# ALMA-ELTs Conference Summary

James Di Francesco (National Research Council of Canada)

## Outline

General Observations
ALMA-ELT Synergies
Discussion Sessions
Learnin'



(This is how I felt when Leonardo asked me to do this)

### ALMA & the ELTs





2019 ?

2019 ?

QuickTime™ and a decompressor ire needed to see this picture. 2019

Total cost: ~\$5,000,000,000!



## **General Observations**

ELTs each have very strong science cases, impressive instrument plans Many excellent talks, up-to-date results shown from that morning's astro-ph! This meeting was meant to draw out the synergy between ALMA & ELTs Discussion about implementing these synergies has been difficult Nobody interrupted any talks....?

## **ALMA-ELT** synergies

High spatial resolution

High continuum sensitivity

High spectral sensitivity

# ALMA-ELT synergies: High spatial resolution

 ALMA's : 0.006" FWHM at 675 GHz (B9), 14.7 km baseline over an 8" FOV
 ELT's: ~0.008" at 1.2 μm with adaptive optics over 30" FOV (TMT; GMT is 20' FOV)

FOV sizes demonstrate why these are not considered as "survey instruments"

# ALMA-ELT synergies: High spatial resolution

 ALMA's : 0.006" FWHM at 675 GHz (B9), 14.7 km baseline over an 8" FOV
 ELT's: ~0.008" at 1.2 μm with adaptive optics over 30" FOV (IRIS IFU on TMT); GMT is 20' FOV)

FOV sizes demonstrate why these are not considered as "survey instruments"

### EGS13035123: Spatially Resolved CO Velocity Field in a z~1 Disk Galaxy



 $M_{gas} \sim 4 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ ; ,  $M_* \sim 2 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$ ,  $f_{gas} \sim 0.2$ 



IRAM PdBI CO(3-2) @2mm

### BzK 15504 z=2.38: A Thick, Clumpy & Globally Unstable Disk



$$\begin{split} &M_{dyn}(<\!10 \ kpc) \ \sim \! 10^{11} \ M_{\odot} \\ &v_c \!=\! 230 \ km/s, \ \sigma = 50 \ km/s, \\ &R_d \!=\! 4 \ kpc, \ Q \!=\! 0.8 \\ &SFR = 150 \ M_{\odot} yr^1, \ f_{gas} \!\sim\! 0.3 \end{split}$$

Genzel et al. 2006

SINFONI +AO (VLT): 0.2" (1.6 kpc) resolution



### Protostellar jets

#### Class 0 (Av > 100 mag)

- molecular flows
- tracers:CO,SiO



Class I (Av ~ 20-50 mag) -molecular and atomic flows

-tracers: H<sub>2</sub>, FeII





·How the jets are launched and collimated

•How angular momentum is transferred from the accretion disk to the jet

•Which is the initial heating process

Davis et al. 2006 2" 5VS13 NACO H2 2.12um

2008

Brunella Nisini INAF-OAR

E-ELT-ALMA workshop

ESO Garching 26-March-

### Velocity structure as a test for ejection models ALMA and ELT may provide a unified picture

#### IRAS04166+2706







Brunella Nisini INAF-OAR

E-ELT-ALMA workshop

ESO Garching 26-March-

# ALMA-ELT synergies: High spectral resolution

ALMA's : 3.8 kHz, or 0.003 km/s at 345 GHz (B7), R ~ 10<sup>8</sup>

ELT's: HROS (TMT), CODEX (ELT) optical eschelle spec'meter, R ~ 50,000, 150,000

### Current constraints: Intriguing but controversial

<mark>≺</mark>∭



Instrument	$N_{abs}$	$Z_{abs}$	∆α/α [10 <sup>-5</sup> ]	Reference		
HIRES	30	0.5–1.6	-1.100 ± 0.400	Webb et al. (1999)	_ i▲i	
HIRES	49	0.5–3.5	-0.720 ± 0.180	Murphy et al. (2001a)		Revisited
HIRES	128	0.2–3.7	-0.543 ± 0.116	Murphy et al. (2003)	- + <b>4</b> +	here -
HIRES	143	0.2–4.2	-0.573 ± 0.113	Murphy et al. (2004)	- <b>⊢</b> ∆-∣	v –
UVES	23	0.4–2.3	$-0.060 \pm 0.060$	Chand et al. (2004)		
UVES	1	1.151	-0.040 ± 0.190 ± 0.270	Quast et al. (2004)	- /	<b>-</b>
UVES	1	1.839	+0.240 ± 0.380	Levshakov et al. (2005)	⊢ <b>ม</b> / ⊢	<b></b>
UVES	1	1.151	+0.040 ± 0.150	Levshakov et al. (2005)	- 4 -	<mark></mark> -
UVES	1	1.151	+0.100 ± 0.220	Chand et al. (2006)	– <u>י</u> מ –	<b></b> -
HARPS	1	1.151	+0.050 ± 0.240	Chand et al. (2006)		<b></b> -
UVES	1	1.151	-0.007 ± 0.084 (± 0.100)	Levshakov et al. (2006)	– á –	н –
UVES	1	1.839	+0.540 ± 0.250	Levshakov et al. (2007)		– <mark>) – © – – )</mark>
UVES	23	0.4–2.3	-0.640 ± 0.360	This work		
					$-1.5$ $-1$ $-0.5$ $\Delta \alpha / \alpha [10]$	0 0.5 -5]

### How much will measurement improve?



#### **Absorption lines**

More sensitive to cold gas along l.o.s. with ALMA 100 times more background sources explore:

- abundances & chemistry as function of z
- T<sub>CMB</sub>(z)
- Hubble constant through time delay btw two lensed images
- variation of fundamental constants:
  - fine structure constant
  - m<sub>e</sub>/m<sub>p</sub>
  - proton gyromagnetic ratio (Kaluza-Klein, Superstrings, compactified extra-dimensions)

Doublets/multiplets: O(10-5)

Radio <u>advantage</u>: high spec. res., cold narrow lines

Problem: kinematical bias



# ALMA-ELT synergies: High sensitivity

ALMA's : ~200 μJy in 60 s (16 GHz BW) at 345 GHz (B7)

ELT's: EPICS or PFI, imaging at high contrasts of 10<sup>6-9</sup> for planet detection



### **EGPs - ALMA Direct Detection**

Expected flux density at 345 GHz:

$$F_{345} = 6 \text{ X } 10^{-2} \text{ T } \frac{R_J^2}{D_{pc}^2} \quad [\mu \text{Jy}]$$

Distance (pc)	Jupiter	Gl229B	Proto-Jupiter
1	12	130	59000
5.7	.36	4.1	1820
10	.12	1.3	590
120	.0008	.009	4.1

Details in Butler, Wootten, & Brown 2003

# Imaging a planet, the last frontier...







#### SPHERE (VLT, 8-m telescope), 2011

- Young self luminous exo-planets
  - Angular separation:
  - + Contrast (Near Infrared):

 $0.1 < \alpha < 1$  arcsec  $10^{-4} - 10^{-6}$ 

#### + EPICS (E-ELT, 42-m telescope),

- Mature gas giant and massive rocky exoplanets
  - + Angular separation:
  - + Contrast (Near Infrared) H:

0.02 < α < 1 arcsec 10-7 - 10-9



### Weighting Functions



# ALMA-ELT synergies: High resolution and sensitivity!

can utilize large apertures and instrumental sensitivities of ALMA & ELTs for breakthroughs in new areas....

Circumstellar disksHigh-Z universe



Note: ALMA can only image lines outside ~10 AU; ELT inside 10 AU

### Disk around pre-main sequence stars



### Hot gas in inner disks

CO v=1-0 band at 4.7  $\mu$ m in disks around Herbig stars

**High-J** 

Low-J

inclination

idisk=20° AB Aur J<9 J>25 0.2 v=2-1 18CO (\*2.08)(\*3.0)Continuum)/Continuum 0.0 MWC 758 idisk=25° J<9 - J>25 0.2 (+4.3) 0.0 MWC 480 idisk=38° - J<9 - J>25 0.1 (\*2.15) 0.0 0.08 HD 163296 idisk=60° J<9 - J>25 (+2.5) I 0.00 (Flux VV Ser  $i_{disk} = 85^{\circ}$ J<9 - J>25 0.08 (\*1.6)0.00 -1000 100 -1000 100 Velocity (km/s)

R=25000 Keck-NIRSPEC



Blake & Boogert 2004 Brittain et al. 2003, 2007 Najita et al.2003

**Excitation by collisions (inner few AU) and resonant fluorescence (larger R)** 

#### Spectro-astrometry at milliarcsec resolution



- Can locate gas down to 1 AU scale

- ELT can image kinematics directly down to few AU with IFU

Pontoppidan et al. 2008



- Neutral IGM has extended GP damping wing  $\rightarrow$  attenuates Ly  $\alpha$  emission line
- Detectability of Ly  $\alpha$  galaxies as markers of IGM optical depth
  - Reionization not completed by z~6.5
  - $f_{\rm HI}$  ~ 0.3 0.6 at z~7
  - Overlapping at z=6-7?

### Reionization Topology with Ly $\alpha$ Emitters

- Ly  $\alpha$  emitter could provide sensitive probe to reionization history, especially during overlapping
  - Evolution of LF (constrain  $f_{HI}$ )
  - Clustering



Angular correlation of Ly $\alpha$  emitters

Distribution of Ly $\alpha$  emitters over 3' FOV



 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Neutral} \rightarrow \text{Ionized} \\ \text{McQuinn et al.} \end{array}$ 

### Probing the Neutral Era with ELT Quasar/GRB Spectroscopy



- High resolution, moderate (R~5000) resolution spectroscopy of bright quasars/GRBs will allow determination of reionization, using
  - optical depth measurements

- distribution of dark absorption troughs
- sizes of quasar HII regions





### [CII] will (almost) make our day at z>7



[CII] line

Need Band 5!

QuickTime™ and a decompressor re needed to see this picture

Q1: Which ELT instruments and/or ALMA upgrades would be needed to produce a major impact in disks and at high-Z?

A1: for disks, ELTs need high R opt/IR eschelle spectrometers; for high-Z, need MOS (GMACS): AO is *critical* for disks, ALMA needs longer baselines; for high-Z, need Bands 1 and 5.

Q2: What are the main scientific synergies in 4 defined areas of research?

A2: I) Fundamental physics, cosmology:
- constants, high-Z galaxies
ii) Galaxy and ISM Evolution:
- galaxy mergers at Z ~ 2-3+
iii) SF from EoR to present:
- disk charcterization
iv) Solar Systems near and far:
- planet detection (direct, indirect)

Q3: Do the communities overlap enough?

A3: Some, but not enough! Tendency to get stuck with the familiar, especially without incentives (\$\$\$) to branch out

- workshops certainly help, especially ones targeted to specific science drivers that demonstrate the utility of other community instruments

- cross-fertilzation of committees can help

- why not hire some people from the other community on your faculty???

Q4: What instrumentation will reinforce the synergies?

A4: Didn't I answer that for Q1? >:-( ELT needs highcontrast imagers for planets, and IFUs for galaxy mergers; ALMA needs more antennas

Q5: Formal connections made to allow simultaneous proposals?

A5: Not sure...probably good to have staggered deadlines so that results of one competition could be folded into the next one, probably up to community input

 perhaps incentives needed for large, "boring" projects since they are important?

Q7: Which survey programs should be planned WRT location of ELTs to enable synergies?

A7: duh...an ELT should be in the south for maximal synergy with ALMA. Putting 3 ELTs in the south is probably a bad idea.

Having ELTs with the same instruments (at first) also probably a bad idea... (TMT has selected its already...)

Large programs are probably worthwhile at a small level during the early days of each facility. Doesn't lock up time for a small cadre of people, and allows usage to grow. Also, instrument will only improve with time!

Q8: Should ALMA systematically prepare follow-up targets for the ELTs?

A8: not really addressed but loads of targets will probably be discovered in the ~6-8 years between ALMA early science and ELTs first lights. I suspect "systematic" observations will come more from dedicated wide-field surveys though...remember "ALMA not a survey instrument"

Q9: What ALMA upgrades will most fully exploit synergy with the ELTs?

A9: God, this again? Haven't I already answered this in Qs 1, 2 and 4? Man, I wonder what time it is back home...holy christ I'm tired.

Q10: Are there possible synergies in terms of data standards, VO tools and post-pipeline analysis?

A10: YES. A VO-standard format will make using data between facilities much easier, helping communities grow. Also good to have "common interfaces for models". Useful tools written by the community should be made available to the project.

Optical community can learn from 3D visualization and analysis tools being developed in radio wavelengths:

- Karma, 3D slicer for visualization

- "dendrograms" for analysis

# Learnin' From Each Other

Can the projects learn from each other and if so in what area?

- International cooperation leads to better instruments
- Level 1 science case to guide development
- Enforcing ease-of-use for planning tools AND data products
- Software that is easy to understand and that are continuously improved
- Accessible archives that are continually re-developed

