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ACTE Project Overview

- NASA DFRC is partnering with the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) and FlexSys Inc. (Ann Arbor, Michigan) to flight-test the Adaptive Compliant Trailing Edge (ACTE) experiment.
  - Does not translate like a Fowler flap
  - Smoothly curling and seamless structure
  - Planned ACTE flight envelope extends outside cleared Fowler flap envelope
  - Possible strength exceedances of the wing box and interface structure warrant real time monitoring of the loads
ACTE Real Time Load Monitoring

Diagram showing parts of a structure labeled as:
- Secondary front spar
- Front spar
- Interface fitting locations
- Rear spar
- Shear bridge
- Axial bridge
- Interface fitting A
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Flight Loads Laboratory Overview

- Single facility capable of conducting mechanical, thermal, and structural dynamics research and testing
  - Wide range of projects supported from X-15 to crew exploration vehicle (CEV)
- MOOG Hydraulic Load Controller can support up 80 channels for hydraulic load testing of single components up to full scale aircraft
- Advanced strain gauge instrumentation capability
- Supported G-III Load Calibration Testing
Objective: Monitor the loads in the ACTE/Wing Box interface during ACTE flights
- Envelope Clearance
- Model Validation

Plan: Instrument and calibrate all eight modified flap track fittings for monitoring the loads real time in flight

The calibration effort aspired to achieve errors on the order of 5% or less for bending and 10% or less for shear
- Benefits of having instrumentation diminish with larger errors
Interface Structural Design
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Interface Structural Design
External loads analysis was performed on the wing and ACTE cartridge.

All credible worst-case loading conditions for the GIII airplane were taken into account.

The resulting pressure loads for each flap deflection were applied to the ACTE finite element method (FEM) model to determine the interface loads.
## Instrumentation Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain gage response variable</th>
<th>Gage response description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rAF1</td>
<td>Top flange axial bridge response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rAF2</td>
<td>Bottom flange axial bridge response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rNF</td>
<td>Shear bridge response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rPM</td>
<td>Pitching moment response (rAF2 - rAF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rAFF</td>
<td>Axial force response (rAF2 + rAF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rBND</td>
<td>Bending bridge response (added to interface fittings B and C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Setup Design
Test Setup Design

- Support hardware was designed to accommodate all four unique interface fitting pairs
- Strain Bridges, Load Cells, LRTs, LVDTs and Photogrammetry were recorded during the test
Derived Load Equation Coordinate System
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Calibration Load Cases

Bending versus shear load

- SHR BND and AXIAL
  - cal case – blue
- SHR BND and NO AXIAL
  - cal case – blue
- SHR BND and NO AXIAL
  - check case – green

Bending, in-lb

Shear, lb
Load Equation Derivation Process

- Raw data analysis
- Correction of applied reaction loads
- Load case selection
- Mathematical model selection
- Linear regression analysis
Load Equation Derivation Process

- Correction of Applied Shear Bending and Axial Loads using Beam Finite Element Method (FEM) Model
  - The reaction loads are calculated as the shape of the interface fitting and load bar deflect during loading to best approximate the applied load components
  - The beam model is validated against the displacement transducers
  - The most error occurs in the bending reaction load during application of the axial jack (Error is on the order of 2%)
The calibration model for calculation of the component loads \( F \) is related to the gage responses \( R \) by a linear function

\[
F = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i R_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i |R_i|
\]

- \( n \) is the number of strain gage response variables (\( n = 3 \) for fittings A and D; and \( n = 4 \) for fittings B and C).
- The \( a, b, \) and \( c \) terms represent the calibration coefficients determined by multiple linear regression.
Load Equation Validation

- **Calibration Load Schedule**
  - Applied loads cover the flight operational envelope

- **Maximum of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)**
  - VIF is a measure of the multicollinearity between the variables in the linear regression analysis
  - VIF should be less than 10
  - VIF larger than 10 may indicate flaws in the load case design

- **Standard Deviation of Load Residuals**
  - $2\sigma$ values are shown as percent of full scale calibration load value

- **Root Mean Square (RMS) Error**
  - $x_i$ is the measured value, $x'_i$ is the derived value, and $n$ is the number of measurements

\[
e = 100 \times \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x'_i - x_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}}
\]

- **Validation Check Case**
  - A quality check case is one that represents realistic flight loads but is not contained in the original calibration load set.
Load Equation Validation

2-Sigma Error for Derived Shear Load Equations

2-Sigma Error for Derived Bending Moment Equations
Conclusions

- The interface fittings in general do not lend themselves to ample bridge response given the large design factors of safety and short, stubby nature of the flight articles

- The preloading of the interface fitting at the beginning of each load cycle made a considerable difference in obtaining acceptable data and is recommended when multiple interfaces are involved that induce hysteresis effects

- The test rig deflection should also be sufficiently investigated before testing, to minimize off-axis loading effects
  - Finite Element Methods were used to correct the loads for off axis effects
Conclusions

- The Primary load equations were selected based on multiple calibration metrics.
- An independent set of validation cases were used to validate each derived equation.
- The $2\sigma$ residual errors for shear load validation cases are less than 8% of full scale calibration load (Desired 10% or better) and the $2\sigma$ residual errors for bending moment load validation cases are less than 3% of full scale calibration load (Desired 5% or better).