

Subject: [Aligo_sus] Items for tomorrow's telecon
From: "Greenhalgh, RJS (Justin)" <J.Greenhalgh@rl.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 12:22:25 +0100
To: "Aligo_Sus@Ligo. Caltech. Edu (E-mail)" <aligo_sus@ligo.caltech.edu>

Dear Janeen and others,

I propose two agenda items for tomorrow's telecon.

1. DCC: could we have authors notified when their paper is put onto the web, please?

2. Issues concerning UK scope (See document ALUK0014d, from http://www.eng-external.rl.ac.uk/advligo/papers_public)

- how soon will we decide for sure about putting the CP onto the ITM SUS?
- how soon will we decide if the BS and FM can be triples?
- policy on spares (see also below)
- the eddy-current dampers which I propose to move into the UK scope at least for the purpose of cost estimates
- Whether the costs of Frey include adjustment (for which I need Janeen's spreadsheets)

On spares:

a) The spirit of the proposal had the following spares, first articles, and prototypes:

- 2 noise prototypes, one each ETM and ITM. Not to be used on final detector.
- 1 First article ETM type, which would become a spare.
- 3 spare ETM/ITM types
- 2 spare BS/CP type
- 1 spare FM type

b) The detail of the proposal - Frey's costings - had all of that except that

- the FA was destined to be used, rather than be a spare. This is a detail.
- the spare ETM/ITM types were all labelled as ETM. Not significant, I think.
- the spare BS/CP types were all labelled as BS type. Not significant, I think.
- the spare FM type was replaced by a BS type
- there was also a spare a "SOS" type for IFO3 at 8,000 USD rather than the 40,000 USD cost used for all the other SUS.

(If you want to check, and you are very welcome because the Frey costing is a detailed one and I might have misread it, you may find my document ALUK0015 useful).

c) Since then things have moved on.

- The ETM and ITM are no longer identical and we need to decide what spares to provide
- The CP may not need its own SUS at all - so no spares required.
- The BS and FM may be triples.
- The FM and ITM will need to be a combined SUS for space and weight reasons.

d) What next

To get discussion going I propose

- 1 spare ETM and 1 spare ITM/CP at each site - total of four spare SUS
- 1 spare BS to cover both sites
- 1 spare ITM/CP/FM structure plus masses for the FM chain (which of course is only needed at Hanford).

This has the same total number of spares, but at which site do we then keep

the BS spare?

I welcome input at the telecon.

Cheers - Justin

Justin Greenhalgh
Head of Advanced Materials Group
Engineering Department
Room 21, Building R34
Rutherford Appleton Laboratory
Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX
01235 445297 or 446683 (office)
01235 445843 (fax)
01235 762603 (home)

Aligo_sus mailing list

Aligo_sus@ligo.caltech.edu

http://mm.ligo.caltech.edu/mailman/listinfo/aligo_sus