DUSEL

(U.S. Deep Underground Science and Engineering Lab) and UNO (Underground proton decay and Neutrino Observatory)

Jeffrey Wilkes U. of Washington, Seattle



KEK 1 Nov 2005



http://ale.physics.sunysb.edu/uno/

http://nngroup.physics.sunysb.edu/husep/

Outline

- DUSEL in USA
- DUSEL @ Henderson Mine (Colorado)
- UNO, and where it could go
 - Overview
 - Physics goals, briefly
 - Neutrino beams to UNO?
 - Outreach and education

DUSEL: Deep Underground Science and Engineering Lab

• A long-standing dream in USA! e.g., see **PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL UNDERGROUND SCIENCE FACILITY.** By <u>Alfred K. Mann</u> (<u>Pennsylvania II</u>). Presented at Workshop on Science Underground, Los Alamos, N. Mex. Sep 27 - Oct 1, 1982. Published in **AIP Conf.Proc.96:16-36,1983**

- Initiative by US National Science Foundation (NSF)
 - Create a new national lab for underground science
 - Supports research on physics, geology, biology (life in extreme environment), mine/tunnel engineering
- 2nd (recent) attempt to do this!
 - 2003: Bahcall and Haxton led "NUSEL" process
 - Conclusion: Homestake mine is best site
 - But: many thought selection process was biased
 - South Dakota government failed to act promptly mine was sold to company in Canada, closed, and allowed to flood!
 - Estimated cost to restore = \$50 million

U.S. DUSEL process now

- Solicitation 1 (2004): Define requirements for *potential* underground experiments in physics, geosciences, biology, & engineering
 - 14 working groups established
 - Meetings and workshops (too many!): final report due soon
- Solicitation 2 (2005): Different sites respond: conceptual designs for DUSEL
 - Proposals from sites in California (San Jacinto), Washington (Icicle Creek), Minnesota (Soudan), and several others
 - Two finalist sites: Homestake Mine and Henderson Mine
 - Funding of 0.5M\$ each provided to prepare proposal
- Solicitation 3 (2006): submit construction proposals
 - final choice of site in late 2006 ?

Work on S-2 is going on NOW!

DUSEL Candidates: first round (2004)



DUSEL Candidates: July, 2005



Henderson Underground Science/Engineering Project



Henderson Mine (near Denver, Colorado USA)



Using site details for simulations and proposal

- Working molybdenum mine; 150M\$ modernization completed in 2000
- Easily accessible; near expressway, roads kept clear in winter
- Near major urban/industrial area and airline hub
 - < 1.5 hr drive from Denver International Airport
 - Nearby research infrastructure, institutes and universities:
 - U. Colorado, NIST, Colorado State U., Denver U., USAFA, Colorado College, Aspen Center for Physics
 - Direct flights to cities around the world

J. Wilkes, 1 Nov '05

Henderson Mine, Empire, Colorado



Henderson Mine

- Owned by Climax Molybdenum Company, a subsidiary of Phelps Dodge Corporation
- Opened in 1970's
 - modern mine, developed under strict environmental and safety regulations: company just spent \$150M updating
- Mining molybdenum (Mo) ore, by 'Block Caving'
- Huge elevator/hoist for vertical access
 - 8.5 m diameter shaft with with two hoisting compartments
 - Elevator: 7m long X 2.5m wide X 4m tall, 50 tons capacity
 - Can carry a ship container
 - Or 200 people...



- Now:>1000m deep, minimum overburden ~3000 mwe
 - Can go deeper...

J. Wilkes, 1 Nov '05

Elevator and office space

Main elevator

1 Tom Kirk = 2m



Surface buildings

[Thanx to R. Wilson for photos]

Excellent DUSEL Site



Henderson Mine parameters

- Excavation Capacity: ~40,000 50,000 ton/day
 - Actual operation: ~20,000 30,000 ton/day
 - under-utilized capacity
- 15km tunnel with high speed conveyor and train track
 - Conveyor belt: 50kton/day max capacity, 20kton/day normal operation
- Electric power station: 2 x 30 MW
- Rock disposal site (approved) with huge capacity
- Large office buildings and warehouses
- Anticipated mine closing in 10~20 years
 - Mine Co. and local politicians see underground science as way of retaining employment, revitalizing local economy, etc
 - Local residents are supportive: most are miners!

J. Wilkes, 1 Nov '05

Henderson: Big toys for big boys (and girls) !



10 ton underground loader.

80 ton side-dump truck.



Jumbo Boom Drill

Mining @ Henderson: how to make tunnels cheaply

Basic drilling cycle for drill and blast tunneling:

- 1. Survey and setup
- 2. Drilling
- 3. Charging
- 4. Blasting
- 5. Ventilation
- 6. Scaling
- 7. Mucking
- 8. Scaling
- 9. Bolting



Gigantic Rock Handling/Removal System



- 1. 80 ton trucks dump rock at crusher.
- 2. 17 km underground conveyors belts remove rock.
- 3. 7 km surface conveyor to mill site.
 - 40~50 kton/day capacity

Cheapest excavation cost: ~ \$60/ton



Conveyer belts total 25 km

Ore conveyer tunnel can give horizontal access after mining is finished







Last year: core sample from DUSEL area

- Universities and Colorado government funded exploratory core drill into the proposed DUSEL site
 - 750 m long, inclination of 26 degrees, right through proposed Central Campus area
- Results = good news:
 - 'Extremely competent' porphyry (granite)
 - Very hard with a high percentage of quartz.
 - Expected to have high compressive strength
 We evidence of mineralization/
 - 'No evidence of mineralization'
- No Mo: company won't want to mine here!
 - No problem foreseen for constructing DUSEL



Experimental areas

- Upper campus
 - Old company machine shop (32k ft² area) at UC-1 level (8100' asl, 2500 mwe) can be ready for experiments within a few months, at cost of 100K\$
 - Slightly deeper UC-2 (7700' asl, 3100 mwe) also possible quickly
- Central Campus
 - 6750' asl, 4200 mwe overburden
 - Accessed by new ramps from existing shaft area, ~2 years
 - Several large, multipurpose rooms (~20x20x100 m³)
 - Natural location for megaton-scale proton decay/neutrino detector UNO (not part of official DUSEL scope)
- Possible: Midway Campus at bend in access tunnels
 - 5800' asl, 5100 mwe overburden
- Lower Campus
 - 4900' asl, 6000 mwe overburden
 - In ~5 years: several rooms sized ~20x20x50 m³
 - For projects requiring lowest background
 - double-beta decay, dark matter, solar neutrinos
 - Second core drill in planning stage, to confirm geology





Compare Dark Matter Sensitivity to other mines:



UNO Detector Concept

- Water Cherenkov Detector optimized for:
- Light attenuation length limit
- PMT pressure limit
- Cost (staging built-in) (Total \$500M incl. contingency)

3 sections, each (60m)³ 13x Super-K total mass 20x Super-K fiducial mass excavation: \$100~250M

60m

60m

40% photocathode

2.5m veto layer with outward-facing PMTs optical separation between sections

10%

photocathode

60x60x180m³ Total Vol: 650 kton Fid. Vol: 440 kton Inner: 56,000 20" PMTs Outer: 14,900 8" PMTs Detector cost: \$250M

Salient features

- ~ 20X Super-K fiducial mass
- Build on well-known water Cherenkov techniques
 - Significant new detector development not required
 - Cost estimates can be made with reasonable confidence, BUT
 - Detector R&D may reduce costs significantly
- Site independent proposal!
 - Henderson Mine site would be ideal, but...
 - More or less independent of DUSEL site selection process
 - DUSEL will not include funding for UNO anyway
 - Physics goals can be met at any site with <a>3000 mwe depth

UNO Collaboration: 98 members, 40 institutes

ANL	GRPHE / UHA - Mulhouse, France	LANL	SUNY at Stony Brook		
Maury Goodman	Yann Benhammou	Todd J. Haines	Marcus Ackerman		
D. Reyna	Gyeongsang National Univ., Korea	Louisiana State Univ.	John Hobbs		
R. Talaga	S. H. Kim	Bob Svoboda	Chang Kee Jung		
J. Thron	I. G. Park	Univ. of Minesota, Duluth	Tokufumi Kato		
BNL	C. S. Yoon	Alec Habig	Dan Kerr		
Milind Diwan	Indiana Univ.	Univ. of Minesota, Minneapolis	Kenkou Kobayashi		
Maurice Goldhaber	Rick Van Kooten Marvin Marshak		Matthew Malek		
Dick Hahn	INFN-Napoli Earl Peterson		Bob McCarthy		
Brett Viren	Vittorio Paladino	Univ. of Nebraska	Clark McGrew		
Minfang Yeh	INFN-Padova	Dan Claes	Michael Rijssenbeek		
Caltech	Mauro Mezzetto	NHMFL	Antony Sarrat		
Christopher Mauger	INR (Institute for Nuclear Research), Rusia	John Miller	Ryan Terri		
Univ. of California, Davis	Leonid Bezrukov	Univ. of New Mexico	Chiaki Yanagisawa		
Daniel Ferenc	Anatoly Butkevich	Sally Seidel	IRES / ULP - Strasbourg, France		
California State Univ., Dominguez Hills	Marat Khabibullin	Northern Illinois Univ.	Chantal Racca		
Ken Ganezer	Yury Kudenko	Gerald C. Blazey	Jean-Marie Brom		
Jim Hill	Stanislav Mikheyev	Dhiman Chakraborty	Tuft Univ.		
Bill Keig	Iowa State University	David Hedin	Tomas Kafka		
Univ. of Cantania, Italy	Jim Cochran	Northwestern Univ.	Tony Mann		
Renato Potenza	Univ. of Kansas	Heidi Schellman	Univ. of Utah		
Colorado School of Mines	Phil Baringer	Okayama Univ., Japan	Kai Martens		
John Fanchi	Dave Besson	Makoto Sakuda	Warsaw Univ., Poland		
Uwe Greife	Kansas State Univ.	Purdue Univ.	Danka Kielczewska		
Murray Hitzman	Tim Bolton	Wei Cui	Univ. of Washington		
D. Scott Kieffer	Eckhard von Toerne	John Finley	Rick Gran		
Mark Kuchta	Ron A. Sidwell	Saclay, France	Jeff Wilkes		
James McNeil	Noel Stanton	Jacques Bouchez	Tianchi Zhao		
Fred Sarazin	KEK, Japan	Luigi Mosca	College of William and Mary		
Colorado State Univ.	Taku Ishida	Francois Pierre	Jeff Nelson		
John Holton	Kenzo Nakamura	Sejong University, Korea	WIPP		
Jim Sites	Kyungpook National Univ., Korea	Yeongduk Kim	Roger Nelson		
Walter Toki	Wooyoung Kim	Jungyeon Lee	Bill Thompson		
Dave Warner	Vitaly Batourine	Jungil Lee			
Bob Wilson	Seungwook Jin				
	Dmitriy Nekrasov				

joined in past year

Advisory committees

- UNO advisory committee
 - Jacques Bouchez (Saclay)
 - Maury Goodman (ANL)
 - Tom Kirk (BNL)
 - Takahaki Kajita (ICRR)
 - Tony Mann (Tufts)
 - Kenzo Nakamura (KEK)
 - Masayuki Nakahata (ICRR)
 - Yoichiro Suzuki (ICRR)
 - Jeff Wilkes (U. of Washington)
 - Bob Wilson (Colorado State U.)

- Theoretical advisory committee
 - John Bahcall (IAS/Princeton)
 - John Beacom (FNAL)
 - Adam Burrows (U. of Arizona)
 - Maria Concepcion Gonzales-Garcia (Stony Brook)
 - Jim Lattimer (Stony Brook)
 - Bill Marciano (BNL)
 - Hitoshi Murayama (Berkeley)
 - Jogesh Pati (U. of Maryland)
 - Robert Shrock (Stony Brook)
 - Frank Wilczek (MIT)
 - Edward Witten (IAS/Princeton)

Tank liner and concept for PMT mounting



UNO Design and Construction Timeline

Conceptual UNO Schedule												
	Year -2	Year -1	Year 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R&D Proposal/LOI												
Tech. Proposal												
Excavation												
Water containment												
PMT delivery												
Preparation												
Installation												
Water fill												
											contingency	

Two years of rigorous detector design needed Proposal just submitted (10/05) for R&D funding



- Multi-purpose detector
- Comprehensive programs in astrophysics, nuclear and particle physics
- Synergy between accelerator and non-accelerator physics
- Nominal cost: ~\$450M total (~\$400M for site @ Henderson mine)



UNO Proton Decay Sensitivity

Need help from theorists to update this!)

J. Wilkes, 1 Nov '05

Supernovae



UNO's Supernova Reach: ~ 1 Mpc (Local Group of galaxies)

Supernova Rate: ~ 1 per 10 ~ 15 yr

140K events for SN @ 10 kpc

Galactic Supernova



~140,000 events in UNO:

msec timing structure of the flux \Rightarrow Determination of core collapse mechanism Possible Observation of Birth of a Black Hole via cutoff

J. Wilkes, 1 Nov '05

Diffuse supernova relic flux

- Super-K limit (1.2 v_e/cm²s >19 Mev @ 90%CL) must be reduced by factor of ~6 to address all current predictions
- Can be reached by UNO in ~6 yrs @ 4000 MWE depth (longer if shallower)
 - Event rate 20~60 / year for 450 MT fiducial volume
 - BG-limited search

Direct Observation of Oscillatory Behavior in atm v L/E



DUSEL Candidate Sites and Potential VLBL/Superbeam Experiments

N2O° 105° 90° 75° Lake Canada 8 Winnipeg Recina innipe Spokane, Quebec MISSING Lake Montreal North Dakota Superior. lelena Sudbury Montana Faige Ottawa 🔿 Duileth Bismarck 🛱 Aùqus' Montpelier <u>130</u> N.H. Michigan km Idaho Lake Huron Homestake Minne apolis Boise Dalota Łake Toront 2560 km Ontarie Boston **O**Pierr Albany 🔍 Mass.-Wisconsin Stales Providence Nev York Hartford W yoming 1315 km Lansing Corn Màdison 👜 FNA Pennsylvania Inwa 1 Harrisburg Chiladelphia Trenton Henderson de 500 km Netraska BN willes Moines t٧ Pittsburgh Indiana aDo ver Columbus Washington CAnnapolis Lincoln® Illinois nada **etndranapolis** $D \cap$ West ∽Dekavare Springfield: 2760 km Dernver Y irgiria Utah Cdasto. Charleston o Kansas Oity Pichmond a Topeka® Filankfort St.Lous Nonolk <mark>Jeffe</mark>rson Citv[®] Kansas Chio. Atlantic Y irginia Kentucky Missour Ocea Rateigh Arizon a Nashville 🏟 North Canoliná Santa Fe<u>/</u> Tulss Oklahoma City T ennessee South Arkanses Albuquerque Memphis Columbia 🗃 Salahan Okkhoma Little Rock Phoenix 🛛 Atlanta Nev √Mexico United State Challeston Birmingham 🍦 ž Ft. Worth Dalas Tucsor \odot Montgomer y National capital Georgia Jackson El Pas Lousiana Alabama State capital T exas Mississippi Secondary dity Jacksonville Tallahassee Prim ary road Baton Rouge Austin Mexico Florda Nev Orleans Railroad Holston San Antoni State borcer

37

J. Wilkes, 1 Nov '05

Why VLBL?

 Marciano pointed out that for HE neutrino beams, 2nd and 3rd oscillation dips can be very handy...

Marciano (hep-ph/0108181):

- Yes, statistics fall off with baseline $(1/L^2)$
- but, CP asymmetry grows with baseline (L)
- so, FOM = $A^2 N_{\nu}/(1 A^2)$ is ~constant



Message: don't be afraid to get high and go long!

M. Diwan, B. Viren

3-D Neutrino Super Beam Perspective



US Department of Energy Brookhaven Science Associates T. Kirk February 15, 2003



Now and near future

- UNO R&D proposal submitted to US DOE and NSF
 - UNO is still site-independent
 - Let's build it wherever we can!
- DUSEL @ Henderson Physics Workshop planned for Nov 18-19, 2005 at CSU, Ft. Collins, Colorado

See <u>http://ale.physics.sunysb.edu/husep</u> and click on "Conferences and Workshops"

- HUSEP Physics Committee (J.W. = chair) Working groups:
 - Neutrino mass (solar, 0vββ)
 - Neutrino mixing (atm v, LBL)
 - Dark matter/nuclear physics
 - Nucleon decay
 - Astrophysics

