

## 8/27/09 UEC Meeting

Notes taken by K. Nasta

Attendees: B. Ravel, A. Lanzirotti, G. Flynn, J. Bohon, L. Ehm, A. Caruso, M. Dudley, A. Heroux, H. Robinson, S. Khalid, Y. Meng, M. Bourassa, P. Northrup; ex-officio: C.-C. Kao, K. Nasta, S. Hulbert.  
Invited: S. Bare, Peter Stephens, S. Dierker.

Called to order 8:35 by Bruce

Simon sitting in for Jean who is away, Kathy takes notes

Reviewed minutes – Jean wrote after the fact – some attendees missing (Kathy has list)

Robinson motioned to accept minutes with amended attendees list, Meng 2nded, motion carried

Agenda is tight; want to stay on schedule; lots to talk about with Steve D after Town Meeting (Bruce had seen Steve day before)

### Tony – Users' mtg update:

Statistics from 2009 – 310 attendees overall – historically about the same

Theme is Climate Change. Keynote speaker: invited Steven Chu. Ira Flatow and Alan Alda as backup.

Plenary will keep mix of science and updates plus will be free.

Meeting costs same - \$220/regular, \$110 student, all one price. Vendors increase from \$1300 to \$1500

Workshops: 6 full day, \$4500 budget, 2 CFN workshops, one workshop will solicit for community outreach/education type. Question: should education workshop be priced more cheaply? Bruce stated he thought this was a good thing; encouraging people who would not normally come to the Meeting and also these types of attendees will not attend other workshops.

Poster session – require that work be partially done at NSLS/CFN and be noted. Simon Bare stated work should be substantially done at the NSLS.

Banquet – offsite this year – maybe Atlantis Marine World. \$60-65/head – comparable to Nayarrasons on site. Will need to rent bus; no costs associated with entertainment and decorations.

### Bruce Ravel – XAFS training initiatives

At Chi-Chang's suggestion, work on web-based training and hands-on training

Orientation module pretty much done and will be announced soon –

[www.nsls.bnl.gov/users/access/modules](http://www.nsls.bnl.gov/users/access/modules)

Working on topical modules and “training the trainers” materials now for hands-on course (beginners’ level) so it can be disseminated to broader XAFS community

Scattering is next community working on similar initiative

Contact Kathy if there are ideas for other subject matter training or if you know other people who may be interested in creating training

Tony Caruso asked does this exist elsewhere? Are we reinventing the wheel? Bruce is not aware of anything this focused for XAFs. Chi-Chang states that there is stuff available on web but not all packed together in one place and organized. Also, this material was beta tested by experts and non-experts in the field to make it best available. Jen Bohon mentioned that industrial users at NUFO stated they would very much like this. Bruce said you can probably find everything spending time googling it, but this is all together.

Tony suggested maybe UEC wants to organize a list of what they would like to see. Bruce hadn’t thought about but it’s a good idea. George Flynn said you may want to suggest topics but not necessarily try to present an exclusive list. Kao will present in his talk at Town Meeting but probably more appropriate in this room. Most SpIGs represented here today are technique based, so Bruce encourages asking those communities if interested.

Jen Bohon – NUFO meeting in June 2009 – Jen represented UEC at meeting

Contingent of NSLS and CFN attended NUFO meeting in June 2009, focus on increasing industrial usage.

Jen’s perspective is organized by 3 requests from other users in terms of what to pay attention to ((1) what is NUFO?, (2) foreign users access issues, (3) industrial usage))

(1) NUFO mission statement – questions about NUFO as an organization – Simon suggested waiting until we hear Brant’s talk

(2) Visa delays - > 60 days – foreign scientists avoid US conferences, facilities

Happened in 2004 also, created Science and Security council – joint statement of recommendations (and has reconvened since):

Longer duration clearance/visa

Renegotiate visa reciprocity agreements

Reassess Technology Alert List (Mantis review)

State Dept promises action soon

Amer Phys Soc has website to report visa delays and also use of meeting planning tools (to validate US meetings for purposes of helping with visa clearances)

Export controls: expect a new controlled items list

Security processing required for each facility with different rules and no sharing between facilities

Redundant processes – Mantis and Indices

Increase reciprocity

NUFO prepare white paper with recommendations to DOE

Master User Agreement (Nanocenters in 2005) – uniform across lab (within)

Proprietary user retains IP rights, still receives limited facility support

5-year auto renewal, 1 pager signed by individual user

(3) Industrial Users

Harriet Kung – reenergize nat'l labs, double budget, reduce barriers to industrial usage; looking for NUFO to prepare white paper that Harriet could take to facility directors' meeting

Industrial user needs:

Wide variety of tools, staffed by experts, standard equipment/software

Clear info to allow users to connect with experts (outreach)

Simple and straightforward proprietary agreements

Rapid and easy access

Reduce barriers:

No central info center

Proposal system is too geared to academia (review panels, metrics)

- Question from Howard: proposal system is not reasonable for corporate users.
- Bruce says he does think the system is reasonable. Do industrial users understand there is a price to pay if wants to do proprietary time.
- Flynn – know people who work for companies who perform services, want data measured and in form they can understand. They are accustomed to paying for these services and a high rate.
- Simon Bare – pay substantial tax in US economy. Not just academic users pay taxes.

- Bruce – academic user will publish/share results with anyone, but industrial user will sell products.
- Jen mentioned that Doe wants to see societal impact that is derived from industrial usage.
- Simon – proposal system maybe rewritten to take account for technology impact in the criteria
- Bruce – proposal system does keep some control of “keeping bad science” out. Worries about something that will remove oversight and let anything else in.
- Simon – we are not proposing that there be no oversight.
- Annie – the reviews she says often just say “OK” – proprietary users do show up and plan every minute. Very demanding of beamline and pushing us, which Annie feels is good.
- Kao – policy is to accept all proprietary requests but just focus on time desired.

Opaque and varied proprietary agreements between facilities

Varied equipment, not always reliable; learning curve wastes time, no guaranteed results

Significant time of expert staff is required (MOST IMPORTANT REQUEST) and may not publish – what incentive is there for the staff to do this? Of course will help because they are users, but where is the line drawn.

Addressing Barriers – NUFO white paper

Outreach – industrial liaisons, conferences...

Analyze acceptance of proposals (are some turned away?)

Facility access via “fast-track” rapid access

Resolve prepayment processing requirements

Metrics for facility reviews that recognize value of industry research

Include career advancement for scientific staff that helps industry users

Discussion

NUFO as a whole: if DOE accepts recommendations, this is useful.

Increasing industrial access – change is coming – what does this mean?

Does increase industry mean lower academic access?

Will there be increased educational materials?

Increased staff?

Bruce – question about what the incentives might be? Jen involved in discussion at the meeting but nothing specific (and nothing specific in report).

Bruce – to Simon: any thoughts from NUFO about incentive? perhaps we can use CLS as model?

Simon: it is a model but may not work in US. NUFO will take any ideas there are from the UEC. Jun Wang has been in contact with CLS and SPRING-8 models.

Annie – staff on BL will be much faster and efficient. Put someone there at BL. Annie was trying to do this for crystallography – BNL expressed that they do not know when Annie is working for the company and when working for BNL.

Tony – what barriers and what should be addressed most urgently? Proposal system changes – if we spend a lot of time on this, will this make a significant impact.

George – what they are accustomed to doing is bringing a sample and getting back a sheet of paper with the data analyzed. Feels most industrial users want this. Need some kind of model to address this.

Mike Dudley – acting as middleman at his BL for last 20 years. His experience is that industrial user wants much more than this – almost a thesis. This is given over to post doc. They don't want to travel here; just want problem solved. Done usually via subcontract with company. Becomes academic problem for student to solve. Proprietary never becomes an issue.

Bruce – floor scientist does not have incentive because they are judged by publishing.

Simon – we shouldn't be trying to put all industrial users into a box. They are a distribution.

Tony – his sense is that key point to focus on is how we have staff deal with industrial users. Think hard about how we get BL staff to interact with industry.

Bruce – reason for all the NUFO type talks this morning was due to request for funding for an Outreach Poster Session in DC in October. Has been postponed now but would have required a vote of the UEC in order to answer request. Peter will address SNUG. Perhaps there needs to be a small working group of the UEC and how they interact with NUFO and/or industrial users. Will discuss later.

Peter – doesn't know much about NUFO specifically. Independent of users (certainly BES users) for a long time. NUFO meeting at BNL the year Peter was chair of UEC. Now reaching out more to BES facilities. SNUG grew out of more spontaneous visits to D.C. – one or two people from each facility – thought it was a great idea but would always fall apart because UEC member would rotate out. Needed continuing presence. The year that Peter was chair decided to create a group that would stay together for longer than a visit or two. Had a few good visits and can pass lessons-learned. Held together by Joy

Andrews who really kept track of everything (but since took another position where she could not work with SNUG). Worked closely with Amer Phys Soc as a bridge. NUFO presents an opportunity for a sister relationship and may be a good thing for them (to have different types of research facilities represented). Asked for Jen's take on the meeting. Jen: Felt they are interested in changing from just being facility people to reaching out to the UEC.

Simon – SNUG lacked continuity and grand plan. Joined NUFO to see if this would be the way to have some impact over years. Definitely a big movement in the beginning to benchmark and share best practices. Sensed in NUFO that there is potential for bifurcation. SNUG always had debate about what is education and what is lobbying. NUFO is going through same discussions – do they go full speed at lobbying or tone it down and make sure it is education. NUFO still evolving. Simon thinks exhibition is still a good idea. Liked SNUG that it was on a personal level; personal visits. Feels NUFO is not down to that level. Hope that NUFO will evolve over next few years and have a good financial base.

Bruce – some confusing things between what Peter said and what Simon said. Was it started by administrators or by HENP? Peter and Simon tried to clarify.

Peter feels SNUG had done great work in connecting national investments to local communities. Example of visit to Texas with James Kaduk.

Bruce question: does organization including administrative types that has more continuity become more effective?

Peter – too focused on one individual for leadership. Believes group of users with strong advocacy role is important and probably should be separate from facility administration that is talking about best practices.

Tony – being half user admin offices does it make it appropriate to have included in advocacy group.

Simon – maybe standing committee within NUFO that is separate for strictly the advocacy. Valuable for user administration to get together. Always comes down to money. UEC paid for SNUG visits. How does NUFO secure a stable financial basis? Difficult – you have to do on non-work time, it costs money to travel, and it's hard to keep going. Hopes that involvement

Tony Caruso – hit American Competes hard when he visits with joy. What is message today?

Simon – jobs.

Need to stop for photo. 10:15. Will resume 10:40

B. Ravel – suggest that the UEC puts together a small group of people to discuss the things that came out of the NUFO how to engage with industrial users. Jean would probably someone needs to take the lead. A coherent examination of what was presented at NUFO and report to the UEC next meeting. C. Kao mentioned that there is a plan in place, Bruce asked if the progress of that plan can be shared at the

s. Bare suggested inviting a NUFO representative to the next UEC next in November and at that time maybe NUFO will be much further along. The exhibition will happen in DC and funds will be asked of from the UEC. Also suggested that each person go online to

Does SNUG still exist – discussed, it is believed to still exist since there is still ongoing discussion.

C. Kao – NUFO goal is to assist so that mixing up staff and user does not happen (lobbying, etc. ), NUFO has a much bigger ??? so the message is not the same as SNUG

P. Stephens - Attractive for NUFO to get others from outside states to speak on behalf of states like NY.

### Nasta – Users’ Office of Future

Needs to build plan for UA to get to NSLSII, needs a proposal from that end point on what we need to do now, in the areas of:

Services, training and education for staff, software needs and other resources

List of tasks UA/IO currently covers:

Location:

May need to stay in current location at NSLS, how should we facilitate interaction with the users, proposals, workshop, and other information that comes during the day. This will be tough if we are across from the building. If there is going to be a Central LOB the problems may be similar. Considering having a person stationed at each LOB.

Services:

ALS experimental set up coordinators – help users complete SAF forms, notify Beamline scientist of the users visit

SSRL either does the scheduling for the scientists or works with them

ESRF – separate offices – do a lot of exhibitions and community involvement.

More services:

Track students that come to the light source

High school and middle school level introductory courses

Remote access program

You tube style videos for the NSLS website. Howard will let Kathy know of other you tube videos

PASS modifications

More beamline support, scheduling purchasing, data tracking, shipping, tracking beamline supplies

Resources:

Most light sources have more staff available of do less. GUV does assist us currently with check in and expediting. Should we consider any other functions that GUV can perform on behalf our users?

Is more support needed for weekends or over nights, longer hours, etc. Discussion.

Y. Meng- A big inconvenience when the badge office closes at 1 on Friday

How about an online chat, having someone available to answer email questions.

H. Robinson – user support will we have someone spread out to assist users and the opcos have someone also? K. Nasta depends on what the problems are

B. Ravel – what issues fall into the category of admin support and what fall in the category of engineering. If we're here and the user is over there (NSLSII) we are a long way from help. The APS has a floor coordinator on the floor who can answer any questions. Suggested coordinating with opcos, and providing support on the experimental floor.

A. Heroux – databases do not talk to each other, causes problems

G. Flynn – does not believe that someone needs to be close by, what's really critical is someone who can answer a phone call or email. Bruce however is a big fan of a floor coordinator. Howard agreed that a floor coordinator is necessary

T. Lanzirotti – have there been statements about is the NSLS users' office going to become the NSLS II user's office. Kathy or Chi-Chang does not have much information on that yet.

S. Bare suggested the UEC write a letter to the LS directorate in support of the current UA/IO office.

B. Ravel – are you proposing the UEC put together a sub committee to visit this.

Kathy asked the committee to email her with any questions or suggestions.

Discussed – addressing the issue with Light source directorate.

Bruce – Charter discussion – piggyback on discussion via email

Have some responsibilities on top of traditional responsibilities because of NSLS II. Still have responsibility to NSLS while moving toward new. Mechanism for users to have voice to advocate with management.

How will we evolve and how will affect how we do our business?

Thoughts this way – any synchrotron group could organize (1) by technique or (2) by scientific disciplines. Probably could do both also. But these two grouping are kind of orthogonal. Example: Within XAFS, disciplines like life sciences, materials, etc., can be challenging to really understand for all. Would like to suggest that the person that represents the scientific disciplines (and the many tools available) is easier than the other way around (a technique trying to know all the different scientific disciplines). Bruce suggests representatives are for scientific communities. LS directorate has been organizing work along similar lines. BTWG has been looking at beamlines by community.

Suggest 9 communities: life science, catalysis and energy, hard condensed matter, soft condensed matter, earth and environmental sciences, magnetism, plus others: CFN, industry, students and post docs. Propose two year service with half of the seats open for election each year. Student/post doc should have 1 year term, elected annually, and can't be vice chair. Chair remains on UEC for one additional year as past chair for continuity. Communities listed explicitly in charter. New community added by majority vote. Elections must be contested – if community fails to have two or more candidates.

BATs: 1 or more UEC members are selected by NSLS II BATs to represent specific interests of NSLS II BATs.

Ex-officio members still in.

Officers – chair etc.

Voting: like SPIG reps now. Vice-Chair selected in May as is now, for once year. All members of NSLS community may vote. Any voter can vote in multiple categories.

Flynn: concern that no matter how many categories, you can capture all the work done here (example space). Techniques capture all.

Bruce: not a one-to-one mapping of techniques in any direction (NSLS to NSLS-II or vice versa).

Flynn: wouldn't that be the role of the NSLS-II spig rep?

Bruce: believes his proposal addresses this.

Tony Caruso: not comfortable representing these communities – too broad. Hard condensed matter – need to represent too many techniques and couldn't possibly do it.

Dudley: we need to be as inclusive as possible. Need to represent all the users. These categories are too broad.

Bruce: the UEC could more effectively communicate with LS directorate if we were organized the same way as they are.

Flynn: if I have an IR problem, I know who exactly to approach. By community, feels he doesn't really fit. There will always be someone who doesn't fit the list.

Tony: APS UEC has all general members and nominate who to represent them for certain things.

Mike Dudley: Communities change.

Meng: benefit to community organization. For life sciences, might not be aware of all techniques that can be used for different types of problems with the community.

Jen: couldn't we have both?

Paul: that's effectively what we have now with general members and spig reps?

Bruce: criticisms of communication level between users and directorate. This is a moment that we can take advantage of as proactive, engaged users and where we can have real impact. Believes there is much to gain by being proactive in pursuing the communication.

Flynn: NASA – advisory groups do not represent all and there is some dissatisfaction with this.

Meng: maybe a hybrid? Spig groups remain but also add in communities. Make more flexible.

Dudley: nomination process; try to balance out representation. Best to err on side of being inclusive rather than exclusive.

Annie: when you have a problem, you seek anyone who will listen. At some point, a user is a user and you will go wherever to get help.

Tony: do we want to continue having Spigs in current form? May not be effective as is now.

Bruce: what do we do?

Howard: Bring issues to user administration.

Tony C: engage new users to come to beamline.

Bruce: how is that your role as SPIG as opposed to a beamline rep?

Tony C: anyone who shows any interest, he's trying to get here. Get students, write proposals, etc.

Bruce: how is what you do different now as opposed to the new group we might have? We can have any structure we want.

Tony: we may have adequate group now, but is it organized the best for going to NSLS II?

Bruce: Does anyone have adequate communication about NSLS II?

Flynn: Not our problem – it's management that's not communicating.

Bruce: can stamp our feet and say communicate! Maybe part of problem could be we are not organized in a way that helps them do their work.

Jen: adding BAT council member might be good no matter what we do.

Tony: if we add BAT, we still need to remember we need to represent user needs today. APS has partner user council which does much of what we do here. Perhaps this would be better way to go.

Bruce: met Steve yesterday and he says he will talk about ideas about how to get advisory committee about staff transition and getting involvement from broader BNL community. Believes what he wants to do is make up a task force with representatives from all different groups to address issues.

Howard: BTWG is effective. What kinds of initiatives do you want to put in place that will help? This one in particular works.

Bruce: As Michael V. mentioned, we can do whatever we want. It's just that we should try to be as effective as possible so that they will be really engaged.

Jen: Maybe we should ask how they want to be communicated with.

Chi-Chang: Meets with Bruce about once per month. Things are discussed in private and other things can be used with discretion. How do you communicate with your constituents? If Management communicates at a UEC meeting, does this get down to community? New directions workshops – have broader input from user community and then we make decisions. Can that decision be made with broader impact from UEC? For example, working on NSLS strategic plan a few years ago; this group had great input into it. Since you are not getting paid for this, need to think about how we define the agenda for what we want to accomplish.

Bruce: we don't yet know what the scientific plan is for NSLS-II; but looking at the first 6 beamlines, not a single spig rep is representing something that is relevant to NSLS II now. Seems to be inherent conflict in how we are going to represent NSLS II users.

Flynn: still think you are trying to solve wrong problem. If you poll community, they need highly capable instruments in diverse fields, and we should be advocating for instruments in those fields not represented. We ought to be making the case for why those instruments are valuable. We need to play that role.

Annie: making Bruce's point stronger.

Kao: next step is for UEC to advocate. At some point will have a list of recommended beamlines.

Flynn: if we organize this way, the groups will all be competing for a particular technique but with a slight adjustment for each community.

Kao: this group will exist now and until the Users' meeting for now. This may be more of an exercise for the future. There are near-term issues about beamlines which will probably get worked out now.

Tony: do we run the risk that there are other organizations they will consult with rather than this one?

Howard: is that bad? Just different.

Kao: do you feel you are representing the users? Right now, there is no avenue of communication with NSLS II. Not viewed as representing NSLS II users.

Jen: what we need is to have NSLS II to find out how best to communicate? What do they want?

Paul: how might we better represent our communities than we have been?

Kao: need to identify constituents (list serve?) and then reach out.

Steve Hulbert: about how to slice up things? We've tried and want to do scientific disciplines but always wind up doing techniques, unless it's for workshops.

Kao: Bruce trying to address Steve D. comment that how you can represent users when there are techniques that are not here at NSLS but will be at NSLS II. Doesn't really matter as long as you are strong in your message – need to get the message out there and be persistent.

General discussion about how this group can do everything possible to be open for communication from the LS directorate.

We all seem to be working individually and in void from a bigger perspective.

Advisory board would be more of a communication channel.

Communicating to a dead end, no one knows anything about how the new beamlines are going to come into being; there is not avenue for communicating concerns with management.

BATs and 6 beamlines – BAT draws reputation only from existing resources, cannot do the job that UEC needs done. The UEC represents all users. Communication seems to be at top management level and does not trickle down. There does not seem to be a scientific plan.

Is it inappropriate for this group to say these are some of the concerns of the user community regarding the NSLS II. The UEC is striving to open the communication with management. Question is how is changing the name of the group going to effect this?

Organizing workshop, or follow up to workshops previously held. SpIGs should take a more active role active role.

Hard to keep communities engaged – worked on white papers and not sure what was the result of the first round? How can we then go back to community and ask them to give input again? Too long a gap and there's nowhere to connect these communities to NSLS II.

No scientific mission of LS directorate.

What exactly are we asking of the LS directorate? Should we just move forward with the Charter as it has been updated now, since we don't have consensus now and won't happen anytime soon? What are we going to ask Steve D this afternoon?

Howard: how can we galvanize communities so they could be organized and prepared when input is needed.

Jen: would like to give input; how do you want to receive?

Flynn: if there is a large drop off in users in year 1 and 2, it's critical that they get as many experienced users as they can over there so the publications can be as high as possible.

Kao: NSLS has some to say about beamlines that can move over – if large user demand behind it. People who want to engage need to be the best people – keep them engaged.

#### Steve Dierker/Chi-Chang Kao – Q and A session after Town Hall Meeting

Facilities plan vs science plan – facilities plan business communication, safety, etc. will include detailed action plan. Scientific plan is part of this.

Jen: who is involved?

SD: facilities plan is reflection of work and input from previous workshops, interactions, discussions. Trying to synthesize all input into coherent plan for how to best serve community through into ops.

Part of it is making strawman proposal for what fully built-out facility will look like – different techniques, etc., high throughput vs. high impact. Ask for feedback on this. Making proposal to DOE to begin providing funds in FY 11 instead of 12 (because of stimulus funds). Small group at NSLS II working to create call for proposals (should align with strawman plan being developed also by small group).

Jen: question going toward how UEC can help.

SD: consider NSLS UEC to be important stakeholder. But fabricating large document is difficult with large committee so trying to do themselves. Ask for comments later.

SD: essential that user community and its interest are represented well so can be taken into account when planning for either facility. It's essential to have good representation and good relationship with openness. Lots of stakeholders – user community not the only one. Staff is also stakeholder as well as BNL, BSA, and DOE. Helpful not to make distinction between NSLS users and NSLS II users. One group should represent both and should have a very good and open communication. Steve would like to

create task force and include Bruce as rep of this group and include staff members and other representatives as stakeholders. What ways can we interact with the most health dialog? Would like it to happen with open mind as things may happen differently as they had in the past. Feels we need to go out to other light sources to find out what works best and not so well about interactions between users and facility representatives.

Bruce: will each stakeholder group have its own deliberating body or will this task force be its own entity?

Steve: whatever structure is best, whatever works is what we will do. No preconceived notions going into it.

Howard: time frame?

SD: 2-3 months probably, maybe includes visits and/or phone calls. Ambitious time scale but feels it would be beneficial to get it done. First group that he has brought this idea to. In general, feeling is enthusiastic about it within management. Other BNL departments are enthusiastic.

Jen: why would other BNL depts. feel they have a stake?

SD: because it's a priority for BNL, and partner with a group that represents what is important. SD will appoint task force to make recommendations. SD wants two-way communication and goal to work together. Now, NSLS UEC is not officially recognized as representing NSLS II UEC.

Bruce: used analogy that need to be careful about what language you use. UEC has its own responsibility how to organize itself and best represent the users.

Howard: believe moving on at this point is our best bet.

Tony: don't envision the task force living longer than the 2-3 months?

SD: no

Bruce: how large a group is imagined for the task force? Would it be reasonable to ask if another member to attend as well?

SD: 8-10 people on the committee. SD would consider but not sure. SD is creating task force to provide information to himself. UEC can do what it wants and create its own task force if they want. Doesn't have a fully formed idea of who to include and a charge; may take a few weeks but not a few months. Interested in knowing UEC's feelings about whether it's useful.

Tony: need to consider ultimate charge of group, but sounds like it could be useful. Clarifying charge would be important.

Bruce: can use email list serve once there is a charge.

Tony C: have recommendations of task force and then that feedback would influence what goes into the RFP. What the users want would slant the kinds of beamlines or science goes into the RFPs?

SD: doesn't see what the question is.

Tony C: this task force won't have its recommendations until January, and RFP is coming out in Fall. So the feedback won't make it into the RFP.

SD: we have all sorts of input already. We have 400 people who talk to the community already. Just suggesting a way that we can have a healthier dialog on a broad set of issues than the UEC currently deals with.

Tony C: what are some of the issues you would like to have enhanced dialog with?

SD: needs to have enhanced dialog on NSLS and NSLS II issues. This group currently does not do both.

Tony C: just wanted to know if any specific things were in mind?

SD: design of LOBs...This is the sort of conversation that needs to happen in task force. What should a users' group be looking at, and what is best forum, best way of interacting? How do we ensure dialog covers right set of topics. Don't want to infringe on anyone's independence. Need organized way of having that discussion.

Megan: would we be segregated by techniques and scientific areas? How are things going to be organized?

SD: haven't decided on how ops organization will be structure. Organizing along scientific disciplines is a possibility.

Tony: can we get update on transition planning. Some confusion about, with scientific staff, whether they will have a place in future.

SD: developing a strategic plan for the directorate, and this will include a staffing plan (later). Expect in near future, we will hold an all-hands meeting to discuss it. Main point is LS directorate has a lot going on...as projects and work changes, what we do may change over time, and it will take acclimation. What people may work on eventually may change over time. Work must be done successfully, staffing plans must be based on needs of the work.

Tony: transition planning can help alleviate some of the stress about the future.

Howard: also nervousness on part of users because we're not sure what happens after submitting white papers and providing feedback.

Paul: as move toward NSLS II, want to develop programs to take advantage of NSLS II, but afraid that NSLS may be ramping down. Don't want to spend time on updating something if the NSLS goes out.

Kao: we are still trying to develop new things and keep experienced users working toward a new instrument/equipment. Lot of momentum now – tremendous advantage now – people see an access to move toward NSLS II.

Tony: Beamline Advisory Team Council – still planning?

SD: topic for task force? No predetermined feeling about it.

Tony: partner users – any sense on how that might be defined?

SD: would like to see us better define the user access policy over the next few years. Needs to be more comprehensive than what we have now. Do not see this as task force project, however.

Howard: a rather large budget in FY 15/16, is this real?

SD: yes.

Kao: includes some PRT funding in our budget now.

Howard: need to completely re-think structure for future. Especially need to consider facility beamlines and how much support will be available for those.

Howard proposed **Weds. 11/4** as next UEC meeting. Bruce asked for discussion, vote 10 for, 2 against.

Howard suggest a motion that we table issue of charter given that committee will be formed by Steve. Bruce agrees that we wait until Steve D.'s idea plays out. Tony seconded motion. Bruce took vote – all voted.

Tony said ultimately this task force is going to hear from users, and to move forward quickly is a good thing, and if it works, we can have an active discussion on a regular basis. In the end, doesn't see it as a different group than we have now.

Jen said she got from discussion that SD doesn't want to just hear from us – that he feels he needs other stakeholders.

Meng, Tony: clear that we won't get much input. We've already given whatever input we could with the white papers.

Paul: provided white paper but was thrown out.

Kao: different relationship going forward; more facility-central. \$150M is not all coming from Doe.

Howard: with budget that high, it's going to be very different atmosphere.

Tony: certainly want something that's scientifically productive.

Kao: think about what you need from the facility – things like user services. Facility has to provide.

Howard: provide environment where BL scientists can survive not as technicians but as scientists. Need an attractive environment if you want smart people to come and work for you.

Kao: need dynamically changing people but also very experienced people. Hard but you can have both. How do you build in under current circumstances. Not clear that any partner users can be long-term.

Tony: perhaps as part of task force can recommend a Stony Brook person be involved.

Kao: doesn't see that the task force outcome will be much different from what it is now. ESRF often mentioned as gold standard.

Tony: trying to stake our ground too hard will delay. Will need to wait and see.

Bruce: anything else about NUFO?

Kao: Recommend separating out administrative (facility) people. Administrators are better organized. Users would have to spend time/money to organize with it. What do you think NUFO can do for you?

Bruce: too bad NUFO didn't make overture to SNUG in beginning. Questions are what activities do we want to support with our \$? Be prepared that they will ask for \$ in future. Asked everyone to think about what they want from NUFO. Asked for budget generalities to understand what \$1K means.

Tony C: what are the return benefits from contributing to NUFO?

Howard: valuable to have NUFO working on coordinating between facilities for streamlining efforts.

Kao: benefit that NUFO has national voice as opposed to just single user administrators trying to fight causes on their own. Beyond that, SNUG may take over NUFO with some hangers-on. SNUG will dominate naturally because there are more synchrotron users. Doesn't make sense to have both separately. Because budget looks good now, so there's not an urgent need to go to congress any more.

Jen: remains to be seen if NUFO actually succeeds.

Tony: we have choices and need to decide where our interests are primarily based.

Bruce: hopes Tony C. will talk about return on investment when the issue comes up in later email. Bruce expressed to Simon that he was very disappointed in the wording of the letter and lack of substance.

Kao: tone of letter requesting funds was pretty horrible. For NUFO to really work, every organization really has to participate. Then, person on receiving end will take money and will be different.

4:20 p.m. - Meng motioned to adjourn, Annie seconded. Vote taken.