ATF2 week meeting: Impact of cooling water on the final doublets vibrations

Laboratories in Annecy working on Vibration Stabilization







Introduction

 ✓ Presentation at Nanobeam 08 (1 June 08): Study of supports for ATF2 final doublets

- Appropriate supports found and built
- Vibratory behavior of supports and of final doublets when subjected to ground motion measured at LAPP
- Relative motion tolerances checked
- ✓ Study done at LAPP at the end of July 08: Effect of cooling water on the vibrations of final doublets

Final doublets installation at LAPP as it will be at KEK





Plan of my presentation

ATF2 specifications of final focus vibrations for LAPP team Relative motion of final doublets to the floor below 10nm above 0.1Hz

Vibration measurements with and without cooling water

On the final doublets and the honeycomb table From 0.1Hz to 100Hz with GURALP and ENDEVCO sensors

Stationary of vibrations?

Stationary study of cooling water vibrations

Temporal data analysis

3D frequency analysis: Transfer function at each second versus frequency

If stationary

2D Frequency analysis in [0.1; 100] Hz range

50 averages on 64 seconds data set of:

Transfer function, coherence, integrated relative motion RMS

Vibration measurements with and without cooling water

Experimental set-up



O.1Hz - 50Hz

 ✓ Same water flow as specified for ATF-2 (20 litres/minute)

✓ Measurements done on each final doublet

Simultaneously on the magnet and on the table
 With and without cooling water

10Hz – 100Hz

Introduction

Vibratory behavior study of final doublets subjected to cooling water: Stationary of vibrations?

- 1. Measurements: Cooling water activated at half of their time lenght
- 2. Temporal analysis (digital high-pass and low-pass Butterworth filter of 5th order) with:
 - GURALP geophones (0.2Hz-50Hz)
 - ENDEVCO accelerometres (10Hz-100Hz)
- 3. 3D frequency analysis: transfer function, time, frequency
 - Window: Hanning
 - Overlap: 66.67%
 - Frequency resolution: 2Hz (only ENDEVCO sensors used)
 - Time resolution: 0.5s
 - Averaging: Exponential (2*Tau=1.167s) and 5 averages

Stationary study of cooling water vibrations \implies **Quadrupoles** Sextupoles

Temporal vibrations of QD0 and QF1 quadrupoles

Stationary of ground motion checked to compare with/without water



No significative increase of vibrations with cooling water

3D frequency analysis of QD0 and QF1 quadrupoles





✓ For QD0 and QF1, almost the same vibratory behavior

Quadrupoles

Sextupoles

✓ With cooling water, very low random vibrations above 70Hz

✓ Stationary of these random vibrations

Temporal vibrations of SD0 and SF1 sextupoles

Stationary of ground motion checked to compare with/without water





Quadrupoles

Sextupoles

3D frequency analysis of SD0 and SF1 sextupoles





✓ For SD0 and SF1, quite the same vibratory behavior

Quadrupoles

Sextupoles

✓ With cooling water, a high
 vibration peak appears above
 70Hz for bothe SD0 and SF1

 ✓ Stationary of this vibration peak

2D Frequency analysis in [O.1; 100] Hz range

Study done on the impact of cooling water on final doublets vibrations: Stationary of vibrations checked ✓ 2D Frequency analysis in [0.1; 100] Hz range can be now done Frequency resolution: 0.016Hz Window: Hanning Averaging: Linear and 50 averages Overlap: 66.67% ✓ 2 sets of vibration measurements done during 17min40s First set with no cooling water The other set with cooling water ➢ GURALP (0.1Hz-13Hz) and ENDEVCO (13Hz-100Hz) sensors used This analysis allows us knowing accurately transfer function,

coherence, integrated RMS of relative motion in [0.1; 100] Hz range $_{10}$

2D Frequency analysis in [0.1; 100] Hz range

Transfer function of the QD0 and QF1 quadrupoles Transfer function magnitude of the guadrupole final doublets fixed to the honeycomb table Transfer function magnitude of the guadrupole final doublets fixed to the honeycomb table QD0 with cooling water QD0 with cooling water With cooling water: very low QF1 with cooling water QF1 with cooling water random vibrations added to the Transfer function magnitude QD0 with no cooling water QD0 with no cooling water spectrum compared to without QF1 with no cooling water QF1 with no cooling water Magnitude Magnitude 10° 10^{1} 70 10² 40 50 60 80 90 100 70 Frequency [Hz] Frequency [Hz] Transfer function phase of the quadrupole final doublets fixed to the honeycomb table QD0 and QF1: Almost the same \checkmark



Transfer function magnitude []

10

10

0.2

vibratory behavior with and without cooling water

Quadrupoles

Sextupoles

✓ Same results than the one obtained from measurements done with no water for Nanobeam 08

Relative motion between quadrupoles and table within tolerances₁₁

2D Frequency analysis in [O.1; 100] Hz range



- With no water: SD0 and SF1 almost the same vibratory behavior
 Same results than the ones obtained from measurements done for Nanobeam 08 (relative motion within tolerances)
- ✓ With cooling water, vibration peak appears (≠90°: not a resonance)
 ➢ For SD0: 78Hz and for SF1: 90Hz (high frequency for ATF2)
 - Need to evaluate the impact of these peaks on relative motion

Quadrupoles

Sextupoles

2D Frequency analysis in [O.1; 100] Hz range

Quadrupoles **Sextupoles**

Integrated RMS of SD0 and SF1 relative motion to the table at ATF2

$$RMS_{int y-x}(k) = \sqrt{\sum_{k_1}^{k_2} [H(k) - 1][H^*(k) - 1]PSD_x _ ATF(k)}$$

✓ Relative motion to the table due to cooling water vibration peak :
 ➢ SD0: 0.74nm and SF1: 0.68nm

Since results of Nanobeam 08 show low relative motion of sextupoles to the floor above 0.2Hz compared to tolerances 13 → Sextupole relative motion to the floor within tolerances with water