

Minutes
APS Users Organization Steering Committee Meeting

Monday, July 11, 2011
Advanced Photon Source
Building 401, Room E1100/E1200
Peter Eng, APSUO Chair

Attendees: L. Assoufid, D. Brown, E. Dufresne, P. Eng, P. Focia, J. Kropf, R. Leheny (via phone), B. Lin, D. Mancini, M. Miller, D. Mills, A. Sandy, B. Stephenson, S. Strasser, and C. Vanni

Note: All presentations are posted on the APSUO meetings Website:
http://www.aps.anl.gov/About/Committees/APS_Users_Organization/Meetings

Peter Eng welcomed the group and briefly reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

APS Update– B. Stephenson

Stephenson reviewed new science highlights and safety issues happening since the last meeting in January. He also discussed the new, high-resolution powder XRD beamline at 11-BM. This robotic-capable beamline has the highest resolution in this hemisphere and is developing a rapid access mail-in program (see slides for details). An uptick in the number of safety incidents (both at Argonne and at the APS) has management concerned. Recent incidents reviewed include a hand truck/dewar incident (crush injury, similar to incident at Los Alamos) and an electrical shock incident in May at APS (employee replacing switches in cabinet with exposed 120VAC). No one was injured (mild shock only), but it highlights the necessity to plan carefully, be aware of the safety envelope that defines the work, and watch for unanticipated conditions. Investigation of this event resulted in several action items that have mitigated the situation (e.g., movement of switches out of high-voltage cabinets, etc.). These and other safety issues have resulted in DOE involvement. Stephenson encouraged all to rethink/refocus their approaches to safety planning for all activities. Stephenson also discussed the cyber security history of recent attacks at APS and other national laboratories (Oakridge, PNNL, JLab). E-mail phishing is a prevalent method used. Contact Ken Sidorowicz, APS Information Technology Group Leader with any questions.

The recent 13th annual National School on Neutron and X-ray Scattering was very successful and popular; classes are oversubscribed at least by a factor of two. Classes are split between APS and the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. We are now beginning to track students from 10 years ago. Some of these students are now professors and are driving research directions at major universities. We need to keep making the case to DOE about the importance of this activity to the future of our science to ensure that funding continues. Eng asked if the APSUO could do anything to promote/assist this effort? Stephenson recommended talking to school organizers to determine when it would be most effective to contact DOE in support of continued funding for the school. The capacity limitations are beamline space for hands-on part of the school, not classroom space. This year the lectures were heavily advertised to local population. Eng suggested that we determine how many local people attended lectures and also consider adding a web cast of lectures for off-site access? Beamlines make time available for the school, and General User beam time credit is given for beamline participation. Currently the school is only DOE funded, but this may be a good time to explore interagency (e.g., NSF) involvement.

User awards recognition: P. Fenter (2012 ACA Warren Award), K. Moffat (2011 ACA Patterson Award), ACA Fellows included several APS Users. Internal awards: J. Lang (Outstanding Service), ANL's Director's Team Award for Outstanding Safety Performance for SPM 441 effort (APS' Engineering Support), and U of C scholarship award for daughter of J. Zhao.

Staffing: S. Marconi is moving to Argonne's Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCF division); John Quintana will be the Deputy Chief Operating Officer for Argonne.

Budget update: In July, the APS received an encouraging FY2011 budget: \$9M above FY2010. The House mark up of the FY2012 budget was more or less flat, with a decrease of 0.9% for the Office of Science (from FY2011) and an increase of 0.6% for BES (from FY2011). The budget scenario literally changes on a daily basis. Current efforts are focusing on putting money back in for FY2012. So far, the Upgrade budget is on track for us to receive \$20M in FY2012. Given the focus on austerity at the federal level, we are doing well. Advocacy continues to be important for ensuring continued support for investment in science.

Upcoming reviews:

The triennial DOE review of APS is scheduled for September 12-15, 2011. This DOE review will involve a combination of plenary talks, posters, and breakout sessions with staff. Users will be asked to give science highlight talks and posters.

The U of C review (shorter and simpler than the DOE review) will take place July 27-29, 2011.

User involvement in the Upgrade has been very healthy thus far. The scientific cases prepared by users have been very important. APS wants to maintain this strong involvement and interest of users in driving the upgrade agenda. User input is critical to the planning of Upgrade activities in order to minimize any detrimental impact on beamlines. Eng asked how the APSUO can support this effort? What about the projects/beamlines that are not currently funded? Stephenson indicated that incremental growth of other opportunities at the facility (beyond what is delineated in the initial upgrade scope) will indeed be possible now that the initial push to get the project locked in is nearly completed. Other sources (e.g., other agencies) can be tapped to obtain additional funding for such projects. The topic of timing and its role in the Upgrade budget was discussed at length.

Written comments from March 2011 SAC review will be sent out shortly. SAC review recommendations were not only science based but also value based. APS needs to make sure that the infrastructure/necessary key components (things needed for normal operation on the beamline) associated with the new projects are accounted for in the planning and budgeting. The Collaborative Development Teams (CDT) model is meant to accomplish this: to ensure that each new beamline tracks as the building and design progress. APS-U needs to have a strong connection between the designers and the scientists who will use the beamlines. These relationships can also generate funding opportunities.

Upcoming Reviews – D. Mills

U of C Argonne LLC Review: Ten reviewers are expected. Our operating contractor is now doing yearly review of ALD-ships at Argonne—this review will act as a dry run for the DOE review in September. Most of presentations will be by local speakers (APS staff and users). Mills reviewed the overall schedule (lunch, talks, tours, poster session). Attendance of APSUO and PUC members at lunch with the reviewers is important.

Triennial DOE/BES Review: DOE reviews all facilities every three years. The September 12-15,

2011, event will review fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010. Mills showed the list of reviewers and the tentative agenda.

User involvement in these reviews is important: APS is seeking representatives from the various user organizations, inviting user science talks, and asking for the top dozen or so important publications. Beamlines should identify their best science results and speakers. Tour routes will also be set at a later date. Mills needs list of attendees for these meetings as soon as possible.

**APS Upgrade: Remaining Steps to CD-1 and Process/Timeline to Beamline Roadmap –
D. Mancini**

The Upgrade effort will be chartering a new, high-level APSU Stakeholder Committee; the current APS-U Steering Committee is being retired. This new committee will have regular meetings. Nominees are now being identified.

APS-U Important Dates:

May 17-19, 2011: CD-1 “Lehman” review—very successful (Done)

June 2011: anticipated \$5M in funding earmarked for R&D came through (Done)

July 2011: \$2.5M in funding for preliminary design was earmarked—expected to come through

Future Dates:

August 3, 2011: CD-1 Approval

October 2011: \$20M MIE project money (TEC start) preliminary design and some procurement (including staffing, which will present a significant challenge)

August 2012: DOE “Lehman” review CD-2 review

October 2012: CD-2 approval (allows funding for final design)

What happens after CD-1? The process is a formal one and includes several tiers of reviews that will ensure that the presentation for the CD-2 review goes off perfectly the first time. Each step of the process involves standardized design and review steps that are being held to a rigorous schedule. The initial “roadmap” or the Map that shows where each beamline will be is expected to be complete within the next 12 weeks. Mancini reviewed the timeline for achieving these goals in the process of CD-1 to CD-2. Costing tools used at NSLS and NSLS2 are being evaluated to see if they would be useful for this effort.

Scope/funding/budget profile: A budget profile was not given—projections can’t be shown until they’ve been signed off. Follow through and timing to meet DOE expectations is critical. The project must achieve a date when it is set; thus, the scheduling has built-in “flex” to ensure that goals are met. Mancini discussed “float” ranges for late finish dates and the increase in the budget provided to cover cost increases. It is very important to manage this process to keep users positive and vested in this work. Users need to be assured that their concerns and needs will be considered and worked on—the roadmap meetings will be a chance to show all 35 groups (all approved and prioritized by the SAC) that there is potential for them. Opportunities are expected to fund things that are currently not covered in the baseline of the scope. Adding scope can happen when risk from an earlier part of the effort is retired—contingency can be used as things time out and get completed. Another roadmap meeting (similar to the Dean Haeffner straw man roadmap meeting held earlier in the year) would be very useful. The message to the user community needs to point out the big picture/national level need for the goals of the upgrade—R&D will be done to make sure that the new high-energy capabilities are indeed feasible and will not take away anything from the existing beamlines.

NUFO Update – S. Strasser

Strasser reviewed the highlights from the 2011 NUFO annual meeting, first presenting the following highlights of the 2011-12 outreach agenda:

- Second User Facilities Exhibition will include one day each in the House and the Senate. Invitations for this event have been received from Congress, but no date is set yet.
- Second National Science Festival and Expo in Washington DC – set for April 27-29, 2012.
- Outreach to colleagues at scientific society meetings (e.g., AAAS, APS, ACS, ACA, MRS, GeoUnion)

Strasser noted that it is important for all users and staff to work on their “elevator” talks to reach out to the community at large to ensure that the message about science is positive at the community level.

NUFO is looking at forming working groups: (1) working with industry/tech transfer; (2) administrative issues including user agreements, user portals, metrics (what to collect and how), and sharing best practices (e.g., the APS scheduling process may be shared with another lab); (3) cybersecurity; and (4) NUFO and universities. High-level university staff needs to hear from users about how their important, published work is both used by and reflects positively on the universities. Such scientific advances could not be achieved without facilities like the APS (and this is a great value to universities as BES facilities do not charge access fees for nonproprietary use). The group discussed travel subsidies (commonly given in Europe) and how they serve as a way of conferring to universities that access has been granted. Travel cost is more a factor for second-tier universities. The subject of travel expenditure seems to be a “lightning rod” for bad press, especially during economically challenging times.

Strasser also presented the roster of newly elected NUFO steering committee members.

APSUO Executive Session

Advocacy: It used to be that there were clear windows of time during which advocacy efforts would be made. Now it seems that budget considerations are a virtual year-round effort and it is less clear when the “right” time is.

The NUFO Steering Committee will ask Fermi (a centralized location) to host the next annual meeting for NUFO. (*Note: The next NUFO Annual Meeting is now set for June 18-20, 2012, at Los Alamos National Laboratory.*) The APSUO SC needs to begin working more closely with NUFO for advocacy-related efforts. The off-site (GoDaddy) list server allows contacts to be made without the use of government funds. The APSUO needs to figure out the best way to utilize this tool? How should it decide when the timing is right and the issue is hot enough to utilize it? Timing is tricky (e.g., only found out this morning that Rep. Rush Holt would be seeking to put back \$45M in the budget this afternoon). The group agreed that we do not want advocacy efforts to be “reactive” to any given current crisis. Argonne has recently gotten more proactive about bringing in Washington DC types to Argonne, but we need to know how/when can we actually go see Congressmen in their offices? Should we do it a day in advance of the exhibitions—hand-deliver packets of info in advance and have specific users stop in to visit their Congressmen? Currently we have good, science-oriented support for user facilities at DOE. However, the key to communicating with Congressmen is telling the right level of story about science—it’s not detailed scientific information but more the “success stories” that sell the results that will convey the needed message. The APSUO needs to be on the lookout for these kinds of exciting results—contact Rick Fenner so that the science can be presented at the right level for DC types. Can the

NUFO list server site employ a tool where a user could type in their zip code and find their local Congressmen for the purpose of sending a letter in support of some activity? The APS user database can be used—it is very cross disciplinary. Can NUFO host this web-based effort?

Election of Vice Chair: A vice chair is elected at this meeting each year to chair the next Users Meeting effort and then become the next Chair for the APSUO. Eng reviewed the general level of effort. The Group wanted to know if the next users meeting would be combined with CNM, and EMC as in 2011? Eng noted that subcommittees would be formed for the 2012 meeting to assist the chair. Eng opened the floor for nominations. Pam Focia was nominated and subsequently accepted the nomination, which was seconded. Chair directed a unanimous ballot be cast for this nominee.

2011 User Meeting Review: The 2011 meeting reflected a significant change in meeting format from prior years. The first day was heavily packed with speakers for the combined and parallel plenary sessions, the award presentation, and the meeting social event; the second day included the cross-facility workshops and poster session; and the third day included the facility-specific workshops and the APS Town Hall meeting. This format resulted in fewer workshops/speakers. Comment: The Town Hall meeting was heavily attended by local APS people—was it because off-site people left at immediately at the end of the meeting? Comment: For university people, it is a very difficult time of year to hold the Users Meeting due to end-of-year classroom commitments. Could it be moved one week later? It was noted that the Users Meeting is scheduled during a down time on the ring. The 2012 meeting is already set for one week later than the 2011 meeting. For 2013 meeting, the APSUO suggested pushing the meeting into the second week of May rather than the first week of May. It was noted that John Freeland and Gregory Wurtz are the CNM co-chairs for the 2012 UM. Focia and the CNM/EMC organizers need to meet quickly to establish the framework for 2012 UM. Focia, Eng, and Lin need to brainstorm ideas for cross-facility workshop themes that the APS can offer.

Eng reviewed how the cross-facility themes were chosen and noted that he, Focia, and Binhua Lin should plan to attend the early meetings to help identify the topics for the cross-facility workshops. For 2012, we definitely need to have representatives from all three facilities choose the topics and make sure they are not cross inviting speakers (the inclusion of cross-facility workshops gives additional opportunities to bring in quality, high-profile speakers). Getting good keynote speakers needs an early start in the meeting planning process. Eng also reviewed how APS-specific workshops are solicited and selected.

- Subcommittee for APS-specific workshop planning: Alec Sandy, Lahsen Assoufid, and Jeremy Kropf.
- Subcommittee for Keynote Speaker Search (covering both the combined plenary and the APS plenary): Matthew Miller and Robert Suter.
- Subcommittee for Poster Session and Annual Awards: Bob Leheny and Peter Eng.

Idea for possible day one keynote/award speaker: Pair Alexis Templeton (the first APS Rosalind Franklin Young Investigator Award winner, 2004) with the 2012 Franklin award winner.

The group lightly touched on the topics of entertainment and banquet options for 2012 (go off-site? stay on site?). Assoufid suggested having a keynote speaker at the banquet that could address the depiction of science in the media (e.g., a CNN science editor)—the group thought that this type of speaker would be a great idea for the first morning session. Eng strongly wants to keep the poster session on the second day.

Workshop funding issues: It is too much work to have the workshop organizers manage the funding issues and responsibilities. Organizers need to urge speakers to follow the rules that apply to travel reimbursement and support. For the 2012 meeting, workshop organizers will be asked to provide each speaker with a “receipt” that clearly delineates what funding support is provided.

General Business: Volunteers for July lunch for U of C review: Binhua Lin, Pam Focia, Eric Dufresne, Lahsen Assoufid, and Peter Eng.

Minutes of past meeting: no changes, approved unanimously.

Closeout with APS Management – (*P. Eng, P. Focia, D. Mills, B. Stephenson, S. Strasser, and C. Vanni*)

Discussed recent incidents of people on the floor being unhappy about the level (or lack of) info about down time during recent losses of beam. It was suggested to have updates refreshed within fixed periods of time so that people are not left hanging. The new option of receiving Tweets was discussed. How can APSUO help to improve communication on the floor? When something happens on the floor, it would be helpful if more than one method of communication (e.g., e-mails, Tweets, TV. screens, and on-floor announcements) was employed to keep info flowing.

Pam Focia was introduced at the new APSUO Chair Elect. Discussed the Users Meeting and the newly built subcommittees. The possibility of having a large international meeting at the APS was mentioned—the timeframe is not set at this point. If spring 2012, how would it impact the May users meeting? Could possibly piggyback the meeting on to the end of the UM; will wait and see what happens.

Stakeholders meetings for the Upgrade: Eng should find two people to participate on behalf of the APSUO. Considerations: a local person to make attendance at meetings easy. Mancini is envisioning once every two weeks to once a month meetings. Mills will be the non-voting organizing chair. Mills will send Eng an e-mail to let him know when the first meeting will be held.

Planning the approach to info sharing for roadmap process needs consideration. Need to run a couple versions through the SAC and possibly have the plan ready to present to APSUO/PUC at the next meeting. The APSUO is willing to help in any way. Eng will send out a note to the steering committee and potentially to the user community at large via User News.

Action Items:

APSUO Chair: Contact Jonathan Lang to determine the cycle of communication to contact DOE in support of continued funding for the NSNX school.

All: Be on the lookout for exciting science results—contact Rick Fenner for preparation of materials suitable for distribution to Congress/Senate contacts.

Strasser: Determine if the NUFO site can offer a tool for typing in zip codes to find local congressmen for the purpose of sending support letters.

All: Determine if the 2012 meeting will again have a joint format between APS, CNM, and EMC.

Strasser: For 2013 users meeting, aim to push the UM into the second week of May rather than the first week of May.

Eng, Focia, and Lin: Attend the early UM planning meetings to help identify the topics for the cross-facility workshops.

Focia: Meet with CNM/EMC counterparts to set framework for 2012 Users Meeting.

Focia, Eng, and Lin: Brainstorm ideas for cross-facility themes that the APS can offer for 2012 Users Meeting planning.

Eng: Find two people to participate as part of the Stakeholders committee for APS Upgrade.

Eng: Potentially begin sending out an APSUO update note to the user community at large via User News.