

SE 160A: Project 2 Write Up

1. A spinning engine rotor blade...

- a.) Calculate the A- and B-Basis allowable strength properties.

Given that  $E = 16.0 \times 10^6$  (16.0 Msi) and  $\nu = 0.31$ ,  $G$  can be found by  $G = \frac{E}{2(1+\nu)}$ . This gives a  $G$  value of  $6.106870229 \times 10^6$  (6.10687 Msi). Plugging the given inputs into the Input file and running my matlab code (SE160A\_2\_Dunn\_Ryan.m) provides the following outputs for A-Basis and B-Basis:

2.) Allowable Strengths

Variable	Description	A-Basis	B-Basis	Units
$\sigma_T^*$	Allowable Tension	100.6667	105.3333	Ksi
$\sigma_C^*$	Allowable Compression	-103.3333	-107.3333	Ksi
$\tau^*$	Allowable Shear	63.3333	66.6667	Ksi
$\tau^*$	Allow Shear Tresca (Mixed)	51.0000	53.1667	Ksi

- b.) Calculate the Margin of Safety (MS) using the Tresca, Rankine, and Von Mises failure theories for both the A- and B-Basis allowable strength properties.

Margin of Safety (MS)

Minimum Margin of Safety		Rankine	Tresca*	Von Mises
MS <sub>min</sub> (A)	Min Margin of Safety (A Bas	0.1185	0.1185	0.1185
MS <sub>min</sub> (B)	Min Margin of Safety (B Bas	0.1704	0.1704	0.1704

- c.) Scale the stress state so that (MS = 0) for the B-Basis strength properties based upon the Von Mises failure theory.

Applied Stress State for (MS=0) - B Basis

Variable	Description	Von Mises	Units
$\sigma_{xx}$	Normal Stress - x	105.3333	Ksi
$\sigma_{yy}$	Normal Stress - y	0.0000	Ksi
$\sigma_{zz}$	Normal Stress - z	0.0000	Ksi
$\tau_{yz}$	Shear Stress - yz	0.0000	Ksi
$\tau_{xz}$	Shear Stress - xz	0.0000	Ksi
$\tau_{xy}$	Shear Stress - xy	0.0000	Ksi

2. Engineers at the aircraft engine company of problem (#1) are investigating the use of new nano-material technology to alter the stress state of the spinning rotor blade for the purpose of increasing the MS.

- a.) What is the MS if the spinning blade stress state is altered to (...stress state...) Use B-basis allowables and the von Mises Failure Criteria.

For this stress state, B-basis does not pass the von Mises Criteria because it produces a -0.2149 margin

Margin of Safety (MS)		
Minimum Margin of Safety	Rank	Von Mises
MS <sub>min</sub> (A)	Min Margin of Safety (A Basis)	-0.2497
MS <sub>min</sub> (B)	Min Margin of Safety (B Basis)	-0.2149

Allowable Strengths			
Variable	Description	B-Basis	Units
$\sigma_T^*$	Allowable Tension	105.3333	Ksi
$\sigma_C^*$	Allowable Compression	-107.3333	Ksi
$\tau^*$	Allowable Shear	66.6667	Ksi
$\tau^*$	Allow Shear Tresca (Mixed)	53.1667	Ksi

- b.) What is the MS if the spinning blade stress state is altered to (...stress state...) Use B-basis allowables and the von Mises Failure Criteria.

However, in this stress state, the B-Basis did pass using von Mises Criteria because it produces a +0.1704 margin

Margin of Safety (MS)		
Minimum Margin of Safety	Rank	Von Mises
MS <sub>min</sub> (A)	Min Margin of Safety (A Basis)	0.1185
MS <sub>min</sub> (B)	Min Margin of Safety (B Basis)	0.1704

Allowable Strengths			
Variable	Description	B-Basis	Units
$\sigma_T^*$	Allowable Tension	105.3333	Ksi
$\sigma_C^*$	Allowable Compression	-107.3333	Ksi
$\tau^*$	Allowable Shear	66.6667	Ksi
$\tau^*$	Allow Shear Tresca (Mixed)	53.1667	Ksi

**Table 1: Strength Properties for Ti-6Al-4V (solution treated) - Experimentally Measured**

Property	A-Basis	B-Basis	S-Basis	Units
$\sigma_{Ty}$	136	143	145	Ksi
$\sigma_{Tu}$	151	158	160	Ksi
$\sigma_{Cy}$	-140	-150	-150	Ksi
$\sigma_{Cu}$	-155	-161	-165	Ksi
$\sigma_{Sy}$	86	89	91	Ksi
$\sigma_{Su}$	95	100	100	Ksi

3. A uniform bar is subjected to an axial force and a shear force. Students apply four strain gage rosettes along the bar length and then measure strains (a, b, c).

#	Rosette Type			Measured Strains ( $\mu$ in/in)		
	$\theta_a$	$\theta_b$	$\theta_c$	$\epsilon_a$	$\epsilon_b$	$\epsilon_c$
1	0°	45°	90°	1000.0	600.0	-300.0
2	0°	60°	120°	1000.0	241.5	-191.5
3	0°	60°	120°	946.7	362.6	-259.3
4	0°	60°	120°	1033.5	123.7	-107.2

- a.) Calculate the structural strains (xx, yy, xy) for the four gages.

Plugging in the values of strain for the rosette types above, and assuming the gage is orientated at 0 degrees, My matlab code produces the following results:

Gage #1

Variable	Description	Value	Units
$\epsilon_{xx}$	normal strain (x)	1000.000	$\mu$ in/in
$\epsilon_{yy}$	normal strain (y)	-300.000	$\mu$ in/in
$\gamma_{xy}$	shear strain	500.000	$\mu$ in/in

Gage #2

Variable	Description	Value	Units
$\epsilon_{xx}$	normal strain (x)	1000.000	$\mu$ in/in
$\epsilon_{yy}$	normal strain (y)	-300.000	$\mu$ in/in
$\gamma_{xy}$	shear strain	499.985	$\mu$ in/in

shear strain is negligible ~500 micro in/in

Gage #3

Variable	Description	Value	Units
$\epsilon_{xx}$	normal strain (x)	946.700	$\mu$ in/in
$\epsilon_{yy}$	normal strain (y)	-246.700	$\mu$ in/in
$\gamma_{xy}$	shear strain	718.108	$\mu$ in/in

Gage #4

Variable	Description	Value	Units
$\epsilon_{xx}$	normal strain (x)	1033.500	$\mu$ in/in
$\epsilon_{yy}$	normal strain (y)	-333.500	$\mu$ in/in
$\gamma_{xy}$	shear strain	266.620	$\mu$ in/in

- b.) It was suspected that maybe the 3rd and 4th gages were orientated incorrectly since their results did not closely matched the strain gage (#2) results. A visual examination revealed that both gages were incorrectly positioned, but the observed angle could not be determined. Calculate the mis-alignment angle of gages (#3) and (#4).

To answer this, we must draw the correct mohr circle for strain gages 1 and 2. From my matlab code for case 1 and 2, the principal strains are found to be:  $\epsilon_{p1} = -346.419$  and  $\epsilon_{p2} = +1046.419$

The center is found by taking the average of these two values which is +350. Then, we draw the circle by plotting the points of gages #1 and 2. (strain-xx, shear strain /2 ). After this we find the following points:

	(x,y) coord in micro-in/in	angle produced from center (350,0)
Center	(350,0)	
Gages #1 and #2	(1000,250)	$\arctan(250/(1000-350))$ = 21.037511025421818 degrees
Gage #3	(946.7, 359.054132409028)	$\arctan(359.054/(946.7-350))$ = 31.036714321560599 degrees
Gage #4	(1033.5, 133.310177155885)	$\arctan(133.310177155885/(1033.5-350))$ = 11.036444090371834 degrees

As we know, rotation on the Mohr circle is positive in the CCW direction and the angle on the circle is double the actual rotation angle. So,

**Gage #3 rotation** =  $1/2 * (\alpha_3 - \alpha_1) = 4.999601648069390$  degrees

~5.000 degrees (CCW by convention)

and

**Gage #4 rotation** =  $1/2 * (\alpha_4 - \alpha_1) = -5.000433467524992$  degrees

~ -5.000 degrees (CW by convention)

A diagram of my work has been attached on a separate page explaining my visuals.

Gage #3 rotation from expected ( $\alpha_1$ )

$$\Delta\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_3 - \alpha_1) \approx \boxed{+5.000^\circ} \text{ (CCW)}$$

Gage #4 rotation from expected ( $\alpha_1$ )

$$\Delta\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_4 - \alpha_1) \approx \boxed{-5.000^\circ} \text{ (CW)}$$

