

Meeting of the Executive Committee of the DPF

21 December 2000

Minutes by Nick Hadley, Secretary-Treasurer

The meeting was conducted by video and phone conference.

Present: Jon Bagger, Vernon Barger, Gene Beier, Martin Breidenbach, William Carithers, Janet Conrad, Sally Dawson, Glennys Farrar, Howard Gordon, Nick Hadley, Young-Kee Kim, Peter Meyers, Cathy Newman-Holmes, Donna Naples, Chris Quigg, and Stanley Wojcicki John Krane (visitor), Geralyn (Sam) Zeller (visitor)

Agenda for DPF Executive Committee Meeting, December 21, 2000 via video conference, 11 am EST.

I. What is DPF? What should we be doing? Quigg, all

II. Meetings:

April 2001 (April 28 May 1, Washington D.C.) - Stan Wojcicki
April 2002?
DPF 2002 (May 24-28, William and Mary)

III. Snowmass 2001 Plans - Chris Quigg

IV. Interactions with Washington - Gene Beier

1. Congressional Reception - do we want it? Who will organize it? Other approaches, e.g. ACS approach. Action needed now!
2. Interactions with DOE, OMB, OSTP?

V. Young Physicist's Panel - Janet Conrad

VI. Report from APS Council - Peter Meyers

VII. Report of Secretary Treasurer - Cathy Newman-Holmes

VIII. Prize Committees, Panofsky Prize Fund Status - Gene Beier

VII. DPF Nominating Committee membership - Gene Beier

Gene Beier chaired the meeting

The meeting opened with Gene Beier welcoming new members of the Committee, Jon Bagger, the New Vice-Chair, Nick Hadley, the new Secretary-Treasurer, and Martin Breidenbach and Young-Kee Kim, the new Members of the Executive Committee.

What is DPF? What should we be doing?

Chris Quigg then moderated a discussion of what DPF should be doing and what we are doing. Quigg spoke about the lack of time for reflection and a need to spend more time considering our goals. He mentioned that we should look at other divisions and what they are doing, perhaps also particle physics in other countries. Many of our members have ideas. However, it is not easy to get these ideas turned into real initiatives given the constraints on people's time. It was stated that the role of the DPF Executive Committee is to point the way. We can recruit other people to help with work. For example, we could get someone to help undergraduates to attend and to participate in our divisional meetings as the Division of Nuclear Physics (DNP) does. There was a comment that the DNP seems to have a closer relationship with the DOE and NSAC than the DPF does with DOE and HEPAP. Beier is a member of HEPAP as the DPF chair and has completed a term on ICFA. Wojcicki is the new ICFA delegate. The possibility was raised of continuing those Snowmass committees that are effective after the Snowmass conference ends. It was noted the some divisions receive income from their divisional meetings, as well as from dues and industrial sponsors. The DPF, however, is not involved with the funding of our divisional meetings to a large extent. Quigg proposed that we form a sub-committee to look at the general question of what the DPF should be doing with the following members: Conrad, Barger, Carithers, and Farrar, who are all continuing Executive Committee members. This proposal was agreed to unanimously.

Meetings

There was then a discussion of future meetings.

The April 2001 meeting will be held in Washington DC April 28 - May 1.

The April 2002 meeting will be in Albuquerque April 20-23.

The April 2003 meeting will be in Philadelphia (April 5-8) and the April 2004 meeting in Denver (May 1-4).

The next DPF meeting will be at William and Mary May 24-28, 2002.

We are planning to have DPF meetings in odd years and to emphasize the April meeting in even years, and to try meet in phase with the DPB. The question of whether to have the next meeting in 2003 or 2005 was raised. There were comments in favor of a meeting in 2003 since there would be interesting results from the colliders then and that we would want to have a Snowmass follow up at that time. Some felt that 1.5 years between meetings might be the right spacing, and that we should time our meetings to meet the specific needs of the DPF. It was noted that separate DPF meetings are a good idea and that they are excellent meetings for younger physicists.

Stan Wojcicki then led a discussion of the Washington Meeting Program The meeting will take place April 28-May 1 in DC. There will be a 8 DPF invited sessions. The sessions have been formalized, two joint with DPB, two joint with DNP, one joint with Astrophysics, 3 solo sessions. It was noted that invited speakers can be contributed session chairs. There will be a DPF-EC meeting and a business meeting combined with the prize session in Washington. The April meeting will include Primakoff lecture which

will be given by Frank Wilczek and a lecture by Janet Conrad who is this year's Maria Goeppert Mayer award winner. The Tanaka award will be given for the first time in 2001.

The AAAS meeting will have a Particle Physics day in February. Again there will be a very interesting set of talks. with considerable press coverage. The DPF should try to arrange for talks on Particle Physics at the AAAS meetings. Glennys Farrar volunteered to help coordinate the DPF efforts to include more particle physics in AAAS meetings.

Snowmass 2001 Plans

Chris Quigg then led a discussion of Snowmass plans.

Snowmass 2001 will take place Saturday June 30 - Saturday July 21.

The names of the Organizing committee members from Particle Physics are: C. Quigg, S. Dawson, P. Grannis, D. Gross, J. Lykken, H. Murayama, R. Ong, N. Roe, H. Schellman, and M. Spiropulu. The organizers from Accelerators and Technology are: R. Davidson, A. Dragt, A. Chao, G. Dugan, N. Holtkamp, C. Joshi, T. Roser, R. Ruth, J. Seeman, and J. Strait. Snowmass2001.org will be used for the web site as soon as the name can be registered. The DPB has a complete list of working groups already. Chris et al are working on the Particle Physics list. They will try to complement the DPB list. Charges to the working groups should be ready soon. There will be a technology school (run by the IEEE Nuclear and Plasma Sciences Society - NPSS) during Snowmass, which will consist of lunch time lectures and will have short courses. The hope is to get 30 people at each course. These lectures will occur during the ten days without plenary talks and teachins. There will be a real emphasis on outreach at Snowmass. The outreach organization is going well. NSF and DOE are positive about outreach. There will be Physics Vans, public lectures and events along with Quarknet activities. The second week will have midcourse plenary sessions to try to bring groups back together. One goal is to have more time to work this Snowmass and fewer talks. Another goal is to have a positive atmosphere where people work together, as it was at the last Snowmass. There will be many international convenors and considerable international participation, not just from the Lab directors. The goal is 20% participation from outside the US. A successful Snowmass should be a mini-sabbatical where one can do real work in a different area, with tools provided by experts. A question was raised about how to get young people engaged and not just listening to talks and also how to get them to attend since Snowmass is expensive. Quigg noted that there will be student subsidies for 50 people at \$25 per night, with a student style life of group living. and that the organizers are trying to include young people as convenors. Quigg commented that providing a place for students to get together at night might be a good idea. However, there are conflicting goals. Students should meet the wider community and also their fellow students. There was a general comment about the need for more publicity as many people have not heard about the meeting. There will be a poster by January 2001 and a web site. (Note added after the meeting: The web site is in operation and is <http://www.snowmass2001.org>).

There will also be announcements in Physics Today and the CERN Courier. A question was raised about how Snowmass will relate to the planned HEPAP subpanel. Quigg commented that there has been considerable thought on how Snowmass relates to the subpanel. He would have liked this subpanel convened after Snowmass. However, DOE wants subpanel convened in Spring before Snowmass. The subpanel is likely to want an evening meeting at Snowmass. With a new administration, the subpanel may get delayed. (The DOE and NSF now sponsor HEPAP.)

Quigg noted that there will be the usual Snowmass proceedings which might only be available electronically. The Agencies are OK with electronic publication now. However, the organizers want the proceedings to be permanent and are discussing how to do this. There will be three other documents produced at Snowmass. 1) A brief (16 page) survey presenting our field, done with professional help. The goal is to have a draft before Snowmass. (aside: HEPAP is producing a Briefing Book with the goal of raising ceiling on accelerator R&D). 2) A Survey of the accelerator research and development program that will help us decide on our next project. We need to be preparing a number of futures, and to educate people that we need to do R&D before we are committed to a project. The document will also explain all the good things that have come out of Accelerators over the years in one chapter. The document will be about 20 pages. 3) 100 page White paper on the field in all its richness and potential.

There were comments that Particle Physics and its impact on other fields needs to be included and as does what other technologies have done for Particle Physics. It was noted that the APS has Physics Success stories on the web, and that these are well presented and that a major problem is the feeling that Particle Physics is flat funded and will not recover to earlier levels.

Chris Quigg asked for approval to spend up to \$20K on outreach for Snowmass. Gene Beier asked the secretary-treasurer to give the committee the balance in the DPF general fund. Cathy Newman-Holmes replied that the DPF has \$132K on hand and can afford the requested \$20K for outreach. It was proposed that the Committee authorize Chris Quigg to spend up to \$20K on Outreach now. The motion passed unanimously. Quigg also noted that he would also like DPF to pay for an illustrated survey document, which will be a 16 page booklet. Quigg will come back to the Committee with a request for about another \$25K when he understands the illustrated survey costs more completely. There were comments that the DPF needs to continue reporting on what we are doing. The Space Telescope Science Institute does a lot of this and it seems effective.

Young Physicist's Panel

Janet Conrad led a discussion with members of the Younger Physicists Panel, John Krane and GERALYN (Sam) Zeller. The panel is a group of about 15 people, graduate students and postdocs. Their goal was to produce a shadow white paper on young persons view of the field. However, people have discouraged them from writing the paper which was viewed as not being too useful. Instead the group plans to take a survey and generate an ntuple of results. They will formulate the survey and present results at Snowmass, This will

provide a tool to gauge opinion. A question was asked about whether the survey is needed as it would be better for younger physicists to attend Snowmass and participate directly. There were also concerns expressed about methodology and bias. Krane replied that they will try to get an unbiased survey perhaps with professional help. A question was raised about the timing of the survey. Since Snowmass is the place for opinion to evolve, why do the survey in advance? Krane said that the group hoped to do the survey at more than one time to show how opinions had changed. Concerns about the group being dominated by people from Fnl. Krane indicated that the group had contacted young physicists at SLAC and in Europe. The question was asked about what the Younger Physicists Panel would like the DPF Executive Committee to do. Krane replied that they would like Executive Committee to be receptive and to try to get the DPF behind this. There were suggestions that the DPF have a committee for younger physicists with a charter and so on, that the Executive Committee should do something so that this effort would survive, and that this would be an appropriate topic for the newly formed "Role of the DPF" subcommittee to address.

Interactions with Washington

Gene Beier then led a discussion of the Congressional Reception and related topics.

Beier noted that particle physicists (and others) did a lot of letter writing and this may have done some good with the budget last year. Also, considerable work went into the Congressional Reception. This year have a new administration and congress who we need to contact. A question was asked about whether we should have one large reception or go to a new paradigm of having more, smaller meetings? Last year, we worked in concert with DNP and DPB. DNP does not appear to want to organize the reception this year. It was noted that we should coordinate with the Fnl Users Executive Committee and the SLAC Users organization. We need to work on these issues year round and need to find someone with energy to do this next year. The question was raised about doing the reception at the same time as the as the April APS meeting. There are more general APS plans for contracting congress at the same time as the April meeting. A congressional visits day has been set up for May 1-2. Details of Congressional Visits Day can be found at <http://www.agiweb.org/cvd/>. The contact person at the APS is Christina Hood, 202-662-8700 (hood@aps.org). There were comments that we need to establish relationships with the decision makers outside of budget time. This would then help at budget time. There were a number of comments in favor of a permanent state based network that maintains contact with local politicians.

Discussion of Interactions with DOE, NSF, OMB, OSTP.

Gene Beier noted that the APS wants to coordinate what the different divisions are doing when they go to Congress or the Executive Branch so that the divisions speak in a unified manner on behalf of physical science. He suggested that the Division Chairs could visit congress together. This visit would be modeled after the joint visit the DOE advisory committee chairs (HEPAP, NSAC, and five others) made last year. It was noted that NSF increase didn't trickle down to the Math and Physical Sciences and that perhaps the DPF

Executive Committee could meet with congress as representatives of the Field, not just people with a financial stake. The DOE could do more outreach with lectures as NSF does. Janet Conrad agreed to contact Marv Goldberg and Alex Firestone and ask about how best to talk to the NSF.

Report from APS Council

Peter Meyers gave the Report from the APS Council. There is a briefing document from APS to incoming administration with one page on reorganizing DOE science. Two alternatives are given:

1. Elevate the Director of Science to an Assistant Secretary who would be the science advisor to the Secretary.
2. Combine DOE Science with NIST and NOAA and make them part of a renamed Department of Commerce. This agency would support basic and applied research.

This report follows the "Crisis Panel" report discussed in the Dec. 20, 2000 edition of "Whats New". See <http://www.aps.org/WN/WN00/wn122200.html> for details.

Prize Committees, Panofsky Prize Fund Status

Gene Beier thanked the departing members, of the Committee: Donna Naples, Nick Hadley who is changing hats, and particularly Howard Gordon for all his hard work, He also thanked Cathy Newman Holmes for her long hours as Secretary Treasurer. Gene noted that thanks, especially, to Marty Breidenbach and David Leith, we have donations of over \$40K for Panofsky fund.

DPF Nominating Committee membership

Gene Beier then noted that we should start nominating committee work soon as we are supposed to start March 1 and often start later.

Report of Secretary Treasurer

Cathy Newman Holmes sent treasurers report by email after the meeting. The report is given here. "The DPF balance as of 30 November 2000 was \$132,613. This is an increase of \$14,766 since the last Executive Committee meeting and is mostly from dues which were credited in the month of October."