## UNCLASSIFIED

## AD NUMBER

## ADB017280

## LIMITATION CHANGES

## TO:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

## FROM:

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies only; Test and Evaluation; JAN 1975. Other requests shall be referred to Air Force Materials Lab., Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433.

# AUTHORITY

WL/DOA ltr 25 Feb 1994

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

## AFML-TR-74-65, PART IV

DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 AND 49

Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dedham, Massachusetts 02026

JULY 1976

Ber 7 280

# AD-B017280

## TECHNICAL REPORT AFML-TR-74-65, PART IV REPORT FOR PERIOD JANUARY 1975 - APRIL 1976

Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; January 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Materials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Materials Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio 45433.

AIR FORCE MATERIALS LABORATORY AIR FORCE WRIGHT AERONAUTICAL LABORATORIES AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

#### 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 any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, 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.

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

This report was prepared by Fabric Research Laboratories, Dedham, Mass., under U. S. Government Contract No. F33615-73-C-5034. The work was initiated under Project 7320, "Fibrous Structural Materials," and was conducted from January 1975 through April 1976. It was administered under the direction of the Air Force Materials Laboratory, Air Force Systems Command, with Mr. Stanley Schulman acting as project engineer.

Mr. Norman J. Abbott was the FRL director responsible for the overall program. Design, weaving and testing of the materials was under the supervision of Robert J. Coskren, with the assistance of Donat J. LaPointe, who directed the weaving activities; James G. Donovan, who carried out the impact studies; and Pamela F. Aist and Edmund S. Bednarz, who did the tensile and other laboratory tests. The photomicrographs were taken by Mr. Leo Barish. The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. Milton M. Platt, Vice President of FRL, for handling contractual matters and for many helpful discussions throughout the course of the work.

This report was submitted by the authors in July 1976.

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

.1

Se level man -

S. Schulman, Project Monitor

For the Director

T(J. REINHART, CHIEF Composites and Fibrous Materials Branch Nonmetallic Materials Division

AIR FORCE - 23 MARCH 77 - 350

REPORT NUMBER       2 GOVT ACCESSION NO. 1. PECIPETES CATALOG NUMBER         AFML-TR-74-65, Part IV       5. TYE JF REPORT & PERIOD COVI         TITLE (and Subtits)       5. TYE JF REPORT & PERIOD COVI         DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT       5. TYE JF REPORT & PERIOD COVI         MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49       5. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBERS         AUTHOR(s)       6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBERS         Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren,       J33615-73-C-5034         James G. Donovan       10. PPOSPLA ELEMENT PROJECT.         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PPOSPLA ELEMENT PROJECT.         1000 Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 20208       12. REPORT DATE         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE         JULy 1976       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE         JULY 1000 STATEMENT (of this Report)       Unclassified         15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this Report)       Unclassified         15. SECURI	SQRT NUMBER       2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.       3. PECH-PENTS CATALOG NUMBER         PRMLTR-7A-65, Part IV       5. TVFL 3F REPORT A PERIOD COVERE         LE (and Subition)       5. TVFL 3F REPORT A PERIOD COVERE         MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49       5. TVFL 3F REPORT A PERIOD COVERE         THOR(s)       5. CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBER(s)         Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren,       F33615-73-C-5034         James G. Donovan       10. PPOSPAWELEMENT PROJECT, TAP         RFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PPOSPAWELEMENT PROJECT, TAP         Fabric Research Laboratories       10. PPOSPAWELEMENT PROJECT, TAP         1000 Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Decham, Mass. 02026       11. NUMBER OF PAGES         INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE         DONTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS() different from Controlling Office)       15. SECLONITY CLASS. (of Mix report)         Unclassified       13. NUMBER OF PAGES       121         DESTANDUNG STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECLONITY CLASS. (of Mix report)         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECLONITY CLASS. (of Mix report)         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the sector of cover nement agencies only: test and evaluation; Jam         TRUDTION STATEMENT (of the sector)       15. SECLONITY CLASS.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of	REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
AFML-TR-74-65, Part IV  TITLE (and Sublifie) DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49  AUTOR(*) AUTOR(*) AUTOR(*) AUTOR(*) PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS IO00 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026 I. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS IO00 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026 I. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS IIII ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) IS SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified IS-DESTIGATION/OWNGRAD ECCLASS.FICATION/OWNGRAD	AFML-TR-74-65, Part IV       5. TYFE 35 REPORT 4 PERIOD COVERED THE SUMMERS         DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT WATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49       5. TYFE 35 REPORT 4 PERIOD COVERED THE Technical Report January 1975 - April 1976         Stream of the summary set of the s	REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCESSIO	N NO. 3. PECIP'ENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
TITLE (and Sublition)       5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVI         DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT       MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49       Technical Report         AUTHOR(s)       6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)         AUTHOR(s)       6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PROGRAW ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAREA WORK UNIT NUMBER(s)         Partoming ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PROGRAW ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAREA WORK UNIT NUMBER(s)         Partoming ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PROGRAW ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAREA WORK UNIT NUMBER(s)         Dedham, Mass., 02026       12. REPORT DATE         JULY 1976       13. NUMBER OF PARES         14. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS, (of different)         4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS, (of different)         5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       Unclassified         15. SECURITY CLASS, (of different)       15. SECURITY CLASS, (of different)         5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the searce of this document must be referred to the Air Force M         6. NEEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         Same       .         8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None       .         9. ASSTRECT (Continue on rever	LE (and Subititie) DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49 THOR(:) Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan FROMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dechman, Mass. 02026 INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dechman, Mass. 02026 INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS JULY 1976 II. NUMBER OF PAGES JULY 100 STATEMENT (of Mis Report) Istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory. Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selfact entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame PPOLENAMY NOTES IONE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selfact entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame PPOLENAMY NOTES IONE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selfact entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame PPOLENAMY NOTES IONE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selfact entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame PPOLENAMY NOTES IONE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selfact entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame PPOLENAMY NOTES IONE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selfact entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame PPOLENAMY NOTES IONE STRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, neluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabrics raided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nech sourcesponding rulo materials of the same strength. This permits a sam of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of VIONE 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	AFML-TR-74-65, Part IV	
DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49       Technical Report January 1975 - April 1976         AUTHOR(*)       • CENTRALT OR GRANTATION NAME AND ADDRESS       • CENTRALT OR GRANTATION NAME AND ADDRESS         James G. Donovan       • CONTRACT OR GRANTATION NAME AND ADDRESS       • CENTRALT OR GRANTATION NAME AND ADDRESS         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       • CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       • Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       • CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       • REPORT DATE July 1976         • CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       • REPORT DATE July 1976       • DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)         Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Juary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force N rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         * DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the selected in Block 20, II different from Report)         Same         * SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None         * ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number)         parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabri webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.         * ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component material	DESIGN OF PARACHUTE COMPONENT MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49       Technical Report January 1975 - April 1976         THOR(0)       6       FERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS         Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. DONOVAN       6       CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(0)         RFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass.       02026       12       REPORT NUMBER(0)         INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12       REPORT DATE July 1976         DANITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controlling Office)       13. NUMER's OF PAGES         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       13. NUMBER's Colling of this report)         istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam'ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory, Nommetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Materia tranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebatrect entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report)         areachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spectuting.         STRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, necluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric radided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materia	TITLE (end Subtitie)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
AUTHOR(#)       January 1975 - April 1976         AUTHOR(#)       Servorman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan       B. CONTRACT ON GANT NUMBER(#)         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       F33615-73-C-5034         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dodo Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dodo Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dodo Providence Highway       12. REPORT DATE         July 1976       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         14. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE         4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only: test and evaluation; J. ary 1975. Ohrer requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Mater         5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         Same         8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None         9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabri webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.         6. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute com	JANSON OF PARACHOLE DE COMPONENT         MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49         MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49         Immary 1975 - April 1976         MATERIALS FROM KEVLAR 29 and 49         Immary 1975 - April 1976         Immary 1976	DECICN OF DADA CHUTE COMPONENT	Technical Report
MATERIALS FROM REVLAR 29 and 49       6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER(2)         AUTHOR(2)       9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(2)         Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan       9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(2)         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PPOERING "Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       12. REPORT DATE July 1976       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976       121         MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified       14. DECLASS (of this report)         Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only: test and evaluation; Ji ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force M rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, If different from Report)       Same         Same       .         A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       .         None       .         A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       .         None       .         A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       .         None       .         A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       .         A	INTERNALS FROM KEVLAK 29 and 49 <ul> <li>PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER</li> <li>PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER(*)</li> <li>CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBER(*)</li> <li>CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBER(*)</li> <li>F33615-73-C-5034</li> </ul> RFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS <ul> <li>Contract on GRANT NUMBER(*)</li> <li>F33615-73-C-5034</li> <li>Project 7320, Task 732002</li> <li>Project 7320, Task 732002</li> <li>Project 7320, Task 732002</li> <li>Project 7320, Task 732002</li> <li>NUMER OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS</li> <li>REPORT DATE</li></ul>	MATERIALS FROM KEVIAR 20 and 40	January 1975 - April 1976
AUTHOR(s)       s. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)         Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan       F33615-73-C-5034         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       10. PPGGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, T APE & AWORK UNIT NUMBERS         Penfor Research Laboratories       10. PPGGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, T APE & AWORK UNIT NUMBERS         Dedham, Mass.       02026         CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified         S. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         S. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         S. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the stated entered in Block 20, If different from Report)         Same       5. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None       *         C. ABSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the stated entered in Block 20, If different from Report)         Same       *         Supplementary NOTES       *         None       *         *       *         AKEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by	THOR(*) <ul> <li>CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)</li> <li>Signed G &amp; DOROVAN</li> </ul> RFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ACORESS         F33615-73-C-5034           Fabric Research Laboratories              10. ProcePair ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK Fabric Research Laboratories           1000 Providence Highway              Project 7320, Task 732002           Dedham, Mass. 02026              12. REPORT DATE July 1976            INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS              12. REPORT DATE July 1976            STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jan ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material ranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.            STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract intered in Black 20, if different from Report)            ame           IPPLEMENTARY NOTES           Ione           STRIBUTION STATEMENT (Confine and reverse and identify by black number)           And and reverse and if increasers and identify by black number)           Area and reverse and if increasers and identify by black number)           Barachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics reubings, ribbons, tapes, words, sewing threads, impact proper	MATERIALS FROM REVLAR 29 and 49	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan       F33615-73-C-5034         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report)       Interpret Project 7320, Task 732002         I. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the source of theres in tered in Block 20, If different from Report) </td <td>Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan RFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ACORESS Pabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026 II. REPORT DATE July 1976 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT II. REPORT II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT D</td> <td>AUTHOR(s)</td> <td>B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(8)</td>	Norman J. Abbott, Robert J. Coskren, James G. Donovan RFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ACORESS Pabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026 II. REPORT DATE July 1976 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT DATE JULY 1000 II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT II. REPORT II. REPORT DATE II. REPORT D	AUTHOR(s)	B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(8)
James G. Donovan PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Decham, Mass. 02026 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME A ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) I. SEQUENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) I. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified Istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; JI ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force N rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433. C. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the statest entered in Block 20, If different from Report) Same S. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr. webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a ring of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar insteany nylon.	Tames G. Donovan       FOOLS TO CONTRACT         READTIC RESEARCH Laboratories       10. PPOGRAW FLEMENT, PROJECT, TASK         Fabric Research Laboratories       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       1. REPORT DATE         JUUD Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       1. REPORT DATE         JULY 1976       1. NUMBER OF PAGES         JULY 1976       1. NUMBER OF PAGES         JULY 1976       1. SECURTY CLASS. (of this report)         Unclassified       1. SECURTY CLASS. (of this report)         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       1. SECURTY CLASS. (of this report)         istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only: test and evaluation; Jan         TY 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory. Nonnetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material         itranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, if different from Report)         ame         IPPLEMENTARY NOTES         ione         VWORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high specutiting.         STRIGUTION STA	Norman J. Abbott Robert J. Coskren	F33615-73-C-5034
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS     Fabric Research Laboratories     10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT. T     Fabric Research Laboratories     10. Project 7320, Task 732002     Dedham, Mass. 02026     Jedham, Mass. 02028     Jedham, Mass. 02028     Jedham, Mass. 0208     Jedham, Je	PROMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Fabric Research Laboratories fabric	James G. Donovan	
Fabric Research Laboratories 1000 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026       Project 7320, Task 732002         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified         I. CONTROLLING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Bistribution STATEMENT (of this Report)       Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Ji ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force M rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         Same         8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None         9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr: webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, inpact properties, high sp cutting.         0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s	Fabric Research Laboratories       APES A WORK UNIT NUMBERS         1000 Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Decham, Mass. 02026       12. REPORT DATE         July 1976       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         DINTROLLING OFFICE NAME A ADDRESS(// different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Unclassified       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Unclassified       16. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam         ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material         iranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, if different from Report)         ame         UPPLEMENTARY NOTES         ione         STRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by black number)         rarechute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics, rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spectuting.         STRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by black number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, meluding ribbons, tapes, we	PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PPOGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
1000 Providence Highway Dedham, Mass. 02026       Project 7320, Task 732002         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         1. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified         1. OSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Ji ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force M rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         Same         8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None         9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr. webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.         0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes ma	1000 Providence Highway       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       Project 7320, Task 732002         Dedham, Mass. 02026       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         Introlling office NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE July 1976         DENTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         DENTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       Schedule         istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam         ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matias Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Materia         iranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, If different from Report)         ame         IPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Ione         EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by black number)         Designs for Kevlar, Kevlar, Sewing threads, impact properties, high spectuting.         BSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by black number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, necluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric private and cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximate	Fabric Research Laboratories	APEA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Dedham, Mass. 02026         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS         1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS         1. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)         1. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         1. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)         1. S. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Ji ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force N rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         Same         8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         None         9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr, webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.         0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kev	Decham, Mass. 02026 INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS IL: REPORT DATE July 1976 I.: NUMBER OF PAGES 121 IS: SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified IS: DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Mati ials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material iranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433. STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, If different from Report) ame PPPLEMENTARY NOTES NORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by black number) PARACHUE materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec- utting. BISTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by black number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, meluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sam ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of Norm. 1473 EDITION of INOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	1000 Providence Highway	Project 7320, Task 732002
	INTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE         July 1976       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         121       121         DINITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         istribution statement (of this Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. FICATION/DOWNGRADING         stribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only: test and evaluation; Jam         ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material         irranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ame         UPPLEMENTARY NOTES         ione         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ame         UPPLEMENTARY NOTES         ione         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ame         UPPLEMENTARY NOTES         ione         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         areachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics (rebbings, ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric product number)         Designs for Kevl	Dedham, Mass. 02026	
A MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office)     IS NUMBER OF PAGES     121     IS SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)     Unclassified     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     SCHEDULE     SCHEDULE     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     SCHEDULE     Is. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD     I	In the second seco	1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
ADDRESS (If different from Controlling Office)     121     121     15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)     Unclassified     15. DECLASS FICATION/DOWNGRAD     Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Ji     ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force N     rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.     DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)     Same     Supplementary notes     None     *     AESTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)     parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr;     webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, inpact properties, high sp     cutting.     AESTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)     Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed,     including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/     much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead	121         DNITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Unclassified       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jamery 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material ranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ame         UPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Ione         STRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         varachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spectuting.         DESTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, neluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 anuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a san ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead cylon.		
<ol> <li>MONITORING AGENCY NAME &amp; ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)         <ol> <li>SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)</li></ol></li></ol>	DNITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) IS. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) IS. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) IS. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Mati ials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433. STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) ame IPPLEMENTARY NOTES None EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Darachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec utting. BSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sar ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of Nord. 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 15 OBSOLETE		191
Unclassified  15a DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRAD  6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Ji ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force M rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.  7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report)  Same  8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  None  9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.  9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a si nylon.	Unclassified  Isa DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING  STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Mat ials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material tranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.  STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) ame  PPPLEMENTARY NOTES None  EV WORDS (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec utting.  ESTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, neluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric raided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sam of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of uplon.	4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Of	fice) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
	15a DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)         istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam'ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Matials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Materials tranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.         STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, If different from Report)         ame         OPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Ione         EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics, rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spectuting.         STRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, necluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 is nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sam of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead or nylon.		Unclassified
SCHEDULE  C. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Distribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Ji ary 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force M rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Mater Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.  DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Same  SuppLEMENTARY NOTES None  KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr: webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.  ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a si nylon.	SCHEDULE STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) istribution limited to U. S. Government agencies only; test and evaluation; Jam ry 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Air Force Mat ials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division, Composite and Fibrous Material tranch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433. STRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, it different from Report) ame PPPLEMENTARY NOTES None  Stranch, Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics rebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec utting.  STRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, mcluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric raided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sam ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of Non.		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
<ul> <li>Same</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)</li> <li>parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabriwebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)</li> <li>Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabribraided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.</li> </ul>	ame pppLEMENTARY NOTES None EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics yebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec- utting. BSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of hylon.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc	, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433.
<ul> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr: webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.</li> </ul>	IONE         EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics vebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spectuting.         BSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a saving of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead on hylon.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ	e Base, Ohio 45433.
<ul> <li>None</li> <li>* KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>* ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.</li> </ul>	EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec- utting. ESTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of hylon.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 differ Same	e Base, Ohio 45433.
<ul> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.</li> </ul>	EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) barachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics vebbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spee utting.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	rent from Report)
<ul> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabry webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.</li> </ul>	EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) barachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spee utting. ESTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of nylon.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None	e Base, Ohio 45433.
<ul> <li>parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabr webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.</li></ul>	barachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics, webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high spec- utting.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None	n, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433.
<ul> <li>webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high sp cutting.</li> <li>ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.     </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threads, impact properties, high specutting.</li> <li>Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a same of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of anylon.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r</li> </ul>	aumber)
<ul> <li>ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.     </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sam ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead onlylon.</li> </ul>	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None	n, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433.
O. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits as ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.	Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of nylon.	rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Forc 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None	n, Composite and Fibrous Material e Base, Ohio 45433. ent from Report)
Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.	Designs for Kevlar parachute component materials have been developed, ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of hylon.	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force</li> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>*</li> <li>* KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> </ul>	n, Composite and Fibrous Material e Base, Ohio 45433. ent from Report) g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ids, impact properties, high speed
including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabr braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.	ncluding ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular webbings, canopy and pack fabric braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of hylon.	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r</li> </ul>	n, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433. ent from Report) g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ads, impact properties, high speed
braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/ much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.	praided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar materials weigh approximately 1/3 a nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of nylon.	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Fore</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstreet entered in Block 20, it differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block n Designs for Kevlar parachute component m</li> </ul>	n, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433. ent from Report) g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ids, impact properties, high speed
much as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a sing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead nylon.	nuch as corresponding nylon materials of the same strength. This permits a say ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead of hylon.	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block n Designs for Kevlar parachute component m including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular w</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>a. Composite and Fibrous Materials</li> <li>be Base, Ohio 45433.</li> <li>sent from Report)</li> <li>sent from Report)</li> <li>g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics</li> <li>ads, impact properties, high speed</li> <li>umber)</li> <li>aterials have been developed,</li> <li>ebbings, canopy and pack fabrics</li> </ul>
ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instea nylon.	ng of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachutes made from Kevlar instead on a second start of the second seco	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Fore</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block n Designs for Kevlar parachute component m including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular w braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar ma</li> </ul>	number) g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ids, impact properties, high speed umber) atterials have been developed, ebbings, canopy and pack fabrics iterials weigh approximately 1/3 a
nylon.	FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Fore</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, it differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block n Designs for Kevlar parachute component m including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular w braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar ma much as corresponding nylon materials of the s</li> </ul>	n, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433. ent from Report) (g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ids, impact properties, high speed umber) haterials have been developed, ebbings, canopy and pack fabrics iterials weigh approximately 1/3 a ame strength. This permits a sav
	FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Fore</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block n Designs for Kevlar parachute component m including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular w braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar ma much as corresponding nylon materials of the s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parachal</li> </ul>	n, Composite and Fibrous Materials e Base, Ohio 45433. ent from Report) (, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ads, impact properties, high speed umber) aterials have been developed, ebbings, canopy and pack fabrics tterials weigh approximately 1/3 a ame strength. This permits a sav chutes made from Kevlar instead of
	FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	<ul> <li>rials Laboratory, Nonmetallic Materials Division Branch, AFML/MBC, Wright-Patterson Air Force</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if differ Same</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>None</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r parachute materials, Kevlar, Kevlar processing webbings, ribbons, tapes, cords, sewing threa cutting.</li> <li>10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block n Designs for Kevlar parachute component m including ribbons, tapes, webbings, tubular w braided cords, and sewing threads. Kevlar ma much as corresponding nylon materials of the s ing of about 50% as the weight and bulk of parac nylon.</li> </ul>	number) g, narrow fabrics, canopy fabrics ads, impact properties, high speed number) mumber) aterials have been developed, ebbings, canopy and pack fabrics aterials weigh approximately 1/3 a ame strength. This permits a sav chutes made from Kevlar instead of

Contract of the second s

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
11	PROCESSING PROCEDURES Warp Preparation Weaving	1 9 9
III	STRENGTH TRANSLATION EFFICIENCY Structural Influences	11 13
IV	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	16
v	WOVEN NARROW FABRIC DESIGNS	18
VI	BROAD WOVEN FABRIC DESIGNS	18
VII	BRAIDED CORDS Basic Structure Braid Construction Stress-Strain Behavior	57 57 57 59
VIII	SEWING THREADS	59
IX	COMPARISON OF KEVLAR 29 AND KEVLAR 49	74
x	COMPARATIVE WEIGHTS OF KEVLAR AND NYLON WOVEN FABRIC	78
XI	IMPACT STUDIES OF KEVLAR STRUCTURES The Measuring System Experimental Procedure Data Reduction Discussion of Results , Laboratory Modifications to the Photographic Method for the Testing of Kevlar Structures Data Reduction Discussion of Results Conclusion and Recommendations	78 78 84 85 88 93 93 96 96
XII	PARACHUTE PACKS	100
XIII	CONCLUSIONS	101
	APPENDIX	102

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. 4. -

di al

Figur	<u>e</u>	Page
1	Effect of Twist on Tensile Strength of Kevlar 29 Yarns	2
2	Effect of Twist on Tensile Strength of Kevlar 29 Yarn	3
. 3	Effect of Twist on Tensile Strength of Kevlar 29 Yarns	4
4	Influence of Warp Crimp on Strength Translational	14
5	Yarn Deniers Needed for Various Fabric Strengths	19
6	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XII (FRL Sample No. 5034-76)	24
7	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-20)	25
8	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 2-In:h Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XIV (FRL Sample No. 5034-73)	26
9	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 2-Inch Wide Xavlar 29 Ribbon, Type XV (FRL Sample No. 5034-95)	27
10	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 2-Inch Wide Kevla ?9 Ribbon, Type XVI (FRL Sample No. 5034-94)	28
11	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1/2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-89)	29
12	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 9/16-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-113)	30
13	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type V (FRL Sample No. 5034-107)	31
14	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-1/2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type VII (FRL Sample No. 5034-106)	32
15	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-42)	33
16	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type II (FRL Sample No. 5034-65)	34
17	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-81)	35
18	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type V (FRL Sample No. 5034-63)	36

v

PREVIOUS PAGE IS BLANK C

Figure		Page
19	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type VI (FRL Sample No. 5034-32)	37
20	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type VII (FRL Sample No. 5034-93)	38
21	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type VIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-117)	39
22	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type X (FRL Sample No. 5034-55)	40
23	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XI (FRL Sample No. 5034-75)	41
24	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type XII (FRL Sample No. 5034-16)	42
25	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-74)	43
26	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 2-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XIV (FRL Sample No. 5034-15)	44
27	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XV (FRL Sample No. 5034-31)	45
28	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XVII (FRL Sample No. 5034-62)	46
29	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XVIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-61)	47
30	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1/2-Inch Wide Tubular Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-90)	48
31	Average Load-Elongation Curve for 9/16-Inch Wide Tubular Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type II (FRL Sample No. 5034-64)	49
32	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 5/8-Inch Wide Tubular Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type III (FRL Sample No. 5034-36)	50
33	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 3/4-Inch Wide Tubular Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-37)	51
34	Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-Inch Wide Tubular Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type J (FRL Sample No. 5034-35)	52

And A Library

e. . .

1.1.1.

Figure		Page
35	Load-Elongation Characteristics of Kevlar Canopy Fabric	56
36	Relationship Between Strength Translation Efficiency and Construction for Kevlar Coreless Braided Cords	58
37	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-21)	61
38	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type II (FRL Sample No. 5034-22)	62
39	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type III (FRL Sample No. 5034-39)	63
40	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-40)	64
41	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type V (FRL Sample No. 5034-23)	65
42	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type VI (FRL Sample No. 5034-24)	66
43	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type VII (FRL Sample No. 5034-25)	67
44	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type VIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-26)	68
45	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 49 Braided Cord, Type VIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-27)	69
46	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Typé IX (FRL Sample No. 5034-28)	70
47	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type XI (FRL Sample No. 5034-29)	71
48	Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type XI (FRL Sample No. 5034-41)	72
49	Load-Elongation Curves of Kevlar 29 Braided Cord After Cyclical Loading (FRL Sample No. 5034-26)	76
50	Load-Elongation Curves of Kevlar 49 Braided Cord After Cyclical Loading (FRL Sample No. 5034–27)	77

Fi	gure		Page
ñ	51	Strength: Weight Relationships for Nylon and Kevlar Narrow Fabric	79
	52	Schematic Diagram of Impact Testing Machine	80
	53	High Speed Framing Camera	82
h	54	Optical Schematic of Model 350 Dynafax Camera	83
	55	A Contact Print Showing the Actual Size of Each Film Frame Obtained with the Model 350 Dynafax High Speed Camera	86
	56	A Photograph Typical of the Many Recorded During Each Impact Test with the Model 350 Dynafax High Speed Camera.	86
	57	Work Sheet for Test 19	87
	58	Force and Strain versus Time, Measured During a Tensile Test of 1–Inch Wide Nylon Webbing, Type XVII, Impacted at 240 fps	89
	59	Force-Strain Diagrams for 1-Inch Wide Nylon Webbing, Type XVII, Tensile Tested at an Impact Velocity of 240 fps	90
	60	Typical Force-Strain Diagrams for 1-Inch Wide Nylon Webbing Type XVII, Tensile Tested at Two Widely Differing Strain Rates	92
	61	A Photograph Typical of the Many Recorded During each Impact Test	94
	62	Force and Strain versus Time for a Tensile Test of 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, FRL Sample No. 5034-93, Impacted at 150 fps	95
	63	Force-Strain Diagrams for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, FRL Sample No. 5034-93, Tensile Tested at Two Widely Differing Strain Rates	97
	64	One of the Two Missile Configurations Employed	105
	65	Typical Force-Strain Diagrams for the Three Loadlines Under Study, Obtained Using a Strain Rate of Approximately 10%/Min	106
	66	Enlargement of a Single Film Frame from Among the Many Obtained for Each Test in which the High Speed Camera was Employed	111
	67	Strain as a Function of Time During a Test of a 9000 lb Webbing Impacted by a Steel Hook Tine Simulator at a Velocity of 200 fps	112

Figure		Page
68	Change in Rupture Energy of 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadling at High Strain Rate (compared to Instron value) as a Function of Thick- ness and Material of the Impacting Edge	114
69	Change in Rupture Energy of 14000 lb, GR-16 Loadline at High Strain Rate (compared to Instron value) as a Function of Thick- ness and Material of the Impacting Edge	115
70	Strain as a Function of Time During a Test of 12000 lb , GR-14 Loadline Impacted by a 1/16-Inch Thick Stainless Steel Edge	116
71	Strain as a Function of Time During a Test of 12000 lb, GR-16 Loadline Impacted by a 1/2-Inch Thick Aluminum Projectile Nose	117
72	Rupture Ends of 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline after Impact with a 1/16-Inch Stainless Steel Edge at a Velocity of 500 fps	119
73	Rupture Ends of 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline after Impact with a 1/2-Inch Wide Blunt Missile Nose	119
74	SEM Photograph of Ruptured Fiber Ends from a 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline that was Impacted at 500 fps by a Blunt-Nosed Projectile	120
75	SEM Photograph of Ruptured Fiber Ends from a 12000 lb , GR-14 Loadline that was Impacted at 500 fps by a 1/16-Inch Stainless Steel Edge	120

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Cable</u>		Page
1	Optimization of Ply Twist for 400 Denier Kevlar 29 Yarn	5
2	Optimization of Ply Twist for 1000 Denier Kevlar 29 Yarn	6
3	Optimization of Ply Twist for 1500 Denier Kevlar 29 Yarn	7
4	Warp Yarn Twist	8
5	Effect of Various Weaving Operations on Strength of 1000 Denier Kevlar 29 Yarns	10
6	Strength Translation Efficiency	12
7	Warp Crimp Measurements	15
8	Effect of Picks per Inch on Breaking Strength in Plain Woven Structures	16
9	Yarn Choices for a Structural Strength of 2500 Pounds	17
10	Construction and Characteristics of Kevlar Ribbons	20
11	Construction and Characteristics of Kevlar Tapes	21
12	Construction and Characteristics of Kevlar Webbings	22
13	Construction and Characteristics of Kevlar Tubular Webbings	23
14	Effect of Construction on the Air Permeability of Kevlar Broad Woven Fabrics	54
15	Kevlar Broad Woven Fabric Constructions	55
16	Construction and Characteristics of Kevlar Coreless Braided Cords	60
17	Construction and Characteristics of Kevlar Sewing Threads	73
18	Properties of Zero Twist 1500 Denier Kevlar 29 and 1420 Denier Kevlar 49 Yarns	75
19	Braids made from Kevlar 29 and 49 Yarns	75
20	Effect of Load Cycling on the Tensile Properties of Kevlar 29 Yarn	75

1. C. S. S. S.

## LIST OF TABLES (Cont)

Table		Page
21	Summary of Tensile Data Obtained for One-Inch Wide, Type XVII Nylon Webbing	91
22	Rupture Energy of One-Inch Wide, 9000 lb Kevlar Webbing (FRL No. 5034-93) Tensile Tested at an Impact Velocity of 150 ft/sec	98
23	The Effect of Strain Rate on the Rupture Energy of Nylon and Kevlar 29 Webbings of Approximately Equal Tensile Strength	99
24	Missile Masses Required to Evaluate High Strength Nylon Suspension Lines at Various Impact Velocities	103
25	Tensile Properties of One-Inch Wide, 9000 lb Webbing Subjected to Several Modes and Rates of Strain	107
26	Tensile Properties of 12,000 lb GR-14 Loadline Subjected to Several Modes and Rates of Strain	108
27	Tensile Properties of 14,000 lb GR-16 Loadline Subjected to Several Modes and Rates of Strain	109

### I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main reasons for wanting to use Kevlar in parachutes is the potential it offers in reducing weight and bulk for a given strength, in relation to the commonly-used high ionacity nylon. This is because the tenacity of Kevlar fiber is 3 to 4 times that of high tenacity nylon fiber. However, it is apparent that maximum benefit can only be derived from this high tenacity if the fiber strength is translated efficiently into the strength of the structure.

The fabric designer, as well as the processor, cannot assume that a new fiber can be handled or used exactly like another fiber with which he is familiar. Particularly if the fiber has a totally new, hitherto unavailable set of properties, as Kevlar has, one can expect to have to learn how to handle it through yarn and fabric processing, and how to design structures which retain and reflect the desirable characteristics of the fiber, in this case its high tenacity.

This report describes the problems encountered in developing efficient designs for Kevlar parachute component materials, and the solutions arrived at in the design of some 60 structures in the form of tapes, ribbons, webbings, tubular webbings, braided cords, sewing threads and broad woven fabrics.

#### II. PROCESSING PROCEDURES

Because of Kevlar's peculiar tensile characteristics, particularly its low rupture elongation and high modulus, and its sensitivity to abrasive damage, it is much more susceptible to damage during all phases of processing than a fiber like nylon. A study was made of the effect of several critical processing steps on yarn or fabric strength, with a view to optimizing conditions in each of those steps for maximum strength retention.

#### Yarn Twist

#### 1. Singles Yarn Twist Optimization

Prior to conducting any fabric weaving studies the relation between yarn twist and strength was determined for each of four commercially available deniers of Kevlar 29 yarn, as well as one denier available to this program in experimental quantities.

The data from the singles yarn twist studies are presented graphically in Figures 1, 2 and 3. Figure 1 shows the breaking tenacity in grams per denier for each of the five yarn sizes as a function of Twist Multiplier.\* Optimum values range from 1.0 for the 200 denier yarn to 1.75 to 2.0 for the 100 and 1000 deniers. The strength of the 400 and 1500 yarns is maximized at a twist multiplier of 1.25 to 1.50.

\*Twist Multiplier (TM) =  $\frac{\text{tpi }\sqrt{\text{denier}}}{73}$ , a parameter normalized with respect to yarn diameter. Thus yarns having the same twist multiplier contain fibers lying at approximately the same helix angle.



State State







Figure 3. Effect of Twist on Tensile Strength of Kevlar 29 Yarns

Figure 2 is a plot of yarn tenacity versus actual turns of twist inserted into each of the five yarns. Optimum values are found to be 10 to 12 turns per inch in the 100 denier, 4 to 6 turns per inch for the 200 and 400 deniers, 3 to 5 for the 1000 denier and 2.5 to 3.5 for the 1500 denier.

Figure 3 shows how the absolute breaking strength of each yarn size varies with twist. Optimizing the twist raises the breaking strength of the 100 and 200 denier yarns approximately ten percent while the 400, 1000 and 1500 denier yarn strengths are raised by approximately twenty percent.

## 2. Optimization of Ply Twist

Many of the planned Kevlar structures required the use of plied yarn in order to attain the desired ultimate tensile strength. A study was made, therefore, to determine the relation between twist and strength in plied yarns. The results are given in Tables 1, 2 and 3.

#### TABLE 1

## OPTIMIZATION OF PLY TWIST FOR 400 DENIER KEVLAR 29 YARN

	Tenacity (gpd),
	Made with Zero
Ply/Twist	Twist in Singles
2/1.798	24.4
2/2.088	24.7
2/2.58	24.5
2/3.035	24.0
3/1.798	23,9
3/2.08S	24.0
3/2.58	24.4
3/3.038	24.3
4/1.79S	23.4
4/2.08S	23.7
4/2.58	24.1
4/3.038	23.2
5/1.79S	23.4
5/2.08S	23.9
5/2.58	24.5
5/3.038	23.5

time and a start the

Ĩ

2.

## OPTIMIZATION OF PLY TWIST FOR 1000 DENIER KEVLAR 29 YARN

	Tenacity (gpd),	
	Made with Zero	Made with 5Z
Ply/Twist	Twist in Singles	tpi in Singles
3/1.0S	20.4	20.1
2/1.79S	20.7	20.7
2/2.08S	21.9	22.1
2/2.58	21.7	22.0
2/3.035	21.1	21.9
3/1.0S	20.4	21.1
3/1.79S	21.6	21.2
3/2.085	21.6	21.2
3/2.5S	20.8	20.9
3/3.035	20.0	21.1
4/1.0Z	22.6	
4/1.79Z	22.6	
4/2.08Z	22.6	
6/1.05	22.5	
6/1.795	21 7	
6/2.085	20.9	
6/2.58	19.5	
6/3 035	17 7	
6/4.98	13.2	
-,		

、日本語を

a section of the section

## OPTIMIZATION OF PLY TWIST FOR 1500 DENIER KEVLAR 29 YARN

		Tenacity	(gpd),
		Made with Zero	Made with 5Z
	Ply/Twist	Twist in Singles	tpi in Singles
		<u></u>	<u> </u>
	2/1.0S	20.3	
	2/1.798	20.9	
	2/2.088	18.5	Spine Mark State Spine
	3/1.0S	17.7	17.2
	3/1.798	18.4	17.0
	3/2.085	18.4	16.8
	A/1 00	20.7	
	4/1.05	20.7	
	4/1.195	10.0	
	4/2.085	18.8	
	6/1.0S	20.7	
	6/1.79S	19.1	
	6/2.08S	18.6	
	0/1 707 - 1	00 10 0	
x	2/1.79Z X 1.	05 19.9	
X	2/1.79Z x 1.	79S 19.5	600 das 100 das
	8/1.05	20.1	
	8/1.795	16.9	
	8/2.085	15.3	

3

Two methods are possible for ply twisting. The first involves twisting the singles to its optimum value and then combining two or more of the yarns by inserting ply twist in the opposite direction. A second method is merely to combine two or more untwisted singles yarns by twisting them together at a relatively low level. Both methods have been evaluated selectively for both 1000 and 1500 denier Kevlar 29 yarns and there appears to be no significant difference between the two. The second method is preferable, therefore, since it involves only one twisting operation. More importantly, there does not appear to be any significant loss in strength between the singles and plied yarns. In general, the plied yarns made with the 400 denier singles have a breaking tenacity of 24 grams per denier, while the plied yarns made from the 1000 and 1500 denier yarn are ten to twenty percent weaker than this. This result indicates that wherever maximum emphasis is placed on strength to weight, 400 denier parent yarn should be used. If cost is more important than strength-to-weight ratio, however, allowance must be made for the fact that 400 denier yarn costs 50 to 100% more per pound than 1000 or 1500 denier yarn.

## 3. Yarn Twist Recommendations

Because twist has been found to have an unusually high influence on yarn strength, significant benefits will be derived from using the optimum twist for all load-bearing yarns. Accordingly, all of the narrow fabrics which were designed in this program used optimum twist yarns in the warp direction. The draft tentative Military Specifications which resulted from our work all contained the following table giving optimum levels of warp yarn twist (see Table 4).

## TABLE 4

## WARP YARN TWIST

Singles		
Yarn		Ply Twist
Denier	Ply	(turns/inch)
200	1	6.0
	3	4.0
400	1	5.0
	2	2.5
	3	2.5
	4	2.5
1000	1	4.0
	. 2	2.1
	3	1.8
	4	1.6
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5	1.4
	6	1.0
1500	1	3.0
	2	1.8
Automatical and a second	3	1.6
	4	1.2
	5	1.0
	6	1.0
	8	0.8

Note: In all cases the singles yarn contains producer's twist.

These draft specifications also give some guidance to handling the yarn through twisting and winding operations to minimize damage, as follows:

- (a) Twisting precautions
  - (i) Feed roll speed should be as follows for various Kevlar yarns and twist levels:

Yarn Denier	<u>Twist (tpi)</u>	(yards per min)
200	5.0	70
400	4.0	90
1000	4.0	60
1500 & greater	1.8	20

(ii) Slightly heavier travelers than those used for nylon yarn should be used.

- (iii) High humidity should be maintained to minimize electrostatic charge between filaments.
- (b) Winding Precautions "Anti-wear" wide tension gates (Leesona Corporation), or their equivalent, should be used.

#### Warp Preparation

Kevlar yarns containing the recommended amount of twist can be woven into narrow fabrics without the addition of size. Thus, yarns may be drawn from the creel and wound directly on a warp beam. Because of Kevlar's low elongation, more than the usual degree of care is required to keep the tension uniform across the warp. Good dead-weight disc type tensioners can be used on the creel, provided the band of yarn is not allowed to relax until it is wound on the beam. All surfaces which the yarn contacts must be rounded or flat, and as smooth as possible to minimize snagging. The beam on which the warp yarns are wound must not be more than one half inch wider than the finished width of the woven fabric, or uneven edge yarn tensions will result.

## Weaving

In the loom, the warp yarns contact many surfaces from the warp beam to take-up roll. Some of these are stationary, and some, such as the heddles and the reeds, move. All stationary surfaces must be smooth and contain no sharp edges. Take-up rolls should be covered with the smoothest surface which can be tolerated. An experiment was conducted to determine the effect of some variables in the heddle and reed surfaces on yarn strength.

As a means of determining the extent of damage incurred by the Kevlar yarn during the weaving process, an experiment was conducted whereby sections of warp yarns were withdrawn at various stages. The action of three types of reeds and heedles was studied:

- 1. Stainless steel reed and heddles.
- 2. Stainless steel reed and Teflon coated heddles.
- 3. Teflon coated reed and heddles.

Approximately thirty out of forty warp yarns in a given section were tested, 10 from the area near each edge and 10 from the middle of the warp. The tensile data obtained are shown in Table 5.

#### TABLE 5

## EFFECT OF VARIOUS WEAVING OPERATIONS ON STRENGTH OF 1000 DENIER KEVLAR 29 YARNS

		Tensile S	Strength Lo	ss (%)
		Left Edge	Middle	Right Edge
a.	After warping	0	0	0
b.	After Teflon heddles	0	- 2	+ 1
c.	After (b) and regular reed	- 6	- 5	- 6
d.	After (c) + shuttle moving	- 9	- 7	- 7
e.	After regular heddles	- 4	- 4	- 7
f.	After (e) + regular reed	-12	-13	-16
g.	After (f) + shuttle moving	-25	-15	-18
h.	After Teflon heddles, Teflon reed + shuttle moving	-21	-16	-12

It is apparent that the use of Teflon coated heddles reduces yarn damage significantly, but the Teflon coated reed damaged the yarn. The reason for damage in the reed was found to be due to the abrasion of the yarn against the reed wires which roughened the Teflon surface to the point where yarn damage occurred. We concluded from this study that all of our weaving would be done with Teflon coated heddles and a regular, rust-free reed. This recommendation is also included in the draft specifications.

Included in the draft specifications are also guidelines for adjusting the loom, based on our experience in weaving Kevlar. These are:

1. Harness times should be 2" before front center for 1/2" wide ribbon when using 400 denier yarn and 3/4" before front center for 1" and wider ribbons.

- 2. Warp line should be level.
- 3. Loom (s) selected for weaving Kevlar 29 yarns must be in good running condition with minimum wear or "play" in various mechanical components. Loom should be operated at reduced speed (90 to 100 picks per minute) when weaving 200 or 400 denier yarn into narrow ribbon.
- 4. Due to the low extensibility of Kevlar 29 yarn it is important that uniform yarn length be maintained at all times across the entire set of warp yarns.
- 5. High humidity should be maintained during weaving.

## **III. STRENGTH TRANSLATION EFFICIENCY**

The success with which fiber strength is translated into the strength of the structure is usually indicated by a quantity known as the strength translation efficiency. This is the ratio of structure strength to the accumulated strengths of the components making up the structure, and is commonly expressed as a percentage. The value of this percentage will depend, of course, upon the base from which it is calculated, that is, the component whose strength is taken to represent the ultimate achievable.

This is illustrated in the example given in Table 6, in which three different reference bases have been used. は、19月1日の1月1日には、19月1日の19

- (a) the strength of the individual fibers,
- (b) the strength of the yarn as received from the manufacturer, containing producer's twist (nominally zero),
- (c) the strength of the twisted yarn used in the load-bearing direction of the structure in question.

The effect of these bases on the value of the strength translation efficiency is apparent in the last column of the table.

## STRENGTH TRANSLATION EFFICIENCY

## Kevlar webbing, 1-3/4", 2500 lb nominal 2620 lb actual

Warp:1000 denier, 4 tpi, 71 total endsFilling:1000 denier, 0 tpi, 22 picks per inchFiber:1-1/2 denier

A 1000 denier yarn contains 666 fibers in its cross section.

		Estimated	Strength
		Webbing	Translation
Tenacity	Unit Strength	Strength	Efficiency
(gpd)	(lb)	(lb)	(%)
26.9	0.089	4210	62
17.8	39.2	2780	94
22.5	49.6	3520	74
	Tenacity (gpd) 26.9 17.8 22.5	TenacityUnit Strength (lb)26.90.08917.839.222.549.6	Estimated           Webbing           Tenacity         Unit Strength           (gpd)         (lb)         (lb)           26.9         0.089         4210           17.8         39.2         2780           22.5         49.6         3520

The choice of the base to be used in calculating strength translation efficiency is an arbitrary one, but it is clear that if comparisons between structures are to be meaningful, the same base must always be used. In all of our work we have chosen the strength of the twisted load-bearing varns as the reference in calculating strength translation efficiency. We believe that this represents best the influence of the weaving operation and the weave design on the strength of the structure. Efficiencies as low as 40 to 50% were encountered in our early attempts to design and weave efficient Kevlar structures, but during the course of the work we learned to obtain efficiencies in the range of 70 to 90%, relative to the strength of the twisted yarn used in the warp, with reasonable consistency. It has never been completely clear, however, how efficient structures can be designed with confidence. Minimum damage to the yarns during warp preparation in the loom is, of course, necessary and, as already described, we learned how to handle the yarns through these operations so as to virtually eliminate such damage. The construction of the fabric, however, has proven to be critical, particularly with respect to the number of picks per inch used. Often the addition of only one pick per inch will cause the strength to drop 10% or more.

1. 202 D 20

The availability of some 50 samples of woven Kevlar webbings, tapes and ribbons afforded us an opportunity to learn more about the influences of changes in structural geometry on strength translation efficiency. Some preliminary cross sections indicated that there were significant differences in warp crimp level between fabrics, and suggested that this might be an important parameter. It seemed likely, however, that differences in warp crimp should be considered in relation to the denier of warp and filling yarns. The same absolute level of crimp in a 400 denier warp yarn, for example, might not have the same influence on strength translation efficiency as it would have in 1500 denier warp yarn. Out of the samples currently available, eight comparisons were selected in each of which warp and filling yarn deniers were kept constant. Warp yarn crimp was determined for each of these materials by marking a 10" length on the fabric, and then removing 5 warp yarns, straightening them by application of a low tension, and measuring the distance between the gauge marks on the straightened yarn. The crimp is then expressed as

$$\operatorname{crimp} = \frac{\frac{\ell_{s} - \ell_{f}}{\ell_{f}} \times 100\%$$

where

 $l_{a}$  is the straightened distance between the gauge marks,

 $\ell_{e}$  is the distance between gauge marks in the fabric = 10".

In Table 7, the entries are grouped by paired or three-way comparisons, and pertinent data given for each of the materials studied. In each case, the variability between the five individual measurements was relatively small, the maximum standard error being only 0.3%.

A plot of all the data is given in Figure 4 which makes it clear that a general trend exists in which decreases in warp crimp lead to increases in strength translation efficiency. There is, however, a significant scatter outside the area delineated by the remainder of the data. An examination of the selected comparisons in Table 7 shows clear evidence of the consistent trend existing between changes in warp crimp and changes in strength translation efficiency for the paired comparisons, except for two instances. Samples 5034-19 and -75, for example, apparently show an inverse trend. However, neither the translation efficiencies or warp crimps are significantly different from one another. The other case, which is the comparison between 5034-34 and -63, shows a significant difference in efficiency, but no difference in crimp. It is possible that additional measurements would clarify this apparent inconsistency.

Additional analysis of this relationship would be interesting, particularly to attempt to determine why apparently small changes in warp crimp can have a significant effect on strength translation efficiency. This was not done in the present program, however, for even the relatively small amount of data already obtained makes it clear that, in Kevlar woven narrow fabric structures, warp crimp should be kept at the lowest acceptable level to ensure that optimum strength translation efficiencies are achieved.

#### Structural Influences

The procedure used in the laboratory to develop efficient Kevlar structures was to set up a short (10-yard) warp containing the number of yarns of a suitable denier which would be needed to provide the desired strength, using 70% strength translation efficiency as the estimate of what should be achieved.





### WARP CRIMP MEASUREMENTS

FRL				Er	ıds	Picks		Effi-	Warp
Sample	Yarn D	enier	Width	Total	per	per	Strength	ciency	Crimp
No. 5034-	Warp	Fill	(inch)	No.	Inch	Inch	(lb)	( <sup>9</sup> / <sub>0</sub> )	(%)
42	400	400	1/2	39	78	23	590	69	3 3
55	400	400	1-3/4	104	59	24	1390	62	4 9
56	400	1000	2	148	74	22	2030	61	4.4
76	1000	1000	2	76	38	19	2300	61	5.0
90	1000	1000	1/2	39	78	20	1550	80	3.4
38	1000	1000	9/16T*	45	80	17	1820	83	1.7
64	1000	1000	9/16T*	43	76	17	1600	75	2.3
19	1000	1000	1-3/4	71	41	22	2620	74	3.7
75	1000	1000	1-3/4	84	48	16	2620	70	3.4
36	1500	1000	5/8 <b>T</b> *	39	31	14	2180	83	1.2
37	1500	1500	3/4T*	59	39	14	3020	79	2.3
35	1500	1500	$1T^*$	81	40	14	3950	75	3.0
34	1500/2	1000	1	47	47	11	4900	74	3.3
63	1500/2	1000	1	39	39	12	4780	80	3.3
65	1500/2	1500	3/4	31	41	12	3200	84	4.4
74	1500/2	1500	1-3/4	50	67	17	4850	69	4.9
61	1500/3	1500	1-3/4	137	78	9	22700	89	1.0
62	1500/3	1500	1-3/4	121	69	12	20400	68	4.3

\*Tubular weave.

Various filling yarns, at various levels of picks per inch were then woven into this warp and it was found that the strength of the woven material is very critically dependent upon the picks per inch. Maximum strength is achieved with a structure woven so loosely as to be unusable. As the picks per inch are increased, a critical degree of packing is reached where the strength falls rapidly with each additional pick per inch. Unfortunately, the critical packing giving maximum strength is usually still too loose to be usable, so in most cases a compromise must be reached between tightness of weave and strength, neither one being at the optimum level.

Some results indicating this behavior are given in Table 8, which indicates that a change of as little as one or two picks per inch can alter the strength by as much as 25%.

Width	Warp Yarn		Filling Yarn	Picks	Strength
(inch)	Denier	Total Ends	Denier	per Inch	<u>(lb)</u>
2	200	72	200	58	430
				56	525
1	400	96	400	34	910
				32	1050
				30	1110
1-3/4	1500	140	1500	16	4800
				14	6075
				12	6715
1-3/4	1500/2	52	1500	17	4900
				15	5400
		•		13	5650
1	1500/3	76	1500	9	8600
				8	10800

## EFFECT OF PICKS PER INCH ON BREAKING STRENGTH IN PLAIN WOVEN STRUCTURES

During this experimentation the effect of weave was also studied, for twill or satin weaves which have relatively few warp/filling intersections per unit of area might be expected to show better strength translation efficiency than a plain weave, which has the maximum number of intersections per unit area.

It was found that, because of the need to reduce picks per inch as much as possible to maintain a reasonable strength translation efficiency, a more stable structure could be made using a plain weave rather than the more usual herringbone twill. Experiments with various weaves indicated that the best compromise between strength translation efficiency and firmness of structure could be obtained with the plain weave. This was adopted, therefore, for all narrow fabric designs except for those in which the strength/width relationship imposed very dense warp yarn packing, when a herringbone twill or a double-layer weave was used.

#### IV. DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

The critical characteristics which dictate the design of webbings, ribbons and tapes used in parachute applications are width and strength. The strength of a narrow fabric is determined by the sum of the strengths of the lengthwise yarns used in its manufacture, modified by the strength translation efficiency of the structure, as discussed previously. These lengthwise yarns must be constrained by the weaving operation to lie within the desired width. Depending upon their size and number in relation to this width, the resultant packing may be loose, tight or even stacked into two, three or four levels. Kevlar yarns are available only in 200, 400, 1000 and 1500 denier.\* Within these constraints, and assuming a 70% strength translation efficiency, it is clear that any desired strength, for example 5000 lb, can be obtained in the way shown in Table 9.

#### TABLE 9

### YARN CHOICES FOR A STRUCTURAL STRENGTH OF 2500 POUNDS

		Effective	٦		Width of a
	Twisted	Yarn	Number	Twisted	Contiguous
	Yarn	Strength	Required	Yarn	Array of
Yarn	Strength	(Strength x	for 5000	Diameter	n Yarns
Denier	<u>(lb)</u>	0.7 lb)	lb (n)	(inch)	(inch)
200	10.7	7.5	333	0.0063	2.1
400	22.4	15	167	0.0119	2.0
1000	49.6	35	71	0.0169	1.2
1500	66.5	46	54	0.0264	1.4

The numbers in the right hand column of the table show clearly the degree of lateral packing which must occur in relation to the yarn denier chosen, when a width requirement is added to the strength requirement. For example, a 2", 2500 lb ribbon made from 1000 or 1500 denier yarns would be too open to be usable. On the other hand, a 1", 2500 lb webbing might be made from 200 or 400 denier warp yarns, though this would involve tight lateral packing so that either the cross section of the yarns would have to be distorted or a degree of stacking into a second longitudinal layer of warp yarns would have to take place. These changes from a simple structure would result in a tighter, firmer structure, but their effect on strength translation efficiency could only be determined by a weaving trial. In fact, many of the structures selected for the draft specifications involved this kind of tight warp packing without unacceptably low strength translation efficiencies.

In addition to the structural factors discussed above, another consideration entered into our choice of yarn denier for any given structure. The current price of Kevlar yarns varies with the denier in the following manner\*\*: 200 denier, \$21.50/ lb; 400 denier, \$14.50/lb; 1000 denier, \$9.50/lb; 1500 denier, \$7.50/lb. In all of our work, we adopted the attitude that when a choice was to be made between two yarn deniers for a structure, preference was given to the higher denier because it was cheaper. Clearly, this does not necessarily result in structures of optimum firmness of packing, and in a few cases, particularly in the ribbons, it is probable that additional use requirements not considered in the work described herein should be introduced, which could alter the recommended construction to one which might be heavier and more expensive but, at the same time, perform better in service.

<sup>\*</sup>For this program a small amount of experimental 100 denier yarn was available.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Prices as of June, 1976.

A plot of the actual structures made in the work being described herein is shown in Figure 5. The two curved lines represent the envelopes of acceptable fabric strengths achievable for the various yarn deniers. It is clear from the shape of these curves that at the higher strengths, less choice of warp yarn denier is available than at the lower strengths, where acceptable structures can be made from two or even three different warp yarn deniers. These structures will differ, of course, in other characteristics such as thickness, tightness of weave, deformability and air permeability. The choice between available warp yarn deniers will have to be made, therefore, on the basis of the importance of these other characteristics.

## V. WOVEN NARROW FABRIC DESIGNS

のののないでは、4日ののから、4日の

The designs which were considered to be the best compromise between strength translation efficiency and structural firmness are given in Tables 10 through 13 for ribbons, tapes, webbings and tubular webbings. Stress-strain curves for each of these structures are given in Figures 6 through 34.

Ratios of the weights of these materials to their nylon counterparts which have the same strength and width average 0.36, with a low of 0.26 and a high of 0.46. In general, the ribbons and tubular webbings are somewhat heavier in relation to their nylon counterparts (weight ratio 0.40) than are the tapes and webbings (0.34). Limited experience with the ribbons in parachute drop tests indicate that the structures designed as indicated in Table 10 are in some cases too openly woven to provide adequate joint strength, and in some cases to retain their structural integrity during deployment. These structures may have to be woven tighter, with a corresponding slight weight increase, in order to perform well in service. Experience with the tapes and webbings has indicated that they appear to perform well.

#### VI. BROAD WOVEN FABRIC DESIGNS

The most important characteristics of broad woven fabrics for most parachute applications are strength and air permeability. These are the characteristics which determined the design of the fabrics which were made from Kevlar.

An unexpected problem arose in the early experimental work. Because of the fact that the cross section of Kevlar yarns is shaped like a flat ribbon, permeabilities were very low at normal weaving densities. Thus, it became easy to design a low porosity pack fabric, but much more difficult to obtain the degree of openness needed in a canopy fabric without excessive sleaziness. Indeed, the pack fabrics which were designed tended to be somewhat sleazier than their nylon counterparts because they did not need to be woven as tightly. Thus, a new set of compromises is needed in designing Kevlar broad woven fabrics, which were not worked out in a completely satisfactory way within the scope of the contract under which this work was carried out. As a result, no draft tentative military specifications for pack or canopy fabrics were written. The following outlines some of the approaches which were taken in a study of the influence of some design variables.



A STATE OF

Figure 5. Yarn Deniers Needed for Various Fabric Strengths

CONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF KEVLAR RIBBONS

		picks	/inch	46	35	19	16	15	12	17	
	Filling		den/ply/twist	200/1/0	1000/1/0	1000/1/0	1000/1/0	1500/1/0	1500/1/0	1500/1/0	
		total	ends	80	42	76	96	92	60	64	
	Warp	-	den/ply/twist	200/1/6.0	1000/1/4.0	1000/1/4.0	1000/1/4.0	1500/1/1.8	1500/2/1.8	1500/3/1.8	
			Weave	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	$2x2 HBT^2$	
		Thickness	(inch)	3	3	0.017	0.020	0.026	0.032	0.045	
		ht	yd/lb	°	6	37.3	33.0	23.5	19.2	12.4	
		Weig	oz/yd	33	33	0.43	0.49	0.68	0.83	1.29	
		Elong	(%)	3	3	4.4	4.1	5.2	4.2	3.9	
	Translation	Efficiency (%)		57	20	61	77	66	74	78	
trength		nge	High	520	1520	2440	3780	4825	6620	9450	
S		Ra	Low	450	1430	2060	3300	4030	5950	9050	
		Mean	(ID)	485	1455	2300	3650	4530	6220	9290	
		Width	(inch)	2	2	Ci	0	7	01	2	
FRL	Sample	No.	5034-	-	82	76	20	73	95	94	
Draft	Spec	Type	No.	IX	x	IIX	IIIX	XIV	XV	XVI	

20

1. When a plied yarn is used, this is the value of the ply twist. Singles twist is always zero, or producer's twist.

2. 2 x 2 herringbone twill, center reversal.

3. Not determined.

TABLE 11

X

ないである

CONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF KEVLAR TAPES

21

2. Not determined.

CONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF KEVLAR WEBBINGS

Filling	picks en/ply/twist <sup>1</sup> /inch	400/1/0 22	1500/1/0 12	1500/1/0 11	1500/1/0 14	1000/1/0 12	1500/1/0 12	1500/1/0 8	1500/1/0 9	1000/1/0 26	1000/1/0 23	1000/1/0 16	1000/1/0 15	1500/1/0 17	1500/1/0 11	1000/1/0 10	1500/1/0 12	1500/1/0 12	1500/1/0 9	1000/1/0 24
	total ends c	39	31	41	24	39	49	76	68	60	103	84	55	50	140	88	127	121	137	200
Warp	en/ply/twist1	400/1/5.0	1500/2/1.8	1500/2/1.8	1500/2/1.8	1500/2/1.8	1500/3/1.8	1500/3/1.8	1500/3/1.8	400/1/5.0	400/1/5.0	1000/1/4.0	1000/2/2.1	1500/2/1.8	1500/1/3.0	1500/2/1.8	1500/2/1.8	1500/3/1.8	1500/3/1.8	400/1/5.0
	Weave	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	$2x2 HBT^2$	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain 🧯	plain	plain	$2x2 HBT^2$	double plain	double plain	plain
	Thickness (inch)	0.012	0.040	0.044	0.024	0.037	0.065	0.094	0.105	0.013	0.014	0,019	0.021	0.030	0.034	0.043	0.064	0.079	0.092	0.016
	ht yd/lb	210.0	40.0	31.0	46.5	33.6	17.7	11.7	10.8	75.0	52.0	37.7	31.9	21.7	17.7	14.7	10.0	7.4	6.8	26.9
	Weig oz/yd	0.075	0.40	0.52	0.34	0.48	0.90	1.37	1.48	0.21	0.31	0,42	0.50	0.74	0.90	1.09	Ĩ.60	2.16	2.36	0.59
	Elong (%)	2.8	3.8	ຕ 	3.5	4.3	4.1	4.3	°	4.8	4.2	4.8	3.8	5.1	5.6	5.9	3	°	3.3	ຕ 
Translation	Efficiency (%)	68	84	85	77	80	75	73	84	65	61	70	80	69	76	73	66	85	89	°
trength	nge High	622	3275	5000	2750	4550	7000	10500	14200	890	1595	3030	4480	5120	7200	9180	ຕ 	19500	23360	۳ 
	Ra	562	3140	4800	2475	4300	6390	10100	13200	746	1310	2660	4200	4730	6900	8920	°	16500	21950	°
	Mean (1b)	• 590	3210	4930	2610	4380	6780	10260	13600	870	1400	2910	4370	4850	7100	0006	11800	18000	22600	ຕ 
	Width (inch)	1/2	3/4	3/4	1	1	1	1	1	1 - 1/4	1 - 3/4	1 - 3/4	1 - 3/4	1 - 3/4	1 - 3/4	1 - 3/4	1-3/4	1 - 3/4	1 - 3/4	e
FRL Sample	No. 5034-	42	65	99	81	63	32	93	119	117	55	75	16	74	15	31	108	62	61	116
Spec 5	Type No.	I	п	ш	IV	Λ	ΙΛ	ΠЛ	ШЛ	X	x	IX	ПΧ	ШХ	XIV	XV	XVI	ПЛХ	XVIII	XIX

22

When a plied yarn is used, this is the value of the ply twist. Singles twist is always zero, or producer's twist. |\_:

a second second

a instant is

2. 2 x 2 herringbone twill, center reversal.

3. Not determined.

CONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF KEVLAR TUBULAR WEBBINGS

		picks	/inch	40	34	27	27	27
	Filling	-	den/ply/twist <sup>1</sup>	1000/1/0	1000/1/0	1000/1/0	1500/1/0	1500/1/0
Maru		total	ends	39	45	41	59	81
	Warp	-	den/ply/twist <sup>1</sup>	1000/1/4.0	1000/1/4.0	1500/1/1.8	1500/1/1.8	1500/1/1.8
			Weave	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain
		Thickness	(inch)	0.034	0.032	0.038	0.045	0.046
		ht	yd/lb	71.0	70.4	55.8	36.4	26.0
		Weit	oz/yd	0.25	0.23	0.29	0.44	0.62
		Elong	(%)	3.6	3.6	2.9	3.3	4.0
	Translation	Efficiency	(%)	78	72	80	77	73
trength		nge	High	1520	1650	2320	3100	4030
S		Ra	Low	1475	1530	2050	2850	3800
		Mean	(qp)	1505	1600	2180	3020	3950
		Width	(inch)	1/2	9/16	9/16	3/4	1
FRL	Sample	No.	5034-	06	64	36	37	35
Draft	Spec	Type	No.	I	II	Ш	Ν	Λ

1. When a plied yarn is used, this is the value of the ply twist. Singles twist is always zero, or producer's twist.



Figure 6. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XII (FRL Sample No. 5034-76)


Elongation (%)

Figure 7. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-20)



Elongation (%)

Figure 8. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XIV (FRL Sample No. 5034-73)

Ser of sect



Figure 9. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XV (FRL Sample No. 5034-95)



Figure 10. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Ribbon, Type XVI (FRL Sample No. 5034-94)

t.



and the second second second

Figure 11. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1/2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-89)



.

A REAL PARTY OF A REAL PARTY OF

Elongation (%)

Figure 12. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 9/16-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-113)

30

A CALL AND A CALL



Figure 13. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type V (FRL Sample No. 5034-107)



Figure 14. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-1/2-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Tape, Type VII (FRL Sample No. 5034-106)



Figure 15. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-42)



Figure 16. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type II (FRL Sample No. 5034-65)



Figure 17. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-81)



「「「「「「「「」」」」

the second second second

「日本の」という

Elongation (%)

Figure 18. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type V (FRL Sample No. 5034-63)

Figure 19. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type VI (FRL Sample No. 5034-32)



Figure 20. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type VII (FRL Sample No. 5034-93)



Figure 21. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type VIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-117)



And And

added a state of the state of t

Figure 22. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar Webbing, Type X (FRL Sample No. 5034-55)



Figure 23. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XI (FRL Sample No. 5034-75)







いいいいで、「おいたいない」

Elongation (%)

Figure 25. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4-Inch Wide Kewlar 29 Webbing, Type XIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-74)





Figure 27. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4 Inch Wide Kevler 29 Webbing, Type XV (FRL Sample No. 5034-31)



Figure 28. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4 Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XVII (FRL Sample No. 5034-62)



とない、「「たん」

Figure 29. Average Load-Elongation Diagram for 1-3/4 Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type XVIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-61)

Elongation (%)

Figure 30. Average Load-Elongation Curve for 1/2-Inch Wide Tubular Kevlar 29 Webbing, Type I (FRL Sample No. 5034-90)





語に見たいたというという

the formation of the second seco







Load (Ib)

Elongation (%)



We have found that, although narrow fabrics can be woven successfully from an unsized Kevlar warp, the weaving of broad fabrics is improved significantly by the use of a size. Most of our weaving was done with warp yarns sized with 2% polyvinyl alcohol. Determination of the number of ends and picks per inch of a given yarn denier needed to obtain a prescribed air permeability, then, involved weaving a short length of some selected construction, removing it from the loom, scouring it, measuring the air permeability and then, if the permeability was not correct, going back to the loom to readjust the construction to get closer to the target value. If the permeability of the first sample is too low, it can be raised by decreasing the number of picks per inch, by increasing the filling yarn twist, or by changing the fabric weave. In other fibers, the air permeability of the fabric can be expected to respond to such constructional changes in a fairly predictable manner. In Kevlar, however, the relationship is less predictable, as is illustrated by the values given in Table 14.

In the first group of fabrics, the end and pick counts were changed systematically. Plain woven fabrics 87, 86, 85 and 84, for example, show the effect of reducing pick count at constant ends per inch from 58 to 45. This increased the air permeability, when the warp yarns still carried size, from 6.4 to  $25.7 \text{ ft}^3/\text{ft}^2/\text{min}$ , consistent with expectations. When the size was removed by scouring, however, the warp yarns flattened out to such an extent that the permeability was low  $(5.7 \text{ ft}^3/\text{ft}^2/\text{min})$  and, more importantly, virtually unaffected by this large reduction in picks per inch. When the ends per inch were reduced, as in fabrics 88A, B and C, so that the fabric was more open, a relatively small reduction in picks per inch from 48 to 44 and then to 40 had a significant effect on air permeability, even in the scoured state.

The effect of changes in yarn twist is illustrated in the next group of fabrics. In fabrics 77G and 77H the addition of 3 turns per inch of twist to the filling yarn only has significantly increased the permeability in the sized condition. Other examples are shown in the 79 series of fabrics, which also illustrates the influence of fabric weave. Note, however, that no measurements were made after removal of the warp size, which would be expected to show the behavior mentioned above, namely, that changes in filling yarn twist would have little if any influence on the permeability of a fabric with a tightly packed warp, but a significant influence when the warp yarns are not closely packed.

Weave changes have the expected results, which are that a reduction in interlacing density produces an increase in air permeability.

Only two broad fabrics were produced in any quantity in this program. One was a canopy fabric, the other a pack fabric. Their constructions and characteristics are given in Table 15. Load-elongation curves for warp and filling directions of the canopy fabric are given in Figure 35.

TABLE 14

「「「「」」」

# EFFECT OF CONSTRUCTION ON THE AIR PERMEABILITY OF KEVLAR BROAD WOVEN FABRICS

	Weight (oz/yd <sup>2</sup> )	3.2	3.0 3.0	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.3	4.1	4.1	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	3.2	3.2	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.4	3.4	
	Warp Strength (lb/inch)	460	460	490						170				-	360	400	330	1	330	320	280	370	350	370	
	ir billity * Scoured	5.6	5.c 4.7	7.2	72.0	80.0	85.0							-	2	18	10	75	65	60	28	44	31	32	
	A Permea Sized	6.4	9.3 11.4	25.7			 	50	60	80	150	30	06	165	1		-							-	
	Picks per Inch	58	50 50	45	48	44	40	34	34	60	60	60	60	60	60	59	53	54	52	51	54	53	74	73	
	Ends per Inch	09	09 90	60	45	45	45	40	40	60	09	60	60	60	58	59	52	54	51	51	51	53	52	53	
	Weave	ii .								11	111	П	1	1		ket	1	п	11	1	1	sss, 3 move satin	less, 3 move satin	ness, 5 move satin	ssure differential.
	> 1	pla	plan plai	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	plain	1/3 twi	1/3 tw	2/2 twi	2/2 twil	2/2 twil	plain	2/2 bas	2/2 twil	2/1 twi	3/1 twi	1/3 twi]	4/4 twil	8 harne	8 harr	8 har	er pres
	vist pi) <u>Fill</u>	0 pla	u plai	0 plain	0 plain	0 plain	0 plain	0 plain	3 plain	0 1/3 twi	5 1/3 tw:	0 2/2 twi	2 2/2 twil	5 2/2 twil	0 plain	0 2/2 bas	0 2/2 twil	0 2/1 twi	0 3/1 twi	0 1/3 twil	0 4/4 twil	0 8 harne	0 8 harr	0 8 har	0.5" water pres
	Twist (tpi) <u>Warp Fill</u>	0 0 0 pla	0 0 0 Dlai	0 0 plain	0 0 0 plain	0 0 Dain	0 0 plain	0 0 plain	0 3 plain	0 0 0 1/3 twi	0 5 1/3 tw:	0 0 2/2 twi	0 2 2/2 twil	0 5 2/2 twil	0 0 plain	0 0 2/2 bas	0 0 2/2 twil	0 0 2/1 twi	0 0 3/1 twi	0 0 0 1/3 twil	0 0 0 4/4 twil	0 0 8 harne	0 0 8 harr	0 0 8 har	$t^3/ft^2$ at 0.5" water pres
	Twist Yarn (tpi) <u>Denier Warp Fill</u>	200 0 0 pla	200 0 0 0 plan 200 0 0 plan	200 0 0 0 plain	200 0 0 0 plain	200 0 0 plain	200 0 0 plain	400 0 0 plain	400 0 3 plain	100 0 0 1/3 twi	100 0 5 1/3 tw:	100 0 0 2/2 twi	100 0 2 2/2 twil	100 0 5 2/2 twil	200 0 0 plain	200 0 0 2/2 bas	200 0 0 2/2 twil	200 0 0 2/1 twi	200 0 0 3/1 twi	200 0 0 1/3 twil	200 0 0 4/4 twil	200 0 0 8 harne	200 0 0 8 harr	200 0 0 8 har	ability, $ft^3/ft^2$ at 0.5" water pres
FRL	Sample Twist No. Yarn (tpi) 5034- Denier Warp Fill	87 200 0 0 0 pla	86 200 0 0 0 plan 85 200 0 0 0 plan	84 200 0 0 0 plain	88C 200 0 0 Dlain	88B 200 0 0 plain	88A 200 0 0 plain	77G 400 0 0 plain	77H 400 0 3 plain	79B 100 0 0 1/3 twi	79C 100 0 5 1/3 tw:	79A 100 0 0 2/2 twi	79E 100 0 2 2/2 twil	79D 100 0 5 2/2 twil	4B 200 0 0 plain	5 200 0 0 2/2 bas	6 200 0 0 2/2 twil	58 200 0 0 2/1 twi	7 200 0 0 3/1 twi	8 200 0 0 1/3 twil	10 200 0 0 4/4 twil	12 200 0 0 8 harne	13 200 0 0 8 harr	11 200 0 0 8 har	*Air Permeability , $\mathrm{ft}^3/\mathrm{ft}^2$ at 0.5" water pres

# TABLE 15

### Canopy Fabric Pack Fabric 5034-60 5034-118 Yarn Denier Warp and Filling 200 200 Yarn Twist (tpi) Warp 5Z 0 Filling 0 0 Ends x Picks per Inch 55 x 54 60 x 43 Weight $(oz/yd^2)$ 2.9 3.0 Thickness (inch) at 0.02 psi 0.0076 0.1 psi 0.0059 Air Permeability $(ft^3/ft^2/min)$ 67 6 at 0.5" water pressure differential) Breaking Strength (lb/inch) Warp 360 Filling 340 Breaking Elongation (%) Warp 2.7 Filling 2.6 Rupture Energy (in. lb/in.) Warp 3.8 Filling 3.6

# KEVLAR BROAD WOVEN FABRIC CONSTRUCTIONS



the second second

Figure 35. Load-Elongation Characteristics of Kevlar Canopy Fabric

### Basic Structure

Braided cords used in nylon parachute systems may be either coreless (MIL-C-7515) or cored (MIL-C-5040). The latter contain a straight, central yarn assembly, the core, surrounded by a braided tube, the sheath. The coreless cords consist simply of a braided tube, corresponding in structure approximately to the sheath, without any central core. In order to obtain good strength translation efficiency in a cored braid, the elongation properties of core and sheath must be carefully matched. In a nylon cord, this is usually done by inserting a fairly high twist in the core yarn in order to give it a higher elongation to match the characteristics of the sheath. This is possible, within reasonable limits, because of the high elongation inherent in the nylon yarn itself.

In braids made from Kevlar yarns, which have extremely low elongation and in which the insertion of high levels of twist drastically reduces the strength, it was not possible to balance the elongation characteristics of a twisted core with those of a braided sheath. Thus, it did not seem feasible to make an efficient cored braid from Kevlar. All of the braids which were designed, therefore, were coreless.

### Braid Construction

A braiding machine uses an even number of ends of yarn, half of which are wound around the structure in a clockwise direction, the other half in a counterclockwise direction. In order to balance torques and achieve a structure with no tendency to twist or kink, one set of yarns is twisted in a Z-direction, while the other set has an S-twist. Aside from the size of yarn used and the number of ends which are braided together (usually 8, 16, 24, 32, 64 or 96) the braid construction is determined by the relationship between the rate at which the braid is drawn off the machine and the speed of revolution of the yarn carriers in their circular track. This ratio (A/B) determines both the braid angle, which is the angle between the yarns and the axis of the braid, and the picks per inch, or the number of yarns intersected per inch by a line drawn parallel to the braid axis. As the size of the ratio increases, so does the braid angle and the picks per inch. Thus, a low ratio value implies an open, loose braid, and a high ratio a tight braid.

Experiments with seven different braid constructions gave relationships between the A/B ratio and the strength translation efficiency of the form illustrated in Figure 36, which is for a series of braids made from 1000 denier, 3ply Kevlar yarn on a 16 carrier braider. The consistent decrease of strength translation efficiency with increasing A/B ratio is in part a geometric effect, and in part a true loss in yarn strength due to increasing yarn/yarn interactions within the structure. Thus, if strength were the sole criterion, we would choose the lowest possible ratio. In parachute applications, however, braid constructions must be tight enough to give good structural integrity, as well as providing for good strength in joints made by back-splicing. The final selection of braid construction, therefore, is the choice of the openest construction which will provide the desired integrity and spliceability.



The final constructions chosen for the range of braids called for are given in Table 16. Strength translation efficiencies ranged from 60 to 96%, the weakest braids having the highest efficiencies.

### Stress-Strain Behavior

Stress-strain curves for all of the braids listed in Table 15 are given in Figures 37 through 48.

## VIII. SEWING THREADS

Choice of a suitable sewing thread for any application depends on thread diameter as well as strength. Because Kevlar threads can all be expected to have adequate strength, it was decided that the range of designs should be developed to duplicate, as closely as possible, the diameters of the corresponding nylon threads.

Using Federal Specification V-T-295 as a guide, nine Kevlar threads were designed to approximate the diameters of nylon threads size A, B, E, F, FF, 3-cord, 5-cord, 6-cord and 8-cord. Singles yarn deniers and twist levels were chosen to correspond as closely as possible to the nylon counterparts.

The resulting designs are given in Table 17, which also summarizes the results of measurements of tensile, knot and loop strengths and weight. The tensile strengths of the Kevlar threads average about 2-1/2 times that of their nylon counterparts, while the knot and loop efficiencies are only approximately one half those of the nylon threads. Thus, absolute knot and loop strengths of the Kevlar threads are only slightly higher than those of the corresponding nylon threads.

Sewability tests run at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base using all of these threads gave good results. Even without an added finish, good seams could be sewn using standard commercial equipment and techniques.

Subsequent use of some of these threads indicated that a good finish on the thread might aid in handling as well as in seam efficiency. A standard wax finish made little improvement, but it was found that application of as little as 1/2 to 1% of polyvinyl butyral to the thread gave better structural integrity, improved sewability and, in some cases, higher seam efficiencies. This finish is offered as an alternative in the tentative draft Military Specification for Kevlar sewing threads. It is applied by passing the thread through an impregnating bath containing 20% by weight of Butvar Dispersion BR (Monsanto Corporation, 50% solids in the product), followed by wiping over a soft felt and drying in a heated tube or over drying cylinders. TABLE 16

	Picks <sup>2</sup> per Inch	6	18	23	15	13	11	10	80	7	9	4	
	Total Ends	4	8	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	24	
	Ends per Carrier		T	1	1	1	1	Т	1	1	1	1	•
CUM	No. Carriers	4	œ	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	24	
	Yarn den/ply/twist <sup>1</sup>	200/1/5.0	200/1/5.0	200/1/5.0	200/3/2.5	1000/1/4.0	1500/1/3.0	1000/2/2.1	1500/2/1.8	1500/3/1.0	1500/6/1.0	1500/6/1.0	0, <u>1</u> , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Weight (ft/lb)	15,000	7,200	3,600	1,200	800	475	375	225	150	75	55	ĺ
	Elong (%)	3.7	4.2	4.0	1	3.7	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.9	5.2	3.7	
	Translation Efficiency (%)	92	91	96	82	82	81	77	75	77	60	72	
trength	ge High	41	81	160	460	680	870	1240	1750	2300	4300	7500	traint
S	Ran Low	37	78	150	430	640	840	1180	1660	2200	3700	6900	la of the
	Mean (1b)	40	80	155	450	655	855	1220	1705	2260	4000	7190	the related
Diameter	on Flat Width (inch)	0.017	0.026	0.050	0.093	0.114	0.134	0.157	0.200	0.240	0.347	0.500	ie need this is
	FRL Sample No.	21	22	39	40	23	24	25	26	28	29	41	- nlied vern
)raft	pec ype No.		П	II	Λ	2	11	II/	/111	X	м	ы	When a

2. All constructions are a 2 over, 2 under conventional stitch except Type I, which is a 1 up, 1 down basket or diamond.
Nation States





Figure 38. Average Load-Elongation Cu<sup>w</sup>ve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type II (FRL Sample No. 5034-22)

h



Elongation (%)

がたいというとして、

Load (Ib)



the state of the s

A DESCRIPTION OF A DESC

Figure 40. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type IV (FRL Sample No. 5034-40)



Figure 41. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type V (FRL Sample No. 5034-23)



X X Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

1

and the second second second

Figure 42. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type VI (FRL Sample No. 5034-24)



i e

Figure 43. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type VII (FRL Sample No. 5034-25)



Figure 44. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type VIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-26)



Figure 45. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 49 Braided Cord, Type VIII (FRL Sample No. 5034-27)



Figure 46. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type IX (FRL Sample No. 5034-28)



Figure 47. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type XI (FRL Sample No. 5034-29)



Figure 48. Average Load-Elongation Curve for Kevlar 29 Braided Cord, Type XI (FRL Sample No. 5034-41)

TABLE 17

## CONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF KEVLAR SEWING THREADS

			Kno	ot	loc I	۵				
Designation	Diameter (inch)	Strength (1b)	Strength (1b)	Efficiency (%)	Strength (1b)	Efficiency (%)	Weight (yd/lb)	Yarn Den/Ply	Twist Singles	(tpi) Ply
° V	0.008	80	3.7	33	3.6	32	20,000	100/2	20S	10Z
В	0.013	16	7.1	33	7.0	32	10,000	200/2	12S	Z9
н	0.015	25	13.1	40	13.2	40	6,700	200/3	12S	<b>Z</b> 9
н	0.017	35	16.5	37	16.8	38	5,000	200/4	, 10S	ZS
FF	0.021	60	23.4	36	26.7	41	3,350	400/3	8S	4Z
3-cor	0.025	80	37.2	40	48.4	52	2,100	400/5	10S	52
5-cord	0.036	150	66.1	39	88.8	53	1,050	1000/4	7S	3.5Z
6-cord	0.042	175	67.7	35	89.5	46	006	1500/3	6S	3Z
8-cord	0.054	225	113.4	45	151.6	61	550	1500/5	5S	2.5Z

### IX. COMPARISON OF KEVLAR 29 AND KEVLAR 49

One of the braids which had been made from Kevlar 29 was duplicated as closely as possible using Kevlar 49 yarn. This involved substituting a 1420 denier Kevlar 49 yarn for the 1500 denier Kevlar 29 yarn used in the braid designated as Type VIII, and leaving all other aspects of the construction the same. A comparison between the properties of the two yarns is shown in Table 18.

The construction and properties of the two braids are given in Table 19.

The braid made from Kevlar 49 had a lower strength than its Kevlar 29 counterpart because of its reduced total denier and the fact that Kevlar 49 yarn has a lower tenacity than Kevlar 29 yarn. The strength translation efficiency of Kevlar 49 was somewhat higher than that for Kevlar 29. Because of the basic difference in yarn characteristics, the Kevlar 49 braid had a lower rupture elongation than the Kevlar 29 braid.

The load-elongation properties of these braids are shown in curve 3 of Figures 49 and 50. These figures also show the change in load-elongation properties resulting from cyclic stress application. Each braid was loaded, and then unloaded cyclically ten times between zero and both 50 and 75% of its rated rupture value. After a tenth cycle the sample was broken and its new rupture load and extension measured. The behavior of the Kevlar 29 cord is shown in Figure 49, while the Kevlar 49 sample is shown in Figure 50.

The results reveal an increase in strength and decrease in extension for the Kevlar 29 after cycling to 50 and 75% of rupture load with the more significant change occurring at the 75% level. Kevlar 49 does not appear to be as markedly affected, perhaps due to its higher initial modulus and lower extensibility.

After 10 cycles of loading to 75% of the rupture load, the tensile characteristics of the two braids differ only slightly. They have the same rupture elongation (2%), but the Kevlar 29 braid retains its higher strength. Similar cycling experiments with Kevlar 29 400 denier yarns showed a similar change in tensile properties. These results are shown in Table 20, which also gives comparative data for Kevlar 49 400 denier yarn (not cycled).

A few results obtained for Kevlar 29 yarn subjected to as many as 26 cycles to 75% of its rupture strain showed that its modulus had risen to 820 gpd (no information about rupture tenacity or strain is available). It is apparent that such cycling causes the tensile properties of Kevlar 29 to approach those of Kevlar 49 in both yarn and braid. It is reasonable to assume that the same change would occur in narrow and broad woven fabrics, though no measurements were made on these materials. Kevlar 49 shows much less change in tensile properties as a result of load cycling, presumably because its original properties represent the ultimate which can be easily achieved in a fiber of this chemical structure.

18
BLE
TA

PROPERTIES OF ZERO TWIST 1500 DENIER KEVLAR 29 AND 1420 DENIER KEVLAR 49 YARNS

	to Rupture	(10 <sup>3</sup> psi)	6.5	3.5	
	Energy 1	(gpd)	0.35	0.19	
	Modulus	(10 <sup>6</sup> psi)	9.4	13.3	
	Initial	(Epd)	507	715	
Rupture	Elong	(8)	3.6	2.4	
	Rupture Tenacity	(10 <sup>3</sup> psi)	386	308	
		(bdg)	20.8	16.6	
	Actual	Denier	1530	1516	
		Material	Kevlar 29	Kevlar 49	

TABLE 19

# BRAIDS MADE FROM KEVLAR 29 AND KEVLAR 49 YARNS

		51	Strength							
	FRL		Translation					Ends		Picks
	Sample		Efficiency	Elongation	Weight	Yarn	No.	per	Total	per
Material	No.	(q))	(%)	(%)	(ft/lb)	den/ply/twist <sup>1</sup>	Carriers	Carrier	Ends	Inch
Kevlar 29	26	1705	75	4.1	225	1500/2/1.8	16	-1	16	80
Kevlar 49	27	1450	82	2.7	250	1420/2/1.8	16	1	16	80
1. This is th	he ply twist.	Singles t	twist is producer	's, or nomina	ally zero.	Half the yarns are Z-twis	st, the other	half S-twist.		
					,					

EFFECT OF LOAD CYCLING ON THE TENSILE PROPERTIES OF KEVLAR 29 YARN TABLE 20

Material	Actual Denier	Strain Rate (%/min)	Strain Level % of Rupture Strain	No. Cycles	Unrecovered Strain (\$)	Rupture Strain (%)	Rupture Tenacity (gpd)	Initial Modulus (gpd)
Kevlar 29	414 414	10 10	rupture 75	9	${0.41}$	3.3 2.6	$25.2 \\ 22.1$	660 770
Kevlar 49	410	10	rupture	}		2.2	18.5	840

1. After 10 minutes relaxation.

L.A.



Figure 49. Load-Elongation Curves of Kevlar 29 Braided Cord After Cyclical Loading (FRL Sample No. 5034-26)

1600-1400 R 1200 1000. Load (Ib) 800 600 400 1-after ten cycles to 75% of rupture load 2-after ten cycles to 50% of rupture load 3-control 200 4 5 2 3 0 1 Elongation (%)



### X. COMPARATIVE WEIGHTS OF KEVLAR AND NYLON WOVEN FABRICS

Initial interest in the use of Kevlar in parachute systems was the potential for weight reduction, because of Kevlar's high strength per unit weight. The structures described in this report made it possible to determine the magnitude of this weight-saving in narrow fabrics. Figure 51 shows the relationship between weight and strength for many of the Kevlar fabrics which were developed, and for similar nylon fabrics for which the values were taken from military specifications. Over the whole range of strengths represented, the ratio of the weight of nylon fabrics to that of Kevlar fabrics of corresponding strength is 3 or more.

Considering the fact that a significant part of the weight of a parachute system is in the hardware, which would be the same whether the fabrics were made from nylon or Kevlar, one could confidently expect to produce Kevlar parachute systems at half the weight of a corresponding nylon system. Recent experience has shown this to be correct. Since weight and bulk are related through the specific gravity of the fiber (1.14 for nylon, 1.45 for Kevlar) this means that Kevlar parachutes of the same size and strength as their nylon counterparts could be packed in almost one-half the space, or alternately a much larger Kevlar parachute could be packed in the same space.

### XI. IMPACT STUDIES OF KEVLAR STRUCTURES

Approximately 15 years ago, under Air Force Contract AF33(616)-6321, FRL designed and constructed a device capable of rupturing high strength parachute components of up to 10,000 pounds breaking strength at impact speeds between 200 and 700 feet per second. This device has been used in the past to determine the impact behavior of textile structures in use or contemplated for use by the Air Force. It has proven helpful in assessing the potential value of commercial and experimentally produced materials, particularly with regard to their energy-absorbing capabilities at high strain rates. As part of the on-going Kevlar development program it was suggested that the high strain rate response of webbings made from this new fiber be measured in order to determine their effectiveness under impact loading conditions.

### The Measuring System

The impact tester as originally designed is shown schematically in Figure 52. The specimen to be impacted is folded in the shape of a "V" and fastened to the rear of Pendulum No. 1. A missile whose mass can be varied from 0.5 to 10 pounds is propelled from a helium operated gun, through an opening in the first pendulum, striking and rupturing the sample. The deflection of Pendulum No. 1 resulting from the impact can be measured. After breaking the specimen, the projectile enters and is contained in Pendulum No. 2. The deflection of this pendulum can also be recorded.





Knowing the period and displacement of the second pendulum, the residual velocity of the missile can be calculated. Similarly, knowing the period and displacement of the first pendulum, the loss in missile velocity as a result of specimen rupture can be determined. Having measured the residual velocity and the velocity loss, it is possible to determine the striking velocity from a summation of the two known quantities. Impact energy absorption by the specimen can then be calculated knowing the mass of the missile and its initial and final velocities. 
$$E = 1/2 m (V_S^2 - V_R^2)$$

where

and a second of the second

E is the total energy absorbed in rupturing the specimen

m is the mass of the projectile

 $V_{s}$  is the projectile striking velocity

 $V_{p}$  is the projectile residual velocity.

In addition, in much of the past work a high speed multiple flash lamp (up to 25 flashes per 10 microseconds) illuminated the event and recorded it as multiple exposure on one sheet of  $4 \times 5$  inch photographic film. It was intended that the multiple images be used to provide information on projectile deceleration and specimen extension during impact. While much useful information was obtained from this technique, it was apparent that the measurement of precise forces and extensions was very difficult and time-consuming.

During the mid-1960s Beckman-Whitley Corp. introduced a camera, Dynafax Model 350. This camera, a rotating drum type, uses a strip of 35 mm film, approximately 34 inches long, fastened to a rotating drum together with a rotating octagonal mirror to accomplish image separation. The rotational speed of the mirror establishes the rate at which photographs of an event are taken. For example, up to 224 pictures can be taken with an exposure time of each as short as 0.75 microsecond, and constant time between successive exposures as short as 28.6 microseconds. This means that at projectile speeds of 200 feet per second, the position of the missile can be recorded approximately every 1/16 inch during its travel over a one-foot distance. With this capability it is felt that more precise measurement of force (via missile deceleration) and specimen extension can be made.

The Model 350 Dynafax camera is currently marketed by the Cordin Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, and through a leasing arrangement was installed at FRL on a temporary basis so that its capabilities could be determined in conjunction with the Impact Test Machine. Figure 53 is a photograph of the camera and Figure 54 is its optical schematic.

Referring to Figure 54, an image is formed at the mask (2) by the objective lens (1). Light then passes through the field lens (3) to the entrance relay mirror (6). The mirror directs the light through the entrance relay lens (7)







- 1. Objective Lens
- 2. Mask

- 3. Field Lens
- 4. Capping Shutter
- 5. Entrance Diamond Stop
- 6. Entrance Relay Mirror
- 7. Entrance Relay Lens
- 8. Rotating Mirror

- 9. Collimating Relay Lens
- 10. Exit Diamond Stop
- 11. Imaging Relay Lens
- 12. Exit Relay Mirrors
- 13. Film
- 14. Focusing Mirror and Ground Glass
- 15. Focusing Eyepiece

Figure 54. Optical Schematic of Model 350 Dynafax Camera

and onto the rotating mirror face (8). Immediately after reflection from the rotating mirror face the light beam forms a second image. This is a moving image because of the mirror's rotation. As the octagonal mirror rotates, each mirror face, in turn, presents the reflected image to two optical paths arranged to receive it through lenses (9) and (9'). and the state of the second state of the second state of the line

The first path is through the collimating relay lens (9) and the imaging relay lens (11), and then through the exit relay mirrors (12) to form a final image on the front half of the film (13).

When the rotating mirror turns  $22-1/2^{\circ}$  farther, the reflected image is swept across the second optical path. This path is similar to the first, but it places its final image on the rear half of the film. Optical elements in this path are indicated by primed numbers (9', 10', 11', 12').

In each path the final image of the film plane is a moving image, due to the effect of the rotating mirror (8). However, the image moves in the same direction and at the same speed as the film, which is riding in the rotating drum of the camera. As a result the image is stationary relative to the film.

A variable-duration, high-intensity single flash lamp is used to illuminate the event. The flash duration can be varied between one and ten milliseconds depending upon the speed of the event being photographed. The lamp is triggered as the projectile passes through an infrared beam located a known distance ahead of the specimen, in order to provide a series of missile images prior to impact and thereby establish a missile striking velocity.

The flash duration is adjusted so that a number of images are also shown after the specimen is broken, thereby providing a measure of the residual velocity. These two velocities can also be determined from the motion of the two pendulums, thus allowing for an independent mechanical measurement of energy absorption by the specimen as described earler.

### **Experimental Procedure**

The operational procedures associated with the firing of the Cold Gas Gun Impact Tester are essentially unchanged from those employed in the past. The tester is located in a separate area of the laboratory and all firings are performed from a console located in an adjacent room. The major change is that the Dynafax camera and light source have been substituted for the EG&G Multimicroflash and still camera. All tests are conducted with the room lights extinguished and the Dynafax camera shutter opened so that when the missile triggers the light, the event is captured on film.

The camera is brought up to the desired framing rate several minutes before the firing of the missile. The precise rate is checked with an oscilloscope by measuring the rotational speed of the octagonal mirror.

The mirror drive assembly contains a small induction coil built into its housing. A permanent magnet attached to the mirror drive shaft passes close

to this coil on every revolution of the mirror, inducing a pulse of current in the coil. This current is used to operate a built-in electronic tachometer which is graduated to read in pictures per second. However, this measurement is made more precisely by using a measurement oscilloscope.

Once the framing rate stabilizes, the room lights are extinguished, the shutter opened and the missile fired. The lamp is triggered and the event recorded. The camera shutter is then closed, the room lights turned on and the measurements of pendulum displacements made. The strip of film is removed from the camera and developed in the normal manner. Depending upon the framing rate selected, up to 224 images, each approximately 11 mm wide, can be obtained on this one film strip. Figure 55 illustrates the type of negative obtained. Either or both rows of negatives can be enlarged to make a series of photographic prints from which the measurements of missile displacement and specimen extension are made.

### **Data Reduction**

Force-strain diagrams for Type XVII nylon webbing tested at an impact speed of 250 fps were derived solely from data recorded on high speed motion picture film during each test. Extraction of the essential data from the film record of a test required numerous measurements of missile displacement and gauge distance made with great precision. Force was determined at a given instant from the product of missile mass and missile deceleration. Since the second derivative of displacement with respect to time is deceleration, missile displacements were measured as accurately as possible at a number of equallyspaced intervals. Strain values could be obtained more directly by comparison of photographed gauge distances on a stressed specimen with the corresponding distance measured and recorded before the onset of loading. Although the data reduction technique has perhaps not yet been optimized, it has yielded, in its present state of evolvement, a very satisfactory set of force-strain diagrams for the nylon webbing tested.

Photographs similar to the one shown in Figure 56 were printed from each of approximately sixty frames of the motion picture film exposed at 0.1 millisecond intervals during a single test. The separation of two pairs of gauge marks painted on the specimen was determined at each interval. Using dividers, gauge distances were transferred from the photograph to the upper portion of a worksheet similar to the one shown in Figure 57. Thus, the scale of distances shown on the work sheet is that of the printed photographs, 4/10 actual size. Strain ordinates in the force-strain diagram eventually derived were obtained directly from the gauge distance-frame number diagram plotted on the worksheet. The diagram on the lower portion of the worksheet, a plot of missile displacement versus frame number, was also determined by transferring distances directly from the photographs with dividers and eventually became the basic element in the procedure followed to determine force values. Initial attempts to accurately determine the second derivative of missile displacement at a reasonable number of time intervals were not wholly successful. Using measured displacement values, tables of finite differences were made for several sets of test results, but in every case, values of the second difference were



Figure 55. A Contact Print Showing the Actual Size of Each Film Frame Obtained with the Model 350 Dynafax High Speed Camera



Figure 56. A photograph typical of the many recorded during each impact test with the Model 350 Dynafax High Speed Camera. This enlargement is ~0.3X actual size and 17X the size of the film image.



•

generally equal to zero. Theoretically, this indicates a constant velocity (zero deceleration) state, but here it was a consequence of the minimum attainable reading error being large in comparison to the differences obtained and indicated only the futility of the approach. At this point, two changes in technique were implemented that together made the determination of forces by double differentiation of the displacement-time curve viable. First, a missile lighter than that which would normally be employed was substituted and the three tests were repeated. To maintain the same energy transfer from missile to test specimen, the lighter missile must be slowed a greater amount, resulting in potentially greater accuracy when velocity differences are taken. This second set of data was then differentiated graphically, as shown on the worksheet in Figure 57. Notice that a series of straight lines was drawn through data points on the missile displacement-frame number diagram; except for time intervals before and after impact, this is an idealization, since a linear displacement-time diagram indicates constant velocity. The slopes of the linear segments were measured to determine average missile velocity for each of the nine intervals shown. The second derivative, deceleration, was obtained by dividing the velocity change from segment to segment by the time interval represented by the graphical distance from the midpoint of one segment to the midpoint of the next. For example, the deceleration from  $V_2$  to  $V_3$  equals  $V_2$  minus  $V_3$  divided by the time interval represented by six camera frames, 0.6 millisecond. In this example, deceleration was determined at eight intervals, so that, after multiplying each deceleration by the missile mass, eight data points representing force were available for the desired force-strain diagram. The actual forces calculated were divided in half since they represent forces distributed equally on both legs of the "V"-shaped specimen.

After force and strain ordinates had been determined with aid of the worksheet, they were plotted against time as shown in Figure 58. The data point scatter evident in this diagram is a clear illustration of the limitations encountered in this technique. However, by drawing force-time and straintime curves through the midpoint of the scatter at each time interval, average force and strain relationships are defined with far greater accuracy than has been previously possible for high strength members subjected to impact loading. The force-strain diagram for Shot 19, shown in Figure 59, was obtained directly from information shown in Figure 58 by plotting average force versus average strain at ten time intervals. Force-strain diagrams for Shots 15 and 16, also presented in Figure 59, were obtained in a like manner.

### **Discussion of Results**

Inspection of Figure 59 shows excellent agreement among the first three force-strain diagrams derived using the newly developed photographic technique. The validity of the diagrams was verified by comparison with related data obtained through pendulum deflection measurements. As described previously, the established ballistic pendulum technique yields an accurate measure of rupture energy which is completely independent of the photographic method. Thus, by employing both techniques simultaneously, and measuring the area under the photographically-obtained force-strain curves, two independent measures of rupture energy can be compared to provide sound verification.





Force and Strain versus Time, Measured During a Tensile Test of One-Inch Wide Nylon Webbing, Type XVII, Impacted at 240 fps



the state of the state of the state

Figure 59. Force-Strain Diagrams for One-Inch Wide Nylon Webbing, Type XVII, Tensile Tested at an Impact Velocity of 240 fps

This comparison, readily seen in Table 21, shows that agreement between data obtained by the two methods is extremely good. Energies obtained photographically differ by no more than 11% from those obtained using ballistic pendulums.

### TABLE21

## SUMMARY OF TENSILE DATA OBTAINED FOR ONE-INCH WIDE, TYPE XVII NYLON WEBBING

	Testee	d at an		Te	ested at a		
Initia	al Strain I	Rate of ~8500 <sup>9</sup>	%/Sec	Strain	Rate of ~	8%/Min	
Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Energy	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	
Force	Strain	ft-lb/ft]	) from	Force	Strain	Energy	
(lbs)	(%)	Photographs	Pendulums	(lbs)	(%)	(ft-lb/ft)	
2640	20	260	290	3580	27.6		
3180	19	295	299	3595	27.5		
3100	22	248	276	3590	27.0		
				3625	27.8		
				3600	27.4		
2970	20	268	288	3600	27.4	391 Av	7g
							-

The effect of impact loading upon the force-strain characteristics of the Type XVII nylon webbing tested is evident in Figure 60, in which two forcestrain diagrams are presented. The first is typical of the three diagrams obtained through impact testing at an initial strain rate of ~8500%/minute using an Instron Tensile Tester. Precise strain rates are not reported because capstan jaws were used and actual specimen lengths are difficult to determine. Further complicating strain rate reporting is 1) the probability that the stressed specimen length varies significantly during an impact test and, 2) the fact that the missile velocity continuously decreases as kinetic energy is transferred to the test specimen. The differences apparent between the diagrams in Figure 60 are typical of similar comparisons that have been made of nylon tapes at high and low strain rates using the FRL/ AFML piston-driven tensile tester.\* Now, as in the past, a greater initial modulus at the high strain rate is perhaps the most significant difference between diagrams. Beyond the initial portion, both force-strain diagrams are similar in shape, although the high strain rate test terminates with specimen failure at lower levels of force and strain.

\*Mechanical Properties of High-Temperature Fibrous Structural Materials, Part III, High-Speed, High-Temperature Tensile Tester. AFML-TR-67-267, Part III, Sebring, Freeston, Platt and Coskren.





### Laboratory Modifications to the Photographic Method for the Testing of Kevlar Structures

A one-inch wide, 9000-lb Kevlar webbing, FRL Sample No. 5034-93, was selected for impact testing using the cold gas gun and the photographic method for obtaining force-strain diagrams. At the outset, an unexpected problem arose that is apparently unique to Kevlar. The gas blast that preceded the missile as it left the muzzle of the gun (see Figure 61) disturbed the V-shaped specimen to such a degree that full, square contact between missile and specimen could not always be obtained; several partial breaks and complete misses occurred. In addition, specimen flutter caused by gas blast frequently broke the infrared beam that is normally interrupted only by the missile, resulting in erratic triggering of the flash lamp and subsequent failure to record the 3 millisecond impact event photographically. Although specimen flutter has been frequently observed during impact testing of other materials, its magnitude has never been great enough to be of consequence. The extreme flutter observed with Keylar was presumed to be related to its high tensile stiffness, although this phenomenon is not completely understood. Eventually, the difficulties presented by specimen flutter were avoided by making several changes in the test procedure. The location of the apex of the V, the point of impact, was more rigidly fixed by tying it with a network of light tire cord yarn (seen in Figure 61) and shoulders were added to the missile nose to prevent the specimen from slipping off before it was tensioned. The shoulders did not change the nature of the contact area in any way; they merely aided specimen-missile alignment just prior to impact. After these changes were made, the infrared beam, located about four inches from the apex of the V, was still being interrupted prematurely as the specimen legs were moved by the gas blast. This prompted a decision to improve a long-standing deficiency in the cold gas gun apparatus and to solve the immediate difficulty by adding an adjustable delay unit to the triggering circuit for the flash lamp. The delay unit made it possible to move the infrared beam to a point more than two feet ahead of the apex where the width of the V was six inches and specimen-light beam intereference was thus eliminated. The linearly adjustable delay unit also made possible small, precise changes in flash lamp timing and improved the efficiency of the test procedure considerably.

### Data Reduction

Photographic records of three 150 fps impact tests of one-inch wide, 9000lb Kevlar webbing, FRL Sample No. 5034-93, were obtained. The graphical analysis method discussed above was applied without modification using a set of fifty 8 x 10 inch photographs for each test.

Upon completion of the graphical analysis, diagrams showing both force and strain as a function of time were plotted for each test. One of these is shown in Figure 62. Notice that the data points in the strain-time diagram form several steps, or regions where the measured strain remains unchanged for relatively long time intervals. Steps like these, some of longer duration than those seen in Figure 62, occurred in diagrams obtained for the other two tests and led to the inevitable conclusions that the precision of the strain measuring system is



での大学である

Figure 61. A photograph typical of the many recorded during each impact test. In this frame, the missile has not yet begun to strain the Kevlar webbing.



Figure 62. Force and Strain versus Time for a Tensile Test of One-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, FRL Sample No. 5034-93, Impacted at 150 fps. The strain rate was approximately 3300%/sec.

not quite great enough to measure the small incremental changes in strain that occur in Kevlar structures. The precision of the system used is great enough, however, to accurately measured rupture strain and to permit a reasonable approximation of the force-strain curve to be drawn. For the three tests analyzed, rupture strains of 5.5, 5.1, and 5.4% were obtained. An approximate force-strain diagram, plotted directly from data shown in Figure 62, is presented in Figure 63. Fortunately, the validity of this diagram can be verified by a method that is both convenient and reliable: the comparison of the rupture energy value obtained by measuring the area under the curve with that obtained by the ballistic pendulum method. Using a planimeter to measure the area under the force-strain diagram, the rupture energy was found to be 299 ft-lb/ft. This is in good agreement with the value of 324 ft-lb/ft determined by the ballistic pendulum method.

### Discussion of Results

Effective energy absorption comparisons require that the total rupture energy recorded in each test be normalized on a basis of specimen length or weight. However, since capstan jaws must be used to grip high strength webbings of the type under study, the actual energy absorbing length is not clearly defined. Previous work with nylon webbing has shown that approximately two thirds of the material wrapped on the capstans used should be included in the gauge length. Although some evidence exists that suggests an appropriate factor for Kevlar might include more of the capstan wrap, the two thirds factor will be used for both nylon and Kevlar until the subject can be studied fully.

During the course of the development work required to apply the photographic method to Kevlar, ten rupture energy determinations were made for a 9000 lb Kevlar webbing (FRL Sample No. 5034-93) using the ballistic pendulum technique. The rupture energy values obtained, listed individually in Table 22, provide essential data for Table 23, which shows the effect of strain rate on nylon and Kevlar 29 webbings of approximately equal strength. Rupture energy data for two nylon and two Kevlar webbings are included in Table 23. Also presented, wherever possible, are rupture force and strain values, including those obtained by the photographic method at high strain rates. Perhaps the most significant finding reported in Table 23 is the great <u>increase</u> in rupture energy measured for Kevlar webbings when the strain rate is increased to several thousand percent per second: for the 9000 lb webbing, the rupture energy increase is 75%, and for the 4000 lb tubular structure, the increase is 42%. For both nylon webbings, however, a decrease in rupture energy accompanies the increase in strain rate.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

In assessing the impact performance of potential parachute load line materials, tensile rupture energy is perhaps the single most important parameter. Other basic considerations are the impact tensile modulus, rupture strain, rupture force and the weight of the structure. Although impact rupture energy has been a measurable quantity for some time, impact modulus, rupture strain,


A CONTRACT

A Part of the

TATING L

Figure 63. Force-Strain Diagrams for One-Inch Wide Kevlar 29 Webbing, FRL Sample No. 5034-93, Tenside Tested at Two Widely Differing Strain Rates

#### RUPTURE ENERGY OF ONE-INCH WIDE, 9000 LB KEVLAR WEBBING (FRL No. 5034-93) TENSILE TESTED AT AN IMPACT VELOCITY OF 150 FT/SEC

	Gage	Approx			
<b>61</b> 4 37	Length*	Strain Rate	Rupti	ire Energy	
Shot No.	<u>(ft)</u>	(%/sec)	(ft-lb/ft	) (ft-lb/lb)	Description of Break
96	9.14	3300	273		Complete at apex except for 5 warp yarns
100	5.22	5750	363		Complete at apex
102	5.22	5750	326		Complete at apex except for 6 warp yarns
103	5.22	5750	342		Complete at apex
104	5.22	5750	352		Complete at both capstans
106	9.22	3250	307		Complete at one capstan
108	8.88	3400	278		Complete at one capstan and partial at apex
109	8.88	3400	276		Complete at apex
113	9.05	3300	289		Complete at apex
114	9.05	3300	324		Complete at one capstan
Average			313	10.990	
Standard	Deviation		33		
Coefficien	t of Variati	on (%)	11		

\*Includes both sides of V and two thirds of material wrapped on capstan jaws.

#### THE EFFECT OF STRAIN RATE ON THE RUPTURE ENERGY OF NYLON AND KEVLAR 29 WEBBINGS OF APPROXIMATELY EQUAL TENSILE STRENGTH

	Approx			Dupturo	Duratura	Change in Rupture
	Approx	<b>D</b>	. 17	Rupture	Rupture	Energy
	Strain	Ruptur	e Energy	Force	Strain	at High
Material	Rate	<u>(ft-lb/ft)</u>	(ff-lb/lb)	<u>(lb)</u>	( <sup>9</sup> <sub>0</sub> )	Strain Rate (%)
Kevlar webbing 1" wide, 9000	8%/min	180	6,320	10,260	4.3	
lb nominal strength, FRL	3250 to 5750	313	10,990	11,460	5.3	+75
No. 5034-93	%/sec					
Nylon webbing 1" wide, 9000	8%/min	487	9.510	7,225	19.0	
lb nominal	5750	403	7,870			-17
strength	%/sec*					
Kevlar webbing 1" wide, tubular	8%/min	72	5,620	3,950	4.0	
3500 lb nominal FRL No. 5034-35	8500	102	7,960			+42
Nylon webbing, 1" wide, 2500	8%/min	391	20,490	3,600	27.0	
lb nominal Type XVII	8500	288	15,090	2,970	20.0	-26

and force values have not been available to the designer. However, the recently developed photographic technique yields all of this information in the form of a complete force-strain diagram and it has now been successfully applied to a Kevlar structure having a rupture strain of only 5%. In its present state of development, the photographic method is time consuming and expensive, although further development can be expected to improve the situation considerably. The ballistic pendulum technique will continue to be of great value; besides providing a convenient means of checking the photographic method, it can be used for screening potential load lines on the basis of impact rupture energy.

The work described here, besides resulting in significant improvements in impact-test measurement technology, has yielded data on the impact performance of high strength Kevlar structures that, until now, has not been available. In one case a Kevlar webbing showed a rupture energy increase of 75% over the Instron value when tested at approximately 5000%/sec. However, a different Kevlar structure, tested at about 7500%/sec, showed an increase of 42%, indicating that much remains to be learned about structural differences. In fact, that data recorded thus far indicates that several aspects of the impact performance of Kevlar warrant much more study. Behavior over a range of strain rates, the effect of structural differences, the significance of specimen flutter, jaw penetration, high-speed abrasion, joint efficiency under impact conditions, and the impact behavior of webbings under load are all areas in which there is a great, if not total, lack of information, although the required test technology now exists.

#### XII. PARACHUTE PACKS

As part of the requirements of this contract, 25 parachute pack and harness assemblies, AF Drawing 65K1533, were fabricated by ILC Steinthal, Inc., using materials designed and made for the purpose by FRL. The design of these materials is included in previous tables in this report, and need not be listed separately here.

The packs were made entirely of Kevlar, including the sewing thread, except for a few small pieces of heavy stiffening material which were nylon, though even these were covered with Kevlar. No unusual difficulties were encountered in the fabrication, and the packs were satisfactory. Because of the weight of the hardware involved, however, the weight saving was not great. In addition, the harness materials were limper than the customary nylon materials, and were somewhat thin for the hardware which was designed for the thicker, heavier nylon. Nevertheless, it was clearly demonstrated that Kevlar could be used satisfactorily in parachute packs and harnesses, if desired.

#### XIII. CONCLUSIONS

The work described has demonstrated the feasibility of using Kevlar fiber in parachute component materials of widely varying types. A potential weight and volume reduction of at least 50% is possible when all nylon componenets of a parachute system are replaced by Kevlar or, alternately, significantly larger parachutes can be made from Kevlar to replace a nylon parachute with no increase in weight and volume.

A study of the actual performance of Kevlar parachutes was not a part of the current work, but information from other sources indicates that Kevlar may offer other advantages over nylon, and shows promise of becoming an important fiber in parachutes. The structures described herein form the basis for the design of components for Kevlar parachute systems, and have been described in a series of tentative draft military specifications which are currently being considered by the Air Force for adoption.

#### APPENDIX

### Laboratory Simulation of Impact Between AQM-34R Drone Surfaces and Nylon Loadlines

Loadline failure during recent aerial recovery operations has resulted in the loss of two operational AQM-34R drones. In both instances, it was suspected that failure was precipitated by loadline impact with retrieval hook tines or any of several thin edges on the drone itself.

The objective of this program, confirmation of the specific cause of loadline failure, was sought through laboratory simulation of impact between loadlines and the suspect surfaces. Data recorded during the impact events and subsequent examination of the damaged elements provided substantial support for the theory that loadline failures were the result of cutting. Laboratory simulators of two of the four suspect surfaces were capable, under several specific conditions, of inducing premature tensile failure due to cutting. 

#### **Operational Procedure**

The equipment and operational procedures employed in this work are essentially unchanged from those described in Section XI.

In brief, the measuring system consists if (1) a missile launching device, (2) a free flying missile, and (3) a mechanical and photographic means for measuring missile velocity before, during, and after impact.

A high speed rotating drum camera provides a means for visually recording a behavior of a webbing during impact. Gage marks are placed on the specimen prior to impact, making it possible to measure webbing extension-time behavior photographically by noting the changes in spacing which occur during the test. Furthermore, if the deceleration of the missile during impact can be determined, then the buildup of force in the webbing can be calculated for the same time interval. Combining the two sets of data produces an impact forceextension curve for the material under study.

It has been found previously that the method currently being used assumes that the missile mass can be selected such that its velocity will be reduced significantly during specimen rupture. With less than a fifty percent velocity reduction, for example, it is impossible to accurately measure the small incremental velocity time curve. As will be shown shortly, the constraints imposed by loadlines and impact velocities of interest in the present program caused severe problems with the measuring system as currently designed. It soon became apparent that it would be impossible to obtain force-time curves. However, the combination of an extension-time curve and energy to rupture gives a good indication of what the rupture force must be, so that despite the lack of a true force-extension curve, it is still possible to characterize the impact behavior of each material under test in a meaningful way.

#### MISSILE MASSES REQUIRED TO EVALUATE HIGH STRENGTH NYLON SUSPENSION LINES AT VARIOUS IMPACT VELOCITIES

	Missile Striking Velocity (ft/sec)								
	150		200		350		500		
Nominal Webbing	$\overline{M_1}$	M <sub>2</sub>	M <sub>1</sub>	M <sub>2</sub>	M <sub>1</sub>	$M_2$	M <sub>1</sub>	M <sub>2</sub>	
Strength (lb)	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	<u>(lb)</u>	
9,000	13	26	7	14	2	4	1	2	
12,000	17	34	10	20	3	6	2	4	
14,000	20	40	11	22	4	8	2	4	

 $M_1$  is mass required to break webbing with zero residual velocity.  $M_2$  is double  $M_1$  and provides the necessary safety factor.

Table 24 lists the missile masses needed to provide double the kinetic energy input needed to break each of the test webbings under Instron test conditions. Our experience indicates that the 100 percent excess is needed for safety to insure that after rupturing the webbing the missile has sufficient velocity to reach, enter into, and be contained in the catching pendulum.

#### Missile Design

Given the limitations described above it became nessary to modify the standard missile shape to one which would accommodate the masses required. The heaviest mass fired previously had been an approximately 8-inch long, 2-1/2 inch diameter brass bar weighing approximately 10 pounds. Since the diameter of the cold gas gun barrel is fixed, it became necessary to lengthen the missile to approximately 18 inches in order to achieve the heavier weights required to break the test specimens. Increasing the missile length beyond twelve inches introduces a serious potential safety hazard, however. If the missile is deflected from its normal trajectory during a webbing break, it can easily strike, but not enter, the front of the catching pendulum and not be contained therein. The ricocheting missile can then damage other equipment in the area, particularly the camera and/or light source. In order to minimize the chances of such an occurrence, it is necessary to always provide sufficient excess energy so that the missile maintains a straight path. Strict adherence to this rule introduces the problem of getting sufficient missile deceleration to make the desired force-time measurements.

Two impacting metal surfaces were studied, steel and aluminum. Different surface areas and shapes were also to be studied (e.g., drone edges versus hooks), but in order to minimize the number of complete missiles to be fabricated, it was decided to utilize as many of the existing missile body masses as possible, adding only the various shapes as nosepieces which would actually be in contact with the test specimen. Two such nosepieces were constructed, one of steel and the other of aluminum. Both were eventually slotted to accept the various blade inserts designed according to the dimensions provided, and had base weights of approximately 9 pounds for the steel and 2-1/2 pounds for the aluminum. These nosepieces, in combination with the lightest bodies of reasonable length, provided a means for firing masses of approximately 5, 12, and 15 pounds. An exploded view of a typical missile is shown in Figure 64. As can be seen it consists of the following:

- an approximately ten inch tapered nosepiece with a slot in front for carrying the various blades (the blades project approximately 3/8 of an inch ahead of the nosepiece),
- (2) a five-inch long body section to provide stability,
- (3) a light tailpiece,
- (4) a one-half-inch-diameter threaded rod to connect the nose and tail pieces.

The masses selected were sufficient to provide a method of obtaining meaningful data within the limited time and funding established for the task. Now that some initial information has been obtained on the response of materials to the various impact shapes, it might be possible in future work to alter the missile mass and catching pendulum in order to get greater deceleration and thereby obtain the desired force-extension data. BUSSESSE ASSAULT AND A REAL PROPERTY

#### **Discussion of Results**

Data obtained for each of the three tensile members that were studied includes low strain rate (Instron) tensile stress-strain diagrams and rupture energy determinations and high strain rate strain-time diagrams and rupture energy determinations. All high strain rate data was obtained under unique conditions, described in the previous section, that combined tensile impact and loading with several degrees of cutting action. These combinations of destructive elements simulated, in an elemental and closely-controlled way, those thought to have contributed to two recent failures to complete aerial recovery operations involving AQM-34R drones. Analysis of the recorded data lends support to the hypothesis that impact between the loadlines tested and certain surfaces simulating those of an AQM-34 drone will result in premature tensile failure of the loadlines.

Prior to the specialized impact testing that comprised the major portion of the work, a limited number of routine tensile tests was performed using an Instron tensile tester to provide bases of comparison. Force-strain diagrams typical of those obtained are shown in Figure 65, and average values of rupture force, strain and energy are shown in Tables 25, 26, and 27. For the 12,000 and 14,000 lb loadlines, the tables show two sets of slightly differing values that are designated according to the sheath color of the loadline, since, in both cases, not enough material with exactly the same tensile properties was available for high strain rate testing. Notice also, that the actual strength of these webbings is generally less than the rated value; as much as 20% less in the cas of the one inch wide, 9000 lb webbing.



and all all a strength

Figure 64. One of the Two Missile Configurations Employed - Leading Edge Inserts are Replaceable



Figure 65. Typical Force-Strain Diagrams for the Three Loadlines under Study, Obtained Using a Strain Rate of Approximately 10%/Min

- Charles - Andre - Ch

#### TENSILE PROPERTIES OF ONE INCH WIDE, 9000 LB WEBBING SUBJECTED TO SEVERAL MODES AND RATES OF STRAIN

			High	Strain Rat	e
Instron	- Standard	d Test	Missile	Nose as 1	loted
Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Time to
Load	Strain	Energy	Strain	Energy	Rupture
<u>(lb)</u>	(%)	(ft-lb/ft)	( <sup>8</sup> )	(ft-lb/ft)	(msec)
7225	18.8	487		403	
				370	
				435	
				455	
				470	
				480	
			18.0	447	2.6
	Instron Rupture Load (lb) 7225	Instron - Standard Rupture Rupture Load Strain (lb) (%) 7225 18.8	Instron - Standard TestRuptureRuptureLoadStrainEnergy(1b)(%)(ft-1b/ft)722518.8487	High <u>Instron - Standard Test</u> Missile Rupture Rupture Rupture Rupture Load Strain Energy Strain (lb) (%) (ft-lb/ft) (%) 7225 18.8 487 18.0	Instron - Standard TestHigh Strain RatRuptureRuptureRuptureRuptureLoadStrainEnergyStrain(b)(%)(ft-lb/ft)(%)(ft-lb/ft)722518.848740337043543545547048018.0447

C.T.I.M. C.T. FALLANDING M. S. L. L. L.

#### TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 12,000 LB GR-14 LOADLINE SUBJECTED TO SEVERAL MODES AND RATES OF STRAIN

				High	Strain Rat	e
	Instron	- Standar	d Test	Missile	Nose as 1	Noted
	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Time to
	Load	Strain	Energy	Strain	Energy	Rupture
	(lb)	(%)	(ft-lb/ft)	<u>(%</u> )	(ft-lb/ft)	(msec)
1/8" alminum nose white webbing 200 ft/sec	11,520	17.2	680	15.3	351 329	2.0
1/8" aluminum nose black webbing 350 ft/sec	10,230	20.8	710		460 452	
1/8" aluminum nose black webbing 500 ft/sec					362 818	
1/16" aluminum nose white webbing 200 ft/sec				17.0	609 720	3.0
1/16" aluminum nose white webbing black webbing 350 ft/sec					664 643	
1/16" aluminum nose black webbing 500 ft/sec				17.8	921 1019	1.3
1/16" stainless steel black webbing 500 ft/sec				15.4	~20	0.6
blunt nose black webbing 500 ft/sec				15.0	716	1.3
1/64" stainless steel no white webbing 200 ft/sec	ose				367	
1/64" stainless steel no white webbing	ose				1018	

#### TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 14,000 LB GR-16 LOADLINE SUBJECTED TO SEVERAL MODES AND RATES OF STRAIN

				High	Strain Rat	e
	Instron	- Standar	d Test	Missile	Nose as 1	Noted
	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Rupture	Time to
	Load	Strain	Energy	Strain	Energy	Rupture
	(lb)	(%)	(ft-lb/ft)	(%)	(ft-lb/ft)	(msec)
1/8" aluminum nose red webbing red webbing	13,400	18.8	920	18.4	~450 356 282	2.4
white webbing 200 ft/sec	14,310	21.4	1120		349	
1/8" aluminum nose					190	
red webbing					293	
350 ft/sec					560	
1/8" aluminum nose					185	
red webbing					261	
500 ft/sec					473	
1/16" aluminum nose				16.4	791	3.1
red webbing 200 ft/sec					732	
1/16" aluminum nose					692	
350 ft/sec						
1/16" aluminum nose				20.1	1205	1.7
red webbing					1102	
500 ft/sec						
1/64" stainless steel no white webbing 200 ft/sec	se				451	
1/64" stainless steel no white webbing 500 ft/sec	se				342	

H.

The data generated as each of three loadline types was impacted at various velocities with missiles designated to simulate hook and drone surfaces is also presented in Tables 25, 26, and 27, to facilitate comparison with low strain rate (Instron) data. Although the Statement of Work specified two tests for each combination of loadline type, surface simulator, and impact velocity, a greater number was frequently made to confirm significant differences in energy absorption values recorded for the first two tests. In other instances, as trends in the results became obvious, fewer than two tests per condition were made in order to comply with time and budget reqirements. The intent was that specimens of one inch wide, 9000 lb webbing be impacted and punctured with a steel hook tine at velocities of 150 and 200 fps. However, the problem of penetrating a webbing with a sharp-nosed missile was felt to be a dangerous, time-consuming endeavor that clearly would not fall within the budgetary limitations of this work. After consideration of possible alternatives, and with the consent of AFML, a steel missile nose that represented a onedimensional replica of the smallest radius of curvature of the tine of a retrieval hook was fabricated. A photograph of a projectile nose about to impact a test specimen, seen in Figure 66, illustrates one plane of the simulated retrieval hook tine. If a photo were taken of this same projectile nose at 90° to the side view, however, it would show a 2-1/2 inch straight edge that ensured square, full contact between missile and webbing specimen and made the experimental plan workable. Rupture of 9000 lb webbing specimens impacted with this type of projectile nose at both 150 and 200 fps required only slightly less energy than that required to rupture the same material in an Instron tensile tester (see Table 25). Information taken from the film record obtained by using the high speed camera during one of these tests is shown in Figure 67 where strain is plotted as a function of time. Notice that a rupture strain of 18%, approximately equal to that measured during an Instron test, is achieved approximately 2.4 milliseconds after initial impact by the missile. Since rupture energy and rupture strain recorded during impact with the simulated hook do not differ significantly from corresponding values measured during an Instron test, one can assume that the rupture force remains at approximately the same level. These determinations, which are highly dependent upon the simplified projectile nose and specimen configuration used, are not wholly conclusive with regard to the potential for webbing damage by a hook in an actual drone recovery operation, where penetration of the webbing by the tip of the tine might occur. However, the likelihood of this happening is prcbably remote, and it is likely that premature tensile failure would not be expected to occur as a result of non-sliding impact with the hook. Heat generated by sliding the hook along the webbing could produce a different form of failure not studied at this time.

The 12,000 lb GR-14 and GR-16 loadlines were also impacted by each of three drone surface simulators at impact velocities of 200, 350, and 500 fps. The surface simulators represented a 1/8 inch thick aluminum spoiler, a 1/16 inch thick aluminum vertical stabilizer, and a 1/64 inch thick steel elevator. Since the precise alloy and temper of the actual drone components was unknown, FRL selected the material for the simulators based upon estimates of the general material type that would probably be employed and, to some degree, on the availability of stock. The two aluminum simulators were of a moderately high



Figure 66. Enlargement of a Single Film Frame from Among the Many Obtained for Each Test in which the High Speed Camera was Employed



いたかなから

at the set of the

Figure 67. Strain as a Function of Time During a Test of a 9,000 lb Webbing Impacted by a Steel Hook Tine Simulator at a Velocity of 200 fps

strength alloy, 6061-T6, that is frequently used in aircraft applications, and the steel elevator simulator was of stainless steel, chosen because it was the stiffest (highest bending modulus) of the steels available. Tables 26 and 27 include summaries of all data obtained by impacting 12,000 lb GR-14 and 14,000 lb GR-16 loadlines with projectiles carrying noses which simulated the sharp-edged surfaces of the drone. In addition to rupture energies obtained by the ballistic pendulum method for each test, rupture strain and time-to-rupture values are shown for selected tests in which the high speed camera was employed. In Figures 68 and 69 a summary of the effect of simulator material and edge thickness upon the rupture energy of each of the loadlines impacted at three different velocities is shown graphically. This information and careful visual assessments of the surface simulating projectile nose after each test made clear the type of loadline damage suffered under each set of conditions. In every case in which a surface simulator collapsed during impact, the rupture energy of the loadline was found to be close to, or somewhat higher than, the energy required to break the loadline in a low strain rate (Instron) tensile test. However, in cases in which the surface simulator received little or no damage, low loadline rupture energies were measured. It became apparent that collapsed edge simulators allowed the blunt, 1/2-in wide projectile nose to transmit energy to the loadline and the effect became that of a routine high strain rate tensile test, while simulators that were not severely damaged during initial impact did, in fact, cut, or partially cut, the loadline. Notice in Figures 68 and 69 that tests using relatively stiff 1/8inch aluminum impacting edges generally resulted in loadline rupture energies that were significantly lower than those recorded during Instron testing, while loadline rupture energies measured during tests involving 1/16-inch aluminum impacting edges, which completely collapsed upon impact, were similar to Instron values. Edges of 1/64-inch stainless steel, although damaged during impact, cut the loadlines with resultant low rupture energies being recorded in all except one test. In this test it is probable that the thin blade did not initially strike the center of the V-shaped specimen and folded over prior to making full contact. Other exceptions to the foregoing can be noted in two or three instances, all for tests at an impact velocity of 500 fps in which relatively high values of rupture were reported. Previous work [ASD Technical Report 60-511, II. February 1962, Coskren and Chu], however, has shown that in general nylon webbings require significantly greater energy for rupture when impacted at velocities as high as 500 fps.

To corroborate the influence of a thin edge with a high resistance to buckling on loadline cutting, two additional test firings were made. The first firing was of a projectile with a nosepiece of 1/16-inch stainless steel that represented an extreme combination of a thin and relatively stiff edge. The second firing was of a projectile with a blank insert in its nose that offered no protruding edge and thus represented the extreme condition of a case of an easily collapsible impacting edge. The loadline in both tests was 12,000 lb GR-14 and the impact velocity was 500 fps. The contrast in results obtained (see Table 26) provided convincing proof of the prime importance of the nature of the impacting edge; the rupture energy measured in the test with the 1/16inch stainless steel edge was close to nil, indicating that cutting was the sole cause of failure, while the rupture energy measured using the blunt edge was approximately equal to the Instron value, tensile strain being the primary cause of failure. Examination of strain-time diagrams (Figure 70 and 71)

(1)50 200 fps impact velocity 350 fps impact velocity (2) steel ₿ 500 fps impact velocity () number of data points 25 stainles aluminum % Change in Rupture Energy 0 (2) (2) (2) stainles¢ steel 8 (3) aluminum -25 aluminum (2) )) (2) (1)stainless steel - 50 -75 -100 1/16 Edge 1/8 Edge 1/64 Edge Thickness Thickness Thickness

Figure 68. Change in Rupture Energy of 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline at High Strain Rate (compared to Instron value) as a Function of Thickness and Material of the Impacting Edge



Figure 69. Change in Rupture Energy of 14000 lb, GR-16 Loadline at High Strain Rate (compared to Instron value) as a Function of Thickness and Material of the Impacting Edge



and the trade of the second

Figure 70. Strain as a Function of Time During a Test of 12,000 lb, GR-14 Loadline Impacted by a 1/16-Inch Thick Stainless Steel Edge



Figure 71. Strain as a Function of Time During a Test of 12,000 lb, GR-16 Loadline Impacted by a 1/2-Inch Thick Aluminum Projectile Nose

obtained using the high speed camera during the two tests, results in additional confirmation of the cutting theory. Notice that the duration of the event involving the steel nose insert was approximately one half that of the event in which the blunt projectile nose was employed. Rupture strains recorded during these two tests (again, see Figures 70 and 71) were of the same magnitude only because the gage marks were placed very close to the point of impact. Rupture strain in the cut specimen, if measured over the full specimen length, would be significantly lower.

Careful visual examination was made of the ruptured ends of all loadline specimens as testing progressed. Upon completion of the testing program, five specimens were selected for further scrutiny under an optical microscope, and of these five, two were chosen for detailed examination with a scanning electron microscope. Although a considerable amount of time was spent observing broken fiber ends with both the optical microscope and the SEM, and several dozen SEM photographs were taken for additional study, the most pertinent observations were made with the unaided eye. it was clearly established that the cleanness of loadline breaks was directly related to the amount of cutting involved, using rupture energy and a knowledge of the nature of the impacting edge to estimate degrees of cutting action. For example, an observer, who had no knowledge of how the loadlines had been broken, was asked to rank, according to cleanness of break, five specimens of 12,000 lb GR-14 loadline, all tested at an impact velocity of 500 fps. He ranked them in this order: 

Cleanness of Break (No. 1 being most clean)	Nature of Impacting Edge	Rupture Energy (ft-lb/ft)
1	1/16-inch stainless steel	~ 20
2	1/8-inch aluminum	362
3	1/8-inch aluminum	818
4	1/16-inch aluminum	1019
5	blank insert; blunt projectile nose	716

Photographs of two of the specimens from this group, those ranked Nos. 1 and 4, are shown in Figures 72 and 73 to illustrate the great contrast in appearance between the ends of a cut loadline and one that failed primarily due to tensile strain. Although a number of SEM photographs were taken of broken fiber ends from these same two specimens, characteristic features were not readily distinguishable; examples of fiber ends that were similar in appearance could be found in both specimens, as shown in Figures 74 and 75.

#### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The failure mode of 12,000 lb GR-14 and 14,000 lb GR-16 loadlines, when impacted by AQM-34R drone surface simulators at velocities within the range of 200 to 500 fps, was shown to be dependent upon the stiffness of the impacting surface. In tests in which the impacting edge collapsed on impact, relatively



Figure 72. Ruptured Ends of 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline after Impact with a 1/16 Inch Stainless Steel Edge at a Velocity of 500 fps (actual size)



Figure 73. Ruptured Ends of 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline after Impact with a 1/2 Inch Wide Blunt Missile Nose (actual size)



A STATE

E TELL CALL

Figure 74. SEM Photograph of Ruptured Fiber Ends from a 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline that was Impacted at 500 fps by a Blunt-Nosed Projectile



Figure 75. SEM Photograph of Ruptured Fiber Ends from a 12000 lb, GR-14 Loadline that was Impacted at 500 fps by a 1/16 inch Stainless Steel Edge

high tensile energy measurements were recorded, but in tests in which the simulator edge suffered little or no damage, low energy values were obtained, indicative of premature failure due to cutting. Surfaces simulating spoilers (6061-T6 aluminum, 1/8-inch thick) and drone elevators (stainless steel, 1/64 inch) generally cut these loadlines, while the vertical stabilizer simulator (6061-T6 aluminum, 1/16 inch) collapsed and permitted the lines to function fully as tensile members. In applying this finding to the problem at hand, several limitations of the laboratory simulation must be recognized: 1) to achieve tensile loading, a V-shaped loadline configuration was employed; 2) impact was relatively clean without prior projectile-loadline abrasion; and 3) the unsupported depth of the impacting edge was 3/8 inch; in practice, the corresponding dimension is probably much greater.

No definite conclusions were possible in the case of a retrieval hook tine impacting a 9,000 lb loadbearing member, as safety and budget considerations severely limited the scope of this laboratory simulation. However, under the conditions employed in the tests, no evidence of webbing damage causing premature failure was found.

Visual correlation of failure mode with the appearance of ruptured loadline ends could readily be accomplished with the naked eye. Although in practice, flailing of ruptured ends subsequent to failure may tend to obscure identifying features, this sample approach should be exploited as fully as possible. Before the scanning electron microscope can become a practical tool in this application, a great deal of work will be necessary to accurately catalogue the appearance of nylon filaments subjected to many types of combinations of failure-producing strains.

Complete force-strain diagrams for loadlines subjected to impact by various surface simulators would undoubtedly be of great interest, but obtaining such diagrams is an extremely time-consuming task and could not successfully be accommodated within the scope of this program. The data obtained to date, however, provides required background information in the event that a decision is made to pursue the task of obtaining force-strain diagrams.

It would also be valuable to determine how webbings made from Kevlar, which are unusually hard to cut with a pair of scissors, would respond to impact of sharp-nosed missiles such as have been used in the current study. If they showed higher resistance to cutting than the nylon webbings presently being used, serious consideration might be given to using Kevlar suspension lines in the drone recovery parachute.

# SUPPLEMENTARY

## INFORMATION



#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

WRIGHT LABORATORY (AFMC) WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

ERRATA

25 February 1994

WL/DOA, Bldg 22 FROM: 2690 C St Ste 4 Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-7411

SUBJ: Notice of Changes in Technical Report(s) AFML-TR-74-65

TO: Defense Technical Information Center Attn: DTIC-OCC Cameron Station Alexandria VA 22304-6145

Please change subject report(s) as follows:

AFML-TR-74-65, Part I - AD <del>D000960</del> Part II - AD <del>D002047</del> Part III - A<del>D B002047</del> Part IV - AD B017280

All parts have been approved for public release; distribution is unlimited as of 23 Feb 1994.

ERRATA - AD-BO17280

WM OF. WHALEN Chief, Tech. Editing & STINFO Branch Resource Management