eRHIC IR Design Meeting

Minutes for February 22, 2019

1 Draft Agenda

- 1. (Add) discussion of priorities.
- 2. Update from Steve on electron ring matching.
- 3. Update from Guillaume on hadron ring matching.
- 4. Update on Dave's list of questions.
- 5. Update from Bob on status of write up.
- 6. Update from Qiong on the status of the 22 mm to 25 mm crossing angle change control process.
- 7. Any other business.

2 Priorities

- 1. Brett is responsible for the technical aspects of the IR design.
- 2. Ferdinand: Need to clarify the priorities for the group to efficiently and effectively proceed.
- 3. Brett: Will try and guide the effort to arrive at the optimal IR design (low cost, high performance).
- 4. The electron outgoing design and setup looks promising and should be generally kept.
- 5. The cost estimate is the highest priority.
- 6. We need to stop tweaking the lattice for the cost estimate.
- 7. Change control:
 - (a) Switch from 22 mrad to 25 mrad.
 - (b) Don't freeze current lattice in change control since that will end up needing to be undone.
- 8. We need to buckle down and converge on a design.
- 9. The cost estimate will be based on the January 25 design—the October design with the corrections from December.
 - (a) One vendor said the Q2PF magnet parameters for the cost estimate was too tough and needs to be relaxed.

- (b) The cost estimate design will include the relaxed magnet parameters.
- (c) Need to communicate information and better coordinate things. Brett should be kept in the loop regarding things like the need to relax the magnet parameters.
- 10. How many additional elements will be needed in the straight sections?
- 11. How many magnets will be needed to match the IR to the main lattice for the cost estimate design?
 - (a) Use best judgment and have a logical reasoning for the number.
 - (b) Guillaume has a preliminary lattice geometry matched to a hybrid IR, which is partially based on Bob's design.
 - i. Brett wants to see the matching.

3 Steve: Electron Ring Matching

- 1. Slide 1: "[1] B. Palmers' Fit to IR"
 - (a) β functions and dispersions for the January 25 design.
 - (b) Doesn't have high β s for crab cavities.
- 2. Slide 2: "[2] MADX Fit to IR with CRAB Cavities"
 - (a) Have crab cavities in design in the $\beta_x=300\,\mathrm{m}$ regions at $S\simeq25\,\mathrm{m}$ and $S\simeq95\,\mathrm{m}.$
 - (b) Dispersion $\lesssim -0.8 \,\mathrm{m}$ at $S \simeq 95 \,\mathrm{m}$ crab cavity.
- 3. Slide 3: "[3] MADX Fit to IR with CRAB Cavities and higher Q0EF"
 - (a) Refit quadrupoles in $s \lesssim 50 \,\mathrm{m}$ region.
 - (b) β_x needs to come down at $S \simeq 80 \,\mathrm{m}$ (where target is).
- 4. Slide 4: "Table for the Quadrupole Gradients"
- 5. Slide 5: "Geometry, 8mrad angle to DX axis"
 - (a) Final/overall geometry.
 - (b) IP 6 to be moved 1 m down with respect to present DX centerline to allow RCS to pass detector.
 - (c) Try something similar at IP 8.
 - (d) This one should fit in tunnel.
 - (e) The "funny horns" are dispersion suppressors.
 - (f) Christoph: (proposal) Get rid of dispersion suppressors at IR 12 (where we inject) since we need dispersion there anyhow.

- i. Then, 0 dispersion sextapoles at IRs——.
- (g) Rotate by 8 mrad at IPs 6 and 8.
 - i. This makes electron matching possible.

4 Qiong: 25 mrad change

- 1. Up to Christoph.
- 2. Christoph is waiting till Tuesday for responses from other affected parties.

5 Holger

See earlier discussion of magnets parameter relaxation in section 2, item 9(a) on page 1.

6 Dave: List

- 1. We need to make sure there is enough beamline instrumentation to set up the crab cavities.
- 2. Dave will work with Brett regarding other instrumentation for the cost review.

7 Bob: DRAFT IR-Parameters-6 Post Cost Review

(File: 190222-IR2.pdf)

- 1. Slide 1:
 - (a) First iteration of 'Cost Review Forward Design' (from 1/25/19).
- 2. Slide 2: "Steps taken"
 - (a) Recombine the two Q2EF magnets.
- 3. Slide 3: "Layout"
- 4. Slide 4: "Detail"
 - (a) Detectors shown in yellow.
- 5. Brett: Increasing L^* of Q1PF by 2 m raises β peaks, chromaticity, and increases magnet apertures. Hence having the quadrupoles as close to the IP as possible.
 - (a) Bob mentioned the synchrotron radiation from pre-CDR disaster, but he did not show plot. Was this before we added Q0EF?
- 6. Brett:
 - (a) First, 100 GeV alternate design approach geometry matching.

- (b) Then, put a quadrupole corrector in the gap between Q1PF and Q2PF to make a closed orbit bump to limit the change in geometry to the inner IR and to avoid impacting the ring geometry at different energies.
- (c) Then, apply offsets and angling to magnets as a perturbation.
- 7. Slides 5 and 6: [parameter tables]
 - (a) Slide 5: "TB18w7e zbFe362 Hadron forward 275"
 - (b) Slide 6: "TB18w7e zbFe362 Electron Forward 18"
 - (c) Bad on B1 aperture.
- 8. Slide 7: "Central obits for other energies"
 - (a) Considerable B0 kick at low energy.
- 9. Slide 8: "Conclusion"
 - (a) Bob's current program is not exact, but it could be fixed to perform accurate calculations of the α , β , and γ matrices.
 - (b) Brett: The priority is the MAD lattice for both beams.
 - i. We need it for Monte Carlo simulations.
 - ii. Brett will look at using B-MAD for the offset, angled magnets. (See also item 6(c).)
 - iii. Guillaume needs a stable set of parameters.
 - (c) Brett: Wants to proceed forward in a systematic manner, interacting with all the various parties involved.
- 8 Next Meeting: Friday, March 8, 2019 at 2:30 p.m.

8.1 Draft Agenda

- 1. Brett: Process Moving Forward.
- 2. Guillaume: Hadron Matching.
- 3. Dave: Questions.
- 4. Mike (Sullivan, SLAC): Feedback/Progress Report.