

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine

National Academy of Sciences
National Academy of Engineering
Institute of Medicine
National Research Council

August 31, 1999

Dr. Martha Krebs
Director
Office of Science
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20550

Dear Dr. Krebs:

National Research Council Chair Dr. Bruce Alberts, in response to your letter requesting a judgement on the quality of the science in the program of the Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (OFES), has established the Fusion Science Assessment Committee (FuSAC). The committee's study will focus primarily on the science of magnetically confined plasmas and the programmatic strategy for long-term progress in this area. The Department of Energy's defense programs also sponsor major inertial-confinement research for stockpile stewardship purposes. Some of the plasma-science issues are common to both magnetic and inertial confinement, but the program structures are quite different. The committee does not directly address inertially confined plasmas in the attached interim report.

The committee prepared the interim report to fulfill the commitment to provide OFES with some initial comments on the quality of the science in its program in time for inclusion in OFES's plans for the next year. A final report will provide a more comprehensive assessment and will address long-term issues facing the field.

In response to congressional direction in 1996, OFES has shifted the focus of its program, emphasizing the effort to build the science and technological foundations for fusion energy and moving the energy technology development effort into the background. The redirection of funds into a broader range of science and technology issues, and to a broader community, is responsive to the report *Plasma Science: From Fundamental Research to Technological Applications*.¹ The committee finds that this new approach is enabled by recent advances in experiment, diagnostics, theory, and computational modeling.

FuSAC initiated its efforts with a meeting in mid-May 1999 that convened a number of experts on various aspects of the fusion research effort. Discussions with the experts on critical aspects of the program were followed by closed-session discussion by members of the committee about their impressions of the program. On the basis of that work, subsequent telephone conferences, and especially further community inputs and committee discussion at the July 1999 Snowmass meeting, the committee offers a number of observations about the science in the fusion program and about critical unresolved problems. These observations focus on the conceptual advances and the challenges in the program. The connections

¹ National Research Council, *Plasma Science: From Fundamental Research to Technological Applications*, National Academy Press, Washington D.C., 1995. A new decadal survey of physics entitled *Physics in a New Era* is now in progress; the *Plasma Science* report is part of the series.

Board on Physics and Astronomy

2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418

Telephone (202) 334 3520 Fax (202) 334 3575 Email bpa@nas.edu national-academies.org/bpa

between experiment, computation, and theory will be discussed in greater depth in the final report.

The committee's final report will be based on an assessment of the past achievements, current strengths and weaknesses, and future prospects of the field. Development of the final report will be guided by broad questions such as: Does the program ask deep physics questions? What are the current role and future potential of a scientific predictive capability for advancing fusion energy? How does one guide the directions of a fusion energy science program if the ultimate goal is to develop a commercially viable fusion reactor? How can the connectivity of fusion science with other scientific disciplines be strengthened? What structural, programmatic, and institutional innovations and international initiatives might strengthen the scientific approach to fusion energy?

FuSAC's Steering Group joins me in transmitting the committee's interim report to you. The committee members have enjoyed interacting with and learning from the fusion community during the past few months. We look forward to continuing these fruitful interactions as we prepare our final report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Charles F. Kennel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "K".

Charles F. Kennel
Chair, FuSAC

Cc: Anne Davies, Director, OFES
Bruce Alberts, Chair, NRC
Peter Banks, Co-Chair, CPSMA
Carl Lineberger, Co-Chair, CPSMA
Robert C. Dynes, Chair, BPA

Enclosures:

Interim Assessment
FuSAC Roster
May 16-19 Meeting Agenda and Attendance List

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine

National Academy of Sciences
National Academy of Engineering
Institute of Medicine
National Research Council

August 31, 1999

Fusion Science Assessment Committee **Interim Assessment**

The birth of modern plasma science

The development of a practical fusion energy source remains one of the most challenging scientific endeavors undertaken by mankind. The early predictions of tabletop-scale fusion energy machines based on “back of the envelope” calculations very quickly confronted the reality of the plasma state as a complex nonlinear medium. Early plasma experiments more often than not ended with the plasma splattered against the walls of the containment vessels rather than confined within the magnetic bottle as intended. The production of a fusion-grade plasma at a temperature of 100 million Kelvin required the development of the field of plasma science. Scientific tools had to be developed to describe plasma equilibrium, the balance between plasma pressure forces and the confining magnetic forces, and stability. Why do large-scale instabilities cause the plasma to break up and why do instabilities at small scale cause the energy to leak across the magnetic field? How do you heat an essentially collisionless plasma to the temperatures required for fusion and how do you accurately remotely diagnose the complex dynamics of the plasma at both large and small scales to test your understanding of the system? These questions and many more must be answered to establish the firm knowledge base required for the achievement of practical fusion energy production.

Fundamental scientific insights from plasma physics and their impact on other scientific disciplines and industry

The historical development of the fusion program has involved both basic physics and the applied and engineering sciences. Because of the explicitly applied goal of the fusion program, the larger scientific community can lose sight of the contributions the program has made to our understanding of fundamental physics. Basic plasma experiments elucidated the nonlinear properties of the plasma medium. As a consequence, a number of areas in modern nonlinear physics found some of their principal applications in fusion plasma science. In some of these cases, plasma scientists became leaders of these emerging fields—solitons, chaos, and stochasticity are noteworthy examples. Basic tools developed in the fusion program ranging from computer-based algebra to particle simulation techniques have found widespread applications in allied fields.

One measure of the quality of a scientific field is its impact on and acceptance by other fields. Some examples of important topical areas that have had a broad impact on the broader scientific and industrial community include:

Stability: The understanding of the complex plasma dynamics observed in early plasma experiments was initiated with the development of powerful energy principles and eigenmode techniques to explore the linear stability of plasma equilibria. The

Board on Physics and Astronomy

2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418

Telephone (202) 334 3520 Fax (202) 334 3575 Email bpa@nas.edu national-academies.org/bpa

wide variety of instabilities in plasma with an enormous range of spatial scales serves to define the richness of the plasma medium and the challenge to understand its dynamics. Predictions for the thermal pressure beyond which the plasma will disassemble have been confirmed in experiments in which the temperatures of the plasmas are in excess of those found on the surface of the Sun. In addition, experimental explorations have led to the development of methods that significantly increase the plasma pressure limits set by stability. Many of these stability analysis techniques are now essential tools not only in the field of plasma science but also in allied fields such as astrophysics and solar, ionospheric, and magnetospheric physics.

Stochasticity and chaos: The effort to understand how the magnetic surfaces that confine hot plasma in fusion experiments break up led to the development of the standard map, which allowed the generic exploration of the onset of stochasticity. Understanding of the onset of stochasticity in velocity space was also intrinsic to modeling heating in essentially collisionless plasmas. Finally, senior scientists trained in the physics of plasmas developed the first published method for controlling chaos.

Reconnection, field topology, and magnetic dynamos: A three-decade challenge of plasma physicists has been to explain the very short time scales that characterize the release of magnetic energy in the solar corona, in planetary magnetospheres (including Earth's), and in fusion experiments. Classical collisional dissipative processes are orders of magnitude too weak to explain the time scales observed. The difficulty lies in the extreme range in the spatial scales, from the macroscopic to the microscales associated with kinetic boundary layers, and in the necessity to include kinetic processes to provide collisionless dissipation. An emerging understanding based on theory, computation, and basic experiments is linked to the mediating role of dispersive waves, which act at the small scales where the "frozen-in" condition is broken. For the first time the predictions of energy release rates in fusion experiments are consistent with observations. A consequence of the fast release of magnetic energy associated with magnetic reconnection in some fusion experiments is the evolution to a minimum energy state where the magnetic field is partially self-generated by the plasma. The resulting "dynamo" action is related to magnetic dynamo processes in astrophysical systems such as the Sun and the planets. These fusion-sponsored experiments remain among the few laboratory demonstrations of a turbulent dynamo.

Wave dynamics: The plasma state is unique in the rich variety of waves that are supported by the medium. Waves in plasmas not only appear spontaneously as a consequence of instabilities, but also can be generated to control plasma temperature and currents. Understanding how waves propagate and are absorbed in nearly collisionless plasma was a scientific challenge. Building on Landau's idea of the wave-particle resonance as a mechanism for collisionless dissipation, fusion scientists developed models to describe the absorption of high-power radio frequency waves and benchmarked the predictions in fusion experiments. Waves could then be used to engineer the phase space of particle distribution functions. Waves can now be excited in plasmas to generate intense current or to accelerate particles to high energies—a technique that can be applied to the next generation of high-energy accelerators. The nonlinear behavior of waves has also been an intrinsic component of the science of plasma wave dynamics, and knowledge of this phenomenon has spread widely to many other branches of physics. Indeed, such ubiquitous concepts as absolute and convective instabilities, solitons (nonlinear waves that persist through collisions), and parametric instabilities saw extensive development in the fusion context. Important industrial applications include the use of radio frequency technologies for plasma processing in semiconductor manufacturing. Finally, plasma physicists introduced the idea of using solitons in commercial high-speed communications.

Turbulent transport: Understanding transport driven by turbulence is critical to solving such important problems as the accretion of matter into black holes, energy transport in the solar convection zone, and energy confinement in fusion

experiments. Gradients in pressure, angular momentum, or other free energy sources drive small-scale turbulent flows that act to relax the gradient. This “anomalous transport” process should be contrasted with classical transport, which arises from two particle coulomb interactions in magnetic fusion plasmas and can include photon diffusion in astrophysical systems. The identification of anomalous transport in fusion experiments (and the corresponding theoretical work) sparked the recognition of its importance in space science and astrophysics, fields in which concepts such as anomalous transport and heat flux inhibition are now common language. Because of its fundamentally nonlinear and turbulent nature, understanding anomalous transport has been one of the significant scientific challenges of the fusion program. Diagnostics to remotely measure turbulent fluctuations as well as computer codes to describe the nonlinear dynamics of small-scale flows in a collisionless medium were developed. Experimental work in fusion has shown that turbulence can be spontaneously suppressed and a transport barrier formed, and that the mechanism was linked to the development of local zonal flows, which shred the vortices driving transport. The dynamics of this process parallels that of zonal flows in Jupiter’s atmosphere.

Outstanding problems

In its preliminary discussions, the committee has begun to identify critical unresolved problems in fusion science. The following includes some examples.

Turbulence and transport: Despite the scientific success in understanding the turbulent transport of ion thermal energy in magnetic containers, formidable challenges remain. The mechanism by which particles and electron thermal energy are lost from magnetic containers has not yet been clearly identified. This is a key issue for an energy-producing plasma, in which high-energy alpha particles produced during fusion deposit their energy in electrons. A paradox is that the electron energy-loss rate appears to be greatest in the core region of tokamak plasmas where theories based on linearization of equations for small-amplitude disturbances predict no linear instabilities. The source of the turbulence driving transport remains a mystery. The present experiments in tokamaks are in a regime in which magnetic field fluctuations associated with small-scale vortices driving transport are important, yet progress has been slow in developing the computational and diagnostic tools required to include these effects. The exploration of the role of magnetic fluctuations is especially critical for modeling experiments in the innovative magnetic containers now coming on line. Predictions of performance in proposed magnetic confinement experiments have traditionally been based on scaling laws deduced from existing and previous experiments rather than from first-principles theories of turbulent transport. The reliance on this approach over the long term, though previously grounded in necessity since there were no reliable theories of transport, should be re-evaluated in light of the new developments in theory and computation and the emergence of control techniques for manipulating transport. Finally, the role of alpha particles in turbulence and transport, which will be an important issue for burning plasmas, is not well understood.

Energy density limits: The success in understanding pressure limits in confined plasma has been based largely on the ideal (dissipation-free) magnetohydrodynamic description. There is now substantial experimental evidence that, under some circumstances, the plasma pressure can be limited below these “ideal” limits by instabilities whose growth is facilitated by resistive or kinetic effects. Nonlinear instabilities, which self-sustain only when their amplitudes exceed a threshold value, are being studied as a possible mechanism for such limits. A major challenge for the field is to develop the computational tools to study the macroscopic nonlinear development of instabilities that constrain the global pressure of a system and that at the same time resolve the small time and space scales required to describe critical kinetic features. Until this challenge is met, numerical models of the large-scale

plasma dynamics will be subject to the criticism that they are too primitive to fully describe the high-temperature regime of present and future fusion-grade plasmas. The duality of a medium that behaves like a continuum fluid at large scales and yet displays the effects of discrete particles at small scales is a recurring theme of plasma science.

Integrated physics of self-heated plasmas: While the past DT tokamak experiments that produced weakly burning plasma were a milestone, a broad range of scientific and technological issues nevertheless remain to be explored in the strong self-heating regime, where the local energy deposited by fusion-produced alpha particles exceeds the energy from external sources. Key scientific questions concern the stability of the profiles, including transport barriers, in the self-heating regime. As the plasma pressure exceeds stability limits because of self-heating, will transport rise to balance the source in a benign manner or will large-scale instabilities lead to a loss of global confinement? Will a high density of energetic alpha particles destabilize waves and degrade alpha confinement so as to reduce the efficiency of alpha particle heating? Will helium ash accumulation continue to be minimal? On the positive side, will ideas for channeling alpha-particle energy directly into ions rather than electrons be successful and therefore ultimately lead to a more attractive fusion energy source? Conclusive answers to such questions will require experiments in the burning plasma regime.

Summary

The worldwide fusion energy program, with vigorous U.S. participation in all areas and leadership in many, has achieved much in its 40-year history. The fusion energy goal also has driven the development of the modern phase of plasma science. Plasma science, in turn, has contributed to many fields of science and technology during this time.

The reorientation of the U.S. fusion program in 1996 had as its aims the stimulation of innovation and the strengthening of the scientific focus of the program. The extent to which the full promise of this approach has begun to be realized will be addressed in the committee's final report. FuSAC can say with confidence now that the technology needed to create, diagnose, and model sophisticated experiments on fusion-grade plasmas has been developed. The critical materials science issues of fusion energy have been scoped. The progress can be measured in other ways as well: The first preliminary fusion-burning experiments were recently completed. Scientific and engineering understanding of the concepts required for future fusion energy systems is being continually deepened. Nonetheless, the distance to the ultimate goal remains large.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

COMMISSION ON PHYSICAL SCIENCES, MATHEMATICS, AND APPLICATIONS

2101 Constitution Avenue Washington, D.C. 20418

BOARD ON
PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

(202) 334-3520
FAX: (202) 334-3575
INTERNET: BPA@NAS.EDU

FUSION SCIENCE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Terms expire on December 31, 2000

Charles F. Kennel, **Chair**
Director
Scripps Institution of Oceanography
9500 Gilman Drive 0210
La Jolla, CA 92093
858-534-2826 [858-822-2838 telecons]
Fax: 858-453-0167
Email: ckennel@ucsd.edu
Cc: agirten@ucsd.edu,
dbennett@ucsd.edu

Steering Group

Robert H. Socolow
Center for Energy & Environmental
Studies
Princeton University
H102 Engineering Quad
Princeton, NJ 08544-5263
609-258-5446
Fax: 609-258-3661
Email: socolow@princeton.edu
Cc: kozinsky@princeton.edu

Robert A. Frosch
416 Commonwealth Ave., Apt. 605
Boston, MA 02215-2811
617-496-6120 or (h) 437-7322 *also home fax*
Fax: 617-495-8963
Email: robert_frosch@harvard.edu

Albert Narath
Lockheed Martin Corporation (*ret.*)
1534 Eagle Ridge Drive, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87122
505-821-5031
Fax: 505-821-4939
Email: anarath@compuserve.com

France A. Cordova
University of California
Office of Research
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
805-893-8270
Fax: 805-893-2611
Email: cordova@omni.ucsb.edu

Experiment

Claudio Pellegrini
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of California, Los Angeles
6-137C Knudsen
Box 951361
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1361
310-206-1677
Fax: 310-206-5251
Email: pellegrini@physics.ucla.edu

George Gloeckler
Department of Physics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-249-0667 or 405-6206
Fax: 301-249-4057 or 314-9547
Email: gg10@umail.umd.edu

Patrick L. Colestock
Los Alamos National Laboratory
MS H851
Los Alamos, NM 87545
505-665-3565
Fax?
Email: colestock@lanl.gov

FUSION SCIENCE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Terms expire on December 31, 2000

Raymond Fonck
University of Wisconsin
341 Engineering Research Building
1500 Engineering Drive
Madison, WI 53706
608-263-7799
Fax: 608-265-2364
Email: fonck@engr.wisc.edu

Theory and Computation

Robert Rosner
Enrico Fermi Institute
University of Chicago
5640 S. Ellis Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637-1433
773-702-0560
Fax: 773-834-3230
Email: r-rosner@uchicago.edu
Cc: kuntu@flash.uchicago.edu,
clark@flash.uchicago.edu

James W. Van Dam
Institute for Fusion Studies
University of Texas at Austin
26 Street & Speedway
Austin, TX 78712-1081
512-471-6129
Fax: 512-471-6715
Email: vandam@physics.utexas.edu

Nathaniel J. Fisch
Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
Princeton University
P.O. Box 451
Princeton, NJ 08543
609-243-2643
Fax: 609-243-2662
Email: nfisch@pppl.gov

Zoran Mikic
SAIC
10260 Campus Point Drive
MS-C2
San Diego, CA 92121
858-546-6934
Fax: 858-546-6261
Email: mikic@iris023.saic.com

Jonathan Wurtele
University of California
Department of Physics
Berkeley, CA 94720
510-486-6572
Fax: 510-486-6485
Email: wurtele@physics.berkeley.edu

Program Architecture

James F. Drake
University of Maryland
Institute for Plasma Research
Energy Research Bldg. #223
Paint Branch Drive
College Park, MD 20742-3511
301-405-1471
Fax: 301-405-1678
Email: drake@plasma.umd.edu

Stewart C. Prager
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Dept. of Physics
1150 University Ave.
Chamberlain Hall, 3287
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-7768
Fax: 608-262-7205
Email: scprager@facstaff.wisc.edu

Andrew M. Sessler
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
1 Cyclotron Road
Mail Stop 71-259
Berkeley, CA 94720
510-486-4992
Fax: 510-486-6485
Email: amessler@lbl.gov

FUSION SCIENCE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Terms expire on December 31, 2000

Lennard Fisk
University of Michigan
Atmospheric, Oceanic, & Space Sciences
2204 Space Research
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2143
734-647-3660
Fax: 734-764-4585
Email: lafisk@umich.edu

Linda Capuano
Director and General Manager
Commercial Air Transport APU Products
AlliedSignal Inc.
3834 Pearl Avenue
San Jose, CA 95136-1529
408-267-6117
Fax: 408-978-2753
Email: linda.capuano@alliedsignal.com

NRC Staff

Donald C. Shapero, Director
Email: dshapero@nas.edu

Kevin Aylesworth, Program Officer
Email: kayleswo@nas.edu

Joel Parriott, Program Officer
Email: jparriot@nas.edu

Board on Physics and Astronomy
National Research Council
2101 Constitution Avenue
Washington, DC 20418
202-334-3520
Fax: 202-334-3575
Email: bpa@nas.edu

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

COMMISSION ON PHYSICAL SCIENCES, MATHEMATICS, AND APPLICATIONS

2101 Constitution Avenue Washington, D.C. 20418

BOARD ON
PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY
www.nas.edu/bpa

(202) 334-3520
Fax: (202) 334-3575
Email: bpa@nas.edu

Fusion Science Assessment Committee Meeting

May 16-19, 1999
Hotel La Jolla
La Jolla, CA

Agenda*

Sunday, May 16

PLENARY SESSION Room: Bistro

- 4:00 pm Study Overview
Charles Kennel, Committee Chair
Robert Rosner, Head, Theory and Computation Working Group
Claudio Pellegrini, Head, Experiment Working Group
James Drake, Head, Program Architecture Working Group
- 4:30 pm Talk by and discussion with DOE
John Willis, DOE
- 5:00 pm WORKING DINNER -- Discussion
- 5:30 pm Overview of the goals of fusion theory and computation
and linkage with experiments
Bill Nevins, Lawrence Livermore National Lab
- 6:00 pm Discussion
- 6:20 pm Overview of Experimental Portfolio
Mike Mael, Columbia University
- 6:50 pm Discussion
- 7:10 pm International standing of the US fusion physics experiment program
Hiroshi Kishimoto, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Japan
- 7:40 pm Discussion
- 8:00 pm International standing of the US fusion physics theory program
Predhiman Kaw, Institute for Plasma Research, India
- 8:30 pm Discussion

CONCURRENT WORK GROUP SESSIONS (NEXT PAGE)

*Invited respondent: *Bruno Coppi, MIT*

Sunday, May 16 (Continued)

CONCURRENT WORK GROUP SESSIONS

Theory & Computation Working Group Session

Room: McKenzie

8:50 pm Contributions of fusion theory to other disciplines
Steve Cowley, UCLA

9:20 pm Discussion

9:50 pm ADJOURN

Experiment Working Group Session

Room: Ashley

8:50 pm Experimental Tests of Neoclassical Theory
Michael Zarnstorff, Princeton

9:15 pm Turbulence and Transport - Understanding & Control
Michael Zarnstorff, Princeton

9:40 pm Discussion

10:00 pm ADJOURN

Monday, May 17

PLENARY SESSION

Room: Bistro

7:00 am CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

7:30 am Bias Discussion (CLOSED)

CONCURRENT WORK GROUP SESSIONS

Theory & Computation Working Group Session

Room: McKenzie

8:00 am Development of computational models for understanding complex plasma dynamics
Bill Dorland, University of Maryland

8:30 am Discussion

9:00 am Theory of electric field shear generation and its role in transport barriers
Patrick Diamond, UCSD

9:30 am Discussion

10:00 am BREAK

10:30 am The theoretical framework for fusion and plasma science
Liu Chen, UC Irvine

11:00 am Discussion

11:30 am Magnetic reconnection and dynamos
Amitava Bhattacharjee, University of Iowa

Noon Discussion

12:30 pm LUNCH

1:30 pm Future directions for fusion theory and computation
Bill Tang, PPPL

2:00 pm Discussion

CLOSED SESSION

2:30 pm Outline Report Section on Theory & Computation

4:30 pm Discuss plans for next workgroup session

5:30 pm ADJOURN

Monday, May 17 (Continued)

Experiment Working Group Session

Room: Ashley

8:00 am Ideal MHD

Tony Taylor, General Atomics

- 8:20 am MHD, Relaxation, Reconnection
John Sarff, University of Wisconsin
- 8:40 am Discussion
- 9:00 am Burning Plasma Physics
Dale Meade, Princeton
- 9:30 am Discussion
- 10:00 am BREAK
- 10:30 am Wave Interaction with and Manipulation of Plasmas
Miklos Porkolab, MIT
- 11:00am Discussion
- 11:30 am Facilities/Diagnostics Needs
Earl Marmor, MIT
- Noon Discussion
- 12:30 pm LUNCH
- 1:30 pm Basic Plasma Experiments
Cliff Surko, UCSD
- 2:00 pm Discussion
- CLOSED SESSION**
- 2:30 pm Outline Report Section on Experiment
- 4:30 pm Discuss plans for next workgroup session
- 5:30 pm ADJOURN

END OF CONCURRENT WORKGROUP SESSIONS

Room: T-29, Martin Johnson House, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

6:00 RECEPTION (Open)

7:00 DINNER (Open)

Tuesday, May 18

THE ENTIRE DAY IS CLOSED

7:00 am CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

CONCURRENT WORK GROUP SESSIONS

Theory & Computation Working Group Session

Room: McKenzie

7:30 am -- 12:00 Noon Outline Interim Report Section

12:00 Noon LUNCH

Experiment Working Group Session
Room: Ashley

7:30 am -- 12:00 Noon Outline Interim Report Section

12:00 Noon LUNCH

PLENARY SESSION
Room: Bistro

1:00 pm Review of the draft sections

3:00 pm General Discussion, Plans for Snowmass

5:00 pm ADJOURN

6:00 pm DINNER

Wednesday, May 19
THE ENTIRE DAY IS CLOSED

STEERING GROUP MEETING
Room: Bistro

8:00 am	Continental Breakfast
8:30 am	Steering Group introductions
9:00 am	Presentation by the Theory and Computation Working Group
9:45 am	Discussion -- Input from the Experiment Working Group
10:15 am	BREAK
10:30 am	Presentation by the Experiment Working Group
11:15 am	Discussion -- Input from the Theory & Computation Working Group
11:45 am	General Discussion -- Feedback and guidance from Steering Group
12:30 pm	LUNCH
1:30 pm	ADJOURN

Fusion Science Assessment Committee Meeting
May 16-19, 1999
Attendance List

Amitava Bhattacharjee, University of Iowa
Liu Chen, UC Irvine
Bruno Coppi, MIT
Steve Cowley, UCLA
Patrick Diamond, UCSD
Bill Dorland, University of Maryland
Predhiman Kaw, Institute for Plasma Research, India
Hiroshi Kishimoto, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Japan
Earl Marmor, MIT
Dale Meade, Princeton
Mike Mauer, Columbia University
Bill Nevins, Lawrence Livermore National Lab
Miklos Porkolab, MIT
Marschall Rosenbluth, University of California, San Diego
John Sarff, University of Wisconsin
Cliff Surko, UCSD
Bill Tang, PPPL
Tony Taylor, General Atomics
John Willis, DOE
Michael Zarnstorff, Princeton