

**Director's Review of the Project X  
Cost Range Estimate:  
Transfer Line Components**

David Johnson  
Project X Director's Review  
March 16, 2009



- Scope of Estimated Work
  - Components (M&S (construction, purchase, installation))
    - Magnets
    - Power supplies
    - Vacuum
    - Collimation
    - Phase Rotator (cavity & RF system)
    - Linac Dump
- Basis of Estimate
- Cost Estimate
- Technical/Cost Risks
- Summary

# Scope of Estimate



## TL Magnets



- Transfer Line Magnets
  - 69 permanent magnet c-magnets for the arc
  - 3 electromagnet c-magnets for dump switch
  - 4 vertical bend magnets
  - 7 horizontal dipoles (2 lengths)
  - 64 permanent magnet quadrupoles
  - 64 trim dipoles for orbit control
  - 24 trim quads for matching
- Estimates include EDIA, M&S, construction labor, and tooling as required
- Estimated Magnets, stands, and installation
- M&S 3,198K\$ & Labor 13.96 FTE-years

# Basis of Estimate

## TL Magnets



- Magnets
  - Estimates performed by Technical Division staff
  - Based upon previous experience in the construction of similar types of magnets or purchase costs
- Stands
  - Based on stand construction estimates for similar magnet types from previous construction
- Installation
  - Assume contract labor
  - Based upon magnet and stand installation contracts from MI and RR

# Cost Estimate

## TL Magnets



ITEM	Unit	M&S Cost \$	Quantity	M&S Tot. \$k	Sci FTE-yr	Eng. FTE-yr	Draft/Mach FTE-yr	Tech. FTE-yr
Magnets	EE			\$3,198	0	5.75	2.175	6.035
PM Dipoles	EE	ea	69	\$1,662	0	1.725	0.525	1.975
PM Quadrupoles	EE	ea	64	\$795	0	1.525	0.525	1.8
Dump Switch dipoles	EE		3	\$38	0	0.625	0.25	0.625
PM Vertical Bend Dipoles	EE		4	\$89	0	0.375	0.125	0.125
H Achromat Dipole 1 (PM)	EE		5	\$112	0	0.375	0.125	0.15
H Achromat Dipole 2 (PM)	EE		2	\$45	0	0.375	0.125	0.06
Trim Dipoles	EE		64	\$313	0	0.375	0.25	1.3
Trim Quads (MQT)	EE		24	\$144	0	0.375	0.25	0

PM Dipoles	EE	ea		69	\$1,662	0	1.725	0.525	1.975
Construction					\$1,489	0	1.6	0.4	1.975
Magnet EDIA						0	1.6	0.4	0
R&D Prototype		lot	\$32,500	1	\$33				
Tooling		lot	\$90,800	1	\$91				
Magnet Construction (M&S)		ea	\$19,791	69	\$1,366				1.975
Magnet Measurements									
Installation					\$173	0	0.125	0.125	0
Magnet Installation		ea	\$390	69	\$27				
Installation EDIA							0.125	0.125	
Stand Construction (M&S)		ea	\$2,000	69	\$138				
Installation		ea	\$120	69	\$8				



- Permanent magnet c-magnet
  - Only a crude conceptual magnetic design was constructed.
  - Conceptual ideas included for stiffening
  - A detailed magnetic and structural design may alter cost estimate ( 30% cost variance impact TPC <0.06%)
  - Cost estimate within global 40% contingency
- Permanent magnet quads
  - Very little technical risk as these are duplicates of existing magnets
- Trim dipoles
  - Very little technical risk
  - Estimated construction of existing MI trim dipoles
  - Strength could be reduced hence reducing cost
- Trim quads
  - Very little technical risk
  - Duplicate of existing magnets
  - Cost exposure as last magnets made at good price in INFP(?)

# Scope:

## Power Supplies



- With major bends and quads as permanent magnets
  - Linac dump switch power supply
  - Dipole trim supply
  - Quad trim supply
- Trim supply includes installation
- M&S 286K\$ & Labor 1.33 FTE-years

# Basis of Estimate

## Power Supplies



- Dump switch power supply
  - Based on expected resistance and inductance of magnet string a 10-12 kW supply is expected... used EE Support estimate of \$1K/kW and rounded to 20K\$
  - Purchase supply (c.f. Spang)
- Trim Supplies (both dipole and quad)
  - Used costs of FNAL design trim supplies used in MI
  - Included cable pulls
  - Installation costs



# Cost Estimate

## Power Supplies



ITEM	Unit	M&S Cost \$	Quantity	M&S Tot. \$k	Sci FTE-yr	Eng. FTE-yr	Draft/Mach FTE-yr	Tech. FTE-yr
Power Supplies				\$286	0	0.75	0.201	1.375
Dump Switch dipoles	WAG	\$20,000	1	\$20	0	0.25	0.067	0.125
Construction					0	0.25	0.067	0
Installation					0	0	0	0.125
Dipole Correctors	EE	\$3,980	64	\$169	0	0.25	0.067	0.875
Construction				\$104	0	0.25	0.067	0.75
Installation				\$65	0	0	0	0.125
Quad Trims	EE	\$3,708	24	\$97	0	0.25	0.067	0.375
Construction				\$44	0	0.25	0.067	0.25
Installation				\$53	0	0	0	0.125

Dipole Correctors	EE	\$3,980	64	\$169	0	0.25	0.067	0.875
Construction				\$104	0	0.25	0.067	0.75
PS EDIA				\$0		0.25	0.067	
R&D prototype		\$0		\$0				
Power supply construction		\$1,500	64	\$96				0.75
Raw supply	house	\$2,000	4	\$8				
Installation				\$65	0	0	0	0.125
Installation		\$0	0	\$0				0.125
Cables	ea	\$300	64	\$19				
Cable Installation	day	\$3,000	14	\$42				
Controls		\$1,000	4	\$4				

# Technical/Cost Risk

## Power Supplies



- 
- No technical risk
  - Estimate can be refined upon final design

# Scope

## Vacuum



- 
- Assume length of transfer line is ~1.2 km and contains a cryo beam screen inside the warm beam tube.
  - The beam line is broken up into approx 20 meter half cells
  - Assume beam screen does not go through the quads, collimation absorbers, etc.
  - Assume cryogenics is supplied to the tunnel
  - Includes: vacuum beam pipe, extruded cryo shield, super insulation, transitions, feed throughs, ion pumps/ps, instrumentation
  - Assume roughing pumps, and miscellaneous equipment recycled from Tevatron
  - M&S 630K\$ & Labor of 4.225 FTE-years

# Basis of Estimate

**Project X**  
Project X

## Vacuum



- 
- Warm beam pipe, stands ,valves estimates are based upon Nova vacuum system estimates
  - Ion pumps and ps are based upon current prices
  - Cryo screen and support pieces are estimates based upon LHC experience with cryo shields.

# Cost Estimate



## Vacuum

ITEM	Unit	M&S Cost \$	Quantity	M&S Tot. \$k	Sci FTE-yr	Eng. FTE-yr	Draft/Mach FTE-yr	Tech. FTE-yr
Vacuum System				\$630	0	1.5	0.5	2.225
Cold beam tube assembly				\$266	0	1	0.5	1.25
Vacuum pumps				\$240	0	0.25	0	0.375
Power Supplies				\$120	0	0.125	0	0.5
Gauges/Instrumentation				\$5	0	0.125	0	0.1

Cold beam tube assembly				\$266	0	1	0.5	1.25
Construction				\$213	0	1	0.5	0.5
EDIA						0.5	0.25	
R&D prototype						0.5	0.25	0.5
cryo shield	m	\$13	1200	\$16				
insulation	m	\$10	1200	\$12				
insulating vacuum chamber	m	\$100	1200	\$120				
transitions	each	\$145	200	\$29				
bellows/feedthroughs	each	\$180	200	\$36				
Installation				\$53	0	0	0	0.75
beam valves	ea	\$5,000	7	\$35				
beam tube stands	ea	\$100	180	\$18				
installation								0.75

# Technical/Cost Risk

**Project X**  
Project X

## Vacuum



- 
- Estimate based upon conceptual design with rough counts of elements.
  - A realistic thermal model of the beam pipe and beam screen needs to be created to model the heat load to specify the required cryogenic volume
  - Estimates did not include consumables, air handling system, or roughing pumps( assumed to be recycled)

# Scope:

## Collimation



- Two collimation systems
  - Transverse X6 (roughly 8 kW per absorber -> round to 10 kW)
  - Momentum X1 (10 kW)
- Movable collimation foil system
- Movable transverse collimation absorbers
- Fixed momentum collimation absorber
- RAW system
  
- Transverse M&S 870K\$ & Labor 4.5 FTE-years
- Momentum M&S 265K\$ & Labor 3.75 FTE-years

# Basis of Estimate

## Collimation



- 
- Shielding
    - Steel
    - Concrete
    - marble
  - Vacuum chamber
  - Motion control system
    - Assume identical to systems currently in use at FNAL



# Cost Estimate

## Collimation



ITEM	Unit	M&S Cost \$	Quantity	M&S Tot. \$k	Sci FTE-yr	Eng. FTE-yr	Draft/Mach FTE-yr	Tech. FTE-yr
Transverse Collimation (10 kW ea)				\$870	0	2	0.625	1.875
Collimation Foil System		\$15,000	6	\$90	0	0.5	0.125	0.125
Collimation Absorber		\$120,000	6	\$720	0	1	0.25	1.5
RAW System	EE	\$10,000	6	\$60	0	0.5	0.25	0.25
Momentum Collimation (10 kW)				\$265	0	2	0.75	1
Collimation Foil System		\$15,000	1	\$15	0	0.5	0.25	0.5
Collimation Absorber		\$240,000	1	\$240	0	1	0.25	0.25
RAW System	EE	\$10,000	1	\$10	0	0.5	0.25	0.25

# Technical/Cost Risk

## Collimation



- 
- Conceptual design of collimation system will be addressed in the RD&D which could modify absorber capacity
  - Shielding size based upon recent MI collimation experience
  - Absorber design to be done in RD&D plan
  - Assumed RAW system required, to be re-evaluated in RD&D plan
  - Estimates are conservative



- Energy Correction Cavity
  - Warm 1300 Mhz cavity installed in beam line for passive correction of linac RF energy error/phase jitter and for longitudinal injection painting in energy.
  - RF system (copy of high energy linac RF system)
    - 10 MW klystron
    - Modulator system
    - RF distribution, waveguides
- M&S 2,715K\$ & Labor 2.5 FTE-years

# Basis of Estimate

## Energy Correction Cavity



- Warm Cavity
  - Used M&S costs from a previous PD cost estimate
- RF System
  - Based on M&S Estimates for the 1300 MHz RF system in this exercise
  - Estimates incremental engineering labor

# Cost Estimate Energy Correction Cavity



ITEM	Unit	M&S Cost \$	Quantity	M&S Tot. \$k	Sci FTE-yr	Eng. FTE-yr	Draft/Mach FTE-yr	Tech. FTE-yr
RF Phase Rotator	PD			\$2,715		2.5		
RF Cavity				1039	*	1		
EDIA						0.5		
Cavity				\$1,039		0.5		
Installation								
Klystron				866		0.5		
EDIA				\$866		0.5		
Klystron/Install				\$0				
Modulator				460		0.5		
EDIA				\$460		0.5		
Modulator/Install				\$0				
Wave guides				191		0.5		
EDIA				\$190		0.5		
Waveguide/Install				\$0				
Controls				159		0		
EDIA								
Controls				\$160				
Install								

\* It has recently found that the warm (copper) cavity has also been included in section 1.3.3 with an M&S of \$1,174,040 and SWF of \$585,630 based upon an escalated value from the 2005 Proton Driver est.

# Technical/Cost Risk

## Energy Correction Cavity



- Re-evaluate requirements for cavity during the RD&D phase
- Estimate is not a fully engineering estimate
- Cavity specifications are not fully specified
- Cavity structure is not designed (although a system of similar requirements is in operation at SLAC)
- Risks addressed in the construction of the 1300 MHz RF system
- Labor associated with RF system only incremental to the design and construction of remaining linac systems
- These risks will be addressed during the RD&D phase with collaboration of Fermilab and LBNL
- Cost impact evaluated during preliminary design but should be on the order of 0.1% TPC.

# Scope:

## Linac Dump



- 
- The cost estimate for the linac dump includes the core absorber, shielding, RAW system, and installation
  - Thermal monitoring is assumed in the cost of the absorber core
  - Assumes the installation before the enclosure ceiling is in place.
  
  - M&S 735K\$ & Labor 4.125 FTE-years

# Basis of Estimate

**Project X**  
Project X

## Linac Dump



- 
- Absorber core
    - Educated estimate
  - Shielding
    - Scaled from M18 collimation shielding project
  - RAW
    - Based upon a estimate of \$1K/kW for a total price installed
  - Installation
    - Estimated rigging costs of \$10K/day for 8 work days



# Cost Estimate

## Linac Dump



ITEM	Unit	M&S Cost \$	Quantity	M&S Tot. \$k	Sci FTE-yr	Eng. FTE-yr	Draft/Mach FTE-yr	Tech. FTE-yr
Linac Dump (200 kW)				\$735	0	2.5	1	0.625
Absorber core		\$55,000	1	\$55	0	0.5	0.25	0
Shielding		\$400,000	1	\$400	0	1	0.25	0
Installation (core+shielding)		\$80,000	1	\$80	0	0.5	0.25	0.5
RAW System	EE	\$200,000	1	\$200	0	0.5	0.25	0.125

# Technical/Cost Risk

## Linac Dump



- 
- There are no technical risks upon the completion of the Engineering design
  - The assumed beam power is increased which would increase costs of core, cooling and shielding.
  - Design is similar to many of the beam dumps constructed at FNAL, but most similar to that constructed for the MI
  - A radiation model is required to determine actual composition and amount of shielding
  - Since estimate was based on shielding weight an engineering design is required for a more accurate estimate



- 
- All components required for the transfer line estimated based upon requirements of ICD
  - Assumed transfer line made up of permanent magnets with dipole and quad trims for steering and matching (c.f. Current Booster to MI transport line and Recycler ring)
  - Cost drivers: Magnets and Phase rotator cavity
  - Changing to electromagnets may yield some cost savings, but at added installation complexity and operational expense.
  - None of the components present technical risks that cannot be addressed by careful design.