

LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY

High Energy Electron Transport in Solids

R. Snavely, Y. Aglitskii, K. U. Akli, F. Amiranoff, C. Andersen, D. Batani, S. D. Baton, T. Cowan, R. Town, R. R. Freeman, J. S. Green, H. Habara, T. Hall, S. P. Hatchett, D. S. Hey, J. M. Hill, J. Kaae, R. Kodama, M. H. Key, J. A. King, J. A. Koch, M. Koenig, K. Krushelnick, K. L. Lancaster, A. J. MacKinnon, E. Martinolli, C. D. Murphy, M. Nakatsutsumi, P. Norreys, E. Perelli-Cippo, M. Rabec Lc Gloahec, B. Remington, C. Rousseaux, J. J. Santos, F. Scianitti, P. T. Simpson, C. Stoeckl, M. Tabak, K. A. Tanaka, W. Theobald, R. Town, T. Yabuuchi, B. Zhang, P. A. Norreys

October 3, 2005

IFSA Biarritz, France September 4, 2005 through September 9, 2005

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California 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 the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

High Energy Electron Transport in Solids

R.B. Stephens, General Atomics

R.P.J. Snavely, Y. Aglitskii, K.U. Akli, F. Amiranoff, C. Andersen, D.
Batani, S.D. Baton, T. Cowan, R. Town, R.R. Freeman, J.S. Green, H.
Habara, T. Hall, S.P. Hatchett, D.S. Hey, J.M. Hill, J. Kaae, R.
Kodama, M.H. Key, J.A. King, J.A. Koch, M. Koenig, K. Krushelnick, K.L. Lancaster, A.J. MacKinnon, E. Martinolli, C.D. Murphy, M.
Nakatsutsumi, P. Norreys, E. Perelli-Cippo, M. Rabec Le Gloahec, B.
Remington, C. Rousseaux, J.J. Santos, F. Scianitti, P.T. Simpson, C.
Stoeckl, M. Tabak, K.A. Tanaka, W. Theobald, R. Town, T. Yabuuchi, B. Zhang, and P.A. Norreys

Inertial Fusion Science and Applications

Biarritz, France 4-9 Sept. 2005

IVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract W-7405-Eng-48.

IFT/P2005-082

ОНК

Studying transport for fast ignition application

Drive lasers 1) compress the fuel



Electrons

or Protons

Fuel

energetic (MeV) electrons

3) The electrons transport the ignition energy to the core

Laser



Experiments are approaching huge currents required



OHK

STAT

IFT/P2005-082

- Igniting 200 g/cc DT to 10 keV
- Requires 40KJ -> 2e¹⁷ e⁻ @1 MeV
- ⇒ 200 MA, 15 ps



• With laser energy up to 300 J \Rightarrow 10-20 MA, 1 ps in our targets

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

• GENERAL ATOMICS

We use room temp metal to stand in for DT plasma

- $Cu-K_{\alpha}$ fluorescence shows electron propagation
 - A Bragg mirror images the fluorescence emission
 - Observe propagation in slab and wire geometries

• Basic findings

- $-e^{-}$ spread is independent of energy
- -Energy deposition is proportional to energy
- -Propagation length is approx the same in all
- -Largest deposited energy requires corrections
 - -Temperature reduces mirror efficiency
 - -Resistance is limiting current
- —Indications of surface bottleneck?
- Have developed new diagnostics to show local temperature, starting to give a handle on details.



We use K_{α} imaging to see electron transport in Al



Electron beam spread in Aluminum is independent of energy (30J, 70J, and 300J)



Spread well described by heuristic Monte-Carlo model



- e⁻ generation efficiency & energy from local intensity (Beg scaling)
- Random transverse momentum independent of location
- \Rightarrow High energy e- are forward directed, low energy e- spread out



Fluorescence \propto Laser energy and Cu fraction



Propagation distance obtained from the peak K_{α} image brightness vs depth



Side view of CuAl gives the same result - spreading at entry surface and ~ 70 μ m mfp







And in Cu wires where the current can't spread



With increasing current we are getting into complications

- Reached current densities that require more sophisticated diagnostic
 - Must account for temperature
 - Resistance limitations become important
- Challenge is in understanding the laser-plasma interface region



Have added HOPG spectrometers for better understanding of temperature gradients

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

- 0.5 μm Al/5 μm Cu target
- 500 μm x 500 μm size
- 0.5 ps, 300J irradiation

Peak temp 2x general temp -> strong heating from initial beam

3:1 front:back intensity ratio in He_{α} -> strong axial temp gradient -> front surface ~ 2 keV

OHIC

STATE

256 eV XUV image



Cu K shell spectrum



GENERAL ATOMICS

Fluorescence collection efficiency decreases with temperature



Resistivity limits propagation at high current density





Higher current would cause stronger limitations.



Current into the wire was limited so fields aren't too bad



Summary

- Currents are still scaling with increasing intensity
- Propagation lengths are appropriate ~ 100 μm
- Reached current densities that require more sophisticated diagnostic
 - HOPG spectrometers for current and temperature
- Resitivity may be limiting wire current
- Challenge is in understanding the laser-plasma interface region
 - Created diagnostics and analyses to probe that area
 - Adding packages to LSP for self-consistent electron creation in plasma

