

# DEXIS



## FROM THE GALACTIC TO THE ATOMIC

Practicum Takes Paul Sutter  
Deep into Inner Space

PAGE 5



Ying Hu's Road Trips Lead  
to Scattering Discoveries

PAGE 9



DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCE GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP

# DEIXIS

DEIXIS, *The DOE CSGF Annual* is published by the Krell Institute. Krell administers the Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship (DOE CSGF) program for the DOE under contract DE-FG02-97ER25308.

For additional information about the DOE CSGF program, the Krell Institute or topics covered in this publication, please contact:

Editor, DEIXIS  
Krell Institute  
1609 Golden Aspen Drive, Suite 101  
Ames, IA 50010  
(515) 956-3696  
[www.krellinst.org/csgf](http://www.krellinst.org/csgf)

Copyright 2011 Krell Institute.  
All rights reserved.

DEIXIS (ΔΕΙΞΙΣ — pronounced dāksis) transliterated from classical Greek into the Roman alphabet, means a display, mode or process of proof; the process of showing, proving or demonstrating. DEIXIS can also refer to the workings of an individual's keen intellect, or to the means by which such individuals, e.g. DOE CSGF fellows, are identified.

DEIXIS is an annual publication of the Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship program that highlights the work of fellows and alumni.

The DOE CSGF is funded by the Office of Science and the National Nuclear Security Administration's Office of Defense Programs.



**Editor**  
Shelly Olsan

**Publication  
Coordinator**  
Lisa Frerichs

**Senior  
Science Writer**  
Thomas R. O'Donnell

**Design**  
julsdesign, inc.

**Copy Editor**  
Ron Winther



## A TOAST TO 20 YEARS

In 1991, the fates of two technological tools — the Internet and computational science — became linked in the High-Performance Computing and Communications



Act. The law backed creation of the “information superhighway,” but also directed the Department of Energy (DOE) to support computational science education.

The Internet’s phenomenal expansion is renowned, but the parallel escalation in high-performance computing for science has been equally exceptional. Since 1991, the DOE Computational Science Graduate Fellowship has led the field’s maturation into the “third leg” of scientific discovery. With more than 250 alumni, it’s helped create a community of computational science leaders.

This issue bears witness to the fellowship’s success. Our cover story features Paul Sutter, who used his practicum to step outside his scientific comfort zone. We also announce this year’s Frederick A. Howes Scholar in Computational Science: Alejandro Rodriguez, who has matched his work in computational physics with his devotion to outreach. And we feature three alumni, including Brian Moore, who found a calling in nuclear energy.


Alumni and fellows are welcome to participate in the program’s essay contest, which provides them the chance to convey their research to a broader, non-technical audience. The winner, fellow Kenley Pelzer, connects onions to quantum mechanics.

Here’s to 20 years — and many more to come.


# TABLE OF CONTENTS



22



24



26

## 4 Practicum Profiles A Season of Discovery

- 5 **Paul Sutter**  
Fellow Spans Scales from the Universal to the Atomic
- 9 **Ying Hu**  
Illuminating a Path to Cancer Cells
- 13 **Anne Warlaumont**  
Modeling a Neural Network
- 17 **Scott Clark**  
Practicum Charts Career Course Beyond the Velvet Rope

## 22 Alumni Profiles From Alumni to Leaders

- 22 **Brian Moore**  
A Career at the Nuclear Intersection
- 24 **Dan Martin**  
"Cool Problems" Draw Alumnus to Laboratory
- 26 **Mala Radhakrishnan**  
Alumna Busts Resistance — in the Classroom and Lab


## 28 Winning Essays Encouraging Communication

- 28 **Kenley Pelzer**, *Winner*  
Can Peeling an Onion Cure Cancer?
- 30 **Hayes Stripling**, *Honorable Mention*  
On the Quantification of "Maybe": A Niche for Computation

## 32 Howes Scholars Living Up to a Legacy

## 35 Directory


- 35 Fellows
- 38 Alumni



28

# A SEASON OF DISC

FOR FELLOWS, THE SUMMER PRACTICUM NURTURES PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL GROWTH



Left to right:  
Scott Clark, Paul Sutter, Anne Warlaumont and Ying Hu in Washington, D.C., at the DOE CSGF Annual Conference.

**SUMMER PLANS** often take more thought for recipients of the Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship than for other graduate students.

Summer usually is when fellows head to DOE national laboratories to complete their required practicums. Often, they've met the scientist they'll work with at a conference or through a mutual acquaintance. But some fellows — like Ying Hu, who is profiled here — also visit several labs before choosing one.

Practicums push fellows to explore subjects or test skills with little or no connection to their doctoral research. It frequently leads them to refine a computer science skill — as fellow Paul Sutter did — or, like fellow Anne Warlaumont, to develop a greater appreciation for hands-on lab work.

Some fellows even end the summer determined to take on entirely new research subjects. Fellow Scott Clark, for instance, headed to his practicum planning to focus his dissertation on computational fluid dynamics. By summer's end, he'd found a new love: metagenomics.

That's the power of the practicum: reinvigorating, redirecting and remarkable.

# OVERY

The Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship supports the nation's brightest science and engineering students, allowing them to concentrate on learning and research. The work of more than 250 DOE CSGF alumni has helped the United States remain competitive in a global economy.

~~~~~

## FELLOW SPANS SCALES FROM THE UNIVERSAL TO THE ATOMIC

PAUL SUTTER

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory



**WHEN IT CAME TIME** to choose a practicum for summer 2009, Paul Sutter went from the enormous to the minuscule.

Sutter, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship recipient, usually simulated galaxy clusters, the largest structures in the universe. At Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), he calculated electronic structure in atoms.


“The energy scales, the spatial scales, the time scales are the complete opposite end of the spectrum from what I usually do,” says Sutter, who earned his doctoral degree in astrophysics from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) this spring. “And the architecture of the computer code was completely different.”

It’s just what he wanted. Practicums let fellows try research in areas largely outside their studies, but few go as far afield as Sutter did. “I realized that there aren’t a lot of opportunities in your research career to go off and do something completely different,” he says, and he took advantage of it. After meeting several ORNL researchers Sutter opted to work with Robert Harrison, leader of the Computational Chemical Sciences Group.

Sutter focused on MADNESS (Multiresolution Adaptive Numerical Environment for Scientific Simulation), a code that solves the electronic structures of atoms, molecules and nanoscale systems. Harrison led creation of the program, which is used in computational chemistry, superconductor modeling and other areas.

Calculating electronic structure is so difficult scientists must limit their models’ accuracy and the size of the systems they compute. Using MADNESS, researchers can compute the properties of larger systems with higher accuracy than traditional quantum chemistry codes allow. It divides the physical domain being modeled into parts for calculation on parallel processing computers, while repeatedly subdividing the most interesting pieces for more precision.

As the program subdivides the domain it generates an “octree” structure of branching nodes. The number of nodes depends on the level of detail researchers want, the problem size and the computer they use. Typical MADNESS problems involve octrees with 10,000 to 100 million nodes.



This visualization shows a molecular orbital of the benzene dimer computed using MADNESS. It shows the adaptive “grids” used to focus computation on the most important areas.

*Image courtesy of Robert Harrison, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, with support from the Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing program.*

The structure makes scaling MADNESS a challenge; running it on larger computers doesn’t lead to proportionately faster and more efficient performance. Some nodes require lots of work, while others require little, but there’s no way of knowing which is which, so MADNESS randomly assigns them to processors.

“It results in a lot of communication, because if you want to find out what’s going on with your neighbor on the tree, you know your neighbor’s not going to be on your processor. It’s going to be somewhere else,” ORNL Computational

Scientist Rebecca Hartman-Baker says. The sometimes-uneven distribution of work and the constant communication slow things down.

What was needed, Sutter says, was “some way of balancing them out. Instead of, say, 10 nodes on all processors, maybe some processors have just one node, but computationally it’s a very expensive node. Other processors might then have 100 nodes, but they would be very, very cheap. So in the end the amount of work per processor stays the same.”

Sutter and Hartman-Baker implemented a “melding” algorithm that splits up nodes so each processor has roughly the same amount of communication and work. But “we didn’t really have a way of figuring out how much time was required on each node” to weight them for redistribution, Hartman-Baker says.

Sutter addressed that problem with a “profiling” algorithm. In effect, MADNESS runs with the random load-balancing algorithm and gathers data on how long nodes take to compute. Then it uses that data to rebalance the load on the fly. Overloaded processors send work to others while underutilized processors gather data to work on.

“Melding with profiling tries to balance the two — to only move work to another processor if it makes sense for both computation and communication,” Sutter says.

Sutter ran two tests comparing MADNESS with and without the load-balancing algorithm. The first compared basic mathematical operations — multiply two functions, copy one function into another and “compress,” in which MADNESS devolves a function into its constituents.

Using ORNL’s Jaguar, a Cray XT5 rated one of the world’s fastest computers, Sutter averaged the cost of compress, multiply and copy operations across five runs on two problems — one with about 10,000 nodes and one with about a million. The smaller problem produced little difference on compress and multiply operations but improved scaling for copy. The results were essentially the same for the larger problem — except that computing times for copy operations improved dramatically as the number of processors increased. “That was good, because copies happen a lot,” Sutter says.

Sutter and Hartman-Baker implemented a “melding” algorithm that splits up nodes so each processor has roughly the same amount of communication and work.

~~~~~

The second test used a real-world problem: solving the Poisson equation to calculate the electrostatic potential of a large molecule-like structure. “This problem can get very, very big very, very quickly,” Sutter says. “There is a nasty list of things that have to be done.”

Again, Sutter tested the algorithm on large and small problems and averaged results over five runs. Profiling and melding produced a modest gain on the large problem, cutting calculation time by almost 10 percent when compared to the standard approach. Calculation time changed little for both even as the number of processors increased.

Results were more significant for the smaller problem. Calculation time for the standard approach held steady at a bit more than 150 seconds. With the load-



balancing algorithm, calculation time held steady at around 60 seconds — a 60 percent cut. “Overall, we found a pretty solid performance boost when doing this improved load balancing,” Sutter says.

Working with MADNESS gave Sutter insights into extending FLASH, a multiphysics, multiscale code he used in his dissertation research. In fact, he returned to Oak Ridge last fall to work with Hartman-Baker on improving FLASH.

Sutter also got the chance to work with Jaguar, even getting the machine almost all to himself as MADNESS ran during testing after an upgrade. He and his UIUC doctoral advisor, Paul Ricker, also got an allocation on Jaguar. “It’s just a dream to use,” Sutter adds.

Sutter’s research focused on magnetic fields within clusters of hundreds or thousands of galaxies. Astrophysicists think supermassive black holes found in a galaxy at the clusters’ center may generate the fields.


The fields are weak, Ricker says — perhaps a fraction of Earth’s, but spread over a large enough area that they force accelerated particles like electrons to move in a spiral-like pattern, generating radiation in the radio spectrum. Two clusters may look similar in the optical or X-ray spectra, Sutter says, but not in the radio spectrum. “Since radio is nonthermal emission we actually get signatures of the cluster’s history, such as past collisions” with another cluster.



Above: MADNESS has applications in solid-state physics, including calculating the Coloumb potential for electrostatic interaction, as shown here for lithium fluoride.

Left: MADNESS can apply the Hartree-Fock and Density Functional Theory methods to calculate the ground state energies of atoms, molecules and nanoscale systems. This visualization shows a MADNESS calculation of the spin density of a solvated electron.

*Images courtesy of Robert Harrison, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, with support from the Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing program.*



This simulation shows the distribution of gas in a section of the universe 5 billion light-years wide. The enlarged portion zooms in on a pair of merging galaxy clusters. The simulation uses adaptive mesh refinement to focus calculations on areas of interest: the central red turbulent region of the clusters, where peak resolution is a computational cell about the width of the Milky Way galaxy.

Astronomers and cosmologists are building radio telescope arrays to capture signals the clusters emit. The simulations give them ideas of the number and strength of objects they'll see. And when researchers get radio emissions data, simulations will help interpret them into a history of the cluster.

Those simulations must cover enormous swaths of space, but with enough detail to capture the injection of magnetic fields emanating from black holes. "It just becomes a very, very large problem," Sutter adds.

In one project he, Ricker and graduate student Hsiang-Yi Yang used FLASH to create simulated radio astronomy maps. They computationally evolved galaxy clusters and their radio halos over a span of 12 billion years in a "box" of space 366 megaparsecs on a side. (One megaparsec, or million parsecs, equals about 3 million light years.) The simulation had to include the influence of invisible dark matter that makes up the bulk of the universe and then calculate the movement and behavior of hot gas. Yet, it's still only precise enough to estimate just the magnetic fields, rather than radio emissions directly.

Observations show only a small percentage of lower-mass clusters has detectable halos, Ricker says, while about a third of higher-mass clusters do. Yet, the simulated radio maps predicted more low-mass, low-power radio halos and too

few high-mass, high-power halos. That may result from assumptions made in the simulation, Ricker says.

Ricker and Sutter later ran a version simulating a volume of space 1.5 gigaparsecs (1.5 billion parsecs) on a side. The simulation identified the most massive clusters and the researchers used adaptive mesh refinement to focus calculations, "zooming in" on those and a large number of less massive halos. At its finest resolution, one cell in the computational data mesh was about the size of the Milky Way galaxy.

Sutter and Ricker plan to compare simulation results with actual radio telescope observations. Sutter adds, "Hopefully we can match what they see and that will give us some confidence that we're moving in the right direction."

He's fascinated by the idea that every plot, simulation or visualization he does is an attempt to portray an unimaginably enormous reality. "It's a pretty crazy idea. When I actually sit down and think about, outside of the simulations I'm doing, what this means in the real universe — it boggles my mind sometimes."

Sutter finished his doctorate while living the last two years in Newark, Ohio, five hours from Urbana-Champaign. Ricker approved the arrangement so Sutter's new wife, Mandi, could stay at her job.

"With just about any other student, I would have said this is really a bad idea," he says, but Sutter is "disciplined enough that he's been able to get an awful lot done."

That long-distance relationship is nothing compared with Sutter's postdoctoral research post. He's studying the cosmic microwave background and helping design the next generation of cosmic probes with Ben Wandelt, a former UIUC faculty member now at the Paris Institute of Astrophysics. Sutter will spend a few weeks each year in Paris, but most of the time he'll be in Ohio, working with Ohio State University Astronomy Professor David Weinberg.

What's a few thousand miles when you're discussing objects billions of light years across?

Sutter is fascinated by the idea that every plot, simulation or visualization he does is an attempt to portray an unimaginably enormous reality.



# ILLUMINATING A PATH TO CANCER CELLS

YING HU

Rice University


Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory



“What we’re proposing is that by just using one added step you can improve the sensitivity and probably detect something you couldn’t detect before,”

Hu says.

~~~~~



## YING HU SWEARS HIS DECISION

to pursue a practicum in California had nothing to do with the snowstorm that trapped him in his hotel during a January 2009 visit to Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago.

Hu, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship (DOE CSGF) recipient, also visited Lawrence Livermore (LLNL) and Lawrence Berkeley (LBNL) national laboratories in the San Francisco area as he researched practicum locations.

“All the groups I visited are fabulous,” says Hu, a doctoral candidate in biomedical engineering at Rice University in sunny Houston, Texas. He learned how different labs operate and discussed shared scientific interests with researchers, including LBNL’s Jim Schuck and Jeff Neaton. Schuck studies nanoscale optical imaging spectroscopy, investigating how structures hundreds of times smaller than human hairs interact with light. Neaton works on the theory side, understanding nanoscale phenomena and guiding experimental researchers like Schuck.

Their work meshed well with Hu’s doctoral project: Developing computer codes to investigate optical properties of nanostructures and optimize their designs — specifically to target cancer cells. And LBNL had the Molecular Foundry, a nearly new facility where nanoscale theory, fabrication, testing and simulation research share space in a dramatic building overlooking the bay area.

“It played a major role in my decision,” Hu says. “It’s a very integrated facility. You can fabricate a sample in the clean room and then take it to the first floor and do measurements. At the same time people on the third floor are doing calculations” to understand the results.

Hu did all three while researching surface-enhanced Raman (RAH-mon) scattering (SERS), in which scientists decipher the molecular and crystal structures of even miniscule amounts of materials by analyzing the way they react to light.

“You excite the molecule at one wavelength and you collect the whole spectrum and look for the Raman peaks,” Hu says. Like fingerprints, “The locations of the peaks are unique to each molecule.” The effect is weak, but in the 1970s researchers found that placing samples on roughened metal surfaces significantly boosts scattering — thus the SERS name.

Scientists have postulated two explanations for the SERS effect, one arising from chemical bonds between the material and the metal surface, and one from electromagnetic interactions. Hu explored each.

Both projects focused on a substrate of nanocones made of silicon-germanium and coated with a thin layer of gold. It’s like a field packed with a jumble of irregularly sized gold-plated traffic cones, each a thousand times thinner than a hair.

## REWARDING REQUIREMENT

All DOE CSGF recipients must complete a practicum at a national laboratory by the end of their second year — a requirement Ying Hu found a bit intimidating.

“In the beginning you feel like, ‘OK, it just adds another three months that I need for graduate school. It delays my graduation date,’” says Hu, who earned his doctorate at Rice University earlier this year.

He changed his mind after doing research at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in summer 2009. The experience, Hu says, expanded his horizons. He learned how another lab in an area similar to his doctoral research operates, what computing and experimental resources are available in the field, and what other researchers are thinking.

Hu’s summer in Berkeley — and a second practicum at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in fall 2010 — also allowed him to begin building a network of colleagues and possible collaborators.

“It’s really a start for me to think about my career path, to develop my own perspective on what I think should be done or can be done (in his field) in a more realistic way,” Hu adds. “It’s something that’s hard to get from staying in the lab in graduate school.”

During his practicum, Hu studied how the way that a benzene thiol (BT) molecule binds to the substrate — like how a Tinkertoy stick-and-ball model might fit in a socket on the gold traffic cones — affects SERS. The researchers computed relative Raman scattering enhancement for each of three binding configurations and compared the results with actual SERS measurements.

The researchers chose BT because it’s relatively simple to compute. “But it by no means is an easy molecule to work with”

experimentally, says Hu, who prepared and scanned the samples. “It’s a very potent chemical and it has a very strong, skunk-like odor.”


### ENHANCED UNDERSTANDING OF ENHANCEMENT

They found the way light perturbs the charge transfer complex between BT and the gold atoms affects SERS. To continue the analogy, how much scattering is enhanced relies on how light affects the connection between the Tinkertoy and gold on the traffic cones. Some configurations yielded a stronger response than others. In some cases, computer calculations agreed with the experimental results.

Hu presented the research in a paper coauthored with Schuck, Neaton, and LBNL and University of California, Berkeley researchers Alexey Zayak, Hyuck Choo and Stefano Cabrini. “It’s a relatively new theory to explain chemical enhancement,” Hu says. “I think it’s going to have a relatively big impact.”

Schuck says that while different mechanisms for enhancement have been proposed over the past 30 years, no one knew which were important until Hu and his fellow researchers came along. With the interpretation in the paper, “For the first time, we have a general quantitative basis for understanding chemical enhancement for all SERS measurements, which I think is pretty amazing.”

Hu tackled SERS’s electromagnetic foundation after returning to Rice and discussing ideas with Seunghyun Lee, a chemistry graduate student. Other collaborators include Berkeley Lab’s Choo; Jaeseok Jeon and Tae Seok of UC Berkeley; Hu’s advisor, Rebekah Drezek; and Lee’s advisor, Jason Hafner.



The graph shows Raman cross sections of benzene thiol with the isolated molecule tracked in black and the molecule chemisorbed on a Au(111) surface in orange. Chemical enhancement leads to the much stronger intensity from the chemisorbed molecule. The image below the graphic simulates the binding geometry of benzene thiol on a Au(111) surface at 300 K. This shows that at room temperature the binding geometry of benzene thiol on Au(111) is not well defined, both with respect to molecular orientation and sulfur-gold bonding coordination. Sulfur typically tends to pull one gold atom from the surface.

|||||

This scanning electron microscope image shows an overhead view of the nanocone substrate for SERS, seeded with gold nanoparticles (red arrows) to test how seeding enhances Raman scattering. Scale bar (lower left) is 100 nanometers.

Electromagnetic enhancement of SERS is believed to arise from surface-plasmon resonance — the nanostructures' response to electromagnetic radiation. In essence, the gold nanocones act like tiny antennae. Their electrons oscillate in response to visible light because the structures are similar in size to the light's wavelength — 400 to 800 nanometers.

In a typical SERS setup, a laser hits the molecules to be tested — located on the metal substrate — from directly above, Hu says. “Most of the time, if you think of light as electromagnetic waves, the polarization can only be perpendicular to the direction it's propagating,” he adds. A laser coming directly from above will be polarized in the transverse plane — horizontal to the surface. It can't be axially polarized — perpendicular to the substrate.

But the researchers' simulation showed axial polarization would generate stronger electromagnetic enhancement in the nanocones. “So that creates problems,” Hu says. The researchers tackled them by spreading gold nanoparticles on the substrate — like dropping gold balls on the field of traffic cones. Tests found nestling the nanoparticles between the cones boosted SERS activity by more than a factor of 10, even with transversely polarized light, Hu says. Experiments bore out the results, which are reported in a paper accepted for publication in the journal *ACS Nano*.

“What we're proposing is that by just using one added step you can improve the sensitivity and probably detect something you couldn't detect before,” Hu says. Fine-tuning nanoparticle size and concentration could enhance scattering even more, he adds.

While at LBNL Hu also adapted MEEP, an electromagnetic physics code, to run on parallel processing machines at the Molecular Foundry. The task required installing and coordinating multiple software packages. “That was really a learning experience for me because my background is not computer science,” Hu says.

Hu arrived at LBNL, Schuck says, just as he and Neaton “realized there was a whole new range of things we could do that needed to go parallel.” Since Hu installed MEEP, “we use it a ton.”


### TINY TIES

Hu used MEEP to simulate the nanoplasmonic response of bow-tie antennae — tiny gold triangles pointing to each other. In Hu's calculations, there were four triangles, arranged like a Maltese cross, on a dielectric substrate. He studied the consequences of moving a triangle off center.

“By shifting one element we can actually concentrate light at different locations in the structure at different wavelengths,” Hu says, and different configurations can sort light of different wavelengths.

The color-sorting antennae could be used in optical computers, which transmit information with photons instead of tiny wires printed on silicon chips, Schuck says. But a more near-term application may be in extremely small and fast multicolor light detection for cameras and sensors.

LBNL researchers were still analyzing Hu's data and producing papers based on it more than a year after he finished his practicum, Schuck says. “We can't help but send Ying e-mails and ask him questions, because we know he knows the answers to a lot of these things. We'd love nothing more than to work with Ying” again.



Hu was familiar with calculating nanoplasmonic effects. His doctoral research focused on nanoshells: minuscule hollow or layered gold balls. In Drezek's lab, researchers conjugate the particles with antibodies that target cancer cells. Once injected into the body, the nanoshells attach to tumors.

By adjusting their size and geometry, researchers can “tune” nanoshells to absorb or scatter specific light wavelengths. The Rice team engineers nanoshells to resonate with near-infrared light, a spectrum minimally absorbed by surrounding tissue. When a near-infrared laser shines on the particles, they illuminate, defining the tumor's edges.


The surface temperature of the nanoshells also rises quickly as they absorb light. By increasing the laser's power it may be possible to “cook” and kill cancer cells with minimal harm to healthy tissues.

Just a few years ago most nanoshell designs were simple enough that standard computers usually were enough to calculate their properties, Drezek says. Now the nanoparticles labs produce are so complicated it takes parallel processing on a cluster to understand them.

“We weren't doing any of that in our lab before Ying started. We just did our simulations on desktop computers,” she says. “He was able to take all the computational coursework, move what he was doing into the clusters and open up all sorts of different opportunities for us.”



This illustration shows axial and transverse (in-plane) polarizations (in relation to the SERS substrate) of laser light for Raman excitation. Research by Ying Hu and colleagues suggests that seeding the surface with gold nanoparticles, as shown, boosts SERS activity by more than a factor of 10 with transversely polarized light.



“We weren’t doing any of that in our lab before Ying started. We just did our simulations on desktop computers,” Drezek says. “He was able to take all the computational coursework, move what he was doing into the clusters and open up all sorts of different opportunities for us.”

~~~~~


In a paper published in the Nov. 24, 2008 issue of the journal *Optics Express*, Hu, Drezek and Rice biochemistry student Ryan Fleming simulated a nanoshell comprised of a gold outer layer, a silicon inner layer and a gold core. The calculations found each layer’s plasmonic resonance mode interacts with the others. “That interaction is what renders these particles tunable, like how we can tune it to the near infrared spectrum,” Hu says.

Hu graduated this summer, just nine years after moving from China to Houston, where his parents are researchers at the Baylor College of Medicine. His mother’s father, a physics professor, inspired Hu’s interest in science. He recalls his grandfather floating a magnetized needle

on a piece of tissue paper. The wet paper sank, leaving the needle pointing north on the surface. “It was the first compass I’d ever seen and I have to say it is the coolest compass I’ve ever seen,” Hu says.

Hu’s dissertation includes a chapter on his LLNL work and he’s still collaborating with scientists he met there. “It’s just another proof of the value of the practicum,” he says. “It’s really the start of my own independent research.”

In fact, Hu did another practicum at LLNL in fall 2010, with electromagnetics and photonics researchers Daniel White and Tiziana Bond. “I talked to them during my practicum-hunting trip,” he adds. “I just decided to do a second one because I liked the first so much.”



These computer simulations of gold-coated nanoscale cones show how spacing affects electromagnetic enhancement for surface-enhanced Raman scattering.

A single cone (a) or a doublet (b) does not exhibit strong enhancement under transversely polarized light, while a narrow gap between two nanocones (c) does.

# MODELING A NEURAL NETWORK

ANNE WARLAUMONT  
University of Memphis  
Argonne National Laboratory



Warlaumont says the project gave her a different perspective. “In my main research I build neural network models. Those models are even more abstract than the ones we worked with (at ANL). I was happy about the opportunity to work with a detailed model and see what I was missing.”

~~~~~



**USUALLY, ANNE WARLAUMONT DEALS** only with the rough computer counterpart to a brain — building “neural” networks that classify sounds from babies and emulate the way they learn to speak.

But Warlaumont, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship recipient, saw the real thing during her summer 2009 practicum at Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) near Chicago.

Warlaumont shadowed two students in University of Chicago (UC) researcher Wim van Drongelen’s lab and witnessed electrophysiology experiments on mouse and human brain tissue. As her practicum ended she also watched brain surgeons operate on a girl who suffered epileptic seizures since infancy.


“I definitely never thought I would see something like that. It was a special bonus,” says Warlaumont, a doctoral student in the School of Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology at the University of Memphis (UM).

Warlaumont’s peek inside the skull was only appropriate. In her practicum, she designed a program that compared detailed and abstract computational models of an epileptic brain. While working with Mark Hereld, an ANL experimental systems engineer in the Mathematics and Computer Science Division; ANL Associate Laboratory Director for Computing, Environment and Life Sciences, Rick Stevens; and van Drongelen, Hyong Lee and Marc Benayoun at UC, she also compared the models with activity recorded from slices of mouse brain tissue.

Warlaumont says the project gave her a different perspective. “In my main research I build neural network models. Those models are even more abstract than the ones we worked with (at ANL). I was happy about the opportunity to work with a detailed model and see what I was missing.”

The models Warlaumont develops in her UM research “learn” to identify infant utterances — the vowels, squeals, growls, grunts, babbling, crying and laughing babies do as they test their speech abilities and learn to talk.

“There are theories of how infants develop the ability to vocalize and theories of how infants learn sound and why they produce some sounds before others,” she adds. “There is a small group of us interested in translating some of the theories into a way to more rigorously test those computationally.” The end results could include better speech analysis tools or even a model that perceives sounds — both from others and from itself — and learns to “speak” much as infants do.



Each colored point in this figure represents a single neural network model run’s behavior, plotted in an abstract 2-dimensional “behavior space.” Red and orange points are from the two versions of the detailed model; green and blue are from the two versions of the abstract model. Each run within a model version has a different combination of excitation- and inhibition-related parameters. Black points and the star represent samples from a recording of real mouse brain tissue.

“I have several different research threads, all related to infant vocalization research and understanding the computational or technological components involved,” Warlaumont says. “I see these as part of a very long-term research program.”

Warlaumont and Hereld hope her practicum project will help us better understand brain activity by improving neural models, which range from highly complex and computationally demanding to abstract and easy to run.

“Our project was comparing temporal signatures of neural network data produced by a couple of very different types of computational models. We wanted to compare them with each other and with a real system of brain cells,” Warlaumont says.

For example, the researchers wanted to know whether the advantages of a highly realistic model outweigh the demand it places on computer resources. “This project is helping us to understand how low can we go — how simple and therefore computationally fast we can make a model that will still deliver appropriate results,” Hereld says.

Warlaumont adds, “Another factor is your ability to understand what’s going on with a model. The more detailed a model is, the more like a real system it is, but it may be so complex it’s hard to understand.”

On the other hand, simpler models aren’t as readily tweaked to match reality.

The researchers had their work cut out for them. “The problem is pretty difficult because it’s terra incognita,” Hereld says. Scientists typically have some intuition about the relevant processes behind a phenomenon, but epilepsy’s complex, variable nature resists prediction.

The researchers ran two models, one detailed and one abstract, then compared average cell membrane potential — a measure of the voltage difference between the interior and exterior of a cell. Neurons use electrical membrane potentials to transmit signals between different parts of the cell and to initiate communication across cells.

Van Drongelen designed the detailed model, which simulated 656 neurons of six different kinds. Each cell is modeled as a set of compartments corresponding to its parts and includes chemical channels that regulate spontaneous firing and transmission of nerve impulses between cells.

The researchers ran two versions: One with persistent sodium ion channels and one without. Persistent channels could be important to understanding network behavior, Hereld says.

## IN THE ABSTRACT

The more abstract model, developed in 2003 by Eugene Izhikevich, then of the Neurosciences Institute in La Jolla, Calif., treats each neuron as a single compartment and randomly varies parameters to model different types. Neurons are networked more randomly and a simpler mathematical method models ion channels.

The researchers also ran two versions of this simpler model: one with instantaneous transmissions between neurons and one with a six-millisecond delay. They compared simulation results with data recorded from slices of mouse frontal lobe tissue that was excited to produce normal and seizure behavior.

The detailed simulations ran on Jazz, ANL’s recently replaced 350-node computing cluster. Each persistent sodium version took about 200 seconds to run. In contrast, each run of the abstract model’s instantaneous transmission version took about 10 seconds on a standard laptop.

For each model and for the mouse data the researchers averaged neuron activity across all the cells. That was tricky: Both models generated data in physical units — microvolt waveforms — but they had different temporal resolutions and some unimportant differences. Those disparities are “one

of the reasons we had to struggle to try and eliminate artifacts and find real differences,” Warlaumont says.

The researchers filtered simulation results to make them comparable to mouse brain traces, then extracted eight primary metrics from each time series. “We looked at things like, within the network, are all the neurons spiking? If there is a lot of heavy synchrony in the firing of neurons, it would end up leaving traces of big peaks and valleys in the network signal,” a sign of a possible seizure, Warlaumont says. “We also looked at the spectral character of those network voltage signals, the amount of power in different frequency bands.”

They ran a principal components analysis to reduce the dimensionality of the behavioral features space. That let the researchers compare the range of behaviors a given model produced.

Ultimately, the abstract models seemed to produce a range of behaviors as broad and nearly as similar to mouse data as the detailed ones. “You are not necessarily disadvantaged, from that perspective, if you use the less detailed version,” Warlaumont says. Yet, “I wouldn’t want to make it sound like simple models

are always better, because there are advantages to detailed models.”

As to what this work means for understanding and treating epilepsy, Warlaumont says computational models of brain disorders are imperfect, but still informative and can help guide research.

“Assuming you accept that computational modeling is valuable for those purposes, it’s a logical next step to ask how we are going to objectively compare these models,” she adds. “It’s not a big problem now because there are only a few, but if you see a future for this there will be more models. I think figuring out how to compare and evaluate those is important.”


## GRASPING SPEECH DEVELOPMENT

The details of speech recognition and learning Warlaumont hopes to emulate in her UM dissertation research are too complex to capture with the models and computing technologies available today. Still, she hopes her work will help researchers better understand speech development.

One of Warlaumont’s models, built in collaboration with UM colleagues


Eugene Buder, Robert Kozma and Rick Dale, is a neural network that recognizes protophones — early categories of infant vocalizations — with potential ramifications for speech analysis.

Currently infant speech research depends on assistants who spend days listening to recordings and manually coding each sound for its type and other properties. It’s time-consuming, expensive work, and the amount of data to be sifted is growing. Coders also must make subjective judgments about how to classify a protophone, leading to inevitable inconsistencies.



Top right: The points in this plot are the same as in the page 14 plot of the detailed model, abstract model and mouse tissue in 2-D abstract “behavior space.” In this figure, convex hulls are drawn around each model version’s behaviors, indicating the range of behavior and the amount of overlap across the models. The abstract models produce a wider range of behaviors than the detailed models and the real mouse brain tissue.

Right: Each colored line in this plot represents one neural network model run or one sample from a mouse brain tissue recording. Different principal components (i.e., dimensions of an abstract, 22-dimensional “behavior space”) are on the x-axis, and models’ coordinates with respect to those principal component dimensions are on the y-axis.



“Our project was comparing temporal signatures of neural network data produced by a couple of very different types of computational models.

We wanted to compare them with each other and with a real system of brain cells,” Warlaumont says.

~~~~~

The neural networks Warlaumont and colleagues are developing and testing automatically classify infant vocalizations, helping researchers better understand how humans perceive them and creating data that’s more standardized.

Their model, reported in an April 2010 paper in the *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, first converts utterances into spectrograms — frequency, duration and intensity represented as 225 shaded pixels on a square. Those are sent to a type of neural network, called a self-organizing map (SOM), of 16 nodes mathematically arranged in a four-by-four grid with randomly weighted connections between each.

The SOM is “trained” by matching random spectrograms with the nodes whose weights are most similar to it, then

updating that node’s weights and its neighbor’s weights. It’s similar to how real brain cells develop connections based on the animal’s particular previous experiences, Warlaumont says.


Each vocalization triggers states of SOM node activations, which are sent to a second layer, a neural network called a perceptron. The perceptron measures the relevance of the learned SOM features to various categories, classifies the protophone and determines which SOM nodes best distinguish one utterance from another.

After training, the perceptron can classify each protophone input by type and infant age and identity, based on SOM layer node activations. In tests, the model performed significantly better than chance. It guessed the correct protophone

more than half the time, the infant’s age 42.8 percent of the time, and its identity 32.4 percent of the time. “It is understandably very hard to classify age and identity on the basis of a single second of vocalization. We might be able to average many vocalizations in a recording and get better performance,” Warlaumont says.

The model is a step forward, says D. Kimbrough Oller, Warlaumont’s doctoral advisor. “We’re testing its basic capabilities and developing the scripts and tools we need to go on to much more exact things.”

Warlaumont will have lots to contribute to the effort, Oller says. She “is going to have a very significant academic career in helping to establish not only new foundations in the theory of vocal development, but the application of the tools that she’s developing.”



This schematic shows the neural network used to classify infant vocalizations. It combines a self-organizing map (SOM) and a single-layer perceptron. Pixels of an utterance are presented first to the SOM. Activations of SOM nodes are then sent to the perceptron output nodes for classification according to protophone, age and infant identity. The weights from the input layer to the SOM layer are trained first, then weights to the SOM are frozen and the perceptron’s weights are trained.

# PRACTICUM CHARTS CAREER COURSE BEYOND THE VELVET ROPE

SCOTT CLARK


Cornell University

Los Alamos National Laboratory



After a summer working with Hengartner and Joel Berendzen in LANL's Applied Modern Physics Group, Clark made an unusual leap: from the engineering-oriented world of fluid flow to the biological realm of metagenomics.

~~~~~



**ONE OF SCOTT CLARK'S WEAKNESSES**, if it can be called that, is that there are just too many captivating challenges.

"I've always liked to explore new and interesting things," says Clark, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship (DOE CSGF) recipient. "One of my problems is I don't really settle on one."

That willingness to follow what fascinates him set Clark on a new course after completing his DOE CSGF practicum in summer 2009. Characteristically, he told coordinators at the national laboratories he just wanted to work in an interesting group investigating interesting problems. Aric Hagberg, coordinator at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and himself a DOE CSGF alumnus, connected Clark with Nick Hengartner, a researcher with the Information Sciences and Technology Metagenomics team.

Metagenomics approaches biotechnology in a new way. Rather than sequencing the DNA of individual microorganisms, it decodes genomes from entire communities of organisms, like in the human gut or a tidal pool. Then it compares chunks of sequence data to learn important information about the organisms' genes.

When he started his doctoral studies at Cornell University in 2008, Clark had planned to do research in computational fluid dynamics (CFD). He loves the subject, which he began studying as an undergraduate at Oregon State University, but it's a fundamental field that's been scrutinized since computers were invented. He wanted to get into an area where new things are happening and changing and "I might be able to make some big contributions right off the start."

Goodbye, CFD. Hello, DNA. After a summer working with Hengartner and Joel Berendzen in LANL's Applied Modern Physics Group, Clark made an unusual leap: from the engineering-oriented world of fluid flow to the biological realm of metagenomics.

He returned to Cornell with a new research focus. "I was hooked and I haven't looked back," Clark adds.


"It's a field where you can very quickly describe what's going on, which I really like because my friends and family can understand what's happening," Clark says, "but then getting the actual solution is much more difficult."

Metagenomics is possible thanks to rapid "shotgun" genome sequencing technology, which breaks an organism's DNA into chunks, then copies and "reads" them to record the order of the base pairs. With today's fast, relatively inexpensive sequencing scientists can read genomes multiple times for greater accuracy. The DOE supports metagenomics research as it seeks genes that can help microorganisms convert plant materials into biofuels more efficiently and cheaply.



Velvetrope uses two filters to find offsets — areas where two genetic sequences are more similar than expected. This visualization shows four vectors that passed a global filter test with regions marked and shaded as having possible sequence alignments. Blue means no match. Cyan marks a possible random match because it doesn't occur in the same region. Yellow marks regions of possible alignment and red marks positions in the region that have matches. The location of the region is marked along with the total density of matches within that region.

Local Alignments for soi: Escherichia coli str. K12 substr. DH10B vs Bacillus subtilis subsp. subtilis str. 168



But metagenomics also produces an enormous and complex biological puzzle, as scientists reassemble and analyze billions of DNA chunks representing trillions of base pairs. Only massive computational power can do the job.

### GETTING ALIENED

At LANL Clark worked on algorithms to find alignments: chunks of DNA in which a sequence of base pairs or the amino acids they code for are highly similar in the genomes of different organisms. Scientists say these sequences are “conserved” because they weren’t excised through natural selection. Once researchers have multiple DNA chunks, or reads, with signatures of conserved sequence, Hengartner says, they can see how sequences align in multiple genomes “just to make sure they’re all pretty much from the same place.”

It’s rare for large sequence chunks to be identical from genome to genome, but how similar reads align helps scientists understand the sequences’ importance. “If a particular region was conserved across many different genomes, possibly in different places, it almost surely has some genetic benefit,” Clark says. “You also can find relative comparisons like mutation and silent mutation rates within these conserved sequences across all genomes. That would allow us to get some information about the evolutionary distance” between two organisms.

Sequence alignment algorithms are available for parallel computers, but they demand a lot of power, Clark says. Other algorithms have difficulty dealing with transpositions — like gene A appearing before gene B in one sequence but B appearing before A in another. They try to force the two sequences together, “and invariably either give you that the As align and nothing else aligns, or the Bs align but nothing else does.”



## WELCOME TO THE (SEQUENCE) CLUB

Some programs approach sequence alignment by seeking matches of a specified length, called “*k*-mers,” where *k* is a specified number of base pairs or amino acids within a read. For example, the DNA read ATCGGC has the 4-mers ATCG, TCGG and CGGC within it. The program uses *k*-mer matches as “seeds” to index the genome. But “if you have a sequence that’s not superconserved (completely identical) or where every third amino acid might be slightly different — statistically that’s a significant conservation” worthy of study, Clark says, but some programs won’t spot it.

### BEHIND THE VELVETROPE

The approach Clark helped develop, named Velvetrope (see sidebar), skips finding *k*-mers in favor of seeking areas where sequences share many similarities. “It’s a complex search for mostly conserved areas or statistically significant conservation, using filtering effectively and doing it in a very modular way so it can be readily parallelized,” Clark says.

Velvetrope uses two filters. The global filter finds offsets — areas where two sequences share a higher-than-expected similarity. The second, local filter looks at those offsets more closely to find areas with higher-than-expected similarities within them. “Each filter is a statistical step to see whether there’s a significant amount of matches,” Clark adds. “You slowly refine that search until you get just the area you’re interested in.”

Velvetrope uses bitwise comparison to find similar offsets. A sequence of interest, with letters representing the DNA base pairs or amino acids, is lined up with a sequence from another genome. To find matching offsets, the first sequence remains stationary while the second is shifted to the right or left, one letter at a time.

“You’re comparing No. 1 to No. 1. Then you shift the second sequence over one. Now you’re comparing No. 1 to No. 2,” Clark says. “By shifting one sequence and comparing it to a stationary sequence, you’re effectively comparing all the different offsets, which allows for some really quick computational techniques.”

With metagenomics producing datasets in the terabytes — millions of megabytes — speed was important to Clark, Hengartner and Berendzen. They took a computer science approach that emphasized simplicity and parallel operation. Velvetrope’s modular approach makes it especially amenable to computation on general-purpose graphics processing units (GPGPUs), the chips made for video games that now are a major part of the newest supercomputers.


By shifting one sequence and comparing it to a stationary sequence, you’re effectively comparing all the different offsets, which allows for some really quick computational techniques.

The Velvetrope name is meant to evoke the feeling of an exclusive club, Scott Clark says. The algorithm compares DNA or amino acid sequences to find similar sections, gradually restricting criteria to find the most relevant areas.

“The idea was it was like a nightclub and you would get deeper and deeper into it with more and more credentials,” Clark says. “The barrier at a nightclub is always a velvet rope.” Only sequences that match certain specifications get to the “club’s” most exclusive part.

Clark and Los Alamos National Laboratory researchers Nick Hengartner and Joel Berendzen kicked around several names, like “bouncer,” before Berendzen came up with “Velvetrope.” They weren’t concerned that another genomic tool is called Velvet because it involves genome assembly, not searching.

Ironically, since starting sequence assembly research last summer at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, “I’m using Velvet all the time,” Clark says.



Below: Comparing a sequence of interest against a large set of test sequences lets Velvetrope find areas within that sequence that are homologous to multiple test sequences. This histogram combines information about shared identity (solid blue columns) and “club membership” (light, always larger green columns) — areas of high local homology — across many test sequences. This helps find areas of the sequence of interest that are shared among a large percentage of the whole set.

Hengartner says he and his Los Alamos colleagues pushed Clark to adapt the code for GPGPUs, stretching the fellow’s abilities and enabling the program to run on desktop computers. “We’re developing tools that a biologist or practitioner can use on his desktop,” he adds. “This is something that is very dear to my heart — developing something that is usable by the community.”

Hengartner praises Clark for achieving the goal with a minimum of direction. “It’s not like there was a tremendous amount of hand-holding. I was highly impressed” with Clark’s initiative.

Comparing Velvetrope’s performance with other gene alignment software is


difficult, Clark says. “When you compare two sequences you found in the wild, there’s no answer key that says this should align perfectly or this conservation is enough.” Yet, Velvetrope did find the same or similar areas of alignment as BLAST and HMMer, two gene-alignment software tools. The researchers are making Velvetrope available for free download as an open source project.


### SOME ASSEMBLY REQUIRED

Clark’s fascination with metagenomics led him to a second practicum in summer 2010 at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), where he worked with Zhong Wang, a researcher in the Joint Genome Institute, on a project connecting multiple DOE labs. Wang’s lab emphasizes sequence assembly — using computers to put DNA reads in the correct order. One of the algorithms Clark worked on uses sequence reads early in the process, rather than toward the end as is traditionally done, to accelerate assembly. The approach also helps make the calculations easy to run on parallel computers.

At LBNL Clark also worked on a machine-learning algorithm that scores a sequence assembly’s accuracy based on the data it generates. Current assembly scoring metrics are loose and somewhat arbitrary, Clark says. The approach he and Wang are

InClub and Score matches across all alignments.  
Global filter of sigma > 7.0 then local filter of CDF.  
Total genes compared: 20. Reference Gene: Escherichia coli str. K12 substr. DH10B





developing builds formal likelihood models of an assembly given the reads already available. That lets researchers find the probability of a given assembly and use it to validate the assembly or suggest changes to improve the score.

Peter Frazier, Clark’s doctoral advisor and an assistant professor in Cornell’s School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, is collaborating with Clark, Wang and LBNL’s Rob Egan on a paper describing the scoring algorithm. Next they want to optimize it to improve the quality of an assembly, Frazier says, with an ultimate goal of applying the algorithm to metagenomic assembly.

Clark and Frazier also are working with researchers from Cornell’s College of Veterinary Medicine and Department of Computer Science on genomic approaches to find bacteriophages — viruses that infect bacteria — able to treat *Escherichia coli*-related ailments in cows. The researchers hope to find useful features in the phages’ genomes, then use machine learning, optimization and experimental design to mix the best viruses in a “cocktail” for bovine infections.

With his unusual combination of expertise in computation, mathematics and biology, “Scott’s been playing more of an advisory role,” to bridge the gap between the two research communities, Frazier says. “We’d be talking with

biologists and ... sometimes it would be sort of hard to have each of us understand what the other one meant.” Clark “was very valuable from that point of view — and then he’s also just wicked in terms of computation.”

Clark is one of the few people who could tie a career in computers to cows. The Oregon native started programming at age 8, “much to the chagrin of my parents, who were both journalism majors.” He played with PCs from garage sales, and in high school launched a Web page design business. At Oregon State he started in mathematics and computer science but switched to math and physics. While still a freshman, he talked his way into a graduate-level computational physics course with legendary professor Rubin Landau, who later became his mentor. “From that day on I was in love with computational science,” says Clark, who earned bachelor’s degrees in mathematics, physics and computational physics.

In the long run, Clark sees himself starting a biotech or computational science business. His lab experience, however, also has him considering the DOE labs.



Above: This shows two sets of alignments of two Lectin protein sequence domains, with red corresponding to the Lectin1 domain and Green the Lectin2 domain. Orange is the Velvetrope alignment obtained by remapping the areas of high shared identity across the previous set to the sequence of interest. Blue is the alignment from BALiBASE, a traditional sequence alignment program. It resolves the two-domain comparison by manually specifying which domain to align (Lectin1 in the first alignment and Lectin2 in the second). This causes the aligning algorithm to append whatever domain is not specified to the beginning or end of the alignment. Velvetrope picks out homologous areas regardless of position in the sequence without specification. Lectin1 has low homologous identity in the latter part of its domain; therefore Velvetrope doesn’t pick it up while the non-homology components of BALiBASE align it. It’s still picked up by the Velvetrope “club” filter.

ALUMNI PROFILES

# FROM ALUMNI T



Brian Moore  
GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy

## A Career at the Nuclear Intersection

**BRIAN MOORE**'s father had some tough questions for him when a Soviet nuclear reactor exploded in April 1986.

Moore was just beginning his nuclear engineering studies when the Chernobyl accident occurred, spreading radioactivity over Western Europe. The accident hobbled the entire nuclear energy industry, even though — as Moore told his father — a poor design and lax safety standards were to blame.

"I did have some heartburn from, 'Well, why are you still going into this stagnant industry?'" Moore says, but he liked the field's combination of nuclear physics, reactor engineering, applied mathematics and computational science. "It's this sort of in-between world where they all interact."

Moore, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship recipient from 1992 to 1995 — part of just the second class in the program's 20-year history — has inhabited that world since earning his doctoral degree from North Carolina State University in 1996. He joined the nuclear energy arm of the General Electric Co. and now manages the Methods and Software Development Center of Excellence. He's also part of GE Hitachi

Nuclear Energy, an alliance between the iconic American and Japanese companies to develop and market nuclear technology, services and fuels.

"I still feel like I'm sitting on this intersection between all these cool things," Moore says from his office in Wilmington, N.C. "I get to play in all of it. If we're doing computational fluid dynamics simulation of part of the reactor, I get to see that. If we're doing the heterogeneous full transport calculations for part of the fuel bundle, I get to play in that. If I'm getting the whole system aspect or even what happens when someone wants to do a new application, I get to play in that, too."

Moore and his team create predictive reactor core models, combining the physics of fission, fluid dynamics and other processes with decades of reactor operation data. The resulting calculation is fairly straightforward, Moore says. "The only problem is we can't solve it explicitly; it's too complicated and it's too big, so we end up making any number of different kinds of approximations."

To help compensate, Moore and his colleagues may couple detailed models into broad simulations. For instance, they may tie two-dimensional "slices" of fuel assemblies into a three-dimensional setting to calculate a reactor's full power distribution. The data is "in a system where we can both use it to prognosticate what the next two years might be or, in what we're required to do in licensing, what the next 5 seconds" might hold.


"After we've created these nice big physics tools [we] walk them through regulatory licensing approval," Moore says. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) — and similar bodies in countries where GE and GE Hitachi build and service reactors — not only review reactor designs, but also mathematical tools used to estimate their capacities and limits. Regulators aren't "just concerned with, 'Is it doing the right thing?'" They also want



This cutaway drawing of the GE Hitachi Economic Simplified Boiling Water Reactor pressure vessel shows the core and other features. Brian Moore and his team at the Methods and Software Development Center of Excellence helped analyze new reactor core monitoring instruments and core and fuel properties for the design.

Image Copyright GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy.

# DOE LEADERS



Predicted linear heat generation rate (kW/ft) distribution across a boiling water reactor radial plane at an elevation of 21 inches from the base of active fuel early in the operating cycle. The predictive capability is verified via non-destructive fission product signature measurements. Examined for every pin at each point in the cycle and compared to the fuel design limit, the bundle and/or core design can be optimized to maximize performance while meeting all safety limits.

*Image Copyright GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy.*

to know how you're going to use it" and whether the application is conservative enough to account for biases and uncertainties.

The last nuclear plant built in the United States went on line in 1996 — the same year Moore earned his doctorate. But GE still builds in other countries and, just as importantly, helps modify existing plants for greater efficiency and capacity. Moore and his colleagues calculate the consequences of putting more fuel rods in an assembly and worked on MELLLA (Maximum Extended Load Line Limit Analysis) Plus, GE Hitachi's technology to boost output on boiling water reactors.

## DOE CSGF graduates move to the front in their fields

Since 1991, the Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship has seeded government laboratories, industry and academia with scientists trained to apply high-performance computing to challenging research problems. Alumni have made outstanding contributions, including improved fusion plasma models, insights into evolution of drug-resistant diseases and more efficient and economical nuclear power plant designs. More importantly, they've helped develop computer simulation and computational science into a research tool that equals theory and experiment. As these profiles show, alumni are the DOE CSGF's best promoters.

Moore also helped analyze new reactor core monitoring instruments and core and fuel properties in the Economic Simplified Boiling Water Reactor, which, in addition to the PRISM Advanced Recycling Center, is a leading-edge design for GE Hitachi.

And since 2000, Moore has been part of Global Nuclear Fuel, a venture linking GE, Hitachi and Toshiba. "I have the opportunity to look for areas of synergy where we can help each other out ... and try to avoid duplication of effort so we can maximize the brilliant people we have."

Moore's elevation to management has given him another area to play in: spreading the word about how computational science can boost GE Hitachi's overall business. "Taking on the leadership positions has been very good for me to stretch beyond my comfort zone, and that's what I really like."



Dan Martin  
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## “Cool Problems” Draw Alumnus to Laboratory

**i** It may help to think of **DAN MARTIN** as a carpenter whose main tool is a trusty multipurpose saw.

Martin, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship (DOE CSGF) recipient from 1993 to 1996, works with scientists in a variety of fields to build computer models. He’s helped fashion algorithmic “lumber” into simulations portraying devices and phenomena ranging from fusion plasmas’ rapid reactions to ice sheets’ glacial movements.


“It’s fun to work on really cool problems,” says the researcher in the Applied Numerical Algorithms Group (ANAG) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). “That’s one of the advantages of being a computational scientist. I’ve been all over the place. I’ve gotten to learn a lot about a lot of really cool and interesting areas.”

The versatile tool Martin and his colleagues often use is adaptive mesh refinement (AMR), a computational technique that focuses a computer’s power where it’s needed most. AMR automatically casts fine, high-resolution grids or meshes of data points in areas of interest in a simulated domain — like the point where two fluids interact — and coarser meshes elsewhere. Computers calculate changes in physical properties at each data point to provide a complete picture. “You can think of AMR as giving you essentially fine-grid accuracy for essentially coarse-grid (computational) cost,” Martin says.

This visualization of a simulation of Antarctic ice sheet movement shows the magnitude of the ice sheet’s velocity in meters per year, with blue-white the lowest velocity magnitude and blue-green higher magnitude. The visualization also shows the adaptive computational grid used to calculate the velocity magnitude. Small, black boxes have a resolution of 2.5 kilometers and purple boxes are at 5 kilometers. The base resolution for the simulation is 10 kilometers.

That’s just what one of Martin’s latest projects needs. He and his colleagues are part of ISICLES, the Ice Sheet Initiative for CLimate ExtremeS, a DOE program to develop better models of land-based ice sheets. “Ice sheets have an enormous range of dynamic scales. You need incredibly fine resolution to get some features right,” like the grounding line, the point at which an ice sheet slides off land and onto the ocean. “But there also are large regions where nothing’s going on. You really can’t computationally afford to resolve everything at the fine scale.”

The LBNL project, called Berkeley-ISICLES or BISICLES, applies AMR to the Glimmer Community Ice Sheet Model, often a component of larger climate simulations. The team also uses other algorithmic adjustments, including approximating the vertical structure or distribution of the ice-sheet velocity and coupling it to equations for the sheet’s horizontal movement and thickness evolution. That “lets us get away with a two-dimensional vertically integrated solver that’s also a big win” in saving computational power.




Martin spends a lot of time extending AMR and other algorithmic techniques to new and bigger problems. Application scientists can't "just take a problem and drop it into AMR. Everything has its own refinements and its own algorithmic complexity. Doing it correctly for any given problem often requires work and research." The Applied Numerical Algorithms Group also focuses on improving AMR to higher orders of accuracy and on finding better ways to solve the partial differential equations at the heart of computer models.

Martin also is on the development team for Chombo, an ANAG-developed software package for adaptively refined rectangular grids, and frequently answers questions from researchers who use it. "There's an impressive number of really capable people who are using our software to attack problems we don't have time or resources to look at, but are still good candidates for AMR."

One of AMR's creators, ANAG leader Phillip Colella, was his doctoral advisor at the University of California, Berkeley, but Martin says his 1994 practicum under combustion modeler and AMR pioneer John Bell was what set him on course for a laboratory career. "I really enjoyed working with the people," Martin adds. A lab career "seemed like a way to be able to do lots of fun, exciting research without having to go through the tenure process." He's also found a national laboratory is "one of the places where teamwork ... just works so much better."

As LBNL's DOE CSGF practicum coordinator, Martin pairs students with researchers in complementary disciplines. "I meet people all across the lab and they think I'm great because I bring them all these fantastic people," he adds. "It's definitely improved my knowledge of what's going on at the lab in a way that's been fun."



This is a demonstration of an algorithm that uses computational meshes localized in both space and time to compute incompressible viscous flows. It shows two vortex rings angled toward each other at initial time and after 60, 90 and 120 time steps. Black lines depict streamlines. Green boxes are a level 1 mesh, with a resolution four times finer than the background mesh. Blue boxes are a level 2 mesh, with a resolution four times finer than level 1. For clarity, grid boxes are shown only in the rear half of the computational domain.



Mala Radhakrishnan  
Wellesley College

# Alumna Busts Resistance — in the Classroom and Lab

**MALA RADHAKRISHNAN** is out to override resistance. As an assistant professor of chemistry at Wellesley College, much of her research aims to outmaneuver mutations in viruses like HIV that make some drugs nearly useless.


Radhakrishnan, a Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship (DOE CSGF) recipient from 2004 to 2007, builds computational models for drug design. Sometimes those models design and analyze “promiscuous” molecules — ones capable of targeting multiple viral variants. Radhakrishnan also uses optimization methods to help find effective molecular combinations to block many variants with minimal side effects. And in current research she’s searching for common factors in HIV drug resistance.

Just as importantly, Radhakrishnan is sharing her expertise and setting a standard for Wellesley students. She found she was at home in the classroom while participating in the Teach for America program after earning her undergraduate degree.

“During grad school I actually missed teaching. That’s another reason I knew academia would probably be a better fit for me,” Radhakrishnan says. “The teaching, the mentorship is the best part,” whether it’s a chemistry class or writing computer code. “It’s really fun for me to see a student who has never written a piece of code before get excited when something works.”

That’s an especially vital message at Wellesley, Radhakrishnan says. Teaching at a women’s college is important because “there still aren’t enough female computational scientists out there” — something she and her students are reminded of every time they attend a conference or take a job.

At Wellesley, Radhakrishnan carries out most of her projects on a computing cluster with 80 processing cores, but she’s contemplating bigger computers soon, when she takes a year off from teaching to focus solely on research.



Results of simulations to determine instantaneous and integrated cytokine activity at 15,000 minutes as a function of surface/endosomal dissociation rate constant ( $k_{off}$ ) and activation rate constant with a liganded receptor ( $k_{sigf}$ ). Figures (A) and (B) are for endosomal  $k_{off}$  and  $k_{sigf}$  for parameters similar to those for the cytokine Granulocyte-colony stimulating factor (GCSF). Figures (C) and (D) show activity and integrated activity as a function of endosomal  $k_{off}$  and  $k_{sigf}$  for the same parameters, with surface  $k_{off}$  held fixed to reflect mutant GCSF with poorer binding only in the endosome. The alteration further maximizes instantaneous and integrated activity. Figures (E) and (F) show plots for instantaneous and integrated activity for  $k_{off}$  and  $k_{sigf}$  under parameters similar to those for the cytokine Erythropoietin (Epo). The plots show that tighter binders were consistently preferred in the Epo system. In all cases the black line indicates the experimentally measured  $k_{off}$  at cell surface pH.


She's already compiled a strong record of achievement. In a paper published last year in the journal *Biotechnology Progress*<sup>1</sup>, Radhakrishnan and Bruce Tidor, her doctoral advisor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), computationally varied the binding behavior of cytokines, proteins that attach to cells to regulate them. Erythropoietin (Epo), for instance, binds to surface receptors to regulate red blood cell maturation.

Radhakrishnan and Tidor modeled how changing the time cytokines bind to their receptors could affect their longer-term potency. The longer a cytokine remains bound, the more likely it is to be internalized and degraded, making it unavailable to bind at another receptor. Their model indicated that a weakly binding cytokine works better when less of it is available or when cells quickly internalize and degrade it, for example. In those cases the cytokine releases from the receptor and is recycled for binding at another site. Strongly binding cytokines are better in other situations — when they activate slowly or when the cell has fewer receptors.

"A lot of researchers, when they design drugs, they want things to bind as tightly as possible," Radhakrishnan says. "This shows an example where that can be a detriment. You lose the long-term potency."

It took a large-scale cellular model to test that idea. In other research Radhakrishnan used molecular-scale models to design two mutant Epo receptors. The receptors selectively bound to one of two different parts of the Epo molecule, letting Radhakrishnan and her MIT colleagues explore how selective binding affects cell response.

Radhakrishnan takes an equally small-scale approach in a collaboration with fellow DOE CSGF alumnus Jaydeep Bardhan. Bardhan, an assistant professor at Rush University Medical Center in Chicago, has developed a way to efficiently calculate electrostatics — electrical charges and fields — that influence biomolecules. "I'm working with him to try to apply it to biological systems and see in what cases it works well and when it doesn't,"



Mala Radhakrishnan and Bruce Tidor built a computational model of cytokine behavior illustrated here. Cytokines are small proteins that bind to specific cell surface receptors. Cytokines may bind to receptors to activate a signal in the cell, then release to bind at another site. Others are brought into the cell where they may remain activated before they are recycled back to the cell surface or degraded in the lysosome.

Radhakrishnan adds. It could lead to simulations that better capture the fine detail of biochemical interactions.

At the other end of the scale, Radhakrishnan is working with Stanford University medical researcher Robert Shafer to analyze a database of HIV drug-resistance data. "I'm looking for patterns and trying to understand what major drug-resistant genotypes and phenotypes are out there," she says. "Is there a set of representative ways a person could be resistant to HIV drugs?" By identifying key drug-resistance factors, researchers could design "promiscuous" new drugs or drug cocktails with multiple infection targets.

Radhakrishnan will focus on new challenges during her year of research. Meanwhile, she's also tending to her infant son, Samay, and recently published a collection of "chemistry poetry" entitled *Atomic Romances, Molecular Dances*.

<sup>1</sup>Radhakrishnan ML, Tidor B. Cellular-level models as tools for cytokine design. *Biotechnol Prog*. 2010;26:919-937.

# WINNING ESSAYS

ENCOURAGING COMMUNICATION THROUGH AN ANNUAL WRITING CONTEST

WINNER



by Kenley Pelzer

## CAN PEELING AN ONION CURE CANCER?

### AWARDING COMMUNICATION

The DOE CSGF launched an annual essay contest in 2005 to give current and former fellows an opportunity to write about their work with a broader, non-technical audience in mind. The competition encourages better communication of computational science and engineering and its value to society to non-expert audiences.

In addition to recognition and a cash prize, the winners receive the opportunity to work with a professional science writer to critique and copy-edit their essays. The latest winning essays are published here.

For more information on the essay contest, visit [www.krellinst.org/csgf](http://www.krellinst.org/csgf).

**W**ITH NO OFFENSE to the quantum theorist in the room,” the professor said, casting me a quick look and smiling gently, “you should never, ever deal with quantum effects unless you have to.” As an eager young graduate student in theoretical quantum chemistry, I was enthralled by the wonderful and bizarre laws Einstein and other great scientists had discovered. Yet I knew the professor had a point: If you unnecessarily involve these strange principles in your approach to a scientific problem, it will be harder — or perhaps impossible — to solve it.

In the world of quantum mechanics, objects behave in very peculiar ways. An object can pass through walls. It can be in two places at the same time. No matter how hard you try, you can never be sure where it is or where it is going. Fortunately for scientists, these quantum effects are only important for the smallest particles and can be ignored in many situations.

However, it is absolutely crucial to consider quantum theory in some cases, because its messy, complicated rules can help us understand diseases — and how to cure them.


The human body contains a multitude of protein molecules that play a central role in whether we stay healthy or get sick. Each protein contains thousands of electrons — tiny, negatively charged particles that are attracted to positive charges. These attractions influence whether a protein “sticks” to another molecule.

This biological stickiness is especially important in treating cancer. In some types of cancer cells, there are protein molecules with a region called an “active site.” When certain molecules attach to the active site, they trigger a cascade of events that leads to disease. But if a drug can target a particular protein and stick to its active site, it can block other molecules from binding and prevent this dangerous spiral. If a drug can’t stick to the protein — if it falls off and circulates in the bloodstream — it may just float around doing nothing or, worse yet, cause toxic side effects.

To predict which drugs will attach firmly to an active site, scientists must understand how protein molecules and their electrons behave. But because electrons are so small, they obey all of the complicated laws of quantum mechanics.



This image shows a molecular orbital calculated using a quantum mechanics program. By calculating the shapes and orientations of the molecular orbitals, which may contain electrons, scientists obtain detailed information on the distribution of the electrons in space.



So how can anyone possibly study a protein with thousands of these slippery, mysterious little particles?


Since electrons are too small to see through a microscope, chemists predict their behavior with sophisticated computer simulations. Not only do these simulations have the power to study electrons, they also have economic advantages: Once the software has been developed, it costs virtually nothing to use it to study large numbers of potential drugs. Given the massive costs involved in pharmaceutical research, this advantage has important implications in the search for effective medicines.

The bad news is that — thanks to the influence of quantum properties — these simulations may take weeks to generate information about just a few electrons. Since a protein has thousands, accurately predicting the distribution of electrons could take decades. Not very helpful when cancer patients are hoping for a new drug *now*.

This is where the idea of peeling an onion comes to the rescue. With the aptly named ONIOM method (“Our own N-layered Integrated molecular Orbital molecular Mechanics”) the protein molecule is divided into a chosen number (N) of layers. The program treats each with a different simulation technique, carefully selected based on what information is needed. When highly accurate information on the electronic structure is needed, the program uses a “molecular orbital” method that rigorously incorporates quantum theory. The details of quantum theory are so important for these molecular orbital calculations that



Pictured here is dihydrofolate reductase, a protein whose function is crucial for cell proliferation. Drugs that bind to the active site of this protein and inhibit its activity are used to stop the rapid proliferation of cancer cells. The yellow shaded region surrounds the active site.



they are usually referred to as “quantum mechanics” calculations.

When a lower level of accuracy is acceptable for a particular layer, the program may use a less advanced (and less time-consuming) quantum mechanics method. In cases where even more approximate information is sufficient, the computer performs a “molecular mechanics” calculation. Because molecular mechanics methods are less precise and incorporate less quantum mechanical theory, they’re fast — really fast. So by applying molecular mechanics and working with information that’s a little less accurate, the simulations gain a lot of speed.

To understand how the ONIOM approach can help us answer important questions, consider the example of a drug that needs to bind to a particular protein. At the protein’s active site — the onion’s center — the computer uses an advanced quantum mechanics method to calculate the behavior of electrons and predict whether a drug will “stick.”

Then the computer must simulate the next layer of the onion — or rather, the next layer of the protein — which wraps around the active site but isn’t part of the active site. Since this layer doesn’t actually stick to the drug of interest, we don’t need to worry quite as much about its electrons. On the other hand, we can’t totally ignore this layer, because changes in its shape or

electron distribution might affect the active site’s behavior. So scientists compromise and use a less precise method: either a quantum mechanics method that is a little less accurate (and hence faster), or a molecular mechanics method.

The farther we are from the active site, the less we need detailed information about electrons and their quantum mechanical behavior. So we use a less precise simulation technique with each successive layer. By using faster techniques to treat the outer layers of the “onion,” it’s possible to predict how a large protein will interact with a particular drug. And fortunately for patients waiting for the next new medicine, the answers can be obtained in days or weeks — not decades.

By peeling apart a protein as though it were an onion, scientists follow my professor’s advice to never, ever deal with quantum effects unless you have to. The beauty of this approach is that for many physiological proteins, neither quantum mechanics nor molecular mechanics alone could effectively answer our questions. Fortunately, collaboration between scientists who specialize in each method has led to ingenious hybrid programs that can contribute great insights to drug design. And then with the press of a key, a computer can guide us in the urgent quest to develop life-saving medicines.

HONORABLE MENTION



by Hayes Stripling

# ON THE QUANTIFICATION OF “MAYBE”: A NICHE FOR COMPUTATION

## CONSIDER PERHAPS THE MOST

pressing question facing the global community in this and coming decades: “Is human activity adversely affecting the environment and global climate?” A brief skimming of newspaper headlines, scholarly journals and political debates reveals that credible responses to this “yes/no” question all have a flavor of “probably,” “maybe” or “probably not.” In fact, most scientifically based stances concede we cannot provide a definitive “yes/no” answer without many more years’ worth of data, investigation and discovery. So the correct answer today is just “maybe,” with some evidence and proponents on either side.

In response to scientific and political pressure for a more definitive answer, researchers have focused on this reformulation of the question: “To what extent does human activity affect the environment and global climate, and how do we manage the risks of this activity as the scientific investigation continues?” This is not posed as a “yes/no” question; instead, it calls for a quantification of “maybe” — an estimation of uncertainty in our response. Answering the question also requires a multidisciplinary effort — involving experts in science, engineering and policy development — that will evolve as we gain understanding.

These kinds of questions have led to an exploding demand for knowledge. In reaction, researchers are expanding the scientific method, which is founded on the long-lived pillars of theory and experiment, to explore new domains and strategies to support decisions and conclusions. These include computation, an invaluable tool many now accept as the third pillar of


science. Using computational power to simulate a system or experiment is relatively inexpensive and has increasing potential to provide accurate, thorough results. Most importantly, computation also has surfaced as the most valuable tool for exploring uncertainty in “yes/no” questions.

The specific branch of computation that addresses this issue is uncertainty quantification (UQ). UQ — or the quantification of maybe — aims to comprehend how uncertainty in nature affects a particular quantity of interest (QOI). It then uses this understanding to make predictions or informed decisions about the quantity. Achieving this goal, however, is not so simple, for the QOIs we seek are complex results of multidisciplinary systems that are confounded by uncertain inputs and less-than-perfectly-understood physics.

To illustrate the utility of computation in uncertain systems, let’s consider a simple example: determining the forces a passenger experiences in a car crash. Imagine we can identify the five most important factors (such as speed or seat-belt use) contributing to our QOI but that we can’t know exactly what the settings or statuses of these inputs will be (that is, our inputs are uncertain). If we restrict each input to one of two settings (for example, speed is either fast or slow) and wish to test each possible combination of inputs, we would require the design, construction, crashing and analysis of  $2^5$  (32) test cars. This may be an acceptable number of experiments, depending on economic, administrative and/or political constraints. But five inputs probably are too few. A more realistic approach may consider 15 inputs — that’s




Each column of the figure illustrates a calibrated or posterior distribution of a single uncertain input to a massive climate model. The bar charts (histograms) represent the single-variable distribution and the scatter plots illustrate how the calibration of one variable correlates to the other two variables. For example, these results suggest larger values of *cldfrc\_rhminl* and smaller values of *cldwat\_icritc* will improve the accuracy and reduce uncertainty in future model runs.





The error bars represent predictions (with uncertainty) of the time required for laser energy to ablate a beryllium disk. We use existing experimental data to “tune” our uncertain parameters and reduce the magnitude of the predictive uncertainty. The analysis shows that between experimental results, the error bars are comparable to the experimental variability. Predictions at extrapolated (larger) disk thicknesses, however, are less informed by the experimental results and have larger uncertainty.



2<sup>15</sup>, or 32,768 experiments — certainly a number too expensive and time-consuming to consider.

Computation has proven extremely valuable in such cases, in which experimentation is economically or politically infeasible. What if we can afford only five crash tests? We may approach the problem computationally instead. The computer model would solve equations that govern (or simulate) the physics that take place during a crash. We could design the model to accept any number of adjustable inputs that contribute to the final QOI (in this case, the forces a passenger experiences). Inputs could span a range instead of adhering to a binary choice, like fast or slow speed. It would be common, given sufficient computer resources, to run hundreds or thousands of “computer experiments” corresponding to hundreds or thousands of input combinations. The final result is a distribution of our QOI, allowing us to make an informed statement of the form, “We are 99 percent certain that the passenger G-force will be below the injury threshold in 99.9 percent of vehicle collisions.” Such a statement is much more useful to a policy-making board or

consumer than results from only a handful of experiments.

Cutting-edge simulations running on some of the largest computer architectures in the world use this kind of approach to address society’s toughest challenges. But in some cases, the problems are becoming too large and complex. For example, models designed to describe the long-term global climate predict thousands of quantities of interest from thousands of uncertain inputs. To help handle data of this magnitude we employ sensitivity analysis, a sub-discipline of uncertainty quantification. By sampling results from previous computer experiments we can determine which outputs are most sensitive to which inputs. For example, if we find that the computed prediction of global surface temperature isn’t sensitive to lunar cycles but is highly sensitive to cloud coverage, we can adapt our sampling strategies to explore cloud coverage more thoroughly and hold off on varying the lunar effects. This will give us a more precise understanding of global surface temperature behavior and use fewer evaluations of the (potentially time-consuming) computer model. It’s also


something we could never determine using physical experiments alone.

Of course, it’s impossible for computation to ever make experimentation a moot practice. We must compare experimental measurements with computational results to ensure our models are valid. Further, experimentation’s maturity as a technique and the ability to witness its physical results with your own eyes makes it more credible to humans than computational number crunching. For example, let’s return to our car crash case: Would you be more inclined to believe a vehicle’s safety report based on five physical experiments using real crash-test dummies or 1,000 simulated smash-ups in which you can’t see, hear or feel the impact? Would you be more inclined to believe the computer if it exactly predicted the results of the five physical crashes we could afford? We can never abandon experimentation — but we can leverage validated computer models to develop and explore scientific concepts that will guide our society’s policies in the face of the great challenges ahead.

The Frederick A. Howes Scholar in Computational Science award was established in 2001 to honor the late Frederick Anthony Howes, who was a champion for computational science education.

# HOWES AWARD

## HONORS LEADERSHIP AS WELL AS SCHOLARSHIP



### 2011 WINNER ALEJANDRO RODRIGUEZ

Alejandro Rodriguez has been selected as the 2011 Howes Scholar in Computational Science. Dr. Rodriguez was a fellow from 2006 to 2010. He received his Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and currently holds joint postdoctoral positions at the Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and at the MIT Department of Mathematics.

A Cuban émigré who has helped scientists better understand a strange physical force is the 2011 Frederick A. Howes Scholar in Computational Science.

The award recognizes outstanding recent doctoral graduates of the Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship (DOE CSGF) program. Winners are chosen not just for their technical achievements, but also for outstanding leadership, integrity and character — qualities that brought Howes wide admiration.

As manager of DOE's Applied Mathematical Sciences Program, Howes was a staunch defender of the fellowship and its goals. He died unexpectedly on Dec. 4, 1999, at age 51.

Alejandro Rodriguez, a fellow from 2006 to 2010, is the 15th Howes Scholar. Rodriguez graduated from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in June 2010. He's now a postdoctoral researcher with a joint appointment in the Harvard

School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and the MIT Department of Mathematics.

"To be honored for my work and, most importantly, for my devotion to science is not only a tremendous honor but also an invaluable source of encouragement," Rodriguez says.

2010 Howes Scholar Julianne Chung also felt invigorated. She was chosen, in part, for her work supporting budding scholars through groups such as the Association for Women in Mathematics and the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. She's continued that involvement, but "with the award I feel more empowered, in that it's not just my experience I'm sharing with students. It's also Dr. Howes' vision for computational, interdisciplinary research, as well as the greater computational science community, that I represent."

Since earning her doctoral degree from Emory University in 2009, Chung



Above left: 2010 winner Julianne Chung receives her award from Dr. David Brown, chair of the Howes selection committee and longtime friend of the fellowship.

Above right: David Potere, the 2009 Howes Scholar, presents his research at the DOE CSGF Annual Conference in Washington.

## ABOUT FRED HOWES



“To be honored for my work and, most importantly, for my devotion to science is not only a tremendous honor but also an invaluable source of encouragement.”

~~~~~

completed a National Science Foundation Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship at the University of Maryland at College Park. This fall she starts a tenure-track position in the Mathematics Department at the University of Texas at Arlington, where she'll continue her work on inverse problems and image processing.

The Howes award occasionally attracted attention as Chung interviewed for positions. A faculty member at one major research university told her he'd known Howes personally. “In some sense, it was an immediate acknowledgement of the value of my research, as well as the importance of my work,” she adds. “It definitely has an effect on the connection I have with the community.”

DOE CSGF recipients who have completed or plan to complete requirements for their doctoral degree in a calendar year, both with fellowship support or after receiving support for the maximum number of years, are eligible for that year's Howes award. They're nominated by department chairs, advisors and fellowship coordinators at their universities. A review

In the 10 years since it was first conferred, the Frederick A. Howes Scholar in Computational Science award has become emblematic of research excellence and outstanding leadership. It's a fitting tribute to Howes, who was known for his scholarship, intelligence and humor.

Howes earned his bachelor's and doctoral degrees in mathematics at the University of Southern California, an obituary on the Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics website reports. He held teaching posts at the universities of Wisconsin and Minnesota before joining the faculty of the University of California, Davis, in 1979. Ten years later Howes served a two-year rotation with the National Science Foundation's Division of Mathematical Sciences. He joined DOE in 1991.

In 2000, colleagues formed an informal committee to honor Howes. They chose the DOE CSGF as the vehicle and gathered donations, including a generous contribution from Howes' family, to endow an award in his name.

### PAST HOWES SCHOLARS

2010	Julianne Chung
2009	David Potere
2008	Mala Radhakrishnan
2007	Jaydeep Bardhan and Kristen Grauman
2006	Matthew Wolinsky and Kevin Chu
2005	Ryan Elliott and Judith Hill
2004	Collin Wick
2003	Oliver Fringer and Jon Wilkening
2001	Mayya Tokman and Jeffrey Hittinger



Alejandro Rodriguez, the 2011 Howes Scholar in Computational Science, explains his research and award-winning poster at the 2009 annual conference.



committee chooses one or two scholars each year to receive an honorarium and engraved crystal memento at the DOE CSGF Annual Conference in Washington, D.C., where the recipients also deliver lectures describing their research.

David Potere, the 2009 Howes Scholar, said the talk was one of the honor's most significant elements. At Princeton University he focused on applying computer power to analyze the huge quantity of data remote sensing satellites generate, using it for things like predicting epidemics. His Howes lecture focused on what the satellites see.

"I was hoping to just leave the room with a sense of how beautiful the remote sensing satellite imagery is and how much things are changing," Potere says. "We're really at a tipping point now." After graduation he joined the Boston Consulting Group, where he's helped found a "geoanalytics team." It plans to apply geospatial technologies to problems such as store location, demographics and distribution optimization.

Potere says the Howes award surprised him because "I hadn't really thought of myself that way." Yet, like Chung, he found "it was a nice piece of confirmation that there was a leadership impact and a leadership role" to his research.

For Rodriguez, the honor has special meaning "after spending the past five years in the company of extremely talented and passionate CSGF fellows."

Rodriguez, the selection committee wrote in its citation, "embodies the qualities that Fred Howes promoted in all young scientists." He is "not just an exemplary computational physicist," but also "a dedicated spokesman for physics and a mentor for younger scientists." Rodriguez taught physics in the

MIT summer MITES program for under-represented high school students. He also has represented both the MIT physics department and DOE CSGF at national conferences and is profiled in the Physics Society "People in Physics" video series.

"I love to share my work and passion for science with others," Rodriguez says. "The less the audience knows or cares about science, the more I enjoy convincing them of its importance and beauty." The award recognizes the significance of mentorship and scholarship, he adds, and he plans to use it "as fuel to continue to inspire others."

Rodriguez's research has led the way in understanding the Casimir forces. These strange attractions arise from quantum-scale fluctuations in the electromagnetic field and are affecting microelectromechanical systems now in development. Rodriguez's work has led to methods capable of calculating these forces between arbitrarily shaped objects. Previous techniques could only predict them between simply shaped objects. Rodriguez is first author on numerous papers describing the research, including ones published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* and *Physical Review Letters*.

Rodriguez was 13 when he and his family fled Cuba after his stepfather, a physics professor, was fired for refusing to identify the writers of a letter opposing the communist government. They settled in the Miami area and became U.S. citizens.

The award, Rodriguez says, recognizes the role his entire family, including those still in his native land, had in his success. Naturally, they're overjoyed: "My father in Cuba almost went as far as publishing the news in the national Cuban newspaper."



**Eric Chi**  
*Rice University  
 Bioinformatics/Statistics*

**Advisor:** David Scott  
**Practicums:** Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
 and two at Sandia National Laboratories – California  
**Contact:** eric.c.chi@gmail.com



**Anubhav Jain**  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
 Materials Science and Engineering*

**Advisor:** Gerbrand Ceder  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory  
**Contact:** anubhavj@mit.edu



**Matthew Reuter**  
*Northwestern University  
 Theoretical Chemistry*

**Advisor:** Mark Ratner  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** mgreuter@u.northwestern.edu



**Gregory Crosswhite**  
*University of Washington  
 Physics*

**Advisor:** Dave Bacon  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
**Contact:** gcross@phys.washington.edu



**Milo Lin**  
*California Institute of Technology  
 Physics*

**Advisor:** Ahmed Zewail  
**Practicum:** Brookhaven National Laboratory  
**Contact:** miloq@its.caltech.edu



**Sarah Richardson**  
*Johns Hopkins University School  
 of Medicine  
 Human Genetics and Molecular Biology*

**Advisor:** Joel Bader  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory  
**Contact:** notadoctor@jhmi.edu



**Hal Finkel**  
*Yale University  
 Physics*

**Advisor:** Richard Easther  
**Practicum:** Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory  
**Contact:** hal.finkel@yale.edu



**Paul Loriaux**  
*University of California, San Diego  
 Computational Biology*

**Advisor:** Alexander Hoffmann  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** ploriaux@ucsd.edu



**Danilo Scepanovic**  
*Harvard University/Massachusetts  
 Institute of Technology  
 Signal Processing/Cardiovascular Modeling*

**Advisor:** Richard Cohen  
**Practicum:** Sandia National Laboratories – New Mexico  
**Contact:** danilos@mit.edu



**Steven Hamilton**  
*Emory University  
 Computational Mathematics*

**Advisor:** Michele Benzi  
**Practicum:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
**Contact:** sphamil@emory.edu



**James Martin**  
*University of Texas  
 Computational and Applied Mathematics*

**Advisor:** Omar Ghattas  
**Practicum:** Sandia National Laboratories – California  
**Contact:** jmartin@ices.utexas.edu



**Paul Sutter**  
*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
 Cosmology*

**Advisor:** Paul Ricker  
**Practicums:** Two at Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** psutter2@uiuc.edu



**Ying Hu**  
*Rice University  
 Biomedical Engineering*

**Advisor:** Rebekah Drezek  
**Practicums:** Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory  
 and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
**Contact:** hooying@gmail.com



**Matthew Norman**  
*North Carolina State University  
 Atmospheric Sciences*

**Advisor:** Fredrick Semazzi  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** normanmr@ornl.gov



**Cameron Talischi**  
*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
 Computational Mechanics*

**Advisor:** Glaucio Paulino  
**Practicum:** Sandia National Laboratories – New Mexico  
**Contact:** ktalisch@uiuc.edu



**Joshua Hykes**  
*North Carolina State University  
 Nuclear Engineering*

**Advisor:** Youstry Azmy  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** jmhykes@ncsu.edu



**Geoffrey Oxberry**  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
 Chemical Kinetics/Transport Phenomena*

**Advisor:** William Green  
**Practicum:** Sandia National Laboratories – California  
**Contact:** goxberry@mit.edu



**John Ziegler**  
*California Institute of Technology  
 Aeronautics*

**Advisor:** Dale Pullin  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** jackalak@caltech.edu



**Alex Perkins**  
*University of California, Davis  
 Theoretical Ecology*

**Advisor:** Alan Hastings  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** taperkins@ucdavis.edu



## 4<sup>TH</sup> YEAR FELLOWS

### Carl Boettiger

*University of California, Davis  
Biology – Ecology and Evolution*  
**Advisor:** Alan Hastings  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** cboettig@gmail.com

### Scott Clark

*Cornell University  
Applied Mathematics*  
**Advisor:** Peter Frazier  
**Practicums:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory  
**Contact:** sc932@cornell.edu

### Curtis Hamman

*Stanford University  
Flow Physics and Computational Engineering*  
**Advisor:** Parviz Moin  
**Practicum:** Sandia National Laboratories –  
California  
**Contact:** cwhamman@stanford.edu

### Armen Kherlopian

*Cornell University  
Computational and Systems Biology*  
**Advisor:** David Christini  
**Practicum:** Princeton Plasma  
Physics Laboratory  
**Contact:** ark2010@med.cornell.edu

### Kathleen King

*Cornell University  
Operations Research*  
**Advisor:** John Muckstadt  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** kathleen.a.king@gmail.com

### Eric Liu

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Fluid Mechanics*  
**Advisor:** David Darmofal  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** ehliu@mit.edu

### Brian Lockwood

*University of Wyoming  
Fluid Dynamics*  
**Advisor:** Dimitri Mavriplis  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** blockwoo@uwyo.edu

### Douglas Mason

*Harvard University  
Physics*  
**Advisor:** Eric Heller  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** douglasmason@gmail.com

### Britton Olson

*Stanford University  
Computational Fluid Dynamics*  
**Advisor:** Sanjiva Lele  
**Practicums:** Lawrence Berkeley National  
Laboratory and Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** bolson@stanford.edu

### Cyrus Omar

*Carnegie Mellon University  
Programming Language Design/Neurobiology*  
**Advisor:** Jonathan Aldrich  
**Practicum:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
**Contact:** cyrus@cmu.edu

### Claire Ralph

*Cornell University  
Theoretical Chemistry*  
**Advisor:** Garnet Chan  
**Practicums:** Two at Sandia National  
Laboratories – New Mexico  
**Contact:** claire.ralph@gmail.com

### Brenda Rubenstein

*Columbia University  
Theoretical Chemistry*  
**Advisor:** David Reichman  
**Practicums:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
**Contact:** rubenstein.brenda@gmail.com

### Anne Warlaumont

*University of Memphis  
Computational Developmental  
Psycholinguistics*  
**Advisor:** David Kimbrough Oller  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** anne.warlaumont@memphis.edu



## 3<sup>RD</sup> YEAR FELLOWS

### Edward Baskerville

*University of Michigan  
Ecology and Scientific Computing*  
**Advisor:** Mercedes Pascual  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** ebaskerv@umich.edu

### Sanjeeb Bose

*Stanford University  
Computational Fluid Dynamics*  
**Advisor:** Parviz Moin  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** stbose@stanford.edu

### Kurt Brorsen

*Iowa State University  
Physical Chemistry*  
**Advisor:** Mark Gordon  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** kurtbrorsen@gmail.com

### Jeffrey Donatelli

*University of California, Berkeley  
Applied Mathematics*  
**Advisor:** James Sethian  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** jdonatel@math.berkeley.edu

### Virgil Griffith

*California Institute of Technology  
Theoretical Neuroscience*  
**Advisor:** Christof Koch  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** virgil@caltech.edu

### Tobin Isaac

*University of Texas  
Computational and Applied Mathematics*  
**Advisor:** Omar Ghattas  
**Practicum:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
**Contact:** tisaac@ices.utexas.edu

### Mark Maienschein-Cline

*University of Chicago  
Physical Chemistry*  
**Advisor:** Aaron Dinner  
**Practicum:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
**Contact:** mmaiensc@uchicago.edu

### Noah Reddell

*University of Washington  
Computational Plasma Modeling for  
Fusion Energy*  
**Advisor:** Uri Shumlak  
**Practicum:** Princeton Plasma  
Physics Laboratory  
**Contact:** reddell@uw.edu

### Troy Ruths

*Rice University  
Bioinformatics*  
**Advisor:** Luay Nakhleh  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** troy.ruths@rice.edu

### Samuel Skillman

*University of Colorado at Boulder  
Astrophysics*  
**Advisor:** Jack Burns  
**Practicum:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
**Contact:** samuel.skillman@colorado.edu

### Hayes Stripling

*Texas A&M University  
Nuclear Engineering/Uncertainty Quantification*  
**Advisor:** Marvin Adams  
**Practicums:** Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory and Argonne  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** h.stripling@tamu.edu

### Travis Trahan

*University of Michigan  
Nuclear Engineering*  
**Advisor:** Edward Larsen  
**Practicums:** Argonne National  
Laboratory and Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** tjtrahan@umich.edu

### Sean Vitousek

*Stanford University  
Environmental Fluid Mechanics and Hydrology*  
**Advisor:** Oliver Fringer  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** seanv@stanford.edu

### Norman Yao

*Harvard University  
Condensed Matter Physics*  
**Advisor:** Mikhail Lukin  
**Practicum:** Los Alamos National Laboratory  
**Contact:** nyao@fas.harvard.edu

The logo for the 2nd Year Fellows program, featuring a large white number '2' on a dark red background, with the text '2ND YEAR FELLOWS' to its right.

**Mary Benage**  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Geophysics  
**Advisor:** Josef Dufek  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** mary.benage@eas.gatech.edu

**Aleah Caulin**  
University of Pennsylvania  
Genomics and Computational Biology  
**Advisor:** Carlo Maley  
**Contact:** alefox@mail.med.upenn.edu

**Seth Davidovits**  
Princeton University  
Plasma Physics  
**Advisor:** Nathaniel Fisch  
**Contact:** s davidov@princeton.edu

**Leslie Dewan**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Nuclear Waste Materials  
**Advisor:** Linn Hobbs  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** ldewan@mit.edu

**Carmeline Dsilva**  
Princeton University  
Chemical Engineering  
**Advisor:** Yannis Kevrekidis  
**Contact:** cdsilva@princeton.edu

**Christopher Eldred**  
University of Utah  
Climate Modeling  
**Advisor:** Thomas Reichler  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** chris.eldred@gmail.com

**Thomas Fai**  
New York University  
Applied Mathematics  
**Advisor:** Charles Peskin  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** tfai@cims.nyu.edu

**Charles Frogner**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Biology  
**Advisor:** Tomaso Poggio  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** frogner@mit.edu

**Evan Gawlik**  
Stanford University  
Applied Mathematics  
**Advisor:** Margot Gerritsen  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** egawlik@stanford.edu

**Christopher Ivey**  
Stanford University  
Computational Fluid Dynamics  
**Advisor:** Parviz Moin  
**Contact:** civey@stanford.edu

**Irene Kaplow**  
Stanford University  
Computational Biology  
**Advisor:** Daphne Koller  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** ikaplow@stanford.edu

**Miles Lopes**  
University of California, Berkeley  
Machine Learning  
**Advisor:** Martin Wainwright  
**Contact:** mlopes@stat.berkeley.edu

**Peter Maginot**  
Texas A&M University  
Nuclear Engineering  
**Advisor:** Jim Morel  
**Contact:** pmaginot@neo.tamu.edu

**Devin Matthews**  
University of Texas  
Chemistry  
**Advisor:** John Stanton  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** dmatthews@mail.utexas.edu

**Scot Miller**  
Harvard University  
Atmospheric Sciences  
**Advisor:** Steven Wofsy  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** scot.m.miller@gmail.com

**Kenley Pelzer**  
University of Chicago  
Theoretical Physical Chemistry  
**Advisor:** David Mazziotti  
**Contact:** kpelzer@uchicago.edu

**Amanda Peters**  
Harvard University  
Applied Physics  
**Advisor:** Efthimios Kaxiras  
**Practicum:** Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory  
**Contact:** apeters@fas.harvard.edu

**Christopher Quinn**  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Communications  
**Advisor:** Todd Coleman  
**Contact:** quinn7@illinois.edu

**Aaron Sisto**  
Purdue University  
Computational Materials Science  
**Advisor:** Xiulin Ruan  
**Contact:** asisto@purdue.edu

**Edgar Solomonik**  
University of California, Berkeley  
Computer Science  
**Advisor:** James Demmel  
**Practicum:** Argonne National Laboratory  
**Contact:** solomonik@berkeley.edu

**Zachary Ulissi**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Chemical Engineering  
**Advisor:** Michael Strano  
**Contact:** zulissi@gmail.com

The logo for the 1st Year Fellows program, featuring a large white number '1' on a dark red background, with the text '1ST YEAR FELLOWS' to its right.

**Jason Bender**  
University of Minnesota  
Hypersonic Computational Fluid Dynamics  
**Advisor:** Graham Candler  
**Contact:** jbender73@gmail.com

**Rogelio Cardona-Rivera**  
North Carolina State University  
Artificial Intelligence  
**Advisor:** R. Michael Young  
**Contact:** recardon@ncsu.edu

**Daniel Dandurand**  
University of California, Berkeley  
Astrophysics/Cosmology  
**Advisor:** Eliot Quataert  
**Contact:** ddandur@berkeley.edu

**Omar Hafez**  
University of California, Davis  
Structural Mechanics  
**Advisor:** Yannis Dafalias  
**Contact:** omhafez@ucdavis.edu

**Maxwell Hutchinson**  
University of Chicago  
Physics  
**Contact:** maxhutch@gmail.com

**Curtis Lee**  
Duke University  
Computational Mechanics  
**Advisor:** John Dolbow  
**Contact:** calee181@gmail.com

**Sarah Loos**  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Verification of Hybrid Systems  
**Advisor:** Andre Platzer  
**Contact:** sloos@cs.cmu.edu

**Heather Mayes**  
Northwestern University  
Chemical Engineering  
**Advisor:** Linda Broadbelt  
**Contact:** hmeyes@u.northwestern.edu

**Jarrod McClean**  
Harvard University  
Chemical Physics  
**Advisor:** Alan Aspuru-Guzik  
**Contact:** jmclean@fas.harvard.edu

**Robert Parrish**  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Theoretical Chemistry  
**Advisor:** David Sherrill  
**Contact:** robparrish@gatech.edu

**Aurora Pribram-Jones**  
University of California, Irvine  
Theoretical Chemistry  
**Advisor:** Kieron Burke  
**Contact:** apribram@uci.edu

**Alexander Rattner**  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Mechanical Engineering  
**Advisor:** Srinivas Garimella  
**Contact:** alex.rattner@gatech.edu

**Phoebe Robinson**  
Harvard University  
Earth Science  
**Advisor:** Brendan Meade  
**Contact:** phoebemaherobinson@gmail.com

**Michael Rosario**  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
Organismic and Evolutionary Biology  
**Advisor:** Sheila Patek  
**Contact:** mrosario@bio.umass.edu

**Hansi Singh**  
University of Washington  
Geophysics  
**Advisor:** Cecilia Bitz  
**Contact:** hansiatatmos.washington.edu

**Chris Smillie**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Biology, Computer Science and Bioengineering  
**Advisor:** Eric Alm  
**Contact:** csmillie@mit.edu

**Joshua Vermaas**  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Biophysics  
**Advisor:** Emad Tajkhorshid  
**Contact:** vermaas2@illinois.edu

**Matthew Zahr**  
Stanford University  
Computational and Mathematical Engineering  
**Advisor:** Charbel Farhat  
**Contact:** bokie89@sbcglobal.net

# ALUMNI DIRECTORY

## Matthew Adams

University of Washington  
Computational Electromagnetics  
Fellowship Years: 2007-2008

## Joshua Adelman

University of California, Berkeley  
Biophysics  
Fellowship Years: 2005-2009  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Fellow,  
University of Pittsburgh

## Zlatan Aksamija

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Nanostructured Semiconductor Thermoelectrics  
Fellowship Years: 2005-2009  
Current Status: Computing Innovation  
Postdoctoral Fellowship, NTG Group,  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

## Bree Aldridge

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Systems Biology/Computational Biology  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Research  
Fellow, Harvard School of Public Health

## Erik Allen

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Molecular Simulation  
Fellowship Years: 2004-2008

## Marcelo Alvarez

University of Texas  
Astrophysics  
Fellowship Years: 2001-2005  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics  
and Cosmology, Stanford University

## Asohan Amarasingham

Brown University  
Theoretical Neuroscience  
Fellowship Years: 1998-2002  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Fellow,  
Center for Molecular and Behavioral  
Neuroscience, Rutgers University

## Kristopher Andersen

University of California, Davis  
Computational Materials Science  
Fellowship Years: 2001-2005  
Current Status: HPTi

## Matthew Anderson

University of Texas  
Numerical Relativity, Magnetohydrodynamics,  
Relativistic High-Performance Computing  
Fellowship Years: 2000-2004  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Louisiana State University

## Jordan Atlas

Cornell University  
Computational Biology  
Fellowship Years: 2005-2009  
Current Status: Software Development  
Engineer, Microsoft

## Teresa Bailey

Texas A&M University  
Deterministic Transport Theory  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory

## Allison Baker

University of Colorado  
Iterative Methods for Linear Systems, Parallel  
Computing, Software for Scientific Computing  
Fellowship Years: 1999-2003  
Current Status: Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory

## Devin Balkcom

Carnegie Mellon University  
Robotics  
Fellowship Years: 2000-2004  
Current Status: Faculty, Dartmouth College

## Michael Barad

University of California, Davis  
Computational Fluid Dynamics  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: NASA Ames Research Center

## Jaydeep Bardhan

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Numerical Methods for Molecular Analysis  
and Design  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: Assistant Professor,  
Molecular Biophysics and Physiology,  
Rush University

## Edward Barragy

University of Texas  
Engineering Mechanics  
Fellowship Years: 1991-1993  
Current Status: Intel Corporation

## William Barry

Carnegie Mellon University  
Computational Mechanics,  
Engineering Education  
Fellowship Years: 1994-1998  
Current Status: Associate Professor,  
Trine University

## Paul Bauman

University of Texas  
Multiscale Modeling, Error Estimation,  
Automatic Adaptivity, Validation,  
Uncertainty Quantification  
Fellowship Years: 2003-2007  
Current Status: Research Associate,  
University of Texas at Austin

## Martin Bazant

Harvard University  
Applied Mathematics, Fluid Mechanics,  
Electrochemical Systems  
Fellowship Years: 1992-1996  
Current Status: Associate Professor,  
Department of Mechanical Engineering,  
Stanford University

## Mark Berrill

Colorado State University  
Computational Engineering and  
Energy Sciences  
Fellowship Years: 2006-2010  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Eugene P. Wigner Fellowship, Oak Ridge  
National Laboratory

## Kathleen Beutel

University of Minnesota  
Computational Chemistry  
Fellowship Years: 2009-2010

## Bonnie Beyer

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Avionics for Business and Regional Aircraft  
Fellowship Years: 1991-1995  
Current Status: Technical Project Manager,  
Rockwell Collins

## Arnab Bhattacharyya

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computer Science  
Fellowship Years: 2006-2010  
Current Status: Graduate Student

## Mary Bidy

University of Wisconsin  
Engineering  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: British Petroleum

## Edwin Bloesch

University of Florida  
Aerospace Engineering  
Fellowship Years: 1991-1994  
Current Status: Technical Lead,  
CFD-FASTRAN

## Nawaf Bou-Rabee

California Institute of Technology  
Monte Carlo Methods, Numerical Solution of  
Stochastic Differential Equations,  
Molecular Dynamics  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: Courant Instructor,  
New York University

## Jenelle Bray

California Institute of Technology  
Computational Structural Biology  
Fellowship Years: 2006-2009

## J. Dean Brederson

University of Utah  
Synergistic Data Display  
Fellowship Year: 1996

## Paul Bunch

Purdue University  
Chemical Engineering  
Fellowship Years: 1994-1997  
Current Status: Merck & Co. Inc.

## Jeffrey Butera

North Carolina State University  
Mathematics  
Fellowship Years: 1993-1997  
Current Status: Administrative Computing,  
Hampshire College

## Michael Bybee

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Hydrodynamic Simulation of Colloidal  
Suspensions  
Fellowship Years: 2004-2008  
Current Status: Senior Engineer,  
Gamma Technologies Inc.

## Brandoch Calef

University of California, Berkeley  
Imaging Research  
Fellowship Years: 1996-2000  
Current Status: Scientist, Boeing

## Patrick Canupp

Stanford University  
Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering  
Fellowship Years: 1991-1995  
Current Status: Chief Aerodynamicist,  
Joe Gibbs Racing

## Christopher Carey

University of Wisconsin  
Plasma Physics  
Fellowship Years: 2005-2009  
Current Status: Scientific Staff, MIT  
Lincoln Laboratory

## Kent Carlson

Florida State University  
Solidification of Cast Metals  
Fellowship Years: 1991-1995  
Current Status: Assistant Research  
Engineer/Adjunct Assistant Professor,  
University of Iowa

## Nathan Carstens

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Simulation of BWR Fuel  
Fellowship Years: 2001-2004  
Current Status: AREVA

## Edward Chao

Princeton University  
Computed Tomography/Radiation Therapy  
Fellowship Years: 1992-1995  
Current Status: Scientist, TomoTherapy

## Jarrod Chapman

University of California, Berkeley  
Whole Genome Shotgun Assembly,  
Computational Genomics  
Fellowship Years: 1999-2003  
Current Status: Postdoctoral Fellow,  
Computational Genomics Program,  
DOE Joint Genome Institute

## Eric Charlton

University of Michigan  
Aerodynamics and Computational  
Fluid Dynamics  
Fellowship Years: 1992-1996  
Current Status: Lockheed Martin  
Aeronautics Company

## Michael Chiu

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Mechanical Engineering  
Fellowship Years: 1992-1996  
Current Status: Engineering Manager,  
Teradyne

## Kevin Chu

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computer Science and Engineering,  
Applied Math, Artificial Intelligence,  
High-Performance Computing  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2005  
Current Status: Research Scientist/  
Consultant, Serendipity Research; CEO,  
Velexi Corporation

## Julianne Chung

Emory University  
Computational Science, Applied Mathematics,  
Biomedical Imaging  
Fellowship Years: 2006-2009  
Current Status: NSF Mathematical  
Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellow,  
University of Maryland

## Kristine Cochran

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Computational Mechanics, Material Modeling,  
Fracture Mechanics  
Fellowship Years: 2002-2006  
Current Status: Engineering Researcher,  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory

## Joshua Coe

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Chemical Physics, Electronically Excited  
States, Monte Carlo Methodology  
Fellowship Years: 2001-2002  
Current Status: Los Alamos  
National Laboratory

**James Comer**

North Carolina State University  
Computational Fluid Mechanics, Flow in  
Absorbent Structures

**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995

**Current Status:** Technology Leader,  
Modeling and Simulation, Family Care,  
Procter & Gamble

**Gavin Conant**

University of New Mexico  
Molecular Evolution/Bioinformatics

**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004

**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
Animal Sciences and Informatics,  
University of Missouri, Columbia

**William Conley**

Purdue University  
Nonlinear Mechanics of  
Nano-Mechanical Systems

**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2008

**Current Status:** Engineer, Crane  
Naval Warfare Center

**Natalie Cookson**

University of California, San Diego  
Systems Biodynamics and  
Computational Biology

**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
University of California, San Diego

**Ethan Coon**

Columbia University  
Computational Geophysics

**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Los Alamos National Laboratory

**John Costello**

University of Arizona  
Applied Mathematics

**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2002

**Current Status:** Software Engineer, Microsoft

**Nathan Crane**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Computational Mechanics

**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2002

**Current Status:** Sandia National  
Laboratories – New Mexico

**Stephen Cronen-Townsend**

Cornell University  
Computational Materials Physics

**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995

**Current Status:** Drupal Developer,  
Cronen-Townsend Consulting

**Robert Cruise**

Indiana University  
Computational Physics

**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2001

**Current Status:** Department of Defense

**Aron Cummings**

Arizona State University  
Nanoscale Electronics

**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Sandia National Laboratories – California

**Joseph Czyzyk**

Northwestern University  
Industrial Engineering and Management

**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1994

**Current Status:** Business Intelligence  
Analyst, Central Michigan University  
Research Corporation

**Tal Danino**

University of California, San Diego  
Dynamics of Systems Biology

**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Boston University/Massachusetts  
Institute of Technology

**William Daughton**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Plasma Physics

**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1996

**Current Status:** Staff Scientist,  
Los Alamos National Laboratory

**Gregory Davidson**

University of Michigan  
Nuclear Engineering and  
Computational Science

**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006

**Current Status:** Oak Ridge  
National Laboratory

**Jimena Davis**

North Carolina State University  
Uncertainty Quantification, Physiologically  
Based Pharmacokinetic Modeling,  
Risk Assessment

**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow,  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

**Jack Deslippe**

University of California, Berkeley  
Computational Condensed Matter Theory

**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010

**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Mark DiBattista**

Columbia University  
Computational Fluid Dynamics

**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994

**John Dolbow**

Northwestern University  
Computational Methods for Evolving  
Discontinuities and Interfaces

**Fellowship Years:** 1997-1999

**Current Status:** Yoh Family Professor,  
Duke University

**Laura Dominick**

Florida Atlantic University  
Computational Electromagnetics/  
Electromagnetic Performance of Materials

**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1997

**Current Status:** Large Military Engines  
Division, Pratt & Whitney

**Michael Driscoll**

Boston University  
Bioinformatics and Systems Biology

**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006

**Current Status:** Dataspora Inc.

**Jeffrey Drocco**

Princeton University  
Biophysics and Computation

**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Los Alamos National Laboratory

**Brian Dumont**

University of Michigan  
Aerospace Engineering

**Fellowship Year:** 1994

**Current Status:** Airflow Sciences Corporation

**Amanda Duncan**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Electrical Engineering

**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995

**Current Status:** Senior Staff Engineer,  
Intel Corporation

**Mary Dunlop**

California Institute of Technology  
Bioengineering, Synthetic Biology, Biofuels,  
Dynamical Systems

**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006

**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
University of Vermont

**Lewis Dursi**

University of Chicago  
Computational Astrophysics, Large-Scale  
Simulation, Hydrodynamics, Combustion,  
Magnetohydrodynamics

**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003

**Current Status:** Senior Research  
Associate, CITA

**Ryan Elliott**

University of Michigan  
Shape Memory Alloys and Active Materials

**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004

**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
Department of Aerospace Engineering  
and Mechanics, University of Minnesota

**Thomas Epperly**

University of Wisconsin  
Component Technology for  
High-Performance Computing

**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995

**Current Status:** Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory

**Susanne Essig**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Aeronautics and Astronautics,  
Computational Turbulence

**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2002

**Annette Evangelisti**

University of New Mexico  
Computational Molecular Biology

**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
University of New Mexico

**John Evans**

University of Texas  
Computational and Applied Mathematics

**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010

**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Matt Fago**

California Institute of Technology  
Computational Structural Mechanics

**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2003

**Current Status:** Research Scientist

**Michael Falk**

University of California, Santa Barbara  
Stress-Driven Materials Processes Including  
Fracture, Deformation and Semiconductor  
Crystal Growth

**Fellowship Years:** 1995-1998

**Current Status:** Associate Professor,  
Materials Science and Engineering,  
Johns Hopkins University

**Matthew Farthing**

University of North Carolina  
Flow and Transport Phenomena in  
Porous Media

**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2001

**Current Status:** Research Hydraulic  
Engineer, Coastal and Hydraulics  
Laboratory, U.S. Army Corps of  
Engineers Engineer Research and  
Development Center

**Michael Feldmann**

California Institute of Technology  
Computational Finance

**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2002

**Current Status:** Executive Vice President,  
Quantitative Research, Walleye Trading  
Software LLC

**Krzysztof Fidkowski**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Fluid Dynamics

**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007

**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
Aerospace Engineering, University  
of Michigan

**Piotr Fidkowski**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Structural/Computational Engineering

**Fellowship Years:** 2009-2011

**Current Status:** Software Engineer,  
Google Inc.

**Stephen Fink**

University of California, San Diego  
Computer Science

**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1998

**Current Status:** IBM

**Robert Fischer**

Harvard University  
Security, Privacy, Mobile Agents,  
Software Engineering

**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1998

**Current Status:** Quant

**Jasmine Foo**

Brown University  
Applied Mathematics

**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow,  
Harvard University

**Ashlee Ford**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Modeling of Drug Delivery, Numerical Methods  
for Partial Differential Equations

**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010

**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Gregory Ford**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Chemical Engineering

**Fellowship Year:** 1993

**Robin Friedman**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational and Systems Biology

**Fellowship Years:** 2007-2010

**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow,  
Institut Pasteur

**Oliver Fringer**

Stanford University  
Parallel Coastal Ocean Modeling

**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2001

**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
Stanford University

**Kenneth Gage**

University of Pittsburgh  
*Molecular Imaging, Computational Fluid  
Dynamics Design of Artificial Organs*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2002  
**Current Status:** Radiology Resident  
(Research Track), Johns Hopkins  
Medical Institutions

**Nouvelle Gebhart**

University of New Mexico  
*Chemistry*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2003  
**Current Status:** Deceased

**Sommer Gentry**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Optimization*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
Mathematics, U.S. Naval Academy

**Charles Gerlach**

Northwestern University  
*Finite Elements, High Strain Rate  
Solid Mechanics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1995-1999  
**Current Status:** Southwest  
Research Institute

**Timothy Germann**

Harvard University  
*Physical Chemistry*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1995  
**Current Status:** Staff Member, Los Alamos  
National Laboratory

**Christopher Gesh**

Texas A&M University  
*Computational Transport Theory, Nuclear  
Reactor Analysis, Nuclear Non-Proliferation*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1997  
**Current Status:** Pacific Northwest  
National Laboratory

**Matthew Giamporcaro**

Boston University  
*Adaptive Algorithms, Artificial Neural Networks*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2000  
**Current Status:** Engineering Consultant,  
GCI Inc.

**Ahna Girshick**

University of California, Berkeley  
*Computational Models of Vision  
and Perception*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
University of California, Berkeley

**Kevin Glass**

University of Oregon  
*Computational Ecology*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-2000  
**Current Status:** Scientist, Molecular  
Science Computing Facility,  
Environmental Molecular Sciences  
Laboratory, Pacific Northwest  
National Laboratory

**Larisa Goldmints**

Carnegie Mellon University  
*Structural and Computational Mechanics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2001  
**Current Status:** General Electric;  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

**William Gooding**

Purdue University  
*Chemical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1994

**Kristen Grauman**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Computer Vision, Machine Learning*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Clare Boothe Luce  
Assistant Professor, Department of  
Computer Science, University of Texas  
at Austin

**Corey Graves**

North Carolina State University  
*Pervasive Computing/Image Processing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-2000  
**Current Status:** Business Owner, Scholars'  
Advocate; Assistant Professor, North  
Carolina A&T State University

**Michael Greminger**

University of Minnesota  
*Mechanical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2005  
**Current Status:** Seagate Technology

**Noel Gres**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Electrical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2001

**Boyce Griffith**

New York University  
*Mathematical Modeling and Computer  
Simulation in Cardiac and  
Cardiovascular Physiology*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor of  
Medicine, Leon H. Charney Division of  
Cardiology, New York University School  
of Medicine

**Eric Grimme**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Electrical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1997  
**Current Status:** Intel Corporation

**John Guidi**

University of Maryland  
*Computer Science*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1997  
**Current Status:** High School Math Teacher

**Brian Gunney**

University of Michigan  
*Computational Fluid Dynamics, Multi-Physics  
Simulations, Adaptive Mesh Refinement,  
Parallel Computing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory

**Aric Hagberg**

University of Arizona  
*Applied Mathematics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994  
**Current Status:** Staff Member, Los Alamos  
National Laboratory

**Glenn Hammond**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Multiphase Flow and Multicomponent  
Biogeochemical Transport,  
Parallel Computation*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** Scientist III, Pacific  
Northwest National Laboratory

**Jeff Hammond**

University of Chicago  
*Supercomputing, Computational Chemistry,  
Programming Models, Verification  
and Validation*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Director's Postdoctoral  
Fellow, Argonne Leadership  
Computing Facility

**Jeff Haney**

Texas A&M University  
*Physical Oceanography*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** IT Manager, Dynacon Inc.

**Heath Hanshaw**

University of Michigan  
*High Energy Density Physics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Sandia National  
Laboratories – New Mexico

**Rellen Hardtke**

University of Wisconsin  
*Particle Astrophysics (Neutrinos from  
Gamma-Ray Bursts), Gender and Science*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2002  
**Current Status:** Associate Professor,  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

**Kristi Harris**

University of Maryland, Baltimore County  
*Theoretical Solid State Physics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Analyst, Department  
of Defense

**Owen Hehmeyer**

Princeton University  
*Chemical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** ExxonMobil Upstream  
Research Corporation

**Eric Held**

University of Wisconsin  
*Plasma/Fusion Theory*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1995-1999  
**Current Status:** Associate Professor,  
Physics Department, Utah  
State University

**Asegun Henry**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Renewable Energy, Atomistic Level Heat  
Transfer, First Principles Electronic  
Structure Calculations*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Fellow, Advanced  
Research Projects Agency – Energy,  
U.S. Department of Energy

**Judith Hill**

Carnegie Mellon University  
*Computational Fluid Dynamics,  
Partial Differential Equation-  
Constrained Optimization*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** Computational  
Mathematics, Oak Ridge  
National Laboratory

**Charles Hindman**

University of Colorado  
*Aerospace Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** Air Force Research  
Laboratory, Space Vehicles Directorate

**Jeffrey Hittinger**

University of Michigan  
*Computational Plasma Physics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-2000  
**Current Status:** Staff Member, Center for  
Applied Scientific Computing, Lawrence  
Livermore National Laboratory

**Gordon Hogenson**

University of Washington  
*Physical Chemistry*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Technical Writer, Microsoft

**Daniel Horner**

University of California, Berkeley  
*Breakup Processes, Quantum  
Molecular Dynamics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Research Analyst,  
Advanced Technology and Systems  
Analysis Division, Center for  
Naval Analysis

**William Humphrey**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Physics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994  
**Current Status:** Numerix LLC

**Jason Hunt**

University of Michigan  
*Aerospace Engineering and  
Scientific Computing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** General Dynamics –  
Advanced Information Systems

**E. McKay Hyde**

California Institute of Technology  
*Efficient, High-Order Integral Equation  
Methods in Computational  
Electromagnetics and Acoustics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2002  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
Computational and Applied Mathematics,  
Rice University

**Eugene Ingerman**

University of California, Berkeley  
*Applied Mathematics/Numerical Methods*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2001  
**Current Status:** Senior Scientist,  
General Electric

**Ahmed Ismail**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Molecular Simulations and  
Multiscale Modeling*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Junior Professor,  
Mechanical Engineering, RWTH  
Aachen University

**Amber Jackson**

University of North Carolina  
*Applied Mathematics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008  
**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Nickolas Jovanovic**

Yale University  
*Preconditioned Iterative Solution Techniques  
in Boundary Element Analysis*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994  
**Current Status:** Founding Associate  
Professor of Systems Engineering,  
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

**Yan Karklin**  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Computational Neuroscience  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher,  
Center for Neural Science/Howard Hughes  
Medical Institute, New York University

**Richard Katz**  
Columbia University  
Geodynamics, Coupled Fluid-Solid Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Academic Fellow,  
Department of Earth Science, University  
of Oxford

**Benjamin Keen**  
University of Michigan  
Conservation Laws in Complex Geometries  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** IDA Center for  
Computing Sciences

**Peter Kekenes-Huskey**  
California Institute of Technology  
Computational Chemistry and Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2007  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Scholar,  
McCammon Group, University of  
California, San Diego

**Jeremy Kepner**  
Princeton University  
High-Performance Embedded Computing  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Senior Technical Staff,  
MIT Lincoln Laboratory

**David Ketcheson**  
University of Washington  
Applied Mathematics: Numerical Analysis  
and Scientific Computing  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2009  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor,  
King Abdullah University of Science  
and Technology

**Sven Khatri**  
California Institute of Technology  
Electrical Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Honeywell Contractor

**Jeffrey Kilpatrick**  
Rice University  
Computer Science  
**Fellowship Years:** 2008-2010  
**Current Status:** Software Development  
Engineer, Microsoft

**Benjamin Kirk**  
University of Texas  
Aerospace Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2004  
**Current Status:** NASA Johnson  
Space Center

**Bonnie Kirkpatrick**  
University of California, Berkeley  
Computer Science  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008  
**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Kevin Kohlstedt**  
Northwestern University  
Coulomb Interactions in Soft Materials  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Research Fellow, Chemical  
Engineering, University of Michigan

**Justin Koo**  
University of Michigan  
Electric Propulsion Modeling and Simulation  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Engineer, Air Force  
Research Laboratory, Edwards Air  
Force Base

**Michael Kowalok**  
University of Wisconsin  
Monte Carlo Methods for Radiation Therapy  
Treatment Planning  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Medical Physicist,  
Waukesha Memorial Hospital

**Yury Krongauz**  
Northwestern University  
Theoretical and Applied Mechanics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** BlackRock

**Eric Lee**  
Rutgers University  
Mechanical Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** Engineer, Northrop  
Grumman Corporation

**Miller Lee**  
University of Pennsylvania  
Computational Biology, Developmental Genetics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Associate,  
Yale University

**Seung Lee**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Molecular Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Management Consultant,  
Boston Consulting Group (Seoul Office)

**Jack Lemmon**  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Mechanical Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1994  
**Current Status:** Medtronic Inc.

**Mary Ann Leung**  
University of Washington  
Computational Physical Chemistry  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Program Manager,  
Krell Institute

**Brian Levine**  
Cornell University  
Transport Systems  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Jeremy Lewi**  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Neuroengineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Engineering  
Scientist, Intellisys

**Benjamin Lewis**  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006

**Lars Liden**  
Boston University  
Educational Tools for Special Needs Children  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1998  
**Current Status:** Chief Technical Officer,  
TeachTown LLC; Software Technology  
Manager, University of Washington

**Alex Lindblad**  
University of Washington  
Computational Solid Mechanics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Senior Member of  
Technical Staff, Sandia National  
Laboratories — California

**Tasha Lopez**  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Chemical Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2001  
**Current Status:** Sales Specialist,  
IBM Cognos Business Analytics

**Christie Lundy**  
Missouri University of Science and Technology  
Physics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1994  
**Current Status:** Missouri State Government

**William Marganski**  
Boston University  
Computational Biology, Imaging, Modeling  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2002  
**Current Status:** Research Scientist,  
Systems Biology Department, Harvard  
Medical School

**David Markowitz**  
Princeton University  
Computational Neurobiology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009

**Daniel Martin**  
University of California, Berkeley  
Adaptive Mesh Refinement Algorithm  
and Software Development  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory

**Marcus Martin**  
University of Minnesota  
Monte Carlo Molecular Simulation  
(Algorithm Development Focus)  
**Fellowship Years:** 1997-1999  
**Current Status:** Director, Useful Bias Inc.

**Randall McDermott**  
University of Utah  
Numerical Methods for Large-Eddy Simulation  
of Turbulent Reacting Flows  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Staff Scientist,  
National Institute of Standards and  
Technology (NIST)

**Matthew McGrath**  
University of Minnesota  
Computational Aerosol Physics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2007  
**Current Status:** University Researcher,  
University of Helsinki (Finland)

**Richard McLaughlin**  
Princeton University  
Fluid Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1994  
**Current Status:** Professor of Mathematics,  
University of North Carolina at  
Chapel Hill

**Matthew McNenly**  
University of Michigan  
Rarefied Gas Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Staff, Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory

**Lisa Mesaros**  
University of Michigan  
Aerospace Engineering and  
Scientific Computing  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995  
**Current Status:** Business Manager,  
Fluent Inc.

**Richard Mills**  
College of William and Mary  
Scientific Computing  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2004  
**Current Status:** Computational Scientist,  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory

**Julian Mintseris**  
Boston University  
Computational Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow,  
Harvard Medical School

**Erik Monsen**  
Stanford University  
Entrepreneurship, Organization Development  
and Change  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1993  
**Current Status:** Senior Research Fellow,  
Max Planck Institute of Economics  
(Jena, Germany)

**Brian Moore**  
North Carolina State University  
Computational Simulation of Nuclear and  
Thermal-Hydraulic Processes in Boiling  
Water Nuclear Reactors  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1995  
**Current Status:** Leader, Methods  
and Software Development Center  
of Excellence, GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy

**Nathaniel Morgan**  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Computational Fluid Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2005  
**Current Status:** Los Alamos  
National Laboratory

**James Morrow**  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Sensor-Based Control of Robotic Systems  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1995  
**Current Status:** Principal Member of  
Technical Staff, Sandia National  
Laboratories — New Mexico

**Sarah Moussa**  
University of California, Berkeley  
Machine Learning and Genomics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2005  
**Current Status:** Senior Software  
Engineer, Google Inc.

**Michael Mysinger**  
Stanford University  
Molecular Docking Solvation Models and  
G Protein-Coupled Receptor Docking  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-2000  
**Current Status:** University of California,  
San Francisco

**Heather Netzloff**  
Iowa State University  
Quantum/Theoretical/Computational Chemistry  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Community College Math  
Instructor and Tutor

**Elijah Newren**

University of Utah  
Computational Biofluid Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Staff Member, Sandia National Laboratories – New Mexico

**Pauline Ng**

University of Washington  
Computational Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2002  
**Current Status:** Group Leader, Genome Institute of Singapore

**Diem-Phuong Nguyen**

University of Utah  
Computational Fluid Dynamics (Combustion and Reaction)  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** Staff, University of Utah

**Debra Nielsen**

Colorado State University  
Civil Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1996

**Oaz Nir**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2009

**Joyce Noah-Vanhoucke**

Stanford University  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2003  
**Current Status:** Scientist, Archimedes

**Peter Norgaard**

Princeton University  
Computational Plasma Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Ph.D. (ABD) Candidate, Princeton University

**Catherine Norman**

Northwestern University  
Computational Fluid Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Research Analyst, Center for Naval Analyses

**Gregory Novak**

University of California, Santa Cruz  
Theoretical Astrophysics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow, Princeton University

**Christopher Dehmen**

University of Memphis/University of Tennessee  
Health Science Center  
High-Performance Computing in Computational Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 1999-2003  
**Current Status:** Senior Research Scientist, Computational Biology and Bioinformatics Group, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

**Steven Parker**

University of Utah  
Computational Science  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1997  
**Current Status:** Research Assistant Professor, Computer Science, University of Utah

**Joel Parriott**

University of Michigan  
Elliptical Galaxies, Computational Fluid Dynamics, Parallel Computing  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1996  
**Current Status:** Program Examiner, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President

**Ian Parrish**

Princeton University  
Computational Astrophysics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2007  
**Current Status:** Einstein/Chandra Postdoctoral Fellow, University of California, Berkeley

**Tod Pascal**

California Institute of Technology  
Physical Chemistry  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007

**Virginia Pasour**

North Carolina State University  
Physical/Biological Modeling, Modeling of Epidemiological Dynamics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-1999  
**Current Status:** Program Manager, Biomathematics, Army Research Office

**Christina Payne**

Vanderbilt University  
Molecular Dynamics Simulations  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher, National Renewable Energy Laboratory

**Chris Penland**

Duke University  
Computational and Statistical Modeling of Pharmacokinetic/Pharmacodynamic Systems for Biopharma  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1997  
**Current Status:** Expert Modeler, Pharmacometrics – Modeling and Simulation, Novartis Institutes for Biomedical Research

**Carolyn Phillips**

University of Michigan  
Applied Physics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**James Phillips**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Parallel Molecular Dynamics Simulation of Large Biomolecular Systems  
**Fellowship Years:** 1995-1999  
**Current Status:** Senior Research Programmer, University of Illinois

**Todd Postma**

University of California, Berkeley  
Nuclear Engineering, Computational Neutronics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1998  
**Current Status:** Director of Engineering, Totality

**David Potere**

Princeton University  
Demography/Remote Sensing  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008  
**Current Status:** Consultant, Boston Consulting Group

**Rick Propp**

University of California, Berkeley  
Computational Methods for Flow Through Porous Media  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Senior Software Engineer, WorkDay

**Alejandro Quezada**

University of California, Berkeley  
Geophysics  
**Fellowship Year:** 1997

**Catherine Quist**

Cornell University  
Bioinformatics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2004  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow, University of Michigan Cancer Center

**Mala Radhakrishnan**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Computational Drug and Biomolecular Design and Analysis  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2007  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Wellesley College

**Emma Rainey**

California Institute of Technology  
Planetary Sciences  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2006  
**Current Status:** Arete Associates

**Nathan Rau**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Civil Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2001  
**Current Status:** Civil Engineer, Hanson Professional Services

**Clifton Richardson**

Cornell University  
Physics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995

**Christopher Rinderspacher**

University of Georgia  
Inverse Design, Quantum Chemistry  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Army Research Laboratory

**John Rittner**

Northwestern University  
Grain Boundary Segregation  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995  
**Current Status:** Chicago Board Options Exchange

**Courtney Roby**

University of Colorado  
History of Science in the Ancient World  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2003  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, Cornell University

**Alejandro Rodriguez**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Nanophotonics, Casimir Effect  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow, Harvard University

**David Rogers**

University of Cincinnati  
Computational Physical Chemistry  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2009  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Sandia National Laboratories – New Mexico

**David Ropp**

University of Arizona  
Adaptive Radar Array Processing  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1995  
**Current Status:** Senior Scientist, SAIC

**Robin Rosenfeld**

Scipps Research Institute  
Computational Biophysics  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-1997  
**Current Status:** ActiveSight

**Mark Rudner**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Theoretical Condensed Matter Physics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow

**Ariella Sasson**

Rutgers University  
Computational Biology and Molecular Biophysics  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Bioinformatics Specialist, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

**David Schmidt**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Communications  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Epic Systems

**Samuel Schofield**

University of Arizona  
Computational Fluid Dynamics, Hydrodynamic Stability, Interface Methods  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Scientist, T-5, Los Alamos National Laboratory

**Christopher Schroeder**

University of California, San Diego  
Theoretical Particle Physics, Lattice Gauge Theory  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2009  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher

**Robert Sedgewick**

University of California, Santa Barbara  
Computational Biology  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2003  
**Current Status:** Research Associate, Carnegie Mellon University

**Michael Sekora**

Princeton University  
Numerical Analysis, Godunov Methods, Multiscale Algorithms, Asymptotic Preserving Methods  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Laurion Capital

**Marc Serre**

University of North Carolina  
Environmental Stochastic Modeling and Mapping  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-1999  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, University of North Carolina

**Jason Sese**

Stanford University  
Hydrogen Storage on Carbon Nanotubes  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2005  
**Current Status:** Chemical Engineer, Environmental Consulting Company

**Elsie Simpson Pierce**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Nuclear Engineering  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1993  
**Current Status:** Computer Scientist, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

**Amoolya Singh**

University of California, Berkeley  
*Dynamics and Evolution of Stress Response Networks*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Scientist, Amryis Biotechnologies

**Melinda Sirman**

University of Texas  
*Engineering Mechanics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1996  
**Current Status:** At Home

**Benjamin Smith**

Harvard University  
*Cloud and Mobile Computing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Software Engineer

**Steven Smith**

North Carolina State University  
*Chemical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994  
**Current Status:** Invista

**Benjamin Souday**

Princeton University  
*Dimensionality Reduction/Computational Nonlinear Dynamics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2006-2010  
**Current Status:** Goldman Sachs

**Eric Sorin**

Stanford University  
*Simulation Studies of Biomolecular Assembly and Conformational Dynamics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2004  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, Computational and Physical Chemistry, California State University, Long Beach

**Scott Stanley**

University of California, San Diego  
*Large Scale Data Analysis, Search Engine Technology, Fluid Mechanics, Turbulence Modeling*  
**Fellowship Year:** 1994  
**Current Status:** Vice President of Engineering, Buyful

**Samuel Stechmann**

New York University  
*Applied Math, Atmospheric Science*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, University of Wisconsin-Madison

**James Strzelec**

Stanford University  
*Computational Mathematics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994

**Rajeev Surati**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1995-1997  
**Current Status:** Scalable Display Technologies

**Laura Swiler**

Carnegie Mellon University  
*Reliability Analysis, Prognostics, Network Vulnerability Analysis, Combinatorial Optimization*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994  
**Current Status:** Principal Member of Technical Staff, Sandia National Laboratories – New Mexico

**Shilpa Talwar**

Stanford University  
*Array Signal Processing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1994  
**Current Status:** Senior Research Scientist, Intel Corporation

**Brian Taylor**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Detonation, Shock Waves, Reacting Flow*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** National Research Council Postdoctoral Researcher, Naval Research Laboratory

**Mayya Tokman**

California Institute of Technology  
*Numerical Methods, Scientific Computing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-2000  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, University of California, Merced

**William Triffo**

Rice University  
*Biophysical Imaging, 3-D Electron Microscopy*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** Graduate Student

**Mario Trujillo**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Two-Phase Flow, Computational Fluid Mechanics, Atomization Phenomena*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2000  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, Mechanical Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison

**Obioma Uche**

Princeton University  
*Molecular Simulation, Statistical Mechanics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Research Associate, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

**Anton Van der Ven**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*First Principles Modeling of Thermodynamic and Kinetic Properties of Solids*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-2000  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, Department of Materials Science, University of Michigan

**Michael Veilleux**

Cornell University  
*Computational Fracture Mechanics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008  
**Current Status:** Technical Staff Member, Sandia National Laboratories – California

**Rajesh Venkataramani**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Chemical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1995-1999  
**Current Status:** Goldman Sachs

**Stephen Vinay III**

Carnegie Mellon University  
*Application of Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics to Problems in Fluid Mechanics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2000  
**Current Status:** Manager, T&H Analysis Methods Development, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory

**Joshua Waterfall**

Cornell University  
*Molecular Biology*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher, Cornell University

**Philip Weeber**

University of North Carolina  
*Interest Rate Derivative Consulting*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1994-1996  
**Current Status:** Chatham Financial

**Adam Weller**

Princeton University  
*Chemical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2002

**Gregory Whiffen**

Cornell University  
*Deep Space Trajectory and Mission Design, Low-Thrust Mission Design, Nonlinear Optimal Control*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1995  
**Current Status:** Senior Engineer, Outer Planets Mission Design Group, NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory

**Collin Wick**

University of Minnesota  
*Computational Chemistry*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2000-2003  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, Louisiana Tech University

**James Wiggs**

University of Washington  
*Physical Chemistry*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1991-1994  
**Current Status:** Novum Millennium

**Stefan Wild**

Cornell University  
*Operations Research*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2005-2008  
**Current Status:** Assistant Computational Mathematician, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory

**Jon Wilkening**

University of California, Berkeley  
*Numerical Analysis, Computational Physics, Partial Differential Equations, Scientific Computing*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1997-2001  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, University of California, Berkeley

**Glenn Williams**

University of North Carolina  
*Applied and Computational Mathematics, Computational Biology, Environmental Modeling*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Old Dominion University

**Eric Williford**

Florida State University  
*Meteorology*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1996  
**Current Status:** Weather Predict Inc.

**Michael Wolf**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
*Computer Science (Parallel and Combinatorial Scientific Computing)*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher, Sandia National Laboratories – New Mexico

**Matthew Wolinsky**

Duke University  
*Computational Geoscience*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2001-2005  
**Current Status:** Research Scientist, Shell International Exploration and Production

**Allan Wollaber**

University of Michigan  
*Nuclear Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008  
**Current Status:** Los Alamos National Laboratory

**Brandon Wood**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Computational Materials Science*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2003-2007  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Fellow, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

**Lee Worden**

Princeton University  
*Applied Mathematics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1998-2002  
**Current Status:** S. V. Ciriacy-Wantrup Postdoctoral Fellow, Environmental Studies, Policy and Management, University of California, Berkeley

**Michael Wu**

University of California, Berkeley  
*Social Analytics, Graph and Social Network Analysis, Predictive Modeling, High Dim Data Visualization*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2002-2006  
**Current Status:** Principal Scientist of Analytics, Lithium Technologies

**Pete Wyckoff**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*Parallel Architectures and Distributed Networks*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1992-1995  
**Current Status:** Research Scientist, Ohio Supercomputer Center

**Charles Zeeb**

Colorado State University  
*Mechanical Engineering*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1993-1997  
**Current Status:** Deceased

**Etay Ziv**

Columbia University  
*Computational Biology*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008

**Scott Zoldi**

Duke University  
*Analytical Modeling*  
**Fellowship Years:** 1996-1998  
**Current Status:** Vice President of Analytic Science, Fair Isaac Corporation

**John ZuHone**

University of Chicago  
*Astrophysics*  
**Fellowship Years:** 2004-2008  
**Current Status:** Postdoctoral Researcher, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center



The Krell Institute  
1609 Golden Aspen Drive, Suite 101  
Ames, IA 50010  
(515) 956-3696  
[www.krellinst.org/csgf](http://www.krellinst.org/csgf)



Office of  
Science



*Funded by the Office of Science and the  
National Nuclear Security Administration's Office of Defense*

