



October 1998

# **Effects of Grit Roughness and Pitch Oscillations on the S825 Airfoil**

Airfoil Performance Report, Revised (12/99)

R. Reuss Ramsay  
J. M. Janiszewska  
G. M. Gregorek  
*The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio*

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393  
A national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy  
Managed by Midwest Research Institute  
for the U.S. Department of Energy  
under contract No. DE-AC36-83CH10093

# Foreword

Airfoils for wind turbines have been selected by comparing data from different wind tunnels, tested under different conditions, making it difficult to make accurate comparisons. Most wind tunnel data sets do not contain airfoil performance in stall commonly experienced by turbines operating in the field. Wind turbines commonly experience extreme roughness for which there is very little data. Finally, recent tests have shown that dynamic stall is a common occurrence for most wind turbine operating in yawed, stall or turbulent conditions. Little dynamic stall data exists for the airfoils of interest to a wind turbine designer. In summary, very little airfoil performance data exists which is appropriate for wind turbine design.

Recognizing the need for a wind turbine airfoil performance data base, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, awarded a contract to Ohio State University (OSU) to conduct a wind tunnel test program. Under this program, OSU tested a series of popular wind turbine airfoils. A standard test matrix was developed to assure that each airfoil was tested under the same conditions. The test matrix was developed in partnership with industry and is intended to include all of the operating conditions experienced by wind turbines. These conditions include airfoil performance at high angles of attack, rough leading edge (bug simulation), steady and unsteady angles of attack.

Special care has been taken to report as much of the test conditions and raw data as practical so that designers can make their own comparisons and focus on details of the data relevant to their design goals. Some of the airfoil coordinates are proprietary to NREL or an industry partner. To protect the information which defines the exact shape of the airfoil, the coordinates have not been included in the report. Instructions on how to obtain these coordinates may be obtained by contacting C.P. (Sandy) Butterfield at NREL.

---

C.P. (Sandy) Butterfield  
Wind Technology Division  
National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Golden, Colorado, 80401 USA  
Internet Address: [Sandy\\_Butterfield@NREL.GOV](mailto:Sandy_Butterfield@NREL.GOV)  
Phone 303-384-6902  
FAX 303-384-6901

# Preface

The Ohio State University Aeronautical and Astronautical Research Laboratory is conducting a series of steady state and unsteady wind tunnel tests on a set of airfoils which have been or will be used for horizontal axis wind turbines. The purpose is to investigate the effect of pitch oscillations and leading edge grit roughness on airfoil performance. The study of pitch oscillation effects can help to understand the behavior of horizontal axis wind turbines in yaw. The results of these tests will aid in the development of new airfoil performance codes which account for unsteady behavior and also aid in the design of new airfoils for wind turbines. The application of leading edge grit roughness (LEGR) simulates surface irregularities that occur on wind turbines. These irregularities on the blades are due to the accumulation of insect debris, ice, and/or the aging process and can significantly reduce the output of the horizontal axis wind turbines. The experimental results from the application of leading edge grit roughness will help develop airfoils that are less sensitive to roughness.

The present work was made possible by the efforts and financial support of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory which provided major funding and technical monitoring, the U.S. Department of Energy is credited for its funding of this document through the National Renewable Energy Laboratory under contract number DE-AC36-83CH10093. The staff of The Ohio State University Aeronautical and Astronautical Research Laboratory appreciate the contributions made by personnel from that organization. In addition, the authors would like to recognize the efforts of Michael Peterson, an undergraduate student research assistant.

# Summary

A NREL S825 airfoil model was tested in The Ohio State University Aeronautical and Astronautical Research Laboratory 3×5 subsonic wind tunnel under steady state and unsteady conditions. The test defined baseline conditions for steady state angles of attack from  $-20^\circ$  to  $+40^\circ$  and examined unsteady behavior by oscillating the model about its quarter chord pitch axis for three mean angles, three frequencies, and two amplitudes. For all oscillating cases, Reynolds numbers of 0.75, 1, and 1.25 million were used. In addition, the above conditions were repeated after the application of leading edge grit roughness (LEGR) to determine contamination effects on the airfoil performance.

Typical steady state results of the S825 testing showed a baseline maximum lift coefficient of 1.41 at  $10.9^\circ$  angle of attack for 1 million Reynolds number. The application of LEGR reduced the maximum lift coefficient by 11% and increased the minimum drag coefficient value by 67%. The zero lift pitching moment coefficient of -0.1541 showed a 19% decrease in magnitude to -0.1255 with LEGR applied.

Data were also obtained for two pitch oscillation amplitudes,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  and  $\pm 10^\circ$ . The larger amplitude consistently gave a higher maximum lift coefficient than the smaller amplitude and both sets of unsteady maximum lift coefficients were greater than the steady state values. Stall was delayed on the airfoil while the angle of attack was increasing, thereby causing an increase in maximum lift coefficient. A hysteresis behavior was exhibited for all the unsteady test cases. The hysteresis loops were larger for the higher reduced frequencies and for the larger amplitude oscillations. As in the steady case, the effect of LEGR in the unsteady case was to reduce the lift coefficient at high angles of attack. In addition, the hysteresis behavior persisted into lower angles of attack than was observed under clean conditions.

In general, the unsteady maximum lift coefficient was up to 73% higher than the steady state maximum lift coefficient, and variation in the quarter chord pitching moment coefficient magnitude was in some cases over 300% larger in magnitude than the steady state values at high angles of attack. These findings indicate the importance of considering the unsteady flow behavior occurring in wind turbine operation because use of steady values could result in grossly inaccurate loads.

# Contents

# Page

Preface .....	iv
Summary .....	v
List of Symbols .....	ix
Introduction .....	1
Experimental Facility .....	2
Wind Tunnel .....	2
Oscillation System .....	3
Model Details .....	4
Test Equipment and Procedures .....	6
Data Acquisition .....	6
Data Reduction .....	7
Test Matrix .....	8
Results and Discussion .....	10
Comparison With Theory .....	10
Steady State Data .....	11
Unsteady Data .....	13
Summary of Results .....	19
References .....	22
Appendix A: Surface Pressure Tap Coordinates .....	A-1
Appendix B: Steady State Data .....	B-1
Appendix C: Unsteady Integrated Coefficients .....	C-1

# List of Figures

# Page

1. 3×5 wind tunnel, top view. . . . .	2
2. 3×5 wind tunnel, side view. . . . .	2
3. 3×5 wind tunnel oscillation system. . . . .	3
4. S825 airfoil section. . . . .	4
5. Measured-to-desired model coordinates difference curves. . . . .	4
6. Roughness pattern. . . . .	5
7. Data acquisition schematic. . . . .	6
8. Comparison with theory, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ . . . . .	10
9. Comparison with theory, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ . . . . .	10
10. Comparison with theory, $C_p$ vs $x/c$ , $\alpha=-0.1^\circ$ . . . . .	10
11. Comparison with theory, $C_p$ vs $x/c$ , $\alpha=4.2^\circ$ . . . . .	10
12. $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , clean. . . . .	11
13. $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , LEGR, $k/c=0.0019$ . . . . .	11
14. $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , clean. . . . .	11
15. $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , LEGR, $k/c=0.0019$ . . . . .	11
16. Clean, drag polar. . . . .	12
17. LEGR, drag polar. . . . .	12
18. Pressure distribution, $\alpha=2.1^\circ$ . . . . .	12
19. Pressure distribution, $\alpha=14.2^\circ$ . . . . .	12
20. Clean, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.026$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	13
21. Clean, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.078$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	13
22. Clean, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.026$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	13
23. Clean, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.078$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	13
24. LEGR, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.025$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	14
25. LEGR, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.077$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	14
26. LEGR, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.025$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	15
27. LEGR, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.077$ , $\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	15
28. Clean, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.027$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	15
29. Clean, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.082$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	15
30. Clean, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.027$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	16
31. Clean, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.082$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	16
32. LEGR, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.026$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	16
33. LEGR, $C_l$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.081$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	16
34. LEGR, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.026$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	17
35. LEGR, $C_m$ vs $\alpha$ , $\omega_{red}=0.081$ , $\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	17
36. Unsteady pressure distribution, clean, $\omega_{red}=0.052$ , $14\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	17
37. Unsteady pressure distribution, LEGR, $\omega_{red}=0.051$ , $14\pm 5.5^\circ$ . . . . .	18
38. Unsteady pressure distribution, clean, $\omega_{red}=0.055$ , $14\pm 10^\circ$ . . . . .	18
39. $\pm 5.5^\circ$ , unsteady $C_{lmax}$ vs $\omega_{red}$ . . . . .	20
40. $\pm 10^\circ$ , unsteady $C_{lmax}$ vs $\omega_{red}$ . . . . .	20

# List of Tables

# Page

1. S825 Steady State Parameters Summary .....	19
2. S825, Unsteady, Clean, $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .....	19
3. S825, Unsteady, LEGR, $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .....	20
4. S825, Unsteady, Clean, $\pm 10^\circ$ .....	20
5. S825, Unsteady, LEGR, $\pm 10^\circ$ .....	21

# List of Symbols

AOA	Angle of attack
A/C, a.c.	Alternating current
c	Model chord length
$C_d$	Drag coefficient
$C_{dmin}$	Minimum drag coefficient
$C_{dp}$	Pressure drag coefficient
$C_{dw}$	Wake drag coefficient
$C_{du}$	Uncorrected drag coefficient
$C_l$	Lift coefficient
$C_{lmax}$	Maximum lift coefficient
$C_{ldec}$	Lift coefficient at angle of maximum lift, but with angle of attack decreasing
$C_{lu}$	Uncorrected lift coefficient
$C_m, C_{m\frac{1}{4}}$	Pitching moment coefficient about the quarter chord
$C_{mdec}$	Pitching moment coefficient at angle of maximum lift, but with angle of attack decreasing
$C_{m inc}$	Pitching moment coefficient at angle of maximum lift, but with angle of attack increasing
$C_{mo}$	Pitching moment coefficient about the quarter chord, at zero lift
$C_{m\frac{1}{4}u}$	Uncorrected pitching moment coefficient about the quarter chord
$C_p$	Pressure coefficient, $(p - p_\infty)/q_\infty$
$C_{pmin}$	Minimum pressure coefficient
f	Frequency
h	Wind tunnel test section height
hp, Hp, HP	Horsepower
Hz	Hertz
k	Grit particle size
k/c	Grit particle size divided by airfoil model chord length
p	Pressure
q	Dynamic pressure
$q_u$	Uncorrected dynamic pressure
$q_w$	Dynamic pressure through the model wake
$q_\infty$	Free stream dynamic pressure
Re	Reynolds number
$Re_u$	Uncorrected Reynolds number
t	Time
$U_\infty$	Corrected free stream velocity
V	Velocity
$V_u$	Uncorrected velocity
x	Axis parallel to model reference line
y	Axis perpendicular to model reference line



$\alpha$	Angle of attack
$\alpha_{\text{dec}}$	Decreasing angle of attack
$\alpha_{\text{inc}}$	Increasing angle of attack
$\alpha_{\text{m}}$	Median angle of attack
$\alpha_{\text{mean}}$	Mean angle of attack
$\alpha_{\text{u}}$	Uncorrected angle of attack
$\epsilon$	Tunnel solid wall correction scalar
$\epsilon_{\text{sb}}$	Solid blockage correction scalar
$\epsilon_{\text{wb}}$	Wake blockage correction scalar
$\Lambda$	Body-shape factor (0.305 used)
$\pi$	3.1416
$\sigma$	Tunnel solid wall correction parameter
$\omega_{\text{red}}, \omega_{\text{reduced}}$	Reduced frequency, $\pi fc/U_{\infty}$

# Introduction

Horizontal axis wind turbine rotors experience unsteady aerodynamics due to wind shear when the rotor is yawed, when rotor blades pass through the support tower wake, and when the wind is gusting. An understanding of this unsteady behavior is necessary to assist in the design of new rotor airfoils. The rotors also experience performance degradation due to surface roughness. These surface irregularities are due to the accumulation of insect debris, ice, and the aging process. Wind tunnel studies that examine both the steady and unsteady behavior of airfoils can help define pertinent flow phenomena, and the resultant data can also be used to validate analytical computer codes.

A NREL S825 airfoil model was tested in The Ohio State University Aeronautical and Astronautical Research Laboratory (OSU/AARL) 3×5 subsonic wind tunnel (3×5) under steady flow with stationary model conditions, and with the model undergoing pitch oscillations. To study the possible extent of performance loss due to surface roughness, a standard grit pattern (LEGR) was used to simulate leading edge contamination. After baseline cases were completed, the LEGR was applied for both steady state and model pitch oscillation cases. The Reynolds numbers for steady state conditions were 0.75, 1, and 1.25 million, for the angle of attack range from -20° to +40°. While the model underwent pitch oscillations, data was acquired at Reynolds numbers of 0.75, 1, and 1.25 million, at frequencies of 0.6, 1.2, and 1.8 Hz. Two sine wave forcing functions were used;  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  and  $\pm 10^\circ$ , at mean angles of attack of 8°, 14°, and 20°. For purposes herein, any reference to unsteady conditions means the model was in pitch oscillation.

# Experimental Facility

## Wind Tunnel

The OSU/AARL 3×5 was used to conduct tests on the S825 airfoil section. Schematics of the top and side views of the tunnel are shown in figures 1 and 2. This open circuit tunnel had a velocity range of 0 - 55 m/s (180 ft/s) produced by a 2.4-m (8-ft) diameter, six-bladed fan. The fan was belt driven by a 93.2-kw (125-hp)




Figure 1. 3×5 wind tunnel, top view.




Figure 2. 3×5 wind tunnel, side view.


three phase a.c. motor connected to a variable frequency motor controller. Nominal test section dimensions were 1.0-m (39-in) high by 1.4-m (55-in) wide by 2.4-m (96-in) long. The 457-mm (18-in) chord airfoil model was mounted vertically in the test section. A steel tube through the quarter chord of the model was used to attach the model to the tunnel during testing. An angle of attack potentiometer was fastened to the model at the top of the tunnel as shown in figure 2. The steady state angle of attack was adjusted with a worm gear drive attached to the model strut below the tunnel floor.

## Oscillation System

Portions of the testing required the use of a reliable model pitch oscillation system. The OSU/AARL "shaker" system incorporated a face cam and follower arm attached to the model support tube below the wind tunnel floor, figure 3. The choice of cam governed the type and amplitude of the wave form produced. Sine wave forms having amplitudes of  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  and  $\pm 10^\circ$  were used for these tests; the wave form is defined by the equation

$$\alpha = \alpha_m + A \sin(2\pi ft)$$


where A is the respective amplitude. The shaker system was powered by a 5-hp a.c. motor with a variable line frequency controller. The useable oscillating frequency range was 0.1 - 2.0 Hz, with three frequencies used for this test: 0.6, 1.2, and 1.8 Hz.



**Figure 3. 3x5 wind tunnel oscillation system.**


## Model Details

A 457-mm (18-in) constant chord S825 airfoil model was designed and manufactured for the 3×5 wind tunnel test program. Figure 4 shows the airfoil section. The model coordinates are not presented in tabular form, since they are proprietary to NREL. The model trailing edge was thickened to 1.25-mm (0.05-in) for



**Figure 4. S825 airfoil section.**

fabrication purposes. The model was made of a nine layer composite lay up of alternating fiberglass and carbon fiber over ribs. The main load bearing member was a 38-mm (1.5-in) diameter steel tube which passed through the model quarter chord station. Ribs and end plates were used to transfer loads from the composite skin to the steel tube. The final surface was filled, painted and wet sanded to attain given coordinates within a requested tolerance of  $\pm 0.25$  mm ( $\pm 0.01$  inches). The completed model was measured at three spanwise locations using a Sheffield-Cordax coordinate measurement machine. Measurements were made in English units and later converted to metric. Figure 5 shows the results of comparing measured-to-desired coordinates by calculating differences normal to the profiled surface at three stations on the model. The "spikes" showing near the trailing edge and at the leading edge are due to the numerical methods and are not real. The model's lower and upper surfaces were within the required tolerance.




**Figure 5. Measured-to-desired model coordinates difference curves.**

To minimize pressure response times, which is important for the unsteady testing, the lengths of surface pressure tap lead-out lines had to be as short as possible. Consequently, a compartment was built into the model and the pressure scanning modules were installed inside the model. This compartment was accessed through a panel door fitted flush with the model contour on the lower (pressure) surface.

For test cases involving roughness, a standard roughness pattern developed for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory airfoil test program was employed. The pattern was generated using a molded insect pattern taken from a wind turbine in the field. The particle density was 5 particles per  $\text{cm}^2$  (32 particles per square inch) in the middle of the pattern, thinning to 1.25 particles per  $\text{cm}^2$  (8 particles per square inch) at

the edge of the pattern. Figure 6 shows the roughness pattern. To make a usable template, the pattern was repeatedly cut into a steel sheet 102-mm (4-in) wide and 91-cm (3-ft) long with holes just large enough for one grain of grit. Based on average particle size from the field specimen, standard #40 lapidary grit was chosen for the roughness elements, giving a particle height to chord ratio of 0.0019 for a 457-mm (18-in) chord model.



**Figure 6. Roughness pattern.**

To use the template, 102-mm (4-in) wide double-sided tape was applied to one side of the template and grit was poured and brushed from the opposite side. The tape was then removed from the template and transferred to the model. This method allowed the same roughness pattern to be replicated for any test.

# Test Equipment and Procedures

## Data Acquisition

Data were acquired and processed from 60 surface pressure taps, four individual tunnel pressure transducers, an angle of attack potentiometer, a wake probe position potentiometer, and a tunnel thermocouple. The data acquisition system included an IBM PC compatible 80486-based computer connected to a Pressure Systems Incorporated (PSI) data scanning system. The PSI system included a 780B Data Acquisition and Control Unit (DACU), 780B Pressure Calibration Unit (PCU), 81-IFC scanning module interface, two 2.5 psid pressure scanning modules (ESPs), one 20-in water column range pressure scanning module, and a 30 channel Remotely Addressed Millivolt Module (RAMM-30). Figure 7 shows the schematic of the data acquisition system.




Figure 7. Data acquisition schematic.

Four individual pressure transducers read tunnel total pressure, tunnel north static pressure, tunnel south static pressure, and wake dynamic pressure. Before the test began, these transducers were bench calibrated using a water manometer to determine their sensitivities and offsets. Related values were entered into the data acquisition and reduction program so the transducers could be shunt resistor calibrated before each series of wind tunnel runs.

The rotary angle of attack potentiometer of 0.5% linearity was regularly calibrated during the tunnel pressure transducers shunt calibration. The angle of attack calibration was accomplished by taking voltage readings at known values of set angle of attack. This calibration method gave angle of attack readings within  $\pm 0.25^\circ$  over the entire angle range. The wake probe position potentiometer was a linear potentiometer and it was also regularly calibrated during the shunt calibration of the tunnel pressure transducers.

Calibration of the three ESPs was done simultaneously by using the DACU and PCU. At operator request, the DACU commanded the PCU to apply known regulated pressures to the ESPs and read the output voltages from each integrated pressure sensor. From these values, the DACU calculated the calibration coefficients,

and stored them internally until the coefficients were requested by the controlling computer. This calibration was done several times during a run set because the ESPs were installed inside the model and their outputs tended to drift with temperature changes during a test sequence. Frequent on-line calibrations minimized the effect.

For steady state cases, the model was set to an angle of attack and the tunnel conditions adjusted. At operator request, pressure measurements from the airfoil surface taps and all other channels of information were acquired and stored by the DACU and subsequently passed to the controlling computer for final processing. The angles of attack were always set in the same progression - from 0° to -20° then from 0° to +40°.

For model oscillating cases, the tunnel conditions were set while the model was stationary at the desired mean angle of attack. The "shaker" was started, the model was allowed to oscillate through at least five cycles to establish the flow field, and then the model surface pressure and tunnel condition data were acquired. Generally, 120 data scans were acquired over three model oscillation cycles. Since surface pressures were scanned sequentially, the data rate was set so the model rotated through less than 0.50° during any data burst. Finally, due to the unsteady and complex nature of the pitch oscillation cases, model wake surveys (for drag) were not conducted.

## Data Reduction

The data reduction routine was included as a section of the data acquisition program. This combination of data acquisition and reduction routines allowed data to be reduced on-line during a test. By quickly reducing selected runs, integrity checks could be made to insure the equipment was working properly and to allow timely decisions about the test matrix.

The ambient pressure was manually input into the computer and was updated regularly. This value, as well as the measurements from the tunnel pressure transducers and the tunnel thermocouple, were used to calculate tunnel airspeed. As a continuous check of readings, the tunnel total and static pressures were read by both the tunnel individual pressure transducers and the 20-inch water column ESP.

A typical steady state data point was derived by acquiring 10 data scans of all channels over a 10 second window at each angle of attack and tunnel condition. The reduction portion of the program processed each data scan to coefficient ( $C_p$ ,  $C_l$ ,  $C_{m^{1/4}}$ , and  $C_{dp}$ ) using the measured surface pressure voltages, calibration coefficients, tap locations and wind tunnel conditions. Then, all scan sets for a given condition were ensemble averaged to provide one data set and that data set was then corrected for the effects of solid tunnel walls. All data was saved in electronic form.

Corrections due to solid tunnel sidewalls were applied to the wind tunnel data. As described by Pope and Harper (1966), tunnel conditions are represented by the following equations:

$$q = q_u(1 + 2\epsilon)$$

$$V = V_u(1 + \epsilon)$$

$$R_e = R_{e_u}(1 + \epsilon)$$

Airfoil aerodynamic characteristics are corrected by:

$$\alpha = \alpha_u + \frac{57.3\sigma}{2\pi} (C_{l_u} + 4C_{m^{1/4}_u})$$

$$C_l = C_{l_u}(1 - \sigma - 2\epsilon)$$



$$C_{m\frac{1}{4}} = C_{m\frac{1}{4}u} (1 - 2\epsilon) + \frac{\sigma C_l}{4}$$

$$C_d = C_{d_u} (1 - 3\epsilon_{sb} - 2\epsilon_{wb})$$

where

$$\sigma = \frac{\pi^2}{48} \left(\frac{c}{h}\right)^2$$

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_{sb} + \epsilon_{wb}$$

$$\epsilon_{sb} = \Lambda \sigma$$

$$\epsilon_{wb} = \frac{c}{h4} C_{d_u}$$

Model wake data were taken for steady state cases when the wake could be completely traversed. Pressures were acquired from a pitot-static probe which was connected to measure incompressible dynamic pressure through the wake. These pressure measurements were used to calculate drag coefficient using a form of the Jones equation derived from Schlichting (1979).

$$C_{dw} = \frac{2}{c} \int \sqrt{\frac{q_w}{q_\infty}} \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{q_w}{q_\infty}} \right) dy$$

This usage assumes static pressure at the measurement site is the free-stream value. The integration was done automatically except the computer operator chose the end points of the integration from a plot of the wake survey displayed on the computer screen.

For pitch oscillation cases, model surface pressures were reduced to pressure coefficient form with subsequent integrations and angle of attack considerations giving lift, moment and pressure drag coefficients. There was no calibration available for unsteady model pitch conditions; therefore, the unsteady pressure data were not corrected for any possible effects due to time dependent pitching or solid tunnel walls. Also for these cases, the wind tunnel contraction pressures (used for steady state cases) could not be used to calculate instantaneous free stream conditions due to slow response. The tunnel conditions were obtained from a total pressure probe, and the average of opposing static taps in the test section entrance; thereby giving near instantaneous flow pressure conditions for the pitching frequencies used.

## Test Matrix

The test was designed to study steady state and unsteady pitch oscillation data. Steady state data were acquired at Reynolds numbers of 0.75, 1, and 1.25 million with and without LEGR. Refer to the tabular data in Appendix B for the actual Reynolds number for each angle of attack for the steady state data. The angle of attack increment was two degrees when  $-20^\circ < \alpha < +10^\circ$  or  $+20^\circ < \alpha < +40^\circ$  and one degree when  $+10^\circ < \alpha < +20^\circ$ . Wake surveys were conducted to find total airfoil drag over an angle of attack range of  $-6^\circ$  to  $+8^\circ$  for LEGR cases and to  $+12^\circ$  for clean cases. Unsteady data were taken for Reynolds numbers of 0.75, 1, and 1.25 million. Sine wave cams having amplitudes  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  and  $\pm 10^\circ$  were used for pitch oscillations, and the

mean angles for both these amplitudes were  $8^\circ$ ,  $14^\circ$ , and  $20^\circ$ . For all these conditions, the frequencies were varied to 0.6, 1.2, and 1.8 Hz. All data points for the unsteady cases were acquired for both clean and LEGR cases.

# Results and Discussion

An S825 airfoil model was tested under steady state and pitch oscillation conditions. A brief discussion of a portion of the steady and unsteady results follows, including a comparison of steady experimental data and computational predictions.

## Comparison With Theory

The wind tunnel steady state data were compared with the computed predictions made using the North Carolina State Airfoil Analysis Code. This analysis code has proven to be accurate for moderate angles of attack. The analysis was made with specifications set to allow free transition from laminar to turbulent flow, and the pressure distribution comparisons were matched to the same angle of attack as the wind tunnel cases.




Figure 8. Comparison with theory,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure 9. Comparison with theory,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure 10. Comparison with theory,  $C_p$  vs  $x/c$ ,  $\alpha=-0.1^\circ$ .




Figure 11. Comparison with theory,  $C_p$  vs  $x/c$ ,  $\alpha=4.2^\circ$ .

Figure 8 shows the lift coefficient versus angle of attack for the 1 million Reynolds number case. For moderate angles of attack, where the analysis code is valid, the comparison showed good agreement. The pitching moment about the quarter chord, figure 9, showed adequate agreement for angles of attack from  $-5^\circ$  to  $+5^\circ$ . The pressure distributions shown in figures 10 and 11 are for angles of attack of  $-0.1^\circ$  and  $4.2^\circ$ , respectively, and include clean and LEGR wind tunnel data as compared to computed free transition pressure distributions. For both angles of attack, there was good correlation between the clean experimental and predicted values.

## Steady State Data

The S825 airfoil model was tested at three Reynolds numbers at nominal angles of attack from  $-20^\circ$  to  $+40^\circ$ . Figures 12 and 13 show lift coefficients for all the test Reynolds numbers both for model clean and with LEGR applied, respectively. The maximum positive lift coefficient, found at 1.25 million Reynolds number, was 1.43 for the clean cases and 1.26 for the LEGR cases, a 12% reduction due to the application of LEGR. The clean cases had positive stall near  $11.2^\circ$  while the LEGR cases stalled near  $10.1^\circ$  angle of attack. The average lift curve slope through the linear portion of the lift curve for clean data was 0.108 and about 0.107 for the LEGR case. The associated average lift coefficients at zero angle of attack were 0.56 for the clean case and 0.48 for the LEGR case.




Figure 12.  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ , clean.




Figure 13.  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ , LEGR,  $k/c=0.0019$ .

Figure 14 shows the pitching moment about the quarter chord for the clean cases and figure 15 shows the LEGR cases. The magnitude of the zero lift pitching moment was affected by the application of LEGR, there was over a 17% decrease in the zero lift pitching moment from the clean to the LEGR case throughout the range of Reynolds numbers tested. The zero lift pitching moment coefficient about the quarter chord for the 1 million Reynolds number was -0.1541 for the clean case and -0.1255 for the LEGR case. For moderate angles of attack  $-5^\circ$  to  $+5^\circ$  the pitching moment was nearly constant at -0.16 for the clean cases and, although not as consistent, at -0.14 for the LEGR cases.




Figure 14.  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ , clean.




Figure 15.  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ , LEGR,  $k/c=0.0019$ .




Figure 16. Clean, drag polar.




Figure 17. LEGR, drag polar.

Wake drag data were obtained for both the clean and LEGR cases over an angle of attack range of  $-6^\circ$  to  $+8^\circ$  and in some cases up to  $+12^\circ$ . A pitot-static probe was used to describe the wake profile. This method is reliable when there is relatively low turbulence in the wake flow; therefore, only moderate angles of attack have reliable total drag coefficient data. At angles of attack other than those where the wake data were acquired, surface pressure data were integrated to give  $C_{dp}$  and are shown in the drag polars as small symbols. The model clean drag data are shown in figure 16 and the LEGR case is shown in figure 17. At 1 million Reynolds number, minimum drag coefficient for the clean cases was measured as 0.0079, and 0.0132 for LEGR; a 67% increase. The general effect of LEGR was to increase drag consistently through most angles of attack.




Figure 18. Pressure distribution,  $\alpha=2.1^\circ$ .




Figure 19. Pressure distribution,  $\alpha=14.2^\circ$ .

Two examples of the surface pressure distributions are shown in figures 18 and 19 for  $2.1^\circ$  and  $14.2^\circ$ , respectively, for 1 million Reynolds number. At angles of attack close to zero degrees, the effect of LEGR did not appear to significantly affect the pressure distribution in comparison with the clean case distribution; however, the effect was apparent in the lift coefficient where for the LEGR case it was 0.70 and 0.80 for the clean case at  $2.1^\circ$ . For the higher angle of attack case, figure 19, the effect of LEGR was to reduce the magnitude of the pressure peak from  $-4.9$  to  $-4.5$  and increase the pressures on the upper (suction) surface over the forward 40% of the chord. The net effect was a reduction in lift coefficient from 1.21 to 1.08, a 11% decrease.

## Unsteady Data

Unsteady experimental data were obtained for the S825 airfoil model undergoing sinusoidal pitch oscillations. As mentioned earlier, no calibration was available for the unsteady oscillating model conditions; the steady state tunnel calibration was used to set the flow conditions while the model was stationary at its mean angle of attack. A comprehensive set of test conditions was used to describe unsteady behavior of the airfoil including: two angle of attack amplitudes,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  and  $\pm 10^\circ$ ; three Reynolds numbers, 0.75, 1, and 1.25 million; three pitch oscillation frequencies, 0.6, 1.2, and 1.8; and three mean angles of attack,  $8^\circ$ ,  $14^\circ$ , and  $20^\circ$ .




Figure 20. Clean,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.026$ ,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .




Figure 21. Clean,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.078$ ,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .

Figure 20 shows the lift coefficient versus angle of attack for the  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  amplitude model clean case, at reduced frequency of 0.026 and 1 million Reynolds number. Note that all three mean angles of attack are plotted on the same figure. The maximum pre-stall lift coefficient for this case was near 1.57 and occurred when the airfoil was traveling with the angle of attack increasing. In contrast, when the model was traveling through decreasing angles of attack, the stall recovery was delayed and a hysteresis behavior was exhibited in the lift coefficient that can be seen throughout all of the unsteady data. In order to obtain some measure of this hysteresis behavior, the lift coefficient on the "return" portion of the curve, at the angle of attack where maximum lift coefficient occurs, can be used. For the case discussed here, the hysteresis lift coefficient was 1.23, a 22% decrease from the 1.57 unsteady maximum value. In comparison, the steady state maximum lift coefficient was 1.41. At higher reduced frequency of 0.078, the hysteresis behavior was more pronounced as seen in figure 21. In addition to greater hysteresis, the maximum lift coefficient was




Figure 22. Clean,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.026$ ,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .




Figure 23. Clean,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.078$ ,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .

increased to about 1.71, which was a 21% increase over the steady state value. The corresponding hysteresis lift coefficient was 1.03. This difference between steady state behavior and unsteady hysteresis behavior demonstrates the need for unsteady testing of airfoils used in wind turbine applications.

The pitching moment in figures 22 and 23 corresponds to the same conditions as the two lift coefficient plots previously discussed. There was an indication that the hysteresis behavior was present but it was not as apparent as in the lift coefficient plots; but the higher reduced frequency case did show hysteresis more than the lower reduced frequency case. For reference, the steady state maximum lift occurred near  $11^\circ$  angle of attack and the steady state pitching moment at this maximum lift point was  $-0.1131$ . In comparison, when the airfoil was undergoing pitch oscillation for the lower frequency, pitching moment varied from  $-0.1275$  to  $-0.1103$  (at the angle of attack where maximum lift occurred), up to a 13% increase in magnitude from the steady state value. At the higher frequency, shown in figure 23, the pitching moment where maximum lift coefficient occurred was up to 24% higher than the steady state case. Note the angle of attack where the maximum lift coefficient occurred does not necessarily show the "greatest" hysteresis behavior but does give a relative indication of the effect.




Figure 24. LEGR,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.025$ ,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .




Figure 25. LEGR,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.077$ ,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ .

In comparison to the clean data, the application of LEGR reduced the maximum lift coefficient in the pitch oscillation cases. Lift coefficient versus angle of attack with LEGR applied is shown in figure 24 for the 0.025 reduced frequency case. The 0.077 reduced frequency case is in figure 25. Both correspond to the same run conditions which were described earlier for the clean cases. For the lower reduced frequency, the maximum unsteady lift coefficient was reduced to 1.38 from the corresponding clean case of 1.57, a 12% decrease. Hysteresis behavior was apparent at this frequency but it was of slightly smaller order than the clean case; the corresponding hysteresis lift coefficient was 1.12 when LEGR was applied. In contrast, the higher frequency LEGR case had a maximum lift coefficient of 1.60 while the model was increasing in angle of attack and the corresponding decreasing angle of attack lift coefficient was 0.96. Again, the application of LEGR slightly reduced the hysteresis loop behavior for larger angles of attack in comparison with the clean case.

The pitching moment coefficient shown in figure 26 is for 0.025 reduced frequency with LEGR applied. At the angle of unsteady maximum lift, the pitching moment ranges from  $-0.1275$  to  $-0.1150$ , while the steady state LEGR pitching moment is  $-0.1078$  at the steady state stall angle of attack ( $10.1^\circ$ ). The higher reduced frequency of 0.077 with LEGR application is shown in figure 27. As was seen with the lift coefficient, pitching moment hysteresis is more apparent at the higher reduced frequency than the corresponding low reduced frequency case. Unsteady maximum lift angle of attack for this reduced frequency occurs at  $15.3^\circ$  and the pitching moment ranges from  $-0.1742$  to  $-0.1156$  at that angle. Throughout the higher angle of attack

range, the magnitude of the unsteady pitching moment can be very different than the steady state clean case (clean steady state pitching moment at maximum lift is -0.1131). These differences can have an impact on the fatigue life predictions of a wind turbine system.




Figure 26. LEGR,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.025, \pm 5.5^\circ$ .




Figure 27. LEGR,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.077, \pm 5.5^\circ$ .




Figure 28. Clean,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.027, \pm 10^\circ$ .





Figure 29. Clean,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.082, \pm 10^\circ$ .

In addition to the  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  unsteady experimental data,  $\pm 10^\circ$  unsteady data were obtained with and without LEGR. The data shown were taken at 1 million Reynolds number using the same mean angles and frequencies as the  $5.5^\circ$  amplitude cases. Figures 28 and 29 show the  $\pm 10^\circ$ , unsteady, clean, lift coefficient for the reduced frequencies of 0.027 and 0.082, respectively. The maximum lift coefficient for the lower frequency is 1.63 and occurs, as expected, when the airfoil is traveling through increasing angle of attack. The hysteresis lift coefficient (at  $14.4^\circ$ ) is 1.18. At the higher reduced frequency, the maximum lift coefficient occurs at a higher angle of attack,  $19.3^\circ$ , and is 2.02. The corresponding hysteresis lift coefficient is 1.02. The difference between the maximum lift coefficient and the hysteresis lift coefficient indicates a much greater hysteresis response than experienced for the lower reduced frequency. The steady state, clean, maximum lift coefficient is 1.41; therefore, the unsteady behavior created lift coefficients up to 43% higher than the steady state values under these conditions.


The quarter chord pitching moments having the same reduced frequencies as the lift coefficient cases are shown in figures 30 and 31. The hysteresis behavior observed in the lift coefficient plots is also reflected in this pitching moment data. Near the maximum lift angle,  $14.4^\circ$  for the lower frequency, the pitching moment coefficient ranged from -0.1437 to -0.1142; whereas the 0.082 reduced frequency case had maximum




lift near  $19.3^\circ$  and pitching moment ranged from  $-0.2748$  to  $-0.2222$ . In comparison, the steady state pitching moment was  $-0.1131$  near the steady state maximum lift coefficient angle of attack of  $10.9^\circ$ . The higher reduced frequency again showed large hysteresis loops for all three mean angles of attack.




**Figure 30. Clean,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.027$ ,  $\pm 10^\circ$ .**



**Figure 31. Clean,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.082$ ,  $\pm 10^\circ$ .**



**Figure 32. LEGR,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.026$ ,  $\pm 10^\circ$ .**



**Figure 33. LEGR,  $C_l$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.081$ ,  $\pm 10^\circ$ .**

The application of LEGR degraded the lift performance of the airfoil as would be expected from the results discussed previously. The LEGR lift coefficient data for reduced frequencies of 0.026 and 0.081 are shown in figures 32 and 33, respectively. The maximum lift coefficient was reduced to 1.50 from 1.63 for the low frequency clean case. Although there was a reduction, this value was still higher than the LEGR steady state case which had a maximum lift coefficient of 1.25 at  $10.1^\circ$  angle of attack. The higher reduced frequency had a maximum lift coefficient of 2.08 which occurred near  $21^\circ$  angle of attack. The corresponding lift coefficient at  $20.9^\circ$  for the airfoil traveling with decreasing angle of attack was 1.08, a 48% reduction from the maximum.

Figures 34 and 35 show the corresponding pitching moment coefficients for the reduced frequencies of 0.026 and 0.081. For the 0.026 reduced frequency case, the pitching moment varied from  $-0.1413$  to  $-0.1143$  at  $13.4^\circ$  (where the maximum lift occurred). The hysteresis behavior was more pronounced for the higher reduced frequency case, where the range of pitching moments at the maximum lift angle of  $20.9^\circ$  was from  $-0.4653$  to  $-0.1990$ . These values can then be compared to the steady state LEGR value of  $-0.1078$ .




Figure 34. LEGR,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.026, \pm 10^\circ$ .




Figure 35. LEGR,  $C_m$  vs  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega_{red}=0.081, \pm 10^\circ$ .

Although all the unsteady data were not discussed here, the previous discussion included typical examples of the wind tunnel data. The remaining cases of the  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  and  $\pm 10^\circ$  oscillation data for all the Reynolds numbers are included in Appendix C.




Figure 36. Unsteady pressure distribution, clean,  $\omega_{red}=0.052, 14 \pm 5.5^\circ$ .

The unsteady pressure distributions show examples of the data used to calculate the lift, pressure drag, and the pitching moment coefficients. Figure 36 shows the distribution for a clean model, with a reduced frequency of 0.052, a mean angle of attack of  $14^\circ$ , and a  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  pitch oscillation. For plotting clarity, the model pressures were "unwrapped" about the trailing edge. The upper surface pressures are depicted on the right of the surface plot, lower surface values on the left. The trailing edge is then at the midpoint of the x-axis with the leading edge at each extreme. Additionally, the pressure coefficients were linearly interpolated to make an evenly spaced grid. The time scale corresponds to angle of attack. For this case, the negative pressure peak was at approximately -6.5. Figure 37 shows the LEGR case for the same test conditions as the previous figure. The application of LEGR reduced the pressure peak to -4.5. Separated flow is defined as the irregular, "rough" areas on the upper surface. Also note that the lower surface stayed attached through the airfoil travel.




Figure 37. Unsteady pressure distribution, LEGR,  $\omega_{\text{red}}=0.051$ ,  $14 \pm 5.5^\circ$ .

Figure 38 shows the same clean run conditions as above except with the  $\pm 10^\circ$  amplitude oscillation. This case was characterized by significant portions of the upper surface in stall and high pressure peaks. The negative pressure coefficient peaks were about -8.5 for this case while it was near -6.5 for the previous clean,  $14^\circ$  mean angle of attack case. The secondary peaks apparent on the upper surface correspond to a region of partial stall recovery while the model was traveling through decreasing angle of attack.




Figure 38. Unsteady pressure distribution, clean,  $\omega_{\text{red}}=0.055$ ,  $14 \pm 10^\circ$ .

## Summary of Results

An S825 airfoil model was tested under steady state and pitch oscillation conditions. Baseline tests were made while the model was clean, and then corresponding tests were conducted with leading edge grit roughness (LEGR) applied.

A summary of the steady state aerodynamic parameters is shown in table 1. As observed, the application of LEGR reduced the maximum lift of the airfoil 12% and the minimum drag coefficient increased in some cases more than 80%. The magnitude of the zero lift pitching moment coefficient was reduced 18% to 21% by application of LEGR.

**Table 1. S825 Steady State Parameters Summary**

Grit Pattern	Re x 10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>lmax</sub>	C <sub>dmin</sub>	C <sub>mo</sub>
Clean	0.75	1.39 @ 11.3°	0.0089	-0.1568
k/c=0.0019	0.75	1.24 @ 10.1°	0.0147	-0.1237
Clean	1.00	1.41 @ 10.9	0.0079	-0.1541
k/c=0.0019	1.00	1.25 @ 10.1°	0.0132	-0.1255
Clean	1.25	1.43 @ 11.2°	0.0074	-0.1530
k/c=0.0019	1.25	1.26 @ 10.1°	0.0134	-0.1257

The pitch oscillation data can be divided into two groups, the ±5.5° amplitude and ±10° amplitude oscillations which show similar trends. For both ±5.5° and ±10°, the unsteady test conditions and some parameters are in listed tables 2, 3, 4, and 5. Looking at the reduced frequency, which takes oscillation and tunnel speed into account, as this value increased, the maximum lift coefficient also increased. The increase in maximum lift coefficient with reduced frequency was nearly linear for the cases tested as shown in figures 39 and 40. In addition, the hysteresis behavior became increasingly apparent with increased reduced frequency.

**Table 2. S825, Unsteady, Clean, ±5.5°**

$\omega_{red}$	Re x 10 <sup>-6</sup>	f	C <sub>lmax</sub>	$\alpha_{max}$	C <sub>ldec</sub>	C <sub>m inc</sub>	C <sub>m dec</sub>
0.034	0.76	0.59	1.58	12.3	1.19	-0.1377	-0.0976
0.068	0.76	1.19	1.70	14.5	1.06	-0.1479	-0.0982
0.107	0.75	1.85	1.83	16.7	0.98	-0.1841	-0.1039
0.026	1.01	0.60	1.57	12.8	1.23	-0.1275	-0.1103
0.051	1.01	1.19	1.64	14.5	1.14	-0.1438	-0.1051
0.078	1.01	1.83	1.71	14.4	1.03	-0.1402	-0.0945
0.021	1.25	0.61	1.54	12.3	1.30	-0.1257	-0.1131
0.041	1.25	1.19	1.63	14.5	1.14	-0.1374	-0.1065
0.063	1.25	1.83	1.72	14.5	1.04	-0.1421	-0.0976




Figure 39.  $\pm 5.5^\circ$ , unsteady  $C_{l_{max}}$  vs  $\omega_{red}$ .




Figure 40.  $\pm 10^\circ$ , unsteady  $C_{l_{max}}$  vs  $\omega_{red}$ .

Table 3. S825, Unsteady, LEGR,  $\pm 5.5^\circ$

$\omega_{red}$	$Re \times 10^{-6}$	f	$C_{l_{max}}$	$\alpha_{max}$	$C_{l_{dec}}$	$C_{m_{inc}}$	$C_{m_{dec}}$
0.034	0.75	0.59	1.42	13.3	1.02	-0.1377	-0.1158
0.068	0.75	1.19	1.54	16.0	1.01	-0.2026	-0.1478
0.106	0.75	1.85	1.78	16.9	0.88	-0.2393	-0.1378
0.025	1.01	0.59	1.38	12.1	1.12	-0.1275	-0.1150
0.051	1.01	1.19	1.49	14.3	1.01	-0.1658	-0.1058
0.077	1.01	1.81	1.60	15.3	0.96	-0.1742	-0.1156
0.020	1.24	0.59	1.37	11.6	1.20	-0.1219	-0.1208
0.041	1.24	1.19	1.48	13.8	1.04	-0.1502	-0.1271
0.063	1.24	1.83	1.55	14.9	1.05	-0.1750	-0.1271

Table 4. S825, Unsteady, Clean,  $\pm 10^\circ$

$\omega_{red}$	$Re \times 10^{-6}$	f	$C_{l_{max}}$	$\alpha_{max}$	$C_{l_{dec}}$	$C_{m_{inc}}$	$C_{m_{dec}}$
0.036	0.74	0.60	1.65	13.4	1.13	-0.1376	-0.0965
0.071	0.73	1.19	1.93	17.2	0.78	-0.2092	-0.1387
0.109	0.73	1.83	2.40	23.0	1.15	-0.3420	-0.2523
0.027	0.98	0.61	1.63	14.4	1.18	-0.1437	-0.1142
0.054	0.97	1.21	1.84	17.0	1.00	-0.1834	-0.1274
0.082	0.97	1.83	2.02	19.3	1.02	-0.2748	-0.2222
0.021	1.23	0.60	1.61	14.8	1.16	-0.1374	-0.1119
0.042	1.22	1.18	1.78	16.1	1.09	-0.1584	-0.1065
0.065	1.22	1.81	1.99	17.7	1.17	-0.1901	-0.1107

As expected, the application of LEGR reduced the aerodynamic performance of the airfoil. The unsteady maximum lift coefficient was reduced from 3% to 12% for both the  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  case and the  $\pm 10^\circ$  case. As well as following the same trends as the clean, unsteady data discussed previously, the LEGR caused the

hysteresis behavior to persist into lower angles of attack than did the clean cases. Overall, the unsteady wind tunnel data showed hysteresis behavior that became more apparent with increased, reduced frequency. The maximum unsteady lift coefficient could be up to 31% higher for the  $\pm 5.5^\circ$  amplitude and up to 71% higher for the  $\pm 10^\circ$  amplitude than the steady state maximum lift coefficient. In addition, variation in the quarter chord pitching moment coefficient could be over 300% greater in magnitude than that indicated by steady state results. These findings indicate that it is very important to consider the unsteady loading that will occur in wind turbine operation because use of steady state results can greatly underestimate the forces.

**Table 5. S825, Unsteady, LEGR,  $\pm 10^\circ$**

$\omega_{red}$	$Re \times 10^{-6}$	$\omega$	$C_{lmax}$	$\alpha_{max}$	$C_{ldec}$	$C_{m inc}$	$C_{m dec}$
0.035	0.73	0.59	1.59	14.9	1.02	-0.1772	-0.1122
0.071	0.72	1.21	1.92	18.9	0.85	-0.3205	-0.1546
0.108	0.73	1.83	2.12	21.6	0.98	-0.3534	-0.2011
0.026	0.97	0.60	1.50	13.4	1.07	-0.1413	-0.1143
0.054	0.97	1.22	1.72	16.7	0.95	-0.2402	-0.1411
0.081	0.97	1.85	2.08	20.9	1.08	-0.4653	-0.1990
0.021	1.22	0.60	1.45	12.7	1.05	-0.1294	-0.1177
0.042	1.21	1.19	1.64	14.5	0.98	-0.1555	-0.1118
0.065	1.21	1.85	1.79	16.7	0.86	-0.1923	-0.1280

## References

Pope, A.; Harper, J.J. 1966. *Low Speed Wind Tunnel Testing*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schlichting, H. 1979. *Boundary Layer Theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Smetana, F., Summey, D. et-al. 1975. *Light Aircraft Lift, Drag, and Moment Prediction - a Review and Analysis*. North Carolina State University. NASA CR-2523.

## **Appendix A: Surface Pressure Tap Coordinates**



<b>Table A1. S825 Surface Pressure Taps, Non-Dimensional Coordinates</b>		
<b>Tap Number</b>	<b>Chord Station</b>	<b>Ordinate</b>
1	1.00203	--
2	0.96782	--
3	0.94098	--
4	0.90674	--
5	0.86533	--
6	0.81903	--
7	0.76619	--
8	0.71045	--
9	0.65403	--
10	0.59090	--
11	0.55186	--
12	0.51273	--
13	0.48319	--
14	0.46364	--
15	0.44428	--
16	0.42459	--
17	0.38583	--
18	0.34118	--
19	0.29977	--
20	0.26085	--
21	0.22318	--
22	0.19767	--
23	0.17765	--
24	0.15829	--
25	0.13890	--
26	0.11444	--
27	0.08329	--
28	0.05713	--
29	0.03222	--
30	0.02317	--
31	0.01425	--
32	0.00575	--
33	0.00000	--
34	0.00319	--

<b>Table A1. S825 Surface Pressure Taps, Non-Dimensional Coordinates</b>		
Tap Number	Chord Station	Ordinate
35	0.01039	--
36	0.01722	--
37	0.02529	--
38	0.03369	--
39	0.05100	--
40	0.07478	--
41	0.10189	--
42	0.13263	--
43	0.18402	--
44	0.25267	--
45	0.31290	--
46	0.37290	--
47	0.43281	--
48	0.48285	--
49	0.53273	--
50	0.58211	--
51	0.63198	--
52	0.68143	--
53	0.73120	--
54	0.76997	--
55	0.80922	--
56	0.84890	--
57	0.87830	--
58	0.90280	--
59	0.92989	--
60	0.95221	--
End of Table A1		

## **Appendix B: Steady State Data Integrated Coefficients and Pressure Distributions**

# List of Figures

# Page

Pressure Distributions, Steady State, Re = 0.75 million .....	B-18
1. $\alpha = -20.0^\circ$ .....	B-19
2. $\alpha = -17.9^\circ$ .....	B-19
3. $\alpha = -16.0^\circ$ .....	B-19
4. $\alpha = -14.0^\circ$ .....	B-19
5. $\alpha = -12.2^\circ$ .....	B-20
6. $\alpha = -10.1^\circ$ .....	B-20
7. $\alpha = -8.2^\circ$ .....	B-20
8. $\alpha = -6.1^\circ$ .....	B-20
9. $\alpha = -4.3^\circ$ .....	B-21
10. $\alpha = -2.0^\circ$ .....	B-21
11. $\alpha = 0.1^\circ$ .....	B-21
12. $\alpha = 2.0^\circ$ .....	B-21
13. $\alpha = 4.1^\circ$ .....	B-22
14. $\alpha = 6.3^\circ$ .....	B-22
15. $\alpha = 8.5^\circ$ .....	B-22
16. $\alpha = 10.2^\circ$ .....	B-22
17. $\alpha = 11.3^\circ$ .....	B-23
18. $\alpha = 12.3^\circ$ .....	B-23
19. $\alpha = 13.4^\circ$ .....	B-23
20. $\alpha = 14.2^\circ$ .....	B-23
21. $\alpha = 15.0^\circ$ .....	B-24
22. $\alpha = 16.1^\circ$ .....	B-24
23. $\alpha = 17.1^\circ$ .....	B-24
24. $\alpha = 18.1^\circ$ .....	B-24
25. $\alpha = 19.1^\circ$ .....	B-25
26. $\alpha = 20.2^\circ$ .....	B-25
27. $\alpha = 22.1^\circ$ .....	B-25
28. $\alpha = 24.2^\circ$ .....	B-25
29. $\alpha = 26.0^\circ$ .....	B-26
30. $\alpha = 28.1^\circ$ .....	B-26
31. $\alpha = 30.0^\circ$ .....	B-26
32. $\alpha = 32.1^\circ$ .....	B-26
33. $\alpha = 34.1^\circ$ .....	B-27
34. $\alpha = 35.9^\circ$ .....	B-27
35. $\alpha = 38.0^\circ$ .....	B-27
36. $\alpha = 39.9^\circ$ .....	B-27
Pressure Distributions, Steady State, Re = 1 million .....	B-28
37. $\alpha = -20.2^\circ$ .....	B-29
38. $\alpha = -18.1^\circ$ .....	B-29
39. $\alpha = -16.0^\circ$ .....	B-29
40. $\alpha = -14.1^\circ$ .....	B-29
41. $\alpha = -12.1^\circ$ .....	B-30
42. $\alpha = -10.3^\circ$ .....	B-30
43. $\alpha = -8.2^\circ$ .....	B-30
44. $\alpha = -6.0^\circ$ .....	B-30
45. $\alpha = -4.1^\circ$ .....	B-31

46.	$\alpha = -2.0^\circ$	B-31
47.	$\alpha = 0.0^\circ$	B-31
48.	$\alpha = 2.1^\circ$	B-31
49.	$\alpha = 4.2^\circ$	B-32
50.	$\alpha = 6.1^\circ$	B-32
51.	$\alpha = 8.2^\circ$	B-32
52.	$\alpha = 10.4^\circ$	B-32
53.	$\alpha = 10.9^\circ$	B-33
54.	$\alpha = 12.2^\circ$	B-33
55.	$\alpha = 13.2^\circ$	B-33
56.	$\alpha = 14.2^\circ$	B-33
57.	$\alpha = 15.1^\circ$	B-34
58.	$\alpha = 16.1^\circ$	B-34
59.	$\alpha = 17.1^\circ$	B-34
60.	$\alpha = 18.2^\circ$	B-34
61.	$\alpha = 19.2^\circ$	B-35
62.	$\alpha = 20.3^\circ$	B-35
63.	$\alpha = 22.1^\circ$	B-35
64.	$\alpha = 23.9^\circ$	B-35
65.	$\alpha = 26.0^\circ$	B-36
66.	$\alpha = 28.1^\circ$	B-36
67.	$\alpha = 30.2^\circ$	B-36
68.	$\alpha = 32.1^\circ$	B-36
69.	$\alpha = 34.1^\circ$	B-37
70.	$\alpha = 35.9^\circ$	B-37
71.	$\alpha = 38.0^\circ$	B-37
72.	$\alpha = 40.0^\circ$	B-37
Pressure Distributions, Steady State, Re = 1.25 million		B-38
73.	$\alpha = -20.3^\circ$	B-39
74.	$\alpha = -18.3^\circ$	B-39
75.	$\alpha = -16.2^\circ$	B-39
76.	$\alpha = -14.1^\circ$	B-39
77.	$\alpha = -12.1^\circ$	B-40
78.	$\alpha = -10.3^\circ$	B-40
79.	$\alpha = -8.4^\circ$	B-40
80.	$\alpha = -6.3^\circ$	B-40
81.	$\alpha = -4.1^\circ$	B-41
82.	$\alpha = -2.0^\circ$	B-41
83.	$\alpha = 0.0^\circ$	B-41
84.	$\alpha = 2.1^\circ$	B-41
85.	$\alpha = 3.9^\circ$	B-42
86.	$\alpha = 6.1^\circ$	B-42
87.	$\alpha = 8.2^\circ$	B-42
88.	$\alpha = 10.1^\circ$	B-42
89.	$\alpha = 11.2^\circ$	B-43
90.	$\alpha = 12.2^\circ$	B-43
91.	$\alpha = 13.3^\circ$	B-43
92.	$\alpha = 14.0^\circ$	B-43
93.	$\alpha = 15.1^\circ$	B-44

94.	$\alpha = 16.1^\circ$	B-44
95.	$\alpha = 17.2^\circ$	B-44
96.	$\alpha = 18.2^\circ$	B-44
97.	$\alpha = 19.0^\circ$	B-45
98.	$\alpha = 20.0^\circ$	B-45
99.	$\alpha = 22.2^\circ$	B-45
100.	$\alpha = 24.2^\circ$	B-45
101.	$\alpha = 26.0^\circ$	B-46
102.	$\alpha = 28.1^\circ$	B-46
103.	$\alpha = 29.9^\circ$	B-46
104.	$\alpha = 32.1^\circ$	B-46
105.	$\alpha = 33.9^\circ$	B-47
106.	$\alpha = 36.0^\circ$	B-47
107.	$\alpha = 38.0^\circ$	B-47
108.	$\alpha = 39.9^\circ$	B-47

## List of Tables

## Page

B1. S825, Clean, $Re=0.75 \times 10^6$ .....	B-6
B2. S825, Clean, $Re=1.00 \times 10^6$ .....	B-8
B3. S825, Clean, $Re=1.25 \times 10^6$ .....	B-10
B4. S825, $k/c=0.0019$ , $Re=0.75 \times 10^6$ .....	B-12
B5. S825, $k/c=0.0019$ , $Re=1.00 \times 10^6$ .....	B-14
B6. S825, $k/c=0.0019$ , $Re=1.25 \times 10^6$ .....	B-16

Table B1. S825, Clean, Re=0.75x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
456	-20.0	-0.43	0.2797	0.0105	0.76	-
455	-17.9	-0.43	0.2593	0.0170	0.77	-
454	-16.0	-0.35	0.2081	0.0039	0.76	-
453	-14.0	-0.46	0.1950	0.0097	0.76	-
452	-12.2	-0.61	0.0732	-0.0364	0.75	-
451	-10.1	-0.52	0.0467	-0.0445	0.76	-
450	-8.2	-0.39	0.0317	-0.0671	0.75	-
449	-6.1	-0.09	0.0083	-0.1538	0.76	0.0110
448	-4.3	0.14	0.0068	-0.1615	0.76	0.0089
447	-2.0	0.38	0.0042	-0.1612	0.75	0.0095
457	-0.3	0.59	0.0022	-0.1622	0.75	0.0094
446	0.1	0.59	0.0066	-0.1619	0.76	0.0095
483	0.1	0.59	0.0057	-0.1615	0.75	0.0096
458	2.0	0.80	0.0059	-0.1626	0.75	0.0102
459	4.1	1.02	0.0102	-0.1606	0.75	0.0105
460	6.3	1.22	0.0151	-0.1563	0.75	0.0118
461	8.5	1.34	0.0199	-0.1355	0.75	0.0181
462	10.2	1.39	0.0251	-0.1168	0.75	0.0230
463	11.3	1.39	0.0363	-0.1098	0.75	0.0255
464	12.3	1.31	0.0540	-0.1120	0.75	0.0288
465	13.4	1.22	0.0713	-0.1121	0.75	-
466	14.2	1.19	0.0859	-0.1153	0.75	-
467	15.0	1.16	0.1030	-0.1213	0.76	-
468	16.1	1.14	0.1273	-0.1275	0.75	-
469	17.1	1.12	0.1516	-0.1358	0.77	-
470	18.1	1.1	0.1792	-0.1463	0.77	-
471	19.1	1.08	0.2111	-0.1567	0.76	-
472	20.2	1.08	0.2500	-0.1707	0.75	-



<b>Table B1. S825, Clean, Re=0.75x10<sup>6</sup></b>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
473	22.1	1.01	0.4401	-0.2269	0.76	-
474	24.2	1.06	0.5098	-0.2428	0.75	-
475	26.0	1.17	0.5996	-0.2699	0.76	-
476	28.1	1.23	0.6844	-0.2897	0.75	-
477	30.0	1.31	0.7819	-0.317	0.75	-
478	32.1	1.37	0.8864	-0.3445	0.74	-
479	34.1	1.41	0.9849	-0.3687	0.75	-
480	35.9	1.44	1.0738	-0.3906	0.75	-
481	38.0	1.45	1.1711	-0.4146	0.75	-
482	39.9	1.42	1.2149	-0.4136	0.76	-
End of Table B1						

Table B2. S825, Clean, Re=1.00x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m¼</sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
532	-20.2	-0.44	0.2856	0.0113	1.00	-
531	-18.1	-0.40	0.2520	0.0090	0.99	-
530	-16.0	-0.39	0.2254	0.0111	0.98	-
529	-14.1	-0.40	0.2017	0.0160	0.99	-
528	-12.1	-0.61	0.0666	-0.0403	1.00	-
527	-10.3	-0.54	0.0451	-0.0451	1.00	-
526	-8.2	-0.39	0.0324	-0.0675	1.00	-
525	-6.0	-0.12	0.0097	-0.1471	1.01	0.0110
524	-4.1	0.13	0.0034	-0.1616	1.00	0.0079
523	-2.0	0.35	0.0058	-0.1608	1.00	0.0087
522	-0.1	0.56	0.0063	-0.1615	1.01	0.0085
533	-0.1	0.56	0.0060	-0.1611	0.99	0.0092
559	-0.1	0.55	0.0074	-0.1616	1.00	0.0087
534	2.1	0.80	0.0063	-0.1614	1.00	0.0108
535	4.2	1.03	0.0089	-0.1607	0.99	0.0121
536	6.1	1.19	0.0135	-0.1553	1.00	0.0129
537	8.2	1.31	0.0199	-0.1365	1.01	0.0163
538	10.4	1.39	0.0316	-0.1200	1.00	0.0227
539	10.9	1.41	0.0312	-0.1131	1.01	0.0244
540	12.2	1.39	0.0581	-0.1204	1.00	-
541	13.2	1.26	0.0702	-0.1165	1.01	-
542	14.2	1.21	0.0850	-0.1174	1.01	-
543	15.1	1.18	0.1021	-0.1200	1.00	-
544	16.1	1.15	0.1253	-0.1260	0.99	-
545	17.1	1.13	0.1512	-0.1339	1.00	-
546	18.2	1.10	0.1806	-0.1444	0.99	-
547	19.2	1.09	0.2127	-0.1562	1.00	-
548	20.3	1.07	0.2454	-0.1675	1.00	-

Table B2. S825, Clean, Re=1.00x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
549	22.1	1.01	0.4460	-0.2327	1.02	-
550	23.9	1.04	0.4965	-0.2392	1.01	-
551	26.0	1.09	0.5644	-0.2529	1.02	-
552	28.1	1.25	0.6946	-0.2956	1.01	-
553	30.2	1.31	0.7942	-0.3209	0.99	-
554	32.1	1.39	0.9022	-0.3536	1.00	-
555	34.1	1.43	1.0018	-0.3771	1.00	-
556	35.9	1.42	1.0597	-0.3821	1.00	-
557	38.0	1.43	1.1506	-0.4038	0.98	-
558	40.0	1.42	1.2211	-0.4152	0.98	-
End of Table B2						

Table B3. S825, Clean, Re=1.25x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
494	-20.3	-0.46	0.2955	0.0121	1.28	-
493	-18.3	-0.44	0.2680	0.0135	1.29	-
492	-16.2	-0.36	0.2179	0.0031	1.27	-
491	-14.1	-0.44	0.1982	0.0076	1.24	-
490	-12.1	-0.58	0.0617	-0.0460	1.26	-
489	-10.3	-0.52	0.0448	-0.0474	1.25	-
488	-8.4	-0.37	0.0312	-0.0731	1.26	-
487	-6.3	-0.13	0.0096	-0.1429	1.25	0.0119
486	-4.1	0.12	0.0030	-0.1623	1.26	0.0074
485	-2.0	0.36	0.0037	-0.1630	1.26	0.0079
484	-0.4	0.54	0.0051	-0.1628	1.26	0.0085
521	-0.2	0.55	0.0059	-0.1617	1.26	0.0076
495	-0.1	0.57	0.0050	-0.1612	1.25	0.0083
496	2.1	0.80	0.0065	-0.1609	1.25	0.0094
497	3.9	1.01	0.0057	-0.1588	1.25	0.0118
498	6.1	1.18	0.0123	-0.1518	1.25	0.0131
499	8.2	1.31	0.0208	-0.1383	1.27	0.0154
500	10.1	1.41	0.0262	-0.1214	1.26	0.0224
501	11.2	1.43	0.0320	-0.1125	1.26	0.0253
502	12.2	1.40	0.0551	-0.1192	1.27	-
503	13.3	1.27	0.0724	-0.1187	1.28	-
504	14.0	1.21	0.0828	-0.1175	1.27	-
505	15.1	1.19	0.1040	-0.1212	1.26	-
506	16.1	1.16	0.1267	-0.1272	1.27	-
507	17.2	1.13	0.1524	-0.1353	1.26	-
508	18.2	1.10	0.1818	-0.1463	1.25	-
509	19.0	1.08	0.2068	-0.1564	1.26	-
510	20.0	1.05	0.2410	-0.1682	1.25	-

Table B3. S825, Clean, Re=1.25x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m¼</sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
511	22.2	1.33	0.3553	-0.2108	1.20	-
512	24.2	1.06	0.5085	-0.2435	1.28	-
513	26.0	1.14	0.5856	-0.2636	1.27	-
514	28.1	1.26	0.7013	-0.2981	1.25	-
515	29.9	1.31	0.7853	-0.3191	1.24	-
516	32.1	1.37	0.8874	-0.3437	1.23	-
517	33.9	1.44	0.9974	-0.3785	1.21	-
518	36.0	1.42	1.0646	-0.3869	1.20	-
519	38.0	1.43	1.1517	-0.406	1.19	-
520	39.9	1.43	1.2323	-0.4246	1.17	-
End of Table B3						

Table B4. S825, k/c=0.0019, Re=0.75x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3/4</sup></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
608	-20.1	-0.48	0.2820	0.0202	0.75	-
607	-18.1	-0.49	0.2610	0.0277	0.76	-
606	-16.0	-0.61	0.2001	0.0021	0.75	-
605	-14.2	-0.5	0.1075	-0.0347	0.75	-
604	-12.1	-0.56	0.0813	-0.0351	0.75	-
603	-10.1	-0.49	0.0556	-0.0440	0.75	-
602	-8.1	-0.30	0.0328	-0.0753	0.76	-
601	-6.0	-0.22	0.0194	-0.0843	0.75	0.0196
600	-4.1	0.04	0.0081	-0.1309	0.75	0.0156
599	-2.0	0.27	0.0070	-0.1404	0.75	0.0151
598	-0.1	0.46	0.0081	-0.1433	0.75	0.0158
635	-0.1	0.47	0.0076	-0.1421	0.75	0.0147
609	0.0	0.48	0.0077	-0.1430	0.75	0.0162
610	2.0	0.69	0.0104	-0.1440	0.74	0.0168
611	4.0	0.90	0.0103	-0.1427	0.75	0.0184
612	6.1	1.05	0.0168	-0.1357	0.75	0.0181
613	8.2	1.18	0.0247	-0.1241	0.75	0.0237
614	10.1	1.24	0.0295	-0.1073	0.75	0.0367
615	11.1	1.20	0.0430	-0.1087	0.74	-
616	12.2	1.23	0.0799	-0.1305	0.75	-
617	13.2	1.16	0.0903	-0.1230	0.75	-
618	14.2	1.11	0.1072	-0.1254	0.75	-
619	15.0	1.05	0.1270	-0.1323	0.74	-
620	16.1	1.04	0.1580	-0.1437	0.75	-
621	17.1	1.01	0.1934	-0.1566	0.76	-
622	18.1	0.98	0.2305	-0.1692	0.76	-
623	19.2	1.02	0.2641	-0.1802	0.76	-
624	20.0	1.05	0.2982	-0.1924	0.76	-

Table B4. S825, $k/c=0.0019$ , $Re=0.75 \times 10^6$						
RUN	AOA	$C_l$	$C_{dp}$	$C_{m\frac{1}{4}}$	$Re \times 10^{-6}$	$C_{dw}$
625	22.1	1.10	0.3899	-0.2198	0.77	-
626	24.1	1.15	0.4678	-0.2324	0.77	-
627	26.0	1.14	0.5290	-0.2404	0.75	-
628	28.1	1.11	0.5976	-0.2503	0.76	-
629	30.1	1.27	0.7527	-0.3020	0.76	-
630	32.1	1.36	0.8747	-0.3384	0.75	-
631	34.1	1.41	0.9833	-0.3697	0.74	-
632	35.9	1.42	1.0656	-0.3879	0.74	-
633	38.0	1.42	1.1410	-0.4000	0.74	-
634	39.9	1.42	1.2178	-0.4172	0.74	-
End of Table B4						

Table B5. S825, k/c=0.0019, Re=1.00x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3/4</sup></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
646	-20.0	-0.72	0.3225	0.0066	1.01	-
645	-18.1	-0.66	0.2693	0.0129	1.00	-
644	-16.1	-0.60	0.1864	-0.0075	1.00	-
643	-14.2	-0.50	0.0911	-0.0510	1.00	-
642	-12.1	-0.49	0.0746	-0.0551	1.00	-
641	-10.2	-0.41	0.0501	-0.0666	1.00	-
640	-8.1	-0.32	0.0328	-0.0718	1.00	-
639	-6.0	-0.23	0.0198	-0.0820	1.01	0.0254
638	-4.1	0.03	0.0083	-0.1312	1.00	0.0150
637	-2.0	0.27	0.0071	-0.1399	1.00	0.0142
647	-0.1	0.48	0.0068	-0.1433	0.99	0.0147
673	-0.1	0.48	0.0072	-0.1442	0.99	0.0132
636	0.1	0.48	0.0087	-0.1434	1.00	0.0146
648	2.0	0.70	0.0090	-0.1430	0.99	0.0136
649	4.2	0.90	0.0109	-0.1404	1.00	0.0158
650	6.1	1.07	0.0122	-0.1338	1.01	0.0192
651	8.2	1.20	0.0216	-0.1232	1.00	0.0248
652	10.1	1.25	0.0274	-0.1078	1.00	-
653	11.1	1.19	0.0453	-0.1134	1.00	-
654	12.2	1.21	0.0794	-0.1311	1.01	-
655	13.2	1.12	0.0856	-0.1213	1.00	-
656	14.2	1.08	0.1091	-0.1283	1.01	-
657	15.0	1.07	0.1301	-0.1355	1.00	-
658	16.1	1.01	0.1662	-0.1501	1.01	-
659	17.1	1.02	0.1957	-0.1596	1.01	-
660	18.1	1.01	0.2251	-0.1670	1.02	-
661	19.0	1.05	0.2588	-0.1809	1.00	-
662	20.0	1.06	0.2996	-0.1942	1.01	-



Table B5. S825, k/c=0.0019, Re=1.00x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3/4</sup></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
663	22.1	1.09	0.3902	-0.2207	1.01	-
664	24.0	1.12	0.4724	-0.237	1.00	-
665	26.0	1.17	0.5328	-0.2433	1.00	-
666	28.1	1.17	0.6135	-0.2592	1.02	-
667	30.0	1.28	0.7544	-0.3058	1.02	-
668	32.1	1.37	0.8817	-0.3419	1.00	-
669	33.9	1.40	0.9702	-0.3643	1.00	-
670	35.9	1.43	1.0672	-0.3879	1.00	-
671	38.0	1.46	1.1724	-0.4155	0.99	-
672	39.9	1.43	1.2307	-0.4235	0.99	-
End of Table B5						

Table B6. S825, k/c=0.0019, Re=1.25x10 <sup>6</sup>						
RUN	AOA	C <sub>l</sub>	C <sub>dp</sub>	C <sub>m<sup>3/4</sup></sub>	Re×10 <sup>-6</sup>	C <sub>dw</sub>
570	-20.3	-0.68	0.3165	0.0089	1.25	-
569	-18.1	-0.63	0.2604	0.0089	1.26	-
568	-16.1	-0.56	0.1709	-0.0207	1.26	-
567	-14.2	-0.51	0.0916	-0.0576	1.24	-
566	-12.1	-0.48	0.0705	-0.0587	1.24	-
565	-10.1	-0.39	0.0471	-0.0692	1.25	-
564	-8.1	-0.32	0.0339	-0.0700	1.25	-
563	-6.0	-0.23	0.0204	-0.0822	1.25	0.0227
562	-4.1	0.03	0.0091	-0.1314	1.25	0.0148
561	-2.0	0.26	0.0075	-0.1407	1.25	0.0135
560	-0.1	0.48	0.0070	-0.1443	1.25	0.0134
571	0.1	0.50	0.0079	-0.1449	1.25	0.0142
597	0.1	0.51	0.0077	-0.1454	1.25	0.0134
572	2.0	0.71	0.0085	-0.1450	1.25	0.0143
573	3.9	0.91	0.0078	-0.1417	1.25	0.0158
574	6.1	1.07	0.0148	-0.1350	1.25	0.0180
575	8.2	1.21	0.0225	-0.1249	1.25	0.0235
576	10.1	1.26	0.0256	-0.1091	1.24	0.0399
577	11.1	1.23	0.0477	-0.1175	1.25	-
578	12.2	1.21	0.0784	-0.1322	1.25	-
579	13.2	1.14	0.0922	-0.1280	1.25	-
580	14.2	1.09	0.1109	-0.1304	1.25	-
581	15.0	1.04	0.1357	-0.1405	1.25	-
582	16.1	1.02	0.1647	-0.1496	1.25	-
583	17.1	0.99	0.1986	-0.1610	1.27	-
584	18.2	1.01	0.2287	-0.1700	1.26	-
585	19.0	1.05	0.2558	-0.1799	1.27	-
586	20.0	1.07	0.2986	-0.1949	1.26	-

Table B6. S825, $k/c=0.0019$ , $Re=1.25 \times 10^6$						
RUN	AOA	$C_l$	$C_{dp}$	$C_{m\frac{1}{4}}$	$Re \times 10^{-6}$	$C_{dw}$
587	22.2	1.11	0.3920	-0.2235	1.25	-
588	24.0	1.14	0.4672	-0.2394	1.26	-
589	26.0	1.14	0.5295	-0.2453	1.25	-
590	28.1	1.20	0.6327	-0.2736	1.25	-
591	29.9	1.28	0.7523	-0.3067	1.25	-
592	32.1	1.37	0.8824	-0.3435	1.23	-
593	33.9	1.41	0.9757	-0.3685	1.21	-
594	35.9	1.44	1.0727	-0.3914	1.20	-
595	38.0	1.43	1.1440	-0.4025	1.18	-
596	39.9	1.43	1.2186	-0.4175	1.17	-
End of Table B6						

**S825**

**Pressure Distributions, Steady State, Re = 0.75 million**




Figure 1.  $\alpha = -20.0^\circ$




Figure 2.  $\alpha = -17.9^\circ$




Figure 3.  $\alpha = -16.0^\circ$




Figure 4.  $\alpha = -14.0^\circ$




Figure 5.  $\alpha = -12.2^\circ$




Figure 6.  $\alpha = -10.1^\circ$




Figure 7.  $\alpha = -8.2^\circ$




Figure 8.  $\alpha = -6.1^\circ$




Figure 9.  $\alpha = -4.3^\circ$




Figure 10.  $\alpha = -2.0^\circ$




Figure 11.  $\alpha = 0.1^\circ$




Figure 12.  $\alpha = 2.0^\circ$




Figure 13.  $\alpha = 4.1^\circ$




Figure 14.  $\alpha = 6.3^\circ$




Figure 15.  $\alpha = 8.5^\circ$




Figure 16.  $\alpha = 10.2^\circ$






Figure 17.  $\alpha = 11.3^\circ$




Figure 18.  $\alpha = 12.3^\circ$




Figure 19.  $\alpha = 13.4^\circ$




Figure 20.  $\alpha = 14.2^\circ$




Figure 21.  $\alpha = 15.0^\circ$




Figure 22.  $\alpha = 16.1^\circ$




Figure 23.  $\alpha = 17.1^\circ$




Figure 24.  $\alpha = 18.1^\circ$




Figure 25.  $\alpha = 19.1^\circ$




Figure 26.  $\alpha = 20.2^\circ$




Figure 27.  $\alpha = 22.1^\circ$




Figure 28.  $\alpha = 24.2^\circ$




Figure 29.  $\alpha = 26.0^\circ$




Figure 30.  $\alpha = 28.1^\circ$




Figure 31.  $\alpha = 30.0^\circ$




Figure 32.  $\alpha = 32.1^\circ$




Figure 33.  $\alpha = 34.1^\circ$




Figure 34.  $\alpha = 35.9^\circ$




Figure 35.  $\alpha = 38.0^\circ$




Figure 36.  $\alpha = 39.9^\circ$

**S825**

**Pressure Distributions, Steady State,  $Re = 1$  million**




Figure 37.  $\alpha = -20.2^\circ$




Figure 38.  $\alpha = -18.1^\circ$




Figure 39.  $\alpha = -16.0^\circ$




Figure 40.  $\alpha = -14.1^\circ$




Figure 41.  $\alpha = -12.1^\circ$




Figure 42.  $\alpha = -10.3^\circ$




Figure 43.  $\alpha = -8.2^\circ$




Figure 44.  $\alpha = -6.0^\circ$






Figure 45.  $\alpha = -4.1^\circ$




Figure 46.  $\alpha = -2.0^\circ$




Figure 47.  $\alpha = 0.0^\circ$




Figure 48.  $\alpha = 2.1^\circ$




Figure 49.  $\alpha = 4.2^\circ$




Figure 50.  $\alpha = 6.1^\circ$




Figure 51.  $\alpha = 8.2^\circ$




Figure 52.  $\alpha = 10.4^\circ$




Figure 53.  $\alpha = 10.9^\circ$




Figure 54.  $\alpha = 12.2^\circ$




Figure 55.  $\alpha = 13.2^\circ$




Figure 56.  $\alpha = 14.2^\circ$




Figure 57.  $\alpha = 15.1^\circ$




Figure 58.  $\alpha = 16.1^\circ$




Figure 59.  $\alpha = 17.1^\circ$




Figure 60.  $\alpha = 18.2^\circ$




Figure 61.  $\alpha = 19.2^\circ$




Figure 62.  $\alpha = 20.3^\circ$




Figure 63.  $\alpha = 22.1^\circ$




Figure 64.  $\alpha = 23.9^\circ$




Figure 65.  $\alpha = 26.0^\circ$




Figure 66.  $\alpha = 28.1^\circ$




Figure 67.  $\alpha = 30.2^\circ$




Figure 68.  $\alpha = 32.1^\circ$




Figure 69.  $\alpha = 34.1^\circ$




Figure 70.  $\alpha = 35.9^\circ$




Figure 71.  $\alpha = 38.0^\circ$




Figure 72.  $\alpha = 40.0^\circ$

**S825**

**Pressure Distributions, Steady State, Re = 1.25 million**






Figure 73.  $\alpha = -20.3^\circ$




Figure 74.  $\alpha = -18.3^\circ$




Figure 75.  $\alpha = -16.2^\circ$




Figure 76.  $\alpha = -14.1^\circ$




Figure 77.  $\alpha = -12.1^\circ$




Figure 78.  $\alpha = -10.3^\circ$




Figure 79.  $\alpha = -8.4^\circ$




Figure 80.  $\alpha = -6.3^\circ$




Figure 81.  $\alpha = -4.1^\circ$




Figure 82.  $\alpha = -2.0^\circ$




Figure 83.  $\alpha = 0.0^\circ$




Figure 84.  $\alpha = 2.1^\circ$




Figure 85.  $\alpha = 3.9^\circ$




Figure 86.  $\alpha = 6.1^\circ$




Figure 87.  $\alpha = 8.2^\circ$




Figure 88.  $\alpha = 10.1^\circ$




Figure 89.  $\alpha = 11.2^\circ$




Figure 90.  $\alpha = 12.2^\circ$




Figure 91.  $\alpha = 13.3^\circ$




Figure 92.  $\alpha = 14.0^\circ$




Figure 93.  $\alpha = 15.1^\circ$




Figure 94.  $\alpha = 16.1^\circ$




Figure 95.  $\alpha = 17.2^\circ$




Figure 96.  $\alpha = 18.2^\circ$




Figure 97.  $\alpha = 19.0^\circ$




Figure 98.  $\alpha = 20.0^\circ$




Figure 99.  $\alpha = 22.2^\circ$




Figure 100.  $\alpha = 24.2^\circ$




Figure 101.  $\alpha = 26.0^\circ$




Figure 102.  $\alpha = 28.1^\circ$




Figure 103.  $\alpha = 29.9^\circ$




Figure 104.  $\alpha = 32.1^\circ$






Figure 105.  $\alpha = 33.9^\circ$




Figure 106.  $\alpha = 36.0^\circ$




Figure 107.  $\alpha = 38.0^\circ$




Figure 108.  $\alpha = 39.9^\circ$

## **Appendix C: Unsteady Integrated Coefficients**

# List of Figures

# Page

$\pm 5.5^\circ$ Sine, Re = 0.75 million .....	C-3
$\pm 5.5^\circ$ Sine, Re = 1 million .....	C-10
$\pm 5.5^\circ$ Sine, Re= 1.25 million .....	C-17
$\pm 10^\circ$ Sine, Re = 0.75 million .....	C-24
$\pm 10^\circ$ Sine, Re = 1 million .....	C-31
$\pm 10^\circ$ Sine, Re = 1.25 million .....	C-38

## **Unsteady Airfoil Characteristics**

**$\pm 5.5^\circ$  Sine, Re = 0.75 million**




Figure C1. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.76 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.034$**




Figure C2. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C3. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C4. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.76 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.068$**




Figure C5. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C6. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C7. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.75 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.107$**




Figure C8. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C9. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C10. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.75 million**  
 **$\omega_{reduced}=0.034$**




Figure C11. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C12. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .






Figure C13. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.75 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.068$**




Figure C14. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C15. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C16. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.75 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.106$**




Figure C17. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C18. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

## **Unsteady Airfoil Characteristics**

**$\pm 5.5^\circ$  Sine, Re = 1 million**




Figure C19. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.01 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.026$**




Figure C20. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C21. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C22. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.01 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.051$**




Figure C23. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C24. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C25. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.01 million**  
 **$\omega_{reduced}=0.078$**




Figure C26. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C27. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C28. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.01 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.025$**




Figure C29. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C30. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C31. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C32. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C33. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.01 million**  
 **$\omega_{reduced}=0.051$**






Figure C34. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.01 million**  
 **$\omega_{reduced}=0.077$**




Figure C35. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C36. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

## **Unsteady Airfoil Characteristics**

**$\pm 5.5^\circ$  Sine, Re= 1.25 million**




Figure C37. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.25 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.021$**




Figure C38. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C39. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C40. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.25 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.041$**




Figure C41. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C42. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C43. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.25 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.063$**




Figure C44. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C45. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C46. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C47. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C48. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.24 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.020$**




Figure C49. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C50. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C51. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.24 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.041$**




Figure C52. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.24 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.063$**




Figure C53. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C54. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .



## **Unsteady Airfoil Characteristics**

**$\pm 10^\circ$  Sine, Re = 0.75 million**




Figure C55. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.74 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.036$**




Figure C56. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C57. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C58. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.73 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.071$**




Figure C59. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C60. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C61. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.73 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.109$**




Figure C62. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .






Figure C63. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




**Figure C64. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .**

**S825  
LEGR  
Re=0.73 million  
 $\omega_{reduced}=0.035$**



**Figure C65. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .**



**Figure C66. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .**




Figure C67. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.72 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.071$**




Figure C68. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C69. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C70. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.73 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.108$**




Figure C71. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C72. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

## **Unsteady Airfoil Characteristics**

**$\pm 10^\circ$  Sine, Re = 1 million**






Figure C73. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.98 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.027$**




Figure C74. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C75. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C76. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.97 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.054$**




Figure C77. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C78. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C79. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=0.97 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.082$**




Figure C80. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C81. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C82. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825  
LEGR  
Re=0.97 million  
 $\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.026$**




Figure C83. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C84. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C85. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.97 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.054$**




Figure C86. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C87. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C88. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C89. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C90. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S810**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=0.97 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.081$**

## **Unsteady Airfoil Characteristics**

**$\pm 10^\circ$  Sine, Re = 1.25 million**




Figure C91. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.23 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.021$**




Figure C92. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C93. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .






Figure C94. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.22 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.042$**




Figure C95. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .






Figure C96. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




**Figure C97. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .**

**S825**  
**Clean**  
**Re=1.22 million**  
 **$\omega_{reduced}=0.065$**



**Figure C98. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .**



**Figure C99. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .**




Figure C100. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.22 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.021$**




Figure C101. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C102. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C103. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.21 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.042$**




Figure C104. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C105. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C106. Lift coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .

**S825**  
**LEGR**  
**Re=1.21 million**  
 **$\omega_{\text{reduced}}=0.065$**




Figure C107. Pressure drag coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .




Figure C108. Moment coefficient vs  $\alpha$ .