

|                           |   |      |               |                    |
|---------------------------|---|------|---------------|--------------------|
| <b>Title</b>              | <b><i>X-ray Beam Position and Flux Monitoring</i></b> |      |               |                    |
| Project Requestor         | Glenn Decker  |      |               |                    |
| Date                      | May 15, 2008  |      |               |                    |
| Group Leader(s)           | Glenn Decker  |      |               |                    |
| Machine or Sector Manager | Louis Emery   |      |               |                    |
| Category                  | Beam Stability  |      |               |                    |
| Content ID*               | APS_XXXXXX  | Rev. | ICMS_Revision | ICMS Document Date |

\*This row is filled in automatically on check in to ICMS. See Note <sup>1</sup>

**Description:**

|                        |             |                      |          |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------|
| <b>Start Year (FY)</b> | <b>FY08</b> | <b>Duration (Yr)</b> | <b>5</b> |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------|

**Objectives:**

- X-ray bpm system enhancement (APS\_1255209)
- Storage ring portable detector upgrade (APS\_1255145)
- Microminiature xbpm and flux monitor for high-flux micro-focused hard x-ray beams. (APS\_1256819).

**Benefit:**

Enhance long term pointing stability for insertion device beams to the level of 0.5 microradians p-p for a one week time period; provide quantitative diagnostic of beamline performance with portable detector; provide new diagnostic for microfocused beams, with application to beam position monitoring.

**Risks of Project:** See Note <sup>2</sup>

The x-ray bpm enhancement will involve standard vacuum intervention / bake procedures for beamline front ends and within beamline first optic enclosures.

**Consequences of Not Doing Project:** See Note <sup>3</sup>

Users will not benefit from the best pointing stability. Certain classes of experiments requiring outstanding beam stability may not be possible. Source-to-sample optimization capability with the portable detector will be degraded.

**Cost/Benefit Analysis:** See Note <sup>4</sup>

The x-ray bpm system enhancement forms the largest portion of this proposal, amounting to \$35k per beamline , with significant contingency (\$7k / beamline). It should provide at least a factor of two improvement in long term pointing stability. Upgrade to the portable detector will be \$55k / year over three years and will provide absolute flux and AC centroid and size measurement capability. The microminiature xbpm project amounts to \$140k over five years and will develop photoconductive diamond detector capability in house.

**Description:**

The x-ray bpm system enhancement will provide non-destructive hard x-ray front-end position monitoring and retractable destructive flux monitoring in the first optic enclosure, building on results of studies at 19-ID. The portable detector upgrade will add an absolute flux detector, PIN diode-base AC beam position monitoring, and a fast imaging camera to the existing device, now under test at 35-ID.

**Funding Details**

**Cost: (\$K)**

Use FY08 dollars.

| Year  | AIP  | Contingency |
|-------|------|-------------|
| 1     | 345  | 65.5        |
| 2     | 335  | 61.5        |
| 3     | 335  | 60.5        |
| 4     | 270  | 52          |
| 5     | 270  | 52          |
| 6     |      |             |
| 7     |      |             |
| 8     |      |             |
| 9     |      |             |
| Total | 1555 | 291.5       |

Contingency may be in dollars or percent. Enter figure for total project contingency.

APS Strategic Planning Proposal

**Effort: (FTE)**

The effort portion need not be filled out in detail by March 28

| Year | Mechanical Engineer | Electrical Engineer | Physicist | Software Engineer | Tech | Designer | Post Doc | Total |
|------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|------|----------|----------|-------|
| 1    | 0.45                | 0.3                 | 0.26      | 0.4               | 0.4  | 0.3      |          | 2.11  |
| 2    | 0.1                 | 0.2                 | 0.21      | 0.25              | 0.4  |          |          | 1.16  |
| 3    | 0.1                 | 0.2                 | 0.21      | 0.2               | 0.4  |          |          | 1.11  |
| 4    |                     | 0.2                 | 0.05      | 0.05              | 0.2  |          |          | 0.5   |
| 5    |                     | 0.2                 | 0.05      | 0.05              | 0.2  |          |          | 0.5   |
| 6    |                     |                     |           |                   |      |          |          | 0     |
| 7    |                     |                     |           |                   |      |          |          | 0     |
| 8    |                     |                     |           |                   |      |          |          | 0     |
| 9    |                     |                     |           |                   |      |          |          | 0     |

---

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> **ICMS.** Check in first revision to ICMS as a *New Check In*. Subsequent revisions should be checked in as revisions to that document i.e. *Check Out* the previous version and *Check In* the new version. Be sure to complete the *Document Date* field on the check in screen.

<sup>2</sup> **Risk Assessment.** Advise of the potential impact to the facility or operations that may result as a consequence of performing the proposed activity. Example: If the proposed project is undertaken then other systems impacted by the work include ... (If no assessment is appropriate then enter NA.)

<sup>3</sup> **Consequence Assessment.** Advise of the potential consequences to the facility or to operations if the proposal is not executed. Example: If the proposed project is not undertaken then \_\_\_\_ may happen to the facility. (If no assessment is appropriate then enter NA.)

<sup>4</sup> **Cost Benefit Analysis.** Describe cost efficiencies or value of the risk mitigated by the expenditure. Example: Failure to complete this maintenance project will result in increased total costs to the APS for emergency repairs and this investment of \_\_\_\_ will also result in improved reliability of \_\_\_\_\_. (If no assessment is appropriate then enter NA.)