


# High intensity Compact Photon Source

... and the...

## Neutral Particle Spectrometer



Tanja Horn

Spokesperson for the Neutral Particle Spectrometer (NPS) Collaboration




# Outline

---

- ❑ Developments since PAC44
  - High-Intensity Photon Workshop
  - Working Group Activities
- ❑ Compact Photon Source (CPS) – General Concept and Implementations
- ❑ CPS Feasibility Studies
  - Radiation Calculation Benchmarking
  - Prompt Radiation and Dose Rate Calculations
  - Engineering Aspects
- ❑ Similarity of CPS Concept for Halls A/C and KL/Hall D
- ❑ Engineering Concepts
- ❑ Summary


# Multiple Science Opportunities With Compact Photon Source (and NPS)



## Wide Angle Compton Scattering (PAC45) ( $K_{LL}$ , $A_{LL}$ , $K_{LS}$ , $A_{LS}, \dots$ )

## Hadron Spectroscopy with secondary $K_L$ beam (PAC45)

Cross sections and polarization of  $\Lambda$ ,  $\Sigma$ ,  $\Xi$ ,  $\Omega$  hyperons



measured yields of different hadron species in heavy ion collisions

## Additional Science Topics under study

- ☐ WACS exclusive photoproduction
- ☐ Timelike Compton Scattering
- ☐ Short Range Correlations
- ☐ Photoproduction of Few Body Systems
- ☐ Also: Missing mesons, Phi production, ...

# Science Gain with a Compact Photo Source

## Impact of a high intensity photon source for hadron physics at JLab:

- WACS must reach several  $\text{GeV}^2$  in s, t, and u, but since the WACS rates drop with  $\sim 1/s^{7.5}$  this science needs a luminosity boost.
- The KL project is based on a 5 kW photon intensity (>100 times above the 15 W design level for the Hall D beam line) to do “prime physics with a secondary beam”.

## Impact of the photon source for WACS:

- The heat/radiation load is a limiting factor for luminosity with the polarized target.  
The target can take **20 times more photons than electrons**.
- **The experiment productivity is improved even more (30 times)** due to higher target polarization averaged over the experiment, and reduced overhead time for the target annealing procedure.

## Impact of the photon source for the KL project:

- The hermetic CPS concept allows **2 decades increase** of the beam intensity in the existing photon Tagger Area without major rebuilding of the facility.

# Timeline

## ❑ PAC43 on PR12-15-003

*“The PAC is impressed by the concept for a new photon source. It strongly encourages the proponents to work with the members of the previously approved E12-14-006 in order to see whether it could be possible be incorporated here.”*

## ❑ PAC 44 on PR12-16-009

*“We recommend that the laboratory provide resources for a workshop focused on developing the physics case, as well as an optimized compact photon source and beam dump, organized jointly by the spokespersons of the PR12-16-009, PR12-15-003, and E12-14-006 proposals.”*

## ❑ New Opportunities with High-Intensity Photon Sources workshop


6-7 February 2017 @ Catholic University of America

Organizers: T. Horn, C. Keppel, C. Munoz-Camacho and I. Strakovsky

All spokespersons of E12-14-006, PR12-15-003 and PR12-16-009, and also the spokespersons of PR12-17-001 (Hall D KL beam effort) actively involved.

*HIPS conclusion: Lab will set up a meeting with interested groups to fix goals and timeline to benchmark and finalize Compact Photon Source concept*

Detail and proceedings: <https://www.jlab.org/conferences/HIPS2017/>



# Compact Photon Source Working Group

- ❑ **Working group established composed of Hall A/C Leader, NPS spokesperson, Physics AD, RadCon, and 2-3 members each from Hall A and Hall C WACS efforts, and Hall D KL effort.**

*T. Keppel, T. Horn, R. Ent, P. Degtiarenko, D. Day, D. Keller, J. Zhang, G. Niculescu, B. Wojtsekowski, I. Strakovsky (and D. Hamilton in last meetings)*

- ❑ **Working Group Meetings on CPS**

- **March 28:** Organizational meeting, define benchmark simulation input
- **April 20:** Benchmark radiation/activation results with toy CPS models
- **May 11:** Followup radiation/activation simulations, power deposition estimates
- **May 18:** Converged common CPS concept presented at NPS meeting, letter sent to Bob McKeown


*These meetings led to a common CPS concept, with many similarities be it in Halls A/C for WACS or in Hall D for the KL beam*

# Compact Photon Source (CPS) – Concept

- ❑ Strong magnet after radiator deflects exiting electrons
- ❑ Long-bore collimator lets photon beam through
- ❑ No need in tagging photons, so the design could be compact, as opposed to a Tagger Magnet concept
- ❑ The magnet itself is the electron beam dump
- ❑ Water-cooled Copper core for better heat dissipation
- ❑ Hermetic shielding all around and close to the source to limit prompt radiation and activation
- ❑ High Z and high density material for bulk shielding
- ❑ Borated Poly outer layer for slowing, thermalizing, and absorbing fast neutrons still exiting the bulk shielding

# Example: CPS in Polarized WACS


- ❑ Beam intensity is the key at high  $s$  &  $t$ : need  $dN/dE_\gamma \sim \text{few} * 10^{12}$  equivalent quanta/s
- ❑ It is critically important to have
  - a) a small beam spot at target ( $\sim 1$  mm, for background suppression)
  - b) low radiation at detectors (it sets a practical limit in many expts).Use of a collimator is not effective because of loss of beam intensity.  
A better solution is to ensure **a short distance between the radiator and the target.**
- ❑ The short-distance requirement for an 11 GeV beam energy is solved by means of use of a **2 Tesla, one meter long magnet** – It tolerates a high radiation level.
- ❑ Key item of a photon source is a beam dump. **The solution is a hermetic box (CPS)** which results in low radiation outside.



The openings for the incident electron beam and produced photon beam are very narrow compared with the box size.




# General design concept Hermetic CPS



- ❑ Key problem of a beam dump is **high power density in an absorber**. The solution is **a small impact angle with a small (1 mm) raster in a narrow channel (2 mm)**.
- ❑ **A 30 kW configuration was proven** via G4 and heat dissipation calculations. Larger space available in the Hall D/KL project application will allow twice higher beam power (60 kW).


# CPS implementations in Halls A/C & K<sub>L</sub>/Hall D

## Basic CPS design concept for Halls A/C



## CPS in Hall D Tagger Vault

Concept similar, but need more space to achieve 60 kW beam power




❑ If one uses a 2<sup>nd</sup> raster system for Hall D to compensate for the initial 1 mm raster, this can be an equivalent essential design

### ❑ Some differences...


- Hall D alcove has more space, so simpler positioning and shielding placement
- Hall D up to 60 kW ( $< 5 \mu\text{A}$  @ 12 GeV), Halls A/C up to 30 kW ( $2.6 \mu\text{A}$  @ 11 GeV)
- Different length/field magnet for Hall D
- Shielding may differ

# Hall D case: Dose Rate Evaluation and Comparison

Hall D with Tagger Magnet,  $<5 \mu\text{A}$  and  $0.0005X_0$





Hall D with CPS,  $<5 \mu\text{A}$  and  $0.10X_0$



- ❑ Even though for the KL beam/CPS setup a 10% r.l. radiator is used, compared to only a 0.05% r.l. for the default Hall D operations, the **generated dose rates are similar**.
- ❑ The reason is because the radiation spectral composition is different. The hermetic and high-Z shielding close to the source of radiation removes the photons, electrons and positrons, and leaves mostly the high-energy neutrons. Thus, the activation levels will be similarly less.


# Illustration Hall D – GEANT3 with 2000 Electrons



# Hermetic CPS – Radiation Calculations

## ❑ Goal of the Compact Photon Source (CPS): high energy photon beams

- Beam energies up to 11.5 GeV
- Up to 30kW electron beams in Hall A/C (current 2.6uA)
- Runtime: 1000 hours
- Photon source as close to target as possible



Model of tungsten or iron sphere

## ❑ Parameters for feasibility studies and minimal set of requirements

- Prompt dose rates in the hall: < several rem/hr at 10m from the device
- Activation dose rates outside the device envelope at 1 ft distance: < several mrem/h after one hour following the end of a 1000 hour run
- Prompt dose rates at the CEBAF site boundary <1μrem/hr (2.4μrem/hr corresponds to a typical experiment not requiring extra shielding) during run

## ❑ Benchmarking of simulation models

- GEANT3/DINREG – prompt dose rates, site boundary (official)
- FLUKA – dose rates and activation
- MCNP – prompt dose rates
- GEANT4 – prompt dose rates, site boundary



# CPS: Prompt Radiation Doses

Integrated prompt dose rates (rem/h) measured at points 90 degrees around spheres and at 3 m radial distance from the beam line

Material	Source	No boron	No boron	No boron	No boron	No boron	With 10cm Boron	With 10cm Boron	With 10cm Boron
Model		DINREG GEANT3	FLUKA (5 MeV $E_\gamma$ cut)	MCNP6	FLUKA (7MeV $E_\gamma$ cut)	GEANT4	DINREG GEANT3	FLUKA (5 MeV $E_\gamma$ cut)	GEANT4
Iron	neutron	146	10.0 +- 0.1%	11.5+-6%	9.5+-0.39%	123.2	0.8	0.11+-3.4%	0.28
Iron	$\gamma$	0.44	0.039 +- 0.6%	0.16+-29%	0.025+-0.9%	0.56	2.8	0.063+-0.7%	0.56
Tungsten Powder	neutron	13.0	9.37+-0.9%	4.4+-11%	N/A	6.34	2.7	0.52+-15.3%	1.76
Tungsten Powder	$\gamma$	0.06	0.001+-10.3%	0.0002	N/A	0.33	0.003	0.0052+-8.3%	1.28

- ☐ Must have an outer shielding layer of (10 cm) boron
- ☐ Prompt radiation doses in the Hall become 0(rem/hr), for run conditions in Hall C (or A).
- ☐ **In a more realistic configuration with 30 cm tungsten powder and 10 cm B the prompt dose (G4) is 5.6 rem/hr**
- ☐ Typical dose in the Hall D tagger vault were calculated to be much higher (~25 rem/hr for 5  $\mu$ A beam current)

# CPS – Dose Rates at the Boundary

## ❑ Hall D/CPS for KL beam:

- Design compatible with the site boundary as the conditions for regular tagger magnet running dumps 60 kW in a local beam dump, and now the 60 kW is dumped in the CPS itself. **The Hall D tagger vault is designed for this (but additional local shielding may be required).**


## ❑ CPS in Hall C (or A) operation:

- Dose rate estimates in  $\mu\text{R/hr}$  at the RBM-3 boundary condition for the benchmark calculations (3 m iron sphere vs 1.5 m tungsten sphere)
  - iron: 0.24  $\mu\text{R/hr}$  total (0.19 due to n, 0.05 due to  $\gamma$ )
  - W: 2.4  $\mu\text{R/hr}$  total (1.9 due to n, 0.5 due to  $\gamma$ )
- With proper material and ordering choice of iron and W, and a (10 cm) outer layer of borated poly, **the boundary dose can likely be tuned below the 2.4  $\mu\text{R/hr}$  that corresponds to a typical run not requiring additional local shielding, per the radiation budget.**

*Note: a 1000 hour experiment would give 2.4 mr, and the total annual boundary dose is typically capped at 10 mr.*

# CPS – Activation Doses 1 Hour after 1000 Hour run

Worst-case calculation, activation dose 1 hour after 1000 hours at 11.5 GeV & 2.6  $\mu\text{A}$





Activation doses inside the CPS remain large, but not outside the CPS

- Impact for considerations for de-assembly of CPS, not for general Hall maintenance or work/repairs



# Engineering Aspects – Power Deposition



- ❑ Power deposition in the central region of the CPS integrates to 27.001 kW ✓
- ❑ XY Power Deposition for a 5 mm z slice (0.5 x 0.5 mm<sup>2</sup> in x-y)
- ❑ Peak: ~0.7kW @ z=-18 cm

- ❑ Input the power deposition data into a heat-flow simulator assuming various pipe configurations
- ❑ Log equilibrium temperature
- ❑ Temperature stabilizes at an acceptable value

## Engineering Aspects – Water Flow and $\Delta T$

- Use the power deposition data to do heat-flow/cooling calculations
- Calculation of coolant flow
- 2D heat transport for z-slices of the central region

typical pressure

## Manageable H<sub>2</sub>O flow and $\Delta T$ .

d	L	epsilon	nu	Coil Power	Units	6 mm	10000 mm	0.019685 ft	0.000005 ft
	10	m	ft^2/sec	15 kW					

$$v = -2 \sqrt{\frac{2g\Delta P}{0.433} \frac{d}{L}} \log_{10} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{3.7d} + \frac{2.51}{\frac{d}{v} \sqrt{\frac{2g\Delta P}{0.433} \frac{d}{L}}} \right)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{f}} = -2 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{3.7d} + \frac{2.51}{\frac{d}{v} \sqrt{\frac{2g\Delta P}{0.433} \frac{d}{L}}} \right)$$

$$q \left( \frac{\text{gpm}}{\text{circuit}} \right) = v \frac{\pi d^2}{4}$$

$$= v \left( \frac{\text{ft}}{\text{sec}} \right) \frac{\pi d^2 (\text{ft}^2)}{4} \times \frac{\text{gal}}{0.1337 \text{ ft}^3} \times 60 \frac{\text{sec}}{\text{min}}$$

$$\left( \frac{\epsilon}{3.7d} + \frac{2.51}{\frac{d}{v} \sqrt{\frac{2g\Delta P}{0.433} \frac{d}{L}}} \right)$$

$$\text{Re} = \frac{vd}{\nu}$$

$$\Delta T = \frac{3.8P}{q}$$

DeltaP (psi)	$\sqrt{\frac{2g\Delta P}{0.433} \frac{d}{L}}$ (ft/sec)	(no units)	(no units)	f	v (ft/sec)	Re	q (gpm)	DT (deg.C)
30	1.63619567	0.001016	5.98598	0.027903	9.794235	15855.25	1.337681753	42.61103
35	1.76729331	0.000946	6.048238	0.027336	10.68901	17303.75	1.459889005	39.04406
40	1.88931602	0.000889	6.101889	0.026838	11.5284	18662.58	1.574531024	36.20126
45	2.00392225	0.000842	6.148984	0.026448	12.32209	19947.43	1.682931354	33.86946
50	2.11231952	0.000803	6.190921	0.026091	13.0772	21169.84	1.786064648	31.91374
55	2.21541941	0.000769	6.228695	0.025775	13.79917	22338.59	1.884671139	30.24402
60	2.3139301	0.000739	6.263041	0.025494	14.49224	23460.55	1.979323035	28.79765
65	2.40841481	0.000712	6.294513	0.025239	15.1598	24541.22	2.070502398	27.52955
70	2.49933016	0.000689	6.323544	0.025008	15.80462	25585.09	2.158571746	26.40635
75	2.5870525	0.000668	6.350475	0.024796	16.42901	26595.87	2.243849749	25.40277
80	2.67189633	0.000649	6.375581	0.024601	17.03489	27576.69	2.326599875	24.49927
85	2.7541277	0.000632	6.399087	0.024421	17.6239	28530.2	2.407046032	23.68048
90	2.83397403	0.000616	6.421178	0.024253	18.19745	29458.68	2.485300464	22.93411
95	2.91163153	0.000601	6.44201	0.024097	18.75676	30364.11	2.56176972	22.25024
100	2.98727092	0.000588	6.461713	0.02395	19.30289	31248.2	2.63635925	21.62073
105	3.0610418	0.000575	6.480401	0.023812	19.83678	32112.48	2.709275988	21.03882
110	3.13307617	0.000564	6.498168	0.023682	20.35925	32958.28	2.780633188	20.49891
115	3.20349117	0.000553	6.515098	0.023559	20.87106	33786.81	2.850533693	19.99623
120	3.27239133	0.000542	6.531264	0.023443	21.37285	34599.13	2.919073772	19.52676
125	3.33987042	0.000533	6.546729	0.023332	21.86523	35396.2	2.986319617	19.08704
130	3.40601289	0.000524	6.561549	0.023227	22.34872	36178.9	3.052354582	18.67411
135	3.47089515	0.000515	6.575774	0.023126	22.82382	36948.01	3.117243207	18.28539
140	3.53458662	0.000507	6.589448	0.02303	23.29097	37704.26	3.181046031	17.91863
145	3.59715053	0.0005	6.60261	0.022933	23.75058	38448.28	3.24381853	17.57183
150	3.65864473	0.000492	6.615296	0.022851	24.20307	39180.7	3.305611395	17.24391

# Engineering Concepts - General

- ❑ Magnet with 32 mm gap and 2 Tesla field, with water cooled coils at large distance from the radiation source. Total electrical power 40 kW – 0.75 kA x 40 V


- Example of radiation-hard magnet: JPARC

- ❑ Tungsten-Cu alloy insert with a narrow open channel for the beams and water cooling tubes at ~ 20 cm distance from the power deposition.

- ❑ Shielding requires ~ 1 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> of material. Minimum weight will be with Tungsten. The plan is to use W powder (16 g/cm<sup>3</sup>) with a 10 cm layer of boron outside.


- ❑ The plan of development:

- stage #1 engineering ([minimize disassembling](#)),
- develop a concept of a 100% reliability raster with a power source,
- develop a concept of focused raster scheme for the KL case,
- procure ~ 2 tons W powder for bench test of Monte Carlo.
- study Hall integration



# Shielding Concept – Material Choice and Weight

- 1 Leaks through the penetrations are tiny
- 2 Photons/electrons are stopped by  $30X_0$  e.g. 10 cm W
- 3 Fast neutrons are stopped by the mass of material
- 4 After that, slow neutrons are stopped in BPoly layer
- 5 Several-MeV photons from activated inner part are very well shielded by 1 kg of material



View along the beam

The Hermetic CPS weight totals ~ 50 tons:


- 1 Magnet yoke+coils+WCu insert – 5 tons
- 2 Tungsten powder 30 cm – 30 tons
- 3 Outer layer BPoly 10 cm – 0.7 ton
- 4 Holding frame – 5 tons

~50 tons weight should not be an issue for floor loading or the Hall C beam line posts (with a steel plate to spread the load) – for Hall C this is not much different than the very large shielded bunkers and magnets used before.



# Engineering Concepts – Minimize Disassembly

- ❑ In Hall D Tagging Facility Alcove it is conceivable to leave the CPS in place as passive element when running tagged photon beam
- ❑ In Hall C a scheme of moving the CPS laterally when not in use looks promising



Possible steps:

CPS in use: 1) Remove chicane magnets  
2) move girder upstream  
3) install CPS

Not in use: 1) move CPS laterally  
2) move girder downstream  
3) re-install chicane magnets


# Summary

---

- ❑ Science at Jefferson Lab benefits from an optimized high intensity photon source
- ❑ CPS is a novel concept allowing for **high photon intensity** (equivalent photon flux:  $\sim 10^{12}$  photons/s) and **low radiation** (low activation:  $< 1$  mrem/h after one hour) in the hall
- ❑ CPS implementations in Hall A/C and Hall D/K<sub>L</sub> can be equivalent essential design (i.e., similar materials and shielding strategy), with some differences due to the locations (like more space in Hall D, perhaps longer magnet, ..)
- ❑ Strong interest by Hall A/C and Hall D/K<sub>L</sub> to jointly further develop an as common as possible CPS design and seek funding for CPS




# Magnet and Collimator Concept



Power 30 kW x 750 A  
32 mm gap 2.0 Tesla

WCu power  
absorber and  
radiation shielding





# Radiation Hard Magnet Example



fully inorganic magnet

J-PARC – warm magnet

e-mail from Dr. K. Tanaka:





$100 \text{ kRad/hour} = 1\text{K Gy/hour} = 5\text{M Gy/year}$  (assuming 5000h operation/year)  
→  $5 \times 10^7 \text{ Gy/10 years}$ .

This radiation dose is not very serious if you select appropriate insulation resin.

Some epoxy resin can survive well against  $5 \times 10^7 \text{ Gy}$ . However, if you select BT resin, magnet will be much stronger against the radiation dose.

There are several manufacturer of electromagnets in Japan. I can introduce some of companies for you.

# CPS – Prompt Radiation Doses



- ❑ Similar prompt radiation doses along z (the beam axis)
- ❑ Borated plastic largely reduces prompt neutron radiation (such that iron + plastic is similar effective as tungsten + plastic), tungsten is more effective for photons

## **PAC43 on PR12-15-003**

### **Summary:**

The PAC considers the measurement of  $A_{LL}$  to be very valuable. However, as discussed above, it feels that the present proposal does not describe the best approach of addressing the main physics issues. Clearly, coverage of a broader angular range appears necessary. That said, there is added value of going to larger energies. The PAC is impressed by the concept for a new photon source. It strongly encourages the proponents to work with the members of the previously approved E12-14-006 in order to see whether it could possibly be incorporated there. We also note that connecting with E12-14-006 would bring additional polarized target expertise.

## **PAC44 on PR12-16-009**

**Issues:** The PAC commends the PR12-16-009 collaborators on the development of two new photon source designs that move the electron dump away from the polarized target. However, the specifics of the dump design, cost and heat/radiation load to associated equipment in the hall has not been estimated. This needs to be completed in order to fully evaluate the proposal. The PAC recommends working closely with lab management while optimizing the photon source beam and dump design.

### **Summary:**

The PAC considers investigations into the mechanisms behind WACS to be very valuable. We encourage the collaborators on the approved E12-14-006 experiment and the proposed PR12-15-003 and PR12-16-009 to unify their efforts and submit a new proposal with a fully developed photon source, beam dump, polarized target and raster design. Ideally this proposal would encompass the primary physics motivations from all three proposals, with an emphasis on the verification that  $A_{LL} = K_{LL}$  and the measurement of  $A_{LL}$  at large angles (120 degrees) and in the kinematic regime that will allow interpretation within the handbag framework.

We recommend that the laboratory provide resources for a workshop focused on developing the physics case, as well as an optimized compact photon source and beam dump, organized jointly by the spokespersons of the PR12-16-009, PR12-15-003, and E12-14-006 proposals.

### 3.4 The Photon Source

The experimental program laid out in this proposal requires a real photon source. At JLab, Halls B and D have built-in real photon capabilities, but those sources are designed for a tagged photon beam with an intensity of  $10^7$  Hz, which is many orders of magnitude below the intensity required for a WACS experiment at 8-10 GeV. One of the primary tasks of the WACS collaboration is to propose an optimum concept, design, simulate and build a high intensity photon source that can provide required intensity with sufficiently low radiation in the hall, especially in the target and detector area during operation and soon after beam shutdown. After a decade of considering the technical challenges, a conceptual solution was found and presented at the NPS collaboration meeting in November 2014 [48, 19].

This solution is based on the observation that with one meter of heavy shielding a hermetic source could be constructed because the opening channel for the incident electron beam and produced photon beam needs to be just 2 mm in diameter for such a compact size of the source (overall  $3 \times 3 \times 3$  m<sup>3</sup>). The radiation will be produced inside and contained (except of course the photon beam) because the source is hermetic (HCPS). The concept also provides a small photon beam spot at the target which is very important for data analysis and background suppression. The magnetic deflection of the beam is an obvious way to cleanly separate the photon and electron beams. However, the challenge of beam power absorption required a new solution. The standard dump for 1 MW beam power has a reliable

but complicated design. However, even for our case of 30 kW beam power, local peaks in power density could melt the absorber. We noticed that for the proposed 2.5 T field for the cleaning magnet and a 2 mm vertical size of the opening channel in the magnet leads to the desirable small incident angle of electron entry to the absorber. When combined with a 1 mm vertical raster of the beam, the area of power deposition become 30 cm long and local power density is well within operational regime for proposed WCu absorber.

The technical parameters of the source components are modest in complexity:

- a 10 % radiator;
- a compact 1 m long magnet with 2.5 T field in small 3 cm wide gap (designed);
- an inner absorber of WCu alloy;
- low cost W-powder for outer shielding.


More detailed information on the photon source, prompt radiation levels, activation and beam power capabilities can be found in Ref. [22]. For the purposes of the current proposal, it is simply assumed that the beam parameters are defined by a 2 m radiator-to-target distance and  $2.5 \mu A$  primary electron beam current, corresponding to an integrated photon flux on target ( $> 0.5 E_{\text{Beam}}$ ) of  $1.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .

# General design concept HCPS



## A backup slide

A 100 kW power concept with an additional 20-mm horizontal raster

Top view (x-y are not in scale)



# CPS – Activation Dose @ Pivot



- ☐ Benchmarking: Simulations by different groups are consistent
- ☐ x and y are radial, z is along beam
- ☐ Typical find O(0.1mr) for activation dose radial from CPS, and <2 mr for activation dose at the pivot. This assumes access 1 hour after a 1000 hour run (11 GeV, 2.5  $\mu$ A)
- ☐ We believe we can reduce this to <1mr with shielding material choice.

