Comanche Stabilator Horn Cracking Investigation

Final Analysis Report

International Comanche Society

P. O. Box 1810

Traverse City, MI49685-1810

888-300-0082

Hans Neubert, Airworthiness Committee Co-Chairman

DERT-605393-NM

March 29, 2011



Problem Statement

ICS Members Denny Haskins/Eric Paul report horn cracks found in 3 PA24 singles of 6 inspected – Comanche Flyer March 2007

ICS Member Hans Neubert initiates fleetwide survey of member inspection findings via 2 websites and Comanche Flyer magazine

ICS Hq/Dave Fitzgerald initiates 3rd party survey using FAA registered owner database

Response to date are 800+ surveys submitted worldwide, 18 cracked horns found from estimated airworthy fleet of 4000+ aircraft (all models)

FAA performs metallurgical investigation at NIAR, stress corrosion cracking determined as primary cause (ref. NIAR Memorandum dated 31 Aug 2009)

Analytical study initiated to determine stress state in horns and evaluate results to metallurgical SCC cracking threshold



Analytical Approach Used

- Reverse engineer existing forged 2014-T6 horn and create dimensioned drawing
- Develop 3D model of horn from drawing and create 3D CAD Iges model
- Create Finite Element Model of complete Stabilator Torque Tube Assembly
- Incorporate FAA developed applied load conditions and combinations
- Run FEA model and capture all stress and displacement results
- Summarize all results within this report



Typical Cracked Horn









3D CAD Iges Model





FEA Model of Horn Created from Iges Model





FEA Model Development

- Strand7 FEA Software
 - 65 York St., Sydney NSW 2000 Australia
- Model Development
 - Horn body as solid tetrahedral elements
 - Horn skin (.0005") as membrane elements*
 - Torque tube and attachments as shell elements**
 - Counterbalance arm as shell elements
 - Interference condition as equivalent pressure
 - Bolt preloads as equivalent force (distributed)
- * Surface skin required since stress integration points on solid elements are interior to element surface
- ** Attachments to torque tube modeled with full combined thickness and plate offsets for correct EI



Close-Up View of Horn (Torque Tube joined to Horn with rigid links)





Torque Tube Attachments and Details





Boundary Conditions



Bearing race and torque tube as one element. Beam elements representing ball bearings. End of beams constrained in R & Z of the horn cylindrical coordinate system. Bearing is free to rotate in Theta. Global Y constraint at the end of the Counterbalance tube, representing the control cables.



Critical Dimensions

- Torque Tube
 - 2.3115 +.0003/-.0002 after plating per AMS 2400-3
 - (data from Simone Fevola, Piper's DER, 1-31-2005, reading from the screen of the tube drawing).
- Horn P/N 20397-00
 - a. Counterbalance Tube Bore
 - 1.1177 to 1.1185 (was 1.1182 to 1.1190) Change A dated 1-4-1957
 - (Counterbalance bore data from Dallas Wehner, Piper Cust. Svc)
 - b. Torque Tube Bore
 - 2.312 +.001/-.0001
 - (Torque Tube bore from Piper Drawing 20397)
- Counterbalance Arm Tube Outside Diameter
 - a. P/N 20398-00 (used on 24-1 to 24-102) and 20398-02 (used on 24-103 & Up), All Singles except 400
 1.1185 to 1.1187
 - b. P/N 22880-00, Used on Twins and 400
 - 1.1187 to 1.1202
 - (Counterbalance tube data from Dallas Wehner, Piper Cust. Svc)
- Horn Material

2014-T6 Aluminum Die Forging per AMS 4133, AMS-A-22771, and AMS-QQ-A-367



Load Conditions

- Four load conditions
 - Interference fit between horn and counterbalance tube – variable depending on tolerance
 - Horn attachment bolts variable depending on torque
 - Rotation Limiter bolts fixed at 60 in-lb torque
 - Counterbalance Arm bolt fixed at 60 in-lb torque
- Interference Fit limits (diametric)
 - Singles: Max: .0010 Min: .0000
 - Twins/400: Max: .0025 Min: .0002



Load Cases Requested

		Parameters							
	Name	counterbalance arm		torque values - original		torque values -		torque tube wall	
		interference fit (A)		installation (B)		new (C)		thickness (D)	
	Source	drawing	tolerances	current	MM range	SB 1194	kit range	drawing lo	w tolerance
Test Case	Description Value	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Thin	Thick
Ab	counterbalance arm interference only -	х							
	best								
Aw	counterbalance arm interference only -		х						
	worst								
Bb	torque values - original only - best			х					
Bw	torque values - original only - worst				x				
Cb	torque values - new only - best					х			
Cw	torque values - new only - worst						х		
Db	torque tube wall thickness only - thin							х	
Dw	torque tube wall thickness only - thick								х
ABDb	combined counterbalance arm + original	х		х				х	
	torque value + thin wall tube - best								
ABD1w	combined counterbalance arm + original		х		x			х	
	torque value + thin wall tube - worst								
ABD2w	combined counterbalance arm + original		х		x				х
	torque value + thick wall tube - worst								
ACD1w	combined counterbalance arm + SB kit		х				х	х	
	torque value + thin wall tube - worst								
ACD2w	combined counterbalance arm + SB kit		х				х		х
	torque value + thick wall tube - worst								
	Note: For the combined cases, use simple additive superposition if the modeling shows that to be the pattern.								



Load Condition Values

		TORQUE TU	BE HORN AN	ALYSIS PARAMET	ERS AND VA	LUES		
	COUNTERBA	LANCE ARM	ORIGIN	IAL HORN	NE	<i>N</i> HORN	TORQUE TUBE WALL	
TEST CASE	Diametral Interference	Equivalent Pressure	Torque	Bolt Preload	Torque	Bolt Preload	Singles	Twins/400
Ab	0	0						
Aw	0.001	2729						
Bb			70	1124				
Bw			140	2247				
Cb					75	1204		
Cw					95	1525		
Db							0.105	
Dw								0.156
ABDb	0	0	70	1124			0.105	
ABD1w	0.001	2729	140	2247			0.105	
ABD2w	0.001	2729	140	2247				0.156
ACD1w	0.001	2729			95	1525	0.105	
ACD2w	0.001	2729			95	1525		0.156
Twins/400	0.0025	7255	140	2247		1525		0.156
Notes:								
Tube ID	0.75							
Hub ID	1.1181							
Hub OD	1.8780							



Alignment of Bore Surfaces – Local x lengthwise







Final FEA Model

- 49015 Nodes, 180 Beams, 46452 Plates, 129,212 Bricks
- Solution time ~ 20 minutes
- Primary interest is horn skin stresses other elements hidden
- Known cracks develop due to element local yy stress
- Contour plots show overall stress state
- Stress state at key locations from element results
- Results for Singles (except 400) shown next



Condition Aw (Interference Fit Only)





Condition Aw (Selected Elements Hidden for Inside View)





Condition Bb (Bolt Load on Horn – Low Torque)





Condition Bw (Bolt Load on Horn – High Torque)





Condition Bw (Bolt Load on Horn – High Torque)





Condition Cb (Bolt Load on Horn – New Horn – Low Torque)





Condition Cw (Bolt Load on Horn – New Horn – High Torque





Condition ABDb (Combined Case – Interference Fit – Low Torque)





Condition ABD1w

(Combined Case – Interference Fit – High Torque)





Condition ACD1w

(Combined Case – New Horn – High Torque)





Condition ACD1w

(Combined Case – New Horn – High Torque)





Final FEA Model – Twins/400

- FEA Model same as used for Singles, Except:
 - Interference Fit pressure increased to 7255 psi
 - Torque tube wall thickness increased to .161 inches
 - Torque tube mean radius reduced to 1.0753 inches
- Results for Twins/400 shown next

INTERNATIONAL COMANCHE SOCIETY, INC.

Condition Aw (Interference Fit Only)



INTERNATIONAL COMANCHE SOCIETY, INC.

Condition Aw (Interference Fit Only)





Condition Aw (Interference Fit Only Cutaway)





Condition ABD2w

(Interference Fit – High Bolt Torque – Thick Tube)





Condition ACD2w (Interference Fit – New Horn Bolt Torque – Thick Tube)





Summary of Stress Results

	St	ress Resultants - Sir	ngles		
	Contour Plot Ma	our Plot Max/Min yy Stress Max Stress at Crack Initiatio			
Condition	Maximum	Minimum	Horn LHS	Horn RHS	
Aw	13801	-3521			
Bb	5511	-20749	2054	1821	
Bw	11086	-41500	4157	3650	
Cb	5904	-22231	2201	1951	
Cw	7522	-28158	2820	2476	
ABDb	20369	-34559	6390	4962	
ABD1w	18499	-42942	8493	4377	
ACD1w	19685	-34546	7156	6862	
	Stre	ess Resultants - Twir	ns/400		
	Contour Plot Ma	ax/Min yy Stress	Max Stress at Crack Initiation Site		
Condition	Maximum	Minimum	Horn LHS	Horn RHS	
Aw	36748	-9398			
ABD2w	52566	-41222	10448	7367	
ACD2w	43433	-35915	9106	7039	



Summary of Displacement Results

	Diametral Displaceme	nts - Singles				
	Change in Diameter					
Condition	Left Hand Side					
ABDb	0.0040	0.0020				
ABD1w	0.0065	0.0041				
Diametral Displacements - Twins/400						
	Change in Diameter					
Condition	Left Hand Side	Right Hand Side				
ABD2w	0.0040	0.0025				
ACD2w	0.0030	0.0016				



Stress Corrosion Cracking Stress Data

TABLE 7.1.1.1

MEAN PLANE STRAIN FRACTURE TOUCHNESS DATA OF ALUMINUM ALLOY 2014 AT ROOM TEMPERATURE

CONDITION/HT	MEAN KIC + STAND	NRD (NUMBER OF	SPECIMENS)		
	2	AIE			
CONDITION/HT	L-I	I-L	<u>5-1</u>		
T651	23.3 ± 1.0 (10)	21.4 ± 1.2 (19)	17.8 ± 0.1 (2)		
FORGING					
CONDITION/HT	L=I	T-L	8 - L		
T6	27.9 ± 0.8 (2)	17.4 ± 1.7 (4)	16.9 ± 1.9 (5)		
T611			17.8 ± 0.6 (2)		
T652	28.8 ± 3.6 (12)	21.9 ± 3.2 (13)	18.1 ± 1.4 (3)		
	FOR	CED BAR			
CONDITION/HT	L-I	I-L	<u>s-L</u>		
16		16.7 ± 0.6 (2)			

Data Provided by Marv Nuss, FAA, KC Directorate



Summary

- Finite Element Model accurately depicts real structure
- If SCC stress threshold is 16 ksi, then all cases evaluated show local yy stress to be less that critical value
- If bolt threads and nut are lubricated, bolt preload can double at the same torque setting Possible explanation
- Cause of horn cracking uncertain, at this time