ACCEPTANCE SUMMARY FOR LHC MAGNETS BUILT AT BNL

Magnet D4L103

Date of this summary: February 11, 2006

This document contains a short summary of the acceptance status (in italics, just below), the minutes of the acceptance meeting, and actions taken after the acceptance meeting [in square brackets within the text of the minutes, or as footnotes].

Acceptance status:

The BNL Acceptance Committee met on February 2, 2006 and approved the magnet for shipment to CERN, except for the review of the field quality data. The field quality data were reviewed and approved by S. Peggs on February 10. R. Ostojic approved the survey data on November 30, 2005, as part of his review of waiver M0342. The field quality data have been loaded into the CERN data base.

MINUTES OF ACCEPTANCE MEETING

Date of acceptance meeting: February 2, 2006

Present at acceptance meeting: Durnan, Escallier, Hocker, Jain, Muratore, Plate,

Schmalzle, Wanderer

Quench Data: Muratore showed the quench performance of the magnet. In forced flow, the magnet reached the specified current (6.5 kA) after one training quench at 5656A. In liquid mode, it reached 6.5 kA without a quench. The correct operation of the level probes was verified by initiating a power supply trip at 5 kA. His slides are available at http://www.bnl.gov/magnets/LHC Acceptance/default.asp

<u>Field Quality:</u> Jain showed the warm and cold data from the magnet. (His talk is at the address given above.) He said that the magnet was similar to other magnets in the D2/D4 series and very good. Peggs reviewed and approved the data in a separate meeting with Jain and Wanderer on February 10.

<u>Engineering:</u> Escallier reported that the magnet met the electrical specifications. Schmalzle and Plate reported that the mechanical construction of the magnet was acceptable.

<u>QA:</u> Hocker reported that the documentation for the magnet was complete and satisfactory to the point needed for shipment, except for a couple of minor items (including the waiver noted below) that would be cleared up prior to shipment.

<u>Safety:</u> Durnan reported that the documentation for the magnet met the safety specifications. He noted that a waiver regarding a witness to the pressure tests was in process.

Survey: Schmalzle said that he had reviewed the survey data and found them acceptable.

These notes written by P. Wanderer