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Summary

Rotating blade frequencies for a model generic helicopter rotor blade mounted on an articulated hub were experimentally determined. Tests were conducted using the Aeroelastic Rotor Experimental System (ARES) testbed in the Helicopter Hover Facility (HHF) at Langley Research Center. The measured data were compared with pretest analytical predictions of the rotating blade frequencies made using the MSC/NASTRAN finite-element computer code. The MSC/NASTRAN solution sequences used to analyze the model were modified to account for differential stiffening effects caused by the centrifugal force acting on the blade and rotating system dynamic effects. The correlation of the MSC/NASTRAN-derived frequencies with the experimental data is, in general, very good although discrepancies in the blade torsional frequency trends and magnitudes were observed. The procedures necessary to perform a rotating system modal analysis of a helicopter rotor blade with MSC/NASTRAN are outlined, and complete sample data deck listings are provided.

Experimental Apparatus and Procedures

Test Facility

Tests were conducted in the Langley Helicopter Hover Facility (HHF) shown in figure 1. The HHF, a high-bay facility enclosed by a 30-ft by 30-ft by 20-ft coarse-mesh screen, is used for hover testing and rotorcraft model buildup and checkout prior to testing in the Langley Transonic Dynamics Tunnel (TDT). Models are mounted on the test stand such that the rotor plane of bearingless hub designs, often requires the use of modern finite-element computer codes. One widely used finite-element code is the commercially available MSC/NASTRAN program (refs. 1–4). Although a rotating system modal analysis can be performed using the standard release versions of MSC/NASTRAN, some potentially significant dynamic effects caused by rotation will not be accounted for properly. By modifying the standard MSC/NASTRAN solution sequence to include the additional rotational effects, a more accurate modal analysis of a rotating structure may be performed. This report documents an experimental evaluation of the ability of this modified MSC/NASTRAN procedure to accurately predict the rotating blade frequencies of a model articulated helicopter rotor blade.

Figure 1. Helicopter Hover Facility (HHF).
Table 1. Properties of Model Rotor Blade

(a) Structural properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inboard section radius, in.</th>
<th>Section spar area, in²</th>
<th>Chordwise area moment of inertia, in⁴</th>
<th>Flapwise area moment of inertia, in⁴</th>
<th>Torsional area moment of inertia, in⁴</th>
<th>Section mass, lb/ft²</th>
<th>Section mass moment of inertia, lb-in²/ft</th>
<th>Center of mass offset forward of elastic axis, in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.2632</td>
<td>0.4251</td>
<td>0.2200</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.1316</td>
<td>0.1938</td>
<td>0.04826</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.04086</td>
<td>0.02505</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.625</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.15113</td>
<td>0.05671</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>0.00394</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
<td>0.14048</td>
<td>0.05559</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.00249</td>
<td>0.00976</td>
<td>0.03134</td>
<td>0.02779</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.375</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.00249</td>
<td>0.00976</td>
<td>0.04376</td>
<td>0.02961</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.03040</td>
<td>0.00231</td>
<td>0.00976</td>
<td>0.04123</td>
<td>0.02888</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.02636</td>
<td>0.00181</td>
<td>0.00565</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>0.02810</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.02447</td>
<td>0.00151</td>
<td>0.00485</td>
<td>0.03903</td>
<td>0.02756</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.02447</td>
<td>0.00151</td>
<td>0.00485</td>
<td>0.03903</td>
<td>0.02756</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.02448</td>
<td>0.00160</td>
<td>0.00502</td>
<td>0.04125</td>
<td>0.02826</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.00250</td>
<td>0.01435</td>
<td>0.07867</td>
<td>0.03984</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>0.00400</td>
<td>0.01148</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
<td>0.03563</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.00050</td>
<td>0.01435</td>
<td>0.01101</td>
<td>0.004401</td>
<td>-0.940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Assumed material properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modulus of elasticity, lb/in²</th>
<th>Poisson’s ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 × 10⁷</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rotation is effectively out of ground effect (15 ft, or approximately 1.6 times the rotor diameter). All hover testing in the HHF is conducted at sea level atmospheric conditions.

**Model Description**

A four-bladed articulated rotor hub, with coincident lead-lag and flapping hinges, was used in this experiment. The structural and inertial properties of the model blades are listed in table 1. The blades were rectangular in planform and possessed no built-in twist. A standard NACA 0012 airfoil contour was used over the aerodynamic portions of the blade. One blade was instrumented with flapwise, chordwise, and torsional-direction strain gauges mounted at three radial locations. The blade planform geometry, with strain-gauge locations indicated, is illustrated in figure 2.

![Figure 2. Rotor blade geometry.](image)

47-hp output at 12000 rpm) that is connected to the rotor shaft through a belt-driven, two-stage, speed-reduction system. Collective pitch and cyclic pitch inputs are provided through a conventional swashplate arrangement. The swashplate is positioned by three electrically controlled hydraulic actuators, which are controlled remotely from the HHF control room. Signals from the blade strain gauge, as well as the signal from a strain-gauge-instrumented pitch link signal, are transferred from the rotating system to the fixed system through a 30-channel slip-ring assembly.
Test Procedure

The experimental portion of this test was designed to provide accurate measurements of elastic blade mode frequencies over a range of rotor operating speeds. The experimental procedures described below are not necessarily the ideal techniques for experimentally measuring rotating blade frequencies, but are the best use of the existing ARES hardware and instrumentation for this purpose. For this experiment, only elastic blade modes with frequencies up to and including the first torsion mode were measured. Because of the limited blade instrumentation, no attempt was made to measure blade mode shapes during this test.

Rotating-frequency measurements for each mode were made at rotor speeds that ranged from 150 rpm to 660 rpm at approximately 100-rpm intervals. The nonoscillatory collective pitch of the blades was fixed at 0°. At each rpm increment, the blades were excited by sinusoidally oscillating the collective pitch of the rotor with the ARES hydraulic control system. This collective pitch oscillation frequency was varied over a 10- to 20-Hz frequency band in the vicinity of each modal frequency. The amplitude of vibratory loads caused by the movement of the swashplate together with the small amount of aerodynamic excitation present from the collective pitch oscillation was sufficient to excite all of the blade modes of interest.

Blade mode frequencies were determined by processing blade and pitch-link strain-gauge signals with an electronic signal analyzer. Output signals from the blade-mounted strain gauges were used as a measure of the blade modal deflection, while the pitch-link-mounted strain-gauge signal was used as a measure of the force input to the blade structure. From these two measurements, a frequency-response function could be generated using the signal analyzer. The frequency of the excited blade mode was then identified by looking for an amplitude peak in the frequency-response function.

Nonrotating modal frequencies were determined with a different procedure. For these measurements, the hub assembly, with a single attached blade, was removed from the ARES model and suspended so that the blade hung vertically. This method permitted measurements to be made without the blade resting on the hub flapping stops. A conventional impact-response test using a blade-mounted accelerometer, a signal analyzer, and an impact hammer was then performed. Nonrotating blade mode frequencies in this case were identified by looking for the amplitude peaks in the spectral-response function generated with the accelerometer signal.

NASTRAN Analysis

Blade Analytical Model

Analysis of the articulated rotor blade was performed using several versions of the MSC/NASTRAN finite-element-analysis computer code. The original,
pretest runs were performed using MSC/NASTRAN version 66b. Subsequent runs using version 67 and, more recently, version 68 were made to verify that procedures used with previous versions were still applicable and that the results had not changed.

The blade analytical model was constructed using standard finite-element-modeling techniques. A list of the complete input data deck is provided in appendix A. All material and structural property values for the blade model were taken from values shown in table 1. The blade structure was modeled entirely with CBREAM one-dimensional beam elements, with sectional masses and mass moments of inertia for all elements modeled as nonstructural mass.

The blade-root boundary conditions were approximated by allowing rotations only about the Y- and Z-axes of the global coordinate system, which represented motion about the flapping and lead-lag hinges. The blade-root lead-lag damper was modeled using a CELAS2 scalar spring element with an appropriate damping value and a small linear spring rate. Rotation about the X-axis (blade pitching degree of freedom) was constrained to be zero, representing in essence an infinitely stiff control system.

Rotating System Analysis Procedure

MSC/NASTRAN and COSMIC/NASTRAN have both been used to analyze the rotating modal behavior of compressor and turboprop blades (refs. 5 and 6). In these studies, plate, shell, and solid elements were used to model the blades. The computational procedure used in these studies required that two MSC/NASTRAN runs be made for each condition. First, a large-displacement analysis was made using MSC/NASTRAN solution 64. This solution sequence performs a large-displacement analysis on the rotating blade, computes steady-state displacements and stresses, and then stores the blade final stiffness and mass matrices of the blade model in a database. The frequencies and mode shapes were then computed with solution 63, using the saved matrices from the solution 64 run.

The current study also used a two-step process to obtain the blade frequencies and mode shapes although, as mentioned previously, beam elements are used here to model the rotor blade. At each desired rotor speed condition, the blade model was first analyzed using the nonlinear statics (database) MSC/NASTRAN solution sequence 66, which is the updated version of solution 64. This run calculated the deflections of the blade structure caused by a radial force field defined with the RFORCE card in the bulk data deck. Gravity forces and aerodynamic forces were neglected throughout this analysis, and only forces acting on the blade as a result of rotation were considered. The MSC/NASTRAN executive control cards, case control cards, and bulk data used for a sample solution 66 run are included in the listing in appendix A.

Once the static analysis of the blade had been completed, a modified normal modes analysis (solution 63) was performed as a "restart" job using the MSC/NASTRAN database files generated and saved from the solution 66 run. Two modifications were made in the solution 63 DMAP code to obtain the correct rotating-blade mode shapes and frequencies of the structure. The first modification was the inclusion of a standard MSC/NASTRAN rigid format DMAP alter (RF63D89) into the solution 63 source code. This DMAP alter allowed the stiffness matrix generated and saved from the solution 66 run, which included the differential stiffening effects of the radial forces acting on the rotor blade, to be used instead of the stiffness matrix normally generated in the solution 63 run. A second DMAP modification (NLGYRO.ALT) was made to include additional centrifugal softening terms in the stiffness matrix. NLGYRO.ALT also adds Coriolis terms to the damping matrix; however, for the normal modes analysis described here, damping and Coriolis terms can be ignored. This modified solution 63 DMAP source code, with the RF63D89 and NLGYRO.ALT DMAP alters included, was then recompiled and executed as a restart job using the previously generated solution 66 database files.

The nonrotating (0-rpm) case required no initial nonlinear statics run and was performed using the unmodified solution 63 normal-modes solution sequence.

The executive control cards and case control cards necessary to execute the solution 63 runs are shown in appendix B. Changes required between MSC/NASTRAN version 68 and earlier versions (66 and 67) are noted. The RF63D89 alter code, provided in the general distribution of MSC/NASTRAN, has not been shown here. The NLGYRO.ALT alter code, which was written originally for use with version 66b and is not usually provided in the general distribution, was obtained independently from MSC. Several modifications to this DMAP alter are necessary for it to be used with MSC/NASTRAN version 68. These modifications are noted in appendix C.

Presentation of Results

A comparison of the experimental and analytical frequency results is shown graphically in figure 4. This plot shows blade mode frequencies (Hz) versus rotor speed (rpm) for the first five elastic blade modes. The solid
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Figure 4. Comparison of experimental and analytical frequencies vs rotor speed. Rigid body flap and lead-lag modes not shown.

Lines represent the analytical predictions of the blade mode frequencies made by MSC/NASTRAN. The symbols denote experimental frequency values measured in the HHF. A comparison of these experimental and analytical frequency values is also provided in table 2. Analytical calculations of the flapping and lead-lag rigid-body mode frequencies have been omitted. Repeatability in the frequency measurements was within ±1 Hz for the three flapping modes measured, and ±2 Hz for the chord-wise and torsion modes. Variations in the rotor rpm settings were very small, typically less than ±2 rpm.

Discussion of Results

The correlation of the MSC/NASTRAN-computed, rotating-blade frequencies with the experimentally measured frequencies was, overall, very good, with the best results being obtained for the lower flapping and chord-wise modal frequencies. With the exception of blade torsion, trends in mode frequency with rotor speed were adequately predicted by the analysis. The largest discrepancies between the analytical and experimental results occurred with the third elastic flap mode results and the first torsion mode results.

The discrepancies with the third flapping mode were thought to be due to inaccurate flapping stiffness data used in defining the analytical model. MSC/NASTRAN, when given accurate structural modeling information, generally does an excellent job of predicting the non-rotating modes and frequencies of a structure. As the nonrotating-frequency calculation for this mode was still significantly in error with the experimental value, the difference is thought to be due to the structural modeling of the blade and not a fundamental error with the MSC/NASTRAN procedures used in this study.

The discrepancies in the torsional frequency magnitude are thought to be due primarily to the "infinitely stiff" control system approximation used for the blade root boundary conditions. A finite stiffness associated with the pitching degree of freedom at the root would move the frequency magnitudes upward toward the experimentally measured values. The slight upward trend of the measured frequency with rotor speed was also not predicted in the analytical results. This trend is thought to be caused by the absence of a propeller-moment-type term in the NLGYRO.ALT alter code.

Table 2. Comparison of Experimental and Analytical Blade Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>0 rpm</th>
<th>150 rpm</th>
<th>250 rpm</th>
<th>350 rpm</th>
<th>450 rpm</th>
<th>550 rpm</th>
<th>660 rpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st flap</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd flap</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st chord</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>42.82</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.49</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd flap</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>76.80</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>77.97</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>80.01</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st torsion</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>102.05</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>102.06</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>102.09</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding Remarks

The rotating frequencies of a model articulated helicopter rotor blade were measured and compared to analytical frequency calculations performed using the MSC/NASTRAN finite-element structural analysis computer code. These results show that MSC/NASTRAN can, with slight modifications, adequately predict flapping and chordwise rotating modal characteristics of an articulated helicopter rotor blade structure. Accurate prediction of torsional frequencies and trends will most likely require some additional modifications to the MSC/NASTRAN DMAP source code.

NASA Langley Research Center
Hampton, VA 23681-0001
January 22, 1997
Appendix A

MSC/NASTRAN Solution 66 Input Data Deck

The material in this appendix constitutes the complete input data deck used to construct the blade analytical model.

```plaintext
ID ART-L, WKW
SOL 66 $ NONLINEAR STATICS (MSC/NASTRAN VERSIONS 66, 67 OR 68)
TIME 20
CEND

$ EXECUTIVE CONTROL CARDS $

$ TITLE=FRB (LIGHT BALLAST) ON ARTICULATED HUB
LABEL=(CF LOAD II HZ ROTATION)
SUBTITLE= NONLINEAR STATICS SOL 66
$ ECHO= BOTH
DISP= ALL
OLOAD= ALL
$ SEALL= ALL
$ LOAD= 1
$ NLPARM= 100
$ BEGIN BULK
$

$ MISCELLANEOUS PARAMETERS
PARAM,TINY, 0.999
PARAM, GRDPNT, 0
PARAM, MAXRATIO, 1.*13
PARAM, COUPMASS, 1
PARAM, WTMAS9, 0.00259
PARAM, AUTOSEQ, YES
$
$ PARAMETERS FOR SOL 66
PARAM, LGDISP, 1
NLPARM, 100, 2., ITER, 1
$ PARAM, TESTNEG, 1
$ CENTRIFUGAL LOAD
PARAM, RFORCE, 1.0, 11., 0., 0., 0., 1., 2
$
$ ARTICULATED HUB CUFF AND BLADE ROOT: 4-8-92
$ GEOMETRY:
```

7
$$\text{GRID ID CP X1 X2 X3 CD PS SEID}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SEID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRID, 200, 3.00, 0.0, 0.0, 1234
GRID, 201, 6.87, 0.0, 0.0
GRID, 202, 8.87, 0.0, 0.0
GRID, 203, 10.625, 0.0, 0.0
GRID, 204, 3.00, 0.0, 0.0, 123456

$\text{CONNECTIVITY}$

$\text{BLADE CUFF AND ROOT (RS 3.0 TO 12.5)}$

$$\text{CBEAM EID PID GA GB X1 X2 X3}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EID</th>
<th>PID</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{LEAD-LAG DAMPER ELEMENT}$

$$\text{CELAS2 EID K G1 C1 G2 C2 GE S}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EID</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>464.0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{PROPERTY CARDS}$

$$\text{PBEAM PID MID A I1 I2 I12 J NSM}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PID</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I12</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>NSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.04086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.01513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{GEOMETRY}$

$$\text{GRID ID CP X1 X2 X3 CD PS SEID}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SEID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRID 100, 12.500, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1001, 13.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1002, 14.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1003, 15.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1004, 15.375, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1005, 15.600, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1006, 16.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1007, 17.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1008, 17.850, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1009, 18.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1010, 19.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1011, 20.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1012, 21.000, 0.000, 0.000
GRID 1013, 22.000, 0.000, 0.000

---

**Notes:**
- Grids 200 to 204 represent the blade's root section.
- CELAS2 elements are used for lead-lag damping in the range 3.0 to 12.5.
- PBEAM elements are used for the property cards, detailing cross-section properties.

---

**Freon Research Blade, Lightly Ballasted:**
- RS 12.5 to 55.0
- 4-9-92
CBEAM 1000 1000 1000 1001 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1001 1001 1001 1002 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1002 1001 1002 1003 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1003 1001 1003 1004 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1004 1004 1004 1005 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1005 1004 1005 1006 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1006 1004 1006 1007 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1007 1004 1007 1008 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1008 1008 1008 1009 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1009 1008 1009 1010 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1010 1008 1010 1011 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1011 1008 1011 1012 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1012 1008 1012 1013 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1013 1008 1013 1014 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1014 1008 1014 1015 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1015 1015 1015 1016 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1016 1015 1016 1017 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1017 1015 1017 1018 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1018 1015 1018 1019 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1019 1015 1019 1020 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1020 1015 1020 1021 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1021 1021 1021 1022 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1022 1021 1022 1023 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1023 1021 1023 1024 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1024 1021 1024 1025 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1025 1021 1025 1026 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1026 1021 1026 1027 0.0 1.0 0.0
CBEAM 1027 1021 1027 1028 0.0 1.0 0.0
$..............................................................................$
$PROPERTY CARDS:..............................................................................$
$S ..................................................................................$ 
PBEAM, 1000, 1000, 0.377, 0.003550, 0.00394, 0.03940, 0.14048, +P001
+P001, . . . , +P002 +P002, 5.559-2, . . . , +P003 +P003, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1001, 1000, 0.386, 0.002520, 0.00249, 0.00976, 0.3134-1, +P011
+P011, . . . , +P012 +P012, 2.779-2, . . . , +P013 +P013, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1004, 1000, 0.339, 0.002520, 0.00249, 0.00976, 0.4376-1, +P041
+P041, . . . , +P042 +P042, 2.961-2, . . . , +P043 +P043, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1008, 1000, 0.278, 0.003040, 0.00231, 0.00674, 0.4123-1, +P081
+P081, . . . , +P082 +P082, 2.888-2, . . . , +P083 +P083, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1015, 1000, 0.249, 0.002636, 0.00181, 0.00565, 0.400-1, +P151
+P151, . . . , +P152 +P152, 2.810-2, . . . , +P153 +P153, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1021, 1000, 0.224, 0.002447, 0.00151, 0.00485, 0.3903-1, +P211
+P211, . . . , +P212 +P212, 2.756-2, . . . , +P213 +P213, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1046, 1000, 0.247, 0.002447, 0.00151, 0.00485, 0.3903-1, +P461
+P461, . . . , +P462 +P462, 2.756-2, . . . , +P463 +P463, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1047, 1000, 0.279, 0.002448, 0.00160, 0.00502, 0.4125-1, +P471
+P471, . . . , +P472 +P472, 2.826-2, . . . , +P473 +P473, 0.00, 0.0, 0.00, 0.0
$PBEAM, 1048, 1000, 0.305, 0.00500, 0.00500, 0.01435, 0.7867-1, +P481
+P481, . . . , +P482 +P482, 3.984-2, . . . , +P483
**MATERIAL PROPERTY CARDS:**

**1000: FIBERGLASS BLADE (ASSUMED PROPERTIES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>NU</th>
<th>RHO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENDDATA
Appendix B

MSC/NASTRAN Solution 63 Restart Data Deck

This appendix presents the executive control cards and the case control cards required to execute the solution 63 runs.

RESTART

(use this executive control section for MSC/NASTRAN version 66 or 67:)

```
$ $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$$ EXECUTIVE CONTROL CARDS
$$$
$ ID   ATR-L, WKW
SOL  63 $ NORMAL MODES DATABASE V. 66B
TIME 20 $ RECOMPILE SOL 63 TO INCLUDE ALTERS (MSC/NASTRAN VERSIONS 66 AND 67)
$$$
$$ COMPIL SOL63 SOUIN=MSCSOU NOLIST NOREF $ $ ALTER 193 $ FILE RST=OVRWRT/GEI=OVRWRT/GPECT=OVRWRT/KELM=OVRWRT/XDICT=OVRWRT $ $ RFALTER RF63D89 $ $ INCLUDE 'NLGYRO.ALT' $ CEND
```

(use this executive control section for MSC/NASTRAN version 68:)

```
$ $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$$ EXECUTIVE CONTROL CARDS
$$$
$ ID   ATR-L, WKW
SOL  63 $ NORMAL MODES DATABASE V. 66B
TIME 20 $ RECOMPILE SOL 63 TO INCLUDE ALTERS (MSC/NASTRAN VERSION 68)
$$$
$$ COMPIL SOL63 SOUIN=MSCSOU NOLIST NOREF $ NOREF $ NOREF $ $ RFALTER RF63D89 $ $ INCLUDE 'NLGYRO.ALT' $ CEND $ (remaining sections are the same for all versions of MSC/NASTRAN)
```

(title=FRB (LIGHT BALLAST) ON ARTICULATED HUB

12
LABEL=(CF LOAD 11 HZ ROTATION)
SUBTITLE= NORMAL MODES RESTART SOL 63
$ECHO=BOTH
DISPLACEMENT=ALL
OLOAD=ALL
$SEALL=ALL
$LOAD=1
$METHOD=10
$BEGIN BULK
$BULK DATA CARDS
$MISCELLANEOUS PARAMETERS
$PARAM,TINY,0.999
PARAM,GRDPNT,0
PARAM,MAXRATIO,1.+13
PARAM,COPMASS,1
PARAM,WTMASS,0.00259
PARAM,AUTOSEPC,YES
$PARAMS FOR SOL 63
$EIGENVALUE EXTRACTION METHOD FOR SOL 63 RESTART
$EIGH,10,SINV,0.,100.
$CENTRIFUGAL LOAD
$RFORCE,1,0.,11.,0.,0.,1.,2
$ENDDATA

(model definition bulk data omitted; same as solution 66 deck)
Appendix C

Modifications to NLGYRO.ALT for Use With MSC/NASTRAN Version 68

Much of the DMAP language was changed between MSC/NASTRAN Version 68 and earlier versions. Because of this change, two minor changes in the original version 66b NLGYRO.ALT DMAP source code (obtained from MSC) are required for it to execute properly under MSC/NASTRAN version 68. These modifications follow.

1. In line 1 (ignoring comments), change
   \[\text{ALTER 492} \quad \text{\$} \]
   to
   \[\text{ALTER 504} \quad \text{\$} \]

2. In line 23, change
   \[\text{VECPLOT} \quad \text{, , BGPDT, EQEXIN, CSTM, } / \text{RBGLOBAL}///4/ \quad \text{\$} \]
   to
   \[\text{VECPLOT} \quad \text{, , BGPDT, EQEXIN, CSTM, , , } / \text{RBGLOBAL}///4/ \quad \text{\$} \]
   (i.e., add two commas after CSTM.)
References


Rotating blade frequencies for a model generic helicopter rotor blade mounted on an articulated hub were experimentally determined. Testing was conducted using the Aerelastic Rotor Experimental System (ARES) tested in the Helicopter Hover Facility (HHF) at Langley Research Center. The measured data were compared to pretest analytical predictions of the rotating blade frequencies made using the MSC/NASTRAN finite-element computer code. The MSC/NASTRAN solution sequences used to analyze the model were modified to account for differential stiffening effects caused by the centrifugal force acting on the blade and rotating system dynamic effects. The correlation of the MSC/NASTRAN-derived frequencies with the experimental data is, in general, very good although discrepancies in the blade torsional frequency trends and magnitudes were observed. The procedures necessary to perform a rotating system modal analysis of a helicopter rotor blade with MSC/NASTRAN are outlined, and complete sample data deck listings are provided.