Scaled Accelerator Test For the DARHT-II Downstream Transport System[*]

**Yu-Jiuan Chen[ξ], Donald T. Blackfield, George J. Caporaso, Gary Guethlein,
James F. McCarrick, Authur C. Paul, James A. Watson, John T. Weir**

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P. O. Box 808, L-645
Livermore, California, U. S. A.

Abstract

The second axis of the Dual Axial radiography Hydrodynamic Test (DARHT-II) facility at LANL is currently in the commissioning phase[1]. The beam parameters for the DARHT-II machine will be nominally 17 MeV, 2 kA and 1.6 μs. This makes the DARHT-II downstream system the first system ever designed to transport a high current, high energy and long pulse beam [2]. We will test these physics issues of the downstream transport system on a scaled DARHT-II accelerator with a 7.8-MeV and 950-A beam at LANL before commissioning the machine at its full energy and current. The scaling laws for various physics concerns and the beam parameters selection are discussed in this paper.

I. INTRODUCTION

The DARHT-II downstream system, shown in Fig.1, consists of a diagnostic beam stop, a fast high-precision kicker system [3] and the x-ray converter target assembly [2], [4]. The kicker is used to select 1-4 short pulses out of the long beam pulse provided by the accelerator and to send them to the x-ray target. The beam line can be divided into the long pulse region and the short pulse region. Both these sections are mainly long drift sections. The nominal beam pulse length in the approximately 9-m transport line upstream of the quadrupole septum and in the main beam dump line is 1.6 μs. The selected short beam pulses will be delivered to an x-ray converter target through the target line, which is also about 9 m.

There are several concerns, such as ion-hose instability, transverse resistive wall instability and background gas focusing regarding transporting a 1.6-μs and 2-kA beam pulse and a train of short 2-kA pulses over a 1.6-μs period in these two long drift sections. At the converter target region, maintaining the time integrated x-ray spot size in the presence of backstreaming ions is also an issue. Confining hydro-expansion of target material long enough for all four beam pulses to generate the required X-ray dose is another challenge. Finally, the x-ray spot sizes for all pulses need to meet radiography requirements even though

the high intensity beam pulses would interact with the time-evolving target plasma. Many of these issues had been studied on the 5-MeV, 2-kA, 60-ns Experimental Test Accelerator II (ETA-II) [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]. However, ETA-II is a single pulse machine and cannot address long pulse and multiple pulse issues. Since the DARHT-II downstream system is the first system ever designed to transport a high current, high energy and long pulse beam, we will test these physics issues of the downstream transport system on a scaled DARHT-II accelerator with a 7.8-MeV and 950-A beam at LANL before commissioning the machine at its full energy and current.


Figure 1. DARHT-II Downstream System

II. PHYSICS ISSUES

A. Background Gas

The beam electrons will ionize background gas as it propagates in the machine. The resulting ion population increases linearly with background pressure P and with beam time τ until it reaches saturation level. In the envelope equation, the focusing term of these background ions at a given beam time is linearly proportional to $(I/I_o\gamma\beta)P\tau$, where I is the beam current, I_o is the Alfven current (17 kA), and $\gamma\beta$ is the Lorentz factor. The 2 kA and 1.6 μs DARHT-II beam could experience significant different background focusing forces at the head and at the tail if the system's background pressure is high. The average vacuum in the DARHT-II downstream system is designed to be less than 10^{-7} torr. For the nominal beam in

---

[ξ] email: yjchen@llnl.gov

Report Documentation Page

1. REPORT DATE **JUN 2005**	2. REPORT TYPE **N/A**	3. DATES COVERED **-**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **Scaled Accelerator Test For the DARHT-II Downstream Transport System**	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P. O. Box 808, L-645 Livermore, California, U. S. A.**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES
See also ADM002371. 2013 IEEE Pulsed Power Conference, Digest of Technical Papers 1976-2013, and Abstracts of the 2013 IEEE International Conference on Plasma Science. IEEE International Pulsed Power Conference (19th). Held in San Francisco, CA on 16-21 June 2013.

14. ABSTRACT
The second axis of the Dual Axial radiography Hydrodynamic Test (DARHT-II) facility at LANL is currently in the commissioning phase[1]. The beam parameters for the DARHT-II machine will be nominally 17 MeV, 2 kA and 1.6 ìs. This makes the DARHT-II downstream system the first system ever designed to transport a high current, high energy and long pulse beam [2]. We will test these physics issues of the downstream transport system on a scaled DARHT-II accelerator with a 7.8-MeV and 950-A beam at LANL before commissioning the machine at its full energy and current. The scaling laws for various physics concerns and the beam parameters selection are discussed in this paper.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT **SAR**	18. NUMBER OF PAGES **4**	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**			

the designed 1.25×10^{-7} torr vacuum with the head of beam tuned to have a round spot at the converter target, Figure 2 shows that there is some spot size growth from the beam head to the beam tail and the beam tail is slightly elliptical. The beam ellipticity is defined as $|x-y|/(x+y)$. A similar conclusion is given in Ref. [10]. These head to tail variations are quite acceptable. Also, we can use a tune, which makes the middle of the beam pulse round instead of the head of the beam round, to minimize the beam ellipticity. Generally, for radiography analysis, an x-ray source with $\pm15\%$ ellipticity is acceptable which sets the maximum acceptable background pressure at 6×10^{-7} torr. If the beam spot is very elliptical at the target, time varying magnets, such as single coil magnets, can be used in the long pulse region to compensate for the time varying background gas focusing forces and to ensure the beam envelope the same through the entire pulse before entering the quadrupole septum system.


Figure 2. The horizontal and vertical beam sizes and beam ellipticity at the converter target as functions of gas pressure times beam time.

Since the nominal DARHT-II beam has a long beam head, the downstream transport line is designed to have a large beam acceptance. There will still be beam loss from the beam head between the accelerator exit and the kicker entrance. The charge density deposited on the wall in this area is on the order of nC/cm^2 [10]. There will also be beam loss in the septum area during the kicker switching. The deposited charge density on the wall in the septum area is on the order of $\mu C/cm^2$ [10]. In addition, electrons deposited on the dump will raise the dump's graphite temperature approximately by $100^{\circ}C$. These losses may lead to beam stimulated desorption, which provides unwanted time varying focusing on the beam. Our PIC simulations with background gas pressure raised locally in the dump line indicate that background gas may pinch the beam and increase heat load on the dump. Since there is no existing data on beam stimulated desorption for electrons in 10 – 20 MeV range, we need to test the system before the final commissioning at 17-MeV. To observe the same background gas focusing effect on the beam envelope, $I/\gamma\beta$ should be kept constant.

The ion hose instability on a long pulse, high current beam in a long drift could be an issue potentially. Fortunately, the DARHT-II beam's large envelope variation shown in Figure 3 detunes the ion hose instability

[2]. For the nominal design vacuum, our PIC simulations indicate that the peak of power spectrum at the instability's frequency only grows by a factor of 2 in the downstream system while other frequency components are damped. PIC simulations with raised pressure localized in the dump line give a modest growth of a factor of 66 in the peak of the power spectrum for 10^{-6} torr and a large growth of 54000 at 5×10^{-6} torr. The acceleration on the electron beam centroid provided by the ion channel is also proportional $(I/I_o\gamma\beta)P\tau$. Therefore, a similar ion channel effects on the beam centroid can be studied by keeping $I/\gamma\beta$ constant.


Figure 3. Beam envelope in the DARHT-II transport line from the accelerator exit to the target

B. *Return Current and Image Charges*

The return current in a resistive wall dissipates into the wall with time and lets a transversely displaced beam see a time varying dipole force. While this time varying dipole force is usually not a concern for a short pulse, it could potentially threaten the quality of the long pulse, high current beam in a long drift. The DARHT-II transport system with 70% of beam line made out of large radii aluminum pipes is designed to minimize the transverse resistive wall instability. Figure 4 shows that this instability should not be an issue for DARHT-II and that the estimated instability gains for both regions are only about 1.5 -1.6.

Another concern is the beam induced kicker steering. The nonuniform distribution of the return current and image charges along the kicker introduced by an offset beam excites the kicker cavity. The offset beam also excites the kicker cavity while it passes through the kicker gap at the downstream size of the kicker box. The backward propagating slow wave will then kick the beam. Theory and simulations indicate that the beam's displacement is amplified initially and then stays constant roughly after 3 times of kicker transit time, when these two kicking mechanisms eventually cancel out each other's steering effects. We have tested a scaled kicker box with the 60ns ETA-II beam to examine the beam induced steering. The scaled kicker box's critical current is about 4.3 kA, which is much smaller than that of the DARHT-II kicker, and its round-trip transit time of the kicker structure is about 10.6 ns, which is the predicted time scaled for reaching the asymptotic value of kicker induced [12]. There

was no observable beam induced steering on the 60ns ETA-II beam. Nevertheless, a test with a long pulse beam is needed to confirm predictions of the theory and simulations. The acceleration on the electron beam centroid provided by the image forces for both transverse resistive wall instability and beam induced kicker steering is proportional $I/I_o\gamma\beta$.


Figure 4. Amplifications of an initial beam offset caused by the transverse resistive wall instability for various aluminum and stainless steel combinations for (a) the 1.6-μs beam transporting from the accelerator exit to the quadrupole septum and (b) the 4 short pulses traveling from the septum exit to the x-ray converter.

C. X-ray Converter Target

The strong electric field of the high current and high intensity electron beam may pull ions upstream from the desorbed gas at the target surface or from a pre-existing target plasma plume created by preceding pulses. To minimize the time varying focusing effects of those backstreaming ions on the beam spot size on the target, a foil is used as a barrier [13] to confine the ion channel within the disruption length, given as

$$L_D \approx a\sqrt{\pi\gamma\beta^2 I_o\Big/f_i I} \quad , \qquad (1)$$

which is the length of the ion channel needed to make the beam over pinched and rebound back to its original beam size. Success of the foil-barrier scheme depends on the foil's ability to sustain impact of 1-4 high current pulses over 1.6 μs and its inability to become a new backstreaming ion source at its upstream side. To ensure survivability of the foil, the foil material and the beam spot size on the foil must be chosen carefully, and other mitigation methods need to be used to prevent ions from backstreaming from the foil front surface.

In order to minimize the target hydro-expansion over 1.6 μs, the deposited energy density in the x-ray converter material is reduced by distributing the target over a distance [14]. Using the radiation hydrodynamics code, LASNEX, our modeling indicates that there is enough material to generate four x-ray pulses over 1.6 μs with the required doses. The foil-barrier scheme with other mitigations and the target hydro confinement of distributed targets have been demonstrated successfully on the ETA-II/SNOWTRON double pulse facility, However, due to complexity of the target physics and the ETA-II beam being shorter than some of the DARHT-II short pulses, how well the DARHT-II target scheme will work on the multi-pulse DARHT-II is still uncertain.

Table 1. List of physics concerns for the DARHT-II downstream systems and their scaling

Issues	ETA-II test	Remaining issues	Scaling
Transport and kicker			
Kicker operation and control	√	4 pulses 1.6μs	none
Gas desorption	√	4 pulses 1.6μs	$In_p\tau_{sw}$
Beam induced kicker steering	√	1.6μs	$I/\gamma\beta$
Background gas focusing		1.6μs	$I/\gamma\beta$
Ion hose instability		1.6μs	$IP/\gamma\beta$
Resistive wall instability		1.6μs	$I/\gamma\beta$
Spot dilution due to kicker switching	√	none	none
Target			
Backstreaming ions	√	4 pulses 1.6μs	$I/\gamma\beta$
Foil-barrier survivability	√	4 pulses 1.6μs	$I\tau_{total}/a^2$
Target confinement	√	1.6μs	$I\tau_{total}/a^2$

III. SCALED ACCELERATOR

Many of the issues discussed earlier have been studied on the 5-MeV, 2-kA, 60-ns (with 40-ns flattop for $\delta\gamma/\gamma = \pm 1\%$) Experimental Test Accelerator II (ETA-II) [5], [6], [7], [8], [9] as shown by the check marks in Table 1. However, ETA-II is a single short pulse machine and cannot address issues specially concerning long pulse and multiple pulses. Since the DARHT-II downstream system is the first system ever designed to transport a high current, high energy and long pulse beam, the remaining issues need to be studied on DARHT-II. Instead of waiting to learn about these physics concerns after completion of all the accelerator cells, we will test them on a scaled DARHT-II accelerator with a lower energy and current since most of these physics issues scale with $I/\gamma\beta$. The DARHT-II transport hardware has

recently been tested on ETA-II [9]. To take the advantage of the tuning experience gained from the ETA-II's DARHT-II transport experiment, the scaled DARHT-II accelerator's beam parameters, 7.8-MeV and 950-A, are chosen to be close to the ETA-II DARHT-II transport experiment's parameters while $I/\gamma\beta$ is kept about the same value as that for the full energy machine.

To achieve the same amount of beam simulated gas desorption on the scaled DARHT-II accelerator, we will compensate for having a lower current hitting the septum wall either by slowing down the kicker switch time or by increasing the number of times that the beam is being kicked. To observe similar background gas focusing effects in the dump line, we will raise the background pressure in the dump to compensate for having the lower current dumped in the dump. We will keep the beam envelope on the scaled accelerator similar to that on the 17-MeV machine, shown in Figure 3, to exam the envelope variation's detuning effects on the ion hose instability.

As discussed earlier, keeping $I/\gamma\beta$ and the beam envelope in the target area constant makes the length of the backstreaming ion channel or the target plasma channel needed to disrupt the beam spot size the same. Since the backstreaming ions are born on the target surface and pulled of from the target surface by the beam current's space charge forces, their backstreaming velocities are proportional to $I^{1/2}$. Therefore, ions will take a longer time to form such channel on the scaled accelerator. If the beam envelope is the same, to simulate how backstreaming ions change the DARHT-II beam spot size, the short beam pulse lengths on the scale experiment should increase with $I^{-1/2}$. The total energies deposited by electrons on the foil-barrier and x-ray converter target determine their survivability and confinement. Assuming that the beam envelopes for all pulses will stay the same over their durations via some spot control mitigation techniques, we will extend all the short pulses by a factor of $1/I$ to deposit the same amounts of energy on the foil and the x-ray converter.

IV.   SUMMARY

The DARHT-II downstream system will be the first system to transport a long pulse, high energy and high current electron beam, and the first system to deliver four selected 10-100 ns beam pulses to a novel, static x-ray converter target to produce high quality x-ray pulses for flash radiography. The physics concerns regarding the long pulse and multiple-pulse issues need to be tested using a long pulse machine. We will test these physics issues of the downstream transport system on a scaled DARHT-II accelerator with a 7.8-MeV and 950-A beam at LANL before commissioning the machine at its full energy and current.

V. REFERENCES

[1] R. D. Scarpetti, et. al., "Status of the DARHT 2nd Axis at Los Alamos National Laboratory" *Proc. Of Pulsed Power Conf.*, Monterey, CA, June 13-17, 2005.

[2] Y.-J. Chen, *et al*. "Downstream System for the Second Axis of the DARHT Facility", 2002 Linear Accelerator Conference, 21st International LINAC Conference (Gyeongju, South Korea, August 2002), *Proceedings of the 2002 Linear Acceleratory Conference,* **,** pp (2004).

[3] Y. J. Chen, et. al., " Precision Fast Kickers for Kiloampere Electron Beams", *Proc. Of the 1999 IEEE PAC*, New York, NY, March 27 – April 2, 2002, p. 627.

[4] D. D.-M. Ho, et. al., "Hydrodynamic Modeling of a Multi-Pulse X-Ray Converter Target for DARHT-II", LLNL Report. UCRL-JC-1442, July 26, 2001.

[5] B. S. Lee, et. al., "Solid-State Modulated Kicker Pulser", *Proc. of the 2002 IEEE Power Modulator Conference*, Hollywood, CA July 1-3, 2002.

[6] J. A. Watson, et. al., "Control System for the LLNL Kicker Pulse Generator", *Proc. of the 2002 IEEE Power Modulator Conference*, Hollywood, CA July 1-3, 2002.

[7] Y.-J. Chen, et. al., "Eliminating the Spot Dilution due to Kicker Switching in DARHT-II", 2003 IEEE Particle Accelerator Conference (Portland, OR, May 2003), *2003 IEEE Particle Accelerator Conference Proceedings,* pp (2003).

[8] Y.-J. Chen, *et al*. "Beam Physics in X-Ray Radiography Facility", Recent Progress in Induction accelerator Workshop (Tsukuba, Japan, October 2002), *Proc. of Recent Progress in Induction accelerator Workshop,* KEK Rpt # 2002-30**,** pp 167-173 (2003).

[9] J. Weir, et. al., "DARHT II Scaled Accelerator Tests on the ETAII Accelerator", *Proc. Of Pulsed Power Conf.*, Monterey, CA, June 13-17, 2005.

[10] B. R. Poole and Y.-J. Chen, "Particle Simulations of DARHT-II Transport System", *Proc. of the 2001 IEEE PAC*, Chicago. IL, June 18-22, 2001, p. 3299.

[11] K. Chan, "Ion Effects in the DARHT-II Downstream Transport", *Proc. Of Pulsed Power Conf.*, Monterey, CA, June 13-17, 2005.

[12] B. R. Poole, et. Al., "Beam Coupling Impedance of Fast Stripline Beam Kickers", *Proc. of*

[13] T. P. Hughes, "Target Calculations for ITS Short-Focus Experiment", MRC/ABQ-N-589, September 1997.

[14] P. A. Pincosy, et. Al., "Multiple pulse electron beam converter design for high power radiography", *Review of Scientific Instruments*, **72,** 2599-2604 (2001).