SAN097-0464C
SAND--97-0464C

CONF-970707--1

RECEIVED

JUL 30 1997

OSTI

ELASTIC SHOCK RESPONSE AND SPALL STRENGTH OF CONCRETE

Marlin E. Kipp, Lalit C. Chhabildas and William D. Reinhart

*Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, USA, 87185-0820**

Impact experiments have been performed to obtain shock compression, release response, and spall strength of two scaled concrete formulations. Wave profiles from a suite of ten experiments, with shock amplitudes of 0.08 to 0.55 GPa, focus primarily on the elastic regime. Despite considerable wave structure that develops as the shock transits these heterogeneous targets, consistent pullback signals were identified in the release profiles, indicating a spall strength of about 30 MPa. Explicit modeling of the concrete aggregate structure in numerical simulations provides insight into the particle velocity records.

INTRODUCTION

Concrete is a material for which it is desirable to have a comprehensive shock response database in order to assess both local and structural response to projectile impact and explosive loading. The wide range of shock amplitudes that accompany the divergence of a shock from its source requires the acquisition of data over a full spectrum of shock and fracture behavior. The presence of interfaces in the vicinity of shock sources can induce internal fracture (spall) of the material; in addition, shear failure may also occur during propagation of the compressive shock wave.

In this study of two concrete materials with small scale aggregate, gas gun impact experiments are used to obtain Hugoniot data at pressures in the elastic regime. These data are consistent with existing impact data at higher pressure amplitudes. Spall measurements obtained from these low pressure experiments, under the confinement of uniaxial strain, provide insight into one aspect of the fracture response of these two concrete formulations.

In addition, numerical simulations of the impact experiments are reported in which the heterogeneous structure of the concrete is explicitly modeled.

CONCRETE DESCRIPTION

The two concrete formulations considered in the present study - 'SAC-5' and 'CSPC' - differ primarily in the nature of the aggregate (1,2). SAC-5 has a pea gravel and CSPC has an angular gravel, with maximum dimensions of about 10 mm in both cases, constituting about a 40-45% volume fraction of the concrete, and the rest grout. The SAC-5 concrete has a nominal density of 2260 kg/m³ and an ultrasonic longitudinal velocity of 5060 m/s; the CSPC concrete has a density of 2290 kg/m³ and an ultrasonic longitudinal velocity of 5200 m/s. These properties are similar to those of a full scale aggregate concrete (3).

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIGURATION

The present plate impact configuration consisted of a projectile launched in a 64 mm light gas gun. The projectile was faced with carbon foam ($\rho = 0.2 \text{ g/cm}^3$) and a flat polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) impactor. The PMMA impactor plates had thicknesses of approximately 4.5 mm and 9.5 mm, and a diameter of 57 mm. The PMMA impacts directly onto the concrete sample, 12.7 mm thick. Velocity interferometric techniques, VISAR, were used to monitor the velocity of the concrete rear surface. A thin (10 μm) aluminum foil on the rear surface of the concrete ensured that local surface roughness did not impair the veloc-

* Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

DISCLAIMER

**Portions of this document may be illegible
in electronic image products. Images are
produced from the best available original
document.**

ity measurement. The dispersive nature of heterogeneous materials, however, gives rise to non-unique velocity records whose individual character depends upon the location of the monitoring position. Nevertheless, there will be an average shock response that prevails for the bulk behavior of the material.

For the majority of these experiments, the rear surface of the concrete remained free; in two of the experiments, the concrete was backed with a PMMA window to alter the magnitude of the pullback signal relative to the main shock amplitude, providing a complementary measure of the spall strength.

DATA SUMMARY

The PMMA plate impactor velocities in this series were in the range of 30 to 220 m/s, resulting in compressive stresses of ~ 80 to 500 MPa in the concrete (Table 1). The wave profiles for all ten experiments are shown in Fig. 1a (CSPC) and 1b (SAC-5). Shock rise time rates are nearly uniform across all the experiments; larger amplitudes have correspondingly longer rise times.

Stress and particle velocity must be continuous at the impact interface. Consequently, estimates for the stress, the particle velocity and the shock velocity can be made utilizing the PMMA impact velocity, free-surface particle-velocity measurements and the PMMA equation of state (4) (Table 1). These shock velocity vs. particle velocity data are plotted in Fig. 2, labelled "Elastic", and are seen to be consistent with existing data for this concrete taken at higher pressure levels (1,2). The corresponding Hugoniot stress vs.

FIGURE 1. Particle velocity profiles for CSPC (a) and SAC-5 (b) concrete experiments.

particle velocity are plotted in Fig. 3, and are seen to be consistent with the elastic modulus expected based on the concrete longitudinal velocity (dashed line).

TABLE 1. Summary and Results of Impact Conditions.

Shot	Concrete Type	Target Thickness (mm)	Impactor Thickness (mm)	Impact Velocity (m/s)	Shock Velocity (m/s)	Hugoniot Stress (MPa)	Strain (u_p/U_s) (cm/cm)	Spall Stress (MPa)
CS1	CSPC	12.743	9.469	220	3561	553	0.0191	23
CS2	CSPC	12.750	9.437	107	3352	260	0.0101	29
CS3	CSPC	12.746	9.535	62	3201	148	0.0063	41
CS4	SAC-5	12.753	9.528	62	3299	149	0.0060	15
CS5	CSPC	12.753	4.427	66	4334	173	0.0040	29
CS6	SAC-5	12.761	4.404	62	3776	155	0.0048	35
CS7	SAC-5	12.730	4.402	32	3690	80	0.0026	29
CS8	CSPC	12.753	4.553	32	5021	87	0.0015	32
CS9	CSPC/Win	12.743	4.630	62	4334	173	0.0040	20
CS10	SAC-5/Win	12.741	4.460	62	3776	155	0.0048	32

FIGURE 2. Shock velocity vs. particle velocity for these experiments ("Elastic", labelled LCC) and existing data at higher pressures (Grady, (1,2) labelled DEG).

FIGURE 3. Hugoniot stress vs. particle velocity for these experiments ("Elastic") and existing data at higher pressures (1,2).

The results for both SAC-5 and CSPC concretes are included in these figures.

Tensile states form within this heterogeneous material when the release waves from the rear projectile surface and target rear surface interact. When the material tensile limit is exceeded, the signal is transmitted to the monitoring surface, where the change in particle velocity ("pullback") indicates the amplitude of the stress level at which fracture occurred (5,6):

$$\sigma_{spall} = \frac{1}{2} \rho c u_{pb}$$

where ρc is the material impedance, and u_{pb} is the pullback velocity for free surface conditions (cf, Fig. 1a). Although the most accurate means of determining the fracture amplitude is to iterate with a one-dimensional shock wave code, so that decay of the signal from the fractured region to the diagnostic sur-

face can be included in the analysis, the current heterogeneity invests the wave profile with sufficient noise as to make such an approach impractical.

Impedance differences between the aggregate and the matrix (grout) result in the development of considerable wave structure as the shock transits the target. Despite the large scale heterogeneous composition of the concrete, consistent pullback signals were identified in the release profiles. It was also determined that attenuation effects in the release waves that define the pullback signal were minimal: when the PMMA impactor thickness was reduced from 9.5 mm to 4.5 mm, thereby changing the location of the fracture region in the sample, no alterations appeared in the particle velocity pullback record.

The spall strength of the concrete for each experiment is listed in Table 1 and plotted as a function of impact Hugoniot stress in Fig. 4. Within the elastic re-

FIGURE 4. Spall stress as a function of Hugoniot stress for these experiments.

gime, there is some scatter at the lower amplitudes of impact stress, but in general the spall strength appears to be rather constant. The low magnitudes of the fracture stress suggest that the failure is being dominated by the grout or interface bonds, since quartz has a much larger failure stress.

NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

The high pressure Hugoniot data included in Figs. 2 and 3 have been utilized in a continuum concrete model developed by Silling (7). The present elastic impact results have motivated numerical simulations in which the target is modeled with explicit aggregate in a grout matrix. An estimated size distribution is used to characterize the dimensions of the aggregate. The position and orientation of each ag-

gregate particle (ellipsoid) is located randomly within a cylindrical envelope that defines the target sample. Similar techniques have been used to define explicit granular structures to explore hot spot formation in explosives (8), and have also been discussed by Amieur, et al (9).

The Eulerian shock-wave propagation code, CTH (10), was used for the simulations. A uniform resolution of 0.2 mm in all three dimensions allowed for about 60 cells through the target thickness. The constituent materials were modeled with a Mie-Gruneisen equation of state and elastic perfectly plastic deviatoric behavior (Table 2).

TABLE 2. Material Constants for CTH Simulations.

Property / Material	Quartz	Grout
Density, ρ_0 (kg/m ³)	2650	2000
Bulk Sound Speed, C_0 (m/s)	3760	2320
Slope of $U_s - U_p$ Hugoniot, s	1.83	1.68
Gruneisen Coefficient, γ_0	1.0	1.0
Specific Heat, C_v (J/kg-K)	86	86
Yield Stress, Y_0 (GPa)	3.1	0.5
Poisson Ratio, ν	0.18	0.22
Fracture Stress, σ_f (MPa)	500	30

Velocity histories at several spatial locations on the rear surface for the CS6 geometry, obtained from a simulation, are plotted in Fig. 5, and compared with the data. The dispersion and scatter created by the heterogeneous structure of the concrete target is apparent in these records.

FIGURE 5. Numerical simulations of rear surface particle velocity histories compared with experimental data (CS6).

CONCLUSIONS

The Hugoniot and spall stress have been measured in the elastic regime for two scaled concrete materials. Despite considerable wave structure attributed to the heterogeneous nature of the concrete, the spall amplitudes are quite reproducible, and of nearly constant magnitude over this pressure range. These low pressure shock data are consistent with existing data on these concrete formulations at higher amplitudes. In order to compare with full scale concrete, much larger samples will be required. The current studies were of fully supported shock waves introduced into the concrete. Pulse attenuation studies would also be appropriate to pursue for these materials, to determine how the heterogeneous nature of the concrete influences the decay of the shock. Such data would be important in the simulation of diverging waves in concrete due to projectile impact or explosive loading. It is anticipated that these records will provide additional basis for continued development of damage models for concrete failure.

REFERENCES

- [1] Grady, D. E., "Shock and Release Data for SAC-5 Concrete to 25 GPa", Sandia National Laboratories Technical Memorandum - TMDG0595, October 1995.
- [2] Grady, D. E., "Dynamic Decompression Properties of Concrete From Hugoniot States - 3 to 25 GPa", Sandia National Laboratories Technical Memorandum - TMDG0396, February 1996.
- [3] Read, H. E. and Maiden, C. J., "The dynamic Behavior of Concrete", Systems, Science and Software Topical Report 3SR-707, August 1971.
- [4] Barker, L. M. and Hollenbach, R. E., *J. Appl. Phys.*, **41**, 4208-4226 (1970).
- [5] Chhabildas, L. C., Barker, L. M., Asay, J. R., and Trucano, T. G., "Spall Strength Measurements on Shock-Loaded Refractory Metals", Shock Compression of Condensed Matter - 1989, Ed. S. C. Schmidt, J. N. Johnson, and L. W. Davison, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 429-432 (1990).
- [6] Romanchenko, V. I. and Stepanov, G. V., *Zh. Prikl. Mekh. Tekh. Fiz.*, **4**, 142-147 (1980).
- [7] Silling, S. A., "Brittle Failure Kinetics Model for Concrete", in Proceedings of the 1997 ASME Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference, July 27-31, 1997, Orlando, FL.
- [8] Baer, M. R., Personal communication, July 1997.
- [9] Amieur, M., Hazanov, S., and Huet, C., in "Micromechanics of Concrete and Cementitious Composites", Ed. C. Huet, 181-202, 1993 Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes, Lausanne.
- [10] McGlaun, J. M., Thompson, S. L., and Elrick, M. G., *Int. J. Impact Engng.*, **10**, 351-360 (1990).