MD-A125 266	ANALYS (U) AI G E RI	IS OF P R FORCE GGS DEC	ROGRESS INST C 82 AFI	SI¥E COL DF TECH T/CI/NF	WRIGHT 8-82-630	DF COMPL PATTERS	EX STRI SON AFB F/G	UCTURES OH 12/1	1/3		



7

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

REPORT DOCUMEN	NTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION	NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
AFIT/CI/NR 82-63D	AD-A1252	
Analysis of Progressive Co	llapse of Compley	THESIS/DISSERTATION
Structures		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(=)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
Gregory Edward Riggs		
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AN	ND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
AFIT STUDENT AT: Univers	sity of Illinois	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND AD	DRESS	12. REPORT DATE
WPAFB OH 45433		Dec. 82 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 181
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRE	ESS(II dillerent from Controlling Offic	ce) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
· · ·		UNCLASS
		154. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE	; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMIT	
APPRUVED FUR PUBLIC RELEASE	; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMIT	rED DTI MAR 4 Y
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abe 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE	S DISTRIBUTION UNLIMIT	TED MAR 4 11 MAR 4 11 M
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abe 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if	; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMIT niraci entered in Block 20, 11 differen : IAW AFR 190-17 (ירוע) necessary and identify by block nus	TED MAR 4 11 MAR 1 11 MAR 4 11 M
APPRUVED FUR PUBLIC RELEASE 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abe 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if ATTACHED	: IAW AFR 190-17 () fu necessary and identify by block num	TED MAR 1 11 MAR 1 11 M
APPRUVED FUR PUBLIC RELEASE 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abe 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if ATTACHED	:; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMIT	IED MAR 1 11 MAR 1 11 MAR 1 11 MAR 1 11 MAR 1 11 A A MAR 1 11 A A A Molan . LYNN E. WOLAVER Dean for Research and Professional Developme AFIT, Wright-Patterson AF nber)
APPRUVED FUR PUBLIC RELEASE 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebe 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if ATTACHED DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV	ISTRIBUTION UNLIMIT	IED MAR 1 4 MAR 1 4 MAR 1 4 MAR 1 4 MAR 1 4 MAR 1 4 A A A A LYNN E. WOLAVER Dean for Research and Professional Developme AFIT, Wright-Patterson AF nber) Noter)

l

Name: Gregory Edward RiggsDate of Degree: December, 1982Institution: Oklahoma State UniversityLocation: Stillwater, OklahomaTitle of Study: ANALYSIS OF PROGRESSIVE COLLAPSE OF COMPLEX STRUCTURESPages in Study: 192Candidate for Degree of Doctor of PhilosophyMajor Field: Civil Engineeting

-)

Scope and Method of Study: The principal goal of the study was to evaluate an analytical procedure for predicting progressive collapse in damaged complex structures. A structure was modeled for analysis by the finite element method using relatively large, simple elements. There was little or no refinement of mesh size in areas of initial damage or damage propagation. A method was developed for determining and applying allowable stresses to help compensate for the absence of model detail. Stress results of a finite element analysis were examined by a computer post-processor program written for this study to make selective changes to the finite element model. The modified model was analyzed using the finite element method and the procedure was repeated in an iterative fashion to predict progressive collapse. Analytical results were compared to experimental test data to determine the validity of the analytical procedure.

Findings and Conclusions: The analytical procedure provided a relatively economical method for predicting progressive collapse in a complex structure. Evaluation of a complex structure subjected to three initial damage conditions showed acceptable correlation between experimental and analytical results. The method of determining appropriate allowable stresses was general enough to apply to a wide range of materials and structures. The procedure proved to be an economical estimating tool for predicting residual structural strength.

Appendite Ter 1177 3 3 4 4 P110 100 No. Handler Distance. 1 ALLE SID DO THIS Sec. . 1 . 29 . 19 . 2 .

ADVISER'S APPROVAL

AFIT/CI/NR 82-630

AFIT RESEARCH ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to ascertain the value and/or contribution of research accomplished by students or faculty of the Air Force Institute of Technology (ATC). It would be greatly appreciated if you would complete the following questionnaire and return it to:

AFIT/NR

Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433

RESEARCH TITLE: Analysis of Progressive Collapse of Complex Structure

AUTHOR:	Gregory	Edward	Riggs		 	 		
RESEARCH A	SSESSMENT QUESTI	DNS:						

1. Did this research contribute to a current Air Force project?

() a. YES () b. NO

2. Do you believe this research topic is significant enough that it would have been researched (or contracted) by your organization or another agency if AFIT had not?

() a. YES () b. NO

3. The benefits of AFIT research can often be expressed by the equivalent value that your agency achieved/received by virtue of AFIT performing the research. Can you estimate what this research would have cost if it had been accomplished under contract or if it had been done in-house in terms of manpower and/or dollars?

() a. MAN-YEARS

() b. \$

4. Often it is not possible to attach equivalent dollar values to research, although the results of the research may, in fact, be important. Whether or not you were able to establish an equivalent value for this research (3. above), what is your estimate of its significance?

() a. HIGHLY () b. SIGNIFICANT () c. SLIGHTLY () d. OF NO SIGNIFICANT SIGNIFICANT SIGNIFICANCE

5. AFIT welcomes any further comments you may have on the above questions, or any additional details concerning the current application, future potential, or other value of this research. Please use the bottom part of this questionnaire for your statement(s).

NAME

GRADE

POSITION

ORGANIZATION

LOCATION

STATEMENT(s):

FOLD DOWN ON OUTSIDE - SEAL WITH TAPE

.

AFIT/NR WRIGHT-FATTERSON AFE ON 46435

OFFICIAL BUSINESS PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE. \$300

£



*1

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 73236 WINDHINGTON D.C.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

AFIT/ DAA Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433

FOLD IN

52-63)

ANALYSIS OF PROGRESSIVE COLLAPSE

OF COMPLEX STRUCTURES

By

GREGORY EDWARD RIGGS

Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering United States Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, Colorado 1972

> Master of Science University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY December, 1982

ANALYSIS OF PROGRESSIVE COLLAPSE

and the second second

OF COMPLEX STRUCTURES

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

.

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Of the many people deserving acknowledgment, it is appropriate that the first to receive thanks is Dr. Allen E. Kelly. As major adviser and chairman of my committee, he maintained a delicate balance between providing general guidance and giving full rein for me to travel my own course and learn along the way. I thank Dr. Thomas D. Jordan, a committee member, for providing background information concerning the formulation of the F-84F wing finite element model. I thank them and the other members of my committee, Dr. William P. Dawkins, Dr. John W. Harvey, and Professor Louis O. Bass, Jr., for their willingness to interrupt their own work at any time to discuss with me various aspects of the study.

I thank the Joint Technical Coordinating Group for Munitions Effectiveness for funding this study. I sincerely hope this work will provide long-term benefits for the Group in performing its mission.

Mr. Lyle Allen, senior systems analyst in Administrative Systems Development, donated his technical assistance in working within the university computer system. Joey Freeland and John Awezec, undergraduate assistants, directed their energies to both the experimental test program and to the analytical efforts that followed.

Ms. Charlene Fries receives thanks from students every semester for typing manuscripts, but such thanks severely underrate her contributions. She assumes full responsibility for administering the preparation and submission of the documents. I certainly thank her.

My wife, Jan, deserves a special thanks for her part in this program. She provided all of the encouragement and support, including assuming many of my responsibilities within our home, typical of any loving spouse behind a doctoral candidate. Beyond that, she demonstrated the analytical talents needed to assist me in portions of my course work and to recommend improvements to my research. I also thank my two young daughters, Megan and Michele, who donated a portion of their rightful time with their father during the last three months of the study.

· ** (*** **; *)

Date New Server

Finally, I thank my parents, Ed and Marge Riggs, who have always been supportive. I thank especially my mother for taking the time long ago to explain to her puzzled son the difference between a noun and a verb, an adjective and an adverb. I believe her early patient effort helped immensely in my being able to progress through the formal education process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapte	r P	age
۱.	INTRODUCTION	1
11.	LITERATURE REVIEW	3
	2.1 General	3
	2.2 Qualitative Analysis	3
	2.3 Quantitative Analysis of Building Structures	4
	2.4 Quantitative Analysis of Aircraft Structures	4
	2.5 Analysis Method Background	5
tti.	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	7
17.	EXPERIMENTAL TEST PROGRAM	9
	4.1 General	q
	4.2 Specific Test Descriptions	á
	4.3 Wing Support System	12
	4 4 load System	15
	4.5 Deflection Measurements	15
	4.5 Strain Measurements	17
		17
۷.	FINITE ELEMENT MODELS	18
	5.] Background	18
	5.2 Model Variations	20
	5.3 Modeling Initial Damage	20
		20
VI.	ANALYSIS AUTOMATION	24
	6.1 General	24
	6.2 Overstressed Elements	24
	6.3 Failed Elements	26
	6 4 Propagation of Damage	27
	6.5 Adjustment of Load	27
		21
VII.	DETERMINATION OF LIMITING STRESSES	29
	7.1 Need for Limiting Stresses	29
	7.2 Limiting Stresses for Rod Elements	30
	7.3 Limiting Stresses for Web Elements	33
	7.4 Limiting Stresses for Skin Elements	34
	7.5 Damage Propagation	38
		<u> </u>

The Constant of the Andrew and the Constant of the

Chapter															F	age
VIII.	COMPARIS	N OF RESU	LTS .	• • •	• • •	••	••	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	43
	8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 8.6 8.7	General Comparis Load-Ite Internal Comparis Rotation Deflecti	on of ration Load on of of Wi ons .	Failurd Histor Paths Damage ng Spa	e Load ry Model r Root	 s ing s	· · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • • • •	43 44 45 50 62
IX.	SUMMARY A	ND CONCLU	ISIONS	• • •	• • •	••	• •	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	65
BIBLIOG	RAPHY	· • • • •		• • •	•••	•••	•••	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	68
APPENDI	X A - STI	RAIN GAGE	LOCATI	ONS FO	R EXPE	RIME	ENTA	LT	EST	S	•	•	•	•	•	71
APPENDI	X B - FIN	ITE ELEME	NT MOD	EL NUMI	BERING	DET	TAIL	S		•	•	•	•	•	•	76
APPENDI	X C - ROI	ELEMENT	REPLAC	EMENT	SYSTEM	s.	•••	•		•	•	•	•		•	87
APPENDI	X D - FIN	ITE ELEME	NT MOD	ELAL	ISTING	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	92
APPENDI	X E - FIN	ITE ELEME	NT MOD	ELCL	ISTING	•	••	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	104
APPENDI	X F - FII	ITE ELEME	NT TOR	SIONAL	ROD L	1ST	NG	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	115
APPENDI	X G - IN	TIAL DAMA	GE MOD	ELING	• • •	•••		•		•		•	•	•	•	117
APPENDI	X H - PR(GRESSIVE	STRUCT	URAL CO	OLLAPS	E AN	ALY	SIS	5 L1	ST	INC	ì	•	•	•	122
APPENDI	X I - PL(TS OF ANA	LYTICA	L AND I	EXPERI	MENT	TAL	DAT	Α.	•	•	•	•	•	•	148
APPENDI	X J - SUN	MARY OF A	NALYTI	CAL RE	SULTS			•		•		•	•	•	•	181

とうちゃう たいしまい

LIST OF TABLES

l

Table		Page
1.	Designation of Finite Element Models	21
п.	Limiting Stress Factors for Rod Elements	32
	Limiting Factors for Skin Elements	36
١٧.	Summary of Failure Loads	45
۷.	Summary of Results for Test 1, Model D, Simple Damage	182
۷١.	Summary of Results for Test 1, Model D, Detailed Damage	184
VII.	Summary of Results for Test 2C, Model A	186
VIII.	Summary of Results for Test 2C, Model D	188
IX.	Summary of Results for Test 3B, Model A	190
x.	Summary of Results for Test 3B, Model D	191

vii

LIST OF FIGURES

Figu	ire	Page
۱.	F-84F Wing Structure	10
2.	Damage for Test 1	11
3.	Damage for Test 2	13
4.	Damage for Test 3	14
5.	Wing Support Structure	16
6.	F-84F Finite Element Model	19
7.	Rod Elements for Spar Torsional Capacity	21
8.	Modeling Variations for Test Damage	23
9.	Iterative Analysis Procedure	25
10.	Cantilevered Beam Model	30
п.	Cantilevered Front Spar Idealization	32
12.	Typical Panel for Buckling Limits	35
13.	Load-Displacement Curves for Panel Buckling	37
14.	Crack Investigation Models	40
15.	Propagation Stress Factor Curves	41
16.	Load-Iteration Histories	46
17.	Wing Model Results at Test Failure	51
18.	Wing Model Results at Test 2C Failure	54
19.	wing Model Results at Test 3B Failure	57
20.	Failure Load Profiles for Test 3B	63
21.	Strain Gage Locations	73
22.	Finite Element Model Numbering Details	77

1. 500

Sec. Sec.

a free to a feature

NAME AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY.

igure P	age
3. Basic Sizing of Rod Elements	90
4. Rod Element Sizing With Shear Panel Skin	91
5. PROSCAN Functional Flow Diagram	123
6. Comparison of Vertical Reaction Forces	149
7. Comparison of Strains for Test 1	155
8. Comparison of Strains for Test 2C	159
9. Comparison of Strains for Test 3B	163
0. Load Point Displacements for Test 1	167
1. Single-Point Displacements for Test 2C	169
2. Single-Point Displacements for Test 3B	175

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many structures are susceptible to progressive collapse, a chain reaction type of failure following damage to a relatively small portion of the structure. The more specialized a structure is, the more vulnerable it is to progressive failure largely because it is designed to resist fewer possible loading conditions. As efforts increase to optimize designs within acceptable factors of safety, the risks of initiating progressive collapse through relatively minor localized damage also increase. An ability to predict analytically the response of a damaged structure would therefore be beneficial.

Although progressive collapse is normally associated with high-rise buildings, interest in it is not limited to conventional civil engineering applications. The Department of Defense needs the capability to predict the residual strength of battle-damaged aircraft and to know the role of progressive collapse in that setting. Specifically, the Department of Defense Joint Technical Coordinating Group for Munitions Effectiveness is interested in the post-damaged capabilities of potentially hostile aircraft.

In pursuit of its interest, the Group provided research funds and three F-84F aircraft wings for this study. The goal was to evaluate a potentially versatile method for predicting progressive collapse in aircraft structures. The method was to be verified by experimental testing.

Desirable characteristics to be imparted to the method would be relative simplicity in preparing for its use and relative ease and economy in its application.

The finite element method was the fundamental tool for determining stresses within the wing. In this report most discussion of the finite element method is of a general nature. The NASTRAN (<u>National Aeronauti-</u> cal and Space Administration <u>Structural Analysis</u>) program was selected to apply the finite element method because of its versatility and its widespread availability in both industry and the defense community. The reader is assumed to be familiar with the finite element method in general. Where reference to specific program characteristics is essential, a basic familiarity with NASTRAN is also assumed.

Finally, the sponsor of this research is interested in the effectiverass of munitions in destroying combat aircraft. Consequently, any conservative assumption is one which tends to give the structure more strength than actually exists. This definition of conservative is used throughout the study. Caution must be exercised in directly extending the results of this study to more conventional applications. In such use the assumptions of this study would become unconservative.

CHAPTER 11

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 General

Many papers have addressed the topic of progressive collapse of damaged structures, but only one has provided a general quantitative method of analysis (1). The following sections summarize the published papers while the last section details the one general approach.

2.2 Qualitative Analysis

Most studies of progressive collapse, as applied to structures conventionally associated with Civil Engineering, fit into three categories. The first addressed a need to predict statistically the frequency and severity of damaging events such as vehicle impact or explosion (2 through 8).

Another category was the qualitative analysis of a structure's ability to resist damage or to develop alternate load paths around damage. Typical topics of discussion included catenary action of slabs, beam action of adequately tied ceiling-wall-floor systems acting as wide flange sections, and the in-plane arching of walls over damage (4, 7, 9 through 14).

A third category was an effort to develop codes which mate the first two areas into economically and socially acceptable guidelines for design and construction (15 through 23). Additionally, a research workshop was

conducted in 1975 to evaluate present knowledge of the progressive collapse phenomenon and to identify areas requiring further study (24).

2.3 Quantitative Analysis of Building Structures

A smaller, fourth category addressed the need to evaluate quantitatively the behaviors occurring during a progressive collapse. Several studies have been completed, but most have considered only two-dimensional problems and most have required extensive analyst interactive involvement (25 through 29).

Smith and Epstein (30) developed a three-dimensional method to analyze the progressive collapse of a space truss roof. Their approach used the finite element method to determine structural member stresses. As a member approached its buckling load, predetermined for every member in the structure, the member was replaced by opposite equal forces representing post-buckling strength. The method did provide a three-dimensional analysis but was limited exclusively to buckling related failures. It was inappropriate for structures in which other failure modes share equal importance or are dominant.

2.4 Quantitative Analysis of Aircraft Structures

The military's need to predict the behavior of damaged aircraft has precipitated several papers of interest. Venkayya (31) outlined an empirical iterative procedure in 1978 for determining the residual strength of damaged structures. The displacements and decomposed stiffness matrix of an undamaged structure were combined with a sparse negative stiffness matrix representing damage. The result was an iteratively derived secondorder Taylor series approximation of the response of the damaged structure.

The method appeared suitable for economic evaluation of initial structure response to several different damage conditions. However, when the method is applied to progressive collapse analyses, problems surface as component failure progresses toward collapse. Solution convergence times become unacceptably slow and convergence criteria become increasingly difficult to establish.

In 1976, Heard (1) proposed for the Air Force Armaments Testing Laboratory (AFATL) a method of structural modeling and analysis for progressive collapse in aircraft structures. That method, referred to in this study as the AFATL method, appeared to be the most promising general approach to a quantitative analysis of progressive collapse. The next section presents this method in some detail.

2.5 Analysis Method Background

The structure being evaluated must be represented as a computer model for finite element analysis. Because the method requires many iterative analyses to trace the progressive collapse phenomenon, economy urges the use of the largest, simplest elements which still describe the basic geometry of the structure and provide adequate precision to permit a stressbased analysis. A principal feature of the AFATL method is that little or no refinement of the model occurs in the area of damage. This feature aids the economy of the method but, because the large elements mask stress concentrations, the method must include compensating techniques. Heard employed two such techniques which are described later.

A load was applied to the model and the resulting stresses were examined in search of overstressed elements. An overstressed element was one whose stresses exceeded predefined limiting values. A solitary over-

stressed element was removed from the model as having failed. If more than one overstressed element occurred grouped together, only the most severely stressed element of the group was removed. This technique helped represent crack propagation in a model composed of large elements and was supported by studies of Sih and Hartranft (28).

Reducing the values of limiting stresses for elements bordering damage was the second technique to compensate for loss of stress concentrations around crack tips at the edges of damage. Thus the computed stress in an element bordering damage might produce element failure while a similarly stressed element away from damage remained intact. Using different values for limiting stresses complicated the process of selecting which element to fail in a group of overstressed elements. The most severely stressed element could not be determined through a direct comparison of the magnitudes of element stresses.

After the failed elements were removed, the modified model was again analyzed and the procedure was repeated. Iterations continued until the model could sustain some desired maximum load, or until failure occurred. This latter condition was sometimes determined subjectively by evaluating the structure's displaced shape rather than by its residual load-carrying capacity.

CHAPTER III

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The method proposed by Heard appeared to be a versatile approach for the quantitative analysis of progressive collapse. To increase the acceptability of the method, however, four areas were identified as objectives for further study.

Validation of the method was perhaps the most important objective. Due to an absence of actual aircraft wings which his model represented, Heard was unable to substantiate with actual test data the value of his work. The first phase of this study was a laboratory test program which provided data for evaluation of analytical results. Tests of three F-84F aircraft wings measured structural performance under different damage and load combinations.

In the previous study, only one combination of elements was used for modeling the aircraft wing structure. A comparison of several element combinations was made in search of the best selection of model elements.

The actual application of the method required a great amount of manual data analysis for each iteration. A large number of elements had to be checked and compared to limiting stress values. The relative locations of overstressed elements had to be determined and caution applied to remove the appropriate element. Finally, removal of failed elements required modifications of the model. In addition to removing the failed elements, modification included reducing limiting stresses for elements

bordering the newly propagated damage. Automating the application of the method was desirable to reduce both time and expense for a complete analysis.

The final area to address was the appropriate values for limiting stresses. Heard used two levels of limiting stresses: material ultimate strength for elements away from damage, and material yield strength for elements bordering damage. A more sophisticated determination of limiting stresses had the potential for returning more realistic results.

These four areas,

- 1. Comparison of analytical and test results
- 2. Comparison of modeling elements
- 3. Automation of the method
- 4. Determination of limiting stress values,

became the specific objectives of this study.

CHAPTER IV

EXPERIMENTAL TEST PROGRAM

4.1 General

A major objective of this study was to use actual test data as a standard for evaluating analytical results. Three F-84F aircraft wings were tested, each with a different damage and load combination. This chapter contains descriptions of specific damage and loads and of the general test procedure. Appendix A contains diagrams showing strain gage locations for the various tests.

4.2 Specific Test Descriptions

The F-84F aircraft wing is a two-spar, semi-monocoque structure. For general reference, Figure 1 illustrates the upper and lower wing surfaces and the wing structural frame. All three wings were mounted upside down for testing; however, the terms "upper" and "lower" refer to the wing's upper and lower surfaces, not to their physical orientation for the tests. For all tests, the landing gear and gear doors, flaps, and ailerons were removed.

Test 1 consisted of severe damage to the upper half of the front spar as shown in Figure 2. A load applied to the front spar produced a failure with bending as the predominant behavior. The damaged area was stressed in tension.



(a) Upper Surface

، معديد المراجع



(b) Lower Surface



(c) Structural Frame

Figure 1. F-84F Wing Structure

ون ا



.....

.

Upper Surface



Lower Surface



Damage

L. C. Starten

2. E

1.2.2

Figure 2. Danage for Test 1

11

. Strand

Sec. All Sugar

.

Test 2, Figure 3, was to measure behavior with a significant amount of torsion present. The rear spar was completely severed and the load was applied to the rear spar. The result was a combination of bending and torsion in the front spar. This wing could not be failed within safe limits of the laboratory loading apparatus. Consequently, three loading trials were performed on this wing and designated Tests 2A, 2B, and 2C. Each test had slightly modified damage to the skin adjacent to the severed spar. These were efforts to initiate tearing of the skin over the wheel well area; however, no propagation of that damage occurred.

Test 3 was an attempt to represent more closely the damage which could occur from a shaped-charge missile warhead. Figure 4 shows a $5\frac{1}{2}$ inch wide strip of material removed from the lower wing surface. All skin was removed from the strip, which extended from the rear spar to the leading edge. The lower rear spar cap was removed but the web was left intact. The portion of the lower front spar cap extending from the web toward the trailing edge was also removed. The load applied to the rear spar put the damaged surface into compression.

The residual strength of this wing also exceeded the safe capacity of the loading equipment. A variation of this test, designated Test 3B, included further damage to the front spar cap. Half the width of the lower spar cap extending from the web toward the leading edge was removed. A 14-inch width of spar cap remained extending from the rear face of the web toward the leading edge. This additional damage led to complete structural failure.

4.3 Wing Support System

Each wing soar root mounted into a support structure as illustrated



Upper Surface



Lower Surface



Section a-a

Damage

. Alesander

Figure 3. Damage for Test 2



Upper Surface



Lower Surface





Damage Additional Damage for Test 3B

8

. English

long in

Figure 4. Damage for Test 3

in Figure 5. Pins secured the wings in the support structures in the same manner as the wings had been attached to aircraft fuselages. The support structures were extremely rigid compared to the wings so that no appreciable deformation occurred within the supports themselves. Three transducers supported each T-shaped support structure, permitting measurements of vertical reaction forces and reaction moments about two perpendicular horizontal axes.

The wing spar roots were aligned with the support structures and pinned into place within small tolerance; however, some motion of the wing spar roots with respect to the supports was unavoidable. For Tests 2 and 3, dial gages measured relative rotation of each wing spar root about horizontal axes parallel to and perpendicular to the root itself. These data then formed the basis for support conditions in corresponding finite element analyses. These support conditions provided a better analytical representation of wing deflections; however, support conditions assuming no relative rotation were used for stress analyses.

4.4 Load System

A movable overhead crane applied a single point load in each test. The crane was self-adjusting so the load was always applied vertically. A cable attaching the crane to the wing load point was equipped with an in-line transducer to permit continuous accurate monitoring of the actual load applied.

4.5 Deflection Measurements

Vertical deflections were measured at points along the front and rear spars corresponding to node points in the finite element model.



Figure 5. Wing Support Structure

فسيريده كأريته بمنتخل كالتحريب ومتركيته

Aste 1

Steel scales incremented to 0.01 inch were attached to the lower wing surface and measurements were read through an engineer's level. Similarly, scales were mounted on the support structures above each transducer to detect any vertical displacements there. At the load point no scale could be attached to the wing surface as at other locations along the spars. Instead, a cloth tape hung down vertically from the upper wing surface to measure deflections with respect to the laboratory floor.

4.6 Strain Measurements

Strain gages were mounted to the wing to detect changes in load paths as components failed and to detect load levels at which failures occurred. The different designs of each test and experience from previous tests led to slightly different strain gage placement for each wing. Appendix A contains specific locations.

Quarter-inch uniaxial strain gages measured outer fiber strains along spar and rib caps. Three-gage rectangular rosettes attached to selected skin panels measured panel behavior. Similar rosettes measured shear in rib and spar webs in Test 3.

Wings were first loaded enough to compensate for self-weight, and all gages were zeroed. For Test 1, all transducers and strain gages fed into a single switch and balance unit to measure output. All other tests used a Vishay Instruments Measurements Group computer-controlled data acquisition and reduction system. The System 4000 included the software program plus a Controller 4220 and two Strain Gage Scanners 4270. A Hewlett-Packard 98258, upgraded to 9825T capabilities, served as the Executive Control Unit to complete the system hardware.

CHAPTER V

FINITE ELEMENT MODELS

5.1 Background

The fundamental modeling philosophy used by Heard (1) applied also to this study. Rod elements in combination with shear panels represented heavy structural members such as spars and ribs. Shear panel or membrane elements represented aircraft skin. Skin stiffeners were modeled by rod elements.

The specific structure for this study, the F-84F aircraft wing, was also analyzed by Jordan (32, 33). In 1976, he performed a dynamic response and small static load bending analysis of the wing. Although his objective differed from Heard's, he applied the same fundamental philosophy to develop his model of the wing. Jordan's model was the nucleus of the models evaluated in this study and is illustrated in Figure 6. Details of element numbering are presented in Appendix B.

The structure's geometry determined the size of the elements. Intersections of spars and ribs and of skin stiffeners and ribs were model node points. The node points in turn defined the elements. The procedure for assigning area properties for elements, particularly for rods, was detailed by both Heard (1) and Jordan (33). A brief summary is presented in Appendix C.



5.2 Model Variations

The model developed by Jordan gave him good response for conditions where bending dominated; however, it provided no torsional stiffness for the heavy structural members. To evaluate damage and load combinations producing significant torsion, model revisions included torsional stiffness for the front and rear spars.

This stiffness was provided by including rod elements along the centerlines of the spars. These elements had no axial load capacity but did provide torsional resistance. Multipoint constraint equations determined the rotation of each end of a torsion rod by using the lateral displacements of the nodes immediately above and below it. Figure 7 illustrates that the rotation, β , of the end of the centerline rod was

$$\beta = \frac{1}{h} (y_u - y_{\ell})$$
 (5.1)

Although modeling philosophies in the previous efforts were essentially the same, Heard used membrane elements for the skin while Jordan used shear panels. This study compared four modeling combinations. All four models used rods for skin stiffeners and for caps of spars and ribs. All used shear panels for spar and rib webs. The differences are presented in Table I. Appendix D is a listing of Model A and Appendix E is a listing of Model C. The additions for torsional resistance to convert Models A and C to Models B and D, respectively, are presented in Appendix F.

5.3 Modeling Initial Damage

To the extent possible, no special modeling techniques were applied to initial damage. Damaged shear panels or membranes were reduced in



Figure 7. Rod Elements for Spar Torsional Capacity

TABLE I	
---------	--

DESIGNATION OF FINITE ELEMENT MODELS

Model Designation	Skin Elements	Torsional Stiffness
A	Shear Panels	No
B	Shear Panels	Yes
С	Membranes	No
D	Membranes	Yes

21

S. Cr.
thickness or were removed when damage was severe. The rods representing damaged spars were reduced in size to maintain an equivalent moment of inertia, as presented by Jordan (32, 33). One exception to this approach was evaluated for Test 1. Damage to the front spar extended halfway into the web. Figure 8a shows a side view of the damaged front spar and Figure 8b shows modeling of the undamaged spar. The simpler modeling technique is illustrated in Figure 8c. The web element thickness was reduced to half its undamaged size. Rods representing spar caps were unmoved but reduced in size to represent the residual moment of inertia. Figure 8d shows the more detailed approach used by Jordan (32, 33) to model such severe damage. The two methods were compared. The specific changes made to Models A and C for each test are presented in Appendix G. The additional changes for Models B and D are included as part of Appendix F.



CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS AUTOMATION

6.1 General

One shortcoming of the AFATL method cited in Chapter III was the need to examine voluminous computer output. A FORTRAN IV computer code, entitled PROSCAN for <u>Progressive Structural Collapse Analysis</u>, was written to alleviate the problem. PROSCAN was written to apply the method in conjunction with NASTRAN (<u>National Aeronautics and Space Administration Structural Analysis</u>) to perform the finite element analyses. Figure 9 illustrates the analysis procedure, and Appendix H comprises a functional flow chart and a listing of the PROSCAN program.

In exchanging information between the two computer programs, disk storage was used exclusively. All NASTRAN output was stored in punchedcard format in disk files. All case control and bulk data decks were also stored on disks, and all modifications made by PROSCAN to the models were directed to those storage files.

6.2 Overstressed Elements

The first requirement in applying the AFATL method to finite element results was identifying overstressed elements. Because more than one limiting stress value was permissible, some common basis for evaluating severity of stress had to be established. The criterion selected was the margin of safety defined as



Figure 9. Iterative Analysis Procedure

$$M.S. = \frac{\text{allowable stress}}{\text{actual stress}} - 1.0$$
(6.1)

Several elements within NASTRAN, rods and shear panels included, return an element margin of safety as part of the solution. For those elements which do not provide a margin of safety, PROSCAN calculated one. Element principal and maximum shear stresses were compared to analystprovided limiting stresses for tension, compression, and shear. A margin of safety was calculated for each type of stress and the algebraically smallest value was selected as the element margin of safety. PROSCAN then identified any element with a negative margin of safety as an overstressed element.

6.3 Failed Elements

PROSCAN applied the next step of the AFATL method, grouping of overstressed elements, by node matching. The node numbers of each overstressed element were compared to those of every other overstressed element. PROSCAN designated any continuous linkage of those elements as a group, then selected the most severely stressed element from the group.

The element margin of safety again was the basis for decisions. PRO-SCAN selected the element of the group with the most negative margin of safety. That element became a failed element. The process of grouping and failing elements continued until all overstressed elements were considered.

PROSCAN did not actually remove a failed element from the model. Instead, PROSCAN assigned property values to the element which effectively eliminated its contribution to the structure. The failed areas and moduli of elasticity and shear were orders of magnitude below nominal values for unfailed elements.

6.4 Propagation of Damage

The failing of an element represented propagation of the damage, and as a consequence, the borders of the damage expanded. Additional elements had to be identified as bordering the new damage so they could be assigned reduced limiting stresses. Again a node matching scheme was employed. Each element which had at least one node in common with a newly failed element was examined. If it had not already failed itself or had not already bordered damage, lower limiting stresses replaced those previously used. The lowering of limiting stresses accounted for the possible presence of crack tip stress concentrations as introduced in section 2.5.

6.5 Adjustment of Load

PROSCAN had the capability of applying a new load to the model with each iteration. That capability was used in this study as explained below.

If no element failed on a particular iteration, the load was increased for the next NASTRAN analysis. This would occur until the structure sustained some maximum user-specified load without further element failure. Conversely, if an element failed on a particular iteration, PROSCAN reduced the load for the next NASTRAN analysis. The purpose was to determine the structure's ability to carry a lesser load after further weakening by the failed element. Reducing the load every time an element failed continued until the structure could not sustain a minimum load without further failure.

The analyst provided a sequence of loads to be applied, from minimum to maximum, as part of the PROSCAN input data. PROSCAN then made the

appropriate changes to the NASTRAN case control deck to reflect the structure's performance on the previous iteration. In addition to changing the load identification number, PROSCAN could assign new single point and multipoint constraint sets and identify new labels to correspond to each new load.

PROSCAN automated the entire application of the AFATL method. This began with initial viewing of NASTRAN output and finished by establishing new files containing modified case control and bulk data decks.

CHAPTER VII

DETERMINATION OF LIMITING STRESSES

7.1 Need for Limiting Stresses

Repeated reference has been made to limiting stresses. It is appropriate to address in more detail the specifics of allowable stress levels. Heard (1) used two limiting stress criteria: ultimate strength for elements away from damage, and yield strength for elements bordering damage. This study attempted to define more precisely the levels of stress which should cause failure in the model.

Ultimate strength remained the basic criterion for defining failure; but most elements, even those away from damage, were assigned limiting stresses lower than ultimate strength. Consider that a relatively large element returned a computed stress representative of a large structural region. This representative stress was unavoidably lower than the high stress within the region which would cause failure in the actual member. It was necessary then to estimate the effects of the representative stresses by using some value of limiting stress lower than ultimate strength.

Appropriate limiting stresses also estimated the nonlinear behavior experienced through the buckling of skin panels. Since the finite element analyses assumed linearly elastic behavior, the ability to compensate for skin panel buckling was incorporated to enhance results. PROSCAN had the ability to incorporate both the low stresses causing buckling and the reduced stiffnesses subsequent to buckling.

7.2 Limiting Stresses for Rod Elements

Spar and rib sections were each represented by three elements. A shear panel represented the web. One rod element represented the upper spar cap and another rod represented the lower spar cap. The rods were sized and spaced to maintain the moment of inertia about the section's neutral axis and to return outer fiber stresses.

The stress value obtained for rod elements was the average of the stresses at each end of the rod. Because rod elements in the spars were relatively long, the average stress could be substantially less than the maximum stress. A procedure to obtain limiting stresses for a similarly modeled doubly symmetric cantilevered beam served as a foundation for developing limiting stresses for the wing model. Figure 10 shows such a beam with top rod elements numbered and top nodes lettered.



Figure 10. Cantilevered Beam Model

Using rod 3 for illustration, the maximum stress from the applied load occurred at node E, but the stress obtained was the average of

stresses at nodes D and E. Designating L as the length of any member j, the average stress in rod 3 was

$$\sigma_{\text{avg}} = \frac{P(L_1 + L_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_3)\gamma}{1}$$
(7.1)

and the stress at node E was

$$\sigma_{\max} = \frac{P(L_1 + L_2 + L_3)y}{I}$$
(7.2)

where I was the section moment of inertia. Designating a limiting stress factor, F_i , as the ratio of σ_{avq} to σ_{max} ,

$$F_{3} = \frac{L_{1} + L_{2} + \frac{1}{2}L_{3}}{L_{1} + L_{2} + L_{3}}$$
(7.3)

In general terms,

$$F_{i} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}L_{i} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}L_{j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{i}L_{j}}$$
(7.4)

for the single point load shown. The appropriate limiting stress, $\sigma_{\rm L}$, was

$$\sigma_{L_{i}} = F_{i} \sigma_{ult_{i}}$$
(7.5)

where $\sigma_{\mbox{ult}_{2}}$ was the ultimate strength for the member i.

To extend this approach for calculating stress factors to the finite element model of the wing, the wing itself was idealized as a straight cantilevered beam. The front spar dimensions were used for section lengths as shown in Figure 11. Upper surface element numbers are below each rod and corresponding node numbers are above each node.



Figure 11. Cantilevered Front Spar Idealization

Factors to reduce material ultimate strength for elements inboard of the load were calculated as shown in the previous example. Elements between the load and the wing tip used the same factor as the elements immediately inboard of the load. Table II shows the limiting stress factors for the front spar rods on the upper wing surface.

TABLE II

LIMITING STRESS FACTORS FOR ROD ELEMENTS

Rod No.:	641	613	575	529	475	431	393	355
F _i :	0.950	0.937	0.921	0.855	0.788	0.735	0.500	0.500

Each rod representing a skin stiffener was approximately parallel to the spars and was assigned the same factor as its corresponding spar element. Each rib was approximately perpendicular to the spars. Each rod in a rib was assigned the factor of the spar rod immediately inboard of the spar-rib intersection. A single concentrated load was used for analysis to correspond to the actual loading applied in the laboratory test program. However, an aerodynamic load could be represented by any approximation acceptable to the analyst. Although the mathematical expression for F_i would be more complex, the same approach to factoring for limiting stresses in rod elements could be applied.

7.3 Limiting Stresses for Web Elements

Shear panel elements represented the webs of spars and ribs. The limiting stress for shear was determined by comparing the average shearing stress in the web to the maximum shearing stress in the web. If V were designated as the shearing force in the cantilevered beam discussed in the previous section, the web element yielded a shearing stress of

$$\tau_{avg} = \frac{V}{2yt}$$
(7.6)

where t was the web thickness. The maximum shearing stress in the sec-

$$\tau_{\max} = \frac{VQ}{It}$$
(7.7)

The limiting stress factor, F, was the value of τ_{avg} divided by τ_{max} , so the limiting shearing stress, τ_1 , was

$$\tau_{L} = F \tau_{ult}$$
 (7.8)

Calculations for typical spar cross sections showed F = 0.35 to be a representative value. This value was applied to all spar and rib web elements.

Proportions of spar and rib sections indicated web crippling was unlikely; therefore, no reductions in limiting stresses were developed for buckling of undamaged web members. If initial damage to the structure introduced a potential for buckling, residual member proportions dictated the appropriate reductions.

7.4 Limiting Stresses for Skin Elements

Skin panels, unlike spar and rib webs, were susceptible to buckling. Additionally, the skin could tear along rivet lines or rivets themselves could fail. Whether a panel buckled in shear or in compression, or failed along a rivet line, the result was a reduction in stiffness of the panel. Because of the similar change in behavior, panels were divided into either pre-buckling or post-buckling categories even though rivet line failure was not a buckling phenomenon.

Each skin panel on the wing had slightly different geometric properties which gave each slightly different pre- and post-buckling characteristics. Panel 106, forward of the front spar on the lower wing surface, was typical of most skin panels and was used to determine approximate values for all panels. Figure 12 shows its location in the model. The assembly used for calculations included panel 106, a stiffener attached to each long side, and a rib attached to each short side. Averaging the lengths of the two long sides and the two short sides gave a rectangular shape for calculations.

To determine pre-buckling limits, compression perpendicular to the long sides, compression perpendicular to the short sides, and a corner force producing shear were all evaluated separately. Calculations were determined according to Peery (34, Chapters 14 and 15). The average

stress causing buckling in each case was divided by the material ultimate strength to determine the limiting stress factors, F. For the two compression conditions, the more conservative value was used.



Figure 12. Typical Panel for Buckling Limits

Limits for tension were obtained by calculating rivet and skin strengths along a conservative rivet line. Limiting loads, determined according to Peery (34, Chapter 12) and Bruhn (35, Chapter D1), were divided by the ultimate load, the load causing an average stress in the panel equal to the ultimate strength. The result was the limiting stress factor. Skin failure was compared to rivet failure, and the more conservative value was used.

For nost-buckling behavior, the limiting stresses were returned to ultimate strength, but the elastic and shear moduli were reduced to account for the reduction in stiffness following buckling. For compression buckling, bilinear behavior was assumed. The load versus displacement curve of Figure 13a assumed linear behavior prior to buckling, then linear behavior from buckling to an ultimate strength failure. The slope of the pre-buckling portion of the curve, S_1 , was divided into a secant slope, S_2 , from the origin to failure. The result was a reduction factor, M, for the elastic modulus. The same process applied to Figure 13b produced a reduction factor for the modulus of shear. Table III summarizes the results for skin buckling.

TABLE III

Stress Factor Modulus Factor Behavior F Μ Compression, 0.17 1.00 Pre-buckling Shear, Pre-buckling 0.32 1.00 Tension, Pre-buckling 0.55 1.00 Compression, 1.00 0.76 Post-buckling Shear, Post-buckling 1.00 0.53 Tension, 1.00 0.76 Post-buckling

LIMITING FACTORS FOR SKIN ELEMENTS



the second se

Although the assumption of linear behavior from buckling to ultimate failure was not correct, it was a conservative representation of the rather brittle material behavior observed in the laboratory. The result economically approximated the loss in stiffness suffered by the structure from skin_buckling and rivet line failure.

7.5 Damage Propagation

No attempt was made to model ragged edges around initial damage nor to reduce element size in areas of propagating cracks. The large elements then tended to mask the stress concentrations around cracks and produced a model significantly more resistant to progressive collapse than the structure being represented.

Conventionally, the nominal stress in a cracked member would have been multiplied by a stress concentration factor, K. Its value would have been larger than 1.0 and based upon crack length and crack tip severity. The increased value for stress at the crack tip would then have been compared to an allowable stress for the member. PROSCAN used an inverse approach. Rather than increase the nominal stress returned by an element, the allowable stress was decreased by a factor F, where F essentially was the inverse of K. This further reduction of limiting stresses compensated for the absence of increased modeling detail around damage.

Any cracks occurring were assumed to originate at the initial damage or in subsequently failed elements. The further reductions in limiting stresses applied therefore only to unfailed elements bordering either initial damage or failed elements.

Separate reduction factors were determined for tension and for shear. Because cracks were assumed not to propagate in compression, no further

reduction applied to limiting compressive stresses. This portion of the investigation was patterned after similar crack propagation studies by Sih and Hartranft (28).

Two square plate models, one loaded in tension and the other in shear, provided information for reduction factors. Model detail ranged from two elements along a side to thirty-two elements along a side.

A crack initiated at the center of one edge propagated through the plate during sequential analyses. Loads remained constant through all iterations. Crack propagation was represented by creating a new node beside the tip of the crack, thus extending the crack to the next node. Figure 14 illustrates the procedure, exaggerated in scale, on a model using four elements per side. Figure 14b shows node m at the tip of the crack. The creation of node z extended the crack tip to node n in Figure 14c.

Figure 14b shows the plate cracked one-quarter of the way through its width. Stresses in the four elements connected to the node at the crack tip, those indicated by X's, were averaged and then divided into the average stress in the uncracked plate. The result was the limiting stress factor for the plate cracked through one-quarter of its width. The same procedure applied to the plate in Figure 14c produced the factor for the plate cracked halfway through its width. Figure 15 shows variation of the factor as a function of model detail and crack length. F_{T} represents tension loading and F_{c} represents shear loading.

All curves in Figure 15 appeared to approach zero slope as element size reduced. The values of F_{T} and F_{S} selected for this study were for a plate cracked one-eighth of the way through its width in a model with 32 elements along a side. For most components of the F-84F wing, this



Figure 14. Crack Investigation Models

about

40

ł









Figure 15. Propagation Stress Factor Curves

represented a crack less than one inch in length in the longer side of the component. The corresponding stress concentration factor was K = 2.1. For skin panel 106, it represented a crack 0.725 inches long with a crack tip radius of 0.30 inches calculated according to Seely and Smith (36, Chapter 12). Thus the assumed crack around damage was relatively mild and was therefore conservative.

New limiting stresses for an element bordering damage were the product of the appropriate factor, F_T or F_S or $F_C = 1.0$ for compression, and the element's previous limiting stresses. Limiting stress factors were, in this manner, cumulative. The exception was unbuckled skin panels. Their limiting stresses were not reduced to reflect cracks until after buckling stresses were exceeded.

CHAPTER VIII

COMPARISON OF RESULTS

8.1 General

Damage and load conditions for Tests 2C and 3B were analyzed using all four models for each test. Measured rotations of wing spar roots from laboratory data were enforced in the analyses. Examination of those analyses showed the addition of torsional rod elements to the spars made little difference in results. The performance of Model B was very similar to that of Model A, and the results from Model D were almost identical to those from Model C. Apparent reasons for the similarities are presented in the next section.

Further examination of the analytical results revealed unexpected stress distributions in and near the wing spar roots. The enforced rotations of wing spar roots, although developed from experimental measurements, did not produce purely rigid body motions for reasons explained in section 8.6. Consequently, the original analytical representations did not match closely enough the laboratory conditions of the experimental test program.

A second set of analyses was performed using zero support rotations for stress determination and enforced rotations for checking displacements. Tests 2C and 3B were analyzed using Models A and C for each test. Model C described the collapse phenomenon more closely than Model A as explained in section 8.4. Therefore, Model C was next compared to Model

D, the same model with the addition of torsional rod elements. The lack of significant different between Models C and D confirmed the minimal influence of the torsional rod elements. Model B, therefore, was not analyzed further because it would produce essentially the same results as Model A. Even though torsional rod elements were not significantly affecting results, Model D was selected for the comparison of initial damage modeling since its torsional capability could provide greater latitude for an analyst to adjust model stiffness.

Model D was used to evaluate the two approaches to modeling damage for Test 1 described in section 5.3. The simpler method of modeling portrayed more accurately the pattern of failure as explained in section 8.5. The simpler method of modeling the damage was then applied to Model A for a final analysis of Test 1.

8.2 Comparison of Failure Loads

A close correlation of analytically predicted failure loads with experimentally measured failure loads would be a desirable result of evaluating the AFATL method. Table IV summarizes the failure load results. The models ranged from 5 percent to 85 percent stronger than the actual structure. Note that for Test 2 no experimental failure load was determined; therefore, conclusions about Test 2 are judgmental.

Model A gave the closest approximation for Test 3 and may have given a close approximation for Test 2. However, for reasons discussed in section 8.4, Model A was not considered the best model. Model D was more conservative than Model A in estimating wing strength. Although Model D's predicted strength for Test 2 was clearly less conservative than for Test 3, the results may have been acceptably consistent. Both approaches

for modeling Test 1 damage gave excessive predicted strengths; however, section 8.5 discusses how those figures might be improved.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY OF FAILURE LOADS

	Failure Loads (kips)							
Test	Laboratory	Model A	Model C	Model D				
1	12.0	22	<i></i>	22				
2	15.0*	18	20	20				
3	12.4	13	19	19				

*Largest load applied; no failure load determined.

Models C and D showed no differences in failure loads and very little difference in the sequences of element failure. There are two apparent reasons for the similarity. The first is that the torsional capacities of the spars were probably underestimated when the torsional rod elements were sized. Second, bending was the dominant behavior of the F-84F wing even under extreme conditions such as those of Test 2.

8.3 Load-Iteration History

The AFATL method, as applied by PROSCAN, caused loads to vary from iteration to iteration. Figure 16 depicts the variation of load with respect to iteration for the first 35 cycles for Models A and D. The analytical data for any given load level were taken from the last cycle in which that load was applied before the model experienced a higher load. For







(b) Test 1. Model D (with torsional stiffness rods). Detailed Figure 16. Load-Iteration Histories







والمساوية والمحمد والمحمد



Figure 16. (Continued)



(e) Test 3B. Model A (without torsional stiffness rods)





Figure 16. (Continued)

example, the analytical data for the Model A analysis of Test 2C at 16 kips applied load came from iteration No. 8. As shown in Figure 16c, that was not the first application of a 16-kip load, but it was the last iteration before a higher load, 18 kips, was applied.

That procedure for selecting which iterations to use for data comparison occasionally led to gaps of several iterations between successive data-producing loads. Again as an example, Figure 16f shows 13 iterations elapsed between the 14-kip and 16-kip loads for the Model D analysis of Test 3B. During those cycles, six elements failed. This characteristic of the procedure accounted for the occasional sharp discontinuities in the plots of data.

Figure 16 also emphasizes the need for caution in setting the minimum load to be investigated. PROSCAN permitted the load to drop considerably during a series of element failures, then again rise to a high level. Figure 16a shows how the load dropped from 22 kips down to 12 kips before again climbing back up to 22 kips. Making the minimum allowable load too large could result in a premature indication of structural failure. It could occur during such a series of element failures when, in fact, the structure still possessed the capacity for loads well above the minimum level.

8.4 Internal Load Paths

The most demanding test of the models was how realistically they transferred the loads internally through the wing structure and into the supports. Figure 26 (Appendix I) compares the vertical support reactions for experimental and analytical results. Figures 27 through 29 (also

Appendix 1) compare variations of strain at representative points on the wing with respect to applied load.

Examination of Figure 26 through 29 showed that neither Model A nor Model D transferred the load from the loaded spar to the unloaded spar as quickly as the actual wing did. Additionally, neither model transferred as much of the load from spar to spar as the wing did.

The most important indication for this study of how realistically the models transferred the loads internally came from Figures 17 through 19. They depict the buckled and failed elements in Models A, C, and D at their respective failure loads. For Test 3B, Figure 19, Model A did not indicate the nature of the failure as observed in the experimental test program; however, Models C and D did match closely the laboratory observations. For Test 2C, Figure 18, no failure occurred in the experimental program, but Models C and D predicted a plausible failure. Model A, however, predicted failure of the front spar at one of its strongest sections. For Test 1, Figure 17, Model D matched the laboratory failure pattern very closely using the simple modeling of initial damage. Model A, however, indicated failure of the undamaged rear spar. All models indicated more overstressing of skin elements near the wing spar roots than was observed on the actual wing. A complete summary of results for the first 35 iterations of the principal series is presented in Appendix J.

8.5 Comparison of Damage Modeling

Section 5.3 introduced two approaches for modeling Test 1 damage. Both approaches predicted the same failure load, but Figure 17 illusstrates that there were significant differences in which elements failed.



••••• 653





Buckled Shear Panel Elements on Lower Surface and Leading Edge





Failed Shear Panel Elements

mmm Failed Rod Elements

(a) Model A (without torsional stiffness rods), Simple Figure 17. Wing Model Results at Test 1 Failure







Buckled Membrane Elements on Lower Surface and Leading Edge



Buckled Membrane Elements on Upper Surface



Failed Membrane Elements and Vertical Shear Panel Element

Failed Rod Elements

(b) Model D (with torsional stiffness rods). Simple

Figure 17. (Continued)









Failed Membrane Elements and Vertical Shear Panel Element

mmm Failed Rod Elements

(c) Model D (with torsional stiffness rods). Detailed

Figure 17. (Continued)







Buckled Shear Panel Elements on Lower Surface and Leading Edge Buckled Shear Panel Elements on Upper Surface



Failed Shear Panel Elements

Failed Rod Elements

(a) Model A (without torsional stiffness rods)Figure 18. Wing Model Results at Test 2C Failure



.

(b) Model C (without torsional stillness rods)

Figure 18. (Continued)



and the second second

and a second state of the second space of the second second second second second second second second second s





Buckled Shear Panel Elements on Lower Surface and Leading Edge Buckled Shear Panel Elements on Upper Surface



Failed Shear Panel Elements

Failed Rod Elements

(a) Model A (without torsional stiffness rods)

Figure 19. Wing Model Results at Test 3B Failure




zla: u

Failed Rod Elements

(b) Model C (without torsional stiffness rods)

Figure 19. (Continued)



Of the two approaches using Model D, the simpler approach depicted more accurately the failure as observed in the laboratory. The simple approach applied to Model A did not produce an accurate failure pattern; however, all tests indicated that Model A was less suitable for predicting the pattern of failure.

Although the Model D results suggested a preference for the simpler technique, caution is advised before reaching a firm conclusion. In all models for all tests, the webs of spars and ribs were represented by shear panels. Consequently, the front spar in Test 1 could not fail at the damage until shear limits were exceeded. The experimental program showed the damaged front spar web in Test 1 failed in bending tension, a failure mode the shear panel could not predict. For cases of initial damage where all or most of a spar cap or rib cap would be removed, the web should probably be modeled by a membrane element. Although the membrane element would be stiffer than the shear panel, it would be directly sensitive to limiting tensile and compressive stresses as well as to shear limits. Such a recommendation applied to this study may have appreciably reduced the predicted failure load for Test 1, and it may have altered the apparent value of simple modeling over the more detailed representation.

8.6 Rotation of Wing Spar Poots

Specific values of displacement were of interest in this study as an additional means of comparing analytical results to laboratory data. To obtain more accurate displacement values from the analytical method, rotations of wing spar roots were measured in the experimental test program and enforced in the analytical models. However, for most applications of

the AFATL method, rotations at structure supports would not be known. Additionally, the precise displacements of the structure probably would be unimportant. The displaced shape of the structure, which might be used to modify loading for each iteration, was available from the analyses using zero support rotations.

The enforced rotations were derived from experimental data. In translating laboratory measurements into single point constraints for NASTRAN, an assumption was made. It was assumed that the center of rotation for each spar was the point midway between the two pins securing the spar in its support structure. In fact, any point between those two pins could have been the center of rotation, and the center could have changed as loading progressed. The assumption almost certainly contributed to the introduction of erroneous stresses into the models during the first set of analyses.

Another likely contributor to those stresses was the manner in which some of the multipoint constraint equations for the models were written. A spar root was modeled by a shear panel and two rod elements, a configuration that gave the desired resistance to bending but provided no lateral restraint. The necessary lateral restraint was provided by multipoint constraints to keep each root section in line with its adjacent spar section.

The multipoint constraint equations for the original model were formulated not in a general manner, but with an implied assumption that there was no displacement of the wing spar root nodes. Thus any attempt to enforce the measured rotations violated that assumption. The result was erroneous stresses near the base of the wing.

Of the two sources of error identified, the multipoint constraint equations could be easily corrected. The problem of precisely measuring wing spar root rotations cannot be solved without sophisticated measuring equipment. The benefits gained from precise measurements, however, would not begin to justify the added expense for normal applications of the method.

8.7 Deflections

Deflections were measured in the experimental test program and were compared to analytical results. Figures 30 through 32 (Appendix 1) present single-point deflection data for Models A, C, and D, and for the test program. Although Model D was selected as the best model because of its ability to predict the failure most realistically, Model A was superior for predicting displacement values. For general deflected shape, however, there was little difference between Models A and D. Figure 20 compares Test 3B profiles of the front and rear spars for Models A and D, and for the actual wing at their respective failure loads. Both models presented essentially the same deflected shape which differed only slightly from measured results.

As mentioned in the previous section, deflections are not envisioned as a critical factor in the routine application of the AFATL method. Even if deflected shape were important, Models A and D both returned approximately the same results. If specific values of displacement were to become the overriding concern in a specialized application, Model A would appear to be the better model. Otherwise, Model D provided reasonable accuracy for deflected shape.







Figure 20. Failure Load Profiles for Test 3B





🐼 D.m.;·





1997 - A. 1997 - A. 19

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The principal goal of this study was to evaluate the suitability of the AFATL method for predicting progressive collapse in complex structures. Suitability was to be investigated by determining supportable limiting stress values, selecting a good combination of finite elements for modeling, and comparing analytical to experimental results.

Limiting stresses used in this study were a direct application of classical theory. Consequently, any skilled analyst could apply the concepts to any structure. A conscious effort was made to found the work in commonly known principals of materials behavior and to avoid the structuredependency associated with empirical formulations.

All models evaluated used axial rod and shear panel element combinations to represent spars and ribs. Model D used membrane elements to model aircraft skin and rod elements to model skin stiffeners. Additionally, it had torsional rod elements along the spar centerlines. Model A used shear panels and thickened rod elements to represent aircraft skin and skin stiffeners. Model A had no torsional rod elements.

Models A and D both overestimated the residual strength of the damaged structures. For the purposes of this study, those results were conservative. A deficiency observed in the study was the lack of consistency in the degree to which residual strength was overestimated. However, all estimates were within a factor of two of the experimental results.

Model A provided better deflection estimates than Model D. Using shear panel elements for the aircraft skin made Model A more difficult to prepare than the models using membrane elements. As explained in Appendix C, the use of shear panel elements required additional calculations for modifying rod element sizes to represent the membrane capacity of the skin. However, once Model A was developed, it was less expensive to use than models with membrane skin elements. For applications where structure displacements are of primary concern, Model A would provide better results.

Model D described more accurately the actual pattern of failure leading to structural collapse. Using membrane elements for the aircraft skin made Model D a simpler model to prepare as described in Appendix C. The membrane elements also gave a better qualitative representation of skin panel behavior. For applications where the failure pattern is of principal interest, Model D would provide better results.

PROSCAN was developed as a convenience to automate the application of the AFATL method. It proved to be more of a necessity than a convenience in processing the volumes of data generated by many iterative finite element analyses. Additionally, it provided flexibility in the selection of loading sequences and in the application of limiting stresses for elements.

The combination of automation, modeling techniques, and limiting stresses applied to the AFATL method produced a useful estimating tool for predicting progressive collapse in complex structures such as the F-84F aircraft wing. The F-84F wing is a semi-monocoque structure with a heavy two-spar skeletal frame. To further evaluate the versatility of

the method, it should also be tested using other types of structures such as different aircraft designs and components or building structures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- <u>Compendium of Methodologies for Assessing Aircraft Structural Dam-age From Multiple Fragment Impacts</u>. 61 JTCG/ME-76-16. Joint Technical Coordinating Group for Munitions Effectiveness, Aerial Target Vulnerability, Eglin AFB, Fla., Jan. 11, 1977.
- (2) Somes, Norman F. "Progressive Collapse Risk." <u>Proceedings, Inter-national Conference on Planning and Design of Tall Buildings.</u> Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, Pa., Aug., 1972, pp. 21-26.
- (3) Somes, Norman F. <u>Abnormal Loading on Buildings and Progressive</u> <u>Collapse</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, May, 1973.
- (4) Leyendecker, E. V., J. E. Breen, N. F. Somes, and M. Swatla. <u>Ab-normal Loading on Buildings and Progressive Collapse.</u> <u>An Annotated Bibliography</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Jan., 1976.
- (5) Leyendecker, E. V., V. Edgar, and Eric F. P. Burnett. <u>The Incidence</u> of Abnormal Loading in Residential Buildings. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Dec., 1976.
- (6) Woodcock, A. E. R. "Catastrophic Theory: Predicting the Unpredictable." <u>Machine Design</u>, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Feb. 10, 1977), pp. 36-91.
- (7) Leyendecker, E. V., and B. R. Ellingwood. <u>Design Methods for Reducing the Risk of Progressive Collapse in Buildings</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Apr., 1977.
- (8) Sfintesco, Duiliu. <u>Tall Building Criteria and Loading</u>. New York: American Society of Civil Engineers, 1980.
- (9) Regan, P. E. "Catenary Action in Damaged Concrete Structures." <u>Industry in Concrete Building Construction</u>. Detroit: American Concrete Institute, 1975.
- (10) Fintel, Mark, and Donald M. Schultz. "Philosophy for "tructural Integrity of Large Panel Buildings." <u>Journal of Prestressed</u> <u>Concrete Institute</u>, Vol. 21, No. 3 (May-June, 1976), pp. 46-69.
- (11) Ellingwood, B., and E. V. Leyendecker. "Approaches for Design Against Progressive Collapse." <u>Journal of the Structural</u> Division, ASCE, Vol. 104, No. 3 (Mar., 1978), pp. 413-423.

- (12) Muskivitch, John C., and Harry G. Harris. <u>Behavior of Precast Concrete Large Panel Buildings Under Simulated Progressive Collapse Conditions</u>. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Jan., 1979.
- (13) Fintel, Mark, and Donald M. Schultz. "Structural Integrity of Large Panel Buildings," Journal of the American Concrete Institute, Vol. 76, No. 5 (May, 1979), pp. 583-620.
- (14) Girhammar, Ulf Arne. <u>Behavior of Bolted Beam-Column Connections</u> <u>Under Catenary Action in Damaged Steel Structures</u>. Stockholm, <u>Sweden: Swedish Council for Building Research</u>, 1980.
- (15) Ferahian, R. H. 'Buildings. Design for Prevention of Progressive Collapse.'' <u>Civil Engineer</u>, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Feb., 1972), pp. 66-69.
- (16) Pinkham, C. et al. <u>Building Practices for Disaster Mitigation</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Feb., 1973.
- (17) McGuire, W. <u>Prevention of Progressive Collapse</u>. Regional Conference on Tall Buildings, Bangkok, Thailand, Jan., 1974, pp. 851-365.
- (18) Lewicki, B., and S. O. Olesen. "Limiting the Possibility of Progressive Collapse." <u>Building Research Practices</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Jan.-Feb., 1974), pp. 10-13.
- (19) Breen, John E. 'Developing Structural Integrity in Bearing Wall Buildings.'' Journal of the Prestressed Concrete Institute, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Jan.-Feb., 1980), pp. 42-73.
- (20) Popoff, Alexander, Jr. "Design Against Progressive Collapse." Journal of the Prestressed Concrete Institute, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Mar.-Apr., 1975), pp. 44-57.
- (21) Yokel, F. Y., J. H. Pielert, and A. R. Schwab. <u>The Implementation</u> of a Provision Against Progressive Collapse. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Aug., 1975.
- (22) Burnett, Eric F. P. The Avoidance of Progressive Collapse: Regulatory Approaches to the Problem. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Oct., 1975.
- (23) Chapman, R. E., and P. F. Colwell. <u>Economics of Protection Against</u> <u>Progressive Collapse</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Sept., 1974.
- (24) <u>Research Workshop on Progressive Collapse of Building Structures</u>, <u>Held at the University of Texas at Austin, November 13-20</u>, <u>1975</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards, Nov., 1975.

- (25) Watwood, Vernon B. "Mechanism Generation for Limit Analysis of Frames." Journal of the Structural Division, ASCE, Vol. 105, No. 1 (Jan., 1979), pp. 1-15.
- (26) Gross, John L., Thomas A. Mutryn, and William McGuire. "Computer Graphics and Nonlinear Frame Analysis." <u>Seventh Conference</u> on Electronics and Computers, St. Louis, <u>Missouri, August 6-8</u>, 1979. New York: American Society of Civil Engineers, 1979.
- (27) Loetstadt, P. Interactive Simulation of the Progressive Collapse of a Building Revisited. Stockholm, Sweden: Royal Institute of Technology, 1979.
- (28) Sih, G. C., and R. J. Hartranft. "Concept of Fracture Mechanics Applied to the Progressive Failure of Structural Members." <u>Computers and Structures</u>, Vol. 12, No. 6 (Dec., 1980), pp. 813-818.
- (29) Girhammer, Ulf Arne. <u>Dynamic Response of Two-Span Steel Beams Sub-jected to Removal of Interior Support</u>. Stockholm, Sweden: Swedish Council for Building Research, 1980.
- (30) Smith, Erling A., and Howard I. Epstein. "Hartford Coliseum Roof Collapse: Structural Collapse Sequence and Lessons Learned," <u>Civil Engineer</u>, Vol. 52, No. 4 (April, 1980), pp. 59-62.
- (31) Venkayya, V. B., N. S. Khot, and F. E. Eastep. "Vulnerability Analysis of Optimized Structures." <u>AIAA Journal</u>, Vol. 16, No. 11 (Nov., 1978), pp. 1180-1195.
- (32) An Experimental and Analytical Study of the Static Response of an Undamaged and Damaged F-84 Wing, Vols. 1 and 11. 61 JTCG/ME-76-11-1 and -2. Eglin AFB, Fla.: Joint Technical Coordinating Group for Munitions Effectiveness, Aug. 24, 1976.
- (33) Jordan, Thomas D. "An Analytical and Experimental Study of the Dynamic Response of a Semi-Monocoque Aircraft Wing Structure." (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1976.)
- (34) Peery, David J. Aircraft Structures. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- (35) Bruhn, E. F. <u>Analysis and Design of Flight Vehicle Structures</u>. Cincinnati: Tri-State Offset Company, 1973.
- (36) Seely, Fred B., and James O. Smith. <u>Advanced Mechanics of Materi-</u> als. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1952.

APPENDIX A

STRAIN GAGE LOCATIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

.

Three wings were tested in the experimental portion of the study. Surface strains were measured using strain gages manufactured by Micro-Measurements of Romulus, Michigan. Two types of gages were used: EA-13-125AD-120 uniaxial gages, and EA-13-250RA-120 three-gage rectangular rosettes. Figure 21 details strain gage locations for all three tests.









Lower Surface

🕀 Uniaxial

1.

🖌 Rectangular Rosette

(b) Test 2

Figure 21. (Continued)

•



Upper Surface



Lower Surface

🕀 Uniaxial

K Rectangular Rosette

Test 3B only

(c) Test 3

Figure 21. (Continued)

10

APPENDIX B

FINITE ELEMENT MODEL NUMBERING DETAILS

tat ...



















MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

1

J

at at the se

In an in the fair the state

¥ .







APPENDIX C

and the second second second

SIZING OF ROD ELEMENTS

SALA MILLO

The second se

The rationale for sizing rod elements representing spar caps or rib caps was presented by Jordan (32, 33). All symbols in the following summary of his presentation refer to Figures 23 and 24 which were extracted from Reference (32).

Property relationships were first determined for a structural member's cross section. The distance from the top surface of the section to the centroidal axis was identified as h_t . Similarly, the distance from the centroidal axis to the bottom surface of the section was labeled h_b . Maximum bending stresses at top and bottom surfaces, respectively, were

$$\sigma_{\rm T} = \frac{Mh_t}{I}$$
(A.1a)

and

$$\sigma_{\rm B} = \frac{\rm Mh_b}{\rm I}$$
(A.1b)

where M was the applied bending moment, and I was the section moment of inertia about the centroidal axis.

In the model, the rod elements were assumed to be point areas and were positioned at the top and bottom surfaces of a cross section. The rod areas were sized to maintain the location of the centroidal axis and the value of I for the actual section. Such a relationship yielded

$$A_{T}h_{t} = A_{B}h_{b}$$
(A.2)

with $A_{\rm T}$ and $A_{\rm B}$ being the areas of the top and bottom rods. The bending moment, M, in the model then became

$$M = \sigma_{T} A_{T} h_{t} + \sigma_{B} A_{B} h_{b}$$
(A.3)

Next, using actual section properties and desired model properties, the

relationships of Equations (A.1), (A.2), and (A.3) were combined to produce

$$A_{T} = \frac{I}{h_{t}(h_{t} + h_{b})}$$
(A.4a)

and

$$A_{B} = \frac{I}{h_{b}(h_{t} + h_{b})}$$
(A.4b)

which were the rod element areas.

Skin stiffeners also were represented by rod elements. Initially, each of those rods had the same cross sectional area and position in the structure as the stiffener it represented. However, Models A and B used shear panel elements to represent aircraft skin, so the membrane capacity of the skin panels was lost because shear panel elements do not represent membrane behavior. The membrane capacity of the skin was restored to models A and B by adding the cross sectional area of each skin panel to its bordering rod elements. This is illustrated for a typical cross section in Figure 24. Such modification of stiffener rod element areas was not necessary for Models C and D because they used membrane elements to represent the aircraft skin.











A PART AND AND A PART A
APPENDIX D

FINITE ELEMENT MODEL A LISTING

and the second second

And a second second

	93	
IZU- <u>Mu</u> mi Xa igi -Azaregabazezertenzerten e.s.t.t.		

A THE REAL PROPERTY AND A THE REAL PROPERTY AND TH

1

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
\$	
22585866877595866859885988555588655553888555388	
368988888888888888888888888888888888888	



	- R185 - R185 - 141 - 141
	PARS AND Menne Da
	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200
878882118888888888888888888888888888888	101 201
	17 CA
	222102



95

ł

																																						22	2				2:	2 2	=	2	*	22:	2222
	2.	. 2	:=	2:	- 1	1	£	5,	. 4	;									2		3	10	;	::	•	;			:								-					-							
ą	ġ,	5 q	•	ă.	- 2	į	Ä	÷ł				6	9				9 c	; e	ų.				ij.		, ri (Ň		ġ		HAVE F					FACE:	• •	•	, 2	2	12	! =	2	23	<u>;</u>	=	22	1	R	828
•	•	• •	•	•			•	.		-	•		•			•	• •	• •	•	••	-	-	••	* *	•	• •		•		5						52	123			- 9	12	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> 8	35	121		ł		665
22223	22224	2222	22221	32221	12222	222210	2222N	22222	22222	22223	22223						20000	90000	90000		1 CCCC	10000		20000	20000		A6666	SCCC		PAMELS			 TAL ROOM			įş	ğ	89			12	320	222	120	328				
																														N SKIN			 1021304				•	. =	1	- 1		-	•:	::	121	=;		2	225
10	23	53	2	Š.	<u>.</u>		50	Ş		Ē	2	= į	5			ł		8	1 :		5	-	ĘĮ	ŞŞ			8	= 8		CARDS F		0.01	 -					- 4	.=:	21	22	:=	2(83		5:	:	2	222
•	•			·	•		-	-	-		-		-																	PERTY		-			ACE	. 2	2	22	2	29	22	0	21	<u>•</u> 1	2	23	21		222
•	••	• •	n	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	-		•	::		•	• •	•	• •	• •	4	4	• •	•	•	4 4	•		•	i i		Ŧ			Ē		-	= =				-					;		
1222	22223	12222	2229	11222	\$12277	322217	222219	12222	22225	332277	32228	162222						Sccc	10000		CICCCC	\$10000	110000	120000	C20000		52225	196666							100	58	5	È å	1		15		22	526	327			8	886
UK AR						PKAN	FICAN			PRAR.				••	:			UV NG	ALAR ALAR		SHEAR	SHEAR		SHEAR	SHEAR		HEAR .	SHEAR SHEAR		••	·	SHEAR	•	•	-	22	8		8	B		90	21		8		ł	8	

. . .

. . .



96

ALC: NO

		9	+••52244•9525588888555
88817898.878 8.			

		PANELS	
8 = 3 3 5 5 8 8 = - 8 8 5 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	2 87811286-1885, 5875	CANOS 7	
	• C • C • • C • C • • C • C • C • • C		
			3 5 53858555555555555555555555555555555
		1.1 1.1 3	***************************************



		3 ²	333		23	23	<u>.</u>	įĮ	99	5 5	27	13]]	22	1	223		13		52	2	11	S	83		2	1	23	22	52	1 2	
===82		32	193	131	23	2 I	•	99	28	22	8 5				Ē	166	11	223		12	6	īž	<u>8</u> 2	ž i	23	[]	13	33	8	23	11	
		2.0		229	Ş;	38	0 0 0 0 0	ş ş	şş	<u>5</u> 5	Şõ	22	33		22	23		1 2	121	33	ŝŝ	<u>-</u>	88 88	<u>.</u>	2					ŦŠ	ā ā	
838892 <u>7</u>	SOON IN	1 2	\$ \$ \$	3 3 3	8	9 7 2 3	55		53	526	5 20		;;		5	353		i i			193	55	76	12	ii	133		55	133		22	
38 33~•9778 %	VERTIC	3 Ē	139	123	51	59	<u>;</u>	į	ĒĒ	E E	;	22	1		12	121	6	2		i Z (22	63	58	52		11	33	8	58	ĒĒ	
5858- - - ⁹ 538		3 -	:23	15;	21	ĒĒ	:	19	EE	EE	1 5		58		Ē	166		j		2	1	22	Şī	! }	12		9	63	163	281	12	
			222	200	ē;	<u> </u>		, Ş	ž ž	5 5 5 5	.		1:		ž	53				E	į	19	žž	3 3	3		3			į į	\$ \$	
*** ********		Ŧ	\$ 65	588	ŝ	53			<u>;</u> ;	55	į	5	5		35	ē		5	isi		ii	55	14	ÎI		li		i	53	551	<u>.</u>	
	•••	88			8	88	8 8 8 8	88	88	88	8 8 8 8											88	88	88			8	22				

Ę

823		188	81	12:	;;	\$ \$	8	23	8	* \$	4	3	; #	8:	22	2	3	13	18	3	33	3	2	2	2	83	32	1	2 5	3	21	: :	2	2	8		2	28	3	2 3	ğ	2	23	Ξ	N S	2			1	Ξ
\$7:	:::	83	11	179	14	;;	\$ 1	81	2	18	3	33	3	2:	: :	2	21	: :	2	2	2 2	:=	8		: z	21	23	1	23	2	#1	ğ	Ş	z	1		2		2	21	ğ	5	2	1	- 2	12			142	-
5 2	5 <u>7</u> 9	8 9	5	121	<u>.</u> 8	<u>85</u>	2	28	5	<u>ş</u> Ş	Ş	53	5	5	212	I	23		12	2	22	į	2	R .	13	22	22	2		1	23	į	8	201	8		i	23	Ř	51	1	Ş	83		1	Ę			404	121
ŶŤ	žžį	**	1	171	25		20	23	ž	Į	2		ž		::	3	83	12	4	8	89	14	Ş	19	1	1	13	Ş	73	ş	į	1	į	ŧ	410		Ę	5	204	Į	;‡	2		2	1	2			828	8
121	222	:83	27	:23	;\$	\$;	\$;	1 8	\$1	18	Ţ	7	5	\$1	: :	2	21	12	: \$	5	8 5	5	\$;	5	21	£3	: 2	8	5 2	3	21	12	21	2 3	5	: 2	2	1	ā	53	Ş	Ş		5	•	2	<u>,</u>	Ş1	ξΞ	=
R = 1		;\$;	8	121	15	93	Ç:	1 3	21	; \$	5	3 5	5	51	15	8	¢1	23	2	23	3 2	5	53	5 5	ŗ	51	::	3	62	:2	21	ž	ē:	2	2	53	2		ā	81	; <u>9</u>	2	83	2	- 1	1	Ē Š	81	11	2
Ħ	===	Ş	51	2	28	<u>8</u> 8	23		=	::	2		Ş	<u>;</u>		i	§ ;	Į	ž	\$ 3		Ş	ģi	5 9	â	87	i	225		I	23	5	Ş.	,	<u>ě</u>	Ş	=	88	Ŕ	ŞĮ	į	Ş	13	2	; ;	1	8 :	2:	; Ş	ŝ
ĨŔ	i i i	Żź	23	12	iā	ĒĒ	51	į	21	lā		i	5		Į	ţ	;;	; Ş		ţ	Ģġ	8	Ş	Ì	Ę	33	13	\$	1	Į	ĘĮ	į	Į	ļį	Ş	Ę	Ę	5	Ŧ	-	ļş	ŧ	Ēŧ	Ş	įŧ		;;	3	19	
					8		8]}	8		8		3	8			8	§ [88	8	8		8			8		8			8		8		8		8					8		1		8		8

<u>88</u> 1	55	151	7 7	1	2		22	2	2	11	0.5 0.5	0 0 0 0	0.7	20	8			0 0	00	82	• •		81 - N	531	223		39				0.9 - 02	85	235	228	887	32	281	
:::	:::	:::	::	::		:::	::	::	:=:	::	22	22	22	22	21	121	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	229	225	:2:	22	22	22	11	12	22:	123	:2:	: 2 2	32	22:	:
221	624			59	ē	58	22	8	2	<u> </u>	õ	22		2	89	22	Ē	ŞŞ.	Ž	Ş ĝ	<u>ş</u> Ş	25	33	:::			122	220	ş ş	Ş Ş	Ş Ş	Ş	5 2:		::	1	::!	Ş
\$ \$ {				ŝ	8			8		8 8 8 8	┋┋	ŝŝ	ŝ	ŝ	88						B B			888			88	8 B	şş							88	; ;	ł







			82838				
•••	Ĩ	1113404	CANOS FG		Enterna	W IOI	WE FAILED
8		=	0.01				
				ELASTIC			
		7.633+3	<u>885</u>		89:		
•••					Sugersu		•••••••••••••••••••••
		222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 222225 22225 22225 22225 22225 22225 2225 2225 2225 2225 2225 2225 25	5555555 55555555 55555555			- ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	888888
•••			1			SIN	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
	888888 888888	; 2 2 1 ; 2		0000 0000	i PRI RI	~~~~~	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
	22 27 27		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			2	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000
	*****	222552			!!! !!!	*****	888 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
KIIIIII		282ii228			811:2221	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	860 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1
	*******	********		887858555	lijttilit	***	888 9 9 9 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9

1 A. S.

علك ست

ł



	í	10.2.6	3.916	3. (4-3	
	1.80+4	0. 78+1	2.77+4	•	
-	2.64+4	10.0	2.77.5	3. 14-3	*#22
Ì	62	10. 3.	3.9.6	3.14-3	
	2.84+4	8.0114	2.77+4		
	1.00.0		2.77+4	F-41.F	42M-
i	1	10.3•6		3.14-3	12X-
	3.32+4		2.77.4	1 11-1	
• 1121	3.37+4	1.01	2.77.4		
Ī	27	10.346		3.14-3	•H27
Ī		0.0	11.04	0.73-3	• N28
	10.8+4	22.0-4	8.94+4		
	MATERIALS	21 THEU	28 ARE FOR 1-0	AND 2-0 ELEMENTS	
-	RESPECTIV	AS FOLLO	NEVICAS LIMITIN NS: (T:.400)	G STRESSES ARE FURINER (C:1.00) (S:.725)	
• •		1	ferial camps fo	# \$K N PANEL ELENENTS ************************************	
.i	-	10.2+6	3.9.4	3.14-3	Ŧ
į	2.4.4		2. 914 2. 914	3. 14-3	÷
Ţ			1.4844 8.0648	3. 14-3	ş
ļ	7.70+4	1.101	4.00.4	11-3	
Į	3.6714		3.24.6		Į
	THEY ARE		- INBUCHLED AN	Mun Skin Panels. Av from Daumóe	
• •		~ ^	- Intellige AMAY	RDERING DANAGE FROM DANAGE	
-	GASIC LIN	4 15 m 11	- BUCHLED BARE	(R1145 BANAGE 8007.744 AND 544.844	
-	THE BASIC USING FOR	L[M]7]L MT (M18	A STRESSES ARE):TVPE STRESS:F	FACTORED AS FOLLOWS ACTOR)	
	(1:1:,000 (2:1:,000		C 191) (112: 3	241)	
4 4			1:5:0) (3:5:1	(000)	
-	POST-BUCK		MUNS REDUCTION	FACTORS ARE:	
	(e : · / 246 4)		Î		
Ĵ		8.24	3.910	3. 14-3	ŧ
ļ		1. 70 10. 2. 6		8, 14-B	į
ŧ.	3.67+4	1.70+4	3.3444		
	NAY THE		ANE FOR ALUMIN	un skin Panels Bondering Spars. Danage Respictively. No	
* * *	ALCOLUM		NCRLIM LINES	es ane assumed. General. No stresses are used.	
	Å	CIAL PH	PERTY AND MATE	RIAL CANDE FOR INITIAL DAMAGE	••
• •					
Ħ.	Ĩ		8.0 80.84	3. 14-3	ŧ
••			WINDOW		
	•••••				
		•		â	

		÷#PC2	÷.	-	· INPCS	÷.	in co		-812	CIN.		81 N -	9 H I					
				·								-						
	- - 2	Ę	28.	8	Ŗ	. 52	Ą									ę g		
	n n	~	-	•	-	-	-							-			0.8800	
98886888888888888888888888888888888888	Ēz	2	142	8	126	ž	ň		3.14-	3. 14 -5	9.94-0	3. IL-		3. 14-			1	
	• - •	- 1	1 4 -	-	=													<u>s</u>
		-	,				••						I	I			-	
****		22	42	. 8	••		2.	0.1					I					3
	22	2	2	2	2	2	• •	•									ACTER 7	I
			¥	2 		2	2 2 	=	, 2,	i 2 . ! 2 !	i2. 123	; = . : = 1	; 1 , ; <u>1</u> 9	:=, !=!	;#1 ;21		ž	•
**********	5 6 X	51	6 F	6 Ŧ	5 Ŧ	6	16	_ <u>1</u>	7 2 1			1	124	121	111		 	

7.5

TH

Section in the section of the sectio

.

7





APPENDIX E

FINITE ELEMENT MODEL C LISTING

104

30

. <u>(</u>

. Yes

x for x	
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
A CONTRACT OF CONTRACTO OF CONTRACTO OF CONTRACTO OF CONTRACT OF C	
*****	

. .

82-858888	BOTTON OF	
	POINTS	
		#######################################
		n-e-911112227788278897789973887722888



Mark an an Contract

2 A A







DANAGE FOR BKIN PANELS WICH MAY FAILED iistill8.1ist.. i I iistill8.1ist.. i ************ ........... 881:288.-2881.in=8 8 885:2881.in=8 8 ..... -----..... ^bassasifiiraraassa 

	::: :: ::
<b>\$\$\$\$</b> \$``\$ <b>\$</b> !?!????????????????????????????????????	₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩ ₩
₹ <b>₹</b> ₹₹₹₹₹₹ <u>₹</u> ₽ <u>₽</u> ₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽	8

108

	. : :																									
==83		838 <u>8</u>	38	23	823	11	93	28	823	<b>1</b> 1	23	<b>1</b> 29	33	128	93) 93)	129	921	11	223	183	82	133	<b>8</b> 93	883 883	<u> </u>	
		8232	11	23	] [ ]	11	99:	66	861	]]	31	55	66		<b>9</b> 23				993	122	Ŧ	133	333	528	338	111
		\$ \$ \$ \$	55	22	<b>.</b> 2 3	82	22:	:22	223	<u>8</u> 8	5		22		2 § !	55	<u>.</u>	33	<b>5</b> 53	3 <b>3</b> 3	881	123	128	122	<u>3</u> 88	
55582 <u>5</u>		<b>\$</b> \$32	<b>Ş</b>	89		13	88	55		::	33		53				533			38	23:		ĮŞļ	193	535	062
8883	VERTIC	::: <b>:</b>	52	58	153	12	<b> </b>	EE	165	5	59	161	22		599	51		22	612	53	28:	122	633	188	112	511
5 <b>8</b> 58 ² 23		<b>2</b> 3 8 8	55	23	ÌĒ		Ēī	EE	6	1	į	188	EE		639	15	151	29	59		931	22	863	155	•••	143
****		555§	581	20 <b>8</b>		828		22	222	50	;;			63		8 <u>-</u>	Şõ	2 2 2 2	138 138	22	233	22		22		208
		<u></u>	\$\$!	<b>Ş</b> ą	) <b>8</b> 3	35	658	624 624	į		j:	5 <b>5</b> 5	5 S I			11	133	651	55	53	<u>;</u> ;;				185	828
8888888888888				80				88		88			88	88		88		888		88						004

= 5	22	121	8	21	<b>t</b> 7	\$3	;3		•	8 3	2	82	9	3	;;	;;	8	3;	2;	3	3	5	3 3	3	::	12	2	<b>?</b> !	2	8	1	3	21		2	2	8	ł			::	8		2 §	50	2	==	=	22	2				
89	23	; # !	; 3	3:	4 2	23	34	:=:	;;	: 2	3	3	: 3	3	3	13	2	3:	3 \$	22	2	2 2	22	1	:	: 8	8	22	2	2	2	2	21	22	<b>#</b>	<u>5</u> 3	3		5		::	120	122	:	Ş	<b>2</b>	2 3	1	29	22			142	
22	Ż	5		2:	1 1	31	13	5	3 :	15	213	į,	ēá	õ	į.		8	2;	2 2	Ĩ	ē	ģ	ŝ	ŝ	<u>i</u>		8	<b>2</b> :	2	Ξ:	1	1	21	1	<b>Ş</b>	Ş :	5		;		1	Ş	<b>Q</b>	1	Ŧ	3:	55	ē	23	2				
22		i i	<b>, ,</b>	Ĩ	Į		210	14			Ĩ	Į	Į	2	Ë		a de			10	<b>4</b> 23		19	Ş		į	đ	<b>?</b> ;	1	-	1	452	į	13	<b>Ş</b> (		Į			į	55	Ş	Į	Į	Į	ŝ	1	Ę	Ę	32			5.2.6	}
55	22	171	i 2	51	15	83	; 9	\$	54	13	8	<b>s</b> ;	; 8	Ŧ	71	75	\$	51		3	2	53	:=	3	51	: :	2	<b>7</b> F	: 2	=:		5	\$	2	<b>7</b> 1	22	12	2:	; =	2	8 2	2	21	5	ğ	<u>Ş</u>	2	13	=	i g	59	58	<b>6</b> 01	
51	129		; \$	31	38	61	13	<b>\$</b> !	;;	; \$	2		: \$	5	21	1 5	5	5 :	2	12	2	2	:=	8	23	: 2	5	C 1	12	23	53	2	51	2	2	ēġ	2	<u>5</u>	; <b>Š</b>	2	= :	1	Ē	61	ē	Ş i	53	E	2	123	51	181		;
8g	88	2	22	Ž;	: 2	22	12	5	3 3	15	222	8 §	38	8	8	5	ğ	23	: 2	22	8	88	8	8	8	Ĩ	ğ	2	1	23		I	11	2	Ş.	į	ą	Į.	ş	ā.	ŞŞ	Ş	Ş :	6 1	ŝ	ŝ	35	ğ	2 i	22 23	<b>\$</b> 5		52	!
22	22		i R	ŝ	ł	Ì	lā	Ş		1	ā	23	i	i	Ē			1	;;		421		Ģ	424 1	į	38	-		1	1		į	51	16		1	Ş	į	Ē	5	55	11	į	61	Į.	Ş		Ę	ŞĮ	5	;;	:31	228	į
		8		88				8				B					CNO			8			8	8	8		8	88	8	8		8			8		8			8	88		8		8	81	38	8	9	3	88			

. . .

			:::	
************	1917 - 1918 1917 - 1918 1917 - 1918	<b>162833</b>		
**********	118 izee	955599		9
-96		*****		6 6004
######################################	23588888888888	••••••		SPAR AN
RRR: \$ \$ 8 8 8 F 1 8 8 5 5 5	825588865 <b>55</b> 866	i <b>f 1</b> 81333333		
		⁸ ş		

A Low Antorethington

	5004
	ICAL
	1834
	1 414
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	
8	8





a lot a bar and the second of the

9 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		2	0.01				
***				ELASTIC	Sowia45		
CELASS CELASS CELASS CELASS	iii	7.033-3 1.1.4	2 <b>2</b> 5		893 893		
****				I ANGULAI			
G CTRNEH CTRNEH	942 942	222251	22	:2	**		
CTRNEN CTRNEN		222252 222252 222252	<b>2</b> 29	282	: 2 ^g		
			000	8		- N	0.001
	19222				22222 23222 23222		888
			0.0		290000		
••••				MIG POINT	CONSTR	1415	
,	ş		-	0 0			0.0
žž	<u>8</u> 8	<u>.</u>		0.0	55		0.0
žž	<u>8</u> 8	ii		0.0	33		0.0
š.	8	103			1		
**		S SCON			N N	r	
55 55	<b>ei ei</b> (	ĪĒ		88	ĒĒ	~ •	900.0 900
55	Pi 44 (	<u> </u>		88	ĒĒ	** **	009
<u>.</u>	n n 1	22	n - ·	88	11		800
( <u>x</u> )						N 8	0.017
				85	22:	* * *	0.01
					123		
šš	••	Ē		2	192		
55	•••	5	- 0	86	23		0.00
<u>.</u>	• • •	Ii	(	10.	35	**	012 0.011
( <u>3</u> 9		53		5.			18. 
iää		283		888	233	* * *	
55	22	Ē					0.0
55	222					• •• •	
33	22	21	- <b>n</b> -	0.1	II		\$10°.
äää	521	ĒĒ	- n -	81	ij	~ ~ ·	0.017
iss	:25	122		555	123		10.0 10.0



Ē i i i i ŧ i ************* Canterni O MATERIALS & AND & ARE FOR ALUMINAN SKIN PANELS DOMDERING 27485. ANY PRO DAMAGE AND SOMDERING DAMAGE REPECTIVELY. ND ANY PROPERSION AND CORTENIAL STATEMED. GENERAL SKIN PANEL POST-BUCKLING LIMITING STRESSES MEE USD. 2 MATERIALS 21 THEN 28 ARE FOR 1-D AND 2-D ELEMENTS DEDUCTING DAMAGE AND CONSTSTORD TO MATERIALS 11 THEN 1 REPECTIVELV. DAMAGE AND CONSTSTATE AND THEN 1 REPECTIVELOWS: (T::400) (C:1.00) (S::73) Ş .... 9.000 7.000 (15) (15) (15) (15) (15) (15) (100 (100 (100 (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (100) (10 6.73-3 F FOR ALUMINAM SKIN P BUCKLED ANAY FROM DA BUCKLED ANAY FROM DA BUCKLED ANAY FROM DAMA OCHLED ANAY FROM DAMA DECLED ANAY FROM DAMA BES ARE: TSC-7 7-4 3.14-3 3. 14-3 3, 14-3 3. 14-3 3. 14-3 3.14-3 3.14-3 3.14-3 3.14-3 0000 MATERIALS 1 THRU 4 ARE FOR ALUMINA Her ARE FOR: 1 - UNMORED PANY 3 - UNMORED PANY 3 - UNMORED PANY 4 - BUCHER PANY 1 - B 1 244 10.348 2.444 2 244 1.234 1.444 2 244 1.234 2.444 2 244 1.244 1.444 2 794 1.794 2.644 1 794 1.794 2.944 3, 3244 6, 8144 2, 7744 36 10, 3948 3, 944 3, 3744 7, 03948 3, 944 27 10, 3948 3, 944 31 4644 7, 3749 4, 3, 7744 21 4044 7, 321 944 11, 044 10, 044 232, 944 11, 044 5 10.346 3.946 7.7044 7.7044 4.804 6 10.346 3.946 3.6744 7.7044 3.344 200.4 80.0-0 10.0 1.0 80.0-0 10.0-0 10.0-0 ..... a - - a CADSET PARAM DI LONCE TONCE TONCE ini. Į. ******

• • • • • MATCHIAL CARDS FOR SPARS AND FIRST ANY FROM DAWARE .010 3 
 1
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.000
 0.0 MATERIAL 18 12 FOR STEEL 1-D AND 2-D ELEMENTS ANAY MATERIAL 18 1825551 1-D 2003 AND 5- 143-2. THE FACTOR FOR 16 15: 19600 14E FACTOR FOR 5 FOR ALL NID MANBERS 13 0.8000 AINIS • ĝ-11-Ĵ 3.14-3 0.14-3 3. 14-3 0-14-D . Į HIBBEEEE z 7 8 5 2 .078 75-4 3.76-4 ž 88 ş 8 88 ũ 



Sec. A.

A LANDAR

¢š I,

114

The second with the second

APPENDIX F

وسلمه ومرافقة والمراجع

Y.

FINITE ELEMENT TORSIONAL ROD LISTING

6 . . .

					N Versi			1005.41-
		• • •	8	ŧ	~	-1.0		-1002
	- 5	<b>~</b> 7	••	:	~	· · .		CODE
	. 5	~ 4	• 8	:	~	0.1		1006-11-
	. 2.	<b>n</b> 4 (		=	N	0.1-		
	: 3:	N 4 4		C * 1	"	0.1-		
	:2:		2	ŝ	~	0.1.0		-1000
	11:	<b>.</b> , •	• • • •	143	-	0.6837		18005-84-
	21	~ ~	-0.7967	ī	-	-0.6537		
	32		0.1967	97		0.6837		1000C AII -
	<u> </u>	PI <b>4</b> R	0. 7867 0.0	23		0.6837		1010Call.
	1		0.7567					
	SS.		NSTRAINT W	11 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	# TOASIO	0.7		1006 1
	.8.	• • •	20	8	~	-1.0		-1002
	.8.			ç	~	.1.0		COOC
	. 5.	N 4 1		5	2	0.1.		1005 -
	. 8.	N	200	5	~	0.1		1000.000
	.2.	• •	.8	123	~	0.1.		1000
	, ē	• •	- 8	:5:	~	0 <del>.</del>		1006 48+
	<u>s</u> 2	~ 4	• 9	14	-	0 5847		
	33	~ ~	-0.8321	2	-	-0.8847		
	: ŝ :		8	5		0.5447		1000.481
2002 - 7.00 191 1 0.5647	: 2		0.0321		_			
0.102.01 2 -1.0 -100.011 201 4 5.00 1 2 -1.0 -100.2011	1.		-0.0321	5		0. 8847		
	28	• • •	8	-	~	0.1		110041
	5	IAL DAMAGE	FOR TEST	*				
III AL DAMAGE FOR TEST DE:	<u>}_</u>		0.200	59			6216	
1111AL DAMAGE FON TEST 38: 1022 2115 2143 35:00 80889001 3095 3123 0 0.0 0.308 0.400	. 22	000 000	1000 1000 1000	200 200				
1111.1. DAMAGE POR TEST 30: 1011.1. DAMAGE POR TEST 30: 0.0 0.300 0.400 0.0 0.304 0.400 14 0.0 0.304 0.400	58_	TAL DAMAGE	FOR TEST 2143 0.00001	2C: 2500 0.0000	5004	1400	2123	
11111 DAMMAR FOR TEST 30: 002 2:15 2:13 2000 BABABODI 2095 3123 0.0 0.204 0.400 1.0 0.0 0.204 0.400 1.0 0.0 0.204 0.400 1.111 DAMMOR FOR TEST 2000 3005 3123 0.0 0.20001 0.00001	ΞĒz	IAL DAMAGE	FOR TEST 2143 1.9967	1000	COOC	3008	2123	
11111.1. Dummer Por Its1 20:    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    20:0    <								



APPENDIX G

## FINITE ELEMENT INITIAL DAMAGE MODELING

12 .....

. . . . . . .

in the second

5

••••	•••																		•										ļ			
(SIMPLE DAMAGE) MAJOED VING E CASE D AND CSMEAN	Nem Nem 11 SPARS		L0 P10-2	LD F10-322262		Lo 710-2	LD 710-323552	L0 P10-1		10 P10-232253	10 10-4		PANELS		LD 710-222202	LD PID-2222402	LD PIG-2323901		005	LO PIO-431		10 110-510			10 710-121	LO P10-134	CC1-014 01					
DICK FOR TEST 1 ING PROVICT - DV NUDEL D - STATIC AND RIDS: CARE	TIFFENERS: CAN		P10-11112 0		P10-11112 0	PI0-11112 01		PID-11112 0	P10-11112 0		P10-11114 01		VENTICAL SHEAD	***********	0 20000000-014 .	0 1046666-014		**********	MORTZONTAL BI			PID-0000510 01			PID-000121 DI	0 1010000-014					~ 1	
ATA -	9 X *		Ì	23	Ż	2) 2)		N N			VM CO				CT MEV	AN E				23	Ì	Â	ł	Ĩ	N	23	Ē				0 C	2
778			DOMEN 7		N H H H			COMEN I	A MANOO		COMEN 1				SHEAR 2	SHEAR 2	SHEAR 2					R00 527	928 00K		353 OOU				ç		22	5
			CHANGE C		CHANGE C			CHANGE C			CHANDE C		•		CHANGE C	CHANGE C	CHANGE C					CHANGE C			CHANDE C	CHANGE			;		XCCCC	
****		 							_			-		_						 _					_	_			. 5	E	Į	}

ŝ CODA INTERNET BOOK TTAL DAMAGE 010 FID-2222502 010 FID-22222402 010 FID-2222501 KL 710-3 KL 
 MV
 FID-000111
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-000111
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-0000111
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-000011
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-000011
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-00011
 MO
 FID-0121

 MV
 FID-00011
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-000111
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-000111
 MO
 FID-0111

 MV
 FID-000111
 FID-000111
 FID-00111
· SPECIAL PROPERTY AND MATERIAL CARDS FOR INI 3, 14-3 DIORCECE-GIA AM CHANGE CSHEAR 247 L CHANGE CSHEAR 248 L CHANGE CSHEAR 248 

7C91 9N+	8091 841-		4541 <b>84</b> 4	8C > 1 8M +				+H0118C			
0'1-	- 1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	0.1-	-1.0	-1.0
-	•	-	-	~	•	-	~	•	-	~	•
ī	ž	ž	Ξ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ē	Ē	•	5	2	:
											000
-	- 61 6		•-•	• •• •	••••	•	- 11 (		• - •	- 11 (	
6		Ę	2	2	1		-				
8	ş	8	8	8	§	§	8	8	ŝ	§	ş
ž		, i	,	, ,	2	Ň					

in has

2:	:::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::									
		1				- DAMAR	AILED DAU		••	
	•				10 - 51	ATIC CA			•	
	•		3	AR AR	:501U 0	3 88	D CSHEAR		•	
									• •	
11	•		2	TOPSIC	111 ST 17		N SPARS		• •	
=										
= =										
					PANKLS -	10 0	VIND.		•	
			:							
<u>.</u>			1							
			21		0-11112		10-2			
			:;					_		
	CHANGE	N SHOULD	:;							
	CHANGE	CODMEN	ģ	NEV PIE	0.000	9	(D-22225)			
	CHANDE	COOMEN	8	NEV PIL		98	10-2222V			
	C MARGE	COPIE	õ	Nev PIC	0-11112	930	10-2			
	CUMMOR	COMEN	=	HEA NON	-11112	200	10-2			
2	CHANGE	CODMEN	:	NEV PIL	290000-0	- 970	10-222262	_		
=	CHANGE	COMEN	121	Nev Pil	280000-0	3	10-22226	_		
<u>.</u>	CHANGE		5		D-11114	20	1-01			
=										
					TICAL ST				•	
::										
22	1.4		1912							
	CARDS	IN A SPI	CIAL	SECT 10		H	DAMAGE CL			
.=								ţ		
1		*******					*******	*******		
:	•			-	HORI ZONTA	L ROOS			•	
=:	:									
2:			;							
. :			55				167-01			
	CANNER		: :			38				
	O LENGE	8	1		D-0001310		10-110			
	THE CA	80 / OB	CRODS	528 AN	21 052 0	RPLACE	O IN THE	DAMADE	MULLUN	
	DUMNO	CHOO	ā		D-8688803	3	10-903			
=	CHANG		2		D-0686 121	200	10-121			
2	CHANGE		5		P-8688 134	3	10-134			
-	CHANGE				D-8686833	200	10-E33			
. :										
	2	0.	•	0.1		3.14-3			Ĩ	_
Ę	5		-	1.1						
2.										
							71/E0 DW		•	
		IE TO EL	INING	CLARD	FOR CROC	S 828 B	1 MI 005	IAIN DEC	*	
	AND CA	<b>MO1 200</b>	CS SE	MS 247	240. 8	5				
		_		0	0	0.0				
			- 1		0					
					00					
	520	222	2002			32				
CSHE AL	9247	322	1002	5:4			2			
		8	540	0142	E	23				
			1022		19	E	511			
Ĭ	5726 8	222	1961	2		C713				

PLAN DATA DECK POR TEST 2C F-44F MING POLET - DAMAGED WING PLANS AND R. STATIC CASE S-AAS AND R.BS. CADD AND CSMLAR STATIGUERS CADD AND CSMLAR STATIM PANALS. CSMLAR	NG TORSIONAL STIFFAES IN SPAS	3 MKP F10+19999 OLD F10-222332	NELLICT MET AND	37 MEW PID-9999 DLD PID-2223401 Her Zonfil, 2005	MEM PID-9999 04D PID-416 MEM PID-9999 04D PID-417 MEM PID-69884402 04D PID-409	MOPERT AND INTERIAL CARDS FOR INITIAL DAMAGE	6640 C-21(4-2 C-21) C C-21
		CHANGE CSHEAR B3 NE CHANGE CSHEAR B4 NE		Change Cshear 237 h	CHANGE CROD 505 NEV CHANGE CROD 510 NEV CHANGE CROD 510 NEV	SPECIAL PROPER	10.0 10.0 5.

بناسل مدد

a +41-1-

PARK BATA DECK FOR TAST 26 - 44 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN TAST 26 - 44 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC - CAMARA WAST 2000 LAN COMPANY - 40 VIR FRANCISC		_	Source States	802	Ŧ	56M+
	F-MIK DATA DECK FOR TEST 30 F-MIK DATA DECK FOR TEST 30 MODELA - STATIC CASE 9-MIK AND MIRS - COND AND CS-MEAR 511774MES - COND AND CS-MEAR 511774MES - COND AND CS-MEAR 511774MES - COND AND CS-MEAR 10 FOR FORMLS - CS-MEAR NO TORSTONAL ST(F7MESS IN SPARS	SHEAR PARKLS - BOTTON OF VING SHEAR PARKLS - BOTTON OF VING 5 102 AND 104 MEV PID-99999 OLD PID-222225 5 105 AND 104 MEV PID-99999 OLD PID-2 2 105 AND 104 MEV PID-222225	233    MEU    111001    0.00    PID223401      243    MEU    PID111103    0.00    PID223401      243    MEU    PID111103    0.00    PID223401      244    PID111103    0.00    PID223401      245    PID-111103    0.00    PID-223401      246    PID-111103    0.00    PID-223401      246    PID-111103    0.00    PID-110-111      247    PID-1001    DL0    PID-1001      248    PID-1001    PID-1001    PID-1001			9+6 3, 9+6 3, 14-3
					22.	
						5

7

÷

APPENDIX H

-

## PROGRESSIVE STRUCTURAL COLLAPSE ANALYSIS LISTING

;



in the second second

Figure 25. PROSCAN Functional Flow Diagram



Figure 25. (Continued)

ļ

land





126

.



Figure 25. (Continued)




VI.



and the second second second second

 
 00
 2001
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1</td --SUBROUTINE MAIND >>>*) 0 ) 60 TO 370 NSUR, NDISPN, NOON .EQ. 0 .AND. INEM .EQ. 0 ) 00 TO 365 PRIMI 1102. CARDI. CAND PRIMI 1102. CARDI. CAND PRIMI 1103. CARDI. CAND 9001 FORMATT 1103. CARDI. CAND 9001 FORMATT 1103. CALL SUBROUTIME MAIND CALL MAIND CALL MAIND CALL MAIND CALL MAIND FORMATT 1100 PRIMI 1110 PRIMI 1110 
 0.
 (STEMER(J, 1), J - 1, 3)

 0.
 (STEMER(J, 2), J - 1, 3)

 0.
 (STEMER(J, 2), J - 1, 3)

 0.
 (STEMER(J, 3), J - 1, 3)
 PRINT 1992. ( STRPL7(4,1). 4 = 1, 3 ) PRINT 1994. ( STRPL7(4,2). 4 = 1, 3 ) PRINT 1994. ( STRPL7(4,2). 4 = 1, 3 ) PRINT 1994. ( STRPL7(4,3). 4 = 1, 3 ) PRINT 1994. ( STRP17(4,3). 4 = 1, 3 ) MAT ( 1444.4X) ) MAT ( 1844. // 1844 ) MAT ( 1842. // 1844 ) MAT (140. B (10.4) MAT (140.4) MAAT( 190,515) Maat ( 7( 244, 2K ) ) Maat ( 1844 ) Maat ( 544,4K,1A4 ) 1099 370 CONTINUE -5

000.... 1954 .GT. O 3 PRINT 9003. 1954 ///.ºccccc. INTERMEDIATE PRINT LEVEL 15',12,* >>>>>/) PROJEM (PRODRESSING SINCTURNE, COLLARGE AMLYSIS) MAS PROJEM (PRODRESSING SINCTURNE, COLLARGE AMLYSIS) MAS DOLET (SURGOUP FOR MUNITORS (FFECTIVINGS AMD ARRIAL COLLARGE MALLYSIS OF DAMAGED AIRCAAFT WING STRAFTWESSING FOLLARGE MALLYSIS OF DAMAGED AIRCAAFT WING STRAFTWESS FILS VERSION OF HE PROGRAM MAS COMPLETED 1 AUGUST 1982 00 001 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 - 1.0 15.1 - 1 - 4 ( STR-T(J, L) - J - 1, 3 ) RED 2000, (STR-T(J, L) - J - 1, 3 ) RED 2000, (LAS, 155C, 184C, 1(LA MADAS - 2 - (LAS) RED 1007 ( STR-T(L) - 1, MCADS ) RED 1007, (STS-C(L) - 1, MCADS ) RED 1007, (STS-C(L) - 1, MCADS ) 1400. EQ. 0 ) GO TO 110 1007, [ XM0C(1), I + 1, M.0ADS ] |LBL .E0. 0 ) GD TD 140 • 1. LOADS 1003. ( XLBL(1,J), J - 1, 16 ) ŝ 1 ) 60 10 200 00 TO IF (1) IF (1)

.........

.......

LTYPE(19), MUM(19) CLOTES, CHICE, LOHIS, MBULK, MDISM, MODW CLOTES, CHICE, LOHIS, MBULK, MDISM, MODW CLAB, WES, SUBG, MUMBR(20), STRMEM(3,4), STRML(12,40) STRE, SUBG, SUBG, SUBG, MUMBR(20), STRMEM(3,4), STRML(12,40) COND, SUBG, S SEARCH BULK CONTACTOR MASTANN DISPLACEMENT & STRESS DUTWIN SEARCH BULK ONTA CECK FROM MASTANN DISPLACEMENT & STRESS DUTWIN D3 1 * 1, ... D3 1 * 1, ... D4 * 11 * 1, ... COMTING (LUMS, 1000) CARD WITT (LUMS, 1000) CARD FLAD (LUMS, 1000) CARD FLAD (LUMS, 1000) CARD WITT (LUMS, 1000) CARD WITT (LUMS, 1000) CARD MAIND FROM SUBROUTINE SEARCH >* MASTRAN DISPLACEMENT OUTPUT-) 20 CONTINUE (LUZ) TO. ( A(1), 1 * 1, NK ) 20 CONTINUE C PODETS OIS-ALCHENT PRINTED LUSS C PODETS OIS-ALCHENT PRINT BOOM C PODETS OIS-ALCHENT BOOM C PODE CONTINUE ( POS-CENT) PODE C PODE R. TTTL. 6400. ATA / 44 . 448717. 446400. 444TA / 1594 GT. 0.) PRINT 9001 M. ****** ENTRY SUBROUTING MAIND >>>>*) TEUXE - LUCI COMPANY DIALS X TEL. 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 1000, 100 HENT OUTPUT : <u>9</u> 9 22 SU (01, 0) PRJW < < READ AND 70, < < CARD + READ & TRANSLATE M REVIND LUNAS REVIND LUNA REVIND LUNA FORMAT ( 1H -00 00 00 ...

0100 (mail (mo) 114. (114. (114. 1) 0100 (mail (mo) 114. (114. 1) 0100 (mo) 114. WAY FOR DAMAGE 3176(1,3) 0 WAY FOR DAMAGE 3127(1,3) 0 WATH (CATION MUMBES ', ) 0 WA TILL CARDS IMPUT ARRAY
 TILL CARDS IMPUT ARRAY
 MARN VEST DO RELO IN REAL DATA FOR EACH ELEMENT TYPE
 SUBCISE HOD. TO RELO IN REAL
 SUBCISE TYPE IDENTIFICITION: ENC. FROM FILLE DATA
 AMBAY CARTAN MICH TYPE IS CHECKED
 SUBSCRIPT HOD SOCIATED VEHT LIVE
 ELEMENTS IN EACH GROUP TO IN FAILURE SEARCHES AINING TYPE PF ELEMENT WHICH ART OF A GROUP OF ELEMENTS TO BE DISPLAYED AS A GROUP ECHO. Mail (wi).////// jot. 100 OF PECAR PRODUME EICUTION. )
Mail (wo).121. (lan1196 SIR5555 FOR MAGENEL ELEMENTS -)
Mail (wo).121. (lan1196 SIR5555 FOR MAGENEL ELEMENTS -)
Mail (wo).121. (lan1196 SIR5555 FOR MAGENEL ELEMENTS -)
Mail (151. 'underCution Elements - North Produments - 312PE133
Mail (151. 'underCution Elements - Produments - 312PE133
Mail (151. 'BACCUTO ELEMENTS BODDERING DAMAGE - 312PE133
Mail (151. 'BACCUTO ELEMENTS BACCUTO ELEMENTS - 312PE133
Mail (151. 'BACCUTO ELEMENT FROGRAM CONTROL · . 64. 144) AMEAN CONTAINING NO. OF Pailume Stress value use alphanumeric Array Conta 15 to be Displayed as Pa (/, 138, "COMOD 1 358, "FOR FAILET BORDERING DAM TO BE TABLE OF VARIABLES. C. (2010) - 111 1110) - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 11100 - 100 1 525 2 2 101 100

9	0 40 MTPE - 1, 14 If { ITVPE .(0. LTVPE(MTVPE) } 00 TO 60	00003820
-	DNT IMUE AD TO B20	00003840
	LUI • LU(MTYPE) WRITE (LUE) MOSUR, ETYPE	
	NUMBER - O NE: - MAR(NEVES)	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
	IF ( 1954 .GT. 2 ) PRINT 9003. MOSUB. (1796 If ( 1954 .GT. 3 ) PRINT 9012	00600000
	OMMAT('O<<< CALL SUBROUTINE INPUT FROM SUBROUTINE MAIND >>>') ALL INPUT ( NX )	02620000
	IF ( 1954 .61. 3 ) PRINT \$008 Mumber - Mumber - 1	00003940
	WHITE ELEMENT STRESSES INTO INDIVIDUAL SCRATCH FILES	00003960
	MEAD (LU1,1000,EMD-BD) FIELD DMMAT ('O< < FIELD - '.20A4)	08650000
	IF ( FIELD(+) .EQ. TITL ) 00 TO 40 Ackspace Lui	0004000
	00 TO 70 ME USE DE BACKRAACE FOR EVENY I HE DE DATA 15 VERY INFERICIEUS	00004030
	UTTING THE DECISION STEP FOR FIELD(1) - TITL INTO SUBROUTINE WUT VOUD ELISIANTE THE MEED FOR ALL OF THESE RACESDACE	0000000
		08040000
	PRINT SOODO, MUNEER	00004080
	14 ( MONE .EQ. 0 ) 00 TO 40	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
	LL FILES READ - BEGIN PROCESSING	- 00004110 00004120
	0 100 M · · I · · I	00004130
	IF ( MUMBR(N) . EQ. 0 ) 60 T0 100	00004140
	EVIND INDIVIOUAL ELEMENT STRESS SCRATCH FILES AEVIND LUE	00004160
	IF ( 1PSW .GT. 3 ) PAINT 9013 DPMAT ( Occ. Cut. Cafericie & Subbartine Carm Subbartine :	00110000
	( WIND >>>, )	. 00004200
	IF (LTVPE(M).EQ. 1 .OR. LTVPE(M).EQ. 3) CALL RODS (M.MROW IF (LTVPE(M).EQ.10) Call Rods (M.MROW	5) 00004210 5) 00004220
	IF (LTYPE(N).EQ.16 .OR. LTYPE(N).EQ.62) CALL MEMORY (N.MOV IF (LTYPE/L) EQ.22 AP (TUPE/L) EQ. 2) CALL MEMORY (N.MOV	5) 00004230
	If (LTYPE(N).EQ. 4 .OR. LTYPE(N).EQ. 5) CALL PANELS (N.MOM	5) 00004250 5) 00004250
	IF (LTVPE(N).EO.IS .OR. LTVPE(N).EO.IS) CALL PLATES (N.MON IF (LTVPE/N) FO.IS .OR .LTVPE(N) FO. 71 CALL PLATES (N. MON	5) 00004260
	IF (LTVPE(N).EQ. 6. OR. LTVPE(N).EU. 7) CALL PLATES (N. MOU 15 (LTVPE(N).EQ. 6. OR. LTVPE(N).EQ. 17) CALL PLATES (N. MOU	5) 00004280 5) 00004280
	IF (LITFEND.40, 4) CALL PLATES (N.NNOV IF ( 1PSM .GT, 3 ) PRINT 4014	5) 00004290 00004300
	DAMAT ('O<<< RETURN TO SUBROUTINE MAIND FROM SPECIFIC'.	00004310
	ONTIMUE	000000
	IF ( MHOWS .EQ. 0 ) GO TO 105 IF ( IPSW .GT. 3 ) PRINT 9015	00004340
	DEMAT ('O<<< CALL SUBROUTINE GROUP FROM SUBROUTINE MAIND >>>*) ALL GROUP ( NROWS )	00004360 00004370
	IF ( IPSW .GT. 3 ) PRINT 9016 DAMAT ( 'O<<< RETURN TO SUBROUTINE MAIND FROM SUBROUTINE GROUP	00000114
	DWTINUE If ( 1954 .01. 3 ) PRINT BOID	00004400
_	OPMAT ('Occe CALL SUBPOUTINE CASEDK FROM SUBPOUTINE MAIND >>>'	00004420
	IF ( IPSW . GT. 2 ) PRIMT 9020	00004430
	OAMAT ('O<<< RETURN TO SUBROUTINE MAIND FROM SUBROUTINE CASEDX Demat ('O< < (IIM) -/ 13 % 'IIIM3 -/ 13 % 'AFTATU' 73)	1 00004450
_	OPANT ('Oc < < LUCI 13.54, 'LUC2 -'. 13.54, 'RETAIN' 13)	00004470
	IF ( LUB1 . EQ. 18ULK ) GO TO 500 REVIND LUB1	00004480
	AEVIND LUG2 BEAD (LIM) 1000 END-ECO) CARD	00004200
	MRIFE (LUB2, 1000) CARD	00004310
		00004570
	0 10 130 Petur Ronn	00004550
		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

0500000	00003070	00000000	6110000	0010000	011 00000	00000110000	0810000	00003200 00003210	00003220	00003240	00003260	00003270	00003300	00001310	00000000	00003350	00003360	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0001400	00001420	00003430	00003450	00001470	00003490	00001200	00003520	00003540	00003290	000032000	00003590	00003610	00 900000	00003640	00003640	00003680	00003890	00003710	00001130	05/10000	00003170	00012000
If I KODE .ME. O) RETURN	C READ & TRANSLATE STRESS FILES 39 CONTINUE	17 (1954 .GT. 3) PRIMT 90003, MFS, IGNTSP 90003 FORMAT ('O< < READ AND TRANSLATE STRESS FILES > > '.'	+ '0+ < W'S -',12,54,'10NTSF +',12)	IF (MFS. 160. 0) GD TO 130	PRINT 1004	Number(1) - O	48 CONTINUE NORE = 0	40 If (ISMIP - 1 40 TO 42	1 000 LININA 1 0 24(1) 0 1	42 READ (LUI,1000,EMD-95) CARD If (CARD(2)	If (CAND(3) (CO. STAFE) OK + 1	I CANDIT IN SUBCT J GU TU 42 I (CAND(2) (CO SUBCZ AND OK (CO. 1) GO TO 45 A	45 BACKSPACE LUI	READ (LUI,1020) NOSUB READ (LUI,1030) ITYPE	PRINT 10010, MOSURI, 1149E	C PRINT ELEMENT NAME BASED UPON NASTRAN ELEMENT TYPE NUMBER			IF (ITYPE .60. 6) PRIMT 7006 IF (ITYPE .60. 7) PRIMT 7007	0001 TM PE (0. 0) PAINT 0001		IF (ITTPE .EQ. 12) PRIMT 7012 IF (ITTPE .EQ. 15) PRIMT 7015	IF (1779E .EQ. 16) PRIMT 7016 If (1779E .EQ. 17) PRIMT 7017	IF (ITYPE EQ. 18) PRINT 7010	IF (1149E EQ. 34) PRIM 7034	JF (1177E .60. 62) PRINT 7062 LF (177PE .60. 63) PRINT 7063	7001 FORMAT (144, 41X, '{ CROD)' } 7003 FORMAT (144, 41X, 'I CTURE)']	7004 FORMAT (1H+, 41%, (CSMCAR)')	7006 FORMAT (114- 414, ' CTRLAS)')	7007 700747 (1144, 414, "(CTABSC)") 7008 7004447 (3144, 414, "(CTAPLT)")	7009 FORMAT (144, 414, ' (CTANEN)') 7010 FORMAT (144, 413 ' / COMMON)')	7012 FORMAT (100. 41X. '(CELAS2)')	2016 FORMAT (HH-, 413, 1 CODMEN)')	7017 F CORNA T (11++- 41x, "{ CTR[A2]') 7018 F ORN AT (11+- 41x, "{ CONAD2]' }	7019 FORMAT (14+- 41K, -(COUADI)')	7034 FORMAT (144, 41%, "(CEAR)") 7042 FORMAT (144, 41%, "(CODMENT)")	7043 fORMAT (1144, 414, '{ CODMEN2]')	15 [117PE ME. 12 . AND. 177PE . NE. 34) CO TO 47 PETET 2011	45 READ (LUI, 1000, END-95) CARD IF [CARD(1) HE TIT, 1 AN TO AE		60 T0 40

A.L.A.

a the ball a surprise charge sea

133

i

PALINT 1004. W 114.44 - 0 200 20 M - 1. MM - 1 10 INCLORE FOTENTIAL FAILURES. CANNOR -39- TO -10- IN MEXT LINE 11 (ALC) -40, 0.00 - AND. ALC) -41, 0.0 (0.0 100 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 - AND. ALC) -41, 0.0 (0.0 100 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 - AND. ALC) -41, 0.0 (0.0 100 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 - AND. ALC) -41, 0.0 (0.0 100 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 (0.0 100 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 (0.0 (0.0 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 (0.0 (0.0 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.0 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.0 TO 28 11 (ALC) -40, 0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.0 (0.	us 10 30 11 (12 - 2 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (00 10 20 611 20 20 611 412 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	MEINT (001: NAME RETURN: 193.44 MERTURN: 193.45 MERTURN: 1144.5
ç 	\$ <u></u> \$ 988298899999999999	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	• •

hans

010	81		130	88	ŦŦ
000	81	23	130	8	
2	: 8	2	001		ŦŦ
2	RETURN			88	ΞŦ
		Ë	004) -'< < flemmi Sidfis Induit: sincase nd < 110	88	Ŧ
		í	W TYPE'. 15. * > > *)		ΪŦ
Š	TORMAT	Ē		8	
00	1 COMMAN	j	, ' < < GMID DISPLACEMENT INPUT > > >'		77
000	FORMAT		10. 84. 3 (54. 613.0), (/ 164, 3 (54. 613.0)) 54. 110)	8	1
000	1 On the	12	71, 100)		• •
			5) 5.151	000	÷.
8	, COMMAN				ψ.
	FORMAT		EMON END OF LUPUT FILE")	800	
	PROCE	SSIME	g,)		
			0.'0° • • E & R D R • • •'./' (LEMENT 10 NUMBER' Dicates an fishent type and accession of vary and and an	000	÷.
8 8 9	TAMEO	2	OSUBCASE ND ES ELEMENT TYPE . 15)		
Į			••• ELEMENT IS EITHER A CELASZ ON A CHAR', Resses wor checked ••••',//)	Š	¥ 4
10020	TANK	ē ;	DELEMENTS PROCESSED: ', 10',//)	8	
	2				77
					44
Ş.			000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0000	1
0	SEARCH	18	TYPE ELEMENTS FOR OVER-STRESSING	ð 88	ŦŦ
U			: CROD(1), CTUBE(3), CONNOD(10)	800	-
		55	TLMP2 / BFLAG, WFS, MSUM, MUMBR(20), STANEH(3,4), STAPLT	3.4)0000	÷ ;
		23	EMPT / 1954 BIDAT / HONE (DIA)	0000	
	COMPON		MOUT / CAND(20), ELTYPE(2), CP(4), A(16), PROPID(2		÷ ;
	COMON BAVA C	32.5	MITS2 / LUB1, LUB2, LUF1, LUF2, LUGP, LU(10) 00 CR00 BLAMM/ANDIM ANDIA ANDIA ANDIA ANDIA	000	
	OATA C	5	TUBE / ANCTUB . ANE /		52
	2 2		1000 PSW _QTO} PRINT \$000	0000	23
9003	F DRMA Y	ŏ	<pre><ccc entry="" roos="" subroutine="">>>>>)</ccc></pre>		88
		Ìž	X - NUM(HIYPE)	50000 50000	22
		1	# • Numbr(NTYPE) # • 2	0000	2
		Ξ	FLAG • 1	5000	82
		Ê		000	22
	11	5	TYPE(NTYPE) .EQ. 1) CQ TQ 2 Type(MType) .e. 3) cm to 3	0000	1.
	Ŧ	i i	2003	5000 0000	ññ
	1	32		500 000 000	
~	- WINDO	. K		0000	22
	R.	ž	2002 TVB664 - 5 400	0000	
		2	LTYPE(2) + BLANK		ē .
•	CONTIN.	- *		5000	: 21
•	ł	N N	2004	5500	22
		33	LTYPE(1) - CTUB LTYPE(2) - TUBE	50000	22
•	CONTIN TO L	N N	100	000	: :: :
	2 0 0 0 0	2	LUI 1. MSA		223
	==	Ē	7.46 . 60 1 0 1 0 9	303	125
	9	=			22
•	Ì	-		6000	2

(){}	000000 (104)) KSI4 - WSI (104))	00008830
SUBROUTINE MEMBANE (NTYPE, MADUS) C SEARCH MEMBANE TYPE ELEMENTS FOR DYER-STRESSING	17 (X(1*4)	
C NAME (TYPE) COOMEM 16), COOMEM1(62), COOMEM2(63), CTIMEM(9)	If (1954 . GT. 4) PRINT 9004. STHERK(IRDW., LCGL), KSTR.	000009900
COMMON / BULKOK / CANDI.CANDI.CANDI.CANDI.PIDE.PIDE.PIDE.PIDI.PIDI.PIDI.PIDI. Common / Ciidia / Itypefimi. Amarijai	2004 130 130 130 14001 1 1504	
COMMON / CTLADZ / IFLAG.MS/S.MSUB.MMMR(20).STAMEM(2.4).STAPLT(3.4)	DOG 150 C DETENTINE THE CRITICAL STRESS AND MARGIN OF SAFETY	01 690000
COMMENT / TOTADAT / IPSW COMMENT / GAINAT / MANK IN/AI	400 CONFINALE #01 CONFINALE	00006830
COMMON / INDUT / CAND(20), ELTYPE(2), GP(B), A(16), PROPID(2)	2008100 17 (Fait(2) LF, EMDS) EMDS + FAIt(2)	07690000
COMMON / UNITS2 / LUB1, LUB2, LUF1, LUF2, LUCP, LU(18) DATA FON THEM THEM THEM FILENCE ALL ALL ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE ALLENDE	If [AIL(3) LT [MOS] (1 2 MOS] (10 2 AIL(3) AND A AIL(3) AIL(05490000
DIMENSION ALIMENSION ALIME(0), VIME(16), FAIL(3)		
PRINT 1005		0000889000
POD2 FRAMATINGSSAL ENTRY SUBSCRIPTER ADD2		04490000
Poor remain overse garan sourcesting mensue states	AUG240 C RECORD PREVIOUSLY BUCKLED PANELS WICH ARE NOW OVER-STRESSED	
MFLAG - 100	2006260 X4.1MC (1.482, 1006) X4.1MC .V.1MC	0000/020
	004200 00000 0000 00000 00000 0000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
(34) - (34)(41)(42) - (34)	000000 0000000000000000000000000000000	
(34/1/ MOREN WI	D0 500 100 1 4	00001080
REVIEW LUT	IT (EWGS 100, 2010) (1) PARKA 200, 2010 (2010) 2000, 2000	0201000
AFEND LUDZ	000320 [[([0.00 . 001]]] PEIMI 5000 [[(]] PEIMI 5000 [] [5003 Motion	
C · I • I · 00	900 50MT MAR 900 CONTINUE	00001100
1 FAIL(1) + 400.0 15 / 1744(47445) 50 - 1 00 10 0		00001110
ALPHA - COD	DODESOU CONTRACTION OF PROPERTY ID OF PANELS WHICH JIST AND ANYLLED	
ELTYPE(1) • COO		00001140
IF (LTYPE(MTYPE) .EQ. 63) GO TO 16	IF [VLIME(1) .EQ. PIDF] MRITE [LUB2,1006] XLIME.VLIME.VLIME.VLIME	00001190
- IF (LTVPE(MTVPE) .EQ. 62) CO TO 14		00007160
DOOL STORY		
	1 [[[COL [[0]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]	
14 PRINT 1007	WRITE (LUB2, 1006) ALINE, VLINE	00007260
100 TO 10	DOG450 PRINT BOGO, XLINE, ENDS	00007210
		00001220
ELTTPE(2) + AMEN2	WHITE (LUE2, 1006) XLINE, YLINE	00001240
	200440 C TO INCLUDE POTENTAL FAILURES, CHANGE TO. 0" TO "1.0" IN NEXT LIN	E 00007250
		00001260
ELTVPE(1) + CTR		00007270
ELTYPE(2) - XMEN	IF (EMOS . EQ. FAIL(!)) PRINT 8070, X(S), EMOS	00001290
	IT (EMDS - EQ. FAIL(2)) PRINT BOTO, K(6), EMDS	00001300
PRINT 1001. STRMEN	DOBASO 750 CONTINUE TRUT TATULUT FAIR SUC ALT, ENGS	01 01 00000
tinswit • N OB OG	0004510 00 10 80	00001330
14 1 14 LAG (60, 1) CO 10 20 14 11 151 AA 60 1 1 60 10 20	BO CONTINUE DOORSED 949 BO CONTINUE 949 BO CONTINUE 949 BO CONTINUE 949 BO CONTINUE	04670000
	VICESTO VICES VICE	0000110000
20 IIFLAG - 0	0006610	00001370
N POOL INIE4	2006300 C C COPY THE REMAINDER OF THE RULE DATA DECK	00001300
00 00 M = 1'MM		00001400
READ(LUI) 10, (X(I), 3+1,MX) 1604 - A		00007410
100 READ (LUBI, 1006) ALINE, LINE, YLINE		00001130
IF (IPSW .GT. 4) PRINT SOOS, XLING(1), ALPHA		00007440
IF (ALINELLY = ALTHA / 379, 200, 130 130 WEITE (LURD, 1006) ALINE LINE YLINE		
	0043000	00001470
200 CONTINUE If (mach of a) maint accort :	2004720 Paint 2000. 1NSUB	00007480
	2000/20 2000/20 2000/20	00001100
IF (LINE(J) .ME. 10(J)) GO TO 150	1001 FORMAT (//.SH.'LIMITING STRESES: 102., TENSION COMPRESSION.	00001510
250 CONTINUE	100100 - 101000 - 101000 - 101000 - 101000 - 1010000 - 1010000 - 101000 - 1010000 - 1010000 - 1010000 - 1010000	00007520
C DETERMINE THE CUMPENT PROPERTY ID OF THE ELEMENT	2005700 + FROM DAMAGE: - 3 (2613.2) . 100. BUCKLED BORGENING DAMAGE: -	00001510
200 If (TL(ME(I) .E0. P101) ICOL - 2	000190	100007550
17 (VLIME(1) .[0. PID2) [COL = 4		0000/200
IF (ICON EQ. 0) ICON + 1	2006620 1007 FORMAT (7X, 5 0 D H E H 1.)	00001580
	DODG DODG TOTAL (12, C G D M E M 2)	00007590
		0000

00008370	00008390	00008410	6410000	00000150	00008460	00000480	000001500	00008310	00008520	00008340	00008550	00006570	00008280		00000010	00006620	00008640	00008650	00006670	00008680	00008100	00008710	00008130	00008740	000001200	-00008170	044 80000	00009900		00008300	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00008860		000000000000000000000000000000000000000	01680000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00008940	09680000	00008800-000-000-000	06680000	01080000	00009020	00009040		00009070	06060000	00140000	00000120
17 (X(13) .46. 0.0) 60 TO 29 17 (X(1) .40. 0.0) 60 TO 29	66 70 20	If (x(3).47.1.0) c0 T0 29	PRIMT 2010, ELTYPE, ED. (A(E), I + 1, MX)		10 24 MINUE	HEAD (LUBI, 1007) XLINE, LINE, YLINE	IF LITOW .U. 4 PRIMI 9004, ALINE, ELTYPE 0 If (ALING(1) .EQ. ELTYPE(1) .AND. ALINE(2) .EQ. ELTYPE(2) 10	10 220	WATTE (LUNE2,1007) XLINE, LINE, YLINE To 300	MT I MUE	IF (1954 .GT, 4) PRIMT 4007. (LINE(L).C+1.4). ID 0 340 L + 1. B	14 (LINE(J) .ME. 10(J)) 00 10 290			WITE (LUB2.1007) ALINE. LINE. YLINE	TEAU (LUBT, 1007) ALINE, LINE, YLINE TO 220		17 (VLIME(11) ,ME, PID2 ,AMD, VLIME(1) ,ME, PID3) 0 To 100		COND PREVIOUSLY BUCKLED ELEMENTS WHICH ARE NOW OVER-STRESSED O Print 2030	WITE (LUF 1, 2050) ELTYPE, 10, (YLINE(J), J-3, 10), MCHR, MFLAG, R(3) 0	O I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		11/14G • 1 11 / 1954 07 • 1 Amini anni 18 4121	10 30 30 30 4 7 74144 5001, 10, A(4)	ANDE THE DEPARTY IN AF ALLER AND	NTIMUE	IF (YLINE(1) .EO. PIDF) PRINT 2080	WITE (LUD2, 1007) XLIME, LIME, YLIME	IF (VLIME(1) . EQ. PIDF) 00 TO 30	IF (VLIME(1) .EQ. PID1) 00 TO 120	VLIME(2) - VLIME(1)		VLIME(1) + PIO3 If (IPSV .GT. 4) PRIMT POOD. XLIME .LIME VLIME O	VALTE (LUB2, 1007) ALINE, LINE, YLINE	INT SOOL, NSUE	10 35 D MSLAR • 16 · 1	[WT 1001, INSUE	PY THE REMAINDER OF THE BULK DATA DECK	READ (LUG1,1007,EMD-30) XLIME, LIME, YLIME Vrete (LUG2,1007) XLIME, LIME, YLEME	10.35	REVING LUBI			TURN PRINT 1050, ELTYPE, ID		RMAIL () //////////) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	SUBCASES
		9	â	;	88 5	8		\$	3	220 CB	8	1	88 82	320 08		8	260 CG	ŝ	::				34 60		8	: 2	9 9		٠				8	210 270		32	8		8	2	8	R		1	2 8	# 5 		:

 1000
 1001
 1001
 1001
 1001
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 1000
 <td
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction

 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction

 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction

 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction

 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 Construction
 </t **** 88 888 ğ рани 1004. М 117400 - М 00 - 30 M - 145 10 1440 (14) 10 (4(1), 1 - 1, М.) 10 14440 (14) 10 (4(1), 1 - 1, М.) 10 1444000 РОТЕНТИ, РАЦИНСК, САММС "39- 10 -10" 14 МКЛ ц_рМ IFLAG . EQ. 1) GO TO 9 IIFLAG . EQ. 1) GO TO PIO TUTTEL PERIO READ(LUI) PRINT 1004 - 1 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 3 .



Justice and the second second film and

<pre>[2044] [2044] [2044] [2044][41,444] [2044][41,444][41,444] [2044][40,411,444][41,444] [2044][40,411,444][41,444][</pre>	00013830 00013840 00013840 00013840 00013840 00013800 00013800 00013800 00013800	EX. 00013040 110. 110. 00013040 110. 110. 00013040 00013040 00013040 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130 00013130	152 00013180 00013180 00013200 00012000 00012000 00012000 00012000 00000000	. EM051 00013340 10051 00013340 10051 00013340 11 00013420 11 00013420 10 00013400 1000000000000000000000000000000	Ferrars 00013320 Ferrars 00013320 Ferrars 00013350 Ferrars 00013350 Ferrars 0001350 Ferrars 00001350 Ferrars 00001350 Ferrars 00001350
T (2044) T (204	I) ENTIAL ERGR - Gard Points for card: Propososososo	F FROM MASTRAM GULK DATA D C.C.MOD.S.ANTA. FIDE. FIDE. FLITFF(13). GA(14). X(14). T(15). 24(14). LUE2. LUE2. LUE1. 3. LUE1. LUE2. LUE2. LUE2. 4.CCDOD. 4MCTUB. 4MCDMR. 3. CAT(12.4). ELNUM(2) 2. CAT(12.4). ELNUM(2)	IT 9805, LUF1, LUF2, LF1, ARE COMMECTED TO EACH OTH ARE COMMECTED TO EACH OTH I 1 7002 I ELTTP1 ELNAMI 201, MCN64, I 8003, ZF1, ELTTP1, ELNAM	0 10 100 10 100 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	021, NOW, WIANT 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18
	(104) (244,041,044) (244,041,044) (104,144,044,044) (104,144,044,044) (104,144,044) (104,144,044) (104,144,044) (104,144,044,044) (104,144,044)(104,144,044) (104,144,044)(104,144,044) (104,144,044)(104,144,044)(104,144,044)(104,144,044)(104,144,044	Third Goods) Appropriating (LIRENIA A DULY (CARDICA) A DULY (C	TIT - 1 TIT - 1 TI	(1501C4. (0. 1) C MULC1	(K : E0. 1) 0004

00012190 00012190 000122190 00012210 00012220 00012220 00012220	00012240 00012230 00012230 00012230 00012230 00012230 00012230 00012230		00012400 00012410 00012420 00012420 00012450 00012450 00012450	00012480 00012490 00012500 00012500 00012520 00012530			
ARCTUR /	0 00 10 1	•		 82. XLINE4			• • • •
₹	. EQ. CTU			11			
00, 44004	0 T0 10 0 T0 20 ELTYPE(1) 0 140	0 30		0 90	0		0 140
E2(8) Tum / 4+CH INT 9/01 HOUTINE GI	70) 70) 710 710 710 710 710 710 710 710 710 710	UN CONNERS 70) XL [NE (1)) GD 1 E2(1) E2(2)	្ទ	70) XLIME1 (1)) GD 7	8		70) ALINE (1) 20 1 (1) 20 1))) (1) 20 1 (1) 20 0)) (1) 20 0 (1) 20 0 (1) 20 0)
1(8), LIN 8LAM, C 8LAM, C 81, 3) PR 8MTRY SUB 181 10 - 8LAM	(2) - BLA 000. ED. 100. ELT 10. ELT	MEE ON FO 2000, END-1 2000, END-1 2000, END-1 200, END-	2 XLINE2() XLINE2() 3) GD TO BLANK - BLANK	LIE LENENTS DOOD, END+1 .ME. LINE1		- XLINE 4(3 - XLINE 4(4 - XLINE 4(4 - XLINE 4(5 - XLINE 4(6 - BLANK - BLANK - BLANK - BLANK	4000 Ru
LIDN LINE 100, COM (1958 ('04444 MTRIP MTRIP		15 4174 17 40 (LUB1, 4 1 - 1, 4 1 - 10(1) 40 - 10(1)	-0 100 -0 100	CKSFACE L			
DIMEN DATA C DATA C DATA C DATA C DATA C	9 8 9 8	10 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	DG 35 53 CONTIN 11 11 11 11	200 1 200 2 200 4 200 2 200 1 200 2 200 1 200 2 200 1 200 2 200 1 200 2 200 200	88 <u>8</u> 5 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 5	2 1 8 8 8 8	6 00 10 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10

υu

ľ

Constraint interest

tet: 2

UDI : INCO TOWN (24) 2000 FORMUT (24) 2000 FORMUT (24) 2000 FORMUT (24 + Call, Lambourine Carlon, Form SummOUTIME Carlon - 00001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C call, Lambourine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Laurine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Laurine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Laurine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Laurine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Laurine Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + C carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + 2000, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 100, FORMUT (2001, FORMUT (26 + 0000) 2001 FORMUT (26 + 0000, Carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 0001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + 0000, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 2001850 2001850 2001 FORMUT (26 + 0000, Carlon, Carlon, Carlon, Form - 2001850 20 RETURN 1000 FONNAT ((,'0*** FOTENTIAL ERROR: MAMBER OF ELEMENT MODES',/. 4 241,'NUT ASSIGNED IN SUBROUTINE ELMODE FOR: '.444./) 1 C 340 RED (LUDI, 2000, EMD-340) TEM-WHITE (LUDI, 2000) TEM-WHITE (LUDI, 2000) TEM-MITE (LUDI, 2000) TEM-MITE (LUDI, 2000) TEM-300 TO 30 TO 30 TO 300. REVIND LUD! REVIND LUD! REVIND LUD! LUD! - LUD! LUD! - LUD! LUD! - FIDLD

000

Mining the second second

		0001780 0001780 00017810 00017810 00017820 00017820 00017820 00017820 00017820		
00 10 00 10 000 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	60 10 120 66 10 600			0000000 000000 101 . 4861 /
. fo	1) . (co. ca.) (co. 7103)	· 2044]	UMGE BORDER	1 1110 CAR 1 1110 CAR 0).74.14.(30, 148-, 14(14) 148-, 14 148-, 14 148-, 14 148-, 14
R. CARD(1) CARD(1) CARD(12)	r Four Modi 10 800 68 04. 08 CARO(199 0(5) + PID 70 800	3200. CAMO D1. CAMD DATA FILE:	DACK NAD D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND D7. CAND	Co-co-co-co- Luert Cano Luert Lan (co)mec(c Mri, Luo2 (co)mec(c mriao mriao mriao mriao mriao
- XINI DO - O XINI DO BLANK FILANK FILANK - CA - AND - CA - AND - CA - AND	TTH THACE OF THE THACE OF THE THACE OF THE THACE OF THE	101 1) PRINT : 2 CAND 1 PRINT =00 2 TO BULK	R	Control (Control (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Con
CAMD(9)	LEMENTS	camo(s) = P kaftaa . 60. (tuma, 1000 1954 . 61. 4 04 4 4 411	(LUB1: 100.01 (LUB1:	
CONTINUE CONTINUE CONTINUE IF 10 20 TO 3000 CONTINUE CONTINUE	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	CONTINUE SCONTINUE SCONTINUE MILTE MILTE FORMALT	COPY REIM 17 10 17 10 17 10 17 10 17 10 10 10	
	4 0 5 4 2 5	န္ ဦနီ	U 20000 20	

10)) 1.ME F100AM') 1.ME 7100AM') 1.ME 700 4441) 88 10 50 98 1 00 50 98 1 00 50 1 00 10 350 1 00 10 350 1 00 50 8 10 150 8 10 50 8 10 8 10	00 10 400 0 00 10 400 0 00 10 520 1 00 10 520 10 10 520 10 10 520 10 10 525
LUF2, LU02, LU LU02 , ANCOM , ANO FIDDAM >>>>>'	AND 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 173	00 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01	2(13). E0. P107) 10(18) . E0. 05 10(18) . E0. 05 10(18) . E0. 05 10(18) . E0. 05 10(189) . E0. 05
- LUBS, LUFT, LUBL, LUBL	A BULK DECK MENT DOCK MENT DOCK DOC 1913 MENT DOCK MENT DOCK	10 000 11 10 000 11 10 000 11 10 1	0(3) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Unitity / Lun 	Moline 7 Marker 7 Mar	# * * * <th></th>	
ĝ.			

1.

	CAND(2) - XSPC(JP2)	01061000
8	WITE (LUC2.2500) CARD	
	PRIMT 4900, CAMP	0001000
Ī	IF (1MPC . GT. 20) GD TO 854	00019080
	1955 220 MEANS THERE ARE NO CHANGES TO MPC CARDS AND THE MPC CARD	00019080
_	THE THE THE ANDAL THE LOAD, SPC, ON LABEL CANOS TO BE CHANGE Dead (Luch. Sear) can	000019070
	IF (1PSM .GT. 4) PRINT BODA. CARD	
ī	IF (CARD(1) . EQ. CHPC) 00 TO 562	00101000
	PRINT 4654 Verte (Turs acco) ries	CI 1 81 000
	GD TG 3000	02141000
298	CONT INUE	00101000
	IF (1MPC . EQ. 0) GO TO 564	05101000
	17 (MUUN .GT. 0) 40 TO 762 Canadal - Vinner.mai	00019160
	CANDIDATA - (C)UNIC CANDIDATA - (C)UNIC	00181000
ž	WRITE (LUC2, 3500) CAND	
	PRINT 4500, CAND	00019200
	17 1 1144 .41. 20 .04. 1141 .60. 0) 40 70 \$000 1455 350 MB -10 MEANE THERE ARE AN CULURED TO 14021 SUBJECTION	00019210
	1958 VILL NOT DE ANOMO THE LOAD. SPC. ON MPC CARDS TO AF CHANNED	02211000
	READ (LUCI, JECO) XRON	00018240
-	TF (1PSW .GT. 4) PRINT BOIL, ANDW	00019250
	TUTTER TO S A READ FROM CASE CONTROL DECK: "242,1944) [7 (XROM11) .60. XLAB: AAD XROM12) FA XLARA 1 AM 74 44	00019280
}	PRINT 4660	00013200
	WETE (LUC2, 3600) ARON	00019290
9	20 10 5000 11 / Minus 67 / 00 10 360	0001000
}	DD 645 K = 1. 10	01 681 000
ŝ	XAOW(KP2) - XLBL(IP1,K)	0+081000
2	WRITE (LUC2, 3600) ARON	06681000
	NONX - ORAN - AND	00018360
		00018370
	RESTORE PREVIOUS LOAD. SPC. AND LABEL CANDS IF ANY ELEMENT FAILED	0404000
8		00018400
į	IF (1756 .GT. 4) PRINT \$001 Promise from a constant provided and statical structures	00019410
	IF (J. EQ. 1) 40 TO 710	0001111000
	CAMD(3) - XLOAD(JN3)	00019440
	CAMD(4) - XLUAD(JN1) DA TO TAO	00019490
2 2	CAMD(3) - KLOAD(1)	
	CARD(4) - XLOAD(2)	00181000
21	40 T0 555	00019490
2		00018200
	CAMD(2) = references	01 561 000
	CARD(3) - XSPC(JM+)	00010200
ļ	CO TO 650	00019540
2	CARD(2) = XSPC(1) CARD(2) = X6PC(2)	05561000
ļ	GD TO 450	00019570
762		0019390
	IT (U .EQ. T) EQ TO 760 CARD(2) = ZHPC(_H2)	00019590
	CAND(3) - XMPC(JM1)	
		00019630
	CAND(3) - XMPC(2)	
	co to s64	00019630
	CONTINUE If / / 60 / / 40 TO 344	00019660
		06941000
	00 TO 670	00019700
8	00 745 x • 1, 10 x83 - x • 5	00019720
795	XAON(KP2) - XLBL(1,K)	00019730
000	GD TO 670 CIMITIALE	00181800
1		

ALINE(1) . 50 . BLANK) 00 ' 1 ' ' ' 1 ' ' ' 1 ' ' ' 1 ' ' ' ALINE(10) - BLANK ALINE(10) - BLANK ALINE(10) - BLANK ALINE(10) - ALINE ALINE 1 ' ' ' 1 ' ' ' ' 1 ' ' ' ' ' 1 ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '
30 30 30 30 30 30 30 1 1 30 30 1 1 1 1 30 30 1 <t< td=""></t<>

 \Box

	00020470 00020470 00020480 00020170 000201720 000201720 000201730 000201750 000201750 000201750 00020170 00020170	04105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 0105000 010500000000			
 analy of del Polit Analis, Alan A Lim A.V.S. analy of the Polit Analis, Alan A Lim B. (1) Analy of V.Y. Y 2 (100004011), REPECTIVLY Analy of Limit Graduation and pirit Alan A Lim Analy of Limit of Relation and Alan A Lim Analy of Limit of Relation and Alan A Lim Analy of Limit of Relation and Alan Alan A Lim Analy of Limit of Relation and Alan Alan A Lim Analy of Limit of Relation and Alan Alan Alan A Lim Analy of Limit of Relation and Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan Alan	MAL LUN THAT LUN THAT LUN THAT PROPERTIMATION OF THAT OF MODES WHICH CAN BE THAT THAT FAITH AND THAT THAT OF MODES - (DIRECTION / B THAT THAT / THAT / THAT AND THAT THAT AND AND THAT COMMENT A THAT / THAT AND THAT THAT AND THAT COMMENT A THAT / THAT AND	DITING TAIR / W. / DITING TAIR / W. / TWETTON TO DETING LINE LENTH ALMAN Y. 12, 12, 12, 14, 124 - 11)-0-24(12-21)-0-3 I (1542, -12, 12) + 201(12-21)-0-24(12-21)-0-3 I (1642, -12, 12) + 201(12, 12) I (1622, -12) + 1, 201(12) + 1 I (1622, -12) + 1 I (1622, -1	<pre>remly (inverted in a paint possibility of a paint possibility ('occi the 'inv 'o' support possibility ('occi the 'inv 'o' support possibility ('occi the 'inv 'inverse') 's 'o' support possibility ('inverse') 's 'o' support possibility (</pre>	PRINT 3000 PRINT 300 PRINT 300	Review Lud Review Control Con
	y y y	υ ⁶ ⁶		ň	5 ¥ UU

 456
 FORMAT [101.] / / / / / / 01. 13(3+1) .] ' INTERTTOMAL ABED ', [3(24+1). / /) 00000000

 60
 00000000

 61
 00000000

 62
 00000000

 63
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000

 64
 00000000
 0000 FULL [101.] 1000 FORMUT WOR". 8 Maint 442 4 CASE CONTROL DECK 100-5100) LADIN LUND - LUCI LUCI - LUCI LUCI - LUCI REVIND LUCI COPY BEMAINDER OF THE MALAR (LINCT, 1000, 1) 1 (1 1 1959, 11, 3) 3 POMMAI (100, 4 481, 3) 10 11 (1002, 1000) 1 20 10 3000 ĝ 129 5200 Rt Tum 5250 CONT IN 8 NOON FOR 8 80 98 9359

vu

Not with the second secon

202000 LENGI) + RLM (R(1), Y(1), Z(1), R(J), Y(J), Z(J)) (110 M(J) . ME. 10(J)) 00 10 190 POSITION FILE TO BEGINNING OF DESIRED SUBCASE NM - (NUMSUB - 1) - (NOISPN + 1) 44 CONTINUE 45 CONTINUE 40 CO 17 (MORID .LT. MOISPH) 00 10 100 00 10 \$10 00 Tu tr.v. 10(1) + XX 10(1) + XY 20(1) + 22 20(1) + 22 20(1) + 22 20(1) + 20 8 TO CONTINUE IF (MUNSUE EQ. 1) 00 TO 00 IF (MUNSUE GT. MSUE) 00 TO PRINT OUT RESULTS PRINT OUT RESULTS DO 1301 + 1 + 8 + 1 - 7 [N(1) + 8 + 1 - 7 õ 2 IF CONTINUE 112 CONTINUE DO 114 J 2 0 00 **.**...

145

IF NOT THE PLAN (18 / 18 / 100024380) IF NEED 00024380 IF NOT 18 001 00024390 NUTINE SCALLS FROM SUBMOUTINE PLOT >>>) 00024390 NOUTINE SCALLS FROM SUBMOUTINE PLOT >>>) 00024390 COMMON / TENERT / 195V COMMON / PLINERT / 195V DIMERRA ALLON(9) / 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 /, MA / 8 / UNTERRA ALLON(9) / 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 /, MA / 8 / SEARCH FOR WWIN AND WALK IF MEEDED If (1954-4-4-4 WINT SAMENDUTINE SAMENTINE PLOT >>> 0 FOMMI (0-4-4-4 WINT SAMENDUTINE SAMENTINE PLOT >>> 0 FOMMI (0-4-4-4 WINT SAMENDUTINE SAMENDUTINE PLOT >>> 0 V THE VECTOR OF DATA TO BE SCALED. IF MPN. IS MANT. THE WAREN POINTINE ASSAMES THAT WITH AND WAX. ZERO. THEN THE ROUTINE ASSAMES THAT WITH AND WAX. CONTAIN THE ANIMAM AND MAXIMUM OF THE DATA AND V IS WAY. THE MAXIMUM AND MAXIMUM OF THE DATA AND V IS VALIA THE MAXIMAM DATA VALUE. SHIM .LE WAIN SHIM THE SCALED MAXIMUM VALUE. SHIM .LE WAIN SHIM THE SCALED MAXIMUM VALUE. SHIM .LE WAIN HIM SHIMAM DATA VALUE. SHIM .LE WAIN SHIM THE SCALED MAXIMUM VALUE. SHAL GE WAIN HIM SHIMAM DATA VALUE. SHAL GE WAIN SHIM THE SCALED MAXIMUM VALUE. SHAL GE VALUE SHIM THE SCALED MAXIMUM VALUE SHAL GE VALUE SHIM THE MAXIMUM VALUE SHAL GE VALUE SHIM THE SCALED MAXIMUM VALUE SHAL GE VALUE IN ADDITTON, AN INTEGER ARRAY CALLED "ALLOW" CONTAINS THE ALLOWARE SCILING VALUES. THESE MAY BE COMMOZED SAIDE ALLOWARE Offerens St OF VALUES AS PECIFICAD NEY VALUES AND PLACING THER IN A COMMON ARRAY CALLED /ALLOWG/ (MAXIMUM OF 30 VALUES). THIS IS A BOUTHWE WICH WILL SELECT A SCALE FOR DATA TO BE SUPPLIED. THE USER SAVE TO HE SCALED OF THE THE AND MAILAND DATA VALUES. IN ADDITION. THE USE SUPERIES THE MANDER OF INCERENS'S TO APPEAR ON THE LASS AND A SET OF ALLOWARE FIREERIEST OF APPEAR ON THE .E0. 0) c0 10 180 ICRL - J ICRL - ICRL - ICR IDTR - ICRL - ICR IT (IDTH - ICO, 0, AMD. IDTR IT (IDTH - ICO, 0, 00 TO 100 DO 130 I - ICH, ICM IDIFR . (0. 0) 60 TO 160 16 - 2 TEMP(J) + HEADER(1) 1 - 1 - 1 1 - 4 - 1 1 - 4 - 1 1 - 4 - 1 1 - 1 - 1 1 - 1 - 1 1 - 1 - 1 1 1 051 00 071 130 CONTINUE 15 (ŝ

 0.14. Mu/, Nut, Unr., U

	00025100 00025100 00025210 00025210 00025210 00025210 00025210 00025250			00025500 00025500 00025600 00025620 00025620 00025660 00025660 00025660 00025660 00025660	
The second secon	CONTINUE 75 - MATHRY (K(N), K5) 17 (Max, Mg, MgN) 00 T0 40 17 (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Main Victure T Victure T Victure Victure	If [LM: (10, 1, 10, 1, 12, 11, 1, 1, 10, 1)] If [LM: (10, 1, 10, 11, 10, 1, 10, 1)] If [LM: (10, 1, 10, 11, 10, 1, 10, 1)] If [LM: (1, 2, 1, 11, 20, 1, 10, 1, 10, 1)] If [LM: (1, 2, 1, 1, 10, 1, 10, 1, 10, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 10, 1)] If [LM: (1, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,	Сомит (14: 20 (14:), 14:) Сомит (14:	Construction: The Assignment of TITES OF MARTING MANAGES, LICHWATT LICHNAT THE ACCENT OF PROGRAM, EXCLORENCE ASSIGNMENT, LICHWATT DESIGNATION MANAGES FOR PROGRAM EXCLORENCE ASSIGNMENT ON FROM DESIGNATION MANAGES FOR PROGRAM EXCLORENCE ASSIGNMENT OF THE DESIGNATION MANAGES FOR PROGRAM EXCLORENCE ASSIGNMENT OF THE DESIGNATION MANAGES FOR PROGRAM EXCLORENCE AS DESIGNATION FOR PROGRAM EXCLORE

	A S NO EMPILS	MAN 04 FOUAL TO VINC 0002455 MAN 04 FOUAL TO VINC 0002451 0002451 0002451 0002451 00024550 00024550	1 Scalf V Scalf V 1 Scalf V 1 Scalf V 1 Scalf V 1 Scalf V 1 Scalf V 1 Scalf	0002485 0002495 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 0002475 00024 000245 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00024 00027 0000 007 0000 007 00000 007 00000 007 00000 007 000000		2485.2000 2485.20000 2485.20000 2485.2000000000000000000000000000000000000	00034980 00034980 00035000 00035000 00035000 00035000 00035000
IF (100-1 (0, 0) 20 10 20 VALA - (1) 10 - 2, 200-1 VALA - ANDA (1) VALA - ANDA (VALA, V(1)) VALA - ANDA (VALA, V(1))	(VMA.1 VMIN/VG TO MVK SAME NO. DIGITS NO. 111.4 (1 0.1 + 410010 (1 (01) NO. 111.4 (1 0.1 + 410010 (1 (01) 4 - 40010 (1 NK.) 11 1 4 .1 0.0) 1 - 1 - 1 12 1 4 .1 0.0) 1 - 1 - 1 13 1 4 .1 0.0) 1 - 1 - 1	D AN ELEMIN IN ALLOW THAT IS OFFATER TO 30 1 - 1, MA ALLOW THAT IS OFFATER TO 30 1 - 4, ALLOW (1) 17 4 - 4 (LOW(1) 17 4 - 4 - 4 (LOW(1)) 17 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4	The second secon	E 15 TOO SMALL TO FIT THE ADJUSTED FAMOR 17 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	AND	A APPAY OF A COOPDIANTES T APPAY OF A COOPDIANTES APPAY ANGUES OF COOPDIANTES TAXA BALIRAM Y VALUE IF AMAY ANIHAPA Y VALUE APA BALIRAM Y VALUE ANA BALIRAM Y VALUE ANA BALIRAM Y VALUE ANA BALIRAM Y VALUE ANA ANIHAPA Y VALUE ANA ANIHAPA Y VALUE ANA ANIHAPA Y VALUE	MOM / TEAMORY / 1954 MOM / TEAMORY / 1954 RENE (171(0)), MELT(15) A BELME, 1514A / 14, 140-/

APPENDIX 1

U

ا جيرن

Land

PLOTS OF ANALYTICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL DATA

÷





Figure 26. Comparison of Vertical Reaction Forces









.



and the second second

and a marked







Figure 27. Comparison of Strains for Test 1



D.....





(b) Rod Element 476

Figure 27. (Continued)



D..... 553



Figure 27. (Continued)

-la -



∆ Experimental



(d) Rod Element 576

Figure 27. (Continued)







Figure 28. Comparison of Strains for Test 2C



Second Contraction of the second s



D.....





(b) Rod Element 476

Figure 28. (Continued)



0..... 🖾



Figure 28. (Continued)



(d) Rod Element 576

Figure 28. (Continued)







Figure 29. Comparison of Strains for Test 3B



Experimental

(b) Rod Element 476

Figure 29. (Continued)

ŧ


00 0......

▲ Experimental

- O Analytical. Model A
- ♦ Analytical, Model D



(C) Rod Element 564

Figure 29. (Continued)





(d) Rod Element 576 Figure 29. (Continued)



0..... 553









D.m.s. 559





Figure 30. (Continued)





(a) Load Point, Model A (without torsional stiffness rods)
Figure 31. Single-Point Displacements for Test 2C





D.....





Figure 31. (Continued)











Figure 31. (Continued)



0.....



(e) Lond Point, Model D (with torsional stiffness rods)

.

Figure 31. (Continued)



0......













(C) Load Point. Model C (without torsional stiffness rods)

Figure 32. (Continued)



















•





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

1

.

APPENDIX J

and the second second

واستنقاق والمستان فالمراكر والتمري

SUMMARY OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS

TA	BLE	V
----	-----	---

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 1, MODEL D, SIMPLE DAMAGE

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
1	10	68 118		
2	12	56 112		
3	14	136		
4	16	54 80 106 124 135 255	529	529
5	14			
6	16			
7	18	82		
8	20	111 117 132 134 258		
9	22	64 116	117	117
10	20		137 573	573
11	18		119	119
12	16		135 571	135
13	14		531	531
14	12		***	
15	14			
16	16	105 257		
17	18	85	105 121	105
18	16	123	533	533
19	14			
20	16		123	123
21	14			
22	16			
23	18		579	579
24	16			
25	18			
26	20			
27	22	52 62 89 107 125	75 248	248
28	20	93 114 143 256	107 125 213 257	125

lteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
29	18	126	107 256 257 581	257
30	16		581	581
31	14		126	126
32	12		582	582
33	10			
34	12			
35	14			

TABLE V (Continued)

•

.

TABLE VI

.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 1, MODEL D, DETAILED DAMAGE

lteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
]	10	68 118	* = *	
2	12	56 112 136		
3	14			
4	16	80 135		
5	18	54 106 124 132		
6	20	116 117 134 254 255 258	121	121
7	18		117 137	137
8	16	111	119	119
9	14	256 257	577	577
10	12			
11	14	123		
12	16	82 105 126	123 531 9529	123 9529
13	14		579	579
14	12	*==		
15	14	125		
16	16	85 143	105 125	125
17	14	*==	257	257
18	12	***		
19	14		581	581
20	12			
21	14			
22	16	114		•••
23	18	62 64 89		
24	20	52 93	68 256	68 256
25	18	50 130	~ ~ ~	***
26	20	55		
27	22		126	126
28	20		582	582
29	18			

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
30	20			
31	22		75	75
32	20	67 73	55 57 473	473
33	18	97	57 73	73
34	16		55 471	55
35	14	53	427	427

TABLE VII

.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 2C, MODEL A, SIMPLE DAMAGE

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
1	10	111 135		*=*
2	12	80		
3	14	49 81 82 133 136 255		
4	16	68 129 134	109	109
5	14	114 131	127	127
6	12	132		
7	14	130		
8	16	56		
9	18	50 79 107 108	137	137
10	16		119 575	575
11	14	113 123 125 143 144	119 129 133 135 139 573 577 579	119 129 579
12	12	142	103 121 131 133 135 139 531 567 577 581 605 615	131 577 581
13	10	85 93 97 105 112 115 116 117 118 124 126 141 254 256 257	113 121 125 133 135 139 140 213 223 224 225 226 227 228 535 536 567 569 573 580 582 589 591 607 611 620 625	133 582
14	8	106	97 108 115 117 121 123 125 126 135 139 140 141 223 224 225 226 227 228 257 528 534 535 536 569 571 573 578 580 589 591 609 611 625 627 629 631 632 632 632 631	135 528
15	6	73	97 104 108 110 113 115 117 121 123 125 126 128 139 140 141 144 212 213 223 224 225 226 227 228 257 530 534 535 536 569 578 580 591 593 601	580

186

INDEE ALL (COULINGER)	E VII (Continued)
-----------------------	-------------------

.

iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
15 (Cont.)			618 625 627 628 629 630 631 632	
16	4		97104111115117118121123124125126128139140141142212213222223224225226227228249257532534535536552555567569578589591593595601616623625627628629630631632	111 552 578

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 2C, MODEL D, DETAILED DAMAGE

lteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
1	10	56 68 80 112 114 118 126	<i></i>	
2	12	106 132		
3	14	62 82 111 135 256		
4	16	49 50 108 124 134 255		
5	18	116 117 133 258	68	68
6	16			
7	18		66	66
8	16	79 81 113 129	460	460
9	14			
10	16		462	462
11	14			
12	16			
13	18	61 105 107	70	70
14	16	54		
15	18	52 115		
16	20		56	56
17	18	63	430	430
18	16			
19	18		58 432	58
20	16	64	432	432
21	14		*	
22	16			
23	18		62 255 434	62 255
24	16	254	64 78 81 82 187 434	81 434
25	14		64 78 79 82 105 254 436	78 79 254
26	12	55	64 77 82 105 436 477 479	64 479

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
27	10	85	77 82 105 436 477 481	77 436 481
28	8			
29	10	131	54 80 428 475 477	54 80 475 477
30	8	73 126	52 75 82 428 438	52 75 428 438
31	6		55 473	55
32	4			
33	6		427 429	427 429
34	4			

TA	Bl	.E	ł	X

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 3B, MODEL A, SIMPLE DAMAGE

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
1	10		510	510
2	8			
3	10			
4	11	49 114 134 136	110	110
5	10	130 132	128	128
6	8			
7	10	135		
8	11			
9	12		*=#	
10	13	116 133	66	66
11	12	56		
12	13	111	460 462	460 462
13	12	52 55 82	424 432	424 432
14	10	80 113	58	58
15	8		528	528
16	6			
17	8	81 254	434	434
18	6		436	436
19	4			*
20	6	79 256		
21	8	61 129 197 213	52 438 482	52 438
22	6	62		
23	8	63 107 115 257	109 127 437 582	127 437 582
24	6		109	109
25	4	***		
26	6			
27	8	51	78 111	78 111
28	6		60	60
29	4	54	532	532

TABLE X	
---------	--

SUMMARY	0F	RESULTS	FOR	TEST	3B,
MODEL	. D,	DETAIL	ED D /	AMAGE	

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
1	10	56 68 112 114 118 136		
2	12	132 256		
3	34	62 134		
4	16	49 80 116 135	510	510
5	14		110	110
6	12	130	112 128	112
7	10		566	566
8	8		•	
9	10			
10	12			
11	14		114	114
12	12	50 82	568	568
13	10			
14	12			
15	14	124		
16	16	258		
17	17	67 117		
18	18	111 254		
19	19		530	530
20	18		528 532 534 574	528 532 534
21	17	55 64 73 97 107 113 126 129 143 255 257	118 120 256 552 574	120 256
22	16	115 125	116 117 118 138 257 536 552 574 592	117 118 536
23	14	51 63 85 123 131 133 141	56 58 79 81 85 107 115 119 137 257 279 430 476 499 535 573 574	73 107 115 279 476 573 574

State of the state

Iteration No.	Load	Buckled Elements	Overstressed Elements	Failed Elements
24	12	105	55 56 57 58 69 71 75 78 113 119 197 429 430 467 471 473 535 571	71 113 119 535 571
25	10		55 58 75 78 79 80 105 111 121 197 429 430 467 471 473 478 569 575	105 111 467 473 569
26	8		58 75 77 78 80 109 197 429 430 471 533 567	58 109 471 533 567

VITA

Gregory Edward Riggs

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: ANALYSIS OF PROGRESSIVE COLLAPSE OF COMPLEX STRUCTURES

Major Field: Civil Engineering

Biographical:

a Draft State

- Personal Data: Born in Wichita, Kansas, April 13, 1950, the son of Mr. and Mrs. C. Edward Riggs.
- Education: Graduated from Thomas A. Edison High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, in May, 1968; received the Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering degree from the United States Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, Colorado, in June, 1972; received the Master of Science degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, in February, 1973; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1982.
- Professional Experience: Base civil engineering officer, U.S. Air Force, 1973-1975; staff civil engineering officer, U.S. Air Force, 1975-1977; Civil Engineering Instructor, U.S. Air Force Academy, 1977-1979; Civil Engineering Assistant Professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, 1979-1980.
- Professional Organizations: Chi Epsilon, National Society of Professional Engineers, Society of American Military Engineers.
- Professional Registration: Registered Professional Engineer in Colorado.