

UNCLASSIFIED
AD 427 131

DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER
FOR
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION
CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

64 7

427131
REPLUGED BY DDC 427131
AS AD NO.

Rock Island Arsenal Laboratory



TECHNICAL REPORT

MULTIMETAL COATING PROCESS FOR COMPOSITE STEEL,
MAGNESIUM AND ALUMINUM STRUCTURES
(Interim Report)

By

DDC
1/1/64 1964

Jodie Doss

Department of the Army Project No. 1-H-0-24401-A-110-05

AMC Code No. 5025.11.842

Report No. 63-3471 Copy No. _____

IEL No. 1-9-100-2 Date 24 October 1963

DISTRIBUTED BY THE
OFFICE OF TECHNICAL SERVICES
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

THIS REPORT MAY BE DESTROYED WHEN
NO LONGER REQUIRED FOR REFERENCE

The findings in this report are not to be construed
as an official Department of the Army position.

"Copies Available at Office of Technical Services \$ __.50 ".

Report No. 63-3471

Copy No. _____

MULTIMETAL COATING PROCESS FOR COMPOSITE STEEL,
MAGNESIUM AND ALUMINUM STRUCTURES
(Interim Report)

By

Jodie Doss

Jodie Doss

Approved by:

A. C. Hanson

A. C. HANSON
Laboratory Director

24 October 1963

DA Project No. 1-H-0-24401-A-110-05

AMC Code No. 5025.11.842

Rock Island Arsenal
Rock Island, Illinois

DDC Availability Notice:

Qualified requesters may obtain
copies of this report from DDC.

ABSTRACT

Aluminum, steel and magnesium trimetal assemblies were simultaneously coated in order to decrease galvanic corrosion, and to develop coatings to be used for recoating structurally united components containing dissimilar metals. The composite specimens were processed in modified stannous pyrophosphate solutions. The trimetal assemblies containing various alloys of aluminum were also processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. Composite specimens containing a large aluminum panel and a small magnesium panel, or the reverse, were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. Solutions containing other tin compounds were investigated as solutions to coat trimetal assemblies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The stannate-pyrophosphate solution should be further investigated for use on Army materiel.

**MULTIMETAL COATING PROCESS FOR COMPOSITE STEEL,
MAGNESIUM AND ALUMINUM STRUCTURES
(Interim Report)**

CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Object	1
Introduction	1
Procedure & Results	1
Materials	1
Stannous Pyrophosphate Solution	2
Sodium Stannate Solution	4
Solutions Containing Other Tin Compounds	5
Discussion	5
Literature References	7
Distribution	8

**MULTIMETAL COATING PROCESS FOR COMPOSITE STEEL,
MAGNESIUM AND ALUMINUM STRUCTURES
(Interim Report)**

OBJECT

To develop methods of producing corrosion resistant coatings on assemblies of magnesium, aluminum and steel for use in rebuild work.

INTRODUCTION

The following investigation was a continuation of the work related in the report entitled, "Multimetal Coating Process For Composite Steel, Magnesium and Aluminum Structures."⁽¹⁾

In the report it was stated that the aluminum, steel and magnesium trimetal assemblies were simultaneously coated in order to decrease galvanic corrosion, and to develop coatings to be used for recoating structurally united components containing dissimilar metals. The following experimental solutions were utilized to coat trimetal assemblies: stannate-chromate, phosphate, stannate-gluconate, stannate-hypophosphite and stannous pyrophosphate. The stannous pyrophosphate solution produced the best coatings on the assemblies.

During the current investigation the previously developed stannous pyrophosphate solution was further examined. Other solutions containing tin compounds were also prepared and examined. This is an interim report containing the results of these investigations.

PROCEDURE AND RESULTS

Materials:

The aluminum materials used in the investigation were listed under Federal Specification QQ-A-561, 1100, QQ-A-355, 2024, QQ-A-318, 5052, QQ-A-327, 6061, QQ-A-283, 7075. The magnesium alloy was QQ-M-44, AZ31B. Panels were prepared from sheet material in the following sizes of 2" x 3" or 4" x 6" x .0625" with 1/4" holes drilled through the centers. The two aluminum and magnesium panels were securely fastened together, with the major dimensions at right angle to each other, by means of a 1/4" round head steel machine screw and nut.

Unless another aluminum alloy has been designated, the aluminum alloy used in the trimetal assembly was the 5052 alloy.

The composite specimens were degreased, utilizing a trichloroethylene vapor degreaser, prior to processing.

Stannous Pyrophosphate Solution:

In the previous report⁽¹⁾ a stannous pyrophosphate solution was developed and found to offer the best coating on the trimetal assembly. The composition of the solution was as follows:

50 grams $\text{Sn}_2\text{P}_2\text{O}_7$
50 grams $\text{Na}_4\text{P}_2\text{O}_7 \cdot 10\text{H}_2\text{O}$
10 grams dextrine
1 gram gelatin

Enough water to make a one liter solution.

In this effort, the above formulation was operated at $195 \pm 5^\circ\text{F}$. The pH of the prepared solution was approximately 6.2. The pH was further adjusted to between 7 and 9 with a 5N NaOH solution. During the previous investigation it was found that the best coating was obtained between pH 7 and 8.2.

The first phase of the present investigation was to ascertain if there was an optimum pH within the range of 7 and 8.2. The stannous pyrophosphate solution was prepared and the pH of the solution was adjusted to 7 with a 5N NaOH solution. The solution was stepwisely adjusted between 7 and 8.2, at 0.1 intervals, utilizing a 5N NaOH solution. After each 0.1 interval a composite specimen was processed in the solution for twenty minutes. There were no appreciable differences between the specimens processed at the different pH values.

The second phase of the present investigation was to determine if there is an optimum solution concentration. The concentration of the stannous pyrophosphate in a liter solution was stepwisely adjusted between 20 and 50 grams, at ten gram intervals. After each addition, a composite specimen was processed. There was no apparent improvements in the coatings.

The concentration of the sodium pyrophosphate in a liter solution was likewise adjusted, stepwisely between 50 and 125 grams, at 25 gram intervals. After each

addition a composite specimen was processed. There was evidently no improvement.

Composite Specimens Containing Other Aluminum Alloys:

For the preceding experiments, the 5052 alloy was used as part of the trimetal assembly. During the next investigation the 1100, 2024, 6061 and 7075 aluminum alloys were used as the aluminum component of the trimetal assemblies.

The above trimetal assemblies were processed for twenty minutes in a stannous pyrophosphate solution, prepared according to the previous formulation. After processing, the magnesium specimens appeared to be covered with dark conversion coatings, and shiny tin coatings were produced on the steel panels.

The 1100 alloy and the 2024 alloy were coated with tin. The 6061 and 7075 alloys either had no coating or were only partially coated.

In order to deposit a satisfactory tin coating, it was necessary to alkaline clean the 6061 and 7075 alloys prior to processing in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. The composition of the cleaner was as follows:

- 22 grams sodium carbonate
- 22 grams trisodium phosphate
- Enough water to make a one liter solution

The aluminum alloys were immersed in the solution at 190°F. for five minutes.

The trimetal assemblies containing the different aluminum alloys were exposed in a 5% salt fog cabinet for corrosion resistance tests. The salt fog cabinet was operated in accordance with Method 811.1 of Federal Test Method Standard No. 151. After five hours exposure, the composite specimens appeared to have small amounts of galvanic corrosion products present at the junction of the aluminum and magnesium panels and where the steel screw and nut make contact. The tin coating on the 2024 and the 7075 alloy panels appeared to have poor adhesion. Blisters were visible at the intersection of the aluminum and magnesium panels, and the coated 2024 aluminum alloy had small corrosion spots over the surface of the panel.

Varied Area Ratio of Aluminum Specimen to Magnesium Specimen:

Composite specimens were prepared in which the aluminum panel was 4" x 6" and the magnesium was 2" x 3". A similar

trimetal assembly was prepared in which the aluminum panel was 2" x 3" and the magnesium was 4" x 6". The above sizes were prepared containing 1100, 2024, 5052, 6061 and 7075 alloy specimens.

The assembled specimens were processed in the pyrophosphate solution for twenty minutes. The typical shiny coatings were present on the specimens containing the 1100, 2024 and 5052 alloy panels. In order to obtain the coating on the 6061 and 7075 specimens, it was necessary to alkaline clean the aluminum and to raise the pH of the processing solution from approximately 7.3 to 8.2 with a 5N NaOH solution. This pH is also satisfactory for the other aluminum alloys.

Sodium Stannate - Sodium Pyrophosphate Solution:

It was subsequently determined, through further work, that the following solution would satisfactorily coat the trimetal assembly.

40 grams sodium stannate $\text{Na}_2\text{SnO}_3 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$
50 grams sodium pyrophosphate $\text{Na}_4\text{P}_2\text{O}_7 \cdot 10\text{H}_2\text{O}$
10 grams dextrine
1 gram gelatin
Enough water to make a one liter solution
The above solution was operated at $195 \pm 5^\circ\text{F}$.

The pH of the solution was adjusted to 6.7 with H_3PO_4 (85%) solution. A trimetal assembly was immersed in the solution for thirty minutes. There was an apparent bright tin coating on the three metals in the assembly. Another composite specimen was processed for thirty minutes in the above solution. There was an apparent bright tin coating on the steel and aluminum and a dark conversion coating on the magnesium.

Galvanic corrosion of the trimetal assembly was first noticed after 2 hours exposure to salt spray. The pH of the above solution decreased from 6.7 to 5.8 during the coating formation. It was found that by increasing the pyrophosphate concentration, the adjusted pH could be maintained. The composition of the modified solution was as follows:

40 grams sodium stannate $\text{Na}_2\text{SnO}_3 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$
100 grams sodium pyrophosphate $\text{Na}_4\text{P}_2\text{O}_7 \cdot 10\text{H}_2\text{O}$
10 grams dextrine
1 gram gelatin
Enough water to make a one liter solution

The pH of the above solution was adjusted to 6.8 with phosphoric acid (85%). The solution was heated to $195 \pm 5^{\circ}\text{F}$. A composite specimen was immersed in the solution for thirty minutes. After processing there was an apparent bright tin coating on the three metals in the assembly. The same results were obtained with a second trimetal assembly. After processing 50 square inches of metal in a one liter of solution it was noted that the pH had not changed from the initial value.

Other Tin Solutions:

Solutions containing other tin compounds were prepared and studied for deposition of coatings on the trimetal assemblies.

The first solution contained a stannous fluoroborate solution. Approximately 65 ml of 57% stannous fluoroborate solution was added to a liter of water. The pH of the solution was adjusted and maintained between 5 and 7 by the addition of 5N sodium hydroxide solution. Composite specimens were immersed in the solution for twenty minutes. No satisfactory coatings were obtained on any of the metals in the trimetal assemblies. The magnesium was attacked by the solution. There was a thin, dark coating on the steel and no coating on the aluminum.

Solutions were prepared in which stannous oxide or stannic oxide and concentrated sulfuric acid were the active chemicals. No satisfactory coatings were deposited on the composite specimens. The coatings were either very thin or nonadherent.

Solutions were prepared from the resultant mixture of sulfuric acid (1-1) and metallic tin powder. 15 ml. of (1-1) sulfuric acid were added to ten grams of tin powder. The resultant mixture was stirred occasionally. The resulting mixture was diluted to a one liter solution. The solution was adjusted to a pH of approximately 7 with a 5N sodium hydroxide solution. The solution was heated to $195 \pm 5^{\circ}\text{F}$. Trimetal assemblies were processed for thirty minutes. The coating was nonadherent on the aluminum in the trimetal assembly.

DISCUSSION

It was previously noted that when the pH of the stannous pyrophosphate solution was varied between 5 and 9, a different coating was produced on the trimetal specimens. Apparently the best coatings were obtained when the pH of the stannous pyrophosphate solution was between 7 and 8.2.

An investigation was initiated in order to determine if there was an optimum pH within the range of 7 to 8.2 in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. No optimum pH was found. The resultant coatings appeared the same throughout the range. The pH of the adjusted stannous pyrophosphate solution remained rather constant without further additions.

The concentration of the stannous pyrophosphate solution was varied in order to ascertain the best operating concentration. The best operating concentration appears to be the current formulation.

The stannous pyrophosphate solution satisfactorily coated the 5052 alloy of aluminum, when part of a composite specimen. An investigation was initiated in order to determine if the solution would coat other alloys of aluminum when part of a trimetal assembly. The solution satisfactorily coated the 1100 alloy of aluminum. The solution would not satisfactorily coat the 6061 aluminum alloy nor the 7075 aluminum alloy until they were alkaline cleaned in a carbonate-phosphate solution.

The coated specimen processed in the stannous pyrophosphate appeared to exhibit good galvanic corrosion resistance. The coating on 2024 aluminum alloy and the 7075 aluminum alloy exhibited poor adhesion after the salt spray corrosion resistance test.

The area of the aluminum panel in a trimetal assembly, and also the area of the magnesium panels in another trimetal assembly, was varied in order to determine if the size ratio of the two metals would affect the coating process. The size ratio of the two metals appeared to have very little affect on the coating of the metals in a trimetal assembly.

The stannate-pyrophosphate solution was investigated for coating trimetal assemblies. It was found that the stannate-pyrophosphate solution would coat all three of the metals in a trimetal assembly. The coatings were thin, yet they decreased the galvanic corrosion of the assembly. The galvanic corrosion of the coated trimetal assembly was first noticed after 2 hours exposure to salt spray. The pH of the modified solution, containing 100 grams of sodium pyrophosphate, remained rather constant during and after the coating of a number of composite specimens.

The other tin solutions prepared, and utilized as coating solutions, would not satisfactorily coat the three metals in the trimetal assemblies.

LITERATURE REFERENCES

1. Doss, Jodie, "Multimetal Coating Process for Composite Steel, Magnesium and Aluminum Structures," Rock Island Arsenal Laboratory Report No. 63-1651, 16 May 1963.

DISTRIBUTION

No. of Copies

A. Department of Defense

Office of the Director of Defense
Research & Engineering
ATTN: Mr. J. C. Barrett
Room 3D-1085, The Pentagon
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Commander
Defense Documentation Center
ATTN: TIPDR
Arlington Hall Station
Arlington 12, Virginia

20

B. Department of the Army - Technical Services

Commanding General
U.S. Army Materiel Command
Room 2502, Bldg. T-7
ATTN: AMCRD-RS-CM
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Commanding Officer
U.S. Army Chemical & Coating Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. C. Pickett
Technical Library
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland

1

1

Commanding General
U.S. Army Tank Automotive Center
ATTN: SMOTA-REM.2
SMOTA-REM.3
Warren, Michigan

1

1

Commanding General
U.S. Army Weapons Command
ATTN: AMSWE-RD
AMSWE-PP
Rock Island Arsenal
Rock Island, Illinois

1

1

DISTRIBUTION

	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Commanding General	
U.S. Army Missile Command	
ATTN: Documentation & Technical	
Information Branch	2
Mr. R. E. Ely, AMSMI-RRS	1
Mr. R. Fink, AMSMI-RKX	1
Mr. W. K. Thomas, AMSMI	1
Mr. E. J. Wheelahan, AMSMI-RSM	1
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	
 Commanding Officer	
Frankford Arsenal	
ATTN: SMUFA-1330	1
Library-0270	1
Philadelphia 37, Pa.	
 Commanding Officer	
U.S. Army Materials Research Agency	
Watertown Arsenal	
ATTN: RPD	
Watertown 72, Mass.	1
 Commanding Officer	
Picatinny Arsenal	
ATTN: Plastics & Packaging Lab	1
PLASTEC	1
Dover, New Jersey	
 Commanding Officer	
Springfield Armory	
ATTN: SWESP-TX	
Springfield 1, Mass.	1
 Commanding Officer	
Watertown Arsenal	
ATTN: SMIWT-LX	
Watertown 72, Mass.	1
 Commanding Officer	
Watervliet Arsenal	
ATTN: SWEVW-RDR	
Watervliet, New York	1

DISTRIBUTION

	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Commanding General U.S. Army Munitions Command Dover, New Jersey	1
Commanding Officer U.S. Army Environmental Health Laboratory Army Chemical Center, Maryland	1
Commanding Officer U.S. Army Chemical Warfare Laboratories ATTN: Technical Library Army Chemical Center, Maryland	1
Commanding Officer Harry Diamond Laboratory ATTN: Technical Library Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commanding Officer Engineer R&D Laboratory ATTN: Materials Branch Ft. Belvoir, Virginia	1
Commanding General Quartermaster R&D Command ATTN: Clothing & Organic Materials Div. Natick, Massachusetts	1
Commanding Officer U.S. Army Prosthetics Research Laboratory Forest Glen, Maryland	1
Commanding Officer Headquarters U.S. Army Signal R&D Laboratory ATTN: Materials Branch Fort Monmouth, N. J.	1
<u>Department of the Army - Other Army Agencies</u>	
U.S. Army Reactor Branch Division of Reactor Development Atomic Energy Commission Washington 25, D. C.	1

DISTRIBUTION

	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Commander U.S. Army Research Office Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	1
Commanding Officer U.S. Army Research Office (Durham) Box CM, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina	1
Chief of Research & Development U.S. Army Research & Development Liaison Group ATTN: Dr. B. Stein APO 757 New York, N. Y.	1
 <u>C. Department of the Navy</u>	
Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons Department of the Navy ATTN: RMMP Room 2225, Munitions Building Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commander Department of the Navy Office of Naval Research ATTN: Code 423 Washington 25, D. C.	1
Chief Dept. of the Navy Bureau of Ships ATTN: Code 344 Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commander Department of the Navy Special Projects Office ATTN: SP 271 Washington 25, D. C.	1

DISTRIBUTION

	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Commander U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory ATTN: Code WM White Oak, Silver Spring, Maryland	1
Commander U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station ATTN: Technical Library Branch China Lake, California	1
Commander U.S. Naval Research Laboratory ATTN: Technical Information Center Anacostia Station Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commander Mare Island Naval Shipyard ATTN: Rubber Laboratory Vallejo, California	1
<u>D. Department of the Air Force</u>	
U.S. Air Force Directorate of Research and Development ATTN: Lt. Col. J. B. Shipp, Jr. Room 4D-313, The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commander Wright Air Development Division ATTN: ASRCEE-1 WWRCO Materials Central Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio	1 1 1
6593 Test Group (Development) ATTN: Solid Systems Division, DGSC Edwards Air Force Base, California	1
Commander AMC Aeronautical Systems Center ATTN: Manufacturing & Materials Technology Div., LMBMO Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio	2

DISTRIBUTION

No. of Copies

E. Other Government Agencies

Scientific and Technical Information
Facility

ATTN: NASA Representative (S-AK/DL)

Mr. B. G. Achhammer

Mr. G. C. Deutsch

Mr. R. V. Rhode

P. O. Box 5700

Bethesda, Maryland

George C. Marshall Space Flight Center

ATTN: M-S&M-M

M-F&AE-M

Huntsville, Alabama

Jet Propulsion Laboratory

California Institute of Technology

ATTN: Dr. L. Jaffe

4800 Oak Grove Drive

Pasadena, California

Commanding General

U.S. Army Weapons Command

ATTN: AMSWE-RD

Rock Island Arsenal

Rock Island, Illinois

for

release to

Commander

British Army Staff

ATTN: Reports Officer

3100 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.

Washington 8, D. C.

Commanding General

U.S. Army Weapons Command

ATTN: AMSWE-RD

Rock Island Arsenal

Rock Island, Illinois

for

release to

Canadian Army Staff, Washington

ATTN: GSO-1, A&R Section

2450 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.

Washington 8, D. C.

DISTRIBUTION

	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Prevention of Deterioration Center National Academy of Science National Research Council 2101 Constitution Avenue Washington 25, D. C.	1
Office of Technical Services Stock 1200 South Eads Street Arlington, Virginia	100

AD Rock Island Arsenal Laboratory, Rock Island, Illinois	Accession No.	UNCLASSIFIED
MULTIMETAL COATING PROCESS FOR COMPOSITE STEEL, MAGNESIUM AND ALUMINUM STRUCTURES - Interim Report by Jodie Doss		1. Coatings for Magnesium
RIA Lab. Rep. 63-3471, 24 Oct 63, 14 p. incl. illus., tables. (DA Project No. 1-H-0-24401-A-110- US, AMC Code No. 3025.11.842) Unclassified Report		2. Coatings for Aluminum
Aluminum, steel and magnesium trimetal assemblies were simultaneously coated in order to decrease galvanic corrosion and to develop coatings to be used for recoating structurally united components containing dissimilar metals. The composite specimens were processed in modified stannous pyrophosphate solutions. The trimetal assemblies containing various alloys of aluminum also were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solutions.		3. Coatings for Steel
(Continued) over		4. Tin Coatings
		DISTRIBUTION: Copies obtainable from DDC.

AD Rock Island Arsenal Laboratory, Rock Island, Illinois	Accession No.	UNCLASSIFIED
MULTIMETAL COATING PROCESS FOR COMPOSITE STEEL, MAGNESIUM AND ALUMINUM STRUCTURES - Interim Report by Jodie Doss		1. Coatings for Magnesium
RIA Lab. Rep. 63-3471, 24 Oct 63, 14 p. incl. illus., tables. (DA Project No. 1-H-0-24401-A-110- US, AMC Code No. 3025.11.842) Unclassified Report		2. Coatings for Aluminum
Aluminum, steel and magnesium trimetal assemblies were simultaneously coated in order to decrease galvanic corrosion and to develop coatings to be used for recoating structurally united components containing dissimilar metals. The composite specimens were processed in modified stannous pyrophosphate solutions. The trimetal assemblies containing various alloys of aluminum also were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solutions.		3. Coatings for Steel
(Continued) over		4. Tin Coatings
		DISTRIBUTION: Copies obtainable from DDC.

Composite specimens containing a large aluminum panel, and a small magnesium panel, or the reversal, were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. Solutions containing other tin compounds were investigated as solutions to coat trimetal assemblies.

Composite specimens containing a large aluminum panel and a small magnesium panel, or the reversal, were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. Solutions containing other tin compounds were investigated as solutions to coat trimetal assemblies.

Composite specimens containing a large aluminum panel and a small magnesium panel, or the reversal, were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. Solutions containing other tin compounds were investigated as solutions to coat trimetal assemblies.

Composite specimens containing a large aluminum panel and a small magnesium panel, or the reversal, were processed in the stannous pyrophosphate solution. Solutions containing other tin compounds were investigated as solutions to coat trimetal assemblies.