

FACULTÉ
 DES SCIENCES
 PARIS-SACLAY
 D'ORSAY





# ET-ISB Suspension Meeting Cryostat's Simulations



Scope



- This mechanical design study investigates the <u>achievable stability of the base</u> <u>plate</u>, on which the <u>super-attenuator</u> (SA) is supported
- Two integration options are considered
  - Base plate above cryostat in a single-cavern design
  - Base plate in upper cavern in double cavern design



## Initial conditions : Dimensions

- Following the ET-ISB Fall Workshop on ET-LF TM Tower
  Integration Concepts, in Elba, in September, we decided to begin simulations of the <u>20m height</u> cryostat
- In the ET-LF TM Tower Design Concepts document's we chose that « the outer cryostat diameter is <u>4,5m</u> and the height up to the vacuum separation between the cryostat and the room temperature upper tower is <u>6,3m</u> »
- In the **ET Reference Detector Layout document**, we fixed the footprint base's at a max <u>5m<sup>2</sup></u>, so we can increase it regarding the first concept of K.I.T. which was Ø4,5m
- Finally, during the detector layout, the keeping volume for the inverted pendulum was set to 2,5x2,5x17m so I decided to set up the upper diameter to <u>Ø3m</u>



#### 2025-03-26



height of the tower

## 20m height – Ø3m upper part Aluminium Upper part

- The first modal response is very low due to the
- After a first review, Jacques Lionel, from Liege, suggested to make the upper part in aluminium
- For an aluminium upper part of Ø3m, to obtain a multiplier charge for buckling greater than 4, I applied a thickness of 20mm to the upper part



#### 2025-03-26

#### G. laquaniello | ET-LF Tower Integration Workshop

FACULTÉ

DORSAY

UNIVERSITE

DES SCIENCES

cnrs

4

Université de Paris



## Harmonic Response Analysis



cnrs

Université de Paris



- Fixing recessed faces
- Earth gravity on the structure
- The vacuum chamber and the upper tower are under vaccum => 0,1 MPa
- 1mm input on X, Y or Z axis
- 0-50Hz applied on earth node fixed
- We apply 2% as damped coeffiscient regarding Eurocode 8



- <u>Reference</u> :
  - Eurocode 8 Design of structures for their resistance to earthquakes

Table 3: Values of the damping coefficient

	Welded assemblies	Bolted Assemblies
Steel Structure	ξ = 2 %	ξ = 4 %
Mixed steel-concrete structure	ξ = 4 %	ξ = 4 %





## 20m height – S18 - Ø3m upper part Aluminium Upper part



- 4 -

FACULTÉ

D'ORSAY

Détails de "Top Chamber

Champ d'application

DES SCIENCES

Méthode de champ d'application Sélection de géométrie Géométrie 4 Arêtes Géométrie 4 Arêtes Système de coordonnées Système de coordonnées global système de coordonnées Système de coordonnées globa Coordonnée) 1000. mm Coordonnée X 0, mm 5350, mm Coordonnée Coordonnée Y 20000 mm Coordonnée Z 0. mm Coordonnée Z 0. mm Emplacement Cliquez pour modifier Emplacement Cliquez pour modifier \*\*\*\*\* MODAL MASSES, KINETIC ENERGIES, AND TRANSLATIONAL EFFECTIVE MASSES SUMMARY \*\*\*\*\* +20m EFFECTIVE MASS FREQUENCY MODAL MASS Y-DIR RATIO<sup>®</sup> Z-DIR RATIO MODE KENE X-DIR RATIOS 829.2 3.828 2.866 5.939 10.36 0.3157E-09 0.00 0.9646E-01 0.17 Finally, thanks to harmonic response 3.829 2.865 829.2 0.9673E-01 0.17 0.5769E-09 0.00 5.919 10.33 0.00 14.93 2.372 0.1044E+05 0.1483E-13 0.00 0.4998E-08 0.00 0.1232E-11 100 14.93 4.342 0.1910E+05 0.00 0.2982E-09 0.00 0.1425E-10 0.00 0.1024E-10 we can observe « just » a « bump » at 25.59 2.048 0.2648E+05 0.9849E-05 0.00 0.2065E-08 0.00 0.6070E-06 0.00 90 25.59 2.048 0.2648E+05 0.00 0.4730E-07 0.00 0.1035E-05 0.5816E-05 25.95 6.732 0.8950E+05 0.1200E-06 0.00 9.272 16.18 0.5138E-09 0.00 3,8Hz of a factor 2,8 involving 10,3% 33.96 15.99 0.3639E+06 0.00 8 0.3430E-04 0.00 0.1437E-06 0.7493E-04 35.04 2.065 0.5004E+05 0.4392E-02 0.01 0.1122E-09 0.00 0.3475E-06 0.00 10 35.04 2.048 0.4964E+05 0.1825E-04 0.00 of the total mass of the chamber, 0.00 0.7764E-11 0.00 0.1433E-03 11 35.64 6.521 0.1635E+06 21.17 36.93 0.2432E-06 0.00 0.3158E-03 0.00 12 38.23 5.431 0.1567E+06 0.3046E-03 0.00 0.1683E-06 0.00 19.75 34.45 13 47.49 2.420 0.1077E+06 0.2490E-09 0.00 0.1765E-08 0.00 which is the top chamber 0.00 0.7013E-05 14 47.58 4.827 0.2157E+06 0.2589E-08 0.00 0.2488E-07 0.00 0.1685E-06 0.00 15 48.89 1.860 0.8774E+05 0.00 0.00 0.3797E-09 0.1878E-05 0.00 0.4604E-09 16 49.04 2.080 0.9874E+05 0.2396E-10 0.00 0.1072E-06 0.00 0.8437E-09 0.00 +5.35m 17 51.00 1.869 0.9598E+05 0.1143E-08 0.00 0.9024E-05 0.00 0.1825E-08 0.00 50 At 35Hz, the upper platform, which 51.14 2.090 0.1079E+06 0.00 18 0.1766E-09 0.00 0.5305E-06 0.00 0.5122E-08 19 54.98 3.708 0.2213E+06 1.895 3.31 0.6912E-05 0.00 0.3796E-05 0.00 20 55.89 5.17 3.969 0.2447E+06 0.9290E-05 0.00 0.4627E-05 0.00 2.966 will welcome IP leg, begin to resonate 40 29.10 50.78 9.272 16.18 28.73 50.12 9117 with a factor 50 0m20 The top plate is constrained between the vacuum chamber cover and the 2.8 ferrule, increasing its rigidity. 30,5 31,5 32,5 33,5 35,5 35,5 35,5 35,5 35,5 38,5 33,5 40,5 41,5 41,5 44,5 44,5 28,5

Champ d'application

Méthode de champ d'application Sélection de géométrie





• FACULTÉ UNIVERSITE DES SCIENCES PARIS-SACLAY D'ORSAY



# 14,5m Design

2025-03-26





- At the ET Annual @ Warsaw, we saw presentations on a 12m height inverted pendulum solutions.
- The beam height is fixed at 2,5m in the ET Reference Detector Layout document
- These are solutions of 14,5m height tower VIRGO like, with an external structure, a decoupled structure with bellow between vacuum chamber and upper part, and a stiffeners solution decoupled too.



## 14,5m height tower - Aluminium Upper Part



0,30741

0,26898

0.23055

0.19213

0,1537

0,11528

0,076851

0.038426

0 Min

cnrs

4 Université de Paris

Laboratoire de Physique des 2 Infinis







Decoupled Stiffeners structure Solution n°24 Mass: 127,8 T



2025-03-26

# 14,5m height - 530







Same as the 20 m one, we observe "just" a "bump" at 7.6 Hz by a factor of 2.8 involving 6% of the total mass of the chamber, which is the upper chamber, and the rest at more of 32 Hz.



# 14,5m height tower - S24





- •
- For the « best » structure version of the previous slide, the first modal response increase at ~19,4Hz regarding the Virgo's like one but it involve 54% of the total mass with a factor ~60 on the upper plate (on the Inverted Pendulum Leg point which is supposed to welcome the inverted pendulum) and a factor 143 on the top chamber

Détails de "Point distant 2"	▼ 🛛 🛏 🗙		***** MODA	L MASSES, KIN	ETIC ENERGIES	S, AN	D TRANSLATION	AL EFFEC	TIVE MASSES :	SUMMARY	****	
Champ d'application									EFFECTIV	E MASS		
Méthode de champ d'application	n Sélection de gé.	MODE	FREQUENCY	MODAL MASS	KENE	1	X-DIR	RATIO <sub>8</sub>	Y-DIR	RATIO%	Z-DIR	RATIO*
Géométrie	4 Arêtes	1	19.42	8.303	0.6181E+05		68.56	53.66	0.2026E-03	0.00	0.1234E-03	0.00
Système de coordonnées	Système de coo.	2	20.44	1.438	0.4612E+05		5.867	4.59	0.5137E-04	0.00	0.2524E-02	48.98
Coordonnée X	1000, mm	4	26.42	1.569	0.2161E+05	i.	0.2792E-03	0.00	0.1659E-04	0.00	9.711	7.60
Coordonnée Y	6850, mm	5	29.09	27.98	0.4672E+06	1	0.4147E-04	0.00	0.3331E-04	0.00	0.8798E-03	0.00
Coordonnée Z	0, mm	6	37.68	6.412 0.8741	0.1797E+06 0.2473E+05	1	0.5770E-04 0.1154E-01	0.00	19.81 0.1882E-01	15.50 0.01	0.6953E-05 0.1175E-01	0.00
Emplacement	Cliquez pour m.	8	37.86	0.8811	0.2494E+05	1	0.1241E-01	0.01	0.1936	0.15	0.1196E-01	0.01
Détails de "Top Chamber"		9	46.09	1.016	0.4260E+05	1	0.2662E-03	0.00	0.4896E-03	0.00	0.3502E-04	0.00
Champ d'application		10	49.90	1.904	0.9358E+05	!	0.3974E-06	0.00	0.6213E-05	0.00	0.2621E-05	0.00
Méthode de champ d'application	Sélection de géomé	11	52.84	0.6804	0.3750E+05		0.8710E-04	0.00	0.5140E-03	0.00	0.4213E-05 0.4107E-05	0.00
Géométrie	1 Sommet	13	53.09	1.999	0.1112E+06	i	2.940	2.30	0.1045E-03	0.00	0.3607E-03	0.00
Système de coordonnées	Système de coordor	14	55.22	1.245	0.7492E+05	1	0.2131E-02	0.00	9.575	7.49	0.6849E-02	0.01
Coordonnée X	0, mm	15	55.60	6.122	0.3736E+06	1	0.3931E-05	0.00	0.8369E-02	0.01	4.303	3.37
Coordonnée Y	14500 mm	16	59.35	26.47	0.1841E+07		0.1317E-02	0.00	0.93516-04	0.00	0.9949E-02	0.01
Coordonnée Z	0, mm	18	60.80	2.893	0.2111E+06		14.97	11.72	0.5236E-02	0.00	0.6117E-02	0.00
Emplacement	Cliquez pour modif	19	61.39	8.466	0.6298E+06	i	0.5188E-02	0.00	0.9075E-05	0.00	14.87	11.64
		20	62.13	4.312	0.3286E+06	1	0.1038E-02	0.00	0.1785E-05	0.00	0.2262E-02	0.00
		sum				1	92.38	72.31	30.33	23.74	91.52	71.63









# Double cavern concept





# 20m height - 526 - Double cavern concept



Université de Paris

We wanted to simulate a double cavern solution, like in Kagra, Japan

- The tube is supported by a structure, and decoupled from chambers by 2 bellows
- The feet of the inverted pendulum are 3
  Ø400mm columns embedded on the upper floor
- The first mode is the one where the tube enter into resonance at 15,3Hz and the third, at 20,3Hz, is the first mode where the upper platform of the inverted pendulum enters into resonance







2025-03-26

### Conclusion

universite PARIS-SACLAY

Unité: mm

cnrs

- Is-it acceptable if the upper part ٠ of the chamber resonates at less than 10 Hz, if IP Leg base-ring resonates at more than 30 Hz?
- The double covern is the stiffer ٠ solution regarding the harmonic response on the IP Leg
- The decoupled solution seems not a ٠ good solution regarding harmonic response
- Cryostat's mass increased a lot ٠ regarding what I present during the detector layout this summer due to the stiffeners and the base : m > 50 T without thermal shield, ANM, ...

### 20m Height



Solution n°24 Mass : 57,3 T

### 14,5m Height



### 14,5m Height



Double Covern

FACULTÉ

D'ORSAY

DES SCIENCES



**Double Cavern** Solution n°18 Total Mass : 162 T





### Requirements



### Université

# Solution $\mathbf{V}$ Footprint : $5m^2$ Cryostat keeping volume : Ø4,5 x 6,3m 🕑 Beam's height : 2,5m

# To further progress in our study we need to select among options: Tower's height : 14,5 < x < 20mInverted Pendulum keeping volume: 2,5 x 2,5 x 17m or 2,5 x 2,5 x 12m







Université de Paris

We need answers from PO and ISB suspension division

- Maximum mass acceptance for Civil Infrastructure : ?
- Are the first modal and harmonic responses, on 3 axes, on the upper chamber and the IP leg, sufficient to validate a concept ?
- Any other points / simulations needed ?
- Then, regarding :
- The single-cavern design:
  - Are results as presented on Slide 11 acceptable regarding stability of the base ring?
  - In general, is this a viable integration concept in terms of SA requirements?
- The double-cavern design:
  - Are results as presented on Slide 14 acceptable?





Université de Paris

# Thanks for your attention



Grégory IAQUANIELLO

Ingénieur de Recherche Département Mécanique Service Bureau d'Etudes Bâtiment 208, RDC, Bureau 23

🖀 : (+33) 01.64.46.86.44 @:gregory.iaquaniello@ijclab.in2p3.fr

2025-03-26