

August 5, 2009

To: Howard Fenker
Re: Hall C Detector Review

Dear Howard:

First of all, we, the Detector Review Committee, would like to thank you and all the presenters for the high quality of the presentations given to us at the review. We appreciate the extra effort it takes to make such presentations. We were presented with a detailed view of the detector plans for the SHMS spectrometer, including the infrastructure surrounding them as well as the detailed expectations for the performance of those detectors.

As regards the specific charges to the committee:

1. Are the designs of these detectors consistent with the specified performance of the system so that this performance is likely to be achieved? Yes. The detectors, as designed, all rely on tried and true technologies and were demonstrated to meet or exceed all the performance expectations for the envisioned Physics program.
2. Is the design complete, documented, and controlled such that fabrication drawings or procurement orders may now be pursued by the various groups that will be constructing the subsystems? Yes, adequately for the present stage. This is something that will require continuous attention throughout the course of the Detector development and as such we urge you to continue being diligent in maintaining the situation.
3. Are plans for detector integration in the Super-High Momentum Spectrometer and associated Hall C infrastructure adequate and suitably documented for the present phase of the project? Yes, adequately for the present stage. Again this is something that will require continued diligence on your part. Are individual and group responsibilities clearly identified and accepted by the parties involved? Yes.
4. Have ESH&Q issues been addressed in a manner appropriate for this phase of the project, such that all hazards have been identified and plans for mitigating them developed? Yes, plans involve nothing new. All standard detector technologies are being employed. Assuming all is done as it always is there should be no problem. Have any Quality Control / Quality Assurance needs been overlooked? No.

Re the additional request to the committee, i.e. DoE has asked for a report from a panel of experts commenting on whether or not the cost and technical value of this system are consistent and appropriate for the SHMS. We are still evaluating that and will provide a separate document on that specific issue.

Yours truly,
John J. LeRose (Chair), David Mack, and Mark Jones