AIMSeT: Advanced Innovative Materials Selection Techniques

Christopher C. Ibeh, Dhirendra Bhattarai
Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, KS 66762

Abstract

Basic materials selection techniques typically yield more than one to several suitable materials for a given product, part or application based on pre-specified property requirements and processing method(s). Some of the advanced innovative materials selection techniques recognize that the pre-specified properties do not have the same level of importance in a given design or application. These innovative techniques such as the digital logic approach (DLA) and the life cycle value analysis (LCVA) methods operate on the basis of assigning expertly, pre-determined weighting factors to the pre-specified properties to portray their levels of importance. The weighting factor approach makes it possible to rank pre-selected materials in order of suitability. This paper discusses the successful and innovative use of the DLA and LCVA techniques, as part of the “advanced engineering materials,” graduate engineering technology course at Pittsburg State University (PSU), in the materials selection for the housings of signal and radar detection units. It is the authors’ position that the costs/performance-importance of materials in product, process and system’ design and development dictate that material selection be accorded priority and more attention in engineering technology and SMET curricula and education.

1. Introduction

One of the current trends in the industry is the focus on “costs” as one of the dominant design factors or criteria ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾⁽³⁾. Materials costs account for majority of the development and production costs; it is not uncommon for materials costs to account for more than fifty percent of development and production costs. Materials costs is typically about 50% in the ship building industry, and about 60% in the aerospace industry, and 70% in the automotive industry ⁽²⁾⁽³⁾⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾. The implication of this is that materials selection is critical in any design or production process. Incorrect materials selection can result in difficulty of processing, inadequate product performance and ultimately increase in costs. Appropriate cost estimate include not only the initial materials costs but the fabrication, installation, transportation, disposal/recycling and penalty costs.

The materials selection situation is compounded by the availability of many types and grades of materials such as biomaterials, ceramics, composites, metals, polymers/plastics, wood and others that exhibit variability in property levels, processing requirements and costs. A good materials selection process takes into account these variations in

characteristics and requirements. Most basic selection techniques accomplish this very easily, and often times yield more than one to several suitable materials for a given application, product or part. Some materials selection techniques take into consideration that the properties and requirements used do not always have the same levels of importance with respect to actual performance. These materials selection techniques such as the digital logic approach (DLA), life cycle value analysis (LCVA) and others that utilize a “weighted property system” (WPS) are considered advanced and innovative, and have the capability to rank suitable materials for a given application in order of suitability. The in-built “normalization” strategy of the WPS is tantamount to benchmarking, and provides ease of comparison of materials on an equivalent base.

Considering this apparent importance of materials and materials selection in process and system design, the concept of advanced innovative materials selection techniques has been incorporated as a core component of the “advanced engineering materials” course at Pittsburg State University. This move takes into account that most engineering technology and SMET careers involve one form or another of design, development, production, marketing/distribution and usage of products, parts and processes.

Goals and Objectives

The objectives of this paper are to:

- i. discuss the materials selection process,
- ii. highlight the concept of specific strength or “strength to weight ratio” as the critical parameter for structural applications,
- iii. discuss the innovative use of the weighted property system (WPS) in materials selection,
- iv. discuss case studies of the use of the digital logic approach (DLA) and life cycle value analysis (LCVA) in the materials selection for the housings of signal and radar detection units, and
- v. advocate the “high level priority” inclusion of materials selection in engineering technology and SMET curricula and education.

2. The Materials Selection Process

The material selection process typically consists of four major stages:

1. Materials Requirements Analysis
2. Identification and Screening of suitable materials
3. Evaluation of acceptable materials
4. Development of design database.

Material selection occurs in all phases of process or system design but its effect is more critical at the end phases. The recommended approach is to consider a very wide array of materials at the early phases. The number of materials is reduced in the second phase of the material selection process.

2.1. Materials Requirement Analysis

The materials requirements analysis phase answers the question(s): what are the conditions of service and the operating environment that the product is expected to endure? These conditions are specified and translated into known, critical material properties. The properties of a given material are determined by its composition and structure. The properties and characteristics of a material in turn determine the applications and service performance of a given part or product. Table T.I shows the specific strength of materials and different categories of materials; specific strength or “strength to weight ratio” ⁽⁷⁾⁽⁹⁾⁽¹⁰⁾⁽¹¹⁾⁽¹²⁾⁽¹³⁾⁽¹⁴⁾ is the most appropriate parameter for assessing materials on a one-on-one basis in structural applications. As can be seen from the ninth and tenth columns of Table T.I, specific strength and specific modulus have the appropriate units of length; specific strength and specific modulus can also have strength units of Psi or Mpa if the denominator, weight, is represented as specific gravity rather than density as is in this case.

Table T.2 shows the inter-relationship between materials’ performance, failure modes and properties ⁽²⁾⁽³⁾⁽⁷⁾. In certain cases, the performance and failure mode is determined by more than one property. This is also true for operating and service conditions in which more than one environment may be controlling. The material characteristic referred to as stiffness is critical in structural applications, and is specifically and quantitatively represented by the parameter, modulus of elasticity (E) or as afore mentioned by specific modulus. The properties modulus and compressive strength are the criteria for assessing the buckling condition of a structural column or column under load.

For correct materials selection, it is typical to formalize material properties requirements via design specifications such as performance specifications and product specifications. Performance specification deals with functionality or the ability of a material to do the designated job, and evaluation of risks and consequences of failure. Product specification, on the other hand, deals with product components manufacturing and procurement conditions with emphasis on material properties.

2.2. Identification and Screening of Suitable Materials

This stage of the materials selection process can be accomplished via the use of:

- i. the popular Ashby Charts,
- ii. basic softwares, and
- iii. in-house expertise.

The very popular Ashby Charts (one form is shown below) provide very easy means of identifying and screening suitable materials for a given application. The Ashby Chart shown below can be used to identify suitable materials for “simple axial loading”, “buckling of slender column” and “bending of plate” applications by simply using the modulus of elasticity (E) and density (ρ) of a material as points of entry at the ordinate

*Proceedings of the 2003 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition
Copyright © 2003, American Society for Engineering Education*

Table T.I: Specific Strength of Materials									
Material ↓	Melt Temp. T _m (°C)	Density (r)		Tensile Strength		E		T.S./r	E/r
		(g/cc)	(pci)	(MPa)	(psi)	Modulus (MPa)	Modulus (psi)	Specific Strength (in)	Specific Modulus (in)
Beryllium	1285	1.84	0.0666	448	65000	303000	4.39E+07	975976	6.60E+08
Titanium	1670	4.5	0.163	220	31900	1.16E+05	1.68E+07	195706	1.03E+08
S-Steel (T S20000 Series)		7.85	0.284	1110	161000	1.71E+05	2.5E+07	566901	8.74E+07
C-Steel (AISI 1000 Series)		7.872	0.284	330	47900	2.05E+05	2.97E+07	168662	1.05E+08
Aluminum	646-657	2.705	0.0977	76	11000	6.90E+04	1.00E+07	112590	1.02E+08
Nickel	1455	8.88	0.321	317	46000	207000	3.00E+07	143302	9.35E+07
Copper	1084	8.96	0.324	210	30500	1.10E+05	1.60E+07	94136	4.92E+07
Silver	961	10.491	0.379	140	20300	76000	1.10E+07	53562	2.91E+07
Tin	232	6.45	0.233	220	31900	41400	6004656	136910	2.58E+07
Gold	1064.43	19.32	0.698	120	17400	77200	1.12E+07	24928	1.60E+07
Lead	328	11.34	0.41	18	2610	14000	2030560	6366	4.95E+06
Ceramics									
Silicon Carbide (SiC) (sapco si)	2600	3.1	0.112	390	56600	410000	5.95E+07	505357	5.31E+08
Alumina (Al ₂ O ₃)	2030	3.96	0.143	300	43500	370000	5.37E+07	304196	3.75E+08
Mica		2.5	0.0903	41	5950	76000	1.10E+07	65892	1.22E+08
Titania(TiO ₂) (CeramTec Grade 192 Tan)	1920	4	0.145	51.6	7480	228000	3.31E+07	51586	2.28E+08
Zirconia (ZrO ₂) (CeramTec Grade 848)	2681-2847	6	0.217	551	79900	186000	2.70E+07	368203	1.24E+08
Boron Nitride (BN)	3027	3.49	0.126						
Boron Carbide (B ₄ C)	2350	2.5	0.0903						
Silica (SiO ₂)		2.65	0.0957						
Titanium Carbide (TiC)	3065	4.94	0.178	258	37400	448000-451000	65000000- 54000000	210112	365168539- 367415730
Glass Materials									
Fused Silica		2.2	0.0795			70000-78000	10200000- 11300000		128301887- 142138365
Vycor		2.18	0.0788			68000	9860000		1.25E+08

Table T.I (Continued): Specific Strength of Materials									
Material	Melt Temp.	Density (r)		Tensile Strength		E		T.S./r	E/r
Pyrex (Borosilicate)		2.4	0.0867			60000-64000	8700000-9280000		100346021-107035755
Pyroceram									
Polymers									
HDPE	110-135	0.918-1.4	0.332-0.050	10-50	1450-7250	180-1600	26100-232000	28656-218373	515810-6987952
ABS m-impact		1.02-1.22	0.368-.0441	30-138	4350-20000	1700-2400	247000-348000	98639-543478	5600907-9456522
Polystyrene		1.04-1.07	0.376-.0387	17.9-70	2600-10200	1790-3380	260000-490000	67183-271277	6718346-13031915
Polycarbonate	230*	1.17-1.45	0.423-0.052	54-72	7830-10400	1600-2400	232000-348000	149427-245863	4427481-8226950
Nylon-66	265	1.03-1.16	0.372-0.041	40-85.5	5800-12400	700-3300	102000-479000	138425-333333	2434368-12876344
Polyacetal	175								
PPS	280-290	1.34-1.8	0.484-0.063	69-124	0000-18000	2200-5500	319000-798000	153846-371901	4907692-6487603
PTFE	330	2.15-2.3	0.777-0.083	10-43	1450-6240	400-1800	58000-261000	17449-80309	697954-3359073
Polysulfones (amorphous T.P.)		1.2 – 1.4				10000 – 25800	360000	8333 – 18429	260900-300000
Polyetherimide (PEI) (amorphous T.P)		1.3				14000		10800	
Glass Fiber-Filled PEI						28000		21540	
Carbon Fiber-Filled PEI						34000		26150	
Phenolics		1.28-2.13	0.462-0.071	53.5-60	7760-8700	4100-8640	595000-1250000	100779-188312	7727273-27056277
Fibers --- Reinforcements		KN/m ³		GN/m ²		GN/m ²			
Carbon Fiber	3650	13.8	4.99E-04	1.7	246568	190	2.76E+07	4.94E+08	5.53E+10
Graphite	3650	13.8	4.99E-04	1.7	246568	250	3.63E+07	4.95E+08	7.27E+10
S-Glass Fiber	1725	24.4	8.82E-04	4.8	696192	86	1.25E+07	7.90E+08	1.42E+10
E-Glass Fiber	1725	25	9.03E-04	3.4	493136	72	1.04E+07	5.46E+08	1.16E+10

Legend – Table T.I:

Mica .. Complex Potassium Silicates (K_2A_{14})($A_{12}Si_6O_{20}$)(OH)₄; Fused Silica(Quartz)..99% SiO₂; Vycor ..96% SiO₂, 4% B₂O₃; Pyrex (Borosilicate) .. 81% SiO₂, 12% B₂O₃, 4% Na₂O, 2% Al₂O₃; Soda Lime Gen. Purpose Glass 74% SiO₂, 15% Na₂O, 5% CaO, 4% MgO, 1% Al₂O₃

Pyroceram ... Crystalline Glass; more like ceramics and are based on lithium oxide, magnesium oxide and aluminum oxide with titania as nucleating agent.

Proceedings of the 2003 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition
Copyright © 2003, American Society for Engineering Education

and abscissa of the chart. Materials that fall on the $(E^{0.5}/\rho = C)$ line, for example, have equal suitability for a “buckling” application; materials that lie above the $(E^{0.5}/\rho = C)$ line have superior “buckling” properties to those on or below the line. The chart indicates that carbon fiber and glass fiber reinforced plastics (CFRP, GFRP) are more suitable than aluminum and nickel alloys in slender column loading applications. The $(E/\rho = C)$ and $(E^{0.33}/\rho = C)$ plots represent the simple axial loading and plate bending situations respectively. Ashby charts have plots for application situations other than just the ones stated above ⁽¹⁷⁾.

Table T.2: Critical Material Properties														
Performance/ Failure Type ↓	Material Property													
	Modulus (E)	∇ =COLTE	Impact	TSI	T_g	Conductance	K_{IC}	M.S.	Oxygen Index	Dissipation Factor	Elongation	K-Factor	Gas Permeability	Compressive Strength
Stiffness	x													
Buckling	x													x
Brittle Fracture			x		x		x							
Dimensional Stability		x						x			x			
Flammability									x					
Toughness											x			
Electrical Insulation						x				x				
Thermal Insulation												x		
Environmental Stress Cracking							x						x	
Thermal Fatigue	x	x		x								x		
EMI/RFI Shielding						x								
K_{IC} = Plain Strain Critical Stress Intensity Factor $\cong K_C = \sigma_F(\pi h)^{0.5} = (E G_F)^{0.5}$ [Plot of K_C versus thickness (h) Yields K_{IC} Values Lower Than K_C That Is Independent of Thickness (h); K_{IC} = Intrinsic Form of K_C] G_F = Fracture Toughness; K_{IC} = True Representation of Fracture Toughness $< K_C$.														
M.S. = Mold Shrinkage; T_g = Glass Transition Temperature; Conductance = Electrical Conductivity or Resistivity; K-Factor = Thermal Conductivity Impact = Impact Strength/Energy; TSI = Thermal Shock Index = $(\sigma^* K / \nabla^* E)$ ∇ = COLTE = Coefficient of Linear Thermal Expansion; σ = Tensile Strength														

Several softwares are available in the market for materials selection based on pre-specified property requirements for a given application; these will typically yield several suitable materials for a given search. The GE Polymerland software:

(<http://www.gepolymerland.com>), Steel Weights software: (<http://www.steelforge.com>), Ceramics and Industrial Materials software: <http://www.ceramics.com/>, The Composites Corner: <http://advmat.com/othsites.html>, Composites Registry software: <http://www.compositesreg.com/>, and others are very good materials databases⁽¹⁸⁾⁽¹⁹⁾⁽²⁰⁾⁽²¹⁾⁽²²⁾.

It is also common practice for company experts to meet and pre-select materials for a given application based on their materials expertise. Materials scientists, engineers, technologists, purchasing managers, designers and tool makers develop certain levels of materials expertise with years of experience in their jobs, working with materials and Materials' suppliers, and are good candidates for membership in a materials selection committee or team. Identified and pre-selected materials are then subjected to the evaluation phase of the materials election process.

2.3. Evaluation of Pre-Screened Acceptable Materials

Four major approaches/methods are used in the evaluation of pre-screened acceptable materials; these are the:

- a. Performance-Cost Index (PCI),
- b. Failure Analysis.
- c. Digital Logic Approach (DLA), and
- d. Life Cycle Value Analysis (LCVA).

2.3.a. The performance cost index (PCI) approach is based on the concept of maximization of performance while minimizing cost and weight ⁽²³⁾. This method while popular has the limitation that it uses only one parameter to represent performance, and most often times it is based on the specific strength or "strength-to-weight ratio" parameter afore discussed as per Table T.I.

2.3.b. The failure analysis method is very popular in the aerospace, electronics and high performance systems. It is customary for companies in the aerospace and electronic industries to carry out non-destructive testing programs for their products in order to ensure high quality performance. The Raytheon's fabrication plant in Wichita, Kansas ultra-sonically tests its aircraft components and parts prior to use in the assembly and production. Other non-destructive, destructive and simulation testing programs are employed in the industry. The plastics testing lab at Pittsburg State University is currently undertaking a project, in collaboration with Able Manufacturing Corp., Joplin, MO, to develop a "J-Integral Method for Fracture Toughness of Composites ⁽²⁴⁾."

Ashby Charts: Modulus Versus Density (Specific Modulus Charts)

- (Taken From: (1). Ashby, Michael F., "Materials in Mechanical Design," *Journal of Materials Education*, Volume 15, Page 143 – 166, 1993.
 (2). Jacobs, James A., Kilduff, Thomas, F., *Materials Engineering Technology*, Third Edition, Prentice Hall, 1997.
 (3). Dieter, George F., *Engineering Design: A Materials and Processing Approach*, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, Page 241 – 242.
 (4). Ashby, M. F., *Material Science and Engineering*, Volume 5, page 522, 1989.)

2.3.c. Case Study: Materials Selection for the Directional Radar Unit (DRU) Housing via the Digital Logic Approach (DLA) or Weighted Property Index.

The DLA employs a rather simple but effective equation: $\gamma = \sum \beta_i w_i$ Eq. M.S.1

(γ) is the weighted property index, and is computed for each of the pre-selected materials for the DRU housing such as (1). aluminum 1100, (2). aluminum 3003, (3). aluminum 6006, (4). conductive ABS (acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene terpolymer) and (5). aluminum 1100 sheet. The material with the highest (γ) value is ranked most suitable for the application under consideration.

(β) is the “weighted property” or “OBJECTIVE” to be maximized, and in this particular case is based on the pre-selected properties: (i). EMI/RFI, (ii). Costs. (iii). Stiffness, and (iv). Manufacturability, as per Tables T.3 and T.4. In-house expertise was used to determine that these four are the critical parameters for the DRU housing material. The choice material must be injection moldable or machinable; the fabrication method is performance and costs-driven. The DRU housing must exhibit structural integrity, RFI/EMI shielding properties (RFI/EMI ... Radio Frequency Interference and Electro Magnetic Interference ... interference from outside sources can cause unwanted degradation of operation), seamless design to ensure water, dust proof and wrinkle-free characteristics, extraordinary resistance to corrosion and high specific strength. ABS, like most polymeric materials, is naturally non-conductive and has poor EMI/RFI properties but conductive grades are easily produced by “TOLL Compounders” such as RTP Corp., Polymer Resources Ltd. and others via simple modification with filler materials such as powdered metals, carbon black and others.

The weighted property (β) for the pre-selected materials is derived from the equation:

$$(\beta) = (\text{Value of Property of Material} / \text{Value of Material with Highest Property Value}) * 100$$

Table T.3: Actual Property Values of Pre-Selected DRU Housing Materials				
Materials	Properties			
	EMI/RFI	COSTS	STIFFNESS	MANUFACTURABILITY
Aluminum 1100 Drawn	90	90	70	80
Aluminum 3003 Drawn	90	80	70	70
Aluminum 6006 Drawn	90	70	70	60
Conductive ABS	80	99	70	80
Aluminum 1100 Sheet	90	50	70	40
Steel	90	95	80	35

(w_i) is the weighting factor, and it is determined by comparing the “objectives”, two at a time; the property or “objective” that is considered the more important of the two is given a 1 and the less important property is given a 0. The total number of possible combinations or comparisons, $N = n(n-1)/2$; n = total number of objectives or 4 in this case. Therefore, N for the DRU housing material selection is: $4(4-1)/2 = 6$. The weighting factor procedure is as Table T.5.

2.3.c-i. DLA Results

The (β) and (w_i) values from Tables T.4 and T.5 respectively are put into equation M.S.1. to generate the weighted property index (γ_i) for each of the pre-selected materials under evaluation. The generated (γ_i) values are as follows: conductive ABS = 96.3; drawn aluminum 1100 = 95.5; steel = 89; drawn aluminum 3003 = 88; drawn aluminum 6006 = 81; sheet aluminum 1100 = 67.

Table T.4: Weighted Property (β) Values of Pre-Selected DRU Housing Materials				
Materials	Properties			
	EMI/RFI	COSTS (β^*)	STIFFNESS	MANUFACTURABILITY
Aluminum 1100 Drawn	100	91	87.5	100
Aluminum 3003 Drawn	100	81	87.5	87.5
Aluminum 6006 Drawn	100	70.7	87.5	75
Conductive ABS	89	100	87.5	100
Aluminum 1100 Sheet	100	50.5	87.5	50
Steel	100	96	100	44

Table T.5: Weighting Factor Determination For The DRU Housing Material									
Property ↓		Possible Combinations or Comparisons (N)						Positive Decisions	Weighting Factor (w_i)
		i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi		
		(1)(2)	(1)(3)	(1)(4)	(2)(3)	(2)(4)	(3)(4)		
1	EMI/RFI	0	1	1				2	0.333
2	Costs	1			1	1		3	0.500
3	Stiffness		0		0		0	0	0.000
4	Manufacturability			0		0	1	1	0.167
Total →								6	1.0

2.3.d. Case Study: Materials Selection for the Signal Detector Control Head Unit (SDCHU) Housing via Life Cycle Value Analysis (LCVA).

As in the case of the DRU discussed above, the search for the SDCHU housing material yielded several suitable materials with ABS (acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene) terpolymer and aluminum 1100 as the top two choices. Life cycle value analyses (LCVA) were carried out on the SDCHU with ABS and aluminum 1100 as the housing materials respectively, in an attempt to study the long-term perspective, durability, economic and environmental impact of the SDCHU.

The LCVA process comprises of six main phases:

1. Goals of intended Life Cycle Study (LCS),
2. Scope of Intended Life Cycle Study (LCS),
3. Life Cycle Inventory (LCI),
4. Impact Assessment,
5. Interpretation Life Cycle Study Results, and
6. Process or System Improvement.

The SETAC (Society for Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry), ISO (International Standards Organization) and other databases ⁽²⁶⁾⁽²⁷⁾⁽²⁸⁾⁽²⁹⁾⁽³⁰⁾ provide very adequate guidelines and detailed procedure on how to carry out a successful life cycle value analysis. The system under study is the SDCHU. The Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) of the SDCHU was implemented using such softwares as Unigraphics' Solid Edge, for "Bill of Materials" (not shown) generation and Green Design Initiative's (EIOLCA) ⁽²⁵⁾⁽²⁹⁾. The Impact Assessment of the SDCHU was implemented via use of the EIOLCA and ECO-IT softwares ⁽²⁹⁾⁽³⁰⁾. Impact assessment involves evaluation of potential resource depletion, health and environmental consequences of product implementation. Impact Assessment has three main stages: Classification and Characterization, Normalization, and

*Proceedings of the 2003 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition
Copyright © 2003, American Society for Engineering Education*

Evaluation. The ECO-IT software by Pre Consultants looks at the impact of a given system or design at three levels, production, use and disposal.

2.3.d-i. LCVA Results

Table T.6 shows the LCVA-impact assessment results for the SDCHU with ABS and aluminum as the housing materials. The results on Table T.6 indicate that aluminum housing for the SDCHU yields higher environmental and economic impact in all the eight impact categories studied with the exception of the hazardous waste category; energy usage for the SDCHU with ABS housing is 6.47E-04 MKw-Hr compared to 1.353E-03 MKw-Hr for SDCHU with aluminum housing, conventional pollutants for the ABS-based SDCHU is 5.87E-03 metric tons and 1.118E-02 metric tons for SDCHU with aluminum housing, hazardous waste due to SDCHU with ABS housing is 3.02E-02 metric tons and 2.866E-02 metric tons for SDCHU with aluminum housing, and the total costs for ABS-based SDCHU is \$1412 and \$1770 for the aluminum-based SDCHU.

Table T.6: LCVA – Impact Assessment Results For The SDCHU With ABS And Aluminum 1100 Housings				
	Housing Material Type			
Impact Type ↓	ABS	Aluminum 1100	Status *	Percentage Change *
Electricity Used (MKw-Hr)	6.47E-04	1.353E-03	Increase	109
Conventional Pollutants (Metric Tons)	5.87E-03	1.118E-02	Increase	90.5
Green House Gases (CO ₂) (Metric Tons)	2.69E-01	4.054E-01	Increase	50.7
Fuels Used (Metric Tons)	1.04E-01	1.567E-01	Increase	66.4
Ores Used (Metric Tons)	1.36E-01	1.482E-01	Increase	8.97
Hazardous Waste (Metric Tons)	3.02E-02	2.866E-02	Decrease	5.10
Water Used (Billion Gals.)	2.00E-06	3.00E-06	Increase	50.0
Total Costs	\$1412	\$1770	Increase	25.4
* Status and Percentage Change are based on Switching from ABS Housing to Aluminum Housing for the SDCHU.				

3. Discussion of Results

The “normalization” of resulting data is key to the “innovativeness” of the advanced materials selection techniques being addressed in this paper; normalization makes use of the weighted property system (WPS) and takes into account the variability in the levels of contribution by the different, pre-selected properties and parameters. Normalization⁽²⁶⁾⁽²⁸⁾⁽²⁹⁾⁽³⁰⁾⁽³¹⁾ minimizes error, and makes it easy to compare and evaluate competing materials on an equivalent basis. With normalization, impact results are divided by a reference value; typically, this reference value is the total impact value for the category under consideration. The normalization or benchmarking scheme is comparable to the contributing share of a product system to the GNP/GDP.

The DLA generated (γ_i) values of 96.3 for conductive, 95.5 for drawn aluminum 1100, 89 for steel, 88 for drawn aluminum 3003, 81 for drawn aluminum 6006 and 67 sheet aluminum 1100, ranks these materials in order of suitability for the DRU housing. The relatively close weighted property index values for ABS and drawn aluminum 1100 make these two materials equally suitable for the DRU housing. The DRU producing company may decide to capitalize on its vast and already established experience in aluminum processing, or may seize this opportunity to stake its claim in the ever-growing plastics industry.

In the life cycle value assessment of the SDCHU, the 5.1% decrease in hazardous waste generated due to aluminum use is heavily offset by the 25 to 109% increase in the other impact categories including costs. Data on Table T.6 indicate that the SDCHU with aluminum housing is more expensive than the SDCHU with ABS housing. Normalized data from the ECO-IT output show that SDCHU with aluminum housing has impact data of 110, 46 and –60 in the production, use and disposal phases respectively, and for a total impact score of 96 mPt (ECO-IT milli-points). ABS housing based SDCHU has scores of 101, 22 and –38 or a total of 85 mPt. The disposal stage is scored negatively to represent the concept that recycled material or energy is equivalent to new material. Any amount of material that is recycled or reclaimed is equivalent to an equal amount of new material that is not mined, used or that is conserved. The high values of impact in the production phase of the aluminum and ABS options, 110 mPt and 101 mPt respectively suggest that the production phase of the SDCHU is the most viable area for process or system improvement.

4. Conclusions

This paper has demonstrated the implementation of the digital logic approach (DLA) and the life cycle value analysis (LCVA) methodologies for the materials selection of the directional radar unit (DRU) and signal detector control head unit (SDCHU) housings respectively. The use of the weighted property system (WPS) by the DLA and LCVA techniques is innovative; normalization of generated data provides a very simple but valid method for evaluating pre-selected materials in a given application on an equivalent (benchmarked) basis.

The online availability and accessibility of LCVA softwares such as EIOLCA and ECO-it make it possible to utilize these as tools for teaching and learning the concepts of life cycle value analysis. Government and product marketing (ECO-Labeling) are the driving forces for corporations and organizations engaging in life cycle value assessment of their products and systems.

It is this paper's position that the costs/performance-importance of materials in product, process and system' design and development dictate that material selection be accorded priority and more attention in engineering technology and SMET curricula and education.

Bibliography

1. Ashby, Michael. F., "Materials in Mechanical Design", Journal of Materials Education, Vol. 15, Page 143 –166, 1993.
2. Jacobs, James A., Kilduff, Thomas F., Materials Engineering Technology, Third Edition, Prentice Hall, 1997.
3. Dieter, George F., Engineering Design: A Materials and Processing Approach, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, Page 241 - 242.
4. Bartolotta, Paul, "Materials Processing Technology Transferred to Industry", Aerospace Technology Innovation—Special Edition, Volume 8, Number 2, March/April 2000.
5. "High Performance Metals for the Aerospace Industry: Keeping Costs to Ground", <http://www.transtarmetals.com/aero.html>
6. "Industrial Production managers", <http://www.collegegrad.com/careers/manag19.shtml>
7. Ibeh, Christopher, C., Bhattarai, D., "Materials Selection", Advanced Engineering Materials Lecture Series, Pittsburg State University, <http://www.geocities.com/ETECH880/>
8. Marsden, Will, "Information Management for Aerospace Materials," Advanced Materials & Processes, June 2002, Volume 160, No. 6, Pages 37 – 39.
9. <http://www.matweb.com>
10. <http://www.plasticsusa.com>
11. <http://www.sdplastics.com>
12. Budinski, Kenneth, G., Budinski, Michael, K. "ceramics for Structural Applications," Engineering Materials: Properties and Selection, Sixth Edition, Prentice Hall, 1999, Pages 239 – 255.
13. Manas, Chanda, Salil, Roy, K., "Typical Properties of Polymers Used for Molding and Extrusion," Plastics Technology Handbook, Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1986, Pages 517 – 532.
14. Rodriguez, Fernandez, "Selected Properties of Polymer Systems," Principles of Polymer Systems, McGraw Hill, Second Edition, 1982, Pages 531 –545.
15. Ashby, M. F. Material Science and Engineering, Vol. 5, Page 522, 1989.
16. Dieter, George F., Engineering Design: A Materials and Processing Approach, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, Page 250 - 259.
17. Ashby, M., F., Cebon, D., "New Approaches to Materials Education," Cambridge University, March 2002.
18. <http://www.gepolymerland.com>
19. <http://www.steelforge.com>
20. <http://www.ceramics.com/>
21. <http://advmat.com/othsites.html>
22. <http://www.compositesreg.com/>

23. Grandhi, Ramana, "Computational Nonlinear Aeroelasticity for Multidisciplinary Analysis & Design," <http://www.cs.wright.edu/~lfinkel/ecsresearch/amaeroelasticity.html>
24. Ibeh, Christopher, C., Schultz, Mark, Ostmeyer, Jessica, Spencer, Brooklyn, "J-Integral Method for Fracture Toughness of Composites," Unpublished.
25. Shultz, M., Kustom Signals Inc., <http://www.kustomsignals.com>
26. Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC), <http://www.setac.org/>
27. ISO 14000 Concepts, <http://www.trst.com/gapanal.htm>
28. "life Cycle Value Assessment (LCVA), <http://www.pembina.org>
29. Green Design Initiative, <http://www.eiolca.net>
30. http://www.pre.nl/life_cycle_assessment/impact_assessment.htm
31. Barnthouse et al, " Evolution and Development of the Conceptual Framework and Methodology of Life-Cycle Impact Assessment," <http://www.setac.org/files/addendum.pdf>, SETAC North American and European Work Groups, January 1998.

Biographical Information of the Authors

CHRISTOPHER C. IBEH

Dr. Christopher Ibeh is a professor of Plastics Engineering Technology at Pittsburg State University, where he teaches courses entitled: thermoplastic resins, thermoset resins, heat transfer, thermodynamics, research topics in polymers and plastics, and advanced engineering materials. Professor Ibeh is the director of the NSF-sponsored REU/RET program at Pittsburg State University. He has a Doctorate from the Department of Chemical Engineering at Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA.

DHIRENDRA BHATTARAI

Mr. Dharendra Bhattarai is an "innovation graduate scholar" at Pittsburg State University, and is a candidate for the masters in engineering technology degree. He is currently enrolled in the advanced engineering materials course, and implemented the life cycle value analysis on the signal detector control head unit. Dharendra obtained his bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from St. Louis University, Philippines.