

# 10.05.2012 EC

Please send comments/corrections/additions to the whole mail list.

Present: Stepan, Maurik, Takashi, Tim, FX, Matt, John

## 1. News:

SLAC will provide 160k for the first 5 months of FY13 for HPS to prepare its new proposal and get started on necessary work. We expect to get this support restored by DOE in spring 2013.

The Lehmann Re-Baseline Review at JLAB will be Nov 27-29. We expect to know the outcome at its conclusion, but a formal report is not promised for 60 days. The HPS schedule will depend on knowing the firm outcome.

CLAS meeting next week. Stepan is discussing proposing an MRI with several groups attending. Would request 400k for new APDs (250k), new preamps (50k), and photodetectors for the muon system (100k).

Proposal due to NSF by Jan; results by August; money if successful in FY14. This would help us a lot with DOE.

Marco Oriunno will be our HPS Project Manager, overseeing all work on the experiment, with some formal responsibility for budgets, schedule, milestones, and making us all toe the line both at SLAC and at JLAB. Stepan, Maurik, and I will work closely with him in these matters.

## 2. We had a discussion of what working groups are needed in HPS and who should serve as leaders.

a. Beamline FX and Ken Moffeit. John checked with Ken post meeting--he is happy to serve and will be around for some time to come.

b. Ecal Stepan and Rafael Dupre (Orsay). Stepan will work to get Rafael into the collaboration asap.

c. SVT Tim and Pelle. Some question of whether this is the proper place for Pelle.


d. Muon Stepan will discuss with Keith and Yuri about their joint leadership.

e. DAQ Sergey + Ryan? Tim and John will talk to Ryan about whether he, or Pelle, or Matt has this role with Sergey. We decided we should have a physicist in the subgroup.

f. trigger Ben + Valery? Stepan will confirm with Valery or find someone else. Sho should have a significant role in the group. Ben needs to join HPS.

g. Slow Controls

Hovanes

h. Analysis Matt + ? We talked about adding two of matt's subcategories here: data production and sim (Homer), and Data quality and Data Base  We'd also have physics discussions in this group, but that topic generated some discussion so further refinement of definition is needed.

i. software Maurik + ? As in analysis, we discussed the sub-categories Matt suggested. SVT, Ecal, Online Monitoring, Event display, and level 3 may have survived. Decided to get this straight at next week's Software meeting.

## 3. Subgroup leader duties are given in the attachment above. Once we agree on leadership, we'll send this info out, requesting info from the new leaders.

## 4. Status of HPS' Development.

Takashi reviewed general conclusions. We have already rejected increasing B, since we can't then scale field with beam energy, and we must increase coverage to catch the particles bent out by the higher fields. Takashi recently pointed out that we can't move the target upstream, because the photon line will then be further displaced from the electron beam, and the ecal vac chamber must be changed for very little performance improvement. So we are sticking with the chicane layout of the test run, modified to incorporate a muon system. We are also sticking with the present ecal designs and ecal vac chamber. We are still studying possible variations of the SVT, but they basically all fit in the present beamline footprint. One change seems definite so far. Layer 5 will be changed into a "double layer", where that means two sensors will be placed side by side, both top and bottom. This basically doubles the acceptance. Another change: a layer 6 will be added, even if it doesn't have full acceptance (still being debated) to allow some redundancy and ensure a good fraction of five layer tracks, which are needed for good vertexing. Options with thinner, smaller sensors in layers 1 and 2, options with layer 1 at 5 cm, and options with the magnet gap increased to allow double sensor layers VERTICALLY as well as horizontally in the final layers are all still being considered. Hopefully we can resolve the basic design soon. Increasing the magnet gap would come at considerable expense: new ecal layers needed, new magnet vac tank needed, new capability to handle many more SVT channels needed.

## 5. What's the name of our experiment? We decided to junk the apostrophe. We are HPS.

John