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## FRONT-END OPTIONS

S. Weinreb

The memo describes various choices concerning VLA front-ends, feeds, and feed mounting arrangements. The examples described are not intended to cover all possibilities; the reader is urged to think of other configurations which may be more useful.
I. Front-Ends

Three possible front-ends are summarized here. A breakdown of the cost of each front-end is given in Tables $A, B$, and $C$.

Front-ends $B$ and $C$ require cryogenic refrigerators. NRAO now has 6 refrigerated systems and 5 years experience with one system. It is estimated that the 3 men will be required for refrigerator and vacuum maintenance and the operating cost of the VLA will be increased by $\$ 65 \mathrm{~K}$ a year. It also can be expected that after an initial 6 month break-in period each system will be defective $1 \%$ of the time (i.e., a one-day failure every 3 months) and thus $24 \%$ of the time one of the 27 systems will be defective. The sensitivity advantage is probably worth this degree of unreliability.

Front-End A - 3/11 cm Degenerate Paramp
This is the front-end presently on the interferometer. Improvements would be made on the feed spillover and reliability of the pump multiplier package. The center frequencies are fixed, the allowed IF bandwidth is 40 MHz at 2.695 GHz and

100 MHz at 8.085 GHz , and SSB operation is not practical. Other characteristics are as follows:

| FREQUENCY | SYSTEM TEMPERATURE |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.695 GHz | $90^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| 8.085 GHz | $100^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| Production Cost per Antenna |  |
| Development Cost |  |
| NRAO Engineering Man-years |  |

An uncooled $1.35-1.43 \mathrm{GHz}$ front-end having $100^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ system temperature could be added at a cost of 30 K .

Front-End B - $3 / 11 \mathrm{~cm}$ Cooled Paramps
This is a replacement of the uncooled degenerate paramps of Front-End $A$ with cooled non-degenerate paramps which are commercially available. The paramp bandwidths would be 200 MHz at 2.695 GHz and 500 MHz at 8.085 GHz . DSB or SSB operation is practical. Other characteristics are as follows:

| FREQUENCY | SYSTEM TEMPERATURE |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.695 GHz | $45^{\circ}$ |
| 8.085 GHz | $55^{\circ}$ |
| Production Cost per Antenna | \$159K |
| Development Cost | 300K |
| NRAO Engineering Man-years | 3 |

## Front-End C - Cooled Paramp-Mixer Combination

A multiple-frequency configuration utilizing a basic $4.5-5 \mathrm{GHz}$ paramp in conjunction with an up-converter and two cooled mixers is shown in Figure 1. The technical factors which lead to the consideration of this system are:

1) Cooled paramps for the 4 GHz range are a highly developed art. Over 60 paramps having 500 MHz bandwidth and $<15^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ noise temperature have been produced by a company.
2) The varactor up-converter is an inherently stable, easily tunable type of parametric amplifier. No circulator is required and it is easily cooled. The main disadvantage is low gain, but this is unimportant when it prededes another low-noise amplifier.
3) Cooled mixers are also inherently stable and easily tunable. This is a new art which is being developed at NRAO. The mixers have loss ( $\sim 3 \mathrm{~dB}$ for SSB mixers in this frequency range) but contribute little noise of their own ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{D}} \sim 50^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ ) and produce a fairly low system noise temperature.
4) All of the above devices are fairly small and it is reasonable to put a dual channel system on a single 10 -watt $18^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ refrigerator. Characteristics of this option are as follows:

| FREQUENCY RANGE | SYSTEM TEMPERATURE |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1.35-1.72 GHz | $55^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| 4.5-5 GHz | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| $14.0-15.5 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $130^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| 20-25 GHz | $150^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| Production Cost per Antenna | \$180K |
| Development Cost | 500K |
| Engineering Man-years | 8 |



FIGURE 1 - Cooled paramp, up-converter, and mixer multiple frequency front-end.

A word should be stated about the risk in counting on a system such as this for the VLA. We have no experience with this type of system and cooled mixers are just now being developed. However, the risk is only that a portion of the system will not meet specifications. The 6 cm cooled paramp appears to be a solid item and the $18-21 \mathrm{~cm}$ up-converter has been designed in the past. Even if the cooled mixers are a total failure the remainder of the system is quite worthwhile.

## II. Feeds

The following feed characteristics are desirable for the VLA:

1) Multiple-frequency Operation - It is desirable to operate the array with concentric beams at two frequencies which are in a ratio of 3:1.
2) Dual-circular Polarization - For linear polarization measurements it is desirable to have dual-circular polarized feeds with axial ratio < 1.04
3) Wide bandwidth - For simultaneous coverage of more than one spectral line it is desirable to have feeds with bandwidths in the 10 to $25 \%$ range. Examples: $1.35-1.72 \mathrm{GHz}$ for H and $\mathrm{OH}, 4.66-4.83 \mathrm{GHz}$ for OH and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{CO}$ and $22.2-23.8 \mathrm{GHz}$ for $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$. Wide bandwidth feeds will also allow a change of frequency to avoid interference and allow an increased continuum sensitivity if a wide band IF transmission and delay system is developed. It is also desirable to be able to quickly (say $<1$ day) change to operation at 2 or 3 more frequency bands.

Any one of the above requirements can be met in a conventional manner. Any two can be met with some difficulty and perhaps a compromise in performance. All three requirements are probably unfeasible in one feed. It will be necessary to have three feeds with changeover accomplished by one of the methods presented in the next section. Some examples are as follows:

Feed System A

| Feed | Frequency | Bandwidth | Polarization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | $4.7-5.0 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $6 \%$ | Dual-circular |
|  | $14.4-15.4 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $7 \%$ | Dual-circular |
| 2 | $1.35-1.72 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $25 \%$ | Dual-1inear |
| 3 | $20-25 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $22 \%$ | Dual-1inear |

Feeds 2 and 3 could be circularly polarized over a smaller bandwidth or over the larger bandwidth with $20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ loss in system temperature. Alternatively circular polarization could be formed at the front-end outputs with some loss in stability.

## Feed System B

| Feed | Frequency | Bandwidth | Polarization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $1.35-1.43 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $6 \%$ | Circular |
|  | $4.7-5.0 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $6 \%$ | Circular |
| 2 | $1.60-1.73 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $7 \%$ | Circular |
|  | $14.4-15.4 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $7 \%$ | Circular |
| 3 | $20-25 \mathrm{GHz}$ | $22 \%$ | Linear |

III. Methods of Changing Feeds

At the secondary focus sufficient space for several front-ends exists and a change of front-end requires only that the feed be changed. Four options are available.

## Option A - Physically Change the Feed

This is just ine straight-forward-unbolt one feed and install another. However the feeds are likely to be large (i.e., $3^{\prime}$ diameter and $12^{\prime}$ long) and will have four waveguide flanges to be mated. Even with proper equipment this is likely to require 3 hours for 2 men on each antenna.

## Option B - Install Secondary Reflector

It would be possible to switch from a prime focus to a secondary focus front-end by installing the subreflector. This would not be possible with the Option $C$ multiple-frequency front end. One (expensive) possibility would be to have an Option A $3 / 11 \mathrm{~cm}$ front-end at prime focus and an Option $C 1.25 / 2 / 6 / 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ front-end at secondary focus. Another possibility would be to have an $18 / 21 / 75 \mathrm{~cm}$ front-end at prime focus and a $1.25 / 2 / 6 \mathrm{~cm}$ front-end at secondary focus.

## Option C - Pivot or Turret Secondary Focus

A pivot arrangement of secondary feeds and front-ends is shown in

Figure 2. Three feeds and front-ends are pivoted thru an angle of $\sim 11^{\circ}$ to put any feed on-axis. Change-over could be in a few seconds from the control room or by two men going to each antenna for 15 minutes. It may be possible to replace the large 21 cm horn with a short lens-corrected horn to reduce the torque load.

## Option D - Off-axis Feeds

Three feeds could be permanently mounted with two of the feeds off-axis as shown in Figure 3. In this example, Feed Option $A$ is shown. The $2 / 6 \mathrm{~cm}$ feed


FIGURE 2 - Pivot arrangement to position any one of 3 feeds on axis.
is mounted on-axis and the $18-21 \mathrm{~cm}$ and $1.2-1.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ feeds are mounted off-axis in elevation. The $1.2-1.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ beam will be displaced by 4.8 beamwidths from the $2 / 6 \mathrm{~cm}$ beam; the gain loss and coma lobe are negligible at this displacement with a Cassegrain system with this magnification ( $\sim 6.8$ ). There may be some degradation in the instrumental polarization with off-axis feeds. This problem needs further investigation but is probably not serious and, of course, does not effect the on-axis feed.


FIGURE 3 - View looking down at vertex with
Feed System A installed.
Cost Breakdown(1973 Dollars)
Front-End A - $3 / 11 \mathrm{~cm}$ Degenerate Paramp
$3 / 11 \mathrm{~cm}$ Dual-circular Feed 15 K
2 - Single-stage 11 cm Paramps ..... 6 K
2 - Single-stage 3.6 cm Paramps ..... 6K
Pump Multiplier Package ..... 15K
4 - Mixer-preamps ..... 4 K
Pump Power and Phase Control ..... 2K
Calibration Components ..... 2K
Cables and Connectors ..... 10K
Temperature Controlled Box ..... 3K
Miscellaneous ..... 5K
Assembly and Test ..... 20K
TOTAL ..... \$ 88 K
Development Cost
Feed Development ..... 100K
Prototype System ..... 100K

+ One Man-year NRAO Engineering

TABLE B

Cost Breakdown
(1973 Dollars)

Front-End B - $3 / 11$ cm Cooled Paramps

| $3 / 11$ cm Dual-circular Feed | 20 K |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 - Three-stage 3 cm Paramps | 18 K |
| 2 - Three-stage 11 cm Paramps | 18 K |
| Paramp Pumps | 20 K |
| Refrigerator + Compressor | 20 K |
| Vacuum Dewar | 5 K |
| Calibration Components | 2 K |
| Cables and Connectors | 10 K |
| 4 - Mixer-preamps | 3 K |
| Local Oscillator Multipliers | 5 K |
| Miscellaneous | 5 K |
| Packaging | 3 K |
| Assembly and Test | 30 K |

Development Cost

| Feed Development | 100 K |
| :--- | ---: |
| Prototype System | 200 K |
| +3 Man-years of NRAO Engineering |  |

TABLE C.

```
Cost Breakdown
(1973 Dollars)
```


## Front-End C - $1.3 / 2 / 6 / 21 \mathrm{~cm}$ Cooled Front-End

$2 / 6 \mathrm{~cm}$ Dual-circular Feed ..... 20K
18-21 cm Dual-Linear Feed ..... 15K
1.25 cm Dual-Linear Feed ..... 5K
Refrigerator + Compressor ..... 20K
Vacuum Dewar ..... 5K
2 - Three-stage 6 cm Paramps ..... 18K
Paramp Pump ..... 10K
2 - Up-converters ..... 6K
2-2 cm Cooled Mixers ..... 4K
$2-1.25 \mathrm{~cm}$ Cooled Mixers ..... 4K
Calibration Components ..... 3K
2 - Mixer-preamps ..... 2K
Local Oscillator Multipliers ..... 10K
Cables and Connectors ..... 10K
Miscellaneous ..... 5K
Packaging ..... 3K
Assembly and Test ..... 40K

TABLE C (cont.)

Development Cost

| Feed Study | 50 K |
| :--- | ---: |
| Prototype Feeds | 150 K |
| Prototype Up-Converter | 80 K |
| Prototype Cooled-Mixers | 120 K |
| Prototype Other Components | 100 K |

