AD-A141 364

AFWAL-TR-84-3016



EFFECTS OF SURFACE FLAWS ON IMPACT RESISTANCE OF UNCOATED POLYCARBONATE

Michael P. Bouchard

University of Dayton Research Institute 300 College Park Avenue Dayton, Ohio 45469

Interim Technical Report for Period June 1981 - July 1981

March 1984

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

COPY

FLIGHT DYNAMICS LABORATORY AIR FORCE WRIGHT AERONAUTICAL LABORATORIES AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO 45433



84 05 21 124

NOTICE

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the United States Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor have any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, turnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Public Affairs (ASD/PA) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS, it will be available to the general public, including foreign nations.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

2LT ROBERT J. SIMMONS

Project Manager Improved W/S Protection ADPO Vehicle Equipment Division

21/41 RALPH J. / SPEELMAN

Program Manager Improved W/S Protection ADPO Vehicle Equipment Division

FOR THE COMMANDER:

berth

RUDI J. BERNDT Acting Chief Vehicle Equipment Division

"If your address has changed, if you wish to be removed from our mailing list, or if the addressee is no longer employed by your organization, please notify AFWAL/FIEA, WPAFB OH 45433 to help us maintain a current mailing list."

Copies of this report should not be returned unless return is required by security considerations, contractual obligations, or notice on a specific document.

DEPORE COMPLETING FORM 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIC COVERED INTERIM TECHNICAL REPORT JUNE 1981 - July 1981 6. PERFORMING ORG, PEPOR NUMBER UDR-TR-82-74 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMMER(*) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
5 TYPE OF REPORT & PERIC COVERED INTERIM TECHNICAL REPORT JUNE 1981 - July 1981 6. PERFORMING ORG. PEPOR' NUMBER UDR-TR-82-74 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(a) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBER(b) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBER Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 0) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
5 TYPE OF REPORT & PERIC COVERED INTERIM TECHNICAL REPORT JUNE 1981 - July 1981 6. PERFORMING ORG. PEPOR' NUMBER UDR-TR-82-74 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS F70ject 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 0) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
INTERIM TECHNICAL REPORT JUNE 1981 - July 1981 6. PERFORMING ORG. PEPOR' NUMBER UDR-TR-82-74 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMMER(a) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
JUNE 1981 - July 1981 6. PERFORMING ORG. PEPOR' NUMBER UDR-TR-82-74 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMMER(a) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT. PROJECT. TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE 'March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (al this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
6. PERFORMING ORG. PEPOR' NUMBER UDR-TR-82-74 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this result) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
UDR-TR-82-74 S. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMMER(s) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJUCT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
 B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMPLER(#) F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
F33615-80-C-3401 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJICT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this record) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
Project 1926 12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
12. REPORT DATE March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
March 1984 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this reart) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this real) Unclassified 15. Declassification/downgrading SCHEDULE
19 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
Unclassified 15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
156. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
SCHEDULE
from Report)
er)
"' highly susceptible to surface effort of limited scope to of polycarbonate to the im- pact. Test fixturing for flaw arbonate beam specimens is is sensitive to changes in
in scratch depth. Net absorbe

A CARLES AND A CARLES

INCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

Continuation, Item 20.

- 1

Save - Saves

energy decreases with increasing scratch depth. However, scratches of any depth produce fracture if the scratch has a sharp, $\langle {}^{ii} \nabla^{ij} - shaped$ profile,

ANT REPORTANT TRACESCON RESCORDED TO SECONDERING STATE

Ċ

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

FOREWORD

The investigation documented herein was performed by the Applied Mechanics Group, Aerospace Mechanics Division of the University of Dayton Research Institute, Dayton, Ohio, under contract F33615-80-C-3401, Project 1926, "Birdstrike Resistant Crew Enclosure," for the Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Air Force administrative direction was provided by Lt. Robert Simmons, AFWAL/FIEA, the Program Manager. The effort was conducted from June 1981 to July 1981, under the supervision of Mr. Dale H. Whitford, Supervisor, Aerospace Mechanics Division, Mr. Blaine S. West, Head, Applied Mechanics Group, and Mr. Gregory J. Stenger, Project Engineer.



Acce	DELCH OF				
NTIS	GRUSS A				
DTIC	TAS				
Upan	Upannounce C				
Just	fication				
•					
By					
Distributica/					
Ava	Availability Coles				
	Avail and/or				
Dist	Special				
111					
141					
$W \in \Gamma$					
· _					

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
1	TEST PURPOSE AND METHOD	1
2	TESTS AND RESULTS	3
3	CONCLUSIONS	5

a sal

.»." مل² =

6

V

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1.4.4.4.4.4.5.

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Test Specimen for Scratch Depth Study	2
2	Profile of a Scratch Having a Depth of 0.00034 inches (Magnification = 294X)	7
3	Profile of a Scratch Having a Depth of .01771 inches (Magnification = 52X)	8
4	Profile of a Scratch Having a Depth of .00315 inches (Magnification = 208X)	9
5	Load Displacement Curve for Unscratched Specimen	10
6	Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.003 in. deep)	11
7	Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.020 in. deep)	12
8	Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.001 in. deep)	13
9	Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.005 in. deep)	14
10	Load Displacement Curve for Abraded Specimen (600-grit Emery Paper)	15

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Net Absorbed Energies for Broken Specimens	16

vi

SECTION 1 TEST PURPOSE AND METHOD

An experimental program of limited scope was conducted to determine the effect of flaw size on the impact resistance of uncoated monolithic polycarbonate. The testing was accomplished using a high rate (2000 in/min) MTS testing machine and a three-point bending fixture to bend the specimens so that the flawed surfaces were in tension. The span between fixture supports was four inches and the support and impactor radii were 0.125 inches. The polycarbonate was machined to a size of 0.5 x 1.00 x 7 ±0.1, with a scratch 0.33 inches in length centered across the width at the beam's mid-length, as shown in Figure 1. The scratches were made using three methods: the needle point of a draftsman's compass; 600-grit dry emery paper; and a thin steel, circular blade (ground from a used milling machine cutter) rigidly held in place by a fixture chucked in a milling machine. The latter method gave good repeatability of scratch depth and length.







SECTION 2 TESTS AND RESULTS

Six specimens were initially tested: two unflawed, two with a scratch depth of 0.003 inches, and two with a scratch depth of 0.020 inches. (See Figures 3 and 4 for photomicrographs of the profiles of two of these scratches.) These flaw sizes were chosen because they were representative of actual flaw sizes and because the great difference in depths would make apparent any correlation of scratch depth with impact resistance and mode of failure. The scratches were made using the circular blade.

Under load, the unflawed specimens plastically deformed, but did not break. The average yield stress (defined using the 0.2 percent offset method) was 10,830 psi and the average net energy absorbed was 1025 ft.·lb. Figure 5 shows the loaddisplacement curve for one of the samples. The flawed specimens, on the other hand, broke under load. The yield stress for these specimens averaged 10,640 psi for those with the deeper scratches (.020 inches) and 10,730 psi for those with the shallower scratches (.003 inches). Because of breaking, the net absorbed energy was reduced to 552 ft.·lb., for the deep-scratched beams and to 592 ft.·lb., for the shallow-scratched beams. Figures 6 and 7 give load-displacement curves for the two scratched specimen types.

Because breakage appeared to be independent of scratch depth in the initial series of tests, it was decided to test beams with scratches between 0.000 inches and 0.003 inches in depth to verify this observation. Five follow-on tests of three types were carried out for this purpose. The first type consisted of two samples scratched to a depth of approximately 0.001 inches by the circular blade. The second type consisted of two samples hand-scratched to a depth of approximately 0.0005 inches with the sharp point of a draftsman's compase (see Figure 2). The

. 3

last type consisted of one sample abraded by rubbing the surface with 600-grit dry emery paper.

Load displacement curves for these tests appear in Figures 8-10. The blade-scratched and grit-scratched beams broke under load. The yield stress averaged 10,920 psi for both types. The net absorbed energy was 625 ft. lbs., for the blade-scratched specimens and 930 ft. lb., for the grit-scratched specimens. From these energies, plus those obtained from the initial six tests, it appears that the net absorbed energy for the beams which fail by breaking decreases as scratch depth increases (see Table 1). The compass-scratched specimens, which yielded at 10,330 psi and absorbed a net energy of 1000 ft. lb., (see Figure 9), did not break under load. It is believed that the reason they did not break is because the compass point was too blunt to produce a sharp, "V"-shaped scratch (as do the circular blade and emery paper).

SECTION 3 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the 11 beam tests performed to date it has been found that surface scratches in uncoated monolithic polycarbonate reduce the impact resistance and ductility of the material. Sharp, "V"-shaped scratches, when in tension across the beam width, cause polycarbonate to fracture without yielding. As the sharpness of the scratch increases, the tendency toward brittle fracture increases. A blunt scratch may or may not cause brittle fracture, depending on scratch depth. However, scratch depth has no effect in changing the mode of failure from brittle fracture to inelastic yielding as long as the scratch profile is a sharp "V" shape. Thus shallow, sharp scratches produce the same brittle failure mode in polycarbonate as deep, sharp scratches do. Changing the depth does, however, affect the impact resistance (net absorbed energy). As the depth of scratch increases, the net absorbed energy decreases. Finally, it should be noted that the geometry along the length of the scratch (as shown in Figure 1) may affect the impact resistance and mode of failure.

Recommendations

1. Perform more extensive laboratory testing on specimens scratched to various depths, lengths, and profiles to substantiate the results of this study. The effects of crazing should also be included in this investigation.

2. Obtain better characterization data for in-service scratches (length, depth, profile) correlating the scratches with their causes, if possible.

3. Perform more extensive laboratory testing on specimens with scratches similar to in-service ones. Investigate the effects of weathering, stressing, and solvents on the scratches (i.e., do these factors sharpen the scratch profile or propagate cracks from the scratch tip?).

4. If required, perform similar tests with monolithic stretched and/or as-cast acrylic.

5. Establish a method of viewing and measuring scratch profile that does not require sectioning of the specimen (which could smear the scratch profile or induce cracks at the scratch tip).



Sector States

a states

Figure 2. Profile of a Scratch Having a Depth of 0.00034 inches (Magnification = 294X).



Figure 3. Profile of a Scratch Having a Depth of .01771 Inches (Magnification = 52X).

.



a Electronics en a construction de la construction de la construction de la construction de la construction en La construction de la construction e

ļ

22222222 22222222 22222222

561565

and a state of the second state of the second

Figure 4. Profile of a Scratch Having a Depth of .00315 Inches (Magnification = 208X).



Figure 5. Load Displacement Curve for Unscratched Specimen.

525222575 RSSUSSE



Figure 6. Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.003 in. deep).

No. of Contraction



Figure 7. Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.020 in. deep).

and the second burners (and a second



(0.001 in. deep).



AND A CONTRACT AND AND A CONTRACT AN

Figure 9. Load Displacement Curve for Scratched Specimen (0.005 in. deep).



igure 10. Load Displacement Curve for Abraded Specimen (600-grit Emery Paper).

15

State State

Scratch Depth (in.)	Net Absorbed Energies (ft.lb)
0.020	522
0.020	522
0.003	599
0.003	585
0.001	616
0.001	632
unknown*	928

TABLE 1 NET ABSORBED ENERGIES FOR BROKEN SPECIMENS

*Scratches caused by 600-grit emery paper

÷

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE-759-062/822