NIST Center for Neutron Research (NCNR)

Live Report

22-Feb-2004 8:41:33 AM

There are a total of **166** responses FROM 12-Feb-2004 to 21-Feb-2004.

1. Your position

Percent	Count	Answers
14.4%	23/160	Graduate Student
16.9%	27/160	Post-doc
40.6%	65/160	Professor
23.1%	37/160	Staff Scientist
5.0%	8/160	Other
 100.0%	160/160	Summary

2. Your primary instrument (Please use this instrument as the basis for answers to sections 3 and 4)

Percent	Count Answers
24.7%	39/158 30m SANS, NG3
19.6%	31/158 30m SANS, NG7
3.8%	6/158 8m SANS, NG1
7.0%	11/158 Reflectometer, horizontal sample geometry, NG7
3.2%	5/158 Reflectometer, polarized beam option, vertical geometry, NG1
8.2%	13/158 Disk Chopper Spectrometer, NG4
1.9%	3/158 Backscattering Spectrometer, NG2
1.9%	3/158 Spin-Echo Spectrometer, NG5
8.2%	13/158 Cold Neutron Triple-Axis (SPINS), NG5
0.6%	1/158 USANS, BT5
10.1%	16/158 Powder Diffractometer, BT1

	100.0% 158/158 Summary				
	1.9%	3/158 Triple-Axis Spectrometer, BT9			
	7.0%	Triple-Axis Spectrometer with polarized beam option, BT2			
		2/158 Filter Analyzer Spectrometer (FANS), BT4			
1	0.6%	1/158 Residual Stress Diffractometer, BT8			

3. Please rate the proposal process

1) Ease of proposal submission	2.8/3				
2) Referee reports and PAC comments	2.6/3				
3) Proposal process fairness	2.6/3				
4) Scheduling process following approval	2.8/3				
Legends:					
Poor					
Adequate					
Excellent					
Overall rating based of	on the scale from 1 to 3				

1) Ease of proposal submission

	Percent	Count	Answers
	0.6%	1/156	Poor
	18.6%	29/156	Adequate
	80.8%	126/156	Excellent
	100.0%	156/156	Summary
		2.8/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3
2) Referee reports a	nd PAC co	mments	
	Percent	Count	Answers
	3.3%	5/151	Poor
	37.7%	57/151	Adequate
	58.9%	89/151	Excellent
	100.0%	151/151	Summary
		2.6/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3
	f		
3) Proposal process	rairness		

	3.3%	5/151	Poor				
	35.1%	53/151	Adequate				
	61.6%	93/151	Excellent				
	100.0%	151/151	Summary				
		2.6/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3				
) Scheduling proces	Scheduling process following approval						
	Percent	Count	Answers				
		Count 2/154					
	1.3%	2/154					
	1.3% 20.1%	2/154 31/154	Poor				
	1.3% 20.1% 78.6%	2/154 31/154 121/154	Poor Adequate				

4. Please rate the effectiveness of the health physics training

1) Relevance of computer based training content		2.5/3	
2) Efficiency of computer based training		2.5/3	
3) NCNR Health Physics tour		2.6/3	
4) Discussion/exam review with health physicist		2.6/3	
5) Refresher/Reindoctrination Training		2.5/3	
Legends: Poor Adequate Excellent Overall rating based on	the scale from 1 to 3		

1) Relevance of computer based training content

	Percent	Count	Answers
	0.6%	1/156	Poor
	46.8%	73/156	Adequate
	52.6%	82/156	Excellent
	100.0% ⁻	156/156	Summary
		2.5/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3
) Efficiency of compu	iter base	d training	g

			Answers
	5.8%	9/155	
	_		Adequate
	57.4%	89/155	Excellent
	100.0%	155/155	Summary
		2.5/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3
ICNR Health Phy	sics tour		
	Percent	Count	Answers
	0.0%	0/156	Poor
	41.0%	64/156	Adequate
	59.0%	92/156	Excellent
	100.0%	156/156	Summary
		2.6/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3
iscussion/exam	review wi	th health	n physicist
	Percent	Count	Answers
	1.3%		
	1.3%	2/156	
	1.3% 41.0%	2/156 64/156	Poor
	1.3% 41.0% 57.7%	2/156 64/156 90/156	Poor Adequate
	1.3% 41.0% 57.7%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156	Poor Adequate Excellent
?efresher/Reindo	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3
efresher/Reinde	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3 Training	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3
efresher/Reindo	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3 Training	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3 Answers
efresher/Reindo	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0% octrination Percent	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3 Training Count 2/150	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3 Answers
ofresher/Reindo	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0% octrination Percent 1.3%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3 Training Count 2/150 70/150	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3 Answers Poor
efresher/Reinde	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0% octrination Percent 1.3% 46.7% 52.0%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3 Training Count 2/150 70/150 78/150	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3 Answers Poor Adequate
efresher/Reindo	1.3% 41.0% 57.7% 100.0% octrination Percent 1.3% 46.7% 52.0%	2/156 64/156 90/156 156/156 2.6/3 Training Count 2/150 70/150 78/150 150/150	Poor Adequate Excellent Summary Overall rating from 1 to 3 Answers Poor Adequate Excellent

1) User Laboratory facilities	4.0/	5		
2) Tools and supplies in support labs	3.8/5			
3) User Offices	3.1/5			
4) NCNR computers for users				

		3.3/5		
5) Network access for user laptops		3.6/5		
6) Break/snack room facilities		2.9/5		
Legends: Poor Adequate Excellent Overall rating based on th	e scale from 1 to 5			

1) User Laboratory facilities

Percent	Count	Answers
1.3%	2/157	Poor
31.8%	50/157	Adequate
66.9%	105/157	Excellent
100.0%	157/157	Summary
	4.0/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5

2) Tools and supplies in support labs

	Percent	Count	Answers
	1.9%	3/156	Poor
	35.9%	56/156	Adequate
	62.2%	97/156	Excellent
	100.0%	156/156	Summary
		3.8/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5
3) User Offices			
	Percent	Count	Answers

100.0%	155/155 Summary	
41.9%	65/155 Excellent	
46.5%	72/155 Adequate	
11.6%	18/155 Poor	

3.1/5 Overall rating from 1 to 5

4) NCNR computers for users

Percent	Count	Answers
7.8%	12/154	Poor
46.8%	72/154	Adequate
45.5%	70/154	Excellent

100.0% 154/154 Summary							
		3.3/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5				
5) Network access for user laptops							
	Percent	Count	Answers				
	5.5%	8/146	Poor				
	39.0%	57/146	Adequate				
	55.5%	81/146	Excellent				
	100.0%	146/146	Summary				
		3.6/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5				
6) Break/snack room facilities							
6) Break/snack room	n facilities						
6) Break/snack room	n facilities Percent	Count	Answers				
6) Break/snack room	Percent	Count 14/149					
6) Break/snack room	Percent 9.4%	14/149					
6) Break/snack room	Percent 9.4% 57.7%	14/149 86/149	Poor				
6) Break/snack room	Percent 9.4% 57.7% 32.9%	14/149 86/149 49/149	Poor Adequate				

6. Please rate the following aspects of sample environments

1) Availability of different sample environments		3.9/5		
2) Quality and reliability of the equipment		3.9/5		
3) Support from sample environment personnel		4.6/5		
Legends: Poor Adequate Excellent Overall rating based o	n the scale from 1 to 5			

1) Availability of different sample environments

 Percent Count Answers
1.9% 3/156 Poor
33.3% 52/156 Adequate
64.7% 101/156 Excellent
 100.0% 156/156 Summary
3.9/5 Overall rating from 1 to 5

2) Quality and reliability of the equipment

	Percent	Count	Answers
	5.8%	9/156	Poor
	28.2%	44/156	Adequate
	66.0%	103/156	Excellent
	100.0% ⁻	156/156	Summary
		3.9/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5
Support from sa	ample enviro	nment p	ersonnel
	Percent	Count	Answers

3)

Percent	Count	Answers
0.6%	1/154	Poor
12.3%	19/154	Adequate
87.0%	134/154	Excellent
100.0%	154/154	Summary
	4.6/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5

7. What other sample environments would you research benefit from

- o High speed centrifuge at laboratory facility for sample preparation just prior to neutron runs would be useful, in order to remove particle aggregates that influence low-Q data.
- o High pressure cells for neutron scattering
- o inert atmosphere
- o higher magnetic field
- o I would like to know the exact temperature of sample in the shear cell
- o second shear cell, just in case "the one" is broken.
- o Wide-angle horizontal field magnets
- o better high and ultra high vacuum equipment, atomic force microscopy.
- o Pressure cell for liquids
- o increase the number of detectors (compared to 32 at present) could be helpful
- o more and better low temperatrue (< 1 K) environments, especially if they are available with and without high fields.
- o More reliable closed cycle refrigerators in 5K range
- o More cryostats with high-field magnets.
- o I have used NG7, NG3, NG1, NG1 Reflectometry and have found all facilities and assistance to be outstanding. I am interested in also accessing USANS BT5 and in learning more about neutron spin-echo capabilities.
- o During my experiments, I need to change illumination. Therefore, I need block light from my sample environments.
 - NIST provides me this sample enviroment.
- o More on high presure for supercritical fluid applications
- o T-<u>Control</u> Shear Cell
- o Variable oxygen partial pressure
- o smaller sample holders (for precious samples) better temperature regulation and monitoring (biological samples) most of this OK for SANS, but we found that other equipment (pressure cells, sample holders for disk chopper spectrometer, etc) were designed for polymeric materials and not appropriate for biological samples.
- The major need is to be able to use chemicals and 0 solvents which are volitile so that odor will be detected during use in the SANS/USANS work. A good

hood system which is portable and can be used to remove the air column, near the sample holders, to exhaust it outside would provide major flexibility for doing chemical reactions which generate phases or particles within the beam.

- o high pressure, low temperature
- o Parallel Plate Polymer Melt Rheometer
- o <u>I like to make my own. As such I would appreciate more flexible and widely capable control</u> interfaces between the NS instruments and user supplied ancillary equipment.
- <u>This instrument would benefit from more interaction with the</u> <u>sample environments staff.</u>
- o The support staff is conscientious and hard working, but they are understaffed
- o <u>Higher field for both vertical and expecially horizontal</u> cryomagnets.
- Reliable thermometry of sample.
- o In-situ MBE chamber
- o different magneic fields, wider temperature ranges
- o An accurate absolute calibration of the thermometry is essential.
- o <u>N/A</u>
- o low temp. cryostat
- o horizontal magnet with wide access (not SANS-type)
- o <u>N/A</u>
- o <u>I'd like to see an IR spectrometer and/or Brewster angle microscope available to be used on the NG7 refl. beamline simultaneously with the reflectivity measurements on liquid surfaces</u>
- o <u>15 T magnet</u> Low T high pressure equipment modern <u>3He system</u>

8. Please rate your primary NCNR instrument

1) Hardware reliability and performance	4.3/5	
2) Data acquisition software	3.9/5	
3) Support from NCNR staff	4.8/5	
Legends: Poor Adequate Excellent Overall rating based	on the scale from 1 to 5	

1) Hardware reliability and performance

Percent	Count	Answers
0.6%	1/156	Poor
23.7%	37/156	Adequate
75.6%	118/156	Excellent
 100.0%	156/156	Summary
	4.3/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5

2) Data acquisition software

	Percent	Count	Answers
	5.8%	9/155	Poor
	27.7%	43/155	Adequate
	66.5%	103/155	Excellent
	100.0%	155/155	Summary
		3 9/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5
		0.770	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Support from NCN	IR staff	0.770	
Support from NCN		Count	
3) Support from NCN	Percent		Answers
3) Support from NCN	Percent 0.6%	Count 1/156	Answers
3) Support from NCN	Percent 0.6% 5.8%	Count 1/156 9/156	Answers Poor
3) Support from NCN	Percent 0.6% 5.8% 93.6%	Count 1/156 9/156 146/156	Answers Poor Adequate

9. Please rate data analysis and visualization software at the NCNR

1) Quality of software		3.7/5		
2) Range of capabilities		3.5/5		
3) Assistance from NCNR staff		4.4/5		
Legends: Poor Adequate Excellent Overall rating based on	the scale from 1 to 5			

1) Quality of software

	Percent	Count	Answers	
	5.9%	9/153	Poor	
	36.6%	56/153	Adequate	
	57.5%	88/153	Excellent	
	100.0% ⁻	153/153	Summary	
		3.7/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5	
2) Range of capabilities				
	Percent	Count	Answers	

	4.6%	7/153	Poor			
	44.4%	68/153	Adequate			
	51.0%	78/153	Excellent			
	100.0%	153/153	Summary			
		3.5/5	Overall rating from 1 to 5			
3) Assistance from N) Assistance from NCNR staff					
	Percent	Count	Answers			
		Count 0/153				
	0.0%	0/153				
	0.0% 19.0%	0/153 29/153	Poor			
	0.0% 19.0% 81.0%	0/153 29/153 124/153	Poor Adequate			

10. What other data analysis tools would your research benefit from

- o <u>A Small angle scattering model for multilammlar vesicles.</u>
- Additional fitting packages for SANS data(structure factor forms, additional core shell forms (cylinders))
- o <u>Desmearing</u>
- Something like "spyglass transform" for easy and immediate presentation of SANS spectra in 2d and 3d format.
- o Data reduction software and instructions for Spin Echo
- o <u>I know there is an ungoing project to update and extend ICP and DAVE. This should be given full institutional support.</u>
- o <u>Use of stretched exponential functions. More friendly version for user defined fit functions. Fit</u> <u>functions that I'm usually using do not produce stable fit results.</u>
- o More reliable software on NG1
- o <u>I prefer to use my own data analysis tools</u>. In this regard, a unified data file format would be <u>highly welcomed</u>
- One element of our data analysis that has been frustrating is the difficulty in fitting a polydisperse form factor model to our scattering data. We know from experience that some of our samples form aggregates that are oblate ellipsoidal with solvent entrainment and we know they are polydisperse. It has been difficult for us to adequately fit our sample data to the "polydisperse cylinder" model that NIST makes available because the program is not sufficiently robust. Otherwise, all sample analysis tools have been outstanding.
- o A clear manual for the use fo these tools and ease of external access.
- o <u>No.</u>
- Microcal Origin and Matlab.
- o The data analysis tools at SPEAR (Los Alamos) seem to be somewhat more intuitive and easier to use.
- <u>Data analysis software is just in the process of being upgraded and the new system looks like it</u> <u>is vastly improved</u>
- <u>Userfriendly software that allows to test data versus established models: I am an unexperienced industrial user, and it is useful to quickly test data against these established models. Not without the support of the very helpful NIST staff scientists this is possible.</u>
- o <u>Software designed for the occasional user rather than the expert user.</u>
- o See answer to 3.3
- Brian Toby and the rest of the crystallography community participate in an excellent shareware website that has just about any data analysis tool needed.
- The spectrometer control program is primitive and clumsy. It should be updated and

commonalities pursued with other facilities.

- <u>I use my own softwares to analyze and visualize data.</u>
 <u>Current software is sufficient and the choise entered in 3.5 does not mean that the NCNR need to do much more.</u>
- More raw data comparing utilities
- o Fast Fourier Transform of spectra
- Simulated scattering intensity for a number of simple model cross-sections (eg Bragg scatytering by powder and single crystals, a single-particle scattering for a given dispersion)
- o Data fitting software
- Internet collaborative interaction for off site people on the experiment.
- Non command-line data reduction, including real-time display of array data and I(q) if calibrations and transmissions have been run, possibly with LabVIEW. Automation of data reduction, expecially piecing together low and high q datasets. Direct link of reduced I(q) to PC or Mac to Kaliedagraph or Excel spreadsheet file and/or plot.
- The Igor based software has been invaluable. Steve Klein's help in adding some new macros was greatly appreciated.
- We perform SANS under flow resulting in asymmetric 2D patterns. While techniques for analyzing these patterns are being developed it will be key that new analytical tools be easily incorporated into existing NCNR analysis software.
- o a standard comprehensive data file format

11. Please rate to what extent these forms of remote access (would) benefit your research program

1) Remote viewing of instrument status and data		2.2/3			
2) Remote control of instrument		1.8/3			
 Mail in samples for simple, well defined measurements 		1.9/3			
Legends: Not for me Useful Essential Overall rating based on the scale from 1 to 3					

1) Remote viewing of instrument status and data

	Percent	Count	Answers	
	12.2%	19/156	Not for me	
	55.8%	87/156	Useful	
	32.1%	50/156	Essential	
	100.0%	156/156	Summary	
		2.2/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3	
2) Remote control of instrument				
	Percent	Count	Answers	
	34.8%	54/155	Not for me	

48.4% 75/155 Useful

	16.8%	26/155	Essential	
	100.0%	Summary		
		1.8/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3	
3) [3) Mail in samples for simple, well defined measurements			
	Percent	Count	Answers	
	29.5%	46/156	Not for me	
	49.4%	77/156	Useful	
	21.2%	33/156	Essential	
	100.0% 156/156 Summary			
		1.9/3	Overall rating from 1 to 3	

- 12. Please list any neutron instruments not currently at the NCNR that would benefit your research program or the community in general.
 - o Higher neutron flux would be useful
 - o magnetic neutron spin echo
 - powder diffraction with area detector, for visualizing anisotropy of small molecule powder samples--I think that your current powder instruments don't have the right detector capability for this.
 - o <u>BT7</u>
 - o a modern thermal triple axis instrument
 - <u>A better capability to go to high q with a strong magnetic field and a furnace/cryostat</u>. Polarized <u>beams</u>.
 - o <u>No.</u>
 - As quite a portion of proposals are rejected each year, please consider to increase the numbers of SANS and NR.
 - o Zero field spin echo triple axis
 - o Single crystal diffractometer
 - o A spin echo spectrometer that actually worked and had software that wasn't a disaster.
 - o Higher resolution on the BT-1 diffractometer would be greatly beneficial.
 - o <u>BT7</u>
 - <u>I have been really impressed with the new neutron control software at ORNL perhaps NIST should consider a similar interface.</u>
 - o <u>N/A</u>
 - some supplemental x-ray equipment for simple characterization while doing neutron experiments. For example x-ray reflectivity for film thickness determination while running neutron refelctivity. This capability exists at NCNR but is not easily available to visiting users (though the management such a facility might be difficulty).
 - o spin-polarized SANS
 - An instrument covers the Q range from 0.01 to 2.0 A-1. It is an instrument between the currently existing SANS and wide-angle diffractometer. The instrument shall be very capable of Machine wiht subc a range tackles the nano-scale, which will benefit the entire nano-community.
 - <u>dedicated polarized beam spectrometer</u> <u>four circle single crystal diffractometer</u> <u>polarized beam diffractometer</u>

13. Are there any other comments or suggestions about the NCNR that you would like to add?

- This is an excellent facility which I hope will continue to develop and grow.
- <u>the NIST-NCNR is probably the greatest American scientific asset and it deserves to be funded at</u> <u>the requested level or more.</u>
 - X.S. Ling, Associate Professor of Physics
- This is a great facility made all the more wonderful by the personnel I work with and have interacted with (Hammouda, Kline, Glinka).
- During the proposal submission process it should be made horribly, insultingly, condescendingly clear that only 3 figures are allowed to be included with the experimental report.. maybe its 4 actually. Whatever the hell the number is I spent a week writing a report that had to many figures, then had to re-write it at the last minute cause I had too many figures.. granted, I'm an idiot, but the process should be made as idiot proof as possible.. in short, it should be easier for short-sighted people like me to have access to a nuclear reactor.
- It's a wonderful place to do research--supportive, friendly staff and excellent facilities and training.
- o Remote viewing apparatus to see samples during runs without interruptions.
- It is an excellent facility which has been an integral part of the research group that I am in over the years. Our studies at NCNR have increased our understanding of complex fluids and in assembling new structures.
- I am now retired and am no longer using the neutron scattering facilities. However, I was one of those responsible for first establishing SANS facilities in the US, first at ORNL and later at NIST. I was a member of the Seitz-Eastman Committee which urged the creation and development of these facilities. I recognized the need for these which have been very valuable for my previous work and appreciate the need for their continued development and support in order that the US remain at the forefront of research. My experience at NIST was that the facility is very well run and serves a very important function. I strongly urge its conti9nued support.
- o More spare parts and second quartz shear cell, just in case something is broken.
- o <u>I would like to indicate my satisfaction with the staff. They have been extremely helpful.</u>
- <u>My experience at the NCNR is the best I have had in comparison other user facilities through out</u> <u>the country (which in general has been from good-very good). The scientific output from the</u> <u>neutron reactor as I have seen it is exceptionally good.</u>
- NCNR became real external user-friendly facility. However, I guess, the user community will broaden even more if NCNR will provide travel support for users (the way it works, for example, at ILL or ESRF in Grenoble). NCNR supports (with a limited amount) first time users only. When I'm coming with 2-3 students for ~7-10 days to Gaithersburg, it requires large travel money. The system like the one existing in Grenoble will remove this concern and will broaden user community that at the end will result in more effective use of NCNR.
- o Great facility and great people!!
- NCNR programs had significant role in the development of my research. Summer schools were excellent chance to learn from well known scientists, staff are very available and helpful, and there are good tools and softwares for data analysis.
- NCNR is a valuable source for researchers(graduate students and professors) all over nation. NCNR is a premier neutron scattering facility in terms of the operation policy, resource
- development and user assistance, #1 in the US and arguably that internationally. It deserves the strongest support possible.
- Sorry, I haven't used the instruments yet and I can not rate them but I just wanted to say which setups can be useful for my reserach in future if it's any use for you.
 Sincerely,
 - <u>-d</u>
- o AN excellent facility, world-class personnel, and unique instruments.
- o More available beam time, for both proposal based and collaborative work.
- <u>By and large, my experiences at NIST have been superb. The staff -- health physics, scientific, beamline -- are knowledgable, friendly, and a joy to work with. I am pleased to do anything in my power to assist in keeping the facility vibrant and active.</u>
- The NCNR is one of the finest user facilities in the world. The instruments provide capabilities that are unique and critical to the field of materials research, biological sciences, chemistry, and solid state physics. The facility is maintained such that the instruments are easy to use, always operating reliably, and running around the clock. The funding is put to exceptionally good use. Plus, on a scale of 1-10, the staff is a 99! They are always available to help- before, during and after experiments, and they provide excellent training, teaching and customer service functions. This facility is a precious and indispensible resource for the advancement of science and should, unquestionably, be fully staffed and supported for many years to come.
- o <u>No</u>

- o Is it possible to build up a cafeteria in NCNR building?
- o This facility is essential for neutron research in the eastern US. The staff scientists have been wonderful.
- There seems to be no correlation between the quality of the proposals, and the significance of the results, as indicated by the literature, and the acceptance or rejection. It seems that any new idea faces a very strong resistance while old; pretty much variations on old experiments are welcomed. It defeats the purpose of a dynamic scientific place.
- o This is a wonderful program.
- <u>I use several of the national neutron facilities and, although some of the other facilities in principle have more extensive capabilities, NCNR is by far my first choice because of the excellent support that the staff provide and the reliability of the instrumentation.</u>
- <u>I have been completely pleased with the interactions with the facilities and the people who work</u> there. Keep up the good work!
- o I have found staff to be quite knowledgeable and helpful.

Proposal process and allocation of instrument time seems somewhat politicized; I wonder whether we have received time in the past because of personal connections.

<u>I wish quasi-elastic and inelastic experiments could be made more sensitive and more useable</u> for biological samples. These applications are unique to neutrons (as opposed to X-rays), and it would be great to exploit them.

- This was our first experience at NCNR. Neutron scattering brings an important added dimension to experimental efforts in structural biology of macromolecular machines, and we wanted to explore its potential. I can say without qualification that the scientists and staff at NCNR with whom we interacted were helpful and patient with us (my post doc and gradurate student) in preparing samples, collecting data, and assisting us with the analysis and interpretation. The operation is an excellent model for how a national user facility should operate. Keep up the good work.
- The program bringing graduate students to NIST to conduct experiments based on their submission of short proposals is a superb concept and of enormous value. There is no way we could have ever gotten into the use of Neutron scattering or learned so much about its value without this program. Dr. Glinka and his staff are to be congratulated on contributing to the success of many research programs and for "spreading the neutron gospel" through their excellent service to the scientific community through this program. If ever a program deserved expansion, this is it.
- As I hope is apparent by my responses above, I have had very good experiences at NIST, both in terms of using instruments and interacting with staff scientists. I have used both the SANS and USANS instruments.
- o Can you clone Mike? I think US neutron scattering needs about five of him. And good luck to Pat.
- The NCNR is an excellent resource for science in the US. I realize that there is a large pool of users for the available instruments, but the time seems fairly distributed. However, it would be nice if all of the barriers for doing science there could be examined.
- The NCNR is the only place on the east coast with a constant wavelength neutron source and is
 essential to my research on complex metal oxides and the crystallography community in general.
 User time is apportioned in a reasonable process, given the recent cuts in funding to NIST and
 the NCNR. Furthermore, the outreach program through the University of Maryland and the
 summer school on neutron scattering are invaluable forums for introducing new users to the
 instrumentation and encouraging them to take advantage of the unique properties of neutron
 radiation. It would severely hurt the advancement of both applied and basic sciences (already
 affected by the closure of the HFBR at Brookhaven) should this facility not be supported in full.
- <u>The NCNR has the best suite of instruments and sample environments among US neutron</u> <u>facilities. And it is also the most open and fair to the user community. I hope that both can be</u> <u>continued to the future.</u>
- Decreased funding to the NCNR will significantly impact U.S. materials science research capabilities in a negative way, and at a time when efforts abroad are actually being built up. The U.S. needs to maintain and enhance our existing cutting-edge materials research capabilities, not cripple them with funding cuts. The characterization and fundamental understanding of materials with exploitable properties remains the "bottom of the food chain" for the development of

advanced technologies and for realizing the dreams of future applications.

- <u>The NCNR has the best user program of all the neutron sources that I have done experiemnts at.</u> <u>The quality an reliability of the instruments is amazing, as is the publication record coming out of the NIST community.</u>
- <u>NCNR staff are excellent</u>. The secretary, safety trainers, staff scientists (especially <u>Dr. Sushil Satija and Dr. Min Lin) are knowledgable</u> and always ready to help.
- o <u>Do something about those user cubicles!</u>
- Best neutron scattering site in the US and world class facility overall.
- I think that the remote experimentation capability is a very important improvement that could be used to assess feasibility of some kinds of experiments. I am setting up a remote experimentation user facility in my laboratory since I am based on the west coast. This facility is equipped with computers, video projectors, and interaction areas especially designed to facilitate remote experimentation.
- o <u>I hope that the level of support and stability of personel will continue. It makes coming to the NCNR a pleasure.</u>
- A larger sample environment support group
 A modern triple axis instrument control system
- The facility has grown into the world leader by providing facilities in which each instrument operates with minimal user technical problems. All problems are taken care of by the staff including setting up the experiment and providing training for the users. In my experience with two other facilities, no facility has allowed such ease in performing experiments and taking the data home for analysis. This is because the NCNR has considered that by minimizing forseeable problems for the user they can complete their experiments sooner allowing more users per cycle.

This survey is powered by Infopoll - Internet Survey Engine for Business Intelligence.