



Minutes of the Fermilab UEC Meeting on September 9, 2011

Attending:

Todd Adams, Michael Cooke, Dick Gustafson, Sergo Jindariani, Dan Kaplan, Jonathan Lewis, Ryan Patterson, Manfred Paulini, Greg Pawloski, Nikos Varelas, Lisa Whitehead, Bob Zwaska

GSA Officers: Zeynep Isvan, Joel Mousseau, Ritoban Dasu Thaker

Guests:

Pier Oddone, Young-Kee Kim, Bridget Glynn (remote), Virginia Neale (remote)

Introductions

Since it is a new term, all of the members of the UEC introduced themselves. As outgoing Chair, Todd reviewed the activities of the UEC in past years and the organization of subcommittees (details available on the UEC Indico webpage).

Barb Book and Amanda Thompson from the Users Office introduced themselves and discussed their roles in the lab and working with the UEC. Amanda reported that her office is working on a study of relocation issues that includes surveys of users just arriving at the lab and those just departing.

View from Washington – Bridget Glynn and Virginia Neale (Lewis-Burke Associates)

The appropriations process continues to move through the House and Senate. However, we expect a continuing resolution (CR) through at least Thanksgiving and likely the end of CY11. The House bill has passed the committee with the full HEP request while the Senate committee passed it with slightly less. They are working to merge the two versions.

Q: what funding level do we expect the CR to be?

A: At the FY11 level. There is a good chance that the FY12 will finally be part of a yearlong omnibus bill.

Q: how does the Congressional supercommittee affect the FY12 budget?

A: The supercommittee (SC) must report by mid-October and there needs to be a full vote of Congress by the end of the calendar year. It should affect bigger ticket items primarily. We also expect that it will mostly affect FY13 and beyond.

Q: will funding for DUSEL be considered at this level?

A: no, not at the SC. The House bill does include LBNE.

There was a discussion of how to do outreach, especially in light of APS report and Mike Lubell's colloquium at Fermilab. This includes informing Congress all year round.

Q: is it a national or local issue? For example, when talking to Congressional offices should we concentrate on the importance of research to the nation or do we concentrate on the effects at the local level (e.g. jobs)?

A: both.

Chat with Fermilab Directorate – Pier Oddone and Young-Kee Kim

Dick brought up that he received a rude letter about his expiring visitor ID. Pier said that the letter was probably generated by a computer. He will investigate.

Q: is the FRA contract up?

A: No, the lab has earned a 3-year contract extension based on performance and expects additional extensions through CY15 or 16. Every year of good performance gives another year of extension. It can be extended up to 20 years if performance continues. The connection with University of Chicago has helped the lab. That was a strong benefit that came out of the competition process of a few years ago.

Q: DOE has recently introduced comparative reviews for university programs. Is there a similar review process for the labs?

A: Yes, Pier discussed how labs compete for money within the DOE budget and review process. An individual Budget and Reporting category is reviewed across all the labs. DOE can reallocate money based on the outcome of those reviews. The lab pays great attention to these reviews, both to see that our program excels and to ensure that the financial support of the laboratory continues.

Q: Dan asked about the lab's preparations to accumulate antiprotons should the need arise in the future.

A: We are using parts of the anti-proton facility (pbar source), in particular the accumulator and debuncher, for the new muon experiments. The design is in flux for using the pbar source for g-2 and mu2e. There are issues regarding the cost of the needed modifications. Looking for a simpler scheme since the mu2e experiment is more expensive than had been foreseen. Relative to the muon experiments, the Physics Advisory Committee put the pbar experiments at lower priority.

Q: Nikos asked how people will be re-tasked as the Tevatron ends.

A: Pier discussed the surveys that the lab has done to find out what the scientists interests are. The lab has been encouraging scientists to move into the intensity frontier. That has gone well and the survey showed that we do not have to do heavy arm-twisting for scientist to meet the needs of the new intensity frontier program. For non-scientist personnel, the lab has largely realigned the workforce to where they are needed for the new programs. There will be about a 100 person reduction in force; about 70% of that has been accomplished with two voluntary separations. The rest will be done through an involuntary separation. Cuts in FY13 will depend on the deficit reduction committee and further Congressional actions.

Q: Nikos expressed concern that it may be difficult between neutrino experiments and the LHC in the transitions graduate student -> post-doc and post-doc -> permanent job. To what extent will young scientists have opportunities to get faculty jobs to work in the intensity frontier in the future?

A: Pier said that the funding would follow the interest in the research in the community at large. Young-Kee pointed out that the competition for jobs in LHC research is very fierce. Pier said that the intensity frontier is very rich, and with Project X, we will have a much broader spectrum of research at the lab, EDM, etc.

Pier reviewed the prospects for the size of the user community. It has been greater than 2000. It is projected to fall to about 1500 and then rise to about 2300 when Project X is running full bore.

Y2K discussed plans for the end of Tevatron running on Sept. 30. This event is focused on people at the lab. The June 2012 event is more public. There will be cameras at MCR and CDF and D0 control rooms. There will be big screens with views of all three with commentary on activities as run is ended at 2pm. 3-5pm will have a lab-wide party with tents in parking lot near high-rise. Starting at 6pm, CDF and D0 will have separate parties.

Other Business

Nikos asked about a subcommittee about helping people getting jobs. There have been seminars sponsored by the QoL committee and GSA on these topics.

Manfred discussed the outreach committee. Wanted to use lab's experience with outreach to help university groups to go to schools and groups in their communities. Nikos mentioned outreach efforts in CMS.

There was a general consensus that we keep our subcommittee structure.

Dan asked about tracking what happens to students trained in HEP. HEPAP has a demographics group working on this issue. They are trying to get a grant from DOE to do additional research. They need two people. One is to build software for a database. There is hepfolk at LBL, but it is incomplete and not updated properly. They also need a person to track down where people have gone.

There was a discussion about getting users to meet with their government representatives and the role of the Government Relations committee in organizing people to do local visits in addition to the DC trip. The message from DC is that our trip is great, but they want to hear from people at home.

Election for UEC Chair

Dan Kaplan was elected UEC Chair for the 2011-2012 term.

PREP at Fermilab

Jonathan discussed the role of PREP in the lab and about the PREP Strategic Task force. He solicited the committee to help the task force in reaching out to users.

Next UEC meeting: October 7, 2011 in the morning

Scribes: Jonathan Lewis and Todd Adams