

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. DO NOT return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22161.

The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Many position, unless so designated by other authorized doughtures.

The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute indersement of any connercial product.

DESTRUCTION NOTICE

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. DO NOT return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22161.

The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.

REPORT	DOCUMENTATIO	ON PAGE			form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
18 REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION		16 RESTRICTIVE	MARKINGS	J	
28. SECURE Y CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	·	3 DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY OF	REPORT	
26 DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHED	DULE	unlimited.	r public rel •	ease, di	stribution
A PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUM	BER(S)	S. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION R	PORT NUMB	ER(S)
BRL-MR-3662					
S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory	66 OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) SLCBR-LF-R	7a. NAME OF MO		VIZATION	
ic. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		7b. ADDRESS (Cit	y, State, and ZIP (ode)	
herdeen Proving Ground, Maryla	and 21005-5066				
I. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMEN	T INSTRUMENT IDI	NTIFICATION	NUMBER
Ic. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF F	UNDING NUMBER	s	
		ELEMENT NO	NO.	NO.	ACCESSION I
		61102A	1L161102AH4	<u> </u>	001 /
3a. TYPE OF REPORT 13b TIME Memorandum Report FROM_ 6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION	COVERED TO	14. DATE OF REPO	RT (Year, Month,	Day) 15. Pi	AGE COUNT
	18 SUBJECT TERMS	(Continue on revers	e <i>if necessary and</i> Se Cavity	lidentify by	block number)
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	iransonic Flo	W 585			^
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	Inplicit Recipculation	w pas Na Pa	vier-Stokes	D	rag Lomponer
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP 01 191 20 04 19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessa	Iransonic Flo Implicit Recirculation iny and identify by block	Na Na Ba	vier-Stokes se Flow	DA	rag lompone <u>xisymmetric</u>
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP 01 01 20 04 9 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necesse Test firings of a 155mm ar ffected by small changes in th nese changes affect the flight or the two base cavity configu- erformed at 0.8 \leq Mach \leq 1.5 u omponents have been computed a ifferences in qualitative feat redicts small differences in o	Iransonic Flo Implicit Recirculation by and identify by block rtillery projects the base cavity co t behavior does n urations flight t using a Navier-St and the total dra tures of the reci drag between the	w Bas Na Bay number) not exist. A tested. Flow tokes base flow tokes base flow tokes base flow tokes base flow tokes base flow tokes base flow	n that its f se Flow A clear u computation field comput ow code. Th Computed ow in the ba configuratic	D A Iight pe Inderstan al study ations h e aerody results se regio ns.	rag Componen <u>xisymmetric</u> ding of why has been ma ave been namic drag show n. The code
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP 01 01 01 20 04 19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessa Test firings of a 155mm ar ffected by small changes in th hese changes affect the flight or the two base cavity configu erformed at 0.8 ≤ Mach ≤ 1.5 u omponents have been computed a ifferences in qualitative feat redicts small differences in c 20 0ISTRIBUTION (AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT)	Iransonic Flo Implicit Recirculation by and identify by block rtillery projects he base cavity co t behavior does r urations flight t using a Navier-St and the total dra tures of the reci drag between the	Na Ba Ba number) (1e have show) (onfigurations (ot exist. A tested. Flow) (okes base cavity flow)	n that its f . A clear u computation field comput ow code. Th . Computed ow in the ba configuratio	D A Iight pe nderstan al study ations h e aerody results se regio ns.	rag Componer <u>xisymmetric</u> formance is ding of why has been ma ave been namic drag show n. The code
IV. COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP 01 01 01 20 04 19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessa Test firings of a 155mm ar ffected by small changes in th hese changes affect the flight or the two base cavity configure enformed at 0.8 ≤ Mach ≤ 1.5 u omponents have been computed at ifferences in qualitative feat redicts small differences in col 20 DISTRIBUTION (AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACE DUNCT COLLEGATION (AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACE Question of RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Jubarai	Iransonic Flo Implicit Recirculation by and identify by block rtillery projects the base cavity co t behavior does r urations flight t using a Navier-St and the total dra tures of the reci drag between the	Na Ba Ba number) (1e have show onfigurations not exist. A tested. Flow tokes base flow tokes b	n that its f n that its f A clear u computation field comput ow code. Th Computed ow in the ba configuration FIED (Include Area Code 78-3707	D A Dight pe Inderstan al study ations h e aerody results se regio ins. ATION	rag Compone <u>xisymmetric</u> rformance i ding of why has been namic drag show n. The cod n. The cod

nine and a second and a second and a second a s

UNCLASSIFIED

Treesed Treesed

- TALES - REALES-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pa	ige
	LIST OF FIGURES	v
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
11.	GOVERNING EQUATIONS AND SOLUTION TECHNIQUE	1
	1. GOVERNING EQUATIONS	1
	2. SOLUTION TECHNIQUE	2
III.	MODEL GEOMETRY AND COMPUTATIONAL GRID	3
IV.	RESULTS	4
У.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	5
	REFERENCES	23
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	25
	DISTRIBUTION LIST	27



	L	1	S 1	i 0	F	F	I	G	U	R	E	S	
--	---	---	------------	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Figure	<u>.</u>	ige
1	Actual XM825 projectile	6
2	Computational model	7
3	Base cavity configurations	8
4	Computational grid expanded near the model	9
5a	Base region grid for the standard base	10
5b	Base region grid for the dome base	11
б	Mach number contours, $M_{\infty} = 0.98$, $\alpha = 0$, (dome base)	12
7	Mach number contours, $M_{\infty} = 1.1$, $\alpha = 0$, (dome base)	13
Я	Particle traces over the projectile, M_{∞} = 1.1, α = 0, (dome base)	14
9a	Particle traces in the base region, $M_{\infty} = 1.1$, $\alpha = 0$, (standard base)	15
9b	Particle traces in the base region, $M_{\infty} = 1.1$, $\alpha = 0$, (dome base)	16
10	Convergence history of drag, M_{∞} = 1.1, α = 0, (standard base)	17
11	Convergence history of drag, $M_{\infty} = 0.8$, $\alpha = 0$, (standard hase)	13
12	Variation of pressure drag with Mach number, $\alpha = 0$	19
13	Variation of viscous drag with Mach number, $\alpha = 0$	20
14	Variation of base drag with Mach number, $\alpha = 0$	21
15	Variation of total drag with Mach number, $\alpha = 0$	22

.

.

1. INTRODUCTION

The ability to compute the base region flow field for projectile configurations using Navier-Stokes computational techniques has been developed over the past few years. This capability is most important for determining aerodynamic coefficient data and in particular the total aerodynamic drag. The total drag as described in this paper consists of the pressure drag (excluding the base), viscous drag and base drag components. At transonic and low supersonic speeds the base drag component is the major contributor to the total aerodynamic drag.

The majority of base flow calculations to date have modeled the base region as a flat solid surface. Many of the actual configurations have some form of base cavity. General opinion has been that the inclusion of a base cavity or modifications to the interior cavity of a projectile base would have little or no effect on the overall flight performance parameters.

The M325 projectile under certain conditions is expected to be aeroballistically similar to its parent configuration the M483A1. The M325 has an aluminum/steel base which is configured as a flat cavity (standard). A recent product improvement program, undertaken to reduce the production costs and improve shell integrity, resulted in the design of a new base configuration made from steel and containing a dome cavity. A series of aeroballistic tests¹ were conducted in the Transonic Range Facility of the US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory (BRL), to determine any difference in the aeroballistics which may occur between the standard and dome base configurations. As a result of these tests, differences in aerodynamic performance were found to exist between the two rounds. The most significant changes in the aerodynamic data were in the lift and static moment coefficients. The drag was found to be reduced by a few percent with the dome configuration having the lower drag.

A computational study was undertaken to determine the ability of the present Navier-Stokes codes to predict these differences and to further understand the fluid dynamic behavior which can account for such small changes. The use of Navier-Stokes codes can provide a detailed description of the flow field associated with the M825 configuration as well as the integrated aerodynamic coefficients. The work reported here has been accomplished using an axisymmetric base flow code. Numerical computations have been completed for a Mach number range of $0.8 \le M \le 1.5$. The computed aerodynamic drag show the same effect as the experimental data, that is, a small reduction in the total aerodynamic drag. Qualitative features of the computed flow field are presented in the form of mach contours and particle traces.

II. GOVERNING EQUATIONS AND SOLUTION TECHNIQUE

1. GOVERNING EQUATIONS

The complete set of time-dependent thin-layer Navier-Stokes equations is solved numerically to obtain a solution to this problem. The numerical technique used is an implicit finite difference scheme. Although time-dependent calculations are made, the transient flow is not of primary interest at the present time. The steady flow, which is the desired result, is obtained in a time asymptotic fashion. The time-dependent, thin-layer, Navier-Stokes equations written in strong conservation law form for the axisymmetric formulation² are:

$$\frac{\delta q}{\delta 1} + \frac{\delta E}{\delta z} + \frac{\delta G}{\delta z} + \hat{H} = \frac{1}{Re} \frac{\delta S}{\delta z} .$$
(1)

The general coordinate transformations are defined as:

$\xi = \xi(x,y,z,t)$	is the longitudinal coordinate
n = n(x,y,z,t)	is the circumferential coordinate
$\zeta = \zeta(x,y,z,t)$	is the near normal coordinate
τ = t	is the time.

The vector q contains the dependent variables $[\rho, \rho u, \rho v, \rho w, e]$ and the flux vectors \hat{E} , \hat{G} contain terms which arise from the conservation of mass, momentum and energy in the three coordinate directions. The source vector \hat{H} , in Equation (1), contains terms which result from an analytic determination of the circumferential flux vector, given the assumption of axisymmetric flow and

constant angular velocity.² The viscous terms are contained in the vector S which is seen to have variation in the ζ direction only. This is representative of the thin-layer approximation.

2. SOLUTION TECHNIQUE

Equation (1) is solved using the Beam and Warming³ implicit approximately factored finite difference scheme which uses central differencing in both ξ and ζ directions. Code improvements have been made to include a variable time step, numerical smoothing based on local solution gradients and code vectorization.⁴ The Beam-Warming implicit algorithm has been used in various applications³⁻⁶ for the equations in general curvilinear coordinates. The algorithm is first-order accurate in time and second- or fourth-order accurate in space. The equations are factored (spatially split), which reduces the solution process to one-dimensional problems at a given time level. Central difference operators are employed and the algorithm produces block tridiagonal systems for each space coordinate. The main computational work is contained in the solution of these block tridiagonal systems of equations.

To suppress high frequency components that appear in regions containing severe pressure gradients e.g., shocks or stagnation points, artificial dissipation terms are added. In the present application, a switching dissipation model is used which is a blend of second- and fourth-order dissipation terms. This model uses a fourth-order dissipation in smooth regions and switches to a second-order dissipation in regions containing high pressure or density gradients. Incorporation of this dissipation model has resulted in an improvement in the quality of the results and has made the code more robust. The developed axisymmetric code uses a unique flow field segmentation procedure to compute the full flow field over a projectile or a missile including the base region. This procedure preserves the sharp corner at the base. The details of this development can be found in Reference 6. For the computation of turbulent flows, the two-layer algebraic Baldwin-Lomax turbulence model⁷ is used over the body. A second algebraic turbulence model which is based on a simple exchange-coefficient concept is used in the base region.⁸

III. MODEL GEOMETRY AND COMPUTATIONAL GRID

The external configuration of the M325, excluding the base, is similar to the M483Al shown in Figure 1. The features of this projectile which have not been modeled exactly are the meplat on the fuze and the rotating band near the base. The rotating band was eliminated and the meplat was modeled as a hemisphere cap. The computational model is shown in Figure 2 and consists of a 2.84 caliber nose, a 2.7 caliber cylindrical section, and a 0.26 caliber 8° boattail. The ogive contours were matched as well as the undercut on the cylindrical section.

The current problem of interest is the effect of the different base geometries on the overall projectile aerodynamics. Figure 3a and 3b show the standard and dome base configurations respectively. The standard base is a combination of aluminum and steel and contains a base cavity which is characterized as a flat surface. The PIP configuration is an all steel base and is characterized as a domed surface. The cavity volume is also significantly larger for the dome configuration.

The solution technique requires the discretization of the entire flow region of interest into a suitable computational grid. The grid outer boundary has been placed at 2.5 body lengths upstream and surrounding the projectile. The downstream boundary was placed at 2 body lengths. Since the calculations are in the subsonic/transonic regime the computational boundaries must extend out beyond the influence of the body. This ensures that the boundary conditions specified in the flow code are satisfied.

Figure 4 shows a grid generated for the standard configuration. The grid consists of 225 points in the streamwise direction and 50 points in the normal direction. This is broken down into two sections: a body region and a base region. The surface points for each region are selected using an interactive design program. Each grid section is then computed separately using a hyperbolic grid generation program.⁹ There are 165 points along the projectile surface, including 60 points along the afterbody. The normal distribution of points in base region consists of 50 points along the base cavity. Longitudinally, the base region is matched point for point with the 60 surface points on the afterbody. An expanded view of the base grid is shown in Figure 5a. The generally flat sections on the standard base enabled a grid to be routine-However, due to the extreme concavity the grid for the dome ly generated. base (Figure 5b) required an increase in the smoothing values used by the hyperbolic grid generator, as well as the addition of a grid averaging techniaue.

IV. RESULTS

Numerical computations have been made for both the standard and the dome hase configurations for the range of Mach numbers from M = 0.80 to 1.5 and at zero angle of attack. Solutions were marched in time until the steady state results were achieved. Atmospheric flight conditions were used.

A few qualitative results are presented next. Figures 6 and 7 show the Mach number contours for the dome base configuration for M = 0.98 and 1.1, respectively. Figure 6 shows the flow expansion at the ogive corner, a shock-wave on the cylinder, and an expansion at the boattail corner. In addition, a shock system exists downstream of the base corner. As the Mach number is increased to 1.1, the flow pattern has changed. For this Mach number, Figure 7 shows a bow shock system in front of the nose of the projectile as well as the expansions at the ogive and boattail corners. The expansion at the base corner is much more pronounced and is followed by the recompression shock downstream of the base.

Figure 8 shows that the particle traces at Mach number, M = 1.1 and α = 0. It shows the flow expanding at ogive and boattail corners. In addition, the recirculatory flow in the base region is evident. The recirculation region extends to about one caliber downstream of the base corner. Expanded views of the particle trace plot in the base region are shown in Figures 9a and 9h, respectively, for the standard and dome base configurations. As shown in Figure 9a for the standard base, the back flow, upon reaching the cavity follows the contour of the cavity and leaves the cavity pushing the flow This, in turn, creates the secondary bubles seen near the base upwards. The shear layer leaving the base corner is displaced upwards weakencorner. ing the expansion at the base. It clearly shows the primary bubble and the secondary bubbles. Figure 9b shows the particle traces for the dome configuration. The flow again follows the contour of the cavity and upon leaving the dome cavity, is almost parallel to the streamwise direction. This flow, thus, has less effect on the free shear layer and doesn't weaken the expansion at the base corner as much compared to the standard base. The net effect is that the size of the primary bubble for the dome base is slightly smaller than that for the standard base. The reattachment point is therefore closer to the base and should result in lower base pressure or higher base drag.

Since the entire flowfield over the projectile including the base region is computed, all three drag components can be determined and thus, the total aerodynamic drag can be obtained. As stated earlier, solutions were marched One of the ways to in time until the steady state results were obtained. check for convergence is to look at the time history of the aerodynamic drag. Shown in Figure 10 is the time history for all the drag components as well as the total drag at M = 1.1 for the standard base. As seen here, the solution has converged in 2000 time iterations. The viscous drag and pressure drag components have converged in less than 500 iterations. However, as expected, it takes a lot longer for the base region flow to converge. The base flow is oscillating in the transient stage but the final converged result indicate that the flow is steady. This result is typical of the high transonic Mach number (M > 1.1) runs for both base configurations. At low transonic Mach numbers (M < 1.1), some unsteadiness in the flowfield has been observed. A typical plot for such a case is shown in Figure 11 for Mach = 0.8. As seen in this figure, the base drag as well as the pressure drag both indicate a

*periodic unsteady flow behavior. The drag values for these cases have been taken as the averages of the amplitude extremes.

Figure 12 shows the pressure drag as a function of Mach number. The pressure drag rise in the transonic speed regime is clearly predicted. The difference in pressure drag between the two projectiles (standard base and dome base) is very small at high transonic Mach numbers and gets larger (~ 15%) at the low transonic Mach numbers (M \approx 0.9). The viscous drag component is shown in Figure 13. This component of the total drag is rather small and the difference in viscous drag due to the base configurations is negligible. The difference in the shapes of the cavities is expected to impact the base drag which is shown in Figure 14. The difference in base drag between the standard base and the dome base is larger at the high transonic Mach numbers $(1.1 \le M \le$ 1.5) as well as at low transonic speeds (M < 0.94). The difference is very small near M \simeq 0.97. In addition, the base drag is higher for the dome base than the standard hase at high transonic Mach numbers (0.97 < M < 1.5) while the reverse is true at low transonic Mach numbers (M < 0.97). The expected rise in base drag at transonic speeds is clearly predicted. Comparison of the total aerodynamic drag is shown in Figure 15. As shown in this figure, the difference in drag is very small near M \simeq 0.97 and is somewhat larger at high transonic speeds (1.1 < M < 1.5) as well as at low transonic speeds (M < This plot also shows the range data for both base configurations. The 0.92).overall comparison of the computed drag data with the range data is fair. As seen in the range data, the dome base has higher drag especially at higher transonic Mach numbers and this trend is seen in the computed results also.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Numerical computations have been made for a projectile with two base cavity configurations at transonic speeds. Computed results show differences in the qualitative features of the base region flowfield between the two base cavities. The drag components and the total drag have been computed. Changes in the base cavity configuration have been found to affect the aerodynamic drag. Differences in drag of between 0 to 15% have been predicted. The dome hase configuration produces a higher drag especially at higher transonic speeds (1.1 $\leq M \leq$ 1.5) and qualitatively agrees with the trend of the experimental range data. At lower transonic speeds (M \leq 0.97), the reverse is true.





Figure 1. Actual XM825 projectile.



■ いいいいいい



a a she a A she a sh





.

Figure 3. Base cavity configurations.



Figure 4. Computational grid expanded near the model.







Figure 5b. Base region grid for the dome base.



ちちちゃくろう しつがんかい インドレ わたたたため アンクロング かいたい コンドイ





Δ



والتحصيب بجراهم فالمجرعة كالشاصب المراجعين ويتكون وفراغتميهم خرائدا ويوكار الوكرا المجرعون	
	والمتحدين المتركب المتركب والمتحدين والمتحد
4	
—	
	6 m 102
	6

Y

2

and the second second second

Service Se

Contraction of the second s





 $\nabla \gamma_{i}$

11112

SAN SNASAS AND AND AND AND

Figure 9a. Particle tracts in the base region, M_{∞} = 1.1, α = 0, (standard base).

 ᡆᠬᡊᡔᡄᡘᡊᡝ᠕ᡐᠺᡔ᠕᠋ᠯᡊᡀᢙᡊᡊᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬᡊᡬ᠕ᢣᡘ᠕ᢣᡘ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡔᡬᡬᡬᡬ᠕ᡔᡬ᠕ᡔ᠕ᡔᡬ᠕ᡔᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ



SAMAN (GSSSS TAXOR ADDAR PARAN RECENT STATE



Makanahahahahahahahahahahahahahahah















いいこういい

22222223230 2022222222

RANG BASADAR BARARAS LAND

20

プロボル ビス・ドレンシス ディー・パー ひん じんいくいい 日本 いい



;

オイスイイ オート・キャストスト・ショー 東京 アイイ インドレー かんたいたい たいない たいない たいたい

1000

200000000000

SECONDER PROPERTY





Render - Doctordon - Viktoric - 1997 COM BOOKCER - WYYYYYYY DY BOOK - GOED AL - BUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUUU

REFERENCES

- 1. D'Amico, W.P., "Transonic Range Testing of the 155mm M825 Projectile with Standard and Dome Steel Bases," US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, report to be published.
- Nietubicz, C.J., Pulliam, T.H., and Steger, J.L., "Numerical Solution of the Azimuthal-Invariant Navier-Stokes Equations," ARBRL-TR-02227, US Army Rallistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, March 1980. (AD A085716) (Also see <u>AIAA Journal</u>, Vol. 18, No. 12, December 1980, pp. 1411-1412)
- 3. Beam, R. and Warming, R.F., "An Implicit Factored Scheme for the Compressible Navier-Stokes Equations," AIAA Paper No. 77-645, June 1977.
- 4. Sahu, J. and Nietubicz, C.J., "Improved Numerical Prediction of Transonic Flow," Proceedings of the 4th Army Conference on Applied Mathematics and Computing, Cornell University, May 1986.
- Pulliam, T.H. and Steger, J.L., "On Implicit Finite-Difference Simulations of Three-Dimensional Flow," <u>AIAA Journal</u>, Vol. 18, No. 2, February 1980, pp. 159-167.
- 6. Sahu, J., Nietuhicz, C.J., and Steger, J.L., "Navier-Stokes Computations of Projectiles Base Flow with and without Base Injection," ARBRL-TR-02532, US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Amerdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, November 1983. (AD A135738) (Also see <u>AIAA Journal</u>, Vol. 23, No. 9, September 1985, pp. 1348-1355)
- 7. Baldwin, B.S. and Lomax, H., "Thin-Layer Approximation and Algebraic Model for Separated Turbulent Flows," AIAA Paper No. 78-257, 1978.
- Chow, W.L., "Improvement on Numerical Computations of the Thin-Layer Navier-Stokes Equation with Emphasis on the Turbulent Base Pressure of a Projectile in Transonic Flight Condition," Contract Report No. DAAG29-81-D-0100, U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, November 1985.
- Nietubicz, C.J., Heavey, K.R., and Steger, J.L., "Grid Generation Techniques for Projectile Configurations," Proceedings of the 1982 Army Numerical Analysis and Computers Conference, ARO Report 82-3, February 1982.

ANN AZZEZER <u>ALARER RELEVEN BERERER RENERER</u>

ススステレイ とうかいしん たんたい 日本 たんかん かいたい かんかい かいかい

LIST OF SYMBOLS

6	=	speed of sound
D	=	body diameter
e	=	total energy per unit volume/p _m a ² m
Ê, Ĝ,	Ŧ	flux vector of transformed Navier-Stokes equations
h	Ŧ	time step
Ĥ	=	n-invariant source vector
J	Ŧ	Jacobian of transformation
۲	=	Mach number
р	=	pressure/pa2
Ŷ	-	dependent variables
Re	=	Reynolds number, e _w a _w D/µ _w
ŝ	=	viscous flux vector
t	=	physical time
U, V, W	=	Cartesian velocity components/a _∞
х, у, z	=	physical Cartesian coordinates
Greek Sym	1001	
۵	=	angle of attack
U	=	coefficient of viscosity/ μ_{∞}
ξ, η, ζ	=	transformed coordinates in axial, circumferential and radial

and street brocked brocked

ρ = density/ρ_∞

directions

DISTRIBUTION LIST

No. of Copies	Organization	No. of Copies	Organization
12	Administrator Defense Technical Info Center ATTN: DTIC-FDAC Cameron Station, Bldg 5 Alexandria, VA 22304-6145	1	Director US Army Aviation Research and Technology Activity Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035-1099
1	HQDA DAMA-ART-M Washington, DC 20310	10	C.I.A OIR/DB/Standard GE47 HQ Washington, DC 20505
1	Commander US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDRA-ST 5001 Eisennower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-0001	1	Commander US Army Communications - Electronics Command ATTN: AMSEL-ED Fort Monmowth, NJ 07703-5301
3	Commander US Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-MSI SMCAR-LCA-F/Klein Hudgins	1	Commander CECOM R&D Technical Library ATTN: AMSEL-IM-L (Reports Section) B.2700 Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5000
1	Dover, NJ 07801-5001 Commander US Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-TDC Dover, NJ 07801-5001	1	Commander US Army Missile Command Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: AMSMI-RD Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5230 Director
1	Commander US AMCCOM ARDEC CCAC Benet Weapons Laboratory ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL Wateryliet NY 12189-4050	1	US Army Missile and Space Intelligence Center ATTN: AIAMS-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5500
1	Commander US Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: AMSMC-IMP-L	1	US Army Tank Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL Warren, MI 48397-5000 Director
1	Rock Island, IL 61299-7300 Commander US Army Aviation Systems Comman ATTN: AMSAV-ES 4300 Goodfellow Blvd. St. Louis, MO 63120-1798	d	US Army TRADOC Aralysis Center ATTN: ATOR-TSL White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502

27

1XXX55110 ALL CALL REPORTED LANGER REAL REPORT DEVELOCT NUMBER DISTORT NUMERAL

No. of Copies Organization 2 Commander US Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Dr. T. Clare, Code DK20 Dr. F. Moore Dahlgren, VA 22448-5000 Commandant 1 US Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD-CS-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905-5400 Commander 1 US Army Development and Employment Agency ATTN: MODE-ORO Fort Lewis, WA 98433-5000 3 Director NASA Ames Research Center ATTN: MS-202-1/Pulliam MS-258-1/Steger Schiff Moffett Field, CA 94035 AFWL/SUL 1 Kirtland AFB, NM 87117 Air Force Armament Laboratory ATTN: AFATL/DLODL (Tech Info Center) Ealin AFB, FL 32542-5000

- 2 Sandia National Laboratories ATTN: Dr. W.L. Oberkampf Dr. F. Blottner Division 1636 Albuquergue, NM 87185
- 1 AEDC Calspan Field Services ATTN: MS 600 (Dr. John Benek) AAFS, TN 37389
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University ATTN: Dr. Clark H. Lewis Department of Aerospace & Ocean Engineering Blacksburg, VA 24061

No. of

CopiesOrganization1University of California,
DavisDepartment of Mechanical
EngineeringATTN:Prof. H.A. Dwyer
Davis, CA 95616

FULL STATES

ESSERT AND FRANKLESSELER AND LEVERAL MANY TO LEVERAL MANAGER LEVERAL LEVERAL DOD

- Pennsylvania State University Department of Aerospace Engineering ATTN: Dr. G. S. Dulikravich University Park, PA 16802
- 1 University of Florida Dept. of Engineering Sciences College of Engineering ATTN: Prof. C. C. Hsu Gainesville, FL 32611
- University of Maryland Department of Aerospace Engineering ATTN: Dr. J.D. Anderson, Jr. College Park, MD 20742
- 1 University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign Department of Mechanical & Industrial Engineering ATTN: Prof. W. L. Chow Urbana, IL 61801
- University of Notre Dame Department of Aeronautical & Mechanical Engineering ATTN: Prof. T.J. Mueller Notre Dame, IN 46556
- 1 University of Texas Department of Aerospace Engineering & Engineering Mechanics ATTN: Dr. D.S. Dolling Austin, Texas 78712-1055

DISTRIBUTION LIST

No. of Copies

; : ; ;

いとくくち

ę

Organization

10100

90

777

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen

Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: AMSTE-SI-F

Cdr, CRDC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MJ SMCCR-SPS-IL

This Laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers to the items/questions below will aid us in our efforts.

1. BRL Report Number _____ Date of Report

<mark>መንገራን እንዲህአን እን</mark>

2. Date Report Received

3. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.)______

4. How specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.)_____

5. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate.

6. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.)

Name

Address

CURRENT ADDRESS

どううと

アンドレンシンション

Organization

City, State, Zip

7. If indicating a Change of Address or Address Correction, please provide the New or Correct Address in Block 6 above and the Old or Incorrect address below.

Name

OLD ADDRESS

Organization

Address

City, State, Zip

(Remove this sheet, fold as indicated, staple or tape closed, and mail.)

and a second and a second and a second and a second a s