

Interim Report to

**the University of California Committee
on Research Policy (UCORP)**

Subcommittee on the Relationship between the University of California and the U.S. Department of Energy Laboratories at Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos

Co-Chairs: Henry Abarbanel, UCSD and Lovell “Tu” Jarvis, UCD.

Members: John Edmond, UCLA; John Featherstone, UCSF; Janis Ingham, UCSB; Alan Jackman, UCD; Todd La Porte, UCB; Robert Powell, UCB.

February 2003

Executive Summary

NOTE: Given current events surrounding UC management of the DOE laboratories, the faculty subcommittee of UCORP that prepared the following report would like to set the report in a proper context. 1) Although the report briefly acknowledges current and past management problems between the university and the labs, it does not dwell on these because they are outside the sphere of influence of the faculty, and if the contract continues into the future, those problems will have been tackled, assumedly successfully. 2) The report does not address whether the UC-labs contract should be continued because current and past evidence indicates the Regents hold the UC-labs relationship in high esteem and are not likely to change that view. Therefore, the subcommittee's report took the likely continuation of the contract as its point of departure. 3) The subcommittee's report takes the long view and centers on enriching the role of faculty in all relevant aspects of the university-laboratories relationship, as part of the faculty's privilege and obligation of shared governance. 4) UCORP unanimously endorsed the report and its recommendations.

Background:

After the contracts under which UC manages the national laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore for the Department of Energy (DOE) were extended in 2001, the Academic Council asked the University Committee on Research Policy to establish a subcommittee to examine the relationship between UC and the national labs in order to help the Senate prepare to be a more active participant in future discussions of the contracts. DOE and Congress have sought recently to increase contractor accountability, e.g., the new contracts included more stringent requirements (Appendix O). The faculty did not oppose one, creation of a Senior Vice President for the Labs at UCOP, but were concerned about others that increased scope for DOE intervention, making it more difficult for UC to successfully manage the labs. We have considered these issues and others have arisen. The first interim report of the subcommittee was submitted in January 2002. This is the second interim report.

Historically, UC has managed the national labs on a "no cost, no gain" basis as a public service to the country. We understand the public service rationale for UC management and possible faculty involvement, especially as it relates to Los Alamos and Livermore, which do classified work, to follow from three premises:

- 1) LANL and LLNL are vital national resources that carry out basic scientific and technical work essential to helping the nation meet immediate and future national security needs.
- 2) UC management is better than alternative possible managers - public or private - at creating the kind of organizational environment and intellectual atmosphere that furthers

these goals, especially those of promoting a spirit of open inquiry and the ability of the staff to “speak truth to power” in reporting on sensitive and critical topics that are essential to high-quality scientific work.

- 3) As stewards of this environment on the UC campuses, the faculty can and, because of joint governance, may have a responsibility for helping the labs maintain this environment.

Conclusions:

First, UC historically has sponsored and lent its good name to the laboratories, rather than managing them in the normal sense of the word. The internal management of the labs has largely been in the hands of the lab Directors in their interactions with DOE, NNSA (National Nuclear Security Administration) and the other federal agencies that sponsor “work for others” at the labs. This decentralized approach is akin to the way that UC manages the campuses. But the extensive formal and informal connections that characterize the relationship between the individual campuses and UC as a whole are much less extensive between UC and the labs. This makes a decentralized approach more difficult to sustain.

Second, despite recent events, UC management has created an atmosphere within which lab technical personnel can better pursue their research tasks and objectively report on their scientific results. UC management has also enhanced the labs’ ability to recruit and retain critical scientific and technical personnel.

Third, UC derives a large benefit from its association with LBNL. The benefit of its association with the NNSA labs (LANL and LLNL) is less clear, except in the sense that managing these labs helps fulfill UC’s longstanding commitment to public service.

Recommendations:

To the extent that the Senate decides that joint governance requires it to play a more active role in UC’s management of the labs, the connections between the faculty and the labs must be strengthened, possibly by:

- 1) establishing a standing Senate body, preferably as a subcommittee of UCORP, to focus on UC/labs issues, with representation of lab technical staff at meetings of this committee;
- 2) involving Senate representatives in preparations for UC/DOE contract negotiations;
- 3) broadening the research linkages between the labs and the UC campuses, including the formation of a Senate/Administration/Laboratory Task Force to prepare a plan for joint and individual laboratory and campus research and education that can be presented to the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal agencies for their adoption and execution;
- 4) inviting the labs to create a peer equivalent organization at the labs that will act in the context of the labs as the Senate does on the campuses.

Next steps:

If the Academic Council accepts these recommendations, the subcommittee, in coordination with Council, will begin discussing these ideas with stakeholders within UC, including the labs, and with DOE and NNSA. We estimate that costs associated with this communication effort would amount to about \$10,000. Detailed costs would be worked out with the Council Chair.

Interim Report

In Fall 2000, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) suddenly proposed to extend the contract under which the University of California (UC) has long managed the DOE laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore. To succeed, the negotiations for the proposed extension had to be completed prior to January 20, 2001. The Academic Council requested that the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) provide advice regarding the proposed extension. UCORP was historically the only Senate connection to the DOE labs. UCORP had visited Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and held a lengthy videoconference with scientists and administrators at Los Alamos National Laboratory during 1999-2000, and had also visited Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the other DOE laboratory managed by UC, which undertakes only unclassified research. UCORP responded, nonetheless, that it was unable to provide proper advice to the Council on such short notice (six weeks), and it acquiesced in the extension of the contract. The extension was negotiated and executed, adding three years to the existing contract. The new agreement terminates on September 30, 2005. Subsequently, the contract for LBNL, the other DOE laboratory managed by UC, was also extended. Thus, the contractual arrangements for all three DOE labs end September 30, 2005.

UCORP also suggested that the Academic Senate begin to prepare itself to comment with greater authority when UC next negotiated a contract for the DOE labs. UCORP felt it did not have the in-depth, long-term knowledge it has of campus based research policy issues. Thus, UCORP suggested that a UCORP subcommittee be established to explore in depth the cost/benefit relationship between the labs at Berkeley, Los Alamos, and Livermore and the University of California.

That subcommittee was formed in Spring 2001, first met at UCSD in June 2001, and has been at work for about 18 months. An interim report was sent to the Academic Council in January 2002 (attached) and a brief description of the subcommittee's work was prepared for the Academic Senate newsletter, *Notice*, which appeared in Spring 2002. Our ideas and suggestions have developed in substantial ways since that time.

Historically, UC has managed the national labs on a "no cost, no gain" basis as a public service to the country, and the highest leadership of UC appears determined to continue to provide this service. The subcommittee's inquiries have been informed by this determination and by our understanding of the nature of this public service role, especially as it applies to the Livermore and Los Alamos labs which, unlike the Berkeley lab, do classified work and report to the DOE through the NNSA. We understand the public service rationale for UC management and possible faculty involvement to follow from three premises:

- 1) LANL and LLNL are vital national resources that play a critical role in helping the nation meet its immediate national security needs and, of equal if not greater importance, doing the basic scientific and technical work essential to helping the nation meet its future needs, including the scientific stewardship of the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile.
- 2) Compared to other possible managers, UC management (with improvements) is better at creating the kind of organizational culture and intellectual atmosphere that furthers these goals. We refer particularly to a spirit of open inquiry and the ability of staff to report candidly on sensitive and critical topics. This is the primary service UC offers, and it is one that has successfully guided the labs for 60 years.

- 3) As stewards of this culture on the UC campuses, the faculty can contribute to - and, because of joint governance, may have a responsibility to contribute to – helping the labs maintain this kind of environment.

In light of this understanding of the public service basis for continued UC management, the issue the subcommittee examined was how we, as a faculty, could improve the relationship for all parties involved: UC, technical staff at the labs, the DOE and the NNSA. Recognizing the difference in mission of the labs and the campuses and the consequent differences in staffing requirements, we placed special emphasis on how we could contribute to maintaining the highest quality personnel at the labs, using our experience in striving for this on our own campuses.

The Subcommittee visited all campuses to discuss its work with the Divisional Senate executive committees and obtain their input. It also visited each laboratory (LLNL twice) and met separately with the Director of LBNL. Following a short respite for contemplation in Spring 2002, it continued intense activity in Fall 2002 with the significant participation of the Academic Council Vice Chair, Larry Pitts (UCSF). In addition, a subgroup of the subcommittee met numerous times to consider questions for a final set of visits to the three laboratories before preparation of a final report to UCORP. A majority of the membership of the subcommittee met with LBNL Director Shank on December 17, 2002 for consultation on involving the UC faculty in interactions with the laboratories. Finally, one subcommittee member met with Regent Peter Preuss to inform him of the issues before the subcommittee.

Where has all this meeting and consulting and consideration brought us?

First, we still understand that the University of California does not “manage” the national laboratories in the usual sense of the word. UC sponsors the laboratories and lends its good name to their operation. The management of the laboratories is in the hands of the Directors (Chancellor level appointments on the UC organization charts) in their interactions with DOE, NNSA, and the other Federal agencies that sponsor “work for others” at the labs. Further, over the 60 or so years of the UC/labs connection, the role of the faculty has been quite minimal in this sponsorship/management. One of the goals of the subcommittee has been to identify those areas where augmented faculty involvement can enhance the value of the labs in their mission and equally their value to the University.

Second, we understand that the value to the laboratories of the UC/labs connection has many facets. UC management has created an atmosphere within which lab technical personnel can better pursue their programmatic and basic research tasks in the spirit of open inquiry. This spirit of open inquiry is essential to attracting high quality scientists capable of meeting the labs’ national mission, to carrying out their research, and to permitting technical staff to “speak truth to power” in reporting to Federal authorities on sensitive and critical topics. The ability of the labs to recruit and retain critical scientific and technical personnel is further enhanced by a shared and successful retirement program, the availability of resident tuition at UC for children of LANL employees, and the prestige associated with being part of UC. LBNL also receives extensive direct support for its programs from UC faculty, especially those from UCB.

Third, the value to UC of the connection with the Berkeley laboratory is clear: joint, indeed tightly integrated research programs embodied in the nearly 200 UCB faculty whose labs are at LBNL, sponsored professorships such as the ALS professors at UCSF and UCD, and other items. The

value of the UC/LBNL connection is so manifest that we have taken it as a “poster lab” for what might be accomplished. The value of the connection with the NNSA labs (LANL and LLNL) appears to be less well established, but may include the sense that UC performs a public service by helping these labs better achieve their important national mission, and perhaps a national stature or presence flowing from association with nationally important applied science missions. It does not appear that UC benefits proportionately more from greater student and faculty interactions with the NNSA labs than do other outstanding universities.

However, during the course of our deliberations a significant change has occurred in the way LANL has chosen to interact with four campuses (UCD, UCR, UCSB, and UCSD). The funds flowing from the DOE/NNSA contract that are designated for lab/campus interactions have historically been distributed via small, short term collaborations between campus faculty and laboratory technical staff. Starting in late 2001, LANL, through the offices of one of its Deputy Directors, negotiated and signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with these individual campuses that provide a formal and financial basis for long-term interaction between LANL and the specific campus. This new mode of interaction promises to improve long-term interaction on a broad range of specified topics that will be governed by a joint lab/campus steering committee in each case.

The main problem we have identified over the period of our deliberations remains how to augment the role of the faculty in the “management” of the labs. This was the vacuum apparent when the Council turned to UCORP for advice in Fall 2000.

Over the last several years the weakness of the informal relationship established in 1943 for UC/labs interaction has been exposed many times, causing severe embarrassment to the University. Management failures at the laboratories have been associated with cover ups on cost overruns at the National Ignition Facility, accusations of misbehavior or even treason by lab employees, lost disk drives, misuse of credit cards and systematic pilfering of lab equipment, and the firing of auditors who appear to have been doing their job. The informality of the “management” relationship means that when these events transpire, and such events will regularly occur in institutions of such size and complexity, the University is blamed for mismanagement when, in fact, it had little if any say in how the events developed or were handled. AT&T ran Sandia Laboratories for many years and, when faced with similar embarrassments arising from the disjoint between actual and apparent responsibilities, simply quit, leaving the DOE to find a new external “manager.”

It is unlikely that greater faculty involvement will be a silver bullet in addressing all of the problematic events that may occur as a result of the continued connection between the labs and UC. However, we believe there are actions that the Senate may take that will allow the faculty to positively influence the UC-labs interaction.

First, to avoid the unsatisfying situation revealed in Fall 2000, when the Council sought UCORP’s advice on the extension of the NNSA labs contract, we urge the establishment of a standing Senate body – preferably a subcommittee of UCORP – to focus on UC/labs issues. We believe that representation of laboratory technical staff at meetings of this committee, in much the same fashion that the laboratory deputy directors sit on the Council for Research, would be appropriate. How the labs would choose their representatives is to be discussed by the Council and the laboratory directors.

Second, we argue that the Academic Senate should have representatives involved in the preparations that precede UC/Federal government negotiations for all contractual extensions or renewals for the contracts for the three labs. Not only is this in the spirit of shared governance, but also the goals of the Senate will complement those of the DOE and of UCOP. The joint responsibility will be underlined by this action.

Third, we feel strongly that the benefits from the laboratories to the University should not be solely focused on the traditional science and technology areas that are the province of the labs. The labs benefit from the University as a whole, i.e., from the medical schools as well as the literature departments, and from political science research as well as plasma physics activities. The broadening of lab interest in UC activities is likely to be encouraged by the growing role of Homeland Security, which necessarily will require different expertise and scientific applications than the more traditional weapons work that has been the focus of the NNSA labs. Indeed, when LANL came to UCSD to negotiate its MOU with UCSD, the LANL staff identified the new School of Management as a prime focus for the MOU insofar as the lab sought assistance in areas of management expertise. This is as it should be. The traditional view of the labs/campus connection as focused solely on science and engineering should be broadened.

Fourth, to have an ongoing Senate faculty to laboratory technical staff connection, we suggest that the Senate, perhaps through the proposed UCORP subcommittee, discuss establishing at the laboratories a peer equivalent organization that will act in the context of the laboratories as the Senate does in the context of the campuses. This assumes interest on the part of the laboratory staff, though our informal discussions during visits to the labs did appear to reveal such an interest.

These are goals that can be pursued by the Academic Council if it is agreed that they meet the goals of the faculty in its role of shared governance and are beneficial to the University and its management of the labs. It is essential to include both the leadership of the laboratories and the core of their technical staff in all efforts to realize these goals. We proposed that UCORP, through the current subcommittee and with participation of the Council's leadership, accept the task of pursuing these matters.

If all this were accomplished, we might have improved the situation we find at present of disconnected and relatively uninformed faculty participation in the laboratory/UC campus connection. This would be welcome, but we think that one can proceed further.

The role of the NNSA labs in national security affairs has altered substantially since the end of the cold war and further altered since 9/11. UC faculty have participated little in these changes, though there is great expertise within UC that might be brought to bear on these important issues. We have considered an idea that might benefit the laboratories' mission while simultaneously enhancing the kind of mutually beneficial, long-term interaction between the laboratories and campus faculty and students that has been largely missing in the past.

The establishment of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) creates a major opportunity for the campuses to work with the labs in developing programs that realistically address national security needs. Such research would be basic and applied, unclassified (to be performed on campuses and at the labs) and classified (to be performed at the NNSA labs). It would encompass the spectrum of expertise at UC, including medicine, management, and linguistics as well as physics and political science.

We propose the formation of a Senate/Administration/Laboratory Task Force to prepare a research and development plan for joint and individual laboratory and campus research and education that can be presented to DHS and other Federal entities for adoption and execution. (We are undecided at this time what role the members of the Regent's subcommittee on the labs might play here and encourage discussion of this at the Academic Council and with UCOP.) This effort would complement, doubtless with overlap, the plans developed by Federal agencies without consultation with UC and the labs and provide a long-term mode of interaction between the labs and the campuses led by the faculty working with the laboratory technical staff. The task force would report to the Academic Council, UCOP, and the laboratory directors in Winter 2003/04 in a manner that would influence the negotiations for future UC lab contracts as well as the development of DHS programs.

To our knowledge this would be the first time that campus expertise, coupled with the three laboratories, will have been exercised to meet recognized national needs. It would result, we expect, in joint long-term relationships that will enhance the mission goals of the campuses as well as those of the laboratories. It will also concretely address the desires of the University, often expressed by the Regents as well as others, to expand UC's public service achievements as well as its research and educational accomplishments.

In the past we have loosely discussed the idea of extending the service of UC to national goals by expanding on the clear successes of LBNL through the creation of a Southern branch of LBNL. The idea was to involve the campuses established since 1960 as much as the older campuses have been involved with the Berkeley lab. This would be a consideration of the Task Force to identify whether such a "Southern LBNL" would meet DHS requirements as well.

The net thrust of our suggestions is to greatly expand the involvement of UC in the laboratories that we "manage" or sponsor for national missions, enhancing that mission while augmenting our own education and research goals. Our charge has been to scrutinize the cost/benefit relation between the campuses and the DOE labs. We have done that and found, we believe, a manner in which we can enhance the benefits to the mission of the labs and the nation's goals, as well as the core mission of UC.

This is a report of activities of the UCORP subcommittee over the calendar year 2002. If the Academic Council accepts the recommendations of this report, there is still much work to do. The first effort will be to bring these ideas to stakeholders within UC, including the labs, and within DOE and NNSA. These include:

- Members of the Senate Divisions, as a follow-up to earlier visits
- The Academic Council
- The Academic Assembly
- The President
- The Provost
- The Chair of the President's Council
- The President's Council as a whole
- Faculty members of the President's Council
- Laboratory Directors and their Management Officers
- Laboratory Technical Staff
- Council of Chancellors

- Council of Executive Vice Chancellors
- Council of Vice Chancellors of Research
- The Council on Research
- Members of the Board of Regents committee on the labs
- Perhaps the Board of Regents itself

This is a long list. Implementation of this effort will require time and energy on the part of UCORP and its subcommittee. We have received approval by UCORP as a whole of the suggestions and work program outlined here, and ask that this report be brought to the Academic Council for approval and support for these further actions.

January 30, 2002

To: Academic Council of the University of California Academic Senate

From: Henry Abarbanel, Chair, UCORP 01-02

Re: University Committee On Research Policy Subcommittee on the Relationship
between the University of California and the United States Department of
Energy Laboratories at Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos

Henry Abarbanel, UCSD and Lovell "Tu" Jarvis, UCD, Co-Chairs

Progress Report

Background

In the Fall of 2000 the US Department of Energy (DOE) exercised its option under its contract with the University of California (UC) to extend for three years the existing contract with the Livermore and Los Alamos laboratories. The existing termination date for these two laboratories of 30 September 2002 was extended to 30 September 2005. The contract for the Berkeley laboratory remained intact with an expiration date of 30 September 2002.

The Academic Council (AC) of UC under the chairmanship of Professor Michael Cowan requested the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) to provide advice to the Council on the proposed extension of the LANL and LLNL contracts. UCORP has been the UC Academic Senate committee charged over the years with consideration of UC/DOE Laboratory connections and has spent considerable time working with laboratory management and members of the UC Office of the President (UCOP) on these matters.

It became rapidly clear that there was not sufficient time to seriously consider the broad issues involved in this charge. UCORP gave its acquiescence to the extension of the LANL and LLNL contracts while suggesting that some form of Academic Senate inquiry into the overall costs and benefits of the UC's relation to the DOE labs be initiated.

After some discussion with the AC and with UCOP, a subcommittee of UCORP was formed in Spring, 2001 charged with inquiring into the costs and benefits of the relationship of UC with the three DOE laboratories at Berkeley, Los Alamos, and Livermore: the costs and benefits to the laboratories, to UC, and to the national mission of the laboratories.

The UC involvement with the labs dates from the WWII establishment of the Los Alamos laboratory in 1943 as part of the Manhattan Project. For the first 45 years of this connection there was a rather hands-off relationship between UC and the labs. The UC Regents appointed the Directors of the labs in consultations with the President of UC and the Department of Energy (or its predecessors the Atomic Energy Commission or the Energy Research and Development Agency). After that consultation, the labs ran more or less on their own. From the outset it was

recognized that collaborations with members of the UC faculty would be beneficial to the laboratory technical staff members and funds were identified in each contract to foster that confluence of basic science at the UC campuses and its applications to national needs at the laboratories. In the 2001-2003 time period these funds amount to approximately \$17 million annually and have been utilized in a variety of ways ranging from individual peer-to-peer collaborations to support of “academic” institutes at one or more laboratories to specific, written cooperative agreements between one lab and one campus.

This format changed somewhat in the early 1990s when the focus of the UC/lab contract changed to a “performance based” format. Critical to this format was the establishment of the President’s Council on the National Laboratories (PC) and recently (2001) the creation of the Vice President for Laboratory Management in UCOP. Through its panels on Science and Technology, National Security, Environmental Health and Safety, Program Management, and Laboratory Security the PC explores in some detail the quality of various performance aspects of all three laboratories. Academic Senate membership on the PC includes the present, past, and next Chair of the AC, the Chair or Vice Chair of UCORP, and three or four “at large” UC faculty.

Over the nearly 60 years of UC connection to the national laboratories the actual engagement of the UC faculty in support of laboratory goals has been informal, even sporadic, and primarily based on coincidence of research interests between faculty and scientific peers at the laboratories.

The involvement of the UC faculty beyond this has often taken a role of examining the very rationale of the connection of UC and the labs and occasionally resulting in considerable debate. Over the years there has been a spectrum of faculty discomfort with the connection between the labs and UC apparently based on unease at a University’s involvement with the Los Alamos and Livermore national security mission. At various times this unease has expressed itself as a sense that UC was not performing its responsibility with respect to the national labs with the same demands of excellence we demand of ourselves as scholars.

At the same time it has been clear that the administrative leadership at UCOP and the members of the Board of Regents valued the connection between UC and the labs.

Our view of the core value of UC sponsorship of the DOE laboratories is that it provides an atmosphere at these labs critical to the ability of lab technical personnel to pursue their programmatic and basic research tasks in an atmosphere of open inquiry. It also gives foundation to the reporting of laboratory personnel to governmental bodies allowing the presentation of “truth to power” even when the outcomes may be unwelcome. The suggestions we develop as a result of our inquiries are in this spirit and lie at the heart of what it means for the University of California to render this public service.

Our subcommittee has taken as given the long term connection between UC and the three DOE laboratories. On that basis we have sought ways in which the UC faculty, UCOP, and the DOE can act together and in their own spheres to enhance the effectiveness of the UC involvement with these labs. Our report reflects this assumption and presents several actions that each stakeholder can take which will move toward that goal. Some of our suggestions can be implemented by UC alone; some require cooperation and agreement between UC and DOE.

Activities of the Subcommittee

We have made visits to 8/9 academic senate division executive committees to consult with our colleagues on issues associated with UC/lab interactions. Visits were as follows:

October 29	Santa Barbara Also Chancellor Henry Yang	Ingham, Abarbanel
November 5	Berkeley Met separately with VCR Beth Burnside	Jarvis, LaPorte, Abarbanel
November 6	Irvine Also VCR Bill Parker	Ingham, Maradudin, Abarbanel
November 21	Riverside Also Chancellor Ray Orbach and	Ingham, Neiman, Abarbanel VCR Richard Luben
December 3	San Diego Met with VCR Attiyeh earlier	Ingham, Tanaka, Abarbanel
December 6	San Francisco	Jarvis, Featherstone, Abarbanel
December 14	Davis Met separately with VCR Barry Klein	Jarvis, Abarbanel
December 18	Los Angeles Met separately with VCR Roberto Peccei	Ingham, Edmond, Abarbanel

Santa Cruz in January '02

Each session began with a very brief introduction to the issues starting with DOE extension of contracts for LANL and LLNL in Fall, 2000. Charge to subcommittee from Academic Council to inquire into costs and benefits of relationship for lab, campuses, national mission. General questions followed along with specific suggestions from subcommittee members.

Questions and issues raised at various meetings. No order of priority or chronology:

All agreed Berkeley lab was different. Issues outlined below do not seem to fit, except perhaps a desire expressed primarily in the South that it act more as a national laboratory.

Walter Kohn (UCSB) said he approved of our effort and would work with us. Cost/benefit anything but simple bookkeeping. Include in final report issues beyond cost/benefit. Post 9/11 he said it is "not appropriate now for UC to take the position that UC/lab relation is not 'right'." But he says we should note the issue for future discussion.

Kohn has a proposal for transforming LLNL into an energy lab—no classified work.

How many UC faculty, students, postdocs, ... from the campuses are involved with the labs (not LBNL)? What is the representation of other universities—now, last five years?

The DOE established a “Plant Research Laboratory” at Michigan State University circa 1965. How did this happen? Does it have any lessons for a Southern LBL?

Should UC be more involved in the direction of research at LLNL and LANL? Are they “campuses” or are we managing them?

How many UC students are involved in classified research at LLNL and LANL? Does this impact their dissertations? Publications?

If we get dinged for misperformance, should we not get a bonus for good performance on DOE contract?

Point of view of UCI VCR: no special costs to campus. Opportunities for benefit from LANL interactions are high.

UCR: redefine “management” in the contract to clearly define UC responsibilities and liabilities. If we are stewards of labs, then define it that way. If we are sponsoring the labs, be clear. Make it clear this is not (or is) a “fee for service” relationship.

Is cost of LBL land (owned by UC) to be considered a benefit to DOE?

Are collaborations of lab staff with UC discouraged by lab managers? Perhaps impacts on programs at labs are seen as negative.

UCD: one faculty member was worried that an “audit” of costs and benefits might show we owe the DOE money.

UCB: one faculty member felt UCOP had cut a bad deal with DOE to have a management contract for so little money. Implication was we should charge substantially more than the \$17 million.

UCLA: great concern about UC’s ability to actually perform the public service claimed. If we are not actively engaged in managing and providing a sense of “academic freedom” to lab staff, then we do not give them the ability to “speak truth to power” when they must, especially if the facts are politically unwelcome. We should have local UC, not DOE, representation at the labs—local managers from UC to assure our real role and preserve goal of public service.

Better information for faculty on history of labs, history and goals of subcommittee, and on what actually happens at labs.

+++++

We have also visited the UC/DOE laboratories (LANL in April 2001, LBNL in October 2001, and LLNL in January 2002) In each case we met with laboratory technical staff separately from lab managers and then met with lab managers for additional discussion. The meetings with technical

staff focused on their issues, the cost and benefits of the UC/lab relationship to the labs and to the campuses and how UC faculty could work with them to enhance the benefits.

Near Future

We have designated task groups to address specific recommendations and will meet at UCLA in early April, 2002 to further discuss these. A report will be developed before Summer, 2002 and brought to the Academic Council at its June 2002 meeting (we hope). Based on discussions with the AC we will finalize the report and bring it to the AC in Fall, 2002 for adoption. In June, 2002 we also wish to discuss with the AC how to present the report to the various “stakeholders” in this matter. These include:

- UCOP---Vice Provost Research, Provost, Vice President Laboratory Management, Vice President Business and Finance
- Councils of Chancellor, Executive VCs, VCs Research, Council on Research, ...
- President’s Council on the National Laboratories
- DOE Laboratory Directors in Berkeley, Los Alamos and Livermore
- Others...?