
- UEC: "...SPIG representatives, and representatives of BNL light sources directorate (ex-officio)."

Later in day, we will revisit the Charter. It will be distributed around and members will need to physically indicate their approval. Then it can be presented at Users' Meeting.

Discussed how to get appointment through without justification appropriate to site access.

(6) SpIGs: what do they do? Parise believes targeted mailings are a good idea but not sure how much they actively solicit their user bases. Add to SpIG responsibilities that they should seek out who can be added to distribution lists. Discussed that we UA can provide initial database of names based on beamlines and users. It's up to SpIG groups to keep active the lists. Parise said he remembers that there are certain things that are very specific to the particular SpIG, and that there is this specific purpose. Newsletter perhaps that are specific to SpIGs? On website? UEC definitely wants to resurrect the SpIG mailing lists. Action Item: SpIGs get in touch with UA to help get the list going.

(7) Discussion on SNUG versus NUFO. Parise feels it's important to keep SNUG as distinct from NUFO. Need to assign person from UEC to interact with NUFO. Parise will do that for now. Peter Stephens active for now in SNUG. Perhaps a duty for SpIGs to reach out to users who may be interested in interacting with one or both of these groups.

(8) Ravel: XAFS training initiatives: demo'd XAFS training orientation module. Detailed the three phases of how this will lay out. Questions about use of FLASH; questions about how to transfer this. Ravel stated we will share with other light sources. FLASH is multimedia and cross-platform, and seemed best to use. Creative commons license. Wants to encourage wide usage. Cannot be printed and read later and that was on purpose (we are offering a FLASH product and people can choose it or not). Also plan to have some pieces offered just as a page available on web site. Vaughan asked what about people who don't know XAFS is what they need (Nasta will consider).

(9) Community Service Award: Sanchez-Hanke proposed Keith Klaus for his help and work on lab spaces on the experimental floor. Alamgir suggested Gary Nintzel who won previously in 2002. Open vote: 9 for Klaus; 2 for Nintzel. Award goes to Klaus.

(10) Hulbert: presentation on transitioning NSLS beamlines to NSLS II – Hulbert, Shen, and Hill have lists of beamlines that are transitioning. Will meet next week to mesh lists together. Presented MIDT idea on D&I beamlines. Beamlines that are transitioning are still the same. What's the next step? What's the transparency? Point is that the overutilized and best beamlines is to keep them running at same level they are now, but use the D&I beamlines as a supplement to test out the ideas for the future. Strey: not every beamline is good for every technique. Hulbert: open space that doesn't already have limited techniques. Plans proceeding whether or not beamlines are sure they will eventually appear at the NSLS II.

(11) Hosting:

Credentials review vs. feasibility review of work – maybe two sets of host approvals; who is legitimate from the organization? What is value added to having scientific host “vet” the person. Lenny noted what value the scientist adds by vetting their credentials. Lenny is really concerned about the security risk – whether someone lies about their experience and affiliation, that may or may not be a security issue. Discussion about issues; Kao raised that Pedro Montano offered to help from his position within DOE. Talked about working group that we are setting up to address whatever issues we can reasonably address. Perhaps there can be an administrative check of the institution's existence and the person's existence at that institution. Some kind of certification from the institution? Add PI to the GIS form so that can be used to help investigate who that person is. Question from Alamgir: what role is the host actually asked to fulfill? Talked about how the language is a bit heavy, and how we might tailor the training to be a little more general so it would soften the language but maintain the spirit of the order. White DePace suggested that we bring these suggestions to the attention to the NUFO group so other facilities would help get behind it with us. Strey brought up how we approach getting the light source people interested with no access. Keister suggested that a NSLS person (or perhaps BNL person) as a hosting resource that could be assigned so that person can figure out where the scientist can go when they have questions.

(12) Nominating Committee Report – (Jordan-Sweet not here; Parise read email of status)

Dan Fischer, Tony Lanzirrotti, Jen Bohon, Jay Brandies, Dave Mullins are ready to serve (agreed).

Oleg Gang, Paul Stevens, John Hill, Ben Hsiao – plus maybe some others – still waiting to hear if okay.

Need six people.

Keister suggests that a General Member can, in their second year, stand for election as Vice Chair. Parise said it doesn't seem to be written in the Charter to exclude that.

****Adjourn for lunch and Town Meeting ...

(13) Parise opened with call for questions toward Steve Dierker's presentation and Chi-Chang's presentation during the Town Meeting:

Ravel: MIE plans? Dierker: working on synthesizing input from community and organize it into plan for how the build out of facility might look like. Also strategic focus areas for next beamlines. Doesn't feel they have all community input so call for additional workshops. Beyond that, need to integrate bls from NSLS over to NSLS II. Wide scope of considerations. Not moving as quickly as we'd like but still pursuing.

Ravel: is there a specific call for workshops coming before the start of the MIE process? Dierker repeated answer similar to above.

Ravel: Is there an answer to "we want to build these x beamlines?" Dierker: Details of what bls are not ironed out; depends on techniques and needs. The approach of going out to community with interest for MIE bls didn't fly with DOE. We need to look at what we get from community and work forward from there.

Widener: Can this be a progressive process for beamlines to come forward? To build a whole case before you start populating it might be pushing things out a great deal. What if there's just an intent? How do we not lose momentum from the workshops already held last year? Dierker: discussed workshops that people are planning...agreed with this approach and is trying to support that, but might not be moving as quickly as would be hoped. Slowness is due to the fact that there's a lot going on and also that people are very overstretched (can't hire fast enough).

Strey: what should we ask from the users as part of being a SpIG rep? should we ask for them to propose new ideas? Kao: Example of XAFS – NSLS II does not currently have. Ravel should be worried about what users of XAFS beamlines will do when the beamlines go away. What is the dark period for these people? Need to look at each group and come back to talk to UEC. Many demands on people's time so need to keep making the case known. Strey: should SpIGs be looking at analysis of utilization of beam time per community? Should we be meeting regularly with management? Reach out to constituency and really represent their needs.

Ravel: someone in the community has to stand up and be the leader to get things going and define needs. Kao: UEC is advocacy group that should advocate for each group's needs.

Vaughan: As high pressure SpIG rep, held workshop, submitted LOI, what else do we need to do? Dierker: Can only repeat that we want to look toward having careful balance of programs, not just "first come, first served." Feel overwhelmed already – don't need to worry about it now because there are so many other things they are dealing with first.

Heroux: Regarding May shutdown, can we coordinate shutdowns between us and APS at least, if not all synchrotrons? Maybe we can schedule it more into June rather than May. Discussion about pros and cons. Led into power issues – maybe we should shift shutdown to July/August time frame. Hard to accommodate grad students; also technicians prefer to keep August open to do travel. Parise: UEC attitude that management can optimize situation as they see fit.

Ravel: operations schedule at NSLS II? Dierker: not thought about it yet.

Ravel: dipole wigglers? Dierker: currently space for them everywhere, examining space issues. As IDs are introduced, will there be a need for tuning knobs? Possibility that half of the lattice spaces might be needed for corrector magnets.

Vaughan: are superconducting wigglers still in the mix and how many? Dierker: haven't heard about any changes; think they can be accommodated.

Strey: UEC moving toward integrating/transitioning to represent both NSLS and future NSLS II users.

Dierker: don't have organized feedback yet, but feel management of both groups need to get together to consider all issues. Strey: Should we share thoughts that we had? Parise: Shared thoughts already in December with Dierker. Dierker: The UEC meets infrequently. If the need arose to have special meeting, for example, after the proposals about this, is everyone open to an ad hoc meeting? Parise: Yes. Ravel: Probably many of us would be open to that.

Tu: Interest in JPSI...is building ready? Founding model? Kao: Building plans are going on now and to secure \$20M above the first \$10M in order to get building constructed. Starting to develop scientific programs. Workshop being planned. Did reach out to NYSTAR but they merge out of existence.

(14) Parise – AOB?

Ravel: Where are we with the charter? Parise: will take clean copy of the charter and replace reference to NSLS where necessary. Will adjust and distribute to UEC and they will comment. Should be made well ahead of the Users' meeting so that it can be voted on ahead. Any comments should go to all those on the list.

Preference for doing things this way with updates during town meeting and question and answer afterward? Yes.

Strey: desire to see some hard numbers/data about what is actually moving to NSLS II and/or being built there. Parise: this goes along with getting SpIGs involved. Sanchez-Hanke: everyone is very busy and looking for someone else to take over to step up – both sides expecting the other to lead. Ravel: organizing a "community meeting" – perhaps everyone can do this too. Sanchez-Hanke: some SpIGs cross many beamlines like magnetism –can't propose a whole suite onto itself. Parise: SpIG reps should organize themselves the way they want to.

Will hold another UEC meeting when Dierker is available and schedule accordingly.

(15) Parise: motion to adjourn at 4:00 p.m.; Ravel, Sanchez-Hanke, Flynn seconded.