Table of Contents

```
Given 4
ASEN 3128: Homework 6
Author: Caleb Bristol
Date: 26 April, 2022
clear
close all;
clc
```

Problem 3

Part a)

```
% Given
DD = [-1.610e04 -3.062e05 2.131e05;0 -1.076e07 -1.330e06;0
9.925e06 -8.934e06];

C_y_beta = -0.8771;
C_l_beta = -0.2797;
C_n_beta = 0.1946;
C_y_p = 0;
C_l_p = -0.3295;
C_n_p = -0.04073;
C_y_r = 0;
C_l_r = 0.304;
C_n_r = -0.2737;

W = 2.83176e06;
S = 511.0;
```

```
c = 8.324;
    b = 59.64;
    I_x = 0.247e08;
    I y = 0.449e08;
    I_z = 0.673e08;
    I zx = -0.212e07;
    u_0 = 235.9;
    theta 0 = 0;
    rho = 0.3045;
    C_L_0 = 0.654;
    C_D_0 = 0;
    % Dimensionalize
    Y_v = 0.5*rho*u_0*S*C_y_beta;
    L v = 0.5*rho*u 0*b*S*C 1 beta;
    N_v = 0.5*rho*u_0*b*S*C_n_beta;
    Y_p = 0.25*rho*u_0*b*S*C_y_p;
    L_p = 0.25*rho*u_0*b^2*S*C_l_p;
    N p = 0.25*rho*u 0*b^2*S*C n p;
    Y_r = 0.25*rho*u_0*b*S*C_y_r;
    L_r = 0.25*rho*u_0*b^2*S*C_l_r;
    N_r = 0.25*rho*u_0*b^2*S*C_n_r;
    DD_ = [Y_v L_v N_v; Y_p L_p N_p; Y_r L_r N_r];
    % Display Results
    fprintf('Problem 3: \n \n')
    fprintf('Part a) \n')
    fprintf('Table 6.7: \n')
    disp(DD)
    fprintf('Dimensionalized Derivatives from Table 6.6: \n')
    disp(DD)
Problem 3:
Part a)
Table 6.7:
      -16100
                 -306200
                              213100
           0
               -10760000
                            -1330000
                 9925000
                            -8934000
Dimensionalized Derivatives from Table 6.6:
   1.0e+07 *
   -0.0016
            -0.0306
                        0.0213
            -1.0755
         0
                       -0.1329
             0.9923
                       -0.8934
```

Part b)

```
% i)
delta_p = 0.05; %[rad/s]
```

```
L i = L p * delta p;
    % ii)
    delta_r = -0.05; %[rad/s]
    N_ii = N_r * delta_r;
    % iii)
    delta_r = 0.01; %[rad/s]
    L_iii = L_r * delta_r;
    % iv)
    delta_p = -0.7; %[rad/s]
    N_{iv} = N_p * delta_p;
    % v)
    delta_p = 0.15; %[rad/s]
    delta_v = 2.04; %[m/s]
    Y_v = Y_p * delta_p + Y_v * delta_v;
    % vi)
    delta v = -1.3; %[m/s]
    delta_p = 0.5; %[rad/s]
    delta_r = 0.37; %[rad/s]
    N_vi = N_v * delta_v + N_p * delta_p + N_r * delta_r;
    % Display Results
    fprintf('Part b) \n')
    fprintf('i) \n')
    fprintf('Change in L due to perturbations [Nm]: \n')
    disp(L_i)
    fprintf('ii) \n')
    fprintf('Change in N due to perturbations [Nm]: \n')
    disp(N ii)
    fprintf('iii) \n')
    fprintf('Change in L due to perturbations [Nm]: \n')
    disp(L_iii)
    fprintf('iv) \n')
    fprintf('Change in N due to perturbations [Nm]: \n')
    disp(N_iv)
    fprintf('v) \n')
    fprintf('Change in Y due to perturbations [N]: \n')
    disp(Y v)
    fprintf('vi) \n')
    fprintf('Change in N due to perturbations [Nm]: \n')
    disp(N_vi)
    fprintf('\n')
Part b)
```

```
i)
Change in L due to perturbations [Nm]:
    -5.3775e+05

ii)
Change in N due to perturbations [Nm]:
    4.4668e+05

iii)
Change in L due to perturbations [Nm]:
    9.9226e+04

iv)
Change in N due to perturbations [Nm]:
    9.3060e+05

v)
Change in Y due to perturbations [N]:
    -3.2839e+04

vi)
Change in N due to perturbations [N]:
    -4.2470e+06
```

Problem 4

Given

```
A_lat = [-0.0869 0 -0.825 32.175;-0.0054 -1.184 0.3350 0;0.0026
-0.0210 -0.2280 0;0 1.0000 0 0];
V = 825; %[ft/s]
h = 33000; %[ft]
theta_0 = 0; %[rad]
g = A_lat(1,4); %[ft/s^2]
```

Part a)

```
% Calculate Eigenvalues/Eigenvectors
[eigenvec,eigen] = eig(A_lat);

% Identify Dutch Roll Mode (2,2) and (3,3)
w_n = sqrt(real(eigen(2,2))^2 + imag(eigen(2,2))^2);
zeta = real(eigen(2,2)) / w_n;

% Identify Roll Mode (1,1)
t_roll = log(0.5) / real(eigen(1,1));

% Identify Spiral Mode (4,4)
t_spiral = log(0.5) / real(eigen(4,4));
```

Part b)

```
% Pull Variables from Matrix
N_r_ = A_lat(3,3);
L_v_ = A_lat(2,1);
N_v_ = A_lat(3,1);
L_r_ = A_lat(2,3);
% Compute Approximation
lambda_spi = (N_r_ * L_v_ - N_v_ * L_r_) / (L_v_);
t_spi_ = log(0.5) / lambda_spi;
```

Part c)

```
% Pull Variables from Matrix
L_p_ = A_lat(2,2);
% Compute Approximation
lambda_roll = L_p_;
t_roll_ = log(0.5) / lambda_roll;
```

Part d)

```
% Pull Variables from Matrix
N_p_ = A_lat(3,2);

% Compute Approximation
E = g * (N_r_ * L_v_ - N_v_ * L_r_);
D = V * (L_v_ * N_p_ - L_p_ * N_v_) - g * L_v_;
C = V * N_v_;

lambda_spi_comb = (-D + sqrt(D^2 - 4*C*E)) / (2 * C);
lambda_roll_comb = (-D - sqrt(D^2 - 4*C*E)) / (2 * C);
t_spi_comb = log(0.5) / lambda_spi_comb;
t_roll_comb = log(0.5) / lambda_roll_comb;
```

Part e)

```
% Pull Variables from Matrix
Y_v_ = A_lat(1,1);

% Compute Approximation
w_n_ = sqrt(Y_v_ * N_r_ + V * N_v_);
zeta_ = (Y_v_ + N_r_) / (2 * w_n_);
```

Display Results

```
fprintf('Problem 2: \n \n')
```

```
% Part a)
    fprintf('Part a) \n')
    fprintf('Eigenvectors: \n')
    disp(eigenvec)
    fprintf('Eigenvalues: \n')
    disp(diag(eigen))
    fprintf('Dutch Roll Mode: \n')
    fprintf('Natural Frequency: \n')
    disp(w n)
    fprintf('Damping Coefficient: \n')
    disp(zeta)
    fprintf('Spiral Mode Time to Half [s]: \n')
    disp(t_spiral)
    fprintf('Roll Mode Time to Half [s]: \n')
    disp(t_roll)
    % Part b)
    fprintf('Part b) \n')
    fprintf('Spiral Mode Approximation Time to Half [S]: \n')
    disp(t_spi_)
    % Part c)
    fprintf('Part c) \n')
    fprintf('Roll Mode Approximation Time to Half [s]: \n')
    disp(t_roll_)
    % Part d)
    fprintf('Part d) \n')
    fprintf('Combined Spiral and Roll Mode: \n')
    fprintf('Combined Spiral Mode Approx Time to Half [s]: \n')
    disp(t_spi_comb)
    fprintf('Combined Roll Mode Approx Time to Half [s]: \n')
    disp(t_roll_comb)
    % Part e)
    fprintf('Part e) \n')
    fprintf('Dutch Roll Approximation: \n')
    fprintf('Natural Frequency: \n')
    disp(w_n_)
    fprintf('Damping Coefficient: \n')
    disp(zeta_)
Problem 2:
Part a)
Eigenvectors:
                    0.9999 + 0.0000i 0.9999 + 0.0000i
   0.9981 + 0.0000i
                                                            0.9999 +
 0.0000i
   0.0492 + 0.0000i -0.0042 - 0.0005i -0.0042 + 0.0005i -0.0001 +
 0.0000i
  -0.0015 + 0.0000i
                    0.0027 - 0.0061i 0.0027 + 0.0061i
                                                            0.0159 +
 0.0000i
```

```
-0.0378 + 0.0000i 0.0007 + 0.0112i 0.0007 - 0.0112i 0.0011 +
 0.0000i
Eigenvalues:
  -1.3034 + 0.0000i
  -0.0657 + 0.3664i
  -0.0657 - 0.3664i
  -0.0642 + 0.0000i
Dutch Roll Mode:
Natural Frequency:
    0.3722
Damping Coefficient:
   -0.1765
Spiral Mode Time to Half [s]:
   10.7995
Roll Mode Time to Half [s]:
    0.5318
Spiral Mode Approximation Time to Half [S]:
   10.3914
Part c)
Roll Mode Approximation Time to Half [s]:
    0.5854
Part d)
Combined Spiral and Roll Mode:
Combined Spiral Mode Approx Time to Half [s]:
  167.3500
Combined Roll Mode Approx Time to Half [s]:
    0.5314
Part e)
Dutch Roll Approximation:
Natural Frequency:
    1.4713
Damping Coefficient:
   -0.1070
```

Comparisons Between Models

```
% Part b)
%
The spiral mode approximation is incredibly close to the actual
```

- % calculated value, being off only by a couple of tenths of a second.
- % Considering this error has been propagated through the calculation of
- $\mbox{\ensuremath{\$}}$ time to half, the eigenvalue is only off by a couple hundredths, and
 - % remains on the same order of magnitude as the real value.
 - % Part c)

응

- % Much like the spiral mode approximation, the roll mode approximation
- % is very accurate. It is only off by a couple hundredths of a second,
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\$}}$ though its error is very close to the spiral mode considering that
- $\mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{\$}}}$ while its error may be an order of magnitude less, so is its value.
 - % Part d)

્ર

- $\ensuremath{\$}$ This approximation was somewhat close with the roll mode, actually
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\$}}$ being even closer to the original value than the individual roll mode
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\$}}$ approximation; however, the spiral mode was significantly off. The
- % time to half provided by this approximation was off by an order of
- $\mbox{\ensuremath{\upsigma}{\it \$}}$ magnitude, and doesn't accurately reflect the actual behavior at all.
 - % Part e)

응

- % This approximation was really far off with the natural frequency,
 - % being an order of magnitude off of the original value, though
- % strangely enough the damping ratio came out to be a somewhat similar
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\$}}$ value. Considering the fact that the damping ratio must be between
- $\ensuremath{\,^{\circ}}$ zero and one for oscillations to occur, however, means this relation
- $\ensuremath{\text{\%}}$ could very easily be more of a coincidence based on the constraints
 - % of the problem more than a gauge of the accuracy of this
- % approximation. Considering how far off the natural frequency was from
- % the original value, I wouldn't consider this approximation
 accurate
 - % at all.

Published with MATLAB® R2020a