Target Activation and Radiological Response of ARIES-IFE Dry Wall Chamber

**L.A. El-Guebaly, D.L. Henderson,
P.P.H. Wilson, A.E. Abdou, ARIES Team**

April 2002

UWFDM-1178

FUSION TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

MADISON WISCONSIN

Target Activation and Radiological Response of
ARIES-IFE Dry Wall Chamber

L.A. El-Guebaly, D.L. Henderson, P.P.H. Wilson,
A.E. Abdou, ARIES Team

Fusion Technology Institute
University of Wisconsin
1500 Engineering Drive
Madison, WI 53706

April 2002

UWFDM-1178

Abstract

The choice of target coating and hohlraum wall materials is among the most critical decisions to be made for inertial fusion energy (IFE) designs. Gold and gold/gadolinium have long been considered to be the coating and hohlraum wall materials of choice for direct drive (DD) and indirect drive (ID) targets, respectively, offering high target performance and low beam energy losses. More recently, a variety of other materials have been considered, including W, Pb, Pt, Pd, and Ag for the DD target coating and Au, W, Pb, Hg, Ta, Cs, and Hf for the hohlraum wall of the ID target. The choice of the coating/hohlraum material is a tradeoff between the target design elements such as safety, target physics, economics, etc. We identified the key safety issues and have investigated the neutron-induced irradiation effects of the candidate coating/hohlraum materials using the radiation chamber conditions of the ARIES-IFE dry wall concept. The safety requirements have specific impacts in terms of the coating/hohlraum materials choice.

1. Introduction and General Overview

Recent developments have led to viable approaches for IFE power plants. Laser or heavy ion beams can be used directly or indirectly to drive DT targets that are repetitively injected into the chamber. In June 2000, the ARIES team established an assessment approach for IFE and investigated three types of chamber concepts, which are the dry wall, wetted wall, and thick liquid wall. Between 1975-1995, several concepts of each of these types have been proposed, but an integrated assessment by the multi-institution ARIES team was envisioned necessary at the present time. The ARIES approach is not to develop point designs, but instead establish credible design windows and examine critical issues in concert with potential laser and heavy ion beam (HIB) drivers and targets.

The first phase of the dry wall study is now complete[1,2] with particular emphasis on defining the design windows in key design areas. During this phase, a range of 160-400 MJ target yield served as the source of irradiation for the dry wall chamber. The radius of the solid first wall (FW) is in the 4-7 m range. The laser spherical shell targets[3] have a radius of 1.95 mm, containing the frozen DT fuel interior layer and are covered with a 300 Å thick coating. For the HIB driver,[4] a 15 µm thick hohlraum wall, having a 0.0085 cm^3 volume, surrounds the capsule. It is estimated that for a rep-rate of 6 Hz, approximately 190 million targets will be needed per year.   The more massive HIB hohlraums produce a substantial amount of heavy metal debris in the chamber, 20 tonnes of Au/Gd per year as compared to 5 kg/y for Au laser target coating.

The ARIES dry wall chamber employs the low activation SiC/SiC composites as the main structure and the $Li_{17}Pb_{83}$ eutectic as the coolant and breeder. The design allows the flexibility of installing a thin armor (2 mm) on the 1 cm thick FW to protect it against ablation by target x-rays and enhances its survivability. Based on neutronics calculations, a 45 cm thick blanket is sufficient to provide an overall tritium breeding ratio of 1.1. A burnup limit of 3% for the SiC/SiC structure has been adopted in the study. This translates into an end-of-life fluence of 21 MWy/m^2, meaning a neutron wall loading of 3.5 MW/m^2 would correspond to a FW lifetime of 6 full power years (FPY).

2. Main Issues and Concerns

The sequence of the activation process would begin with the insertion of the target at the center of a spherical or cylindrical chamber that is either empty or filled with a low pressure buffer gas. The multiple laser (or HI) beams focus on the target and initiate the DT fusion process, generating highly energetic ion debris, x and gamma rays, and neutrons. The coating/hohlraum debris interact with the source neutrons during burn and become radioactive, then travel through the cavity, and eventually condense on the solid wall in the absence or presence of a low pressure chamber buffer gas (< 0.5 torr). For high yield targets, the gas is essential to slow down the debris and mitigate the effect of the shock waves on the structure of the chamber. During the subsequent shots, the condensed materials on the wall get re-irradiated for several years, and then are disposed of with the FW and blanket at the end of their service lifetime. The accumulation of the radioactive target materials on the FW has prompted an interest in the issues regarding the waste management of the chamber structure plated with radioactive target debris. The motivation of this assessment is to identify technical issues and concerns related to the radiological response of the dry wall plated with radioactive target materials and to develop a list of recommended coating/hohlraum materials that would offer outstanding safety features under the ARIES-IFE operating conditions. This problem has not been addressed in past dry wall IFE designs that mainly emphasized the safety issues of bare structures without condensed materials. Among the candidate coatings (Au, W, Pb, Pt, Pd, Ag) and hohlraums (Au/Gd, Au, W, Pb, Hg, Ta, Cs, Hf), Au and Au/Gd are the materials of choice for laser

and HIB targets, respectively, based on target physics. However, the activation of materials and target physics are not the only issues that play an essential role in the choice of target materials for IFE power plants. Other considerations include:

- -- Target performance (instability, gain, etc.)
- -- Target fabrication (cryo-laying, T fill time, etc.)
- -- Target injection
- -- Target heating (emmissivity, reflectivity, etc.)
- -- Tritium retention/inventory/permeation
- -- Safety:
  - Radioactive waste:
    - + Waste disposal rating (high- or low-level waste)
    - + Volume of target waste
  - Offsite dose during in-chamber accident

3. Model Description and Assumptions

The activation problem of the target coating and hohlraum materials is more complex than that of the chamber components. The energetic source neutrons irradiate the target materials immediately after the shot. The target materials reach the chamber wall in a few microseconds, and then get re-irradiated by the softer FW neutron flux for up to 10^9 subsequent shots before the replacement of the FW due to radiation damage. The target materials keep accumulating over the 6 FPY FW lifetime, reaching a thickness of 8 μm for the laser target coatings (10^9 shots per 6 FPY x 1.4×10^{-6} cm^3 per target / FW surface area) and 5 cm for the more massive HIB hohlraum wall materials (10^9 shots per 6 FPY x 0.0085 cm^3 per target / FW surface area). It seems likely that the x-rays will melt most of the HIB hohlraum materials, leaving only ~1 mm sticking on the wall if the FW temperature remains below 1000°C. The molten materials would run down the FW, accumulate at the bottom of the chamber, and eventually be removed for disposal.

The irradiation history for the target coatings and hohlraums can be represented as a pulsed history with a single pulse using the target neutron flux and 10^9 pulses over the 6 FPY period using the lower and softer FW flux. This is a conservative approach because in the actual case, not all materials get re-irradiated for the entire 6 FPY lifetime of the FW. This results in slightly overestimated fluence-dependent responses such as the waste disposal rating (WDR). The model for the chamber structure is relatively simple. The activation responses for the FW and blanket are calculated using the 10^9 pulses over the 6 FPY period and the spatial distribution of the neutron flux. Both models explicitly include the effect of the 85% system availability. Note that the fluence-dependent WDR is not sensitive to the FW location as long as the material-dependent end-of-life (EOL) fluence remains fixed at 21 MWy/m^2. This means a larger chamber would call for a lower wall loading and a longer FW lifetime and will have a WDR comparable to the 4 m radius base case. A target yield of 160 MJ and a rep-rate of 6 Hz have been considered in this analysis. The upper value of 400 MJ will not alter the main conclusions of the analysis.

The activity and WDR were computed using the ALARA pulsed activation code[5] and the FENDL-2 175 neutron group transmutation cross section library. The neutron flux throughout the chamber was calculated with the DANTSYS[6] discrete ordinates transport code and the FENDL-2 175 neutron 42-gamma group coupled cross section library. The computational model included the essential components that influence the analysis, namely the W armor, FW, blanket, and shield. During operation, the coating and hohlraum wall materials will continue to accumulate on the armor,

Figure 1. Activity of gold as a function of time after shutdown for single irradiation with target flux (Curve I) and 6 FPY irradiation with FW flux (Curve II). Activity of bare SiC FW/Blanket included for comparison.

reaching a maximum thickness of 8 μm and 0.1 cm for the laser and HIB targets, respectively. Highly pure materials were assumed for the target.

As a top level requirement for the ARIES power plants, all components should meet both Fetter's and 10CFR61 NRC waste disposal limits for Class C low level waste.[7] A computed volume average WDR ≤ 1 at the end of a 100 year storage period means the component qualifies for shallow land burial as a low level waste. The WDRs reported herein are based on Fetter's limits, as they are more restrictive than the NRC's for all materials considered in this analysis.

4. Results

The main long-lived radionuclides contributing to the WDR of the W armor and SiC structure are ^{186m}Re and ^{26}Al, respectively. From the design standpoint, it seems desirable to integrate the FW with the blanket and in this case, the armor has a relatively small impact on the already low WDR of the SiC FW/blanket (0.017).

The specific activity for the Au coating condensed on the FW is displayed in Figure 1. We have done some work to characterize the importance of the exposure of the coating/hohlraum materials to a single shot with the high flux of the target (curve I) versus the extended irradiation (6 FPY) with the lower FW flux (curve II). We observed that during the short burn time (tens of picoseconds), the interaction of the target materials with the source neutrons results in the highest activity almost immediately at the shutdown of the machine. This activity is dominated by the short-lived radionuclides and within a few minutes the activity drops by nearly 3-5 orders of magnitude.

3

Table 1

Waste Disposal Ratings for Target Coatings and Hohlraum Wall Materials
Condensed on the SiC/SiC Structure of the ARIES-IFE Chamber

Coatings:		C/W/FW	C/W/FW/B
	---	0.24	0.04
Au	0.87 (^{194}Hg)	0.24	0.04
W	1.03 (^{186m}Re)	0.24	0.04
Pb	3.6 (^{208}Bi)	0.24	0.04
Pt	169 (^{192n}Ir)	0.35	0.05
Pd	4.6 x 10^3 (^{108m}Ag)	3.3	0.4
Ag	1.7 x 10^5 (^{108m}Ag)	114	12.4
Hohlraum Walls:		**H/W/FW**	**H/W/FW/B**
	---	0.24	0.04
Au/Gd (50:50)*	1.2 x 10^4 (^{158}Tb)	924	107
Au	0.87 (^{194}Hg)	0.28	0.043
Pb	3.6 (^{208}Bi)	0.5	0.068
Hg	0.4 (^{194}Hg)	0.25	0.04
Ta	0.06 (^{182}Hf)	0.22	0.04
W	1.03 (^{186m}Re)	0.3	0.045
Pb/Ta/Cs (45:20:35)	1.5 (^{208}Bi)	0.34	0.05
Hg/W/Cs (45:20:35)	0.26 (^{194}Hg, ^{186m}Re)	0.24	0.04
Pb/Hf (70:30)	2.9 (^{208}Bi)	0.44	0.06

* atom %

The activity of the target materials plated on the FW that have been re-irradiated during subsequent shots dominates the total activity at longer times after shutdown (> 10 min). This last process generates long-lived radioisotopes that are the dominant contributors to the WDR of the coating/hohlraum materials sticking on the FW. The other candidate coating/hohlraum materials exhibit similar behavior to Au as illustrated in Figures 2 and 3.

We have determined the WDR for the fully compacted waste at 100 y following shutdown, the end of institutional control at the disposal site. The volume average WDRs are summarized in Table 1 for the coatings (C) and hohlraum walls (H) only and for two other cases, which are C/H combined with W armor on a separate FW and C/H combined with a W/FW attached to the blanket. The main long-lived radionuclides contributing to the WDR are included between parentheses. These radionuclides have well-defined primary production pathways beginning with the original isotopes[2]. One notes immediately that the gold plated FW qualifies as Class C low level waste. The silver and gadolinium generate high level waste (WDR >>1) even when the WDR is averaged over the entire FW/blanket. Of interest is that even very thin layers of 1 µm Ag and 10 µm Gd on the FW cause waste disposal problems. Admittedly, it is feasible to separate the small amount of ^{108m}Ag and ^{158}Tb radioisotopes from the waste stream and dispose of them as high level waste. However, the high cost of the isotopic separation process could be prohibitive. If palladium is the preferred coating for laser

Figure 2. Activity of coating materials as a function of time after shutdown.


Figure 3. Activity of hohlraum wall materials as a function of time after shutdown.

targets, the palladium plated FW and blanket should be disposed of as a single unit to meet the Class C waste requirement.

To understand the tradeoff between the hohlraum materials and target performance, Meier and Callahan-Miller (LLNL) examined the sensitivity of the conventional and close-coupled target parameters to the hohlraum wall materials of the HIB system. There are three considerations for the hohlraum wall materials: the energy loss to the ion beam, the driver energy/cost, and the incremental change in the cost of electricity (COE). From the physics and design standpoint, a combination of Pb/Ta/Cs can have an energy loss almost as low as the Au/Gd. Both mixtures possess salient properties of high opacity and low heat capacity, offering the lowest energy loss, driver cost, and COE. However, the neutron-induced radioactivity of Gd is excessive to the extent that even an extremely thin layer of 10 μm Au/Gd condensed on the dry wall will inhibit the disposition of the chamber structure as low level waste. This comparison suggests that other combinations of materials can work nearly as well as Au/Gd. In particular, the Hg/W/Cs and Pb/Hf mixtures have 4% higher losses and an insignificant cost penalty. Single materials would also offer attractive safety features and result in a reasonable 3-5% increase in COE.

5. Conclusions

We have evaluated the targets of ARIES laser and HIB inertial fusion designs from the safety perspective. The list of target coatings and hohlraum materials includes Au, Gd, W, Pb, Pt, Pd, Ag, Hg, Ta, Cs, and Hf. Unless stopped, then pumped out with the chamber buffer gas, these materials will condense on the first wall and change the attractive safety features of the low activation SiC/SiC composites employed for the ARIES-IFE chamber. We have shown that the gold plated first wall would qualify as Class C low level waste. If palladium is the preferred coating for laser targets, the palladium plated FW and blanket should be disposed of as a single unit to meet the Class C waste requirement. Only silver and gadolinium generate high level wastes, considering a realistic thickness on the dry wall exceeding one and ten microns, respectively. On this basis, we recommend excluding the silver and gadolinium from the list since other materials can work nearly as well, then select the best material(s) based on considerations other than WDR and take a small penalty in the economics if necessary. Other design issues such as target fabrication/instability/gain, tritium retention, tritium fill time, and offsite dose during an accident may further limit the coating/hohlraum materials choice. The merits and additional cost associated with the exclusion of some materials should be evaluated with the perspective that the incremental change in COE is only 5% or less.

References

[1] R. Raffray, R. Peterson, M. Billone, L. El-Guebaly, et al., "Assessment of IFE Dry Chamber Wall," to be published in *Fusion Engineering and Design*.

[2] L.A. El-Guebaly, D.L. Henderson, P.P.H. Wilson, and A.E. Abdou, "Activation of Target Coatings/Hohlraums and Influence on Waste Management of IFE Chambers," University of Wisconsin Fusion Technology Institute Report, UWFDM-1154 (2001).

[3] S.E. Bodner et al., "New High Gain Target Design for a Laser Fusion Power Plant," Proceedings from the IAEA Technical Meeting on Physics and Technology of Inertial Fusion Energy and Chambers, June 7, 2000, Madrid, Spain.

[4] D. Callahan-Miller and M. Tabak, "Progress in Physics and Design of Heavy Ion Fusion," Physics of Plasma, Vol. 7, No. 5 (May 2000) 2083-2091.

[5] P. Wilson and D. Henderson, "ALARA: Analytic and Laplacian Adaptive Radioactivity Analysis Code Technical Manual," University of Wisconsin Fusion Technology Institute, UWFDM-1070, January 1998.

[6] "DANTSYS: A Fusion Accelerated Neutral Particle Transport Code System," Los Alamos National Laboratory Report, LA-12969-M (June 1995).

[7] D. Henderson, L. El-Guebaly, P. Wilson, and A. Abdou, "Activation, Decay Heat, and Waste Disposal Analysis for ARIES-AT Power Plant," *Fusion Technology*, Vol. 39, No. 21, Part 2 (March 2001) 444-448.