

# FLIGHT EXPERIMENTS ON SWEPT WING TRANSITION USING DISTRIBUTED ROUGHNESS

William S. Saric, Andrew L. Carpenter, Helen L. Reed Texas A&M University College Station TX 77843-3141

Keywords: Stability, Laminarization, Flight, Experiments

#### Abstract

Difficulties with freestream turbulence in wind tunnels initiated a program of flight testing at Texas A&M University. The work cumulated in a series of laminar-turbulent transition flighttest experiments on a swept wing with the goal of validating the spanwise-periodic distributed roughness elements (DRE) technology in a Revnolds number range applicable to SensorCraft technology. Phase I of the program measured freestream turbulence levels that were nominally 0.05% to 0.06% of the freestream speed and thus established the suitability of the flight environment for the laminarization flights. Phase II of the program did the baseline transition measurements on the airfoil i.e. with and without DRE technology. The region of laminar flow was extended from 30% to 60% chord at a chord Reynolds number of Rec = 8.1 $x10^6$  and sweep angle,  $\Lambda = 30^\circ$ .

# **1** Introduction

Establishing the origins of turbulent flow and transition from laminar to turbulent flow remains an important challenge of fluid mechanics. The common thread connecting aerodynamic applications is the fact that they deal with bounded shear flows (boundary layers) in open systems (with different upstream or initial amplitude conditions). It is well known that the stability, transition, and turbulent characteristics of bounded shear layers are fundamentally different from those of free shear layers. Likewise, systems open are fundamentally different from those of closed systems. The distinctions are trenchant and thus form separate areas of study.

For the classic open system, no mathematical model exists that can predict the transition Reynolds number on a simple flat plate because the influences of freestream turbulence, sound, and surface roughness are incompletely understood. With the maturation of linear stability methods and the conclusions breakdown mechanisms are initialthat condition dependent, more emphasis is now placed on the understanding of the source of initial disturbances than on the details of the later stages of transition.

### **1.1 Roughness-Induced Meanflow Changes** for Laminar Flow Control

There is no dearth of historical work on the role of roughness in stability and transition. Therefore, it is well known that surface roughness generally causes an earlier transition to turbulence and in some cases it can delay transition. Advances in transient-growth theory for 2-D boundary layers have guided more relevant experimental work in this area. Moreover, the development of nonlinear PSE computations, along with careful experiments in 3-D boundary layers, has validated the important physics of boundary-layer problems [9]. However, some recent surprises have occurred and this forms the justification of the proposed work.

Swept-wing flows have 3-D boundary layers with crossflow which exhibit a different type of instability than that of 2-D boundary layers [9]. Whereas T-S waves react strongly to freestream sound and weakly to freestream turbulence, crossflow vortices are insensitive to

sound but sensitive freestream very to turbulence [1]. low-turbulence In a environment, the crossflow instability is in the form of stationary co-rotating vortices aligned (almost) with the inviscid streamlines. Recent reviews of the classic stability problems are given by Saric et al [9] and the details and complete references are contained therein.

In a series of crossflow dominated sweptwing experiments, Saric et al [7, 8] demonstrated that one could use spanwiseperiodic discrete roughness elements (DRE) to favorably modify the boundary-layer by exciting subcritical wavelengths. The subcritical waves would grow early, modify the meanflow, prevent the most unstable modes (critical wavelengths) from growing, and then decay before causing transition.

They excited stationary crossflow wavelengths with small roughness elements whose height was 6 µm and whose diameter was 1 - 2 mm. The critical wavelength was 12mm and when this spacing was used, transition moved forward as expected. When an 8-mm spanwise spacing was used, essentially fullchord laminar flow was achieved - even beyond the pressure minimum at 71% chord. The nonlinear response of the streamwise vortices created harmonics in wavenumber space - not The subharmonics. higher wavenumber disturbances initially grow and inhibit the growth of low wavenumber disturbances. These higher wavenumber disturbances then decay leaving nothing. This set of experimental results was confirmed with nonlinear PSE by Haynes & Reed [3] and with DNS by Wassermann & Kloker [11].

The experiments and computations were done in a modest chord-Reynolds-number range (2.2 to 3.5 million) and the goal has been to extend this to higher chord Reynolds numbers more typical of flight systems. Because of the sensitivity of the crossflow instability to freestream turbulence, it appears to be difficult (but not impossible) to do laminar crossflow experiments at higher Reynolds numbers (>5 million) in wind tunnels because of turbulence. This is justified next.

Flight tests can be very difficult since one does not have the collection of instrumentation

available to a wind tunnel. However, if one follows the guidelines of Reshotko for transition research in flight and use the care outlined by Dougherty [2] and Saric [6], there is a chance for success.

# **1.2 Role of Freestream Disturbances**

Before initiating the flight test program, the authors were conducting laminar flow control experiments on a swept wing at the Illinois Institute of Technology National Diagnostic Facility. Here was a case of a 3-D boundary layer subject to early-growing stationary crossflow vortices as a breakdown mechanism. The flow quality and low-turbulence levels ranks the IIT tunnel as one of the best in the world. Nevertheless, when using spanwiseperiodic discrete roughness elements (DRE) designed to laminarize the boundary layer, a reduction in laminar flow was observed and longer spanwise scales were introduced. Table 1 is a comparison of roughness heights, k, roughness Reynolds numbers, Rek, and unit Reynolds numbers, Re' for three different experiments conducted by the author.

	ASU [7]	IIT	F-15B [10]
Roughness: <i>k</i> [µm]	6-48	6	6
Roughness $Re:$ $Re_k$	0.1 – 7.0	0.8 – 1.2	2.0
Unit <i>Re</i> : $[1/m x 10^{-6}]$	1.6	6.6	9.6 – 12.0

Table 1. Comparison of roughness conditions

The ASU experiments were indeed at low Re' but used rather large k. The flight experiments at NASA-Dryden used the same roughness elements as the IIT experiments but the destabilizing behavior was not observed - even though the unit Reynolds number, Re', was considerable larger. The measured turbulence levels were in the range of  $0.10 - 0.15 \ \% U_{\infty}$ . This may seem somewhat high but this was at Mach 0.24 - 0.3 and stationary crossflow waves were clearly observed which indicated, based on

the experiments of Bippes [1] and White [12], that the turbulence effects were not strong.

Figure 1 is a good example from the IR Thermography where the tic marks on the 50% chord line are spaced at 24 mm. The lighter colors correspond to turbulent flow. Although the DRE spacing is at 2 mm, the transition wedges are between 20 - 25 mm. The longwavelength modulation is a puzzle. One could guess that it may be related to transient growth but this is just speculation at this point. We also tried a five different combinations of elements going down to a 0.4 mm diameter roughness with 1.75 mm spacing. In each case, the 20 - 25mm spacing of the wedges were observed.



**Figure 1.** Flow left to right. Dashed line is 50% chord location. Marks are at 24 mm spacing. Mach = 0.22,  $U_{\infty} = 74.6 \text{ m/s}$ ,  $T_{\infty} = 291 \text{ K}$ ,  $P_{\infty} = 97 \text{ kPa}$ , chord  $Re = 5.0 \times 10^6$ . DRE at x = 21.1 mm normal to LE,  $k = 6 \mu \text{m}$ , diameter = 0.75 mm, spacing = 2 mm.

White & Ergin [13] also observed an effect of freestream turbulence in the case of transient growth on a flat plate and say "As for breakdown to turbulence, perhaps freestream turbulence can lead to breakdown at a lower  $Re_k$ than would be observed in flight ..." The Bippes [1] and White [12, 13] cases are completely different in that the 2-D case has transient growth and the 3-D case has stationary crossflow waves. There seems to be some unexplained roughness issues in both the 2-D and 3-D boundary layers and the common denominator is most likely weak freestream turbulence.

It was concluded that even the best wind tunnels are challenged to conduct experiments on swept-wing boundary layers. The influence of freestream disturbances must be resolved and an important step is to do careful stability and transition experiments in flight where the disturbance levels are indeed low. These experiments should form the base state for the influence of roughness. A wellknown and very successful flight program was conducted by Dougherty [2]. Since the identical model was taken to every supersonic facility, this work actually provided a means to evaluate flow quality in high-speed tunnels. Since then, the achievements have been meager for a variety of reasons – not the least of which is the cost of doing flight experiments.

# **1.3 Ojectives**

The objective was to investigate, in a lowdisturbance, flight-test environment, the DRE technology on a subsonic swept-wing test article. The test article was designed to be consistent with a SensorCraft-type wing section  $(30^{\circ} \text{ leading-edge sweep})$ . The goals are to quantify the effectiveness of DRE in increasing the extent of laminar flow (i.e. transition location in chordwise direction) on the suction and/or pressure sides beyond the baseline (nocontrol) case; investigate the robustness and utility of DRE in maintaining laminar flow over the SensorCraft flight envelope i.e., variations in test-article angle-of-attack (AoA) over chord Reynolds numbers,  $Rec = 7.5 \times 10^6$ ; gain insight into conducting boundary-layer transition control experiments in a flight environment versus a wind-tunnel environment; and obtain a database that provides additional insight into boundary-layer stability and transition and for validation of prediction tools. The AoA was nominally set at -2.5° but was adjusted by  $\pm 2^{\circ}$ around  $-2.5^{\circ}$  using sideslip.

The program planning objectives were: (1) Measure the freestream disturbance environment and establish that the flight test has an acceptable disturbance environment within which one can conduct boundary-layer stability and transition measurements; (2) Develop a map of breakdown due to isolated roughness as a function of *Rek* and roughness location (*Rex*); (3) Develop the laminarization technology with periodic DRE and determine the sensitivity to roughness at higher Reynolds numbers; (4) Determine how the low-disturbance environment of flight can validate (or wind-tunnel invalidate) experiments; (5)Complement the experiments with stability computations; (6) Provide program guidelines for laminarization and long-range flight. All six objectives were met.

## 2 Test Results

The primary objective for Phase I testing was to determine whether the in-flight turbulence intensities were low enough to proceed with the swept-wing experiment. A value less than 0.08% for  $u'/U_{\infty}$  was expected. Experimental results show that the nominal value is between  $0.05\% U_{\infty}$  and  $0.06\% U_{\infty}$ .

Basically the target conditions for achieving 70% laminar flow where a chord Reynolds number of  $Rec = 7.5 \times 10^6$ , at model angle of attack of  $AoA = 0^\circ$ , and a swept angle of  $\Lambda = 30^\circ$ . The model (see Figure 2).was fabricated was flown on a Cessna O-2 as an external store.





Figure 2. The swept-wing model hung on O-2.

#### 2.1 Initial results with a polished leading edge

The swept-wing model was designed with an accelerated flow to 70% chord. The intent was to make the boundary layer sub-critical to T-S waves but rather unstable to crossflow instabilities. One of the principal result is that we achieved 80% laminar flow with a polished leading edge at  $Re_c = 8.1 \times 10^6$ ,  $AoA = -4^\circ$  and  $\Lambda$ =  $30^{\circ}$ . This corresponds to linear stability Nfactors of well over 16. Background roughness was 0.3 µm rms with 2.2 µm avg peak-to-peak. The linear stability N-factor is the log of the unstable disturbance amplitude ratio: N = $\ln(A/A_0)$  where  $A_0$  is the initial amplitude at the first neutral point and A is the amplitude at transition. Thus, an  $e^{16}$  growth is an amplitude ratio of almost 10<sup>6</sup>. The IR Thermography for this case is shown in Figure 3



**Figure 3.** IR image at 170 KTAS, Rec = 8.1 x 10<sup>6</sup>,  $AoA = -4^{\circ}$ ,  $\Lambda = 30^{\circ}$ ; 3500 ft MSL, Polished LE, No DRE, peak to peak roughness = 4.3 µm; rms roughness = 0.33 µm, *N*-factor > 16 at mid-span, x/c)tr = 80%

The colder area denoted by the dark orange color indicates laminar flow while the lighter area denotes turbulent flow. These conclusions were confirmed by placing large roughness elements on the model and tripping the boundary layer. The white marks at the bottom and top of the model are pieces of aluminum tape denoting 40%, 60%, and 80% chord respectively. The light orange color near the top of the model is due to the cabin IR reflection. The diagonal line across mid-span is the reflection of the bottom of the aircraft. The bright area near the top is the forward propeller and forward engine exhaust reflections.

Achieving an *N*-factor greater than 16 with the polished leading edge demonstrates the lowturbulence environment of flight. Results such as these have never been obtained in wind tunnels where *N*-factors of 8-9 have been achieved with N = 6 being more common. With 80% laminar flow, there is not much that can be done with DRE for laminar flow control. However, the polished leading edge with 0.33 µm rms can be considered a base state. A more realistic, operational surface would be painted.

# 2.2 Laminarization with a painted surface

The model surface was painted to achieve a background roughness level of  $1.0 \ \mu m \ rms$  with a  $3.8 \ \mu m \ avg$  peak-to-peak.



**Figure 4.** IR thermography at 173 KTAS, *AoA* =  $-4^{\circ}$ , *Rec* = 8.13 x 10<sup>6</sup>, no DRE, White painted LE. x/c)tr  $\approx 30\%$ .

In this case transition moved forward to 25% to 30% chord under conditions of  $Re_c = 8.13 \times 10^6$ ,  $AoA = -4^\circ$ ,  $A = 30^\circ$  and an *N*-factor

= 8. This is shown in figure 4. In this case transition moved forward to 30% chord and this is our new base state.

When a double layer of DREs (12 µm high) was used, the transition location moved back to 60% chord.  $Re_c = 8.13 \times 10^6$ ,  $AoA = -4^\circ$ ,  $\Lambda = 30^\circ$  and an *N*-factor = 15. This shown in Figure 5. The region of laminar flow was doubled from the base state and, according to linear theory, the disturbance amplitude was reduced by  $e^{-7}$  or  $< 10^{-3}$ . This rather remarkable result demonstrates the DRE technology in flight at a chord Reynolds number of 8 million.



**Figure 5**. 180 KTAS,  $AoA = -2.5^{\circ}$ , Rec = 8.13 x 10<sup>6</sup>, White painted LE, DRE x 2 placed at 1% x/c at inboard pressure row, and 1.3% x/c at outboard pressure row, d = 1 mm,  $\lambda = 2.25 \text{ mm}$ , transition moved to 60% x/c

# **3 Summary**

# **3.1 Boundary-Layer Stability and the Transition Measurements**

Transition due to the crossflow instability has been found to be very sensitive to freestream turbulence and rather insensitive to sound. The reason for going to flight is that the turbulence levels in even the best wind tunnels increase with speed to a level that this turbulence is a significant factor in the transition results, thereby calling into question their applicability to free-air flight conditions. Our freestream turbulence measurements in flight showed  $u'_{\rm rms}$ levels of the order of 0.05%  $U_{\infty}$ . These were considered low enough even though these numbers included electronic noise.

The most significant lesson learned was in the case of the polished leading edge. We achieved 80% laminar flow at a  $Re_c$  of 8 million. The linear stability *N*-factor was 16 in this case. This is an astounding result for the following reasons:

- (1)The importance of both surface roughness on the model and freestream turbulence in wind tunnels were not given their proper significance and thus, wind-tunnel transition results were thought to be a "not-too-bad" result;
- (2)Although it has long been recognized that crossflow transition was nonlinear, it was thought that linear theory could be used as a rough correlation for transition and generally accepted *N*-factors in wind tunnels were approximately 6 - 8.

The swept-wing model was designed assuming transition at N = 8. This implied that linear stability had to be discarded and calculations of the Nonlinear Parabolized Stability Equations (NPSE) were done.

The NPSE results showed the following:

- (1)The NPSE could demonstrate the stabilization of the critical mode due to the presence of a roughness-induced mode at a smaller wavelength;
- (2)The DRE are only effective when the amplitude control wavelength is not only larger than the critical amplitude, but had to be of a specific ratio;
- (3)The optimum position for the control DRE is at the neutral point of the critical wavelength and not at the neutral point of the control wavelength.

#### Acknowledgements

The work was supported by the Air Force Research Laboratory (ARFL), WPAFB, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR), and Northrop-Grumman (NGC), El Segundo. The authors acknowledge the valuable contributions of the pilots Mr. Roy Martin (NGC), Dr. Donald Ward (TAMU), and Ms Celine Kluzek (TAMU) and technical support of Mr. Shane Schouten, Mr. Jerrod Hofferth, Ms Lauren Hunt, and Mr. Cecil Rhodes.

#### References

- Bippes H 1999. Basic experiments on transition in three-dimensional boundary layers dominated by crossflow instability. *Prog. Aero. Sci.* 35(4):363-412
- [2] Dougherty NS Jr. 1980. Boundary layer transition on a 10-degree cone. Wind tunnel/Flight data correlation. *AIAA Pap. No. 80-154*
- [3] Haynes TS, Reed HL. 2000. Simulation of sweptwing vortices using nonlinear parabolized stability equations. J. Fluid Mech. **405**:325-49
- [4] Radeztsky, RH, Reibert, M, Saric, WS 1999. Effect of Isolated Micron-Sized Roughness on Transition in Swept-Wing Flows. AIAA J., 37(11):1370-77
- [5] Reed HL, Saric WS, Arnal D 1996. Linear stability theory applied to boundary layers. Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. 28:389-428
- [6] Saric W 1990 Low-speed experiments: requirements for stability Measurements. In *Instability and Transition, Volume 1.* eds. MY Hussaini, RG. Voight, Springer-Verlag. pp. 162-76
- [7] Saric WS, Carrillo R, Reibert M 1998a Leading-edge Roughness as a Transition Control Mechanism. AIAA Paper No. 98-0781
- [8] Saric WS, Carrillo R, Reibert M. 1998b Nonlinear Stability and Transition in 3-D Boundary Layers. *Meccanica* 33: 469
- [9] Saric WS, Reed HL, White EB 2003 Stability and transition of three-dimensional boundary layers. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* 35:413-40
- [10] Saric WS, Reed HL, Banks DW. 2005 Flight Testing of Laminar Flow Control in High-Speed Boundary Layers. *RTO-MP-AVT-111/RSM*.
- [11] Wassermann P, Kloker M. 2002 Mechanisms and control of crossflow-vortex induced transition in a three-dimensional boundary layer. J. Fluid Mech. 456:49-84
- [12] White EB. 2002 Transient growth of stationary disturbances in a flat plate boundary layer. *Phys. Fluids* 14(12):4429–39
- [13] White EB, F. Ergin G. 2003 Receptivity and transient growth of roughness-induced disturbances. *AIAA Pap. No. 2003-4243.*

#### **Copyright Statement**

The authors confirm that they, and/or their company or institution, hold copyright on all of the original material included in their paper. They also confirm they have obtained permission, from the copyright holder of any third party material included in their paper, to publish it as part of their paper. The authors grant full permission for the publication and distribution of their paper as part of the ICAS2008 proceedings or as individual off-prints from the proceedings.