189
2-12-87 JS (2)

55

I. 29465

DR # 0142-2

ornl

ORNL/TM-10267

**OAK RIDGE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY**

MARTIN MARIETTA

**Assessment of Ceramic Composites
for Multimegawatt Space Nuclear
Power Systems**

T. M. Besmann

**DO NOT MICROFILM
COVER**

OPERATED BY
MARTIN MARIETTA ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.
FOR THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

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.

Printed in the United States of America. Available from
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161
NTIS price codes—Printed Copy: A03; Microfiche A01

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.

DO NOT MICROFILM
COVER

METALS AND CERAMICS DIVISION

ASSESSMENT OF CERAMIC COMPOSITES FOR MULTIMEGAWATT SPACE
NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS

T. M. Besmann

Date Published: December 1986

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.

NOTICE: This document contains information of a preliminary nature. It is subject to revision or correction and therefore does not represent a final report.

Prepared for
Division of Defense Energy Projects
U.S. Department of Energy

Prepared by the
OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831
operated by
MARTIN MARIETTA ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.
for the
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under contract DE-AC05-84OR21400

MASTER

page blank

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	1
EQUILIBRIUM THERMODYNAMIC ANALYSIS	2
BRAYTON CYCLE, CONTINUOUS MODE	3
BRAYTON CYCLE, BURST MODE	9
RANKINE CYCLE	11
NONEQUILIBRIUM ASSESSMENT	14
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
REFERENCES	18

ASSESSMENT OF CERAMIC COMPOSITES FOR MULTIMEGAWATT SPACE
NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS*

T. M. Besmann

ABSTRACT

A calculational thermodynamic equilibrium analysis of the compatibility of ceramic-ceramic composites and a nonequilibrium assessment based on the literature of their use in proposed multimegawatt space nuclear power systems was performed. The five candidate composites included Al_2O_3 -reinforced Al_2O_3 , SiC-whisker-toughened Al_2O_3 , SiC-whisker-toughened Si_3N_4 , SiC-fiber-reinforced ZrC, and carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC. The reactor concepts included Brayton cycle (continuous and burst mode) and Rankine cycle. It was determined that Al_2O_3 -reinforced Al_2O_3 and carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC are compatible in the Brayton-cycle continuous-mode system and that Al_2O_3 -reinforced Al_2O_3 , SiC-fiber-reinforced ZrC, and carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC are compatible in the Rankine-cycle system. None of the candidate ceramic composite systems was likely to be sufficiently stable under Brayton-cycle burst-mode conditions.

INTRODUCTION

Proposed multimegawatt (MMW) space nuclear power systems are designed to operate at high temperatures that are unprecedented and, in some designs, with potentially corrosive working fluids. These temperatures, levels of stress, and hostile environments may be outside the capability of refractory alloys, so designers are interested in the use of ceramic composites as structural materials.

Two MMW space reactor power cycles are under consideration, a Brayton and a Rankine cycle. The Brayton cycle is envisioned as using inert gas as the working fluid during continuous operation with a peak temperature of 1500 K, and hydrogen as the working fluid for short-duration (30-min) high-power operation at a temperature of 2500 K. The Rankine-cycle system uses potassium liquid and vapor as the working fluid with a peak temperature of 1450 K.

*Research sponsored by the Division of Defense Energy Projects, U.S. Department of Energy, under contract DE-AC05-84OR21400 with Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc.

The object of this assessment is to determine the applicability of several candidate ceramic composites to the proposed MMW space power systems. Five ceramic composites have been identified as potentially possessing the necessary high-temperature stability and mechanical properties. These include two previously developed materials - SiC-whisker-reinforced Al_2O_3 and SiC-whisker-reinforced Si_3N_4 - and three speculative materials - carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC, SiC-fiber-reinforced ZrC, and Al_2O_3 -reinforced Al_2O_3 .

Two approaches were taken in assessing the use of the ceramic composites in the proposed power cycles: an equilibrium thermodynamic analysis and a nonequilibrium assessment based on a literature review. In the equilibrium thermodynamic analysis, gas pressures were calculated and the stable liquid and solid phases containing the constituent elements for each ceramic composite-power cycle combination were determined over the appropriate temperature range. For the nonequilibrium assessment, reported results of high-temperature compatibility studies between the ceramic phases and the proposed working fluids were reviewed for indications of detrimental interactions.

EQUILIBRIUM THERMODYNAMIC ANALYSIS

The equilibrium thermodynamic assessment was performed by calculating the equilibrium state for each set of constituents under the appropriate pressure, temperature, and compositional conditions. The computer program SOLGASMIX-PV¹ was used to execute the calculations to determine equilibrium pressures of the gaseous species and the amounts of each of the stable solid and liquid phases. Equilibrium states were computed for sets of conditions for each of the power cycles (Table 1). The species used and

Table 1. Power cycle conditions

Conditions	Cycles		
	Brayton, continuous	Brayton, burst	Rankine
Temperature, K	ΔT , 1100-1500	2500 (once through)	ΔT , 1340-1450
Pressure, MPa	Inert gas, 2.76	Hydrogen, 6.89	Potassium, 1.38

attendant thermodynamic data are listed in Tables 2 and 3. Two separate data sets were used for convenience and to avoid exceeding the capacity of the SOLGASMIX-PV program.

Thermodynamic values were obtained from available data compilations, as indicated in Tables 2 and 3. The values of enthalpy of formation (ΔH_f°) and entropy (S°) at 1800 K were used to determine the Gibbs free energy of formation over the entire temperature range of interest. Although this is an approximation, little error is incurred in the free energy values over a range of several hundred degrees. For some species elevated-temperature values were not available, so 298 K values were used.

For the zirconium silicides, the only values found were 298 K ΔH_f° . Entropy values at 298 K for the zirconium silicides thus had to be estimated, and this was done using the averaged S° values for other transition metal silicides of the same composition.⁶ For phases where data for other metals were not available, (M_6Si_5 and $MSi_{1.62}$) values were determined from a curve of 298 K S° per gram-atom versus metal/silicon ratio that was constructed from the average values for transition metal silicides that do exist (Fig. 1). Liquid phases were assumed to be adequately modeled with a single, ideal solution.

The results of the thermodynamic calculations are shown as plots of gas and vapor pressures versus temperature for each of the power cycle-ceramic composite systems. Due to the large number of species for which pressures were calculated, each is not shown explicitly on the plots. Rather, the sums of the partial pressures of species having the same elemental constituents are shown. Also indicated on these plots are the stable liquid and solid phases in the equilibrium system at the temperatures shown.

BRAYTON CYCLE, CONTINUOUS MODE

Alumina is thermodynamically stable to 1800 K based on the pressures indicated in Fig. 2, which show no species pressures in excess of 10^{-5} Pa.

Table 2. Thermodynamic data at 1800 K for the H-K-Al-Si-C-O system

Species	ΔH_f° (kJ/mol)	S° (J·mol ⁻¹ ·K ⁻¹)	Ref.	Species	ΔH_f° (kJ/mol)	S° (J·mol ⁻¹ ·K ⁻¹)	Ref.
Gaseous				Gaseous (continued)			
H ₂	0.0	184.7	2	O	254.9	198.9	4
O ₂	0.0	264.7	2	SiO	-162.8	272.7	2
Al	304.7	202.1	2	SiO ₂	-361.1	326.8	2
Al ₂	307.9	436.3	2	O ₃	145.4	330.3	2
AlH	234.2	247.5	2	Si	393.2	206.2	2
AlOH	-212.3	297.0	2	SiH ₄	-25.7	335.0	3
AlO ₂ H	-486.0	373.4	2	Si ₂	594.1 ^a	229.8 ^a	6
AlO	43.1	283.1	3	Si ₂ H ₆	79.9 ^a	274.3 ^a	6
AlO ₂	-206.8	348.9	3	Si ₃	615.1 ^a	253.7 ^a	6
Al ₂ O	-179.2	362.4	3	Liquid			
Al ₂ O ₂	-481.0	414.1	3	K	-69.7	128.3	2
AlC	660.1	287.9	2	Al	0.0	92.3	2
CH	590.5	240.0	2	Si	0.0	93.4	2
CH ₂	378.0	270.2	4	Al ₂ O ₃	-1601.5	290.2	3
CH ₃	133.7	290.0	2	K ₂ CO ₃	-1197.8	478.1	2
CH ₄	-92.7	295.9	2	K ₂ SiO ₃	-1650.5	475.9	5
CO	-117.3	254.8	2	SiO ₂	-939.5	163.8	2
C	717.4	195.4	2	Crystalline phases			
CO ₂	-397.4	302.9	2	Si	-49.9	63.7	2
SiC	661.7	288.3	2	C	0.0	38.2	2
Si ₂ C	413.0	342.2	2	α-Al ₂ O ₃	-1683.4	256.7	5
C ₂	832.5	266.6	2	β-SiC	-122.9	94.2	2
C ₂ H	468.6	288.2	2	Al ₂ SiO ₅	-2634.5	416.1	2
C ₂ H ₂	220.8	312.7	2	Al ₆ O ₁₃ Si	-6925.1	1116.7	2
C ₂ H ₄	35.3	362.4	2	SiO ₂	-946.8	160.2	2
C ₂ H ₆ O	-66.6	416.1	2	K ₂ CO ₃	-1209.5	464.5	2
C ₂ O	284.4	328.9	2	AlH ₃	-11.5 ^a	29.3 ^a	6
SiC ₂	550.0	334.7	2	Al ₄ C ₃	-265.7	380.6	2
C ₃	795.6	313.3	2	K ₂ O	-456.0	287.0	2
C ₃ O ₂	-93.9	436.6	2	K ₂ O ₂	-564.1	357.2	2
C ₄	960.9	353.7	2	K ₂ SiO ₃	-1693.9	440.0	5
H	226.1	152.0	2	Al ₂ O ₃ ·H ₂ O	-2004.2 ^a	28.6 ^a	6
HO	37.0	238.6	2	Al ₂ O ₃ ·3H ₂ O	-2586.6 ^a	140.2 ^a	6
HO ₂	-2.1	308.3	2	Al ₄ C ₃	-215.7 ^a	88.7 ^a	6
SiH	315.0	256.6	2	K ₂ Si ₂ O ₅	-299.2 ^a	182.0 ^a	6
H ₂ K ₂ O ₂	-830.2	512.7	2	KH	-57.7 ^a	51.5 ^a	6
H ₂ O	-251.1	259.3	2				
H ₂ O ₂	-141.1	324.4	2				
K	0.0	197.6	2				
KO	-17.9	305.7	2				
K ₂	-54.3	319.9	2				

^aValues at 298 K.

Table 3. Thermodynamic data at 1800 K for the H-K-Zr-Si-C-N system

Species	ΔH_f° (kJ/mol)	S° (J·mol ⁻¹ ·K ⁻¹)	Ref.	Species	ΔH_f° (kJ/mol)	S° (J·mol ⁻¹ ·K ⁻¹)	Ref.
Gaseous				Gaseous (continued)			
H ₂	0.0	184.7	2	N ₃	423.3	320.0	5
K	0.0	197.6	2	Si	393.2	206.2	2
CH ₂	378.0	270.2	4	Zr	1310.1	233.5	2
CKN	-9.9	353.3	2	CH	590.5	240.0	2
CN	430.2	260.2	2	CH ₃	133.7	290.0	2
NCN	477.4	321.9	5	CH ₄	-92.7	295.9	2
C	717.4	195.4	2	Si ₂	594.0 ^a	229.8 ^a	6
SiC	661.7	288.3	2	Si ₂ H ₆	79.9 ^a	274.3 ^a	6
Si ₂ C	413.0	342.2	2	Si ₃	615.0 ^a	253.7 ^a	6
C ₂	832.5	266.6	2	Liquid			
C ₂ H	468.4	292.4	2	Si	0.0	93.4	2
C ₂ H ₂	220.8	312.7	2	Zr	18.4	101.8	2
C ₂ H ₄	35.3	362.4	2	K	-69.7	128.3	2
C ₂ K ₂ N ₂	-174.6	588.7	2	CKN	-166.4	269.7	2
C ₂ N	558.0	330.9	2	Crystalline phases			
C ₂ N ₂	311.6	369.2	2	β-SiC	-122.9	94.2	2
SiC ₂	550.0	334.7	2	ZrC	-199.8	123.1	2
C ₃	795.6	313.3	2	C	0.0	38.2	2
C ₄	961.1	353.7	2	Si ₃ N ₄	-878.5	367.6	2
C ₄ N ₂	538.5	489.0	2	Si	-49.9	63.7	2
C ₅	969.4	401.0	2	Zr	0.0	93.2	2
H	226.1	152.0	2	CKN	-188.8	247.3	2
HN	377.2	236.4	5	KH	-57.7 ^a	-51.5 ^a	6
HSi	315.0	256.6	5	ZrN	-368.2 ^a	-38.9 ^a	6
HZr	494.8	277.1	2	ZrH ₂	-169.5 ^a	-35.1 ^a	6
N ₂ H ₂	208.5	316.8	2	Zr ₂ Si	-338.9 ^b	-105.4 ^b	2
N ₂ H	183.9	266.6	2	Zr ₅ Si ₃	-613.8 ^b	-225.9 ^b	2
NH ₃	-55.4	283.9	2	Zr ₆ Si ₅	-850.6 ^b	-268.8 ^b	2
N ₂ H ₄	94.9	390.4	2	ZrSi	-147.7 ^b	-46.9 ^b	2
SiH ₄	-25.7	335.0	2	ZrSi _{1.62}	-149.8 ^b	58.4 ^b	2
K ₂	-54.3	319.9	3				
N	479.4	190.6	2				
SiN	312.9	279.3	2				
Si ₂ N	283.5	360.4	2				
N ₂	0.0	248.2	2				

^aValues are at 298 K.^bEnthalpy values are at 298 K from Kubaschewski and Alcock,⁶ and entropy values are estimated for 298 K as described in the text.

Fig. 1. Entropy per gram-atom at 298 K of transition metal (M) silicides versus M/Si ratio. *Source of entropy data:* O. Kubaschewski and C. B. Alcock, *Metallurgical Thermochemistry*, 5th ed., Pergamon Press, Ltd., Oxford, U.K., 1979, pp. 268-323.

Fig. 2. Equilibrium partial pressures over Al_2O_3 in 2.76 MPa of inert gas.

SiC-whisker-toughened Al_2O_3 , however, is significantly less stable, with C-O, Si-O, and aluminum species exhibiting pressures well above 100 Pa at 1800 K (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3. Equilibrium partial pressures over Al_2O_3 and SiC in 2.76 MPa of inert gas.

Carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC has extremely low vapor pressures to 1800 K with only carbon species exhibiting any significant pressure ($<10^{-7}$ Pa), as shown in Fig. 4. Silicon carbide-fiber-reinforced ZrC, however, is calculated to have moderate silicon species pressures equalling 10^{-2} Pa at 1800 K (Fig. 5).

Silicon carbide-whisker-toughened Si_3N_4 suffers from high nitrogen species pressures over the temperature range, with a value of almost 1 kPa at 1800 K (Fig. 6). Silicon-containing species also have substantial pressures in this system.

Fig. 4. Equilibrium partial pressures over ZrC and C in 2.76 MPa of inert gas.

Fig. 5. Equilibrium partial pressures over ZrC and SiC in 2.76 MPa of inert gas.

Fig. 6. Equilibrium partial pressures over Si_3N_4 and SiC in 2.76 MPa of inert gas.

BRAYTON CYCLE, BURST MODE

The alumina-based composites are unstable in hydrogen at the high operating temperatures, forming a liquid phase and generating H-O and aluminum species pressures near 100 kPa at 2500 K (Fig. 7). Silicon carbide-whisker-toughened Al_2O_3 also exhibits undesirable equilibrium properties with species pressures in excess of 1 MPa and the formation of a liquid phase above 1500 K (Fig. 8).

Carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC reacts with hydrogen to generate high pressures of hydrocarbons, of the order of 1 MPa, over the entire temperature range of the calculations (1300-2500 K). Less than 1 Pa of other species such as carbon and Zr-H are also generated (Fig. 9).

ORNL-DWG 86-14986R

Fig. 7. Equilibrium partial pressures over Al_2O_3 in 6.89 MPa of hydrogen.

ORNL-DWG 86-14987

Fig. 8. Equilibrium partial pressures over Al_2O_3 and SiC in 6.89 MPa of hydrogen. The liquid phase is Al and Si containing dissolved Al_2O_3 and SiC .

Fig. 9. Equilibrium partial pressures over ZrC and C in 6.89 MPa of hydrogen.

Silicon carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC not only also exhibited substantial hydrocarbon pressures under these conditions, but indicated the formation of a liquid phase above 1500 K as well (Fig. 10).

The SiC-whisker-toughened Si_3N_4 material generates significant nitrogen pressures at these high temperatures, more than 1 MPa at 2500 K. In addition, a number of species such as the hydrocarbons, H-N, and Si-H also maintain significant pressures down to lower temperatures (1300 K) (Fig. 11).

RANKINE CYCLE

The alumina ceramic composite is calculated to be relatively stable in the presence of potassium with K-O species pressures less than 10^{-3} Pa at 1550 K (Fig. 12). Silicon carbide-whisker-toughened Al_2O_3 , however, has significant aluminum, C-O, and Si-O pressures under these conditions (Fig. 13).

Fig. 10. Equilibrium partial pressures over ZrC and SiC in 6.89 MPa of hydrogen.

Fig. 11. Equilibrium partial pressures over Si_3N_4 and SiC in 6.89 MPa of hydrogen.

Fig. 12. Equilibrium partial pressures over Al_2O_3 in 1.38 MPa of potassium vapor and liquid.

Fig. 13. Equilibrium partial pressures over Al_2O_3 and SiC in 1.38 MPa of potassium vapor and liquid.

Carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC is thermodynamically stable in potassium under these conditions with only a minor carbon species pressure calculated (Fig. 14). Silicon carbide-fiber-reinforced ZrC also appears to be relatively stable, with the largest species pressure being that of silicon at less than 10^{-4} Pa at 1550 K (Fig. 15).

Fig. 14. Equilibrium partial pressures over ZrC and C in 1.38 MPa of potassium vapor and liquid.

The SiC-whisker-toughened Si_3N_4 shows less stability than do the other systems, with nitrogen having an equilibrium pressure greater than 10 Pa (Fig. 16).

NONEQUILIBRIUM ASSESSMENT

The nonequilibrium assessment of the candidate ceramic composites is based on a review of the literature with regard to observed interactions between the composite components and the environment of the proposed power

Fig. 15. Equilibrium partial pressures over ZrC and SiC in 1.38 MPa of potassium vapor and liquid.

Fig. 16. Equilibrium partial pressures over Si_3N_4 and SiC in 1.38 MPa of potassium vapor and liquid.

cycles. Unfortunately, there have been few studies of these interactions, and those that have been reported are typically for temperatures well below those of the system designs. McKee and Chatterji⁷ studied the corrosion of SiC in N₂ and H₂ at 1173 K and found no material loss or reaction. Horn et al.⁸ observed significant erosion of SiC beginning at 1400 K in steam-hydrogen mixtures, but they attributed the reaction to the effect of the steam. Alumina was also evaluated in steam-hydrogen, but it displayed little erosion to 1550 K, the maximum temperature used in the study. Sheehan⁹ examined the effect of helium containing H₂, H₂O, CO, and CH₄ impurities on alumina and Si₃N₄ to 1200 K and found the alumina to be unaffected and the Si₃N₄ to undergo passive oxidation. Strength tests following 5000-h exposures showed no strength degradation.

Cook¹⁰ did a scoping study of the corrosion resistance of various ceramics and cermets to liquid metals. Although potassium was not included as a corrodent, sodium was, and it is expected that the response of the ceramics to the two alkali metals will be similar. It was found that ZrC exposed to sodium for 100 h at 1089 K showed zero depth of attack, zero percentage weight change, and zero dimensional change. Alumina, SiC, and Si₃N₄ were described as having fair to good resistance to corrosion, which was defined as less than 25- μ m depth of attack, less than 2% weight change, and less than 1% dimensional change. Blanc et al.¹¹ studied the inclusion of potassium in alumina at 2073 K and determined that there was little solubility for the alkali metal (5-10 ppm) and therefore little effect of exposure to potassium.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The compatibility of the ceramic composites determined from the equilibrium calculations may be conservative since equilibrium may never be reached because of mass transport or chemical kinetic constraints. The conclusions of the equilibrium assessment, based on calculated partial pressures, are summarized in Fig. 17. To illustrate the effect of significant species pressures on mass transport in a system, consider the

example of the calculated 10^{-3} Pa partial pressure of silicon over SiC-whisker-toughened Si_3N_4 in inert gas at 1500 K. Assuming the current design criteria of 241 kg/s gas flow (72% He, 28% Xe) at 2.76 MPa, and equilibrium partial pressures maintained in the hot (1500 K) and cold (1100 K) regions of the system, 16.7 kg/year of silicon will be vaporized from the hotter region and condensed in the lower-temperature regions. It is likely that this rate of mass transport would be unacceptable.

ORNL DWG 88C-15097

Fig. 17. Summary of the conclusions of the thermodynamic equilibrium assessment. The stabilities of the ceramic-ceramic composites are related to the maximum species pressures, which are shown in the figure. Equilibrium pressures less than 10^{-10} Pa indicate that the system is stable; pressures between 10^{-10} and 10^{-5} Pa indicate less, but possibly acceptable, stability; and pressures greater than 10^{-5} Pa indicate unstable systems.

Using the criteria for the Brayton-cycle continuous-mode power system, the composites containing Al_2O_3 , ZrC, or carbon appear to be thermodynamically stable. The SiC-containing systems, however, are likely to have unacceptably high silicon partial pressures.

The combination of hydrogen and the extreme temperature of the Brayton-cycle burst-mode system eliminates all of the ceramic composites considered. Should the system need to operate for a very short period of time it may be possible to tolerate material vaporization, although such material loss would have to be accommodated in the design. Experimental observations at lower temperatures (1173–1550 K) of interactions with hydrogen, however, indicate little degradation of alumina and Si_3N_4 and little likely degradation of SiC.

For the Rankine-cycle systems the Al_2O_3 composite, SiC-fiber-reinforced ZrC, and carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC appear to have acceptable thermodynamic equilibrium stabilities. These systems also appear to have fair to good compatibility based on experimental determinations.

Based on the above considerations, it is recommended that Al_2O_3 -reinforced Al_2O_3 and carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC be considered for the Brayton-cycle continuous-mode system and that Al_2O_3 -reinforced Al_2O_3 , SiC-fiber-reinforced ZrC, and carbon-fiber-reinforced ZrC be considered for the Rankine-cycle system. None of the candidate ceramic composite systems are likely to be sufficiently stable under Brayton-cycle burst-mode conditions.

REFERENCES

1. T. M. Besmann, *SOLGASMIX-PV, a Computer Program to Calculate Equilibrium Relationships in Complex Chemical Systems*, ORNL/TM-5775, April 1977.
2. D. R. Stull and H. Prophet, project directors, *JANAF Thermochemical Tables*, 2d ed., NSRDS-NBS 37, U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1971.
3. M. W. Chase, J. L. Curnutt, R. A. McDonald, and A. N. Syverud, "JANAF Thermochemical Tables 1978 Supplement," *J. Phys. Ref. Data* 7(3), 793–940 (1978).
4. M. W. Chase, J. L. Curnutt, H. Prophet, R. A. McDonald, and A. N. Syverud, "JANAF Thermochemical Tables 1975 Supplement," *J. Phys. Ref. Data* 4(1), 1–175 (1975).

5. M. W. Chase, J. L. Curnutt, A. T. Hu, and H. Prophet, "JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 1974 Supplement," *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* 3(2), 311-480 (1974).
6. O. Kubaschewski and C. B. Alcock, *Metallurgical Thermochemistry*, 5th ed., Pergamon Press, Ltd., Oxford, U.K., 1979, pp. 268-323.
7. D. W. McKee and D. Chatterji, "Corrosion of Silicon Carbide in Gases and Alkaline Melts," *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 59(9-10), 441-44 (1976).
8. F. L. Horn, J. A. Fillo, and J. R. Powell, "Performance of Ceramic Materials in High Temperature Steam and Hydrogen," *J. Nucl. Mater.* 85&86, 439-43 (1979).
9. J. E. Sheehan, *Elevated Temperature Controlled-Impurity Helium Aging of Ceramics*, GA-A15411, General Atomic Company, San Diego, July 1979.
10. W. H. Cook, *Corrosion Resistance of Various Ceramics and Cermets to Liquid Metals*, ORNL-2391, May 1960.
11. M. Blanc, A. Mocellin, and J. L. Strudel, "Observation of Potassium B^{'''}-Alumina in Sintered Alumina," *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 60(9-10), 403-09 (1977).

page blank

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1-2. Central Research Library	30. J. R. Keiser
3. Document Reference Section	31. J. F. King
4-5. Laboratory Records Department	32. M. M. Martin
6. Laboratory Records, ORNL RC	33. H. E. McCoy
7. ORNL Patent Section	34. D. L. McElroy
9. P. Angelini	35. R. E. Pawel
10. P. F. Becher	36. D. F. Pedraza
11-15. T. M. Besmann	37. J. M. Robbins
16. A. Bleier	38. A. C. Schaffhauser
17. M. K. Booker	39. G. M. Slaughter
18. C. R. Brinkman	40. J. O. Stiegler
19. A. J. Caputo	41. D. P. Stinton
20. R. H. Cooper, Jr.	42. R. A. Strehlow
21. W. R. Corwin	43-45. P. T. Thornton
22. D. F. Craig	46. F. W. Wiffen
23. J. R. DiStefano	47. R. J. Charles (Consultant)
24. J. I. Federer	48. G. Y. Chin (Consultant)
25. H. Henson	49. H. E. Cook (Consultant)
26. J. A. Horak	50. Alan Lawley (Consultant)
27. H. S. Hsu	51. W. D. Nix (Consultant)
28. R. R. Judkins	52. J. C. Williams (Consultant)
29. M. J. Kania	

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

53. ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, IL 60439
S. K. Bhattacharyya
- 54-57. BATTELLE PACIFIC NORTHWEST LABORATORIES, P.O. Box 999, Richland, WA 99352
J. O. Barner W. J. Krotiuk
B. M. Johnson R. D. Widrig
58. BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY, Upton, NY 11973
J. R. Powell
59. HANFORD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, P.O. Box 1970, Richland, WA, 99352
D. S. Dutt
- 60-63. IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING LABORATORY, P.O. Box 1625, Idaho Falls, ID 83415
J. A. Dearien J. W. Martinell
J. W. Henscheid R. E. Rice

64. JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, Deputy Project Manager for Aerospace Technology, SP-100 Project Office, MS 506-432, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109
J. F. Mondt
- 65-68. LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY, P.O. Box 1633, Los Alamos, NM 87545
C. R. Bell S. V. Jackson
R. J. Bohl M. A. Merrigan
69. LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY, L-275, Box 808. Livermore, CA 94550
C. E. Walter
70. NASA LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER, 2100 Brookpart Road, Cleveland, OH 44135
R. J. Sovie
- 71-72. SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES, Department Manager, Division 6430, P.O. Box 5800, Albuquerque, NM 87185
N. R. Ortiz F. V. Thome
73. WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION, Manager, Materials Technology Advanced Energy Systems Division, P.O. Box 10864, Pittsburgh, PA 15236
R. W. Buckman
74. W. J. SCHAFER ASSOCIATION, 1901 N. Fort Myer Drive, Suite 800, Arlington, VA 22209
S. A. Bassett
- 75-76. SDIO/SL, THE PENTAGON, Washington, DC 20301-7100
R. L. Verga R. L. Wiley
77. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, Dep/NE521, Washington, DC 20545
D. R. Bennett
- 78-79. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, Office of Space Reactor Projects, NE-54 Washington, DC 20545
W. P. Carroll E. U. Khan
80. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, DP-22.2 Germantown, Washington, DC 20545
R. D. Hahn

- 81. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, Division of Defense Energy Projects,
Washington, DC 20545
E. J. Wahlquist
- 82. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, P.O. Box 550, Richland, WA 99353
K. R. Absher
- 83. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, 785 DOE Place, Shelly, ID 83275
P. J. Dirkmaat
- 84. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, Albuquerque Operations Office,
P.O. BOX 5400, Allbuquerque, NM 87115
R. L. Holton
- 85. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, Chicago Operations Office,
9800 S. Cass Avenue, Argonne, IL 60439
J. L. Hooper
- 86-87. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, Magnetic Fusion and Nuclear Division,
San Francisco Operations Office, 1333 Broadway, Oakland, CA 94612
J. K. Hartman W. L. Lambert
- 88-92. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, National Materials Programs, Oak Ridge
Operations Office, Oak Ridge, TN 37831
E. E. Hoffman
- 93. AIR FORCE WRIGHT AERONAUTICAL LABS, AFWAL/POOS-3, Wright Patterson
AFB, OH 45433
E. T. Mahefkey
- 94-277. DOE, TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER, Office of Information Services,
P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831

For distribution as shown in DOE/TIC-4500, Distribution
Category UC-25 (Materials).