

This work is dedicated to my parents and brother: Robert, Bonnie, and Bradley Burdette

Acknowledgements

Sincere gratitude is expressed to my advisor, Dr. Kenneth L. Reifsnider, for his patience, support, enthusiasm, and guidance during the research and writing processes for this thesis. I could not have asked for a more exciting topic for a master's thesis, nor a more pleasant relationship with an advisor.

Thanks also to Dr. Scott W. Case and Dr. Ronald G. Kander for their insight and advice on this research and for serving on my graduate committee.

Many thanks to undergraduate research assistant John Burden for his role in the experimental portion of this work. His skills in designing and constructing the experimental equipment, and his assistance in setting up and running experiments were extremely valuable contributions to this research.

Thanks to Chris Wieczorek of the Reactive Flows Laboratory & Virginia Active Combustion Control Group in the Department of Mechanical Engineering for his general advice on fire experimentation and his willing response to specific questions encountered during this work. Thanks also to Jason Floyd, with the Building and Fire Research Laboratory at NIST, for his guidance in setting up and running the fire model software used in this project.

Thank you to administrative assistants Shelia Collins and Beverly Williams, and to all the members of the Materials Response Group for providing regular assistance in the office and labs and for their companionship both in and out of work.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Project Background	2
1.3 Composites in the Navy	3
1.4 Residual Strength and Structural Integrity	5
1.5 Approach	8
CHAPTER 2: EXPERIMENTAL	10
Overview	10
2.1 Equipment	10
2.1.1 Burner	10
2.1.2 Chamber	15
2.1.3 Loading Device	16
2.1.4 Material Samples	20
2.2 Procedure	21
2.3 Experimental Results	22
2.4 Discussion	26
CHAPTER 3: MODEL DEVELOPMENT	27
Overview	27
3.1 Fire Model	27
3.2 Thermal Response Model	37
3.3 Stiffness-Temperature Model	40
3.4 Mechanical Response Model	42
3.5 Material Failure Model	47
CHAPTER 4: MODEL VALIDATION	53
Overview	53
4.1 Fire Model	53
4.2 Thermal Response Model	58
4.3 Stiffness-Temperature Model	60
4.4 Mechanical Response Model	61
4.5 Material Failure Model	63
CHAPTER 5: LIFE-PREDICTION	67
Overview	67
5.1 Life-Prediction Procedure	67
5.2 Life-Prediction Results	69
5.3 Discussion	71
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	76
6.1 Summary	76
6.2 Recommendations	76
REFERENCES	79
APPENDIX A	83
APPENDIX B	87

Table of Figures

Figure 1.1: Set-up of system studied in thesis	9
Figure 2.1: Diagram of diffusion burner	11
Figure 2.2: Schematic of heat-release measurement set-up	12
Figure 2.3: Typical results of Aluminum disc temperature measurements	13
Figure 2.4: Burner heat release vs. measured flow-rate	14
Figure 2.5: Diagram of the fire chamber	15
Figure 2.6: Diagram of loaded material sample	16
Figure 2.7: Free-body diagram of beam section	17
Figure 2.8: Maximum applied strain vs. end-to-end distance (sample length = 203 mm)	20
Figure 2.9: Photograph of experiment in progress	21
Figure 2.10. Experimental Results ($\epsilon_{\max} / \epsilon_{\text{failure}} = 0.25$)	23
Figure 2.11. Experimental Results ($\epsilon_{\max} / \epsilon_{\text{failure}} = 0.50$)	24
Figure 2.12. Experimental Results ($\epsilon_{\max} / \epsilon_{\text{failure}} = 0.75$)	25
Figure 3.1: Zone model set-up	28
Figure 3.2: Field model set-up	39
Figure 3.3: Data file for FDS simulation	30
Figure 3.4: Visualization of FDS simulation	31
Figure 3.5: Radiative heat flux contours from FDS	33
Figure 3.6: Convective heat flux contours from FDS	33
Figure 3.7: Radiative heat loss contours from FDS	33
Figure 3.8: Old and new beam discretization schemes	34
Figure 3.9: Radiative heat flux distributions	35
Figure 3.10: Convective heat flux distributions	35
Figure 3.11: Radiative heat loss distributions	36
Figure 3.12: Heat added to and lost from beam element i	37
Figure 3.13: Specific heat and thermal diffusivity vs. temperature	39
Figure 3.14: Temperature distributions	40
Figure 3.15: Elastic modulus distributions	42
Figure 3.16: Free-body diagram of beam section	43
Figure 3.17: Illustration of shooting method procedure	46
Figure 3.18: Maximum strain distributions	47
Figure 3.19: Section of composite failed under compressive load	48
Figure 3.20: Compressive strain-to-failure distributions	51
Figure 4.1: Schematic of experiments to validate fire model	53
Figure 4.2: Schematic of analysis to validate fire model	54
Figure 4.3: Predicted vs. measured plume temperatures ($Q = 115.2$ W)	55
Figure 4.4: Predicted vs. measured plume temperatures ($Q = 156.4$ W)	56
Figure 4.5: Predicted vs. measured plume temperatures ($Q = 174.2$ W)	57
Figure 4.6. Schematic of experiments to validate thermal response model	59
Figure 4.7: Schematic of analysis to validate thermal response model	59
Figure 4.8: Predicted vs. measured surface temperatures	60
Figure 4.9: Calculated vs. measured elastic modulus	61
Figure 4.10: Schematic of experiments to validate mechanical response model	62
Figure 4.11: Predicted vs. measured deflections	63
Figure 4.12: Schematic of experiments to validate material failure model	64

Figure 4.13: Predicted vs. measured compressive strain-to-failure	65
Figure 5.1: Evolution of applied strain and strain-to-failure distributions	67
Figure 5.2: Critical element location vs. time	68
Figure 5.3: Applied strain and strain-to-failure in critical element vs. time	69
Figure 5.4: Predicted vs. measured time-to-failure ($h = 24 \text{ cm}$, $\epsilon_{\text{max}}/\epsilon_f = 0.25$)	70
Figure 5.5: Measured vs. predicted mid-span temperatures ($Q = 68.1 \text{ W}$)	72
Figure 5.6: Measured vs. predicted mid-span temperatures ($Q = 115.2 \text{ W}$)	72
Figure 5.7: Measured vs. predicted mid-span temperatures ($Q = 156.4 \text{ W}$)	73
Figure 5.8: Measured vs. predicted mid-span temperatures ($Q = 174.2 \text{ W}$)	73
Figure 6.1: Example of more complex fire model set-up	77