

Updates to the n+^{63,65}Cu Angular Distributions

J. D. McDonnell, M. T. Pigni

Nuclear Data Group, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Nuclear Data Week, CSEWG Evaluation Session (Online Meeting)

ORNL is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC for the US Department of Energy





INTRODUCTION

- This work updates neutron reactions on ^{63,65}Cu
- Motivation: To correct deficiencies in benchmark performance since critical assembly configurations use Cu as reflector
- Adjusts the angular distribution data to improve benchmark performance
- Validation against copper-sensitive ICSBEP benchmarks is ongoing



SHIELDING BENCHMARKS

The ENDF/B-VIII.0 evaluation was found to perform poorly in the Rez shielding benchmark above 4 MeV.

INDEN has resolved this by adopting JENDL data above 4 MeV (R. Capote, *private communication*)





Figure 7: Neutron leakage spectra comparison for different libraries.

ANGULAR DISTRIBUTIONS

- This work endeavors to clarify the role of the copper angular distributions for the performance of the copper-reflected benchmarks.
- The work of Shaw et al suggested reverting the ⁶⁵Cu File 4 to that of ENDF/B-VII.1.
- Transitioning smoothly between RRR and high energy treatments appears to be the path forward.





BENCHMARK PERFORMANCE - PRELIMINARY

The ⁶³Cu drives the reactivity high if $\overline{\mu}$ is too low (purple triangles). The ENDF/B-VIII.0 angular distribution for ⁶³Cu is the better starting point.



Figure 2: Performance of copper-sensitive ICSBEP benchmarks



CONCLUSIONS

- As expected, the performance of the benchmark suite is very sensitive to changes in the angular distribution data.
- The quasi-differential measurements performed by Blain et al at RPI provide a valuable constraint. Furthermore, ENDF/B-VIII.0 disagrees with their measurements consistently at 300 keV (the transition between RRR and high energy).
- The next step is to conservatively adjust the Legendre coefficients near 300 keV, validating performance against both critical benchmarks and the RPI quasi-differential measurements.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- Special thanks to J. Brown (ORNL), R. Capote (IAEA), R. Cullen (LLNL),
 K. Guber (ORNL), A. Holcomb (ORNL), W. Marshall (ORNL), A. Shaw (ORNL),
 A. Trkov (JSI), and V. Sobes (UTK)
- This work was supported by the Nuclear Criticality Safety Program, funded and managed by the National Nuclear Security Administration for the US Department of Energy



REFERENCES

- N. M. Larson, ORNL/TM-9179 (2008)
- V. Sobes et al., Nuclear Data Sheets 118, 155 (2014)
- D. A. Brown et al., Nuclear Data Sheets 148, 1 (2018)
- T. Kawano and D. A. Brown, J. Nucl. Sci. Technol. 52, 274 (2015)
- W. Wieselquist, R. A. Lefebvre, and M. Jessee, SCALE Code System, ORNL/TM-2020/1495 (2020)
- A. Shaw, F. Rahnema, A. Holcomb, and D. Bowen, Nuclear Science and Engineering 195, 412 (2021)
- E. Blain, Y. Danon, D. P. Barry, B. E. Epping, A. Youmans, M. J. Rapp, A. M. Daskalakis, and R. C. Block, Nuclear Science and Engineering (2021)

