

Panel on Public Affairs Meeting
February 1, 2013
APS Washington Office of Public Affairs
529 14th Street, NW, Suite 1050, Washington, DC

Members present:

R. Jaffe (Chair Elect), S. Koonin (Vice Chair), J. Dahlburg (Past Chair)
S. Aronson, A. Bienenstock, P. Coyle, A. Falk, W. Goldstein, M. Goodman, M. Gunner, T. Meyer, J. Phillips (via phone), M. Rosenthal, R. Schwitters, S. Seestrom, P. Taylor, T. Theis, J. Trebes

Guests:

John Ahearne (via phone), Paul Cottle, Marcius Extavour (via phone), Dimitri Kusnesov

Advisors/Staff present:

M. Beasley, K. Cole, K. Kirby, J. Lieberman (via phone), M. Lubell, J. Russo, F. Slakey, M. Turner

Members Absent:

A. Garcia, R.S. Kemp, R. Rosner (Chair)

Call to Order

J. Dahlburg called the meeting to order at 8:16 AM.

Welcome, Introductions, & Approval of Minutes
--

J. Dahlburg welcomed everyone and asked them to introduce themselves. Then she walked through the October minutes and asked for comments. *(Let the record note that the October minutes do not follow normal format. POPA Administrator, J. Russo, was on maternity leave when POPA last convened.)*

Commentary: A few typos were noted. M. Goodman requested a minor change in the way an action item was reported. J. Russo will make both adjustments.

Action: T. Meyer moved to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2012 POPA meeting; A. Falk seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

Purpose & Activities of POPA

F. Slakey provided a review of the purpose & activities of POPA. There are two primary activities of POPA: (1) developing and approving statements and (2) conducting studies. He referred to the section of the Society's website devoted to APS statements. There are five categories under which a statement may fall: Education, Ethics & Values, Human Rights, Internal Policy, and National Policy. He then described the process by which a statement is

approved by the Society, a course which normally takes a year or longer (see Article XVI of the APS bylaws).

F. Slakey went on to explain how POPA reports are generated. From start to finish a study conducted by POPA takes about a year; study deliverables are actionable items. At least one member of POPA must be involved as a committee member for a study to proceed. POPA reports are short (roughly 30 pages), have a quick turnaround (approximately 1 year), have a budget of approximately \$25K, can be done in partnership with other societies, and are often tied to congressional or executive branch issues. F. Slakey pointed to the POPA Energy Critical Elements (ECE) Report as an example. Senate Bill S383 incorporated all of the recommendations made in the POPA ECE Report. R. Jaffe (Chair of the ECE Study Committee) provided background on how the idea for the study came about and his general experience throughout the course of the project. If the Panel decides there is an issue greater than the scope of a POPA report, they can consider moving the topic forward as an APS Study. APS studies have a larger budget, a longer timeline and require more staffing to complete.

Commentary: S. Koonin asked about the length of time it takes for an APS Statement to achieve approval. He questioned whether there were alternative ways to allow the Society to address an issue if a statement had yet to be approved. K. Cole and K. Kirby reminded the group that the APS Executive Board can produce statements, good for one year, with a quick turnaround in circumstances that require immediate action on part of the Society.

J. Dahlburg asked each of the POPA Subcommittee Chairs to explain the issues and projects they are currently working on. Members should volunteer to serve on the subcommittees prior to breaking for lunch.

- Steering Committee – this consists of the POPA chair line, the Physics Policy Committee (PPC) Chair, the APS Vice President, and the Chairs of all the other subcommittees; the steering committee designs the agendas for each POPA meeting.
- National Research Policy – works closely with the PPC, which handles budgetary policy issues. This subcommittee needs a strong, new vision if it intends to remain viable. PPC Chair, A. Bienenstock, said he doesn't see the need for this POPA subcommittee.
- Physics & the Public – most recently worked on statements dealing with the misuse of physics. There are currently statements from the APS Committee on Education under consideration, which will be presented for review today.
- National Security – most recently conducted a study for the DNDO regarding their R&D plan for the next decade. The subcommittee is now focused on the issue of non-strategic nuclear warheads (tactical nuclear weapons), conducting a “think tank” workshop in partnership with the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).
- Ethics – this subcommittee is only active when a need arises; it is made up of the POPA chair line.
- Energy & Environment – has dealt with topics such as Direct Air Capture and Energy Critical Elements, producing reports on both. Presently, the subcommittee is working on a project regarding technical issues associated with the extension of licenses for nuclear reactors. New issues include proposed legislation on the U.S. helium reserve and revisiting the APS Statement on Climate Change.

Commentary: The idea of creating a strategic planning subcommittee for POPA was suggested by M. Beasley. The committee would be responsible for considering the issues POPA may encounter down the line and would provide an overall strategic look at efforts the Panel chooses to make. S. Koonin said looking strategically at societal issues and physics issues is important. R. Jaffe wondered if our current Ethics subcommittee should be expanded to include additional POPA members, based on his new understanding of the role it serves. A. Bienenstock chaired the Ethics Subcommittee in the past and remarked that, while it exists to handle individual problems, there are times when statements will emerge from (or have to be revised by) the Subcommittee. M. Beasley suggested that the ethics statements of all societies need to be revisited as times change.

Discussion: National Security Laboratories – Workforce & Priorities

J. Dahlburg welcomed guests John Ahearne (via phone) and Dimitri Kusnesov. J. Ahearne began by providing his read on recent defense authorization language establishing an advisory panel study. He finds the idea of government agencies directly sponsoring the national labs, without strict laws requiring them to do so, hard to imagine. It is difficult to obtain funding from the agencies as things currently stand. It's unlikely that costs will be reduced through these efforts, as the language proposes. He found the proposal for an advisory panel study strange and reasoned there might be underlying reasons for its existence (perhaps the dismantlement of the national labs).

Commentary: M. Turner said the language seems to suggest that Congress is really interested in the NNSA labs and needs help in assessing whether the ideas proposed make sense. Another assessment won't solve the root problem. J. Dahlburg agreed. J. Ahearne said it's more likely to be a hindrance and could be a very lengthy study. P. Coyle said there are elements in the language that capture the current situation, namely nuclear weapons labs obtaining funding from more than one agency. He reminded the group that there is an inter-agency committee (MEC - Mission Executive Committee) that was created to deal with issues related to the funding weapons labs receive from other agencies, apart from the NNSA. S. Aronson mentioned a study done by the Stimson Institute in 2009 whose executive summary reads similarly to the legislative language presented. F. Slakey reminded everyone that the author of the Stimson report was Libby Turpen, who visited POPA last October to introduce this issue. A. Bienenstock asked P. Coyle whether the barriers that used to be in place, restricting other agencies from funding DOE labs, have been removed. W. Goldstein said the language presented is some of the least objectionable out there regarding the governance of NNSA laboratories. The barriers are administrative and they are significant. He said it's important to keep in mind that the labs rely on "work for others" to help them maintain their health. J. Phillips said the capabilities needed for the nuclear weapons programs would be impeded if they did not receive some investment from other customers and, in very limited cases, stewardship funding from other agencies.

D. Kuznezov joined the conversation. He said there are a number of reports and studies currently being conducted and, out of those, there are three we really need to consider in relation to this issue: (1) the Congressional Advisory Panel – dealing with governance, (2) Peer Review – at the NNSA laboratories, and (3) the Inter-agency Governance Study. What is of concern to NNSA is whether enough thought is being put into where we are headed and what the long-term

problems are. How are vibrant workforces to be maintained? What is the role of the national laboratories in today and tomorrow's world? The labs traditionally centered on nuclear weapons and the appropriations structure has not been responsive to the changes of our world. The NNSA doesn't have an official position on how we should think about the role of laboratories in handling new security threats. Should we look to the national labs, or academia, or elsewhere for the expertise in handling new threats? There is value in considering inter-agency governance. There are usually adjacent needs when assessments are conducted. Labs aren't thought of as a resource by many agencies. The full scientific capability of the labs isn't tapped. The NNSA shouldn't house all of the different projects underway. Existing national investments should be leveraged against the nation's mission, as opposed to the missions of the national laboratories. Are there better models for tapping into the academic world for expertise and engaging people to work on these newer issues? There is a value in maintaining relationships with people you can turn to for help in a moment's notice. Government could use help from the outside looking in and would be delighted if POPA would consider playing that role.

Commentary: F. Slakey asked about the advisory panel and whether there was a need for advice/suggestions from APS on members with technical expertise. D. Kusnesov said names have been gathered, the National Academies have been approached, and nothing has been settled on to date. M. Goodman observed that a lot of these decisions come down to money. No one wants to pay for infrastructure, because it is expensive, but someone must. How we've come to fund activities has changed. J. Dahlburg said there was an IDA study that speaks to this. The URL for the study is:

- <https://www.ida.org/upload/stpi/pdfs/p-4916-final-12-12-12.pdf>
IDA's Nov 2012 Study of Facilities & Infrastructure Planning, Prioritization, and Assessment at Federal Security Laboratories

A. Bienenstock said there is a reason to follow up on these studies. He wondered if the extent to which large-scale funding funnels down to small-scale projects is a result of individual scientists being peer-reviewed, but not the lab as a whole. Maybe POPA has a place in speaking out about peer-review being taken too far. M. Rosenthal said an intra-agency mechanism would help focus ongoing research on current issues. S. Koonin said we should start with 3-4 DOE security labs (including PNNL), as the weapons labs have an important national security mission. They also assist with national security agencies. The labs can do things on a much larger scale than universities can, and they can work on things that industry won't because of dollars. DOE, NIH, and NASA are all broadening their missions as well. This is a problem with many different layers and there is something here for the APS to consider helping with. M. Gunner asked whether we should include other societies like IEEE, the ACS, etc. D. Kusnesov said they hadn't engaged any of the other societies yet, but thought it was a good idea to do so. R. Jaffe asked whether this issue falls under the category of "POPA Report" or "APS Study." He said it seems like a very large issue. F. Slakey suggested that POPA might be involved in a more advisory way – suggesting technical people. J. Dahlburg said she thinks all 67 labs need to be considered if APS decides to get involved with this project. M. Rosenthal said the NNSA is not fully behind the idea of a multi-agency bureaucracy. S. Aronson said he doesn't think this falls under the purview of POPA, but it is a fundamental issue. Administrative and oversight issues hobble the laboratories; that has already been studied.

Action: J. Dahlburg moved to have PPC consider this issue at their March meeting and bring comments back to POPA at our June meeting. S. Aronson seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

P. Coyle added that he thinks it would be worthwhile for APS to capture how America can ensure the health of its laboratories (ideas & principles). J. Dahlburg thought that might be a good place for PPC to start. S. Seestrom advised against another study. We either have to do something broader, or not at all. W. Goldstein agreed. M. Lubell said this may well lead to an APS Statement.

Physics & the Public Subcommittee

Education Statement

S. Seestrom framed the discussion and introduced Paul Cottle, Chair of the APS Committee on Education (CoE) to speak about a proposed APS statement on K-12 physics education. The CoE wants to provide a way for APS members to talk to their legislators about the need for access to high quality physics classes. APS currently has a general science education statement. The CoE proposes a statement more focused on physics and the physical sciences.

Commentary: A. Bienenstock said there is an important difference between the current APS statement and the proposed statement brought forth by the CoE. He prefers that we keep the current wording, with an emphasis on “schools of education”, as opposed to “departments of physics.” M. Turner suggested making the second paragraph the actual statement. If the statement is approved, paragraphs one & three could be included as context on the APS website. M. Goodman said the description of the role of physics should include the informed populace. The definition, as written, is too narrow. S. Koonin said the statement should speak to the fact that physics is both a subject and a style of thinking. P. Cottle said the CoE aimed to construct a statement using language legislators and Departments of Education would understand. M. Rosenthal asked for clarification on the difference between “physics” and “physical science.” P. Cottle said “physics” doesn’t exist in the education administrator’s jargon until high school level curriculum. Prior to high school, the term used is “physical sciences.” P. Coyle said he is bothered by calling on government to help without stating the actions APS plans to take on their end. P. Cottle said we are fighting against public schools that are focused on reading and math. The language in the proposed statement is strong because it has to be. We should set responsibilities for the physics community as a whole. T. Meyer agreed that we do need a statement. He asked how we expected the statement to be used and agreed that the changes M. Turner suggested should be incorporated. A. Falk suggested making the language broader. M. Gunner questioned whether the statement was aimed at the school boards or the physics departments. R. Jaffe advised POPA to keep those who will be most effective in using such a statement in mind. The CoE has made the case that they will, and that should be taken into consideration.

Action: J. Dahlburg moved that the Physics & the Public Subcommittee rewrite the statement, with suggestions as noted. An electronic vote on the new

statement will take place by the end of March. S. Seestrom seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Note: The APS Executive Board & Council meets in April.

Energy & Environment Subcommittee

Nuclear Reactor Lifetime Extension Study Update

R. Jaffe turned the floor over to R. Schwitters, Chair of the Study Committee, for an update. He provided an overview of the work that has been done, the goal of the study, the makeup of the committee (academia, national labs, industry, EPRI), and the workshop that will be held later in the month. The committee is trying to uncover the key issues that will set the research agenda to enable the extension of the U.S. reactor fleet's lifetime from 60 to 80 years. From a policy perspective, the committee will research the role of the federal government as related to this issue.

Commentary: M. Rosenthal asked about the opposition in Congress. Could we separate this topic from climate change? Is this an energy security issue or a national security issue? F. Slakey made comments about the price tag and the economics surrounding license extension. While private industry will make their decision on whether to refurbish based on the economics, the federal government may have an interest in choosing to refurbish reactors to keep a non-carbon emitting source of power online.

Climate Change Statement – Procedure & Timetable

R. Jaffe and F. Slakey provided context. There is a general dissatisfaction with the current APS Climate Change Statement. The statement is due for review, per protocol (every 5 years), and POPA must determine how best to conduct the analysis. An evaluation must occur on whether to re-write the current statement, to establish a new statement, to provide an avenue for skeptics to convene and discuss the issue, etc. The type of statement APS should make – simple & declarative or one that incorporates many details – needs consideration. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is also due to report on climate change in 2013; using their review as a trigger for an in-depth look at the APS statement is appropriate.

Commentary: J. Trebes agreed that using the IPCC review as a trigger is appropriate. Using it as a scientific basis for our statement will mitigate scientific argument within the APS. S. Koonin cautioned that APS should create its own statement and make its own judgment, separate from the IPCC report. M. Gunner asked whether we could allow members to air their concerns regarding the topic. M. Beasley suggested that members be involved in a more direct way than just commenting on the statement. To facilitate, the Topical Group on the Physics of Climate should be included in the process. R. Schwitters asked for clarification on POPA's role. The Panel will provide the first draft of a statement which will be informed by the findings of the Topical Group, the IPCC review, and a workshop set up by POPA. M. Beasley suggested we start the process now. A small steering group should be convened to manage the process. M. Gunner showed concern for a great process being derailed by a vocal minority. What's the best way to have the majority report clearly stated, with respect to the minority? A. Falk said

he supports a robust process and a simple & declarative statement. He also supports a productive conversation with the APS Executive Board about the political issues surrounding the statement. Board members need to know that the process is going to be controversial; POPA needs assurance that the Board will support a clear statement when we put it in front of them. M. Goodman pointed out that APS won't be conducting this review in a vacuum. Other societies will be weighing in on the issue, and it might look strange if our statement is released a year after the other societies' statements. M. Lubell said he thinks the APS should work on its own timetable, making sure that we scientifically justify what we say. J. Dahlburg suggested that a steering committee be formed. The steering committee should prepare to present POPA with a procedure and timetable at the June meeting. She asked R. Jaffe to chair. R. Jaffe agreed and asked POPA members, as well as APS Executives, to join in the effort. The final group should be small (4-5 people). K. Kirby and F. Slakey will participate. J. Dahlburg suggested that people approach R. Jaffe at lunchtime if they are interested in joining the group. An initial proposal will be circulated to POPA for feedback, prior to being presented to the Executive Board at their meeting in April. A procedural document and timetable will be presented at the June POPA meeting for final decision.

Action: R. Jaffe read the charge aloud.

The Climate Statement Review Steering Committee is charged with the following:

POPA, which has the responsibility to review APS statements every five years, is undertaking a review of the APS Climate Change Statement. A steering committee will be formed to recommend a procedure, timetable, and format for the review. The committee will be chaired by R. Jaffe, and consist of P. Coyle, S. Koonin, M. Beasley, K. Kirby, and F. Slakey. The committee will circulate a draft proposal recommending a procedure, timetable and format for reviewing the climate statement to POPA for POPA member input in time for the draft proposal to be discussed at the APS Executive Board at its April 11 meeting.

A. Bienenstock moved to proceed as indicated in the charge. S. Aronson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

J. Dahlburg thanked everyone for the opportunity to Chair POPA and ceremoniously passed the gavel to R. Jaffe, acting Chair in R. Rosner's absence.

Call for Subcommittee Volunteers

Members volunteered to participate on subcommittees by submitting their names to each of the Subcommittee Chairs. J. Russo will amend the subcommittee list to indicate new membership.

Action: M. Beasley & R. Jaffe moved to create an ad hoc POPA Strategic Planning Group to consider areas of possible activity looking forward over the next decade. The committee will also keep new POPA membership in mind. They will report back to POPA in June. J. Dahlburg & S. Aronson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

POPA members interested in participating on the Strategic Planning Group should let M. Beasley and R. Jaffe know at lunchtime. Those who demonstrated interest in participating include: S. Koonin, M. Beasley, T. Meyer, M. Gunner, and W. Goldstein.

New Candidates for POPA 2014

Several candidate names were brought forth by the committee at large. K. Cole and K. Kirby noted those suggested.

National Security Subcommittee

DNDO Study Review

J. Trebes provided a power point slide overview and update on the technical review POPA and the IEEE produced for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) Transformation and Applied Research Directorate's (TARD) Research and Development Program. The study charge was to:

- Review strengths/weaknesses of the current TARD R&D portfolio
- Recommend changes to the portfolio
- Recommend new R&D opportunities
- Investigate a broader range of issues affecting TARD and DNDO

An aggressive schedule was followed. A draft report was provided to DNDO in the Fall and it is currently undergoing independent, external review. J. Trebes shared the major results that came out of the Study Committee's review. Next steps include (1) reviewing and discussing all of the comments received from the external review, (2) implementing edits, (3) having the entire document copy-edited to improve overall quality, and (4) submitting the review to POPA and IEEE for a vote.

Commentary: S. Koonin asked if J. Trebes feels safer or less safe as a citizen after having done this review. J. Trebes said he feels less safe. R. Jaffe asked J. Trebes to review the time schedule, moving forward. J. Trebes said the Study Committee is due to have a teleconference within a week to go over reviewer's comments. The report should be ready in 2-3 months for a POPA vote. An electronic vote will take place if the Study Committee finishes up prior to the June POPA meeting. R. Jaffe asked if the review will be formatted to resemble a typical POPA report. J. Trebes said it is currently formatted in the style of an IEEE peer-reviewed journal publication. APS can do with it whatever we choose. R. Schwitters asked if this is the sort of activity we'd like POPA to work on in the future. J. Dahlburg noted that this had been an unusual request, and so POPA had

brought in the IEEE to co-author the study so that the precedent would not be set for POPA to lead these sorts of reviews as normal activity in the future.

APS-CSIS Non-Strategic (Tactical) Nuclear Warhead Workshop Update

J. Trebes provided a power point slide overview and update on the “Technical and Policy Issues Associated with a U.S. – Russian Agreement on Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons”, co-sponsored by the American Physical Society and the Center for Strategic and International Studies. He explained what a non-strategic nuclear weapon is and how these weapons present a severe arms control challenge. The plan is to convene a workshop (later this month) with policy and verification experts from the U.S., Europe, and Russia. Participants will be presented with a scenario: a treaty has been agreed to by the leaders of both the U.S. and Russia. The workshop participants will focus on the policy issues that must be addressed and the verification tools needed to enable the passage of said treaty by the Senate and the Duma.

Commentary: S. Koonin said this is a really hard problem. He asked whether there was a sense that there is a solution out there. J. Trebes said no. M. Rosenthal asked whether the verification challenge is that there are no weapons west of the Urals or that it’s a challenge to measure how many were removed. J. Trebes said you need to know how many were there and how many were moved – and it’s not clear that this can be done. There are many variables that make this a very complicated problem. It’s a verification nightmare. M. Beasley asked whether there was a history of POPA studies that include international collaboration. F. Slakey said this was the first time we’ve attempted it. We’ve been working with Amy Flatten in the APS International Affairs. The way the workshop is set up, both in the presentation of the scenario and the way the group will be asked to tackle policy & verification issues (two separate groups, one receiving background information – one entering the discussion cold), is very original.

Helium Issue

R Jaffe introduced the issue and guest speaker, Marcius Extavour. A crisis has begun to emerge with regards to the U.S. helium supply and legislation on the matter has stalled. There is a dwindling federal stockpile of helium and this is of growing concern to scientific users. The “helium cliff” is slated for January 1, 2015. If no action is taken, there could be supply disruption, market instability, and price volatility. M. Extavour explained the problem and the players affected (helium refining industry, scientific community, hi-tech manufacturers, and the federal government). He also provided (1) a history of helium, from the beginning of stockpiling in the 1920’s to the present, (2) a map of the helium supply sources and major facilities in the U.S., and (3) proposed legislative fixes and gaps. There may be an opportunity for leadership by POPA in framing and assessing the technical and scientific challenges associated with helium conservation, recycling, and increasing co-production from natural gas. These measures may have the greatest stabilizing impact on the scientific research and high-tech manufacturing communities.

Commentary: R. Jaffe said if the world market for helium continues to expand, recycling will never catch up to the need. M. Extavour agreed and said wellhead capture technology is extremely important. A. Falk questioned what would happen to the transport and storage infrastructure when the stockpile has been depleted. Is that worthy of discussion? M. Extavour said the current federally-owned storage facility would cease

to be available to private suppliers. They would want it to remain operational, but questions then arise on who should own it, who should pay for it, and who should operate it. M. Goodman asked what kind of regulatory authority government would have if the storage facility became fully private. One of the considerations, going forward, would have to be how to handle the stockpile storage facility as a strategic resource.

POPA discussed the issue further when the guest speaker stepped off the line. J. Lieberman in the APS Washington Office has been tracking the He legislative issue on the Hill. Some of the research questions presented today look like they could provide an avenue for a POPA report. M. Rosenthal said the issue strikes him as being an industrial question, which doesn't need an R&D program. Industry doesn't need POPA's advice. R. Jaffe said one of the key differences between helium and other commodities is that it is a by-product. Raising the visibility of the issue and using basic research to develop cost effective extraction is something private companies may not invest in. M. Gunner said there is legislation coming down the pike and it would be better for science if the legislation were good. POPA can play a part in making sure that happens. J. Trebes asked who would champion this issue within POPA. If no one takes the lead, it's not going to happen. S. Aronson said there might be a broader study here and we might want to invite other stakeholders to the table. F. Slakey said the question POPA would tackle is "Is there an R&D pathway to increase capture technology efficiency enough to make it economical to extract?" No one volunteered to develop a proposal for a POPA study. F. Slakey suggested taking the idea of increasing capture technology efficiency and having the Washington Office work on inserting this into the legislation being tracked.

Action: R. Jaffe made a motion for the APS Washington Office staff, recognizing the importance of helium to the community, to work on inserting the concerns and ideas discussed into legislation. S. Seestrom seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Francis Slakey & Jodi Lieberman will work on this issue.

Proposed New Activities/Action Items

A. Bienenstock brought the issue of administrative burdens on faculty to POPA's attention. The National Science Board has formed a task force to see what can be done to reduce the amount of time spent on administrative matters (currently 42% of federally funded research time, on average). A. Bienenstock leads that task force and would like any input POPA members have that would be relevant to the issue.

S. Seestrom indicated that the Committee on Education will bring another proposed statement, on undergraduate research, to the June POPA meeting. She will be working with them to develop the supporting material required.

Intersessional Minutes

- Electronic votes were cast to determine whether POPA recommended forwarding the revised version of the proposed K-12 Education Statement to the APS Council for commentary (vote took place between March 8th through noon EST on March 15th, 2013). The motion to forward the statement was approved by a majority vote (17 - 1).

Council returned comments, which were considered by the Physics & the Policy Subcommittee. The proposed statement was brought to the Executive Board for consideration at its April 11, 2013 meeting. A motion to forward the proposed statement to APS membership for comment was made by Serene and seconded by Meystre. The motion was approved unanimously. K. Kirby will arrange to have the proposed statement available for review and comment by membership on the APS website.

As of Friday, May 31st, 117 comments have been submitted by APS Membership. An article on the statement will run in APS News, which may generate additional commentary by the close of the input period on June 30th.

- The procedural document for how to handle a review of the APS Climate Change Statement was sent to POPA members for comment. Comments were considered by the Climate Statement Review Steering Committee. The proposed procedural document was brought to the Executive Board for consideration at its April 11, 2013 meeting. Several Executive Board members spoke in favor of moving ahead because it is required, it is an opportunity to consider revising objectionable wording in the current statement, and it is an opportunity to emphasize responsible science in climate research.
- An electronic vote was taken on the DNDO Report. While the report passed, a decision was made to discuss it at the next POPA meeting before proceeding to an APS Executive Board vote.

Next Meeting

The date for the next POPA meeting will be June 7th, 2013.

Adjournment

Action: *J. Dahlburg adjourned the meeting at 3:03 PM.*