

CONF-8506130 - - 4

RECEIVED BY OSTI

JUL 09 1985

## LIGHT MASS ELEMENTS TOTAL HALF-LIVES FOR SELECTED LONG-LIVED NUCLIDES

Norman E. Holden  
National Nuclear Data Center  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
Upton, New York 11973

**MASTER**

BNL-NCS--36553

DE85 014217

**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.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy  
(Contract DE-AC02-76CH00016).

To be presented at the meeting of the International Committee for Radionuclide Metrology (ICRM) on June 3-7, 1985 at Grenoble France

Light Mass Elements Total Half-lives for Selected Long-lived Nuclides

NORMAN E. HOLDEN (National Nuclear Data Center-Brookhaven National Laboratory)

I. Introduction

In the past, many compilations and evaluations of half-lives have been made which have uncritically accepted authors' values and uncertainties. They have merely recommended weight-averaged reported results. This evaluation attempts to reanalyse each experiment in the literature including an estimate of the standard deviation utilizing, where possible, an estimate of the systematic error. This paper constitutes a preliminary step in the process of recommending values.

The long-lived nuclides of light elements are of interest for their use in dating methods and for calculating cosmic-ray exposure ages of meteorites.

Experimental data on the half-lives of selected nuclides have been evaluated and recommended values and uncertainties are presented for the following nuclides:  $^3\text{H}$ ,  $^{10}\text{Be}$ ,  $^{14}\text{C}$ ,  $^{26}\text{Al}$ ,  $^{39}\text{Ar}$ ,  $^{40}\text{K}$ ,  $^{50}\text{V}$ ,  $^{53}\text{Mn}$ ,  $^{76}\text{Ge}$ ,  $^{87}\text{Rb}$ ,  $^{92}\text{Nb}$ ,  $^{107}\text{Pd}$ ,  $^{113}\text{Cd}$ ,  $^{115}\text{In}$  and  $^{123}\text{Te}$ .

The impact of the recommended  $^{14}\text{C}$  half-life of 5715 years on the carbon dating technique, which uses the Libby value of 5568 years, will be discussed. Also the possible primordial occurrence of  $^{92}\text{Nb}$  is now definitely ruled out by the recommended half-life of  $3.7 \times 10^7$ .

Finally, based on the recommended  $^{26}\text{Al}$  half-life value, the  $^{21}\text{Ne}$  production rate for calculating cosmic-ray exposure ages remains too high, compared to rates using the  $^{53}\text{Mn}$  and  $^{10}\text{Be}$  half-life values.

## II. Recommended Data

The recommended data are given in the following tables.

Table 1 -  $T_{1/2}({}^3\text{H})$

| Author            | Reference | Value(years)            | Comment        |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Jenks             | 89        | $12.46 \pm 0.1$         |                |
| Jones, W. M.      | 90        | $12.41^{+0.15}_{-0.25}$ |                |
| Jones, W. M.      | 3         | $12.262 \pm 0.004$      | precision only |
| Popov             | 91        | $12.57 \pm 0.18$        |                |
| Merritt           | 92        | $12.31 \pm 0.13$        |                |
| Jordan            | 2         | $12.346 \pm 0.003$      | precision only |
| Jones, P.M.S.     | 93        | $12.25 \pm 0.03$        |                |
| Unterweger        | 4         | $12.43 \pm 0.05$        |                |
| Recommended Value |           | $12.3 \pm 0.1$          |                |

The uncertainties quoted by Jones (3) and Jordan (2) are statements of statisticals precision with no estimate of the systematic error. An indication of the systematic error is given by the spread in values measured by various methods, counting, calorimetry, helium growth. The measurement by Unterweger was performed on a tritiated water standard with a 17 years interval between measurements and to fit the measured activity, a half-life much larger than currently accepted was required. The recommended value is based on W. M. Jones<sup>3</sup>, Jordan, P. M. S. Jones, and Unterweger and the standard deviation is based on the disagreement between W. M. Jones, Jordan and Unterweger.

Table 2  $T_{1/2} (^{10}\text{Be})$

| Author            | Reference | Value x ( $10^{-6}$ years) | Comment          |
|-------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Hughes            | 94        | 2.0 n.u.                   | Revised from 2.9 |
| McMillian         | 5         | $2.5 \pm 0.5$              | see ref. 7       |
| Yiou              | 6         | $1.55 \pm 0.3$             |                  |
| McMillian         | 7         | $1.71 \pm 0.34$            | revision of 5    |
| Emery             | 8         | $1.6 \pm 0.2$              | no details       |
| Recommended Value |           | $1.6 \pm 0.2$              |                  |

The recommended value is based on agreement among Yiou, McMillian and Emery.

Table 3  $T_{1/2} (^{14}\text{C})$

| Author            | Reference | Value (years) | Comment               |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Mann              | 9         | $5760 \pm 50$ | see 13                |
| Watt              | 10        | $5780 \pm 65$ |                       |
| Olsson            | 11        | $5680 \pm 40$ |                       |
| Godwin            | 12        | $5730 \pm 40$ | average of<br>9,10,11 |
| Mann              | 13        | $5730 \pm 50$ | revision of 9         |
| Bella             | 14        | $5660 \pm 30$ |                       |
| Emery             | 8         | $5736 \pm 84$ | no details            |
| Recommended Value |           | $5715 \pm 45$ |                       |

Mann (9) discussed the problem of retention of a small amount of high specific activity ( $\sim 0.02\%$ ) carbon dioxide during the gas dilution phase. This systematic effect could cause up to a 30% spread in the resulting half-life and was eliminated by substituting a clean flask during subsequent dilution

phases. Earlier measurements, which varied from 4700-7200 years, were performed either with very low enrichment (a few percent) or with the above mentioned dilution process with large systematic error. These results were discarded.

Because of the absence of any details on his measurement, Emery<sup>8</sup> was assigned one half the weight of the others in the unweighted average, and the listed error was adjusted from 59 years as originally quoted in the weighted average.

In Mann's revision of his earlier measurement he mentions a discrepancy between mass spectrometric determination of the amount of  $^{14}\text{C}$  atoms. Samples which were run at NBS and Aldermaston showed a lower reading on one of the three machines at NBS. Mann noted that the result obtained on the mass spectrometer at AWRE agreed with the results on the two other NBS instruments but chose not to use this information. In my analysis, I have average the results on the samples from all four instrument which has slightly lowered Mann's half-life.

A weighted average of the data in table 3 (excluding Godwin) gives  $5692 \pm 20$  years, while an unweighted average gives  $5715 \pm 24$  years.

The unweighted average is recommended because the wide variation in authors estimates of systematic error sources tends to penalize those who do the best job of error analysis. The standard deviation is expanded to account for the variation in the weighted and unweighted averages and to allow for undisclosed systematic errors.

It should be noted that although the fifth (Godwin<sup>12</sup>) and sixth (Johnson<sup>189</sup>) International Carbon-14 Conferences recognized that the best available half-life at that time for the decay of radiocarbon was  $5730 \pm 40$  years, the measurers of radiocarbon dates would continue to use 5568 years realizing that to obtain the correct dates, a factor of 1.03 must be used. The factor now becomes 1.026 with this recommended half-life.

Table 4  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{26}\text{Al}$ )

| Author            | Reference | Value ( $10^{-5}$ years) | Comment          |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Rightmire         | 15        | $7.14 \pm 0.32$          | Revised using 16 |
| Norris            | 153       | $7.05 \pm 0.24$          |                  |
| Thomas            | 154       | $7.8 \pm 0.5$            |                  |
| Recommended Value |           | $7.17 \pm 0.18$          |                  |

The specific activity measurement by Rightmire has been revised using the Ge(Li) measurement of gamma ray intensities by Samworth<sup>16</sup> to obtain the positron branching ratio more accurately.

Table 5  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{39}\text{Ar}$ )

| Author   | Reference | Value (years) | Comment   |
|----------|-----------|---------------|---|
| Zeldes   | 19        | $265 \pm 30$  |   |
| Stoenner | 7         | $268 \pm 8$   | Revised $^{37}\text{Ar}$ half-life by Kishore (ref. 18) |

The weighted average is  $268 \pm 8$  years, where the 3% systematic error quoted by Stoenner has been used rather than the 1% statistical error usually associated with the half-life.

Table 6  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{40}\text{K}$ )

| Author      | Reference | Value x ( $10^{-9}$ years)         | Comment                           |
|-------------|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Gleditsch   | 125       | $11 \pm 2$                         | electron capture                  |
| Ahrens      | 126       | $11.8 \pm 0.2$                     | electron capture                  |
| Graf        | 127       | $1.47 \pm 0.07$                    | $\beta$ decay                     |
| Stout       | 128       | $1.29 \pm 0.08$                    | $\beta$ decay                     |
| Floyd       | 129       | $1.54 \pm 0.39$                    | total decay                       |
| Sawyer      | 130       | $12 \pm$                           |                                   |
| Graf        | 131       | $12 \pm 2$                         | electron capture                  |
| Spiers      | 132       | 1.18                               | total decay                       |
| Faust       | 133       | $1.13 \pm 0.10$                    | total decay                       |
| Sawyer      | 134       | 1.3-1.4                            | $\beta$ decay                     |
| Houtermans  | 135       | $1.31 \pm 0.07$                    | total                             |
| Smaller     | 136       | $1.75 \pm 0.05$                    | $\beta$ decay                     |
| Delaney     | 137       | $1.23 \pm 0.01$                    | $\beta$ decay                     |
| Good        | 20        | $1.46 \pm 0.03$                    | $\beta$ decay                     |
| Burch       | 138       | $11.7 \pm 0.5$                     | electron capture                  |
| Suttle      | 21        | $1.33 \pm 0.03$<br>$13.3 \pm 0.2$  | $\beta$ decay<br>electron capture |
| McNair      | 22        | $1.44 \pm 0.01$<br>$11.6 \pm 0.2$  | $\beta$ decay<br>electron decay   |
| Backenstoss | 32        | $11.3 \pm 0.5$                     | electron capture                  |
| Wetherill   | 33        | $12.2 \pm 0.6$                     | electron capture                  |
| Kelly       | 23        | $1.45 \pm 0.03$                    | $\beta$                           |
| Glendenin   | 24        | $1.40 \pm 0.015$                   | $\beta$                           |
| Fleishman   | 25        | $1.45 \pm 0.04$                    | $\beta$ precision only            |
| Brinkman    | 26        | $1.35 \pm 0.02$                    | $\beta$                           |
| Leutz       | 27        | $12.1 \pm 0.3$<br>$1.40 \pm 0.002$ | $\epsilon c$<br>$\beta$           |
| Wetherill   | 34        | $11.6 \pm 0.4$                     | $\epsilon c$                      |
| Kono        | 28        | $1.36 \pm 0.05$                    | $\beta$                           |
| Feuerhake   | 31        | $1.42 \pm 0.02$                    | $\beta$                           |
| DeRuytter   | 35        | $12.2 \pm 0.2$                     | $\gamma$                          |
| Egelkraut   | 29        | $11.8 \pm 0.5$<br>$1.40 \pm 0.07$  | $\epsilon c$<br>$\beta$           |

|                |     |           |     |
|----------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| Saha           | 30  | 12.3±0.6  | ε c |
|                |     | 1.37±0.04 | β   |
| Venkataramaiah | 139 | 1.31±0.06 | β   |
| Gopal          | 140 | 1.13±0.06 | β   |
| Cesana         | 36  | 12.3±0.04 | ε c |

The half-life is determined by averaging the beta branch using Good, Suttle, McNair, Kelly, Glendenin, Fleishman, Brinkman, Leutrz, Kono, Egelkraut, Saha, and Feuerhake, and by averaging the electron capture branch using Backenstoss, McNair, Wetherill, Saha, Egelkraut, Leutz, DeRuytter, and Cesana.

Table 7  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{50}\text{V}$ )

| Author            | Reference | Value ( $10^{-17}$ years)           | Comment          |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Bauminger         | 155       | .005                                |                  |
| McNair            | 156       | >.08                                | electron capture |
|                   |           | >.12                                | β-               |
| Watt              | 157       | .06                                 |                  |
| Sonntag           | 158       | >0.9                                | electron capture |
|                   |           | >0.69                               | β-               |
| Pape              | 159       | >7.                                 | β-               |
|                   |           | >8.8                                | electron capture |
| Alburger          | 160       | 1.5 <sup>+0.3</sup> <sub>-0.7</sub> |                  |
| Simpson           | 161       | 1.2 <sup>+0.8</sup> <sub>-0.4</sub> |                  |
| Recommended Value |           | 1.4 <sup>+0.5</sup> <sub>-0.6</sub> |                  |

The recommended value is based on the Alburger and Simpson measurements.



Table 8  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{53}\text{Mn}$ )

| Author     | Reference | Value x ( $10^{-6}$ years) | Comment |
|------------|-----------|----------------------------|---------|
| Kaye       | 94        | $1.9 \pm 0.5$              |         |
| Hohlfelder | 95        | $10.8 \pm 4.5$             |         |
| Matsuda    | 96        | $2.9 \pm 1.2$              |         |
| Hondo      | 37        | $3.71 \pm 0.14$            | revised |
| Wolfe      | 39        | $3.84 \pm 0.62$            | revised |
| Heimann    | 38        | $3.73 \pm 0.41$            | revised |

The early measurements assumed a constant cosmic ray flux over a period of 10 million years, which is a questionable assumption. Hondo's measurement was revised for the  $^{54}\text{Mn}$  half-life of 312 days rather than 303 days used by the author. Wolfe's measurement was revised for the  $^{54}\text{Mn}$  half-life of 312 days rather than 308 days used by the author. Heimann's measurement was revised for the  $^{26}\text{Al}$  half-life of  $0.714 \times 10^6$  years rather than  $0.75 \times 10^6$  years used by the author. The recommended value is  $3.7 \pm 0.2 \times 10^6$  years.

Table 9  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{76}\text{Ge}$ )

| Author   | Reference | Value x ( $10^{-22}$ years) | Comment             |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Leccia   | 163       | $>0.2$                      |                     |
| Bellotti | 164       | $>0.8$                      | first excited state |
|          |           | $>2.$                       | ground state        |
| Avignone | 165       | $>1.3$                      |                     |
| Forster  | 106       | $>1.9$                      |                     |
| Simpson  | 167       | $>1.6$                      | first excited state |
|          |           | $>3.2$                      | ground state        |
| Goulding | 168       | $>4.$                       |                     |

The recommended value is based on Goulding's preliminary data.

Table 10  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{87}\text{Rb}$ )

| Author            | Reference | Value $\times (10^{-10} \text{ years})$ | Comment |
|-------------------|-----------|---|---------|
| Geese-Bahnisch    | 142       | $4.3 \pm^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$                 |         |
| Fritze            | 143       | $4.6 \pm 0.5$                           |         |
| Aldrich           | 144       | $5.0 \pm 0.2$                           |         |
| Libby             | 151       | $5.07 \pm 0.2$                          |         |
| Flynn             | 145/24    | $4.7 \pm 0.1$                           |         |
| Ovchinnikova      | 146       | $5.0 \pm 0.2$                           |         |
| McNair            | 147       | $5.25 \pm 0.10$                         |         |
| Egelkraut         | 148       | $5.82 \pm 0.1$                          |         |
| Leutz             | 149       | $5.80 \pm 0.12$                         |         |
| Brinkman          | 26        | $5.22 \pm 0.15$                         |         |
| McMullen          | 150       | $4.72 \pm 0.04$                         |         |
| Neumann           | 40        | $4.88^{+0.06}_{-0.10}$                  |         |
| Davis             | 41        | $4.89 \pm 0.04$                         |         |
| Akatsu            | 162       | $5.56 \pm 0.025$                        |         |
| Recommended Value |           | $4.88 \pm 0.05$                         |         |

The most accurate measurements of those of Neumann and Davis, who remeasured McMullen's sample. The recommended value is based on these two measurements. The recent measurement by Akatsu was ignored.

Table 11  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{92}\text{Nb}$ )

| Author            | Reference | Value ( $10^{-7} \text{ years}$ ) | Comment |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Apt               | 97        | $\sim 17$                         |         |
| Makino            | 42        | $3.5 \pm 0.4$                     | revised |
| Nethaway          | 43        | $3.9 \pm 0.5$                     | revised |
| Recommended Value |           | $3.7 \pm 0.5$                     |         |

Makino's result for the specific activity measurement as reported is in error. It should give  $T_{1/2} = 3.98 \pm 0.76 \times 10^7$  years.

In Nethaway's measurement, he ignores all other measured (n,2n) cross section values for producing the m-state except his own (ref. 98). The author notes a 10% effect is involved in treating the cross section for producing the long lived state, the author averages all total (n,2n) cross sections from 13 to 15 MeV, but selects the peak cross section for m-state production at 14.8 MeV. In this evaluation, I have renormalized the  $^{238}\text{U}$  (n,f) flux monitor to the latest value of the Evaluated Nuclear Data File ENDF/B-V and I have recalculated the half life on the basis of 13-15 MeV average (n,2n) cross section difference for total and m-state production as well as 14.8 MeV differences. The former gives  $3.79 \times 10^7$  years and the latter  $4.02 \times 10^7$  years. An average is selected to represent this experiment.

The recommended value is  $3.7 \pm 0.5 \times 10^7$  years.

Table 12  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{107}\text{Pd}$ )

| Author | Reference | Value ( $10^{-6}$ years) | Comment         |
|--------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Flynn  | 54        | $6.5 \pm 0.3$            | enriched sample |

Table 13  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{113}\text{Cd}$ )

| Author    | Reference | Value ( $10^{-5}$ years) | Comment                  |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Martell   | 99        | $> 0.6$                  | natural Cd               |
| Kalkstein | 100       | $> 0.5$                  | natural Cd               |
| Selig     | 101       | $> 3.$                   | natural Cd               |
| Watt      | 46        | $> 1.3$                  | natural Cd               |
| Greth     | 44        | $9.3 \pm 1.9$            | 96.38% $^{113}\text{Cd}$ |

The recommended value is based on the 96.3% enriched  $^{113}\text{Cd}$  measurement by Greth.

Table 14  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{115}\text{In}$ )

| Author   | Reference | Value( $10^{-14}$ years) | Comment |
|----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------|
| Martell  | 99        | $6 \pm 2$                |         |
| Cohen    | 102       | $\sim 1$                 |         |
| Beard    | 103       | $7.05 \pm 1.51$          | revised |
| Watt     | 46        | $5.1 \pm 0.4$            |         |
| Pfeiffer | 45        | $4.41 \pm 0.25$          |         |

The recommended value is based on Pfeiffer's measurement. This was a Indium loaded liquid scintillator measurement.

Table 15  $T_{1/2}$  ( $^{123}\text{Te}$ )

| Author  | Reference | Value ( $10^{-13}$ years) | Comment   |
|---------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Heintze | 152       | $> 100$                   | K-capture |
|         |           | $> 1$                     | L-capture |
| Watt    | 46        | $1.2 \pm 0.1$             | K-capture |
| Selig   | 101       | $> 5$                     | L-capture |

The recommended half-life is based on Watt's measurement in the low background laboratories at Glasgow and Aldermaston, which has been revised for the isotopic abundance value for  $^{123}\text{Te}$  of 0.908% rather than the 0.87% assumed. This measurement is preferred to the others where the number of counts were lost in the background and assumed to be zero.