

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

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 2004 09:45:17 -0500 (EST)

UEC Minutes -- March 20, 2004

Present: Bose (GSA), Clark (GSA), Gottschalk, Hagopian, Tanaka,
Tschirhart, Trischuk, White, Zimmerman, apologies: Bloom,
Groer, Rolli.

Bicycle Rentals at the Lab (White):

- In an effort to address transportation for users without drivers licenses he and Bruce Chrisman have been searching for a local bicycle rental company. A prototype bicycle lending system already exists at the lab although it could be more widely advertised, but would be unlikely to be able to fill the demand. The URA has offered to expand the system by buying some new bikes. Looking for a way of sharing the bikes equitably. It was suggested that we follow the housing model allocating a certain number of bikes to the collaborations and requesting they manage the actual use during the summer season. The URA's understanding was that these bikes would be provided for transportation to/from the experiments on site, not for recreational purposes. Chris will now solicit the reaction of the experiments. GSA members have already expressed an interest in being bike-wardens and/or first contact repair people. Chris will consult with these people to suggest an appropriate bicycle configuration. The goal would be to put this in place for 'this season'. Will also plan to acquire helmets.

Users' Meeting Planning (White):

- A detailed schedule of talks for the two days of the meetings was presented. Between half and two-thirds of the speakers have been confirmed. Members of the organising committee have been assigned to get names for the remainder of the talks. White solicited feedback on 'proper' titles for some of the talks where the content might not be 100% obvious.

- The next phase of organising the meeting is to take advantage of the stellar speakers to attract local and state politicians to visit Fermilab during the meeting.

Status of the Laboratory (Mike Witherell) - ([Mike Witherell's presentation](#))

- Four major reviews will have been held in a recent 30 day window. The accelerator review February 24-26 (<http://www-bdnew.fnal.gov/doereview04/index.htm>) was very successful, given the recent performance of the machine. A URA visiting committee came March 12/13. There was a DOE review of Operations March 16-18 (http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/DOE_Review_TeV_Ops.html). The

annual program review will be held March 23-25.

- Have now delivered 0.11 fb^{-1} to each collider experiment this fiscal year in addition to about 0.25 fb^{-1} as of the end of the last fiscal year. We are three weeks ahead of the optimistic luminosity goal and in the middle of a two weeks shutdown. Hope to come out of this still ahead of design and continue integrating at the higher than design rate similar to the last couple of months. It should be possible to exceed the design goal of 0.3 fb^{-1} for FY 2004 (0.55 fb^{-1} total for Run II). We are achieving record luminosities despite the fact that the p-Bar tax is being extracted. The recycler is taking advantage of these antiprotons and is being commissioned on schedule. At the previous Accelerator review the lab was told these past 6 months would be crucial. Have now been commended that the progress over the 'last 7 months' has exceeded expectations. Must maintain the campaign of 'operations, maintenance and upgrades' to continue on the current rate of integrating luminosity.

- The biggest reward from the recent successful review is that 6 months from now there will only be a mini-review. The next full review will be in February 2005. Q: Is the outcome of these reviews just based on the current performance of machine complex? A: Of course the performance of the machine is a prerequisite for a successful review. But the review also reflects the planning done for the next year. It is good for perspective and morale of the people working on the accelerator to have received such a positive review. Q: The 'problems' of the last year have necessitated pulling in a number of people from elsewhere in the lab. Will they soon be returning to their original tasks? A: Not immediately, but that will happen to some extent in FY 2005 as certain sub-projects end. Many projects (like the BPMs being worked on by members of the Computing Division) are still in full swing at this point. When those projects wrap up over the next year those people will return to work on other projects within their divisions Q: What about people were pulled into Recycler and electron cooling? A: Those areas are still ramping up in their staffing. So their return to other tasks is not currently being planned.

- The Director provided an overview of all the physics going on at the lab that he gave to the URA visiting committee. The collider programme is well known but he included emphasis on the lesser known pieces of the programme (such as the neutrino programme and the goals of the switch-yard 120 effort). He highlighted the results of the P5 exercise and the positive impact it has had on the BTeV project. Discussed the long range planning exercise and the charges being given to the Proton Driver and Linear Collider R&D groups.

- The DOE Operations review went very well. They asked the lab to prepare to discuss 'certain areas' of the lab operations, but when it was all added up it turned out they wanted to look at activities that involve something like 90% of the laboratory budget... They endorsed Fermilab's plans for operations and how the Lab is coping with the budget cuts that have resulted from the flat-flat funding over the last few years. Q: Other labs have

gotten some budget relief from similar exercises. Will this be the outcome here? A: Probably not. In fact the mandate of the review committee seemed to be "Everything is so tight where can we find efficiencies?". It seems unlikely that any were found. So the likely outcome is that further cuts will be avoided.

- The Long Range Planning (LRP) Exercise drawing to a conclusion. Hugh Montgomery (the Planning Committee chair) gave a well attended talk in the auditorium 10 days ago. They considered two scenarios: I) FNAL as host of a Linear Collider, with a neutrino programme, LHC physics and other flavour, astro-particle and non-Particle physics continuing at a lower level; II) the Linear Collider is built off-shore or delayed. In the latter case a neutrino programme based on a Proton Driver, seems to be emerging as the highest priority for the lab, but contributions to the off-shore linear collider, LHC physics and other activities would be included as in scenario I. The LRP Committee report is expected out May 1. Q: Will the report include a plot of funding trade-offs considered? A: Probably not. The report will discuss the financial implications of the choices but forecasting the budget 15 years ahead is very difficult.

- The first Lehman review for BTeV will occur April 27-29. This will be preceded by a directors review. An on-site review of the lab's long range plans will be held on May 6.

- Q: How will the LRP advise on how/when to make a choice between vision I and vision II. A: The bottom two-thirds of the plan can proceed independent of the choice because it is identical identical in either scenario. Even much of the top third (R&D for a cold linac could be used either for Linear Collider or Proton Driver) can proceed for a few years before one would have to make choices that would distinguish between vision I and vision II. The Proton Driver is a major upgrade to the lab programme (like the main injector). It will require a significant commitment from the DOE Q: Everything that needs to be done is being done from a physics point of view, but will building support for a Proton Driver/neutrino programme be seen as detrimental to the linear collider consensus? A: The main next step should be to develop the physics case for the neutrino physics programme. The Proton Driver can then follow the physics case. But this can't be done in isolation at FNAL. Need to consider vision from labs elsewhere in the country and around the world. That consensus will be built over the next few of years.

Planning for the UEC/SLUO DC trip (Zimmerman)

- Joined by members of the SLAC Users Organisation by phone conference. Continued planning for the visit to Washington including the 'take home' message we want to leave and the one-page document that we will be leaving in the offices we visit. Final appointments are still being made and pairings between FNAL UEC and SLUO members will be made before we arrive in Washington,

Status of the Director Search (White-- reported by email after the meeting)

- As agreed at the previous meeting, the next Committee meeting will be held at Fermilab on April 15-16 for interviews with members of the Fermilab community. With input from several of the Fermilab members of the Committee, a preliminary list of Fermilab people to be invited for the interviews has been assembled. In order to accommodate as many key interviewees as possible, the meeting will convene at 8:00AM on April 15. The meeting will adjourn by 3:00 PM on April 16 to allow Committee members to depart on late afternoon-early evening flights.

- The Fermilab Director Search webpage at <http://www.fnal.gov/directorsearch> was initiated last Tuesday and several comments and nominations have already been received. The Search website has a permanent link from the Fermilab home page. Classified advertisements (which also refer to the Search website) will appear in the next month in CERN Courier, Physics Today and Science - in both print and on their job opportunities websites. As agreed, I will now send announcements to the physics professional groups.

Next meeting April 17, 2004