

Minutes EB phone meeting April 5, 2005

Agenda

1. RIFs at BNL

Present: B. Palmer, S. Geer, M. Zisman, K. McDonald, D. Kaplan, B. Weng, A. Sessler, J. Wurtele, D. Summers, A. Tollestrup, G. Hanson, D. Cline

Bob gave a report

The issues arose for the first time in January 2005.

Issues to be discuss:

- 1) DoE seems to agree to lift the "fence" between base funding for the group (Collaboration??) at BNL and the Lab's monies.
- 2) Consequences to the MC if indeed the BNL group is RIFed in its entirety or partially.

Mike gave a report

The strategy chosen was to argue in "bureaucratic terms", Mike is the Project Manager, needed to be informed and consulted; he is responsible for the budget, although the Labs are free to make personnel decisions.

MCOG was briefed but not otherwise involved.

Visit to Washington: presentation and discussion with Aesook

Byon-Wagner:

her view at the meeting was that MC is not a national program; the "fence" needs to be lifted.

Others:

Initial discussions and charge for sub-panel to look at Advanced Accelerator R&D(????).

First draft talks about

budget of \$60M; ILC is excluded

Main points are:

Scope of the program

Quality

Relevance

Performance

Management

It was discussed how we can put out input in the draft, some have done it already.

The coming MUTAC Review is very important and could be seen as a "dry run" for the HEPAP upcoming review of the accelerator R&D program. We need a very good report from MUTAC.

Suggestions for course of action: 1) go to Orbach; 2) talk to Gilman, and request time for a presentation to HEPAP, next meeting May 18(??)

Kirk: There is it seems the beginning of a public debate about High Energy Physics. (article in Science)

There will be an EB meeting in a week.

=====
===

Appendix on MCOG Teleconference

Shortly after the Executive Board meeting, we had a teleconference with MCOG. Sam Aronson and Satoshi Ozaki, Jim Siegrist, Steve Holmes, Steve Geer, Bob Palmer and Mike Zisman were on the line. Earlier in the day Steve, Mike and Bob had received an email from Steve Holmes that summarized the

current understandings that he had with BNL. Since this is significantly

different from earlier statements that we had heard, it is included here:

Notes from April 4, 2005 Holmes-Ozaki Discussion on Muons at BNL

Satoshi's comments on the BNL situation:

1. The potential RIF within the BNL Muon Group is one person, not two.

2. No formal action has yet been taken on the RIF. It is the view of BNL that if this RIF were to transpire they would still have a viable

group.

3. BNL's HEP program was discussed in their HEP budget briefing with Robin on March 7. The briefing covered the future either with or without Muon R&D at BNL.

4. Robin views the Muon program as a national program. He wants it examined as part of the national accelerator R&D portfolio by the HEPAP (accelerator R&D) subpanel currently being established. BNL anticipates no action to dismantle their Muon R&D program in advance of the HEPAP report.

5. It is important for the Muon Collaboration to form a vision of what should/can be accomplished over the balance of the decade as input to this subpanel.

Steve agreed with Satoshi that the upcoming MUTAC meeting is critical to this process and it is important for the MC to establish a vision (for the balance of the decade) at the meeting.

Before the MCOG meeting, Bob Palmer spoke with Satoshi and Howard Gordon

and they both confirmed this new understanding.

The MCOG discussions further confirmed that this is indeed the current

situation and we are to understand that, as of now:

- a) The immediate potential BNL RIF is one rather than 2.
- b) The BNL group is expected to remain "viable", rather than plan for elimination in 6 months.
- c) Beyond the immediate case of the one position, BNL Physics is NOT free to move money saved by accelerator RIFs to help Research budgets without explicit DOE approval (they had earlier been told that they were free to do so at any time).
- d) That "Robin (Staffin) views the Muon program as a national program" (Aesook had said we were "too small to be a National Program").
- e) That "BNL anticipates no action to dismantle their Muon R&D program in advance of the HEPAP report". With the implication that if the HEPAP sub-panel (that is yet to be named) recommends that we be protected, then we might be so protected.
- f) Our presentations at MuTAC, the DOE Revues, and at the Sub-panel will be very important.

This is still not a comfortable situation, but far better than it had been.

We heard, from an informal exchange between Sam and Steve Holmes, that the fact that BNL was RIFing more than 100 people meant that they had further administrative problems that would delay any action for another month.

It was acknowledged that the future of RSVP was unclear at this time.

It was encouraging to hear that Steve Holmes believed that MCOG should have an advocacy role.

In answer to Mike Zisman's questions as to how we address our international collaborators on MICE, the target experiment, and Study III, we were encouraged to inform them of the situation. We were not told to disengage.

Satoshi urged us to assume success, but Sam emphasized that DOE has been flip-flopping on whether BNL is free to redirect the accelerator funds, and we should not assume that it can not flip back.