

Issues Related to the Transition from NSLS I to NSLS II

David Mullins, ORNL

- 1) Loss of PRT time
 - Need to learn to do our science in a different way.
 - Catalysis Consortium is a good model for how the GU / PU system will work
- 2) Can existing beamlines be used, in whole or in part, at the NSLS II?
 - Yes, provided there is a strong programmatic justification and are “state of the art” or can be “brought up to code”.
- 3) What modifications will need to be made in order to bring them up to minimum standards (radiation safety, power loads, new hutches, etc.)?
 - First optical hutch to meet radiation requirements
 - Three pole wiggler has only 20% more power than NSLS I BM
 - Changes in beamline lengths etc likely means new mirrors(?)
- 4) How much will this cost?
 - Hulbert estimated \$1M, Chi-Chang said \$2M
- 5) Where will this money come from?
 - NSLS II has budgeted operating funds
 - BATs will have to make their case!!

- 6) Does the NSLS II have a plan for what lines to move and how many lines to have for each technique?
 - Strawman proposal presented yesterday. Again, subject to modification based on feedback from these groups.
- 7) Will enough beamlines / beamtime be available?
 - Need to review our user base and critically examine claim that higher throughput will compensate for fewer beam lines.
 - Need to carefully weigh high risk, new techniques vs. continuing to serve a large existing user community.
- 8) Will there be a bias against moving conventional beamlines?
 - Unknown, however NSLS II management recognizes the need to transfer some beamlines and may be more predisposed to fund this compared to a new peer-reviewed proposal.
- 9) Does it make sense to upgrade existing beamlines?
 - End stations and detectors, yes.
 - Beamline optics, yes if they can be transferred.
 - If they can't, you need to carefully weigh the cost vs. benefit over the anticipated lifetime of NSLS I.