

# Use of Thermal Spray as an Aerospace Chrome Plating Alternative



Courtesy U.S. Navy. Photo by Ensign John Gay

**Report to:  
William Green  
Geo-Centers**

**Rowan Project #: 3105JSF3**

**Contract Number: N00173-98-D-2006, D.O. 0002  
Subcontract Number: GC-3363-99-004  
P.O. Number: 28578MK**

**Report Number: Final**

**Date: October 27, 2000**

**Authors: Keith Legg (<mailto:klegg@rowantechnology.com>)  
(Rowan Technology Group, Principal Investigator)**

**John Sauer  
(Sauer Engineering)**

**UNCLASSIFIED NON-PROPRIETARY - Distribution Statement A**



**ROWAN TECHNOLOGY GROUP**

1590 S. Milwaukee Ave., Suite 205, Libertyville, IL 60048, U.S.A • 847-680-9420 • Fax: 847-680-9682  
Email: [rowan@rowantechnology.com](mailto:rowan@rowantechnology.com) • [www.rowantechnology.com](http://www.rowantechnology.com)

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Thermal spray coatings have been used for many years in aircraft turbine engines as wear and erosion resistant coatings, thermal barriers, and clearance control coatings. As increasing environmental and safety issues have driven a search for chrome plating alternatives, engineers have found that thermal spray coating, long used for gas turbine engines, can be a very cost-effective alternative to hard chrome plating. Although the initial driver for the substitution of thermal spray coatings for chrome was environmental, the alternatives are now being widely adopted because of their better performance, higher reliability, and lower life-cycle cost.

This document summarizes the current state-of-the-art, property and performance data, and usage of thermal spray coatings as replacements for hard chrome plating on aerospace components. The information covers the use of hard chrome for both original equipment and for overhaul and repair. Its purpose is to provide in one place a summary of information on thermal spray coatings that will be useful for engineers engaged in the design and maintenance of aircraft components.

This document is designed as an electronic book, with links to guide the user directly to information of interest. The document itself contains data summaries and examples, with a large number of underlying full-text references (available at the click of a mouse) to provide as much detail as possible. The information is current as of August 2000, but the document is intended to be readily revised and updated as more information is generated. After a brief introduction, the document is broken into four parts:

**[Part 1. Aerospace Usage of Chrome](#)** – An overview of the types of components and applications in which hard chrome is currently used in the aircraft industry, and the requirements for chrome replacement.

**[Part 2 Overview of Thermal Spray](#)** – Types and principles of thermal spray, especially High Velocity Oxy-Fuel (HVOF) and Plasma Spray – the two primary chrome replacement technologies. This Part includes thermal spray equipment and powders, thermal spray producibility and quality control, stripping, and finishing.

**[Part 3. Thermal Spray Data](#)** – Summary of current data on structure, properties, and performance of thermal spray coatings – hardness, adhesion, embrittlement, corrosion, fatigue, wear, hydraulic rig testing, landing gear rig testing, and flight testing. The text contains data summaries and graphs, with the underlying data accessible via full-text documents.

**[Part 4. Specifications and Qualified Components](#)** – Summary of thermal spray specifications, and of thermal spray-qualified applications and components.

In summary, the data shows that in all critical respects HVOF coatings perform as well as (and in most cases better than) hard chrome. This is certainly true in critical areas, including hardness, wear, fatigue, corrosion, hydraulic testing, and extended flight testing. HVOF can be applied to almost any material without causing hydrogen embrittlement, and in many cases the fatigue debit can be completely eliminated. **As a result HVOF coatings (primarily tungsten carbide cermets) are now specified on more than a hundred components on Boeing aircraft, and are used extensively for overhaul and repair of landing gear cylinders and axles, and flap and slat tracks.** The new Boeing 767-400 is specified for HVOF-coated or chrome plated landing gear, whichever customers request. Parker-Hannifin is eliminating chrome plate, and using thermal spray coatings on all new aerospace hydraulic actuator designs. Airlines such as Delta, Lufthansa, and United are all qualifying HVOF for landing gear overhaul. There are several standard and widely used aerospace specifications for thermal spray processes and for the powder materials they employ. However, thermal spray is not a simple drop-in replacement for chrome plate. As a dry spraying process rather than an electroplate it fits differently into the OEM production and overhaul sequence. Although it can be done in-house, and is in fact available at most repair shops and DoD depots, OEMs frequently contract it out. Furthermore, HVOF coatings, the most common chrome alternative, cannot be used on internal diameters, although plasma spray can be used on diameters down to about 2". Thermal spray cannot be used to replace thin dense or flash chrome, since it cannot be made thin enough.

The process lends itself to a large number of different coating materials and a wide range of deposition conditions. This makes it highly flexible but more complex to use. Therefore the specifications for a thermal spray coating must be properly defined, and the process optimized to fit both the material being processed and the coating material being applied. For example:

- Since it utilizes a torch or plasma gun, it is possible to overheat heat-sensitive components, making proper temperature measurement and control an essential part of the process specification.
- The coating material must fit the substrate material. The most common coating material is tungsten carbide, but thermal sprayed hard alloys, such as Tribaloy, give better fatigue performance on aluminum alloys.
- The thermal spray coating must be optimized properly for the application. Some thermal spray coatings have performed poorly because they used the wrong coating material or used a deposition process that was optimized for the wrong application. For example, thermal spray coatings optimized for wear resistance may have as large a fatigue debit as chrome (or even larger). Re-optimizing the coating for fatigue has reduced, or even eliminated, the fatigue debit while still retaining superior resistance to wear.

- The finishing specifications for thermal spray coatings are not necessarily the same as for chrome. Thermal spray coatings must in general be finish-ground or superfinished to a much finer surface than is typical for chrome plate. For example, a 16  $\mu$ inch finish is typically specified for chrome plated hydraulics. Using HVOF coatings with this finish leads to very rapid seal failure. With a 4  $\mu$ inch or better finish, however, both seal life and rod life are greatly extended.

In summary, the thermal spray process is highly recommended and growing as a replacement for hard chrome plate, but it must be used properly, with accurate specifications, a qualified sprayer, and proper account taken for the materials and applications in which it is used.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This compilation would not have been possible without the assistance of a great many people in the aerospace industry. We would therefore like to acknowledge the many people and organizations that have contributed to this document. Funding for the work was provided by the Joint Strike Fighter Program Office, NADEP Jacksonville, poc Jean Hawkins. HCAT information has been provided by the members of the HCAT team, courtesy of Bruce Sartwell, NRL, the team leader. Many documents and other information have been provided by companies such as Boeing, Messier-Dowty, Praxair, Sulzer Metco, Southwest Aeroservice, Metcut Research, and the National Research Council of Canada, among others. Many of the documents have been provided by courtesy of ASM International, Materials Park, OH 44073-0002, other documents by courtesy of Gorham Advanced Materials, Gorham, Maine, and by numerous individual authors as indicated in the text.

# HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This document is designed to be used electronically, so that it can be a living document that can be updated with the latest information as it becomes available. It is extensively hyperlinked to permit the reader to jump immediately to items of interest in the text.

Many items in the text – figures, tables, references, section headings, etc. – are hyperlinked, and can be identified by their [blue text](#). Clicking on the text takes you to the item.

The report is designed to contain the most important information within the text. Details and backup information are provided in the form of attached documents, which can be recognized by the yellow boxes, like the one below. **Clicking** on the icon within the box brings up the document, making all the details readily available.

Later cross-references to these documents are shown in blue, and the Document can be opened by clicking on the blue text.



When you have finished with the Document, just close it to return to the Report. If you need to keep it available you can switch between Document and Report by clicking on the “Window” menu button and choosing which item to view.

These documents were created by Adobe Acrobat™ in .PDF format, and can be read with Acrobat Reader™. Most computers already have this utility installed for browsing the web. If yours does not, it can be obtained free of charge by clicking on the link below, which will take you to the Adobe web site.



**A note on the use of the Acrobat Reader™** - Make sure to open the menu item File/Preferences/General and **uncheck** the box “Open Cross-Doc Links in Same Window”. This will ensure that the Document opens in a separate window from the Report. Also click the button “Show navigation pane” to put the Bookmarks and Thumbnails for navigation at the left edge of the screen.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>How to use this report</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>Index of Tables</b> .....	<b>xv</b>
<b>Index of Figures</b> .....	<b>xix</b>
<b>Table of Documents</b> .....	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>Table of Acronyms</b> .....	<b>xxvi</b>
<b>1.</b> Introduction.....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Documents .....	<b>2</b>
1.2. Recent data on health effects of Cr <sup>6+</sup> .....	<b>2</b>
1.3. Progress in chrome replacement.....	<b>3</b>
<b>Part 1. Aerospace usage of chrome</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.</b> Typical Chrome Plated Components .....	<b>6</b>
2.1. New equipment usage.....	<b>6</b>
2.2. Overhaul and repair usage .....	<b>7</b>
2.3. Landing gear components .....	<b>7</b>
2.4. Hydraulic actuators.....	<b>9</b>
<b>3.</b> Chrome replacement options and requirements .....	<b>10</b>
3.1. Hard chrome replacement criteria.....	<b>11</b>
3.2. Thermal spray for hard chrome replacement .....	<b>13</b>

## **Part 2. Overview of thermal spray .....14**

<b>4.</b>	Principles of thermal spray.....	14
4.1.	Summary.....	14
4.2.	Documents .....	14
4.3.	General .....	15
4.4.	Thermal spray processes .....	16
4.5.	Factors determining coating properties.....	18
4.6.	Applications of common thermal spray coatings .....	19
4.7.	Limitations of thermal spray.....	20
4.7.1.	Line of sight issues.....	21
4.7.2.	Heating issues.....	21
4.7.3.	Coating thickness.....	21
<b>5.</b>	Thermal spray coatings .....	23
5.1.	Summary.....	23
5.2.	Thermal spray materials .....	23
5.2.1.	General .....	23
5.2.2.	Powders frequently used for chrome replacement	26
5.3.	Typical structural properties of thermal spray coatings .....	27
5.4.	Typical applications of thermal spray coatings.....	29
<b>6.</b>	Types of thermal spray processes .....	31
6.1.	Flame spray.....	31
6.2.	Arc spray .....	31
6.3.	Plasma spray.....	32
6.4.	High velocity oxy-fuel (HVOF) spray and detonation gun....	33
<b>7.</b>	Thermal spray producibility .....	34
7.1.	Summary.....	34
7.2.	Documents .....	34
7.3.	Quality Control Of the Thermal Spray Process .....	35
7.3.1.	Choice of powder .....	35
7.3.2.	General .....	35
7.3.3.	Metallography.....	37

7.3.4.	Hardness.....	39
7.3.5.	Tensile/Adhesion.....	40
7.3.6.	Temperature monitoring .....	40
7.3.7.	Monitoring residual stress.....	43
7.4.	Process optimization and control .....	44
7.4.1.	General .....	44
7.4.2.	Example 1 – Optimization of WC-Co .....	46
7.4.3.	Example 2 – Optimization of WC-CoCr .....	48
7.5.	Stripping .....	52
7.5.1.	Documents.....	52
7.5.2.	Stripping of WC-Co .....	53
7.5.2.1.	Southwest Aeroservice.....	53
7.5.2.2.	Sulzer-Metco .....	54
7.5.2.3.	Lufthansa .....	55
7.5.2.4.	Other specifications.....	55
7.5.3.	Stripping of WC-CoCr.....	56
7.5.4.	Stripping of Tribaloy 400 .....	56
7.5.5.	Water-jet stripping .....	57
7.6.	Finishing.....	57
7.6.1.	Documents.....	57
7.6.2.	General requirements.....	57
7.6.3.	Specifying the surface finish.....	58
7.6.4.	Superfinishing .....	61
7.6.5.	Rig test experience.....	63
7.6.6.	Flight experience.....	64
7.7.	Inspection.....	65
<b>8.</b>	Thermal spray equipment .....	66
<b>9.</b>	Thermal spray services.....	67
<b>Part 3.</b>	<b>Thermal Spray Data .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>10.</b>	Coating structure .....	70
10.1.	Summary.....	70

10.2.	Documents .....	70
10.3.	General .....	71
10.4.	Microstructure.....	71
10.4.1.	General Description and Test Methods .....	71
10.4.2.	Microstructural Features .....	73
10.4.2.1.	Porosity/Voids .....	73
10.4.2.1.1.	Comparison of Porosity vs. Particle Velocity .....	73
10.4.2.2.	Matrix/Carbide Phases/Composition.....	74
10.4.2.3.	Transverse Cracks .....	76
10.4.3.	General trend of microstructural features .....	76
10.5.	Phase Determination and Effect.....	76
10.5.1.	General Description and Test Methods .....	76
10.5.2.	Phase Determination and Effect Results.....	77
10.5.2.1.	Carbide Phase Comparison vs. Process Type.....	77
10.5.2.2.	Carbide Degradation Indexing .....	79
10.5.3.	General Trend of Carbide Phase Distribution.....	79
<b>11.</b>	<b>Coating properties .....</b>	<b>81</b>
11.1.	Summary.....	81
11.2.	General Background.....	81
11.3.	Hardness.....	82
11.3.1.	Documents.....	82
11.3.2.	General Description and Test Methods .....	82
11.3.3.	Hardness Results.....	82
11.3.4.	General Trend of Hardness Results .....	85
11.4.	Adhesion .....	85
11.4.1.	Documents.....	85
11.4.2.	General Description and Test Methods .....	85
11.4.3.	Tensile/Adhesion Results.....	86
11.4.4.	General Trend of Tensile Results.....	86
11.5.	Residual Stress .....	86
11.5.1.	Documents.....	86
11.5.2.	General Description and Test Methods .....	87
11.5.3.	Residual Stress Results .....	89
11.5.3.1.	Almen strip .....	89

11.5.3.2.	Almen/Residual Stress Comparison .....	90
11.5.3.3.	Modified Layer Removal Technique .....	93
11.5.3.4.	Residual Stress by X-ray Diffraction .....	95
11.5.3.5.	Residual Stress by Neutron Diffraction .....	96
11.5.4.	General Trend of Residual Stress Results .....	98
<b>12.</b>	<b>Coating performance .....</b>	<b>99</b>
12.1.	Summary .....	99
12.2.	General Background.....	100
12.3.	Documents .....	100
12.4.	Test Protocol Summaries .....	101
12.4.1.	Start-up test Protocol .....	101
12.4.2.	JTP for Landing Gear.....	102
12.4.3.	Other Protocols .....	102
12.5.	Corrosion.....	103
12.5.1.	Documents.....	103
12.5.2.	Corrosion Test Methods.....	104
12.5.2.1.	Atmospheric Methodology .....	104
12.5.2.2.	Simulated Cabinet Testing.....	104
12.5.3.	Corrosion Data.....	108
12.5.3.1.	Simulated Cabinet Results from Lufthansa.....	108
12.5.3.2.	Cabinet and Atmospheric Testing - HCAT .....	111
12.5.3.2.1.	ASTM B117 Salt Fog Testing.....	111
12.5.3.2.2.	GM 9540P/B Testing.....	114
12.5.3.2.3.	Atmospheric Testing .....	114
12.5.3.2.4.	Interpretation of results.....	115
12.5.3.3.	Electrochemical Testing of Carbide Coatings .....	115
12.5.3.3.1.	Interpretation of results.....	117
12.5.3.4.	Corrosion Work Planned in JTP Landing Gear .....	117
12.5.4.	General Trend of Corrosion Results.....	118
12.6.	Fatigue .....	118
12.6.1.	Documents.....	118
12.6.2.	General Description and Test Method.....	119
12.6.3.	Fatigue Results .....	123
12.6.3.1.	Comparison of Hard Chrome vs. HVOF WC-Co and	

T400.....	123
12.6.3.2. Comparison of Hard Chrome vs. HVOF WC-Co for Landing Gear.....	127
12.6.3.3. Comparison of Hard Chrome vs HVOF WC-CoCr .	132
12.6.3.4. Other .....	134
12.6.3.5. Comparative Study of Compressive Stress Effects on Fatigue for HVOF .....	134
12.6.3.5.1. Interpretation of results.....	137
12.6.4. General Trend of Fatigue Results .....	137
12.7. Wear – Erosion, Abrasion, Sliding, Fretting .....	138
12.7.1. Documents.....	138
12.7.2. General Description and Test Methods .....	139
12.7.3. Test Methods .....	141
12.7.3.1. Erosion Testing per ASTM G 76 .....	141
12.7.3.2. Abrasion Testing .....	142
12.7.3.3. Sliding/Fretting Wear Methods .....	142
12.7.4. Wear Results .....	143
12.7.4.1. ASTM G 65 Erosion Testing .....	143
12.7.4.1.1. Interpretation of results.....	145
12.7.4.2. ASTM G 76 Abrasion Testing .....	145
12.7.4.2.1. Interpretation of results.....	147
12.7.4.3. Other Abrasion Tests.....	147
12.7.4.4. Sliding and Fretting Wear Results .....	148
12.7.4.4.1. DARPA program – GEAE/NU.....	148
12.7.4.4.2. JTP for Landing Gear .....	150
12.7.5. General Trend of Wear Results.....	151
12.8. Impact .....	152
12.8.1. General Description and Test Methods .....	152
12.8.2. Impact Test Results .....	152
12.9. Hydrogen Embrittlement.....	153
12.9.1. General Description and Test Methods .....	153
12.9.1.1. Embrittlement Testing:.....	153
12.9.2. Lufthansa embrittlement tests .....	153
12.9.3. Hydrogen Embrittlement Tests Planned - HCAT .....	154
12.9.4. General Trend of Hydrogen Embrittlement Results ...	154

12.10.	Creep .....	155
12.10.1.	General Description and Test Methods.....	155
12.10.2.	Documents .....	155
12.10.3.	Creep Testing Results .....	156
12.10.3.1.	Results for HVOF WC-Co and T400.....	156
12.10.3.1.1.	Test conditions .....	156
12.10.3.1.2.	Results .....	157
12.10.3.1.3.	Interpretation of results.....	157
12.10.4.	General Trend of Creep Results .....	157
<b>13.</b>	<b>System performance .....</b>	<b>158</b>
13.1.	Summary.....	158
13.2.	Rig tests .....	159
13.2.1.	Hydraulic Seals – Green, Tweed Phase 2 hydraulic rig test .....	159
13.2.1.1.	Documents .....	159
13.2.1.2.	Test Description .....	159
13.2.1.3.	Test Conditions .....	159
13.2.1.4.	Results .....	160
13.2.1.5.	Interpretation of Results .....	161
13.2.1.6.	Comments.....	162
13.2.2.	Landing Gear Pins – Boeing landing gear rig test .....	163
13.2.2.1.	Documents .....	163
13.2.2.2.	Test Conditions .....	163
13.2.2.3.	Results .....	164
13.2.2.4.	Interpretation of results.....	164
13.2.2.5.	Comments.....	164
13.2.3.	Rig tests under development – Messier-Dowty .....	164
13.3.	Flight tests.....	165
13.3.1.	Lufthansa .....	165
13.3.1.1.	Documents .....	165
13.3.1.2.	Test Conditions .....	165
13.3.1.3.	Results .....	166
13.3.1.4.	Interpretation of results.....	166
13.3.1.5.	Comments.....	166

13.3.2.	Delta .....	166
13.3.2.1.	Test Conditions .....	167
13.3.2.2.	Results .....	169
13.3.2.3.	Interpretation of results.....	170
13.3.2.4.	Comments.....	170
13.3.3.	F-18 landing gear repair.....	170
13.3.4.	Flight tests under way or under development.....	171

**Part 4. Specifications and qualified components...172**

<b>14.</b>	Specifications and standards for thermal spray .....	172
14.1.	Documents .....	172
14.2.	Boeing thermal spray specs – method, powder, grinding..	172
14.2.1.	Boeing Thermal Spray Spec – BAC 5851 .....	172
14.2.2.	Boeing Powder Spec – BMS 10-67 .....	174
14.2.3.	Boeing Grinding Spec – BAC 5855 .....	174
14.3.	Hamilton-Sundstrand – HS 4412 .....	174
14.4.	Society of Automotive Engineers - AMS 2447 .....	174
14.5.	American Welding Society – AWS C.2-19-XX .....	175
14.6.	AMS standards under development.....	176

<b>15.</b>	Qualified Thermal Sprayed Airframe Components.....	177
15.1.	Documents .....	177
15.2.	Usage of thermal spray in Gas Turbine Engines.....	177
15.3.	Summary of thermal spray coatings on non-engine components .....	179
15.4.	Boeing – qualified thermal sprayed components .....	180
15.5.	Landing gear .....	181
15.5.1.	OEM Production - Boeing 767-400 landing gear .....	181
15.5.2.	Flight tested landing gear repair - Canadian F-18 MLG axle.....	183
15.5.3.	Other qualified landing gear applications.....	184
15.5.4.	Boeing overhaul manual revision .....	184
15.5.5.	Delta Airlines qualified landing gear repair – Boeing 737, 757, 767 .....	185
15.5.6.	Qualified landing gear repair .....	186

15.6. Hydraulics ..... 186

    15.6.1. P&W F-119 engine convergent nozzle  
            actuator ..... 187

    15.6.2. Flight test – Sikorsky CH-53 blade damper ..... 187

15.7. Production - Flap and slat tracks ..... 188

    15.7.1. OEM tracks - Boeing ..... 188

    15.7.2. OEM tracks - Bombardier..... 188

    15.7.3. Flap track repair – Bombardier Dash 8..... 189

    15.7.4. O&R of tracks – Boeing and other aircraft..... 190

15.8. Other components ..... 191

**References .....193**

# INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1. Hard Chrome Alternatives Team members (full list available on HCAT web site). .....	4
Table 2. Some typical OEM chrome plated components.....	6
Table 3. Some differences between OEM and O&R chrome replacement.....	10
Table 4. Hard chrome replacement criteria. ....	12
Table 5. Typical characteristics of thermal spray coating processes. ....	17
Table 6. Some fundamental terms that define the quality of thermal spray coatings. ....	19
Table 7. Some common thermal spray coatings, their structure, performance, and applications.....	20
Table 8. Some major thermal spray powder classifications.....	24
Table 9. Important parameters defining thermal spray powders and electric arc wire.....	25
Table 10. Examples of thermal spray powder used in chrome replacement operations. ....	26
Table 11 Comparison of thermal spray coating processes – general properties. ....	28
Table 12. Comparison of thermal spray coating processes - permeability, thickness. ....	29
Table 13. Some applications of thermal spray coatings.. ....	30
Table 14. Producibility summary and links. ....	34
Table 15 Commonly Used Quality Control Tests.....	36
Table 16 Common Characteristics Evaluated in Metallographic Specimens.....	38
Table 17. Thermal spray process parameters.....	45
Table 18. Design of Experiment analysis tool. ....	47
Table 19 Response vs. Coating Property.....	48
Table 20. Comparison of hydrogen versus propylene DOE. ....	48
Table 21. Electrolytic stripping method for HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice).....	53
Table 22. Electrolytic stripping method for HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy Sulzer Metco). ....	54
Table 23. Electrolytic stripping method for “aged” HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy Lufthansa). ....	55
Table 24. Electrolytic stripping method for "new" HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy	

Lufthansa).	55
Table 25. Electrolytic stripping method for HVOF WC-Co (NTS/NADEP Cherry Point).	56
Table 26. Seal life in HVOF-WC-Co sprayed landing gear. <sup>18</sup> .	64
Table 27. Qualified providers for Boeing 5851 thermal spray coatings, as of June 2000 (Source, Boeing Aircraft Corporation).	67
Table 28. Common microstructural Characteristics Observed in Tungsten Carbide Materials.	72
Table 29. Features seen in Figure 35.	75
Table 30. Physical properties of coatings produced by different guns.	78
Table 31. Effect of Gas Flows and Cooling Gases on Retained Carbon.	78
Table 32. Retained C and XRD phases.	78
Table 33. Microhardness for various HVOF coatings and equipment (Courtesy Praxair Surface Technology).	83
Table 34. Comparison of Microhardness Values and Resultant Variation (Courtesy Sulzer Metco and SUNY Stony Brook).	84
Table 35. Qualitative techniques for measuring residual stress.	88
Table 36. Common quantitative residual stress measurement techniques.	89
Table 37. Zone analysis of thermal spray coatings.	92
Table 38. WC coating system designations for Document 24.	93
Table 39. Comparison of Residual Stress by Varied Techniques.	96
Table 40. Experimental set-up for neutron diffraction.	96
Table 41. Summary of performance tests.	99
Table 42. Chemistry of Triballoys.	101
Table 43. Materials and heat treats for HCAT Landing Gear JTP.	102
Table 44. Common Corrosion Testing Methods.	104
Table 45. GM9540 Protocol for Corrosion testing.	106
Table 46. Visual ranking criteria (ASTM B537-70).	107
Table 47. Coatings tested (Lufthansa). Note: 25µm+0.001”.	109
Table 48. Summary of corrosion ratings for coatings tested by Lufthansa.	110
Table 49. Coatings and substrates - HCAT corrosion testing.	111
Table 50. Corrosion of 4340 steel with HVOF and Cr coatings - appearance and protection rankings.	113
Table 51. GM9540P/B corrosion of 4340 steel with HVOF and Cr coatings - appearance and protection rankings.	113

Table 52. HVOF coatings used for Comparison of Electrochemical Corrosion Potential. ....	116
Table 53. HCAT/C-HCAT corrosion test matrix for landing gear steels and coatings. ....	117
Table 54. Fatigue testing variables. ....	122
Table 55. Materials and Substrates in Study.....	123
Table 56 Fatigue Test Parameters.....	123
Table 57. Fatigue Matrix for Initial Validation .....	124
Table 58. Substrate and coating materials - landing gear JTP. ....	128
Table 59. Test conditions for landing gear JTP. ....	128
Table 60. Tungsten Carbide Coating System Designations (Volvo) ....	135
Table 61. Fatigue Test Parameters for Volvo Evaluation .....	136
Table 62. Four Primary Wear Mechanisms .....	140
Table 63. Erosion Results as Conducted By Praxair.....	144
Table 64. ASTM G76 data from Praxair.....	146
Table 65. ASTM G76 Data from NRC. ....	146
Table 66. ASTM G76 Data from NRL and Sulzer Metco. ....	147
Table 67. Average wear coefficients, K, expressed in units of $10^{-4}$ mm <sup>3</sup> /N-m, for the various coating/substrate combinations. ....	148
Table 68. Fretting test parameters. ....	149
Table 69. Wear test variables for DOE factors.....	151
Table 70. Creep test parameters .....	156
Table 71. Summary of rig and flight testing data. ....	158
Table 72. Hydraulic test conditions. ....	159
Table 73. Stroke and frequency profile for hydraulic tests.....	160
Table 74. Military flight tests of HVOF-coated components.....	171
Table 75. Boeing thermal spray coating types. ....	173
Table 76. AMS 2447 HVOF Coating specifications.....	175
Table 77. Summary of thermal spray-qualified non-engine components. (Click on links to access data directly.) .....	179
Table 78. Summary of Boeing components specified for thermal spray. ....	180
Table 79. Other landing gear components qualified for OEM HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). ....	184
Table 80. Landing gear components commonly repaired with HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). ....	186
Table 81. Flap and slat tracks specified for thermal spray coating with	

Super D-gun WC-18Co (Courtesy Boeing). .....	189
Table 82. Bombardier Dash 8-100, -200, -300 flap tracks qualified for HVOF repair (Courtesy Vac Aero). .....	190
Table 83. Common flap/slat track repairs using HVOF WC-Co (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). .....	191
Table 84. Other OEM HVOF WC-Co applications (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). .....	192
Table 85. United Airlines O&R components qualified for HVOF in place of chrome plate. ....	193

# INDEX OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Boeing 737 nose landing gear inner cylinder. Shiny areas are chromed - piston and four axle journals (Courtesy Sulzer Metco). ....	8
Figure 2. Boeing 767 main landing gear (Courtesy Sulzer Metco). ....	8
Figure 3. F-18 main landing gear Oleo Attach Pin (Courtesy Boeing). ....	9
Figure 4. F/A-18 E/F aileron servocylinder, manufactured by HR Textron (Courtesy Boeing).....	9
Figure 5. Thermal spray process schematic (left); close-up view of surface (right). ....	15
Figure 6. Types of thermal spray processes. Types covered in this report shown in green. <sup>8</sup> .....	16
Figure 7. Structure of Thermal Spray Deposit at 100-500X. <sup>8</sup> .....	18
Figure 8. Example of powder definition for sintered irregularly shaped 88/12 Tungsten Carbide Cobalt powder.....	27
Figure 9. Components of a typical plasma spray system. ....	32
Figure 10. Typical HVOF coating cross sections; Ni-Al left (200x), WC-Co right (500x). (Courtesy Praxair-TAFA).....	38
Figure 11. Tensile Assembly from ASTM C-633 .....	40
Figure 12. Typical non-contact temperature arrangement for HVOF. ....	41
Figure 13. Typical Temperature Plot From a Spray Cycle (J. Schell, GEAE, Courtesy HCAT). ....	42
Figure 14. Almen “N” Test Strip. ....	43
Figure 15. Almen holding fixtures (Electronics Inc.). ....	44
Figure 16. Almen measuring instrument (Electronics Inc). ....	44
Figure 17. Kinetic versus thermal energy for the main thermal spray technologies. ....	46
Figure 18. Best propylene results. Degradation index = 4.25. ....	49
Figure 19. Best hydrogen results. Degradation index = 3.46.....	49
Figure 20. Graph showing the temperature/velocity profile with varied fuel types.....	50
Figure 21. Microstructure/morphology of selected powders. ....	51
Figure 22. Particle size distribution for the three best powders. ....	51
Figure 23. Typical surface profile. ....	59
Figure 24. Three different surfaces with the same Ra.....	60
Figure 25. Other surface roughness parameters.....	60
Figure 26. Definition of bearing ratio. ....	61

Figure 27. Effect of various finishing methods on an HVOF coating at 175x (Courtesy Supfina).....	62
Figure 28. Surface finishes obtained on Chrome and HVOF WC-CoCr by various finishing methods. <sup>18</sup> .....	63
Figure 29. Sulzer Metco F210 ID plasma spray gun (Courtesy Sulzer Metco). .....	66
Figure 30. HVOF spraying of WC-CoCr on landing gear with TAFE gun (Courtesy Praxair-TAFE). .....	66
Figure 31. Northwest Mettech Axial III tri-electrode plasma system (Courtesy Northwest Mettech).. .....	66
Figure 32. Stellite Jet-Kote HVOF gun (Courtesy Deloro Stellite).....	66
Figure 33. Comparison of porosity at 200x and 1000x magnification. ...	73
Figure 34. Relationship between velocity and porosity.....	74
Figure 35. Comparison of Carbide Distributions in 88-12 WC-Co (left) vs. 83-17 WC-Co (right) at 500X (Courtesy Praxair/TAFE).....	74
Figure 36. Microstructure of WC-CoCr 1000X.....	75
Figure 37. Transverse cracking in plasma sprayed carbide coatings. <sup>25</sup> . 76	
Figure 38. X-ray diffraction plot of powder(lower curve) and coating (upper curve). .....	77
Figure 39. Comparison of carbide content in as-sprayed A-12 (12% cobalt ). Hybrid 2600 gun (left), air-cooled DiamondJet (right). .....	79
Figure 40. Tensile assembly from ASTM C-633.....	85
Figure 41. Stress as a function of coating thickness for HVOF WC-CoCr. ....	90
Figure 42. Almen strip stress measurement.....	91
Figure 43. Average residual stress as a function of spray distance. ....	91
Figure 44. Average residual stress as a function of powder feed rate. .	92
Figure 45. Bend test technique, evaluation criteria, results. ....	94
Figure 46. Typical stress profile for modified layer removal technique. .	95
Figure 47. Air Plasma Spray residual stress pattern. ....	97
Figure 48. Wire Arc Spray residual stress pattern. ....	98
Figure 49. HVOF Spray residual stress pattern.....	98
Figure 50. B117 Appearance Rankings for coatings on 4340 high strength steel, PH13-8Mo stainless steel, and 7075 Al. ....	112
Figure 51. GM9540P/B Appearance Rankings for coatings on 4340 high strength steel, PH13-8Mo stainless steel, and 7075 Al. ....	112
Figure 52. 4340 steel 18-month beach exposure tests, with and without scribing. ....	114

Figure 53. 7075 Al 18-month beach exposure samples with and without scribing.....	115
Figure 54. Corrosion Current for an Aerated 0.1 N HCl Solution. <sup>40</sup> .....	117
Figure 55. Typical hourglass-shaped fatigue bar.....	121
Figure 56. Typical smooth fatigue bar.....	121
Figure 57. Flat Kb fatigue bar.....	122
Figure 58. Comparison of Fatigue Data on Smooth Bars for 4340 .....	125
Figure 59. Comparison of fatigue data on Kb bars for 4340 .....	125
Figure 60. Fatigue of coated 4340 steel - hourglass samples. ....	126
Figure 61. Fatigue Results for HVOF and Chrome on 7075 Aluminum	127
Figure 62. Fatigue Curve for 300M with .24”dia. hourglass tested in air – coating thickness 0 .003”.....	129
Figure 63. Fatigue Curve for 300M with .24”dia. hourglass comparing air results with samples tested in NaCl and .003” Coating Thickness.	130
Figure 64. Fatigue Curve Comparing Thickness Effects 0.003” (.250” dia.) vs. 0.010” (.500” dia.) on 4340 using hourglass configuration tested in air.....	131
Figure 65. Fatigue of HVOF-coated and chrome plated high strength steels, $K_t=1.5$ , Boeing qualification testing. (Courtesy Engelhard Surface Technology).....	133
Figure 66. Comparison of fatigue for chrome and HVOF WC-CoCr deposited with Jet Kote and Diamond Jet guns. (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice.).....	133
Figure 67. Comparison of Residual Stress and Resistance of Coating to Crack Initiation.....	136
Figure 68. Comparison of Final Fatigue Life with Residual Stress .....	137
Figure 69. Typical Set-up of ASTM G76 erosion test. ....	141
Figure 70. ASTM G 76 set-up. ....	142
Figure 71. Schematic of Sliding Wear Apparatus for hydraulics .....	143
Figure 72. Side view of fretting apparatus.....	143
Figure 73. Erosion Results As Conducted By Stony Brook/Sulzer Metco .....	144
Figure 74. Comparison of HVOF Processes and WC-Co Powders .....	148
Figure 75. Fretting wear of hard chrome, HVOF WC-17Co, and HVOF T400. (Note – the zero wear measurement resulted from material transfer from the uncoated block to the coated shoe, protecting it from wear.) .....	150
Figure 76. Average creep measured by direct micrometer readings. ..	157
Figure 77. Cumulative hydraulic fluid leakage in rig tests.....	161

Figure 78. Seal wear during hydraulic rig tests.....	162
Figure 79. F/A-18E/F main landing gear, showing locations of HVOF-coated pins.....	164
Figure 80. Landing gear components HVOF sprayed for flight testing by Delta Airlines (sprayed areas numbered). (Courtesy Delta Airlines.) .....	168
Figure 81. Boeing 737 nose landing gear inner cylinder undergoing flight test inspection at Delta Airlines (Courtesy Delta Airlines). .....	168
Figure 82. Boeing 757 axle sleeves HVOF-sprayed with WC-CoCr (Courtesy Delta Airlines).....	169
Figure 83. Canadian F-18 main landing gear polygon repair (Courtesy Messier-Dowty).....	171
Figure 84. Thermal spray coatings used in a typical gas turbine engine. (Courtesy GE Aircraft Engines) <sup>50</sup> .....	178
Figure 85. Boeing 767-400 with HVOF coated landing gear. ....	181
Figure 86. Boeing 767-400 main landing gear (Courtesy Sulzer Metco). .....	181
Figure 87. Boeing 767 main landing gear axle (part # 2207-85-10), showing HVOF areas (engineering note 3). (Courtesy Sulzer Metco.) .....	182
Figure 88. Boeing 767-400 main landing gear inner cylinder (Part # 2207-4-10) with asterisks showing locations of HVOF coatings (Courtesy Sulzer Metco.).....	183
Figure 89. Canadian F-18 main landing gear axle (Courtesy Messier-Dowty).....	183
Figure 90. Repair area of F-18 main landing gear polygon (Courtesy Messier-Dowty).....	184
Figure 91. HVOF WC-Co repair of Boeing 737 nose landing gear inner cylinder (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). .....	186
Figure 92. Thermal spray actuator coating system developed by Praxair.....	187
Figure 93. CH-53 helicopter (Sikorsky). ....	188
Figure 94. Bombardier Q-400 (Courtesy Bombardier.).....	189
Figure 95. Typical flap track - Bombardier Dash 8 (Courtesy Vac Aero, Canada). ....	190
Figure 96. HVOF-sprayed Dash 8 flap track. Coated areas are dark. (Courtesy, Vac Aero, Canada.) .....	191
Figure 97. Flap and slat track repair by HVOF (Southwest Aeroservice). .....	191
Figure 98. Boeing 737 nose landing gear lower bearing shock strut, Part # 69-76508. HVOF WC-Co coated and super finished. (Courtesy Sulzer Metco.).....	192

# TABLE OF DOCUMENTS

Document 1. Hard Chrome Coatings - Advanced Technology for Waste Elimination, DARPA Grant MDA972-93-1-0006, Keith O. Legg, Jerry Schell, George Nichols, Robert Altkorn.....	2
Document 2. Lung Cancer Among Workers in Chromium Chemical Production, Herman J. Gibb et. al., American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 38, 115-126 (2000). (Courtesy of the authors and American Journal of Industrial Medicine.) .....	2
Document 3. Clinical Findings of Irritation Among Chromium Chemical Production Workers, Herman J. Gibb et. al., American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 38, 127-131 (2000). (Courtesy of the authors and American Journal of Industrial Medicine.) .....	2
Document 4. JSF Phase 1 Report: Chrome Replacements for Internals and Small Parts. (Rowan Technology Group).....	14
Document 5. JSF Phase 2 Report: Optimal Chrome Replacement Technologies for Internal Diameters and Heat-Sensitive Parts. (Rowan Technology Group).....	15
Document 6. Common thermal spray powder types.....	25
Document 7. Test standardization: a Key Tool in Coating System Implementation (Courtesy Sauer Engineering, Gorham Advanced Materials).....	34
Document 8. Training in Coating Evaluation Techniques: a Unique Approach for Discussion (Courtesy Sauer Engineering). .....	34
Document 9. The Use of Metallographic Standards in Calibration of the Polishing Process (Courtesy Sauer Engineering). .....	34
Document 10. Metallographic Preparation of Thermal Spray Coatings: Coating Sensitivity and the Effect of Polishing Intangibles (Courtesy Sauer Engineering).....	35
Document 11. Tensile Bond Variance of Thermally Sprayed Coatings with Respect to Adhesive Type. ....	35
Document 12. Almen Strips and Temperature Measurement During HVOF Processing (Courtesy, Sauer Engineering). ....	35
Document 13. Design of Experiment for HVOF WC-Co process (Courtesy HCAT, www.hcat.org).....	35
Document 14. Summary of DOE results for optimization of HVOF WC-CoCr (Courtesy NRC Montreal and C-HCAT). ....	35
Document 15. NTS Stripping Report,PDF. ....	52
Document 16. NDCEE Evaluation of Stripping Methods. ....	52
Document 17. Stripping of WC Coatings from Aermet 100, Southwest Aeroservice, Menasco, Carpenter Technology (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). ....	52

Document 18. Surface Metrology Guide (Courtesy Precision Devices, Inc.).	57
Document 19. Superfinishing of Hard Chrome and HVOF Coated Workpieces (Courtesy Supfina and Gorham Advanced Materials).	57
Document 20. Surface Finishing of Tungsten Carbide Cobalt Coatings, J. Nuse, J. Falkowski.	57
Document 21. Barkhausen Noise as a Quality Control Tool (Courtesy Stresstech Inc., Finland).	57
Document 22. Evaluation of Four High Velocity Thermal Spray Guns Using WC-10Co-4Cr Cermets (Courtesy of J.G. Legoux, B.Arsenault, C. Moreau, V. Bouyer, L. Leblanc).	70
Document 23. Fracture Toughness of HVOF Sprayed WC-Co Coatings (Courtesy of S. De Palo, et al).	70
Document 24. Tungsten Carbide-Cobalt Coatings for Industrial Applications (Courtesy of M. Dorfman, J Defalco, J. Karthikeyan).	70
Document 25. A Critical Evaluation of the Employment of Microhardness Techniques for Characterizing and Optimizing Thermal Spray Coatings 2000 (Courtesy of M. Factor and I. Roman, Hebrew University).	82
Document 26. Behaviour of Tungsten Carbide Thermal Spray Coatings 1995, J. Wigren et al.	86
Document 27. An ASM Recommended Practice for Modified Layer Removal Method (MLRM) to Evaluate Residual Stress in thermal Spray Coatings 2000, Ed Rybicki and ASM TSS Committee.	86
Document 28. Properties of WC-Co Components Produced Using the HVOF Thermal Spray Process 2000, J. Stokes and L. Looney.	86
Document 29. X-ray diffraction residual stress techniques, P.S. Prevey.	86
Document 30. Processing Effects on Residual Stress in Ni+5%Al Coatings-Comparison of Different Spraying Methods 2000, J.Matejicek et al.	87
Document 31. Residual Stress Measurement in Plasma Sprayed Coatings by X-Ray Diffraction (Courtesy of J. Matejicek et al) 1997.	95
Document 32. HCAT Test Protocol for Initial Work 1996 (Courtesy of HCAT Team)	100
Document 33. Joint Test Protocol (JTP) for Landing Gear 1998 (Courtesy of HCAT and CHCAT Teams)	100
Document 34. Joint Test Protocol (JTP) for Propeller Hub Components 2000 (Courtesy of HCAT, JG-PP, and C-HCAT Teams)	100
Document 35. Joint Test Protocol (JTP) for Gas Turbine Engines 2000 (Courtesy of HCAT and PEWG Teams)	101

Document 36. Report of Replacement of Chromium Electroplating Using HVOF Thermal Spray Coatings AESF Plating Forum 1998 (Courtesy of Bruce Sartwell and HCAT Team). .....	103
Document 37. Replacement of Chrome Plating by Thermal Spray – Results of Corrosion Testing of HVOF Coatings 1996 (Courtesy of Lufthansa). .....	103
Document 38. Replacement of chrome plating by thermal spray coatings – Summary of tests (Courtesy of Lufthansa). .....	103
Document 39 Performance of HVOF Sprayed Carbide Coatings in Aqueous Corrosive Environments 2000 (Courtesy of S. Simard (NRC) et al). .....	103
Document 40 Summary of 4340 Data from Initial HCAT Protocol (Courtesy of Phil Bretz Metcut) .....	118
Document 41 Summary of 7075 Al Data from Initial HCAT Protocol (Courtesy of Phil Bretz Metcut) .....	118
Document 42 Summary of 13-8 Stainless Data from Initial HCAT Protocol (Courtesy of Phil Bretz Metcut) .....	119
Document 43. HCAT landing gear JTP fatigue data - HVOF WC-Co on 4340, 300M, AerMet 100 in air and NaCl solution.....	119
Document 44 Advanced Thermal Spray Coatings for Fatigue Sensitive Applications (Courtesy of John Quets Praxair).....	119
Document 45 Compressive Creep Tests of Hard Chrome and HVOF coatings 1998, J. Schell, GE Aircraft Engines. ....	155
Document 46. Evaluation of Chrome Rod Alternative Coatings, Tony Degennaro, Green Tweed, 1999.....	159
Document 47. F/A-18E/F Main Landing Gear HVOF-coated Pin Testing and Evaluation.....	163
Document 48. Table of contents of BAC 5851 Thermal Spray Specification, 2000 (Courtesy Boeing Aircraft Corp.). .....	172
Document 49. Standards for the Thermal Spray Industry, Bhusari and Sulit. ....	172
Document 50. HVOF WC aerospace applications for OEM and rebuild (Courtesy Southwest Aeroservice). .....	177
Document 51. Thermal Spray Applications at GE Aircraft Engines (Dorothy Comassar, Courtesy GE Aircraft Engines). .....	177
Document 52. OEM Approval for HVOF Wear Resistant and MCrAlY Coatings (Gary Naisbitt and Gorham Advanced Materials). .....	177
Document 53. Replacement of Chromium Electroplating on Gas Turbine Engines. ....	177
Document 54. List of Boeing thermal sprayed parts (Courtesy, Boeing Aircraft Corp). .....	180

# TABLE OF ACRONYMS

AFRL	Air Force Materials Lab (Dayton, OH)
ALC	Air Logistics Center (Air Force maintenance depot)
AMS	Aircraft Materials Specification (a specification of the Society of Automotive Engineers)
APS, VPS	Air Plasma Spray, Vacuum Plasma Spray
BFG	B.F. Goodrich
C-HCAT	Canadian Hard Chrome Alternatives Team
Cr <sup>6+</sup>	Hexavalent chrome
DARPA	Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
D-Gun	Detonation gun (also Super D-Gun) – high velocity thermal spray method based on fuel detonation (proprietary to Praxair)
DND	Department of National Defence (Canada)
DoD	Department of Defense (US)
DOE	Design of Experiment (statistically designed matrix of experiments used for process optimization)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESTCP	Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (funding HCAT)
GEAE	General Electric Aircraft Engines
GTE	Gas turbine engine
HCAT	Hard Chrome Alternatives Team
HVOF	High Velocity Oxy-Fuel thermal spray
ID	Inside diameter
JG-PP	Joint Group – Pollution Prevention (DoD environmental group assisting with qualifying clean processes)
JSF	Joint Strike Fighter
JSF IPT	Joint Strike Fighter Integrated Product Team
JTP	Joint Test Protocol
NADEP	Naval Aviation Depot (Navy Maintenance depot)
NAWC	Naval Air Warfare Center
NDCEE	National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence
NRC	National Research Council of Canada

NTS	National Technical Systems, Inc.
O&R	Overhaul and Repair
OD, ID	Outside diameter, inside diameter
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
OSHA	Occupational Health and Safety Administration
PC	Personal computer
PEWG	Propulsion Environmental Working Group (turbine engine environmental issues)
PVD	Physical Vapor Deposition (vacuum coating deposition process)
P & W	Pratt and Whitney
QPL	Qualified Provider List
R&O	Repair and Overhaul
SERDP	Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (funding ID chrome replacements)
TPC	Technology Partnerships Canada (funding C-HCAT)
WC	Tungsten Carbide
WC-Co, WC-CoCr	Cobalt cemented WC (usually WC-17Co or WC-12Co) and cobalt-chrome alloy cemented WC (usually WC-10Co4Cr). (Percentages by weight.)