

**INVESTIGATION
OF
DEEP FLAWS
IN THIN WALLED TANKS**

**CASE FILE
COPY**

By

J. N. Masters, W. P. Haese and R. W. Finger

Prepared for

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Contract NAS 3-10290

THE **BOEING** COMPANY

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), nor any person acting on behalf of NASA:

- A.) Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B.) Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method or process disclosed in this report.

As used above, "person acting on behalf of NASA" includes any employee or contractor of NASA, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of NASA, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with NASA, or his employment with such contractor.

Requests for copies of this report should be referred to

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
Attention: AFSS-A
Washington, D.C. 20546

NASA CR-72606
D2-121696-1

FINAL REPORT
INVESTIGATION OF DEEP FLAWS IN THIN WALLED TANKS

By
J. N. Masters, W. P. Haese, and R. W. Finger

Prepared for
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

December 1969

Contract NAS 3-10290

Technical Management
NASA Lewis Research Center
Cleveland, Ohio

Liquid Rocket Technology Branch
Gordon T. Smith

THE BOEING COMPANY
Aerospace Systems Division
Seattle, Washington

PREFACE

This report describes an investigation of static and cyclic flaw growth characteristics of deep flaws in thin walled cryogenic tank materials performed by The Boeing Company from June 1967 to March 1969 under Contract NAS3-10290. The work was administered by Mr. Gordon T. Smith of the NASA Lewis Research Center.

Boeing personnel who participated in the investigation include C. F. Tiffany; J. N. Masters, project supervisor; W. P. Haese, Principal investigator; and R. W. Finger and R. C. Shah, research engineers. Program support was provided by A. A. Ottlyk and H. M. Olden, specimen testing; F. D. Walsh, fracture surface photography; and D. G. Good, technical illustrations and art work.

The information contained in this report is also released as Boeing Document D2-121696-1.

INVESTIGATION OF DEEP FLAWS IN THIN WALL TANKS

By

J. N. Masters, W. P. Haese, and R. W. Finger

ABSTRACT

The conditions controlling fracture instability and subcritical flaw growth in relatively thin sections containing deep surface flaws were experimentally investigated for 2219-T87 aluminum and 5Al-2.5Sn titanium base metal and weldments. The program consisted primarily of testing uniaxially loaded surface flawed specimens in ambient, liquid nitrogen, and liquid hydrogen environments. It was concluded that for test conditions in which the plastic zone size is relatively small with respect to the thickness, well ordered static and cyclic data is generated, and experimentally determined deep flaw magnification factors adequately describe the fracturing process. As relative thickness is reduced, combinations of stable flaw growth and plasticity effects control, and cyclic flaw growth rates increase rapidly. In the extreme case, (very thin gages with respect to the plastic zone size) the surface flaw grows through the thickness, under rising load, and ultimately fails as a through-the-thickness crack.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.0 TECHNICAL BACKGROUND	5
2.1 Irwin Analysis	6
2.2 Kobayashi Analysis	6
2.3 Smith Analysis	7
2.4 Kobayashi - Moss Analysis	8
3.0 MATERIAL AND FABRICATION PROCEDURES	9
3.1 Materials	9
3.2 Welding	10
3.3 Straightening of Welded Panels	10
3.4 Specimen Fabrication Procedure	11
4.0 EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE	13
5.0 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS	15
5.1 Mechanical Property Tests	15
5.2 Static Tests of Surface Flawed Specimens	15
5.3 Static Tests of Center Crack Panels	19
5.4 Cyclic Flaw Growth Tests	20
5.5 Comparison of Static and Cyclic Data	23
5.6 Design and Analysis Implications	27
6.0 OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	29
REFERENCES	31
APPENDIX A - MATERIAL COMPOSITION	33
APPENDIX B - WELDING PARAMETERS	35

ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
1	Shape Parameter Curves for Surface and Internal Flaws	37
2	Stress Intensity Magnification Due to Deep Flaw and Plastic Yielding for Plane Strain	38
3	Stress Intensity Magnification Factor for Deep Surface Flaws	39
4	Stress Intensity Factor for a Semi-Circular Surface Flaw	39
5	Stress Intensity Factor for a Semi-Elliptical Surface Flaw	40
6	Elastic Stress Intensity Magnification Factor for Deep Surface Flaws (Estimations by F. Smith)	40
7	Elastic Stress Intensity Magnification Factor, M_{eF} , for a Surface-Flawed Tension Plate	41
8	Plastic Stress Intensity Magnification Factor for Penny-Shaped Crack in an Infinite Solid Subjected to Uniaxial Tension	41
9	End View of Weld Tooling Used for Titanium Welding	42
10	Weld Distortion in 0.125 Inch Thick 2219-T87 Aluminum Panel	42
11	Removing Weld Distortion with Magnetic Hammer	43
12	0.125 Inch Thick 2219-T87 Welded Panel after Straightening	43
13	Mechanical Property Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium and 2219-T87 Aluminum (Base and Weld Metal)	44
14	Mechanical Property Specimen for 1.00 Inch Thick 2219 Aluminum Weld	44
15	Surface Flaw Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium	45
16	Surface Flaw Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium	45
17	Surface Flaw Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium	46
18	Surface Flaw Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium	46
19	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219-T87 Aluminum	47
20	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219-T87 Aluminum	47
21	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219-T87 Aluminum	48

ILLUSTRATIONS (Continued)

<u>Figure Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
22	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219-T87 Aluminum	48
23	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219 Aluminum Weld	49
24	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219 Aluminum Weld	49
25	Surface Flaw Specimen for 2219-T87 Aluminum	50
26	Center Crack Flaw Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium	50
27	Center Crack Flaw Specimen for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium	51
28	Center Crack Flaw Specimen for 2219-T87 Aluminum	51
29	Drilling Loading Roles with Drill Jig in 1.00 Inch Thick Specimen	52
30	Test Setup for Fatigue Sharpening Flaw in 0.020 Inch Thick Titanium Specimen	52
31	Horizontal 350 KIP Test Machine Used to Cycle and Static Test Larger Room Temperature and -320°F Specimens	53
32	LH ₂ Cryostat	53
33	Trace of Strain Gage Bonded to Back of Specimen to Detect Break Through of Flaw	54
34	Tensile Properties of 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, 0.040 Inch Thick Base Metal	55
35	Tensile Properties of 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, 0.200 Inch Thick Base Metal	55
36	Tensile Properties of 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, 0.040 Inch Thick Weldment	56
37	Tensile Properties of 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, 0.200 Inch Thick Weldment	56
38	Tensile Properties of 2219-T87 Aluminum, 0.125 Inch Thick Base Metal	57
39	Tensile Properties of 2219-T87 Aluminum, 0.625 Inch Thick Base Metal	57
40	Tensile Properties of 2219 Aluminum, 0.125 Inch Thick Weldment	58
41	Tensile Properties of 2219 Aluminum, 1.00 Inch Thick Weldment	58

ILLUSTRATIONS (Continued)

<u>Figure Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
42	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 0.625''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -423°F)	59
43	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 0.200''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal @ -423°F)	59
44	Baseline K_{Ic} Values as a Function of Test Temperature	60
45	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal @ R.T.)	61
46	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal @ -320°F)	61
47	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal @ -423°F)	62
48	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 0.063''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -423°F)	62
49	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 0.020''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal @ -423°F)	63
50	Effect of Flaw Depth on Apparent K Values ($t = 0.020''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal @ -423°F)	63
51	Apparent Magnification-Data ($t = 0.200''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, $a/2c = .12-.19$)	64
52	Apparent Magnification-Data ($t = 0.200''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, $a/2c = .21-.24$)	64
53	Apparent Magnification-Data ($t = 0.200''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium, $a/2c = .33-.41$)	65
54	Apparent Magnification-Data ($t = 0.625''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum, $a/2c = .09-.11$)	65
55	Apparent Magnification-Data ($t = 0.625''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum, $a/2c = .25-.27$)	66
56	Apparent Magnification-Data ($t = 0.625''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum, $a/2c = .35-.40$)	66
57	Deep Flaw Magnification Curves ($t = 0.200''$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal (Transverse) & Weldment @ -320°F & -423°F)	67

ILLUSTRATIONS (Continued)

<u>Figure Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
58	Deep Flaw Magnification Curves ($t = 0.625"$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal, Longitudinal Grain, @ R.T., -320°F & -423°F)	67
59	Relationship for Calculating K_{CN} from Center Crack Specimens	68
60	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium @ R.T.)	69
61	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium @ -320°F)	70
62	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium @ -423°F)	71
63	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ R.T.)	72
64	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -320°F)	73
65	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -423°F)	74
66	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (2219 Aluminum Weldments @ R.T.)	75
67	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (2219 Aluminum Weldments @ -320°F)	76
68	Cyclic Flaw Growth Rates (2219 Aluminum Weldments @ -423°F)	77
69	Cyclic Life Curves ($t = 0.063"$ and $0.100"$, 2219-T87 Aluminum @ -320°F)	78
70	Cyclic Flaw Growth Data for 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium @ -320°F (50-100-50 Load Profile)	79
71	Comparison of Surface Flaw & Center Crack Data ($t = 0.020"$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal @ -423°F)	80
72	Fractograph of a Cyclic Test Specimen ($t = 1.00"$, 2219 Aluminum Weldment @ -320°F , specimen No. AWC80N-5)	81
73	Apparent First Cycle Growth - 2219 Weldments	82
74	Schematic of Deep Flaw Behavior	82

TABLES

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
1	Tensile Properties ($t = 0.04"$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal)	83
2	Tensile Properties ($t = 0.20"$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal)	83
3	Tensile Properties ($t = 0.04"$ and $0.20"$, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weldment)	84
4	Tensile Properties ($t = 0.125"$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal)	84
5	Tensile Properties ($t = 0.625"$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal)	85
6	Tensile Properties ($t = 0.125"$ and $1.00"$, 2219 Aluminum Weldment)	85
7	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick 5 Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .075$, Room Temperature	86
8	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature	86
9	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	87
10	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .25$, -320°F	87
11	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F	88
12	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F	88
13	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F	89

TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
14	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .075$, Room Temperature	89
15	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature	90
16	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	90
17	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .25$, -320°F	91
18	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F	91
19	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F	92
20	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F	92
21	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	92
22	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	93
23	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	93
24	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	94
25	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F	94
26	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	95

TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
27	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	95
28	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	95
29	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	96
30	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F	96
31	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .10$, Room Temperature	97
32	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature	97
33	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .10$, -320°	98
34	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .25$, -320°F	98
35	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F	99
36	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .10$, -423°F	99
37	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F	100
38	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	100
39	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature	101

TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
40	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	101
41	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	102
42	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	102
43	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F	103
44	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 1.0 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature	103
45	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 1.0 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .30$, Room Temperature	103
46	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 1.0 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	104
47	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 1.0 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .30$, -320°F	104
48	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 1.0 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	104
49	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 1.0 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .30$, -423°F	105
50	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	105
51	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature	105
52	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	106

TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
53	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F	106
54	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	107
55	Static Fracture Toughness Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F	107
56	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal, Transverse Grain	108
57	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal, Transverse Grain	108
58	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weldment	109
59	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weldment	109
60	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal, Long Grain	110
61	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal, Long Grain	110
62	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weldment	111
63	Static Fracture Toughness Data - Center Cracked Panels, 1.00 Inch Thick 2219 Aluminum Weldment	111
64	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature	112
65	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F	112
66	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F	113

TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
67	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature	113
68	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F	114
69	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F	114
70	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	115
71	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	115
72	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal - Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	116
73	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	116
74	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	117
75	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	117
76	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature	118
77	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F	118
78	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F	119
79	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal-Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	119
80	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	120

TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
81	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.100 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	120
82	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal - Long Grain $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	121
83	Cyclic Fracture Data, 1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .30$, Room Temperature	121
84	Cyclic Fracture Data, 1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .30$, -320°F	122
85	Cyclic Fracture Data, 1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .30$, -423°F	122
86	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature	123
87	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F	123
88	Cyclic Fracture Data, 0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F	124

SYMBOLS

K	Stress intensity factor defined by linear elastic fracture mechanics.
K_I	Stress intensity factor under condition of plane strain.
K_{Ic}	Plane-strain fracture toughness of a material.
a	Depth of semielliptical surface flaw or semiminor axis of the ellipse $x^2/a^2 + y^2/c^2 = 1.$
2c	Effective width of semielliptical surface flaw.
ϕ	Elliptical angle measured for semi-major axis of ellipse.
Φ	Complete elliptical integral of the second kind having modulus K defined as $K = (1 - a^2/c^2)^{1/2}$
Q	Flaw shape parameter $= \Phi^2 - 0.212 (\sigma/\sigma_{ys})^2$
σ	Uniform tensile stress applied perpendicularly to plane of crack or peak cyclic value thereof.
σ_{ys}	Uniaxial tensile yield strength.
σ_{ult}	Uniaxial tensile ultimate strength.
E	Young's modulus.
N	Number of loading cycles.
ν	Poisson's ratio.

Subscripts

i	at initial conditions
F	at final conditions

SUMMARY

The experimental work described herein was undertaken to investigate the conditions controlling fracture instability and subcritical flaw growth of thin sections containing deep, part-through flaws. Two materials were tested: 2219-T87 aluminum and 5Al -2.5Sn titanium base metal and weldments. Uniaxially stressed surface flawed specimens were tested in ambient, liquid nitrogen, and liquid hydrogen environments. Tests performed were either static tests to failure or cyclic tests with zero-to-tension loading profiles. Additionally, center cracked panels were tested statically for each material, thickness, and test temperature. Each material was tested in two thicknesses. The aluminum base metal was tested in gages of 0.625 and 0.063-inch thickness; the aluminum weldments in 1.00 and 0.125-inch thicknesses; and the titanium base metal and weldments both in 0.200 and 0.020-inch thicknesses.

By comparing the data from the various types of tests it was concluded that the behavior of surface flaws subjected to a rising load to failure can be placed into two distinct categories:

1. In one case, the flaw remains stable until a stress intensity is reached at which point the flaw growth occurs very rapidly, resulting in complete fracture; the flaw is critical before it reaches the back surface.
2. In the second case, significant slow flaw growth occurs prior to reaching maximum load. In some cases, the flaw actually grows slowly completely through the thickness. Upon a further rise in load, the flaw can then become critical as a through-crack.

The parameters controlling these behaviors are not fully understood; however, it appears that the size of the plastic zone at the bottom tip of the flaw, relative to the specimen thickness or to the size of the remaining ligament (i.e., the net thickness, t_n), plays an important part. For plane strain conditions, the plastic zone size can be estimated by $\rho \approx \frac{\pi}{16} (K_{Ic} / \sigma_{ys})^2$. From the data generated, it appears that for values of ρ/t_n up to about 1.00, the flaw will become critical before growing through-the-thickness. In this category, well ordered data was generated, describing the effects of flaw shapes and a/t values for thick 2219-T87 aluminum base metal at all test temperatures and for thick 5Al -2.5Sn titanium base metal and weldments at cryogenic temperatures. In this same category, it was found that cyclic flaw growth rates were relatively low, and the cyclic specimens (cycled at stress levels just less than that at which comparable static specimens fail) failed before the flaw grew through the thickness.

In the second category the static test results were characterized by an absence of deep flawed effects (i.e., Irwin's apparent K_{Ic} did not decrease with increasing flaw depth). In the extreme case, where the flaw did grow through-the-thickness before failure, the failure stress was, as expected, relatable to the through-the-thickness crack tests, even though the initial defect was a surface flaw. In this category cyclic flaw growth rates are much higher than in item (1) above, and the flaws were also found to grow through-the-thickness before failure.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Previous investigations of failure modes of structure loaded in tension and containing crack-like defects have been directed primarily to the problems of either embedded or surface flaws which are relatively small with respect to the thickness, or to through-cracks. Relatively thin walled structure fabricated from materials of moderate toughness can involve the problem of part-through flaws which either initially or during service, may extend to depths which are quite large with respect to the thickness. Prior to initiation of this program, some analytical efforts had been directed toward the problem of fracture instability of deep flaws, experimental data on fracture, and on subcritical growth of such flaws was very limited.

This experimental investigation was thus undertaken to investigate the conditions controlling fracture instability and subcritical flaw growth characteristics of tension loaded structures containing deep, part-through flaws. Two materials in base metal and weld metal form were investigated: 2219-T87 aluminum and 5Al-2.5 Sn titanium. Uniaxially stressed surface flawed specimens were tested in ambient, liquid nitrogen, and liquid hydrogen environments, under conditions of either loading directly to failure or under zero-tension loading profiles. Thickness, flaw shapes, and flaw depth-to-thickness ratios were systematically varied. With these variables, several combinations of strength and plastic zone sizes were investigated.

2.0 TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

Relationships between stress intensity, flaw size, and nominal stress field have been derived for a number of crack geometries and loading conditions. In order to predict pressure vessel performance, solutions for the semi-elliptical surface flaws have proved to be the most useful. To date several approximate solutions are available.

Irwin (Ref. 1) first obtained a solution for a semi-elliptical surface flaw in a plate and estimated that the solution may be valid for flaws with depth up to about one-half the material thickness. As part of the Boeing research and development program (IR&D), Kobayashi (Ref. 2) arrived at an approximate stress intensity solution for deep flaws having small depth-to-length ratios, i.e., small $a/2c$ values. Smith derived a solution for the semi-circular flaw in a semi-infinite body (Ref. 3). This solution provided further refinement of the free surface correction Irwin used in his equation. As part of the Boeing IR&D program, Smith estimated what the free surface corrections should be for the semi-elliptical surface flaws in a semi-infinite space (Ref. 4). He also obtained an approximation of the stress intensity for the semi-circular surface flaws which become very deep with respect to the thickness (Ref. 4). Using the single-edge-notch solution, i.e., $a/2c = 0$ of Gross, et al., (Ref. 5) and his solution for the deep semi-circular flaw, Smith roughly estimated stress intensity factors for deep surface flaws of intermediate shape, i.e., $a/2c$ ratios between 0 and 0.5 (Ref. 4). Kobayashi and Moss (Ref. 6) have derived an approximate solution for the surface flaw that accounts for the effects of the stress-free surfaces and the ductility of the material.

The limited experimental evidence obtained before this program suggested that:

- (1) Irwin's estimated flaw depth limitation of $0.5t$ for his solution is approximately correct;
- (2) The stress intensity for deep semi-circular flaws can be reasonably approximated using Smith's solution;
- (3) The Kobayashi solution for deep flaws provides a reasonable approximation of the stress intensities for flaws with $a/2c$ ratios of approximately .30, but may tend slightly to underestimate the values for very small $a/2c$ ratios;
- (4) The Smith estimates for deep semi-elliptical flaws will overestimate the stress intensities for flaws with small $a/2c$ ratios, i.e., $a/2c$ less than .20.

The stress intensity relationships for the surface flaw obtained by Irwin, Kobayashi, Smith and Kobayashi and Moss are summarized below.

2.1 Irwin Analysis

Utilizing Green and Sneddon (Ref. 7) solution for the distribution of stresses near a flat elliptical crack in an elastic solid subjected to uniform tension in a direction perpendicular to the plane of the crack at infinity, Irwin (Ref. 1) derived the expression for the stress intensity factor.

$$K_I^* = \frac{\sigma \sqrt{\pi a}}{\Phi} \left[\frac{1}{c^2} (a^2 \cos^2 \phi + c^2 \sin^2 \phi) \right]^{1/4} \quad (1)$$

Irwin estimated the stress intensity factor for a semi-elliptical surface flaw in a finite thickness plate as

$$K_I = 1.1 \sigma (\pi a/Q)^{1/2} \left[\frac{1}{c^2} (a^2 \cos^2 \phi + c^2 \sin^2 \phi) \right]^{1/4} \quad (2)$$

where he introduced the constant 1.1 to account for the effect on stress intensity of the stress-free plate surfaces and replaced Q for Φ to account for the effect on the stress intensity of the plastic yielding around the flaw periphery. Figure 1 describes Q for varying flaw shapes and stress ratios. Expression (2) was considered valid for surface flaws for flaw depths up to one-half the plate thickness and for stress levels not exceeding yield stress.

The maximum value of K_I occurs at the end of the semi-minor axis of the ellipse and has the value:

$$K_I = 1.1 \sigma (\pi a/Q)^{1/2} \quad (3)$$

2.2 Kobayashi Analysis

For surface flaws that have a small depth to length ratio, but are deep with respect to the plate thickness, Kobayashi assumed the following form for the stress intensity:

$$K_I = 1.1 M_K \frac{\sigma \sqrt{\pi a}}{\Phi} \quad (4)$$

where: $M_K = M_{kf} \times M_{kp}$

Following Irwin (Ref. 1) the multiplying constant, 1.1, is taken to account for the effect of the free surface on the stress intensity factor.

M_{kf} , the elastic stress intensity magnification due to deep flaw, was estimated from an infinite strip with a central through-the-thickness crack under the conditions of plane strain.

M_{kp} is the stress intensity magnification due to plastic yielding in an infinite plate with a central through-the-thickness crack under the conditions of plane strain.

* See List of Symbols for Definition of Terms.

A Plot of M_K , i.e., $M_{kf} \times M_{kp}$, versus a/t is given in Figure 2 for $(\sigma / \sigma_{ys}) = 0.4$ and 0.8 for $\nu = 1/3$.

Based on the experimental data, Tiffany et al., (Ref. 8) extended the plot of M_K up to $a/t = 1$ as shown in Figure 3. They represented the stress intensity equation as

$$K_I = 1.1 M_K \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\pi a}{Q}} \quad (5)$$

2.3 Smith Analysis

Smith's (Ref. 3) linear elastic analysis of a semi-circular surface flaw in a semi-infinite body resulted in the following stress intensity relationship:

$$K_I = M_I \frac{2 \sigma \sqrt{a}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$$

This result corresponds to that shown in equations (2) and (3) except that the 1.1 free surface correction assumed by Irwin is replaced by the M_I coefficient, which is dependent upon location on the flaw periphery (Figure 4) and plasticity correction is not incorporated.

For semi-elliptical flaws in semi-infinite bodies Smith (Ref. 4) estimated the free surface coefficient, M_I' . This result is shown in Figure 5. The stress intensity relation thus becomes:

$$K_I = M_I' \sigma (\pi a/Q)^{1/2}$$

where:

$$M_I' = M_I \left[\left(\frac{a}{c} \right)^2 \cos^2 \phi + \sin^2 \phi \right]^{1/4} \left[\frac{1.1}{M_I} - \left(\frac{1.1}{M_I} - 1 \right) \frac{a}{c} \right] \quad (6)$$

As seen in Figure 5 the point of maximum stress intensity occurs at the point of maximum flaw depth for all flaws with $a/2c$ ratios less than about .35 to .40. This is consistent with Irwin's analysis; however, the magnitude of the free surface corrections are slightly less than the 1.1 he estimated. Smith (Ref. 4) obtained the stress intensity factors for semi-circular flaws in a finite thickness plate and using it and Gross's single-edge-notch solution he estimated the stress intensity factors for semi-elliptical surface flaws in a plate as a function of $a/2c$ and a/t ratios. The resulting relationship is:

$$K_I = M_I' M_K' \sigma (\pi a/Q)^{1/2}$$

M_K' is the finite thickness (or deep flaw stress intensity magnification) correction. The M_K' versus a/t curve for the semi-circular flaw and the estimated curves for semi-elliptical flaws with $a/2c$ ratios of .10, .15, .20, .25 and .30 are shown in Figure 6.

2.4 Kobayashi-Moss Analysis

Kobayashi and Moss (Ref. 6) assumed that the stress intensity magnification factor in surface-flawed tension plates is decomposable in three parts. They, then, represented the stress intensity at the minor axis of surface flaw as

$$K_I = M_F M_B M_p \frac{\sigma (\pi a)^{1/2}}{\Phi} \quad (8)$$

The first part of the magnification factor, M_F , is due to the stress free front surface. Utilizing the results of previous investigations (Ref. 3 and 9) M_F was represented as

$$M_F = 1 + 0.12 (1 - a/2c)^2$$

The second part of magnification factor, M_B , is caused by the stress free back surface. This was estimated from the approximate solution by Kobayashi, et al., of two coplanar elliptical flaws in an infinite solid subjected to uniaxial tension (Ref. 10). Assuming no coupling between M_F and M_B , the elastic part of the magnification factor $M_e = M_F M_B$ is given for the surface flaw in Figure 7. The free surfaces effect M_e was truncated at the particular values of a/t for given σ/σ_{ys} when the modified Dugdale yield zone penetrated the thickness of the specimen.

The plasticity magnification, M_p , was based on a modified Dugdale yield zone surrounding a penny-shaped crack of radius, b , in an infinite solid composed of strain hardening material. The normal stress component in the modified Dugdale model of extended yield zone was assumed to vary linearly from a maximum value of σ_0 at the edge of physical crack of radius b to a minimum value of σ_{ys} at the edge of extended crack of radius d as shown in Figure 8. The plasticity magnification is obtained by comparing the crack opening displacement at the center of this modified Dugdale crack to that of the physical crack. Values of M_p for various values of m ($m = 1 - \sigma_{ys}/\sigma_0$) are shown in Figure 8.

This is the only approximate solution for surface flaws which shows the effect of strain hardening on stress intensity. It should be noted that the solution is still preliminary and needs refinements in the elastic and plastic magnification factors. General usage of this approximate solution is discouraged until it is refined. It should be used only to gain the intuition of the magnitude of corrections and the effect of strain hardening.

3.0 MATERIAL AND FABRICATION PROCEDURES

3.1 Materials

The 5A1-2.5Sn (ELI) titanium plate, 0.04 x 24.0 x 72.0-inches and 0.20 x 36.0 x 72.0-inches was purchased in the annealed condition per MIL-T-9046E, Type II, composition B. Composition of the heats used on the program is given in Appendix A.

The 5A1-2.5Sn (ELI) specimens were fabricated and tested in the annealed condition. Two of the plates used for fabricating base metal specimens and most of the plates used to fabricate weld panels required a hot flattening cycle before they could be used to fabricate parts since they were received from the vendor with considerable waviness. The thermal cycle used for flattening, 1250°F for one-half hour would not be expected to affect material properties significantly.

5A1-2.5Sn (ELI) titanium filler wire used for making the titanium welds was purchased per AMS 4953 except composition was to be:

Aluminum	4.7 - 5.6%
Tin	2.0 - 3.0%
Iron	0.15% Max
Carbon	0.035% Max
Oxygen	0.09% Max
Nitrogen	0.009% Max
Hydrogen	0.005% Max
Other Elements	0.10% Max
Titanium	Remainder

Ultimate tensile strength was set at 100 ksi. Actual compositions of the spools used on the program are given in Appendix A.

2219-T87 aluminum plate, 0.125 x 36 x 96-inches, 0.625 x 36 x 96-inches, and 1.0 x 36 x 96-inches was purchased per BMS 7-105C. All sheets of the same gage were from the same heat lot. Compositions for each gage are given in Appendix A.

The aluminum base metal specimens were fabricated in the T87 condition. Welded aluminum specimens were made by welding T87 material with the GTA process, leaving the weld in the as-welded condition.

Filler wire was used to weld 0.125-inch thick panels only. Filler wire was 2319 aluminum alloy purchased per BMS 7-75 Type III. Actual composition of spools used for welding is given in Appendix A.

3.2 Welding

The welds on the program were made to be typical of welds used on space program tankage. Consequently, both aluminum and titanium were welded with the GTA (Tungsten Inert Gas Process). All panels welded on the program had square butt edge preparations.

5A1-2.5Sn Titanium

Titanium panels were welded in two thicknesses, 0.04-inch and 0.20-inch. The panels and filler wire were chemically cleaned before welding per BAC 5753. Immediately prior to welding, the parts were hand scraped for a distance of 1/2-inch back from the abutting edges, and the faying surfaces were draw filed. Special tooling was used to weld the panels and shield the welds from oxidation. Figure 9 shows an end view of the tooling setup.

On the 0.040-inch thick welds a single weld pass was used with 0.045-inch diameter filler wire. On the 0.20-inch thick welds two passes were made from one side and 0.062-inch diameter filler wire was used. Weld quality in both gages was comparable with the quality of space program flight tankage as determined by X-ray and visual inspection. Actual weld parameters used on the titanium are included in Appendix B.

2219-T87 Aluminum

Aluminum panels were welded in two thicknesses, 0.125-inch and 1.00-inch. Panels and filler wire were cleaned before welding per BAC 5765. Just prior to welding, parts were hand scraped for a distance of 1/2-inch back from the abutting edges and the faying surfaces were draw filed.

The 0.125-inch thick welds were welded with one pass using 0.063-inch diameter 2319 aluminum filler wire. The 1.00-inch thick aluminum welds were made with four passes and no filler wire. One seal pass and one penetration pass was made from each side. Weld quality was comparable with the quality of space program tankage as determined by X ray and visual inspection. Actual welding parameters are shown in Appendix B.

3.3 Straightening of Welded Panels

Significant weld distortion occurred during welding specimen panels with the exception of 0.040-inch thick 5A1-2.5Sn titanium.

Figure 10 shows weld distortion in a 0.125-inch thick aluminum panel. The distortion is shown being removed by impacting the area adjacent to the weld with a magnetic hammer in Figure 11. Final contour of the straightened part is shown in Figure 12.

A large press was used to straighten the 1.00-inch thick welded specimens. X ray and penetrant checks were made on the straightened aluminum parts to assure that they were not damaged during straightening.

Weld distortion of 0.20-inch thick 5Al-2.5Sn titanium welded panel was removed by hot flattening the parts at 1250°F for 30 minutes in a hot sizing press.

3.4 Specimen Fabrication Procedure

Three different types of test specimens were fabricated on the program. Smooth tensile specimens used for determining mechanical properties are shown in Figure 13 and 14. Surface flaw specimens used to evaluate the static and cyclic flaw growth characteristics for surface flaws are shown in Figures 15 through 25. Center crack specimens used to determine failure stresses for through the thickness crack specimens of the plate and weld thicknesses tested on the program are shown in Figures 26 through 28.

All specimens were machined from plate and weldments of the same thickness as the specimen to minimize machining except for the thin flawed titanium specimens that were machined from 0.040-inch thick titanium sheet and the thin base metal aluminum specimens that were machined from 0.125-inch thick plate. Loading holes were drilled and reamed using drill jigs to assure uniform loading of the specimen. Figure 29 shows hole drilling on a one-inch thick welded aluminum specimen.

Specimens were oriented per the requirement of the contract instrument i.e., the major axis of the surface flaw and the length dimension of the through-flaw were perpendicular to the minimum tensile strength direction established from the mechanical property tests. This requirement resulted in the axis of the flaw being oriented parallel to rolling direction in the titanium specimens and perpendicular to rolling direction in the aluminum specimens.

All initial flaws were prepared by using an electric discharge machine (EDM) to introduce an initial flaw with a terminating radius of less than 0.003-inch. The EDM flaw was then extended using low stress fatigue. Maximum cyclic stress levels for surface flaw specimens for the 5Al-2.5Sn (ELI) titanium varied from 16 to 40 ksi. For the 2219 aluminum surface flaw specimens maximum cyclic stress levels ranged from 10 to 16 ksi. The number of cycles required to extend the initial flaw varied from specimen to specimen, depending on initial flaw size. Because the weld center is the weakest part of the weld, flaws were placed in the center of the weld for all welded specimens. Figure 30 shows the setup for fatigue sharpening the flaw on a 0.020-inch thick titanium specimen. The microscope was used to determine when the flaw had been sharpened by tension fatigue.

4.0 EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

All room temperature test specimens were tested in ambient atmosphere in an enclosed building with temperatures ranging between 65 and 75°F. A strain rate of 0.005 in/in/minute was used on all smooth tensile specimens until the material yield strength was reached. A strain rate of 0.02 in/in/minutes was then used for the remaining portion of the loading sequence until failure. Static fracture toughness specimens were pulled at a rate needed to precipitate complete fracture within 1 to 3 minutes after initial application of load.

Cyclically tested specimens were subjected to trapezoidal loading profile with a maximum frequency of 20 cycles per minute. Figure 31 shows the test machine used to cycle test many of the larger specimens on the program at room temperature and -320°F. This machine was also used for static tests and flaw sharpening. Minimum stress of the trapezoidal loading profile was approximately 10 per cent of the maximum load. The trapezoidal loading profile was generated by dividing each cyclic period into four equal parts. The first part was spent in going from minimum load to maximum load, the second in holding the specimen at maximum load; the third in unloading; and the fourth part at minimum load.

The -320°F and -423°F tests were conducted in the environments of liquid nitrogen and liquid hydrogen, respectively. The liquid nitrogen was introduced into a wrap-around open can cryostat to keep the gage area of each specimen completely submerged. The -423°F tests were conducted in a similar manner except that to keep the specimen completely immersed in hydrogen, double walled vacuum insulated cryostats were used. Figure 32 shows the double walled cryostat that was used for the majority of hydrogen specimens on the program. Thermocouples were attached to control specimens to check temperature during each series of tests.

The point at which the flaw grew through the thickness during cycle testing of the thinner specimens on the program was detected by strain gages bonded to the back side of the specimen. A typical trace of one of these strain gages is shown schematically in Figure 33.

5.0 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

5.1 Mechanical Property Tests

Results of mechanical properties tests of the plates and weldments used on the program are given in Tables 1 through 6. Tests were conducted at room temperature in air, at -320°F in liquid nitrogen, and at -423°F in liquid hydrogen; the effect of temperature on ultimate tensile strength, yield strength, elongation, and Poisson's ratio is illustrated in Figures 34 through 41.

Uniaxial yield strengths were calculated using loads corresponding to a 0.2-percent offset on load-strain curves. For all tests at room temperature and at -320°F, longitudinal strains were measured using 2.0-inch gage length extensometers; at -423°F, strains were measured using longitudinally oriented back-to-back strain gages.

Poisson's ratio measurements were made from continuous strain gage recordings of load (P) versus longitudinal strain (E_L) and transverse strain (E_T). The elastic Poisson's ratio was then computed from the formula

$$\mu = \frac{dE_T}{dP} \div \frac{dE_L}{dP}$$

where: μ is the elastic Poisson's ratio;

$\frac{dE_T}{dP}$ and $\frac{dE_L}{dP}$ are the average slopes of the elastic portions of the load-versus-transverse-strain and load-versus-longitudinal-strain recordings respectively.

5.2 Static Tests of Surface Flawed Specimens

Results of surface flawed specimens tested statically are summarized in Tables 7 through 55. The data is presented in the following sequence:

- 0.200-inch titanium base metal --- Tables 7 through 13.
- 0.200-inch titanium weld metal --- Tables 14 through 20.
- 0.020-inch titanium base metal --- Tables 21 through 25.
- 0.020-inch titanium weld metal --- Tables 26 through 30.
- 0.625-inch aluminum base metal--- Tables 31 through 37.
- 0.063-inch aluminum base metal--- Tables 38 through 43.
- 1.00 -inch aluminum weld metal--- Tables 44 through 49.
- 0.125-inch aluminum weld metal--- Tables 50 through 55.

In each of the above-noted tables, specimen dimensions, test conditions, and gross and net area stresses at maximum load are shown in the first columns, followed by initial flaw dimensions as measured after fracture. For reference purposes, the apparent K_{Ic} is shown as calculated from equation 3, using initial flaw sizes and gross stress at maximum load. Where applicable, the last column shows apparent M_K values obtained by dividing the estimated true K_{Ic} value by the apparent value listed in the preceding column. The true or baseline K_{Ic} values were estimated as follows. First, all the data points were grouped by material, thickness, and test temperature. Each group was then plotted in terms of apparent K_{Ic} value versus flaw depth-to-thickness ratio (a/t), noting net stress-to-yield strength ratios and nominal flaw shapes ($a/2c$ values) on each plot.

A preliminary review of the data of tables 7 through 55, when plotted as noted above led to the following general observations and comments:

- (1) For comparable flaw shapes and a/t values, the titanium weld metal data points exhibited a slightly greater scatter than that of base metal. Fracture faces of the weld specimens were very coarse.
- (2) The majority of 0.200-inch base metal specimens came from heat #G-7622. A very few specimens were machined from heat #303268. This latter heat was considerably tougher than normal. Because of this, and since only a few specimens of the tougher heat were involved, they were not included in subsequent studies of the data trends.
- (3) Several of the 0.625-inch aluminum base metal specimens exhibited rather severe delaminations at the flaw bottom. This was most predominant at room temperature in the longest flaws (lowest $a/2c$ ratios) and was not evident in any of the specimens tested at -423°F . In almost all cases, the apparent calculated toughness was higher for those specimens in which a delamination was observed. Accordingly, these specimens (noted in Tables 31 through 35) were also not included in subsequent studies of data trends.

From observation of the remaining data (i.e., after eliminating points from titanium heat #303268, and from delaminated aluminum base metal specimens) it became apparent that the fracture behavior for the various materials, thicknesses, and test temperatures could be grouped into one of two general categories, as follows:

- (1) In one case, the plots showed a trend of gradually decreasing apparent K_{Ic} with increasing a/t value. Additionally, this K_{Ic} decrease became more pronounced as the flaw depth-to-length value decreased and as the a/t values increased above values of about 0.30. These trends, in these material/temperature combinations appeared to prevail for net-to-yield stress ratios (σ_n/σ_y) of up to about 0.90 for the

aluminum, and for possibly somewhat higher ratios for the titanium. Above these values of σ_n/σ_y , the trend was reversed (i.e., apparent K_{Ic} values were depressed with increasing σ_n/σ_y values even as a/t values decreased). The trends noted above applied to the 0.625-inch thick 2219-T87 aluminum base metal at all test temperatures, and to both base metal and weldments in 0.200-inch 5A1-2.5 Sn titanium at -320°F and -423°F. Examples of this behavior are shown in Figures 42 and 43. Through the use of such plots, by visually extending scatter band curves to intersect the ordinate (at a/t of zero), baseline K_{Ic} values were selected for the above-noted combinations. The K_{Ic} values selected are summarized below.

<u>MATERIAL</u>	<u>THICKNESS INCHES</u>	<u>TEMPERATURE</u>	<u>BASELINE K_{Ic} KSI $\sqrt{IN}$</u>
2219-T87 Base Metal	0.625	Room	47.0
2219-T87 Base Metal	0.625	-320°F	50.0
2219-T87 Base Metal	0.625	-423°F	50.0
5A1-2.5 Sn Base Metal	0.200	-320°F	75.0
5A1-2.5 Sn Base Metal	0.200	-423°F	60.0
5A1-2.5 Sn Weld Metal	0.200	-320°F	85.0
5A1-2.5 Sn Weld Metal	0.200	-423°F	75.0

These toughness values are plotted in Figure 44 as a function of test temperature.

- (2) In the second group of material/thickness/temperature combinations apparent K_{Ic} values did not decrease with increasing a/t values. This held true for the 0.125 and 1.00-inch aluminum welds, the 0.063-inch aluminum base metal, the 0.020-inch titanium base metal and weldments at all test temperatures, as well as the 0.200-inch titanium base metal and weldments at room temperature. Examples of these data are shown in Figures 45 through 50. Figures 45, 46, and 47 include the 1.00-inch aluminum welds at room temperature, -320°F, and -423°F, respectively, and in order, represent σ_n/σ_y values well above 1.00 at room temperature, to elastic failures at -423°F. Figures 48, 49 and 50 show representative thin gage data. Note that in each of these figures, data points are included for specimens which were machined down from the thick gage stock. For example, Figure 48, which illustrates the 0.063-inch thick aluminum base metal, includes two data points of 0.063-inch specimens machined from 0.625-inch

stock. These additional tests were performed in an attempt to resolve differences observed (in both static and cyclic behavior) between the thick and thin tests. It can be seen that the data from the specimens milled down from the thicker stock generally fall quite close to that of the thin wrought specimens, and thus possible metallurgical differences resulting from the amount of rolling can be ruled out as a major contributor to the observed differences of fracture behavior of the varied gages.

Returning to the data in item (1) above, the next step involved the determination of apparent magnification factors. This was done by dividing the respective baseline K_{Ic} value (as shown in Figure 44) by the corresponding apparent K_{Ic} value (calculated from Equation 3, and included in Tables 9 through 35). The magnification factors were then plotted against a/t values for each flaw shape, material, and test temperature. The resulting plots are shown in Figures 51 through 53 for the 0.200-inch titanium and in Figures 54 through 56 for the 0.625-inch aluminum. For reference purposes, Kobayashi's approximate M_K curve is scribed on all plots. Note first, that for a given flaw shape, both the titanium weldments and base metal data are shown together. Except for the slightly greater scatter in the weld data, the points do generally fall in the same pattern. Secondly, it can be seen that, for a given material and flaw shape, data from all test temperatures are in good agreement. On the other hand, the magnification factors for the titanium are somewhat higher than those of aluminum at corresponding flaw shapes. This is shown more clearly in Figures 57 and 58. These curves were constructed by visually fairing a curve through each family of data and then linearly interpolating to the $a/2c$ values shown. Note that the family of curves are extended only to a/t values of 0.80 for the titanium which represents the limit of those specimens tested. The curves for the aluminum are extended to an a/t value of 0.85, even though some specimens were tested at larger depth ratios. From examination of the actual data (see Figures 54, 55, and 56) it appears that magnification reaches a maximum at about this depth ratio, and then tends to level off or even drop again at greater depths. As $a/2c$ values decrease, this drop in apparent magnification appears to be more pronounced. Not very many specimens were tested in this range; however, there are data points for -320°F test specimens representing each of the three flaw shapes in the noted figures. The magnification reaches a maximum at approximately the same depth ($a/t = 0.85$) for each shape. It is interesting to note that the calculated plastic zone size just envelopes the remaining unbroken ligament (t_n) at about this depth for -320°F properties. This and the following may explain the observed behavior.

Once the remaining ligament is completely yielded, fracture may initiate at some angle, α , around the flaw periphery from the bottom of the flaw. As longer flaws (lower $a/2c$ values) are tested, the angle at which fracture initiates must become larger in order for fracture initiation to take place outside of the yielded region. The larger the angle, the lower is the applied stress intensity as compared to that at

$\alpha = 0$, and as calculated by equation 3. Thus, a higher load is required to cause failure. This behavior then would be characterized by magnification curves which drop rapidly after reaching a maximum.

For shorter flaws, α need not be as large. Secondly, the applied stress intensity does not vary rapidly as α increases. Thus, the expected behavior for short flaws is for the magnification to reach a maximum, but not to drop off as rapidly with further increase in flaw depth. Observation of the -320°F data in Figures 54, 55, and 56 suggests that this may be occurring. However, since there are only a few data points in this range, the curves in Figures 57 and 58 were limited in a/t values of 0.80 and 0.85, respectively. By comparing these curves to corresponding data points of Figures 51 through 56, it is seen that with very few exceptions, the data falls within a band of about plus or minus ten percent. This spread is not substantially greater than that observed in static fracture testing of identical specimens.

When comparing the experimentally developed magnification curves with the approximate solutions developed earlier by Kobayashi and by Smith, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (1) When comparing the titanium data (Figure 57) with that of Smith's work (Figure 6) it appears that for low $a/2c$ values, Smith's curves greatly overestimate the magnification, and for high $a/2c$ values, they underestimate the magnification. The magnification factors are in very good agreement at an $a/2c$ value of 0.20.
- (2) For the aluminum data (Figure 58), it is seen that Smith's curves greatly overestimate the magnification at all flaw shapes except possibly those approaching a semicircular shape.
- (3) Kobayashi's magnification curve (Figure 3) compares well with the experimental data at intermediate flaw shapes (i.e., for $a/2c$ values of about 0.35 in titanium and about 0.20 in aluminum).

5.3 Static Tests of Center Crack Panels

Tables 56 through 59 give data from 5A1-2.5 Sn titanium base metal and weld metal tested at room temperature, -320°F , and -423°F . Tables 60 through 63 contain results of 2219-T87 aluminum base metal and weld metal tested at room temperature, -320°F , and -423°F . K_{CN} values shown in these tables were calculated using the expression below:

$$K_{CN} = Y \sigma_G \sqrt{a}$$

where: $a = 1/2$ the initial crack length (no crack growth measurements were taken)

Y = parameter obtained from Figure 59

σ_G = gross area stress

5.4 Cyclic Flaw Growth Tests

Results of surface flawed specimens tested under cyclic loading conditions are summarized in Tables 64 through 88. The data is presented in the following sequence:

- 0.200-inch titanium base metal --- Tables 64 through 66.
- 0.200-inch titanium weld metal --- Tables 67 through 69.
- 0.020-inch titanium base metal --- Tables 70 through 72.
- 0.020-inch titanium weld metal --- Tables 73 through 75.
- 0.625-inch aluminum base metal--- Tables 76 through 78.
- 0.063 and 0.100-inch aluminum base metal --- Tables 79 through 82.
- 1.00 -inch aluminum weld metal--- Tables 83 through 85.
- 0.125-inch aluminum weld metal--- Tables 86 through 87.

Make-up of these tables is similar to that of the static tests except that gross stress column represents maximum cyclic stress and the last column represents either total number of cycles to failure (for specimens which became critical before the flaw grew through-the-thickness) or cycles to grow the flaw through-the-thickness. Note that some specimens were cycled a predetermined number of cycles, and then were marked and pulled to failure. In this case, flaw dimensions at the end of the first cyclic run (as measured after failure) are noted at the bottom of the respective tables.

Review of the data contained in Tables 64 through 88 reveals that failure occurred prior to the time that the flaw grew through-the-thickness in only two groups of tests. This behavior occurred in the 0.625-inch 2219-T87 aluminum base metal at all test temperatures, and in the 0.200-inch 5A1-2.5 Sn titanium (base metal and weldments) at test temperatures of -320°F and -423°F. In all other cases (except, of course, where only incremental growth tests were performed) the flaw grew through-the-thickness prior to failure. These two types of behavior were not unexpected: if the critical flaw depth at the maximum cyclic stress is less than the thickness, failure before growing through will result. Conversely, if the critical flaw size is greater than the thickness, then breakthrough before failure results. The cyclic failure mode of the following combinations were thus unexpected:

- 1.00 -inch aluminum welds at -423°F.
- 0.063-inch aluminum base metal at -320°F and -423°F.
- 0.020-inch titanium at -423°F.

In each of these cases, the prior static tests had produced failures at stresses well below yield strength. Failure before breakthrough would then have been predicted at similar cyclic stresses and flaw shapes, yet, the flaws grew through the thickness prior to failure in each instance. For example, compare the static and cyclic behavior of the 1.00-inch aluminum welds at -423°F . Static specimen 3AW90H-3 (see Table 49) contained an initial flaw 0.835 inches deep by 2.895 inches long, and failed statically at a gross stress of 18.8 KSI. Cyclic specimen AWC65H-4 (see Table 84) contained a smaller initial flaw (0.645 by 2.080-inch), and was cycled at a slightly higher maximum stress, 20.0 KSI. Instead of failing, the flaw grew through in 148 cycles. Final flaw length was slightly greater than 3.0 inches. The bottom of the flaw had penetrated the thickness for a length of about an inch. Similar comparisons between static and cyclic behavior can be made for the other combinations noted above. This is discussed in more detail in Section 5.5.

Regardless of the fracture mode, cyclic growth rates can be calculated by differentiating cyclic life curves of the various sets of data. Where test conditions resulted in cyclic failure, this involved first making a plot of applied initial stress intensity (including appropriate magnification from Figures 57 and 58) versus cycles-to-failure for all specimens of a given thickness and test temperature. Where the flaws grew through-the-thickness before failure, the rate data were obtained by first plotting the initial flaw size versus cycles-to-leak. Note here, though, that for any test condition, different cyclic stress levels result in a different curve of (a_i) versus cycles-to-leak. Thus, only one stress level was used for each of these cases.

From the resulting plots (of either K_I versus cycles-to-fail or a_i versus cycles-to-leak) curves were faired through the data points, and these curves were then differentiated. The resulting rate curves are shown in Figures 60 through 62 for the titanium base metal and welds, Figures 63 through 65 for the aluminum base metal, and Figures 66 through 68 for the aluminum weldments. Note that on several of these curves average rates from incremental growth tests are included. These points usually involved tests of thick stock incrementally cycled at lower-than-normal stress levels (and thus lower K levels) so that rough comparisons between "thick" and "thin" growth rates could be compared at a fixed K level. Additionally, where growth rates had been established earlier for similar materials (Ref. 11), these rates are included for direct comparison.

Observation of the data in Figures 60 through 68 leads to the following general comments:

- (1) For the titanium (Figures 60 through 62) at a given thickness, test temperature, and stress intensity, the base metal growth rates are comparable to weldment growth rates. Growth rates are significantly higher at room temperature than at either -320°F or -423°F . At all temperatures, growth rates at a given calculated stress intensity of the

0.020-inch stock are higher (by a factor of about 100) than that of the thicker material. Minor differences in rates exist at reduced temperatures between the 0.200-inch material tested herein and similar gages of Reference 11; however, this appears to be attributable to inclusion of magnification factors for the 0.200-inch data.

- (2) For the aluminum base metal (Figures 63 through 65) it is seen that growth rates are essentially unaffected by test temperature. Rates for the 0.063-inch stock are consistently much higher than for the 0.625-inch specimen tests. Note in Figure 64 that two additional series of tests were performed. The first involved testing of 0.063-inch specimens machined from 0.625-inch stock. The resulting rates fall on the same curve as the 0.063-inch wrought specimens. Secondly, the series of intermediate thickness tests (0.100-inch thick) are seen to be at rates between the two extremes of thicknesses. As with the titanium data, growth rates of the 0.625-inch (longitudinal) are somewhat lower than that of similar gages reported in Reference 11 (note transverse grain). Some, but not all, of this difference can be attributed to inclusion of magnification factors in the K values of the 0.625-inch data (these factors reached a maximum of about 1.05). The remaining differences probably represent the effect of grain direction: the more pronounced delamination tendencies in the longitudinal direction may tend to retard flaw growth.
- (3) For the aluminum weldments (Figures 66 through 68) it is seen that, while growth rates are higher, trends similar to that of the aluminum base metal exist. That is, rates are relatively unaffected by test temperature and rates for the thin (0.125-inch) stock are much higher than that of the thick (1.00-inch) stock.

The most significant of the above-noted observations is that of the large differences in growth rates of the thin stock with respect to that of the thick specimen tests. Recall that for the titanium at cryogenic test temperatures and for the aluminum base metal at all test temperatures, magnification was included in the thick specimen stress intensity values and was not included in the thin specimen stress intensity values. This procedure was adopted to maintain consistency with observed static test behavior. Note in Figure 61 that rate curves are shown for the 0.020-inch base metal tests, both with and without magnified stress intensities. The result, of course, forces better agreement in the right-hand portion of the curve (note that increasing initial flaw depths are involved in this area) but has a decreasing effect for the shallower flaws which make up the left-hand portion of the curve. It is concluded that differences in magnification alone cannot account for the observed differences in behavior.

Additionally, as noted by Hall (Ref. 12), there is reason to believe that flaw growth rates should vary between specimens of widely different flaw shapes. It was estimated that the growth rate of long flaws ($a/2c \approx 0$) should be between two and five times higher than that of semicircular flaws. Note that for the data described in Figures 60 through 68, all of the thinner stock involved $a/2c$ values of about 0.05; the thick stock contained flaws with $a/2c$ values of about 0.30 to 0.40. It appears that this variable could account for some of the difference in observed rates between the thick and thin data, but certainly not all of it.

5.5 Comparison of Static and Cyclic Data

As a result of the observations noted in the previous paragraphs, the major areas of concern involve: (1) large variations in the effect of flaw depths on static fracture behavior of the various materials and test conditions; and (2) large differences in cyclic flaw growth rates with variations in thickness. Possibly, a better understanding of these phenomena can be provided by additional study of the results of the different types of tests performed, but with an eye toward discovering possible factors common to the flaw growth or fracturing behavior involved in the different types of tests.

For example, review of the thin stock cyclic data reveals that in two series of tests, flaw growth through the thickness occurred on the first cycle. These involved the 0.063-inch and the 0.100-inch 2219-T87 base metal tests at -320°F . The cyclic life curves associated with these tests are shown in Figure 69. As seen, the curves are plotted in terms of initial flaw depth versus cycles-to-leak. Incidentally, these are the same type of curves which were drawn and differentiated to obtain the growth rate curves presented in Section 5.4. Note that the curves faired through the points would intersect the ordinate (the one-cycle line) at a flaw size less than the thickness. In fact, two 0.063 specimens (one cycled to 51 KSI gross stress and one to 61 KSI) did grow completely through on the first cycle. Of the 0.100-inch data, it is seen also that two specimens grew through on the first cycle. In terms relatable to the growth rate curves shown earlier, these four specimens represent average rates ranging from 16,000 to above 30,000 micro-inches per cycle (in other words, rates more than another order of magnitude greater than plotted in Figures 63 through 65). This observation leads to the following:

- (1) First, rough approximations for these thin specimens show that on the last cycle before flaw breakthrough, the plastic zone ahead of the flaw occupies most if not all of the remaining unbroken ligament. In other words, in the flaw depth direction, there is little if any elastic material between the flaw and the back surface. Therefore, even though the nominal applied stress is elastic, the flaw front is effectively subjected to a completely plastic field. The result might not be unlike the problem of cyclic behavior of shallow flaws in thick-walled structure cycled to very high cross-section stresses. An example of this was

published in Reference 11. Figure 70, reprinted from Reference 11, illustrates the point for 5Al-2.5 Sn base metal, 0.188-inches thick, and cycled at various stress levels in liquid nitrogen. Note that at maximum gross cyclic stresses from about 115 to 160 KSI, the cyclic lives are in excellent agreement with predictions based on end-point data. However, at cyclic stresses of 175 KSI (approaching 98 percent of yield strength) the cyclic growth increased by a factor of from seven to forty times above that expected.

- (2) Secondly, consider the implication of the one-cycle-to-breakthrough in terms of static fracture behavior. Recall that one of the 0.063-inch thick cyclic specimens (specimen ABC48N-5 in Table 80) contained an initial flaw which was 0.048 inches deep. The flaw grew through the thickness on the first 51-KSI cycle. Additionally, from Table 40, it is seen that all corresponding static specimens failed at stress levels above 53 KSI. The actual range of fracture stresses was 53.1 to 56.7 KSI. The range of initial flaw depths was 0.046 to 0.057 inches. It is suggested that in some, if not in all, of these fracture tests, the flaw grew through the thickness (without becoming critical) well before the time that the maximum failure load was reached. If this is true, then fracture would be controlled by through-crack considerations, and, obviously, surface crack solutions would not be meaningful. To check this possibility, the thin stock static data was again reviewed in an attempt to see if a correlation existed between the static surface flaw test results and the static center crack test results. The assumption was made that if the surface flaw grew through the thickness (under stable conditions) prior to rapid failure, then the failure stress should be predictable by considering the K_{CN} value and a through-crack length ($2a$) comparable to the initial surface flaw length ($2c$). Unfortunately, for most of the materials involved, this would result in net section stresses too close to (or even exceeding) the yield strength, and thus not within the realm of applicability of the K_{CN} values. However, the thin-gage titanium tested at -423°F failed at low enough stress levels to provide a comparison. Figure 71 shows the results. The solid curve represents the conventional stress-flaw size relationship for through cracks of initial lengths ($2a$) and the experimentally determined K_{CN} value of $104.7 \text{ KSI } \sqrt{\text{IN}}$. The curve is computed based upon a finite width specimen equal in width to the surface flaw specimens (i.e., 4.00 inches). Superimposed on the figure are corresponding surface flaw data points (from Tables 24 and 25). The points now are plotted in terms of gross area failing stress versus initial surface crack length ($2c$). The striking correspondence observed in the thru-crack and surface flaw data strongly suggests that these surface flaws did break through, under stable conditions and, indeed, did fail as through cracks. Similar checks were made on the other groups of thick

specimens, but, as expected, no good correspondence was noted except possibly that noted in the next item.

- (3) The above-noted studies lead to the belief that large amounts of stable growth can occur during the rising load portion of either cyclic or static fracture tests. It is believed that this occurred, to some extent in all the static tests performed on the series of "thin" stock (i.e., at all temperatures for the 0.020 titanium, the 0.063 aluminum base metal, and the 0.125 aluminum weldments). At the one extreme, this growth can result in the flaw completely penetrating the back side well before reaching critical stress intensities. The material/thickness combinations noted above are, in each case, those in which deep flaw magnification was not observed. The only other series of tests in which elastic failures prevailed, but in which no deep flaw magnification was apparent, were the 1.00-inch aluminum weldments tested at cryogenic temperatures and the 0.200-inch (long flaws) titanium at room temperature. This fact led to another review of the cyclic test specimens for the corresponding materials. Close examination of the fracture faces of the 1.00-inch aluminum weldments revealed, in most cases, signs of two slightly different textures occupying the area between the initial and the final flaw size. Figure 72 is a fractagraph of one of these specimens. Based on the prior discussions, it might be assumed that these differences in texture actually represent the differences resulting from stable growth on the first cycle, as opposed to a more uniform growth on subsequent cycles. Accordingly, the fracture faces of each of the 1.00-inch weldment cyclic specimen was reviewed, and the assumed first cycle growth was measured and recorded. Study of this data resulted in the conclusion that this "first-cycle" growth appeared to be related to the applied stress intensity. This is illustrated in Figure 73. As noted, at K_I values below about 15 KSI $\sqrt{IN}$, no growth is seen, but at higher K levels, at all test temperatures, this growth increased rapidly.
- (4) As noted above, the only other set of static data which did not display a deep flaw effect was the 0.200-inch titanium tested at room temperature. Observation of the fracture faces of the cyclic specimens in this series of tests failed to reveal distinct markings which might be considered to be evidence of large first cycle growth. One specimen (number TBC12R-5) contained a faint line between the initial and final flaw, but certainly not conclusive.

While there remains a question regarding the growth characteristics of the 0.200-inch titanium tested at room temperature, there is considerable evidence to suggest that relatively large amounts of stable growth can occur during the rising load portion of either static or cyclic tests. The factors controlling this occurrence are not

fully understood. However, it is significant that it is not necessarily limited to the thin section, deep flawed tests (e.g., the 0.063 inch aluminum and the 0.020-inch titanium). Large amounts of growth apparently occurred in fifty percent deep flaws in the one-inch aluminum welds. Thus, neither thickness, nor a/t values alone are responsible. Rather, it appears that this phenomenon may be related to the plastic zone size (ρ) in relation to the thickness of the remaining ligament (t_n) below the flaw. If this is true, one can speculate on the effect of varying ρ/t_n or ρ/t values on fracture and flaw growth behavior. A schematic model is shown in Figure 74. Assume that for a given material and test temperature, specimens of different thicknesses ($t_1 > t_2 > t_3 > t_4$) are tested statically with identical flaw shapes but with several a/t values for each thickness. The data is then plotted in terms of K_{Ic} (from equation 3, and using initial flaw size and maximum load). The resultant set of data might plot as shown in the figure. For the largest thickness, t_1 , the calculated toughness value would first increase with increasing a/t values until the net section stresses are below the yield strength. With further increase in a/t , the calculated toughness would drop, to reach a minimum when the plastic zone engulfs the remaining ligament (as discussed in Section 5.2). With increased thickness, the curve of t_1 in Figure 74 would not change materially. However, with reduced thickness (t_2), the test results are such that there is a lessened effect of increasing a/t . With another decrease in thickness (t_3), the curve flattens out because of combinations of plasticity and stable flaw growth effects; that is, the actual critical flaw size is larger than estimated and thus the actual maximum K_{Ic} value is not calculated. Finally, as the thickness is further reduced (t_4) growth through the thickness occurs prior to reaching maximum load, and the resulting calculated K is (though fictitious) completely unaffected by a/t value. It is speculated that each of these behaviors occurred in the program, as follows:

0.200-inch titanium at -320°F and -423°F	---- equivalent to t_1
0.625-inch aluminum at all temperatures	---- equivalent to t_2
0.200-inch titanium at room temperature	---- equivalent to t_3
1.00 -inch aluminum weld at all temperatures	---- equivalent to t_3
All other combinations	---- equivalent to t_4

With regard to static tests, then, the above is offered as a possible explanation of the behavior experienced as to whether deep flaw magnification was observed or not. The difference in behavior of thicknesses t_1 and t_2 may explain some of the differences in apparent M_K values noted in Figure 57 as opposed to those of Figure 58.

With regard to cyclic behavior, for a given material, growth rates at moderate stress levels increase with decreasing thickness. For thicknesses t_1 and t_2 , the flaw would not grow through the thickness prior to failure. For thicknesses t_3 and

t_4 , flaw growth through the thickness would occur prior to failure, even at cyclic stresses approaching the materials yield strength.

5.6 Design and Analysis Implications

Several past studies (Ref. 8, 11, and 12) have dealt with the problem of applying fracture data and analytical methods in the areas of (1) material selection; (2) the estimation of failure modes and structural life; and (3) the determination of non-destructive inspection acceptance limits. At first, these studies involved structures in which initial and critical flaws were small with respect to the thickness. In such cases, analytical methods were shown to be adequate. With time, though, several instances arose which involved deep flaws in thinner gages. Because sufficient experimental data was not usually available, certain analytical assumptions were required to be made. Primarily, these involved (1) the use of Kobayashi's magnification (Figure 3), and (2) it was assumed that cyclic flaw growth rates from thick walled tests could be used if adjusted for the magnified stress intensities. It was a major objective of the program reported herein to assess the adequacy of these assumptions. Based upon the findings of this program, it is seen that deep flaw magnification levels can be somewhat higher than assumed by Kobayashi. In certain cases, this would result in an error in failure mode predictions for a given vessel. Where the plastic zone size is relatively small, cyclic flaw growth rates do not vary significantly with increased flaw depth to thickness ratio. On the other hand, it is seen that cyclic life can be greatly underestimated for the thinnest cases. Fortunately, in this category, the failure mode is leakage, not catastrophic failure.

Additional experimental work is required to resolve the above noted shortcomings. In the interim the following suggestions are made:

- (1) Where sufficient data is not available, assume that deep flaw magnifications are as shown in Figure 57.
- (2) Where the calculated plastic zone size is small (e.g., less than ten percent of the thickness) cyclic flaw growth rates can be predicted by using thick walled data adjusted by the above noted magnifications.
- (3) For thinner stock, experimental cyclic growth rate data obtained by maintaining strict similitude between test specimen and vessel gages is considered mandatory.

6.0 OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Some observations and conclusions relative to the 5A1-2.5 Sn titanium and 2219-T87 aluminum tested herein are applicable to most metallic materials. These are as follows:

- (1) For a given material, if the thickness is relatively large with respect to the surface flaw plastic zone size, a deep flaw stress intensity magnification exists which increases with increased flaw depth and decreased $a/2c$ values. This behavior was observed in the 0.200-inch titanium base metal and weldments tested at -320°F and -423°F , and the 0.625-inch aluminum base metal tested at all temperatures.
- (2) For somewhat thinner gages (relative to the plastic zone size) stable flaw growth and increased plasticity effects result in an effect which makes it appear that deep flaw magnification does not exist (i.e., a curve resulting from a plot of Irwin's K versus a/t is approximately horizontal). Rather, it is believed that K_{IC} values are underestimated at low a/t values, even though failure might occur at net section stresses well below yield strength. This behavior was observed in the 1.00-inch aluminum weldments at reduced test temperatures, and probably in the 0.200-inch titanium base metal and weldments at room temperature.
- (3) With an additional reduction in relative thickness/plastic zone size, fracture occurs after the surface flaw penetrates the back surface. In this case the failure mode is actually that of a through-the-thickness crack. It is believed that this behavior occurred in the 0.020-inch titanium base metal and weldments at all test temperatures, in the 0.063 inch aluminum base metal at all test temperatures, and in the 0.125-inch aluminum weldments at all test temperatures.
- (4) As thickness decreases per the above items, cyclic flaw growth rates increase much more rapidly than previously expected.

REFERENCES

1. Irwin, G. R., "Crack Extension Force for a Part-Through Crack in a Plate," *Journal of App. Mech.*, Vol. 29, Trans. ASME, Vol. 84, Series E, December 1962.
2. Kobayashi, A. S., "On the Magnification Factors of Deep Surface Flaws," Structural Development Research Memorandum No. 16, The Boeing Company, December 1965.
3. Smith, F. W., "Stresses Near a Semi-Circular Edge Crack," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1966.
4. Smith, F. W., "Stress Intensity Factor for a Semi-Elliptical Flaw," Structural Development Research Memorandum No. 17, The Boeing Company, August 1966.
5. Gross, B., Sawley, J. E., and Brown, W. F., "Stress Intensity Factors for a Single Edge Notch Tension Specimen by Boundary Collocation of a Stress Function," NASA TND-2395, 1964.
6. Kobayashi, A. S., and Moss, W. L., "Stress Intensity Magnification Factors for Surface-Flawed Tension Plate and Notched Round Tension Box," presented at the Second International Conference on Fracture, Brighton, England, 1969.
7. Green, A. E., and Sneddon, I. N., "The Distribution of Stress in the Neighborhood of a Flat Elliptical Crack in an Elastic Solid," *Proc. Cambridge*.
8. Tiffany, C. F., Masters, J. N., and Pall, F. A., "Some Fracture Considerations in the Design and Analysis of Spacecraft Pressure Vessels," presented at the ASM National Metals Congress, Chicago, October 1966.
9. Wiggleworth, L. A., "Stress Distribution in a Notched Plate," *Mathematika*, Vol. 4, 1957.
10. Kobayashi, A. S., Ziv, M., and Hall, L. R., "Approximate Stress Intensity Factor for an Embedded Elliptical Crack Near Two Parallel Free Surfaces," *International Journal of Fracture Mechanics*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1965.
11. Tiffany, C. F., Lorenz, P. M., and Hall, L. R., "Investigation of Plane-Strain Flaw Growth in Thick-Walled Tanks," NASA CR-54837, Final Report on Contract NAS3-4194, February 1966.
12. Hall, L. R., "Plane-Strain Cyclic Flaw Growth in 2014-T62 Aluminum and 6Al-4V(ELI) Titanium," NASA CR-72396, Final Report on Contract NAS 3-7993, November 1968.

APPENDIX A

MATERIAL COMPOSITION (% By Weight)

5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Plate

Thick- ness	Heat No.	C	Fe	N	Al	H	Sn	Mn	O ₂	Remarks
.20	G-7622	.022	.15	.008	5.0	.005	2.6	.003	.060	Used for most static base metal tests
.20	303268	.020	.06	.007	5.5	.007	2.6	.010	.109	Used for most cycle base metal tests and five base metal tests
.20	293622	.020	.07	.009	5.2	.005	2.6	.010	.103	Used only for weld specimens
.20	7909	.023	.14	.014	5.0	.005	2.6	.001	.080	Used only for weld specimens
.20	G-8818	.025	.16	.013	5.2	.005	2.4	.001	.090	Used only for weld specimens
.04	G-1207	.015	.07	.012	5.5	.011	2.7	.003	.080	Used for both base metal and weld metal

2219-T87 Aluminum Plate

Thick- ness	Heat No.	Mn	Si	Cu	Mg	Zn	Ti	Fe	V	Zr
0.125	720471	.40 Max .20 Min	.20 Max	6.8 Max	.02 Max	.10 Max	.10 Max	.30 Max	.15 Max	.25 Max
0.625	720891			5.8 Min			.02 Min		.05 Min	.10 Min
1.00	719511									

5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Wire

C	Fe	Mn	N	O ₂	H	Al	Zn
.014	.063	.05	.009	.100	.0050	5.58	2.56

2319 Aluminum Weld Wire

Cu	Fe	Si	Mn	Mg	Zi	Ti	V	Zr&Be
6.00	0.18	0.15	0.25	0.02	0.05	0.14	0.07	0.17

APPENDIX B
WELDING PARAMETERS

Welding Parameters: 0.040-inch Titanium

Single Pass Weld

Filler Alloy: 5Al-2.5Sn-Ti	
Torch Gas: 90 CFH 100% He	Weld Position: Downhand
Back-up Gas: 15 CFH 100% AR	Weld Process: DCSP-GTA
Electrode Size: -3/32" 2% Thoriated Tungsten	
Electrode Configuration: -Start Point	
Hold-Down Finger Spacing: -5/32"	
Filler Wire Diameter: -0.045	
Amperage: 85-90	Gas Cup Orifice: 1/2 inch-ID
Voltage: 11.5	No trailer was used for these welds.
Travel Speed: 20-IPM	
Wire Speed: 10-IPM	

Welding Parameters: 0.200-inch Titanium

Two Pass Weld from One Side

Filler Alloy: 5Al-2.5Sn-Ti	Weld Position: - Down Hand
Torch-Gas: 100 CFH - He	Weld Process: - DCSP-GTA
Back-up Gas: 45 CFH - He	Gas Cup Orifice: 1/2 inch I. D.
Trailer Gas: 70 CFH - He	Back-up Groove: 0.400 inch
Edge Groove Gas: 10 CFH - He	
Electrode: 1/8 inch 2% Thoriated Tungsten	
Electrode Configuration: 0.040 Blunt End	
Electrode Stickout: 1/4 inch	
Hold Down Finger Spacing: 0.400 inch	
Filler Wire Diameter: 0.062	

Penetration Pass: -

Filler Pass:

AMPS	230-250	AMPS	185-200
Volts	9.5-10	Volts	11
Travel Speed	6-IPM	Travel Speed	6-IPM
Wire Speed	None	Wire Speed	23-IPM

Variations in amperage and voltage on the above weld setting were due primarily to moving from one power supply to another, midway through this phase of the program.

Welding Parameters: 0.125-inch aluminum

One and Two Pass Weld from One Side

Filler Alloy: 2319 Aluminum-.063
Torch Gas: 90 CFH 100% He
Electrode Configuration: Sharp Point
Electrode Stick-Out 1/2 inch
Electrode: 1/8" 2% thoriated tungsten
Finger spacing 1/2 inch on each side of joint
Pass #1
Amps - 90
Volts - 13.5
Travel Speed - 8-IPM
Wire Speed - 20-IPM

Joint Thickness - 0.125 inch
Weld Position: Down Hand
Weld Process: DCSP-GTA
Gas Cup Orifice 5/8 inch

Pass #2 if needed for fill
Amps - 90
Volts - 14
Travel Speed - 10-IPM
Wire Speed - 10-IPM

Welding Parameters: 1.00-inch aluminum

Filler Alloy - None	Weld Position - Down Hand
Torch Gas: 110 CFH 100% He	Weld Process - DCSP-GTA
Electrode: 3/16 2% Thoriated Tungsten	Gas Cup Orifice 5/8 inch
Electrode Configuration: Rounded tapered point, blunt end	
Electrode stick-out: 1/2 inch	
Fusion Pass:	1st Penetration Pass: Side #1
Amps - 200	Amps - 400
Volts - 12.1	Volts - 12
Travel Speed - 15-IPM	Travel Speed - 3-IPM
Wire Speed - None	Wire Speed - None

Side #2 parameters were the same as above used for side #1.




Figure 1: SHAPE PARAMETER CURVES FOR SURFACE AND INTERNAL FLAWS




Figure 2 : STRESS INTENSITY MAGNIFICATION FACTOR DUE TO DEEP FLAW AND PLASTIC YIELDING FOR PLANE STRAIN
 $\nu = 1/3, a/2c < 0.3$




Figure 3: STRESS INTENSITY MAGNIFICATION FACTORS FOR DEEP SURFACE FLAWS




Figure 4: STRESS INTENSITY FACTOR FOR A SEMI-CIRCULAR SURFACE FLAW




Figure 5: STRESS INTENSITY FACTOR FOR A SEMI-ELLIPTICAL SURFACE FLAW




Figure 6: ELASTIC STRESS INTENSITY MAGNIFICATION FACTORS FOR DEEP SURFACE FLAWS (Estimations by F. Smith)




Figure 7: ELASTIC STRESS INTENSITY MAGNIFICATION FACTOR, M_e , FOR A SURFACE-FLAWED TENSION PLATE




Figure 8: PLASTIC STRESS INTENSITY MAGNIFICATION FACTOR FOR PENNY-SHAPED CRACK IN AN INFINITE SOLID SUBJECTED TO UNIAXIAL TENSION




Figure 9: END VIEW OF WELD TOOLING USED FOR TITANIUM WELDING




Figure 10: WELD DISTORTION IN 0.125 INCH THICK 2219-T87 ALUMINUM PANEL




Figure 11: REMOVING WELD DISTORTION WITH MAGNETIC HAMMER






Figure 12: 0.125 INCH THICK 2219-T87 WELDED PANEL AFTER STRAIGHTENING



On Welded Specimens Grind Weld Bead Flush Within $\pm .01$ On Both Sides
 Weld Metal Specimens For 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium & 2219-T87 Aluminum All Thicknesses
 Base Metal Specimens For 5Al-2.5 Sn (ELI) Titanium & 2219-T87 Aluminum All Thicknesses Except
 1.00 (See Figure)

All Dimensions In Inches

Figure 13: MECHANICAL PROPERTY SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM AND 2219-T87 ALUMINUM (Base and Weld Metal)



All Dimensions In Inches

1 Thickness In Reduced Section Must Not Be Less Than The Plate Thickness After Removing The Weld Bead

Figure 14: MECHANICAL PROPERTY SPECIMEN FOR 1.00 THICK 2219 ALUMINUM WELD




Figure 15: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM





Figure 16: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM




Specimen No.	Dim. A	Dim. B	Dim. C	
3-4	9.00	7.00	7.00	Base Metal Only
3-14	8.75	6.00	5.75	Weld Metal Only
3-16	8.75	6.00	6.00	Base Metal Only

Specimens Made From
0.20" Thick Plate

All Dimensions in Inches

On Welded Specimens Grind Weld Bead Flush Within $\pm .01$ On Both Sides

Figure 17: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM




Specimen No.	Dim. A	Dim. B	No. Holes	
3-5	20.00	13.5	26	Base Metal Only
3-15	17.50	11.00	22	Weld Metal Only

Specimen Made From .20 Thick Plate All Dimensions in Inches

On Welded Specimens Grind Weld Bead Flush Within $\pm .01$ On Both Sides


Figure 18: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM



Specimen No.	Dim. A	Dim. B	Radius	Thickness	
5-1	2.50	4.50	3.00	.063	Base Metal
7-1	3.75	6.00	2.00	.125	Weld Metal

All Dimensions In Inches

Figure 19: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219-T87 ALUMINUM




All Dimensions In Inches

Specimen No.	Dim. A	Dim. B	Dim. C	Dim. D	Radius	Thickness	
7-3	24.00	8.50	8.00	7.50	1.5	.125	Weld Metal Only
5-2	27.00	8.90	10.00	5.50	3.0	.063	Base Metal Only
5-3	27.00	8.90	10.00	6.75	3.0	.063	Base Metal Only
5-2A	27.00	8.90	10.00	5.50	3.0	.625	Base Metal Only
5-3A	27.00	8.90	10.00	5.50	3.0	.625	Base Metal Only

On Welded Specimens Grind Weld Bead Flush Within $\pm .01$ On Both Sides

Figure 20: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219-T87 ALUMINUM



Specimen No.	Dim. A	Dim. B	Dim. C	Thickness	No. Holes	
10-1	36.00	18.00	11.00	.625	22	Base Metal
10-2	36.00	22.5	14.5	.625	26	Base Metal
10-3	36.00	30.00	22.00	.625	38	Base Metal
5-4	27.00	20.00	12.0	.063	26	Base Metal

Figure 21: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219-T87 ALUMINUM




Figure 22: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219-T87 ALUMINUM




Figure 23: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219 ALUMINUM WELD






Figure 24: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219 ALUMINUM WELD



All Dimensions In Inches
Grind Weld Flush Within $\pm .01$
On Both Sides Of Weld Metal
Specimens

Specimen No.	Dim. A	Dim. B	Thickness	No. Holes	
7-5	30.00	12.00	.125	14	Weld Metal Only
7-6	30.00	13.50	1.00	14	Weld Metal Only
7-7	30.00	16.00	1.00	18	Weld Metal Only
7-8	36.00	24.00	1.00	30	Weld Metal Only
7-9	36.00	30.00	1.00	38	Weld Metal Only
7-11	36.00	20.00	1.00	22	Weld Metal Only

Figure 25: SURFACE FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219-T87 ALUMINUM



[2] This Dimension Applies Only To Specimens
Made From .040 Sheet

On Welded Specimens Grind Weld Bead
Flush Within $\pm .01$ On Both Sides

Specimen No.	Thickness
8-1	.040
8-1A	.200

All Dimensions In Inches
Weld & Base Metal

Figure 26: CENTER CRACK FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM




Figure 27: CENTER CRACK FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 5AL-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM




Figure 28: CENTER CRACK FLAW SPECIMEN FOR 2219-T87 ALUMINUM




Figure 29: DRILLING LOADING HOLES WITH DRILL JIG
IN 1.00 INCH THICK SPECIMEN




Figure 30: TEST SETUP FOR FATIGUE SHARPENING FLAW
IN 0.020 INCH THICK TITANIUM SPECIMEN




Figure 31: HORIZONTAL 350 KIP TEST MACHINE USED TO CYCLE AND STATIC TEST LARGER ROOM TEMPERATURE AND -320°F SPECIMENS




Figure 32: LH₂ CRYOSTAT




Figure 33: TRACE OF STRAIN GAGE BONDED TO BACK OF SPECIMEN TO DETECT BREAK THROUGH OF FLAW




Figure 34: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 5Al-2.5Sn
TITANIUM, 0.040-INCH-THICK BASE METAL




Figure 35: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 5Al-2.5Sn
TITANIUM, 0.200-INCH-THICK BASE METAL




Figure 36: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 5Al-2.5Sn TITANIUM, 0.040-INCH-THICK WELDMENT




Figure 37: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 5Al-2.5Sn TITANIUM, 0.200-INCH-THICK WELDMENT




Figure 38: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 2219-T87 ALUMINUM, 0.125-INCH-THICK BASE METAL




Figure 39: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 2219-T87 ALUMINUM, 0.625-INCH-THICK BASE METAL




Figure 40: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 2219 ALUMINUM,
0.125-INCH-THICK WELDMENT




Figure 41: TENSILE PROPERTIES OF 2219 ALUMINUM,
1.00-INCH-THICK WELDMENT




Figure 42: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
($t = 0.625''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -423°F)




Figure 43: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
($t = 0.200''$, 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal @ -423°F)





Figure 44 : BASELINE K_{Ic} VALUES AS A FUNCTION OF TEST TEMPERATURE




Figure 45: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal @ R.T.)




Figure 46: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal @ -320°F)




Figure 47: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal @ -423°F)




Figure 48: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
($t = 0.063''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -423°F)




Figure 49: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
 ($t = 0.020''$, 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Weld Metal @ -423°F)




Figure 50: EFFECT OF FLAW DEPTH ON APPARENT K VALUES
 ($t = 0.020''$, 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal @ -423°F)




Figure 51: APPARENT MAGNIFICATION - DATA
($t = 0.200$ ", 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium, $a/2c = .12 - .19$)






Figure 52: APPARENT MAGNIFICATION - DATA
($t = 0.200$ ", 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium, $a/2c = .21 - .24$)






Figure 55: APPARENT MAGNIFICATION - DATA
 ($t = 0.625"$, 2219-T87 Aluminum, $a/2c = .25 - .27$)




Figure 56: APPARENT MAGNIFICATION - DATA
 ($t = 0.625"$, 2219-T87 Aluminum, $a/2c = .35 - .40$)




Figure 57: DEEP FLAW MAGNIFICATION CURVES
 (t = 0.200", 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal
 (Transverse) & Weldment @ -320°F & -423°F)




Figure 58: DEEP FLAW MAGNIFICATION CURVES
 (t = 0.625", 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal,
 Longitudinal Grain, @ R.T., -320°F & -423°F)




Figure 59: RELATIONSHIP FOR CALCULATING K_{CN} FROM CENTER CRACK SPECIMENS




Figure 60: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (5Al-2.5Sn Titanium @ R.T.)




Figure 61: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (5Al-2.5Sn Titanium @ -320 °F)




Figure 62: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (5Al-2.5Sn Titanium @ -423 °F)




Figure 63: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ R.T.*)




Figure 64: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -320 °F*)




Figure 65: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal @ -423°F^*)




Figure 66: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (2219 Aluminum Weldments @ R.T. *)




Figure 67: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (2219 Aluminum Weldments @ -320 °F *)




Figure 68: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH RATES (2219 Aluminum Weldments @ -423 °F *)




Figure 69: CYCLIC LIFE CURVES($t = 0.063''$ And $0.100''$, 2219-T87 Aluminum @ -320°F)




Figure 70: CYCLIC FLAW GROWTH DATA FOR 5Al-2.5Sn (ELI) TITANIUM
@ -320 °F (50-100-50 Load Profile)




Figure 71: COMPARISON OF SURFACE FLAW & CENTER CRACK DATA
(t = 0.020", 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal @ -423 °F)




Figure 72: FRACTOGRAPH OF A CYCLIC TEST SPECIMEN ($t = 1.00''$, 2219 Aluminum Weldment @ -320°F , Specimen No. AWC 80N-5)




Figure 73: APPARENT FIRST CYCLE GROWTH - 2219 WELDMENTS




Figure 74: SCHEMATIC OF DEEP FLAW BEHAVIOR

Table 1 : TENSILE PROPERTIES ($t = 0.04"$,
5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	NOMINAL GAGE ~ IN.	MEASURED GAGE ~ IN.	ATMOSPHERE	GRAIN DIRECTION (L = LONGITUDINAL T = TRANSVERSE)	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	ULTIMATE STRENGTH ~ PSI	YIELD STRENGTH ** ~ PSI	% ELONGATION FOR LENGTH = 4 x DIA.	ELONGATION ~ % PER 2.0 INCHES	REDUCTION IN AREA ~ %	POISSONS RATIO	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY ~ E x 10 ⁻⁶ PSI
TLR-1	.04	.0368	Air	L	72	117,800	108,100		13		.38	16.6
L-1		.0363	Air		72	119,200	110,400		13			15.7
						118,500	109,200	Avg.	13			16.3
TLN-1		.0366	LN ₂		-320	184,100	173,200		14		.36	17.5
L-3		.0360	LN ₂		-320	185,100	174,000		14			18.6
						184,600	173,600	Avg.	14			17.9
TLH-1		.0388	LH ₂		-423	207,200	199,400*		-		.42	
TLH-2		.0358	LH ₂		-423	219,500	213,400*		-			
						213,300	206,400*	Avg.				
T-1		.0371	Air	T	72	117,200	112,600		14			15.5
T-2		.0372	Air		72	116,100	111,800		15			16.0
						116,600	112,200	Avg.	14			15.7
T-3		.0368	LN ₂		-320	179,300	172,500		16			17.0
T-4		.0360	LN ₂		-320	180,000	172,800		17			18.8
						179,600	172,500	Avg.	16			17.9
TTH-1		.0353	LH ₂		-423	203,300	201,100*		-			
TTH-2		.0372	LH ₂		-423	208,000	201,600*		-			
						205,600	201,300*	Avg.				

* 0.2% offset yield strength obtained by strain gage

** 0.2% offset yield strength obtained by extensometer on 2.0 gage length

Table 2 : TENSILE PROPERTIES ($t = 0.20"$,
5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal***)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	NOMINAL GAGE ~ IN.	MEASURED GAGE ~ IN.	ATMOSPHERE	GRAIN DIRECTION (L = LONGITUDINAL T = TRANSVERSE)	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	ULTIMATE STRENGTH ~ PSI	YIELD STRENGTH ** ~ PSI	% ELONGATION FOR LENGTH = 4 x DIA.	ELONGATION ~ % PER 2.0 INCHES	REDUCTION IN AREA ~ %	POISSONS RATIO	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY ~ E x 10 ⁻⁶ PSI
TLR-1	.20	.2165	Air	L	72	117,000	110,300		17	40	.33	16.1
TILR-1		.2181	Air		72	116,200	111,600		17	42		16.0
						116,600	110,900	Avg.	17	41		16.0
TLN-1		.2160	LN ₂		-320	187,400	178,200		17	21	.36	17.7
TILN-1		.2150	LN ₂		-320	187,900	178,300		17	24		17.4
						187,600	178,200	Avg.	17	22		17.6
TLH-1		.2122	LH ₂		-423	208,600	206,700*		-	19	.42	
TLH-2		.2153	LH ₂		-423	208,100	206,200*		-	22		
						208,300	206,400*			20		
TITR-1		.2188	Air	T	72	115,600	113,500		17	41		15.7
TITR-2		.2198	Air		72	115,900	112,600		17	40		15.7
						115,700	113,000	Avg.	17	40		15.7
TITN-1		.2205	LN ₂		-320	185,500	177,900		15	22		18.8
TITN-2		.2198	LN ₂		-320	185,600	177,900		15	22		18.3
						185,500	177,900	Avg.	15	22		18.5
TTH-1		.2200	LH ₂		-423	203,400	199,800*		-	26		
TTH-2		.2190	LH ₂		-423	208,100	203,600*		-	21		
						205,700	201,700*			23		

* 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by strain gage

** 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by extensometer on 2.0 gage length

*** Heat Number G 7622

Table 3 : TENSILE PROPERTIES ($t = 0.04"$ & $0.20"$,
5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Weldment)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	NOMINAL GAGE ~ IN.	MEASURED GAGE ~ IN.	ATMOSPHERE	GRAIN DIRECTION (L = LONGITUDINAL T = TRANSVERSE)	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ OF	ULTIMATE STRENGTH ~ PSI	YIELD STRENGTH ** ~ PSI	% ELONGATION FOR LENGTH = 4 x DIA.	ELONGATION ~ % PER 2.0 INCHES	REDUCTION IN AREA ~ %	POISSONS RATIO	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY ~ E x 10 ⁶ PSI
TWR-1	.04	.0335	Air	T	75	112,500	104,800		8		.38	16.4
TWR-2		.0314	Air		75	116,500	108,900		6		.31	16.1
						114,500	106,800	Avg.	7		.34	16.2
TWN-1		.0302	LN ₂		-320	186,200	174,000		8		.34	18.4
TWN-2		.0314	LN ₂		-320	181,700	171,600		9		.34	17.1
TWN-3		.0330	LN ₂		-320	180,900	170,900		10		.34	18.1
						182,900	172,100	Avg.	9		.34	17.8
TWH-1		.0313	LH ₂		-423	194,100						
TWH-2		.0320	LH ₂		-423	205,400					.34	
						199,700						
TWTR-1A	.20	.2197	Air	T	72	116,600	110,800		12	41		17.9
TWTR-2A		.2202	Air		72	117,600	110,900		11	37	.27	18.7
						117,100	110,800	Avg.	11	39		18.3
TWTN-1A		.2210	LN ₂		-320	185,200	176,300		12	24		18.6
TWTN-2A		.2203	LN ₂		-320	185,300	176,400		10	20	.26	19.0
						185,200	176,300	Avg.	11	22		18.8
TWTH-1A		.2200	LH ₂		-423	202,100	▷					
TWTH-2A		.2182	LH ₂		-423	208,100				21	.25	
						205,100						

** 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by extensometer on 2.0 gage length

▷ Failed Before Reaching Yield Point

*** Heat G 7622

Table 4 : TENSILE PROPERTIES ($t = 0.125"$,
2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	NOMINAL GAGE ~ IN.	MEASURED GAGE ~ IN.	ATMOSPHERE	GRAIN DIRECTION (L = LONGITUDINAL T = TRANSVERSE)	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ OF	ULTIMATE STRENGTH ~ PSI	YIELD STRENGTH ** ~ PSI	% ELONGATION FOR LENGTH = 4 x DIA.	ELONGATION ~ % PER 2.0 INCHES	REDUCTION IN AREA ~ %	POISSONS RATIO	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY ~ E x 10 ⁶ PSI
ALR-1	.125	.1242	Air	L	72	68,200	55,900		10	35	.30	10.5
ALR-1		.1240	Air		72	67,900	55,800		11	36		10.4
						68,000	55,800	Avg.	10	35		10.5
ALN-1		.1242	LN ₂		-320	78,000	61,100		12	29	.29	11.4
ALN-1		.1235	LN ₂		-320	84,600	67,000		11	27		10.7
						81,300	64,000	Avg.	11	28		11.2
ALH-1		.1245	LH ₂		-423	96,400	71,300*		-	28	.35	10.9
ALH-2		.1240	LH ₂		-423	93,900	69,500		-	27		12.1
						95,100	70,400*	Avg.		27		11.5
AITR-1		.1246	Air	T	72	68,900	55,200		10	27		10.5
AITR-2		.1244	Air		72	68,500	55,200		10	25		10.1
						68,700	55,200	Avg.	10	26		10.3
AITN-1		.1245	LN ₂		-320	87,200	67,000		13	22		12.1
AITN-2		.1244	LN ₂		-320	87,000	66,900		12	24		11.6
						87,100	66,900	Avg.	12	23		11.8
ATH-1		.1247	LH ₂		-423	98,800	71,900*		-	20		11.2
ATH-2		.1248	LH ₂		-423	99,300	71,400*		-	19		11.0
						99,000	71,600*	Avg.		19		11.1

* 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by strain gage

** 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by extensometer on 2.0 gage length

Table 5 : TENSILE PROPERTIES ($t = 0.625"$,
2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	NOMINAL GAGE ~ IN.	MEASURED GAGE ~ IN.	ATMOSPHERE	GRAIN DIRECTION ($L = \text{LONGITUDINAL}$ $T = \text{TRANSVERSE}$)	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	ULTIMATE STRENGTH ~ PSI	YIELD STRENGTH ** ~ PSI	% ELONGATION FOR LENGTH = 4 x DIA.	ELONGATION ~ % PER 2.0 INCHES	REDUCTION IN AREA ~ %	POISSONS RATIO	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY ~ $E \times 10^{-6}$ PSI
ALR-1	.625	.6240	Air	L	72	69,500	56,000		14	31	.30	11.3
ALR-2		.6255	Air		72	69,200	56,100		14	29		9.7
						69,300	56,000	Avg.	14	30		10.5
ALN-1		.6268	LN ₂		-320	85,200	67,200		15	29	.31	12.0
ALN-2		.6245	LN ₂		-320	85,900	67,000		15	29		13.8
						85,500	67,100	Avg.	15	29		12.6
ALH-1		.6258	LH ₂		-423	92,100	70,300*		-	21	.36	10.8
ALH-2		.6255	LH ₂		-423	93,800	72,700*		-	22		9.9
						92,900	71,500*	Avg.		21		10.3
ATR-1		.6266	Air	T	72	69,300	56,000		14	31		9.8
ATR-2		.6240	Air		72	69,300	56,100		14	29		11.4
						69,300	56,000	Avg.	14	30		10.6
ATN-1		.6250	LN ₂		-320	86,800	66,100		12	19		12.2
ATN-2		.6248	LN ₂		-320	86,700	65,200		12	18		11.0
						86,700	65,600	Avg.	12	18		11.6
ATH-1		.6250	LH ₂		-423	94,900	-		-	16		12.4
ATH-2		.6250	LH ₂		-423	-	71,400*		-	16		11.1
						94,900	71,400*	Avg.		16		11.7

* 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by strain gage

** 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by extensometer on 2.0 gage length

Table 6 : TENSILE PROPERTIES ($t = 0.125"$ & $1.00"$,
2219 Aluminum Weld Metal)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	NOMINAL GAGE ~ IN.	MEASURED GAGE ~ IN.	ATMOSPHERE	GRAIN DIRECTION ($L = \text{LONGITUDINAL}$ $T = \text{TRANSVERSE}$)	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	ULTIMATE STRENGTH ~ PSI	YIELD STRENGTH ** ~ PSI	% ELONGATION FOR LENGTH = 4 x DIA.	ELONGATION ~ % PER 2.0 INCHES	REDUCTION IN AREA ~ %	POISSONS RATIO	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY ~ $E \times 10^{-6}$ PSI
AWR-3	.125	.1232	Air	L	72	39,000	27,900		3	22		9.5
AWR-4		.1218	Air		72	38,200	25,500		3	35	.22	8.9
						38,600	26,700	Avg.	3	28		9.2
AWN-3		.1228	LN ₂		-320	53,800	30,900		4	22		10.1
		.1200	LN ₂		-320	55,000	32,500		4	25	.27	9.8
						54,400	31,700	Avg.	4	23		10.0
AWH-3		.1248	LH ₂		-423	69,700	34,200*		15			10.9
		.1200	LH ₂		-423	62,800	26,700*				.31	10.6
						66,200	30,300*					10.7
AWR-1	1.00	1.006	Air	L	72	42,900	22,100		8	19		9.5
AWR-2		1.0142	Air		72	42,900	21,800		8	20	.33	9.4
						42,900	21,900	Avg.	8	19		9.45
AWN-1		1.0175	LN ₂		-320	54,700	25,900		7	13		10.7
SWN-2		1.0230	LN ₂		-320	56,200	27,700		7	15	.29	11.4
						55,400	26,800	Avg.	7	14		11.1
AWH-1		1.0090	LH ₂		-423	65,600	33,300*		-	9		10.4
AWH-2		1.0185	LH ₂		-423	62,600	30,900*		-	9	.36	9.3
						64,100	32,100*	Avg.		9		9.8

* 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by strain gage installed on weld metal only

** 0.2% Offset yield strength obtained by extensometer on 2.0 gage length

Table 7: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .075$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M_K
TB16R-1	0.210	13.490	RT	Air	92.0	101.2	0.156	2.136	0.742	0.073	0.90	74.21	
TB16R-2	0.209	13.490	RT	Air	93.0	102.5	0.161	2.128	0.770	0.076	0.91	76.17	
TB17R-3	0.212	13.504	RT	Air	92.0	101.2	0.148	2.288	0.698	0.065	0.90	72.73	
TB17R-4	0.207	13.492	RT	Air	103.4	115.4	0.158	2.330	0.765	0.068	1.02	86.05*	
TB18R-5	0.221	13.506	RT	Air	93.0	104.7	0.180	2.380	0.814	0.076	0.93	80.54	
TB18R-6	0.202	13.515	RT	Air	91.8	103.8	0.164	2.450	0.812	0.067	0.92	76.29*	
TB19R-3	0.210	13.512	RT	Air	88.2	100.3	0.171	2.543	0.816	0.067	0.89	74.35	
TB19R-4	0.213	13.510	RT	Air	87.9	101.3	0.194	2.500	0.910	0.078	0.90	78.25	

NOTE: *Made from Heat 303268. Other specimens are from Heat G-7622.

Table 8: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M_K
TB18R-4	0.209	6.998	RT	Air	96.9	108.7	0.169	1.180	0.809	0.143	0.96	76.55	
TB19R-2	0.218	7.002	RT	Air	95.2	107.8	0.181	1.270	0.830	0.143	0.95	77.68	
TB15R-2	0.216	6.998	RT	Air	104.4	111.8	0.130	1.004	0.603	0.130	0.99	74.30	
TB15R-1	0.220	6.998	RT	Air	102.7	111.6	0.164	1.006	0.746	0.163	0.99	78.91	
TB17R-1	0.220	7.002	RT	Air	99.8	110.8	0.171	1.123	0.777	0.152	0.98	78.87	
TB17R-2	0.218	6.997	RT	Air	98.1	108.5	0.166	1.130	0.762	0.147	0.96	76.64	
TB18R-1	0.213	3.259	RT	Air	80.6	105.7	0.175	1.180	0.822	0.148	0.94	63.00	
TB18R-2	0.215	4.751	RT	Air	86.0	102.8	0.176	1.250	0.819	0.141	0.91	68.41	
TB18R-3	0.221	6.998	RT	Air	98.7	110.4	0.176	1.224	0.796	0.144	0.98	79.75	
TB18R-9	0.221	13.500	RT	Air	105.9	111.8	0.170	1.190	0.769	0.143	0.99	85.20	
TB19R-1	0.218	7.001	RT	Air	97.6	107.8	0.188	1.220	0.862	0.154	0.95	80.43	

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat G-7622.

Table 9: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
TB08N-5	0.214	5.990	-320	LN ₂	107.9	111.4	0.095	0.520	0.443	0.183	0.68	59.44	1.262
TB08N-6	0.220	6.000	-320	LN ₂	150.4	153.9	0.070	0.525	0.318	0.133	0.87	77.09	0.973
TB12N-4	0.218	6.998	-320	LN ₂	71.0	75.5	0.142	0.816	0.651	0.174	0.42	47.17	1.590
TB12N-5	0.217	6.996	-320	LN ₂	68.2	72.6	0.138	0.801	0.636	0.172	0.41	44.70	1.678
TB15N-10	0.217	6.997	-320	LN ₂	65.7	71.3	0.144	1.029	0.664	0.140	0.40	45.34	1.654
TB15N-11	0.214	6.996	-320	LN ₂	56.9	62.0	0.154	0.987	0.720	0.156	0.35	39.85	1.882
TB18N-8	0.216	7.004	-320	LN ₂	48.9	54.7	0.170	1.194	0.787	0.142	0.31	36.38	2.062
TB18N-9	0.220	6.996	-320	LN ₂	52.8	58.8	0.166	1.200	0.755	0.138	0.33	39.01	1.923

Table 10: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .25$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
TB08N-3	0.210	4.002	-320	LN ₂	168.1	171.6	0.070	0.306	0.334	0.229	0.96	78.72	0.953
TB08N-4	0.211	4.001	-320	LN ₂	155.5	158.7	0.070	0.306	0.333	0.229	0.89	72.01	1.042
TB12N-2	0.212	4.742	-320	LN ₂	125.6	130.5	0.100	0.472	0.472	0.212	0.73	69.29	1.032
TB12N-3	0.212	4.740	-320	LN ₂	108.9	113.3	0.100	0.471	0.472	0.212	0.64	59.42	1.262
TB15N-8	0.219	4.750	-320	LN ₂	90.1	95.6	0.129	0.571	0.589	0.226	0.54	54.50	1.376
TB15N-9	0.216	4.749	-320	LN ₂	89.1	94.7	0.125	0.577	0.579	0.217	0.53	53.56	1.400
TB18N-6	0.211	4.754	-320	LN ₂	70.8	77.5	0.156	0.710	0.739	0.220	0.44	47.04	1.594
TB18N-7	0.220	4.753	-320	LN ₂	71.8	78.1	0.152	0.692	0.691	0.220	0.44	47.11	1.592

Table 11: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TB08N-1	0.219	3.257	-320	LN ₂	172.7	175.5	0.075	0.190	0.342	0.395	0.99	68.95	1.088
TB08N-2	0.216	2.754	-320	LN ₂	174.7	177.6	0.067	0.184	0.310	0.364	1.00	68.43	1.096
TB12N-6	0.218	3.244	-320	LN ₂	153.9	159.3	0.107	0.286	0.490	0.374	0.90	74.29	1.010
TB12N-8	0.203	3.245	-320	LN ₂	159.4	165.6	0.106	0.297	0.522	0.357	0.93	78.39*	
TB15N-7	0.219	3.251	-320	LN ₂	118.0	124.8	0.138	0.362	0.629	0.381	0.70	63.02	1.190
TB15N-12	0.219	3.244	-320	LN ₂	110.8	117.0	0.136	0.356	0.622	0.382	0.66	58.51	1.202
TB18N-5	0.219	3.252	-320	LN ₂	100.4	111.0	0.160	0.430	0.731	0.372	0.62	57.90	1.295
TB18N-4	0.203	3.248	-320	LN ₂	131.2	145.0	0.172	0.470	0.847	0.366	0.82	80.05*	

* Made from Heat 303268. Other Specimens are from Heat G-7622

Table 12: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TB08H-2	0.217	5.990	-423	LH ₂	100.3	103.2	0.090	0.524	0.415	0.172	0.51	53.61	1.119
TB08H-3	0.222	5.995	-423	LH ₂	92.5	95.3	0.090	0.515	0.406	0.175	0.47	49.13	1.221
TB12H-6	0.214	6.998	-423	LH ₂	56.2	60.4	0.158	0.814	0.739	0.194	0.30	38.33	1.565
TB12H-7	0.223	6.996	-423	LH ₂	57.0	61.0	0.155	0.816	0.695	0.190	0.30	38.68	1.551
TB15H-6	0.220	6.996	-423	LH ₂	50.1	54.1	0.147	0.985	0.670	0.149	0.27	34.40	1.744
TB15H-7	0.218	6.996	-423	LH ₂	48.9	53.3	0.155	1.017	0.712	0.152	0.26	34.36	1.746
TB18H-6	0.217	7.000	-423	LH ₂	45.6	50.9	0.171	1.192	0.788	0.144	0.25	33.92	1.769
TB18H-7	0.214	6.995	-423	LH ₂	43.3	48.7	0.180	1.190	0.842	0.151	0.24	32.78	1.880

Table 13: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{1c} M_K
TB08H-1	0.219	2.745	-423	LH ₂	143.6	146.3	0.072	0.215	0.329	0.335	0.73	58.56	1.025
TB08H-2	0.213	2.752	-423	LH ₂	164.1	167.1	0.071	0.182	0.334	0.390	0.83	61.50	0.976
TB12H-4	0.205	3.249	-423	LH ₂	150.9	158.4	0.107	0.300	0.523	0.357	0.79	73.45*	
TB12H-5	0.219	3.251	-423	LH ₂	114.9	118.8	0.103	0.278	0.471	0.371	0.59	53.28	1.126
TB15H-4	0.219	3.242	-423	LH ₂	90.4	95.6	0.132	0.350	0.602	0.377	0.47	46.78	1.283
TB15H-5	0.219	3.251	-423	LH ₂	88.1	93.4	0.136	0.356	0.621	0.382	0.46	46.02	1.304
TB18H-4	0.213	3.247	-423	LH ₂	73.4	79.9	0.160	0.420	0.751	0.381	0.40	45.23	1.327
TB18H-5	0.219	3.257	-423	LH ₂	78.7	85.6	0.172	0.420	0.785	0.410	0.42	44.80	1.339

* Heat No. 303268, Other Specimens from Heat G-7622.

Table 14: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = 0.075$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{1c} M_K
7TW16R-1	0.235	10.980	RT	Air	89.8	98.9	0.136	2.160	0.578	0.063	0.89	68.09	
7TW17R-2	0.221	11.000	RT	Air	81.2	92.1	0.152	2.340	0.689	0.065	0.83	64.10	
7TW18R-3	0.230	11.010	RT	Air	85.4	97.9	0.162	2.450	0.704	0.066	0.88	70.00**	
7TW19R-4	0.232	11.003	RT	Air	81.0	95.0	0.184	2.600	0.794	0.071	0.86	70.04	

** Made from Heat G-8818. Other Specimens from Heat 293622.

Table 15: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.200 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M_K
ITW15R-1H	0.214	5.749	RT	Air	102.4	114.1	0.153	1.036	0.715	0.148	1.03	77.54	
ITW17R-1J	0.213	5.748	RT	Air	96.9	108.8	0.147	1.126	0.690	0.131	0.98	72.56	
ITW18R-1B	0.210	2.756	RT	Air	93.1	130.7	0.159	1.185	0.757	0.134	1.18	71.79	
ITW18R-2	0.223	4.006	RT	Air	90.9	111.6	0.162	1.203	0.728	0.135	1.01	70.48	
ITW18R-3I	0.215	5.744	RT	Air	96.0	110.4	0.160	1.216	0.744	0.132	1.00	74.81	
ITW18R-4	0.214	11.002	RT	Air	95.1	101.4	0.155	1.200	0.724	0.129	0.92	73.01	
ITW19R-1J	0.213	5.748	RT	Air	87.8	103.6	0.172	1.348	0.806	0.128	0.94	70.30	

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat G-7622.

Table 16: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.200 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M_K
ITW15N-1J	0.201	5.748	-320	LN ₂	89.6	99.4	0.120	1.010	0.597	0.119	0.56	58.19	1.461
ITW08N-1H	0.212	5.748	-320	LN ₂	165.9	170.3	0.071	0.525	0.334	0.135	0.97	87.04	0.977
ITW12N-1	0.216	5.747	-320	LN ₂	109.6	116.1	0.113	0.805	0.524	0.140	0.66	68.58	1.239
ITW18N-1I	0.214	5.754	-320	LN ₂	58.4	67.8	0.174	1.215	0.812	0.143	0.38	44.06	1.929

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat G-7622.

Table 17: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .25$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M _K
2TW08N-1	0.233	3.502	-320	LN ₂	184.8	188.8	0.070	0.070	0.301	0.227	1.07	87.51	
2TW12N-2	0.237	3.999	-320	LN ₂	131.9	137.7	0.110	0.460	0.464	0.239	0.78	74.40	1.142
2TW15N-3	0.236	4.000	-320	LN ₂	114.3	122.9	0.136	0.593	0.576	0.229	0.70	71.66	1.186
2TW18N-4	0.236	4.000	-320	LN ₂	102.7	113.0	0.154	0.695	0.652	0.222	0.64	68.64	1.238

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 293622.

Table 18: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .40$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M _K
4TW08N-1F	0.227	2.752	-320	LN ₂	179.7	182.6	0.069	0.181	0.305	0.381	1.04	70.16	
4TW12N-1F	0.227	2.753	-320	LN ₂	150.1	155.6	0.105	0.268	0.462	0.392	0.88	70.25	1.200
4TW15N-1E	0.233	2.754	-320	LN ₂	123.7	130.7	0.127	0.345	0.544	0.368	0.74	63.83	1.332
4TW18N-1F	0.224	2.755	-320	LN ₂	122.5	133.2	0.154	0.409	0.687	0.377	0.76	69.64	1.221

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 7909.

Table 19: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.200 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
ITW08H-2H	0.206	5.744	-423	LH ₂	137.0	141.1	0.076	0.547	0.368	0.139	0.69	70.81	1.059
ITW12H-2I	0.211	5.749	-423	LH ₂	78.2	83.1	0.112	0.830	0.530	0.135	0.41	47.86	1.567
ITW15H-2J	0.213	5.749	-423	LH ₂	61.2	67.0	0.138	1.010	0.648	0.137	0.33	41.29	1.826
ITW18H-2I	0.220	5.748	-423	LH ₂	50.9	58.5	0.175	1.230	0.797	0.142	0.29	38.38	1.954

NOTE: All Specimens Made from Heat Number G-7622.

Table 20: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.200 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .40$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
4TW08H-2D	0.235	2.754	-423	LH ₂	181.9	184.8	0.070	0.185	0.299	0.378	0.90	70.84	1.059
4TW12H-2D	0.234	2.760	-423	LH ₂	156.0	161.6	0.102	0.278	0.436	0.367	0.79	73.37	1.022
4TW15H-2F	0.225	2.755	-423	LH ₂	138.1	146.4	0.128	0.343	0.569	0.373	0.71	71.71	1.046
4TW18H-2E	0.235	2.758	-423	LH ₂	89.5	96.8	0.154	0.410	0.655	0.376	0.47	50.08*	1.498

NOTE: All Specimens Made from Heat Number 7909.

Table 21: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TB18R-1	0.020	4.005	RT	Air	112.3	120.6	0.018	0.390	0.900	0.046	1.08	32.67	
TB18R-2	0.020	4.003	RT	Air	120.7	129.6	0.018	0.390	0.900	0.046	1.16	35.11	

Table 22: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TB17N-1	0.020	3.997	-320	LN ₂	171.8	181.6	0.016	0.345	0.800	0.046	1.05	47.06	
TB17N-2	0.020	4.001	-320	LN ₂	165.6	175.8	0.017	0.350	0.859	0.049	1.02	46.28	
TB15N-1	0.020	4.002	-320	LN ₂	173.0	183.0	0.018	0.305	0.914	0.059	1.06	49.92	
TB15N-2	0.020	4.001	-320	LN ₂	170.2	180.8	0.018	0.330	0.905	0.055	1.05	49.09	
TB18N-1	0.020	4.001	-320	LN ₂	166.0	177.3	0.018	0.360	0.900	0.050	1.03	47.72	
TB18N-2	0.020	3.998	-320	LN ₂	173.7	185.6	0.018	0.360	0.909	0.050	1.08	50.42	
TB19N-1	0.020	3.998	-320	LN ₂	166.0	179.2	0.019	0.395	0.950	0.048	1.04	49.08	
TB19N-2	0.020	4.002	-320	LN ₂	166.8	179.9	0.019	0.390	0.960	0.049	1.04	49.36	
TB15N-5	0.018	4.002	-320	LN ₂	175.7	187.3	0.018	0.325	0.984	0.055	1.09	50.83	
TB14N-1*	0.018	3.995	-320	LN ₂	162.3	171.7	0.015	0.390	0.811	0.044	0.97	42.23	
TB18N-2*	0.020	3.995	-320	LN ₂	151.2	163.3	0.018	0.410	0.918	0.044	0.92	42.52	

* Milled from .20 Inch Thick Plate Heat Number G-7622.

Table 23: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TB15N-3	0.020	3.998	-320	LN ₂	190.4	193.6	0.015	0.106	0.761	0.142	1.12	46.17	
TB15N-4	0.019	4.001	-320	LN ₂	186.3	189.3	0.015	0.105	0.777	0.143	1.10	45.11	
TB17N-4	0.020	3.998	-320	LN ₂	187.3	190.6	0.015	0.114	0.765	0.132	1.10	45.92	
TB17N-3	0.020	4.001	-320	LN ₂	187.4	191.0	0.017	0.116	0.867	0.147	1.11	48.10	
TB18N-3	0.020	3.997	-320	LN ₂	180.6	184.3	0.018	0.126	0.882	0.143	1.07	47.90	
TB18N-4	0.019	4.003	-320	LN ₂	186.3	190.7	0.018	0.128	0.933	0.141	1.11	49.54	
TB19N-3	0.020	3.998	-320	LN ₂	181.0	185.2	0.018	0.138	0.882	0.130	1.07	48.67	
TB19N-4	0.021	4.002	-320	LN ₂	182.0	186.7	0.019	0.140	0.918	0.136	1.08	49.99	
TB15N-6	0.019	4.000	-320	LN ₂	190.9	194.4	0.016	0.107	0.860	0.150	1.13	47.37	
TB17N-5	0.018	3.999	-320	LN ₂	188.5	192.7	0.017	0.118	0.955	0.144	1.12	48.52	

Table 24: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M _K
TB12H-1	0.020	3.999	-423	LH ₂	161.7	167.7	0.013	0.280	0.647	0.046	0.83	38.13	
TB12H-2	0.020	4.002	-423	LH ₂	151.5	157.3	0.013	0.280	0.657	0.046	0.78	35.40	
TB15H-1	0.020	3.998	-423	LH ₂	135.0	142.8	0.016	0.350	0.792	0.046	0.71	34.56	
TB15H-2	0.020	4.000	-423	LH ₂	139.6	147.2	0.016	0.330	0.812	0.049	0.73	35.81	
TB18H-1	0.020	3.999	-423	LH ₂	125.7	135.2	0.018	0.400	0.887	0.045	0.67	33.92	
TB18H-2	0.020	4.002	-423	LH ₂	128.1	137.7	0.018	0.400	0.887	0.045	0.68	34.62	
TB19H-1	0.020	4.003	-423	LH ₂	121.8	132.0	0.019	0.425	0.936	0.045	0.66	33.68	
TB19H-2	0.020	4.002	-423	LH ₂	116.3	126.7	0.019	0.440	0.941	0.043	0.63	32.07	
ZTB15H-1*	0.020	3.997	-423	LH ₂	126.7	133.9	0.016	0.340	0.804	0.047	0.66	32.27	
ZTB15H-2*	0.019	3.990	-423	LH ₂	132.6	140.5	0.016	0.340	0.842	0.047	0.70	33.92	

* Milled from .20 Inch Thick Plate Heat Number G-7622.

Table 25: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M _K
TB12H-3	0.021	4.000	-423	LH ₂	197.5	199.7	0.013	0.092	0.634	0.141	0.99	44.25	
TB12H-4	0.021	4.001	-423	LH ₂	197.6	199.6	0.012	0.084	0.580	0.143	0.99	42.47	
TB15H-3	0.021	4.002	-423	LH ₂	189.4	192.1	0.015	0.104	0.728	0.144	0.95	45.08	
TB15H-4	0.020	4.000	-423	LH ₂	192.5	195.7	0.016	0.106	0.812	0.151	0.97	47.10	
TB17H-3	0.021	4.002	-423	LH ₂	189.8	193.3	0.016	0.118	0.777	0.136	0.96	47.11	
TB17H-4	0.020	3.997	-423	LH ₂	190.8	194.4	0.017	0.116	0.850	0.147	0.97	48.28	
TB19H-3	0.021	4.003	-423	LH ₂	177.0	181.5	0.019	0.144	0.922	0.132	0.90	47.49*	
TB19H-4	0.021	3.997	-423	LH ₂	196.0	200.2	0.017	0.136	0.802	0.125	0.99	51.01	

* Fatigue Sharpening Incomplete.

Table 26: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
TW18R-1	0.020	4.019	RT	Air	108.5	114.1	0.016	0.320	0.784	0.050	1.07	29.69	

Table 27: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
TW15N-1	0.020	4.009	-320	LN ₂	152.9	160.9	0.017	0.325	0.854	0.052	0.93	41.88	
TW17N-1	0.019	4.019	-320	LN ₂	154.1	164.1	0.017	0.350	0.885	0.049	0.95	42.37	
TW18N-1	0.020	4.012	-320	LN ₂	155.1	165.9	0.018	0.370	0.909	0.049	0.96	43.93	
TW19N-1	0.021	4.010	-320	LN ₂	149.9	161.7	0.019	0.400	0.927	0.048	0.94	43.37	
2TW15N-2*	0.020	4.009	-320	LN ₂	148.9	153.7	0.019	0.360	0.754	0.042	0.89	38.22	
2TW18N-2*	0.021	3.992	-320	LN ₂	136.2	146.2	0.018	0.400	0.874	0.045	0.83	37.70	

* Milled from .20 Inch Thick Weld from Plate Heat Number G-7622.

Table 28: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
TW15N-3	0.019	4.009	-320	LN ₂	176.4	179.2	0.015	0.106	0.781	0.142	1.04	42.78	
TW17N-3	0.019	4.012	-320	LN ₂	169.7	173.2	0.017	0.118	0.876	0.144	1.01	43.50	
TW18N-3	0.020	4.020	-320	LN ₂	173.1	176.9	0.017	0.128	0.854	0.133	1.03	45.11	
TW19N-3	0.021	4.022	-320	LN ₂	165.5	169.6	0.019	0.135	0.922	0.141	0.99	44.78	

Table 29: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TW12H-1	0.019	4.008	-423	LH ₂	152.0	157.0	0.012	0.255	0.645	0.047	0.79	34.25	
TW15H-1	0.019	4.010	-423	LH ₂	148.3	156.9	0.016	0.340	0.829	0.047	0.74	38.46	
TW18H-1A	0.020	4.009	-423	LH ₂	144.2	151.6	0.015	0.325	0.758	0.046	0.76	36.10	
TW19H-1	0.020	4.019	-423	LH ₂	130.8	141.2	0.019	0.400	0.936	0.048	0.71	36.44	
2TW15H-1*	0.020	3.991	-423	LH ₂	129.8	138.4	0.017	0.365	0.867	0.047	0.67	34.11	
2TW15H-2*	0.020	3.995	-423	LH ₂	134.8	144.2	0.018	0.360	0.923	0.050	0.70	36.52	

* Milled from .20 Inch Thick Weld Heat Number G-7622.

Table 30: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
TW12H-3	0.020	4.016	-423	LH ₂	177.7	179.4	0.014	0.080	0.700	0.175	0.90	39.25	
TW15H-3	0.020	4.004	-423	LH ₂	173.7	176.8	0.017	0.105	0.842	0.162	0.89	42.70	
TW17H-3	0.020	4.012	-423	LH ₂	180.0	183.5	0.017	0.114	0.867	0.149	0.92	45.13	
TW19H-3	0.021	4.012	-423	LH ₂	177.7	182.1	0.019	0.136	0.914	0.140	0.91	47.52	

Table 31: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .10$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
AB24R-1A	0.633	9.002	RT	Air	61.4	66.5	0.316	2.306	0.499	0.137	1.19	68.68*	1.574
AB24R-2	0.643	8.997	RT	Air	42.2	45.3	0.296	2.411	0.460	0.123	0.81	44.25*	
AB36R-1	0.630	11.000	RT	Air	55.6	61.8	0.370	3.570	0.588	0.104	1.10	69.58	
AB36R-2	0.628	10.992	RT	Air	53.2	59.2	0.380	3.610	0.605	0.105	1.06	66.69*	
AB45R-1	0.628	14.479	RT	Air	35.2	43.4	0.465	4.650	0.741	0.100	0.78	46.44*	
AB45R-2	0.627	14.474	RT	Air	32.0	39.4	0.472	4.510	0.753	0.105	0.70	42.04*	
AB54R-1	0.638	22.010	RT	Air	21.7	24.3	0.530	5.380	0.831	0.099	0.43	29.86	
AB54R-2	0.627	22.005	RT	Air	30.7	34.5	0.535	5.395	0.853	0.099	0.62	43.06*	
AB57R-1	0.643	22.005	RT	Air	21.6	26.8	0.600	5.725	0.934	0.105	0.48	31.43	
AB57R-2	0.628	22.003	RT	Air	32.0	36.5	0.555	5.940	0.884	0.093	0.65	46.09*	

* Delamination

Table 32: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
AB24R-1	0.625	5.502	RT	Air	54.1	56.5	0.271	0.654	0.434	0.414	1.01	40.11	1.132
AB24R-2	0.641	6.748	RT	Air	55.0	56.5	0.239	0.601	0.373	0.398	1.01	39.11	
AB36R-1	0.640	5.500	RT	Air	48.0	51.8	0.339	0.922	0.530	0.368	0.93	41.51	
AB36R-2	0.626	5.504	RT	Air	48.6	52.6	0.362	0.961	0.578	0.377	0.94	43.03*	
AB45R-1	0.644	6.747	RT	Air	42.3	46.7	0.432	1.190	0.670	0.363	0.83	41.10	
AB45R-2	0.624	6.749	RT	Air	46.9	51.1	0.390	1.150	0.625	0.339	0.91	44.86	
AB54R-1	0.629	6.747	RT	Air	39.8	45.5	0.485	1.370	0.771	0.354	0.81	41.22	
AB54R-2	0.641	6.748	RT	Air	35.8	41.5	0.527	1.440	0.823	0.366	0.74	37.92	
AB57R-1	0.672	11.995	RT	Air	37.2	40.0	0.530	1.343	0.789	0.395	0.71	38.36	
AB57R-2	0.644	11.996	RT	Air	39.0	42.2	0.538	1.353	0.835	0.398	0.75	40.49	

* Delamination

Table 33: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .10$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
AB24N-1	0.640	8.996	-320	LN ₂	45.6	50.2	0.275	2.430	0.430	0.113	0.75	45.97*	
AB24N-2	0.638	8.980	-320	LN ₂	44.4	48.9	0.272	2.449	0.426	0.111	0.73	44.49	1.124
AB36N-1	0.646	10.994	-320	LN ₂	38.7	45.6	0.360	3.610	0.557	0.100	0.68	44.65*	
AB36N-2	0.647	11.003	-320	LN ₂	35.6	41.8	0.375	3.615	0.580	0.104	0.62	41.54	1.204
AB45N-1	0.633	14.486	-320	LN ₂	28.1	34.3	0.450	4.610	0.712	0.098	0.51	35.75	1.399
AB45N-2	0.627	14.484	-320	LN ₂	38.5	47.3	0.445	4.645	0.710	0.096	0.70	49.56*	
AB54N-1	0.643	22.004	-320	LN ₂	21.5	25.6	0.525	5.405	0.817	0.097	0.38	29.34	1.704
AB54N-2	0.639	22.005	-320	LN ₂	19.7	23.5	0.533	5.385	0.834	0.099	0.35	27.00	1.852
AB57N-1	0.627	21.994	-320	LN ₂	23.3	28.7	0.560	5.815	0.893	0.096	0.43	32.93	1.518
AB57N-2	0.643	21.995	-320	LN ₂	21.3	26.0	0.555	5.525	0.863	0.101	0.39	29.79	1.678

* Delamination

Table 34: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .25$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{Ic} M _K
AB24N-1	0.643	5.497	-320	LN ₂	56.7	59.8	0.247	0.971	0.384	0.254	0.89	47.67	1.049
AB24N-2	0.631	5.499	-320	LN ₂	57.0	60.5	0.262	0.978	0.415	0.268	0.90	48.61*	
AB36N-3	0.638	9.003	-320	LN ₂	45.6	48.8	0.351	1.303	0.550	0.269	0.73	44.06	1.135
AB36N-4	0.625	9.007	-320	LN ₂	50.8	54.3	0.347	1.324	0.555	0.262	0.81	49.63*	
AB45N-3	0.642	12.004	-320	LN ₂	35.9	39.1	0.470	1.750	0.732	0.269	0.58	39.67	1.260
AB45N-4	0.633	12.003	-320	LN ₂	40.0	43.8	0.480	1.780	0.758	0.270	0.65	44.83*	
AB54N-3	0.626	12.009	-320	LN ₂	34.5	39.4	0.565	2.070	0.903	0.273	0.59	41.53	1.204
AB54N-4	0.646	12.006	-320	LN ₂	31.5	35.5	0.555	2.030	0.860	0.273	0.53	37.44	1.335

* Delamination

Table 35: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{1c} M _K
AB24N-3	0.647	5.500	-320	LN ₂	61.5	63.7	0.249	0.612	0.385	0.407	0.95	43.85	
AB24N-4	0.630	5.497	-320	LN ₂	61.2	63.1	0.225	0.587	0.357	0.383	0.94	42.60	
AB36N-1	0.641	5.498	-320	LN ₂	53.4	57.0	0.311	0.889	0.485	0.350	0.85	44.86	1.115
AB36N-2	0.637	5.502	-320	LN ₂	50.9	55.3	0.369	0.964	0.579	0.383	0.82	44.72	1.118
AB45N-1	0.646	6.748	-320	LN ₂	45.8	50.3	0.432	1.170	0.669	0.369	0.75	43.91	1.139
AB45N-2	0.632	6.748	-320	LN ₂	49.3	54.1	0.417	1.165	0.660	0.358	0.81	47.24	1.058
AB54N-1	0.632	6.750	-320	LN ₂	44.0	50.2	0.486	1.363	0.770	0.357	0.75	45.28*	
AB54N-2	0.630	6.753	-320	LN ₂	44.3	50.2	0.472	1.370	0.749	0.345	0.75	45.55	1.098
AB57N-1	0.642	11.991	-320	LN ₂	37.8	41.0	0.546	1.371	0.851	0.398	0.61	39.14	1.277
AB57N-2	0.626	12.003	-320	LN ₂	40.7	44.1	0.554	1.404	0.885	0.395	0.66	42.74	1.170

* Delamination

Table 36: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .10$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{1c} M _K
AB24H-1	0.644	9.000	-423	LH ₂	49.7	53.8	0.225	2.425	0.349	0.093	0.75	46.29	1.080
AB24H-2	0.643	8.996	-423	LH ₂	49.6	53.6	0.228	2.430	0.355	0.094	0.75	46.53	1.075
AB36H-1	0.630	11.008	-423	LH ₂	33.8	40.2	0.375	3.595	0.595	0.104	0.56	39.16	1.277
AB36H-2	0.630	11.005	-423	LH ₂	34.5	40.6	0.355	3.610	0.564	0.098	0.57	39.15	1.277
AB45H-1	0.642	14.487	-423	LH ₂	26.7	32.6	0.460	4.670	0.717	0.099	0.46	34.18	1.463
AB45H-2	0.641	14.487	-423	LH ₂	26.1	31.9	0.460	4.645	0.718	0.099	0.45	33.37	1.498
AB54H-1	0.641	14.489	-423	LH ₂	23.5	31.3	0.500	5.375	0.780	0.093	0.44	31.42	1.591
AB54H-2	0.643	14.484	-423	LH ₂	23.4	31.0	0.520	5.510	0.809	0.094	0.43	31.87	1.569

Table 37: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M _K
AB24H-1	0.645	5.500	-423	LH ₂	67.4	69.4	0.224	0.591	0.347	0.379	0.97	47.17	
AB24H-2	0.624	5.490	-423	LH ₂	68.7	70.8	0.216	0.589	0.346	0.367	0.99	47.99	
AB36H-1	0.647	5.497	-423	LH ₂	54.7	59.1	0.355	0.956	0.549	0.371	0.83	47.77	1.047
AB36H-2	0.625	5.496	-423	LH ₂	56.9	61.5	0.352	0.930	0.564	0.379	0.86	49.23	1.016
AB45H-1	0.641	6.748	-423	LH ₂	49.9	54.7	0.422	1.176	0.659	0.359	0.77	47.88	1.044
AB45H-2	0.633	6.750	-423	LH ₂	51.2	56.3	0.410	1.161	0.648	0.353	0.79	48.81	1.024
AB54H-1	0.642	6.747	-423	LH ₂	44.3	50.2	0.476	1.361	0.742	0.350	0.70	45.32	1.103
AB54H-2	0.627	6.745	-423	LH ₂	44.8	51.1	0.476	1.371	0.759	0.347	0.71	45.99	1.087

Table 38: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K _{IC} M _K
AB54-1	0.067	2.508	RT	Air	36.6	50.5	0.054	1.090	0.806	0.050	0.91	17.19	
AB54-2	0.065	2.507	RT	Air	35.5	50.1	0.055	1.090	0.851	0.051	0.90	16.77	
AB54-3	0.064	6.757	RT	Air	47.4	53.4	0.056	1.070	0.875	0.052	0.96	23.45	
AB54-4	0.067	6.757	RT	Air	48.1	53.3	0.052	1.060	0.782	0.049	0.96	23.03	
AB54-5	0.067	12.000	RT	Air	48.0	50.8	0.051	1.080	0.761	0.047	0.91	22.78	
AB54-6	0.066	12.010	RT	Air	48.8	51.5	0.051	1.079	0.779	0.048	0.92	23.31	
AB57R-1A	0.069	6.748	RT	Air	44.8	50.4	0.057	1.128	0.823	0.050	0.90	22.09	
AB57R-2	0.066	6.748	RT	Air	45.5	51.4	0.058	1.116	0.875	0.052	0.92	22.67	
AB47R-1*	0.069	6.746	RT	Air	45.7	50.2	0.050	1.006	0.730	0.050	0.89	21.20	
AB47R-2*	0.063	6.745	RT	Air	46.3	50.5	0.050	0.947	0.796	0.053	0.90	21.49	

* Milled from 0.625 Inch Thick Plate.

Table 39: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
AB54R-1	0.067	5.501	RT	Air	52.6	54.8	0.056	0.336	0.836	0.167	0.98	23.72	
AB54R-2	0.064	5.505	RT	Air	53.1	55.6	0.055	0.338	0.851	0.162	1.00	23.82	
AB57R-1	0.067	5.501	RT	Air	54.3	56.5	0.050	0.370	0.746	0.135	1.01	24.12	
AB57R-2	0.065	5.501	RT	Air	52.2	54.8	0.053	0.379	0.807	0.139	0.98	23.49	

Table 40: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
AB51N-1	0.068	6.746	-320	LN ₂	55.3	61.0	0.052	1.000	0.767	0.052	0.95	26.18	
AB51N-2	0.067	6.750	-320	LN ₂	55.3	60.8	0.051	1.000	0.761	0.051	0.95	25.95	
AB54N-2	0.065	6.745	-320	LN ₂	55.9	62.6	0.055	1.032	0.846	0.053	0.98	27.25	
AB57N-1	0.070	6.748	-320	LN ₂	53.7	60.2	0.055	1.100	0.785	0.050	0.94	26.06	
AB57N-2	0.069	6.750	-320	LN ₂	55.0	61.9	0.057	1.120	0.827	0.051	0.97	27.26	
AB54N-1A	0.068	6.757	-320	LN ₂	53.1	59.2	0.051	1.060	0.748	0.048	0.93	24.80	
AB47N-1	0.063	6.752	-320	LN ₂	56.7	61.7	0.046	0.943	0.728	0.049	0.92	25.39	
AB47N-2	0.065	6.747	-320	LN ₂	54.8	59.3	0.048	0.968	0.736	0.050	0.88	24.92	

Table 41: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
AB54N-1	0.068	5.501	-320	LN ₂	66.8	69.1	0.047	0.340	0.696	0.138	1.08	28.76	
AB57N-1	0.066	5.502	-320	LN ₂	63.8	66.6	0.052	0.370	0.794	0.141	1.04	28.55	
AB54N-2	0.064	5.503	-320	LN ₂	64.5	67.1	0.051	0.343	0.793	0.149	1.05	28.38	
AB57N-2	0.064	5.504	-320	LN ₂	64.0	67.0	0.057	0.369	0.888	0.155	1.05	29.53	

Table 42: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
AB45H-1	0.068	6.748	-423	LH ₂	60.6	64.7	0.044	0.789	0.647	0.056	0.92	26.47	
AB45H-2	0.067	6.746	-423	LH ₂	59.1	64.4	0.059	0.807	0.879	0.073	0.91	29.40	
AB54H-1	0.065	6.750	-423	LH ₂	57.1	63.6	0.054	1.025	0.835	0.053	0.90	27.42	
AB54H-2	0.067	6.746	-423	LH ₂	56.7	63.4	0.056	1.046	0.836	0.054	0.90	27.68	
AB57H-1	0.067	6.750	-423	LH ₂	55.0	62.4	0.058	1.036	0.862	0.056	0.89	27.17	
AB57H-2	0.068	6.749	-423	LH ₂	55.8	62.8	0.055	1.106	0.803	0.049	0.89	26.90	
AB47H-1*	0.062	6.748	-423	LH ₂	57.9	62.9	0.050	0.940	0.804	0.053	0.88	26.78	
AB47H-2*	0.062	6.747	-423	LH ₂	59.0	64.6	0.051	0.952	0.820	0.054	0.90	27.69	

* Milled from 0.625 Inch Thick Plate.

Table 43: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
AB54H-1	0.067	5.498	-423	LH ₂	70.30	72.8	0.047	0.321	0.707	0.146	1.03	29.93	
AB54H-2	0.069	5.503	-423	LH ₂	68.10	70.8	0.052	0.339	0.754	0.153	1.01	30.06	
AB57H-1	0.066	5.500	-423	LH ₂	67.60	70.5	0.052	0.359	0.788	0.145	1.00	30.09	
AB57H-2	0.064	5.502	-423	LH ₂	67.70	70.8	0.050	0.376	0.780	0.133	1.01	29.94	

Table 44: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
1AW50R-2	1.006	20.01	RT	Air	21.9	23.3	0.470	3.320	0.467	0.142	1.06	29.73	
1AW63R-1	1.022	24.00	RT	Air	22.8	25.3	0.690	4.155	0.676	0.166	1.16	36.46	
1AW75R-2	1.017	29.99	RT	Air	20.7	22.8	0.725	4.995	0.713	0.145	1.04	34.36	
1AW90R-1	1.031	30.00	RT	Air	20.4	23.5	0.845	5.915	0.820	0.143	1.07	36.55	

Table 45: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .30$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwin's Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
3AW75R-1	1.007	13.50	RT	Air	23.5	26.0	0.696	2.377	0.691	0.293	1.19	32.40	
3AW83R-1	1.005	16.02	RT	Air	23.1	25.5	0.773	2.533	0.769	0.305	1.16	33.07	
3AW90R-1	1.005	16.01	RT	Air	22.1	25.2	0.830	2.850	0.826	0.291	1.15	33.34	
3AW95R-1	1.005	16.01	RT	Air	21.5	24.7	0.889	3.010	0.885	0.295	1.13	33.30	

Table 46: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{In}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
1AW50N-3	1.007	19.972	-320	LN ₂	24.6	26.2	0.467	3.330	0.464	0.140	0.98	32.77	
1AW63N-2	1.018	24.005	-320	LN ₂	19.8	22.0	0.710	4.245	0.698	0.167	0.82	30.67	
1AW75N-3	1.037	30.020	-320	LN ₂	15.4	17.0	0.735	5.035	0.709	0.146	0.63	24.31	
1AW90N-2	1.019	30.015	-320	LN ₂	21.1	24.2	0.825	5.785	0.810	0.143	0.90	36.42	

Table 47: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .30$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{In}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
3AW75N-2	1.007	13.49	-320	LN ₂	25.3	28.0	0.703	2.374	0.698	0.296	1.04	34.63	
3AW95N-2	0.989	16.01	-320	LN ₂	21.6	24.8	0.787	2.584	0.796	0.305	0.93	30.44	
3AW90N-2	1.008	16.00	-320	LN ₂	24.4	27.6	0.841	2.832	0.834	0.297	1.03	36.33	
3AW83N-2	1.000	16.01	-320	LN ₂	24.6	28.3	0.898	3.022	0.898	0.297	1.06	37.87	

Table 48: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{In}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
1AW50H-4	1.002	16.01	-423	LH ₂	14.3	15.6	0.500	3.355	0.499	0.149	0.49	18.34	
1AW63H-3	1.010	20.01	-423	LH ₂	17.3	19.3	0.620	4.165	0.614	0.149	0.60	24.93	
1AW75H-4	1.016	24.01	-423	LH ₂	14.3	15.8	0.700	4.215	0.689	0.166	0.49	21.34	
1AW90H-3	1.010	30.00	-423	LH ₂	11.6	13.3	0.840	5.970	0.832	0.141	0.41	19.32	

Table 49: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .30$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c				Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
3AW75H-3	1.014	13.472	-423	LH ₂	20.2	22.4	0.710	2.335	0.701	0.304	0.70	26.60	
3AW83H-3	1.007	16.011	-423	LH ₂	20.7	22.9	0.775	2.490	0.770	0.311	0.71	28.29	
3AW90H-3	0.998	15.998	-423	LH ₂	18.8	21.2	0.835	2.895	0.837	0.288	0.66	27.21	
3AW95H-3	1.000	16.009	-423	LH ₂	17.0	19.6	0.870	2.985	0.870	0.292	0.61	24.92	

Table 50: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c				Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
5AW50R-1	0.122	6.015	RT	Air	32.8	34.8	0.056	0.970	0.460	0.058	1.30	16.71	
5AW75R-1	0.119	7.507	RT	Air	27.3	30.4	0.088	1.430	0.737	0.062	1.14	17.39	
5AW94R-3	0.124	9.520	RT	Air	26.4	30.3	0.097	1.990	0.785	0.049	1.13	17.75	
5AW113R-1	0.123	11.986	RT	Air	30.2	34.3	0.099	2.300	0.804	0.043	1.28	20.64	

Table 51: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c				Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
1AW50R-1	0.125	3.753	RT	Air	31.7	32.6	0.047	0.341	0.375	0.138	1.22	13.66	
1AW75R-1	0.123	3.754	RT	Air	29.6	31.3	0.063	0.496	0.514	0.127	1.17	14.94	
1AW94R-1	0.122	3.750	RT	Air	30.4	33.3	0.082	0.629	0.672	0.130	1.25	17.45	
1AW113R-1	0.122	3.746	RT	Air	26.5	30.6	0.101	0.733	0.828	0.138	1.15	16.71	

Table 52: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
5AW50N-2	0.122	6.004	-320	LN ₂	36.5	38.1	0.044	0.982	0.361	0.045	1.20	16.61	
5AW75N-2	0.121	7.508	-320	LN ₂	34.5	38.4	0.087	1.400	0.772	0.062	1.21	21.84	
5AW94N-2	0.123	9.513	-320	LN ₂	33.2	36.9	0.081	1.865	0.661	0.043	1.16	20.52	
5AW113N-2	0.122	11.988	-320	LN ₂	34.0	39.1	0.100	2.250	0.823	0.044	1.23	23.34	

Table 53: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	a/2c	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
1AW50N-2	0.123	3.754	-320	LN ₂	39.9	41.0	0.046	0.344	0.374	0.134	1.29	17.09	
1AW75N-2	0.123	3.754	-320	LN ₂	36.1	38.6	0.078	0.488	0.634	0.160	1.22	19.54	
1AW94N-2	0.123	3.749	-320	LN ₂	34.4	37.9	0.086	0.631	0.699	0.136	1.20	20.09	
1AW113N-2	0.125	3.746	-320	LN ₂	33.3	37.9	0.094	0.747	0.752	0.126	1.20	20.56	

Table 54: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
5AW50H-3	0.126	5.994	-423	LH ₂	43.9	46.6	0.052	1.065	0.413	0.049	1.53	21.67	
5AW75H-3	0.123	7.508	-423	LH ₂	33.2	36.6	0.070	1.455	0.571	0.048	1.20	19.03	
5AW94H-3	0.122	9.480	-423	LH ₂	34.2	38.2	0.075	1.900	0.615	0.040	1.26	20.38	
5AW113H-3	0.123	11.995	-423	LH ₂	32.7	37.7	0.105	2.465	0.852	0.043	1.24	23.02	

Table 55: STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .15$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS				FRACTURE DATA						
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_N)	Flaw Depth (in) a	Flaw Length (in) 2c	a/t	$a/2c$	σ_N/σ_{ys}	Irwins Apparent K (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Based On Avg. K_{Ic} M_K
1AW50H-3	0.125	3.751	-423	LH ₂	40.3	41.4	0.042	0.310	0.336	0.136	1.36	16.46	
1AW75H-3	0.124	3.757	-423	LH ₂	37.1	39.5	0.070	0.495	0.567	0.141	1.30	19.44	
1AW94H-3	0.125	3.749	-423	LH ₂	37.2	40.7	0.080	0.625	0.643	0.128	1.34	21.14	
1AW113H-3A	0.123	3.748	-423	LH ₂	35.9	41.2	0.097	0.770	0.792	0.126	1.36	22.51	

Table 56 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.020$ ", 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal, Transverse Grain)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K _{ICN}	TYPE FRACTURE
TBCR-2	.0192	30.00	15.02	RT	Air	32.3	185.4	Full Shear
TBCN-1	.0218	8.00	4.03	-320°F	LN ₂	78.0	232.3	Full Shear
TBCH-1	.0208	8.001	3.93	-423°F	LH ₂	35.9	104.7	Full Shear

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown
and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication
No. 410

Table 57 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.20$ ", 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Base Metal, Transverse Grain)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K _{ICN}	TYPE FRACTURE
TBCR-1	.218	29.985	15.05	RT	Air	38.4	220.8	Full Shear
TBCN-2	.216	8.008	4.05	-320°F	LN ₂	19.4	58.0	Flat
TBCH-2	.216	8.010	4.00	-423°F	LH ₂	18.6	55.0	Flat

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown
and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication
No. 410

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat No. G-7622

Table 58 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.020"$, 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Weldment)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH ** ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K _{ICN}	TYPE FRACTURE
TWCR-1	.0198	29.99	14.82	RT	Air	25.8	146.2	Full Shear
TWCN-1	.0197	8.010	4.01	-320°F	LN ₂	47.5	141.0	Full Shear
TWCH	.0208	8.001	4.08	-423°F	LH ₂	39.9	120.1	Full Shear

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown
and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication
No. 410

** Flaw in Center of Weld

Table 59 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.20"$, 5Al-2.5Sn Titanium Weldment)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH ** ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K _{ICN}	TYPE FRACTURE
TWCR-2	.2172	30.00	15.13	RT	Air	30.8	177.9	Full Shear
TWCN	.2165	8.012	4.02	-320°F	LN ₂	25.7	76.3	Flat
TWCH	.2145	8.011	3.92	-423°F	LH ₂	25.6	74.4	Flat

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown
and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication
No. 410

** Flaws in Center of Weld

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat No. G-8818

Table 60 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.063$ ", 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal, Long Grain)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K _{ICN}	TYPE FRACTURE
ABCR-1	.0679	15.97	7.98	RT	Air	16.6	69.5	Full Shear
ABCN-2	.0670	15.97	7.98	-320°F	LN ₂	20.9	87.5	Full Shear
ABCH-3	.0702	12.00	6.00	-423°F	LH ₂	18.9	68.6	Full Shear

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication No. 410

Table 61 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.625$ ", 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal, Long Grain)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K _{ICN}	TYPE FRACTURE
ABCR-1	.6275	16.00	8.00	RT	Air	15.1	63.2	Mixed Mode
ABCN-1	.6355	16.00	8.06	-320°F	LN ₂	13.1	55.1	Flat
ABCH-1	.6265	12.02	6.01	-423°F	LH ₂	15.6	56.6	Flat

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication No. 410

Table 62 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 0.125"$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH** ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K_{IC}	TYPE FRACTURE
AWCR-2	.1240	36.00	18.10	RT	Air	11.06	69.9	Full Shear
AWCN-2	.1240	35.94	18.02	-320°F	LN ₂	11.23	70.6	Mixed Mode
AWCH-2	.1240	30.00	15.10	-423°F	LH ₂	10.67	61.6	Mixed Mode

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown
and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication
No. 410

** Flaws in Center of Weld

Table 63 : STATIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DATA - CENTER CRACKED PANELS
($t = 1.00"$, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal)

SPECIMEN NUMBER	THICKNESS ~ IN.	WIDTH ~ IN.	CRACK LENGTH** ~ IN.	TEST TEMPERATURE ~ °F	TEST ENVIRONMENT	GROSS AREA FAILURE STRESS ~ KSI	K_{IC}	TYPE FRACTURE
AWCR-1	.9850	36.00	18.415	RT	Air	9.1	58.5	Flat
AWCN-1	1.0075	36.03	18.270	-320°F	LN ₂	7.9	50.1	Flat
AWCH-4	1.0083	12.01	6.190	-423°F	LH ₂	8.5	35.8	Flat

* Calculated using an expression recommended by Brown
and Srawley in the ASTM Special Technical Publication
No. 410

** Flaws in Center of Weld

Table 64: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_{f_i} (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TBC08R-1	0.201	2.749	RT	Air	85.0	0.073	0.196	0.364	0.372	33.58	2337
TBC10R-2	0.204	2.747	RT	Air	39.0	0.088	0.236	0.432	0.373	16.48	3000*
TBC10R-3	0.200	2.747	RT	Air	85.0	0.090	0.248	0.450	0.363	37.69	1546
TBC10R-4	0.199	2.748	RT	Air	39.0	0.086	0.240	0.432	0.358	16.54	6000*
TBC12R-5	0.200	2.749	RT	Air	85.0	0.106	0.286	0.524	0.371	40.55	1130

* Specimens Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below:

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
TBC10R-2	39.0	0.095	0.255	0.466	0.373	17.13
TBC10R-4	39.0	0.107	0.299	0.537	0.358	18.46

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 303268.

Table 65: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_{f_i} (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
TBC08N-1	0.203	2.747	-320	LN ₂	108.0	0.075	0.205	0.370	0.366	43.06	1964
TBC10N-2	0.196	2.748	-320	LN ₂	66.0	0.086	0.237	0.439	0.363	27.89	3000*
TBC10N-3	0.202	2.746	-320	LN ₂	66.0	0.091	0.242	0.451	0.376	28.29	4130
TBC10N-4	0.200	2.747	-320	LN ₂	108.0	0.090	0.243	0.450	0.370	46.94	756
TBC12N-5	0.199	2.747	-320	LN ₂	108.0	0.105	0.284	0.529	0.370	50.74	530

* Specimen Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below:

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
TBC10N-2	66.0	0.130	0.351	0.664	0.370	34.02

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 303268

Table 66: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
TBC08H-1	0.200	2.747	-423	LH ₂	80.0	0.072	0.198	0.360	0.364	30.95	1688**
TBC10H-2	0.194	2.748	-423	LH ₂	39.9	0.086	0.238	0.443	0.361	16.79	3000*
TBC10H-3	0.202	2.744	-423	LH ₂	80.0	0.086	0.248	0.425	0.347	34.44	1188
TBC10H-4	0.205	2.746	-423	LH ₂	40.0	0.086	0.244	0.419	0.353	16.99	4500*
TBC12H-5	0.200	2.747	-423	LH ₂	80.0	0.105	0.290	0.525	0.362	37.43	922

* Specimens Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below:

** Failed in Grip Holes.

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
TBC10H-2	39.9	0.093	0.250	0.479	0.372	17.27
TBC10H-4	40.0	0.091	0.250	0.443	0.364	17.27
TBC08H-1	80.0	0.130	0.310	0.649	0.493	39.40

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 303268.

Table 67: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .040$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TWC08-R1G	0.234	2.749	RT	Air	85.0	0.071	0.196	0.304	0.362	33.55	2808
TWC10-R2E	0.229	2.747	RT	Air	39.0	0.089	0.245	0.389	0.363	16.75	2000*
TWC10-R3D	0.230	2.748	RT	Air	85.0	0.087	0.233	0.378	0.373	36.67	2055
TWC10-R4FA	0.222	2.747	RT	Air	39.0	0.087	0.236	0.392	0.369	16.46	1500*
TWC12-R5E	0.233	2.750	RT	Air	85.0	0.104	0.281	0.446	0.370	40.24	1790

* Specimen Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below:

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
TWC10-R2E	39.0	0.096	0.251	0.419	0.383	17.04
TWC10-R4FA	39.0	0.095	0.256	0.428	0.371	17.16

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 7909.

Table 68: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .40$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_{i_i} (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
TWC08N-1	0.227	2.747	-320	LN ₂	108.0	0.071	0.195	0.312	0.364	42.00	1004
TWC10N-2	0.232	2.747	-320	LN ₂	66.0	0.090	0.235	0.389	0.383	27.93	2700
TWC10N-3	0.229	2.746	-320	LN ₂	108.0	0.084	0.240	0.368	0.350	46.39	276
TWC10N-4	0.232	2.748	-320	LN ₂	66.0	0.090	0.235	0.389	0.383	27.04	2000*
TWC12N-5	0.231	2.747	-320	LN ₂	108.0	0.104	0.205	0.450	0.366	50.71	573

* Specimen Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below.

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
TWC10N-4	66.0	0.120	0.294	0.518	0.408	31.40

NOTE: All Specimens from Heat 7909.

Table 69: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.20 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .40$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_{i_i} (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
TWC08H-1G	0.222	2.747	-423	LH ₂	80.0	0.072	0.199	0.324	0.362	31.00	1344**
TWC10H-2F	0.226	2.746	-423	LH ₂	40.0	0.086	0.240	0.380	0.358	16.89	2000*
TWC10H-3G	0.226	2.747	-423	LH ₂	80.0	0.087	0.234	0.385	0.372	33.71	521
TWC10H-4G	0.226	2.748	-423	LH ₂	40.0	0.087	0.246	0.386	0.354	17.07	3500*
TWC12H-5G	0.222	2.747	-423	LH ₂	81.8	0.103	0.278	0.464	0.371	37.57	178

* Specimen Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below

** Last 20 Cycles were run at a Stress of 81.0 KSi.

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
TWC10H-2F	40.0	0.095	0.244	0.420	0.389	17.18
TWC10H-4G	40.0	0.096	0.251	0.426	0.383	17.39

Table 70: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TBCR-1	.020	4.002	RT	Air	83.3	0.011	0.202	0.564	0.055	17.90	325
TBCR-2	.019	4.000	RT	Air	83.3	0.013	0.220	0.703	0.059	19.41	267
TBCR-3	.019	4.000	RT	Air	83.3	0.012	0.212	0.632	0.057	18.67	445
TBCR-4	.020	4.000	RT	Air	83.3	0.014	0.208	0.707	0.067	20.03	168
TBCR-5	.020	4.002	RT	Air	83.3	0.015	0.200	0.758	0.075	20.61	175

Table 71: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TBCN-1	0.019	4.000	-320	LN ₂	128.3	0.014	0.226	0.722	0.062	30.83	23
TBCN-2	0.019	3.999	-320	LN ₂	128.3	0.012	0.224	0.628	0.054	28.70	49
TBCN-3	0.019	4.000	-320	LN ₂	128.3	0.015	0.224	0.790	0.067	31.81	12
TBCN-4	0.020	4.002	-320	LN ₂	128.3	0.017	0.206	0.872	0.083	33.45	10
TBCN-5	0.020	3.999	-320	LN ₂	128.3	0.014	0.222	0.700	0.063	30.83	46

Table 72: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Base Metal -
Transverse Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	($a/2c$) _i	Irwin's Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
TBCH-1	0.020	4.000	-423	LH ₂	146.8	0.013	0.218	0.667	0.060	33.99	5
TBCH-2	0.019	3.999	-423	LH ₂	146.8	0.013	0.250	0.677	0.052	34.15	3
TBCH-3	0.020	3.995	-423	LH ₂	130.3	0.013	0.230	0.657	0.057	29.84	12
TBCH-4	0.020	4.000	-423	LH ₂	130.4	0.015	0.236	0.769	0.064	31.94	16
TBCH-5	0.021	4.001	-423	LH ₂	130.6	0.015	0.220	0.732	0.068	31.90	29

Table 73: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	($a/2c$) _i	Irwin's Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TWCR-19	0.019	4.015	RT	Air	83.3	0.012	0.206	0.635	0.058	18.71	100
TWCR-20	0.020	4.016	RT	Air	81.8	0.014	0.228	0.707	0.061	19.76	59
TWCR-21	0.020	4.008	RT	Air	81.8	0.014	0.206	0.686	0.068	19.67	59
TWCR-22	0.019	4.008	RT	Air	81.0	0.011	0.202	0.567	0.055	17.39	141
TWCR-25	0.020	4.007	RT	Air	81.8	0.010	0.200	0.495	0.050	16.81	241

Table 74: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_{I_i} (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TWCN-26	0.020	4.017	-320	LN ₂	130.6	0.013	0.198	0.667	0.066	30.27	10
TWCN-27	0.020	4.022	-320	LN ₂	130.6	0.012	0.212	0.606	0.057	29.26	45
TWCN-29	0.019	4.007	-320	LN ₂	130.6	0.012	0.206	0.625	0.058	29.23	10
TWCN-30	0.020	4.006	-320	LN ₂	130.6	0.012	0.202	0.603	0.059	29.21	23
TWCN-37	0.020	4.023	-320	LN ₂	130.6	0.014	0.200	0.701	0.070	31.32	53

Table 75: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.020 Inch Thick, 5Al-2.5 Sn Titanium Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_{I_i} (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
TWCH-31	0.020	4.007	-423	LH ₂	130.6	0.010	0.188	0.500	0.053	26.31	82
TWCH-32	0.017	4.007	-423	LH ₂	130.7	0.010	0.184	0.575	0.054	26.32	37
TWCH-33	0.020	4.006	-423	LH ₂	130.5	0.010	0.208	0.510	0.048	26.36	25
TWCH-34	0.020	4.011	-423	LH ₂	130.7	0.014	0.210	0.686	0.067	30.90	12
TWCH-35	0.020	4.009	-423	LH ₂	130.6	0.012	0.202	0.612	0.059	28.72	17

Table 76: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwin's Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
ABC25R-1	0.645	6.743	RT	Air	36.0	0.230	0.569	0.357	0.404	24.16	2927
ABC31R-2	0.627	6.743	RT	Air	31.0	0.286	0.724	0.456	0.395	23.30	3909
ABC31R-3	0.638	6.742	RT	Air	41.0	0.278	0.740	0.436	0.376	31.44	1013
ABC31R-4	0.636	6.744	RT	Air	36.0	0.282	0.743	0.443	0.380	27.49	2737
ABC38R-5	0.643	6.744	RT	Air	36.0	0.350	0.875	0.545	0.400	29.95	798

Table 77: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwin's Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Failure
ABC25N-1	0.642	6.740	-320	LN ₂	43.0	0.232	0.577	0.361	0.402	29.05	1774
ABC31N-2	0.624	6.748	-320	LN ₂	48.0	0.311	0.769	0.499	0.404	37.66	585
ABC31N-3	0.644	6.744	-320	LN ₂	43.0	0.290	0.761	0.450	0.381	33.24	977
ABC31N-4	0.642	6.736	-320	LN ₂	38.0	0.276	0.742	0.430	0.372	28.79	1723
ABC38N-5	0.630	6.743	-320	LN ₂	43.0	0.345	0.882	0.547	0.391	35.85	925
A-1	0.638	6.752	-320	LN ₂	31.6	0.246	0.608	0.386	0.405	21.70	1000*
A-2	0.637	6.746	-320	LN ₂	31.6	0.243	0.611	0.382	0.398	21.73	3000*
A-3	0.631	6.747	-320	LN ₂	22.0	0.298	0.762	0.472	0.391	16.77	6000*

* Specimens Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below.

SPECIMEN	σ_G	a_f	$2c_f$	(a/t) _f	(a/2c) _f	K_f
A-1	31.6	0.263	0.644	0.412	0.408	22.35
A-2	31.6	0.295	0.735	0.463	0.401	23.85
A-3	22.0	0.345	0.878	0.547	0.393	18.01

Table 78: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.625 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .40$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Net Section Stress (Ksi) σ_i	$2c_i$	$(a/t)_i$	$(a/2c)_i$	Irwins Apparent K_i	Cycles to Failure
ABC25H-1	0.625	6.756	-423	LH ₂	43.0	0.229	0.578	0.367	0.396	28.97	1373
ABC31H-2	0.629	6.744	-423	LH ₂	20.0	0.274	0.750	0.436	0.365	15.00	3000*
ABC31H-3	0.635	6.745	-423	LH ₂	43.0	0.284	0.740	0.447	0.384	32.70	504
ABC31H-4	0.646	6.676	-423	LH ₂	30.0	0.296	0.760	0.458	0.389	22.91	2000*
ABC38H-5	0.631	6.747	-423	LH ₂	43.0	0.342	0.875	0.542	0.391	35.61	315

* Specimens Marked and Failed after Indicated Number of Cycles.
Flaw Information after Indicated Number of Cycles Given Below.

SPECIMEN	σ_G	σ_f	$2c_f$	$(a/t)_f$	$(a/2c)_f$	K_f
ABC31H-2	20.0	0.310	0.801	0.493	0.387	15.59
ABC31H-4	30.0	0.360	0.930	0.558	0.387	25.33

Table 79: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	$(a/t)_i$	$(a/2c)_i$	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
ABC30R-1A	0.067	6.748	RT	Air	42.0	0.031	0.553	0.462	0.056	15.94	370
ABC39R-3	0.062	6.753	RT	Air	32.0	0.044	0.822	0.706	0.054	14.49	106
ABC39R-2	0.066	6.749	RT	Air	42.0	0.038	0.800	0.579	0.048	16.81	241
ABC39R-4	0.068	6.756	RT	Air	52.0	0.042	0.800	0.622	0.053	22.64	22
ABC48R-5	0.061	6.750	RT	Air	42.0	0.046	0.967	0.758	0.048	19.52	8

Table 80: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
ABC30N-1A	0.068	6.748	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.038	0.610	0.559	0.062	20.40	205
ABC39N-2	0.067	6.759	-320	LN ₂	41.0	0.040	0.747	0.595	0.053	21.04	23
ABC39N-3	0.069	6.756	-320	LN ₂	61.0	0.045	0.830	0.650	0.054	27.60	1
ABC39N-3A	0.065	6.755	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.040	0.795	0.614	0.050	16.51	63
ABC48N-5	0.064	6.751	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.045	0.955	0.704	0.047	22.40	1
ABC35N-1	0.063	6.755	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.037	0.690	0.589	0.054	20.00	50*
ABC38N-2	0.062	6.752	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.044	0.790	0.714	0.056	21.80	2*

* Specimens Milled from 0.625 Inch Thick Plate.

Table 81: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.100 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
ABC40N-1	0.101	6.755	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.040	0.855	0.398	0.047		240
ABC50N-2	0.100	6.754	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.050	1.040	0.501	0.048		75
ABC60N-3	1.101	6.757	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.058	1.240	0.574	0.047		16
ABC65N-6	0.100	6.754	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.066	1.420	0.657	0.047		2
ABC70N-4	0.100	6.758	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.070	1.420	0.700	0.049		1
ABC80N-5	0.100	6.760	-320	LN ₂	51.0	0.075	1.560	0.700	0.048		1

Table 82: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.063 Inch Thick, 2219-T87 Aluminum Base Metal -
Long Grain, $a/2c = .05$, -423 °F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
ABC30H-1	0.065	6.744	-423	LH ₂	49.3	0.029	0.633	0.445	0.046	17.10	398
ABC39H-2	0.068	6.757	-423	LH ₂	40.0	0.043	0.805	0.631	0.053	16.51	162
ABC39H-3	0.065	6.749	-423	LH ₂	50.0	0.050	0.800	0.770	0.063	22.59	8
ABC39H-4	0.067	6.750	-423	LH ₂	55.0	0.045	0.795	0.676	0.057	23.96	5
ABC48H-5	0.068	6.751	-423	LH ₂	50.0	0.047	0.980	0.695	0.048	22.09	4

Table 83: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .30$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
AWC50R-1	1.003	16.005	RT	Air	16.0	0.510	1.630	0.509	0.313	17.84	846
AWC65R-2	1.001	16.011	RT	Air	19.0	0.630	2.090	0.629	0.301	24.22	230
AWC65R-3	0.999	16.007	RT	Air	13.0	0.660	2.080	0.661	0.317	16.21	2095
AWC65R-4	0.995	16.009	RT	Air	16.0	0.634	2.090	0.637	0.303	20.10	420
AWC80R-5	0.997	16.008	RT	Air	16.0	0.765	2.565	0.767	0.298	22.21	203

Table 84: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .30$, -320°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	($a/2c$) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
AWC50N-1	0.988	16.007	-320	LN ₂	21.0	0.500	1.615	0.506	0.310	23.39	416
AWC65N-2	0.988	16.008	-320	LN ₂	13.0	0.640	2.070	0.648	0.309	15.98	3206
AWC65N-3	1.000	16.008	-320	LN ₂	19.0	0.625	2.080	0.625	0.301	23.73	139
AWC65N-4	0.991	16.012	-320	LN ₂	22.0	0.652	2.075	0.658	0.314	27.95	21
AWC80N-5	0.996	16.013	-320	LN ₂	19.0	0.750	2.560	0.753	0.293	26.21	56

Table 85: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
1.00 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .30$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	($a/2c$) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
AWC50H-1	1.003	16.005	-423	LH ₂	17.00	0.482	1.615	0.481	0.299	18.38	1195
AWC65H-2	1.000	16.010	-423	LH ₂	13.00	0.635	2.080	0.635	0.305	15.90	3089
AWC65H-3	0.998	16.012	-423	LH ₂	17.00	0.600	2.080	0.601	0.289	20.73	822
AWC65H-4	1.001	16.008	-423	LH ₂	20.00	0.645	2.080	0.644	0.310	24.86	148
AWC80H-5	1.006	16.010	-423	LH ₂	16.90	0.755	2.550	0.751	0.296	22.92	60

Table 86: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, Room Temperature

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwin's Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
AWC62R-1	0.121	11.985	RT	Air	17.0	0.066	1.285	0.544	0.051	8.79	545
AWC81R-2	0.125	11.992	RT	Air	14.0	0.080	1.680	0.641	0.048	7.87	561
AWC81R-3	0.126	11.998	RT	Air	17.0	0.090	1.689	0.714	0.053	10.25	217
AWC81R-4	0.133	12.000	RT	Air	21.0	0.082	1.630	0.619	0.050	12.41	33
AWC100R-5	0.121	11.999	RT	Air	17.0	0.091	2.060	0.752	0.044	10.35	92

Table 87: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -320 °F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature (°F)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	(a/2c) _i	Irwin's Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
AWC62N-1	0.119	11.810	-320	LN ₂	20.0	0.056	1.275	0.473	0.044	9.55	637
AWC81N-2	0.125	11.850	-320	LN ₂	17.0	0.080	1.630	0.643	0.049	9.56	669
AWC81N-3	0.125	12.000	-320	LN ₂	20.0	0.071	1.643	0.570	0.043	10.75	1072
AWC81N-4	0.124	11.910	-320	LN ₂	25.0	0.077	1.645	0.624	0.047	14.34	12
AWC100N-5	0.126	11.989	-320	LN ₂	20.0	0.098	2.090	0.780	0.047	12.61	11

Table 88: CYCLIC FRACTURE DATA,
0.125 Inch Thick, 2219 Aluminum Weld Metal,
 $a/2c = .05$, -423°F

SPECIMEN			TEST CONDITIONS			CYCLE TEST DATA					
Number	Thickness (in) (t)	Width (in) (w)	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Environment	Gross Section Stress (Ksi) (σ_G)	Initial Flaw Depth (in) a_i	Initial Flaw Length (in) $2c_i$	(a/t) _i	($a/2c$) _i	Irwins Apparent K_i (Ksi $\sqrt{\text{in}}$)	Cycles to Breakthrough
AWC62H-1	0.125	11.990	-423	LH ₂	20.0	0.062	1.280	0.494	0.048	10.06	348
AWC81H-2	0.125	11.996	-423	LH ₂	17.1	0.093	1.630	0.746	0.057	10.29	156
AWC81H-3	0.122	11.998	-423	LH ₂	20.0	0.082	1.630	0.675	0.050	11.56	68
AWC81H-4	0.122	11.990	-423	LH ₂	25.0	0.087	1.680	0.713	0.052	15.30	15
AWC100H-5	0.123	11.988	-423	LH ₂	20.0	0.098	1.980	0.797	0.050	12.65	47

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR FINAL REPORT NASA CR-72606

CONTRACT NAS3-10290

INVESTIGATION OF DEEP FLAWS IN THIN WALL TANKS

The Boeing Company
Seattle, Washington

Report Copies <u>R D</u>	<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
	National Aeronautics & Space Administration Lewis Research Center 21000 Brookpark Road Cleveland, Ohio 44135	
1	Attn: Contracting Officer, MS 500-313	
5	Liquid Rocket Technology Branch, MS 500-209	
1	Technical Report Control Office, MS 5-5	
1	Technology Utilization Office, MS 3-16	
2	AFSC Liaison Office, MS 4-1	
2	Library	
1	Office of Reliability & Quality Assurance, MS 500-111	
1	D. L. Nored, Chief, LRTB, MS 500-209	
3	G. T. Smith Project Manager, MS 500-209	
1	W. F. Brown, MS 105-1	
1	R. H. Kemp, MS 49-1	
1	J. E. Srawley, MS 105-1	
1	J. G. Kennard, MS 3-14	
1	G. T. Smith, MS 500-209	
2	Chief, Liquid Experimental Engineering, RPX Office of Advanced Research & Technology NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	
2	Chief, Liquid Propulsion Technology, RPL Office of Advanced Research & Technology NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	
1	Director, Launch Vehicles & Propulsion, SV Office of Space Science & Applications NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	

<u>Report Copies R D</u>	<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
1	Chief, Environmental Factors & Herodynamics Code RV-1 Office of Advanced Research & Technology NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	
1	Chief, Space Vehicles Structures Office of Advanced Research & Technology NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	
1	Director, Advanced Manned Missions, MT Office of Manned Space Flight NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	
6	NASA Scientific & Technical Information Facility P.O. Box 33 College Park, Maryland 20740	
1	Director, Technology Utilization Division Office of Technology Utilization NASA Headquarters Washington, D.C. 20546	
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration Ames Research Center Moffett Field, California 94035 Attn: Library	
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration Flight Research Center P.O. Box 273 Edwards, California 93523 Attn: Library	
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration Goddard Space Flight Center Greenbelt, Maryland 20771 Attn: Library	

Report Copies <u>R D</u>	<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration John F. Kennedy Space Center Cocoa Beach, Florida 32931 Attn: Library	
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration Langley Research Center Langley Station Hampton, Virginia 23365 Attn: Library	
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration Manned Spacecraft Center Houston, Texas 77001 Attn: Library	
1	National Aeronautics & Space Administration George C. Marshall Space Flight Center Huntsville, Alabama 35812 Attn: Library	
1 1	Jet Propulsion Laboratory 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, California 91103 Attn: Library	R. Boundy
1	Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Building 5 5010 Duke Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314 Attn: TISIA	
1	Office of the Director of Defense Research & Engineering Washington, D.C. 20301 Attn: Office of Asst. Dir. (Chem. Technology)	
1	RID (RINP) Bolling Air Force Base Washington, D.C. 20332	

Report
Copies
R D

Recipient

Designee

1	Arnold Engineering Development Center Air Force Systems Command Tullahoma, Tennessee 37389 Attn: Library	
1	Advanced Research Projects Agency Washington, D.C. 20525 Attn: Library	
1	Aeronautical Systems Division Air Force Systems Command Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio Attn: Library	
1	Air Force Missile Test Center Patrick Air Force Base, Florida Attn: Library	
1	Air Force Systems Command Andrews Air Force Base Washington, D.C. 20332 Attn: Library	
1	Air Force FTC (FTAT-2) Edwards Air Force Base, California 93523 Attn: Library	
1	Air Force Office of Scientific Research Washington, D.C. 20333 Attn: Library	SREP, Dr. J.F. Mast
1	Space & Missile Systems Organization Air Force Unit Post Office Los Angeles, California 90045	
1	U. S. Air Force Washington, D.C. Attn: Library	

Report Copies <u>R D</u>	<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
1	U. S. Army Missile Command Redstone Scientific Information Center Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35808 Attn: Document Section	
1	Bureau of Naval Weapons Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. Attn: Library	
1	Commander U. S. Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93557 Attn: Library	
1 1	Director (Code 6180) U. S. Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20390 Attn: Library	J. M. Krafft
1	Picatinny Arsenal Dover, New Jersey 07801 Attn: Library	
1	Aerojet-General Corporation P.O. Box 296 Azusa, California 91703 Attn: Library	
1	Aerojet-General Corporation 9200 East Flair Drive El Monte, California 91734 Attn: Library	
1	Aerojet-General Corporation 11711 South Woodruff Avenue Downey, California 90241 Attn: Library	
1 1	Aerojet-General Corporation P.O. Box 15847 Sacramento, California 95803 Attn: Technical Library 2484-2015A	C. E. Hartbower

Report
Copies
R D

Recipient

Designee

1	Aeronutronic Division of Philco Ford Corp. Ford Road Newport Beach, California 92663 Attn: Technical Information Department	
1	Aerospace Corporation 2400 E. El Segundo Blvd. Los Angeles, California 90045 Attn: Library-Documents	
1	ARO, Incorporated Arnold Engineering Development Center Arnold AF Station, Tennessee 37389 Attn: Library	
1	Battelle Memorial Institute 505 King Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43201 Attn: Report Library, Room 6A	
1	Beech Aircraft Corporation Boulder Facility Box 631 Boulder, Colorado Attn: Library	
1 1	Bell Aerosystems, Inc. Box 1 Buffalo, New York 14205 Attn: Library	T. Reinhardt
1 1	Boeing Company Space Division P.O. Box 868 Seattle, Washington 98124 Attn: Library	C. F. Tiffany
1	Boeing Company P.O. Box 1680 Huntsville, Alabama 35801	

Report Copies		<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
<u>R</u>	<u>D</u>		
1	1	IIT Research Institute	C. K. Hersh
	1	Technology Center	K. E. Hofer
		Chicago, Illinois 60616	
		Attn: Library	
1		Ling-Temco-Vought Corporation	
		P. O. Box 5907	
		Dallas, Texas 75222	
		Attn: Library	
1		Lockheed Missiles and Space Company	
		P.O. Box 504	
		Sunnyvale, California 94087	
		Attn: Library	
1		Lockheed-California Company	
		10445 Glen Oaks Blvd.,	
		Pacoima, California	
		Attn: Library	
1		Lockheed Propulsion Company	
		P.O. Box 111	
		Redlands, California 92374	
		Attn: Library, Thackwell	
1		Marquardt Corporation	
		16555 Saticoy Street	
		Box 2013 - South Annex	
		Van Nuys, California 91409	
1	1	Martin-Marietta Corporation (Baltimore Division)	J. Calathes
		Baltimore, Maryland 21203	
		Attn: Library	
1	1	Denver Division	R. D. Keys
	1	Martin-Marietta Corporation	F. R. Schwartzberg
		P.O. Box 179	
		Denver, Colorado 80201	
		Attn: Library	

Report Copies		<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
R	D		
1	1	Chemical Propulsion Information Agency Applied Physics Laboratory 8621 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	T. Reedy
1		Chrysler Corporation Space Division New Orleans, Louisiana Attn: Librarian	
1	1	Syracuse University Research Institute Department of Metalurgy Syracuse, New York	V. Walss
1		Curtiss-Wright Corporation Wright Aeronautical Division Attn: Library	
1	1	General Dynamics/Convair P.O. Box 1128 San Diego, California 92112 Attn: Library	W. Witzel J. Christian
1		Missiles and Space Systems Center General Electric Company Valley Forge Space Technology Center P.O. Box 855 Philadelphia, Pa. 190101 Attn: Library	
1		Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation Bethpage, Long Island, New York Attn: Library	
1		Hercules Powder Company Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory P.O. Box 210 Cumberland, Maryland 21501 Attn: Library	

Report Copies			
<u>R</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
1	1	Western Division	R. Rawe
	1	McDonnell Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc. 3000 Ocean Park Blvd. Santa Monica, California 90406 Attn: Library	B. V. Whiteson
	1	McDonnell Douglas Aircraft Corporation P.O. Box 516 Lambert Field, Missouri 63166 Attn: Library	
	1	Rocketdyne Division North American Rockwell Inc. 6633 Canoga Avenue Canoga Park, California 9134 Attn: Library, Department 596-306	
	1	Space & Information Systems Division North American Rockwell 12214 Lakewood Blvd. Downey, California Attn: Library	
	1	Northrop Space Laboratories 3401 West Broadway Hawthorne, California Attn: Library	
	1	Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana 47907 Attn: Library (Technical)	
	1	Rocket Research Corporation Willow Road at 116th Street Redmond, Washington 98052 Attn: Library	
	1	Stanford Research Institute 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, California 94025 Attn: Library	

Report
Copies
R D

Recipient

Designee

1	TRW Systems Inc. 1 Space Park Redondo Beach, California 90278 Attn: STL Tech. Lib. Doc. Acquisitions	
1	TRW Incorporated 23555 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44117	E.A. Steigerwald
1	United Aircraft Corporation United Technology Center P.O. Box 358 Sunnyvale, California 94038 Attn: Library	
1	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433 Attn: AFML (MAAE)	
1	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433 Attn: AFML (MAAM)	
1	Department of the Army U.S. Army Material Command Washington, D.C. 20315 Attn: AMCRD-RC	
1	Commander U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 Attn: Library	
1	Commanding Officer U.S. Naval Weapons Laboratory Dehlgren, Virginia 22448 Attn: Technical Library	
1 1	Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80521 Attn: Library	F. W. Smith

Report Copies		<u>Recipient</u>	<u>Designee</u>
<u>R</u>	<u>D</u>		
1	1	Brown University Providence, R. I. 02912 Attn: Library	J. R. Rice
1		California Institute of Technology 1201 E. California Blvd. Pasadena, California Attn: Security Officer	
1	1	General Electric Company Apollo Support Department P.O. Box 2500 Daytona Beach, Florida 32015 Attn: Library	C. Day
1	1	Carnegie Institute of Technology Department of Civil Engineering Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Attn: Library	R. B. Anderson
1	1	Frankford Arsenal Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19137 Attn: 1320, Library	C. Carman
1	1	Cornell University Department of Materials Science & Engineering Ithaca, New York 14850 Attn: Library	H. H. Johnson
1		Director Special Projects Office Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360	
1	1	Sandia Corporation P.O. Box 969 Livermore, California 94550 Attn: Technical Library	H. Lucas
1	1	Sandia Corporation	H. E. Montgomery
	1	Sandia Base	B. R. Allen
	1	Albuquerque, New Mexico Attn: Library	W. Herrmann

Report
Copies
R D

Recipient

Designee

1 1

Brunswick Corporation
Defense Products Division
P.O. Box 4594
43000 Industrial Avenue
Lincoln, Nebraska
Attn: Library

J. Carter

1 1

General Dynamics
P.O. Box 748
Fort Worth, Texas 76101
Attn: Library

D.E. Westerheide

1 1

Institution of Aerospace Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto 5, Ontario
Attn: Library

Dr. I.I. Glass