An Impurity Beam-Trapping Instability in Tokamaks

J. T. Hogan
H. C. Howe

MASTER

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

OPERATED BY UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION FOR THE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS LIMITED

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Printed in the United States of America. Available from
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161
Price: Printed Copy \$4.00; Microfiche \$3.00

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the Energy Research and Development Administration/United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

Contract No. W-7405-eng-26

Fusion Energy Division

AN IMPURITY BEAM-TRAPPING INSTABILITY IN TOKAMAKS

J. T. Hogan and H. C. Howe

Date Published: December 1976

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

prepared by the
OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830
operated by
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
for the
ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

AN IMPURITY BEAM TRAPPING INSTABILITY IN TOKAMAKS*

J. T. Hogan and H. C. Howe
Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

ABSTRACT

We consider the sensitivity of neutron energy production to the trapping by impurities by injected neutral beams. The beam-trapping process is affected by inherent low-Z contamination of the tritium plasma, by the species composition of the neutral beam, and by the entrance angle of the beam. We compare the sensitivities of the process to these variables and to the variation with wall material. We find that use of a low-Z, low-sputtering material could retard a possible beam trapping instability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Plasma-surface interactions play an important role in all present CTR devices.^{1,2} With the advent of high power levels of neutral beam heating,^{3,4} where injected power is greater than or equal to ohmic power, new considerations also require detailed understanding of plasma-surface effects, and more stringent requirements on materials may become necessary.

The conventional view of the problems posed by impurity contaminants is that the radiative losses which they cause may impose impossibly high requirements for plasma τ_E values.⁴ Neoclassical transport theory predicts that impurities will accumulate in the core, so that heavy metals used in the wall or limiter may cause substantial energy losses even at elevated temperatures. This is viewed as a serious problem for thermonuclear power reactors, which should operate with pulse lengths

many times longer than one energy confinement time in order to produce high values of Q ($\equiv$ fusion output/energy input). An analysis of the energy deposition-impurity production cycle may be schematized as in Fig. 1. There is a natural time delay which allows the production of small amounts of energy ($Q \simeq 1$) before impurity effects predominate; thus, experiments such as the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR) near plasma break-even conditions should be feasible.

This conventional view must be modified when intensely beam-driven tokamaks are considered. While ohmic heating energy may be preferentially deposited in high-resistivity plasma regions, the energy input through fast-ion thermalization must be reconsidered.

Rome et al.⁵ have treated the beam-deposition problem. They find that for ratios of plasma minor radius to mean free path (a/λ_0) ≤ 4 , the beam energy will be deposited in the plasma core. The mean free path is computed from several beam trapping processes:

- a) Charge exchange by protons (deuterons, tritons) and impurity ions,
- b) Impact ionization by protons (deuterons, tritons) and impurity ions.

Cross sections for trapping by hydrogenic particles are given by Riviere⁶ and Freeman.⁷ The influence of impurities in beam trapping has been suggested by Girard et al.⁸ and Furth.⁹

It is the impurity trapping process which we must consider. For injection experiments now under way or planned, rough typical values for a/λ_0 range from about 2.4 (ORMAK, ORMAK Upgrade, respectively), to about 4 (PLT), to 8 (TFTR, full-radius). We see that attainment of

Fig. 1. Schematic view of the energy deposition-impurity production process. The beam slows from its initial energy in a time τ_s , thereby delivering E_{plasma} . This energy is confined for a time τ_E before being released to the wall. There the impurity production rate $N_Z(a)$ is started, and after an inward impurity diffusion time τ_d^Z , the impurities arrive in the plasma core. The Q value rises on the beam-slowng time scale, however, and values near unity can be achieved before $N_Z(0)$ is significant.

$a/\lambda_0 \leq 4$ may be difficult. If this is true, the beam will be trapped closer to the plasma edge than had been supposed. When the fast ions thermalize and heat the edge region, with its higher neutral density, the charge exchange bombardment will be more intense than the flux from the core considered in Ref. 1. Thus, more impurities will be produced, a/λ will increase even more, the beam will be trapped even closer to the edge, and an instability will occur which will eventually prevent further beam penetration.

To describe the requirements on materials which this new process imposes, we first discuss the models that we employ for the plasma and wall. We then take up the dynamics of the beam trapping instability, and finally discuss the sensitivity of the process to the choice of materials.

2. MODELS FOR PLASMA AND WALL PROCESSES

We use a transport code which computes the radial and temporal evolution of the plasma and impurity temperatures and densities. (See Ref. 10 for a review.) The plasma transport and injection models are described elsewhere.^{11,12} The neutral gas is treated with an analytic¹ transport model. The beam processes are treated with moments of the Fokker-Planck equation¹³ or by direct solution of the Fokker-Planck equation. The energy balance includes thermal conduction and convection processes, charge exchange, line radiation, bremsstrahlung and recombination losses, and input from the thermalization of fast injection particles and alpha particles. The particle balance accounts for diffusive losses and input by ionization of neutrals, thermalized

injected particles and electrons produced by the stripping of impurity ions.

We describe more fully processes which are of special interest in the plasma-wall interaction:

1. Impurity properties: The important plasma transport variables are

$$a) Z_{\text{eff}} \equiv \frac{\sum N_k Z_k^2}{N_e}$$

$$b) [Z] \equiv \frac{\sum N_k Z_k^2 M_f/M_k}{N_e}$$

$$c) N_f \equiv N_e - \sum_k N_k Z_k$$

d) Q_{low} : Radiation from 'low-Z' impurities ($Z \leq 30$)

e) Q_{high} : Radiation from 'high-Z' impurities ($Z > 30$)

2. Charge exchange losses: The plasma profiles are computed self consistently and lead to a spectrum of outgoing neutrals which is a function of energy and angle (E, θ).

The normal incidence sputtering yield is multiplied by $1/\cos \theta$ and integrated with $f_{\text{CX}}(E, \theta)$ to obtain a $\bar{Y}(E)$. This result is integrated to obtain a net sputtering yield over all energies and angles. Figure 2 shows results for a fixed T_i profile (unlike calculations presented later) in which we vary the machine size. One sees that

$$\bar{Y} \equiv \frac{\int d^3v v_{\perp} f_{\text{CX}}(\underline{v}) \bar{Y}(E)}{\int d^3v v_{\perp} f_{\text{CX}}(\underline{v}) E} \quad (\#/eV)$$

is a slowly varying function of size. Detailed calculations of the

ORNL-DWG 74-7846

Fig. 2.. The charge-exchange sputtering process for H-Au is examined with fixed plasma profiles. As machine size increases by a factor of 5 in minor radius, the number of impurities produced per eV of charge-exchange flux varies by 10%, while the central neutral density drops by a factor of 15.

emergent spectra are needed for interpretation of experiments, and will yield needed information for experiments such as ISX and TEXTOR. For the purposes of this sensitivity study, we will characterize the sputtering produced by the plasma-wall interaction in terms of a fixed number ($\bar{Y}$) of impurity ions per eV of emergent charge exchange loss.

3. Impurity diffusion: We treat neoclassical impurity diffusion in the Pfirsch-Schlüter regime¹⁴:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} N_Z = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \Gamma_Z) + \Sigma_Z, \quad (1)$$

where Γ_Z and Σ_Z are the flux and source of impurity ions, respectively. We assume that all ions produced by sputtering are deposited in the outermost spatial cell of the computation. We treat the relative distribution of charge states by means of the coronal equilibria calculated by Jordan.¹⁵

4. Beam-impurity effects:

a) Cross section for trapping. As we have noted, there exists some probability that the impact ionization process for beam-impurity collisions will be the dominant effect at energies of interest for thermonuclear plasmas. We assume that the beam trapping along the path of a beam line⁵ is given by

$$\frac{dn_b}{ds} = -n_b(\sigma_{CX} n_i + Z^2 \sigma_i N_Z + \sigma_i n_i) \quad (2)$$

where Z , n_Z are the impurity charge and density. The charge exchange and fuel ion (H, D, or T) impact ionization cross sections are

represented by $\sigma_{CX,i}$. The beam, fuel ion, and electron densities are given as $n_{b,i,e}$.

b) Thermalization. During thermalization the fast ions scatter in pitch-angle at a rate proportional to $\langle Z_{eff} \rangle$. This does not affect the energy deposition to the background. The fast ions transfer energy primarily to electrons when their energy $W \geq E_{crit}$, where

$$E_{crit} = 14.8 T_e M_b \left[\frac{[Z]}{M_f} \right]^{2/3} M_{b,f}, \quad (3)$$

and $M_{b,f}$ is the mass of beam, fuel ions. Thus, a heavy admixture of low-Z impurities can shift the heating to the electrons by lowering $[Z]$ and hence E_{crit} .

c) Radial dependence. The fast-ion lifetime τ_f varies by a large factor from the plasma core to the corona. This effect strongly influences the beam trapping instability, since the metabolism of the impurity production cycle is enhanced by quicker delivery of energy to the plasma.

3. BEAM TRAPPING INSTABILITY

To show the instability in clear-cut form we examine a beam-driven system. We choose a tokamak with the dimensions of TFTR, and choose beam power levels which are those envisaged for the device. Figure 3 shows the results of the evolution of this instability. We assume that charge-exchange sputtering of the iron wall is the dominant impurity production process.

3.1 EVOLUTION OF THE INSTABILITY

We assume the plasma (100% T) has been pre-heated to 4 keV and isolated from the wall. The current is at 1 MA at $t = 0$ and injection starts at 20 msec. The subsequent heating is shown in Fig. 3a. In the course of the plasma's free expansion from its initial isolated position, a 'cold plasma blanket' is formed which is helpful in reducing inward migration of impurities¹⁶ (Fig. 3b). The iron impurities manage to 'tunnel through' this blanket, however, and eventually reach the plasma core (Fig. 3c). The beam-deposition properties are measured by the function $H(r)$ ⁵ which is normalized so that its volume integral is unity. In Fig. 3d we see the time evolution of $H(r)$ (for the full energy component of the beams) as the beam deposition moves out. As the injected beam is assumed to have full, one-half, and one-third energy components present in the ratio 1:2:1, we show the time evolution of $H(0)$ for all components in Fig. 3e. The output of the TFTR is shown in Fig. 3f, where attainment of neutron energy of 1 MJ/pulse is achieved in spite of the instability. At 300 msec, however, temperatures and Q are decreasing, so that this process cannot be extrapolated to longer times in a power-producing reactor.

We note that Q is defined for the entire injection pulse, and that for selected intervals of time within this pulse, $Q \sim 1$ experiments may be performed.

3.2 VARIATION WITH PRE-HEATING IMPURITY CONTENT

The presence of significant amounts of low-Z impurities, such as oxygen, can produce an early onset of the beam-exclusion process.

Fig. 3. The TFTR configuration we adopt as a standard case has these parameters:

a_{plasma}	54 cm	I 1 MA
a_{limiter}	85 cm	$T_e, T_i(0)$ 4 keV
R_0	248 cm	$N_e(0,0)$ $7 \cdot 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$
$B_T(\text{axis})$	50 kG	$N_o(0,0)$ $1.4 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$
		$N_{\text{Fe}}(0,0)$ $3.5 \cdot 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-3}$

- 3a: The evolution of T_e and T_i . Impurity trapping causes preferential heating near the edge.
- 3b: Electron density evolution. Cold external neutral gas and the plasma evolution from the initial isolated state create an inverted density profile in a region of low T_e .
- 3c: The iron diffusion is hindered by the cold plasma blanket, but after about 200 msec substantial diffusion into the plasma core occurs.
- 3d: The beam deposition profile for the 120-keV D_0 shows the progression from strongly peaked deposition to edge heating.
- 3e: The one-half and one-third energy components penetrate very weakly. $H(0)$ values of 1 or 2 are acceptable initially, but within 100 msec the beam trapping instability develops.
- 3f: Ion temperatures reach 7 keV before falling; the Q value peaks at .36, while neutron output exceeds 1.8 MJ.

ORNL-DWG 76-12911

ORNL-DWG 76-18100

Figures 4a, b show a comparison between two cases with initial oxygen content leading to Z_{eff} of 3 and 6, respectively. These bracket the current experimental range. While the neutron energy production is not greatly affected, the cleaner case shows substantially higher ion temperature and a longer useful pulse.

3.3 VARIATION WITH BEAM ENERGY COMPOSITION

If the species in the D^0 neutral beams can be controlled, significant improvement will be obtained. Figures 5a, b show a case with the 1:2:1 mixture of full, one-half, and one-third energy components compared with a case in which all of the injected D^0 beam is at 120 keV. Q is increased by 100% and the pulse is not limited by impurity effects.

3.4 VARIATION WITH ANGLE OF INJECTION

Within limits, the beam may be aimed at a sharper angle to the plasma to reduce the path length required to penetrate to the core. Figures 6a, b show cases where the beam radius of tangency is 250 and 220 cm, respectively. Some delay in the onset of the instability is gained, but Q and neutron energy production vary only slightly.

These cases serve to illustrate the sensitivity of this process to changes in plasma variables. It is important to note that these variables may be fixed by other constraints, such as the efficiency of discharge cleaning (for initial low- Z content), the success of ion source species control, and the design of neutral beam line systems (for angle of injection).

Fig. 4: The standard case is revised to include an 8% initial oxygen content. The Q and W_n values change by less than 20%, but there is no bulk heating of the thermal ions. $T_i(0)$ reaches final values of 6.8 keV (2% oxygen) and 3.9 keV (8% oxygen).

Fig. 5: If the beam were to be composed solely of 120-keV deuterons, the Q and W_n values would increase. The greater bulk heating of ions is prevented by onset of the beam trapping instability. Final $T_i(0)$ is ~ 3.5 keV for both cases. Q rises rapidly in time and reaches values of .68 and .38, respectively.

Fig. 6: Steepening the entrance angle for near-parallel injection produces a slight enhancement of T_i , and a slightly longer pulse length. Final $T_i(0)$ is near 6 keV for both cases. Q , rising rapidly in time, reaches .35.

Wall-limiter materials other than SS/tungsten or molybdenum have not been widely used in tokamaks, and so it is of interest to determine the sensitivity of the beam-trapping process to the use of different materials.

4. MATERIALS

As noted in Section 2, we use a simplified model for the charge exchange sputtering process for these sensitivity studies. As for sputtering yields, we have adapted the data recently reported by Behrisch and Kadomtsev.¹⁷ The table shows the range of assumed values for $\bar{Y}$ for the materials we consider.

TABLE: Values for $\bar{Y}$

<u>Material</u>	<u>$\bar{Y}$ (#/eV)</u>
SS	2.10^{-6}
C*	1.10^{-6}
S _i C [†]	2.10^{-6}
M _O	$1.4 \cdot 10^{-6}$
W	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$

*Pyrolytic graphite sample (Union Carbide) quoted by Behrisch.¹⁷

[†]See Ref. 17.

Figures 7a, b show the comparison of C, S_iC, F_e, M_O, and W for the TFTR case discussed in Section 3. While there are uncertainties in the measured sputtering yields, and only preliminary results concerning the validity of the neoclassical inward diffusion assumption,¹⁸ we see that the best results have been obtained for the low-Z, low-sputtering pyrolytic graphite and S_iC as reported by Behrisch and Kadomtsev.¹⁷ The reduction of impurity effects by choice of materials could well ease the constraints on power supplies, beam line design and species control imposed in other areas.

Fig. 7: A survey of materials is complicated by the absence of needed information about sputtering thresholds and yields, and about the radiative properties of highly stripped heavy metals. Nonetheless, the relative advantages of low-Z and low maximum yield can be compared with metals with higher Z and low yield. The variation with material produces a factor of 2 improvement in deposition at 300 msec, and the low-Z candidate would produce long pulses if pessimistic impurity diffusion assumptions were relaxed (Fig. 7a). Figure 7b shows results in the case where we assume that only 1/10 of the sputtered impurities are retained in the plasma. However, we do not include self-sputtering effects. The $H(0)$ values are uniformly decreasing with time in the figure, although this variation represents merely an adjustment to a new density profile in Fig. 7b.

5. DISCUSSION

These calculations serve to demonstrate the relative sensitivity of neutron energy production, in a given device, to the variation of several parameters. The same model is used for each parameter survey, and the model has been compared with existing experiments where it has been found to have predictive value.

Uncertainties in the relevant cross sections for trapping allow only this relative analysis, and dictate the rather simple model for charge exchange sputtering. As more precise information becomes available for low energy charge exchange neutral desorption, electron and photoelectron desorption, and desorption by charged fuel ions, the model can be improved.

THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

REFERENCES

1. J. T. Hogan and J. F. Clarke, J. Nucl. Mater. 53, 1 (1974).
2. E. Hinnov, J. Nucl. Mater. 53, 9 (1974).
3. L. A. Berry et al., Proc. 5th Conf. on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion, p. 113 (1975).
4. K. Bol et al., Proc. 5th Conf. on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion, p. 77 (1975).
5. J. A. Rome, J. F. Clarke, and J. D. Callen, Nucl. Fusion 14, 141 (1974).
6. A. C. Riviere, Nucl. Fusion 11, 363 (1971).
7. R. L. Freeman and E. M. Jones, Atomic Processes in Plasma Physics Experiments, CLM-R137, Culham Laboratory, Abingdon, Oxon, United Kingdom (1974).
8. J. P. Girard, D. A. Marty, and P. Moriette, Proc. 5th Conf. on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion, p. 681 (1975).
9. H. P. Furth, private communication.
10. J. T. Hogan, Multi-Fluid Tokamak Transport Models, ORNL/TM-5153, Oak Ridge (1975); to be published in Methods of Computational Physics, Vol. 16.
11. J. T. Hogan, R. H. Fowler, and H. C. Howe, Proc. 7th Conf. on Numerical Simulation of Plasmas (1975).
12. J. K. Munro et al., A User's Manual for the Oak Ridge Tokamak Transport Code, ORNL/TM-5262, Oak Ridge (to be published).
13. J. D. Callen et al., Proc. 5th Conf. on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion, p. 645 (1975).

REFERENCES (cont'd)

14. P. H. Rutherford, Phys. Fluids 17, 1782 (1974).
15. C. Jordan, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 142, 501 (1969).
16. W. Tang et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 660 (1975).
17. N. R. Behrisch and B. B. Kadomtsev, Proc. 5th Conf. on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion, p. 229 (1975).
18. S. A. Cohen, J. L. Cecchi, and A. S. Marmor, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 1507 (1975).

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- 1-3. Laboratory Records
- 4. Laboratory Records — RC
- 5. Y-12 Document Reference Section
- 6-7. Central Research Library
- 8. Fusion Energy Division Library
- 9. Fusion Energy Reports Office
- 10. ORNL Patent Office
- 11. J. D. Callen
- 12. J. F. Clarke
- 13. R. A. Dory
- 14. G. G. Kelley
- 15. D. G. McAlees
- 16. O. B. Morgan
- 17. M. W. Rosenthal
- 18-40. J. T. Hogan

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- 41. Plasma Physics Library, Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton Univ., Forrestal Campus, P.O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08540
- 42. Controlled Thermonuclear Research Library, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94550
- 43. Q Division Library, c/o F. L. Ribe, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, Los Alamos, NM 87544
- 44. Controlled Thermonuclear Research Library, c/o Weston M. Stacey, Jr., Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439
- 45. CTR Computer Center, c/o Dr. John Killeen, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94550
- 46. Librarian, Culham Laboratory, U.K. Atomic Energy Authority, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14, 3DB, United Kingdom
- 47. Ruth Lengye, Bibliothek, Max Planck Institut für Plasmaphysik, 8046 Garching bei München, Federal Republic of Germany
- 48. Library, Centre de Recherches en Physique des Plasma, 21 Avenue des Bains, 1007, Lausanne, Switzerland

49. A. M. Dupas, Documentation S.I.G.N., Department de La Physique du Plasma, Et de La Fusion Controlée, Association EURATOM-CEA, Sur La Fusion, Centre d'Etudes Nucleaires, BP 85 Centre Du TRI 38041 Grenoble Cedex (France)
50. Bibliotheque, Service du Confinement des Plasmas, C.E.A., B.P. No. 6, 92, Fontenay-aux-Roses (Seine) France
51. Library, International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy
52. Library, Laboratorio Gas Ionizzati, Frascati, Italy
53. V. E. Ivanov, Physical-Technical Institute of the Ukranian Academy of Sciences, Sukhumi, U.S.S.R.
54. M. S. Rabinovich, Lebedev Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leninsky Prospect 53, Moscow, U.S.S.R.
55. Thermonuclear Laboratory, Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, 46 Ulitsa Kurchatova, P.O. Box 3402, Moscow, U.S.S.R.
56. Library, Institute for Plasma Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan 464
57. Library, FOM-Institut voor Plasma-Fysica, Rijnhuizen, Jutphaas, Netherlands
58. Plasma Physics Group, Department of Engineering Physics, Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra A.C.T. 2600 Australia
59. Thermonuclear Library, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Tokai, Naka, Ibaraki, Japan
60. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. Dieter J. Sigmar, Room 37-391, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139
61. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. D. W. Kerst, Dept. of Physics, Sterling Hall, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706
62. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. I. B. Bernstein, Yale Univ., New Haven, CT 06510
63. Center for Plasma Physics and Thermonuclear Research, c/o D. W. Ross, Univ. of Texas, Physics Dept., Austin, TX 78712
64. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. B. D. Fried, Physics Dept., Univ. of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024

65. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. David C. Montgomery, Physics & Astronomy Dept., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52240
66. Magneto-Fluid-Dynamics Library, Courant Inst. of Math. Sci., New York Univ., 251 Mercer St., New York, NY 10012
67. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. Allan N. Kaufman, Physics Dept., Univ. of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
68. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. W. B. Thompson, Physics Dept., Univ. of California, La Jolla, CA 92037
69. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. Alvin W. Trivelpiece, Dept. of Physics & Astronomy, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
70. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. T. Kammash, 103 Research Admin. Bldg., N. Campus, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48105
71. CTR Reading Room, c/o Dr. Ravi N. Sudan, Phillips Hall, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, NY 14850
72. Prof. Marshall N. Rosenbluth, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540
73. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. R. Gross, Plasma Research Lab., Columbia Univ., New York, NY 10027
74. CTR Reading Room, c/o Prof. Roy Gould, California Inst. of Tech., Pasadena, CA 91103
75. Dr. Nicholas A. Krall, Science Applications, Inc., P.O. Box 2354, 1200 Prospect St., La Jolla, CA 92037
76. CTR Reading Room, c/o Dr. Jay P. Boris, Plasma Physics, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC 20390
77. Professor A. Simon, Dept. of Mechanical & Aerospace Sciences, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627
78. CTR Library, c/o Dr. Alan F. Haught, United Technologies Research Labs, East Hartford, CT 06108
79. Dr. Robert E. Price, Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Energy Research and Development Administration, G-234, Washington, DC 20545
80. Dr. Bennett Miller, Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Energy Research and Development Administration, G-234, Washington, DC 20545

81. Dr. Arthur Sleeper, Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Energy Research and Development Administration, G-234, Washington, DC 20545
82. Dr. Walter Sadowski, Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Energy Research and Development Administration, G-234, Washington, DC 20545
83. Dr. D. H. Priester, Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Energy Research and Development Administration, G-234, Washington, DC 20545
84. Dr. E. E. Kintner, Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Energy Research and Development Administration, G-234, Washington, DC 20545
85. Dr. L. D. Pearlstein, L-388, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94550
86. Dr. J. P. Friedberg, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos NM 87544
87. Dr. David J. Rose, Dept. of Nuclear Engineering, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139
88. Dr. Gareth E. Guest, General Atomic Co., P.O. Box 81608, San Diego, CA 92138
89. Dr. Claude Mercier, Service du Theorie des Plasmas, Centre d'Etudes Nucléaires, Fontenay-aux-Roses (Seine) France
90. Dr. J. B. Taylor, Culham Laboratory, UKAEA Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, United Kingdom
91. Dr. D. Pfirsch, Institute for Plasma Physics, 8046 Garching bei München, Federal Republic of Germany
92. Dr. V. D. Shafranov, I. V. Kurchatov Inst. of Atomic Energy, 46 Ulitsa Kurchatova, P.O. Box 3402, Moscow, U.S.S.R.
93. Dr. Harold Grad, Courant Inst. of Math. Sci., New York Univ., 251 Mercer St., New York, NY 10012
94. Dr. J. G. Cordey, Culham Laboratory, UKAEA, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14, 3DB, United Kingdom
95. Dr. David Baldwin, L-388, Lawrence Livermore Lab., P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94550
96. Prof. Bruno Coppi, Dept. of Physics, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139

97. Dr. Harold P. Furth, Princeton Plasma Physics Lab., Princeton Univ., P.O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08540
98. Dr. Paul H. Rutherford, Princeton Plasma Physics Lab., Princeton Univ., Princeton, NJ 08540
99. Dr. Herbert H. Woodson, Dept. of Electrical Engineering, Univ. of Texas, Austin, TX 78712
100. Research and Technical Support Division, Energy Research and Development Administration, P.O. Box E, Oak Ridge, TN 37830
- 101-303. Given distribution as shown in TID-4500, Controlled Thermo-nuclear Processes (25 copies NTIS).