OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

operated by

UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION

for the

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

ORNL - TM - 3365

CONF-710304-6

DATE - April 1, 1971

Neutron Physics Division

APPLICATION OF DOT-MORSE COUPLING TO THE ANALYSIS OF
THREE-DIMENSIONAL SNAP SHIELDING PROBLEMS[†]

E. A. Straker, R. L. Childs,* and M. B. Emmett*

Abstract

Many radiation transport problems can best be solved by using both discrete ordinates and Monte Carlo techniques with a coupling between the two techniques occurring at a geometry interface. A general discussion of two possible coupling schemes is given. The calculation of the reactor radiation scattered from a docked service and command module is used as an example of coupling discrete ordinates (DOT) and Monte Carlo (MORSE) calculations.

[†]Presented at the National Symposium on Natural and Manmade Radiation in Space, Las Vegas, Nevada, March 1-5, 1971.

*Mathematics Division.

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.

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.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or 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.

Many SNAP shielding problems involve determining neutron and gamma-ray transport in three-dimensional geometries. The solution of this problem by the application of Monte Carlo techniques alone frequently requires considerable computer time; however, many parts of the transport problem are only one- or two-dimensional and can easily be solved with discrete ordinates techniques. A convenient approach to solving the three-dimensional problem is to combine the discrete ordinates and Monte Carlo techniques, using Monte Carlo only for the transport that is three dimensional.

In coupling discrete ordinates with Monte Carlo, there is generally some difficulty associated with the compatibility of cross-section representation. This is due to the use of multigroup cross sections in the discrete ordinates codes and point cross sections in the Monte Carlo calculations. Additional problems of solving the coupled neutron-gamma-ray calculations in the Monte Carlo part also arise in some cases. The use of the multigroup Monte Carlo code MORSE¹ alleviates both of these problems in that the same multigroup cross sections can be used in both the discrete ordinates and the Monte Carlo calculations, and the coupled neutron-gamma-ray transport can be solved as one problem.

In using the results of discrete ordinates calculations as a source term for a Monte Carlo calculation, it is desirable to use as much as possible of the detail that is available, or else determine the effect of ignoring the detail. In other words, the assumption of separation of energy, angular, and spatial variation of the radiation should be avoided.

In general, the source term for the Monte Carlo calculation may be distributed over a volume or may be a boundary or surface source. Both

types of coupling will be discussed, and then an example will be given to illustrate a specific application.

The first case to be discussed is the coupling of results of discrete ordinates calculations (in this case, DOT² results) to Monte Carlo with a volume or region being common to both calculations. The results of a DOT calculation of the fluence $\Phi(r,z,E,\theta,\phi)$, a five-dimensional array defined for r,z within the volume of interest, is assumed to exist. In general, one would like to select the source term for subsequent Monte Carlo calculations from a conditional probability distribution for particles leaving a collision as a function of each of the five variables. Because of the large array of numbers, approximations have been made in the past in which some of the variables are selected from non-conditional probabilities that are volume integrated. For example, the energy may be selected from the spectrum integrated over the volume. Likewise, the angular distribution may be assumed to be the same for all points in the volume, or for all energies. However, complete detail can be used with increased data handling and storage requirements.

The first step in coupling over a spatial region is to convert the fluence Φ to χ , the density of particles leaving a collision. This is accomplished by multiplying the fluence by the group-to-group cross section:

$$\chi(r,z,E_g,\theta,\phi) = \sum_{\theta'} \sum_{E'} \Phi(r,z,E',\theta',\phi) \Sigma_s(E' \rightarrow E_g, \theta' \rightarrow \theta) .$$

Then, define

$$T = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_r} 2\pi \bar{r} \Delta r \sum_{\mathbf{v}_z} \Delta z \sum_g \sum_{\ell} \sum_m wt(\ell,m) \chi(r,z,E_g,\theta,\phi) ,$$

where $\chi(r, z, E_g, \theta, \phi) 2\pi \bar{r} \Delta r \Delta z$ is defined as the density of particles leaving a collision at r, z with energy E in group g per unit polar angle θ and azimuthal angle ϕ .

$wt(\ell) = \sum_m wt(\ell, m)$ is the solid angle segment for each polar angle θ ,
and

$wt(\ell, m)$ = the solid angle of each azimuthal angle ϕ for each polar angle index ℓ .

In order to select from this distribution, one must form the five following distributions:

$$R(r) = \frac{2\pi \bar{r} \Delta r}{T} \sum_{v_z} \Delta z \sum_g \sum_{\ell} \sum_m wt(\ell, m) \chi(r, z, E_g, \theta, \phi) ,$$

$$Z(z|r) = \frac{2\pi \Delta z \bar{r} \Delta r}{TR(r)} \sum_g \sum_{\ell} \sum_m wt(\ell, m) \chi(z, E_g, \theta, \phi | r) ,$$

$$E(E|z, r) = \frac{\Delta z 2\pi \bar{r} \Delta r}{TZ(z|r)R(r)} \sum_{\ell} \sum_m wt(\ell, m) \chi(E_g, \theta, \phi | z, r) ,$$

$$P(\theta | E_g, z, r) = \frac{\Delta z 2\pi \bar{r} \Delta r}{TE(E_g|z, r)Z(z|r)R(r)} \sum_m wt(\ell, m) \chi(\theta, \phi | E_g, z, r) ,$$

$$A(\phi | \theta, E_g, z, r) = \frac{wt(\ell, m) \Delta z 2\pi \bar{r} \Delta r \chi(\phi | \theta, E_g, z, r)}{TP(\theta | E_g, z, r)E(E_g|z, r)Z(z|r)R(r)} ,$$

where the vertical bar (|) indicates that specific values of the variables to the right are given.

From these conditional probability distributions one may select values for the source coordinates. With the assumption of linear variation between spatial points and angular directions the discrete values are not carried forth in the Monte Carlo calculation, but instead a

continuous distribution of coordinates is selected. Care must be exercised in utilizing this type of coupling so that the transport in the overlap region is not included twice. This may be accomplished using a pure absorber in the overlap region in the Monte Carlo calculation.

Perhaps a more useful coupling technique is the coupling at a boundary of the system. For this case, similar conditional probabilities must also be formed, with some minor exceptions. Consider the coupling surface to be the outer boundary of a cylinder.

The leakage fluence, $\Phi(r, Z, E_g, \theta, \phi)$, at the top, bottom, and curved surface of a cylinder is determined as a function of energy, polar, and azimuthal angles, as well as the spatial variation on the surfaces. The leakage fluence on these surfaces designated as R_o , Z_T , and Z_B must be converted to current for the selection of the source term of the Monte Carlo calculation. Thus, there are three spatial terms - the radial variation at the top, the radial variation at the bottom, and the height variation at the outer surface of the cylinder. Define T, B, and S for the integrated leakage for the top, bottom, and side of the cylinder.

$$T = \sum_{0, R_o} 2\pi r \Delta r \sum_{E_g} \sum_{\cos\theta > 0} \cos(\theta_\ell) \sum_m wt(\ell, m) \Phi(r, Z_T, E_g, \theta, \phi) ,$$

$$B = \sum_{0, R_o} 2\pi r \Delta r \sum_{E_g} \sum_{\cos\theta < 0} |\cos(\theta_\ell)| \sum_m wt(\ell, m) \Phi(r, Z_B, E_g, \theta, \phi) ,$$

$$S = 2\pi R_o \sum_{Z_B, Z_T} \Delta z \sum_{E_g} \sum_{\ell} \sin(\theta_\ell) \sum_{\cos\phi > 0} wt(\ell, m) \cos\phi \Phi(R_o, Z, E_g, \theta, \phi) ,$$

with total leakage $TL = T + B + S$.

For each of the above terms, a four-dimensional conditional probability must be determined. For example, consider the bottom surface leakage:

$$R_B(r) = \frac{2\pi\bar{r}\Delta r}{B} \sum_{E_g} \sum_{\cos\theta>0} |\cos(\theta)| \sum_m wt(\ell,m)\phi(r,Z_B,E_g,\theta,\phi) ,$$

$$E_B(E_g|r) = \frac{2\pi\bar{r}\Delta r}{BR(r)} \sum_{\cos\theta<0} |\cos(\theta)| \sum_m wt(\ell,m)\phi(r,Z_B,E_g,\theta,\phi) ,$$

$$P_B(\theta|E_g,r) = \frac{2\pi\bar{r}\Delta r|\cos(\theta)|}{BR(r)E_B(E_g|r)} \sum_m wt(\ell,m)\phi(r,Z_B,E_g,\theta,\phi) ,$$

$$A_B(\phi|\theta,E_g,r) = \frac{2\pi\bar{r}\Delta r|\cos\theta|wt(\ell,m)}{BR(r)E_B(E_g|r)P_B(\theta|E_g,r)} \phi(r,Z_B,E_g,\theta,\phi) .$$

The results for the top surface leakage and side leakage are similar.

With probability B/TL and T/TL the source would be selected from the bottom and top surface, respectively, and with probability S/TL the source would be selected from the side of the cylinder. Then, given the spatial coordinates, an energy group is chosen from E_B , and then the direction cosines are chosen for P_B and A_B .

The selection from the probability distribution given above is sometimes hindered by negative fluxes in the DOT-calculated source term. If there are no negative values, then the selection of a value x is selected from the distribution by choosing a random number R and finding j such that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} f(x_k) < R \leq \sum_{k=0}^j f(x_k);$$

then

$$x = \frac{[R - f(x_{j-1})]}{f(x_j) - f(x_{j-1})} (x_j - x_{j-1}) + x_{j-1} .$$

However, if some values of the distribution $f(x_j)$ are negative, then an alternate scheme is required. The random number is scaled by the sum of the absolute values of the probabilities and a selection is made. A weight correction is required which can result in negative particle weights. These negative weights in general will not severely affect the solution, but they do, of course, affect the variance of the result.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} |f(x_k)| < R * \text{SUM} \leq \sum_{k=0}^j |f(x_k)| ,$$

where

$$\text{SUM} = \sum_{k=0}^{Nk} |f(x_k)|$$

and

$$\text{wate} = \text{wate} * \frac{f(x_j)}{|f(x_j)|} \text{SUM} .$$

If there is a large probability of selecting a negative weight, then the DOT source term should be recalculated.

To illustrate DOT-MORSE coupling, we have considered a problem in which the coupling is at a boundary surface. More specifically, the problem consists of calculating the radiation scattered from a docked command and service module due to the leakage radiation from a 600-kWt ZrH reactor (with its associated shielding). The problem is illustrated in Fig. 1. The problem which consists of determining the scattered

Fig. 1. Schematic of Reactor Power System and Docked Service and Command Module.

neutron and gamma-ray dose at a detector plane due to neutrons and gamma rays leaking from the reactor power assembly has previously been investigated at Atomics International.^{3,4} A drawing of the reactor and shield assembly is shown in Fig. 2.

There are several approaches that could be used in determining the dose due to radiation scattering from the docked module. For example, one may use the boundary leakage flux obtained in a discrete ordinates calculation of the reactor and shield assembly as a source term for the Monte Carlo calculation, transport the radiation to the module, follow the transport in the service module, and estimate the dose at the detector plane. A second approach is to perform an adjoint calculation of the importance of radiation leaking from the core-shield assembly by Monte Carlo and then integrate the importance function over the source of particles leaking from the reactor assembly which was obtained in a discrete ordinates calculation. Another approach is to determine the spatial and energy distribution of the fluence at a surface surrounding the module and use this surface as the boundary for coupling the discrete ordinates results to a Monte Carlo calculation of the scattering in the service module. This last approach will be discussed.

A two-dimensional calculation of the reactor and shield assembly, as shown in Fig. 2, was made with the DOT² code. An S_8 quadrature was used to determine the energy spectra in 21 neutron and 18 gamma-ray groups. The radiation field at 15 radial locations along a plane at the top of the service module was obtained with SPACETRAN² using the leakage boundary fluence. SPACETRAN performs a ray-tracing calculation from each spatial mesh point to the detector point. The intensity and energy distribution

Fig. 2. Reactor Shield Assembly.

of both neutrons and gamma rays was determined for each of these 15 locations. See Table I for energy group structure and fluence-to-dose conversion factors. The angular distribution of the source was determined by assuming that all the radiation was coming from the center of the reactor core located approximately 90 feet away. (The problem is not expected to be very sensitive to the small angular variation of the radiation incident on the module.) This radiation field as a function of space and energy was used as the source term for Monte Carlo.

At a plane just above the module, the intensity variation was determined to be that shown in Fig. 3. The energy distribution, or the number in each of the 21 neutron groups and 18 gamma-ray groups, is shown as a cumulative distribution for three different radii in Fig. 4. These curves illustrate the distributions used for the selection of the source in the MORSE Monte Carlo calculation. By using MORSE, it was possible to determine the contribution to the scattered dose of the incident neutrons and gamma rays as well as the secondary gamma rays produced in the module.

The geometry employed in the calculation is illustrated in Fig. 5, which shows boundary crossing events in the transport of neutrons in the module. The radial and longitudinal location of the crossing events is shown. This collision density plot is an output from MORSE and gives the boundary crossings for approximately 1000 source particles. The typed numbers give the density of the homogenized parts of the service module, and Table II gives the material composition for each region. Figure 6 shows the density of collisions of neutrons in one particular problem. The rotational symmetry of the module is taken into account in the plot,

Table I. Energy Group Structure and Fluence-to-Dose Conversion Factors

Group	Upper Energy (eV)	Fluence-to-Dose Conversion Factors (mrem/hr)/(part/cm ² /sec)
Neutrons:		
1	1.4918(+7)*	1.5000(-1)
2	1.0000(+7)	1.5000(-1)
3	6.7032(+6)	1.3700(-1)
4	4.4933(+6)	1.3200(-1)
5	3.0119(+6)	1.3100(-1)
6	2.0190(+6)	1.2500(-1)
7	1.3534(+6)	1.1600(-1)
8	9.0718(+5)	1.0600(-1)
9	5.5023(+5)	7.5700(-2)
10	3.3373(+5)	5.5100(-2)
11	2.0242(+5)	4.0100(-2)
12	1.2277(+5)	2.4500(-2)
13	4.0867(+4)	8.5000(-3)
14	1.1709(+4)	5.0000(-3)
15	3.3546(+3)	5.0000(-3)
16	7.4852(+2)	5.0000(-3)
17	1.6702(+2)	5.0000(-3)
18	3.7266(+1)	5.0000(-3)
19	8.3153(0)	5.0000(-3)
20	1.8554(0)	5.0000(-3)
21	4.1399(-1)	3.7500(-3)
Gamma Rays:		
22	1.0000(+7)	9.8000(-3)
23	8.0000(+6)	8.5000(-3)
24	7.0000(+6)	7.6000(-3)
25	6.0000(+6)	6.7000(-3)
26	5.0000(+6)	5.8000(-3)
27	4.0000(+6)	5.0000(-3)
28	3.5000(+6)	4.5000(-3)
29	3.0000(+6)	4.0000(-3)
30	2.5000(+6)	3.5000(-3)
31	2.0000(+6)	3.0000(-3)
32	1.6000(+6)	2.4000(-3)
33	1.2000(+6)	2.0000(-3)
34	9.0000(+5)	1.5000(-3)
35	6.0000(+5)	1.0500(-3)
36	4.0000(+5)	6.0000(-4)
37	2.1000(+5)	2.8000(-4)
38	1.2000(+5)	1.4000(-4)
39	7.0000(+4)	4.0000(-4)

* Read as 1.4918×10^7 .

Fig. 3. Spatial Distribution of Radiation at Source Plane Adjacent to the Service and Command Module.

Fig. 4. Cumulative Probability for Energy Distribution of Neutrons and Gamma Rays at Three Locations Along Source Plane.

Table II. Material Composition for the
Service and Command Module

Medium	Weight (lbs)	Density (gm/cc)	<u>Composition (wt %)</u>				
			H	O	Al	Ti	Fe
1	13,500	0.612	3.3	46.7	20.0	17.0	13.0
2	20,800	0.193	3.3	46.7	20.0	17.0	13.0
3	200	1.36					100.0

Fig. 6. Collision Density Plot for Neutrons Scattering in the Service and Command Module. Numbers 1-9 include the number of collisions in the intervals with 0 indicating 10 or more collisions.

and there are few collisions in the center. The use of this type of on-line plot has been useful in determining where the events are occurring and the effects of importance sampling.

The contribution of scattered neutrons and gamma rays to the dose at the detector plane (117 ft from the reactor) is shown in Table III (about 5% of the gamma-ray dose is due to secondary gamma rays produced in the service module). The total scattered dose of 0.34 mrem/hr should be compared to the direct dose of 0.70 mrem/hr (0.66 mrem/hr gamma rays and 0.04 mrem/hr neutrons). These results are compared with values calculated at Atomics International for various locations on the detector plane. There is surprisingly good agreement between the Monte Carlo and single-scattering results.

As a check on the adequacy of the SPACETRAN calculated spatial distribution at the service module location, a DOT calculation with a 100-angle quadrature biased in the downward direction was made. Figures 7 and 8 show the spatial distribution at the source plane and the energy distributions. There are fairly large differences in these results compared to those in Figs. 3 and 4; however, the scattered dose contribution does not change more than 15%.

Table III. Scattered Dose at the Detector Plane
(mrem/hr)

Detector Location (ft)		Neutron Dose		Gamma-Ray Dose		Total	
Along Axis ^a	⊥ Axis	Single Scattering ^b	Monte Carlo	Single Scattering	Monte Carlo	Single Scattering	Monte Carlo
0	0	0.228	0.29	0.063	0.05	0.30	0.34
11	0	0.73	0.31	0.27	0.08	1.0	0.39
0	11	0.27	0.39	0.09	0.04	0.36	0.43

^aAxis of the command and service module.

^bWith self-absorption.

Fig. 7. Spatial Distribution of Radiation at Source Plane Adjacent to the Service and Command Module Calculated With a 100-angle Asymmetric Quadrature.

Fig. 8. Cumulative Probability for Energy Distribution of Neutrons and Gamma Rays at Three Locations Along Source Plane Calculated With a 100-angle Asymmetric Quadrature.

REFERENCES

1. E. A. Straker *et al.*, "The MORSE Code - A Multigroup Neutron and Gamma-Ray Monte Carlo Transport Code," Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report ORNL-4585 (September 1970).
2. F. R. Mynatt, F. J. Muckenthaler, and P. N. Stevens, "Development of Two-Dimensional Discrete Ordinates Transport Theory for Radiation Shielding," CTC-INF-952 (August 11, 1969).
3. V. Keshishian, "Shielding Analysis for NASA's Manned Orbital Space Station Using the Zirconium Hydride Reactor Power System," TI-696-23-014, Atomics International (1969).
4. R. J. Thomson, "Neutron and Photon Scattering Off Command and Service Module," TI-696-23-053, Atomics International (1970).

Blank Page

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1-3. L. S. Abbott	20. R. W. Peelle
4. R. G. Alsmiller, Jr.	21. F. G. Perey
5. C. E. Burgart	22. R. W. Roussin
6. A. R. Buhl	23-32. E. A. Straker
7. R. L. Childs	33. D. Sundberg
8. H. C. Claiborne	34. H. A. Wright
9-10. C. E. Clifford	35. E. R. Cohen (consultant)
11. M. B. Emmett	36. H. Feshbach (consultant)
12. W. W. Engle, Jr.	37. H. Goldstein (consultant)
13. R. M. Freestone, Jr.	38. C. R. Mehl (consultant)
14. L. B. Holland	39-40. Central Research Library
15. J. Lewin	41. ORNL Y-12 Technical Library
16. R. E. Maerker	Document Reference Section
17. F. C. Maienschein	42-44. Laboratory Records
18. F. J. Muckenthaler	45. Laboratory Records ORNL RC
19. F. R. Mynatt	46. ORNL Patent Office

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- 47. W. H. Hannum, Division of Reactor Development and Technology,
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C. 20545
- 48. P. B. Hemmig, Division of Reactor Development and Technology,
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C. 20545
- 49. K. O. Laughon, AEC Site Representative, ORNL.
- 50. R. L. Detterman, Atomics International, 8900 Desota Street,
Box 309, Canoga Park, Calif.
- 51. J. G. Gallagher, Manager, Thermal & Nuclear Design, Westinghouse
Astronuclear Laboratory, P. O. Box 10864, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15236
- 52. G. A. Graves, N-2 Division, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory,
P. O. Box 1663, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544
- 53. P. G. Johnson, Space Nuclear Propulsion Office, U. S. Atomic
Energy Commission, Washington, D. C. 20545
- 54. I. M. Karp, Lewis Research Center, National Aeronautics & Space
Administration, 21000 Brookpark Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44135
- 55. C. P. McCallum, Division of Space Nuclear Systems, U. S. Atomic
Energy Commission, Washington, D. C. 20545
- 56-57. Division of Technical Information Extension (DTIE)
- 58. Laboratory and University Division (ORO)