



Level 2 Industrial Case Study

Longboard

Claes Fredriksson

Ansys Academic Development Team


First Published: 2018

Current Edition (3rd): 2022

1. Material Selection in Design

When developing products, material options should be considered early in the design to allow great performance. Usually, lightweighting, cost reduction and sometimes green credentials are important aspects. The challenge is to select materials rationally to maximize benefits. In this Case Study, we look at materials for a longboard.

A longboard is a type of skateboard designed for downhill and slalom racing but also for simple cruising and transport. Because it is longer than a regular skateboard and normally has bigger wheels, it promotes higher speeds. Their greater weight and bulk makes them less suitable for many skateboarding tricks but contributes to stability and a fluid motion by providing more momentum. The decks can bow up or down along the length of the board. They can also be double-curved; concave in the width direction and convex in the length.



Longboard decks are typically made from plywood with several layers, each usually 2 mm in thickness. These are composed of, for example, maple wood. Longboards are commercially available in a variety of shapes and sizes. Each one has its advantages and disadvantages, depending on the technique or personal preferences.

2. How to tackle the Problem

The systematic way to select materials by Ashby *et al.* involves identifying the Function, Objectives and Constraints for the design. It is good to determine which mechanical properties are key to the performance for longboard decks. Strength will, of course, be one of the crucial parameters in the sense that the deck must be strong enough. However, it is not that property that limits the performance. Rather, like in other equipment used for sports and racing (skis, rackets, bikes *etc.*), it is the *Stiffness* that we want to promote.

Whereas the mass of the deck provides stability to the board, it does not contribute to higher speeds when going downhill, due to higher inertia. Instead, it is low friction and air resistance that promote speed. Uphill, on the other hand, the mass definitely contributes to harder work, which inhibits speed. It is thus natural to seek to minimize mass when selecting material for the deck. We will focus on stiffness/mass performance in this case study, but cost will also be considered. The Learn button (Learn > Material Selection > Performance Indices) shows the options:

Table of performance indices

Click the buttons to view a table of relevant performance indices.

	Mass	Cost	Embodied Energy	CO ₂ Footprint
Stiffness-limited design	kg	\$	H _m	CO ₂
Strength-limited design	kg	\$	H _m	CO ₂

Function:

The longboard deck itself is very much a **panel in bending** limited by **stiffness** (we do not want the deck to deflect too much). The free design variable is the thickness of the panel. In EduPack (Learn), we can find:

Objective:

The material Index Tables (see above) available via the **Learn** button in EduPack tell us to maximize the cubic root of the flexural modulus, E_f , over the density, ρ . E_f is the flexural modulus, which means stiffness in bending. Since this parameter is only available in Level 3 databases, we use **Young's modulus** as a measure of the stiffness at Level 2 instead. Our objective is thus:

Maximize: $M=E^{1/3}/\rho$ (selection line of slope=3 in E vs ρ)

Constraints:

These constraints are based largely on existing decks. They are inserted via a **Limit stage** in Granta EduPack.

- Service temperature: **-20°C to +60°C**
- Yield strength: **> 10 MPa**
- Young's modulus: **> 7.5 GPa**
- Resistance to rain and salt water: **Limited+Acceptable+Excellent**

3. The material selection

The basis of the selection is the data records for around 100 engineering materials available in Level 2 of Granta EduPack.

- Click the Chart/Select button (All materials) on the toolbar and plot **Young's modulus vs Density**
- Put a selection line of slope 3 using a Chart stage
- Place the line through the Plywood bubble
- Add the constraints via a **Limit stage** (can be tricky)

The Young's modulus constraint can also be put in as a selection line with slope 0, as shown in the Chart below:




Chart: Several materials have a performance as good as plywood, or better (above the selection line).

Using an Index line of slope 3, corresponding to the exponent 1/3 of the index expressions, it can be seen that bamboo is the best performing natural material, even outperforming carbon-fiber reinforced epoxy (CFRP) composites, and so does hardwood, like oak (see Rank by: Index value).



In the picture above, some common types of deck materials are shown. From the left: A traditional maple plywood deck is shown. These typically have 5-7 cross-plies and are at the lower end of the price range. Next, a unidirectional bamboo deck is shown and to the right, a lightweight sandwich panel deck, consisting of carbon-fiber/maple/glass-fiber layers, is shown. These typically cost more than \$100. Our results indicate that the cheaper Maple and Bamboo longboards should still provide a very good performance. But what about Boron Carbide, that also rank very well in the selection? This technical ceramic has relatively high fracture toughness.

One indication as to why there are no skateboards made of this material is the price. A comparison of the price per volume (price per kg * density) is shown below:



Chart: Boron carbide (and CFRP) usually have very good performance but are also very expensive. Wood costs less.

A plot of the more advanced Performance Index for cost from the Help menu shows the same picture. It is too costly. Other reasons for not using ceramics, that you can explore using the datasheets, are the higher embodied energy and CO2-footprint, as well as poor recyclability. A search for “skateboard” at Level 2 in EduPack gives the plywood datasheet with a picture of a skateboard as an example.



Left. Close-up of the material. © Chris Lefteri
Right. Skateboard made with plywood. © Chris Lefteri

4. Conclusions

The traditional wood materials, particularly Bamboo, compare very well in the mechanical performance with more expensive composite materials. Considering additional factors, such as cost, CO₂-footprint or recyclability supports this decision. Using Granta EduPack enables systematic and rational material selection. It provides the necessary information and tools for an interactive and visual investigation of interesting real engineering problems.

5. Expanding the Material Selection with Simulation

The material selection methodology provided recommendations on the best materials for the deck, however information such as Price and Carbon footprint were given per kg of material. It remains therefore the question of what is the total cost of boards made with different materials. Indeed, while CFRP is more expensive per kg than bamboo, it is also stronger and stiffer, thus a CFRP board could be thinner than a bamboo one and in turn weight less. To answer this questions, structural simulation can be performed to find the optimal thickness board for each material, its corresponding weight, and thus compare the total cost (e.g. £ and not £/kg) of different board designs. This extended simulation analysis can be found in the following [case study](#), in which Longboard simulation was performed in Ansys Mechanical as shown in the figure below.




Figure: a) Longboard Assembly, b) Structural Simulation Results of Longboard in Ansys Mechanical

© 2022 ANSYS, Inc. All rights reserved.

Use and Reproduction

The content used in this resource may only be used or reproduced for teaching purposes; and any commercial use is strictly prohibited.

Document Information

This case study is part of a set of teaching resources to help introduce students to materials, processes and rational selections.

Ansys Education Resources

To access more undergraduate education resources, including lecture presentations with notes, exercises with worked solutions, microprojects, real life examples and more, visit www.ansys.com/education-resources.

Feedback

If you notice any errors in this resource or need to get in contact with the authors, please email us at education@ansys.com.

ANSYS, Inc.
Southpointe
2600 Ansys Drive
Canonsburg, PA 15317
U.S.A.
724.746.3304
ansysinfo@ansys.com

If you've ever seen a rocket launch, flown on an airplane, driven a car, used a computer, touched a mobile device, crossed a bridge or put on wearable technology, chances are you've used a product where Ansys software played a critical role in its creation. Ansys is the global leader in engineering simulation. We help the world's most innovative companies deliver radically better products to their customers. By offering the best and broadest portfolio of engineering simulation software, we help them solve the most complex design challenges and engineer products limited only by imagination.

visit www.ansys.com for more information

Any and all ANSYS, Inc. brand, product, service and feature names, logos and slogans are registered trademarks or trademarks of ANSYS, Inc. or its subsidiaries in the United States or other countries. All other brand, product, service and feature names or trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

© 2022 ANSYS, Inc. All Rights Reserved.