The Ninth Triennial International Aircraft Fire and Cabin Safety Research Conference

October 28-31, 2019 – Atlantic City, New Jersey, USA

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation at different levels of modeling detail

P. Schatrow, M. Waimer, M. Petsch, C. Leon Munoz, D. Kohlgrüber

German Aerospace Center (DLR) – Institute of Structures and Design

Stuttgart - Germany

Overview

Motivation

- Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

Strategy

- Method developments

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

- Process chain tool

Current status: first results for tool & model check

- Simulation model details
- Fuselage section crash analysis
- Full aircraft crash analysis

Summary & Next steps

Motivation

Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

Simplifications by analyzing a <u>typical fuselage section</u> instead of a <u>full aircraft xz-crash</u>



	Typical fuselage section (vertical drop)	***Full aircraft (combined xz-impact)***
• Local impact velocity	mainly constant	different along the fuselage stations (e.g. crash event with pitch angle)
• Local stiffness	mainly constant	different along the fuselage stations (e.g. typical and wingbox sections)
• Boundary conditions	free end-sections (partly "somehow" reinforced) (distinct ovalization)	real structural environment (real ovalization)
• Horizontal impact loads	neglected	considered

Motivation

Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

Simplifications by analyzing a <u>typical fuselage section</u> instead of a <u>full aircraft xz-crash</u>



	Typical fuselage section (vertical drop)	***Full aircraft (combined xz-impact)***
• Horizontal impact loads	neglected	considered

Exemplary aspect

– What happens to a cabin floor structure damaged at the first vertical impact, when the max. horizontal load will apply at a subsequent phase? Still capable to remain structurally integer?

– What happens to specific crash structures at the sub-cargo area when high horizontal decelerations act during crushing, e.g. for xz-impact on soft soil? Still progressive crushing or structural collapse?

Overview

Motivation

- Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

Strategy

- Method developments

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

- Process chain tool

Current status: first results for tool & model check

- Simulation model details
- Fuselage section crash analysis
- Full aircraft crash analysis

Summary & Next steps

Strategy

Method developments

Different levels of model fidelity (application-driven)

- A) Low fidelity: Simplified, efficient beam modeling
- B) Medium fidelity: Hybrid macro-FE modeling
- C) High fidelity: Cost intensive shell modeling incl. further details



Automated finite element model generation

- Parametric modeling (geometry, FE meshes and models)
- Modules for aircraft structure, occupants, cargo, masses, impact terrains, etc.

Validation of method developments based on available experimental data

- Fokker F28 Pendulum Crash Test (performed by FAA/NASA in 2019)
  - Collaboration with Fokker Services, FAA, NASA (exchange of data)

https://www.nasa.gov/langley/fokker-f28-crash-test-nasa

Overview

Motivation

- Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

Strategy

- Method developments

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

- Process chain tool

Current status: first results for tool & model check

- Simulation model details
- Fuselage section crash analysis
- Full aircraft crash analysis

Summary & Next steps

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

Process chain tool

Automated finite element model generation

- Parametric modeling (geometry, FE meshes and models)
- Modules for input, aircraft structure, occupants, cargo, masses, impact terrains, etc.



Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

Process chain tool



A) Input module

- CPACS file format
- Parameterized and automated generation of different aircraft configurations (wide-body, single-aisle, regional)



CPACS: Common Parametric Aircraft Configuration Schema
https://cpacs.de/

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

Process chain tool



B) Aircraft structure module

- Generation of full aircraft models
- Generation of individual fuselage section models



Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

Process chain tool



C) Occupant module and D) Cargo module

- Development of each module acc. to the building block (BB) approach

Occupant module
(BB for pax & seats)



Cargo module
(BB for cargo container)



Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

Process chain tool



E) Mass module

- Discrete masses for
    - Payload (occupants, cargo)
    - Structure (wing, vertical and horizontal stabilizer, landing gears, etc.)
    - Systems, power units, fuel
    - Interiors/monuments (overhead bins, linings, coverings, lavatories, gallies, etc.)





Method development for full aircraft crash simulation
Process chain tool



"Ready to use" simulation model (process chain output)

- Each module provides individual levels of model fidelity (structure, occupants, cargo, terrain, etc.)



Depicted high fidelity model generated with previously developed DLR tool, which is limited to a typical fuselage section.

Overview

Motivation

- Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

Strategy

- Method developments

Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

- Process chain tool

Current status: first results for tool & model check

- Simulation model details
- Fuselage section crash analysis
- Full aircraft crash analysis

Summary & Next steps

Current status: first results for tool & model check

Simulation model details (low fidelity)

Code

- LS-Dyna R10.2.0
- Linux cluster

Element formulation and material model

(simplified assumptions for tool & model check)

- Beam elements
    - ELFORM = 2 (Belytschko-Schwer)
    - ELFORM = 1 (Hughes-Liu)
    - *MAT_SIMPLIFIED_JOHNSON_COOK (*MAT_098) (isotropic)
- Shell elements
    - ELFORM = 2 (Belytschko-Tsay)
    - *MAT_PIECEWISE_LINEAR_PLASTICITY (*MAT_024) (isotropic)

Typical section



Center section



Rear conical section



Full aircraft



Current status: first results for tool & model check

A) Fuselage sections vertical drop (low fidelity)

For tool & model check only!
Not yet validated!

Crash kinematics

- v_z = 7.6 m/s (25 ft/s)
- Rigid impact surface









	Typical section	*Center section*	*Rear conical section*
Length	2130 mm (3 seat rows)	5990 mm (7 seat rows)	2130 mm (3 seat rows)
Mass	2215 kg	6972 kg	2209 kg
Number of nodes	≈ 7400	≈ 64,100	≈ 7703
Number of mass elements	≈ 64	≈ 160	≈ 64
Number of beam elements	≈ 3900	≈ 29,300	≈ 3900
Number of shell elements	≈ 5700	≈ 56,300	≈ 5700

Discrete mass elements
- Occupants & seats
- Carry-on luggage
- Overhead bins

Current status: first results for tool & model check

A) Fuselage sections vertical drop (low fidelity)

For tool & model check only!
Not yet validated!

Energy plot (v_z = 7.6 m/s, rigid impact surface)

- Plot of energies indicate different deformation/ stiffness of the fuselage sections (reasonable result) ☑

Typical section





Center section





Rear conical section



For tool & model check only!
Not yet validated!

Current status: first results for tool & model check

A) Fuselage sections vertical drop (low fidelity)

Injury criteria for spinal injuries: Dynamic Response Index (DRI)

- DRI values indicate different deformation/ stiffness of the fuselage sections (reasonable result) ✓

[1]

DRI range	Risk of injury
0 < DRI ≤ 15.0	Risk of injury (< 1 %)
15.0 < DRI ≤ 17.7	Risk of injury (1 % to 10 %)
17.7 < DRI ≤ 21.3	Risk of injury (10 % to 50 %)
21.3 < DRI	Risk of injury (> 50 %)

Typical section

	4	5	6
F	18.8	19.0	19.0
E	12.8	12.6	12.9
D	13.1	12.4	12.6
C	13.6	12.8	13.1
B	13.1	13.2	13.5
A	19.0	19.4	19.4

Center section



	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
F	20.0	19.2	20.7	19.9	20.9	18.6	17.4
E	18.9	17.4	19.4	19.9	21.3	17.3	14.8
D	19.4	18.7	20.9	21.6	23.9	19.4	15.6
C	19.2	18.4	20.5	21.5	23.8	19.2	15.8
B	18.4	17.3	18.5	19.7	21.2	17.0	14.4
A	18.6	18.3	19.9	19.3	20.5	18.4	17.1

Rear conical section

	24	25	26
F	19.0	19.0	19.0
E	16.7	15.6	15.0
D	25.2	18.1	13.0
C	25.2	18.0	12.8
B	16.7	15.6	14.9
A	18.9	19.0	18.8

[1] Brinkley, J.W., Shaffer, J.T.: Dynamic simulation techniques for the design of sscape systems: Current applications and future air force requirements., AMRL-TR-71-29 (1971).

Current status: first results for tool & model check

B) Full aircraft vertical drop (low fidelity)

For tool & model check only!
Not yet validated!

Crash kinematics

- v_z = 7.6 m/s (25 ft/s)
- Rigid impact surface
- 5° pitch angle



	Full aircraft
Length	36,495 mm (26 seat rows)
Mass	23,974 kg [1)]
Number of nodes	≈ 205,600
Number of mass elements	≈ 586
Number of beam elements	≈ 96,400
Number of shell elements	≈ 177,400

Discrete mass elements [1)]

- Occupants & seats
- Carry-on luggage
- Overhead bins

[1)] Further masses not included, for direct comparison with fuselage section drop tests: cargo, wing, vertical & horizontal stabilizer, power units, systems, fuel, landing gear, pylons, galley, lavatory, etc.

Current status: first results for tool & model check

B) Full aircraft vertical drop (low fidelity)

For tool & model check only!
Not yet validated!

Energy plot (v_z = 7.6 m/s, rigid impact surface)

- Energy plot indicates different phases during the drop test of the aircraft with 5° pitch angle
  - Phase 1: impact at the rear
  - Phase 2: rotation of the aircraft
  - Phase 3: impact of the center and forward fuselage





For tool & model check only!
Not yet validated!

Current status: first results for tool & model check

B) Full aircraft vertical drop (low fidelity)

[1]

DRI range	Risk of injury
0 < DRI ≤ 15.0	Risk of injury (< 1 %)
15.0 < DRI ≤ 17.7	Risk of injury (1 % to 10 %)
17.7 < DRI ≤ 21.3	Risk of injury (10 % to 50 %)
21.3 < DRI	Risk of injury (> 50 %)

Injury criteria for spinal injuries: Dynamic Response Index (DRI)

- After the first impact at the rear, the aircraft rotates (pitch rotation)
- Pitch rotation results in increasing local impact velocity towards the forward fuselage
- Known from accidents: typical passenger injuries are higher in the forward fuselage for similar crash scenarios ☑

5° pitch angle





[1] Brinkley, J.W., Shaffer, J.T.: Dynamic simulation techniques for the design of sscape systems: Current applications and future air force requirements., AMRL-TR-71-29 (1971).

Summary

Motivation: Full aircraft crash analysis as a research goal at DLR

- Today's simplifications in analyzing a fuselage section drop test instead of a full aircraft xz-crash



Strategy: Method development for full aircraft crash simulation

- Different levels of model fidelity (application-driven: suitable model fidelity for any given application)
- Development of individual modules for aircraft structure, occupants, cargo, masses, impact terrains, etc.
- Validation of method developments based on available experimental data



Current status: first results for tool & model check (low fidelity model, not yet validated)

- Fuselage section: vertical drop of typical, center and conical section
- Full aircraft: vertical drop with 5° pitch angle





Next steps (future work)







Past

- Previously developed DLR tool
- Limited to typical fuselage sections (low and high fidelity modeling)

Present

- New DLR tool (in development)
- Full aircraft parametric modeling
- Currently limited to **low fidelity modeling**

Future

- New DLR tool (further developments)
- Full aircraft parametric modeling
- **Low & high fidelity modeling**
- Development of modules for occupants, cargo, impact terrain, etc.

Thank you for your attention!