

From: Timothy Hallman <hallman@bnl.gov>
Subject: **Getting organized for upcoming DOE review of STAR TOF Proposal**
Date: July 9, 2005 8:13:12 PM CDT
To: Geary Eppley <eppley@physics.rice.edu>, "Huan Z. Huang" <huang@physics.ucla.edu>, "Jo Schambach" <jschamba@physics.utexas.edu>, "W.J. Llope" <llope@physics.rice.edu>, "Xu, Zhangbu" <xzb@bnl.gov>, Nu Xu <nxu@lbl.gov>, ??? <ygma@sinr.ac.cn>, "Hongfang CHEN" <hfchen@ustc.edu.cn>, Wang Yi <yiwang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn>, rlbrown@exchange.bnl.gov
Cc: Billy Bonner <bonner@physics.rice.edu>, "G. W. Hoffmann" <hoffmann@physics.utexas.edu>, Charles Whitten <whitten@carnot.physics.ucla.edu>, Dick Majka <MAJKA@hepmail.physics.yale.edu>, Hallman@bnl.gov, roberts@physics.rice.edu

Hi Geary and all.

I would like in this email to share some thoughts on a proposed agenda/speakers for the upcoming TOF review.

I have thought about this a bit, and also discussed it with Dick Majka and Tom Ludlam to get their thoughts. The result is the draft line-up below. This is of course open to discussion.

A reasonable line-up might be something like the following:

Importance to STAR Experiment/General overview	T. Hallman or R. Majka
The essential new scientific reach the proposed TOF detector adds to STAR	Zhangbu Xu
The choice of MRPC Technology for STAR: price, performance, previous use in other experiments, suitability for the STAR environment	G. Eppley
System Level Overview of TOF Barrel Electronics/ data acquisition issues/interface	J. Schambach
Component/card level electronics design/ E. performance/fabrication plan	Lloyd from Blue Sky
System level plan for TOF Barrel fabrication integration/installation	W. Llope
Chinese organization/management plan for mass production of MRPC chambers; overview of Chinese participation on STAR/TOF projects	H. Huang

Resource loaded cost and schedule plan for TOF barrel construction R. Brown

Review of Project Responsibilities/ Summary R. Majka/
G. Eppley

Please look this over and let's have some discussion with the goal of coming to a consensus soon (early next week) so people can begin to plan draft presentations for our meeting on July 21. Let me know what has been left out above, or how it might be organized more effectively. I think it will be very important to demonstrate that the physics requires 2π acceptance; as well that a partial acceptance does not save much money (as we have seen). The cost/schedule/contingency will need to be bulletproof, since these will form the basis that we will subsequently be tracked against if as we hope the review is successful. It will be important to have rock-solid evidence that the chambers work, as the committee may contain a skeptic from Belle (TBD). As soon as the committee is public knowledge, I will forward the membership and charge. Suffice it to say though, that despite all of our success to date, and all the positive indicators, we can not take anything for granted concerning the outcome of this review. We need to prepare well and defend it vigorously.

As a side comment, I think it may be important for any institution which has a major responsibility for the construction (Rice, UCLA, UT) to have their chief rep plan to attend this review on August 22-23, so that it is clear to Jehanne Simon-Gillo (especially if she asks) that this project has full institutional backing from the institutions involved in the construction. (In principle, some Chinese institutions would be good as well (USTC, Tsinghua, SINR, but this is likely problematic and can be covered in any event by Huan. Still--some letters of commitment from important people at those institutions might be valuable).

Send your thoughts on this soon, to this list.

Regards,

Tim