

**Minutes of the ANS  
Fusion Energy Division  
Executive Committee Meeting**  
(Appended with subsequent meeting notes)

**June 6, 1999**

**Harvard Room  
Marriott Copley Place  
Boston**

Members Present: S. Brereton, W. Hogan, C. Martin, C. Wong, J. Blanchard  
(newly elected)

Members Present via TeleCon: M. Bourham, S. Milora, L. Cadwallader (newly  
elected)

Others Present: S. Herring, G. Miley, K. Schultz, Dick Benjamin, Warren  
Funk

Executive Committee Members Absent: D. Dudziak, W. Houlberg, G. Logan,  
K. McCarthy, D. Ruzic, R. Santoro, Y. Seki

**Call to Order**

C. Wong

C. Wong, Vice-Chair, called the meeting of the ANS/FED to order at 3:05 p.m.  
The meeting agenda is provided in Attachment A. A list of the current ANS  
officers and EC members is provided in Attachment B.

**1. Approval of the Previous Meeting's Minutes**

S. Brereton

The November/98 meeting minutes were reviewed, and approval was  
recommended by members present and by those on conference call.

**2. Treasurer's Report**

S. Brereton

S. Brereton reported that as of June 1999, income includes \$6233 of  
carryover and \$612 from member dues. The expense total is \$138 (cost of  
last conference call) and the balance is \$6707. The forecast total expense for  
CY1999 is approximately \$1350 and the balance at the end of the year is  
expected to be approximately \$5495<sup>1</sup>. It was noted that two of the three  
awards given at the June/98 Topical meeting have not yet been claimed

---

<sup>1</sup> Including the agreed to \$500 donation to the Teller endowment (see Section 6 of these minutes), the CY-  
1999 expenses would be \$1850 and the year-end balance would be \$4995. The budget spreadsheet shown in  
Attachment C has been adjusted to include this new expense.

(N. Gohneim and J. Welsey have not yet claimed their awards). J. Kulcinski had indicated earlier to S. Brereton that he would attempt to contact both N. Ghoniem and J. Wesley. N. Gohneim subsequently contacted S. Brereton and will submit a receipt for artwork soon, and claim his \$500 award.

Details of the proposed budget for CY1999 and the budget history are presented in the table provided in Attachment C.

It was noted that ANS would no longer utilize the past-complicated method to determine the amount of funds a technical division could carry over from one year to the next. Since December 31, 1998, the year-end balance will be the beginning balance for the next year, with no adjustments.

**3. Petition from Accelerator Applications Technical Group to become a Division**  
Warren Funk (and Dick Benjamin)

Warren Funk, the new chair of the Accelerator Applications Technical Group (AATG), asked for FED's support of their petition to become a division within ANS. Warren provided handouts, which are given in Attachment D. Accelerator Applications became a Technical Group within ANS at the Washington meeting, in November of 1996. It was established to be a technical home for nuclear applications of accelerators (use of accelerators and specialized targets for neutron production and associated science). This has expanded to include other applications, as summarized in Attachment D.

The main incentive to become a division is the right to participate in the governance of the society. It would not change the financial situation, or provide enhanced information exchange. It was noted that AATG ranked very well in the recent ANS division vitality survey. Even as a technical group, Accelerator Applications outperformed most of the divisions.

This organization presents a broad range of potential new membership for ANS. Membership within the AATG has grown linearly since 11/96, and it now has 222 members. Regular ANS meeting support has grown since 11/96, as has the number of papers. W. Funk was not sure if anyone in the technical group was involved with fusion-type accelerators. AATG also has topical meetings, and one is currently in the planning stages. M. Bourham asked about competition with other societies like IEEE. The response was that IEEE has nothing to do with accelerator applications, so no conflict or competition would be expected. There is an International Conference on Accelerators in Research and Industry, but this focuses more on the technology of the accelerator (formation and transport of the beam), rather than the applications themselves. So, topicals put on by

Accelerator Applications would provide a unique forum for information exchange on applications.

G. Miley asked about applications for inertial fusion. There is certainly overlap in this area (ion driven fusion and radiation effects/materials development), and a synergistic relationship is possible if the divisions worked together. Apparently Accelerator Applications has two sessions at the Boston ANS meeting, which were not known to FED. Clearly, coordination needs to take place. It was agreed that it would be in the best interest of both divisions to work together.

C. Martin asked about the effect of the recent DOE decision, selecting the reactor option over the accelerator for tritium production. The response was that some impact would be expected, but the AATG membership is diversified (coming from universities and industry, as well as national laboratories), and the long-term survival of the division would not depend on large government projects.

It was suggested that Accelerator Applications might publish articles or conference proceedings in Fusion Technology (the journal name could be changed if necessary, depending on the level of participation). AATG does not have its own publication and has used mechanisms within ANS to publish proceedings. They are also in the stages of putting together an issue of Nuclear Technology on accelerator applications.

A motion was put forward to establish a position of liaison to the AATG or AAD, if they become a division. The responsibilities of the liaison would be to attend AATG/AAD executive committee meetings, work with them, understand what they are doing, and communicate this back to FED. EC members in attendance and those on conference call approved the motion. C. Wong took the action to appoint a suitable candidate as the liaison. He will coordinate with AATG/AAD to see if there currently is a person who is a member in both areas. Someone already active in both areas would be the ideal candidate.

A second motion was put forward to endorse the status of Accelerator Applications Technical Group as a division, under the condition that they also establish a liaison to help the divisions work together. The motion was approved by EC members present and by those on conference call.

Subsequently, the petition for AATG to become AAD was unanimously approved at the Profession Division Chairs (PDC) meeting on June 8. C. Wong got agreement from Warren Funk that the AAD and FED will exchange liaisons.

#### 4. Report on ANS National Activities

C. Wong

C. Wong reported on the status of Infrastructure III. (Attachment E) The purpose of Infrastructure III is to review and reshape relationships with the divisions. A task force was appointed and 13 actions were recommended. The Recommended Action 1 has 3 tasks, provided earlier in the week by C. Wong to EC members (Attachment F). FED needs to review and respond to these by Tuesday, June 8 at the PDC meeting.

##### Tasks 1 is on Meeting Planning and Scheduling

There was concern about the first task (see Task 1, Attachment F), related to planning and scheduling of topicals. The technical part of a topical is the responsibility of the divisions; ANS-HQ has logistical responsibilities, and oversight through the national program screening committee. The subtask indicates that ANS-HQ will provide recommendations for periodic topicals, related to locations and hotel contracts. It was unclear if these recommendations would be mandatory, or if the divisions could consider them and adopt them if they felt appropriate (note, ANS-HQ has to approve the proposals for topicals anyways). It was also unclear if ANS-HQ would provide logistical support for separate topicals. This might mean a loss of income for divisions and local sections, and a loss of flexibility associated with the topicals. If adopted on June 10 at the ANS board meeting, the recommendation would take effect in January 2001. C. Wong will ask at the PDC meeting on June 8 on how they are interpreting this item, and will get their support for clarification of the language so that the recommendations are not mandatory.

##### Task 2 is on Meetings Improvements

Task 2, item 3 indicates that a minimum level of support for national meetings is needed from the divisions. FED does not support national meetings, unless there is an embedded topical. It was suggested that a subcommittee be set up to examine ways that FED could better support the national meetings. A motion was put forward to establish such a subcommittee. The motion was approved by EC members present and those on the conference call. C. Wong will poll the EC and see how to best establish this subcommittee. S. Herring, K. Schultz and W. Hogan indicated that they would be members of the subcommittee, but would not chair it. The action on this motion will depend on the outcome of the PDC meeting on June 8. (Subsequent to the PDC meeting, C. Wong does not see the need to establish such a subcommittee at this time. Notes on the PDC are in Attachment H.)

##### Task 3 is on Finance

Incentives will be provided to encourage paper submissions at National, Embedded Topical and Co-located Meetings. After a minimum number of

20 papers per meeting and 40 per year, ANS-HQ will pay the divisions for extra full papers, summary papers and panel presentations. For stand alone Topical and Co-located Topical Meetings, in the past, ANS-HQ got 50% of the revenues from topicals. With the new proposal, ANS-HQ would get \$60/attendee and 25% of the remaining net revenue. The remaining 75% of the revenues would be shared between the division and the local section (this used to be 50% of the net revenue). It appears that if a topical has more than 91 attendees, the divisions would fare better than before. However, there are other subtleties, and it was not clear if this proposal would be in the division's best interest or not. These proposals would essentially encourage the continuation of two national meetings per year and penalize the smaller divisions for not participating fully.

Those on the EC that will still be in Boston on 6/7 agreed to meet for lunch to further discuss the Infrastructure III Recommended Action 1-tasks.

#### Subsequent Meetings:

- A. Luncheon meeting between C. Wong, K. Schultz, W. Hogan and C. Martin on 7 June.

#### Summary:

The 3 tasks under Recommended Action 1 of Infrastructure III were reviewed. C. Wong would go to the PDC meeting with the following observations:

1. Infrastructure III pointed to the potential evolution to one national meeting per year in the next 10 to 15 years, yet Task 3 establishes the penalties for not supporting 2 meetings per year.
2. ANS strategic plan says that ANS should support divisions, yet Task 2 and 3 say divisions should support ANS.
3. FED has been supporting one good Topical meeting every 2 years and would be willing to support embedded topicals.
4. The only way to get good attendance is through good meetings and papers, but not by incentives given to divisions.
5. Don't try to push small divisions into a position that they are not comfortable with.

- B. Wong attended the PDC meeting on 8 June.  
(PDC meeting agenda, Attachment G; meeting notes, Attachment H)

Summary:

J. Braun (PDC, chair) ran the PDC meeting with the goal of getting approval of all Infrastructure III Recommended Actions and subtasks in toto.

Each action item was discussed and voted on.

A new action item 13 was identified. This action recommends the financial arrangements between ANS-HQ and Divisions including scholarship and awards. Division Chairs felt that there is duplication with Recommended Action 1, task 3 and there was not enough time given to the PDC to study the recommendations. J. Braun refused to head the evaluation of this task in the next 3 months, may be after the other Recommended Actions have been settled.

As shown in Attachment H, all Recommended Actions were discussed. In general the tone of the Recommended Actions was softened by changing the wording from the "responsibility of the divisions..." to "divisions are encouraged to..."

The key item under Recommended Action 1, Task 3, on the incentive payment plan for National Meetings, Embedded Topical and Co-Located Topicals was voted down.

Under Recommended Action 9, W. Houlberg filled out the division vitality check for FED and submitted it to ANS-HQ. FED has a score of 438 points. The average for all 17 ANS divisions is 337 and the range is 593-156. Therefore, the vitality of FED in ANS is very strong and we should be proud of the result.

5. **Progress on October 2000 Fusion Topical**

S. Herring

The 14<sup>th</sup> topical is set for October 15-19/2000, in Park City UT. We received preliminary approval on the morning of 6/6 (by the National Screening Committee). The proposal will go before the National Program meeting on Wednesday June 8, for formal approval.

The conference committee has been established. They have a budget and a publication plan. They have hotel contracts in place, and have established a technical program chair. Only minor changes have taken place to the proposal shown to FED in November of 1998. Refer to Attachment F of the November 1998 meeting minutes for details on the proposal.

M. Bourham recommended that we not have graduate students review papers for this conference, as has happened in the past. All were in agreement with this recommendation.

## **6. FED Honors and Awards**

J. Blanchard

J. Blanchard reported for J. Kulcinski on awards to be given at the October 2000 topical. A draft announcement and call for nominations is provided in Attachment I. Any comments should be given to J. Kulcinski or J. Blanchard. The announcement/call will be issued in the fall.

W. Hogan provided Attachment J on the new proposal for the Edward Teller medal. This would be awarded at the International Conference on Inertial Fusion Sciences and Applications (IFSA). The main issue is to establish the financial credibility of the endowment. It was proposed at the ANS Honors and Awards committee meeting that ANS establish the Edward Teller medal as an ANS award and that the award be endowed so a cash prize can be given. They also thought it should not be an ANS award alone, rather it should be an ANS/FED award so that FED expertise could be utilized to verify that nominees were credible. ANS provides a tax-exempt organization to accept the funds for the endowment, and is currently accepting donations. Edward Teller agreed that the ANS was an appropriate home for this award.

W. Hogan explained the difficulty with awarding the medal this year, before the endowment is fully established (against ANS policy). This problem is avoided with the stipulation in the Hertz foundation donation, that requires that initial expenses and 1999 awards be taken directly from their \$5,000 contribution, and any remaining go to the endowment. Current fund raising has reached \$14,500; the goal is \$40,000. The award would be self-sustaining in that the amount of cash prizes would depend on the value of the endowment at the time of the award. After 1999, two awards would be given every two years at IFSA. W. Hogan asked for FED's endorsement to present the new proposal to the ANS Honors and Awards Committee. A motion was made to endorse the proposal. The motion was approved by EC members present and those on conference call.

A suggestion was made that FED consider donating \$500 to the endowment. The Hertz foundation has agreed to donate up to an additional \$5000 in matching funds if additional donations are made. A motion was put forth for FED to make such a donation. The motion was approved by EC members present and those on conference call. S. Brereton will arrange for FED's donation. A letter stating the decision of the EC was signed by C.Wong (Attachment K)

## **7. Division Newsletter**

C. Wong

C. Wong reported for L. El-Guebaly on the FED newsletter. The June issue is ready to go, with the exception that we need to provide two names for FED representatives: one on the Public Policy Committee and a second on

the National Program Committee. Names will be provided (see next item).

G. Miley suggested that the newsletter mention his upcoming retirement as Editor of Fusion Technology. The EC thought it was up to G. Miley whether to include it in this issue, or wait until the December issue. K. Schultz indicated that he would provide something on this subject to L. El-Guebaly to include in June's issue.

THE FED WOULD LIKE TO COMMEND AND THANK L. EL-GUEBALY FOR HER EXCELLENT JOB ON THE FED NEWSLETTER.

#### **8. FED Committee Representatives**

C. Wong

C. Wong reported that the division must provide representatives for the National Program Committee and the Public Policy Committee. W. Hogan has agreed to be the representative for the Public Policy Committee. S. Herring agreed to be on the National Program Committee as FED's representative. The committee representatives agreed to provide reports (via email) to FED EC members regarding the committee meetings and activities.

#### **9. FESAC Activities**

C. Wong

C. Wong reported that FESAC has just finished the preparation of the Opportunities in the Fusion Energy Sciences Program Report. He indicated that he would inquire of J. Sheffield if the report could be published in NUCLEAR NEWS. In the last few months, FESAC has been continuing on the second assigned task of community assessment of the restructured fusion program for further redirection given projected flat budgets for fusion. Recommendations should also be provided on the proof-of-principle experiments and on the balance of the program between tokamak and non-tokamak physics and between magnetic and inertial fusion energy. The second report is due September 1999. The committee has been reviewing programs at different fusion institutions. A question was asked about the relationship of FESAC with Snowmass. Snowmass is to build consensus on the technical direction of the US program, but it is supposed to be accomplished by a series of meetings. Snowmass may not come up with any consensus or recommendations by July. C. Wong mentioned that according to John Sheffield, FESAC will receive input from Snowmass, but Snowmass input is only part of the total input to FESAC. FESAC will formulate its own recommendations.

#### **10. Snowmass Meeting**

C. Wong

A brief discussion on how technology will be included at the Snowmass meeting took place. It was suggested that the Snowmass web page be viewed (<http://www.fusion.pppl.gov/snowmass>). It appears that the

technology area is one of the best organized. C. Wong offered to provide additional information to anyone interested. Since there will be many technical presentations prepared for the Snowmass meeting, G. Miley encourages the possibility of preparing some of the presentations for the journal Fusion Technology.

#### **11. Report on Fusion Technology**

G. Miley

The Editor's report for Fusion Technology is given in Attachment L. K. Schultz stated that all ANS Journals are making a net profit, but the reduction on the subscription of Fusion Technology is alarming. He urged FED members to subscribe and ask libraries to subscribe. For the coming year, Fusion Technology will be reduced from 7 to 6 issues. Discussions were focused on the means of broadening the subject coverage of the journal, e.g. by including changes of the title to Fusion/Accelerator Technology and/or including papers from fusion research related diagnostics technology, as an example. Taking advantage of the situation that G. Miley would be retiring from the editorship of Fusion Technology in two years, this may be the right time to prepare for changes. Ken Schultz was asked to come up with a recommendation by the next FED EC meeting. C. Wong was asked to contact Warren Funk to solicit their interest in focusing the publications of the AAT the Journal with the potential name of Fusion/Accelerator Technology.

G. Miley reported that the new EC associate editor is Ulrich von Mollerdorff. ANS is closing the EC Fusion Technology office and will consolidate all the work at HQ. G. Miley projected that this might reduce the number of EC paper submissions.

#### **12. Transfer of FED Website**

S. Brereton

S. Brereton reported that the process for transferring the FED website from the UCSD location to a server at ANS headquarters has started. According to Joe Koblich, Director of Information Services for ANS, a new webmaster has been hired (as of mid-May). The webmaster will contact Mark Tillack (current website manager) and arrange for the transfer of files.

#### **13. Welcome of New Officers**

C. Wong

C. Wong, the new FED chair, welcomed the three new Executive Committee members: Jake Blanchard of UW, Lee Cadwallader of the INEEL, and Scott Willms of LANL. He indicated that Kathy McCarthy (INEEL) had been elected as the new Vice-Chair, and Sandra Brereton (LLNL) had been re-elected as the Secretary/Treasurer. New officers/EC members will begin their tenure starting at the conclusion of the June ANS summer meeting.

**14. Other Business**

**C. Wong**

None.

**The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.**

**Attachment A**

**ANS Fusion Energy Division  
Executive Committee Meeting**

**3 – 5 pm EDST, June 6, 1999  
Boston Marriott Hotel  
Harvard Room**

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order – C. Wong
2. Approval of minutes, November 1998 FED Executive Committee meeting – S. Brereton
3. Treasurer's Report – S. Brereton
4. Petition from Accelerator Applications Technical Group to become a Division – W. Funk and R. Benjamin (AATG)
5. ANS National activities – C. Wong
6. Progress on 2000 Fusion Topical in Park City – S. Herring
7. FED Honors and Awards (Teller Award, 2000 Topical) – G. Kulcinski
8. FED newsletter – L. El Guebaly
9. FED committee representatives (NPC, Public Policy) – C. Wong
10. FESAC activities – C. Wong
11. Snowmass meeting/role of technology in planning – C. Wong
12. Fusion Technology – K. Schultz, G. Miley
13. Transfer of FED website – S. Brereton
14. Welcome of new officers and EC members
15. Other business
16. Adjournment

## Attachment B

### ANS/OFE Officers and Executive Committee List

Chair: Clement Wong (99-00) wongc@gav.gat.com  
Vice-Chair: Kathryn McCarthy (99-00) KM3@inel.gov  
Secretary/Treasurer:  
Sandra Brereton (99-00) brereton1@llnl.gov

#### Executive Committee Members:

James Blanchard (99-02) blanchard@enr.wisc.edu  
Mohamed Bourham (98-01) bourham@ncsu.edu  
Lee Cadwallader (99-02) lcc@inel.gov  
Grant Logan (97-00) logan1@llnl.gov  
Charles Martin (98-01) charlesm@dnfsb.gov  
Stan Milora (98-01) miloras1@ornl.gov  
Robert Santoro (97-00) santorr@ornl.gov  
Yasushi Seki (97-00) sekiy@naka.jaeri.go.jp  
Scott Willms (99-02) willms@lanl.gov

FED Standing Committee Chairs: (No less than 3 members each, according to FED bylaws)

Nominating Committee Wayne Houlberg (Chair)  
Program Committee Steve Herring (Chair)  
K. McCarthy(member)  
(according to FED bylaws)  
Honors/Awards Committee Gerald Kulcinski (Chair)

#### FED Special Committee Chairs:

Membership Committee Ken Schultz

#### FED Representatives at National Committees

ANS Publications Ken Schultz  
ANS Public Policy Bill Hogan

#### Editors

Fusion Technology Journal George Miley  
Newsletter Laila El-Guebaly  
Web site maintenance Mark Tillack

#### Liaisons to other Organizations

MS&T Division John Davis  
AAD TBD  
IEEE George Miley

## Attachment H

Summary of the PDC meeting, 8 June 1999.

Recommended Actions 2 to 12 were discussed. (Please refer to attachment D.)

Action 2 on the acquaintance of Bylaws and Rules, was changed from Division Chair training to Division Officer training.

Action 3 on designation of primary or secondary division membership was recommended to add a phase that "This is for information only and will not affect financial arrangements."

Actions 4,5,7 and 10 were changed that division chairs are encourage to liaison and not responsible to liaison.

Action 6 was approved.

Action 8 was changed to investigate the guideline and consideration for merging division.

Action 9 became a voluntary participation on the Division tracking and accountability program to evaluate viability of the Division.

Action 11 C. Wong identified that fusion can also contribute in the area of Food Irradiation and Space Rectors.

Action 12 has no discussion.

Back to the three tasks on Recommended Action 1.

During the debate on the following tasks, C. Wong stated FED's position and explained the sensitive position of the US fusion program with the 3 national reviews and 1 summer workshop.

Task 1 on meeting planning and scheduling

Division Chairs felt that the screening committee has too much power and they worried about the composition of the screening committee.

J. Braun emphasized that this task is for coordination only.

After a lot of debate, it was adopted in toto.

Task 2 on meeting improvements

After some debate, it was adopted in toto.

### Task 3 on meeting revenue incentives

General debate was on the National Meetings, Embedded Topical Meetings and Co-Located Meeting incentives. C. Wong stressed that he failed to see the connection between financial incentives to participation.

Fierce debate took place, this item was tabled and off-tabled and the proposal on graded incentive between small and large division was defeated. At the end this incentive proposal was voted down.

The proposal for Stand Alone Topical Meetings and Co-located Topical Meeting was approved.