

Contract No:


This document was prepared in conjunction with work accomplished under Contract No. DE-AC09-08SR22470 with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Environmental Management (EM).

Disclaimer:

This work was prepared under an agreement with and funded by the U.S. Government. Neither the U. S. Government or its employees, nor any of its contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any express or implied:

- 1) warranty or assumes any legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, or for the use or results of such use of any information, product, or process disclosed; or
- 2) representation that such use or results of such use would not infringe privately owned rights; or
- 3) endorsement or recommendation of any specifically identified commercial product, process, or service.

Any views and opinions of authors expressed in this work do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, or its contractors, or subcontractors.



Fabrication of Enhanced Pinch Weld Electrodes

Paul Korinko¹, Anthony McWilliams¹, Dale Hitchcock, & Kevin Faraone²

¹ Savannah River National Laboratory, ² Kansas City National Security Campus, Honeywell

Date (09/2018)

SRNL-STI-2018-00493



DISCLAIMER

This work was prepared under an agreement with and funded by the U.S. Government. Neither the U.S. Government or its employees, nor any of its contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any express or implied:

1. warranty or assumes any legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, or for the use or results of such use of any information, product, or process disclosed; or
2. representation that such use or results of such use would not infringe privately owned rights; or
3. endorsement or recommendation of any specifically identified commercial product, process, or service.

Any views and opinions of authors expressed in this work do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, or its contractors, or subcontractors.

Printed in the United States of America

**Prepared for
U.S. Department of Energy**

Keywords: *Pinch Welding, Electrodes, PDRD, Failure Analysis*

Retention: *Permanent*

Fabrication of Enhanced Pinch Weld Electrodes

Paul Korinko

Anthony McWilliams

Dale Hitchcock

Kevin Faraone

Sept. 2018

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under
contract number DE-AC09-08SR22470.



REVIEWS AND APPROVALS

AUTHORS:

Signature on file

Paul Korinko, Energy Materials Group 9-24-2018

Signature on file

Anthony McWilliams, Materials Applications and Process Technology 9-25-2018

Signature on file

Dale Hitchcock, Energy Materials Group 9-24-2018

Signature on file

Kevin Faraone, Kansas City National Security Campus 9-24-2018

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

Signature on file

Stanley Howard, Materials Evaluation 9-26-2018

APPROVALS:

Signature on file

Brenda Garcia-Diaz, Manager 9-27-2018
Energy Materials Group

Signature on file

Timothy Worrell, PDRD Program Manager 9-25-2018
Savannah River Tritium Enterprise

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the Tony Curtis of the MS&T Met Lab, Matthew van Swol, formerly of the Corrosion Group, Mitchell Vogatsky for conducting preliminary resistance testing, Dean Thompson for his assistance in getting pieces silver plated, John McIntosh for support of the pinch welder, and Savannah River Tritium Enterprise for funding the project through the Plant Directed Research and Development (PDRD) program.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Savannah River Site uses brazed copper / tungsten electrodes for a specialized weld referred to as a pinch weld. As part of an internally funded PDRD program, an alternative method to produce the pinch weld electrodes was sought to improve quality and to reduce the manufacturing steps. Back casting of pinch weld electrodes was selected as such a process. During preliminary testing, deformation of the electrodes was observed. A failure analysis was conducted, and the strength of the electrodes was found to be significantly less than required to enable welding of the tubes. This assessment includes compression testing metallographic analysis. The pinch weld electrodes fabricated by back casting do not meet the requirements with respect to strength. In addition, a minimum strength requirement for conventionally prepared electrodes is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Experimental Procedure.....	4
3.0 Results and Discussion	9
4.0 Conclusions.....	14
5.0 Recommendations, Path Forward, or Future Work	14
6.0 References.....	15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1 Dimensions (mm) of critical diameters, before and after ‘ (Fig. 2-7), for the PWE as shown in Fig. 3-6 with yield load (N) and strengths shown.....	14
---	----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1 Figure Schematic of the welding process showing the tubing and process evolution, a) tube is placed in the fixturing, b) force is applied to crush the tubing, c) current is initiated to heat the tubing while the force continues to crush the tube, d) faying surfaces heat and diffusion bonding occurs across the interface, e) continued current and deformation results in more extrusion, diffusion, and grain growth, f) current flow is terminated, welds cools, and electrodes are retracted.	1
Figure 1-2 Condition of electrodes that failed quality inspection a) PWE after torque testing, one sample failed, b) close-up of failed brazed sample after torque testing with failure at the braze joint, c) close-up of failed brazed sample after torque testing with failure at the braze joint and into the W insert d) samples that failed the die penetrant non-destructive test.	3
Figure 1-3 Comparison of the a) current PWE processing state vice b) the proposed processing state.	4
Figure 2-1. Configuration for Ohmmeter testing left side showing (a) electrode, (b) thin spacer (c) thick spacer (d) Delrin support (e) Ohmmeter (f) current & voltage wiring (g) electrode connector.	5
Figure 2-2 Updated resistance test station that improved the contact points to make the system work like a four-point resistance probe.	5
Figure 2-3 Pinch weld X-ray radiographs showing short bonds with sharp root radii for both conventional and EPWE at 300V and longer bonds with a small amount of extrusion for the conventional and EPWE at 400V.....	6
Figure 2-4 All of the pinch weld electrodes at the force and voltage used typically for Type 304L stainless steel tubing produced similar closure length welds.	7
Figure 2-5 Typical pinch welds a) cold ~ 300V b) nominal ~340 V and c) hot welding ~400V at all 1250 lbs force.	7
Figure 2-6 Fixtures showing the compression testing of a BCPWE.....	8
Figure 2-7 Location of diameters of interest for the PWE and reported in Table 3-1.	8
Figure 3-1 Figure Data showing that defects could be detected, but the separation between good and bad is small.....	9
Figure 3-2 Photo of the a) Back cast slug b) conventional PWE c) machined electrodes BC short W d) BC long W, e) radiograph showing short W and f) long W machined PWE.	10
Figure 3-3 (a) Damaged BCPWE after making about 50 pinch welds, note the apparent axial crack in the reduced section and the bending of the PWE. Higher magnification images of damaged BCPWEs b) showing the barreling in the reduced section and c) apparent deformation slip lines and barreling... ..	11

Figure 3-4 Metallographic cross sections of BCPWE and CPWE, a) BCPWE showing a single grain boundary, b) CPWE showing fine grains at low magnification and c) same view as “b” but at higher magnification.	12
Figure 3-5 Macroetched BC slug showing a) the W insert and three grains and b) the opposite side showing two to three grains.	12
Figure 3-6 Compression results for a typical PWE in the BCPWE SW, BCPWE LW, and CPWE.	13

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SRNL	Savannah River National Laboratory
PWE	Pinch Weld Electrodes
PW	Pinch Weld
SRTE	Savannah River Tritium Enterprise
Hz	Hertz
N	Newtons
A	Amperes
BCPWE	Back Cast Pinch Weld Electrode
CPWE	Conventional Pinch Weld Electrode
V	Voltage

1.0 Introduction

Savannah River Site uses pinch welds, a very specific type of resistance spot weld, to seal hydrogen gas containers. Pinch welding in Type 304L stainless steel is performed by applying a force of nominally 1250 lbs (5560 N) to 0.125" (3.17 mm) Type 304L stainless steel (SS) with a 0.035" (0.89 mm) wall. The force crushes the tubing and brings the surfaces nearly into contact, a schematic of the weld process is shown in Figure 1-1. A current between 3000 – 4000 Amperes is applied for a total of 12 60 Hz cycles (0.2 seconds). The weld is then formed by dynamic recrystallization and solid-state diffusion across the faying surfaces (1,2). This welding process has been successfully used for this application for nearly 60 years with no field failures (3).




Figure 1-1 Figure Schematic of the welding process showing the tubing and process evolution, a) tube is placed in the fixturing, b) force is applied to crush the tubing, c) current is initiated to heat the tubing while the force continues to crush the tube, d) faying surfaces heat and diffusion bonding occurs across the interface, e) continued current and deformation results in more extrusion, diffusion, and grain growth, f) current flow is terminated, welds cool, and electrodes are retracted.

A number of pinch welding studies have been conducted to better understand the limits of the process and other effects. For instance, studies have been completed to characterize the effects of control systems (4), stem machine oil (5,6), internal bore scratches (7), internal brushing (8) and weld atmosphere on the bond quality and interfacial contamination (9). The use of constant current vs constant voltage did not reveal any significant difference in appearance of the weld interface, using standard optical metallographic sample analysis methods (4). The stem supplier needed to change vendors for their cutting fluid and due to the high reliability required for the stems, a series of test welds were prepared. Using the established nominal weld conditions, this study indicated that the stems would weld acceptably (5,6). The stems are also inspected using a borescope, the borescope leaves shallow scratch like linear indications in the tube, these periodically seem to have a “visual” depth and are subsequently rejected. While the presence of an actual scratch may result in an undesirable stress riser and be a valid cause for rejection; there was an interest in determining if measurably deep scratches would cause welds to leak. Scratches with depths of 25 μm were created and successfully welded. The deep scratch was evident in the flow lines of the weld, but it had been completely filled with metal and held the requisite pressure. This scratch was significantly worse than what is observed in production and shows the robustness of the process (7). Occasionally, the stem supplier observes surface related defects or debris in the stems. This debris is unacceptable so a rework procedure to remove it entails running a rotating stainless-steel brush through the ID. The effect of this treatment on the weld quality was shown to be somewhat detrimental to the weld interface with the deposits being observed at the weld interface, but the welds held the minimum required pressure (8). The weld atmosphere has also been investigated by flowing either air or nitrogen at 15 psig through the tubes during welding. The concern was that the air in the tube would be sufficient to cause the weld interface to form visible oxides upon inspection; there was an assumption that the level of oxidation between welding in an inert (N_2) environment vice the oxidizing environment could be the difference between continuous or discontinuous oxides. The difference between the atmospheres was not sufficient to be detected using optical microscopy (9).

All the efforts described above demonstrate that properly prepared stems, using the nominal conditions, and good practices for cleanliness lead to acceptable welds. Furthermore, the process is generally robust enough for the weld quality to be inferred as a function of the weld conditions (10). However, there can be challenges in the tube and process preparation steps. For instance, the preparation of the pinch weld electrodes can result in unacceptable electrodes being produced, such as those shown in Figure 1-2. These electrodes were not prepared per the drawing due to poor manufacturing processes; Fig 1-2a shows a pinch weld electrode (PWE) where there is a center hole; the center point is not permissible per the drawing. Figure 1-2b shows an incorrect braze alloy being used; the vendor selected a “better” braze without consulting the customer. Fig. 1-2c shows improper cleaning prior to brazing with associated braze skips. Fig. 1-2d shows a properly prepared PWE after torsion testing indicating that the PWE can accommodate much shear. Due to the failures in manufacturing, a new method of preparing PWE was sought that requires fewer steps than those required for the conventional PWE fabrication. A comparison of the approaches is shown in Fig. 1-3. Savannah River National Laboratory teamed with the Kansas City National Security Campus to evaluate the use of back casting for PWE fabrication.

This project was intended to develop an alternative source to produce PWE, develop additional non-destructive testing methodologies, in particular a resistance test, compare the weld characteristics of CPWE to BCPWE, compare the functionality of the PWE using the nominal welding conditions used for Type 304L SS and conduct metallographic sample analysis. As the task unfolded, damage to the PWE was detected. This paper describes how the PWE were

evaluated and additional steps taken to validate why the back cast PWE (BCPWE) had inferior performance.



Figure 1-2 Condition of electrodes that failed quality inspection a) PWE after torque testing, one sample failed, b) close-up of failed brazed sample after torque testing with failure at the braze joint, c) close-up of failed brazed sample after torque testing with failure at the braze joint and into the W insert d) samples that failed the die penetrant non-destructive test.




Figure 1-3 Comparison of the a) current PWE processing state vice b) the proposed processing state.

2.0 Experimental Procedure

Resistance Testing

Resistance testing was conducted using two different systems with variable connectors, power supplies, and instruments. The initial testing was conducted on the instrumentation shown in Figure 2-1. This high resolution volt meter was used with the copper connectors with the system configured to provide what was intended to be a four point contact system. The testing did not prove successful so a second four point contact system was prepared by three-dimensionally printing a case and adding spring loaded contact pins, Figure 2-2. A high resolution volt meter and a high resolution power supply were used to read and energize the electrodes to determine the resistance.




Figure 2-1. Configuration for Ohmmeter testing left side showing (a) electrode, (b) thin spacer (c) thick spacer (d) Delrin support (e) Ohmmeter (f) current & voltage wiring (g) electrode connector.




Figure 2-2 Updated resistance test station that improved the contact points to make the system work like a four-point resistance probe.

Pinch Welds

A series of test welds were prepared using voltages from 300 to 400V and forces from 1100 to 1300 lbs. The welds were made on standard Type 304L and 316L SS tubing; X-ray radiographs are shown in Figure 2-3 with the low voltage welds exhibiting sharp root radii and no extrusion while the higher voltage welds exhibiting the expected extrusion but no expulsions. The weld closure lengths were consistent across the applied voltages and weld forces as shown in Figure 2-4. The typical weld microstructures at the range of currents for the three different electrode types, Short W BCPWE, Long W BCPWE, and CPWE, are shown in Figure 2-5.

As the welds were prepared, there was no indication that anything untoward was occurring, the weld heats were consistent and no significant bending was observed in the tubing. However, when the electrodes were removed so conventional PWE could be tested, it was observed that the PWE were deformed. The BCPWE exhibited barreling and there were apparent slip bands on the

reduced diameter. Subsequent testing indicated that the BCPWE deformed during the first weld cycle but did not sufficiently change dimensions to cause weld failures, or indications of weld failures. Due to the observed damage to the electrodes, additional welding with this set of electrodes was not continued and a lifetime weld determination test was conducted where the electrodes were examined immediately after the first weld. It was observed that damage occurred after the first loading, consequently all testing was halted on the BCPWE and a failure investigation into the first set of BCPWE was conducted.

The BCPWE were macroetched, sectioned and examined metallographically and compared to conventionally fabricated PWE. Based on the metallurgical and pinch weld testing, compression testing of the PWE was undertaken as well. Compression testing was conducted on a MTS load frame with a compression platen, in displacement control, using a 10,000-pound loadcell, Figure 2-6. Electrodes were placed so they were vertical and various fixturing devices were used to determine the strength of several areas of the electrode, as shown in Figure 2-7.




Figure 2-3 Pinch weld X-ray radiographs showing short bonds with sharp root radii for both conventional and EPWE at 300V and longer bonds with a small amount of extrusion for the conventional and EPWE at 400V.




Figure 2-4 All of the pinch weld electrodes at the force and voltage used typically for Type 304L stainless steel tubing produced similar closure length welds.




Figure 2-5 Typical pinch welds a) cold ~ 300V b) nominal ~340 V and c) hot welding ~400V at all 1250 lbs force.



Figure 2-6 Fixtures showing the compression testing of a BCPWE.




Figure 2-7 Location of diameters of interest for the PWE and reported in Table 3-1.

3.0 Results and Discussion

The results for the resistance testing of the PWE are shown in Figure 3-1. The resistance between all of electrodes is only a few microvolts, but the scatter for the good electrodes is fairly large as well with well bonded PWE bracketing the range. Bad PWE could be determined using the relatively small sample size that was available, but the reliability was not adequate.




Figure 3-1 Figure Data showing that defects could be detected, but the separation between good and bad is small.

Pinch Weld Electrode Investigation

Macrographs of the BCPWE blanks are shown in Figure 3-2. The blanks are cylinders, approximately 80 mm long and 30 mm in diameter. There are two lengths of tungsten inserts, a short 12 mm and a 50 mm. The 12 mm W is consistent with conventionally produced PWE (CPWE) and is the primary subject of this study. The X-rays, Figure 3-2e & f, indicate the different lengths of the W inserts, with the long W insert ending right at the hole that is drilled through the electrodes to accommodate the banana clip for voltage measurement. In the as machined condition, it is challenging to see the differences between the short W BCPWE and CPWE. A close examination of the W to Cu interface will show the thin braze line, whereas the long W electrodes are obviously different.




Figure 3-2 Photo of the a) Back cast slug b) conventional PWE c) machined electrodes BC short W d) BC long W, e) radiograph showing short W and f) long W machined PWE.

The post weld condition of a single BCPWE is shown in Figure 3-3. The BCPWE exhibit deformation bands on the reduced section of the barrel, some obvious bending, cracking, and some increase in diameter (barreling). Higher magnification images are shown in Figure 3-3 b and c showing evidence of slip bands on the small diameter. A subsequent test indicated that the damage occurred during the first load cycle, which is logical if the compressive yield strength of the material has been exceeded. It was only due to processing multiple welds without inspection that suggested that the BCPWE life was greater than 1.

One failed PWE was sectioned axially, mounted, polished, etched and examined. Contrary to expectation, no grains or other features were observed, except a single grain boundary, as shown in Figure 3-4a. The wrought microstructure of the CPWE is also shown, Figures 3-4b and 3-4c, for comparison. The lack of evident structure was confusing since the expectation was to find multiple grains. Consequently, the BC blanks were macro etched. After this treatment, it was noted that the BC blanks were directionally solidified and had few grains; an unexpected result, shown in Figure 3-5.




Figure 3-3 (a) Damaged BCPWE after making about 50 pinch welds, note the apparent axial crack in the reduced section and the bending of the PWE. Higher magnification images of damaged BCPWEs b) showing the barreling in the reduced section and c) apparent deformation slip lines and barreling.

A comparison of the compression properties of the BCPWE and CPWE was conducted using an MTS Criterion screw driven uniaxial test machine. The samples were supported vertically

between the compression platens and a compressive load was applied while monitoring in the crosshead displacement and the load. The various diameters of interest were measured and compressive yield values were determined. The configuration of a sample being tested is shown in Figure 2-6.




Figure 3-4 Metallographic cross sections of BCPWE and CPWE, a) BCPWE showing a single grain boundary, b) CPWE showing fine grains at low magnification and c) same view as “b” but at higher magnification.




Figure 3-5 Macroetched BC slug showing a) the W insert and three grains and b) the opposite side showing two to three grains.

The load-displacement curves for selected short W BCPWE, long W BCPWE, and two different lots of CPWE are shown in Figure 3-6. It is interesting to note the different properties within the short W BCPWE. There are different load-displacement behaviors for the materials. It is interesting to note that there were no significant differences in the starting dimensions of the samples. The diameter changes for each sample are listed in Table 3-1 along with the nominal load at deformation, which is also reported as a yield strength. The yield strength is based on the diameter that exhibited deformation at the end of the test. For instance, the BC PWE with short tungsten deformed at diameter “A” while the CPWE and BCPWE with long W at diameter “C”; the locations of “A”, “B”, and “C” are indicated in Figure 2-7. The yield strength of several conventional wrought alloys are presented for comparison. The comparison reveals that the BCPWE are weaker than all but fully annealed copper. The value reported as nominal is the minimum strength required to prevent yielding at normal loads of 1250 pounds.




Figure 3-6 Compression results for a typical PWE in the BCPWE SW, BCPWE LW, and CPWE.

Table 3-1 Dimensions (mm) of critical diameters, before and after ‘ (Fig. 2-7), for the PWE as shown in Fig. 3-6 with yield load (N) and strengths shown.

Sample	Type	A	B	C	A'	B'	C'	Py	YS
005	PBC SW	10.1	15.7		10.4	15.7		1540	19.3
021	PBC SW	10.1	15.7		10.6	15.7		3660	45.7
043	PBD LW	10.0	15.7	9.5	10.1	15.7	9.8	3520	45.1
034	PBC LW	10.1	15.7	9.5	10.1	15.7	9.8	3713	46.4
055	PBC LW	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6450	NA
008 XH	CPWE	10.1	15.7	9.5	10.2	15.7	9.6	6300	78.1
CLP	CPWE	10.1	15.7	9.5	10.3	15.7	9.5	13570	169.1

4.0 Conclusions

The resistance test method developed to interrogate the bond quality of the pinch welds did not have sufficient resolution to be applied universally across the population of PWE. It worked to differentiate poorly bonded samples within a series of PWE, but there were too many sub-populations to be applied.

All of the PWE used in this study produced acceptable pinch welds, but the electrodes lacked strength and the BCPWE failed the testing protocol. The BCPWE were prepared in such a manner as to produce a directionally solidified structure. The strength of the copper substrate needs to be considered when preparing PWE.

5.0 Recommendations, Path Forward, or Future Work

The minimum yield strength of pinch weld electrodes to avoid yielding at the typical maximum load of 7562 N, is 106 N/mm². Prudent engineering suggests that the actual yield strength be at least 1.5* YS, so 150 N/mm² is suggested.

6.0 References

1. WSRC-RP-2005-01762, Pinch Weld Evolution, P.S. Korinko, W.L. West, September 2005
2. WSRC-TR-2001-00256, "Determination of the Parametric Weld Window for Confined Pinch Welds in Forged Type 304L Stainless Steel (U)", P. S. Korinko and G. J. McKinney, May 31, 2001, WSRC
3. WSRC-MS-2000-000061, "Development of Resistance Welding Methods for Tritium Containment", Proceedings of the Symposium, 50 years of Excellence in Science and Engineering at the Savannah River Site, pp. 201-206, May 17, 2000.
4. WSRC-TR-2005-00434, Effect of Constant Current on Pinch Welds, P.S. Korinko, and S.R. Howard, September 2005.
5. WSRC-STI-2008-00098, Fill Stem Manufacturing Changes and Pinch Weld Qualifications, Paul S Korinko and David N Maxwell, Feb 21, 2008
6. WSRC-STI-2008-00041, Pinch Weld Testing to Support Change in Manufacturing Oil at the KCP, PS Korinko and DN Maxwell, Feb 21, 2008
7. WSRC-TR-2005-00435, Effect of Scratches on Pinch Weld Quality, P.S. Korinko, September 2005. (11-10-05)
8. WSRC-TR-2005-00436, Effect of Brushing on Pinch Weld Quality, P.S. Korinko, September 2005. (12-15-05)
9. WSRC-TR-2005-00433, Effect of Atmosphere on Pinch Weld Quality, P.S. Korinko, Sept. 2005
10. LA-UR05-6057, In-Process Monitoring of Pinch Welding: An Investigation into a Bond Quality Metric, D. A Hartman, P.S. Korinko, N.R. Tolk, S.H. Malene, M.G. Smith, M.J. Cola, V.R. Dave', J.P. Miller, W.H. King, 7th International Conference on Trends in Welding Research, May 16-20, 2005 -- Pine Mountain, Georgia, USA
11. WSRC-MS-2001-00672, "Characterization of Confined Pinch Welds in Type 304L Stainless Steel", P. S. Korinko*, M. J. Pechersky*, D. L. Zecha*, G. J. McKinney*, L. Reister**, P. Blau**, E. Lara-Curzio**, * Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC., **Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge TN, "6th International Conference on Trends in Welding Research * 15-19, April 2002 *Callaway Gardens Resort, Pine Mountain, Georgia USA", ASM International
12. SRNL-STI-2018-00297, Failure Analysis of Pinch Weld Electrodes, Paul Korinko, Anthony McWilliams, Matthew Van Swol, & Kevin Faraone, published in Failure Analysis and Prevention, July 2018.

Distribution:

Records Administration (EDWS)

Kristine Ziegler

Brenda Garcia-Diaz

Dale Hitchcock

Anthony McWilliams

David Maxwell

Timothy Krentz

Timothy Worrell

Bill West

Jacob Schaufler

Summer Schaufler

Colin Ferguson

Paul Korinko

Kevin Faraone