Meeting of the Executive Committee of the DPF

10 August 2000

Minutes by C. Newman-Holmes (DPF Secretary-Treasurer)

Present: V. Barger, G. Beier, J. Conrad, G. Farrar (phone), H. Gordon, P. Meyers, D, Naples, C. Newman-Holmes, C. Quigg, S. Wojcicki

Absent: B. Carithers, S. Dawson, N. Hadley

Visitors: Alan Chodos (APS), Stuart Raby (OSU), K.K. Gan (OSU), Marc Sher (College of William and Mary; phone)

Agenda:

Open Session

- 1. DPF 2000 discussion (Gan, Raby)
- 2. DPF 2002 plans (Sher)
- 3. Discussion with APS Associate Executive Officer (Chodos)
- 4. Plans for APS 2001 meeting (Wojcicki)

Closed Session

- 1. Report from Secretary-Treasurer (C. Newman-Holmes)
- 2. Letter about funding for DPF Conference Attendees
- 3. Snowmass 2001 (Chris Quigg)
- 4. Report from HEPAP (Howard Gordon)
- 5. Panofsky Prize funding (Gene Beier)

APPENDIX

Open Session

DPF 2000 discussion (Gan, Raby)

K.K. Gan and Stuart Raby (co-chairs of the organizing committee for the DPF 2000 meeting in Columbus) joined us for a discussion of organizational issues related to DPF meetings. We had a similar meeting with Roberto Peccei at the time of the DPF 99 meeting at UCLA. Gene Beier suggested that it would be useful to write down some procedures, etc. for divisional meetings so that future organizers could learn from the experience of the past.

K.K. discussed several administrative details. DPF 2000 received financial support from DOE and NSF. K.K. emphasized that DOE and NSF had very different requirements for how their funding was to be spent so the organizers should be prepared to be flexible. Ohio State University also provided some financial support. The registration fee was lower than that of DPF 1999 since lunch was not provided. The conference did not lose money.

S. Wojcicki pointed out that NSF has another department for supporting foreign visitors; this may be a possibility for additional funding.

K.K. gave us some statistics for the meeting: # abstracts submitted: ~ 550 # talks: ~ 450 # speakers: ~ 400 # participants: 500

The number of participants was higher than at the UCLA meeting in 1999.

There was a request to have a reduced registration fee for retired persons as APS does for its meetings.

Some members of the Executive Committee felt that the meeting had too many parallel sessions; there were as many as 12 at a time. At DPF 99, there were problems with combining abstracts into a smaller number of talks though.

The proceedings for DPF 2000 will be published by World Scientific as a supplement in the International Journal of Modern Physics A (IJMP). The paper copy of proceedings will be distributed free to all IJMP subscribers. The electronic version of the proceedings will eventually be available on the DPF 2000 and World Scientific web sites.

DPF 2000 was broadcast live on the World Wide Web. Marc Sher, who viewed portions of the meeting on the Web, commented that the system was working but the light was too dim.

C. Quigg emphasized the importance of diversity in the plenary speakers.

DPF 2002 plans (Sher)

Marc Sher (College of William and Mary) joined us by speaker phone to talk about plans for the next DPF meeting in 2002. The meeting is scheduled for Friday 24 May 2002 to Tuesday 28 May 2002 in Williamsburg, Va. Marc had sent a handout for distribution that described plans to date. The Local Organizing Committee is already in place and preparations for the meeting are well underway.

C. Quigg mentioned that the University of Washington may host the following DPF meeting (in 2003).

Discussion with APS Associate Executive Officer (Chodos)

APS Associate Executive Officer Alan Chodos joined us. His principal topic for discussion was the budget situation for the DOE Office of Science. He mentioned that e-mail was sent to APS officers about a budget alert for the DOE Office of Science. It was not clear what the response would be and whether it would do any good. There was an extended discussion about the grim funding situation and how best to respond. H. Gordon pointed out that paper letters are worth more than e-mail, but they would have to be sent right away. V. Barger suggested generating a form letter that people could sign and forward. J. Conrad pointed out that if something could be drafted fast enough, we could get DPF meeting attendees to sign the letters and we could mail them ourselves right away. Alan Chodos, Howard Gordon and Gene Beier agreed to work on a letter that afternoon.

Plans for APS 2001 meeting (Wojcicki)

DPF Vice-Chair Stan Wojcicki is working on plans for the APS 2001 meeting to be held in Washington, D.C. 28 April 2001 - 1 May 2001. Stan asked for help with the following items:

Topics for invited sessions - We had 6 slots at the 2000 APS meeting in Long Beach. If you co-sponsor a session with another unit, it only counts as half so we increased our number by doing this (to 8).

Length of invited sessions - These were 5 talks of 36 min. at Long Beach, but with this schedule there was no time for lunch.

Focus sessions? These consist one or two invited talks + some number of contributed talks. G. Beier was not enthusiastic about his experience with these. Longer contributed papers? J. Conrad polled ~10 people and many complained about 10 minute talks.

Joint sessions with other divisions and groups?

Other ideas for getting good attendance?

Some discussion followed resulting in a preliminary plan for sessions.

Closed Session

The meeting continued the evening of 10 August 2000. P Meyers joined us, Donna Naples left. Alan Chodos was present and G. Farrar was on the phone.

Report from Secretary-Treasurer (C. Newman-Holmes)

The treasurer's report was given at the DPF Business meeting held on 9 August 2000 so it was not repeated here. As of 30 June 2000, the DPF balance was \$117,847.

CNH proposed that candidate information on paper (for the next DPF election) be sent only to people receiving paper ballots rather than to everyone with the newsletter. The

Executive Committee approved this proposal. For those voting electronically, candidate information is available on the Web.

Letter about funding for DPF conference attendees

H. Gordon, A. Chodos and G. Beier drafted a letter about funding for high- energy physics for DPF conference attendees to sign and mail to members of Congress. A copy is attached at the end of these minutes. The letter was copied and copies were subsequently signed by about 200 DPF members. Envelopes were stuffed and stamps affixed. Maybe it did some good; recent news about this year's budget has been more positive.

Snowmass 2001 (Chris Quigg)

DPF Chair-Elect and Snowmass organizer Chris Quigg distributed copies of the talk he had given earlier at the DPF Business Meeting (see

http://lutece.fnal.gov/Drafts/SnowmassDPFtalk.pdf). The Snowmass 2001 summer study wil be held 30 June 2001 - 21 July 2001. Chris has also made presentations about the Snowmass summer study at the FNAL, SLAC and BNL Users' meetings. The FNAL conference staff is negotiating contracts with the Snowmass Village Resort Association. Chris has been in contact with HEP leaders throughout the world.

There was a lengthy discussion of Snowmass plans; some of the ideas expressed were:

It is important to have enough time for people to work and explore new ideas; some people thought that the last Snowmass summer study had too many talks scheduled.

Snowmass 2001 will include some "teach-ins". This idea arose when people were asking how they could contribute to accelerator physics. Suggestions so far, for teach-in topics, include linear collider physics, particle astrophysics, accelerator physics, and string theory. C. Quigg is looking for other ideas for teach-ins. There will be education and outreach activities. Liz Simmons (Boston University) has agreed to chair a committee to organize this.

C. Quigg has been assembling an organizing committee. He later sent a list of names to the DPF Executive Committee and received suggestions.

The working group organization is under discussion. Four convenors (two experimentalists and two theorists) are envisioned for each working group. It is important to have younger physicists well-represented in the convenor population. There was a long discussion about whether or not the linear collider proposal should be treated differently from other future machine options at Snowmass, 2001.

There was some discussion of HEPAP's role and the formation of a new subpanel. C. Quigg mentioned that funding from DPF of order \$15K - \$40K would be needed to pay professional writing consultants to work on documents that will come out of Snowmass. Chris envisions three documents coming out of

Snowmass. Descriptions below are quoted from the talk Chris gave at the DPF meeting:

- 1. A brief and illustrated thematic survey of what particle physics is and aspires to be, guided by the scientific imperatives.
- 2. A coherent accelerator R&D plan.
- 3. A more detailed but still < 100 page "white paper" on the field in all its richness and potential.

Report from HEPAP (Howard Gordon)

H. Gordon asked HEPAP for input about plans for the Snowmass 2001 summer study. At this point in the agenda, we were getting tired so CNH offered to circulate comments from HEPAP to the Executive Committee by e-mail. This was subsequently done.

Panofsky Prize funding (Gene Beier)

G. Beier is in the process of increasing the endowment for the Panofsky Prize. His goal is \$100K and he is optimistic about reaching or exceeding it.

Next meeting

The next meeting of the DPF Executive Committee is expected to be in December, 2000 with the newly elected members. It is likely to be a video conference.

APPENDIX

Sample letter sent by DPF 2000 meeting participants to key members of Congress

The Honorable Pete V. Domenici Chairman, Senate Appropriations Energy and Water Development Subcommittee SH-328 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510-3101

Dear Senator Domenici:

I am writing to support an increase in the funding level for the Office of Science in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. I am actively working in the field of High Energy Physics.

The pursuit of basic knowledge in the physical sciences and training of scientists and engineers for the future are the keys to our continuing prosperity. The Office of Science of the Department of Energy supports the majority of physical science research in the U.S., including High Energy Physics, Nuclear Physics, Fusion Research, Basic Energy Sciences and the Spallation Neutron Source.

The field of High Energy Physics explores some of the deepest mysteries of our universe: the basic nature of matter, the forces that govern the behavior of the fundamental constituents, and the events when the universe began. The pursuit of these questions has also yielded many immediate benefits to society including the World Wide Web, accelerators, and experimental methods that are now used widely in medicine and industry as well as other sciences.

In High Energy Physics we are on the verge of exciting new discoveries at Fermilab and SLAC. The new facilities we have just constructed need full funding to exploit these opportunities. We are also in the process of planning the next two decades based on recent results and the fundamental questions that have arisen. To address these questions requires Research and Development on several types of accelerators.

At the currently projected level of funding, the effect will be most severe on the universities where the young scientists of tomorrow are being trained. I am asking that the Congress restore the funding level for the Office of Science in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill to the full \$3.16 B requested by the Administration of which \$714.7 M would be for High Energy Physics.