

LEGIBILITY NOTICE

A major purpose of the Technical Information Center is to provide the broadest dissemination possible of information contained in DOE's Research and Development Reports to business, industry, the academic community, and federal, state and local governments.

Although a small portion of this report is not reproducible, it is being made available to expedite the availability of information on the research discussed herein.

CONF-890565--3

LA-UR -90-1684

LA-UR- -89-1684

DE89 013444

Received

JUN 07 1989

Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by the University of California for the United States Department of Energy under contract W-7405-ENG-36

TITLE HIGH PRECISION ISOTOPIC ANALYSES OF URANIUM AND PLUTONIUM BY TOTAL SAMPLE VOLITILIZATION AND SIGNAL INTEGRATION

**AUTHORS: Ernest L. Callis, CLS-1
Robert M. Abernathy, CLS-1**

**SUBMITTED TO 11th Symposium on Safeguards and Nuclear Material Management
LUXEMBOURG, May 20 - June 1, 1989**

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, or product disclosed herein, or that it would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, or otherwise, does not imply endorsement or recommendation by the United States Government, nor does it imply that it is the best available for the purposes for which it is used. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

By acceptance of this article the publisher agrees that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this article.

By acceptance of this article the publisher agrees that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this article.

The Los Alamos National Laboratory

agrees that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Los Alamos Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

MASTER

HIGH PRECISION ISOTOPIC ANALYSES OF URANIUM AND PLUTONIUM BY TOTAL
SAMPLE VOLATILIZATION AND SIGNAL INTEGRATION

E. L. Callis and R. M. Abernathey
Analytical Chemistry Group - MS G740
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545

ABSTRACT

Techniques have been developed which permit rapid, high-precision analyses of uranium and plutonium by multiple-filament thermal ionization mass spectrometry utilizing a commercial multicollector instrument. The salient feature of the method is volatilization of the entire sample while simultaneously integrating the signal from each isotope, thus virtually eliminating the effects of isotope fractionation in the evaporation process. The method permits the analysis of samples much smaller than required for conventional techniques using Faraday collectors and is expected to have application in the analysis of many elements in addition to uranium and plutonium. Precision-reproducibilities of $\pm 0.02\%$ (RSD) have been obtained for isotope ratios of uranium and plutonium.

HIGH PRECISION ISOTOPIC ANALYSES OF URANIUM AND PLUTONIUM BY TOTAL SAMPLE VOLATILIZATION AND SIGNAL INTEGRATION

E. L. Callis and R. M. Abernathy
Analytical Chemistry Group, MS G740
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545

1. INTRODUCTION

Conventional thermal ionization techniques rely on the use of rigidly controlled experimental conditions such as sample size, purity, chemical form, heating pattern, as well as other parameters to attempt to reproduce fractionation behavior and biases observed due to the evaporation process.¹ Sample evaporation is generally believed to follow the Rayleigh distillation law in which the lighter isotopes are preferentially evaporated.² Observed ratios, in general, change throughout the analysis, producing a fractionation curve. To obtain a stable ion beam for single collector measurements and to reduce the rate of fractionation, only a small percentage, typically 1% to 50%, of the sample is actually evaporated. Unfortunately, unless a known isotope ratio is present in the sample, either inherent or added, one has no way of knowing at a given point in the analysis, the corresponding position on the fractionation curve.³ The use of an internal normalizing ratio, when available, or an added double-spike can improve reproducibility dramatically.^{4,5} However, not all elements are amenable to these techniques and the double-spike method generally requires an additional analysis of the unspiked material.

A direct outcome of Rayleigh distillation is that if all of the sample is evaporated, and all, or a fixed fraction, of them collected, no fractionation is introduced in the evaporation process.⁶ While this has been known for many years, applications to single collector measurements have been difficult. Problems include the necessity of obtaining a stable ion beam and uncertainty in the amount of sample evaporated for a given time during the analysis and the unknown amount of material remaining on the filament at the termination of the analysis.

The availability of multicollector instrumentation, however, eliminates most of the problems in applying the total evaporation method. Some advantages are: a stable ion beam is no longer required because all isotopes are collected simultaneously and more intense ion beams can be obtained as a result, and the duty cycle, the fraction of time that the ion beams are actually being collected, is nearly 100%.

Accordingly, techniques and software were developed to exploit the advantages of the multicollector system. Similar techniques have been simultaneously developed by others.⁷

2. EXPERIMENTAL

Apparatus

A commercial mass spectrometer, (VG Isotopes, Winsford, England, Model VG-354) equipped with five adjustable Faraday collectors and a Daly detector ion-counting system was employed in this work. Demountable triple filament assemblies and filaments of high purity rhenium were used. The instrument is equipped with a 16 sample turret and is fully automated, except for collector positioning.

Reagents

Uranium and plutonium isotopic standards U-500, U-900, U-100, U-111, NBS-944, NBS-945, NBS-946 (US National Bureau of Standards) and CRM-128 (New Brunswick Laboratory, US DOE) were converted to the nitrate form and diluted to nominal concentrations of 0.5 mg/ml (U) and 0.01 mg/ml (Pu) in 1M HNO₃. The plutonium standards, except for CRM-128, were purified by ion exchange to remove ²⁴¹Am ingrowth.

Analysis Procedure

The standard instrument operating software was modified to perform analyses in the total evaporation integration mode. These modifications were made with the goal of minimizing sample evaporation during the initial stages of peak capture and focusing, and of rapidly returning the intensity level to as large a value as practical after starting the integration. Details of the procedure are as follows. While waiting for the sample filament current to zero, the auxiliary filament is heated to prevent the temperature from falling and the ¹³⁶Xe intensity is monitored.

peaks are next located and the total beam intensity is set to 10^{-14} A using the ion-counting system. Use of the ion-counting system at this stage, while not essential, minimizes the consumption of sample before initiation of the integration. After the peaks have been located and focusing has been completed, the Daly system is turned off, Faraday amplifier zeros are measured, and the integration/current ramp is started. Before each 5-second integration period, the sample filament current is incremented in steps of 20 to 100 mA, depending on the present beam intensity. The maximum beam intensity is controlled roughly between 6×10^{-11} and 7×10^{-11} A by suspending the current ramp when the intensity is within these limits. Because all isotopes are collected simultaneously, a stable ion beam is not required. The integration/current ramp continues until sample exhaustion ($\sim 10^{-13}$ A intensity). A second set of amplifier zeros is measured at the end of the analysis and averaged with the first set.

Individual ratios are calculated and printed for each 5-second integration period. The final ratios, however, are based on the summations of the individual DVM readings, corrected for amplifier zeros, which are proportional to the integrated intensities.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A typical intensity profile and current ramp for a plutonium sample is shown in Fig. 1. Note that the intensity rises rapidly and is maintained at a high level, in this case 3×10^{-11} A, yielding a high signal/noise ratio, and then drops rapidly on exhaustion of the sample. The jagged nature of the profile in the mid portion is due to the step wise incrementation of the filament current. The rapid drop in intensity on sample exhaustion is important in reducing the effect of the termination intensity level on the integrated ratios.

Integration times are generally about 10 minutes, but, of course, depend on the quantity of sample loaded. Overhead activities such as target positioning, ionizing filament warm-up, focusing, and channel gain calibration bring the total analysis time to about 40 minutes.

A fractional alpha plot for a uranium (U^{238}) sample and a theoretical curve, based on a simple fractional model, are shown in Fig. 2. Note

the rapid drop in the observed ratios early in the analysis to a value very near the true ratio and then the slow change until 95% sample consumption. The difference between the theoretical and observed curves is probably due to the assumption of complete mixing of the residual sample in the model. In the total evaporation procedure, the sample is volatilized very rapidly and hence mixing probably only occurs in the top few monolayers of sample. This view is reinforced by the behavior at the end of the analysis when only a few monolayers are present, in which a rapid drop in the ratio is observed, more in line with the model.

The fact that even extreme variations in the observed fractional behavior during the analysis can be overcome by total integration as demonstrated in Fig 3, a plot of the results of a Sr analysis. In contrast to the behavior of U or Pu, which usually exhibit a single peak in the intensity profile and a monotonically decreasing ratio (if light/heavy ratios are plotted), Sr exhibits two, possibly three, distinct peaks as the filament temperature is ramped with a corresponding variation in the observed 86/88 ratio. This behavior is apparently due to the presence of multiple chemical species which volatilize at different temperatures. In spite of the volatilization of different species, however, the integrated ratio is very near (within) the certified value for this standard.

Results obtained on uranium and plutonium standards which indicate the very low biases observed with the technique are shown in Table 1. These data have been corrected only for the amplifier gain, determined with a built-in current source, and the relative collection efficiency, discussed later. The observed values are all well within the uncertainty limits of the standards, indicating that, within these uncertainty limits, "true" or unfractiated ratios are obtained.

The extremely high precision (repeatability) in replicate measurements of uranium analyses is shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Both the precision (PE) for the major isotopes and the typical accuracy (AE) are shown. While these data represent short term (1 week) variability, measurements made over periods of several months show only slightly expanded (to a PE of approximately 1.5%) limits.

The precision of minor isotope measurements is determined primarily by the noise level and drift of the amplifiers, and the maximum intensity level that can be tolerated on the major isotope. Observed values are typically ± 2 to ± 3 ppm abundance for integrated intensities in the 10-50 V-min (Volt-minutes) range. The loading of larger samples would probably not reduce these values significantly.

In the case of ^{238}Pu measurements, the contribution due to ^{238}U from filament materials or the sample itself must be considered. Data on NBS-947 indicates a contribution of about ± 10 ppm abundance from these sources.

The amount of sample loaded was 10-20ng Pu and 100-200 ng U. With $10^6 \Omega$ input resistors, these sample sizes yielded integrated intensities of about 10 V-min for plutonium and 50 V-min for uranium. The total analysis time for samples of this size is typically 30 minutes. As indicated in Tables 2 and 3, the total integrated intensity for a given size sample may vary considerably, particularly for uranium. This effect may be due to the sensitivity of the uranium ionization to oxygen pressure in the source region.

Using conventional techniques, where only a portion of the sample is evaporated, care must be exercised to control the amount of sample loaded because the fractionation behavior is affected. This can be difficult or impractical in real-world situations where the precise amount of sample may not be known. In Table 4 are shown the effects of a sample size variation of a factor of 10 for uranium using the total evaporation procedure. While there is a discernible effect, on the order of 0.02%, it is small compared to what one would expect using conventional techniques. In addition, the integrated intensity became a valuable diagnostic tool for rejection of analyses which yield integrated intensities far outside the norm. With conventional techniques, one often has little indication of problems based on the analysis data alone.

In general, the precision of replicate plutonium analyses is somewhat better than uranium. This is thought to be due to two factors. First, the volatilization of Pu from the filament is more nearly complete. After analysis, several ^{238}Pu and ^{239}Pu sample filaments were dissolved and analyzed by alpha particle counting to determine the residual sample. The

filament. Residual Pu was less than 1% while uranium averaged about 1%. The larger uranium residual may be due to diffusion of U into the filament material at the somewhat higher temperatures required for U volatilization.

Secondly, the production rate of uranium oxide ions may vary during the analysis, and hence alter the fraction of sample molecules converted to U^+ ions and collected. The production of plutonium oxide ions appears to be insignificant.

Another interesting difference in the behavior of U and Pu is that uranium volatilizes quite differently from filaments which have been previously degassed. On undegassed filaments, both elements exhibit a relatively rapid drop in intensity as the sample is exhausted, the desired behavior. On degassed filaments, however, uranium exhibits a long, relatively low intensity tail, which may last many minutes even at filament currents of 4A ($\approx 1900^\circ\text{C}$). An explanation of this behavior is not readily apparent.

Collector Calibration

The standard VG software provides for determination of the collector efficiency, which may be defined as the ratio of the gains measured with the current source to those measured with an actual ion beam, by sequentially measuring an ion beam, such as ^{187}Re and ^{133}Cs , on each of the collectors. Because this is essentially a peak switching technique, and subject to beam instabilities, long data acquisition times are often required to obtain adequate precision. In addition, the standard procedure was not fully automated. A fully automated procedure was developed which allowed the acquisition of large amounts of data in a more convenient manner. The collector efficiencies determined in this manner, using a ^{238}Pu ion beam, varied from 0.006 to 0.016, with respect to the axial collector, with a precision of about 100%, based on 10 filament loadings.

To check the validity of the efficiencies measured in this manner, a series of measurements were made using the total evaporation rate method procedure in which a known mass and separation rate, 1.0×10^{-10} g/s, was measured on each of the four pairs of adjacent collectors (Ax, Ax II, III, IIII).

Unfortunately, identical results were not obtained on each pair of collectors, the differences indicating errors on the order of 10% in the efficiency factors.

Accordingly, a method was sought for calibrating the collectors in the simultaneous collection mode to resolve this discrepancy. Because no standards are available having ratios certified to the accuracy levels required (<.01%), a procedure was sought which would be independent of the true value of the ratio being measured. An inspection of the possibilities of using a one mass unit separation ratio such as Pu 240/239, reveals an unsolvable system since for N collectors, only N-1 equations can be written, and the number of unknowns is N (i.e., the relative gain of N-1 collectors plus the unknown ratio). Similarly for other isotope mixtures, the number of unknowns is always one more than the number of independent equations that can be written for a fixed collector arrangement.

However, for adjustable collector systems, calibration is possible using a mixture of isotopes such as U-233-235-238 without any knowledge of the actual isotope ratios or fractionation during the analyses by repositioning the collectors. Consider the arrangements shown in Fig. 4:

For position 1 we have

$$r_1 = \frac{F_1}{F_4} P_1 (1 - \alpha_1)^5 \quad \text{eq 1}$$

$$r_2 = \frac{1}{F_4} R_2 (1 - \alpha_2)^3 \quad \text{eq 2}$$

where r_1, r_2 = observed ratios, corrected for amplifier gains

F_1, F_4 = collector efficiency factors, M and H.

P_1, P_2 = True ratios 233/238 and 235/238, in sample

α_1 = Fractionation factor for AMU's in this analysis

For position 2

$$r_3 = \frac{F_1}{F_4} \cdot R_1 (1 - \alpha_2)^5 \quad \text{eq 3}$$

$$r_4 = \frac{F_2}{F_4} R_2 (1 - \alpha_2)^3 \quad \text{eq 4}$$

where r_3, r_4 = observed ratios

F_2 = Collector efficiency factor, L1

α_2 = Fractionation factor for second analysis

By combining eq 1 and eq 3 we have

$$\frac{r_1}{r_3} = \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{1 - \alpha_2} \right)^5 \quad \text{or} \quad \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{1 - \alpha_2} \right)^3 = \left(\frac{r_1}{r_3} \right)^{3/5} \quad \text{eq 5}$$

combining eq 2 and 4 we have

$$\frac{r_2}{r_4} = \frac{1}{F_2} \cdot \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{1 + \alpha_2} \right)^3 \quad \text{eq 6}$$

Combining eq 5 and 6 and solving for F_2 we have

$$F_2 = \frac{r_4 / r_1^{3/5}}{r_2 / r_3^{3/5}} \quad \text{eq 7}$$

For statistical analysis of multiple runs at the two positions the terms can be regrouped as

$$F_2 = \frac{r_1^{3/5}}{r_2} \cdot \frac{r_4}{r_3^{3/5}} \quad \text{eq 8}$$

because the expressions in brackets should be constant from run to run for a given collector arrangement.

Similar rearrangements can be devised for determining the remaining efficiency factors F_1, F_3 and F_4 .

A comparison of the efficiencies determined in this manner with those determined by pluckswitching a single ion beam is shown in Fig 5. While the differences are not large (0.03 to 0.01), they are sufficient to account for the variations observed when measuring a given isotopic ratio on different parts of collector.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The combination of multicollector instrumentation and techniques which permit total sample volatilization has been found to provide significant improvements in analysis precision and sample through-put. The insensitivity of the method to sample size and drying procedures allows the relaxation of controls normally applied in order to achieve high precision and accuracy. The method should be applicable to many elements in addition to those studied so far, which include U, Pu, Am, Eu and Sr. It appears that the method is capable of producing near-absolute measurements based on uranium and plutonium standard data. Unfortunately, an order-of-magnitude improvement in reference material uncertainties will be required to evaluate the method fully.

5 REFERENCES

1. Garner, E. L., Machlan, L. A. and Shields, W. R., Nat. Bur. Std. (US) Spec Publ. 260-27 (April 1971).
2. Lord Rayleigh, Philos. Mag. (1896) 493.
3. Habfast, K., Int. J. Mass Spec. and Ion Physics, 51 165-189 (1983).
4. Chen, J. H and Wasserburg, G. J., Anal. Chem. 53, 2060 (1981).
5. Callis, E. L., Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conf. on Analytical Chem. in Energy Tech., W. S. Lyon Ed., Ann Arbor Science Publishers, p. 115 (1982).
6. Cohen, K., The Theory of Isotope Separation, McGraw-Hill, New York 1951.
7. Wagner, G., Tuttas D., Poesthorst D., Romkowski, M., Franzini S. and Koch L. presented at 36th ASMS Conference San Francisco, 1984.

Fig 1: A typical intensity profile and current ramp for a plutonium sample.

Fig 2: Observed and theoretical fractionation curves (U500)

Fig 3: Intensity profile, fractionation curve, and current ramp for a strontium sample.

Fig 4: Example of collector calibration ($L1/Ax$) by repositioning of L2 and H2 collectors.


Fig 5: Comparison of collector efficiencies, determined by single ion beam switching and collector repositioning.


Table 1: Observed versus certified values for several uranium and plutonium standards


Table 2: Replicate analyses of NBS-947 plutonium standard demonstrating the high precision obtainable, 10-20 ng Pu loaded.

Table 3: Replicate analyses of U-500 uranium standard, 100-200 ng U loaded.

Table 4: Effect of sample size on observed $^{235}/^{238}$ ratio for NBS-U500 standard.








	L2	LI	Ax	HI		H2
Position 1:	□	□	□	□		□
	233		235			238

	L2		LI	Ax	HI	H2
Position 2:	□		□	□	□	□
	233		235			238

Example of collector calibration (LI/Ax) by repositioning of L2 and H2 collectors.

Collector Efficiency, Axial = 1



Collector Efficiency by Different Methods

OBSERVED VS CERTIFIED VALUES FOR URANIUM AND PLUTONIUM STANDARDS

<u>Standard</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Observed Value</u>	<u>Deviation from Certified</u>	<u>Uncertainty of Certified Value</u>
NBS-946	Pu	240/239	0.144963	-0.019%	± 0.14%
NBS-947	Pu	240/239	0.241278	+0.003%	± 0.14%
NBS-948	Pu	240/239	0.086353	+0.049%	±0.14%
CRM-128	Pu	242/239	1.00096	+0.022%	±0.026%
NBS-U500	U	235/238	0.99985	+0.015%	±0.1%
NBS-U900	U	235/238	10.3785	+0.034%	±0.1%
NBS-U100	U	235/238	0.113642	+0.037%	±0.1%
NBS-U020	U	235/238	0.020812	+0.010%	±0.1%
NBS-U010	U	235/238	0.010144	+0.040%	±0.1%

Los Alamos
CLS-89-7239

ANALYSES OF NBS-947

20 ng Pu Loaded

<u>Run</u>	<u>V-Min</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>241</u>	<u>242</u>
1	10.6	.2659	77.6597	18.869	2.0331	1.2244
2	13.2	.2667	77.6601	18.8159	2.0331	1.2243
3	10.3	.2658	77.6616	18.8164	2.0324	1.2239
4	6.2	.2662	77.6586	18.8164	2.0349	1.2240
5	9.7	.2645	77.6590	18.8191	2.0331	1.2243
6	9.4	.2655	77.6582	18.8172	2.0343	1.2248
7	14.5	.2653	77.6617	18.8158	2.0330	1.2242
8	12.5	.2650	77.6583	18.8194	2.0330	1.2242
MEAN		<u>.2656</u>	<u>77.6597</u>	<u>18.8171</u>	<u>2.0334</u>	<u>1.2242</u>
STD DEV		7	14	14	8	3
RSD		±.26%	±.0018%	±.0074%	±.039%	±.025%
CERTIFIED VALUE		.264	77.66	18.816	2.034	1.226

Los Alamos
CLS-89-7237

ANALYSES OF NBS - U500

100-200 ng Uranium Loaded

<u>Run</u>	<u>V-Min</u>	<u>Atom Ratios</u>		
		<u>234/238</u>	<u>235/238</u>	<u>236/238</u>
1	32.5	.010413	.999801	.001528
2	80.1	.010411	.999743	.001520
3	142.5	.010426	.999756	.001520
4	75.0	.010437	.999622	.001522
5	13.4	.010414	.999892	.001532
6	65.9	.010437	.999850	.001529
7	32.3	.010428	.999796	.001516
8	58.0	.010427	.999733	.001511
9	37.6	.010424	.999762	.001531
10	14.3	.010427	.999773	.001520
MEAN	55.4	.010424	.999768	.001523
STD DEV	38.6	± 9	± 68	± 7
CERTIFIED VALUE		.010422	.9997	.001519

Los Alamos

CLS-89-7236

<u>Ng U Loaded</u>	<u>Integrated Intensity, V-min</u>	<u>Observed 235/238 Ratio</u>
20	10.0	.99982
50	17	.99985
100	45	.99975
200	103	.99962

**Variation of observed 235/238 ratio with sample size for NBS U-50u standard.
Certified value = .9997. (Mean of 2 determinations at each level.)**

Los Alamos
CLS-89-7238