Accelerator Driven Nuclear Energy - The Thorium Option

Rajendran Raja
Fermilab
“Fact finding mission”

• Will briefly review the world energy situation
• Global warming - Inconvenient truth - Why this approach may be timely
• Nuclear reactors -101
  » Uranium 235 Fission reactors
    • Pressurised water reactors
    • CANDU Heavy water reactors
  » Fast Breeder Reactors
  » Problems -
    • Fuel enrichment
    • Nuclear Waste Storage
• Accelerator supplying neutrons is an old idea. 1948 fear of uranium shortage - MTA accelerator project started to produce fissile material from U238 (0.25Amps of deuterons).
• Accelerator Driven Breeder reactors (C.Rubbia et al-1993-1997)
  » Thorium option
  » Uranium 238 Option
  » Advantages in fuel availability, efficiency and waste storage
• Needs a 1 GeV 10-20 MegaWatt accelerator
  » May be doable with SCRF.
  » Challenging accelerator R&D. May appeal to FN Accelerator L.
• Discuss physics that can be done with such a machine.
U.S. Energy Consumption by Fuel, 1970-2025
(quadrillion Btu)

Source-Talk given by Guy Caruso, Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Center for Energy Studies
Industry Associates, Baton Rouge, LA (2005.)
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U.S. Petroleum Production, Consumption, and Net Imports, 1970-2025 (million barrels per day)
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World Marketed Energy Consumption by Region, 1970-2025
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KEY Findings of DoE’s Energy Information Administration

- In the short-term, tight markets and political tensions keep world oil prices high.
- Through 2025, oil remains the dominant source of worldwide energy use with 39 percent of total energy demand.
- Both domestically and internationally, natural gas demand will expand rapidly.
- The United States and developing Asia, including China, account for 60 percent of the growth in world oil demand in the mid-term.
- Transportation will account for much of the growth in oil use in the industrialized world; in the developing world, oil demand grows in all end-use sectors.
- The United States will rely on imports for 68 percent of its oil requirements in 2025.
- U.S. dependence on Persian Gulf OPEC will increase, but other OPEC and non-OPEC producers will remain important U.S. suppliers.
Global Warming

• It is being taken very seriously
• An Inconvenient Truth (Gore’s Movie) winning two oscars has brought a significant amount of public attention to this problem
• Great Britain just announced cut in Greenhouse gases (CO₂, Methane, Nitrous oxide)
• European Union will follow suit
• U.S will need to comply as well sooner or later. U.S. Supreme court ruled EPA responsible for controlling greenhouse gases. MoveOn.org is organizing ~1000 demonstrations across nation
• How will we meet our energy needs?
• Nuclear energy will need to make a comeback
• Accelerator driven Thorium option represents an attractive method
  » No greenhouse gases
  » Plenty of fuel
  » Sub-critical
Global Warming - GASES

Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide
Measured at Mauna Loa, Hawaii

Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Sector

- Industrial processes: 16.8%
- Power stations: 21.3%
- Transportation fuels: 14.0%
- Waste disposal and treatment: 3.4%
- Agricultural byproducts: 12.5%
- Land use and biomass burning: 10.0%
- Fossil fuel retrieval, processing, and distribution: 11.3%
- Residential, commercial, and other sources: 10.3%

Carbon Dioxide
(72% of total)

- 20.6%
- 29.5%
- 8.4%
- 9.1%
- 12.9%

Methane
(18% of total)

- 40.0%
- 4.8%
- 6.6%
- 18.1%
- 29.6%

Nitrous Oxide
(9% of total)

- 62.0%
- 1.1%
- 1.5%
- 2.3%
- 5.9%
Global Warming - Glaciers

Mountain Glacier Changes Since 1970

Effective Glacier Thinning (m/yr)

Cumulative Mean Thickness Change (meters)

Average Glacier Thickness Change (cm/yr)
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Global Warming-model spread

Global Warming Projections

- CCSR/NIES
- CCCma
- CSIRO
- Hadley Centre
- GFDL
- MPIM
- NCAR PCM
- NCAR CSM

Temperature Anomaly (°C)

Year:
- 1900
- 1950
- 2000
- 2050
- 2100
Calculations from Hadley Centre HADCM3 Climate model - If nothing is done by 2100
Predicted effects of global warming

• Top Scientists Warn of Water Shortages and Disease Linked to Global Warming

• By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
• Published: March 12, 2007
• WASHINGTON, March 11 (AP) — The harmful effects of global warming on daily life are already showing up, and within a couple of decades hundreds of millions of people will not have enough water, top scientists are likely to say next month at a meeting in Belgium.

• At the same time, tens of millions of others will be flooded out of their homes each year as the earth reels from rising temperatures and sea levels, according to portions of a draft of an international scientific report by the authoritative Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

• Tropical diseases like malaria will spread, the draft says. By 2050, polar bears will mostly be found in zoos, their habitats gone. Pests like fire ants will thrive.

• For a time, food will be plentiful because of the longer growing season in northern regions. But by 2080, hundreds of millions of people could face starvation, according to the report, which is still being revised.

• Loss of coastal cities in 100 years?
How do we combat global warming?

- Conservation
- Cleaner burning of coal, oil, natural gas
- More solar, wind, geothermal
- Nuclear energy---Fission, Fusion

- Which one shall we choose?
- Answer all of the above.
- Nuclear energy currently has problems-
  - Nuclear Waste—long term storage, use only 0.7% of natural Uranium ($^{235}\text{U}$). If more fuel needed, will have to breed.
  - Fast breeder reactors are inherently critical. Need to react in ~1 second to insert control rods.- Need plutonium core—not economically competitive with Light Water Reactors (LWR) at present
  - Try a new tack—breed using accelerators.
### Nuclear Reactors by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of reactors</th>
<th>Power MW</th>
<th>Constructing</th>
<th>Planned or ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>370721</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>130267</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63363</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21743</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16810</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12599</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13107</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7572</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Periodic Table of the Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Be</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>137.36</td>
<td>Ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>79.904</td>
<td>Br</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>35.453</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>39.948</td>
<td>Ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>39.102</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>24.305</td>
<td>Mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>30.974</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>28.086</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>26.981</td>
<td>Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>35.453</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>39.948</td>
<td>Ar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The subgroup numbers 1–10 were adopted in 1990 by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry. The symbols of elements 11-109 are the IUPAC equivalents of those numbers.

Atomic masses in parentheses are those of the most stable or common isotope.
Reactors 101--Fissile and Fertile Nuclei

• In the actinides, nuclei with odd Atomic Weight (U$^{235}$, U$^{233}$, Pu$^{239}$) are fissile nuclei. They absorb slow thermal neutrons and undergo fission with the release of more neutrons and energy.

• Those with even Atomic Weight (Th$^{232}$, U$^{238}$ etc) are Fertile nuclei. They can absorb “Fast neutrons” and will produce fissile nuclei. This is the basis of “fast breeders” and also the “energy amplifier”, the subject of this talk.

Mean energy released per fission
～200 MeV
Fission and breeding cross sections.

Cross section in barns for $\text{U}^{235} + n \rightarrow \text{Fission}$ vs incident neutron energy (eV).

Cross section in barns for $\text{Th}^{232} + n \rightarrow \text{Th}^{233} + \gamma$. This is a breeding cross section. Another is

$\text{U}^{238} + n \rightarrow \text{U}^{239} + \gamma$

$\text{U}^{239} \rightarrow \text{Np}^{239} + \beta^- (23.4\text{m})$

$\text{Np}^{239} \rightarrow \text{Pu}^{239} + \beta^- (2.35\text{d})$
Fission Reactors—Pressurised Water reactors (PWR)

- Moderation using boric acid in pressurised water (150 atm). Too much heat will produce steam, will reduce moderation. Safety feedback loop
- Uranium is enriched to ~4% \( U^{235} \), Natural 0.7%
- Delayed neutrons from decay of isotopes make the reactor just critical.

Control rods used for starting and stopping the reactor.
Fission Reactors—Pressurised Heavy Water reactors

- Heavy Water reactors—CANDU type. Moderated using D$_2$O—Permits operation with natural Uranium, since more neutrons survive being slowed down by the heavy water. Heavy water is a considerable expense.
Fast Breeder Reactors

- Neutrons not moderated.
- Use then neutrons to breed fissile material using fertile nuclei ($\text{U}^{238}$, $\text{Th}^{232}$).
- Coolant is usually liquid sodium.
- Fissile core eg ($20\%\text{PuO}_2 + 80\%\text{UO}_2$)
- Breeds more fuel in the blanket and also in the fissile fuel.
- Controlled rods have to be inserted “Fast!” in case of emergency.

Two common designs shown= Pool type and loop type.
Drawbacks of Fission reactors

• Enrichment needed for both PWR and FBR.
  » Proliferation worries

• Waste storage is a worry for PWR's and PHWR's.
  » Fission products are highly toxic, but are shortlived (Max ~30yrs halflife). However, higher actinide waste products take ~10^5 years storage to get rid of.

• All reactors operate at criticality. So are potentially unsafe.

• Economics of pre-processing fuel and post-processing the waste must be taken into account in costing the reactor kiloWatt hour.

• Uranium 235 is not that plentiful.

• Fast reactors need enriched Pu^{239} or U^{235} and do not compete economically (currently) with conventional fission reactors. French reactor Superphenix (1.2 GWe Commissioned 1984) was shut down in 1997 due to political and other problems.

• Fast Breeders have not caught on. At present BN-600 (Russia), Monju (Japan) FBTR (India) comprise most of the list.
Accelerator Driven Energy Amplifier

- Experimental Determination of the Energy Generated in Nuclear Cascaded by a High Energy beam (S.Andriamonje et al) CERN/AT/94-45(ET)
- A Physicist's view of the energy problem, lecture given at Energy and Electrical Systems Institute, J-P Revol, Yverdon-les-bains, Switzerland, 2002
- Advantages-
  - Sub-Critical
  - Use Thorium- More plentiful than U^{238}
  - Breed more fuel
  - Can burn waste
- Disadvantages-
  - Needs 10 MW proton accelerator- Does not exist as yet
Geothermal energy is 38 Terawatts. Due to mostly decay of Th$^{232}$ (predominant), U$^{238}$ and Potassium 40.

Th$^{232}$ has half-life of 14 billion years, U$^{238}$ (4.5 billion years) and K$^{40}$ (1.3 billion years).

Th$^{232}$ is roughly 4-5 times more abundant than U$^{238}$. May be enough Thorium to last $2.2 \times 10^5$ years using the energy amplifier method.

### Table 1.1 - Thorium resources (in units of 1000 tons) in WOCA (World Outside Centrally Planned Activities) [21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reasonably Assured</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe Total</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America Total</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>no estimates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Total</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total WOCA</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>4106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This compilation does not take into account USSR, China and Eastern Europe. Out of 23 listed countries, six (Brazil, USA, India, Egypt, Turkey and Norway) accumulate 80% of resources. Brazil has the largest share followed by Turkey and the United States.
The basic idea of the Energy Amplifier

- In order to keep the protactinium (It can capture neutrons as well) around for beta decay to $^{233}\text{U}$, one needs to limit neutron fluxes to $\sim 10^{14}$ cm$^{-2}$ sec$^{-1}$. Provide this by an accelerator.
- Let $\sigma_i$ be the capture cross section of neutrons and $\sigma_f$ be the fission cross section.

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{^{232}\text{Th}}{\Phi} & \Rightarrow \frac{^{233}\text{Pa}} \Rightarrow \frac{^{233}\text{U}}{\tau_2} \\
\frac{dn_1}{dt} &= -\lambda_1 n_1(t) ; \quad \frac{dn_2}{dt} = \lambda_1 n_1(t) - \lambda_2 n_2(t) ; \quad \frac{dn_3}{dt} = \lambda_2 n_2(t) - \lambda_3 n_3(t)
\end{align*}
\]

- Where $\Phi$ is the neutron flux and $\tau_2$ is the lifetime of Pa

\[
\lambda_1 = \sigma_i \Phi ; \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{\tau_2} ; \quad \lambda_3 = (\sigma_i^3 + \sigma_f^3) \Phi
\]
Thin slab of Thorium solution

• In the limit $\lambda_1 \ll \lambda_2$ and $\lambda_1 \ll \lambda_3$, one finds

\[
n_1(t) = n_1(0)e^{-\lambda_1 t}; \quad n_2(t) = n_1(t)\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}(1-e^{-\lambda_2 t})
\]

\[
n_3(t) = n_1(t)\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}\left(1-\frac{1}{\lambda_3 - \lambda_2}(\lambda_3 e^{-\lambda_2 t} - \lambda_2 e^{-\lambda_3 t})\right)
\]

• In stationary conditions

\[
\frac{n_3}{n_1} = \frac{\sigma^1_i}{(\sigma^3_i + \sigma^3_f)}
\]

• Independent of neutron flux $\Phi$
Thin Slab solution

- Operate above the resonance region where \(n_3/n_1=0.1\) a factor 7 larger than thermal neutron regime.

Operate with fast neutrons here

Thermal neutron regime
Criticality factor $k$

- Let number of neutron at the first step of spallation $= N_1$. After these interact in the fuel once, they produce $kN_1$ neutrons. After the second level of interactions, this will produce $N_1k^2$ neutrons and so on. So in total there will be

$$N_{tot} = N_1(1 + k + k^2 + k^3 \ldots) = \frac{N_1}{1-k}$$

neutrons.

$k$ has to be less than 1 or we have a runaway situation.
Situation more complicated. Do full MC
Pure thorium initial state.
Thorium with initial $^{233}\text{U}$ as fuel
Natural Uranium 238 as fuel

Figure 7

Integrated neutron flux (10^{25}xcm^{-2}s^{-1})

Fractional content

U\textsubscript{235}, Pu\textsubscript{242}, Pu\textsubscript{239}, Pu\textsubscript{240}, U\textsubscript{236}, Am\textsubscript{245}, Pu\textsubscript{241}, Am\textsubscript{241}, Am\textsubscript{242}, Np\textsubscript{239}, Np\textsubscript{237}
Variation of $k$ with time for EA

```
Without fission fragments

With fission fragments
```

Effective multiplication coefficient ($k$)

Integrated burn-up (GW day/t)
Waste problem a lot better than conventional reactors.

- Trends in radiotoxicity (degree of risk following ingestion) over the course of time for the two components of nuclear wastes from spent PWR fuel.
Advantages of the EA:

Safety margin with different systems (fraction of delayed neutrons) as compared with that of an Energy Amplifier.

- Ingestive Radiotoxicity index [Relative units]
- Time after shutdown [years]
Experimental Verification - S. Andriamonje et al.
The Conceptual design

Figure 1.1
EA reactor details
Each 10MW EA will produce ~700MW of electricity. A complex of 2 GWe will have three such reactors and machines. Mass production of machines and industrialization of EA systems will be needed.
Spectrum of neutrons in various parts of EA
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Fission produces are shorter lived (~30 years half-life) than actinides (~10^5 years). So actinide wastes need storage for geological periods of time – Yucca mountain solution. EA produces less actinide waste so the storage time is reduced.
A preliminary Estimate of the Economic Impact of the Energy Amplifier—CERN/LH/96-01(EET)

Table 30. Cost estimate of kWh$^2$, cost ratios and limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy source</th>
<th>Costs in $/kWh$</th>
<th>Ratio to EA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best estimate</td>
<td>Lower limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net disc. rate 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net disc. rate 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nay Sayers

Accelerator Driven Subcritical Assemblies

Report to:

Energy Environment and Economy Committee
U.S. Global Strategy Council

Richard Wilson
Harvard University

June 20th 1998

Abstract

Recently three groups in Gatchina, Russia, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory USA, and CERN, Switzerland have proposed to use accelerator driven subcritical assemblies as sources of electricity as an alternate to nuclear fission reactors. By this means the proposers hope to avoid some of the problems that presently plague these reactors and prevent universal acceptance and expansion of the technology. These proposals are discussed and it is shown that there is no appreciable improvement in any real safety parameter, and although there may be an improvement in public acceptance this is very uncertain. An alternate proposal, to use these assemblies to transmute long lived transuranic actinides into other material is also discussed. It is pointed out that such transmutation may well be unnecessary. Nonetheless a modest research program along these lines may well be advisable.
The future of Nuclear power—Deutsch
Moniz Study—2003

The U.S. Department of Energy should focus its R&D program on the once-through fuel cycle;

The U.S. Department of Energy should establish a Nuclear System Modeling project to carryout the analysis, research, simulation, and collection of engineering data needed to evaluate all fuel cycles from the viewpoint of cost, safety, waste management, and proliferation resistance;

The U.S. Department of Energy should undertake an international uranium resource evaluation program;

The U.S. Department of Energy should broaden its waste management R&D program;

The U.S. Department of Energy should support R&D that reduces Light Water Reactor (LWR) costs and for development of the HTGR for electricity application.

HTGR = High Temperature gas Cooled Reactor
NOTES


2. Several nations have explored breeder reactors, notably the U.S., France, Russia, Japan, and India.

3. Minor actinides are Americium (Am), Neptunium (Np), and Curium (Cm).

4. There are still other options, such as using an accelerator to produce neutrons in a sub-critical assembly.

5. The three surviving developmental breeder reactors are Phenix in France, Monju in Japan, and BN600 in Russia.

6. The MOX fueled plants are currently operating with only about a third of their core loaded as MOX fuel; the balance is UOX fuel. Hence only about 9 GW(e) are being generated in these reactors from the MOX fuel.

7. Single pass recycle means that a discharged fuel batch is reprocessed once only.

8. TRU here refers to the U.S. definition: low-level waste contaminated with transuranic elements.

9. Due to process holding time, the actual amount of separated Pu inventory could be several or more years’ worth of separations.

10. For additional details, see Appendix S-E and Marvin Miller, Uranium resources and the future of nuclear power, Lecture notes, MIT, Spring 2001; for copies contact marvimiller@mit.edu.


12. Such resources are also known as measured resources and reserves.


14. For example, recent research in Japan indicates that uranium in seawater — present in concentration of 3.3 ppb — might be recovered at costs in the range of $300–$500/kg.
More Cold Water

• I talked with the head of the reactor group at Argonne. He said that his group has studied the EA extensively and had concluded that it was
  » Expensive
  » Had problems with non-uniform cooling within the reactor (these need to be addressed).
  » He however conceded that sub-criticality was an advantage
  » They were going towards recycling waste using “Fast Burner Reactors”
Many articles on ADS and Thorium—eg
Too many to mention all
Accelerator development in India for ADS programme

P SINGH, S V L S RAO, RAINI PANDE, T BASAK, SHWETA ROY, M ASLAM, P JAIN, S C L SRIVASTAVA, RAJESH KUMAR, P K NEMA, S KAILAS and V C SAHNI*

Nuclear Physics Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai 400 085, India
*Physics Group, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre and Raja Ramanna Centre for Advanced Technology, Indore 452 013, India
E-mail: psingle@barc.gov.in

Abstract. At BARC, development of a Low Energy High Intensity Proton Accelerator (LEHIPA), as front-end injector of the 1 GeV accelerator for the ADS programme, has been initiated. The major components of LEHIPA (20 MeV, 30 mA) are a 50 keV ECR ion source, a 3 MeV Radio Frequency Quadrupole (RFQ) and a 20 MeV drift tube linac (DTL). The Low Energy Beam Transport (LEBT) and Medium Energy Beam Transport (MEBT) lines match the beam from the ion source to RFQ and from RFQ to DTL respectively. Design of these systems has been completed and fabrication of their prototypes has started. Physics studies of the 20–1000 MeV part of the Linac are also in progress. In this paper, the present status of this project is presented.

Keywords. High intensity proton Linac; space charge compensation; beam dynamics; radio frequency quadrupole; drift tube Linac; accelerator driven sub-critical reactor system.
FAIR Deal for India

Three accords have opened a new era in scientific collaboration between Europe and India, bolstered last week at a meeting in New Delhi between India’s science minister and his counterparts from the European Union (E.U.).

The first such gathering outside Europe, the parley featured India committing to a $250 million contribution for the $1.5 billion Facility for Antiproton and Ion Research (FAIR) at the GSI heavy-ion research lab in Darmstadt, Germany. Indian scientists will collaborate on the project, which once completed in 2014 will produce beams for research into nuclear physics, plasmas, and nuclear astrophysics.

“It’s good to have India on board,” says John Wood, head of the U.K.’s Central Laboratory of the Research Councils.

In addition, India and the E.U. will each contribute $7.5 million annually to a joint research fund for projects in health, climate, and energy. Indian scientists will also be able to compete for grants under the E.U.’s 7-year, $75 billion Seventh Framework Programme, which began earlier this year. “India will be the most important and first partner in the Seventh Framework Programme,” said Annette Schavan, Germany’s minister for education and research, who led the E.U. delegation. Indian science minister Kapil Sibal called the agreement “historic.”

--PALLAVA BAGLA
**Scenarios and Possibilities**

- If Fermilab decides (is allowed to?) to work on this challenging project, the reactor can be built elsewhere (simultaneously, more than one R&D version in more than one country).
- Will need to obtain funds from outside the DoE HEP to do this.
- An approved accelerator project in the billion dollar class will mean increase in hiring into the lab.
- We will now attempt to show that superconducting rf technology may be a candidate used to make the 10-20 MWatt proton source for the project.
EA accelerator design - PSI type solution-1995 vintage-PSI has just started incineration studies with 1 MW beam in liquid target - Cern Courier
Twos stage Cyclotron solution

- 30 MW in and 10 MW out. Efficiency achievable (so claimed) because lot of the power costs are “overheads” and do not scale with beam intensity. So higher the beam power, the greater the efficiency. Can we pump 10 MW into the rf cavities? No one has done this to date. This is the greatest challenge for the EA and one that calls for accelerator R&D.
Accelerator Design—1995 vintage

### Tables and Figures relevant to Section 3.

#### Table 3.1 - Main parameters of the two ring cyclotrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accelerator</th>
<th>ISSC</th>
<th>BSSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External diameter</td>
<td>10.5 m</td>
<td>16 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet iron weight</td>
<td>1000 tons</td>
<td>3170 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet power</td>
<td>0.6 MW</td>
<td>2.7 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF power</td>
<td>1.54 MW</td>
<td>12.5 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.2 - Main parameters for the 42 MHz design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accelerator type</th>
<th>Injection</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Booster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injection</td>
<td>100 KeV</td>
<td>10 MeV</td>
<td>120 MeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>10 MeV</td>
<td>120 MeV</td>
<td>990 MeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>42 MHz</td>
<td>42 MHz</td>
<td>42 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet gap</td>
<td>6 cm</td>
<td>5 cm</td>
<td>5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb. sectors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector angle (inj/ext)</td>
<td>15/34 deg</td>
<td>26/31 deg</td>
<td>10/20 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector spiral extraction</td>
<td>0 deg</td>
<td>0 deg</td>
<td>12 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb. cavities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of cavity</td>
<td>delta</td>
<td>delta</td>
<td>single gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Peak Voltage inj.</td>
<td>110 kVolt</td>
<td>170 kVolt</td>
<td>550 kVOLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Peak Voltage extr.</td>
<td>110 kVolt</td>
<td>340 kVolt</td>
<td>1100 kVOLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radial gain per turn ext.</td>
<td>16 mm</td>
<td>12 mm</td>
<td>10 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.3 - Main parameters of the injector cyclotrons

| Injection energy | 100 keV |
| Extraction energy | 10 MeV |
| Number of sectors | 4 |
| Pole radius | 0.75 m |
| Total yoke height | 1.2 m |
| Maximal field in the sectors | 1.5 T |
| Number of main RF cavities | 2 |
| RF frequency | 42 MHz |
| Harmonic number | 4 |
| Peak Voltage | 113 kV |
| Losses per cavity | 17 kW |
| Number of flat-top cavities | 2 |
| RF frequency of flat-top cavities | 126 MHz |
| Peak Voltage of flat-top cavities | 13 kV |
| Axial Deflector field | 15 kV/cm |

#### Table 3.4 - Main characteristics of the ISSC cyclotron RF cavities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main cavities</th>
<th>Flat-top cavities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cavities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of cavity</td>
<td>L/2, double-gap, tapered walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>420 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavity height</td>
<td>1.8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavity length</td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage at injection</td>
<td>2-170 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage at extraction</td>
<td>2-340 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality factor</td>
<td>13000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses/cavity</td>
<td>220 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam power/cavity</td>
<td>550 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total power/cavity</td>
<td>770 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electric power/cavity (70% efficiency)</td>
<td>1.1 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can the 8GeV PD be modified to do 10MW?

- It is straightforward.
- The design would be more comparable to the RIA driver linac, which was CW and could put out something like 0.5MW for 800 MeV protons if I recall correctly.
- The FFAG machine is also very attractive for this kind of application.

keep smiling,

-Bill

On 3/9/07, Rajendran Raja <raja@fnal.gov> wrote: Hi Bill,

Good to see you at Fermilab the other day. I am looking into the possibility of using SCRF to produce a 10 Megawatt 1 GeV Linac. That is 10mA of beam, CW.

The design of your 8 GeV proton driver, delivers 10mA but at 15Hz yielding 2 MWatts. How difficult do you think it would be to get 10mA CW at 1GeV?

The idea is to investigate the feasibility of an Energy Amplifier using Thorium.

regards

Raja

---

G. William (Bill) Foster  
Cell: (630) 853-1749  
Home: (202) 216-0690  
Email: GWFoster@gmail.com  
Web: http://gwfoster.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Ultimate</th>
<th>SNS (Spallation Neutron Source)</th>
<th>TESLA-500 (w/ FEL)</th>
<th>TESLA-800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 GeV</td>
<td>8 GeV</td>
<td>8 GeV</td>
<td>1 GeV</td>
<td>500 GeV</td>
<td>800 GeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse Width</td>
<td>3 msec</td>
<td>1 msec</td>
<td>1 msec</td>
<td>0.95 msec</td>
<td>0.86 msec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.5 MW</td>
<td>2 MW</td>
<td>1.56 MW</td>
<td>22.6 MW</td>
<td>34 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (incl. warm FE)</td>
<td>5.5 MW</td>
<td>13 MW</td>
<td>~15 MW</td>
<td>97 MW</td>
<td>150 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current(avg. in pulse)</td>
<td>8.6 mA</td>
<td>26 mA</td>
<td>26 mA</td>
<td>9.5 mA</td>
<td>12.7 mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>2.5 Hz</td>
<td>10 Hz</td>
<td>60 Hz</td>
<td>5(10) Hz</td>
<td>4 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perconducting Cavities</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21024</td>
<td>21852 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comodules</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vities per Klystron(typ)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Fields (max)</td>
<td>52 MV/m</td>
<td>52 MV/m</td>
<td>35 MV/m</td>
<td>46.8 MV/m</td>
<td>70 MV/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Gradient(max)</td>
<td>26 MV/m</td>
<td>26 MV/m</td>
<td>16 MV/m</td>
<td>23.4 MV/m</td>
<td>35 MV/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Frequency (MHz)</td>
<td>1300, 325</td>
<td>1300, 325</td>
<td>805, 402.5</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Length</td>
<td>614 m</td>
<td>614 m</td>
<td>258 m</td>
<td>22 km</td>
<td>22 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need to go from pulsed to CW linac.
**SCRF Q factor vs normal rf Q factor**

- Q factor of an oscillating system is defined as
  \[ Q = \frac{\text{Energy stored in cavity}}{\text{Power lost in cavity}} \]
  
  eg. \( Q = \frac{1}{R} \sqrt{\frac{L}{C}} \) for a resonant tuned circuit

- SCRF Q factors \( \sim 2.0 \times 10^{10} \)
- Normal rf Q factors are of order \( 3 \times 10^5, 5 \times 10^5 \).

- So SCRF has an advantage of \( \sim 1 \times 10^5 \) in terms of energy dissipated in the rf itself. However, one needs to factor in cryogenics, klystron losses etc.
Figure 6 – Layout of the 325 MHz Front End Linac, which includes: the H- Ion Source (IS), Radiofrequency Quadrupole (RFQ), Medium-Energy Beam Transport (MEBT), Room-Temperature Triple-Spoke Resonators (RT-TSR), Superconducting Single-Spoke Resonators (SSR), Double-Spoke Resonators (DSR), Triple-Spoke Resonators (TSR).

RFQ built by KEK for J-parc

Ion Source built by LBNL for SNS
**Front end linac**

325 MHz Front-End Linac

- 325 MHz Klystron – Toshiba E3740A (JPARC)
- Single Klystron Feeds SCRF Linac to E > 100 MeV
- Charging Supply
- Modulator Capacitor / Switch / Bouncer
- RF Distribution Waveguide
- Ferrite Tuners
- MEBT
- RFQ
- SCRF Spoke Resonator Cryomodules
8 GeV PD parameters

- Present proton Driver design takes ~250m to get to 1 GeV and use three different flavors of SCRF $\beta=0.47,0.61,0.81$) to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINAC SEGMENT LENGTHS</th>
<th>8 GeV Linac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ion Source (H- and P)</td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Energy Beam Transport (LEBT)</td>
<td>~0.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio-Frequency Quad (RFQ)</td>
<td>~4.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Energy Beam Transport (MEBT)</td>
<td>~3.6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Temperature Front End (RT-TSR)</td>
<td>~10.4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRF Single-Spoke Resonator (SSR)</td>
<td>~12.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRF Double-Spoke Resonator (DSR)</td>
<td>~17.2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRF Triple-Spoke Resonator (TSR Baseline)</td>
<td>~64.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta=0.47 SCRF (Low Beta Elliptical option)</td>
<td>~18.8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta=0.61 SCRF (Medium Beta Elliptical Opt.)</td>
<td>~38.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta=0.81 SCRF (High Beta Elliptical)</td>
<td>~70.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta=1 SCRF (1300 MHz &quot;ILC&quot; Main Linac)</td>
<td>~438.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINAC ACTIVE LENGTH *</td>
<td><strong>613.6 m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Line to Ring</td>
<td>~972.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel to Front End Equipment Drop</td>
<td>~20.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNNEL TOTAL LENGTH *</td>
<td><strong>1606.0 m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Either 3-Spoke or Elliptical for 110-400 MeV
Ad-Hoc group

An Ad-Hoc group of interested people (Eric Prebys, Pushpa Bhat, Al Moretti, Jay Theilacker, Arkadiy Klebaner, Ralph Pasquinelli, Chris Hill, Estia Eichten, Dave McGinnis, Giorgio Apollinari, Mark Champion, Bob Webber, Chuck Ankenbrandt, Milorad Popovic, Vladimir Shiltsev, RR) met to discuss how one may achieve the needed performance—SCRF linac and Cyclotrons were considered.

Excerpts from Bob Webber’s slides on what changes are need to the existing Proton driver front end to reach 10MW.

- 50 keV ion source
- RFQ to 2.5 MeV
- Copper Spoke Cavities to 10 MeV
- $\beta = 0.2$ Superconducting Single Spoke Cavities to ~ 30 MeV
- $\beta = 0.4$ SC Single Spoke Cavities to ~ 125 MeV
- $\beta = 0.6$ SC Triple Spoke Cavities to ~ 400 MeV
- $\beta = 0.8$ SC “Squeezed” ILC Cavities to > 1 GeV

All structures except 1300 MHz “squeezed” ILC cavities are 325 MHz
## Scale Comparisons - B. Webber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proton Driver Phase 1</th>
<th>Proton Driver Phase 2</th>
<th>APT Linac</th>
<th>Energy Amplifier Linac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beam Current</strong></td>
<td>26 mA pulse</td>
<td>9 mA pulse</td>
<td>100 mA</td>
<td>10 mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 µA average</td>
<td>0.25 mA average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pulse Length</strong></td>
<td>3 msec</td>
<td>1 msec</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repetition Rate</strong></td>
<td>2.5 Hz</td>
<td>10 Hz</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beam Duty Factor</strong></td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF Duty Factor</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 GeV Beam Power</strong></td>
<td>0.0625 MW</td>
<td>0.25 MW</td>
<td>100 MW</td>
<td>10 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What of Proton Driver Design Works -
B. Webber

• Peak energy is not an issue
• Peak beam current capabilities are adequate
• Low emittance design of PD should satisfy beam loss control requirements of EA Linac
What of PD Design Does Not Work—
B. Webber

- Ion Source - not designed for CW operation
  » (LEDA proof-of-principle) (LEDA—Low Energy Demonstration Accelerator)
- RFQ - not designed for CW operation
  » (LEDA proof-of-principle)
- Room Temp. Cavities (2-10 MeV) - not designed for CW operation
- Superconducting Cavity Power Couplers - not designed for CW
- Entire RF power system - not designed for CW operation
  » Pulsed modulator → DC power supplies (LEDA proof-of-principle)
  » Klystrons (LEDA partial proof-of-principle)
  » RF Distribution System
  » Fast Phase Shifters??
- Cryogenics System - not sized for CW RF operation
- Power and cooling water utilities infrastructure is inadequate
- Controls and Machine Protection System
- Radiation Shielding?
### Klystron Comparison - B. Webber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Phase 2 (1 GeV)</th>
<th>EA Linac (1 GeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 325 MHz 2.5 MW</td>
<td>4 - 325 MHz 1 MW* CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulsed</td>
<td>(10 mA at .4 GeV = 4 MW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1.3 GHz 10 MW**</td>
<td>6 - 1.3 GHz 1 MW*** CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulsed</td>
<td>(10 mA at .6 GeV = 6 MW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the number of klystrons from PD to EA might only increase by a factor of two, the installed “wall power” and cooling system capability must increase as the ratio of beam power.

10 MW/ 0.25 MW = 40!

* LEDA klystrons at this power level were 350 MHz
** Under development for ILC
*** availability unknown
In present Proton Driver design, ~40 “squeezed” ILC cavities provide 600 MeV to boost energy from 400 MeV to 1 GeV. This is average 15 MeV/cavity and at 10 mA CW implies 150 kW average power per coupler, 75 times the nominal ILC coupler design.
AC Power requirements for a Superconducting 1 GeV 10 MW Linac/Al Moretti– Preliminary

There are 87 Superconducting cavities at 4 K and 18 cavities at room temperature plus Rt. RFQ at 325 MHz and 50 ILC superconducting cavities at 1.8 K to reach 1 GeV. I have used data from reports of the PD, XFEL and Cryo group to derive this AC Power Table below. All Cavities and RFQ are made superconducting in this case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eff = 64 %</th>
<th>Power to Beam 10 MW</th>
<th>Mains Power 15.6 MW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water tower cooling</td>
<td>Eff=80 %</td>
<td>15.6 MW/.80</td>
<td>7 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Deg Load</td>
<td>6100 W</td>
<td>AC Power ratio 200/1</td>
<td>1.2 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 K Load</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>AC Power ratio 800/1</td>
<td>1 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 K load</td>
<td>5580</td>
<td>AC Power ratio 20/1</td>
<td>0.1 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOM 2 K load</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>AC Power ratio 800/1</td>
<td>0.1 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 MW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 26, 2007
Rajendran Raja, Accelerator Division Seminar
International Fusion Materials Irradiation Facility (IFMIF) - 125mA x2 14 MeV Deuterons

Ion Source SACLAY + LEBT + RFQ Saclay below

ECR ion source JAERI + RFQ Jaeri below
Physics potential of an intense proton source

1) Recent progress in neutrino factory and muon collider research within the Muon collaboration.
e-Print: hep-ex/0207031
TOPCITE = 100+
References | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | BibTeX | Keywords | Cited 120 times

2) The Program in muon and neutrino physics: Super beams, cold muon beams, neutrino factory and the muon collider.
e-Print: hep-ex/0108041 References | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | BibTeX | Keywords | Cited 18 times

3) Status of muon collider research and development and future plans.
e-Print: physics/9901022
TOPCITE = 250+ References | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | BibTeX | Keywords | Cited 322 times

Physics Possibilities
  » Staged Physics
  » First Stage-Cold Muons
  » Second Stage-Neutrino Factory
  » Third Stage-Muon Collider
    • Higgs factory
    • >3 TeV CMS Muon Collider—Energy frontier

April 26, 2007 Rajendran Raja, Accelerator Division Seminar
Stage 2 collection, phase rotation
Stage 2

- Muon beam is phase rotated and transversely cooled. Central momentum 220MeV/c, transverse normalized emittance of 2.7 mm-rad and an rms energy spread of ~4.5%. 4x $10^{20}$ muons per year.
- Cold muon physics can start.

Table 3.2: Some current and future tests for new physics with low-energy muons (from [73], [80], and [81]). Note that the “Current prospects” column refers to anticipated sensitivity of experiments currently approved or proposed; “Future” gives estimated sensitivity with Neutrino Factory front end. (The $d_\mu$ measurement is still at the Letter of Intent stage and the reach of experiments is not yet entirely clear.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Current bound</th>
<th>Current prospects</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B(\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+\gamma)$</td>
<td>$&lt; 1.2 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>$\approx 5 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>$\sim 10^{-14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B(\mu^- \rightarrow e^-\text{Ti})$</td>
<td>$&lt; 4.3 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>$\approx 2 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
<td>$&lt; 10^{-16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B(\mu^- \rightarrow e^-\text{Pb})$</td>
<td>$&lt; 4.6 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B(\mu^- \rightarrow e^+\text{Ca})$</td>
<td>$&lt; 1.7 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B(\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+e^-)$</td>
<td>$&lt; 1 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_\mu$</td>
<td>$(3.7 \pm 3.4) \times 10^{-15} \text{ e-cm}$</td>
<td>$10^{-24} \text{ e-cm}$</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Some examples of new physics probed by the nonobservation of $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion at the $10^{-16}$ level (from [73]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Physics</th>
<th>Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy neutrino mixing</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced $Z\mu e$ coupling</td>
<td>$g_{Z\mu e} &lt; 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced $H\mu e$ coupling</td>
<td>$g_{H\mu e} &lt; 4 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositeness</td>
<td>$\Lambda_c &gt; 3,000 \text{ TeV}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 3, Stage 4

- Stage 3 - Accelerate muons to 2.5 GeV.
- $g-2$, edm of muons can start. (needs 3.1 GeV magic momentum)
- Stage 4 - Full neutrino factory
Neutrino Factory Physics Potential

- Determination of $\delta m_{32}^2 \sin^2 2\theta_{23}$ with high accuracy
- Matter effects and sign of $\delta m_{32}^2$
- Observation of CP violation in the lepton sector. Measurement of the phase $\delta$. Importance of CP violation in the lepton sector to baryon asymmetry in the early universe.
- Non-oscillation physics.
Neutrino factory determination of oscillation parameters

Predictions for 2800 km baseline $2 \times 10^{20}$ muon decays.
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Neutrino Factory Determination of $\delta m^2_{32}$ Sign


20GeV $\mu$ 2800km $10^{20}$ decays
50k-ton detector

Baseline km.
Non-oscillation Physics

- Parton densities x>0.1, best accessible with 50GeV muon beams. Knowledge would improve by more than one order of magnitude. Individual quark and gluon components are measured with relative accuracies of 1-10% 0.1<x<0.6. Higher twist corrections accurately determined. Theoretical systematics in extracting \( \alpha_s \) from sum rules and global fits reduced.
- Polarized parton densities measurable. Few percentage accuracy for up and down. Requires a-priori knowledge of polarized gluon density. Polarized DIS experiments at CERN and DESY and RHIC will provide this.
- \( \sin^2 \theta_W \) at the neutrino factory can be determined with error \( \sim 2 \times 10^{-4} \)
- Permits usage of hydrogen targets. Nuclear effects can be bypassed.
- Rare lepton flavor violating decays of muons can be tagged with the appearance of wrong sign electrons and muons or of prompt taus.
Physics with Higgs factory/Muon Collider

Muon Colliders

- Muon colliders are attractive because they are compact. Muon is 200 times heavier than electron, so Higgs like objects will have 40,000 more cross section in s-channel.
- First Muon Collider/Higgs Factory can be used to scan a narrow Higgs of mass 115 GeV and width 2-3 MeV. This is possible since we can measure the energy of the muon bunches to 1 part per million using g-2 spin precession as described in R. Raja and A. Tollestrup, Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 013005.
- Emittances need to be cooled by $10^6$ for FMC to be a reality. However, if this is done (Emittance Exchange is a must), then higher energy colliders become feasible.
- W and top thresholds can be scanned and W mass and top quark mass measured very well.
- $H_0/A_0$ Higgs of the MSSM can be resolved in the s-channel using an MC if they are degenerate as in the ‘decoupling limit’ of the theory.
- Muon Colliders of 3-4 TeV can fit on existing lab sites.
- Backgrounds can be brought under control in detector regions using clever shielding ideas.

Schematic of Muon Collider


Scanning the Higgs peak using the muon collider

Energy scale of muon ring measurable to 1E-6, (g-2) expt R. Raja, A. Tollestrup, PRD58,013005,1998

Light Higgs Resonance Profile

Convolve $\sigma$ with Gaussian spread

$$\sigma_h(\sqrt{s}) - \int \sigma_h(\sqrt{s}) \frac{\exp \left[ - \frac{(\sqrt{s} - \sqrt{s_0})^2}{2\sigma^2} \right]}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \, d\sqrt{s}$$

Effective Cross Sections: $m_h = 110$ GeV

Need resolution $\sigma_h = 10$ to be sensitive to the Higgs width

Light Higgs width

$80 \leq m_h \leq 120$ GeV

$\Gamma_h = 2$ to 3 MeV if $\tan\beta \sim 1.8$

$\Gamma_h = 2$ to 800 MeV if $\tan\beta \sim 20$
Higher energy Muon Colliders

- 3TeV center of mass
  Will not cause neutrino
  Background problems.
  More exotic cooling,
  Exotic locations etc.

Top quark threshold - ISR and beam effects

Separation of $A^0$ & $H^0$ by Scanning

$A^0, H^0 \rightarrow b \bar{b}$
$m_{A^0} = 350$ GeV

$\tan\beta = 10, 5$

$\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)

Number of events/0.01 fb$^{-1}$
Conclusions

• SCRF technology may help produce a high power proton source that can add to the mix of nuclear technologies. Sub-criticality is an advantage. Challenging accelerator R&D.

• In order to make further progress, a workshop that brings together all the interested parties may be worth pursuing.