

Minutes of the November '05 UGBoD, JLab

User Group Directors (UGD) present: J. Arrington, G. Cates, G. Dodge, C. Keppel, K. Owen, J. Roche, P. Stoler, M. Vanderhaeghen, R. de Vita.

JLab management present: C. Leemann, J. Gomez, V. Burkert, R. Ent, R. Sprouse, T. Thomas, L. Cardman, D. Skopik, A. Lung, W. Brooks.

Highlights:

- Preparation to phase the transition from the 6 to the 12 GeV program.
- Maximum energy currently available at JLab.
- The DOE request for proposals for the new JLab management contract.
- Raising the visibility of JLab within the whole nuclear physic community

12 GeV upgrade (A. Lung)

Following the very successful Lehman Review in July, paperwork has been submitted to the office of science to get the actual CD1 signed. During this phase the budget scope of the project has been increased from \$250M (DOE money) + \$28M (non DOE money) to a total of \$300M. This said, the CD1 is still not signed. It was expected to be signed before the end of this year, but this is now improbable. Reason for this "delay": there are a new people at DOE and there is no money set aside for this in the '06 budget. For the users, the focus should be now on phasing the 6 to 12 GeV operations. Allison will ask for input from the users on this subject.

Report from the director (C. Leeman)

- Budget: It is difficult to have an idea of the '06 budget; the signals from DOE are very mixed. There is the idea within some parts of DOE that the upgrade can be constructed by redirecting baseline (operation) money, this is not true.
- DOE: There is a new secretary (S. Bodman) for DOE who says that he is a "fan of science"; he sees science as a goal of DOE and good for the economy. Christoph found him convincing.
- JLab management re-competition: DOE has call for an open re-competition for the management of JLab; a formal request for proposal (RFP) is available on the DOE web site. Meanwhile, the contract held by SURA has been extended for the six first months of 2006. The RFP deals mostly with issues of administrative management of the lab. Science strategy is a small part of the RFP but is the aspect that is most likely to affect the JLab users. Though it is an open competition, so far only SURA has made public is intention to submit a proposal. As seen by DOE, safety and fiscal responsibility are pre-requisite for science, and they feel that corporations are better suited than universities or consortium of universities to achieve fiscal responsibilities. This is why SURA has selected Computer Science Corporation to join this proposal. SURA will stay the majority stakeholder of this association. Allison Lung suggested that users interested in the possible effects of the recompetete

on the users look at the sections of the RFP that relate directly to the science operations of the lab.

- Finally, some users inputs have been solicited by the SURA-CSC group; G. Cates is now part of this preparation team. This mean that he has sign a non-disclosure agreement, so the users should consider him has a mean to pass their concerns to the SURA-CSC group but not has a source of information. Because of the non-disclosure agreement, G. Cates asked C. Keppel to lead the questioning of Cristoph and reduced himself from any direct discussion of the details of the contract.

Report from the Chief scientist (T. Thomas)

- Tony Thomas met this summer with D. Kovar. Denis is very enthusiastic about the science of the 12 GeV. In particular, he was convinced that there are more than a couple of experiments to be done at this energy but actually a whole program.
- For the future, the JLab community should make sure to emphasize its links to the whole nuclear physics community: push forward experiment that are relevant to the whole nuclear physics community, make sure that the JLab physics is well represented at all major conferences (like INPC, PANIC...)
- Tony emphasized the role of bridge positions to grow the JLab community. The UGBoD will contact SURA to remind them of this tool. (action item).

Report from the Physics division (L. Cardman)

- 6 to 12 GeV transition: We still don't have a clear time table of the switch over but we need to be prepared: the funding profile of the 12 GeV might include some redirect from the Lab current budget; also the division will have to start staffing hall D and some support staff at some point. But as important, the current 6 GeV program need to be reviewed to identify 1) physics that cannot wait the upgrade to be done 2) experiments that are necessary to prepare the 12 GeV physics 3) already approved experiments that can be after the upgrade. For the already approved 6 GeV experiments requiring new detectors, the budget priorities of the division are hardware developments that can be used during the 12 GeV era. PAC 30 (summer '06) may be dedicated to review 12 GeV proposal, as during the initial JLab PAC, although this depends on the progress of the upgrade, and in particular when CD1 is signed.

Cebaf Center addition (R. Sprouse)

The outside construction is completed; the work is now concentrating on fitting the inside. The network and telecommunication group will start moving mid-December. The users move will happen during the first three week of January. The hall secretaries are in charge of coordinating the move with the users. Users are strongly encouraged to use the services of the professional movers hired by JLab. Boxes, labels and instructions will be distributed shortly. If the users need special arrangements for their move, they should contact the hall secretaries. (action item)

Reports from and questions for the Hall leader

- Hall A (J. Gomez)
 - Budget: some experiments needed special apparatus are experiencing delays because of the short budget. The real worry though is that hall A shares technical and engineering personnel with the others halls. What will happen when those persons are called on 12 GeV related projects?

- Hall B (V. Burkert)
 - Budget: hiring is almost impossible, currently there are 2 scientist positions and 1 technician position open in Hall B. project are left behind, people are on call 24/7, and this is not the way to operate on the long term.
 - Next year low energy running is a problem to schedule experiments in Hall B. The maximum currently available is 5.4 GeV; this is also a planning issue.

- Hall C (R. Ent)
 - The apparent backlog is 4.5 year assuming 70 PAC days of running per year. But most of the experiences are large scale installation so if one take into account the installation time and likely extensions of some of the large scale experimental programs, the backlog is more like 6 year. This doesn't take into account constraint of energy compatible with the other program going on in the other hall. This is more than the time available before the upgrade (~2012, with 1 year of down time for the upgrade)
 - Budget: All the money is used to install the experiments; there is a lack of capital money to be for items such as new detectors. Users are encouraged to come up with standard equipment or "pre-paid" experiments.
 - HKS: Installation was rough and reflected lack of technical manpower in both hall C and the ACC (2 Hall C technicians have been hired since) and communication problems when more than 2 groups have to interact. Project coordinators will be nominated to oversee all future large installations. At the end, the experiment was a success. The F1-TDCs (to be used in the 12 GeV project) have been commissioned successfully.

Maximum beam energy currently available at CEBAF (Cardman, Leeman, Lung)

The maximum beam energy currently available is 5.4 GeV (with a reasonable trip rate). 6.0 GeV is both necessary for some of the approved experiments and as a milestone for the 12 GeV upgrade, but it is not necessary for the experiments scheduled in '06. To be able to deliver 6.0 GeV, some old cryo-modules need to be refurbished and the new Renaissance cavity needs to be operational. The new cavity is not yet operational because of heating problems. It is hoped that 6.0 GeV will be available during the first quarter of 2007.

Connection of the JLab community with the other nuclear physics communities (L Cardman, G. Cates, T. Thomas, M. Vanderhaeghen)

The importance of raising the visibility of JLab physics within the nuclear community as a whole is essential especially when NSAC will come up with a new long range plan in a near future). As emphasized by T. Thomas we should make sure that JLab is well represented at major conferences (with plenary talks). It is also important to make sure that we have representative at the DNP executive committee. C. Keppel is on the ballot for the upcoming election, we should at the appropriate time organize a call for vote.

Area Reports

- Quality of life (J. Arrington):
 - The notes of the UGBoD meeting should be reviewed by the UGD and released promptly on the web site. An email should be sent to the users to announce the release and highlight important issues.
 - New traffic regulation: A user reported that when they received a traffic citation under the lab's updated procedures, it was not at the time of the offense but later, and that the traffic citation did not report when, where, or who cited you but only the type of offense. Moreover, there is no information available on how to contest it. The UGBoD will write a letter to C. Leemann to signal this abuse. (action item)

- Running experiments (G. Dodge): As reported partly by the survey the spokespersons fill at the end of a run.
 - Recovery from beam test/development is rarely on time; ACC should provide a more reliable timing to help with planning.
 - Not enough beam time is given for commissioning of new apparatus (especially in Hall A). Also the experiments greatly benefit from getting a break between their commissioning and their actual run. Maybe getting this break should be formalized so all experiments benefit from it.
 - The cubicles above the counting houses are not really available for running experiment (cluttered with papers, screen locked...). The Hall leaders are in charge of those spaces and should be contacted if there are problems.
 - The beam is instable at high energy, when will 6 GeV beam will be available?

- PAC issues (R. de Vita):
 - Though this issue is usually well taken care of, one should be careful about conflict of interest within the PAC members. Also the fact that some PAC members are excluded of some discussion (because of conflict of interest) depletes the PAC from necessary expert. Maybe some external experts should be asked to take part to the discussion in those cases.
 - L. Cardman asks the UGBoD to provide him with a medium size list of person to fill 2 open positions within the PAC. These are replacements for two experimentalists on the PAC. It was suggested that it would be desirable to find experts in traditional nuclear structure, and some board members suggested that we should look for candidates who would take a critical look at experimental details of the proposals. A preliminary list of names was discussed (action item).

- Theory issues for the remaining 6 GeV running (M. Vanderhaeghen)

- The N^* program is one of the promised science goal of JLab that is the most behind. Following a meeting in July at DOE, \$0.25M JLab money has been redirected to support EBAC (Excited Baryon Analysis Center). This will support a postdoc plus a senior visiting scientist. The UGBoD will try to push to get money for a second postdoc. (action item)
- 6 GeV priorities for experiments: the experiment that help prepare the 12 GeV are on the top, also special care should be given to come up with experiments that link JLab to other physics communities (high energy, neutrino...)

- Annual meeting

The next annual meeting will be held at the end of May or June 2006. The most favorable dates seem to be May 29 to 31. We also need to decide of a theme. (action item)