

From: william@physics.utoronto.ca (William Trischuk)

Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2003 14:39:59 -0400 (EDT)

UEC meeting -- September 13, 2003

Present: Bloom, Gottschalk, Groer, Hagopian, Jenkins(GSA), Messier, Rolli,
Sheldon, Tanaka, Trischuk, Tschirhart, White, Zhang(GSA), Zimmerman

White called the meeting to order at 9:00am. Introduction of new UEC members.

How the UEC works:

New members of the committee were introduced to the goals and operations of the UEC. Main activities are the DC trip in the spring and the users meeting in June.

White updated the committee on activities over the summer including his being approached by users committees from other labs (notably BNL) to join forces in some of our common efforts. The UEC will send representative(s) to a joint meeting of UEC chairs to be held at Brookhaven at the end of October where visa issues and new government regulations will be discussed. There was a brief discussion of the reorganisation at the DOE earlier this summer.

Nominations for UEC chair

Hagopian is nominated followed by a brief discussion of what the goals of the committee should be for the coming year. Tschirhart suggests that we see if there is some way the user community can get more involved in helping out with the accelerator. This discussion is suspended when the director arrives to give us an update and answer questions..

Witherell was introduced to the new members of the committee. In a brief statement he comments that 240 pb^{-1} of luminosity was delivered to the collider experiments and they now have data samples roughly twice as big as those of run I on tape. He outlined some of the plans for the 10-week shutdown currently underway that includes work on every machine. They plan to aggressively commission the recycler during the next fiscal year. Machine studies have been successfully merged into operations over the last month returning to decent luminosities after study periods. The long range machine plan was reviewed in July. The plan is to get to 150-300 E30 leading to $4-8 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ prior to LHC startup. The reduced luminosity prospects and financial cut backs led him to cancel the IIB silicon upgrades for both experiments. D0 is working hard on a L0 addition to their silicon tracker to maintain efficient tracking as radiation damage, sensor and readout attrition and increased luminosities all lessen the capabilities of the current D0 silicon detector.

Mini-boone should get a factor of two increase in protons/hr allowing them to reach 5 E20 protons on target one year from now.

The shutdown includes all the work needed to keep the NuMI project on schedule, aiming for the first neutrinos at the end of 2004. We will know more about the prospects for BTeV and CKM when the P5 panel report is released at the HEPAP meeting on Sept 29. The international linear collider project continues to evolve, heading towards a world-wide decision process on the accelerator technology. The long range planning (LRPC) exercise at the lab is starting to hold public meetings and the director is expecting a report by the end of the calendar year.

The director then took questions from members of the committee:

Q: Will there be enough protons for MiniBoone and the collider (and later MINOS)?

A: Specific interventions are planned in the proton source that should bear fruit as we come out of the shutdown.

Q: How will users know which shutdown tasks have been successful?

A: Progress on the accelerator upgrade program is begin tracked in detail and most of the information is publicly available. The accelerator plans and the presentations for the July 2003 accelerator review include milestones through FY04. These and the report of the review are posted at:

<http://www-bd.fnal.gov/run2upgrade/>

There will be a mini-review of the machine progress October 8 and the next full review is scheduled for late February. The documents and presentations for that review will also be posted, and will include tracking of progress against the milestones. On a shorter timescale, progress is reported in public at the ops meetings (MWF 9AM) and the all experimenters meeting (M 4PM). The lab is trying to make information presented at the all experimenters meeting more accessible, and the program planning office has set up a web page:

http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/program_planning/all_experimenters_meetings/index.html

Monthly Run II strategy meetings are held to discuss the balance between machines studies, operations and shutdowns. These are not public, but representatives from the experiments attend and are expected to communicate with their collaborators. Finally, monthly program management group meetings review the progress and identify problems that need attention. The Beams Division also reviews critical work before it is done. For example, before the present shutdown, Peter Limon chaired a review of the recycler shutdown work and Helen Edwards a review of Tevatron alignment. Such reviews are included in the milestones tracked and reported at the DOE reviews.

Q: What is the FY04 budget for FNAL?

A: \$285M. House has added 10M\$ to the President's budget request for all of HEP. Senate committee stuck with the original budget that included \$285M for FNAL. The FY03 budget was \$286M.

Q: How will the director convince the funding agencies that RunII remains the highest priority for the lab after canceling the silicon upgrades?

A: Staffin has said he will support the continuation of run II and supports the detector upgrade decision the laboratory made. He intends to support it fully beyond FY04 but of course there can be no guarantees for anything in the federal budget. Witherell discussed the cancellation with Staffin and Goldberg prior to

making

the announcement to cancel. We are still in a position to double datasets on the 1-2 year timescale. Other running experiments

would

like to have doubling times this short.

Q: What are the prospects for BTeV and CKM?

A: The director could not comment on the outcome of the P5 process

that

will be made public at the HEPAP meeting at the end of the month. More discussion of this could occur at the October UEC meeting.

Q: Prospects for neutrino physics at FNAL?

A: Feldman had given a wine and cheese talk at the lab the day before and is chairing the neutrino working group of the LRPC. An off-

axis

neutrino experiment could be complementary to reactor experiment. The director expects a proposal for an off-axis experiment later this year. This will be a topic for the 2004 PAC meeting. Fermilab and Argonne are also contacting the local power utilities as it

might

make sense for one of them to provide the base for a reactor

experiment.

However Fermilab is not in a position to pursue it as aggressively

as

LBNL at this time. DNP/DPF are sponsoring an extended workshop to consider these issues.

Q: How should users be interfacing with the long range planning committee (LRPC)?

A: The laboratory planning process is designed to extend HEPAP planning

exercises rather than to compete with them. SLAC is going through a very similar process. There are five university physicists on

the committee.

Real work is being done by sub-committees that have been bolstered by additional users. The sub-committees are in the middle of

hosting

a series of workshops describing their thinking and soliciting

input

from the community. Montgomery should be invited to a future UEC meeting to explain more. LRPC is not intended to prioritise, just lay out the sensible options. The PAC and users will then be asked for comment prior to any decisions being made.

UEC chair election:

Hagopian was acclaimed to the chair of the UEC. The only negative comments were that someone would have to replace her as minute-taker and webmaster...

Trischuk volunteers to take minutes. Gottschalk volunteers to be webmaster.

Priorities for the coming year:

Some discussion of Hagopian (and other's) priorities then followed. Continue to press on visa issues, quality of life and other issues. We should consider polling the user community for input on various issues facing the lab and its users. Should re-consider how we are interacting (if at all) with LRPC (a few members of the UEC are helping out on the sub-committees but none are on the committee itself). Should continue to ensure one or more UEC members attend HEPAP meetings. Should consider finding someone on the committee to track shutdown progress and machine performance.

Formation of Committees:

Hagopian and returning members outlined the roles of each of the UEC sub-committees. There was some consideration given to whether this set of committees were still the ones we needed but in the end they were all retained. Chairs were found for each of them and their membership was fleshed out:

Inreach: SHELDON, Groer, Tanaka, Zimmerman, Bloom
Outreach: WHITE, Tschirhart, Gottschalk, Messier
Users Meeting: WHITE, Tschirhart, Zimmerman, Trischuk, Bloom, Rolli,
DC trip: ZIMMERMAN, Tschirhart, Tanaka, Sheldon, Gottschalk
Non-US Issues: GROER, Trischuk, Gottschalk, Tanaka, Rolli
Quality of Life: MESSIER, Trischuk, Groer, Rolli
(chair in CAPS)

GSA representatives will be found for each of these committees however the GSA election is coming at the end of September so no attempt was made to match the outgoing GSA members with committee assignments.

July HEPAP report (Sheldon and Tschirhart)

Crawford gave a talk on performance metrics -- the new mantra in Washington. Goals for the year, goals for the next 5 years. Funding in subsequent years will depend on meeting your goals. The committee members raised the concern that this will lead naturally to a minimisation of expectations and a reduction in risk taking and initiative.

The DOE Facilities report remains under consideration at that Office of Science and in the Secretary of Energy's office. 51 possible future projects are considered, 13 of them are from HEP. An APS FYI article in May quoted Orbach as stating that current funding can support 29 of them. At this point there is no clear time-table for the release of the report.

UEC response to announcement of IIb silicon upgrades:

Next year is critical for FNAL and we have to keep the pressure on to get the highest possible integrated luminosity. The concern seems to be how the resources, human and financial, from silicon detector upgrades can be redirected to the accelerator. Users have also questioned whether the funding crisis that appears to have played a major role in the decision could have been relieved if users -- particularly non-US users had been informed and asked for help.

There are already anecdotes from people who were working on IIb silicon who are losing their funding. The fear is that there is a tendency to support construction projects at a higher level than experiment operations and data analysis. This might be particularly true in Europe where there will be great pressure to bring European collaborators on the run II collider experiments back "into the fold" for the LHC.

Non-collider members of the UEC also expressed the worry that this decision will impact their ability to sign up foreign collaborators for future Fermilab projects.

Future meetings: October 25, November 22 and December 13