A corrosion resistant fiberglass reinforced plastic (FRP), earth-covered, ammunition storage magazine was developed to provide an alternative to the steel and concrete materials presently used. Conceptual designs were investigated, materials were selected, and a final design was developed in sufficient detail for construction of a prototype structure. Methods for manufacture, shipping, and field erection were also established along with comparative construction cost data. (continued)
20. ABSTRACT (continued).

Adequacy of the developed FRP magazine design was determined by finite element analyses. Soil load distribution equations were derived and the MRI STARDYNE computer code was extensively employed with increasingly detailed structural models of the FRP magazine.

An FRP earth-covered, ammunition storage magazine is shown to be feasible and highly competitive with present construction materials. Construction of a prototype structure is recommended.
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CONVERSION FACTORS, INCH-POUND TO METRIC (SI) UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

Inch-pound units of measurement used in this report can be converted to metric (SI) units as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>To Obtain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feet</td>
<td>0.3048</td>
<td>metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inches</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>millimetres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inch-pounds</td>
<td>0.1129848</td>
<td>metre-newtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pounds (force)</td>
<td>4.448222</td>
<td>newtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pounds (force) per square inch</td>
<td>6.894757</td>
<td>kilonewtons per square metre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Maintenance and construction costs of ammunition storage magazines have steadily increased. These cost increases, and recent advances in construction materials, have indicated the need to study the feasibility of fiberglass reinforced plastic (FRP) as an alternate to the steel and concrete structures that are presently used.

Fiberglass reinforced structural plastics are being successfully employed in primary structural applications such as (Reference 1):

a) Boats and ships up to 80 ft. long.
b) Sewage tank domes up to 110 ft. diameter.
c) Tanks up to 100,000 gallon capacity.
d) Molded shell-roofed vacation houses.
e) Automobile and truck bodies.
f) Cargo containers for ocean, rail and truck shipment.
g) Large diameter buried piping.
h) Radomes and antennas.

1.2 OBJECTIVE

The objective of this study is to develop feasibility data and establish a design for a fiberglass-reinforced plastic (FRP) earth-covered ammunition storage magazine so as to provide designers with an added materials option.

1.3 SCOPE

The scope of the study performed may be summarized as follows:

a) Performance of a literature search and canvass of industrial and DOD organizations to document recommended practices for the design, manufacture and installation of fiberglass-reinforced plastic structures.

b) Determinations of:

- structural material, best chemical composition,
- proper fabrication and assembly procedures,
- best component fastener and waterproofing systems,
- maintenance requirements for various environmental conditions and compatibility with various explosives.
- cost and other data needed to determine the feasibility of constructing such fiberglass reinforced plastic, earth-covered structures.

c) Development of several conceptual designs for an earth-covered ammunition storage magazine, using the present steel oval arch structure shown in figure 1.1 for definition of storage space requirements and soil cover depth required for blast protection.

d) Development of a final design, along with construction cost data, of the most promising concept in sufficient detail for the construction of a prototype structure.
CHAPTER 2
DOCUMENTED PRACTICES

A literature search and canvass of industrial and DOD organizations was made in order to compile currently available practices for the design, manufacture and installation of fiberglass-reinforced plastic structures. During this effort, a computer literature search was conducted of the NTIS and COMPENDEX data bases.

A compilation of selected pertinent current practices and other guidance materials is listed in Table 1.

Technology and criteria provided by these documents were employed in the development of a fiberglass-reinforced plastic earth-covered ammunition storage magazine as described in later chapters of this report.
TABLE 1

COMPILED PRACTICES AND OTHER GUIDANCE MATERIALS


B. "Hand Lay-up Spray-up Guide"; 1979; Publication No. 5-PL-9342 Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp. Toledo, OH.


D. B. Jay Schrock; "Installation of Fiberglass Pipe"; Nov. 1978; Pages 835-846; Transportation Engineering Journal, ASCE, N.Y., N.Y.


F. "Frp—An Introduction to Fiberglass-Reinforced Plastics Composites" Publication No. 1-PL-6305A by Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. Toledo, OH.


3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

Isophthalic polyester resin was selected as the most suitable plastic for this application, based on collected data and the recommendations of FRP material suppliers. Considered major advantages of this resin may be listed as:

a) Adequate strength at reasonable cost.
b) Demonstrated corrosion resistance in various soils and chemical environments.
c) Wide usage and availability.

Commercially available isophthalic polyester resins have been developed for use in a wide variety of soils encountered nationally and internationally. This resin has been used successfully for approximately 20 years in many applications of large diameter buried pipe and underground storage tanks.

Polyester resin systems are most common for general product applications. Increased mechanical properties obtainable with other resins (e.g. epoxy) are not commensurate with the higher cost of the laminate.

Fiberglass pipe is competitive with many conventional pipe materials on an as-installed basis and is considerably lower in cost than other engineering materials offering equivalent corrosion resistance and service life (Reference 2).

Only polyester resin is specified for underground storage tanks of glass fiber reinforced plastic in MIL Spec. MIL-T-5277A.

The National Bureau of Standards specification NBS-PS-15-69 has been adopted by industry to guarantee consistent quality of custom contact molded reinforced polyester process equipment.

Over 40,000 UL-listed Fiberglass (Owens Corning) fuel tanks are in service in every state from Maine to Hawaii.
Suitability of polyester resins for use in various soils and chemical environments is well-documented (Reference 3).

Balsa wood core material was selected for FRP panels of sandwich construction. Balsa was selected as the most suitable sandwich panel core material (over e.g. plastic foams, and honey-combs) for the following major reasons:

a) High available strength at minimum cost.
b) Maintenance of mechanical properties over a broad temperature range.
c) Wide usage and availability.

The forms of commercially available fiberglass reinforcement selected for the polyester resin were woven roving, mat and chopped fibers. Use of fiberglass cloth was not considered suitable because of its higher relative cost.

3.2 PROPERTIES

Typical strengths of fiberglass reinforced polyester resin laminates are listed in Table 2.

Typical strengths of Balsa FRP sandwich core material are listed in Table 3.
## TABLE - 2

**TYPICAL STRENGTH PROPERTIES OF AROPOL 7241 TYPE LAMINATES AT ROOM TEMPERATURE**

(Provided by Ashland Chemical Co., Resins and Plastics Div., Columbus, Ohio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Glass</th>
<th>1/3&quot;</th>
<th>1/4&quot;</th>
<th>ASTM TEST METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Strength, psi</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>D638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Modulus x 10^6, psi</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>D638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Elongation, %</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>D638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Strength, psi</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>D790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Modulus x 10^6, psi</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>D790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Strength, psi</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>D695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 3

**Physical Properties of Balsa FRP Sandwich Core**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Specific Gravity</th>
<th>0.962</th>
<th>1.28</th>
<th>1.76</th>
<th>2.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compressive Strength (lbs./sq.in.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Parallel to grain (end grain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stress at proportional limit</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximum at crushing strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modulus</td>
<td></td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>768,000</td>
<td>1,164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Perpendicular to grain (flat grain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stress at proportional limit</td>
<td>High strength</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modulus</td>
<td>High strength</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>19,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bending Strength (lbs./sq. in.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static bending</td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>2,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stress at proportional limit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>4,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modulus of rupture</td>
<td></td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modulus of elasticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tensile Strength (lbs./sq. in.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Parallel to grain (end grain)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>4,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Perpendicular to grain (flat grain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximum high strength value</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toughness (inch pound per specimen)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shear (lbs./sq. in.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hardness (lbs.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load required to embed a 0.444&quot; ball to</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one half its diameter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Parallel to grain (end grain)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Perpendicular to grain (flat grain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleavage (lbs./sq. in. of width)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load to cause splitting</td>
<td>High strength</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient of Linear Expansion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangential</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.60 x 10^-4 (0.00000860)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radial</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.92 x 10^-4 (0.00000692)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.99 x 10^-4 (0.00000199)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Provided by Baltek Corp., Northvale, NJ)
CHAPTER 4
CONCEPTUAL DESIGN STUDIES

4.1 ARCH

An intensive design review was made of the present corrugated steel plate oval arch and concrete slab magazine configuration shown in Figure 1.1. Retention of the concrete floor slab and arch foundations was considered to be most cost effective with corrosion protection provided by presently specified drains and barriers.

An FRP semi-circular arch configuration was selected to replace the present magazine multi-radius, steel oval-arch section. This configuration was selected because of its high efficiency in resisting the external pressure applied by the earth embankment which is placed over the magazine for blast protection.

The semi-circular arch section is formed by two equal arc length FRP panels extending from the footings to the top center of the arch. This arrangement provides the following considered advantages:

a. All panels are identical and can be manufactured from one basic mold.
b. Field assembly labor is minimized because only one circumferential panel joint is employed per panel.
c. Individual panel size and configuration permit ready shipment by truck, rail, air or water.

An arch radius of 15 feet was established because it provides a magazine internal volume approximately equal to that of the present design. A magazine internal volume comparison is shown in Figure 4.1.

Because the modulus of elasticity of FRP is generally lower than that of steel, various FRP panel cross sections with increased moments of inertia were investigated to insure stability of the 30 foot span arch. Several of the semi-circular arch panel cross section conceptual designs developed for subsequent cost evaluation are shown in Figure 4.2.

4.2 END WALLS

The present steel arch magazine employs reinforced concrete end
walls at the entrance and rear. As shown in Figure 4.3, the concrete rear wall is earth-covered and its top edge is formed to match the radii of the steel oval arch. As shown in Figure 4.4, the entrance end wall extends above the steel oval arch and retains the end of the earth embankment over the arch. The entrance wall also includes wing walls for the sloped embankment portions at both sides of the steel oval arch.

Several end wall conceptual designs employing FRP panels were developed for subsequent evaluation. These design concepts are shown in Figure 4.5.

Two conceptual designs (flexible and rigid) were developed for the connection between the FRP end walls and adjacent arch panel edges as shown in Figures 4.6 and 4.7. The flexible connection design employed a standard roof expansion joint (recommended by Johns Manville Corp.) and an FRP protective cover as shown in Figure 4.6. The flexible sealing strip and installation clearance dimensions shown permit relative motion between the arch panels and end walls during and after placement of the earth embankment over the magazine. The edge sealing strip would be adhesive bonded to the magazine end walls and arch panels. Tape would be used to hold the edge sealing strip in place during curing of the adhesive.

The rigid connection design consists basically of an adhesive filled socket as shown in Figure 4.7.
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CHAPTER 5
FRP MAGAZINE DESIGN

5.1 CONFIGURATION

The FRP magazine configuration developed as an alternative to the specified present steel oval arch structure is shown in Figure 5.1. The magazine is constructed completely of FRP panels except for the internal concrete floor slab and arch foundations.

Site preparation, concrete floor slab, arch foundations, drains, capillary water barrier, subgrade and vapor barrier requirements would be similar to those presently specified on OCE drawing no. 33-15-73.

5.2 ARCH

The selected FRP semi-circular arch panel design has the squared-vee cross-section as shown in Figure 4.2, sheet 2. The panel consists of solid FRP at the top and bottom horizontal portions of the vee, and balsa core FRP sandwich construction on the inclined portions.

The panel vee cross section was selected over the other concepts developed because it was considered to offer the following advantages:

a. Efficient use of material.
b. Minimal required manufacturing labor and forms.
c. High nestability for reduced shipping volume.
d. Symmetrical cross section efficient in bending.
e. Minimal reduction of magazine useful internal volume.

These 90 degree arc length by 7' feet wide panels permit magazine construction to required lengths by continued placement and attachment of adjacent panels. Details of these panels are shown in Figure 5.2.

To achieve increased inherent stability of the arch, the lower ends of the panels are grouted at the foundations.

The connection between adjacent circumferential edges of the FRP magazine semi-circular arch panels is shown in Figure 5.3. During field erection, structural adhesive/sealant would be applied to panel edges.
and then FRP wedge blocks would be driven over the edges as shown (approx. 6" apart) to maintain panel alignment during curing of the adhesive/sealant. The wedge blocks and adhesive/sealant would be applied by workers standing on portable staging located on the magazine floor slab.

The top connection between adjacent pairs of semi-circular arch panels is shown in Figure 5.4. This panel end joint design employs a socket molded into one end of the panel as shown in Figure 5.5. During field erection, the straight panel ends would simply be inserted and adhesive bonded within the opposite panel socket ends. Major features of this connection are: its effective utilization of adhesive lap shear strength; direct load paths and minimal required field assembly labor. Similar adhesive bonded socket joints are successfully employed on standard FRP underground units such as piping and prefabricated manhole panels.

The rigid connection between the FRP end walls and adjacent arch panel edges as shown in Figure 4.7 was selected over the alternate flexible design concept, after subsequent detailed analysis, because of its considered superior reliability.

5.3 REAR WALL

The design of the FRP magazine rear wall is shown in Figure 5.6. This wall consists of vertical vee panels similar in cross section to the semi-circular arch panels. The top ends of these vertical panels extend approximately 12" above the semi-circular arch panels. The vertical panels are designed for the lateral soil pressure exerted by the embankment. They are supported horizontally by the edge of the floor slab and by the earth embankment annulus beyond the outer edge of the arch panels. Manually tamped cohesionless back fill would be located at the outer edge of the panels as shown. The complete wall would be formed by placement of adjacent vertical panel sections. Edges of adjacent panels would be adhesive-bonded as the arch panels. The bottom of the wall would
be grouted into the floor slab.

5.4 ENTRANCE AND WING WALLS

The design of the FRP magazine entrance end wall and wing walls is shown in Figure 5.7. They are designed as solid face crib walls and are formed by FRP panels. The front and rear header wall panels are designed to resist lateral pressures developed in the crib when filled with soil prior to construction of the magazine embankment. The FRP front-to-back tie plates (stretcher panels) are designed for the tensile loading produced by lateral earth pressure acting on opposite header panels. A factor of safety of 1.5 on the stability of this gravity type retaining wall is obtained by spacing the front and rear header panels at a minimum horizontal distance equal to one half the height of the retained soil. The front and rear header panels are of FRP sandwich construction with a 30" span between flange stiffeners as shown in Fig. 5.7, sheet 3. The tie plates would be installed and adhesive bonded between adjacent header panel flanges. Bolts would be installed through the tie plate ends and header panel flanges to permit ready field erection and to maintain panel alignment during curing of the structural adhesive. Subsequent corrosion and loss of the steel bolts would be unimportant because, the structural adhesive would provide necessary strength. Cohesionless fill would be placed within the crib to permit drainage and to provide desired high friction and shear strength. The fill placed within the crib would also form a portion of the required magazine earth embankment. Considered advantages of this design may be listed:

- Effective utilization of materials.
- Present wing wall reinforced concrete footings are not req'd.
- Minimal required shipping volume.

Additional security protection can be easily provided in the FRP magazine entrance end wall, when necessary, by placement of expanded metal grating within the panel during molding.

Relative disadvantages of the alternative FRP end wall design
The FRP magazine entrance door, with a required minimum clear opening of 8' X 9'-6" high is considered to be a commercially available, fiberglass, sectional, vertically opening door assembly as illustrated by Figure 5.8. When required, the present magazine design steel door and reinforced concrete framing can be easily incorporated in the FRP magazine entrance end wall. In the event that the present reinforced concrete end walls are required at certain magazine locations, FRP arch panel edge connections can be made as shown in Figure 5.9. These connection details are similar to those indicated on Sheet 4 of Dept. of the Army drawing 33-15-73.

5.5 PANEL JOINT ADHESIVES AND SEALANTS

FRP panel joint structural adhesives and sealants selected are considered to be: cost effective, proven, and suitable for field usage on large FRP panels.

3M Co. number 5200 Scotch Seal marine bedding sealant has been selected for the arch panel/foundation joints; arch panel circumferential edge joints, and general usage. This one-part sealant forms a rubbery, extremely strong, waterproof seal. It is non-shrinking,
and is commonly used for the manufacture and maintenance of FRP boats.

H.B. Fuller Co. FRP reactive adhesive was selected for the higher stressed joints such as the arch panel edge/end wall connection, adjacent FRP panel joints in the end walls, and at the arch panel top end flanged socket joints. Major advantages of this two part product are that it is among the toughest structural adhesives and it requires no mixing in the field, because the activator is applied to one mating part and the base adhesive is applied to the opposite mating part.

5.6 MANUFACTURING METHODS

Considering low to medium volume production rates (less than 25, sixty feet long magazines per year), hand lay-up and spray-up FRP manufacturing methods would be most applicable. These methods (described in Ref. 4) are commonly used for production of large, high strength parts. Associated tooling costs are relatively low and these contact molding methods are widely used and proven.

Panels produced by more automated methods such as compression molding with steel dies would not be economically feasible until panel production quantities of approximately 500, sixty feet long magazines per year are required.

5.7 PACKING AND SHIPPING

Maximum FRP panel sizes were established to minimize panel joints and also to permit ready shipment from the manufacturer to world wide installations by truck, rail, ship or air. Minimal packing material, e.g., spacer blocks and strapping, would be required for these rugged FRP panels. Integral lifting attachments would be incorporated in each FRP panel to facilitate handling and field erection. Calculated maximum single FRP panel weight is approximately 1500 pounds.
Arch and end wall panels are of vee and U cross-sections and therefore can be nested compactly for minimum shipping volumes.

The shipping weight of arch panels for a 60 feet long magazine was estimated to be 24,000 pounds for FRP as compared to 41,000 pounds for the present steel plate.

5.8 FIELD ERECTION PROCEDURE

Another major advantage of the developed FRP magazine design is that it employs large shop-fabricated panel sections suitable for rapid field erection. Erection of the FRP semi-circular arch panels would commence after placement and set up of the magazine concrete floor slab and arch foundations.

A portable staging would be located on the floor slab to provide convenient worker access during panel alignment and the installation of panel joint wedge blocks. Application of structural adhesives to all FRP panels edges would be readily performed at ground level prior to erection; allowing approximately 30 minutes adhesive set-up time. Temporary wooden shims would be used at the base of the arch panels to facilitate panel edge alignment and to correct for any concrete footing irregularities.

Upon completion of erection of the arch panels to the edges of the end wall foundations, grouting of arch panels and footings would commence.

The vertical end wall panels would then be placed into their footings and positioned so their semi-circular molded flanges engage the end arch panel circumferential edges (see Fig. 4.7). Adjacent vertical edges of the end wall panels would then be joined and the end walls and footings would be grouted. At this time additional sealant/adhesive would be applied externally at the arch panel and end wall joints.

Installation of the remaining FRP panels of the crib type entrance wall and wing walls would also proceed.

Next, granular fill would be placed within the entrance and wing crib and on the arch panel adjacent to the top edge of the rear wall.
Placement of the earth embankment over the magazine would then continue until completion. Backfilling would be performed per present steel arch magazine requirements repeated below (Reference 5). Fill would be placed on each side of the arch and over the arch in a manner to obtain uniform loading on the sides and top of the arch. Fill would be placed in successive horizontal layers of 8 to 12 inches in loose depth.

Filling operation would commence at both magazine ends and continue uniformly towards the center.

Compaction would be accomplished by sheep-foot rollers, pneumatic-tired rollers, steel-wheeled rollers or other equipment suitable for the soil being compacted. Heavy equipment should not be run over or used for compaction of the fill directly above or closer than 6 feet to the sides of the arch, nor should heavy equipment be operated closer than 6 feet to the magazine rear wall or to the rear face of the magazine front wall. Heavy equipment for spreading and compacting backfill should not be operated closer to foundation or retaining walls than a distance equal to the height of backfill above the top of footing; the area remaining should be compacted by power driven hand tampers suitable for the material being compacted. Backfill should not be placed in wet or frozen areas and it should be free of debris, roots, frozen matter, fat clay (CH), and stones with any dimension greater than 2 inches.

5.9 MAINTENANCE

No required maintenance is anticipated for the developed FRP magazine design over its required service life of 20 years.
FIGURE 5.3  CONNECTION BETWEEN ADJACENT ARCH PANEL EDGES
Figure 5.4 Arch Panel Top End Connection
Figure 5.7 (Sh. 2 of 3)
FIGURE 5.7 (SH. 3 OF 3) ENTRANCE END WALL PANEL - TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION
531 SERIES FIBERGLASS DOORS

DESCRIPTION

Here is a fiberglass, sectional, upward-acting door that offers not only economy but good looks. It is ideal where additional light is needed and rough treatment is not a problem.

A simple hosing down once in a while will keep it looking great for years. And you never have to worry about it splitting, cracking, curling or rotting.

SPECIFICATIONS

The stiles and rails are extruded from 6063T6 aluminum alloy to produce a nominal wall thickness of 2". Center rails are designed with weather joint. Reinforcing fins on intermediate rails are standard on doors 10'3" and wider.

Deeply ribbed white, green or sand fiberglass panels extend the full width of each section. They are secured to both the end and center stiles and are sealed to the end stiles with polyurethane tape.

The color is impregnated into the fiberglass so it's permanent.

The hinges and fixtures are galvanized steel. The full floating ball bearing rollers are hardened steel.

The lock is a five-pin tumbler lock with a single unit lock mechanism.

All tracks are galvanized steel with Miracle Wedge weather closures. Depending upon the door size the tracks are 2" or 3". The verticals are bracket mounted for wood jambs or angle mounted for steel jambs.

OPERATION, MAINTENANCE

A hand pull rope operates the door. All service and parts are available through your local Distributor of THE OVERHEAD DOOR.

OPTIONS

A chain hoist is recommended for doors over 13' high. Glazing, 17" x 4" with special glazing mould.

FIGURE 5-8 FRP ENTRANCE DOOR (SH. 1 OF 2)
JAMB, FRAMING AND COUNTERBALANCE PAD DETAIL

The dimensions and locations of the framing and pads vary with the individual installation. Consult your "OVERHEAD DOOR" distributor for exact dimensions and details.

STANDARD 2" TRACK

This type track recommended for most installations of large or heavy doors; however, tracks should be designed to stay as near the wall and ceiling as possible. Post-tension drums available on torsion spring equipped doors up to 18' high.

HIGH LIFT TRACK

For situations requiring higher than normal clearance, specify the "OVERHEAD DOOR" with high lift track. It's counterbalanced with one or more torsion springs. Extension springs are not available with high lift tracks.

Overhead Door Corporation recommends the use of high lift track to locate the door as near the ceiling as possible.

Post-tension drums are not available.

FIGURE 5.8 (SH. 2 OF 2)
FIGURE 5.9 CONCRETE END WALL/FRP ARCH PANEL EDGE CONNECTION (ENTRANCE)

REF. DEPT. OF THE ARMY
DRAWING NO. 33-15-23, SHEET 1 OF 2

SECTIONAL ELEVATION VIEW

SH. 1 OF 2
Figure 5.9 (SH. 2 OF 2)
CHAPTER 6
STRUCTURAL ANALYSES

6.1 CONCEPTUAL DESIGN ANALYSES

During the FRP magazine conceptual design studies, structural analyses were performed using design equations provided in references 6, 7, and 8 for long span metal culverts and FRP pipe along with elastic stability equations from reference 9.

Upon selection of a concept for development of a detail FRP magazine design, more extensive analyses were employed along with the MRI-STARDYNE computer program (Reference 10). This computer code was used with three increasingly exact structural models: an arch-beam element model; an arch-plate element model; an arch and end wall-plate element model.

6.2 ARCH-BEAM ELEMENT MODEL

This first structural model was used to represent the FRP arch panels as two-dimensional beam elements having cross-sectional properties of an 18 inch width of the squared-kee cross-section.

A 90 degree arc segment of the semi-circular arch panels was modelled with symmetry boundary conditions at the crown. Sixteen beam elements were used along the 90 degree arc.

Horizontal and vertical loads due to the magazine earth cover, during and after construction, were applied at uniform intervals over its surface.

This model was used primarily to:

a) Establish and verify the developed magazine soil load distribution.

b) Evaluate the effects of arch panel foundation soil springs.

c) Establish arch panel major section properties required along the arch radius.
6.2.1 SOIL LOAD DISTRIBUTION

The loadings applied to the magazine were the soil weight directly above the shell and the soil weight beyond the arch footing as indicated in Reference 6. The vertical pressure on the shell due to the overburden was taken as a simple function of the soil depth. The effect of the soil beyond the arch footing was determined as a function of the embankment height and the angle of inclination of the arch surface per table 10-1 of Reference 11. The weight of this soil beyond the arch footing, was accounted for by considering the pressure exerted by a soil wedge extending upward from the footing at a vertical angle of inclination. The development of the soil load distribution and its verification with Reference 6 data are included in Appendix A.

6.2.2 FOUNDATION SOIL SPRINGS

Computer runs were made with the arch foundation fixed in the soil and also with attached springs representing soil stiffnesses. Arch panel applied stresses were found to be somewhat higher with fixed foundations. To ensure realistic modeling of the arch, horizontal, vertical and rotational foundation soil springs were determined per equations 11 and 12 of Ref. 12 and employed for all subsequent analyses.

6.2.3 SECTION PROPERTIES

Several analyses were performed to evaluate panel section properties required with the arch panel rigidly attached to the foundation and with soil springs connected from the foundation to ground. Increased FRP arch panel thickness was shown to be necessary directly adjacent to the foundation as shown in Figure 6.1.

6.3 ARCH-PLATE ELEMENT MODEL

The second structural model used was three-dimensional. A 90 degree arc length and 18" wide strip of the arch was employed. The panel squared-vee cross section was represented by triangular sandwich plate elements at the sloped surfaces of the panel cross section and by solid
quadrilateral plate elements at the horizontal surfaces. This model included: arch panel top end joint sections; arch panel reinforcement at the foundation interface and foundation soil springs. A computer plot of the model is shown in Fig. 6.2. A thickness of 0.5 inch was used for the quadrilateral elements. A 0.5 inch thick core with 0.125 inch thick skins was used for the triangular elements. Two rows of elements at the base had increased thicknesses. Elements at the crown had a thickness of 1.0 inch to reflect the joint between the two quarter arc sections. Element mesh was increased in the thinner section at each discontinuity.

The mean radius of the arch was 180 inches and the 90 degree arc was divided into 28 basic rows of elements. At discontinuities, such as at the crown and the reinforcement at the foundation, elements were subdivided to allow for greater stress gradients. The soil loads were calculated based on the 28 rows of elements and applied accordingly. The loads applied to each row of elements were determined using the mean radius of the arch. There were eleven nodes at each row cross section. Applied forces were equally divided among the nodes at each level. Calculated maximum plate element model stresses and allowable FRP material stresses are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Applied Stress</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Allowable Material Stress</th>
<th>Factor of Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Stress</td>
<td>panel</td>
<td>16,000 PSI</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sandwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Shear Stress</td>
<td>balsa</td>
<td>490 PSI</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Applied Stress</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Allowable Material Stress</th>
<th>Factor of Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,304 PSI</td>
<td>panel</td>
<td>16,000 PSI</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive stress</td>
<td>solid section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allowable FRP material stresses are based on laminate thicknesses previously described, 35% glass content and balsa core with a density of 5 pounds per cubic foot. The gross axial load and bending moment at various cross sections are plotted in Figure 6.3 for comparison with the results of the beam model.

6.4 ARCH AND END WALL-PLATE ELEMENT MODEL

This final structural model of the FRP magazine was developed primarily to evaluate local stresses at the junction of the rear magazine arch and end wall. The longitudinal length of arch model used was based on that length at which local edge effects diminish. The shell length was calculated to be 72 inches. (Reference 13)

Triangular sandwich and solid quadrilateral plate elements were employed as in the arch model described above. The density of the plate element mesh used decreased with the distance from the end wall/arch joint.

The end wall was modeled with plate elements. Soil springs were included at the foundation and at the upper edge of the end wall.

Soil loadings were simultaneously applied to the FRP arch and end wall panels. A computer plot of the model is provided in Figure 6.4.

Longitudinal support of the end wall upper portion, provided by backfill, was found to be adequate. Longitudinal loading and displacement of the arch panels were found to be insignificant.

The opposing sloped surfaces of the FRP panel vee-cross-section were found to provide inherent longitudinal equilibrium.
Local stresses at adhesive joints between the end wall and adjacent edge of the arch panel, and those between adjacent arch panel edges, were found to be well within the structural adhesive shear and peel strengths.

This final large structural model of the magazine used with the MRI-STARDYNE program provided a very detailed analysis of stresses and displacements throughout the structure. This analysis was considered to provide substantial verification of the adequacy of the design developed for the applied soil loadings.

6.5 STABILITY

The overall stability of the FRP arch was determined considering it to be an elastic curved panel with fixed edges and loaded by uniform radial pressures. The allowable applied pressure was conservatively determined per Reference 14 to be 24 PSI. (The maximum external pressure on the arch due to the earth cover occurs at the base and is approx. 14 PSI.)

FRP panel local and overall stability under axial loadings were evaluated, with data provided in Reference 15, and found to be adequate.

In all analyses performed, a reduced FRP modulus of elasticity ($1 \times 10^6$ PSI) was employed to account for long term properties and elevated temperature.

6.6 SERVICE TEMPERATURE RANGE

FRP laminates constructed with polyester resins are indicated per Reference 16, Table 1, and material supplier's data to have little loss of strength over an operating temperature range of -40 to +130 degrees F.

6.7 CREEP

Data provided in Reference 17 indicates that short and long term creep are not significant design considerations with properly fabricated FRP panels having reinforcement oriented in the direction of the applied loads.

Little long term creep data is available for fiberglass reinforced...
polyester resins. General information on creep of FRP laminates indicates that strains may increase about 20 to 30% with long term application of stress. This is equivalent to a modulus of elasticity for long term load of about 0.70 times that for short term loads (Ref. 18).
FIGURE 6.1 ARCH PANEL THICKNESS AT FOUNDATION
FIGURE 6.2 ARCH-PLATE ELEMENT MODEL (SH. 1 of 2)
FIGURE 6.3 ARCH-AXIAL AND BENDING LOADS
FIGURE 6.4 ARCH AND END WALL-PLATE ELEMENT MODEL (SH. 1 of 2)
FIGURE 6.4 (SH. 2 of 2)
CHAPTER 7
CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Estimated manufacturing and field installation costs for the FRP magazine arch and end walls were developed as shown in Table-4 based on early 1980 prices.

For comparison purposes, manufacturing and field installation costs of the present magazine steel oval arch structure per Corps of Engrs. dwg. 33-15-73 were also developed as shown in Table-5 with early 1980 cost data.

Some additional factors which should be considered in cost comparisons for specific magazine sites are:

a) Material transportation costs.
b) Required service life.
c) Corrosiveness of available backfill.
d) Cathodic protection system operation costs.
e) Anticipated life cycle maintenance costs.
# TABLE - 4

## ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST

### FRP Arch and End Walls

1. **ARCH**
   
   a) Semi-circ. pns. 15' R, 90° arc, 7 1/2" wide, 8 ea. r.h. and l.h.
   
   60' magazine length x $755.65/ft   = $45,338

   b) joint wedge blocks, adhesive/sealer, reactive adh.
   
   = $295

   c) Inst. labor:
      
      foreman 24 hrs @ 18.50
      laborers 48 hrs @ 15.70
      (Ref. 19)

   = $1,198

   d) $18,000 mold cost dist. over 10 magazines
      
      at 1800 each

   = $1,800

   subtotal $48631

2. **REAR FRP WALL ABOVE FOOTING**
   
   a) Vee wall pns. 402 s.f. x $15/s.f.   = $6,030

   b) Joint materials
      
      reactive adh. and wedge blocks   = $120

   c) Inst. labor:
      
      foreman 8 hrs @ 18.50
      laborers 16 hrs @ 15.70

   = $399

   subtotal $6549

3. **FRP ENTRANCE AND WING WALLS**
   
   a) Panels and tie mbrs. 2960 s.f. x $10/s.f.   = $29,600

   b) Joint materials (bolts and adh.)   = $350

   c) Inst. labor:
      
      foreman 24 hrs. @ 18.50
      laborers 48 hrs. @ 15.70

   = $1,198

---
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d) FRP door and track installed $ 625

subtotal $ 31773

4. TOTAL ESTIMATED COST $ 86953
TABLE - 5

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST

Present Steel Plate Arch and Reinforced Concrete End Walls:
(Per DWG. 33-15-73)

1. ARCH
   a) Steel plate arch plates, bolts, sealing strips, anchor bolts and channels, (knockdown):
      60' Magazine length x $400/ft. \(\text{Ref. Armco Co. Quote}\) $24,000
   b) Installation Labor:
      \[24000 \times 0.4524 = \] $10,857
   c) Waterproofing Membrane and Protector Boards:
      $0.75/ft.\(^2\) x 2827 ft.\(^2\) \(\text{Ref. 19}\) $2,120
   subtotal $36,977

2. REAR REINFORCED CONCRETE WALL ABOVE FOOTING (Ref. 19):
   a) 13.4 C.Y. \(\times\) $215/C.Y. Conc. in place \(\text{incl. forms and reinf.}\) $2,881
   b) Arch anchor bolts, $4.31/s.f. \(\times\) 612.5 s.f. $2,640
      and finishing.
   c) Waterproofing, $0.75/s.f. \(\times\) 637.5 s.f. $478
   subtotal $5,999

3. REINFORCED CONCRETE ENTRANCE WALL ABOVE FOOTING AND RETAINING WALLS AND FOOTINGS
   a) 93.3 C.Y. \(\times\) $125/C.Y. conc. \(\text{in place incl. forms and reinf.}\) $20,060
   b) Arch anch. bolts $4.31/s.f. \(\times\) 1138 s.f. \(\text{and finishing}\) $4,905
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c) Sliding steel $145/s.f. x 76 s.f. ——— $11,020
   door and frame
   (Galv.)
   subtotal $35,985

4. CATHODIC PROTECTION SYSTEM
   Estimated $5,000

5. TOTAL ESTIMATED COST $83,961
8.1 CONCLUSIONS

A corrosion resistant FRP, earth-covered ammunition storage magazine design was developed and shown to be highly feasible.

Based on magazine total life-cycle cost, and early 1980 manufacturing and installation cost data, the cost of the FRP magazine is expected to be less than that of the present steel plate and concrete magazine.

Other major advantages of the FRP magazine were determined to be:

a) Reduced material handling and shipping weight.
b) Reduced field erection time required.
c) Reduced maintenance.
d) Increased service life.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a prototype FRP, earth-covered ammunition storage magazine be constructed.

Also, it is recommended that the prototype structure be constructed so as to demonstrate:

a) Structural design.
b) Manufacturing, shipping and field erection.
c) Construction cost.
APPENDIX A
DERIVATION AND VERIFICATION OF SOIL LOADING EQUATIONS

Equations for the soil load distribution on the FRP magazine arch were derived for use with the structural model developed and the MRI STARDYNE computer program.

In Reference 6, the results of numerous non-linear finite element analyses of various combinations of culverts and backfills are provided in empirical formulas and graphs. These formulas and graphs were used to verify the soil load distribution equations derived.

The soil loading on arch beam elements 1-8, shown in Fig. A-1, was considered to include the additional weight of the soil beyond the arch span. The loading on arch elements 9-16 was considered to be only that of the soil plug directly above.

The loading on elements 1-8 was determined assuming that each element was loaded by the adjacent inclined soil column as shown in Fig. A-1.

The forces on a typical element, due to the inclined column of soil, were determined by the equations below.

\[
\theta = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\Delta x_1}{\Delta x_2}\right) \\
F = w \cos 30^\circ \\
\gamma = \text{Soil Density} = 120 \text{pcf}
\]
The vertical forces on elements 9-16 are a function only of the plug of earth directly above the element. The horizontal pressure on each of these elements were determined using an "at rest" coefficient of lateral pressure equal to 0.5 (Ref. 11).

\[
W = \gamma \left[ \frac{(15+2)(12) - x_2 \text{ave}}{\cos 30^\circ} \right] L \sin (30 + \theta) \tag{18}
\]

\[
F = \gamma \left( 204 - x_2 \text{ave} \right) L (18) \sin (30 + \theta)
\]

\[
F_V = \gamma \left( 204 - x_2 \text{ave} \right) L (18) \sin (30 + \theta) \cos 30^\circ
\]

\[
F_H = \gamma \left( 204 - x_2 \text{ave} \right) L (18) \sin (30 + \theta) \sin 30^\circ
\]

\[
F_V = \gamma \left( 204 - x_2 \text{ave} \right) (\Delta x_1) \tag{18}
\]

\[
F_H = 0.5 \gamma \left( 204 - x_2 \text{ave} \right) (\Delta x_2) \tag{18}
\]
\( P_V \) and \( P_H \) - Vertical and Horizontal Components of the Force at the center of each element

\( X_1 \) - Global Coordinate System of the Model

Vertical Angle of Inclination = \( 45 - \frac{\theta}{2} = 30^\circ \)

**ELEMENT LOADING**

**FIG. A-1**
The above loads were applied to the arch beam element model described previously with arch ends simply supported as in Ref 6. The maximum axial stress was 1968 PSI and the maximum axial force was 20,851 lbs. The corresponding data from an analysis performed with data from Ref. 6 were:

Maximum Axial Force = 23,250 lbs.
Maximum Axial Stress = 2210 PSI

The maximum bending moment was found to be 106,156 in.-lbs. and the maximum bending stress was 2986 PSI. The comparable values using Ref. 6 were:

Maximum Bending Moment = 58,860 in.-lbs.
Maximum Bending Stress = 1660 PSI

The bending stress using the model is approximately 1.8 times that obtained analytically. The error in the stress due to axial compression was approximately 10%. The bending stress obtained from the model was conservative, and the axial stress was slightly unconservative compared to results using Ref. 6. However the maximum combined stress from model was greater than the sum of the maxima using Ref. 6.

\[
\text{MAX} = 4150 \text{ PSI} \quad \text{MAX} = 3870 \text{ PSI}
\]

A plot of the arch bending moment and axial force are provided in Fig. 6.3. A comparison of the plots in Fig. 6.3 with similar plots in Ref. 6 indicates that the form of the curves is essentially the same. Maximums occur at approximately the same relative locations (i.e., maximum bending moment at a point 30 degrees up from base and maximum axial force at the base).

Thus, the method of calculating the applied loads described above was considered acceptable and used in subsequent computer analyses.
REFERENCES


2. Pipeline Sub-committee; "Reinforced Thermosetting Resin Pipe" March 1979, Page 167; Transportation Engineering Journal; ASCE, NY, NY; Unclassified.


In accordance with letter from DAEN-RDC, DAEN-ASI dated 22 July 1977, Subject: Facsimile Catalog Cards for Laboratory Technical Publications, a facsimile catalog card in Library of Congress MARC format is reproduced below.

Hunt and Wales Co., Inc.
76 p. : ill. ; 27 cm. (Technical report - U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station ; SL-80-6)
References: p. 75-76.

TA7.W34 no.SL-80-6