### SC Magnet Shielding

Cale Caldwell Van Graves

IDS-NF Phone Meeting April 6, 2010





## **General Target Concept**



for the U.S. Department of Energy

SC Magnet Shielding 6 Apr 2010

National Laboratory

# Study 2 Energy Deposition (Table 3.5)

- SC shielding absorbs ~60% of beam power (589kW for 1MW beam)
- Value confirmed by more recent studies

| 101C 0.0. L | nergy deposition by een in the | target system.    | (A) Stands | 101 ~10 |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------|---------|
| Cell        | Description                    | Energy Deposition |            |         |
| Number      |                                | (Mev/gm-p)        | $(W/cm^3)$ | (kW)    |
| 8           | Surrounding shield             | 3.11(-4)          | 0.16       | 589     |
| 12          | Primary mercury target         | 2.62              | 1.48(3)    | 53.1    |
| 2           | Coaxial shield around target   | 1.55(-3)          | 0.82       | 40.4    |
| 3           | Iron plug behind target        | 1.21(-3)          | 0.39       | 0.99    |
| 81          | First coaxial magnet           | 2.61(-4)          | 0.08       | 3.54    |
| 82          | Second coaxial magnet          | 1.04(-4)          | 0.03       | 4.43    |
| 83          | Third coaxial magnet           | 2.38(-5)          | 0.01       | 1.70    |
| 91          | Mercury beam stop              | 6.04(-4)          | 0.34       | 1.07    |
| 92          | Mercury beam stop              | 8.64(-4)          | 0.49       | 2.55    |
| 93          | Mercury beam stop              | 1.13(-3)          | 0.64       | 4.01    |
| 94          | Mercury beam stop              | 4.80(-4)          | 0.27       | 1.20    |
| 95          | Mercury beam stop              | 4.42(-4)          | 0.25       | 1.57    |
| 96          | Mercury beam stop              | 4.89(-4)          | 0.28       | 1.74    |
| 97          | Mercury beam stop              | 5.34(-4)          | 0.30       | 1.89    |
| 98          | Mercury beam stop              | 6.87(-4)          | 0.39       | 2.44    |
| 99          | Mercury beam stop              | 6.61(-4)          | 0.37       | 2.35    |
| 100         | Mercury beam stop              | 4.86(-4)          | 0.27       | 1.73    |
| 101         | Mercury beam stop              | 3.65(-4)          | 0.21       | 0.93    |

#### Table 3.5: Energy deposition by cell in the target system. (x) stands for $\times 10^{x}$ .

3 Managed by UT-Battelle for the U.S. Department of Energy



## **Shielding Geometry**

- Baseline concept is water-cooled Tungsten spheres
  - Unknown heat transfer coefficient
  - Unknown packing factor
- Geometry
  - ID = 70cm, OD=114cm, thickness=22cm
  - Length =5m
  - Less thickness available at up-beam end due to resistive magnets
- Can this geometry remove 600kW heat energy?
  - 2.3MW for 4MW beam???



# **First Approximation Heat Transfer**

- Assume solid tungsten cylinder with internal water tubes, single pass water flow
- Q=**m**\*c<sub>p</sub>\*(To-Ti)
  - Q=600kW
  - $c_{p} = 4186 J/kg^{*}K$



Using water as the coolant and assuming 600kW of heat generated, the required flow rate is  $1.4 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ .



## **Flow Distribution**



- The large flow rate can be distributed into 1 cm tubes.
- 152 tubes are required to achieve the necessary flow rate.
  - q = 570 liters/min (150gpm) per tube
  - v = 120 m/sec, not feasible
- 11cm of Tungsten allows enough room for the cooling tubes, while 82% of the cross-sectional area is Tungsten.
  - Reduces effective shielding density

6 Managed by UT-Battelle for the U.S. Department of Energy

SC Magnet Shielding 6 Apr 2010



## **Issues/Next Steps**

- Further analysis needed for this case
- More sophisticated analysis needed for spheres
- Look at mercury as a shield/coolant
- Recalculate for 4-MW beam