

Evaluation of a New Concept for Reducing Freestream Turbulence in Wind Tunnels

R.A. Wigeland,* J. Tan-atichat,* and H.M. Nagib†
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.

A 45 deg honeycomb flow manipulator, mounted parallel to the corner turning vanes, was investigated for improving the flow quality in wind tunnels with little or no settling chamber length. This manipulator permits increased turbulence decay distance in comparison to a conventional honeycomb arrangement. The resulting turbulence levels in a wind tunnel using the 45 deg honeycomb are comparable to those obtained using a conventional honeycomb, but only when a 45 deg screen is mounted immediately downstream of the honeycomb, and when some separation distance between the turning vanes and the 45 deg honeycomb is used to permit adequate decay of the turning vane wakes (at least twice the spacing between the turning vanes). As the turbulence scales are different at the start of the contraction for each of these honeycomb types, the best choice will depend on the relative effect of the contraction on reducing the different scales of turbulence.

Introduction

MOST experiments conducted in wind tunnels require a low turbulence intensity in the test section, with good spatial uniformity of both the mean velocity and the turbulence intensity. Recent proposed experiments, such as laminar flow control (LFC), impose a severe restriction on the maximum allowable turbulence level in the test section. According to Dr. W. Pfenninger of NASA LaRC, turbulence intensities of less than 0.1% will be required.

Due to recent work in the area of turbulence control and management,¹⁻³ as well as on control of secondary flows in ducts⁴⁻⁶ this level is not unattainable under certain conditions. Specifically, efficient compact combinations of honeycombs, grids, screens, and other flow manipulators have been developed which lead to substantial reductions in the freestream turbulence levels with a minimum of power loss due to manipulator pressure drop. The optimum arrangements depend on maximization of the manipulator turbulence suppression functions and minimization of their generation functions.¹⁻³ In particular, the important role of the shear layer instabilities and the proper balance between the different scales of the manipulator and the turbulence are considered in the design of efficient manipulator combinations.^{2,3} In most cases, available power limitations of the facility make the use of these combinations desirable, if not mandatory, to achieve the required turbulence level.

However, another extremely important feature of using these flow manipulator combinations is the provision for adequate decay distance between manipulators, as well as downstream of the final manipulator ahead of the contraction. Unfortunately, most wind tunnels have little, if any, settling chamber between the turning vanes and the start of the contraction. This lack of any appreciable settling chamber has a severe restrictive effect on the type and number of manipulators that can be used for improving the turbulence level, with subsequent limits on the amount of turbulence reduction that can be accomplished. While new wind tunnel facilities are, or should be, designed with a settling chamber long enough for proper turbulence management, and some older facilities can be modified to provide an adequate settling

chamber for maximum reduction in the test-section turbulence intensity, there are many wind tunnels, especially those of large cross-sectional area, that cannot be modified. The LaRC/5m TDT is one of these tunnels.

Since new large facilities are extremely expensive, efforts are underway in several facilities to improve performance of these short settling chamber wind tunnels for present-day experiments, such as LFC. In particular, the LaRC/5m TDT was being considered as a possible facility for conducting LFC experiments. While no reliable measurements of turbulence intensity are available for the test section, realistic estimates indicate a level much higher than the 0.1% required for LFC experiments, probably 0.3-0.5%. These estimates are based on the turbulence decay downstream of the last set of turning vanes ahead of the contraction. This indicates the necessity of a substantial turbulence reduction in the test section with essentially no appreciable settling chamber length to allow for the flow manipulators and the turbulence decay. As one method of possibly overcoming this situation, a "new concept" honeycomb was proposed.

In the conventional method of installing honeycombs, screens, and grids in the wind tunnel, the plane of the manipulator is normal to the mean flow. This results in the manipulator being closer to the turning vanes at the inside of the corner and further away at the outside of the corner. This situation is depicted in Fig. 1. There is a much larger distance at the outside of the corner over which the turbulence and wakes from the turning vanes decays. From the point of view of turbulence control, this additional distance is wasted, especially in wind tunnels with little settling chamber distance. Instead of using this distance for the decay of the "uncontrolled" flow characteristics due to the turning vanes, the new concept honeycomb uses it for additional decay of the modified, and usually improved (i.e., faster decaying and of more appropriate scales), turbulence downstream of the manipulator. This arrangement is also depicted in Fig. 1. Note that the cells of the honeycomb are still aligned with the mean flow direction, although the plane of the honeycomb is now parallel to the plane of the turning vanes at 45 deg to the mean flow direction. For this reason the new concept honeycomb will also be referred to as the 45 deg honeycomb. Although this type of honeycomb is more expensive, there is an additional advantage in that the 45 deg honeycomb can be supported by the turning vanes and thus eliminates the need for a separate support structure.

In light of the totally new nature of this manipulator, several experiments were performed to evaluate the overall performance characteristics and optimize the parameters involved. Of particular interest is the relative effectiveness of

Presented as Paper 80-0432 at the AIAA 11th Aerodynamic Testing Conference, Colorado Springs, Colo., March 18-20, 1980; submitted March 18, 1980; revision received July 7, 1980. Copyright © American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., 1980. All rights reserved.

*Visiting Assistant Professor.

†Professor. Member AIAA.




Fig. 1 Schematic of proposed new-concept 45 deg honeycomb and comparison with a conventional honeycomb.

the 45 deg honeycomb (and 45 deg screen combination) in comparison with the conventional honeycomb (and screen combination). The majority of the experiments were conducted to reveal the turbulence reduction mechanisms, document the effectiveness of the new concept honeycomb and to provide information as to whether or not the 45 deg honeycomb (and 45 deg screen combination) is a viable alternative to the conventional honeycomb (and screen).

Test Facilities and Instrumentation

In order to evaluate the proposed new concept 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination, a scale model of the 90 deg corner and turning vanes of the NASA LaRC/5m TDT was used. Based on the results of the scaling process, which will be discussed further in this section, a small open circuit wind tunnel was selected for the experiments.

The wind tunnel was powered by a blower that exhausted into the upstream end of its settling chamber. Velocities in excess of 75 m/s are possible in the test section, with the lower speeds being attained by throttling the blower output. Several flow manipulators are located in the settling chamber in order to make the flow velocities spatially uniform and to control turbulence. The test section is located downstream of a 25-1 contraction and is assembled using various lengths of plexiglass tube of circular cross section, 15 cm in diameter. Every section has a flange on each end, so that as many sections as desired can be bolted together to form the test section. The flow characteristics in the test section can be readily modified due to this modular construction by insertion of flow manipulators either inside the duct or between two sections. This design also makes it extremely easy to modify the wind tunnel test section for investigation of any type of ducted flow, such as that through a 90 deg corner. The open circuit design also facilitates complete probing of the flow from the downstream end, with probe positioning being accomplished by using the motorized three-dimensional traversing mechanism available with this tunnel.

Standard hot-wire instrumentation was used for all of the detailed velocity measurements. The data in this report are presented in the form of traverses across the test section,

which are extremely important for evaluating the flow characteristics in the full scale settling chamber and test section.

Scaling of 5 m TDT Turning Vanes

With full-scale Reynolds numbers in the range from 1×10^6 to 1.9×10^6 , based on the chord of the turning vanes, it was obvious that this could not be approached in our modeling. However, the main influence of the chord Reynolds number is to make the boundary layers sufficiently turbulent. In a scale model of the turning vanes, a Reynolds number of 1×10^5 was thought to be sufficient to provide adequate turbulence in the boundary layers. Even if the initial experiments indicated that this was not the case, the turning vane boundary layers could be tripped. These Reynolds numbers resulted in a maximum scale of approximately 12-1.

Another important restriction existed for the mesh Reynolds number of the honeycombs and other turbulence manipulators. Based on 6.25 and 12.5 mm mesh honeycombs for the full-scale tunnel, the mesh Reynolds number varied from 1×10^4 to 4×10^4 . For the model, a minimum mesh Reynolds number of 4×10^3 was required to ensure turbulent flow in each cell of the honeycomb. In order to satisfy this requirement, the honeycomb meshes for the model facility were selected as 6.25 and 3.13 mm, with 1.56 mm mesh being acceptable; but its Reynolds number was as low as 2500 at the lower speeds. Generally, the length to diameter ratio of the honeycomb is about 10 for efficient operation, resulting in lengths of 62.5 and 31.3 mm for the 6.25 and 3.13 mm mesh honeycombs, respectively. To provide adequate strength for the 1.56 mm mesh honeycomb, a length of 25.4 mm was used. All of these mesh sizes were examined in the new concept 45 deg configuration, but only the 3.13 mm mesh was incorporated in the conventional manner.

From the aforementioned considerations, it was decided to use a 12:1 ratio for the prototype to model ratio, i.e., 1.0 m in the full-scale wind tunnel corresponding to 8.33 cm in the model facility.

Test Flow Conditions

The flow through the test section in its usual configuration has a turbulence intensity less than 0.5%, especially at higher speeds due to the more efficient blower operation. It was realized that the conditions in the prototype wind tunnel would most likely not be as good as this, being of somewhat higher turbulence and possibly contaminated by upstream swirl. To simulate these conditions, a coarse grid upstream of the turning vanes was used to generate turbulence of about 3-4% intensity at the turning vanes. This flow condition is referred to as the "high upstream turbulence" flow condition in the rest of the report. The upstream swirl was generated using the airfoil swirl generator. This generator utilizes two adjacent airfoils, each spanning half of the test section, and set at adjustable equal but opposite angles of attack. A grid was also used in this flow condition to provide additional background turbulence. This flow condition is referred to as the "upstream swirl" flow condition. The third flow condition is the "low upstream turbulence" flow condition utilizing the flow as it usually exists in the test section without modification by flow manipulators.

Experimental Results

The experiments were conducted according to the schematic shown in Fig. 1. The open circuit design of the wind tunnel allowed easy access to the flow downstream of the turning vanes or any flow manipulators inserted in the duct. The three different upstream flow conditions (low turbulence, high turbulence, and swirl) were generated as described in the previous section on the test facility and instrumentation. With the 90 deg corner and the turning vanes mounted as part of the test section of the wind tunnel, the first step was to document the flow downstream of the turning vanes. For almost all of

the experimental data, velocity profiles downstream of the turning vanes were taken along lines perpendicular to the mean flow, i.e., the y direction as shown in Fig. 1. For wind tunnel applications, this direction is most appropriate, since the spatial uniformity in this direction of important flow characteristics, such as the turbulence intensity, will help assure a similar uniformity in the test section. A few profiles were also taken in the z direction, perpendicular to the x and y directions, and the flow characteristics were quite uniform, as expected.

Flow Downstream of the Turning Vanes

The 90 deg corner and turning vanes were mounted in the wind tunnel as shown in Fig. 1 with a low turbulence flow entering the turning vanes. Traverses in the y direction were taken at several downstream positions, and the results are plotted in Fig. 2, where the downstream distance x is defined with the origin at the inside corner of the 90 deg turn which contains the turning vanes, as indicated on Fig. 1. The velocity axis scale is greatly expanded and will be used in every case to accentuate whatever nonuniformities exist. The reader should also be cautioned about the behavior outside the central region of the duct, i.e., between dashed lines on figures. These regions are only useful for predicting the conditions near the walls of the full-scale settling chamber. From the profiles of the mean velocity \bar{U} , the wake of each turning vane is clearly evident, especially for the traverse taken at $x = 3.13$ cm. The wakes become stronger as the value of y decreases since the vanes are closer to the probe at the inside corner. This is a result of the turning vanes being at 45 deg to the axis of the downstream duct, i.e., the x direction, while the y direction is at 90 deg to this axis, as shown in Fig. 1. As one would expect, the wake defects become less noticeable as they merge, eventually resulting in a flow which is reasonably uniform at $x = 21.6$ cm. The turbulence intensity u'/U_∞ also decreases and becomes more uniform as the

distance from the turning vanes increases and the turbulence decays. For the definition of turbulence intensity u'/U_∞ , u' is the rms of the U component velocity fluctuations, while U is the spatial average of the mean velocity \bar{U} . The turbulence intensity is higher for negative values of y , again since there is less distance from the turning vanes to the probe location. These results indicate that the turning vanes operate as intended and that the flow characteristics downstream of these model turning vanes represent the expected full-scale situation. The accuracy of this representation depends on a comparison with full-scale data, which unfortunately were not available. The rate at which the wakes merge and the mechanism behind the process is extremely important for optimum placement of any flow manipulators and will be discussed later in this section.

To further document the flow conditions that were used for the experiments, the transverse distributions of mean velocity \bar{U} and turbulence intensity u'/U_∞ are plotted in Figs. 3 and 4, respectively, for conditions of low upstream turbulence, high upstream turbulence, and upstream swirl. All of the results are for data taken at a probe location of $x = 21.6$ cm, as this position approximates the average location of the start of the contraction for many existing wind tunnels (although some have shorter settling chambers and a few are longer). Knowledge of the turbulence intensities at this location also approximates what would be entering the contraction after a rather short but not unreasonable decay distance from the last flow manipulator.

Upon examining the data presented in Figs. 3 and 4, it became apparent that the higher upstream turbulence results in spatially more uniform mean velocity and turbulence intensity distributions with essentially no change in the turbulence level from the low upstream turbulence case. The presence of upstream swirl does not affect the mean velocity profile very much (i.e., the downstream flow is quite similar to the low turbulence case), although the turbulence intensity is less uniform. Detailed measurements of the three velocity components proved that there was essentially no swirl emerging from the turning vanes, even though it was quite




Fig. 2 Lateral profiles of mean velocity and turbulence intensity at several distances downstream of turning vanes with low upstream turbulence.




Fig. 3 Lateral profiles of mean velocity with either a conventional honeycomb or no flow manipulator downstream of turning vanes in several flow conditions.




Fig. 4 Lateral profiles of turbulence intensity with either a conventional honeycomb or no flow manipulator downstream of turning vanes in several flow conditions.

strong upstream of them. Based on these results, only the high and low upstream turbulence conditions were used for further experiments. These results also indicate that the turbulence in the settling chamber is dominated by that generated by the turning vanes. However, the role of upstream turbulence is important in the initial decay of the wakes from these vanes.

As the 45 deg honeycomb concept is quite new, a means of evaluating its effect on the turbulence as compared with more conventional methods was desired. For this reason a standard "conventional" honeycomb and low-solidity screen combination was used for both low and high upstream turbulence to develop the typical expected turbulence levels. These results are also shown on Figs. 3 and 4 for the mean velocity and turbulence intensity, respectively. It is apparent that the spatial uniformity of both the mean velocity and turbulence intensity is slightly improved for higher upstream turbulence. Approximately the same overall turbulence level is achieved by this manipulator for both high and low upstream turbulence conditions. Obviously, the results in both cases are improved over having the turning vanes alone. While this honeycomb-screen combination is an efficient turbulence management solution, the actual solutions are usually more complicated, involving several flow manipulators. Even so, the data show that conditions in the test section are quite good, both in magnitude and uniformity, as well as being reasonably independent of upstream turbulence conditions, which is always desirable. Again, the important comparisons between figures are made in the central part of the duct inside the two dashed lines.

The dashed lines on each figure correspond to those shown on Fig. 1, indicating the region of the duct that is influenced by the sidewall boundary layers. Between the dashed lines, the flow represents conditions that exist in the full-scale wind tunnel.

This completes the description of the basic flow conditions and the standard (or typical) turbulence improvement which is used as the basis for comparison with the results of the new concept honeycomb and screen combination, as well as other flow manipulators. The flow characteristics downstream of each flow manipulator (and combinations) are discussed in detail in the following for the two test flow conditions.




Fig. 5 Lateral profiles of mean velocity and turbulence intensity with a 3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb positioned at trailing edges of turning vanes with and without a 0.91 mm mesh 45 deg screen at downstream end of honeycomb in low turbulence flow condition.

45 Deg Honeycomb and 45 Deg Screen

Several honeycombs were constructed based on the new concept, where the honeycomb can be mounted up against the turning vanes, at 45 deg to the mean flow, yet still have the cells aligned with the flow direction. Three mesh sizes were used, 1.56, 3.13 and 6.25 mm, with the honeycombs having a length/cell diameter ratio of 16, 10 and 10, respectively.

Selecting the 3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb, which is optimally scaled with the screen, the effectiveness of the honeycomb and honeycomb-screen combination was documented with the honeycomb positioned at the downstream end of the turning vanes, i.e., $x = 0$ in Fig. 1. There are several important characteristics of the flow apparent from the mean velocity and turbulence intensity profiles presented in Fig. 5. Considering the mean velocity first, the wake from each turning vane is clearly visible at the probe position $x = 21.6$ cm, both with and without the screen. These wake defects are noticeably smaller when the screen is present at the downstream end of the honeycomb. An encouraging observation is that there is hardly any evidence of a mean shear from the screen, as would be expected for a screen mounted at an angle to the flow. Both of these results suggest that the 45 deg screen can be effectively used with the 45 deg honeycomb. The turbulence intensity profiles indicate that the screen contributes to reducing and uniformizing the turbulence level although there is still a large amount of spatial variation. Based on these observations, all subsequent results in this section will be presented for the 45 deg honeycomb in combination with a 45 deg screen positioned next to the downstream end of the honeycomb.

A disturbing character of these data is the apparent persistence of the wake defects in the mean velocity and the large spatial variations in the turbulence intensity, especially in comparison to Fig. 2. The peaks correspond to the shear layers of the turning vanes, and are obvious even at the probe location $x = 21.6$ cm. Obviously the nonuniformity caused by the turning vanes lasts for large distances when the 45 deg

honeycomb and 45 deg screen combination is positioned at the downstream end of the turning vanes. Recall from Fig. 2 that the wake defects decay rapidly with downstream distance when there is no flow manipulator in the duct. Even with the conventional honeycomb-screen combination in the duct, there was no evidence of the turning vane wakes; see Figs. 3 and 4. The wake mixing mechanism present in those cases has been inhibited or eliminated by the presence of the 45 deg honeycomb. It was also determined in the discussion of Figs. 3 and 4 that higher upstream turbulence led to better spatial uniformity of the flow characteristics downstream of the turning vanes. It is hypothesized that the turbulence that was available for mixing the wakes of the turning vanes, both in the mean flow and in the vane shear layers, has been removed by the 45 deg honeycomb before it was able to have an effect. The turbulence subsequently generated by the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination is at the wrong scale, probably too small, to have any significant effect on these large scale mean velocity nonuniformities. To establish whether or not this was true, and to determine if there was an effective way to correct the problem, the following experiments were conducted.

Effect of Separation Between Turning Vanes and 45 Deg Honeycomb

If the honeycomb removed turbulence from the flow that was of a scale suitable for the wake mixing, some separation between the turning vanes and the upstream end of the honeycomb Δx should give the existing turbulence a chance to mix the wakes before the honeycomb removes it and generates its own turbulence of a different scale. Figure 6 shows the mean velocity and turbulence intensity profiles for three separations; Δx equals 0, 2.5, and 5.0 cm. Recall that the spacing between the turning vanes is about 2.5 cm as well.




Fig. 6 Effect of separation between 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination and trailing edges of turning vanes on lateral profiles of mean velocity and turbulence intensity in high turbulence flow condition.

The effect of providing some decay time for the wakes to merge before they enter the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination is quite clear, with the spatial uniformity in mean velocity improving as the separation increases. At a separation $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm, the uniformity is about as good as that downstream of the conventional honeycomb and screen as shown in Fig. 3. A similar improvement is noted in the turbulence intensity profiles, particularly between the cases $\Delta x = 0$ and 2.5 cm. However, with an increase in x , the honeycomb becomes closer to the probe since the probe position is fixed at $x = 21.6$ cm; see Fig. 1. In spite of the shorter decay distance as Δx increases, the average turbulence intensity is decreasing.

This result not only substantiates our hypothesis on the importance of the turbulence generated by the turning vanes in initially making the mean velocity and turbulence intensity uniform, but also indicates one possible solution to the problem of the persistent wake defect when using the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination. The feasibility of using separation depends on the design of the tunnel, as a Δx of 2 vane spacings is apparently adequate to provide sufficient uniformity.

Effect of 45 Deg Honeycomb Mesh Size

Another variable of importance is the mesh size of the honeycomb, as this determines the dominant generated-turbulence scales. The relationship between the scales for each turbulence generating device influences the overall performance. On Figs. 7 and 8 are shown the mean velocity and turbulence intensity profiles obtained using the three different honeycomb mesh sizes, 1.56, 3.13 and 6.25 mm, at two separations, $\Delta x = 0$ and 5.0 cm.

Concentrating first on the results for $\Delta x = 0$, increasing the honeycomb mesh size decreases the magnitude of the wake defects from the turning vanes. This is due to the larger-mesh




Fig. 7 Effect of 45 deg honeycomb mesh on lateral profiles of mean velocity for a 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination with no separation from turning vanes, $\Delta x = 0$ and 5.0 cm in high turbulence flow condition.




Fig. 8 Effect of 45 deg honeycomb mesh on lateral profiles of turbulence intensity for a 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination with no separation from turning vanes, $\Delta x = 0$ and 5.0 cm in high turbulence test flow condition.

honeycomb generating larger scales that are better suited for effectively mixing the wakes. However, the spatial uniformity of the mean velocity is still not as good as that which can be obtained using separation between the honeycomb and the turning vanes, as shown in Fig. 6. The turbulence level is also highest downstream of the 6.25 mm mesh honeycomb. This is partly because the downstream end of the longer larger-mesh honeycombs is closer to the probe position, $x = 21.6$ cm, and partly because the turbulence reduction is not as effective with the larger honeycomb, due to the generated turbulence characteristics. The same 45 deg screen was also used with all three honeycombs, and previous work² has shown that there is an optimum mesh ratio between the screen and honeycomb of 3 or 4 to 1. The screen used for these experiments matches the 1.56 and 3.13 mm mesh honeycombs better. One other detrimental effect of the larger mesh honeycomb is that there is substantially more mean shear generated by the turning action of the screen. Presumably this would not be the case if the screen mesh was appropriately scaled for the larger mesh honeycomb to optimize the blockage for each cell while generating turbulence of appropriate scale for overcoming the honeycomb generated turbulence.

Considering the case with separation, $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm, the mean velocity profiles again demonstrate the importance of allowing some distance for the turning-vane wakes to mix. The spatial uniformity in both cases is about as good as that obtained for the conventional honeycomb, although there is slightly more mean shear present for the 3.13 mm mesh honeycomb due to the turning effect of the screen. There is a much more significant difference in the turbulence intensity, being quite low for the 1.56 mm mesh honeycomb, and being much more spatially uniform for both mesh sizes as compared with the results for $\Delta x = 0$. However, the pressure drop associated with the 1.56 mm mesh honeycomb is high, and usually does not lead to the most efficient way of improving the turbulence.

The mesh size is, therefore, quite important, especially if the honeycomb is to be mounted along the turning-vanes trailing edges. The mesh of the honeycomb must be properly scaled to the turning vanes so that the wakes mix quickly. However, the turbulence reduction effectiveness is usually lessened. With some separation, the honeycomb mesh can be




Fig. 9 Effect of using no manipulator, a 45 deg screen, a conventional honeycomb-screen combination, and a 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination downstream of turning vanes on lateral profile of mean velocity in low turbulence flow condition.

selected based on the freestream turbulence characteristics, much in the same way as for conventional honeycombs,² with significant improvement in the efficiency of the turbulence reducing flow manipulators.

Before discussing the relative effects of the methods for reducing the turbulence, one more parameter was investigated for the new-concept honeycomb. As is the case for using any type of flow manipulator, a very desirable, almost necessary, characteristic is that the turbulence reduction should be independent of freestream velocity.

Effect of Freestream Velocity on 45 Deg Honeycomb Performance

Both the mean velocity and turbulence intensity profiles are reasonably independent of freestream velocity, both in spatial uniformity and in turbulence intensity magnitude. This demonstrates that the use of the 45 deg honeycomb and 45 deg screen combination with a separation $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm from the turning vanes results in the flow characteristics downstream being independent of freestream velocity, and certainly strengthens the possibilities of using such a combination for turbulence control.

Relative Effectiveness of Different Types of Turbulence Manipulators

In order to make a final evaluation of the new-concept honeycomb, a direct comparison with the conventional honeycomb, as well as with other flow manipulators, is necessary. The flow characteristics downstream of the new-concept 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination, the turning vanes when there is no manipulator present, a 45 deg screen at the turning vanes trailing edge, and a conventional honeycomb-screen combination are presented in Figs. 9-12 for both low and high upstream turbulence. Concentrating first on the results for low upstream turbulence, Figs. 9 and 10, one notes that the conventional honeycomb and screen combination provides the best spatial uniformity of the mean velocity, with the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination slightly worse, but not much different from the case with no manipulator in the duct. A 45 deg screen alone at the trailing edge of the turning vanes provides the worst performance, in that the mean velocity is at least 15% higher downstream of the outside of the corner. This was caused by the turning effect of the screen.




Fig. 10 Effect of using no manipulator, a 45 deg screen, a conventional honeycomb-screen combination, and a 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination downstream of turning vanes on lateral profile of turbulence intensity in low turbulence flow condition.

Reviewing the turbulence intensity profiles of Fig. 10, the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen results in the lowest overall turbulence intensity, although it is less spatially uniform than the turbulence intensity downstream of the conventional honeycomb and screen combination. There is a greater turbulence intensity at the same downstream location for both the 45 deg screen and the turning vanes alone, with the 45 deg screen being lower. However, all of these results are for low upstream turbulence and, as was noted before, higher upstream turbulence permits better mixing of the turning-vane wakes for more spatially uniform flow characteristics, and is also a more realistic condition for most wind tunnels.

The effects of higher upstream turbulence are demonstrated for any manipulator by comparing the corresponding profiles in Figs. 9 and 11. There is a substantial improvement in the mean velocity spatial uniformity in all cases, with greater improvement for the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination and the 45 deg screen alone. As a result, the flow downstream of the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination is now comparable to that obtained with the conventional honeycomb and screen combination. A similar effect is observed for the turbulence intensity, Fig. 12, for these flow-manipulator combinations. Again, there is a greater improvement in the uniformity of the flow downstream of the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination due to the higher upstream turbulence as compared to the conventional honeycomb screen combination; see Figs. 10 and 12. Interestingly, there is no appreciable change in the turbulence intensity at the probe position with the much higher upstream turbulence, indicating that both of the honeycomb flow manipulators are at least properly controlling the turbulence.

In summary, the overall flow characteristics downstream of the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination are comparable to those present downstream of the conventional honeycomb and screen combination, especially for higher upstream turbulence, when the manipulator combination is positioned and scaled correctly. A single 45 deg screen along the downstream edges of the turning vanes provides inferior performance, in some respects even worse than with no manipulator downstream of the turning vanes at all.




Fig. 11 Effect of using no manipulator, a 45 deg screen, a conventional honeycomb-screen combination, and a 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination downstream of turning vanes on lateral profile of mean velocity in high turbulence flow condition.




Fig. 12 Effect of using no manipulator, a 45 deg screen, a conventional honeycomb-screen combination, and a 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination downstream of turning vanes on lateral profile of turbulence intensity in high turbulence flow condition.

Therefore, the screen just mentioned should not be recommended as a logical choice for improving mean velocity and turbulence level in the settling chamber of any wind tunnel.

Summary

In order to attach some overall quantitative significance to the results of Figs. 2-12 and to have some measure of the relative performance of each manipulator, the effect on the turbulence intensity for each of the manipulator combinations

Table 1 Comparison of manipulator performance

Manipulator	$U_\infty, m/s$	Low upstream turbulence		High upstream turbulence	
		$u'/U_\infty, \%$	F_I^*	$u'/U_\infty, \%$	F_I^*
Turning vanes alone	≈ 30	3.6	1	3.8	1
45 deg screen, ^a $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 30	2.43	1.48	2.59	1.47
3.13 mm mesh conventional honeycomb and screen	≈ 30	1.58	2.28	1.58	2.41
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm	≈ 30	1.47	2.45	1.39	2.73
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 2.5$ cm	≈ 30			2.02	1.88
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb, $\Delta x = 2.5$ cm	≈ 30	2.53	1.42		
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 30	1.74	2.07	1.71	2.22
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb, $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 30	2.34	1.54		
1.56 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm	≈ 30			1.09	3.49
1.56 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 30			2.15	1.77
6.25 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 30			2.21	1.72
6.25 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb, $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 30	2.78	1.29		
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm	≈ 20.4			1.77	2.15
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 0$	≈ 20.4			2.04	1.86
3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb + 45 deg screen, $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm	≈ 36.0			1.40	2.71

^aScreen mesh is 0.91 mm in all cases.^b $F_I^* = \frac{(u'U_\infty)_{\text{turning vanes alone}}}{(u'U_\infty)_{\text{manipulator}}}$ ^cValues of (u'/U_∞) in parentheses are typical maximum and minimum values in the y-direction.

and their relative positions is compiled in Table 1. In the table, under the heading u'/U_∞ , the turbulence intensity, the numbers in parentheses are approximate maximum and minimum values of the turbulence intensity across the test section, while the third number is a realistic spatial average. It should be noted that the maximum levels occur near the inside corner and may be artificially high due to the sidewall boundary layer or to some separated region at the inside

corner. The quantity F_I^* is defined as the ratio of the turbulence intensity downstream of the turning vanes alone to the turbulence intensity at the same downstream position when a flow manipulator is used. The higher the value of F_I^* , the more effective the flow manipulator is at reducing the turbulence. At large downstream distances, i.e., long decay time, turbulence reductions of approximately $2F_I^*$ may be expected.

While all of the values reflect the observations discussed in connection with the appropriate figures, a quantitative comparison of the most promising manipulator combinations is useful. As in the foregoing discussion, the performance level of the 3.13 mm mesh conventional honeycomb and screen combination is used as the standard. With respect to this standard, the 3.13 mm mesh 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination, $\Delta x = 5.0$ cm, provides slightly better (5-10%) overall turbulence reduction for both low and high upstream turbulence, although there is a larger difference between the maximum and minimum turbulence intensity levels. This is a reflection of the somewhat higher spatial nonuniformity, as observed in Figs. 10 and 12. The other manipulator combinations which do as well as, or better than, the conventional honeycomb and screen combination can also be easily selected from this table. However, the values quoted in the table should always be used in connection with the appropriate figures and discussion before making any conclusions.

Conclusion

Based on the results of this investigation and the discussion of the previous section, the following conclusions on the operation of wind tunnel turning vanes and on using the new-concept honeycomb in conjunction with these turning vanes can be stated.

1) Higher turbulence upstream of the turning vanes (even a very small increase in turbulence intensity) yields better spatial uniformity of the mean flow and turbulence intensity downstream of the turning vanes, both with and without flow manipulators.

2) Upstream swirl is almost completely eliminated by the turning vanes, even though the swirl has a strong concentrated vortex. The flow manipulators downstream of the turning vanes do not have to be designed to remove such swirls.

3) A single screen stretched across the trailing edges of the turning vanes leads to conditions that are inferior to those present when using the turning vanes alone. Either a conventional honeycomb and screen combination or the new-concept 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination would, therefore, offer much better solutions. The addition of a single screen immediately downstream of the honeycomb significantly improves the performance for all honeycombs, especially where the mean velocity is reasonably uniform upstream of the honeycomb.

4) Proper turbulence management solutions, using either the conventional honeycomb and screen combination or the new-concept 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination, result in overall flow characteristics essentially independent of conditions upstream of the turning vanes. However, spatial uniformity is affected by the upstream conditions (see conclusion 1).

5) The new-concept 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination with adequate separation from the turning vanes (approximately 2 vane meshes) results in mean flow conditions and turbulence intensity levels comparable to those produced by a conventional honeycomb and screen combination.

6) Separation between the turning vanes and the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination leads to improved performance by allowing the vane wakes some distance to mix and decay under the influence of their own generated turbulence. Eliminating the separation distance and placing the honeycomb too close to the turning vanes removes the turbulence necessary for efficient wake mixing too soon, resulting in persistent mean velocity wake defects for large distances downstream. Adequate separation distance is approximately 2 vane meshes, and is made shorter by higher upstream turbulence and honeycomb pressure drop.

7) Using no separation between the turning vanes and the 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination renders the concept less effective due to the lack of turning vane wake decay, as described in conclusion 6, resulting in large spatial nonuniformities and slower turbulence decay. The honeycomb mesh must be scaled to the turning vanes mesh when no separation is used (mesh ratio of about 5) to improve spatial uniformity, instead of being scaled to the turbulence characteristics for maximum turbulence reduction.

8) Proper selection of the honeycomb-screen combination downstream of the turning vanes could lead to a reduction in turbulence by a factor of almost 7 ahead of the contraction and a factor of more than 10 after the contraction.

As just stated, the new-concept honeycomb and screen can be used in place of the conventional honeycomb and screen with some improvement in the turbulence reduction, if some separation is provided between the turning vanes and the honeycomb. However, in the Introduction, it was theorized that by acting on the turbulence sooner, the turbulence intensity at any position downstream should be much lower. The turbulence is also at a later stage of decay, indicating larger scales of the turbulence. Considering the slightly better turbulence reduction using the new concept 45 deg honeycomb-45 deg screen combination, the real proof of whether or not it is significantly better will depend on the contraction effects on the two turbulence flows of approximately the same turbulence intensity but of different scales. Unfortunately, this question cannot be answered at present, as no study of this effect has been performed to date. Once this information is known, it will then be possible to decide whether the extra expense incurred for fabricating and installing the new-concept honeycomb will be justified.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to express their gratitude to several people involved with this project. In particular, W. Don Harvey as the technical monitor was very helpful to us in establishing the project and through discussions as the project was being carried out. We would like to thank Dennis Bushnell who was partly responsible for the project being initiated. We are also very grateful to Thelma Grymes for her expert typing of the manuscript.

References

- Loehrke, R.I. and Nagib, H.M., "Experiments on Management of Free-Stream Turbulence," AGARD Rept. 598, 1972; also available from NTIS as AD-749-891.
- Loehrke, R.I. and Nagib, H.M., "Control of Free-Stream Turbulence by Means of Honeycombs: A Balance Between Suppression and Generation," ASME Paper 76-FE-2; also *Journal of Fluids Engineering, Transactions of the ASME*, Vol. 98, Sept. 1976, pp.342-353.
- Tan-atichat, J., Nagib, H.M., and Loehrke, R.I., "Interaction of Freestream Turbulence with Screens and Perforated Plates: A Balance Between Turbulence Scales," accepted for publication in *The Journal of Fluid Mechanics*.
- Ahmed, M., Wigeland, R.A., and Nagib, H.M., "Generation and Management of Swirling Flows in Confined Streams," I.I.T. Fluids and Heat Transfer Rept. R76-2; also Interim Technical Rept. ARO-ITR-76, 1976.
- Ahmed, M., Wigeland, R.A., and Nagib, H.M., "Generation, Management and Suppression of Large Scale Vorticity in Internal Flows," *Proceedings of the SQUID Workshop on Turbulence in Internal Flows*, Washington, D.C., 1976, Plenum Publishing Corp., 1977.
- Wigeland, R.A. Ahmed, M., and Nagib, H.M., "Management of Swirling Flows with Application to Wind-Tunnel Design and V/STOL Testing," AIAA Paper 77-585, AIAA/NASA Ames V/STOL Conference, Moffett Field, Calif., June 1977; also *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 16, Nov. 1978, pp. 1125-1131.