

Fermilab

TS-SSC 91-075  
4/25/91

To: S.Delchamps, A.Devred, S.Gourlay, C. Goodzeit, W.Koska, M.Lamm,  
R.E.Sims, M.Wake, M.Winters  
From: Jim Strait  
Subj: Strain gauge calibration "errors"

Yesterday Arnaud complained to me about the poor quality of some of our cold strain gauge data from both 40 and 50 mm magnets. He in particular reminded me of the strange shape of the data with excitation from one of the inner coil gauges on DSA321. (See Figure 1.) To try to determine whether this shape reflects something real in the magnet or results from problems with the stress-strain calibration I recomputed the strain in the beam gauge from the raw data from one strain gauge run (DSA321.CA007) and found that the the unusual shape is absent from the strains. (See Figure 2.) Not only does the strain data from the offending gauge have a "sensible" shape, but the other three gauges show a significantly more linear strain versus  $I^2$  than "stress" versus  $I^2$  relation, and the spread in both initial strain and in the slope with  $I^2$  is smaller than the spread in "stress". It would be surprising to me if the actual stress versus  $I^2$  relation were non-linear and the stress-strain calibration of the beam gauges were non-linear in exactly the inverse way so as to generate a fortuitously linear strain versus  $I^2$  relation.

It is conceivable that this was a problem just with DSA321 since it was put together in a great hurry. I made the same comparison of strain versus stress as a function of  $I^2$  for DSA323 (file DSA323.CA005) and found the same effect, although it is less dramatic. Figure 3 is the coil "stress" versus  $I^2$  (with the error in the quadratic term of the calibrations corrected) and Figure 4 is the beam strain versus  $I^2$ . As with DSA321, the strain versus  $I^2$  is more linear and the spread among the gauges is smaller than with the "stress" data. It would be surprising if the actual spread in coil stresses were large but on two magnets the spread in stress-strain calibrations were just right to give closer agreement among the beam strains. The more likely explanation is that the stress-strain calibration is introducing significant "noise" into the data and that we might be better off using a generic and perhaps linear calibration than using individual non-linear calibrations.

Wayne has proposed a possible explanation for the apparently non-linear stress-strain relation in the calibration setup but the apparently linear relation in the magnet under excitation. He notes that the coil modulus effects the coil stress versus beam strain calibration in various ways, some of whose effects in the magnet may be more or less well simulated in the calibration setup. Since the coil modulus is a function of coil stress, particularly at low stress, this would generate a non-linear stress-strain relation in the calibration apparatus. As the force applied to the beam gauge in the calibration setup goes to zero the coil becomes uncompressed and "fluffy" and the modulus decreases significantly. However, as the magnet is excited and the force applied to the beam gauge decreases, the coil is being more, not less, compacted; its modulus stays high and in a regime in which it is a less strong function of stress. Thus the beam gauge calibration under these circumstances will be much more linear than that determined with a ten-stack and a hydraulic press. Just

to make life more difficult, however, the coil loading during magnet assembly is rather similar to that in the calibration setup. During cooldown the decrease in the force applied by the coil to the beam gauge is accompanied also by a decrease in coil compaction. Therefore we might expect the calibration to be "correct" under this circumstance also.

Of course, the above does not address the issue of the increased spread in the data from applying the stress-strain calibration. Clearly more work is needed to understand the reproducibility (or lack thereof) of the calibrations. Given the arguments above it is not at all clear to me what sort of calibrations should be used to get the most correct pole stress data under all circumstances. This just reflects the difficulties that result from having a load cell design that is sensitive to the properties of the material whose load it is measuring. (But let me be the first to admit that I do not have a design ready that would be better than this one.)




Figure 1

# DSA321 Inner Gauge Strain (DSA321.CA007)






Figure 2

# DSA323 Inner Coil Stress (DSA323.CA005)



\* LEGEND \*

x .....str(1)


\* .....str(2)

o - - - -str(3)

+ .....str(4)

Figure 3

# DSA323 Inner Gauge Strain (DSA323.CA005)



\* LEGEND \*

○ - - - - ue1

\* - - - - ue2

△ - - - - ue3

△ - - - - ue4

Figure 4