	D-A280 / 5		Form Approved OBM No. 0704-0188
bito reporting burden for this col intaining the data needed, and ci reducing this burden, to Washir o Oflice of Managament and Bus		the time for reviewing in this burden or any other corts, 1215 Jefferson De	natructions , searching existing data sources, gathering, "aspect of this collection of information, including suggesti avis Highway, Suite 1204, Artington, VA 22202-4302, and
Agency Use Only (Leave mann).	<	3. Report Type and I Final - Journal Ar	Jates Covered. ticle
Title and Subtitle. Microbiologically Influenced Deg	radation of Fiber-Reinforced Poly	/meric Composites	5. Funding Numbers. Program Element No. 0601153N Project No. 03103
Author(s). Wagner, P., R. Ray, B. Little, and	- Task No. Accession No. DN094463 Work Unit No. 573505203		
Performing Organization Name(s) Naval Research Laboratory Oceanography Division Stennis Space Center, MS 3952	and Address(es). 9-5004		8. Performing Organization Report Number. Materials Performance, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 46-49, April 1994
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Na Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217	ame(s) and Address(es). ELF JUN	ECTE 2 8 1994	10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. NRL/JA733394-0035
 Supplementary Notes. * Naval Undersea Warfare C Newport, RI 	enter Division,	G	
2a. Distribution/Availability Statement. Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			94–19566
Abstract (Maximum 200 words).			
Two fiber-reinforced polymer Composites, resins, and fibers w	r composites were examined to rere exposed to sulfur/iron-oxidizi	r susceptibility to mic ng, calcareous-deposi	robiologically influenced degradation ting, ammonium-producing, hydrogen
producing, and sulfate-reducing bacteria. Epoxy and vinyl ester n species. SRB degraded the orga producing bacteria appeared to c	Dacteria (SRB) in batch culture. S leat resins, carbon fibers, and epo inic surfactant on glass fibers and j disrupt bonding between fibers ar	Surfaces were uniformly xy composites were no preferentially colonized nd vinyl ester resin and	y colonized by all physiological types on tadversely affected by microbiologica I fiber-vinyl ester interfaces. Hydrogen to penetrate the resin at the interface
producing, and sulfate-reducing bacteria. Epoxy and vinyl ester n species. SRB degraded the orga producing bacteria appeared to o	Dacteria (SRB) in batch culture. S leat resins, carbon fibers, and epo inic surfactant on glass fibers and j disrupt bonding between fibers ar	Surfaces were uniformly xy composites were no preferentially colonized ad vinyl ester resin and	y colonized by all physiological types o ot adversely affected by microbiologica I fiber-vinyl ester interfaces. Hydrogen to penetrate the resin at the interface
producing, and sulfate-reducing bacteria. Epoxy and vinyl ester n species. SRB degraded the orga producing bacteria appeared to o	Dacteria (SRB) in batch culture. S leat resins, carbon fibers, and epo inic surfactant on glass fibers and i disrupt bonding between fibers ar	Surfaces were uniforminy xy composites were no preferentially colonized ad vinyl ester resin and	y colonized by all physiological types o ot adversely affected by microbiologica I fiber-vinyl ester interfaces. Hydrogen to penetrate the resin at the interface
producing, and sulfate-reducing bacteria. Epoxy and vinyl ester n species. SRB degraded the orga producing bacteria appeared to o Subject Terms. Biofouling; corrosion; biodeterio	ration; sulfate-reducing bacteria (SRB)	v colonized by all physiological types o of adversely affected by microbiologica l fiber-vinyl ester interfaces. Hydrogen to penetrate the resin at the interface 15. Number of Pages. 4 16. Price Code.
producing, and sulfate-reducing bacteria. Epoxy and vinyl ester n species. SRB degraded the orga producing bacteria appeared to o Subject Terms. Biofouling; corrosion; biodeterio Security Classification of Report. Unclassified	pacteria (SRB) in batch culture. Seat resins, carbon fibers, and epo inic surfactant on glass fibers and i disrupt bonding between fibers ar ration; sulfate-reducing bacteria (18. Security Classification of This Page. Unclassified	SRB)	y colonized by all physiological types on adversely affected by microbiological types of adversely affected by microbiological types. I fiber-vinyl ester interfaces. Hydrogen to penetrate the resin at the interface 1 to penetrate the resin at the interface 2 to penetrate the resin at the interface

-28

Paper No. 255





MICROBIOLOGICALLY INFLUENCED DEGRADATION

OF FIBER REINFORCED POLYMERIC COMPOSITES

Patricia A. Wagner, Richard I. Ray, and Brenda J. Little Naval Research Laboratory Stennis Space Center, MS 39529

> Wayne C. Tucker Naval Undersea Warf?-e Center Division Newport, RI 02841

Accesi	Accesion For				
NTIS DTIC Unann	CRA&I TAB ounced				
By Distrib	By Distribution /				
Availability Codes					
Dist	Avail and/or Special				
A-1					

ABSTRACT

Two fiber reinforced polymer composites were examined for susceptibility to microbiologically influenced degradation. Composites, resins, and fibers were exposed to sulfur/iron-oxidizing, calcareous-depositing, ammoniumproducing, hydrogen-producing and sulfate-reducing bacteria (SRB) in batch culture. Surfaces were uniformly colonized by all physiological types of bacteria. Epoxy and vinyl ester neat resins, carbon fibers, and epoxy composites were not adversely affected by microbial species. SRB degraded the organic surfactant on glass fibers and preferentially colonized fiber-vinyl ester interfaces. Hydrogen-producing bacteria appeared to disrupt bonding between fibers and vinyl ester resin and to penetrate the resin at the interface.

Keywords: polymer, composite, microorganism, degradation

INTRODUCTION

Fiberglass/polymer and carbon/polymer composite materials are used in many aquatic environments. With high strength to weight ratios and improved stiffness for high performance, these materials surpass conventional metals and alloys for many structural applications. Unfortunately, little attention has been paid to environmental degradation. It was long believed, for example, that fiberglass boat hulls would not suffer the corrosion, biofouling or deterioration found in conventional materials. However, it is now recognized that all engineering materials become colonized by microorganisms, including bacteria, within hours after exposure in natural waters.¹ Microorganisms grow and produce a viscoelastic layer or biofilm. The environment at the biofilm/material interface is radically different from the bulk medium in terms of pH, dissolved oxygen, and organic and inorganic species.² Furthermore, polymeric composites are subject to degradation from moisture intrusion and osmotic blistering.³ Although the problems of moisture intrusion and blistering have been studied⁴ and can be eliminated by proper manufacturing and maintenance procedures,⁵ repair costs and safety risks are high.

Publication Right

Copyright by NACE International. NACE International has been given first rights of publication of this manuscript. Request for permission to publish this manuscript in any form in part or in whole, must be made in writing to NACE International. Publications Division. P.O. Box 218340. Houston, Texas 77218. The manuscript has not yet been reviewed by NACE International, and accordingly, the matched and the views expressed are solely those of the author(s) and are not necessarily endorsed by the Association. Printed in the U.S.A.

Polymeric composites are subject to many kinds of environmental degradation. Tucker and Brown⁶ showed that carbon/polymer composites galvanically coupled to metals are degraded by cathodic reactions in seawater. Jones et al.⁷ demonstrated that epoxy and nylon coatings on steel were breached by mixed cultures of marine bacteria. Pendrys⁸ reported that p-55 graphite fibers were attacked by a mixed culture of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter calcoaceticus*, common soil isolates. Possible mechanisms for microbial degradation of polymeric composites include: direct attack of the resin by acids or enzymes, blistering due to gas evolution, enhanced cracking due to calcareous deposits and gas evolution, and polymer destabilization by concentrated chlorides and sulfides.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

Identity and Maintenance of Bacterial Cultures

A sulfur/iron oxidizing bacterium, *Thiobacillus ferroxidans*, Leathan strain, obtained from Dr. Norman Lazaroff, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY, was maintained in 9K medium⁹ containing 3.0 g $(NH_4)_2SO_4$, 0.1 g KCl; 0.5 g K₂HPO₄, 0.5 g MgSO₄•7H₂O, 0.01 g Ca $(NO_3)_2$ dissolved in 700 ml distilled water previously acidified to pH 2.5 with H₂SO₄. The salt solution was sterilized at 250°C and 150 psi for 15 minutes. Three hundred ml of an iron solution containing 44 g FeSO₄•7H₂O in pH 2.5 H₂SO₄ were filter sterilized and added to the salt solution.

Psuedomonas fluorescens, a calcareous-depositing bacterium, was obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC #17571), Rockville, MD. The organism was originally isolated from polluted seawater. *Ps. fluorescens* was maintained in a medium containing 0.25 g calcium acetate, 0.4 g yeast extract, 1.0 g glucose, 100 ml distilled water, and adjusted to pH 8.0 using NaOH.¹⁰

Lactococcus lactis subsp. lactis, ATCC #19435, an ammonium-producing bacterium, was maintained in brain heart infusion medium.¹¹ Clostridium acetobutylicum, ATCC #824, a bacterium previously shown to produce copious amounts of hydrogen from fermentation of sugars, was maintained in a growth medium described by Ford et al.¹² Sulfate-reducing bacteria (SKB), isolated as a mixed culture of facultative microorganisms from a corrosion failure of a carbon steel waster piece on a surface ship,^{13,14} were maintained in Postgate B growth medium.¹⁵

Exposure Conditions

Triplicate coupons $(2.5 \times 2.5 \times 0.6 \text{ cm})$ of two fiber reinforced polymer composites—a carbon fiber (T-300) reinforced epoxy (NARMCO-5208/T-300, BASF)⁽¹⁾ (Figure 1a) and a glass (S-2) and carbon (T-300) reinforced vinyl ester (Derakane 411-45)⁽²⁾ (Figure 1b) were exposed to microbiological cultures for 161 days. The epoxy was cured in a vacuum bag autoclaved at 250°F. Vinyl ester resins were post-cured at 100°C for 8 hours. Additionally, carbon fibers, glass fibers, vinyl ester, and epoxy resins were individually exposed for 90 days to SRB and hydrogen-producing bacteria. Glass fibers had been treated with organofunctional Silane A-172⁽³⁾, a vinyl tris (2-methoxyethoxy) silane. All cultures were maintained at room temperature and were periodically refreshed with new media. Triplicate uninoculated controls were maintained under the same exposure conditions.

Moisture Uptake

Samples were weighed before and after exposure. Moisture uptake was calculated after the biofilm had been removed with a cotton swab containing acetone and the sample reweighed.

⁽¹⁾Structural Materials, Anaheim, CA

⁽²⁾Dow Chemical, Midland, MI

^{(3)®}Union Carbide, Danbury, CT

Surface Analysis

Samples were examined before and after exposure using an environmental scanning electron microscope (Electroscan Corporation, Wilmington, MA) coupled with an energy-dispersive x-ray analysis system (NORAN, Middleton, WI) (ESEM/EDS). The ESEM uses a secondary electron detector capable of forming high resolution images at pressures in the range of 0.1 to 20 torr. At these pressures, specimen charging is dissipated into the gaseous environment of the specimen chamber, enabling direct observation of uncoated, nonconductive specimens, including polymeric composites. If water vapor is used as the specimen environment, wet samples can be observed. Wet biofilms can be imaged directly without fixation, dehydration or metal coating, and EDS data can be collected at the same time sample morphology/topography is photographed.^{16,17} Exposed coupon samples were fixed in 2% glutaraldehyde, rinsed to distilled water, examined wet for evidence of degradation resulting from microbial activity, and compared to uninoculated controls.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In all cases, composite, neat resin and fiber surfaces were colonized by all microbial types. Neither the epoxy nor the vinyl ester composites were adversely affected by calcareous-depositing or ammonium-producing bacteria. There was no evidence of attack of resins and fibers remained embedded within both resins. Composites exposed to sulfur/iron-oxidizing bacteria (Figure 2) were covered with crystalline deposits containing iron and sulfur in addition to microbial cells. All surfaces exposed to SRB were black due to the deposition of iron sulfides. No damage to the epoxy composite, epoxy neat resin, carbon fibers or vinyl ester neat resin could be attributed to the presence and activities of SRB and hydrogen-producing bacteria.

SRB grew preferentially at fiber/resin interfaces on the vinyl ester composite (Figure 3). Figure 4 shows unexposed glass fibers (Figure 4a), glass fibers exposed to uninoculated medium (Figure 4b), and glass fibers exposed to SRB in culture medium (Figure 4c). Glass fibers exposed to SRB lost all rigidity after the 90-day exposure so that the weave pattern was no longer evident. Control glass fibers remained rigid and maintained the original weave pattern. Glass fibers are routinely treated with an organic surfactant used to size the fibers and to facilitate handling. The silane surfactant promotes adhesion between the vinyl ester resin and glass fibers. Microbial degradation of the surfactant by SRB was further demonstrated with ESEM/EDS dot maps of silicon distribution (Figure 5). Dot maps of control fibers exposed to uninoculated media showed concentrations of silicon within the core of each fiber and small amounts of silicon along the length of each fiber. Similar maps for fibers exposed to SRB showed increased amounts of silicon along the length of the fiber. Many microorganisms are known to degrade organic polymers.^{18,19} The mixed anaerobic culture containing SRB used in this work has been shown previously to degrade marine caulks and traditional polymeric coatings.^{7,13,14}

Hydrogen-producing bacteria appeared to disrupt bonding between fibers and vinyl ester resin (Figure 6). The organisms penetrated the resin and disruption of fibers and resin may be due to gas formation within the composite.

Previous work published for moisture uptake for vinyl ester neat resin and the carbon vinyl ester composite indicate that the materials should be saturated after 90 days.²⁰ The neat resin and the carbon vinyl ester composite are typically saturated at 0.78 and 2.25% weight gain, respectively. In the presence of biofilms, moisture uptake was typically 0.1 and 0.9% for the neat resin and composite, respectively. It appears that biofilms may act as a diffusion barrier for water, retarding moisture uptake.

CONCLUSIONS

Epoxy resin and carbon fibers, either individually or in composite, were not degraded by sulfur/iron-oxidizing, hydrogen-producing, calcareous-depositing, or SRB. Bacteria did colonize resins, fibers and composites, but did not cause damage. SRB preferentially colonized vinyl ester composites at the fiber-resin interfaces. SRB did not degrade neat vinyl ester resin. SRB degradation of the organic surfactant on glass fibers was demonstrated with ESEM/EDS. Hydrogen-producing bacteria appear to have disrupted the fiber-vinyl ester resin bonding with penetration of the resin.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the University of Rhode Island Seagrant Foundation, Kingston, RI 02881 and by the Offshore Technology Research Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77845. Naval Research Laboratory Contribution Number NRL/PP/7333--93-0014.

REFERENCES

- 1. B.J. Little, P. Wagner, J. Adhesion 20, 3(1986): p. 187.
- 2. B. Little, R. Ray, P. Wagner, Z. Lewandowski, W.C. Lee, W.G. Characklis, F. Mansfeld, Biofouling 3, (1991): p. 45.
- R. Davis, J.S. Ghotra, T.R. Malhi, G. Pritchard, "Blister Formation in RP: The Origin of the Osmotic Process," 38th Annual Conference, SPI Reinforced Plastics/Composites Institute, paper no. 17-B, (New York, NY: Society of Plastics Industry, 1983).
- 4. "Guidance Notes for the Manufacture of Glass Fiber Reinforced Polyester Laminates to be Used in Marine Environments," British Plastics Federation Report, 1978.
- 5. "Repairs to Blisters in Glass Fiber Hulls," British Plastics Federation, Report no. 224/1.
- 6. W.C. Tucker, R. Brown, J. Composite Materials 23, 4(1989): pp. 389-395.
- 7. J.M. Jones, M. Walsh, F.B. Mansfeld, "Microbial and Electrochemical Studies of Coated Steel Exposed to Mixed Microbial Communities," CORROSION/91, paper no. 108, (Houston, TX: NACE, 1991).
- 8. J.P. Pendrys, J. Electrochemical Society 136 (1989): p. 113C.
- 9. M.P. Silverman, D.G. Lundgren, J. Bacteriology 77 (1959): p. 642.
- 10. E. Boquet, A. Boronat, A. Ramos-Cormenzana, Nature 246 (1973): p. 527.
- 11. Difco Manual, Difco Laboratories (Detroit, MI).
- 12. T.E. Ford, P.C. Searson, T. Harris, R. Mitchell, J. Electrochemical Society 137 (1990): p. 1175.
- J. Jones-Meehan, K.L. Vasanth, R.K. Conrad, B. Little, R. Ray, "Corrosion Resistance of Several Conductive Caulks and Sealants from Marine Field Tests and Laboratory Studies with Marine, Mixed Communities Containing Sulfate Reducing Bacteria," International Symposium on Microbiologically Influenced Corrosion (MIC) Testing, (Miami, FL: American Society for Testing and Materials, in press).
- J. Jones-Meehan, M. Walch, B. Little, R. Ray, F. Mansfeld, "ESEM/EDS Studies of Coated 4140 Steel Exposed to Marine, Mixed Microbial Communities Including SRB," (Taranto, Italy: 8th International Congress on Marine Corrosion and Fouling, 1992).
- 15. J.R. Postgate, The Sulphate Reducing Bacteria (London, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 26.
- 16. B. Little, P. Wagner, R. Ray, R. Pope, R. Scheetz, J. Industrial Microbiology 8, (1991): p. 213.
- 17. P. Wagner, B. Little, R. Ray, J. Jones-Meehan, "Investigations of Microbiologically Influenced Corrosion Using Environmental Scanning Electron Microscopy," CORROSION/92, paper no. 185, (Houston, TX: NACE, 1992).

- 18. B.F. Sagar, "The Mechanism and Prevention of Microbial Attack on Polyurethane Coatings," Shirley Institute Conference, (Manchester, UK: Shirley Institute Publication S41, 1981).
- 19. F.J. Upsher, The Royal Australian Chemical Institute 43-44, 6(1976): p. 173.
- 20. W.C. Tucker, R.J. Brown, Composite Materials 23 (1989): p. 787.



FIGURE 1 — Fiber reinforced polymer composite coupons $(3\times)$ (a) carbon fiber reinforced epoxy and (b) glass and carbon reinforced vinyl ester.







FIGURE 3 — SRB at fiber/resin interfaces of vinyl ester composite.



FIGURE 4 — Light microscope micrographs of glass fibers $(2\times)$ (a) unexposed, (b) exposed to culture medium, and (c) exposed to SRB in culture medium.



FIGURE 5 — EDS dot map of silicon for glass fibers (a) exposed to culture medium and (b) exposed to SRB in culture medium.







FIGURE 6 — Hydrogen-producing bacteria at disrupted interfaces between fibers and vinyl ester resin.