

CONF-9509100-34

**RECENT VALIDATION EXPERIENCE WITH MULTIGROUP  
CROSS-SECTION LIBRARIES AND SCALE**

S. M. Bowman, R. Q. Wright, M. D. DeHart, C. V. Parks, and L. M. Petrie  
Computational Physics and Engineering Division  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory\*  
P.O. Box 2008  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

**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.

To be presented at  
ICNC '95  
Fifth International Conference on  
Nuclear Criticality Safety  
Albuquerque, NM  
September 17-21, 1995

RECEIVED  
DEC 08 1995  
OSTI

The submitted manuscript has been authored by a contractor of the U.S. Government under contract No. DE-AC05-84OR21400. Accordingly, the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

\* Managed by Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc., under contract DE-AC05-84OR21400 with the U.S. Department of Energy.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

**DISCLAIMER**

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

## RECENT VALIDATION EXPERIENCE WITH MULTIGROUP CROSS-SECTION LIBRARIES AND SCALE

S. M. Bowman, R. Q. Wright, M. D. DeHart, C. V. Parks, and L. M. Petrie  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory\*  
P.O. Box 2008, Building 6011, MS 6370  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6370  
615/574-5263  
615/576-3513 FAX

### INTRODUCTION

This paper will discuss the results obtained and lessons learned from an extensive validation of new ENDF/B-V and ENDF/B-VI multigroup cross-section libraries using analyses of critical experiments. The KENO V.a Monte Carlo code in version 4.3 of the SCALE computer code system [1] was used to perform the critical benchmark calculations via the automated SCALE sequence CSAS25. The cross-section data were processed by the SCALE automated problem-dependent resonance-processing procedure included in this sequence. Prior to calling KENO V.a, CSAS25 accesses BONAMI to perform resonance self-shielding for nuclides with Bondarenko factors and NITAWL-II to process nuclides with resonance parameter data via the Nordheim Integral Treatment.

### DESCRIPTION OF NEW CROSS-SECTION LIBRARIES

New cross-section libraries released for use with SCALE-4.3 in 1995 include a 238-group library [2] and a 44-group library derivative from the 238-group library [3] containing approximately 300 sets of nuclide data processed from version 5 of the Evaluated Nuclear Data Files (ENDF/B-V). Another new library available for SCALE users is the VITAMIN-B6 199-group

ENDF/B-VI library [4], which contains data for approximately 120 nuclides. The group structure for this library has been enhanced from the VITAMIN-E 174-group ENDF/B-V library [5] to better cover the thermal range. Besides the group structure, the ENDF/B version of the data, and the number of nuclides, the libraries differ in other significant ways. The 238-group library was developed for criticality safety applications and was processed from ENDF/B-V using AMPX-77 [6] and for most nuclides has resonance data for the resolved resonance range and Bondarenko factors for the unresolved range. The processing capabilities of AMPX, coupled with NITAWL-II and BONAMI, have been effective in criticality safety applications. Conversely, VITAMIN-B6 was produced and tested for light-water-reactor (LWR) shielding and reactor pressure vessel dosimetry applications. VITAMIN-B6 was processed using NJOY [7] /SMILER [6] which uses the shielding-factor method and has Bondarenko factors for the entire energy range (all 199 groups) for all nuclides except H, He, Li,  $^9\text{Be}$ ,  $^{10}\text{B}$ , and C. Unfortunately AMPX and NITAWL-II cannot process several of the resonance parameter formalisms in ENDF/B-VI.

One major advantage of the SCALE ENDF/B-V libraries is that they include ENDF/B-V data for all nuclides (approximately 300) that have complete ENDF/B-V data evaluations. The libraries also contain

\* Managed by Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc., under contract DE-AC05-84OR21400 with the U.S. Department of Energy.

ENDF/B-VI data for  $^{16}\text{O}$ ,  $^{154}\text{Eu}$ , and  $^{155}\text{Eu}$  because studies indicate that these data are significantly superior to the ENDF/B-V data [3]. The 44-group library was collapsed using a pressurized-water-reactor (PWR) fuel pin spectrum and was designed specifically for LWR applications. This broad-group library has a similar group structure to the 27-group ENDF/B-IV library. Additional groups were added (1) to accommodate two windows in the oxygen cross section and a window in the iron cross section, (2) to add better definition for the Maxwellian thermal peak, and (3) to provide structure across the broad 0.3-eV resonance in  $^{239}\text{Pu}$ . The 238-group library is a general-purpose library with adequate group structure for most fast and thermal criticality safety applications.

Since initial validation results with the ENDF/B-V libraries were published in Ref. 8, some enhancements have been made. Resolved resonance data for  $p$ -wave and  $d$ -wave resonances were added to the ENDF/B-V libraries because it was found that they can have a significant effect on results for unmoderated, intermediate-energy problems. Another discovery that has been made is that there are several ENDF "nonresonance" materials that have important resonance structures that need to be taken into account. Resonance structures in some light-to-intermediate mass nuclides, such as  $^7\text{Li}$ ,  $^{28}\text{Si}$ ,  $^{19}\text{F}$ , and  $^{27}\text{Al}$ , are now accounted for using Bondarenko shielding factors. These improvements can have significant effects on certain types of systems, in particular where the intermediate-energy range is important.

Predecessors to the VITAMIN-B6 library contained almost no data in the thermal energy range and were designed primarily for shielding applications. With the addition of thermal energy data, VITAMIN-B6 is the first ENDF/B-VI multigroup library available that may be used for criticality safety analysis applications. The VITAMIN-B6 library, like the 238-group library, is a general-purpose library with adequate group

structure for most fast and thermal criticality safety applications. Initial testing of the library with Cross-Section Evaluation Working Group (CSEWG) criticals [9] indicated good agreement with the critical condition. One of the limitations of the VITAMIN-B6 library, though, is that it contains data for only 120 nuclides.

## VALIDATION RESULTS

Validation was performed using the 238-group, 44-group, and 199-group libraries to calculate 77 critical experiments. These experiments are a subset of the 92 critical experiments used in the 44-group validation presented in Refs. 3 and 8. The remaining experiments are omitted because they contained materials that were not available in the 199-group library. The majority of the experiments that were analyzed are low-enriched  $\text{UO}_2$  LWR-type fuel rod lattices. There are also several mixed-oxide (MOX) LWR-type and fast-reactor fuel rod lattices, four homogenous  $\text{UF}_4$  green blocks, two high-enriched  $\text{UO}_2\text{F}_2$  solutions, and two high-enriched  $\text{UO}_2(\text{NO}_3)_2$  solutions. Case names and descriptions for these benchmark cases are provided in Table 1.

The calculated results for these cases are presented in Table 2. There is generally good agreement between all three libraries. The mean calculated  $k_{\text{eff}}$  value for each library is within 0.2% of unity, as shown in Table 3. There are three cases, *baw1645s*, *baw1645t*, and *pnl194*, where the 44-group and the 199-group libraries produce  $k_{\text{eff}}$  values that are more than 1% greater than the 238-group results. Note that the average energy causing fission (AEF) is greater than 1 eV for these cases, whereas the AEF for almost all other cases is less than 1 eV and generally an order of magnitude less than those for the three cases mentioned. These fuel pin lattice experiments are less thermalized due to the very low moderator-to-fuel volume ratios (approximately 0.5 or less). All other fuel

Table 1. Validation test case descriptions

Case No.	Case designation	Enrichment (wt %)	Description	Lattice water/fuel volume ratio	Ref.
LWR-type UO <sub>2</sub> fuel pin lattices					
1	p2438x05	2.35	No absorber plates	2.92	10
2	p2438x17	2.35	Boral absorber plates	2.92	10
3	p2438x28	2.35	Stainless steel absorber plates	2.92	10
4	p2615x14	4.31	Stainless steel absorber plates	3.88	11
5	p2615x23	4.31	Cadmium absorber plates	3.88	11
6	p2615x31	4.31	Boral absorber plates	3.88	11
7	p2827u2a	2.35	Uranium reflector	2.92	12
9	p2827non	2.35	No reflector	2.92	12
10	p2827u2b	4.31	Uranium reflector	3.88	12
12	p3314a	4.31	0.226 cm Boroflex absorber plates	1.6	13
13	p3314b	4.31	0.452 cm Boroflex absorber plates	1.6	13
14	p3602n2	2.35	Steel reflector, no absorber	2.92	14
15	p3602non	4.31	Steel reflector, no absorber	1.6	14
16	p3602s4	4.31	Steel reflector, borated steel absorber plates	1.6	14
17	p3602b4	4.31	Steel reflector, Boral absorber plates	1.6	14
18	p3602c4	4.31	Steel reflector, cadmium absorber plates	1.6	14
19	p3926u2a	2.35	Uranium reflector	1.6	15
21	p3926n2	2.35	No reflector	1.6	15
22	p3926u4a	4.31	Uranium reflector	1.6	15
24	p3926nob	4.31	No reflector	1.6	15
25	p4267a	4.31	No soluble boron	1.59	16
26	p4267b	4.31	2550 ppm soluble boron	1.59	16
27	p4267c	4.31	No soluble boron	1.09	16
28	p4267d	4.31	2550 ppm soluble boron	1.09	16
29	pn1194	4.31	Hexagonal lattice, narrow pitch	0.509	17
30	ft214r	4.31	Flux traps, no voids	1.6	18
31	ft214v	4.31	Flux traps with voids	1.6	18
32	baw1231a	4	Core I - 1152 ppm soluble boron	0.994	19
33	baw1231b	4	Core I - 3389 ppm soluble boron	0.994	19
34	baw1273m	2.46	Core XX - 1675 ppm soluble boron	0.999	20
35	baw1484a	2.46	Core IV - 84 B4C pins - 1 pitch between assemblies	1.84	21
36	baw1484b	2.46	Core IX - No B4C pins - 4 pitches between assemblies	1.84	21
37	baw1484c	2.46	Core XIII - 1.6 wt% Boral - 1 pitch between assemblies	1.84	21
38	baw1484d	2.46	Core XXI - 0.1 wt% Boral - 3 pitches between assemblies	1.84	21
39	baw1645t	2.46	Triangular pitch, pitch = pin O.D.	0.149	22
40	baw1645s	2.46	Square pitch, pitch = pin O.D.	0.383	22
41	bw1645so	2.46	Square pitch, pitch = 1.17*pin O.D.	1.014	22
42	bnw1810a	2.46 and 4.02	Core 12 - No Gd fuel rods	1.84 and 1.53	23

Table 1 (continued)

Case No.	Case designation	Enrichment (wt %)	Description	Lattice water/fuel volume ratio	Ref.
LWR-type UO <sub>2</sub> fuel pin lattices (continued)					
46	epru615b	2.35	0.615 in. pitch, 464 ppm soluble boron	1.196	24
47	epru75	2.35	0.750 in. pitch, 0 ppm soluble boron	2.408	24
48	epru75b	2.35	0.750 in. pitch, 568 ppm soluble boron	2.408	24
50	epru87b	2.35	0.870 in. pitch, 286 ppm soluble boron	3.687	24
51	saxu56	5.74	2 lattice pitches, SS clad, 0.56 in. pitch	1.933	25
52	saxu792	5.74	2 lattice pitches, SS clad, 0.792 in. pitch	5.067	25
54	w3269b	3.7	Ag-In-Cd (0.330 in. O.D) absorber rods, 0.435 in. pitch	2.9	26
56	ans33bp2	4.75	Cruciform box, polyethylene powder absorbers	1.81	27
57	ans33bb2	4.75	Cruciform box, polyethylene balls absorbers	1.81	27
58	ans33bh2	4.75	Cruciform box only	1.81	27
59	ans33h2	4.75	No absorbers	1.81	27
LWR-type mixed-oxide (UO <sub>2</sub> -PuO <sub>2</sub> ) fuel pin lattices					
60	epri70un	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	0.700 in. pitch, 0 ppm soluble boron, 2 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	1.195	24
61	epri70b	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	0.700 in. pitch, 681 ppm soluble boron, 2 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	1.195	24
62	epri87un	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	0.870 in. pitch, 0 ppm soluble boron,	1.527	24
63	epri87b	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	0.870 in. pitch, 1090 ppm soluble boron, 2 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	1.527	24
64	epri99un	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	0.990 in. pitch, 0 ppm soluble boron, 2 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	3.641	24
65	epri99b	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	0.990 in. pitch, 767 ppm soluble boron, 2 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	3.641	24
66	saxton52	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	UO <sub>2</sub> /PuO <sub>2</sub> square lattice, 0.52 in. pitch, 6.6 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	1.681	25
67	saxton56	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	UO <sub>2</sub> /PuO <sub>2</sub> square lattice, 0.56 in. pitch, 6.6 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	2.165	25
68	saxtn56b	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	UO <sub>2</sub> /PuO <sub>2</sub> square lattice, 0.56 in. pitch, 337 ppm boron, 6.6 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	2.165	25
69	saxtn735	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	UO <sub>2</sub> /PuO <sub>2</sub> square lattice, 0.735 in. pitch, 6.6 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	4.699	25
70	saxtn792	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	UO <sub>2</sub> /PuO <sub>2</sub> square lattice, 0.792 in. pitch, 6.6 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	5.673	25
71	saxtn104	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 90	UO <sub>2</sub> /PuO <sub>2</sub> square lattice, 1.04 in. pitch, 6.6 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	10.754	25
Fast Reactor (FFTF) Mixed-Oxide (UO <sub>2</sub> -PuO <sub>2</sub> ) Fuel Pin Lattices					
73	p5803x21	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 86	FFTF rods, H <sub>2</sub> O Moderated, 0.968 cm pitch, 20 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	3.49	28
74	p5803x32	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 86	FFTF rods, H <sub>2</sub> O Moderated, 1.935 cm pitch, 20 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	18.13	28
75	p5803x43	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 86	FFTF rods, H <sub>2</sub> O Moderated, 1.242 cm pitch, 20 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	6.65	28

Table 1 (continued)

Case No.	Case designation	Enrichment (wt %)	Description	Lattice water/fuel volume ratio	Ref.
Fast Reactor (FFTF) Mixed-Oxide (UO <sub>2</sub> -PuO <sub>2</sub> ) Fuel Pin Lattices (continued)					
76	p5803x67	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 86	FFTF rods, H <sub>2</sub> O Moderated, 0.761 cm pitch, 20 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	1.62	28
77	p5803x68r	<sup>235</sup> U: 0.72 <sup>239</sup> Pu: 86	FFTF rods, H <sub>2</sub> O Moderated, 1.537 cm pitch, 20 wt % PuO <sub>2</sub>	10.93	28
Low-Enriched Homogeneous Uranium Criticals					
82	ydr14un2	2	Homogenized uranium in paraffin, unreflected	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 293.9	29
83	ydr14pl2	2	Homogenized uranium in paraffin, Plexiglas & paraffin reflectors	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 406.3	29
84	ydr14pl3	3	Homogenized uranium in paraffin, Plexiglas & paraffin reflectors	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 133.4	29
85	ydr14un3	3	Homogenized uranium in paraffin, no reflector	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 133.4	29
High-Enriched Uranium Solutions					
86	or260901	93.2	UO <sub>2</sub> F <sub>2</sub> solution sphere, no reflector	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 1112	30
87	or260906	93.2	UO <sub>2</sub> F <sub>2</sub> solution sphere, H <sub>2</sub> O reflector	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 1270	30
88	rfp2710u	93.2	UO <sub>2</sub> (NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> solution, 142.9 g U/l, cylinder, no reflector		31
89	rfp2710r	93.2	UO <sub>2</sub> (NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> solution, 345.3 g U/l, cylinder, Plexiglas reflector		31
90	or2968s1	4.89	UO <sub>2</sub> F <sub>2</sub> solution, 42.54 g <sup>235</sup> U/l, SS cylinder, no reflector	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 524	32
91	or2968al	4.89	UO <sub>2</sub> F <sub>2</sub> solution, 42.54 g <sup>235</sup> U/l, Al box, H <sub>2</sub> O reflector	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 524	32
92	or2968s2	4.89	UO <sub>2</sub> F <sub>2</sub> solution, 24.22 g <sup>235</sup> U/l, SS cylinder, no reflector	H/ <sup>235</sup> U = 994	32

Table 2. Validation Results

	238g $k_{\text{eff}}$	238g std. dev.	238g AEF (eV)	44g $k_{\text{eff}}$	199g $k_{\text{eff}}$	$\Delta k$ (238g-44g)	$\Delta k$ (238g-199g)
ans33bb2	1.0059	0.0011	0.21007	1.0084	1.0066	-0.0025	-0.0007
ans33bh2	1.0103	0.0011	0.19792	1.014	1.0095	-0.0037	0.0008
ans33bp2	0.996	0.0011	0.22838	1.0001	0.9971	-0.0041	-0.0011
ans33h2	0.9952	0.0012	0.19796	0.9976	0.9948	-0.0024	0.0004
baw1231a	0.9925	0.001	0.7384	0.9942	0.9981	-0.0017	-0.0056
baw1231b	0.9942	0.001	1.20499	0.997	1.0017	-0.0028	-0.0075
baw1273m	0.9908	0.0011	0.53765	0.9957	1.0004	-0.0049	-0.0096
baw1484a	0.9913	0.001	0.19302	0.9932	0.9927	-0.0019	-0.0014
baw1484b	0.9918	0.0013	0.14075	0.9974	0.9896	-0.0056	0.0022
baw1484c	0.9941	0.0014	0.19646	0.9949	0.9965	-0.0008	-0.0024
baw1484d	0.9886	0.0014	0.15571	0.9932	0.9887	-0.0046	-0.0001
baw1645s	0.9946	0.0012	1.44406	1.0046	1.0069	-0.01	-0.0123
baw1645t	0.997	0.001	2.30048	1.0057	1.0107	-0.0087	-0.0137
bnw1810a	0.9965	0.0011	0.35955	0.9984	0.9986	-0.0019	-0.0021
bw1645so	0.9986	0.0012	0.41653	0.9989	1.0024	-0.0003	-0.0038
epri615b	0.9954	0.0014	0.3239	0.9988	1.0022	-0.0034	-0.0068
epri70b	0.9985	0.0015	0.769	1.0002	0.9975	-0.0017	0.001
epri70un	0.9965	0.0015	0.579	0.9981	0.9948	-0.0016	0.0017
epri87b	1.0041	0.0013	0.282	1.0088	1.0015	-0.0047	0.0026
epri87un	1.0015	0.0011	0.193	1.0034	0.9938	-0.0019	0.0077
epri99b	1.006	0.001	0.182	1.0081	1.0009	-0.0021	0.0051
epri99un	1.0024	0.0016	0.136	1.0078	1.0004	-0.0054	0.002
epri75	0.9973	0.001	0.11538	0.9973	0.9964	0	0.0009
epri75b	0.9977	0.001	0.14369	1.0014	0.9961	-0.0037	0.0016
epri87b	0.9969	0.0012	0.0938	1.0014	0.996	-0.0045	0.0009
ft214r	0.9931	0.0016	0.37036	0.9977	0.999	-0.0046	-0.0059
ft214v3	0.9936	0.0011	0.37366	0.9971	0.9962	-0.0035	-0.0026
or260901	1.0061	0.0014	0.0334	1.0073	1.0041	-0.0012	0.002
or260906	1.0009	0.0012	0.0322	1.0039	1.0009	-0.003	0
or2968al	1.007	0.001	0.0499	1.0085	1.0107	-0.0015	-0.0037
or2968s1	0.9915	0.0016	0.054	0.993	0.9915	-0.0015	0
or2968s2	1	0.001	0.0393	0.9998	1.0027	0.0002	-0.0027
p2438x05	0.9928	0.0014	0.0967	0.9956	0.9925	-0.0028	0.0003
p2438x17	0.9944	0.001	0.0997	0.9964	0.9949	-0.002	-0.0005
p2438x28	0.9953	0.0014	0.0979	0.996	0.9939	-0.0007	0.0014
p2615x14	0.9956	0.0015	0.11467	0.9982	0.9926	-0.0026	0.003
p2615x23	0.9987	0.0016	0.11559	0.9992	0.9966	-0.0005	0.0021
p2615x31	0.9957	0.0015	0.11615	0.9986	0.9918	-0.0029	0.0039
p2827non	0.9926	0.0013	0.0967	0.9942	0.9919	-0.0016	0.0007
p2827u2a	0.9958	0.0013	0.17423	1.0024	0.9951	-0.0066	0.0007
p2827u2b	0.9976	0.0015	0.2787	1.0049	0.9961	-0.0073	0.0015
p3314a	0.9974	0.0015	0.31604	1.003	1.0051	-0.0056	-0.0077
p3314b	0.9974	0.0011	0.32215	1.0028	0.9989	-0.0054	-0.0015
p3602b4	0.9921	0.0016	0.30714	0.9955	0.9968	-0.0034	-0.0047
p3602c4	0.9958	0.0011	0.30888	0.9997	0.9971	-0.0039	-0.0013
p3602n2	0.9952	0.0014	0.0993	0.9991	0.9964	-0.0039	-0.0012
p3602non	1	0.0016	0.29088	1.0027	0.9972	-0.0027	0.0028
p3602s4	0.9968	0.0017	0.30277	1.0015	0.9956	-0.0047	0.0012
p3926n2	0.9936	0.0014	0.16301	0.9924	0.9927	0.0012	0.0009
p3926nob	0.9978	0.0016	0.27956	1.0007	0.9938	-0.0029	0.004
p3926u2a	0.9923	0.0014	0.34961	0.9965	0.9944	-0.0042	-0.0021
p3926u4a	0.9983	0.0016	0.51584	1.0012	0.9981	-0.0029	0.0002
p4267a	0.9934	0.0011	0.28105	0.9985	0.9944	-0.0051	-0.001



Table 2 (continued)

	238g $k_{\text{eff}}$	238g std. dev.	238g AEF (eV)	44g $k_{\text{eff}}$	199g $k_{\text{eff}}$	$\Delta k$ (238g-44g)	$\Delta k$ (238g-199g)
p4267b	1.0017	0.0013	0.61372	1.0047	1.0026	-0.003	-0.0009
p4267c	0.9952	0.0011	0.5294	1.0013	0.9973	-0.0061	-0.0021
p4267d	0.9916	0.0013	1.17106	0.9964	0.9979	-0.0048	-0.0063
p5803x21	1.0008	0.0011	0.8919	1.0051	0.9981	-0.0043	0.0027
p5803x32	1.0071	0.0017	0.11345	1.0087	0.9997	-0.0016	0.0074
p5803x43	1.003	0.0011	0.28961	1.003	0.9993	0	0.0037
p5803x67	0.9947	0.0011	2.90878	1.0004	0.9967	-0.0057	-0.002
p5803x68r	1.0026	0.0016	0.16572	1.0057	0.9953	-0.0031	0.0073
pnl194	0.9984	0.0014	3.52691	1.0093	1.0121	-0.0109	-0.0137
rfp2710r	1.0031	0.0021	0.2241	1.0088	1.01	-0.0057	-0.0069
rfp2710u	1.0066	0.0021	0.08	1.0075	1.005	-0.0009	0.0016
saxtn104	1.0037	0.0016	0.10144	1.0037	0.9962	0	0.0075
saxtn56b	0.995	0.0016	0.64781	1.0019	0.9944	-0.0069	0.0006
saxtn735	1.0016	0.0016	0.19013	1.0001	0.9935	0.0015	0.0081
saxtn792	1.0019	0.0017	0.15514	1.0034	0.9932	-0.0015	0.0087
saxton52	0.9968	0.0011	0.90107	1.0026	0.9929	-0.0058	0.0039
saxton56	0.9953	0.0017	0.55471	0.9995	0.9937	-0.0042	0.0016
saxu56	0.9884	0.0016	0.29855	0.9964	0.9971	-0.008	-0.0087
saxu792	0.9956	0.0011	0.10365	0.9989	0.9923	-0.0033	0.0033
w3269b	0.9968	0.0015	0.43864	1.0031	1.0052	-0.0063	-0.0084
ydr14pl2	1.0003	0.0013	0.0869	1.003	1.0206	-0.0027	-0.0203
ydr14pl3	1.0116	0.0015	0.24078	1.015	1.0384	-0.0034	-0.0268
ydr14un2	1.0024	0.0015	0.13709	1.0023	1.0243	0.0001	-0.0219
ydr14un3	1.0125	0.0015	0.32832	1.0186	1.0447	-0.0061	-0.0322

Table 3. Statistical Summary of Results

44 g results		238 g results		199 g results	
Mean	1.0014	Mean	0.9979	Mean	0.9998
Standard error	0.0006	Standard error	0.0006	Standard error	0.0011
Median	1.0007	Median	0.9968	Median	0.9971
Count	77	Count	77	Count	77
44 g results, no YDR's		238 g results, no YDR's		199 g results, no YDR'S	
Mean	1.0009	Mean	0.9975	Mean	0.9980
Standard error	0.0006	Standard error	0.0006	Standard error	0.0006
Median	1.0002	Median	0.9968	Median	0.9968
Mode	0.9964	Mode	0.9952	Mode	0.9971
Count	73	Count	73	Count	73

pin lattice experiments have moderator-to-fuel volume ratios greater than 1.

The last four cases in Table 2, beginning with the prefix *ydr*, are the homogenous  $UF_4$  green blocks. The 199-group results for these cases are 2% higher than the 238-group and the 44-group results. These are low-enriched thermal homogeneous systems with low H/U ratios (8 or less). This same phenomenon has been noted in calculations performed for other critical experiments with the same general characteristics. The PCTR Central Region Experiments (k-infinite) have also been calculated using the 199- and 238-group libraries. These experiments are  $UO_3/H_2O$  at approximately 1 to 1.6 wt %  $^{235}U$  and H/U of 3.73 to 7.52 [33]. The results shown in Table 4 clearly indicate that the 238-group library gives the correct values and that the 199-group values are approximately 2% high. The differences for the cases are consistent with the green block cases and with other calculational comparisons for which no experimental data exist. A statistical summary of the results in Table 2 is given in Table 3, both with and without the YDR green block benchmarks.

Examination of the differences in the way the ENDF/B-VI library was generated and further calculations seem to indicate that the reason for the poor results for these four experiments is due to the failure of the narrow resonance approximation assumed in the NJOY/BONAMI shielding factor method. The narrow resonance approximation assumes that the collision density is constant across the resonance and that there is complete flux recovery on the lower side of the resonance. For this assumption to be valid, the width of the resonance must be narrow relative to the average scattering width (i.e., the scattering must be sufficient through the resonance to allow no more than one collision in the resonance). However, for a low-enriched system with a low H/U

ratio, the  $^{238}U$  capture cross-section resonance is wide relative to the scattering. The assumption of complete flux recovery on the lower side of the resonance is not valid due to the significant amount of capture in the resonance. The overprediction of the flux on the lower side of the resonance causes the lower part of the resonance to be overweighted, resulting in too much self-shielding. The evaluated capture cross section is thus too low, and  $k_{eff}$  is too high.

Some of the difference between the 199- and 238-group results could also be due to changes in the ENDF/B-VI data or group structure differences. To verify that the difference in results is not due to these other factors, additional calculations were performed for the first PCTR case in Table 4. A new energy-pointwise discrete-ordinates computer code CENTRM [34] under development for SCALE was used to generate problem-dependent cross sections from both ENDF/B-V and ENDF/B-VI for this case. CENTRM uses a fine multigroup calculation in the high- and low-energy ranges combined with a continuous-energy (i.e., pointwise) solution for intermediate energies in the resolved resonance region. XSDRNPM calculations were performed using the two sets of CENTRM-generated cross sections and an MCNP calculation was performed using ENDF/B-VI pointwise data. The results of these three calculations are compared in Table 5 to the results previously presented for the 199- and 238-group libraries. The agreement of the results of these additional calculations with the 238-group results clearly demonstrates that the differences between the two libraries are not due to differences in ENDF/B-V and -VI data or group structure. Hence we conclude that the differences are due to the failure of the narrow resonance approximation for these low-enriched, undermoderated (less thermalized) homogeneous systems.

Table 4. PCTR Central Region Experiments<sup>a</sup>

Case No.	<sup>235</sup> U wt %	H/U	Exp. k-inf	199-group k-inf	238-group
1	1.006	3.83	0.986	1.011	0.987
2	1.006	6.23	0.986	1.000	0.982
3	1.006	6.95	0.974	0.991	0.974
4	1.006	7.52	0.960	0.984	0.967
5	1.071	3.78	1.005	1.032	1.007
6	1.071	5.84	1.005	1.028	1.008
7	1.071	7.14	0.992	1.014	0.996
8	1.157	3.73	1.031	1.057	1.031
9	1.157	5.99	1.031	1.056	1.036
10	1.157	6.90	1.030	1.047	1.028
11	1.157	7.52	1.019	1.039	1.022
<i>Average</i>			<i>1.002</i>	<i>1.024</i>	<i>1.003</i>

<sup>a</sup>See Ref. 33.

Note: Experimental uncertainty is  $\pm 0.006 \Delta k$  (varies from 0.005 to 0.007).

Table 5. k-inf Calculations of PCTR Case No. 1  
PCTR Central Region Experiments

ENDF/B-V		ENDF/B-VI	
238-group	0.9866	199-group	1.011
CENTRM/XSDRNPM	0.9903	CENTRM/XSDRNPM	0.9896
MCNP	0.9880 $\pm$ 0.0007	MCNP	0.9810 $\pm$ 0.0007

## CONCLUSIONS

The 238-, 44-, and 199-group libraries demonstrate good agreement for the vast majority of the benchmark cases analyzed. However, the 44- and 199-group results for severely undermoderated LWR-type fuel pin lattices are approximately 1% higher than the 238-group library. Results obtained with the 199-group library for homogeneous thermal systems with low H/U ratios are approximately 2% high and indicate a failure in the narrow resonance approximation used to generate the cross sections in this library. The narrow resonance approximation, which

has proven satisfactory for shielding analysis, can produce unreliable results for criticality calculations. Broad resonances, such as those that occur in some nuclides near thermal energies, are not satisfactorily represented using the narrow resonance approximation. Therefore, the 199-group VITAMIN-B6 library with the shielding-factor method (e.g., NJOY/BONAMI) should not be used for homogeneous thermal systems with low H/U ratios. The validation results presented here highlight the importance of validation using benchmark critical experiments that are in the area of applicability for systems that are to be analyzed.

Minimal attention has been given in the past to preparation of multigroup libraries that have the structure and parameters necessary to be applicable for all types of systems. Reasons include computational limitations and focus on specific types of applications. There is presently no system available to process ENDF/B-VI data into multigroup cross sections that are effective for all types of systems requiring criticality safety analyses. NJOY can process ENDF/B-VI data but uses the narrow resonance approximation. AMPX has not been updated for compatibility with the ENDF/B-VI formats. Results using CENTRM (see Table 5) indicate that a modified version of the VITAMIN-B6 library gives very acceptable results when an adequate resonance processing treatment is used with ENDF/B-VI point data to self-shield the multigroup cross sections. Additional testing of CENTRM is clearly needed and is planned for the near future. This testing will consider LWR-type fuel rod lattices as well as a variety of homogeneous thermal and intermediate systems. In addition, there are plans to update AMPX and process and test a complete ENDF/B-VI library with at least 300 energy groups.

#### REFERENCES

1. SCALE: A Modular Code System for Performing Standardized Computer Analyses for Licensing Evaluation, NUREG/CR-0200, Rev. 4 (ORNL/NUREG/CSD-2/R4), Vols. I, II, and III (April 1995). Available from Radiation Shielding Information Center as CCC-545.
2. Greene, N. M., et al., *The LAW-238 Library - A Multigroup Cross-Section Library for Use in Radioactive Waste Analysis Calculations*, ORNL/TM-12370, Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., August 1994.
3. DeHart, M. D., and Bowman, S. M., *Validation of the SCALE Broad Structure 44-Group ENDF/B-V Cross-Section Library for Use in Criticality Safety Analyses*, NUREG/CR-6102 (ORNL/TM-12460), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 1994.
4. Ingersoll, D. T., et al., *Production and Testing of the VITAMIN-B6 Fine-Group and the BUGLE-93 Broad-Group Neutron/Photon Cross-Section Libraries Derived from ENDF/B-VI Nuclear Data*, ORNL-6795, Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., January 1995.
5. Weisbin, C. R., et al., *VITAMIN-E: An ENDF/B-V Multi-Group Cross-Section Library for LMFBR Core and Shield, LWR Shield, Dosimetry, and Fusion Blanket Technology*, ORNL-5505, Union Carbide Corp., Nucl. Div., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., February 1979.
6. Greene, N.M., et al., *AMPX-77: A Modular System for Generating Coupled Multigroup Neutron Gamma Cross-Section Libraries from ENDF/B-IV and/or ENDF-B-V*, ORNL/CSD/TM-283, Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., October 1992.
7. McFarlane, R. E., and Muir, D. W., *The NJOY Nuclear Data Processing System-Version 91*, LA-12740-M, Los Alamos Natl. Lab., October 1994.
8. Bowman, S. M., Wright, R. Q., Taniuchi, H., and DeHart, M. D., "Validation of SCALE-4 Criticality Sequences Using ENDF/B-V Data," *Proc. ANS 1993 Topical Meeting on*

- Physics and Methods in Criticality Safety*, Nashville, Tennessee, September 19-23, 1993.
9. Wright, R. Q., White, J. E., and Ingersoll, D. T., "Fast and Thermal Reactor Data Testing of ENDF/B-VI," *Proc. International Conference on Nuclear Data for Science and Technology*, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, May 9-13, 1994.
  10. Bierman, S. R., et al., *Critical Separation Between Subcritical Clusters of 2.35 Wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Water with Fixed Neutron Poisons*, PNL-2438, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, October 1977.
  11. Bierman, S. R., et al., *Critical Separation Between Subcritical Clusters of 4.31 Wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Water with Fixed Neutron Poisons*, NUREG/CR-0073 (PNL-2615), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 1978.
  12. Bierman, S. R., Durst, B. M., and Clayton, E. D., *Criticality Experiments with Subcritical Clusters of 2.35 wt % and 4.31 wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Water with Uranium or Lead Reflecting Walls*, NUREG/CR-0796 (PNL-2827), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, April 1979.
  13. Bierman, S. R., and Clayton, E. D., *Criticality Experiments with Subcritical Clusters of 2.35 wt % and 4.31 wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Water at a Water-to-Fuel Volume Ratio of 1.6*, NUREG/CR-1547 (PNL-3314), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, July 1980.
  14. Bierman, S. R., and Clayton, E. D., *Criticality Experiments with Subcritical Clusters of 2.35 wt % and 4.31 wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Water with Steel Reflecting Walls*, PNL-3602, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, April 1981.
  15. Bierman, S. R., et al., *Criticality Experiments with Subcritical Clusters of 2.35 Wt % and 4.31 Wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Water with Uranium or Lead Reflecting Walls*, PNL-3926, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, December, 1981.
  16. Durst, B.M., et al., *Critical Experiments with 4.31 wt % <sup>235</sup>U Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Rods in Highly Borated Water Lattices*, PNL-4267, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, August 1982.
  17. Bierman, S. R., et al., *Criticality Experiments with Low Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Fuel Rods in Water Containing Dissolved Gadolinium*, PNL-4976, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, February 1984.
  18. Bierman, S. R., *Criticality Experiments With Neutron Flux Traps Containing Voids*, PNL-7167, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, April 1990.
  19. Engelder, T. C., et al., *Critical Experiments on Lattices Moderated by D<sub>2</sub>O-H<sub>2</sub>O Mixtures*, BAW-1231, Babcock & Wilcox Company, December 1961.
  20. Engelder, T. C., et al., *Measurement and Analysis of Uniform Lattices of Slightly Enriched UO<sub>2</sub> Moderated by D<sub>2</sub>O-H<sub>2</sub>O Mixtures*, BAW-1273, Ca-7, Babcock & Wilcox Company, November 1963.
  21. Baldwin, M. N., et al., *Critical Experiments Supporting Close Proximity Water Storage of Power Reactor Fuel*, BAW-1484-7, Babcock and Wilcox Company, July 1979.

22. Hoovler, G. S., et al., *Critical Experiments Supporting Underwater Storage of Tightly Packed Configurations of Spent Fuel Pins*, BAW-1645-4, Babcock & Wilcox Company, November 1981.
23. Newman, L. W., et al., *Urania Gadolinia: Nuclear Model Development and Critical Experiment Benchmark*, BAW-1810, Babcock and Wilcox Company, April 1984.
24. Smith, R. I., and Konzek, G. J., *Clean Critical Experiment Benchmarks for Plutonium Recycle in LWRs*, EPRI NP-196, Vols. I and II, Electric Power Research Institute, April 1976 and September 1978.
25. Taylor, E. G., et al., *Saxton Plutonium Program Critical Experiments for the Saxton Partial Plutonium Core*, WCAP-3385-54, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Atomic Power Division, December 1965.
26. Leamer, R. D., et al., *Critical Experiments Performed with Clustered and Uniform Arrays of Rodded Absorbers*, WCAP-3269-39, Westinghouse Electric Corp., November 1965.
27. Manaranche, J. C., et al., "Dissolution and Storage Experimental Program with 4.75% Enriched Uranium-Oxide Rods," *Trans. Am Nucl. Soc.* 33: 362-364 (1979).
28. Bierman, S. R., *Criticality Experiments with Fast Test Reactor Fuel Pins in Organic Moderator*, PNL-5803, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, December 1986.
29. Raffety, S. J., and Mihalcz, J. T., *Homogenized Critical Assemblies of 2 and 3% Enriched Uranium in Paraffin*, Y-DR-14, Union Carbide Corp., Nucl. Div., Oak Ridge Y-12 Plant, 1969.
30. Fox, J. K., "Critical Parameters of Uranium Solutions in Simple Geometry," p. 42, *Neutron Physics Division Annual Progress Report for Period Ending September 1, 1958*, ORNL-2609, Union Carbide Corp., Nucl. Div., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., 1958.
31. Rothe, R. E., *Benchmark Critical Experiments on High Enriched Uranyl Nitrate Solution Systems*, NUREG/CR-0041, RFP-2710, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1978.
32. Cronin, D. F., *Critical Mass Studies, Part X*, ORNL-2968, Union Carbide Nuclear Corp., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., 1960.
33. Jordan, W. C., and Turner, J. C., *Minimum Mass of Moderator Required for Criticality of Homogeneous Low-Enriched Uranium Systems*, ORNL/CSD/TM-284, Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., December 1992.
34. Williams, M. L., Asgari, M., and Tashakkori, R., "Discrete Ordinates Transport Calculations with Pointwise Cross Section Data," *Proc. 1994 Topical Meeting on Advances in Reactor Physics*, Knoxville, Tennessee, April 11-15, 1994.