### IDS120j WITHOUT GAPS AND WITH MAXIMUM SIZE GAPS ( aka "NIGHTMARE" SCENARIO )

SC#4, SC#7 AZIMUTHAL DPD DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS.

Nicholas Souchlas, PBL (3/20/2012)

## **IDS120j GEOMETRY: WITHOUT GAPS/WITH MAX SIZE GAPS**

## # DP SIMULATIONS. # SC#4, SC#7 AZIMUTHAL DPD DISTRIBUTION STUDIES.

>SIMULATIONS CODE: mars1510 / MCNP

>NEUTRON ENERGY CUTOFF: 10<sup>-11</sup> MeV

>SHIELDING: 60% W + 40% He (WITH STST VESSELS)

>PROTON BEAM POWER: 4 MW

>PROTON ENERGY: E = 8 GeV

>PROTON BEAM PROFILE: GAUSSIAN,  $\sigma_x = \sigma_y = 0.12$  cm

#### IDS120j WITHOUT (LEFT) AND WITH GAPS (TWO SHIELDING CONFIGURATIONS RIGHT)

YZ CROSS SECTION PLOTS.



#### IDS120j: DP DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT GAPS (LEFT) AND WITH MAXIMUM GAPS SIZE (RIGHT)



FIRST LOOK: GAPS AFFECT MOSTLY SC#3, SC#4 AND SC#7, SC#4 WITH MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM. GAP BETWEEN CRYO #1 AND #2 HAS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT EFFECT NOT ONLY IN THE NEIGHBORING SCs BUT ALSO IN THE SCs FURTHER DOWNSTREAM.

### IDS120j: GAP BETWEEN CRYO 1-2 AND SC#4 SEGMENTATION DETAILS.



4

# SC#4 DPD AZIMUTHAL DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT GAPS: 15.8 g/cc (LEFT) AND 18.2 g/cc (RIGHT) W DENSITY (AVERAGE FROM 4 5E05 EVENT SIMULATIONS).



 $\label{eq:DPD} DPD \lesssim 0.008 \mbox{ mW/g} \ (\mbox{ sum } 0.023 \mbox{ kW} \ ) \qquad DPD \lesssim \ 0.011 \mbox{ mW/g} \ (\mbox{ sum } 0.012 \mbox{ kW} \ ) \\ \mbox{PEAKS APPEAR TO BE IN THE UPPER HALF OF SC#4, TOWARD} \ - \ x \mbox{ AXIS}$ 

# SC#4 DPD AZIMUTHAL DISTRIBUTION WITH GAPS: 18.2 g/cc W DENSITY (LEFT) FROM 5E05 EVENTS.

AZIMUTHALLY AVERAGE DPD PLOT BY USING ROOT SOFTWARE (RIGHT).



SC#4: DPD  $\leq$  2.4 mW/g (sum = 3.64 kW vs. 3.73 kW without segm.) DPD  $\leq$  0.7 mW/g PEAKS APPEAR TO BE ALSONG THE + y AND - x DIRECTION. FROM RIGHT PLOT: DOES THAT MEAN THE STUDY II GEOMETRY SC#1 PEAK IS IN REALITY > 19 mW/g ?!!

#### CRYO #2 AND #3 GAP AND SC#7 AZIMUTHAL SEGMENTATION DETAILS.



Aspect Ratio: Y:Z = 1:1.25

70 < r < 89.97 cm

dr = 9.985 cm  $N_r$  = 2 bins 1036.0 < z < 1046.67 cm dz = 10.67 cm  $N_z = 1 \text{ bin}$  $0.0 < \phi < 360.0 \text{ deg.}$   $d\phi = 30 \text{ deg.}$   $N_{\phi} = 12 \text{ bins}$ N<sub>tot</sub> = 24 "pieces"



SC#4: DPD  $\lesssim 0.15$  mW/g (sum = 0.060 kW vs. 0.061 kW without segm.) PEAK APPEAR TO BE ALONG THE + y AND - x DIRECTION AS IN SC#4. PROBLEM IN SC#4 LOOKS LIKE IS MANEGEABLE. SC#3 SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS IN PROGRESS.

NO GAPS	GAPS	
SC#1 : 0.383 kW	>	0.368 kW
SC#2 : 0.105 kW	>	0.120 kW
SC#3 : 0.053 kW	>	0.799 kW
SC#4 : 0.012 kW	>	3.700 kW
SC#5 : 0.003 kW	>	0.080 kW
SC#6 : 0.001 kW	>	0.052 kW
SC#7 : 0.003 kW	>	0.061 kW
SC#8 : 0.008 kW	>	0.006 kW
SC#9 : 0.002 kW	>	0.006 kW
SC#11-12 : 0.035	kW	> 0.052 kW
SC#1-12 : 0.605	kW	> 5.244 kW
<b>RADIAL DP FLOW</b>	: 74.15 kW	> 531.78 kW

GAP BETWEEN CRYO #1 AND #2 IS THE MAJOR PROBLEM IN THE GAPS CONFIGURATION. AT THE SAME TIME THAT FIRST GAP SHOULD BE BIGGER THAN THE OTHERS TO SATISFY THE NEEDS FOR Hg POOL VESSEL + BEAM PIPE + Be WINDOW + SHIELDING MATERIAL COOLING, AS WEEL AS OTHER ENGINEERING COMPONENTS THERE. AT LEAST ~ 20 cm WILL BE DEDICATED TO THE UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM STST FLANGES OF THE NEIGHBORING SHIELDING VESSELS AND MORE THAN ~ 20 - 30 cm FOR THE DIFFERENT COMPONENTS, THEREFORE SHIELDING GAP  $\geq$  50 - 60 cm. A VIABLE SOLUTION (BUT NOT NECESSARILY ENGINEERINGLY FAVORABLE) CAN INCLUDE:

- A. INTRODUCTION OF SHIELDING IN THE UPPER HALF OF THE Hg POOL VESSEL,
- **B.** NOT EXTENDING THE POOL ALL THE WAY TO THE END OF THE #1 CRYOSTAT LENGTH,

8

- C. ASSYMETRIC EXTENSION OF THE SHIELDING FROM CRYO #1 TOWARDS CRYO #2,
- D. SC IR INCREASE MAYBE EVEN TO 120 cm.