NUCLEAR ASSESSMENT OF SHIELDING CONFIGURATION OPTIONS FOR FINAL OPTICS OF HAPL LASER FUSION POWER PLANT

Mohamed Sawan, Ahmad Ibrahim, Tim Bohm, Paul Wilson

Fusion Technology Institute, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI

OBJECTIVE

Assess impact of shielding configuration options on nuclear environment at final optics

Design Parameters Used in Analysis

Target yield	367.1 MJ
Rep Rate	5 Hz
Fusion power	1836 MW
Chamber inner radius	10.75 m
Thickness of Li/FS blanket	0.6 m
Thickness of SS/B_4C/He shield	0.5 m
Chamber outer radius	11.85 m
GIMM angle of incidence	85°
GIMM distance from target	24 m





Shielding Configuration Options Assessed

Option I:

All optics including GIMM enclosed in concrete shield



- Good support for GIMM
- Eliminates streaming contribution from other ports
- Small volume under vacuum

- Might be steering streaming neutrons towards dielectric focusing and turning mirrors
- Might require large amount of concrete

Shielding Configuration Options Assessed

Option II:

Only focusing and turning mirrors enclosed in concrete shield with GIMM left in open space between chamber and larger containment building



- Might reduce amount of required concrete
- Could reduce flux at dielectric mirrors by eliminating the "steering" effect in long duct

- GIMM support is challenging
- Large volume between chamber and containment building should be maintained under vacuum (could be reduced by using steel beam duct between chamber and bio-shield)
- Possible large contribution from neutrons streaming through other ports

Shielding Configuration Options Assessed

Option III:

Only focusing and turning mirrors enclosed in concrete shield with neutron trap added at inner surface of containment building behind GIMM



- Might reduce amount of required concrete
- Could eliminate "steering" effect in long duct
- Neutron traps reduce contribution from neutrons streaming through other ports

- GIMM support is challenging
- Large volume between chamber and containment building should be maintained under vacuum (could be reduced by using steel beam duct between chamber and bio-shield)

Fast Neutron Flux at Final Optics with Different Shielding Configuration Options



	Peak Fast Neutron Flux (n/cm²s)		
	Option I	Option II	Option III
GIMM	1.40×10^{13}	1.38×10^{13}	1.37×10^{13}
Focusing Mirror	2.28×10^{10}	4.27×10^{10}	4.05×10^{10}
Turning Mirror	4.34×10^{8}	1.13×10^{9}	1.03×10^{9}

Total Gamma Flux at Final Optics with Different Shielding Configuration Options

	Peak Gamma Flux (γ/cm²s)		
	Option I	Option II	Option III
GIMM	1.68×10^{12}	9.93×10^{11}	9.48×10^{11}
Focusing Mirror	1.33×10^{10}	4.90×10^{10}	4.25×10^{10}
Turning Mirror	8.89×10^{8}	4.36×10^{9}	3.50×10^{9}

Nuclear Heating in Final Optics with Different Shielding Configuration Options



	Peak Nuclear Heating (mW/cm³)		
	Option I	Option II	Option III
GIMM	610	580	579
Focusing Mirror	1.14	1.84	1.68
Turning Mirror	0.02	0.10	0.07

Fast Neutron Flux Distribution in Final Optics of HAPL



Dominating Effect for Fast Flux Level at Focusing Mirror



Which of these is the dominant effect?

1. "Steering" of streaming neutrons in beam duct of option I
2. Contribution from neutrons streaming through all ports in the "open" configuration of options II and III

- **Results clearly show that dominating effect is enhanced contribution from other ports in the "open" configuration**
- **This is confirmed by comparing results for options I and II that show increased secondary neutron and gamma fluxes at focusing mirror**
  - E<0.1 MeV neutron flux is x7 higher in option II
  - Gamma flux is x4 higher in option II

Preferred Final Optics Shielding Configuration



Preferred configuration is the original Option I where all optics including the GIMM are enclosed in concrete shield

- **Results in lowest radiation levels at the dielectric focusing and turning mirrors**
- **Allows for better GIMM support**
- **Reduces volume maintained under vacuum**
- **Requires the least amount of concrete**

  Relative amount of concrete: 1, 1.12, and 1.14 for options I, II, and III

Conclusion

Original shielding configuration with all optics including GIMM enclosed in concrete shield is the preferred option since it yields lowest flux at dielectric mirrors, provides better GIMM support, reduces volume under vacuum, and requires least amount of concrete