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ABSTRACT

An agreement between DSTO and the US Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) was established as a part of a larger Aging Aircraft Project Agreement (PA). As a part of this agreement a large experimental program was organised to examine the long-term environmental durability of bonded composite repairs to metallic aircraft structure. An important aspect of the program was to examine the reliability and performance of current or recently developed surface treatments for metallic surfaces being repaired in field situations. The program involved the production of over 100 metal skinned honeycomb beam samples that were each patched with boron composite doublers. The beam samples are now being cyclically loaded in four point bending rigs at the DSTO tropical test facility in Innisfail, northern Queensland. It was anticipated that cyclic loading of the beams would result in adhesive disbonding for samples where the surface treatments were known to be inferior on the basis of accelerated laboratory testing. The overall results were hoped to enable the durability of metal to adhesive bonds present in boron composite repairs to be assessed for conditions similar to those expected in aircraft operating environments. An additional outcome of the research was hoped to be the ability to correlate accelerated durability testing conducted in the laboratory with more realistic aging conditions expected in aircraft service.
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Executive Summary

Bonded composite repair of metallic structure has become a useful aircraft structural life extension solution over the last two decades. Repairs have been applied to aircraft worldwide and in the last decade, the United States Air Force (USAF) has used bonded repair technology to solve some difficult flight safety and fleet readiness problems.

In Australia, the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) has been using bonded technology in niche applications for over 20 years. One of the initial applications involved repair to the Mirage III fleet, whilst repairs to F-111 have been ongoing. DSTO and the RAAF also applied a patch to the F-111 lower wing skin in a region that contained a critical crack for the limit load condition.

The most extensive use of bonded composite repairs to metallic structure in the USAF was for the wing-cracking problem in the Lockheed C-141. Over one thousand patches were applied to cracked fuel weepholes in the aging Starlifter. For the C-141, the repair option was the most practical solution to ensure the flight safety of the fleet, whilst maintaining operational readiness. Although part replacement would have served to restore structural integrity to an original condition, the wing planks in question were complex, 33-foot-long, integrally stiffened, highly priced items. As such, no stockpile of parts existed, and Lockheed was incapable of producing the components in the volume and time required to prevent a significant impact on fleet availability.

Whilst there are obvious advantages in using bonded repairs, the technology does have disadvantages, which have limited the widespread application on aircraft fleets throughout the world. Bonded repairs typically are not preferred in applications where bolted repairs or component replacement are feasible. Commercial airline maintenance organisations rarely use bonded repairs due to risks and complications perceived by many practising engineers. The reliability of bonded repairs relies heavily on the skills of the technicians applying the repairs and the quality of the engineering systems the practitioners adhere to. Due to a limited number of isolated incidents in which bonded structure on aircraft have catastrophically failed, the technology is not yet considered to be mature. In contrast to the perceptions of commercial airline maintenance engineers, defence based applications of the technology have been very reliable. The implementation of quality management systems by the RAAF have produced durable and reliable repairs on a range of aircraft for a number of years.
Additionally, the long-term environmental durability of adhesively bonded structure cannot be easily predicted without supporting field evidence. Typically, certification can only be provided in initial construction, where quality control of the bonding procedures can be guaranteed within the confines of a factory environment. It is more difficult for bonded repairs carried out on aircraft structure in the field to be performed with similar environmental control and repairs, as such, are not given structural credit. Clearly, the ability to certify the environmental durability of bonded repairs will expand their application and will offer substantial cost benefits to aircraft maintenance. Research and development needs to focus on methods to improve and guarantee the reliability of the technology and, therefore, facilitate certification and consequent widespread usage.

An agreement between DSTO and the US Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) was established as a part of a larger Aging Aircraft Project Agreement (PA). As a part of this agreement a large experimental program was organised to examine the long-term durability of bonded composite repairs to metallic aircraft structure. An important aspect of the program was to examine the reliability and performance of current or recently developed surface treatments for metallic surfaces being repaired in field situations. The program involved the production of over 100 metal skinned honeycomb beam samples that were each patched with boron composite doublers. The beam samples are now being cyclically loaded in four point bending rigs at the DSTO tropical test facility in Innisfail, northern Queensland. It was anticipated that cyclic loading of the beams would result in adhesive disbonding for samples where the surface treatments were known to be inferior on the basis of accelerated laboratory testing. The overall results were hoped to enable the durability of metal to adhesive bonds present in boron composite repairs to be assessed for conditions similar to those expected in aircraft operating environments. An additional outcome of the research was hoped to be the ability to correlate accelerated durability testing conducted in the laboratory with more realistic ageing conditions expected in aircraft service.

The current report details the beam construction and patch lay-up, together with the details of the surface pretreatments applied to the metallic adherend and the loading conditions employed, as well as initial results from testing.
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1. Introduction

Bonded composite repair of metallic structure has become a useful aircraft structural life extension solution over the last two decades. Repairs have been applied to aircraft worldwide [1] and in the last decade, the United States Air Force (USAF) has used bonded repair technology to solve some difficult flight safety and fleet readiness problems.

In Australia, the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) has been using bonded technology in niche applications for over 20 years. One of the initial applications involved repair to the Mirage III fleet [2], whilst repairs to F-111 have been ongoing. DSTO and the RAAF also applied a patch to the F-111 lower wing skin in a region that contained a critical crack for the limit load condition [3].

The most extensive use of bonded composite repairs to metallic structure in the USAF was for the wing-cracking problem in the Lockheed C-141. Over one thousand patches were applied to cracked fuel weepholes in the aging Starlifter [4]. For the C-141, the repair option was the most practical solution to ensure the flight safety of the fleet, whilst maintaining operational readiness. Although part replacement would have served to restore structural integrity to an original condition, the wing planks in question were highly expensive components to replace. As such, no stockpile of parts existed, and Lockheed was incapable of producing the components in the volume and time required to prevent a significant impact on fleet availability.

Whilst there are obvious advantages in using bonded repairs, the technology does have disadvantages, which have limited its widespread application on aircraft fleets throughout the world. Bonded repairs typically are not preferred in applications where bolted repairs or component replacement are feasible. Commercial airline maintenance organisations rarely use bonded repairs due to risks and complications perceived by many practising engineers. The reliability of bonded repairs relies heavily on the skills of the technicians applying the repairs and the quality of the engineering systems the practitioners adhere to. Due to a limited number of isolated incidents in which bonded structure on aircraft has catastrophically failed, the technology is not yet considered to be mature. In contrast to the perceptions of commercial airline maintenance engineers defence-based applications of the technology have been very reliable. The implementation of quality management systems by the RAAF have produced durable and reliable repairs on a range of aircraft for a number of years.

Additionally, the long-term environmental durability of adhesively bonded structure cannot be easily predicted without supporting field evidence. Typically, certification can only be provided in initial construction, where quality control of the bonding procedures can be guaranteed within the confines of a factory environment. It is more difficult for bonded repairs carried out on aircraft structure in the field to be performed with similar environmental control and repairs, as such, are not given structural credit.
Clearly, the ability to certify the environmental durability of bonded repairs will expand their application and will offer substantial cost benefits to aircraft maintenance. Research and development needs to focus on methods to improve and guarantee the reliability of the technology and, therefore, facilitate certification and consequent widespread usage. DSTO and ASI are currently developing processes and systems which are designed at increasing the quality of bonding operations and officially recording the performance of field repairs to provide direct evidence for the highly reliable performance of bonded repairs performed by RAAF for more than 10 years.

An agreement between DSTO and the US Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) was established as a part of a larger Aging Aircraft Project Agreement (PA). As a part of this agreement a large experimental program was organised to examine the long-term durability of bonded composite repairs to metallic aircraft structure. An important aspect of the program was to examine the reliability and performance of current or recently developed surface treatments for metallic surfaces being repaired in field situations. The program involved the production of over 100 metal skinned honeycomb beam samples that were each patched with boron composite doublers. The beam samples are now being cyclically loaded in four point bending rigs at the DSTO tropical test facility in Innisfail, northern Queensland. It was anticipated that cyclic loading of the beams would result in adhesive disbonding for samples where the surface treatments were known to be inferior on the basis of accelerated laboratory testing. It was hoped that the overall results would enable the assessment of the durability of metal to adhesive bonds present in boron composite repairs for conditions similar to those expected in aircraft operating environments. An additional outcome of the research was hoped to be the ability to correlate accelerated durability testing conducted in the laboratory with more realistic ageing conditions expected in aircraft service.

Presented in this report are the details of the beam construction and patch lay-up, together with the details of the surface pretreatments applied to the metallic adherend and the loading conditions employed, as well as initial results from testing.

## 2. Test Variables

The primary test variables examined in the program include the surface treatment applied to the metallic adherend, including the effect of chromate primers, adhesive type, and patch taper angle.

### 2.1 Surface Treatment

The most crucial part of the bonded repair installation process is the surface preparation of the metal being patched. The success in Australia and the US of bonded repairs has relied on the development of robust Engineering Standards, underpinned
by effective personnel training. The inability of any currently available NDI procedures to accurately determine the quality of an adhesive bond means the success of the technology relies on the skills of the technicians applying the repairs and the quality control of the engineering systems in place. Rigid quality control and effective personnel training are often seen as a restriction for the increased use of bonded repairs due to the associated cost and time burdens. However, the development of adhesive bonding into a mature and accepted technology cannot overlook these critical aspects. Once greater confidence in the technology is established, these perceived time and cost disadvantages would be easily outweighed by the range of substantial advantages bonded repairs offer in numerous applications.

2.1.1 Established Surface Treatments

DSTO and RAAF have typically employed a surface treatment known as the “Australian Silane Treatment” for a number of years in bonded composite repairs to metallic structure and metal to metal repairs in F-111 honeycomb panel maintenance [5]. The AFRL Materials Directorate carefully examined the process variables and determined that conditions employed by DSTO were, in general, optimal [6]. The grit-blast and silane process (GBS) involves degreasing the metallic surface, abrading to remove weakly adhered layers, followed by grit-blasting and application of an epoxy silane coupling agent, prior to bonding. The process is a convenient and durable treatment for on-aircraft repairs. The best factory treatment available for bonding to aluminium alloys is the phosphoric acid anodisation process (PAA) [7], which involves deoxidising the aluminium prior to anodisation in a 10% phosphoric acid solution at approximately 10V for 10-15 minutes. PAA cannot be used for repairs on in-service aircraft and two versions for in-field use have been developed, the phosphoric acid containment system, or PACS [8], and the phosphoric acid non-tank anodise, or PANTA [9]. DSTO and the RAAF successfully used PANTA on 180 repairs to Mirage III lower wing skins [10].

Regardless of the process, a good surface preparation can require between four and ten hours to complete, and at times, 14 hours or more may be required for the entire patch installation. In many cases, however, this is still considerably faster than implementing a comparable bolted repair. Increasing the speed of surface preparation without compromising quality is, however, a useful objective in increasing the usage of the technology, particularly in areas of secondary and tertiary structure.

The RAAF and USAF have adopted two slightly different versions of the GBS process in that the RAAF does not use primer during patch application. Chromated primers pose an increased health and safety risk to workers and application is by no means a fail-safe step, as the thickness of the primer layer is critical to its effectiveness. Once the primer layer exceeds prescribed thickness values, the adhesive joint strength can be reduced due to the formation of a brittle interfacial layer. Additionally, recent research [11] has indicated that the primer offers no obvious benefit in durability, as measured by the wedge test, when FM73 adhesive is co-cured at 80°C for 8 hours. This is typically
the case for minimising thermal residual stresses in field repairs using boron composites. The research has shown that primered GBS systems perform slightly better in standard Boeing Wedge Test (BWT) and Long Crack Extension (LCE) experiments for the FM73 standard cure condition of 120°C [11]. Clearly, however, the BWT and LCE tests are conducted in a laboratory to provide accelerated aging, but cannot be used to estimate the true long-term durability of an adhesive joint in service. RAAF anecdotally report very few problems with repairs carried out at Amberly on F-111, mainly on the secondary and tertiary structure of metallic skinned honeycomb panels. Presently, a survey is underway in order to quantify these assertions, and it is hoped teardown of representative patches will provide direct evidence of the surface treatment success. In contrast, the USAF still allows the use of primer in repair installation, but health and safety concerns may soon restrict its use as it has in the RAAF. Clearly the program will provide valuable long-term performance data on the influence of primers on bonded repair durability.

2.1.2 New Surface Treatments

Beyond altering the traditional surface preparation processes to become more time friendly, other options include developing altogether new surface preparations. The Sol-Gel surface preparation was developed by Boeing under contract from the Materials Directorate of AFRL and is now sold commercially through AC Tech as the product AC-130 [12]. The Sol-Gel technology is based on the GBS process and uses the same epoxy-silane coupling agent. In addition to the epoxy-silane, a zirconium-based alkoxide is also used. The application of dilute zirconium alkoxide and epoxy-silane mixture in aqueous solution provides a thin inorganic zirconium oxide film incorporated with epoxy-silane. The zirconium reacts with the metallic surface to produce a covalent chemical bond and the epoxy-silane provides a reactive organic group for bonding to the epoxy adhesive. The possible improvement of the sol-gel process over the GBS process would rely on the increased hydrolytic stability of the zirconium bonding to the metal and epoxy-silane and adhesive, compared with the straight epoxy-silane bonds to the metal and adhesive. An obvious benefit of the sol-gel process providing a more chemically resistant adhesive bond would be an increase in the speed and a reduction in the complexity of application. Such advantages may facilitate removal of the difficult grit-blasting step. Similarly, a better chemical bond may imply increased robustness of the process and, therefore, increased tolerance in production.

2.1.3 Surface Treatment Issues Addressed by the Durability Trial

The primary objectives of the bonded repair durability trial are the correlation of long-term bond durability with the metallic surface treatment, relating the durability assessed in the trial with accelerated testing conducted in laboratories and assessing the performance of established factory and field based metallic surface treatments with the recently developed sol-gel process.
The established treatments considered in the trial are the PAA and GBS processes. The PAA process provides a benchmark for the trial, as it is the best factory treatment available, and is only ever used with a chromate based primer. The GBS treatment is the most widely used process employed by RAAF and is used with and without a chromate primer in the trial to represent the variability that exists in field repair applications. The trial may also provide an indication of the relative effect that a small improvement in durability, observed by use of the primer with the GBS treatment in the wedge and LCE test, has on service life.

The GBS process has also been varied to simulate varying degrees of quality that may be possible in real life application (Table A1, Appendix A). These variations include extreme cases where the grit-blasting and silane treatment may have been overlooked (designated the Scotchbrite abrasion treatment (SB)), the epoxy-silane application is missing (designated the grit-blast treatment (GB)), the silane is applied without the grit-blasting (designated the Scotchbrite abrasion and silane treatment (SBS)) and the epoxy-silane solution is only 50% of the required concentration (designated the bad silane treatment (BS)). The benefit of these variations is to provide a realistic assessment of varying lapses in quality control of the GBS treatment on service life durability. Additionally, because these variations provide a wide spectrum of wedge test and LCE performance, the trial data will serve as a “calibration curve” for relating accelerated testing to service life performance.

The new sol-gel treatment is also examined in terms of its sensitivity to each of the processing steps to overall bond durability performance. Sol-gel is applied to the metallic surface with and without primer and with and without grit-blasting. The variations in treatment, thereby, provide the ability to relate performance directly with the GBS process and ascertain the sensitivity of the process to quality control.

2.2 Adhesive Evaluation

Two different adhesives have been selected for use in the durability trial, namely: FM-73 and FM 300-2. FM-73 has been used extensively in bonded repair applications undertaken by DSTO [1] and was used in the Starlifter program mentioned previously [4]. Whilst the recommended cure of 120°C (248 °F) has been used in this program, a cure at 80°C (176 °F) is typically used in field repairs. The increased cure temperature used in the trial will provide a valuable assessment of the influence of residual thermal stresses on durability, particularly for high and low peel stress patching configurations, referred to below. FM-73 is adequate for repairs to structures not expected to see temperatures above 80°C. For applications that stand to see slightly higher temperatures (up to 100 °C), FM 300-2 is an alternative. Thus FM 300-2 could be used on repairs to supersonic aircraft where aerodynamic heating becomes an issue. The choice of two adhesives allows the durability trial to evaluate repair configurations for adhesives that would typically be employed for the operational temperature envelopes of most defence aircraft.
2.3 Patch Design Variations

Another goal of the durability trial is to investigate the impact of different patch designs on the above combinations of surface preparations and adhesives. The final patch designs are straightforward, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. The two designs are very similar, with the only difference being in the stacking sequence of boron fibre plies and the taper ratio. The differences in taper ratio cause the two patches to be of slightly different lengths. The key is that one patch design will induce higher (undesirable) peel stresses at the tip of the patch. The other design, naturally, will be of a more optimum configuration and seek to minimise the peel stresses at the patch termination.

Using a combination of basic patch design guidelines and physical constraints caused by the specimen and load frame combination, the general design parameters for the low-peel patches are as follows:

- Extensional stiffness: 1.1
- Taper step-off rate: 25:1 – 3 mm (0.118 inch) steps
- Total length: 152 mm (6 inch)—limited to 190mm maximum by the load fixture
- Patch shape: Rectangular
- Width: 40 mm (1.575 inch)—same as specimen width
- Adhesive plies: 1
- Stacking sequence: Inverse wedding cake
- Thickness: 4 plies (4 x 0.0052”=0.0208”)

![Figure 1 Low-peel-stress patch design.](image)
The second patch design serves to maximise load attraction into the composite and minimise the repaired stress intensity (if damage were present). A higher peel stress at the patch tips should also result. The key design parameters for this patch follow:

- Extensional stiffness: 1.1
- Taper step-off rate: 12.5:1 – 1.5mm (0.059 inch) steps
- Total length: 133mm (5.25 inches)
- Patch shape: Rectangular
- Width: 40mm (1.575 inch) – same as specimen width
- Adhesive plies: 1
- Stacking sequence: Wedding cake
- Thickness: 4 plies (4 x 0.0052” = 0.0208”)

Again, the only differences between the two patch designs are the taper step-off rate, the length (a direct result of the tapering), and the stacking sequence of the boron fibre plies. The inverse wedding cake sequence as used on the low-peel stress specimens is traditional for on-aircraft repair. In this way, all plies have at least some portion in contact with the metal, and the largest ply on top provides some protection against accidental or environmental damage to the plies beneath. For the high-peel configuration, however, it will be necessary to use a wedding cake sequence, as the taper ratio is too severe to use an inverse lay-up with the stiff boron fibre.

The patch configuration with the higher patch-tip strains should be more sensitive to the harsh environmental conditions and, thus, be at higher risk of failure. While it is generally not sought to have high patch tip adhesive strains, certain design constraints may restrict the taper step-off rate. For instance, geometric constraints of the repaired part may force the length of the patch taper to be less than optimum. The increased peel strains expected for the patch detailed in Figure 2 will provide a more demanding test of the durability of the various surface treatments examined and when combined with the increased residual stresses created by the 120°C cure used for the FM-73 specimens, will provide a good range of adhesive strain conditions for the trial.
3. Test Matrix

The test matrix is provided in Appendix A, Table A2. The test facility at DSTO-Innisfail has 9 load frames (Figure 3), each with a capacity of 12 specimens (Figure 4), enabling 108 beams to be tested. The beams with the PAA treatment are all primed, include high and low peel stress patches, FM-73 and FM300-2 adhesive and have not been grit-blasted. The sol-gel treated beams are primed or unprimed, grit-blasted or not grit-blasted and have the patch and adhesive variations. The standard GBS treatments are varied by being primed or unprimed and also have the patch and adhesive variations. The off-optimum GBS treatments were added to the test matrix in the final stages and only examine the FM-73 in the low and high peel patch configurations. Each configuration is tested in triplicate to enable consistency in the testing to be established.

In the testing, the possibility of a block effect exists because several specimens are being tested in one load fixture. Differences in the fixtures might cause a different effect that is unrelated to the factors the test is designed to investigate. The only way to determine if these effects are significant is to insure triplicate samples are placed in different rigs and with different orientations. The position of each beam and its orientation is detailed in Appendix B, Table B1.
The Innisfail facility has the ability to monitor 80 strain gauge loads simultaneously during the fatigue loading. The positions of each strain gauge on the selected specimens are detailed in Appendix C.

**Figure 3** Loading rig at DSTO-Innisfail facility [13]

**Figure 4** General specimen dimensions and load arrangement. The Aluminium face sheets are 40 mm wide and 1.27 mm (0.050 inch) thick [13].
4. Experimental Details

The DSTO facility in Innisfail, Queensland occupies land adjacent to a rainforest in one of the wettest places in Australia. On average, Innisfail receives four metres (157 inches) of rain per year, and has an average relative humidity of 83%. The average daily temperature is 24°C (75°F) with maximums occasionally reaching 40°C (104°F). Due to the nature of the environment, significant demands will be placed on the bonded joints, but also importantly on the testing equipment and facilities. During the set-up phase of this trial significant time and effort was devoted to overhauling the pump, hydraulics, wiring systems, load cells and dataloggers. Over 10 years of humid exposure had taken its toll on numerous items and during the course of the trial it would be expected further maintenance and overhaul will be needed. Additionally, obsolete data-logging systems will require replacement at some stage during the trial.

4.1 Specimen Fabrication

AFRL manufactured all the specimens used in this research program. Materials included aluminium face sheets and honeycomb core for the beams themselves and boron fibre and adhesive for the patches.

To build the basic beam, the bonding shop at the USAF Warner Robins Air Logistics Centre, (WR-ALC) used Cytec FM-300-2 to bond large sheets of aluminium honeycomb 5052 H-191 core (cell 1/8”, gage 0.002, 8.1 pcf) from Hexcel to face sheets of 1.27 mm (0.050 inch) Alclad 2024-T3 aluminium. Before bonding, the large aluminium sheets were PAA treated in the process line at WR-ALC [7]. Due to initial panel lay-up, the majority of beams had to be cut with the honeycomb core running perpendicular to the length direction, which unfortunately doesn’t provide optimum stiffness. Details of the panel cutting are provided in Figure 5. Using the two panels of PAA treated and BR-127 primed honeycomb, 140 beams of fixed length were cut. Fifty-eight beam specimens aligned perpendicular to the ribbon direction were cut from each panel. Twelve beam specimens aligned with the ribbon direction were also cut from each panel. The tolerance on the beam width was +/- 0.020”. Each beam cut perpendicular to the ribbon direction (or width direction) was etched with an ID number, starting with #1 and continuing through #116. The ID number corresponded to the run order number in Appendix A Table A2. Beams numbered from 109-114 were used for the calibration of the strain gauge loads, detailed in Appendix D. The remaining samples with the core running in the length direction were numbered and treated as detailed in Appendix A Table A3. These samples may be tested using accelerated laboratory procedures or tested at Innisfail should funding opportunities arise.

Boron-epoxy patches were laid up as detailed in Figure 1 and 2 using Boron-epoxy Prepreg Tape-5521/4 with nylon release plies on either side during autoclave cure at 120°C (250°F) and 50psi for 60 minutes. Before the cured patches were bonded to the pretreated metal surface of the honeycomb beams, the peel plies were removed and the
bonding surface was solvent cleaned with methyl ethyl ketone (MEK), water-break free tested with distilled water, dried 60 minutes at 110°C (230°F) and grit-blasted lightly to produce a matte finish.

Surface preparation of the aluminium skins, for the samples that were not to be bonded to the PAA and primed surfaces, involved abrasion using 3M Scotchbrite 8447, with MEK solvent to remove the existing PAA and primer layer. There was no direct intention to remove the clad layer from the aluminium surface, although additional examination of the beams after the trial is completed will be needed to verify the final state of the aluminium surface. The abraded surface was then solvent cleaned by unidirectional wiping of MEK soaked lint and lanoline free disposable cloths. Abrasion and wiping was then repeated replacing the MEK with distilled water. Cleaning was considered sufficient if a single pass of the tissue did not transfer contaminant from the surface. The surface was then water-break tested and dried at 110°C (230°F) for 5 minutes. In the case of the silane treated surfaces, epoxy silane (γ-glycidoxypropyltrimethoxy silane) was prehydrolysed for at least 1 hour in a 1 % solution of distilled water. After removal from the silane solution the surface was dried at 110°C (230°F) for 60 minutes. If BR-127 primer was applied, it was dried at room temperature for 30 minutes followed by oven dry at 121°C(250°F) for 30 minute, prior to bonding.

Table A1 provides details of the epoxy-silane pre-treatment samples where critical processing steps were removed from that detailed above. In the case of the sol-gel or
AC-130 treatment, Table 1 provides details of the process variations. All treatments were performed for both adhesives, both patch configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface treatment</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Primer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No grit-blast</td>
<td>Abrade with scotchbrite and MEK, followed by solvent wipe with tissues and MEK, paint with AC-130 solution, 10 minutes and dry at 110°C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit-blast</td>
<td>Abrade with scotchbrite and MEK, followed by solvent wipe with tissues and MEK, followed by grit-blast with 50mm alumina, paint with AC-130 solution, 10 minutes and dry at 110°C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AC-130 is available from AC-Tech\(^1\) and is a surface treatment developed under contract by Boeing for adhesive bonding and is reported to be adaptable to a wide range of metals. The formulation is detailed in Table 2. The procedure for grit-blasting prior to AC-130 treatment application is detailed below:

Table 2 Composition of AC-130 from AC Tech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Volume (mL)</th>
<th>Mass (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glacial Acetic Acid</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zirconium (IV) Propoxide (70wt%)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\gamma)-glycidoxypropyltrimethoxysilane ((\gamma)-GPS)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distilled Water</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>96.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) solvent wiping: single wiping of the aluminium surface used methyl ethyl ketone (MEK) soaked lanoline and lint free tissues. A fresh tissue is used after each pass. Single wiping is conducted along the grain direction and at 90° relative to the grain until no observable debris or staining of the tissue can be observed,

2) Scotchbrite® abrasion with MEK: following solvent wiping the surface is abraded with Scotchbrite pad soaked in MEK along the grain direction and at 90° relative to the grain until a uniform surface appearance is observed. Single

\(^{1}\) Advanced Chemistry & Technology, 7341 Anaconda Avenue, Garden Grove, California 92841 phone 714 373-2837 fax 714 373-1913
wiping of the aluminium surface then uses MEK soaked lanoline and lint free tissues. A fresh tissue is used after each pass. Wiping is conducted in the direction of the abrasion until no presence of debris or staining of the tissue can be observed.

3) Grit-blasting: uniform grit-blasting of the surface employs 50 μm alumina grit and dry nitrogen propellant with a pressure of 450kPa and a working distance of 15 to 20 cm

4) AC-130 treatment: the mixture detailed in Table 2 is mixed and allowed to sit for several hours prior to commencing the surface pre-treatment steps listed above. The grit-blasted aluminium surface is “immersed” in the AC-130 solution for 15 minutes by applying the solution regularly to the aluminium surface with a clean paint brush.

5) The AC-130 solution should be used within 8 hours of production. The aluminium surface is dried by forced removal of the solution from the surface with pressurised air. “Cross-linking” of the zirconate-silane film is then performed at 110°C (230°F) for 1 hour for optimal performance

The boron-epoxy patches fabricated above were bonded to the beams using FM-73 and FM-300-2K. FM-73 with a 0.085psf and knit carrier was cured 60 minutes at 120°C (250°F) using a ramp rate of 3°C (6°F) per minute and a vacuum pressure of 20 inches of mercury initially before commencing the heating. The pressure was reduced to 10 inches of mercury when the temperature reached 80°C(176°F). FM-300-2K with a 0.08 psf and a knit carrier was cured 90 minutes at 120°C (250°F) using a ramp rate of 3°C (6°F) per minute and a vacuum pressure of 20 inches of mercury initially before commencing the heating. The pressure was reduced to 10 inches of mercury when the temperature reached 80°C (176°F).

4.2 Specimen Loading

4.2.1 Fatigue Durability of Honeycomb Beams

Specimen loading was determined initially by establishing the maximum permissible load that the beams could withstand in fatigue for the duration of the trial. The properties and dimensions of the materials used in the beams are detailed in Table 3. Definitions of the terms used in the calculation of the fatigue properties of the honeycomb are detailed in Table 4.
### Table 3  Beam material dimensions and properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Mechanical Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1.575” (40mm)</td>
<td>1” (25.4mm)</td>
<td>CR3, 8.1pcf, 1/8” cell, 1” thick, 5052 alloy, 0.002 gage</td>
<td>Plate Shear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800psi (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670psi (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>1.575” (40mm)</td>
<td>0.05” (1.27mm)</td>
<td>Al-2024T3-72.4GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.575” (635mm)</td>
<td>25” (635mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>530psi (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400psi (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boron-Epoxy</td>
<td>1.575” (40mm)</td>
<td>0.13/ply 152/133 mm</td>
<td>5521/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.575” (635mm)</td>
<td>25” (635mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultimate Longitudinal Strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4  Definitions of the terms and symbols used in the calculation of fatigue properties of the honeycomb beams used in the durability trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definitions [14]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{\text{limit}}$</td>
<td>honeycomb beam core shear stress in fatigue loading, psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{\text{ult}}$</td>
<td>honeycomb beam ultimate core shear stress allowable, psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_s$</td>
<td>honeycomb beam ultimate core shear stress measured from plate shear test, psi (minimum strength quoted from Hexcel corporation in L direction [15])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>applied load, lbF (4.448N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W$</td>
<td>beam width, in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>beam height or thickness, in. (core thickness + skin thickness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_\theta$</td>
<td>fatigue modification factor to allow for honeycomb core direction in beam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{config}}$</td>
<td>fatigue modification factor to allow for temperature, core density, face sheet thickness, core height, load span</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatigue life assessment of the honeycomb core in 4 point bending was determined from reference [14] using equation (1),

\[ \tau_{ult} = \tau_s K_\Theta K_{config} \]  

where:
\( \tau_s \) is 670psi, \( K_\Theta \) is 0.8, \( K_{config} \) is 0.95 (\( K_{config} \) was extrapolated from Figure 8, reference 1, pcf\(^2\) 2.3 0.829, pcf 3.1 0.881, pcf 5.3 0.976.)

therefore:

\[ \tau_{ult} = 510 \text{psi} \]

Given the duration of durability trial is expected to be 5 years and the fatigue loading occurs at 0.013Hz and \( R=0 \), then [13]:

Number of Cycles required (N): \((5y \times 365d \times 24h \times 60m \times 60s)/76.9 = 2,049,840\)

From Figure 6 (reference 14):

\[ \frac{\tau_{limit}}{\tau_s K_\Theta K_{config}} = 1.0158 - 0.076531 \log(N) \]

\[ \frac{\tau_{limit}}{\tau_{ult}} = 0.456 \]

\[ \tau_{limit} = 0.456 \times 510 = 233 \text{psi} \]

Therefore:

\[ \tau_{limit} = \frac{P}{[W x H]} \]
\[ = \frac{P}{[1.575 \times 1.1]} \]

\[ P = W \times H \times \tau_{limit} \]
\[ P = 233 \times 1.575 \times 1.1 \]
\[ = 404 \text{lbF} = 1800 \text{N} \]

\(^2\text{pcf}=\text{pounds per cubic foot}\)
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Figure 6  Cycles to failure for honeycomb beams manufactured from 3.1 pcf CRIII Hexcel core in width direction orientation from Ref 14 for R = -1

4.2.2 Static Stresses in the Boron Composite Patches

Appendix E: and Appendix F: detail the calculations used to determine the stresses in the honeycomb metallic skins both underneath and at the end of the patch as well as the strain level in the adhesive. The method used the formulae and processes detailed in AAP7021.016-1, Chapter 6, Appendix 2, Annexe C, for Single Sided Supported Repairs, pages 6C2-1 to 6C2-15. Briefly, the maximum fatigue load determined in section 4.2.1, was used to back-calculate the far-field stress in the aluminium skin and the equivalent stress in the adhesive, assuming all load is transferred through the patch. Beam loading in 4 point bending was determined from ASTM C-393. Table 5 indicates the adhesive and skin stresses for the patched beams loaded at 1800N.

Table 5  Summary of the adhesive and skin stresses for patched aluminium honeycomb beams loaded at 1800N in four point bending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Elastic Shear Strain Limit ($\gamma_e$)</th>
<th>Max. shear strain ($\gamma_{adh}$)</th>
<th>Stress Under the Patch (Skin) ($\sigma_{ups}$ (psi))</th>
<th>Stress at End of the Patch (Skin) ($\sigma_{eps}$ (psi))</th>
<th>Far-Field Stress (Skin) ($\sigma_s$ (psi))</th>
<th>4 Point Bending Load (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1.325x10^4</td>
<td>2.901x10^4</td>
<td>1.536x10^4</td>
<td>1.808x10^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM-300-2K</td>
<td>0.0957</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.401x10^4</td>
<td>3.066x10^4</td>
<td>1.554x10^4</td>
<td>1.829x10^3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: (Table D2) indicates the strains measured at room temperature and 80°C for the FM73 bonded patches in the 2 configurations.

4.2.3 Strain Monitoring of the Beams During Trial

Strains in the patches on the compression and tension sides are being logged from locations indicated in Figure C1 during the long term trial. Loads are also being monitored concurrently with the strain readings. The voltages from the strain gauges and load cells are logged with a Hewlett Packard 3497A Data Acquisition unit housed in an air conditioned laboratory. In order to allow for variations in strain with temperature due to thermal coefficient of expansion mismatch of the gauge and the patch, the compliance is monitored i.e. the load divided by the strain. During the loading cycle the first 21 voltage readings of load and strain are taken between 0N and approximately 1600N. This is done as the initial loading provides the linear portion of the load-strain curve. The measurements are repeated and the compliance of the patch is calculated and compared with the initial condition. Figure 7 indicates the results for Rig number 5 from December 03 to June 04. It can be seen that 4T1 and 4T2 fail in the early stages of the trial (Refer Appendix B: ), referring to Scotchbrite only treatment and FM-73 with a high peel patch. At this stage NDI measurements of the remaining specimens which have the Scotchbrite only treatment, that did not contain strain gauges, have not been performed.

The procedure of calculating the strains from the logged voltages involves initially providing a zero load correction to the strain voltage reading. Zero strain voltage readings for the WA-03-125BT-120 Micro-Measurement gauges were taken with the beams in the ladder rigs disconnected from the hydraulic ram. This provides a reasonable approximation of a zero load condition, although beams will be bearing the weight of other beams and the rig. The strain voltage in the zero and loaded condition then needs to be normalised for the excitation voltage used (equation 1):

\[ V_r = \frac{V_{o(strained)}}{V_{ex(strained)}} - \frac{V_{o(unstrained)}}{V_{ex(unstrained)}} \]  

where

- \( V_r \) is corrected strain output voltage
- \( V_{o(strained)} \) is the strain output voltage during loading
- \( V_{o(unstrained)} \) is the strain output voltage at zero load
- \( V_{ex(strained)} \) is the strain excitation voltage at during loading
- \( V_{ex(unstrained)} \) is the strain excitation voltage at zero load

Table 6 indicates the excitation and strain voltages for strain gauges in the “zero” load condition. Output strain (\( \varepsilon \)) is then determined for quarter bridge circuit according to equation 2:
where \( GF \) is the gauge factor for the WA-03-125BT-120 Micro-Measurement gauges and was equal to 2.05. Correction for lead wire resistance was ignored as the effect on strain reading was insignificant relative to the measured strain values.

Table 6  Excitation and strain voltages for strain gauges in the “zero” load condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Excitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>-0.001111</td>
<td>-0.003065</td>
<td>-0.004225</td>
<td>-0.002399</td>
<td>-0.004953</td>
<td>5.0103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>-0.005624</td>
<td>-0.002544</td>
<td>-0.003315</td>
<td>-0.002893</td>
<td>-0.004653</td>
<td>5.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>-0.006220</td>
<td>0.012968</td>
<td>-0.003411</td>
<td>-0.002375</td>
<td>-0.004097</td>
<td>5.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>0.008219</td>
<td>-0.002314</td>
<td>-0.003079</td>
<td>-0.002211</td>
<td>-0.001391</td>
<td>5.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>-0.002406</td>
<td>-0.003031</td>
<td>-0.002460</td>
<td>-0.002972</td>
<td>-0.002942</td>
<td>5.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0.003616</td>
<td>-0.002404</td>
<td>-0.004754</td>
<td>-0.003629</td>
<td>-0.005609</td>
<td>5.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>-0.001546</td>
<td>-0.003217</td>
<td>-0.001752</td>
<td>-0.003291</td>
<td>-0.004808</td>
<td>4.9951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>-0.004946</td>
<td>-0.002111</td>
<td>-0.002086</td>
<td>-0.002539</td>
<td>0.000354</td>
<td>4.9897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>-0.002070</td>
<td>-0.003704</td>
<td>-0.004101</td>
<td>-0.001277</td>
<td>-0.002744</td>
<td>4.9845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>-0.003658</td>
<td>-0.002488</td>
<td>-0.002195</td>
<td>-0.002088</td>
<td>-0.003251</td>
<td>4.9933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>-0.003207</td>
<td>-0.002688</td>
<td>-0.003375</td>
<td>-0.003246</td>
<td>-0.002708</td>
<td>4.9814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>-0.005449</td>
<td>-0.002121</td>
<td>-0.002469</td>
<td>-0.003239</td>
<td>-0.001506</td>
<td>4.9815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>-0.001348</td>
<td>-0.003151</td>
<td>-0.004183</td>
<td>-0.002902</td>
<td>-0.004060</td>
<td>4.9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>-0.002710</td>
<td>-0.003512</td>
<td>-0.002363</td>
<td>-0.003141</td>
<td>-0.002360</td>
<td>4.9850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>-0.003761</td>
<td>-0.003626</td>
<td>-0.005695</td>
<td>-0.005088</td>
<td>-0.004056</td>
<td>4.9808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>-0.003746</td>
<td>-0.004274</td>
<td>-0.001669</td>
<td>-0.004890</td>
<td>-0.003112</td>
<td>4.9786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7  Load/Strain slope for Rig 5 beams from December ’03 to June ’04.

Load calibration was performed by manually applying calibrated weights to the load cells and recording voltage. A plot of load versus voltage enabled an average gradient and intercept to be determined for each load cell. Loads up to 186.37kg were applied and the slopes for each cell are provided in Table 7.

Table 7 Slope and intercept calculated for each of the 9 load cells used in the durability trial determined by measuring voltage as a function of load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig #</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.613320</td>
<td>-19553.349822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.448541</td>
<td>-20392.794944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2.067262</td>
<td>-19751.158316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.571375</td>
<td>20527.394710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.389074</td>
<td>-20136.254989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.212409</td>
<td>-20008.455317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.588712</td>
<td>-19688.786729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.029994</td>
<td>-19918.356254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1.754614</td>
<td>23398.896418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Load \( P \) in Newtons was then calculated from the recorded output voltage, \( V_o \), using equation 3:

\[
P = ((V_o \times \text{Slope}) + \text{intercept}) \times 9.80665
\]  

(3)

A typical scan of the loads and strains for Rig 1, strain gauge 3 and the calculated slope is provided in Table 8.

Table 9 indicates the details of the strain gauge failures from December 2003 to November 2004. The Scotchbrite abrade samples failed rapidly, as expected, based on accelerated environmental resistance tests on similar treatments performed using the wedge test [16]. Strangely, the Scotchbrite abraded sample number 4, with the high peel patch, failed on the compression loaded side before the tension loaded side. The Scotchbrite abraded sample number 97, with the low peel patch, failed at similar times on the compression and tension sides and before the tension gauges on sample 4. The failures have been confirmed using tap testing. The remaining two samples appear to indicate strain gauge failure rather than disbonding.
Table 8 Typical output and calculated values for a load-strain scan of the rigs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start time</th>
<th>Load Cell Excitation (V)</th>
<th>Vo (unstrained)</th>
<th>Vex (unstrained)</th>
<th>Vex(strained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load 3 (V)</th>
<th>Load 3 (N)</th>
<th>Strain Gauge 3 (V)</th>
<th>Vr</th>
<th>Strain Gauge 3 (με)</th>
<th>Load/strain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.007881</td>
<td>1495.38301</td>
<td>-0.005645</td>
<td>-0.000283754</td>
<td>553.979895</td>
<td>2.699345271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.007942</td>
<td>1507.079934</td>
<td>-0.00565</td>
<td>-0.000284752</td>
<td>555.929903</td>
<td>2.710917196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.007999</td>
<td>1518.009847</td>
<td>-0.00566</td>
<td>-0.000286748</td>
<td>559.8299422</td>
<td>2.7115553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008052</td>
<td>1528.172748</td>
<td>-0.005676</td>
<td>-0.000289943</td>
<td>566.0700699</td>
<td>2.699617644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008103</td>
<td>1537.952144</td>
<td>-0.005688</td>
<td>-0.000292338</td>
<td>570.750218</td>
<td>2.69461508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008149</td>
<td>1546.772776</td>
<td>-0.005698</td>
<td>-0.000294335</td>
<td>574.6503757</td>
<td>2.691676263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.00819</td>
<td>1554.634643</td>
<td>-0.005702</td>
<td>-0.000295134</td>
<td>576.2104475</td>
<td>2.698032723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008232</td>
<td>1562.688263</td>
<td>-0.005709</td>
<td>-0.000296531</td>
<td>578.9405851</td>
<td>2.699220443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.00827</td>
<td>1569.974871</td>
<td>-0.005718</td>
<td>-0.000298328</td>
<td>582.4507846</td>
<td>2.69546357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008305</td>
<td>1576.686221</td>
<td>-0.005719</td>
<td>-0.000298528</td>
<td>582.840803</td>
<td>2.705174722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008336</td>
<td>1582.63056</td>
<td>-0.005727</td>
<td>-0.0003000125</td>
<td>585.9610092</td>
<td>2.700914455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008369</td>
<td>1588.958404</td>
<td>-0.005741</td>
<td>-0.000302922</td>
<td>591.4214089</td>
<td>2.68677182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0084</td>
<td>1594.902743</td>
<td>-0.005747</td>
<td>-0.000304118</td>
<td>593.7615989</td>
<td>2.694496108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008426</td>
<td>1599.888317</td>
<td>-0.005747</td>
<td>-0.000304118</td>
<td>593.7615989</td>
<td>2.694496108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008453</td>
<td>1605.065644</td>
<td>-0.005752</td>
<td>-0.000305116</td>
<td>595.7117658</td>
<td>2.694366196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008475</td>
<td>1609.284207</td>
<td>-0.005758</td>
<td>-0.000306314</td>
<td>598.0519763</td>
<td>2.690876832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008498</td>
<td>1613.694523</td>
<td>-0.005761</td>
<td>-0.000306913</td>
<td>599.2220858</td>
<td>2.692982387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008522</td>
<td>1618.296592</td>
<td>-0.005764</td>
<td>-0.000307512</td>
<td>600.3921981</td>
<td>2.695399102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008543</td>
<td>1622.323402</td>
<td>-0.005767</td>
<td>-0.000308111</td>
<td>601.5623132</td>
<td>2.696850128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008563</td>
<td>1626.158459</td>
<td>-0.005779</td>
<td>-0.000310506</td>
<td>606.2428016</td>
<td>2.68235508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008583</td>
<td>1629.993516</td>
<td>-0.005779</td>
<td>-0.000310506</td>
<td>606.2428016</td>
<td>2.688681023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.008603</td>
<td>1633.828573</td>
<td>-0.005782</td>
<td>-0.000311105</td>
<td>607.4129307</td>
<td>2.689815265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average    | 2.696251805 |
Table 9 Indications of disbonding from strain gauge readings from 15/12/03 to 8/11/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gauge/Specimen No.</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Gauge Failure Date</th>
<th>Cycles Completed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>15/12/03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Almost instantaneous failure of Scotchbrite abraded sample with high peel patch on compression side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97T</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, L, 7</td>
<td>31/12/03</td>
<td>8883</td>
<td>Very rapid failure of Scotchbrite abraded sample with low peel patch on compression and tension side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97C</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, L, 7</td>
<td>31/12/03</td>
<td>8883</td>
<td>Very rapid failure of Scotchbrite abraded sample with low peel patch on compression and tension side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T2</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>9/1/04</td>
<td>26493</td>
<td>Failure of Scotchbrite abraded sample with high peel patch on tension side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T1</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>21/1/04</td>
<td>37400</td>
<td>Failure of Scotchbrite abraded sample with high peel patch on tension side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51C</td>
<td>G, NBR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>12/2/04</td>
<td>60334</td>
<td>Most likely failure of gauge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18T2</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, H, 3</td>
<td>5/4/04</td>
<td>117039</td>
<td>Most likely failure of gauge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Summary

The current report details the motivation and mechanisms for examining the durability of a range of surface treatments relevant to bonded composite repairs applied to metallic aircraft structure. As a part of an Aging Aircraft PA between the USAFRL and DSTO it was agreed to examine three standard treatments applied to aluminium aircraft structure for bonded repairs for the purpose of establishing the long term durability of the treatment in a hot and humid tropical environment. Phosphoric acid anodise (PAA) represents the best standard factory treatment for aluminium, whereas grit-blast and epoxy silane represents a mature surface treatment favoured for in-field repairs. A newer surface treatment using sol-gel chemistry is also being trialled. The sol-gel treatment contains the same epoxy silane, but also takes advantage of unique zirconium chemistry and offers the potential of improving the reliability of the grit-blast and epoxy silane treatment and removing the need for grit-blasting.

More than 100 honeycomb beams have had boron patches bonded to the aluminium skins using FM-300-2K and FM-73 adhesives in two configurations. The two adhesives offer two temperature envelopes for usage and the two patch configurations examine
the influence of peel stresses in the critical taper region of the boron reinforcement. Additionally, some beams were patched in which the grit-blast and silane and sol-gel treatments have had some critical steps removed. It is anticipated the effects of removing these steps will enable a more detailed correlation between accelerated durability tests and long term environmental durability to be established.

Initial trials began in December 2003 in which the beams are being loaded to 1800N and patch compliance is being monitored. By early June 2004, more than 180,000 cycles had been completed and only the worst surface treatment samples had provided indications of disbonding, based on strain gauge indications. Tap testing of the strain gauged samples revealed that delaminations at the perimeter of the patch had occurred. The worst surface treatment was an abrade followed by solvent wiping prior to bonding. These samples provided strain gauge indications of disbonding within a few months of the trial beginning and were expected to show poor durability based on accelerated durability trials conducted in the laboratory. Two additional samples have unusual strain gauge readings but do not appear to be linked to sample degradation. NDI measurements of these samples is still required to verify the gauges are no longer functioning.

Loads being applied to the beams have been calculated based on the fatigue life of the core and it is anticipated they should survive for more than 2 million cycles, which will cover the 5 year trial period. At the load being applied the adhesive is conservatively estimated to be loaded at 80% of the elastic limit and should provide a good test for the adhesive bonds. It is expected that over the life of the trial a good indication in relationship between accelerated durability testing and service life performance will be established. The influence of service treatment quality on long term durability should also be provided as a result of the trial.

Further reports are intended over the period of the trial to provide an indication of the surface treatment performance. At the conclusion of the trial it is hoped teardown inspection and residual strength testing of the patched samples will be undertaken to verify the strain gauge results and confirm the relative durability of the surface treatments trialed.

6. December 2004 Update

From the period between 15th of December 2003 and 30th of August 2004, 278,384 cycles were run using a 1800N maximum load. During this period three samples failed in the aluminium skin just outside the patch, as shown in Figure 8, which shows sample 42. Sample 42 (P, BR, NGB, H, 3) failed on the 3/7/04, sample 70 (G, NBR, NGB, L, 3) failed on the 26/7/04 and sample 81 (G, NBR, NGB, H, 7) failed on the 7/9/04. Initial inspection of the failed samples revealed that fatigue cracking in the skin had initiated from the scratches at the edge of the skin where the beams had been cut to size during
manufacture. Cutting had left deep scoring and had clearly led to substantial reduction in the fatigue strength of the aluminium. Approximate calculations suggested that a reduction in skin stress to 30% of yield strength would enable the beams to last the required trial time of 4 years. Additionally, the samples were turned over in order to place the tension skins under compression and try and obviate the reduction in fatigue life that a number of samples would have experienced. As a result of the revised load, strain levels in the adhesive will be around 30% lower than for the original loading used from December 2003 to August 2004. The stress at the end of the patch in the aluminium, $\sigma_{\text{eps}}$, will also decrease by 30% and the far field stress in the aluminium, $\sigma_s$, should decrease by 40%. Beams will continue to be monitored and should any failures occur during 2005 a more thorough review of the loading conditions in the patches would need to be made. Since the 24th of September 2004 more than 50,000 cycles have been completed without further incident. The average beam compliance monitored with the strain gauges remains around 2.

![Boron patch](image)

*Figure 8* Failed honeycomb beam sample number 42.
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Appendix A: Test Matrix and Details

A.1. Beam Numbering, Identification and Painting

The beams have been engraved with the number corresponding to the RUN ORDER number in the Beam Test Matrix Table (Table A2), enabling details of each specimen to be traced. After engraving the beams were primed and painted with standard F-111 paint to protect the freshly exposed aluminium.

A.2. Beam Test Matrix

108 beams are used for the trial, all with the honeycomb ribbon oriented at 90 degrees to the length of the beam. 8 beams from the original manufacture remain to be used as dummies which will be required to replace samples in the rigs that fail before the trial ends. Of these 8 samples 6 calibration samples referred to in Appendix B will be used and 2 remaining beams with the PAA treatment will be available.

Table A1  Beams with Silane Surface Treatments missing critical processing steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface treatment Abbreviation</th>
<th>Details of Surface Treatment</th>
<th>Primer</th>
<th>Gritblast</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Abrade with scotchbrite and MEK, followed by solvent wipe with tissues and MEK</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>Abrade with scotchbrite and MEK, followed by solvent wipe with tissues and MEK, followed by dip in 1% aqueous Silane solution and dry</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Abrade with scotchbrite and MEK, followed by solvent wipe with tissues and MEK</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Perform standard gritblast and silane treatment but use 0.5% silane solution instead of 1% silane solution</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Beam Test Matrix

### Table A2  
Core running in the width direction of the beam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KEY:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Surface</strong></th>
<th><strong>Grit Blast</strong></th>
<th><strong>Patch</strong></th>
<th><strong>Adhesive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Blast</strong></td>
<td><strong>Patch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adhesive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P – PAA</td>
<td>GB – Grit Blast</td>
<td>NGB – No Grit Blast</td>
<td>L – Low Peel Stress</td>
<td>7 – FM-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS-scotchbrite abrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – FM-300-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G – Sol-Gel</td>
<td>GB-gritblast BS-0.5% silane solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – GBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Primer:
- **BR** – Primer
- **NBR** – No Primer

### Run Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run Order</th>
<th>Blocks</th>
<th>Std Order</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Primer</th>
<th>Grit Blast</th>
<th>Patch</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Order</td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Std Order</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Grit Blast</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td>Adhesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Order</td>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>Std Order</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Grit Blast</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td>Adhesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A3** Core running in the width direction of the beam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run Order</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Primer</th>
<th>Gritblast</th>
<th>Patch</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Order</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Primer</td>
<td>Gritblast</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td>Adhesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Beam Positions in Loading Rigs

Table B1

(T-T tension side of beam is top surface, T-B tension side of beam is bottom surface)

| Rig Number 1 | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Rig Position| Run Order No. (Gages) | Description                        |
| 1 (T-T)      | 75                | PAA                               |
| 2 (T-B)      | 49 (3)            | Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast        |
| 3 (T-T)      | 86                | Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast     |
| 4 (T-B)      | 27                | Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast     |
| 5 (T-T)      | 46                | Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast  |
| 6 (T-B)      | 16                | Silane, prime, grit-blast         |
| 7 (T-T)      | 62 (2)            | Silane, no prime, grit-blast      |
| 8 (T-B)      | 106 (2)           | 0.5% Silane, no prime, grit-blast |
| 9 (T-T)      | 101               | SB silane, no prime, no grit-blast|
| 10 (T-B)     | 105               | Grit-blast                         |
| 11 (T-T)     | 99                | Scotchbrite                        |
| 12 (T-B)     | 18 (3)            | Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast     |

| Rig Number 2 | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Rig Position| Run Order No. (Gages) | Description                        |
| 7 (T-T)      | 74 (2)            | PAA                               |
| 8 (T-B)      | 57                | Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast        |
| 9 (T-T)      | 85 (2)            | Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast     |
| 10 (T-B)     | 30 (2)            | Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast     |
| 11 (T-T)     | 39 (2)            | Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast  |
| 12 (T-B)     | 17                | Silane, prime, grit-blast         |
| 1 (T-T)      | 64                | Silane, no prime, grit-blast      |
| 2 (T-B)      | 107               | 0.5% Silane, no prime, grit-blast |
| 3 (T-T)      | 102               | SB silane, no prime, no grit-blast|
| 4 (T-B)      | 104               | Grit-blast                         |
| 5 (T-T)      | 98                | Scotchbrite                        |
| 6 (T-B)      | 8 (2)             | Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast     |
(T-T tension side of beam is top surface, T-B tension side of beam is bottom surface)

### Rig Number 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Position</th>
<th>Run Order No. (Gages)</th>
<th>Treatment Description</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (T-T)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T-B)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (T-T)</td>
<td>24 (2)</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (T-B)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (T-T)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.5% Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (T-B)</td>
<td>100 (2)</td>
<td>SB silane, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (T-T)</td>
<td>103 (2)</td>
<td>Grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (T-B)</td>
<td>97 (2)</td>
<td>Scotchbrite</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (T-T)</td>
<td>73 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rig Number 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Position</th>
<th>Run Order No. (Gages)</th>
<th>Treatment Description</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (T-T)</td>
<td>61 (2)</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (T-B)</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (T-T)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (T-B)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (T-T)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (T-B)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (T-T)</td>
<td>77 (2)</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T-B)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5% Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (T-T)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>SB silane, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Scotchbrite</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>65 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(T-T tension side of beam is top surface, T-B tension side of beam is bottom surface)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Number 5</th>
<th>Rig</th>
<th>Run Order No. (Gages)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (T-T)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T-B)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (T-T)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>51 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (T-T)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (T-B)</td>
<td>25 (3)</td>
<td>0.5% Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (T-T)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>SB silane, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (T-B)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (T-T)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>Scotchbrite</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (T-B)</td>
<td>50 (2)</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Number 6</th>
<th>Rig</th>
<th>Run Order No. (Gages)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>28 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (T-T)</td>
<td>89 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T-B)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (T-T)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (T-B)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (T-T)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5% Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (T-B)</td>
<td>88 (3)</td>
<td>SB silane, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (T-T)</td>
<td>14 (3)</td>
<td>Grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (T-B)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Scotchbrite</td>
<td>FM-73</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (T-T)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(T-T tension side of beam is top surface, T-B tension side of beam is bottom surface)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Position</th>
<th>Run Order No (Gages)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (T-T)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (T-B)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (T-T)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (T-B)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (T-T)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (T-B)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (T-T)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T-B)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (T-T)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>76 (3)</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>87 (2)</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Position</th>
<th>Run Order No (Gages)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (T-T)</td>
<td>38 (2)</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (T-B)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (T-T)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(T-T tension side of beam is top surface, T-B tension side of beam is bottom surface)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rig Position</th>
<th>Run Order No.</th>
<th>Treatment Description</th>
<th>Adhesive</th>
<th>Patch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (T-B)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (T-T)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (T-B)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  (T-T)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  (T-B)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  (T-T)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  (T-B)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  (T-T)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  (T-B)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sol-gel, prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  (T-T)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Sol-gel, no prime, no grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  (T-B)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Silane, prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  (T-T)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Silane, no prime, grit-blast</td>
<td>FM-300-2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B1  Beam position identification in loading rig (Side view)
## Appendix C: Gauge positions on Beams

### Table C1: Gauge positions on beams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run Order No.</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Number of Gauges</th>
<th>Gauge Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S, BR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>G, BR, NGB, H, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>G, BR, NGB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GB, NBR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, H, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S, BR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>BS, NBR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>G, BR, NGB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S, BR, GB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>P, BR, NGB, H, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>G, BR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S, NBR, GB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>G, BR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>S, NBR, GB, H, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>P, BR, NGB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>P, BR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>S, NBR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>G, BR, GB, H, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>G, BR, GB, L, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>P, BR, NGB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, H, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>S, NBR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>G, NBR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>S, BR, GB, H, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>SBS, NBR, GB, H, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C, T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>G, BR, NGB, H, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>SB, NBR, NGB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>SBS, NBR, NGB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>GB, NBR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>BS, NBR, GB, L, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-compression side, T-tension side (close to patch termination), T1-tension side (close to patch termination-position 1), T2-tension side (close to patch termination-position 2). Refer to Figure C1 for details.
Figure C1  Tension and compression side gauge positions.
Appendix D: Calibration Beams and Measured Strains

Table D1  Surface treatments used for calibration beams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adhesive: FM-73 &lt;br&gt; Surface Prep: PAA (P) primer (BR) &lt;br&gt; Patch: High Peel Stress (H) &lt;br&gt; Honeycomb Direction: Ribbon Perpendicular to Length</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhesive: FM-73 &lt;br&gt; Surface Prep: PAA (P) primer (BR) &lt;br&gt; Patch: Low Peel Stress (L) &lt;br&gt; Honeycomb Direction: Ribbon Perpendicular to Length</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D2  Strain Gauge readings and equivalent stress for high and low peel stress patches on honeycomb beams bonded with FM73 adhesive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patch</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
<th>Strain Gauge Position</th>
<th>Slope (N/ε)</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Strain at 1800N (με)</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Equivalent Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Stress from 7021.016-1 (ksi)³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Peel, FM73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tension, Boron, Patch run-off</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compression, Boron, patch centre</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tension, Aluminium, patch perimeter</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Peel, FM73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tension, Boron, patch run-off</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compression, Boron, patch centre</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tension, Aluminium, patch perimeter</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peel, FM73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tension, Boron, patch run-off</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compression, Boron, patch centre</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tension, Aluminium, patch perimeter</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peel, FM73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tension, Boron, patch run-off</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compression, Boron, patch centre</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tension, Aluminium, patch perimeter</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Static Stresses Calculated for the FM300-2K Bonded Boron-Epoxy Patches[17]

\[ \eta := 0.006 \, \text{inch} \quad G := 70000 \, \text{psi} \quad \tau_p := 6700 \, \text{psi} \]

**Elastic Modulus**

\[ F_c := G \cdot (1 + 0.33) \quad F_c := 1.862 \times 10^6 \, \text{psi} \]

**Adhesive**

\[ \gamma_e := 0.0957 \quad \gamma_f := 0.190 \]

\[ \gamma_p := \gamma_f - \gamma_e \]

\[ \eta := 0.006 \, \text{inch} \]

**Thermal Expansion Coefficient**

\[ \alpha_e := 12.7 \times 10^{-6} \quad \alpha_i := 10^{-5} \quad \alpha_o := 2.3 \times 10^{-6} \]

**Elastic Modulus**

\[ \nu_i := 0.33 \]

**Yield Stress**

\[ \sigma_{yi} := 44000 \, \text{psi} \]

**Poisson’s Ratio**

\[ \nu_i := 0.33 \]

**Fracture toughness**

\[ K_c := 83500 \]

**Ultimate Stress**

\[ \sigma_{ui} := 64000 \, \text{psi} \]

**Applied Local Strain**

\[ \varepsilon_a := 1000 \times 10^{-6} \]

**Elastic Modulus**

\[ E_i := 10.5 \times 10^6 \, \text{psi} \]

**Thermal Expansion Coefficient**

\[ \alpha_i := 12.7 \times 10^{-6} \]

**Ply Thickness**

\[ t_{ply} := 0.0052 \]

**Ultimate Longitudinal Strain**

\[ \varepsilon_o := 6.4 \times 10^{-3} \]

**Input Structure Material**

2024-T3 Aluminium Alloy

\[ t_0 := 0.0208 \text{ (4 plies)} \]

**Thermal Expansion Coefficient**

\[ \alpha_i := 12.7 \times 10^{-6} \quad \alpha_e := 10^{-5} \quad \alpha_o := 2.3 \times 10^{-6} \]

**Shear Modulus**

\[ G_o := 0.33 \]

**Longitudinal Strength**

\[ \sigma_{L} := 192 \times 10^3 \, \text{psi} \]

**Ultimate Longitudinal Strain**

\[ \varepsilon_o := 6.4 \times 10^{-3} \]

**Patch Material Properties:**

Boron Epoxy 5521 Composite

**Elastic Modulus**

\[ E_o := 30.0 \times 10^6 \, \text{psi} \]

**Thermal Expansion Coefficient**

\[ \alpha_o := 2.3 \times 10^{-6} \]

**Shear Modulus**

\[ G_o := 7.0 \times 10^6 \, \text{psi} \]

**Ply Thickness**

\[ t_{ply} := 0.0052 \]

**Ultimate Longitudinal Strain**

\[ \varepsilon_o := 6.4 \times 10^{-3} \]

\[ t_0 := 0.0208 \text{ (4 plies)} \]
Maximum Shear Strain In Adhesive Assuming All Load Transferred into the Patch

\[ \gamma_{adh} := 0.064 \]

\[ G := 70000 \text{ psi} \quad \tau_a := G \gamma_{adh} \]

\[ \tau_a = 4.48 \times 10^3 \text{ psi} \quad \tau_a' = 0.00689 = 30.867 \text{ MPa} \]

\[ \lambda := \sqrt{\frac{G}{\eta \left( \frac{1}{E_1 t_1} + \frac{1}{E_0 t_0} \right)}} \quad \lambda = 6.397 \]

Stress under the patch (middle) in the Structure (aluminium)

\[ \sigma_{ups} := \frac{\gamma_{adh} G}{(t_1 \lambda)} \quad \sigma_{ups} = 1.401 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]

Stress at the end of the patch in the Structure (aluminium)

\[ \sigma_{eps} := \frac{\sigma_{ups} (E_0 t_0 + E_1 t_1)}{E_1 t_1} \quad \sigma_{eps} = 3.066 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]

Load Attraction Factor

\[ \Omega_L := 1.26 \quad \text{From AAP 7021.016-1 Table 6.C.1-1 assuming} \]

L/w=3.6 and Eoto/Eiti=1.2

Residual Stresses Due to Thermal Expansion Mismatch

\[ \sigma_{tem} := E_1 \left[ (\alpha_o - \alpha_i) \left( 75 - T_{\text{cure}} \right) + (\alpha_o - \alpha_i) \left( T_{\text{oper}} - 75 \right) \right] \]

\[ \sigma_{tem} = 1.889 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]

Far field stress in the aluminium skin

\[ \sigma_s := \frac{\sigma_{eps} - \left[ E_1 \left[ (\alpha_o - \alpha_{i\text{eff}}) \left( 75 - T_{\text{cure}} \right) + (\alpha_o - \alpha_i) \left( T_{\text{oper}} - 75 \right) \right] \right]}{\Omega_L} \]

\[ \sigma_s = 1.554 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]
STEP (ALEX): CALCULATE THE LOAD TO ACHIEVE $\sigma_f$

Beam Properties

- Core thickness: $c := 1$ in
- Sandwich Thickness: $d := c + 2 \cdot t_i$ in
- Sandwich Width: $b := 1.575$ in
- Beam Length: $\text{length} := 25$ in

Loads

- Internal Moment: $M := \sigma_S \left( t_i \cdot b \cdot \frac{(d + c)}{2} \right)$
- Refer to ASTM C393
  
  $M = 1.285 \times 10^3$ lb.in

Applied Load (1/4 point bend test - $M=PL/8$)

Note: Far field stress taken between the load applicators

$$P := 8 \cdot \frac{M}{\text{length}} \quad P = 411.211 \text{ lb}$$

$$\text{lb2N} := 4.448$$

$$P_{\text{newtons}} := P \cdot \text{lb2N}$$

$$P_{\text{newtons}} = 1.829 \times 10^3 \text{ N}$$
Appendix F: Static Stresses Calculated for the FM73 Bonded Boron-Epoxy Patches [17]

FM73 Wet (250 F Autoclave Cure) Using 75 operating temperature data max load MDC 91B0330 dated 30 Jun 91

Adhesive Thickness

\[ \eta = 0.004 \text{ inch} \quad G = 47380 \text{ psi} \]

Adhesive Shear Stress

\[ \tau_p = 4845 \text{ psi} \]

Elastic Modulus

\[ F_c = G \cdot 2 \cdot (1 + 0.33) \quad F_c = 1.26 \times 10^5 \text{ psi} \]

Operating Temperature

\[ T_{cure} = 250 \quad T_{oper} = 90 \text{ F} \]

Adhesive Strain Limit

Elastic \[ \gamma_c = 0.102 \quad \gamma_{fail} = 0.756 \]

Plastic \[ \gamma_p = \gamma_{fail} - \gamma_c \quad \gamma_p = 0.654 \]

Input Structure Material

2024-T3 Aluminium Alloy

\[ t_l = 0.05 \text{ in} \quad \sigma_{yi} = 44000 \text{ psi} \]

Ultimate Stress \[ \sigma_{ui} = 64000 \text{ psi} \]

Poisson's Ratio \[ \nu_i = 0.33 \]

Elastic Modulus \[ E_i = 10.5 \times 10^6 \text{ psi} \]

Fracture toughness \[ K_c = 83500 \]

\[ \alpha_i = 12.7 \times 10^{-6} \text{ in/in/F} \]

\[ \epsilon_a = 1000 \times 10^{-6} \]

\[ \sigma_a = \frac{\epsilon_a E_i}{\nu_i} \quad \epsilon_a = 1.05 \times 10^4 \]

\[ \alpha_{eff} = \frac{\alpha_i (1 + \nu_i)}{2} \]

Patch Material Properties:

Boron Epoxy 5521 Composite

Elastic Modulus \[ E_o = 30.0 \times 10^6 \text{ psi} \]

Thermal Expansion Coefficient \[ \alpha_o = 2.3 \times 10^{-6} \text{ in/in/F} \]

Shear Modulus \[ G_o = 7.1 \times 10^6 \text{ psi} \]

Ply Thickness \[ t_{ply} = 0.0052 \text{ psi} \]

Ultimate Longitudinal Strain \[ \sigma_L = 192 \times 10^3 \text{ psi} \]

\[ \epsilon_o = \frac{\sigma_L}{E_o} \]

\[ \epsilon_o = 6.4 \times 10^{-3} \]

\[ t_o = 0.0208 \text{ (4 plies)} \]
Maximum Shear Strain In Adhesive Assuming All Load Transferred into the Patch

\[ \gamma_{adh} := 0.085 \]

\[ G := 47380 \text{ psi} \quad \tau_a := G \cdot \gamma_{adh} \]

\[ \tau_a = 4.027 \times 10^3 \text{ psi} \quad \tau_a \cdot 0.00689 = 27.748 \text{ MPa} \]

\[ \lambda := \sqrt{\frac{G}{\eta \left( \frac{1}{E_i t_i} + \frac{1}{E_o t_o} \right)}} \quad \lambda = 6.077 \]

Stress under the patch (middle) in the Structure (aluminium)

\[ \sigma_{ups} := \frac{\gamma_{adh} G}{(t_i \lambda)} \quad \sigma_{ups} = 1.325 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]

Stress at the end of the patch in the Structure (aluminium)

\[ \sigma_{eps} := \frac{\sigma_{ups} \left( E_o t_o + E_i t_i \right)}{E_i t_i} \quad \sigma_{eps} = 2.901 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]

Load Attraction Factor

\[ \Omega_L := 1.26 \quad \text{From AAP 7021.016-1 Table 6.C.1-1 assuming L/w=3.6 and Eo/Eiti=1.2} \]

Residual Stresses Due to Thermal Expansion Mismatch

\[ \sigma_{tem} := E_i \left[ \left( \alpha_o - \alpha_i \right) \left( 75 - T_{\text{cure}} \right) + \left( \alpha_o - \alpha_i \right) \left( T_{\text{oper}} - 75 \right) \right] \]

\[ \sigma_{tem} = 1.747 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]

Far field stress in the aluminium skin

\[ \sigma_s := \frac{\sigma_{eps} \left[ \left( \alpha_o - \alpha_{\text{ieff}} \right) \left( 75 - T_{\text{cure}} \right) + \left( \alpha_o - \alpha_i \right) \left( T_{\text{oper}} - 75 \right) \right]}{\Omega_L} \]

\[ \sigma_s = 1.536 \times 10^4 \text{ psi} \]
STEP (ALEX): CALCULATE THE LOAD TO ACHIEVE $\sigma_f$

Beam Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core thickness</td>
<td>$c := 1$</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich Thickness</td>
<td>$d := c + 2 \cdot t_i$</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich Width</td>
<td>$b := 1.575$</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Length</td>
<td>$\text{length} := 25$</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loads

- Internal Moment
  - Refer to ASTM C393
  - $M = 1.27 \times 10^3$ lb.in

Applied Load (1/4 point bend test - $M = PL/8$)

Note: Far field stress taken between the load applicators

$$P := 8 \cdot \frac{M}{\text{length}} \quad P = 406.437 \text{ lb}$$

$$\text{lb2N} := 4.448$$

$$P_{\text{newtons}} := P \cdot \text{lb2N}$$

$$P_{\text{newtons}} = 1.808 \times 10^3 \text{ N}$$
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An agreement between DSTO and the US Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) was established as a part of a larger Aging Aircraft Project Agreement (PA). As a part of this agreement a large experimental program was organised to examine the long-term environmental durability of bonded composite repairs to metallic aircraft structure. An important aspect of the program was to examine the reliability and performance of current or recently developed surface treatments for metallic surfaces being repaired in field situations. The program involved the production of over 100 metal skinned honeycomb beam samples that were each patched with boron composite doublers. The beam samples are now being cyclically loaded in four point bending rigs at the DSTO tropical test facility in Innisfail, northern Queensland. It was anticipated that cyclic loading of the beams would result in adhesive disbonding for samples where the surface treatments were known to be inferior on the basis of accelerated laboratory testing. The overall results were hoped to enable the durability of metal to adhesive bonds present in boron composite repairs to be assessed for conditions similar to those expected in aircraft operating environments. An additional outcome of the research was hoped to be the ability to correlate accelerated durability testing conducted in the laboratory with more realistic aging conditions expected in aircraft service.