

Meeting Minutes for
MINERvA Working Group Meeting (WGM)
Thursday, July 13, 2005
1:30 pm Snakepit

Attendees: E. Temple, N. Grossman, D. Harris, J. Butler, J. Appel, D. Boehnlein, D. Hoffer, R. Ransome (by phone)

Action Items:

1. Dave to check NuMI PMP vs. BTeV PMP to get most recent DOE philosophy on PMP's vs. PEP's. NOTE: Dave has already done this and has a few comments.
2. Dave to send out PMP to project people for review/comment and then to Ed & Dean. NOTE: Dave has already completed the revisions and sent the PMP out for comment by the project people.
3. Kevin to provide any updates on "Mission Need Document" status/who doing and whether MINERvA needs a NuSAG review.
4. Ed to find out from Danny if a single CD1,2,3 review would be sufficient for MINERvA under either the under \$5M or \$10M scenario.
5. MINERvA project people to give Mont several scenarios (if they have several), in order of preference (with all R&D removed) by July 19 at the latest NOTE: Debbie has already sent Mont e-mail on this to set something up.
6. Ed to schedule next meeting for July 27, 1:30 pm Snakepit.

Agenda & Minutes:

- 1) Timelines for MINERvA as O(\$10M) project. No additional questions from the project people. See June 30 meeting minutes for more information.
- 2) Timelines for MINERvA at less than \$5M. No additional questions from the project people. See June 30 meeting minutes for more information. Ed later commented that he had thought a single CD1,2,3 review would be sufficient for MINERvA under either the under \$5M or \$10M scenario. He asked D. Lehmann if that would be the case, but has not heard back. See action item 4.
- 3) Review Draft PMP. Dave Boehnlein is working on this (v2.0). He is addressing 3 main issues (along with Ed's comments):
 - 1) Need to filter out NuMI PMP type parts and make more applicable to MINERvA.
 - 2) Move away from collaboration management bases to FNAL management bases.
 - 3) Update ES&H structure section.
See action items 1 and 2.
- 4) Review Draft PEP. Dave has a rough outline based on the NuMI and BTeV PEPs. He will start working on that more once the current PMP revision is complete.
- 5) Status of Other Action Items
 - a. Find out if Mike P. is doing the "Justification of Mission Need Document" (Kevin). Kevin contacted M. Precario who stated that they were discussing this and will get back to him next week. Mike made the same

- comment about a NuSAG review for MINERvA. See action item 3.*
- b. Someone verify that MINERvA does not need a NuSAG review? *See item a and action item 3. Good news is that MINERvA has not appeared on the NuSAG agenda other than as a reference wrt NOVA (comment from Debbie).*
 - c. Dean to send Nancy/Debbie/Ron BTeV Acquisition Strategy Document. *Done. Project people are looking it over.*
 - d. List purchases of ~\$100K or more as a start to the acquisition strategy plan (Debbie, Nancy, Ron). *Debbie has done this and passed it around for comment. Initially 11 items were more than \$100K, but only 3 of the 11 are single items versus groups of components. Those three are the phototubes, Wavelength shifting (WLS) fibers and the steel for the wedges. The project will use this information as a starting point for the acquisition strategy document.*
 - e. Find out who in FSO is to be assigned to MINERvA (Dean & Ed) *Ron Lutha says Steve Webster.*
 - f. Dave to work on PMP/PEP for possible discussion at the next meeting. *See 3 & 4 above.*
 - g. Dave to contact Jeff Simms for FESS general PEP. *Done.*
 - h. Ed & Dean to give an update at the next meeting as to what they have learned from Dr. Byon-Wagner visit. *Believe scheduled for July 21 in Washington. P. Oddone, K. Stanfield, S. Holmes and H. Montgomery to attend meeting. Don't know if MINERvA will be specifically discussed at this meeting.*
 - i. MINERvA project management to present a possible funding proposal with DOE MINERvA MIE funding under \$5M (before Dr. Byon-Wagner's visit) to Mont.
Assumptions: R&D not part of project MIE as covered by PPD (\$2.5M). Thus \$10M is more like \$7.5M. Note all numbers are FY05 dollars with contingency. So need to get \$7.5M to under \$5M.

Debbie presented three initial scenarios:

- i. *MIE: all M&S costs (FNAL & University)=\$4.8M and SWF covered elsewhere. \$4.8M is a bit too close to \$5M for comfort.*
- ii. *MIE: all university M&S = \$3.8M. FNAL M&S and SWF covered elsewhere and University SWF covered elsewhere.*
- iii. *MIE: everything but PMT's and boxes and related electronics M&S/SWF = \$3M. Based on the PMT's/Boxes are a lab resource that can be used elsewhere much like PREP equipment for future initiatives and tests (and MINERvA). Specifically, perhaps the PMT's can be considered "hot spares" for the MINOS near detector?*

Project brought up concern of is it worth it to get the "FNAL MIE" under \$5M?

- *There are concerns about making sure the money to cover the other parts of the project can be found and counted on.*

- *Ron commented on the difficulty of getting University Grants to cover SWF other than operating costs such as student salaries. Getting money for technicians is difficult and time consuming as it requires reviews and approvals.*
- *Ed commented that it will be much easier to get the project going with an <\$5M MIE and Greg's e-mail was referenced:
"We have to let MINERVA know that if DOE is hinting at a definition of <\$5M the project had better pay attention. I think McFarland and collaboration are capable of running the project tightly enough under any set of funding circumstances. They just have to agree ahead of time on it. The Lab may be able via PMG's etc to provide an apparent heavyhanded-enough oversight role to help the project management team keep things under control."*

Joel suggested a couple more ways of breaking up the project:

- 1) *2 pieces that are a first and a second phase or two parts/projects? It is hard to break the project up and still do any physics as the whole detector is needed, but the project will think more about this.*
- 2) *Can part be considered useful for MINOS? (i.e. a beam background counter, neutron background measurements, etc.) Perhaps use MINOS operating to build parts of it as it helps measure something useful for MINOS. The project could not think of anything specific at the time (besides the physics benefits), but will think more.*

FNAL MIE of all FNAL M&S and SWF: \$3M suggested by Ed. Then there needs to be a trust between Kevin, Jorge and PK Williams so that PK must agree to cover the University costs (M&S and SWF). After the meeting Nancy spoke to Jorge and he thought it very unlikely PK would be able to do that. Kevin also mentions that the 5M\$ contribution is likely the sum of all DOE support, regardless of if it's in the MIE or if it's in the DOE University Operating grants.

This is the big concern. The program office must support the universities so the entire project cost gets covered.

Could add PMT costs to this \$3M FNAL MIE or outer detector steel to have less financial risk, but still stay comfortably below \$5M.

See action item 5.

- j. *Ed to schedule next meeting for July 13, 1:30 pm Snakepit. Done.*

