LIGHTMAT PROJECT ID#: MAT230



LASER POWDER BED FUSION PARAMETER DEVELOPMENT FOR NOVEL STEEL AND ALUMINUM POWDERS USING IN SITU SYNCHROTRON IMAGING AND DIFFRACTION



AARON GRECO Argonne National Laboratory ANDREW BOBEL GM R&D

2021 Vehicle Technology Office Annual Merit Review

June 24th 2021

This presentation does not contain any proprietary, confidential, or otherwise restricted information





OVERVIEW

Timeline	Budget
Project start date: Jan 2020 CRADA end date: Sept 30 2021, NCTE to June 30 2022	DOE funds: \$250,000 GM in-kind cost share: \$250,000
Barriers & Technical Targets	Partners
 Powertrain weight reduction through use of additive manufacturing Current printable aluminum alloys lack strength at elevated temperatures for use in dynamically loaded components; current printable steels are too high cost New alloys require significant time and resources to properly tune printing parameters 	Argonne National Laboratory General Motors





RELEVANCE/OBJECTIVE

Additive Manufacturing for Automotive Components

- **Opportunity:** Additive manufacturing (AM) offers significant potential for reducing the weight of components and systems through optimization of design and use of low density/high strength materials
- Challenge: Current AM alloys lack strength and fatigue performance at elevated temperatures for use in critical automotive applications
- **Objective:** Optimize the printing parameters for several advanced alloys (AlSiCu, FeCu, Fe393, AlTi, etc)









AlSiCu

Performance at Elevated temperatures (300C) 15% increase* in Yield Strength at 300C 25% increase* in Ultimate Tensile Strength @ 300C 160% increase* in fatigue strength *compared to AlSi10Mg

Application: Super charger rotors 45% weight reduction 40% inertia reduction

FeCu 50% cheaper than 17-4PH SS Maintains key performance metrics

Application: Connecting rods 15% weight reduction

3

APPROACH

In-situ AM Experiments:

- Subsurface porosity formation
- High speed infrared (IR) measurements
- X-ray diffraction

Modeling:

- Thermal model for porosity risk (high throughput / computationally efficient)
- Integrated Computational Materials Engineering (ICME) modeling, microstructural validation

Post test material characterization:

- Microstructural characterization: electron fusion using simultaneous backscatter diffraction (EBSD)
 high speed infra-red and X-ray imaging JOM
- Porosity/density



APPROACH In-situ Experiments



2mm Laser Scans on Shim

- Simulating laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) metal AM
- Simultaneous IR and x-ray collection
- IR calibration and melt pool identification
 - Matching melt pool geometry with x-ray images to fit the correct melt pool boundary temperatures



Bobel, A. et al, "In-situ X-ray, IR, and Diffraction Measurements of Automotive Grade Steel During Laser Powder Bed Fusion", TMS 2020 invited talk



PROJECT MILESTONES

Task Number & Brief		Ye	ar 1			Yea	ar 2	
Description	(Alloy set #1)		(Alloys set #2)					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Task 1: Sample preparation								
Task 2: In-situ LPBF								
experiments								
Task 3: Experiment data								
processing/analysis								
Task 4: Post experiment								
sample analysis								

Milestones/Deliverables:	
Milestone 1:	Complete sample preparation for in-situ experiments for Alloy Set #1 (complete by end of Year 1 Q2, ANL and GM), Completed
Milestone 2:	Complete in-situ experiments and data collection for Alloy Set #1 (complete by end of Year 1 Q3, ANL), Completed
Milestone 3:	Complete data processing and posttest sample analysis for Alloy Set #1 (complete by end of Year 1 Q4, ANL and GM). Prepare report with GM. 75% complete
Milestone 4:	Complete sample preparation for in-situ experiments for Alloy Set #2 (complete by end of Year 2 Q2, ANL and GM)
Milestone 5:	Complete in-situ experiments and data collection for Alloy Set #2 (complete by end of Year 2 Q3, ANL)
Milestone 6:	Complete data processing and posttest sample analysis for Alloy Set #2 (complete by end of Year 2 Q4, ANL and GM)
Milestone 7:	Derive quantitative relationships between LPBF processing parameters and probability of defect formation for the two alloy sets (end of project milestone, ANL and GM). Prepare report with GM.



TECHNICAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Alloys: AlTi, AlSiCu, FeCu, Fe393
- In-Situ experiments complete
 - (106 experiments 32 hrs beam time)
- IR thermal analysis complete
- Diffraction measurements next beam cycle
- Modeling started
- Microstructural analysis complete on FeCu
- Highlights:
 - Oxide vaporization porosity formation AI
 - Correlation IR and porosity

Materials Tested	Laser Power Tested (W)	Laser Scan Speeds Tested (mm/s)	
AITi (on printed substrate)	260, 302, 395, 520	300, 800, 1000, 1300, 1600	
AlTi (on cast substrate)	302, 520	300, 800, 1000, 1300	
AlSiCu (on printed substrate)	260, 364, 520	800, 1300, 1400, 1600, 2000	
FeCu (on printed substrate)	213, 348	190, 300, 400, 500	
Fe393 (on printed sustrate)	213, 348	300, 400, 700	





FeCu – X-ray and IR imaging

High Energy (Exp72)

Low Energy (Exp 74)





FeCu – Thermal Analysis (Pore formation)





Laser Power: 350 W Scan Speed: 400mm/s



TECHNICAL PROGRESS FeCu – Thermal Analysis (No Pore Formation)





Laser Power: 350W Scan Speed: 500mm/s



TECHNICAL PROGRESS Fe393 – X-ray and IR imaging

High energy (52)









Fe393 – Thermal Analysis (Pore formation)

Calibrated IR temperature measurements @ center of scan







TECHNICAL PROGRESS Fe393 – Thermal Analysis (No Pore Formation)







Lightweight Materials Consorti

Porosity Formation in Aluminum Alloys Casted vs Printed





Microstructural Analysis

- Electron backscatter diffraction (EBSD) analysis was performed on the printed samples (FeCu samples) complete to date)
- More microstructural anisotropy observed in low energy density test as compared to high energy density conditions FeCu High FeCu Low

Parameter Set	Spot Size (µm)	Power (W)	Speed (mm/s)	SED (J/mm²)
FeCu High	80	350	300	14.6
FeCu Mid	80	350	400	10.9
FeCu Low	80	350	500	8.75
FeCu Slow	80	200	190	13.2



ightweight Materials Consortiu

COLLABORATION WITH PARTNER

- GM Research & Development
 - CRADA partner
 - Provides alloy powders and shim samples
 - Participates in experiments at Argonne APS
 - Thermal modeling to predict porosity risk
 - ICME modeling for microstructural validation
 - Microstructural analysis of samples post-test (EBSD and optical)
 - Co-author journal articles and conference presentations



REMAINING CHALLENGES AND SCHEDULING ISSUES

- Technical challenges:
 - Establish relation between AM machine processing parameters and parameters used in in-situ experiments
- Scheduling issues:
 - Argonne/APS
 - APS access limitations due to COVID19, subject to DOE guidance
 - Beam time for in-situ experiments has been granted and request are submitted for summer cycle
 - GM
 - Limited access to microstructural analysis lab
 - Staff on rotations till July
 - Next alloy set samples are delayed (making shims)



FOLLOW-ON RESEARCH

- Perform in-situ experiments and post test analysis for alloy set #2
- Complete simulations of the parameter set/alloy combinations using thermal model
- Perform in-situ x-ray diffraction experiments and correlate with ICME modeling
- Complete correlation of in-situ experiments to AM printer parameters aided by thermal model
- Derive quantitative relationship between AM print parameters to probability of defect formation for the studied alloys







SUMMARY

- Demonstrated that advanced high energy x-ray in-situ experimentation is a useful tool for accelerating the development of X-Ray advanced alloy for additive manufacturing
- Completed analysis for Fe-based alloys, identified processing parameters that related to defect formation
- Aluminum-based alloys exhibit unanticipated result of secondary porosity formation, possibly due to vaporization of trapped oxides





IR



TECHNICAL BACKUP SLIDES



Experimental Conditions

4140 Powder: Fe-0.4C-1.1Cr-0.86Mn-0.26Si-0.19Mo wt%

Baseplates/shims from conventional bar stock primarily **ferrite-bainite** microstructure

Parameter Set	Spot Size (µm)	Power (W)	Scan Speed (mm/s)	SED (J/mm)
Fill	100	250	500	5.0
Fill 1.5x	100	374	750	5.0
High Energy	100	364	500	7.3
Keyhole	80	208	300	8.7

Specific Energy Density
$$\left[\frac{J}{mm^2}\right] = \frac{Power[W]}{Speed[mm/s] * Spot Size[mm]}$$

4140 Baseplate/Shim



Bobel, A. et al, "In-situ X-ray, IR, and Diffraction Measurements of Automotive Grade Steel During Laser Powder Bed Fusion", TMS 2020 invited talk





X-ray imaging of porosity 4140 X-ray Imaging



Bobel, A. et al, "In-situ X-ray, IR, and Diffraction Measurements of Automotive Grade Steel During Laser Powder Bed Fusion", TMS 2020 invited talk 22







IR thermal maps







Parameter Set	Spot Size (µm)	Power (W)	Scan Speed (mm/s)	SED (J/mm)
Fill	100	250	500	5.0
Fill 1.5x	100	374	750	5.0
HE	100	364	500	7.3
Кеу	80	208	300	8.7

Bobel, A. et al, "In-situ X-ray, IR, and Diffraction Measurements of Automotive Grade Steel During Laser Powder Bed Fusion", TMS 2020 invited talk



g<u>m</u>



Temperature plot and comparison to model



Only using input from melt pool geometry for Fill parameter

_ightMAT

Lightweight Materials Consortium

HOT CRACKING CASE STUDY Aluminum 6061



