

~~SECRET~~

This document consists of 7 pages.

No. 104 of 122 copies, Series TA

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

MIT-2018

PROGRESS REPORT FOR JANUARY 1954

January 27, 1954

Metallurgical Project
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts



Technical Information Service, Oak Ridge, Tennessee

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~

This document contains restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Its transmission or disclosure of its contents in any manner to any unauthorized person is prohibited.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Work performed under Contract No. AT(30-1)-981.
Previous report in this series: MIT-2017.

M. I. T. METALLURGICAL PROJECT
A. R. Kaufmann, Director
T. T. Magel, Assistant to Director

This report has been reproduced with minimum alteration directly from manuscript provided the Technical Information Service in an effort to expedite availability of the information contained herein.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

AEC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REPORT

MIT-2018(2)
Progress Report

Photostat Charge \$ 0.85 for
Access Permitees

Available from
Technical Information Service
P. O. Box 1001, Oak Ridge, Tennessee

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW

1st review date <u>5/23/70</u>	Determination (circle numbers)
Authority <u>DC</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>DD</u>	1 Classification retained
Name <u>David Bellis</u>	2 Classification changed to
Title <u>Classification Officer</u>	3 Contains no DOE classified info
2nd review date <u>5-23-11</u>	4 Coordinate with
Authority <u>DD</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 Classification cancelled
Name <u>Paul Krenzel</u>	6 Classified info bracketed
Title <u>OSTI Class Consult</u>	7 Other (specify)
Derived from <u>G-NMP-2</u>	DOE OC Issue date <u>9-2000</u>

M. I. T. METALLURGICAL PROJECT

This document is
PUBLICLY RELEASABLE

H. Kruiser
Authorizing Official
Date: 5/23/11

Progress (P) Report
for
January, 1954

This report was prepared as a scientific account of Government-sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission makes any warranty or representation, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights. The Commission assumes no liability with respect to the use of, or from damages resulting from the use of, any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~
This report contains restricted information as defined in Executive Order 12958. Its transmittal outside of its contents in any form is prohibited.
[Redacted]

Issued: January 27, 1954

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Contract AT(30-1)-981

A. R. Kaufmann, Director
T. T. Magel, Assistant to Director 34

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Standard Distribution

Figure 2

TABLE I

Year	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
...

...

...

A. Research

1. Beryllium Metallurgy^C

1.1 Beryllium Reduction and Purification

1.16 Analytical Methods: Routine analyses continue.

1.2 Beryllium Melting and Casting: No work.

1.3 Beryllium Fabrication

1.311-1 Extrusion of Jacketed Beryllium: Thirty-six small rods of beryllium were extruded.

1.311-4 Extrusion and Drawing of Beryllium Tubing: No work.

1.4 Physical Metallurgy of Beryllium

1.41-5A Tensile Properties of Sized and Extruded Beryllium Powders: Testing of the rolled-extruded stock continues and elongations of 30-40 percent in two directions continue to be observed.

Preliminary investigation by the Norton rod (x-ray) method showed no differences in the amount of [001] fibre texture in rods extruded to 28:1, 38:1, and 45:1. The amount of preferred orientation apparently changes little, if any, with reduction ratio in this range.

1.43-3 Annealing Behavior of Deformed Cast Beryllium: Work on this program has been held up because of work on the SRO problem.

2. Uranium Metallurgy

2.2-1 Extrusion Cladding of Uranium: An alloy of uranium with 0.5 wt.% zirconium appears to be more stable in thermal cycling than the 2% alloy. The study of the effect of cladding (Zr) on the thermal cycling behavior of uranium continues.

Uranium and zirconium billets are being machined for assembly into a composite billet for extrusion. The special shapes found so promising in eliminating the end effects with brass-copper extrusions are being tested with uranium clad with zirconium.

Some 1.6 at.% silicon in uranium alloy has been tested in the thermal cycling apparatus and appears rather stable—0.5% per 100 cycles.

2.8 Cooling of Uranium with Liquid Metals: Work on casting U-Cr eutectic around a 2" diameter bundle of bare Globe iron tubes, cooled internally with flowing Pb-Bi, is being discontinued. Either it was not possible to fill the cavity with eutectic or the latter alloyed excessively with the iron causing rupture of the tubes and intermixing of eutectic and coolant.

Handwritten mark

Templates are ready for assembling a 6" hexagonal section of tubes (1027 tubes), around which tubes U-Cr will be cast.

The heat transfer apparatus has been set up for a final run to test how long zirconium tubing will resist attack by U-Cr eutectic at some temperature slightly above 850°C.

Steel dies have been used successfully for "stamping" fine detailed slots and ridges into hot (just below the melting point) U-Cr eutectic.

2.10 Other Uranium Work: Dilatometric studies on U-Zr alloys continue. Work on U-Si (epsilon) temporarily suspended.

3. Thorium Metallurgy

No work.

4. Zirconium Metallurgy

4.1 Zirconium Reduction and Purification

4.17 Analytical Techniques: Work continues on a new method for determining Hf/Hf + Zr in amounts from 1 - 100%.

4.18 Preparation of Zirconium with Known Contaminants: Controlled additions of oxygen have been added to zirconium for the study of heat treatment versus corrosion resistance.

4.2 Melting of zirconium: No work.

4.3 Fabrication of Zirconium: No work.

4.4 Physical Metallurgy of Zirconium

4.45 Alloys of Zirconium with Uranium, Thorium, etc.: The determination of the solidus in the U-Zr system is continuing. Additional zirconium alloys between 75 and 96 wt.% uranium are being studied dilatometrically.

5. Corrosion Studies

5.1 Pure and Contaminated Zirconium in 600°F water: Nothing new to report.

5.10 Corrosion in 750°F Steam: Data is being accumulated to show the relative effects of temperature and pressure in steam corrosion testing.

5.12 Corrosion at Other Temperatures: 680°F water. Interesting data is being obtained on the effect of annealing previously quenched (from between 800°-900°C) zirconium and Zircaloy II. The effects of small additions of iron and nickel on corrosion resistance of quenched zirconium are being observed. Nickel appears more effective than iron in preventing corrosion in this series of experiments.

22

1111

4

5.5 Corrosion Properties of Aluminum-15% Uranium Alloys: After 28 days in boiling water, extruded aluminum specimens with imbedded graphite particles showed no pitting corrosion. Extruded aluminum with no apparent imbedded graphite particles and as-received aluminum showed about the same corrosion: wt. gain after 28 day, 13 mg/dm².

6. Aluminum Alloy Development

6.3 Aluminum Alloys for Hanford

6.3-3 Creep Testing of aluminum alloys for Hanford: Creep tests continuing.

6.4 Aluminum-Uranium Alloys for Savannah River

6.41 Production of Aluminum-Uranium Alloy Castings for SRO: Work is directed at refinement of techniques and at supplying billets and jackets for extrusion into clad tubing. This program appears to be moving smoothly.

6.42 Evaluation of Al-U alloy castings for SRO: A bar cut from a large casting has been examined in detail for homogeneity by means of macroetching, hardness surveys, microstructure, density measurements, and chemical analyses. Hardness versus cold work data has been obtained for a melt cast with 2S aluminum and for a melt cast with 99.9% purity aluminum. Microhardness data has been obtained on a specimen taken from a small, clad extruded tube.

A series of small melts ranging from 7.5 to 20 wt.% uranium has been prepared. Radiographs have been made and the ingots are being sectioned for density, chemical analysis and microspecimens. The possibility of correlation between density and chemical analysis is being examined in detail.

6.5 Extrusion of Al-U Alloy Sandwich Tubing for SRO: During extrusion of either aluminum or uranium-aluminum alloys, seizure of aluminum into the cones and dies, etc., causes a poor finish to result. Cones of many different materials have been tried including magnesium, copper, cast iron, graphite, and wood. (The wood cones burned away during the extrusion.) Graphite appears most promising.

The effect of temperature of tools on the surface is being examined. Heated soft steel cones gave poor results while one extrusion with graphite cones was successful. Two attempts to repeat the latter were not successful.

Several drawing lubricants have been tried on 3" diameter aluminum tubing but with no outstanding success.

Several types of magnesium alloys have been obtained from which canning tubing will be fabricated for jacketing the Al-U alloy sandwich billets for extrusion. From the recently obtained extrusion constants for magnesium and 2S aluminum, it appears that they have similar extrusion

CONFIDENTIAL

properties between 600° to 1000° F. Magnesium may not be the best jacketing material but in tests to date it has shown most promise in maintaining a good underlying surface of aluminum.

Work continues on attempting to eliminate the "dog bone" effect at the end section of the fuel alloy on the extruded sandwich tubing. It is contemplated to test a plug of 7 wt.% Si-Al alloy (which extrudes similarly to the U-Al alloy "meat") placed in the composite billet before extrusion which should cut off or prevent the "dog bone" effect.

Two-inch diameter 2S aluminum billets have been extruded with a 0.012" silver plate jacket. These extrusions were successful inasmuch as the underlying aluminum was smooth and the silver cladding completely covered the entire extruded shape. A 6" diameter billet will next be silver plated and extruded.

7. Ceramics

Routine crucible fabrication continues.

CONFIDENTIAL

[Handwritten signature]

SECRET

MIT-2018

7

METALLURGY AND CERAMICS

MIT-2018
Series TA
Copy No.

Standard Distribution

AF Plant Representative, Wood-Ridge	1
Argonne National Laboratory	2- 9
Atomic Energy Commission, Washington	10- 14
Battelle Memorial Institute	15
Brookhaven National Laboratory	16- 18
Brush Beryllium Company	19
Bureau of Mines, Albany	20
Bureau of Ships	21
California Research and Development Company	22- 23
Carbide and Carbon Chemicals Company (K-25 Plant)	24- 25
Carbide and Carbon Chemicals Company (ORNL)	26- 31
Carbide and Carbon Chemicals Company (Y-12 Plant)	32- 35
Chicago Patent Group	36
Commonwealth Edison Company	37
Detroit Edison Company	38
Dow Chemical Company (Rocky Flats)	39
duPont Company, Augusta	40- 43
duPont Company, Wilmington	44
Foster Wheeler Corporation	45
General Electric Company (ANPP)	46- 48
General Electric Company, Richland	49- 56
Hanford Operations Office	57
Iowa State College	58
Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory	59- 62
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory	63- 65
Mallinckrodt Chemical Works	66
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Kaufmann)	67
Materials Laboratory (WADC)	68
Monsanto Chemical Company	69
Mound Laboratory	70
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Cleveland	71
National Bureau of Standards	72
National Lead Company of Ohio	73
Naval Research Laboratory	74
New Brunswick Laboratory	75
New York Operations Office	76- 80
North American Aviation, Inc.	81- 83
Nuclear Development Associates, Inc.	84
Patent Branch, Washington	85
Phillips Petroleum Company	86- 89
Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division (Fox Project)	90- 91
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.	92
University of California Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley	93- 96
University of California Radiation Laboratory, Livermore	97- 98
Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Inc.	99
Westinghouse Electric Corporation	100-103
Technical Information	104-122

SECRET

SECRET

SECRET