

LONGITUDINAL STABILITY AND MOTION OF
TRIMARAN WING IN GROUND EFFECT MODEL
DURING TAKE-OFF

NOVERDO SAPUTRA

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the
Requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Marine Technology)

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

SEPTEMBER 2011

DEDICATION

I dedicate this knowledge to:

My beloved father and mother
Development of science and technology
Welfare of all people in the world

“Nothing is impossible in this world; keep trying, learning and seeking blessing from
The God until the end of your life”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express special appreciation for my main supervisor Professor Dr. Adi Maimun Bin H. Abdul Malik, for support, guidance, criticism and suggestions during the study. I am also very grateful to my co-supervisor Dr. Agoes Prijanto for advice, guidance and motivation. I will never forget and are very grateful to my external supervisor, Professor Kirril V. Rohtdezvensky for basic concept and knowledge about "ground effect". I am also very grateful to Dr. Maurizio Collu that has been provided all references about hydrodynamic hull planning and his advice. And also I am very grateful to Dr. John Rogers for vortex lattice algorithm and Mr. Dingo Twedie for Savitsky Method Algorithm.

I would like to tank to the following individuals:

- 1 All Aerodynamic Laboratory staff for the assistance given during the wind tunnel test.
- 2 All Marine Laboratory staff for the assistance given during the hydrodynamic test.
- 3 All Centre of Composite Laboratory staff for the assistance given during making model and prototype.
- 4 All Structure Laboratory staff for the assistance given during strength assessment.
- 5 All my fellow colleagues in the Marine Laboratory, Saeed Jamee, Mobasser, Ike Suharyanti. Mr. Rahimudin, Mr. Nurcholis, Mr.Yogi, Syaril.

- 6 All my fellow colleagues in Centre of Composite Laboratory, Mr. Imran, Mr. Kamal, Mr. Rizal, Zamrie.
- 7 My entire PSM student, Rahim, Waqiyudin, Faisal, Tan Yong Seng, Syakur, Izad.
- 8 My Best friend in KTC S47, Arief, Kazman, Uda Umar, Aak, Yudis, Delin, Mr. Prabowo, Akhry Nuddin
- 9 All contractor and supplier which has been supporting this research.
- 10 My family and my special friend for their encouragement during my study.

ABSTRACT

Wing in Ground Effect is a relatively new concept in transportation technology. It is more efficient than conventional aircraft and quicker compared to conventional marine vehicles. However WIG is still not widely use as a public transportation. One of the criteria to be fulfilled is stability. Longitudinal stability of WIG craft is still of concern to the designer and the solutions are being investigated. Instability of a small WIG craft occurs when aerodynamic-hydrodynamic phase changes into pure aerodynamic phase during the take-off. In this research, investigations were conducted to determine the longitudinal static and dynamic stability effect of Trimaran WIG craft during takeoff and to verify the factors affecting its stability. Two parameters considered are aerodynamic and hydrodynamic characteristics. The investigation resorts to vortex lattice method and examines the effects of flat ground and end plate on the performance of aerodynamic characteristic of the WIG craft. Planing hull has been chosen for the hull shape of the WIG craft due to higher speed takeoff. The hydrodynamics of prismatic planing surfaces, presented by Savitsky, is used to calculate the hydrodynamic characteristic. Numerical result is compared to the experimental results and against published data. The Static Stability Margin (SSM) for longitudinal static stability of Trimaran WIG model has been investigated and using the classical aircraft motion modification and calculating the aerodynamic, hydrostatic and hydrodynamic forces, the complete equation of motion that uses a small perturbation assumption for WIG during take-off has been derived and solved. Finally, dynamic stability for Trimaran WIG during take-off has been investigated and analyzed using Routh-Hurwitz Stability Criterion and Control Anticipation Parameter (CAP).

ABSTRAK

Kenderaan 'Wing in Ground' (WIG) merupakan konsep yang berbanding baru dalam teknologi pengangkutan. Ia lebih cekap dari pesawat konvensional dan lebih pantas berbanding kenderaan air konvensional. Walau bagaimanapun, WIG masih tidak boleh digunakan sebagai kenderaan pengangkutan awam. Salah satu kriteria yang perlu dipenuhi adalah kestabilan. Kestabilan melintang kenderaan WIG masih menjadi perhatian para pereka dan penyelesaiannya sedang dikaji. Masalah kestabilan kenderaan WIG yang kecil berlaku semasa pertukaran fasa aerodinamik-hidrodinamik kepada fasa aerodinamik sepenuhnya ketika berlepas. Di dalam penyelidikan ini, penyasatan telah dijalankan untuk menentukan pengaruh kestabilan melintang statik dan dinamik model kenderaan trimaran WIG semasa berlepas dan mengesahkan faktor yang mempengaruhinya. Dua parameter yang dipertimbangkan ialah ciri aerodinamik dan ciri hidrodinamik. Kajian telah memilih kaedah kisi 'vortex lattice' dan memilih kesan tanah rata dengan hujung plat kepada prestasi ciri aerodinamik dan ciri hidrodinamik kenderaan WIG. 'Planing hull' telah dipilih sebagai bentuk badan kenderaan trimaran WIG disebabkan perlunya kelajuan yang tinggi untuk ia berlepas. Ciri Hidrodinamik permukaan prismatic untuk 'planing hull' yang dibentangkan oleh Savitsky telah digunakan untuk mengira ciri-ciri hidrodinamik. Keputusan analisis berangka dibandingkan dengan keputusan uji kaji dan data yang telah diterbitkan. Margin Kestabilan Statik (SSM) untuk kestabilan statik membujur model kenderaan trimaran WIG telah dikaji. Dan dengan menggunakan modifikasi pergerakan asas pesawat udara dengan mengira aerodinamik, hidrostatik dan daya hidrodinamik, persamaan lengkap pergerakan yang menggunakan andaian perturbasi kecil, telah diterbitkan dan diselesaikan untuk kenderaan WIG semasa ia berlepas. Akhirnya, kestabilan dinamik Trimaran WIG semasa berlepas telah dikaji dan telah dianalisis menggunakan Kriteria Stabiliti Routh-Hurwitz dan Faktor Kawalan Antisipasi (CAP).

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABSTRACT	vi
	ABSTRAK	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENT	viii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
	LIST OF TABLES	xviii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONs	xxiii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xxv
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxxi

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background and problem statement	1
1.2 Purpose and objective of the study	3
1.3 Scope of this study	4
1.4 Significance of the study	4
1.5 Thesis outline	5
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Historical ground effect vehicles	7
2.2 Aerodynamic WIG characteristic	10
2.3 Hydrodynamic WIG characteristic	11
2.4 Longitudinal static stability	15
2.5 Longitudinal dynamic stability	17
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	21
3.1 Introduction	21
3.2 Initial design of model	21
3.3 Computational calculation	23
3.3.1 Vortex Lattice Method (VLM)	23
3.3.1.1 Preprocessor Vortex lattice Method (VLM)	23
3.3.1.2 Solver Vortex lattice Method (VLM)	24
3.3.1.3 Postprocessor Vortex lattice Method (VLM)	25
3.3.2 Planing hull	26
3.4 Experimental work	27
3.5 Comparison and analysis of results	28

3.6	Longitudinal static stability & longitudinal dynamic stability analysis	28
MATHEMATICAL MODEL DeVELOPMENT		30
4.1	Introduction	30
4.2	Vortex Lattice Method	30
4.3	Effect of flat ground and endplate on aerodynamic characteristic	37
4.3.1	Effect flat ground	37
4.3.2	Effect endplate	38
4.4	Step by step Savitsky method	39
4.5	Longitudinal static stability	44
4.6	Longitudinal dynamic stability & dynamic motion	50
4.6.1	Aerodynamic force	50
4.6.2	Hydrodynamic force	51
4.6.3	Propulsion system, control system and disturbance	52
4.6.4	Gravitational force	53
4.6.5	Equilibrium state, linearized, and cauchy standard equation of motion	53
EXPERIMENTAL WORK		57
5.1	Wind Tunnel Test	57
5.1.1	Facility Low Speed Wind Tunnel Universiti Technology Malaysia (LST -UTM)	58
5.1.2	Procedure wind tunnel test at LST-UTM	61
5.1.2.1	Preparation model	62
5.1.2.2	Set up Instrumentation	65
5.1.2.3	Testing	71

5.1.2.4	Gathering data	73
5.1.2.5	Correction, normalization, and linearization data	76
5.2	Free running test	78
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		81
6.1	Validation Vortex Lattice Method (VLM)	81
6.1.1	Lift coefficient (C_L) without endplate	82
6.1.2	5.1.2 Lift coefficient (C_L) with endplate	89
6.1.3	Drag coefficient (C_D) without endplate	95
6.1.4	Drag coefficient (C_D) with endplate	102
6.2	Aerodynamic Trimaran WIG Model	108
6.2.1	Numerical Results	109
6.2.2	Experimental Results	115
6.2.3	Comparison numerical results with experimental result	118
6.3	Hydrodynamic Trimaran WIG Model	125
6.3.1	Result and validation Savitsky Method (SM) program with Hullspeed Maxsurf.	126
6.3.2	Free running test result	130
6.3.3	Comparison numerical result (SM) with free running test	133
6.4	Longitudinal Static Stability Trimaran WIG Model	136
6.5	Longitudinal Dynamic Stability Trimaran WIG Model	139
6.6	Routh-Hurwitz Stability Criterion and Control Anticipation Parameter (CAP)	142
6.7	Dynamic Motion Trimaran WIG Model	152
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK		154

	xii
7.1 Conclusion	154
7.2 Recommendations	158
REFERENCES	160
APPENDIX A	165
APPENDIX B	169
APPENDIX C	176
APPENDIX D	183
APPENDIX E	195
APPENDIX F	197
APPENDIX G	202
APPENDIX H	216

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Hull form	12
2.2	Photograph spray produced of a planing hull	13
2.3	Wetted area surface	13
2.4	Hydrostatic lift & hydrodynamics lift component	14
2.5	Dynamic airplane component	18
2.6	Dynamic WIG component	19
3.1	WIG trimaran Design	22
3.2	Flowchart preprocessor	24
3.3	Flowchart processor	25
3.4	Flowchart postprocessor	26
3.5	Flowchart savitsky method	27
3.6	Flowchart research	29
4.1	Flat wing sketch	31
4.2	Flat wing with dihedral sketch	31
4.3	Looking from upstream toward the trailing edge	32
4.4	Vortex filaments	33
4.5	New configuration SSM during take-off	49
5.1	Layout LST-UTM	60
5.2	LST-UTM main component	60
5.3	Aluminum block for model wind tunnel test	63
5.4	CNC milling MAHO 500 E2	63

5.5	Cold milling	64
5.6	Wing model for wind tunnel test	64
5.7	Set up fan power for wind speed	65
5.8	Honeycomb and screen LST-UTM	66
5.9	Heat exchanger LST-UTM	66
5.10	Balance and support system LST-UTM	67
5.11	3-Struts support	68
5.12	Street lantern light using single-strut support	68
5.13	Data Acquisition and Reduction System (DARS) LST-UTM	69
5.14	Pressure measurement tools LST-UTM	70
5.15	Flow visualization LST-UTM	70
5.16	Pitot probe	71
5.17	Air stream check apparatus	72
5.18	Free running test schematic	79
5.19	Free running test	79
5.20	Recording data from running test	80
5.21	Real time data dashboard	80
6.1	Panel VLM	82
6.2	CL versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1$	83
6.3	CL versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1.5$	84
6.4	CL versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 2$	85
6.5	CL versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1$	86
6.6	CL versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1.5$	87
6.7	CL versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 2$	88
6.8	CL versus AOA for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1$, endplate $h_e/c = 0.05$	90
6.9	CL versus AOA for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1.5$, endplate $h_e/c = 0.1$	91
6.10	CL versus AOA for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 2$, endplate $h_e/c = 0.05$	92
6.11	CL versus AOA for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1$, endplate $h_e/c = 0.05$	93

6.12	CL versus AOA for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1.5$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	94
6.13	CL versus AOA for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 2$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	95
6.14	C_D versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1$	96
6.15	C_D versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1.5$	97
6.16	C_D versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 2$	98
6.17	C_D versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1$	99
6.18	C_D versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1.5$	100
6.19	C_D versus angle of attack for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 2$	101
6.20	C_D versus AOA for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	103
6.21	C_D versus AOA for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 1.5$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	104
6.22	C_D versus AOA for $h/c = 0.1$ and $AR = 2$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	105
6.23	C_D versus AOA for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	106
6.24	C_D versus AOA for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 1.5$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	107
6.25	C_D versus AOA for $h/c = 0.3$ and $AR = 2$, endplate $he/c = 0.05$	108
6.26	C_L versus h/c every AOA for $AR = 1.25$ rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model without endplate using VLM	110
6.27	C_L versus h/c every AOA for $AR = 1.25$ rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model with endplate $0.05c$ using VLM	111
6.28	C_D versus h/c every AOA for $AR = 1.25$ rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model without endplate using VLM	113
6.29	C_D versus h/c every AOA for $AR = 1.25$ rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model with endplate $0.05c$ using VLM	115

6.30	Experimental result of lift coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model with endplate (AR = 1.25)	116
6.31	Experimental result of drag coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model with endplate (AR = 1.25)	118
6.32	Comparison of C_L versus AOA for h/c= 0.06 he/c=0.06 and AR = 1.25 between VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	119
6.33	Comparison of C_L versus AOA for h/c= 0.1 he/c=0.06 and AR = 1.25 between VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	120
6.34	Comparison of C_L versus AOA for h/c= 0.15 he/c=0.06 and AR = 1.25 between VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	121
6.35	Comparison of C_D versus AOA for h/c= 0.15 he/c=0.06 and AR = 1.25 between VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	123
6.36	Comparison of C_D versus AOA for h/c= 0.15 he/c=0.06 and AR = 1.25 between VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	124
6.37	Comparison of C_D versus AOA for h/c= 0.15 he/c=0.06 and AR = 1.25 between VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	125
6.38	Hull without step and hull with step (Clements's step)	126
6.39	Planing hull simulation using Hullspeed [52]	127
6.40	SM & Hullspeed Maxsurf comparison [52]	127
6.41	Drag water resistance Trimaran WIG model with or without step using SM	129
6.42	Lift coefficient planing surface with and without Step	129
6.43	Calibration RIG result (Thrust versus RPM)	131
6.44	Free running dashboard	132

6.45	Total drag trimaran WIG model result from free running test	133
6.46	Comparison drag trimaran Wig model every speed between numerical result (SM) and experimental work (free running test)	134
6.47	Draft change during take off	135
6.48	SSM wing without endplate, $h/c = 0.06 - 0.3$	137
6.49	SSM wing with endplate, $h/c = 0.06 - 0.3$, $h_e/c = 0.06c$	138
6.50	SSM wing with endplate and tail, $h/c = 0.06 - 0.3$ $h_e/c = 0.06c$	139
6.51	Short Period Pitch Oscillation (SPPO) Trimaran WIG every ground clearance (h/c) during take-off	140
6.52	Short Period Pitch Oscillation (SPPO) trimaran WIG every angle of attack (AOA) during take-off	140
6.53	Long Period Pitch Oscillation (Phugoid) trimaran WIG every ground clearance (h/c) during take-off	141
6.54	Long Period Pitch Oscillation (Phugoid) trimaran WIG every angle of attack (AOA) during take-off	142
6.55	Comparison trimaran WIG during take-off between Simulink Flightgear simulation and free running test	143
6.56	Pitch motion trimaran WIG model	153
6.57	Heave motion trimaran WIG model	153

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
3.1	Principle dimension of WIG trimaran	22
5.1	Model for wind tunnel test	62
6.1	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1, h/c = 0.1, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	83
6.2	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.5, h/c = 0.1, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	84
6.3	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 2, h/c = 0.1, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	85
6.4	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1, h/c = 0.3, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	86
6.5	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.5, h/c = 0.3, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	87
6.6	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 2, h/c = 0.3, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	88
6.7	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1, h/c = 0.1, endplate ratio $h_e/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	89
6.8	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.5, h/c = 0.1, endplate ratio $h_e/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	90

6.9	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 2$, $h/c = 0.1$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	91
6.10	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1$, $h/c = 0.3$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	92
6.11	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1.5$, $h/c = 0.3$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al.	93
6.12	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 2$, $h/c = 0.3$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	94
6.13	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1$, $h/c = 0.1$, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	96
6.14	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1.5$, $h/c = 0.1$, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	97
6.15	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 2$, $h/c = 0.1$, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	98
6.16	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1$, $h/c = 0.3$, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al.	99
6.17	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1.5$, $h/c = 0.3$, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al	100
6.18	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 2$, $h/c = 0.3$, based on VLM, CFD, and experimental by Jung et al.	101
6.19	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1$, $h/c = 0.1$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	102
6.20	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1.5$, $h/c = 0.1$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	103

6.21	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 2$, $h/c = 0.1$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	104
6.22	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1$, $h/c = 0.3$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	105
6.23	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 1.5$, $h/c = 0.3$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	106
6.24	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for $AR = 2$, $h/c = 0.3$, endplate ratio $he/c = 0.05$, based on VLM, and experimental by Jung et al	107
6.25	Lift coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model without endplate ($AR = 1.25$) using VLM	110
6.26	Lift coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model ($AR = 1.25$) with endplate ($he/c=0.05$) using VLM	112
6.27	Drag coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) Rectangular-Dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model ($AR = 1.25$) without endplate using VLM	113
6.28	Drag coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-dihedral (50-50) wing trimaran WIG model ($AR = 1.25$) with endplate ($he/c=0.05$), using VLM	114
6.29	Experimental result of lift coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-dihedral (50-50) Wing trimaran WIG model with endplate ($AR = 1.25$)	116
6.30	Experimental result of drag coefficient every angle of attack (AOA) versus ground clearance (h/c) rectangular-	

	dihedral (50-50) Wing trimaran WIG model with endplate (AR = 1.25)	117
6.31	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.25, h/c = 0.06, endplate ratio he/c = 0.06, based on VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction.	119
6.32	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.25, h/c = 0.1, endplate ratio he/c = 0.06, based on VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	120
6.33	Lift coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.25, h/c = 0.15, endplate ratio he/c = 0.06, based on VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	121
6.34	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.25, h/c = 0.06, endplate ratio he/c = 0.06, based on VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	122
6.35	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.25, h/c = 0.1, endplate ratio he/c = 0.06, based on VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	123
6.36	Drag coefficient versus angle of attack for AR = 1.25, h/c = 0.15, endplate ratio he/c = 0.06, based on VLM, experimental LST-UTM, and experimental LST-UTM after correction	124
6.37	Drag water resistance trimaran WIG model with and without step	128
6.38	Calibration RIG result	130
6.39	Thrust from experiment free running test	132
6.40	Comparison drag trimaran WIG model between SM and free running test	135
6.41	SSM on rectangular-dihedral reverse wing NACA 6409 A/R = 1.25 trimaran WIG model without endplate	136

6.42	SSM on rectangular-dihedral reverse wing NACA 6409 A/R = 1.25 trimaran WIG model with endplate (0.06c)	137
6.43	SSM on rectangular-dihedral reverse wing NACA 6409 A/R = 1.25 trimaran WIG model with endplate (0.06c) and NACA = 0012 Tail A/R = 5	138
6.44	Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion for SPPO every ground clearance (h/c)	143
6.45	Control Anticipation Parameter (CAP) for SPPO every ground clearance (h/c)	144
6.46	Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion for Phugoid every ground clearance (h/c)	145
6.47	Control Anticipation Parameter (CAP) for Phugoid every ground clearance (h/c)	147
6.48	Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion for SPPO every angle of attack (AOA)	147
6.49	Control Anticipation Parameter (CAP) for SPPO every angle of attack (AOA)	148
6.50	Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion for Phugoid every angle of attack (AOA)	150
6.51	Control Anticipation Parameter (CAP) for Phugoid every angle of attack (AOA)”	150

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WIG	Wing In Ground Effect
CDGE	Chord Dominated Ground Effect
SDGE	Span Dominated Ground Effect
PIV	Particle Image Velocimetry
LDA	Laser Doppler Anemometry
RANS	Reynolds Average Navier-Stokes
VLM	Vortex Lattice Method
BEM	Boundary Element Method
SPM	Surface Panel Method
DHMTU	Department of Hydro-Mechanics of the Marine Technical University
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
ACH	Aerodynamic Center in Height
ACP	Aerodynamic Center in Pitch
SSM	Static Stability Margin
WISES	Wing in Surface effect Ship
AOA	Angle of Attack
LOA	Length over all
BOA	Breadth over all
B	Hull breadth
LST-UTM	Low Speed Wind Tunnel University technology Malaysia
ABB	Allan Bradley
HCH	Hydrodynamic Centre in Heave
AAMV	Aerodynamically Alleviated Marine Vehicle
HCH	Hydrodynamic Centre in Pitch
COG	Centre of Gravity
SPPO	Short Period Pitch Oscillation

Phugoid	Long Period Pitch Oscillation
CAP	Control Anticipation Parameter
EDF	Electric Ducting Propeller
NACA	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
COG	Centre Of Gravity
MATLAB	language programming
FORTTRAN	language programming
vortex	spinning, often turbulent, flow of fluid
chord	long of the wing
span	width of the wing
hull	body of ship
fuselage	body of airplane
tail	small wing at
EHP	small wing at
RULM	Rectilinear Uniform Level Motion

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Aerodynamic

A	<i>aspect ratio (b/c)</i>
b	<i>wing span (m)</i>
c	<i>Chord length (m)</i>
C_M	<i>moment coefficient ($=L/0.5\rho AU_\infty^2$)</i>
C_L	<i>lift coefficient ($=L/0.5\rho AU_\infty^2$)</i>
C_D	<i>drag coefficient ($=D/0.5\rho AU_\infty^2$)</i>
C_{Di}	<i>induced drag coefficient</i>
h/c	<i>ground clearance</i>
h_e/c	<i>endplate ratio</i>
N	<i>maximum number of element panel</i>
c_c	<i>cord along trailing leg of elemental panel (m)</i>
α	<i>angle of attack ($^\circ$)</i>
ϕ	<i>dihedral angle ($^\circ$)</i>
σ	<i>ground influence coefficient</i>
φ	<i>endplate influence coefficient</i>
ψ	<i>sweep Angle ($^\circ$)</i>
ρ	<i>air density</i>
Γ	<i>vortex strength</i>
F	<i>influence function geometry of single horshoe</i>
S	<i>wing area (m^2)</i>
U	<i>free stream velocity (m/s)</i>
u	<i>backwash velocity (m/s)</i>
v	<i>sidewash velocity (m/s)</i>

w	<i>downwash velocity (m/s)</i>
r_1, r_2	<i>vector distance</i>
h/c	<i>ratio height ground into chord</i>
h/b	<i>ratio height ground into span</i>
a	<i>angle of attack</i>
e	<i>downwash angle at the tail wing</i>
z	<i>damping ratio</i>
q	<i>pitch angle</i>
n	<i>root of the speed subsidence mode</i>
w	<i>frequency</i>
alt	<i>lift curve slope of the tail wing</i>
x,y,z	<i>distance along X,Y,Z</i>
X_{ac}	<i>distance center of aerodynamic from leading edge</i>
X_{cg}	<i>distance center of gravity from leading edge</i>
X_h	<i>distance center of height from leading edge</i>
$\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$	<i>body-axis system for plan form</i>
$\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}$	<i>wind axis system</i>
$\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}$	<i>distance along $\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}$</i>
x,y,z	<i>distance along X,Y,Z</i>
X,Y,Z	<i>axis system for horsoe vortex</i>
X_{ac}	<i>distance center of aerodynamic from leading edge</i>
X_{cg}	<i>distance center of gravity from leading edge</i>
X_h	<i>distance center of height from leading edge</i>
X_H	<i>distance center of hydrodynamic pitch from leading edge</i>
$\frac{\partial X}{\partial h}$	<i>derivatives height into surging</i>
$\frac{\partial Z}{\partial h}$	<i>derivatives height into heaving</i>
$\frac{\partial M}{\partial h}$	<i>derivatives height into pitching</i>
S_{ref}	<i>reference area</i>

Subscript

<i>U</i>	<i>backwash</i>
<i>V</i>	<i>sidewash</i>
<i>w</i>	<i>downwash</i>
<i>n</i>	<i>index for elemental panel</i>
<i>H</i>	<i>hydrodynamic pitch</i>
<i>OGE</i>	<i>out ground effect</i>
<i>IGE</i>	<i>in ground effect</i>
<i>E</i>	<i>with endplate</i>
<i>WE</i>	<i>without endplate</i>

Hydrodynamic

LOA	<i>length over all</i>
LWL	<i>length water line on (hydro)static condition</i>
b	<i>chine beam (average) or beam of planing surface measured between the chine(BPa)</i>
Ä	<i>displacement mass or vertical load on water</i>
∇	<i>displacement volume</i>
h	<i>vertical depth of trailing edge of boat (at keel) below level water surface or depth of keel @ transom</i>
LCG	<i>location of the longitudinal centre of gravity , forward of transom</i>
VCG	<i>vertical centre of gravity, above baseline</i>
p	<i>number of propellers</i>
r	<i>number of rudders</i>
V_s	<i>boat forward planing velocity or horizontal velocity of planing surface</i>
b	<i>deadrise angle (degrees) - average, usually taken @ 0,5 L_p</i>
e	<i>propeller shaft line inclination relative to the baseline (or keel line)</i>
t	<i>trim (angle between planing bottom and horizontal)</i>
C_v	<i>speed coefficient</i>
FN_{∇}	<i>volume Froude number</i>

C_f	<i>Schoenherr frictional drag coefficient based on Reynolds number</i>
$\ddot{A}C_f$	<i>friction coefficient allowance for roughness of planing surface or Correlation Allowance, Savitsky used $CA = 0.0004$ & ITTC recommends $CA = 0.003$ for this friction line. (CA)</i>
CL_0	<i>Lift coefficient @ zero deadrise</i>
CL_β	<i>lift coefficient with deadrise surface</i>
L_P	<i>projected length of chine from transom to bow profile</i>
L_K	<i>Projected wetted keel length</i>
L_C	<i>Projected wetted chine length measured from transom to spray root (stagnation line) intersection with chine (excluding spray)</i>
L_M	<i>Mean wetted length of pressure Area</i>
B_X	<i>beam max</i>
λ	<i>or L_M/b; mean wetted length / beam ratio</i>
$\ddot{A}\lambda$	<i>Effective increase in friction area length beam ratio due to spray contribution to drag</i>
L_{CP}	<i>longitudinal location of centre of pressure from trailing edge (i.e.transom)</i>
C_P	<i>Centre of pressure</i>
N	<i>Resultant of pressure (hydrodynamic) and buoyancy (hydrostatic) forces assumed acting normal to hull bottom</i>
A_P	<i>projected planing bottom area (excluding external spray strips) or total bottom pressure area</i>
S_w	<i>principal wetted surface area (bounded by trailing edge, chines and heavy spray line)</i>
S_S	<i>area wetted by spray</i>
f	<i>perpendicular distance off shaft line to Centre of Gravity (CG)</i>
a	<i>the perpendicular distance between frictional drag-force component D_f and CG</i>
f_a	<i>Distance between Appendage Drag D_a (assumed as acting parallel to keel line) and CG</i>
g	<i>acceleration due to gravity (or gravitational constant) = 9.81 m/s^2</i>
R_N	<i>Reynolds number</i>
n	<i>Kinematic viscosity of fluid (salt water @ $20^\circ = 1*10^{-6}$)</i>

V_M	<i>Average water bottom velocity over the pressure area</i>
q	<i>Angle between the keel (centreline) and the outer edge of spray area measured in plane of bottom</i>
\bar{n}	<i>specific weight of water (or mass density of water)</i>
D_f	<i>Frictional Drag-force component along bottom of surface</i>
D_a	<i>Appendage Drag (assumed as acting parallel to keel line)</i>
T	<i>Propeller thrust along shaft line</i>
d	<i>Diameter of shaft or bossing</i>
c	<i>distance between N (pressure force applied to centre of pressure) and CG measured longitudinally from transom stern and normal to N</i>
RT	<i>total resistance</i>

Dynamic Stability and motion

F_a	<i>Aerodynamic force</i>
F_h	<i>Hydrodynamic force</i>
F_c	<i>Control force</i>
F_d	<i>disturbance force</i>
F_g	<i>gravitational force</i>
F_p	<i>Propulsion force</i>
F_0	<i>equilibrium state of force</i>
F'	<i>perturbation from datum</i>
\dot{u}	<i>surge displacement</i>
\dot{q}	<i>heave displacement, positive downward</i>
\dot{w}	<i>pitch rotation, positive bow up</i>
A	<i>mass matrix</i>
B	<i>damping matrix</i>
C	<i>restoring matrix</i>
D	<i>influence height into aerodynamic force</i>
I	<i>moment inertia</i>

Superscript

a	<i>related to aerodynamics</i>
h	<i>related to hydrodynamics</i>
$'$	<i>perturbation value</i>

Subscript

0	<i>value at the equilibrium state</i>
h	derivative with respect to height

Experiment formula

Y_w	<i>width of wake</i>
q	<i>local dynamic pressure</i>
q^∞	<i>free stream</i>
C_{mLE}	<i>moment coefficient from leading edge</i>
$x(dc)$	distance from leading edge (or other selected reference point)
$\frac{\Delta P}{q}$	<i>pressure difference at each location</i>
P_a	<i>pressure at inlet</i>
P_b	<i>pressure at outlet</i>
Y	<i>error every airspeed</i>

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Trimaran WIG design	165
B	Airfoil analysis	169
C	Aero-hydro derivatives	176
D	Vortex Lattice Method software	183
E	Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion code	195
F	Savitsky method program	197
G	Free running test set up	202
H	Simulation program	216

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and problem statement

Moving marine vehicles at high speed has been one of the biggest challenges faced by naval architects and hydrodynamic researcher over the years especially after the invention of aircraft, much thought have been given to find different methods that can move ships quickly, Wing In Ground Effect (WIG) Craft is the most successful one in terms of gaining high speed. The phenomenon of ground effect was observed by many researchers since early in the birth of aviation. The advantages of using a high speed craft in ground condition are commonly acknowledged by reduce drag and increase lift. Wieselsberger [0], Reid [0] and Carter [0], hypothetically and experimentally was analyzed the influence of the ground on aerodynamics wings. Analysis of experimental drag of wing with endplate shown effect endplate in aerodynamic characteristic has investigated by Hemke [0]. Absolutely, ground clearances and endplate ratio have influence in static stability margin (SSM). Kumar [0,0], Irodov [0], Zhukov [0], and Staufenbiel [0,0], Chun, and Chang [0], all of them tell about the problem of longitudinal stability in ground condition, where position aerodynamic centre in pitch (ACP) and position aerodynamic in height (ACH) was influenced from the scenery of the longitudinal stability every comparative position. Plentiful studies have been conducted analyzing the influence of the ground effect on wing performance. However, few largely disregarded. Rozhdestvensky [0] presents a

summation of research investigating the influence of wing profile and platform on the positioning of the two aerodynamic centers.

All problems above tell us about longitudinal static stability and longitudinal dynamic stability during cruise which means that only aerodynamic affects the stability. However, the stability problem that often occurs on the small WIG craft is when WIG's phase change from hydrodynamic-aerodynamic phase into pure aerodynamic phase during take-off. Collu et al [0] has been tried to solve advance mathematical framework for the longitudinal stability of a high-speed craft with planing hull and aerodynamic surfaces. Eventually, a complete kinematics model is been developed. Their observation illustrates a mathematical method for performance Aerodynamically Alleviated Marine Vehicle (AAMV) in dynamic condition. That vehicle was designed to take advantage of combination aerodynamic forces and hydrodynamic force in high speed craft to get fuel efficiency and to reach further and with a greater payload.

There are similarities between an AAMV with a WIG, when the WIG in phase "aero-hydro" during take-off. Not only the aerodynamic force that worked when she takeoff, but both of aerodynamic force and hydrodynamic force that worked at that moment. In this research, observations were performed to determine aerodynamic characteristic of NACA 6409 dihedral rectangular wing (50-50) of aspect ratio 1-1.5 with taper 0.8. The observation were conducted using vortex lattice method and investigating the influence of "*flat ground*" and endplate on enforcement of a trimaran WIG for relative ground clearances of $0.01 < h/c < 0.2$, with ratio endplate $0.015 < h_e/c < 0.1$ on angles of attack between 0 and 8°. Planing hull has been chosen for the Wig as high speed is necessary to takeoff .In 1964; a comprehensive paper that summarized previous experimental studies on the hydrodynamics of prismatic planing surfaces was presented by Savitsky. He presented a method for application of these results for the design of moving ships. Besides, many laboratories and research centers have conducted hydrodynamic

studies on several fundamental planing hull phenomena. All numerical result will be validated with experimental results or other published work.

After that, the old concept Static Stability Margin (SSM) was modified by adding hydrodynamic factor. Thus, SSM during takeoff will be presented with the new configuration with three criteria, first, “ *the position Aerodynamic centre in Pitch (ACP) should be located downstream of the position Aerodynamic Centre in Height (ACH)* ”, second, “*the position of center of gravity (COG) of the craft should be located upstream of the aerodynamic center of pitch (ACP)*” and third, “*the position Aerodynamic Centre in Height (ACH) should be located upstream of Hydrodynamic center in Pitch (HCP)*”. The classical aircraft motion has been modified by calculating the aerodynamic force, hydrostatic and hydrodynamic forces, using a small perturbation assumption the full equations of motion WIG during takeoff are derived and solved.

1.2 Purpose and objective of the study

The major aim of this investigate is to overpass this problem by investigating a new configuration equation of motion WIG by calculating the equal importance of aerodynamic and hydrodynamic forces in small-disturbance composition. The arithmetical model of this framework was developed to investigate the longitudinal static stability and longitudinal dynamic stability of a trimaran WIG during take-off.

1.3 Scope of this study

- i. To estimate aerodynamic characteristic trimaran WIG using vortex lattice method with criteria; NACA 6409 dihedral rectangular wing, aspect ratio 1.25, taper 0.8.
- ii. To investigate influence of “*flat ground*” and “*endplate*” on the performance of a trimaran WIG for several ground clearances, with ratio endplate 0.06 on angles of attack between 0 and 8°.
- iii. To calculate hydrodynamic characteristic of prismatic planing surfaces using Savitsky method.
- iv. To validated the numerical results by experiment or publish work or commercial software.
- v. To arrange Static Stability Margin (SSM) criteria on WIG trimaran for investigate longitudinal static stability WIG trimaran during takeoff.
- vi. To arrange configuration equation of motion by calculating the equal importance of aerodynamic and hydrodynamic forces in small-disturbance composition for investigate longitudinal dynamic stability WIG trimaran during takeoff.

1.4 Significance of the study

The significance of this study is to investigate longitudinal static stability and dynamic stability of a trimaran WIG model during take-off. Where we should be to calculate aerodynamics characteristic and hydrodynamics characteristic using numerical equation and compare these calculation with experimental data or commercial software.

1.5 Thesis outline

This thesis is managed into seven chapters. There are:

The first chapter provides about the background and problem statement of the study, purpose and objective of the study, scope of the study, significant of the study. Finally, thesis managing is presented.

The second chapter tells about literature review; history of vehicles on ground condition, aerodynamic characteristic of vehicles on ground condition, hydrodynamic of ground effect vehicles, longitudinal static stability of ground effect vehicles, and dynamic stability of ground effect vehicles.

Chapter three provides the research methodology of longitudinal stability and dynamic motion WIG trimaran during takeoff, where the stages of research are initial design model, computational calculation, experimental work, comparison and analysis of computational results with experiments or other published researchers, longitudinal static and dynamic stability.

Chapter four propose mathematical modeling of aerodynamic characteristic wing in ground effect using vortex lattice methods, effect ground effect on lift coefficient, effect endplate on lift coefficient, hydrodynamic wing in ground effect using Savitsky methods, analysis static stability ground effect with new configuration static stability margin, and last on this chapter try propose new configuration equation motion of a trimaran wing in ground effect during take-off for analysis Routh-Hurwitz criteria and Criteria for public transportation(CPT).

Chapter five provides procedure experiment in wind tunnel test at Low Speed Tunnel (LST) UTM and free running test.

Chapter six provides comparison results of computational calculation and experimental, also analytical results

Chapter seven presents the conclusion and suggestion which can be used for further research.

REFERENCES

- Prandtl, Ludwig (1920). "*Theory of Lifting Surface*". NACA, TN 09
- Wieselsberger C (1921). "*Wing Resistance near the Ground*", NACA, TM-77
- Paul E. Hemke. *Drag Of Wing With End Plates*. NACA, Rep 267,1927
- Elliot GR. *Full Scale of Investigation Ground effect*, NACA, Rep-265,1937
- Saunders H.E. *Hydrodynamics in Ship Design. Vol. 1*. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, New York, 1957.
- E. P. Clement and J. D. Pope. *Graphs for predicting the resistance of Large Stepless Planing hulls at High Speeds*. DTMB Report 1318 April 1959.
- Eugene P.Clement and James D.Rope. *Stepless and Stepped Planing Hull Graph for Performance Prediction and Design*. DTMB, Report-1490, 1961.
- Arthur W. Carter. *Effect Ground Proximity On The Aerodynamic Characteristics Of Aspect- Ratio-1 Airfoil With and Without Endplates*. NASA,TN-D-970,1961
- D.Savitsky. *Hydrodynamic design of Planing Hull*. SNAME, January 1964
- J.B.Hadler. *The Prediction of Power Performance of Planing Craft*. SNAME, November 1966
- Kumar P.E. *An Experimental Investigation into the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Wing with and without Endplates in Ground Effect*. College of Aerodynamics, Cranfield, England, Rept. Aero 201, 1968.
- Irodov R.D. *Criteria of Longitudinal Stability of Ekranoplan*. Ucheniye Zapiski TSAGI, 1970, 1 (4), 63-74.
- Richard J. Margason and John E. Lamar. *Vortex Lattice Foftran Program for Estimating Subsonic Aerodynamic Characteristic of Complex Planforms*. NASA TN D-6142, 1971.
- Kumar P.E. *Some Stability Problems of Ground Effect Vehicle in Forward Motion*. Aeronautical Quarterly, 1972, 18, 41-52.

- Zhukov V.I. *Some matters of Longitudinal Stability of Ekranoplans*. Trudy TSAGI, 1974.
- Blount & Fox. *Small Craft Power Prediction*, Marine Technology, Jan. 1976
- D. Savitsky. *Chapter IV Planing Craft of Modern Ships and Craft*. Naval Engineers Journal, February 1985.
- Staufenbiel RW and Schlichting UJ. *Stability of Airplanes in Ground Effect*. Journal of Aircraft, 1988, 25, (4), 289-294.
- Staufenbiel R and Kleineidam G. *Longitudinal Motion of Low-Flying Vehicles in Nonlinear Flowfields*. Proceedings of the Congress of the International Council of the Aeronautical Sciences, Munich, 1980, 293–308.
- Rae, William H. Jr., Pope, Alan. *Low-Speed Wind Tunnel Testing*. John Wiley & Sons, 1984
- <http://www.se-technology.com/>. *Wing in Ground Effect Aerodynamics*. 1996
- Rozhdestvensky K.V. *Ekranoplans – The GEMs of Fast Water Transport*. Trans ImarE, Vol 109, Part 1, 1996, pp 47-74.
- Couser P.R. *Calm Water Powering Prediction for High Speed Catamaran*. Fast '97, Sydney, Australia, 1997
- V.I. Korolyov. *Longitudinal Stability of Ekranoplans and Hydrofoils Ships*. RTO AVT Symposium on Fluid Dynamics Problem of Vehicles Operating Near or in The Air-Sea Interface, held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 5-8 October 1998, and published in RTO MP-15.
- A.I. Maskalik, K.V. Rozhdestvensky, and D.N. Sinitsyn. *A View of The Present State of Research in Aero-and Hydrodynamics of Ekranoplans*. RTO AVT Symposium on Fluid Dynamics Problem of Vehicles Operating Near or in The Air-Sea Interface, held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 5-8 October 1998, and published in RTO MP-15.
- K.V. Rozhdestvensky. *Theoretical Analysis of Dynamics of A WIG Vehicle in Extreme Ground Effect*. RTO AVT Symposium on Fluid Dynamics Problem of Vehicles Operating Near or in The Air-Sea

- Interface, held in Amsterdam, Netherlands, 5 - 8 October 1998, and published in RTO MP-15.
- Halloran M, O'Meara S. *Wing in Ground Effect Craft Review*. DSTO Aeronautical and Maritime Research Laboratory, Australia, 1999.
- K.V. Rozhdestvensky. *Aerodynamics of a Lifting System in Extreme Ground Effect*. Springer, Moscow, 2000.
- H.H. Chun and C.H. Chang. *Longitudinal Stability and Dynamic Motions of a Small Passenger WIG Craft*. Elsevier journal of ocean engineering, vol. 29, 2002, p. 1145-1162.
- Takinaci A.C, Atlar M, Korkut E. A Practical Surface Panel Method to Predict Velocity Distribution around a Three-Dimensional Hydrofoil Including Boundary Layer Effects. Elsevier journal of ocean engineering, 2002, PII: S00 29 -8018(02)00015-X
- Todd E. Whalen. *Optimal Deadrise Hull Analysis and Design Space Study of Naval Special Warfare High Speed Planing Boats*. Master's thesis Department Master of Science in Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering and Master of Science in Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2002.
- Zhang, Zerihan, Ruhrmann. *Tip vortices generated by wing in ground effect*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Applications of Laser Techniques to Fluid Mechanics, Portugal, 2002.
- N. Kornev. *Complex Numerical Modeling of Dynamics and Crashes of Wing in Ground Vehicles*. 41st Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, Reno, Nevada, 2003.
- Chun and Chang. *Turbulence flow simulation for wings in ground effect with two ground conditions: fixed and moving ground*. International Journal of maritime engineering, p.211-227. 2003
- R. Savander Brant & Hyung Rhee Shin. *Steady Planing Hydrodynamics: Comparison of Numerical and Experimental Results*. Presentation outline Fluent Users' Group Manchester, NH, 2003
- Hiromichi Akimoto, Syozo Kubo and Motoki Tanaka. *Investigation of the Canard Type Wing In Surface Effect Ship*. The 2nd Asia Pacific Workshop on Hydrodynamics, Bussan, Korea, 2004

- Eugene P.Clement. *A Configuration for a Stepped Planing Boat Having Minimum Drag (Dynaplane Boat)*. This publication is available on the web site of the International Hydrofoil Society: <http://www.foils.org>, Jan 2006.
- I. S. Ishak, S.Mat, T.M.Lazim, M.K.Muhammad, S.Mansor, M.Z.Awang. *Estimation of Aerodynamic Characteristic of A Light Aircraft*. Jurnal Mekanikal No. 22, 64-74, December, 2006
- K.V. Rozhdestvensky. *Wing-in-ground effect vehicles, Progress in Aerospace Sciences*. 2006, 42, (3), 211-283.
- D.Savitsky, M.F.Delorme, Raju Datla. *Inclusion Whisker Spray Drag In Performance Prediction Method For High Speed Planing Hulls*. Marine Technology Vol 44 No.1, January 2007
- B. Leon. *Wing in Ground Effect (WIG) Aircraft Aerodynamic*. Project assessment Scholl Of Mechanical engineering The University of Adelaide, Australia, 2007
- BPPT. *Inter Island Transportation*. Annual report BPPT, 2007
- H. Ghassemi, M. Ghiasi. *A Combined Method for the Hydrodynamic Characteristics of Planing Crafts*. Ocean engineering Journal, 2007, doi:10.1016/j.oceaneng.2007.10.010, 2007.
- Collu, M., Patel, M. H. & Trarieux, F. *Unified Mathematical Model For High Speed Hybrid (Air and Water-Borne) Vehicles*. 2nd International Conference on Marine Research and Transportation, Ischia, Naples, Italy, 28-30 June 2007.
- Kwang Hyo Jung, Ho Hwan Chun, Hee Jun Kim. *Experimental Investigation of Wing-in-Ground Effect with a NACA 6409 Section*. Springer Jasnoe, 2008.
- Tulapurkara E.G. *Flight Dynamics-I (Performance Analysis)*. Department. of Aerospace Engineering, IIT Madras, Chennai-600036, India, 2008
- Suhaimi. *Low Speed Wind Tunnel*. Specification LST UTM Facility, Nov, 2008
- Kyoungwoo P. and J. Lee. *Optimal Design of 2-Dimensional Wings in Ground Effect Using Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithm*. Manuscript Ocean Engineering, July, 2009

- Nicola de Divitiis. *Performance and Stability of Winged in Ground Effect*. ArXiv: 0912.3355v1, Dec, 2009.
- S.C Rhodes and A.T Sayers. *Experimental Investigation: Stability criteria of an Uncambered Airfoil in Ground Effect*. R & D Journal of the South African Institution of Mechanical Engineering 2009, 25.
- Maurizio Collu, Minoo H. Patel and F. Trarieux. The Longitudinal Static Stability of an Aerodynamically Alleviated Marine Vehicle, a Mathematical Model. *Proc. R. Soc. A 2010 466*, 1055-1075 first published online 2 December 2009, doi: 10.1098/rspa.2009.0459.
- S. Noverdo, Mobasser. *Effect of Stepped Hull on Wing in Ground Effect (WIG) Craft during Takeoff*. 3rd International Graduate Conference on Engineering, Science, and Humanities (IGCESH 2010) UTM, Malaysia, November 2 – 4, 2010.
- Saaed J., S. Noverdo. *Effect Ground Effect for Environmental*. 3rd International Graduate Conference on Engineering, Science and Humanities (IGCESH 2010) UTM, Malaysia, November 2 – 4, 2010
- M. Adi, P.Agoes, S. Noverdo, S.Ike, Mobasser, J. Saeed. *Investigation on the Stability of a Trimaran wing in Ground Effect (WIG) Craft with Endplate*. International Conference on Marine Technology (MARTEC 2010). The Department of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering (NAME), Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET), Dhaka, 11-12 December 2010.