OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

Operated by

UNION CARBIDE NUCLEAR COMPANY

Division of Union Carbide Corporation

Post Office Box X
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

MASTER
External Transmittal
Authorized

ORNL
CENTRAL FILES NUMBER

58-9-40

DATE: October 2, 1958

SUBJECT: Critical Experiments with Arrays of ORR and BSR
Fuel Elements

TO: Distribution

FROM: J. K. Fox and L. W. Gilley

COPY NO. 36

Abstract

Critical experiments were performed with ORR and BSR fuel elements to determine safe arrays in which the elements could be handled and stored. The data indicate that the optimum spacing for criticality of 168-g ORR elements in water is 0.2 in. between locating bosses and that an infinite array of vertically placed elements one element high would probably be subcritical with a 1-1/2-in. spacing between locating bosses. For uniform arrays of adjacent elements in water, variation in the fuel loading per element between 140 and 200 g made very little difference in the critical mass. When 132 elements with an average loading of 160 g per element were closely packed in water in an 11 by 12 element array in which the rows were separated with 20-mil-thick cadmium sheets, no appreciable source neutron multiplication was observed; nor was there any appreciable multiplication when both the cadmium sheets and the water moderator were removed and the array was surrounded with a 12-in.-thick paraffin reflector. A two-row slab-shaped array with 24 200-g center elements and 14 168-g elements on each end, all spaced 0.2 in. between locating bosses, was subcritical, and it appears that two infinitely long rows of 168-g elements would be subcritical.

NOTICE

This document contains information of a preliminary nature and was prepared primarily for internal use at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. It is subject to revision or correction and therefore does not represent a final report.

The information is not to be abstracted, reprinted or otherwise given public dissemination without the approval of the ORNL patent branch, Legal and Information Control Department.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, 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 any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission to the extent that such employee or contractor prepares, handles or distributes, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission.

Critical Experiments with Arrays of ORR and BSF Fuel Elements

The increasing number of pool-type reactors being constructed throughout this and other countries has emphasized the need for defining the nuclear parameters which will assure the safe handling and storage of the fuel elements for these reactors. The important parameter to establish is the maximum number of fuel elements which will remain subcritical when arranged in patterns appropriate to the specific requirements. Although some data on square arrays are available from experiments performed with the Bulk Shielding Reactor, they are too limited in scope for general application. A number of experiments were therefore performed at the Critical Experiments Facility to determine critical lattices of this type of element.

Elements were available for these experiments from the inventories of the Oak Ridge Research Reactor and the Bulk Shielding Reactor. They contained uranium enriched to 93.2% in U^{235} and varied in total U^{235} content as follows:

- 24 ORR elements, each containing 200 g of U^{235} (18 of these elements were received near the end of the experiments)
- 28 ORR elements, each containing 168 g of U^{235}
- 28 ORR elements, each containing 140 g of U^{235}
- 70 BSF elements, each containing 135 - 140 g of U^{235}
- 8 BSF elements, each containing 31 - 109 g of U^{235}

The heavier loaded elements are always of the most interest for experiments of this type, but unfortunately only a few 200-g elements were available at the beginning of this series. As a result, the experiments largely consisted of various arrangements of 168-g elements. They were first arranged vertically in approximately square arrays, one element high, in water and the spacing between elements was varied. The results are shown in Table 1 and Fig. 1 in terms of the critical number of fuel elements as a function of the distance between locating bosses. (The locating bosses are mounted on the end boxes of the elements and extend laterally on all four sides.) These distances can be converted to fuel-to-fuel spacings by adding 0.44 in. to the distances between bosses parallel to the fuel plates and 0.164 in. to the distances between bosses perpendicular to the plates.

Because of the limited inventory of 168-g elements it became necessary to combine them with elements having other loadings for the larger spacings between elements. For the 1-in. spacing, for example, three 140-g elements were added on the edge of an array of 28 168-g elements. For the 1-1/4-in. spacing, 28 168-g elements were placed in a ring around six 200-g center elements, and 27 140-g elements were positioned in an outer ring. Placing the heavier loaded elements in the center gave the maximum reactivity for the elements available at the time. This assumption can be substantiated by comparing the difference in the critical masses of two arrays shown in Table 1 which used approximately the same number of 168-g elements in combination with 140-g elements. The reactivity was lower in the array in which the 140-g elements were grouped in the center of the array rather than dispersed throughout the array.

The curve in Fig. 1 is quite flat for spacings less than $3/8$ in., but it increases rapidly for greater distances. The optimum spacing is about 0.2 in. This corresponds to a 0.364-in. fuel-to-fuel spacing along a perpendicular to the fuel plates and a 0.64-in. spacing along a parallel to the fuel plates. This agrees fairly well with data on the spacing of U^{235} -enriched uranium-aluminum slugs¹ for which the optimum spacing was found to be about 0.5 in.

The rapid increase in the number of ORR elements required for criticality at spacings greater than 1 in. indicates that an infinite array one element high would probably be subcritical with a 1-1/2-in. spacing between the elements. Since the increase in the number of elements required for criticality at larger spacings in water is due to the absorption of neutrons that would otherwise interact between elements, it would appear that the separations required for the isolation of individual elements would not vary much with the element loading. However, no attempt was made to show this experimentally.

The experiments with approximately square arrays also included arrays of elements in contact. For uniform arrays, that is, arrays of elements having the same U^{235} loading, variations in the fuel loading per element between 140 and 200 g affected the critical mass very little although the number of elements required for criticality differed. This can be shown by comparing the critical masses reported in Table 1 for arrays with no spacings between locating bosses. This insensitivity of the critical mass to a variation in the fuel element loading is not surprising since the H: U^{235} atomic ratio for 168-g elements in contact in water is about 370, which is near the optimum moderation for minimum mass. Hence small changes in the U^{235} loading within the elements would have little effect on the critical mass. As mentioned above, small changes in the spacing, that is, less than $3/8$ in., between elements would also have little effect in the critical mass.

In addition to the experiments reported in Table 1 and Fig. 1, a number of individual experiments were performed to explore other parameters. In one of these the effect of placing 20-mil-thick cadmium sheets between rows of closely packed elements in water was determined. The elements, which had an average loading of 160 g per element, were stacked in an 11 by 12 array with the heavier elements in the center to obtain maximum reactivity. The cadmium sheets between the rows were parallel to each other and perpendicular to the fuel plates within the elements. No appreciable multiplication of source neutrons was noted, nor was there any appreciable multiplication observed when both the cadmium sheets and water moderator and reflector were removed and the array was surrounded with a 12-in.-thick paraffin reflector.²

A study of slab-shaped arrays was also made with elements moderated and reflected by water at the optimum spacing of 0.2 in. between bosses. Step additions of elements were made to a two-row array which remained subcritical

1. Dixon Callihan et al., Y-801 (1951) (Classified).
2. The experiment in which no water was used was performed by Dunlap Scott and J. J. Lynn.

for all additions. The final two-row slab had 24 200-g elements in the center and 14 168-g elements on each end; a total of 52 elements. Increases in the source neutron multiplication were observed for all additions up to 17 elements per row; however, further additions to this 34-element array had no appreciable effect. The addition of three elements in a third row opposite the center of the 34-element array was sufficient to make the system critical. From these results it appears that two infinitely long rows of 168-g elements would be subcritical. There were insufficient data to determine the reactivity of two rows of 200-g elements.

Table 1. Critical Number of ORR Fuel Elements in
Approximately Square Arrays in Water

Distance Between Locating Bosses (in.)			
Bosses Parallel to Fuel Plates	Bosses Perpendicular to Fuel Plates	Approximate Critical Array	Approximate Critical Mass (g of U235)
0	0	15-1/2 168-g elements	2575
1/8	1/8	15 168-g elements	2510
1/4	1/4	15 168-g elements	2515
3/8	3/8	15-1/2 168-g elements	2575
1/2	1/2	16-1/2 168-g elements	2775
3/4	3/4	20-1/2 168-g elements	3450
1	1	{ 28 168-g elements with 3 140-g elements on outside edge of array	5200
1-1/4	1-1/4	{ 28 168-g elements with 6 200-g elements in the center of the array and 27 140-g elements on outside edge of array	9575
1/8	3/16	15 168-g elements	2510
0	1/8	15 168-g elements	2510
0	1/4	15 168-g elements	2505
0	3/8	15 168-g elements	2520
0	1/2	15-1/4 168-g elements	2550
1/8	0	15-1/4 168-g elements	2540
1/4	0	15-1/4 168-g elements	2545
0	0	{ 12 168-g elements with 4 140-g elements dis- persed throughout array	2575
0	0	{ 13 168-g elements with 3 140-g elements in the center of the array	2622
0	0	18-3/4 140-g elements	2615
0	0	13 200-g elements	2620

UNCLASSIFIED
ORNL-LR-DWG 32121

Fig. 1. Critical Number of ORR Fuel Elements in Approximately Square Arrays in Water as a Function of the Distance Between Locating Bosses.

Distribution List

Internal

1. E. P. Blizard	9. L. B. Holland	17. M. J. Skinner
2. Dixon Callihan	10. E. B. Johnson	18. J. T. Thomas
3. R. A. Charpie	11. F. C. Maienschein	19. A. M. Weinberg
4. C. E. Clifford	12. D. W. Magnuson	20. C. E. Winters
5. J. K. Fox	13. J. T. Mihalcz	21. W. Zobel
6. L. W. Gilley	14. M. L. Nelson	22-23. Laboratory Records
7. R. Gwin	15. A. B. Reynolds	24. ORNL-RC
8. K. M. Henry	16. E. G. Silver	

External

- 25. Dow Chemical Co., Rocky Flats Plant, Denver, Colorado (Attn: C. L. Schuske)
- 26. E. I. DuPont De Nemours and Co., Aiken, South Carolina (Attn: H. K. Clard)
- 27. Goodyear Atomic Corporation, Portsmouth, Ohio (Attn: F. E. Woltz)
- 28. Hanford Atomic Products Operation, Richland, Washington (Attn: J. E. Faulkner)
- 29. K-25 (Attn: H. F. Henry)
- 30. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico (Attn: H. C. Paxton)
- 31. National Lead of Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio (Attn: Howard Zeitz)
- 32. Paducah (Attn: O. W. Herman)
- 33. University of California Laboratory, Livermore, California (Attn: J. E. Carothers)
- 34-35. Y-12 (Attn: Paul Kasten, J. D. McLendon)
- 36-50. TISE, AEC