

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

ANALYSIS OF AN INDUCTION LINAC DRIVER SYTEM FOR INERTIAL FUSION

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2v45p08j>

Author

Hovingh, J.

Publication Date

1987-07-01



Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Accelerator & Fusion Research Division

**Analysis of an Induction Linac
Driver System for Inertial Fusion**

J. Hovingh, V.O. Brady, A. Faltens,
D. Keefe, and E.P. Lee

July 1987


RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY

SEP 18 1987

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

For Reference

Not to be taken from this room



LBL-22713
21

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

ANALYSIS OF AN INDUCTION LINAC DRIVER SYSTEM
FOR INERTIAL FUSION*

J. Hovingh
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Livermore, CA 94550

V.O. Brady, A. Faltens, D. Keefe, and E.P. Lee
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

July 1987

*This was supported by the Office of Energy Research, Office of Program Analysis, U.S. Department of Energy, under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

2.1. ANALYSIS OF AN INDUCTION LINAC DRIVER SYSTEM FOR INERTIAL FUSION

J. Hovingh

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

V. O. Brady, A. Faltens, D. Keefe, and E. P. Lee
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

ABSTRACT

A linear induction accelerator that produces a beam of energetic (5 to 20 GeV) heavy (130 to 210 amu) ions is a prime candidate as a driver for inertial fusion. Continuing developments in sources for ions with charge state greater than unity allow a potentially large reduction in the driver cost and an increase in the driver efficiency. The use of high undepressed tunes ($\sigma \approx 85^\circ$) and low depressed tunes ($\sigma \approx 8.5^\circ$) also contributes to a potentially large reduction in the driver cost.

The efficiency and cost of the induction linac system is discussed as a function of output energy and pulse repetition frequency for several ion masses and charge states. The cost optimization code LIACEP, including accelerating module alternatives, transport modules, and scaling laws is presented. Items with large cost-leverage are identified as a guide to future research activities and development of technology that can yield substantial reductions in the accelerator system cost and improvement in the accelerator system efficiency. Finally, a cost-effective strategy using heavy ion induction linacs in a development scenario for inertial fusion is presented.

INTRODUCTION

The use of heavy ion accelerators as drivers to initiate inertially confined fusion reactions has been under study since 1975.^{1,2} Early heavy ion accelerator concepts to provide 1 to 10 MJ of 5 to 20 GeV ions of atomic mass between 130 and 210 amu included an rf linac-accumulator system, a synchrotron-accumulator system, and an induction linac system.^{2,3} Recent designs have concentrated on the rf linac-accumulator system as an ICF driver for the HIBALL⁴ and the HIBLIC -I⁵ studies centered, respectively, in Germany

and Japan. The Heavy Ion Fusion System Assessment (HIFSA) study in the USA assumes an induction linac, which does not require an accumulator because of the more intense ion bunches that are accelerated. This paper describes the model, computational tools and results of a cost-performance study of an induction linac to drive an inertial fusion power plant. Also given is a strategy for reducing the buy-in cost of heavy ion fusion for a single pulse test facility through an experimental power reactor by multiple pulsing, and increasing the pulse repetition frequency of the accelerator.

INDUCTION LINAC SYSTEM

An induction Linac driver shown in Figure 2.1-1 is now envisioned as a multiple beamlet transport lattice consisting of (N) closely packed parallel FODO transport channels. Each focussing channel is composed of a periodic system of focussing (F) and defocussing (D) quadrupole lenses with spaces (O) between successive lenses. Surrounding the lattice are massive induction cores of ferromagnetic material and associated pulser circuitry which apply a succession of long duration, high voltage pulses to the N parallel beamlets. Longitudinal focussing is also achieved through the detailed timing and shape of the accelerating waveforms (with feedback correction of errors). A multiple beam injector of heavy ions operates at 2-3 MV, producing the net charge per pulse required to achieve the desired pellet gain. Initial current (and therefore initial pulse length) are determined by transport




Fig. 2.1-1. Schematic of current concept for a 3.3 MJ driver that uses ions with $A = 200$, $q = 3$.

limits in the lattice at low energy. The use of a large number of electrostatic quadrupole channels ($N \sim 16-64$) appears to be the least expensive focal option at low energies (below ~ 50 MV). This is followed by a lower number of superconducting magnetic channels ($N \sim 4-16$) for the rest of the accelerator. Merging of beams may therefore be required at this transition. Furthermore, some splitting of beams may be required after acceleration to stay within current limits in the final focus system.

The use of multiple beams increases the net charge which can be accelerated by a given cross section of core at a fixed accelerating gradient. Alternatively, a given amount of charge can be accelerated more rapidly with multiple beams since the pulse length is shortened and a core cross-section of specified volt-seconds per meter flux swing can supply an increased gradient. Thus the cost of the accelerating subsystem can be decreased. However, an increase in the number of beamlets increases the cost and dimensions of the transport lattice and also increases the cost of the core for a given volt-sec product since a larger core volume is required. For a core of given cross section (\propto volt-seconds/m), the volume of ferromagnetic material increases as its inside diameter is increased. Hence there is a tradeoff between transport and acceleration costs with an optimum at some finite number of beamlets. The determination of this optimum configuration is a complex problem depending on projected costs of magnets, core, insulators, energy storage, pulsers and fabrication. The induction linac design code LIACEP⁶ is used for this purpose.

The choice of superconducting magnets for the bulk of the linac is mandated by the requirement of system efficiency; overall, this must be at least $\sim 10\%$ in an ICF driver and ideally $\geq 20\%$ to avoid large circulating power fractions (which result in a high cost of electricity (COE)). Induction cores are most likely to be constructed from thin laminations of amorphous iron, which is the preferred material due to its excellent electrical characteristics and flux swing. At a projected cost of ~ 4 \$/lb (insulated and wound) this is a major cost item for the first 2-4 GV of a typical linac. At higher voltage the cost of pulsers and fabrication of the high gradient column with insulators dominates.

COST OPTIMIZATION CODE LIACEP

The LBL Linear Induction Accelerator Cost Evaluation Program (LIACEP) is an optimization program that varies several of the physical parameters of an

induction linac in search of a minimum cost combination.^{6,7} In addition to estimating the accelerator system cost and efficiency, LIACEP can be used to identify the components and materials that have a high leverage on the cost and efficiency of the accelerator system. These high leverage items are logical areas for research and technology development to reduce the cost and increase the efficiency of the accelerator system.

In using LIACEP, the ion mass and charge, the normalized transverse emittance, single particle and depressed tunes (betatron phase advance per period of the transport lattice), number of beamlets, charge per beamlet, and pulse repetition frequency are set. Also set are engineering parameters such as clearances, the acceleration module core material, and various limits to insulator voltages, module size, etc. Then, for a given particle kinetic energy, current and focussing system packing fraction, the required field at the beamlet edge, the maximum beamlet envelope radius, and the half period of the transport lattice are determined using the approximation of Lee et al.⁸ These are used as input into a focussing system subroutine, which consists of a description of either electrostatic or superconducting quadrupoles. From the focussing system subroutine, the quadrupole length and the transport channel inner radius are obtained, as well as focussing system costs and power consumption that satisfy constraints on the maximum pole tip field and beam radius and the minimum focussing system length-to-bore ratio. The acceleration system subroutines are then used to determine the accelerator module dimensions, power requirements, and costs for each module design. A cost comparison subroutine selects the minimum cost alternative of the various acceleration module designs. Successively higher values of current are then selected throughout a range limited by focal constraints; the minimum cost current is then selected. Next, the ratio of the focussing system length to the half period length is increased and the calculations repeated. After the optimization at one particle kinetic energy point is completed, the process is repeated at a higher kinetic energy level. Finally, the total cost, length, power, efficiency, etc., are determined for this minimum cost accelerator system.

The module options investigated in the LIACEP are of three types.⁷ The first type consists of cores external to the beam but internal to the insulator. The second type has the insulator external to the beam and internal to the cores. The third type is similar to the second type, but has

an accelerator core wrapped around the focussing element. In most runs, the cost-optimized design option uses the third type modules in the low-to-medium voltage portion of the accelerator (< 1000 MV) and the second type modules in the high voltage region. The core material options in LIACEP include amorphous-iron, nickel-iron, silicon-iron, and ferrite.

COST STUDIES

Four cost studies were completed. The purpose of the first study was to examine the state of LIACEP, and to vary some of the physical parameters of an induction linac to examine their cost leverage. The purpose of the second study was to examine, throughout a large parameter space of ion species, kinetic energies, emittances, beam energies, pulse repetition frequencies, and number of beamlets, the minimized cost and the resultant efficiencies of an induction linac to be used in a variety of power plant systems. The third study was based on several possible power plant sizes, reactor chamber target yield capabilities, and target gain curves to identify the requirements of the linear induction accelerator driver, and using LIACEP, to determine their cost and efficiency. The fourth study was performed to verify the modeling of the accelerator cost and efficiency for the various combinations of power plant subsystems for which the cost of electricity is near to a minimum.

In all but the third study, the accelerator system assumes an initial voltage of 50 MV, and the costs do not include the low voltage (< 50 MV) portion of the accelerator, nor do they include the final compression, transport, and focussing portion of the energetic ion beam to the target. These sections receive a separate treatment in the systems study due to their distinctive roles and technologies. However, their costs are expected to be small compared to the accelerator (on the order of 20%). For the third study, the initial voltage of the accelerator was 3 MV, using magnetic focussing through the length of the accelerator.

EFFECTS OF PHYSICAL PARAMETERS ON COST

A preliminary problem was run to determine the current state of LIACEP. This exercise reproduced the results presented by Faltens et al.⁹ for a 200 amu, unity charge state ion (Hg^+) using 4 beamlets of $75\mu\text{C}$ of charge per beamlet and a total output energy of 3 MJ. The accelerator input voltage is 50 MV and the output voltage is 10 GV. The normalized transverse emittance

is 1.17×10^{-5} meter-radians per beamlet and the tune is depressed from 60° to 24° . The acceleration cores are of amorphous-iron, and the focussing is by superconducting quadrupoles. The pulse repetition frequency is 1 hertz, which is lower than will be used for a fusion power plant and results in a relatively low efficiency because the transport system and acceleration system power requirements are comparable at 1 Hz. Increasing the pulse repetition frequency increases substantially the accelerator system efficiency.

The Reference Case given above is used as a base for comparison with other runs with changes in some of the material properties assumed in the accelerator design. One such property is the vacuum insulator flashover limit expressed as a function of pulse duration, which has an appreciable effect on the system cost and efficiency. The assumed design limits for flashover gradient vary from more than 20 kV/cm for sub-microsecond pulses to 5 kV/cm for pulse lengths of 1 μ s and longer. There are few, if any, 1 meter diameter, several meter long graded accelerating columns with several megavolts applied across them, let alone data on their time dependent flashover. Thus it is desirable to examine the consequences of different assumptions about these limits. Increasing the short time flashover field by a factor of 2.5 will decrease the system cost by 13% and increase efficiency by 7.5%. Doubling the long pulse flashover field will reduce the cost by 14% and increase efficiency by 13%. Doing both will reduce cost by 24% and increase efficiency by 11%. Clearly, this provides motivation for investigation of the usable fields in a realistic structure and environment.

Increasing the breakdown voltage across vacuum gaps does not affect the cost of the accelerator system. This is due to the high cost of the insulator which requires the insulator to be located between the acceleration core and the beam such that the regions between the acceleration cells in the module can be insulated. However, if the cost of the insulators can be reduced such that the core costs prevail and the insulators must be placed outboard of the cores for a minimum cost acceleration module, the breakdown voltage across vacuum gaps will become important to the cost of the system.

The effect of the high voltage breakdown of ceramic insulators in vacuum as a function of length on the cost and efficiency of the accelerator system was also investigated. The voltage-breakdown design curves that were used allow only about 38% of the voltage hold-off properties of high-power

microwave tubes presented by Staprans,¹⁰ which is in turn about 80% of the voltage breakdown gradient of porcelain. By using a design curve at 40% of Staprans holdoff properties (the breakdown gradient for porcelain) the cost of the accelerator can be decreased by about 11%, and the efficiency increased about 14%. Re-X, a General Electric castable insulator, has about 80% of the voltage breakdown gradient of porcelain, such that it lies on the current design curve. Faltens recommends operating at about half the voltage breakdown gradient,¹¹ which will change the cost of the accelerator system. However, the performance of the insulators can be increased by more frequent subdivisions using gradient rings. But because the cost of the Re-X insulators is expected to be substantially less than that of porcelain insulators, there may be a cost advantage to using the somewhat lower performing Re-X insulators in the accelerator system.

To date we have identified the surface vacuum flashover gradient as a function of pulse duration for short pulses as a potential high-leverage field of research for induction linacs to be used as inertial fusion drivers. An experimental program that identifies the variables that affect short pulse flashover and determines the effects of 10^8 pulses on flashover will be very cost-effective.

In addition, further studies on voltage breakdown as a function of length for ceramic insulators in vacuum may be cost effective. Of special interest is the effect of size and configuration on the breakdown.

Using the reference case, but with the pulse repetition frequency increased to 5 hertz, the cost was examined as a function of beam energy, where the beam energy was varied by varying the beam charge and holding the final voltage at 10 GV. The cost was found to vary as a constant plus a linear term with energy. An increase in energy from 1 to 10 MJ results in an increase in cost by a factor of 3.3. For an output beam energy of 3 MJ, the cost varied as a constant plus a linear term with the pulse repetition frequency. For an increase in frequency from 1 to 10 hertz, the cost increased by only 8 percent. For the reference case at 5 hertz the number of beamlets was varied between 1 and 16, with the minimum cost of 8 beamlets only 3.5% less than the cost of 4 beamlets.

HEAVY ION FUSION SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT PROJECT ACCELERATOR COST STUDY

The Heavy Ion Fusion Systems Assessment (HIFSA) Project sponsored by the

DOE and EPRI investigated the economic aspects of potential heavy-ion driven ICF power plants over a large parameter space.^{1,2} To facilitate this, LIACEP was used to perform the cost and efficiency studies for an induction linac. The accelerator parameter space investigated for this study is given in Table I. The selection of a tune of 60° and depressed tune of 24° is conservative, as somewhat larger undepressed tunes and much smaller depressed tunes have been demonstrated to allow stable beam propagation in the laboratory in small scale experiments. The amorphous iron cores were

TABLE 2.1-I.

ACCELERATOR PARAMETER SPACE INVESTIGATED
FOR HEAVY ION FUSION SYSTEM ASSESSMENT

Ion Mass	130, 160, 190, 210 amu
Ion Kinetic Energy	5, 10, 15, 20 GeV
Beam Energy	1, 2, 3, 5, 10 MJ
Emittance (un-normalized)	1.5 x 10 ⁻⁵ , 3 x 10 ⁻⁵ m-radians
Pulse Repetition Frequency	5, 10, 15, 20 hertz
Number of Beamlets	4, 8, 16
Ion Charge State	+1
Tune : 60°, Depressed Tune : 24°*	
Initial Ion Kinetic Energy	50 MeV
Focussing System:	Superconducting Quadrupoles
Core Material:	Amorphous Iron

* Recent experiments show that depressed tune of 8° can be achieved. This will lead to cost savings.

selected because they were calculated to cost only about 67% of the silicon iron cores, and less than half of the nickel iron cores, and will operate at an efficiency of greater than 1.5 times that of the other core materials.

Qualitatively, the results of the parameter space investigated for the Heavy Ion Fusion Systems Assessment Project show that the increase in accelerator cost with beam energy increases more rapidly for low kinetic

energy ions on target than for higher kinetic energy ions of the same mass, provided the number of beamlets is fixed. The number of beamlets that produces the minimum integrated cost of an accelerator increases with a decrease in the ion kinetic energy, as well as with an increase in the total output beam energy. For a given voltage and total accelerator output energy, the optimum number of beamlets increases with a decrease in the ion charge to mass ratio and increases with an increase in the ratio of the depressed tune to the normalized emittance. At a given beam energy and ion kinetic energy, the accelerator cost increases with the ion mass for the fixed ion charge state. The cost of the accelerator decreases with an increase in emittance for the fixed depressed tune over the parameter space investigated. However, for the given accelerator parameters (total output beam energy and ion kinetic energy), the cost of the accelerator is a function of ion charge to mass ratio as well as the depressed tune to normalized emittance ratio. Finally, the accelerator efficiency is related to the cost of the accelerator in that, in general, the highest efficiency accelerators tend to have the lowest optimized cost; moreover, efficiency can be increased by higher cost tradeoffs about the cost optimized designs, if necessary.

ACCELERATOR COST STUDY BASED ON TARGET PERFORMANCE AND FUSION POWER

This portion of the accelerator study was based on the ICF reactor constraints and fusion power. Monsler et al. have identified the yield constraints on several generic reactor concepts.¹³ The cost of a power plant is dependent on the fusion power output. This study was based on fusion powers of 1500, 3000, and 6000 MW_f and target yields of 300, 600, and 1200 MJ, which cover several generic types of reactor chambers. The pulse repetition frequencies of the accelerator system can be determined from the target yield and fusion power.

The required accelerator output parameters for a given target yield can be determined for a single shell target design using the Lindl-Mark gain curves.¹⁴ These include the total energy and, for a given ion species, the emittance and ion kinetic energy. For a given target yield, the output energy, W, is determined based on the upper bound of the Lindl-Mark "best estimate" gain curve. Also determined is the $r^{3/2}R$ parameter where R is the range of the ions in g/cm² in the target material and r is the

target spot radius which must satisfy

$$0.1 W^{1/3} < r < 0.2 W^{1/3} \quad (W, \text{ MJ}; r, \text{ cm}). \quad (1)$$

From the $r^{3/2}R$ parameter and the target spot radius, the desired range can be determined. From this range, the required ion kinetic energy can be specified from the ion range-kinetic curve of Bangerter et al.¹⁵ From the ion kinetic energy and spot radius, for a given angle of convergence, the maximum normalized emittance of the accelerator beamlets can be determined assuming that it dominates the spot radius. This completes the description of the required accelerator output. Associated with the target gain and beam energy is a peak power requirement which can be independently modulated by the final transport drift lines.

For an ion mass of 200 amu, the ion kinetic energy and normalized emittance (based on a half-angle of convergence in the chamber of 0.015 radians and no aberrations) as a function of target yield or accelerator




Fig. 2.1-2. Accelerator Parameter Space as a Function of Target Yield for a Range of Target Spot Radii for Ion Mass 200 amu.

output energy are shown in Figure 2 for the upper, middle, and lower bounds on the spot radius for which high confidence exists in the gain curves. For a given $r^{3/2}R$, the range for the lower bound spot radius must be greater than for the upper bound spot radius. This requires, for a given ion mass, higher kinetic energies of the ions for the lower bound spot radius. The effect of the higher ion kinetic energy for the smaller spot radius is to require a smaller normalized transverse emittance than that for the larger spot radius.

The minimum cost of the accelerator system per unit fusion power as a function of target yield or accelerator output energy for the upper and lower bounds on the spot radius and several fusion powers is shown in Figure 3. The cost of accelerators producing 3000 MW of fusion power at the lower bound spot size is given in Table II. The tune depression of the accelerator




Fig. 2.2-3. Normalized Cost of Accelerator Per Unit Fusion Power as a Function of Target Yield for Several Fusion Power Outputs and a Range of Target Spot Radii for Ion Mass 200 amu, charge state +1.

system is from 75° to 24°, and the normalized cost is based on the cost minimum of 4, 8, and 16 beamlets.¹⁶ The cost for the lower bound spot radius is minimized at 8 beamlets, as given in Table II. The cost for the upper bound spot size is minimized at 16 beamlets. The cost for the intermediate spot radius shown for the 1500 MW_f case is also minimized at 16 beamlets.

Table 2.1.II Accelerator Output Characteristics, Efficiencies and 1979\$ Costs for 300, 600, and 1200 MJ Target Yields and 3000 MW Fusion Power using 200 amu, q = +1 Ions.

$$\phi = 0.5 \text{ MV/m}; \sigma_0 = 75^\circ, \sigma = 24^\circ$$

$$\text{Initial Voltage} = 50 \text{ MV}; \text{Spot Radius} = 0.1 \text{ W}^{1/3} \text{ cm}$$

$$\text{Range} = R \text{ g/cm}^2$$

Yield, MJ	300	600	1200
Pulse Rep. Rate, hertz	10	5	2.5
Energy, (W) MJ	2.91	4.25	6.57
Gain (G)	103	141	183
$r^{3/2}R, 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-1/2} \text{ g}$	7.2	10.4	15.9
Normalized Emittance (ϵ_n), $\mu\text{m-r}$	7.15	8.65	10.8
Ion Kinetic Energy, (E_i), GeV	10.12	11.46	13.24
Cost, G\$			
Beamlets: 4	1.149	1.275	1.483
8	1.107	1.227	1.427
16	1.152	1.276	1.473
Efficiency, (η)%			
Beamlets: 4	21.2	21.5	21.6
8	22.7	24.6	26.2
16	20.7	23.0	25.3

For a given accelerator energy, costs tend to vary inversely with the final ion energy due to the increased beam charge for a fixed normalized transverse emittance and tune depression. Thus, the cost of the maximum spot radius should be more than that of the minimum spot radius because a lower ion kinetic energy is associated with the maximum spot radius. The increased normalized emittance associated with the maximum spot radius tends to reduce the cost differential between the maximum and the minimum spot radius.

However, the cost of acceleration of the lower ion kinetic energy (associated with the maximum radius) is more sensitive to the number of beamlets than that of the more energetic ions (associated with the minimum radius) for a fixed accelerator energy.

A final consideration of the analysis is the accelerator efficiency and ratio of fusion power to accelerator input power. For the minimum normalized cost shown in Figure 3, the lowest accelerator efficiency is about 22% ranging to a maximum of about 32%. The ratio of fusion power to accelerator input power (nG) ranges from 22 ranging to 52. This ratio is substantially greater than the minimum goal of 10 and the desired goal of 20 for inertial fusion.¹³

The costs given in Table 2.1-II and shown in Figure 2.2-3 can be reduced by increasing the charge state, increasing the undepressed tune, and decreasing the depressed tune limits. For example, the cost of the 4.25 MJ, 8 beamlet accelerator above 50 MV that produces 11.46 GeV ions can be reduced from 1.23 G\$ to 0.639 G\$ (1979\$) by increasing the ion charge state to +3, increasing the undepressed tune to 85°, and decreasing the depressed tune to 10.5° while increasing the number of beamlets to 16. From perveance considerations, this accelerator system will require at least 16 beams focussed on target. The cost can be decreased further to 0.514 G\$ by increasing the allowable vacuum surface flashover voltage gradient (ϕ) from 0.5 MV/m used above to 1.0 MV/m used in the Palaiseau Study⁹. The effect of these cost reduction techniques is to reduce the length of the accelerator above 50 MV from 10.7 to 2.23 km, and increase the efficiency from 24.6 to 34.5%. The somewhat longer front end (<50 MV) of the higher charge state option is more than offset by this large length reduction.

The cost of this accelerator can be further reduced from 0.514 to 0.483 G\$ by double pulsing a 2.125 MJ accelerator. However, the efficiency decreases from 34.5% to 20.8% using current technology. Complete reactor plant system studies^{17,18} have shown that the increased balance of plant costs due to the lower efficiency of double pulsing offsets the capital cost advantage of double pulsing.¹⁹

The increase in the charge state (q) of the ions may be made possible by the development of the metal vapor vacuum arc (MEVVA) source which produces large quantities of ions in a range of charge states for most metals.²⁰ The

higher charge state savings are due to the shortening of the accelerator, with savings in the quantity of cores and quadrupoles. Some of the cost savings may be used up by the increased number of beamlets, which scales as q^2 in the final focus to meet perveance constraints. These are discussed by Lee.^{21,22} For the case selected for this paper, the number of beamlets from perveance considerations in the final focus does not exceed the number of beamlets in the accelerator.

The increase of the undepressed tune to 85° is speculative. However, there is some experimental evidence that this value of undepressed tune may be achieved²² as discussed later in this paper.

The use of a vacuum surface flashover voltage gradient of 1 MV/m results in the high acceleration gradients of about 2 MV/m in the final regions of the driver. These high acceleration gradients are adventurous, and derived from the model used to estimate the enhancement of the flashover gradient at short pulse durations.

The use of multiple pulsing²³ to reduce the cost of the accelerator is most effective for ions with low kinetic energy. Cost savings of 30% can be realized with low kinetic energy (≈ 5 GeV) ions. A possible strategy for a low cost accelerator using low kinetic energy ions may be to use double pulsing coupled with a charge state of +2. This may ease the perveance conditions in the final focus and reduce the number of beamlets in the final focus elements to the target. Advances in tube technology may reduce the power consumption of the pulsers, which will increase the efficiency of the double pulsed accelerator.

Using the cost reduction strategy described above, three accelerators were analyzed using LIACEP to give target yields of 300, 600, and 1200 MJ using the minimum spot radius and the upper bound of the best estimate gain curve.²⁴ The fusion power, which is the product of fusion yield and pulse repetition frequency, was fixed at 3000 MW. The charge state +3, 200 amu ions are injected into the accelerator with a kinetic energy of 9 MeV. This low voltage section of the accelerator consists of 64 beamlets, using superconducting quadrupoles and amorphous iron cores. The transition ion kinetic energy ($q V_c$) for which it becomes cost effective to combine the 64 beamlets into 16 beamlets is the energy at which the total unit costs for the 64 beamlet system is equal to that of the 16 beamlet system. This transition ion energy is typically between 400 and 600 MeV for the cases considered.

The 64 beamlets are then combined into 16 beamlets, and accelerated to the desired final kinetic energy. The accelerator output characteristics are as shown in Table 2.1-II, and repeated in Table 2.1-III.

TABLE 2.1-III.

Accelerator Output Characteristics, Efficiencies and 1979 and 1985\$ Costs for 300, 600, and 1200 MJ Target Yields and 3000 MW Fusion Power using 200 amu, $q = +3$ Ions.

$$\phi = 1.0 \text{ MV/m}; \sigma_0 = 85^\circ$$

$$\text{Initial Voltage} = 3 \text{ MV}; \text{Spot Radius} = 0.1 \times W^{1/3} \text{ cm}$$

$$\text{Range} = R \text{ g/cm}^2; N = 16 \text{ beamlets, } V > V_c$$

Yield, MJ	300	600	1200
Energy, (W) MJ	2.91	4.25	6.57
Gain (G)	103	141	183
$r^{3/2}R, 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-1/2} \text{ g}$	7.15	8.65	10.8
Normalized Emittance (ϵ_n), $\mu\text{m-rad}$	6.79	8.21	10.2
Ion Kinetic Energy, (E_i), GeV	10.12	11.46	13.24
Pulse Repetition Frequency, hertz	10	5	2.5
64 Beamlet Cost to 50 MV, M\$ (1979)	108	124	162
64 to 16 beamlet transition voltage (V_c), MV	133	160	180
$\epsilon_n/\sigma, \mu\text{m-rad/degree, } V < V_c$	1.1	0.82	1.1
Depressed Tune (σ), $V > V_c$, degrees	7.5	10.5	10.0
Total Cost, M\$ (1979)	552	633	749
Total Cost, M\$ (1985)	715	788	911
Total Length, km	1.97	2.22	2.57
Total Efficiency (η)%	26.9	28.7	29.0
ηG	27.7	40.6	52.9

The undepressed tune σ_0 of 85° and the allowable vacuum surface flashover voltage gradient 1 MV/m are used for these accelerators. The depressed tune for each of the accelerators is given in Table 2.1-III.

The costs and performance of the accelerators to produce target yields of 300, 600, and 1200 MJ are given in Table 2.1-III for a fusion power of 3000 MW. The cost of the accelerator increases with the target yield, but the performance, measured as ηG (accelerator efficiency times target gain),

also increases, resulting in a lower recirculating power fraction to the accelerator. The costs of the low voltage (<50 MV) section are about 20% of the accelerator costs.

The unit costs (1979\$) per volt for a driver which will produce a target yield of 300 MJ are shown in Fig. 4 as a function of the ion energy. At low ion energies, the core costs dominate the total cost. At high ion energies, the structure (including insulators) and pulsers are the more costly units. Integrating the costs over the ion kinetic energy gives the total costs for the complete accelerator. The cumulative distribution of the costs of the elements of this accelerator is shown in Fig. 5 as a function of the ion kinetic energy. The core costs are about 33% of the total cost of the accelerator. The superconducting magnet costs represent about 23% of the total costs of the accelerator. The structure (including insulators) and the pulsers represent about 17 and 15%, respectively, of the total costs. These




Fig. 2.1-4. Distribution of the accelerator costs (1979 dollars per volt) as a function of ion kinetic energy for a 300 MJ target yield producing a fusion power of 3000 MW. The transition ion energy for 64 beamlets to 16 beamlets is 400 MeV (133 MV). The depressed tune is 7.5° above the transition ion energy.

cost percentages will change when the costs are in 1985\$, as discussed later in this paper.

The results for the low voltage section (<50 MV), as computed by LIACEP and shown in Fig. 4, are not very satisfactory. The cost differential between the 64 beamlet system and the 16 beamlet system is actually larger than currently calculated by LIACEP. This is due in part to not having a maximum velocity tilt ($\delta\beta/\beta$) limit in the code.²⁵ This limit on the tilt will increase the costs of the low voltage region of the accelerator where the beam length is long by forcing a lower acceleration rate and increasing the cost of the quadrupoles. The effect of the tilt limit will be more severe with the smaller number of beamlets than with the larger number of beamlets. The costs of the pulsers shown in Fig. 4 can be reduced by driving several modules with a single pulser in the region where the ion kinetic energy is less than 60 MeV. This could reduce the pulser cost per volt by




Fig. 2.1-5. Cumulative distribution of the accelerator costs (1979) dollars as a function of ion kinetic energy for a 300 MJ target yield producing a fusion power of 3000 MW. The transition ion kinetic energy for 64 beamlets to 16 beamlets is 400 MeV.

perhaps an order of magnitude in the low voltage (<20 MV) region. The LIACEP results show very low superconducting quadrupole fields in the low voltage section of the accelerator due to the constraint that their length to bore ratio must be greater than a minimum specified number. This constraint results in large beamlet diameters, with concomitant large quad and core costs. By relaxing this constraint, the depressed tune could be increased which will increase the quadrupole field and reduce the beamlet diameter, resulting in a reduction in the quad and core costs.²⁵ Also, the use of electrostatic quadrupoles in the low voltage region may decrease the costs.

The combining of 64 beamlets into 16 beamlets in space and time may result in a cost savings. This combination of beamlets will result in an increased emittance in the region with the smaller number of beamlets (or conversely, require a reduced emittance in the region with the larger number of beamlets). Thus, there is a maximum number of beamlet combinations that can be allowed that will give the required spot size on target with a given source brightness. In addition, the depressed tune should be held proportional to the emittance. The output emittance is determined from target considerations, and the depressed tune in the high voltage portion of the accelerator is selected to minimize the cost of this portion of the accelerator. The decrease in emittance in the low voltage section due to the combining of beamlets will require a reduction in the depressed tune to minimize the cost in this section. There may be a lower limit to the depressed tune before instabilities occur that may offset some of the cost advantages of combining beamlets.

Additional cost savings can be made by changing the depressed tune along the length of the accelerator. For the case of the 4.25 MJ driver given in Table 2.1-III, but with a vacuum surface flashover voltage gradient of 0.5 MV/m, with 16 beamlets and an initial ion energy of 150 MeV, the cost savings, by reducing the depressed tune from 10.5° to 8° for ion energies between 200 and 1500 MeV, was greater than 7 M\$.

Three accelerators using mass 133, charge state +2 ions were also analyzed to give target yields of 300, 600, and 1200 MJ using the minimum spot radius and the upper bound of the best estimate gain curve.²⁶ The fusion power was fixed at 3000 MW. The ions are injected into the accelerator with a kinetic energy of 6 MeV. The subsequent low voltage section of the accelerator consists of 64 beamlets, using superconducting

quadrupoles and amorphous iron cores as before. The transition ion kinetic energy for which it becomes cost effective to combine the 64 beamlets into 16 beamlets is the energy at which the total unit costs for the 64 beamlet system is equal to the 16 beamlet system. This transition ion kinetic energy (qV_c) is typically between 200 and 400 MeV for the 133 amu, charge state +2 ion cases considered. The 64 beamlets are then combined into 16 beamlets, and accelerated to the desired final kinetic energy. The accelerator output characteristics are as shown in Table 2.1-IV.

The undepressed tune (σ_0) of 85° and the allowable vacuum surface flashover voltage gradient (ϕ) of 1 MV/m is used for these accelerators. The depressed tune for each of the accelerators is given in Table 2.1-IV.

The costs and performance of the accelerators are given in Table 2.1-IV. The cost of the accelerator increases with the target yield, but the performance, measured as ηG (accelerator efficiency times target gain), also increases, resulting in a lower recirculating power fraction to the accelerator.

The costs of the accelerators given in Tables 2.1-II, III, and IV are for a mature technology in 1979 dollars. The cost estimate escalation factor for a typical major construction project at high energy physics laboratories with a cost distribution of 70% conventional construction and 30% technical components, from 1979 dollars to 1985 dollars, is 1.606. This cost escalation factor should not be applied across the board to the costs estimated by LIACEP for the following reasons.

The amorphous iron cores including both the material and fabrication were priced at \$8.81 per kilogram in 1979. These costs are still appropriate. The cost of the superconductor material and fabrication are the same in 1985 dollars on a per unit mass basis as they were in 1979 dollars, but the number of ampere-turns required has decreased by about 25%, resulting in an effective cost escalation factor of 0.75. The development of castable insulators has cut the cost of the brazed insulators in the structure by about an order of magnitude. The SSC cost estimates for tunneling of 4.0 k\$/m in 1985 dollars is about the same as the accelerator building costs used in LIACEP (5.1 k\$/m). However, the cost of stored energy has escalated from \$2.80 per Joule to about \$8.50 per Joule for long-lived capacitors.

Table 2.1.IV Accelerator Output Characteristics, Efficiencies and 1979 and 1985\$ Costs for 300, 600, and 1200 MJ Target Yields and 3000 MW Fusion Power using 133 amu, $q = +2$ Ions.
 $\phi = 1.0$ MV/m; $\sigma_0 = 85^\circ$

Initial Voltage = 3 MV; Spot Radius = $0.1 \times W^{1/3}$ cm
 Range = R g/cm²; $N = 16$ beamlets, $V > V_c$

Yield, MJ	300	600	1200
Energy, (W) MJ	2.91	4.25	6.57
Gain (G) 103	141	183	
$r^{3/2}R$, 10^3 cm ^{-1/2} g	7.2	10.4	15.9
Normalized Emittance (ϵ_n), $\mu\text{m-rad}$	6.79	8.21	10.2
Ion Kinetic Energy, (E_i), GeV	6.077	6.885	7.953
Pulse Repetition Frequency, hertz	10	5	2.5
64 to 16 beamlet transition voltage (V_c), MV	110	150	200
ϵ_n/σ , $\mu\text{m-rad/degree}$, $V < V_c$	1.1	0.82	1.1
Depressed Tune (σ), $V > V_c$, degrees	7.1	10.1	9.5
Total Cost, M\$ (1979)	545	635	757
Total Cost, M\$ (1985)	706	775	913
Total Length, km	1.77	2.16	2.40
Total Efficiency (η)%	27.6	31.6	29.8
η_G	28.7	44.6	54.5

A rough estimate of the escalation of the accelerator costs given in 1979 dollars to 1985 dollars is as follows:

1985 cores	≈	1979 cores
1985 quads	≈	1979 quads
1985 pulsers	≈	3. x (1979 pulsers)
1985 structure	≈	0.5 x (1979 structure)
1985 remainder	≈	1.606 x (1979 remainder).

These escalation costs may be higher than if the appropriate costs were placed in LIACEP because the costing algorithms in LIACEP are quite complex. The superconducting quadrupole cost escalation factor of 1. given above takes into account that the quads consist of more than superconductor. Likewise the cost escalation factor of 0.5 for the structure takes into account that the structure consists of more than insulator. The cost escalation factor of

3 for the pulsers does not take into consideration that the pulsers consist of more than energy storage, but does allow for a factor of 10 increase in repetition rate and total life.

The costs escalated to 1985\$ of the accelerators using mass 200, charge state +3 ions and mass 133, charge state +2 ions are given in Tables 2.1-III and 2.1-IV respectively.

The distribution of the accelerator costs using mass 133, charge state +2 ions is given in Table 2.1-IV in both 1979\$ and 1985\$ for a driver that will produce a target yield of 300 MJ and a fusion power of 3000 MW. For the driver optimized to 1979\$, the cores are the most expensive component followed by the superconducting quadrupoles. Escalating this design to 1985\$ results in the pulsers becoming the most expensive component followed by the core. If the driver design is optimized to 1985\$, the cost distribution and costs will differ from that shown in Table 2.1-V.

Table 2.1-V. Distribution of Accelerator Costs for a Driver Producing a Target Yield of 300 MJ and a Fusion Power of 3000 MW using 133 amu, $q = +2$ Ions.

<u>Basis Year</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1985</u>
Total Cost, M\$	545	706
Core, %	34.2	26.5
Structure, %	15.2	5.9
Pulsers, %	14.9	34.4
Quads, %	23.6	18.3
Remainder, %	12.1	14.9

The costs of the accelerators using 133 amu, charge state +2 ions are within 2% of those using 200 amu, charge state +3 ions for a given target yield. For all cases, the charge state to mass ratio was held constant. For a given target yield, the (depressed tune/normalized emittance) ratio was held constant. The difference in the cost and performance for a given target yield is due to the difference in the required ion kinetic energy (and hence, beam charge) of the two particle masses to satisfy the range requirement for the specified target yield.

The 1985\$ cost of the accelerator using 133 amu, charge state +2 ions optimized to 1979\$ costs is cheaper than that using 200 amu, charge state +3 ions for low target yields. However, the final transport costs of the lower mass, lower charge state ions may be greater than the higher mass, higher

charge state ions due to the increased number of beamlets on target required by the perveance limitation in the final focus.^{22,27} The required number of beamlets on target is about 33% greater for the 133 amu, +2 ions than for the 200 amu, +3 ions due to the difference in the required ion kinetic energy of the two particle masses to satisfy the range requirement for the specified target yield. The number of final transport beamlets of 200 amu, +3 ions on target is matched to the 16 beamlets in the high voltage end of the accelerator such that no beam splitting is required for the final transport to the target. The 16 beamlets of the 133 amu, +2 ions from the high voltage end of the accelerator may need to be split into a minimum of 22 beamlets, with a decrease in the beamlet emittance in the accelerator to preserve the spot radius on target. The decrease in the emittance may require a lower depressed tune in the accelerator to mitigate the impact of the lower emittance on the accelerator costs. If the depressed tune is reduced too far, stability problems may occur in beamlet transport.²⁸ An additional consideration is that the emittance increases due to excessive combining and/or splitting of the beamlets can lead to an unacceptable loss of beam brightness at the final focus.

The cost and performance of the accelerators to produce a given target yield using mass 133, charge state +2 ions is very close to that using mass 200, charge state +3 ions. The final focussing requirements for the mass 133, charge state +2 are more demanding than that for the mass 200, charge state +3 ions. Beamlet splitting may be required to satisfy the final focussing requirements for the driver using the mass 133, charge state +2 ions.

LIACEP Analysis of Selected HIFSA Project Code Sample Cases

The inertial fusion power plant systems analysis code ICCOMO was written by McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company for the HIFSA Project.²⁹ ICCOMO used curve fits to LIACEP calculations of the accelerator cost in 1979\$ and performance for the parameter space given in Table I. The LIACEP results for ion charge state +1, an undepressed tune (σ_0) of 60°, depressed tune (σ) of 24° and a vacuum voltage flashover gradient (ϕ) of 0.5 MV/m used in ICCOMO were multiplied by "appropriate" factors to account for the higher charge state, undepressed tune, voltage flashover gradient and lower depressed tune presently believed to be feasible, and the conversion to 1985 dollars.

Table 2.1-VI. Comparison of the Accelerator ($V > 50$ MV) with those used in ICCOMO for $A=130$ amu Ions.

Parameters	LIACEP	ICCOMO	
σ_0	85	60	
σ	8.5	24	
ϕ (MV/m)	1.0	0.5	
q	+3	+1	
N beamlets	16	16	
Case	1	15	16
Frequency, hertz	11	3	5
Ion kinetic energy, GeV	7	8	7
Total Energy, MJ	4.72	7.76	3.40
Normalized Emittance, $\mu\text{m-radians}$	11.3	11.7	9.38
Cost, M\$			
LIACEP (1979\$)	500	570	380
LIACEP (1985\$)	700	740	480
ICCOMO (1985\$)	727	840	614
Efficiency, %			
LIACEP	39.5	38.2	36.2
ICCOMO	41.2	32.3	35.5
Length, km			
LIACEP	1.61	1.99	1.51
ICCOMO	1.39	1.68	1.31

The cost and performance of the accelerators for three promising power plant systems were selected for verification by LIACEP of the curve fit and factors used in ICCOMO. The three cases represent a wide variation in the accelerator output energy and pulse repetition frequency. The output parameters of the accelerators for the three cases as well as their cost and performance are given in Table VI for the acceleration region above 50 MV. Three costs are given for each accelerator; the LIACEP computed cost in 1979 dollars, the LIACEP computed cost to 1985 dollars, and the cost generated by ICCOMO. These new results, when input into ICCOMO, should reduce the cost of electricity of the Case 15 and 16 inertial fusion power plants.

Accelerator Scaling Laws

The scaling laws for transportable current can be derived from a simple set of formulas relating transportable current to lattice properties which were originally derived by A. Maschke and presented by Courant². Since these serve as a good framework for the discussion of recent developments in high current transport they are rederived here. The continuous limit approximation for alternate gradient focussing is adopted here, but the more accurate expressions developed by Lee⁸ are used in LIACEP. Let σ_0 be the phase advance of a single ion trajectory (at low current) per lattice period of length (2L), η the lens occupancy factor, (B') or (E') is the focal field gradient, [B ρ] the particle's magnetic rigidity and v its velocity. Then we have approximately

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{\eta(B', E'/v)L^2}{[B\rho]} \quad (1)$$

The depressed tune (σ), which is the actual phase advance per period in the high current beam [mean edge radius (a) and electric current (I)], is given by

$$\sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2 - \frac{2I}{(\beta\gamma)^2[B\rho]} \left(4\pi\epsilon_0 c^2\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{2L}{a}\right)^2 \quad (2)$$

Normalized emittance ($\epsilon_n = \beta\gamma\epsilon$) is related to depressed tune and radius by

$$\epsilon_n = \beta\gamma \frac{\sigma}{2L} a^2 \quad (3)$$

In addition to these three relations we have the definitions

$$[B\rho] = \frac{\beta\gamma M c}{qe} \quad (4)$$

$$\beta\gamma = \left[\left(\frac{E}{Mc^2}\right)^2 + 2 \left(\frac{E}{Mc^2}\right) \right]^{1/2}$$

where $M = M_0 A$ is ion mass, M_0 is the atomic mass unit, q is charge state and E is kinetic energy. Values of β are generally less than about .33 for

conceptual drivers, so with $\leq 1\%$ error we set

$$\beta\gamma = \left(\frac{2 \text{ qeV}}{M_0 A c^2} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (5)$$

where V is the cumulative accelerating voltage experience by an ion. The magnetic field or electric potential of the quadrupoles, evaluated at the beam radius, are respectively

$$B = B'a < 3.0 \text{ T}, \quad (6)$$

$$\phi = E'a^2/2 < 50 \text{ kV}. \quad (7)$$

In the original treatments of high current transport equations (1)-(3) were solved for I , a , and L as functions of the other parameters; this gave for magnetic lenses:

$$I = (2.89 \text{ MA}) \left(1 - \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0} \right)^2 \right) \sigma_0^{2/3} (\beta\gamma)^{5/3} \left(\frac{A}{q} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{\sigma_0 \epsilon_n}{\sigma} \right)^{2/3} (\eta B)^{2/3}, \quad (8)$$

$$a = (2.32 \text{ m}) \sigma_0^{-1/3} (\beta\gamma)^{-1/3} \left(\frac{A}{q} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{\sigma_0 \epsilon_n}{\sigma} \right)^{2/3} (\eta B)^{-1/3}, \quad (9)$$

$$L = (2.68 \text{ m}) \sigma_0^{1/3} (\beta\gamma)^{1/3} \left(\frac{A}{q} \right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{\sigma_0 \epsilon_n}{\sigma} \right)^{1/3} (\eta B)^{-2/3} \quad (10)$$

with B given in Tesla, ϵ_n in meter-radians, and the tunes in radians.

In the earliest application of these formulas there was little sound basis for fixing the values of σ_0 and σ . The assumptions, $\sigma_0 \leq 90^\circ$ and $\sigma/\sigma_0 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ were made somewhat arbitrarily, although the factor $1/\sqrt{2}$ corresponds to the space-charge defocussing force being equal to one-half of the restoring force of the lenses. The current limit [Eq. (8)] does not apply in final focus, where the beamlets are expanded to large radii for the last 180° of phase advance before the reactor chamber is reached. However, it does apply, along with Eqs. (9) and (10) in the transport lines prior to finalfocus and the induction linac transport lattice. Developments relating to the use of these transport limits since 1976 are summarized here, and discussed in more detail later:

- a. Calculations based on a Kapchinskij-Vladmirskij model for the beam distribution strongly suggested in 1983 that the beam should be stable provided $\sigma/\sigma_0 \geq 0.4$ and $\sigma_0 \leq 60^\circ$.
- b. Measurements in the Single Beam Transport Experiment at LBLZ found no evidence of instability for $\sigma/\sigma_0 \geq .1$, thus broadening the window of available parameter space. Both experiment and simulation are in agreement; the latter shows that for a well-aligned beam there may be no lower limit to σ/σ_0 .

Heavy ion driver studies have for several years concentrated on the use of charge state $q = 1$ and the highest available mass ($A \geq 200$); however, it has been noted that increased charge state may be desirable in order to lower linac cost and length⁹. It is clear that increased q or decreased A decreases the final cumulative acceleration potential required to reach a final given ion velocity, but it is less clear, given the constraints of transportable current and range in the target, that this is a useful path to take. Examination of Eqs. (5)-(10) shows that increased q and decreased A are equivalent as regards transport for given V . The primary differences are in the availability of good sources and range in the target at fixed final velocity.

For ion range in the target the situation is clear: at $\beta \approx .3$ an ion of mass number $A = 100$ has about twice the range as an ion of mass number 200. Other things being equal the doubled range would halve the specific energy deposition, and to achieve equal target gain the spot radius would need to be decreased by approximately a factor of $\sqrt{2}$.

The only heavy ion sources available at present which can be readily adapted to driver requirements are the contact ionization of Cs and the Mercury vapor arc. However, the metal vapor vacuum arc (MEVVA),²⁰ which produces copious ions of high brightness in a range of charge states for all metals, is undergoing an impressive development and may be considered as a possible future driver source. The main problem in adaptation appears to be the removal of unwanted charge states from the pulse before introduction into the induction linac.

We assume here that the highest mass ions will be used because of their short range, and that charge state can be increased arbitrarily until some transport or focal limit is reached. If σ/σ_0 is small, so that the factor $[1-(\sigma/\sigma_0)^2]$ in Eq. (8) can be replaced by unity, then the following scale relations are found for $(\frac{q}{A}) \rightarrow (\frac{q}{A})'$:

At each value of voltage V , comparing beams of the same normalized emittance (ϵ_n) but differing charge state we have

$$\left(\frac{q}{A}\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{q}{A}\right)' = \alpha \left(\frac{q}{A}\right), \quad (11)$$

$$V \rightarrow V, a \rightarrow a, \eta B \rightarrow \eta B, \epsilon_n \rightarrow \epsilon_n, \sigma_0 \rightarrow \sigma_0,$$

$$I \rightarrow \alpha I, \tau_p \rightarrow \tau_p,$$

$$E \rightarrow \alpha E, \beta\gamma \rightarrow \alpha^{+1/2} \beta\gamma,$$

$$\sigma \rightarrow \alpha^{-3/4} \sigma, L \rightarrow \alpha^{-1/4} L,$$

$$\text{volt-sec/m} \rightarrow \text{volt-sec/m}.$$

The significance of this transformation is that the transported power is increased by the factor α at given V with very little change in the transport lattice. Only the half period has been decreased by the modest factor $\alpha^{-1/4}$. The big change is that the depressed tune σ is decreased by the factor $\alpha^{-3/4}$. A discussion of tune limits is given below.

There are many possible linac configurations for a given value of q ; the low cost optimum is found by LIACEP. One attractive possibility (not optimal) is found by simply applying the transformation [Eq. (11)] to a known configuration with $q = 1$, raising its charge to $q = \alpha$ and eliminating the high voltage portion of the linac so that the final kinetic energy is unchanged. This procedure is expected to yield incremental cost savings for the main portion of the linac of $\sim 28\%$ for each doubling of q , and in fact LIACEP verifies this approximate cost scale. This cost savings does not include the first 50 MV or the final transport and focus lines. The cost of these components will, in fact, increase with higher charge state, so that an optimum charge state can be established.

At low voltage ($V < 50$ MV) the current that can be conveniently transported with superconducting quadrupoles is low, and the use of electrostatic quadrupoles is preferred. Unfortunately, the scale law for increased charge state is not attractive for this form of transport. It is found that the electric line charge density per meter is limited by the value⁸

$$\lambda \lesssim \left(.6 \frac{\mu\text{C}}{\text{m}} \right) \frac{\phi(a)}{50 \text{ kV}} , \quad (12)$$

where we assume $\sigma_0 = 90^\circ$, $\sigma \ll \sigma_0$, and $\eta = 1/2$. Hence electric current increases only as $q^{1/2}$, and we are led to consider a large number of beamlets of small radius, which are merged for the magnetic transport lattice.

As mentioned, in the early work on transport limits Maschke adopted the values $\sigma_0 = 90^\circ$ and $\sigma/\sigma_0 = 1/\sqrt{2}$. In fact, it is not immediately apparent from Eqs. (8)-(10) that a higher allowed value of σ_0 and lower allowed σ will result in lowered accelerator costs since the beam radius is also increased as the current increases. If the half period is eliminated between Eqs. (1) and (2) we get the suggestive result for $\sigma \ll \sigma_0$

$$I = \frac{(\beta\gamma)^2}{8} 4\pi\epsilon_0 c^2 a \sigma_0 \eta B , \quad (13)$$

which shows current to be independent of σ and proportional to σ_0 for fixed a , η , and B . Hence it is good to raise σ_0 as high as possible. The corresponding value of depressed tune is given by

$$\sigma = \frac{2\epsilon_0 \eta}{a^{3/2}} \left(\frac{Mc\sigma_0}{\beta\gamma q e \eta B} \right)^{1/2} , \quad (14)$$

and a lower allowed value for σ permits either a lower normalized emittance or increased charge to mass ratio.

Since the work of Maschke there have been several developments in the understanding of tune limits, which now stand at the values $\sigma_0 \lesssim 80^\circ$,

$\sigma/\sigma_0 \gtrsim .1$; a brief summary of part of this work is given here:

- a. Analytical calculations³⁰ showed that the Kapchinskij-Vladimirskij (K-V) distribution of transverse phase space variables is unstable in stop bands depending on σ and σ_0 . Perturbations of order n in the radial coordinate are potentially unstable for $\sigma_0 > 180^\circ/n$. Simulation studies^{30,31} supported this point by demonstrating the onset of the third order and second order (envelope) modes with characteristic phase space distortions. To stabilize these modes the conditions $\sigma_0 \leq 60^\circ$, $\sigma \geq 24^\circ$ were adopted for driver studies during the period 1981-84.
- b. Simulation studies performed with realistic (non K-V) distributions [by I. Haber and C. Celata], have shown little evidence of unstable mode growth for $\sigma/\sigma_0 > .1$ and $\sigma_0 < 80^\circ$. The principal diagnostic is the growth of transverse emittance. This empirical result may be the consequence of the detuning effect of the slightly rounded charge profile of the non-KV distributions, which could damp modes higher than $n = 2$ (the envelope equations and $n = 2$ modes are nearly independent of distribution details).
- c. Recent simulation work²⁸ has considered the effects of both images and higher order focal multipoles which are always present to some degree. For large amplitude oscillations of the beam's centroid, the image forces are found to drive a coherent internal sextupole mode, resulting in emittance growth for $\sigma/\sigma_0 < .1$ and moderate values of σ_0 (60° - 72°). This effect can be largely cancelled by the addition of dodecapole elements of appropriate magnitude.
- d. High current transport experiments performed at LBL with a coasting 160 kV C_s^+ beam focussed by an electrostatic FODO lattice yield the result³² that for $\sigma_0 > 88^\circ$ no current loss or emittance growth could be detected for values of σ/σ_0 as low as 0.1. A phenomenological rule for stability is (M. Tiefenback):

$$\omega_p \leq \frac{1}{3} \omega_L, \quad (15)$$

where ω_p is the plasma frequency within the pulse and

$$\omega_L = \frac{2\pi\sigma_0 v}{2L} \quad (16)$$

is the lattice frequency. This condition may be written

$$\sigma_0^2 - \sigma^2 < (85^\circ)^2. \quad (17)$$

A plot of results from this experiment is given in Fig. (2.1-6) along with the stability boundaries predicted for the envelope mode. Finite beam emittance prevents experimental conclusion being made for very low tune values ($\sigma < 8^\circ$ at $\sigma_0 = 60^\circ$). Above σ_0 of 90° , instability is observed and this region is therefore not of interest for practical high-current linac design.

Accelerator Architecture

This study has focussed on single pass induction linear accelerators, with a small effort on multiple pulsing a single pass linac. Another architecture would feature the recirculation of the ion beam to make better use of and reduce the number of accelerator cores and quadrupole sets.²³ A recirculating induction linac would require a number of bending magnets between the acceleration zones. The field strength of these magnets would need to change after each time the beam was recirculated to compensate for increased stiffness with acceleration. Also, the pulsers for the induction cores would have to produce different voltage waveforms each time the beam was recirculated to compensate for the compression and bunching of the beams as they increase in energy through the accelerator. These difficulties can be overcome, but a recirculating induction linac system has not yet been analyzed.

Strategy for Introduction of HIF

The cost of a heavy ion induction linear accelerator for inertial fusion has decreased substantially with the prospect of higher charge state ion sources, higher undepressed tunes and lower depressed tunes. Indeed, if these prospects are substantiated in the laboratory, induction linear




Fig. 6. The experimental limits on beam stability in terms of the undepressed time (σ_0) and depressed tune (σ). Zones of predicted and observed instability are depicted in the (σ, σ_0) plane. The cross hatched area corresponds to the unstable envelope mode predicted for the KV distribution. Data points (except for those on the lower broken line) indicate the onset of emittance growth or disruption as σ_0 is increased, with the phenomenological fit $\omega_p = \omega_L/3$ given by the dotted line. The zone below the lower broken line is inaccessible due to the nonzero emittance of the SBTE beam. (Courtesy of M. Tiefenback)

accelerators using heavy ions may be economically competitive with photon drivers for driving inertial fusion reactions on a single pulse basis, as well as an inertial fusion electric power plant.

A Single Pulse Test Facility (otherwise called a Target Physics Demonstration Facility)^{3a} is the next step in the development and demonstration of the U.S. Inertial Confinement Fusion Program supported by the DOE Defense Programs. This facility, between 1 and 10 MJ, will be capable of both military and civilian applications experiments, in addition to target physics studies. Because of the higher efficiency of coupling the beam energy to a target by heavy ions relative to short wave photons, if a heavy ion driver were selected, it might require only about half the output energy on target as a laser.

The energy output of a given induction linac can be substantially increased by multiple pulsing, which has been demonstrated in the laboratory, where a sequence of pulses about 10 to 20 microseconds apart are produced. Thus, a heavy ion induction linac driver can double its output energy on target (at the cost of lowering the accelerator efficiency) by double pulsing, for only the incremental cost of the additional stored energy, fast pulsers to reset the cores between pulses, and the installation of beam delay lines between the final beam compression and bunching region and the target chamber. Since accelerator efficiency is not an issue in the early part of an ICF development scenario, a heavy ion 1 MJ induction linac can be used in a driver for the Single Pulse Test Facility (SPTF) to, for example, demonstrate target gain, and perhaps produce a target yield of about 40 MJ. This accelerator can be upgraded to a driver output of 2 MJ by double pulsing (which may produce a target yield of 150 MJ), or 4 MJ by quadrupole pulsing.

The pulse repetition frequency of the accelerator can be increased to 1 hertz, and a second target chamber can be built. This facility, which can be operated in parallel with the existing Single Pulse Test Facility using the same accelerator, can be used as an Engineering Test Facility (ETF) for evaluating materials, civilian reactor concepts, and components, as well as perform other missions requiring a fusion environment, and capable of being performed at a fusion power of 150 MW. This Engineering Test Facility will require the mass production of targets as well as a target injection system, and a heat removal system capable of handling about 200 MW.

For a modest cost, the accelerator can be upgraded to a pulse repetition

frequency of 3 hertz, and a third target chamber can be built based on the results from the SPTF and the ETF. This target chamber, which can, if desired, operate in parallel with the SPTF and the ETF, will be integrated into a complete, scaled, engineered electric production plant for the net production of electricity from inertial fusion. This facility, called the Experimental Power Reactor (EPR), will produce 300 MW of fusion power with a net electric power to a grid of 30 Mw_e if it is operating in parallel with the ETF, and 450 MW of fusion power with 120 MW_e net electric power if it is operating as a stand-alone machine.

The evolution of HIF facilities using the above strategy is given in Table VII, using 6.7 GeV, mass 200, charge state +3 ions with a normalized emittance of 4 μm -radians. The target gains are based on the Lindl-Mark curve¹⁴ of single-shell targets, using the lower bound target spot radius determined at 1 MJ of driver output energy. Increasing the driver output energy to 2 MJ will require that the target spot radius must be increased by about 50%, which can be done in the final optics.

The HIF development scenario given above may result in an attractive buy-in price for the driver portion of a Single Pulse Test Facility. Since this would be a first-of-a-kind device, we are unable to readily estimate its cost in 1985 dollars. However, percentage incremental costs for its extension as an ETF and EPR driver have been made. The upgrade incremental cost of the accelerator for use in an ETF is about 32%. This machine would simultaneously drive the SPTF and ETF. For an additional 3.5% incremental cost, which covers the upgrade to a higher rep rate, the HIF community will possess an accelerator that can drive SPTF, ETF and an EPR. Separate accelerators for all three facilities would cost 275% of the combined use

Table VII. Evolution of Facilities by Multiple-Pulsing an Induction Linac Driver Producing 1 MJ per Pulse in a HIF Development Scenario.

<u>Energy Output</u> <u>MJ</u>	<u>Pulses</u>	<u>Repetition Rate</u> <u>hertz</u>	<u>Fusion Power</u> <u>MW</u>	<u>Facility</u>
1	1	<1	<40	SPTF
2	2	<1	<150	SPTF
2	2	1	150	ETF
2	2	3	450	EPR

machine. It must be pointed out here that the additional transport lines and final focus magnets for these facilities will add a substantial and unknown cost, estimated roughly at 10% of the total for each facility.

Other accelerator upgrade scenarios can be constructed to implement the HIF development scenarios using multiple pulsing and taking advantage of the small cost of increasing the pulse repetition frequency of induction linear accelerators. The options, coupled with physical separability of the driver from the fusion reaction chamber intrinsic to inertial fusion could make possible a cost effective path to the operation of an Experimental Power Reactor based on inertial fusion using induction linacs as part of a heavy ion driver.

Conclusions

Recent advances in the technology and experimental results on key transport physics issues result in increased prospects for significantly reducing the cost of a linear induction accelerator using heavy ions as a driver for inertial fusion. These advances include a source that produces a substantial percentage of ions at a selected charge state greater than +1. The stability of a heavy ion beam in a transport lattice for a high undepressed tune with a low depressed tune has been demonstrated in the Single Beam Experiment. The acceleration of several parallel beamlets by a single core has been demonstrated in the Multiple Beam Experiment. Multiple pulsing of cores has been demonstrated. Other important issues such as combining beamlets in a matching section at the transition from electrostatic focussing to magnetic focussing, bending of space charge dominated beams, drift compression, and final focus physics, can be investigated in the proposed scaled driver experiment ILSE³⁴ for a relatively small cost.

The intrinsic advantage of inertial fusion that the driver is separable from the fusion reaction chamber can be utilized to operate several fusion reaction chambers from a common driver. This is possible by switching the driver beam to the various chambers in the time interval between beam pulses by using simple switching magnets. Because the incremental cost of increasing the pulse repetition frequency is small, and because the output heavy ion beam energy from a linear induction accelerator can be multiplied by multiple pulsing at a small fraction of the initial cost, a cost-effective

scenario for the development of inertial fusion is possible. This scenario would use a single heavy ion linear induction accelerator as a driver, with several upgrades, for a Single Pulse Test Facility to be used for target physics studies, as well as civilian and military applications, an Engineering Test Facility for testing materials and inertial fusion reactor concepts and subsystems, and an Inertial Fusion Experimental Power Reactor for studying issues in an integrated inertial fusion reactor facility with a net production of electrical power. These facilities would be constructed in series, but operated in parallel.

The use of energetic heavy ion beams from linear induction accelerators is a cost-effective, minimum risk way to proceed in the shortest time to commercial power from inertial fusion. A strategy includes the use of heavy ions from an induction linac for all the intermediate facilities between the current Nova/PBFA class of machines and a commercial fusion power plant. A scaled driver, such as ILSE, is necessary to address many of the driver physics issues that currently exist.

References

1. A. W. Maschke, "Relativistic Heavy Ions for Fusion Applications," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., NS-22, 3, p. 1825 (June 1975).
2. ERDA Summer Study of Heavy Ions for the Inertial Fusion, (R. O. Bangerter, W. B. Herrmannsfeldt, D. L. Judd, and L. Smith, editors), Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Report LBL-5543, Berkeley, CA (December 1976).
3. Proceedings of the Heavy Ion Workshop Held at Brookhaven National Laboratory-1977, (L. W. Smith, editor), Brookhaven National Laboratory Report BNL-50769, Upton, NY (1978).
4. B. Badger, et al., HIBALL-II, An Improved Conceptual Heavy Ion Beam Driven Fusion Reactor Study, Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe Report KFK 3840, Karlsruhe, FRG (July 1985).
5. T. Katayama, A. Itano, A. Noda, M. Takanaka, S. Yamada, and Y. Hirao, "Design Study of a Heavy Ion Fusion Driver, HIBLIC-I," Laser and Particle Beams, 3, Part 1, p. 9 (February, 1985) also Proc. 1984 INS Int. Symp. Heavy Ion Accelerators and their Application to Inertial fusion, p. 192, Institute for Nuclear Study, Tokyo, Japan (1984).
6. A. Faltens, E. Hoyer, D. Keefe, and L. J. Laslett, "Design/Cost Study of an Induction Linac for Heavy Ions for Pellet Fusion," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., NS-26, 3, p. 3106 (1979); also, LBL-8357.
7. A. Faltens, E. Hoyer, D. Keefe, and L. J. Laslett, "Status Report on the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Heavy Ion Fusion Program, Part I, A Design and Cost Procedure for Heavy-Ion Induction Linacs," Proceedings of the Heavy Ion Fusion Workshop held at Argonne National Laboratory-1978, (R. C. Arnold, editor), Argonne National Laboratory Report-79-41, Argonne, IL, p. 31 (1979).
8. E.P. Lee, T.J. Fessenden and L.J. Laslett, "Transportable Charge in a Periodic Alternating Gradient System," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., NS-32, No. 5, p. 2489 (October 1985); also, LBL-19560.
9. A. Faltens, E. Hoyer and D. Keefe, "A 3 Megajoule Heavy Ion Fusion Driver," Proc. 4th Int. Top. Conf. on High-Power Electron and Ion-Beam Research and Technology, Palaiseau, France (1981); also LBL-12409.
10. W.H. Kohl, Handbook of Materials and Techniques for Vacuum Devices, p. 596, Reinhold Publishing Co., New York (1967).
11. A. Faltens and S.S. Rosenblum, "Investigation of Re-X Glass Ceramic for Accelerator Insulating Columns," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., NS-32, No. 5, p. 3131 (October 1985); also, LBL-19526.
12. L. M. Waganer, D. S. Zuckerman, K. W. Billman, and W. W. Saylor, "Critical System Issues for an HIF Reactor," Proc. 11 Symp. on Fusion Engineering, Austin, TX (November, 1985).

13. M. J. Monsler, J. Hovingh, D. L. Cook, T. G. Frank, and G. A. Moses, "An Overview of Inertial Fusion Reactor Design," Nuclear Technology/Fusion, I, p. 302 (July 1981).
14. J. D. Lindl and J. W-K. Mark, "Recent Livermore Estimates on the Energy Gain of Cryogenic Single-Shell Ion Beam Targets," Lasers and Particle Beams, 3, Part 1, p. 37 (1985).
15. R.O. Bangerter, J. W-K. Mark, and A. R. Thiessen, "Heavy Ion Inertial Fusion: Initial Survey of Target Gain Versus Ion Beam Parameters," Phys. Lett. A, 88, p. 225 (1982).
16. J. Hovingh, V. O. Brady, A. Faltens, E. Hoyer, and E. P. Lee, "Cost/Performance Analysis of an Induction Linac Drive System for Inertial Fusion," Proc. 11th Symp. on Fusion Engr., p. 975, Austin, TX (Nov. 1985); LBL-20613.
17. L. M. Waganer, D. E. Driemeyer and D. S. Zuckerman, "Survey of System Options for Heavy Ion Fusion," Proceedings of the International Symposium on Heavy Ion Fusion, (p. 482), Washington, D.C. (May, 1986).
18. D. S. Zuckerman, D. E. Driemeyer, L. M. Waganer, J. Hovingh, E. P. Lee, and K. W. Billman, "Performance and Cost Modeling of a Linac-Driver HIF Power Plant," Proceedings of the International Symposium on Heavy Ion Fusion, (p. 489), Washington, D.C. (May, 1986).
19. D. E. Driemeyer, L. M. Waganer, and D. S. Zuckerman, "Influence of System Optimization Considerations on LIA Driver," Proceedings of the International Symposium on Heavy Ion Fusion, (p. 498), Washington, D.C. (May, 1986).
20. I. Brown, "An Intense Metal Ion Beam Source for Heavy Ion Fusion," Proceedings of the International Symposium on Heavy Ion Fusion, (p. 207), Washington, D.C. (May, 1986), also, LBL 21593.
21. E. P. Lee, "Accelerator and Final Focus Model for an Induction Linac Based HIF System Study," Proceedings of the International Symposium on Heavy Ion Fusion, (p. 461), Washington, D.C. (May, 1986) LBL-21346.
22. E. P. Lee, "Transport of Intense Ion Beams," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Charged Particle Optics, (to be published), Albuquerque, NM (May, 1986); also LBL-21559.
23. A. Faltens and D. Keefe, "Quasi-Static Drift-Tube Accelerating Structure for Low Speed Heavy Ions," Particle Accelerators, 8, p. 245 (1978); also LBL-7200.
24. J. Hovingh, V. O. Brady, A. Faltens, D. Keefe, and E. P. Lee, "The Cost of Induction Linac Drivers for Inertial Fusion for Various Target Yields," Proc. Int. Symp. on Heavy Ion Fusion, (p. 474), Washington, D.C. (May 1986); also LBL-21350.
25. A. Faltens and L. J. Laslett, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, private communication (May, 1986).

26. J. Hovingh, V. O. Brady, A. Faltens, and E. P. Lee, "A Comparison of the Design and Costs of Induction Linac Drivers for Inertial Fusion Using Ions of Mass 133 and 200," Fusion Technology, Vol. 10, No. 3, p. 1424 (November, 1986); also LBL-21826.
27. J. Hovingh, V. O. Brady, A. Faltens, and E. P. Lee, "A Comparison of the Design and Costs of Induction Linac Drivers for Inertial Fusion Using Ions of Differing Mass," Trans. Am. Nucl. Soc., 52, 289 (1986); also LBL-20979.
28. C. M. Celata, I. Haber, L. J. Laslett, L. Smith, and M. G. Tiefenback, "The Effects of Induced Charge at Boundaries on Transverse Dynamics of a Space-Charge-Dominated Beam," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., NS-32, No. 5, 2480 (1985); also LBL-19485.
29. D. S. Zuckerman, D. E. Driemeyer and L. M. Waganer, "A Systems Performance and Cost Model for Heavy Ion Fusion," Trans Am. Nuc. Soc., 52, p. 295 (1986).
30. I. Hofmann, L. J. Laslett, L. Smith and I. Haber, "Stability of the Kapchinskij-Vladimirskij (K-V) Distribution in Long Periodic Transport Systems," Particle Accelerators, 13, p. 145 (1983).
31. I. Hofmann, "Emittance Growth of Ion Beams with Space Charge," Nucl. Instr. and Methods., 187 P. 281 (1981).
32. M. G. Tiefenback and D. Keefe, "Measurements of Stability Limits for a Space-Charge-Dominated Ion Beam in a Long A.G. Transport Channel," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., NS-32, No. 5, 2483 (1985); also LBL-19647.
33. J. Blink. "Inertial Confinement Fusion Development Options: Facility Characteristics and Schedule from a Reactor Physics Viewpoint," Fusion Technology, 9, p. 381 (May, 1986).
34. T. J. Fessenden, et al., "Preliminary Design of a 10 MV Ion Accelerator for HIF Research," LBL-21194, (1986).

*LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720*