

Minutes of USLUO Executive Committee Meeting on December 17, 2010

Attending: Darin Acosta, Kevin Burkett, Sarah Demers, Sridhara Dasu,
Al Goshaw, Joey Huston, Boaz Klima, Jen Nahn, Harvey Newman, Randy Ruchti

o Introduction [Harvey]:

Harvey opened the meeting, reminding everyone of the successes of the LHC during the past year.

o Election of US LUO Chair and Secretary for 2011 [Sarah, Kevin]:

There were two nominations for Chair: John Huth and Harvey Newman. The vote

for chair would be held via email.

(Update: Harvey was subsequently elected chair for 2011.)

Kevin was elected secretary unanimously.

o Impressions from the 2010 Annual US LUO Meeting [All]:

The general feeling was that the meeting was a success, but the attendance could be better. There was a support for the idea of funds to support the attendance of young speakers. There was some discussion of whether the timing or location of the meeting next year could be changed to improve attendance. Boaz suggested surveying colleagues to understand why they didn't attend and if there are changes that could be made to make the meeting more attractive to them. One idea was to co-locate the meeting with US ATLAS or US CMS meetings. The date of the 2011 US CMS meeting has already been decided (May 5-7 at Notre Dame) while the US ATLAS meeting has not been settled

yet. It was emphasized that we need support from the hosting institution.

Another idea was to have the meeting at CERN, but the feeling was that the meeting should be held in the US, though it could have a shared

session with CERN which would include talks from the spokespeople.

The action item following the discussion was for Nick/Al/Ian Shipsey to work on the coordination of meetings/location/date. Once the location of the US ATLAS meeting has been settled, a planning meeting should be held. This would likely be towards the end of January.

o Outcome of initiative to have US LUO become an APS unit [Harvey]:

The history of this initiative is that the original plan for for APS to host USLUO, as either topical group or forum. DPF was initially supportive of the idea of a topical group, but their executive committee expressed concerns about the overlap, which effectively killed the proposition. This led to the possibility of being a forum, but the prospects for this depended on the APS executive committee and their view. They felt that a forum should deal with very broad issues, and suggested a forum on large international collaborations. However, the feeling was that this was becoming too broad and getting away from the mission of USLUO, so it was concluded that we should not continue in that direction. This led to the idea of URA being the host organization.

o URA as US LUO host organization [Harvey, Randy]:

A letter had been sent to Fred Bernthal and Marta Cehelsky, which highlights the overlap of the URA missions with those of USLUO. The letter also highlighted other ULSUO activities, including work in DC, participation in the events such as the science festival, and experience with communication in the context of large international collaborations.

The letter was well-received, and the response from URA included a few questions. A proposed budget had a total of \$49k, including:

\$20k for staff/support

12k for travel to Washington

7k for other travel

10k to encourage participation from younger members

An initial exchange indicated that URA did not have a staffer who could work 1/3-1/2 time on US LUO. If they hired a new staffer, would USLUO have to pay for this staffer? In terms of collecting funds, little money was collected

from donations, so we need to collect dues. Fees are collected at the annual meeting and some of those funds should come back to USLUO.

Regarding collecting funds from URA members, we could not collect this as fees but could make an appeal for funding on a voluntary basis. Universities might make a one-time donation but would probably not do it on a yearly basis, so it was proposed to enlist the PIs in making an appeal. One other funding option mentioned in the letter was to seek funds from FNAL/FRA. This should be explored, however there is significant overlap between URA and FRA.

To solicit funds from NSF to support the Annual Meeting, a request should be attached to an ongoing grant with NSF as supplemental support for the Annual Meeting. It should be emphasized that this is a conference where young people will present results. This would be separate from lobbying efforts. Sridhara proposed asking URA to host a meeting in Washington to emphasize the LHC. It

was felt that a meeting in DC could get good attendance. Harvey cautioned against explicitly highlighting the the LHC, and instead highlight funding of the physical sciences in general. This would probably not be a big meeting. It was suggested to seek help from JHU/UMD, the APS, or even the national academies to organize such a meeting.

o US LUO participation in the US Science Exhibition on Capitol Hill 2011, organized by NUFO

The exhibition would possibly be in late March or early April. The exact date should be settled in January. The lead organization is NUFO, supported by several congress people.

o DC Trip 2011 [Sridhara, Sarah]:

There have already been email exchanges to start planning the trip. It will probably occur in late March or early April, as recommended by Carol Maguire. There are a few issues with this date though: overlaps with other meetings and also the cherry blossom season in DC which would make it more expensive. The trip is still in the planning stages, and more will be known in January. The

planning meeting with the other Users Organizations has been postponed to January. In the interim discussions have focused on what should be updated for the trip this year. John asked if the one-pager will have the same format as in the past. Sridhara said it would, though the message should be tuned to match the new congress.

o AOB [All]:

- ACCU Notes of December 8 sent out to US LUO

Harvey mentioned that the notes had been circulated by Darin. Harvey will send a note to the DG to thank him for the progress in the past year in addressing several issues. There were no other current issues that people felt needed to be brought to the attention of the DG.

- Accelerator and Beams brochure

Harvey had earlier circulated the information about this excellent brochure. It has a broader scope on the use of accelerators, which should be kept in mind for the one-pager. There was an older brochure about particle physics in pictures, but this was specific to FNAL. Action item to check with USLHC communications to see if there is time for an updated brochure that will be left behind on visits.

- NUFO: Science Exhibition on Capitol Hill (see above)

- User Administrator [Jen]:

Jen reported on the monthly administrator meetings she is now attending. The first meeting was a few weeks ago, where the main topic was the science exhibition on Capitol Hill. The science festival was a huge success, with over 5k people visiting the NUFO booth.