DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF BELLWETHER:
A FLYING WING FEATURING THE BELL-SHAPED SPANLOAD

By

Scott Weekley
Bachelor of Science in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK
2019

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
Master of Science
May, 2021
DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF BELLWETHER:
A FLYING WING FEATURING THE BELL-SHAPED SPANLOAD

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Jamey D. Jacob
Thesis Advisor

Dr. Ryan Paul

Dr. Andy Arena
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Author recognizes aircraft design partner and friend, Cole Kelly, for being an integral part of this effort from its inception. From design to modeling to analysis to concepts in aircraft construction, this research effort would not have been possible without his influence. Thanks to Hill Jordan, Alex Langseth, and Boone Miller for the great work on Leading-Edge Flow Sensing concepts and designs.

Thanks to Dr. Andy Arena for constructive discussions and guidance on the topic of aircraft stability & control.

Author credits Dr. Aaron Alexander for expertise in computational fluid dynamics with STAR-CCM+.

Thank you to Dr. Ryan Paul for joining the team and becoming a massive influence in the understanding of advanced aerodynamics and applications of vortex lattice methods as well as helping to earn the NASA grant for fabrication of the aircraft designed in this thesis.

Author gives thanks to advisor Dr. Jamey Jacob for support financially and intellectually and for providing the tools and housing for the aircraft construction at his research lab, Excelsior.

Special thanks to family for the undying support and unconditional love.

Acknowledgments reflect the views of the author and are not endorsed by committee members or Oklahoma State University.
Name: SCOTT WEEKLEY

Date of Degree: MAY, 2021

Title of Study: DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF BELLWETHER: A FLYING WING FEATUREDURING THE BELL-SHAPED SPANLOAD

Major Field: MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Abstract:

This body of work details the design and analysis, as well as discussion of requirements for eventual fabrication and flight testing, of a flying-wing aircraft. The design presented is focused primarily on matching the lift distribution to a bell curve and its effect on aerodynamic performance for this aircraft configuration. Various analysis methods of the software-driven design are justification for the wing shape: panel method, vortex lattice method, and computational fluid dynamics. The key phenomenon examined by the analysis methods, and to be measured from the on-board inertial measurement unit, is proverse yaw. The unique wing twist used to match the desired lift distribution encourages a favorable longitudinal force differential by the aileron-deflected wingtips engulfed in upwash flow to induce thrust at the wingtips. This yawing motion as a consequence of roll promotes a naturally coordinated turn without the demand for rudder authority. The observation of proverse yaw coupled with vorticity scenes, resultant from computational fluid dynamics, synchronizes this work with emerging research suggesting the bell spanload is the apt model for avian flight. Additionally, this study parameterizes lift distribution to investigate, through highly-computational methods, the centralization of lift and the aerodynamic effect with the change in shape of the flow field. The inboard movement of the vortex cores with centralized lift is found to be directly proportional to the proverse yaw control power responsible for coordinated flight without an auxiliary yaw device. Level and banked-flight analyses are used to weight the tradeoffs between the creation of favorable yaw and the aerodynamic efficiency of the lift distribution in steady operation. The significance of this validation through computational methods may be used to justify reducing the size of a vertical tail on more traditional aircraft configurations or to consider using a bell-shaped lift distribution on flying-wing aircraft for greater efficiency in banked turns.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation

The shape of the lift distribution across a finite wing greatly influences aerodynamic performance, in terms of induced drag, and the need for structural rigidity at the wing root. In 1921, Ludwig Prandtl presented the classical result that minimum induced drag is achieved for a finite wing when the lift distribution is elliptical in shape [16]. This understanding has prevailed and modern wing designs are still commonly compared to the elliptical lift distribution to assess efficiency with the common span efficiency factor, $e$. In 1933, Prandtl revised his previous work after recognizing that the elliptical distribution may not be the most efficient if a wing was not subject to a span constraint. Rather, a bell-shaped, spanwise loading results in lower induced drag for a given lifting capacity [11] if the designer accepts a higher wingspan. This optimization was achieved in the 1933 paper by applying a bending moment constraint rather than assuming a fixed span, effectively increasing aspect ratio rather than shaping the lift distribution to achieve an $e$ of 1. A beneficial consequence of the bell spanload, not recognized by Prandtl at the time, is proverse yaw[2] which can obviate the need for a vertical stabilizer to provide a means for turn coordination in flying wing configurations further reducing overall aircraft drag. In fact, the vertical stabilizer may be omitted altogether if the resulting aircraft is immune from flight conditions where asymmetric thrust would be encountered (i.e., single-engine) and has no need to operate off of paved landing surfaces in crosswind conditions where alignment of the aircraft’s longitudinal axis to the runway direction is desired prior to touchdown. Albion Bowers[2] recently lead a group of researchers at NASA Armstrong through an experiment to validate the purported efficiencies of a flying-wing glider featuring the 1933 Bell spanload. The researchers observed the favorable proverse yaw in data collected from their flight test experiments, and provided insights to the aerodynamics community synchronizing aerodynamic theory and observations of avian formation flight.

This body of work describes progress towards the author’s design, manufacturing, and plans for flight testing of Bellwether: a flying wing platform featuring the 1933 Prandtl Bell lift distribution. Bellwether is intended to be used for atmospheric data collection while demonstrating minimum induced drag. The Bell spanload is particularly well-suited to this application for its induced drag characteristics which will increase platform endurance, while keeping the centroid of the aerodynamic load close to the wing root which serves to limit bending moments that must be passed through the center section. Bellwether has been de-
signed using a combination of medium- and high-fidelity aerodynamic analysis techniques. Vortex Lattice Methods (VLM) were used to design the geometric twist distribution to match the desired span loading and to analyze local section aerodynamics towards selecting appropriate airfoils. Following lofting of the flying wing with the desired twist distribution, in SolidWorks, the geometry was extracted for mesh generation. Numerous simulations of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) have been performed to validate the medium-fidelity analysis techniques, allowing for an interesting comparison to be made between VLM and CFD. This thesis compares the bell-shaped lift distribution (BSLD) to the industry-preferred elliptical distribution (ELD), and it rigorously investigates the performance of other span-loads as a parametric study on lift distribution and its affect on aerodynamic performance. These differences are quantified for flying-wing aircraft configurations. Variance in geometric wing twist are used to produce the desired distributions, and the different aircraft models are evaluated by various computational methods. This work provides insight to the aircraft design process, and it details the methods by which the experimental aircraft design is generated and analyzed.

1.2 Background

This design follows in the footsteps of the Preliminary Research Aerodynamic Design to Lower Drag, or Prandtl-D platform developed at NASA Armstrong[2]. A combination of geometric and aerodynamic twist was utilized to ensure the lift distribution per unit span conformed to the bell shape proposed by Prandtl as a more efficient alternative to the elliptical spanload when a span constraint is not present. Past research gives the expectation that the design will realize an up to 11.1% decrease in induced drag while increasing the span by 22.5% for a given structural weight, which this research effort intends to verify through more robust aerodynamic analysis than previous efforts have utilized.

Figure 1: Elliptical Lift Distribution (a) v. Bell-Shaped Lift Distribution (b) [2]

*Figure 1* illustrates how the wing-tip twist to a negative angle of attack in the region of upwash can induce thrust, resulting in the favorable proverse yaw characteristic. Once
aileron are deflected anti-symmetrically, the lift vector on the high-lift wing will benefit from the upwash, and it can be thought of as tilting forward. Due to the negative angle of attack, the opposite wing tip is producing a negative lift vector, when the aileron is actuated upward, tilting in the direction of the freestream, and thus, it fails to utilize the region of upwash. This resultant force differential on the wingtips shows an ability for proverse yaw in roll.

Figure 2: Change in Regions of Downwash from Elliptical (Left) to Bell-Shaped (Right) Lift Distribution [2]

The movement of the upwash region inboard (Figure 2) matches what is believed to be exhibited by bird flight. This has been examined by the formation of flight. To achieve an optimal formation, birds overlap their wing tips such that they are capturing the entire region of upwash. The amount of overlap is congruent with the inboard region of upwash produced from the application of Prandtl’s revision of the most efficient spanwise lift distribution [2].

The lift-to-drag ratios, flow field, and roll-yaw characteristics are evaluated in this research by computational methods for four different lift distributions (later defined), and they will be used to justify the shape of the finalized wing design for optimal aerodynamic performance. Before outlining the design methodology and procedures, a literature review is provided for a comprehensive understanding of the emerging research on the application of this newly-analyzed lift distribution and its relationship to avian flight observations.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review and Previous Work

2.1 Literature Review

This section journeys through a brief history of the industry-standard lift distribution before exploring examples and research in support of an alternative. Discussion of the analysis tools, methods, and results of various research help us understand what is known and how to best contribute to the advancement of this alternative lift distribution. Research examining avian flight formation provides a biomimetic link between bird flight and aircraft design. This is used to suggest that birds benefit from the alternative lift distribution both in formation flight and performing perfectly coordinated turns with favorable roll-yaw characteristics. The collective theories and experiments are used to inform the aircraft design detailed in this thesis.

2.1.1 Origin and Implementation of Elliptical Lift Distribution

For a century, aircraft have been designed using the same theory presented by Ludwig Prandtl in "Applications of Modern Hydrodynamics to Aeronautics" in 1921 [16], where he describes the minimum drag solution for a finite wing is to design the wing such that the distribution across the span takes the shape of an ellipse. This major theoretical installment discusses many topics and applications. The portion most pertinent to modern aerodynamics is the discussion on the theory of lift as it pertains to a monoplane. The theory described in the published manuscript relies on the lifting-line approximation which describes a lifting surface as a vortex-inducing line orthogonal to the free stream. This simplification leads to the horseshoe vortex representation (Figure 3). The lifting line generates a bound vortex inducing a downward component to freestream velocity. It is assumed that the lift is produced uniformly across this line which means the total circulation is produced at the ends of the lifting line creating the free vortices at the wingtips. As is easily depicted in (Figure 3), the flow direction is downward between the vortices at the ends of the lifting line, and upwash occurs outside of the horseshoe. This can also be viewed as a vortex ribbon (Figure 4) formed from the curling of the flow at the wingtips in reaction to the pressure differential caused on the wing. The high-pressure fluid flows to the region of low pressure on top of the wing resulting in a curling flow in the wake of a finite lifting surface. The true nature of the wake vortices is to dissipate and gravitate at a distance from the wings, but since the greatest influence on the wing occurs nearest the body, the underpinnings of Prandtl’s theory makes calculations reliant upon considering all vortex filaments as running in a straight line opposite the aircraft’s direction of motion. The simplification makes the problem linear and solvable.
The influence of the vortical structure to the lifting surface increases the effective angle of attack and the induced drag as the ends of the vortex sheet are positioned closer together, which is to say the aspect ratio is inversely proportional to the induced drag (the next section will utilize this idea by the reframing of design constraints to achieve a new analytical solution). Prandtl uses this basis for the derivation of an elliptical shape of circulation distribution across the span having fixed wingspan, total lift, and velocity (derivation in text [16]). Vorticity and its relationship to the flow field and aerodynamic performance is an ongoing theme in this thesis that will draw qualitative and quantitative comparisons to the general overview provided in this section.

Prandtl’s early work also applies the lifting-line theory to multiple wing configurations suggesting the elliptical lift distribution for a two-wing system.

Researchers at Pisa University, Italy [9] reference the Prandtl’s Best Wing System [8], derived from Ludwig Prandtl’s 1924 work “Induced Drag of Multiplanes” [17], in their effort to optimize a box wing configuration for minimal induced drag. Inspired by Prandtl’s theories of a century prior, the Italian research team aim to solve a modern optimization problem in the drag reduction of large, transport aircraft. The designs of which have been refined over decades to a point of near stagnation. Noting that a 1% reduction in drag for a large aircraft can save 400,000 liters of fuel and 5,000 kilograms of noxious emissions annually [20], improvements in aerodynamic efficiency have great societal benefits. The researchers at Pisa University present models produced by the in-house code MSD (Multiple Shape Design), and analysis through CFD, to introduce an automated solution to optimization of box-wing aircraft configurations. Two-dimensional curves and airfoils, in the form of .Dat files, are used to construct all of the main features of the “PrandtlPlane” by use of the MSD code:
fuselage, wings, holes, fillets, etc. The swept box wing was analyzed in CFD at transonic
mach regimes to simulate flight conditions observed by most transport aircraft. The fuselage
is comparable to the Airbus A380, sporting a wingspan of 78 meters, so it is noted that the
reduction of the span of the PrandtlPlane to 70 meters produces a weight reduction of 30%,
though it is not mentioned how this is reconciled with the aft wing of equivalent span. The
researchers proceed with this design methodology for a smaller unmanned aircraft which was
fabricated as a scaled model for wind-tunnel testing. Though the results indicated longitudi-
nal static stability, the aircraft does not begin to produce lift until around 6 angle of attack,
and the trim point is shown graphically to occur at 12. These results are as unconventional
as the aircraft configuration, but the aerodynamic efficiency maintains satisfactory. This
research does not provide evidence of an aerodynamic advantage to the industry standard in
the implementation of the Prandtl’s Best Wing Design for a box-wing aircraft, but it offers
a design option to be further explored in the search for reduction of induced drag. 90% of
total drag is due to friction and induced drag, which depends heavily on the distribution of
lift across the wing span. It is posited in this body of work that, for today’s large transport
aircraft, ”no significant induced drag reduction is now possible” due to the decades of aircraft
design optimization. However, a new branch of research into alternative lift distributions,
spurred by none other than Ludwig Prandtl, may provide evidence to the contrary.

2.1.2 Discovery and Applications of Bell-Shaped Lift Distribution

In 1933, Ludwig Prandtl issued a publication titled “On Wings with the Least Induced Drag”
in the “Journal of Aviation Engineering and Motorized-Airship Aeronautics” amending the
case that the elliptical distribution is the optimum distribution to minimize induced drag
for all cases [11]. He notes that it is the desired solution when the aircraft designer has pre-
scribed gross weight and wingspan as design constraints. Prandtl derives an analytic solution
for an alternative curve that initializes gross lift (Equation 2.1.2) and moment of inertia of
the lift distribution (Equation 2.1.3) in the determination of induced drag (Equation 2.1.1)
to achieve the minimal induced drag solution. This solution resembles a bell curve which
gradually reduces the sectional lift produced to zero at the wingtips.

\[
D_i = \rho \int_{-s}^{s} \Gamma wdy \quad (2.1.1)
\]

\[
L = \rho V \int_{-s}^{s} \Gamma dy \quad (2.1.2)
\]

\[
I = Lr^2 = \rho V \int_{-s}^{s} \Gamma y^2 dy \quad (2.1.3)
\]

For the listed equations \( \rho \) is density, \( V_\infty \) is freestream velocity, \( \Gamma \) is circulation, \( w \) is
downwash, \( y \) is the non-dimensional spanwise location with 0 being the wing centerline, \( s \) is
the semispan, and \( r \) is the radius of gyration for an ELD wing.

Equation 2.1.2 and Equation 2.1.3 are transformed into Equation 2.1.4 and Equation
2.1.5, respectively, where the parameterized spanload, \( b \), is introduced. \( \Gamma_0 \) is the circulation
at the center of the wing, and \( \mu \) is a ratio of circulations across the span (Equation 2.1.6) for \( \mu = 0 \) representing the ELD.

\[
L = \frac{\pi}{4} \rho b V_\infty \Gamma_0 (1 - \frac{\mu}{4}) \quad (2.1.4)
\]

\[
L r^2 = \frac{\pi}{64} \rho b^3 V_\infty \Gamma_0 (1 - \frac{\mu}{2}) \quad (2.1.5)
\]

\[
\mu = -\frac{\Gamma_2}{\Gamma_0} \quad (2.1.6)
\]

\[
\Gamma = (\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_2 (\frac{y}{s}))^2 \sqrt{1 - (\frac{y}{s})^2} \quad (2.1.7)
\]

After allowing span to become a parameter, Equation 2.1.8 is substituted into Equation 2.1.4 to isolate the circulation at the center of the wing as a function of the gross lift, the freestream velocity, and the circulation ratio across the span (Equation 2.1.9).

\[
b = 4r \sqrt{\frac{1 - \frac{\mu}{4}}{1 - \frac{\mu}{2}}} \quad (2.1.8)
\]

\[
\Gamma_0 = \frac{L}{\pi \rho V_\infty r \sqrt{1 - (\frac{\mu}{4})^3}} \quad (2.1.9)
\]

Transferring these variables to express induced drag yields Equation 2.1.10.

\[
D_i = \frac{L^2}{8 \pi \rho V_\infty^2 r^2} \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{2}\right)(1 - \frac{\mu}{2} + \frac{\mu}{4}) \quad (2.1.10)
\]

From the table shown in Figure 5 it is apparent that the minimum induced drag occurs at \( \mu \) equal to unity, but the function continues to decrease past this local minimum (Figure 6). However, the function loses its rational meaning beyond this inflection point because the negative lift at the wingtips would cause a negative bending moment (M). Since the prescribed structural weight is a function of bending moment, and the negative bending moment does not result in a negative structural weight, the equation fails to hold the relationship among these terms. Therefore, the largest reasonable value occurs at a \( \mu \) of 1, which is also the point of lowest induced drag.

Figure 5 also shows a 22.47% increase in span (1.0000 to 1.2247) from the elliptical distribution at \( \mu = 0 \) to the bell-shaped distribution \( \mu = 1 \). The change in shape and increase in span for the variation in circulation ratio is plotted in Figure 7.

\( \mu = 1 \) is the analytical solution for minimal induced drag, but another artifact of relaxing the wingspan constraint is the variation of downwash velocity distribution with change in circulation ratio (Figure 8). It can be seen that a negative downwash (upwash) occurs at the wingtips of circulation ratios of 0.5 and greater. For the bell-shaped lift distribution, this location occurs at the 70.4% semispan. The upwash at the wingtip can provoke a forward force, induced thrust. The variation in the downwash velocity, and its transition to upwash, along with the actuation of induced thrust to create a favorable moment on an aircraft have
implications on the aircraft design presented in this thesis and are the central themes to this body of work.

In 1950, Robert T. Jones creates his own solution to the minimal-induced-drag problem in his publication “The Spanwise Distribution of Lift for Minimum Induced Drag of Wings having a given Lift and a given Bending Moment” [13] that mirrors the constraints set by Prandtl’s revision: gross lift, freestream velocity, and root bending moment. Like Prandtl, Jones alleviated the limitation on wingspan for a set structural weight (the root bending moment constraint). His expression of minimum induced drag (Equation 2.1.11 - derivation found in original text [13]) yields a 15% increase in span with a 15% reduction in induced drag in the application of a bell spanload as opposed to the existing ELD.

\[
D_i = \frac{L^2}{\pi^2 \rho V^2 \infty (2s_e)^2} \left[ 8 \left( \frac{s_e}{s} \right)^4 - 16 \left( \frac{s_e}{s} \right)^3 + 9 \left( \frac{s_e}{s} \right)^2 \right] \tag{2.1.11}
\]

In accordance with the other analytical solutions for minimum induced drag, Jones applies Prandtl’s lifting-line theory. He notes that the results are not restricted to that approxima-
tion stating that the induced drag of a lifting surface will be equivalent to that of a lifting line if the spanwise distributions are the same. This is to say that the mathematical solution may be applied to a flying wing, like the planform of the aircraft presented in this thesis, not simply lifting surfaces spanning orthogonal to the freestream flow.

Around the same time Prandtl issued his revision of the minimal drag solution, Reimar Horten independently derived an equivalent solution naming it "bell shaped" in wing loading. Though the methods were different, Horten generated the solution and added to the effort in providing a calculation for the induced drag across the span. This novel finding lead to the discovery of a consequence of the bell-shaped lift distribution not recognized by Prandtl at the time; it produces proverse yaw. This is the act of the aircraft yawing in coordination with a banked turn without the use of an auxiliary yaw device. By contrast,
aircraft today experience adverse yaw as a consequence of the high-lifting wing producing greater induced drag as a consequence of lift in a banked turn.

The authors of "Tailless Aircraft in Theory and Practice" [15] stand firm against the claims made in favor of the bell-shaped distribution in its chapter entitled "Fables, Misjudgements and Prejudices, Fairy Tales and Myths" positing that proverse yaw is not observed, and additional drag is a consequence of the application of this distribution to a flying wing. Both claims are made in reference to Horten’s flying wings which produce adverse yaw in roll and, cited admission from Horten, increased the induced drag by a factor of 4/3 in cruising flight. Emerging research provide considerable counterarguments to the criticisms posed by the authors [15].

In 2016, researcher of NASA Armstrong address this theory in the development and testing of the Preliminary Research Aerodynamic Design to Lower Drag, or Prandtl-D [2]. This aforementioned research simplified the equations of circulation and lift distributions derived by Ludwig Prandtl (Equation 2.1.12 and Equation 2.1.13, respectively) and confirmed a decrease of up to 11.1% in induced drag while increasing the span by 22.5% in the application of the BSLD for a set structural weight enforced by a restriction on root bending moment. These are the equations from which this work will reference to graphically match the computational results through CFD to the BSLD.

\[
\Gamma(Y) = \Gamma_0 (1 - \left(\frac{2Y}{b}\right)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \tag{2.1.12}
\]

\[
L(Y) = L_0 (1 - \left(\frac{2Y}{b}\right)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \tag{2.1.13}
\]

Additionally, this research was the first to perform experimental flight tests which observed proverse yaw. The promising demonstration of coordinated flight without a tail provoked recent interest in research regarding the application of this lift distribution to flying wings.

D. F. Hunsaker and W. F. Phillips of Utah State University have done extensive research in the wake of NASA’s recent discoveries. One of the recent contributions by these authors, in addition to the translation of Prandtl’s 1933 publication [11], produces minimal induced drag solutions from various design constraints [12]. By removing the constraints of gross weight and wingspan, as prescribed by Ludwig Prandtl in 1933, the researchers solve for optimum lift distributions for three example rectangular wings as a result of varying design constraints. The constraints and their resultant optimal distributions follow:
1) Prandtl’s suggested constraint on gross lift and moment of inertia of gross lift without a constraint on wingspan governed by equation 2.1.14.
2) Gross weight, maximum stress, and wing loading of a rectangular wing planform presented in equation 2.1.15.
3) An optimal lift distribution resulting from design choices of gross weight, maximum deflection, and wing loading shown in equation 2.1.16.
The equations above, detailed in the research production [12], are obtained assuming a non-structural weight distribution given by 2.1.17 and only differ by the magnitude of a Fourier coefficient. This method holds for rectangular wings of constant chord and thickness. Variations of chord length and thickness along the span require numerical methods that exceed the scope of the research. The research goes further and shows that for any fixed lift and distribution of weight there exists an optimum wingspan for which the condition of minimal induced drag is satisfied. However, the solutions presented for each set of constraints are derived specifically for rectangular wings and cannot be applied when wing sweep is introduced. Though the solutions for the rectangular planform may not contribute to tailless flight, it provides groundwork for aircraft designers concerned with drag reduction, weight reduction, and fuel economy of commercial airliners.

\[
\frac{bL^\sim(\theta)}{L} = \frac{4}{\pi} \left[ \sin(\theta) - \frac{1}{3} \sin(3\theta) \right] ; z = -\frac{b \cos(\theta)}{2} \quad (2.1.14)
\]

\[
\frac{bL^\sim(\theta)}{L} = \frac{4}{\pi} \left[ \sin(\theta) - 0.13564322 \sin(3\theta) \right] ; z = -\frac{b \cos(\theta)}{2} \quad (2.1.15)
\]

\[
\frac{bL^\sim(\theta)}{L} = \frac{4}{\pi} \left[ \sin(\theta) - 0.05971587 \sin(3\theta) \right] ; z = -\frac{b \cos(\theta)}{2} \quad (2.1.16)
\]

Investigation of non-elliptical lift distribution wings for commercial aircraft application has been carried out by the Aerospace Integration Research Centre at Cranfield University [5] in efforts to reduce the tail size of such aircraft. Authors use early-stage design tools, such as XFLR5 and Athena Vortex Lattice (AVL), to generate Prandtl’s 1933 solution to replace the wing of a commercial aircraft. Consistent with the previous research methods, the wingspan is not selected as a design constraint, rather span extension and wing twist are the output of yet another analytical revolution in aerodynamics by the early works of Ludwig Prandtl, Lifting-Line Theory. The baseline model used for analysis is the wing of a small, transport aircraft, SF50. The baseline is compared to two competing models. One applies the analytical solution for the twist to produce minimum drag, while the other uses this technique with the allowance of increased wingspan (Prandtl’s prescription). Vertical tailplane size is parametric for the three competing models to gauge aerodynamic performance with reduction in structural weight. The approach inspired by Prandtl shows a 14% increase in lift-to-drag ratio, a 44.34% reduction in vertical tail weight, and up to 17% improvement in range of the aircraft. Flight stability in dutch roll mode was compromised for efficiency metrics in both models deviating from the baseline. Control surface sizing and placement must be further investigated in this study of lift distribution to aptly evaluate its effect on aerodynamic performance and aircraft stability. Despite the promising results, the analysis methods do not apply to swept-wing configurations.
Seeking to contribute computation to the application of a bell-shaped lift distribution to swept wings, professors at the Mangalore Institute of Technology and Engineering in India implement the Prandtl design to a forward-swept flying wing. They believe that an increase in efficiency to this wing configuration will make it superior to a traditional, aft-swept flying wing since it is inherently more maneuverable. Another benefit of this adaptation to the forward-swept wing is that the reduction in load held by the outboard wing sections further reduced the chance of tip stall. The wing modeling begins with a set root and tip airfoil. Tip twist is parameterized at angles of 0, 2, 5, -2, and -5 degrees to modify the lift distribution while maintaining constant aerodynamic twist (constant airfoil cross sections along the wing). Each configuration is analyzed through computational methods with ANSYS. The researchers conclude that the aircraft with the tip twist of -2 relative to the freestream flow exhibits the greatest aerodynamic performance, but the aerodynamic coefficients for the other configurations are not presented. Though this tip twist is assumed to resemble the Prandtl bell curve, the lift distributions of these configurations are not shown to be validated. Additionally, the research does not relate the findings to the performance of a traditional swept wing to justify the use of a forward sweep.

Richter et al [18] studied control surface efficacy in the generation of proverse yaw on straight tapered flying wings applying the bell spanload. The relationship between aircraft geometry and proverse yaw control power is realized by key variants: taper ratio, wing chord, span length, twist distribution, and outboard wing control surface (OWCS) size. Generally, an increase in the size of the OWCS exacerbates the yaw effect on the aircraft, whether proverse or adverse yaw. This effect is tied to the amount of upwash or downwash experienced at the outboard wing section. It is shown that the proverse yaw control power is maximized when the control surface is engulfed in the region of upwash. It follows that the lift distribution greatly affects the yaw ability in roll given that the distribution of lift commands the regions of upwash and downwash. Researchers conclude that the application of the bell spanload, increased wingspan, and greater tip twist suggest straight tapered flying wings may be controllable and naturally coordinate turns. Though this research parameterized geometries particular to straight tapered wings, the findings of the relationship among the lift distribution, regions of upwash/downwash, control surface size and placement, and yaw control power can be used for aircraft design prescriptions of various configurations. The results provide additional support for the emerging research advocating for the use of the BSLD, as opposed to the ELD, for favorable yaw in banked turns of tailless aircraft. The research presented in this thesis will source these results for aileron sizing and placement for the aircraft design, Bellwether.

2.1.3 Avian Flight Formation

Modern modeling of avian flight is done by assuming birds apply the elliptical lift distribution, since it has been thought to be the most efficient. This explanation fails to explain why birds overlap their wings in flight formations, and it is contrary to reasonable explanations of how birds perform effortlessly coordinated turns without an auxiliary yaw device to counteract the adverse yaw that is common with the ELD. Beyond the observation of proverse yaw in accordance with Horten’s theory, Chief Scientist Albion Bowers of the National
Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA) Armstrong Flight Research Center relate their observations of the bell-shaped lift distribution, and its effect on the flow field, to avian flight formation to suggest that birds dynamically utilize this distribution for increased aerodynamic performance [2]. Dr. Bowers states three main distinctions between avian flight and aircraft designed for elliptical spanloading:

1. The feathers at birds’ wingtips are soft, flexible, and narrow with thin structures (ligaments, tendons, muscles, and bones) incapable of supporting load necessary to match an ELD. By contrast, aircraft wings are reinforced structures designed to carry a distributed lifting force out to the wingtips.

2. Birds fly in formation to receive aerodynamic benefits from the wing vortex roll-up of the bird ahead of it in formation. This is observed that birds do this in a v-formation with the wings overlapping. Aircraft also benefit from flying in formation, however, the optimum location for aircraft is to position themselves with wingtips aligned.

3. Despite their sharp-tipped, narrow wings, birds do not experience wingtip stall. The location of stall on a bird’s wing is observed to occur about 20% of the semispan from the root. Aircraft of swept wings with sharp tips, primarily fighter aircraft, experience wingtip stall and require mitigation techniques to avoid the detriment to aircraft control in these events.

This is to suggest that the lift generated by bird wings tapers at the wingtips, and thus, the distributed load across the span cannot match that of an ellipse. The lift distribution is the ultimate influencer of the flow field.

The vortex shed line, which is the point at which the region of downwash transitions to upwash [18], is shown in Figure 2 to be inboard at the 0.704 spanwise location for the BSLD. It is suggested that the wing overlap in the v-formation of bird flight coincides with this vortex shed line. A trailing bird, it is thought, willingly positions itself to fly with enough wing overlap as to span the upwash region for energy savings without much intrusion into the region of downwash. NASA researchers note that this location varies from previous research on different flocks of birds: Portugal [7] citing a vortex core separation of 0.753 for the overlap of northern ibis flying formation, Spedding [10] noting 0.76 as the location for his kestrel research, and NASA’s own analytical result of 0.704 semispan location. Though Portugal, Spedding, and others prior have used ELD to model avian flight, all results of inboard vortex cores suggest upwash flow at the wingtips. Referring back to Figure 1, this suggests that birds coordinate turns with favorable yaw by the induced thrust at the wingtips that is a natural consequence of the BSLD.

Kyle Lukacovic provides a charitable contribution to the examination of wingtip overlap of bird and aircraft flight formation and its effect on aerodynamic performance in ”A Parametric Study of Formation Flight of a Wing Based on Prandtl’s Bell-Shaped Lift Distribution” [14]. This study adds a computational analysis to two models of the NASA BSLD wing, Prandtl-D, in flight formation parameterizing wing spacing and comparing the overall efficiency of the two-wing system. The substantial outcomes of this study are (1) the BSLD
Figure 9: Common cranes (grus grus) flying in formation over lake Fehér near Sárdorfalva, Hungary [14]

shows potential for significant increase in performance of formation flight and (2) the ELD is unfit to model bird flight, which seems to relate much more closely to the BSLD on the basis of wing overlap in flight formation. The study models the Prandtl-D using the planform, wing geometry, and airfoil data provided in the NASA publication [2]. The trailing aircraft is placed at different spanwise locations in the wake of the leading Prandtl-D model. The trailing model is set at a distance of one wingspan behind the lead for all simulations. The wing spacing is denoted as Y/b. For Y/b equal to zero, the port wingtip of one wing is aligned with the starboard wing of another. Negative values of Y/b indicate a wing overlap, whereas positive values correspond to the length of spanwise gap between the wings of the two models. Figure 10 tabulates the results of a collection of CFD simulations ranging the Y/b parameter from 0.148 to -0.444. This table presents the aerodynamic benefits received by the trailing aircraft as a percentage of the experience of the leading model.

A Trefftz plane analysis was used to determine the reduction of induced drag for the two-wing system. This is a far-field analysis that identifies the forces in the wake of a lifting body by capturing velocity vectors in the wake. The perturbation velocities are related to the aerodynamic parameters on the Trefftz plane. These analysis planes have been set up to determine the aerodynamic benefits received by the trailing aircraft and quantify the efficiency of the flight formation for various wing spacing. CFD shows maximum trailing-wing benefits of a L/D ratio of 28.5% and a reduced system induced drag of 33.9%. It is noted that this is not a direct comparison to the efficiency savings of formation flight for ELD systems, but ”literature research of studies of aircraft in differing configurations reported comparable induced drag reduction of 20-30%” [14]. This is to say that the ideal wing overlap in a BSLD system outweighs the aerodynamic benefits of the wing-overlap
optimization for an ELD system in flight formation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wing Spacing, Y/b</th>
<th>Lift Percent Change, %</th>
<th>Total Drag Percent Change, %</th>
<th>Lift-to-Drag Ratio Percent Change, %</th>
<th>System Induced Drag Percent Change, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>-6.489</td>
<td>7.855</td>
<td>-14.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>-6.805</td>
<td>10.234</td>
<td>-16.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>3.101</td>
<td>-7.785</td>
<td>11.805</td>
<td>-18.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>-9.040</td>
<td>13.870</td>
<td>-20.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>-10.645</td>
<td>16.555</td>
<td>-23.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>4.789</td>
<td>-12.517</td>
<td>19.783</td>
<td>-25.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>5.430</td>
<td>-14.511</td>
<td>23.326</td>
<td>-28.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>5.797</td>
<td>-16.083</td>
<td>26.072</td>
<td>-31.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>5.891</td>
<td>-17.090</td>
<td>27.718</td>
<td>-32.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>5.795</td>
<td>-17.652</td>
<td>28.473</td>
<td>-33.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>-17.690</td>
<td>28.231</td>
<td>-33.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>5.176</td>
<td>-17.264</td>
<td>27.123</td>
<td>-33.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>4.697</td>
<td>-16.387</td>
<td>25.216</td>
<td>-32.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.370</td>
<td>4.082</td>
<td>-14.978</td>
<td>22.418</td>
<td>-30.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td>-11.037</td>
<td>15.100</td>
<td>-24.522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Aerodynamic Parameter Percent Change Between Y/b = 0.148 and -0.444 for the Trailing Wing Compared to the Leading Wing [14]

The ELD design aircraft wings has an average optimal spanwise position at Y/b = -0.128 where the vortex is at the wingtip location (Y/b = 0). It is hypothesized by the author that the reason for the trailing wingtip to span beyond the vortex shed line is that it exposes more of the higher loaded wing area to the beneficial upwash of the vortex while avoiding much of the ramifications of the downwash. Figure 11 gives the optimal wing overlap of different systems and for different aerodynamic objectives for the bell-shaped lift distribution. Additionally, the beneficial range of operation of the trailing wing is tabulated for each metric. “BSLD wide range of beneficial positioning of 0.407b (41% of the full wingspan) or greater” is a substantial claim resultant from this research that relates to Dr. Bowers and the juxtaposition of the ELD and BSLD flow fields in Figure 2. The average range for trailing wings of ELD is around 0.250 which is significantly less than the range allowed for trailing wings of BSLD to observe aerodynamic benefit. The difference is ascribed to the wider vortex created by the bell spanload as opposed to the narrow vortex core generated by elliptical wings at the wingtips resulting in the sharp, distinct discontinuity between regions of upwash and downwash.

2.1.4 Literature Review - In Summary

For over a century, from the guidance of Ludwig Prandtl, aircraft wings have been designed with the idea that lift distributed across the span should take the shape of an ellipse for the most efficient aerodynamic result. By Ludwig Prandtl’s own revision, the discovery of the
bell-shaped lift distribution has sparked research that suggest that this spanload is the most efficient method of generating lift for a fixed amount of lift and a maximum root bending moment (or structural weight). Most notably, Dr. Bowers at NASA Armstrong is the first to measure provere yaw by experimental flight data. The data materialized Horten’s theory which recognized the phenomenon of induced thrust as a consequence of inboard upwash to encourage favorable yaw without need for a vertical tail. NASA researchers correlate the characteristics of the BSLD with bird flight which has been previously understood with ELD analysis models. These correlations, advanced by Kyle Lukacovic of California Polytechnic State University [14], provide three explanations to bird flight being modeled by BSLD that have failed to be explained by ELD:

1. Birds can effortlessly and precisely coordinate turns without the use of an auxiliary yaw device, which would be necessary to counteract the adverse yaw ELD wings produce in roll consequential to the region of downwash engulfing the wingspan. This suggests that the flow field generated by bird flight contains a vortex shed line that lies within the wingspan (i.e. upwash is created within the span).

2. Birds have thin and light feathers, ligaments, tendons, and bones at their wingtips not suitable to carry the load prescribed by an ELD. Furthermore, unlike thin-tipped aircraft, birds do not experience tip stall; they stall close to the 20% span location. This can be explained with the application of the BSLD to suggest that the load across the span tapers to zero at the wingtip.

3. Birds overlap their wings when flying in formation to optimize energy savings. The beneficial location can vary, but the ELD demands a much narrower range of wingtip locations for the trailing bird to receive benefits. The spanwise area for formations of ELD wings is hardly overlapping wingtips. Birds much more closely match the wing overlap that proves to be most beneficial for wings designed with a BSLD.

This is pertinent because, in part, the aircraft design presented in this thesis is a biomimetic solution in understanding how birds can maneuver with no observable yaw authority.
This work turns to the aircraft design process that seeks to leverage this understanding of inboard upwash and its assistance to proverse yaw.
CHAPTER III

Design Methodology

Overall, the design lift distribution is intended to match the Prandtl Bell shape. Prandtl [11], and subsequent researchers of the bell spanload, noted that optimization of this problem would require the abolition of the constraints placed on aircraft wingspan; however, this design relies on placing that constraint. Although the theoretical underpinnings of this lift distribution dictate no inherent wingspan, practical limits apply on the high-side to keep vehicle weight below the maximum allowed for operations under the Federal Aviation Administration’s Part 107 rules. Thus, design iterations were performed using historically validated mass property models from Oklahoma State’s long history with development and construction of fixed-wing unmanned aircraft systems. It was found that the design could be reasonably guaranteed to fall below the 55 lb maximum (categorically remaining a small, unmanned aircraft (SUAS)) while allowing for carriage of the desired atmospheric sensing payloads if the span was limited to 25 feet. Additionally, this design point is congruent with lab space availability and our current construction capability. These constraints allow for the Bellwether aircraft to benchmark the Prandtl-D 3C from NASA Armstrong to define a planform. Thus, this aircraft, Bellwether, is prescribed a 25 ft. wingspan (not including the width of the fuselage), a 25 sweep, and 2.5 dihedral angles that have been demonstrated previously. All analysis methods will use a flow of thermodynamic values reflective of standard atmospheric conditions at 1000 ft. asl. to simulate the flight conditions expected for Stillwater, OK.
With the known planform and atmospheric flight conditions previously stated, the design methodology steps through the chronology beginning with airfoil analysis by low-fidelity, panel methods. XFOIL, developed by Mark Drela [6], and XFLR5 are used to design airfoil sections on the basis of Reynold’s number and desired sectional lift to match the desired spanload. Once the root and tip airfoils are selected, they are geometrically linearly lofted together adding consistent aerodynamic twist along the wing. The root and tip airfoils are interpolated to create the airfoils at each foot of the span. All airfoils are saved as ‘.dat’ files to import coordinates to and from different software packages. These spanwise airfoils are used as control points individually rotated to introduce geometric twist along the wing. This geometric twist is varied such that its addition to the set aerodynamic twist will yield lift distributions desired by this comparative study. Vortex Lattice Methods are used to estimate the sectional rotations required for each lift distribution evaluated. Four separate
lift distributions, and in turn four separate wing designs, are generated for comparison. CAD modeling applies these geometric wing twists, suggested by VLM, to a model with a fuselage designed to make each lift distribution graphically continuous at the root. CFD evaluates each flying wing’s adherence to the distribution it seeks to match. Conventional wing design does not account for the effect of the fuselage to the lift distribution, but the design of this flying wing incorporates a lifting-body fuselage to ensure a continuous curve validated by high-fidelity, CFD analysis. Changes to wing twist, and observation of its adherence to its desired lift distribution, iterate until convergence on the desired curve passes visual inspection. The design of Bellwether concludes when the aircraft has matched the curve described by Prandtl’s revision of the minimal induced drag solution. After finalization of the aircraft design, the wings are analyzed in absence of the fuselage to add comparison of aerodynamic performance among the various analysis methods. Since VLM are not reliable in resolving shear and pressure forces influenced by bluff fuselages, the comparison of XFLR5, AVL, and CFD are done as wing-only analyses.

The methodology flow chart Figure 12 guides the reader through the process leading to the aircraft design and analysis of Bellwether, though the presentation of this work is not precisely adherent to the temporal flow chart. The analysis of the wing-only geometry takes precedence in providing correlations among the methods of aerodynamic analysis. This is done to encourage future aircraft designers to choose rapid results of VLM for highly-iterative design changes. So, the analysis of the final wing design absent the fuselage is presented first in this thesis comparing the low- and high-fidelity analysis tools before the presentation of computational fluid dynamic processes and results of the four different aircraft designs matching different lift distributions. This design process chose to accept computational expense of iterating in CFD to ensure the final aircraft design, including the fuselage, matches the promising spanload. The computational burden is placed on Oklahoma State University’s High-Powered Computing Center (HPCC), Pete.

### 3.1 Span Loading Design Target

Given a planform, the objective of the flying wing design becomes to match the target Prandtl Bell lift distribution by appropriate specification of geometric and aerodynamic twist across the span. The Prandtl Bell distribution is shown by the blue line in Figure 13. This line is generated from Equation 3.1.3, and is simply a scaled version of the circulation distribution achieved from Prandtl’s 1933 analysis. Also included in the figure are curves representative of the modern bell distribution (orange, Equation 3.1.1), the cosine distribution (gray, Equation 3.1.2), and the aforementioned elliptical distribution (green, Equation 3.1.4). These curves are included for reference, as they have been extensively used in past aerodynamic analyses.

\[
L' = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{z - \mu^2}{\sigma} \right) \right) \quad \text{ModernBell} \quad (3.1.1)
\]

\[
L' = A \cos \frac{y_0}{B} + A \quad \text{Cosine} \quad (3.1.2)
\]

\[
L' = L_{y=0}(1 - y^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{PrandtlBell} \quad (3.1.3)
\]
Figure 13: Lift Distributions to be Matched

\[ L' = \frac{x^2}{a^2} + \frac{y^2}{b^2} \quad \text{Ellipse} \quad (3.1.4) \]

### 3.1.1 Span Load Analysis Using Vortex Lattice Methods (VLM)

Vortex Lattice Method, VLM, is a medium-fidelity software method for evaluating the aerodynamics of 3D wings subject to the limitations of potential flow. This numerical method models aircraft lifting surfaces as a thin sheet of discrete vortices. Each vortex ring induces velocity at all points in the flowfield domain. A system of equations linear is generated which enforce zero normal flow boundary condition at each vortex ring’s control point based on the amount of bound circulation retained in each vortex ring. The system of equations is readily solvable using standard matrix inversion techniques from linear algebra. Knowing the circulation bound by each vortex ring allows for rapid calculation of the lift and induced drag. The insight brought by the tools leveraging this method allows for changes and quick results as a result of these modifications, without the designer being burdened by the more expensive calculations required by more robust methods, such as CFD.

The rapid, lower-fidelity analyses are performed using XFLR5 and Athena Vortex Lattice (AVL). The flying wing is created and analyzed directly within the software package XFLR5. At the spanwise locations indicated in Figure 16, the interpolated airfoils are angled to modify the lift distribution until the target distribution presented in Section 3.1 is achieved.
3.2 Airfoil Analysis and Selection

Using low-Reynold’s number airfoils from the UIUC [21] database, a batch analysis gave guidance for the selection of a root airfoil. The analysis ranged Reynold’s numbers of 200,000 to 700,000 by increments of 100,000 in order to capture all likely conditions experienced by all wing sections in flight. Figure 15 displays the performance of the selected foils across this operating range with the root airfoil shown in bright green, the tip airfoil in blue, and the interpolated airfoils between the two.

Since the root airfoil is to be geometrically linearly lofted to the tip, good performance at a large range of angle of attack, $\alpha$, values is desired. It proved beneficial to add camber to a NACA 4412 airfoil. This change shows greater consistency in performance of the lift-to-drag ratio for alphas ranging from 8 to 0. The airfoil selected as the root, BellwetherOne, was crafted by a 50% interpolation of the NACA 4412 airfoil with the Wortmann FX74_CL5_140.

Unique to this design, the selection of the tip airfoil is not significantly dependent upon Reynold’s number or lift-to-drag performance; it is designed to taper the lift distribution to zero at the tips to match the bell spanload. This wing selects a symmetric airfoil at the tip to employ enough aerodynamic twist to make it easier to match the center-loaded distributions without needing excessive geometric twist. The tip airfoil is positioned at a slightly negative angle of attack to (1) taper the lift at the outboard wing section and (2) effectuate the region of upwash for induced thrust. The anti-symmetric aileron deflection will engage the utility of this design in producing proverse yaw.

The semispan airfoils are created at specified sections to build control points from which angles of attack may be independently changed to match the desired lift distribution. The creation of these airfoils are simply interpolated in XFLR5 between the root and tip airfoils.
to match a continuous lofting between the two. Figure 16 shows the change in shape of the airfoil sections and the shape of each airfoil, from root (green) to tip (blue), whose location along the span is shown in Figure 17.

3.3 Aircraft Modeling

With the use of SolidWorks, a baseline flying wing is made for the purpose of preliminary analysis. The wing-section control points are placed at angles of attack determined by the particular airfoil cross section’s performance as evaluated by XFLR5. With help of Figure 15, the section’s angle is graphically determined by the product of the chord and coefficient of lift that section is required to produce to adhere to the desired lift distribution. This is used to initialize the wing geometry prior to entering the loop of high-computational analysis for lift distribution curve matching. This is done for four different models each achieving one of the desired spanloads: Modern Bell, Cosine, Prandtl Bell, and Elliptical. Equations 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4 define these curves, respectively, and Figure 13 provides the graphical representation of the curves to be achieved from the aircraft models.
Modeling a wing of the elliptical distribution presents design considerations in deviating from the centrally concentrated spanloads. The first attempt aimed to use geometric twist to achieve the lift distribution while keeping the same wing sections used for the other curves. However, this requires outboard wing sections to experience local angles of attack in excess of 9 which is not a feature that would be seen if the design was meant for that distribution. The solution is to decrease aerodynamic twist by changing the airfoil cross sections such that less camber is needed at the root and more at the tip. Since the root airfoil was generated by adding camber to a NACA 4412 airfoil, that airfoil has been chosen as the constant wing section of the ELD model. Congruent with the processes of the other distributions, the curve determined the lift required for each semispan section of the wing. The coefficient of lift is determined from the chord length and lift required and the flight condition. The initial guess at each section’s angle of attack is generated from the lift-curve slope for each airfoil in XFLR5. CFD iterations are used to modify geometric twist of the airfoil sections for closer adherence to the elliptical curve.

This study adds Cosine and Modern Bell curves to offer a wider selection of designs from which to compare lift-to-drag ratios and other aerodynamic performance metrics. The Cosine curve closely resembles the Prandtl curve with slightly more central loading. The addition of this spanloading allows for a closer look at how an incremental deviation to the theoretical minimal induced drag will perform using high-fidelity aerodynamic tools. Introducing the Modern Bell spanloading presents a highly-centralized lift distribution which can be expected to shift the vortex cores farther inboard resulting in a larger region of upwash within the span. Presenting various flow fields may contribute to the understanding of vortex core location and proverse yaw control power.

Though the aileron sizing should be specific to each flow field to maximize yaw authority, each wing design has been modeled with ailerons sized in accordance with the suggestion by Richter et al [18] for favorable yaw moment in the flow field resulting from Prandtl’s lift distribution. This guidance results in aileron placement ranging from the 80% span to the wingtip. The control surface width extends from the trailing edge to the quarter chord tapering with the wing geometry.
CHAPTER IV

Comparing VLM and CFD Solutions for the Bellwether Wings

The analysis from the lower-order methods, XFLR5 and AVL, are compared to computational fluid dynamics results from STAR-CCM+ using the same wing geometry without the influence of a fuselage. In particular, the coefficient of lift at pre-stall angles of attack are compared among these analysis methods as well as the shape of the lift distributions presented as c*CL across the wingspan in vortex lattice methods.

4.1 Wing-Only Analysis of Bellwether in Vortex Lattice Methods

XFLR5 was used to model the wing for the VLMs. Beginning with the root airfoil, BellwetherOne, the interpolated airfoils shown in Figure 16 are placed one foot apart along the span as shown in Figure 17 (with the exception of the last interpolated airfoil to the tip airfoil, RAE 101, whose distance is half a foot). In the wing editor window, the x and y panels used for vortex lattice analysis are selected to use cosine spacing for each airfoil section to provide a higher concentration of panels on the leading and trailing edge of the wing as well as the root and the tip. All analysis methods found in XFLR5 were compared at a 0 degree angle of attack in a fixed-speed analysis at a freestream velocity of 35 feet per second. Analysis methods VLM1 and VLM2 each produced coefficient of lift values of 0.762 regardless of the addition of viscosity to the analysis settings. The Ring Vortex analysis setting produced a coefficient of lift of 0.788, and lifting-line theory (LLT) output a coefficient of 0.830. LLT is not generally used for swept wings, so that analysis method will be disregarded for this aircraft configuration. The analysis setting used for the comparison of coefficients of lift across angles of attack ranging from -4 to 10 degrees is VLM1.

The wing geometry from XFLR5 was directly imported into AVL for analysis. Solving at a 0 angle of attack yields a coefficient of lift of 0.85 in the inviscid analysis. The Trefftz plane results (Figure 18 - downwash marked in blue), as with XFLR5 (Figure 14), indicate the transition from upwash to downwash begins within the span at the same approximate location.

The discrepancies in the coefficients will be discussed with the results from CFD and the evaluation of performance from all methods across the prescribed range of angles of attack. The curve matching of lift distributions across the span will be performed at a constant coefficient of lift for all analysis methods. Before introducing these results, the methodology and design settings in STAR-CCM+ must be outlined.
4.2 Wing-Only Analysis of Bellwether in STAR-CCM+

The CAD model of Bellwether is first imported as a parasolid into STAR-CCM+ in the creation of a surface mesh. A geometric block part of (25 x 30 x 50) cubic meters is used as the flow domain from which the aircraft is extracted through a Boolean Subtract feature. The wing surfaces are split by patch for additional surface control and command of prism layer design.

The wing-extracted domain is added as a region with a region for each part and a boundary for each part surface. The inlet of the domain is set as a velocity inlet with a magnitude of 35 feet per second. The aft surface of the block domain is set as a pressure outlet at atmospheric pressure. The walls of the domain are set as a freestream with a mach number of 0.031 in correspondence with the inlet velocity magnitude and air at 1000 feet above sea level to simulate atmospheric conditions in Stillwater, OK. A physics continuum is added with the settings listed in Figure 20. Completion of the physics continuum settings prompts reports and plots to be made to track desired performance parameters. Reports for coefficients of lift, drag, and moment, as well as lift and drag forces, are monitored and plotted on the same graph tracking their values per iteration of RANS flow solving. To output distributions of lift and drag across the wingspan an accumulated force table is added as a tool. These tables are referenced as the data series used in plotting the distributions, particularly used for the
Figure 19: Flow Domain used for the Wing-Only Analysis of Bellwether

comparison of lift distribution to lower order methods. The data is collected as the average force experienced within spanwise bins. The bin number is set to 20, which is to say, there are 20 bins of equal width from wingtip to wingtip within each an accumulated force is the output. This allows for an aggregate force distribution across the span. All main physics reports, monitors, plots, and scenes (with the exception of the vorticity scenes which will be explained later) can be duplicated by using the attached macro `FlyingWingMacro.java` found in Appendix 0.7. Most of the settings are universal and can be transferred to any flying wing re-imported into the domain, though some modifications may be required. Guidance for most of these required changes can be found in the comments of the macro code. Once the simulation has been constructed to report all of the physical properties desired, setup proceeds with mesh settings and design.

Mesh design begins with the creation of a 3D-Automated mesh added to the flow domain. A polyhedral mesher is selected with surface remesher enabled. Prism layer mesher is added to accurately capture boundary layer by constructing thin, prismatic cells along boundary surfaces. Surface controls are added for control of these prism layer numbers and thickness for each surface independently. Default controls such as base size, target surface size, minimum surface size, surface growth rate, and prism layer values are modified through an iterative process to achieve a suitable mesh by inspection as a baseline. Leading and trailing edges of the wing are examined to ensure the cell sizes are fine enough to produce smooth surfaces in the mesh scenes as an indication that the model will be represented well when the flow physics are introduced. Imperfections on thin or or highly-curved surfaces may be the
result of cells adjacent to the surface too large to capture the gradient of the surface. This may result in a curved surface appearing jagged or lacking in resolution. Alternatively, this problem may occur if the parasolid lacks resolution. The tessalation density determines how closely the parasolid matches the CAD part. Density increases allow for a smaller minimum surface size and higher quality mesh on the part surfaces but come at the cost of increased cell count, and thus, greater computational effort and file size. Importation of the parasolid is chosen with a 'very fine' tessalation density after a 'medium' density proved insufficient for the trailing edge of the flying wing. Examination of prism layers, mesh size, and surface boundaries (*Figures 21, 22, and 23*) initiate a baseline mesh to be refined with guidance from scalar scenes, reports, and residual plots. The mesh is validated by a mesh independence study. This study involves changing all mesh values to be relative to the base size then changing the base size by 20 percent. If the physics values reported are closely similar to the values solved for by the original mesh, then the mesh is said to be largely independent of the cell size, meaning an increase in the cell count and computational effort does not provide much aid in producing a more accurate result.

After iterations of meshing to create a visibly suitable mesh design, the physics are set to run to 1000 iteration. In unpacking the physics results, two main metrics are evaluated in the determination of a quality mesh design: convergence and wall y+. Checking convergence of monitors and plots indicate whether the solver has achieved what it determines to be a consistent answer to the physical parameters it is tracking. Wall y+ is a scalar measure of velocity gradients near surface boundaries, essentially, indicating at which areas on the surface of the part are losing information in adjacent cells close to the surface. This value...
is desired to be close to unity. Coefficients and forces are monitored at each iteration shown in Figure 24 and Figure 26, respectively. The values appear to converge as quickly as 100 iterations. Wall \( y^+ \) scalar values shown in Figure 28 show values higher than optimal on the wing, particularly on the leading edge. Due to the quick convergence of the physical parameters, despite the sub-optimal wall \( y^+ \) scenes, the CFD analysis proceeds with a mesh independence study to validate the mesh design.

The base size of the mesh is increased by 20\%, and the physics is run again to 1000 iterations. The comparison of the force coefficients is presented in Figure 29, and they indicate this mesh design to be independent of cell size and accurately reporting the flow physics. Additionally, the unsteady RANS physics solver ran on the same mesh to provide
greater validation of the mesh and physics reports. The physics ran 5000 steps reporting coefficients of lift and drag of 0.6363 and 0.03254 with a percent error of 0.1418% and 0.1346%, respectively, compared to the steady RANS physics solution.

Visualizing vorticity in the wake of the aircraft is a strong qualitative tool for understanding the flow field and the changes caused by differences in lift distribution. This becomes particularly pertinent in Chapter V. Here, it will be described how each of these scenes are generated.

Figure 30 is a top view of a wake plane made from a derived part in STAR-CCM+. The vorticity vector length corresponds to the magnitude. The largest vector is shown in red. The vector lengths are modified in the properties window until the maximum vorticity vector interacts with the wing for ease in identifying the location with the STAR-CCM+ measurement tool. This is the central location about which the flow is turning (vortex core), and it
is normal to the rotation of the flow (i.e. the rotation is spanwise with each vortex rotating towards the aircraft centerline). The difference in vector directions from port to starboard vortices indicate opposite directionality. The flow outboard of the vortex center is where the region of upwash occurs. The identification of the core location provides a qualitative understanding of the influence on the change in flow field to aerodynamic performance when this work turns to the comparison of the various lift distributions.

Another way to create this view in STAR-CCM+ is to add the wake plane to a scalar scene where vorticity about the longitudinal axis is the scalar quantity (Figure 31). The
Figure 27: Bellwether Wing-Only Unsteady RANS - Forces Monitor

Figure 28: Bellwether Wing-Only CFD - Wall Y+

scalar values are single values stored in each cell lying on the plane. The wake plane is the same derived part used in Figure 30. Upper and lower bounds may be set in the properties window to control the color gradient to better illustrate the change in vortex intensity around the core.

Alternatively, the vortex cores may be generated directly in a displayer with moderate computational expense (Figure 32). This is accomplished by creating a vortex core as a
Figure 29: Mesh Resolution Percent Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Size (ft.)</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cell Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.637225</td>
<td>0.032498</td>
<td>4,548,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.641063</td>
<td>0.032832</td>
<td>3,378,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ERROR</td>
<td>0.59866</td>
<td>1.01859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30: Bellwether Wing-Only CFD - Vorticity Vector Top View

Figure 31: Bellwether Wing-Only CFD - Wake Vorticity Scalar Scene
derived part, choosing the entire flow domain as the part added to the vortex core, and viewing that part in a scalar scene. The scalar field of the scene must be set as the vorticity about the axis of interest.

The qualitative tools aid in connecting this research with the work done by Ludwig Prandtl [11] and Dr. Bowers of NASA [2] in Chapter V, but the wing-only analysis progresses with the quantitative results to compare VLM to CFD.

4.3 Wing-Only Comparison of Analysis Methods

The alpha sweep in the vortex lattice methods range from -4 to 10. The VLM1 analysis in XFLR5 solved for performance at 2 increments. AVL results were produced in 1 steps. The range of angles of attack in CFD are from -2 to 6 in increments of 2 to reduce the computational burden. Figure 33 illustrates the linear shift in CL values among the analysis methods, though the slopes are similar. AVL, XFRL5, and STAR-CCM+ generate coefficient of lift values at the zero angle of attack of 0.85, 0.762, and 0.64, respectively. The constrained streamlines shown in Figure 121 show the 3-dimensional "leakage" of flow captured in the high-fidelity analysis performed by STAR-CCM+. The flow runoff reduces the lift produced at the sections with the most cross flow. This spanwise flow is not observed by the lower-fidelity methods which helps explain the over estimation of lift coefficient by the vortex lattice analyses at the root sections showing the most cross flow. In the comparison of the shape of the lift distributions, the wings used in the VLMs were analyzed at a constant CL of 0.64 to match the value produced in STAR-CCM+ to maintain the imposition of fixed lift and freestream velocity constraints. Geometric rotation of the wing is used to achieve a common CL among the low-order analysis methods. This adjustment requires analysis of the wing in AVL at an angle of attack of -2.2 and an angle of attack of -1.3 in XFRL5.
resultant distributions of chord multiplied by the coefficient of lift at each section along the wing, $c*CL$, is plotted in Figure 35 against the shape of the differential lift, $dL$, distribution output by STAR-CCM+ and the Prandtl curve that represents the desired distribution. Recall that this wing was designed with the lifting-body fuselage in STAR-CCM+ to match the Prandtl curve, and Figure 35 overlays the wing-only distributions to show commonality of the lower-order methods to CFD to inform the aircraft designer of the efficacy of VLM for rapid results in capturing the flow field. Since $L'$, $dL$, $c*CL$, and circulation are scalable distributions of one another, the $dL$ distribution, shown by STAR-CCM+ results, is scaled by a factor of 0.62 to illustrate its shape in contrast with the vortex lattice results.
4.3.1 Mathematical Justification for Curve Scaling

A challenge faced in this research was found when trying to compare the medium-fidelity aerodynamic solutions to the high-order CFD computations. The CFD computations output physics parameters describing the flow at each cell in the computational grid. Overall forces and moments acting on surfaces that the grid has been generated over can be output in post-processing. The solution of the full Navier-Stokes equations at each point in the computational grid means that the overall forces and moments acting on the outer-mold line of the geometry include components from the pressure distribution and skin friction from streamline scuffing in and near the boundary layer. In addition to outputting the total forces and moments at a specified point in the computational domain, the Star-CCM software allows the user to define equidistant chordwise strips on the surface geometry and to isolate force components acting along these strips.

The vortex lattice method discretizes the geometry by placing potential flow singularities, vortex-ring elements in common implementations, over the mean camber line of the lifting surfaces. For the purposes of explanation, the discussion below is considering a simple VLM with only one horseshoe vortex in the chordwise direction. A linear system of equations is developed to enforce the boundary condition of zero-normal flow through the control point of each vortex ring. The boundary condition equation, in the absence of body angular rates, at one vortex ring control point may be expressed as \( \vec{V} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \vec{g}_{ki} \Gamma_i \hat{n}_k = 0 \), where \( \vec{V} \) is the freestream velocity, \( \vec{g}_{ki} \) is the velocity induced by vortex ring \( i \) at control point \( k \), \( \Gamma_i \) is the strength of the vortex ring \( i \), and \( \hat{n}_k \) is the panel normal vector for control point \( k \). Writing this equation for each control point in the geometry results in a matrix expression.
In the form represented below:

\[
[AIC][\Gamma] = [w_i]
\]  

(4.3.1)

In this equation, the aerodynamic influence coefficient matrix \(AIC\) is an \(nxn\) matrix containing the terms \(\vec{g}_{ki}\) for a unit vortex strength, \(w_i\) is an \(nx1\) vector containing the term \(\vec{V} n_k\) (the normal flow component) for each control point based on the current inflow condition and geometric twist at the local strip of the wing. For a given geometry and inflow condition, the \(nx1\) circulation strength vector \(\Gamma\) can be solved for by inverting the \(AIC\) matrix and pre-multiplying the vector of normal flow on the right-hand side of the above equation, which is formed by simply considering the freestream flow contribution at each of the panel control points.

Knowledge of the circulation distribution across the span allows for computation of several aerodynamics quantities of interest. Firstly, applying the Kutta-Joukowski theorem gives the spanwise lift distribution:

\[
L'(y) = \frac{dL(y)}{dy} = \rho V_\infty \Gamma(y)
\]

(4.3.2)

Note that the \(dL\) and \(L'\) distributions is the same shape as the \(\Gamma\) distribution since for a given flow solution, the density and inflow velocity are constant.

The incremental lift on segment \(dy\) of span can then be written as:

\[
dL(y) = \rho V_\infty \Gamma(y)dy
\]

(4.3.3)

From the definition of 2-D lift coefficient in airfoil theory, the lift per unit span can also be written as:

\[
L'(y) = \frac{1}{2} \rho V_\infty^2 c(y)C_l(y)
\]

(4.3.4)

Therefore, local lift coefficient at spanwise location \(y\) can be written as:

\[
C_l(y) = \frac{2\Gamma(y)}{c(y)V_\infty} = \frac{2}{c(y)V_\infty} \Gamma(y)
\]

(4.3.5)
For a given wing geometry and inflow condition, it is easily seen that the $c(y)C_l(y)$ distribution is simply a scaled version of the $\Gamma$ distribution. Thus, many readily available outputs from a Vortex Lattice Method, or similar, are seen to be the same shape, and simply scaled versions of each other.

$$\Gamma(y) \overset{\text{Same Shape}}{\longrightarrow} \frac{dL(y)}{dy} = \rho V_\infty \Gamma(y) \overset{\text{Same Shape}}{\longrightarrow} c(y)C_l(y) = \frac{2}{V_\infty} \Gamma(y) \quad (4.3.6)$$

Induced drag is quite simple to predict in a VLM after the $\Gamma$ distribution is solved. Traditional VLM formulations calculate the induced drag in the Trefftz plane, theoretically located infinitely far behind the lift system using the equation below:

$$D_i = \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Gamma_i V_{nt,i} ds_i \quad (4.3.7)$$

In the expression, $D_i$ is the total induced drag, $\rho$ is the density of the freestream flow, $\Gamma_i$ is the bound circulation at spanwise wing station $i$, $V_{nt,i}$ is the velocity normal to the wake in the Trefftz plane at spanwise station $i$, and $ds_i$ is the incremental distance along the span at section $i$. As the wake normal velocity in the Trefftz plane is simply the sum of all the velocity increments from each bound and trailing vortex in the lift system, the total induced drag is simply a function of the resultant $L'(y)$ distribution.

The lift distribution shape is useful in an aerodynamics optimization problem as it fully determines the induced drag that will result from producing the required amount of lift with a given spanload. The lift distribution is also useful for determination of wing structural loading and the overall wing-root bending moment. Because the spanload distribution is designed using a combination of geometric and aerodynamic twist, it is critically important to remember that $L'(y)$, $\Gamma(y)$, $dL$, and $c(y)C_l(y)$ distributions will all be the same shape and simply scaled versions of one-another but that the spanwise distribution of local $C_l$ will result in a different shape because the chord is not constant along the span.

**Induced Drag Comparison from VLM and CFD**

The induced drag is the entirety of the drag force predicted by the VLM implementation as no physics to include any contributions from skin friction terms are not included in the potential flow formulation. Conversely, the CFD drag prediction contains both the lift induced drag and contributions from viscous effects. There is no simple way to isolate only the lift induced drag portion of the CFD solution (without the computational expense of a Trefftz plane as a derived part [14]) or to reliably incorporate $C_{D_p}$ type drag contributors in a VLM.
Therefore, the knowledge that induced drag is entirely due to the shape of the resultant spanwise lift distribution is applied to compare the VLM and CFD solutions. From the VLM, readily available outputs include the spanwise chord distribution and local section $C_l s$. These can be multiplied together and plotted as a representation of $\Gamma$ or $dL$. In the CFD post-processing, the lift over a strip of the wing can be output and co-plotted with the VLM $c*C_l$ distribution. The resultant curves are not expected to be of the same magnitude, but should be the same shape. Therefore, the plots are made by applying a linear scale factor to one of the curves to make the peak of the curves overlay each other. Then, the shape of the curves from the two methodologies can be directly compared. If the shape is the same, not only is the resultant lift distribution from each method equivalent, the induced drag will be the same as well.
CHAPTER V

CFD Analysis of Bellwether

The previous section validates the use of vortex lattice methods to develop rapid results for the aircraft designer. This section turns to how CFD is leveraged to evaluate aerodynamic performance of the BSLD and how it compares to its elliptical wing counterpart. The analyses performed onward in this body of work will be done using high-fidelity tools on aircraft designs with the fuselage included to best capture performance. Beginning with CFD validation techniques used in the previous section, this section progresses through high-fidelity computation for the comparison of lift-to-drag ratios of the four different wing models at level, steady flight and roll-yaw coupling in an aileron-deflected banked turn. Interpretation of vorticity vector scenes describe upwash regions in the aircraft wake providing discussion of the relationship of inboard upwash to proverse yaw.

5.1 Mesh Development

After importation of the aircraft parasolid models, the surfaces are split by patch for additional control of mesh settings. Select surfaces are broken up by sections: wing leading edge, wing trailing edge, central patches of both wings, wingtip leading edges, wingtip trailing edges, wingtip mid-section, fuselage nose, fuselage body, and fuselage tail, which are selected to be displayed in the planform view of the scene shown in Figure 41. This offers specific control of these areas to directly command scalar values of interest, such as wall y+, turbulent kinetic energy, and convective courant number. These values can be used to provide guidance in the iterative mesh design process to achieve convergence of physical flow properties. Prism layer design and wake refinement are two vital parameters in capturing the flow physics. Figure 36 and Figure 37 visually depict the outcome of these designs. It is pertinent to note, for purposes of computational expense, that iterations of physics runs are used to refine the prism layer design and base cell size to create a mesh that begins to reduce residuals across iterative steps, and limit wall y+ and turbulent kinetic energy values, before wake refinement is enabled. This is done to capture the surfaces of the model through iterative mesh/run steps before adding wake refinement which is likely to introduce millions more cells into the domain increasing computational cost. Once the mesh design is completed, and wake refinement enabled, analysis proceeds to check mesh independence by evaluating the current mesh with a mesh of 20% reduced base size with all mesh elements enabled as "relative to base."

The physics for the aircraft models without aileron deflection are run on a mesh of 23
millions. The computational burden is placed on the High-Powered Computing Center (HPCC) at Oklahoma State University.

Figure 36: Longitudinal Mesh at the Root Airfoil

Figure 37: Horizontal Mesh with Wake Refinement Enabled

5.2 Level, Steady Flight Performance

Each model is first analyzed at the 0 degree angle of attack at a freestream velocity of 35 fps. The performance was originally recorded by the unsteady Reynolds-Averaged Navier Stokes (U-RANS) solver for each model for 1 physical second of 5000 iterative steps. The results, albeit small and bounded, were oscillatory. A steady RANS model was introduced to provide a level, convergent result within the bounded U-RANS results for clarity of presentation.
The lift distributions, dL, across the span are plotted against the desired curves in Figure 39 to confirm each wing is producing lift congruent with how it is designed. Next, the aerodynamic performance of each is measured in the ratio of lift to drag produced at the common flight condition. To save on computational expense, the Modern Bell and Cosine curves have not been iterated extensively to match their curves. Instead, they have been designed with enough distinction to provide significant differences to the flow fields produced by the Prandtl and ELD wings. The Bellwether design, applying the bell spanload outlined by Ludwig Prandtl, shows greatest efficiency in level flight (Figure 40). The ELD wing is found to be operating at a much lower coefficient of lift (0.323) than the other distributions, so this comparison of the ELD to the other wings on this basis is ill-founded. The ELD design failed to adhere to the fixed-lift design constraint placed upon the other distributions. This can be corrected by running an alpha sweep and comparing the performance of the
ELD at an incidence angle where the CL matches that of the other distributions. However, this method is likely to introduce greater parasitic drag, so a $L/D$ comparison would not be representative of the efficiency of lift generation. A comparison could be made in setting up a Trefftz plane in STAR-CCM+ as a grid of planar probes from which the velocity vectors recorded are used to calculate induced drag from the flow field. This may be a suitable method of comparing induced drag computationally, and the truest comparison of aerodynamic efficiency in level flight, but it cannot entirely capture the aerodynamic performance without also accounting for the parasite drag by measuring the total drag and calculating induced drag ($C_D = C_{D_0} + C_{D_1}$). No clear comparison in level flight is made to ELD, but it is determined that increasing the centralization of lift deviating from the bell spanload results in decreased aerodynamic efficiency for this aircraft configuration in this flow regime.

Figure 40: Comparison of Lift-to-Drag Ratios of the Various Wing Designs

For a physical explanation of how the change in lift distribution affects the roll-yaw coupling response of the aircraft, we revert to the discussion of the regions of upwash and downwash discovered by Dr. Bowers and the research team at NASA responsible for the design and testing of the Prandtl-D flying wing [2]. Referencing Figure 2 depicts the sharp induction of upwash flow at the wingtips caused by the elliptical lift distribution. The bell spanload offers a smoother transition between regions of upwash and downwash that begin within the wingspan. Depictions of trailing vortices for Bellwether and the ELD model are observed to relate the computational findings to the Prandtl-D research and avian flight correlations [2] [14].

Figure 41 and Figure 42 use vorticity vector scenes from STAR-CCM+ to illustrate where these regions occur for Bellwether and the Elliptical model, respectively. ELD (Figure 42) places the center of its vortex at the wingtip with a sharp gradient in vorticity vector strength. By contrast, BSLD (Figure 41) captures a much smoother change in vorticity.
magnitude congruent with Figure 2. The measurement tool in STAR-CCM+ was used to measure the location of the maximum vorticity vector to the aircraft centerline which spans the region of downwash and indicates where the transition from upwash to downwash occurs (i.e. distance from the root to the vortex core). This distance measures 9.17 feet which is 70.5% of the 13-foot semispan. The measured vortex core location nearly exactly mirrors the 70.4% semispan location found by NASA’s investigation of this lift distribution in 2016 [2].

5.3 Banked Turn Performance

In order to simulate a banked turn, the aircraft models are revised with the addition of ailerons from the 80% span position to the RAE 101 airfoil section at the wingtips. This design choice was advised by the range of optimal placement between 76% and 82% found by Richter et al [18] for maximum proverse yaw control. The inboard and outboard surfaces of the ailerons extend to the quarter chord, and they are linearly lofted together as a solid. They are designed such that the angle of deflections can be easily modified for a downward deflection on the port side aileron and an upward deflection on the starboard aileron. This banked turn simulation deflects the ailerons 20 anti-symmetrically.

Like the level-flight analysis, the banked-turn CFD records yaw moment by the implicit U-RANS solver for each model tested. The results presented are from the subsequent analyses using the steady RANS solver to output a clear value within the oscillatory bounds of the U-RANS result. This is done primarily for validation of the physics continuum and clear
presentation of results. The creation of proverse yaw \((\text{Figure 43})\) is evident for the wing designs in which the ailerons are engulfed in the upwash. The distributions centralizing lift the most experience the greatest effect of proverse yaw. Bellwether, utilizing the spanloading described by Prandtl, exhibits the greatest aerodynamic efficiency in level flight \((\text{Figure 40})\) and is the closest to performing a perfectly coordinated turn in roll \((\text{Figure 43})\). Deviations from this spanloading shows decreases in overall flight performance. As discussed in the level flight section, the \(L/D\) comparison does not apply to the elliptical wing. The ELD is reported to be the most efficient solution for a fixed wingspan. Since the analyses of this work does not alleviate wingspan constraint for a fixed structural weight (or root bending moment), previous research would lead to the belief that this design should perform best when the ailerons are not engaged. As expected, the ELD operates with clear adverse yaw effects in roll. \textit{Figure 44} tracks the convergent yaw values for each physics iteration. The first 100 iterations of the steady RANS results have been clipped to remove extraneous values from the plot.

Examination of an aileron mesh scene \((\text{Figure 45})\) encourages discussion on improvements to be made in the modeling and mesh design for the aileron-deflected models. These models have been made such that the port aileron deflects 20 down with attachment along the high-pressure surface of the wing. Conversely, the starboard aileron is deflected 20 up with attachment at the upper wing surface. The deflection angle creates sharp edges of surface discontinuity. CAD features such as this should be avoided for purposes of importation as surface mesh for CFD simulation. Notice the prism layer contraction to the sharp edge causing the thin, prismatic layer to no longer follow the flow direction to precisely capture
Figure 43: Yaw Control Power per Unit Roll from 20 Anti-Symmetric Aileron Deflection

Figure 44: Yaw Moment Monitor by Iteration of Steady RANS Solver in STAR-CCM+
velocity gradients close to the surface boundary. Future CAD modeling could create a filled boundary by creating planar surfaces in the gaps of the ends of each aileron and a surface bounding the upper surfaces. This may also be remedied using a solid loft feature from creating a sketch profile in the corner gaps at the ends of each aileron and using the attachment surface as a guide curve to avoid a potential non-manifold-body error in STAR-CCM+.

A smooth, continuous surface allows for greater control of prismatic layer design and, in turn, improved accuracy of velocity and pressure gradients around the body. It can also be seen in Figure 45 that the trailing edge curvature is not matched causing a sharp, angular feature. Again, the prism layers are forced to turn at the sharp angle instead of rounding smoothly. The aileron surface mesh should be imported at an increased tessalation density to build small surfaces of high curvature with greater accuracy. This must be coupled with refined mesh settings on the control surface such as decreasing minimum surface and target surface sizes.
CHAPTER VI

Avian-Inspired Aircraft Design and Performance

The previous sections detail analytical and computational methods to justify the aerodynamic design of Bellwether. The aerodynamic shape has been driven by the application of the BSLD and artistic resemblance to birds with the shaping of the lifting-body fuselage. This section discusses aircraft performance metrics for stability and control from computational results and progresses to CAD modeling of the final aircraft shape, internal structure, and basic construction techniques.

6.1 Longitudinal Stability and Performance

Understanding of the aircraft’s performance beings with unpacking the results of an alpha sweep. The results give a graphical understanding of longitudinal performance across incidence angles (Figure 46) to illustrate the range for optimal performance and the stall region where the linear, elastic region of lift loses its efficacy. The range of greatest lift-to-drag ratio can be seen between $-2$ and $2$ operate at high coefficients of lift ranging from 0.7 to 1 for maximum aerodynamic performance. This is optimal for the aircraft to complete its mission of atmospheric data collection while demonstrating minimum induced drag.

To understand stability of the aircraft the center of gravity must be estimated after modeling the aircraft and all of the internal components. The center of gravity (c.g.) location is approximated by a spreadsheet of point masses in cooperation with the SolidWorks c.g. displayer to model each component and report the location with respect to the model. Density of aircraft composite skin made of fiberglass layers and a divinycell foam core is approximated based on previous aircraft fabricated through Oklahoma State University’s long history of building unmanned aircraft. Other known internal components (Pixhawk OrangeCube autopilot, electric motor, RunCam camera, video transmitter, receiver, 12” propeller, servo motors, and batteries) are available in the Unmanned Systems Research Institute (USRI) lab space, Excelsior, to be sized and weighed for accurate modeling. The c.g. location is used as the origin for many aircraft stability concerns through STAR-CCM+ including the reports and monitors constructed to track the coefficient of moment about the c.g. Since this aircraft configuration operates without the use of a tail, there is little margin for error in the placement of the c.g. for maintaining longitudinal stability. As not to induce a positive or negative pitching moment that would require additional control, the propulsor placement is designed to run through the center of gravity in line with the freestream, or longitudinal axis. Figure 47 shows how this design works with a 3D-printed, fin-like support
structure for the propulsor shaft. This addition is adhered to the composite fuselage, and the motor shaft slides through the fuselage and the fin to drive the propeller. This design allows for the CFD analysis of pitch stability to be representative of the aircraft behavior without needing to account for the pitching moment induced by the propulsive system. Additionally, the propeller placement was chosen to operate aft of the fuselage as not to influence the freestream flow on the fuselage, since the lift generated by the body was included in the design and analysis to match the Prandtl bell lift distribution.

For longitudinal stability, the pitching moment about the c.g. for various angles of attack is the primary plot used to understand the aircraft’s behavior in flight. For a positive moment corresponding to a pitch up, and negative for pitch down, Figure 48 plots $C_{m_\alpha}$ for a range of c.g. locations along the longitudinal axis. The purpose for ranging the point of interest:

1. Finding the aerodynamic center which, for a flying wing, is equivalent to the neutral point and is the location about which pitching moment is constant and independent
of incidence angle.

2. Graphically identifying the c.g. locations to satisfy longitudinal static stability: $C_{m_{\alpha}} < 0$, $C_{m_{\alpha}=0} \geq 0$, and it must cross the x-axis to achieve trim.

3. Noting the range of static margin required for longitudinal static stability, where the static margin is equivalent to the distance of the center of gravity from the neutral point divided by the mean aerodynamic chord;

$$SM = \frac{(X_{np}-X_{cg})}{MAC} \times 100\%$$

The optimal point can be seen to be a static margin, SM, of 20% to satisfy the enumerate criteria above. At this c.g. location the $C_{m_{\alpha}}$ slope crosses the x-axis at 0 angle of attack, meaning there exists no positive or negative pitch moment at this trim point, and it will seek to return to this operating point when subject to perturbations. Conveniently, the trim point occurs at the angle of attack of greatest efficiency by metric of $L/D$ as graphed above (Figure 46). The computer-calculated center of gravity marked the location at a SM of 26.5%. Bellwether has been designed with a modular propulsion bay that slides out the back hatch of the fuselage to swap or rearrange the propulsive components. Rails are designed within the bay to allow for the batteries powering the electric motor to be positioned at various longitudinal locations to set the c.g. to achieve the desired SM. Figure 48 provides a top view of the fuselage to show the c.g. relation to the body and the c.g. travel necessary to the attain the SM corresponding to the desired performance curve. Each criterion for longitudinal static stability has been met and, thus, concluding analysis for pitch-axis control.
6.2 Lateral Stability of Bellwether

In order to better understand aircraft performance in a banked turn, the effect of sideslip to yaw and roll must be in account. To observe this effect, CFD analysis is performed on Bellwether for freestream sideslip angles of 2.5, 5, 7.5, and 10. The aircraft is rotated inside the flow domain by an exposed parameter responsible for setting yaw angle in degrees. If unchanged, the lab coordinate system will remain to output forces and moments in accordance with a zero-sideslip condition. This fixed coordinate system is said to be in wind frame, since it maintains an axis along the direction of the freestream regardless of aircraft position. However, the desired outcomes of forces and moments are considered with respect to the body of the aircraft, so the reports and monitors must be made to reflect its changes in position. An adaptable coordinate system is not made available in Flying-WingMacro.java, but the change can be made with relative ease. A new coordinate system can be developed in the CAD window of STAR-CCM+ relating the points and/or planes constructing the Cartesian coordinates to the aircraft body so the reference system changes with body rotation and translation. A less adaptable method, but equally effective, is to define a new local coordinate system under the "Tools" tab of the main page. It can be defined as Cartesian, cylindrical, or spherical. For this application, it is easiest to create a Cartesian system that sets an axis as a rotated vector from the original Cartesian coordinates.

Alternatively, the resultant forces and moments may be passed through a rotation matrix to correct for the change of frame as was done here. A Direction Cosine Matrix (DCM) changes the resultant vectors of roll, pitch, and yaw moments from wind frame to body frame (Equation 6.2.1 and Equation 6.2.2) [23].
The coefficients of these moments are transformed for each $\beta$ value of 2.5, 5, 7.5, and 10 for a constant angle of attack, $\alpha = 0$.

$$DCM_{bw} = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos(\alpha)\cos(\beta) & \sin(\beta) & \sin(\alpha)\cos(\beta) \\
\cos(\alpha)\sin(\beta) & \cos(\beta) & -\sin(\alpha)\sin(\beta) \\
\sin(\alpha) & 0 & \cos(\alpha)
\end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$

(6.2.2)

Roll and yaw coefficients ($C_l$ and $C_n$, respectively) are plotted from the beta sweep (Figure 49). The analysis indicates that a negative roll moment is created for positive sideslip with a slight yaw moment into the freestream suggesting that static directional, or weathercock, stability is inherent. The trendlines of the figure indicate the roll and yaw stability coefficients to be $C_{l\beta} = -0.0086$ and $C_{n\beta} = 0.0008$, respectively.

Figure 49: Coefficients of Roll ($C_l$) and Yaw ($C_n$) with Respect to Sideslip Angle ($\beta$)

Perfect coordination would assume zero sideslip, but that may not be the case in flight. Relating these results back to the banked turn performance offers a more comprehensive understanding of the turn coordination. The coefficient of roll for the 20 aileron deflection, $C_{l\delta=20}$, is approximately 0.25 from CFD results. From Figure 49, this positive roll moment is only slightly counteracted in sideslip, so it is acting only marginally as a wing leveler. If the linear relationship holds for greater angles of sideslip, it would take a $\beta$ of 30 to nullify the roll moment caused by 20 aileron deflection. The yaw moments created are much less pronounced. The yaw coefficient with respect to sideslip (per degree) is 0.0008. The proverse yaw created by aileron deflection is roughly $C_{n\delta=20} \approx 0.0018$, which is to say the effect of sideslip is additive to proverse yaw. The Modern Bell and Cosine wing models operate with
yaw control is excess of $C_{n\delta=20} = 0.005$. By contrast, the Elliptical wing creates a coefficient of nearly $C_{n\delta=20} = -0.007$ that appears to be negated at 8.75 of sideslip according to the linear trend reported by STAR-CCM+. A tradeoff made by seeking more centralized lift distributions for increase yaw control power may not be worth sacrificing $L/D$ performance in level flight, since the directional stability will add favorable yaw in sideslip.

6.3 CAD Modeling, Internal Design, and Fabrication Techniques

The modeling begins with the importation of .dat files as x,y,z coordinates into SolidWorks to create splines of specific airfoil geometry. From these splines, sketch blocks are created so that they may be inserted as different sizes at different locations and angles of twist. The airfoils are positioned from *BellwetherOne* at the root to *RAE 101* at the tip of the wing in accordance with Figure 50.

![Figure 50: Geometric Twist Angles for Each Spanwise Airfoil](image)

The semispan wing sections are lofted together and connected to the fuselage cross section at the centerline through the use of guide curves to obtain the desired biomimetic shape. The fuselage shape was made iteratively through high-fidelity analysis to ensure it produces the lift required to promote the smooth, continuous bell curve. The aerodynamic shape is hollowed out for the creation of the structural components. The ribs are created at the semispan locations of the sketch blocks created from the .dat file splines and lofted to an adjacent intersection curve made from the interaction between the wing and a reference plane distanced the rib thickness from the airfoil sketch block. A lofted feature is chosen over an extrusion to adhere to the sweep and dihedral along the span. The fuselage ribs and bulkheads are made using the same technique. Lightning holes are laser cut in the Aeroply ribs and bulkheads to reduce the weight of the structural components while remaining to support shear flow. The fuselage internal structure harbors specific bays: camera system, avionics, propulsion, and storage. Each compartment is accessible through magnetic hatches composed from the fiberglass skin.
The wing bending moment is supported by a 6’ carbon fiber spar positioned at the quarter chord and a balsa wood spar positioned at the 3/4 chord. The balsa spar is adhered inside the wing by a carbon-fiber infused epoxy in the composite layup process. For additional support at the root, 3 blocks of dense foam are fit between the first 3 wing sections. The dense, supporting foam is cut using a computer numerical control (CNC) router which is the same technique used to shape the aircraft molds. The mold designs and images of CNC operation can be seen in Appendix 0.4. Due to the unique wing twist the aircraft molds require a non-linear parting line for the halves of the structure (Appendix 0.4). This results in a piecewise linear surface as the interface between top and bottom molds of an aircraft part. Each half of a wing mold is made as a solid, lofted body in CAD from which the wing shape is extracted with a lofted cut feature using the wing profiles. This aircraft fabrication process has begun, and its creation and experimental conclusions will ensue as future works.
Figure 52: Bellwether - Rear View

Figure 53: Bellwether - Front View
CHAPTER VII

Future Works

The ambitions for this research effort extend to seeking experimental validation through numerous methods. Some methods have been tried, but no conclusive data have been obtained to present in this document. Images of wind tunnel and laser-optic water tunnel testing can be found in Appendix 0.5. The pinnacle of comparing aircraft performance from computation to experimentation will come from the full-size fabrication of the 26 ft. wingspan aircraft. The roll-yaw coupling is to be parsed from the inertial measurement unit (IMU) to retrieve data that may be suitable for comparison to the aileron-deflected model in CFD. A pitot probe will provide airspeed to couple with the IMU to determine if the aircraft is flying at the expected cruise speed for the lift required (operating CL expected for level flight). In addition to the standard sensors used on unmanned aircraft systems, a network of sensors are to be integrated in the wing of the aircraft as a unique, theoretical method of determining the distribution of lift experimentally.

7.1 Leading-Edge Flow Sensing

To revert to a common theme, we can see many examples of flow sensing found in the natural world such as with avian flight. Birds have neural networks of mechanoreceptors responsible for sensing dynamic, atmospheric conditions in flight. In the case of the peregrine falcon, vibration magnitude is the sensory stimulus used for sensing incidence angle when engaged in a rapid dive maneuver [4]. This research aims to mimic this streamlined, built-in sensing by gathering pressure data along the wing for the purpose of outputting incidence angle and obtaining sectional lift coefficient, $C_l$. Flush air data sensing (FADS) are an effective method of obtaining this information, but there are drawback to their implementation. Such booms require intrusive and rigid mechanical ties to the body of the aircraft. These external designs are susceptible to damage for a belly-landing aircraft such as Bellwether. Seeking an internal and well-integrated method of flow sensing leads to the pursuit of an alternative.

A fundamental aspect of this research is evaluating the effect of lift distribution to performance of a flying wing. Currently, experimental data is not present in confirming the computational results. An experimental flow sensing project has begun to validate the lift distribution from flight testing. 5-hole probes are used to measure stagnation points on the leading edge of the aircraft. This section discusses the theory, design, and integration of the flow-sensing system into a wing of Bellwether.
7.1.1 Theory

Discrete surface pressures measured at 5 ports on the leading edge of a wing are passed through an algorithm to calculate air-data parameters as detailed by researchers at North Carolina State University [19]. The real-time measurement of aerodynamic parameters in flight enhances aircraft capabilities while preventing dangerous stall situations. This is particularly useful for this flying wing which operates at a very high coefficient of lift and notices stall effects at a 7° angle of attack.

The measurement of the stagnation point \( P_0 \), which is the point of maximum pressure, can be used to calculate the freestream velocity \( U \) and any incidence angle.

\[
P_0 = P + \frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 \quad (7.1.1)
\]

\[
U = \sqrt{\frac{2(P_0 - P)}{\rho}} \quad (7.1.2)
\]

A parabola is used for the estimation of the shape of the leading edge of the wing section. The pressure distribution measured from the 5 ports are used as inputs to an algorithm solving the exact potential-flow solution using a nonlinear regression. The angle of attack and lift coefficient are found using a look-up table which is found to be accurate for subsonic, pre-stall flow regimes [19].

The shape of an airfoil is given by the expression of the nose radius \( r \) of the airfoil and the initial slope of the camber line \( \lambda \) from the reduction of a high-order polynomial derivation (complete derivation and theory cited [19]) resulting in Equation 7.1.3.

\[
y = \pm (2rx)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda x \quad (7.1.3)
\]

The algorithm is made with the ability to predict the lift coefficient and angle of attack on a wing section, and it can be extended to compute the aerodynamic parameters for sections along the wing. Due to the unique aerodynamic and geometric twist of this wing, and added redundancy, this design proceeds with multiple processing points on the semispan.

7.1.2 Design and Integration

This pressure-sensing experiment involves the integration of pressure sensors within the composite shell. 3D-printed sleeves harboring the pressure sensors are to be placed at specified locations along the span. Each sleeve is made by lofting two intersection curves. The intersection curves are made from the creation of planes parallel to the freestream and their interaction with the wing section. Extruded cuts are made so that the sleeve only occupies the leading edge and does not extend down the chord. The part is shelled to create internal volume for the pressure sensors. 5 extruded circular cuts are made at the leading edge in precise locations: the point on the leading edge of zero curvature, 2% chord location on top and bottom, and 5% chord location top and bottom. The holes punches are made orthogonal to the surface.
3 locations are selected at the presumed area of highest gradient in the lift distribution to experimentally determine its adherence to the Prandtl bell curve. Each 3D-printed sleeve must then be designed separately to follow the sectional mold line of the wing. Due to symmetry, the leading-edge inserts will only be placed on the port wing (Figure 54). The starboard wing will harbor ballast mirroring the masses and locations of the sensing system.

The sleeves must be applied in such a way in order for the pressure holes to receive freestream air, but the design also favors internal integration. The composite layup process will accommodate this design by cutting out the skin and core material at the leading edge locations for the sensing sleeves prior to the application of epoxy. After the creation of the composite within the mold, the sleeves may be epoxied and the Arduino wired internally to create a neural sensing network within the wing that runs to the power source in the avionics bay.

### 7.1.3 Wind Tunnel Demonstration System

A leading-edge sleeve designed for the 7.5 ft. semispan location is printed out of ABS plastic (Figure 55) to used as a demonstration system for wind-tunnel testing. The model adds a sting attachment for the model to be place on the force balance in the wind tunnel. Thin extrusion features are made on the inside of the sleeve to connect rubber tubes from the holes...
on the leading edge to their respective pressure sensors. The pressure sensors are wired to an Arduino computer board responsible for applying the algorithm and storing the in-flight data to an SD card. The first sleeve (Figure 55) has been tested for basic readings of pressure data containing only 1 pressure sensor for the initial test. This model is representative of what will be included in the wing, but a second model (like the sleeve shown in Figure 54) is made to more accurately simulate the in-flight reading since the model will take the shape of the entire wing section housing the sensing mechanism.

Figure 55: Sensing Sleeve Mounted in the Endeavor Wind Tunnel

The algorithm has yet to be applied for the determination of aerodynamic properties.
CHAPTER VIII

Conclusion

This thesis set out to design an unmanned aircraft using a bell-shaped lift distribution and investigate, through highly-computational methods, the centralization of lift and the aerodynamic effect on the change of shape of the flow field. Vortex Lattice Methods are performed to provide the aircraft designer with confidence in the use of rapid tools for aerodynamic calculation. VLM is compared to CFD to illustrate its viability for initial-stage calculations. The author suggests the use of the lower-order methods for highly-iterative design processes of subsonic lifting bodies.

The primary theory tested is the centralization of lift and the effect on aerodynamic performance with the change in the flow field. Four separate wing models have been made, each designed with a different distribution of lift by the command of aerodynamic and geometric twist. Observation of the vortical structures and core locations in the flow field provide an intuition for the relationship of the centralization of lift to roll-yaw coupling. Further parameterizations would provide greater clarity to this relationship:

1. More aileron deflection angles to be tested
2. Changes in aileron area and inboard reach with relation to the vortex core location
3. Alpha sweep for ELD to compare to BSLD at common CL
4. Swap wingspan constraint for bending moment constraint and compare BSLD to ELD

It is stated that the change in shape of the lift distribution from elliptical to bell decreases the drag by about 11% with a 22.5% increase in span for the same structural weight [2]. As discussed in the early sections, aspect ratio is inversely proportional to induced drag. However, this is not to say that the BSLD is more efficient than ELD in level flight. Greater parasite drag is expected from the increase in span, and since $C_D = C_{D0} + C_{Di}$, the overall drag could remain the same (or even increase) dependent upon the ratio of increased parasite drag to the induced drag reduction. No evidence in this study, or in the referenced research, is provided to confidently suggest that any aircraft configuration will benefit in level flight from deviating from the ELD.

The elliptical wing in this study operates at a much lower coefficient of lift (0.323) than the other distributions. Therefore, it cannot be accurately compared in terms of aerodynamic performance since it did not meet the required lift constraint. The CL can be matched through an alpha sweep analysis of the wing and extracting the performance metrics at the CL corresponding to a particular point on the lift-curve slope. This may fix the issue of the lift constraint, but adding geometric rotation to the wing to alter CL introduces
more parasite drag. A better way to do this comparison could be to set up a Trefftz plane in STAR-CCM+ as a grid of planar probes from which the velocity vectors recorded are used to calculate induced drag from the flow field. Though this may be the best method of comparing induced drag computationally, no clear process using software tools has been identified by the author to provide evidentiary results in favor of the BSLD to ELD in level flight.

Distributions of centralized lift have a clear advantage in performing a banked turn without need for an auxiliary yaw device. The change in the flow field for the creation on inboard upwash allow for the presence of proverse yaw for anti-symmetric aileron deflection. The inboard travel of the vortex cores is proportional to proverse yaw control power. When the aileron is engulfed in upwash, induced thrust will occur so long as the deflected aileron does not produce enough downwash to counteract the upwash from the inboard vortex core. The behavior of favorable yaw into a banked turn and the location and size of the vortex core are used as evidence of its application to bird flight. From coordinated turns to the variable wing spacing in avian flight formation, it is suggested that birds use the much wider inboard vortex created by the BSLD to set their wing overlap to enhance aerodynamic efficiency in the wake of the leading bird.

It could potentially be reasoned that the incorporation of this spanload can reduce the tail size of more traditional aircraft configurations. The application of the BSLD may prove to be beneficial to standard aircraft if the reduction in structural weight is of greater importance than any losses occurring in level flight, though true comparisons of the ELD to BSLD in level flight have not been performed. This body of work is not conclusive in the advocation for the application of a bell spanload for optimal aerodynamic efficiency. However, these findings are congruent with the suggestions of emerging research positing that this spanload is more apt for modeling avian flight.

8.1 Summary

1. VLM overestimates the lift coefficient compared to CFD for a swept wing designed by the BSLD, but the distribution across the span closely matches the high-fidelity lift distribution.

2. CFD results suggest BSLD as most fit for performing coordinating turns from the examination of roll-yaw coupling behavior.

3. CFD shows favorable L/D for BSLD in level flight for a fixed wingspan constraint compared to the other distributions operating at the same CL (cosine and modern bell curves).

4. Vorticity scenes produced in STAR-CCM+ agree with Ludwig Prandtl’s revised work and NASA’s Prandtl-D project locating the vortex core produced by the BSLD to occur at the 70.4-70.5% semispan location.

5. Congruent with emerging research, most notably the work from Kyle Lukacovic [14] in the wake of the Prandtl-D [2], the activation of the induced thrust at the wingtips and shape of the flow field suggest avian flight is best modeled by the bell spanload.
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0.1 Aircraft CAD Drawings and Renderings

Figure 56: Bellwether Side View - Avian Inspiration
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>PART NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BellwetherV4.5</td>
<td>Fuselage w bulkheads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bellwether V9 Solid</td>
<td>Wings w Ribs LH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Camera_5.8GHz_RunCam_Swift2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Electric Motor Speed Controller (ESC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FREEZE_Aircraft Controls Reciever Jeti</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FREEZE_Servo_2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FREEZE_Video Transmitter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OrangeCube_Autopilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power Sensor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TelemetryDiskAntenna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TelemetryRadio_RFD90 0x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Turnigy G32 770kV</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.25ft carbon fiber spar no mass</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LiPo_4500mAh_22.2V</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Propeller</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 57: Propulsor Placement in Line with Center of Gravity

Figure 58: Bellwether Planform View
Figure 59: Bellwether1
Figure 60: Bellwether2
Figure 61: Bellwether3

Figure 62: Bellwether4
Figure 63: Bellwether5

Figure 64: Bellwether6
0.2 Data Plots

Figure 65: Lift and Drag Monitor of Bellwether - Unsteady RANS results
Relevant citations: Prandtl21 AdvancedUAV Bowers WingSections UASDesign [1] [3] XFLR5Low [18] [12] [21]
Figure 68: Cosine Model - Drag Distribution in Roll

Figure 69: Cosine Model - Lift Distribution in Roll
Figure 70: Modern Bell - Drag Distribution in Roll (bin direction is backwards on this plot)

Figure 71: Modern Bell - Lift Distribution in Roll (bin direction is backwards on this plot)
Figure 72: Prandtl Bell - Drag Distribution in Roll

Figure 73: Prandtl - Lift Distribution in Roll
Figure 74: Elliptical - Drag Distribution in Roll (bin direction is backwards on this plot)

Figure 75: Elliptical - Lift Distribution in Roll
Figure 76: Combine Alpha Sweep
Figure 77: Distributions at Common CL of All Analysis Methods
0.3 CFD Mesh Scenes

Figure 78: Wake Refinement

Figure 79: Aileron Mesh 1
Figure 80: Aileron Mesh 2

Figure 81: Aileron Mesh 3
Figure 82: Aileron Mesh 4
0.4 Aircraft Mold Design and Fabrication

Figure 83: Fuselage Mold

Figure 84: Inboard Wing Mold

Figure 85: Inboard Wing Mold - Top View
Figure 86: Outboard Wing Mold

Figure 87: Outboard Wing Mold - Top View

Figure 88: Mold 1
Figure 91: System of Components for Leading-Edge Flow Sensing Sleeve
Figure 92: Wind Tunnel Setup for 3D-Printed Bellwether Model
Figure 93: Wind Tunnel Flow Visualization
Figure 98: Wind Tunnel 5

Figure 99: Water Tunnel 1
Figure 100: Water Tunnel 2

Figure 101: Water Tunnel 3
Figure 102: Water Tunnel 4

Figure 103: Water Tunnel 5
0.6 CFD Streamlines and Vorticity Scenes

Figure 104: Bellwether Vorticity 1
Figure 105: Bellwether Vorticity 2
Figure 106: Bellwether Vorticity 3
Figure 107: Bellwether Vorticity 4

Figure 108: Bellwether Vorticity 5
Figure 109: Elliptical Vorticity 1
Figure 110: Elliptical Vorticity 2
Figure 111: Elliptical Vorticity 3
Figure 112: Cosine Vorticity 1
Figure 113: Cosine Vorticity 2
Figure 114: Cosine Vorticity 3
Figure 115: Modern Bell Vorticity 1
Figure 116: Modern Bell Vorticity 2

Figure 117: Bellwether Streamlines 1
Figure 118: Bellwether Streamlines 2

Figure 119: Bellwether Streamlines 3
Figure 120: Bellwether Vector Scene

Figure 121: Bellwether Vortex Core
0.7 Flying Wing Macro
// Scott Weekley
// 6 August 2020
// Setup of Mesh, Physics, Reports, Plots, and Scenes for Aircraft
// Used for Design and Analysis of Flying-Wing, Bellwether

// ----------------------------- Expected Steps Prior to Running
--------------------------------
// User is to have imported the aircraft as a surface mesh, and
// named the surfaces "Flying Wing"
// Create a Block part with dimensions of the desired flow domain
// NOTE: It may be desired to separate parts of the aircraft for
// analysis of specific regions // (this is done in the
// analysis of Bellwether). This is accomplished by selecting the
// aircraft part surface, then right click to select "Split
// by Patch." This will require all // of the dependencies to
// reflect this change (all reports, scenes, etc.)
// Perform a Boolean-Subtract between the Block part and the Flying
// Wing with the Block as the // target part
// Rename the Subtract "Flow Domain"
// In the Flow Domain surfaces, right click on the Block Surface and
// "Split by Patch"
// Select the surface from which the flow will enter the domain and
// name it "Inlet"
// Name the opposite surface "Outlet"
// Close
// Rename the remaining Block Surface "Freestream"
// Assign the Flow Domain to Region and select "Create a Region for
// Each Part" and "Create a // Boundary for Each Part Surface"

// ----------------------- Important Modifications for your Design
-------------------------------
// Depending on the size of your aircraft and domain, the mesh
// default controls should change:
// Base Size
// Target Surface Size
// Maximum Cell Size
// The mesh custom controls "Flying Wing" should also change to meet
// the needs of your aircraft
// Target Surface Size
// Number of Prism Layers
// Prism Layer Total Thickness
// Growth Rate
// Wake Refinement Options
// NOTE: If the aircraft surfaces are split by patch, all surfaces
// need to be added to this // surface control.
// In Regions, the surface "Freestream" should include a Mach number
// that agrees with the physics // conditions set for the
// flight speed
// Derived Part, "Longitudinal Tip", should be moved along the Z-
// axis to coincide with wing tip
// STAR-CCM+ macro: FlyingWingMacro.java  
// Written by STAR-CCM+ 14.04.013

package macro;

import java.util.*;
import star.common. *
import star.base.neo. *;
import star.material. *;
import star.base.report. *;
import star.coupledflow. *;
import star.prismmesher. *;
import star.flow. *;
import star.vis. *;
import star.dualmesher. *;
import star.metrics. *;
import star.meshing. *;

public class FlyingWingMacro extends StarMacro {

    public void execute() {
        execute0();
        execute1();
    }

    private void execute0() {
        Simulation simulation_0 = getActiveSimulation();
        MeshPart meshPart_0 = ((MeshPart) simulation_0.get(SimulationPartManager.class).getPart("Flow Domain"));
        AutoMeshOperation autoMeshOperation_0 = simulation_0.get(MeshOperationManager.class).createAutoMeshOperation(new StringVector(new String[] {"star.resurfacer.ResurfacerAutoMesher", "star.dualmesher.DualAutoMesher", "star.prismmesher.PrismAutoMesher"}), new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {meshPart_0}));
        autoMeshOperation_0.setLinkOutputPartName(false);
        simulation_0.getUnitsManager().getSystemOption().setSelected(UnitsManagerSystemOption.Type.SYSTEM_USCS);
        autoMeshOperation_0.getDefaultValues().get(BaseSize.class).setValue(0.7);
        PartsTargetSurfaceSize partsTargetSurfaceSize_0 = autoMeshOperation_0.getDefaultValues().get(BaseSize.class).getValue();
    }

    public void execute1() {
        // ...
    }
}
partsTargetSurfaceSize_0.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(2.0);
partsTargetSurfaceSize_0.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(100.0);

PartsMinimumSurfaceSize partsMinimumSurfaceSize_0 =
    autoMeshOperation_0.getDefaultValues().get(PartsMinimumSurfaceSize.class);
partsMinimumSurfaceSize_0.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(2.0);

DualAutoMesher dualAutoMesher_0 =
    ((DualAutoMesher) autoMeshOperation_0.getMeshers().getObject("Polyhedral Mesher"));

dualAutoMesher_0.setEnableGrowthRate(true);

PrismAutoMesher prismAutoMesher_0 =
    ((PrismAutoMesher) autoMeshOperation_0.getMeshers().getObject("Prism Layer Mesher"));

prismAutoMesher_0.getPrismStretchingOption().setSelected(PrismStretchingOption.Type.WALL_THICKNESS);

MaximumCellSize maximumCellSize_0 =
    autoMeshOperation_0.getDefaultValues().get(MaximumCellSize.class);
maximumCellSize_0.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(1000.0);

SurfaceCustomMeshControl surfaceCustomMeshControl_0 =
    autoMeshOperation_0.getCustomMeshControls().createSurfaceControl();
autoMeshOperation_0.getMesherParallelModeOption().setSelected(MesherParallelModeOption.Type.PARALLEL);
surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getGeometryObjects().setQuery(null);

PartSurface partSurface_2 =
    ((PartSurface) meshPart_0.getPartSurfaceManager().getPartSurface("Flying Wing"));
surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getGeometryObjects().setObjects(partSurface_2);
surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.setPresentationName("Flying Wing");
surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomConditions().get(PartsTargetSurfaceSizeOption.class).setSelected(PartsTargetSurfaceSizeOption.Type.CUSTOM);
PartsCustomizePrismMesh partsCustomizePrismMesh_0 =
    surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomConditions().get(PartsTargetSurfaceSizeOption.class).get(PartsTargetSurfaceSizeOption.Type.CUSTOM);
partsCustomizePrismMesh_0.getCustomPrismOptions().setSelected(PartsCustomPrismsOption.Type.CUSTOMIZE);

PartsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementOption_0 =
    surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomConditions().get(
        PartsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementOption.class);

partsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementOption_0.
    setPartsWakeRefinementOption(true);

PartsTargetSurfaceSize_1 =
    surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().get(
        PartsTargetSurfaceSize.class);

partsTargetSurfaceSize_1.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(2.0);

PartsCustomizePrismMeshControls_0 =
    partsCustomizePrismMesh_0.getCustomPrismControls();

partsCustomizePrismMeshControls_0.
    setCustomizeNumLayers(true);

partsCustomizePrismMeshControls_0.
    setCustomizeTotalThickness(true);

NumPrismLayers_0 =
    surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().get(
        CustomPrismValuesManager.class).get(NumPrismLayers.class);

IntegerValue_0 =
    numPrismLayers_0.getNumLayersValue();

integerValue_0.getQuantity().setValue(6.0);

PrismThickness_0 =
    surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().get(
        CustomPrismValuesManager.class).get(PrismThickness.class);

prismThickness_0.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(5.0);

surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().get(
    PartsWakeRefinementValuesManager.class).getDistance().setValue(20.0);

Units_1 =
    ((Units) simulation_0.getUnitsManager().getObject("deg"));

surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().get(
    PartsWakeRefinementValuesManager.class).getSpreadAngle().
    setUnits(units_1);

surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().get(
    PartsWakeRefinementValuesManager.class).getSpreadAngle().
    setValue(572.9577951308231);
surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().getPartsWakeRefinementValuesManager().getSpreadAngle().setValue(10.0);

PartsWakeRefinementSize partsWakeRefinementSize_0 = surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().getPartsWakeRefinementValuesManager().getIsotropicSize();

partsWakeRefinementSize_0.getRelativeSizeScalar().setValue(50.0);

PartsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementSet partsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementSet_0 = surfaceCustomMeshControl_0.getCustomValues().getPartsWakeRefinementValuesManager().getPartsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementSet();

partsRemesherTetPolyWakeRefinementSet_0.getGrowthRateQuantity().setValue(1.5);

SurfaceCustomMeshControl surfaceCustomMeshControl_1 = autoMeshOperation_0.getCustomMeshControls().createSurfaceControl();

surfaceCustomMeshControl_1.getGeometryObjects().setQuery(null);

PartSurface partSurface_1 = ((PartSurface) meshPart_0.getPartSurfaceManager().getPartSurface("Freestream"));

PartSurface partSurface_3 = ((PartSurface) meshPart_0.getPartSurfaceManager().getPartSurface("Inlet");

PartSurface partSurface_4 = ((PartSurface) meshPart_0.getPartSurfaceManager().getPartSurface("Outlet");

surfaceCustomMeshControl_1.getGeometryObjects().setObjects(partSurface_1, partSurface_3, partSurface_4);

PartsCustomizePrismMesh partsCustomizePrismMesh_1 = surfaceCustomMeshControl_1.getCustomConditions().getPartsCustomizePrismMesh();

partsCustomizePrismMesh_1.getCustomPrismOptions().setSelected(PartsCustomPrismsOption.Type.DISABLE);

surfaceCustomMeshControl_1.setPresentationName("No Prism Layers");

PhysicsContinuum physicsContinuum_0 = simulation_0.getContinuumManager().createContinuum(PhysicsContinuum.class);

physicsContinuum_0.enable(ThreeDimensionalModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(ExplicitUnsteadyModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(SingleComponentGasModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(CoupledFlowModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(CoupledEnergyModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(IdealGasModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(LaminarModel.class);
LaminarModel laminarModel_0 =
    physicsContinuum_0.getModelManager().getModel(LaminarModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.disableModel(laminarModel_0);
IdealGasModel idealGasModel_0 =
    physicsContinuum_0.getModelManager().getModel(IdealGasModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.disableModel(idealGasModel_0);
CoupledEnergyModel coupledEnergyModel_0 =
    physicsContinuum_0.getModelManager().getModel(CoupledEnergyModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.disableModel(coupledEnergyModel_0);
CoupledFlowModel coupledFlowModel_0 =
    physicsContinuum_0.getModelManager().getModel(CoupledFlowModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.disableModel(coupledFlowModel_0);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(CellQualityRemediationModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(CoupledFlowModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(CoupledEnergyModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(IdealGasModel.class);
physicsContinuum_0.enable(LaminarModel.class);
VelocityProfile velocityProfile_0 =
    physicsContinuum_0.getInitialConditions().get(VelocityProfile.class);
velocityProfile_0.getMethod(ConstantVectorProfileMethod.class).getQuantity().setComponents(35.0, 0.0, 0.0);
Region region_0 =
    simulation_0.getRegionManager().getRegion("Flow Domain");
Boundary boundary_0 = region_0.getBoundaryManager().getBoundary("Freestream");
FreeStreamBoundary freeStreamBoundary_0 = ((FreeStreamBoundary) simulation_0.get(ConditionTypeManager.class).get(FreeStreamBoundary.class));
boundary_0.setBoundaryType(freeStreamBoundary_0);
MachNumberProfile machNumberProfile_0 = boundary_0.getValues().get(MachNumberProfile.class);
machNumberProfile_0.getMethod(ConstantScalarProfileMethod.class).getQuantity().setValue(0.031);
Boundary boundary_1 = region_0.getBoundaryManager().getBoundary("Inlet");
InletBoundary inletBoundary_0 = ((InletBoundary) simulation_0.get(ConditionTypeManager.class).get(InletBoundary.class));
boundary_1.setBoundaryType(inletBoundary_0);
VelocityMagnitudeProfile velocityMagnitudeProfile_0 = boundary_1.getValues().get(VelocityMagnitudeProfile.class);
velocityMagnitudeProfile_0.getMethod(ConstantScalarProfileMethod.class).getQuantity().setValue(35.0);
Boundary boundary_2 = region_0.getBoundaryManager().getBoundary("Outlet");
PressureBoundary pressureBoundary_0 = ((PressureBoundary) simulation_0.get(ConditionTypeManager.class).get(PressureBoundary.class));
boundary_2.setBoundaryType(pressureBoundary_0);
Units units_2 = simulation_0.getUnitsManager().getPreferredUnits(new IntVector(new int[]{0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0}));
Scene scene_1 = simulation_0.getSceneManager().getScene("Geometry Scene 2");
scene_1.setTransparencyOverrideMode(SceneTransparencyOverride.MAKE_SCENE_TRANSPARENT);
PartDisplayer partDisplayer_4 = ((PartDisplayer) scene_1.getCreatorDisplayer());
partDisplayer_4.initialize();
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setQuery(null);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setObjects(region_0);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setQuery(null);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setObjects(region_0);

PlaneSection planeSection_0 =
(PlaneSection) simulation_0.getPartManager().createImplicitPart(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {}), new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 1.0}), new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 0.0}), 0, 1, new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0}));
LabCoordinateSystem labCoordinateSystem_0 = simulation_0.getCoordinateSystemManager().getLabCoordinateSystem();
planeSection_0.setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);
planeSection_0.getInputParts().setQuery(null);
planeSection_0.getInputParts().setObjects(region_0);
planeSection_0.getInputParts().setObjects(region_0);
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits0(units_2);
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits1(units_2);
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits2(units_2);
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setDefinition("");
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setValue(new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 0.0}));
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setCoordinate(units_2, units_2, units_2, new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 0.0}));
planeSection_0.getOriginCoordinate().setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits0(units_2);
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits1(units_2);
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits2(units_2);
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setDefinition("");
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setValue(new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 1.0, 0.0}));
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setCoordinate(units_2, units_2, units_2, new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 1.0, 0.0}));
planeSection_0.getOrientationCoordinate().setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);

SingleValue singleValue_0 = planeSection_0.getSingleValue();
singleValue_0.getValueQuantity().setValue(0.0);
singleValue_0.getValueQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
RangeMultiValue rangeMultiValue_0 = planeSection_0.getRangeMultiValue();
rangeMultiValue_0.setNValues(2);
rangeMultiValue_0.getStartQuantity().setValue(0.0);
rangeMultiValue_0.getStartQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
rangeMultiValue_0.getEndQuantity().setValue(1.0);
rangeMultiValue_0.getEndQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
DeltaMultiValue deltaMultiValue_0 = planeSection_0.getDeltaMultiValue();
deltaMultiValue_0.setNValues(2);
deltaMultiValue_0.getStartQuantity().setValue(0.0);
deltaMultiValue_0.getStartQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
deltaMultiValue_0.getDeltaQuantity().setValue(1.0);
deltaMultiValue_0.getDeltaQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
MultiValue multiValue_0 = planeSection_0.getArbitraryMultiValue();
multiValue_0.getValueQuantities().setUnits(units_2);
multiValue_0.getValueQuantities().setArray(new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0}));
planeSection_0.setValueMode(ValueMode.SINGLE);
scene_1.setTransparencyOverrideMode(SceneTransparencyOverride USE_DISPLAYER_PROPERTY);
planeSection_0.setPresentationName("Horizontal");
scene_1.setTransparencyOverrideMode(SceneTransparencyOverride .MAKE_SCENE_TRANSPARENT);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setQuery(null);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setObjects(region_0);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setQuery(null);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setObjects(region_0);

PlaneSection planeSection_1 = (PlaneSection) simulation_0.getPartManager().createImplicitPart(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {}), new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 1.0}), new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 0.0}), 0, 1, new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0}));

planeSection_1.setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);
planeSection_1.getInputParts().setQuery(null);
planeSection_1.getInputParts().setObjects(region_0);
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits0(units_2);
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits1(units_2);
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits2(units_2);
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setDefinition("0");
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setValue(new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 0.0}));
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setCoordinate(units_2, units_2, units_2, new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 0.0}));
planeSection_1.getOriginCoordinate().setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits0(units_2);
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits1(units_2);
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits2(units_2);
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setDefinition("0");
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setValue(new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 1.0}));
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setCoordinate(units_2, units_2, units_2, new DoubleVector(new double[] {0.0, 0.0, 1.0}));
planeSection_1.getOrientationCoordinate().setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);

SingleValue singleValue_1 = planeSection_1.getSingleValue();
singleValue_1.getValueQuantity().setValue(0.0);
singleValue_1.setValueQuantity().setUnits(units_2);

RangeMultiValue rangeMultiValue_1 =
  planeSection_1.getRangeMultiValue();
rangeMultiValue_1.setNValues(2);
rangeMultiValue_1.getStartQuantity().setValue(0.0);
rangeMultiValue_1.getStartQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
rangeMultiValue_1.getEndQuantity().setValue(1.0);
rangeMultiValue_1.getEndQuantity().setUnits(units_2);

DeltaMultiValue deltaMultiValue_1 =
  planeSection_1.getDeltaMultiValue();
deltaMultiValue_1.setNValues(2);
deltaMultiValue_1.getStartQuantity().setValue(0.0);
deltaMultiValue_1.getStartQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
deltaMultiValue_1.getDeltaQuantity().setValue(1.0);
deltaMultiValue_1.getDeltaQuantity().setUnits(units_2);

MultiValue multiValue_1 =
  planeSection_1.getArbitraryMultiValue();
multiValue_1.getValueQuantities().setUnits(units_2);
multiValue_1.getValueQuantities().setArray(new DoubleVector(new
double[] {0.0}));
planeSection_1.setValueMode(ValueMode.SINGLE);
scene_1.setTransparencyOverrideMode(SceneTransparencyOverride.
USE_DISPLAYER_PROPERTY);
planeSection_1.setPresentationName("Longitudinal - Root");
scene_1.setTransparencyOverrideMode(SceneTransparencyOverride.
MAKE_SCENE_TRANSPARENT);

scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setQuery(null);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setObjects(region_0);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setQuery(null);
scene_1.getCreatorGroup().setObjects(region_0);

PlaneSection planeSection_2 =
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(PlaneSection) simulation_0.getPartManager().createImplicitPart(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[]{}), new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0, 0.0, 1.0}), new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0, 0.0, 0.0}), 0, 1, new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0}));

planeSection_2.setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);
planeSection_2.getInputParts().setQuery(null);
planeSection_2.getInputParts().setObjects(region_0);
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits0(units_2);
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits1(units_2);
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setUnits2(units_2);
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setDefinition("");
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setValue(new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0, 0.0, 12.5}));
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setCoordinate(units_2, units_2, new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0, 0.0, 12.5}));
planeSection_2.getOriginCoordinate().setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits0(units_2);
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits1(units_2);
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setUnits2(units_2);
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setDefinition("");
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setValue(new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0, 0.0, 1.0}));
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setCoordinate(units_2, units_2, new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0, 0.0, 1.0}));
planeSection_2.getOrientationCoordinate().setCoordinateSystem(labCoordinateSystem_0);

SingleValue singleValue_2 = planeSection_2.getSingleValue();
singleValue_2.getValueQuantity().setValue(0.0);
singleValue_2.getValueQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
RangeMultiValue rangeMultiValue_2 = planeSection_2.getRangeMultiValue();
rangeMultiValue_2.setNValues(2);
rangeMultiValue_2.getStartQuantity().setValue(0.0);
rangeMultiValue_2.getStartQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
rangeMultiValue_2.getEndQuantity().setValue(1.0);
rangeMultiValue_2.getEndQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
DeltaMultiValue deltaMultiValue_2 =
    planeSection_2.getDeltaMultiValue();
deltaMultiValue_2.setNValues(2);
deltaMultiValue_2.getStartQuantity().setValue(0.0);
deltaMultiValue_2.getStartQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
deltaMultiValue_2.getDeltaQuantity().setValue(1.0);
deltaMultiValue_2.getDeltaQuantity().setUnits(units_2);
MultiValue multiValue_2 =
    planeSection_2.getArbitraryMultiValue();
multiValue_2.getValueQuantities().setUnits(units_2);
multiValue_2.getValueQuantities().setArray(new DoubleVector(new double[]{0.0}));
planeSection_2.setValueMode(ValueMode.SINGLE);
scene_1.setTransparencyOverrideMode(SceneTransparencyOverride.USE_DISPLAYER_PROPERTY);
planeSection_2.setPresentationName("Longitudinal - Tip");
ForceCoefficientReport forceCoefficientReport_0 =
simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(ForceCoefficientReport.class);
forceCoefficientReport_0.setPresentationName("Coefficient of Drag");
forceCoefficientReport_0.getReferenceVelocity().setValue(35.0);
forceCoefficientReport_0.getParts().setQuery(null);
Boundary boundary_3 =
    region_0.getBoundaryManager().getBoundary("Flying Wing");
forceCoefficientReport_0.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);
forceCoefficientReport_0.getReferenceArea().setValue(45.0);
ForceCoefficientReport forceCoefficientReport_1 =
simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(
ForceCoefficientReport.class);
forceCoefficientReport_1.setPresentationName("Copy of
Coefficient of Drag");
forceCoefficientReport_1.copyProperties(
forceCoefficientReport_0);
forceCoefficientReport_1.setPresentationName("Coefficient of
Lift");
forceCoefficientReport_1.getDirection().setComponents(1.0, 1.0,
0.0);
forceCoefficientReport_1.getDirection().setComponents(0.0, 1.0,
0.0);
ForceReport forceReport_0 =
simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(ForceReport.
class);
forceReport_0.setPresentationName("Drag");
forceReport_0.getParts().setQuery(null);
forceReport_0.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);
ForceReport forceReport_1 =
simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(ForceReport.
class);
forceReport_1.setPresentationName("Copy of Drag");
copyProperties(forceReport_0);
}
private void execute1() {
Simulation simulation_0 =
getActiveSimulation();
ForceReport forceReport_1 =
((ForceReport) simulation_0.getReportManager().getReport("Copy of Drag")
forceReport_1.setPresentationName("Lift");
forceReport_1.getDirection().setComponents(1.0, 1.0, 0.0);
forceReport_1.getDirection().setComponents(0.0, 1.0, 0.0);
MomentReport momentReport_0 =
simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(MomentReport.
class);
momentReport_0.setPresentationName("Moment - Roll");
momentReport_0.getDirection().setComponents(-1.0, 0.0, 0.0);
momentReport_0.getParts().setQuery(null);
Region region_0 =
  simulation_0.getRegionManager().getRegion("Flow Domain");
Boundary boundary_3 =
  region_0.getBoundaryManager().getBoundary("Flying Wing");
momentReport_0.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);
MomentReport momentReport_1 =
  simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(MomentReport.class);
momentReport_1.setPresentationName("Copy of Moment - Roll");
momentReport_1.copyProperties(momentReport_0);
momentReport_1.setPresentationName("Moment - Pitch");
momentReport_1.getDirection().setComponents(-1.0, 0.0, -1.0);
momentReport_1.getDirection().setComponents(0.0, 0.0, -1.0);
MomentReport momentReport_2 =
  simulation_0.getReportManager().createReport(MomentReport.class);
momentReport_2.setPresentationName("Copy of Moment - Roll");
momentReport_2.copyProperties(momentReport_0);
momentReport_2.setPresentationName("Moment - Yaw");
momentReport_2.getDirection().setComponents(-1.0, -1.0, 0.0);
momentReport_2.getDirection().setComponents(0.0, -1.0, 0.0);
ForceCoefficientReport forceCoefficientReport_0 =
  ((ForceCoefficientReport) simulation_0.getReportManager().
getReport("Coefficient of Drag");
ForceCoefficientReport forceCoefficientReport_1 =
  ((ForceCoefficientReport) simulation_0.getReportManager().
getReport("Coefficient of Lift");
simulation_0.getMonitorManager().createMonitorAndPlot(new
NeoObjectVector(new Object[]{forceCoefficientReport_0,
forceCoefficientReport_1}), true, "Reports Plot");
ReportMonitor reportMonitor_0 =
  ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor(
"Coefficient of Drag Monitor");
ReportMonitor reportMonitor_1 =
    ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor("Coefficient of Lift Monitor"));
MonitorPlot monitorPlot_0 =
    simulation_0.getPlotManager().createMonitorPlot(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {reportMonitor_0, reportMonitor_1}), "Reports Plot");

monitorPlot_0.open();

Scene scene_1 =
    simulation_0.getSceneManager().getScene("Geometry Scene 2");
SceneUpdate sceneUpdate_1 =
    scene_1.getSceneUpdate();

HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_1 =
    sceneUpdate_1.getHardcopyProperties();

hardcopyProperties_1.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);
hardcopyProperties_1.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);

PlotUpdate plotUpdate_0 =
    monitorPlot_0.getPlotUpdate();

HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_2 =
    plotUpdate_0.getHardcopyProperties();

hardcopyProperties_2.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);
hardcopyProperties_2.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);

monitorPlot_0.setPresentationName("Coefficients");

ForceReport forceReport_0 =
    ((ForceReport) simulation_0.getReportManager().getReport("Drag"));
simulation_0.getMonitorManager().createMonitorAndPlot(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {forceReport_0, forceReport_1}), true, "Reports Plot");
ReportMonitor reportMonitor_2 =
    ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor("Drag Monitor"));
ReportMonitor reportMonitor_3 =
    ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor("Lift Monitor"));
MonitorPlot monitorPlot_1 =
    simulation_0.getPlotManager().createMonitorPlot(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {reportMonitor_2, reportMonitor_3}), "Reports Plot");
monitorPlot_1.open();

hardcopyProperties_2.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);

hardcopyProperties_2.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);

PlotUpdate plotUpdate_1 =
    monitorPlot_1.getPlotUpdate();

HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_3 =
    plotUpdate_1.getHardcopyProperties();

hardcopyProperties_3.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);

hardcopyProperties_3.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);

monitorPlot_1.setPresentationName("Forces");

simulation_0.getMonitorManager().createMonitorAndPlot(new
    NeoObjectVector(new Object[]{momentReport_1, momentReport_0, 
    momentReport_2}), true, "Reports Plot");

ReportMonitor reportMonitor_4 =
    ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor(
    "Moment - Pitch Monitor");

ReportMonitor reportMonitor_5 =
    ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor(
    "Moment - Roll Monitor");

ReportMonitor reportMonitor_6 =
    ((ReportMonitor) simulation_0.getMonitorManager().getMonitor(
    "Moment - Yaw Monitor");

MonitorPlot monitorPlot_2 =
    simulation_0.getPlotManager().createMonitorPlot(new
    NeoObjectVector(new Object[]{reportMonitor_4, reportMonitor_5, 
    reportMonitor_6}), "Reports Plot");

monitorPlot_2.open();

hardcopyProperties_3.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);

hardcopyProperties_3.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);

PlotUpdate plotUpdate_2 =
    monitorPlot_2.getPlotUpdate();

HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_4 =
    plotUpdate_2.getHardcopyProperties();

hardcopyProperties_4.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);

hardcopyProperties_4.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);

monitorPlot_2.setPresentationName("Moments");
AccumulatedForceTable accumulatedForceTable_0 = simulation_0.getTableManager().createTable(AccumulatedForceTable.class);

accumulatedForceTable_0.setPresentationName("Drag Distribution");

accumulatedForceTable_0.getParts().setQuery(null);
accumulatedForceTable_0.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);

AccumulatedForceHistogram accumulatedForceHistogram_0 = ((AccumulatedForceHistogram) accumulatedForceTable_0.getHistogram());

accumulatedForceHistogram_0.getBinDirection().setComponents(1.0, 0.0, -1.0);

accumulatedForceHistogram_0.getBinDirection().setComponents(0.0, 0.0, -1.0);

accumulatedForceHistogram_0.setNumberOfBin(150);

AccumulatedForceTable accumulatedForceTable_1 = simulation_0.getTableManager().createTable(AccumulatedForceTable.class);

accumulatedForceTable_1.setPresentationName("Lift Distribution");

accumulatedForceTable_1.getParts().setQuery(null);
accumulatedForceTable_1.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);

AccumulatedForceHistogram accumulatedForceHistogram_1 = ((AccumulatedForceHistogram) accumulatedForceTable_1.getHistogram());

accumulatedForceHistogram_1.setNumberOfBin(150);

accumulatedForceHistogram_1.getBinDirection().setComponents(1.0, 0.0, -1.0);

accumulatedForceHistogram_1.getBinDirection().setComponents(0.0, 0.0, -1.0);

accumulatedForceHistogram_1.getForceDirection().setComponents(1.0, 1.0, 0.0);

accumulatedForceHistogram_1.getForceDirection().setComponents(0.0, 1.0, 0.0);

XYPlot xYPlot_0 = simulation_0.getPlotManager().createPlot(XYPlot.class);
xYPlot_0.open();
hardcopyProperties_4.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);
hardcopyProperties_4.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);

PlotUpdate plotUpdate_3 = xYPlot_0.getPlotUpdate();
HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_5 = plotUpdate_3.getHardcopyProperties();
hardcopyProperties_5.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);
hardcopyProperties_5.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);
xYPlot_0.setPresentationName("Lift Distribution");

xYPlot_0.getDataSetManager().addDataProviders(new NeoObjectVector(new Object[] {accumulatedForceTable_1}));
xYPlot_0.getParts().setQuery(null);
xYPlot_0.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);

XYPlot xYPlot_1 = simulation_0.getPlotManager().createPlot(XYPlot.class);
xYPlot_1.open();

hardcopyProperties_5.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);
hardcopyProperties_5.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);

PlotUpdate plotUpdate_4 = xYPlot_1.getPlotUpdate();
HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_6 = plotUpdate_4.getHardcopyProperties();
hardcopyProperties_6.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);
hardcopyProperties_6.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);
xYPlot_1.setPresentationName("Drag Distribution");
xYPlot_1.getParts().setQuery(null);
xYPlot_1.getParts().setObjects(boundary_3);

simulation_0.getSceneManager().createGeometryScene("Mesh Scene", "Outline", "Mesh", 3);

Scene scene_2 = simulation_0.getSceneManager().getScene("Mesh Scene 1");
scene_2.initializeAndWait();

PartDisplayer partDisplayer_5 =
((PartDisplayer) scene_2.getDisplayerManager().getDisplayer("Mesh 1"));

partDisplayer_5.initialize();

SceneUpdate sceneUpdate_2 =
scene_2.getSceneUpdate();

HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_7 =
sceneUpdate_2.getHardcopyProperties();

hardcopyProperties_7.setCurrentResolutionWidth(25);

hardcopyProperties_7.setCurrentResolutionHeight(25);

hardcopyProperties_6.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);

hardcopyProperties_6.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);

hardcopyProperties_7.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);

hardcopyProperties_7.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);

scene_2.resetCamera();

scene_2.setPresentationName("Mesh - Horizontal");

partDisplayer_5.getInputParts().setQuery(null);

PlaneSection planeSection_0 =
((PlaneSection) simulation_0.getPartManager().getObject("Horizontal"));

partDisplayer_5.getInputParts().setObjects(planeSection_0);

simulation_0.getSceneManager().createGeometryScene("Mesh Scene", "Outline", "Mesh", 3);

Scene scene_3 =
simulation_0.getSceneManager().getScene("Mesh Scene 1");

scene_3.initializeAndWait();

PartDisplayer partDisplayer_6 =
((PartDisplayer) scene_3.getDisplayerManager().getDisplayer("Mesh 1"));

partDisplayer_6.initialize();

SceneUpdate sceneUpdate_3 =
scene_3.getSceneUpdate();

HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_8 =
sceneUpdate_3.getHardcopyProperties();
hardcopyProperties_8.setCurrentResolutionWidth(25);
hardcopyProperties_8.setCurrentResolutionHeight(25);
hardcopyProperties_7.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);
hardcopyProperties_7.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);
hardcopyProperties_8.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);
hardcopyProperties_8.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);
scene_3.resetCamera();
scene_3.setPresentationName("Mesh - Longitudinal - Root");
partDisplayer_6.getInputParts().setQuery(null);
partDisplayer_6.getInputParts().setObjects(boundary_3);
Scene scene_4 =
    simulation_0.getSceneManager().createScene("Copy of Mesh -
Longitudinal - Root");
scene_4.setPresentationName("Copy of Mesh - Longitudinal - Root");
scene_4.copyProperties(scene_3);
scene_4.initializeAndWait();
PartDisplayer partDisplayer_7 =
    ((PartDisplayer) scene_4.getDisplayerManager().getDisplayer("Mesh 1"));
partDisplayer_7.initialize();
scene_4.open();
SceneUpdate sceneUpdate_4 =
    scene_4.getSceneUpdate();
HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_9 =
    sceneUpdate_4.getHardcopyProperties();
hardcopyProperties_9.setCurrentResolutionWidth(25);
hardcopyProperties_9.setCurrentResolutionHeight(25);
hardcopyProperties_8.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);
hardcopyProperties_8.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);
hardcopyProperties_9.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);
PlaneSection planeSection_2 = ((PlaneSection) simulation_0.getPartManager().getObject("Longitudinal - Tip"));
partDisplayer_7.setInputParts().setQuery(null);
partDisplayer_7.setInputParts().setObjects(planeSection_2);
partDisplayer_6.setInputParts().setQuery(null);

PlaneSection planeSection_1 = ((PlaneSection) simulation_0.getPartManager().getObject("Longitudinal - Root"));
partDisplayer_6.setInputParts().setObjects(planeSection_1);
simulation_0.setSceneManager().createScalarScene("Scalar Scene", "Outline", "Scalar");
Scene scene_5 = simulation_0.setSceneManager().getScene("Scalar Scene 1");
scene_5.initializeAndWait();
PartDisplayer partDisplayer_8 = ((PartDisplayer) scene_5.getDisplayerManager().getDisplayer("Outline 1");
partDisplayer_8.initialize();
ScalarDisplayer scalarDisplayer_0 = ((ScalarDisplayer) scene_5.getDisplayerManager().getDisplayer("Scalar 1");
scalarDisplayer_0.initialize();
Legend legend_0 = scalarDisplayer_0.getLegend();
BlueRedLookupTable blueRedLookupTable_0 = ((BlueRedLookupTable) simulation_0.getLookupTableManager().class).getObject("blue-red");
legend_0.setLookupTable(blueRedLookupTable_0);
SceneUpdate sceneUpdate_5 = scene_5.getSceneUpdate();
HardcopyProperties hardcopyProperties_10 = sceneUpdate_5.getHardcopyProperties();
hardcopyProperties_10.setCurrentResolutionWidth(25);
hardcopyProperties_10.setCurrentResolutionHeight(25);
hardcopyProperties_9.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1018);
hardcopyProperties_9.setCurrentResolutionHeight(735);
hardcopyProperties_10.setCurrentResolutionWidth(1016);
hardcopyProperties_10.setCurrentResolutionHeight(734);

scene_5.resetCamera();

scene_5.setPresentationName("Wall Y");

scalarDisplayer_0.getInputParts().setQuery(null);

scalarDisplayer_0.getInputParts().setObjects(boundary_3);

Scene scene_0 = simulation_0.getSceneManager().getScene("Geometry Scene 1");

scene_0.setPresentationName("Flying Wing");

PartDisplayer partDisplayer_0 = ((PartDisplayer) scene_0.getDisplayerManager().getDisplayer("Outline 1"));

partDisplayer_0.getInputParts().setQuery(null);

partDisplayer_0.getInputParts().setObjects(boundary_3);
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