

Minutes of UEC Meeting

3/7/2013, taken by K. Nasta

Attendees: B. Ravel, P. Stephens, J. Smedley, J. Bohon, D. Fischer, D. Arena, G. Cisco, K. Nasta, K. Ludwig (on phone)

Meeting called to order by Jen 9:20 a.m.

Reviewed minutes

Discussion about including sensitive information in December minutes. Dario will help edit appropriately; Jen will have abbreviated version prepared, to be approved later by UEC via electronic vote.

Kathy's Presentation

UEC Account – potential change in splitting between a workshop account (what we have now) and credit union account. Discussion of issues surrounding these changes.

ACTION ITEM: Peter will look into possibility of setting up SBU account.

New PASS – re: dynamic info; concern that it may be a lot of work for not much reward. Look into this. Concern about how we will authenticate – would be nice if we can continue as we do now. Still open issue.

ACTION ITEM: Kathy will share PASS Advisory Committee report with the UEC.

Essential personnel – much discussion about what's appropriate, safety issues, issues with no food being available. Ongoing improvements to process. May discuss with Doon and/or approach BNL to do better at this.

Kathy discussed NUFO requests in general, and need for a scientific person to help with requests that are of scientific and/or outreach nature. Discussion that we should appoint UEC Outreach Officer. Need small committee (Bruce Ravel and Peter Stephens) to come up with language for charter and a motion. We could establish as actual position but if someone is good at it, it means they will rotate out. Could be task for Past Chair.

(Similar idea for a website coordinator.)

ACTION ITEM: Bruce (and Peter) will come up with language for Charter change, propose to UEC.

Bruce's Presentation

Users' Meeting update

- Retrospective workshop – currently well within budget established

Funds – proposals for utilization

- Snack bags for winery tour (minor expenditure - no vote necessary)
- Scholarships for students to attend meeting:
 - Advisor applies, 1 per advisor up to x number, waive reg fee and banquet, strongly recommend student submits poster. Apply through user admin, not too long open period.
 - Discussion about criteria, should poster be required, and whether this is considered an “award” in a prestigious sense.
 - **Bruce motioned student scholarships for up to \$3,000 worth. Dario seconded. All in favor.** Bruce still in favor of having discussion how to implement.
 - **John motioned that abstract and poster required; if hit cap, judge on basis of abstract. Jen seconded. All in favor.** Bruce can work out details of implementing this.
- Outreach activities
 - Travel
 - “sexy” demos – equipment, materials (Legos) to create models plus student time to work on these types of things

ACTION ITEM: Bruce work on how “scholarship” will work.

Community Service Award

Need nominees – nominally solicited in the past. Need to move on this. Dario put forward a suggested candidate.

ACTION ITEM: Bruce contact Gretchen to send out reminder about Community Service award.

John’s Presentation

Nominating committee (John (committee chair), Dan, Jean Jordan-Sweet, Annie Héroux)

Goal – at least 1 nominee to cover each technique not already covered; Broad collection of representatives (academia, gov’t, industry); all access modes represented (PU, facility, GU); broad range of experience with UEC.

Have 10 people, possibly 11 on slate.

John moved to accept the slate of candidates, Bruce seconded, all in favor.

ACTION ITEM: John send slide with slate of UEC candidates to Gretchen.

Jen – discussion

Issues for discussion with BES:

- 1) Additional development at NSLS-II – specifically to meet the needs of those whose research was done at NSLS. Include NXTGEN and NEXT? When will there be additional MIEs or possibility of funding undulator-based beamlines. NEXT2? Will BESAC allow for quicker ramping up at NSLS-II?
- 2) Waiting for User Access policy, Partner User policy, Beamline development policy.
- 3) Concern of users over lack of SAC input / involvement in user issues.

Following up on beamline project execution plan (BPEP)? Document that you sign to indicate relationship with NSLS-II and that we work together.

Theme: we are currently highly focused on the June 2014 deadline...what about July 2014? Day 1 is rapidly approaching, and whole list of issues that will be with us on that day, and how are we setting up to be prepared? Discuss a list of things needed such that we are ready for NSLS II operations.

Perhaps we should call UEC meeting to discuss July 2014 prior to meeting with BES and invite Steve Dierker and Doon Gibbs to be a part of it.

Lunch with Doon Gibbs:

Discussed issues with BNL closures during storms, particularly about food not making it over to housing areas. A suggestion was made that care packages (food) be available at all times (perhaps at security and in NSLS).

Discussion about readiness for July 2014, concern over lack of working SAC for extended period. Doon explained that attention was given, had to be given, to LINAC event and emphasized serious nature of this. Discussed concern over delayed release of User Access policy. UEC wants to get point across that we just want to be ready for July 2014. Can Doon give advice on how to do this better in the future? Keep Doon involved. BNL has a priority to integrate with user community, consistent with DOE vision. Doon mentioned there will be presentation on first science at upcoming management retreat, and that there is a large amount already done. Scientific programs, early science -- Information has been gathered. How do we develop the 5,000 users expected for NSLS II? Early science and transition to operations is absolutely essential. Both Doon and Steve feel vulnerability UEC has expressed related to delayed start of NXTGEN beamlines. Doon assures the UEC that Steve is leading the fight. The UEC is offering assistance and involvement to help management in meeting goals. Doon recommends that we need to reach out to Steve. Doon: DOE is completely committed and NSLS-II has enjoyed high priority for years. Doesn't mean it is not invulnerable to reductions, which are coming. Steve very directly involved in working with DOE and keeping high priority. It will be helpful to UEC to understand from Steve what his perspective is in terms of what DOE is thinking.

Discussion with Steve Dierker, Erik Johnson, Qun Shen, Diane Hatton

Question about sequestration and affect on NSLS/NSLS-II: not expecting reduction relative to this for operating funds for either NSLS or NSLS-II. NEXT project funds not expected to be impacted in FY 2013.

FY 14 and onwards, not sure. Will we get equal amount of what we got in first 6 months, or will it be less? Once budget passed, expect to get remaining amount.

Put proposal forward last year for NXTGEN (starting ops FY 15) – thought reasonable budget expectations – initial budget guidance not nearly reaching expectations. FY 13 expected bulk of work to be done. DOE would like it to happen but not expected that DOE can provide any additional funds. It could only happen if we were able to find funds in our operating budgets, but don't expect this to happen.

Is there a contingency plan if NXTGEN doesn't happen? Erik discussed coordination already in progress with other light sources. Jen - can outside funding be brought in? Steve – would need a rather large amount of money to do so. Jen – policies that would enable outside users to help...what is progress? Steve – not ready for release. Prioritization plan delayed things a bit. Jen – UEC would really like to help out if there are issues that the users can help with. Concerned that there have already been lost opportunities for gaining outside funds. Users ready to work with PS on the things that only PS can do.

Steve: Comprehensive and descriptive policies and procedures need to be in place. But also need people to spend time and effort partnering with people (users) to discuss options and create strong interactions. Lots of issues (procurements, etc.) – but not enough staff or staff time available to be able to work on all these issues. Do not have a person assigned to do this as more of a full-time job, and are currently discussing staffing needs for this at this time. Need point person. Steve feels it would be helpful if “type 2 persons” could articulate what the problems are in interacting with PS staff – nitty-gritty answers to specific questions you need answered (design of monochromators, ray tracings, etc.). Also if you have thoughts and suggestions on how to more effectively interact (meetings, what kind of resource (designer, engineer), what type of person who be effective to interact with). Define the line (shield wall?) for who does what in terms of the chores to be done.

ACTION ITEM: Deliver to Steve a list of nitty-gritty answers to specific questions, and how to more effectively interact (see above).

Given the categories from recent BESAC, is there anything we can take from that which would affect remaining 3 cycles of NSLS? DOE still seems committed to continuing ops to September 2014. We know money situations are tight and we just have to deal with it as best we can.

Expect next SAC meeting to be held over Summer 2013. The terms of current members have expired so there will likely be some turnover in membership prior to that time. There needs to be communication from Steve, but then Steve will reach out to UEC and ask for suggestions from UEC for persons to nominate for SAC. From Steve's perspective: the DOE does not hold SAC responsible for decisions and managing facility; SAC advice is valuable and desired, but is not essential to decision-making. SAC not required but perhaps more retrospective role.

LINAC incident really pushed things back in several areas and for long periods of time. Many people don't realize how much of an impact and how important this has been. Has had to be a priority. Outcome is good that we are stronger as a result but it has delayed many things. UEC acknowledges

that we realize how important LINAC incident has been, but since that has happened, will we be ready for science in July 2014 if we do finish the machine by June 2014?

Early science readiness review in October 2012 – are we doing all things that we can to be ready for after June 2014? UEC is concerned about science readiness. Policies are not in place to allow partner users to propose, for example. Some users are making plans to move to other light sources, and UEC feels we can do better about trying keep our users here as best we can. Steve said facility can only do so much with funds available. Considering increasing staff to provide this but that means something else will suffer. Facility does recognize priority but at some point there is a limit to what can be done. If facility had more people to throw at this problem, they would do it. Must get to the point where we recognize that we can't expect to keep all our users; that it's reality that there will be people who go to other light sources, and for some time.

UEC can perhaps help with users who can provide leverage. Perhaps UEC can provide list to help divvy up responsibilities a little bit differently. Can help with not just money but also completing work. Looking for the pathway to help, but also concerned about having no scientific advisement to the facility for a while.

From Steve's perspective: some of the non-SAC beamline and facility reviews are quite scientific and provide good advice, not to downplay importance of SAC.

How can UEC help PS Management?

Work with PS and include UEC in discussions on re-location to LOBs, and how they will work for the users when they locate there someday. Discussion about what to do with 725 building when we are done.

Ending Discussion:

Think about possibility of having real quarterly meeting at Users' Meeting or perhaps a week or two afterward.

Meeting called to close 4:40 pm.