ANL-6932

ANL-6932

325/
11-17-64

MASTER

Argonne National Laboratory

DATA RELATING TO THE PRODUCTION OF TRANSCURIUM ELEMENTS IN HIGH NEUTRON FLUXES

by

D. C. Stewart, R. W. Anderson,
and John Milsted

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, expressed 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, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

ANL-6932
Physics
(TID-4500, 34th Ed.)
AEC Research and
Development Report

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, Illinois 60440

DATA RELATING TO THE PRODUCTION OF
TRANSCURIUM ELEMENTS IN
HIGH NEUTRON FLUXES

by

D. C. Stewart, R. W. Anderson,
and John Milsted

Chemistry Division

September 1964

Operated by The University of Chicago
under
Contract W-31-109-eng-38
with the
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.	5
SCOPE OF WORK.	8
METHOD OF CALCULATION.	9
DATA USED	10
THE BUILDUP PATH	10
ALPHA EMISSION	11
HELIUM ACCUMULATION.	13
NEUTRON EMISSION	13
HEAT FROM ACTINIDE FISSION AND DECAY	18
RATE OF TARGET CONVERSION TO FISSION PRODUCTS	20
APPENDIX A - Calculation Methods for Tables 1 and 2.	23
REFERENCES	26

THIS PAGE
WAS THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

DATA RELATING TO THE PRODUCTION OF TRANSCURIUM ELEMENTS IN HIGH NEUTRON FLUXES

by

D. C. Stewart, R. W. Anderson,
and John Milsted

INTRODUCTION

Milsted, Fields, and Metta⁽¹⁾ have published calculated yield curves showing the formation rates and levels of production of the very heavy nuclides when certain transneptunium isotopes are exposed for varying lengths of time in a series of high neutron fluxes. Since publication these authors have modified certain of the cross sections and half-lives they had originally assumed, partly on the basis of newly published information,⁽²⁾ and partly because of adjustments made to bring the calculated isotopic compositions of the various product elements more in line with compositions observed experimentally in a series of research samples processed over the last decade. Using these new data, Milsted, Fields and Metta have now repeated their earlier calculations.⁽³⁾

In the present work, the computer programs used in calculating these new yield curves have been extended and modified to obtain additional data of interest to those individuals concerned with the practical questions of encapsulating, irradiating, and processing the target materials. Among these questions are:

- (1) Will enough helium be formed by alpha decay of the target and its products during the irradiation to produce dangerous pressures in the irradiation can or target rod under reactor conditions?
- (2) What will the maximum heat release be from the target at various flux levels, i.e., what will the target-cooling problem be?
- (3) What will be the handling problem with respect to neutron emission from spontaneously fissioning nuclides at the time the sample is removed from the reactor?
- (4) What will the problem of alpha containment be?
- (5) What will the problem of β - γ shielding be?

Data are given in the form of curves relevant to the first four of these questions. The problem of β - γ hazard is a much more difficult one to solve, but it is hoped that it can be made the subject of a later separate report. Approximate curves are included here, however, to indicate the rate at which the various targets are converted to fission products at different flux levels as a rough indication of the magnitude of the gamma problem after any given irradiation time.

For convenience, the buildup path assumed for the yield curves is reproduced in Figure 1. The basic and derived data used in the calculations are summarized in Tables 1 and 2, and the results of the calculations are given in Figures 2 through 24. The simple calculation methods used to obtain the required factors for application to the yield curves are given in Appendix A.

Table 1
DECAY AND CROSS-SECTION DATA

Nuclide	Half-lives		Natural Decay (Per μg)			Cross Sections			Helium Buildup cc/day/g
	Nonspontaneous Fission	Spontaneous Fission	dis/sec (Nonspontaneous Fission)	Spontaneous Fission		Capture		Fission (b)	
				fissions/sec	neutrons/sec	b	cm ² /g		
Pu ²³⁸	89.6 y	3.8 x 10 ¹⁰ y	6.22 x 10 ⁵	0.0015	0.0054	403	1.03	16.8	0.002
Pu ²³⁹	24360 y	5.5 x 10 ¹⁵ y	2270	1 x 10 ⁻⁸	3.4 x 10 ⁻⁸	340	0.86	810	7.2 x 10 ⁻⁶
Pu ²⁴⁰	6580 y	1.22 x 10 ¹¹ y	8380	4.51 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.0017	530	1.34	0	2.7 x 10 ⁻⁵
Pu ²⁴¹	13 y		4.23 x 10 ⁶			350	0.88	1100	
Pu ²⁴²	3.79 x 10 ⁵ y	7.1 x 10 ¹⁰ y	144	7.7 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.0029	50	0.125	0	4.6 x 10 ⁻⁷
Pu ²⁴³	4.98 h		9.57 x 10 ¹⁰			170	0.42	130	
Pu ²⁴⁴	~7.6 x 10 ⁷ y	2.5 x 10 ¹⁰ y	~0.72	0.0022	0.0082	1.5	0.004	0	2.3 x 10 ⁻⁹
Pu ²⁴⁵	11 h		4.3 x 10 ¹⁰					260	
Am ²⁴¹	458 y	2.3 x 10 ¹⁴ y	1.20 x 10 ⁵	2.4 x 10 ⁻⁷	9 x 10 ⁻⁷	50 (to Am ^{242m}) 620 (to Am ²⁴²)	0.13 1.56	3.1	3.8 x 10 ⁻⁴
Am ^{242m}	152 y		3.59 x 10 ⁵			5500	13.8	6400	
Am ²⁴²	16.0 h		2.99 x 10 ¹⁰					3000	
Am ²⁴³	7600 y		7150			150	0.37	0	2.3 x 10 ⁻⁵
Am ²⁴⁴	26 m		1.1 x 10 ¹²					2000	
Cm ²⁴²	162.5 d	7.2 x 10 ⁶ y	1.23 x 10 ⁸	7.6	29	30	0.075	0	0.39
Cm ²⁴³	35 y		1.56 x 10 ⁶			250	0.62	590	0.005
Cm ²⁴⁴	17.9 y	1.346 x 10 ⁷ y	3.03 x 10 ⁶	4.01	15.2	35	0.086	0	0.0097
Cm ²⁴⁵	14000 y		3850			300	0.74	1850	1.2 x 10 ⁻⁵
Cm ²⁴⁶	6600 y	1.66 x 10 ⁷ y	8170	3.23	12.3	7	0.017	0	2.6 x 10 ⁻⁵
Cm ²⁴⁷	>4 x 10 ⁷ y		<1.34			50	0.12	200	4.3 x 10 ⁻⁹
Cm ²⁴⁸	4.7 x 10 ⁵ y	4.6 x 10 ⁶ y	113	11.6	44	8	0.020	0	3.2 x 10 ⁻⁷
Cm ²⁴⁹	64 m		4.4 x 10 ¹¹						
Bk ²⁴⁹	310 d	6 x 10 ⁸ y	6.26 x 10 ⁷	0.088	0.34	800	1.95	0	
Bk ²⁵⁰	3.20 h		1.45 x 10 ¹¹			350	0.85	650	
Cf ²⁴⁹	360 y	4.5 x 10 ⁸ y	1.48 x 10 ⁵	0.2	0.45	270	0.66	1600	4.7 x 10 ⁻⁴
Cf ²⁵⁰	13.2 y	16600 y	4.00 x 10 ⁶	3180	12100	1330	3.22	0	0.013
Cf ²⁵¹	~800 y		~66000			2000	4.83	3000	2.1 x 10 ⁻⁴
Cf ²⁵²	2.64 y	85.5 y	1.97 x 10 ⁷	6.13 x 10 ⁵	2.33 x 10 ⁶	9	0.022	0	0.061
Cf ²⁵³	19 d		1.0 x 10 ⁹			2	0.005	0	
Cf ²⁵⁴	-	60.5 d		3.14 x 10 ⁸	1.19 x 10 ⁹	2	0.005	0	
Cf ²⁵⁵	7 d		2.7 x 10 ⁹					500	
Es ²⁵³	20.03 d	6.3 x 10 ⁵ y	9.55 x 10 ⁸	83	315	200 to 37 h 7 to 480 d	0.48 0.017		3.1
Es ²⁵⁴	480 d	1.5 x 10 ⁵ y	3.96 x 10 ⁷	346	1310	40	0.095	2000	0.13
Es ²⁵⁴	37 h	>10 ⁵ y	1.23 x 10 ¹⁰	<520	<1980				
Es ²⁵⁵	24 d		7.9 x 10 ⁸			40	0.095	0	
Fm ²⁵⁴	3.38 h	246 d	1.35 x 10 ¹¹	7.73 x 10 ⁷	2.94 x 10 ⁸	100	0.24		430
Fm ²⁵⁵	21.5 h	1.2 x 10 ⁴ y	2.12 x 10 ¹⁰	4300	16400	100	0.24	100	68
Fm ²⁵⁶	-	3 h	-	1.5 x 10 ¹¹	5.7 x 10 ¹¹	20	0.047	0	
Fm ²⁵⁷	100 d		1.9 x 10 ⁸			100	0.24	100	0.6
Fm ²⁵⁸	-	5 h		9 x 10 ¹⁰	3.4 x 10 ¹¹	5	0.012	0	
Fm ²⁵⁹	10 d		1.9 x 10 ⁹			100	0.23	50	
Md ²⁵⁹	3.5 d		5.3 x 10 ⁹			250	0.58	0	17
Md ²⁶⁰	10 h		4.5 x 10 ¹⁰					1050	

Table 2
FISSION AND HEAT DATA

Nuclide	Induced Fission f/sec/ μ g at Flux of:			Heat, W/ μ g				
				From Induced Fission at Flux of:			From Spontaneous Fission	From Nonspontaneous Fission
	2×10^{15}	5×10^{15}	1×10^{16}	2×10^{15}	5×10^{15}	1×10^{16}		
Pu ²³⁸	8.5×10^7	2.1×10^8	4.2×10^8	0.0028	0.007	0.014	5×10^{-14}	5.6×10^{-7}
Pu ²³⁹	4.1×10^9	1.0×10^{10}	2.0×10^{10}	0.14	0.35	0.70	3×10^{-19}	1.9×10^{-9}
Pu ²⁴⁰							1.5×10^{-14}	7.0×10^{-9}
Pu ²⁴¹	5.5×10^9	1.4×10^{10}	2.8×10^{10}	0.18	0.45	0.90		1.4×10^{-8}
Pu ²⁴²							3×10^{-14}	1.2×10^{-10}
Pu ²⁴³	6.5×10^8	1.6×10^9	3.2×10^9	0.022	0.055	0.11		0.0089
Pu ²⁴⁴							7×10^{-14}	5.2×10^{-13}
Pu ²⁴⁵	1.3×10^9	3.2×10^9	6.4×10^9	0.043	0.11	0.22		0.0083
Am ²⁴¹	1.6×10^7	3.9×10^7	7.8×10^7	5×10^{-4}	1.3×10^{-3}	2.6×10^{-3}	8×10^{-17}	1.1×10^{-7}
Am ^{242m}	3.2×10^{10}	7.8×10^{10}	15.6×10^{10}	1.07	2.63	5.33		3.5×10^{-8}
Am ²⁴²	1.5×10^{10}	3.7×10^{10}	7.4×10^{10}	0.50	1.25	2.5		0.0028
Am ²⁴³								6.2×10^{-9}
Am ²⁴⁴	9.9×10^9	2.5×10^{10}	5.0×10^{10}	0.33	0.80	1.65		0.26
Cm ²⁴²							2.5×10^{-10}	1.2×10^{-4}
Cm ²⁴³	2.9×10^9	7.2×10^9	1.4×10^{10}	0.097	0.24	0.48		1.5×10^{-6}
Cm ²⁴⁴							1.3×10^{-10}	2.9×10^{-6}
Cm ²⁴⁵	9.1×10^9	2.3×10^{10}	4.6×10^{10}	0.31	0.78	1.55		3.5×10^{-9}
Cm ²⁴⁶							1.1×10^{-10}	7.1×10^{-9}
Cm ²⁴⁷	9.8×10^8	2.4×10^9	4.8×10^9	0.033	0.08	0.16		$>1.1 \times 10^{-12}$
Cm ²⁴⁸							3.9×10^{-10}	8.3×10^{-11}
Cm ²⁴⁹								0.062
Bk ²⁴⁹							3×10^{-12}	1.1×10^{-6}
Bk ²⁵⁰	3.2×10^9	8×10^9	1.6×10^{10}	0.10	0.25	0.50		0.044
Cf ²⁴⁹	7.8×10^9	2.3×10^{10}	4.6×10^{10}	0.26	0.65	1.30	4×10^{-12}	1.5×10^{-7}
Cf ²⁵⁰							1.1×10^{-7}	3.9×10^{-6}
Cf ²⁵¹	1.45×10^{10}	3.6×10^{10}	7.3×10^{10}	0.48	1.20	2.40		6.5×10^{-8}
Cf ²⁵²							2.1×10^{-5}	1.9×10^{-5}
Cf ²⁵³								4.3×10^{-5}
Cf ²⁵⁴							0.011	-
Cf ²⁵⁵	2.4×10^9	6.0×10^9	1.2×10^{10}	0.08	0.20	0.40		4.3×10^{-4}
Es ²⁵³								0.001
Es ²⁵⁴	9.5×10^9	2.4×10^{10}	4.8×10^{10}	0.32	0.80	1.60		4.1×10^{-5}
Es ²⁵⁴ (37 h)								0.0022
Es ²⁵⁵								4.8×10^{-5}
Fm ²⁵⁴							0.0026	0.16
Fm ²⁵⁵	4.7×10^8	1.2×10^9	2.4×10^9	0.016	0.04	0.08	1.4×10^{-7}	0.024
Fm ²⁵⁶							5	-
Fm ²⁵⁷	4.7×10^8	1.2×10^9	2.4×10^9	0.016	0.04	0.08		1.4×10^{-4}
Fm ²⁵⁸							3	-
Fm ²⁵⁹	2.3×10^8	5.7×10^8	1.2×10^9	0.008	0.02	0.04		3×10^{-4}
Md ²⁵⁹								0.006
Md ²⁶⁰	4.9×10^9	1.2×10^{10}	2.5×10^{10}	0.16	0.40	0.80		0.007

SCOPE OF WORK

At the present time, production of macro amounts of the "synthetic" elements above uranium can be accomplished only by adding neutrons to the U^{238} nucleus in a high-flux reactor (this picture may possibly soon be modified by the use of "instant" reactors, i.e., controlled underground nuclear explosions). As weighable amounts of each of the heavier elements derived from uranium have become available over the last twenty years, they have been separated, purified, and repackaged for reactor exposure to serve as base material in turn for the production of elements of still higher mass. Intermediate nuclides used in this cycling process were originally formed either as the primary products of certain reactor operations (as was Pu^{239}), or as byproducts from such operations (as in the cases of Am^{241} and Np^{237}). The cycling process with such intermediate materials (primarily with Pu^{239}) has brought about the present stage of development in which multigram quantities of nuclides of mass of 242 or higher are now, or soon will be, available to serve as target materials for the next step in the cyclic process.

Because of the vagaries of fission and capture cross sections, decay half-lives, etc., certain nuclides of each element have longer survival times during the buildup process and thus tend to dominate the isotopic composition of that element during much of the irradiation period. Nuclides of this type are Pu^{242} , Am^{243} , Cm^{244} , and Cf^{252} . These four will be considered in the present work as the most probable candidates over the next few years as targets for still heavier element production. Three neutron-irradiation flux levels were chosen for the calculations, based on the characteristics of two very high-flux reactors soon to be available or in the planning stage: the Oak Ridge High Flux Isotope Reactor (HFIR) and the Argonne Advanced Research Reactor (A^2R^2). Fluxes chosen were 2×10^{15} n/cm²/sec (estimated to be the average flux in the HFIR center thimble), 5×10^{15} n/cm²/sec (HFIR maximum flux, A^2R^2 average center thimble flux) and 1×10^{16} n/cm²/sec (A^2R^2 maximum flux).

Two possible target nuclides, Am^{241} and Np^{237} , which could be made available in very large amounts as byproducts from production reactor operations, were not considered in the present study. Since the buildup path based on Np^{237} goes through Pu^{239} , the latter isotope itself is the more reasonable target, being available in quantity.

The nuclide Am^{241} is a more subtle case. The first step in its buildup path involves the formation of two nuclear isomers of Am^{242} , both of which have very high fission cross sections.⁽⁴⁾ In moderately high fluxes, a usable amount of buildup can occur past the Am^{242} stage, but in very high fluxes the destruction rate at this point in the chain is so large as to make the material of little use as a raw material for production of heavier elements.

Am^{241} does, however, have much utility as a starting nuclide for forming large quantities of Cm^{242} , an isotope that is of considerable interest because of its intense alpha activity and its promise as a compact energy source. A separate report is being prepared on that subject.⁽⁵⁾

METHOD OF CALCULATION

The calculations were carried out with an IBM 1620 (II) computer, programmed by means of the FORTRAN (II) coding system. The basic growth and decay program was that of Milsted, Fields and Metta,⁽³⁾ which uses the analytic solution of differential equations originally due to Bateman.⁽⁶⁾ However, this solution breaks down if any two members of the chain have identical destruction constants, as in the case of a chain involving feedback through alpha decay to a nuclide already included in the chain. In these cases, the integration process was carried out numerically, by considering the formation and destruction of each member of the chain during successive small time intervals. In order to achieve accuracy comparable with that of the Bateman solution, it was necessary to make these time increments quite small (10^4 sec in most cases), and each calculation therefore involved many thousands of iterations to cover irradiation times up to several years. The calculations were therefore considerably slower than when using the Bateman solution.

The input and output cards for either program were identical in format. The input cards specified the half-lives and cross sections for formation and destruction of each nuclide, and the irradiation times required. The output cards gave relative yields (atoms of product per initial target atom) at each specified irradiation time. The output from either program could be used as data for the final calculations.

The alpha and neutron activities, and the heat output were calculated by applying the appropriate conversion factors from Tables 1 and 2 to the relative yield data, summing, and normalizing to one gram of starting material.

The rate of helium production at any time could be calculated from the sum of the alpha activities of the important alpha emitters and from the helium-production factor. The accumulation of helium during the interval between two successive time values was approximated from the rate of production at the mean relative yields and the length of the time interval. These helium increments were then summed to give the cumulative data shown in the curves.

The data for total fission product accumulation were calculated by adding the relative yields of all transuranium nuclides present and subtracting from unity. The result of this calculation is strictly the total

relative yield of the products of all competing reactions resulting in loss of atoms from the buildup chains. However, since all-important neutron-capture processes were included in the buildup chains, the calculation gave a good approximation to the relative number of target atoms undergoing fission. The use of these yield figures as mass fission product percentages ignores any gain in mass by neutron capture before fission and the mass of the fission neutrons lost. For the present purpose, however, these inaccuracies were considered unimportant.

DATA USED (Tables 1 and 2)

The basic data presented in Tables 1 and 2 are the decay half-life and cross-section values, the other numbers being derived from them as indicated in Appendix A. For the most part, the basic values were taken from reference (3), supplemented where needed by information from the compilations of Isaac and Wilkins⁽⁷⁾ of Hyde⁽⁸⁾, and from the Isotope Tables prepared by Strominger, Hollander, and Seaborg.⁽⁹⁾

It should be realized that many of the quoted cross sections and half-lives (particularly for the transcalifornium isotopes) are still very poorly known; in some cases, the values in the tables are simply estimates based on systematics or experimental yield considerations.

THE BUILDUP PATH (Figure 1)

Figure 1 presents the buildup path assumed in the present study. In the case of the Pu^{242} , Am^{243} , and Cm^{244} targets, the contribution of "feedback" (i.e., the cycling back into the buildup chain of daughter nuclides formed by natural decay during the irradiation period) can be ignored. In the case of the Cf^{252} target, however, the relatively short half-life of the parent target (leading to rapid Cm^{248} daughter production) combined with the relatively low destruction cross section of Cf^{252} does cause an appreciable contribution which must be considered. (This is particularly true for the calculations of heat production from Cf^{252} targets, owing to the presence of highly fissionable Cf^{251} in the feedback chain.) This particular reverse cycle is accordingly indicated in Figure 1. Feedback paths from the alpha decays of Fm^{254} and Es^{253} (yielding Cf^{250} and Bk^{249} , respectively) were also included in the calculations for Cf^{252} . Although these paths contributed appreciably to the heat production, they are omitted from Figure 1 for the sake of clarity.

Fig. 1. Assumed Buildup Path

ALPHA EMISSION (see Figures 2-6)

Of the four target materials studied, three (Pu^{242} , Am^{243} , and Cm^{244}) showed quite similar patterns for all of the properties calculated. This fact can be really understood when it is realized that there are only two mass units separating their initial weights, and that the three form a very compact chain with short-lived intermediates ($\text{Pu}^{242} \xrightarrow{5 \text{ hr}} \text{Pu}^{243} \xrightarrow{5 \text{ hr}} \text{Am}^{243} \xrightarrow{26 \text{ min}} \text{Am}^{244} \xrightarrow{26 \text{ min}} \text{Cm}^{244}$). Thus the patterns of the various curves at a given flux tend to be separated only in time, as can be seen in the "C" curves of Figures 2-3-4. With a Pu^{242} target, the first large alpha-emission peak (due to Cm^{244}) occurs after about 6 weeks at a flux of $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ n/cm}^2/\text{sec}$; with Am^{243} , the peak appears in about 2 weeks; with Cm^{244} , of course, it is at zero time. In all three cases, a sharp drop in alpha activity occurs as the Cm^{244} is burned out, but a second smaller peak then appears as Cf^{252} , Es^{253} , and Fm^{254} grow in. This is shown in Figure 5, which presents a detailed picture of the contribution of the various products to alpha emission when Cm^{244} is irradiated at a flux of $5 \times 10^{15} \text{ n/cm}^2/\text{sec}$.

120-8921

Fig. 2. Total Alpha Activity. Target: 1 gram Pu²⁴².

120-8922

Fig. 3. Total Alpha Activity. Target: 1 gram Am²⁴³.

120-8923

Fig. 4. Total Alpha Activity. Target: 1 gram Cm²⁴⁴.

120-8924

Fig. 5. Detail - Alpha Emission.
1 gram Cm²⁴⁴ at 5×10^{15} Flux.

Fig. 6

Total Alpha Activity.
Target: 1 gram Cf^{252} .

120-8925

As with the other parameters calculated, the Cf^{252} case is somewhat atypical when its alpha-emission curves are compared with those of the other three targets. Total alpha-emission levels higher by some factors of ten are reached than in the case of the lighter targets, with the emission curves at all three fluxes showing a single peak some one or two months after the start of the irradiation. This peak arises primarily from the contribution of the 3.38-hr Fm^{254} . In practice, this short half-life means that a substantial decrease in the alpha activity of the sample would ordinarily occur between the time of removal from the reactor and the beginning of processing. On the other hand, the Fm^{254} contribution to the helium-accumulation problem (see next section) will be very large.

HELIUM ACCUMULATION (see Figures 7-10)

As would be expected from the alpha-emission curves, the helium-accumulation data for the Pu^{242} , Am^{243} , and Cm^{244} targets are very similar to each other, all leveling off at between 1- and 2-ml total helium buildup per gram of target (see Figures 7-9). There is an interesting reversal in the curves for long irradiations in that less total helium is formed at the higher fluxes, simply indicating that at these very high fluxes the very intense alpha emitters have a shorter residence time in the reactor before they are transmuted or fissioned.

120-8926

Fig. 7. Cumulative Helium from α Activity. Target: 1 gram Pu²⁴².

120-8927

Fig. 8. Cumulative Helium from α Activity. Target: 1 gram Am²⁴³.

120-8928

Fig. 9
Cumulative Helium from α Activity. Target: 1 gram Cm²⁴⁴.

As pointed out in the previous section, the Cf^{252} case is decidedly different (see Figure 10) since the total alpha accumulation is some fifty times as great as for the other targets during long irradiations. In addition to the Fm^{254} contribution discussed above, substantial quantities are also derived from Es^{253} and from the original Cf^{252} target itself.

Fig. 10
Cumulative Helium
from α Activity.
Target: 1 gram Cf^{252} .

120-8929

NEUTRON EMISSION (see Figures 11-15)

In the case of all four target nuclides, the neutron emission from spontaneous fission is essentially determined by the level of Cf^{252} and Cf^{254} production. This is best demonstrated in Figure 14, which indicates the contribution made by individual products to the total neutron output per gram of sample when Cm^{244} is irradiated in a flux of $5 \times 10^{15} \text{ n/cm}^2/\text{sec}$. As with earlier parameters, the three lighter targets show very similar curves of neutron growth (see Figures 11-13) and all eventually reach essentially the same emission level.

With a Cf^{252} target (see Figure 15), a dramatic increase occurs in the total neutron output in the $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ n/cm}^2/\text{sec}$ flux comparatively early in the irradiation, although the growth over the initial emission level is very slight at $2 \times 10^{15} \text{ n/cm}^2/\text{sec}$, but substantial at $5 \times 10^{15} \text{ n/cm}^2/\text{sec}$. These peaks (all occurring in the range of 4 to 6 months of irradiation time) are due to formation and eventual destruction of 60.5-d Cf^{254} , which is

believed to decay essentially completely by spontaneous fission. Heavy-element-production programs based on the use of Cf^{252} in very high fluxes are required to be very cognizant of the Cf^{254} problem in designing shielding for facilities for processing the irradiated targets. However, since most of the buildup products of interest reach their maximum concentrations in a Cf^{252} target in slightly less than two months (see Figure 16 of Reference 3), the Cf^{254} hazard can be partially mitigated by planning the irradiation program around a shorter processing schedule and removing the target from the reactor before the maximum emission point is reached.

120-8930

Fig. 11

Total Neutron Emission
from Spontaneous Fission.
Target: 1 gram Pu^{242} .

Fig. 12
Total Neutron Emission
from Spontaneous Fission.
Target: 1 gram Am^{243} .

120-8931

Fig. 13. Total Neutron Emission from Spontaneous Fission. Target: 1 gram Cm^{244} .

Fig. 14. Detail - Neutrons from Spontaneous Fission. 1 gram Cm^{244} in 5×10^{15} Flux.

Fig. 15
Total Neutron Emission from Spontaneous Fission. Target: 1 gram Cf^{252} .

HEAT FROM ACTINIDE FISSION AND DECAY (see Figures 16-20)

The curves shown in Figures 16-20 include (a) heat from natural decay, (b) heat from spontaneous fission, and (c) heat from induced fission in the targets and their buildup products. Heat of capture of pile neutrons on the fission products or capsule materials is not included.

120-8935

Fig. 16

Heat from Actinide Fission and Decay. Target: 1 gram Pu^{242} .

Fig. 17

Heat from Actinide Fission and Decay. Target: 1 gram Am^{243} .

120-8936

120-8937

Fig. 18. Heat from Actinide Fission and Decay. Target: 1 gram Cm^{244} .

120-8938

Fig. 19. Detail - Heat from Fission and Decay. 1 gram Cm^{244} in 5×10^{15} Flux.

120-8939

Fig. 20
Heat from Fission and Decay.
Target: 1 gram Cf^{252} .

Heat from induced fission dominates the heat-release problem in all situations save for very long irradiations. There is some error in the induced-heat calculations as shown, since the factor of 3×10^{10} fissions/sec being equal to one Watt is based on the assumption that 200 MeV of energy are available per fission. Calculations based directly on yield curves such as are made here implicitly assume that all 200 MeV of this energy appear as heat at the moment of fission, whereas in actuality some 7 or 8% of the heat appears more gradually during fission product decay, etc.⁽¹⁰⁾

In the case of the Pu^{242} , Am^{243} , and Cm^{244} targets, the position and maximum level of the heat-release peak are largely dominated in the first 8-12 months of an irradiation by the level of Cm^{245} present, whereas Cm^{247} controls in the one- to two-year period (see Figure 19). From this point of view as well as from that of avoiding the large actinide target loss in the Cm^{245} stage, the observation of Diamond, Côté, and Barnes⁽¹¹⁾ that the Cm^{245} fission cross section might be caused to fall by increasing the thermal temperature of the neutron flux of a reactor is of considerable interest. (As these authors indicate, however, any benefit gained would be lost if the Cm^{245} capture cross section was simultaneously decreased, a point that still must be clarified.)

As can be seen from the insert graph on Figure 18, the point of maximum heat release with the Cm^{244} target appears in the very early stages of an irradiation. In a flux of 1×10^{16} n/cm²/sec the peak is reached in less than 2 d at the very respectable level of better than 18,000 W/g of target material.

Cf^{252} is a comparatively lesser problem from the heat-release point of view, the maximum value attained being less by roughly a factor of ten (see Figure 20) than those seen for starting materials of lighter mass. As indicated in an earlier section, a substantial amount of the heat that is released in this case comes from Cf^{251} arising in feedback cycles. For example, in a flux of 1×10^{16} n/cm²/sec a maximum value of 340 W/g is obtained if feedback is ignored, whereas the corresponding maximum with feedback is 1880 W/g (both peaks being at $5-6 \times 10^6$ sec irradiation).

RATE OF TARGET CONVERSION TO FISSION PRODUCTS (see Figures 21-24)

The similarities in the rates with which the three lighter targets are destroyed is again apparent from Figures 21-23, in which the primary differences in the families of curves for each element is their displacement to the left in going from Pu^{242} to Cm^{244} , reflecting primarily the time necessary to reach the Cm^{245} stage in each case. The Cf^{252} target, for which the buildup chain does not involve a step comparable with the Cm^{245} roadblock in the lighter elements, has a comparatively long lifetime in the reactor (see Figure 21).

120-8940

Fig. 21. Percent Original Atoms Converted to Fission Products, Pu^{242} Target.

120-8941

Fig. 22. Percent Original Atoms Converted to Fission Products, Am^{243} Target.

120-8942

Fig. 23

Percent Original Atoms Converted to Fission Products, Cm^{244} Target.

It will be seen in Figures 21-24 that an appallingly large amount of any of the targets eventually ends up as fission products rather than as the elements sought. From this point of view, controlled nuclear explosions as a source of very heavy elements have much appeal, since the desired elements are all formed essentially instantaneously. The high-loss stages, such as Cm^{245} fission, that are inevitable in a normal reactor irradiation are thus effectively bypassed.

Fig. 24

Percent Original Atoms Converted to Fission Products. Cf^{252} Target.

120-8943

APPENDIX A

Calculation Methods for Tables 1 and 2I. Definitions $T_{1/2}$ = Half-life λ = decay constant σ_C = neutron capture cross section (thermal) σ_F = fission cross section (thermal) f = neutron flux (n/cm²/sec) ν = prompt neutrons emitted per fission A = atomic number M = atomic weight

Sp. Act. = Disintegrations per unit of time per unit of mass

II. Specific Activity (See Columns 4 and 5 of Table 1)

Sp. Act. (in same time units as $T_{1/2}$) = $(\lambda)(\text{atoms per unit weight}) = (0.693/T_{1/2})(\text{atoms per unit weight})$

To obtain Sp. Act. as dis/sec/ μ g:

$$\text{Sp. Act.} = \left(\frac{0.693}{T_{1/2} \text{ in sec}} \right) \left(\frac{10^{-6} \times 6.02 \times 10^{23}}{A} \right) = \frac{\text{Constant}}{(T_{1/2})(A)}$$

The factor necessary to convert the quoted half-life to seconds can be included as part of the constant:

<u>If $T_{1/2}$ is expressed in:</u>	<u>Constant is:</u>
sec	4.16×10^{17}
min	6.95×10^{15}
hr	1.16×10^{14}
d	4.83×10^{12}
yr	1.32×10^{10}

Half-lives from column 2 were used to calculate specific activities given in column 4, and $T_{1/2}$ values from column 3 to calculate fissions/sec/ μ g for column 5.

III. Neutron Emission (See Column 6 of Table 1)

Asplund-Nilsson, Condé and Starfelt⁽¹²⁾ have recently experimentally determined ν for the spontaneous fission of Cf²⁵² to be 3.799 ± 0.034 neutrons/ μ g.

This value was assumed for all of the spontaneously fissioning nuclides considered in this report, and was used to multiply the figures of column 5 to obtain those in column 6.

IV. Cross Sections (See Columns 7, 8, and 9 of Table 1)

Values in columns 7 and 9 of Table 1 are quoted or estimated as described in the text. Column 8 data is derived from column 7 by the formula

$$\text{cm}^2/\text{g} = \frac{\sigma_c \times 10^{-24} \times 6.02 \times 10^{23}}{A} = \frac{0.602\sigma_c}{A}$$

V. Helium Buildup (See Column 10 of Table 1)

The helium-buildup curves (see Figures 7-10) are cumulative, representing the integrated yield of alpha particles from the original target plus irradiation products. The data of column 10 are expressed as cc of helium produced per day per gram of nuclide, measured under standard conditions of temperature and pressure. These tabulated data are for rapid calculations; the curves are more exact, since all of the alphas emitted at a given time were summed and converted to milliliters of helium.

For alpha emitters:

$$\frac{\text{Sp. Act.}}{6.02 \times 10^{23}} = \text{moles helium produced per second per microgram;}$$

$$\left(\frac{\text{Sp. Act.}}{6.02 \times 10^{23}} \right) (8.64 \times 10^4)(10^6) = \text{moles helium produced per day per gram} = (1.44 \times 10^{-13})(\text{Sp. Act.});$$

$$\text{cc/day/gram} = (\text{Sp. Act.})(1.44 \times 10^{-13})(22400) = (3.19 \times 10^{-9})(\text{Sp. Act.}).$$

Since decay-scheme data are not available in most cases, the possibility of branching was ignored, and decay of alpha emitters was assumed to be 100% by that mode. Alphas from daughter nuclides or "feedback" chains were not considered, save in the case of Cf^{252} targets.

VI. Induced Fission (See Columns 2, 3, and 4 of Table 2)

$$N_B = \text{number of atoms fissioned in time } t = N_A \sigma_F t;$$

$$N_A = \text{atoms of target per microgram;}$$

$$N_B = \frac{6.02 \times 10^{23}}{A \times 10^6} \times \sigma_F \times 10^{-24} \times f \times t;$$

$$\text{Fissions in one microgram per second} = \frac{6.02 \times 10^{-7}}{M_A} \times f \times \sigma_F.$$

VII. Heat from Fission (See Columns 5-8 of Table 2)

$$3 \times 10^{10} \text{ fissions/sec} = 1 \text{ W.}$$

The values in columns 5, 6, and 7 were obtained by dividing the corresponding figures in columns 2, 3, and 4 by 3×10^{10} . Similarly, the values in column 8 were obtained by dividing the values of column 5 of Table 1 by the same quantity.

VIII. Heat from Nonfission Radioactive Decay (See Column 9 of Table 2)

Q values (average energy in MeV of particles emitted from the nuclide under consideration) were taken from the Table of Isotopes.⁽⁹⁾ Where values were not given in that reference (for Cf^{255} , Fm^{257} , Fm^{259} , Mv^{259} , and Mv^{260}) a value of 7 MeV was assumed for alpha emitters, and a value of 1 MeV for beta emitters.

$$1 \text{ MeV/sec} = 1.60 \times 10^{-13} \text{ W.}$$

$$(\text{Sp. Act.})(Q) = \text{MeV/sec per } \mu\text{g of emitter}$$

$$W/\mu\text{g} = 1.60 \times 10^{-13} \times \text{Sp. Act.} \times Q$$

IX. Percent of Original Atoms Converted to Fission Products

This quantity (see Figures 21-24) was calculated by summing the number of actinide element atoms (buildup products plus daughters) at any given time and subtracting from the original number of atoms present. The difference was assumed to be due to loss by fission. The expression of these data on a strict weight basis would, of course, involve corrections for mass and energy lost during the fission process as well as corrections for the mass and energy gained by target capture of pile neutrons.

REFERENCES

1. J. Milsted, P. R. Fields, and D. N. Metta, ANL-6756 (Aug. 1963).
2. D. Metta, H. Diamond, R. F. Barnes, J. Milsted, J. Gray, Jr., D. J. Henderson, and C. M. Stevens, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., in press.
3. J. Milsted, P. R. Fields, and D. N. Metta, to be published.
4. E. K. Hulet, R. W. Hoff, H. R. Bowman, and M. C. Michel, Phys. Rev. 107, 1294-96 (1957).
5. D. C. Stewart, R. W. Anderson, and John Milsted, ANL-6933.
6. H. Bateman, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 15, 423 (1910).
7. N. W. Isaac and J. W. Wilkins, ANL-6042 (Sept. 1959).
8. E. K. Hyde, UCRL-9036, Rev. (April 1962).
9. D. Strominger, J. M. Hollander, and G. T. Seaborg, Revs. Mod. Phys. 30, 585-904 (1958).
10. S. Glasstone, Principles of Nuclear Engineering, D. Van Nostrand, Inc., New York (1955), p. 24.
11. R. E. Cote, R. F. Barnes, and H. Diamond, Phys. Rev. 134, 1281-84 (1964).
12. I. Asplund-Nilsson, H. Conde, and N. Starfelt, Nucl. Sci. Eng. 16, 124-30 (May 1963).