UCRL-85175, Rev. 1
PREPRINT

CONF-810613--10 (Rev. 1)

MASTER

LASERS IN MATERIALS PROCESSING

J.I. Davis
E.B. Rockower

This paper was prepared for submittal to
the Conference on Laser and Electro-
Optical Systems, June 10-12, 1981
Washington, D.C.

June 10-12, 1981

**Lawrence
Livermore
Laboratory**

This is a preprint of a paper intended for publication in a journal or proceedings. Since changes may be made before publication, this preprint is made available with the understanding that it will not be cited or reproduced without the permission of the author.

LASERS in MATERIALS PROCESSING*

J.I. Davis
E.B. Rockower

DISCLAIMER

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
University of California
P.O. Box 5508
Livermore, CA 94550

Introduction

How can the unique properties of laser photons be best utilized in the production of materials and components despite the high cost of laser energy? To answer this question we need first to identify the characteristics of potential applications that are necessary for success. We will also point out those factors that have up to now frustrated attempts to find commercially viable laser induced chemical and physical processes for the production of new or existing materials. Having identified the general criteria to be satisfied by an economically successful laser process and shown how these, in turn, imply the laser system requirements, we will present a status report on the uranium Laser Isotope Separation (LIS) Program at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The LIS program is the only large scale application for bulk laser photochemical processing that thus far satisfies these criteria.

*This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract number W-7405-ENG-48.

Process Economic Analysis

Figure 1 depicts the crucial issue with which any potential application must contend, the high cost of laser energy. The classical concept of laser photochemistry envisions the production of bulk chemical compounds through selective excitation or breaking of specific chemical bonds, leading to a preferred pathway for the ensuing chemical reactions. The laser may drive the reaction through this selective application of energy or merely catalyze it. Either way one hopes to gain an advantage by achieving a higher process yield of the desired product by bypassing many steps in the reaction scheme and avoiding nonproductive chemical pathways. However, one must deal with both process- and laser-related issues in realizing this hope. Standard chemical processes utilizing temperature and pressure control of the reactions are often quite efficient. This is reflected in the selling price of under \$1/lb (or \$2/kg) for most bulk chemicals sold in large volume. As shown in Fig. 1, the specific laser costs are typically quite high relative to this. Consider a chemical process requiring one 2 eV (visible) photon for each molecule of product, enough to break a typical chemical bond. At a typical molecular weight of 100 this translates into on the order of \$10/kg for laser energy.

In terms of the major process parameters listed in Fig. 2, which shows the elements of a generic laser photo-process, how are currently successful applications of lasers in production able to overcome this high laser cost? The specific laser energy requirement in megajoules of laser energy per kilogram of product (MJ/kg_p) is favorable in such

applications as the cutting of fabrics, the welding of metals, and the heat treating of various materials because only a fraction, e.g., a surface layer or cross section, of the material is treated. In these applications the process yield in kilograms of product per kilogram of feed (kg_p/kg_f) is typically near 1, while maintaining low specific laser energy per unit product. The value of the product is clearly also high relative to the laser costs for these fabricated products, as is the market size (kg_p/yr) allowing realization of economies of scale.

As opposed to fabricated products, the production of homogeneous substances such as bulk or high-value chemicals, pharmaceuticals, or reactor-grade enriched fuel, requires selective interaction within the volume of the feed stock. The selectivity can be intramolecular, picking out one bond to be broken thus initiating a desired chemical reaction, or interspecies, picking out one isotope or distinct chemical compound to be activated. In either case, to realize the same advantage of low specific laser-energy requirements (MJ/kg_p) enjoyed by the above fabrication processes, we again seek applications in which the number of product molecules per photon absorbed is large. This can occur through initiating chain reactions such as in polymerization, in creating catalysts that then promote many cycles of the ensuing reactions, or by selectively interacting with a minority species such as (1) H_2S in the laser purification of synthesis gas ($\text{CO} + \text{H}_2$)¹ or (2) ^{235}U in atomic vapor laser isotope separation as pursued at LLNL. The cost of the feed stream is minimized by seeking applications with high yield per kilogram of

feed. Because of the high laser costs we again want applications in which both the product value (\$/kg_p) is high and demand levels are high enough to allow some economies of scale. Unfortunately these are often conflicting requirements, as seen in Fig. 3. Achieving economies of scale for lasers [Fig. 3(a)] implies processing many kg of product per year. Figure 3(b) shows that materials with a large demand in kg/yr tend not only to have lower cost per kg (magnifying the specific laser processing cost problem)² but also tend to have lower dollar volume per year (making it a much less rewarding market to penetrate). The requirements of (1) sufficient selling price to offset the laser energy costs and (2) sufficient demand to obtain economies of scale are seen to exclude most chemicals produced.

Clearly the unique selective characteristics of laser energy must be well utilized in any laser process in order to achieve the process and economic leverage necessary to justify its high cost. Unfortunately rapid intramolecular vibrational relaxation rates can quickly (on a picosecond time scale) spread the energy selectively absorbed by one bond, leading to thermalization of the laser energy. The broad electronic (~vibronic) absorption bands of molecules also frustrate the selective intramolecular application of laser energy. In addition few viable high yield per photon applications have been identified.

For a new process to be adopted the risk/reward ratio must also be favorable. The reward is measured by the reduction in unit cost of the product, achieved from a laser photoprocess, along with the size of the

potential market. Requirements on these two factors have been covered above. The level of risk is measured by the probability of failure and by the up-front at-risk expenditures consisting of RD&D plus capital costs. In the capital-intensive chemical industry the cost, availability, and possibility of loss of the capital investment must be carefully weighed not only against the potential benefits but also against the sunk costs in the existing process to be displaced. Hence a new laser process may have a significantly lower unit cost but, as shown in Fig. 4, unless it also boasts (1) lower capital costs and (2) lower cost/kg_p than the forward (operating) costs of the existing process, it will have a low chance of acceptance. The diagonal lines on the graph in Fig. 4 are lines of constant cost/kg of product, which consists of amortized capital cost/kg plus the operating cost/kg. The two shaded regions on the graph point up the conclusion that it is much more difficult to compete against the forward costs of a capital intensive existing process than to compete for new capacity against such a conventional process.

In Fig. 5 we have summarized the conclusions from our analysis in the form of four criteria for an economically successful laser photoprocessing application. In scoping out a new process these general criteria must be supported by a more quantitative, although approximate, estimate of the laser system requirements.

Atomic-Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS)

In the isotopic enrichment of uranium for light water reactor (LWR) fuel rods we see that each of our four criteria can be satisfied. Furthermore, the added cost of enrichment, presently about \$600/kg for LWR fuel, exceeds our \$10/kg estimate of typical laser processing costs by a favorably large margin. Figure 6 summarizes the other factors that allow us to meet our criteria quite comfortably.

Note that the high value of the fuel for light water nuclear reactors as well as the current and projected demand readily satisfy our first and second criteria for an economically viable laser materials processing application. We also see that the unique, precisely definable properties of laser radiation can be applied to realize highly selective ionization of ^{235}U without also ionizing ^{238}U atoms (criterion 3), which are much more abundant in both the feed and product. In the specific enrichment process under development for the DOE at LLNL we use precisely tuned (laser-pumped) dye laser radiation to selectively photoionize the ^{235}U component in atomic vapor. Three visible beams are produced with sufficiently precise wavelengths to distinguish between the ^{238}U and ^{235}U electronic energy levels, which are slightly shifted relative to each other. This and alternate one- and two step processes are shown in Fig. 7. Following ionization the ^{235}U atoms are extracted from the neutral vapor by pulsed electromagnetic fields and collected as enriched product. Figure 8 shows the basic elements of this process. The major elements of photon stream, feed stream, process chamber, and product

stream in Fig. 2 are readily identified with their counterparts in this figure.

Figure 9 shows the alternative financial perspective, which we have just considered, and process-oriented perspective in which we may view the economics of the process. The materials handling and laser-system contributions to the cost/kg_p are calculated from the process performance and process engineering costs defined in the figure. Solving the equation in Fig. 9 for $(\$/\text{MJ})_L$, we will determine acceptable laser-system photon costs ($\$/\text{MJ}$) once the process parameters have been estimated. This along with laser power, frequency, and beam parameters will define the laser technology development goal and show the sensitivity of acceptable laser costs to some of the process physics parameters. In this way we obtain the projected range for $\$/\text{MJ}$ and may select candidate lasers having a reasonable chance of development to the required engineering and cost specifications.

Figure 10 presents an estimate of the order of magnitude of the important process and laser parameters. The total mass throughput is calculated in terms of the process chamber geometry, atomic number density (n), vapor velocity (v), and average uranium molecular weight (238) to be on the order of 10^7 kg/year. The requirements for laser pulse repetition frequency (PRF) are determined by the inverse clearing time for the laser interaction region. Specific laser energy requirements are determined to be about 1 MJ/kg_p by combining the uranium ionization energy of about 6 eV, the molecular weight, and the system photon

utilization efficiency η . The latter consists of the product of laser chain and frequency conversion efficiency, beam transport efficiency, and the fraction of photons absorbed by ^{235}U . Total system average power P is the product of mass throughput and the specific laser energy. Converted to appropriate units it is on the order of 10^5 W. Finally we can estimate the process yield from the desired feed, product and tails assays to be about 10 %.

With these estimates in hand we can now use our simple economics model to determine acceptable photon costs. Figure 11 shows on the left the trade-off of specific laser energy requirements with acceptable laser system costs assuming the process yield in Fig. 10, $\sim \$10/\text{kg}_F$ for materials handling and $\sim \$100/\text{kg}_p$, which is the approximate goal for enrichment costs for our process. While substantially less than the present $\$600/\text{kg}_p$ quoted above, the latter figure is still many times our $\$10/\text{kg}_p$ typical laser-processing estimate. Choosing our point estimate of $1 \text{ MJ}/\text{kg}_F$ on this sensitivity curve corresponds to an acceptable photon energy cost of $\sim \$10/\text{MJ}$.

The allocation of this life-cycle cost per MJ between capital and operating must be consistent both with attainable laser-system lifetimes and efficiencies and with the particular market-acceptance requirements for capital expenditures we discussed above and in Fig. 3. The right half of Fig. 11 depicts the parameter space for total system capital cost per watt C_L , laser electrical efficiency ϵ_L , and yearly operating cost f , expressed as a fraction of capital cost. Each point on the surface

corresponds to our acceptable laser energy cost of \$10/MJ. The particular (not unreasonable) point indicated on the curve corresponds to \$6.66/MJ for operating cost and \$3.34/MJ for capital costs, certainly a favorable allocation (cf. Fig. 3), especially as compared with highly capital intensive conventional enrichment methods.

Having scoped out the total laser-system cost and power requirements and determined trade-offs available between capital and operating expenses, we now indicate how to distribute these cost and performance parameters among laser head, beam transport, and beam combination optics. Figure 12 shows a representative AVLIS laser-system design in which trade-offs can be made to (1) optimize optical extraction efficiency vs laser head economies of scale (Fig. 4), interstage losses, and beam combination losses using series and parallel laser-chain staging, and (2) match laser head PRF to process-chamber requirements by multiplexing. In an iterative design process these trade-offs are performed in order to minimize overall laser-system costs and arrive at copper-vapor laser (CVL) (our baseline pump laser) and dye-laser technology development goals. Figure 12 shows the dye lasers pumped from both sides since this optimizes beam quality. Following combination with the second- and third-step wavelengths (λ_2 and λ_3) the photons are transported to the process chamber with the correct energy fluence and pulse repetition frequency.

As mentioned above, our baseline AVLIS process consists of a three step excitation to ionization. We are developing CVLs to pump dye lasers with frequencies tuned to each of these steps. As a result of the

analysis procedure we have established the horizontal dark band on the development schedule shown in Fig. 13 as the required single aperture power for a commercial plant. The open circles denoting performances achieved at Livermore show that we have already demonstrated CVLs at plant scale. Future work will emphasize perfecting integrated operation and reliability, and reducing costs.

Figure 14 displays three generations of copper vapor lasers developed at progressively larger scale (1-2 W, 10-20 W, and 100-200 W, respectively) at Livermore. The "Venus" laser facility consists of 32 CVL heads rated at 15 W that operate at 6 kHz PRF. These lasers, based on 1977 technology, typically occur in six-head master-oscillator-power-amplifier (MOPA) units. Figure 15 shows CVLs being tested before installation.* The modular-design CVLs are contained in a rigid space frame that allows each CVL head to slide out for servicing. The quick-disconnect features make it possible to repair or replace one CVL without interrupting the entire system operation. The electronics are also packaged in replaceable modules. By demonstrating integrated laser-system operation we have achieved significant progress towards scaling up to the 100 kW level appropriate to a full-scale plant.

* We appreciate the help of the General Electric Valley Forge Space Sciences Laboratory in the development of these copper lasers.

We made significant progress in scaling up the individual CVL heads when during the last year we achieved a major advance in laser technology with the first successful operation of a large-bore (7.5 cm diam) longitudinal-discharge CVL. Figure 16 shows the stainless steel water-cooled vacuum housing surrounding the alumina plasma tube that comprises the CVL. Figure 17 shows it being tested. We have obtained power levels appropriate to a full-scale plant with well over 100 W of extractable power at 5 kHz PRF. The achievement of high average powers at kHz PRFs is made possible by the discovery that volumetric deactivation of the lower metastable level between pulses is possible using high-pressure buffer gas, as reported by workers in the Soviet Union^{3,4} and in Israel.⁵ Prior to this it was thought that deactivation of the metastables could only be obtained through diffusion to the walls. This had directed development to annular designs that had limited volume (and power) for a given PRF. Along with obtaining high average power with large-bore CVLs we are also able to avoid the optical difficulties inherent in transporting annular laser beams.

Summarizing in Fig. 18, we see that in both single-aperture power and in integrated operation the feasibility of scaling copper vapor lasers to full scale plant power requirements is essentially demonstrated.

Given the flexibility in defining the process wavelengths afforded us by the many available transitions in atomic uranium, we have also been developing an advanced pump laser option. A two-step photoionization process (cf. Fig. 7) using XeCl laser-pumped dyes has been pursued with

the development of the rare-gas halide (RGH) closed-cycle test bed (CCTB) laser shown in Fig. 19. This system comprises a flow loop that continuously circulates a rare-gas halogen mixture through the (rectangular cross section) discharge-excitation region. An electron gun is used for preionization, followed by the thyatron-triggered discharge. Operating the CCTB as a XeCl laser we have achieved 70 W of average power at 850 Hz PRF. The high-power prototype (HPP), a scaled up RGH laser system presently under construction, will be potentially capable of operating at power levels comparable to the "Venus" CVL system.

The dye laser system converts the fixed-frequency green-yellow CVL light (or the appropriate wavelength RGH light) into tunable radiation. A master oscillator feeds the desired frequency into a chain of highly saturated transversely pumped dye amplifiers, which we combine for transmission into the isotope-separation chamber. The dye fluid, flowing near vertically through the amplifier, passes through an active volume pumped by the green light from a CVL. Figure 20 shows this configuration. Figure 21 shows the laboratory test bed for development of this dye waveform generator. The green CVL beam can be seen pumping the dye oscillator and amplifiers.

Over the past year we developed an outstanding dye master oscillator (Fig. 22) that has significantly improved the dye laser system. The dye master oscillator defines the wavelengths precisely matching the appropriate ^{235}U transitions. Accomplishments in the dye laser area also include development of new dye compounds with improved stability and

photon conversion efficiency, and demonstration of a significant portion of our efficiency and beam quality goals required for a plant. Figure 23 shows a recently developed dye amplifier that achieved improved beam characteristics through suppression of internal reflections.

For the development of these lasers we have constructed an integrated system of enrichment facilities shown in Fig. 24. A schematic of the systems in each facility is presented in Fig. 25. We have enriched macroscopic quantities of ^{235}U at progressively larger scales using the SPP-II lasers and the "Regulis" vaporizer. The "Venus" laser system enables us to illuminate a greater volume of the uranium vapor. The recently constructed "Mars" vaporizer and process chamber system, a significant step towards full-scale technology, is currently being brought on-line through integrated testing and evaluation. A factor of 10 increase in vapor throughput will give us a great deal of developmental information at increased scale over the next several years.

We have completed an intensive science and technology evaluation phase in which the process technology has been shown to be scalable to full production plant scale ($\sim 10^7$ kg/yr throughput and $\sim 10^5$ W laser power as in Fig. 10). While technology evaluation will continue on alternative options such as the RGH lasers, as shown in Fig. 26 we are now in the technology demonstration phase in which AVLIS may be the advanced isotope separation process chosen by the DOE to be demonstrated at engineering scale in the late 1980s. Following successful engineering demonstration, a full-scale isotope-separation plant could be in production in the 1990s.

The DOE is planning to select an advanced isotope-separation process in 1982 for engineering demonstration. If a laser process is chosen, we will have the first real opportunity to achieve large-scale application of lasers in a materials processing application. Figure 27 shows an artist's conception of the Advanced Isotope Separation facility (AISF) consisting of the 80,000 ft² laboratory building in the foreground and the closed-circulation-pattern office building for 175 LIS staff behind it. The AISF will house a large-scale LIS system capable of demonstrating empirically the process performance we have projected. If this effort is fully funded in 1982, we would be able to verify full-scale process performance as early as 1985-1986. With realization of the projected savings in enrichment costs for LWR fuel, and the hundreds of millions of dollars per year of laser/EO business that could easily result, the acceptance and support of laser technology for a broader range of applications should be considerably enhanced.

The future prospects for laser materials-processing applications may be expected to be improved by the factors listed in Fig. 28, such as steadily improving laser performance resulting in lower photon costs, and the identification of new high-photon-leverage processes as the result of continuing research in corporations, universities, and in the national laboratories. Finally, we should not entirely write off potential high-value material applications merely because of too small a market. With some reduction in laser costs we may yet find products with favorable price elasticities so that a reduction in price from an improved efficiency laser process could result in significantly increased revenues.

References

1. H.-L. Chen and C. Borzileri, "Laser Cleanup of H_2S from Synthesis Gas," IEEE J. Quantum Electron. QE-16, 1229 (1980).
2. W. Happer, J. Chamberlain, H. Foley, N. Fortson, J. Katz, R. Novick, M. Ruderman, and K. Watson, Laser Induced Photochemistry, JASON Report JSR-78-11, SRI International, Stanford, CA (1979).
3. P.A. Bokhan, V.A. Gerasimov, V.I. Solomonov, and V.B. Sheheglov, "Stimulated Emission Mechanism of a Copper Vapor Laser," Sov. J. Quantum Electron. 8, 1220 (1978).
4. A.A. Isaev and M.A. Kazaryan, "Investigation of Pulsed Copper Vapor Laser," Sov. J. Quantum Electron. 7, 253 (1977).
5. J. Smilanski, A. Kerman, L.A. Levin, and G. Erez, "Scaling of the Discharge Heated Copper Vapor Laser," Opt. Commun. 25, 79 (1978).

LASER ENERGY IS EXPENSIVE

- Relative to other forms of energy

~ \$0.005/MJ

~ \$0.01/MJ

~ \$1 - \$100/MJ

- Relative to most bulk chemicals

$$(\$/\text{kg})_{\text{product}} = (\$/\text{kg})_L + (\$/\text{kg})_M$$

$$(\$/\text{kg})_{\text{product}} \lesssim \$2/\text{kg}$$

But

$$(\$/\text{kg})_L \gtrsim \$10/\text{kg}$$

70-01-0681-1574

Figure 1.

ELEMENTS OF A LASER PHOTO-PROCESS

30-90-0681-1575

Figure 2.

SCALE OF PLANT VS SCALE OF MARKET

- High value products are typically low volume/yr

70-01-0681-1572 • Therefore difficult to obtain economies of scale

Figure 3.

CAPITAL COSTS – CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE

- Most difficult acceptance is new, high capital vs old, low capital
- Best chance of acceptance is new, low capital vs old, low capital

70-01-0681-1571

Figure 4.

QUALITATIVE CRITERIA FROM "MACRO-ECONOMIC" ANALYSIS

- Produce "High Value" or new products
- Have markets consistent with both
 - High value/unit
 - High volume/year
- Achieve maximum leverage from laser photons
 - Utilize unique laser properties
 - Maximize product yield per photon
- Require lower capital expenditures than existing process
 - As well as lower \$/kg_p

1
20
1

WHY ATOMIC VAPOR LASER ISOTOPE SEPARATION OF URANIUM

- High value product, currently $\sim \$600/\text{kg}_p$ enrichment cost
reduce to $\sim \$100/\text{kg}_p$ " "
- Current and projected demand is sufficiently large
 - Displace existing gaseous diffusion capacity
 - Strip ^{235}U from existing waste stockpile
- High photon leverage
 - Selectivity is high
 - Non-stoichiometric, i.e. ^{235}U is small fraction of feed and product
- Capital costs are significantly lower than diffusion and gas centrifuge

Figure 7.

ATOMIC VAPOR LASER ISOTOPE SEPARATION – MAJOR SYSTEMS

Figure 8.

ELEMENTARY ECONOMICS MODEL

• Process performance

- Process yield - (kg_p/kg_F)
- Specific laser energy - $(MJ/kg_F)_L$

• Process engineering costs

- Materials handling subsystems - $(\$/kg_F)_M$
- Laser EO subsystems - $(\$/MJ)_L$

70-01-0681-1570

Figure 9.

AVLIS PROCESS AND LASER REQUIREMENTS

- $M \approx m_0 \cdot \nu n W L \sim 10^7 \text{ kg}_F/\text{yr}$ (mass throughput)

- $\text{PRF} \approx \frac{\nu}{H} \sim 10^4 \text{ Hz}$ (pulse repetition frequency)

- $\left(\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kg}_F} \right)_L \approx \frac{3h\nu}{\eta \cdot m_0} \sim 1 \text{ MJ/kg}_F$ (specific energy)

- $\bar{p} \approx \frac{h\nu \dot{M}}{\eta \cdot m_0} \sim 10^5 \text{ watts}$

(laser system power $\sim 3 \times 10^6 \text{ MJ/yr}$)

- $\text{kg}_P/\text{kg}_F = \theta \sim 10^{-1}$ ("cut")

AVLIS LASER COST AND PERFORMANCE TRADE-OFFS

• Process performance and costs

• Laser performance and costs

$$\frac{(\$/kg_p) \frac{kg_p}{kg_F} - (\$/kg_F)_m}{MJ/kg_F} \Rightarrow \$10/MJ \leftarrow \underbrace{\frac{0.011}{\epsilon_L}}_{\text{Operating cost}} + \underbrace{(f + 0.163) 0.037 C_L}_{\text{Capital cost}}$$

- Process physics + market conditions + materials handling costs
⇒ photon cost requirements
- We trade-off laser capital costs against performance (power, electrical efficiency, lifetime and reliability) to achieve photon costs

LASER SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE + PROCESS REQUIREMENTS → LASER HEAD REQUIREMENTS

- Optimizing optical system performance requires serial and parallel staging
- Obtaining optimum laser PRF generally requires multiplexing
- Trade-off
 - ✓ Availability/redundancy
 - ✓ Damage limits
 - ✓ Extraction efficiency
 - ✓ Combination losses
 - ✓ Interstage losses
 - ✓ Economies of scale/laser head

30-01-0001-1567

Figure 12.

LARGE BORE CVL's HAVE BEEN DEMONSTRATED AT PLANT SCALE

30-17-0681-1565

Figure 13.

Fig. 14. CVLs have been developed at progressively larger scales.

25 Venus CVCs have achieved excellent integrated system performance.

Fig. 17. Large bore CVLs have achieved between 100-200 M of extractable

COPPER VAPOR LASERS – SUMMARY

- Existing 15 W laser meets production performance requirements for Cu MOPA oscillator
- Present large bore CVLs operate at average power levels of 100-200 W
- Scaling of average power to plant requirements is essentially a systems integration job
- Copper laser life and reliability can be achieved with a systematic engineering and test program

- 33 -

CLOSED CYCLE TEST BED - RGH LASERS

04-02-0681-1576

Figure 19

WAVEFORM MODULE

Figure 20.

Fig. 22. Dye master oscillator.

Fig. 23. This dye amplifier can be readily scaled to plant requirements.

ATOMIC VAPOR LASER ISOTOPE SEPARATION INTEGRATED FACILITIES

- 39 -

Figure 24.

ENRICHMENT FACILITIES SCHEMATIC

ALVIS PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT PHASES

Figure 26.

Figure 27.

FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR LASERS IN MATERIALS PROCESSING

- Favorable price elasticities may result in significantly increased revenues

- Lower energy costs will continue to decline
- New processes will be identified
- Successful implementation of uranium process will significantly improve commercial acceptability of lasers in materials processing

30-90-0681-1568

Figure 28.