Contact Dose Rates from Encapsulated Sources



Ron Goans

F

orise.orau.gov/reacts

Overview: Significant levels of secondary electron radiation are emitted from the surface of sealed sources. Accurate quantification of the hazard is essential to accurate contact dose estimation. The contribution of secondary electrons to the total dose rate is examined and variation from previously accepted values for contact dose rates are presented.



 Initially, MCNPX was used to generate gamma dose rate constants, which were found to be within 10% agreement of published values (Unger &

Gamma Ray Dose Constant at 1 metre

Isotope	mSv h⁻¹ MBq⁻¹			
	ORNL	MCNPX	%diff	
Cs-137	1.07E-04	1.01E-04	6.3	
Co-60	3.69E-04	3.73E-04	1.0	
lr-192	1.63E-04	1.51E-04	7.2	
Ra-226	3.13E-04	3.00E-04	4.0	

·Relative contribution of secondary electrons were modeled and compared to literature (Quimby, Marinelli, & Blady, 1939) with good agreement



References

Trubey, 1982)

[1] Benner, S. (1931). On Secondary β-Rays from the Surface of Radium Containers. Acta Radiologica [Old Series], 401-412.
[2] Quimby, E. H., Marinelli, L. D., & Blady, J. V. (1939). Secondary Filters in Radium Therapy. San Francisco. American Radium Society.

[3] Unger, L. M., & Trubey, D. K. (1982). Specific Gamma - Ray Dose Constants for Nuclides Important to Dosimetry and Radiological Assessment. Oak Ridge: Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

[4] Wilson, C. (1941). The Dependence of the Secondary Electronic Emission Produced by Gamm Radiation Upon the Direction of the Radiation. London: Physics Department, Westminster Hospital.

and compared to literature (Wilson, 1941) with good agreement.



·Contact dose rates were modeled and found to be a factor of 3-4 times lower than those published in NCRP 40.

Isotope	mSv h⁻¹ MBq⁻¹		
	NCRP40	MCNPX	%diff
Cs-137	8.32	1.83	78
Co-60	33.6	9.88	71
lr-192	13.2	2.92	78
Ra-226	21.2	7.67	64

Conclusions

It has been found that NCRP40 published contact dose rates are higher by a factor of 3-4 than those estimated in this work. The implication is that dose calculations based on NCRP40 values will overestimate dose and lead to underestimated risk when compared to biological indicators.

The authors wish to acknowledge support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the University Network of Excellence in Nuclear Engineering (UNENE)