	OF ADA 043385	2 2007 2007 2007	2005-00			aninar A				*Ø 14	
					N						
			4229138022 22512582	anter		Aller Adars Higher Heller High	END DATE FILMED 9-77 DDC				
									Ŧ		
681								2			
+ '	ф.		20 ar								
									2-	*	



N0014-75-C-0837

GEOMETRY AND FUNCTION DEFINITION FOR DISCRETE ANALYSIS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE DESIGN DATA BASE

H. A. Kamel & M. W. McCabe University of Arizona Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering Department Tucson, Arizona 85721

AUG 24 1917

August 1, 1977

Technical Report No. 2



Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

Department of the Navy Office of Naval Research Structural Mechanics Program (Code 474) Arlington, Virginia 22217

NOQ14-75-C-0837, DOT-CG-43565-A

1

GEOMETRY AND FUNCTION DEFINITION FOR DISCRETE ANALYSIS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE DESIGN DATA BASE .

H. A./Kamel M. W./McCabe University of Arizona Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering Department Tucson, Arizona 85721

August 1, 1977 1 TR Technical Report No. 2

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

Department of the Navy Office of Naval Research Structural Mechanics Program (Code 474) Arlington, Virginia 22217

402 192

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
NOO14-75-C-0837	ACCESSION NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
GEOMETRY AND FUNCTION DEFINITION FOR DEADALYSIS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE DE	ISCRETE Technical Report No. 2
DATA BASE	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(s)	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
Kamel, H. A. & McCabe, M. W.	N0014-75-C-0837
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
University of Arizona Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering De	ept: NR 064-531
Tucson, Arizona 85721	12. REPORT DATE
Department of the Navy, Office of Nava	1 Research August 1, 1977
Structural Mechanics Program (Code 474 Arlington, VA 22217	19 pages
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Cont	trolling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
Same as above	Unclassified p D C
	154. DECLASSIFICATION DO NGRADING
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	24 197
Approved for public release, distribut	ion unlimited AUG ~
	Insortin.
	C C
To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-2 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited	D, If different from Report) ONAL SYMPOSIUM ON COMPUTER-AIDED 27, 1977, in Annapolis, Maryland, cts and Marine Engineers.
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-2 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 	C, If different from Report) ONAL SYMPOSIUM ON COMPUTER-AIDED 27, 1977, in Annapolis, Maryland, cts and Marine Engineers.
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-2 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 	0, If different from Report) ONAL SYMPOSIUM ON COMPUTER-AIDED 27, 1977, in Annapolis, Maryland, cts and Marine Engineers.
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-2 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 	0, If different from Report) ONAL SYMPOSIUM ON COMPUTER-AIDED 27, 1977, in Annapolis, Maryland, cts and Marine Engineers.
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-2 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side " necessary and identify to the second se	by block number)
 Provide the statement (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-2 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde " necessary and identify to Computer-Aided design automatic model 	by block number)
 P. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26-4 hosted by The Society of Naval Archited 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde " necessary and identify to Computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics 	by block number) generation, surface definition,
 P. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Archited SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side " necessary and identify the Computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics 	by block number) generation, surface definition,
 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Archited 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde " necessary and identify to Computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics 0. ABLIRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by 	by block number) y block number)
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Architection SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side " necessary and identify to Computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics ABYTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify to The purpose of this paper is to dianalysis, in order to clarify its depen- whole 	by block number) generation, surface definition, y block number) iscuss data requirements for structural ndence on the design process as a
 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Architection 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde " necessary and identify the computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics 0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by The purpose of this paper is to do analysis, in order to clarify its dependent whole. 	by block number) generation, surface definition,
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Architection SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde " necessary and identify to Computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by The purpose of this paper is to di analysis, in order to clarify its dependent whole. The model generation capabilities analysis system (CIFTS 4), heavily or it 	by block number) generation, surface definition, y block number) iscuss data requirements for structural ndence on the design process as a of a state-of-the-art structural ented towards pre- and post-processing
 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Architer SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side " necessary and identify to computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify to The purpose of this paper is to do analysis, in order to clarify its dependence whole. The model generation capabilities analysis system (GIFTS 4), heavily original computer graphics, is presented. 	<pre>pure c p, if different from Report) ONAL SYMPOSIUM ON COMPUTER-AIDED 27, 1977, in Annapolis, Maryland, cts and Marine Engineers. by block number) generation, surface definition, y block number) iscuss data requirements for structural ndence on the design process as a of a state-of-the-art structural ented towards pre- and post-processing The system is capable of generating.</pre>
 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 To be presented at the FIRST INTERNATION HULL-SURFACE DEFINITION, September 26- hosted by The Society of Naval Architection 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde " necessary and identify the computer-Aided design, automatic model structural analysis, computer graphics 0. ABXIRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify the The purpose of this paper is to dianalysis, in order to clarify its dependent whole. The model generation capabilities analysis system (GIFTS 4), heavily original and computer graphics, is presented. 10. FORM, 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE 	by block number) generation, surface definition, y block number) iscuss data requirements for structural ndence on the design process as a of a state-of-the-art structural ented towards pre- and post-processing The system is capable of generating Unclassified

(married to

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

Coints, curves, surfaces, and solids in a hierarchical manner. It recognizes that geometric definition is only a part, albeit a fundamental part, of the structural system definition. The geometric components are used as a reference geometry, upon which the user may define loading patterns, kinematic boundary conditions, material property variation and so on. It is in linking these items together with the geometry that a structural analysis becomes feasible.

In presenting and discussing the data base requirement for a structural analysis in a consistent manner, the designer of a CAD system is presented with basic data requirements to be included in his data base design.

1.55

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research condusive to this paper has been supported by the Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-75-C-0837 and the Ufited States Coast Guard under Contract No. DOT-CG-43565-A.

Special thanks are to Mr. Michael Jacobs, Mrs. Erika Rawlings, and Mr. Peter Nagy for their help with finite element analysis and to Mr. Keith Hunten for help with surface generation examples. The manuscript was typed by Ms. Anne Dupont, Ms. Juanita Alvarez, and Ms. Sharon Rohrbach for whose dedication we are also grateful.

While Section ACCESSION for Butt Section D NTIS D CHAN IOUNCED 200 10571-104-104 POSTACOTOR (NYN) JALEN (OPES SP:CIAL 13 Dis

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to discuss data requirements for structural analysis, in order to clarify its dependence on the design process as a whole.

The model generation capabilities of a state-of-the-art structural analysis system (GIFTS 4), heavily oriented towards pre- and postprocessing and computer graphics, is presented. The system is capable of generating points, curves, surfaces, and solids in a hierarchical manner. It recognizes that geometric definition is only a part, albeit a fundamental part, of the structural system definition. The geometric components are used as a reference geometry, upon which the user may define loading patterns, kinematic boundary conditions, material property variation and so on. It is in linking these items together with the geometry that a structural analysis becomes feasible.

In presenting and discussing the data base requirement for a structural analysis in a consistent manner, the designer of a CAD system is presented with basic data requirements to be included in his data base design.

I. INTRODUCTION

The paper describes a geometrical definition scheme used in the GIFTS 4 program, a structural analysis package. The scheme is based on a hierarchical representation of geometrical entities: points, curves, surfaces, and solid chunks.¹

While primarily oriented towards surface definition in this particular structural package, the interface between discipline-oriented packages such as GIFTS and similar packages in other disciplines, such as hydrodynamics, heat transfer, and numerical control is discussed. The lack of a common data base is in a way regrettable, but also understandable. The various disciplines are at different stages of development, in which different mathematical tools are used. Difficulty exists within each discipline in defining the data needed for the analysis, and the most efficient schemes to conduct the analysis and supply the appropriate results. The lack of communication between the various disciplines will be eventually resolved by a centralized computer-aided design effort, such as that of Reference 2. The traditional role of the designer is the hub of the wheel to which all disciplines are connected. In the absence of a well-defined central system for object and problem definition, it is natural that those involved with the day to day analysis, often under pressure, have to take their own initiative and go their own ways.

This is not to be taken as advocating a top-heavy approach resulting in an extensive computer-aided design system, that is unwieldy and inaccessible except to large organizations. The problem is much simpler than that. It is that of the acceptance of a standard for communication, a standard for data storage and conventions so that data and programs may be interchanged with relative ease. It is possible to interface packages that were developed independently at a later stage.

11. GEOMETRIC HIERARCHY OF DEFINITION IN GIFTS 4

A three-dimensional object, to be designed or analyzed, may be described in terms of a minimum amount of geometric input and some basic logic (see References 1 and 3). A minimum number of points in space, called key points, are chosen and digitized. Next, a number of curves may be generated, using these key points as reference locations. Curves may be straight lines joining two points, circular arcs joining three points, or parametric curves of second and third order. On each curve, GIFTS can generate, automatically, intermediate nodes and line elements (rods, beams). The intermediate nodes need not be equally spaced as will be described later. GIFTS 4 also allows the definition of composite curves constructed out of (up to nine) different segments of the standard types described above. Any curve, including composite lines, is used as an entity in subsequent operations, and is given an alphanumeric indentifier.

Once curves have been defined, surface patches may be generated based on them. These patches are generated in a discrete fashion in

the form of internal points and surface elements. The fineness of the grid required for the discrete presentation may be controlled by the user at the time of curve generation. Surface patches are of two basic types, a four-sided patch and a three-sided patch, whose edges may be any of the above curve types. In both cases, the discretization technique generates internal points by blending one edge into the opposite edge or corner. Examples of such patches are given in Figure 1. A number of surface patches may be collected together under a common name to produce a composite patch. Each surface patch, including composite patches, is used as an entity in subsequent operations, and is designated an alphanumeric identifier by the user.

A new addition, expected by the end of this summer, will utilize previously defined surfaces in order to generate solid chunks. Several types are contemplated. For example, the PRISM4 chunk is a solid piece of continuum bounded by six four-sided grids or patches. The PRISM 3 chunk is a piece bounded by five sides, three of which are rectangular and two triangular. A tetrahedron (TETR4) solid chunk is a four-sided piece of continuum bounded by four three-sided patches (see Figure 2).

It may be argued that the generation of geometrical figures in such a manner is basically a computer-aided design problem and should perhaps be incorporated in a computer-aided design system, rather than in a structural analysis program. Indeed, such information may and should eventually, be obtained from a computer-aided design package. However, structural analysts need a certain amount of sophistication in the definition of geometry, and are apt to resort to their own means to produce such definitions in a readily accessible form so as to be usable in analysis programs. It is important to note that the geometric definition of the surface patches, the curves and the solid chunks, is not by itself sufficient for the conduct of the structural analysis. The structural analysis analyst must perform additional operations, based on the geometrical definition, the most important of which is the discretization of lines, patches and chunks by the introduction of grids, containing internal nodes and line, surface, and solid elements.

The fineness of the grid is an important factor in determining the accuracy of analysis. It will be shown in this report that there are simple ways of varying the fineness of the grid from one area to another in order to produce accurate modeling where needed, a matter very much dependent on the judgment and experience of the structural analyst.

Furthermore, surfaces and solids are the basic geometric entities on which loads and temperatures may be defined. In the process of discretization, simple loading patterns, such as a pressure on a surface, or a distributed load along an edge, have to be translated into hundreds of individual load vectors applied to the nodes of the structural grid. This is a process that can only be performed if the geometric properties of the surfaces and the curves are known and available explicitly to the structural analyst, who is concerned with the discretization of the load. The GIFTS 4 program preserves the logic of the model and allows the user to address the individual geometric elements in defining his loads. For example, he may apply distributed loads to lines, pressures to surfaces



Figure 1. Generation of 3 and 4-sided surface patches with arbitrary side shapes



Figure 2. Solid Chunk Generation using GIFTS 4

1

and body forces to solid chunks as easily as he can apply concentrated loads to key nodes or individual nodes within his grid.

From this discussion, we hope that we have explained the motivation behind the incorporation of geometric definition schemes and a structural data base in a structural analysis program. It is also clear that such a data base has to be available to the analyst, via powerful user-oriented manipulation commands, which allow him to control the accuracy and efficiency of his solution.

III. LOAD APPLICATION

As mentioned before, the geometric definition of the structure is only the first step towards the design. Structures are designed to support certain loads, and it is the function of the structural analyst to investigate the efficiency with which the structure carries such a load. In order to do this, he may resort, for example, to the finite element method, the method upon which the GIFTS 4 package is built.

Load's may be defined with a minimum number of specifications in the same way that a geometric surface can be represented by a minimum number of coordinates and logical connections. It is useful that the user may reference the surface definition in creating his loads. For example, the user may specify the distributed load values at the two ends of a curve and let the program discretize the pressure into individual loads automatically placed at the individual points.

A curve may be a straight line, a circular arc, a parametric curve, or a composite line. GIFTS computes the pressure at an internal node using first order Lagrange interpolation functions (Ref. 4 and 5). The developed length of the polygonized curve is used as a length parameter (see Figure 3).

The same approach can be applied to surface patches. For example, a four-sided patch (see Figure 4) is defined in terms of four boundary curves. Pressure values are given in this case at the four corner nodes. The values of the intermediate pressures are derived on the basis of a bilinear interpolation scheme which establishes a 2 x 2 square and maps it onto the actual shape of the patch. Since the borders of the patch are arbitrarily shaped and blended by the GIFTS patch generation scheme into a series of parallel curves, the bilinear interpolation is based on the developed chord length along each of the two intersecting lines at a particular point.

The loads per unit area can be deduced, therefore, at each one of the individual nodes. Considering a surface elements, one can compute the resultant forces on its corners, using a kinematically consistant load method (Ref. 6), and assign them to the surrounding nodes.

Loads may be applied along one of the global directions x, y, z, in which case the pressure values at the patch corners are interpreted as the loads per unit surface area, acting in the specified directions.







Loads may also be applied as pressures perpendicular to the surface. In such a case, there is a need to determine the direction of the normal to the surface at the point at which the pressures are applied. This presents no particular difficulty, and the normal vector is computed on the basis of two local chord segments.

Special load applications in GIFTS include hydrostatic pressures, due to liquid heads, which may not cover the patch entirely. Such a loading occurs often in marine applications and, therefore, is considered a useful addition to the commands of the program.

The above methods of load description and discretization may be expanded to higher order variations of pressures, such as, for example, quadratic and cubic pressure distributions on the patch. Such extensions will be incorporated if there is demand for them.

Figure 5 represents a patch generated from complex edge curves. Figure 6 shows the results of an automatic pressure load discretization by one of the GIFTS modules. Figures 7 and 8 represent a fictitious ship hull generated and displayed by the GIFTS program in order to demonstrate GIFTS' ability to generate complex surfaces.

IV. EFFECT OF MESH SPACING ON ACCURACY

Once a structure has been defined, a mathematical model is required in order to perform a finite element analysis. The accuracy of such an analysis depends on many factors. The word accuracy itself here needs clarification since it usually is not constant within the model itself.

It is a well-established fact that the finite element method is convergent, which means that, by subdividing the model into smaller and smaller pieces, the results will improve (see Ref. 7). The speed of convergence is, for example, a function of the element type being used. Simple elements have a slower convergence rate than more complex higher order elements. It has also been observed that the element shape is an important factor in obtaining a numerically accurate solution. This claim is somewhat difficult to assess since element shapes cannot be completely uncoupled from other variables. Another factor affecting accuracy is that of grid density. It is common practice to put more nodes and elements at a particular location in the structure where, for example, a high stress gradient is expected, and to reduce the density of nodes and elements in areas where the stress field is fairly constant. Such variable grids are possible with the finite element method and have a great advantage. However, more study is needed in order to determine precisely the effect of such a procedure on the accuracy of the analysis as a whole. Furthermore, the variation of a grid in order to obtain higher accuracy assumes that the analyst knows, in advance, where stress concentrations are, and that he is willing to sacrifice the accuracy in other parts of the structure in favor of the local area.

A number of student projects were conducted at the University of Arizona in order to study the efficiency of grid configuration. The



Figure 5. Surface patch generated from four arbitrarily shaped sides.



Figure 6. Automatic generation and discretization of bilinearly varying pressure load on arbitrarily four-sided grid.



Figure 7. Head on view of part of ship side shell.



Figure 8. Isometric view of ship side shell.

problem of stress concentration around a circular hole in a square membrane plate was solved using an increasingly larger number of equally spaced nodes. Alternatively, a feature of the GIFTS program in which the grid is biased to increase the point and element density at the point of interest was employed (see Figure 9).

Table 1 gives the results of parametric studies which show the striking superiority and accuracy of grid biasing as compared to the uniform refinement over the plate. In estimating the accuracy, the von-Mises stress value at the centroid of the (isoparametric quadrilateral) element nearest the stress concentration was compared to the classical solution, including the correction for the finite plate size, at the point of maximum stress concentration. Although some questions still remain unanswered, such as the accuracy of the exact solution, and whether extreme bias of mesh size produces numerical errors, it is, in our opinion, clear that using biased simple grids is the most efficient method for accuracy enhancement. It is recommended that an analysis be performed in two stages, using a simple grid with a small number of nodes and elements. The first analysis serves to indicate areas of interest, while the second is aimed at obtaining more accurate results at these areas. It is also clear that more research should be conducted in order to produce simple modelling guidelines and clarify the above questions.

V. AUTOMATIC GENERATION OF INTERNAL POINTS WITH BIAS

Two types of bias are possible in the GIFTS System. For the time being they cannot be combined. The "center bias" results in automatically generated points being closer towards the center of the curve for a positive bias and towards both ends of the curve for a negative one. For "end bias," the points are closer towards the second endpoint in the curve (positive bias) or towards the first (negative bias).

From a user's point of view, the most convenient way of specifying bias is to give the ratio between the longest and the shortest segment in the form of a percentage. In this manner, a zero bias means equal segments, a bias of 100 indicates the largest is twice as long as the shortest.

For straight lines and circular arc segments a simple arithmetic progression can be established from which one can calculate the length of the first and the last segments and the increments as one moves from one segment to the next. This scheme is indeed utilized in the program for its simplicity and accuracy. In parametric curves, however, the position of the intermediate geometric reference points, necessary to generate the parametric curve, may result in non-equal length for the various segments, even if the parameter values corresponding to the intermediate points are equally spaced. A method must be derived, therefore, from which the values of these parameters can be selected so as to produce the correct ratio between the longest and the shortest segments regardless of the position of the intermediate points. The following



Figure 9. Stress concentration around a hole, alternative modelling approaches to increase accuracy.

NO. OF NODES	EST. COST MULTIPLIER	ERROR %
40	1.000	22.6
60	1.884	15.6
84	3.327	10.5
112	5.209	8.0
144	7.975	6.0

TABLE 1

LENGTH RATIO(BIAS)	ERROR %
1	22.60
2	13.10
3	8.17
4	5.00
5	3.00
6	1.40
7	0.27
80	220

section describes the scheme currently utilized, which is successful as long as the intermediate points are approximately equally spaced. It may fail in situations where the intermediate points are unreasonably chosen, particularly if they produce, ab initio, a node spacing in conflict with the one specified by the user. The following discussion will clarify this point, and describe the method employed to achieve biasing.

V.1 Effect of Center Point Position on the Spacing of Internal Nodes

Assume a straight line, of length 2L, joining two points. It is required that the intermediate nodes be generated such that the spacing may be biased towards one end. It is proposed here that this be done by using a second order parametric interpolation utilizing a fictitious intermediate point on the original line, whose position may be used to control the spacing. The second order Lagrangian interpolation functions are given by:

$$f_{1} = -S(1-S)/2,$$

$$f_{2} = 1 - S^{2},$$

$$f_{3} = S(1+S)/2,$$

where S is a parameter varying between -1 and +1.

From Equation 1, one may derive an interpolation relationship giving the position, x, of an intermediate point as a function of the parameters. Assuming the coordinates of the first, intermediate, and last points to be -L, β L, and +L, one arrives at:

$$\mathbf{x} = -\beta \mathbf{L} \mathbf{S}^2 + \mathbf{S} \mathbf{L} + \beta \mathbf{L}$$
(2)

Figure 10 shows the relationship between equally spaced set of S parameters and the resulting x parameters for various values of β . For example, if the intermediate point is the midpoint ($\beta = 0$), the mapping function is a straight line and results in equal spacing. If β is negative, the nodes are closer towards the first point and if β is positive, then the nodes are closer to the second point. Therefore, it seems that by the appropriate choice of β , one can produce and control an end bias and may be indeed able to compute the β value to achieve a particular bias. One must note, however, that if the value of β increases beyond 0.5 or is less than -0.5, that some interpolated values will lie outside the range of -L to +L, and will not be acceptable. It is possible to prove this by using Equation 2. The derivative of x with respect to S is given by Equation 3 from which one can see that the derivative will become zero at the line end points for values of β outside the range $-\frac{1}{2}$ to $+\frac{1}{2}$.

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{S}} = (1 - 2 \beta \mathbf{S}) \mathbf{L}$$

11

(1)

(3)



It remains now to devise a method by which β may be chosen in order to produce a particular ratio of segment length, say B. If we define B as the ratio the length of the first segment to the last segment, then this may be approximated by the raito between the derivatives at both ends.

$$B \simeq \frac{dx/dS' - 1}{dx/dS' + 1} \simeq \frac{1 + 2\beta}{1 - 2\beta}$$
(4)

From which one can calculate the value for β to produce a certain length ratio B:

$$\frac{(R-1)}{2(B+1)}$$
 (5)

It must be noted, however, that this relationship is approximate since it is based on a continuous approach, rather than discrete. If one wishes to be accurate, a Newton-Raphson procedure has to be used in order to force the ratios to be as specified by the user. The convergence of the procedure, however, cannot be guaranteed for complex curve shapes.

V.2 Producing Center Bias on a Straight Line

B

In order to produce a center bias on a straight segment, we chose a third order parametric representation in which two auxiliary points equally distant from the midpoint of the line are chosen. These coordinates are given by $-\beta L$ and $+\beta L$. By changing the value of β , one should be able to produce and control a center bias. The third order Lagrangian interpolation functions, in this case, are given by:

$$f_{1} = (9 \ S^{2} - 1) \ (1 - S)/16$$

$$f_{2} = 9 \ (1 - S^{2}) \ (1 - 3S)/16$$

$$f_{3} = 9 \ (1 - S^{2}) \ (1 + 3S)/16$$

$$f_{4} = (9S^{2} - 1) \ (1 + S)/16$$

From these equations, it is possible to write the coordinate x of an intermediate point on the line as a function of β .

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[(18 - 54\beta) \, \mathrm{S}^3 \, \mathrm{L} + (54\beta - 2) \, \mathrm{S} \, \mathrm{L} \right] / 16 \tag{7}$$

The mapping of S into x is shown in Figure 11, where it is seen that if β is chosen to be 1/3, a straight line mapping function is produced, which results in equal spacing. If the auxiliary points are taken further apart ($\beta > 1/3$), a negative end bias is produced and the points are denser towards the ends of the line. Beyond a certain value of β , points are produced outside the original segment, which is undesirable.

(6)



Figure 11. Generation of center-biased intermediate nodes.

On the other hand, if the auxiliary points are taken closer together ($\beta < 1/3$), a positive center bias is produced, whereby the intermediate points are closer towards the midpoint of the line. It also appears that moving the midpoints in that direction is much less sensitive than moving them towards the outside. However, if β is small enough, the curve becomes such that multiple values are possible towards the center of the line, which again should be avoided. In order to compute the limits on β values we use Equation 7 to obtain:

$$\frac{dx}{dS} = \frac{(54 - 162\beta) S^2 L + (54\beta - 2)L}{16}$$
(8)

In order for the derivative to become zero at the ends, we have:

$$\frac{dx}{dS} + 1 = \frac{(52 - 108\beta)L}{16} = 0$$
(9)

which produces β values of 13/27. On the other hand, to investigate the case of the derivative disappearing at the center point, we obtain:

$$\frac{dx}{dS}_{0} = \frac{(54\beta - 2)L}{16} = 0$$
(10)

which produces a value for β of 1/27. It appears, therefore, that acceptable β values lie between 1/27 and 13/27.

It now remains to find the value for β for which a certain bias, B, may be produced. From Equation 8 we write:

$$B = \frac{dx/dS}{dx/dS}_{0} = \frac{52 - 108\beta}{54\beta - 2}$$
(11)

It is now possible, therefore, to choose the value of β to produce a known bias (length ratio) of B:

$$\beta = \frac{52 + 2B}{108 + 54B}$$
(12)

The remark in the case of end bias applies here also. This is only an approximate method. To obtain exact values for β , an iterative method has to be used, whose convergence is not always guaranteed.

V.3 Producing Bias on Parametric Curves

The above derivations were based on the idea of producing known end or center bias on a straight line. The generalization to parametric curves follows the same logic, utilizing a two-step procedure.

Figure 12 shows an example of a third order geometric curve generated using four points. It is to be discretized using, for example, an end bias. The parametric equation of the curve is solely determined by the



Figure 12. Generation of end-biased intermediate nodes on an arbitrary parametric curve.

1.4

position of these four points, the two intermediate points being directly related to S values of -1/3 and +1/3, respectively. One constructs a straight line of length two, which maps one to one onto the S line. A center point on that line is chosen, which may be placed eccentrically by a value of β in order to produce non-uniform spacing on that straight line. It will be assumed that no appreciable distortion results from the definition of the original parametric curve so that the bias ratio of the line produces a sufficiently close bias ratio on the parametric curve. The generated coordinates of the intermediate points on the straight line are then used as parameter values, s, of points on the parametric curve. An iterative process is necessary here. The ratio of the first and last segments are measured after each step and a Newton-Raphson procedure is used in order to obtain closer values. In the process, care must be taken that β does not depart from allowable limits.

Because of the success of the method of point-biasing in improving one's results without major reconfiguration of the discretized model, we plan to continue improving upon the current capabilities and produce amongst other things, a combined end/center bias to give more flexibility to the user. It would also be desirable to incorporate the actual geometry of the parametric curves in the computation of β so as to provide a non-iterative method.

VI. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STRUCTURAL DESIGN DATA BASE AND MASTER DESIGN DATA BASE

It was necessary, in order to produce a structural analysis system that would completely span the process of analysis, from definition of geometry and loads, to the processing of the final results, to infringe upon the area of computer-aided design insofar as creating geometry definition programs, upon which discretized models are based. It is clear, however, that all or most, of the key information required to construct a model may, and should indeed, be extracted from a master design data base. Not only should geometry be extracted, but also such things as material properties and thicknesses. Such quantities should be stored in the master design data base because they will be used by more than one user. If the structural analysis shows that, for example, certain thicknesses or materials have to be changed, such changes should be communicated back to the master data base so that other users may have access to them.

In essence, we are talking about a distributed data base (8) which is made up of a central design data base and a number of special purpose ones. We are confronted with many problems, including the integrity of such data bases, so that for example, a change in the thickness by a structural engineer does not conflict with a change introduced by the heat transfer engineer. It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into this in detail, since the problems are complex and belong naturally enough in the realm of computer science. On the other hand, if the problem

of design of such a system is left entirely to people in the computer science area, the result may be unwieldy and encumbered by lack of appreciation for the engineering aspects involved in the computeraided design.

It is obvious that information such as key point locations, and the boundary lines and surface patches should be available from the computeraided design group, in such a way as to be acceptable to the discretization program. We also need scantlings and thicknesses and material properties. In addition, we need to extract from the master data base the loads under which the structure is to be analyzed.

Files generated locally, such as those containing the coordinates of internal points specifically computed in order to obtain numerical answers should not, in any way, be communicated back to, or maintained by the design data base. The loads, on the other hand, are computed for example, by the hydrodynamicist and may be passed directly to the structural engineer, possibly via the master data base. It appears that the following rules should determine the relationships between the various data bases:

- 1. There is a central design data base and a number of specialized data bases.
- 2. Data contained in the master data base should include local master data base information required for the management of the project (but not necessarily available to any of the individual users). It should also comprise all data shared by more than one user. Such data should be accessible to those involved in the individual disciplines.
- 3. Each specialized data base should contain those items extracted from the master data base, plus additional local files that are necessary to conduct relevant computations. If the results of a computation should specify a change to one of the items in the master data base, the new value should be communicated to the master data base.
- 4. Any changes introduced from the special data base to the master data base should be subject to approval by the central design team. As soon as a change is accepted and incorporated in the master data base, the specialized data bases should be immediately notified of the effect of this on local activities, some of which may be already in progress. If a change triggered by a special group is in conflict with a proposed change from another group, automatic communication must be established by the system, prompting the individuals concerned to resolve their conflict.

The discussion in this section is bound to be over-simplified. It is not meant as a comprehensive solution to the problem, but rather as a reinforcement of current thoughts on a difficult problem being tackled at the moment by many capable groups. By attempting to portray the problem from a structural engineer's point of view, we hope to have made the designer of a computer-aided design system and the associated centralized data base aware of a specialized point of view that may benefit him in producing an efficient system.

It is important to note here that reduction of system size and complexity is extremely important, affecting its operational efficiency. One has to resist the tendency to produce systems in which great amounts of sophistication are an investment without a visible return.

VII. CONCLUSION

The paper describes a structural analysis program which in some ways may appear to infringe upon computer-aided design. This infringement is based on necessity rather than over-ambition. It is hoped that such infringement may be reduced in the future. This can only be the result of a satisfactory resolution of the complex problem of computeraided design.

The paper includes a description of specialized geometry generation techniques which are useful in the performance of accurate structural analysis. The purpose is to make the computer-aided design specialist aware of particular needs that the structural analyst may have in the area of computer-aided analysis.

REFERENCES

- R.R. Heldenfels, "Automation of the Aircraft Design Process", Paper presented at the IXth Congress of the International Council of the Aeronautical Sciences, Haifa, Israel, August 25-30, 1974.
- H.A. Kamel & H.K. Eisenstein, "Automatic Mesh Generation in Two and Three Dimensional Interconnected Domains", Paper presented at the IUTAM Symposium, Liege, August 23-28, 1970.
- H.A. Kamel & P. Shanta, "A Solids Mesh Generator and Result Display Package", Paper presented at the 1974 Pressure Vessels and Piping-Materials-Nuclear Conference, Miami, Florida, June 24-28, 1974.
- 4. O.C. Zienkiewicz, <u>The Finite Element Method in Engineering Science</u>, McGraw-Hill, London, 1971.
- B. Carnahan, H.A. Luther, & J.O. Wilkes, <u>Applied Numerical Methods</u>, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969, pp. 27-34.
- J.S. Archer, "Consistant Matrix Formulation for Structural Analysis Using Finite Element Techniques", A.I.A.A. Journal 3, 1910-1918, 1965.
- E.R. de A. Oliveira, "Completeness and Convergence in the Finite Element Method", Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Matrix Methods in Structural Mechanics, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, 1968.
- G.A. Champine, "Six Approaches to Distributed Data Bases", <u>DATAMATION</u>, May 1977, pp. 69-72.

ONR DISTRIBUTION LIST

PART 1 - GOVERNMENT

A Inistrative & Liaison Activities

Chief of Naval Research Department of the Navy Arlingon, Virginia 22217 Attn: Code 474 (2) 471 222

Director ONR Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210

Director ONR Branch Office 219 S. Dearborn Street Chicago, Illinois 60604

Director Naval Research Laboratory Attn: Code 2629 (ONRL) Washington, D.C. 20390 (6)

U.S. Naval Research Laboratory tn: Code 2627 Washington, D.C. 20390

Director ONR - New York Area Office 715 Broadway - 5th Floor New York, N.Y. 10003

Director ONR Branch Office 1030 E. Green Street Pasadena, California 91101

Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (12)

Army

Commanding Officer U.S. Army Research Office Durham Attn: Mr. J. J. Murray CRD-AA-IP Box CM, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina 27706 2. Commanding Officer AMXMR-ATL Attn: Mr. R. Shea U.S. Army Materials Res. Agency Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

Watervliet Arsenal MAGGS Research Center Watervliet, New York 12189 Attn: Director of Research

Technical Library

Redstone Scientific Info. Center Chief, Document Section U.S. Army Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35809

Army R&D Center Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Navy

Commanding Officer and Director Naval Ship Research & Development Center Bethesda, Maryland 20034 Attn: Code 042 (Tech. Lib. Br.) 17 (Struc. Mech. Lab.) 172 174 177 1800 (Appl. Math. Lab.) 5412S (Dr. W.D. Sette) 19 (Dr. M.M. Sevik) 1901 (Dr. M. Strassberg) 1945 196 (Dr. D Feit) 1962 Naval Weapons Laboratory Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375 Attn: Code 8400 8410 8430 8440 6300 6390 6380 Undersea Explosion Research Div. Naval Ship R&D Center Norfolk Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Virginia 23709 Attn: Dr. E. Palmer Code 780

Naval Ship Research & Development Center Annapolis Division Annapolis, Maryland 21402 Attn: Code 2740 - Dr. Y.F. Wang 28 - Mr. R.J. Wolfe 281 - Mr. R.B. Niederberger 2814 - Dr. H. Vanderveldt

Technical Library Naval Underwater Weapons Center Pasadena Annex 3202 E. Foothill Blvd. Pasadena, California 91107

U.S. Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93557 Attn: Code 4062 - Mr. W. Werback 4520 - Mr. Ken Bischel

Commanding Officer U.S. Naval Civil Engr. Lab. Code L31 Port Hueneme, California 93041

Technical Director U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Fechnical Director
Naval Undersea R&D Center
San Diego, California 92132

Supervisor of Shipbuilding U.S. Navy Newport News, Virginia 23607

Technical Director Mare Island Naval Shipyard Vallejo, California 94592

U.S. Navy Underwater Sound Ref. Lab. Office of Naval Research P.O. Box 8337 Orlando, Florida 32806 Chief of Naval Operations Dept. of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20350 Attn: Code Op07T

Strategic Systems Project Office Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20390 Attn: NSP-001 Chief Scientist

Deep Submergence Systems Naval Ship Systems Command Code 39522 Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360

Engineering Dept. U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland 21402

Naval Air Systems Command Dept. of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360 Attn: NAVAIR 5302 Aero & Structures 5308 Structures 52031F Materials 604 Tech. Library 320B Structures Director, Aero Mechanics Naval Air Development Center Johnsville Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974

Technical Director U.S. Naval Undersea R&D Center San Diego, California 92132

Engineering Department U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland 21402

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Dept. of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360 Attn: NAVFAC 03 Research & Development 04 " " 14114 Tech. Library Naval Sea Systems Command Dept. of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360 Attn: NAVSHIP 03 Res. & Technology 031 Ch. Scientist for R&F

03412 Hydromechanics

037 Ship Silencing Div. 035 Weapons Dynamics Naval Ship Engineering Center rince George's Plaza Hyattsville, Maryland 20782 Attn: NAVSEC 6100 Ship Sys Engr & Des Dep 6102C Computer-Aided Ship Des 6105G 6110 Ship Concept Design 6120 Hull Div. 6120D Hull Div. 6128 Surface Ship Struct. 6129 Submarine Struct.

Air Force

Commander WADD Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio 45433 Attn: Code WWRMDD AFFDL (FDDS) Structures Division AFLC (MCEEA)

Chief, Applied Mechanics Group U.S. Air Force Inst. of Tech. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio 45433

_nief, Civil Engineering Branch WLRC, Research Division Air Force Weapons Laboratory Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117

Air Force Office of Scientific Research 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, Virginia 22209 Attn: Mechanics Div.

NASA

Structures Research Division National Aeronautics & Space Admin. Langley Research Center Langley Station Hampton, Virginia 23365

National Aeronautic & Space Admin. Associate Administrator for Advanced Research & Technology Washington, D.C. 02546

Scientific & Tech. Info. Facility MASA Representative (S-AK/DL) 0. Box 5700 Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Other Government Activities

Commandant Chief, Testing & Development Div. U.S. Coast Guard 1300 E. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20226

Technical Director Marine Corps Dev. & Educ. Command Quantico, Virginia 22134

Director National Bureau of Standards Washington, D.C. 20234 Attn: Mr. B.L. Wilson, EM 219

Dr. M. Gaus National Science Foundation Engineering Division Washington, D.C. 20550

Science & Tech. Division Library of Congress Washington, D.C. 20540

Director Defense Nuclear Agency Washington, D.C. 20305 Attn: SPSS

Commander Field Command Defense Nuclear Agency Sandia Base Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115

Director Defense Research & Engrg Technical Library Room 3C-128 The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301

Chief, Airframe & Equipment Branch FS-120 Office of Flight Standards Federal Avaiation Agency Washington, D.C. 20553

Chief, Research and Development Maritime Administration Washington, D.C. 20235

Deputy Chief, Office of Ship Constr. Maritime Administration Washington, D.C. 20235 Attn: Mr. U.L. Russo Itomic Energy Commission Div. of Reactor Devel. & Tech. Germantown, Maryland 20767

Ship Hull Research Committee National Research Council National Academy of Sciences 2101 Constitution Avenue Washington, D.C. 20418 Attn: Mr. A.R. Lytle

PART 2 - CONTRACTORS AND OTHER TECHNICAL COLLABORATORS

Universities

Dr. J. Tinsley Oden University of Texas at Austin 345 Eng. Science Bldg. Austin, Texas 78712

Prof. Julius Miklowitz California Institute of Technology Jiv. of Engineering & Applied Sciences Pasadena, California 91109

Dr. Harold Liebowitz, Dean School of Engr. & Applied Science George Washington University 725 - 23rd St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Prof. Eli Sternberg California Institute of Technology Div. of Engr. & Applied Sciences Pasadena, California 91109

Prof. Paul M. Naghdi University of California Div. of Applied Mechanics Etcheverry Hall Berkeley, California 94720

Professor P. S. Symonds Brown University Division of Engineering Providnece, R.I. 02912

'rof. A. J. Durelli The Catholic University of America Civil/Mechanical Engineering Washington, D.C. 20017 Prof. R.B. Jesta Columbia University Dept. of Civil Engineering S.W. Mudd Bldg. New York, N.Y. 10027

Prof. H. H. Bleich Columbia University Dept. of Civil Engineering Amsterdam & 120th St. New York, N.Y. 10027

Prof. F.L. DiMaggio Columbia University Dept. of Civil Engineering 616 Mudd Building New York, N.Y. 10027

Prof. A.M. Freudenthal George Washington University School of Engineering & Applied Science Washington, D.C. 20006

D. C. Evans University of Utah Computer Science Division Salt Lake City, Wash 84112

Prof. Norman Jones Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Dept. of Naval Architecture & Marine Engrng Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor Albert I. King Biomechanics Research Center Wayne State University Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dr. V. R. Hodgson Wayne State University School of Medicine Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dean B. A. Boley Northwestern University Technological Institute 2145 Sheridan Road Evanston, Illinois 60201 of. P.G. Hodge, Jr. university of Minnesota Dept. of Aerospace Engng & Mechanics Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. D.C. Drucker University of Illinois Dean of Engineering Urbana, Illinois 61801

Prof. N.M. Newmark University of Illinois Dept. of Civil Engineering Urbana, Illinois 61801

Prof. E. Reissner University of California, San Diego Dept. of Applied Mechanics La Jolla, California 92037

Prof. William A. Nash University of Massachusetts Dept. of Mechanics & Aerospace Engng. Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

ibrary (Code 0384)
...S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940

Prof. Arnold Allentuch Newark College of Engineering Dept. of Mechanical Engineering 323 High Street Newark, New Jersey 07102

Dr. George Herrmann Stanford University Dept. of Applied Mechanics Stanford, California 94305

Prof. J. D. Achenbach Northwestern University Dept. of Civil Engineering Evanston, Illinois 60201

Director, Applied Research Lab. Pennsylvania State University P. O. Box 30 State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Prof. Eugen J. Skudrzyk nnsylvania State University Applied Research Laboratory Dept. of Physics - P.O. Box 30 State College, Pennsylvania 16801 Prof. J. Kempner Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn Dept. of Aero.Engrg.& Applied Mech 333 Jay Street Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Prof. J. Klosner Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn Dept. of Aerospace & Appl. Mech. 333 Jay Street Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Prof. R.A. Schapery Texas A&M University Dept. of Civil Engineering College Station, Texas 77840

Prof. W.D. Pilkey University of Virginia Dept. of Aerospace Engineering Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. H.G. Schaeffer University of Maryland Aerospace Engineering Dept. College Park, Maryland 20742

Prof. K.D. Willmert Clarkson College of Technology Dept. of Mechanical Engineering Potsdam, N.Y. 13676

Dr. J.A. Stricklin Texas A&M University Aerospace Engineering Dept. College Station, Texas 77843

Dr. L.A. Schmit University of California, LA School of Engineering & Applied Science Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. H.A. Kamel The University of Arizona Aerospace & Mech. Engineering Dept. Tucson, Arizona 85721

Dr. B.S. Berger University of Maryland Dept. of Mechanical Engineering College Park, Maryland 20742

Prof. G. R. Irwin Dept. of Mechanical Engrg. University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742 Dr. S.J. Fenves Carnegie-Mellon University Dept. of Civil Engineering Schenley Park Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Ronald L. Huston Dept. of Engineering Analysis Mail Box 112 University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Prof. George Sih Dept. of Mechanics Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015

Prof. A.S. Kobayashi University of Washington Dept. of Mechanical Engineering Seattle, Washington 98105

Librarian Webb Institute of Naval Architecture Crescent Beach Road, Glen Cove Long Island, New York 11542

Prof. Daniel Frederick Virginia Polytechnic Institute Dept. of Engineering Mechanics Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Prof. A.C. Eringen Dept. of Aerospace & Mech. Sciences Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Dr. S.L. Koh School of Aero., Astro.& Engr. Sc. Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Prof. E.H. Lee Div. of Engrg. Mechanics Stanford University Stanford, California 94305

Prof. R.D. Mindlin Dept. of Civil Engrg. Columbia University S.W. Mudd Building New York, N.Y. 10027 Prof. S.B. Dong University of California Dept. of Mechanics Los Angeles, California 90024 Prof. Burt Paul University of Pennsylvania Towne School of Civil & Mech. Engrg. Rm. 113 - Towne Building 220 S. 33rd Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104 Prof. H.W. Liu Dept. of Chemical Engr. & Metal. Syracuse University Syracuse, N.Y. 13210

Prof. S. Bodner Technion R&D Foundation Haifa, Israel

Prof. R.J.H. Bollard Chairman, Aeronautical Engr. Dept. 207 Guggenheim Hall University of Washington Seattle, Washington 98105

Prof. G.S. Heller Division of Engineering Brown University Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Prof. Werner Goldsmith Dept. of Mechanical Engineering Div. of Applied Mechanics University of California Berkeley, California 94720

Prof. J.R.Rice Division of Engineering Brown University Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Prof. R.S. Rivlin Center for the Application of Mathematics Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015

Library (Code 0384) U.S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 9**39**40

Dr. Francis Cozzarelli Div. of Interdisciplinary Studies & Research School of Engineering State University of New York Buffalo, N.Y. 14214

Industry and Research Institutes

Library Services Department Report Section Bldg. 14-14 Argonne National Laboratory 9700 S. Cass Avenue Argonne, Illinois 60440

Dr. M. C. Junger Cambridge Acoustical Associates 129 Mount Auburn St. Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Dr. L.H. Chen General Dynamics Corporation Electric Boat Division Groton, Connecticut 06340

Dr. J.E. Greenspon J.G. Engineering Research Associates 3831 Menlo Drive Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Dr. S. Batdorf The Aerospace Corp. P.O. Box 92957 Los Angeles, California 90009

Dr. K.C. Park Lockheed Palo Alto Research Laboratory Dept. 5233, Bldg. 205 3251 Hanover Street Palo Alto, CA 94304

Library Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Company Newport News, Virginia 23607

Dr. W.F. Bozich McDonnell Douglas Corporation 5301 Bolsa Ave. Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Dr. H.N. Abramson Southwest Research Institute Technical Vice President Mechanical Sciences P.O. Drawer 28510 San Antonio, Texas 78284 Dr. R.C. DeHart Southwest Research Institute Dept. of Structural Research P.O. Drawer 28510 San Antonio, Texas 78284

Dr. M.L. Baron Weidlinger Associates, Consulting Engineers 110 East 59th Street New York, N.Y. 10022

Dr. W.A. von Riesemann Sandia Laboratories Sandia Base Albuquerque, Ney Mexico 87115

Dr. T.L. Geers Lockheed Missiles & Space Co. Palo Alto Research Laboratory 3251 Hanover Street Palo Alto, California 94304

Dr. J.L. Tocher Boeing Computer Services, Inc. P.O. Box 24346 Seattle, Washington 98124

Mr. Willian Caywood Code BBE, Applied Physics Laboratory 8621 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20034

Mr. P.C. Durup Lockheed-California Company Aeromechanics Dept., 74-43 Burbank, California 91503

Assistant Chief for Technology ONR - Code 200 Arlington, Virginia 22217