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Outline

- Recap from my previous presentation.
  - Initial picture slightly changed.
- New calculations:
  - Normalisation with respect to beam sigma.
  - Luminosity reduction estimation.
  - Amplification effects at collimators.
- Recap on actual ground motion estimation.
  - Amplification of cold mass.
  - Old measurements/estimations.
- TODO list
From previous meeting

- Computing closed-orbit separation at the IPs under the effect of triplet transverse misalignments.
- “Best case” scenario:
  - Each element moves independently from the others.
  - Sum in quadrature of each single element effect
- “Worst case” scenario:
  - The whole IR moves coherently according to the worst mode.
  - Sum of the absolute effects within each IR, then in quadrature over the 4 IRs
Conclusions from previous meeting:

- The main concern is the factor 2 smaller (nominal) beam size at IP1/5 with respect to LHC.
Optics now analyzed

- **HL-LHC 1.3 July 2017 (≠ January 2017):**
  - $\beta^* = 15\text{cm}$ (as in January, even if present baseline is 20 cm)
  - on_x1=255; phi_ir1 = 90; on_x5=255;
  - on_x2=170; phi_ir2 = 90; on_x8=-250;
  - on_lhcb=-1; on_alice=1;
  - E = 7 TeV; $\sigma_E = 1.08e-04$; $\varepsilon_N = 2.5$ μm

- **LHC (runll/2016/opt_400_10000_400_3000_totem5.madx)**
  - $\beta^* = 40\text{cm}$
  - on_x1 = -185; on_x5 =185; on_x2 = 200; on_x8 = -250;
  - on_sep(1258)=0; on_o(1258) = 0;
  - E = 6.5 TeV; $\sigma_E = 1.13e-04$; $\varepsilon_N = 3.75$ μm
Repeated simulations.

**HL-LHC 1.3**
**January**

**HL-LHC 1.3**
**July**

Probably different phase advance. To be re-checked.
Normalisation to beam size

HL-LHC:
Beam $\sigma \approx 7 \, \mu m$

LHC:
Beam $\sigma \approx 15 \, \mu m$
Luminosity [1]

\[
\mathcal{L} = \frac{N_1 N_2 f N_b}{2\pi \sqrt{\sigma_{1x}^2 + \sigma_{2x}^2} \sqrt{\sigma_{1y}^2 + \sigma_{2y}^2}} W e^{\frac{p^2}{A}} S
\]

\[
W = e^{-\frac{1}{4\sigma_x^2}(d_2-d_1)^2}
\]

\[
A = \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\phi}{2}\right)}{\sigma_x^2} + \frac{\cos^2\left(\frac{\phi}{2}\right)}{\sigma_s^2}
\]

\[
B = \frac{(d_2 - d_1) \sin\left(\frac{\phi}{2}\right)}{2\sigma_x^2}
\]

\[
S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_x} \tan\left(\frac{\phi}{2}\right)\right)^2}}
\]

Dynamic effect

Assuming all Gaussian:

\[
\langle W \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{4\sigma_b^2} (s)^2} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_s} \right) e^{-\frac{s^2}{2\sigma_s^2}} \, ds
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2\sigma_b^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} \right)}
\]

\[
= \frac{\sqrt{2\sigma_b}}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + 2\sigma_b^2}}
\]

\[
= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 / \sigma_b^2 + 2}}
\]

Where:

\[ \sigma_b = \sigma_{\text{beam}} \]

\[ s = d_2 - d_1 \]

\[ \sigma_s = \text{r.m.s. separation jitter} \]

For uncorrelated planes:

\[
\langle W \rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\sigma_{sx}^2 / \sigma_x^2 + 2} \sqrt{\sigma_{sy}^2 / \sigma_y^2 + 2}}
\]
Luminosity loss (dynamic)

**HL-LHC:**

\[ \frac{L}{L_0} = 0.5 \]

**LHC:**

\[ \frac{L}{L_0} = 0.5 \]

**σ_{field} = 0.5 \, \mu m**
Effect at collimators (B1)

Note: Limit is 200 μm, but in 2012 smaller movements caused dumps [Rogelio]
Effect at collimators (B2)

Note: Limit is 200 μm, but in 2012 smaller movements caused dumps [Rogelio]
Effect at collimators (B1) – norm beam sigma

**HL-LHC**

**Horizontal**

**Vertical**

**LHC:**

**Graphs show the normalized beam sigma for different scenarios:**
- **Uncorrelated**
- **Cryo-correlated**
- **IPSide-correlated**
- **IP-correlated**

**Axes:**
- $\sigma_x / \sigma_y$ (field motion) [um]
- $\sigma_y / \sigma_x$ (field motion) [um]

**Labels:**
- TCP_D6L7_B1
- TCP_C6L7_B1
- TCP_B6L7_B1
- TCPV_A6L7_B1
- TCPCH_A4L7_B1
- TCP_6L3_B1
Effect at collimators (B2) – norm beam sigma

**HL-LHC**

**Horizontal**

- $\sigma_x / \sigma_{(field motion)}/[\mu m]$ for various components:
  - TCP 8R3.B2
  - TCP D6R7.B2

**Vertical**

- $\sigma_y / \sigma_{(field motion)}/[\mu m]$ for various components:
  - TCP 8R3.B2
  - TCP D6R7.B2

**LHC:**

- Similar graphs for LHC components with the same notation.
Effect at secondary collimators (B1) norm beam sigma

HL-LHC:

LHC:
Effect at secondary collimators (B2) norm beam sigma

HL-LHC:

LHC:

Horizontal

Vertical

HiLumi ML-LHC PROJECT
Amplification by cold mass

Vibration analysis of TT41 TAG41, Michael Guinchard, 16 Jul 2015

Measurements confirmed by modal analysis [5].
According to the transfer function measured at SM18 on Q1, the expected motion of the cold mass during LHC operation is around 0.1 µm integrated from 100 Hz. [M. Guinchard, 16/07/2015]

For standard civil engineering tools at the surface, the expected magnetic center motion should stay below 0.5 µm between 4 and 100 Hz. [M. Guinchard, 29/05/2017]
Measurements done in the past

Vibrating truck impact

- Beam measurements with the vibrating truck were performed for the squeezed optics (80 cm) at 6.5 TeV and at injection.
  - Multi-turn data (all BPMs) & ADT data.

- Measurements results:
  - Beam oscillations were only observed in the vertical plane ⇔ truck location.
  - Beam oscillations were only observed for vibration frequencies of 18-22 Hz – consistent with the triplet resonances.
  - Observed B1/B2 amplitude ratio of ~2.5 implies that the different triplet quads oscillated with different amplitudes.
  - The oscillation amplitudes of the triplet CMs were in the few μm range for a ground motion amplitudes of ~50 nm in the tunnel.

The observations are consistent with the triplet resonances that enhance the vibrations by a factor >> 10

Rough calculation:

\[ \sqrt{\frac{\beta_{ADT}}{\beta^*}} \approx 20 \]

Amplification x5 (?!)
by LHC optics

80 [μm] \[ \frac{20 \times 5}{5} = 0.8 [μm] \]

Amplification x16?! (x100)
by cold mass
**MQXA Cold Mass – EMA Results (modal shapes)**

**Vertical Modes**

1st

![Vertical Mode 1st](image)

- 23.5 Hz

2nd

![Vertical Mode 2nd](image)

- 65.9 Hz

**Lateral Modes**

1st

![Lateral Mode 1st](image)

- 25.7 Hz

2nd

![Lateral Mode 2nd](image)

- 63.4 Hz

3rd

![Lateral Mode 3rd](image)

- 104 Hz

**From: M. Guinchard, 29/05/2017**

- In the previous simulations I assume that the whole magnet is rigidly displaced.
- The **actual effect on the beam might be smaller**.
  - TODO: simulate it.
  - Repeat for HL-LHC.
Still TO DO…

- Perform new **measurements**:
  - **3 geophones** sensors (IP1, IP5 and surface) are now logged on Timber.
    - Contact person is Michael Guinchard.
  - Look at correlations with beam orbit (**DOROS, ADT**) and losses at collimators.
    - More ADT data will be available/logged during summer.
      - (see also [7] for online data retrieval)
  - **Spectra of the beam oscillation** have been computed only occasionally in the past
    - need to perform systematic analysis.
- Follow up on the response of the **new cold masses**.
  - **Simulations** taking into account actual **vibration modes**.
  - Contact person is Delio Duarte Ramos.
Still TO DO…

- Idea of having back the “vibrator truck” back to CERN for further studies.
  - When tests done in 2015 only looked at multi-turn data (good enough for a few Hz expected oscillations)
  - Presently this idea is dropped, but it could be re-considered [P.Fessia].

- Contribute to OP effort:
  - Jorg and Michaela aim is to observe and quantify the noise now and next year when excavation works will start.
  - Also interested in single-source events (earthquakes).

- Follow Geothermie 2020 evolution. [9]
The program might be stopped in Geneva.

- It could induce small earthquakes (several per week)
- Expected cold mass movements up to 10 μm! [10]

Recent developments close to Vernier:

- But much less deep drilling (only about 60 m) and not of a few thousand metres as foreseen by GEothermie2020 plan.

... to be followed up!
Conclusions

- HL-LHC optics is very similar to LHC in terms of sensitivity to ground motion, but:
  - x2 smaller beam size -> x2 more sensitive to possible luminosity degradation.
  - x2 more sensitive at collimators.

- Confidence on the model of ground motion
  - Geophones will give additional information.

- It is important to follow up on the new cold mass design (and its resonances)
  - We might gain what we loose from optics.
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From last meeting

- Rogelio clarifies that one cannot rely on the orbit feedback to maintain collision.
- Gianluigi suggests marking the frequencies of the two modes on the spectrum plot.
- Gianluigi suggests normalising the plot to beam sigma and to show the corresponding luminosity reduction.
- Gianluigi suggests trying to use measurements with the DOROS and the measurements of the ground motion at the triplets in order to infer the amplification factors and/or typical patterns in the movement of the triplets.
- Gianluigi suggests checking the induced movements of the beam also at the positions of collimators as a large movement there can lead to loss spikes and beam dump. Rogelio: limit is 200 μm, but smaller movements led to beam dumps in 2012.
Repeated simulations.

HL-LHC 1.3 January

Probably different phase advance. To be re-checked

HL-LHC 1.3 July