

## The Fast Injection Bump and Machine Tunes

L. Ahrens

January 1985

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. DE-AC02-76CH00016 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.



AGS Studies Report

Date(s) January 8, 1985 Time(s) 0530-1100

Experimenter(s) L. Ahrens and C. Gardner

Reported by L. Ahrens

Subject(s) The Fast Injection Bump and Machine Tunes

Observations and Conclusions

The fast injection bump, which allows the AGS equilibrium orbit (E.O.) at the injection stripping foil to be radially controlled and in particular rapidly moved away from the foil once the Linac beam pulse is completed, continues to be an unexploited degree of freedom in the injection process. A gradual increase in applicable beam diagnostics (PIP and the E.O. PUE program) make the study of the bump a reasonable early step in a general understanding of injection.

Since the commissioning of  $H^-$  injection, and indeed before, studies of relative amplitudes of the two kicks ("A13" and "B7") necessary to give minimal residuals have yielded what appear to be non-reproducible results. However, parameters such as machine tune, intensity, and bump amplitude have been different for the different measurements. As a start toward clearing up the situation, this study attempted to correlate bump residuals with the machine tunes.

The injection set up (HEBT steering, equilibrium orbit steering, tunes, etc.) was left as it had been set for HEP. The Linac pulse width was reduced so that  $6 \times 10^{12}$  protons were stacked in the AGS. The beam was accelerated for 30 ms. The effect of the A and B injection kicks on the E.O. was measured using the ring PUE system (NORB and ORBED programs) with an external trigger 500  $\mu$ s after injection was finished (and the bump turned off). Sufficient bunching (rf on) has occurred by this time to get an orbit. The bump was then extended for 600  $\mu$ s beyond its normal off time and another orbit taken. The difference between these orbits showed the effect of the bump (see Figure 1). The relative amplitudes of the two kicks was then adjusted to minimize the residuals. The initial ratio ( $I_B/I_A$ ) of 1.9 gave a 0.6 cm peak residual, at a ratio of  $1.3 \pm 0.05$  the residual was a minimum at 0.1 cm. This would imply, by the simplest model a ratio of betatron functions ( $\beta_{B7}/\beta_{A13}$ ) =  $(1.3)^2 = 1.7$  and the standard machine model gives approximately 2. Next different orbits were obtained for three tune settings. The tunes were adjusted using the nu-quad array and measured using PIP. Table I gives a summary of the results. Case 1 is the starting situation, Case 2 attempted to apply a horizontal tune shift, and Case 3 a vertical.



PIP and the equation relating tune to quadrupole strengths and calibrations agreed well as to the tune shifts. The residuals have a spatial variation  $\propto \cos(\nu\theta + \phi)$  so the ninth harmonic  $\propto \cos(9\theta + \phi')$  is dominant and its amplitude can be used as a measure of residual. A perfect bump would contribute approximately 1/18 of its amplitude to a ninth harmonic, so this is subtracted from the measured ninth.

Aside from the tunes and the qualitative behavior of the bump and residual waves, the information gathered shows, on first pass, contradictory and/or ridiculous information. In particular, the PUE data reports large changes in horizontal E.O. when the vertical tune is changed, PIP sees none within errors. The PUE data sees a large change in horizontal residuals with vertical tune. The PUE results are somewhat suspect at least as to normalization since the beam is presumably not fully bunched and it was noted that the captured intensity varied significantly with changes in  $\nu_v$ . The PIP readings are taken 600  $\mu$ s before the PUE's and for a minute intensity beam relative to the PUE beam.

Despite these strange effects, the PUE data, if taken as a relative monitor only, did not see a strong variation in bump residual with tune. A search for such a variation was the study motivation.

The next step in this effort is to obtain some predictions via the BEAM program for bump-machine interaction. On the experimental side, an attempt will be made to reproduce the anomalous effects seen above. The bumps can be refired after bunching is complete. An experimental study of residuals vs. bump amplitude is also straightforward.

mvh-AHRENS/STUDY



0-JAN-85 06:25 NOR. ORBIT 0 55 EXTND. NAME: 5 HARMONIC ANALYSIS  
 \*\*\*\*\* DIFFERENCE DATA USING FILE IJJ \*\*\*\*\*  
 NORMALIZED BY L20CT = 581  
 AVERAGE POS= -0.221


	N	SIN	COS	AMP
	8	-0.05	-0.03	0.061
	9	-0.13	-0.07	0.148
	10	-0.06	0.02	0.061

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
A	-0.03	0.03	0.08	0.40	1.23	A						
B	1.00	0.59	-0.07	0.05	0.10	0.21	B					
C	0.17	0.21	0.15	0.12	0.04	0.10	C					
D	0.09	0.16	0.22	0.19	0.21	0.09	D					
E	-0.03	-0.04	0.04	0.10	0.18	0.17	E					
F	0.11	0.07		0.05	0.06	0.11	F					
G	0.19	0.16	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.00	G					
H	-0.02	0.11		0.19	0.23	0.14	H					
I	0.05	-0.00	0.10	0.12	0.22	0.17	I					
J	0.17	0.08	-0.00	0.08	0.07	0.15	J					
K		0.24	0.16	0.10	0.07	0.06	K					
L	0.03	0.07		0.26	0.24	0.08	L					

H-1420 U 1650

we null at best  
we can



R(RESTART), E(EXIT), S(SAVE FILE), N(NO OUTPUT), L(LOOP), C(NORMC), <CR>(LOOP ONCE):

Figure 1



TABLE I

Case	Nu-Quad Setting		Measured Tunes		$\Delta v$ Meas.		$\Delta v$ Cal.	
	NUQHB	NUQVB	$v_H$ $\pm .002$	$v_V$ $\pm .002$	H	V	H	V
1	-1420	1650	8.789	8.909	--	--	--	--
2	- 820	1350	8.675	8.908	-.114	-.001	-.113	0
3	-1120	1050	8.786	8.803	-.003	-.106	0	-.113

	E.O. Motion at Foil (PIP)				E.O. Motion at <A18,B2> (PUE) Horizontal (mm)
	Horizontal		Vertical		
	Pos.	Angle	Pos.	Angle	
	<u>mm</u>	<u>mr</u>	<u>mm</u>	<u>mr</u>	
1	--	--	--	--	--
2	1.7±1	.05±.04	-2±1	+.03±.05	+.3
3	0.8±1	.03±.04	-1±.9	-.18±.04	-2.1

	Ninth Harmonic (mm) Due to Kicks		Bump Peak (mm)	Ninth Harmonic Residue/Peak
	Raw	Bump Induced Portion Subtracted		
1	1.4	0.7	12	6%
2	0.94	0.34	10.6	3%
3	1.2	0.8	7	11%