

Low-Cost Solar Array Project

5101-62

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or 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.

Photovoltaic Solar Panel Resistance to Simulated Hail

Donald Moore

Abraham Wilson

October 15, 1978

Prepared for
Department of Energy

by
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED *eb*

PREFACE

The work described in this report was performed by the Applied Mechanics Division of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, under the cognizance of the Low-Cost Solar Array Project.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to recognize the contributions of Lee Albers of the Environmental Testing Laboratory at Jet Propulsion Laboratory, who set up and operated the simulated-hail test apparatus. We would also like to thank Mike Giovan of the Materials Development Group for his consultation in the fracture mechanics discipline. Finally, we would like to thank the manufacturers who contributed photovoltaic solar panels to this program.

ABSTRACT

As part of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's Low-Cost Solar Array Project, test methods have been evaluated and procedures developed for testing photovoltaic flat-plate solar cell modules for resistance to impact by hailstones. Testing has included the use of simulated hailstones (frozen ice spheres projected at terminal velocity), steel balls, and other projectile types applied with three loading methods: pneumatic gun, gravity drop, and static loading. Results are presented that compare the advantages and disadvantages of the three test methods. Dropped-steel-ball tests are shown to exhibit little correlation with high-velocity ice-ball tests, whereas statically-loaded steel balls show a somewhat better correlation with ice-ball tests. Results are also presented on the hail impact strength of 16 flat-plate photovoltaic modules. The module designs tested have been shown to be capable of withstanding as large as 1-1/2-inch diameter and not capable of withstanding as small as 1/2-inch diameter simulated hail. The top surface material of the modules has a dominant influence on the hail impact resistance of the modules. In order of increasing impact strength for a given thickness, the top surface materials encountered in the modules tested were: clear silicone rubber, annealed glass, tempered glass, and acrylic sheet. The critical failure mechanism of each module type is explored and means for improving the hail resistance of future modules are described.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION -----	1
II.	HAIL IMPACT SIMULATION -----	2
III.	SIMULATED HAIL IMPACT TEST APPARATUS -----	4
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF PANELS TESTED -----	7
V.	HAIL IMPACT RESISTANCE OF PANELS -----	10
	A. HIGH-SPEED MOVIES OF SIMULATED HAILSTONE IMPACT -----	10
	B. PRE-HAIL AND POST-HAIL ELECTRICAL POWER MEASUREMENTS -----	17
VI.	SIMPLIFIED TEST METHODS -----	18
	A. DROPPED STEEL BALLS -----	18
	B. STATICALLY-LOADED STEEL BALLS -----	20
VII.	IMPROVING PANEL IMPACT STRENGTH -----	22
	A. EDGE EFFECTS - GLASS PANELS -----	22
	B. EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE TOP LAYER MATERIALS -----	23
	C. PROTECTION OF SOLAR PANELS -----	23
	D. SHOCK MOUNTING OF PANELS -----	25
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS -----	26
IX.	RECOMMENDATIONS -----	27
	REFERENCES -----	28

Figures

1.	Simulated Hailstone Mold -----	5
2.	Storage of Simulated Hailstones -----	5
3.	Pneumatic Hail Gun -----	6
4.	Photovoltaic Panels -----	8
5.	Acrylic Sheet Top Surface (Panel Type AI) - Impact Site of 1.61-inch Diameter/70 mph Simulated Hailstone -----	13
6.	Silicone Rubber Top Surface (Panel Type BI) - Impact Site of 1.28-inch Diameter/61 mph Simulated Hailstone -----	13
7.	Annealed Glass Top Surface (Panel Type EII) - Impact Site of 1.61-inch Diameter/70 mph Simulated Hailstone -----	14
8.	Tempered Glass Top Surface (Panel Type BIIK) - Impact Site of 1.61-inch Diameter/70 mph Simulated Hailstone -----	14
9.	Comparison of Two Types of Impact Behavior of 1.05-inch Diameter/55 mph Simulated Hailstones -----	16
10.	Correlation of Damage Due to Dropped Steel Balls with Damage Induced by Simulated Hailstones -----	19
11.	Correlation of Damage Due to Statically Loaded Steel Balls with Damage Induced by Simulated Hailstones -----	20
12.	Edge Configuration of Edge Effect Test Panel -----	22

Tables

1.	Weight, Velocity, and Kinetic Energy of Hailstones and Other Objects -----	3
2.	Mechanical Design Features of Photovoltaic Panels Tested -----	9
3.	Observed Damage to Photovoltaic Solar Panels Due to Impact of Simulated Hailstones -----	11
4.	Effect of Hail Impact on Power Output of Photovoltaic Panels -----	17

5.	Critical Drop Height (Inches) for Steel Balls -----	18
6.	Critical Steel Ball Drop Height for Glass Panels with Various Edge Conditions -----	23
7.	Evaluation of Candidate Solar Panel Top Surface Materials -----	24

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

Until recently, hail was recognized as an element of the environment that must be considered in the design of solar arrays, but was generally considered of low priority. With the development of the largest photovoltaic system (25 kW) to date in Mead, Nebraska, and an even larger system (250 kW) in progress for the Mississippi County Community College in Arkansas (both severe hail areas), increased importance has been placed on the damage potential of hail. In response to this importance, a portion of the engineering activities of the LSA Project has been directed at understanding the hail environment and defining environmental design criteria including qualification test procedures. Review of the available literature and discussions with numerous specialists in the field of hail have indicated a lack of data characterizing the hail environment and a lack of hail design criteria and test standards. As a result, a five-phased effort was conducted with the following objectives:

- (1) Define the hail resistance of current photovoltaic module designs.
- (2) Define design changes and costs associated with improving module hail resistance.
- (3) Develop hail testing procedures appropriate for environmental qualification tests.
- (4) Characterize the natural hail environment.
- (5) Explore the life-cycle cost effectiveness of various degrees of hail resistance to support the definition of appropriate design criteria.

This report describes the results associated with the first three objectives listed above. A companion report presents the results of the study characterizing the natural hail environment (Reference 1). The life-cycle costs are presently being studied and will be the subject of a future report on photovoltaic module design criteria for hail.

SECTION II

HAIL IMPACT SIMULATION

In simulating impact phenomena, the weight, velocity, material properties (hardness, strength, stiffness, etc.), and geometry of both target and projectile are important. To establish the hail impact strength of currently available commercial photovoltaic panels, it was decided to duplicate all of the above parameters as closely as possible by impacting molded ice spheres on actual solar panels at velocities corresponding to the terminal velocity of naturally occurring hail. The question of whether a molded ice sphere adequately simulates naturally occurring hail remains.

Of ten Illinois hail storms studied by Changnon (Reference 2) five were accompanied by winds in the SW-NW quadrant, while five were accompanied by winds in the NW-NE quadrant, the median wind direction being NW. Photovoltaic solar panels are generally installed at 30 to 45 degrees to the horizontal with southern exposure. If most hail is accompanied by northerly winds, the panels will receive only glancing blows. On the other hand, if the hailstones come from the south, borne by a wind whose velocity is equal to the vertical terminal velocity of the hailstones, the hailstones will have a velocity 1.414 times their vertical terminal velocity. The kinetic energy of these hailstones will be twice that of the same hailstones in still air. They will impact normal to the surface of a solar panel tilted 45 degrees to the horizon. From the standpoint of hail-damage risk to photovoltaic solar panels, then, northerly winds will tend to decrease damage and southerly winds will increase damage. Avoiding ultraconservatism, it was decided to impact the panels normal to their surface with simulated hailstones at still-air terminal velocities.

Table 1 gives the weight, terminal velocity, kinetic energy, and momentum for hailstones ranging in diameter from 0.50 inch to 3.00 inches. To construct this table, the commonly reported value of 0.9 g/cm^3 is taken as the density of hail. The terminal velocities, v_T , are obtained from Equation 1, which is readily derived by equating the weight and aerodynamic drag of a sphere.

$$v_T = \sqrt{\frac{4 \rho_H d g}{3 \rho_A C_D}} \quad (1)$$

where

C_D = drag coefficient of sphere

d = diameter of hailstone

g = acceleration of gravity

ρ_A = density of air

ρ_H = density of hail

The velocities so obtained, taking $C_D = 0.47$, are slightly higher than those reported by Friedman (Reference 3). To put this information in perspective, the same quantities are reported for several familiar sports balls, human-propelled, at world record speeds.

Examination of Table 1 shows that while the diameter of the hailstones shown (0.5 to 3.0 inches) varies by a factor of 6, the weight varies by a factor of over 200, and the kinetic energy by a factor of nearly 1500. Also note that 2-inch diameter hailstones have only about one-fourth the kinetic energy of the human-propelled objects listed.

Table 1. Weight, Velocity, and Kinetic Energy of Hailstones and Other Objects

OBJECT	DIAMETER, in	WEIGHT, lb	TERMINAL VELOCITY, mph	KINETIC ENERGY, ft-lb	MOMENTUM, lb-s
HAILSTONE	0.50	0.00213	36.4	0.094	0.0035
HAILSTONE	0.75	0.00718	44.6	0.476	0.0146
HAILSTONE	1.00	0.0170	51.5	1.51	0.0399
HAILSTONE	1.25	0.0332	57.5	3.67	0.0871
HAILSTONE	1.50	0.0574	63.0	7.62	0.165
HAILSTONE	2.00	0.136	72.8	24.1	0.451
HAILSTONE	2.50	0.266	81.3	58.8	0.986
HAILSTONE	3.00	0.460	89.1	122.0	1.87
BASEBALL (REFS. 7, 8)	2.90	0.320	101 ^a	109.1	1.47
SOFTBALL (REF. 7)	3.82	0.414	>100 ^b	138.4	1.89
TENNIS BALL (Refs. 9, 10)	2.56	0.127	137 ^c	79.7	0.793

^aTHROWN BY NOLAN RYAN.

^bTHROWN BY EDDIE FEIGNER.

^cSERVED BY SCOTT CARNAHAN.

SECTION III

SIMULATED HAIL IMPACT TEST APPARATUS

The apparatus used to manufacture hailstones and project them at the photovoltaic solar panels is similar to that used by other investigators (References 4, 5, and 6). This equipment consists of simulated hailstone molds, a freezer, a pneumatic gun, and a velocity measuring system.

The mold for making ice spheres was obtained from a previous JPL program (Reference 4) of the mid-1960s where hail impact on antenna reflecting surfaces was studied. This mold, shown in Figure 1, has a hemispherical cavity of the appropriate size in each of the aluminum mold halves. The mold is opened, a piece of ice somewhat larger than the desired hailstone is inserted, and a combination of heat and pressure is used to mold the ice into a sphere as the mold is closed. Immediately after forming, the ice ball is placed in a freezer (see Figure 2) where they are "stabilized" at -8°C for a minimum of eight hours prior to use. Greenfeld (Reference 5) and Smith (Reference 6) use casting techniques to form the ice spheres, but the ice balls are stored in the same manner.

A pneumatic gun, shown in Figure 3, was constructed to fire the simulated hailstones at the solar panels. To simplify aiming, the gun fires vertically upward at the target solar panel which is mounted overhead. The gun consists of a large ($\approx 2 \text{ ft}^3$) reservoir, which is prepressurized with compressed air to the desired firing pressure. An opening in the top of the tank is equipped with a large, fast-opening solenoid valve. Interchangeable barrels for the various hailstone sizes are fitted directly to this valve. The barrels are 3 feet long and constructed of standard pipe.

In operation, an ice ball slightly larger than the barrel bore is placed at the muzzle (top) of the barrel. Melting and gravity cause the ice ball to fall gently to the breech (bottom) of the barrel. The fast-opening solenoid valve is then opened, admitting the compressed air to the barrel and propelling the ice ball vertically upward at the target. To verify that the simulated hailstones achieve the desired velocity, a photoelectric velocity measuring system is installed between the muzzle of the gun and the test article. The ice balls used are made from water containing a small amount of ink to make them opaque to the photoelectric device.




Figure 1. Simulated Hailstone Mold




Figure 2. Storage of Simulated Hailstones




Figure 3. Pneumatic Hail Gun

SECTION IV

DESCRIPTION OF PANELS TESTED

The terrestrial photovoltaic solar panels tested consist of an array of thin silicon solar cells electrically connected in various series/parallel combinations to provide the desired output voltage. The cells are encapsulated in a dielectric to isolate them electrically and to protect them from the elements. In addition, some means is required to support the cells under the environmental loads. A total of sixteen panel designs from nine manufacturers were tested. In some cases, more than one panel of a given design was tested. Figure 4 shows the sixteen panels tested, and a brief physical description of the panels is provided in Table 2.

Some additional discussion of the salient design features of these modules is considered necessary to better understand the failures resulting from the simulated hail impact reported later. Solar panel Type AI, which employs acrylic sheets top and bottom to support the cells and protect them from the elements, did not have an encapsulant per se. The cells were bonded to the bottom sheet of acrylic and the top sheet of acrylic was installed with an air space between the top and bottom acrylic sheets, both being held in an extruded aluminum frame. Type BIIK is essentially a modification of Type BII in which a 0.125-inch tempered glass cover sheet is bonded over the top of the silicone encapsulant.

Note that eight of the sixteen designs tested employ glass as part of the superstrate system. Two of the designs, Type EII and Type H4, use the glass superstrate as the sole means of cell support although an aluminum frame and rubber gasket are employed to support the glass panel around its periphery.









Figure 4. Photovoltaic Panels

Table 2. Mechanical Design Features of Photovoltaic Panels Tested

PANEL TYPE	OVERALL DIMENSIONS, in.	TOP SURFACE MATERIAL	ENCAPSULANT	SUBSTRATE	FRAME	BASIC CONSTRUCTION CROSS-SECTIONAL SKETCH
AI	16.3 x 12.9 x 0.8	0.10-in. ACRYLIC SHEET	NONE	0.10-in. ACRYLIC SHEET	ALUMINUM EXTRUSION WITH RUBBER GASKET	
BI	22.5 x 6.5 x 0.5	SILICONE POTTING	SILICONE POTTING	ALUMINUM EXTRUSION INTEGRAL STIFFENERS	NONE	
BII	22.9 x 11.4 x 1.8	SILICONE POTTING	SILICONE POTTING	STAMPED ALUMINUM PAN INTEGRAL STIFFENERS	NONE	
CI	20.0 x 10.3 x 0.2	SILICONE POTTING	SILICONE POTTING	FIBERGLASS SHEET	NONE	
CII	22.9 x 22.9 x 1.8	SILICONE POTTING	SILICONE POTTING	FIBERGLASS SHEET	WELDED ALUMINUM EXTRUSIONS	
DI	24.0 x 14.8 x 0.3	SILICONE POTTING	SILICONE POTTING	FIBERGLASS SHEET	NONE	
DII	46.0 x 15.3 x 1.9	SILICONE POTTING	SILICONE POTTING	MOLDED FIBERGLASS INTEGRAL STIFFENERS	NONE	
BIIK ^a	22.9 x 11.4 x 1.8	0.12-in. TEMPERED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING	STAMPED ALUMINUM PAN INTEGRAL STIFFENERS	NONE	
EI	26.1 x 4.9 x 2.7	0.09-in. ANNEALED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING	ALUMINUM EXTRUSION INTEGRAL STIFFENERS	NONE	
F42	45.5 x 9.0 x 2.0	0.12-in. TEMPERED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING	ALUMINUM PAN	ALUMINUM	
F43	45.5 x 9.0 x 2.0	0.12-in. TEMPERED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING	STAINLESS STEEL PAN	STAINLESS STEEL	
G4	23.0 x 11.5 x 0.8	0.09-in. ANNEALED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING	ALUMINUM EXTRUSION INTEGRAL STIFFENERS	ALUMINUM	
J4	23.0 x 21.0 x 2.0	0.12-in. TEMPERED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING	STAINLESS STEEL PAN	STAINLESS STEEL	
EII	46.0 x 15.3 x 1.4	0.12-in. ANNEALED GLASS	POLYVINYL BUTYRAL AND MYLAR FILM	NONE	ALUMINUM EXTRUSION WITH RUBBER GASKET	
H4	44.5 x 9.0 x 1.3	0.19-in. TEMPERED GLASS	SILICONE POTTING AND CONFORMAL COATING	NONE	ALUMINUM EXTRUSION WITH RUBBER GASKET	
F41	45.0 x 9.0 x 1.4	TEDLAR FILM	POLYVINYL BUTYRAL	ALUMINUM	ALUMINUM	

^aMODIFICATION OF TYPE BII

SECTION V

HAIL IMPACT RESISTANCE OF PANELS

Table 3 summarizes the results of impacting molded ice spheres on the solar panels at velocities corresponding to the terminal velocities of naturally occurring hail. The vertical lines in Table 3 demark the hail impact resistance of a given panel type. Examination of the table shows that the hail performance of solar panels is largely a function of the material used for the outermost layer. No panel design using a clear silicone potting as the outermost layer proved capable of withstanding 1-inch diameter simulated hailstones without cell cracking. Two types using annealed glass as the outermost layer were capable of withstanding up to 1-inch diameter simulated hailstones, but the glass was broken under the impact of 1-1/4-inch diameter hailstones; one type employing annealed glass survived 1-1/4-inch diameter hailstones. Three other designs, one incorporating 0.10-inch thick acrylic and the other two 0.125-inch thick tempered glass, withstood 1-1/4-inch, but not 1-1/2-inch, diameter simulated hailstones. Three other designs, two employing 0.125-inch thick tempered glass and the third using 0.19-inch thick tempered glass, withstood 1-1/2-inch diameter ice balls but broke under impact of 2-inch ice balls.

Figures 5, 6, 7, and 8 show several types of damage sustained by the solar panels subjected to simulated hailstone impact. Figure 5 shows the damage to a Type AI solar panel at the impact site of a 1.61-inch diameter molded ice sphere traveling at 70 mph. Note that the front acrylic sheet has been completely penetrated and that the underlying solar cell is cracked.

Figure 6 shows the damage to a Type BI solar panel at the impact site of a 1.28-inch diameter molded ice sphere traveling at 61 mph. The damage shown is fairly typical of those module designs that employ a silicone rubber top surface encapsulant. The cell is extensively cracked, but the silicone encapsulant is intact and adherent. Figure 7 shows the damage to a Type EII solar panel at the impact site of a 1.61-inch diameter simulated hailstone traveling at 70 mph. Again, this type of damage is typical of panel types incorporating annealed glass as the outermost surface (Types EI, EII, and G4). Note that the center of impact is near the edge of the panel. The glass panels were found to be much more prone to failure when impacted near the edge. The failure of types BIIK, F42, and F43, which incorporate a tempered glass superstrate, is very similar to the annealed glass types, except that the glass shatters over the entire surface of the panel as shown in Figure 8. On type H4, also tempered glass, the shattered area is confined to one end of the panel.

A. HIGH-SPEED MOVIES OF SIMULATED HAILSTONE IMPACT

In an effort to better understand the failure mechanisms involved, high-speed motion pictures were made of ice balls impacting

Table 3. Observed Damage to Photovoltaic Solar Panels Due to Impact of Simulated Hailstones

PANEL TYPE	TOP SURFACE MATERIAL	TEST DATE	HAILSTONE DIAMETER ^a , INCHES, AT VELOCITY, mph					
			0.49 AT 33	0.74 AT 44	1.05 AT 55	1.28 AT 61	1.61 AT 70	2.07 AT 79
AI	ACRYLIC SHEET	6/16/77			NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	PUNCTURED TOP OF ACRYLIC SHEET	
BI	SILICONE POTTING	5/20/77		SLIGHT CELL CRACKING	APPRECIABLE CELL CRACKING	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING	
BII	SILICONE POTTING	4/28/77	SLIGHT CELL CRACKING 2 OF 9 HITS	APPRECIABLE CELL CRACKING	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING; DENTS ALUMI- NUM PAN	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING; DENTS ALUMI- NUM PAN	
CI	SILICONE POTTING	6/14/77			SLIGHT CELL CRACKING, 1 OF 4 HITS	APPRECIABLE CELL CRACKING, 3 OF 5 HITS		
CII	SILICONE POTTING	6/14/77		NO DAMAGE	SLIGHT CELL CRACKING	APPRECIABLE CELL CRACKING	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING	EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING; PUNCTURED FIBER-GLASS SUBSTRATE
		9/28/77			SLIGHT CELL CRACKING	APPRECIABLE CELL CRACKING		
DI	SILICONE POTTING	6/13/77		NO DAMAGE	SLIGHT CELL CRACKING, 3 OF 5 HITS			
		9/26/77		NO DAMAGE	SLIGHT CELL CRACKING			
DII	SILICONE POTTING	4/27/77		DENTS IN SILICONE; SLIGHT CELL CRACKING	DENTS IN SILICONE; APPRECIABLE CELL CRACKING	DENTS IN SILICONE; EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING	DENTS IN SILICONE; EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING	DENTS IN SILICONE; EXTENSIVE CELL CRACKING; PUNCTURED FIBER-GLASS SUBSTRATE
BIIK	TEMPERED GLASS	6/15/77			NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE; 2 HITS; SHATTERED GLASS; 1 HIT NEAR EDGE	
		12/20/77					NO DAMAGE; 2 HITS	NO DAMAGE; 1 HIT; SHATTERED GLASS; 1 HIT 3.5 in. FROM EDGE
EI	ANNEALED GLASS	6/14/77			NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	BROKE GLASS, 2 OF 3 HITS	
		6/17/77			NO DAMAGE	BROKE GLASS, 1 OF 4 HITS		
		9/27/77				NO DAMAGE	BROKE GLASS	

^aTHE DIAMETERS SHOWN ARE THE ACTUAL DIAMETERS OF THE SIMULATED HAILSTONES; NOMINAL DIAMETERS ARE USED ELSEWHERE IN THIS REPORT.
NOTE: THE VERTICAL LINES INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE EXTENT OF THE HAIL IMPACT STRENGTH OF A GIVEN DESIGN.

Table 3. Observed Damage to Photovoltaic Solar Panels Due to Impact of Simulated Hailstones (Continued)

PANEL TYPE	TOP SURFACE MATERIAL	TEST DATE	HAILSTONE DIAMETER ^a , INCHES, AT VELOCITY, mph					
			0.49 AT 33	0.74 AT 44	1.05 AT 55	1.28 AT 61	1.61 AT 70	2.07 AT 79
E11	ANNEALED GLASS	4/26/77		NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE: 2 HITS MIDDLE; BROKE GLASS; 1 OF 3 HITS NEAR EDGE	NO DAMAGE: 3 HITS MIDDLE; BROKE GLASS; 2 OF 4 HITS NEAR EDGE	
		9/27/77				NO DAMAGE	BROKE GLASS	
F41	TEDLAR FILM	6/14/78				NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	
		6/28/78						NO DAMAGE ^b
F42	TEMPERED GLASS	6/15/78					NO DAMAGE	
		6/16/78					NO DAMAGE	SHATTERED GLASS: 1 HIT NEAR EDGE
F43	TEMPERED GLASS	6/14/78			NO DAMAGE		NO DAMAGE: 3 HITS SHATTERED GLASS: 1 HIT NEAR EDGE	
G4	ANNEALED GLASS	6/15/78			NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE: 1 HIT	
		6/28/78				NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE: 2 HITS; BROKE GLASS: 1 HIT NEAR EDGE	
H4	TEMPERED GLASS	6/14/78		NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	
		6/28/78						NO DAMAGE: 13 HITS; SHATTERED GLASS; 1 HIT NEAR EDGE
J4	TEMPERED GLASS	6/14/78			NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE	NO DAMAGE: 3 HITS; SHATTERED GLASS; 1 HIT NEAR EDGE

^aTHE DIAMETERS SHOWN ARE THE ACTUAL DIAMETERS OF THE SIMULATED HAILSTONES; NOMINAL DIAMETERS ARE USED ELSEWHERE IN THIS REPORT.

^bNO VISIBLE DAMAGE; HOWEVER, WHEN VIEWED WITH 6 POWER MICROSCOPE NUMEROUS CRACKS IN CELLS WERE SEEN.

NOTE: THE VERTICAL LINES INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE EXTENT OF THE HAIL IMPACT STRENGTH OF A GIVEN DESIGN.




Figure 5. Acrylic Sheet Top Surface (Panel Type AI) - Impact Site of 1.61-inch Diameter/70 mph Simulated Hailstone




Figure 6. Silicone Rubber Top Surface (Panel Type BI) - Impact Site of 1.28-inch Diameter/61 mph Simulated Hailstone




Figure 7. Annealed Glass Top Surface (Panel Type EII) - Impact Site of 1.61-inch Diameter/70 mph Simulated Hailstone




Figure 8. Tempered Glass Top Surface (Panel Type BIIK) - Impact Site of 1.61-inch Diameter/70 mph Simulated Hailstone

various panels. Using a Fastax camera and a frame rate of approximately 4500 frames per second, it was possible to study the ice ball fracture patterns at intervals of approximately 200 μ s.

The camera used expended 100 feet of film at each operation, with useful data usually occupying about 10 feet of film. A total of 24 impacts were filmed with three camera malfunctions. The useful film obtained was edited, titled, and stored on a single 400-foot reel to simplify handling and viewing.

Review of the data on this reel shows a great variety of failure mechanisms for the 21 ice-ball impacts recorded. In some cases, the ice ball merely bounced away from the panel it struck, in others it broke into a few large pieces after impact, and in still others it broke into hundreds of small pieces. The frames of interest were enlarged and studied. Figure 9 shows the extremes of ice ball fractures observed.

As shown in Figure 9, in one case, the simulated hailstone was shattered on impact with a glass panel. In the other case, the ice ball bounced off of a panel whose top surface layer is silicone rubber. Of the 21 impacts filmed, twelve were on a glass surface, the remaining nine were on a silicone rubber surface. In all cases involving impact on a glass surface the ice ball was shattered. In three of the nine cases involving impact on a silicone rubber surface the simulated hailstone bounced off intact. The fact that the ball bounced back is indicative of a high peak force at the hailstone/panel interface. When the hailstone bounces, it is known that the entire ice ball decelerates simultaneously, and thus that the peak force reached was greater than with a crushed ball, where the deceleration gradually progressed from the leading surface to the ball rear. Analysis of the photographs of both bouncing and crushing balls indicates that the hailstone deceleration is complete approximately 0.001 second following impact.

The peak force generated is considered the critical parameter for those modules with silicone rubber front surfaces. With these modules, the cell is crushed between the hailstone and the module substrate, which supports the cell. Cells were found to be particularly vulnerable when the substrate did not provide uniformly rigid support, as when voids or layers of silicone rubber greater than several thousandths of an inch thick existed below a cell. Design features resulting in this condition include:

- (1) A corrugated substrate designed to enhance substrate bending stiffness, but leading to a grooved substrate surface.
- (2) Projections on the rear surface of the cells associated with the attachment of the rear electrical contacts or excessive solder buildup.
- (3) Moderate layers of silicone rubber beneath the cell to provide electrical isolation and/or to provide for differential thermal expansion.




Figure 9. Comparison of Two types of Impact Behavior of 1.05-inch Diameter/55 mph Simulated Hailstones Fired Upward. Film Strip at Left Shows Impact on Silicone Rubber Surface; Strip at Right Shows Impact on Glass Surface

Unlike the silicone rubber panels, the glass in the glass panels is the critical element, not the solar cells. It has been determined that the failure is initiated within 200 μ s of first contact (it occurs in the first movie frame showing impact). The failure mechanism has been identified as local plate bending where the crack initiates on the back side of the glass, as opposed to Hertzian cracks that initiate at the contact surface and form the characteristic conical fracture.

B. PRE-HAIL AND POST-HAIL ELECTRICAL POWER MEASUREMENTS

In addition to the hail impact testing and the qualitative remarks recorded above pertaining to the observed damage, quantitative electrical power measurements were made on four of the panel types before and after hail impact testing. In these tests, the electrical power output of the panel is measured while the panel is irradiated with a standard light source. The results of these tests appear in Table 4.

Table 4. Effect of Hail Impact on Power Output of Photovoltaic Panels

PANEL	HAIL IMPACT TEST DATA	HITS/ft ² PANEL AREA	PANEL OUTPUT POWER - P _{max} W		POWER DEGRADATION, %	TOP SURFACE MATERIAL
			PRE-HAIL	POST-HAIL		
BII	4/28/77	15	11.0	2.7	75	SILICONE POTTING
CII	4/21/77	10	19.6	11.7	40	SILICONE POTTING
DII	4/27/77	6	34.8	21.3	39	SILICONE POTTING
EII	4/26/77	5	24.8	23.5	5	ANNEALED GLASS

Four of the panel types were subjected to impacts by simulated hailstones ranging from a 3/4-inch to 1-1/2-inch diameter. In addition, Types CII and DII were impacted with 2-inch diameter spheres. Note further the number of hits per square foot of panel area was not held constant in these tests. Suffice it to say that not too much emphasis should be placed on the numerical values reported. These results do indicate, however, that the visual damage previously discussed has a marked effect on the electrical power output of the panels that employ a silicone rubber top surface. At the same time the power output of panel Type EII, which has an annealed glass top surface, is practically unaffected even though the glass is cracked as shown in Figure 7.

SECTION VI

SIMPLIFIED TEST METHODS

At the outset of the program it was recognized that the simulated hail impact testing method just discussed is rather elaborate and expensive. A simplified test method is desired. Having studied the failure modes of the panels subjected to simulated hailstone impact at some length, it was felt that the applicability of a simplified test method would be verified if that method reproduced (for all design types) the failure modes previously observed using simulated hailstones.

A. DROPPED STEEL BALLS

The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specified dropped steel ball tests to determine the impact resistance of such items as safety glasses (Reference 11) and motor vehicle safety glazing materials (Reference 12). This type of test is simple and inexpensive and thus appeared to be a logical starting point. Table 5 summarizes the results of dropping steel balls on the various panel types. The critical drop height reported is the minimum drop height that produced failure of any kind (glass or cell fracture) when dropped on the most sensitive portion of the panel. The panels were supported as intended by the manufacturer.

Table 5. Critical Drop Height (Inches) for Steel Balls

PANEL TYPE	TEST DATE	DIAMETER OF STEEL BALLS, INCHES		
		0.75	1.00	1.25
AI	6/27/77	>96	47	34
BI	6/27/77	27	10	12
CI	6/27/77	90	65	33
DI	6/27/77	>96	>96	90
DII	6/29/77	33	10	11
EI	6/27/77	17	16	12

In Figure 10, the critical drop heights reported in Table 5 are plotted on the ordinate against the smallest simulated hailstone diameter reported to have caused damage (see Table 3). Examination of this figure shows that there is very little correlation between steel ball drop tests and the impact strength of a photovoltaic panel subjected to impact by simulated hailstones. This is especially apparent for panel Types CI and DI. The outermost layer of each is a clear silicone potting material and each has a critical simulated hailstone diameter of 1 inch, yet the critical drop height for 1.25-inch diameter steel balls varies by a factor of nearly 4 to 1.

Also superimposed on this figure are dotted and dot-dash lines that represent the steel ball drop height that will duplicate the kinetic energy and momentum, respectively, of a simulated hailstone of the same diameter. Note that the test results are approximately bounded by these two curves. Duplicating momentum yields reasonable correlation for three of the design types tested, but design Types CI and DI correlate better with steel ball drop heights providing kinetic energy similitude. This lack of uniform correlation between dropped steel balls and simulated hailstones was considered sufficient to rule out further consideration of the dropped steel ball testing approach.




Figure 10. Correlation of Damage Due to Dropped Steel Balls with Damage Induced by Simulated Hailstones

B. STATICALLY-LOADED STEEL BALLS

In the dropped steel ball tests, drop heights providing momentum similitude often tended to produce the same damage as the simulated hailstone. This together with the fact that ice balls have a limited crushing strength encouraged the hypothesis that the damage might be related to the peak force applied by the hailstone. Figure 11 summarizes the results of applying static loads to a steel ball that was placed against the surface of the various panels. The panel was mounted as the manufacturer intended, and the steel ball was placed at critical locations on the panel surface (near the edge of glass panels and near the edges of cells at cell junctions for silicone encapsulated panels). The minimum static load that produced failure of any sort is plotted against the minimum diameter of simulated hailstone that caused like damage.

The scatter in the data is indicative of the brittle nature of the materials being tested. The silicon solar cells that fail on those panels employing a clear silicone rubber top surface and the glass that fails on those designs employing glass cover sheets are both brittle materials.




Figure 11. Correlation of Damage Due to Statically Loaded Steel Balls with Damage Induced by Simulated Hailstones

Superimposed on the test results is a dotted curve representing the calculated value of the peak impact force based on the following considerations. The impulse or momentum change of the simulated hailstone is given by

$$\int F dt = m \Delta v \quad (2)$$

where F is the impact force, t is the time, m is the mass of the simulated hailstone, and Δv is the velocity change undergone by the hailstone during impact. If the force-time history of impact is assumed to be a half-sine pulse, Equation (2) becomes

$$F_{\text{peak}} = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{m \Delta v}{t_i} \quad (3)$$

where t_i is the total impact time. The dotted curve shown in Figure 11 is based on a total impact time of 0.001 second and a hailstone rebound velocity of 10% of the approach velocity so that $\Delta v = 1.1 v_T$. Both of these values were observed in the analysis of the high-speed movies taken of simulated hailstone impact on photovoltaic solar panels. These comments are primarily of academic interest, but it is interesting to note that the general trend of the data follows this analytical model.

Except for the poor correlation of panel Type BI, statically loaded steel balls might be considered as a simple means of assessing the hail impact strength of photovoltaic solar panels.

SECTION VII

IMPROVING PANEL IMPACT STRENGTH

The tests already discussed were directed toward assessing the hail impact resistance of currently available commercial solar panels. The additional tests and considerations discussed below are intended to provide groundwork for improving the impact resistance of future generations of photovoltaic solar panels.

A. EDGE EFFECTS - GLASS PANELS

During the testing conducted to assess the hail impact resistance of the commercially available solar panels, it was noted that those designs using glass were much more subject to damage when struck near the edge of the glass panels.

This effect was further studied by making up a series of dummy solar panels by installing double strength window glass 45 by 15 by 0.125 inches in an aluminum frame with a rubber glazing gasket. A cross section near the frame edge is shown in Figure 12. This configuration very nearly duplicates the configuration of panel Type EII.

These test panels were tested with double strength window glass (annealed glass, 0.125 inch thick) having both unground and bevel-ground edges. Dropped and statically loaded steel ball tests were performed. The results of the drop tests are summarized in Table 6. The results of the static load tests are not reported. They are considered inconclusive since an insufficient number of tests were performed to be statistically significant.




Figure 12. Edge Configuration of Edge Effect Test Panel

Table 6. Critical Steel Ball Drop Height for Glass Panels with Various Edge Conditions

STEEL BALL DIAMETER, INCHES	CRITICAL DROP HEIGHT, INCHES			
	UNGROUND EDGES		BEVEL-GROUND EDGES	
	0.75 in. EDGE DISTANCE	2.5 in. EDGE DISTANCE	0.75 in. EDGE DISTANCE	1.5 in. EDGE DISTANCE
0.75	40	44		
1.00	28	35	54	54
1.25	22	24		

The drop tests show that there is little improvement to be gained in the impact resistance of glass panels by increasing the edge distance from 0.75 inch to 2.5 inches. Therefore, increasing the width of the glazing frame does not appear to be a practical means of improving the hail impact resistance of glass panels.

There is, however, substantial improvement to be gained by grinding the edges of glass panels, or otherwise improving the finish of the edges.

B. EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE TOP LAYER MATERIALS

It has been shown that the top layer of the solar panel is of paramount importance in determining the impact strength of solar panels. The outermost layer of a photovoltaic solar panel that protects the silicon solar cells from the environment should be low-cost, transparent, weather and abrasion resistant, and should have good impact resistance. Additional testing was performed on acrylic sheets to determine whether a panel could be constructed to survive the impact of a 2-inch diameter hailstone. The results of these and previous tests are shown in Table 7 along with data on cost, transparency, and weather and abrasion resistance. Annealed glass has the advantage in all categories, especially cost, except for resistance to hail impact. Acrylic panels could be made to withstand 2-inch diameter hailstones.

C. PROTECTION OF SOLAR PANELS

Rather than making the solar panels resistant to large hailstones, it has been suggested that the panels be shielded from impact of large hailstones by fitting a wire mesh screen in a plane several inches above the surface of the panels. Hailstones larger

than the opening size in the screen would be slowed and broken by the screen before striking the solar panels.

Two costs inherent in such a scheme are readily identified. That is, the installed first cost and the cost penalties associated with the blockage or shadowing of the solar panels, which amounts to 6% for a 1-inch square wire mesh screen constructed of 0.030-inch diameter wire. Preliminary calculations show that these two cost components alone are approximately equal to the cost increment attributable to improving panel impact resistance from 1-inch diameter to 2-inch diameter hailstones by changing from a 1/8-inch thick annealed glass to a 3/16th-inch thick acrylic top surface. Additionally, such screens will collect debris and complicate the cleaning of the solar panels.

For these reasons, the use of wire mesh screens to protect photovoltaic solar panels from hail damage does not appear to be as cost effective as improving the hail impact resistance of the panels by suitable design changes.

Table 7. Evaluation of Candidate Solar Panel Top Surface Materials

MATERIAL	THICKNESS, INCHES	IMPACT RESISTANCE, INCHES ^a	COST \$/ft ²	TRANSPARENCY	WEATHER RESISTANCE	ABRASION RESISTANCE
ANNEALED GLASS	0.125	1	0.3	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT
TEMPERED GLASS	0.125	1 1/4	1.0	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT
TEMPERED GLASS	0.188	1 1/2	1.5	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT
ACRYLIC	0.100	1 1/4	0.8	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD
ACRYLIC	0.125	1 1/2	0.9	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD
ACRYLIC	0.188	2	1.0	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD

^aWITHSTANDS SIMULATED HAILSTONE OF DIAMETER INDICATED.

D. SHOCK MOUNTING OF PANELS

It was desired to learn whether soft mounting would improve the hail impact resistance of photovoltaic solar panels.

The annealed glass top surface of panel G4 was broken by the impact of a 1.61-inch diameter simulated hailstone when the panel was rigidly mounted to a frame.

In a crude attempt to soft mount the panel it was hung from four wires to see if it could better withstand impact. It did withstand 1.61-inch diameter ice ball impacts when so mounted; however when impacted by a 2.07-inch diameter ice ball at its terminal velocity the panel failed.

A Type BII mini-module was also tested, in both fixed and hung positions. It was found that the damage due to a 1.61-inch diameter ice ball for the soft mounted panel was about the same as done by 1.05-inch diameter ice balls with the panel fixed. Also the slight cracking caused by a 1.28-inch diameter ice ball for the soft mounted panel was less than that caused by a 0.74-inch diameter ice ball with the panel fixed.

There were other indications of panels using rubber grommets that resisted impact better with the grommets than without them. These results of improvements due to soft mounting are based on comparatively few measurements, but indicate a promising way to improve the hail resistance of photovoltaic panels.

SECTION VIII

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the work reported herein, a number of useful general conclusions may be drawn.

- (1) The top surface material of the panels is the design feature which most affects the hail impact resistance of photovoltaic solar panels.
- (2) None of the six panel designs incorporating clear potting silicone material as the outermost layer was capable of protecting the silicon solar cells from damage due to impacts by simulated hailstones of 1-inch diameter or larger.
- (3) Of the three module designs using annealed glass as the outermost layer, two could withstand the impact of 1-inch diameter, but not 1-1/4-inch diameter, simulated hailstones; and one could withstand 1-1/4-inch diameter, but not 1-1/2-inch diameter, ice ball impacts.
- (4) The module design using 0.100-inch thick acrylic and two of the four designs employing a 0.125-inch thick tempered glass top surface could withstand the impact of 1-1/4-inch diameter, but not 1-1/2-inch diameter, simulated hailstones. Two of the four designs employing a 0.125-inch thick tempered glass top surface and the single design employing a 0.188-inch thick top surface of tempered glass withstood the impact of 1-1/2-inch, but not 2-inch, diameter simulated hailstones.
- (5) The simplified test methods evaluated, namely the dropped or statically-loaded steel ball tests, did not provide acceptable correlation with the simulated hail impact tests.
- (6) A photovoltaic module employing a 0.188-inch thick acrylic cover sheet should be capable of withstanding the impact of a 2-inch diameter hailstone.
- (7) Protection of photovoltaic solar panels from damage by large hailstones by shielding the panels with wire mesh screens does not appear to be as cost-effective as modifying the design of the panels to increase resistance to hail impact damage.
- (8) Preliminary tests indicate that soft mounting has potential for increasing the impact resistance of solar panels.

SECTION IX

RECOMMENDATIONS

This program has provided much useful information with regard to the hail impact strength of current photovoltaic solar panels, and design features that enhance or detract from that strength. It has produced some information pertinent to the problem of finding a simpler test method to evaluate the hail resistance of solar panels. At the same time, it has emphasized the need for further study. It is suggested that further work be carried out as follows:

- (1) Study the direction and magnitude of the winds that accompany hailstorms to better assess the angle of incidence of the hailstone impact on photovoltaic solar panels.
- (2) Subject panels to oblique hailstone impact at probable angles of incidence to see how this affects the hail resistance of the panels.
- (3) Explore the life-cycle cost effectiveness of various degrees of hail resistance.
- (4) Examine the validity of using ice spheres or other means to simulate impact by naturally occurring hailstones.
- (5) Further study of a simpler test method to evaluate hail impact resistance of solar panels.
- (6) In addition, those design features of solar panels that most influence the impact strength should be studied further to find cost effective means of enhancing the hail impact resistance of photovoltaic solar panels. Fire polishing the edges of glass panels, for example, should be studied.

REFERENCES

1. Gonzalez, Charles Environmental Hail Model for Assessing Risk to Solar Collectors, 5101-45, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, December 6, 1977.
2. Changnon, Stanley A., "Hail Sensing and Small Scale Variability of Wind Blown Hail," Journal of Weather Modification, Vol. 5, No. 1, May 1973, pp. 30-42.
3. Friedman, D. G., Severe Storm Climatology in Kansas, The Travelers Insurance Companies, Hartford, Connecticut, October 10, 1975.
4. Stoller, Floyd W., Investigation of Hailstorm Damage to DSIF Antennas, Technical Memorandum No. 33-81, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, February 23, 1962.
5. Greenfeld, S. H., Hail Resistance of Roofing Materials, Building Science Series 23, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C., August 1969.
6. Smith, Milton, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, August 2, 1977, private communication.
7. Hovis, Ford, The Encyclopedia of Sports, Praeger Publishers, Inc., New York, New York, 1976.
8. McWhirter, Norris, and Ross, Guinness Book of World Records, Bantam Books, New York, New York, 1977.
9. Official Encyclopedia of Tennis, edited by the staff of United States Lawn Tennis Association, Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., New York, New York, 1972.
10. Bairstow, J., "Meet the New King of the Serve: Scott Carnahan Hits 137 mph," Tennis, December 1976.
11. American National Standard Practice for Occupational and Educational Eye and Face Protection, ANSI Z87.1-1968, American National Standards Institute, New York, New York, September 18, 1968.
12. Safety Code for Safety Glazing Materials for Glazing Motor Vehicles Operating on Land Highways, ANSI Z26.1-1966 (R1973), American National Standards Institute, New York, New York, July 15, 1966.