²³⁵U Resolved Resonance Evaluation for Benchmark Calculations in the Intermediate Energy Region*

L. C. Leal

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, P. O. Box 2008, Oak Ridge, TN, leallc@ornl.gov

Y. Danon, D. Williams

Gaerttner LINAC Center, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY 12180

M. Jandel

C-NR, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, 87545

INTRODUCTION

The Working Party on International Nuclear Data Evaluation Co-operation (WPEC) subgroup 29 (SG 29) was established to investigate an issue with the ²³⁵U capture cross-section in the energy range 0.1 to 2.25 keV.[1] The WPEC criticality calculation results indicated an overestimation of the ²³⁵U capture crosssection of 10% or more. To understand and solve the problem, a recommendation was made to perform new capture cross-section measurements followed by a resonance evaluation. Hence, time-of-flight capture cross-section measurements were done at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) [2] and at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL).[3] These new measurements were used together with the computer code SAMMY to reevaluate the ²³⁵U resonance parameters in the energy range from thermal to 2.25 keV. The impact of the new evaluation in benchmark calculations was done for the critical benchmark sensitive to the 0.1 to 2.25 keV energy range. The purpose of this work is to describe the ²³⁵U SAMMY evaluation and present the critical benchmark results.

²³⁵U RESONANCE EVALUATION

In the 1990s, a ²³⁵U resonance evaluation was released for inclusion in the US Evaluated Nuclear Data File.[4] The evaluation was done based on high-resolution transmission and fission cross-section data. Although at the time there existed capture cross-section data, these data were not systematically included in the SAMMY evaluation due to issues such as normalization and background. In addition to experimental data included in the previous ²³⁵U evaluation, new capture cross-section data recently performed at RPI and LANL were used in the ²³⁵U resonance reevaluation. A few selected existing experimental data are shown in Table I, while the complete set is listed in Table 2 of Ref. [4]. Integral quantities such as fission and capture resonance integral Westcott factors were also included in the evaluation.

TABLE I. Sel	lected Set of Ex	perimental L	Data Inc	luded
in the	SAMMY Reso	nance Evalua	ation	

	Energy			
Author	Range	Data		
	(eV)			
De Saussure	0.01-2250.0	Fission and capture at		
(RPI/1967)		25.2 meters		
[5]		23.2 meters		
Perez	0.01–100.0	Fission and capture at		
(ORNI / 1973)	0.01 100.0	30.7 meters		
(OKNL/17/3)		59.7 meters		
Wester	14.0.2250.0	Figsion at 18.0 maters		
weston	14.0-2250.0	Fission at 18.9 meters		
(ORNL/1984)				
[7]				
Gwin	0.01 - 20.0	Fission at 25.6 meters		
(ORNL/1984)				
[8]				
Spencer	0.01-1.0	Transmission at		
(ORNL/1984)		18.0 meters and sample		
[9]		thickness of		
		0.001468 atom/barns		
Harvey	4.0-2250.0	Transmission at		
(ORNL/1988)		80.0 meters and sample		
<u>[</u> 10]		thickness of		
L · J		0.001468 atom/barns		
Harvey	4.0-2250.0	Transmission at		
(ORNL/1988)		80.0 meters and sample		
[10]		thickness of		
		0.03260 atom/barms		
Danan	100.0	Eission and contum viold		
	100.0-	rission and capture yield		
(KPI/2011[2]	2250.0	at 25.56 meters		
Jandel	100.0-	Capture at 25.45 meters		
(LANL/2012)	2250.0			
[3]				

In the present evaluation the Reich-Moore formalism was used, and resonance parameters representing the experimental data reasonably well in the energy region up to 2250 eV were derived.

Figure 1 displays a comparison of the average capture yield calculated with the ENDF/B-VII.0, the new

^{*}Notice: This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

Data Analysis in Nuclear Criticality Safety-II

evaluated resonance parameter, and the RPI experimental capture yield. Clearly, as can be seen, the overprediction

of the capture cross-section has been removed with the new 235 U preliminary resonance parameter evaluation.



Fig. 1. Comparisons of the RPI capture yield data with calculations done with the preliminary set of 235 U resonance parameters. It is also shown with the calculation using the ENDF/B-VII.0 resonance parameters.

BENCHMARK RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The impact of the new preliminary ²³⁵U resonance evaluation in benchmark calculations was investigated using intermediate energy benchmark listed in the International Handbook of Evaluated Criticality Safety *Experiments* (IHECSBE).[11] Benchmark The experiments included in the IHECSBE and identified as HEU-MET-INTER-006 series (ZEUS benchmark) were calculated with the MCNP code. The new set of resonance parameters was converted into the ENDF/B format and included in the Japanese Evaluated Nuclear Data Library (JENDL-4), where it replaced the existing JENDL resonance parameters. The new ²³⁵U library named JENDL4+ORNL was processed with the NJOY code to generate MCNP formatted cross-section. In the MCNP calculation, everything else was taken from the ENDF/B-VII.0. The MCNP calculated-to-experimental (C/E) results are shown in Table II together with results from ENDF/B-VII.0 and JENDL-4. Listed also in Table II is the energy corresponding to the average neutron lethargy causing fission (EALF). EALF indicates the portion of the neutron spectrum that has a component in the resolved resonance region of 235 U.

It is interesting to note that as the EALF increases, the k_{eff} bias appears to be reduced with the new preliminary ²³⁵U resonance evaluation. The C/E for EALF=80.80 keV also indicates that the ²³⁵U evaluation in unresolved and high-energy range need to be reviewed. In conclusion, although the new cross-section measurement done at RPI and LANL seems to indicate that the reduction on the capture cross section leads to a better calculation of k_{eff} for intermediate-energy benchmark systems, additional benchmarks sensitive to the intermediate energy region are needed.

REFERENCES

1. NEA/NSC/WPEC/DOC(2011)433, Final Report of WPEC Subgroup 29 on ²³⁵U Capture Cross-section in the keV to MeV Energy Region, Nuclear Energy Agency, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2011.

2. Y. DANON, "Nuclear Data Measurements at RPI," 2011 Cross Section Evaluation Working Group Meeting, National Nuclear Data Center, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY, November 16, 2011.

3. T. A. JANDEL et al., "New Precision Measurements of the 235 U(n, γ) Cross Section," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (November 2012).

4. L. C. LEAL, H. DERRIEN, N. M. LARSON, and R. Q. WRIGHT, "R-Matrix Analysis of ²³⁵U Neutron Transmission and Cross-Section Measurements in the 0- to 2.25-keV Energy Range," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* **131**, 230 (February 1999). Also as ORNL/TM 13516.

5. G. de SAUSSURE, R. GWIN, L. W. WESTON, and R. W. INGLE, "Simultaneous Measurements of the Neutron Fission and Capture Cross Section for ²³⁵U for Incident Neutron Energy from 0.4 to 3 keV," ORNL/TM-1804, Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN (1967).

Data Analysis in Nuclear Criticality Safety-II

Fucie II: Michael Benefiniarie Results for the 22005 Internetiate Energy Benefiniarie							
Case Number	EALF (keV)	Benchmark k_{eff}	C/E values for k_{eff}				
			ENDF/B-VII.0	JENDL4	JENDL4+ORNL		
HEU-MET-INTER-006-1 (ZEUS1)	4.44	0.9977 ± 0.0008	0.9953 ± 0.0088	1.0031 ± 0.0088	0.9987 ± 0.0088		
HEU-MET-INTER-006-2 (ZEUS2)	9.45	1.0001 ± 0.0008	0.9960 ± 0.0088	1.0049 ± 0.0088	1.0000 ± 0.0088		
HEU-MET-INTER-006-3 (ZEUS3)	22.80	1.0015 ± 0.0008	0.9992 ± 0.0088	1.0066 ± 0.0088	1.0006 ± 0.0088		
HEU-MET-INTER-006-4 (ZEUS4)	80.80	1.0016 ±0.0008	1.0059 ± 0.0088	1.0051 ± 0.0088	1.0034 ± 0.0088		

Table II. MCNP Benchmark Results for the ZEUS Intermediate Energy Benchmark

6. R. B. PEREZ, G. de SAUSSURE, and E. G. SILVER, *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* **52**, 46 (1973).

7. L. W. WESTON and J. H. TODD, *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* 88, 567 (1984).

8. R. GWIN, R. R. SPENCER, R. W. INGLE, J. H. TODD, and S. W. SCOLES, *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* 88, 37 (1984).

9. R. R. SPENCER, J. A. HARVEY, N. W. HILL, and L. WESTON, *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* **96**, 318 (1987).

10. J. A. HARVEY, N. W. HILL, F. G. PEREY, G. L. TWEED, and L. C. LEAL, *Proc. Int. Conf. on Nuclear Data for Science and Technology*, Mito, Japan, May 30–June 3, 1988.

11. International Handbook of Evaluated Criticality Safety Benchmark Experiments, NEA/NSC/DOC(95)03, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, September 2006 (rev).