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ACT2 characteristics affecting design choices

1. The ACT2 plasma provides modest steady-state loads:
   • Peak/average neutron wall loading $P_{nw} = 2.2/1.5$ MW/m$^2$
   • Peak divertor surface heat flux $q_{div} < 10$ MW/m$^2$
   • Peak FW heat flux $q_{fw} = 0.28$ MW/m$^2$

2. A “conservative” DCLL blanket was explored by our Team for the first time in an integrated tokamak power plant configuration.
   • ARIES-ST (spherical torus)
   • ARIES-CS (compact stellarator)
   • US ITER TBM (small test articles)
   • He-cooled RAFS structure (e.g. F82H), PbLi in SiC inserts

3. He-cooled W-alloy divertor was chosen as the only known option that meets requirements on safety, waste & performance.

4. Brayton power cycle is possible with $\eta \approx 45\%$ (350°C blanket inlet)
ACT2 uses traditional ARIES full-sector maintenance concept: components contained in a structural ring.
The reference blanket is related to ARIES-ST

- 550°C limit for steel, 500°C limit for steel/PbLi interface.
- 8 MPa He cools the FW toroidally (385–436°C) and grid plates vertically (470°C).
- 0.28 MW/m² peak heat flux and 2.2 MW/m² peak wall load result in low thermal stresses.
- 2 W/mK SiC insulators (FCI’s) allow PbLi temperature to exceed 550°C.
- Simple LM flow paths keep primary stresses low.
- Complete thermal, fluid and elastic stress analyses were performed.
An alternative blanket design concept was explored in an attempt to simplify the manufacturing. Each module is fed by one Pb-Li access pipe.
Comparison of reference design and small-module design

- The main penalty of the small-module design is increased steel fraction (and reduced PbLi), requiring adjustments to maintain TBR.
- Modifications to the FW design allowed us to use 6-module concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARIES-CS (2m x 2m module)</th>
<th>ACT2 DCLL (Sector)</th>
<th>ACT2 DCLL (6 Modules-A)</th>
<th>ACT2 DCLL (6 Modules-B)</th>
<th>ACT2 DCLL (6 Modules-C)</th>
<th>ACT2 DCLL (8 Modules)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Wall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 cm</td>
<td>8% ODS FS 27% F82H 65% He</td>
<td>5.3% ODS FS 28.4% F82H 66.3% He</td>
<td>35.5% F82H 64.5% He (4/30/4 mm)</td>
<td>39.3% F82H 60.7% He (4/28/6 mm)</td>
<td>37.3% F82H 72.8% He (4/32/4 mm)</td>
<td>35.5% F82H 64.5% He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breeding Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.2 cm</td>
<td>77% LiPb 7% F82H 3.7% SiC 12.3% He</td>
<td>79.2% LiPb 6.1% F82H 6.2% SiC 8.5 % He</td>
<td>72.3% LiPb 8.7% F82H 5.3% SiC 13.7 % He</td>
<td>72.3% LiPb 9.5% F82H 5.3% SiC 12.9 % He</td>
<td>69.8% LiPb 9.0% F82H 5.2% SiC 15.3 % He</td>
<td>65.5% LiPb 10.9% F82H 5.8% SiC 17.8 % He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Back Plate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cm</td>
<td>80% F82H 20% He 15.9% He</td>
<td>84.1% F82H 64.4% He</td>
<td>35.6% F82H 62.1% He</td>
<td>37.9% F82H 63.2% He</td>
<td>36.8% F82H 64.4% He</td>
<td>35.6% F82H 64.4% He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Pr Load, MPa</strong></td>
<td>(PbLi pressure not considered in ARIES-CS)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parametric studies were performed to explore variations of the FW of the alternative design

- 8-module design results in too much steel for TBR
- We attempted to find a solution with 6 modules by adjusting the dimensions of the FW channels
- Option B gave the best results (2.1 MPa max PbLi pressure)

A  (reference)
B  (thicker back wall)
C  (thicker He channel)
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Modeling of MHD heat transfer is needed to provide heat flux boundary conditions into steel structures

- 2D radial/vertical geometry modeled, including PbLi and SiC
- Boundary temperatures provided by ANSYS; heat fluxes solved iteratively for use in thermal and thermal stress analysis at blanket top and bottom

- Iterative solver used previously for ACT1:

\[
\frac{de}{dt} = k \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + Q - u \frac{\partial e}{\partial z} = 0
\]
Structures remain within their limits, with a modest variation from front to back.

- Assumed flow “inverts” due to U-bend at top
The highest leverage on grid plate heat flux comes from $k_{\text{SiC}}$.

- $q > 10^5 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ can cause difficulty maintaining steel within acceptable temperature range
- $k = 2 \text{ W/mK}$ provides acceptable temperatures
- Recent R&D (Ultramet, Sharafat) shows this is achievable
Load conditions and design limits for primary stress

- Helium operating pressure is 8 MPa
- Pb-17Li static pressure at bottom: ~1.6 MPa front, ~1.5 MPa back (MHD pressure drop of 0.1 MPa was assumed)
- Stress allowables for F82H steel:
  - Average membrane stress < 1 $S_m$
  - Primary membrane plus bending stresses < 1.5 $S_{mt}$ (2/3 of min. creep stress to rupture)
  - Thermal stresses < 1.5 $S_{mt}$
  - Combined primary and secondary stresses < 3 $S_m$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>$S_m$, MPa</th>
<th>$S_t$, MPa</th>
<th>1.5 $S_{mt}$, MPa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inboard blanket primary (membrane + bending) stress using 1.6 MPa in PbLi, 8 MPa He

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location</th>
<th>$\sigma$, MPa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first wall</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second wall</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separation plate</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grid plate</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back plate</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak stress concentration ~228 MPa

We assume local stress can be reduced (below 216 MPa @475°C) by adding welding fillers.
Excluding local concentrations, the *inboard blanket* can accommodate internal pressure up to 2.5 MPa.

Peak stresses away from local concentrations (that we believe can be easily fixed).

![Graph showing primary membrane plus bending stress versus pressure load](image)
Thermal stress analysis of OB Blanket-I at bottom section shows requirements are met ($k_{\text{SiC}} = 2 \text{ W/mK}$)

- Maximum FW temperature is well below 550°C limit.
- Maximum LiPb/F82H interface temperature $\sim 495$ C (within design limit of 500°C).
- Maximum thermal stress is $\sim 144$ MPa ($1.5 S_{mt}=203 \text{ MPa}$ at $T=500°C$)
- Similar results at top and mid-plane
The plate divertor concept provides acceptable performance with minimum complexity.

(results for 600/700°C He inlet/outlet temperature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Pumping power/Thermal power (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>~1 m</td>
<td>$10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-tube</td>
<td>~10 cm</td>
<td>$10^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>~1.5 cm</td>
<td>$10^6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surface Heat Flux (MW/m²)
Power flows and HX temperatures are consistent with all power core inlet/outlet temperatures.
Brayton cycle efficiency is degraded 2.5% due to the low inlet temperature required to maintain steel/PbLi interface below 500 C.
Summary and Conclusions

• The modest loading conditions in ARIES-ACT2 allow the DCLL blanket to easily satisfy materials requirements. However, PbLi technologies must be further developed and demonstrated.

• The moderate divertor loading allows us to use the simpler He plate-type divertor. However, W-alloy development is a critical issue. Advanced (high temperature) steel alloys are also needed.

• An alternative, “small module” design was proposed. However, further studies are needed to demonstrate fabricability (including manifolds) and acceptable performance.

• Much progress has been made on design details. However, more effort will be needed on design details and fabricability in order to implement in a next-step device such as FNSF.

• The ACT2 power core is a reasonably conservative design that meets the design requirements and provides an attractive 45% conversion efficiency.