NASA-TM-84225 19820025522

A Ground-Simulator Investigation of Helicopter Longitudinal Flying Qualities for Instrument Approach

J. V. Lebacqz, R. D. Forrest, and R. M. Gerdes

September 1982

LIBRARY COPY

SEP 1 6 1982

LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER LIBRARY, NASA HAMPTON, VIRGINIA



.

and the second sec

--

•

.

computerized functions were needed to complete the procedure: approximate analysis with the established input variables, optimization of an objective function, and refined analysis for design verification.

ENTER:

With Later

1 RN/NASA-TM-84225

DISPLAY 09/2/1 82N33398*# ISSUE 24 PAGE 3393 CATEGORY 8 RPT#: NASA-TM-84225 A-8983 NAS 1.15:84225 82/09/00 91 PAGES UNCLASSIFIED DOCUMENT UTTL: A ground-simulator investigation of helicopter longitudinal flying qualities for instrument approach AUTH: A/LEBACQZ, J. V.; B/FORREST, R. D.; C/GERDES, R. M. PAA: B/(FAA,

Moffett Field, Calif.)

CORP: National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif. AVAIL.NTIS SAP: HC A05/MF A01

MAJS: /*FLIGHT CHARACTERISTICS/*FLIGHT SIMULATORS/*GROUND BASED CONTROL/* HELICOPTER PERFORMANCE/*INSTRUMENT APPROACH/*LONGITUDINAL STABILITY MINS: / DYNAMIC STABILITY/ MICROWAVE EQUIPMENT/ STATIC STABILITY

ABA: Author

ABS: A ground-simulation experiment was conducted to investigate the direct and interactive influences of several longitudinal static and dynamic stability parameters on helicopter flying qualities during terminal-area operations in instrument conditions. Variations that were examined included five levels of static control-position gradients ranging from

.

•

A Ground-Simulator Investigation of Helicopter Longitudinal Flying Qualities for Instrument Approach

N82-33398#

J. V. Lebacqz, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California R. D. Forrest, Federal Aviation Administration Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California

R. M. Gerdes, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California



Ames Research Center Moffett Field, California 94035

-بر

• 1

A GROUND-SIMULATOR INVESTIGATION OF HELICOPTER

LONGITUDINAL FLYING QUALITIES FOR INSTRUMENT APPROACHES

J. V. Lebacqz, R. D. Forrest, and R. M. Gerdes

Ames Research Center

SUMMARY

A ground-simulation experiment was conducted to investigate the direct and interactive influences of several longitudinal static and dynamic stability parameters on helicopter flying qualities during terminal-area operations in instrument conditions. Variations that were examined included five levels of static controlposition gradients ranging from stable to unstable; two levels of dynamic stability for the long-period oscillation; two levels of the steady-state pitch-speed gradient; two levels of angle-of-attack stability and pitch-rate damping; and two levels of stability and control augmentation. These variations were examined initially in calm air and then in simulated light-to-moderate turbulence and wind shear. Five pilots performed a total of 223 evaluations of these parameters for a representative microwave landing system precision approach task conducted in a dual-pilot crewloading situation. Pilot ratings indicated (1) that the system is clearly adequate for the IMC approach in calm air for neutral and slightly unstable static controlposition gradients but that adding turbulence causes a significant degradation in system performance; (2) that high angle-of-attack stability has an adverse effect because of pitch-to-rate of descent coupling; and (3) that the steady-state pitchspeed gradient has a minimal influence.

INTRODUCTION

The increase in civil helicopter operations during the past decade has led to greater emphasis on providing a more fundamental understanding of the aeromechanics and flight-control requirements of helicopters in the flight regimes of interest. One such regime is all-weather operations, and in particular terminal-area operations in instrument meteorological conditions (IMC). As a part of their continuing efforts to provide design and airworthiness information for helicopter IMC flight, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) instituted in 1978 a joint program of analyses, ground simulation, and flight experiments at Ames Research Center. This program is directed at the following two general goals:

1. Provide analyses and experimental data to support or amplify the Airworthiness Criteria for Helicopter Instrument Flight (ref. 1), which are the final proposed appendices to FAR Parts 27 and 29, respectively (refs. 2,3).

2. Provide analyses and experimental data to determine the flying-qualities, flight-control, and display aspects required for a good helicopter IMC capability, and to relate these aspects to design parameters of the helicopter.

The first four experiments that were conducted in this joint NASA/FAA program are described in references 4-7. In the first two ground simulation experiments, the influences of neutral versus stable static control gradients and the requirements for various levels of stability and control augmentation systems (SCAS) were examined for a nonprecision very-high-frequency omnidirectional range (VOR) instrument approach task, assuming a dual-pilot crew-loading situation (no auxiliary tasks) and raw-data displays without flight directors. Cooper-Harper pilot ratings (CHPRs) indicated (1) a need for some level of SCAS above the bare airframe to ensure a level of adequate performance with tolerable workload (CHPR < 6.5) (ref. 4), (2) a requirement for attitude augmentation in pitch and roll to obtain a level of satisfactory (CHPR < 3.5) (refs. 4,5), and (3) that neutral longitudinal and lateral static stabilities were acceptable (ref. 5). In the third ground simulation experiment, the influences of flight-director display assistance and the effects of representative single-pilot auxiliary tasks on the suitability of the static stabilities and SCAS concepts considered in the first two experiments were examined in relation to precision MLS instrument approaches (ref. 6). The Cooper-Harper pilot ratings indicated, among other things, that the hypothesized trade-off between control complexity and display sophistication for equivalent levels of acceptability was evident only for combinations rated as satisfactory (CHPR < 3.5); little average improvement for control systems rated as only adequate (CHPR < 6.5) was provided by changing the display from raw-data-only to three-axis flight directors. As in the first two experiments, pitch- and roll-attitude augmentation were required for ratings of satisfactory and, for the single-pilot case, were effectively required for ratings better than marginally adequate (CHPR < 5.5).

The fourth experiment was conducted, using the variable-stability UH-1H V/STOLAND helicopter, to verify in flight some of the results of the first three ground-simulation experiments (ref. 7). Neutral and stable longitudinal static stability, rate-damping and attitude-command SCAS implementation, and raw-data and three-axis flight directors were examined for a precision MLS approach task with a dual-pilot crew-loading situation. The results of this experiment corroborated the conclusions from the ground experiments for these variables: (1) rate-damping augmentation provided an adequate but unsatisfactory system, (2) neutral longitudinal static stability provided a degraded but still adequate (with rate-damping augmentation) system, (3) attitude augmentation in pitch and roll was required to achieve a satisfactory system, and (4) three-axis flight directors provided little average improvement for the rate-damping system and a small but noticeable improvement with attitude augmentation (ref. 7).

As is indicated by this summary, the major thrust of the first four experiments was to examine the interactive influences of static stability, SCAS type, flightdirector displays, and crew loading. This focus was determined to some extent by the initial version of the IFR criteria (ref. 8), as well as industry questions concerning them and proposed alternatives (ref. 9). During the 2 years between the time the experiment reported in reference 4 was conducted and the time the experiment described in this report was conducted, the criteria set forth in reference 8 were modified and used as the proposed instrument flight rules (IFR) appendix given in reference 1. The general goal of this present experiment was to provide data in support of the final versions of the criteria on static and dynamic stability, thereby bringing to a conclusion this initial sequence of experiments.

٩.

To place the parameters selected for investigation in context, the IFR Appendix criteria dealing with static and dynamic stability from reference 1 are summarized in table 1 for normal- and transport-category rotorcraft. The category definitions are

(1) normal--9 passenger seats or fewer and less than 6,000 lb; (2) transport B--9 passenger seats or fewer, over 6,000 lb (with some additional restrictions if over 20,000 lb); and (3) transport A--10 passenger seats or more, all weights. No differentiation between transport categories A and B is made for the static and dynamic criteria, nor is any distinction made between dual-pilot and single-pilot crew load-ings for transport-category helicopters.

Three points are worth noting about these criteria. First, they are intended to assure minimum safety. It is tacitly understood that an aircraft could be certified for IFR if one of these criteria is barely met, but it is unlikely that certification would be granted if several criteria were only marginally satisfied. Second, no distinction among longitudinal, lateral, and directional characteristics is made for dynamic stability, nor is any effort made to limit interaxis coupling or to prescribe desirable rapidity of response. In addition, the requirement for a positive longitudinal static-force gradient effectively precludes an unstable aperiodic root longitudinally for most realizable situations; as a result, the dynamic criteria relating to aperiodic roots appear to be overridden by the static criteria for longitudinal motions. Third, the criteria do not address any SCAS or display requirements as a function of crew loading in terms of their influences on the flying qualities, nor is the influence of turbulence explicitly discussed, as it was in the reference 8 proposal.

For this experiment, some aspects of these criteria that were not directly addressed in the previous experiments were selected for examination. Because of the importance of glide-slope and airspeed control in terminal-area maneuvers, only longitudinal variations were considered. The intent was to have the parameters overlap those of the previous experiments in some cases so that collectively the experiments would constitute a data set pertinent to the applicability of these criteria for constant-speed helicopter IFR terminal-area operations. On this basis, the primary variables selected for investigation were

1. Longitudinal static stability, as measured by cockpit control-position gradient with speed, with variations from stable to unstable yielding unstable aperiodic responses

2. Longitudinal long-term (P > 10 sec) oscillations ranging from damped to unstable

3. Longitudinal steady-state pitch-attitude-to-speed gradient ranging from nearly neutral to highly stable

4. Longitudinal short-term pitch-attitude and angle-of-attack responses to cyclic and collective inputs

5. Longitudinal stability and control-system implementation rate and attitude command

6. Level of turbulence: none and light-to-moderate

Ę

Cooper-Harper pilot ratings were obtained from five pilots for several values of each parameter during the performance of a precision 60-knot IFR approach task, with and without simulated turbulence. The Vertical Motion Simulator (VMS) at Ames Research Center was used in conjunction with a generic nine-degree-of-freedom helicopter mathematical model to implement and examine the experimental configuration.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows. The design and conduct of the experiment to address the variables outlined above are described in the next two sections. Flying qualities results are then presented and discussed, followed by conclusions and recommendations.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. G. W. Hall, Ames Research Center, and Lt. Col. R. K. Merrill, U.S. Army, who served as evaluation pilots. In addition, the authors wish particularly to express their gratitude to Mr. P. L. G. Harper of the Civil Aviation Authority, England, and Mr. Dennis Tuck of the Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, who also served as evaluation pilots; their professionalism and interest greatly enhanced many aspects of the experiment.

DESIGN OF EXPERIMENT

Mathematical Model

The basic mathematical model used to simulate the flight dynamics of the helicopters investigated in this experiment was the same nine-degree-of-freedom model that was used in the previous ground simulator studies (refs. 4-6). The model explicitly includes the three-degrees-of-freedom tip-path-plane dynamic equations for the main rotor (ref. 10) and the six-degree-of-freedom rigid-body equations. The main-rotor model includes several major rotor system design parameters, such as flapping-hinge restraint, flapping-hinge offset, blade Lock number, and pitch-flap coupling. Simulation of different rotor systems (e.g., hingeless, articulated, and teetering) may be accomplished by appropriate combinations of those design parameters.

The model is structured to permit full state feedback to any of the four controllers (longitudinal and lateral cyclic, collective stick, and directional pedals) plus control interconnects and gearings. All feedback and control gains may be programmed as functions of flight parameters, such as airspeed. This structure permits the construction of typical SCAS networks; it may also be used as a responsefeedback variable-stability system to modify the basic characteristics of the simulated helicopters.

In the previous experiments, the rotor design and helicopter geometric parameters of the mathematical model were selected and tuned to simulate stability and control characteristics similar to those of the UH-1H, OH-6A, and BO-105 aircraft, which use teetering-, articulated-, and hingeless-rotor systems, respectively (refs. 4,5). For this experiment, only the generic teetering-rotor aircraft model was used, as in the reference 6 experiment, to reduce the scope of the study to a manageable level. Because the intent of the experiment was to focus upon variations in the longitudinal degrees of freedom, a lateral-directional SCAS consisting of a highgain rate-command-attitude-hold roll channel plus yaw-rate damping and enhanced directional weathercock stiffness was implemented for all configurations.

٩.

Experimental Configurations

For convenience in discussing the experimental configurations, they have been broken into three groups: (1) high-rate-damping, low-drag-damping; (2) high-rate-damping, high-drag-damping; and (3) low-rate-damping, low-drag-damping.

<u>Group 1: High rate-damping, low drag-damping configurations</u>—In the high ratedamping, low drag-damping group a fairly high level of pitch-rate damping ($\tau_p = 0.33$ sec) was incorporated to be consistent with the rate SCAS systems investigated in the experiment of reference 6; this pitch-rate SCAS was held constant for the configurations in this group. The variations in longitudinal dynamics and statics that were considered in this group were achieved by feedback of aircraft states to the longitudinal cyclic. Accordingly, the inherent steady-state speed-to-pitch-attitude relationship (with collective fixed) of the simulation model was unchanged by these variations. For the basic model, the steady-state attitude-to-speed gradient is very low (about 0.03°/knot), which considerably aggravates the difficulty of controlling speed. This characteristic was constant for all these configurations.

Four major types of variations were considered in this group (table 2 and Appendix A) and may be summarized as follows:

1. Static control-position stability: Variations in the static controlposition stability were achieved by feedback of airspeed to longitudinal cyclic. Five levels were considered: two stable (~1.0 in./15 knot and ~0.5 in./15 knot), one neutral (~0.0 in./15 knot) and two unstable (unstable aperiodic roots) giving times-to-double-amplitude of ~10.0 sec and ~6.0 sec.

2. Angle-of-attack stability: Each of the five levels of static controlposition stability defined in (1) was examined with two levels of angle-of-attack stability: zero, and a fairly-high stable value to give a "short-period" frequency of about 2.5 rad/sec with a damping ratio of about 0.8. These variations were achieved with feedback of the angle of attack to longitudinal cyclic. As can be seen in table 2, unlike the case with fixed-wing aircraft, the angle-of-attack stability variations had a negligible effect on the static control-position gradients for the stable and neutral gradient cases; to maintain the aperiodic instability at the same level, however, somewhat more unstable gradients were required for the two unstable cases.

3. Long-term dynamic stability: The two stable levels of static controlposition stability with both levels of angle-of-attack stability were examined with two levels of damping of the phugoid or long-term oscillation: stable ($\zeta = 0.10$), and unstable (time-to-double-amplitude of ~15.0 sec). These variations were achieved by feedback of rate-of-change of longitudinal speed (u) to the longitudinal cyclic. As is evident in table 2, this variation had a negligible effect on the phugoid frequency and a minor effect on the short-term damping.

4. Pitch-attitude augmentation: The five levels of static control-position stability in combination with zero angle-of-attack stability were considered with the pitch-rate SCAS only and also with an attitude-command SCAS. This latter stabilization system was achieved by feedback of pitch attitude to the longitudinal cyclic in addition to the pitch-rate feedback of the rate SCAS; for consistency with the experiment reported in reference 7, the level of stabilization was selected to provide an undamped natural frequency of about 1.5 rad/sec; it was constant for each of the five attitude-stabilized configurations. As shown in table 2, this stabilization augments the static control-position gradients of the baseline configurations and modifies the short-term dynamics.

The variations in this group were selected for the following reasons. With regard to the static control-position stability variations, the neutral and lower stable levels correspond to those considered for a hingeless-rotor helicopter in the

experiment of reference 5; the higher stable level was added to provide a more clearly perceptible level of static stability (the resultant phugoid frequency (~0.34 rad/sec) is still low enough to remain well separated from the short-term response dynamics). The unstable level with a 10-sec time-to-double-amplitude aperiodic root was selected to meet barely the normal-category, dual-pilot criteria; the 6-sec root level exceeds the criteria but is consistent with earlier examinations of permissible levels of static instability for transport aircraft (ref. 11).

The zero angle-of-attack stability case is effectively equivalent to the hingeless-rotor configurations examined in the previous experiments; the stable value was considered to ascertain any beneficial influences of a more "airplane-like" short-term response, as well as any deleterious influences of the pitch-to-rate-ofdescent coupling it introduced. Figure 1 illustrates this coupling for responses to a step 1-in. collective input; as can be seen, the stable value of M_w increases the peak pitch-attitude response by a factor of 5 and the velocity change by a factor of 15, thereby eliminating the uncoupled appearance of the $M_w = 0$ responses. Because the achievement of a stable control-position gradient with velocity stability (M,) in a helicopter tends to increase the frequency of the long-term roots while decreasing their damping, an unstable phugoid was examined that met the normal-category dual-pilot criteria but did not meet the transport-category criteria; an "unnatural" feedback of u was used to vary the stability of this oscillation so that equivalent levels of instability for different frequencies could be examined (see Appendix B for description of u feedback). Finally, even though the difference between a longitudinal rate-damping SCAS and pitch-attitude-command SCAS had been examined in the previous experiments (refs. 4-6), it was repeated here both for consistency among the experiments and to examine the influence of an effectively neutral stick gradient, even with attitude augmentation, which arose when the most unstable static configuration was attitude augmented.

<u>Group 2: High rate-damping, high drag-damping configurations</u>—In the high rate-damping, high drag-damping configurations (table 3 and Appendix A), the same variations in static control-position gradient (excluding the more stable value), angle-of-attack stability, and pitch-attitude augmentation were considered for an air-craft with a much higher steady-state pitch-attitude-to-speed gradient. The intent was to determine if the low attitude-speed gradient of the baseline configurations exacerbated the speed-control problems occasioned by neutral or unstable stick gradients, as was suggested in reference 6. This variation was implemented by including an additional drag force that varied linearly with velocity to add $\Delta X_u = -0.1 \text{ sec}^{-1}$ to the baseline configuration ($X_u \doteq -0.03 \text{ sec}^{-1}$). As a result of this addition, the steady-state, collective-fixed attitude-speed gradient was increased from 0.03°/knot to about 0.33°/knot for this group of configurations. A concomitant change in the power-required curve resulted from this implementation: The same torque was required at 60 knots as with the low-gradient baseline configurations, but an increase of about 12% was required for 80 knots with the modified high gradient; only a 2 percent increase was required with the baseline configurations.

4

٣

<u>Group 3:</u> Low rate-damping, low drag-damping configurations—The low ratedamping, low drag-damping configuration (table 4 and Appendix A) again included the same variations in static control-position stability, angle-of-attack stability, and long-term dynamic stability with the baseline low steady-state attitude-speed relationship, but with no pitch attitude and with reduced pitch-rate feedback. The intent here was to consider in effect an SCAS failure (in the feedback loops) of the configurations of the first group (high rate-damping, low drag-damping); in

particular, for example, the longitudinal-control sensitivity was not reduced to be consistent with the reduced pitch-rate damping. The reduced rate feedback yielded an augmented M_q of -1.0 sec⁻¹ at 60 knots, which is only slightly above the unaugmented model value; an augmented value of $M_q = -3.0 \text{ sec}^{-1}$ was used in the first two configuration groups. It is important to note that these configurations were designed such that the resulting changes in the short-term dynamics still meet the IFR criteria given in table 1 (primarily because the criteria do not specifically require a given rapidity or sensitivity for the short-term responses).

Turbulence Model

Turbulence was included as an experimental variable in addition to the stability and control variations of the 43 configurations outlined above (19 in group 1, 10 in group 2, and 14 in group 3). The purpose was to determine the influence of atmospheric disturbances on the suitability of those stability and control characteristics for IFR operations. The wind model was identical to that of reference 6, and consisted of a 10-knot crosswind which sheared in direction from 49° right to 49° left and back to 30° left over a range of 1,200 ft, starting from a range-to-go of 6,600 ft; the intent of this shear was to impose a lateral tracking perturbation in the middle of the approach to distract attention from the longitudinal tasks. Three independent Gaussian gusts (u,v,w) were generated through Dryden spectral filters and added to the wind, with break frequencies of about 0.1 rad/sec for u and v and a range from 0.06 rad/sec to 0.17 rad/sec for w, depending on altitude. The intensities used in the previous experiments (refs. 5,6) were again implemented: $\sigma_u = \sigma_v$ = 3.0 ft/sec, and σ_w = 1.5 ft/sec; in addition a higher level with intensities 1.5 times greater was available. A more complete description of this turbulence model is given in references 5 and 12.

CONDUCT OF EXPERIMENT

Equipment.

,

τ

The Vertical Motion Simulator (VMS) ground-based simulation facility at Ames Research Center was used for this experiment (fig. 2). It includes a complex movable structure that provides six-degrees-of-freedom motion, including vertical travel of ± 30 ft to enhance simulation fidelity of longitudinal motions. A visual scene from a terrain board is presented through the cab window on a color television monitor with a collimating lens. In this experiment, the approaches were made to a model of an offshore oil rig, with simulated fog obscuring the visual scene down to an altitude of 350 ft above ground level (AGL); partial clearing began thereafter, followed by re-fogging at the decision height of 300 ft AGL, thus forcing a missed approach.

The flight instruments, arranged in a standard "T" for this experiment, were conventional with the exception of the attitude indicator, which was a 5-in. unit incorporating heading (through longitudinal lines on the ball), as well as pitchroll information. Turn-rate-slip information was presented on a separate instrument. The controls consisted of cyclic stick, collective stick, and directional pedals, with force-feel characteristics provided by programmable electrohydraulic units; table 5 lists the control throws and gradient and friction forces used for all the configurations. Force trimming could be accomplished either by a momentary switch on the cyclic, which simultaneously released the forces on both cyclic axes and the

pedals, or by single-axis rate "beeper" trimmers, which were located on the cyclic stick for the cyclic and on the collective stick for the pedals.

Evaluation Task and Procedure

For this experiment, the simulated aircraft was defined to be a transportcategory dual-pilot helicopter, performing terminal-area operations in instrument conditions. The specific tasks to be accomplished for each configuration were as follows:

1. Practice MLS approaches in visual conditions

2. Dual-pilot IMC approach and missed approach

3. Second IMC approach as above, assign Cooper-Harper pilot rating (ref. 13), and make comments in response to a comment card

The approach elements consisted of MLS azimuth capture at 80 knots and approximately 1,200 ft AGL, a deceleration to 60 knots, capture of a 6° glide slope and tracking at 60 knots, and, following the re-fogging at the decision height of 300 ft AGL, execution of a missed-approach maneuver consisting of a standard-rate turn and a 1,000-ft/min climb.

During the first half of the experiment, all of the configurations were evaluated for these tasks in no turbulence; most of the configurations were then evaluated in the lower level of turbulence, and a few at the higher level. Neither the order of the configurations nor any previous ratings assigned was known to the pilots.

Scope

Five pilots participated in this experiment: two from NASA, and one each from the FAA, the Army, and the Civil Aviation Authority of the United Kingdom. A total of 223 evaluations were conducted: 138 in no turbulence, 74 in the lighter turbulence level, and 11 in the heavier turbulence level.

PILOT RATING RESULTS

Because of the volume of the data, experimental results are discussed here primarily in terms of averaged pilot ratings. This averaging is done in the interest of simplifying the discussion and highlighting major trends. It is recognized, however, that the Cooper-Harper scale is ordinal rather than interval (ref. 13), and that caution must be exercised when a large spread of ratings is averaged; in this experiment, a total spread of ±1 CHPR was rarely exceeded for a given configuration among the five pilots. The actual ratings as assigned are given in tables 6 through 11.

Influence of Long-Term Dynamics

Consider initially the influences of longitudinal control-position gradient and the concomitant variation in long-term dynamics. The data for configurations with high pitch-rate damping and low drag damping (group 1) are shown in figure 3 as Cooper-Harper pilot ratings versus the inverse of time-to-half-or-double amplitude of the long-term oscillation. In no turbulence, very little change in average rating with control-position stability is evident except for the most unstable level (that which yields the 6-sec time-to-double aperiodic root), at which point a degradation of CHPR > 1 occurs. These results extend those of reference 5 — in which no significant difference between a neutral gradient and a 0.5-in/15 knot gradient was found to include both a higher level of stability (-1.0 in./15 knot) and a low level of instability (T₂ = 10 sec).

Pilot comments indicated equivalent types of difficulty in maintaining trim speed for the neutral and mildly unstable gradients, but noted that, because of good pitch dynamics and the absence of coupling from other inputs, compensation for this deficiency was not too difficult. With the higher level of instability ($T_2 = 6$ sec), however, it was noted that speed control required considerable attention to pitch attitude, with any upsets from other inputs (such as the power change and bank-angle change for the missed approach) contributing to speed changes in excess of 10 knots. As in the previous experiments, the neutral and stable gradients were rated on average in the clearly adequate category, but not as satisfactory without improvement; attention to pitch attitude was required for some of the pilots, even with the stable gradient.

The influence of turbulence on the ratings for these configurations is also shown in figure 3. As can be seen, the effect of turbulence was minimal with the highest static gradient, but turbulence degraded the ratings increasingly as the static gradient decreased to neutral and unstable. The turbulence inputs, therefore, clearly show the benefit of static control-position stability (provided by M_u in the absence of pitch-attitude or angle-of-attack stability), with speed control in particular degrading in turbulence for the neutral and unstable configurations; the average rating of 5.3 for the neutral static configuration in turbulence is consistent with the results presented in references 5 and 6 (CHPR = 5.8 and 5.5, respectively, without the rate-command-attitude-hold lateral SCAS).

A different effect of the long-term dynamics was also considered by artificially destabilizing the phugoid root oscillations for the two levels of stable staticcontrol-position gradient; in both cases, the instability corresponds to a time-todouble-amplitude of about 15 sec. Figures 4 and 5 show the influences of the change from stable ($\zeta \doteq 0.10$) to unstable ($T_2 = 15$ sec) long-term oscillations on the timehistory responses to longitudinal cyclic inputs (fig. 4) and collective inputs (fig. 5). Note that for the time duration shown for this configuration, the major difference is about 1.5 times as much longitudinal velocity response for either input with the unstable oscillation. For comparison, the responses to step inputs in both controls for a configuration with an unstable aperiodic response ($T_2 = 10$ sec, unstable gradient) are given in figure 6, where it can be seen that the velocity responses are similar in magnitude to those with an unstable oscillation over the time region of interest.

The pilot ratings assigned to the unstable oscillation cases (with $M_w = 0$) are shown in figure 7. Also shown in figure 7 is the plotting of the pilot ratings for the same static gradients (from fig. 3) but with stable oscillations, plus the ratings for the unstable gradient yielding a long-term unstable aperiodic response with a time-to-double amplitude of 10 sec. For these configurations with no turbulence, the average rating was about 0.5 units worse than with the damped long-term oscillation; three of the five pilots indicated difficulty in maintaining speed within the desired bounds, although the comments from the other two are similar to their comments for the damped oscillation. The degrading influence of the unstable long-term oscillation was more apparent in turbulence, however, with a change in rating of over one unit compared with that of the stable cases; the pilots noted considerable difficulties in both speed and glide-slope steady-state tracking for these configurations in turbulence. Although the average ratings still fall in the adequate category, it is possible that the unstable gradient or unstable long-term dynamic configurations may not produce a sufficient margin from the CHPR = 6.5 boundary in turbulence, and that such characteristics may not be acceptable for certification.

A final variation involving long-term and steady-state characteristics was the introduction of artificially high drag damping, X_u . As was discussed, this change increased the steady-state collective-fixed attitude-speed gradient to about 0.33°/knot; this gradient was 0.03°/knot for the baseline case. A concomitant change occurs in $d\gamma/dV$, going from -0.05°/knot for the baseline cases to -0.34°/knot for the high drag cases, thereby producing operation well on the front side of the power-required curve. The change in drag damping does not, however, modify the control-position gradient with speed (unless pitch-attitude augmentation is added), so that this steady-state characteristic is the same as the baseline configurations with equivalent values of M_u . The pilot ratings for the high-drag cases ($M_W = 0$, high pitch-rate damping) are plotted in figure 8 and compared with the baseline low-drag data. As can be seen, little change in average rating is evident for the neutral or stable gradients, with a small improvement for the unstable gradient.

The pilot comments for these configurations demonstrate mixed reactions and difficulties. One of the pilots consistently rated the high-drag configurations as better than the low-drag ones, because small speed changes caused fairly significant rate-of-climb changes as a result of the increased stable $d\gamma/dV$; hence rate of climb could be well controlled using pitch attitude. However, the other pilots noted that the requirement for large power changes with speed was a detriment, particularly since the power was still the primary controller for rate-of-descent. As a result, the required changes for speed led to apparent speed-and-rate-of-descent coupling, thereby negating any advantages of more precise speed control. Consequently, in general the average ratings for the equivalent high-drag and low-drag configurations were about the same, both in no turbulence and in light turbulence.

One final note about the data in figure 8: the unstable cases shown have an unstable aperiodic root with a time-to-double amplitude of 10 sec, but the actual control-position gradient is more unstable than that of the corresponding low-drag configurations because of the influence of drag-damping on the low-frequency roots. The pilot ratings are approximately equivalent to those of the low-drag, 10-sec instability configurations, indicating that it is the magnitude of this root and not the resulting control-position gradient that has the major influence on the pilot ratings.

Influence of Short-Term Dynamics

*

7

As was discussed in the experimental design section, other variations that were considered in this experiment were aimed at modifying primarily the short-term response characteristics, either independently or in combination with modified longterm characteristics. Consider initially the influences of adding a significant level of angle-of-attack stability. As noted above, the angle-of-attack stability had only a minor influence on the control-position gradient but did introduce a well-damped "airplane-like" short-period mode. It was hypothesized that this characteristic might improve the vernier control of rate-of-descent with pitch attitude for short-term changes. Pilot comments indicated, however, that for all these configurations the angle-of-attack stability coupled through pitch attitude to large inadvertent speed changes when large changes in rate-of-descent were made with the collective; the greatest difficulty was experienced during the transition to the missed approach.

These characteristics are illustrated in figure 9 — for the configurations with the highest stable-control-position gradient — as sketches of the Bode asymptotes for pitch-attitude response to longitudinal cyclic and collective, respectively. As can be seen, a considerable amplification of the pitch response to collective (about a factor of 3 at 1 rad/sec) is introduced by the angle-of-attack stability over a wide frequency range (0.1 < ω < 3.0); it is this amplification that causes the concomitant speed variations for collective inputs. The "insidious" nature of this coupling should be noted, because any high-frequency coupling of collective pitch was eliminated with control cross-gearings.

The pilot ratings for some of the configurations with $M_w = -0.025$ are shown in figure 10 for configurations with low drag damping and high pitch-rate damping; similar trends were observed with either high drag damping or low pitch-rate damping (see table 6). As in the $M_w = 0$ cases, little influence of control-position gradient (or time-to-half-or-double amplitude) is evident until the most unstable case $(T_2 = 6)$; the ratings assigned to the $M_w = -0.025$ cases were between 0.5 and 1.5 units worse (higher number) than the $M_w = 0$ cases. Only three of these configurations with the high angle-of-attack stability were considered in turbulence. As shown in figure 10, the neutral- and unstable-gradient cases were considered inadequate for the task. Pilot comments for these configurations note considerable pitchcontrol problems coupling into poor performance of both airspeed and glide-slope tracking. Finally, one rating was obtained for a $M_{cr} = -0.025$ case with an unstable long-term oscillation (most stable control-position gradient, configuration LO6u). It indicates a considerable degradation compared with the damped-oscillation case; pilot comments indicate difficulty in controlling glide-slope as a major problem. Figure 11 shows the reason for this degradation: the unstable phugoid in combination with $M_{tr} = -0.025$ led to about 50% more speed excitation through the first one-fourth phugoid cycle than did the stable phugoid (refer to fig. 1(b)).

Influence of Stability and Control Augmentation System

A final variation, which affected both short-term and long-term characteristics, was the level of stability and control augmentation. All of the cases discussed so far had a baseline SCAS consisting of a high level of pitch-rate augmentation $(M_q \doteq -3.0 \text{ sec}^{-1})$. Two variations were considered, one with low-pitch-rate damping $(M_q \doteq -1.0)$, approximately the inherent value of the helicopter model), and one with pitch-attitude stabilization added to the high pitch-rate damping. Several of the pilot ratings are given in figure 12 to indicate trends; all of the data are provided in tables 6-11.

Ê

1

Consider initially the low pitch-rate damping cases. As was noted in the discussion of the experimental design, these configurations may be considered to represent an SCAS failure of pitch-rate and attitude characteristics, but with the stable-gradient (and stable long-term oscillation) configurations still meeting the static and dynamic criteria of reference 1. As shown in figure 12, the ratings in smooth air for these configurations range from adequate (CHPR \doteq 5.5) with stable

statics to marginally inadequate for the neutral and unstable static cases; in turbulence the ratings range from marginally adequate (CHPR = 6.2 or 6.3) to clearly inadequate. The pilot comments uniformly noted the match of pitch sensitivity to pitch damping as being much too high, which when coupled with the poor pitch predictability led to extensive pilot compensation being required to perform the tasks. These two short-term characteristics (overly sensitive, poor predictability) overshadowed to a large extent the variations in the static characteristics. The important point from a certification aspect, of course, is that the criteria as written were met by these configurations because neither control sensitivity nor short-term response predictability characteristics are specifically required.

Finally, the use of pitch-attitude augmentation around the baseline aircraft was required to obtain ratings in the clearly satisfactory category (fig. 12). This result is consistent with those obtained in all the previous experiments in this program (refs. 4-7). Pilot comments note both good short-term response and long-term stability, with the ability to fly a portion of the approach "hands-off" in smooth air. Although one of the baseline aircraft configurations was sufficiently statically unstable that the stick gradient remained unstable (positive) even after applying the attitude stabilization, it was still rated as satisfactory; again a minimal influence of the amount of stick-position stability on the pilot ratings is evident for the other configurations.

A significant degradation in average rating was exhibited for the pitch-attitude stabilized configurations in turbulence, with the ratings generally indicating a marginally satisfactory to marginally unsatisfactory suitability for the task in turbulence. The range of ratings is consistent with the dual-pilot results of reference 7 (average CHPR = 4.0); the pilot comments indicate that the wind shear in azimuth plus the turbulence degraded the lateral tracking performance noticeably for the configurations. Further, it is possible that the rate-command-attitude-hold lateral control system, in conjunction with an attitude-command longitudinal control system, led to harmony problems; an exploratory look at changing the lateral system also to attitude command improved one pilot's ratings from 4-1/2 to 3 in turbulence. Although the baseline rate-damping configuration with the most stable control gradient is not significantly worse than the best of the attitude-stabilized configurations, the attitude-stabilized results still confirm the conclusions from the previous experiments that this type of SCAS is in effect required to obtain ratings of satisfactory.

CONCLUSIONS

This piloted-simulator experiment was conducted to investigate the influence of several longitudinal stability and control parameters on helicopter flying qualities for terminal-area operations in instrument meteorological conditions. Simulated test configurations were evaluated for a precision microwave landing system approach with 6° glide slope to an offshore oil rig both in smooth air and in simulated light turbulence and variable crosswind. The baseline helicopter model was representative of a medium-weight, teetering-rotor helicopter, with parameter variations of interest being achieved through use of a simulated programmable fly-by-wire control system.

Based on the characteristics of the baseline helicopter and the implementation of the parameter variations, the following conclusions may be drawn from the results of this experiment.

1. Considering the static-gradient influences with no angle-of-attack or pitch-attitude stability and without turbulence, very little influence of position gradient was evident among the values investigated except for the most unstable. The rating range of 3-1/2 to 4-1/2 for the neutral and 0.5-in./knot configurations in smooth air is consistent with ratings assigned to equivalent configurations in previous experiments; it was shown to exist both for a more stable case (~1.0 in./15 knots) and a slightly unstable case (time-to-double-amplitude of 10 sec for the aperiodic root). In light turbulence, a clear trend of degrading suitability with reduced control-position gradient was shown by the pilot ratings, with the most stable case being effectively unchanged from the smooth-air results; however, an average rating degradation of about 1.0 was shown for the neutral and slightly u unstable gradients. Nevertheless, the slightly unstable (10-sec time-to-doubleamplitude), neutral, and stable cases were still rated on average as adequate in light turbulence. The ratings assigned the neutral and 0.5-in./15-knot configurations in light turbulence were consistent with ratings given similar configurations in previous experiments. The exclusion of neutral or slightly unstable gradients by the IFR criteria was not supported by the results of this or the previous experiments, if Cooper-Harper ratings indicating adequate performance are the basis for acceptability.

2. The unstable gradient with a 10-sec time-to-double-amplitude aperiodic root was rated as clearly adequate in smooth air (average ratings = 4.0) and adequate in light turbulence (average rating = 5.5). The unstable gradient with a 6-sec timeto-double-amplitude aperiodic root was adequate in smooth air (average rating = 5.5) but marginally inadequate in light turbulence (average rating = 6.2). These results support the IFR criteria for dual-pilot conditions in terms of allowable aperiodic roots, although the unstable control-position gradients that led to the aperiodic roots would not be permitted by the criteria.

3. For the stable-gradient cases, unstable long-term oscillations with a timeto-double-amplitude of 15 sec led to a degradation in pilot ratings of about 1.0 in light turbulence when compared with stable long-term oscillations. The ratings were about the same as those assigned to the slightly unstable gradient case — that is, in the adequate category. It is not possible on the basis of these results to verify the validity of the dual-pilot, normal-category criteria boundary on unstable oscillations (time-to-double-amplitude of greater than 10 sec), but the level investigated here, which does meet the criteria, was found to be adequate.

4. Pitch-attitude augmentation was required to achieve average ratings of satisfactory for the IMC task. No significant influence of control-position gradient was evident on the ratings except the most unstable level. Light turbulence caused significant degradation in average ratings for the pitch-attitude-augmented configurations: from clearly satisfactory in no turbulence to marginally unsatisfactory in turbulence. The range of ratings is consistent with ratings given equivalent configurations in previous experiments as is the conclusion regarding the necessity of pitch-attitude augmentation to achieve a satisfactory capability.

ŗ

ŗ,

5. The addition of angle-of-attack stability had an insignificant effect on static control-position stability, and the level used in this experiment introduced undesirable coupling of pitch attitude to rate-of-climb. The net result was a degradation in pilot rating of 0.5 to 1.0 unit in smooth air; the degradation rates higher in light turbulence. As a result, the neutral and slightly unstable-gradient cases received ratings of inadequate.

6. With a stable control-position gradient, configurations with the higher level of pitch rate-damping (0.33-sec pitch-attitude response-time constant) and no angle-of-attack or pitch-attitude stability were rated as marginally unsatisfactory; the lower level of pitch damping, used to simulate an SCAS failure (response-time constant of 1.0 sec with a corresponding increase in pitch rate for unit control deflection by a factor of about 3) was used to simulate operation with an SCAS failure and resulted in average rating degradations of about 2.0. Configurations with the lower level of pitch-rate damping were rated marginally inadequate to inadequate in light turbulence.

7. The addition of artificial drag damping had mixed effects: speed control with pitch attitude was improved, but speed-power coupling increased also. No net change in pilot rating resulted.

APPENDIX A

CONFIGURATION CHARACTERISTICS

Details regarding the evaluation configurations are given in Tables 12 and 13. The stability and control derivatives of the configurations are given in firstorder form in table 12 for a 60-knot, level-flight condition. The elements of the matrices include the body-axes stability/control derivatives, plus lumped gravitational/kinematic terms; in addition, the influence of \dot{u} feedback is included as modified values of these parameters in the manner described in appendix B.

Table 13 summarizes the longitudinal eigenvalues and transfer-function numerators of the evaluation configurations. The notation used to indicate the values of the poles and zeroes is:

 $\Delta(S)$ characteristic equation

٢

r,

 N_i^i transfer-function numerator of i response to j input

 $K(S + 1/\tau)(S^2 + 2\zeta wS + w^2) \Rightarrow K(1/\tau)(\zeta;w)$

APPENDIX B

INFLUENCE OF u FEEDBACK

Consider the longitudinal linearized equations of motion in a stability-axis system for longitudinal cyclic inputs:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{q} \\ \mathbf{\theta} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{\mathbf{u}} & X_{\mathbf{w}} & X_{\mathbf{q}} & -\mathbf{g} \cos \theta_{\mathbf{0}} \\ Z_{\mathbf{u}} & Z_{\mathbf{w}} & +\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{0}} + Z_{\mathbf{q}} & -\mathbf{g} \sin \theta_{\mathbf{0}} \\ M_{\mathbf{u}} & M_{\mathbf{w}} & M_{\mathbf{q}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{q} \\ \mathbf{\theta} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} X_{\delta ES} \\ Z_{\delta ES} \\ M_{\delta ES} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{\delta_{ES}}$$

Now let u be fed back through the longitudinal cyclic:

$$\delta_{ES} = k_{u} \dot{u} + \delta_{ES_{c}}$$

Then:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - X_{\delta ES} k_{u}^{*} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -Z_{\delta ES} k_{u}^{*} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -M_{\delta ES} k_{u}^{*} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ d \\ \theta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{u} & X_{w} & X_{q} & -g \cos \theta \\ Z_{u} & Z_{w} & u_{o} + Z_{q} & -g \sin \theta \\ M_{u} & M_{w} & M_{q} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \\ q \\ \theta \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} X_{\delta ES} \\ Z_{\delta ES} \\ M_{\delta ES} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}^{\delta ES_{c}}$$

To write this equation in "conventional" first-order state-variable form, we multiply through by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - X_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -Z_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -M_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{1 - X_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{Z_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*}}{1 - X_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*}} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{M_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*}}{1 - X_{\delta ES} k_{\mathbf{u}}^{*}} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\dot{u}} \\ \mathbf{\dot{w}} \\ \mathbf{\dot{q}} \\ \mathbf{\dot{\theta}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\ddot{x}}_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{\ddot{x}}_{\mathbf{w}} & \mathbf{\ddot{x}}_{\mathbf{q}} & -\mathbf{g}\cos\theta_{0} \\ \mathbf{\ddot{z}}_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{\ddot{z}}_{\mathbf{w}} & \mathbf{u}_{0} + \mathbf{\ddot{z}}_{\mathbf{q}} & -\mathbf{g}\cos\theta_{0} + \mathbf{\ddot{z}}_{0} \\ \mathbf{\ddot{M}}_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{\dot{M}}_{\mathbf{w}} & \mathbf{\ddot{M}}_{\mathbf{q}} & -\mathbf{g}\cos\theta_{0} + \mathbf{\ddot{z}}_{0} \\ \mathbf{\dot{M}}_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{\dot{M}}_{\mathbf{w}} & \mathbf{\dot{M}}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{\dot{M}}_{\theta} \\ \mathbf{\dot{\theta}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{q} \\ \mathbf{\theta} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\overline{X}}_{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}} \\ \mathbf{\ddot{z}}_{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}} \\ \mathbf{\ddot{M}}_{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \delta_{\mathrm{ES}_{\mathrm{C}}}$$

where

$$\overline{X}_{i} = \frac{X_{i}}{1 - X_{\delta ES} k_{u}} \qquad i = u, w, q, \theta, \delta_{ES}$$
$$\hat{Z}_{i} = Z_{i} + Z_{\delta ES} k_{u} \overline{X}_{i}$$
$$\hat{M}_{i} = M_{i} + M_{\delta ES} k_{u} \overline{X}_{i}$$

As can be seen from this equation, the influence of the u feedback is to modify all of the terms in the state and control matrices. Note in particular the addition of a "pitch-attitude-stability" from \hat{M}_{θ} , as well as the modified values for M_u and M_w . For this reason, the aircraft characteristics given in appendix A show all derivatives to be different for the stable and unstable long-term oscillation cases.

It is important to recognize that although all of the individual derivatives are effectively modified by using this type of feedback, the way they are changed relative to each other has different influences on the resulting characteristics than would individual changes. As a primary example, since the feedback in question is of u, there should be <u>no</u> change in the steady-state gradient of stick position with velocity; individual feedbacks of u, w, or θ all change this gradient, however, and so it is the <u>ratios</u> as determined by the equations above that are important. In particular, it is straightforward to show that

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}}{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}}\Big|_{\mathrm{SS}} = \begin{vmatrix} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}} & \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{w}} & -\overline{\mathbf{g}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}} & \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathrm{w}} & \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\theta} \\ \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{\delta_{\mathrm{ES}}} & \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathrm{w}} & \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{\theta} \end{vmatrix} \qquad (\text{for } \theta_{0} = 0)$$

$$\frac{|\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{w}}}{|\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{w}}} & \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{w}} & -\overline{\mathbf{g}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathrm{u}} & \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathrm{w}} & \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\theta} \\ \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathrm{u}} & \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathrm{w}} & \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{\theta} \end{vmatrix}$$

	x ses	Xw	-g			
:	z _{δes}	z _w	0			
	M _{ôes}	Mw	0	- no influence of	•	feedback
	x.,	X.,	-g	, no influence of	u	recuback
	Zu	v Z _w	0			
	Mu	Mw	o			

For the range of u feedback considered in this experiment, the primary influence was therefore on the damping of the long-term roots, with a minor influence on the frequency and damping of the short-term roots. As an initial approximation to the effect, consider a hovering cubic with feedback having yielded an effective M_u:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{g} \\ -\mathbf{s}\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{q}}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{\theta} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_{\delta} \end{bmatrix} \delta$$

The characteristic equation is

 $s^{3} + (-M_{q} - X_{u}) s^{2} + (M_{q}X_{u} + gM_{u}) s + gM_{u} = 0$

Then the Bairstow approximation is

$$\lambda^2 \stackrel{\circ}{=} \frac{gM_u}{M_q + X_u}$$

therefore,

$$(-M_q - X_u) s^2 + (M_q X_u + \frac{M_u g}{M_q + X_u} + gM_u) s + gM_u = 0$$

As can be seen, the influence of m_{11}^{\bullet} is to change the "phugoid" damping term by

$$\Delta(2\zeta_{ph}\omega_{ph}) = \frac{gM_{\dot{u}}}{-M_{q}} = \frac{gM_{\dot{u}}}{-M_{q}}$$

To the level of accuracy of the approximation, therefore, the feedback has no influence on the undamped natural frequency of the oscillating roots in the cubic. This expression was used to estimate the levels of feedback required, following which computer studies using the full longitudinal equations were conducted to select the exact levels.

- 1. Rotorcraft Regulatory Review Program Notice No. 1; Proposed Rulemaking. Federal Register, Vol. 45, No. 245, 18 Dec. 1980.
- Federal Aviation Regulation Part 27 Airworthiness Standards: Normal Category Rotorcraft. Federal Aviation Administration, Feb. 1965.
- 3. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 29 Airworthiness Standards: Transport Category Rotorcraft. Federal Aviation Administration, Feb. 1965.
- Forrest, R. D.; Chen, R. T. N.; Gerdes, R. M., Alderete, T. S., and Gee, D. R.: Piloted Simulator Investigation of Helicopter Control Systems Effects on Handling Qualities during Instrument Flight. Paper No. 79-26, 35th Annual National Forum of the American Helicopter Society. Washington, D.C., May 1979.
- 5. Lebacqz, J. V., and Forrest, R. D.: A Piloted Simulator Investigation of Static Stability and Stability/Control Augmentation Effects on Helicopter Handling Qualities for Instrument Approach. Paper No. 80-30, 36th Annual National Forum of the American Helicopter Society, Washington, D.C., May 1980.
- Lebacqz, J. V.; Forrest, R. D.; Gerdes, R. M.; and Merrill, R. K.: Investigation of Control, Display, and Crew-Loading Requirements for Helicopter Instrument Approach. AIAA Paper No. 81-1820, Albuquerque, N.M., Aug. 1981.
- Lebacqz, J. V.; Weber, J. M.; and Corliss, L. D.: A Flight Investigation of Static Stability, Control Augmentation, and Flight Director Influences on Helicopter IFR Handling Qualities. Paper No. 81-25, 37th Annual National Forum of the American Helicopter Society, New Orleans, La., May 1981.
- 8. Airworthiness Criteria for Helicopter Instrument Flight. Federal Aviation Administration draft, 15 Dec. 1978.
- Airworthiness Criteria for Helicopter Instrument Flight. Helicopter Association of America revision to FAA proposals 151, 413, submitted at FAA Rotorcraft Regulatory Review Program, New Orleans, La., 10-14 Dec. 1979.
- 10. Chen, R. T. N.: A Simplified Rotor System Mathematical Model for Piloted Flight Dynamics Simulation. NASA TM-78575, 1979.
- 11. Snyder, C. T.; Fry, E. B.; Drinkwater, F. J. III; Forrest, R. D.; Scott, B. C.; and Benefield, T. D.: Motion Simulator Study of Longitudinal Stability Requirements for Large Delta Wing Transport Airplanes during Approach and Landing with Stability Augmentation Systems Failed. NASA TM X-62,200, 1972.
- 12. Aiken, E. W.: A Mathematical Representation of an Advanced Helicopter for Piloted Simulator Investigations of Control System and Display Variations. USAAVRADCOM TM80-A-Z-2, Apr. 1980.
- 13. Cooper, G. E.; and Harper, R. P., Jr.: The Use of Pilot Rating in the Evaluation of Aircraft Handling Qualities. NASA TN D-5153, 1969.

۴

٢,

Characteristic	Normal (single pilot)	Normal (dual pilot)	Transport (single and dual)
l. Trim	1. All forces trim to zero	1. Same	1. Same
2. Static longitudinal	2. Demonstrate positive force stability ±20 knots from trim for climb, cruise, slow cruise, descent, approach	 Demonstrate positive force stability ±20 knots from trim for cruise, approach 	2. Same as "Nor- mal single pilot"
3. Static lateral/ directional	 Stable directional con- trol position; no neg- ative dihedral apparent through force or posi- tion 	3. Same	3. Same
4. Dynamic stability (all axes)	 4. Period P < 5 sec: damp to 1/2 amplitude in < 1 cycle Period 5 < P < 10: damp to 1/2 amplitude in < 2 cycles Period 10 < P < 20: damped Period P > 20 or aperiodic: double amplitude > 20 sec 	 4. • Period P < 5 sec: damp to 1/2 ampli- tude in < 2 cycles • Period 5 < P < 10: damped • Period P > 10 or aperiodic: double amplitude > 10 sec 	4. Same as "Nor- mal single pilot"

.

2

TABLE 1.- SUMMARY OF STATIC AND DYNAMIC CRITERIA FROM REFERENCE 1

Low X_u , $M_q = -3.0$, Stable oscillations SS: Control position gradient, in/15 kt (λ): $s + \lambda$ [ζ ; ω]: $(s^2 + 2\zeta \omega s + \omega^2)$ Group 1S: $M_w = 0, M_\theta = 0$ $M_{\rm cr} = -0.025, M_{\rm H} = 0$ $M_{w} = 0, M_{\theta} = 2.25$ L01S L06S L11 Stable (2.92)(1.33)[0.10;0.34] [0.79; 2.46] [0.10; 0.27](1.91)(1.50(0.78)(0.22))2 SS = -1.03SS = -1.05SS = -1.08L02S L075 L12 Stable (2.95)(1.33)[0.10;0.24][0.79; 2.47] [0.11; 0.20](1.72(1.59)(0.98)(0.10))1 SS = -0.53SS = -0.55SS = -0.58L03 L08 L13 Neutral (3.00)(1.33)[0.17;0.057] [0.79;2.49][0.13;0.057] [0.99;1.61](1.14)(0.011)SS = -0.03SS = -0.05SS = -0.08L04 L09 L14 Unstable (3.01)(1.33)(0.07)[0.99; 1.61](1.16)(0.0014)[0.79; 2.49](0.069)1 (-0.062)(-0.061)SS = +0.03SS = +0.053SS = -0.01L05 L10 L15 Unstable (3.01)(1.33)(0.12)[0.79; 2.49](0.096)[0.99; 1.61](1.19)(-0.016)2 (-0.11)(-0.10)SS = +0.125SS = 0.138SS = 0.092Group 1U: Low Xu, Mq = -3.0, unstable oscillations LOIU L06U $\sigma = 0.043$ $\sigma = 0.046$ Stable (3.24)(1.35)[-0.13;0.34] [0.84;2.61][-0.17; 0.28] 2 SS = -1.03SS = -1.05L02U L07U $\sigma = 0.050$ $\sigma = 0.048$ Stable 1 (3.25)(1.35)[-0.21;0.24) [0.83;2.60](-0.24;0.20] SS = -0.53 $SS = -0.55^{\circ}$

TABLE 2.- EXPERIMENTAL CONFIGURATIONS: GROUP 1

21

ę

TABLE 3.- EXPERIMENTAL CONFIGURATIONS: GROUP 2

Group 2: High X_u , $M_q = -3$					
	$M_w = 0, M_\theta = 0$	$M_w = -0.25, M_{\theta} = 0$	$M_{\rm W} = 0, M_{\rm H} = -2.25$.		
Stable gradient	L16 (3.05)(1.34)[0.20;0.24] SS = -0.53	L20 [0.80;2.49][0.29;0.196] SS = -0.55	L24 (1.75)(1.57)(0.96)(0.22) SS = -1.23		
Neutral gradient	L17 (3.02)(1.33)[0.94;0.06] SS = -0.03	L21 [0.79;2.49][0.89;0.04] SS = -0.04	L25 [0.99;1.62](1.14)(0.12) SS = -0.73		
Unstable 2	L18 (3.01)(1.33)(0.19) (-0.075) SS = +0.125	L22 [0.79;2.49](0.17) (-0.063) SS = 0.145	L26 [0.99;1.61](1.20)(0.085) SS = -0.55		
Unstable 3	L19 (3.01)(1.33)(0.18) (-0.066) SS = +0.10				

Group 3S: Low X_u , $M_q = -1.0$ stable oscillations				
	$M_{W} = 0$	$M_{\rm W} = -0.025$		
Stable 2	L28S (0.96)(1.31)[0.10;0.59] SS = -1.03	L33S [0.51;1.89][0.10;0.36]		
Stable 1	L29S (0.98)(1.30)[0.099;0.43] SS = -0.53	L34S [0.50;1.90][0.13;0.26] SS = -0.53		
Neutral	L30 (1.09)(1.25)[0.009;0.098)	L35 [0.51;1.92][-0.0041;0.075]		
	L31	L36		
Unstable 1	(1.07)(1.26)(0.063)(-0.063)	[0.51;1.92](0.073)(-0.069)		
	L32 -	L37		
Unstable 3	(1.05)(1.27)(0.12)(-0.11)	[0.51;1.92](0.10)(-0.11)		
	Group 3U: Low X _u , M _q =	-1.0, unstable oscillations		
Stable 2	L28U $\sigma = 0.047$ (1.25) (1.25) [-0.086;0.54] SS = -1.03	L33U σ = 0.050 [0.55;1.91][-0.14;0.37]		
Stable 1	L29U $\sigma = 0.045$ (1.23) (1.23) [-0.11;0.40]	L34U σ = 0.045 [0.54;1.92][-0.17;0.26]		

ŝ

TABLE 5.- COCKPIT CONTROLLER CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Pitch	Roll	Yaw	Collective
Maximum throw, in	±5.6	±5.5	±3.2	10
Gradient, lb/in	0.5	0.5	3.0	0
Breakout, 1b	1.0	1.0	3.0	0
Hysteresis, 1b	0.75	0.75	1.6	2 ^a

^aAdjustable

TABLE 6.- PILOT EVALUATION DATA: GROUP 1, LO1-L15 NO TURBULENCE

.

د

Ľ

٨

LOIS	LOIU	LO6S	L06U	L11
3 1/2 (G-11/24) 4 1/2 (H-11/26) 4 (M-12/2) 3 (P-12/5) 3 1/2 (T-12/9)	3 (G-12/1) 6 (H-12/2) 3 1/2 (P-12/8) 4 1/2 (T-12/10) 4 (M-12/18)	4 1/2 (G-17/3) 5 1/2 (M-12/5)	7 (G-12/5)	2 (G-12/3) 2 1/2 (P-12/5) 2 (T-12/9) 2 (H-12/15) 2 (M-12/18) L11 +
				2 (P-12/11)
L02S	L02U	L07S	L07U	L12
3 (G-11/24) 3 (H-11/26) 5 1/2 (M-12/1) 3 (P-12/3) 4 (T-12/9) 5 (M-12/18)	3 (G-11/24) 4 1/2 (M-12/1) 5 1/2 (H-12/2) 4 1/2 (P-12/3) 5 (T-12/9)	5 1/2 (G-12/1) 4 (H-12/2) 3 1/2 (M-12/5) 5 (P-12/8) 5 1/2 (T-12/10)		2 (G-12/3) 2 (P-12/11)
	L03	L08	L13	
	5 (G-11/24) 5 1/2 (H-11/26) 4 (M-12/1) 4 (P-12/5) 3 1/2 (T-12/9)	5 1/2 (G-12/1) 5 1/2 (H-12/2) 5 (P-12/8) 4 (T-12/10) 4 1/2 (M-12/18)	3 (G-11/24) 2 (H-11/26) 3 (M-12/1) 2 (T-12/9)	
	L04	L09	L14	
	4 (G-11/24) 4 (H-11/26) 3 1/2 (M-12/3) 4 1/2 (P-12/5) 4 (T-12/9)	6 1/2 (G-12/1) 4 1/2 (M-12/3) 5 (P-12/8) 3 (T-12/10) 5 (H-12/15)	2 1/2 (G-12/1 3 (M-12/3))
	L05	L10	L15	
	5 1/2 (G-11/24) 6 (H-11/26) 5 (M-12/2) 5 (P-12/5) 6 (T-12/9)	6 1/2 (G-12/3)	4 (G-11/2 3 (H-11/2 2 1/2 (M-12/2 3 (P-12/8 2 (T-12/9	4) 6)))

Note: (I - j/k) = pilot identification and date; Lll+designates attitude command in roll.

TABLE 7.- PILOT EVALUATION DATA: GROUP 2, L16-L26, NO TURBULENCE

L16	L20	L24	
3 1/2 (G-11/26) 5 (H-12/1) 3 (M-12/3) 4 1/2 (P-12/8) 3 1/2 (T-12/10)	5 (G-12/3)	2 1/2 (G-11/26) 1 1/2 (H-12/1) 3 1/2 (P-12/8) 2 (T-12/10)	
L17	L21	L25	
3 1/2 (G-11/26) 3 (M-12/3) 4 1/2 (P-12/8) 4 (T-12/10) 5 1/2 (H-12/15)	6 1/2 (G-12/5)	2 (G-11/26)	
L19	L22	L26	
4 (G-11/26) 6 (H-12/1) 3 (M-12/3) 5 1/2 (P-12/8) 2 1/2 (T-12/10) 4 1/2 (P-12/11)	3 1/2 (M-12/3) 6 1/2 (G-12/3)	2 (H-12/1) 2 1/2 (M-12/3) 2 (G-12/5) 3 1/2 (P-12/8) 2 (T-12/10) 3 (P-12/10)	
L18			

Note: Pilot identification in parentheses.

TABLE 8.- PILOT EVALUATION DATA: GROUP 3, L28-L37, NO TURBULENCE

L28S	L28U	L33S	L33U
4 (G-11/24) 5 (H-11/26) 6 (M-12/2) 5 1/2 (P-12/5) 6 (T-12/9)	6 1/2 (H-11/26) 5 (G-12/1) 6 (P-12/8) 6 (T-12/9)	6 1/2 (G-12/3)	5 (G-12/5)
L29U	L29u	L34S	L34U
5 (G-12/1) 6 1/2 (H-12/2) 4 (M-12/3) 5 (P-12/8) 7 (T-12/9)	5 (G-12/4)		
	L30	L35	
	6 (G-12/1) 6 1/2 (H-12/2) 6 (P-12/8) 6 (T-12/9	7 (G-12/3)	
	L31	L36	
	7 (G-12/1) 6 1/2 (P-12/8) 7 (T-12/9) 7 (H-12/15) 6 (M-12/18)	7 (G-12/5)	
	L32	L37	
·	6 1/2 (G-11/24) 7 (M-12/2) 6 1/2 (H-12/2) 6 (P-12/5) 5 (T-12/9)		

£

Note: Pilot identification in parentheses.

•

TABLE 9.- PILOT EVALUATION DATA: GROUP 1, LO1-L15, TURBULENCE

LOIS		LOIU	LO6S	LOGU	L11
5 (P-1) 3 (T-1) 6 HVY (T-1) 3 (G-1) 4 1/2 (H-1) 3 1/2 (M-1)	2/9) 2/11) 2/16) 2/16) 2/16) 2/18)	5 1/2 (P-12/16) 4 (G-12/17) 6 (H-12/19)			2 (H-12/15) 3 (M-12/18) 4 (M-12/19)HVY 4 1/2 (P-12/9) 3 (T-12/10) 3 (T-12/10) 3 (T-12/11) 4 1/2 (T-12/11)HVY 3 (G-12/11) 4 (P-12/11) L11+ 3 (P-12/11) 4 1/2 (P-12/11)HVY
L02S		L02U	L07S		L12
5 (P-12 2 1/2 (T-12 4 (G-12 6 (H-12 4 (M-12 5 HVY (M-12	2/9) 2/10) 2/11) 2/15) 2/18) 2/19)	6 (P-12/9) 3 (T-12/10) 5 1/2 (G-12/11) 5 1/2 (H-12/15) 6 1/2 (M-12/18) 7 HVY (M-12/19)	5 1/2 (G-12/16) 5 (H-12/19)		3 1/2 (G-12/15)
		L03	L08	L13	
		5 1/2 (P-12/9) 4 (T-12/10) 5 1/2 (G-12/15) 6 1/2 (M-12/18) 5 (H-12/19)	7 (6-12/16)	4 1/2 (P-12 3 1/2 (G-12 4 (H-12	/10) /15) /19)
		L04	L09	L14	
		6 (P-12/9) 4 (T-12/10) 6 (H-12/15) 5 1/2 (G-12/15) 6 (M-12/18) 6 HVY (M-12/19)	7.5 (6-12/16)	3 1/2 (6-12	/16)
		L05	L10	L15	
		6 1/2 (P-12/9) 4 1/2 (T-12/11) 7 1/2 (T-12/11) H 7 (G-12/16) 6 (H-12/16) 7 (M-12/18)	νy	5 (P-12) 3 (G-12) 4 1/2 (M-12) 5 HVY (M-12)	/9) /16) /18 /19)

Notes: Pilot identification in parentheses; HVY indicates higher level of turbulence.

TABLE 10.- PILOT EVALUATION DATA: L16-L26, TURBULENCE

-

1

	L16	L20	L24
5 5	(P-12/10) (G-12/17)		4 1/2 (P-12/10)
	L17	L21	L25
5	(P-12/10)		
	L19	L22	L26
6 4	(P-12/10) (G-12/17)		4 1/2 (P-12/10)
	L18		
	-		

Note: Pilot identification in parentheses.

TABLE 11.- PILOT EVALUATION DATA: GROUP 3, L28-L37, TURBULENCE

L28S	L28U	L33S	L33U
7 (P-12/9) 4 1/2 (T-12/11) 6 1/2 (G-12/16) 6 (H-12/16) 7 (M-12/18	6 1/2 (P-12/10)		
L29S	L29U	L34S	L34U
6 (P-12/10) 6 1/2 (G-12/17)	6 1/2 (G-12/15)		
	L30	L35	
	7 (P-12/10)		
	L31	L3 <u>6</u>	
	7 (P-12/10)		
	L32	L37	
r	7 (P-12/9) 5 (T-12/11) 7 1/2 (T-12/11) 7 1/2 (G-12/16) 7 1/2 (M-12/18)	9 HVY (T-12/11) HVY	
TABLE 12.- STABILITY AND CONTROL DERIVATIVES: 60 KNOT LEVEL FLIGHT

.

.

CONFIGURATION LO1U

F MATRI	IX IS			··· .	· · · ·		
U	V	Q	THETA	v	Ρ	PHI	R
70008E-01 19110E 00 .11497E-01 .00000E 00 22521E-01 80793E-02 .00000E 00 .10602E-01	.14719E-Ø1 1319ØE Ø1 94533E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 37489E-Ø2 4Ø198E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 49112E-Ø2	.11876E Ø2 .14Ø69E Ø3 31142E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 34668E-Ø1 .82694E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .54351E-Ø1	33455E Ø2 49Ø97E Ø1 .24115E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 13878E ØØ 20118E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .12995E ØØ	.6958ØE-Ø3 247Ø3E-Ø1 .17821E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø78E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47332E-Ø1	93315E ØØ 30264E Ø1 .15038E ØØ .Ø0000E ØØ 11846E Ø2 10042E Ø2 .10000E Ø1 15010E Ø1	.17656E-Ø1 3%922E ØØ .116Ø7E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82873E ØØ	.11861E Ø1 .83886E-Ø1 2757ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97517E Ø2 .511Ø5E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35396E Ø1
G MATE	RIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19876E Ø1 56826E Ø1 .37474E ØØ	.55Ø95E ØØ 97167E Ø1 .41Ø36E-Ø2	29528E-Ø2 .51719E-Ø1 19744E-Ø4	.30744E-01 .10021E-02 36684E-02	:			
.00000E 00 21566E 00 31262E-01 .00000E 00 .20194E 00	.00000E 00 80156E-01 38747E-01 .00000E 00 .34698E-01	.00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00 .13848E 00	.80808E 88 11827E 81 29981E 88 .88888E 88 .86568E 88				i -

31

4

.

.

•

.

CONFIGURATION LOIS

F MATRIX IS

.

4

1

...

.

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
64496E-Ø1 17534E ØØ .1Ø457E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 21922E-Ø1 79926E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ42E-Ø1	.1356ØE-Ø1 13223E Ø1 .12397E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38746E-Ø2 4Ø381E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 47935E-Ø2	.10941E 02 .13802E 03 29379E 01 .10000E 01 13613E 00 14625E-01 .00000E 00 .14936E 00	30820E 02 .26213E 01 25548E 00 .00000E 00 .14703E 00 .21314E-01 .00000E 00 13768E 00	.641Ø1E-Ø3 24859E-Ø1 .2815ØE-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47337E-Ø1	85968E ØØ 28163E Ø1 .13653E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11838E Ø2 1ØØ4ØE Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø85E Ø1	.16266E-Ø1 31319E ØØ .37817E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82859E ØØ	.10927E Ø1 18312E ØØ .14851E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ 97527E Ø2 .50958E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35301E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
18311E Ø1 52352E Ø1 .34523E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 19868E ØØ 288Ø1E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.50757E 00 98408E 01 .12282E-01 .00000E 00 84863E-01 39429E-01 .00000E 00	27203E-02 .52384E-01 63578E-04 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10459E 01 .00000E 00	.28323E-Ø1 59187E-Ø2 3212ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1183ØE Ø1 29985E ØØ				~
.186Ø4E ØØ	.391Ø6E-Ø1	.13846E ØØ	.86585E ØØ				

1

1.4

١

•

i.

4

2

•

.

CONFIGURATION LO2S

	F MATRI	X IS					••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	· .
	U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
	37915E-Ø1	.13789E-Ø1	.11125E Ø2	31336E Ø2	.65174E-Ø3	874Ø8E ØØ	.16571E-Ø1	.111Ø8E Ø1
	99561E-Øl	13216E Ø1	.13855E Ø3	.11464E Ø1	24923E-Ø1	28576E Ø1	3126ØE ØØ	13Ø81E ØØ
	.54537E-Ø2	.8121ØE-Ø4	29724E Ø1	15822E ØØ	.26533E-Ø4	.13926E ØØ	.32236E-Ø3	.11412E-Ø1
	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.10000E 01	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØJØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.00000E 00
	20322E-01	-:38520E-02	11625E ØØ	.910601-01	11050E 00	1184ØE Ø2	.22269E Ø2	97525E Ø2
	63929E-02	40362E-02	11/31E-01	.13202E-01	210//E-01	10041E 02	62585E Ø1	.50987E 00
	.00000E 00	.00000E 00 - 49176E-02	120775 00	- 952545-01	.00000E 00	- 150705 01	•00000E 00	- 38939E-ØI
ω	.115306-01	-,401/02-02	.130772 00	052042-01	.4/33/E-01	15070E 01	020021 00	323196 01
	G MATR	IX IS						
	DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P			•	
	18618E Ø1	.51599E ØØ	27467E-Ø2	.28759E-Ø1				
	53228E Ø1	98174E Ø1	.52252E-Ø1	44Ø31E-Ø2				
	.351Ø1E ØØ	.1Ø699E-Ø1	58278E-Ø4	32998E-Ø2				
	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.00000E 00	.ØØØØØE ØØ				
	2Ø2Ø1E ØØ	83924E-Ø1	.16555E Ø1	11829E Ø1				
	29289E-Ø1	39284E-Ø1	.10458E Øl	29984E ØØ				
	.000001 00			.000005 00				
	.18310F NN	.JUZ44E-01	.138465 80	.005/9E 00		i		

CONFIGURATION LO2U

F MATRIX IS

£

4

.

.

	J	w a	THET	A V	Р	PHI	R
4896 1882 .6928 .8888 2865 6448 .8888 .1184	5E-Ø1 .148 3E ØØ 131 3E-Ø2 127 ØØ .ØØØ 3E-Ø1 373 3E-Ø2 4Ø1 3E ØØ .ØØØ 3E-Ø2 4Ø1 3E ØØ .0ØØ 3E-Ø1 493	98E-Ø1 .12020 85E Ø1 .14110 97E-Ø3 31412 ØØE ØØ .10000 16E-Ø2 19127 87E-Ø2 .23506 ØØE ØØ .00000 .002.000 .39830	E Ø233858E E Ø36Ø623E E Ø1 .31716E E Ø1 .ØØØØØE E-Ø118253E E-Ø226464E E ØØ .ØØØØØE E-Ø1 .17Ø91E	Ø2 .7Ø418E Ø1 24773E ØØ .16646E ØØ .069000E ØØ 11059E -Ø1 21076E ØØ .00000E ØØ .47332E	-Ø394441E -Ø13Ø586E -Ø4 .15252E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ11847E -Ø11ØØ42E ØØ .10ØØØE -Ø114999E	ØØ .179Ø4E-Ø Ø1 3Ø879E ØØ .7Ø977E-Ø ØØ .22269E Ø2 .22269E Ø2 .62585E Ø1 .ØØØØE Ø1 .82875E	1 .12002E 01 0 .12472E 00 454396E-02 0 .00000E 00 297516E 02 1 .51128E 00 0 .38939E-01 035410E 01
	G MATRIX IS						
DE	TA E DE	LTA C DE	LTA A DELT	A P			
2011 5751 .3792 .0000 2182 3164 .0000 .2043	5E Ø1 .557 1E Ø1 969 5E ØØ .287 7E ØØ .800 7E 8Ø 794 5E-Ø1 386 ØE ØØ .808 3E ØØ .340	51E ØØ 29677 87E Ø1 .5162Ø 17E-Ø2 1661Ø 100E ØØ .000ØØ 19E-Ø1 .16555 31E-Ø1 .10458 100E ØØ .000ØØØ 12E-Ø1 .13848	E-Ø2 .31Ø73E E-Ø1 .22127E E-Ø4 37361E E ØØ .80000E E Ø1 11827E E Ø1 29980E E ØØ .00000E E ØØ .80000E E ØØ .80556E	- Ø 1 - Ø 2 - Ø 2 Ø Ø Ø Ø Ø Ø Ø Ø			• •••

•

1

-s., 1

CONFIGURATION LO3

F MATRIX IS

4

--

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
10490E-01 21470E-01 .292022-03 .00000E 00 18621E-01 47766E-02 .00000E 00 .12927E-01	.14083E-01 13208E 01 .25341E-04 .00000E 00 38222E-02 40329E-02 .00000E 00 48478E-02	.11366E Ø2 .13923E Ø3 3Ø18ØE Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 9ØØ4ØE-Ø1 79384E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1Ø621E ØØ	32Ø17E Ø2 79894E ØØ 29936E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .17227E-Ø1 .2497ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 16132E-Ø1	.66394E-Ø3 24788E-Ø1 .23592E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47335E-Ø1	89306E 00 29110E 01 .14281E 00 .00000E 00 11842E 02 10041E 02 .10000E 01 15051E 01	.16908E-01 31139E 00 .25838E-03 .00000E 00 .22269E 02 62585E 01 .00000E 00 82864E 00	.11351E Ø1 62&37E-Ø1 .68532E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97523E Ø2 .51Ø25E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35344E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19022E Ø1 54382E Ø1 .35863E ØØ .00000E ØØ 20638E ØØ 29913E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ .19325E ØØ	.52725E ØØ 97843E Ø1 .857Ø1E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 8269ØE-Ø1 39Ø95E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .37111E-Ø1	28357E-Ø2 .52Ø82E-Ø1 42327E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13847E ØØ	.29422E-Ø1 27756E-Ø2 34193E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86574E ØØ	5:			

ω

CONFIGURATION LO4

F MATRI	XIS						
U	W	Q	THETA	V	P	PHI	R
66998E-Ø2 1Ø66ØE-Ø1 42173E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ 18388E-Ø1 456Ø3E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .131Ø7E-Ø1	.14162E-Ø1 132Ø6E Ø1 .10753E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø79E-Ø2 40274E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48539E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83975E-Ø1 7Ø856E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ47E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.41763E-Ø3 24763E-Ø1 .518Ø4E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1ØØ46E ØØ 185Ø9E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .39913E-Ø1	89744E ØØ 29235E Ø1 .14364E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 10Ø41E Ø2 .10ØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16913E-Ø1 31115E ØØ .25548E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62586E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.11408E Ø1 45763E-Ø1 .57942E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 97522E Ø2 .51036E Ø0 .38939E-Ø1 35350E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19117E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 20739E ØØ 3ØØ56E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.52984E ØØ 9777ØE Ø1 .8Ø835E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82439E-Ø1 39Ø78E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	28104E-02 .52042E-01 46439E-04 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00 .1847F 00	.29568E-Ø1 23584E-Ø2 34468E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	:::			

1

36

•

.

1

12

CONFIGURATION LO5

•

F MATRI	IX IS						
U	v	Q	THETA	: v	P	PHI	R
19054E-02 .31131E-02 13250E-02 .00000E 00 18084E-01 42838E-02 .00000E 00 .13331E-01	.14147E-Ø1 132Ø6E Ø1 .13458E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38130E-Ø2 4Ø313E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48557E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83952E-Ø1 7Ø5Ø6E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ53E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.41075E-03 24858E-01 .53697E-04 .00000E 00 10046E 00 18506E-01 .00000E 00 .39915E-01	89747E ØØ 29242E Ø1 .14367E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.17026E-01 31133E 00 .23714E-03 .00000E 00 .22269E 02 62585E 01 .00000E 00 82865E 00	.11407E Ø1 45943E-Ø1 .57934E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19117E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø739E ØØ 3ØØ54E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19422E ØØ	.52986E ØØ 9777ØE Ø1 .8Ø776E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82431E-Ø1 39075E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .3683ØE-Ø1	283Ø1E-Ø2 .52Ø42E-Ø1 41254E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13847E ØØ	.29539E-Ø1 22Ø12E-Ø2 3445ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29982E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86571E ØØ	29.			

.

37

.

.

.

-

.

¢

4

•

38

.

CONFIGURATION LO6S

F MATI	RIX IS						
U	¥	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
65582E-Ø1 17836E ØØ .1Ø661E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 22Ø44E-Ø1 8Ø116E-Ø2 .SØØØØE ØØ .1Ø153E-Ø1	.1437ØE ØØ 95138E ØØ 24373E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .42291E-Ø2 .35627E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16492E-Ø2	.11125E Ø2 .13855E Ø3 29725E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 11621E ØØ 1171ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13Ø77E ØØ	31337E Ø2 .11448E Ø1 15812E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .91ØØ5E-Ø1 .13197E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 852Ø6E-Ø1	.65079E-03 24923E-01 .26728E-04 .00000E 00 11060E 00 21077E-01 .00000E 00 .47337E-01	874Ø7E ØØ 28574E Ø1 .13926E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 1184ØE Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø7ØE Ø1	.16527E-Ø1 31241E ØØ .32828E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82861E ØØ	.11109E Ø1 13076E ØØ .11405E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ 97525E Ø2 .50986E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35319E Ø1
G MA	TRIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
18619E Ø1 53227E Ø1 .35102E ØØ .00000E ØØ 20203E ØØ 29296E-Ø1 .000002E ØØ	.51602E 00 98164E 01 .10686E-01 .00000E 00 83919E-01 39291E-01 .00000 00	27563E-Ø2 .52Ø96E-Ø1 55838E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1	.28759E-Ø1 44Ø16E-Ø2 32999E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29984E ØØ				.

۹.

,

- · • •

.

CONFIGURATION LO6U

F MATRIX IS

.21294E ØØ

.31633E-Ø1

· •

.1385ØE ØØ

۹

۴

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
73828E-Ø1 2Ø193E ØØ .12216E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 22939E-Ø1 81414E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1Ø991E-Ø1	.16176E ØØ 89973E ØØ 27779E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .61896E-Ø2 .3847ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 18646E-Ø3	.12524E Ø2 .14254E Ø3 32362E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 .35573E-Ø1 .1Ø3Ø1E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11345E-Ø1	35277E Ø2 1Ø12ØE Ø2 .58474E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 33655E ØØ 488Ø3E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .3151ØE ØØ	.73263E-Ø3 24689E-Ø1 .113Ø1E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø59E ØØ 21Ø76E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47329E-Ø1	98397E ØØ 31716E Ø1 .15998E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11852E Ø2 1ØØ42E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 14959E Ø1	.18605E-01 30647E 00 63506E-04 .00000E 00 .22269E 02 62585E 01 .00000E 00 82882E 00	.12505E 01 .26855E 00 14929E-01 .00000E 00 97510E 02 .51206E 00 .38939E-01 35461E 01
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
20960E 01 59920E 01 .39516E 00 .00000E 00 22743E 00 32980E-01 .00000E 00	.58091E ØØ 9631ØE Ø1 15468E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 76879E-Ø1 3827ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	31029E-02 .51105E-01 .95024E-05 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00	.32376E-Ø1 .59363E-Ø2 39817E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11825E Ø1 29978E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ				

.86543E ØØ

CONFIGURATION L07S

.

.

4

,

1	Μ	A	Т	R	I	X	I	S	

.

40

••

.

U	Ŵ	Q	THETA	v	Р	PHI	R
38059E-01 99972E-01 .54807E-02 .00000E 00 20334E-01 63940E-02 .00000E 00 .11542E-01	.14424E ØØ 94993E ØØ 24474E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .42899E-Ø2 .35733E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1596ØE-Ø2	.11167E Ø2 .13867E Ø3 298Ø4E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 11171E ØØ 11104E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .12645E ØØ	31455E Ø2 .8Ø676E ØØ 13583E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .78165E-Ø1 .11329E-Ø1 .8ØØØØE ØØ 73197E-Ø1	.65805E-03 24822E-01 .25046E-04 .00000E 00 11060E 00 21077E-01 .00000E 00 .47338E-01	87743E ØØ 28671E Ø1 .13987E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 1184ØE Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø67E Ø1	.16579E-Ø1 31242E ØØ .31984E-Ø3 .ØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82863E ØØ	.11153E Ø1 11897E ØØ .1Ø6Ø1E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97525E Ø2 .5Ø993E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35324E Ø1
G MATR	RIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
18689E Ø1 53428E Ø1 .35234E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 20276E ØØ 29387E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .18988E ØØ	.51809E 00 98107E 01 .10300E-01 .00000E 00 83709E-01 39247E-01 .00000E 00 .38055E-01	27763E-Ø2 .52067E-Ø1 5234ØE-Ø4 .00000E ØØ .16555E Ø1 .10459E Ø1 .00000E ØØ .13847E ØØ	.289%6E-Ø1 42512E-Ø2 3322%E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29984E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	1.1			

a

æ

.

- 1

.

CONFIGURATION LO7U

F MATRI	IXIS						
U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
42506E-01 11269E 00 .63191E-02 .00000E 00 20016E-01 64640E-02 .00000E 00 .11994E-01	.16109E 00 90174E 00 27651E-01 .00000E 00 .61184E-02 .38383E-02 .00000E 00 11627E-03	.12471E Ø2 .1424ØE Ø3 32264E Ø1 .1000ØE Ø1 .29851E-Ø1 .94137E-Ø2 .0000ØE ØØ 61139E-Ø2	35131E Ø2 97007E Ø1 .5571ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 3206ØE ØØ 46466E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .30022E ØØ	.73494E-Ø3 246Ø2E-Ø1 .1Ø55ØE-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø59E ØØ 21Ø76E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .4733ØE-Ø1	97996E ØØ 316Ø2E Ø1 .1592ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11851E Ø2 1ØØ42E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 14963E Ø1	.18516E-Ø1 3Ø688E ØØ 45374E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82882E ØØ	.12456E Ø1 .25358E ØØ 13968E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97511E Ø2 .51198E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35456E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
20872E Ø1 59671E Ø1 .39351E ØØ .00000E ØØ 22645E ØØ 32821E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ .21206E ØØ	.57863E ØØ 96377E Ø1 1113ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 77142E-Ø1 38296E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .319Ø4E-Ø1	31007E-02 .51139E-01 .88192E-05 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10459E 01 .00000E 00 .13850E 00	.32284E-Ø1 .54Ø49E-Ø2 39588E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11826E Ø1 29979E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86546E ØØ				- 410

41

*

æ

.

.

.

•

ĸ

4

CONFIGURATION LO8

	F MATRI)	K IS	·····	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-		
	U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
42	10438E-01 21307E-01 .28231E-03 .00000E 00 18616E-01 47762E-02 .00000E 00 .12922E-01	.1461ØE ØØ 94456E ØØ 24825E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .44928E-Ø2 .36Ø28E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .14Ø6ØE-Ø2	.11310E 02 .13908E 03 30074E 01 .10000E 01 96106E-01 88223E-02 .00000E 00 .11188E 00	3186ØE Ø2 34942E ØØ 59579E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .34286E-Ø1 .49694E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 321Ø7E-Ø1	.66068E-03 24813E-01 .24365E-04 .00000E 00 11060E 00 21079E-01 .00000E 00 .47336E-01	88868E ØØ 28981E Ø1 .14198E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11841E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø56E Ø1	.16792E-Ø1 31145E ØØ .2781ØE-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82864E ØØ	.11294E Ø1 77969E-Ø1 .79155E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97523E Ø2 .51Ø17E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35338E Ø1
	G MATR	IX IS						
	DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
	18929E Ø1 54117E Ø1 .35687E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 20537E ØØ 29766E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19232E ØØ	.52464E ØØ 97917E Ø1 .9Ø598E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82995E-Ø1 39151E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .37372E-Ø1	27828E-Ø2 .51964E-Ø1 49163E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13847E ØØ	.29288E-Ø1 31889E-Ø2 33921E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86575E ØØ	•			

1

٠.

H.

.

.

CONFIGURATION L09

F MATRIX IS

.

.

....

U	W	Q	THETA	v	р	PHI	R
47777E-Ø2 51885E-Ø2 78348E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ 18262E-Ø1 44478E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13195E-Ø1	.14754E ØØ 94040E ØØ 25098E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ .46503E-Ø2 .36259E-Ø2 .00000E ØØ .12592E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 8397ØE-Ø1 7Ø892E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ46E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.4137ØE-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .52525E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 185Ø7E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .39915E-Ø1	89751E ØØ 29236E Ø1 .14365E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 18Ø41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.1697ØE-Ø1 31115E ØØ .24644E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.11407E Ø1 45763E-Ø1 .58035E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 97522E Ø2 .51035E Ø0 .38939E-Ø1 35350E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						•
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19117E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 20742E ØØ 3ØØ7ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19422E ØØ	.52978E ØØ 9777ØE Ø1 .8Ø932E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82413E-Ø1 39Ø61E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36836E-Ø1	283Ø1E-Ø2 .52Ø42E-Ø1 42832E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13848E ØØ	.29568E-Ø1 23584E-Ø2 34468E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86572E ØØ	¥!	·		

CONFIGURATION L10

F MATRIX IS

ĸ.

ą

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	' PHI	R
.11792E-Ø4 .849Ø2E-Ø2 16854E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 17959E-Ø1 41728E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13416E-Ø1	.14754E ØØ 94Ø43E ØØ 25Ø97E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .46495E-Ø2 .36253E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .12587E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 30286E Ø1 .1000ØE Ø1 83960E-Ø1 70753E-Ø2 .0000ØE ØØ .10048E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.41862E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .51781E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 185Ø8E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .39915E-Ø1	89745E ØØ 29245E Ø1 .14365E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 10041E Ø2 .10000E Ø1 15047E Ø1	.1697%E-Ø1 31115E ØØ .24618E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82865E ØØ	.11408E Ø1 45943E-Ø1 .57828E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø33E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P	,			
19116E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 20741E ØØ 3ØØ63E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19422E ØØ	.52983E ØØ 97768E Ø1 .8Ø835E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82412E-Ø1 39Ø67E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36823E-Ø1	28202E-02 .51885E-01 43959E-04 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00 .13848E 00	.29568E-Ø1 23584E-Ø2 34466E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29982E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .8657ØE ØØ	:::.	Y		•

١

ŧ

٠

14

.

CONFIGURATION L11

F MATRIX IS

*

U	W	Q	THETA	v	Р	PHI	R
67330E-01 18347E 00 .10992E-01 .00000E 00 22230E-01 80301E-02 .00000E 00 .10327E-01	.14148E-Ø1 13206E Ø1 .1294ØE-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø92E-Ø2 4Ø287E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48553E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 30286E Ø1 .1000ØE Ø1 83974E-Ø1 70834E-Ø2 .0000ØE ØØ .10048E ØØ	20175E 02 .32953E 02 22591E 01 .00000E 00 .76113E 00 .68871E 00 .00000E 00 .55011E 00	.41862E-Ø3 24763E-Ø1 .51691E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 18046E ØØ 185Ø8E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .39913E-Ø1	89745E ØØ 29236E Ø1 .14364E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31Ø97E ØØ .2467ØE-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62586E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.11407E Ø1 45943E-Ø1 .58063E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 97522E Ø2 .51034E Ø0 .38939E-Ø1 35350E Ø1
G MA	TRIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19117E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 30Ø62E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19422E ØØ	.52987E ØØ 97768E Ø1 .8Ø758E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82434E-Ø1 39Ø75E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36835E-Ø1	283Ø1E-Ø2 .51885E-Ø1 42381E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13848E ØØ	.29568E-Ø1 23584E-Ø2 34468E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86572E ØØ				- 44

.

.

CONFIGURATION L12

F-MATRI	x-15-						
- U		Q	THETA		p	рнт	R -
38932E-01	•14150E-01	•11422E 02	20175E 02	•41370E=03	89746E 00	•16913E*01	•11407E 01
10256E-00		•13940E-03- -•30286E 01		•52435E-01	•14365E 00	+31097E 00 +25393E+03	•58035E-02
	+0000E 0C +38129E-02		•COOCCE-00 •76117E 00	•00000E CO •10046E 00	•00000E 00 ••11842E 02	•0000gE 00 •22269E 02	•00000E 00 •97522E 02
•00002 00					•10041E 02 •10000E 01 •15047E-01	•00000E 00 •82866E 00	•38939E=01 •35350E=01
	-1x-1s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • · · ·		·		
	-DELTA-C	BELTA A	DEL TA P	•			· <u>····</u> ·····
*•19116E 01	•52981E 00	••28399E+02	•29578E-01				
•36040E 00	.80853E-02	-+40803E-04	34470E-02				A
+0c000E-00- 2c741E CO		•16555E 01	*•11828E 01				
•00000E 00	+0CÖOCE 00 +36851E=01-	•00000E c0 •13846E-00	+00000E 00 +86572E-00			un trata a su companya da	
				• • • • • • • •			

.

÷

46

.

.

3

۴.

ъ

.

.

CONFIGURATION L13

F-MATRIX-IS

10

.

- u	\ 	Q ~~	THETA	v	Р	рнт	R
1c541E-C1	• 14154E=01	•11422E_c2	• 20175E 02	•41567E=03	••89752E 00	•16902E•01	•11407E 01
.3c147E-C3	• 1206 1E • 04	- 30286E C1	22591E 01	•52255E•04	14366E 00	+25703E+03	+58027E+02
-+00000E-00- -18630E-01		+10000E-01 -+83957E-01	•00000E 00 •76117E 00	• 10046E 00	+0000cE-00 -+11842E 02	•00000E 00 •22269E ,02	•97522E 02
• OCOOE 00	•00000E 00 •48562E=02	•00000E co •10047E-00	•00000E 00 •55011E-00	• 00CCOE 00 • 39915E=01	•10000E 01 •15047E-01	•00000E 00 •82866E-00-	•38939E*01 •38939E*01 ••35350E-01
GMATR	-1x-19						
-DELIA-E	DELTA C	DELTA-A	DELTA-P				
•19116E 01	+52983E 00	++27908E=02	.29578E-01				
-+5+653E-01		52042E-01					
• 360 % 1E 00	•80°14E=02	••49595E=04					
2c74oE 00	*+82404E=01	+16555F of	-11828E 01				
3c063E-01		•10458E-01					
•00000E 00	.00000E 00	+00000E 00	.0000CE 00				
-+19421E-00-	+36837E-01	+13848E_co					

•

CONFIGURATION L14

----F-MATRIX-IS-

¥.

à

- U	h	0	THETA	Α	<u>Р</u>	PHI	R
67028E-02	• 14157E=01	•11422E c2	-20175E 02	•41370E=03	-+89751E 00	•16958E=01	*11408E 01
421C1E+C3	•11677E+04	30286E 01	22591E 01	•52570E=04	14365E 00	•24799E+03	•57942E-02
-+00000E-00			•76113E 00 •68871E-00	• 10C46E 00 • 185c8E-01		•00000E-00 •22269E 02 •••••2585E 01	+ 97522E 02
•0COCOE 004	•00000E 00 	•00000E 00 •10047E-00	•0000CE 00 •55010E-00	• COCCOE 00 • 39915E-01	+1000cE 01 +15047E-01	•0000E ·00 •82867E 00	•38939E+01 +35350E-01-
	1x-13			<u></u>	*	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
DELIA-E		DELTA-A	DELTA-P			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
19116E C1	•52978E 0C	••28399E=02	+29568E-01				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
•36041E CO	•80925E-02	•••1254E=04	34466E=02				
2c739E 00		•16555E 01	11828E 01				
• 0CÔCOE CO • 19423E-00	• 0CÖODE 00	•00000E 00	•0000CE 00 +86572E-00			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·····

٧

۲

ŧ

۹

.

.

CONFIGURATION L15

.

F MATRIX IS

.

, **e**

r

·.

.

-U	W	<u> </u>	THETA	····· V	P	PH1	R -
• 26532E • 04	•14158E=01	•11422E c2	20175E 02	•41665E=03	89745E 00	•16879E+01	•11407E 01
-16883E-02	•11677E=04	-•30286E 01	*•2259iE 01	++24842E+01 +52728E+04	•.29244E 01 •14367E 00		+58025E=02
			•000CCE 00 •76119E 00	•000C0E 00 •10C46E 00	+0000CE-00 +11842E 02	•00000E 00 •22269E 02	•00000E 00 ••97522E 02
• 0COCCE 00 	•00000E 0C	•00000E co •10052E-00	+00000E 00 +55011E-00	+000COE 00 +39915E=01	+1000cE 01	•00000E 00 •82865E 00	•38939E=01 •38939E=01 ••35350E=01
	1x 15		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				·····
-DELTA-E	DEF14-C	DELTA-A	CELTA-P				
19117E C1	•52982E 0C	-•28202E-02	•29539E-01				
•36041E 00	•80 ⁹ 14E=02	-+42832E+C4	*•3445CE=02				
		•00000E co •16555E c1		······································			
3C061E*G1			• 29982E-00				
-+124555-00		•00000E 00 ••••13847E00	•86571E-00	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

49

CONFIGURATION L16

F MATRI	IX IS		· ···· · ·· ·· ···	·····			
U	w	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
13891E ØØ 1Ø253E ØØ .56461E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø415E-Ø4 64Ø43E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1162ØE-Ø1	.14164E-Ø1 132Ø6E Ø1 .1ØØØ9E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø92E-Ø2 4Ø292E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48562E-Ø2	.11423E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 839Ø5E-Ø1 7Ø749E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ4ØE ØØ	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67607E-03 24779E-01 .21979E-04 .00000E 00 11060E 00 21078E-01 .00000E 00 .47335E-01	89749E ØØ 29235E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 18Ø41E Ø2 .10ØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.17026E-01 31133E 00 .23714E-03 .00000E 00 .22269E 02 62585E 01 .00000E 00 82866E 00	.11404E 01 45763E-01 .57906E-02 .00000E 00 97522E 02 .51036E 00 .38936E-01 35350E 01
G MATE	RIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 3ØØ57E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19422E ØØ	.52984E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8Ø8Ø8E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82388E-Ø1 39Ø45E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36838E-Ø1	75665E-Ø2 .52356E-Ø1 .5Ø632E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .18464E Ø1 .1Ø942E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 12987E-Ø2	.29676E-Ø1 22012E-Ø2 34522E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 11829E Ø1 29984E Ø0 .00000E Ø0 .86576E Ø0	· •			

.

¥

.

50

.

4

4

.

•

.

•

CONFIGURATION L17

F MAT	RIX IS						
U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
11052E 00 21509E-01 .30151E-03 .00000E 00 18615E-01 47753E-02 .00000E 00 .12922E-01	.14162E-Ø1 13207E Ø1 .11114E-Ø4 .Ø0000E Ø0 38081E-Ø2 40281E-Ø2 .Ø0000E Ø0 48552E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.1141ØE Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58097E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38936E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MA	TRIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54652E Ø1 .36Ø4ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 3ØØ51E-Ø1 .0980ØE ØØ .19424E ØØ	.52986E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8Ø78ØE-Ø2 .8ØØØØE ØØ 82425E-Ø1 39071E-Ø1 .8ØØØØE ØØ	76058E-02 .52356E-01 .51060E-03 .00000E 00 .18464E 01 .10942E 01 .00000E 00 -12835E-02	.29686E-Ø1 22Ø12E-Ø2 3452ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29984E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ				•

CONFIGURATION L18

F MATRI	X 15						
U	W	۵	THETA	. V	P	PHI	R
101885 00 .312885-02 132515-02 .000005 00 180685-06 428005-02 .000005 00 .133185-01	.14162E-Ø1 13207E Ø1 .11114E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38081E-Ø2 4Ø281E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48552E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 18Ø41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.11410E Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58097E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 97522E Ø2 .51034E Ø0 .38936E-Ø1 35350E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54652E Ø1 .36Ø4ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø74ØE ØØ 3ØØ51E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19424E ØØ	.52986E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8Ø78ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82425E-Ø1 39Ø71E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36831E-Ø1	76058E-02 .52356E-01 .51060E-03 .00000E 00 .18464E 01 .10942E 01 .00000E 00 12835E-02	.29686E-Ø1 22012E-Ø2 34520E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 11829E Ø1 29984E Ø0 .00000E Ø0 .86575E Ø0	. . : .			

.

52

.

8

•

.

~~

CONFIGURATION L19

F MATRIX IS

U	Ŵ	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
10360E 00 10238E-02 10008E-02 .00000E 00 18180E-01 43809E-02 .00000E 00 .13238E-01	.14162E-Ø1 132Ø7E Ø1 .11114E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø81E-Ø2 4Ø281E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48552E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.1141ØE Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58Ø97E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38936E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1

G MATRIX IS

1

DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P
19116E Ø1	.52986E ØØ	76Ø58E-Ø2	.29686E-Ø1
54652E Ø1	97773E Ø1	.52356E-Ø1	22Ø12E-Ø2
.36Ø4ØE ØØ	.8Ø78ØE-Ø2	.51Ø6ØE-Ø3	3452ØE-Ø2
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
2074ØE ØØ	82425E-Ø1	.18464E Ø1	11829E Ø1
3ØØ51E-Ø1	39Ø71E-Ø1	.1Ø942E Ø1	29984E ØØ
.00000E 00	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
.19424E ØØ	.36831E-Ø1	12835E-Ø2	.86575E ØØ

1.

.

.1Ø942E Ø1

.ØØØØØE ØØ

-.12835E-Ø2

.

1

.

.

.

CONFIGURATION L20

F MATRIX IS

	U	W	Q	THETA	v	Р	PHI	R
÷								
	13891E ØØ 10245E ØØ	.14755E ØØ 94Ø5ØE ØØ	.11422E Ø2 ·	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244F Ø1	.16958E-Ø1	.1141ØE Ø1
	5646ØE-Ø2	25Ø98E-Ø1	3Ø286E Ø1	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.21979E-Ø4	.14358E ØØ	.24851E-Ø3	.58Ø97E-Ø2
• • •	ØØØØØE Ø Ø	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.10000E 01	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
	2Ø415E-Ø1	.465Ø5E-Ø2	83874E-Ø1	.ØØØØØE ØØ	11Ø6ØE ØØ	11842E Ø2	.22269E Ø2	97522E Ø2
1	64Ø44E-Ø2	.36259E-Ø2	~.7Ø564E-Ø2	.ØØØØØE ØØ	21Ø79E-Ø1	1ØØ41E Ø2	62585E Ø1	.51Ø34E ØØ
•	NUNNHE NN	.NNNNNE NN	.999996 90	.00000E 00	. BRANKE BR	.10000E 01	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.38936E-Ø1
•	110195-01	.125886-02	.10041E 00	.NONNNE NN	.4/334E-ØI	1504/E ØI	82866E ØØ	35350E Ø1
	G MATR	IX IS						
	DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
	19116E Ø1	.52986E ØØ	76Ø58E-Ø2	.29686E-Ø1				
	54652E Ø1	9777SE Ø1	.52356E-Ø1	22Ø12E-Ø2				
· .	36Ø4ØE ØØ	.8Ø78ØE-Ø2	.51Ø6ØE-Ø3	3452ØE-Ø2	• ·			
	ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ			· · ·	
j - .;	2Ø74ØE ØØ	82425E-Ø1	.18464E Ø1	11829E Ø1				

-.29984E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86575E ØØ

-.30051E-01 .00000E 00 .19424E 00

-.39071E-01 .00000E 00

.36831E-Ø1

r

JJ

•

.

~

CONFIGURATION L21

F MATRIX IS

տ Մ

.

.

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
11052E 00 21509E-01 .30151E-03 .00300E 00 18615E-01 47753E-02 .00000E 00 .12922E-01	.14755E ØØ 94050E ØØ 25098E-01 .00000E ØØ .46505E-02 .36259E-02 .00000E ØØ .12588E-02	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 30286E Ø1 .1000ØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 70564E-Ø2 .0000ØE Ø0 .10041E Ø0	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.1141ØE Ø1 46564E-Ø1 .58Ø97E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38936E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATI	RIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54652E Ø1 .3604ØE ØØ .00000E ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 30051E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ	.52986E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8Ø78ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82425E-Ø1 39Ø71E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	76058E-02 .52356E-01 .51060E-03 .00000E 00 .18464E 01 .10942E 01 .00000E 00 -12835E-02	.29686E-Ø1 22Ø12E-Ø2 3452ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29984E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ				· •••

1

CONFIGURATION L22

F MATRIX IS

ç

:	U	Ŵ	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
9 . 8 1 4 . 8 . 1	99953E-Ø1 5688E-Ø2 688ØE-Ø2 80008E Ø0 7946E-Ø1 1691E-Ø2 8000E Ø0 3406E-Ø1 G MATR	.14755E ØØ 94Ø5ØE ØØ 25Ø98E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .465Ø5E-Ø2 .36259E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .12588E-Ø2 IX IS	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E ØØ	32176E Ø2 12528E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.1141ØE Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58097E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38936E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
	DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
1 5 .3 .Ø 2 3 .Ø .1	9116E Ø1 4652E Ø1 6Ø4ØE ØØ ØØØSE ØØ Ø74ØE ØØ ØØ51E-Ø1 ØØØØE ØØ 9424E ØØ	.52986E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8078ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82425E-Ø1 39071E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36831E-Ø1	76058E-02 .52356E-01 .51060E-03 .00000E 00 .18464E 01 .10942E 01 .00000E 00 12835E-02	.29686E-Ø1 22012E-Ø2 34520E-Ø2 .Ø0000E Ø0 11829E Ø1 29984E Ø0 .Ø0000E Ø0 .86575E Ø0	.:			

3

•

.

.

.

.

,

CONFIGURATION L24

F MATRI	IX IS						
U	v	Q	THETA	V	Р	PHI	R
13891E ØØ 1Ø245E ØØ .5646ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø415E-Ø1 64Ø44E-Ø2 .ØØØØE ØØ .11619E-Ø1	.14162E-Ø1 132Ø7E Ø1 .11114E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø81E-Ø2 4Ø281E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48552E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E ØØ	20175E 02 .32954E 02 22591E 01 .00000E 00 .76119E 00 .68074E 00 .00000E 00 .55008E 00	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.11410E Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58097E-02 .00000E 00 97522E Ø2 .51034E Ø0 .38936E-Ø1 35350E Ø1
G MATE	RIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P			•	
19116E Ø1 54652E Ø1 .36040E ØØ .00000E ØØ 20740E ØØ 30051E-01 .00000E ØØ .19424E ØØ	.52986E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8Ø78ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82425E-Ø1 39Ø71E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36831E-Ø1	76058E-02 .52356E-01 .51060E-03 .00000E 00 .18464E 01 .10942E 01 .00000E 00 12835E-02	.29686E-Ø1 22012E-Ø2 34520E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29984E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86575E ØØ		•		

.

۰.

ŧ

...

.

CONFIGURATION L25

F MATRI	IX IS	•	· •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• ••				•
U	¥	Q	THETA	v	Р	PHI	R
11052E 00 21509E-01 .30151E-03 .00000E 00 18615E-01 47753E-02 .00000E 00 .12922E-01	.14162E-Ø1 13207E Ø1 .11114E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø81E-Ø2 4Ø281E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48552E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E ØØ	20175E 02 .32954E 02 22591E 01 .00000E 00 .76119E 00 .68874E 00 .00000E 00 .55008E 00	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.1141ØE Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58Ø97E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38936E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATE	XIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54652E Ø1 .36Ø4ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 3ØØ51E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.52986E ØØ 97773E Ø1 .8Ø78ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82425E-Ø1 39Ø71E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	76058E-02 .52356E-01 .51060E-03 .00000E 00 .18464E 01 .10942E 01 .00000E 00	.29686E-Ø1 22012E-Ø2 34520E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 11829E Ø1 29984E Ø0 .000000E Ø0 86575E Ø0				~**

•

.

•

9

4

•

.

.

,

CONFIGURATION L26

F MATRIX IS

.

.

U	w	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
99953E-Ø1 .85688E-Ø2 1688ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 17946E-Ø1 41691E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .134Ø6E-Ø1	.14162E-Ø1 132Ø7E Ø1 .11114E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø81E-Ø2 4Ø281E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48552E-Ø2	.11422E Ø2 .1394ØE Ø3 3Ø286E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 83874E-Ø1 7Ø564E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1ØØ41E-ØØ	20175E 02 .32954E 02 22591E 01 .00000E 00 .76119E 00 .68874E 00 .00000E 00 .55008E 00	.67411E-Ø3 24779E-Ø1 .21979E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14358E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16958E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24851E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.1141ØE Ø1 46664E-Ø1 .58Ø97E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38936E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATR	RIX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				

19116E Ø1	.52986E ØØ	76Ø58E-Ø2	.29686E-Ø1	
54652E Ø1	97773E Ø1	.52356E-Ø1	22Ø12E-Ø2	
.36Ø4ØE ØØ	.8Ø78ØE-Ø2	.51Ø6ØE-Ø3	3452ØE-Ø2	1.1
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	
2Ø74ØE ØØ	82425E-Ø1	.18464E Ø1	11829E Ø1	
3ØØ51E-Ø1	39Ø71E-Ø1	.1Ø942E Ø1	29984E ØØ	
.OØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	
.19424E ØØ	.36831E-Ø1	12835E-Ø2	.86575E ØØ	

CONFIGURATION L28S

.

F MATRIX IS

4

٠

60

U	Ψ.	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
62711E-Ø1 17024E ØØ .10121E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ 21733E-Ø1 79663E-Ø2 .00000E ØØ .98615E-Ø2	.13184E-Ø1 13234E Ø1 .19518E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ 3917ØE-Ø2 4Ø451E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 47556E-Ø2	.68952E ØØ .1Ø881E Ø3 1ØØ82E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 76643E ØØ 62071E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 38431E ØØ	2997ØE Ø2 .5Ø518E Ø1 41575E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .23926E ØØ .34681E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 224Ø4E ØØ	.62059E-03 24925E-01 .31738E-04 .00000E 00 11061E 00 21080E-01 .00000E 00 .47340E-01	83594E ØØ 27479E Ø1 .132Ø6E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11836E Ø2 1ØØ4ØE Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 151Ø9E Ø1	.15786E-Ø1 31465E ØØ .46878E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82854E ØØ	.10626E Ø1 27037E Ø0 .20537E-01 .00000E 00 97531E 02 .50909E 00 .38939E-01 35270E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				

- **...**

•

ų.

178Ø6E Ø1	.49349E ØØ	26361E-Ø2	.27514E-Ø1
5Ø9Ø8E Ø1	988Ø9E Ø1	.52439E-Ø1	79892E-Ø2
.3357ØE ØØ	.14932E-Ø1	77146E-Ø4	3Ø636E-Ø2
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
19319E Ø&	86335E-Ø1	.16555E Ø1	1183ØE Ø1
28ØØ3E-Ø1	39621E-Ø1	.1Ø458E Ø1	29986E ØØ
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
.18Ø9ØE ØØ	.4ø527E-ø1	.13846E ØØ	.86592E ØØ

.

4

CONFIGURATION L28U

F MATRIX IS

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
- 559105-01	120275-01	722685 00	- 31455E Ø2	651335-03	- 87736F ØØ	155685-01	11152F Ø1
17913E ØØ	13215E Ø1	.1Ø891E Ø3	.8Ø683E ØØ	24837E-Ø1	28663E Ø1	31242E ØØ	11987E ØØ
. 16757E-01 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.00000E 00	10147E 01 .10000E 01	.00000E 00	.259422-04	.139872 00	.00000 00	.500000 00
22Ø7ØE-Ø1 8Ø151E-Ø2	38461E-Ø2 4Ø349E-Ø2	62018E 00	.1133ØE-Ø1	21Ø79E-Ø1	1848E 82	62585E Ø1	97525E Ø2 .5Ø992E ØØ
.00000E 00 .10177E-01	.ØØØØØE ØØ 4822ØE-Ø2	.ØØØØØE ØØ 38778E ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ 73193E-Ø1	.ØØØØØE ØØ .47337E-Ø1	.10000E 01 15067E 01	.ØØØØØE ØØ 82862E ØØ	.38939E-Ø1 35324E Ø1

• :

.

G MATRIX IS

DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P
18688E Ø1	.51794E ØØ	27667E-Ø2	.28878E-Ø1
5343ØE Ø1	9811ØE Ø1	.52Ø66E-Ø1	4Ø921E-Ø2
.35233E ØØ	.1Ø323E-Ø1	52524E-Ø4	~.332Ø5E-Ø2
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
2Ø276E ØØ	83683E-Ø1	.16555E Ø1	11829E Ø1
2939ØE-Ø1	39236E-Ø1	.1Ø458E Ø1	29983E ØØ
. AAAAAE AA	. ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
.18987E ØØ	.38Ø43E-Ø1	.13847E ØØ	.86578E ØØ

.

.

.

•

1

.

•

•

.

.

9

CONFIGURATION L29S

F MATRIX IS

.

1	U	w	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
-	.37431E-Ø1 .98249E-Ø1 .53632E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .2027ØE-Ø1 .63853E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .11481E-Ø1	.13609E-01 13222E 01 .11526E-03 .00000E 00 38698E-02 40387E-02 .00000E 00 48009E-02	.71171E ØØ . .1Ø888E Ø3 1Ø124E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 764Ø2E ØØ 62Ø36E ØØ .ØØØØÆ ØØ 38656E ØØ	30934E 02 .22959E 01 23402E 00 .00000E 00 .13467E 00 .19521E-01 .00000E 00 12611E 00	.63866E-Ø3 24868E-Ø1 .28141E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47336E-Ø1	86282E ØØ 28247E Ø1 .13713E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11838E Ø2 1ØØ4ØE Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø82E Ø1	.16358E-Ø1 31321E ØØ .36322E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82859E ØØ	.10968E Ø1 17248E ØØ .14093E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ 97527E Ø2 .50964E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35305E Ø1
	DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
	.18379E Ø1 .52545E Ø1 .3465ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .1994ØE ØØ .289Ø4E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .18672E ØØ	.50938E 00 98362E 01 .11947E-01 .00000E 00 84614E-01 39376E-01 .00000E 00 .38910E-01	27209E-02 .52197E-01 61161E-04 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00 .13846E 00	.2839ØE-Ø1 54581E-Ø2 323Ø5E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1 29984E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86583E ØØ				

62

· 、

.

٠

ę

~

.

4

CONFIGURATION L29U

F MATRIX IS

.

4

	U	W	۵	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
	38778E-Ø1 10210E ØØ 56170E-Ø2 00000E ØØ 20416E-Ø1 64065E-Ø2 00000E ØØ 11618E-Ø1	.14099E-01 13208E 01 .22974E-04 .00000E 00 38167E-02 40310E-02 .00000E 00 48506E-02	.73731E ØØ .1Ø895E Ø3 1Ø172E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 76124E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	32047E 02 88524E 00 24244E-01 .00000E 00 .13952E-01 .20223E-02 .00000E 00	.66163E-Ø3 248Ø2E-Ø1 .2381ØE-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	89385E ØØ 29135E Ø1 .14298E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1	.16947E-Ø1 31152E ØØ .25229E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.11362E Ø1 59698E-Ø1 .6655ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97523E Ø2 .51Ø26E ØØ .38939E-Ø1
•	G MATR	IX IS	······································	130042-01	. 4/334E-01	130302 01	02005 00	35345E ØI

	DELTA P	DELTA A	DELTA C	DELTA E
				1
	.29411E-Ø1	28188E-Ø2	.5277ØE ØØ	19Ø4ØE Ø1
	25386E-Ø2	.51917E-Ø1	97838E Ø1	54435E Ø1
: :	3423ØE-Ø2	4271ØE-Ø4	.84926E-Ø2	.35896E ØØ
	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
	11828E Ø1	.16555E Ø1	82627E-Ø1	2Ø657E ØØ
	29983E ØØ	.1Ø458E Ø1 ·	39Ø88E-Ø1	29944E-Ø1
	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.øøøøøe øø	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
	.86573E ØØ	.13847E ØØ	.37Ø48E-Ø1	.19343E ØØ

.

CONFIGURATION L30

F MATRI	F MATRIX-IS							
- U	h	0 ····	THETA	VV	P	рні	. R	
10542E-01	•14154E=01	•74023E 00	32176E 02	•4137cE-03	89745E 00	•16992E=01	*1140 ^{8E} 01	
•30185E•03	•11993E•04	• 10178E C1	+00000E 00	•52435E=04	•14364E 00			
	.00000E 00 • 38108E • 02	+10000E 01 +•76095E 00	•00000E 00 •00000E 00	•000C0E 00 •10046E 00	•00000E 00 •11842E 02	•00000E 00 •22269E 02	•00000E 00 •97522E 02	
•00000E 00.	•00000E 0C	• COCOOE 00 • 38949E-co	•00000E 00 •00000E 00	•00000E 00 •39914E=01	10000E 01 +15047E-01	•00000E 00 •00000E 00	•38939E-01 •35350E-01	
	tx is							
-DEL <u>IA-E</u>	DELTA C		DELTA-P			<u></u>		
19116E 01	•52 ^{986E} 00	••28399E-02	•29578E-01					
•36041E 00		+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++			<u> </u>			
		•00000E c0 •16555E 01						
00 300000 • 00 -00 300000 • 00	•00000E 0C	•00000E 00	•00000E 00			······		
18P+ 0								

,

.

r

٠

CONFIGURATION L31

F MATRIX IS

.

4

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
81365E-Ø2 14654E-Ø1 152Ø1E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ 18479E-Ø1 46421E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13Ø43E-Ø1	.14165E-Ø1 13206E Ø1 .10482E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38131E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 4857ØE-Ø2	.74030E 00 .10896E 03 10178E 01 .10000E 01 76096E 00 61994E 00 .00000E 00 38948E 00	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.67Ø18E-Ø3 24858E-Ø1 .23129E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47335E-Ø1	89745E ØØ 29242E Ø1 .14367E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 .1ØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.17026E-01 31133E 00 .23714E-03 .00000E 00 .22269E 02 62585E 01 .00000E 00 82865E 00	.11407E Ø1 45763E-Ø1 .57955E-Ø2 .00000E Ø0 97522E 02 .51033E Ø0 .38939E-Ø1 35350E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19117E Ø1	.52981E ØØ	28399E-Ø2	.29529E-Ø1				

54652E Ø1	9777ØE Ø1	.51885E-Ø1	22Ø12E-Ø2
.36Ø41E ØØ	.8Ø859E-Ø2	38323E-Ø4	3445ØE-Ø2
.JØØØØE ØJ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
2Ø743E ØØ	82436E-Ø1	.16555E Ø1	11828E Ø1
3ØØ79E-Ø1	39Ø79E-Ø1	.1Ø458E Ø1	29983E ØØ
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ
19422F RR	36825F-Ø1	13847F ØØ	.86571F ØØ

t

••

CONFIGURATION L32

F MATRIX IS

v

9

, U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
66959E-Ø2 1Ø566E-Ø1 4230%E-Ø3 .80030E Ø0 18384E-Ø1 45585E-Ø2 .80000E Ø0 .13107E-Ø1	.14155E-Ø1 132Ø7E Ø1 .12556E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 38Ø81E-Ø2 4Ø274E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 48534E-Ø2	.74021E 00 .10896E 03 10178E 01 .10000E 01 76098E 00 61997E 00 .00000E 00 38951E 00	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.66821E-Ø3 24795E-Ø1 .22971E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47335E-Ø1	89745E ØØ 29244E Ø1 .14365E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.1697ØE-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24644E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62586E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.114Ø8E Ø1 45943E-Ø1 .57926E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø34E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P			•	
19116E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .3604ØE ØØ .00030E ØØ 20738E ØØ 3305ØE-Ø1 .0009ØE ØØ .19421E ØØ	.52988E ØØ 97768E Ø1 .8074ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82423E-Ø1 3907ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36827E-Ø1	28399E-Ø2 .52042E-Ø1 41028E-Ø4 .00000E Ø0 .16555E Ø1 .10458E Ø1 .00000E Ø0 .13848E Ø0	.29578E-Ø1 23584E-Ø2 34468E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ				• • • •

66
.

. 6

CONFIGURATION L33S

F MATRIX IS

. .

4

U	v	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
6644ØE-Ø1	.14559E ØØ	.73053E ØØ	31751E Ø2	.6623ØE-Ø3	88561E ØØ	.16723E-Ø1	.11256E Ø1
.10823E-01 .00000E 00	2473ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	10159E 01 .10000E 01	80104E-01 .00000E 00	.24687E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.14144E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.29Ø7ØE-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ	88824E-01 .86443E-02 .00000E 00
22137E-Ø1 8Ø247E-Ø2	.4437ØE-Ø2 .35939E-Ø2	762Ø1E ØØ 62ØØ8E ØØ	.46Ø96E-Ø1 .668Ø3E-Ø2	11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1	11841E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2	.22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1	97524E Ø2 .51Ø1ØE ØØ
.00000E 00 .10240E-01	.ØØØØØE ØØ .14566E-Ø2	.ØØØØØE ØØ 38847E ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ 43167E-Ø1	.ØØØØØE ØØ .47335E-Ø1	.10000E 01 15059E 01	.ØØØØØE ØØ 82863E ØØ .	.38939E-Ø1 35334E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						

DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P	
18865E Ø1	.52284E ØØ	2783ØE-Ø2	.29149E-Ø1	
5393ØE Ø1	9797ØE Ø1	.52148E-Ø1	33163E-Ø2	
.35565E ØØ	.94Ø14E-Ø2	49853E-Ø4	33715E-Ø2	. :
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	
2Ø466E ØØ	83218E-Ø1	.16555E Ø1	11829E Ø1	
2966ØE-Ø1	392Ø4E-Ø1	.1Ø458E Ø1	29983E ØØ	
.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	.ØØØØØE ØØ	
.19166E ØØ	.37534E-Ø1	.13847E ØØ	.86575E ØØ	

•

CONFIGURATION L33U

F MATRI	IX IS	·····	· ··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ···		the second second	· · · · · · · · ·	
U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
71716E-Ø1 19592E ØØ .11818E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 227Ø9E-Ø1 81Ø76E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1Ø777E-Ø1	.15716E ØØ 9129ØE ØØ 2691ØE-Ø1 .800ØØE ØØ .56914E-Ø2 .37757E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .28188E-Ø3	.78854E ØØ .1Ø91ØE Ø3 1Ø269E Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 75571E ØØ 61917E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 39436E ØØ	34272E Ø2 72466E Ø1 .39527E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 22746E ØØ 32964E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .213Ø1E ØØ	.71489E-Ø3 24732E-Ø1 .14771E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21078E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .4733ØE-Ø1	95594E ØØ 3Ø914E Ø1 .1547ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11849E Ø2 1ØØ42E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 14987E Ø1	.18051E-01 30799E 00 .40316E-04 .00000E 00 .22269E 02 62585E 01 .00000E 00 82876E 00	.1215ØE Ø1 .16672E ØØ 82Ø82E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97514E Ø2 .5115ØE ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35425E Ø1
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
20363E Ø1 58213E Ø1 .38390E ØØ .00000E ØØ 22092E ØØ 32016E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ .20688E ØØ	.56436E ØØ 96783E Ø1 .15735E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 78713E-Ø1 38552E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .33316E-Ø1	30040E-02 .51517E-01 81856E-05 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00 .13849E 00	.31464E-Ø1 .33Ø14E-Ø2 38Ø79E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11826E Ø1 29979E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86552E ØØ	1 2 <u>2</u> .			

and the second second

•

.

•

.

•1

ι

.

89

•

•

6

.

.

•

. .

CONFIGURATION L34S

F MATRIX IS

.

.#

U	W	Q	THETA	v	Р	PHI	R
38166E-Ø1 1ØØ27E ØØ .5501ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø35ØE-Ø1 63974E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .11555E-Ø1	.14464E ØØ 94869E ØØ 2455ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .43327E-Ø2 .35786E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .1554ØE-Ø2	.72571E ØØ .1Ø892E Ø3 1Ø15ØE Ø1 .1ØØØØE Ø1 76251E ØØ 62Ø15E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 38798E ØØ	31542E Ø2 .55722E ØØ 11937E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .68679E-Ø1 .995Ø6E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 64321E-Ø1	.65217E-Ø3 24911E-Ø1 .26521E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø77E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47337E-Ø1	87979E ØØ 28738E Ø1 .14Ø34E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 1184ØE Ø2 18Ø41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø64E Ø1	.16647E-Ø1 31229E ØØ .3Ø763E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82861E ØØ	.11182E Ø1 1Ø993E ØØ .1ØØ37E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97525E Ø2 .5Ø999E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 35327E Ø1
G MATR	IXIS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
18741E Ø1 53578E Ø1 .35332E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø329E ØØ	.51937E ØØ 98068E Ø1 .10054E-Ø1 .Ø0000E ØØ 83555E-Ø1	27744E-Ø2 .522Ø1E-Ø1 51527E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1	.28958E-Ø1 38629E-Ø2 33357E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11829E Ø1				

-.29984E ØØ

.ØØØØØE ØØ

.86578E ØØ

69

-.20329E 00 -.29453E-01

.00000E 00 .19039E 00

.

.

-.39231E-Ø1

.ØØØØØE ØØ

.37899E-Ø1

•

•

.16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1

.00000E 00

.13846E ØØ 🔅

•

...

CONFIGURATION L34U

.

...

.

F MATRIX IS

¢

r

•

.

U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
40969E-01 10829E 00 .60294E-02 .00000E 00 20654E-01 64414E-02 .00000E 00 .11840E-01	.15526E ØØ 91832E ØØ 26553E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .54847E-Ø2 .37456E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .475Ø4E-Ø3	.77900E 00 .10907E 03 10251E 01 .10000E 01 75673E 00 61931E 00 .00000E 00 39339E 00	33859E Ø2 6Ø641E Ø1 .31728E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 18255E ØØ 26449E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .17Ø97E ØØ	.70006E-03 24774E-01 .17493E-04 .00000E 00 11060E 00 21077E-01 .00000E 00 .47332E-01	94439E ØØ 3Ø584E Ø1 .15252E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11847E Ø2 1ØØ42E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 14999E Ø1	.17869E-Ø1 -3Ø879E ØØ .77185E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82873E ØØ	.12003E Ø1 .12480E Ø0 54426E-02 .00000E Ø0 97516E Ø2 .51128E Ø0 .38939E-01 35410E Ø1
G MATR	1X IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
20117E Ø1 57512E Ø1 .37927E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 21821E ØØ 31616E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .20437E ØØ	.55750E 00 96977E 01 .28642E-02 .00000E 00 79419E-01 38632E-01 .00000E 00 .34025E-01	29781E-Ø2 .51619E-Ø1 13121E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13848E ØØ	.31084E-01 .22158E-02 37365E-02 .000000 00 11827E 01 29980E 00 .00000E 00 .86557E 00	4. 1			

.

٢

CONFIGURATION L35

F MATRI	IX IS						
U	W	Q	THETA	v	P	PHI	R
10547E-01 21524E-01 .30176E-03 .00000E 00 18632E-01 47795E-02 .00000E 00 .12934E-01	.14755E ØØ 94Ø39E ØØ 25Ø98E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .46481E-Ø2 .36250E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .126ØØE-Ø2	.74027E 00 .10896E 03 10178E 01 .10000E 01 76096E 00 61994E 00 .00000E 00 38947E 00	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.6692ØE-Ø3 24873E-Ø1 .23242E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21078E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47335E-Ø1	89746E ØØ 29246E Ø1 .14367E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 .10041E Ø2 .10000E Ø1 15047E Ø1	.17815E-81 31133E 88 .23843E-83 .88888E 88 .22269E 82 62585E 81 .888886E 88	.11407E 01 45583E-01 .57942E-02 .00000E 00 97522E 00 .51033E 00 .38939E-01 35350E 01
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19117E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø41E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2Ø742E ØØ 3ØØ65E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19423E ØØ	.52982E ØØ 97771E Ø1 .80853E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82436E-Ø1 39076E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36834E-Ø1	283Ø1E-Ø2 .51885E-Ø1 4Ø127E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .13847E ØØ	.29529E-Ø1 22012E-Ø2 34450E-Ø2 .00000E 00 11828E 01 29982E 00 .00000E 00 .86571E 00	:			

17

.

.

...

.

.

•

.

CONFIGURATION L36

F MATRI	IX IS						
U	v	Q	THETA	v	. P	PHI	R
10061E-01 20219E-01 .21080E-03 .00000E 00 18594E-01 47494E-02 .00000E 00 .12953E-01	.14755E ØØ 94042E ØØ 25099E-Ø1 .00000E ØØ .46503E-Ø2 .36264E-Ø2 .00000E ØØ .12601E-Ø2	.74020E 00 .10896E 03 10178E 01 .10000E 01 76096E 00 61995E 00 .00000E 00 38949E 00	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.66821E-Ø3 24795E-Ø1 .22971E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 1106ØE ØØ 21079E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47334E-Ø1	8975ØE ØØ 29236E Ø1 .14365E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.1697ØE-Ø1 31133E ØØ .24644E-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.11408E 01 45943E-01 .57934E-02 .000000 00 97522E 02 .51033E 00 .38939E-01 35350E 01
G MATR	IX IS						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54652E Ø1 .36Ø4ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 30Ø55E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.52988E ØØ 97768E Ø1 .8Ø738E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82429E-Ø1 39Ø7ØE-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36839E-Ø1	28399E-Ø2 .52Ø42E-Ø1 417Ø5E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ .16555E Ø1 .1Ø458E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ	.29578E-Ø1 23584E-Ø2 34468E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 86572E ØØ	. :		•	

TABLE 12.- CONCLUDED

٠

a di

CONFIGURATION L37

F MATRI	XIS		an a		······································	·····	
U	v	Q	THETA	v	Р	PHI	R
28645E-#2 .31445E-#3 11439E-#2 .###################################	.14754E ØØ 94Ø4ØE ØØ 25Ø97E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .465Ø7E-Ø2 .3626ØE-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ .12588E-Ø2	.74026E 00 .10096E 03 10178E 01 .10000E 01 76092E 00 61991E 00 .00000E 00 38946E 00	32176E Ø2 12529E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ	.66526E-Ø3 24795E-Ø1 .23152E-Ø4 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11Ø6ØE ØØ 21Ø79E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .47333E-Ø1	89744E ØØ 29237E Ø1 .14366E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 11842E Ø2 1ØØ41E Ø2 .1ØØØØE Ø1 15Ø47E Ø1	.16947E-Ø1 31133E ØØ .2498ØE-Ø3 .ØØØØØE ØØ .22269E Ø2 62585E Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ 82866E ØØ	.114Ø8E Ø1 46844E-Ø1 .57968E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 97522E Ø2 .51Ø32E ØØ .38939E-Ø1 3535ØE Ø1
G MATR	IX IS ·						
DELTA E	DELTA C	DELTA A	DELTA P				
19116E Ø1 54653E Ø1 .36Ø4ØE ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ 2074ØE ØØ 30Ø61E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .19421E ØØ	.52981E ØØ 97771E Ø1 .8Ø866E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 824ØØE-Ø1 39Ø49E-Ø1 .ØØØØØE ØØ .36847E-Ø1	28301E-02 .51805E-01 40577E-04 .00000E 00 .16555E 01 .10458E 01 .00000E 00 .13848E 00	.29529E-Ø1 22Ø12E-Ø2 34452E-Ø2 .ØØØØØE ØØ 11828E Ø1 29983E ØØ .ØØØØØE ØØ .86572E ØØ				- a.e

٢.

٠

.

.

÷

	LOIS	L03
Δ(S)	(2.93)(1.34)(0.10;0.34)	(3.00)(1.34)(0.16;0.056)
$N_{\delta ES}^{u}$	-1.8(0.15;2.46)(1.41)	-1.9(0.15;2.46)(1.41)
N ^w _{SES}	-5.2(-6.17)(0;0.06)	-5.4(-6.17)(0.036;0.039)
$N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$	0.34(1.32)(0.009)	0.36(1.32)(0.0085)
$N_{\delta C}^{u}$	0.5(3.24)(1.15)(-0.17)	0.53(3.24)(1.15)(-0.17)
N _o C	-9.84(2.80)(0.07;0.35)	-9.78(2.90)(0.11;0.069)
$N^{\theta}_{\delta C}$	0.012(1.51)(0.50)	0.008(0.025)(1.52)
	LOIU	L04
Δ(S)	(3.24)(1.35)(-0.13;0.34)	(3.02)(1.34)(0.74)(-0.63)
$N_{\delta ES}^{u}$	-1.99(0.15;2.45)(1.41)	
NGES	-5.7(-6.17)(0.073;0.053)	
$N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$	0.37(1.32)(0.045)	As per LO3
N ^u N ^c	0.55(3.20)(1.13)(-0.17)	
N _{SC}	-9.84(3.26)(-0.16;0.34)	0.53(3.23)(1.14)(-0.17)
$N^{\theta}_{\delta C}$	0.012(0.61)(1.5)	0.008(1.53)(-0.017)
	L02S	L05
∆(S)	(2.96)(1.34)(0.10;0.24)	(3.01)(1.34)(0.13)(-0.11)
$N_{\delta ES}^{u}$	-1.86(0.15;2.46)(1.41)	
N ^w _{SES}	-5.3(-6.17)(0.0092;0.052)	
$N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$	0.35(1.32)(0.0087)	AS PET LOS
$N_{\delta C}^{u}$	0.52(3.24)(1.15)(-0.17))
NốC	-9.84(2.84)(0.077;0.25)	0.53(3.23)(1.14)(-0.17)
N ⁰ _{6C}	0.012(1.50)(0.26)	0.008(1.51)(-0.072)
	L02U	LOGS
∆(S)	(3.26) (1.35) (-0.21;0.24)	(0.79;2.50)(0.10;0.27)
N ^u SES	-2.01(0.15;2.46)(1.41)	-1.86(0.15;2.43)(1.32)
NgES	-0.58(-6.17)(0.016;0.050)	-5.3(-6.17)(-0.029;0.075)
$N_{\delta ES}^{\Theta}$	0.38(1.32)(0.0088)	0.35(1.31)(0.0099)
N _d C	0.56(3.24)(1.15)(-0.17)	0.52(-1.71)(0.54;2.99)
N ^w _{ŠC}	-9.7(3.26)(-0.26;0.24)	-9.82(2.89(0.03;0.34)
	0 020 (0 55) (4 77)	

TABLE 13.- CONTINUED

	loõu	L09
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\delta}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\delta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$	(0.83;2.60)(-0.17;0.28) -2.1(0.15;2.43)(1.31) -6.0(-6.17)(0.34;0.012) 0.40(1.30)(0.0082) 0.58(-1.71)(0.54;2.99) -9.63(3.55)(-0.29;0.33) -0.0015(-173.0)(0.038)	(0.79;2.52)(0.066)(-0.063)
	L07S	L10
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{W}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{W}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$	(0.79;2.51)(0.11;0.20) -1.87(0.15;2.43)(1.31) -5.3(-6.17)(0.017;0.050) 0.35(1.30)(0.0088) 0.52(-1.71)(0.54;2.99) -9.81(2.86)(0.06;0.25) 0.01(23.76)(0.023)	(0.79;2.52)(0.10)(-0.10) As per L08 -9.78(2.92)(0.15)(-0.13) 0.008(30.3)(0.0053)
	LO7Ū	L11
$\begin{array}{c} \Delta (S) \\ N_{\delta ES}^{u} \\ N_{\delta ES}^{w} \\ N_{\delta ES}^{\theta} \\ N_{\delta ES}^{\theta} \\ N_{\delta C}^{u} \\ N_{\delta C}^{w} \\ N_{\delta C}^{\theta} \\ N_{\delta C}^{\theta} \end{array}$	(0.82;2.60)(-0.24;0.20) -2.1(0.15;2.43)(1.31) -6.0(0.051;0.039)(6.17) 0.39(1.30)(0.0085) 0.58(-1.71)(0.54;2.99) -9.64(3.47)(-0.36;0.24) -0.077(236.0)(0.024)	(1.97)(1.50)(0.22)(0.72) -1.91(0.15;2.43)(1.42) -5.5(-6.17)(0.018;0.076) 0.36(1.33)(0.0098) 0.53(2.05)(1.62)(0.63) -9.78(1.96)(0.22)(0.76) 0.008(1.89)(0.56)
	L08	L12
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$	<pre>(0.79;2.52)(0.15;0.057) -1.9(0.15;2.43)(1.31) -5.4(-6.17)(0.066;0.031) 0.36(1.30)(0.0083) 0.52(-1.71)(0.54;2.99) -9.79(2.88)(0.18;0.070) 0.009(27.0)(0.010)</pre>	<pre>(1.83)(1.55)(0.84)(0.10)</pre>

•

3

	L13	L17
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$	(1.64)(1.64)(1.06)(0.013) As per L11	(3.02)(0.97;0.056)(1.34) As per L16
Ν _{δC} Ν _δ C	-9.78(1.48)(1.48)(0.015) 0.008(1.55)(0.026)	-9.78(2.93)(0.87;0.061) 0.008(1.55)(0.13)
	L14	L18
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\omega}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$	(1.64)(1.64)(1.08)(0.0028) As per L11	(3.01)(0.19)(1.34)(-0.075) As per L16
N ^W ₆ C	-9.78 (1.50)(1.50)(0.0059)	-9.78(2.91)(0.19)(-0.074)
Ν _{δC}	0.008(1.53)(-0.017)	0.008(1.51)(0.031)
	L15	L19
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{w}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$	(1.63)(1.63)(1.12)(-0.015) As per L11	(3.01)(1.34)(0.17)(-0.062) As per L16
N _o C	-9.78(1.52)(1.52)(-0.011)	-9.78(2.92)(0.18)(-0.061)
NδC	0.008(1.50)(-0.094)	0.008(1.52)(0.051)
	L16	L20
Δ(S)	(3.06)(0.19;0.24)(1.34)	(0.79;2.53)(0.29;0.20)
N ^u SES	-1.91(0.15;2.46)(1.41)	-1.91(1.31)(0.15;2.43)
N ^w A	-5.47(-6.17)(0.082)(0.019)	-5.47(-6.17(0.11)(-0.0043)
N _{õES}	0.36(1.32)(0.11)	0.36(1.30)(0.11)
N _o C	0.53(3.24)(1.15)(-0.17)	0.53(-1.71)(0.54;2.99)
N _δ C vθ	-9.78(2.99)(0.17;0.25)	-9.78(2.99)(0.16;0.25)
^N δC	0.008(1./1)(0.49)	0.008(30.77)(0.12)

TABLE 13.- CONTINUED

	L21	L26
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{W}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$	(0.79;2.53)(0.053)(0.053) As per L20	(1.63)(1.63)(1.12)(0.082) As per L16
N _{SC} N _{SC}	-9.78(2.93)(0.79;0.66) 0.008(30.4)(0.11)	-9.78(1.50)(1.50)(0.082) 0.008(1.50)(0.0087)
	L22	L28S
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\delta \theta}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\omega}$	(0.79;2.53) (0.17) (-0.064) As per L20 -9.78(2.91) (0.20) (-0.088)	(1.30)(1.03(0.10;0.59)) -1.78(0.18;2.46)(1.40) -5.1(-6.17)(0.003;0.060) 0.34(1.32(0.009) 0.49(3.94)(0.95;1.32)) -9.88(0.032;0.61)(0.88)
N _{õC}	0.008(30.3)(0.11)	0.015(1.39)(0.36)
	L24	L28U
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\omega}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\delta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\omega}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$	<pre>(1.84)(1.53)(0.22)(0.79) As per L16 0.53(2.04)(1.64)(0.63) -9.78(1.78)(1.02)(0.22) 0.008(1.71)(0.49)</pre>	(1.27)(1.27)(-0.086;0.54) -1.87(0.18;2.46)(1.41) -5.3(-6.17)(-0.018;0.069) 0.35(1.32)(0.0096) 0.52(0.39)(0.95;1.31) -9.81(1.15)(-0.14;0.55) 0.01(1.64)(0.53)
	L25	L29S
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$	$(1.64) (1.64) (1.06) (0.11)$ $\begin{cases} As \text{ per L24} \\ -9.78 (0.99; 1.47) (0.12) \\ 0.008 (1.55) (0.13) \end{cases}$	(1.27)(1.07)(0.096;0.42) -1.84(0.18;2.46)(1.40) -5.3(-6.17)(0.023;0.048) 0.35(1.32)(0.0088) 0.51(0.39)(0.95;1.32) -9.84(0.037;0.44)(0.88) 0.012(1.44)(0.23)

	L29U	L33S		
Δ(S)	(1.26)(1.26)(-0.11;0.40)	(0.52;1.91)(0.098;0.36)		
^N δES	-1.90(1.41)(0.18;2.46)	-1.89(0.18;2.43)(1.32)		
N _{ŠES}	-5.4(-6.17)(-0.012;0.063)	-5.4(-6.17)(-0.0087;0.065)		
N _{ŠES}	0.36(1.32)(0.0093)	0.36(1.31)(0.0094)		
N _{SC}	0.53(0.39)(0.95;1.32)	0.52(-2.57)(0.39;2.42)		
N _{SC}	-9.78(1.12)(-0.16;0.41)	-9.80(1.19)(-0.17;0.54)		
N _{ŠC}	0.0085(1.66)(0.33)	0.0094(26.5)(0.036)		
	L30	L33U		
Δ(S)	(1.21)(1.21)(0.11;0.095)	(0.55;1.93)(-0.14;0.40)		
N _{õES}	-1.91(0.17;2.46)(1.42)	-2.04(0.18;2.43)(1.32)		
NČES	-5.5(-6.17)(0.023;0.043)	-5.8(-6.18)(-0.020;0.070)		
N _{SES}	0.36(1.33)(0.0087)	0.38(1.31)(0.0097)		
N _o C	0.53(0.39)(0.95;1.31)	0.56(-2.57)(0.39;2.42)		
NŠC	-9.78(0.97)(-0.058;0.12)	-9.68(1.55)(-0.43;0.50)		
N _o C	0.0081(1.55)(0.026)	0.0016(166.0)(0.037)		
	L31	L34S		
Δ(S)	(0.079)(-0.064)(1.20)(1.20)	(0.51;1.91)(0.13;0.26)		
N ^u SES		-1.87(0.18;2.43)(1.32)		
NŠES	As per L30	-5.4(-6.18)(-0.018;0.065)		
$N_{\delta ES}^{\theta}$		0.35(1.31)(0.0094)		
$N_{\delta C}^{u}$)	0.52(-2.57)(0.39;2.42)		
N _{ŠC}	-9.78 (0.96)(0.057)(-0.050)	-9.81(1.04)(-0.064;0.42)		
N _{SC}	0.0081(1.54)(-0.0005)	0.01(24.4)(0.023)		
	L32	L34U		
Δ(S)	(1.20(1.20)(0.13)(-0.11)	(0.54;1.94)(-0.17;0.27)		
N ^u SES		-2.0(0.18;2.43)(1.32)		
NGES	As per L30	-5.8(6.17)(-0.018;0.065)		
NSES		0.38(1.31)(0.0094)		
N _o C		0.56(-2.57)(0.39;2.42)		
N _o C	0.53(0.39)(0.95;1.32)	-9.70(1.40)(-0.44;0.37)		
Noc	0.0081(1.53(-0.017)	0.003(90.0)(0.024)		

TABLE 13.- CONCLUDED

	L35	
$\Delta(S)$ $N_{\delta ES}^{u}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{\omega}$ $N_{\delta ES}^{e}$ $N_{\delta C}^{u}$ $N_{\delta C}^{e}$ $N_{\delta C}^{\theta}$	(0.52;1.93)(0.13;0.075) -1.91 $(0.18;2.43)(1.32)$ -5.5 $(-6.17)(-0.014;0.059)$ 0.36 $(1.31)(0.0091)$ 0.53 $(-2.57)(0.39;2.42)$ -9.78 $(0.99)(0.0013;0.10)$ 0.0081 $(30.0)(0.010)$	
	L36	
Δ(S) N _{δES} N _{δES} N _{δES} N _{δE} S N _{δC} N _{δC} N _{δC}	<pre>(0.52;1.93)(0.012;0.070)</pre>	
	L37	
Δ(S) N ^u δES N ^δ ES N ^δ ES N ⁶ δES N ⁶ δC N ⁶ δC N ⁶ δC N ⁶ δC	(0.51;1.93) (0.10) (-0.11) As per L35 -9.78(9.17) (-0.17) 0.0081(30.0) (0.0068)	
		-



Figure 1.- Stable-gradient responses to 1-in. collective step.

.7



Figure 2.- Motion Performance of VMS.



Figure 3.- Influence of static position gradient: high M_q , low drag damping, $M_w = 0$.







Figure 5.- Responses to collective step, $M_w = 0$, configuration L02S.

、 84



Figure 6.- Responses to cyclic and collective steps, $M_w = 0$, unstable aperiodic: configuration L04.

85



Figure 7.- Influence of long-term oscillation damping (high M_q , low drag damping, $M_w = 0$).



Figure 8.- Influence of high drag damping ($M_w = 0$, high M_q).



Figure 9.- Pitch attitude response to longitudinal cyclic and collective for $M_w = 0$ and $M_w = -0.025$.



Figure 10.- Influence of $M_w = -0.025$ (low drag damping, high pitch-rate damping).



Figure 11.- Response to collective step, unstable phugoid, $M_w = -0.025$ (low drag damping, high pitch-rate damping).



1. Report No. NASA TM-84225	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.				
4. Title and Subtitle A GROUND-SIMULATOR INVESTION ITUDINAL FLYING QUALITIES	5. Report Date September 1982 6. Performing Organization Code					
7. Author(s) J. V. Lebacqz, R. D. Forre:	 8. Performing Organization Report No. A-8983 10. Work Unit No. T-6292Y 11. Contract or Grant No. 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Memorandum 14. Sponsoring Agency Code 					
9. Performing Organization Name and Address						
MASA Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035						
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address						
Washington, D.C. 20546						
15. Supplementary Notes *FAA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035 Point of Contact: J. V. Lebacqz, Ames Research Center, MS 211-2, Moffett Field, CA 94035. (415) 965-5272 or FTS 448-5272.						

16. Abstract

A ground-simulation experiment was conducted to investigate the direct and interactive influences of several longitudinal static and dynamic stability parameters on helicopter flying qualities during terminal-area operations in instrument conditions. Variations that were examined included five levels of static control-position gradients ranging from stable to unstable; two levels of dynamic stability for the long-period oscillation; two levels of the steady-state pitch speed gradient; two levels of angle-of-attack stability and pitch-rate damping; and two levels of stability and control augmentation. These variations were examined initially in calm air and then in simulated light-to-moderate turbulence and wind shear. Five pilots performed a total of 223 evaluations of these parameters for a representative microwave landing system precision approach task conducted in a dual-pilot crew-loading situation. Pilot ratings indicated (1) that the system is clearly adequate for the IMC approach in calm air for neutral and slightly unstable static controlposition gradients but that adding turbulence causes a significant degradation in system performance; (2) that high angle-of-attack stability has an adverse effect because of pitch-to-rate of descent coupling; and (3) that the steadystate pitch-speed gradient has a minimal influence.

17. Key Words (Suggested by Author(s))	18. Distribution Statement			
Helicopter Airworthiness criteria		Unlimited		
Instrument flight		Subject Category - 08		
19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (20. Security Classif. (of this page)		22. Price*
Unclassified	Unclassifi	led	91	A05

*For sale by the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

z 3

¥.,

3

ţ