Supported by Supported by

### Effects of Applied Non-axisymmetric Fields on ELMs and Plasma Rotation Using New Midplane Coil

College W&M **Colorado Sch Mines** Columbia U Comp-X **General Atomics** INEL Johns Hopkins U LANL LLNL Lodestar MIT Nova Photonics New York U **Old Dominion U** ORNL **PPPL** PSI Princeton U SNL Think Tank. Inc. UC Davis UC Irvine UCLA UCSD **U** Colorado **U** Maryland **U** Rochester **U** Washington **U** Wisconsin

## Configurations in NSTX

S.A. Sabbagh<sup>1</sup>, J-K. Park<sup>2</sup>, R. Maingi<sup>3</sup>, S. Gerhardt<sup>2</sup>, R.E. Bell<sup>2</sup>, J.M. Bialek<sup>1</sup>, B. LeBlanc<sup>2</sup>, J.E. Menard<sup>2</sup>, K. Tritz<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Physics, Columbia University <sup>2</sup>Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory <sup>3</sup>Oak Ridge National Laboratory <sup>4</sup>Johns Hopkins University

Modeling of Plasma Effects of Applied Resonant Magnetic Perturbations August 25th, 2008 General Atomics, San Diego, CA

Culham Sci Ctr U St. Andrews York U Chubu U Fukui U Hiroshima U Hyogo U Kvoto U Kvushu U Kyushu Tokai U **NIFS** Niigata U **U** Tokyo JAEA Hebrew U loffe Inst **RRC Kurchatov Inst** TRINITI **KBSI** KAIST ENEA. Frascati CEA, Cadarache **IPP**, Jülich **IPP.** Garching ASCR, Czech Rep **U** Quebec

**Office of** 

Science

### Examine effects on ELMs, plasma rotation using new midplane coil configurations

### Motivation

- Potential simplification of coils for ELM control/mitigation desired/required in tokamaks (e.g. ITER) – midplane coils enough?
- Will even parity, non-resonant fields effect plasma rotation? – future V<sub>6</sub> profile control
- Applied fields from reconfigured coil circuitry
  - New field spectra add dominant even parity fields to past odd parity configurations





### Exploratory approach to ELM control with midplane nonaxisymmetric coils

- Follows past NSTX experiments by T. Evans, et al.
  - $\Box$  n = 3 fields: ELM suppression not reproducible, ELM triggering observed
- Approach
  - Target development
    - Run with reduced  $q_{95} = 6 8$  thought to be superior for mitigation
    - Variation of  $q_{95}$  in this range to insure mitigation not missed due to possible resonance effects
  - Application of DC fields
    - Past odd parity fields (n = 3) operating on lower  $q_{95}$  target
    - New even parity field (n = 2, with strong n = 4) capability for 2008
    - New combined odd/even parity (n = "2 + 3")
  - Application of AC fields
    - Using either/both odd and even parity fields
  - Repeat best cases in low recycling plasmas with lithium first wall preparation

### New n = 2 configuration used to compare to past n = 3 results

<u>n = 2 field configuration (planform view)</u>

<u>n = 3 field configuration (planform view)</u>



Modeling of Plasma Effects of Applied RMPs (GA 8/25/08) - Sabbagh 4

### Broader field spectrum in n = 2 vs. n = 3 configuration

### "n = 2 configuration"

Spectrum at r/a=0.8

"n = 3 configuration"

Spectrum at r/a=0.8



- Broader spectrum and greater radial penetration should lead to larger nonresonant damping by neoclassical toroidal viscosity (NTV)
- n = 2 configuration has very small n = 1 component reduces resonant braking and n = 1 NTV due to resonant field amplification

### IPEC used to analyze Chirikov parameter



- Ideal MHD plasma response to applied field included in IPEC
  - IPEC Chirikov computed using field jump at rational surfaces



### Vacuum and IPEC computed Chirikov parameter > 1 near edge for n = 2, n = 3 field configurations used in experiments



# $\frac{\text{Reduced ELM frequency, increased } D_{\alpha} \text{ duration observed in}}{\text{AC applied field configurations}}$



ELMs broaden, roughly match frequency of applied field

Broadening due to multiple ELMs/filaments "compounded" together

effectively decreases frequency

### Compound ELMs distinguished from single ELM with USXR



### Soft X-ray detail supports compound ELM leading to multiple energy expulsions



### ELMs modified with either DC or AC fields



n = 2 AC field, 70 Hz vs. no field



### Mixed "2 + 3" field configuration tested for potential increase in edge ergodization





### New n = "2+3" configuration with broader field spectrum used

#### n = 2+3 configuration (planform view) 0 Degrees Bav L Bav A Coil 1 Coil 2 Coil 6 ۲ (m) ٥ 270 Degrees Coil 5 Coil 3 -1 Coil 4 127905 t = 0.35s180 Degrees -2 -2 -1 0 1 X (m)

#### n = 2+3 configuration n, m spectrum



- Broadest n, m spectrum of all configurations attempted
- n = 2, 3 components strongest
  - Significant n = 0 component cancelled by vertical stability control

### ELMs not mitigated with n = 2 + 3 field; frequency reduced



### Lithium input to reduce recycling led to ELM mitigation without applied field; field triggers ELMs



- As found in XP728 (Mansfield, et al.)
  - Reproduced with significantly smaller Li evaporation here
- Similar line-averaged n<sub>e</sub> evolution
- Significant increase in  $\beta_N$  with lithium pre-ELM
- Non-axisymmetric field used to trigger ELMs for impurity control (see J. Canik, next talk)



### Even parity non-axisymmetric fields used to determine impact on plasma rotation

### Follows past experiments

n = 3 field configuration used on NSTX for a few years for (nonresonant) rotation control

### General results

- n = 2 applied field configuration shows expected global, nonresonant character of damping
  - Damping not due to resonant n = 1 component (as conjectured for n = 3 configuration) since n = 1 component is small
- Increased rotation damping observed with lithium evaporation
  - Theoretical increase in non-resonant torque expected at increased T<sub>i</sub> (lower ion collisionality)



### Experimentally observed braking in quantitative agreement with <u>NTV</u> theory for n = 3 field configuration

- Quantitative agreement in NSTX between neoclassical toroidal viscosity (NTV) theory and nonresonant damping by odd parity fields
  - Revised calculation including Shaing erratum maintains O(1) agreement
    - Past factor used to invoke field shielding in core not used here
- Details of saturation of 1/v<sub>i</sub> dependence important for ST-CTF and ITER
  - Additional physics may increase torque at lower collisionality
    - e.g. precession drift/bounce frequency resonances



Dominant NTV Force for NSTX collisionality...

$$\left\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}}_{t} \bullet \vec{\nabla} \bullet \vec{\Pi} \right\rangle_{(1/\nu)} = B_{t} R \left\langle \frac{1}{B_{t}} \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{1}{R^{2}} \right\rangle \frac{\lambda_{li} p_{i}}{\pi^{3/2} v_{i}} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} (\Omega_{\phi} - \Omega_{NC}) I_{\lambda}$$

...expected to saturate at lower v<sub>i</sub>

$$\frac{1}{\nu_i} \Longrightarrow \frac{\nu_i}{\left(\nu_i^2 + \omega_E^2\right)}$$

but - uncertainty in level of torque at which effect will saturate

### <u>Clear braking observed due to n = 2 field</u>



n = 2 has broader braking profile than n = 3 field (field spectrum)

### <u>n = 2 non-resonant braking evolution distinct from resonant</u>



### Stronger non-resonant braking with Li evaporation



- Examine v<sub>i</sub>
  dependence of NTV
  by injecting lithium
- Li produces higher T<sub>i</sub> in region of high rotation damping
- Expect stronger NTV torque at higher T<sub>i</sub> (~T<sub>i</sub><sup>5/2</sup>)
  - At braking onset, Ti ratio<sup>2.5</sup> = (0.45/0.34)<sup>2.5</sup> ~ 2
  - Consistent with measured d\omega\_{\u03c6}/dt
- Rotating MHD eliminated with Li evaporation

#### Before Li evaporation After Li, reduced $\delta B$ After Li evaporation 40 m..... 30 \_\_\_\_\_\_ t(s) t(s) t(s) 800A peak RWM 800A peak RWM 600A peak RWM 0.575 0.575 0.575 coil current coil current coil current 0.585 0.585 0.585 (~ 45% less torque) 0.595 0.595 0.595 30 0.605 0.605 0.605 <sup>20</sup>ω<sup>φ</sup>(kHz) 0.615 0.615 0.615 20 0.625 0.625 0.625 10 10 (braking saturates) 130720 130722 130723 0.9 1.0 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.6 0.9 1.0 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.0 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 R(m)R(m)R(m)Stronger V<sub>6</sub> damping by NTV at higher T<sub>i</sub> ( $\tau_{NTV} \sim T_i^{5/2}$ ) $V_{\phi}$ saturates in case with lithium at reduced applied $\delta B$ Modeling of Plasma Effects of Applied RMPs (GA 8/25/08) - Sabbagh 22

### Non-resonant n = 2 braking evolution altered by Li evaporation

### New non-axisymmetric field spectra in NSTX used to influence ELMs and plasma rotation

- ELMs affected, not fully mitigated
  - ELMs frequency "lowered" (duration increased compound ELMs created) by AC and DC fields
  - n = 2 + 3 configuration showed reduction in ELM frequency at maximum permitted coil current
  - Lithium wall conditioning attempted for pumping
    - ELMs fully mitigated with application of lithium alone, ELMs *triggered* by fields
- H-mode onset time altered by n = 2 DC field application
- Non-resonant  $V_{\phi}$  braking observed with even parity fields
  - Significant braking at field levels used to produce Chirikov > 1
  - Global non-resonant braking supports NTV theory in  $1/v_i$  regime
  - Lithium wall conditioning increases T<sub>i</sub>, non-resonant braking strength
- Edge plasma rotation may play key role in ELM stability physics
  - □ Li increases edge  $V_{\phi}$  → mitigation, field reduces  $V_{\phi}$  → ELM less stable

### Design proceeding for potential upgrade of non-axisymmetric control capabilities

- Non-axisymmetric control coil (NCC) – at least <u>four</u> applications
  - ELM control
    - Poloidal spectrum flexibility and greater n spectrum
    - Initial analysis by Evans shows favorable conditions for ELM control
  - RWM stabilization
    - n > 1 control, address poloidal deformation of mode
    - higher  $\beta_N$  new design reaches  $\beta_N$  up to the ideal with-wall beta limit
  - Plasma rotation control
    - increased V profile control, possible n > 1 propagation
  - Error field correction capability significantly enhanced
- Similarity to proposed ITER coil design (VAC02)
- In 5 Year Plan incremental budget

Proposed Internal Non-axisymmetric Control Coil (NCC) (initial designs - 12 coils toroidally)

Secondary passive plate option

