

Fatigue Testing of 9 m Carbon Fiber Wind Turbine Research Blades

Joshua Paquette

Sandia National Laboratories

Scott Hughes and Jeroen van Dam

National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Jay Johnson Georgia Institute of Technology

46th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit Reno, NV January 10th, 2008







Background, Purpose, and Overview

• Background

- SNL initiated a blade research program in 2002 to investigate the use of carbon in subscale 9 m blades
- 7 CX-100 and 7 TX-100 blades were manufactured
- Blades from each set have undergone modal and static tests

Purpose of Fatigue Tests

- Verify that blades met their design criteria
- Investigate unique structural aspects of the blades
- Examine the use of advanced sensors

Overview

- Carbon in blades
- 9 m Blade Designs
- Test Setup
- Test Results
- Conclusions



Carbon in Blades

0° Carbon

-45° Fiberglass

Advantages:

- High stiffness/
- Highly orthotro
- Excellent fatigue fibers
- Disadvantages:
 - Higher cost
 - Limited availat
 - Difficult to infu
 - Poor propertie
 - Possible stiffne
- Potential solution triax fabric
 - Relatively inex
 - Infusible
 - Dry fabric for c techniques
 - Maintains excellent fiber straightness

*Studies of carbon materials performed by and in collaboration with GEC and MSU

0° Carbon

Fiberglass

January 10th, 2008

46th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit

+45° Fiberglass



Sandia

National

Laboratories

+45° Fiberglass

SAERTEX Carbon Tri-ax Fatigue Performance



Source: Montana State University



CX-100

- CX-100 (Carbon Experimental 100 kW)
- Manufactured using existing 9 m molds
- Based on ERS-100 blade with nonscalloped root
- Glass-Epoxy blade with full length carbon spar cap



CX-100 Blade Skin





- TX-100 (<u>T</u>wist-Bend Coupled Experimental <u>100</u> kW)
- Identical geometry to CX-100
- Partial-length glass spar cap
- 20° off-axis carbon in outboard (~>3.5 m) skins to produce material-induced, passive aerodynamic load alleviation



Material Induced Twist-Bend Coupling



TX-100 Blade Skin

January 10th, 2008





9 m Blade designs



CX-100 (top) and TX-100 (bottom) Geometry and Major Laminate Regions

January 10th, 2008





Fatigue Test Methodology

- Test objective
 - Demonstrate 20-year fatigue equivalent life
 - Complete test in 1-4 million cycles

Fatigue Equivalent Life Calculation Procedure

- 1. Perform system dynamics simulations
- 2. Count fatigue cycles/second
- 3. Extrapolate to 20-years
- Compute damage fraction using damage model along with material data, appropriate safety factors, and damage accumulation counting method



CX-100 and TX-100 Simulations







Test Setup: CX-100

- Fatigue analysis focused on carbon spar cap
- Slope parameter of 12 used (GL standards: 10 for glass, 14 for carbon)
- Single-axis flapwise point loading
 - Hydraulic cylinder used to apply oscillating load at single point
 - Robust, simple setup
 - Only allows for target load matching in limited area
- 1.25-12.5 kN applied at saddle for 1M cycles, then increased by 10% every 500k cycles
- 20-year fatigue equivalent life demonstrated in 6k cycles





Test Setup: TX-100

- Fatigue analysis focused on both glass and carbon areas
- Slope parameter of 10 used (for off-axis loading)
- Single-axis flapwise resonant loading
 - Uses oscillating mass to excite natural frequencies of blade-mass system
 - Mean load adjusted by exciter and ballast masses
 - Amplitude adjusted by exciter displacement
 - Complicated setup required to produce correct shape and amplitude
 - Potentially allows for load matching for large portion of blade span
- 1M, 2M, and 4M cycle test loads calculated
- Test began with 4M load and then increased 10% beginning at 1M cycle count and repeating every 500k cycles
- Unable to increase at 2.5M cycles, load was held constant thereafter
- 20-year fatigue equivalent life demonstrated at 2M cycles





- Developed specifically for the unique aspects of testing bendtwist coupled blades
- Pair of hydraulic actuators mounted to the blade through a ballast saddle
- Rotational inertia minimized compared to mounting actuator and resonant mass above the blade
- Possible to apply torsional loading by adjusting actuator phases
- Horizontally mounted cylinder can be used to excite edge movement



UREX Schematic





Applied Loads



Fatigue Test Applied Loads







CX-100 Early in Fatigue Test

January 10th, 2008









CX-100 Dimple (left) and Tip Movement (right) just before Failure

January 10th, 2008







CX-100 Dimple (left) and Tip Movement (right) at Failure

January 10th, 2008





CX-100 Failure Mechanism

- Dimple formed early during test around max chord
- Low pressure skin pushed outward aft of sparcap and inward forward of sparcap
- At 1.5M cycles, crack began to grow along sparcap/aft-panel intersection
- Crack resulted in greatly decreased stiffness in the area and cause severe edgewise movement



CX-100 Crack Growth







TX-100 Early in Fatigue Test

January 10th, 2008







TX-100 Sparcap Tip Stress Contours

January 10th, 2008







TX-100 Crack Growth Beginning (left) and Progression (right)

January 10th, 2008





TX-100 Strain Gage Layout



TX-100 Failure Mechanism

- At 723k cycle count, crack began to grow just outboard of HP sparcap termination
- Cracks grew at 65° angle from blade axis until 2.4M cycles
- Crack then changed direction and grew along 20° direction corresponding to carbon fiber direction
- Growth of crack continued until 4M cycles when excessive torsional movement of the blade tip occurred



TX-100 HP Crack Growth





- CX-100 failed due to buckle formation near max-chord which caused a fracture between the sparcap and aft balsa panel leading to excessive edge movement
- TX-100 failed due to crack which grew from sparcap termination on HP surface along carbon fiber direction causing excessive tip rotation
- Infused carbon was effectively implemented in a CX-100 and TX-100 blade designs
- Both blades failed in carbon areas
- Blades failed due to damage in off-axis directions, showing the difficulty in using fiber-direction fatigue calculations





Acknowledgements

US Department of Energy Mike Jenks, Jason Cotrell, and Dave Sims (NREL) Dayton Griffin and Tim McCoy (GEC) Mark Rumsey, Perry Jones, Wesley Johnson (SNL) Mike Zuteck Derek Berry (TPI)

