## **Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory**

**Recent Work**

## **Title**

BEVATRON OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. 43 July through Sept. 1964.

## **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6zf270g3>

## **Authors**

Allison, Robert W. Crebbin, Kenneth C. Sverette, William L. [et al.](https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6zf270g3#author)

**Publication Date** 1965-02-12

## University of California

,111

# **Ernest** 0. **Lawrence Radiation**  Laboratory

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

This is *a library Circulating Copy*  which *may be borrowed for two* weeks. *For a personal retention copy, call*  Tech. *Info.* Dioision, *Ext.* 5545

BEVATRON OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. 43 July through September 1964

Berkeley, California

#### **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or · assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

UCRL-11935

UC-28 Particle Accelerators and High Voltage' Machines: TID 4500 (37th Ed. )

#### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

'•

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W -7405-eng-48

#### BEVATRON OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. 43

July through September 1964

Robert W. Allison, Jr., Kenneth C. Crebbin, William L. Everette, and Emery Zajec

February 12, 1965

 $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{F}}$  .

Printed in USA. Price \$1.00. Available from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, National Bureau of Standards, U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia.

## BEVATRON OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. 43

July through September 1964

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



 $\mathcal{Q}$ 



\*Preceding quarterly reports: UCRL-11737, UCRL-11560.

#### BEVATRON OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. 43

#### July through September 1964

#### Robert W. Allison, Jr., Kenneth C. Crebbin, William L. Everette, and Emery Zajec

'

#### Lawrence Radiation Laboratory University of California Berkeley, California

February 12, 1965

#### ABSTRACT

The Bevatron beam was on for  $87.1\%$  of the scheduled operating time. A loss in efficiency of injected-beam pickup was caused by a shorted turn in one of the inflector magnets. This caused some jitter in normal beam operation for a period of about ten weeks until the magnet was replaced during a scheduled shutdown in September. Two primary experiments ended this quarter and installation was started on three new primary experiments. Injector studies showed a misalignment of the injector beamtransport system. The injector was realigned during the shutdown. The external proton beam channel was extended to the third focus.

#### I. OPERATION

The Bevatron operation record is shown in. Fig. 1. The beam was on for 87.1% of the scheduled operating time. The beam was off for 7.2% of the time because of equipment failure and 5.7% of the time for experimental setup, tuning, and routine checks .

•

Early in July operation of the injected beam became erratic. The beam signal would suddenly disappear from the east Faraday cup monitor and then slowly return to normal, more or less independently of tuning by the Bevatron crew. An electrical alignment of the inflector system required a higher current than normal in the final magnetic stage of the inflector system IM3 to steer the beam through the system. IM3 is located. in the east tangent tank just ahead of the final electrostatic inflector. Changes in the resistance of the magnet winding, and the increased current, indicated a possible shorted turn in 1M3. The magnet power supply was changed from current regulation to voltage reg'ulation. 'This produced less jitter in the injected beam, and we were able to operate in a reasonable manner this way. Beam capture was less efficient in the Bevatron than previously, and we had to inject 8 to 10 mA of beam instead of 4 to 6 mA to  $\frac{1}{2}$  accelerate our normal-intensity beam of 2.5 $\times$ 10<sup>12</sup> protons per pulse.

A spare 1M3 magnet was already in production and this job was speeded up in case a catastrophic failure in 1M3 occurred. We decided to operate 1M3 in the above condition rather than try to repair it at that time. If IM3 were to fail before the replacement was ready, we would shut down: and try to repair it. Otherwise, we would continue operation until the spare was ready, and then pick a convenient time for the shutdown. We could then either repair or replace IM3 depending on what was found on examining the magnet coils. We continued operating in this manner until September 14, when we shut down the Bevatron for 3 weeks.

#### II. SHUTDOWN

The Bevatron was turned off on 14 September for a 3 -week shutdown. The primary job was to fix the 1M3 inflector magnet. Because of the high level of residual radiation in the east tangent tank (see Sec. VI. C), the work time allowed per person in the area was rather short. A brief examination of 1M3 showed an apparently burned section in one coil. We decided to replace the magnet. References for the position of the magnet<br>were made. The magnet was removed and the new one installed. The "burned" section observed turned out to be deposited organics rather than damage to the epoxy coil covering. The actual short (found later from electrical measurements) appeared to be in the end region where the conductors cross over from one coil layer to the next. It is believed to be a failure brought about by a fabrication fault rather than by radiation damage. The epoxy in the general area showed no particular damage from radiation.

The start of the shutdown was actually determined by completion of the University of Washington (Masek) experiment and of the Powell-Birge



MUB-5454

σ

Fig. 1. Operations record.

Group 25-inch hydrogen and 30-inch Freon bubble chamber runs. These experimental setups were removed and the following setups installed. In the external proton beam (EPB) the Michigan-Stanford experiment was set up at the new third focus,  $F_3$ . The first part of the Crowe Group experiment was installed in the main shielding of the Bevatron at the first focus of the external proton beam. The Segre-Chamberlain experiment was set up at the north area of the main Bevatron shielding. This experiment will use the internal proton beam on a target in the north (north outside west, N. 0. W. ) straight section.

An inside -radius Faraday cup was installed in the south straight section. It is to be used for beam studies and as a diagnostic tool for beam monitoring at injection.

Routine maintenance was also carried out during this shutdown.

#### III. BEVATRON DEVELOPMENT AND STUDIES

#### A. Study Periods

Most of the Bevatron study periods were devoted to extending the EPB beam channel and to investigating the injector transport system. The EPB channel is discussed in more detail in Section VI of this report.

#### B. Injector Studies

#### Robert W. Allison, Jr. , and Emery Zajec

Observations of the total injected beam were made after 1/4 turn in the machine, with a quartz scintillator in the south tangent tank. The size of this quarter -turn beam is, as expected, approximately 13 ·in. radially by 2 in. vertically. However, large deflections vertically were observed when the inflection-system components were tuned. This indicated that all the bending magnets and quadrupoles except 1M3 were misaligned. In addition, varying the linac rf level or the strength of the linac quadrupoles caused a vertical position shift of about  $3\cdot$  in. at the south scintillator.

Because of these observed beam effects, an elevation survey was made of IM1 and 1M2. IM1 was low by 0.195 in. and 1M2 low by 0.214 in. from the initial elevations established in September 1962. A complete elevation alignment of the linac and beam transport system was done during the shutdown in September.

With reference to the linac entrance elevation (8615.436 in.), the linac and transport system had settled as follows: linac exit, 0.90 in.; IQ1, 0.163 in.; IQ3, 0.289 in.; debuncher entrance, 0.394 in.; debuncher exit, 0.294 in;

*(/* 

'~

During the repositioning, the linac entrance was lowered 0.070 in. to 8615.366 in., and the rest of the system was leveled to this value. This lowering of the injection system was to compensate for the general settle $ment<sup>1</sup>$  of the Bevatron magnet. The elevations before and after the repositioning are shown in Fig. 2.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The Powell-Birge experiment investigating the  $Y_4^*$  interactions in the K- -nucleon reactions in the 25 -inch hydrogen bubble chamber ended this  ${\tt quarter,~along~with~the~University~of~Washington~(Mask)~experiment~investi$ gating the magnetic moment of the  $\Sigma^+$  hyperon in 200-kG pulsed magnetic fields. The Alvarez Group study of the  $K^-$ -p interactions in the 72-inch hydrogen bubble chamber continued through this quarter.

Emulsion exposures were made in the  $800$ -MeV/c K<sup>-</sup> beam which was set up for the 25-inch hydrogen bubble chamber experiment. A summary of the experimental program is shown in Table I.

#### V. MAGNET POWER SUPPLY

The magnet pulsing record is shown in Table II.

#### VI. RADIATION DETECTION AND CONTROL STUDIES

#### William L. Everette

#### A. Arrangement of Experimental Facilities

No major changes were made in the experimenter schedule during the running time of the third quarter period. Therefore, the arrangements shown in Fig. 2 of the second quarterly report are valid for this period. There were two minor exceptions. The exploratory work conducted by the Segre-Elioff Group (using target EPB- $F_4$ ) and by the Perl-Longo Group {n-p scattering at 0 deg, forward of the external beam stop) was concluded July 24. Following this date, work commenced on phase II of the external beam transport system, which is designed to·transport the proton beam through the building annex to a beam stop in the adjacent parking lot. The final arrangement is shown in Fig. 3. The beam size measured at focuses  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ , and  $F_3$  are as follows (the dimensions are for full width at half maximum):



 $\mathcal{C}$ 



MUB-5241

Fig. 2. Elevation of linac-injector system.

UCRL-11935

 $\frac{1}{5}$ 

۴D



Table I. Summary of Bevatron experimental research program, July. through September, 1964.

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

#### Table II. Bevatron motor-generator set monthly fault report.

 $a$  14 indicates an arc-back, 26 indicates an arc-through.

 $=$ 

UCRL-11935

 $-1$ 

 $\mathcal{I}$ 

 $\mathbb{G}$ 

e

MUB-5455

بحر





#### B. Detection and Control of Neutrons and the External Beam

Neutron intensities in working· spaces about the building were reported previously and did not change significantly for this period.

During modifications in the external beam shielding, part of the shielding structure was disassembled and magnets M4B, Q4A, and Q4B · were installed during machine maintenance periods. Since the machine was shut down, there were no problems of neutron exposure.

In the new arrangement,  $M4B$  is enclosed at its corners, top, and outboard side with pieces of iron and lead in such a way as to wall off the upstream portion of the shielding enclosure, leaving a 7-foot entrance hall. A 4-foot concrete -block wall partition, downstream from M4B, encloses a small quadrupole magnet and completes an entrance labyrinth to the upstream section. A 4-foot iron beam stop (EPB BS1), raised to intercept the proton beam, and the amount of shielding in the upstream section of the. enclosure give adequate protection to workmen outside for beam intensities as high as  $5 \times 10^{11}$  ppp at 5 BeV. The distance from EPB BS1 to the small quadrupole is roughly 40 ft. The neutron intensity forward of the partition is about 80  $n/cm<sup>2</sup>$ -sec in line with the beam port, and less than 30  $n/cm^2$ -sec at other points adjacent to the blocks. These values drop rapidly as one moves away from the partition, and are no cause for alarm.

A monitored entrance gate will be installed at this location and will be interlocked with one segment,  $EPB$  0, of the external beam radiation safety chain. The EPB 0 segment includes all beam space up to EPB BSL When the EPB shield enclosure and radiation safety chain are complete, modification and maintenance work may be safely conducted while an experimenter is using EPB 0 at target  $F_f$ . The outboard section of the EPB facility will be known as EPB 1, and will have a safety subchain that may be operated in series with the EPB 0 chain. A simple schematic diagram of the radiation safety chain is show'n in Fig, 4.

The arrangement for the Perl-Longo run was designed for a neutron· beam, but the port is so near the forward direction that some consideration for safe disposal of the proton beam was essentiaL The methods presently used exist in two arrangements. When the neutron beam is used, the proton beam is deflected 7.5 degrees away from the neutron port by magnet M4D, and the magnet current supply is interlocked in the EPB 1 safety chain. When neutrons are not required, but disposal of the beam at EPB  $F_2$  is required, a plunged beam stopper (BS2) blocks the port and removes the M4D current interlock requirement in the safety chain. However, a finite chance remained that a lethal proton beam might escape the beam stop. For this reason and for purposes of shielding experimenters' detectors from stray particles (the shielding requirement for detectors being considerably more stringent than that for health purposes), a concrete enclosure was built downstream from EPB BS2 and labeled the EPB 2 region. A monitored entrance station is provided, but may remain open if the beam port has been blocked while the beam is disposed of at BS2.



**MUB-5456** 

يمنز



#### C. Residual Radioactivity--Machine Shutdown

A 3 -week machine shutdown began 14 September and extended through 5 October. One task for the period was to substitute a new inflector magnet for the old one, in which a short had developed in a coil turn. The magnet, 1M3, is located in the east straight section adjacent to the external beam magnets, M1-QI. The surface intensity of the residual radioactivity in the EPB magnets was measured and found to be 15 roentgens per hour 105 minutes after beam-off time. This residual activity decayed by a factor of three during the next 240 hours. Work in the tank was delayed by 12 hours during which a  $33\%$  decrease in activity from MI-QI was observed. The magnets were then enclosed in iron and lead shields, leaving 1M3 as the major exposed source (reading 450 milliroentgens per hour at the downstream end). Radiation intensity in the working space was about 150 mR per hour when the process of removing 1M3 began.

During the course of the shutdown, 75 man-hours were spent inside the Bevatron vacuum tank by 64 men. The number of hours per man varied from a maximum of 6.6 to as low as 0.06. Forty-six man-hours were spent in the east tank, but only six of these were required for radiation survey, shielding M1-Q1, and removing 1M3 from the tank. The remaining 40 were used for clean-up, local repair jobs, and installing the new magnet. The largest integral dose to one man for the 3 -week period was 450 millirem. The permissible dose for the period was 500 millirem .

..•

#### STAFF

Edward J. Lofgren

Walter D. Hartsough

Kenneth C. Crebbin Fred H. G. Lothrop Wendell Olson

William Everette

Duward *\$.* Cagle Frank W. Correll Robert G. Gisser William H. Kendall

G. Stanley Boyle Robert W. Brokloff Ashton H. Brown Norris D. Cash Ferdinand Dagenais James R. Guggemos Charles H. Hitchen Arthur K. !kuma William Lee William J. Meserve Martin E. Scolnick Joseph F. Smith Selwyn M. Spray Marsh M. Tekawa John E. Tommaney

RobertW. Allison, Jr. Trancuilo Canton Warren W. Chupp Bruce Cork Kenneth C. Crebbin Tom Elioff Robert Force Leroy T. Kerth Fred H. G. Lothrop Donald Milberger Robert Richter Glenn White William Wenzel Emery Zajec

/

Edward Hartwig Robert Force

Marion Jones

Harold Vogel

Donald Milberger

Kenow Lou Cedric Larson Abraham Glicksman Bevatron Group leader

In charge of Bevatron operations

Operation supervision

Radiation control

Operating crew supervisors

Bevatron operators

Development and support

In charge of Electrical Engineering Group

In charge of Electrical Coordination Group In charge of Motor Generator Group In charge of Electrical Maintenance Group

In charge of Mechanical Engineering Group

#### REFERENCES

1. Kenneth. C. Crebbin, Robert Frias, William L. Everette, and Walter D. Hartsough, Bevatron Operation and Development. 41, January through April, 1964, UCRL-11560, July 1964.

 $\sigma$ 

s.)

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ 

 $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$