https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19870008260 2020-03-20T12:33:40+00:00Z

NASA Technical Paper 2392

February 1985

Effects of Empennage Surface Location on Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Twin-Engine Afterbody Model With Nonaxisymmetric Nozzles

1. 19

Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr.



NASA

Date for general release . Bebruary 1987



NASA Technical Paper 2392

1985

Effects of Empennage Surface Location on Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Twin-Engine Afterbody Model With Nonaxisymmetric Nozzles

Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr.

Langley Research Center Hampton, Virginia



and Space Administration

Scientific and Technical Information Branch

Summary

The effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin-engine fighter-type configuration have been determined in an investigation conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin vertical tails. The investigation was conducted at different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9° . Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off (1) to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. An analysis of the results of this investigation was made at a tail deflection of 0° .

Tail interference effects were present throughout the test range of Mach numbers and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position. The effects of vertical tail position on aft-end drag were usually dependent on Mach number and configuration. Generally a forward position of the vertical tails produced the lowest total aft-end drag. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. At a Mach number of 0.60, the nonaxisymmetric nozzle configuration had lower drag with tails-on than the axisymmetric nozzle configuration but unfavorable interference caused higher drag at a Mach number of 0.90. A decrease in total aft-end drag occurred as vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° .

Introduction

The mission requirements for the next generation fighter aircraft may dictate a highly versatile vehicle capable of operating over a wide range of flight conditions. These aircraft will most likely be designed for high maneuverability and agility, will operate in a highly hostile environment, and will possess short take-off and landing characteristics to operate from bomb-damaged airfields. These aircraft require variable geometry nozzles to provide high internal nozzle performance; thus, important aft-end parameters such as closure and local boattail angles continuously change throughout the operating range of Mach number, angle of attack, and engine pressure ratios. Large drag penalties can result from integration of the propulsion system into the aircraft because of adverse interactions originating from empennage surfaces, base areas, actuator fairings, and tail booms (refs. 1 to 5).

A comprehensive program to study the interference effects of empennage surfaces on single- and twin-engine fighter afterbody/nozzle drag has been conducted at the Langley Research Center (refs. 6 to 11) because these interference effects can account for a major portion of total aft-end drag. These studies, which are summarized in references 12 and 13, were conducted with configurations with conventional axisymmetric nozzles. Little information is currently available on empennage effects on configurations with advanced nozzle concepts.

This paper presents results from an investigation of the effects of horizontal and vertical tail position on twin-engine fighter aft-end drag with a model which had nonaxisymmetric (two-dimensional convergent-divergent) nozzles. This exhaust system has the potential to satisfy many different mission requirements with less installation penalties than axisymmetric nozzles (refs. 14 to 16). The present study was part of an overall research program that also determined nonaxisymmetric nozzle thrust reverser performance (ref. 17) and effects of thrust reversing on horizontal tail effectiveness (ref. 18). This investigation was conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20, at angles of attack from -3° to 9° , and at nozzle pressure ratios up to 9. Horizontal tail incidence angle was varied from 0° to -10°.

Symbols

Model forces and moments are referred to the stability axis system with the model moment reference center located 4.45 cm above the model centerline at fuselage station 91.6 cm, which corresponds to $0.25\bar{c}$. All coefficients are nondimensionalized with respect to $q_{\infty}S$ or $q_{\infty}S\bar{c}$. A discussion of the data reduction procedure and definitions of the aerodynamic force and moment terms and the propulsion relationships used herein are presented in the appendix. The symbols used in the computer-generated tables are given in parentheses in the second column.

$A_{mb,1}$	model cross-sectional area at FS 113.67 and FS 122.56, cm ²
$A_{mb,2}$	model cross-sectional area at FS 168.28, cm^2
$A_{\rm seal,1}$	cross-sectional area enclosed by seal strip at FS 113.67 and FS 122.56, cm^2

$A_{ m seal,2}$		cross-sectional area enclosed by seal strip at FS 168.28, cm^2	C_m	(CM)	total aft-end aerody- namic pitching-moment coefficient
C_D	(CD)	total aft-end drag coefficient	$C_{m,\mathrm{aft}}$	(CMAFT)	afterbody (plus tails) pitching-moment coefficient
$C_{D,\mathrm{aft}}$	(CDAFT)	afterbody (plus tails) drag coefficient	$C_{m,n}$	(CMN)	nozzle pitching-moment coefficient
$C_{D,n}$	(CDN)	nozzle drag coefficient	C .	(CMT)	total aft-end pitching-
$C_{D,\mathrm{tails}}$		tail drag coefficient	$O_{m,t}$	(0.001)	moment coefficient (in-
$C_{(D-F)}$	(C(D-F))	drag-minus-thrust coeffi- cient, $C_{(D-F)} \equiv C_D$ at NPR = 1 (jet off)			cluding thrust compo- nent), $C_{m,t} \equiv C_m$ at NPR = 1
$C_{D,o}$		C_D at $C_L = 0$	ō		wing mean geometric chord, 44.42 cm
$\Delta U_{D,ia}$		nage interference drag	D_f		friction drag, N
		coefficient on afterbody (eq. (A13))	F_A		total aft-end axial force, N
$\Delta C_{D,in}$		increment in empennage interference drag coeffi-	$F_{A,\mathrm{Mbal}}$		axial force measured by main balance, N
		cient on nozzle (eq. (A12))	$F_{A,\mathrm{mom}}$		momentum tare axial force due to bellows, N
L C <i>D</i> , <i>n</i>		interference drag coef- ficient on total aft end	$F_{A,\mathrm{Sbal}}$		axial force measured by afterbody shell balance, N
$(\Delta C_{D,ia})_o$		(eq. (AII)) increment in empennage	F_{aft}		afterbody (plus tails) axial force, N
		ficient on afterbody at $C_L = 0$	F_i		ideal isentropic gross thrust
$(\Delta C_{D,in})_o$		increment in empennage	F_{j}		thrust along body axis, N
		interference drag coeffi- cient on nozzle at $C_L = 0$	Μ	(MACH)	free-stream Mach number
$(\Delta C_{D,it})_o$		increment in empennage	NPR		nozzle pressure ratio, $p_{t,j}/p_\infty$
		cient on total aft end at $C_L = 0$	'n		measured mass-flow rate, kg/sec
$C_{F,i}$		ideal isentropic gross thrust coefficient	\dot{m}_i		ideal mass-flow rate, kg/sec
C_L	(CL)	total aft-end aerodynamic lift coefficient	$ar{p}_{es,1}$		average static pres- sure at external seal at
$C_{L,\mathrm{aft}}$	(CLAFT)	afterbody (plus tails) lift coefficient	ñ.,,)		FS 113.67, Pa average static pres-
$C_{L,n}$	(CLN)	nozzle lift coefficient	F 53,4		sure at external seal at
$C_{L,t}$	(CLT)	total aft-end lift coefficient (including thrust com- ponent), $C_{L,t} \equiv C_L$ at NPR = 1	$ar{p}_{es,3}$		average static pres- sure at external seal at FS 168.28, Pa

|

1

I

$ar{p_i}$		average internal static pressure, Pa
$p_{t,j}$		average jet total pressure, Pa
p_{∞}		free-stream static pressure, Pa
q_∞		free-stream dynamic pressure, Pa
S		wing reference area, 4290.00 cm ²
R		gas constant, 287.3 J/kg-K
t/c		thickness-chord ratio
$T_{t,j}$		jet total temperature, K
α	(ALPHA)	angle of attack, deg
γ		ratio of specific heats, 1.3997 for air at 300 K
δ_h		horizontal tail deflection, positive leading edge up, deg
Λ_{le}		leading-edge sweep angle, deg
ϕ_{ι}		vertical tail cant angle, positive tip out, deg
Abbreviatio	ns:	
ASME		American Society of Mechanical Engineers
BL		buttock line, cm
FS		fuselage station (axial location described by distance in centimeters from model nose)
Fwd		forward
НТ		horizontal tails
VT		vertical tails
WL		water line, cm

Apparatus and Procedure

Wind Tunnel

This investigation was conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel, a single-return atmospheric wind tunnel with a slotted octagonal test section and continuous air exchange. The wind tunnel has continuously variable airspeed up to a Mach number of 1.30. Test-section plenum suction is used for speeds above a Mach number of 1.05. A complete description of this facility and operating characteristics can be found in reference 19.

Model and Support System

Details of the general research, twin-engine fighter afterbody model and wing-tip-mounted support system used in this investigation are presented in figure 1. Photographs of the model and support system installed in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel are shown in figure 2. A sketch of the wing planform geometry is presented in figure 3.

The wing-tip model support system shown in figure 1 consisted of three major portions: the twin support booms, the forebody (nose), and the wingcenterbody combination. These pieces made up the nonmetric portion (that portion of the model not mounted on the force balance) of the twin-engine fighter model. The fuselage centerbody was essentially rectangular in cross section having a constant width and height of 25.40 cm and 12.70 cm, respectively. The four corners were rounded by a radius of 2.54 cm. Maximum cross-sectional area of the centerbody (fuselage) was 317.04 cm^2 . The support system forebody (or nose) was typical of a powered model in that the inlets were faired over. For these tests, the wings were mounted above the model centerline (model has capability for both high or low wing mount). The wing had a 45° leading-edge sweep, a taper ratio of 0.5, an aspect ratio of 2.4, and a cranked trailing edge (fig. 3). The NACA 64-series airfoil had a thickness ratio of 0.067 near the wing root to provide a realistic wake on the afterbody. From BL 27.94 outboard to the support booms, however, wing thickness ratio increased from 0.077 to 0.10 to provide adequate structural support for the model and to permit transfer of compressed air from the booms to the model propulsion system.

The metric portion of the model aft of FS 113.67, supported by the main force balance, consisted of the internal propulsion system, afterbody, tails (not shown in fig. 1), and nozzles. The afterbody lines (boattail) were chosen to provide a length of constant cross section aft of the nonmetric centerbody and to enclose the force balance and jet simulation system while fairing smoothly downstream into the closely spaced nozzles. The afterbody shell from FS 122.56 to FS 168.28 and tail surfaces (when installed) were attached to an afterbody force balance which was attached to the main force balance (fig. 1). The main force balance in turn was grounded to the nonmetric wing-centerbody section. The nozzles were attached directly to the main force balance through the propulsion system piping. Three clearance gaps (metric breaks) were provided between the nonmetric and the individual metric portions (afterbody and nozzles) of the model at FS 113.67, FS 122.56, and FS 168.28, to prevent fouling of the components upon each other. A flexible plastic strip inserted into circumferentially machined grooves in each component impeded flow into or out of the internal model cavity (fig. 1).

In this report, that section of the model aft of FS 122.56 is referred to as the total aft end (includes afterbody, tails when installed, and nozzles). That section of the model from FS 122.56 to FS 168.28 is referred to as the afterbody, and that section aft of FS 168.28 is considered the nozzles. A skin-friction drag adjustment to the axial force results of the main balance was made for the section of the model from FS 113.67 to FS 122.56. (See appendix.)

The afterbody had provisions for mounting both the twin vertical tails and horizontal tails in three axial positions. The vertical tails at a cant angle of 0° , were tested in three positions—forward, mid, and aft as shown in figure 4. With the vertical tails in the mid position, cant angles of -10° , 10° , and 20° were also tested. The horizontal tails were only tested in the mid and aft positions which are about at the same positions as those of references 9 to 12. Note that both the vertical and horizontal tails have smaller tail spans when installed in the aft position than when they are installed in the other positions.

Sketches of the horizontal and vertical tails are presented in figures 5 and 6, respectively. These tail surfaces were sized to be representative of current twinengine fighter aircraft. Individual root fairings (fillers) contoured the tails to the afterbody at each tail position. Clearance gaps were provided between the nozzles and horizontal and vertical tails (aft position) in order to prevent fouling between the main and afterbody balances (fig. 4). These tail surfaces (without fairings) were also used in the investigations of references 9 to 11.

Twin-Jet Propulsion Simulation System

The twin-jet propulsion simulation system is shown in figure 1. An external high-pressure air system provides a continuous flow of clean, dry air at a controlled temperature of about 306 K at the nozzles. This highpressure air is brought into the wind-tunnel main support strut where it is divided into two separate flows and passed through remotely operated flow-control valves. These valves are used to balance the total pressure in each nozzle.

The divided compressed airflows are piped through the wing-tip support booms, through the wings, and into the flow-transfer bellows assemblies (fig. 1). A sketch of a single flow-transfer bellows assembly is shown in figure 7. The air in each supply pipe is discharged perpendicularly to the model axis through eight sonic nozzles equally spaced around the supply pipe. This method is designed to eliminate any transfer of axial momentum as the air is passed from the nonmetric to the metric portion of the model. Two flexible metal bellows are used as seals and serve to compensate the axial forces caused by pressurization. The cavity between the supply pipe and bellows is vented to model internal pressure. The airflow is then passed through the tailpipes into the transition sections and then to the exhaust nozzles. (See fig. 1.)

The nonaxisymmetric (two-dimensional convergentdivergent) nozzle used in this investigation is shown in figure 8. The nozzle simulated a dry-power or cruise operating mode with a design NPR of about 3.5. The nozzle throat area (17.48 cm^2) and expansion ratio (1.15) were sized to be consistent with advanced mixed flow turbofan cycles. The ratio of total throat area to maximum body cross-sectional area was 0.11, and the nozzle throat aspect ratio was 3.45. This nozzle was one of a series of nozzles tested in the study reported in reference 20. Nozzle static performance, ideal thrust coefficients, and scheduled pressure ratios are presented in figure 9.

Instrumentation

Forces and moments on the metric portions of the model were measured by two six-component straingauge balances. The main balance measured forces and moments resulting from nozzle gross thrust and the external flow field over that portion of the model aft of FS 113.67. The tandem afterbody shell balance measured forces and moments resulting from the external flow field over the afterbody and empennage surfaces from FS 122.56 to FS 168.28. The tandem balance arrangement permits the separation of model component forces for data analysis.

Eight external seal static pressures were measured in the seal gap at the first metric break (FS 113.67). All orifices were located on the nonmetric centerbody and spaced symmetrically about the model perimeter. An additional five orifices, positioned symmetrically about the right side of the model measured seal gap pressures at the second metric break (FS 122.56). The final seal pressures were measured by two sets of surface taps, both consisting of two orifices, each an equal distance fore and aft of the third metric break (FS 168.28). In addition to these external pressures, two internal pressures were measured at each metric seal. These pressure measurements were then used to correct measured axial force and pitching moment for pressure-area tares as discussed in the appendix.

Chamber pressure and temperature measurements taken in the supply pipe, upstream of the eight sonic nozzles (fig. 7), were used to compute mass-flow rates for each nozzle. Instrumentation in each charging section consisted of a stagnation-temperature probe and a total-pressure rake. Each rake contained four totalpressure probes. (See fig. 8.)

All pressures were measured with individual pressure transducers. Data obtained during each tunnel run were recorded on magnetic tape and reduced with standard data reduction procedures. Typically, for each data point, 50 samples of data were recorded over a period of 5 sec and the average was used for computational purposes.

Tests

This investigation was conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9° . Nozzle pressure ratio varied from 1 (jet off) to 9, depending upon Mach number. Basic data were obtained by varying nozzle pressure ratio at zero angle of attack and by varying angle of attack at fixed nozzle pressure ratios. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Horizontal tail incidence was varied for selected configurations from 0° to -10° . Reynolds number based on the wing mean geometric chord varied from 4.4×10^{6} to 5.28×10^{6} .

All tests were conducted with 0.26-cm-wide boundary-layer transition strips consisting of No. 120 silicon carbide grit sparsely distributed in a thin film of lacquer. These strips were located 2.54 cm from the tip of the forebody nose and on both upper and lower surfaces of the wings and empennage at 5 percent of the root chord to 10 percent of the tip chord.

Presentation of Results

The results of this investigation are presented in both tabular and plotted form. Table 1 is an index to the tabular results contained in tables 2 to 17. The computer symbols appearing in these tables are defined in the section "Symbols" with their corresponding mathematical symbols which are described in the appendix. Plotted data are presented only at $\delta_h = 0^\circ$ because subsequent analysis cannot be made at a constant lift coefficient. Because this investigation was conducted with a partially metric model, data were obtained at essentially three different ranges of lift coefficient as tail deflection was varied from 0° to -10° . Basic and summary data for selected conditions at $\delta_h = 0^\circ$ are presented in figures 10 to 22 as follows:

Figure

Variation of aft-end aerodynamics at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ with NPR for— Horizontal tails mid, variable vertical tail position,

and $\phi_t = 0^\circ$ 10

Horizontal tails aft, variable vertical tail position,	
and $\phi_t = 0^\circ$	11
Horizontal tails aft, vertical tails mid, and variable	le
ϕ_t	12
Variation of total aft-end aerodynamics with α for-	
Horizontal tails mid, variable vertical tail position	ı,
and $\phi_t = 0^\circ$	13
Horizontal tails aft, variable vertical tail position,	
and $\phi_t = 0^\circ$	14
Horizontal tails aft, vertical tails mid, and variabl	e
ϕ_t	15
Summary data:	
Total aft-end drag, $C_L = 0$, and	
empennage location	16
Interference drag terms, $C_L = 0$, and	
empennage location	17
Interference drag terms, $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$,	
and horizontal tails mid	18
Interferience drag terms, $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$,	
and horizontal tails aft	19
Comparison with axisymmetric nozzle	•
configurations with $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$	20
Total aft-end drag, $C_L = 0$, and vertical	~ ~
$tail cant angle \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	21
Interference drag terms, $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$,	~~
and vertical tail cant angle	22

Discussion

Basic Data

The basic data obtained during this investigation are presented in figures 10 to 15 for the various configurations tested at $\delta_h = 0^\circ$ only. Two types of data presentation are made to illustrate the effects of nozzle pressure ratio and angle of attack. First, the variation of total aft end, afterbody, and nozzle aerodynamic drag and lift coefficients with nozzle pressure ratio at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ is presented in figures 10 to 12. Second, the variation of total aft-end aerodynamic lift and drag coefficients with angle of attack is presented in figures 13 to 15 at jet-off conditions and at a scheduled pressure ratio for each Mach number (fig. 9(c)). Test parameters not shown in plotted form, such as total aft-end pitching-moment coefficient, or obtained on configurations investigated at tail deflections other than 0° have been tabulated (tables 2 to 17).

In general, the variation of total aft-end drag coefficient C_D with nozzle pressure ratio for any particular configuration (figs. 10 to 12), follows expected trends (e.g., see refs. 6 and 9). Total aft-end drag decreases with initial jet operation up to nozzle pressure ratios of 2 to 3. This decrease in total aft-end drag is primarily a result of a decrease in drag on the nozzles particularly at M = 0.60 and 1.20. This decrease in nozzle drag is caused by a reduction in the external flow expansion required at the nozzle exit as the exhaust flow fills the nozzle base region. As nozzle pressure ratio is further increased, there is an increase in nozzle drag and, hence, total aft-end drag. Except at M = 0.60, nozzle drag subsequently decreases again with additional increases in NPR. The change in drag trend with increasing NPR (generally a drag increase) at NPR above 2 to 3 is probably caused by exhaust flow entrainment effects on the external nozzle flow, whereas the drag decreases at the higher nozzle pressure ratios (NPR > 3) are caused by a compression at the nozzle exit created by the increased thickness of the exhaust flow plume. These trends with increasing nozzle pressure ratio are typical for jet-powered models (ref. 6).

The effects of angle of attack on total aft-end aerodynamic characteristics shown in figures 13 to 15 are also typical for partially metric afterbody propulsion models. A single break occurs in the lift curves at $\alpha \approx 3^{\circ}$ at M = 0.60, whereas at M = 1.20, there are breaks at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ and 3° . At M = 0.90, the lift curves are nonlinear. Total aft-end drag polars also exhibit characteristics that are typical for afterbody propulsion models. A typical shape of the drag at M = 0.90probably results from changes in the wing downwash on the afterbody and empennage surfaces in the transonic range.

Effect of Empennage Location

The effects of twin vertical tail longitudinal position on total aft-end zero-lift drag coefficients and individual zero-lift interference drag increments are presented in figures 16 and 17, respectively, for the two horizontal tail positions investigated. These values were determined by interpolation at $C_L = 0$ from data obtained as angle of attack was varied at constant nozzle pressure ratio (fig. 13(b), typical). These nozzle pressure ratios correspond to the schedule shown in figure 9(c). In addition, the effect of nozzle pressure ratio on individual interference drag coefficients at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ is shown in figures 18 and 19 for the various configurations tested. Note that these interference drag data are at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ (because of the method used to obtain data) rather than $C_L = 0$; thus, absolute levels may differ from those presented in figure 17.

Horizontal tails mid. There are no definite trends to total aft-end zero lift drag $C_{D,o}$ as the vertical tails are moved from the forward to the mid position (fig. 16) for the test Mach numbers. The lowest value of $C_{D,o}$ was measured for this investigation at M = 0.60 and NPR = 3.5 with all tail surfaces in the mid position (fig. 16). The lowest jet-off (NPR = 1) value of $C_{D,o}$ also occurred for this configuration (fig. 13(a)). The trends of zero-lift total aft-end empennage interference drag coefficient (fig. 17) are the same as for $C_{D,o}$ as vertical tail position is varied for the test Mach numbers. Note that $(\Delta C_{D,it})_o$ is negative at M = 0.60 and 1.20; this indicates favorable interference. At M = 0.60, this favorable interference is due to the tails-on nozzle drag being lower than the tails-off nozzle drag. At this Mach number, favorable interference is a result of favorable interference on the nozzles. However, the favorable interference effects on the total aft end at M = 1.20 are caused from favorable interference on the afterbody and not the nozzles (fig. 17). Similar results at M = 1.20 were found in reference 9.

At M = 0.90, favorable interference on the nozzles also occurred. However, the favorable interference effects on the nozzles are negated by adverse interference now present on the afterbody (fig. 17), which is greatly aggravated as the vertical tails are moved from the forward to the mid position. With the vertical tails in the mid position, afterbody interference drag is 57 percent and total aft-end interference drag is 47 percent of the total aft-end zero-lift drag $C_{D,o}$. As the vertical tails are moved from the forward to mid location at M = 0.60 and 0.90, there is a decrease in nozzle drag (fig. 10) and a favorable increase (more negative) in nozzle interference drag increment. This trend is similar to that obtained previously on a single-engine configuration (ref. 6) but opposite to that obtained on a twin-engine configuration (ref. 9). Both of these studies utilized models with axisymmetric nozzles.

Horizontal tails aft. As shown in figure 16, a large increase in total aft-end zero-lift drag occurs subsonically as the vertical tails are moved from the forward to mid position. Further movement of the vertical tails to the aft position then results in a decrease in $C_{D,o}$. A similar trend was observed at M = 1.20, but the changes in $C_{D,o}$ are small. With the horizontal tails aft, the configuration with the vertical tails forward produced the lowest total aft-end drag at all Mach numbers. In general, configurations with staggered tail arrangements (vertical tails forward, horizontal tails aft) have been found to have lower total aft-end drag for both single- and twin-engine configurations (refs. 6 and 9).

Examination of zero-lift individual interference drag increments shows a large effect of moving the horizontal tail from the mid to aft position (fig. 17). With the horizontal tails in the aft position, the increment in empennage interference drag coefficient on the nozzle is always unfavorable, even though nozzle drag coefficient is still negative at M = 0.60 and 0.90 (fig. 11). This probably indicates a reduction in pressure recovery on the nozzles or flow separation on the nozzle sidewalls when the horizontal tails are located adjacent to the nozzles. As the vertical tails are moved from the forward to the aft position, there is an increase in empennage interference drag on the nozzle (except at M = 0.6 with vertical tails aft) and an increase in nozzle drag (fig. 11). This trend is opposite to the one noted with the horizontal tails mid and is the same as that reported in reference 9.

At M = 0.9, there is a sharp increase in both the total and afterbody empennage interference drag terms (fig. 17) as the vertical tails are moved from the forward to mid position. Similar results were also found with the horizontal tails in the mid position. Although the reasons for this behavior are not known, one possible explanation is that the adverse interference is a result of the vertical tails being misaligned with the local flow field of the wing/forebody at the mid position. Reference 10 indicates that total aft-end drag was extremely sensitive to vertical tail toe angle. The vertical tail toe angle was 0° for the present investigation.

At lifting conditions (figs. 13 and 14), the configuration with the vertical tails forward generally had the lowest jet-on drag coefficient throughout the Mach number and angle-of-attack ranges except at M = 0.60. At this Mach number, the configuration with the vertical and horizontal tails mid had the lowest drag over the angle-of-attack range.

Comparison with other data. A comparison of the total aft-end drag coefficient at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ of the present study with that of the configuration of reference 9 is made in figure 20. Both of these configurations were identical up to FS 122.56 and used the same tail surfaces. The afterbody (FS 122.56 to FS 168.28) of reference 9 was designed to have axisymmetric nozzles installed at FS 168.28. Since the nozzles of both these investigations had the same nozzle throat areas and expansion ratios, the afterbody closure ratios (ratio of twice throat area to maximum body cross-sectional area) were the same.

In order to make the comparisons between the two configurations, it is first necessary to discuss the total aft-end drag characteristics of both configurations without tails. Additional drag differences between the two configurations are caused by tail interference effects since the drag of the tails is essentially the same. Tails-off total aft-end drag coefficients at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ are presented in the table on this page. As can be seen, the nonaxisymmetric nozzle configuration of the present study has lower drag at M = 0.60 and 0.90 because of the nozzle installation. The higher drag at M = 1.20 is attributed to poor cross-sectional area distribution characteristics.

As seen in figure 20, the present configuration always had lower total aft-end drag than that of reference 9 for all the combinations of empennage surfaces tested at

	Drag from	n present	Drag	from
	study	for—	reference	e 9 for—
		Schedule		Schedule
М	Jet off	NPR	Jet off	NPR
0.60	0.0039	0.0035	0.0050	0.0041
.90	.0032	.0028	.0040	.0030
1.20	.0166	.0158	.0150	.0122

M = 0.60. However, at M = 0.90 and M = 1.20, the configurations of the present study nearly always had higher drag than that of reference 9 because of unfavorable tail interference effects. In general, the trends in C_D with vertical tail movement are similar to that of reference 9.

Effect of Vertical Tail Cant Angle

The effects of vertical tail cant angle on total aft-end zero-lift drag coefficient and increments in empennage interference drag coefficient at $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ are presented in figures 21 and 22. As can be seen, increasing tail cant angle from -10° to 20° reduced total aft-end zero-lift drag coefficient and, in general, reduced each of the drag interference terms over the test Mach number range. Figure 15 also shows that reductions in drag coefficient from increasing tail cant angle also occur over the test angle-of-attack range. Similar results were obtained in reference 10.

Conclusions

An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twinengine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin vertical tails. The investigation was conducted at different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 over an angle-of-attack range from -3° to 9° . Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off (1) to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. An analysis of the results of this investigation at a tail deflection of 0° indicates the following conclusions:

1. Tail interference effects were present throughout the test range of Mach numbers and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. 2. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position.

3. The effects of vertical tail position on aft-end drag were usually dependent on Mach number and configuration. Generally, a forward position of the vertical tails produced the lowest total aft-end drag.

4. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90.

5. At a Mach number of 0.60, the nonaxisymmetric nozzle configuration had lower drag with tails on than

the axisymmetric nozzle configuration but unfavorable interference caused higher drag at a Mach number of 0.90.

6. A decrease in total aft-end drag occurred as vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° .

Langley Research Center National Aeronautics and Space Administration Hampton, VA 23665 October 3, 1984

Appendix

Data Reduction and Calibration Procedure

Calibration Procedure

The main balance measured the combined forces and moments due to nozzle gross thrust and the external flow field of that portion of the model aft of FS 113.67. The tandem shell balance measured forces and moments due to the external flow field exerted over the afterbody and tails between FS 122.56 and FS 168.28.

Force and moment interactions exist between the flow-transfer bellows system (fig. 7) and the main force balance because the centerline of this balance was below the jet centerline (fig. 1). Consequently, single and combined loadings of normal and axial force and pitching moment were made with and without the jets operating with ASME calibration nozzles. These calibrations were performed with the jets operating because this condition gives a more realistic effect of pressurizing the bellows than capping the nozzles and pressurizing the flow system. Thus, in addition to the usual balanceinteraction corrections applied for a single force balance under combined loads, another set of interactions were made to the data from this investigation to account for the combined loading effect of the main balance with the bellows system. These calibrations were performed over a range of expected normal forces and pitching moments. Note that this procedure is not necessary for the afterbody forces because the flow system is not bridged by the tandem shell balance.

Data Adjustments

In order to achieve desired axial-force terms, the axial forces measured by both force balances must also be corrected for pressure-area tare forces acting on the model and the main balance corrected for momentum tare forces caused by flow in the bellows. The external seal and internal pressure forces on the model were obtained by multiplying the difference between the average pressure (external seal or internal pressures) and free-stream static pressure by the affected projected area normal to model axis. The momentum tare force was determined from calibrations with the ASME nozzle prior to the wind-tunnel investigation.

Axial force minus thrust was computed from the main balance axial force with the following relationship:

$$F_{A} - F_{j} = F_{A,\text{Mbal}} + (\bar{p}_{es,1} - p_{\infty})(A_{mb,1} - A_{\text{seal},1}) + (\bar{p}_{i} - p_{\infty})A_{\text{seal},1} - F_{A,\text{mom}} + D_{f}$$
(A1)

where $F_{A,\text{Mbal}}$ includes all pressure and viscous forces, internal and external, on both the afterbody and thrust system. The second and third terms account for the forward seal rim and interior pressure forces, respectively. In terms of an axial-force coefficient, the second term ranges from -0.0001 to -0.0007 and the third term varies ± 0.0075 , depending upon Mach number and pressure ratio. The internal pressure at any given set of test conditions was uniform throughout the inside of the model; thus, no cavity flow was indicated. The momentum tare force $F_{A,mom}$ is a momentum tare correction with jets operating and is a function of the average bellows internal pressure that is a function of the internal chamber pressure in the supply pipes just ahead of the sonic nozzles (fig. 7). Although the bellows were designed to minimize momentum and pressurization tares, small bellows tares still exist with the jet on. These tares result from small pressure differences between the ends of the bellows when internal velocities are high and also from small differences in the forward and aft bellows spring constants when the bellows are pressurized. The last term D_f (eq. (A1)) is the friction drag of the section from FS 113.67 to FS 122.68. A friction drag coefficient of 0.0004 was applied at all Mach numbers.

Afterbody axial force is computed from a similar relationship as follows:

$$F_{aft} = F_{A,Sbal} + (\bar{p}_{es,2} - p_{\infty})(A_{mb,1} - A_{seal,1}) + (\bar{p}_i - p_{\infty})A_{seal,2} + (\bar{p}_{es,3} - p_{\infty})(A_{mb,2} - A_{seal,2})$$
(A2)

Since both balances are offset from the model centerline, similar adjustments are made to the pitching moments measured by both balances. These adjustments are necessary because both the pressure area and bellows momentum tare forces are assumed to act along the model centerline. The pitching-moment tare is determined by multiplying the tare force by the appropriate moment arm and subtracting the value from the measured pitching moments.

Model Attitude

The adjusted forces and moments measured by both balances were transferred from the body axis (which lies in the horizontal tail chord plane) of the metric portion of the model to the stability axis. Attitude of the nonmetric forebody relative to gravity was determined from a calibrated attitude indicator located in the model nose. Angle of attack α , which is the angle between the afterbody centerline and the relative wind, was determined by applying terms for afterbody deflection, caused when the model and balance bent under aerodynamic load, and by a flow angularity term to the angle measured by the attitude indicator. The flow angularity adjustment was 0.1°, which is the average angle measured in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel.

Ideal Thrust

The ideal isentropic gross thrust of each nozzle can also be determined if the mass-flow rate for each nozzle is known. The effective discharge coefficients of the eight sonic nozzles (fig. 7) forward of each of the nozzle tail pipes were determined and used for measuring mass flow.

The total ideal isentropic gross thrust or exhaust jet momentum for both nozzles is

$$F_{i} = \dot{m} \sqrt{RT_{t,j} \frac{2\gamma}{\gamma - 1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{p_{\infty}}{p_{t,j}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma}} \right]}$$
(A3)

where \dot{m} is the mass-flow rate measured in the flowtransfer assemblies and $p_{t,j}$ is the average jet stagnation pressure for both nozzles.

Thrust-Removed Characteristics

The resulting force and moment coefficients (including thrust components) from the main balance include total lift coefficient $C_{L,t}$, drag-minus-thrust coefficient $C_{(D-F)}$, and total pitching-moment coefficient $C_{m,t}$. Force and moment coefficients from the tandem shell balance are afterbody (plus tails) lift coefficient $C_{L,aft}$, afterbody drag coefficient $C_{D,aft}$, and afterbody pitching-moment coefficient $C_{m,aft}$.

Thrust-removed aerodynamic force and moment coefficients for the entire model were obtained by determining the components of thrust in axial force, normal force, and pitching moment and subtracting these values from the measured total (aerodynamic plus thrust) forces and moments. These thrust components at forward speeds were determined from measured static data and were a function of the free-stream static and dynamic pressure. Thrust-removed aerodynamic coefficients are

 $C_L = C_{L,t}$ – Jet lift coefficient (A4)

$$C_D = C_{(D-F)} + \text{Thrust coefficient}$$
 (A5)

 $C_m = C_{m,t}$ - Jet pitching moment coefficient (A6)

Nozzle coefficients are obtained by simply combining the measured results from both force balances as follows:

$$C_{L,n} = C_L - C_{L,\text{aft}} \tag{A7}$$

$$C_{D,n} = C_D - C_{D,\text{aft}} \tag{A8}$$

$$C_{m,n} = C_m - C_{m,\text{aft}} \tag{A9}$$

Tail Interference Terms

Vertical and horizontal tail drag was defined as the sum of form drag plus skin-friction drag for $M \leq 0.90$ and wave drag plus skin-friction drag for M > 1.00. The subsonic form factors for the tails were calculated with the equation:

Form factor =
$$1 + 1.44(t/c) + 2(t/c)^2$$
 (A10)

The individual fairings required for each tail location were also included in the skin-friction and wave-drag calculations. Values of $C_{D, \text{tails}}$ are given in table 18.

The tail interference terms used in this report are consistent with those used in references 6 and 9. The total tail interference increment on the aft end was determined from

$$\Delta C_{D,it} = (C_D)_{\text{tails on}} - (C_D)_{\text{tails off}} - C_{D,\text{tails}}$$
(A11)

where $(C_D)_{\text{tails on}}$ is the measured total aft-end drag for a given configuration, $(C_D)_{\text{tails off}}$ is the measured aftend drag for the same afterbody/nozzle configuration with the tails removed, and $C_{D,\text{tails}}$ is the computed value of tail drag as discussed previously. Hence this total tail interference increment includes the interference effects of one empennage surface on another, of the afterbody/nozzles on empennage surfaces, and of empennage surface on the afterbody/nozzles. It also includes drag increments associated with misalignment of the empennage surfaces with the afterbody flow field. The empennage interference effects on the nozzles alone were found from the following equation:

$$\Delta C_{D,in} = (C_{D,n})_{\text{tails on}} - (C_{D,n})_{\text{tails off}} \qquad (A12)$$

where the nozzle drags are obtained from equation (A8). This empennage interference increment, then, is the result of changes in nozzle external pressure distributions resulting from adding empennage surfaces to an afterbody/nozzle configuration. The empennage interference increment on the afterbody alone was then defined to be the difference between the empennage interference increments on the total aft end and the nozzles alone or

$$\Delta C_{D,ia} = \Delta C_{D,it} - \Delta C_{D,in} \tag{A13}$$

References

- 1. Nichols, Mark R.: Aerodynamics of Airframe-Engine Integration of Supersonic Aircraft. NASA TN D-3390, 1966.
- Glasgow, E. R.: Integrated Airframe-Nozzle Performance for Designing Twin-Engine Fighters. AIAA Paper No. 73-1303, Nov. 1973.
- Runckel, Jack F.: Interference Between Exhaust System and Afterbody of Twin-Engine Fuselage Configurations. NASA TN D-7525, 1974.
- Richey, G. K.; Surber, L. E.; and Laughrey, J. A.: Airframe/Propulsion System Flow Field Interference and the Effect on Air Intake and Exhaust Nozzle Performance. Airframe/Propulsion Interference, AGARD-CP-150, Mar. 1975, pp. 23-1-23-31.
- Berrier, Bobby L.; and Staff, Propulsion Integration Section: A Review of Several Propulsion Integration Features Applicable to Supersonic-Cruise Fighter Aircraft. NASA TM X-73991, 1976.
- Berrier, Bobby L.: Effect of Nonlifting Empennage Surfaces on Single-Engine Afterbody/Nozzle Drag at Mach Numbers From 0.5 to 2.2. NASA TN D-8326, 1977.
- Burley, James R., II; and Berrier, Bobby L.: Investigation of Installation Effects on Single-Engine Convergent-Divergent Nozzles. NASA TP-2078, 1982.
- 8. Burley, James R., II; and Berrier, Bobby L.: Effects of Tail Span and Empennage Arrangement on Drag of a Typical Single-Engine Fighter Aft End. NASA TP-2352, 1984.
- Leavitt, Laurence D.: Effect of Empennage Location on Twin-Engine Afterbody/Nozzle Aerodynamic Characteristics at Mach Numbers From 0.6 to 1.2. NASA TP-2116, 1983.
- 10. Leavitt, Laurence D.; and Bare, E. Ann: Effects of Twin-Vertical-Tail Parameters on Twin-Engine Afterbody/

Nozzle Aerodynamic Characteristics. NASA TP-2158, 1983.

- Bare, E. Ann; and Berrier, Bobby L.: Investigation of Installation Effects on Twin-Engine Convergent-Divergent Nozzles. NASA TP- 2205, 1983.
- Leavitt, Laurence D.: Effects of Various Empennage Parameters on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Twin-Engine Afterbody Model. AIAA-83-0085, Jan. 1983.
- Berrier, Bobby L.: Empennage/Afterbody Integration for Single and Twin-Engine Fighter Aircraft. AIAA-83-1126, June 1983.
- 14. Capone, Francis J.: The Nonaxisymmetric Nozzle—It Is for Real. AIAA Paper 79-1810, Aug. 1979.
- Nelson, B. D.; and Nicolai, L. M.: Application of Multi-Function Nozzles to Advanced Fighters. AIAA-81-2618, Dec. 1981.
- Capone, Francis J.; and Reubush, David E.: Effects of Varying Podded Nacelle-Nozzle Installations on Transonic Aeropropulsive Characteristics of a Supersonic Fighter Aircraft. NASA TP-2120, 1983.
- Carson, George T., Jr.; Capone, Francis J.; and Mason, Mary L.: Aeropropulsive Characteristics of Nonaxisymmetric-Nozzle Thrust Reversers at Mach Numbers From 0 to 1.20. NASA TP- 2306, 1984.
- Capone, Francis J.; and Mason, Mary L.: Interference Effects of Thrust Reversing on Horizontal Tail Effectiveness of a Twin-Engine Fighter Aircraft at Mach Numbers From 0.15 to 0.90. NASA TP-2350, 1984.
- Peddrew, Kathryn H., compiler: A User's Guide to the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel. NASA TM-83186, 1981.
- Yetter, Jeffery A.; and Leavitt, Laurence D.: Effects of Sidewall Geometry on the Installed Performance of Nonaxisymmetric Convergent-Divergent Exhaust Nozzles. NASA TP-1771, 1980.

	Positi	ion of—		
Table	Horizontal tails	Vertical tails	ϕ_t, \deg	δ_h , deg
2	Off	Off		
3	Mid	Forward	0	0
4	Mid	Mid	0	0
5	Aft	Forward	0	0
6	Aft	Forward	0	-5
7	Aft	Forward	0	-10
8	Aft	Mid	0	0
9	Aft	\mathbf{Mid}	0	-5
10	Aft	Mid	0	-10
11	Aft	\mathbf{Aft}	0	0
12	Aft	\mathbf{Aft}	0	-5
13	Aft	\mathbf{M} id	-10	0
14	Aft	Mid	10	0
15	Aft	Mid	20	0
16	Aft	Mid	20	-5
17	Aft	Mid	20	-10

TABLE 1. INDEX TO DATA TABLES

FABLE 2. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR TAILS OFF

•100.• -0003 0010 • • 0034 .0028 • 0180 ZWU .0016 0010 • • 0024 -.0002 .0025 .0108 .0004 0001000 00016 .0003 .0003 0003 .0004 0000 CON .0035 .0035 -0044 0700** • 0028 • 0019 0033 -0024 .0028 .0036 .0021 .0035 .0020 .0025 • • 0 0 2 6 .0026 .0037 .0021 .0019 0110 .0023 .0022 0200 . z 0001 -.0020 0024 000 -,0014 .0018 4 5000°-0003 om .0012 -0011 0008 ដ .0001 - 001 100 001 000 .001 . C N A F T .0197 00333 0314 0030 .0201 .0315 00400 0002 00046 0025 0016 0043 0018 0011 0023 0000 0024 0019 0015 0004000 0050 10 00500 0026 CDAFT 0080 0086 0085 N 9 N 1 7 N 9 N 1 .0065 850c 050 0055 0500054 0069 , 0054 0054 1054 0057 0062 0.061 CLAFT -.0021 -.0042 -.0047 1900 · · .00200023 -.0049 -.0019 -0762 0001 .0035 .0005 0020 .0013 0166 0024 ž 1200 • • 0000 0015 .001 0021 0014 011 000 200 6 0033 0039 0028 0032000 0037 5200 0038 0037 01:00 0047 0031 100 0028 .0038 .0044 0052 0045 • 0019 1500--0129 • 0036 • 0036 • 0035 .0044 ដ -,0051 .0051 0038 -.0024 0047 0011 0011 0941 ÷ ; 4 0016 0043 0075 0094 -.0188 .0121 0160 00200 *****000*-.0102 .0039 CMJ 0170 .0006 .0184 .0089 .0024 .0067 .0018 0120 0123 0029 011900137 .0098 0167 1000 0021 0015 0151 C (D=F) . 00.40 . 00.41 . 00.41 . 00.41 . 00.40 . 04.80 . 1 N 9 M C H C M M M N H 0 0 0 0 H 0 0 0 0 6170 7470 9140 9140 0188 0171 0204 0246 0348 8100 .1036 .1042 10043 .1034 <mark>ل</mark> .0046 0020 •.0063 -0082 -0056 - 3000 - 1000 - -,0112 -.0139 .0044 -.0032 -.0016 .00**3**8 0090 .00.59 0017 -.0071 .0183 .0011 . ALPHA • 10 8 92 1 09 **-** 0.8 60°-• 0 • 60 -9.8.8 -3.12 8,93 •3,12 ÷.09 5.92 80 • 09 2 0 0 8.93 5 3.11 5 9.91 3.11 N In Шd 6 . 9 B 00.00 100.00 100.00 7U -95 M N O 3 C CI- C 5.00 5.04 2 N N N -. 00 c . o 5 è. è . ¢ u 9 HUW 8666666 004 004 600 568 206 609 561 109. 40**%** 6.0 606 106 £ u 3 900 1 6 C 6 6 6 9 6 9 5 609 504 601

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE 3. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS MID, VERTICAL TAILS FORWARD, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = 0^\circ$

		•			2						i			
MACH	NPR	ALPHA	כרד	C(D=F)	CMT	CL	00	л С	CLAFT	CDAFT	CMAFT	CL N	CON	Z E
1.199	.93	00.	0012	59ZU"	8400 - -	Z	.0259	-004B	0032	0184	0031	0200.	0075	••016 ••03•
0 v 2 - 1	3,00	00	0035	20045	0017	-002B	.0256	- • 0041	0040	0185		200	100	
1,200	5.00	20	6046	-0165	1000	0035	.0259	007U	0033	0184	0058	1000"-	6/00	
1,200	7.00	<u>.</u>	87vJ -	0380	A[00.	-0034	.0256		1100-			4000	1/00	
1 200	8.99		-0061	- 0504	900a	-,0043	.0243	0036	0039	0185	0200	7000*	8400.	
1 199	. 63	-3.02	0519	0599	, r559	0519	2020.	.0559	- 020-	1020	.0567	1.00.	8400°	
1.201	. 92		0032	0207	0046	0032	.0263	-0046	005a	0146	- 0034	-000	1100	
1001	6 6	5.99	0529	1120.	0679	.0529	.0307	0679	9270.	8040	0617	• 01-0.		2000
100	. 87	5.94	010	0404	-1122	.010.	2040.	-,11,22	0755	0,74	-1041	.0154	• 0127	
	18.	1 98	1300	_0549	-1633	1300	.0545	-,1633	.1094	0110	-,1521	9020.	0175	
801	6.99	66 2 -	- 0571	034A	.0618	0523	.0289	.0555	0515	8020 °	.0586	8000"-	0000	1500
	6.90	c	0000-	.0379	0001	+200 . -	.0257	45uù"=	0030	CH10	- 0032	- 000t	.0070	
1.109	7.00	2.09	.0553	.0339	0629	.0534	.029A	0692	• 0730	8020	0633	5600	0600	PC00 -
1.109	7.00	5.96	.0979	-0230	-1087	. 1927	.0396	1150	.0757	.0274			0123	
1.201	7.01	А 07	1423	-0096	1638	1337	.0535	1701	.109A	0110	-,1524	6120°	.0105	
000		c	0139	0118	1150-	.0139	.0114	.0211	.0132	0142	••0193	1000	-,002A	0018
905	2,01	0.0	1 NUU	0000	0142	1000	.0106	6169	.0123	,0136	0179	0032	0030	.0010
	101	- -	.0065	0280	- 0109	0079	.0103	-0153	0110	0136	- 0173	01700	- 00.53	•0200
	v 0 v	207	0039	- 0653	0000	LOOSA.	.0105	0127	.0110	0137	0159	0052	-0012	.0032
	1.00	200	0005	-1037	20002-	0200	.0097	0114	80108	0133	-0155	- ,0058	0036	1004
000		-3.01	- 0051	<0105	- 0011	- 0051	.009A	- 1011	2000.	0132	••0014	0053	0035	.0003
		0.0	010	0112	-0195	.0101	.0108	-0195	.0131	10101	- .0193	- ,0030	• 0033	- 0003
600	-	5 0 0 2	0254	0128	0390	.0264	.0124	0390	.0279	0155	9 070°-	- v015	0031	.0017
899		5,00	.0495	.0167	0699	• n495	.0163	66 90 .	.0460	0186	0691	5400°	-0020	+0008
006	1.12	66 ° ¥	.0866	0251	- 1165	. 6856	.0247	-,1165	.0755		-,1105	.0111	-0001	••0020
. 900	5.01	•3,n1	0164	0670	.0137	0105	.0087	•00teo	001A	,0127	.0015	- · · · · 8 7	0700 -	0.044
.899	5,00	.0.	0000	- 0667	0034	.0040	£600°	0116	.0101	7134	- 0149	-004	2700 -	.0052
006	5,00	3.01	0200	-,064A	0266	- 220 -	.0110	0344	.0253	0149	0368	-0054	- 0050	0054
.899	00.1	5,99	.0504	0612	0541	.0443	01/13	0619	.0436	0176	-0638	2000	-0033	0200
.899	5.00	н, 99	• 0 4 2 5	- 0525		, 0825	.0227		.0757	1720	0/01		•••••	
	1.04		9000	0000	0113	.0028	.0065		0101	10105	0154	- 0075	500°-	
.601	2.01	00 .	- DUNB	••0344	- 0034	2200	- 002 	1600.	1000	1010	1210.	6000		
- 9 u 5	20 5	00	200 .	- 0.80 F	1200	1000 1000	.005	2710 .	5010 .			**00* -		
- 602	5°.5		c200.											
, 6n4	5.02		0014	- 1637	5500	1500	2400		1010.					
- e u u	1.04	00 • 2 •	- 013b	0017	0114	0136	. 1075							
109.	1 U 1	••01	.0076	< 800 .	0134	.0076	0078	-0134	• 01 02	1010	5410 . .	0500.	9200-	2000
, 6n0	1.04	3.02	0620.	.010	0381	0620.	.0103	0341	1010	111	-0397	• • • • • • •	- 0015	.0015
. 599	1.04	t.01	.0612	.0165	0765	- 1612	.0162	• 0765	•	12101	570 . .	1500.		• 0010
. 6 n G	1.04	9. U	- 639	67Z0 .	-1164	.0936	.0245		5 40.	0100	• 1116	0210.	6200 °	5000-
. 600	3,51	₩3 ,01	-,0244	1012	1920.	0153	.0063	0.142		1010	64 L 0		+ 0042	- 0012
. 400	5.5	. 01	.0054	-1009		4400	.0069			1010	•••0150 ••••		1900 .	1000
109.	3,51	3.01	.0365	- 097A	-0323	0341	9600.	-0441	.0114		••0414	1200	- 0010	1200.
. 599	3,51	6.01	.0747	- 0923		.0467	.0155	8180 .	- 0507	2910			5000.	PC00 -
9 u g	3.51	60° X	.1115	0834	1097	-0479	.0217	-1215	1240.	120.	••1125	.0150	\$200	2400

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

L

L

AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS MID, VERTICAL TAILS MID, TABLE 4.

Ĭ	
FOR	
CHARACTERISTICS	
MAMIC	$_{1} = 0^{\circ}$
AERUD	AND δ_h
BLE 4.	$\phi_t = 0^\circ$,
-	

MACH	a a v	ALPHA	CLT	C (D=F)	ΓMJ	ป	5	Ň	CLAFT	CDAFT	CMAFT	CLN	CDN	CMN
9.1	1.10	00	.0119	.0139	0175	.0119	.0135	0175	.0088	0181	-0197	.0031	-0046	5200
.897	2.01	- 01	6600	0082	0150	010	.01210	0177	1600	0167	0203	0015	-0046	0026
.899	3,03	00	.0083	0200	0127	1600	.0121	0171	0086	1710	0193	1100	0500	0.022
.898	5.03	- 02	.0084	- 0630	0103	0104	.0125	-0182	2600.	0168	0202	1100	2400 -	020
901	7.01		.0066	- 1013	0.54	1600	.0121	-0166	0082	0168	0187	0000	L 7 0 0 -	0.021
.898	1,10	-3.01		0115	0030	0017	.0111	0200	2000-	0167	- 0061	- 0015	- 0056	0031
808.	1,10	C C -	.0093	0132	- 0174	2606	.0128	- 0174	0004	0176	0206	1000 -	0078	0032
106.	1.09	2.97	.0207	.0149	n317	.0207	.0145	0317	.020.	0187	0367	0000	2100-	00200
. 898	1.09	5,99	0425	0183	- 0600	.0425	.0179	0090 -	0389	0200	0646	0015	0027	0046
.898	1.10	8,99	.0815	0264	- 1085	. 0815	.0260	-1085	0697	0263	-1083	0118	000	2000
. 899	5.01	-3,01	-,0092	- 0653	0055	0033	.0106	0.023	0000	0160	- 0055	- 0026	0054	0.031
.899	5.01	.01	0058	- 0641	- 0087	. 0077	021u.	.0165	0086	0110	-0194	- 000	- 0050	00200
.899	5,00	1,00	.0259	- 0621	.0285	.0239	.0138	0363	.0215	0178	0387	0023	0040	0024
.897	5,00	5.98	0150.	- 054r	• 0564	0449	1110.	n642	2040 -	0100	0661	0047	- 0027	.0019
006	4.99	R.97	.0922	- 049A	- 1017	.0823	.0251	-1095	.0685	0254	-1064	0137	- 0003	0131
- 6.2	1.04	- c -	u600°	1900°	- 0155	0600	.0061	0155	-0112	0107	0172	0022	.0046	0017
.611	2.01	- u	2800	0070	0097	.0106	• 002a		.0112	1010	- 0171	0007	- 0 U S I	.0014
. 60.0	3.01	1 0 1	.0099	- 0Ang	-0093	.0130	.0050	0191	.0120	0105	0182	0100	- 0055	0000-
. 601	3.50	- 02	8600.	- 1012	0073	. 132	.0058	- 0191	.0117	0105	.0179	0015	- 0047	-0012
- 602	5.02	00	.0093	-1640	0015	.0136	.0063	.0190	.0120	0104	0182	0017	- 0041	000A
, 6n1	1 04	-3.02	0800.	.0061	. 2073	- , r 1 8 0	.0057	. 0073	0176	0100	. n 0 7 8	- 0003	- 0052	- 0005
- 6.2	101	0.	1210.	.0075	0170	.0127	.0071	0170	.0118	1010.	0179	6000°	-, nn36	6000°
900-	1.04	3,00	.0334	6010	0417	.0334	.0105	0110 -	8010°	0120	0431	.0026	-0015	.0021
.598	1.04	5.97	.(1653	.0171	- 0793	.0653	.0167	-0793	• 0563	0157	0786	0000	.0010	1000 -
- 598	1.04	8.97	. 1967	1920-	-1168	.0967	.0257	-1188	.0817	,021A	-,1150	0150	0039	-0038
, 599	3,51	-3.00	0176	- 1025	•0 2 0 4	0086	• 0076	.0086	0084	0108	.00A9	- 0003	- 0050	- 0004
- 602	3.51	- c •	.0128	1005	0600 -	.0161	.0065	0207	.0122	0105	0185	.0039	• • 0040	0022
, 6n1	3.51	2.99	.0431	- 0974	0384	.0408	.0101	0502	.0328	0119	.0461	.00A1	001A	1400
, 599	3.50	5.97	.0812	- 0907	0761	0733	.0170	0879	.0578	0150	080-	.0155	r 100°	0070
.598	12°	8,98	.1170	-,0813	.1157	.1034	.0259	-,1275	.0832	0219	1173	-020S	.000.	0103
1.198	4 C -			.0273	.0133	0114	.0269	.0133	-0000	0187	.0087	0016	6800	9100
. 200	3.01	- 05	.0140	-0017	.0171	0133	.0259	•0176	0103	0186	1600°	••0200	.0073	5300
1.201	5	.01	0124	0144	2 714 2		.0201	96 00	-0105-	0185	.0097	000 - B	.076	1000.
1.201	00 2		1600 -	.0380	1010	0083	.0255	• 0040	2010-	0185	.0101	7200.	0071	-,0057
1.199	00 6		- 600 -		.0116	- U019	.0244	.0034	0080	, 0186	.0079	• 100 •	.005A	0045
1,198		-3.01	-°0200	.0313	. 111 J	-0200	.0309	.0717	-0530	5120 J	.0647	••0040	9600	.0071
1,202	1 8	.01	0125	0280	.0128	0125	.9276	.0128	-004	0187	0078		6400.	0500
1.200	. 8	2.98	, 139 A	1010	-, n488	.0394	* u 2 u 3	0488	.0353	02020	0500	0000.	00600	.0013
1,197	9	5,98	.0766	.0394	0912	.0766	.0392	0912	• 0 6 4 A	1001	- () A 79	.0118	0120	003\$
1.205	8	в 97	.1158	.0530	1420	.1158	.0526	-1420	5820.	0353	1354	.0175	0174	- 0006
1,202	10.7	-3.00	0598	077U -	. 1696	0550 -	.0285	.0633	- 0514	2120	.0671	00AU	.0072	0038
1.199	00 1		1600	0382	.0104	0083	.0255	• 0041	•• N N A 4	0187	.0078	•000•	.006A	-0037
1.200		2.97	0481	- 0346	- 0521	.0462	.0293	.0584	.0359	, 0205	• 0200	•10 3	490v.	- r079
1.201	20.7	5.95	.0872		••0935	. 1820	.383	-0998	.0457	8040	0888	.0162	.0115	0110 -
1.201	7.01	8.97	.1308	-0116	1471	.1222	• 0214	-,1534	1460°	0355	-,1352	, n241	.159	-,0182

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OE POOR QUALITY

AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS FORWARD, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = 0^\circ$ TABLE 5.

-, 002A -.0020 • 0016 -.0007 -000g - 007A --0022 --0005 --0007 - 0062 6000. -0043 • 0059 -.0106 -.0012 -.0081 ••0131 0000 .0006 0010 ..0041 9000 0020 -.0021 0018 0200 0000 012 00200 CMN 0100 .0028 .0010 .0017 -.0007 .0004 -,0086 6100*--.0061 -.0203 .0017 .0027 .0006 -,0022 0000 1000. --0027 -,002A -.0030 -0025 1200 0000 - 0026 -000 B 0014 0086 0075 0061 0085 - 0017 --0022 CDN £80u 0114 0192 0082 0083 - 0027 -0033 -.0027 - 0028 .0058 0103 0136 .0185 -0020 - 0029 -0024 0029 2000. 0020 0030 0084 - 0035 -_001A 053 0141 0003 -0034 -.0034 --0044 -.0023 -0031 -.0013 -_004B -,0008 C L N -,0043 0164 0116 0188 0258 .0128 .0900.-.0028 .0115 0125 0013 0018 1100. •200**.** .0010 0008 -.0025 -.0003 0100 1000. -.0058 -.0031 .0029 -,0029 -0038 .0034 .0116 0160 -.0015 0200 - no13 .0067 .0111 --0197 -.0176 ••0152 --0045 -.0196 -,0008 -.0146 -.0143 -.0140 •0045 -.0018 --0022 -.0171 -.0357 - 1031 .0757 .0798 CHAFT -.0009 .0582 - 1079 . 594 .1561 -.0161 -,1065 --0144 -.014R -. n403 -,0014 --0024 -.1UA0 -.0532 -.0165 -.0132 -.1123 ••0151 .1175 -.0634 •.0013 -.0622 -.0571 -0017 .0151 COAFT 0087 0174 0,75A 0349 0172 0193 0255 9720 0117 0115 0115 0113 9112 0118 0132 0154 0213 0108 0114 0124 0148 0.085 0.086 0136 0193 56v0 0047 0137 0173 0173 0173 0173 0171 0195 0198 0195 0087 2600 0089 0100 00400 0101 CLAFT 0100 -.0058 -.0051 -.0054 10201 .0384 1020 4100. 0116 .03AA .0007 0520 0547 .071A .0117 .0104 0103 2600 .0636 9600. .0103 0105 .0104 .010. .0286 0100 0105 -04AA .0050 .0390 -.0054 -.0065 -0105 .0311 0000. -0045 .0575 . USA1 -, 0 n **1**5 -,1764 -.0176 -.0143 -.0204 -.0354 -.1072 -.0137 -.0465 -.0857 2700--. n70P -.0203 .0020 .0618 -.0119 -.0147 -1659 -.0140 -.0134 .0104 -.0131 -.0374 -,0034 .0029 .0690 -.0040 --0526 -.112A -.0345 •.0106 -.0764 -_nn2A .1157 -... 0146 .1166 .0152 .0161 -.1261 ξ 0520 .0233 0140 0063 0053 0255 0088 0084 0400 .0064 .0064 .0250 006900 0167 .0232 0290 .0243 .0311 .0399 0277 .0085 2400 0.095 0148 2800. . U087 .0103 .0164 0058 0391 0531 1000. .0111 0076 0087 0101 0103 0257 <u>8</u> -.0035 -.0514 -.0510 0000 -, n036 7700--. n5n1 .0075 .0079 5760-.0882 .1236 0.00 .1287 .0058 .0103 .0227 0782 5520. .0416 0046 0048 .0076 0278 .05A7 .0876 .0345 -.0038 .0060 9000--00.94 .0082 . 1072 .0028 .0419 0047 0751 .0071 -.0108 -. n143 . 0663 -.0038 0501 .0067 .0061 Ч -. 015n - 0165 -.0020 0098 -,0068 -,1267 -0994 -.0038 - U 374 **-**0764 -.0030 - n34A -.0639 - 0354 .0626 -.1128 -,0119 9700--.0023 0000 -.0131 - 1166 -,1144 62V()**-**--,0694 850r. - 114R 1701 -,0117 0104 -_ nn2A 0110 .0048 . 1575 .0645 -.0540 .0740 .0015 -,1659 .0271 -.1157 000. CHI -0650 -.0679 -,0670 00A0 -,0359 \$600 •••0110 , 0086 0000 .0237 .0067 -.0396 -- 0Ang -,1631 n62u. 0315 - 03R4 -.0243 - 0295 -.0671 -1051 .0152 -,0616 -,1006 .0168 - 1003 -, URUR 0043 -.0391 50403 .0115 .0107 .0254 -.1021 -,0971 - 0905 .0261 1207 0545 ..0100 -.0535 0068 -.0165 -..... -.0341 C (D=F) .0079 -.0235 0103 0127 0040 0876 -.0038 -.0046 --0047 0960 --.0062 .0519 .0419 .0475 . nn41 0278 .0058 0366 1004 .0058 .0030 .0046 0241 0046 .0024 1077 .0559 .0958 1730. .0028 .0851 .0029 -.0108 9100----0060 .0882 1236 0041 .0501 1371 0741 CL ₹ 0003---0 ----0 N с -**6**0*****-6 c = 00.4 **6**0 • 6 u • 6 u • 60 -R. 01 ي ج ا - 0 0 4 - 0 0 4 - 0 0 4 -3,09 2 91 5 90 -.10 -3.10 2 89 5 91 8.89 100 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 -3,08 0000 0000 0000 •3°04 -3.08 60 -ALPHA 5.02 .10 с Т. 4.99 4.99 10.7 с с Г.Т. ----۲ د ع 00000 00000 00000 00000 3.50 न 0 5°. <u></u> 9 נו 0000 0000 ---ccc6 cccc-6 и. 99 и. 98 и. 97 2.01 · • 5.01 a a z 199 895 896 906 599 2005 2005 .199 202 901 918 000 .899 899 897 .897 009 600 600 5.5 .612 602 602 598 C L Q 601 6 n 1 612 HUVH

ORIGANAL PANE OF POOR QUALITY

16

TABLE 6. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS FORWARD, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = -5^\circ$

CMA	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
CDN	+ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
C L N	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
CMAFT	88000000000000000000000000000000000000
CDAFT	3 6 N N H B 3 6 N N N M M 6 B C B C O C O D 3 O M 3 0 N B B C A D 3 D 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
C L. AFT	0 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
M U	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
5	20000000000000000000000000000000000000
CL	
CHT	<pre></pre>
C (D-F)	N-M9C3CL30CC02000000000000000000000000000000
CLT	<pre>************************************</pre>
ALPHA	11111100001000000000000000000000000000
X d N	- MW3 F
MACH	~ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

TABLE 7. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS FORWARD, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = -10^\circ$

MACH	2 2 2	ALPHA	CLT	C(D=F)	CMT	CL	CD	х С	CLAFT	CDAFT	CMAFT	CLN	CDN	N N U
401	1 - 04	• •	- 1016	.0169	1713	-1016	.0165	.1713	- 0969	0240	1587	10047	-0075	.0125
604	2.00	0.0	- 1074	- 0294	1806	1201 -	.0158	1745	-0994	0236	1621	- 0057	- 0078	.0124
508	3.00	00	-1117	- 0706	1886	-1087	0154	1787	-1013	.0238	.1649	- 0074	-0084	.0138
192	3.51	00	-1134	- 0924	1913	-1100	.0165	1294	-1014	0239	.1654	-,0083	-0074	.0140
	06.1	0	- 1159	.1539	1972	- 1115	.0170	1797	-1025	.0237	.1664	0600 -	0068	.0133
805	1.03	-2.99	1181	0255	1915	- 1161	.0251	1915	- 1109	0306	.1790	- 0071	-,0056	.0125
5	1.04	C	• 1035	0190	1714	- 1035	.0186	.1714	• • 0969	.0238	.1590	- 0066	- 0152	0125
	1,04	3,00	.0854	0134	1459	- 0854	0130	.1459	- 0795	0181	1339		0050	.0121
598	1 04	6.00	- 0602	0111	1085	0602	.0107	.1085	0566	0138	.0998	0036	-0031	.0087
	1,05	9.01	0367	0094	0125	0367	0600*	.0725	0340	0120	.0647	0027	0030	.0078
599	3.50	-3.00	- 1375	.0829	2150	- 1284	.0244	. 2033	1167	, 9310	.1871	0117	- 0066	.0161
665	3.51	01	- 1145	0906	1912	- 1111	.0173	1794	-1016	,0236	.1653	9600 -	- ,0063	• U 1 4 0
900	3,51	3.01	0889	- 0966	1629	0912	.0111	1151.	0833	0176	.1389	nn79	190v"-	.0123
.597	5.50	6.00		-1004	.1267	- n664	.0077	.1148	0608	.0132	.1055	0056	055	2600
599	3,51	00.6	• 0555	1 009	.0848	0392	•0097	.0730	0349	0114	.0655	* ,0043	• 0020	.0075

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Ì

Ţ

i

TABLE 8. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t = 0^\circ, \text{ AND } \delta_h = 0^\circ$

Z	(14) (14)	046)14	044	152	175	052	151	5.9	77	200	145	126	73	235	34	744	134	33	25	145	39	161	173	29	.47	36	75			GI P (ູ	JA Z		<u>.</u> 11	02Y 50	32	202	22	145	690	23
z	3.0.0	ō• 0	č•• • u	4 - 01	00	, , ,	°. ∼	۲ °0(č = 9	3 - 0	- - -	4 - 0 C			2	ۍ ج	۲ ۲	5 • •	7 . 0	с •	с ,	п • 0(0	т ⁰	ہ ۔ د	7 . 0(0	ۍ ۲)0 • 0	5	č -						•••	1	а С	3 0(н 10(5 - 0() - -		
C J	.010	.010	.010	600.	800°	.011	011	.012	.014	.019	6 00	600°	.011	01	.018	- 005	-005	-005	.001	- 001	-002	-005	-002	- 001	000	.001	- 005	- 001	-1001-	001	-005			-001		• 001	100 -	600	000	100	-001	• 000	000	003	Sù0
C L N	0031	0039	0011	1000	.0011	0071	-0019	.0027	0141	. nire	- 0039	• 0004	.0141	.0213	.0282	0011	0024	0200	0017	0010	8700-	0024	0021	••0010	-0082	0057	0025	.0015	005200	.0126	0035	-0053	0001	5000	1000.	0056	0100.	9000	1000	.0139	•200 •	.0017	.0069	0159	90Z0 .
CMAFT	.0110	.0096	.0045	.0059	.0061	.0615	.0059	-,0532	• 0951	-,1375	.0620	.0032	0558	-,0963	-,1409	-,0260	0241	••0546	0253		0130	-,0263	- ,0396	-,0574	1042	-0122	-,0251	0410	0657	-1108	- 0177	0174		1010	0 h l û •	.0056	• •0176	0425	0757	-,1151	.0083	0194		0638	••1225
COAFT	0100	0169	0167	0168	10167	2610	0100	, n189	,0256	0338	0101	,0167	0140	0255	01120	0110	2910	0143	0144	0139	.0135	0148	.0161	0180	2920,	,0128	2110	0157	0810	,0245	16.0	0000	2600 2	2600		00000	5000	0114	0152	1120	0900	1600	.0115	.0157	2220
CLAFT	0116	0107	86UO .	0077	820J . -	0476	0079	.0340	.0638	1000	0479	U05A	.0359	0647	.0927	.0136	.0126	.012A	.0132	.0130	.005A	9110.	.0220	.0325	.0540	.005 .	• u 1 3 0	.0224	.0376	• 0661	.0115	£110°	0127	8210 . 8210	.0125	4100	• 0 1 1 4	-02820 -	.0501	.0747	0054	.0126	.0322	.0552	2010.
х U	.0158	5 n l a 5	.0071	.0014	.0010	.0690	.0111	1920	6ÚUI -	• 1452	.0618	0012	••0684	• 1137	1644	- .0226	0197	0212	0220	0224	00A5	7220 -	0335	.0500	-1013	0074	0215	+.0385	.0636	1129	-0154	0152	-0204	0020	rovo.	.0056	- 0158	0394	0763	11A3	.0045	0217	• • 0529	0926	-,1346
CD	.0272	.0269	.0267	.0262	.0247	.0308	.0279	.0316	-040S	.0531	,02A9	• 1260	.0304	.0395	.0523	.0125	.0119	.0121	.0127	.0120	.0110.	•0124	.0139	.0166	0200	.0111	.0123	.0141	.0171	.0260	6 900	.0066	• 002	.0075	NH00.	.0073	• 00 H 4	.0115	.0160	.0250	.0071	.00A7	.0124	-01A7	.0277
لر د	0147	0146	- 0100 -	0073	0067	0547	0129	.0366	.0779	1001	0518	0054	, 15 00	.0860	.1210	.0125	.0102	.0109	.0115	1510.	0100	.0114	.0200	2120.	.0702	- 000 4	.0105	0720	• 0 4 0 1	.0787	0800.	0040	0127	5113	- C I C -	0072	1010.	1950.	~02a5	•0AR6	1000	.0144	102u	.0711	1000
C M T	.0158	.0167	.0115	.0077	2600.	_0690	.0111	0481	1009	- 1452	.0681	1500	0621	-1074	- ,1581	• <u>,0226</u>	0170	0169	0142	0111	0085	0224	0335	0500	- 1013	P000	0137	0307	0557	-,1051	0154	- 0002	-0104	- 0001	b 200 .	.0065	015A	- U394	0763	-,1183	2020	0100	0411	-080H	1227
C(0+F)	.0276	0056	-0159	0375	-,0605	CIE0.	.0243	.0320	.0406	.0535	£710**	0378	0330	0237	0106	.0129	-0079	0257	0633	1025	_0114	.012A	.0143	.0170	.0253	0646	0633	0617	- 0587	- 0494	.0073		- 0805	-1004	16.54	.0077	8400°	.0119	.0164	0264	- 0986	- 0079	0455		.079A
CLT	0147	0153	0120	00A6	00A4	0547	0129	.0366	.0779	.1091	0565	0065	0250	.0914	.1290	.0125	1000	.0095	2000.	.0094	.0010	-0114	.0200	.0315	.070 <i>2</i>		.00A5	.0260	.0451	-0880 -	0000.	09 00	9 6 00.	8000	1800.	0072	.0104	.0201	5920 .	, PAA	01A0	0110.	0170	.0791	.1136
AL PHA	• 0 •	.07	20	6v *	9 c) •	-2.93	.07	3.07	6.08	90°6	<u>-</u> 2,93	• 0 8	3,09	6 .06	90.6		M u	05	03	7U -	-3,02	• 04	2.96	5,95	8.96	-3.03	- 03	2.97	5.97	20° a	• 03	-°5	-04	1 C •	• 07	-3.03	£0°.	2,9Å	5.97	4 07	-3.04	03	2,96	5.05	8.07
2 2 2	.89	10	5.02	20.1	20.6	- 90	69.	.87	86	- 82	6.99	7.04	7.00	101	7.00	1,009	1.99	3.00	5,03	7.01	1.10	1.09	1.09	1.08	1,10	5,00	5.00	5.01	5.00	5.02	- 0°2	2.01	2°05	M 1	2°.	1.04	1.05	1 ° 0 4	1.04	1.05	3.49	3.51	3.52	5.2	5.52
MACH	1.203	1,199	1,201	1.201	1,199	1.197	1.201	1,196	1.204	1,195	1,202	1.202	1,202	1,203	1.201	106.	. 896	. 900	- 9 n 2	. 897	. 899	- 0 - 1	. 897	. 898	. 900	, 899	.901	- 9 n 1	.899	006	.601	600	, 598	- en1	. 600	, 6n0	. 601	- 6 J	- 6 - 2	,599	. 602	. 6.3	.601	.598	- 600

TABLE 9. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = -5^\circ$

-			F L		۲ ۲	ī	ć	2	C A C T	L D D F T	CMAFT	Z	200	ž Ž
	2 2		۔ د		- - -	ال ر		;	-	2	•	3	,	
	1.08	00	11411	0137	.0614	0411	.0133	.0614	- 0359	2810.	.0580	0042	• * 00 * •	.0034
_	2.01	0	- 0454	- 0074	0664	- 0444	.0126	.0637	- 0379	5110	.0597	-0064		00700
_	5.02		.0495	- 0257	0728	-0481	.0126	-0684	0389	-0172	.0615	.0003	9700	.0070
	100 7	00	- 0530	0628	0801	- 0510	0127	.0723	1100-	0173	.0647	66 00 -	0046	.0076
	0	207	- 0550	-1018	0859	0531	.0117	0747	1200 -	0171	.0566	0107	-,0054	.0081
	1.08	-2.98	- 1514	0162	0751	- 0514	.0158	.0751	0443	19197	.0710	0071		.0041
_		c	-0453	0137	0631	- 0453	.0133	.0631	0363	.0176	.0574	0600*-	- 0073	.0058
~	1.08	2.99	0345	0114	0487	- U345	.0110.	.0487	0277	0157	.0433	- ,0068	8700**	.0054
	0.0	6.03	- 0242	009600	0304	0242	-0092	.0304		0144	.0224	8800 -	- 0052	0800
•	60.	9.03	0082	0119	-0171	5800	.0115	0171	0101	0163	0186	-,0019	0047	.0015
•	5	-2.99	0650	- 0607	0948	- 0597	.0154	.0870	• 0 4 9 6	10194	.0795	0101	0700	• U U V 6
	50	5.0	- 0541	0633	_0805	- 0522	.0123	.0727	0407	0170	.0642	-0115	4700	.0085
	5.02	3.01	0379	- 0665	0642	-0400	.0096	, n564	0319	.0150	.0497	1800	0054	.0067
	5.02	6.01	. 0213	0683	0417	- 0274	.0078	.0339	0182	0134	.0264	0093	0056	.0075
	5.01	00.6	1210	0658	0011	.0021	.0098		- 0072	,0151		0051	0053	•0046
	1 04	00	0505	.0086	.0696	0505	.0082	.0696	<pre></pre>	, 0122	.0629	0127		.0067
	1.99	10	0543	- 0375	0803	0520	.0073	* t L U *	0414	0124	.0679	0106	0050	.0064
	. 0 .	207	0544	- 0789	.0836	0514	.0065	.0738	0416	0125	.0682	9600*-		.0055
	3.5	10	.0546	- 1001	.0855	0512	.0072	.0738	••0422	0125	.0690	0091	- ,0053	60047
	5.00	00.	0558	-1635	.0914	n515	.0071	.0739	•270	1124	.0699	••00800	0054	0700
	1.04	10.2-	0631	.0121	.0928	0631	.0117	.0928	0544	,0157	.0877	- 0087	0000-	.0051
	1 04	.01	0451	£600°	.0679	0451	6800.	.0679	0378	0126	.0629		0037	.0050
	1.04	5.00	- <u>0288</u>	0077	0449	0288	.0073	6 + + + 0 *	0211	0110	. 0360	0077	-0037	, 0068
	1.04	5,98	- 0070	.0083	0118	0070	.0079	.0118	0001	0111	.0058	0069	-,0032	9200
	50.1	10.6	0185	0115	0259	0185	.0111	0259	.0217	0128	0285	0031	0017	.0026
	3.50	-2.99	- 0784	- 0953	1143		.0113	.1025	0606	0161	.0967	0089	8700	. n058
	3.51	00	0517	0996	.0844	0484	.0077	.0727	0423	,0126	.0693		6700°-	• 0034
-	5.51	2.99	-0250	-1011	.0534	0273	.0058	.0417	0227	0107	.0398	0046	-0014	.0019
	3,50	6.00	0,028	-1010	0192	0051	.0060	.0075	- 0008	0100	.0066	0043	0040	6000 -
	3.52	0 ° 6	.0364	- 0979	0197	.0226	.0105	0317	• r 2 2 6	,0127	-,0300	0000.	0022	0016

ORIGERAL PART IS OF POOR QUALITY

ļ

I

1

TABLE 10. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t=0^\circ,$ and $\delta_h=-10^\circ$

CMN	
Z D Z	 ■ ■
CLN	0.000000000000000000000000000000000000
	01100000000000000000000000000000000000
Ĉ Ņ Å F T	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
CLAFT	 ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
۶ U	
C D	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
נו	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
F 70	
C(D=F)	1 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
CL T	► M 0M0NBM:NNH - ► 5 ► M 0M0NBM:NOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOC
ALPHA	1 14 400 M 1400 0000000000000000000000000000000000
A A A	
MACH	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

ORECALL FLORE ST OF POOR QUALINY

TABLE 11. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS AFT, $\phi_t=0^\circ,$ AND $\delta_h=0^\circ$

N F O		
NGO)))
CL N		***
CMAFT	11111111111111111111111111111111111111	
COAFT	- E & F IR NJ IR C & O IR & F F & F F F M NM NN IR IR O - & NM N F & O & O & C F NO O O O C C C O O HM & E & E & E & O & C MO F + +	3
CH AFT		5010
ч С	0 0 <td></td>	
C	- F WR D + O + F W & F W O D M C F 3 M D G 3 M O + O + F W & F W O D M C F 3 M D G 3 M O + O + O + O + O + O + O + O + O + O	102
ŭ		10124
CMT	NRUSSCHART NRUSSCHART <td>0121</td>	0121
C (D-F1	11111111 11111111111111111111111111111	- 1 6 0 •
CLT		• 1 U 8 7
AL PHA	11111 MUC 11111 M 100C 11111100 202000000000000000000000000000	0, 0
37 6 7		5.00
H J H H		- 59B

! ! | TABLE 12. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS AFT, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = -5^\circ$

U	č -
CLN	0042
CMAFT	0785
CAFT	0164
CLAFT	- 0501
X U	.0851
c	.0140
נו	••0543
121	0.851
C (D=F)	0144
CLT	- 0543
ALPHA	50°•
۲ ۵	1.06

1

2 2 0	111
C D N	M & C N K Z - M K B C C M C K K M K H NNNNNNNNNN - NMMNMNNN C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
CLN	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
CMAFT	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
CHAFT	30010000000000000000000000000000000000
CLAFT	
х U	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
C C	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
CL	M 0 − 3 0 0 F 0 N N 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 N N 0 F 0 F 0
۲×1	
C (D-F)	11111111111111111111 - 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000
CLT	IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII COCOCCOCCOCCOCCCOC
ALPHA	1 1 1 1 W 1 V N 0 2 1 1 1 2 W 1 V V V 0 C C C C C C D 0 C C C C C C C C D 0 0 C C C C
2 2 2	
н Ц е,	

ORIGANUL PUBLICA DE POOR QUALITY

TABLE 13. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t = -10^\circ, \text{ AND } \delta_h = 0^\circ$

MACH	aaN	ALPHA	CLT	C (D=F)	CHT	CL	C	Σ U	CLAFT	CHAFT	CMAFT	CLN	CDN	CMN
1.199	-94	•••	- 0136	0280	.0146	• 0136	.0276	.0146	9600	1210	0600	0100	6600 6600	.0056 2026
1,200	20°5		5910 . .	4500 - I	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		0220	. 010			- 000 -		6600°	0004
0.01				0381	0121	- 0105	.0258	.0057	0101	0175	1010	0001	0083	0044
198	8.96		- 0115	- 0602	0130	8600-	.0246	.0047	-0000	0174	0084	- 000A	0071	- 0037
1.199	.89	-3.00	0556	0311	0704	0556	.0307	.0704	046F	, 0202	.0613	-,00AB	.0105	•0041
1.200	88.	00 -	0145	.0284	0139	0145	.0280	.0139	-,0085	1210	.0075	••0060	.0104	.0063
1,200	88.	5°96	.0322	.0311	-,0437	.0322	.0307	0437	.0295	0191		.0027	.0117	.0026
1,202	.86	5.97	.0703	• r393	.0915	.0703	.0389	0915	.0585	0 2 4 B	0.872	.0118		- 0043
1,199	1 8 1	60°T	1026	.0517	- 1379	.1026	.0513	1379	.0865	5220 1	1314	.0161	0188	••00 65
1,200	1.03	=3°05	0576	0350	.0694	.0527	.0280	.0631	0480	0000	0629	• 007B	6800 °	2000
1.201	10 1		0116	-0380	2110.	0101	.0257	0049	0034	0172	61 00		.0085 0105	9200 -
1,202	20.2	200°5	0 E 4 C		- 0218		1620°	- 0.5 M -	.0315			C010.		10040 1040
			1121.	4210				1961						
										1110				
					.0100		1210			0140	7020-	2500	-0055	00.54
			0040				0110	- 0167	1010	0148	- 0214	- 0041	0018	0048
		201	0048	101	0000-	0073	0126	- 0173	0110	0145	0217	- 0035	0020	0045
809	00	-3,02	0028	0122	1200 -	A 500 -	0118	.0031	0031	10147	0083	0900	- 0020	0051
206	1.09	0.5	0056	0135	- 0153	.0056	.0131	0153	.0103	0156	• 0 2 0 8	0047	0024	.0055
.898	1.08	2,99	0133	0144	• 0254	.n133	.0140	-,0254	.0175	,0160	0328	0042	- 0200	.0074
0.00	1.08	5,99	.0263	0170	0432	.0263	.0166	0432	.0274	,0172	0503	••0011	• • 0006	.0071
. 900	1.09	8,98	.0630	.0245	092A	, n630	.0241	092A	.0562	0220		.0068	.0013	.0034
503	5,01	-3.03	- 00AZ	0635	-003A	0023	.0118	0039	.0037	0143	- 0193	0060	• 0056	0053
.899	5.01	10	.0058	-0635	1000	.0078	.0127	12121	• 0104	0120	0211	1200	- 0053	0040
.899	5° C	2.97	.0220	0618		0200	0144	0332	7660.	0158	••0364	900 0 -	• 0014	2500
898-	0 0 0	5,99	0110	- 0587	- 0476	0320	.0172	* • 5554	• 0318	0175 10175	• 0575	0032	F000 -	1200
, 898	5.04	6 0 °	.0800	-0204		\$010°		0101-	1640 -	2020		1110.	2200	9100-
109	1.04		2900 .		1010	1000 ·			# 6 0 0 -			0500	- 000 -	7700°
965						1610.								
, 599 600	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			•110•		- 0140				0004		
					1000	0117	2000	- 0175		0000	0169	0000	000	- 0007
	101	10.0	- 0076	6830	0074	- 0076	0085	0074	1500	0104	0076	200 ·	0019	0002
109	1.06	0.0	0084	0102	- 0137	.0048	.009A	-0137	2010.	0103	0154	- 0014	-000	.0017
209.	1.04	2.09	.0261	0131	0357	.0261	.0127	0357	0261	0115	.0389	.000	0013	1032
009.	100	5,99	.0539	0181	0714	.0539	.0177	• 0714	.0476	0146	.0721	.0063	0032	. 1007
. 597	1.04	R. 97	9780°	.0266	-1126	.0838	.0262	-,1126	.0711	2020	1097	.0127	0000	0030
.599	3,50	•3,03	0191	-1000	.0225	0100	.0075	.0107	0071	0103	.0102	-0029	-,002A	5000.
-601	3,50	M U .	.0087	0981	0063	.0121	1000.	•.01A1	.0110.	20102	0167	.0011	0011	0014
, 599	3.49	66°~	.0376	- 0451	- 0362	.0354	.0122	- 0480 -	•0300	0115	- 0452	.0053	6000	0028
- 59 <u>8</u>	03.0	5.97	0738		0440		•0186 •2·5		.0519	0149	0620 -	.0140	.0037	-0068
.603	3.50	89.8	.1073	0787	1150	626U°	.0268	1267	.0752	9020.	-,1164	.0187	.0062	-0103

!

1

TABLE 14. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t = 10^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = 0^\circ$

2 X U	111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111
CDN	7 L 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2
N C	<pre>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</pre>
CMAFT	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
CUAFT	
CLAFT	40 F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F
1 U	2000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000
C C	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
ر ر د ر	40000000000000000000000000000000000000
ĽμJ	11111111111111111111111111111111111111
C (J=F)	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
CLT	
АЦРНА	
01 12	WU49-4WW37-4WW3 00000000000000000000000000000000000
MACU	00N000000NN0 0000000000000000

ORIGINAL FAUE IS OF POOR QUALITY TABLE 15. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t = 20^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = 0^\circ$

-0003 .0044 • 0030 -, nU66 -0054 • 0100 -.0156 -.0217 -0008 -.0023 -,0085 .0052 .005A 0001 .0023 .0015 .0019 -.0051 2 ¥ 0 0045 0000-.0033 .003A 0030 .0027 01010 0059 .0037 0018 .0014 -.0005 0055 0027 -0025 .001A -.0013 -0005 -000B -,0025 -0045 .0019 0027 .0006 .0008 -0118 0019 -0030 .0030 .0026 -0026 -.00.52 -00ZB0014 •000°-0010 -,0024 -.0029 -,0020 °0027 0087 -.0015 0000 -__001A 0092 0184 0104 • 0023 -0023 -0014 0093 .0175 -.0031 0200 0001 0034 0094 0071 0110 1410 0131 -.0010 -.0029 -.0028 00 0105 -0037 1010 -0054 -.0036 t200 --,0043 -,0045 -.0035 .0010 - 0066 ר∠ כר .0112 .0166 .0009 .0007 080u .0148 .0194 -.0037 -.0029 -0000 -.0074 .0027 .0055 .0103 1220. -0034 .030 .0021 .0003 -,0059 6000°-.0038 -,0015 --0009 -.0029 .0123 -0012 0062 0200 -9410. .0127 -.0026 .0100 - 0017 1100 1200 -.0275 --0045 -.0108 -.0901 -.1298 -,0975 .0079 - 1444 -.0285 -.0266 -.0273 -.0740 .0161 -.0174 -.0170 -.0506 .0105 0078 5070°. ----------.0283 -,0462 • 1151 --0084 -.1209 -.0169 0600 0000 -.0266 -.0271 -,0669 -.0454 -.0832 CMAFT 0095 0081 -.0529 .0113 .0695 - 1431 -.0527 .0171 -1251 C DAFT 0165 0187 0120 0331 0165 8760 0332 0135 0128 0129 0121 0149 0172 0,235 0119 0126 9173 0236 U0R7 2000 9020 0145 0208 0166 0164 0165 0164 0193 0184 0126 0086 0.088 0088 0091 7010 0105 0141 0000 0088 0095 0164 194 CLAFT ••0103 - 0545 0155 0260 0729 .0826 .0657 .0953 .0668 .0952 0156 0145 0149 .0152 .0032 .0026 0149 .0104 .0097 0100 0300 .0343 .0605. -.0539 .0341 .0561 .0110 • · · · · · -.0113 -0092 9600 ---0095 0.691 0435 0100 0106 -.0132 0144 0113 0600 -0341 -.uSin -.0252 **-**,0228 -.0242 -__0423 -.0176 -,0182 .0179 .010A -.0155 ••0434 •.0248 •.0256 -,1282 • 0 0 0 • .0061 .0136 .0707 .0840 .0146 9110. .004A .0753 -.1015 .0055 .1660 -.0239 .0143 .0135 - 1497 -.0627 -.1145 -.0072 -.0610 -,1145 -.0047 -.0255 -.0725 -.1234 -.0136 **•**•0193 -,0551 -- 09A7 **•**1416 ž •00A9 (1297 .0107 0600. .0164 .0112 .0264 .0258 0256 .0248 0235 .0063 .0067 .0072 .0171 .017R 0515 0244 .0340 .0104 .009R 0000 .0101 6600. .0249 .0255 0059 .0260 0058 .0072 .0270 0270 0300 0.349 .0280 .0288 0507 0162 .0104 0063 0064 .0077 0108 0131 5 -,0600 5910.--.0112 -.0140 -.013A .1213 .0122 .0123 .0474 0020 .0316 6760 .0368 .0769 .0854 0100 .012A 0.062 0044 .0103 .0119 .0405 -.0162 .0162 .119 -.0121 1970. .0140 0856 .0144 .1047 .0444 0119 0134 0100 0H00-.0641 .0753 -. 0011 .0271 0402 .0033 .0121 1 - 1015 - 1497 -1597 -,0252 -,1145 -_0177 -.0077 7900 --.0155 -,0434 - J840 .0265 -,0433 -___0A6A 0124 0136 .0770 .0119 -.0564 -.0072 -,0256 -.0423 -_0647 -,1156 -0143 -,0075 .0108 -,1282 -0075 5112 · 0140 0753 -.0610 .0031 -.0005 .0130 -.0510 .1082 -_ 1201 -.0194 -_012A - 129A -.0169 0135 t ε υ 0393 -.0357 -.0276 -.0656 -0596 16004--0394 -,0799 -1011 -,1624 .0175 .0264 -.101A -,1002 - 0965 - 0347 - 0394 - *0349 -,0103 -0904 .0264 0045 0310 .0093 0135 0253 5110. -.0615 .0274 -.0663 -.1027 0111 .0166 , nn67 .0068 .00A1 -.0799 CCD-FI .0907 ... 0254 .0104 0301 4 - 064B .0464 0089.00 6760 -.0136 .0368 .1119 .1299 **6000** .0701 0059 .0233 .0769 -_____35 .0122 .0106 0109 1410. .0535 .0956 .0064 .0067 .0316 2420. -_0149 -.0129 .0271 --0092 0834 .000990134 5000. .003A .0061 -.0119 .00A9 .1184 0110---.0169 -.0162 .0641 ר י =2°08 ALPHA 2.95 .04 -2.97 ° 0 3 7 Ú * -2.97 5 0 C 6 0 C 7 C 6 0 C 200 6 U 0 0.03 03 10. 0 4 3,05 9.01 9.01 -2.95 3,02 4,02 9,00 9,00 • ۲۲ -2.98 3.04 6.02 ••03 03 0.4 .03 03 с С .03 5 .05 10. \$0° • 01 • 0 4 .52 10 60 601 20. 5.04 66. - 52 . 99 . 0 ۰° 5.0 5.5 3.51 - 90 . 89 **č** č - - N A B A A ē. 3.52 5.03 6 5 • 8 6 2 2 002 .200 **599** 201 -198 698 599 505 6 n 0 202 198 .199 201 201 006 006. 898 206 206 206 0.06 3 u 6 006 600 602 598 パロショ 201 201 901 897 901 [U 9 " 601 601 509 601 NACH

ł I I

ł

L

26

TABLE 16. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t = 20^\circ$, AND $\delta_h = -5^\circ$

MACU	8 8 7	АЦРНА	CLT	C (D=F)	F M Û	Ū	C	х С	CI AFT	CRAFT	CMAFT	v TJ	20v	r U
106	1.09	00	0325	.0124	.0519	0325	.0120	.0519	-0309	0168	.0501	0016	8400°-	100
006	2.04	- 01	0375	-000 -	.0587	0365	.0109	.0559	0330	0161	.0533	0035	-,0052	005
006	3.00	0.0	0415	0267	. 1653	- 0405	-0112	.060.	033B	.0162	.0549	0067	-,005n	900
.898	5,02	00	- 0457	- 0651	0732	0438	.0114	.0653	• 0350	0161	0581	-0019	- 0047	.007
898.	20.7	• 01	04110 -	-1037	.0791	- 0464	.0105	.057A	0372	0158	1090	0042	* *0023	1200
897	1.09	90"2-	- 0440	.0145	.0726	987U . -	.0141	.0726	0436	0180	.0702	-* n049	U03A	1 2 00 5 1
- 6 -	1.00		- 0376	0129	0545	0376	.0125	.0545	0314	0165	. 0508	2400	00040	500
. 9 n 1	00.1	60°2	0238		.034R	-0238	.0107	.034A	-0185	, n151	.0307	0053	• • 0044	.004
.899	1.04	5.09	-0108	5010.	.0118	010A	.000 B	.0118	0032	0147	.0053	0075	-00049	900
. 899	1,10	8,09	0520	01510	0372	.0250	.0147	0372	.0235	0176	0375	.0016	.0029	000
.899	00 7	•3.01	- 0649	0622	0990	05A0	.0135	.0AR1	0501	0179	.0805	- 00A9	-0043	.007
. 899	5.02	00	0471	.0651	0737	0452	•0111	.0658	0358	0158	.0541	-0003	9700 -	. 40.4
0.00	5,00	66° č	02A1	- 0566	.0523	1010-	2000.	.0445	0220	0144	.0340	-,0072	0051	.006
.899	5.04	6.0Z	00A2	0685	.0249	0143	.0079	1710.	0052	0137	1010.	- 00A1	- 005A	.007
.898	5.04	00.6	0220	0635	0190	.C17R	.0126	0269	• 0 S Q 3	,0163	• 0315	5200 -	.0037	004
. 600	1.04	00	0459	C 8 0 0 -	.0005	-,0459	.0078	.0665	• •0320	0118	.0403	0100		000
. 6 n 1	2.00	000	0505	0342	0780	04R1	.0068	.0720	0394	.0118	.0654	00A7	050	000
.598	3.02	-01	-,051A	0110	.0830	0487	• 500 *	.0730	6070°-	0210	.0673	-0078	0061	.500
.599	3,52	.01	.0510	-1016	0134U	0483	.0066	.n725	040A	0120	.0672	-,0075	••0054	°002'
599	5.03	- -	- 0535	- 1661	1160	• 0491	.0065	.0734	0421	0120	.0688	0070	0055	007
009	1.04	-3,00		.0111	• 10 d b	0624	.0107	9760"	••0566	,0154	.0903	005A	4000-	700
. 6 . 0	1,04	20	0411	, U08A	.0654	1170 -	1400.	.0654	0301	0121	.0606	0500	0037	v70v*
0.0	1.04	3.01	0211	.0077	.0376	0211	.0073	.0376	0159	.0107	.0314		-,0034	.900
600	1 0 4	ູ່ເ	0040	0000	1000	0700	9400.	0001	-00AA	0113	• • 0 0 5 P	1000	0027	.005.
1.0	1,05	66 [°] ч	.0331	.014n	-1012	.0331	.0130	2170 -	0330	0138	0433	100u .	2000	.002
- 600	3,50	-3.01	- 0792	- 0969	1179	0702	2010.	.1061	0432	, 0158	8000.	0200	-,0055	•000
	3,52	2 v *		-1009	(140).	1980-	.0070	.0723	~ 170 ~	,0122	.0678	• " U 0 1 0	0052	001
6 u]	3.52	3,00	01AR	-1023	C870.	0211	.0055	.0364	0177	, c105	- 23 A	0034	0050	• 003(
.599	3,52	6.00	.0103	-100B	2800.	.0063	.0073	0037	.00P5	0104	0056	••0054	-0031	.001
c 9	3,51	00.6	.0507	0932	0343	.0372	.0133	0461	.0337	013R	,0445	• 0 U Z A	••0004	-100

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE 17. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS FOR HORIZONTAL TAILS AFT, VERTICAL TAILS MID, $\phi_t=20^\circ,$ AND $\delta_h=-10^\circ$

N N D	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
CDM	
CLN	
CMAFT	71100000000000000000000000000000000000
CHAFT	0,0,0,3,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0
CL AFT	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
¥ ن	40000000000000000000000000000000000000
CO	- COCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOC
บี	
Γ¥Ĵ	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
C (0+F)	9 × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×
CL.7	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
ALPHA	0 C 0 0 7 C 0 0 C 0 0 0 C 0 0 0 C 0 0 0 C 0 0 0 0 C 0 0 0 0 C 0
8 2	- V W W W W W W W W
MACH	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

.

4

28

HT	VT	ϕ_t	M	$C_{D, tails}$
Mid	Forward	0	0.6	0.0032
			.9	.0031
			1.2	.0092
	Mid	0	0.6	0.0033
			.9	.0032
			1.2	.0095
Aft	Forward	0	0.6	0.0033
			.9	.0032
			1.2	.0093
	Mid	-10, 0, 10, and 20	0.6	0.0034
			.9	.0033
			1.2	.0095
	Aft	0	0.6	0.0035
			.9	.0034
			1.2	.0097

TABLE 18. TAIL DRAG COEFFICIENTS

- - -

I

:

l

٩

|



ORIGHNAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY



Figure 2. Aircraft model.

L-82-1375

(b) Vertical tails canted 20° .

Figure 2. Continued.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY



Figure 2. Concluded.





;

i


Figure 4. Location of horizontal and vertical tails.





I

I

1





I

i

i I

i I

I









Ì

1

ł

(a) Static performance.

Figure 9. Nozzle characteristics.



 $|^{r}$



Figure 9. Continued.



ł

i

ł

(c) Scheduled nozzle pressure ratios.

Figure 9. Concluded.



Figure 10. Effect of vertical tail position on afterbody aerodynamic characteristics for horizontal tails mid, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, and $\alpha = 0^\circ$.



(b) M = 0.90.

Figure 10. Continued.

n.



(c) M = 1.20.

Figure 10. Concluded.



(a) M = 0.60.

Figure 11. Effect of vertical tail position on afterbody aerodynamic characteristics for horizontal tails aft, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, and $\alpha = 0^\circ$.



_ _

(b) M = 0.90.

Figure 11. Continued.



(c) M = 1.20.

Figure 11. Concluded.



(a) M = 0.60.

Figure 12. Effect of vertical tail cant angle on afterbody aerodynamic characteristics for horizontal tails aft, vertical tails mid, and $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$.



ļ

ţ

(b) M = 0.90.

Figure 12. Continued.



(c) M = 1.20.

Figure 12. Concluded.





1 --

,

1

Ì

I

(a) M = 0.60; NPR = 1.0.

 $\mathbf{52}$

Figure 13. Continued.

(b) M = 0.60; NPR = 3.5.





Figure 13. Continued.

i

54



Figure 13. Continued.



ىي

(e) M = 1.20; NPR = 1.0. Figure 13. Continued. L









- - - - -

I



Figure 14. Continued.

(b) M = 0.60; NPR = 3.5.



ىتى

Figure 14. Continued.

| | | |



Figure 14. Continued.

(d) M = 0.90; NPR = 5.0.



لى

Figure 14. Continued.

T T



Figure 14. Concluded.





I

l i i

> i 1

.032 .028 ф Q Q .024 .020 ¤δ ð .016 പ .012 (b) M = 0.60; NPR = 3.5. R .008 30 \diamond • ⁴, ^{deg} 0 -10 20 20 20 .004 0 12 80 Q œ 800 a, deg 4 ÌO 30 0 ণ্ঠ প্ৰেৰ্ -.06 L -4 . 14 . 12 DI . .08 8 0 -.02 -. 64 8 .04 ىر

Figure 15. Continued.



Figure 15. Continued.

i



_

Figure 15. Continued.

- - -



L

i T

(e) M = 1.20; NPR = 1.0.





Figure 15. Concluded.



ł

Figure 16. Summary of effect of empennage location on total aft-end drag coefficient at $C_L = 0$ for scheduled NPR. $\phi_t = 0^\circ$.


Figure 17. Summary of effect of empennage location on individual interference drag increments at $C_L = 0$ for scheduled NPR. $\phi_t = 0^\circ$.

Vertical tails

---- Forward



Figure 18. Effect of vertical tail position on individual interference drag increments for horizontal tails mid, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, and $\alpha = 0^\circ$.



Figure 19. Effect of vertical tail position on individual interference drag increments for horizontal tails aft, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, and $\alpha = 0^\circ$.

73







Figure 21. Summary of effect of vertical tail cant angle on total aft-end zero-lift drag coefficient for scheduled NPR, horizontal tails aft, and vertical tails mid.



75



1

L

.

Figure 22. Effect of vertical tail cant angle on individual interference drag increments for horizontal tails aft, vertical tails mid, $\phi_t = 0^\circ$, and $\alpha = 0^\circ$.

4. This and Subside 5. Report Date EFFECTS OF EMPENNAGE SURFACE LOCATION 5. Report Date CON AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF A TWIN. 6. Performing Organization Code NOZZLES 50-543-90-07 7. Autor(e) 6. Performing Organization Report No. Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr. 5. Performing Organization Report No. NASA Langle Research Center 10. Work Unit No. Hampton, VA 23665 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Paper 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empenage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin- engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two different empenage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail cont dach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3 to 9. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet of to approximately 0, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers tested and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number. Tail adverse interference effects accounted for a significant precording outonal taft-end drag with tails-off than a simi	1. Report No. NASA TP-2392	2. Governme	ent Accession No.	3. Recipient's Ca	talog No.	
EFFECTS OF EMPENNAGE SURFACE LOCATION ON AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF A TWIN- ENGINE AFTERBODY MODEL WITH NONAXISYMMETRIC February 1985 ENGINE AFTERBODY MODEL WITH NONAXISYMMETRIC 6. Performing Organization Code Notation of the second	4. Title and Subtitle	1		5. Report Date		
ON AERODVNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF A TWIN- ENGINE AFTERBODY MODEL WITH NONAXISYMMETRIC February 1985 COZZLES 6. Performing Organisation Code 505-43-90-07 7. Author(s) 8. Performing Organisation Report No. L-15825 9. Performing Organization Name and Address 10. Work Unit No. NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23665 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered National Aeronautics and Space Administration Technical Paper Washington, DC 20546 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 13. Supplementary Notes 15. Sponsoring Agency Code 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract. An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin- engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration frequentiated two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozeles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from percentage of total aft-end darge. Interference effects were	EFFECTS OF EMPENNAGE SURFACE L		E have 1095			
ENGINE AFTERBODY MODEL WITH NONAXISYMMETRIC 6. Performing Organization Code 505:43:90-07 7. Autor(s) Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr. 8. Performing Organization Report No. L-15825 9. Performing Organization Name and Address NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23665 10. Work Unit No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Acconautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Paper 13. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozel pressure ratio was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozel pressure ratio was varied from percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozele readerse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.00 to a stark from -3° to 9°. Nozel total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozele were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position with axisymmetric nozeles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suzgested by Authors(s)) Tail interference [48. Distribu	ON AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTIC	VIN-	February 1985			
NO2ZLES 505-43-90-07 7. Aukor(s) Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr. 8. Performing Organization Report No. L-15825 9. Performing Organization Name and Address 10. Work Unit No. NASA Langley Research Center 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 11. Contract or Grant No. Washington, DC 20546 11. Contract or Grant No. 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. The configuration fractured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozeles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical alian cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet of to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Bit defense total aft-end dares (Interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers total aft-end dares. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tail were moved from a mid to an aft position with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(o)) 118. Distribution Statement 121. Interference Enclose at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 122. Key Wo	ENGINE AFTERBODY MODEL WITH NONAXISYN		IMETRIC	6. Performing Organization Code		
7. Autor(s) 8. Performing Organization Report No. Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr. 1. L15825 9. Performing Organization Name and Address 10. Work Unit No. NASA Langley Research Center 11. Contract or Gram No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Washington, DC 20546 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract The investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin- engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozales and twin-vertical tail solitons. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers form 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozale pressure ratio was varied from jet of opportunityly 9, depending upon Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozale were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 14. Distribution Statement. 18. Distribution Statement. Until February 1987 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 14. Distr	NOZZLES		505-43-90-07			
Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr. L-15825 9. Performing Organization Name and Address 10. Work Unit No. NASA Langley Research Center 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered National Aeronautics and Space Administration 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empenage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end acrodynamic characteristics of a twin-engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional covergent-divergent nozales and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empenage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle of tatak from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.060 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozale pressure ratio was varied from jet of to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from and to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.00, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozales had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozales at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s))	7. Author(s)			8. Performing Or	ganization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address 10. Work Unit No. NASA Langley Research Center 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered National Aeronautics and Space Administration 13. Type of Report and Period Covered 14. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin-engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. The configuration sets condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.90, advrese interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozele were generally favorable but became advress & generally favorable on an id to an aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement 19. Security Classif.(of this page) 120. Security Classif.(of this page) <td< td=""><td colspan="2">Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr.</td><td></td><td>L-15825</td><td>- ·</td></td<>	Francis J. Capone and George T. Carson, Jr.			L-15825	- ·	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address 18. NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23665 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Washington, DC 20546 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a win-engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal aft-end drag. Interference effects on a significant percentage of Mach number. Tail aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distributiog Statement Tail interference Enclose interference Empemnage location Thuno favoreloverge for a significant percentage of 0.60 a				10 Work Unit N		
MASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23665 11. Contract or Grant No. 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract 17. Sponsoring Agency Code 18. Supplementary Notes 19. Abstract 10. Abstract 11. Contract or Grant No. 11. Sponsoring Agency Code 13. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract 17. May Notes 18. Distribution Statement 19. Optimized States 10. Abstract 10. Abstract 11. Contract or Grant No. 11. Contract or Grant No. 13. Type of Report and Period Covered 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement 19. Security Classifed 17. Key Words (Suggested b	9. Performing Organization Name and Address		10. WOR One IN			
Hampton, VA 23663 11. Consoring Agency Name and Address 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered National Aeronautics and Space Administration 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 17. May Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 18. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract 16. Abstract 17. Nevertical tail Cart angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin- engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tail Cart angle of the approximately 9, depending upon Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Mit tails-off than a similar configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) Tail interference effects 18. Distributi	NASA Langley Research Center			11 Contract on C	Innat No	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Washington, DC 20546 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twinengine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an atf position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement T	nampton, VA 23005			11. Contract of Grant No.		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Technical Paper National Aeronautics and Space Administration Technical Paper 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twinengine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tail and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twinengine fighter-type configuration was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects are upper to nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement. Tail interference Empennage location Twin noise Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 19. Security Classif.(of this report) 20. Security Classif.(of this page) 21. No. of Page				13. Type of Repo	rt and Period Covered	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration International Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546 It. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes It. Sponsoring Agency Code 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin-engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle on the 30° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers tested and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozales were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal atail series moved from a mid to an aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozales had lower total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozales at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) It. Distribution Statement total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag. Interference for the nozide	12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address		Technical Paper			
14. Sponsoring Agency Code 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin-engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement Tail interference Empennage location Twin noise Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 18. Nonaxisymmetric nozzles 18. Distribution Statement 19. Security Classified 20. Security Classified (of this page) 21. No. of Page 22. Price 19. Security Classified 10. Security Classified 77 20. Price 20. Security Classified 21. No. of Page	National Aeronautics and Space Administration		Technical Taper			
13. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empennage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin-engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigations was conducted with different empennage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers tested and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozile were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement Tail interference Empennage location Twin noise Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 19. Security Classified 20. Security Classified (of this page) 12. No. of Page 22. Price Unclassified 77	Washington, DC 20546		14. Sponsoring Agency Code		gency Code	
16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empenage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin- engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empenage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9°. Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers tested and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90. 17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) Tail interference Empenage location Twin noise Afterbody drag Nonaxisymmetric nozzles 18. Distribution Statement Until February 1987 19. Security Classif.(of this report) 20. Security Classif.(of this page) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price 19. Security Classified 77 77 77	15. Supplementary Notes					
17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement Tail interference Until February 1987 Empenage location Until February 1987 Twin noise Subject Category 02 Afterbody drag Subject Category 02 19. Security Classif.(of this report) 20. Security Classif.(of this page) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price Unclassified 77 77	16. Abstract An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel to determine the effects of empenage surface location and vertical tail cant angle on the aft-end aerodynamic characteristics of a twin- engine fighter-type configuration. The configuration featured two-dimensional convergent-divergent nozzles and twin-vertical tails. The investigation was conducted with different empenage locations that included two horizontal and three vertical tail positions. Vertical tail cant angle was varied from -10° to 20° for one selected configuration. Tests were conducted at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.20 and at angles of attack from -3° to 9° . Nozzle pressure ratio was varied from jet off to approximately 9, depending upon Mach number. Tail interference effects were present throughout the range of Mach numbers tested and were found to be either favorable or adverse, depending upon test condition and model configuration. At a Mach number of 0.90, adverse interference effects accounted for a significant percentage of total aft-end drag. Interference effects on the nozzle were generally favorable but became adverse as the horizontal tails were moved from a mid to an aft position. The configuration with nonaxisymmetric nozzles had lower total aft-end drag with tails-off than a similar configuration with axisymmetric nozzles at Mach numbers of 0.60 and 0.90.					
Tail interference Empenage location Twin noise Afterbody drag Nonaxisymmetric nozzles 19. Security Classif.(of this report) Unclassified 20. Security Classif.(of this page) Unclassified 21. No. of Pages 22. Price Unclassified	17. Key Words (Suggested by Authors(s)) 18. Distribution Statement					
Emperinage location Until February 1987 Twin noise Afterbody drag Afterbody drag Subject Category 02 19. Security Classif.(of this report) 20. Security Classif.(of this page) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price Unclassified Tr Trice Trice	Tall Interference					
Afterbody drag Nonaxisymmetric nozzles Subject Category 02 19. Security Classif.(of this report) Unclassified 20. Security Classif.(of this page) Unclassified 21. No. of Pages 77 22. Price	Twin noise		Until February 19	87		
Nonaxisymmetric nozzles Subject Category 02 19. Security Classif.(of this report) 20. Security Classif.(of this page) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price Unclassified 77 77	Afterbody drag					
Subject Category 02 19. Security Classif.(of this report) 20. Security Classif.(of this page) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price Unclassified 77	Nonaxisymmetric morely					
19. Security Classif.(of this report)20. Security Classif.(of this page)21. No. of Pages22. PriceUnclassified77	1.010215ymmetric nozzies			Subject	Category 02	
13. Occurity Classified 20. Security Classified 21. No. of Pages 22. Price Unclassified 77	10 Security Classif (of this and)	00 0			00 D :	
	Unclassified	Unclassif	orassin. (of this page) led	21. No. of Pages 77	22. Frice	

į