

May 6, 2005 SHUG Executive Committee Conference Call:

Members Present (9):

Paul Butler
Joanna Krueger
Despina Luca
Mark Lumsden
Megan Ruegg
Steve Shapiro
Mike Snow
Lynn Walker
Angus Wilkinson

1. Approve minutes from Dec. 17, 2004 and Jan. 21, 2005 meetings

To complete the business of the Jan. 21 meeting:

- a. The SHUG secretary will be Mark Lumsden
- b. There are 2 candidates for vice-chair: Despina Luca and Mike Snow.

[Action Item] Angus will request an email vote for the vice-chair position.

The minutes have been approved.

2. Discuss the FY06 budget situation

The letter template was posted at the APS site. Despite a slow initial response, we eventually had about 50 responses of the 700 email requests. Of this 700, about 3% were dead email addresses and many were foreign nationals. According to the APS statistics, you typically expect about a 5% response so the over 7% response we received is considered quite good.

Steve Shapiro forwarded us the link to the AIP web site which had a report of a letter signed by more than 2/3 of the U.S. senators recommending a 3.2% increase in the DOE Office of Science budget. As our letter specifically asked for senators to support this letter, it appears that this effort may have done some good.

Steve suggested that during the Memorial Day break, we urge people to make an appointment to visit with their congressmen to keep up the pressure.

[Action Item] Steve will draft and circulate a letter which thanks the user group for responding to our request and will urge everyone to keep up the political pressure. Included in this will be the suggestion to visit their local congressmen.

The question of how to maintain the email list was raised. It was suggested by Joanna that JINS maintain the email list. It was agreed that this was a good idea and Takeshi

Egami has agreed in principal although there was some question as to whether he understood the infrastructure needed to do this. The concern about being able to categorize this list correctly was raised. It would be nice if we could contact the proper people from this list for issues like funding and avoid bothering people unnecessarily. The question was raised as to whether we could get Al Ekkebus to categorize the list for us. Paul brought up the point that when joining the SHUG email list, people get to choose whether they want to receive email from SHUG or not. This separation may be sufficient to meet our needs.

3. Program for the October 12-14 User Meeting

a) Angus has discussed the issue of the scientific component of this meeting with Al Ekkebus. Al wants to have a session discussing what would be good first experiments for SNS instruments. Steve Shapiro suggested selecting IAT (Instrument Advisory Team) members to talk about the exciting science that will be performed on these instruments. We will focus on the first three instruments being installed: Backscattering, Liquids Reflectometer, and Magnetism Reflectometer. The hope is that these presentations will lead to a discussion about what exciting science could be performed on these instruments.

Angus will suggest this idea to Al Ekkebus and if he agrees, we will start to contact specific IAT members listed below:

Backscattering:

[Action Item]

Juergen Eckert: juergen@lanl.gov Los Alamos National Laboratory

Despina agreed to contact Juergen and invite him to speak at the User Meeting.

Liquids Reflectometer:

[Action Item]

Tom Russell: russell@mail.pse.umass.edu UMass Amherst

Susan Krueger: susan.krueger@nist.gov NIST

Magnetism Reflectometer:

[Action Item]

Julie Borchers: borchers@nist.gov NIST

Gian Felcher: felcher@anl.gov Argonne

Chuck Majkrzak: charles.majkrzak@nist.gov NIST

We should recommend to Al Ekkebus that we pay for these speakers to attend the user meeting.

b) Additionally, there will be some discussion of user issues and processing at the User Meeting. It was suggested that Al Ekkebus and Greg Smith give presentations discussing the current state and future directions. **[Action Item] Steve Shapiro volunteers to lead the discussion of these issues.**

c) The issue of a poster session was briefly mentioned and it was generally agreed that a poster session displaying both science and instruments was a good idea.

d) In terms of the main scientific session of the User Meeting, two sessions were identified:

1. The first session should emphasize what's currently being done at HFIR. This will largely be triple-axis experiments (perhaps some reflectometer experiments as well as this instrument has just entered into the user program) and it was recommended that Greg Smith be the organizer for this portion of the sessions.
2. The second session should emphasize the scientific capabilities of the first set of SNS instruments, namely Backscattering, Liquids Reflectometer, and Magnetism Reflectometer. The science discussed here will represent measurements taken from any neutron source. It was suggested that the names mentioned above could also be asked for a list of speakers in their respective fields.

e) The idea of a tutorial was mentioned. **[Action Item]** We should recommend JINS combines this meeting with one of their workshops.

4. Policy of HFIR and SNS regarding the handling of samples after experiments

The discussion of this issue was postponed for a future conference call and it was suggested that this issue be discussed at the user meeting.

5. Encourage facility management to make most up-to-date schedule available

We will monitor the situation with respect to publishing the HFIR schedule and revisit this issue in the future.

6. SHUG representation on committees that evaluate proposals and schedule beam time

We don't want to be responsible for allocation of beamtime itself but rather we want to ensure the process is fair and equitable. One possibility is to provide input into who is on the proposal review committees. **[Action Item]** Ask Al Ekkebus and Greg Smith if we can provide input into the membership of the proposal review committee with an eye toward scientific diversity and fair representation for all fields.

7. Orbach is visiting ORNL on June 7th and requests meeting with SNS user

This issue was discussed briefly. Steve Shapiro suggested Igor Zaliznyak. Despina Luca was also suggested as a possibility. **[Action Item]** Email suggestions to Angus.