PMK

~~SECRET~~

RFP - 158

UNCLASSIFIED

MASTER

AEC RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT REPORT

~~This document contains Secret-Restricted Data
relating to civilian application of atomic energy.~~

C-46 Criticality Hazards

M-3679 (22nd Ed., Rev 1)

Plutonium Graphite Assemblies

Part II

by

A. Goodwin, Jr.

C. L. Schuske

THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

ROCKY FLATS PLANT DENVER, COLORADO

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACT AT (29-1)-1106

RESTRICTED DATA

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS RESTRICTED DATA AS DEFINED IN
THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954. ITS TRANSMITTAL OR
DISCLOSURE OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN
UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED.

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

1 1568

UNCLASSIFIED

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.

Printed in USA. Charge 45 cents. Available from the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Technical Information Service Extension, P. O. Box 1001, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Please direct to the same address inquiries covering the procurement of other classified AEC reports.

037241030

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.

UNCLASSIFIED

RFP-158

C-46 - CRITICALITY HAZARDS
(M-3679 22nd Ed., Rev. 1)

This document consists of 21
pages, No. 123 of 162 copies,
Series A.

THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY
ROCKY FLATS PLANT
DENVER, COLORADO

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Contract AT(29-1)-1106

PLUTONIUM GRAPHITE ASSEMBLIES - PART II

by

A. Goodwin, Jr.
C. L. Schuske

Work Done by

A. Goodwin, Jr. by
A. N. Nickel
C. L. Schuske
D. F. Smith

Classification cancelled (or changed to **UNCLASSIFIED**)
by *from Declassification Branch*
by authority of *date Dec. 9, 1959*

TIE, date *12-30-59*

Criticality Group

L. A. Matheson - Technical Director
J. G. Epp - Assistant Technical Director

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains restricted data as defined in the
Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Its transmission or disclosure
of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person
is prohibited.

Date Distributed: August 10, 1959

UNCLASSIFIED

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.

03712281030

[REDACTED]

Date Distributed: August 10, 1959

RFP-158
C-46 - CRITICALITY HAZARDS
(M-3679 22nd Ed., Rev. 1)

DISTRIBUTION

INTERNAL:

Copy No.

1	R. R. Harrison
2	L. A. Matheson
3	C. L. Schuske
4-7	Seth R. Woodruff, Jr., RFAO
8-11	Library

EXTERNAL:

12-13	Aerojet-General Corporation
14	Aerojet-General, San Ramon (IOO-880)
15-18	Air Force Ballistic Missile Division
19-20	AFPR, Lockheed, Marietta
21	AFPR, North American, Canoga Park
22-23	Air Force Special Weapons Center
24-25	Albuquerque Operations Office
26	Alco Products, Inc.
27-30	Argonne National Laboratory
31	Armed Forces Special Weapons Project, Sandia
32	Armed Forces Special Weapons Project, Washington
33-36	Atomic Energy Commission, Washington
37	Atomics International
38-39	Babcock and Wilcox Company (NYOO-1940)
40	Babcock and Wilcox Company (NYOO-274)
41	Battelle Memorial Institute
42-43	Bettis Plant (WAPD)
44-45	Brookhaven National Laboratory
46	Bureau of Aeronautics
47	BAR, Aerojet-General, Azusa
48	Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
49	Bureau of Ships
50	Bureau of Yards and Docks
51-53	Chicago Operations Office
54	Combustion Engineering, Inc.
55	Division of International Affairs (Pennington)
56-57	duPont Company, Aiken
58	duPont Company, Wilmington

~~SECRET~~

59	Electric Boat Division
60	Franklin Institute of Pennsylvania
61	General Atomic Division
62-64	General Electric Company (ANPD)
65-68	General Electric Company, Richland
69	General Nuclear Engineering Corporation
70	Goodyear Atomic Corporation
71	Hanford Operations Office
72	Idaho Test Division (LAROO)
73	Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory
74	Lockland Aircraft Reactors Operations Office
75-76	Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
77-79	Mallinckrodt Chemical Works
80	Marquardt Aircraft Company
81	Martin Company
82	Mound Laboratory
83	National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Cleveland
84	National Bureau of Standards
85	National Lead Company of Ohio
86	Naval Air Development Center
87	Naval Air Material Center
88-89	Naval Research Laboratory
90	New Brunswick Area Office
91-92	New York Operations Office
93	New York Shipbuilding Corporation
94	Nuclear Development Corporation of America
95	Nuclear Metals, Inc.
96	Oak Ridge Operations Office
97	Office of Naval Research
98	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
99	Office of the Surgeon General
100	Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation
101	Patent Branch, Washington
102	Phillips Petroleum Company (NRTS)
103	Power Reactor Development Company
104	Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Division
105	Sandia Corporation
106	Sandia Corporation, Livermore
107	Sylvania-Corning Nuclear Corporation
108-109	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (ORGDP)
110-114	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (ORNL)
115	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (Paducah Plant)
116	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (Y-12 Plant)
117-118	University of California Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley
119-120	University of California Radiation Laboratory, Livermore
121	Westinghouse Electric Corporation (NYOO-222)
122	Yankee Atomic Electric Company (NYOO-222)
123-162	Technical Information Service Extension (For Official AEC Use)

ABSTRACT

Neutron multiplication measurements were made on a number of cylindrical assemblies of plutonium and graphite discs. S_n calculations were made on homogeneous mixtures of plutonium and graphite with varying C/Pu ratios and varying reflector thickness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

These tests were made possible by the cooperation of Mr. I. B. Venable and staff. The S_n calculations were performed at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory with the cooperation of Dr. Hugh Paxton, Dr. Gordon Hansen, and Mr. Bengt Carlson.

We would also like to thank Mr. H. V. Duba for his assistance in illustrating the report.

0376281300

1. INTRODUCTION

Neutron multiplication measurements were made on cylindrical disc assemblies constructed of alternate layers of graphite and plutonium metal sheet. The thicknesses of the graphite and plutonium layers were changed in order to study the effect of inhomogeneity.

S_4 calculations were made on homogeneous mixtures of plutonium and graphite with varying graphite reflector thicknesses. The C/Pu ratios used in the calculations were 0, 5, 10, 15, and 20. These calculations are correlated with the experiments.

This report is a continuation of RFP-123. (1)

2. EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS

The measuring equipment used in these experiments included scalers, Atomic Model 1050-A, coupled to G.E. B¹⁰-lined counters encased in 8-in. diameter polystyrene moderators and a LiI (Eu) scintillator.

2.1 Materials

2.1.1 Moderator and Reflector (Graphite National Carbon Grade CS-312)

(1) A. Goodwin, Jr. and C. L. Schuske, "Plutonium Graphite Assemblies," USAEC Report RFP-123, September 29, 1958 (Secret)

A) Moderator and reflector dimensions:

Discs 14 in. in diameter and 1/2-in. thick.

B) Moderator and reflector density: 1.76 g/cm³.

2.1.2 Fuel (Plutonium)

A) Fuel dimensions: Discs ~13.25 x 0.056-in.

B) Fuel density: ~15.8 g/cm³

C) Average weight of fuel pieces: 2075 g.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND PROCEDURES

Figure 1 is a schematic of the assemblies. Regions A are graphite of equal thickness on each end, regions B are plutonium discs, and regions C are graphite discs. Table I summarizes the results of the experiments.

TABLE I

Thickness of Region A in.	Number of Sheets of Pu in Region B	Thickness of Region C in.	Number of Sheets in Exp. Core	Critical Number of Sheets (Extrap- olated)	Critical Mass (Extrap- olated) kg	C/Pu Ratio
1/2	1	1/2	36	~ ∞	~ ∞	20
1-1/2	5	2-1/2	35	~ ∞	~ ∞	20
1	6	1	30	34	70.55	6.67
1	9	1-1/2	27	31.5	69.5	6.67
1-1/2	8	2	32	37	76.8	10
1	8	1	26	31.2	64.7	5

The C/Pu ratios in Table I were calculated assuming the core to be as shown in Figure 1a. Under this assumption the C/Pu ratio remains constant as the core is assembled.

Figures 2 through 7 show the extrapolations to critical of $\frac{1}{M}$ versus the number of sheets for the above experiments. An indication of the experimental uncertainty can be seen from these curves.

4. THEORETICAL CORRELATION

Some S_4 calculations were done on homogeneous mixtures of carbon and plutonium reflected by carbon. Table II gives a description and the results of these S_4 calculations. The densities were calculated assuming the plutonium metal density to be 15.8 g/cm^3 and the graphite density to be 1.76 g/cm^3 .

TABLE II

Problem Number	Fuel Density	Moderator and/or Reflector Density	Geometry	C/Pu Ratio	Core Radius or Half Thickness cm	Reflector Thickness cm
1	15.8	1.76	slab	0	1.83	0.91
2*	15.8	0	slab	0	2.18	0
3	4.86	1.22	cylinder	5	10.14	0.92
4	4.86	1.22	slab	5	5.50	0.92
5*	2.81	1.43	slab	10	8.05**	1.07
6*	2.81	1.43	cylinder	10	14.29	1.06
7	2.04	1.53	cylinder	15	17.65	1.10
8	2.04	1.53	slab	15	9.98	1.42
9	1.58	1.58	cylinder	20	20.36	1.20
10	1.58	1.58	slab	20	11.84	1.32
* Also reported in RFP-123.						
** This core thickness is given incorrectly in Table III of RFP-123. It should be 16.10 cm instead of 17.10 cm.						

These calculations were interpolated to finite geometries by use of a constant buckling and extrapolation length formula. The buckling and extrapolation length were calculated from the overall dimensions (core + reflector) of the cylinder and slab for each C/Pu ratio. Table III lists these parameters.

TABLE III

C/Pu	Buckling (B^2) cm ⁻²	Extrapolation Length cm
0	0.150*	1.87*
5	0.0323	2.32
10	0.0182	2.46
15	0.0127	2.59
20	0.00986	2.66
* Values reported in RFP-123 obtained from the sizes of a bare slab and a bare cylinder of plutonium metal (density 15.6 g/cm ³) calculated by S ₄ using six group cross sections.		

It was shown in RFP-123 that for a C/Pu ratio of 10 the reflector savings is approximately equal to the reflector thickness for thin reflectors (≤ 1 cm). Therefore for the C/Pu ratios ≥ 10 the above bucklings and extrapolation lengths can be used for bare systems. They were also used for the bare C/Pu = 5 systems although without verification. We are primarily interested here in systems which are partially reflected since all of the experiments had some graphite on the ends and also had graphite extending radially beyond the plutonium discs. Therefore, the above bare buckling and extrapolation length

[REDACTED]

were not verified by making a completely bare calculation for a system with $C/Pu = 5$.

The slab for $C/Pu = 15$ in Table II has a rather large reflector thickness and is probably too thick to use the overall size of the system to calculate the buckling and extrapolation length. Therefore, the above buckling and extrapolation length for $C/Pu = 15$ were obtained by subtracting 0.05 cm (refer to Figure 8) from the overall size of the slab with $C/Pu = 15$.

In order to determine the effect of thicker graphite reflectors some S_n calculations were made at a C/Pu of 10. The results of these calculations are given in Table IV.

TABLE IV

Problem Number	Geometry	Core Radius or Half Thickness cm	Reflector Thickness cm
11	Slab	7.28	1.94
12	Cylinder	13.81	1.50
13	Slab	5.55	5.05
14	Cylinder	12.35	3.86

Knowing the sizes of the bare geometries (slab and cylinder obtained using buckling and extrapolation length in Table II) we can obtain reflector savings for the above reflector thicknesses. In order to extend these calculations to larger reflector thicknesses a one-group formula was fitted

[REDACTED]

to the S_n slab calculations. The critical equation for a one-group reflected slab reactor is:

$$(1) \quad \tan \left(B \frac{H}{2} \right) = \frac{D_r K_r}{D_c B} \quad \text{Coth} [K_r (T + \delta_r)]$$

where B^2 = core buckling

D = diffusion coefficient (subscripts denote core or reflector)

K_r = reciprocal diffusion length for reflector

δ_r = extrapolation length for reflector.

The following parameters were obtained to fit the S_n calculations to this formula:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} B^2 &= 0.0182 \text{ cm}^{-2} \quad (\text{see Table III}) & K_r &= 0.075 \text{ cm}^{-1} \\ \frac{D_r}{D_c} &= 0.893 & \delta_r &= 2.3 \text{ cm} \end{aligned}$$

Using this method the reflector savings for an infinite reflector is 5.89 cm.

The curve of reflector savings versus reflector thickness is plotted in Figure 8. The S_n cylinder calculations also fall on this curve showing that the reflector savings is not greatly dependent on geometry for the sizes calculated.

The above formula can be used to determine the reflector savings for finite cylinders reflected on the ends if the buckling in equation 1 is reduced by subtracting

$$(3) \quad B_r^2 = \left(\frac{2.4048}{R + \delta_r} \right)^2.$$

Using this method the reflector savings for a 14-in. diameter cylinder reflected on the ends by infinite graphite was calculated to be 5.34 cm whereas for the infinitely reflected

[REDACTED]

infinite slab the reflector savings was 5.89 cm. The difference in reflector savings between infinite slabs and finite end reflected cylinders would be less for finite reflectors.

Figure 9 shows calculated curves and the experimental points of critical mass versus C/Pu ratio. The curve labeled "bare" in Figure 9 was calculated from the bucklings and extrapolation lengths of Table III. The curves labeled 1/2-in., 1-in., and 1-1/2-in. end reflector were obtained from the bare curves and using Figure 8 to obtain reflector savings at $C/Pu = 10$. These reflected cylinders were also assumed to have 3/8-in. radial reflectors. At $C/Pu = 0$ cylinders with 1/2-in., 1-in., and 1-1/2-in. end reflector thickness can be estimated from Figure 6 of RFP-123. This was done using a 13.25-in. diameter cylinder. In using Figure 6 of RFP-123 the mass used for the bare 13.25-in. cylinder was obtained using the buckling and extrapolation length for $C/Pu = 0$ of Table III, then a curve was drawn parallel to the experimental curves. Finally, all curves in Figure 9 ("bare", 1/2 in., 1 in., 1-1/2 in.) must go to infinity for the same C/Pu ratio.

The points of the arrows in Figure 8 represent the experimental C/Pu ratios and masses listed in Table I plus some data taken from RFP-123. From this method of displaying the data one would conclude that there is a rather large decrease in critical mass as one lumps the fuel into large pieces keeping the C/Pu ratio constant. For the fast systems

[REDACTED]

described here it would be difficult to explain such an effect as being due to inhomogeneity.

Another method of calculating the C/Pu ratios of a homogeneous core was tried in order to determine if the experimental points could be made to fit the theoretical calculations better. In this method the C/Pu ratios were calculated for a core as illustrated in Figure 1b. Both methods of calculating C/Pu ratios assumed that the graphite which extended radially beyond the fuel sheets was reflector. It is evident that the C/Pu ratios do not remain constant as the assembly is constructed when using the method illustrated in Figure 1b. Therefore, the C/Pu ratio has to be calculated for the system after it has been extrapolated to critical. The C/Pu ratios of the inscribed points in Figure 9 were calculated by this latter method.

The scatter of the experimental points is due mostly to experimental uncertainties and whatever effect is actually due to inhomogeneity would be masked by these experimental errors. Disagreement between calculation and experiment can be due to calculational error, experimental uncertainty, or both. The method of converting from the infinite geometries calculated by S_n to the finite geometries of the experiments would also contribute to the error. The conversion from non-homogeneous systems to homogeneous systems greatly affects the comparison between experiment and calculation.

[REDACTED]

The equivalent homogeneous core would seem to be best represented by Figure 1b, that is, the core surface is the smallest cylinder which would enclose all the fuel.

FIGURE I

[REDACTED]

FIGURE 2

FIGURE 3

FIGURE 4

FIGURE 5

REFLECTOR SAVINGS Vs. REFLECTOR THICKNESS

Core—Graphite Plutonium Mixture C/Pu=10
Reflector—Graphite (Density 1.76 gm/cm³).
Calculated For Infinite Cylinders And
Slabs By Sn.

FIGURE 8

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 9