

NOV 19 2001

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be liable for collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE**

AFRL-SR-BL-TR-01-

0598

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 11-01-01		2. REPORT TYPE Final Technical Report		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 1999-2001	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Limit Cycle Oscillations (LCO) and Nonlinear Aeroelastic Response: Reduced Order Models				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER F49620-97-1-0063	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER 313-6019	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER NA	
6. AUTHOR(S) Earl H. Dowell				5d. PROJECT NUMBER NA	
				5e. TASK NUMBER 2302 / DX	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER NA	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Duke University Mech. Eng. and Materials Sciences Pratt School of Engineering P.O. Box 90300 Durham, NC 27708				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NA	
				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) AFOSR	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) NA	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT No Limitations					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES NA					
<p>AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (AFOSR) NOTICE OF TRANSMITTAL DTIC. THIS TECHNICAL REPORT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND IS APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE LAW AFR 190-12. DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.</p>					
14. ABSTRACT Unsteady aerodynamic computational models for aeroelastic phenomena such as flutter and limit cycle oscillations are complex and high dimensional. Under this grant, reduced order models are being developed that offer increased physical insight and greatly reduced computational cost. Transonic flows are emphasized because of their practical importance and significant technical challenge.					
20011203 180					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Limit Cycle Oscillations, Nonlinear Aeroelasticity, Reduced Order Models, Transonic, Unsteady Aerodynamics					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: NA			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 12	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Earl H. Dowell
a. REPORT NA	b. ABSTRACT NA	c. THIS PAGE NA			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 919-660-5302

Final Technical Report
Limit Cycle Oscillations (LCO) and Nonlinear
Aeroelastic Response: Reduced Order Models

AFOSR Grant Number F49620-97-1-0063

Earl H. Howell
Duke University


September, 2001



Relevancy

- Objective: To construct reduced order models (ROM) of unsteady aerodynamic forces to achieve orders of magnitude reduction in computational cost and model degrees of freedom
- A key enabling methodology to analyze and design for transonic flutter and limit cycle oscillations (LCO)

Chart #1



Relevancy

• Five years ago, such work was pioneered at Duke.
Now several research groups are pursuing such work.
For example,

Dr. Philip Beran, AFRL

Dr. John Kim, Boeing

- A systematic approach has been taken, starting from two-dimensional models and adding the effects of compressibility, shock wave motion and now
 - large shock motions
 - viscosity



Relevancy

- Three dimensional flows have been modeled within the small shock motion approximation.
- Applications to aircraft systems (including UCAV), space launch vehicles (subsonic to hypersonic) and weapons such as aircraft stores.

Chart #1 (cont'd 2)



Background Information and Partnerships

- Traditional approaches are based upon classical theory that ignores shock waves and viscosity
- or
- More elaborate CFD models that are very expensive computationally and thus not suitable for engineering analysis and design.


Chart #2



Background Information and Partnerships

- We are collaborating with industry and government (AFRL and NASA) through reports to the Aerospace Flutter and Dynamics Council and as a partner with ZONA Technology (funded by a STTR grant).

Chart #2 (cont'd)



Innovation In Science

- First work to show how one can dramatically reduce the size, complexity and cost of physically sophisticated CFD models.
- Typical results for 2D and 3D flow

First Figure: Flutter boundary for an airfoil with control surface freeplay/reduced velocity (or dynamic pressure) vs Mach number.

Chart #3



Innovation In Science

- Note rapid change in the most critical structural mode in the transonic range. Such behavior has been reported in experiments, but this is first systematic theoretical result. LCO results have also been obtained for this configuration.

Next Figure: Flutter boundary of a wing in three dimensional transonic flow.

Chart #3 (cont'd 1)





Innovation In Science

- Flutter calculations with a POD/ROM model are no more expensive and the model size is no larger for 3D flow than for 2D flow. Of course, constructing a 3D vs a 2D POD/ROM is conceptually more complex and somewhat (factor of 2 to 3) more computationally costly.

Chart #3 (cont'd 2)



Mach Number Flutter Trend



Mach Number Flutter Trend for AGARD 445.6 Wing ‘Weakened Configuration’




Chart #4 (cont'd)

Innovation In Design

- POD/ROM models make transonic flutter and LCO analysis feasible for engineering design.
- POD/ROM methods are expected to impact currently operational flight vehicles (F-16 and F-18) and also future aerospacecraft (JSF, UCAV, new launch vehicles).
- Flutter and LCO are important drivers to these developments, but gust response and design of smart structures will also substantially benefit.

Chart #5

