



Certification of Composite-Metal Hybrid Structures

Damage Tolerance Testing and Analysis Protocols for Full-Scale Composite Airframe Structures under Repeated Loading

2013 Technical Review Waruna Seneviratne & John Tomblin Wichita State University/NIAR

Certification of Composite-Metal Hybrid Structures

• Motivation and Key Issues

- Damage growth mechanics, critical loading modes and load spectra for composite and metal structure have significant differences that make the certification of composite-metal hybrid structures challenging, costly and time consuming.
- Data scatter in composites compared to metal data is significantly higher requiring large test duration to achieve a particular reliability that a metal structure would demonstrate with significantly low test duration.
- Metal and composites have significantly different coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE)
- Mechanical and thermal characteristics of composites are sensitive to temperature and moisture
- Need for an efficient certification approach that weighs both the economic aspects of certification and the time frame required for certification testing, while ensuring that safety is the key priority









Certification of Composite-Metal Hybrid Structures

• Primary Objective

- Develop guidance materials for analysis and large-scale test substantiation of composite-metal hybrid structures.
- Secondary Objectives
 - Evaluate the damage mechanics and competing failure modes (origination and propagation)
 - Mechanical & bonded joints
 - Data scatter and reliability analysis, i.e., LEF
 - Modifications to load spectra and application LEF
 - Address mismatched Coefficient of Thermal Expansion (CTE) and ground-air-ground (GAG) effects
 - Impact of environmental effects on hybrid structures
 - Environmental compensation factor (ECF)
 - Test environments





















Certification of Composite-Metal Hybrid Structures

- Principal Investigators & Researchers
 - John Tomblin, PhD, and Waruna Seneviratne, PhD
 - Upul Palliyaguru
- FAA Technical Monitor

- Curtis Davies and Lynn Pham

- Other FAA Personnel Involved
 - Larry Ilcewicz, PhD
- Industry Participation
 - Airbus, Boeing, Bombardier, Bell Helicopter, Cessna, Hawker Beechcraft, Honda Aircraft Co., NAVAIR, and Spirit Aerosystems







Spectrum Truncation & Clipping

- Differences between composite and metallic spectrums •
 - Metals: severe flight loads result in crack-growth retardation

 Clipping
 - Composites: severe flight loads significantly contribute to flaw growth in composite structures and reduce the fatigue life
 - Flaw growth threshold for metals may be lower load level than that for composites



6

Load-Life Combined (LEF) Approach









Load-Life Hybrid (LEF-H) Approach



Spread high load cycles throughout the spectrum (may require additional crack growth analysis for hybrid structures)







Hybrid (Load-Life) Approach for Hybrid (Composite-Metal) Structures



(3) LEF Hybrid (LEF-H) Approach







Certification of Hybrid Structures

- Two separate fatigue test articles each focusing metal and composite spectrums
 - Time consuming and costly
- Pre-production subcomponent repeated load tests primarily focusing composite structure certification and full-scale test repeated load test focusing metal structure certification
 - Multiple test articles → time consuming and costly
- Replace failed metallic part during repeated load test
 - May not be applicable for metallic driven design
 - Load redistribution due to wide-spread fatigue damage (WFD), i.e., multiple-site damage (MSD) or multiple element damage (MED) scenarios may not be representative
 - Time consuming and costly
 - Stiffening (reinforce) metal members may cause uncharacteristic load redistribution
- Hybrid citification approach using single article initial phase with low or no LEF focusing metallic structure certification and apply LEF for the second phase
 - Use of *Load-Life Shift* to calculate equivalent certified life accounting for the complete test duration for composite
 - Economical and reduce the total required test duration







Load-Life Shift

• Provides a mechanism to obtain credit for the loads applied during first phase (focusing metal) so that the test duration for the composite certification phase can be reduced.

$$\frac{N_{LEF_1}^T}{N_{LEF_1}^R} + \frac{N_{LEF_2}^T}{N_{LEF_2}^R} + \dots + \frac{N_{LEF_n}^T}{N_{LEF_n}^R} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{N_{LEF_i}^T}{N_{LEF_i}^R} \ge 1.0$$

• Simplified version:

$$N_2^T = \left(1 - \frac{N_1^T}{N_1^R}\right) \cdot N_2^R$$









Full-Scale Test Sequence [Typical Transport Aircraft]



Ref: CMH-17







Test Sequence for Full-Scale Test Substantiation via Load-Life Shift Hybrid Approach



Load-Life Shift (LLS) Approach

- One durability test article through Load-Life Shift Approach for Hybrid (Composite-Metal) Structures
 - Application of life factor to high loads ensure the reliability for the most critical load levels (for composites)
 - Apply high LEF to reduce the time on low stress cycles
 - Require fatigue analysis of metal structure to alleviate undesirable impacts on metal part
 - 3 DSG for metal substantiation and then composite (credits given to composite cycles during 3 DSGs per Load-life Shift Method)
 - High loads required for composite structure that are above clipping level (prior to applying LEF) can be applied in Phase 2
 - LLS approach provides a mechanism for an efficient certification approach that weighs both the economic aspects of certification and the time frame required for certification testing, while ensuring that safety is the key priority



Significant time and cost savings









Load-Enhancement Factor Curve (Example: NIAR FAA-LEF Data)



Composite Certification Phase with Load-Life Shift



 Load-Life Shift Test Requirements in Composite Phase (after 3 DLT test with LEF=1 for Metal Certification Phase)

NAVY Data

| Option | LEF | Required Test Duration without LLS | Required Test Duration with LLS | Total Test Duration |
|--------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 1.000 | 14.0 | 11.0 | 14.0 |
| 2 | 1.019 | 10.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 |
| 3 | 1.052 | 6.0 | 2.4 | 5.4 |
| 4 | 1.079 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 4.6 |
| 5 | 1.127 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 3.8 |

NIAR Data

| Option | LEF | Required Test Duration without LLS | Required Test Duration with LLS | Total Test Duration |
|--------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 1.000 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| 2 | 1.016 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 4.6 |
| 3 | 1.033 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 4.2 |
| 4 | 1.058 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 3.8 |
| 5 | 1.088 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 3.5 |







LLS Hybrid Certification for Metal-Composite Hybrid **Structures** Example ONLY



Separate Metal and Composite Certification Test Articles





BUILDING-BLOCK OF TESTING

Metal/Composite Specimen Testing Hybrid Splice joint F/A-18 Bonded Step-Lap Joint F/A-18 Full-Scale Fatigue Test



Composite-Metal hybrid Element Testing

- 2 x 3 0.25-inch fasteners with 0.5-inch pitch ٠
- 2 metallic splice plates

Anti-buckling fixture for compression loading



Metal

000



Composite-Metal Fatigue Data









Composite-Metal Fatigue Data with CTE Effects



Progressive Failure on F/A-18 Composite-Titanium Step-Lap Joint

- large delaminations initiated around the areas where titanium fatigue cracks formed
- Presence of microcracks in resin rich areas and adhesive
- Even though the titanium has failed across the step 8 and large delaminations were present, these specimens were able to transfer the fatigue loads across the remainder of the stepped-lap joint for a significant number of fatigue cycles.
 - The load redistribution noticeably overloaded the reminder of the titanium section and caused the final failure.





Ref: Seneviratne, *et. al.*, **Durability and Residual Strength Assessment of F/A-18 A-D Wing-Root Stepped-Lap Joint,** 11th AIAA ATIO Conference, AIAA Centennial of Naval Aviation Forum, Sept., 2011.





Progressive Failure on F/A-18 Composite-Titanium Step-Lap Joint





(a) Fatigue crack propagation from titanium to composite through adhesive layer.



(b) Failure surface -OML side





(c) Failure surface -IML side







Open-Hole

Unstable Crack Growth





Stable Crack Growth











NAVAIR Public Release SPR-11-455: Distribution Statement A - "Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited"

Summary

• One durability test article for Hybrid (Composite-Metal) Structures

– Load-Life Hybrid (LEF-H) Approach

- Application of life factor to high loads ensure the reliability for the most critical load levels (for composites)
- Apply high LEF to reduce the time on low stress cycles

- Load-Life Shift (LLS) Approach

 provides a mechanism for an efficient certification approach that weighs both the economic aspects of certification and the time frame required for certification testing, while ensuring that safety is the key priority

Significant time and cost savings











Looking Forward

Benefit to Aviation

- Efficient certification approach that weighs both the economic aspects of certification and the time frame required for certification testing, while ensuring that safety is the key priority.
 - Guidance materials for analysis and large-scale test substantiation of composite-metal hybrid structures.
 - Damage mechanics and competing failure modes (origination and propagation)
 - Guidance for hybrid load spectra and application LEF

Future needs

- Representative test articles
- Guidance on spectrum development







Notes

- Contact (Waruna Seneviratne):
 - waruna@niar.wichita.edu
 - Ph: 316-978-5221
- References:
 - Tomblin, J and Seneviratne, W., Determining the Fatigue Life of Composite Aircraft Structures Using Life and Load-Enhancement Factors, DOT/FAA/AR-10/06, Federal Aviation Administration, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA, 2010.
 - Tomblin, J and Seneviratne, W., Durability and Damage Tolerance Testing of Starship Forward Wing with Large Damages, DOT/FAA/AR-11/XX, Federal Aviation Administration, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA, 2013.
 - Whitehead, R. S., Kan, H. P., Cordero, R., and Seather, E. S., Certification Testing Methodology for Composite Structures, Report No. NADC-87042-60, Volumes I and II, October, 1986.







End of Presentation.

Thank you.







JOINT ADVANCED MATERIALS & STRUCTURES CENTER OF EXCELLENCE