



# Active Wing Shaping Control Concept Using Composite Lattice-based Cellular Materials

**ARC:** Sean Swei (PI), Kenny Cheung (Co-I), Nick Cramer (UCSC),  
Nhan Nguyen, Benjamin Jenett (MIT), Daniel Cellucci (Cornell)  
Robert Nakamura

**LaRC:** Mike Fremaux, Mark Croom, Mia Siochi, Wes Oneal, Clinton Duncan,  
Lee Pollard, Earl Harris, Sue Grafton, Gary Wainwright

**MIT/CBA:** Prof. Neil Gershenfeld, Sam Calisch, Dick Perdichizzi



NASA Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate (ARMD)

2015 LEARN/Seedling Technical Seminar

January 13–15, 2015

# Project Objectives

- ◆ Develop a novel aerostructure concept by combining the advanced composite lattice-based cellular materials/ components and the multi-objective optimal flight control systems to realize mission adaptive and aerodynamically efficient air vehicles
- ◆ The goal is to utilize the “*building block*” strategy for lattice-based components to enable high “stiffness-to-density” ratios; large Young’s modulus for an ultra-light material, and provide great adaptability for varying flight scenarios





kenny@nasa.gov

*Aircraft industries are beginning to explore the potential use of digital composite materials and manufacturing in aircraft construction to reduce weight and construction/assembly costs.*

# Innovation of Research



- ◆ Aim to take advantage of an emerging manufacturing method based on micro-lattice structures to build a topologically optimized aerostructure with digital composite materials that enables *variable stiffness* control surfaces
- ◆ The developed platform will be used to assess the aerodynamic and aeroelastic benefits of morphing wing configurations compared to conventional airframe designs
- ◆ The aerostructure needs to be sufficiently robust to be evaluated in wing tunnel tests to determine the stability of such a reconfigurable structure to maintain the necessary shapes for optimal performance across flight envelop



sam.calisch@cba.mit.edu 2014

# Technical Approach



## ◆ Development of lattice-based digital composite wing structures



- Design and fabrication process
- Bench-testing
- Preliminary wind tunnel tests at MIT

## ◆ Modeling and control of lattice structures

- Physical finite element; lumped mass
- Discrete-time transfer matrix method
- Optimal decentralized controls

## ◆ Wind tunnel testing of digital wings

- 12-FT low speed tunnel at LaRC
- Assess aerodynamic characteristics
- Control authority via wing shaping





# Development of Lattice-based Digital composite Wing Structures

## Team Members

Benjamin Jenett (MIT)

Daniel Cellucci (Cornell)

Nick Cramer (UCSC)

Sam Calisch (CBA, MIT)



Dick Perdichizzi (A&AE, MIT)

Neil Gershenfeld (CBA, MIT)

Robert Nakamura (ARC)




**Kenny Cheung (ARC)**

# Morphing Wings, Lattice Wings



$$\frac{\rho}{\rho_s} = \frac{\rho_c}{\rho_s} (\text{connection contribution}) + \frac{\rho_l}{\rho_s} (\text{ligament contribution})$$

$$\frac{\rho}{\rho_s} = C_c \frac{r_c^2}{F} + C_l \frac{r_l^2}{F} \propto \frac{r^2}{F}$$





# Morphing Lattice Wings

$$E/E_s \propto t^2/l^2 + t^4/l^3 \propto (\rho/\rho_s) + (t^2/l)(\rho/\rho_s) \propto (\rho/\rho_s) + (\rho/\rho_s)^n \propto (\rho/\rho_s)^n$$

1900 1950 2000

Wright Flyer I

DARPA/AFRL/NASA Smart Wing

KU Adaptive Honeycomb

Bristol Chiral Core Airfoil

Parker Variable Camber Wing

NASA Morphing UAV

NASA Hyper Elliptic Cambered Span

NASA AFRL ACTE

**Continuously  
Deformable  
Aerostructures**

1900 1950 2000

Wright Flyer I

DARPA/AFRL/NASA Smart Wing

KU Adaptive Honeycomb

Bristol Chiral Core Airfoil

Parker Variable Camber Wing

NASA Morphing UAV

NASA Hyper Elliptic Cambered Span

**Truss Aerostructures**

**Cellular Solids**

$\rho = 5.4\%$

$\rho = 8.3\%$





2 cm

2 cm




$(\rho/\rho_s)^1 < (\rho/\rho_s)^n < (\rho/\rho_s)^{3/2}$

**Reversibly Assembled Cellular Composite Materials**  
Kenneth C. Cheung and Neil Gershenfeld  
*Science* **341**, 1219 (2013);  
DOI: 10.1126/science.1240889




$\delta = \delta_{axial} + \delta_{bending} \propto Fl/E_s t^2 + Fl^2/E_s I \propto Fl^2/E_s I$



# Performance, Flexibility



sam.calisch@cba.mit.edu 2014



**Reversibly Assembled Cellular Composite Materials**  
 Kenneth C. Cheung and Neil Gershenfeld  
*Science* **341**, 1219 (2013);  
 DOI: 10.1126/science.1240889








# NACA0012


- Patch sizing/geometry determination



# Physical Finite Elements




sam.calisch@cba.mit.edu, MS Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2014



# Natural Modes – Simulation



sam.calisch@cba.mit.edu 2014



# Manufacturing



Boeing 737

~2e6 parts, ~1e6 types, ~24 hour assembly

Boeing 787

Goal ~144 hour assembly

Vickers Wellington, 1935


24 hour production



(Boeing)

Magnesium metal produced from Harrington sea water magnesia was vital for wartime production of light alloys used in aircraft frames and for munitions

Wellington Bomber assembly



(Spirit Aerosystems)









Lego Plane Set # 773x

~200 bricks ~10 types ~100 different planes










FIGURE 2.1.1 The pyramid of tests (Reference 2.1.1(a)).

# Manufacturing











# Assembly



# Bench Testing



NASA Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate 2015 LEARN/Seedling Technical Seminar

morphing lattice wing prototyping and actuation testing NASA Team Seedling 2015

morphing lattice wing prototyping and actuation testing NASA Team Seedling 2015

# Bench Seat Testing




Composite Cellular Material  
Morphing Wing  
NARI Team Seedling

Skin Stiffness Testing


2014  
bej@mit.edu  
dwc238@cornell.edu  
kenny@nasa.gov









# MIT Wright Brothers 8-ft Tunnel



# MIT Wright Brothers 8-ft Tunnel



# MIT Wright Brothers 8-ft Tunnel




# LaRC 12-ft Tunnel



# LaRC 12-ft Tunnel



# LaRC 12-ft Tunnel



# Summary



- Demonstrated successfully the building-block based composite cellular structure concept
- Component level Physical Finite Elements was formulated, analyzed, and validated with test results
- Advanced fabrication and manufacturing process was tested and successfully implemented in producing robust lattice wing structures
- A series of rigorous bench tests and wind tunnel tests were conducted which proved the proposed concept

# LaRC 12-ft Test Team – Thanks!







# Modeling and Control of Lattice Structures

## Team Members

Nick Cramer (UCSC)

Sam Calisch (CBA, MIT)

Neil Gershenfeld (CBA, MIT)

Kenny Cheung (ARC)

**Sean Swei (ARC)**

# Modeling and Control of Lattice Structures



## ◆ Technical challenges


- Very high dimensions!
- Conventional FEM approach is difficult
- Prone to numerical errors

## ◆ Development of control-centric model

- Low dimension
- Easy to analyze and simulate
- Suit for control design

## ◆ Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)


- Suit for interconnected multi-flexible body systems
- Integrating numerical analysis technique with transfer matrix method
- Small matrix operation!



# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)




- ◆ Discrete-time lumped mass approximation for cellular structures
  - Easy migration to flight computer
  - Explicit control with maximum bandwidth



# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



- ◆ Equation of motion for a single element;  $n^{\text{th}}$ -element



$$m_n \ddot{x}_n(t_i) = \tau_n^R(t_i) - \tau_n^L(t_i) + \underbrace{f_n(t_i)}_{\text{Control input!}}$$

where

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tau_n^L(t_i) = k_n(t_i) [x_n^L(t_i) - x_{n-1}^R(t_i)] + c_n(t_i) [\dot{x}_n^L(t_i) - \dot{x}_{n-1}^R(t_i)] \\ \tau_n^L = \tau_{n-1}^R \\ x_n^R = x_n^L \end{array} \right.$$

# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



## ◆ General Discretization; $n^{\text{th}}$ -element

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{\mathbf{x}}_n(t_i) = \mathbf{A}_n(t_i)\mathbf{x}_n(t_i) + \mathbf{B}_n(t_i) \\ \dot{\mathbf{x}}_n(t_i) = \mathbf{D}_n(t_i)\mathbf{x}_n(t_i) + \mathbf{E}_n(t_i) \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\mathbf{m}_n(\mathbf{A}_n\mathbf{x}_n + \mathbf{B}_n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_n^R - \boldsymbol{\tau}_n^L + \mathbf{f}_n$$

and


$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^L = \mathbf{k}_n[\mathbf{x}_n^L - \mathbf{x}_{n-1}^R] + \mathbf{c}_n\left[(\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{x}_n + \mathbf{E}_n)^L - (\mathbf{D}_{n-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1} + \mathbf{E}_{n-1})^R\right]$$

Note: The quantities  $\mathbf{A}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{D}_n$ , and  $\mathbf{E}_n$  depend on the type of numerical integration scheme used in the analysis!

# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



- Matrix formulation: From LEFT to  $n^{\text{th}}$ -element



**Mass**

$$\begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_n^R = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ m_n A_n & 1 & m_n B_n - f_n \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_n^L$$



$$\mathbf{v}_n^R = \mathbf{P}_n \mathbf{v}_n^L$$

**Spring-Damper**

$$\begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_n^L = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{k_n + c_n D_{n-1}^R}{k_n + c_n D_n^L} & \frac{1}{k_n + c_n D_n^L} & \frac{-c_n (E_n^L - E_{n-1}^R)}{k_n + c_n D_n^L} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_{n-1}^R$$




$$\mathbf{v}_n^L = \mathbf{F}_n \mathbf{v}_{n-1}^R$$

# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



- Matrix formulation: From RIGHT to  $n^{\text{th}}$ -element



**Mass**

$$\begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_n^L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -m_n A_n & 1 & -m_n B_n + f_n \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_n^R \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_n^L = \mathbf{J}_n \mathbf{v}_n^R$$


**Spring-Damper**

$$\begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_n^R = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{k_n + c_n D_{n-1}^R}{k_n + c_n D_n^L} & \frac{1}{k_n + c_n D_n^L} & \frac{-c_n (E_n^L - E_{n+1}^R)}{k_n + c_n D_n^L} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x \\ \tau \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}_{n+1}^L \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_n^R = \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{v}_{n+1}^L$$

# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



- ◆ Propagation from **BOTH** sides to  $n^{\text{th}}$ -element



Left to right propagation:  $Q_n = \prod_{i=0}^n P_i F_i$

Right to left propagation:  $T_n = \prod_{i=m}^n H_i J_i$

Combination of  $Q$  and  $T$  :  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} v_n^L = F_n Q_n v_0^R \\ v_n^R = T_n v_m^R \\ m_n (A_n x_n + B_n) = \tau_n^R - \tau_n^L + f_n \end{array} \right.$

Full system description in terms of LOCAL degree of freedom;  $n^{\text{th}}$ -element



# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



- ◆ Third order Houbolt numerical integration method was chosen
- ◆ Decentralized control problem formulation:

$$\mathbf{x}_n(t_i) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n(t_{i-1}) + \mathbf{B}(\alpha + \mathbf{f}_n)^{**}$$

Linear discrete-time system!

where  $\alpha$  denotes the coupling between  $n$ th-element and its neighbors.

- ◆ A “weak” coupling can be ensured by making the time step size small; diagonal dominance!
- ◆ The control problem can be solved using standard LQR approach:





$$\min_{\mathbf{f}_n} \mathbf{J} = \sum_{k=0}^N \mathbf{x}_k^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_k + (\mathbf{f}_n)_k^T \mathbf{R} (\mathbf{f}_n)_k ; \mathbf{Q} > 0, \mathbf{R} > 0.$$

\*\* : Cramer et al. “Application of Transfer Matrix Approach to Modeling and Decentralized Control of Lattice-based Structures,” appeared in 2015 SciTech Conf.

# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)





## ◆ Example: 3-Mass System Control



# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)




## Example: 5-Mass System Control




# Discrete-time Transfer Matrix Method (DT-TMM)



## Example: 5-Mass System Control



Full-state continuous LQR




DT-TMM LQR

# Modeling and Control of Lattice Structures




## Example: 5-Mass System Control (Continuous-Time LQR)



# Modeling and Control of Lattice Structures



## Example: 5-Mass System Control (DT-TMM LQR)





# Summary

- ◆ Utilized lumped-mass approximation to model the lattice structures
- ◆ Through recursive application of discrete-time transfer matrix method, a localized reduced-order model was attained
- ◆ Houbolt numerical integration scheme was proposed, which allows for tuning the level of coupling from neighboring elements
- ◆ LQR-based decentralized controller was proposed, and it was used to effectively suppress vibrational behavior

# Wind Tunnel Testing of Digital Wings



## Team Members

### **LaRC**

Mike Fremaux  
**Mark Croom**  
Emilie (Mia) Siochi  
Wes Oneal  
Clinton Duncan  
Lee Pollard  
Earl Harris  
Sue Grafton  
Gary Wainwright

### **ARC**

Nick Cramer (UCSC)  
Benjamin Jenett (MIT)  
Daniel Cellucci (Cornell)  
Kenny Cheung  
Sean Swei





# Wind Tunnel Tests: Overview

- One rigid and two flexible models of the digital structural design were created to explore the viability of the concept
- Two wind-tunnel investigations (MIT and LaRC 12-Ft Low Speed Tunnel) demonstrated the suitability of the wing concept against a range of environments:
  - Flight-like distributed loads
  - Aerodynamic performance
  - Flight control effectiveness



# Wind Tunnel Tests: Key Findings

- Digital structure easily withstood aero loading across typical UAV flight envelope
  - dynamic pressures up to 7 psf (10 Pa)
  - speeds up to 77 fps (23 m/s)
  - thru post-stall angles of attack ( $>16^\circ$ )
  - moderate sideslip angles (generally only  $\pm 4^\circ$ , limited to  $16^\circ$ )
- Digital structure at neutral twist exhibited similar aero properties as rigid variant in performance and static stability and roll-damping
- Flex structure allows for improved control options to enhance efficiency as compared to conventional design
- Controls-active tests demonstrate viability of digital structure active twist response dynamics against realistic loads and states



# Models: Wing (+ Fuselage)




- Simplistic UAV platform component for this proof-of-concept study
- Flex and Rigid are geometrically identical
  - except for flap

Flexible twist  
Cont. variable

Rigid flaps  
Separate parts


-6° T.E. up to  
+10° T.E. down

0, ±10°, ±20°,  
±30° both sides



Dimensions in inches

# Rigid Model vs. Flex Model




# 12-Foot Low Speed Tunnel




## Specifications

- Type: Atmospheric, closed throat, annular return
- Test section: 8 sided, 12 feet wide, 15 feet long
- Operational: 1939 (as free-flight tunnel)
- Motor: 280 hp
- Velocity: 0 - 77 ft/s
- Static force and moment: -10 to 90 degrees alpha, +/- 90 degrees beta
- Surface pressures
- Arbitrary motion forced oscillation
- Free-to-roll
- Flow visualization (laser light sheet, tufts, smoke, sublimating chemicals)




# Models Installed in 12-Ft LST




# Comparisons – Longitudinal Aero

- Flexible shows similar levels of lift & drag as Rigid
- Both exhibit similar pitch static stability ( $C_{m_\alpha}$ ) levels
- *Flex has ability to modulate the forces while maintaining trim more so than Rigid*

## Flexible Model




## Rigid Model



# Comparisons – Pitch Control



- Using twist as a pitch controller on the Flex design shows potential for improved efficiencies
- Flex provides increased lift with reduced drag compared to the conventional flap in the pre-stall regime*
- Flex requires minimal balancing forces to maintain trim
  - Influenced by design approach






# Lateral-Directional Static Stability



## Flexible Model


- Effective dihedral angle is stable (negative  $C_{l\beta}$ ) as aoa increases
- Low levels of directional stability (wing only)
- Similar trends between Flex and Rigid (not shown)





# Comparisons – Lateral Control

- Twist is an effective static lateral (roll) controller
  - “weighted per area” effect is similar to differential flaps
- Post-stall: twist roll control degrades and brings on more pronounced coupling yawing moments
  - Twist can be further tailored to reduce yaw onset at post stall using non-zero average




# Comparisons: Roll Damping



- Flex and Rigid show nearly identical classic roll forced oscillation rate derivative levels


- Across aoa, freq, amp variations tested
- Controls fixed
- Wing component provides suitable levels of roll damping



# Damping Augmentation




- Wing twist commanded in response to the sensed model motion
  - Drive controls in-phase and out-of-phase, and quadrature wrt sensed bank angle
    - Stabilizing and destabilizing influences with rate and angular position
    - Classic roll damper (Rt = +p)
  - Experimentally demonstrate efficacy against uncertainties in the control flow
  - Lightweight wing structure is advantageous from a testing standpoint (dynamic tares)






# Dynamic Controls

- Analyses of force and moment time-histories collected at a set condition (fixed AoA,  $q_{bar}$ ) indicate twist oscillations hold potential for performance improvements




*Oscillation around certain twist can improve performance!*

# Wind Tunnel Tests: Animations



- Flutter suppression tests
  - High AoA
  - Stabilized via wing tip twist

- High frequency morphing
  - Free roll
  - Can vary wing twist frequency





# Summary

- Digital structure approach provides classic stable and controllable wing attributes across general low-speed small UAV operating envelope of AoA, speed, sideslip and control
  - Structurally and aerodynamically
  - Statics and dynamics
- Modulating twist can improve efficiencies of overall vehicle design
- Closed-loop tests demonstrate effectiveness of the realistic actuator-to-fluid control “system”
- **Continued studies**
  - **Bring in additional total-vehicle components (horizontal and possibly vertical surfaces/controls)**
  - **Include on-surface flow measurements; additional controller dynamics**
  - **Exploit aerodynamics (vehicle structure, controls, and ensuing motion) for enhanced performance/efficiencies**



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY





# Executive Summary

- ◆ Design and fabrication of wing structures utilizing lattice-based construction approach, with limited number of distinct components
- ◆ A novel transfer matrix approach to model and control the dynamics of lumped-mass behaviors of interconnected cellular components
- ◆ Through rigorous best tests and wind tunnel tests, the proposed lattice-based flexible wing structures proved to behave as conventional wing design, but with added versatilities that could enable new mission objectives






# PLAN FORWARD

# Plan Forward



dwc238@cornell.edu

- ◆ Development of Physical Finite Element Model (PFEM) analysis technique
- ◆ Lattice structural modal identification and validation
  - System ID process
  - Structural properties
- ◆ Flexible PCB for onboard, real-time, flow sensing
- ◆ Mission adaptive wing shaping to improve in-flight aerodynamic performance



# Plan Forward



- ◆ Wind tunnel tests with total-vehicle components (horizontal and possibly vertical surfaces/controls)
- ◆ Development of robotic assembly and repair capability
- ◆ Large scale shape morphing-based propulsion that enables the flapping wing flight



**Thank you!**

***Question?***

# LaRC 12-ft Test Team – Thanks!

