

Report No. Y/DA-7745

MATERIALS FOR HIGH-TEMPERATURE
HYDROGEN-FLUORINE ENVIRONMENTS

C. E. Holcombe
L. Kovach
G. W. Weber

February 21, 1978

**UNION
CARBIDE**

OAK RIDGE Y-12 PLANT
OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE

*prepared for the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY under
U.S. GOVERNMENT Contract W-7405 eng 26*

19980309 281

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Accession Number: 4025

Publication Date: Feb 21, 1978

Title: Materials for High-Temperature Hydrogen-Fluorine Environments

Personal Author: Holcombe, C.E.; Kovach, L.; Weber, G.W.

Corporate Author Or Publisher: Union Carbide, Oak Ridge Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN Report Number: Y/DA-7745

Report Prepared for: U.S. Department of Energy Report Number Assigned by Contract Monitor: SLL 80 629

Comments on Document: Archive, RRI, DEW.

Descriptors, Keywords: Material High Temperature Hydrogen Fluorine Environment Experiment Test Chamber Thermocouple Beryllium Oxide Magnesia Alumina Lanthanum Hexaboride Metal Silicon Nitride

Pages: 00049

Cataloged Date: Dec 07, 1992

Contract Number: W-7405 ENG 26

Document Type: HC

Number of Copies In Library: 000001

Record ID: 25507

Source of Document: DEW

UNCLASSIFIED

UNION
CARBIDE

UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
NUCLEAR DIVISION
P. O. BOX Y, OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE 37830

Ltr. No. 78F-0309-067

TRW(62)
AO 3443

SLL 80 629
copy 1

LASER
CL, M

March 9, 1978

Air Force Weapons Laboratory
Attention: Capt. N. Pchelkin
Chemical Laser Branch
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico 87115

✓ Department of Defense
Defense Advanced Research Project Agency
Attention: Capt. H. Winsor
Materials Science Section
1400 Wilson Blvd
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Gentlemen:

Advanced Low-Heat-Loss Nozzle Research Program

Enclosed is a report describing the results of work conducted during the period from October 1, 1977, to February 15, 1978, on AFWL Project Order 78-002. This document covers investigations conducted to complete cylindrical sample testing, initial design of the configuration testing assembly, new materials developments, and initial heat transfer studies.

Please direct any comments you might have regarding this report to Dr. G. W. Weber.

Very truly yours,

W R Martin

W. R. Martin, Director
Development Division

GWW:tf

Attachment: Y/DA-7745

Distribution:

Same as listed in report

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

PLEASE RETURN TO:

BMD TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION
7100 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON D.C. 20301-7100

UNCLASSIFIED

U4025

Report Number Y/DA-7745

MATERIALS FOR HIGH-TEMPERATURE
HYDROGEN-FLUORINE ENVIRONMENTS

AFWL Project Order 77-054

C. E. Holcombe
L. Kovach
G. W. Weber

Y-12 Development Division

February 21, 1978

OAK RIDGE Y-12 PLANT
P. O. Box Y, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830
Operated by
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION, NUCLEAR DIVISION
for the
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS

CONTENT

SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	5
SECTION I. EXPERIMENTAL: DESIGN AND FABRICATION OF A	
MATERIALS TEST CHAMBER ASSEMBLY	6
SECTION II. EXPERIMENTAL: OPERATION OF MATERIALS	
TESTING FACILITY	6
A. MATERIALS TESTING RUNS	6
B. TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENTS AND THERMOCOUPLE	
EXPERIMENTS	8
C. BERYLLIUM OXIDE TESTING RUNS	9
SECTION III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	10
A. GENERAL DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS	10
B. DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS FOR SPECIFIC	
CANDIDATES	15
1. BERYLLIA	15
2. MAGNESIA	19
3. ALUMINA	19
4. LANTHANUM HEXABORIDE	22
5. METALLICS	24
6. SILICON-NITRIDE AND LANTHANUM-SILICON	
OXYNITRIDE	27
CONCLUSIONS	28
REFERENCES	29
APPENDICES	30

SUMMARY

This report is a continuation of the testing of candidate materials for use as uncooled nozzles for a hydrogen-fluorine laser system currently being developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), the Air Force Weapons Laboratory (AFWL), and the Missile Research and Development Command (MIRADCOM).

Data from 36 recent runs in the hydrogen-fluorine (HF) test facility have been collected, with emphasis on the current primary candidates for the project—beryllia (BeO), magnesia (MgO), alumina (Al₂O₃), and lanthanum hexaboride (LaB₆). Metallics, including nickel (Ni-270), nickel and titanium aluminides (NiAl and TiAl), scandium (Sc), and yttrium (Y), were also tested. Single crystals of Al₂O₃ (sapphire) and MgO were examined. Also included were lanthanum chromite (LaCrO₃), silicon nitride (Si₃N₄), and lanthanum-silicon oxynitride (La₂O₃·Si₃N₄). All specimens were tested to failure in order to determine the surface temperature of emergence of rapid reaction, or the surface temperature which cannot be equalled or exceeded without significant weight and dimensional changes.

In previous studies at Y-12, the upper use-temperature for near-zero corrosion appeared to be determined by the stability and characteristics of the protective fluoride layer. When this layer melts, sublimates or otherwise loses integrity, protection for the substrate deteriorates, with the degree of deterioration at that point determined by the heat of reaction, viscosity of the fluoride layer, and its vapor pressure. The adherence, porosity, and degree of microcracking of the layer are other determining factors of the corrosion rate. Whether a single or polycrystalline sample is used appears to have little effect on film protection (based on Al₂O₃ or MgO results).

The current ranking of best performers for a low-heat-loss, uncooled laser nozzle, in order of decreasing performance is:

LaB₆ [1750K]⁺ > La₂O₃·Si₃N₄ [1600K] > Sc $\approx$ LaCrO₃ $\approx$ Ni $\approx$ NiAl $\approx$ Y

[1450K] > MgO [1300K] > BeO $\approx$ Al₂O₃ $\approx$ TiAl [1200K] > C [1000K].

LaB₆ is approximately 300K "better" than metallics, which would also have low strengths and low creep resistance at ≥ 1400 K making it difficult to maintain dimensional tolerances. Thus, the practical upper use-temperatures of metallics may be well below their approximate zero-reaction temperatures.

⁺Approximate zero-reaction temperature rounded to nearest 50K.

After ten runs on a single LaB_6 sample with 87 minutes at flame temperatures $> 1700\text{K}$, the cumulative weight loss was less than 0.6% with virtually no detectable dimensional changes. Even after "failure", the corrosion was not catastrophic as the fluoride layer appeared viscous and relatively protective, as only 0.96% cumulative weight loss occurred and sample configuration was retained. A further experiment demonstrated the thermal shock resistance of the material by direct heating of LaB_6 in a 3000K flame and subsequent rapid cooling. There was no indication of thermal shock cracking.

In addition to HF testing, a materials test chamber assembly has been designed and constructed. Initial operation will begin shortly, followed by testing of C, MgO , Al_2O_3 , and LaB_6 two and three-dimensional configurations.

INTRODUCTION

The HF (hydrogen-fluoride) chemical laser requires high-temperature, hydrogen-fluoride molecules that are excited to an elevated vibrational state and allowed rapid expansion.

The principal nozzle material previously considered was nickel—requiring internal cooling and thus special machining for coolant flow, as well as creating reduced lasing efficiencies from the high energy losses through the flowing coolant. Therefore, interest has developed in uncooled nozzle materials in the activity entitled "Advanced Low-Heat-Loss Nozzle Research Program."

In previous reports^(1,2) the design, construction, and operation of the HF test facility has been outlined, including the results of the initial screening phase of the program and the testing of over 100 samples. The initial materials selection criteria was also previously discussed.

This report covers the continuation of materials testing, particularly relating to the determination of the relative upper use-temperature for near-zero corrosion. Also, the preliminary design and construction of a materials test chamber assembly is presented.

SECTION I. EXPERIMENTAL: DESIGN AND FABRICATION OF A MATERIAL TEST CHAMBER ASSEMBLY

Upon completion of the screening phase encompassing the testing of 1-inch-diameter cylindrical specimens, a new testing phase will be conducted. In addition to the chemical and temperature effects, the erosion effects of the HF torch gases on test materials will be evaluated. Initial exploratory runs will be conducted in a test chamber design as shown in Figure 1.

Selected materials will be fabricated as test plates, drilled with a prescribed number of holes, and fastened to the bottom of the chamber. Initial runs will be made with 36 drilled holes, 1.016 mm diameter, set in a square array on 5.59 mm centers. A sight port with a sapphire or calcium fluoride window will permit observation of the flame and its effect on the test plate. The temperature of the test plate will be determined with a 1.0-mm-diameter thermocouple, inserted from the side, and pyrometer readings taken through the sight port. A pressure tap connected to a pressure gage will monitor the pressure in the chamber. Maximum pressure should not exceed approximately 5 psig. Provision has also been made in the chamber design to reduce the distance between the nozzle tip and the test plate as desired. This may be required if gas flow rates need to be reduced. The deflection ring, shown in Figure 1, is designed to reduce eddy flows and the possibility of accelerated corner corrosion.

The chamber will be threaded onto the existing Monel nozzle assembly within the large Monel test chamber to permit easy installation and removal. Initially, the chamber will be fabricated from ATJ graphite because of its low cost, easy machinability, and low corrosion rate in a fluorine environment at temperatures below 700°C.

The nozzle currently in use for specimen testing was also redesigned. Instead of a tapered coaxial converging flame, the new design will provide a broader flame front to equalize temperatures and exposure on the broader sample plates.

SECTION II. EXPERIMENTAL: OPERATION OF MATERIALS TESTING FACILITY

A. MATERIALS TESTING RUNS

Thirteen different materials were investigated with 36 separate runs in the HF test facility. For nonmetallic specimens, a nickel sample holder was used. For metallic, either a nickel or a graphite (thermal conductivities are approximately equal to or above 1073K) sample holder was used with a thin (~ 1.5 mm) alumina disc placed between the metal and sample holder to ensure relative thermal isolation. For rod specimens (supplied by TRW), a nickel holder was used and the flame contacted the rod on an edge, splitting the flame. The ends of the rod were isolated thermally by placing oxide grit (≤ 1.5 mm grains of Al_2O_3 or MgO), of the material being tested between the nickel support and the rod.




Figure 1. MATERIAL TEST CHAMBER ASSEMBLY.

A programmed heating cycle was used for nonmetallic specimens (except for one LaB_6 and one LaCrO_3 sample) to minimize the possibility of thermal shock, as previously discussed.^(1,2) Because of the improved performance, it was found necessary when testing certain materials to use higher flame temperatures than previously employed.^(1,2) This was necessary to reach the surface temperatures at which failure occurs. Characteristically, these materials had high thermal conductivities and high thermal resistances. Although not strictly correct, a linear extrapolation of an existing theoretical flame temperatures plot from 1400K to 2400K for various helium, $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ mixtures, was used to attain temperatures ranging from 2400K to 3000K. Recent computer calculations have indicated that these extrapolated values were in error at higher temperatures and necessary changes in the run data presented in Appendices I and II have been made accordingly. In the most extreme case, the calculated flame temperature was determined to be 2853K instead of the predicted 3015K. In only one instance (Run HF-102 on LaB_6) was it found necessary to use a flame estimated to be in excess of 3000K. This was effected by decreasing the fluorine/hydrogen ratio from 2 to 1.2.

Run data presenting gas flows, theoretical flame temperatures, run cycle times, and recorded temperatures are presented in Appendix I. A change has been made in the data presentation. The temperature profile of the test chamber, previously measured with four thermocouples, is no longer reported. It is felt this data is not significant in our current investigations.

A summary of the run data, any dimensional and weight changes in the test specimens, plus visual observations are presented in Appendix II.

B. TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENTS AND THERMOCOUPLE EXPERIMENTS

The experiments have been monitored with both a manual and an automatic pyrometer. Pyrometer readings required, from calibration studies, a +15 to +25K correction (depending upon temperature) for the combined 3-mm-thick sapphire and 12.7-mm-thick quartz windows in the view port. A recent recalibration showed approximately no change in the calibration in the period covered by this report. The manual pyrometer readings utilized a mirror, which requires an additional temperature correction of +20K. The manual pyrometer permitted temperature readings as low as 1050K, while the automatic pyrometer began recording at 1138K. Slightly higher temperature readings normally resulted with the manual pyrometer because of the ability of the operator to selectively read the hotter areas on the specimen and discriminate from interfering gases being released from some samples. The automatic pyrometer, however, remains in a fixed attitude and averages the light emitted from the center of the specimen with a large reticle spot without regard for local anomalies and interference.

Uncertainty typically exists concerning surface temperatures determined by optical pyrometry, because of nonblackbody emissivity corrections. Further uncertainties arise because of the thin, possibly opaque, fluoride layer. In an effort to define true surface temperatures, further thermocouple experiments (as described previously⁽²⁾) were conducted with alumina and are planned with LaB₆, MgO, Ni-270, NiAl, and C. In these experiments, four nickel-sheathed, Pt-Pt/10 Rh thermocouples, 1.02 mm in diameter are placed into ~ 1.5 mm dia. holes drilled in the typical 2.54-cm-dia., 1.27-cm-high cylinder. One thermocouple (#4) is very slightly (~ 1 mm) off-center, 6.6 mm (0.26 in) down from the top surface and another (#2) is 6.4 mm from the axis, 1.0 mm down from the top surface. The fourth thermocouple (#1) is 6.4 mm from the axis of the disc contacting the bottom surface. The thermocouples were monitored with a multipoint recorder capable of making ten measurements per minute for each thermocouple. During these runs (HF-130, HF-131, HF-132), both manual and automatic pyrometer readings were taken along with visual observations.

Two of the alumina runs (HF-130 and HF-131) were designed to maintain surface temperatures below those previously found to result in significant corrosion. The other run (HF-132) was designed to exceed the failure point. Further discussion of these runs may be found in Section III.B.3.

C. BERYLLIUM OXIDE TESTING RUNS

In the present operation of the facility, exhaust gases from the test chamber are discharged directly to the plume of the building ventilation stack. Because of the toxicity of finely divided Be compounds, it was necessary to meet specific industrial hygiene requirements to permit testing of BeO in this device. A stainless steel filter unit with a porous Monel element having 4 ft² of filter area and a removal rating of 100% for 1.0 μ m size particles was installed in the 2-inch exhaust line. During the specimen testing runs, the filter performed satisfactorily, and there was no observable differential pressure.

Upon completion of the runs, the test chamber was determined to be highly contaminated with Be. However, the contamination in the exhaust piping adjacent to the filter and at the filter was found to be below acceptable levels. After a complete cleaning of the chamber with TF Freon and water and additional contamination tests, the equipment was deemed acceptable to permit resumption of normal operations.

SECTION III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. GENERAL DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS

The materials used in the high-temperature hydrogen fluoride tests are characterized by the data presented in Tables 1 and 2.* Most

*Note that SiC is characterized in Tables 1 and 2 since the data were not yet determined at the issue date of the previous report.⁽²⁾

Table 1

IMPURITY LEVEL INFORMATION

Materials	Impurities (wt % level in parentheses) Determined at a Detection Level ≥ 0.1 wt %	Comments
BeO (Y-12)	None detected	Spark source mass spectrographic analysis (MS) indicated > 99.99% pure; contains 390 wppm Li or 0.22 wt % Li_2O
BeO (Nat'l Beryllia Berlox K-150)	Mg (0.15), Si (0.2)	MS indicated > 99.54% pure; 0.08 wt % Al, probably clay-bonded
MgO Single Crystal	None detected	No impurities > 35 wppm, vendor certification (VC)
Sapphire Single Crystal (Al ₂ O ₃)	None detected	MS indicated > 99.93% pure
Al ₂ O ₃ (Coors)	Si (0.1)	
Sc ₂ O ₃	Ta (< 0.15), Cs (< 0.6), Rb (0.2) P (< 1), Cd (1.5), U (< 0.3)	Emission Spectrographic Analysis (ES)
LaCrO ₃	Ta (< 0.15), Cs (< 0.6), Rb (< 0.15), P (< 1), Th (< 0.3)	ES
SiC	Ta (< 0.15), Al (5), Cs (< 0.6), Rb (< 0.15), P (< 1), Ti (0.15), B (0.15), U (< 0.3)	ES; ~ 5% Al as a hot-pressing aid
LaB ₆	None detected	MS indicated > 99.84% pure
Si ₃ N ₄ (nominal 5 wt % MgO)	Mg (5), Ta (< 0.15), Al (0.3), Cs (< 0.6), Rb (< 0.15), P (< 1), Ca (0.15)	ES
La ₂ O ₃ ·Si ₃ N ₄	Ta (< 0.15), Cs (< 0.6), Rb (< 0.15), P (< 1), Th (< 0.3)	ES

Table 2
PHYSICAL PROPERTY DATA

Materials	Bulk Density ³ (g/cm ³)	Real Density ³ (g/cm ³)	Open Porosity ³ (%)
BeO (Y-12)	3.00	3.02	0.6
BeO (Berlox)	2.87	2.87	0.1
MgO Single Crystal	3.60	3.60	0
Sapphire (Al ₂ O ₃) Single Crystal	3.99	3.99	0
Al ₂ O ₃ (Coors)	3.91	3.91	0
Sc ₂ O ₃	3.43	3.76	8.9
LaCrO ₃ ⁽¹⁾	6.08	6.26	2.9
SiC	2.95	2.95	0.1
LaB ₆	4.56	4.57	0.2
Si ₃ N ₄ (MgO doped) ⁽²⁾	3.16	3.19	0.9
La ₂ O ₃ ·Si ₃ N ₄ ⁽¹⁾	3.75	4.70	20.3

¹X-ray diffraction (XRD) indicated single phase

²XRD indicated major phase = β - Si₃N₄; intermediate phase = α - Si₃N₄

³Determined by mercury porosimeter

samples were purchased as hot-pressed cylinders, nominally > 99% pure, > 90% dense. Sapphire and magnesia single crystals in the typical cylindrical shape were also obtained. Lanthanum chromite (LaCrO_3), a candidate material for magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) generator channels, was purchased as a pressed-and-sintered cylinder. The silicon nitride materials (Si_3N_4 and $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot \text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$) were hot pressed at Y-12.

The testing results are presented in detail in Appendix II. Only for Sc_2O_3 did catastrophic thermal shock failure prohibit obtaining any surface temperature information. Since the Sc_2O_3 sample was > 90% dense, it appears that Group IIIB oxides (also Y_2O_3) have such poor thermal shock resistance that they are unsuitable for this application. For rather porous Y_2O_3 samples, such cracking was previously considered to result from YF_3 vapor-pressure buildup in the pore blockage. Testing of a near-100% dense Y_2O_3 specimen is planned to attempt to verify the cause of such behavior.

Lanthanum chromite, LaCrO_3 , while not reacting rapidly with $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$, forms a very thick fluoride film. This film measured 0.029 inch thick on the top, 0.031 inch thick on the side of the cylinder near the top, and is readily flaked off. The film was identified as LaF_3 by X-ray diffraction. This indicates that the chromium fluorides (probably CrF_2 and CrF_3) volatilize. Since some melting of the film occurred, possibly a eutectic $\text{LaF}_3/\text{CrF}_2$ occurs first, causing some flow before CrF_2 vaporizes. The porous nature of the residual LaF_3 film probably depends on the atomic packing characteristics of the substrate and the number and size of the atoms which react and volatilize. The atomic density (atoms/cc) of the atoms removed by fluorination compared to the atomic density of residual (nonvolatile) atoms should determine the relative density (and thus protection from further reaction) of the fluoride layer that forms. In the case of LaCrO_3 , the LaF_3 layer that forms is too porous to be very protective and thus considerable corrosion occurs. It should be noted that the material appears to have excellent thermal shock resistance since it withstood, with no apparent cracking, direct heating with a 2400K flame followed by subsequent rapid cooling. LaCrO_3 is also not water reactive.

The comparable maximum surface temperature for near-zero corrosion determined for twelve different materials is shown in Table 3. Test results for specific materials will be discussed later in the report. Note that emissivities of 0.4 are assumed for nonmetallic specimens and 0.5 for metallic specimens. While this is arbitrary, it does indicate maximum surface temperatures for there would be some emissivity correction. Oxide emissivities are typically in the 0.2-0.5 range, while a graybody (0.5) is a fair estimate for metals.

Considering 1400K as a lower maximum surface temperature for candidate materials, only LaB_6 , $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot \text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$, Sc, LaCrO_3 , Ni, NiAl , and Y would be included. Because of its poor film characteristics, LaCrO_3 would probably be eliminated.

Table 3

MATERIAL PERFORMANCE IN HIGH-TEMPERATURE HF ENVIRONMENTS

Material	Maximum Surface Temperature ¹ (K)	Assumed Film Emissivity ¹ (ϵ)	Assumed Emissivity Correction ² (K)	Max. Surface Temp. Including Assumed Emissivity Correction ² (K)	Remarks
BeO (Y-12), HF-134	1158	0.4	62	1220	mp BeF ₂ = 825-1075K; mp Be-O-F = 1025K
BeO (Berlox), HF-133	1093	0.4	53	1146	
MgO Single Crystal, HF-137	1241	0.4	70	1311	Rapid rise of surface temperature to 1464K (ϵ included); mp MgF ₂ = 1536K; mp MgF ₂ -MgO = 1487K
MgO, HF-74	1248	0.4	71	1319	Rapid rise of surface temperature to 1560K (ϵ included)
MgO-3%Y ₂ O ₃ (TRW), HF-116	<< 1410	0.4	90	<< 1476	Rod specimen; reaction rate was too rapid for accurate temperature determination
Sapphire Single Crystal, HF-121	1126	0.4	57	1183	Sublimation point of AlF ₃ = 1550K
Al ₂ O ₃ (Coors), HF-132	1145	-	-	1145	From top thermocouple
Al ₂ O ₃ (Coors), HF-135	1163	0.4	62	1225	
Al ₂ O ₃ -0.5%Y ₂ O ₃ (TRW), HF-114	<< 1390	0.4	88	<< 1478	Rod specimen; reaction rate was too rapid for accurate temperature determination

Table 3 (Cont'd)

MATERIAL PERFORMANCE IN HIGH-TEMPERATURE HF ENVIRONMENTS

Material	Maximum Surface Temperature ¹ (K)	Assumed Film Emissivity ¹ (ϵ)	Assumed Emissivity Correction ² (K)	Max. Surface Temp. Including Assumed Emissivity Correction (K)	Remarks
LaCrO ₃ , HF-122	1365	0.4	85	1450	Withstood 2400K shock; LaF ₃ film was 0.029 in thick; mp LaF ₃ = 1766K, mp CrF ₂ = 1373K; subl. CrF ₃ = 1370K
LaB ₆ , HF-102	1636	0.4	120	1756	Withstood 3000K shock, LaF ₃ film was 0.004 in thick
Si ₃ N ₄ (MgO doped), HF-127	< 1135	-	-	< 1135	Reacted at all observable temperatures, catastrophic reaction above 1450K
La ₂ O ₃ ·Si ₃ N ₄ , HF-125	~ 1495	0.4	100	1595	Specimen cracked; also too porous
Sc, HF-119	1400	0.5	64	1464	mp ScF ₃ = 1788K
TiAl, HF-124	1163	0.5	44	1207	
NiAl, HF-109	1375	0.5	61	1436	mp NiF ₂ = 1430K
Ni-270, HF-110	1390	0.5	62	1452	
Y, HF-111	1365	0.5	59	1424	mp YF ₃ = 1425K

¹Remote optically observed surface temperature of emergence of rapid reaction (including window corrections of 15-23K and mirror if manual reading of 20K).

²From NBS Monograph 30.

The temperatures given in Table 3 were determined by observing the surface temperature at which the fluoride film ceases to be protective. In some cases, the "break point" could be seen on the pyrometer traces by a discontinuous rapid rise in temperature from the exothermic reaction as the material is no longer protected by a fluoride film. For rod specimens (HF-116 and HF-114), when such a "break point" occurred, very rapid reaction led to complete corrosion of the specimen so that the "after reaction" temperatures (noted by << in Table 3) could be recorded and, possibly, the last manual pyrometer reading before the very rapid reaction.

Perhaps the most difficult maximum surface temperatures to obtain are for subliming fluorides, since the "break point" is a gradual transition to ever-increasing rates of reaction, as with graphite and alumina. Therefore, all graphite data from previous report^(1,2) has been plotted and is shown in Figure 2. The assumption is made that if the surface temperature was $< 1000\text{K}$, the surface temperature is equal to the base thermocouple temperature. The glassy carbon run (HF-13) is normalized for a 1.2-cm (0.5 in)-thick specimen. The data (excluding the zero-corrosion samples) are fit to a least-squares straight line which yields a maximum surface temperature of 1009K excluding emissivity, and for $\epsilon = 0.9$, 1014K .

B. DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS FOR SPECIFIC CANDIDATES

1. Beryllia

Two grades of BeO were obtained—National Beryllia Corporation Berlox K-150 and high purity Y-12 material. From Table 1 it can be seen that the Y-12 grade contained < 400 wppm Li as its main impurity, whereas the Berlox material has $\sim 0.5\%$ impurities apparently from a clay hot-pressing aid.

The data for maximum surface temperature with near-zero corrosion are based on the rapid rise in surface temperature above the points noted in Table 3. Figure 3 shows the temperature versus time data for Berlox. The data for the Y-12 material is shown in Figure 4. For Berlox, the film created an initially darker appearance on the top surface of the sample during the run as compared to the edges. This is attributed to the thicker film on top as compared to the edge. Because of this initial darker appearance, it was possible to note when the top and edges appear equally hot. The temperature where this occurred coincided with the point where surface temperature began to rapidly rise—or where film protection ceased. The darker-film phenomena did not occur for the Y-12 BeO so that it may be impurity-related. The Y-12 grade appeared to survive $\sim 65\text{K}$ higher surface temperatures before failure.




Figure 2. CORROSION RATE DATA FOR CARBON.




Figure 3. TEMPERATURE VERSUS TIME CURVE FOR BERLOX K-150 (BERYLLIA) EXPOSED TO $2F_2/H_2$ (Run HF-133).




Figure 4. TEMPERATURE VERSUS TIME CURVE FOR Y-12 BERYLLIA EXPOSED TO $2F_2/H_2$ (Run HF-134).

The melting temperature of BeF_2 is from 825-1075K, ^(3,4) and an oxyfluoride ($2\text{BeO} \cdot 5\text{BeF}_2$) may ⁽⁴⁾ or may not ⁽⁵⁾ exist—melting at 1025K. ⁽⁴⁾ Therefore, the maximum surface temperature for near-zero reaction (Table 3) of BeO is reasonable, especially since both the fluoride and oxyfluoride would be present as a glass with viscosity decreasing with increasing temperature past its melting range. That BeO reacts rapidly at 1273K with F_2 had also been established in an earlier General Electric Company study ⁽⁶⁾ of refractories in halogen environments.

2. Magnesia

Previous tests on magnesia (MgO) were aimed at determining the maximum flame temperature for near-zero corrosion. A surface temperature of 1158K was reported with a 2200K maximum flame temperature (HF-73). Reexamining Run HF-74 where MgO failed at a flame temperature of 2320K, a "break point" of 1248K was determined after which the temperature rapidly rises to 1560K (emissivity of 0.4, +100K included). This data is shown in Table 3 along with the Runs HF-137 (single crystal) and HF-116 (rod specimen). The single crystal run was almost identical to the polycrystalline MgO run. A "break point" occurred at 1241K after which a rapid temperature rise to 1464K (emissivity of 0.4, +84K included) occurred. Therefore, it appears that (1) there is little or no effect of grain boundaries for MgO ; (2) fluoride film protection on MgO ceases at 150-175K below the eutectic (MgF_2 - MgO) temperature of 1487K; and (3) the exothermic heat of reaction forming MgF_2 after film protection is lost is a large additional heat source causing the discontinuous rapid rise in temperature to or somewhat above the eutectic temperature. In fact, for the MgO single crystal, HF-137, the eutectic (MgF_2 - MgO) caused a characteristic endothermic drop in the recorded temperature (automatic optical pyrometer). This cooling was observed visually for a few seconds. No flow (He , H_2 , F_2) changes had occurred. The liquid surface layer was previously determined to be the eutectic oxide-fluoride mixture by X-ray diffraction of a melted droplet.

3. Alumina

Further tests on alumina (Al_2O_3) have involved the thermocouple experiments to further define the surface temperature. The temperature versus time data are shown in Figure 5 for surface temperatures less than that where film stability ceases, and in Figure 6 for temperatures above the maximum surface temperature for near-zero corrosion. As previously reported, the ΔT between top and bottom thermocouples was approximately zero for the first 30 seconds of heatup, until the specimen was above $\sim 600\text{K}$. The ΔT then increases continuously reaching $\sim 200\text{K}$ maximum. The pyrometer readings and top thermocouples agree well below 1100K (where emissivity corrections are generally $< 50\text{K}$) and are only 50-100K different above 1100K. The Run HF-132 showed a "break point" in the top thermocouple scan, indicating the film failure point. Such a "break point" occurred with another run (HF-135) on the automatic pyrometer scan.




Figure 5. TEMPERATURE VERSUS TIME CURVES FOR THERMOCOUPLE EXPERIMENT WITH ALUMINA (RUN HF-131) BELOW MAXIMUM SURFACE TEMPERATURE FOR NEAR-ZERO CORROSION.




Figure 6. TEMPERATURE VERSUS TIME CURVES FOR THERMOCOUPLE EXPERIMENT WITH ALUMINA (RUN HF-132) WITH TEMPERATURE EXCEEDING THE MAXIMUM SURFACE TEMPERATURE FOR NEAR-ZERO CORROSION.

These "break points" were rarely seen with Al_2O_3 specimens—probably because the automatic pyrometer initiation point and the film failure points are so similar.

The single crystal (HF-121) of Al_2O_3 appeared to react like the polycrystalline material, except with a possibly higher corrosion rate. By X-ray diffraction, the index of the face of the sapphire single crystal which was exposed to the torch was the (010). Thus, this face may result in somewhat more favorable reaction kinetics.

The data from all alumina runs (excluding Run HF-22 with specimen off-centered and erratic gas flows and HF-24 with a cracked specimen and lost process He) are shown in Figure 7. Sapphire runs are circled. Data from two cracked specimens(*) are shown to indicate the accelerated rate of reaction if cracking occurs. Below 1100K, the surface temperature was estimated from base thermocouple data and data from Run HF-90. From this curve, the maximum zero-corrosion temperature appears to be $\sim 1110\text{K}$; or with emissivity corrections for $\epsilon = 0.4$, $\sim 1165\text{K}$.

4. Lanthanum Hexaboride

As mentioned previously,⁽²⁾ lanthanum hexaboride (LaB_6) forms a white adherent fluoride film immediately on initial exposure to a fluorine/hydrogen environment. The white film is a strong contrast to the bluish purple LaB_6 and by scanning electron microscopy was shown⁽²⁾ to be $\sim 100\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (0.004 in) thick after 34 minutes of exposure to $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ flame temperatures $> 1700\text{K}$. Further testing of LaB_6 involved increasing flame temperatures above 2400K to 3000K in $\sim 100\text{K}$ increments (Runs HF-96 to HF-103). After ten runs on a single sample with a total of 87 minutes at flame temperature $> 1700\text{K}$, the cumulative weight loss was less than 0.6% with virtually no detectable dimensional changes. In fact, weight losses tended to decrease somewhat as the flame temperatures increased. The LaF_3 coatings appeared to sinter or densify with high temperature exposure for prolonged periods. The LaF_3 layer may also become more protective and thinner as the surface temperature increases.

After 10.75 minutes of 3000K, $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ flame temperature (HF-102), with no observable corrosion, the temperature was further increased by decreasing the fluorine flow to $1.2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$. At this point, some film flowing was visually observable, yet no dramatic temperature increase characteristic of surface exothermic reaction, when protection from a fluoride film ceases, occurred. The LaF_3 film appeared viscous and protective. Observable flowing of the LaF_3 film occurred in a temperature range of 1616-1636K (uncorrected for emissivity). Adding 120K for $\epsilon = 0.4$, the maximum use range is 1736-1756K. Even after "failure", the sample retained its configuration and catastrophic corrosion did not occur.




Figure 7. CORROSION RATE DATA FOR ALUMINA.

A further experiment (HF-103) demonstrated the thermal shock resistance of the material. Direct heating of LaB_6 in a 3000K flame and subsequent rapid cooling after equilibration by instantaneously securing the flame showed no indication of thermal shock cracking. Conventional non-metallic specimens require the programmed heating cycle to avoid fragmentation. Other than graphite, LaB_6 and LaCrO_3 (mentioned previously) are the only nonmetallic specimens that have withstood direct heating with a flame temperature $> 2000\text{K}$. [Note: BeO was not tested by direct heating and would possibly have survived this thermal shock without cracking.]

Figure 8 shows the LaB_6 sample after all the $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ torch tests. The shape retention is readily seen. A closeup of the sample is shown in Figure 9, where the LaF_3 film and the "teardrops" of clear, melted LaF_3 are very noticeable. The flame velocity caused sufficient surface film flowing to create these small drops, yet very little change in the top surface of the specimen occurred.

To summarize, these experiments indicate that LaB_6 can withstand surface temperatures of 1736K to 1756K with near-zero corrosion. Previously, the vaporization of LaF_3 was demonstrated to be low—below 1640K. No corrosion would be expected below that temperature. The excellent behavior of LaB_6 probably results from the adherent, relatively dense LaF_3 coating which may have a microcracking stress relief mechanism.⁽²⁾ The dense coating probably results from the relatively high atomic density (atoms/cc) of LaB_6 . Even after melting, the LaF_3 film remains intact minimizing reaction of the LaB_6 substrate. The excellent thermal shock resistance and machining possibilities (with electronic techniques because of its electrical conductivity) are additional factors favoring this material as a nozzle candidate.

5. Metallics

Because of their high thermal conductivities, it was difficult to heat metallic materials to a sufficiently high temperature to induce failure.⁽²⁾ However, by using the higher flame temperature (2400-3000K), as with LaB_6 , it was possible to achieve surface temperatures sufficiently high for breakdown of their fluoride films. This point was followed in all cases by catastrophic failure resulting from the heat input from the exothermic, uninhibited fluoride reaction plus the heat being transmitted by the flame.

Considering Table 3, TiAl reacted at virtually the same temperature as Al_2O_3 , which is reasonable since AlF_3 is the protective layer for both. However, NiAl reacted at the NiF_2 melting point which is over 200K higher than the AlF_3 film failure temperature. The only apparent advantage of NiAl over pure Ni is that NiAl melts at 1920K compared to a Ni melting point of 1725K. Yttrium also reacted catastrophically when the melting point of YF_3 was exceeded by shattering completely into pieces as it reacted.




Figure 8. LANTHANUM HEXABORIDE SAMPLE AFTER HIGH-TEMPERATURE $2F_2/H_2$ TESTS.




Figure 9. LANTHANUM HEXABORIDE SAMPLE—CLOSEUP SHOWING MELTED LaF_3 SURFACE AND "TEARDROPS".

Melted droplets from NiAl, Ni, and Sc were analyzed by X-ray diffraction from samples near the center of the droplets. Only the respective metals were detected. Thus, the Sc data are somewhat anomalous. It appears that ScF_3 ceases to be protective (spalls off, cracks, or otherwise fails) approximately 300K below its reported melting point. When failure occurs, as with all the metallics, a large jump in surface temperature occurs, resulting in melting of the metal substrate.

While the maximum surface temperature from near-zero corrosion of the metallic specimens (excluding TiAl) are relatively high, these temperatures represent 75-85% of the substrate melting points (T_m). Significant loss of high-temperature strength and configurational stability would be expected when diffusional creep occurs (over $0.7 T_m$ in $^\circ\text{K}$). Also, if film failure occurs, the resulting rapid deterioration of the part would be unacceptable.

6. SILICON NITRIDE AND LANTHANUM-SILICON OXYNITRIDE

Silicon nitride, Si_3N_4 , (with $\sim 5\%$ MgO additive) was the only nonfluoride-film former listed in Table 3. That sample, HF-127, reacted at all observable temperatures, becoming catastrophic above 1450K where no protection from the MgO dopant would occur. Weight loss was excessive, 29.3% after 4 minutes of 2215 K flame temperature. Its behavior may be compared to SiC, another nonfilm former, which lost 27 weight % after 4.5 minutes at 2000 K flame temperature. The Si_3N_4 sample had a thin, friable, lace-like coating after the run. This was identified by X-ray diffraction as MgF_2 .

Because of the low thermal expansion and good mechanical properties, silicon nitride is considered to be a high toughness ceramic and is under study for turbine blade applications. For rigorous thermal changes it would appear to be a good candidate material. For a $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ environment, however, it reacts rapidly—presumably forming NF_3 (or N_2) and SiF_4 . These species are noneutectic-forming, volatile fluorides. Thus, an increased dopant level with a fluoride-film former could yield a very promising material with the good properties of Si_3N_4 while forming a protective fluoride layer. For this reason, the compound $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot \text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$ (7) was prepared by reactive hot pressing a 1:1 molar mixture of calcined La_2O_3 and Si_3N_4 at 1600°C at 21 MPa (~ 3 ksi) for 1 hour. From Table 2, it can be seen that the oxynitride was only 80% dense. On testing in $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$, the specimen developed cracks even with programmed heating. Nevertheless, the maximum surface temperature for near-zero reaction appears quite high (Table 3). Because of the porosity, the specimen appeared to be reacted throughout to some extent but was protected well from complete destruction, considering its high porosity. The upper use-temperature seems to be $\sim 150\text{K}$ less than for LaB_6 , but the apparent coating failure could have been influenced by the surface cracking and specimen porosity. It should be noted that $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot \text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$ is apparently not very reactive with water, since no weight change resulted on immersion of a sample in water for 1 week.

The cracking failure of $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot \text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$ may be caused by either a high thermal expansion coefficient or by buildup of SiF_4 vapor in the pores followed by pore blockage. A more dense specimen should be examined to resolve the cause of the cracking. Additionally, the compound $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 2\text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$ has been reported⁽⁷⁾ and could exhibit good behavior in the $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ environment. Further testing along these lines including doping silicon nitride is in progress.

CONCLUSIONS

The continuation of materials testing with 36 runs in the HF facility has revealed the following:

1. Surface temperatures of emergence of rapid reaction depend upon the failure of the protective fluoride film to limit substrate exposure or to kinetically inhibit the fluoriding reaction.
2. Fluoride-film failure can occur by melting, sublimation, vaporization, spalling, or microcracking. For most materials, film failure occurs at melting or sublimation. Magnesia (MgO) and Sc form fluorides which fail to protect the substrate 150-300K below their respective fluoride melting points.
3. In general, when corrosion occurs, materials with subliming fluorides (i.e., Al_2O_3 , C) have lower rates of corrosion after failure and have better configurational stability than materials with melting fluorides. For LaB_6 , the fluoride film is sufficiently viscous to protect to some extent after film melting to retain sample configuration.
4. Immediately after failure of the fluoride film, the observed surface temperature rises from the large extra heat input from the exothermic fluoriding reaction in addition to the heat input from the flame.
5. There is little apparent effect of grain boundaries from single and polycrystalline Al_2O_3 and MgO runs or purity (at a nominal 99% level) on the upper use-temperature.
6. The best performers in the $2\text{F}_2/\text{H}_2$ torch on the basis of maximum surface temperature for near-zero corrosion:

LaB_6 [1750K] > $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot \text{Si}_3\text{N}_4$ [1600K] > (Sc, LaCrO_3 , Ni, NiAl , Y)
[1450] > MgO [1300K] > (BeO , Al_2O_3 , TiAl) [1200K] > C [1000K].

REFERENCES

1. G. W. Weber, L. Kovach, C. E. Holcombe, and J. B. Condon, "Evaluation of Materials for Use in Hydrogen-Fluorine Environments," Report Y/DA-7321, Union Carbide Corporation, Nuclear Division, Oak Ridge Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee; June 17, 1977.
2. C. E. Holcombe, L. Kovach, and G. W. Weber, "Materials for High-Temperature Hydrogen-Fluorine Environments," Report Y/DA-7477, Union Carbide Corporation, Nuclear Division, Oak Ridge Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee; October 3, 1977.
3. JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition; D. R. Stull and H. Prophet, Project Directors; National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.; 1971.
4. K. Illig, M. Hosenfeld, and H. Fischer, In Beryllium, Its Production and Application, R. Rimbach and A. J. Michel, Translators, The Chemical Catalog Company, Inc., New York, 1932, pp 39-51.
5. Carlos E. Bamberger, 1977, Personal Communication of 1968 Data, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
6. "High-Flux Reactor Materials Gaseous Fuels Research", Report GEMP-334B, General Electric Company, pp 161-184.
7. R. R. Wills, R. W. Stewart, J. A. Cunningham, and J. M. Wimmer, "The Silicon Lanthanide Oxynitrides", J. Matls Sci., 11, 749-59 (1976).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. SUMMARY OF TEST CONDITIONS DURING THE EXPOSURE OF
SPECIMENS TO A HYDROGEN-FLUORINE FLAME

APPENDIX II. OBSERVATIONS ON TEST SPECIMENS EXPOSED TO A
HYDROGEN-FLUORINE FLAME

APPENDIX I. SUMMARY OF TEST CONDITIONS DURING THE EXPOSURE OF SPECIMENS TO A HYDROGEN-FLUORINE FLAME

Run No.	HF-93	HF-96	HF-97	HF-98
Specimen Identification				
Source	Sc ₂ O ₃	LaB ₆ HF-78	LaB ₆ HF-96	LaB ₆ HF-97
Nozzle Flows, scfm				
Helium	3.8 3.6 3.6	3.8 3.6 3.0 3.6 3.8	3.8 3.6 2.85 3.6 3.8	3.8 3.6 2.7 3.6 3.8
Fluorine	0.9 1.0 1.2	0.9 1.0 1.6 1.0 0.9	0.9 1.0 1.7 1.0 0.9	0.9 1.0 1.73 1.0 0.9
Hydrogen	0.45 0.5 0.6	0.45 0.5 0.8 0.5 0.45	0.45 0.5 0.85 0.5 0.45	0.45 0.5 0.865 0.5 0.45
	<u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.4</u>	<u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.4</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.15</u>	<u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.40</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.15</u>	<u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.295</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.15</u>
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700 1830 2000	1700 1830 2400 1830 1700	1700 1830 2450 1830 1700	1700 1830 2535 1830 1700
Duration of Run, min	1 1 1.25	1 1 4.67 1 1	1 1 4.75 1 1	1 1 4.75 1 1
Optical Pyrometer, °C (a)	No indication < 850	1038	1060	1125
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	743	815	848	842

(a) Direct uncorrected readings

Run No.	HF-99			HF-100			HF-101		
Specimen Identification	LaB ₆			LaB ₆			LaB ₆		
Source	HF-98			HF-99			HF-100		
Nozzle Flows, scfm									
Helium	3.8	3.6	2.55	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	2.3	3.6
Fluorine	0.9	1.0	1.8	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.95	1.0
Hydrogen	0.45	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.45	0.45	0.5	0.976	0.5
	5.15	5.1	5.25	5.1	5.15	5.15	5.1	5.226	5.1
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700	1830	2615	1830	1700	1700	1830	2770	1830
Duration of Run, min.	1	1	4.75	1	1	1	1	4.83	1
Optical Pyrometer, °C	1120			1170			1193		
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	838			843			903		

Run No.	HF-102	HF-103	HF-108	HF-109	HF-110
Specimen Identification					
Source	LaB ₆ HF-101	LaB ₆ HF-102	NiAl HF-29	NiAl HF-108	Ni-270 HF-43
Nozzle Flows, scfm					
Helium	3.8 3.6 2.15 2.15	2.15	3.8 3.6 3.3	3.0 2.7	3.0 2.7
Fluorine	0.9 1.0 2.0 (b)	2.0	0.9 1.0 1.4	1.6 1.73	1.6 1.73
Hydrogen	0.45 0.5 1.0 1.0	1.0	0.45 0.5 0.7	0.8 0.87	0.8 0.865
	5.15 5.1 5.15	5.15	5.15 5.1 5.4	5.4 5.30	5.4 5.3
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700 1830 2840 2840+	2840	1700 1830 2215	2400 2535	2400 2535
Duration of Run, min	1 1 10.75 3.42	3.75	1 1 4.77	5.33 4.52	4.25 5.25
Optical Pyrometer, °C	1375	925	830 Manual	1295	825 Manual
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	1080	842	700	1065	700 800 895 1200

(b) F₂ flow was reduced in stages to 1.4, 1.25, and 1.0 scfm when flame-out occurred.

Run No.	HF-111	HF-112(c)	HF-113(c)	HF-114(c)
Specimen Identification				
Source	Yttrium	Al ₂ O ₃ - HF-84 TRW A10206	Al ₂ O ₃ TRW A10205	Al ₂ O ₃ HF-113
Nozzle Flows, scfm				
Helium	3.0 2.7	3.8 3.6 3.3 3.0	3.8 3.6 3.6 3.8	3.8 3.6 3.4 3.3
Fluorine	1.6 1.73	0.9 1.0 1.4 1.6	0.9 1.0 1.2 1.0	0.9 1.0 1.3 1.4
Hydrogen	0.8 0.865	0.45 0.5 0.7 0.8	0.45 0.5 0.6 0.5	0.45 0.5 0.65 0.7
	5.4 5.3	5.15 5.1 5.4 5.4	5.15 5.1 5.4 5.1	5.15 5.1 5.35 5.4
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	2400 2535	1700 1830 2215 2400	1700 1830 2000 1830 1700	1700 1830 2120 2215 1830 1700
Duration of Run, min	2.75 1.12	1 1 4.08 0.08	1 1 4.5 1 1	1 1 4 2.25 1 1
Optical Pyrometer, °C	965 1280	1280	< 750 Manual	1155
Thermocouple Reading °C under the Specimen, °C	1090	863	748	NA

(c) Specimen was previously exposed to the HF flame for periods of 8.5 and 13 minutes; the flame was not operating properly; however, and the runs were not considered valid.

Run No.	HF-115 ^(d)	HF-116 ^(d)	HF-118	HF-119
Specimen Identification				
Source			Scandium Research Chem. Lot. Sc-M-3-272D	Scandium HF-118
Nozzle Flows, scfm				
Helium	3.8 3.6 3.3 3.0	3.8 3.6 2.6 2.45	3.0 2.6	2.45
Fluorine	0.9 1.0 1.4 1.6	0.9 1.0 1.7 1.9	1.6 1.7	1.9
Hydrogen	0.45 0.5 0.7 0.8	0.45 0.5 0.85 0.95	0.8 0.85	0.95
	<u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.4</u> <u>5.4</u>	<u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.15</u> <u>5.30</u>	<u>5.4</u> <u>5.15</u>	<u>5.30</u>
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700 1830 2215 2395	1700 1830 2550 2690	2400 2550	2690
Duration of Run, min	1 1 3.5 4.5	1 1 3.33 1.92	3.3 2.78	0.77
Optical Pyrometer, °C	No indication < 850	No indication Manual > 1100(e)	1047	1280
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	None	None	675	580

(d) MgO powder used at specimen support points

(e) Temperature rose rapidly near end of run

Run No.	HF-120			HF-121	HF-122		
Specimen Identification	Sapphire - Single Crystal			Sapphire - Single Crystal	LaCrO ₃		
Source	ESPI			HF-120			
Nozzle Flows, scfm							
Helium	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.3	3.8
Fluorine	0.9	1.0	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.4	0.9
Hydrogen	0.45	0.5	0.6	0.45	0.5	0.7	0.45
	5.15	5.1	5.4	5.15	5.1	5.4	5.15
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700	1830	2000	1700	1830	2215	1700
Duration of Run, min	1	1	5	1	1	3.83	1
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	657			678	740		
Optical Pyrometer, °C (a)	No indication Manual pyrometer - no indication			No indication Manual - 818°C	1065		

Run No.	HF-123	HF-124	HF-125	HF-126
Specimen Identification				
Source	LaCrO ₃ HF-122	TiAl AFML	La ₂ O ₃ ·Si ₃ N ₄	Al ₂ O ₃ Coors
Nozzle Flows, scfm Helium Fluorine Hydrogen	3.0 1.6 0.8 <u>5.4</u>	3.3 1.4 0.7 <u>5.4</u>	3.8 3.6 3.3 3.6 3.8 0.9 1.0 1.4 1.0 0.9 0.45 0.5 0.7 0.5 0.45 <u>5.15</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.4</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.15</u>	3.8 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.8 0.9 1.0 1.3 1.3 0.9 0.45 0.5 0.65 0.65 0.45 <u>5.15</u> <u>4.8</u> <u>5.25</u> <u>5.1</u> <u>5.15</u>
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	2395	2215	1700 1830 2215 1830 1700	1700 1910 2150 2280 2150 1910 1700
Duration of Run, min	2.33	3.93	1.0 1.0 4.0 1.0 0.883	1.0 0.58 0.58 2.08 0.67 0.58 1.0
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	700	813	747	680
Optical Pyrometer, °C	1048	1435	1360	965

Run No.	HF-127	HF-128	HF-129(a)
Specimen Identification	Si ₃ N ₄ (MgO doped 5%)	Al ₂ O ₃	ATJ Graphite
Source		Coors	
Nozzle Flows, scfm			
Helium	3.8	3.8	3.0
Fluorine	0.9	0.9	1.4
Hydrogen	0.45	0.45	0.7
	<u>5.15</u>	<u>5.15</u>	<u>5.1</u>
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700	1700	2280
Duration of Run, min	1.0	1.0	4.13
Thermocouple Reading under Specimen, °C	780	735	750
Optical Pyrometer, °C	1335	1220	1280

(a) To check flame alignment

Run No.	HF-130	HF-131	HF-132	HF-133
Specimen Identification	Al ₂ O ₃	Al ₂ O ₃	Al ₂ O ₃	BeO
Source	Coors	HF-130	HF-131	National Beryllia, Berlox K-150
Nozzle Flows, scfm				
Helium	3.8 3.7 3.8	3.8 3.6 3.8	3.8 3.5 3.3	3.8 3.6 3.3
Fluorine	0.9 1.1 0.9	0.9 1.2 0.9	0.9 1.3 1.4	0.9 1.0 1.4
Hydrogen	0.45 0.55 0.45	0.45 0.6 0.45	0.45 0.65 0.7	0.45 0.5 0.7
	5.15 5.35 5.15	5.15 5.4 5.15	5.15 5.45 5.4	5.15 5.1 5.4
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700 1900 1700	1700 2000 1700	1700 2090 2215	1700 1830 2215
Duration of Run, min	1.0 7.25 1.0	1.0 8.0 1.0	1.0 8.33 3.92	1.0 1.0 6.33
Thermocouple Readings under the Specimen, °C	-	-	-	805
Optical Pyrometer, °C	No indication Manual pyrometer 740°C after 5 min	No indication Manual pyrometer 820°C after 7 min 20 sec	1035	1025
Thermocouple Experiment Readings, °C				
#1	687	726	810	
2	758	798	931	
3	775	822	981	
4	768	815	927	

Run No.	HF-134	HF-135	HF-137
Specimen Identification			
Source	BeO	Al ₂ O ₃	Single Crystal MgO (c) Materials Research
Nozzle Flows, scfm			
Helium	3.8 3.6 3.3 3.6 3.8	3.8 3.3 3.3 3.0 3.3 3.3 3.8	3.8 3.6 2.85 3.6 3.8
Fluorine	0.9 1.0 1.4 1.0 0.9	0.9 1.0 1.3 1.4 1.3 1.0 0.9	0.9 1.0 1.7 1.0 0.9
Hydrogen	0.45 0.5 0.7 0.5 0.45	0.45 0.5 0.65 0.7 0.65 0.5 0.45	0.45 0.5 0.85 0.5 0.45
	5.15 5.1 5.4 5.1 5.15	5.15 4.8 5.25 5.1 5.25 4.8 5.15	5.15 5.1 5.4 5.1 5.15
Theoretical Flame Temperature, K	1700 1830 2215 1830 1700	1700 1910 2150 2280 2150 1910 1700	1700 1830 2450 1830 1700
Duration of Run, min	1.0 1.0 3.17 1.0 1.0	1.0 0.58 0.58 4.58 0.58 0.58 1.0	1.0 1.0 2.5 1.0 1.0
Thermocouple Reading under the Specimen, °C	700	650	735
Optical Pyrometer, °C	978	1155	1395

(c) Specimen was previously exposed to the HF flame for periods of 8.5 and 13 mins; the flame was not operating properly, however, and the runs were not considered valid.

APPENDIX II. OBSERVATIONS ON TEST SPECIMENS EXPOSED TO A HYDROGEN-FLUORINE FLAME

Run No.	Material	Theoretical Flame Temperature (K)	Duration of Run (min)	Sample Surface Temperature (K)	Weight Loss (%)	Diameter Loss (%)	Height Loss (%)	Measured Loss in Height (mm)	Remarks
HF-93	Sc ₂ O ₃	1700 1830 2000	1 1 1.25	No indication < 1138					Specimen appeared to be cracked after 1 minute; broke apart after approximately 2 1/2 minutes
HF-96	LaB ₆ HF-78	1700 1830 2400 1830 1700	1 1 4.67 1 1	1328	0.07	0	0	0	Brownish area on top lessened
HF-97	LaB ₆ HF-96	1700 1830 2450 1830 1700	1 1 4.75 1 1	1350	0.04	0	0	0	Brownish area still visible
HF-98	LaB ₆ HF-97	1700 1830 2535 1830 1700	1 1 4.75 1 1	1416	0.06	0	0	0	Brownish area still visible
HF-99	LaB ₆ HF-98	1700 1830 2615 1830 1700	1 1 4.75 1 1	1410	0.05	0	0	0	Brownish area still visible

(1) Includes sight-port window correction only and represents the temperature observed during the hot-test portion of the run; for manual pyrometer observations; 20K degrees are also added for a mirror correction.

Run No.	Material	Theoretical		Duration of Run (min)	Sample Surface Temperature (K)	Measured			Remarks
		Flame Temperature (K)	Weight Loss (%)			Diameter Loss (%)	Height Loss (%)	Height Loss (mm)	
HF-100	LaB ₆ HF-99	1700		1					Brownish area faint
		1830		1					
		2690	0.02	5	1463	0	0.4	0.05	
		1830		1					
		1700		1					
HF-101	LaB ₆ HF-100	1700		1					Brownish area increased
		1830		1					
		2770	0.02	4.83	1486	0	0.4	0.05	
		1830		1					
		1700		1					
HF-102	LaB ₆ HF-101	1700		1					Partial melting of the fluoride layer took place. Specimen had a glazed appearance
		1830		1					
		2840		10.75			+1.8/-1.6		
		2840+		3.42	1672	0.2	+0.23/-0.20		
HF-103	LaB ₆ HF-102	2840	0.06	3.75	1213	0	0.2	0.03	Coating on specimen turned from gray to white after exposure to room air
HF-108	NiAl HF-27	1700		1					No change
		1830		1	Manual				
		2215	0.13	4.77	1138	0	0	0	
HF-109	NiAl HF-108	2400	34.3	5.33	1591	4.1	29.8	4.1	Melting and corrosion of a specimen took place. Melting on specimen surface per manual pyrometer, appeared at 1468K.
		2535		4.52					
HF-110	Ni-270 HF-43	2400		4.25					Specimen corroded and fused to Ni specimen support. Reaction at top surface started at 1390K
		2535		5.25					
		2615		3.0					
		2690		2.0					
		2840		1.5	1544				

Run No.	Material	Theoretical Flame Temperature (K)	Duration of Run (min)	Sample Surface Temperature (K)	Weight Loss (%)	Diameter Loss (%)	Height Loss (%)	Measured Loss in Height (mm)	Remarks
HF-111	Yttrium	2400 2535	2.75 1.12	1576	-	-	-	-	Specimen melted. Melting and film burnoff started at 1365K
HF-112	Al ₂ O ₃ (TRW) HF-84	1700 1830 2215 2400	1 1 4.08 1.08	1576	-	-	-	-	Specimen corroded; one small section left. Extensive corrosion noticed at 1478K
HF-113	Al ₂ O ₃ (TRW) A-10205	1700 1830 2000	1 1 4.5	Manual < 1058	0.45	Length 0	0.39 & 0.62	0.03 & 0.03	Little change
HF-114	Al ₂ O ₃ HF-113	1700 1830 2120 2215	1 1 4 2.25	1447	39.7	Length 0	26.0 & 51.6	1.7 & 2.1	Specimen corroded and thinned down
HF-115	MgO (TRW)	1700 1830 2215 2395	1 1 3.5 4.5	< 1138	0.16	Length 0	0.4 & 0	0.03 & 0	Top edge slightly rounded
HF-116	MgO (TRW)	1700 1830 2550 2690	1 1 3.3 1.92	Manual > 1410	-	-	-	-	Specimen corroded

Run No.	Material	Theoretical Flame Temperature (K)	Duration of Run (min)	Sample Surface Temperature (K)	Weight Loss (%)	Diameter Loss (%)	Height Loss (%)	Measured Loss in Height (mm)	Remarks
HF-118	Scandium	2400 2550	3.33 2.78	1336	+4.4	+2.1	+10.8	1.4	White coating on side of specimen
HF-119	Scandium HF-118	2690	0.77	1576	-	-	-	-	Specimen melted Started to go at 1395K
HF-120	Sapphire Single Crystal	1700 1830 2000 1830 1700	1 1 5 1 1	No indication " < 1138	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.08	Specimen appeared to be etched all over
HF-121	Sapphire HF-120	1700 1830 2105 1830 1700	1 1 5 1 1	Manual 1126	7.4	0.4 (average)	5.4 (average)	0.69 (average)	Specimen had cracks in it, but did not fall apart
HF-122	LaCrO ₃	1700 1830 2215 2320 2395 1830 1700	1 1 3.83 1.67 4.17 0.83 1.0	1340	1.4	+2.0	+3.4	+0.43	Specimen had white coating all over except for small area on the bottom; almost one-half of top surface had a glaze and showed evidence of melting
HF-123	LaCrO ₃ HF-122	2395	2.33	1338	0.3	0	0	0	Some cracking evident in the coating layer; condition of basic structure not visible.
HF-124	TiAl (AFML)	2215	3.93	1732	10.0	1.5	3.9	0.61	Specimen had a black nonadherent coating
HF-127	Si ₃ N ₄ MgO doped	1700 1830 2215 1830 1700	1.0 1.0 4.0 1.0 1.0	1631	39.3	6.1-6.6	13.9	1.75	Specimen corroded and was covered with a white flaky coating

Run No.	Material	Theoretical Flame Temperature (K)	Duration of Run (min)	Sample Surface Temperature (K)	Weight Loss (%)	Diameter Loss (%)	Height Loss (%)	Measured Loss in Height (mm)	Remarks
HF-125	La ₂ O ₃ ·Si ₃ N ₄	1700	1						
		1830	1						
		2215	4	1656	13.5	+0.4	+0.4	0.05	Specimen cracked almost immediately upon upon flame ignition; white coating did form on main portion of specimen
		1830	1						
HF-126	Al ₂ O ₃	1700	0.883						
		1700	1						
		1910	0.58						
		2150	0.58						
		2280	2.08						
		2150	0.67	1254	2.4	0	3.7 Average	0.48 Average	Specimen corroded unevenly
		1910	0.58						
HF-128	Al ₂ O ₃	1700	1.0						
		1910	0.58						
		2150	0.58						
		2280	2.67	1514	11.7	2.2-1.7	8.3 Average	1.1 Average	Flame apparently off-center; uneven corrosion; visible crack lines
		2150	0.58						
		1910	0.58						
		1700	1.0						
HF-130	Al ₂ O ₃	1700	1.0						
		1900	7.25	1048(a)	0.07	0	0	0	Thermocouple experiment
		1700	1.0						
HF-131	Al ₂ O ₃ HF-130	1700	1.0						
		2000	8.0	1095(a)	0.39	0	0.2	0.03	Thermocouple experiment. Several whiskers appeared at top outer edge
		1700	1.0						

(a) Highest thermocouple reading in center of specimen at point nearest the top surface

Run No.	Material	Theoretical		Duration of Run (min)	Sample Surface Temperature (K)	Weight Loss (%)	Diameter Loss (%)	Measured		Remarks
		Flame Temperature (K)	Temperature (K)					Height Loss (%)	Loss in Height (mm)	
HF-132	Al ₂ O ₃ HF-131	1700		1.0						Thermocouple experiment Two-thirds of top surface was corroded; center thermocouple hole became visible, some cracks observed
		2090		8.33						
		2215		3.95	1325	5.99	1.4	10.1 (max.)	1.3 (max.)	
		1700		1.0						
HF-133	BeO National	1700		1.0						Specimen corroded
		1830		1.0						
		2215		6.33						
		2395		3.33	1315	53.3	12.4 Average	32.6 Average	3.2	
		1830		1.0						
		1700		1.0						
HF-134	BeO (Y-12)	1700		1.0						Specimen corroded; stuck to support due to melting
		1830		1.0						
		2215		3.17	1267	18.6	2.8 Average	10.3 Average	1.2 Average	
		1830		1.0						
		1700		1.0						
HF-135	Al ₂ O ₃	1700		1.0						Specimen corroded unevenly
		1910		0.58						
		2150		0.58						
		2280		4.58	1446	17.6	4.0 Average	8.1 Average	1.0 Average	
		2150		0.58						
		1910		0.58						
HF-137	Single Crystal MgO	1700		1.0						Specimen melted on top and cracks developed
		1700		1.0						
		1830		1.0						
		2450		2.5	1692	NA	+0.9	9.9	1.3	
		1830		1.0						
		1700		1.0						

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

SAMSO

Attention: Lt. Col. J. R. Doughty
Worldway Postal Center
Post Office Box 92960
Los Angeles, CA 90009

Rocket Propulsion Laboratory

Attention: Maj. John Dean
Edwards Air Force Base, CA

TRW/DSSG

Attention: Dr. Richard Ackerman
 Dr. Joe Mace
Mail Station 01/2270
One Space Park
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Rocketdyne

Attention: Dr. H. Carpenter
Dept. 590-175/B 833
M.C. BA0-4
6633 Canoga Park, CA 91304

Air Force Weapons Laboratory

Attention: Capt. N. Pchelkin
 Capt. Paul Flynn
 Maj. D. Olson
Kirtland Air Force Base, N. M. 87117

Air Force Materials Laboratory

Attention: Dr. H. Graham
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory

Attention: Dr. Roy Feber, CMB-8
 Dr. Steven Stoddard, CMB-6
 Dr. Terry Wallace, CMB-3
 Dr. D. J. Sandstrom, CMB-6
 Dr. P. Wagner, CMB-8
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

Bell Aerospace Company

Attention: Dr. Wayne Solomon
 Dr. Frank Anthony
Post Office Box One
Buffalo, N. Y. 14240

Atlantic Research Corporation
Attention: J. R. MacPherson
5390 Cherokee Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314

Yale University
Attention: Prof. Paul C. Nordine
Department of Engineering and Applied Science
Chemical Engineering Section
New Haven, CT 06520

U. S. Army Research Office
Post Office Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709

DARPA/Materials Sciences
Attention: Dr. Arden Bement
Capt. Harry Winsor
Dr. Stanley Ruby
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209

Rice University
Department of Chemistry
Attention: Dean John L. Margrave
Post Office Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001

United Technologies Research Center
Attention: Mr. Ronald Grose
Mr. Arthur Chalfante
East Hartford, Conn. 06108

Lawrence Livermore Laboratory
Attention: Dr. Don Olander
Post Office Box 808
Livermore, California 94550

Stanford Research Institute
Attention: Dr. D. L. Hildenbrand
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

U. S. Army Missile Research and Development Command
DRDMI-HAL
Attention: J. Walters
S. Clapp
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

H. D. Hickman
E. J. Barber, ORGDP
D. J. Bostock
J. M. Case
R. L. Farrar, ORGDP
C. F. Hale, ORGDP
C. E. Holcombe
L. Kovach
G. B. Marrow
J. M. Mills/TIC
J. H. Pashley, ORGDP
L. R. Phillips
A. J. Taylor
W. H. Thompson, Jr./F. D. Bender
P. R. Vanstrum
G. W. Weber
W. J. Wilcox, Jr.
W. R. Martin
Y-12 Central Files (Y-12RC)