

Shuyu 'Frank' Xia, William Smoot, Sung Lin 'Jason' Tien, and Mark Tuttle Mechanical Engineering Dept University of Washington

> 2016 Fall AMTAS Meeting UW Center for Urban Horticulture



#### Motivation and Key Issues:

 In-service bond failures between composite facesheets and honeycomb cores have been reported

X-33 Liquid Hydrogen Tank Failure Boeing 747 upper skin disbonds





Airbus A-310 Rudder Failure



approx. 24" x 60" upper skin disbond

(Photos courtesy of Ronald Krueger, National Institute of Aerospace



- Disbond initiation and growth is not completely understood, but is thought to occur due to combination of factors:
  - Pressure differences between inside and outside of unvented honeycomb structures (Ground-Air-Ground or 'GAG' pressure cycles)





- Disbond initiation and growth is not completely understood, but is thought to occur due to combination of factors:
  - Pressure differences between inside and outside of unvented honeycomb structures (Ground-Air-Ground or 'GAG' pressure cycles)
  - Excessive in-plane (design) loads



- Disbond initiation and growth is not completely understood, but is thought to occur due to combination of factors:
  - Pressure differences between inside and outside of unvented honeycomb structures (Ground-Air-Ground or 'GAG' pressure cycles)
  - Excessive in-plane (design) loads
  - Water ingression into core, followed by freeze-thaw cycles



- Disbond initiation and growth is not completely understood, but is thought to occur due to combination of factors:
  - Pressure differences between inside and outside of unvented honeycomb structures (Ground-Air-Ground or 'GAG' pressure cycles)
  - Excessive in-plane (design) loads
  - Water ingression into core, followed by freeze-thaw cycles
- Water ingression most commonly attributed to wicking of liquidous water through microcracks, along fiber/matrix interface, and/or through improper edge closeouts (all accentuated by GAG pressure cycles)



- Disbond initiation and growth is not completely understood, but is thought to occur due to combination of factors:
  - Pressure differences between inside and outside of unvented honeycomb structures (Ground-Air-Ground or 'GAG' pressure cycles)
  - Excessive in-plane (design) loads
  - Water ingression into core, followed by freeze-thaw cycles
- Water ingression most commonly attributed to wicking of liquidous water through microcracks, along fiber/matrix interface, and/or through improper edge closeouts (all accentuated by GAG pressure cycles)
- Water ingression may also occur simply due to diffusion of water molecules through (undamaged) facesheets



- Significant moisture transport via diffusion typically requires months or years, depending on:
  - Temperature
  - Thickness and material properties
  - External humidity level



#### Motivation and Key Issues:

Moisture diffusion in solid 48-ply Gr-Ep laminate; 160°F, 85%RH (W. Seneviratne and J. Tomblin, JAMS 2012)









#### Motivation and Key Issues:

Inner Outer 4.0 Facesheet 3.5 Moisture diffusion in Honeycomb Core honeycomb sandwich panels: 3.0 13.9 days % Moisture Content -12-ply Gr-Ep facesheets 27.8 days 2.5 - 0.5 in Nomex core 55.6 days - 90°F, 80%RH 2.0 -83.3 days (Tuttle, AMTAS 2009) 1.5 1.0 0.5









#### Implication:

Since sandwich structures are exposed to low external temperatures during flight (-50°C), a condense-freeze-thaw-evaporate cycle will occur as internal humidity increases within the core volume of a sandwich composite, even if no mechanical damage of the facesheet has occurred

#### Objective of this study:

Determine if the condense-freeze-thaw-evaporate cycle is detrimental by monitoring room-temperature interfacial fracture toughness,  $G_c$ , associated with facesheet disbonding for four specimen types:

<u>Type A</u>: As produced, "dry" specimens

<u>Type B</u>: "Dry" specimens exposed to 300 thermal cycles from RT to -50°C <u>Type C</u>: "Humid" specimens, with internal core humidity ~80%RH

<u>Type D</u>: "Humid" specimens exposed to 700 thermal cycles from RT to -50°C



- UW Principal Investigator and Researchers
  - Mark Tuttle (PI), Shuyu 'Frank' Xia (MSME), William Smoot (MSME), Sung Lin 'Jason' Tien (MSAA)
- FAA Technical Monitors
  - Lynn Pham, Zhi-Ming Chen
- Additional FAA Personnel Involved
  - Larry Ilcewicz, Curt Davies, Dave Westlund
- Industry Participation
  - Hamid Razi, Adam Sawicki, Bill Avery/The Boeing Company
  - Dan Holley and Chris Praggastis/3M
  - Bob Fagerlund/Bell Helicopter
- Study Initiated in September 2015



#### Technical Approach

 Sandwich panels with 4-ply <u>woven</u> facesheets and [45/0/0/45]<sub>T</sub> stacking sequence:

Туре	Manufacturer/Material Designation			
Facesheet	Cytec T300/970 3k plain weave fabric			
Core	Hexcel HRH-10 – 1/8 – 3.0 (0.50 in thick)			
Adhesive	3M Scotch-Weld Structural Film AF 163-2K			



#### Technical Approach

• Facesheets produced using an autoclave:







#### Technical Approach

• The cured facesheets and Nomex core were machined to size and stored for 2 months at 50°C (122°F) at 8% RH in a humidity chamber, to insure components were as "dry" as possible







#### Technical Approach

• Four parent sandwich panels were then produced using dried facesheets and core, using secondary bonding and a hot press







#### Technical Approach

 Also fabricated instrumented "witness" panels with Ohmic Instruments Model HC-610 capacitive humidity sensors to monitor core humidity levels





Technical Approach

- Six tests specimens were machined from the four "parent" panels (24 test specimens in total)
- Specimens produced from each panel were used for each Type, to avoid any potential manufacturing bias

Туре	Specimen Number					
A (as-produced)	1-1	2-2	3-3	4-4	1-5	2-6
B (thermally cycled)	2-1	3-2	4-3	1-4	2-5	3-6
C (humid)	3-1	4-2	1-3	2-4	3-5	4-6
D (humid&thermally Cycled)	4-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-5	1-6



#### Technical Approach

• Three witness panels and all Type C and D specimens were placed in the humidity chamber at 65°C (150°F) and 90%RH. Core humidity levels increased to about 80% in one month







#### Technical Approach

 All thermally-cycled specimens (Types B and D) were individually vacuum bagged (to insure constant moisture content in core volume) and subjected to 2-hr thermal cycles from 30°C ↔ -50°C







#### Technical Approach

• The interfacial fracture toughness, *G<sub>c</sub>*, was measured in accordance with a (draft) single-cantilever-beam (SCB) test standard being developed by Dan Adams, Waruna Seneviratne, and other members of a CMH-17 working group











#### Technical Approach

- A typical test involves six load cycles
- Crack length is measured after each cycle
- G<sub>c</sub> can be calculated using data collected during any one of the six cycles (data from cycle 1 is normally discarded)













			Average G <sub>c</sub> ,
			Normalized
Condition	Ave G <sub>c</sub> (J/m <sup>2</sup> )	StdDev G <sub>c</sub> (J/m <sup>2</sup> )	to Type A
Туре А	1508	213	1.00
Туре В	1410	214	0.94
Туре С	1440	142	0.95
Type D	1368	198	0.91



#### **Conclusions**

- Environmental factors (i.e., thermal cycling and/or elevated humidity levels) have a modest but measureable impact on interfacial fracture toughness, *G<sub>c</sub>*, associated with facesheet disbonding in sandwich composites
- The most aggressive environmental conditions considered during this study (humid specimens exposed to 700 thermal cycles from RT to -50°C) resulted in about a 10% reduction in G<sub>c</sub>.



#### A Look Ahead

- Expand Test Matrix:
  - Kevlar honeycomb core
  - Different Nomex core densities (e.g., 8 lb/ft<sup>3</sup>)
  - Thinner (3-ply?) and thicker (8-ply?) facesheets
- Formally participate in CMH-17 sandwich disbond round-robin study



### Thank You!

### Questions, Comments, Suggestions?



A part of the FAA Joint Advanced Materials & Structures Center of Excellence

### **Backup Slides**





