

ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY



Galvanic Corrosion of Tungsten Coupled With Several Metals/Alloys

by F. C. Chang, J. H. Beatty,
M. J. Kane, and J. Beck

ARL-TR-1845

November 1998

19990115 015

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Citation of manufacturer's or trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use thereof.

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

Army Research Laboratory

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5069

ARL-TR-1845

November 1998

Galvanic Corrosion of Tungsten Coupled With Several Metals/Alloys

F. C. Chang, J. H. Beatty, M. J. Kane, J. Beck
Weapons and Materials Research Directorate, ARL

Abstract

From an environment perspective, tungsten is a more desirable material than depleted uranium (DU) for penetrator applications. However, the ballistic performance attained by current tungsten (W) alloys is inferior to DU. Recently, advanced tungsten-metal (W-M) composites have been developed to improve their ballistic penetration, but the corrosion properties are unknown and need to be determined. In this work, the galvanic corrosion behavior of W coupled with several selected metals/alloys was investigated. Electrochemical potentiodynamic polarizations and galvanic couplings were employed. The testing was conducted in a 1 wt-% sodium sulfate solution. The selected metals/alloys were: pure W, pure titanium (Ti), Ti 6Al-4V (Ti-6-4), hafnium (Hf), 36Ni64Fe0.03C (Invar), pure iron (Fe), and brass (CDA 260). The galvanic corrosion of these couples is examined and discussed based on the results from electrochemical tests and visual observations.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. Experimental Procedure	1
3. Results and Discussion	4
4. Conclusions	12
5. References	13
Distribution List	15
Report Documentation Page	17

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Typical Microstructure of W-Ni-Fe Alloys, Taken From Cai et al. (1995)	2
2. Experimental Setup Used for Galvanic Testing	3
3. Galvanic Corrosion Current Densities as a Function of Time: (a) W Coupled With Ti, Ti-6Al-4V, Hf, and Ni; and (b) W Coupled With CDA, Fe, and Invar . .	5
4. Schematic Illustrating the Mixed Potential Theory	6
5. Potentiodynamic Scans and Mixed Potentials	7

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Chemical Compositions of Metals and Alloys Selected for This Study	2
2. Summary of Galvanic Corrosion Tests	6
3. Mixed Potentials and Mixed Current Densities as Determined From Polarization Curves	10
4. Average Open-Circuit Potentials Measured After 1 hr of Immersion	11

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

1. Introduction

Depleted uranium (DU)- and tungsten (W)-based alloys are attractive candidate materials for kinetic energy (KE) penetrator applications (Cai et al. 1995; Chang, Levy, and Lin 1985; Levy and Chang 1981; Stein and Geary 1957) because of their unique combination of mechanical properties and high density. Traditionally, DU penetrators have better ballistic properties than W penetrators, but the toxicity and radioactivity of DU creates environmental repercussions. Thus, efforts to develop W alloys to replace DU have been undertaken by the U.S. Army and Department of Defense (DOD). Potential tungsten alloys have included W-Ni-Fe-Co, W-Ni-Co, W-Ni-Mn, W-Hf, W-Ti, and others (Cai et al. 1995).

These new W alloys are being developed strictly for improved ballistic performance; their corrosion properties are of secondary importance. However, this study is looking to uncover potential galvanic corrosion issues in tandem with the alloy development. Tungsten alloys generally contain at least two discrete phases. In most alloys under consideration, relatively pure W grains are encapsulated by a matrix consisting of the other alloying elements (Cai et al. 1995), as shown in Figure 1 for W-Ni-Fe. Galvanic corrosion can occur between these two discrete phases. The work reported herein is a preliminary study of the galvanic corrosion behavior of tungsten-metal (W-M) couples immersed in test solutions. Both potentiodynamic scans and galvanic couple experiments were performed.

2. Experimental Procedure

Samples for electrochemical testing were made from pure W, and other seven other metallic materials selected for study, namely: brass (CDA 260), hafnium (Hf), 36Ni64Fe0.03C (Invar), iron (Fe), nickel (Ni), titanium (Ti), and titanium 6Al-4V(Ti-6-4). Their typical chemical compositions are listed in Table 1. Disk-type specimens 0.318 cm thick and 1.588 cm in diameter were used in all of the tests. Immediately before initiating electrochemical tests, the specimens were polished with 600-grit silicon carbide (SiC) paper, rinsed with distilled water, acetone degreased, and air dried. One square centimeter of each specimen was exposed to the test solution.




Figure 1. Typical Microstructure of W-Ni-Fe Alloys, Taken From Cai et al. (1995). The Solubility of Fe and Ni in W Is Extremely Low, Leading to Almost Pure W Grains Surrounded by an Fe-Ni Matrix. The Alloy Shown Is 95W-3.5Ni-1.5Fe.

Table 1. Chemical Compositions of Metals and Alloys Selected for This Study

Material Studied	Nominal Composition
Pure W	99.99 W
Fe	99.99 Fe
Ni	99.7 Ni
Hf	95.3Hf-3.5Zn-1.2Fe
Ti	99.9 Ti
Ti-6-4	90Ti-6Al-4V
CDA 260	70Cu-30Zn
Invar	36Ni64Fe0.03C

Tests were performed in a dilute sodium sulfate solution (1 wt-% Na_2SO_4) to simulate the humid industrial atmosphere. Potentiodynamic tests were conducted at room temperature in a cell manufactured by Princeton Applied Research (PAR) Model K0235 containing about 325 ml of test

solution. A computer-controlled PAR M273 potentiostat was used, with a sweep rate of 0.166 mV/s. Separate specimens were used for the anodic and cathodic portions of the curves. The solution was deaerated with argon gas. The open-circuit corrosion potential was measured for a period of 1 hr before the scans commenced. Potentials were measured against the saturated calomel electrode (SCE).

The galvanic corrosion tests were conducted in a modified version of the PAR Model K0235 flat cell, as shown in Figure 2. Two PAR M273 potentiostats were utilized. A W specimen is placed at one end of the cell, while the other specimen is clamped to the opposite end. The first potentiostat is set to keep the potential difference between the W and the other sample at 0 V (effectively a short circuit) and simultaneously measure the galvanic current (I_g) generated. A second potentiostat is used to monitor the open circuit potential of the corroding couple (E_g) vs. SCE. The galvanic couple cells were not deaerated, and galvanic currents were measured for a period of 3 days.




Figure 2. Experimental Setup Used for Galvanic Testing. Clamps at Both Ends Secure Each Material of the Couple Being Tested. The Potentiostat Is Used to Effectively Short-Circuit Each Specimen and Measure the Galvanic Current.


3. Results and Discussion

In the galvanic tests, variations of the galvanic currents, I_g vs. time, were recorded for the 72 hr of testing. The I_g is useful as an indicator of the severity of galvanic corrosion. Additionally, potentiodynamic scans are often used to predict galvanic corrosion behavior using mixed potential theory. The following results compare the predictions of mixed potential theory to the actual galvanic tests and comment on the implications this will have on the corrosion resistance of W alloys under development.


Figures 3a and b show the variation in galvanic current, I_g , as function of time. "Positive" currents in this case mean that the W is behaving as the anode, while negative currents denote that W is behaving as the cathode. These curves show that at the end of the 72-hr test, only Fe and Invar behaved as anodes with respect to W. Iron was more anodic than W throughout the test, while Invar changed behavior from cathodic to anodic after a few hours of immersion. At the outset of the test Ni, Hf, Ti, and Ti-6-4 were anodic with respect to W in the W-M couples, but they all became more noble (cathodic) in less than 10 hr.

The results of the galvanic corrosion tests are summarized in Table 2. The couples are ranked in decreasing order of the magnitude of the galvanic current density.

When two metallic specimens are coupled together and immersed in an aqueous electrolyte, the well-established mixed potential theory states that the corroding potential and corresponding galvanic current can be predicted from the potentiodynamic scans of each metal. Figure 4 shows a schematic illustrating this method. The mixed potential of the couple, E_m , and the galvanic current, I_m , can be represented by the intersection of the anodic polarization curve of the anode (the alloy/metal with the more active E_{corr}) and the cathodic polarization curve of the cathode (the alloy/metal with the more noble E_{corr}) as the two polarization curves are overlapped. Generally, I_m may be considered the corrosion rate of the anode in the couple.



(a)



(b)

Figure 3. Galvanic Corrosion Current Densities as a Function of Time: (a) W Coupled With Ti, Ti-6Al-4V, Hf, and Ni; (b) W Coupled With CDA, Fe, and Invar.

Table 2. Summary of Galvanic Corrosion Tests

W Coupled To	I_g (A/cm ²)
Fe	-1×10^{-5}
CDA	1×10^{-6}
Invar	-1×10^{-6}
Ni	1×10^{-7}
Ti	3×10^{-8}
Ti-6Al-4V	3×10^{-8}
Hf	0×10^{-8}

Note: Negative sign indicates that the material was anodic with respect to W.






Figure 4. Schematic Illustrating the Mixed Potential Theory. The Combined System Must Equilibrate to a Common Potential and Common Current Density When the Specimens Are Electrically Connected. The Common (Mixed) Potential Is Designated E_m , and the Current Density Obtained Is I_m .

Figures 5 a–g show the overlapped potentiodynamic scans of the couples under investigation and the corresponding values of E_m and I_m . Tables 3 and 4 summarize these results, providing the open-circuit potentials (E_{corr}) for each metal/alloy studied, as well as the E_m and I_m predicted from




(a) W and Invar.




(b) W and CDA.

Figure 5. Potentiodynamic Scans and Mixed Potentials.




(c) W and Fe.




(d) W and Ni.

Figure 5. Potentiodynamic Scans and Mixed Potentials (continued).




(e) W and Ti.



(f) W and Ti-6Al-4V.

Figure 5. Potentiodynamic Scans and Mixed Potentials (continued).



(g) W and Hf.

Figure 5. Potentiodynamic Scans and Mixed Potentials (continued).

Table 3. Mixed Potentials and Mixed Current Densities as Determined From Polarization Curves

W Coupled To	W is More	E_m (V vs. SCE)	I_m (A/cm ²)
Fe	Noble	-0.748	6.109×10^{-6}
Ni	Noble	-0.443	7.261×10^{-7}
Hf	Noble	-0.431	2.158×10^{-7}
Ti-6-4	Noble	-0.431	2.094×10^{-7}
Ti	Noble	-0.431	1.315×10^{-7}
Invar	Active	-0.403	(1.552×10^{-6})
CDA	Active	-0.383	(2.553×10^{-6})

Table 4. Average Open-Circuit Potentials Measured After 1 hr of Immersion

Material	E_{corr} (V vs. SCE)
CDA	-195
Invar	-277
W	-431
Pure Ti	-463
Pure Ni	-522
Hf	-533
Ti-6Al-4V	-535
Pure Fe	-785

mixed potential theory. Comparing I_m to I_g shows that the mixed potential theory agrees reasonably well with the longer term galvanic couple data. The materials with large I_m 's (Fe, CDA, Invar) show the largest I_g 's. The Fe:W couple sustained the largest current density, at 1×10^{-5} A/cm². The Invar:W couple shows a reversal of current that is not easily explained. The remaining materials (Ti, Ti-6-4, Ni, and Hf) have E_m 's close to the E_{corr} of W. This means that the W, which is near its free-corrosion potential, can behave either as an anode or a cathode as drifting of the corrosion potential occurs. Long-term measurements of E_{corr} often show "drifting" from 10-30 mV, suggesting that changes in the anodic/cathodic relationship (current reversals) should be expected if the E_m is near E_{corr} of either material in the couple. Current reversals are seen for all of the couples except W-Fe and W-CDA. However, relatively small galvanic currents would be expected, and this is precisely what is observed.

It should be noted that there are certain limitations of the methods used in this preliminary study; for instance, the effect of grain boundaries, solid solubility, and intermetallic compound formation that may result in certain processes have been ignored. Also, other factors such as the ratio of anode/cathode surface area must be accounted for. However, because of the two discrete phases found in W alloy composites (Figure 1), it is reasonable to assume that the galvanic effects measured in this study will agree well with the general corrosion behavior of the W alloys under development.

4. Conclusions

Comparison of mixed potential theory and galvanic corrosion tests provided good agreement for the materials studied. Pure Ti, Ti-6Al-4V, Ni and Hf when coupled with W showed small galvanic current densities ($< 1.0 \times 10^{-7} \text{ A/cm}^2$) and maintained galvanic corrosion potentials near the E_{corr} of W. Tungsten alloys utilizing these materials as the matrix material should show little or no galvanic corrosion. When W was coupled to Fe, CDA, and Invar, significantly larger current densities were measured. This suggests that corrosion protection schemes will need to be developed for W alloys under development using these materials in the matrix.

5. References

- Cai, W. D., Y. Li, R. J. Dowding, F. A. Mohamed, and E. J. Lavernia. "A Review of Tungsten-Based Alloys as Kinetic Energy Penetrator Materials." *Review in Particulate Materials*, vol. 3, pp. 71–131, 1995.
- Chang, F., M. Levy, and S. S. Lin. "The Effect of Ion Implantation on the Corrosion Behavior of a High Density Sintered Tungsten Alloy." *NACE Corrosion*, vol. 85, paper no. 71, 1985.
- Levy, M., and F. Chang. "Corrosion Behavior of High Density Tungsten Alloys." *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Environmental Degradation of Engineering Materials in Aggressive Environments*, pp. 33–42, 1981.
- Stern, M., and A. Geary. *Journal of Electrochemical Society*. Vol. 104, p. 56, 1957.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

2 DEFENSE TECHNICAL
INFORMATION CENTER
DTIC DDA
8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD
STE 0944
FT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218

1 HQDA
DAMO FDQ
D SCHMIDT
400 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0460

1 OSD
OUSD(A&T)/ODDDR&E(R)
R J TREW
THE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-7100

1 DPTY CG FOR RDE HQ
US ARMY MATERIEL CMD
AMCRD
MG CALDWELL
5001 EISENHOWER AVE
ALEXANDRIA VA 22333-0001

1 INST FOR ADVNCD TCHNLGY
THE UNIV OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
PO BOX 202797
AUSTIN TX 78720-2797

1 DARPA
B KASPAR
3701 N FAIRFAX DR
ARLINGTON VA 22203-1714

1 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CTR
CODE B07 J PENNELLA
17320 DAHLGREN RD
BLDG 1470 RM 1101
DAHLGREN VA 22448-5100

1 US MILITARY ACADEMY
MATH SCI CTR OF EXCELLENCE
DEPT OF MATHEMATICAL SCI
MAJ M D PHILLIPS
THAYER HALL
WEST POINT NY 10996-1786

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
AMSRL D
R W WHALIN
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1145

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
AMSRL DD
J J ROCCHIO
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1145

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
AMSRL CS AS (RECORDS MGMT)
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1145

3 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
AMSRL CI LL
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1145

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

4 DIR USARL
AMSRL CI LP (305)

<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
1	CDR US ARMY NATICK RD&E CTR TECHL LBRY NATICK MA 01760-5010
1	CDR US ARMY SAT COMMCTN AGCY TECHL DCMNT CTR FORT MONMOUTH NJ 07703
1	CDR TACOM AMSTA TSL TECHL LBRY WARREN MI 48397-5000
1	PRES AIRBRN ELECT & SPEC WARFARE BD LBRY FORT BRAGG NC 28307
1	CDR DUGWAY PRVNG GRND TECHL LBRY TECHL INFO DIV DUGWAY PROVING GROUND UT 84022
1	CDR USA AEROMEDICAL RSRCH UNIT TECHL LBRY PO BOX 577 FORT RUCKER AL 36360
1	DIR US ARMY AVN TRAIN LBRY BLDG 5906 5907 FORT RUCKER AL 36360
1	CDR US ARMY AGCY FOR AVN SFTY TECHL LBRY FORT RUCKER AL 36362
1	CDR CLARKE ENGR SCHL LBRY LBRY 3202 NEBRASKA AVE N FORT LEONARD WOOD MO 65473-5000

<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
1	CDR US ARMY ENGR WATEWAYS EXPRMNT STA RSRCH CTR LBRY PO BOX 631 VICKSBURG MS 39180
1	CDR US ARMY QUARTERMASTER SCHL QUARTERMASTER SCHL LBRY FORT LEE VA 23801
1	DIR NATL INST OF STAND & TECHLGY GAITHERSBURG MD 20899
1	CDR NAVAL CIVIL ENGR LAB TECHL LBRY PORT HUENEME CA 93043
1	DIR LLNL TECHL LBRY PO BOX 1663 LIVERMORE CA 94550
1	DIR SANDIA NATL LAB TECHL LBRY ALBUQUERQUE NM 87185-5800
1	CDR ARDEC TECHL LBRY PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
1	CDR NWC TECHL LBRY CHINA LAKE CA 93555
1	CDR NSWC TECHL LBRY DAHLGREN VA 22448-5000
1	DIR AIR FORCE WRIGHT LAB TECHL LBRY ARMAMENT DIV 101 EGLIN AVE STE 239 EGLIN AFB FL 32542

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- 1 DIR
SOUTHWEST RSRCH INST
TECHL LBRY
PO DRAWER 28510
SAN ANTONIO TX 78228-0510

- 1 DIR
INST FOR ADVANCED TECHLGY
UNIV OF TEXAS AUSTIN
TECHL LBRY
AUSTIN TX 78759

- 1 DIR
DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGCY
TECHL LBRY
6801 TELEGRAPH RD
ALEXANDRIA VA 22192

- 1 DIR
NAVAL RSRCH LAB
TECHL LBRY
WASHINGTON DC 20375

- 1 CDR
USAF WRIGHT RSRCH & DEV CTR
TECHL LBRY
WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB OH
45433-6523

- 1 DIR
BENET WEAPONS LAB
LCWSL
USA AMCCOM
TECHL LBRY
WATERVLIET NY 12189

- 1 CDR
USA FOREIGN SCI & TECHLGY CTR
TECHL LBRY
220 7TH ST NE
CHARLOTTESVILLE VA 22901-5396

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

- 20 DIR USARL
AMSRL WM MC
F CHANG (5 CP)
K BEATTY (5 CP)
M KAME (5 CP)
J BECK (5 CP)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<small>Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.</small>				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE November 1998	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final, 1994 - 1997	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Galvanic Corrosion of Tungsten Coupled With Several Metals/Alloys			5. FUNDING NUMBERS 88M458	
6. AUTHOR(S) F. C. Chang, J. H. Beatty, M. J. Kane, and J. Beck				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Laboratory ATTN: AMSRL-WM-MC Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5069			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER ARL-TR-1845	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) <p>From an environment perspective, tungsten is a more desirable material than depleted uranium (DU) for penetrator applications. However, the ballistic performance attained by current tungsten (W) alloys is inferior to DU. Recently, advanced tungsten-metal (W-M) composites have been developed to improve their ballistic penetration, but the corrosion properties are unknown and need to be determined. In this work, the galvanic corrosion behavior of W coupled with several selected metals/alloys was investigated. Electrochemical potentiodynamic polarizations and galvanic couplings were employed. The testing was conducted in a 1 wt-% sodium sulfate solution. The selected metals/alloys were: pure W, pure titanium (Ti), Ti 6Al-4V (Ti-6-4), hafnium (Hf), 36Ni64Fe0.03C (Invar), pure iron (Fe), and brass (CDA 260). The galvanic corrosion of these couples is examined and discussed based on the results from electrochemical tests and visual observations.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS galvanic corrosion, tungsten, depleted uranium (DU), penetrator application			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 25	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This Laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers to the items/questions below will aid us in our efforts.

1. ARL Report Number/Author ARL-TR-1845 (Chang) Date of Report November 1998

2. Date Report Received _____

3. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.) _____

4. Specifically, how is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.) _____

5. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided, or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate. _____

6. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.) _____

CURRENT
ADDRESS

Organization

Name

E-mail Name

Street or P.O. Box No.

City, State, Zip Code

7. If indicating a Change of Address or Address Correction, please provide the Current or Correct address above and the Old or Incorrect address below.

OLD
ADDRESS

Organization

Name

Street or P.O. Box No.

City, State, Zip Code

(Remove this sheet, fold as indicated, tape closed, and mail.)
(DO NOT STAPLE)