



BNL-105810-2014-TECH

EP&S No. 95;BNL-105810-2014-IR

## Costs of running FEB and SEB programs - combined and alternating

A. S. Carroll

April 1981

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.

Accelerator Department  
BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY  
Associated Universities, Inc.

EP&S DIVISION TECHNICAL NOTE

No. 95

A. S. Carroll

April 1, 1981

COSTS OF RUNNING FEB AND SEB PROGRAMS-  
COMBINED AND ALTERNATING

INTRODUCTION

Since 1973, we have run the Slow Extracted Beam (SEB) and Fast Extracted Beam (FEB) programs at the AGS in an alternating manner. That is, so many weeks are given to FEB and to SEB as separate operations. Apparently, the reasons for this mode of operation have never been formally documented, and in view of the rapidly escalating electrical power costs and changes in the experimental program, it seems worthwhile to review this decision.

ELECTRICAL POWER AND NUMBER OF PROTONS

On purely economic grounds, we should run the program in such a way that we deliver the required number of protons for the minimum electrical power cost. Since the parameters involved in calculating this cost vary, we shall develop formulae into which the reader may insert her own values.

$T$  = Total power for the year (assumed fixed by budget).

$E_S$  = Electrical usage per hour of SEB running.

$E_F$  = Electrical power usage per hour of FEB running.

$E_I$  = Increment of power usage per hour for combined FEB and SEB operations.

$n_S$  = Number of pulses per hour for SEB or FEB combined with SEB.

$n_F$  = Number of pulses per hour for FEB.



$p$  = Number of protons/pulse. Assumed the same for SEB and FEB running.

$f_F$  = Fractions of protons given to FEB for combined operation.

$q_F$  = Fraction of time allotted to FEB for separate operation.

$H_a$  = Number of hours of operation per year in alternating operations.

$H_c$  = Number of hours of operation per year of combined operation.

$P_a$  = Number of protons delivered, alternating operation.

$P_c$  = Number of protons delivered, combined operation.

Power usage per year:

Alternating

$$[ E_F q_f + E_S (1 - q_F) ] H_a = T \quad (1)$$

Combined

$$[ E_S + E_I ] H_c = T \quad (2)$$

Number of protons delivered:

Alternating

$$P_a = p H_a [ \underbrace{q_F n_f}_{\text{To FEB}} + \underbrace{(1-q_F) n_s}_{\text{To SEB}} ] \quad (3)$$

Combined

$$P_c = p H_c n_S \quad (4)$$

$$\text{fraction to FEB: } f_F P_c \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{fraction to SEB: } (1-f_F) P_c \quad (4b)$$



Now let us put some values into these formulae;

$T = 5.2 \times 10^4$  MWH which corresponds to approximately 15 weeks of SEB and 10 weeks of FEB operation for 120 hours/week, which provides about 100 hours/week to experiments (83% efficiency).

$$E_S = 22 \text{ MW at } 28.5 \text{ GeV/c}$$

$$E_F = 10 \text{ MW at } 28.5 \text{ GeV/c}$$

$$E_I = 1 \text{ MW}$$

$$n_S = 1500 \text{ pulses/hr} \quad (\text{repetition rate } 2.4 \text{ sec})$$

$$n_F = 3000 \text{ pulses/hr} \quad (\text{repetition rate } 1.2 \text{ sec})$$

$$p = 10^{13} \text{ protons/pulse} = 10 \text{ TP (tera protons).}$$

$$f_F = 0.5, \text{ This is one possible value.}$$

$$q_F = 0.4 = 10 \text{ out of } 25 \text{ weeks.}$$

Using equation (1)

$$H_a = 3023 \text{ hours} \Rightarrow \sim 25 \text{ weeks.}$$

Using equation (2) for combined operation throughout year:

$$H_c = 2261 \text{ hours} \Rightarrow \sim 19 \text{ weeks.}$$

Using equation (3)

$$\text{to FEB: } 3.00 \times 10^7 \text{ TP at } 83\% \text{ efficiency.}$$

$$\text{to SEB: } \underline{2.26 \times 10^7} \text{ TP at } 83\% \text{ efficiency.}$$

$$\text{Total: } 5.26 \times 10^7 \text{ TP at } 83\% \text{ efficiency.}$$

Using equation (4)

$$\text{to FEB: } 1.41 \times 10^7 \text{ TP at } 83\% \text{ efficiency.}$$

$$\text{to SEB: } \underline{1.41 \times 10^7} \text{ TP at } 83\% \text{ efficiency.}$$

$$\text{Total: } 2.82 \times 10^7 \text{ TP at } 83\% \text{ efficiency.}$$



Number of protons delivered for total power cost T is 54% for combined running with respect to alternating operation. So there is a very clear economic benefit to this mode of operation.

#### Other Considerations

The complexity of operation and number of technicians required to maintain the beam transport equipment is more for combined operation.

#### Recommendations

1. We continue alternating FEB and SEB operation.
2. The AGS intensity and repetition rate be made as high as possible for FEB operations since the neutrino experiments are never intensity limited. Running time for the neutrino experiments should be in terms of numbers of protons, and then be run off as quickly as possible.
3. The SEB program is not necessarily intensity limited and we should consider trading machine energy for an extended running period.
4. The base load for the Accelerator Department is  $\sim 4.4 \times 10^4$  MWH per year (85% of the electrical power needed to run the AGS program) and so significant reductions in this load could be translated into running weeks.
5. The "standby" power of about 4 MW should be reduced and/or this equipment should be modified to allow shedding this load for shorter shutdowns.

#### Acknowledgments

I wish to thank G. Bunce and J.W. Glenn for their comments and suggestions.