



## Minutes of the Fermilab UEC Meeting on October 7, 2011

### Attending:

Todd Adams, Mike Cooke, Dick Gustafson, Sergo Jindariani, Dan Kaplan, Jonathan Lewis, Manfred Paulini (remote), Ryan Patterson (remote), Greg Pawloski, Brian Rebel, Nikos Varelas, Lisa Whitehead, Bob Zwaska

GSA officers: Gene Kafka, Brian Tice

### Guests:

Greg Bock, Kaitlin Chell (remote), Carol McGuire (remote), Katie Yurkewicz

### **News from the Chair (Dan Kaplan)**

Meeting Dates: Next meeting Nov. 17, then Dec. 15. Aim for Fridays in future, depending on people's schedules, so ongoing discussion. Asked that professors aim for teaching schedules avoiding Fridays.

Q: Meeting schedule: suggestion for initial meeting each year to be 2-3x as long – "retreat." Concept: get to know each other as soon as possible, set strategy for year, settle UEC subcommittee assignments and charges, etc.

A: Seems a good idea for next year. Could also consider retreat later this year.

Q: What UEC "value-added"? Washington visit? Users Meeting? Monthly meetings?

A: Monthly meetings make Pier, Y2K, other administrators talk to group of users, take questions, try to answer. UEC gave important feedback on end-of-Tevatron party that substantially changed the plans, we think for the better.

Bruce Chrisman retiring as early as January, as soon as replacement can be found.  
(Bruce controls UEC activities budget.)

Initial subcommittee assignments (based on people's first and second choices):

- Government Relations: Adams, Gustafson, Jindariani, Lewis, Patterson, Pawloski, Rebel (Chair), Whitehead, Zwaska.
- Non-U.S. Users: Jindariani, Lewis (Chair).
- Outreach: Cooke, Paulini, Varelas (Chair).
- Quality of Life: Cooke (Chair), Gustafson, Patterson, Rebel.
- Users Meeting: Gustafson, Patterson, Paulini, Pawloski, Varelas, Whitehead (Chair), Zwaska.

Q: Scope of Outreach subcommittee?

A: Previously organized outreach workshop in conjunction with Users Meeting; probably not an option this year with the Tevatron Symposium. Another possibility: look into public displays, e.g. at O'Hare. Manfred says some resources already together, will give info to those interested.

Q: UEC connections to other users' committees (US-LHC, etc.)? Many UEC members on those groups as well.

A: Few direct connections beyond the DC visit.

Q to QoL subcommittee: Set up shuttle to West Chicago Metra Station for several commuters from Chicago?

A: Subcommittee to investigate – perennial issue but never yet worked out. Complicated by legal and tax issues (but note LBNL has shuttle); also, how to fund, how many people would it serve (multiple lines, stations, train times)? Mike to poll Fermilab community for potential riders.

### **News from the Directorate - Greg Bock**

DOE Intensity Frontier Workshop set up (<http://www.intensityfrontier.org/>), all are encouraged to attend and participate. Want community to show up, international participation appreciated too.

Q: How antiproton experiments fit in workshop? Fermilab Antiproton Source capabilities unique.

A: Muon planning a high-priority, taking all available effort. Very cost-constrained. Need to reduce Mu2e price tag, maximize accelerator savings by reusing existing infrastructure; task force chartered by Stuart Henderson, chaired by Eric Prebys.

Q: Lab should consider all opportunities, fit in what it can; believe PBar experiments to be feasible and cost-effective.

A: Lab went through that process, Director could not see how to do PBar under current funding and staffing levels.

Q: Timing of 2012 shutdown?

A: Nominal March, 2012 start date, substantial chance of delay to deliver beam to MINERvA, MINOS, SeaQuest before starting modifications. NuMI target situation in hand, NT-07 operating a month without issue, good sign for the long run.

Q: Lab staffing levels?

A: Smaller staff than before, recent reductions to fit expected budget, more are likely needed.

Q: How to cost projects? Cost far more than previously, due to overheads and other requirements, requiring large project offices. Safety can be overdone. Dan recently got positive response from Glen Crawford about reducing management burden.

A: Greg thinks most is imposed by law, regulation, or FRA contract, so not changeable simply or quickly. Cindy Conger could explain overhead calculation. Greg and Dan: weapons labs have had worse overruns; we may be tarred with the same brush meant to rein them in.

Q: ARRA reporting – ARRA rules might be extended to all university grants.

A: Greg agrees ARRA grants require more reporting, doesn't know about future implementation.

Q: Joint appointments? Win-win arrangements for Lab.

A: Greg thinks 7 or 8 in place now, mostly nearby junior faculty. Overheads applied to joint appointments vary by location – university overhead.

C'tee comment: university connection useful – faculty can apply for grants that Lab cannot.

Q: Lab support for international students?

A: International Fellowships for grad students, postdocs, and scientists from non-U.S. institutions (see

<http://www.fnal.gov/pub/forphysicists/fellowships/international/index.html>).

Q: Future-year budgets?

A: Expect FY12 no worse than previously planned. Real worry: possible automatic cuts under Budget Control Act. New Starts (LBNE, MicroBooNE, Mu2e) possibly okay with an Omnibus, but not if Continuing Resolution. Project X and g-2 pre-CD0, so OK for now.

Q: Why Lab effort on ATLAS?

A: The major HEP lab almost required to take part in one of HEP's dominant experiments. Many URA members on ATLAS. Lab can contribute expertise in triggering, for example. Maintains our strong ties with ANL and UChicago. Group will be smallish, around 6 FTE.

Q: ATLAS university people don't see selves as Fermilab users. Does this really make sense in constrained environment?

### **Update from the Office of Communication - Katie Yurkewicz**

Katie on 2012 Users Meeting and other events, including adjacent Tevatron Symposium. Dates June 11-13. Gala event or dinner possible in conjunction, probably June 11 – maybe Black Tie.

Q: How seek benefactor support for special events, or the field generally? Way to fund alternative research, e.g. early-2000s State of Illinois accelerator R&D funding. An ILC workshop was funded similarly.

A: Illinois Accelerator Research Center (IARC, [www.fnal.gov/pub/iarc/facility.html](http://www.fnal.gov/pub/iarc/facility.html)) upcoming groundbreaking, tentatively Oct. 24 – new building wrapped around CDF assembly building, funded in partnership with State of Illinois to tune of \$20M. (Date depends on governor's availability.)

Fermilab developing HEP brochure in partnership with DPF. To be HEP-specific, but not Fermilab-specific.

Q: IEEE and DPB already have nice brochures.

A: They're useful, but HEP version needed. Katie wants info, pictures, and other content from UEC.

Q: How to track graduate (Fermilab “alumni”) outcomes? Does HEPAP plan to develop this info?

A: Katie in contact with them, plan not yet in place.

Also, Office of Communications to put out new edition in “Discoveries” series – essentially picture books about Fermilab work.

Q: How communicate Lab’s future to the public?

A: Always explained future plans in detail when discussing Tevatron turnoff. Point continually made to the press, often picked up in stories. Discussion: not always successful – some fraction of readers got impression Lab is closing.

Katie wants recent examples of detector applications (has enough about accelerator applications). Needs specific stories – applications within this decade to medicine, technology, etc. Also wants feedback on the draft Long-Range Plan for the Lab.

Q: Level of detail seems variable. Who is the audience?

A: A revamp of Steering Group report, directed at scientific community, but also at Washington policy-makers. Goal to expound Lab’s plan concisely, yet specific enough to be useful to potential users. Young-Kee actually responsible for it; Katie and her office assisting.

### **Lewis-Burke Report - Carol McGuire**

Government has not shut down. The CR through mid-November has ~ 1.5% reduction.

Omnibus appropriation bill likely, possibly broken into 2 or 3 parts, but not individual bills. Final negotiations to be by appropriations staff behind closed doors.

Appropriations caps now slightly higher than initial House mark-up, so some good news possible. 5-6 week timescale to get this done. Continuing Resolution would be problem, esp. for LBNE and other new starts. Once Omnibus or final CR submitted, will be no opportunity for modification. Pushing on congressional delegations to preserve HEP in negotiations. Pier also communicating with Congress. Different situation from last surprise, after Hastert retired – we now have wider support from more members including Durbin, Kirk, Hultgren, Biggert, Lipinsky, et al.

Details of Energy & Water bill. Office of Science likely held to freeze level, which is House mark for DOE. Senate worse, with explicit cut for LBNE. But both considered not bad in present environment. Water also a risk considering recent storms and flooding, raising question how disaster funding to be structured. If part of normal appropriations process, Water and Energy share same cap, so additional Army Corps of Engineering work could cut into DOE.

Q: Does Congress understand significant efficiency cost of strings attached from Washington?

A: Congress generally aware, but also want high degree of transparency. Transparency can be good – clarifies cost of compliance. But short-term progress unlikely. Questioning safety is non-starter. ARPA-E a hopeful example – their streamlined procedure popular in Congress, even if program is not. Hope for change within DOE, but

not directly from Congress. ARRA required more reporting – don't expect it to go away. In addition to law and regulations, some requirements written into Lab's contract. Some discussion at laboratory directors' roundtable; Pier is chair next year and obviously aware of these issues.

Q: Might budget process change?

A: Carol worked on Senate appropriations for 20 years, various ideas regularly come up. Biennial process often considered more efficient, but appropriators opposed.

Congress will have recesses soon. People should try to get a meeting soon before the CR. House recesses Oct 17-21 and Nov 7-11. Senate recesses Oct 24-28 and Nov 7-11.

Q: Should involve larger groups (AIP, etc.) in lobbying?

A: Their efforts may be too broad for our purposes. Better for us to emphasize needs for and benefits of HEP funding.

Q: Should we send small group to Washington in fall in addition to our spring visit?

A: Carol thinks sensible to talk at home. Most legislators do not have direct hand in Omnibus negotiations. One-on-one local contact probably works better than groups.

People should deliver message to legislators that Lab still operating, has many new projects, needs funding to realize them all. Focus on job creation (or jobs saved) overused and ineffective. Appropriators and their staffs do listen.

### **Other Business**

What special guests useful for future meetings? Stuart, repeat visits from Pier, Young-Kee, and Greg. Give suggestions to Dan. Purpose of visits: for our information and to give feedback.

Todd and Jon introduced UEC wiki. All UEC members should request accounts.

Q: Should UEC start a campaign to Congress?

A; If we do, should be done internally and not in conjunction with Lab communications. Government relations subcommittee to convene and discuss this issue.

UEC Local Congressional Visits subcommittee was disbanded in previous years because of poor performance. Local visits more important in non-local districts – local districts already in frequent communication with Lab. Consensus to make local visits a concern of the Government Relations subcommittee.

Q: How define the Tevatron Symposium, how it interacts with Users' Meeting?

A: Users' Meeting controlled by Users' Organization. Unclear who will control Tevatron Symposium, nor impact on Users' Meeting. Users' Meeting subcommittee to meet, devise vision and plan.

Dan asked all subcommittees to meet and devise plans for the year and near future.

Dick reminded all to keep eyes open for new committee members.

Q: GSA activities?

A: Currently planning Halloween party, will set up subcommittees for further planning.

Q: Could UEC support job fairs, particularly for students and postdocs remote from their home universities?

Discussion: Previously responsibility of QoL subcommittee. Fall is good time for job fairs –when applications are due. Recent successful job-finders are best resource.

Important to maintain pipeline for students when graduates much more plentiful than academic openings. Some in community said to frown on steering students into private-sector jobs – bias that private-sector jobs easy to find, while getting back into HEP then difficult. Committee nevertheless accepts importance of so doing.

Next UEC meeting: November 17, 2011 in the morning

Scribe: Bob Zwaska