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## ABSTRACT

An experimental study has been conducted in the Ohio State University subsonic wind tunnel to measure the detailed aerodynamic characteristics of an airfoil with a simulated glaze ice accretion. A NACA 0012 model with interchangeable leading edges and pressure taps every one percent chord was used. Surface pressure and wake data were taken on the airfoil clean, with forced transition and with a simulated glaze ice shape. Lift and drag penalties due to the ice shape were found and the surface pressure clearly showed that large separation bubbles were present. Both total pressure and split-film probes were used to measure velocity profiles, both for the clean model and for the model with a simulated ice accretion. A large region of flow separation was seen in the velocity profiles and was correlated to the pressure measurements. Clean airfoil data were found to compare well to existing airfoil analysis methods.
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## NOMENCLATURE

Symbol
$\stackrel{C}{C}_{\text {d }}$
$C_{1}$
$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}$

## $C_{p}$

$\overline{\mathrm{d}}$
$\mathrm{E}_{1}, \mathrm{E}_{2}$
k
LWC
m
P
q
$\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{e}}$
u, v
$\mathrm{V}_{\text {tot }}$
$\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}$

Y-SEP
Y-STAG
$\alpha$
$\delta^{*}$
$\theta$
Subscripts
1
u
$\infty$

Description
Airfoil chord length
Airfoil drag coefficient, Drag/q $\mathrm{q}_{\infty} \mathrm{C}$
Airfoil lift coefficient, Lift/ $\mathrm{q}_{\infty} \mathrm{C}$
Airfoil moment coefficient about $x=c / 4$,
Moment $/ q_{\infty} c^{2}$
Pressure coefficient, $P-P_{\infty} / q_{\infty}$
Volume median diameter
Hot film output voltage
$E_{1} / E_{2}$
Liquid water content
Mach number
Pressure
Dynamic pressure
Reynolds number
Streamwise and normal
velocity components
Total velocity measured by hot film probe
chordwise and normal coordinate,
or $y$ can be the boundary layer
coordinate
Y location of separation streamline
Y location of $u$ component
stagnation streamline
Angle of attack
Boundary layer displacement
thickness
Boundary layer momentum thickness
lower surface
upper surface
freestream condition


## I. INTRODUCTION

Ice formation on an airfoil often leads to a sizeable leading edge protuberance. This protuberance causes a leading edge separation bubble to form, thus reducing the lift and increasing the drag. As the angle of attack is increased, the bubble will eventually fail to re-attach causing a reduction in airfoil stall angle and maximum lift. For unprotected airfoils, these aerodynamic penalties are important and further research is needed before they can be accurately predicted.

Airfoil aerodynamic penalties have been investigated by other researchers, primarily by making lift and drag measurements. Jacobs [1] in 1932 measured the lift, drag and moment change due to various protuberances on a NACA 0012 airfoil. While these protuberances were not specifically ice simulations, the data show the sensitivity of the airfoil to any leading edge disturbance. In the $1950^{\prime}$ s the NACA investigated the effects of ice on airfoil performance. Some of these results can be found in the work of Gray [2,3], on the NACA 65-212 and NACA 65A004 airfoil with actual ice accretions. These data show the adverse effects of ice on airfoil performance, but report only the integrated lift, drag and moment data. More recent studies such as that by Korkan, et. al. [4], Lee [5] and Flemming [6] have also reported lift, drag and moment effects on airfoils with simulated ice shapes.

In an attempt to obtain more detailed flowfield data, Bragg et.al. [7,8] have obtained surface pressures on airfoils with simulated rime and glaze ice shapes. These data give not only the integrated lift, drag and moment data, but provide information on
the length of the bubble, re-attachment and trailing edge separation. Flow visualization data reported by Bragg [9], give the first information about the glaze ice separation bubble geometry. Approximate bubble shapes reduced from photographs of oil flow on a splitter plate are presented for two different glaze ice shapes at two angles of attack.

Recently sophisticated computational tools have begun to be applied to the problem of an airfoil with leading edge ice accretion. Potapczak [10] used a parabolized Navier-Stokes code to predict the aerodynamic characteristics of an airfoil with and without ice. Cebeci [1l] has modified his interactive boundary layer technique to make similar calculations. The results of these calculations are encouraging, but more experimental data are needed to fully develop and validate these methods.

This report presents the initial results of a detailed experiment to study the effect of a particular glaze ice shape on a NACA 0012 airfoil. Part of this work has been published previously by Bragg and Coirier [12,13] in summary form. The purpose of this report is to present a single report with as much of the detailed data as possible. It should be noted that this work is continuing and more and better data are currently being acquired, and plans for more tests are being made. It was, however, felt that a report presenting the data gathered to date would be valuable at this time.

## Wind Tunnel and Model

These tests were conducted in the Ohio State University's subsonic wind tunnel located at the Aeronautical and Astronautical Research Laboratory. The tunnel is of conventional design with approximately a three-by-five foot test section, eight feet in length. The tunnel operates at speeds from zero to 220 feet per second at Reynolds number of up to $1.3 \times 10^{6}$ per foot. The tunnel is of open return type and uses four turbulence screens and honeycomb in the settling chamber to reduce the tunnel turbulence. The tunnel will accommodate airfoils mounted vertically in the test section or three-dimensional models, strut mounted using an internal strain gauge balance. Tunnel speed, Reynolds number and Mach number are measured through facility transducers.

Standard wind tunnel instrumentation was used for this test. Pressure measurements were made using a Scanivalve system. Two scanivalves capable of measuring 48 pressures each were used. The valves were connected in series sharing one pressure transducer to reduce calibration time and improve the accuracy of the measurements. No cut-off valves were used for this test. A single traversing total pressure probe was used to measure the airfoil wake. The probe was located approximately one chord length downstream of the model trailing edge and was traversed automatically by the computer system.

Two different NACA 0012 models were used for this test. Both models were 21 inches in chord and had a span of 39 inches. The models were mounted vertically in the tunnel providing a height (actually width since the model was mounted vertically) to chord ratio of 2.62. Simulated ice shapes were used with both models which were constructed to approximately duplicate an actual measured ice accretion. The ice was accreted in the NASA Lewis Research Center's Icing Research Tunnel on a NACA 0012 airfoil, also of 21 inch chord [14]. In Figure 1. the measured ice shape, as recorded from an actual tracing, compared to the one used in this test. Data were first taken on NACA 0012 Model No. 1 while construction was continuing on the more complex model. This model was made from a section of a UHIH helicopter rotor blade. Since the model had twist, all data were taken and the angle of attack was reported on the model center line. The model used external one-eighth inch tubing to provide surface pressure information (pressure belts) and the wooden ice shape was internally tapped. Although pressure data and wake data were acquired on this model, see reference 12 , it is considered preliminary and will not be presented here. Split film measurements of the separation bubble were taken using this model and will be presented. NACA 0012 airfoil coordinates clean (i.e. no ice shape attached) are given in Table l. The coordinates of the airfoil plus ice shape for Model No. 1 are given in Table 2.

NACA Model No. 2 was built for this experiment with some special features. The model has a $2 l-i n c h$ chord and was cut from mahogany using a numerical control machine and laminated together to
form the 39 -inch span. A unique feature of this model is its interchangeable leading edges. Past experiences using simulated ice on airfoils has identified a problem with the proper placement of the ice shape over the clean leading edge. To avoid this problem, the current model has the ice shape as an integrable part of the first 15 percent of the model (about 3 inches). In this way, the first 15 percent of the model could be attached precisely to the main model section, and the exact airfoil plus ice shape geometry would be accurately known. Experience with earlier simulated models demonstrated the need for a very dense placement of surface pressure taps. The current model was internally tapped with approximately 90 surface pressure ports. The upper surface was instrumented with a tap every one percent ( 0.21 inches) surface length back to the forty percent chord station. Another 40 taps were located around the rest of the airfoil, on the model centerline. Eight taps were located spanwise at the five percent station to ensure the twodimensionality of the flow. The entire ice shape was also instrumented with internal pressure taps every one percent surface length resulting in 19 taps ahead of the five percent chord station. The basic airfoil coordinates for Model No. 2 are the same as those in Table 1. The ice shape is also basically the same, although due to the construction technique some slight differences do exist from the ice shape of Model No. l. Therefore, the ice shape plus airfoil coordinates for Model No. 2 can be found in Table 3. All the force and surface pressure data shown in this report will be from Model No. 2.

## Velocity Profile Measurements

In order to measure the velocity profiles in the separation bubble, a probe capable of determining flow reversal must be accurately positioned in the model boundary layer. A split film probe, TSI model 1288 , was chosen. Here two separate films are placed, front and back, on the same 0.006 inch diameter rod. The plane of the split is parallel to the axis of the probe, perpendicular to the freestream flow, thus allowing for the determination of flow reversal. The probe was modified by incorporating a special shield [10]. The shield was set so that it touched the model before the probe, allowing probe protection and setting the probe a known distance off the surface of the model to start each run. This system worked well and prevented damaging the very delicate probe. The hot film data channels were both taken using TSI 1053B anemometers with TSI 1057 signal conditioners.

The entire tunnel set-up is shown in Figure 2. A close-up of the traverse system is shown in figure 3. A two-dimensional traversing system was used to position the probe in the horizontal plane, containing the airfoil section on the tunnel centerline. The bottom traverse positioned the probe axially from a position approximately 15 percent chord ahead of the model to a point at the airfoil 65 percent chord station. A L.C. Smith BBR30180 traverse was placed on this traverse and provided the probe positioning out from the model. The hot-film probe was supported through a TSI probe support and shield which slid through an airfoil shaped strut extending into the tunnel. This steel strut was rigidly mounted to
the fixed end of the top traverse and moved chordwise (along the tunnel axis) through a sealed slide arrangement. Both traverses were driven by d.c. motors and may be either positioned locally or through the computer system. Probe position was determined using standard potentiometers. Using this system probe positioning tolerance including all errors through digitizing, was no more than +0.003 inches or +0.00014 chord-lengths out from the model and no more than +0.010 inches or +0.00048 chord-lengths in the chordwise direction.

On the airfoil without ice, boundary layer profiles were measured using a traversed total pressure probe. The traversing system, and therefore positioning tolerances, were the same as that used for the split film measurements. The probe was constructed of 1/32-inch stainless steel tubing compressed at the tip to reduce its height to approximately 0.020 inches. The probe was positioned on the surface by hand, then traversed out from the wall by the computer controlled traversing system.

## Data Acquisition and Reduction

The data were gathered online by the in-house Digital Computer and Data Acquisition System. The system currently based on a Harris Hl00 computer, a 48 -bit machine expandable to 768 K bytes internal memory, with virtual memory address space to 12 M bytes. Two analog-to-digital ( $A / D$ ) systems were used to acquire these data. A high speed Datel model 256 system with a throughput rate exceeding 100 kHz was used to acquire the hot film data. A medium speed RTP system with 8 kHz throughput was used to sample tunnel conditions
and probe position. The system was operated through a CRT terminal with disk and tape data storage, as well as printed and plotted data hardcopy, all were available through the laboratory's computer facility.

## III. DATA REDUCTION

## Pressure Data

The pressure data, both model surface pressures and wake data were reduced in the usual way. Models pressures were converted into pressure coefficients using the expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{p}=\frac{P-P_{\infty}}{1 / 2 \rho_{\infty} U^{2}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here all pressure differences were measured directly from the Scanivalve. The pressure coefficients were then integrated to obtain the lift and moment coefficients. It should be noted that since no cut-off valves were used, as much as 90 seconds could elapse between the time the first and last surface pressures were measured. Therefore, the tunnel dynamic pressure was sampled simultaneously with each surface pressure to provide the correct dynamic pressure to be used in eq. (1).

Airfoil drag was obtained from the total pressure survey made in the airfoil wake. Since the survey was made one chord-length downstream of the model, the static pressure was assumed to be just the free stream value. The airfoil drag was then found from the following expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{d}=2 \int \sqrt{\frac{P_{t w}-P_{\infty}}{q_{\infty}}}\left(1-\sqrt{\frac{P_{t w}-P_{\infty}}{q_{\infty}}}\right) d\left(\frac{Y}{c}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the implementation of this equation allowances were made for any tunnel speed variation which occurred during the traverse. The variation in tunnel speed across the tunnel due to model and wake blockage at high angles of attack was also incorporated.

The lift, drag and moment coefficients, as well as the model angle of attack, have been corrected for tunnel wall interference. These corrections used the procedures outlined by Rae and Pope [15]. The coefficients and angle of attack were corrected for solid blockage, streamline curvature and wake blockage; due to the test section design, no buoyancy corrections were made. The primary effect of these corrections was a reduction in the airfoil lift curve slope on the order of ten percent. Both the corrected and uncorrected values are given in the data tables. No attempt has been made in this report to correct the measured surface pressure distributions.

Velocity profiles were obtained from the boundary layer total pressure probe by assuming a constant static pressure across the boundary layer. Using a surface static pressure tap at the same chordwise location as the boundary layer total probe, the dynamic pressure as each location in the boundary layer was measured. For incompressible flow this was easily converted into a boundary layer velocity using the Bernouilli equation. Probe wall proximity and probe Reynolds number correction were found to be small, therefore,
all total pressure probe boundary layer velocity profiles are reported uncorrected.

## Split Film_Data

The split film probe data reduction utilized calibration data of voltage versus velocity for a range of $0-300 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ and several flow angles. The total velocity sensed by the probe was determined from

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{\text {tot }}=f\left[\left(E_{1}+E_{2}\right)^{2}\right] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ are the voltages from the front and back of the film, respectively, both corrected for ambient temperature effects. The function $f$ is a fourth order polynomial. The streamwise velocity component, $u$, and the perpendicular component, $v$, could be determined knowing the flow angle, $\theta$. Where $\Theta$ is 90 degrees in the free stream. Using the expression for $\sin \theta$ given in reference 16,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sin =\left[\frac{E_{1}^{2}-k^{2} E_{2}^{2}}{\left(E_{1}^{2}-k^{2} E_{2}^{2}\right)}\right]_{\max }^{h\left(V_{t o t}\right)} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The constant $k$ is the ratio of $E_{1}$, to $E_{2}$ at $\theta=0$ degrees and is a function of velocity. The denominator is the value of $E_{1}{ }^{2}-k^{2} E_{2}^{2}$ at $\theta=+90$ degrees depending on the sign of the numerator.

The term $h\left(V_{\text {tot }}\right)$ was assumed to be one, independent of velocity. This was curve fit based on the calibration data as a polynomial in v. Then $u$ and $v$ are

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{\text {tot }} \sin \theta, \quad u=\sqrt{v_{\text {tot }}^{2}-v^{2}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $u$ greater than zero if $E_{1}{ }^{2}-\mathrm{k}^{2} \mathrm{E}_{2}{ }^{2}$ is greater than zero. Note that with a two element split film probe the flow angle can at best be determined only in the range $-90^{\circ} \leq \theta \leq 90^{\circ}$. Therefore, the sign of the $v$ component cannot be determined. When using many samples to determine a time averaged velocity, only the average $u$ component can be calculated. The average $v$ component and average total velocity are unknown. Therefore all velocity data presented here are the average streamwise component, u. RMS values were calculated but are not discussed, since no attempt was made to document the split film frequency response. Note that each split film velocity value presented in this report is really an average of 2048 data samples. These data were taken at a rate of 5 KHz using a 10 KHz low pass filter.
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section some of the more important results obtained from these tests are summarized. All of the data, except the split film measurements, were obtained on the NACA 0012 Model No. 2. A more complete set of data is presented in the appendices.

Initial tests were conducted on the NACA 0012 Model No. 2 without the ice shape. This is usually referred to as the clean configuration. Due to the slight seam in the model at the 15 percent chord location where the leading edge section meets the main model body, there was some question regarding its affect on the boundary layer transition location. To remove this question, and for ease in comparing these measurements to the computational results, tests were run with the boundary layer tripped at the five percent chord location on the upper and lower surface. The trip strip used was carborundum grit, nominally 0.009 inches in diameter, attached to the model using double-sided tape. The trip was approximately 0.25 inches in the chordwise direction with the back edge at the 0.05 , $x / c$ location. Only results from measurements at positive angles of attack are shown for the clean airfoil, with or without trip. Negative angles to stall were tested, but were similar to those at positive angles of attack. All data presented here have been corrected for tunnel wall effects by applying the correction method of Rae and Pope [15].

In Figure 4, the lift as a function of angle of attack for the clean model is shown. Presented are the data for a Reynolds number of $1.5 \times 10^{6}$ and Mach number of 0.12. Also shown are the theoretical predictions from the airfoil analysis codes of Eppler [17] and Smetana [18]. The lift curve slope compares well to the results of Smetana since this code iterates on the displacements thickness to include the decambering of the airfoil due to boundary layer growth.

Eppler merely assumes a lift curve slope of $2 \Pi$ per radian and this overpredicts these data. The Eppler code does contain a simple $C_{1, m a x}$ prediction which predicts a maximum lift of approximately 1.12 at $1.5 \times 10^{6}$ Reynolds number. Using the plot of reference 15 , a $C_{1, \max }$ of 1.22 occurs at an effective Reynolds number of approximately $2 \times 10^{6}$. Tests were also run at 0.9 and $2.0 \times 10^{6}$ in Reynolds number with little affect on the lift.

The drag performance of this airfoil was measured and presented in Figure 5. Here the experiment as well as the theories of references [17] and [18] are shown with natural transition and fixed transition. Both theories show more of a drag bucket than is reflected in the experiment, although some bucket is also seen in the data. At zero degrees angle of attack the experimental data have a drag coefficient of 0.0075 with 0.0070 and 0.0067 predicted by [17] and [18], respectively. This is probably due to some early transition on the wind tunnel model since the data with the boundary layer tripped compare very well to theory. With transition fixed at the 5 percent station, the measured drag rises to 0.0106 with the theories only 2 or 3 drag counts higher. The comparison remains excellent until the theories fail to predict the large drag rise associated with separation at high angle of attack. Experimental and theoretical results were also obtained at 0.9 and $2.0 \times 10^{6}$ in Reynolds number. The drag increased with decreasing Reynolds number as expected.

The measured and predicted pitching moment about the quarter chord location is shown in Figure 6. For the natural transition case, the experimental data show a slightly positive $C_{m}$ which becomes larger with increasing angle of attack due to the boundary layer growth. The theory due to Smetana reflects this trend but underpredicts its magnitude. Near stall, Smetana's $C_{m}$ prediction is poor as would be expected. Eppler predicts the $C_{m}$ trend near stall, but since it includes no boundary layer effects, it does poorly at low angle of attack. Fixed transition had little affect on the $C_{m}$ in the experimental or theoretical data. Changing the Reynolds number from 0.9 to $2.0 \times 10^{6}$ also had little affect on $C_{m}$.

In Figure 7, the measured pressures are compared to those predicted by the Smetana code. Comparisons were made at matched lift coefficient since the pressure coefficient data has not been corrected for the tunnel wall interference. The experimental data are for uncorrected angles of attack of 2 and 6 degrees. The comparisons are excellent with only some small deviation near the 15 percent chord location. This is probably due to the slight discontinuity where the model leading edge joins the main element. Note that with the very dense distribution of measured pressures near the leading edge, every symbol represents a measured pressure, the peak pressure was obtained in good agreement to the theory. Changes in $C_{p}$ with Reynolds number and with the boundary layer trip were small as expected.

After completing the clean NACA 0012 Model No. 2 tests just described the ice shape shown in Figure 1 was installed. The ice shape was tested with no transition strip and with no distributed roughness. Since the airfoil was symmetric, the clean NACA 0012 performed the same at positive and negative angles of attack. However, with the ice shape, the airfoil was no longer symmetric and this was reflected in its aerodynamic characteristics. The ice shape was then tested to $C_{1, \max }$ for both positive and negative angles of attack. For ease in data presentation, the negative angles of attack are plotted as positive in Figures 8 and 9 and labelled, "Ice - Lower Horn". In this way, the data are presented as if the ice shape was removed and then inverted, upper and lower surfaces, for these tests. Five pressure taps were located, equally spaced spanwise, on both the upper and lower surfaces at an $x / c$ of 0.05. These taps were compared to ensure the two-dimensionality of the flow, particularly when large separation zones were present. These taps compared well across the span and indicated that the flow was indeed two-dimensional at all conditions examined.

In Figure 8, the lift coefficient as a function of angle of attack for the NACA 0012 clean and with the glaze ice shape is shown. A large $C_{1, \max }$ penalty is seen for the airfoil with glaze ice due to either the upper or lower surface horn. The maximum lift decreased from the clean value of over 1.2 , to the iced value of about 0.55 , over a 50 percent decrease. The angle of attack for stall was also reduced about 50 percent. It is interesting that while the upper and lower surface horns were quite different in shape and location,
their affect on the airfoil lift was remarkably similar. Stall for the airfoil with ice shape was due to the failure of the leading edge separation bubble to re-attach at the higher angles of attack. This will be seen more clearly when the pressure distributions are examined. These data were also duplicated at Reynolds numbers of 0.9 and $2.0 \times 10^{6}$ with little affect on the lift.

The effect of the ice accretion on drag is shown in Figure 9 . As expected, the drag increase due to the ice was significant, from 0.0075 at $\alpha=0$ degrees clean to 0.0260 with the glaze ice shape. The drag rose quickly with angle of attack for the glaze shape since it stalled at only seven degrees angle of attack. The drag rise corresponding to the lower surface horn (negative angles of attack) was slightly larger than that from the upper surface horn (positive angles of attack), although the trend was very similar. While this ice shape did not correspond directly to any of those measured by Olsen [17], it was quite similar to one of the shapes reported there and the drag values reported by Olsen compare well to those in Figure 9. Again, these data were repeated at .9 and $2.0 \times 10^{6}$ Reynolds number and no significant effects were noted.

Figure 10 shows the pitching moment coefficient measured on the clean and iced airfoil. The ice shape cambers the airfoil which can be seen by noting the pitching moment at zero degrees angle of attack. The upper horn ice shape data indicate a positive cambering since the $C_{m}$ here is less than zero. As the angle of attack was increased, the separation bubble on the upper surface grew, thickening the boundary layer and decambering the airfoil causing a positive
increase in the moment coefficient. This continued until the airfoil started to stall and the moment becomes a large negative, nose down, value. The affect of the ice shape on the pitching moment, even at the low angles of attack, may be significant in rotorcraft applications. No significant Reynolds number effects were seen on the measured pitching moment coefficient.

Pressure distributions for the airfoil with simulated ice are shown in the next four figures. These pressure distributions have not been corrected for wind tunnel wall effects. As seen in Figure 7, these corrections are not necessary. Therefore, the $C_{p}$ 's here are uncorrected and the angle of attack and lift coefficient indicated on the figures for each distribution are also uncorrected values.

In Figure 1l, the pressure distributions for the NACA 0012 clean and with simulated ice are shown at an angle of attack of four degrees. Note first the zone of almost constant pressure occurring on the iced pressure distribution at a $C_{F}$ level of approximately -1.4 . This is the separation bubble aft of the upper surface horn. The flow accelerated from the stagnation point as it moved toward the upper surface horn and separated as it attempts to flow over the tip of the ice horn. The separation zone was characterized by fairly constant but slightly falling pressure $\left(C_{p}\right.$ was decreasing as the flow accelerated) for approximately ten percent chord; then the pressure rose rapidly and ultimately returned to the clean value at about the 40 percent chord station. Hot-film measurements indicated re-attachment somewhat downstream of the minimum pressure point. At
a $C_{p}$ of approximately -0.4 a constant pressure region corresponding to the lower surface bubble was seen. This also occurred at a much lower pressure than the clean airfoil experienced at this same location since the flow accelerated rapidly toward the lower surface horn before separation occurred. The uncorrected lift coefficient at four degrees angle of attack dropped from 0.439 clean to 0.376 iced, due to the separation.

The measured pressure distributions for the airfoil with simulated glaze ice are shown for various angles of attack in figures 12 and 13. In Figure 12, pressures for 0,2 and 4 degrees angle of attack are shown. The circles represent the zero angle of attack measured pressures. Here the lower and upper surface separation zones were at $C_{p}$ 's of approximately -0.9 and -0.7 , respectively. As the angle of attack was increased, these constant pressure zones occurred at decreasing pressures for the upper surface separation and increasing pressures for the lower. Note also that at $\alpha=0$ degrees the upper surface separation occurred at a higher pressure than the lower surface separation. At 2 and 4 degrees, this was reversed with the upper surface separation zone occurring at a lower pressure level.

In Figure 13, the pressure distributions for angles of attack of 4,6 and 8 degrees are shown. Here, as the airfoil begins to approach stall, the upper surface separation bubble grew rapidly in length and the constant pressure zone occurred at higher pressures. Remember that the airfoil stalled at approximately seven degrees angle of attack. As the angle of attack increased the trailing edge
pressure is seen to fall, as do the pressures on the entire aft portion of the airfoil. At eight degrees angle of attack, the airfoil has stalled and the scatter in the leading edge, upper surface measured pressures was an indication of the unsteadiness of the flow in this region.

A comparison of the 4 and -4 degree pressure distributions are shown in figure 14 so that the relative affect of the two ice horns on the pressure distribution may be more easily compared. The suction side separation zone can be seen, as discussed earlier, to be slightly longer and to have a more gentle pressure recovery for the -4 degree case. Both suction and pressure side separation occurred at lower pressures for the positive 4 degree measurements. The constant pressure separation zones all started at the leading edge of the particular ice horn concerned. These plots show that the lower surface horn does, indeed, cause a more severe aerodynamic penalty at negative angles of attack than the upper surface horn does at positive angles. This is an interesting result since these negative angle of attack cases are not usually considered. This finding would be important for any surface which must operate at both positive and negative angles of attack, such as the horizontal stabilizer. It may also have application to airfoils which operate at lower angles of attack than that at which the ice is accreted.

## Velocity Profile Measurements

Velocity profile data were taken using a total pressure probe on the NACA 0012 Model No. 2 and a split film probe using Model No. 1. The purpose of these data was to measure the detailed boundary
layer and separation zone mean velocity profiles for comparison to the computational results.

Total pressure boundary layer surveys were taken on the model with the trip strip installed and at a Reynolds number of $1.5 \times 10^{6}$. The surveys were reduced in the standard way by assuming no pressure gradient through the boundary layer and, therefore, applying the measured surface static pressure through the boundary layer. Using the measured total pressure, the velocity profile in the boundary layer was determined. In figure 15, a sample of the measured profiles are shown. The profiles shown are the measured velocity divided by the local edge velocity. The vertical lines are 1.25 $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{e}}$ apart. The $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{c}$ location, measured above the surface, of 0.02 is shown which corresponds to 0.42 inches. Profiles at several chordwise locations are shown at an angle of attack of four degrees in Figure 15. Since the boundary layer was tripped at $x / c=.05$, all of the measured profiles are turbulent. The boundary layer displacement thickness, $\delta / c$, calculated from the measured profiles versus $x / c$ for both the $\alpha=0$ and $\alpha=4$ degree cases, are shown in Figure 16. Also shown are the predicted values from the Smetana analysis. Overall, the comparisons are quite good except at the 10 and 20 percent stations where the experiment showed a much larger displacement thickness. This was probably due to the trip strip initially increasing the displacement thickness more than would be due to transition alone. Further downstream of the trip the measurements and theory compared very well.

Whenever a separation zone is being probed, as with the splitfilm probe used in this test, the problem of probe interference must be considered. In Figure 17 a sketch of the NACA 0012 airfoil and the traversing system used for these experiments is shown. While the traversing mechanism itself was outside of the tunnel, a substantial probe support strut was required to properly position the probe. The entire traverse system consisted of the traversing mechanism (not shown), the strut, sleeve and the probe itself.

Surface pressures were measured on the airfoil with the probe at various locations to quantify the affect of the probe on the separation bubble. In figure 18 the pressure distribution on the airfoil with simulated glaze ice is compared with and without the probe present. The probe and support system when located at the $x / c$ $=0.03$ location was seen to lower the pressure in the bubble. If pressure level can be used as a basis for flow re-attachment, the probe and support moved the point of bubble re-attachment forward. The lower surface and the aft part of the upper surface did not appear to be significantly affected by the presence of the probe. The position of the probe in the bubble was shown to be important, Figure 19. Here the probe and support were positioned at three different chordwise locations and the surface pressures recorded. The probe at $x / c=0.1 l$ had the largest affect on bubble re-attachment which occurred around $x / c=0.20$. Only the $x / c=0.19$ position had little affect on the pressure level in the relatively constant pressure region of the bubble. Tests were also made by positioning the strut and sleeve but not placing the probe in the bubble. These tests showed that the strut and sleeve could be modified so as not
to affect the separation zone pressures, however, once the probe was inserted into the bubble the pressures were always affected.

The interference studies showed that the presence of the probe affected the bubble in all cases tested. The primary results were a decreased plateau pressure in the bubble, and an increased pressure in the re-attachment region. The probe appeared to cause early bubble re-attachment, shortening the bubble by a few percent chord. Therefore, all the split-film data where the probe was in the separation bubble included this probe interference error for which no correction has been made.

In Figures 20 through 22 , the velocity profiles are shown for the NACA 0012 Model No. 1 , upper surface, in the vicinity of the glaze ice shape. All runs were made at a Reynolds number based on chord of $1.5 \times 10^{6}$ and a Mach number of 0.12 . Note that the velocity shown was actually the streamwise component of the total boundary layer velocity and was nondimensionalized by the edge velocity. The edge velocity was defined as the maximum velocity measured for each profile. The vertical lines on the plot are the zero velocity reference line for each profile. So points to the left indicate negative velocity or reversed flow. These vertical lines are spaced a distance apart of 1.25 times the local edge velocity. The height scale nondimensionalized by the airfoil chord of 21 inches and is measured from the airfoil surface. All airfoil angles of attack are uncorrected.

The bubble shapes are also represented in Figures 20 through 22. The dashed lines are the stagnation streamline and are merely
taken from the point above the surface where the measured streamwise velocity zero (i.e. the velocity changes from negative to positive). The solid lines are the dividing stream lines. These were found by integrating the mass flow in the streamwise direction. The point above the surface where the net mass flow is zero defines the dividing streamline.

The profiles for the -0.15 degree case are shown in Figure 20. If it is assumed that separation occurred at the leading edge of the upper surface horn, $x / c=-.0225$, then the first profile was only -. 0025c downstream. Therefore a relatively large reversed flow region developed very quickly. The reversed flow region grew initially, then decreased until the bubble re-attached around an $x / c$ of .08. The last profile is a fairly characteristic turbulent profile. From the streamline plot it is clear that the reversed flow region was relatively thick and slow moving. Conversely, the shear layer was thin and rapidly accelerated to the edge velocity.

Figure 21 is similar but for the the 1.85 degree angle of attack case. Here, as expected, the bubble was thicker and larger than the previous case. Re-attachment occurred around the 12 percent chord location. Note in the $x / c=.14$ profile a change in second derivative that occurred about one-fifth of the way up on the profile. This appears to be characteristic of all the re-attached profiles measured to date.

In Figure 22 the profiles are shown for a model angle of attack of $3.85^{\circ}$. Here the bubble was extremely large as shown. In figure 22, re-attachment occurred around the 18 percent airfoil station.

Note that for this bubble, reversed flow extended up from the airfoil over one-half inch in some cases. Figure 22 also shows three profiles further downstream, aft of re-attachment. Note that here the height scale is different from the other plots. These were clearly turbulent profiles. Re-attachment appeared to be at approximately 18 percent chord for the 3.85 degree case. Note that this was uncorrected and probe interference has probably shortened all the bubble length measurements.

## Data Presentation

The detailed results, run by run, are given in the appendices. In Appendix $A$ the wind tunnel run summaries are tabulated. The runs are listed in order by run number and separated into groups according to the model and configuration. For example, NACA 0012 Model No. 2 with Glaze Ice appears as one of the group headings. For the runs where pressure data were taken, both the uncorrected or raw data, and the corrected values are given for the angle of attack; lift, drag and pitching moment coefficients. Mach number and Reynolds number are also given. For the data runs where velocity profile data were taken, no force coefficient data are available. In this case the uncorrected angle of attack, tunnel velocity, Reynolds number, Mach number, and calculated boundary layer thicknesses are given. In the tables $A O A$ is just the angle of attack in degrees and VEL and U-EDGE are the tunnel velocity and boundary layer edge velocity, respectively, in feet per second.

It should be noted that many run numbers are missing. Blocks of run numbers are often missing which represent tunnel runs on other models and projects. In some instances one or two runs may be
omitted when the data is bad or questionable due to an equipment or software problem.

In Appendix $B$ the pressure coefficient plots are given in run number order. Each symbol represents a measured pressure with the apex of the triangular symbol up, for upper surface taps, and down, for lower surface taps. Some taps were removed from the plots due to blockage in the pressure lines. Tabulated on each plot are the tunnel conditions and the corrected angle of attack and corrected integrated force coefficients. The nomenclature is straight-forward with the possible exception of the term CDW. Since the OSU software is also capable of calculating and outputting the integrated pressure drag coefficient, the total airfoil corrected drag coefficient obtained from the wake survey probe is given as CDW. This corresponds to the $C D$ value in the table of Appendix $A$.

The model construction did cause some inconsistencies in the data which should be explained. The model was constructed with a removable leading edge which caused a spanwise seam in the model at the 15 percent chord location. This slight discontinuity in the airfoil surface can be seen in the pressure distribution plots, particularly on the upper surface where taps were located every one percent chord. Some asymmetry, about zero degrees angle of attack, was also seen in the integrated coefficients due to this model seam, since it was slightly smoother on one side than the other. Although an effort was made to smooth the seams, this was not completely successful. This asymmetry was most evident in the drag data on the clean model. Due to what is thought to be different laminar boundary layer transition points, the drag was somewhat asymmetric about
zero degrees angle of attack. Also contributing to this was the surface pressure tap installation. From previous experience at OSU it is known that the presence of these taps increases the airfoil drag since they act as boundary layer trips and as surface roughness. This model has many more taps on the upper surface than on the lower, which may explain in part why the drag was higher at negative angles of attack. Even when the boundary layer trip was installed at the five percent chord location, this asymmetry was present. On the runs of the NACA 0012 Model No. 2 with boundary layer trip, a small discontinuity was seen in the pressure plots near the forty percent chord station on the upper surface. This was the point where the pressure measurement was switched to a second Scanivalve. Apparently some small deviation in transducer reference pressure was present. Unfortunately, this was not discovered until after the experiment was completed, but the data are still of acceptable quality and are included here.

In Appendix $C$ selected wake traces are presented. It was not felt that these data would be useful to most readers, so only a representative sample of these plots are presented here. In these figures the dynamic pressure in the wake, assuming that the wake static is just the tunnel freestream static pressure, were plotted versus the position in the wake. Since only the relative positions of the data are used in the data reduction, no attempt has been made to maintain a common coordinate system for all runs. The wake deficit is then a measure of the total airfoil drag. Since, as in the integration of the pressure distributions of Appendix $B$, the tunnel dynamic pressure is measured to correspond to each wake
point, integrating these plots alone will not give the exact drag value reported here. The tunnel speed variation correction is, however, small and the two values should be very close.

The detailed velocity measurements are presented in Appendix D. Two sets of measurements are found here; the split-film results on Model No. 1 with glaze ice and the total probe boundary layer measurements on Model No. 2 with the trip strip. These runs can be easily distinguished by the plot title or run number. In addition to the data listed for each run in the table of Appendix $A$, the important parameters are gives on each plot. These include run number, uncorrected angle of attack in degrees, the probe chordwise location, the freestream velocity in $f t / s e c$ and the model chord Reynolds number in millions. Each symbol represents the measured velocity at a particular height above the model where $Y$ is always zero on the surface. The total pressure data has somewhat more scatter than the split-film data since each total probe data point represents only one data sample instead of the 2048 samples averaged for each split-film velocity.

## SUMMARY

An experimental program has been conducted to document the aerodynamic characteristics and flow field about a NACA 0012 airfoil with simulated glaze ice. Two different NACA 0012 models were used for the tests.

NACA 0012 Model No. 2 was instrumented with an extremely dense distribution of surface pressure taps to provide additional details concerning the large separation zones aft of the ice horns. Airfoil
lift and drag were severely affected by the ice shape as was expected. However, the surface pressure provided additional information about the separation bubbles. The bubbles are characterized by a region of almost constant, but slightly falling pressure, followed by a region of pressure recovery. Work on Model No. 1 has shown that re-attachment occurred in this pressure recovery region. The lower surface horn caused a larger separation zone and a more severe aerodynamic penalty when tested at negative angles of attack than did the upper surface horns at positive angles of attack. This is an interesting result which should be studied further. Model No. 2 was also used to document the baseline performance of the NACA 0012 airfoil. These tests were conducted with natural transition and transition fixed at the five percent chord location on both surfaces. The forced transition data compared well to theoretical results in all aerodynamic quantities including the measured boundary layer parameters.

Velocity profile measurements were performed in the separated flow region behind the upper surface glaze ice horn. Using splitfilm anemometry on the NACA 0012 Model No. l, streamwise velocity profiles have been measured at several chordwise locations and angles of attack. These profiles have shown the bubble extent and the large regions of reversed flow.

Much of the detailed data from these experiments can be found in the appendices. In addition to the run summary tables, plots of surface pressures, wake total pressure profiles and velocity profiles are also in the appendices. It is hoped that these data will be useful in testing and developing airfoil performance in
icing computer codes and providing a better understanding of the flow field.
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TABLE 1. COORDINATES FOR THE NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 2 - CLEAN CONFIGURATION

| No. | $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | $Y_{u}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 2 | 0.00309 | 0.00967 | 0.00309 | -0.00967 |
| 3 | 0.00621 | 0.01356 | 0.00621 | -0.01356 |
| 4 | 0.01380 | 0.01984 | 0.02230 | -0.02481 |
| 5 | 0.02230 | 0.02481 | 0.04080 | -0.03256 |
| 6 | 0.03140 | 0.02899 | 0.08000 | -0.04307 |
| 7 | 0.04080 | 0.03256 | 0.12000 | -0.04988 |
| 8 | 0.05000 | 0.03555 | 0.16000 | -0.05442 |
| 9 | 0.06000 | 0.03838 | 0.20000 | -0.05738 |
| 10 | 0.07000 | 0.04086 | 0.24000 | -0.05913 |
| 11 | 0.08000 | 0.04307 | 0.28000 | -0.05993 |
| 12 | 0.09000 | 0.04505 | 0.32000 | -0.05993 |
| 13 | 0.10000 | 0.04683 | 0.36000 | -0.05926 |
| 14 | 0.11000 | 0.04843 | 0.40000 | -0.05803 |
| 15 | 0.12000 | 0.04988 | 0.44000 | -0.05631 |
| 16 | 0.13000 | 0.05119 | 0.50000 | -0.05294 |
| 17 | 0.14000 | 0.05238 | 0.56000 | -0.04878 |
| 18 | 0.15000 | 0.05345 | 0.60000 | -0.04563 |
| 19 | 0.16000 | 0.05442 | 0.65000 | -0.04132 |
| 20 | 0.17000 | 0.05529 | 0.70000 | -0.03664 |
| 21 | 0.18000 | 0.05607 | 0.75000 | -0.03160 |
| 22 | 0.19000 | 0.05676 | 0.80000 | -0.02623 |
| 23 | 0.20000 | 0.05738 | 0.85000 | -0.02053 |
| 24 | 0.21000 | 0.05792 | 0.90000 | -0.01448 |
| 25 | 0.22000 | 0.05839 | 0.95000 | -0.00807 |
| 26 | 0.23000 | 0.05879 | 0.97500 | -0.00471 |
| 27 | 0.24000 | 0.05913 | 1.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 28 | 0.25000 | 0.05941 |  |  |
| 29 | 0.26000 | 0.05864 |  |  |
| 30 | 0.27000 | 0.05981 |  |  |
| 31 | 0.28000 | 0.05993 |  |  |
| 32 | 0.29000 | 0.06000 |  |  |
| 33 | 0.30000 | 0.06002 |  |  |
| 34 | 0.31000 | 0.05999 |  |  |
| 35 | 0.32000 | 0.05993 |  |  |
| 36 | 0.33000 | 0.05982 |  |  |
| 37 | 0.34000 | 0.05967 |  |  |
| 38 | 0.35000 | 0.05949 |  |  |
| 39 | 0.36000 | 0.05926 |  |  |
| 40 | 0.37000 | 0.05900 |  |  |
| 41 | 0.38000 | 0.05871 |  |  |
| 42 | 0.39000 | 0.05839 |  |  |
| 43 | 0.40000 | 0.05803 |  |  |
| 44 | 0.42000 | 0.05723 |  |  |
| 45 | 0.44000 | 0.05631 |  |  |

TABLE I. (continued)

| No. | $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{u}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| -16 | 0.47000 | 0.05473 |
| 47 | 0.50000 | 0.05294 |
| 48 | 0.53000 | 0.05095 |
| 49 | 0.56000 | 0.04878 |
| 50 | 0.60000 | 0.04563 |
| 51 | 0.65000 | 0.04132 |
| 52 | 0.70000 | 0.03664 |
| 53 | 0.75000 | 0.03160 |
| 54 | 0.80000 | 0.02623 |
| 55 | 0.85000 | 0.02053 |
| 56 | 0.90000 | 0.01448 |
| 57 | 0.95000 | 0.00807 |
| 58 | 0.97500 | 0.00471 |
| 59 | 1.00000 | 0.00000 |

TABLE 2. COORDINATES FOR THE NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 1 - GLAZE ICE CONFIGURATION

| No. | $\bar{X}_{u}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $Y_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -0.02557 | $0.02729 *$ | -0.02557 | 0.02729 |
| 2 | -0.02501 | 0.02877 * | -0.02000 | 0.00621 |
| 3 | -0.02445 | 0.02922* | -0.01800 | 0.00097 |
| 4 | -0.02389 | 0.02945* | -0.01200 | -0.01151 |
| 5 | -0.02333 | 0.02952 * | -0.00600 | -0.02115 |
| 6 | -0.00305 | 0.02632 | 0.00000 | -0.02907 |
| 7 | 0.01857 | 0.02263 | 0.00600 | -0.03577 |
| 8 | 0.03140 | 0.02899 | 0.01200 | -0.04155 |
| 9 | 0.05000 | 0.03555 | 0.02166 | -0.05215* |
| 10 | 0.06000 | 0.03838 | 0.02278 | -0.05283* |
| 11 | 0.08000 | 0.04307 | 0.02333 | -0.05290* |
| 12 | 0.10000 | 0.04683 | 0.02389 | -0.05283 * |
| 13 | 0.12000 | 0.04988 | 0.04798 | -0.04683 |
| 14 | 0.14000 | 0.05238 | 0.06952 | -0.04026 |
| 15 | 0.16000 | 0.05442 | 0.09900 | -0.04700 |
| 16 | 0.18000 | 0.05607 | 0.12000 | -0.04988 |
| 17 | 0.20000 | 0.05738 | 0.16000 | -0.05442 |
| 18 | 0.22000 | 0.05839 | 0.20000 | -0.05738 |
| 19 | 0.24000 | 0.05913 | 0.24000 | -0.05913 |
| 20 | 0.26000 | 0.05864 | 0.28000 | -0.05993 |
| 21 | 0.28000 | 0.05993 | 0.32000 | -0.05993 |
| 22 | 0.30000 | 0.06002 | 0.36000 | -0.05926 |
| 23 | 0.32000 | 0.05993 | 0.40000 | -0.05803 |
| 24 | 0.34000 | 0.05967 | 0.44000 | -0.05631 |
| 25 | 0.36000 | 0.05926 | 0.50000 | -0.05294 |
| 26 | 0.38000 | 0.05871 | 0.56000 | -0.04878 |
| 27 | 0.40000 | 0.05803 | 0.60000 | -0.04563 |
| 28 | 0.42000 | 0.05723 | 0.65000 | -0.04132 |
| 29 | 0.44000 | 0.05631 | 0.70000 | -0.03664 |
| 30 | 0.47000 | 0.05473 | 0.75000 | -0.03160 |
| 31 | 0.50000 | 0.05294 | 0.80000 | -0.02623 |
| 32 | 0.53000 | 0.05095 | 0.85000 | -0.02053 |
| 33 | 0.56000 | 0.04878 | 0.90000 | -0.01448 |
| 34 | 0.60000 | 0.04563 | 0.95000 | -0.00807 |
| 35 | 0.65000 | 0.04132 | 0.97500 | -0.00471 |
| 36 | 0.70000 | 0.03664 | 1.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 37 | 0.75000 | 0.03160 |  |  |
| 38 | 0.80000 | 0.02623 |  |  |
| 39 | 0.85000 | 0.02053 |  |  |
| 40 | 0.90000 | 0.01448 |  |  |
| 41 | 0.95000 | 0.00807 |  |  |
| 42 | 0.97500 | 0.00471 |  |  |
| 43 | 1.00000 | 0.00000 |  |  |

* NOTE: Upper and lower surface horn radius of curvature, $r / c=0.002232$.

TABLE 3. COORDINATES FOR THE NACA OOl2 MODEL NO. 2 - ICED CONFIGURATION

| No. | $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -0.02660 | 0.01690* | -0.02660 | 0.01690 |
| 2 | -0.02450 | $0.02870^{*}$ | -0.02220 | 0.00390 |
| 3 | -0.02080 | 0.03060 * | -0.01750 | -0.00700 |
| 4 | -0.01000 | 0.02880 | -0.01070 | -0.01840 |
| 5 | -0.00010 | 0.02680 | -0.00360 | -0.02840 |
| 6 | 0.01000 | 0.02500 | 0.00590 | -0.03930 |
| 7 | 0.02210 | 0.02670 | 0.01500 | -0.04740 |
| 8 | 0.03110 | 0.03000 | 0.02580 | -0.05330** |
| 9 | 0.04070 | 0.03330 | 0.03000 | -0.05300** |
| 10 | 0.04910 | 0.03610 | 0.03970 | -0.05030 |
| 11 | 0.05950 | 0.03900 | 0.04950 | -0.04730 |
| 12 | 0.06940 | 0.04140 | 0.06000 | -0.04410 |
| 13 | 0.07940 | 0.04350 | 0.06950 | -0.04210 |
| 14 | 0.08910 | 0.04550 | 0.07930 | -0.04360 |
| 15 | 0.09900 | 0.04720 | 0.10940 | -0.04870 |
| 16 | 0.10970 | 0.04870 | 0.11930 | -0.05000 |
| 17 | 0.11970 | 0.05000 | 0.12900 | -0.05110 |
| 18 | 0.12969 | 0.05140 | 0.14000 | -0.05200 |
| 19 | 0.14000 | 0.05240 | 0.16000 | -0.05442 |
| 20 | 0.16000 | 0.05442 | 0.20000 | -0.05738 |
| 21 | 0.17000 | 0.05500 | 0.24000 | -0.05913 |
| 22 | 0.18000 | 0.05607 | 0.28000 | -0.05993 |
| 23 | 0.19000 | 0.05676 | 0.32000 | -0.05993 |
| 24 | 0.20000 | 0.05738 | 0.36000 | -0.05926 |
| 25 | 0.21000 | 0.05792 | 0.40000 | -0.05803 |
| 26 | 0.22000 | 0.05839 | 0.44000 | -0.05631 |
| 27 | 0.23000 | 0.05879 | 0.50000 | -0.05294 |
| 28 | 0.24000 | 0.05913 | 0.56000 | -0.04878 |
| 29 | 0.25000 | 0.05941 | 0.60000 | -0.04563 |
| 30 | 0.26000 | 0.05864 | 0.70000 | -0.03664 |
| 31 | 0.28000 | 0.05993 | 0.75000 | -0.03160 |
| 32 | 0.30000 | 0.06002 | 0.85000 | -0.02053 |
| 33 | 0.32000 | 0.05993 | 0.90000 | -0.01448 |
| 34 | 0.34000 | 0.05967 | 0.95000 | -0.00807 |
| 35 | 0.36000 | 0.05926 | 0.97500 | -0.00471 |
| 36 | 0.38000 | 0.05871 | 1.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 37 | 0.40000 | 0.05800 |  |  |
| 38 | 0.42000 | 0.05700 |  |  |
| 39 | 0.44000 | 0.05631 |  |  |
| 40 | 0.47000 | 0.05473 |  |  |
| 41 | 0.50000 | 0.05294 |  |  |
| 42 | 0.53000 | 0.05095 |  |  |
| 43 | 0.56000 | 0.04878 |  |  |
| 44 | 0.60000 | 0.04563 |  |  |
| 45 | 0.70000 | 0.03664 |  |  |

TABLE 3. (continued)

| No. | $X_{u}$ | $Y_{u}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -0.03160 |  |
| 46 | 0.75000 | 0.02623 |
| 47 | 0.80000 | 0.02623 |
| 48 | 0.85000 | 0.02053 |
| 49 | 0.90000 | 0.01448 |
| 50 | 0.95000 | 0.00807 |
| 51 | 0.97500 | 0.00471 |
| 52 | 1.00000 | 0.00000 |

* NOTE: Upper surface horn radius of curvature, $(r / c)_{u}=0.00595$.
** NOTE: Lower surface horn radius of curvature, $(r / c)_{1}=0.01042$.
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FIGURE 2. OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY SUBSONIC WIND TUNNEL.
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FIGURE 3. TWO-DIMENSIONAL TRAVERSE SYSTEM.


FIGURE 4. COMPARISON OF MEASURED LIFT WITH NATURAL AND FIXED TRANSITION TO THEORY.


FIGURE 5. COMPARISON OF MEASURED DRAG WITH NATURAL AND FIXED TRANSITION TO THEORY.


FIGURE 6. MEASURED AIRFOIL PITCHING MOMENT WITH AND WITHOUT SIMULATED GLAZE ICE.


FIGURE 7. MEASURED SURFACE PRESSURES COMPARED TO THEORY AT TWO ANGLES OF ATTACK.



FIGURE 9. MEASURED AIRFOIL DRAG WITH AND WITHOUT SIMULATED GLAZE ICE.


FIGURE 10. COMPARISON OF MEASURED PITCHING MOMENT WITH NATURAL AND FIXED TRANSITION TO THEORY.


FIGURE 11. MEASURED SURFACE PRESSURES WITH AND WITHOUT SIMULATED GLAZE ICE AT $\alpha=4$ DEG.



FIGURE 13. MEASURED SURFACE PRESSURES WITH SIMULATED ICE AT HIGH ANGLES OF ATTACK.


FIGURE 14. MEASURED SURFACE PRESSURES WITH SIMULATED ICE AT $\alpha=-4$ and 4 DEG.
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FIGURE 17. HOT FILM SUPPORT SYSTEM
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## APPENDIX A

RUN SUMMARIES

NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 1 - GLAZE ICE CONFIGURATION SPLIT FILM VELOCITY PROFILES

| RUN | $\begin{gathered} A O A \\ (\text { deg) } \end{gathered}$ | X/C | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Re} \\ & \times 10^{-6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { VEL } \\ (\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{U}-\mathrm{EDGE} \\ & (\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \delta^{*} / C \\ & \times 10^{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \theta / C \\ & \times 10^{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Y-STAG/C | Y-SEP/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 236 | -0.15 | 0.00 | 1.46 | 131.7 | 171.7 | 0.02146 | 0.42626 | 0.014721 | 0.020143 |
| 238 | -0.15 | -0.02 | 1.46 | 131.7 | 166.9 | 0.00950 | 0.35212 | 0.006662 | 0.008399 |
| 239 | -0.15 | 0.02 | 1.46 | 131.7 | 170.0 | 0.02144 | 1.07510 | 0.012993 | 0.018715 |
| 240 | -0.15 | 0.04 | 1.46 | 131.7 | 167.4 | 0.01697 | 0.77877 | 0.008640 | 0.014875 |
| 241 | -0.15 | 0.06 | 1.42 | 133.5 | 176.1 | 0.01214 | 1.79805 | 0.004461 | 0.008394 |
| 242 | -0.15 | 0.08 | 1.42 | 133.5 | 169.2 | 0.00737 | 3.05670 | 0. |  |
| 243 | -0.15 | 0.10 | 1.44 | 132.7 | 160.6 | 0.00489 | 2.90518 |  |  |
| 244 | -0.15 | 0.12 | 1.44 | 132.7 | 160.7 | 0.00375 | 2.56528 |  |  |
| 245 | 1.85 | -0.02 | 1.44 | 132.7 | 184.2 | 0.01161 | 0.21754 | 0.008947 | 0.010372 |
| 246 | 1.85 | 0.00 | 1.44 | 132.7 | 200.5 | 0.01265 | -0.17896 | 0.020703 | 0.025558 |
| 247 | 1.85 | 0.02 | 1.44 | 132.7 | 201.7 | 0.03009 | 0.46930 | 0.021808 | 0.028466 |
| 248 | 1.85 | 0.04 | 1.44 | 132.7 | 201.8 | 0.02606 | 0.91716 | 0.016222 | 0.023689 |
| 249 | 1.85 | 0.06 | 1.44 | 132.9 | 199.4 | 0.02066 | 1.88002 | 0.009068 | 0.016413 |
| 250 | 1.85 | 0.08 | 1.44 | 132.5 | 191.8 | 0.01703 | 2.68549 | 0.006024 | 0.011304 |
| 251 | 1.85 | 0.10 | 1.44 | 132.5 | 185.3 | 0.01478 | 3.49155 | 0.004404 | 0.006891 |
| 252 | 1.85 | 0.12 | 1.44 | 132.5 | 176.7 | 0.01116 | 4.33792 |  |  |
| 254 | 1.85 | 0.14 | 1.51 | 130.0 | 167.3 | 0.00835 | 4.28289 |  |  |
| 255 | 1.85 | 0.16 | 1.51 | 130.0 | 165.5 | 0.00704 | 4.42153 |  |  |
| 257 | 3.85 | -0.02 | 1.51 | 130.0 | 180.0 | 0.01041 | 0.27493 | 0.008068 | 0.009076 |
| 258 | 3.85 | 0.00 | 1.51 | 130.0 | 202.4 | 0.02907 | 0.14864 | 0.022242 | 0.027926 |
| 262 | 3.85 | 0.02 | 1.54 | 129.0 | 200.0 | 0.03682 | 0.57272 |  | - |
| 263 | 3.85 | 0.04 | 1.53 | 129.3 | 197.9 | 0.03195 | 1.15141 | 0.019096 | 0.029356 |
| 264 | 3.85 | 0.06 | 1.53 | 129.3 | 197.6 | 0.03110 | 1.91804 | 0.018119 | 0.027221 |
| 265 | 3.85 | 0.08 | 1.53 | 129.3 | 198.2 | 0.02875 | 2.72787 | 0.012555 | 0.022697 |
| 267 | 3.85 | 0.10 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 212.3 | 0.02849 | 3.10515 | 0.012515 | 0.021727 |
| 268 | 3.85 | 0.12 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 208.9 | 0.02717 | 3.90636 | 0.009639 | 0.018506 |
| 269 | 3.85 | 0.14 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 205.6 | 0.02418 | 4.80094 | 0.007583 | 0.012813 |
| 270 | 3.85 | 0.16 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 197.4 | 0.02072 | 5.57149 | 0.002420 | 0.004897 |
| 271 | 3.85 | 0.18 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 192.9 | 0.01939 | 6.21330 |  |  |
| 272 | 3.85 | 0.20 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 186.8 | 0.01797 | 6.96573 | - |  |
| 273 | 3.85 | 0.22 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 183.3 | 0.01687 | 7.44755 |  |  |
| 274 | 3.85 | 0.30 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 175.4 | 0.01279 | 7.94107 |  |  |
| 275 | 3.85 | 0.40 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 169.5 | 0.01223 | 8.40160 |  |  |
| 276 | 3.85 | 0.50 | 1.49 | 130.6 | 166.5 | 0.01297 | 9.47147 | -- |  |

NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 2 - CLEAN CONFIGURATION

| RUN | $\text { ALPHA }_{u}$ (deg) |  | $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | CL | u | CD | $\mathrm{CM}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | CM | MACH | Re $\times 10^{-6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 364 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.005 | -0.005 | 0.0080 | 0.0078 | 0.0004 | 0.0003 | 0.126 | 1.465 |
| 365 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.003 | -0.003 | 0.0078 | 0.0076 | 0.0006 | 0.0005 | 0.126 | 1.484 |
| 366 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 0.101 | 0.096 | 0.0080 | 0.0078 | 0.0010 | 0.0017 | 0.126 | 1.484 |
| 367 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 0.208 | 0.198 | 0.0083 | 0.0081 | 0.0010 | 0.0025 | 0.126 | 1.489 |
| 368 | 3.00 | 3.09 | 0.318 | 0.303 | 0.0085 | 0.0083 | 0.0011 | 0.0034 | 0.126 | 1.506 |
| 369 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.434 | 0.414 | 0.0092 | 0.0090 | 0.0023 | 0.0053 | 0.126 | 1.507 |
| 370 | 5.00 | 5.15 | 0.535 | 0.511 | 0.0095 | 0.0093 | 0.0027 | 0.0065 | 0.126 | 1.499 |
| 371 | 6.00 | 6.18 | 0.652 | 0.622 | 0.0098 | 0.0096 | 0.0010 | 0.0056 | 0.126 | 1.500 |
| 372 | 7.00 | 7.21 | 0.774 | 0.738 | 0.0101 | 0.0099 | -0.0014 | 0.0041 | 0.126 | 1.499 |
| 373 | 8.00 | 8.24 | 0.870 | 0.829 | 0.0114 | 0.0111 | 0.0004 | 0.0066 | 0.126 | 1.500 |
| 374 | 9.00 | 9.27 | 0.962 | 0.917 | 0.0127 | 0.0124 | 0.0036 | 0.0105 | 0.126 | 1.501 |
| 375 | 10.00 | 10.29 | 1.052 | 1.003 | 0.0142 | 0.0139 | 0.0058 | 0.0132 | 0.125 | 1.493 |
| 376 | 11.00 | 11.32 | 1.134 | 1.080 | 0.0165 | 0.0161 | 0.0088 | 0.0168 | 0.126 | 1.497 |
| 377 | 12.00 | 12.35 | 1.217 | 1.159 | 0.0205 | 0.0200 | 0.0127 | 0.0212 | 0.125 | 1.494 |
| 378 | 13.00 | 13.37 | 1.279 | 1.216 | 0.0261 | 0.0254 | 0.0152 | 0.0240 | 0.125 | 1.494 |
| 379 | 14.00 | 14.10 | 0.908 | 0.862 | 0.0317 | 0.0308 | -0.1319 | -0.1228 | 0.118 | 1.407 |
| 380 | 15.00 | 15.10 | 0.876 | 0.831 | 0.0373 | 0.0362 | -0.1310 | 0.1220 | 0.117 | 1.388 |
| 381 | 16.00 | 16.09 | 0.713 | 0.676 | 0.0429 | 0.0416 | -0.0959 | -0.0887 | 0.117 | 1.394 |
| 382 | 12.50 | 12.86 | 1.256 | 1.194 | 0.0233 | 0.0227 | 0.0146 | 0.0233 | 0.126 | 1.500 |
| 384 | 13.50 | 13.87 | 1.298 | 1.234 | 0.0289 | 0.0281 | 0.0179 | 0.0268 | 0.126 | 1.497 |
| 385 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.423 | 0.403 | 0.0092 | 0.0090 | 0.0021 | 0.0051 | 0.126 | 1.469 |
| 386 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.007 | -0.006 | 0.0072 | 0.0070 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | 0.125 | 1.455 |
| 387 | -2.00 | -2.06 | -0.228 | -0.217 | 0.0078 | 0.0076 | -0.0005 | -0.0021 | 0.126 | 1.463 |
| 388 | -4.00 | -4.12 | -0.437 | -0.417 | 0.0075 | 0.0073 | -0.0037 | 0.0067 | 0.125 | 1.452 |
| 389 | -6.00 | -6.18 | -0.681 | -0.650 | 0.0067 | 0.0065 | 0.0011 | -0.0038 | 0.125 | 1.459 |
| 0 | -8.00 | -8.24 | -0.900 | -0.857 | 0.0127 | 0.0124 | 0.0009 | -0.0055 | 0.126 | 1.469 |
| 391 | -6.00 | -6.19 | -0.683 | -0.651 | 0.0069 | 0.0067 | 0.0010 | -0.0039 | 0.126 | 1.462 |
| 392 | -5.00 | -5.16 | -0.563 | -0.537 | 0.0077 | 0.0075 | -0.0031 | -0.0070 | 0.125 | 1.455 |
| 393 | -10.00 | 10.30 | -1.084 | -1.032 | 0.0170 | 0.0166 | -0.0061 | -0.0137 | 0.127 | 1.478 |
| 394 | -10.00 | -10.30 | -1.077 | -1.025 | 0.0170 | 0.0166 | -0.0063 | -0.0139 | 0.125 | 1.458 |
| 95 | -12.00 | -12.35 | -1.240 | -1.178 | 0.0272 | 0.0265 | -0.0114 | -0.0200 | 0.125 | 1.458 |
| 996 | -14.00 | -14.16 | -1.015 | -0.963 | 0.0374 | 0.0363 | 0.1055 | 0.0960 | 0.116 | 1.353 |
| 397 | -15.00 | -15.17 | -1.057 | -1.002 | 0.0425 | 0.0412 | 0.1087 | 0.0987 | 0.115 | 1.333 |
| 398 | -13.00 | -13.37 | -1.299 | -1.233 | 0.0323 | 0.0314 | -0.0159 | -0.0248 | 0.125 | 1.455 |
| 399 | -13.50 | -13.87 | -1.191 | -1.129 | 0.0349 | 0.0339 | -0.0445 | -0.0520 | 0.117 | 1.360 |
| 400 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.015 | -0.014 | 0.0087 | 0.0085 | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | 0.168 | 2.018 |
| 401 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 0.097 | 0.093 | 0.0081 | 0.0079 | 0.0002 | 0.0008 | 0.168 | 2.025 |
| 402 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 0.203 | 0.194 | 0.0083 | 0.0081 | 0.0006 | 0.0020 | 0.168 | 2.017 |
| 403 | 3.00 | 3.08 | 0.301 | 0.287 | 0.0086 | 0.0084 | 0.0002 | 0.0024 | 0.168 | 2.022 |
| 404 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 0.407 | 0.388 | 0.0087 | 0.0085 | 0.0008 | 0.0037 | 0.168 | 2.016 |
| 405 | 5.00 | 5.14 | 0.523 | 0.499 | 0.0098 | 0.0096 | 0.0017 | 0.0054 | 0.167 | 2.011 |
| 406 | 6.00 | 6.17 | 0.622 | 0.594 | 0.0099 | 0.0097 | 0.0004 | 0.0048 | 0.168 | 2.016 |
| 407 | 7.00 | 7.20 | 0.742 | 0.708 | 0.0099 | 0.0097 | -0.0009 | 0.0045 | 0.167 | 2.009 |
| 408 | 7.00 | 7.20 | 0.744 | 0.710 | 0.0089 | 0.0087 | -0.0010 | 0.0044 | 0.166 | 1.964 |
| 409 | 5.00 | 5.14 | 0.523 | 0.499 | 0.0087 | 0.0085 | 0.0012 | 0.0050 | 0.166 | 1.964 |
| 410 | 3.00 | 3.08 | 0.300 | 0.286 | 0.0083 | 0.0081 | 0.0001 | 0.0023 | 0.165 | 1.955 |
| 412 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.004 | -0.004 | 0.0076 | 0.0074 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | 0.167 | 1.980 |
| 413 | 8.00 | 8.23 | 0.843 | 0.803 | 0.0112 | 0.0109 | 0.0001 | 0.0062 | 0.166 | 1.959 |


| RUN | ${ }^{\text {ALPHA }} \mathbf{u}$ <br> (deg) | ALPHA <br> (deg) | $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | CL | $\mathrm{CD}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | $C D$ | $\mathrm{CM}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | CM | MACH | $\operatorname{Re} \times 10^{-6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 414 | -2.00 | -2.06 | -0.224 | -0.213 | 0.0071 | 0.0069 | 0.0000 | -0.0016 | 0.167 | 1.970 |
| 415 | -2.00 | -2.06 | -0.222 | -0.212 | 0.0076 | 0.0074 | 0.0000 | -0.0016 | 0.166 | 1.960 |
| 416 | -4.00 | -4.12 | -0.420 | -0.401 | 0.0082 | 0.0080 | -0.0014 | -0.0044 | 0.167 | 1.970 |
| 417 | -6.00 | -6.18 | -0.646 | -0.616 | 0.0085 | 0.0083 | -0.0015 | -0.0061 | 0.168 | 1.981 |
| 418 | -8.00 | -8.24 | -0.868 | -0.827 | 0.0114 | 0.0111 | 0.0003 | -0.0059 | 0.167 | 1.974 |
| 420 | 9.00 | 9.26 | 0.929 | 0.886 | 0.0119 | 0.0116 | 0.0023 | 0.0089 | 0.165 | 1.948 |
| 421 | 10.00 | 10.28 | 1.014 | 0.967 | 0.0140 | 0.0137 | 0.0048 | 0.0120 | 0.165 | 1.948 |
| 422 | 11.00 | 11.31 | 1.098 | 1.046 | 0.0158 | 0.0154 | 0.0069 | 0.0146 | 0.164 | 1.942 |
| 423 | 12.00 | 12.33 | 1.184 | 1.127 | 0.0184 | 0.0179 | 0.0093 | 0.0176 | 0.164 | 1.940 |
| 425 | 13.00 | 13.36 | 1.254 | 1.193 | 0.0220 | 0.0214 | 0.0116 | 0.0204 | 0.163 | 1.935 |
| 426 | 14.00 | 14.15 | 0.965 | 0.917 | 0.0256 | 0.0249 | -0.1052 | -0.0963 | 0.148 | 1.749 |
| 427 | 13.50 | 13.68 | 1.034 | 0.983 | 0.0238 | 0.0232 | -0.0942 | -0.0850 | 0.151 | 1.788 |
| 428 | -10.00 | -10.29 | -1.035 | -0.986 | 0.0165 | 0.0161 | -0.0040 | -0.0113 | 0.166 | 1.958 |
| 429 | -10.00 | 10.29 | -1.034 | -0.985 | 0.0165 | 0.0161 | -0.0036 | -0.0109 | 0.166 | 1.960 |
| 430 | -12.00 | -12.34 | -1.201 | -1.142 | 0.0227 | 0.0221 | -0.0100 | -0.0183 | 0.166 | 1.957 |
| 431 | -14.00 | -14.20 | -1.110 | -1.054 | 0.0289 | 0.0281 | 0.0919 | 0.0822 | 0.153 | 1.800 |
| 432 | -13.00 | -13.36 | -1.267 | -1.205 | 0.0258 | 0.0251 | -0.0120 | -0.0208 | 0.166 | 1.955 |
| 433 | 13.50 | .8 | 1.292 | 1.228 | 0.0274 | 0.026 | 0.0129 | -0.0218 | 0.165 | 1.951 |

NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 2 - ICED CONFIGURATION

| RUN | $\operatorname{ALPHA}_{u}$ (deg) | ALPHA <br> (deg) | $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | CL | $\mathrm{CD}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | CD | $\mathrm{CM}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | CM | MACH | $\operatorname{Re} \times 10^{-6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 434 | 0.00 | -0.02 | -0.039 | -0.037 | 0.0282 | 0.0274 | -0.0106 | -0.0106 | 0.127 | 1.476 |
| 435 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.381 | 0.361 | 0.0399 | 0.0387 | 0.0134 | 0.0158 | 0.127 | 1.467 |
| 436 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.385 | 0.364 | 0.0401 | 0.0389 | 0.0140 | 0.0164 | 0.123 | 1.421 |
| 437 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.380 | 0.361 | 0.0401 | 0.0389 | 0.0147 | 0.0171 | 0.123 | 1.420 |
| 438 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.380 | 0.361 | 0.0390 | 0.0379 | 0.0135 | 0.0159 | 0.123 | 1.421 |
| 439 | 0.00 | -0.02 | -0.043 | -0.041 | 0.0258 | 0.0251 | -0.0103 | -0.0104 | 0.124 | 1.428 |
| 440 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.070 | 0.066 | 0.0261 | 0.0254 | -0.0056 | -0.0050 | 0.124 | 1.429 |
| 441 | 2.00 | 2.05 | 0.176 | 0.167 | 0.0283 | 0.0275 | 0.0007 | 0.0019 | 0.124 | 1.426 |
| 442 | 3.00 | 3.08 | 0.274 | 0.260 | 0.0333 | 0.0324 | 0.0066 | 0.0084 | 0.124 | 1.457 |
| 443 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.380 | 0.360 | 0.0405 | 0.0393 | 0.0144 | 0.0167 | 0.123 | 1.455 |
| 444 | 5.00 | 5.15 | 0.478 | 0.452 | 0.0537 | 0.0520 | 0.0177 | 0.0207 | 0.123 | 1.452 |
| 445 | 6.00 | 6.16 | 0.553 | 0.521 | 0.0763 | 0.0735 | 0.0075 | 0.0112 | 0.122 | 1.443 |
| 446 | 7.00 | 7.14 | 0.601 | 0.561 | 0.1141 | 0.1092 | -0.0252 | -0.0201 | 0.121 | 1.431 |
| 447 | 8.00 | 8.10 | 0.577 | 0.535 | 0.1519 | 0.1442 | -0.0549 | -0.0485 | 0.121 | 1.438 |
| 448 | 9.00 | 9.07 | 0.521 | 0.479 | 0.1897 | 0.1787 | -0.0704 | -0.0633 | 0.120 | 1.429 |
| 449 | 0.00 | -0.02 | -0.038 | -0.036 | 0.0270 | 0.0263 | -0.0095 | -0.0096 | 0.124 | 1.483 |
| 450 | -2.00 | -2.09 | -0.251 | -0.238 | 0.0345 | 0.0335 | -0.0172 | -0.0187 | 0.124 | 1.482 |
| 451 | -4.00 | -4.14 | 0.444 | -0.420 | 0.0494 | 0.0479 | -0.0194 | -0.0220 | 0.123 | 1.477 |
| 452 | -4.00 | -4.14 | -0.443 | -0.420 | 0.0503 | 0.0487 | -0.0203 | -0.0230 | 0.123 | 1.406 |
| 453 | -6.00 | -6.13 | -0.577 | -0.544 | 0.0649 | 0.0627 | 0.0218 | 0.0171 | 0.121 | 1.392 |
| 454 | -8.00 | -8.08 | -0.516 | -0.486 | 0.0798 | 0.0769 | 0.0553 | 0.0500 | 0.120 | 1.379 |
| 455 | -7.00 | -7.11 | -0.547 | -0.515 | 0.0724 | 0.0698 | 0.0332 | 0.0284 | 0.120 | 1.377 |
| 456 | -6.00 | -6.13 | -0.580 | -0.547 | 0.0649 | 0.0627 | 0.0232 | 0.0185 | 0.121 | 1.389 |
| 457 | -5.00 | -5.15 | -0.536 | -0.505 | 0.0686 | 0.0662 | -0.0043 | -0.0079 | 0.122 | 1.402 |
| 458 | 0.00 | -0.02 | -0.043 | -0.041 | 0.0272 | 0.0265 | -0.0101 | -0.0102 | 0.161 | 1.883 |
| 459 | 2.00 | 2.05 | 0.167 | 0.159 | 0.0287 | 0.0279 | 0.0008 | 0.0020 | 0.161 | 1.880 |
| 460 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 0.364 | 0.345 | 0.0417 | 0.0405 | 0.0135 | 0.0158 | 0.160 | 1.870 |


| RUN | ALPHA $^{\text {a }}$ | ALPHA | $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | CL | $\mathrm{CD}_{u}$ | CD | $\mathrm{CM}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | CM | MAC | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 461 | 6.00 | 6.15 | 0.535 | 0.504 | 0.0769 | 0.0741 | 0.0052 | 0.0088 | 0.157 | 1.840 |
| 462 | 8.00 | 8.11 | 0.575 | 0.537 | 0.1121 | 0.1073 | -0.0443 | -0.0387 | 0.154 | 1.798 |
| 463 | 7.00 | 7.12 | 0.568 | 0.532 | 0.0945 | 0.0908 | -0.0294 | -0.0244 | 0.155 | 1.815 |
| 464 | 9.00 | 9.06 | 0.489 | 0.455 | 0.1297 | 0.1237 | -0.0679 | -0.0618 | 0.152 | 1.775 |
| 465 | -2.00 | -2.08 | -0.238 | -0.226 | 0.0342 | 0.0332 | -0.0178 | -0.0192 | 0.160 | 1.875 |
| 466 | -2.00 | -2.09 | -0.239 | -0.227 | 0.0342 | 0.0332 | -0.0181 | -0.0194 | 0.161 | 1.904 |
| 467 | -4.00 | -4.14 | -0.424 | -0.401 | 0.0506 | 0.0490 | -0.0199 | -0.0225 | 0.160 | 1.890 |
| 468 | -6.00 | -6.15 | -0.546 | -0.513 | 0.0837 | 0.0806 | 0.0038 | -0.0002 | 0.157 | 8 |
| 469 | -8.00 | -8.16 | -0.644 | -0.601 | 0.1168 | 0.1117 | 0.0187 | 0.0135 | 0.154 | 1.826 |
| 470 | -9.00 | -9.16 | -0.688 | -0.640 | 0.1334 | 0.1271 | 0.0280 | 0.0221 | 0.153 | 1.806 |
| 471 | -10.00 | -10.16 | -0.729 | -0.676 | 0.1499 | 0.1424 | 0.0360 | 0.0294 | 0.150 | 1.777 |
| 472 | -10.00 | -10.05 | -0.414 | -0.384 | 0.1499 | 0.1424 | 0.0549 | 0.0496 | 0.152 | 1.794 |
| 473 | -8.00 | -8.10 | -0.545 | -0.508 | 0.1168 | 0.1117 | 0.0491 | 0.0435 | 0.153 | 1.814 |
| 474 | -6.00 | -6.13 | -0.537 | -0.504 | 0.0900 | 0.0865 | 0.0144 | 0.0101 | 0.157 | 1.859 |
| 475 | -4.00 | -4.14 | -0.426 | -0.403 | 0.0506 | 0.0490 | -0.0185 | -0.0211 | 0.160 | 1.894 |
| 476 | -7.00 | -7.13 | -0.582 | -0.546 | 0.0947 | 0.0909 | 0.0261 | 0.0211 | 0.156 | 1.840 |
| 477 | 0.00 | -0.02 | -0.048 | -0.046 | 0.0250 | 0.0243 | -0.0104 | -0.0106 | 0.075 | 0.848 |
| 478 | 2.00 | 2.05 | 0.182 | 0.173 | 0.0278 | 0.0271 | 0.0002 | 0.0015 | 0.075 | 0.853 |
| 479 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.396 | 0.375 | 0.0392 | 0.0381 | 0.0143 | 0.0168 | 0.075 | 0.849 |
| 480 | 6.00 | 6.17 | 0.575 | 0.542 | 0.0718 | 0.0693 | 0.0122 | 0.0160 | 0.074 | 0.844 |
| 481 | 8.00 | 8.11 | 0.596 | 0.558 | 0.1044 | 0.1001 | -0.0490 | -0.0432 | 0.073 | 0.830 |
| 482 | 9.00 | 9.08 | 0.571 | 0.533 | 0.1210 | 0.1156 | -0.0735 | -0.0668 | 0.073 | 0.826 |
| 483 | 7.00 | 7.14 | 0.624 | 0.586 | 0.0880 | 0.0846 | -0.0243 | -0.0192 | 0.074 | 0.836 |
| 484 | -2.00 | -2.09 | -0.269 | -0.256 | 0.0302 | 0.0294 | -0.0187 | -0.0203 | 0.075 | 0.849 |
| 485 | -4.00 | -4.15 | -0.470 | -0.445 | 0.0477 | 0.0462 | -0.0208 | -0.0237 | 0.075 | 0.845 |
| 486 | -6.00 | -6.14 | -0.603 | -0.566 | 0.0839 | 0.0807 | 0.0216 | 0.0167 | 0.074 | 0.834 |
| 487 | -8.00 | -8.07 | -0.528 | -0.494 | 0.1044 | 0.1001 | 0.0651 | 0.0592 | 0.073 | 0.826 |
| 488 | -7.00 | -7.10 | -0.581 | -0.546 | 0.0880 | 0.0846 | 0.0527 | 0.0470 | 0.074 | 0.833 |
| 489 | -5.00 | -5.17 | -0.567 | -0.535 | 0.0669 | 0.0646 | -0.0094 | -0.0132 | 0.074 | 0.842 |
| 490 | 0.00 | -0.03 | -0.050 | -0.047 | 0.0250 | 0.0243 | -0.0105 | -0.0107 | 0.075 | 0.862 |
| 1 | 2.00 | 2.05 | 0.177 | 0.169 | 0.0278 | 0.0271 | 0.0011 | 0.0023 | 0.075 | 0.861 |
| 492 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.398 | 0.378 | 0.0392 | 0.0381 | 0.0143 | 0.0168 | 0.074 | 0.857 |
| 493 | 6.00 | 6.17 | 0.583 | 0.549 | 0.0718 | 0.0693 | 0.0117 | 0.0155 | 0.074 | 0.851 |
| 494 | -4.00 | -4.15 | -0.469 | -0.444 | 0.0477 | 0.0462 | -0.0210 | -0.0238 | 0.074 | 0.856 |
| 495 | -2.00 | -2.09 | -0.258 | -0.245 | 0.0302 | 0.0294 | -0.0196 | -0.0211 | 0.075 | 0.861 |
| 500 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.011 | -0.010 | 0.0078 | 0.0076 | 0.0006 | 0.0005 | 0.075 | 0.872 |
| 501 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 0.213 | 0.203 | 0.0077 | 0.0075 | 0.0013 | 0.0028 | 0.075 | 0.873 |
| 502 | 4.0 | 4.12 | 0.435 | 0.415 | 0.0088 | 0.0086 | 0.0030 | 0.0060 | 0.076 | 0.875 |
| 503 | 6.00 | 6.19 | 0.691 | 0.659 | 0.0089 | 0.0087 | -0.0026 | 0.0024 | 0.076 | 0.876 |
| 504 | 8.00 | 8.24 | 0.888 | 0.846 | 0.0129 | 0.0126 | 0.0021 | 0.0084 | 0.076 | 0.875 |
| 505 | 10.00 | 10.30 | 1.061 | 1.010 | 0.0165 | 0.0161 | 0.0086 | 0.0160 | 0.076 | 0.876 |
| 60 | 10.00 | 10.30 | 1.061 | 1.010 | 0.0169 | 0.0165 | 0.0092 | 0.0166 | 0.076 | 0.876 |
| 507 | 12.00 | 12.34 | 1.189 | 1.131 | 0.0244 | 0.0238 | 0.0166 | 0.0247 | 0.075 | 0.873 |
| 508 | 14.00 | 14.12 | 0.842 | 0.800 | 0.0319 | 0.0310 | -0.1027 | -0.0946 | 0.072 | 0.832 |
| 509 | 13.00 | 13.32 | 1.166 | 1.108 | 0.0282 | 0.0274 | 0.0011 | 0.0094 | 0.075 | 0.871 |
| 510 | 12.50 | 12.84 | 1.188 | 1.129 | 0.0263 | 0.0256 | 0.0170 | 0.0251 | 0.075 | 0.872 |
| 511 | -2.00 | -2.06 | -0.233 | -0.222 | 0.0082 | 0.0080 | -0.0010 | -0.0026 | 0.076 | 0.879 |
| 512 | -4.00 | -4.13 | -0.452 | -0.431 | 0.0100 | 0.0098 | -0.0035 | 0.0067 | 0.076 | 0.896 |
| 513 | -6.00 | -6.19 | -0.714 | -0.681 | 0.0137 | 0.0134 | 0.0061 | 0.0009 | 0.076 | 0.899 |
| 514 | -6.00 | -6.19 | -0.710 | -0.677 | 0.0133 | 0.0130 | 0.0060 | 0.0008 | 0.076 | 0.895 |


| RUN | ALPHA <br> $\mathbf{u}$ <br> (deg) | ALPHA <br> (deg) | $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | CL | $\mathrm{CD}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | CD | $\mathrm{CM}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | CM | MACH | $\mathrm{Re} \times 10^{-6}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 515 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.433 | 0.413 | 0.0080 | 0.0078 | 0.0024 | 0.0055 | 0.076 | 0.901 |
| 516 | -8.00 | -8.25 | -0.909 | -0.866 | 0.0146 | 0.0142 | -0.0029 | -0.0093 | 0.076 | 0.900 |
| 517 | -10.00 | -10.31 | -1.093 | -1.040 | 0.0192 | 0.0187 | -0.0097 | -0.0173 | 0.076 | 0.902 |
| 518 | -12.00 | -12.35 | -1.210 | -1.150 | 0.0269 | 0.0262 | -0.0163 | -0.0246 | 0.076 | 0.894 |
| 519 | -14.00 | -14.12 | -0.847 | -0.804 | 0.0346 | 0.0336 | 0.1031 | 0.0949 | 0.073 | 0.858 |
| 520 | -13.00 | -13.32 | -1.164 | -1.105 | 0.0308 | 0.0300 | 0.0005 | -0.0078 | 0.076 | 0.895 |
| 521 | -12.50 | -12.85 | -1.197 | -1.138 | 0.0288 | 0.0280 | -0.0191 | -0.0272 | 0.076 | 0.900 |

NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 2 - CLEAN CONFIGURATION
TRIP AT X/C $=0.05$ (BOTH UPPER AND LOWER SURFACES)

| RUN | $\mathrm{ALPHA}_{\mathbf{u}}$ (deg) | ALPHA (dea) |  | CL |  | CD | M | CM | MACH | Re $\times 10$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 748 | 0.00 | 0.00 | . | . 0.00 | . | . 007 | . 0.025 | 0.002 | 0.116 | 387 |
| 749 | 8.00 | 8.25 | 0.875 | 0.832 | 0.0108 | 0.0105 | . 0015 | 0.0051 | 0.116 | 1.386 |
| 750 | 8.00 | 8.25 | 0.880 | 0.837 | .0111 | 0.0108 | . 0025 | 0.0042 | 0.116 | 1.387 |
| 751 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.006 | -0.006 | 0.0109 | 0.0106 | 0.0001 | -0.0002 | 0.116 | 1.374 |
| 752 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 0.217 | 0.207 | 0.0111 | 0.0108 | 0.0007 | 0.0023 | 0.117 | 1.384 |
| 753 | 4.00 | 4.13 | 0.438 | 0.417 | 0.0115 | 0.0112 | 0.0004 | 0.0037 | 0.116 | 1.380 |
| 754 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 0.208 | 0.198 | 0.0110 | 0.0107 | -0.0013 | 0.0003 | 0.117 | 1.385 |
| 755 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 0.430 | 0.409 | 0.0116 | 0.0113 | -0.0012 | 0.0021 | 0.117 | 1.391 |
| 756 | 6.00 | 6.19 | 0.653 | 0.620 | 0.0136 | 0.0133 | 0.0006 | 0.0055 | 0.116 | 1.381 |
| 757 | 8.00 | 8.25 | 0.849 | 0.806 | 0.0139 | 0.0135 | 0.0045 | 0.0109 | 0.117 | 1.390 |
| 758 | 10.00 | 10.31 | 1.038 | 0.986 | 0.0176 | 0.0171 | 0.0083 | 0.0161 | 0.115 | 1.370 |
| 759 | 12.00 | 12.36 | 1.198 | 1.136 | 0.0247 | 0.0240 | 0.0139 | 0.0226 | 0.116 | 1.373 |
| 760 | 14.00 | 14.13 | 0.932 | 0.882 | 0.0318 | 0.0309 | -0.124 | 0.11 | 0.109 | 1.293 |
| 761 | 13.00 | 13.38 | 1.247 | 1.181 | 0.0299 | 0.0290 | 0.0167 | 0.0257 | 0.116 | 1.375 |
| 762 | -4.00 | -4.14 | -0.463 | -0.440 | 0.0125 | 0.0122 | -0.0030 | -0.0065 | 0.117 | 1.394 |
| 763 | -8.00 | -8.26 | -0.856 | -0.812 | 0.0173 | 0.0168 | -0.0055 | -0.0119 | 0.116 | 1.380 |
| 764 | -13.00 | -13.37 | -1.190 | -1.127 | 0.0283 | 0.0275 | -0.0184 | -0.0270 | 0.109 | 1.295 |
| 765 | -14.00 | -14.19 | -0.939 | -0.889 | 0.0318 | 0.0309 | 0.0728 | 0.0641 | 0.113 | 1.337 |
| 766 | -12.00-1 | -12.36 | 1.174 | . 112 | 0.0285 | 0.0277 | -0.0160 | -0.0246 | 0.116 | 1.376 |

* NOTE: Pressure difference between transducers.

NACA 0012 MODEL NO. 2 - CLEAN CONFIGURATION $\operatorname{TRIP}$ AT $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{C}=0.05$
TOTAL BOUNDARY LAYER PROBE VELOCITY PROFILES

| RUN | $\begin{gathered} \text { AOA } \\ (\mathrm{deg}) \end{gathered}$ | X/C | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Re} \\ & \times 10^{-6} \end{aligned}$ | VEL $(f t / s)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{U}-\mathrm{EDGE} \\ & (\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} * / C \\ \times 10^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \theta / C \\ & \times 10^{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 788 | 3.85 | 0.03 | 1.43 | 131.8 | 151.8 | 3.20166 | 2.10189 |
| 789 | 3.85 | 0.03 | 1.41 | 130.7 | 151.1 | 3.21301 | 2.10328 |
| 790 | 3.85 | 0.02 | 1.42 | 131.6 | 163.9 | 2.15226 | 1.42940 |
| 791 | 3.85 | 0.02 | 1.42 | 131.1 | 163.3 | 2.33087 | 1.50410 |
| 792 | 3.85 | 0.02 | 1.42 | 131.3 | 162.9 | 2.37040 | 1.57792 |
| 793 | 3.85 | 0.02 | 1.41 | 130.8 | 162.8 | 2.76799 | 1.79168 |
| 794 | 3.85 | 0.01 | 1.42 | 131.2 | 162.7 | 1.53397 | 0.93361 |
| 795 | 3.85 | 0.01 | 1.42 | 131.0 | 163.9 | 1.69846 | 1.02513 |
| 796 | 3.85 | 0.00 | 1.42 | 131.3 | 194.0 | 0.77307 | 0.43989 |
| 797 | 3.85 | 0.00 | 1.43 | 132.5 | 194.8 | 0.88946 | 0.55715 |
| 798 | -0.15 | 0.03 | 1.43 | 131.1 | 148.0 | 2.30661 | 1.57829 |
| 799 | -0.15 | 0.03 | 1.43 | 132.4 | 147.9 | 2.28867 | 1.52718 |
| 801 | -0.15 | 0.02 | 1.44 | 132.0 | 155.8 | 1.58051 | 1.03879 |
| 802 | -0.15 | 0.02 | 1.43 | 130.4 | 155.5 | 1.80664 | 1.17000 |
| 803 | -0.15 | 0.01 | 1.44 | 131.8 | 159.4 | 1.10019 | 0.67952 |
| 804 | -0.15 | 0.01 | 1.44 | 131.6 | 159.4 | 1.24502 | 0.77926 |
| 805 | -0.15 | 0.00 | 1.44 | 131.5 | 159.2 | 0.53174 | 0.24111 |
| 807 | -0.15 | 0.00 | 1.44 | 131.6 | 159.8 | 0.62718 | 0.33051 |
| 808 | -0.15 | 0.01 | 1.49 | 132.9 | 179.8 | 1.12362 | 0.65278 |
| 811 | -0.15 | 0.02 | 1.48 | 132.8 | 168.2 | 1.72779 | 1.12934 |
| 812 | -0.15 | 0.02 | 1.48 | 132.3 | 168.0 | 1.95480 | 1.22531 |
| 813 | -0.15 | 0.03 | 1.48 | 132.2 | 155.4 | 2.63122 | 1.74612 |

APPENDIX B

PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS
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## APPENDIX C

WAKE SURVEYS






















APPENDIX D

VELOCITY PROFILES

























































