

LA-UR-

98-2764

Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

Title:

HELIOS Calculations for UO-2 Lattice
Benchmark Problems

CONF-981003--

Author(s):

Russell D. Mosteller

Submitted to:

International Conference on the Physics
of Nuclear Science and Technology

Islandia, Long Island, New York
October 5-8, 1998

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED



MASTER

Los Alamos
NATIONAL LABORATORY

Los Alamos National Laboratory, an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer, is operated by the University of California for the U.S. Department of Energy under contract W-7405-ENG-36. By acceptance of this article, the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or to allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes. Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy. The Los Alamos National Laboratory strongly supports academic freedom and a researcher's right to publish; as an institution, however, the Laboratory does not endorse the viewpoint of a publication or guarantee its technical correctness.

Form 836 (10/96)

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.**

HELIOS CALCULATIONS FOR UO₂ LATTICE BENCHMARKS

Russell D. Mosteller
Los Alamos National Laboratory
MS J562
Los Alamos, NM 87545
(505) 665-4879
mosteller@lanl.gov

ABSTRACT

Calculations for the ANS UO₂ lattice benchmark have been performed with the HELIOS lattice-physics code and six of its cross-section libraries derived from ENDF/B-VI Release 3. The results obtained from these comparisons suggest that further refinement may be needed to the cross sections for ²³⁸U. They also suggest that different group structures among the libraries produce a small but consistent reactivity bias.

I. INTRODUCTION

Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) initially purchased the HELIOS lattice-physics code¹ from Scandpower A/S several years ago, along with a set of cross-section libraries based on Release 2 of ENDF/B-VI. Subsequently, Scandpower provided LANL with six additional cross-section libraries. Three of the latter libraries were derived directly from Release 3 of ENDF/B-VI (ENDF/B-VI.3) and differ only in the number of groups (34, 89 or 190). The other three libraries are identical to the first three except for a modification² to the cross sections for ²³⁸U in the resonance range.

HELIOS solves the two-dimensional neutron transport equation using the method of collision probabilities (CPs). At the user's option, adjacent regions can be coupled neutronically using cosine-current coupling (CCC) rather than CPs.

II. BENCHMARK MODELS

HELIOS calculations have been performed with all six libraries for the ANS UO₂ lattice benchmark.³ Fluxes within individual pin cells were calculated with CPs, and adjacent pin cells were coupled using CCC. A few of the infinite-lattice cases were run using CPs for the entire assembly, but, as shown in Table 1, the difference in k_{∞}

relative to the corresponding cases with CCCs is essentially negligible.

Table 1. Comparison of CCC versus CP Results for Infinite-Lattice Cases.

Configuration	Groups	k _∞	
		CCC	CP
B	190	1.0500	1.0503
C	190	0.9798	0.9806
C	89	0.9795	0.9798

Each of the fuel-pin cells contains eight mesh regions: two in the fuel pin, one in the cladding, and five in the moderator. This mesh structure, although unconventional, was shown to accurately reproduce pin-cell results for much finer mesh structures (25 mesh regions in the fuel, one in the clad, and eight in the moderator). It was found that the presence of an inner annulus in the moderator was necessary to match pin-cell results from the MCNP Monte Carlo code.⁴ The finer mesh in the moderator is necessary because of the density of the water (approximately 50% more dense than at reactor operating conditions), as has been noted elsewhere.⁵ Water-hole cells contain exactly the same mesh structure as the fuel-pin cells, although each mesh region contains only borated water.

Cells with Pyrex absorber rods each contain seven mesh regions, two in the absorber rod and five in the moderator (the absorber rods have no cladding). Much finer mesh structures, with as many as 25 mesh regions in the absorber pins, were investigated because of differences in results between HELIOS and MCNP. However, it was found that the HELIOS results are quite insensitive to the number of mesh regions in the absorber rods.

III. RESULTS FOR CORE CONFIGURATIONS

The results for the core configurations are given in Table 2. An input buckling of 0.00037 cm^{-2} was used for these cases. Core calculations were performed only with the 89-group and 34-group libraries because of storage limitations imposed by the computer system employed. Table 2 also includes corresponding results⁶ from MCNP calculations with continuous-energy cross sections derived from ENDF/B-VI.3. Comparisons amongst the HELIOS results can quantify the effect of the number of energy groups and of the modification to the ^{238}U cross sections, while comparisons between the ENDF/B-VI.3 results from HELIOS and MCNP permit methodological effects to be separated from cross-section effects.

The 89-group library with the modified ^{238}U cross sections produces better agreement with the benchmark value for k_{eff} (1.0007 ± 0.0006) than does the 89-group library with true ENDF/B-VI.3 cross sections. However, the 89-group ENDF/B-VI.3 library produces much better agreement with the MCNP values for k_{eff} . This result suggests that the modification to ^{238}U produces more accurate behavior and that the ENDF/B-VI.3 evaluation for ^{238}U may need to be modified accordingly.

Two other trends also are evident from Table 2. First, the 34-group library consistently predicts a value for k_{eff} that is approximately $0.003 \Delta k$ higher than that from the corresponding 89-group library. Second, all four libraries predict a downward swing of approximately $0.005 \Delta k$ between core B and core C. Although MCNP also predicts a downward swing, the magnitude of that swing is less than $0.002 \Delta k$.

Pin-power distributions for the central assembly in cores B and C are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Although the results are shown only for the true ENDF/B-VI.3 libraries, the distributions from the modified libraries are effectively identical.

IV. RESULTS FOR INFINITE-LATTICE CONFIGURATIONS

Calculations for the infinite-lattice configurations were performed with all six cross-section libraries. Not surprisingly, the same reactivity trends that are observed for the core configurations also are present in the results for the infinite-lattice configurations, as Table 3 shows. In particular, the true ENDF/B-VI.3 190-group and 89-group libraries produce results in good agreement with

Table 2. Reactivity Results for Core Configurations.

Core	k_{eff} MCNP	HELIOS Library		k_{eff} HELIOS
		Groups	^{238}U	
A	0.9956 ± 0.0003	89	ENDF/B-VI.3	0.9956
			Modified	0.9992
		34	ENDF/B-VI.3	0.9988
			Modified	1.0025
B	0.9957 ± 0.0003	89	ENDF/B-VI.3	0.9971
			Modified	1.0004
		34	ENDF/B-VI.3	1.0005
			Modified	1.0038
C	0.9940 ± 0.0003	89	ENDF/B-VI.3	0.9917
			Modified	0.9951
		34	ENDF/B-VI.3	0.9942
			Modified	0.9977

MCNP, and all six libraries produce much bigger reactivity swings between lattices A and B than MCNP does. Although the 190-group libraries produce results that are very similar to those from the corresponding 89-group libraries, the 34-group libraries consistently predict a value for k_{∞} that is approximately $0.003 \Delta k$ higher. All six libraries produce effectively identical pin-power distributions. However, as shown in Figures 3 and 4, those distributions differ slightly from the distributions predicted by MCNP.

The results for the spectral indices also provide insight into the higher value of k_{∞} predicted by the 34-group libraries. The 34-group library produces essentially the same values for δ_{25} (fast-to-thermal fission ratio in ^{235}U) and ρ_{28} (fast-to-thermal capture ratio in ^{238}U) as does the 190-group library. However, it produces lower values for δ_{28} (ratio of fissions in ^{238}U to fissions in ^{235}U) and the conversion ratio (CR) and higher values for ρ_{25} (fast-to-thermal capture ratio in ^{235}U). Taken together, these results suggest that the 34-group library produces slightly more fissions and slightly fewer thermal captures in ^{235}U . Both of these differences tend to increase k_{∞} .

The larger reactivity swing between lattices B and C predicted by HELIOS relative to MCNP is due almost entirely to the difference in the Pyrex absorption fraction (PAF). Although the cause for this behavior has not been determined, it does not appear to be related to the mesh structure for the absorber pin. For example, the value for k_{∞} with two mesh regions in the Pyrex is only $0.0003 \Delta k$ less than the value with 15. It is possible, although unlikely, that some problem exists with the boron cross sections, since HELIOS predicts about the same reactivity as MCNP for cases with assembly A (1511 PPM) but slightly greater values for cases with assembly B (1335.5 PPM).

Some additional insight can be gained by comparing the spectral indices from HELIOS with those from MCNP. HELIOS consistently predicts slightly higher values for δ_{25} and ρ_{25} , which suggests that it may predict a harder spectrum. However, a harder spectrum also should produce larger values for δ_{28} and ρ_{28} , whereas HELIOS actually predicts lower values for those indices than MCNP (the exception, ρ_{28} for infinite-lattice configuration C, probably results from the harder spectrum induced by the higher capture rate in the Pyrex). An alternative explanation is that the HELIOS libraries predict less absorption in ^{238}U , and this suspicion is reinforced by the fact that HELIOS produces lower conversion ratios than MCNP. All in all, the HELIOS ENDF/B-VI.3 libraries appear to produce

slightly higher absorption rates in ^{235}U and lower absorption rates in ^{238}U than the MCNP library does.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The modified 89-group HELIOS library consistently produces better agreement in reactivity with the core benchmarks than does its true ENDF/B-VI.3 counterpart. However, the ENDF/B-VI.3 libraries consistently produce better agreement with MCNP results than the modified libraries. This pattern suggests that the ENDF/B-VI.3 representation for ^{238}U may need to be modified.

The 34-group libraries consistently produce a bias of approximately $0.003 \Delta k$ relative to the 89- and 190-group libraries. The principal cause of this bias appears to be the cross sections for ^{235}U .

REFERENCES

1. Eduardo Villarino, Rudi J. J. Stamm'ler, Aldo Ferri, and Juan J. Casal, "HELIOS: Angularly Dependent Collision Probabilities," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **112**, pp. 16-31 (September 1992).
2. M. Edenius, "Adjustment of the Effective ^{238}U Resonance Integral to Force Agreement with Integral Data," pp. 87-94, *Seminar on ^{238}U Resonance Capture*, S. Pearlstein, Ed., BNL-NCS-50451 (CONF-750323) (March 1975).
3. T. A. Parish, *et al.*, "Summary Results for the ANS Uranium Benchmark Problem," presented at the International Conference on the Physics of Nuclear Science and Technology, Islandia, Long Island, New York (October 5-8, 1998).
4. Judith F. Briesmeister, Ed., "MCNP—A General Monte Carlo N-Particle Transport Code, Version 4B," Los Alamos National Laboratory report LA-12625-M, Version 4B (March 1997).
5. W. J. Eich, O. Ozer, and R. D. Mosteller, "Cell Criticals Benchmarking," Part I, Chapter 2, *ARMP-02 Documentation*, Electric Power Research Institute report NP-4574-CCM (August 1988).
6. Russell D. Mosteller, "ENDF/B-V and ENDF/B-VI Results for UO_2 Lattice Benchmark Problems Using MCNP," presented at the International Conference on the Physics of Nuclear Science and Technology, Islandia, Long Island, New York (October 5-8, 1998).

Water	1.107±0.002	1.026±0.006	1.000±0.001	1.025±0.007	1.026±0.003	0.980±0.021	0.983±0.008
Water	1.109	1.058	1.036	1.027	1.024	1.000	0.976
Hole	1.109	1.058	1.036	1.027	1.024	1.000	0.976
Hole	1.119±0.013	1.059±0.012	1.017±0.011	1.028±0.012	1.021±0.012	0.978±0.011	0.963±0.011
Water	1.068±0.002	1.075±0.000	1.036±0.007	1.047±0.004	1.098±0.006	1.026±0.023	1.003±0.031
Water	1.091	1.101	1.061	1.054	1.073	1.020	0.981
Hole	1.091	1.101	1.061	1.054	1.073	1.020	0.981
Hole	1.072±0.012	1.107±0.009	1.051±0.009	1.047±0.009	1.070±0.009	1.013±0.009	0.969±0.008
Water	1.116±0.012	1.118±0.011	1.111	Water	1.070±0.010	0.961±0.010	
Water	1.113	1.113	1.111	Hole	1.060	0.987	
Hole	1.113	1.113	1.111	Hole	1.060	0.987	
Hole	1.113±0.009	1.139±0.009	1.139±0.009		1.073±0.009	0.984±0.008	
Water	1.091±0.009	1.145±0.008	1.133±0.010	1.032±0.026	0.924±0.006		
Water	1.103	1.129	1.107	1.026	0.979		
Water	1.103	1.129	1.107	1.026	0.979		
Water	1.097±0.012	1.148±0.009	1.135±0.009	1.030±0.008	0.972±0.008		
Water	1.109±0.007	1.107±0.014	1.007±0.026				
Hole	1.079	0.998	0.966				
Hole	1.079	0.998	0.966				
Hole	1.095±0.009	1.003±0.008	0.953±0.008				
RMS Differences							
89 Groups	34 Groups	MCNP					
0.021	0.021	0.019					
Measured	HELIOS, 89 Groups	0.920±0.013					
	HELIOS, 34 Groups	0.931					
	MCNP	0.930					
		0.934±0.011					

Figure 1. Pin Power Distributions in Central Assembly of Core B (ENDF/B-VI.3 Libraries).

Water	1.107±0.002	1.026±0.006	1.000±0.001	1.025±0.007	1.026±0.003	0.980±0.021	0.983±0.008
Hole	1.109 1.109 1.119±0.013	1.058 1.058 1.059±0.012	1.036 1.036 1.017±0.011	1.027 1.027 1.028±0.012	1.024 1.024 1.021±0.012	1.000 1.000 0.978±0.011	0.976 0.976 0.963±0.011
Water	1.068±0.002	1.075±0.000	1.036±0.007	1.047±0.004	1.098±0.006	1.026±0.023	1.003±0.031
Hole	1.091 1.091 1.072±0.012	1.101 1.101 1.107±0.009	1.061 1.061 1.051±0.009	1.054 1.054 1.047±0.009	1.073 1.073 1.070±0.009	1.020 1.020 1.013±0.009	0.981 0.981 0.969±0.008
Water	1.116±0.012	1.118±0.011	1.111	Water	1.070±0.010	0.961±0.010	
Hole	1.113 1.113 1.113±0.009	1.111 1.111 1.139±0.009	1.129 1.129 1.139±0.009	Hole	1.060 1.060 1.073±0.009	0.987 0.987 0.984±0.008	
Water	1.091±0.009	1.145±0.008	1.133±0.010	1.133±0.010	1.032±0.026	0.924±0.006	
Hole	1.103 1.103 1.097±0.012	1.129 1.129 1.148±0.009	1.129 1.129 1.135±0.009	1.107 1.107 1.135±0.009	1.026 1.026 1.030±0.008	0.979 0.979 0.972±0.008	
RMS Differences							
89 Groups	34 Groups	MCNP					
0.021	0.021	0.019					
Measured	0.920±0.013						
HELIOS, 89 Groups	0.931						
HELIOS, 34 Groups	0.920						
MCNP	0.934±0.011						

Figure 1. Pin Power Distributions in Central Assembly of Core B (ENDF/B-VI.3 Libraries).

Water	1.148±0.007	1.027±0.004	1.045±0.006	1.057±0.006	1.047±0.005	1.088±0.004	1.124±0.016
1.125	1.034	1.022	1.025	1.033	1.071	1.071	1.104
1.124	1.033	1.022	1.025	1.033	1.071	1.071	1.104
1.144±0.019	1.048±0.017	1.021±0.016	1.034±0.017	1.009±0.016	1.106±0.017	1.114±0.017	
Pyrex	0.945±0.007	1.001±0.006	0.982±0.021	0.962±0.008	1.070±0.014	1.105±0.009	
Rod	0.966	0.986	0.989	0.972	1.044	1.099	
0.952	0.965	0.985	0.989	0.972	1.044	1.099	
1.051	0.965	0.985	0.989	0.972	1.050±0.012	1.099±0.009	
1.069±0.018	0.957±0.012	0.967±0.012	0.985±0.012	0.958±0.012			
Pyrex	0.901±0.006	0.900±0.019	Pyrex	1.001±0.021	1.087±0.007		
Rod	0.916	0.917	Rod	0.999	1.094		
0.915	0.916	0.916	Rod	0.999	1.095		
0.902±0.011	0.890±0.011	0.890±0.011		1.005±0.012	1.097±0.012		
Pyrex	0.914±0.004	0.854±0.017	0.933±0.005	1.049±0.014	1.088±0.005		
Rod	0.920	0.895	0.933	1.045	1.112		
0.919	0.895	0.895	0.933	1.045	1.113		
0.938±0.016	0.878±0.011	0.912±0.011	0.933±0.012	1.033±0.012	1.122±0.012		
RMS Differences							
89 Groups	34 Groups	MCNP					
0.017	0.018	0.019					
Measured	HELIOS, 89 Groups		1.164±0.003	1.199±0.008	1.206±0.011		
	HELIOS, 34 Groups		1.168	1.188	1.203		
			1.169	1.190	1.205		
			1.181±0.018	1.209±0.013	1.238±0.018		

Figure 2. Pin Power Distributions in Central Assembly of Core C (ENDF/B-VI.3 Libraries).

Table 3. Results for Infinite-Lattice Configurations.

Lattice	Index	MCNP	HELIOS (ENDF/B-VI.3)			HELIOS (^{238}U Modified)		
			190 Groups	89 Groups	34 Groups	190 Groups	89 Groups	34 Groups
A	k_{∞}	1.0582 ± 0.0003	1.0575	1.0566	1.0592	1.0614	1.0639	1.0631
	δ_{25}	0.1297 ± 0.0001	0.1306	0.1308	0.1309	0.1305	0.1307	0.1308
	δ_{28}	0.0649 ± 0.0001	0.0622	0.0622	0.0616	0.0620	0.0620	0.0613
	ρ_{25}	0.3619 ± 0.0004	0.3736	0.3786	0.3802	0.3735	0.3785	0.3801
	ρ_{28}	2.2923 ± 0.0024	2.2441	2.2559	2.2461	2.1896	2.2020	2.1906
	CR	0.4710 ± 0.0004	0.4620	0.4633	0.4619	0.4543	0.4557	0.4540
	k_{∞}	1.0466 ± 0.0003	1.0500	1.0497	1.0526	1.0534	1.0530	1.0561
B	δ_{25}	0.1153 ± 0.0001	0.1164	0.1166	0.1166	0.1163	0.1165	0.1165
	δ_{28}	0.0601 ± 0.0001	0.0580	0.0580	0.0575	0.0578	0.0578	0.0573
	ρ_{25}	0.3211 ± 0.0003	0.3338	0.3379	0.3391	0.3337	0.3378	0.3390
	ρ_{28}	2.0448 ± 0.0023	2.0363	2.0399	2.0285	1.9884	1.9926	1.9799
	CR	0.4414 ± 0.0003	0.4381	0.4383	0.4367	0.4312	0.4315	0.4297
	k_{∞}	0.9842 ± 0.0003	0.9798	0.9795	0.9811	0.9831	0.9828	0.9845
	δ_{25}	0.1282 ± 0.0001	0.1308	0.1310	0.1312	0.1307	0.1309	0.1311
C	δ_{28}	0.0658 ± 0.0001	0.0639	0.0639	0.0635	0.0637	0.0637	0.0632
	ρ_{25}	0.3585 ± 0.0004	0.3757	0.3803	0.3822	0.3756	0.3802	0.3821
	ρ_{28}	2.2859 ± 0.0025	2.2967	2.3009	2.2909	2.2420	2.2470	2.2354
	CR	0.4700 ± 0.0004	0.4687	0.4689	0.4675	0.4610	0.4613	0.4597
	PAF	0.1389 ± 0.0002	0.1423	0.1422	0.1424	0.1420	0.1427	0.1429

Water Hole	1.048	1.002	0.984	0.980	0.982	0.966	0.951
	1.048	1.002	0.984	0.980	0.982	0.966	0.951
	1.048	1.002	0.984	0.980	0.982	0.966	0.951
	1.054 ± 0.004	0.996 ± 0.003	0.972 ± 0.003	0.971 ± 0.003	0.978 ± 0.003	0.959 ± 0.003	0.944 ± 0.003
	1.032	1.043	1.008	1.006	1.030	0.987	0.957
	1.032	1.044	1.009	1.007	1.030	0.987	0.957
	1.032	1.044	1.009	1.007	1.031	0.987	0.957
	1.022 ± 0.003	1.052 ± 0.002	0.998 ± 0.002	1.001 ± 0.002	1.040 ± 0.002	0.980 ± 0.002	0.951 ± 0.002
	Water Hole	1.059	1.062	Water Hole	1.026	0.965	
	Water Hole	1.060	1.063	Water Hole	1.026	0.964	
	Water Hole	1.060	1.063	Water Hole	1.026	0.965	
		1.065 ± 0.002	1.079 ± 0.002		1.038 ± 0.002	0.967 ± 0.002	
	Water Hole	1.054	1.083	1.068	0.997	0.960	
	Water Hole	1.054	1.084	1.068	0.997	0.960	
	Water Hole	1.054	1.084	1.068	0.997	0.960	
		1.050 ± 0.003	1.094 ± 0.002	1.081 ± 0.002	0.993 ± 0.002	0.967 ± 0.002	
	Water Hole	1.045	1.045	1.045	0.974	0.951	
	Water Hole	1.045	1.045	1.045	0.974	0.951	
	Water Hole	1.045	1.045	1.045	0.974	0.951	
		1.058 ± 0.002			0.969 ± 0.002	0.945 ± 0.002	
	Water Hole	0.992	0.957	0.957	0.944	0.951	
	Water Hole	0.992	0.957	0.957	0.944	0.951	
	Water Hole	0.992	0.957	0.957	0.944	0.951	
		0.990 ± 0.003			0.954 ± 0.002	0.942 ± 0.002	
	Water Hole	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.939	0.951	
	Water Hole	0.944	0.944	0.944	0.939	0.951	
	Water Hole	0.944	0.944	0.944	0.939	0.951	
		0.941 ± 0.003			0.941 ± 0.003	0.937 ± 0.003	
	MCNP	0.939	0.939	0.939	0.939	0.937	
	MCNP	0.939	0.939	0.939	0.939	0.937	
	MCNP	0.939	0.939	0.939	0.939	0.937	
		0.937 ± 0.003			0.937 ± 0.003	0.937 ± 0.003	

Figure 3. Assembly Pin Power Distribution for Infinite-Lattice Configuration B (ENDF/B-VI.3 Libraries).

Water Hole	1.099 1.099 1.098 1.098 1.137 ± 0.004	1.008 1.008 1.008 1.008 1.016 ± 0.003	0.995 0.995 0.994 0.994 1.009 ± 0.003	0.994 0.994 0.994 0.994 1.000 ± 0.003	0.998 0.998 0.998 0.998 1.003 ± 0.003	1.028 1.028 1.028 1.028 1.037 ± 0.003	1.054 1.054 1.054 1.054 1.059 ± 0.004
	1.027 1.027 1.026 1.026 1.037 ± 0.003	0.942 0.942 0.942 0.942 0.930 ± 0.002	0.959 0.959 0.959 0.959 0.968 ± 0.002	0.959 0.959 0.959 0.959 0.964 ± 0.002	0.939 0.939 0.939 0.939 0.930 ± 0.002	1.002 1.002 1.002 1.002 1.005 ± 0.002	1.049 1.049 1.049 1.049 1.054 ± 0.003
	Pyrex Rod	0.890 0.890 0.889 0.876 0.891 ± 0.003	0.888 0.888 0.888 0.870 ± 0.002	0.888 0.888 0.888 0.848 ± 0.002	Pyrex Rod	0.958 0.958 0.958 0.943 ± 0.002	1.044 1.044 1.044 1.043 ± 0.002
		0.892 0.892 0.891 0.891 0.891 ± 0.003	0.865 0.865 0.865 0.848 ± 0.002	0.897 0.897 0.897 0.881 ± 0.002	0.897 0.897 0.897 0.881 ± 0.002	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.006 ± 0.002	1.059 1.059 1.059 1.068 ± 0.003
	Pyrex Rod	0.941 0.941 0.941 0.924 ± 0.002	0.941 0.941 0.941 0.924 ± 0.002	0.941 0.941 0.941 0.924 ± 0.002	0.943 0.943 0.944 1.047 ± 0.002	1.082 1.082 1.082 1.089 ± 0.003	
		1.021 1.021 1.021 1.020 ± 0.003	1.021 1.021 1.021 1.020 ± 0.003	1.080 1.080 1.080 1.086 ± 0.002	1.080 1.080 1.080 1.086 ± 0.002	1.105 1.105 1.105 1.113 ± 0.003	
				1.108 1.108 1.108 1.117 ± 0.003	1.108 1.108 1.108 1.117 ± 0.003	1.122 1.122 1.122 1.129 ± 0.003	
	HELIOS, 190 Groups HELIOS, 89 Groups HELIOS, 34 Groups MCNP					1.132 1.132 1.132 1.138 ± 0.004	

Figure 4. Assembly Pin Power Distribution for Infinite-Lattice Configuration C (ENDF/B-VI.3 Libraries).