

Office of ENERGY EFFICIENCY & RENEWABLE ENERGY

Adhesive Bonding of Aluminum and Copper in HVAC&R Applications



Oak Ridge National Laboratory Patrick Geoghegan, PhD geogheganpj@ornl.gov



Cu-Cu U-joints and pre-packaged field



Al-Al manifolds



Project Summary

Timeline:

Start date: 10/1/2016

Planned end date: 3/1/2020

Key Milestones

- 1. M24-meet 75% of joint strength requirements
- 2. M33-meet full strength and leakage requirements

<u>Key Partners</u>:







Budget:

Total Project \$ to Date:

- DOE: \$1,500K
- Cost Share: \$*

Total Project \$:

- DOE: \$1,500K
- Cost Share:*

*In-kind contribution from CRADA partner-exceeds DOE funding level; exact total is confidential information

Project Outcome:

- Aluminum-copper, aluminum-aluminum, and copper-copper adhesive joints that supplant traditional brazing in HVAC&R applications
- Heat exchanger production cost reduced by 30–40% compared with controlled atmosphere brazing
- More compact, lighter units requiring less refrigerant charge

Team

Patrick Geoghegan, PhD Principal Investigator <u>Adrian Sabau, PhD</u> Materials Science R&D Staff



ORNL:

Expertise in building equipment, neutron radiography, material characterization and functionality <u>Shari Loushin</u> Lead Application Engineering Specialist <u>Matthew Kryger, PhD</u> Research Polymer Scientist



3M: World leaders in adhesives



Purdue University: Renowned graduate program

Eckhard A. Groll

Reilly Professor of Mechanical Engineering & Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Education, College of Engineering Justin A. Weibel Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering & Director of the Cooling Technologies Research Center (CTRC) Haotian Liu PhD Student

Challenge

 According to the 2016 Annual Energy Outlook, the United States consumed 2.15 Quads in delivered energy in cooling, refrigeration, and freezing across the residential and commercial sectors



After ETSU (1997), *Cutting the cost of refrigerant leakage*, Good Practice Guide 178, Energy Technology Support Unit, Didcot, UK.



www.homeadvisor.com

R&D Opportunities for Joining Technologies in HVAC&R, BTO, October 2015

- Reduce refrigerant leakage
- Increase lifetime equipment operating efficiency and reliability
- Decrease equipment production cost
- Enable new designs not feasible with brazing

Approach — Adhesive Bonding

Develop adhesives with specific chemistries for bonding to aluminum and copper



Enhanced surface preparation (laser structuring, etc.) and characterization (XPS, SEM, etc.)

- UL207, ASHRAE 15, ISO 14903, etc.
- Prototype testing
- Strong business model

Structural analysis and optimization and non-destructive coverage quantification via neutron imaging

Braze Replacement Adhesive — Concepts

Heat exchanger (tube & fin) manufacturing





Unit assembly connections











- U-bend receptacle or robotic dispense with
 - Upright heat bank cure
 - Room temp cure
 - UV trigger cure
- Solid ring pre-applied with
 - Upright heat bank cure



- Hand-held pneumatic dispense or robotic dispense with
 - Heat bank cure
 - UV trigger cure
 - Room temp cure



- Hand-held pneumatic dispense tip with
 - Heat clamp cure
 - UV trigger cure
 - Room temp cure

1K Liquid	1K Solid Epoxy	UV Triggered Epoxy	2К Ероху	
1-part epoxy designed for good balance of Tg and cure profiles	Patented epoxy that can solidify at room temp (can pre-apply on parts) then melt and cure with heat	Cure is triggered by exposure to UV; latency period allows for joint completion	2-part epoxy cures at room temperature	
Pros: Would not require surface prep on Cu, Tg around 130°C	Pros: Good Tg, unique application method; RT stability of months in its solid form	Pros: Fast cure without heat; room temp stability; cure is triggered very rapidly	Pros: Room temp cure; room temp stable	
Cons: Heat cure required; RT stability limited	Cons: Have to cure vertically (to get flow into joints)	Cons: OLS/Tg may not be achievable without secondary heat cure (?); may require surface prep. This concept not proven out yet	Cons: RT cure would have lower Tg (post cure may be needed); cure time vs. nozzle life; may require surface prep	

All formulations meet pressure requirements up to at least 180 °F

Solid 1K Adhesives — Autobrazing Concept

MJK-177



Quantitative Coverage — Neutron Imaging









Laplacian of Gaussian





scikit-image.org http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.453

• In situ curing

Non-invasive

Approach — Header & Subassembly Connections

Joint geometry optimization



Adhesive application



Header insertion



Curing









Robotic dispensing arm with radiative heat bank cure

<u>Robotic application system</u> detects pipe end and dispenses adhesive on male end (5 seconds/joint) Cost: \$50,000

<u>1-part adhesive</u> Cost: \$0.10 per joint

Radiative Heat Bank:

- 1. Position heat exchanger upright in radiative heat bank (2 min)
- 2. Dwell time in heat bank (300[°]F) (20 min)
- 3. Repeat for other side of heat exchanger, if needed

Cost: \$3000

Energy Usage: ~29kW per heat exchanger cycle (\$0.60/coil)

Surface Preparation Approach — Laser Structuring





Samples with different laser structuring conditions



2D surface profile with profilometry



Approach — Laser Structuring Enhancement

Method:

- Laser interference structure technique
- Shear strength measured by single lap joint test





Failure mechanism: (a) adhesive failure, (b) mixed failure mechanism.

Results:

- Laser raster can leave a clean and structured surface
- Compared with traditional surface preparation methods, laser structure can enhance the bonding shear strength significantly
- Higher raster speed results in a higher shear strength





- D: Traditional method
- B: Laser raster with 6 mm/s
- C: Laser raster with 12 mm/s

Adhesive Characterization Driving ABAQUS Modeling

Epoxy adhesive with cohesive failure:

- Fracture toughness: Double cantilever beam (DCB) test; Endnotched flexure (ENF) test
- DCB samples will be prepared similarly as for previous studies at Purdue University
- Elastic/shear modulus: tensile/shear test

Optimized flare geometry





INSTRON 3345



Failure mechanism at the interface

Jibin Han and Thomas Siegmund (2012), "Cohesive Zone Model Characterization of the Adhesive Hysol EA-9394," *Journal of Adhesion Science and Technology*, 26:8-9, 1033-1052.

Approach — System Testing and Demonstration



Vibration testing





Modified heat pump dryer system

- Mechanical testing of joints according to relevant standards
- Standards ISO 14903, ASHRAE 15, UL207, etc.

Cycling

Stakeholder Engagement

 Approximately 40 HVACR-M companies contacted and with varying response and levels of engagement

Braze suppliers	Aluminum Microchannel heat exchanger manufacturers
Flaring equipment manufacturers	AC Equipment Manufacturers
Potable water/chillers	Brazed plate heat exchanger manufacturers

- ASHRAE RP-1808 "Servicing and Installing Equipment using Flammable Refrigerants: Assessment of Field-made Mechanical Joints"
- On-site visits (>18) to manufacturing plants
- Initial samples formulated for preliminary evaluation

Stakeholder Engagement

Summary of feedback:

- Value proposition especially for hand brazers under development
- Potential for automation appealing
- Large original equipment manufacturers most interested in the final heat exchanger design
- Working within the limitations set by flaring equipment manufacturers

Focus:

- Aluminum microchannel heat exchanger to copper tube connection
- Copper to copper U bends
- New heat exchanger concepts, particularly for aluminum heat exchangers
- Refrigerant compatibility

Progress and Remaining Work



Immediate future: Intensive joint testing, neutron imaging Distant future: Prototype testing

Thank You

Oak Ridge National Laboratory Patrick Geoghegan, PhD geogheganpj@ornl.gov

REFERENCE SLIDES

Project Budget

Project Budget: DOE Total \$1500K **Variances**: Project delayed until 3/1/2017 due to contract negotiations **Cost to Date**: \$561K **Additional Funding**: None

Budget History							
10/1/2016- FY 2018 (past)		FY 2019 (current)		FY 2020 (planned)			
DOE	Cost-share	DOE	Cost-share	DOE	Cost-share		
\$1,500K		\$OK		\$OK			

Project Plan and Schedule

Project Schedule								
Project Beginning: 10/1/2016		Completed Work						
Projected End: 3/1/2020		Active Task (in progress work)						
		Milestone/Deliverable (Originally						
		Milestone/Deliverable (Actual) use						
		FY2019			FY2020			
Task	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (Jul-Sep)	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (Jul-Sep)
Past Work				•		•		
HVAC&R manufacturers response								
Preliminary Cost Analysis								
Assessment of adhesive and surface combination								
Current/Future Work								
Go/No-Go Identification of joints that reach the joint stength requirement								
Preliminary cost analysis of current brazing process								
Complete T2M plan and product literature								