SANDIA REPORT

SAND2005-3904

Unlimited Release

Printed June 2005

Cleaning and Materials Compatibility Test Results For Elimination of Flammable Solvents in Wipe Applications

Edwin P. Lopez
Corrosion and Electrochemical Sciences

Prepared by Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185

Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation,
a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy's
National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

Approved for public release; further dissemination unlimited.

Sandia National Laboratories

Issued by Sandia National Laboratories, operated for the United States Department of Energy by Sandia Corporation.

NOTICE: 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, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represent 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, any agency thereof, or any of their contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, any agency thereof, or any of their contractors.

Printed in the United States of America. This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Telephone: (865)576-8401
Facsimile: (865)576-5728
E-Mail: reports@adonis.osti.gov
Online ordering: <http://www.osti.gov/bridge>

Available to the public from

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Rd
Springfield, VA 22161

Telephone: (800)553-6847
Facsimile: (703)605-6900
E-Mail: orders@ntis.fedworld.gov
Online order: <http://www.ntis.gov/help/ordermethods.asp?loc=7-4-0#online>

SAND2005 – 3904
Unclassified Unlimited Release
Printed June 2005

**Cleaning and Materials Compatibility Test Results
For Elimination of Flammable Solvents in Wipe Applications**

Edwin P. Lopez
Corrosion and Electrochemical Sciences

Sandia National Laboratories[†]
Albuquerque, NM

Abstract

In recent years, efforts have been made within the nuclear weapons complex (National Nuclear Security Administration) of the Department of Energy (DOE) to replace Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulated solvents (i.e., flammable, toxic, corrosive, and reactive) and ozone-depleting chemicals (ODC) with more benign alternatives. Within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Defense (DoD) sectors, these solvents are used for cleaning hardware during routine maintenance operations. A primary goal of this study is to replace flammable solvents used in wiping applications. Two cleaners, including a hydrofluoroether (HFE) and an azeotrope of the HFE and isopropyl alcohol (IPA), have been studied as potential replacements for flammable solvents. Cleaning efficacy, short-term and long-term materials compatibility, corrosion, drying times, flammability, environment, safety and health (ES&H) and accelerated aging issues were among the experiments used to screen candidate solvents by the interagency team performing this work. This report presents cleaning efficacy results as determined by the contact angle Goniometer as well as materials compatibility results of various metal alloys and polymers. The results indicate that IPA (baseline cleaner) and the HFE/IPA azeotrope are roughly equivalent in their ability to remove fluorinated grease, silicone grease, and a simulated finger print contaminant from various metal alloys. All of the ASTM sandwich and immersion corrosion tests with IPA, HFE or the HFE/IPA azeotrope on metal alloys showed no signs of corrosion. Furthermore, no deleterious effects were noted for polymeric materials immersed in IPA, HFE, or the HFE/IPA azeotrope.

[†]Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract No. DE-AC04-94AL85000.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to extend a special thanks to Carly Glauner for her tireless effort in completing all the required tests. The manuscript was reviewed by Rob Sorensen.

Contents

	<u>Pg.</u>
Tables	12
Figures	26
I. Introduction	5
II. Experimental	5
III. Results and Discussion	9
IV. Summary	11
V. References	11
VI. Distribution List	28

Tables

	<u>Pg.</u>
1. Solvent Properties	12
2. Relative Corrosion Severity Rating System	12
3. Contact Angles – Difference after wiping 6X and 3X with HFE/IPA Azeotrope, Isopropyl Alcohol, and HFE-7100	13-14
4. Contact Angles - Samples wiped 6X with HFE/IPA Azeotrope	14
5. Contact Angles - Coupons wiped 3X with HFE/IPA Azeotrope	15
6. Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 6X with Isopropyl Alcohol	16
7. Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 6X with HFE-7100	16-17
8. Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 3X with Isopropyl Alcohol	17
9. Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 3X with HFE-7100	18
10. Sandwich Corrosion Test Results	19
11. Immersion Corrosion Test Results	19-20
12. Materials Compatibility of Other Materials – 1 st Round	20-22
13. Materials Compatibility of Other Materials – 2nd Round	22-24
14. Materials Compatibility of Other Materials – 3rd Round	24-25

Figures

1. Contact Angle Differences – IPA versus Neat HFE-7100	26
2. Contact Angle Differences – IPA versus HFE/IPA Azeotrope	27

I. INTRODUCTION

Sandia National Laboratories, BWXT Pantex Plant, Kansas City Plant, Los Alamos and other NNSA sites have teamed to identify suitable replacements for RCRA solvents and ozone depleting chemicals, used in nuclear maintenance operations. The primary goal of this project is to systematically reduce the usage of flammable solvents (principally isopropyl alcohol) used in proximity to and near nuclear operations. It includes a risk-cost benefit assessment of solvent and combustible material elimination, minimization or substitution. The cost benefits to all programs at BWXT Pantex Plant by removing a flammable solvent, such as IPA, would include (1) the savings of significant process time if the requirements for task exhaust, bonding and drying times were lifted due to the use of nonflammable solvents; (2) the ability to use facilities that are not currently available for weapons work due to the absence of exhaust systems; (3) the reduction of waste disposal costs for both the NNSA/BWXT Pantex Plant and the DoD because the waste generated has the potential of not being categorized as hazardous or mixed; and most importantly (4) the enhancement of safety through the elimination of flammable solvents.

II. EXPERIMENTAL

Solvents Evaluated

Isopropyl alcohol (IPA) was the baseline solvent evaluated in this study. A hydrofluoroether (HFE-7100) and HFE-7100/IPA azeotrope (a liquid mixture that is characterized by a constant boiling point which is lower or higher than any of the components) were evaluated as potential replacements for IPA. HFE-7100 is an inseparable mixture of methoxynanofluorobutane and methoxynanofluoroisobutane. A comparison of some of the physical properties of IPA, HFE-7100, and HFE-7100/IPA azeotrope are shown in Table 1.

Cleaning Efficacy - Contact Angle/Goniometer Substrates

The substrates used for the cleaning study were 1.5" diameter metal disks that were 1/4" thick and machined to a 16 rms finish. The metal alloys tested included; bare, alodined, and anodized 2024 and 6061 aluminum, alodined and anodized 7075 aluminum, bare 303 and 304L stainless steel, passivated 304L stainless steel, and titanium.

Cleaning Efficacy - Contaminants

The contaminants selected were a representative cross-section of those found on weapon surfaces. The three contaminants included Krytox 240-AD fluorinated grease, Dow Corning 4 (DC-4) silicone insulating compound, and dust sebum emulsion (a simulated fingerprint oil).

Sample Preparation and Cleaning Procedure

Following machining, the metal discs were vapor degreased in trichloroethylene (TCE) followed by an IPA rinse and then flushed with dry nitrogen to create a uniform initial substrate surface.

The contaminants were then applied as follows. For the dust sebum emulsion, approximately 4 microliters (μL) [i.e., 4 milligrams (mg), assuming a density of 1 gram/milliliter (g/ml)] of the simulated fingerprint oil were deposited and spread over the center of each disc using a micro dispenser. The dust sebum emulsion consists primarily of organic acids, paraffin, and oils. Since a fingerprint weighs ca. 0.1 milligrams, each deposit corresponds to 40 superimposed fingerprints. The Krytox fluorinated grease and the DC-4 silicone grease were each deposited by weighing 0.05grams (g) [or 50 milligrams] of the contaminant on a disc and then lightly spreading the contaminant across the entire surface of the disc. After being applied to the disc, the samples were allowed to dry for 30 minutes before being wiped clean and the contact angle measured.

The contaminants were removed by wiping with HFE-7100, IPA or 4.5 wt.% IPA in HFE-7100 using a Kimwipe or KayDry impregnated with roughly 5 ml of solvent. One wipe consists of applying a light pressure with the middle and forefingers on the wiper and dragging it across the surface of the metal disc. A second wipe consists of using a fresh Kimwipe or Kay Dry impregnated also with fresh 5 ml of solvent, etc. In some cases, up to six wipes were necessary to remove the contaminant from the surface, regardless of the type of solvent used. Removal of the three contaminants from the metal substrates was evaluated with water drop contact angle method. Replicates of three samples per condition were performed.

Cleaning Efficacy - Contact Angle Measurements

The contact angle is a qualitative measurement that is used as an initial screening tool. A Contact Angle/Goniometer instrument manufactured by Advanced Surface Technology Inc., (Video Contact Angle System, Model 2500) was used to determine relative surface cleanliness.¹ The test measures the contact (tangent) angle that is formed between a drop of water and its supporting surface. The method is a relative measure of surface wettability. In general, the cleaner the surface is of organics, the lower the contact angle measurement. The contact angle results are reported in Table 3 as the differential between the initial pre-contaminated surface and the post clean surface. The smaller the difference the cleaner the surface is of organics.

Sandwich Corrosion per ASTM F1110-90 – Metal Alloys

In addition to the cleaning efficacy of the solvents, it is important to know that the solvent does not react with or corrode the substrate. Therefore, corrosion tests were conducted that included the Sandwich Corrosion Test per ASTM F1110-90, and the Immersion Corrosion Test per ASTM F483-98.^{2,3}

The Sandwich Corrosion Test is a comparative accelerated aging test used to determine the corrosiveness of cleaners (i.e., solvents), generally on aluminum alloys. In this case, the study was expanded to include other metal alloys listed below. The metal samples (2" X 4" X 0.04") were machined to a 16 rms finish and were then pre-cleaned with mineral spirits and methyl ethyl ketone. The beryllium samples were pre-cleaned with methanol.

The sandwiches are created by placing a filter paper (1" X 3") saturated with a candidate solvent between two plates (2" x 4") of the same alloy. The sandwiches (replicates of

three per condition) are cycled between warm air at ambient relative humidity (100°F, 30-60% RH) and warm, humid air (100°F, 95-100% RH) for five days and then left in the warm humid air environment over the weekend, for a total of 168 hours of exposure. After the entire cycle is completed, the samples are inspected with the naked eye and then with 10X magnification to determine whether corrosion has occurred. A relative corrosion severity rating system is used to numerically rank the results (Table 2). Only the surfaces that were in contact with the saturated filter paper are compared. Any corrosion at the edge of the sandwich is disregarded per ASTM F1110-90. Any corrosion in excess of that shown by the control group (H₂O) is cause for rejection per the ASTM standard definition.

Metals tested in IPA, HFE and H₂O include:

- 1) 304 L Stainless Steel
- 2) Passivated 304L Stainless Steel
- 3) 303 Stainless Steel
- 4) Titanium 6A14V
- 5) Beryllium
- 6) 7075 Aluminum
- 7) 2024 Aluminum
- 8) Alodined 2024 Aluminum
- 9) Anodized 2024 Aluminum
- 10) 6061 Aluminum

Immersion Corrosion Test per ASTM F483-98 – Metal Alloys

The Immersion Corrosion Test determines the corrosiveness of the solvents on metals under conditions of total immersion by a combination of weight change measurements and a visual qualitative inspection. The metal types tested were the same as those in the sandwich corrosion tests.

The procedure was as follows: 1) replicate samples of each alloy (9 each for IPA and 8 each for HFE) were pre-cleaned with mineral spirits and methyl ethyl ketone, 2) the samples were weighed to the nearest 0.1 mg prior to immersion, 3) the samples were immersed in the solvent for a 24 hour period at 100°F, 4) at the end of the 24 hour period, the samples were removed from the solvent, reweighed and inspected (for discoloration, dulling etching, presence of growth, pitting, presence of selective or localized attack, etc.). Results were compared to the control sample.

Metals tested in IPA, HFE and HFE Azeotrope include:

- 1) Bare 7075 Aluminum Alloy
- 2) Alodined 7075 Aluminum Alloy
- 3) Bare 2024 Aluminum Alloy

- 4) Bare 6061 Aluminum Alloy
- 5) Bare 303 Stainless Steel
- 6) Passivated 304L Stainless Steel
- 7) Bare 303se Stainless Steel
- 8) Bare 301 Stainless Steel
- 9) Bare 304L Stainless Steel
- 10) 6AL4V Titanium

Materials Compatibility of Other Materials - Immersion of Polymeric Materials per SAND2000-1084

Compatibility is the degree to which materials can coexist in a shared environment without adverse reaction for an acceptable period of time. Compatibility tests on polymeric materials were performed to evaluate the long-term effects of the solvent on the polymers in the event of an inadvertent spill. This compatibility test consists of a minimum 2-minute immersion of representative polymers in either HFE or IPA.⁴ The polymeric samples were tested in the as-received condition. No pre-test cleaning or conditioning was done. Weight and visual analyses (discoloration, swelling, dissolution, texture change, etc.) of the materials were recorded before and after immersion.

Samples Tested – 1st round

Samples A = 186 Sylgard,
 Samples B = 184 Sylgard,
 Samples C = Wilethane 44,
 Samples D = Epoweld 8173,
 Samples E = Nitrile Gloves,
 Samples F = PVC Gloves,

Samples G = Butyl Gloves,
 Samples H = Silastic J,
 Samples I = Barco Bond,
 Samples J = O-Ring,
 Samples K = PolyethyleneTerephthalate
 Shim Stock

Samples Tested – 2nd round

Samples A = Coax Wire Polyimide Insulation,
 Samples B = EN-7Polyurethane Encapsulation,
 Samples C = PET-90 Polyurethane Encapsulation,
 Samples D = CF3262 Samples,
 Samples D2 = CF3262 copper end,
 Samples E = Compression Pad # BBN-3725-F82,
 Samples F = Compression Pad # BBN-3586-E82,
 Samples G = Compression Pad # BBN- 4267 B84,
 Samples H = Compression Pad # BBN- 2848 J80,
 Samples I = Aft det Hold down #530851,
 Samples J = Aft det Hold down #326799,
 Samples K = Aft det Hold down #607526,
 Samples L = Fwd det Hold down #834223,
 Samples M = Fwd det Hold down #396294,
 Samples N = Cable Protector 422078 WSN468459 Cycle 21,
 Sample O = Tube Protector 422012 WSN 834223.

Samples Tested 3rd Round - Lockheed Materials

Samples A = White Chalky pieces,

Samples B = Black with Metal,

Samples C = Long Black

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Goniometer/Contact Angles Measurements

Table 3 shows a summary of contact angle differences for substrates that were wiped (3X and 6X) with the HFE/IPA azeotrope, HFE and IPA. The differences were calculated by subtracting the post clean contact angle values from the pre-contamination contact angle values. More detail on the performance of each cleaner, including contact angles before and after wiping with standard deviations are shown in Tables 4-10.

Initially, the HFE-7100 solvent in neat form was the primary candidate solvent that was selected for testing. Each substrate was wiped 3X with the HFE and then compared to substrates that were wiped the same number of times with IPA. In general, the HFE-7100 solvent was very poor at removing the contaminants when wiped 3X (Figure 1, Table 3 and 9). For example, on titanium, a difference in contact angle of 16.6°, 18.9° and 18.2° was obtained after wiping 3X with HFE on substrates contaminated with Krytox, Silicone, and DSE respectively. Comparatively, the contact angles when wiped 3X with IPA were 7.7°, 6.7°, and 5.3°. Recall, the lower the contact angle the cleaner the surface. In some cases, moderate improvements were noted when the number of wipes was increased to six with HFE. For example, the contact angles were reduced when wiping the contaminants from bare 2024 aluminum (Table 3 and 7). There were also instances where the contact angles were actually worse after wiping 6X with HFE versus 3X (ex., anodized 2024 aluminum).

The data illustrate the inconsistent cleaning performance that can occur when wiping with the neat HFE solvent. In some cases as already indicated, the contact angle values were significantly worse than wiping 3X with IPA and sometimes moderately improved when the number of wipes was increased to six with the HFE solvent. A further illustration of the inconsistency of neat HFE was the result that wiping with the HFE solvent was sometimes comparable to IPA. For example, contact angle values compared favorably with IPA when wiping bare 2024 bare and alodined 2024 aluminum coupons for all three contaminants. However, it normally took wiping 6X with the HFE solvent to clean as well as IPA. In summary, it was apparent that the neat HFE solvent (which has a low solvency property) would not satisfactorily remove the contaminants in a consistent manner.

Due to the poor performance of the neat HFE-7100, a mixture of IPA and HFE-7100 was tested. The addition of IPA to the formulation increases the overall solvency property particularly for ionic soils. The solvent is an azeotrope consisting of 4.5 wt% IPA in HFE-7100.

In most cases, the HFE/IPA azeotrope compared favorably and more consistently with IPA than did the HFE-7100 neat solvent (Figure 2, and Table 3). For example, the

contact angle differences after cleaning Krytox, Silicone and DSE from anodized 6061 aluminum by wiping 3X with the azeotrope were 8.0°, 8.5° and 8.5° respectively. The contact angle differences for IPA after wiping 3X were 3.7°, 5.3°, and 5.3° respectively. A slight improvement in cleaning with the azeotrope was noted when the number of wipes was increased to 6X, with contact angle differences of 6.1°, 7.3°, and 7.8° respectively. The same trend was observed for alodined 6061 aluminum, and anodized and alodined 7075 aluminum.

The azeotrope solvent was the only cleaner that successfully removed all three contaminants from anodized 2024 aluminum. However, it required wiping six times. For example, the contact angle difference after cleaning Krytox 3X and 6X with IPA was 16.2° and 24.7° respectively as compared to 27.3° and 9.0° respectively for the HFE azeotrope. Similarly, the contact angle differences after cleaning silicone and DSE were lower for the azeotrope than for IPA when wiped 6X with the azeotrope. It was hypothesized that poor cleaning of this particular alloy was a result of the high porous surface oxide produced by the anodization process. The resulting anodized surface permits trapping of the 3 contaminants in the pores. The solvent has limited access to the contaminants in the pores and therefore light cleaning by wiping can be inefficient.

An anomaly occurred during wiping of the DSE contaminant from 304L SS. In this case, the contact angle differences were less after wiping with all three solvents, indicating that the post clean surface was actually cleaner than the initial pre-cleaned baseline surface. It was hypothesized that an additive within the DSE formulation, (such as an organic acid or a detergent) was responsible for lowering the surface tension and giving an erroneous contact angle reading, i.e., the surfaces were still contaminated. The contact angle differences after cleaning the DSE contaminant from 304L stainless steel (by wiping six times with the azeotrope and IPA) were less by 12.3° and 12.0° respectively. Similarly, a post clean contact angle of 16.1° less was obtained after wiping three times with HFE-7100 (Table 3). For comparison sake, a 304L SS sample that was contaminated and not wiped had a contact angle difference of 37.2° better. Surface cleanliness needs to be verified with x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy.

In summary, the cleaning ability for the neat HFE-7100 solvent was inconsistent, sometimes requiring wiping six times. The HFE/IPA azeotrope, while also at times requiring 6X to remove the contaminants, appears to be more consistent than the neat HFE-7100 solvent and overall compares favorably with IPA.

Materials Compatibility of Metal Alloys

- 1) Sandwich Corrosion Test – the relative corrosion rating system per ASTM F1110-90 is listed in Table 1. Sandwich corrosion test results for all alloys are listed in Table 10. In almost every case, an average corrosion rating of 1 was obtained when IPA was the candidate solvent, regardless of which metal alloy was tested. A rating of 1 indicates very slight corrosion or discoloration on up to 5% of the affected area. When HFE-7100 was tested, the average corrosion rating was 0 for all metal alloys with the exception of beryllium which was 0 to 1. This effectively means that there was no visible corrosion observed on any part of the

20), with an average corrosion rating of 4, 3, and 3 respectively.

- 2) Immersion Corrosion Test per ASTM F483-98 – the immersion corrosion test results for ten metal alloys are shown in Table 11. No corrosion effects were observed on any of the metal alloys after exposure to IPA or HFE-7100 for 24 hours at 100°F. Also, there was negligible weight change noted after exposure of all alloys.

Materials Compatibility of Polymer Materials

None of the materials that were tested by exposing to IPA or HFE exhibited any significant weight change. Furthermore, there were no detectable visual changes such as discoloration, swelling, dissolution or texture change. Examples of materials that were tested included polyurethane, polyimides, compression pads, polyesters and other polymers.

Tables 12-14 shows the results for all materials tested. Negligible weight changes were observed for all materials after exposure for 2 minutes in IPA or HFE-7100. Weight changes were recorded immediately after removal from the solvent, after 5 minutes, after 10 minutes and after 180 minutes. Only one material, PVC gloves, had a visual change as a result of exposure to IPA. In this case the PVC gloves became brittle and hard after the 2-minute immersion.

IV. SUMMARY

Contact angle test results indicate that isopropyl alcohol and the hydrofluoroether/4.5 weight % isopropyl alcohol azeotrope were roughly equivalent in the removal of the three representative contaminants. The hydrofluoroether (neat) solvent exhibited inconsistent cleaning results. All of the ASTM sandwich and immersion corrosion tests performed with either isopropyl alcohol or hydrofluoroether showed no signs of pitting, etching or other evidence of corrosion on any of the metal alloy substrates. With the exception of the poly vinyl chloride gloves, (which became hard and brittle after exposure to IPA), no deleterious effects were noted for polymeric materials after immersion in isopropyl alcohol, hydrofluoroether or the hydrofluoroether /isopropyl alcohol azeotrope.

V. REFERENCES

1. E. P. Lopez, et.al, Chemical Substitution for Nuclear Weapons Maintenance Operations, SAND2000-1084, Unlimited Release, May 2000.
2. Standard Test Method for Sandwich Corrosion Test, ASTM F1110-90.
3. Standard Test Method for Total Immersion Corrosion Test for Aircraft Maintenance Chemicals, ASTM F483-98.
4. Two Minute Immersion Monitoring Weight Change, Discoloration, Swelling, and Texture Change, SAND2000-1084, Unlimited Release, May 2000.

Tables

Table 1 Solvent Properties

Solvent Properties	IPA	HFE-7100	HFE-IPA Azeotrope
Boiling Point @ 760 mmHg	82°C	61°C	54.8°C
Vapor Pressure	43 mm Hg @ 25°C	202 mm Hg at 25°C	207 mm Hg at 25°C
Flash Point	12° C	None	None
Time Weighted Average (8hr.)	400 ppm	750 ppm	750/400 ppm
Global Warming Potential		320 (lb equivalent CO ₂)	310 (lb equivalent CO ₂)
Ozone Depletion Potential	0	0	0

Table 2 – Relative Corrosion Severity Rating System

0	No visible corrosion
1	Very slight corrosion
2	Slight corrosion
3	Moderate corrosion
4	Excessive corrosion
0	0%
1	Up to 5% of the surface area corroded
2	5 to 10% of the surface area corroded
3	10 to 25% of the surface area corroded
4	25% or more of the surface area corroded

Table 3 - Contact Angles – Difference after wiping 6X and 3X with HFE/IPA Azeotrope, Isopropyl Alcohol, and HFE-7100

Metal Alloy	Azeo. 6X	Azeo. 3X	IPA 6X	IPA 3X	HFE 6X	HFE 3X
2024 Al -Krytox	8.2	10.6	6.4	-	8.7	11.8
2024 Al -Silicone	8.2	9.8	10.6	-	9.3	13.8
2024 Al - DSE	12.0	12.3	4.3	-	3.7	13.7
2024 Al - Alodine Krytox	-	7.3	0.5	6.4	7.8	10.2
2024 Al - Alodine Silicone	-	6.3	4.8	9.3	7.6	5.9
2024 Al - Alodine DSE	-	4.7	5.6	7.4	6.0	7.6
2024 Al Anodized - Krytox	9.0	27.3	24.7	16.2	39.8	27.2
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	7.3	20.7	29.1	38.6	44.8	32.3
2024 Al Anodized - DSE	7.2	28.2	36.5	33.6	39.3	36.4
6061 Al-Krytox	-	2.3	-	2.1	-	2.6
6061 Al-Silicone	-	4.5	-	4.6	-	4.9
6061 Al-DSE	-	4.5	-	6.5	-	5.3
6061 Al Alodined - Krytox	6.1	8.0	-	3.7	-	-
6061 Al Alodined - Silicone	7.3	8.5	-	5.3	-	-
6061 Al Alodined - DSE	7.8	8.5	-	5.3	-	-
6061 Al Anodized - Krytox	4.7	4.8	-	3.7	-	-
6061 Al Anodized - Silicone	4.8	5.0	-	4.5	-	-
6061 Al Anodized - DSE	6.5	6.7	-	5.7	-	-
7075 Alodined - Krytox	5.7	7.7	-	4.7	-	-
7075 Alodined - Silicone	5.7	9.2	-	4.3	-	-
7075 Alodined - DSE	6.0	9.3	-	4.8	-	-
7075 Anodized - Krytox	6.0	8.0	-	4.7	-	-
7075 Anodized - Silicone	8.0	10.0	-	6.0	-	-

7075 Anodized - DSE	5.3	9.8	-	4.2	-	-
303 SS - Krytox	-	7.7	3.4	8.4	3.3	28.0
303 SS - Silicone	-	12.5	4.5	4.3	3.7	24.6
303 SS -DSE	-	8.2	1.3	0.4	2.4	15.0
304L SS - Krytox	7.3	9.0	2.4	1.2	4.7	13.4
304L SS - Silicone	8.5	10.3	5.2	3.2	7.1	12.0
304L SS - DSE	-12.3	-15.8	-12.0	-18.3	4.1	-16.1
304L SS-P Krytox	-	6.3	4.6	6.7	5.0	6.1
304L SS-P Silicone	-	8.2	6.1	8.0	3.0	8.9
304L SS-P DSE	-	7.7	2.4	6.2	5.5	7.5
Titanium - Krytox	6.0	-	-	7.7	-	16.6
Titanium - Silicone	5.2	-	-	6.7	-	18.9
Titanium - DSE	6.5	-	-	5.3	-	18.2

Table 4 – Contact Angles - Samples wiped 6X with HFE/IPA Azeotrope

Metal Alloy	Avg. Preclean CA°	Avg. After Wipe CA°	Difference CA°
2024 Al - Krytox	67.0 ±0.5	75.2 ±0.7	8.2
2024 Al - Silicone	68.0 ±1.9	76.2 ±0.2	8.2
2024 Al - DSE	68.5 ±0.2	80.5 ±0.7	12.0
2024 Al Anodized -Krytox	62.6 ±1.8	71.6 ±2.4	9.0
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	62.6 ±0	70.0 ±1.4	7.3
2024 Al Anodized -DSE	63.1 ±0.2	70.3 ±0.9	7.2
304L SS - Krytox	78.3 ±1.5	85.6 ±1.2	7.3
304L SS - Silicone	78.3 ±1.7	86.8 ±0.8	8.5
304L SS - DSE	78.3 ±1.7	66.0 ±1.5	-12.3
6061 Al Anodized - Krytox	82.7 ±4.7	87.3 ±0	4.7
6061 Al Anodized - Silicone	83.2 ±2.1	88.0 ±2.4	4.8
6061 Al Anodized - DSE	82.5 ±0.2	89.0 ±0.5	6.5
7075 Alodined - Krytox	86.8 ±0.7	92.5 ±2.1	5.7
7075 Alodined - Silicone	83.8 ±1.2	89.5 ±0.2	5.7
7075 Alodined - DSE	85.0 ±1.4	91.0 ±0.5	6.0
7075 Anodized - Krytox	85.0 ±1.4	91.0 ±0.5	6.0
7075 Anodized - Silicone	81.5 ±1.6	89.5 ±8.0	8.0
7075 Anodized - DSE	81.2 ±0.2	86.5 ±1.2	5.3
Titanium - Krytox	64.3 ±0	70.3 ±0.9	6.0
Titanium - Silicone	62.2 ±2.1	67.3 ±2.4	5.2
Titanium - DSE	61.3 ±0.5	67.8 ±0.7	6.5

Table 5 – Coupons wiped 3X with HFE/IPA Azeotrope

Metal Alloy	Avg. Preclean CA°	Avg. After Wipe CA°	Difference CA°
2024 Al - Krytox	84.2 ±0.2	94.8 ±0.7	10.6
2024 Al - Silicone	85.2 ±1.2	95.0 ±0	9.8
2024 Al - DSE	84.2 ±0.2	96.5 ±0.7	12.3
2024 Al Alodine -Krytox	86.3 ±1.4	93.6 ±0.9	7.3
2024 Al Alodine - Silicone	86.8 ±1.2	93.2 ±0.2	6.3
2024 Al Alodine - DSE	85.2 ±3.1	89.8 ±1.2	4.7
2024 Al Anodized - Krytox	59.3 ±2.4	86.7 ±0.9	27.3
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	63.3 ±0.9	83.0 ±1.4	20.7
2024 Al Anodized -DSE	61.0 ±0.9	89.2 ±1.6	28.2
303 SS - Krytox	64.5 ±1.6	72.2 ±3.5	7.7
303 SS - Silicone	62.5 ±0.7	75.0 ±0.9	12.5
303 SS - DSE	65.3 ±0	73.5 ±2.1	8.2
304L SS - Krytox	78.2 ±1.4	87.2 ±1.3	9.0
304L SS - Silicone	78.2 ±2.3	88.5 ±1.3	10.3
304L SS - DSE	79.6 ±0.8	63.7 ±2.6	-15.9
304L SS-P - Krytox	81.3 ±0	87.7 ±1.4	6.3
304L SS-P - Silicone	79.2 ±1.2	87.3 ±0.5	8.2
304L SS-P – DSE	81.2 ±0.7	88.8 ±0.2	7.7
6061 Al - Krytox	81.7 ±0.5	84.0 ±0.9	2.3
6061 Al - Silicone	82.3 ±0	86.8 ±1.2	4.5
6061 Al - DSE	81.8 ±0.2	86.3 ±1.9	4.5
6061 Al Alodined - Krytox	86.0 ±0.9	94.0 ±0.9	8.0
6061 Al Alodined - Silicone	87.0 ±0.5	95.5 ±1.2	8.5
6061 Al Alodined - DSE	85.5 ±1.6	94.0 ±0.5	8.5
6061 Al Anodized - Krytox	81.0 ±2.3	85.8 ±0.7	4.8
6061 Al Anodized - Silicone	82.8 ±0.2	87.8 ±0.2	5.0
6061 Al Anodized - DSE	80.5 ±0.7	87.2 ±0.7	6.7
7075 Alodined - Krytox	86.7 ±0.9	94.3 ±1.4	7.7
7075 Alodined - Silicone	86.7 ±0	95.8 ±0.7	9.2
7075 Alodined - DSE	86.5 ±0.2	95.8 ±1.6	9.3
7075 Anodized - Krytox	75.8 ±1.2	83.8 ±0.2	8.0
7075 Anodized - Silicone	73.7 ±2.8	83.7 ±3.8	10.0
7075 Anodized - DSE	73.8 ±0.2	83.6 ±0.9	9.8

Table 6 - Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 6X with Isopropyl Alcohol

Metal Alloy Contaminant	Avg. Preclean CA°	Avg. After Wipe CA°	Difference CA°
2024 Al - Krytox	86.3 ±1.2	92.7 ±0.8	6.4
2024 Al - Silicone	76.4 ±1.4	87.0 ±0.9	10.6
2024 Al - DSE	79.1 ±2.0	83.4 ±0.5	4.3
2024 Al Alodine -Krytox	82.1 ±3.7	82.6 ±1.2	0.5
2024 Al Alodine - Silicone	81.7 ±2.8	86.5 ±2.7	4.8
2024 Al Alodine - DSE	78.3 ±0.7	83.9 ±1.2	5.6
2024 Al Anodized - Krytox	56.1 ±1.5	80.8 ±5.3	24.7
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	48.6 ±6.0	77.7 ±4.2	29.1
2024 Al Anodized - DSE	49.6 ±5.9	86.1 ±1.3	36.5
303 SS - Krytox	62.4 ±4.3	65.8 ±7.9	3.4
303 SS - Silicone	64.4 ±4.3	68.9 ±5.1	4.5
303 SS -DSE	66.0 ±2.2	67.3 ±1.5	1.3
304L SS - Krytox	66.1 ±2.2	68.5 ±2.3	2.4
304L SS - Silicone	74.9 ±2.4	80.1 ±3.3	5.2
304L SS - DSE	71.3 ±4.1	69.9 ±2.5	-1.4
304L SS-P - Krytox	74.4 ±1.7	79.0 ±3.5	4.6
304L SS-P - Silicone	75.5 ±2.0	81.6 ±3.8	6.1
304L SS-P - DSE	74.9 ±2.9	77.3 ±3.4	2.4

Table 7 – Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 6X with HFE-7100

Metal Alloy-Contaminant	Avg. Preclean CA°	Avg. After Wipe CA°	Difference CA°
2024 Al - Krytox	85.6 ±1.2	94.3 ±0.3	8.7
2024 Al -Silicone	76.5 ±2.7	85.8 ±3.4	9.3
2024 Al - DSE	83.1 ±1.7	86.8 ±4.2	3.7
2024 Al Alodine - Krytox	85.4 ±0.8	93.2 ±0.5	7.8
2024 Al Alodine - Silicone	82.5 ±1.1	90.1 ±1.9	7.6
2024 Al Alodine - DSE	79.7 ±3.4	85.7 ±3.6	6.0
2024 Al Anodized - Krytox	43.1 ±5.8	82.9 ±4.9	39.8
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	44.8 ±3.0	89.6 ±1.8	44.8
2024 Al Anodized - DSE	50.5 ±4.5	89.8 ±3.7	39.3
303 SS - Krytox	64.2 ±1.4	67.5 ±2.7	3.3
303 SS - Silicone	65.2 ±2.9	68.9 ±3.5	3.7
303 SS - DSE	66.1 ±1.9	68.5 ± 3.0	2.4

304L SS - Krytox	69.4 $\pm$ 1.6	74.1 $\pm$ 2.9	4.7
304L SS - Silicone	76.1 $\pm$ 2.1	83.2 $\pm$ 2.7	7.1
304L SS - DSE	76.4 $\pm$ 1.5	64.4 $\pm$ 2.9	-12.0
304L SS-P - Krytox	77.2 $\pm$ 1.3	82.2 $\pm$ 2.2	5.0
304L SS-P - Silicone	75.7 $\pm$ 2.3	78.7 $\pm$ 3.4	3.0
304L SS-P - DSE	75.7 $\pm$ 4.4	81.2 $\pm$ 1.6	5.5

Table 8 – Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 3X with Isopropyl Alcohol

Metal Alloy-Contaminant	Avg. Preclean CA°	Avg. After Wipe CA°	Difference CA°
2024 Al Anodized -Krytox	54.1 $\pm$ 5.3	70.3 $\pm$ 2.1	16.2
2024 Al Alodine -Krytox	84.4 $\pm$ 1	90.8 $\pm$ 1.7	6.4
2024 Al Alodine - Silicone	85.2 $\pm$ 2.7	94.5 $\pm$ 4.3	9.3
2024 Al Alodine - DSE	86.3 $\pm$ 1.0	93.7 $\pm$ 3.4	7.4
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	50.7 $\pm$ 4.2	89.3 $\pm$ 1.8	38.6
2024 Al Anodized - DSE	51.9 $\pm$ 8.6	85.5 $\pm$ 2.9	33.6
6061 Al - Krytox	83.6 $\pm$ 4.0	85.7 $\pm$ 3.3	2.1
6061 Al - Silicone	83.2 $\pm$ 2.4	87.8 $\pm$ 3.3	4.6
6061 Al - DSE	82.4 $\pm$ 1.0	88.9 $\pm$ 1.5	6.5
6061 Al Anodized - Krytox	82.7 $\pm$ 0	86.3 $\pm$ 0	3.7
6061 Al Anodized - Silicone	80.8 $\pm$ 1.2	85.3 $\pm$ 1.9	4.5
6061 Al Anodized - DSE	81.3 $\pm$ 0.9	87.0 $\pm$ 0.5	5.7
7075 Alodine - Krytox	87.5 $\pm$ 1.6	92.2 $\pm$ 1.2	4.7
7075 Alodine - Silicone	89.0 $\pm$ 0.9	93.3 $\pm$ 0.5	4.3
7075 Alodine - DSE	87.3 $\pm$ 0	92.2 $\pm$ 0.7	4.8
7075 Anodized - Krytox	77.5 $\pm$ 0.7	82.2 $\pm$ 0.2	4.7
7075 Anodized - Silicone	77.8 $\pm$ 1.2	83.8 $\pm$ 1.2	6.0
7075 Anodized - DSE	78.0 $\pm$ 0.5	82.2 $\pm$ 0.2	4.2
303 SS - Krytox	66.6 $\pm$ 2.5	75.0 $\pm$ 2.6	8.4
303 SS - Silicone	63.0 $\pm$ 1.7	67.3 $\pm$ 1.5	4.3
303 SS - DSE	52.6 $\pm$ 1.5	53.0 $\pm$ 2.6	0.4
304L SS-P - Krytox	78.4 $\pm$ 2.9	85.1 $\pm$ 6.8	6.7
304L SS-P - Silicone	81.9 $\pm$ 0.1	89.9 $\pm$ 1.3	8.0
304L SS-P - DSE	82.0 $\pm$ 1.0	88.2 $\pm$ 1.2	6.2
304L SS - Krytox	75.3 $\pm$ 1.5	76.5 $\pm$ 3.1	1.2
304L SS - Silicone	71.9 $\pm$ 2.4	75.1 $\pm$ 1.0	3.2
304L SS - DSE	77.5 $\pm$ 1.0	59.2 $\pm$ 1.4	-18.3
Titanium - Krytox	69.7 $\pm$ 0.5	77.5 $\pm$ 3.2	7.8
Titanium - Silicone	61.6 $\pm$ 0.4	68.3 $\pm$ 2.0	6.8
Titanium - DSE	67.5 $\pm$ 2.5	72.9 $\pm$ 4.9	5.3

Table 9 – Contact Angles - Coupons cleaned 3X with HFE-7100

Metal Alloy-Contaminant	Avg. Preclean CA°	Avg. After Wipe CA°	Difference CA°
2024 Al - Krytox	84.3 ±0	96.2 ±1.6	11.8
2024 Al - Silicone	84.2 ±0.7	98.0 ±0.9	13.8
2024 Al - DSE	84.0 ±0.5	97.7 ±0	13.7
2024 Al Alodine - Krytox	86.9 ±1.0	97.1 ±1.7	10.2
2024 Al Alodine - Silicone	85.9 ±2.9	91.8 ±1.7	5.9
2024 Al Alodine - DSE	86.2 ±3.3	93.8 ±3.6	7.6
2024 Al Anodized -Krytox	57.1 ±6.5	84.3 ±4.3	27.2
2024 Al Anodized - Silicone	51.4 ±1.9	83.7 ±2.5	32.3
2024 Al Anodized - DSE	53.3 ±6.2	89.7 ±1.0	36.4
6061 Al - Krytox	84.8 ±2.5	87.4 ±5.0	2.6
6061 Al - Silicone	81.8 ±1.6	86.7 ±1.8	4.9
6061 Al - DSE	84.3 ±1.5	89.6 ±1.4	5.3
303 SS - Krytox	60.3 ±1.5	88.3 ±2.1	28.0
303 SS - Silicone	64.0 ±2.6	88.6 ±2.1	24.6
303 SS - DSE	67.6 ±2.3	82.6 ±3.1	15.0
304L SS-P -Krytox	82.9 ±1.0	89.0 ±1.7	6.1
304L SS-P -Silicone	82.6 ±2.3	91.5 ±1.8	8.9
304L SS-P - DSE	79.9 ±2.3	87.4 ±1.1	7.5
304L SS Krytox	71.0 ±1.8	84.4 ±2.0	13.4
304L SS - Silicone	74.7 ±1.7	86.7 ±2.3	12.0
304L SS - DSE	79.2 ±1.0	63.1 ±4.2	-16.1
Titanium - Krytox	71.5 ±2.0	88.2 ±0.8	16.6
Titanium - Silicone	68.8 ±1.6	87.7 ±4.3	18.9
Titanium - DSE	67.0 ±2.6	85.2 ±3.0	18.2

Table 10 – Sandwich Corrosion Test Results

Metal	Average Corrosion Rating IPA	Average Corrosion Rating H₂O	Average Corrosion Rating HFE
7075 Al - Bare	1	4	1
6061 Al – Bare	1	3	1
2024 Al - Bare	1	1	0
2024 Al - Anodized	0	0	0
2024 Al - Alodined	1	0	0
303 Stainless Steel Type 303se	1	0	0
303 Stainless Steel Type 303	1	0	0
301 Stainless Steel	1	0	0
304L Stainless Steel Bare	1	0	0
304L Stainless Steel Passivated	1	0	0
Titanium 6Al4V	0	0	0
Beryllium	0-1	3	0-1

Table 11 – Immersion Corrosion Test Results

Metal	Avg. Sample Weights Before Exposure (g)	Solvent	Avg. Sample Weights After Exposure(g)	Weight Difference (g)
Bare 7075 Aluminum Alloy	1.4236 ±0.0090	IPA	1.4236 ±0.0090	0.0000
	1.4252 ±0.0071	HFE	1.4252 ±0.0072	0.0000
Alodined 7075 Aluminum Alloy	0.7780 ±0.0204	IPA	0.7777 ±0.0203	-0.0003
	0.7824 ±0.0717	HFE	0.7824 ±0.0719	0.0000
	0.7573 ±0.0484	Azeotrope	0.7572 ±0.0483	0.0001
Bare 2024 Aluminum Alloy	1.4195 ±0.0086	IPA	1.4192 ±0.0086	-0.0003
	1.4215 ±0.0067	HFE	1.4213 ±0.0067	-0.0002
Bare 6061 Aluminum Alloy	1.3368 ±0.0073	IPA	1.3366 ±0.0072	-0.0002
	1.3459 ±0.0134	HFE	1.3458 ±0.0133	-0.0001
Bare 303 SS	3.6816 ±0.0094	IPA	3.6815 ±0.0093	-0.0001
	3.6757 ±0.0069	HFE	3.6756 ±0.0069	-0.0001
Passivated 304L SS	3.8494 ±0.0249	IPA	3.8493 ±0.0249	-0.0001

	3.8381 ±0.0185	HFE	3.8380 ±0.0249	-0.0001
Bare 303se SS	4.9351 ±0.2058	IPA	4.9349 ±0.2058	-0.0002
	4.8516 ±0.3993	HFE	4.8516 ±0.3994	0.0000
Bare 301 SS	3.9436 ±0.0036	IPA	3.9435 ±0.0036	-0.0001
	3.9421 ±0.0146	HFE	3.9420 ±0.0157	-0.0001
Bare 304L SS	3.8286 ±0.01291	IPA	3.8285 ±0.01286	-0.0001
	3.8343 ±0.0234	HFE	3.8342 ±0.0233	-0.0001
6AL4VTitanium Alloy	2.2279 ±0.0212	IPA	2.2279 ±0.0212	0.0000
	2.2387 ±0.0127	HFE	2.2386 ±0.0126	-0.0001

Table 12– Materials Compatibility of Other Materials

1st Round

Samples A= 186 Sylgard	Samples B= 184 Sylgard	Samples C= Wilethane 44	Samples D= Epoweld 8173	Samples E= Nitrile Gloves			
Samples F= PVC Gloves	Samples G= Butyl Gloves	Samples H= Silastic J	Samples I=Barco Bond	Samples J=O-Ring			
Samples K= Polyethylene Terephthalate Shim Stock							
Sample	Chemical	Start Weight	End Weight 1	End Weight 2 (5 min)	End Weight 3 (10 min)	End Weight 4 (180 min)	Difference in Start and End Weight 4
1A	IPA	1.3167	1.3204	1.3178	1.3172	1.3155	-0.0012
2A	IPA	1.1356	1.1389	1.1365	1.1359	1.1349	-0.0007
3A	HFE	1.0614	1.0733	1.0664	1.065	1.061	-0.0004
4A	HFE	1.2217	1.2331	1.2269	1.2254	1.2216	-1E-04
5A	IPA/HFE	0.9671	0.9796	0.9722	0.971	0.967	-1E-04
6A	IPA/HFE	1.445	1.4593	1.452	1.4508	1.4448	-0.0002
1B	IPA	1.0892	1.0954	1.091	1.0902	1.0883	-0.0009
2B	IPA	0.1567	1.1631	1.1588	0.1579	0.1562	-0.0005
3B	HFE	0.9808	0.9917	0.9857	0.9841	0.9808	0
4B	HFE	0.822	0.8306	0.827	0.8255	0.8222	0.0002
5B	IPA/HFE	0.7656	0.776	0.7712	0.7694	0.7654	-0.0002
6B	IPA/HFE	1.0415	1.0589	1.0498	1.0476	1.042	0.0005
1C	IPA	1.6586	1.6613	1.6606	1.6601	1.6597	0.0011
2C	IPA	1.7178	1.7202	1.7194	1.7194	1.7185	0.0007
3C	HFE	1.6876	1.6877	1.6875	1.6873	1.6874	-0.0002
4C	HFE	1.7983	1.7985	1.7984	1.7984	1.7983	0
5C	IPA/HFE	1.5085	1.5085	1.5084	1.5084	1.5082	-0.0003
6C	IPA/HFE	1.5996	1.5997	1.5994	1.5994	1.599	-0.0006

1D	IPA	0.9918	0.9916	0.9915	0.9916	0.9916	-0.0002
2D	IPA	0.8206	0.8217	0.8211	0.8212	0.821	0.0004
3D	HFE	0.9818	0.9815	0.9817	0.9817	0.9817	-1E-04
4D	HFE	0.7238	0.7237	0.7238	0.7238	0.7238	0
5D	IPA/HFE	0.7497	0.7495	0.7495	0.7494	0.7493	-0.0004
6D	IPA/HFE	0.714	0.7139	0.7137	0.7138	0.714	0
1E	IPA	0.042	0.0419	0.0419	0.0418	0.0417	-0.0003
2E	IPA	0.0702	0.0702	0.0702	0.0701	0.07	-0.0002
3E	HFE	0.0525	0.0524	0.0523	0.0523	0.0523	-0.0002
4E	HFE	0.0553	0.055	0.0551	0.055	0.055	-0.0003
5E	IPA/HFE	0.0594	0.0592	0.0591	0.0591	0.059	-0.0004
6E	IPA/HFE	0.0817	0.0815	0.0814	0.0814	0.0811	-0.0006
1F	IPA	0.1208	0.1179	0.1177	0.1178	0.1169	-0.0039
2F	IPA	0.0739	0.0714	0.0714	0.0713	0.0704	-0.0035
3F	HFE	0.0908	0.0905	0.0904	0.0904	0.0904	-0.0004
4F	HFE	0.0749	0.0745	0.0746	0.0745	0.0746	-0.0003
5F	IPA/HFE	0.09	0.0895	0.0894	0.0893	0.089	-0.001
6F	IPA/HFE	0.0801	0.0796	0.0796	0.0795	0.0793	-0.0008
1G	IPA	0.199	0.1987	0.1988	0.1988	0.1988	-0.0002
2G	IPA	0.1609	0.1608	0.1608	0.1608	0.1608	-1E-04
3G	HFE	0.1744	0.1743	0.1743	0.1743	0.1743	-1E-04
4G	HFE	0.147	0.1469	0.1469	0.1469	0.1469	-1E-04
5G	IPA/HFE	0.1993	0.1992	0.1993	0.1993	0.1993	0
6G	IPA/HFE	0.1642	0.1641	0.1641	0.1641	0.1641	-0.0001
1H	IPA	1.4337	0.4376	1.4348	1.4342	1.4333	-0.0004
2H	IPA	1.2059	0.2087	0.2069	0.2063	1.2056	-0.0003
3H	HFE	0.9473	0.9577	0.9517	0.9504	0.948	0.0007
4H	HFE	1.033	1.0411	1.0371	1.0359	1.0336	0.0006
5H	IPA/HFE	0.9436	0.9524	0.9476	0.9466	0.9437	1E-04
6H	IPA/HFE	1.0295	1.0365	1.0333	1.0325	1.0296	1E-04
1I	IPA	0.8202	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	-0.0002
2I	IPA	0.52	0.5193	0.5192	0.5192	0.5192	-0.0008
3I	HFE	0.4317	0.4316	0.4316	0.4316	0.4317	0
4I	HFE	0.6472	0.6469	0.6469	0.6469	0.6469	-0.0003
5I	IPA/HFE	0.4342	0.4342	0.4341	0.4341	0.4341	-1E-04
6I	IPA/HFE	0.419	0.4189	0.4189	0.4189	0.4189	-1E-04
1J	IPA	0.0785	0.0785	0.0785	0.0785	0.0785	0
2J	IPA	0.0703	0.0704	0.0704	0.0704	0.0704	0.0001
3J	HFE	0.1059	0.1059	0.1059	0.1059	0.1059	0
4J	HFE	0.0633	0.0633	0.0633	0.0633	0.0633	0
5J	IPA/HFE	0.0908	0.0908	0.0908	0.0908	0.0908	0
6J	IPA/HFE	0.0975	0.0975	0.0975	0.0975	0.0975	0
1K	IPA	0.0384	0.0384	0.0384	0.0384	0.0384	0
2K	IPA	0.042	0.0419	0.0419	0.042	0.042	0
3K	HFE	0.021	0.0209	0.021	0.021	0.021	0
4K	HFE	0.0112	0.0111	0.0111	0.0111	0.0111	-1E-04

5K	IPA/HFE	0.0216	0.0216	0.0216	0.0216	0.0216	0
6K	IPA/HFE	0.0146	0.0145	0.0145	0.0145	0.0145	-1E-04

Table 13 – Materials Compatibility of Other Materials
2nd Round

Samples A= Coax Wire Polyimide Insulation	Samples B= EN-7 Polyurethane Encapsulation	Samples C= PET-90 Polyurethane Encapsulation	Samples D= CF3262 Samples	Samples D2= CF3262 copper end	Samples E= Compression Pad # BBN-3725- F82		
Samples F= Compression Pad # BBN- 3586-E82	Samples G= Compression Pad # BBN- 4267 B84	Samples H= Compression Pad # BBN- 2848 J80	Samples I= Aft det hold down #530851	Samples J= Aft det hold down #326799	Samples K= Aft det hold down #607526		
Samples L= Fwd det hold down #834223	Samples M= Fwd det hold down #396294	Samples N= Cable Protector 422078 WS N468459Cylce 21	Sample O=tube protector				
Sample	Chemical	Start Weight	End Weight 1	End Weight 2 (5 min)	End Weight 3 (10 min)	End Weight 4 (180 min)	Difference in Start and End Weight 4
1A	IPA	0.1022	0.1033	0.1025	0.1022	0.1022	0
2A	IPA	0.1053	0.1063	1055	0.1053	0.1052	-0.0001
3A	IPA	0.1065	0.1078	0.1067	0.1066	0.1064	-0.0001
4A	HFE	0.0999	0.1	0.0999	0.0999	0.0999	0
5A	HFE	0.1014	0.1014	0.1014	0.1014	0.1014	0
6A	HFE	0.926	0.933	0.926	0.926	0.926	0
1B	IPA	0.3794	0.38	0.3796	0.3195	0.3794	0
2B	IPA	0.3625	0.3633	0.3628	0.3627	0.3624	-1E-04
3B	IPA	0.4599	0.4608	0.4605	0.4602	0.4599	0
4B	HFE	0.3986	0.3986	0.3985	0.3985	0.3986	0
5B	HFE	0.4077	0.4078	0.4077	0.4077	0.4076	-1E-04
6B	HFE	0.4252	0.4252	0.4252	0.4252	0.4252	0
1C	IPA	0.6427	0.6469	0.6444	0.6438	0.6434	0.0007
2C	IPA	0.6379	0.6417	0.6397	0.6391	0.6386	0.0007
3C	IPA	0.5055	0.5088	0.5068	0.5064	0.5061	0.0006
4C	HFE	0.5359	0.5362	0.536	0.5359	0.5364	0.0005
5C	HFE	0.624	0.6242	0.6241	0.624	0.6246	0.0006
6C	HFE	0.6889	0.6892	0.689	0.689	0.6896	0.0007
1D2	IPA	0.9599	0.9601	0.96	0.9599	0.9599	0
2D2	IPA	0.7064	0.7066	0.7065	0.7064	0.7064	0
3D2	IPA	1.1229	1.123	1.123	1.1228	1.1228	-1E-04

4D2	HFE	1.1057	1.1057	1.1057	1.1056	1.1057	0
1E	IPA	0.1609	0.2036	0.187	0.1756	0.1603	-0.0006
2E	IPA	0.1592	0.2338	0.205	0.1879	0.1584	-0.0008
3E	IPA	0.1442	0.1868	0.1675	0.1536	0.1434	-0.0008
4E	HFE	0.1651	0.3465	0.2352	0.197	0.1644	-0.0007
5E	HFE	0.1265	0.2479	0.163	0.1427	0.1252	-0.0013
6E	HFE	0.147	0.226	0.1676	0.1528	0.1463	-0.0007
1F	IPA	0.1138	0.1393	0.1161	0.1139	0.1133	-0.0005
2F	IPA	0.1095	0.1443	0.1208	0.1146	0.1091	-0.0004
3F	IPA	0.1111	0.1325	0.1148	0.1107	0.1105	-0.0006
4F	HFE	0.1356	0.19	0.1365	0.1351	0.1351	-0.0005
5F	HFE	0.1116	0.1604	0.1131	0.1113	0.1112	-0.0004
6F	HFE	0.1131	0.1669	0.1172	0.1127	0.1127	-0.0004
1G	IPA	0.1302	0.2334	0.196	0.1759	0.1293	-0.0009
2G	IPA	0.1191	0.1943	0.169	0.1521	0.1183	-0.0008
3G	IPA	0.1277	0.2116	0.189	0.1647	0.1269	-0.0008
4G	HFE	0.1371	0.293	0.1665	0.1374	0.1366	-0.0005
5G	HFE	0.1553	0.2318	0.1556	0.1167	0.1159	-0.0394
6G	HFE	0.156	0.34	0.2556	0.1818	0.1547	-0.0013
1H	IPA	0.1134	0.181	0.1599	0.1401	0.113	-0.0004
2H	IPA	0.1432	0.2164	0.1947	0.1739	0.1428	-0.0004
3H	IPA	0.1041	0.153	0.1377	0.1238	0.1038	-0.0003
4H	HFE	0.1028	0.21	0.1198	0.1024	0.1026	-0.0002
5H	HFE	0.1046	0.1371	0.1044	0.104	0.1042	-0.0004
6H	HFE	0.1204	0.2166	0.1617	0.1208	0.1199	-0.0005
1I	IPA	0.223	0.2254	0.223	0.2227	0.2223	-0.0007
2I	IPA	0.2614	0.2632	0.2613	0.261	0.2608	-0.0006
3I	IPA	0.2618	0.2633	0.2619	0.2617	0.2613	-0.0005
4I	HFE	0.3434	0.3528	0.3467	0.3455	0.3429	-0.0005
5I	HFE	0.1877	0.1927	0.1898	0.189	0.1873	-0.0004
6I	HFE	0.2629	0.2701	0.2658	0.2646	0.2623	-0.0006
1J	IPA	0.2546	0.2572	0.2548	0.2544	0.2542	-0.0004
2J	IPA	0.2133	0.2152	0.2134	0.2131	0.2128	-0.0005
3J	IPA	0.2114	0.214	0.2116	0.2112	0.2108	-0.0006
4J	HFE	0.2775	0.2843	0.2795	0.279	0.2771	-0.0004
5J	HFE	0.2345	0.2416	0.2375	0.2361	0.234	-0.0005
6J	HFE	0.1382	0.1425	0.1405	0.1393	0.1377	-0.0005
1K	IPA	0.2541	0.2557	0.2541	0.2539	0.2537	-0.0004
2K	IPA	0.3168	0.3197	0.3171	0.3167	0.3163	-0.0005
3K	IPA	0.2545	0.2573	0.2547	0.2543	0.2539	-0.0006
4K	HFE	0.3663	0.3763	0.37	0.3682	0.3659	-0.0004
5K	HFE	0.3239	0.3316	0.3272	0.3254	0.3232	-0.0007
6K	HFE	0.2364	0.2423	0.2395	0.2378	0.2358	-0.0006
1L	IPA	0.0302	0.0306	0.0301	0.0299	0.0299	-0.0003
2L	IPA	0.0426	0.0433	0.0424	0.0424	0.0424	-0.0002

3L	IPA	0.0431	0.0437	0.0429	0.43	0.0429	-0.0002
4L	HFE	0.0342	0.0366	0.035	0.0346	0.0342	0
5L	HFE	0.0357	0.038	0.036	0.0357	0.0354	-0.0003
6L	HFE	0.0384	0.0402	0.0391	0.0385	0.0382	-0.0002
1M	IPA	0.0572	0.058	0.0572	0.0572	0.0571	-0.0001
2M	IPA	0.0453	0.0459	0.0452	0.0451	0.0451	-0.0002
3M	IPA	0.0368	0.0375	0.0368	0.0367	0.0368	0
4M	HFE	0.0531	0.0558	0.0541	0.0535	0.0533	0.0002
5M	HFE	0.0362	0.0384	0.0369	0.0366	0.0361	-0.0001
6M	HFE	0.0589	0.0618	0.0598	0.0594	0.0587	-0.0002
1N	IPA	0.0098	0.0097	0.0096	0.0095	0.0097	-1E-04
2N	IPA	0.0105	0.0105	0.0106	0.0103	0.0105	0
3N	IPA	0.0105	0.0104	0.0104	0.0104	0.0105	0
4N	HFE	0.0137	0.0134	0.0134	0.0135	0.0135	-0.0002
5N	HFE	0.0111	0.0109	0.0109	0.0109	0.0111	0
6N	HFE	0.0098	0.0098	0.0098	0.0098	0.0098	0
1O	IPA	0.0343	0.0342	0.0341	0.0341		-0.0343
2O	IPA	0.0263	0.0261	0.0262	0.0262		-0.0263
3O	IPA	0.0244	0.0241	0.0242	0.0243		-0.0244
4O	HFE	0.028	0.0279	0.028	0.0279		-0.028
5O	HFE	0.0267	0.0265	0.0265	0.0264		-0.0267
6O	HFE	0.0396	0.0394	0.0394	0.0394		-0.0396

**Table 14 – Materials Compatibility of Other Materials
3rd Round**

Samples A= White Chalky Pieces	Samples B= Black with Metal	Samples C= Long Black Pieces	Samples D= AA61583				
Sample	Chemical	Start Weight	End Weight 1	End Weight 2 (5 min)	End Weight 3 (10 min)	End Weight 4 (180 min)	Difference in Start and End Weight 4
1A	IPA	13.6736	13.9306	13.898	13.86	13.752	0.0784
2A	IPA	12.6012	12.8446	12.81	12.7809	12.6839	0.0827
3A	IPA/HFE	14.7729	15.366	15.2121	15.0095	14.8792	0.1063
4A	IPA/HFE	11.8117	12.2481	12.124	12.038	11.8782	0.0665
5A	HFE	9.6825	10.1912	10.037	9.977	9.738	0.0555
6A	HFE	6.4452	6.757	6.6337	6.5974	6.4743	0.0291
1B	IPA	7.4537	7.4545	7.4539	7.4537	7.4532	-0.0005
2B	IPA	9.0789	9.0793	9.0789	9.0786	9.0785	-0.0004
3B	IPA/HFE	8.9434	8.947	8.9437	8.9434	8.9421	-0.0013
4B	IPA/HFE	7.9657	7.9665	7.9658	7.9656	7.965	-0.0007
5B	HFE	8.6858	8.6873	8.6858	8.6852	8.6846	-0.0012
6B	HFE	8.0342	8.0355	8.0347	8.0343	8.0341	-1E-04

1C	IPA	33.16	33.1554	33.1545	33.1545	33.1524	-0.0076
2C	IPA/HFE	28.0529	28.048	28.0474	28.0472	28.0462	-0.0067
3C	HFE	28.9928	28.9911	28.991	28.9909	28.9904	-0.0024
1D	IPA	0.5962	0.6681	0.6299	0.6121	0.5914	-0.0048
2D	IPA	0.6128	0.6375	0.6198	0.6148	0.6095	-0.0033
3D	IPA	0.6787	0.7143	0.6858	0.6786	0.6734	-0.0053
4D	HFE	0.7413	0.7677	0.7487	0.7453	0.7382	-0.0031
5D	HFE	0.6518	0.6918	0.6591	0.6557	0.6484	-0.0034
6D	HFE	0.7906	0.8241	0.7970	0.7939	0.7873	-0.0033
7D	Azeo	0.6712	0.7214	0.6841	0.6778	0.6683	-0.0029
8D	Azeo	0.7130	0.7654	0.7268	0.7200	0.7089	-0.0041
8D	Azeo	0.5890	0.6132	0.5962	0.5927	0.5864	-0.0026

Figures

Figure 1 – Contact Angle Differences – IPA versus Neat HFE-7100

Figure 2 – Contact Angle Differences – IPA versus HFE/IPA Azeotrope

VI. DISTRIBUTION LIST

Sandia National Laboratories

MS-0888	Edwin P. Lopez (5 copies)
MS-0888	Doug Wall
MS-0481	Dennis Helmich
MS-0481	Hal Radloff

1	MS-9018	Central Technical Files, 8940-2
2	MS-0899	Technical Library
3	MS-0612	Review and Approval Desk, 9612 for DOE/OSTI

Los Alamos National Laboratory (NM) 87545

MS-C930, ESA-MEEE	Tom Stephens
MS-G770, MST-6	Jennifer Lillard
MS-MS-C930, ESA-MEE	Marcie Martinez

Honeywell – Federal Manufacturing & Technologies, P. O. Box 419159 Kansas City, Missouri 64141-6159

Mail Code – 2C43	Mark Benkovich
Mail Code – 2C43	George Bohnert

Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc. – Y-12 National Security Complex, Building 9202, P. O. Box 2009, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8095

MS-8095	Lisa Thompson
---------	---------------

BWXT-Pantex Plant, P. O. Box 30020 – Hwy. 60–FM2373, Amarillo TX 79120-0020

MS 11-2	Bill Moddeman
MS 11-2	Jan Birbeck

NNSA-AL	Daniel Romero
NNSA, NA-123/1J-063	Dale Sivils