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ABSTRACT

Dynamic stability characteristics of six Apollo-Saturn IB and V and one Saturn-Centaur upper stage model configurations and static stability characteristics of two Apollo-Saturn IB and V upper stage model configurations were obtained from $M = 0.50$ to $1.40$. The primary test objective was to investigate the changes in dynamic stability characteristics as a function of pitch oscillation center. A secondary objective was to compare three different model mounting techniques - sting, transverse rod, and reflection plane. The static testing resulted from a suspected nonlinear phenomenon observed during the dynamic phase of the test. One model configuration which was stable when the pitch oscillation center was ahead of a separation disk exhibited limit cycle oscillations when the pitch oscillation center was located aft of the disk.
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NOMENCLATURE

A    Base area of model (reference area), 0.1226 ft²

*    Base diameter of model (reference length), 0.125 ft

C    Axial-force coefficient, measured axial force/q_∞ A

Cm   Pitching-moment coefficient, pitching moment/q_∞ Ad

Cmα  Rate of change of pitching-moment coefficient with angle of attack, dCm/dα, per rad

Cmθ + Cmα Effective value of dynamic stability parameter (see Appendix), per rad

CN   Normal-force coefficient, normal force/q_∞ A

M_∞  Free-stream Mach number

p_∞  Total pressure, psf

p_0  Free-stream static pressure, psf

q_∞  Free-stream dynamic pressure, 0.7 p_∞ M_∞², psf

Re/ft Reynolds number/ft, V_∞/ν_∞

T    Temperature, °R

t    Time, sec

V_∞  Free-stream velocity, ft/sec

α    (i) Mean angle of attack about which oscillations occur.
     (ii) Angle of attack, deg

α̇ = dα/dt Time rate of change of angle of attack, rad/sec

θ    Instantaneous pitch angle measured relative to the mean angle of attack (θ = θ̅ sin ω t), deg

θ̅   (i) Pitch oscillation amplitude.
     (ii) Pitch oscillation amplitude of limit cycle oscillations, deg
\[ \dot{\theta} = \frac{d\theta}{dt} \]  
Time rate of change of instantaneous pitch angle, rad/sec

\( \nu_\infty \)  
Free-stream kinematic viscosity, ft\(^2\)/sec

\( \omega \)  
Circular frequency, rad/sec

**SUBSCRIPT**

\( t \)  
Total
SECTION I
INTRODUCTION

This report presents the rigid body dynamic and static stability characteristics of several upper stage model configurations of the Saturn IB and V space vehicle. The data were obtained in the Aerodynamic Wind Tunnel, Transonic (IT).

The primary test objective was to measure the model stability as a function of pitch oscillation center in the transonic Mach number range from 0.50 to 1.40. This test objective resulted from an analytical study (Ref. 1) which predicted the possibility of statically stabilizing loads becoming dynamically destabilizing when the pitch oscillation center is located between the origin of a separated flow field and an afterbody submerged in the separated flow.

A secondary test objective was to compare three different model mounting techniques - sting, transverse rod, and reflection plane. The transverse rod supporting technique resulted from the requirement to oscillate the models over a wide range of pitch oscillation centers. This mounting technique appeared to be the more efficient. The reflection plane mounting was employed more for academic purposes of correlation than a principal method of obtaining data. The sting-mounting technique was employed both in the dynamic and static phases of the test. The intended purpose of the sting-mount dynamic test was to investigate the transverse rod effect on dynamic stability. During the course of the dynamic sting-mount phase of the test, two configurations were observed to oscillate about a nonzero angle of attack when the sting was at zero pitch angle. Consequently, a sting-mount, static force and moment investigation was conducted to determine possible pitching-moment nonlinearities with angle of attack.

The tests were conducted in two separate tunnel entries. During the first entry three Apollo-Saturn IB and V upper stage and two Saturn-Centaur model configurations were tested on a sting-mounted, free-pitch, oscillation balance. During the second entry, four Apollo-Saturn IB and V upper stage model configurations were tested on a sting-mounted static-force balance. One half-model configuration mounted on a reflection plane was tested in free-pitch oscillation. Comparison of test results for the three mounting techniques is presented in the report.
2.1 TEST FACILITY

The tests were conducted in Tunnel IT. A description of the tunnel and associated equipment can be found in Ref. 2.

Schematics of the test section with sting-mounted and transverse rod mounted models are presented in Figs. 1a and b, respectively. Photographs of typical model installations are presented in Fig. 2.

2.2 TEST ARTICLE

Six Apollo-Saturn IB and V upper stage model configurations were tested in free-pitch oscillation. Two of the six configurations were tested statically. In addition, two model configurations of the Saturn-Centaur upper stage were tested in free-pitch oscillation. Model configuration descriptions are presented in Table I, and basic model configuration drawings are shown in Fig. 3. All Apollo-Saturn IB and V upper stage model configurations included the escape rocket and tower.

The reflection plane model configuration (Fig. 3d) has one significant distinguishing feature from most other dynamic reflection plane models. The half-model is spaced away from but attached integral with the reflection plane disk. It was reasoned that viscous "clutch" damping would be measured along with aerodynamic damping if the half-model were permitted to oscillate relative to the disk. This type of damping could possibly obscure the small aerodynamic damping values.

A description of the wall-mounted, free-pitch oscillation, transverse rod balance can be found in Ref. 3. A description of the basic sting-mounted, free-pitch oscillation balance can be found in Ref. 2.

SECTION III
TEST DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROCEDURE

3.1.1 Sting-Mounted Balances

Both a free-pitch oscillation and static-force balance were employed. In the case of free oscillation testing, the model amplitude was obtained
by alternate air pulses impinging on the rear "skirt" of the model. After a desired steady-state oscillatory amplitude was obtained, the air jet system was valved closed and the subsequent transient oscillations recorded. Static-force and moment data were obtained by pitching the model from -2- to 5-deg angle of attack. A three-component, static-force balance was used. Base pressure measurements were not obtained.

3.1.2 Wall-Mounted, Transverse Rod Balance

A mechanical cocking device provided the means by which the models could be released from angle of attack. The models were usually released from a 4.5-deg amplitude and the subsequent oscillations recorded.

3.1.3 Wall-Mounted, Reflection Plane Balance

The reflection plane model was tested on the wall-mounted, transverse rod balance by suitably modifying the model attachment point, as shown in Fig. 3d.

3.1.4 General Test Conditions

Data were obtained at \( M_\infty = 0.50, 0.60, 0.70, 0.80, 0.90, 0.95, 1.00, 1.05, 1.10, \) and 1.40. The tunnel total pressure, which varies with ambient pressure and temperature, ranged from 2755 to 2887 psf. The variation of Reynolds number with Mach number is presented in Fig. 4.

3.2 DATA REDUCTION

The free-pitch oscillation data reduction equations are presented in the Appendix. Except where limit cycle amplitudes exceeded ±2 deg, the damping derivatives, \( C_m\dot{\theta} + C_m'\dot{\theta} \), presented corresponded to the number of cycles to half amplitude over the oscillation amplitude range from ±4 to ±2 deg. Where limit cycle amplitudes were involved, and did not exceed ±3 deg, the decrement measurements were obtained between ±4 and ±3 deg. No decrement measurements were obtained when the limit cycle amplitude exceeded ±3 deg.

3.3 PRECISION OF MEASUREMENTS

The estimated precision of the data obtained during the investigation is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ static</td>
<td>±0.10 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ dynamic</td>
<td>±0.20 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_t$</td>
<td>±3 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_\infty$</td>
<td>±0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_t$</td>
<td>±2°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_A$</td>
<td>±0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_m$</td>
<td>±0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{m\alpha}$</td>
<td>±0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{m\dot{\theta}} + C_{m\dot{\alpha}}$</td>
<td>±1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_N$</td>
<td>±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega/2\pi$</td>
<td>±2 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above uncertainties are based on inaccuracies in balance, oscilloscope, and pressure transducer measurements. The streamwise variation of $M_\infty$ in the vicinity of the model probably did not exceed ±0.003 at $M_\infty = 0.7$ (Ref. 4) and ±0.015 at $M_\infty = 1.40$.

**SECTION IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The test results are presented in a form, Figs. 5 and 6, that illustrates the effect of pitch oscillation center on the dynamic stability. Stability derivatives as a function of angle of attack for one Saturn-Centaur model configuration are presented in Fig. 7 for $M_\infty = 0.70$, 0.90, and 0.95. The dynamic stability results obtained for certain model configurations mounted on the sting-supported balance, the transverse rod balance, and the reflection plane mounting are presented in Fig. 8. Stability derivatives for two Apollo-Saturn, sting-mounted configurations are presented in Fig. 9. In Fig. 10, sting-mount static-force and moment results are presented. Static stability derivatives obtained from the sting-mounted, free-pitch oscillation balance are compared with the corresponding results from the static data in Fig. 11.

No quantitative static stability results were obtained from the transverse rod, free oscillation balance. The mechanical stiffness of the balance was several orders of magnitude greater than the aerodynamic
stiffness. Consequently, small changes in aerodynamic stiffness produced no measurable differences in frequency. Qualitatively, however, the static stability increased as the model pitch oscillation center was moved from rear to front.

Statically unstable models could be tested dynamically because of an overall balance system stability.

4.1 VARIATION OF PITCH OSCILLATION CENTER

The various pitch oscillation centers (see Fig. 3) were coincident with structural bending nodal points for the entire Apollo-Saturn IB and V space vehicle (Ref. 1). It seemed reasonable that the upper stage aerodynamic stability contribution to the entire vehicle could be obtained from pitch oscillation tests where oscillation centers correspond to nodal points. From Fig. 3a it can be observed that the 01 pitch oscillation center passes through the escape rocket ahead of the separation disk, D. The 02 pitch oscillation center (Fig. 3b) passed through the escape rocket tower and just downstream of the disk. The 05 pitch oscillation center (Fig. 3c) passed through the junction between the B₁ command module and the skirt S₁, also downstream of the disk, but farther aft of the 02 pitch oscillation center.

From Ref. 1, an analytical study of the quasi-steady transonic flow characteristics predicted that statically stabilizing loads could become dynamically destabilizing when a nodal point (pitch oscillation center) was between a separation source (D) and an afterbody (B₁, B₁S₁) immersed in the separated flow field. A phase shift could arise because of the time lag between the instant the separation source was perturbed and the instant the separated flow field altered the submerged body loads, thus causing instability.

Unfortunately, a single model configuration could not be tested at all three pitch oscillation centers - 01, 02, and 05 - because of structural requirements for the models. For example, tests of a B₁S₁-01 configuration were prohibited because inertia loads of the B₁S₁ portion of the model could have caused structural failure of the tower at the testing frequency of from 53 to 55 cps.

For model configuration B₁ (Table 1), Fig. 5a shows that shifting the pitch oscillation center from the 01 position to the 02 position had a destabilizing effect. As shown in Fig. 5b, the addition of the disk at the base of the escape rocket (Fig. 3a) produced limit cycle oscillations throughout the Mach number range for the 02 pitch oscillation center. When the pitch
oscillation center was located at the 01 position, the limit cycle oscillations occurred only below Mach number 0.8.

In Figs. 5c and d comparison of the 02 and 05 pitch oscillation center results for configurations B1S1 and B1DS1 are presented. Figure 5c shows that above $M_\infty = 0.6$ a shift from the 02 to 05 pitch oscillation center corresponded to a decrease in stability for the B1S1 configuration. Similarly, for the B1DS1 configuration (Fig. 5d), greater stability was observed for the 02 position.

Summarizing the results of Figs. 5a through 5d, an increase in static stability was accompanied by a corresponding increase in dynamic stability. To be entirely consistent with the arguments of Ref. 1, the dynamic stability level for the 02 position should be lower than either the 01 or 05 level. It is possible, however, that the S1 skirt was not fully immersed in the separated flow field, and as a result, any destabilizing loads acting on the B1 module were obscured. The stability trend from the 01 to 02 pitch oscillation center was consistent with that reported in Ref. 1.

In Fig. 6 the stability characteristics of two Saturn-Centaur upper stage configurations, CR-IS and CR-IIS, are presented. The results in Fig. 6 showed little change in the dynamic stability parameter as the pitch oscillation center was shifted from the II to the I position (Fig. 3g).

In Figs. 7 values of $C_{m0} + C_{m\dot{\alpha}}$ for $M_\infty = 0.70$, 0.90, and 0.95 are presented as a function of mean angle of attack, $\alpha$, for the CR-II configuration. This figure is significant in that it shows a greater variation at small angles of attack rather than at large angles of attack.

4.2 RESULTS OF DIFFERENT MOUNTING TECHNIQUES

Three model mounting techniques were employed: sting, transverse rod, and reflection plane. However, no single configuration was tested with all three techniques. In Figs. 8a and b, $C_{m0} + C_{m\dot{\alpha}}$ values for configurations B1S1 and B1DS1 at the 05 pitch oscillation center are compared for free oscillation sting and transverse rod supports. The comparison is conditional by the fact that the sting-mounted data were obtained in the frequency range from 28 to 32 cps whereas the rod supported data were obtained over the range from 53 to 56 cps. The quasi-steady theory of Ref. 1 is based upon the lag time between a separated and an attached flow impingement on an oscillating body. If this concept is correct, then some discrepancy between the rod and sting values of $C_{m0} + C_{m\dot{\alpha}}$, as shown in Fig. 8a and b might be explained as a frequency effect. This argument is partially supported by the agreement shown in Fig. 8c between the
rod and reflection plane results of the B1-01 configuration. Here the frequency range was approximately the same (53 to 55 cps). The singular disagreement at $M_\infty = 1.10$ is unexplained. Unfortunately, little time was available for the reflection plane phase of testing.

A comparison of the stability derivatives of two sting-mounted configurations, B1S1-05S and B1CS1-05, is presented in Fig. 9. The center spike, C, (Fig. 3c) was representative of a free-flight model tower stiffener used in ballistic range tests. Apparently, there was only a slight increase in dynamic stability, at $M_\infty = 0.95$, attributable to the center spike.

4.3 STATIC TEST RESULTS

As mentioned earlier in the report, a static test was conducted to investigate a suspected nonlinear pitching-moment phenomenon associated with the B1S1-05S and B1DS1-05S configurations. During the dynamic phase of the sting-support testing, both the B1S1 and B1DS1 models were observed to oscillate about a sometimes unrepeatable and intermittent static trim angle, different from zero, in the Mach number range from 0.90 to 1.10. As shown in Figs. 10a and b, the sting-support, static-force and moment investigation apparently did not reveal any abrupt nonlinearities in $C_N$ and $C_m$ with angle of attack. The trim angle behavior appears to be the result of a simple static instability. A comparison of the static stability parameter, $C_{m\alpha}$, as obtained from both static and dynamic sting-supported balances, is presented in Figs. 11a and b for configurations B1S1 and B1DS1, respectively. The rather poor agreement might be the result of pressure lag in the dynamic case that is not present in the static case.

SECTION V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The effect of varying pitch oscillation center showed that the dynamic stability was altered. Whether the corresponding changes in $C_{m\dot{\theta}} + C_{m\dot{\alpha}}$ values were consistent with the quasi-steady arguments of Ref. 1 was not resolved.

No significant variations in the data are believed to have resulted from the three model mounting techniques employed: sting, transverse rod, and reflection plane.
The free-pitch oscillation testing technique did not provide a suitable means to study the nonlinear aerodynamic stability problem associated with the separated flow effects. Forced oscillation testing in which the aerodynamic damping torque is measured directly would afford more complete test results. High response pressure measurements on a larger scale model might shed some light on the time dependency of pressure lag in a separated flow field.
APPENDIX I
DATA REDUCTION EQUATIONS

The free-pitch oscillation, dynamic data reduction equations are

\[ C_{m\dot{\theta}} + C_{m\ddot{\theta}} = -\frac{80\sqrt{T_i}(1 + 0.2M_\infty^2)\zeta}{\rho_1M_\infty^2 d^2} \left\{ (\zeta\omega_\alpha)_1 - (\zeta\omega_\alpha)_2 \right\} \]

\[ C_{m\alpha} = 1.428 \frac{(1 - 0.2M_\infty^2)^{2.5}}{\rho_1M_\infty^2 d} \left\{ (\omega_i^2 - \omega_\alpha^2) + \left[ (\zeta\omega_\alpha)_1 - (\zeta\omega_\alpha)_2 \right] \right\} \]

where

\[ (\zeta\omega_\alpha)_i = \frac{\omega_i}{n\pi} \cdot \ln 2, \ i = 1, 2 \]

\[ \omega_\alpha = \text{Natural circular frequency} \]

\[ \omega_i = \text{Resonant circular frequency} \]

\[ n = \text{Number of cycles to 1/2 amplitude of } \dot{\theta}_j \]

\[ \zeta = \text{Critical damping ratio} \]

Subscript Notations

1 Wind-off
2 Wind-on
o Natural
j Initial

MODEL CONSTANTS

\[ A = 0.01226 \text{ ft}^2 \]

\[ d = 0.125 \text{ ft} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Configuration</th>
<th>Model and Balance Inertia, ft-lb-sec(^2) x 10^6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1-01R</td>
<td>606.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1D-01R</td>
<td>606.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1-02R</td>
<td>602.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Configuration</td>
<td>Model and Balance Inertia, ft-lb-sec² x 10⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁D-02R</td>
<td>602.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁S₁-02R</td>
<td>621.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DS₁-02R</td>
<td>621.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁S₁-05R</td>
<td>615.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DS₁-05R</td>
<td>615.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DCS₁-05R</td>
<td>615.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁-01P</td>
<td>695.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate and Balance</td>
<td>681.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁S₁-05S</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DS₁-05S</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁CS₁-05S</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-IS</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-IIIS</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 10 Concluded
Fig. 11 Static Stability Derivatives for Apollo-Saturn Configurations B1S1-05S and B1DS1-05S
### TABLE I
**MODEL DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Pitch Center</th>
<th>Mount</th>
<th>Notation Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>B₁ Command Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D Disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁D</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S₁ Skirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₃</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C Center Spike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁D</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CR Saturn-Centaur Upper Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁S₁</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Transverse Rod Support Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DS₁</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S Sting Support Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁S₁</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>S*</td>
<td>P Reflection Plane Mounted on Transverse Rod Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁S₁</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DS₁</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>S*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁DS₁</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁CS₁</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁CDS₁</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS:**

Pitch Center 01 - 1.805 in. Aft of Rocket Nose.
Pitch Center 02 - 3.065 in. Aft of Rocket Nose.
Pitch Center 05 - 4.517 in. Aft of Rocket Nose.
Pitch Center I - 1.285 in. Aft of Nose.
Pitch Center II - 1.510 in. Aft of Nose.
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### Abstract

Dynamic stability characteristics of six Apollo-Saturn IB and V and one Saturn-Centaur upper stage model configurations and static stability characteristics of two Apollo-Saturn B and V upper stage model configurations were obtained from $M_x = 0.50$ to $1.40$. The primary test objective was to investigate the changes in dynamic stability characteristics as a function of pitch oscillation center. A secondary objective was to compare three different model mounting techniques - sting, transverse rod, and reflection plane. The static testing resulted from a suspected nonlinear phenomenon observed during the dynamic phase of the test. One model configuration which was stable when the pitch oscillation center was ahead of a separation disk exhibited limit cycle oscillations when the pitch oscillation center was located aft of the disk.
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