DTNSRDC/SPD-1049-



CAVITATION-FREE BUCKETS OF YS-920 AND NACA 66 (MOD) FOIL SECTIONS



# MAJOR DTNSRDC ORGANIZATIONAL COMPONENTS

σερήστης στημέντι τις τι διάσει	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
EPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO	. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
DTNSRDC/SPD-1049-01	
TLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE
CAVITATION-FREEBCKETS OF YS-920 AND NACA	
66 (MOD) FOIL SECTIOINS	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
	. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER
Y. T. Shen	
REORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	
	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
David W, Taylor Naval Ship R&D Center	Element No. 61153N
Bethesda, Maryland 20084	Task Area: SR 0230101
ONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R&D Center	
General <b>Hydrodynamic</b> Research Program	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
Bethesda, Maryland 20084 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II dillerent from Controlling Office)	13. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
HUNIIUNING AGENUT NAME & AUUKESS(II GIIISIMI INM CONTOLLING UIICS)	19, SERRIT A CHAST (or Use Lebolt)
	Unclassified
	154. DECLASSIFICATION/ DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
AFFRUYED FOR FUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNDI	MTIED
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLI	MILED
APPROVED FOR FUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UND	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different h	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, il different in	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, il different in	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, il different in	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, il different in	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered in Block 20, if different in Supplementary notes	an Report)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary ad identify by block numbe	aan Roport)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary ad identify by block numbe Hydrofoil Section Boundary	an Report)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in WPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception	aan Roport)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments	aan Roport)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket	aan Roport)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary ad identify by block number Rydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket section Design	••• Layer Separation
CEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary ad identify by block number) Rydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation_Free Bucket section Design AstRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and	••• Report) •• Layer Separation . boundary layer calculations
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WORDS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket	••• Layer Separation
CEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary ad identify by block number) Rydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation_Free Bucket section Design AstRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and	<pre>** ** Layer Separation . boundary layer calculations d cavitation inception</pre>
CAVITATION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (EY WOROS (Continue on reverse side if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket section Design ASTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and a new series of hydrofoil sections with improve characteristics were theoretically developed an	••• Report) •• Layer Separation • boundary layer calculations d cavitation inception nd presented in previous
CEY WOROS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number BUDDL EMENTARY NOTES CEY WOROS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Rydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket section Design ASTRACT (Continue on reverse ride II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and a new series of hydrofoil sections with improve characteristics were theoretically developed ar papers. To verify these theoretical results e	••• Report) •• Layer Separation • boundary layer calculations d cavitation inception • d presented in previous • experimentally, two hydrofoil
CEY WOROS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number BUPPLEMENTARY NOTES CEY WOROS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Rydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket section Design ASTRACT (Continue on reverse ride II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and a new series of hydrofoil sections with improve characteristics were theoretically developed ar papers. To verify these theoretical results e models, one a newly developed profile designate	••• Report) •• Layer Separation • boundary layer calculations, d cavitation inception • d presented in previous • experimentally, two hydrofoil d YS-920 and the: other an
CEY WORDS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket section Design ASTRACT (Continue on reverse ride II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and a new series of hydrofoil sections with improve characteristics were theoretically developed ar papers. To verify these theoretical results e models, one a newly developed profile designate NACA-66 (MOD) wing section, were tested in a h	<pre> was Report)  // Layer Separation  // Layer Separation  // d cavitation inception  // d presented in previous  // experimentally, two hydrofoil  // d YS-920 and the: other an  // igh-speed water tunnel at </pre>
CEY WORDS (Continue on reverse ride if necessary ad identify by block number Hydrofoil Section Boundary Cavitation Inception Water Tunnel Experiments Cavitation-Free Bucket section Design ASTRACT (Continue on reverse ride II necessary and identify by block number) Based on a wing section design theory and a new series of hydrofoil sections with improve characteristics were theoretically developed ar papers. To verify these theoretical results e models, one a newly developed profile designate NACA-66 (MOD) wing section, were tested in a h	<pre> was Report)  // Layer Separation  // Layer Se</pre>

----

and an all the second and the second and the second s

-

## Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Dete Entered)

# Block #20 ABSTRACT

roughness effect on cavitation In this report, the measured cavitationfree buckets of YS-920 and NACA-66 (HOD) foil sections are presented and compared with theoretical predictions The ability to achieve a significant delay in cavitation inception with a newly designed profile is clearly demonstrated experimentally.

Unclassified

.

÷.

2

.

# PAGE

ABSTRACT	<b>•••</b> 1	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	1	
INTRODUCTION	<b>—</b> 1	
EXPERIMENTAL EQUIPMENT	3	
WATER TUNNEL	- 3	
HYDROFOIL MODELS	<b>-</b> 3	
DISTRIBUTED ROUGHNESS	<u> </u>	
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS	5	
CONCLUDING REMARKS	- 6	
REFERENCES	<u> </u>	

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	1	-	Velocity Distribution of YS-920	11
Figure	2	æ	Cavitation-Free Buckets of YS-920 and NACA-66 (MOD) Sections (Smooth Surface)	12
Figure	3		Cavitation-Free Buckets of YS-920 and NACA-66 (MOD) Sections (Roughed Surface)	13

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 🛥	Profile 920	Coordinates		1	1
-----------	-------------	-------------	--	---	---

iii

Þ

Δ.

## ABSTRACT

**Based** on a wing section design theory and boundary layer calculations, a new series of hydrofoil sections with improved cavitation inception **characteristics** were theoretically developed and presented in previous papers. To verify these **theoretical** results experimentally, two hydrofoil models, one a newly developed profile designated YS-920 and the other an NACA 66 (MOD) **ving** section, were tested in a high speed water tunnel at California **Institute** of Technology. The measurements included force and moment data, flow visualization, cavitation **characteristics**, and surface roughness effect on cavitation. In this report, the measured cavitation-free buckets of YS-920 and **NACA** 66 (MOD) foil sections are presented and compared with theoretical predictions. The ability to achieve a significant delay in cavitation inception with a newly designed profile is clearly demonstrated **experimentally**.

### ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

The work carried out in this experimental investigation was supported by Naval Sea Systems Command, Code 035 under the General Hydrodynamic Research Program, Element **61153N**, Task Area SR 0230101.

## INTRODUCTION

When operated at a practical depth below the free surface, a lifting surface will develop vortex cavitation and surface cavitation on the foil above a certain critical speed. Foil cavitation leads to undesirable changes in hydrodynamic and

**acoustic characteristics** and possible damage to the foil structure. Consequently, the design philosophy of current hydrofoil and propeller blade sections is governed by the requirements of **(1)** providing specified lift, (2) avoiding or **minimizing** cavitation, and (3) supplying adequate structural **strength** finall operating conditions.

In a seaway, the lifting surfaces of a hydrofoil craft experience significant changes in the angle of attack due to both wave orbital velocities and craft motion. Similarly, for a propeller operated behind an inclined shaft and in a ship wake, the propeller blades experience periodic variation in effective angle of attack.

The physical process associated with inception of cavitation is extremely complex. **However**, it has been generally agreed that cavitation inception occurs on a full-scale lifting surface when the local pressure falls to or below the vapor pressure of the **flowing** fluid. Cavitation inception can be predicted from the pressure distribution, since the cavitation-inception index **G**; **e G** is equal to the negative **minimum** pressure coefficient **-C**<sub>pmin</sub>. The hydrodynamic characteristics of a hydrofoil section to delay the **occurrence** of surface cavitation can **then** be **examined** in terms of a so-called minimum pressure envelope, often referred to as the cavitation-free bucket.. For a specified hydrofoil **section** the **internal** region of the minimum pressure envelope defines the region of cavitation-free section lift coefficients (or angles of attack) as a function of sectioa cavitation **number**.

**NACA** *1 6* -series and NACA 66 (HOD) - series wing sections are known to have good characteristics for delaying inception of cavitation. Extensive **application** of these two series of NACA ving sections to existing hydrofoil craft and marine propellers has been well documented **[1,2]**. Since, the **NACA** wing sections were

developed around **1940**, possible **areas** of improvement have **been** investigated both theoretically and experimentally; see Reference **[3]**. By means of recently developed wing section design theory, a series of new hydrofoil sections has been theoretically investigated by Shen and Eppler **[3,4,5]** with noticeable improvement of predicted surface cavitation inception. This encouraging result calls for experimental verification=

The present report provides a comparison of experimentally measured and theoretically predicted cavitation-free buckets of newly designed YS-920 and **NACA-66** (MOD) sections.

#### EXPERIMENTAL EQUIPMENT

## WATER TUNNEL

The High-Speed Water Tunnel (HSWT) **in** the Graduate Aeronautical Laboratories of the California Institute of Technology was used in the present investigation. This water tunnel is equipped with a two-dimensional working section. The model **can** be viewed through top, bottom and side windows. Further descriptions of this water tunnel are given **in** Reference **[6]**.

### HYDROFOIL MODELS

The design lift coefficient of  $C_{L} = 0.2$  is a typical value used in hydrofoil and propeller blade section design. The profile B-920 which has a design lift coefficient of 0.22 was thus selected from Reference [5] for this investigation. The profile shape, coordinate offset, and the design philosophy of t.is profile were given in Reference [5]. A NACA 66 (MOD) wing section with a camber ratio of f/c = 0.020 was also selected in this investigation. The camber ratio of the NACA 66 (MOD) section was selected in such a way that both foils YS-920 and NACA 66

(MOD), have about the same lift coefficient of  $C_L = 0.22$  at the center of their cavitation buckets. Furthermore, both profiles have the same maximum **thickness**-to-chord ratio of 0.09.

For testing in the HSWT, both hydrofoil models had six-inch chord (15.2 cm) and six-inch span. The models were made from 17-4 PH stainless steel hardened to the  $H 1075^{\circ} F(579^{\circ} C)$  condition. To ensure a very accurate surface contour, both models were cut from the blocks by a numerical controlled machine using a total of 850 passes on each foil surface. Deviations from the specified **section** profiles measured normal to the surface at 3 stations along the span were found to be less than 0.0005 of the chord length. The coordinates and profile shape of YS-920 along with velocity distributions at three **foil** angles are **given** in Table 1 and Figure 1, respectively.

#### DISTRIBUTED SURFACE ROUGHNESS

Profile B-920 was designed to have no flow separation on the foil surface at a typical full-scale Reynolds number value of  $3 \times 10^7$ . Thus, if the YS-920 profile were used for a prototype, boundary layer calculations indicate that the boundary layer **on** the foil surface will go through a natural transition from **laminar** to turbulent near the leading edge. The boundary layer calculations **also** show that due to the reduction **in** Reynolds number for the hydrofoil model tested la the water tunnel **(HSWT) laminar** boundary layer separation **will** be encountered near the trailing edge. To simulate the high Reynolds number phenomenon, the models were also tested with surface roughness uniformly distributed near the leading edge, over 1.5 percent of the chord length on the upper and lower surfaces. The surface roughness consisted of glass spheres of 0.004 inch (0.010 cm) nominal diameter bonded to the surface of the fall section with LoctIte General Purpose Epoxy 53.

The **majority** of the experiments were conducted at a tunnel water speed of 50 feet per second (15.2 meters per second), corresponding to a Reynolds number based on the chord length of 2.6 X 10<sup>6</sup> [7]. Flow visualization observations confirmed the boundary layer calculations, that at the design condition of  $C_L^{=}$  0.22 the hydrofoil model of YS-920 did experience laminar boundary layer separation near the trailing edge. Without the installation of surface roughness, the model experienced a band-type cavitation around the measured laminar boundary layer separation zone. With the installation of surface roughness uniformly distributed around the leading edge, the band-type cavitation associated with laminar boundary layer separation was completely eliminated, and the model experienced a traveling bubble type cavitation as is to be anticipated in the prototype. At a large angle of attack, namely a large lift coefficient, the foil experienced leading edge sheet cavitation.

The measured cavitation-free buckets of **YS-920** and NACA 66 (MOD) with and without surface roughness are given in Figures 2 and 3. Without the installation of surface roughness, the foil surface is denoted as smooth. The theoretically computed cavitation-free buckets of these two wing sections are also shown in the same Figures for a direct comparison.

Without the application of surface roughness, when the foil surface is smooth, the measured cavitation-free buckets are seen to be much wider than the theoretically predicted bucket. As predicted from the theoretical computations (See Figure 2), experimental measurements confirmed that the danger of cavitation inception on the pressure side of Profile YS-920 is greatly delayed as compared to that on the NACA 66 (MOD) section.

With the application of leading edge surface roughness, the measured cavita-

tion free buckets show a remarkable agreement with the theoretically predicted buckets. As predicted from the theory, the measured cavitation-free bucket of Profile YS-920. is significantly wider than that of NACA 66 (MOD) section at the design cavitation number **S** - 0.45. The measured bucket widths were found to be around 3.2 and 2.3 degrees in angle-of-attack for profiles YS-920 and NACA 66 (MOD), respectively. Note, 1 degree in angle-of-attack corresponds to approximately 0.1 in lift coefficient. The measured cavitation inception values are in good agreement with the predicted values given in Figure 11 of Reference [5]. This significant result *suggests* that at a given **design** speed, the newly designed **Profile B-920** should be able to tolerate much greater fluctuation (variation) in angle-of-attacks than the compared NACA 66 (MOD) section in a non-uniform wake.

and the design of a second second

#### **CONCLUDING** REMARKS

Experimental measurements confirmed the previous theoretical predictions that at a given design speed, the cavitation-free bucket width of the newly developed section profile YS-920 is significantly greater than that of the comparable NACA 66 (MOD) wing section.

The measured bucket widths of Profiles **YS-920** and NACA **66** (MOD) were found to be around 3.2 and 2.3 degrees in angle-of-attack, respectively. Consequently, Profile PS-920 **should** be able to tolerate much greater variation in **angle-of**attack than the comparable NACA 66 (MOD) section in a non-uniform wake or sea **state**.

The thickness-to-chord ratio of practical interest is 0.09 on existing naval hydrofoils. However, the thickness ratio of practical interest on marine propellers is generally less than 0.09 *at* the **oute**<sup>2</sup> radii. Due to the reduction in

**leading** edge thickness, the cavitation-free bucket widths on thin sections would be smaller than the values quoted previously. This fact makes it difficult to operate a thin blade section in a non-uniform flow without cavitation. However, it is believed that a new type of blade section **can** be designed to delay **cavitation** inception.

The present experimental investigations and previous theoretical predictioas strongly indicate that refining a profile for each application to hydrofoils and propeller blades sections is possible and advantageous in the future .

**Further** discussion of the measured force and moment data, boundary layer characteristics and cavitation characteristics of Profile **YS-920** will. be given in a saparate report.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Ellsworth, W.M., "Hydrofoil Development Issues and Answers," AIAA Paper 74-306, San Diego, California, 1974.
- 2. Brockett, T.E., "Minimum Pressure Envelopes for Modified NACA-66 Sections with NACA 2 = 0.8 camber and BuShips Type I and Type II Sections," DTMB Report 1780, 1966.
- Eppler, R. and Y.T. Shen, "Wing Sections for Hydrofoils Part I: Symmtrical Profiles," Journal of Ship Research, Vol. 23, pp. 209-217, Sept 1979.
- 4. Shen, Y.T. and R. Eppler, "Section Design for Hydrofoil Wing with Flaps," Journal of Hydronautfcs, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 39-45, April 1979.
- 5. Shen, Y.T. and R. Eppler, Wing Sections for 'Hydrofoils Part 2: Nonsymmetrical Profiles," Journal of Ship Research, Vol. 25, pp. 191-200, Sept 1981.
- 6. Ward, **T.M.**, "The Hydrodynamic Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology 1976," Journal of Fluids Engineering, **ASME**, **Dec** 1976.
- Baloga, P., "Water Tunnel Tests on NACA 66 (Modified) and YS-920 Foil Sections With and Without Surface Roughness,"\* GALCIT Report HSWT 1139, May 1982.

Table	Profile	920	coordinates
-------	---------	-----	-------------

10				_		······		and the second
N	Х	Y	N	Х	Ŷ	N	X	Ŷ
	188.486	3	41	25.046	5.175	11	23.375	-3.631
b	99.907	+ 1 2	62	22.194	4.979	a2	25.535	-3.594
2	99,633	.457	43	28.869	• 🖉 🖓 7 🔒	83	27.762	-3.923
3	99.194	.149	4.4	11.797	4.54A	84	38.169	-3.435
٠	94.667	.298	45	lb.463	6.314	85	32.569	-3.334
5	97.894	74	46	15.412	6.6A9	85	34.973	-3.211
÷.	47,653	.697	47	13.256	3.814	a7	ST.494	-3.881
1	76.161	. 932	48	11.584	3.558	- 84	48.263	-2. 963
9	45.631	1.184	- 44	10.004	3.2#4	98	42.673	-2.7911
≁	43.034	1.452	58	1.937	3.443	91	45.315	-2.640
18	92.527	1.739	51	7.171	2.722		67.956	-2.49
11	91.167	2.848	52	9.914	2.437	92	58.661	-2. 342
12	49.547	2.377	53	4.769	2.1.52	93	53.348	-2.148
13	87.976	2.729	- 54	3.744	1.466	94	54.634	-2.635
14	86.285	3.8A7	55	2.829	1.5#3	95	5A.709	-1.885
15	84,522	3.459	56	2.639	1.384	95	61.364	-1.738
16	42.699	3.831	57	1.374	1.031	97	63.993	-1.595
17	80.826	4.197	54	.836	.764	9A	66.545	-1.457
18	78.915	4.532	- 54	● ♦1 <u>@</u>	.514	99	69.133	-1. 324
19	76.943	0.412	64	.152	- 274	165	71.628	-1.200
85	74.898	5.854	61	9	-664	M	1 74.(	;+1.0#1
21	72.749	5-271	52	+646	124	182	76.429	974
22	78,575	5-462	63	.246	344	103	76.719	856
23	64.327	5-631	64	.576	576	164 :	a 11.925	769
Z٩	66,623	5.77 x	65	2.23	812	185	83.539	668
29	63.677	9.923	66	1.625	-1. 654	Мb	A5.650	- 599
26	61,288	6.066	67	2.335	-1.298	107	46.968	- 525
27	5A,866	6.689	ė	3.172	-1.543	144	AA.768	457
28	56.416	5.158	69	4.126	-1.785	189	98.458	39
29	53,946	5. <u>1</u> 91	74	5.195	-2.42s	118	92.6.9	339
34	51.461	6-211	71	4.375	-2.253	111	93.434	287
31	48,968	6-211	72	7.662	-2.475	112	94.733	236
32	46.474	6.191	73	9.051	-2.6A6	113	95.891	142
33	43,985	b. <b>14</b> ₹	- 74	13.544	-2.883	114	96.917	124
34	41.548	6.432	79	12.129	-3.065	115	97.811	169
35	39.050	6.814	76	13.885	-3.228	116	98.568	426
36	36.617	5.914	77	15.567	-3,371	117	99.178	- 66 1
37	34.215	5.413	78	17.468	-3.640	118	91.629	. 38 9
38	31.851	5-675	- 79	19.325	-3.580	119	99.966	. 88 5
39	29.531	5.521		<b>21.JI</b> G	-9.632	126	188.636	488
48	27.26.	5.356						

**g =** 2.65



Fig, Velocity distributions of Profile 920

• •



Lift Coefficient  $C_{\rm L}$ 



Lift Coefficient  $c_{\rm L}$ 

#### DTNSRDC ISSUES THREE TYPES OF REPORTS

1. DTNSRDC REPORTS, A FORMAL SERIES, CONTAIN INFORMATION OF PERMANENT TECH-NICAL VALUE. THEY CARRY A CONSECUTIVE NUMERICAL IDENTIFICATION REGARDLESS OF THE:R CLASSIFICATION OR THE ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT.

2. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS, A SEMIFORMAL SERIES, CONTAIN INFORMATION OF A PRELIM-INARY, TEMPORARY, OR PROPRIETARY NATURE OR OF LIMITED INTEREST OR SIGNIFICANCE. THEY CARRY A DEPARTMENTAL ALPHANUMERICAL IDENTIFICATION.

3. TECHNICAL MEMORANDA, AN INFORMAL SERIES, CONTAIN TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION OF LIMITED USE AND INTEREST. THEY ARE PRIMARILY WORKING PAPERS INTENDED FOR IN-TERNAL USE. THEY CARRY AN IDENTIFYING NUMBER WHICH INDICATES THEIR TYPE AND THE NUMERICAL CODE OF THE ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT. ANY **DISTRIBUTION** OUTSIDE DTNSRDC MUST BE APPROVED **BY** THE HEAD OF THE ORIGINATING QEPARTMENT ON A **CASE-BY-CASE** BASIS.