

4 Attempt to Extract Beam from H10

G. W. Bennett

May 1973

Collider Accelerator Department
Brookhaven National Laboratory

U.S. Department of Energy

USDOE Office of Science (SC)

Notice: This technical note has been authored by employees of Brookhaven Science Associates, LLC under Contract No.AT(30-1)-16 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The publisher by accepting the technical note for publication acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this technical note, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use 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 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 its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Blumberg

G. Bennett, L. Blumberg, R. Glasmann, J. Keane, E. Raka NO,

Scheduled: 1700-2400 Actual 1830-0030 17~~0~~

Objective: Extraction at H10.

Result: We didn't observe external beam, but radiation survey after run indicates beam was extracted, hitting valve upstream of our scintillating screen and current transformer.

- (1). Prior to studies, during HEP on 4/30 WITH $CBM = 4.7 \cdot 10^{12}$ ppp we moved E10 septum in to measure injection aperture. We did not see any effect on CBM until septum was 1.1-inch from Beamcode axis in st. sect. E10. CBM was down 10% at 1.06". Horizontal aperture of AGS is thus surprisingly small. Nominal operating position of E10 is 1.9" for FEB.
- (2). On 5/1 we set up for fractional extraction on flattop at $t = 700$ ms. Lost about 1 hour as EAO searched for cause of water flow fault in external quads UQ1, 2; new No. Area water cooling tower was not on. Lost another hour in clearing No. Area tunnel; a portion of tunnel was locked and inaccessible to MCR.
- (3). Set up with beam grazing E10 and H10 septa. With C15 + E15 beam kickers at 5000 A we see 0.6 cm deflection at E7 electrode. This is about as previously observed. Then increased kickers to maximum (6000 A) which should give 1.2 cm bump at E10. Noted on beam monitor that about 20% of CBM is removed from AGS.
- (4). At H7 we observed a .7 cm positive deflection of particles (mainly 4 bunches) kicked by E10 at 3000 A (~ 1 mrad). This confirms correct polarity of E10. We also saw a beam displacement of $\sim 3/4$ " at H10 flag. E10 septum works fine! With H10 off, we see beam at H15 electrodes which passed through aperture of H10 ejector. We turned on H10 at 1800 A and noted that those bunches previously observed at H15 were removed from AGS. We could not see extracted beam on U16 flag. We suspected incorrect polarity of H10 EM so reversed cables. Still no external beam.
- (5) On 5/2, radiation survey meter indicated hot spot at U10 valve, which was inadvertently closed during 5/1 run. We were extracting!