THERMOPLASTIC COMPOSITE STRUCTURE FOR MASS TRANSIT VEHICLE: DESIGN, COMPUTATIONAL ENGINEERING AND EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION.
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Abstract

In the present paper, a thermoplastic composite component of a mass transit vehicle, is designed using a complex mix of computational analyses and experimental testing. Among the currently available composite materials, Eglass fiber/polyetherimide (PEI) thermoplastic composite material is mainly considered for its inherently fire-retardant properties and in life cycle perspective. The thermoplastic composite panel is designed in order to satisfy AnsaldoBreda structural loading and performance requirements. The final configuration of the thermoplastic panel exhibits excellent weight saving of more 50% compared to the conventional aluminum panel.

1 Introduction

As designer in railways industry strive to reduce fuel consumption, environmental pollution and improve safety, composites are becoming an attractive alternative to standard metallic solution for mass transport applications. Lightweight composite materials are primarily specified because they can be used to produce cost-effective, lightweight components of relatively complex geometries that can be easily molded from composite structures to perform the aerodynamic profile demanded by modern high performance vehicles. Examples of composite structures employed in transportation vehicles can be found in [1,2].

Among the currently available composite materials, in the present work, thermoplastic composite material is considered in the design of a side lower panel of the SIRIO tram carbody produced by AnsaldoBreda (Figure 1), which is one aspect of a larger effort focused on developing thermoplastic composite materials, processes and designs for mass transit applications. Thermoplastic polymers have several advantages over thermoset polymers. They can be shaped by reheating, are easier to recycle, and have superior impact properties and energy absorption because of their high toughness [3]. The aforementioned benefits make thermoplastics excellent materials for structural component of mass transit vehicles such as body panels [4], floor structure [5] and roof door [6].

The design approach is based upon replacement possibilities of subcomponents of conventional metal-based vehicle with a goal of cost and weight savings, involving both
numerical and experimental activities at various levels of structural complexity. The various aspects covered in the paper include; (a) material and manufacturing details of the body segment; (b) experimental characterizations; (c) design and finite element modeling.

2 Material and manufacturing

There are numerous thermoplastic polymers can be used as a matrix for fiber reinforced composites in structural components in transportation industry. An overview of physical, thermal and mechanical properties of common types of thermoplastic polymers is given in [7]. Since the requirements for mass transportation have become more and more severe especially in the area of fire safety, polyetherimide (PEI) thermoplastic composite material is mainly considered for its inherently fire-retardant properties that evolve low levels of smoke and combustion products during a fire exposition. In particular, E-glass/PEI, supplied as pre-impregnate orthogonal woven fabrics with a nominal ply thickness of 0.24 mm, has been selected to offer outstanding toughness and high heat resistance. The selected material, provided by Tencate Advanced Composites Inc., exceeds 35/35 OSU and is qualified at Airbus and Boeing fire requirements for both structural and interior applications [8].

The thermoplastic laminates have been manufactured using a wood mold designed consistent with the geometry of rounded C-shape frame segment. The wood mold has been placed in a compression molding press of 3 tons capacity. Before molding, the material has been processed at 300°C in an oven equipped with heat lamps and an electronic control system that allow to maintain processing temperature uniform until 500°C. The processing setup is shown in Figure 2.

3 Material characterization

Since it is well know that structural analysis of composite requires the determination of a large number of independent parameters, generally not provided by manufacture’s datasheet,
Mechanical characterizations of the selected composite material have been assessed in order to define the basic material properties that can be used as input in structural design and analysis aimed by Finite Element computer code. The experimental activity herein presented was carried out at the Laboratory of the Department of Structural Engineering of the University of Naples Federico II. Test facilities involved in the present activity are: (a) a MTS 500 kN universal test frame controlled by an electronic control unit which allows monitoring the applied load and the stroke of the top cross head; (b) a digital data acquisition system that allows to acquire strain signals.

From the macro-mechanical point of view, a composite material may be characterized by a number of basic stiffness and strength parameters referred to its principal material direction, that in the case of orthogonal woven fabric consists of two set of interlaced yarns: the longitudinal direction of the fabric is called wrap and the transverse direction weft or fill.

In particular, for in-plane loading, a lamina may be fully characterized by: (a) four engineering independent constants - longitudinal (warp) and transverse (weft) Young’s moduli $E_1$ and $E_2$, shear modulus $G_{12}$, Poisson’s ratio $\nu_{12}$; (b) five strength parameters – longitudinal (warp) tensile and compressive strengths $F_{1t}$ and $F_{1c}$, transverse (weft) tensile and compressive strengths $F_{2t}$ and $F_{2c}$, in-plane shear strength $F_{12}$. Additional lamina strength parameter, relevant in composite structural analysis, is the interlaminar shear strength $F_{66}$; (c) five strain parameters - ultimate longitudinal (warp) tensile and compressive strains $\varepsilon_{1t}$ and $\varepsilon_{1c}$, ultimate transverse (weft) tensile and compressive strains $\varepsilon_{2t}$ and $\varepsilon_{2c}$, ultimate in-plane shear strain $\gamma_{12}$.

3.1 Tensile Tests
Quasi-static tensile tests were run on fifteen 2.4x25x250 mm coupons, tested in one series with the warp fibers parallel to the load and in a second series with warp fibers perpendicular to the load. These tests were performed in accordance with the ASTM D3039M standard [9]. Three strain gauges were applied to each coupon to monitoring the deformations, two parallel to the load and one perpendicular to the load direction. Tests were conducted at a constant cross head velocity of 2 mm/min.

Ultimate tensile stress and strain, elastic modulus, and Poisson’s ratio have been measured for both the warp and weft directions. Figure 3 show the stress-strain curves for both warp and weft direction and the principal failure modes. Generally the failure mode occurred in the gage section, however some specimens failed at the grip/tabs interface, but no relevant differences in results are observed.

3.2 Compressive Tests
Quasi-static compressive tests were run on sixteen 3.8x20x140 mm coupons, tested in one series with the warp fibers parallel to the load and in a second series with warp fibers perpendicular to the load. These tests were performed in accordance with the ASTM D6641M standard [10] using a Combined Loading Compression (CLC) test fixture (Figure 4) developed at the University of Wyoming. A comparative study of the CLC fixture and ASTM D 3410 [11] procedure, which uses the wedge loading arrangement developed at the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute (IITRI), was presented in [12]. Results of the study suggested that the CLC test fixture is preferable to the IITRI test fixture from a practical standpoint. Although the compressive properties measured using these two fixtures are statistically similar, the CLC test fixture is easier to use, less expensive to fabricate, and less massive than the IITRI test fixture, making it easier to install and, as a result, less likely to induce testing errors. Furthermore, because of its simpler design, the CLC test fixture is considerably less prone to machining errors.
In the present case, two strain gauges were applied parallel to the load direction to each coupon to monitoring the deformations. Tests were conducted at a constant cross head velocity of 1.3 mm/min. Ultimate tensile stress and strain and elastic modulus have been measured for both the warp and weft directions. Figure 5 show the stress-strain curves for both warp and weft direction and the principal failure modes. Failure modes occurred in the gage section for all the specimen, however two different modes were observed: fiber brooming and through the thickness for both the tested series.
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**Figure 3.** Tensile tests: (a) stress-strain curves; (b) failure modes.

![Figure 4. CLC text fixture.](image3.png)

3.3 In-Plane Shear Tests

Quasi-static in-plane shear tests were run on eight 3.8x25x250 mm coupons with a [+45/-45]_{8s} stacking sequence by tensile loading in accordance with the ASTM D3518M standard [13]. Two strain gauges were applied parallel to the load direction to each coupon to monitoring the deformations. Tests were conducted at a constant cross head velocity of 2 mm/min. Ultimate in-plane shear stress and strain and in-plane shear modulus have been derived. Since the value of the shear strain at maximum shear stress exceed the 5%, according to the standard, the ultimate in-plane shear strain was considered equal to 5%. Figure 6 show the
shear stress-crosshead displacement curve and the principal failure mode, that in these case is due to transverse shear for all the specimens.

![Figure 5](image1.png)
**Figure 5.** Compressive tests: (a) stress-strain curves; (b) failure modes.

![Figure 6](image2.png)
**Figure 6.** In-plane shear tests: (a) shear stress-displacement curves; (b) failure modes.

### 3.4 Short-Beam Tests
Short-beam tests were run on eight 6x12x36 mm coupons, made by parallel laminating of prepreg, using a three-point bending set-up (Figure 7a) in accordance with the ASTM D2344M standard [14]. Tests were conducted at a constant cross head velocity of 1 mm/min. Interlaminar shear strength have been derived as function of ultimate applied load. Figure 7b show the interlaminar shear stress-crosshead displacement curve.

### 3.5 Summary of Test Results
Table 1 reports elastic properties and strength values obtained in static tests of thermoplastic material. These values are the implemented in the laminate composite material card of the Finite Element software as described in the next section. Due to the nearly balanced nature of
the fabrics, laminates with the warp fibers perpendicular to the load are characterized by values close to those with warp fibers perpendicular to the load
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**Figure 7.** Short beam tests: (a) test set-up; (b) interlaminar shear stress-displacement curves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Young Modulus - Warp</td>
<td>E₁ [GPa]</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>(3.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E₂ [GPa]</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>(3.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s Modulus - Warp</td>
<td>ν₁₂ [-]</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>(6.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ν₂₁ [-]</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>(7.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Tensile Strength - Warp</td>
<td>F₁ [MPa]</td>
<td>434.72</td>
<td>(4.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F₂ [MPa]</td>
<td>433.48</td>
<td>(4.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate tensile Strain - Warp</td>
<td>ε₁u [%]</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>(6.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ε₂u [%]</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>(6.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Young Modulus - Warp</td>
<td>E₁ [GPa]</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>(2.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E₂ [GPa]</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Compressive Strength - Warp</td>
<td>F₁c [MPa]</td>
<td>511.74</td>
<td>(5.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F₂c [MPa]</td>
<td>399.41</td>
<td>(10.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Compressive Strain - Warp</td>
<td>ε₁u [%]</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>(9.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ε₂u [%]</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>(10.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-plane Shear Modulus - Warp</td>
<td>G₁₂ [GPa]</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>(0.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate In-plane Shear Strength</td>
<td>F₁₂ [MPa]</td>
<td>109.66</td>
<td>(1.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate In-plane Shear Strain</td>
<td>γ₁₂ [%]</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlaminar shear strength</td>
<td>F₆₆ [MPa]</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td>(1.55%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Mechanical properties of thermoplastic materials investigated in this study.

### 4 Design and Computational Analysis

In the present section design and computational analysis of the thermoplastic composite component is presented. The activity herein presented was carried out by Aerosoft department. Starting from geometrical information, a FE model was developed using MSC Nastran® code. The component was meshed using 4-node shell elements; a 2D-orthotropic material was used to define the thermoplastic prepreg, whereas PCOMP function was used to create the stacking sequence of the panel (Figure 8a).

Since the final side body panel will be adhesively joined to the frame of the vehicle along all the edges for a depth of 20mm, the external nodes of the model were restrained against all the rotation and translation (Figure 8b).

According to the AnsaldoBreda requirements and the European standard [15], the following two static loading conditions were defined into the model as suggested for a vehicle of class P-IV: Case 1 - Inertial Load Condition, combining inertial load equal to 3g of the component mass along the x-direction, inertial load equal to 1g component mass along the y-direction and...
inertial load equal to 3g of the component mass along the gravity direction; Case 1A - Lateral Wind Condition, combining a lateral wind equal to 160 km/h and a inertial load equal to 1g of the component mass along the gravity direction. The lateral wind was simulated applying a dynamic pressure of 1185 N/m² distributed on the surface of the panel.

The described FE model allows to optimize the component, in term of the stacking sequence and the total number of plies, and to verify the structural requirements. The optimization is achieved by changing the values of certain design variables in order to minimize the objective function while at the same time satisfying certain behavioral constraints. In this study, in order to optimize simultaneously the stacking sequence and the total number of plies, discrete ply angles, 0°, ±45° and 90° were considered as design parameters, whereas the objective function is the structural weight and the design constraint is the Hill Maximum Indices that in each ply must be lower than 1.

The design procedure provided that the [0,90]₄S lay-up configuration allows the optimize the structural weight of the component. Table 2 reports the numerical results of the critical ply for the designed composite panel, where RF is the reserve factor calculated as ratio between the derived experimental strength and the numerical stress values. Figure 9 shows the contour plots of the maximum shear stress and Hill Maximum Indices for the optimal layup configuration for the wind loading combinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Load Case</th>
<th>Hill Maximum Indices</th>
<th>Max Shear Value [MPa]</th>
<th>Max Displacement [mm]</th>
<th>RF Shear Stress</th>
<th>RF Max Principal Stress</th>
<th>RF Min Principal Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inertial Load</td>
<td>2.69E-03</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>167.93</td>
<td>330.90</td>
<td>312.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Lateral Wind</td>
<td>9.42E-02</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Mechanical properties of thermoplastic materials investigated in these study.
Conclusion

In the present paper the design procedure, involving both experimental and computational studies, have been presented for the case of study of a thermoplastic lower side panel of a tram vehicle. The experimental activities allow to characterize the basic stiffness and strength parameters of the selected thermoplastic composite material. Whereas, FE analysis have been used both to optimize the layup configuration of the composite component and to assess the structural requirements. The final configuration of the thermoplastic panel exhibits excellent weight saving of more 50% compared to the conventional aluminum panel.

Ongoing work, final validation of the design procedure will be performed testing the final component, such as, in order to reliably predict the structural safety of thermoplastic composite structure, the adverse effects of environmental degradations and in-service impact events will be assessed.
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