Beam dynamics in the Linac4 to PSB transfer line (green field option)

G Bellodi, A Lombardi

& thanks to discussions with Christian, Brennan, Maurizio etc.







> Constant slope solution favoured over step to avoid lack of continuity b/w tunnel sections for installation and maintenance purposes.

> Current slope (8%) near limit for safe machinery utilisation

Layout

"Nested achromats" solution to minimise effects of dispersion on transverse emittance growth and coupling:



Transverse phase space at the end of Linac4

X-X' (cm rad)



 $\varepsilon_x = \varepsilon_y = 0.35 \text{ mm mrad (RMS norm.)}$ 95% of the beam in 5/6 RMS Dx=D'x=0 , zero coupling Y-Y' (cm rad)



Transverse beam transport



- X

Υ

Envelopes (m)



Dispersion, H & V (m)



Beam at PSB – transversally

- So far assumed Linac2-type conditions: $\alpha \sim 0$, small β (<10 m)
- Some freedom for tuning in 2nd part of the transfer line after BHZ30 (6 doublet pairs before injection foil):
 - envelope matching
 - □ zero coupling
 - beam offset
- At PSB: Dx=1.42 m & Dy=0

what are the effects of any dispersion mismatch at injection?

what is the interplay b/w longitudinal and transverse planes at injection?

Longitudinal phase space

Input beam (MeV-ns)

E=163.05 MeV I = 65 mA Energy spread (keV) and phase width (deg) under space charge forces





1) Linac2-type injection:



Beam at Booster:



2) Linac3-type injection:

Energy ramping and longitudinal painting:

X' [rad] x 10E-4

One ramping cavity (2.4 MV) just after Linac4

Linear ramp (energy vs time): [-30 deg, -1.2 MeV] to [30 deg, 1.2 MeV] in 10 µs triangular sweep

Phase-modulated debuncher cavity





3) Radical: no manipulations





All 3 at a glance..

| | Case 1 | | Case 2 | | Case 3 | |
|---|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | no jitter | jitter | no jitter | jitter | no jitter | jitter |
| ε _x mm mrad (RMS norm) | 0.38 (+8%) | 0.385 (+10%) | 1.92 (x5, effective) | 1.96 (effective) | 0.59 (+68%) | 0.75 (+120%) |
| ε _y mm mrad (RMS norm) | 0.48 (36%) | 0.48 (36%) | 0.58 (+66%) | 0.58 (+66%) | 0.53 (+52%) | 0.53 (+52%) |
| ∆E (90%) keV | 165 | ~200 | painting | | 540 | 810 |
| Δφ (90%) rad | 1 | ~1.6 | painting | | 3.1 | 4.8 |

Jitter due to Linac RF errors: $\sigma_{\rm E}{=}270$ keV, $\sigma_{\phi}{=}1.8$ deg RMS at 352 MHz



PSB bucket (0.1 μ s slice) / case 3





Next?

Worth considering a

case 4: more "relaxed" energy modulation & no debuncher cavity to take advantage of 'natural' energy spread? what about uncontrolled jitter effects?

- Continue beam simulations in the Booster (in transfer line approximation)
- Combine transverse & longitudinal studies:
 - effects of dispersion at injection (transverse emittance blowup, correlation b/w transverse and longitudinal phase spaces..)
 - consequences for stripping foil
 - transverse emittance budget?
 - is energy modulation feasible with planned injection HW equipment?
 - line acceptance and required physical aperture?
 - effects of H/V coupling
 - effect of energy jitter due to Linac RF errors...
- Beam dump and diagnostics