Distributed-Flap Layout Trade Study on a Highly Flexible Common Research Model

David L Rodriguez Michael Aftosmis Marian Nemec George Anderson

> June 27, 2018 Aviation Forum

NASA Ames Research Center

Computational Aerosciences Branch

Advanced Supercomputing Division

VCCTEF Concept



- Variable Camber Continuous Trailing Edge Flaps
- Flaps distributed over most of the span of the wing
- Elastomer material between flaps to seal gaps
- Tailors spanwise lift distribution throughout mission

Common Research Model (CRM)

Generic Transport Model (GTM)

Motivation

- Early application of VCCTEF on GTM on overspeed case indicated wave drag could also be significantly reduced
- More effective if circular deflection relaxed





Goals and Methods

- Determine how complex a distributed flap system must be to be effective for overspeed drag reduction
 - how many spanwise flaps?
 - how many chordwise segments per flap?
- Flap layout trade study
 - Install various layouts with different number of spanwise flaps and chordwise segments
 - Optimize flap deflections on all layouts at overspeed condition
 - Examine results for trends





Platform for Trade Study



- Common Research Model (CRM) fuselage/wing/horizontal tail configuration)
- Assume composite wing
 - remove built in deformation from original CRM geometry
 - develop structural model that exhibits greater deformation (about twice original)
- Develop new baseline wing
 - start with original CRM geometry
 - re-optimize twist distribution for cruise using methods that address aeroelastic effects
 - minimize drag
 - constrain lift
 - maintain trim



Static Aeroelastic Analysis Architecture









Modeling the VCCTEF





Modeling the VCCTEF

NASA

- Flap deflections controlled by Blender "armature" (analogous to a skeleton)
- Surface triangulation is bound to "bones"
- Bones can only rotate about hinge lines
- Sequential flaps bones linked to each other
- Blended transition between flaps to mimic elastomer material







Establishing a New Baseline CRM Design

- CRM wing twist distribution reoptimized with more flexible structure
- Minimize drag (C_D) at cruise condition ($M_{\infty} = 0.85$)
 - maintain cruise lift ($C_L = 0.5$)
 - maintain longitudinal trim ($C_M = 0$)
 - cabin deck angle constraint ($\alpha_{max} = 3^\circ$)
- Design variables
 - section incidence at 6 spanwise stations (including root), while linearly vary change in incidence between stations
 - angle of attack (helps satisfy lift constraint)
 - tail incidence (helps satisfy trim)









Convergence of Twist Optimization











Surface Pressure Distribution





Flap Layout Trade Study

NASA

- Install systems with varying numbers of spanwise flaps (4, 8, 12) and chordwise segments (1, 2, 3)
- Increase cruise speed
 - $M_{\infty} = 0.85 \rightarrow M_{\infty} = 0.88$
 - would save 10 minutes on a 5 hour flight
- Optimize the flap deflections
 - minimize drag
 - maintain cruise lift
 - maintain trim

minimize: $C_D(\alpha, \Delta_{flaps}, i_t)$ @ $M_{\infty} = 0.88$ subject to: $C_L(\alpha, \Delta_{flaps}, i_t) = C_L = 0.4665$ $C_M(\alpha, \Delta_{flaps}, i_t) = 0$ $\alpha \le \alpha_{max} = 3^{\circ}$





8 x 2

12 x 2

142.57

0.01095



Performance of Optimized 4-Flap Layouts



0

Lift Distribution on 4-Flap Systems



Pressure Distributions on 4-Flap Layouts





Optimized 4-Flap Geometry



vertical scale is 4 times greater than horizontal for clarity

- 3-segment deflected flap profile very similar to 2-segment
- 1-segment deflected flap somewhere in between undeflected geometry and deflected 2-segment flap
- Deflecting flaps moves reflex backward (consistent with supercritical airfoil theory)

















Pressure Distributions on 2-Segment Layouts





Optimized 4 x 2 Flap Layout Deflections





Conclusions and Future Work



- Flap layout trade study on highly flexible CRM conducted for overspeed off-design case
- 2-segment flaps found to be much more effective than 1-segment flaps, but 3-segment flaps provided only incremental improvement
- 4 spanwise flaps are almost as effective as 12, suggesting induced drag is either already near optimal or wave drag reduction dominates
- Verification with viscous analysis
- Consider other off-design conditions (e.g. maneuver condition)

Acknowledgements



- NASA Advanced Air Transport Technology Project provided partial funding for this work
- NASA Advanced Supercomputing (NAS) Center provided computing resources