nah - 2-

1



# **USAAVLABS TECHNICAL REPORT 70-74A**

## STADILITY AND CONTROL OF HELICOPTERS IN STEEP APPROACHES

VOLUME I Summary Report

> By Julian Welkevitch John A. Hotiman

SEP 20 1971

May 1971

EUSTIS DIRECTORATE

## U. S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

CONTRACT DAAJ02-69-C-0004

MECHANICS RESEARCH, INC.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

١.,



#### DISCLAIMERS

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the United States Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission, to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

#### DISPOSITION INSTRUCTIONS

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

v	W1177 3	ection E	-
	TUTE S	ECTION E	
17		Γ.	
		**********	
			1
	1 27-11-6	5 7 632	Eŝ
i	L '	Jr 832.	1AL
		•	

Unclassified	
Berunity Classification	
(Security clossification of litte, budy of abottoci and indexin,	t RUL DATA + R & U f annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified;
Suismating Activity (Coperate author)	A. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
Mechanics Research, Inc.	Unclassified
9841 Airport Blvd.	ab. GROUP
Los Angeles, California	~~~
STABILITY AND CONTROL OF H VOLUME I. SU	ELICOPTERS IN STEEP APPROACHES MARY REPORT
Finel Report	
Julian Wolk John A. Hof	ovitch Iman
EPONT DATE	TO. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 176. NO. OF REFS
Nev 1971	198 39
CONTRACT ON GRANT NO.	SE. ORIGINATOR'S RECORT NUMBERIES
PROJECT NO.	USAAVLABS Technical Report 70-74A
1F162204A142	
	MRI Report No. 2284-1
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	
Volume I of a 4-volume report	Eustis Directorate U.S. Army Air Mobility R&D Laboratory Fort Eustis, Virginia
Aerodynamics and control charace and steep descents at low speeds are ana compound helicopters are considered and AH-56A, and YHO-1A, for each of which de presented. New analytic methods are use rotors. Using these methods, prediction ring state and of tip loss factors. Goo A new modular stability derivative progr calculate derivatives for the S-58 and A cross-coupling derivatives. It is shown of flight path by collective pitch becom even with stability augmentation, due to the associated wrong-way step response c as an important factor in the observed d approaches.	teristics of helicopters in level flight lyzed. Single-rotor, tandem-rotor, and are specifically represented by the S-58, rivatives and transfer functions are d to describe the flow about descending s are made of the boundaries of the vortex- d agreement with experiment is obtained. am, MOSTAB, is described and is used to H-56A, including lateral-longitudinal that, for these helicopters, control es difficult for low-speed steep descents a nonminimum phase transfer function and haracteristic. The effect is identified egradation of flying qualities in steep

~

1 N

1 .

UNCLASS IFTED

Id. KEY WORDS	LIN	K A	LIN	к п	IN	ĸc
	ROLE		ROLE	wT	ROLK	WT
HELICOPTER STABILITY AND CONTROL	1					
HELICOPTER AERODYNAMICS						
HELICOPTER STABILITY DERIVATIVES						
HELICOPTER TRANSFER FUNCTIONS						
V/STOL STEEP APPROACH						
VORTEX-RING STATE						
SIKORSKY S-58 STABILITY AND CONTROL						
LOCKHEED AH-56A STABILITY AND CONTROL						
BOEING-VERTOL YHC-1A STABILITY AND CONTROL						
MOSTAB DIGITAL COMPUTER PROGRAM						
				•		
						•

Security Classification

5654-71

.



- -

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY EUSTIS DIRECTORATE FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA 23604

The report has been reviewed by the Eustis Directorate, U. S. Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory, and is judged to be technically sound.

The primary effort is to examine the behavior of rotarywing aircraft in steep approaches, from the standpoint of aerodynamics and dynamics, and the resultant effects on human and automatic control.

The report is presented in four volumes. Volume I summarizes the main results of the study. Volume II describes the MOSTAB program. Volume III presents derivatives and transfer functions for the YHC-1A tandem-rotor helicopter and the S-58 single-rotor helicopter. Volume IV presents derivatives and transfer functions for the AH-56A compound helicopter and data on low-altitude turbulence representation.

The program was conducted under the technical management of Mr William D. Vann, Aeromechanics Division.

### Project 1F162204A142 Contract DAAJ02-69-C-0004 USAAVLABS Technical Report 70-74A May 1971

.

### STABILITY AND CONTROL OF HELICOPTERS IN STEEP APPROACHES

VOLUME I

SUMMARY REPORT

MRI REPORT NO. 2284-1

By

Julian Wolkovitch John A. Hoffman

Prepared by

Mechanics Research, Inc. Los Angeles, California

for

EUSTIS DIRECTORATE U.S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

> Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

#### ABSTRACT

Aerodynamics and control characteristics of helicopters in level flight and steep descents at low speeds are analyzed. Single-rotor, tandem-rotor, and compound helicopters are considered and are specifically represented by the S-58, AH-56A, and YHC-1A, for each of which derivatives and transfer functions are presented. New analytic methods are used to describe the flow about descending rotors. Using these methods, predictions are made of the boundaries of the vortex-ring state and of tip loss factors. Good agreement with experiment is obtained. A new modular stability derivative program, MOSTAB, is described and is used to calculate derivatives for the S-58 and AH-56A, including lateral-longitudinal cross-coupling derivatives. It is shown that, for these helicopters, control of flight path by collective pitch becomes difficult for lowspeed steep descents even with stability augmentation, due to a nonminimum phase transfer function and the associated wrong-way step response characteristic. The effect is identified as an important factor in the observed degradation of flying qualities in steep approaches.

#### FOREWORD

This research was performed by Mechanics Research, Inc. under United States Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories<sup>®</sup> Contract DAAJ02-69-C-0004, Project 1F162204A142. The AVLABS Project Monitor was Mr. W. D. Vann.

The authors express their gratitude to Mr. Vann and Mr. Robert P. Smith of AVIABS for constant encouragement and assistance. Thanks are also due to Dr. M. J. Abzug for granting rermission to use TRW technical memoranda, and to Mr. J. M. Drees of the Bell Helicopter Company who supplied several valuable references relating to his pioneering work on the vortex-ring state.

Finally, the authors thank their colleagues at Mechanics Research, Inc. who contributed to this report: in particular, Mr. H. B. Amey and Mr. D. W. Lochtie who gave significant technical support.

\*Redesignated Eustis Directorate, U.S. Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory.

V

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

.

.

			PAGE
ABSTRAC	F	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	iii
FOREWORI	D	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	v
LIST OF	ILLUSTRA	TIONS	x
list of	TABLES	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	xiv
list of	SYMBOLS.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	xvi
<u>CHAPTER</u>			
I	INTROD	UCTION	1
	I.1	THE SCOPE OF THIS REPORT	1
	I.2	SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT	3
II	OPERAT	IONAL ASPECTS OF STEEP APPROACHES	6
	II.1	THE IMPORTANCE OF STEEP APPROACH CAPABILITY	6
	11.2	FACTORS LIMITING (D/L) <sub>MAX</sub>	8
	<b>II.</b> 3	OTHER FACTORS LIMITING STEEPNESS OF HELICOPTER APPROACHES	12
III	THE VO	RTEX-RING STATE	14
	<b>III.</b> 1	INTRODUCTION	14
	III.2	FLOW MODEL AND EQUATIONS FOR VERTICAL DESCENT	14
	III.3	GENERAL THEORY FOR INCLINED DESCENT	17
	III.4	COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT	28
	111.5	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
IV	THRUST	OF AN ISOLATED DESCENDING ROTOR	<u>141</u>
	IV.1	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	44

### CHAPTER

1-

### PAGE

	IV.2	BASIC RELATIONSHIPS FOR MASS FLOW, MOMENTUM, AND POWER	46
	IV.3	BLADE ELEMENT CONSIDERATIONS	52
	IV.4	VORTEX CORE MODEL	54
	IV.5	TIP LOSS FACTOR	62
	IV.6	INCORPORATION OF THE TIP LOSS FACTOR	65
	IV.7	COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT	71
	<b>IV.</b> 8	SUMMARY	77
v	THE MO ITS AP	STAB MODULAR STABILITY DERIVATIVE PROGRAM AND PLICATION TO THE S-58 AND AH-56A HELICOPTERS.	78
	V.l	INTRODUCTION	78
	V.2	THE NEED FOR MOSTAB	78
	<b>v</b> •3	PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF MOSTAB	79
	<b>v.</b> 4	MOSTAB INTERFERENCE VELOCITY SUBROUTINE	82
	V.5	MOSTAB INFUT DATA	84
	<b>v.</b> 6	NUMERICAL DATA FOR S-58, AH-56A, AND YHC-1A.	86
	V•7	CORRELATION OF DERIVATIVES WITH FLIGHT TEST DATA	103
VI	TANDEM	-ROTOR HELICOPTER OPEN-LOOP DYNAMICS	112
	VI.1	INTRODUCTION	112
	VI.2	LONGITUDINAL DYNAMICS	112
	VI.3	LATERAL DYNAMICS	119
VII	SINGLE	-ROTOR HELICOPTER DYNAMICS	126
	VII.1	INTRODUCTION	126

CHAPTER			PAGE
	VII.2	EIGENVALUES	129
	VII.3	CROSS-COUPLING EFFECTS	131
	VII.4	HEIGHT CONTROL	138
VIII	COMPOUN	D HELICOPTER DYNAMICS	152
	VIII.1	INTRODUCTION	152
	VIII.2	EIGENVALUES	153
	VIII.3	CROSS-COUPLING EFFECTS	155
	VIII.4	HEIGHT CONTROL	162
IX	CONCLUS	IONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	169
LITERATU	RE CITED	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	175
DISTRIBU	TION		178

-

### LIST OF TILLETRATIONS

----

FIGURE		PAGE
1	Forces Acting on an Aircraft Flying a Straight- Line Accelerating Descent	7
2	Alternative Approach Flight Profiles	7
3	Effect of Descent/Deceleration Capability on Unproductive Mission Time	9
4	Effect of Head- and Tailwinds on Descent Angle	10
5	Helicopter Approximate Descent Boundaries in Nondimensional Form	11
6	Flow Model for Vertical Descent	15
7	Flow Model for Inclined Descent With No Parasite Drag, Showing Velocity Components Normal to the Disc	18
8	Induced Velocity Versus Rate of Descent From Momentum Theory	21
9	Predicted Upper Boundary of Vortex-Ring State With Zero Tip Loss Factor, B = 1.0	22
10	Predicted Upper Boundary of Vortex-Ring State With Tip Loss Factor B = 0.9	23
11	Predicted Upper Boundary of Vortex-Ring State With Tip Loss Factor $B = 0.8$	24
12	Balance of Forces in Descending Flight	25
13	Measured Thrust Fluctuation for a Model Helicopter Rotor in Vertical Descent	30
14	Measured Thrust Coefficient for a Model Helicopter Rotor in Vertical Descent	31
15	Fluctuations of Mean Induced Velocity, Deduced from Thrust and Torque Measurements, $\alpha = 50$ Degrees	33

. .

### FIGURE

### PAGE

16	Fluctuations of Mean Induced Velocity, Deduced From Thrust and Torque Measurements, $\alpha = 70$	
	Degrees	34
17	Measured Thrust Fluctuations of a Propeller in Inclined Descent	35
18	Flow Model for Lower Boundary of Vortex-Ring State in Vertical Descent	37
19	Predicted Lower Boundary of Vortex-Ring State	38
20	Effect of Reverse-Thrust Propellers on Descent Angle of a STOL Aircraft	42
21	Vortex Model	55
22	Results of Example Calculation of $C_{T}$ Versus J	70
23	Comparison of Analytic and Experimental Results for Thrust vs Descent Rate of a VTOL Propeller	72
24	C <sub>T</sub> vs J for 6-Degree Blade Angle	73
25	C <sub>T</sub> vs J for 9-Degree Blade Angle	74
26	C <sub>T</sub> vs J for 12-Degree Blade Angle	75
27	C <sub>T</sub> vs J for 15-Degree Blade Angle	76
28	Modular Representation Used by MOSTAB	80
29	Standard OH-6A Three-View Drawing Including Example Overall Vehicle Reference Axes and Individual Aircraft Element Basic Axes	85
30	Three-View Drawing of Sikorsky S-58	87

### FIGURE

### PAGE

-

31	Three-View Drawing of Lockheed AH-56A	88
32	Three-View Drawing of Boeing-Vertol YHC-1A	89
33	YHC-1A Pedal Position Versus Sideslip Angle	105
34	YHC-1A Stick Position Versus Sideslip Angle	106
35	A Comparison of Longitudinal Flight Test Response Following a Step Pitch Control Input to a Response Based on Stability Derivatives Obtained from MOSTAB	110
36	A Comparison of Lateral Flight Test Response Following a Step Pitch Control Input to a Response Based on Stability Derivatives Obtained from MOSTAB	111
37	Root Locus for v - 8 <sub>R</sub> Feedback on Tandem-Rotor Helicopter	121
38	Aircraft Equations of Motion in Stability Axes for Small Perturbations from Straight-Line Flight with Zero Bank Angle	128
39	Definition of Height Error, $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$	139
40	Sikorsky S-58, 20 Knots S.L. Time History of Height Error, (Perpendicular Distance from Unperturbed Flight Path) Due to + 0.1 Radian Step Input Increase in Collective Pitch	142
41	Sikorsky S-58, Level Flight, 20 Knots S.L. Components of Height Error Time History per 1.0 Radian Step Increase in Collective Pitch	144 144
42	Sikorsky S-58 Helicopter 20 Knots, Steep Descent $\gamma = -41.8$ Deg. Components of Height Error Time History per 1.0 Radian Step Increase in Collective Pitch	145
43	Sikorsky S-58 Height Error/Collective Root Locus U <sub>0</sub> = 21 Knots, $\gamma$ = - 41.8 Deg	<b>1</b> 46

### FIGURE

Ę.,

PAGE	

----

44	Sikorsky S-58, 20 Knots Airspeed, S.L. Stability Augmented by Pitch Rate Feedback to B <sub>1s</sub> ,	
	Giving Total Pitch Damping Equal to Four Times, That of the Unaugmented Airframe, Response to 0.1 Rad Step Increase in Collective Pitch	150
45	Compound Helicopter Pitch Rate/Longitudinal Cyclic Transfer Functions for Level Flight and 9.8 Degree Descent Angle at Sea Level	159
46	Compound Helicopter Roll Rate/Lateral Cyclic Transfer Functions for Level Flight and 9.8 Degree Descent at Sea Level	160
47	Lockheed AH-56A, 40 Knots Airspeed, S.L. Height Error Response to a 0.1 Radian Step Increase in Collective Pitch	165

xiii

### LIST OF TABLES

-

.

TABLE		PAGE
I	EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF $C_{\mathbf{T}}$ VERSUS J	69
II	MOSTAB INPUT DATA	90
III	FLIGHT CONDITIONS	102
IV	S-58 DERIVATIVES FOR FLIGHT TEST CONDITION	108
v	S-58 RESIDUES AND EIGENVALUES FOR FLIGHT TEST CONDITION	109
VI	TANDEM-ROTOR LONGITUDINAL DENOMINATORS • • • • • •	113
VII	TANDEM-ROTOR $\theta/\delta_{e}$ NUMERATORS	115
VIII	TANDEM-ROTOR $u/\delta$ NUMERATORS IN STABILITY AXES	116
IX	TANDEM-ROTOR $u/\delta_e$ NUMERATORS IN COCKPIT AXES	117
x	TANDEM-ROTOR COLLECTIVE PITCH NUMERATORS FOR VELOCITY PERTURBATIONS OF C.G. NORMAL TO DESIRED FLICHT PATH	118
XI	TANDEM-ROTOR LATERAL EIGENVALUES	119
XII	TANDEM-ROTOR $v/\delta_R$ NUMERATORS	122
XIII	TANDEM-ROTOR $\phi/\delta_A$ NUMERATORS	123
XIV	EFFECT OF VERTICAL DESCENT ON TANDEM-ROTOR y/8A NUMERATORS MEASURED AT THE CENTER OF GRAVITY AND AT THE COCKPIT	124
xv	SIKORSKY S-58 EIGENVALUES WITH SIX DEGREES OF FREEDOM	130
XVI	EFFECT OF CROSS-COUPLING DERIVATIVES; SIKORSKY S-58,100 KNOTS LEVEL, FLIGHT	133
XVII	CROSS-COUPLED TRANSFER FUNCTIONS; SIKORSKY S-58, 100 KNOTS, S.L., LEVEL FLIGHT	134

TABLE		PAGE
XVIII	CROSS-COUPLING EFFECT ON B. IMPULSE INPUT, SIKORSKY S-58 at 100 KNOTS, SEA LEVEL	135
XIX	EFFECT OF DESCENT ON CROSS-COUPLING SIKORSKY S-58 at 40 KNOTS T.A.S. SEA LEVEL	137
xx	SIKORSKY S-58 NUMERATORS FOR COLLECTIVE CONTROL OF NORMAL DISTANCE FROM UNPERTURBED FLIGHT PATH $h/\theta_0$	141
XXI	EIGENVALUES AND HEIGHT ERROR NUMERATORS FOR S-58 WITH $q \rightarrow B_{18}$ STABILITY AUGMENTATION GIVING TOTAL Mq EQUAL TO FOUR TIMES THAT OF THE UNAUGMENTED AIRCRAFT	149
XXII	LOCKHEED AH-56 EIGENVALUES	154
XX111	AH-56A EIGENVALUES AT HOVER	156
XXIV	AH-56A EIGENVALUES IN 28.8 fps VERTICAL DESCENT	156
XXV	EFFECT OF DESCENT ON CROSS-COUPLING; LOCKHEED AH-56A AT 100 KNOTS, SEA LEVEL, NO S.A.S	158
XXVI	LOCKHEED AH-56A, NO S.A.S.; TRANSFER FUNCTION NUMERATOR COEFFICIENTS FOR $\phi/A$ AND $\theta/B$	161
XXVII	LOCKHEED AH-56A YAW/TAIL ROTOR COLLECTIVE NUMERATORS.	162
XXVIII	HEIGHT ERROR/COLLECTIVE NUMERATORS FOR THE AH-56A	164
XIX	PUSHER PROPELLER COLLECTIVE TRANSFER FUNCTION HEIGHT ERROR AND SPEED NUMERATORS FOR THE LOCKHEED AH-56A .	167

### LIST OF SYMBOLS

-

A	Aspect ratio, also characteristic area for interference velocity
A <sub>f</sub>	Profile drag area, $D/\frac{1}{2}(\rho V^2)$
A <sub>1c</sub>	Lateral stick deflection commanding A 1s
A <sub>1s</sub>	Lateral cyclic pitch
a	Blade section lift-curve slope
a <sub>z</sub>	Acceleration along the aircraft z-axis
В	Tip loss factor, R <sub>e</sub> /R
<sup>B</sup> 1c	Longitudinal stick deflection commanding B <sub>1s</sub>
B <sub>1s</sub> .	Longitudinal cyclic pitch
Ъ	Number of blades
с <sub>D</sub>	Drag coefficient = $D/\frac{1}{2}$ ( $\rho V^2 S$ )
CL	Lift coefficient = $L/\frac{1}{2}$ ( $\rho V^2 S$ )
C <sub>T</sub>	$T/\rho(\Omega R)^2 \pi R^2$ , or alternatively, $T/\rho(\Omega R_e)^2 \pi R_e^2$ , as appropriate
C <sub>T</sub>	$T/\rho \pi \Omega^2 R^4$ helicopter rotor thrust coefficient
° <sub>T</sub> p	$T/pn^2D^4$ , propeller thrust coefficient
D	Rotor diameter, or total aircraft drag, as appropriate

xvi

| + -

D p	Parasite drag, i.e., drag not induced by lift
D/L	Drag/lift ratio
e	Span-efficiency factor
F	$T/2\rho A(v-V)^2$
Fo	Momentum flux into the rotor system from the distant atmosphere
F <sub>w</sub>	Momentum flux in the distant wake
f	T/2pAV <sup>2</sup>
g	Acceleration due to gravity
h	Height
ĥ	Height error, i.e., perpendicular distance from unperturbed flight path to the c.g. of the aircraft (= h for $\gamma_0 = 0$ )
h	Rate of climb
I	Moment or product of inertia
J	V/nD
κ <sub>β</sub>	Sideslip feedback gain
k	Ratio of the mean induced velocity under consideration to that at the rotor
L	Rolling moment
М	Pitching moment
M <sub>f</sub>	Nondimensional mass flow: $M_f = \dot{m}/\pi R^2 \rho \Omega R$ , $M_f > 0$ for a net downward flow through the rotor

-

**x**vii

L.

m	Aircraft mass
• m	Mass flow through rotor
N	Yawing moment
n	Rotor rotational speed, revs/sec
Po	Energy influx to the rotor flow system from the distant atmosphere per second
P <sub>R</sub>	Power added to the flow by the rotor
P <sub>w</sub>	Energy efflux through the distant wake per second
р	Aircraft perturbation rate of roll
q	Aircraft perturbation rate of pitch
R	Rotor radius
Re	Effective rotor radius
R <sub>w</sub>	Radius of distant wake (from rotor spin axis to outer edge of vortex core)
r	Aircraft perturbation rate of yaw, or vortex core radius, as appropriate
S	Wing area, or other stated reference area
Se	Momentum theory "area of capture" for tandem rotors
8	Laplace transform complex variable
Т	Thrust, or time constant, as appropriate
T	Mean thrust

-

...

xviii

· ...

U <sub>o</sub>	Unperturbed velocity along the aircraft x-axis
u	Aircraft perturbation velocity along x-axis
v	Descent velocity
v <sub>A</sub>	Wind speed
v <sub>r</sub>	Resultant velocity at actuator disc
v <sub>T</sub>	Resultant velocity at module
v	Sideslip velocity, or $v - V$ , as appropriate
W	Weight
w	Aircraft perturbation velocity along z-axis
x	Force along aircraft x-axis
x	Horizontal distance
x	s/R or s <sub>w</sub> /R <sub>w</sub>
У	Force along aircraft y-axis
Z	Force along aircraft z-axis
z <sub>w</sub>	Plunge damping stability derivative
a	Inclination of plane of actuator disc to flight path, positive for descent
α	v/ΩR
β	Sideslip angle
γ	Angle of flight path to horizontal, negative for descent

xix

1

I\_--

γ <sub>o</sub>	Unperturbed flight path angle, positive for climb
ΔΤ	$T - \overline{T}$
8,8 <sub>w</sub>	Diameter of vortex core divided by R or R w respectively
δ <sub>A</sub>	Lateral stick deflection
δ <sub>e</sub>	Pitch control deflection
δ <sub>R</sub>	Rudder pedal deflection
E	$R_{W}/R$ , wake contraction ratio
θ	Pitch angle
θ <sub>op</sub>	Pusher propeller collective pitch
θο	Collective pitch of main rotor
<sup>θ</sup> otr	Tail rotor collective pitch
θ <sub>r</sub>	Blade pitch angle at the root
θ <sub>t</sub>	Blade pitch angle at the tip
θ <b>.7</b> 5	Blade pitch angle at 0.75R
Λ	V/ΩR
λ	$\nu/\Omega R$
ν	Induced velocity at rotor or actuator disc (positive in the opposite direction to rotor thrust)
V	Induced velocity in the wake

XX

• •

Ч'n	(Thrust of one rotor/ $2\rho\pi R^2$ ) <sup>1/2</sup> , theoretical induced velocity at actuator disc in hover
ρ	Air density
σ	Solidity
ø	Bank angle
Ω	Rotor rotational speed, rad/sec
Ω <sub>h</sub>	Rotor rotational speed in hover, rad/sec
ω	Frequency, rad/sec

### Special Mathematical Symbols

~	Approximately equals				
≙	Defined equal to				
x	Absolute magnitude of x				
×o	Unperturbed value of x				
°, <b>:</b>	Derivative of x with respect to time				

xxi

#### CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

#### I.1 THE SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This introduction is divided into two parts. In the first, we describe the scope of the report and indicate how it advances the state of the art. The second part of the introduction is a summary of the specific contents of the report, chapter by chapter. The reader who does not wish to read the entire report should use Section 2 of the introduction as a guide to areas of specific interest.

Approach and landing are generally the most demanding portions of a flight, for both fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters. Proximity to the ground demands increased precision in controlling the flight path, and the pilot's task may be extremely difficult, particularly in IFR conditions. Pilot comments on helicopters have indicated that the difficulties become more pronounced as the desired approach angle increases (see, e.g., Ref. 1). This suggests that at least part of the difficulty stems from changes in the dynamics and aerodynamic characteristics of the helicopter associated with change in the trim condition from level flight to descent. This is the area of most interest to the present report. The main purpose of this report is to identify the effects of descent angle on the aerodynamics and dynamics of typical helicopters, and to interpret the significance of these effects for human and automatic control.

To achieve this goal it was necessary to go back to fundamentals. As will be described, it was difficult to obtain reliable stability derivatives for small perturbations from steep descents, and these had to be calculated. Such calculations required a better understanding of the effect of descent angle on the flow about the rotor in the unperturbed condition. This required some advances in aerodynamic theory. These included delineation of the boundaries of the vortex-ring state, plus improved analytic models for the aerodynamic tip losses of rotors in level flight and descent.

Having obtained improved flow models for the aerodynamics of rotors in steep descents, it was necessary to calculate stability derivatives incorporating these models. Stability derivatives are presented here for three specific helicopters: the Sikorsky S-58, the Boeing-Vertol YHC-1A, and the Lockheed AH-56A Cheyenne. These are employed to represent the general classes of single-rotor, tandem-rotor, and compound helicopters. Inferences are drawn about the behavior of each class from the dynamics of these individual configurations.

The variety of configurations and the novel flow representations made it impossible to use handbook methods of computing derivatives, or even existing computer programs. The available programs were tied to particular classes of helicopter and/or certain flow representations. We therefore developed a new computer program for calculating derivatives. This program, called MOSTAB (modular stability derivative program), calculates trim and stability derivatives for any flying vehicle, described as an assemblage of rigid and flexible rotors, bodies, and fixed lifting surfaces (wings, tails). The MOSTAB program is an important product of this study. It was used to calculate trim conditions and stability derivatives for speeds of 0, 20, 40, 60, and 100 knots for the S-58 and AH-56A in level flight and descent. For the YHC-1A published derivatives were used.

Having obtained the derivatives, it was noticed that strong cross-coupling between lateral and longitudinal perturbations occurred, as evidenced by large magnitudes of derivatives such as  $L_q$ ,  $M_p$  as compared with  $L_p$ ,  $M_q$ . In many previous analytic studies, these cross-coupling derivatives were not available. Such an incomplete treatment, with arbitrary decoupling of longitudinal and lateral perturbations, did not seem appropriate for a fundamental study, and so all the cross-coupling derivatives were retained; the transfer functions thus indicated the responses in six degrees of freedom to each control input.

To validate the above transfer functions, several sets of responses to step control inputs calculated using MOSTAB derivatives were compared with flight test time histories, showing good agreement.

Finally, the implications of the transfer functions for control of each helicopter were considered. The philosophy was a sort of "reverse optimization"; instead of attempting to produce the best system, by modifying the characteristics of the aircraft, we searched for these characteristics which would cause difficulties for human and automatic control. Special interest centered on adverse characteristics which appeared in descent but were absent from level flight. It was found that some transfer functions did exhibit significant differences between level flight and descent. In particular, at low speeds, control of the normal deviation from the desired flight path by collective pitch becomes more difficult as the desired descent angle increases. This is demonstrated by the appearance of a right-half plane zero in the appropriate transfer functions.

The major advances in the state of the art that are presented in the report are:

- (i) a method of predicting the boundaries of the vortexring state.
- (ii) improved models for the tip losses of helicopter rotors and methods of calculating their effect on derivatives, including cyclic variations of tip losses.
- (iii) the MOSTAB program, which calculates trim and stability derivatives of any helicopter configuration.
  - (iv) presentation of derivatives and transfer functions for representative single-rotor, tandem-rotor, and compound helicopters, including lateral-longitudinal cross-coupling effects.
  - (v) identification of some significant changes in closedloop control characteristics between level flight and descents.

#### I.2. SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT

Chapter II presents a brief summary of the kinematics of steep approaches, demonstrating the equivalence between descent and deceleration capability. The importance of descent/deceleration capability to Army missions is explained. A description is also given of some of the problems that have been observed in steepapproach flight tests. This chapter contains nothing new; it merely sets the stage for the detailed technical analyses that follow, by explaining their relevance to practical problems.

Chapter III presents a theory for predicting the boundaries of the vortex-ring state. This is believed to be the first published theory which predicts the major features of these unsteady flow boundaries. The analysis is very simple, and employs momentum theory and actuator disc concepts. Despite this simplicity, the agreement with experiment is good.

Chapter IV uses flow models developed in Chapter III to calculate the derivatives of an isolated rotor in vertical descent. For purposes of calculating derivatives, it is customary to represent the tip losses by reducing the rotor radius from R to an effective radius BR. Standard formulas exist for B in hover, but in descent these disagree with experiment, yielding inaccurate derivatives. It was therefore necessary to produce modified formulas for B; these

are derived in Chapter IV, and are shown to give good agreement with test data on model rotors in vertical descent. Data were not available for inclined descent, for which the theory predicts that the tip losses should vary cyclically. This cyclic tip loss factor was included in subsequent calculations of derivatives. In addition, some cases were re-run without tip losses, to illustrate their importance by comparing transfer functions (given in Chapter VI) with and without tip losses.

Chapter V presents a general description of the MOSTAB modular stability derivative program. This briefly summarizes MOSTAB, avoiding technical detail (which is given in Volume II). Chapter V also presents a discussion of the accuracy of the MOSTAB derivatives. Flight test data on the S-58 are compared with predictions from MOSTAB. The results are generally in good agreement.

The derivatives and transfer functions for the YHC-1A, AH-56A and S-58 at each flight condition are presented in Volumes II - IV. Eigenvectors and residues of partial fraction expansions of selected transfer functions are given in the main text of the report, where appropriate. These data characterize the transient response characteristics of each helicopter for several forward speeds and descent angles.

The main section of the report continues in Chapter VI with the discussion of the open-loop and closed-loop dynamics of each class of helicopter, as revealed by the above data. Chapter VI discusses the tandem-rotor configuration, exemplified by the YHC-1A. Chapter VII discusses the dynamics of the S-58, representing single-rotor configurations. Chapter VIII discusses some control problems of the compound configuration, typified by the AH-56A. The principal conclusions of the report are given in Chapter IX.

Volume II provides an extensive account of the MOSTAB program. It should be noted that the version of MOSTAB used in this report (MOSTAB-B) does not include rotor stall or compressibility characteristics, as these were not significant for the approach flight conditions of interest here. Volume II describes the coordinate systems and the rationale for finding trim and derivatives, presents the equations used in MOSTAB and explains the underlying assumptions, describes the rotor analysis method used to represent the first flapping mode, includes a listing of the MOSTAB program, and explains computational aspects of MOSTAB.

4

----

Volume III presents derivatives and transfer functions for the YHC-1A tandem-rotor helicopter at forward speeds of 0, 60, and 80 knots, and several descent rates. It also presents derivatives for the S-58 at 0, 20, 40, 60, and 100 knots, and four descent rates (0, 7.5, 15.0, 22.5 fps) at each speed. Transfer functions are also tabulated for all the level flight and maximum descent rate conditions.

Volume IV presents similar data to Volume III for the AH-56A and reviews the literature on turbulence representation for low altitudes.

#### Reader's Guide

1\_\_\_

For a quick overview of the main points of this report, read all of Chapter II; the first half of Chapter V, which describes the MOSTAB program; the summaries at the ends of Chapters III, IV, VI, VII, and VIII: and all of Chapter X.

#### CHAPTER II. OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF STEEP APPROACHES

#### II.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF STEEP APPROACH CAPABILITY

In this chapter we review some analytic and experimental work on helicopter steep approaches in order to pinpoint the vehicle parameters of prime importance. As will be shown, one of the most important parameters is maximum obtainable drag/lift ratio expressed as a function of airspeed. This determines the helicopter's descent and deceleration capability.

Figure 1 illustrates the balance of forces in a straightline descent in still air with acceleration  $\mathring{V}$ . (Note that  $\mathring{V}$  is negative for deceleration and that the flight path angle  $\gamma$  is also negative for descent.) The relationship between  $\gamma$ ,  $\mathring{V}$ , and the drag/lift ratio D/L is

$$\tan(-\gamma) = \frac{D}{L} + \frac{v}{g\cos(-\gamma)}$$
(1)

The second term is merely the ratio of the acceleration along the flight path to the component of gravitational acceleration along the flight path. Since  $\mathring{V}$  is negative for deceleration, increased deceleration at a given V and  $\gamma$  requires more D/L, which implies increased D with constant L. In most instances the value of D/L that can be obtained at a given V is limited; thus descent angle may be traded off against deceleration, but the sum of descent angle and deceleration is limited. This limit is fundamental for helicopter steep approaches. For simplicity, the limit is defined by considering a constant-speed descent for which the maximum descent angle is

$$(-\gamma)_{\max} = \tan^{-1} (D/L)_{\max}$$
(2)

Assuming that the landing is made at essentially zero forward speed, the terminal phase of flight must involve descent and deceleration. The way in which these are combined can greatly affect the effectiveness of the mission. This is illustrated by Figure 2, taken from Reference 2, which compares two alternative approach profiles. One is a 10-degree straight-line descent with constant deceleration of 0.088 g. The other approach involves two straight segments: the first at 14.8 degrees with no deceleration, followed by a level segment with 0.264 g deceleration. In both approaches the aircraft is flying at  $(D/L)_{max} = 0.264$  throughout.



Figure 1. Forces Acting on an Aircraft Flying a Straight-Line Accelerating Descent.

D	ESCENT		LEVEL FLIGHT	TOTAL
APPROACH	ταν γ ν	Δt	<b>ΤΑΝ Γ ν</b> Δ <del>Ι</del>	TIME
	.176 .08	8 9i		91 sec
	.264 0	30	0 .264 31	61 sec



Figure 2. Alternative Approach Flight Profiles.

From Figure 2, it will be seen that the total approach time is reduced from 91 seconds to 61 seconds by the two-segment approach. Undoubtedly, further savings are possible by means of more complicated approach profiles. Much work has been done on the optimization of flight paths within given constraints on maximum D/L. Interesting though this is, it is somewhat outside the scope of this report. Our objective is to determine the constraints limiting  $(D/L)_{max}$  for given helicopters. This forms the main topic of this and the next chapter.

To show the operational benefits of increased  $(D/L)_{max}$  for a given approach profile, consider Figure 3, also taken from Reference 2.  $(D/L)_{max}$  must be at least 0.17 in order to achieve the 10-degree descent. However, raising  $(D/L)_{max}$  from 0.21 to 0.35 reduces the descent time from 3 to 1.5 minutes, measured from the 3-mile point to touchdown.

Further benefits of increased  $(D/L)_{max}$  include enhanced capability to land in confined areas such as valleys and forest clearings. In addition, a high  $(D/L)_{max}$  permits steep <u>downwind</u> approaches. This may be important for forward operations or where a normal into-the-wind approach may bring the helicopter uncomfortably close to the enemy. The effects of head- and tailwinds are illustrated in Figure 4.

Using Figure 4 to construct a simple example: for (D/L) = 0.2, with 60 knots airspeed and a 20-knot headwind, a descent angle of 17 degrees can be achieved. This reduces to 11.5 degrees in still air and to 8.5 degrees for a 20-knot tailwind. The implications for wind shears are profound.

The net conclusion that emerges from this brief review is that a high  $(D/L)_{max}$  is desirable

- (i) to minimize unproductive approach time.
- (ii) to permit approaches with adverse wind directions and to cope with wind shears.
- (iii) to permit approaches to confined areas.

## II.2 FACTORS LIMITING (D/L)MAX

For most helicopters,  $(D/L)_{max}$  is limited by the flow conditions about the main rotor(s). This is illustrated in Figure 5, which shows the permissible regions of horizontal versus vertical



Figure 3. Effect of Descent/Deceleration Capability on Unproductive Mission Time.



Figure 4. Effect of Head- and Tailwinds on Descent Angle.





a di take

velocity for a single-rotor helicopter.\* The boundaries shown stem from two causes:

- (i) the vortex-ring state
- (ii) autorotation

The vortex-ring state is a region of unsteady flow which occurs on rotors operating at high (D/L) at low speeds. It limits the maximum achievable steady (D/L). By contrast, the autorotation boundary is not associated with unsteady flow; it occurs because the torque on the rotor is zero. Steeper descents would be possible if a braking torque could be applied to the rotor. Current practice precludes engine braking, as it is usual to include a freewheel or override device to prevent stoppage of the rotor following engine failure.

Autorotation is not widely used in IFR situations because the rates of descent are usually excessive, particularly for the higher disc loading helicopters. The principal operational limitation on  $(D/L)_{max}$  therefore is due to the vortex-ring state. This is discussed at length in Chapter III.

#### **II.3** OTHER FACTORS LIMITING STEEPNESS OF HELICOPTER APPROACHES

The foregoing discussion has emphasized the importance of  $(D/L)_{max}$ . However, this is by no means the only factor limiting the achievable steepness of helicopter approaches. Let us define the term "nominal flight profile" as a combination of airspeeds, descent angles, and decelerations which is within the limits permitted by  $(D/L)_{max}$ . In practice, a nominal flight profile may be unflyable. The reasons for this include gust response, displays, handling qualities, loss of ground reference, etc. In particular, indications exist that handling qualities deteriorate with increased steepness of the nominal flight path. For example, Reference 1, describing tests on a CH-34C helicopter, notes that, when following a 3-degree nominal flight path, the rate of descent varied from 100 to 700 ft/min. At  $\gamma = -35$  degrees it varied from 400 to 3000 ft/min, which was regarded as unacceptable. In addition to the records of longitudinal and lateral deviations presented in Reference 1, pilot comments also confirmed the deterioration in handling qualities with increased  $-\gamma$ . A similar trend is noted in flight tests on a HUP-1 tandem-rotor helicopter described in References 3 and 4.

\* In Figure 5 the horizontal and vertical velocities have been normalized through division by  $v_h = (1/2\rho)^{1/2} \times (\text{Disc Loading})^{1/2}$ . Figure 5 is illustrative only and should not be scaled. More precise boundaries are given in Chapter III.

ł

To form a complete assessment of the problems involved in flying steep approaches, it is necessary to consider both the limitations on nominal flight profiles and also the limitations associated with small perturbations from nominal flight profiles. Hence, in Chapter III we analyze the limits on  $(D/L)_{max}$ . The results are used to determine nominal flight profiles for the YHC-1A, S-58, and AH-56A, and subsequent chapters study the behavior of these helicopters in small perturbations from these nominal flight profiles.

#### Summary

In this chapter we have tried to "set the stage" for the detailed analyses that follow by demonstrating that:

- (i) High (D/L)<sub>max</sub> is required to minimize unproductive mission time, to permit steep descents into confined areas, and to allow approaches from any direction, irrespective of the wind vector.
- (ii) At approach speeds,  $(D/L)_{max}$  is limited by autorotation and by the vortex-ring state. The latter limit is more serious since it occurs at smaller rates of descent.
- (iii) Within the bounds set by  $(D/L)_{max}$ , the helicopter's steep descent capability may be limited by some handling qualities factors, which appear to deteriorate with increased steepness of the approach.
## CHAPTER III. THE VORTEX-RING STATE

#### III.1 INTRODUCTION

1

In performing steep descents at low speeds, helicopters encounter an unsteady flow condition known as the "vortex-ring state". This state is characterized by severe thrust fluctuations and difficulty of control. This chapter presents a simple method of predicting the combination of rate of descent and angle of descent at which the vortex-ring state occurs. Momentum theory and actuator disc concepts are employed; despite the simplicity of this approach, the results are in good agreement with experiment.

The chapter is organized as follows: Section 2 presents an analytical method of calculating the vortex-ring state boundary for vertical descent using simple momentum theory modified to include certain viscous effects. Section 3 extends the method to the case of nonvertical descent. In Section 4 the experimental data and published analyses are reviewed and compared with the theory of this report. Section 5 gives conclusions and recommendations for further work.

#### III.2 FLOW MODEL AND EQUATIONS FOR VERTICAL DESCENT

The analysis considers both vertical and inclined descent, but the theory is most easily understood by considering the vertical descent case first.

Consider an actuator disc in a uniform stream of air rising with velocity V. This, of course, corresponds to a vertical descent at velocity V on an actual helicopter. The flow model used is illustrated in Figure 6. It consists of a slipstream with uniform flow at any cross-section, surrounded by a tube of vorticity. This tube is modeled by a series of vortex cores. Thus, near the rotor outside the tube the stream velocity is V upward, and inside the tube the velocity is (v - V) downward, where v is the induced velocity at the actuator disc. The rate of descent of the centers of the vortex cores is the mean of these velocities, i.e.,  $(\frac{v}{2} - V)$  downward.

The key assumption of the analysis is that the vortex-ring state will occur when the relative velocity of the vortex cores normal to the disc falls to zero. That is, when the rate of descent is increased to the point where vortex cores no longer move away from the actuator disc, unsteady flow occurs. The critical rate of descent  $V_{\rm crit}$  at which this occurs is given by

$$V_{\text{crit}} = \frac{v}{2} \tag{3}$$



Figure 6. Flow Model for Vertical Descent.

1

• • •

From simple momentum theory (e.g., Reference 5),

$$v = \frac{v}{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) + v_{h}^{2}}$$
(4)

where

1

$$\nu_{h} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \sqrt{\text{Thrust}/2\rho\pi R^{2}}$$
  
 $\rho \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \qquad \text{Air Density}$   
 $R \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \qquad \text{Rotor Radius}$ 

Combining (3) and (4) yields the following formula for the rate of vertical descent at which the vortex-ring state commences.

$$V_{\text{crit}} = \frac{v_{\text{h}}}{\sqrt{2}} = 0.707 v_{\text{h}}$$
 (5)

This formula, although derived by the simplest possible methods, agrees well with experiments, as will be shown.

An alternative formulation of Eq. (5) can be obtained by putting  $J \stackrel{\triangle}{=} V/nD$ ,  $C_{\overline{TD}} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} T/cn^2D^4$ , which gives

$$J_{\text{crit}} = \sqrt{\frac{C_{\text{Tp}}}{\pi}}$$
(6)

A further alternative is obtained by using  $C_{T} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} T/\rho \pi \Omega^{2} R^{4}$  and  $\lambda \stackrel{\Delta}{=} V/\Omega R$ , giving the critical rate of vertical descent as

$$\lambda_{\text{crit}} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{C_{\text{T}}}$$
(7)

## Tip Loss Effects

1

It is necessary to refine the theory slightly to allow for nonuniform flow when considering high disc loading rotors and/or inclined descents. This is done by introducing a tip loss factor B. Blade elements outside of radius BR are assumed to produce no thrust. Thus, near the rotor, instead of a uniform induced velocity v over an area  $\pi R^2$ , we assume a uniform induced velocity v over an area  $\pi R^2 B^2$ . This leads to a slight increase in V for vertical descents, but the effect is small for typical helicopter disc loadings. The tip loss effect for vertical descents is easily obtained as a special case of the more general formulation of the theory for inclined descents, derived below.

#### III.3 GENERAL THEORY FOR INCLINED DESCENT

Figure 7 shows the assumed flow model for inclined descent along a flight path inclined at an angle  $\alpha$  to the horizontal (for vertical descent  $\alpha = 90$  degrees). The velocity of the vortex cores normal to the actuator disc is assumed to be the mean of the normal velocities inside and outside the slipstream, i.e.,  $(\nu/2) - V \sin \alpha$ . Marked unsteadiness is predicted to occur when the rate of descent becomes sufficiently high to cause the velocity to fall to zero. This condition gives the following general formula:

$$V_{\rm crit} = \frac{v}{2 \sin \alpha} \tag{8}$$

To express Eq. (8) in a more convenient form, it is necessary to rewrite it in terms of horizontal velocity (V cosa), rate of descent (Vsina), and the tip loss factor B. This is done below by manipulating some equations of momentum theory.



Figure 7. Flow Model for Inclined Descent With No Parasite Drag, Showing Velocity Components Normal to the Disc.

ا سالہ From momentum theory (e.g., Reference 5) the thrust of an actuator disc descending at an angle  $\alpha$  to the horizontal can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{T} = 2\rho \pi \mathbf{R}^2 \mathbf{B}^2 \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{r}} |$$
(9)

where  $V_r^2 = v^2 - 2Vv \sin \alpha + V^2$  (10)

Eqs. (9) and (10) differ from familiar equations of momentum theory only in that the rotor radius R has been replaced by an effective radius BR. Substituting Eq. (10) in Eq. (9), squaring, and using the definition of  $v_h$  from Eq. (4) gives

$$(2\pi\rho R^2 v_h^2)^2 = (2\pi\rho R^2 v)^2 B^4 (v^2 - 2V v \sin\alpha + V^2)$$
(11)

Expanding,

۱<u>ـ</u>

$$v_{\rm h}^{\ 4} = B^{\ 4}v^{\ 4} - 2BV \ (\sin\alpha) \ B^{\ 5}v^{\ 5} + B^{\ 2}V^{\ 2}B^{\ 2}v^{\ 2}$$
(12)

$$\left(\frac{\nu_{\rm h}}{B\nu}\right)^4 = 1 - \frac{2B \, V \sin\alpha}{B\nu} + \frac{B^2 \, V^2}{B^2 \, \nu^2} \tag{13}$$

$$\left(\frac{B\nu}{\nu_{\rm h}}\right)^{\rm H} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2 \ B \ V \sin\alpha}{B\nu} + \left(\frac{BV}{B\nu}\right)^{\rm 2}}$$
(14)

This is similar in form to the standard quartic equation of momentum theory usually derived for B = 1; i.e., quoting from Reference 5,

$$\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_{\rm h}}\right)^{\rm 4} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2 \, \text{Vsin}\alpha}{\nu} + \left(\frac{\nu}{\nu}\right)^{\rm 2}} \tag{15}$$

Eq. (15) is conveniently graphed with  $\nu/\nu_h$  as ordinate and  $Vsin\alpha/\nu_h$  as abscissa, for a fixed  $\alpha$  forming a nondimensional graph of induced

velocity versus rate of descent for given angle of descent. (Similar graphs are given in References 6 and 7 for B=1.) The graphs can be formed from Eq.(14) for a fixed B using  $B\nu/\nu$  as ordinate and B Vsina/ $\nu$  as abscissa. Figure 8 illustrates has these graphs for several values of  $\alpha$ , from 5 to 90 degrees.

To establish the boundary of the vortex-ring state, for a given B and  $\alpha$ , simply include in Figure 8 the critical condition of Eq. (8). Expressed in terms of the variables of Figure 8, Eq. (8) becomes

$$\frac{Bv}{v_{h}} = \frac{2 B V sina}{v_{h}}$$
(16)

This describes a straight line of slope 2, as shown on Figure 8. The intersection of this line with the remaining graphs denotes the critical value of rate of descent for a given B and  $\alpha$ . It is convenient to plot the results in terms of nondimensional horizontal velocity,  $V\cos\alpha/v_{\rm h}$ , and nondimensional rate of descent,  $V\sin\alpha/v_{\rm h}$ , for a given B as shown of Figures 9, 10, and 11. In these figures, Eq. (16) corresponds to the line marked " zero parasite drag" for which case  $\alpha = -\gamma$ , as explained below.

#### Effect of Parasite Drag

1

The parasite drag of the rotor and of other components has not been included up to this point. This drag causes the boundary of the vortex-ring state to occur at a steeper angle of descent for a given airspeed. The effects of parasite drag can be included in the analysis as indicated below.

Figure 12 shows the forces acting on a helicopter in a steady descent; the aerodynamic forces are assumed to consist only of drag acting parallel to the flight path and rotor thrust normal to the actuator disc.

From Figure 12, resolving parallel and normal to the flight path, noting that  $\gamma$  is negative for descent,

$$T \sin \alpha + D + W \sin \gamma = 0 \tag{17}$$

$$T \cos \alpha - W \cos \gamma = 0 \tag{18}$$



RATE OF DESCENT PARAMETER, B VSIN  $\alpha/\nu_h$ 

# Figure 8. Induced Velocity Versus Rate of Descent From Momentum Theory.







RATE OF DESCENT PARAMETER, VSIN(-7)/Vh

23

ļ



RATE OF DESCENT PARAMETER, VSIN(-7)/Vh



Figure 12. Balance of Forces in Descending Flight.

These equations yield the required relation between  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha$  as:

$$\tan \alpha = \frac{-(D/W)}{\cos \gamma} - \tan \gamma$$
(19)

The drag/weight ratio is conveniently expressed in terms of a "drag area"  ${\rm A}_{\rm f}$  defined as

$$\mathbf{A_f} = \mathbf{D}/\frac{1}{2} \rho \, \mathbf{V}^2 \tag{20}$$

Thus, using the definition of  $v_h$ ,  $(v_h^2 = T/2\rho_{\pi}R^2)$ , and assuming thrust at hover equal to weight, Eq. (19) becomes

$$\tan \alpha = - \frac{A_{f}}{4\pi R^{2}} \left(\frac{V}{v_{h}}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{\cos \gamma} - \tan \gamma \qquad (21)$$

To modify Figures 9, 10, and 11 to show the effect of profile drag, we require the relationship between  $\gamma$  and  $A_f/4\pi R^2$  for a given V and  $\alpha$ . This is obtained by manipulating Eq. (21) to give  $\gamma$  in terms of  $\alpha$ , V, and  $A_f/4\pi R^2$ , as follows. Multiply (21) by  $\cos\gamma$  and  $\cos\alpha$ :

$$\sin \alpha \cos \gamma = - \frac{A_{f}}{4\pi R^{2}} \left(\frac{V}{v_{h}}\right)^{2} \cos \alpha - \sin \gamma \cos \alpha \quad (22)$$

$$\sin (\alpha + \gamma) = - \frac{A_{f}}{4\pi R^{2}} \left(\frac{V}{v_{h}}\right)^{2} \cos \alpha \qquad (23)$$

$$\gamma = -\alpha - \sin^{-1} \left[ \frac{A_{f}}{4\pi R^{2}} \left( \frac{V}{v_{h}} \right)^{2} \cos \alpha \right] \quad (24)$$

Eq. (24) has been used to show the effect of parasite drag in Figures 9, 10, and 11. For a fixed value of the drag parameter  $A_f/4\pi R^2 = 0.05$ , the flight path angle at any V changes from  $\alpha$  to  $\gamma$ as determined from Eq. (22). For zero parasite drag,  $\alpha = -\gamma$ . Note that the inclusion of parasite drag yields the characteristic shape of the vortex-ring boundary, first rising and then falling, as horizontal speed is increased.

The drag parameter  $A_r/4\pi R^2$  was deliberately chosen to be

rather high, so that most helicopters display vortex-ring boundaries falling between the "zero drag" and "with drag" curves of Figures 9, 10, and 11. To appreciate the physical significance of the parameter  $A_{\rm f}/4\pi R^2$ , note that a value of 0.05 corresponds to a parasite drag area

of 20 percent of the disc area. This is much larger than would be expected in level flight for most helicopters. However, in descent, the fuselage may be operating at a large angle of attack, causing a corresponding increase in drag area. When comparing Figures 9, 10 and 11 with exp rimental results on wind tunnel models, note that the parasite drag of the fuselage, tail, and other components will be disproportionately large at low Reynolds numbers.

To predict vortex-ring boundaries of specific configurations using Figures 9, 10 and 11 requires the value of the tip loss factor, B. Well-known formulas exist for B in hover; e.g., Payne (Reference 8) quotes a formula due to Sissingh,

$$B = 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{2C_T}$$
 (25)

Payne notes that Sissingh's formula is in reasonable agreement with tests on untwisted, untapered blades but yields values of B which are too small for uniformly loaded blades. For the latter, Payne suggests an alternative formula, which at hover reduces to

$$B = 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{C_{T}}$$
(26)

For high-disc-loading VTOL rotors, both the above formulas appear to give values of B which are too small. An alternative semiempirical expression is derived in Chapter IV for rotors of ideal twist and is given below. This is more complicated than Eqs. (25) or (26) but gives good accuracy for vertical descent as well as hover.

$$B = 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2} \left(\theta_{t} + V/B\Omega R\right)}$$
(27)

This gives a cubic equation for B, for a given rotor geometry, pitch setting, and rate of descent. Empirically it is suggested that Eq. (27) can be used for inclined as well as vertical descent, replacing V by Vsin $\alpha$ .

## III.4 COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

Although investigations of the behavior of rotors in the vortex-ring state have been made since the 1920's, only the more recent references contain data useful for comparison with the theory of this report. Most of the earlier references (e.g., Reference 9) are confined to measurement and empirical prediction of the mean thrust and throughflow velocity. Reference 10 summarizes various presentations of parameters such as 1/f and 1/F. These parameters are derived from measurements of averaged quantities, so these data are unsuitable for determining the velocity and angle of descent at which noticeable unsteadiness occurs. References 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 do not include any unsteady force measurements, but they do present some flow visualizations, which qualitatively indicate a "region of roughness." These data are discussed later. For purposes of comparison with theory, it is unfortunate that the available test data are for blades with non-ideal twist; e.g., References 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 employ an untwisted rotor. The resulting induced velocity distribution is at variance with the uniform distribution assumed in the present theory. However, even full-scale helicopters do not have ideal twist, so this compromise must be accepted in order to compare theory and experiment.

#### Vertical Descent

1

Azuma (Reference 16) presents data on thrust and inflow fluctuations for a 3-bladed rotor, with a diameter of 1100 mm, a solidity of 0.0573, an NACA 0012 section and  $-8^{\circ}$  twist from root to tip, free to flap and lag. The rate-of-descent parameter was expressed as  $V\Omega_{\rm h}/v_{\rm h}\Omega_{\rm h}$ because the nominal rotational speed of 1,000 rpm was not maintained precisely.

Lacking data on  $V/\Omega R$ , we cannot make allowance for the tip loss factor. However, Eq. (5),  $V_{crit} = 0.707 v_h$ , gives good agreement with the observed onset of significant unsteady thrust and inflow. This is demonstrated in Figure 13. Eq. (5) corresponds to r.m.s. thrust fluctuations  $\Delta T/T$  ranging from 4% to 14% depending on the blade pitch setting. (The thrust fluctuation,  $\Delta T$ , is defined as  $T - \overline{T}$ , where  $\bar{T}$  is the mean thrust; thus the r.m.s. peak to peak fluctuation is 8% to 28% of the mean thrust.) Note that the graph marked  $\theta_{1} = 8$ degrees corresponds to zero blade angle at the tip. As predicted by Eq. (3) and Figures 9, 10, and 11, the critical rate of descent normalized with respect to  $v_h$  and  $\Omega_h$  increases as the tip blade angle is increased (by increasing  $\theta_r$ ). The experimental data of Reference 16 indicate that the mean thrust in descent varies; for  $\theta_n = 10$  degrees at  $V = 0.7 v_{\rm h} \Omega / \Omega_{\rm h}$ , the mean thrust falls to 80% of the hovering thrust. To convert the data to the constant mean thrust assumed by the theory (and appropriate to steady descents), the value of V must be increased above that observed experimentally. Without data on  $C_{\pi}$ , this cannot be done precisely, but the trend will certainly be to move the peaks of the thrust fluctuation curves to the right, thus increasing agreement with the predicted boundary for the onset of unsteady flow.

Washizu (Reference 7) describes tests on a similar rotor in vertical and inclined descent. Figure 14 shows envelopes of  $C_{\rm T}$ versus the rate of descent parameter  $\lambda$ , for vertical descent. For two of the tests, the blade pitch setting is very low and the tips are actually lifting downward in hover. This invalidates comparisons with our theory, which assumes uniform inflow except at the tips, corresponding to the rather high pitch setting appropriate to maximum static thrust/power. For this reason, the data taken at  $\theta_{.75} = 4.5$ degrees are also unsuitable for comparison. However, using Eq. (7) and B = 0.95, the case with  $\theta_{tip} = 8.0$  degrees gives  $\lambda_{crit} = 0.033$ . This corresponds to a mean-to-peak thrust fluctuation of 12% of the mean thrust.

#### Inclined Descent

Washizu <u>et al</u> presents experimental data on thrust and induced velocity fluctuations in the vortex-ring state for singlerotor configurations (Reference 7) and tandem configurations (Reference 17). Contours of percentage thrust fluctuation are shown on the horizontal velocity/rate-of-descent plane; however, the data points are not indicated. Hence results for low pitch angles cannot be removed to enable the remaining data to be compared with the theory. Washizu <u>et al</u> gives more complete data on induced velocity fluctuations, averaged over the disc based on measurements of thrust and torque fluctuations, and these can be compared with theory. Figures 15 and 16



Figure 13. Measured Thrust Fluctuation for a Model Helicopter Rotor in Vertical Descent.



Figure 14. Measured Thrust Coefficient for a Model Helicopter Rotor in Vertical Descent.

I.

illustrate the data of Reference 7 for rotor with  $\theta_{.75} = 7.5$  degrees and  $\alpha = 50$  and 70 degrees. Note that the lower boundary of the induced velocity is close to the momentum theory solutions and that the onset of marked unsteadiness corresponds to the critical condition predicted by Figure 8. This critical condition corresponds to the shaded lines on Figures 15 and 16.

Yaggy and Mort (Reference 18) describe tests on a flapping propeller with the shaft axis inclined at 180, 165, 150, 135, and 120 degrees to the freestream. This corresponds to descent angles of 90, 75, 60, 45, and 30 degrees.\* Contours of the thrust fluctuation  $\Delta T$  (measured from the mean thrust to the peak) divided by the mean thrust  $\overline{T}$  are shown for various mean disc loadings  $\overline{T}/\pi R^2$ , in Figure 7 of Reference 18. Figure 17 illustrates the results for  $\overline{T}/\pi R^2 = 16$  lb/ft<sup>2</sup>. The vortex-ring boundary has also been calculated assuming B = 0.86 and a mean  $v_h$ ,  $\overline{v_h} \triangleq (\overline{T}/2\rho\pi R^2)^{1/2}$ . The boundary corresponds to a  $\Delta T/\overline{T}$  of between 15% and 25%. A more accurate boundary can be calculated if v is based on the lower value of thrust  $\overline{T} - \Delta T$ . This is in accord with Figures 15 and 16, which indicate that the minimum induced velocity during the vortex-ring state is approximately equal to the velocity predicted by momentum theory. To follow this suggestion, substitute the critical condition  $v = 2V\sin\alpha$  in Eqs. (9) and (10). This gives

$$\mathbf{T} - \Delta \mathbf{T} = 4\pi \mathbf{R}^2 \mathbf{B}^2 (\mathbf{V} \sin \alpha)^2 / \sin \alpha \qquad (28)$$

The critical rate of descent can be calculated iteratively by first putting  $\Delta T = 0$ . This gives the solid-line boundary on Figure 17. Since in this case we have knowledge of  $\Delta T/\overline{T}$ , we can refine the solution by reducing the critical rate of descent in the ratio  $(1 - \Delta T/\overline{T})^{1/2}$ . The resulting boundary is also shown on Figure 17 as a broken line. Without prior knowledge of  $\Delta T/\overline{T}$  (or an estimate), it would be possible to calculate only the solid-line boundary.

#### Flight Tests

1

Published data on flight characteristics of holicopters in steep descents are insufficiently complete to permit mapping the boundaries of the vortex-ring region. However, some related data points can be obtained as listed below.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>^</sup> The descent angles of 75, 60, 45, and 30 degrees are necessarily approximate, because Ref. 18 does not give the inclination of the thrust from the shaft axis.



Figure 15. Fluctuations of Mean Induced Velocity, Deduced

From Thrust and Torque Measurements,  $\alpha = 50$  Degrees.

!







7111117 Calculated Vortex - Ring State Boundary Corrected for  $\Delta T$ 

Figure 17. Measured Thrust Fluctuations of a Propeller in Inclined Descent.

Reference 19 notes that for a Westland Whirlwind helicopter, the vortex-ring state was well established at 1300 ft/min vertical descent, corresponding to  $V/v_{\rm h}$  = 0.84. Tests on an early helicopter, the Sikorsky R-4B, described in Reference 2Q showed onset of roughness in vertical descent at 500 f.p.m. and "shuddering" commencing at 900 f.p.m, corresponding to 0.707 $v_{\rm h}$ . In the discussion of Reference 21, hennett states that for the R-4B, the critical rate of descent decreases as forward speed is increased, almost reaching level flight at 60 m.p.h.

The above results are in accord with the theory, but it must be remembered that factors other than the behavior of the rotor itself in the vortex-ring state may influence helicopter flying qualities in descents. The unsteady flow may induce large pitching moments on the fuselage. Reference 22 discusses this phenomenon, noting that the size and cross-section of the fuselage tail cone have an important effect. For example, the R-4B had particularly bad characteristics in the vortexring state because of its thick slab-sided rear fuselage. Quite apart from considerations of unsteady flow, changes in derivatives may affect flying qualities. Reference 19 notes that the magnitude of the plunge damping derivative, Z\_, decreases markedly between hover and the vortexring state. This trend is confirmed by the data of Reference 18. If [Z\_] becomes sufficiently small, the helicopter's flying qualities will be degraded.

#### The Lower Boundary of the Vortex-Ring State

After entering the vortex-ring state, if the rate of descent is increased, eventually steady flow is re-established. The horizontal speed and rate of descent at which this occurs define the lower boundary of the vortex-ring state. The practical importance of the vortex-ring state depends, in part, on the distance between the lower and upper boundaries on the V cos  $\gamma$ , V sin  $\gamma$  hodograph plane. If large areas of the plane are associated with unsteady flow, the operational utility of the helicopter will be correspondingly reduced.

A critical condition for the lower boundary will now be derived. As before, we postulate that the unsteady flow is associated with a breakdown in the protective sheath of vorticity surrounding the slipstream. However, for the lower boundary the "pileup" of vorticity occurs some distance above the rotor, as shown in the flow model of Figure 18.

<sup>\*</sup> See Ref. 34 for an explanation of the influence of  $Z_w$  on handling qualities.





ł



RATE OF DESCENT PARAMETER, VSING 7)/4

Using momentum theory and the flow model of Figure 18, the critical condition is derived as follows. Inside the slipstream the induced velocity is  $k \vee$ , where the value of k varies from 1.0 at the rotor disc to 2.0 at infinity. The rate of ascent of the vortices is  $v_{sino-}(k \vee / 2)$ . In determining the upper boundary, conditions at the disc are relevant, and so a value of k = 1.0 was used, giving the critical condition as Eq. (3), or more generally, Eq. (16). For the lower boundary the choice of k is not so clear-out. At infinity k = 2, but this value is inappropriate because an accumulation of vorticity at infinity would not cause unsteady flow to be reflected back to the rotor. Therefore, the value of k must be less than 2.0. Tuntatively, 1.4 < k < 1.6 is suggested. Cross-plotting lines of slope 2/k on Figure 8 with k = 1.41 and k = 1.54 gives a lower boundary as indicated on Figure 19.

It is interesting to note that the "region of roughness" reported by Drees in Reference 11 on the basis of flow visualization agrees approximately with the predicted boundaries at low speeds.

The lower boundary is not as sharply defined as the upper boundary, in that the development of unsteady flow is less sudden (see, e.g., Figure 15). One would expect this, because the accumulation of vorticity and consequent breakdown of the slipstream are occurring farther away from the rotor. One would also expect momentum theory to become less accurate for predicting the lower boundary at higher forward speed, because distortion of the slipstream, rolling up of vortices, and other viscous phenomena not included in the theory become more important as the critical region moves away from the rotor with increase of k.

## Tandem Rotors

Reference 17 describes experiments on tandem rotors in vertical and inclined descent. Data on fluctuating inflow (similar to Figures 15 and 16) are presented, normalized with respect to alternative parameters  $v_h$  and  $v_h$  where  $v_h \stackrel{\Delta}{=} T/2\rho\pi R^2$ ,  $v_h \stackrel{\Delta}{=} T/2\rho S_e$ , where T = thrust per rotor, and  $S_e$  is one-half the projected area of the tandem rotors. The overlap between the rotors is small, so for the configuration of Reference 17,  $S_e$  should be defined in this

way for momentum theory calculations; Reference 6, p. 312, suggests a larger area. This is the area formed by two semicircles of radius equal to the rotor radius, with centers spaced a distance equal to the hub separation of the actual configuration, plus the area enclosed by straight lines joining the semicircles.

The experimental data of Reference 17 indicate that severe induced flow fluctuations occur at a slightly lower value of  $\frac{V}{v_h}$ 

than that for the single-rotor configuration. However, the periodicity noted in Reference 7 is hardly observable. Because of the mutual induction effect of tandem rotors, it is expected that the theory proposed here will require modification for such configurations.

۱.

# III.5 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS Summery

1. The boundaries of the vortex-ring state can be predicted by momentum theory as described in this chapter. The predicted upper boundary corresponds to measured mean-to-peak thrust fluctuations of approximately 1% of the mean thrust.

2. In vertical descent, the upper boundary is approximately 0.707 times the mean induced velocity at hover. For inclined descents, the upper boundary is very sensitive to parasite drag, and for helicopters with large parasite drag, the vortex-ring state may vanish for descent angles shallower than 20 degrees.

#### Decomende tions

ł.

1. Improved helicopter steep descent capability requires a more complete understanding of the vortex-ring state. The "upper" (k = 1) boundary is of principal interest for helicopters; but for STOL aircraft with reverse-pitch propellers descent angle is limited by the "lower" (k = 1.5) boundary, as shown in Figure 20. Further knowledge of the vortex-ring state is thus of importance in obtaining steep, slow flight of propeller-driven STOL aircraft as well as helicopters.

2. The present theory is limited by the assumptions of momentum theory, e.g., the rather arbitrary Glauert-Kussner hypothesis regarding the "area of capture" and the assumption of uniform induced velocity across the disc. Greater accuracy could be obtained by using more refined theories. A further area for exploration by such theories is the nature of the flow within the vortex-ring state. For example, it appears that the accumulation of vorticity either at or above the disc increases the induced velocity at the disc, thus removing the accumulated vorticity and returning the flow to that predicted by momentum theory. In turn, this causes the vorticity to re-accumulate, causing a cyclic oscillation characteristic of the vortex-ring state. Mathematical formulation of this physical model probably lies beyond the grasp of momentum theory.

3. Although the upper boundary is fairly sharply defined, slight unsteadiness does occur at smaller rates of descent, and even

41



Figure 20. Effect of Reverse-Thrust Propellers on Descent Angle of a STOL Aircraft.

at hover according to the data of Reference 2. A more sophisticated theory is required to analyze this phenomenon.

4. More experimental data on the vortex-ring state are required. The present analysis could serve as a guide to the test conditions of primary interest.

5. The implications of the vortex-ring state on handling qualities and operational maneuvers require investigation. Suitable automatic control of collective pitch may smooth the thrust fluctuations sufficiently to permit comfortable, controlled flight at all descent speeds and angles.

1

1.0

# IV.1. INTRODUCTION AND MIDMARY

Standard methods for calculating helicopter stability derivatives are based on momentum and blade-element theories ( $\bullet$ .g., References 24, 25). As will be shown, these procedures do not give good agreement with experimental data on rotors in descending flight. This chapter therefore presents an analysis of rotors in vertical descent using conventional momentum and blade-element assumptions, plus some additional refinements. These include:

- (i) nonuniform downwash associated with rotor tip vortices
- (ii) the loss of lifting effectiveness of the tips due to three-dimensional flow (i.e., "spillage")

With these factors included, the theory agrees well with experiment.

The basic flow model is shown in Figure 6. The tip vortices are modeled by vortex cores with boundary conditions matched inside and outside the slipstream. This, of course, is a highly simplified model of the actual flow, neglecting swirl, nonuniform downwash due to non-ideal blade twist, unsteady effects, etc. However, this model gives results which are sufficiently accurate for stability and control calculations, predicting derivatives to within  $\pm$  20% accuracy.

The chapter is organized as follows. In Section 2, mass flow, momentum, and energy relationships are derived for the assumed flow model, with the ratio of the parallel sides of the trapezoidal distribution left variable. These basic relationships relate conditions at the rotor disc to those in the ultimate wake. Because of the nonuniform flow at the outer edge of the slipstream, the relationships are more complicated than for the standard model where the flow is assumed to be uniform across the slipstream. Section 3 expresses rotor thrust in terms of blade-element angles of attack, taking into consideration the trapezoidal induced velocity profile. In Section 4 the vortex core model boundary conditions are established in order to fix the geometry of the trapezoidal distribution both at the disc and in the ultimate wake.

44

1

Section 5 discusses the loss of lifting effectiveness of blade elements near the tips due to three-dimensional flow. This is usually accounted for by a "tip loss factor", i.e., defining an effective rotor radius BR where  $H = 1 - \sqrt{2C_{p}}/b$ . This factor gives reasonable accuracy at hover, but it is not apparent how B should be modified for nonhovering conditions. Section 5 therefore presents an alternative derivation of B based on considerations of the loading at the rotor tips rather than the average loading per blade. This permits B to be calculated in a logical fashion for nonhovering conditions. It does, however, lead to a cyclic variation of B which causes some additional complication in calculating derivatives. The procedure adopted for incorporating a cyclic B in the rotor blade time history calculations is too detailed for discussion in the main text of the report and is therefore discussed in Appendix II, in conjunction with the description of the subroutine SWEEP which integrates the blade-element loads radially and with respect to time.

Section 6 shows how the tip loss factor B can be combined with the preceding analysis to compute thrust versus rate of descent for a given rotor. Section 7 compares theoretical predictions with wind-tunnel data on a descending rotor. Because no satisfactory data were available for inclined descent, it was not possible to validate the assumed cyclic component of tip losses, but good agreement is obtained with data for vertical descent for which only noncyclic tip losses are predicted.

1

-

#### IV.2. BASIC RELATIONSHIPS FOR MASS FLOW, MOMENTUM, AND POWER

## Axial Velocity Distribution

A trapezoidal velocity distribution such as that shown in Figure 6 can be described as follows:

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \nu - \mathbf{V} & 0 \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 - \delta \\ \frac{\nu}{\delta} (1 - \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{V} & 1 - \delta \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 \end{cases}$$
(29)

This distribution can be nondimensionalized by dividing through by  $\Omega R$ . The result is

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \lambda - \Lambda & 0 \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 - \delta \\ \frac{\lambda}{\delta} & (1 - \mathbf{x}) - \Lambda & 1 - \delta \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 \end{cases}$$
(30)

The above equations apply near the rotor disc. Similar expressions hold in the wake, except that  $\alpha$  is used in lieu of  $\alpha$ . Of course,  $\lambda$  and  $\delta$  must be used in the  $\alpha$  expression corresponding to Eq. (30). In general,  $\lambda \neq \lambda$  and  $\delta \neq \delta$ , but  $\Lambda$  is the same everywhere and requires no special subscript.

# Mass Flow

+ -----

The mass flow through the rotor disc can be obtained by integrating the trapezoidal velocity distribution over the entire disc. The result is

$$\dot{m} = \int_{0}^{R} 2\pi s \rho v_{1}(\frac{s}{R}) ds \qquad (31)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}} = \rho \pi R^2 \Omega R \left[ 2 \int_0^1 \mathbf{x} \alpha(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right]$$
(32)

$$M_{f} = 2\int_{0}^{1} x\alpha(x) dx \qquad (33)$$

In the distant wake, Eq. (32) is applicable with  $R_w^2$  substituted for  $R^2$  in the area factor (note: the R in the  $\Omega R$  factor remains nonsubscripted because this term was used to transform  $\nu_w$  and V to their nondimensional forms  $\lambda_w$  and A).

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}} = \rho \pi R_{\mathbf{w}}^{2} \Omega R \left[ 2 \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{1} \mathbf{x} \alpha_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right]$$
(34)

Dividing (34) by (32) and rearranging,

$$\varepsilon \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \frac{R_{w}}{R} = \sqrt{\int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(x) dx} \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{w}(x) dx}$$
(35)

# Momentum Considerations

The momentum flux of the air that is eventually encountered by the rotor while it moves in the distant atmosphere is

$$F_{o} = - \dot{m}V \tag{36}$$

where positive F is downward.

In the distant wake, the momentum flux is calculated by integrating the trapezoidal distribution:

$$F_{w} = \int_{0}^{R_{w}} 2\pi s \rho v_{w}^{2} \left(\frac{s}{R_{w}}\right) ds$$
(37)

Nondimensionalizing the integral,

$$F_{w} = \rho \pi R_{w}^{2} (\Omega R)^{2} \left[ 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{w}^{2} (x) dx \right]$$
 (38)

$$F_{w} = \pi R^{2} \rho(\Omega R)^{2} \varepsilon^{2} \left[ 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{w}^{2}(x) dx \right]$$
(39)

Clearly, the change in momentum flux must equal the rotor thrust.

$$\mathbf{T} = + \mathbf{\dot{m}V} + \pi R^2 \rho(\Omega R)^2 \epsilon^2 \left[ 2 \int_0^1 \mathbf{x} \alpha_w^2(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right]$$
(40)

Nondimensionalizing with the help of Eq. (33),

$$C_{\mathbf{T}} = M_{\mathbf{f}} \Lambda + \epsilon^2 \left[ 2 \int_0^1 \mathbf{x} \alpha_{\mathbf{w}}^2(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right]$$
(41)

An alternative form to (41) is

$$C_{\rm T} = 2 \int_{0}^{1} \mathbf{x} [\Lambda \alpha(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon^2 \alpha_{\rm W}^2(\mathbf{x})] d\mathbf{x}$$
(42)

# Energy (Power) Considerations

.

•

The energy flux (power) in the air before it reaches the rotor (i.e., when this air is in the distant atmosphere) is given by

$$P_{o} = 1/2 \text{ mV}^2$$
 (43)

1

The power added to the air by the rotor is

$$P_{R} = \int_{0}^{R} v(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{T} = \int_{0}^{1} v(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{d\mathbf{T}}{d\mathbf{x}}\right) d\mathbf{x}$$
(44)

Eq. (44) can be verified from either force and momentum considerations or blade element considerations.

The assumed blade element has span ds and produces lift dL. The shaft torque produced by this element is

$$dQ = sdL sina_{i}$$

For small  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_i \approx \sin \alpha_i \approx \tan \alpha_i \approx \frac{v(x)}{\Omega s}$ .

Then the torque is

1

$$dQ = s \frac{v(x)dL}{\Omega s} = \frac{v(x)dL}{\Omega}$$

Multiplying through by  $\Omega$  and integrating,

$$Q_{\Omega} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} P_{R} = \int_{0}^{R} v(x) dt = \int_{0}^{1} v(x) \frac{dL}{dx} dx$$

Eq. (44) can be easily nondimensionalized. Putting  $L \cong T$ ,

$$P_{\rm R} = \pi R^2 \rho(\Omega R)^3 \int_0^1 \alpha(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{d C_{\rm T}}{d\mathbf{x}}\right) d\mathbf{x}$$
(45)

The power in the distant wake is assumed to be completely embodied in kinetic energy flux; i.e., the ambient pressure in the distant wake has returned to atmospheric pressure.

In the distant wake, currents flow in radial, tangential, and axial directions. The power could be broken into three corresponding portions denoted by the subscripts r,t, and a.

$$P_{w} = P_{rw} + P_{tw} + P_{aw}$$
(46)

The radial flows occur because of vortices (and vortex cores) in the wake. Tangential flows occur due to "swirl", which is caused by momentum imported to the slipstream by rotor shaft torque. The axial power is associated with the assumed trapezoidal velocity distribution.

Assume for the present that  $P_+ P_t \ll P_a$ . The axial power comes from integration of the trapezoidal distribution:
$$P_{w} = \int_{O}^{R_{w}} (1/2) \rho 2\pi s v_{w}^{3} \left(\frac{s}{R}\right) ds$$
(47)

In the usual manner, the right-hand side of (47) is non-dimensionalized.

$$P_{W} = (1/2)\rho \pi R_{W}^{2} (\Omega R)^{3} \left[ 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{W}^{3} (\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right]$$

$$P_{W} = 1/2 \pi R^{2} \rho (\Omega R)^{3} \epsilon^{2} \left[ 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{W}^{3} (\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right]$$
(48)

or

The following balance of power must exist:

$$P_{w} = P_{R} + P_{o}$$
(49)

Substituting (43), (45) and (48) into (49),

$$(1/2) \pi R^{2} \rho(\Omega R)^{3} \varepsilon^{2} \left[ 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{W}^{3}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right] = \pi R^{2} \rho(\Omega R)^{3} \int_{0}^{1} \alpha(\mathbf{x}) \left( \frac{dC_{T}}{d\mathbf{x}} \right) d\mathbf{x} + (1/2) \dot{m} V^{2}, \text{ or}$$
$$\varepsilon^{2} \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{W}^{3}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{0}^{1} \alpha(\mathbf{x}) \left( \frac{dC_{T}}{d\mathbf{x}} \right) d\mathbf{x} + \Lambda^{2} \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$

This equation can be refined further after the blade element analysis, which follows, provides an expression for  $dC_{\rm T}/ds$ . Looking ahead to Eq. (58),

$$\frac{dC_{T}}{dx} = \frac{\sigma_{a}}{2} x [\theta_{t} - \alpha(x)]$$

Hence,

$$\varepsilon_{0}^{2} \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{w}^{3}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \frac{\sigma_{a}}{2} \int_{0}^{1} x \left[ \theta_{t} - \alpha(\mathbf{x}) \right] \alpha(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \Lambda^{2} \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$
50
(50)

Į

Up to this point, we have discussed only the mass flow, momentum, and energy in the slipstream, using the assumed trapezoidal distribution of induced velocity. Eqs. (33), (34), (35), (42)and (50) summarize the principal results. The next section develops the blade-element expressions for the rotor.

1

.

.

#### IV.3. BLADE-ELEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

If  $x \le 1-\delta$ , the axial velocity is constant and equal to  $\nu-V$ . In this region the thrust per blade is

$$d\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{b}} = 1/2 \,\rho(\Omega \mathbf{s})^2 \mathbf{a} \mathbf{c} \left[ \theta - \frac{(\nu - \mathbf{V})}{\Omega \mathbf{s}} \right] \mathbf{d} \mathbf{s} \qquad 0 \le \mathbf{s} \le \mathbf{R}(1 - \delta) \qquad (51)$$

Assume the twist distribution\*

$$\theta = \frac{R}{s} \theta_{t}$$
(52)

Then

$$dT_{b} = 1/2 \rho(\Omega s)^{2} ac \left[ \frac{\theta_{t} \Omega R}{\Omega s} - \frac{(\nu - V)}{\Omega s} \right] ds$$
$$= 1/2 \rho(\Omega s) ac \left[ \Omega R \theta_{t} + V - \nu \right] ds$$
(53)

Comparing this expression to the Kutta-Joukowski expression with  $T \cong L$ , one sees that

$$\frac{dT_{b}}{ds} = \rho V \Gamma$$
 (54)

 $\Gamma$  is constant for  $0 \le x \le 1-\delta$  and is given by the expression

$$\Gamma = 1/2 \operatorname{ac} \left[ \Omega R \; \theta_{t} + V - \nu \right] \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1 - \delta$$
 (55)

Since  $\Gamma \rightarrow 0$  at the tip, the  $\Gamma$  strength given by (55) must shed as training vortices over the region  $1-\delta \le x \le 1$ .

This distribution is usually called "ideal twist", since it causes uniform inflow ( $\nu$  constant over the disc), and constant circulation along the blade bound vortex system, i.e., in Eq. 55  $\Gamma$  is constant for ideal twist.

From this system, it seems reasonable to assume that the  $\Gamma$  strength fed to the vortex core is given by (55). Nondimensionalizing (27), assuming constant chord c,

$$\Gamma = \frac{\sigma a}{2b} \pi R^2 \Omega \left[ \Theta_t + \Lambda - \lambda \right]$$
 (56)

Continuing with the blade-element theory, from Eq. (53)

$$dT_{b} = 1/2 \rho(\Omega s) ac \left[\Omega R \theta_{t} - v(x)\right] ds \qquad (57)$$

where v(x) has been substituted for v-V in Eq. (53). Note that Eq. (57) holds over the entire blade, unlike Eq. (53).

$$d\mathbf{T}_{b} = 1/2 \ \rho\Omega sac \left[\Omega R\theta_{t} - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})\right] ds$$
$$= 1/2 \ \rho(\Omega R)^{2} Rac \ \mathbf{x} \left[\theta_{t} - \alpha(\mathbf{x})\right] d\mathbf{x}$$
$$= 1/2 \ \rho(\Omega R)^{2} \pi R^{2} a \ \frac{bc}{\pi R} \left(\frac{1}{b}\right) \mathbf{x} \left[\theta_{t} - \alpha(\mathbf{x})\right] d\mathbf{x}$$
(58)

For all b blades, the thrust expression becomes

$$d\mathbf{T} = 1/2 \pi R^2 \rho(\Omega R)^2 \text{ as } \mathbf{x} \left[ \theta_t - \alpha(\mathbf{x}) \right] d\mathbf{x}$$

For the case when the blade chord is constant, this thrust expression can be integrated and nondimensionalized to yield the equation

$$C_{T} = \frac{\sigma a}{4} \left\{ \theta_{t} - 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(x) dx \right\}$$
(59)

Note that the integral in (59) also appears in (33). Thus, an alternative form of (59) is

$$C_{\mathbf{T}} = \frac{\sigma \mathbf{a}}{4} \left( \theta_{\mathbf{t}} - M_{\mathbf{f}} \right)$$
(60)

### IV.4. VORTEX CORE MODEL

The trapezoidal induced velocity distribution shown in Figure 6 is composed of a uniform distribution plus two idealized vortex cores. These cores have a tangential velocity V, which increases linearly with distance from the center of the vortex core until the core radius  $R\delta/2$  is reached, beyond which point the vortex is assumed to induce no velocity either inside or outside the slipstream. Of course, this is a very simplified representation of the actual flow, and to obtain accurate results with this model, some consideration must be given to the characteristics of real viscous vortices. This forms the main topic of this section.

A viscous vortex model is given in Reference 27 which has the tangential velocity profile

$$V_{t}(r,t) = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} \begin{pmatrix} -r^{2}/4v_{e}t \\ 1-e \end{pmatrix}$$
(61)

This velocity distribution for some time, t, is shown in Figure 21.

For  $r < r_c$ , the model tends toward the simple inviscid vortex model

$$V_t = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r}$$

For r<r, the velocity profile tends toward that of a rigid body spinning at a rate  $\omega$ , where

$$\omega = \frac{V_{\text{max}}}{r_c}$$
(62)

It was shown in Chapter III that the boundary condition required to fit the peripheral velocities of a vortex core to the slipstream velocities of a descending rotor is

$$v = 2V_{\pm} \tag{63}$$

where  $V_{+}$  is the tangential velocity of the core.

'- -



4,

....

Figure 21. Vortex Model.

Assume that  $V_t = V_{max}$  as depicted by Figure 21. Then Eq. (63) can be used to determine  $r_c$ , which will later be related to the coordinate  $\delta$  on the trapezoidal velocity distributions.

To determine  $r_c$ , one must first differentiate Eq. (61) with respect to r:

$$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{t})}{\partial_{\mathbf{r}}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{r} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r}}{2\nu_{e}\mathbf{t}}\right) \mathbf{e}}{\mathbf{r}^{2}} - \frac{\mathbf{r}^{2}}{4\nu_{e}\mathbf{t}} - \left(1 - \mathbf{e}^{2}\right)}{\mathbf{r}^{2}} \right]$$

 $\boldsymbol{V}_{\max}$  occurs when this derivative vanishes, leaving the result

$$r_{c}\left(\frac{r_{c}}{2v_{e}t}\right)e^{-\frac{r_{c}^{2}}{4v_{e}t}} = 1 - e^{-\frac{r^{2}}{4v_{e}t}}$$
(64)

For simplicity, define

$$\zeta \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \frac{\mathbf{r_c}^2}{4v_e \mathbf{t}}$$
(65)

Then (64) is written

۱\_

$$1 + 2\zeta = e^{\zeta}$$
 (66)

The approximate numerical solution to this equation is

$$\zeta \cong 5/4 \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \zeta_{g} \tag{67}$$

as can easily be determined by direct substitution.

Combining (65) and (67),

$$4v_{e}t = \frac{r_{c}^{2}}{\zeta_{s}}$$
(68)

and substituting (68) into (61) to get  $V_{max}$ ,

$$V_{\text{max}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r_{c}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{r_{c}^{2} \zeta_{s}}{r_{c}^{2}}}\right) = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r_{c}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{\zeta_{s}}}\right)$$
(69)

Using (66) to substitute for  $e^{\zeta_s}$ ,

$$V_{\text{max}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r_{c}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1 + 2\zeta_{s}} \right)$$
$$V_{\text{max}} = \frac{\Gamma}{\pi r_{c}} \left( \frac{\zeta_{s}}{1 + 2\zeta_{s}} \right)$$
(70)

Using the value 5/4 for  $\zeta_s$  as given by (67), Eq. (70) becomes

$$V_{\text{max}} = \frac{5\Gamma}{14\pi r_c}$$
(71)

Assuming that  $V_t = V_{max}$ , Eqs. (63) and (71) can be combined to get

 $\nu = \frac{5 \Gamma}{7 \pi r_c}$   $\mathbf{r_c} = \frac{5\Gamma}{7 \pi \nu}$ (7.2)
57

or

Eq. (72), when applied to the cores near the rotor, can be manipulated to get (since  $\delta = 2r_c/R$ )

$$\delta = \frac{10\Gamma}{7\pi R\nu}$$
(73)

The value of  $\Gamma$  applies for a single blade and is given by Eq. (56).

the  $\Gamma$  strength of the cores is constant. Thus,

$$\delta_{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{10\Gamma}{7\pi R_{\mathbf{w}} v_{\mathbf{w}}}$$
(74)

An alternative form for (74) would be

.

$$\delta_{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{10\Gamma}{7\pi R \nu_{\mathbf{w}} \epsilon}$$
(75)

At this point, it is appropriate to combine Eqs. (56), (73) and (75).

$$\delta = \frac{10\Gamma}{7\pi R\nu} = \frac{10}{7\pi R(\Omega R)\lambda} \left(\frac{\sigma a}{2b}\right)\pi R^2 \Omega \left(\theta_t + \Lambda - \lambda\right)$$
$$\delta = \left(\frac{5\sigma a}{7b}\right) \frac{\theta_t + \Lambda - \lambda}{\lambda}$$
(76)
$$\left(5\sigma a\right) \frac{\theta_t + \Lambda - \lambda}{\lambda}$$

$$\delta_{\mathbf{w}} = \left(\frac{5\sigma \mathbf{a}}{7\mathbf{b}}\right) - \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}} + \Lambda - \lambda}{\lambda_{\mathbf{w}}\varepsilon}$$
(77)

Having related the core model to the flow inside and outside the slipstream, the next step in calculating the rotor thrust is to allow for tip losses due to three-dimensional flow, or "spillage". This is discussed in Section 5.1 but before beginning that topic, it is convenient to summarize the major equations obtained up to this point and to restate them in convenient nondimensional forms.

# Equation Summary

.

 $\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \lambda - \Lambda & 0 \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 - \delta \\ \frac{\lambda}{\delta} (1 - \mathbf{x}) - \Lambda & 1 - \delta \mathbf{x} \le 1 \end{cases}$ (30)

Flow model

١.,

$$\alpha_{W}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{W} - \Lambda & 0 \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 - \delta_{W} \\ \frac{\lambda_{W}}{\delta_{W}} (1 - \mathbf{x}) - \Lambda & 1 - \delta_{W} \le \mathbf{x} \le 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
(50)

Continuity 
$$\varepsilon = \sqrt{\frac{\int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(x) dx}{\int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{w}(x) dx}}$$
 (35)

Momentum 
$$C_{T} = 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(x) dx + 2 \varepsilon_{0}^{2} \int_{0}^{1} \alpha_{w}^{2}(x) dx$$
 (42)

Energy 
$$\varepsilon_{0}^{2}\int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{W}^{3}(x) dx = \frac{\sigma a}{2} \int_{0}^{1} x(\theta_{t} - \alpha(x)) \alpha(x) dx + \Lambda_{0}^{2}\int_{0}^{1} x\alpha(x) dx$$
 (50)

Blade element 
$$C_{T} = \frac{\sigma a}{4} \left( \theta_{t} - 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(x) dx \right)$$
 (59)

Vortex Core model 
$$\delta = \left(\frac{5\sigma a}{7b}\right) \frac{\theta_t + \Lambda - \lambda}{\lambda}$$
 (76)

 $(5\sigma a) = \theta_{\pm} + \Lambda - \lambda$ Vortex Core Model

$$\delta_{\mathbf{w}} = \left(\frac{-2\sigma \mathbf{a}}{7\mathbf{b}}\right) - \frac{\mathbf{c}}{\lambda_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{c}}$$
(77)

To simplify the equations, introduce the notation

$$R_{1} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha(x) dx = R_{1}(\Lambda, \lambda, \delta)$$
(78)

$$R_2 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} 2 \int_0^1 x \alpha^2(x) dx = R_2(\Lambda, \lambda, \delta)$$
(79)

$$W_{1} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{w}(x) dx = W_{1}(\Lambda, \lambda_{w}, \delta_{w})$$
(80)

$$W_2 \stackrel{\Delta}{=} 2 \int_0^1 x \alpha_w^2(x) dx = W_2(\Lambda, \lambda_w, \delta_w)$$
(81)

$$W_{3} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} 2 \int_{0}^{1} x \alpha_{W}^{3}(x) dx = W_{3}(\Lambda, \lambda_{W}, \delta_{W})$$
(82)

The equations become

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{R_1}{W_1}}$$
(85)

$$C_{T} = \Lambda R_{1} + \epsilon^{2} W_{2}$$
 (84)

$$\varepsilon^2 W_3 = \frac{\sigma a}{2} \left( \theta_t R_1 - R_2 \right) + \Lambda^2 R_1$$
 (85)

$$C_{T} = \frac{\sigma a}{4} \left( \theta_{t} - R_{1} \right)$$
 (86)

$$\delta = \left(\frac{5\sigma a}{7b}\right) \frac{\theta_t + \Lambda - \lambda}{\lambda}$$
(87)

1

1 • - -

$$\delta_{w} = \left(\frac{5\sigma a}{7b}\right) \quad \frac{\theta_{t} + \Lambda - \lambda}{\lambda_{w} \epsilon} \tag{88}$$

The problem we have to solve can now be stated as Given-  $\Lambda, \theta_t, \sigma, a, b$ ; Find:  $\varepsilon, C_T, \lambda, \lambda_w, \delta, \delta_w$ 

### IV.5. TIP LOSS FACTOR

The analysis presented to this point has not included a blade tip loss factor. The purpose of the following presentation is to derive a method for including such a factor.

Eq. (53) expresses blade element thrust for a single blade as:

$$dT_{b} = \frac{\rho ac}{2} \Omega s \left[ \Omega R \theta_{t} + V - \nu \right] ds$$

This can be written in a somewhat more general form as

$$dT_{b} = \frac{\rho ac}{2} (\Omega R)^{2} x (\theta_{t} + \Lambda - \lambda) ds \qquad (89)$$

The blade loading is defined by

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{b}}^{\prime} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \frac{d\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{b}}}{d\mathbf{s}} = \frac{\rho \mathbf{a} \mathbf{c}}{2} (\Omega \mathbf{R})^2 \mathbf{x} (\theta_{\mathbf{t}} + \Lambda - \lambda) \qquad (90)$$

Eq. (89) can be integrated to get the thrust produced by one blade.\* For b constant-chord blades, the thrust is

$$T = 1/4 \text{ bpac}(\Omega R)^{2} R(\theta_{t} + \Lambda - \lambda)$$
$$= a/4 \left( \frac{bc}{\pi R} \pi R^{2} \rho(\Omega R)^{2} (\theta_{t} + \Lambda - \lambda) \right)$$
(91)

The integration assumes uniform inflow, i.e.,  $\lambda$  is not a function of x. This is equivalent to replacing the trapezoidal inflow distribution by the classical uniform distribution. We do this, at this point in the derivation to obtain the classical tip loss factor. Subsequently we return to the trapezoidal distribution to get an improved tip loss factor.

The thrust coefficient is therefore given by Eq. (86) as

$$C_{T} = \frac{\sigma a}{4} \left( \theta_{t} + \Lambda - \lambda \right)$$

 $C_{m}$  can be expressed in terms of the blade loading at the tip, by combining this equation and Eq. (90) and setting x = 1 in Eq. (90). The result is

$$C_{T} = \frac{\sigma a}{4} \left( \frac{2T_{b} | tip}{\rho ac(\Omega R)^{2}} \right)$$
(92)

In Reference 27, a tip loss factor for hovering rotors is presented in terms of  $C_{\rm T}$  as follows:

$$B = 1 - \underbrace{\frac{2 C_T}{b}}$$
(93)

The "tip losses" occur because air flows from the bottom region to the top region of the blades at the tips. The flow occurs because of lift (pressure gradient between the upper and lower blade surfaces). Such flow "destroys" the lift on the blade elements in the immediate region of the tips, because it interferes with the twodimensional lifting mechanism of the airfoil section.

Since tip losses are caused by flows at the tips due to lift at the tips, it seems that the blade distributed loading at the tips really controls the quantitative value of B, not the overall rotor thrust coefficient as suggested by Eq. (93). However, Eq. (93) is valid at hover (assuming the important factor is distributed loading at the tip), since  $C_{\rm T}$  is directly related to T' by Eq. (64). A more general form of (93) can be expressed in terms of T', and, as shown below, this leads to a simple expression for B valid both at hover and in descent.

$$B = 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma a T_{b} | tip}{\rho ac(\Omega R)^{2}}}$$
(94)

Eq. (94) has been derived for rotor systems with uniform induced velocity. Because B is expressed in terms of  $T_{b}$  tip, however, it seems reasonable that it should be applicable to rotors operating with nonuniform inflow, inasmuch as the tip loss is a local phenomenon depending primarily on blade tip operating conditions. For the descending rotor, Eq. (57) is applicable.

$$d\mathbf{T}_{b} = 1/2 \ \rho(\Omega \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{ac} \left[ \Omega \mathbf{R} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t} - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) \right] d\mathbf{s}$$
$$\mathbf{T}_{b}' = \frac{\rho \mathbf{ac}}{2} \ (\Omega \mathbf{R})^{2} \mathbf{x} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}))$$
(95)

At the tip,  $T_b'$  becomes<sup>\*</sup>

$$\mathbf{T}_{b} |_{tip} = \frac{\rho \mathbf{a} \mathbf{c}}{2} (\Omega \mathbf{R})^{2} (\mathbf{\theta}_{t} + \Lambda)$$
(96)

Substituting Eq. (96) into Eq. (94) gives the major result of this section, a general formula for B.

$$B = 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2} (\theta_t + \Lambda)}$$
(97)

Note that  $\lambda$  disappears from the T expression at the tip. This is because  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = -\Lambda$  at  $\mathbf{x} = 1$ , i.e., at the tip. The disappearance of  $\lambda$  is a consequence of the assumption of a trapezoidal inflow distribution. It accounts for the difference between the tip loss factor derived here (Eq. 97) and the classical tip loss factor, Eq. 93. Because the trapezoidal inflow model gives a higher T ' than the uniform inflow model, at a given C and A, the tip loss is larger, i.e., B is smaller.

## IV.6. INCORPORATION OF THE TIP LOSS FACTOR

All the equations required to solve for  $C_{\rm m}$  versus rate of descent of a given rotor have now been obtained. At this point, the problem is to include the effects of B on Eqs. (83) through (88). One way to do this is owtlined below.

Solve Eqs. (83) through (88) in a normal way, without considering tip losses. Results of such a solution process can be expressed in nondimensional form, using the actual rotor radius R as the characteristic length.

To include tip losses, say that the effective rotor radius,  $R_{\mu}$  is given by

$$R_{e} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} RB = R \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2} (\theta_{t} + \Lambda)} \right]$$
(98)

The solutions to (83) through (88) can be considered valid for a rotor with radius R and no tip losses (the no tip loss assumption being already embodied in Eq. (83) through (88)). Thus, when the nondimensional data representing the solutions to Eqs. (83) through (88) are dimensionalized, an effective radius R must be used to account for tip losses.

Obviously, it is desirable to present data nondimensionalized by a constant characteristic length (e.g., R) rather than a variable characteristic length (e.g., R). To accomplish this, the nondimensional data expressed in terms of R must be restated in terms of R. As an example of this process, consider a graph of  $C_T vs \Lambda$ , predicted for a rotor of given geometry by solving Eqs. (83) through (88). For a given  $\Lambda$ , the actual thrust T is given by

$$\mathbf{T} = \pi \mathbf{R}_{e}^{2} \rho(\Omega \mathbf{R}_{e})^{2} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{T}} = \rho \pi \Omega^{2} \mathbf{R}_{e}^{4} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{T}}$$
(99)

Define  $C_{m}^{*}$  as the desired thrust coefficient, i.e., the thrust non-dimensionalized with respect to R. Then

$$\mathbf{T} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \rho \pi \Omega^2 \mathbf{R}^4 \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{T}}^* \tag{100}$$

Combining (99) and (100) to eliminate T

$$C_{T}^{*} = \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{\mu} C_{T}$$
(101)

Eqs. (101) and (98) can be combined to yield

$$c_{T}^{*} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2} (\theta_{t} + \Lambda)}\right)^{\mu} c_{T}$$

The characteristic length,  $R_{e}$ , has also been used to produce  $\Lambda$ :

$$\Lambda = \frac{V}{\Omega R_{e}}$$
(102)

This process is applicable to the value for  $\Lambda$  in the original nondimensionalized data  $C_{\tau} = C_{\tau}(\Lambda)$ .

The question arises, does the nondimensionalizing process (102) apply to Eq. (98)? [If R is included in the A in Eq. (98), then Eq. (98) becomes an implicit expression in R  $\cdot$ ] It is expected that the difference in results as to whether the Å in (98) is nondimensionalized by R or R will be extremely small. Assuming this for the time being, substitute A<sup>\*</sup> into (98) and (101),

$$\Lambda^* \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \frac{V}{\Omega R} \tag{103}$$

66

However, the effect of B should be included in determining the  $\Lambda$  in the original data. Combining (102) and (103) to eliminate V,

$$\Lambda^{*} = \Lambda \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{b}\sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2} \left(\theta_{t} + \Lambda^{*}\right)}\right)\Lambda \quad (104)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda^*}{1 - \frac{1}{b}\sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2}} \left(\theta_t + \Lambda^*\right)}$$
(105)

Summarizing, the major results of this section are the following equations :

$$B = 1 - \frac{1}{b} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma a}{2} \left(\theta_{t} + \Lambda^{*}\right)}$$
(97)

$$\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda^*}{B} \tag{103}$$

$$C_{\mathbf{T}}^{*} = B^{4}C_{\mathbf{T}}$$
(101)

An example hand calculation of  $C_T^*$  versus the rate-ofdescent parameter is done below, to show the method. Note that to obtain the graph of  $C_T^*$  vs J, it is necessary to assume an initial value of J\*, and later to determine what value of J this implies. Thus the method doesn't predict  $C_T^*$  for a given single value of J, but instead predicts the entire  $C_T^*$  versus J\* graph. The derivations given in this chapter employ standard notation used in helicopter analysis. A different notation is traditional in propeller analysis. For example, J is used to denote nondimensional axial propeller velocity. J is related to  $\Lambda$  by

$$J = \pi \Lambda$$

The propeller thrust coefficient is denoted here as  $C_{T_p}$  and is related to the "helicopter" thrust coefficient by

$$C_{T_{p}} = 64 \pi^{3} C_{T}$$

In the comparison of our predicted  $C_T$  versus measured, given in the next section,  $C_T$  the "propeller" notation is used, because the experimental data are presented in this notation.

The results of the calculation are shown in Figure 22 and are compared with the  $C_T$  versus J graph that would be obtained assuming zero tip loss factor. The difference in magnitude of  $C_T$  and slope  $\partial C_T/\partial J$  at a given  $C_T$  is considerable.

TABLE I. EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF CT VERSUS J*											
	σ = .186			β = 1.0		$\theta_t = .25  a = 5.7$			3 b = 3		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)							
Ĵ.	۸*	$\theta_t + \Lambda^*$	$\frac{\sigma a}{2} \mathbf{x}(3)$	<b>√</b> (4)	(5)/b	В	J	с <sub>т</sub>	в <sup>2</sup>	B <sup>4</sup>	C <sup>*</sup> <sub>T</sub>
40	127	.1230	.0658	.256	.0858	.9142	437	.123	.838	•700	.086
30	0955	.1545	.0828	.289	.0965	•9035	332	.152	.818	.669	.102
20	06366	.1863	•0995	.315	.1050	.8950	223	.182	.800	.640	.116
10	03183	.2182	.1160	•341	.114	.886	113	.210	.785	.617	.129
0	0	.2500	.1330	•365	.122	.878	0	.236	.769	•590	.137
.05	.01592	.2659	.1420	•377	.126	.874	.0571	.249	.765	.585	.146
.10	.03183	.2818	.1500	.387	.129	.871	.1145	.260	.760	•579	.150
.15	.04775	.2978	.1590	.398	.133	.867	.1740	.271	.751	•565	.153
.20	.06366	.3137	.1662	.410	.137	.843	.2310	.280	.746	•557	.155
.25	.07958	.3296	.1750	.420	.140	.860	.2910	.287	.740	.548	.156





70

۱.

### IV.7 COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

Hardly any data on thrust of helicopter rotors in vertical descent has been published. Reference 19 describes flight tests on a Westland Whirlwind helicopter in vertical descent, but unfortunately the data obtained are not sufficiently complete to permit correlation with our theory. We therefore have to employ data on VTOL propellers. Reference 18 presents wind-tunnel data on VTOL propellers at shaft angles of attack representing vertical and inclined descents, and Reference 28 gives data on the same propellers in climb conditions (though not all the blade settings were duplicated). By combining these references the experimental data graphed on Figure 25 were obtained (solid lines). The dash-dot lines on Figure 25 show the results obtained by solving Eqs. (78)-(89) for the propeller and then modifying the results (as specified by Eqs. (97)-(101) to include the tip loss effects.

It will be seen that the theory agrees well with experiment for climb, hover, and rates of descent outside the unsteady region of the vortex-ring state.

Figures 24 through 27 are presented to show the comparison between experiment and theory for the following different theoretical approaches:

- (1) Vortex core wake model with variable tip loss factor (Eq. (97)).
- (2) Variable tip loss factor with no vortex cores (i.e., wake represented by uniform downwash over rotor disc of radius BR).
- (3) Conventional analytic model; i.e., constant tip loss factor (B = 1 in this case) and uniform downwash.

For all three of these cases, the solid lines represent the experimental data.

Figures 24 through 27 indicate a striking improvement in the accuracy of theoretical results when the descending rotor models described in this chapter are applied.

Another important conclusion that can be reached, by inspection of the figures, is that correlation between experiment and theory is good if the tip losses are accounted for while retaining the uniform inflow model. This does not mean that the vortex cores are unimportant, since this core model was an essential part of the derivation leading to the tip loss factor (Eq. (97)). However, once the existence of

71



Figure 23. Comparison of Analytic and Experimental Results for Thrust vs Descent Rate of a VTOL Propeller.



Figure 24. C vs J for 6-Degree Blade Angle.

۱.



Figure 25. C<sub>T</sub> vs J for 9-Degree Blade Angle.



Figure 26. C<sub>T</sub> vs J for 12-Degree Blade Angle.



Figure 27. C vs J for 15-Degree Blade Angle.

the viscous "boundary layer" between the slipstream tube and the surrounding air mass is recognized, the simple tip loss factor can be derived. This situation is quite analogous to Prandtl's fixedwing boundary layer model. The presence of the viscous region must be acknowleged to assess correctly the physical flow mechanisms which produce the wing loads. The results for lift and induced drag derived from inviscid theory (which does not include the boundary layer), however, are still accurate if the boundary layer has not separated, causing stall. For the descending rotor, the viscous region is analogous to the boundary layer. The nonuniform downwash indirectly causes a thrust loss by inducing higher blade loadings near the tips. This thrust loss greatly exceeds that due to the momentum loss associated with the nonuniform downwash.

## IV.8. Summary

The performance of a vertically descending rotor can be calculated using a "vortex-core" wake system and a suitable blade tip loss factor. The results obtained by analyzing this flow model show good correlation with available experimental data over the region from fast climb to descent rates outside the vortex-ring buffet boundaries. Although the vortex core model is required to derive the descending tip loss factor, the wake inflow distributions can be assumed uniform (retaining the tip loss factor only and assuming negligible vortex core radius) without seriously degrading the accuracy of numerical results.

The application of the tip loss factor to derivative calculations is discussed in Volume II. The necessity to consider inclined as well as vertical descent requires a cyclicly varying B. Experimental data are not sufficiently complete to check the accuracy of derivatives calculated using this approach; however, it follows logically from the assumption that conditions at the tip determine the tip losses.

# CHAPTER V. THE MOSTAB MODULAR STABILITY DERIVATIVE PROGRAM AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE 8-58 AND AH-56A HELICOPTERS

## V.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes how stability derivatives were calculated for the S-58 and AH-56A. (As explained below, published derivatives were used, for the YHC-1A.) The chapter is organized as follows:

Firstly, the MOSTAB modular stability derivative program is described. MOSTAB was specially evolved for this study; it calculates derivatives for any type of helicopter, with a wide variety of possible flow models. The description in this chapter is very general; full details of the equations used in MOSTAB and a listing are given in Volume II.

Secondly, the forms of the input data required for MOSTAB are summarized, and the specific data for the S-58 and AH-56A are presented. These data include three-view drawings, estimated aerodynamic coefficients for fuselages, rotors, etc., and the appropriate reference areas.

Thirdly, the flight conditions for which derivatives were calculated are tabulated. (The actual derivatives for each flight condition are listed in Volumes III and IV, with the transfer functions.)

Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the accuracy of the MOSTAB derivatives.

### V.2. THE NEED FOR MOSTAB

۰.

During the course of the study described here, it became apparent that it was difficult to obtain reliable stability derivatives for single-rotor, tandem-rotor, and compound helicopters in descending flight. In some cases derivatives were available for level flight, but the programs used to calculate these derivatives contained "built in" assumptions regarding flow models which were inappropriate for descending flight. It was not feasible to modify these programs to incorporate alternative flow models, such as those described in Chapter IV. Furthermore, only limited experimental data on derivatives in descending flight were available.

Accordingly, it was decided to start afresh, by writing a "universal" program to compute trim and stability derivatives for any type of helicopter, with little or no restriction as to the flow models that had to be used. Further requirements were that the stability derivatives should be printed-out in all axis systems of interest, in dimensional form and also divided by the appropriate inertias, and that the contribution of each component to the complete derivative should be printed-out so that the reasons for unexpected values of derivatives could be traced. The result of these requirements is the MOSTAB program described below.

The following description of MOSTAB is the bare minimum required to follow the subsequent discussion. For more details of MOSTAB, see Volume II.

#### V.3. PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF MOSTAB

MOSTAB currently calculates performance, trim, and stability derivatives for any type of subsonic aircraft. The program can be extended for use in hybrid simulation and may also be used to calculate limiting conditions such as 'g' boundaries. The unique feature of MOSTAB which gives such versatility is its modular construction, explained below.

Figure 28 shows a helicopter separated into elements. The physical characteristics of each element are specified in the input data. Separate sections of MOSTAB handle each element type. The influence of each element on the aircraft is summed to calculate dynamic characteristics of the assembled flight vehicle.

When an element (e.g., wing, propeller) produces a force (lift, drag, thrust), the air in the vicinity of the aircraft is set in motion. The induced velocities (sometimes called downwash and sidewash) affect other elements by changing their local airspeed and angle of attack. Interference velocities are thus very important and must be calculated accurately.

MOSTAB includes all of these "aerodynamic coupling" (interference velocity) effects in a single subroutine. Any desired model for interference velocities can be included in this subroutine, which performs all of the necessary interference velocity calculations. No fundamental program changes are required to modify interference velocity models as required to suit particular vehicles; only the interference subroutine need be changed.



Figure 28. Modular Representation Used by MOSTAB.

ł

Either rigid rotors (propellers) or flexible bladed rotors (helicopter rotors - hinged or hingeless) can be studied by MOSTAB. The modular nature of the program allows one to represent an aircraft with as many rotors, aerodynamic bodies (fuselages, nacelles, etc.), and lifting surfaces (wings, empennage surfaces, canard surfaces, etc.) as desired.

Because aerodynamic rotors are the most complicated element types, a brief description of the rotor analyses incorporated in MOSTAB is presented here. "Rotors" are either of the flexible bladed type (e.g., helicopter rotors with hinged blades, or the socalled "rigid" rotors, whose blades deflect structurally to a substantial degree) or of the truly rigid type (propellers). The same subroutines compute flexible and rigid rotor characteristics in MOSTAB. Since the rigid rotor (propeller) blades do not deflect, they provide no particular analytic difficulty. MOSTAB numerically integrates computed inertial and aerodynamic loads radially and azimuthally to determine the characteristics of rigid rotors (propellers). The blade motion of flexible rotors must be determined before loads from such rotors can be determined. The "normal mode" method is used in MOSTAB to represent the flexible blades. The normal mode shape and frequency for the first flapping mode of the flexible blade are inputted to MOSTAB. (Other modes can be added easily to MOSTAB if required, but the first mode adequately represents flexible bladed rotors when determining stability derivatives.) Generalized mass and force are generated in the program, and the flapping motion of the blades is then computed numerically. Blade motion histories for all flexible blade rotors are printed out for the trim flight condition.

### Other Versions of MOSTAB

As the MOSTAB program undergoes more development, various versions will appear, each useful for analyzing aircraft under certain conditions. The first version, MOSTAB-A, is considered obsolete and unusable. This report describes the MOSTAB-B version, which will always have applicability if its basic assumptions and aerodynamic models are appropriate for the vehicle and flight regimes being studied. More advanced versions (-C, -D, etc.) will subsequently appear, each with more refined aerodynamic models, or with special effects added for specific vehicle studies (e.g., tilt-wing, ducted-fan, etc., configurations). As of June 1970, MOSTAB-C had been completed, together with a user's manual. The principal improvements of MOSTAB-C over MOSTAB-B are:

- (1) Airfoil data can be automatically corrected for compressibility effects by means of a subroutine which reads local Mach number. The subroutine applies to both stalled and unstalled flow regimes. This compressibility correction is important at moderate and high speeds. MOSTAB was originally developed for approach conditions; hence, compressibility is not explicitly included in MOSTAB-B although an overall correction can be made by modifying the two-dimensional lift-curve slope in the wing and rotor input data.
- (2) MOSTAB-C has an option to print out forces and moments acting on each element due to overall vehicle velocity and the induced velocity of the element itself, but excluding induced velocities due to other elements. This is important for correlating "isolated rotor" tests and calculations with data determined for complete aircraft.
- (3) Rotor integration subroutines have been refined by removing a number of small-angle assumptions.
- (4) Derivatives can be called in "stability axes" for any flight condition including hover (this is done by extending the definition of stability axes to include hover).
- (5) A number of improvements and extensions to the data input and print-out formats have been made.

## V.4 MOSTAB INTERFERENCE VELOCITY SUBROWTINE

۱<u>.</u>

The interference velocities between the various modules are calculated by an extension of the classical Glauert expression which applies to fixed wings as well as rotors. The Glauert expression is

$$v = \frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{T}}{2\rho \mathbf{A} | \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{T}} |}$$
(102)

1

- where T = Resultant aerodynamic force on the module (e.g., wing or rotor)
  - v = The induced velocity at a specified location (e.g., downwash at the rotor).
  - $\rho$  = Air density
  - A = "Characteristic Area" ( =  $\pi R^2$  for a rotor of radius R, =  $\frac{\pi}{h} b^2$  for an elliptic wing of span b)
  - $V_m$  = Resultant velocity at the module
  - k = A factor which relates the downwash at the desired location to the downwash at the module. Thus at some distance away from a rotor, when the slipstream has fully contracted, k = 2, whereas in the plane of the rotor k = 1.

MOSTAB extends the above Glauert expression to a multidimensional form so that all linear and angular components of the "wash" can be related to the forces and moments acting on the module. Thus such effects as swirl due to rotor torque, and nonuniform downwash can be included. The generalized form of Eq. (102) consists of two matrix equations:

$$\left\{ \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \right\} = \frac{1}{2\rho |\boldsymbol{v}_{T_{i}}|} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{A}_{i} \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \boldsymbol{f}_{i} \right\}$$
(103)

$$\left\{ v_{j} \right\} = \left[ K \right] \left\{ v_{j} \right\}$$
(104)

where

νŧ

= A 6-component vector, the elements of which are the linear and angular induced flow velocities at module i

[A] = A 6 x 6 matrix which is input to MOSTAB. Its elements have units of (1/area) and represent the reciprocals of the characteristic areas of module i.

- {f<sub>i</sub>} = A 6-component vector, the elements of which are the X, Y, Z forces and L, M, N moments acting on module i.
- $\{v_j\}$  = A 6-component vector, the elements of which are the linear and angular induced velocities at the location of module j induced by the forces and moments acting on module i (e.g., i could be the main rotor and j the horizontal tail)

In the complete MOSTAB program, the order of vectors is increased from 6 to 6N where N is the number of modules (e.g., N = 5for a helicopter with a fuselage, a main rotor, a tail rotor, a horizontal tail, and a vertical tail). Thus a wide variety of interference effects can be modeled with ease.

### V.5. MOSTAB INFUT DATA

I.,

The numerical values of the derivatives calculated by MOSTAB for the S-58 and AH-56A are given in Volumes III and IV. To supplement these derivatives, this section presents data which permits the basic assumptions underlying the derivatives to be checked. That is, relevant dimensions and aerodynamic coefficients for each "module" (wing, fuselage, etc.) are tabulated, together with the assumptions regarding interference velocities between the modules. Because of the low speeds of interest to the present study, compressibility corrections are not included. Hence, the aerodynamic coefficients for each module are the same for all flight conditions.

To understand the input data, it is first necessary to review the axis systems used in MOSTAB.

Figure 29 presents a three-view drawing of the Hughes OH-6A helicopter with various coordinate systems attached. These axes will now be discussed under individual headings.

(1) Overall vehicle reference axes - Axes x, y, z of Figure 29 are the "overall vehicle reference axes" or "overall vehicle axes". These coordinates are defined in the main text and are the most basic axes used in MOSTAB. The positions of all vehicle elements are specified in the basic MOSTAB input data deck in vehicle coordinates, and the first set of stability and control derivatives is output in vehicle axes.



Figure 29. Standard OH-6A Three-View Drawing Including Example Overall Vehicle Reference Axes and Individual Aircraft Element Basic Axes.

1

85

1\_
- (2) <u>Individual element axes</u> basic element axes All coordinate systems shown by Figure 29, with the exception of the overall vehicle axes, are "individual element axes" or "individual element basic axes" These axes all lie parallel to overall vehicle reference axes, but with origins located at the "reference points" of their respective aircraft components, as shown in the figure. The  $F_{VA}$ ,  $F_{VI}$  and  $F_{c}$  matrices printed as part of MOSTAB output, and the columns DW, WE, WO, VIO, VAO and FO printed as the trim-iteration solution all refer to these basic element axes, as discussed in detail in Volume II.
- (3) Individual element local axes These coordinate systems are not shown on Figure 29, but they are defined in detail in Volume II. The "individual element local axes" have their origins at the respective element reference points (as do the individual element basic axes discussed in (b) above), but they are rotated from the basic axes to lie in a convenient position for analysis of the particular aircraft component. For example, the main rotor local axes are rotated from the basic axes (coordinates x<sub>n</sub>, y<sub>n</sub>, z<sub>n</sub> in Figure 29) so that their z axis lies along the rotor shaft centerline. Also from Figure 29, one sees that the tail rotor basic axes must be rotated approximately 90 degrees about the x<sub>tr</sub> axis along the tail rotor local axes (with the z axis along the tail rotor shaft).
- (4) <u>Stability axes</u> These coordinates are translated and rotated from "overall vehicle axes" so that their origin lies at the aircraft's center of gravity and so that the v and w airspeed components in stability axes, at trim, vanish. This is the classical definition of stability axes. In MOSTAB, stability axes are defined with their z axis in the xz plane of the overall vehicle axes. For hover, stability axes are arbitrarily defined such that the x and y axes are horizontal with the stability x axis parallel to the projection of the overall vehicle x axis on the horizontal plane.

### V.6. NUMERICAL DATA FOR S-58, AH-56A, and YHC-1A

Figures 30, 31, and 32 show 3-view drawings of the S-58, AH-56A and YHC-1A. The input data for the S-58 and AH-56A are summarized in Table II. All symbols are defined in Volume II.



Figure 30. Three-View Drawing of Sikorsky S-58.



Figure 31. Three-View Drawing of Lockheed AH-56A.





Figure 32. Three-View Drawing of Boeing-Vertol YHC-1A.

1

All dimensions are in feet.



Seite, 1

...

TABLE II AIRCRAFT	- MOSTAB INPUT DATA LOADING CONFIGURATION AND I	NERTIA (POUN	ID+FOOT+SLUG)
MOSTAB Symbol	DEFINITION	SIKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEED AH-56A
GROSS WE	IGHT	•1560+05	•1187+05
XCG	CENTER OF GRAVITY	.3300-00	.0000
YGG	RELATIVE TO OVERALL VEHICLE COORDINATES	.0000	•0000
ZCG		.8750	.0000
IXX		.1150+05	•5895+04
IXY		•0000	•0000
IXZ	MOMENTS OF INERTIA WITH	.0000	.0000
IYX	RESPECT TO THE CENTER	.0000	.0000
IYY	OF GRAVITY WITH THE #X#	.5000+05	.2750+05
IYZ	AXIS ALIGNED WITH D.V.C.	.0000	.0000
IZX	(O.V.C. = OVERALL VEHICLE	.0000	.0000
IZY	COORDINATES)	.0000	.0000
127		.5500+05	.2309+05

CHARACTERISTIC AREA MATRIX ELEMENTS A(1+1)=A(2+2)=A(3+3)

ALL OTHER ELEMENTS ARE ZERO.

	SIKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEED AH-56A
FUSELAGE	.2770-01	•1350-01
HORIZONTAL TAIL	•4140-01	.1080-01
VERTICAL TAIL	.3000-01	.2500-01
MAIN ROTOR	•4100-03	.4800-03
TAIL ROTOR	.1400-01	.1270-01
WING		.1750-02
PROPELLER		.1270-01

	CHARACTERISTICS (RADIAN)	FOOT . SECOND	)
MOSTAB Symbol	DEFINITION	SIKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEED
PSI B		.0000	-0000
THETA B	ANGULAR DISPLACEMENTS RELATIVE TO OVERALL VEHICLE COORDINATES	.0000	• 0 0 0 0
PHI B		.0000	• 0 0 0 0
X		•0000	.0000
Y	RELATIVE TO OVERALL VEHICLE COORDINATES	.0000	• 0 0 0 0
Z		.0000	• 0 0 0 0
AB	REFERENCE ARFA	•5400+02	•1500+03
C0	DRAG COEFF. ALPHA=0.	•4600+00	.1000-00
C1	DRAG COEFF/ALPHA	• 1000	.3000-03
C2	DRAG COEFF/ALPHAXALPHA	.0000	•6000-03
CYO	SIDEFORCE COFFF.BETA=0.	• 0 0 0 0	.0000
CY1	-SIDEFORCE COEFF/BETA	•1400+01	•1000+01
C <b>ZO</b>	-Z-FORCE COEFF.ALPHA=0.	•0000	-2800-01
CZ1	-Z-FORCE COEFF/ALPHA	.7000-00	•4000-00
LB	REFERENCE LENGTH	•4400+02	•5260+02
CMO	PITCH COEFF.ALPHA=0.	.0000	•2000-02
CM1	PITCH COEFF/ALPHA	.3400-00	.2500-00
CNO	YAW COEFF ALPHA=0.	.0000	.0000
CN1	YAW COEFF/BETA	6600-00	6000-00

# TARLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) FUSELAGE CHARACTERISTICS (RADIAN+FOOT+SECOND)

91

1

•

# TABLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) HORIZONTAL TAIL CHARACTERISTICS (RADIAN,FOOT,SECOND)

•

.

1

٠

MOSTAR Symbol	DEFINITION	SIKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEFD AH-56A
PSI L	ANGULAR DISPLACEMENTS	•0000	•0000
THETA L	RELATIVE TO OVERALL VEHICLE COORDINATES	•0000	•5240-01
PHI L		•0000	•0000
x	I THEAD DIED ACENENT	2830+02	2770+02
Y	RELATIVE TO OVERALL	.0000	•0000
7		2000+01	.0000
AW	SECTION LIFT CURVE SLOPF	.6000+01	•6000+01
SW	REFERENCE AREA	.1238+02	•3450+02
CHORD	REFERENCE CHORD	•5550+01	•3180+01
CD0	SECTION CD AT ALPHA=0.	•0000	.0000
CD1	SECTION CD/ALPHA	.0000	.0000
CDS	SECTION CD/ALPHAXALPHA	.0000	.0000
AWCLD	ALPHA AT CD-MINIMUM	.0000	•0000
CAP GAMMA	DIHEDRAL ANGLE	•0000	.0000
BW	REFERENCE SPAN	•5550+01	•1083+02
LAMDA W	TAPER RATIO	.0000	•5700-00
CMO	CM AT ALPHA=0.	.0000	.0000
CMA	CM/ALPHA	.0000	.0000

92

# TABLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) VERTICAL TAIL CHARACTERISTICS (RADIAN.FOOT.SECOND)

MOSTAB Symbol	DEFINITION	SIKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEED AH-56A
PSI L		.0000	.0000
THETA L	RELATIVE TO OVERALL	•6600	.0000
PHI L	VEHICLE COURDINATES	+1570+01	•1570+01
X	I THEAD DICH ACEMENT	3100+02	2666+02
Y	RELATIVE TO OVERALL	.0000	.0000
Z	VEHICLE COURDINATES	3300+01	.2770+01
AW	SECTION LIFT CURVE SLOPE	.6000+01	.6000+01
SW	REFERENCE AREA	.2400+02	•2460+02
CHORD	REFERENCE CHORD	.3880+01	•4250+01
CDO	SECTION CD AT ALPHA=0.	.0000	.0000
CD1	SECTION CD/ALPHA	.0000	.0000
CDS	SECTION CD/ALPHA/ALPHA	.0000	.0000
AWCLD	ALPHA AT CD-MINIMUM	.0000	.0000
CAP GAMMA	DIHEDRAL ANGLE	.0000	.0000
BW	REFERENCE SPAN	•6200+01	•5800+01
LANDA W	TAPER RATIO	• 0 0 0 0	.0000
CMO	CH AT ALPHA=0.	.0000	.0000
CHA	CH/ALPHA	.0000	.0000

93

l

# TABLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) WING CHARACTERISTICS (RADIAN+FOOT+SECOND)

MOSTAB Symrol	DEFINITION	S IKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEED AH-56A
PSI L			.0000
THETA L	RELATIVE TO OVERALL		•1660-00
PHI L	VEHICLE COORDINATES		•0000
x			6500-00
۲	RELATIVE TO OVERALL		.0000
z	VEHICLE COORDINATES		•3400+01
AW	SECTION LIFT CURVE SLOPE		.6000+01
SM	REFERENCE AREA		•1950+03
CHORD	REFERENCE CHORD		.7250+01
CD0	SECTION CD AT ALPHA=0.		•8000-02
CD1	SECTION CD/ALPHA		7000-02
CD5	SECTION CD/ALPHA/ALPHA		.1470-00
AWCLD	ALPHA AT CD-MINIMUM		.1750-01
CAP GAMMA	DIHEDRAL ANGLE		.0000
RW	REFERENCE SPAN		.2700+02
LAMDA W	TAPER RATIO		•5100-00
CMO	CM AT ALPHASO.		6100-01
CMA	CM/ALPHA		.0000

94

i\_\_\_\_

TABLE	II	•	MOSTAB	INPUT	DATA	(CONTINUED)
MAIN	ROTO	R	CHARACT	ERISTI	ICS	(RADIAN+FOOT+SECOND+SLUG)

MOSTAR Symbol	DEFINITION	SIKORSKY S-5A	LOCKHEED AH-56A
OMEGA	ROTATIONAL VELOCITY	.7325+02	.2570+02
80	CONSTANT TIP LOSS FACTOR	.9700-00	.9701-00
BA	VARIABLE TIP LOSS FACTOR	.1680-02	.1760-02
RB	EXTRA TIP LOSS FACTOR	.0000	.0000
DELTA O	SECTION CD AT ALPHA=0.	.7500-02	.7500-02
DFLTA 1	CD/ALPHA	.0000	.0000
DELTA 2	CD/ALPHA/ALPHA	.3200-00	•3200-00
DELTA 3	PITCH/FLAP COUPLING	.0000	.0000
THETA 1	TOTAL PLADE TWIST	1395-00	8730-01
R	BLADE RADIUS	-2800+02	.2570+02
SMALL B	NUMBER OF BLADES	.4000+01	•4000+01
SMALL A	SECTION LIFT CURVE SLOPE	.6000+01	•6000 <b>•</b> 01
PSI R	ANGULAD DIEDLACEMENTS	.0000	.0000
THETA R	RELATIVE TO OVERALL -	.3300-01	.0000
PHI R	VEHICLE COURDINATES.	•0000	.0000
x	I INFAD DIED ACEMENT	.2700-00	.0000
¥	RELATIVE TO OVERALL	.0000	.0000
Z	VEHICLE COORDINATES	8200+01	4150+01
ρ	NAT.FLAP.FREQUENCY/OMEGA	•1050+01	+1150+01
BOE	ESTIMATED RETA.PSI=0.	• 9 0 0 0	5000-02
BDOE	ESTIMATED BETADOT.PSI=0.	.0000	.1000-02
P <b>R</b>	BETA PERTURBATION	.5000-02	.5000-02
PBD	BETADOT PERTURBATION	.1000-00	•1000-00
CHORD	CONSTANT CHORD BLADES	+1360+01	•5350+01

•

.

ALADE	SIKORS	KY S-SA	LOCKHEED AH-56A	
STATION	RADIAL	DISTRIBUTED	RADTAL	DISTRIBUTED
NUMBER	DISTANCE	MASS	DISTANCE	MASS
i	.0000	.1360-00	.0000+01	.1000+01
2	.1000+01	.1360-00	.7700+02	.3800-00
3	.8400+01	.1360-00	.1160+02	.3800-00
4	.1340.02	.1360-00	.1540+02	.2700-00
5	.1690+02	.1360-00	.1800+02	.2700-00
6	·1960+02	.1360-00	.2050+02	.2700-00
7	-5180+05	.1360-00	.2170+02	.2700-00
8	.2370+02	.1360-00	.7310+02	.2700-00
9	.2530+02	.1360-00	.2430+02	.2700-00
10	.2670+02	.1360-00	.2570+02	.2700-00
11	.2800+02	.1360-00		
	INITIAL	FIRST	INITIAL	FIRST
	SHAPE	FLAPPING	SHAPE	FLAPPING
		NODESHAPE		NODESHAPE
1	.0000	.0000	. 1000	.0000
2	.0000	.0000	1000-00	3A00+01
3	.0000	7400+01	1500-00	7180+01
4	.0000	1240+02	1500-00	1100+05
5	.0000	1590+02	1500-00	1350+02
6	.0000	1860+02	1500-00	1610+02
7	.0000	2080+02	1500-00	1730+02
8	.0000	2270+02	1500-00	1850+02
9	.0000	2430+02	1500-00	1980+02
10	.0000	2570+02	1500-00	2110+02
11	.0000	2700+02		
POINT MAS	SES-			
STATION	RADIAL	MASS	RADIAL	MASS
NUMBER	DISTANCE		DISTANCE	
1	.2800+02	.3477-00	.2570+01	.7700+01
2			<b>.R950+01</b>	1000+01

## TABLE II - HOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) MAIN ROTOR DISTRIBUTED BLADE PROPERTIES-

3			.2570+02	.5000-01
	INITIAL Shape	FIRST FLAPPING Modeshape	INITIAL Shape	FIRST Flapping Modeshape
1 2 3	.0000	2700+02	7500-01 1500-00 1500-00	7400-00 4880+01 2110+02

TABLE II -	HOSTAB INPUT DATA	(CONTINUED)
TAIL ROTOR	CHARACTERISTICS	(PADIAN+FOOT+SECOND+SLUG)

MOSTAR Symbol	DEFINITION	SIKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEFD AH-56A
OMEGA	ROTATIONAL VELOCITY	.1390+03	.1300+03
80	CONSTANT TIP LOSS FACTOR	.9700-00	.9500-00
BA	VARIABLE TIP LOSS FACTOR	.0000	.0000
98	EXTRA TIP LOSS FACTOR	.0000	.0000
DELTA- 0	SECTION CD AT ALPHA=0.	.1000-01	.1000-01
DELTA 1	CD/ALPHA	.0000	.0000
DELTA 2	CN/ALPHA/ALPHA	.3200-00	.3200-00
DELTA 3	PITCH/FLAP COUPLING	1000+01	.000i
THETA 1	TOTAL BLADE TWIST	.0000	.0000
R	BLADE RADIUS	.4670+01	• <b>500</b> 9•01
SMALL B	NUMBER OF BLADES	.4000+01	.4000+01
SMALL A	SECTION LIFT CURVE SLOPF	.6000+01	•6000 <b>•</b> 01
PSI R		.0000	.0000
THETA R	RELATIVE TO OVERALL	.0000	.0000
PHI R	VENICLE COURDINATES	.1570+01	•1570+01
X		3300+02	2990+02
Y	RELATIVE TO OVERALL	1750+01	6000+01
Z	VENICLE COORDINATES	5750+01	.0000
P	NAT.FLAP.FREQUENCY/ONEGA	.1000+0)	.1000+01
80E	ESTIMATED RETA+PSI=0.	.0000	.0000
BDOF	ESTIMATED RETADOT.PSI=0.	.0000	.0000
PB	BETA PERTURBATION	.5000-02	•2000-02
PBD	BETADOT PERTURBATION	.1000-00	.1000-00
CHORD	CONSTANT CHORD BLADES	.6120-00	.1170+01

.

TABLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) TAIL ROTOR DISTRIBUTED BLADE PROPERTIES-

RLADE	SIKORS	KY 5-58	LOCKHE	ED AH-S6A
STATION	RADIAL	DISTRIBUTED	RADIAL	DISTRIBUTED
NUMBER	DISTANCE	MASS	DISTANCE	MASS
1	.0000	.2560-01	.9000	.1000-00
2	.1400+01	.2560-01	.1000+01	.1000-00
3	.2230+01	.2560-01	.1500+01	.1000-00
4	.2820+01	.2560-01	.2000+01	.1000-00
5	.3270+01	.2560-01	.2500+01	.1000-00
6	.3640+01	.2560-01	.3000+01	.1000-00
7	.3950+01	.2560-01	.3000+01	.1000-00
8	.4220+01	.2560-01	.4000+01	.1000-00
9	.4460+01	.2560-01	.4500+01	.1000-00
10	.4670+01	.2560-01	.5000+01	•1000-00
	INITIAL	FIRST	INITIAL	FIRST
	SHAPE	FLAPPING	SHAPE	FLAPPING
		MODESHAPE		MODESHAPE
1	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
2	.0000	.1400+01	.0000	.1000+01
3	.0000	•5530+01	.0000	.1500+01
4	.0000	•2820+01	.0000	•2000+01
5	.0000	•3270+01	.0000	.2500+01
6	•0000	.3640+01	.0000	.3000+01
7	.0000	•3950+01	.0000	•3500+01
8	.0000	•4220+01	.0000	•4000+01
9	.0000	•4460+01	.0000	•4500+01
10	.0000	•4670+01	.0000	.5000+01

١

## TABLE II - NOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) PROPELLER CHARACTERISTICS (RADIAN+FOOT+SECOND+SLUG)

MOSTAB Symbol	DEFINITION	STKORSKY S-58	LOCKHEED AH-56A
OMEGA	ROTATIONAL VELOCITY		.1800+03
90	CONSTANT TIP LOSS FACTOR		.9500-00
BA	VARIABLE TIP LOSS FACTOR		.0000
RR	EXTRA TIP LOSS FACTOR		.0000
DELTA O	SECTION CD AT ALPHA=0.		-00008.
DELTA 1	CD/ALPHA		.0000
DELTA 2	CD/ALPHA/ALPHA		.3200-00
DELTA 3	PITCH/FLAP COUPLING		.0000
THETA 1	TOTAL BLADE TWIST		•2600-00
R	BLADE RADIUS		.5000+01
SMALL B	NUMBER OF BLADES		.3000+01
SMALL A	SECTION LIFT CURVE SLOPE		.6000+01
PSI R			.0000
THETA R	RELATIVE TO OVERALL		•1570 <b>•</b> 01
PHI R	VENICEE COUNDINATES		.0000
X			3129+02
Y	RELATIVE TO OVERALL		.0000
Z	VENICEE GOORDINATES		.0000
Ρ	NAT.FLAP.FREQUENCY/OMEGA		.0000
80E	ESTIMATED BETA.PSI=0.		.0000
BDOF	ESTIMATED BETADOT.PSI=0.		.0000
PB	BETA PERTURBATION		.0000
PRD	BETADOT PERTURBATION		.0000
CHORD	CONSTANT CHORD BLADES		.1000+01

99

1

ŧ

## TABLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONCLUDED) PROPELLER DISTRIBUTED RLADE PROPERTIES-

DISTRIBUTED BLADE PROPERTIES-

BLADE	SIKOF	RSKY S-58	LOCKHE	ED AH-56A
STATION	RADIAL	DISTRIBUTED	RADTAL	DISTRIBUTER
NUMBER	DISTANCE	MASS	DISTANCE	MASS
1			.0000	.1000-00
2			.1000+01	.1000-00
3			.1500+01	.1000-00
4			.2000+01	.1000-00
5			.2500+01	-1000-00
6			.3000+01	.1000-00
7			. 3000+01	.1000-00
8			.4000+01	.1000-00
9			.4500+01	.1000-00
10			.5000+01	.1000-00
	INITIAL	FIRST	INTITAL	FIRST
	SHAPE	FLAPPING	SHAPE	FLAPPING
1			.0000	.0000
2			-0000	-1000+01
3			.0000	.1500+01
4			.0000	.2000+01
5			.0000	.2500+01
6			.0000	.3000+01
7			.0000	.3500+01
8			.0000	.4000+01
9			.0000	.4500+01
10			.0000	.5000+01

100

1

1 +

## TABLE II - MOSTAB INPUT DATA (CONTINUED) INDUCED VELOCITY INTERFERENCE FACTORS-VELOCITIES ARE IN OVERALL VEHICLE COORDINATES ALL ELEMENTS NOT SHOWN ARE ASSUMED 7ERO

INDUCED VEL	OCITY	COMPONENT		INDUCED VELOCITY				
ORIGINATING	FROM	VELOCITY		MULTIPLYING	FACTORS			
LOADS ON TH	IE	AFFECTED BY						
FOLLOWING		THE INDUCED		SIKORSKY	LOCKHEED			
COMPONENTS		VELOCITY		5-59	AH-56A			
FUSFLAGE	(U)	FUSELAGE	(U)	.0000	.1000+01			
	(V)		(V)	.0000	.1000+01			
	(W)		(W)	.0000	.1000+01			
	(U)	HORIZONTAL	(U)	.1000+01	.0000			
	(U)	VERTICAL	(U)	.1000+01	.0000			
	(1)	PROPELLER	(U)		.1000+01			
	(U)	TAIL ROTOR	(U)	.1000+01				
	(W)		(W)		•1500+01			
HORIZONTAL	(U)	HORIZONTAL	(U)	. 1000	.1000+01			
TAIL	(V)	TAIL	(V)	.0000	.1000+01			
	(W)		(W)	.1000+01	.1000+01			
WING	(U)	WING	(U)		.1000+01			
	(V)		(V)		.1000+01			
	(W)		(W)		.1000+01			
	(W)	MAIN ROTOR	(W)		•1000+01			
VERTICAL	<b>(U)</b>	VERTICAL	(U)	.0000	.1000+01			
TAIL	(V)	TAIL	(V)	.1000+01	.1000+01			
	(W)		(W)	.0000	.1000+01			
MAIN ROTOR	(U)	MAIN ROTOR	(U)	.1000+01	.1000+01			
	(V)		(V)	.1000+01	.1000+01			
	(W)		(W)	.1000+01	.1000+01			
	(W)	WING	(W)		.1600+01			
	(W)	HORIZONTAL	(W)	.1600+01	.0000			
TAIL ROTOR	(U)	TAIL ROTOR	(U)	.0000	.1000+01			
	(V)		(V)	.1000+01	•1000+01			
	(W)		(W)	.0009	·1000+01			
PROPELLER	(U)	PROPELLER	(U)		.1000+01			
	(V)		(V)		.1000+01			
	(W)		(W)		.1000+01			

1

ł,

For the YHC-1A it was decided not to employ MOSTAB to calculate the derivatives. This was because published derivatives were available from Ref. 29. These derivatives were calculated by the manufacturer and use simple downwash models, not including the cyclic variation of tip loss factor, B. Some accuracy is lost because of this. On the other hand, the manufacturer undoubtedly possesses good information on the important interference effects between front and rear rotors. This would have to be estimated if the YHC-1A derivatives were calculated by MOSTAB. It was felt that the errors incurred in such estimates would exceed those caused by oversimplified tip loss models. Thus, the manufacturer's derivatives are used.

The resulting derivatives are presented in Volumes III and IV (together with the transfer functions) for the flight conditions tabulated in Table III below. For the S-58 and AH-56A, the maximum rate of descent corresponds approximately to the upper boundary of the vortex-ring state.

TABLE III. FLIGHT CONDITIONS										
HELICOPTER	TOTAL SPEED (knots)	RATE OF DESCENT (fps)								
Ан-56А	20, 40, 60, 100	0, 9.2, 19.2, 28.8, at each speed								
	Vertical Descent	0, 9.2, 19.2, 28.8								
<b>s-</b> 58	20, 40, 60, 100	0, 7.5, 15 22.5 at each speed								
	Vertical Descent	0.9, 9.2, 19.2, 28.8								
YHC-1A	60.1	0, 25								
	80.1	0, 25								
	Vertical Descent	0, 25								

#### V.7 CORRELATION OF DERIVATIVES WITH FLIGHT TEST DATA

Before presenting transfer functions based on the published YHC-1A derivatives and the AH-56A and S-58 derivatives calculated by MOSTAB, it is highly desirable to check the accuracy of these derivatives. The only really satisfactory check is to compare calculated derivatives with those deduced from flight tests. Unfortunately, many derivatives are hard to obtain from flight tests, and only incomplete flight test data were available for the helicopters of interest. However, an incomplete check is better than none at all, so this section summarizes the comparisons that were made between calculated derivatives and the available flight test data.

In brief:

Ł

- (i) For the YHC-1A, the results of steady sideslip flight tests were available. These substantiate the published derivatives  $Y_{\delta A}$ ,  $L_{\delta A}$ ,  $N_{\delta A}$ ,  $Y_v$ ,  $L_v$ ,  $N_v$ , and  $Y_{\delta R}$ ,  $L_{\delta R}$ ,  $N_{\delta R}$ .
- (ii) For the S-58 flight test data showing time histories of responses to B<sub>10</sub>, longitudinal control inputs were compared

to time histories predicted from the calculated derivatives. The agreement is good for the longitudinal degrees of freedom, but less so on the lateral motions induced by longitudinal-lateral cross-coupling. Unfortunately, it is not known whether any lateral control inputs were applied, so the accuracy of the cross-coupling derivatives remains uncertain. However, the longitudinal derivatives appear to be substantially correct.

(iii) No flight test data were available for the AH-56A; wherever possible, manufacturer's wind-tunnel data were used as inputs to MOSTAB, and derivatives appear to be reasonable.

In general, there is little value in making comparisons between the MOSTAB derivatives and other calculated derivatives. This is because the other derivatives are generally calculated by less sophisticated programs which do not include all the interference velocities between components. For example, Ref. 24 presents S-58 derivatives and flight test data; however, the derivatives yield responses which do not agree with the test data. This is principally due to the neglect of main rotor downwash on the tail and tail rotor, giving inaccurate M. Adequate flight test data are difficult to obtain, but they constitute the only valid criteria against which calculated derivatives may be checked.

#### YHC-1A Flight Tests

Ref. 30 describes steady sideslip tests performed on a YHC-1A in level flight at forward speeds of 45, 60, and 80 knots. Derivatives for the latter two speeds are presented in Volume III; and as shown in Ref. 30, the steady-state variation of lateral stick position ( $\delta_A$ ) and rudder pedal position ( $\delta_B$ ) with sideslip angle (B) can be predicted from the following equation, using stability axis derivatives.

$$\begin{bmatrix} Y_{\mathbf{v}} & \mathbf{g} & Y_{\mathbf{\delta}_{R}} \\ \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{v}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{\delta}_{R}} \\ \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{v}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{\delta}_{R}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{\delta}_{R} \end{bmatrix} = -\begin{bmatrix} Y_{\mathbf{\delta}_{A}} \\ \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{\delta}_{A}} \\ \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{\delta}_{A}} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\delta} \mathbf{A}$$
(105)

This solution applies even to a basically unstable aircraft such as the YHC-LA, provided it is stabilized by feedbacks from yaw and roll rates, these feedbacks being supplied either by the pilot or the stability augmenter system. Figures 33 and 34 (taken from Ref. 31) indicate that the calculated v,  $\delta_R$ , and  $\delta_A$  derivatives are in reasonable agreement with flight test. Furthermore, the helicopter's behavior is fairly linear with sideslip angle for moderate perturbations.

#### 8-58 Flight Tests

Seckel (Ref. 25) presents geometric and inertial data on the S-58, wind-tunnel data on components, and manufacturer's estimates of derivatives for the helicopter flying at 5,000 feet with a gross weight of 11,600 pounds. Flight test data are also shown, i.e., time histories of a response to a longitudinal stick input in pitch rate, angle of attack, normal acceleration, and airspeed. These time histories are reproduced from the original flight test report (Ref. 32), but for some variables the reproduction is not sufficiently precise for purposes of checking derivatives. Ref. 32 should, therefore, be used in preference to Ref. 25. In addition, Ref. 32 includes the time histories of the lateral degrees of freedom (although the lateral control time histories are not recorded).



Figure 33. YHC-1A Pedal Position Versus Sideslip Angle.



Figure 34. YHC-1A Stick Position Versus Sideslip Angle.

The time history response following a step  $B_1$  input from trim (-0.015 rad.) at 7<sup>4</sup> knots C.A.S., 5000 ft., level flight, was selected from the available flight test histories of Ref. 32. The appropriate six-degree-of-freedom stability derivatives generated from MOSTAB are shown in Table IV. The derivatives were input into program ZEPLIN, which solves the six-degree-of-freedom, small-perturbation, linear equations of motion and obtains eigenvalues (R + JI) and the modulus and angle of corresponding residue vectors (L,A) for response to a unit  $B_1$  step. The eigenvalues and residue matrix are shown

on Table V. The aircraft response was then obtained using the following relationship:

$$Response = B_{1} \sum_{r = 1}^{r = n} e^{R_{r}t} \left[ (L_{r} \cos A_{r}) \cos I_{r}t - (L_{r} \sin A) \sin I_{r}t \right]$$

The comparison of the MOSTAB-generated and experimental time histories for the selected flight condition is shown on Figure 35. For longitudinal motions, there is excellent agreement with airspeed, pitch angle, and angle of attack, but poor agreement with pitch rate. This discrepancy is attributed to malfunctioning pitch rate instrumentation, because the measured pitch rate does not agree with the differentiated pitch attitude.

For lateral - directional motion (Figure 36), the flight test results show an initial roll and yaw to the right; however, MOSTAB derivatives show a roll and yaw to the left. There is a possibility that the pilot applied some roll control as he pulled back the stick, but the disagreement may be due to too large a MOSTAB-generated value for L (-10,940 ft-lb-sec), causing a strong left rolling moment as the vehicle pitches up. Further studies and flight test comparisons will be required to produce a suitable explanation for this disagreement between time histories.

#### Summary

The MOSTAB program has been described in general, avoiding technical detail which is given in Volume II. Flight test data are limited, but they generally support the values of derivatives used for the YHC-1A and S-58.

TABLE IV S-58 DERIVATIVES FOR FLIGHT TEST CONDITION SIKORSKY S-58 73 KNOTS 5000 FT. LEVEL FLIGHT FWD. C.G. SEE REFS. 25 AND 32 VEHICLE WEIGHT XCG YCG **Z66** .1147+05 .9400-00 .0000 .0000 STABILITY DERIVATIVE MATRICES U V R x -.1361+02 -.2267-00 -.1557+01 -.7005+03 .1244+04 -.1142+03 .1098+01 -.3349+02 -.2662+01 -.1360+04 -.6969+03 .4766+03 Z -.7200+01 -.3777+01 -.2183+03 -.7174+03 -.3487+02 .9191+03 L .2137+02 -.2062+03 .1326+02 -.2033+05 -.1094+05 .2179+04 .1106+03 .1790+02 .5892+02 .1070+05 -.2400+05 M .1189+04 N -.7655+02 .3494+03 -.2985+03 -.4758+03 .1070+05 -.1969+05 U DOT V DOT W DOT P DOT O DOT R DOT .3690-02 -.8526-03 -.4382-01 -.2570+02 -.9115+01 -.2130+01 X Y -.7242-02 .6685-01 .8638-01 .9947+01 -.2444+02 -.1500+01 .1053-03 -.1471-02 -.8709-03 -.8389-00 -.8005-00 -.2350-01 7 L -.1981-00 .5054-00 .2353+01 .2673+04 -.3945+03 .2080+03 M -.1607-00 -.5245-01 .1959+01 .4154+03 .2672+04 .3676+02 N .8099-02 -.2248+01 -.1042+00 -.4841+02 -.5217+02 .7643+02 C( 3) C( 1) C( 2) C( 4) X -.3872+04 -.6976+03 .1218+05 -.1047+03 Y -.6522+03 .1258+05 .1009+04 .4204+04 2 -.9315+05 -.3025+02 .2802+05 -.1032+03 .6394+03 .1882+06 .3210+04 .3163+05 .5190+04 -.1940+06 -.3360+04 .9605+05 M .7851+05 .4805+03 .3463+05 -.1414+06 N THE INERTIA TENSOR .5940+04 .0000 -.8800+03 .0000 .2750+05 .0000 .0000 -.8800+03 .2304+05 TRIMMED VELOCITIES WITH RESPECT TO OVERALL VEHICLE REFERENCE AXES-U V 0 R W -.6314+01 -.0000 .0000 .1230+03 -.0000 -.0000 TRIMMED ITERATION COLUMN VECTOR, TE-.2507-00 -.1755-01 .2118-01 .8137-01 -.5127-01 -.1546-01 STABILITY AXIS SYSTEM EULER ANGLES- THETA= .1220-04 PHI -.1544-01 AIRCRAFT INERTIAL SPEED= .1232+03

108

. .

	TA	GLI		V	5	•5	58	RĮ	:5	ID	UE	5 A	ND	EI	GE	NVA	LU	ES	FO	R	FL	.16	HT	TE	<b>S</b> T	C	ON	nt	TON	
	-			• •		_																						••		
	EI	GEN	VV	AL	Ū.	E S	5				_																			
		R ·	•	11	7	8+	00		••(	12	B 1 -	+01	•	65	49	-00		.41	82	-0	1		418	12-	01	•	. 3	357	-00	
		I	•	00	0	0				00	00			00	00			. 32	289	-0	Ō		326	9-	00		.1	114	4 11	
																					•							910		
		L	•	11	7	8•	00			521	B1 -	+01		65	49	-00		.33	116	-0	0		331	6-	00		. 1 9	284		
		A	•	18	0	0+	03	ļ	•1	8	00	•03		18	00	+03		.82	75	+0	2		827	15.	02	(		335	10.1	
1	/E	CTO	R	5																	-				VE			943		
l	) (	L	•	42	6	9+	01			)3/	11.	-01		73	56	+02		.83	57	• 0	3			7.	03		23	74		
	,	A	•	00	0	0			. 0	00	00			00	00	•••		.17	54	• 0	ž		176		A 3	_	06		101	
															• •			•••				-•			vJ	-0	94	70 /	+02	
N	1	L	•	4	4:	3+	20		.6	19	)5.	-00		17	194	-04		. 18	06	• •	2		284		0.2		•			
	- 1	4		00	0(	D			. 0	000	)Ō	•••		00	00	• • •		.15	02		1		J6V 160	34	03	•			+03	
									•		•		•	••					76	· v.	5	-•	137	C T	VJ	-	11	45	+03	
l	11			39	62	2-1	00		.4	39	)1-	-00		17	75.	104		40	01.	• • •	2				• •					
	(	4		00	0(	)			. 0	00	0				00		•	13	01		3	•	490	14	0.5	•	20	77	+02	
									•••				•				•	113	0.01	<b>,</b> 0,	3 '	••	130	8+1	US	•	14	7.5	+03	
P			• 1	11	40	)+(	00		.2	58	6-	00		16	26.	.02		42	66	1										
	1	N		8	00	)+(	03		-0	00	0	•••		18		02	_	20	107	01		•	430	0+1	10	•	12	:51	+01	
									••	••	•		•			03		27	144	102		• (	541	8+1	20	-,	32	67	+01	
Q	L		. 5	6	89	)-(	50		.1	62	6-	01		141	174	01		20					201							
	4	1	• 1	8	0 0	+	03		1	80		03		1.0/	10.	01	•	15	77.			• 6	294	1+(	11	•	25	53	-00	
									• •	••	•••	•••	•		/0+	03	•	12	1.4	03	•	•	121	2+(	)3	••	62	54	+02	
R	L		. 2	62	23	-(	00		. 1	25	7-	01	. 1	40	12.	02		244												
	Ā		. 0	00	00					00	0	••			10	UE	_•	10	0/¶	01		06	240	7+(	1	٠	13	22	+01	
Ε	IG	EN	VA	L	JE	S				••	•		• •		0		-•	104	4 (J T	03	,	• 1	.04	0+(	13	٠	10	77	+03	
	R	-	.3	35	57	-0	00	•	. 1	26	7•	01	. (	000	0			0.04	•••					•			• •	• •		
	I	-	.1	31	6	+0	)1		. 0	00	0	••		100	0		•	000				• 0		0		•	00	00		
										••	v		• •	, v u	v		•	000	10			• U	1000			٠	00	00		
	L		.1	35	58	+0	1		.1	26	7•	01	- (	000	0			~~/					0.0.0					• •		
	A	-,	. 1	04	3	+0	3		1	80	0+	03		000	0		•	000				• 1				٠	00	00		
V	EC	TOP	25		-	-	-		-		•••	00	• •		U		•	000	10			• 0	000	)		•	00	00		
U	L		.2	77	4	+0	1		.14	48	7	63	- 1	50	2.	A 2						•						• •		
	A	8	9	86	7	+0	2		11	90		11		20	0.	03	•					• 1	000			•	00	00		
							-					03	• •	00	V.	03	•	000	0			• U	000	)		•	00	00		
V	L		1	37	7	+ 0	3		91	3	7 • 1	50	. 0	00	^			1 0 0		AF		•								
	Ā		1	79	5	+0	3		15	201		11		00	0		•	100	4+	05		• 0	000			•	00	00		
			-		Ť		-						• •	00	U		•	000	0			• 0	000			•	00	00		
W	L		2	07	7	+ 0	2		11	5		14	0	00	•										_					
	Δ		1	42	7	+ 0	2	•	16	100		17	• •	00	0		•		0			•1	160	+0	3	• (	00	00		
		•	-			· ·	•	•	1.0			5	• 0	00	U		•	000	0			• 0	000			• (	00	00		
Ρ	I.	-	1	25	1 -	• 1	1	_	50	0	2	11	^	~ ~	•				•			-								
	Ā		3	26	7	• 0	î	•	00	000	, <b>▼</b> ( )		• U	00	U A		•	100	0			• 0	000			• 3	374	•5-	03	
	1	•	-	. 0	•		•	•	00	νı	,		• 0	00	U		• (	100	ŋ			• 0	000			• 0	000	0		
0	L	_	21	55	3.	-0	٥		45	7 2		1	•	00	•							•					_			
	Ā		6	25	4	0	2	•	000	00	≠ t 1		• U	00	0		• (	100	0			• 0 (	VOO			.4	74	1-	00	
			4				-	•	U U	V U	,		• 0	00	U		• 0	100	0			• 0 (	000			• 0	00	0		
R	Ł		11	12	24	0	1	-	10	20		2	•	^^	•		-		•							~				
	Δ		10	)7	7	0	2	•	10	00		2	• •	000	U N		• 0	000	U			• 0 (	000			• 3	07	0+	02	
			- '		• •		-	•	4 U	00	- U		• •	ννι	<b>U</b>		• 0	00	()			.01	000			. 1	RA		02	

109

.

()·



Figure 35. A Comparison of Longitudinal Flight Test Response Following a Step Pitch Control Input to a Response Based on Stability Derivatives Obtained From MOSTAB.





Figure 36. A Comparison of Lateral Flight Test Response Following a Step Pitch Control Input to a Response Based on Stability Derivatives Obtained from MOSTAB.

### CHAPTER VI. TANDEM-ROTOR HELICOPTER OPEN-LOOP DYNAMICS

### VI.1 INTRODUCTION

In this section we consider the transfer functions of the YHC-1A, which is taken to represent a typical tandem-rotor helicopter. The transfer functions are presented in Volume III. Unlike the singlerotor and compound configurations, for the tandem configuration laterallongitudinal cross-coupling effects were neglected; thus, separate lateral and longitudinal transfer functions were calculated." The format of the transfer function print-out is explained below.

The format is basically similar to that of Reference 33, but a number of detailed refinements have been added. These include additional sets of numerators referred to a station distant from the c.g. The coordinates of this station are conveniently chosen as the location of the pilot, to relate pilot cues to the motion of the c.g. of the aircraft.

#### VI.2 LONGITUDINAL DYNAMICS

As noted in Volume III, the derivatives are inputted in body (i.e., waterline) axes. The input format of the program used contains a number of redundancies, e.g., Mach number, which are arbitrarily put to zero.

The print-out, in Volume III, gives:

- (i) Derivatives in stability axes
- (ii) Eigenvalues, and associated information, such as the coefficients of the denominator quartic
- (iii) Numerators for the pitch attitude control, which is here designated "CYCLIC".

Actually, the YHC-1A control is predominantly differential collective, though some cyclic variation is included as shown by the nonzero  $X_{\delta_e}$  at hover. For each numerator the roots, D.C. gain (i.e., Bode gain), and root locus gain are presented. In addition, various secondary items of information such as the coefficients of the numerator polynomial are printed out. The numerators correspond to  $\theta$ , u, w,  $a_z$  (as measured by an accelerometer,  $a_z = \hat{w} - U_0 q + g \sin \gamma_0 \int q dt$ ), and

The equations of motion are the standard longitudinal and lateral sets. These can be obtained from the coupled equations given in Chapter VII by neglecting all cross-coupling terms.

horizontal velocity perturbations  $\hat{x}$  (= u for  $\gamma_0 = 0$ ). In addition, the print-out includes rate-of-climb perturbations ( $\hat{n} - \hat{n}_0$ ) and perturbations in velocities parallel and normal to the undisturbed flight path. Note that only for  $\gamma_0 = 0$  is the normal velocity perturbation equal to the rate-of-climb perturbation.

For steep approaches, the "normal velocity" perturbation indicates the rate of deviation from the desired flight path. The "parallel velocity" perturbation indicates the rate of deviation from the desired position <u>along</u> the desired flight path. Hence, this quantity is important for stationkeeping, e.g., in formation flight or scheduling of multiple operations.

#### Longitudinal Eigenvalues

	TABLE VI.	. TANDEM-RC	TOR LONGITUDINAL DENOMINATORS
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Horiz.* Speed (knots)	Case No.	Eigenvalues (rad/sec)
0	0	15	974,35, .099 <u>+</u> .45 j
1500	0	16	824,25, .109 <u>+</u> .70 j
0	60	L3	-2.34,214 <u>+</u> .345j, .473
1500	60	L4	-2.35,35 <u>+</u> .29j, .406
0	80	L1	-2.50,212 <u>+</u> .33j, .43
1060	80		-2.37,31 <u>+</u> .32j, .400
1500	80	L2	-2.36,35 <u>+</u> .29j, .406

For ease of reference in the subsequent discussion, the eigenvalues are summarized in Table VI below.

Before discussing the changes that occur between level flight and steep descent, the nature of the modes for level flight will be reviewed.

This column shows horizontal speed, not total speed, and is therefore zero for vertical descent.

° **11**3

For level flight, the eigenvalues are distributed similarly to those of the HUP-1 given in Reference 34 (p. 258). The principal difference is about a 50% reduction in the magnitude (i.e., frequency). This would be expected from the increased mass and size of the YHC-1A (see Reference 35). It appears, therefore, that the general conclusions of Reference 34 regarding the physical nature of the modes should still be valid. That is, away from hover, the motion consists of three modes, one of which is aperiodic and appreciably larger than the others. This mode is a degenerate short-period mode with time constant  $T_{sp_1}$ 

$$\frac{1}{T_{sp}} = \frac{-(M_{q} + Z_{w} + U_{o} M_{w})}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{(M_{q} + Z_{w} + U_{o} M_{w})^{2}}{2}} + U_{o} M_{w} - M_{q} Z_{w}$$
(107)

This mode contains little u and is dominated by w and  $\theta$  motions.

The remaining modes involve u, w, and  $\theta$  and can be traced to the effect of the negative  $M_u$  on the short-period roots. The root-locus presentation of page 119 of Reference 34 can be used to predict the eigenvalues, with the condition that  $-Zw + (Z_u M_w/M_u) < 0$ . In summary, the open-loop longitudinal modes in level flight are the conventional modes for a tandem-rotor helicopter, as predicted in Reference 34.

In this report, our principal concern is to detect and study <u>changes</u> in dynamic characteristics from the level flight condition, so we shall now consider the descent cases; a more complete discussion of level flight dynamics of tandem-rotor helicopters is given in Reference 34.

At 60 and 80 knots, descent angle has little effect on the denominator roots, as shown by Table VI. The only significant change is an increase in phugoid damping. This would be expected, since the phugoid damping increases with  $-X_u$ .  $X_u$  depends on the trimmed drag/lift ratio, which of course must increase to balance out the X-force gravity component in descent.

For vertical descent, the changes are also rather small. Hence, if any marked changes in tandem-rotor control characteristics occur, when going from level flight to descent at the same horizontal speed, the changes must be associated with the transfer function numerators. These will now be discussed.

#### Longitudinal Numerators

At a given horizontal speed, the  $\theta/\delta e$  numerator shows little change with rate of descent. For ease of reference, the  $\theta/\delta e$ numerators are summarized below. We employ the convention that a positive time constant is "stable"; i.e., the zero is in the lefthalf complex plane.

TABLE VII. TANDEM-ROTOR 0/8 NUMERATORS										
Rate of DescentHoriz. Speed (knots)		Case No.	Root-Locus Gain	1/T <sub>01</sub> (rad/sec)	l/T <sub>62</sub> (rad/sec)					
0	0	L5	. 355	+.019	+.3789					
1500	0	l6	. 3436	+.0156	+.267 +.817					
0	60	L3	.45	+.035						
1500	60	۲۲	.47	+.0312	+.912					
0	80	Ll	.48	+.043	+.935					
1500 80		L2	.50	+.038	+.99					

The effect of descent on  $1/T\theta_1$ ,  $1/T\theta_2$  is slight. As noted above, the changes in the denominator roots are also small. Hence, any effect of descent on pitch control must be associated with feedbacks other than  $\theta$ . One of the most common feedbacks for tandem-rotor configurations is  $u \rightarrow \delta e$ . This is employed to correct the negative Mu characteristic of tandem-rotor helicopters at forward speed. Accordingly, the  $u/\delta_e$  transfer functions are examined below.

Volume III presents u numerators in stability axes, and also in axes parallel to the stability axes, but located 17 feet farther forward, at the cockpit. The latter axis system is appropriate when considering feedbacks from air data, since such data are measured well forward on the fuselage to minimize rotor downwash effects. For inertial systems using stable platforms or frequently updated corrections obtained from ground tracking equipment applied to strapdown components, "stability axes" with origin at the c.g. appear to be more appropriate. Thus, for S.A.S. design and such pilot tasks as stationkeeping, the "cockpit" axes are appropriate, whereas for inertial guidance the usual "stability" axes are relevant. As shown below, the two sets of numerators show marked differences.

First, consider the  $u \rightarrow \delta_e$  stability axis numerators tabulated below. Root locations are presented here, not inverse time constants; i.e., a negative real part of the root location indicates a "stable" root.

TABI	TABLE VIII, TANDEM-ROTOR u/8 NUMERATORS IN STABILITY AXES										
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Horiz. Speed (knots)	Case No.	Root-Locus Gain	Root Locations (rad/sec)							
0	80	Ll	.185	-9.99, -1.14, 6.84							
1500	80	r5	. 312	-10.35,656, 7.45							
0	60	L3	.189	-10.2,87, 7.07							
1500	60	L <sup>4</sup>	•37	-9.08,567, 6.83							
0	0	15	.178	-9.05,37, 7.118							
1500	0	L6	.13 <sup>),</sup>	-1.045, 6.68, 14.39							

At 60 and 80 knots, there is little change in the numerator with descent angle. The vertical descent case shows a marked change; however,  $u/\delta_e$  referred to stability axes is unimportant for control in vertical descent, since u is then vertical, and is more logically controlled by collective, rather than by  $\delta_e$ , which is the pitch attitude control.

Thus we conclude that, for inertial feedbacks referred to the c.g. and to the aircraft's desired flight path, there is little effect of descent on the vehicle open-loop or closed-loop dynamics. By contrast, for feedbacks using air data, or other data referred to the pilot's location, ahead of the c.g., the effect of descent angle is considerable, as indicated overleaf, in Table IX.

TABLE IX. TANDEN-ROTOR $u/\delta_e$ NUMERATORS IN COCKPIT AXES											
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Horiz. Speed (knots)	Case No.	Root-Locus Gain	Root Locations (rad/sec)							
0	66	ы	.164	-1.71, 3.22, 16.1							
1500	80	12	.146	796 <u>+</u> .639j, 105.9							
0	(r)	L3	.142	-2.53, -1.34, 24.8							
1500	60	I/4	.126	7 <b>89</b> <u>+</u> .53j, 122.1							
0	0	15	.177	-9.05, -0.37, 7.11							
1500	0	16	.166	-1.32, -0.285, 50.36							

Some significant changes occur in going from level flight to descent. At 80 knots, the right-half plane zero at 3.22 rad/sec joins with the lefthalf plane zero at 1.71 and forms a complex pair in the left-half plane. The third zero moves into the distant right half-plane, becoming too far out to be significant. Similar changes occur at 60 knots. These changes are potentially significant, because there are no near-cancellations between numerator and denominator in the transfer functions, listed below for ease of reference.

## u/Se Transfer Functions at 80 Knots Horizontal Speed

Level Flight:

1

 $\frac{u}{\delta_{e}} / = \frac{.164 (s + 1.71)(s - 3.22)(s - 16.1)}{(s + 2.50)(s + .212 + .33j) (s - .43)}$ 1500 fpm Descent:  $\frac{u}{\delta_{e}} / = \frac{.146(s + .796 + .639 j)(s - 105.9)}{(s + 2.36)(s + .35 + .29 j)(s - .406)}$ 

The rather small  $1/T_{\theta_1}$  (see Table VII) limits the degree to which the unstable eigenvalue can be stabilized by  $\theta$  and q feedback. Hence it is quite possible that the  $u \rightarrow \delta_e$  feedback will be required to achieve stability, even if  $\theta$  and q feedbacks are also employed. In these circumstances, the changes in the  $u/\delta_e$  transfer function should be considered carefully when designing stability augmentation systems using air data recorded away from the c.g.

Let us now consider the effects of descent on collective pitch control. The primary function of collective pitch is to control the deviation of the aircraft c.g. normal to the desired flight path. The appropriate transfer function numerators are summarized below.

T2/	TABLE X. TANDEM-ROTOR COLLECTIVE PITCH NUMERATORS FOR VELOCITY PERTURBATIONS OF C. G. NORMAL TO DESIRED FLIGHT PATH												
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Speed (knots)	Case No.	Root-Locus Gain	Root Locations (rad/sec)									
0	80	ы	-9.51	-1.87,209, .495									
1500	80	L2	-8.99	-1.13,778, .2148									
0	60	L3	-8.56	-1.84,217, .548									
1500	60	L/4	-7.85	952 <u>+</u> .3735j, .267									
0	0	15	-7.43	953, .105 <u>+</u> .445j									
0	1500	16	-1.466	652, .054 <u>+</u> 1.26j									

At hover, the usual cancellation of the denominator roots occurs, leaving the transfer function as  $\hbar/\delta_c = Z_{\delta_c}/(s - Z_w)$ . For vertical descent, the above transfer function becomes  $\frac{1}{2}/\delta_c$  and is not important for practical flight control. Chapter VII shows that for single-rotor helicopters, control of velocity normal to the unperturbed flight by collective pitch becomes difficult at very low speeds ( $\pm 20$  knots) in steep descents. Unfortunately, derivatives were not available for the YHC-1A in such conditions, so it is not known whether this effect (due to an uncancelled right-half plane zero) also occurs on tandem-rotor helicopters.

The importance of the changes in the above numerators for descending flight is hard to assess in general, because the "normal velocity" collective control is affected by feedbacks to cyclic from u, q, and  $\theta$ . Such feedbacks will probably be employed for inner-loop stabilization.

It is not feasible to discuss all the tandem-rotor longitudinal transfer functions that are tabulated in Volume III. However, from those that have been examined here, it would appear that descent angle does not cause radical changes in the transfer functions. The most important exception to this generalization is  $u/\delta / \operatorname{cockpit}$ . The numerator of this transfer function exhibits some significant changes, which should be considered when designing stability augmenter systems that employ M augmentation based on air data sensors located away from the c.g.

### VI.3 LATERAL DYNAMICS

1

The lateral transfer function denominators for the YHC-LA are presented in Table XI. The table has been arranged to fit the following discussion which first considers the variation of the level flight denominators with forward speed, and then analyzes the effects of descent.

	TABLE XI. TANDEM-ROTOR LATERAL EIGENVALUES									
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Horiz. Speed (knots)	Case No.	Eigenvalues (rad/sec)							
0	0	L5	.0594 <u>+</u>	<b>.</b> 511j	057	975				
0	60	L3	.225 <u>+</u>	.604j	058	-1.29				
0	80	ы	.281 <u>+</u>	.642j	0768	-1.36				
1500	0	L6	.052 <u>+</u>	.707j	052	925				
1500	60	L <sup>1</sup> 4	.134	.542	048	-1.77				
1500	80	L2	140	.772	.0023	-1.832				

The hover behavior is standard and closely analogous to the longitudinal case illustrated in Table VI. Note the close proximity of the frequencies of the longitudinal hovering phugoid ( $\omega = 0.45$  rad/sec) and the lateral hovering dutch roll ( $\omega_{\rm dr} = 0.51$  rad/sec). As stated in Chapter V, for the tandem configuration, longitudinal-lateral cross-coupling was arbitrarily neglected. Undoubtedly, some coupling exists, and the near-coincidence of  $\omega_{\rm dr}$  and  $\omega_{\rm p}$  may make this coupling important for the YHC-LA. The question will only be settled by more extensive measurements of derivatives and flight test responses to control inputs.

The principal effect of descent at the higher speeds, is to change the unstable dutch roll oscillatory roots into an aperiodic pair. At 60 knots, both these roots are unstable; but as speed is increased one becomes stable while the other root moves farther out into the right-half plane. For the YHC-1A, this degeneration of the dutch roll roots into an aperiodic pair is a consequence of the low (actually negative)  $N_{\rm w}$ .

N remains negative for all the level and descending forward flight conditions considered here, when measured in stability axes (which is the appropriate axis system for defining directional stability). It is difficult to design a tandem-rotor configuration with the c.g. far removed from the mid-point of the rotor axes; hence, negative N is characteristic of these configurations. It is usually "fixed" by feeding back p to  $\delta_{\rm R}$  to achieve static stability, plus additional feedbacks of  $\phi$  to  $\delta_{\rm A}$ , and possibly r to  $\delta_{\rm R}$  command, to move all the roots into the right-half plane and to achieve good turn coordination.

Feedback of sideslip alone is usually insufficient to ensure stability. This is illustrated in Figure 37 for the 80-knot levelflight case. Note the awkwardly-placed zero of the sideslip numerator. Because of the fundamental importance of directional stability for good handling qualities, particular interest attaches to the variation of the  $v/\delta_{\rm R}$  transfer functions with descent angle. Numerators of these transfer functions are tabulated below.

120



Figure 37. Root Locus for  $v \rightarrow \delta_R$  Feedback on Tandem-Rotor Helicopter.

۱\_\_\_\_
Ľ	BLE XII. T	ANDEM-ROT	ior v/s, n	IUMERATORS
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Horiz. Speed (knots)	Case No.	Root -Locus Gain	Root Locations (rad/sec)
0	80	Ll	.099	92,00145, 256.9
1500	80	L2	.07	41,020, 422.9
0	60	L3	.106	86,0025, 163.5
1500	60	L4	.073	151,0239, 524.9
0	о	L5	.146	0226,.79 <u>+</u> 6.04j
1500	0	Ľб	.143	-1.33,055, 77.96

In these numerators, v is referred to stability axes. For analyzing stability augmenter systems, it is perhaps more meaningful to refer v to a location near the cockpit, where the sideslip sensing ports are located. However, as shown in Volume III, there is relatively little difference between the  $v/\delta_{\rm R}$  transfer functions referred to either location at 60 and 80 knots. The  $v/\delta_{\rm R}$ transfer function is not particularly important at zero forward speed, since v is then controlled directly through lateral cyclic pitch.

From Table XII, the effect of the descent on the  $v/\delta_R$  numerators is seen to be relatively minor at 60 and 80 knots. The low-frequency zero limits the possible improvement of the unstable spiral root at 80 knots, suggesting that additional feedbacks (e.g.,  $\phi \rightarrow \delta_A$ ) are required to stabilize this root. The degenerate dutch roll modes may also require excessive gain for stabilization through  $v \rightarrow \delta_R$ feedback alone. (The low accuracy to which v can be measured constrains practical  $v \rightarrow \delta_R$  feedbacks to rather low gains.) The net effect of descent upon  $v \stackrel{R}{\rightarrow} \delta_R$  feedback control seems to be adverse, and it appears that a system designed for level flight would not necessarily be suitable for steep approaches.

From the above discussion,  $\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{o}}_{p}$  feedback appears to be mandatory for tandem-rotor helicopters. Such feedback represents an "inner loop" which will affect the other loop closures such as  $\mathbf{\hat{e}} \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{o}}_{A}$ . In level flight, the  $\mathbf{\hat{e}}/\mathbf{\hat{o}}_{A}$  numerator exhibits some undesirable nonminimum phase characteristics" as noted in Reference 34. These become appreciably worsened in descent, as shown in Table XIII.

	TAL	RLE XIII	. TANDEM RO	TOR \$/8 NUMERATORS
Rate of Descent (fpm)	Horiz. Speed (knots)	Case No.	Root -Locus Gain	Root Locations (rad/sec)
0	80	ы	.495	70, .543
1500	80	L2	.48	-1.09, .911
0	60	L3	.51	496, .368
1 <b>50</b> 0	60	L <sup>1</sup> 4	.45	856, .70
0	0	L5	•55	249,057
1500	0	ГQ	.52	055 <u>+</u> .02j

The poor handling qualities associated with the unaugmented  $\phi/\delta_A$  closure in level flight noted in Reference 34 are likely to become even more degraded in descent. For example, at 80 knots, the  $\phi/\delta_A$  transfer fraction has one right-half plane zero and two right-half plane real poles, thus presenting a situation which is quite difficult to stabilize.

An important feedback for human-pilot control is  $y \rightarrow \delta_A$ , where y is the lateral displacement of the helicopter measured either at the c.g. or at the cockpit.

1

. 1

A nonminimum phase transfer function is one with one or more right-half plane zeros.

The print-out in Volume II includes both alternatives, however at the higher speeds the differences between the transfer functions for  $y/\delta_{A/cockpit}$  and  $y/\delta_{/c.g.}$  are relatively minor. For vertical descent the differences become more pronounced, as shown by the following comparison.

TAB	LE XIV.	EFFECT OF y/& NUME GRAVITY A	VERTICAL RATORS MEA ND AT THE	DESCENT ON TANDEM-ROTOR SURED AT THE CENTER OF COCKPIT
Flight Condition	Case No.	Location of Origin	Root -Locus Gain	Root Location (rad/sec)
Hover	L5	c.g.	.998	082 <u>+</u> 4.22j,037,0177
Hover	L5	cockpit	3.26	108 <u>+</u> 2.33j,053,0123
Vertical Descent	16	c.g.	•98	083 <u>+</u> 4.05,1,051, 0
Vertical Descent	L5	cockpit	0116	-26.7,083, 0, 52.8

A complete assessment of the significance of this difference in  $y/\delta_{A}$  is beyond the scope of this report. It would involve loop closures using assumed models for the pilot; e.g. the "series closure" model used in Reference 36 and in the PAPER PILOT program described in Reference 37. The validity of these closures for conditions other than hover is subject to question. However, if the series closure is employed, the  $y/\delta_{A/cockpit}$  and  $9/\delta_{A}$  transfer functions would be relevant for the inner and outer loops. As shown in Tables XIII and XIV, marked changes in these transfer functions occur between hover and vertical descent. It is therefore to be expected that correspondingly large changes in handling qualities will appear when going from hover to vertical descent.

#### Summery

In this chapter, we have reviewed the major effects of descent on the transfer functions of a typical tandem-rotor helicopter. It was assumed that longitudinal and lateral motions were uncoupled. Longitudinally, the effects of descent (at normal approach speeds of 60 to 80 knots) are generally minor. Some increase in phugoid damping occurs, but the important  $\theta/\delta e$  pitch attitude control numerator hardly changes. Similarly, little change was observed in the  $u/\delta_e$ numerator referred to stability axes. However, marked changes occur in the  $u/\delta_2$  numerator referred to body axes with origin at the cockpit. These changes are potentially significant for stability augmenter systems which employ air data sensors to augment  $M_{\rm H}$ 

Laterally, the effects of descent are more noticeable. At forward speed the unstable dutch roll degenerates into an aperiodic pair, having at least one unstable root. This unstable root is usually stabilized by v  $\delta_R$  feedback; however, this feedback has little effect on the spiral mode (which may be unstable) because of a "close-in" zero in the  $v/\delta_R$  transfer function. This awkwardly placed zero is retained in descending flight. Thus, additional feedbacks (e.g.,  $\oint \delta_A$ ,  $r \delta_R$ ) are still required to achieve good handling qualities. The nonminimum phase characteristics of the  $\oint/\delta_A$ numerator worsen in descent, thus increasing the need for still further feedbacks, such as  $r \delta_P$ . Because of the large number of feedbacks required it is hard to form an assessment of the effects of descent on closed-loop characteristics without performing detailed calculations on "" nous alternative loop closures. However, the changes in the transfer functions are sufficiently large and numerous to indicate the necessity of performing these calculations for descent in addition to level flight.

ł

# CHAPTER VII. SINGLE-ROTOR HELICOPTER DYNAMICS

### VII.1. INTRODUCTION

L

This chapter discusses the open-loop and closed-loop dynamics of a typical single-rotor helicopter, the Sikorsky S-58. The basic data are presented in Volume III, which tabulates derivatives and eigenvalues.

The flight conditions presented in Volume III include level flight and rates of descent of 7.5 fps, 15 fps, and 22.5 fps. At low speeds the latter condition is virtually at the boundary of the vortex-ring state. For each rate of descent, true airspeeds of 0, 20, 40, 60 and 100 knots are considered.

All lateral-longitudinal cross-coupling derivatives were included, as shown by the equations of motion presented in Figure 38. To illustrate the importance of cross-coupling, one case was re-run with all cross-coupling derivatives set to zero. This was done for level flight at 100 knots.

The cyclically varying tip loss factor was included in all cases. To demonstrate the effect of tip losses on open-loop dynamics, two cases were re-run with tip losses removed. These cases were 22.5 fps rate of descent with 40 knots airspeed, and vertical descent at 22.5 fps.

Rigenvectors for u, v, w, p, q, r, in stability axes, residues for unit impulse inputs in  $A_{1s}$ ,  $B_{1s}$ ,  $\theta_0$ ,  $\theta_{OTR}$ , and transfer functions relating u, v, w, p, q, r, to  $A_{1s}$ ,  $B_{1s}$ ,  $\theta_0$ ,  $\theta_{OTR}$ , were also calculated for all the above cases. To save space, these data are not presented in full in Volume III, but selected values are given in this chapter where appropriate.

The main points discussed here are:

- (i) The effects of forward speed, rate of descent, and tip losses on the eigenvalues
- (ii) Cross-coupling effects ch open-loop dynamics as demonstrated by the eigenvectors
- (iii) Cross-coupling effects on closed-loop dynamics and human pilot control as demonstrated by the transfer functions and residues

The volume of data generated for the S-58 is large, and it is not easy to condense it to its essentials. Only the "highlights" can be indicated here. The reader will gain worthwhile insight into helicopter dynamics by examining Volume III in detail.

•

•

$$\begin{bmatrix} B \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \mathbf{x} \right\} + \begin{bmatrix} C \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \mathbf{x} \right\} = \begin{bmatrix} F \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{w} \mathbf{q} \ \Theta \mathbf{v} \mathbf{p} \ \mathbf{\phi} \mathbf{r} \end{bmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}}$$

where

1

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{u}} & -\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{w}} & -\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{g} \cos \gamma_{\mathbf{o}} & -\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{r}} \\ -\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{u}} & -\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{w}} & -\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{o}} - \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{g} \sin \gamma_{\mathbf{o}} & -\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}} \\ -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{u}} & -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{w}} & -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{r}} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{u}} & -\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{w}} & -\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{g} \cos \gamma_{\mathbf{o}} \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{o}} - \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{r}} \\ -\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}} & -\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{w}} & -\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{r}} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} & \tan \gamma_{\mathbf{o}} \\ -\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{u}} & -\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{w}} & -\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{q}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{r}} \end{bmatrix}$$

 $[\mathbf{F}] = [\mathbf{X}_{\delta} \quad \mathbf{Z}_{\delta} \quad \mathbf{M}_{\delta} \quad \mathbf{O} \quad \mathbf{Y}_{\delta} \quad \mathbf{L}_{\delta} \quad \mathbf{O} \quad \mathbf{N}_{\delta}]^{\mathrm{T}}$ 

1 -X° u	-X∘ ₩	-x <sub>q</sub>	0	-X° v	-X <sub>p</sub>	0	-× <sub>r</sub>
-Z°u	I-Z∘ ₩	-Z°	0	-Z∘v	-Z°p	0	-Z°r
-M° u	-M∘ ₩	1-M.q	0	-M∘ V	-M° p	0	-M° r
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
-Y°u	-Y° w	-Y°	0	1−Y° v	-Y• p	0	-Y°r
-L° u	- L° W	-L <sub>q</sub>	0	-L° v	1-L° p	٥	$\frac{I_{xz}}{I_x}$
0	0	0	0	0	0	<del>-</del> 1	0
-N° u	-N∘ w	⊷N°ď	0	-N°v	$\frac{I_{xz}}{I_z}$	0	! -N°r
	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -X_{u}^{\circ} \\ & -Z_{u}^{\circ} \\ & -M_{u}^{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & -Y_{u}^{\circ} \\ & -L_{u}^{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & -N_{u}^{\circ} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - X_{u}^{\circ} & -X_{w}^{\circ} \\ -Z_{u}^{\circ} & 1 - Z_{w}^{\circ} \\ -M_{u}^{\circ} & -M_{w}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} \\ -L_{u}^{\circ} & -L_{w}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 \\ -N_{u}^{\circ} & -N_{w}^{\circ} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -X_{u}^{\circ} & -X_{w}^{\circ} & -X_{q}^{\circ} \\ -Z_{u}^{\circ} & 1-Z_{w}^{\circ} & -Z_{q}^{\circ} \\ -M_{u}^{\circ} & -M_{w}^{\circ} & 1-M_{q}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} & -Y_{q}^{\circ} \\ -L_{u}^{\circ} & -L_{w}^{\circ} & -L_{q}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -N_{u}^{\circ} & -N_{w}^{\circ} & -N_{q}^{\circ} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - X_{u}^{\circ} & -X_{w}^{\circ} & -X_{q}^{\circ} & 0 \\ -Z_{u}^{\circ} & 1 - Z_{w}^{\circ} & -Z_{q}^{\circ} & 0 \\ -M_{u}^{\circ} & -M_{w}^{\circ} & 1 - M_{q}^{\circ} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} & -Y_{q}^{\circ} & 0 \\ -L_{u}^{\circ} & -L_{w}^{\circ} & -L_{q}^{\circ} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -N_{u}^{\circ} & -N_{w}^{\circ} & -N_{q}^{\circ} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -X_{u}^{\circ} & -X_{w}^{\circ} & -X_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -X_{v}^{\circ} \\ -Z_{u}^{\circ} & 1-Z_{w}^{\circ} & -Z_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -Z_{v}^{\circ} \\ -M_{u}^{\circ} & -M_{w}^{\circ} & 1-M_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -M_{v}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} & -Y_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & 1-Y_{v}^{\circ} \\ -L_{u}^{\circ} & -L_{w}^{\circ} & -L_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -L_{v}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -N_{u}^{\circ} & -N_{w}^{\circ} & -N_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -N_{v}^{\circ} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -X_{u}^{\circ} & -X_{w}^{\circ} & -X_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -X_{v}^{\circ} & -X_{p}^{\circ} \\ -Z_{u}^{\circ} & 1-Z_{w}^{\circ} & -Z_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -Z_{v}^{\circ} & -Z_{p}^{\circ} \\ -M_{u}^{\circ} & -M_{w}^{\circ} & 1-M_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -M_{v}^{\circ} & -M_{p}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} & -Y_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & 1-Y_{v}^{\circ} & -Y_{p}^{\circ} \\ -L_{u}^{\circ} & -L_{w}^{\circ} & -L_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -L_{v}^{\circ} & 1-L_{p}^{\circ} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -N_{u}^{\circ} & -N_{w}^{\circ} & -N_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -N_{v}^{\circ} & \frac{-I_{xz}}{I_{z}} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -X_{u}^{\circ} & -X_{w}^{\circ} & -X_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -X_{v}^{\circ} & -X_{p}^{\circ} & 0 \\ -Z_{u}^{\circ} & 1-Z_{w}^{\circ} & -Z_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -Z_{v}^{\circ} & -Z_{p}^{\circ} & 0 \\ -M_{u}^{\circ} & -M_{w}^{\circ} & 1-M_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -M_{v}^{\circ} & -M_{p}^{\circ} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -Y_{u}^{\circ} & -Y_{w}^{\circ} & -Y_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & 1-Y_{v}^{\circ} & -Y_{p}^{\circ} & 0 \\ -L_{u}^{\circ} & -L_{w}^{\circ} & -L_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -L_{v}^{\circ} & 1-L_{p}^{\circ} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -N_{u}^{\circ} & -N_{w}^{\circ} & -N_{q}^{\circ} & 0 & -N_{v}^{\circ} & \frac{-I_{xz}}{I_{z}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$

# Figure 38. Aircraft Equations of Motion in Stability Axes for Small Perturbations from Straight-Line Flight with Zero Bank Angle.

### VII.2. EIGENVALUES

**ا**ي :

The eigenvalues are summarized in Table XV and are discussed below.

The effects of cross-coupling on most eigenvalues are not large. For example, at 100 knots in level flight, only two modes are significantly changed when the cross-coupling derivatives are suppressed. This is illustrated by the excerpt from Table XI reproduced below.

Cross-	Coupling			Eig	envalues	
Yes	46 <u>+</u> 1.63j,	-4.96,	12,	47,	-1.82,	.12 <u>+</u> .33j
No	48 <u>+</u> 1.73j,	-5.23,	11,	32,	-1.79,	.22 <u>+</u> .34j

S-58, 100 Knots Level Flight

As will be shown later, the fact that most eigenvalues are essentially unchanged by the cross-coupling derivatives does <u>not</u> mean that cross-coupling effects are unimportant.

For level flight, the eigenvalues change only slightly as forward speed is increased. The unstable phugoid mode and the degenerate short-period modes characteristic of hover remain remarkably unchanged with forward speed. This is contrary to the usual trend noted in Reference  $3^4$ , where the phugoid becomes stable and the  $1/T_{sp1}$ ,  $1/T_{sp2}$  modes merge to form the conventional shortperiod.

The roll subsidence root remains roughly equal to  $L_p$  over the speed range 0 to 100 knots. The dutch roll mode is stable even at hover due to the N of the tail rotor as explained in Reference 38, page 15). The frequency increases from  $\omega = 0.73$  to  $\omega = 1.163$  rad/sec, and the damping ratio rises slightly from 0.098 to 0.131.

In descent, at the higher speeds there is not much change in the eigenvalues. By analogy to fixed-wing aircraft, in which the phugoid damping ratio is roughly proportional to (D/L), one would expect that  $\omega_p$  would increase in descent. This does occur, but the effect is not large. Thus at 100 knots in level flight,  $\zeta_p = -.172$ , whereas at the same horizontal speed and 22.5 fps rate of descent,  $\zeta_p = -.14$ . At lower speeds a similar effect occurs. For 20 knots forward speed in level flight,  $\zeta_p = -.111$ ; with the same horizontal speed and 22.5 fps rate of descent,  $\zeta_n = -.057$ .

The largest effect of descent on the eigenvalues occurs at very low forward speeds. In addition to the increased phugoid damping noted above, the degenerate short-period roots coalesce to form a heavily damped oscillatory pair.

		TABLE X	<pre>v. sikorsky s-5€</pre>	BEIGENVA	LUES WITH SIX DE	GREES OF	FREEDOM.	
CASE	$^{\rm VTAS}_{\rm FPS}$	γ DEG	DUTCH ROLL MODE	ROLI	-SPIRAL-SPEED-PI MODES	тсн	PHUGOID	REM! RKS
		ATE OF DE	ESCENT = 0					
ŝ	0	0	088 + .49j	-4.49	266 + .075j	-1.14	£765. + 560.	
9	33.8	0	146 7 .73j	-4.76	•• 197 7 -• 385	-1.15	.061 ± .334	
2	67.8	0	24 ±985j	-5.08	141479	-1-33	.085 ± .374.j	
ω	101-5	0	323 ± 1.23j	-5.15	118  577	-1.42	.058 ± .324j	
0	8 <u>.</u>	0	$46 \pm 1.63j$	-4-96	117  466	-1.82	·121 ± ·331j	
-6	109.0		<u>475 ± 1-75j</u>	-5.23	111323	-1-79	.219 ± .336j	Uncoupled
		IN JULY	$\frac{10}{13}$ (•) = TMEDOD	ļ				
10	7.5	-90.0	116 ± .466j	-4.56	256 ± .103.j	-1.11	.082 ± .3761	
1	33.8	-12.8	162 ± .712j	-4.88	185  381	-1.13	.048 ± .332.	
2	67.8	- 6.35	255 ± 1.003j	-5.24	127589	-1.23	·035 ± .3161	
13	101.5	- 4.12	343 ± 1.205j	-5.29	107579	-1.42	· 044 ± .315.	
14	169.0	- 2.54	492 ± 1.6j	-5.05	108455	-1.83	.11 ± .326j	
		RATE OF DE	ESCENT = 15 FT/SEC					
15	15.0	-90.0	147 ± .4453	-4.63	247 ± .12.	-1.08	.069 ± .388j	
9	33.8	-26.4	-179 ± -687.j	-4.97	176  366	-1.103	.039 ± .334j	
17	67.8	-12.8	271 ± -95j	-5.4	115603	-1.214	.023 ± .308j	-
9 9	101-5	- 8 - 7		-5-44	09858	-1.42	•031 ± •305j	
2		ATE OF DE	$\frac{1}{5} = -210 = 1 - 2/3$	1-2-17 SRC	10++	đ	16616. 2 01.	
0	00 F			1, 68	0)E + 100+			
1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			р т т	0E1 + 122	5.5		
	33.0	-41.8	1974 + 901 -				1060 - 600.	SSOT dil on
) -		α α						
- K							fc. = 110.	Ē
<u>ک</u> ر	101 101					200		SSOT GLT. ON
55	0.69	- 7.65		5.5	- 093 - 42	-1-86	107 - KIN.	

1\_\_\_\_

In summary, it appears that the variation of the eigenvalues both with horizontal speed and rate of descent is less than one might have expected. In part, this is due to the small and rather low aspect ratio tail surfaces of the S-58. These are extremely ineffective, in that M remains positive throughout the speed range 0-100 knots. A more effective tail would tend to produce "airplane" type modes, i.e., oscillatory short-period and stable phugoid, as speed is increased.

### VII.3. CROSS-COUPLING EFFECTS

1

As noted above, only minor changes in the eigenvalues occurred when the cross-coupling derivatives were set to zero. This trend is shown on Table XV for 100 knots level flight, but has also been verified by some calculations (not published here) for descending flight and lower speeds with and without the coupling terms. From this, it might be inferred that cross-coupling effects are minor. Nothing could be further from the truth! Examination of the print-outs (Volume III) reveals strong cross-coupling at all flight conditions.

In this section we demonstrate lateral-longitudinal crosscoupling by three complementary approaches:

- 1. Calculation of transfer functions with and without the cross-coupling derivatives
- 2. Calculation of the residues of the partial fraction expansion of the Laplace transform of the time response to a given input, such as a step or impulse in  $B_{1s}$ , or  $\theta_{0}$ .
- 3. Study of the eigenvectors (the ratios of which equal the ratios of the residues in each degree of freedom for a given eigenvalue).

We show that the cross-coupling between longitudinal and lateral motions is strong for many of the modes. Furthermore, the cross-coupling occurs at all forward speeds and rates of descent examined here. In this respect the S-58 is believed to be representative of single-rotor helicopters in general. Little change occurs in the lateral-longitudinal cross-coupling for each mode as descent angle is increased at a given forward speed. Hence, the explanation of the difficulties encountered in flight path control in steep descent must be elsewhere. In the final section of this chapter, the culprit is identified as a nonminimum phase  $\gamma/\theta_0$ transfer function. This transfer function is crucial in flight path control at low speeds, and it is shown that in descent a nonminimum phase zero appears which causes a marked deterioration in the achievable level of accuracy with which the desired approach path can be followed.

A nonminimum phase transfer function has one or more right-half plane zeros. The terms 'nonminimum phase zero' and 'right-half plane zero' are synonymous.

### Effect of Cross-Coupling Derivatives on the Transfer Functions

For brevity, transfer functions will not be written in the usual form; e.g., r = n

$$\frac{\text{Output}(s)}{\text{Input}(s)} = \frac{(\text{Root locus gain}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \Pi \\ r = 1 \end{array} \quad (s + z_r) \\ \Pi \\ i = m \\ i = 1 \end{array}$$

Instead, we adopt the equivalent notation

$$\frac{\text{Output}}{\text{Input}} = \frac{(\text{Root locus gain})}{\prod_{i=1}^{i=m} (-p_i)} \prod_{i=1}^{r=n} (-p_i)$$

For example, the transfer function

$$\frac{w(s)}{\theta_0}(s) = \frac{154.4 (s + 0.802) (s - 0.32)}{(s + 0.312)(s - 0.0354 + 0.34j)(s - 0.0354 - 0.34j)}$$

is written as

I\_

$$\frac{w}{\theta_0} = \frac{154.4 (-0.802) (+ 0.32)}{(-0.312) (+ 0.0354 \pm 0.34j)}$$

In this abbreviated style, right-half-plane poles and zeros are indicated by numbers with positive real parts.

As noted in Table XV, the 100-knot, level-flight case was run twice. Firstly, all the derivatives calculated from MOSTAB were included. Secondly, all derivatives coupling longitudinal forces or moments with lateral perturbations and vice versa were dropped. In addition, all lateral forces and moments produced by  $\theta_0$  and  $B_{1s}$  were put equal to zero, as were all longitudinal forces and moments produced by  $\theta_{0TR}$  and  $A_{1s}$ .

The results are compared in Table XVI.

	TABLE XVI. EFFECT OF CROSS-COUPLING DERIVATIVES; SIKORSKY S-58, 100 KNOTS, LEVEL FLIGHT
Cross Coupling	Pitch Rate/B Transfer Function
No	$\frac{8.43(-0.657)(-0.029)(0)}{(-0.33)(-1.79)(0.219 \pm 0.336j)}$
Yes	$\frac{8.48(0.017)(-0.061)(-0.109)(-5.25)(-0.46 + 1.69j)(-0.66)}{(0.117)(-4.96)(-0.466)(0.12 + 0.33j)(-0.46 + 1.63j)(-1.82)}$
With approxim	nate pole-zero cancellations removed, this becomes:
Yes	$\frac{8.48(0.017)(-0.061)(-0.66)}{(-0.466)(-1.82)(0.12 \pm 0.33j)}$
Cross Coupling	Roll Rate/A <sub>ls</sub> Transfer Function
No	$\frac{-59.0(0.0000017)(-0.60 + 1.64j)}{(-0.11)(-5.23)(-0.476 + 1.73j)}$
Yes	$\frac{-58.9(0.000053)(-0.58 + 1.69j)(0.234 \pm 0.328j)(-1.86)(-0.31)}{(-0.117)(-4.96)(-0.466)(0.12 \pm 0.33j)(-0.46 \pm 1.63j)(-1.82)}$
With approxim	ate pole-zero cancellations removed, this becomes:
Vog	$-58.9(0)(-0.577 \pm 1.69j)(-0.311)$
TER	$(-0.117)(-4.96)(-0.46 \pm 1.63j)(-0.466)$

Table XVI shows that the  $q/B_{1s}$  transfer function and the  $p/A_{1s}$  transfer function are hardly changed by the presence or omission of cross-coupling terms. Of course, if the cross-coupling terms are omitted, then the  $p/B_{1s}$  and  $q/A_{1s}$  transfer functions will be zero. This would be a serious error. To see just how serious, consider the  $p/B_{1s}$  and  $q/A_{1s}$  transfer functions. These are listed in Table XVII.

		TABLE XVII. CROSS-COUPLED TRANSFER FUNCTIONS; SIKORSKY S-58, 100 KNOTS, S. L., LEVEL FLIGHT
a	_	-0.906(-30.27)(-0.56 <u>+</u> 1.67j)(0.077)(-0.67)(-0.086 <u>+</u> 0.95j)
A <sub>1s</sub>	-	$(-0.117)(-4.96)(-0.466)(0.12 \pm 0.33j)(-0.46 \pm 1.63j -1.824)$
D	=	$0.048(0.093)(597.2)(-0.11 \pm 1.83j)(0.000012)(1.94)(-1.37)$
B <sub>1s</sub>		$(-0.117)(-4.96)(-0.466)(0.12 \pm 0.33j)(-0.46 \pm 1.63j)(-1.824)$
Expai	nded	in partial fractions
F		
p <sup>B</sup> 1s	=	$\frac{0.061}{s + 0.117} - \frac{6.99}{s + 4.96} + \frac{4.91}{s + 0.466} + \frac{1.82 \angle 24.4^{\circ}}{s - 0.12 - 0.33j}$
	s	$\frac{+1.82 \ \angle -24.4^{\circ}}{s \ -0.12 \ + \ 0.33j} + \frac{1.63 \ \angle \ 96.9^{\circ}}{s \ + \ 0.46 \ - \ 1.63j} + \frac{1.63 \ \angle \ 96.9^{\circ}}{s \ + \ 0.46 \ + \ 1.63j} - \frac{0.96}{s \ + \ 1.824}$

It is not easy to assess the relative magnitude of the pitch versus the roll motions produced by  $B_{1S}$  by comparing the transfer functions as listed in Tables XVI and XVII. A more direct comparison is obtained by expanding the  $q/B_{1S}$  and  $p/B_{1S}$  transfer functions into partial fractions and comparing the magnitude of each coefficient in the expansion, i.e., each residue, as shown in the lower half of Table XVII. Table XVIII shows such a comparison. For compactness, some numbers have been rounded off in Table XVIII, and only the residue corresponding to the upper-half plane root of each complex pair is shown.

134

TABLE	XVIII. CR SI	OSS-COUPLING KORSKY S-58	EFFECTS ON B AT 100 KNOTS, S	IMPULSE IN EA LEVEL	PUT;
Lev	el Flight		7.65 De	g. Descent	
Root	Re	sidues	Root	Rest	Idues
s, rad/sec	р	q	s, rad/sec	p	q
117 -4.96 466 .121 + .33j 46 + 1.63j	.061 -6.99 4.91 1.82 ⁄24° 1.63 ⁄97°	.0033 .7245 622 1.2 2-152 <sup>0</sup> .264 2 24 <sup>0</sup>	0926 -5.25 421 .091 + .31j 541 + 1.54j	0062 -5.59 6.16 2.39 4 19 <sup>0</sup> 3.14 4 107 <sup>0</sup>	797 .469 797 1.18 ∠-147° .511 ∠29°
-1.824	- •955	-6.942	-1.865	-2.37	-6.851

Table XVII shows p and q residues for  $B_{1s}$  inputs at two flight conditions. To form a complete picture of cross-coupling, u, v, w, and r must also be considered. However, Table XVII suffices to demonstrate that, in level flight at 100 knots,  $B_{1s}$  induces considerable roll (compared to pitch) and that this cross-coupling is not much changed by descent.

To understand Table XVIII, first compare the relative magnitudes of the residues for each mode. The relative importance of p to q in each mode depends upon the ratio of the residues. For example, Table XVIII shows that the rapidly decaying s = 4.96 mode is predominantly roll. On the otner hand, the unstable oscillatory mode displays almost as much pitch as roll, and the s = -1.824 mode has about seven times as much pitch rate as roll rate.

The above remarks indicate the relative magnitude of pitch and roll in each mode, but this information, by itself, is insufficient to predict the cross-coupling induced by the pitch control,  $B_{1s}$ . To determine that, we must scrutinize the absolute magnitude of each of the q residues. If the residues of the "pitch" modes (s = 0.12 ± 0.33j, s = -1.324) are very much larger than the residues of the other "coupled" or "roll" modes, then the response will be dominated by pitch, and  $B_{1s}$  will induce little cross-coupling. Examining Table XVIII leads to the conclusion that although the residues of the "pitch" modes are somewhat larger than those of the other modes, the difference in magnitude is not so overwhelming that we can say that the roll induced by  $B_{1s}$  is small. We therefore conclude that  $B_{1s}$  induces appreciable roll in level flight at 100 knots.

135

The descent situation is summarized by the right-hand side of Table XVIII. Overall, there is very little change in the residues between level flight and descent at 100 knots. If this result is representative, it implies that the difficulties in control in steep approaches due to cross-coupling are no worse than those encountered in level flight. Hence, we cannot ascribe the difficulties experienced in following steep glide slopes to changes in cross-coupling between leve! flight and descent.

To verify that the above result is representative, we have calculated the residues for u, v, w, p, q, r, to  $A_{1s}$ ,  $B_{1s}$ ,  $\theta_{0}$ ,  $\theta_{0TR}$  for a wide range of flight conditions.

Table XIX illustrates a typical comparison between level flight and two descending cases, all at 40 knots airspeed. This confirms the conclusions of Table XVIII that descent angle has only a minor influence on cross-coupling. From examination of the residues for the entire range of flight conditions presented here (0 to 100 knots airspeed, and zero to 22.5 fps rate of descent), the effect of descent angle is quite small. We therefore conclude that variations in crosscoupling between level flight and descent are not a major source of difficulty in controlling steep approach paths on single-rotor helicopters.

Before leaving the subject of cross-coupling, it should be noted that, although the effect of descent rate is small, cross-coupling varies significantly with airspeed. This can be seen by examining the transfer functions presented in Volume III. It is usual to reduce the effects of cross-coupling by suitable phasing of A, and B, to B, through offset of the servos. This correction can be exact only at a single flight condition.

	5	γ =-19.μ <sup>0</sup>	ħ21°	44.1-	1.29	1.05 6 58°	1.39 <b>4-</b> 172 <sup>0</sup>	4°.89
	RESIDUES TO	γ =-6. <sup>μο</sup>	5th0	-3.31	3.67	1.16 2 66 <sup>0</sup>	0.88 <b>1</b> 63.4 <sup>0</sup>	2.64
TLING . SEA LEVEL.	d.	ν = 0	+1-01x6.0-	71.4-	2.73	1.24 2.52 <sup>0</sup>	ر 147 <sup>0</sup> د 147 <sup>0</sup>	2.45
on cross-couf	B <sub>ls</sub>	γ =-19.4°	0058	260.	ረተተ.	.94 2 -110 <sup>0</sup>	• 395 • 95 <sup>0</sup>	11.7-
of descent ( KY S-58 AT 4	RESIDUES TO	۲ =-6.4 <sup>0</sup>	0067	.258	<b>τ</b> ε•		.26 2 90.9 <sup>0</sup>	-7.10
XIX. EFFECT SIKORS	đ	γ = 0	-0.8x10 <sup>-5</sup>	•351	226	1.2 <b>८</b> -135 <sup>0</sup>	0.15 2 71 <sup>0</sup>	-6.045
TABLE		γ =-19.4 <sup>0</sup>	104	-5.56	-0.616	.011 +.298j	28 +.924.j	-1.198
	ROOTS	γ =_6.4 <sup>0</sup>	127	-5.24	-0.589	.035 +.316j	255 +.97j	-1.23
		<b>γ</b> = 0	41	-5.078	-0.479	.085 + .37j	24 +.99j	-1.33

·---

### VII.4. HEIGHT CONTROL

The effect of descent angle on the transfer function relating flight path angle,  $\gamma$ , to collective pitch is most significant. The difference between level flight and steep descent cases for this transfer function is such that control at low speeds is seriously degraded in descent. As explained below, the effect is caused by a right-half plane zero. It appears that this zero is the primary cause of the control difficulties experienced in steep descent.

It is first necessary to define the quantities of importance in precise flight path control for slow, steep approaches.

The key quantity determining how accurately a given approach flight path is followed is, in general, not height, nor flight path angle, but the displacement of the helicopter from the desired approach path. This quantity is illustrated in Figure 39. For brevity we shall call it "height error", denoted by the symbol h.

This section:

- (1) defines h in terms of w and q (for which transfer functions have been calculated)
- (2) presents transfer functions relating h to collective pitch
- (3) demonstrates that, at low speeds, control of h by collective pitch is relatively easy in level flight but difficult in steep descents
- (4) traces the reason for the difficulty to a nonminimum phase zero in the  $\hat{h}/\theta_0$  transfer function
- (5) investigates methods for alleviating the difficulty through typical stability augmenter systems

# Definition of Height Error, h

1

Consider Figure 39. This indicates the distance of the helicopter c.g. from the desired flight path. Call this distance the "height error" h.

Using stability axis quantities,

$$\frac{d\hat{h}}{dt} = U_0 \int qdt - w$$

Note that this expression neglects products of small-perturbation quantities, and also products of small-perturbation quantities with the small trim bank angle  $\phi_0$  which is typically of the order of 1 degree.



Figure 39. Definition of Height Error, h.

-

The flight path angle perturbation, with the same assumptions, becomes

$$\gamma = \int_{(U_0 + u)dt}^{h}$$

For vertical and almost-vertical descents the above expressions are not appropriate. Vertical descents are usually made close to the ground and the key parameter is the height above the ground. Using stability axes, in vertical descent this parameter is given by

$$h = \int (U_0 + u) dt$$

# Transfer Functions for h to Collective Pitch

Volume III does not give the h numerators directly, but these can be constructed from the q/s and w transfer functions. The results are displayed in Table XX.

As will be shown, the significant feature to note in Table XX is the right-half plane zero. At 20 knots (Cases 6, 11, and 20), this zero increases with descent angle. This trend is reversed at the higher speeds, but this reversal is not relevant to height-control because above about 40 knots  $B_{1s}$  becomes more effective than  $\theta_0$  in controlling height. However at low speeds  $\hat{h} = \int (U q dt - w dt)$  is dominated by the w term and cannot effectively be controlled by cyclic pitch. The  $\hat{h}/\theta_0$  transfer function is thus of prime importance, at low speeds.

## Height Error Response to Collective Input

Figure 40 shows the time histories of the responses to a unit collective pitch input for the S-58 at 20 knots (1) in level flight and (2) in a steep descent ( $\gamma_{0} = -41.8 \text{ deg}$ ). Note that, in the descending case, the height error goes the "wrong way" after about 8 seconds, never returning to the "right" direction. By contrast, for level flight during the first 30 seconds the height error moves only a little way in the wrong direction, between 17 and 22 seconds after the step input.

Both responses are oscillatory. This is due to the unstable phugoid mode. As shown later, this oscillatory mode can be stabilized by standard feedback of pitch rate to longitudinal cyclic. Considering the remaining modes in Figure 40, there is a fundamental similarity between the responses, in that both ultimately go in the wrong direction. This is characteristic of the step response of a system with one nonminimum phase zero. It can be proved (from the Laplace transform initial and final value theorems) that for such a system,

This is shown by the partial fractions listed on page 143.

ORS FOR COLLECTIVE CONTROL OF NORMAL DISTANCE FROM UNPERTURBED	LEVEL FLIGHT	Numerator Root Locations (rad/sec)	$087 \pm .50j$ $-4.48$ $0$ $159$ $-1.15$ $.091 \pm .37$ $j$ $073 \pm .72j$ $-4.74$ $.078$ $22$ $-1.05$ $0455 \pm .263j$ $139 \pm .896j$ $-5.08$ $.056$ $252$ $796$ $173 \pm .556j$ $064 \pm 1.18j$ $-5.19$ $.043$ $(795 \pm .736j)$ $121 \pm .093j$ $121 \pm 1.54j$ $-5.13$ $.035$ $(89 \pm 1.5 j)$ $113 \pm .071j$	TPS RATE OF DESCENT	-115 $\pm .4744$ $-4.57$ 0 $18$ $-111$ $.062 \pm .5793$ -108 $\pm .7253$ $-487$ $.1143$ $247$ $-105$ $029 \pm .1733$ -157 $\pm .9183$ $-5.24$ $.054$ $(64 \pm .3853)$ $-103 \pm .1293$ 157 $\pm .9183$ $-5.24$ $.054$ $(278 \pm .8363)$ $-103 \pm .1293$ 616 $\pm 1313$ $-5.34$ $.029$ $(278 \pm .8363)$ $103 \pm .1293$ 616 $\pm 1313$ $-5.34$ $.029$ $(278 \pm .8363)$ $103 \pm .0793$ 616 $\pm 1313$ $-5.34$ $.029$ $(278 \pm .8363)$ $109 \pm .0793$ 161 $\pm .4753$ $-4.69$ $0$ $227$ $-1.01$ $004 \pm .0793$ 164 $\pm .7113$ $-4.00$ $.268$ $256$ $-1.01$ $015 \pm .0923$ 221 $\pm .8913$ $-5.64$ $-062$ $276$ $-1.11$ $015 \pm .0923$ 221 $\pm .8913$ $-5.64$ $-062$ $276$ $-1.017$ $015 \pm .043$ 221 $\pm .8913$ $-5.64$ $062$ $023 \pm .7863$ $015 \pm .043$ $015 \pm .043$ 221 $\pm $	
NUMERATOR		Root Locus Sain	236.1 227.5 249.7 276.2	7.5 f	255.9	
RSKY S-58 HT PATH h		Y O Deg	*o *o *o *o *o		-90* -6.35 -6.35 -4.12 -4.12 -4.12 -12.8 -12.8 -12.8	
K. SIKO FLIG		V TAS f ps	1.0 33.8 67.8 101.5 169		7.5 33.8 67.8 101.5 101.5 169. 101.5 169.	
TABLE X		Case	50000		10 13 14 21 22 22 22	

For perturbations from level flight, h = height. For vertical descent, h is defined as vertical distance from the unperturbed position. \*

141





the sign of the initial <u>slope</u> of the step response is different from the sign of the final value of the response.

The <u>difference</u> between the responses of Figure 40 lies in the rapidity with which they move in the wrong direction, and it is this factor which causes difficulty of control. To demonstrate this, form the <u>unit</u> step response time history by expanding the Laplace transform of 1/s times the transfer function, and taking the inverse transform of each partial fraction. This yields, per radian of increased collective.

Level Flight:  

$$\hat{h} = -670 + 377.2t - 13.6t^{2} + 869e^{-0.385t} + 465e^{-0.197t} - 675e^{0.06t} (\cos 0.33t - 0.28 \sin 0.33t) + 0.038e^{-4.76t} + 21.7e^{-1.16t} - 28e^{-0.146t} (\cos 0.73t - 2.4 \sin 0.73t)$$

Steep Descent

$$h = -1,298 +7.1t -9.94t^{2} +568e^{-0.385t} +1,496e^{-0.18t} -812e^{\cdot035t} (\cos 0.54t -1.5 \sin 0.34t) -0.031 e^{-4.98t} -6.9e^{-1.07t} +53e^{-0.196t} (\cos 0.65t +1.72 \sin 0.65t)$$

Figures 41 and 42 show how the above components sum to form the complete response. The  $h/\theta_0$  transfer function has two poles at the origin (see Figure 43, or Tables XX\_and XV); hence, the step input yields partial fractions involving  $1/s^2$ ,  $1/s^2$ , and 1/s, corresponding to parabolic, ramp, and constant components of the step response time history. These components are primarily responsible for the differences between the responses for level flight and descent. The components depend on the vector distances from the poles at the origin to other uncancelled poles and zeros, and are markedly affected by the change in the right half plane zero from s = 0.074 for level flight to s = 0.268 for steep descent.

## Closed-Loop Control of Height Error

The adverse effect of the shift in the nonminimum phase zero from 0.078 rad/sec for level flight to 0.268 rad/sec for  $\gamma_0 = -41.8$  degrees can be demonstrated by constructing a root locus. The simplest feed-back to consider is a "pure gain" feedback of h to collective. This is illustrated on Figure 43, which shows the  $\gamma = -41.8$ -degree case. Note that even at low gains, a root moves close to the zero at s = 0.268. For example, for a feedback gain,  $\theta_0/h$ , of 0.08 radian per 100-foot height error, the system is unstable with a root at s = 0.13, i.e., doubling amplitude every 5.3 seconds. This divergence is too rapid to be acceptable.

For level flight, the zero is still present but is reduced in magnitude from s = 0.268 sec<sup>-1</sup> to s = 0.078 sec<sup>-1</sup>. For the same gain as used in descent ( $\theta$  /h = 0.08/100 radian per foot); the closed-locp time constant is approximately 0.057; hence the time to double amplitude is increased to 12 seconds.



Figure 41. Sikorsky 3-58, Level Flight, 20 Knots, S. L. Components of Height Error Time History per 1.0 Radian Step Increase in Collective Pitch.

ł



Figure 42. Sikorsky S-58: 20 Knots, S.L. Steep Descent  $\gamma = -41.8$  Degrees Components of Height Error Time History per 1.0 Radian Step Increase in Collective Pitch.

1\_



1\_\_\_\_

Of course, the "pure gain" closure discussed above is the simplest form of control, and the instability can be cured by more complicated compensation, plus "wrong-way" gain (i.e., increasing collective to compensate for being above the desired flight path). However, little can be done to alter the position of the nonminimum phase zero, which (as shown below) is the basic cause of the unsatisfactory tracking capability.

The reason why the zero is so tenacious is that, at low speeds, collective pitch is the only effective way of controlling height error. This can be seen by going to the limit, i.e., hover, when cyclic pitch produces essentially no Z-force. Thus there is no real possibility for multiloop control of height error. (In passing, note that this possibility does exist on the AH-56A discussed in the next chapter because the propeller pitch can effectively control the flight path.) Whatever feedbacks are employed, the overall transfer function relating height error to collective retains the nonminimum phase zero.

Summarizing the above discussions: the  $\hat{h}/\theta_{o}$  right-half plane zero is objectionable because:

- (1) It causes the initial step response to be in the opposite direction to the final response.
- (2) It makes it difficult to obtain a stable closure of the  $h \rightarrow \theta_{1}$  loop.
- (3) It cannot be moved appreciably by closing other loops (e.g.,  $h \rightarrow B_{1s}$ ) unless excessively high gains are used.

Granted all the above points, some further explanation is still required. This is because right-half plane zeros are quite common in aircraft transfer functions but do not normally cause a major deterioration in handling qualities. For example, the height-to-elevator transfer function of a conventional aircraft flying above its minimum drag speed contains a "far-out" right-half plane zero. However, neither "far-out" or "very close-in" zeros cause a significant deterioration in the step response. What, then, is so bad about the S-58  $h/\theta_0$ 

transfer function at 20 knots,  $\gamma = 41.8$  degrees, and the associated step response shown on Figure 40?

The answer can be found rigorously by considering the effects of the relative magnitude of the nonminimum phase zero and the gust break frequency on the performance of an optimal regulator. This is done in Reference 39, but the essential point can be grasped by the following reasoning.

147

۱.

Consider the task of a pilot flying a helicopter in a gusty environment, approximated by a series of randomly spaced square wave w-gusts of random amplitude. Let the average time between successive gusts be  $\tau_g$  seconds. Suppose, the helicopter has a stable step response to collective which is "up" for  $\tau$ , sec and "down" thereafter (i.e., a nonminimum phase characteristic). If  $\tau_g$  is very much less than  $\tau_h$ , the optimal control requires negative feedback, i.e., reduced collective pitch, to counter an up-gust. On the other hand, if the gusts are very widely spread, the integrated absolute value of the perturbation from the desired flight path is minimized by positive feedback. Between these two cases a condition exists where the optimal policy is zero feedback. At this condition, there is nothing that the pilot (or S.A.S.) can do to improve the accuracy with which the helicopter is following the desired flight path. In such circumstances the pilot will regard the helicopter's handling qualities as unsatisfactory.

It can be shown (Reference 39) that with a single nonminimum phase zero located at s = n rad/sec, and standard gust power spectrum of the form  $\Phi_{WW} = K/(s^2 + \omega_b^2)$ , the above condition occurs when  $n = \omega_b$ , i.e., when the zero is of equal magnitude to the input break frequency. For hover and low-speed flight,  $\omega_b$  is normally assumed to be  $\doteq 0.3$  rad/sec (see Appendix VIII). Hence, the zero located at s = + 0.268, as predicted for the  $\gamma_0 = -\frac{141.8}{2}$ -degree case, will adversely affect handling qualities.

Strictly, the above discussion applies only to single-loop control. However, at low speeds, control of h is virtually limited to collective pitch, so this restriction is realistic. A zero cannot be moved provided only one control is used. Hence, no cure is possible through stability augmentation in the collective loop.

### Effect of Stability Augmentation

1

For simplicity, the foregoing analysis has considered only the unaugmented helicopter. The effect of stability augmentation on the nonminimum phase zero is not large, as explained above; however, <u>some</u> benefit is obtained, since there is a limited effect of cyclic pitch on h. This is illustrated by Table XXI, which shows the effect of a typical S.A.S. feedback on the poles and zeros. With a feedback gain just adequate to stabilize the phugoid, the  $h/\theta_0$  zero remains about the same magnitude as in the unaugmented case. The time histories (see Figure 44) show similar objectionable "wrong-way" characteristics to the unaugmented case (Figure 40); the stability augmentation merely damps the phugoid.

TABLE	CXI. EIGENV	ALUES AND TOTAL Mq	HEIGHT ERROR EQUAL TO FOU	NUMERATORS FOR THE R TIMES THAT OF THE	e s-58 Wi Unaucani	TH Q-+B	STABIL	ITY AUG	<b>JENTATION</b>	
Case	Rate of Descent	γ Deg.	Root Locus Gain	Dutch Roll	Roll S and Sh	ubsidenc lort-Peri	e, Spira. od Modes	í.	Phugoid	
20 KNO	IS. EIGENVA	LUES								
9	•	0		132 <u>+</u> .724j	-4.31	211	354	-3.57	0001 19	98j
8	-22.5	-41.8		193 ± .64 j	-4.77		.093j	-3.4	0026 ± .1	935
w/eo 1	UMERATORS									
9	0	0	-227-5	1207 <u>+</u> .702j	-4.08	•00 <sup>4</sup> 8		-3.6		435
8	-22.5	-41.8	-154.4	209 <u>+</u> .647j	£7.4-	.236		-3.36	14 + .1	38j
9,(s/p)	NUMERATORS									
9	0	0	1.06	16 ± 1.35j	-3.5	1721.	411		114 + -1	785
80	-22.5	-41 <b>.</b> 8	•742	155 <u>+</u> 1.14j	-3.96	SI71.	381		108	595
ћ/е <sub>о</sub> н	EIGHT ERROR	NUMERATORS								
9	0	0	227.5	<b>;</b> 755 <b>;</b> <u>+</u> 101	-4.25	<sup>†</sup> 60°	123	-3.58	069 ± .1	68j
20	-22-5	-41.8	154.5	-191 <u>+</u> .667j	-4.82	.225	0319	-3.42	-•137 <u>+</u> •1	jlj
TO KUOT	E, EIGENVAL	UES								
4	0	o		246 <u>+</u> 1-003j	†8•†−	141	508	-3.49	•0087 <u>+</u> •2	58J
-	-22-5	-19.4		314 <u>+</u> -962j	-5.49	- 106	582	-3.72	0088 ± .1	16J
W/00 M	MERATORS									
2	0	0	-250.	[thz6" + 902"-	<b>76°</b> 7-	-112		-2.65		543
1	-22.5	-19.4	-224.	336 <u>+</u> -935 <b>j</b>	-5.65	1005		-2.79	.10211	R
°⊖(s/Ъ)	NUMERATORS									
7	0	0	1.85	164 <u>+</u> 1.34 <b>j</b>	-5.16	.1266	£74		089 ±.1	333
-	C•22-	+•6	22.2	[on•1 + 077••	-0-0-	6610.	- •00 -		R. + 640	F
He HE	GHT ERROR N	UMERATORS								
~-	-22.5	-19_4 0	25 <b>0.</b> 224	196 <u>+</u> .984j	-4.88 -5.53	•0564 -0321	18 224	-3.22	053 <u>+</u> .2	515
							•			?





At higher speeds, e.g.,  ${}^{4}O$  knots, cyclic pitch has more effect on the flight path, so  $q \rightarrow B_{1s}$  feedback is effective in reducing the wrong-way characteristic.

### Summary

For single-rotor helicopters, as typified by the S-58, the effects of longitudinal-lateral cross-coupling on the eigenvalues are relatively small. However the cross-coupling is large, as shown by the eigenvectors and such transfer functions as  $p/B_{1s}$  and  $q/A_{1s}$ . Except at very low speeds, the variation of the eigenvalues with rate of descent is small. The cross-coupling also changes little between level flight and the upper boundary of the vortex-ring state.

The major reason why control is degraded in steep descents is shown by the transfer function relating collective pitch to the distance of the helicopter from the unperturbed flight path. This transfer function contains a right-half plane zero which cannot easily be removed by multiloop feedbacks. The effect of the zero is to cause the step response to collective pitch to be largely in the wrong direction when performing steep descents at low speeds.

Because of the large number of derivatives involved in the coupled longitudinal-plus-lateral equations of motion, it has not yet been possible to identify the significant derivatives causing the nonminimum phase zero. The question arises as to whether this is some special peculiarity of the S-58 or whether it is indeed representative of single-rotor helicopters in general. Conclusive proof will require a more general analysis; however, in the next chapter it is shown that the same nonminimum phase effect occurs on the AH-56A. It is therefore probable that the effect is typical of single-rotor helicopters.

### CHAPTER VIII. COMPOUND HELICOPTER DYNAMICS

### VIII.1 INTRODUCTION

This section discusses the open-loop and closed-loop dynamics of a typical compound helicopter. The principal features which differentiate such vehicles from "single-rotor" helicopters are the wing and the auxiliary thrusting device, which may be a jet engine or a propeller. Both these features are intended to unload the rotor at high speeds. One might expect, therefore, that at low speeds, there would be few significant differences between the dynamics of the "single-rotor" and "compound" configurations. This proves to be the case; the eigenvalues and eigenvectors display similar variations with forward speed and descent angle for both types of helicopters. For this reason frequent reference will be made to the preceding discussion of singlerotor helicopter dynamics, and Chapter VII should be read before this chapter.

The example vehicle chosen to represent compound helicopters is the Lockheed AH-56A. As originally flown, this helicopter incorporated an all-mechanical stability augmenter system (the "gyro"). Difficulties were experienced in flight as a result of coupling between the gyro and blade modes other than the first flapping mode. At the time of writing, alternative S.A.S. schemes are under consideration, and for our purposes, it appears logical to consider the basic AH-56A with gyro removed. The resulting configuration should be more representative of the dynamics of compound helicopters in general than the AH-56A with gyro, and the data presented here are thus suitable for preliminary design of S.A.S. systems and for prediction of handling qualities.

The detailed AH-56A data presented in Volume IV is similar to that previously discussed for the S-58. That is, it includes derivatives and transfer functions relating u, v, w, p, q, r to  $A_{1s}$ ,  $B_{1s}$ ,  $\theta_0$ ,  $\theta_{oTR}$ ,  $\theta_0$  (collective pitch of the pusher propeller). Residues and eigenvectors were also calculated and are quoted in this chapter where appropriate, but they are not listed in Appendix VII.

The above information is presented for the AH-56A at sea level, with true airspeeds of 0, 20, 40, 60, and 100 knots. For each speed, descent rates of 0, 9.6, 19.2, 28.8 fps are considered. At low speeds, the highest descent rate is almost at the boundary of the vortex-ring state. Two cases were re-run with the cyclically varying tip loss factor set to zero. This caused noticeable shifts in the eigenvalues but no radical change in the general nature of the vehicle response. That is, modes which were stable with tip losses included remained stable with B=1, and the residues were of the same order of magnitude with and without tip losses. For example, at 40 knots and 28.8 fps descent rate ( $\gamma = -25.1$  deg), the eigenvalues changed as indicated below.

AH-56A	40	Knots,	Steep	Descent,	7 = -	5.1	Deg

TIP LOSS		EIGEN	ALUES,	rad/sec	- 11		
INCLUDED	233 + .758j,	-9.9,	063,	526,	-1.89,	041 +	.26j,
OMITTED	234 + .76j,	-8.36,	064,	603,	-1.51,	036 +	.257

The above changes are rather less than might be expected by considering the effect of tip losses on the derivatives. The explanation is that the magnitudes of some derivatives (e.g.,  $Z_W$ ) are decreased by the tip loss, whereas others (e.g.,  $M_q$ ,  $L_p$ ) are increased in magnitude because tip loss gives increased flapping. In all the cases discussed below, tip losses were included.

## VIII.2 EIGENVALUES

1

Table XXII summarizes the AH-56A eigenvalues. In level flight, the eigenvalues are generally similar to those calculated for the S-58, at the corresponding speeds. The major differences are

- (1) The AH-56A roll subsidence root is about twice as large as that of the S-58, due to the increase in "effective hinge offset" of the hingeless rotor.
- (2) The AH-56A develops longitudinal static stability at lower speeds than the S-58. This is due to the negative M<sub>w</sub> contributions of the tail and the pusher propeller. The result is that the phugoid is stable at speeds above 50 knots, approximately. In addition, the shortperiod degenerate modes combine to form an oscillatory mode at 100 knots.

In descent, the eigenvalues generally do not change significantly from their values in level flight at the same airspeed. The exceptions to this statement are noted below.

At the higher speeds, descent increases the phugoid damping and causes some reduction in frequency. This would be expected from the increase in  $|X_u|$ . At 100 knots and the most rapid descent rate (which corresponds to  $\gamma = -9.8$  deg) this trend progresses so far that the phugoid degenerates into a pair of aperiodic roots. One

	Remarks	Level Flight	9.6 f.p.s. Mate of Descent	19.2 f.p.s. Rate of Descent	28.8 f.p.s. No Tip Loss Rate of Descent Io Tip Loss
	Phugoid	.035 <u>-</u> .151 .009 <u>-</u> .362 .032 <u>-</u> .36 .056 <u>-</u> .258 041 <u>-</u> .188	016 <u>-</u> .424, 024 <u>-</u> .526, .265, <u>-</u> .265, .265, <u>-</u> .265, .265, <u>-</u> .265, .265, <u>-</u> .265, .265, <u>-</u> .265, .141,	69:2 00 69:2 100 69: - 200 69: - 200 69: - 200 69: - 20	059 <u>-</u>
		-2.01 -2.02 -2.07 -1.88 -1.88	-1.98j -1.95 -1.902 -1.82 -1.82	-1.94 -1.92 -1.76 -1.76	-1.91 -1.45 -1.9 -1.51 -1.51 -2.16
WALUES .	-Speed-Pitch	255 40 954 (-1-58	± .0621) 28 70 948 (-1.55	± .082J) 275 38 962 (-1.52	
+56A EIG	l-spiral	205 072 052 052	(.206 105 064 05 052	() 61 70 140 20.0	(- 181 (- 20 (- 17 (- 17 - 065 - 065 - 057 - 057
COLUMN A	Rol	-10. -9.94 -9.82 -10.51 -10.6	-9.94 -9.84 -10.25 -10.25 -10.25	-9.88 -9.78 -10.06 -9.98 -9.78	-9.82 -7.75 -9.78 -9.9 -8.36 -9.7
TABLE XOLL . IL	Dutch Roll Node	018 <u>-</u> -3945 115 <u>-</u> -5845 2 <sup>61</sup> <u>-</u> -8165 281 <u>-</u> -1.065	057 <u>-</u> -581, 154 <u>-</u> -567, 222 <u>-</u> -796, 292 <u>-</u> 1-06, -414 <u>-</u> 1-51,	059 <u>-</u> -572) 149 <u>-</u> -536) 266 <u>-</u> -782) 305 <u>-</u> 1-051 426 <u>-</u> 1-50	08 ± -362 -09 ± -366 -155 ± 478 -155 ± 758 -254 ± 758 -254 ± 1.027 -507 ± 1.027 -491
	y Deg.		-90.0 -16.5 -8.05 -5.41	-90.0 -33.5 -16.5 -10.9 -6.52	-90.0 -90.0 -5.8 -2 -2 -1.6 - -3.81 -9.81
	V <sub>DNS</sub> ft/sec	0 53.8 67.8 101.5 169.0	9.6 33.8 67.8 101.5 1 <b>69.0</b>	19.2 33.8 67.8 101.5 169.	28.8 28.8 33.8 57.8 67.8 67.8 101.5 169.
	Case	2 V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	0 1 2 2 4	15 16 18 19	8-5-58

of these roots is slightly unstable at s = 0.073. This "tuck" mode instability is caused by the change in M<sub>u</sub> that occurs between 60 and 100 knots at 28.8 fps descent rate. (At 60 knots, M<sub>u</sub>=+0.336 x 10<sup>-4</sup> rad/sec<sup>2</sup>; at 100 knots, M<sub>u</sub>=-17.6 x 10<sup>-4</sup> rad/sec<sup>2</sup>.)

Apart from this phugoid change, the only other significant effect of descent on the eigenvalues occurs at vertical and nearvertical descents. For such conditions, two modes, which at hover are aperiodic, coalesce to form a vell-damped low-frequency oscillation. The eigenvectors (discussed later) indicate that this behavior is due to  $N_{\rm w}$ . This derivative, referred to body axes, increases by a factor of approximately 30 going from hover to the maximum vertical descent rate at the boundary of the vortex-ring state. This marked change occurs because the tail rotor thrust becomes more sensitive to perturbations in vertical velocity as the rate of descent is increased. A similar effect was noted on the S-58.

### VIII.3 CROSS-COUPLING EFFECTS

As with the single-rotor helicopter, lateral-longitudinal cross-coupling is severe. This is illustrated by Table XXIII which presents AH-56A eigenvectors at hover. Note that u, v, w, p, q, r, are referred to stability axes which, in hover, are arbitrarily defined such that the x-axis is horizontal and the y-axis is normal to the plane of the symmetry of the fuselage, which is almost but not exactly vertical. (The print-out gives the stability axis Euler angles in radians for each flight condition.) In Table XXIII the choice of the unit eigenvector varies arbitrarily from mode to mode. As in Table XVII, only the upper-half plane root of each complex pair is shown.

Examination of Table XXIII reveals the dominant degrees of freedom of each mode, and the names of each mode are chosen accordingly. However, with the exception of the roll subsidence, each mode displays strong lateral-longitudinal coupling, so the names should not be taken too literally. The resemblance of each mode to the corresponding uncoupled mode is not necessarily close.

	TABLE XXIII. AH-56A EIGENVECTORS AT HOVER.									
(u, v, w, p, q, r, in stability axes)										
S	u	v	v	100p	10 <b>0</b> q	100r	Mode Name			
235	•39	.014	1.0	.00067	039	.569	" Plunge"			
205	.107	.829	1.0	.0058	102	1.85	" Yaw "			
.035 +.415j	1.0	106 +.322j	00001 +.024j	.015 175j	.518 117j	.231 +.417j	"Phugoid"			
018 +.394 j	713 0775	1.0	.0135 +.043j	48 +.009j	394 0967j	.681 -1.27j	"Dutch Roll"			
-10.0	.022	.63 <b>27</b>	0185	100.0	6.3	-1.93	"Roll Subsi			
-2.01	1.0	245	.053	-2.02	-10.56	-24.2	"Speed -Pitch"			

TABLE XXIV. AH-56A EIGENVECTORS IN 28.8 fps VERTICAL DESCENT.									
Body Axis 5 Bate	su	v	¥	100p	100q	100r	Mode Name		
181 +.091j 039 +.439j	. 391 348j -1.0	099 +.147j .057 187j	1.0 0225 0248j	.0213 +.0472j 0081 +.107j	.00135 +.0076j 57 119j	1.32 -4.38j .237 +.166j	"Coupled Plunge- -Yaw" "Phugoid"		
08 +.362j -9.8	449 .229j 079	1.0 1.0	06 092j .012	446 +.0197j -4.4	204 089j -2.85	717 +1.48j 824	"Dutch Roll" "Roll		
-1.91	-1.0	.171	•0045	4.5	-21.8	+.77	dence" "Speed- Pitch"		
Stability Axis Rates	-¥	v	u	100r	100q	-100p			

1.5

The cross-coupling hardly changes with descent rate, provided that u, v, w, p, q, r are referred to body axes rather than stability axes. This point is important for very steep descents. For example, in vertical descent the body x-axis and the stability x-axis differ by 90 degrees. This must be considered when comparing Table XXIII with Table XXIV, its counterpart for 28.8 fps vertical descent.

At the foot of Table XXIV are listed the stability axis quantities corresponding to the body axis quantities at the head of the table. Thus, for example, to trace the effect of vertical descent on the "dutch roll" mode, note that, at hover, the ratio of |u|: |v|: |w| is approximately 0.72: 1.0:0.045. For vertical descent the corresponding ratio in body axes is 0.5: 1.0: 0.10. By comparing the eigenvectors in this fashion, it is seen that there is not much difference between the hover and descent modes with the exception of the plunge and yaw modes which couple together in vertical descent. This is caused by the increased sensitivity of the tail rotor to perturbations in vertical descent velocity. The tail rotor is not immersed in the main rotor wash at hover and in vertical descent. At hover, by symmetry, the tail rotor thrust is equally sensitive to "up" and "down" w perturbations; hence, its contribution to the cross-coupling derivative N, is negligible. However, as the descent rate increases, the unperturbed flow conditions at the tail rotor become asymmetric, and the derivative N, increases markedly, causing the "yaw" and the

"plunge" modes to couple.

۰.

Cross-coupling is pronounced at forward speed. For example, the short-period oscillatory mode,  $s = -1.58 \pm 0.556j$ , which emerges at 100 knots involves about one-third as much roll as pitch. This is illustrated by Table XXV, which presents some typical residues for pitch and roll response to  $B_{1S}$ . Table XXV shows that the cross-coupling does not change much with shallow angles of descent.

The pitch rate/B<sub>1</sub> transfer function also changes rather little from level flight to steep descent, as shown by Figure 45. Numerous near-cancellations occur, leaving essentially a second-order numerator and a third-order denominator.
TABLE X	XV. EFFECT O AT 100 K	F DESCENT ON NOTS, SEA LE	CROSS-COUPLI	ING; LOCKHEED	) AH-56A
Ro	ots	-q Residue:	s to B <sub>1s</sub>	-p Residues	to Dls
<b>y</b> = 0	γ = -9.8 <sup>°</sup>	γ = 0	γ = -9.8°	γ = 0	γ = -9.8°
401 +1.51j	431 +1.49j	.035 < -152.8	.034 <-128.9	.429 <-137.5	.36 < -173.0
-10.6	-9.56	1.90	1.526	<b>36.4</b>	32.95
037	025	. 104	0079	.0777	.00317
-1.58 -1.50 +.556j +.58j		13.7 < -130.6	11.7 < -135.8	5.52 < -105.0	3.61. < -110.8
041 +.188j	129	.56 < -89.6	517	.537 < +98.6	.265
	.0733	$\geq$	287	$\sum$	322

As noted previously, the AH-56A has a large roll subsidence root, (typically about 10 rad/sec), due to the hingeless rotor. This is well separated from the other roots, which should lead to little coupling with other modes in the  $p/A_{12}$  transfer function. This is confirmed by Figure 46, which shows the transfer functions for  $p/A_{13}$ at 100 knots in level flight and 22.8 fps descent. Note that only the roll subsidence pole is not cancelled by a nearby zero.

The above trends are typical. For ease of reference, Table XXVI has been extracted from the data of Appendix VII to show the effect of descent angle on the  $\theta/A_{1g}$  and  $\theta/B_{1g}$  numerators at various forward speeds. From this table and Table XXV, it is evident that the effect of descent angle on pitch and roll control is small. Similar comments apply to yaw control by tail rotor collective (see Table XXVII). Table XXVII shows that the yaw/ $\theta_{OTR}$ numerators change little with descent angle, provided that the yaw is referred to body axes (i.e., overall vehicle axes) rather than stability axes.



Figure 45. Compound Helicopter Pitch Rate/Longidutinal Cyclic Transfer Function for Level Flight and for a 9.8-Degree Descent Angle at Sea Level.



Figure 46. Compound Helicopter Roll Rate/Lateral Cyclic Transfer Functions for Level Flight and 9.8-Degree Descent at Sea Level. 160

	TAB	LE XXVI.	LOCKHEED	AH-56A, No COEFFICIEN	S.A.S. TS FOR 4	TRANS FE	R FUNCTIO	И			
Case	V TAS Ft/Sec	$\mathbf{Y}_{Deg}$	Root Locus Gain			Numerat	or Root L	ocations			
<sup>т</sup> v/ф	s Numerato	rs,		Rate	of Desc	ent = 0	0.				
N0100	0 33.8 67.8 101.5 169.	00000	-79.76 -79.61 -79.46 -79.46 -79.26	231 + 208 + 334 + 454 +	.0071 .451. .727. 1.001 1.48j			032 397 58 845 (-1.603 ±	-2.07 -2.09 -2.14 -2.01 .3631)	.038 ± .043 ± .043 ± .038 ± .038 ±	.4093 .3673 .3983 .283 .2073
				Rate	of Desc	ent = 2	8.8 Ft/Sei				
25 T T 8 8	28.8 33.8 67.8 101.5 169.	-90. -58.3 -25.1 -16.6 - 9.81	1.854 -38.78 -69.82 -73.27 -75.01	2.43 .165 ± . .111 ± . .262 ± 1	.916 .7565 .7285 1.005		141 191 212 (258	(-2.64 ± 584 542 542 3033	.336j) -1.99 -1.94 -2.21 .473j)	038 + 037 + 046 + 245 -	.4351 .3761 .2765 .092
0/B <sub>12</sub>	Numerato	rs ,		Rate	of Desc	ent = 0	0.				
60760	0 33.8 67.8 101.5 169.	00000	13.68 13.68 13.7 14.4 16.0	034 <u>+</u> 115 <u>+</u> 206 <u>+</u> 283 <u>+</u> 1	.408, .58, .608, .808, 1.06, 1.51,	-11.4 -11.3 -11.8 -11.8 -11.6	(237 .048 .012 .012	91 91		.03 ± 119 ± 052 ± 064 ±	.0951 .0821 .0091 .0261 .0261
				Rate	of Desc	ent = 2	8.8 Ft/Se	0			
%77%	28.8 33.8 67.8 101.5 169.	-90. -58.3 -25.1 -16.6 - 9.81	13.27 13.29 13.4 13.69 15.31		.3585 .4755 .755 .755 .755 .755 .755 .755	-11.3 -11.2 -11.2 -10.8 -10.3	(169 (208 013 .002	- 536 - 93		013 + 038 + 036 - 031 - 036 -	01 077 077 050 050

VIAGe         VIAGe         VIAGe         Root         Root <throot< th="">         Root         Root</throot<>		đ	BLE XXVI	I. LOCK	cheed ah-56a Yaw/	TAIL ROTO	R COLLEC.	LIVE NUM	ERATORS
$\mathbf{r}/e_{OTR}$ NUMERRATIONS, RATE OF DESCRANT = 0.0           5         0         0 $-5 \cdot 12$ $-049 \pm .41$ $-9.97$ $246$ $-2.01$ $002$ 6 $33.6$ 0 $-4.55$ $.025 \pm .384$ $-9.91$ $413$ $-2.02$ $011$ 7 $67.6$ 0 $-4.55$ $.026 \pm .3883$ $-9.91$ $413$ $-2.02$ $011$ 8         101.5         0 $-4.55$ $.026 \pm .3883$ $-9.791$ $413$ $-2.02$ $017$ 9         106.5         0 $-425$ $.026 \pm .3883$ $-9.791$ $017$ $007$ 9         106.5         0 $-425$ $038 \pm .3263$ $-10.51$ $-1.677$ $057$ 2         28.6 $FT/SEC$ $EOTSMT = ZB.6$ $FT/SEC$ $EOTSMT = A.607$ $057$ $057$ $057$ 2         28.6 $FT/SEC$ $EOTSMT = ZB.6$ $056$ $057$ $057$ $057$ $057$ $057$ $057$ <t< td=""><td>Case</td><td>V<sub>TAS</sub> Pos</td><td>۲ Deg.</td><td>Root Locus Gain</td><td></td><td>Numerator</td><td>r Zeros</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Case	V <sub>TAS</sub> Pos	۲ Deg.	Root Locus Gain		Numerator	r Zeros		
$5$ $0$ $-5.12$ $.049 \pm .41$ $1$ $-9.97$ $248$ $-2.01$ $001$ $7$ $67.8$ $0$ $-4.55$ $.02 \pm .3844$ $-9.91$ $413$ $-2.02$ $011$ $7$ $67.8$ $0$ $-4.55$ $.02 \pm .3844$ $-9.91$ $413$ $-2.02$ $011$ $8$ $101.5$ $0$ $-4.25$ $.036 \pm .3894$ $-9.79$ $636$ $-2.02$ $011$ $8$ $101.5$ $0$ $-4.25$ $-0374$ $-10.534$ $-10.56$ $-1.057$ $-0.07$ $8$ $101.5$ $0$ $-6.95$ $038 \pm .3264$ $-10.68$ $-1.677$ $-0.677$ $-0.058$ $2$ $28.08$ $FT/SEC$ $BOT$ $ATT$ $AT$ $A = 0$ $DEGREE$ $2$ $28.08$ $FT/SEC$ $BOT$ $ATT$ $A = 0$ $A = 0.75$ $-10.90$ $-0.05$ $2$ $28.08$ $-9.05$ $-10.58$ $-10.59$ <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>r/eorr</td><td>TUMERATO</td><td>RS, RATE OF DESCE</td><td>0.0 = TW</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>			r/eorr	TUMERATO	RS, RATE OF DESCE	0.0 = TW			
6 $33.8$ 0 $-455$ $.02$ $\pm .384.3$ $-9.91$ $413$ $-2.02$ $-001$ 7 $67.8$ 0 $-425$ $.036 \pm .388.3$ $-9.79$ $626$ $-2.06$ $-001$ 8 $101.5$ 0 $-5.14$ $009 \pm .339.3$ $-10.51$ $955$ $-1.87$ $037$ 9 $169.0$ 0 $-5.14$ $009 \pm .339.3$ $-10.51$ $975$ $-1.87$ $037$ 9 $169.0$ 0 $-5.14$ $009 \pm .338.3$ $-10.51$ $057$ $-1.87$ $037$ 2 $28.08$ $-900.$ $-443$ $058$ $-3.068$ $-10.59$ $-10.97$ $-0.41$ 2 $28.08$ $-900.$ $-443$ $-0.057 \pm .364.3$ $-9.77$ $-10.90$ $-0.65$ 2 $28.08$ $-900.$ $-443$ $-0.057 \pm .364.3$ $-0.158$ $-1.903$ $-0.05$ 2 $28.08$ $-590.3$ $-9.78$ $-1.99$	ŝ	0	0	-5.12	£ 14. ± 640.	76.6-	248	-2.01	002 + .4055
7 $67.8$ 0 $-423$ $.036 \pm .3893$ $-9.79$ $626$ $-2.06$ $015$ 8 $101.5$ 0 $-5.14$ $019 \pm .3393$ $-10.51$ $955$ $-1.87$ $037$ 9 $169$ 0 $-5.14$ $019 \pm .3393$ $-10.51$ $955$ $-1.87$ $037$ 9 $169$ 0 $-6.95$ $038 \pm .3263$ $-10.66$ $-1.671$ $037$ 2 $28.8$ $-90$ $-4.43$ $057 \pm .32643$ $-9.78$ $-3.773$ $-0.041$ 2 $28.8$ $-90$ $-4.4364$ $-90.68$ $-1.903$ $-0.057$ 2 $28.8$ $-90$ $-4.4364$ $-9.778$ $-1.903$ $-1.903$ $-0.053$ 2 $28.8$ $-4.974$ $-0.574 \pm .36443$ $-9.778$ $-1.903$ $-1.903$ $-0.053$ 2 $28.8$ $-4.071$ $-2.544$ $-1.903$ $-0.053$ $-0.053$ $-0.053$ $-0.053$ <th< td=""><td>9</td><td>33.8</td><td>0</td><td>-4.55</td><td>·02 <u>+</u> ·3843</td><td>16.6-</td><td>413</td><td>-2.02</td><td>011 ± -38 J</td></th<>	9	33.8	0	-4.55	·02 <u>+</u> ·3843	16.6-	413	-2.02	011 ± -38 J
$8$ $101.5$ $0$ $-5.14$ $019 \pm .3391$ $-10.51$ $955$ $-1.67$ $057$ $9$ $169.$ $0$ $-6.95$ $038 \pm .3261$ $-10.68$ $(-1.59 \pm .5771)$ $041$ $2$ $169.$ $0$ $-6.95$ $038 \pm .3261$ $-10.68$ $(-1.59 \pm .5771)$ $041$ $2$ $28.8$ $777$ $28.8$ $7775$ $200Y$ $2.5771$ $041$ $2$ $28.8$ $-90.5$ $057 \pm .364J$ $-90.78$ $-1.900$ $065$ $2$ $28.8$ $-90.7$ $057 \pm .364J$ $-9.78$ $-1.900$ $-1.900$ $-0.057$ $2$ $28.8$ $-25.1$ $-3.78$ $-0.72$ $-1.900$ $-0.053$ $201$ $67.8$ $-25.1$ $-3.78$ $-0.594$ $-1.900$ $-0.053$ $21$ $101.5$ $-16.6$ $-1.505 \pm .251J$ $-9.92$ $-1.900$ $-0.053$ $2010$ $-50.8$ $-25.4J$ $-22.8J$ <	2	67.8	0	-4.23	•036 ± •3883	62.6-	626	-2.06	015 ± -3653
9169.0-6.95 $038 \pm .326$ $-10.68$ $(-1.59 \pm .5773)$ $041$ 228.890. $-4.43$ $03 \pm .4363$ $-9.78$ $-1.592$ $-1.903$ $065$ 2033.8 $-90.$ $-4.43$ $03 \pm .4364$ $-9.78$ $1518$ $-1.903$ $065$ 2033.8 $-58.3$ $-4.3$ $057 \pm .3644$ $-9.78$ $1518$ $-1.903$ $065$ 2033.8 $-58.3$ $-4.3$ $057 \pm .3644$ $-9.78$ $1518$ $-1.903$ $065$ 2033.8 $-58.3$ $-4.3$ $057 \pm .3644$ $-9.78$ $-1.903$ $065$ 20101.5 $-16.6$ $-4.43$ $057 \pm .3644$ $-9.72$ $-1.29$ $-1.905$ $043$ 21101.5 $-16.6$ $-4.43$ $049 \pm .2954$ $-9.92$ $-1.89$ $043$ 22169. $-9.81$ $-6.85$ $-1.505 \pm .604$ $-9.73$ $+.071$ $15$ $053$	ω	101-5	0	-5.14	<b>1</b> 019 <u>+</u> 5393	-10.51	955	-1.87	••037 <u>+</u> •2633
RATE OF DESCENT = 28.6 FT/SEC. BODY AXIS AT $\theta$ = 0 DEGREE         2       28.8       -90.       -4.45      05 $\pm$ .436j       -9.78      1518       -1.903      065         20       33.8       -58.3       -4.3      057 $\pm$ .364j       -9.78      1518       -1.903      065         20       33.8       -58.3       -4.3      057 $\pm$ .364j       -9.7      223       -1.903      065         20       33.6       -58.3       -4.3      057 $\pm$ .364j       -9.7      223       -1.903      065         21       67.8       -25.1       -3.78      049 $\pm$ .295j       -9.92      5444       -1.89      043         21       101.5       -16.66       -4.96      2744 $\pm$ .197j       -9.76 $\pm$ .25.15      055         22       169.       -9.81       -6.85       -1.505 $\pm$ .60 j       -9.75       +.071      15      055	6	169.	0	-6.95	038 <u>-</u> .326j	-10.68	(-1.59	± •5773)	f 61. ± 140
2       28.8       -90.       -4.45      05       ±.456J       -9.78      1518       -1.903      065         20       33.8       -58.3       -4.3      057       ±.364J       -9.7      223       -1.9       0         20       33.8       -58.3       -4.3      057       ±.364J       -9.7      223       -1.9       0         20       1       67.8       -25.1       -3.78      049       ±.295J       -9.92      544       -1.89      045         21       101.5       -16.6       -4.96      274       ±.197J       -9.76       +.25       -2.15      055         22       169.       -9.81       -6.85       -1.505 ± .60 J       -9.73       +.071      15      055			RATE OF	DESCENT	= 28.8 FT/SEC.	BODY AXIS	<b>AT 0 =</b>	O DEGREE	
20       33.6       -58.3       -4.3      057 ± .364J       -9.7      223       -1.9       0         1       67.8       -25.1       -3.78      049 ± .295J       -9.92      544       -1.89      045         21       101.5       -16.6       -4.96      274 ± .197J       -9.76       +.25       -2.15      055         22       169.       -9.81       -6.85       -1.505 ± .60 J       -9.73       +.071      13      063	ŝ	28.8	-90.	-4.43	03 <u>+</u> -436j	-9.78	1518	-1.903	065 ± .381,
1 $67.8$ $-25.1$ $-3.78$ $049 \pm .2951$ $-9.92$ $544$ $-1.89$ $043$ 21 $101.5$ $-16.6$ $-4.96$ $2744 \pm .1971$ $-9.76$ $+.25$ $-2.15$ $053$ 22 $169.$ $-9.81$ $-6.85$ $-1.505 \pm .60$ $-9.73$ $+.071$ $13$ $063$	8	33.8	-58-3	-4-3	057 <u>+</u> .3643	7.6-	223	-1-9	5 0 <del>1</del> . ± 0
21       101.5       -16.6       -4.96      274       -1973       -9.76       +.25       -2.15      053         22       169.       -9.81       -6.85       -1.505 ± .60 J       -9.73       +.071      13      063	-	67.8	-25.1	-3.78	t262. + 640	-9.92	544	-1.89	0432673
22 1699.81 -6.85 -1.505 <u>+</u> .60 J -9.73 +.07113063	5	101.5	-16.6	-4.96	f261. ± 472	-9.76	+.25	-2.15	053 ± .2573
	22	169.	-9.81	-6.85	-1.505 <u>+</u> .60 j	£7.6-	+-071	13	063 <u>-</u> .222

#### VIII.4 HEIGHT CONTROL

As with the S-58 (discussed in the previous chapter), it is anticipated that the AH-56A will experience difficulty in flight path control in slow, steep descents. This can be inferred from Table XXVIII, which presents numerators for the transfer function relating height error to collective pitch. (See Figure 39 for the definition of "height error", h.) Table XXVIII shows that, at the lower speeds and steeper descent angles a nonminimum phase zero appears at 0.1 < s < 0.6rad/sec. As shown in Chapter VII, such a zero degrades the handling qualities. Typical effects of this zero are shown in the step responses of Figure 47, which display awkward "wrong-way" characteristics for the descending flight conditions.

The difficulties of removing this right-half plane zero by feedbacks to cyclic pitch, explained in Chapter VII for the S-58, apply equally to the AH-56A. However, the AH-56A does have the extra possibility of flight path control through the pusher propeller, as described below.

### Control Effectiveness of the Pusher Propeller

Assuming that the aircraft is trimmed so that the pusher propeller is not operating in the vortex-ring state (a condition which is satisfied for the flight conditions presented in this report), the principal effects of  $\theta_{op}$  relate to control of u and h. The appropriate numerators for level flight and steep descent are summarized in Table XXIX. Completing the transfer functions with the denominators given in Table XXII permits some preliminary assessment of the effectiveness of the pusher propeller as a control device.

At 100 knots in level flight, many approximate cancellations occur between numerator and denominator, leaving the following approximate transfer function for speed control:

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}}{\mathbf{\theta}_{op}} \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \frac{-34.0}{(\mathbf{s} - 0.073)}$$

This indicates that the pusher propeller controls speed by exciting the unstable "tuck" mode of the degenerate phugoid pair. This would be unsatisfactory for x(=) udt) control (e.g., stationkeeping) since the  $x \rightarrow \theta$  locus lies entirely in the right half-plane. The situation would be improved by stability augmentation involving feedbacks of  $\theta$  to B<sub>1</sub>, which would stabilize both phugoid roots. Descent improves the  $u/\theta_{op}$  transfer function: at 100 knots and  $\gamma = -9.8$  degrees, it becomes approximately

		VCC TIBLE	/III. HEIGH	IT ERROR/	N HALLOHTINE N	IUMERATORS FU	DR THE AH	H-56A			
CASE	<sup>V</sup> TAS FT/SEC	) DBC	ROOT LOCUS GALN			NUMERATOR ZE	ROS				
5	0	0	229.9	0197	± •393 <b>3</b>	-10.0		134	-2.01	. o33	<u>+</u> 4161
9	33 <b>.</b> 8	0	218.4	122	fč09• <del>+</del>	- 9.93	5460.	104	-1-96	8 <b></b> €0	± •343
2	57.8	0	238.	- 203	<u>+</u> -8323	- 9.8	.0684	142	-1.89	- 226	<u>+</u> •238
ω	101.5	0	283.	- 206	± 1.058j	-10.41	<b>.</b> 0514	878	-2,88	9 <b>ć0 -</b>	1840. +
6	169.	0	336.	424	± 1.52 J	-10.6	-0215	(-1.11	<u>+</u> 2.25J)	-•074	± •033J
10	9•6	06-	230	04	± -382 ±	+6•6 -	0	148	-1.98	.017	+ . <sup>4</sup> 25J
11	33.8	-16.5	202.4	147	± .571 J	-9.83	.132	<b>0</b> 58	-1.93	170	± •2725
12	67.8	-8.05	243.6	219	+ • <sup>81</sup> J	-10.2	.057	561	-1.49	- 107	+ •048J
5	101.5	-5.41	284.6	297	t 1.07 j	-10-5	.027	(-1.09	(fi26. <del>+</del>	072	t9:00 +
14	169.	-3.25	340.2	42	<u>+</u> 1.55	-10.18	· 045	(-1.28	± 2.1 J)	0.0	015
-15	19.2	-90	231	062	± •3735	-9.88	0	η⊆ι	-1-94	600	± •4335
16	33.8	-33.5	170.	171	± .5393	17.6-	.182	064	-1-96	160*-	± •259j
17	67.8	-16.45	237.	221	± .7891	-10.	.126	016	-1.68	091	342
18	101-5	-10.9	282.	309	f 1.05j	-9-96	• 031	(-1-05	(6406. +	034	<u>+</u> .016j
19	169.	- 6.52	344.	438	± 1.485	-9.83	•023	(.276	+ 1.753)	024	± .021j
2	28 <b>.</b> 8	<b>06-</b>	233	084	+ .362j	-9.82	0	-,166	-1-91	1.50	± .44 5
କ୍ଷ	<b>3</b> 3 <b>.</b> 8	-58.3	112.	- 195	<u>+</u> • <sup>4</sup> 665	-9.78	.248	08	-1-97	- 105	± •2753
-	67.8	-25.1	222.	231	± .7625	-9 <b>-</b> 88	.106	011	-1.71	082	36
21	101.5	-16.55	273.	305	+ 1.04J	-9.68	.189	851	-1.12	0.0	037
22	169.	-9.81	345.5	436	± 1.49j	-9.52	.0125	(-1.07	<u>+</u> 2.17J)	027	tero. ±



Figure 47. Lockheed AH-56, 40 Knots Airspeed, S. L. Height Error Response to 0.1 Radian Step Increase in Collective Pitch.

**1**65

١.

$$\frac{u}{\theta_{op}} = \frac{-54.1 (s + 0.095)}{(s + 0.04 \pm 0.188j)}$$

This provides stable  $x \rightarrow \theta_{op}$  closures provided that excessive lags are avoided.

At lower speeds, fewer approximate cancellations occur. For example, at 40 knots in level flight,

$$\frac{u}{\theta_{00}} \stackrel{!}{=} \frac{-18.2 (s + 0.162 \pm 0.062j)}{(s - 0.072) (s + 2.07) (s + 0.032 \pm 0.38j)}$$

whereas at 40 knots in descent at  $\gamma = -25.1$  degrees,

$$\frac{u}{\theta_{op}} \doteq \frac{-18.14 (s + 0.174) (s - 0.057 \pm 0.312j)}{(s + 0.526) (s + 1.89) (s + 0.041 \pm 0.262j)}$$

The appearance of a nonminimum phase zero in descent is not important here because of the proximity of the phugoid mode, which will yield only a small residue and will largely cancel out the wrong-way characteristics of the step response.

Simultaneously with u-perturbations, 3 also induces h perturbations; hence it is necessary to consider these also in assessing the control effectiveness of the pusher propeller. The appropriate transfer functions are given in Table XXIX; some rather gross cancellations have been made in the approximate transfer functions presented below in order to simplify the discussion.

 $\gamma = 0$ :

1

$$\frac{h}{\theta_{00}} = \frac{1.62 (s + 0.475) (s - 0.349) (s - 43.52)}{s(s + 1.58 \pm 0.556j) (s + 0.041 \pm 0.188j)}$$

 $\gamma = -9.8$  degrees

$$\frac{\hat{h}}{\theta_{op}} \stackrel{\circ}{=} \frac{-3.15 (s + 5.97) (s - 2.12)}{s(s - 0.073) (s + 1.5 + 0.58j)}$$

		TABLE XX	IX. PUSHER P	NOPELLER COLLECTIV	LE TRANSITE NE LOCKIE	D AH-SAA.	HEIGHT E	RPR	
Case	<sup>V</sup> TAS Ft/Sec	y Deg.	Root Locus Gain	*	umerator 2	eroe			
h/9 <sub>op</sub>	HEIGHT ERRO	R NUMERATOR							
5	0	0	1807	f67. ± 540	-10.	185	-2.65	076	406j
9	33.8	0	2014	101 ± .5743	19.6-		-16.56	69	· · · · ·
7	67.8	0	3615	18 <u>+</u> -8073	-8.37	077	-13.3	190.	1.453
۵	101.5	0	.1066	261 ± 1.063	-12.34	051	- <b>10</b> 1	c010.	± .575
6	169.	0	1.62	408 ± 1.513	-13.42	527	45.52	052,	645.
N	26.8	-90.	-10.5	084 <u>+</u> .3663	-9.82	726	-1.32	-115	<b>b</b> 211. ±
8	33.8	-58.3	-11.25	145 <u>+</u> -474.	-9.78	60	-1.58	206	- •03
-	67.8	-3.1	-8.6	f192. + 62	-9.95	190	-2.51	245	± .453
۲	101.5	-16.6	-7.0	306 ± 1.021	<b>.</b>	.539	-5.21	- 166	045
22	169.	18.6-	-3.15	432 <u>+</u> 1.48 <u></u>	-11.12	-2.12	-5.97	-119	036
do <sub>θ</sub> /n	SPEED NUMER	ATOR							
5	0	0	-8.95	25 <u>+</u> . <sup>4</sup> 063	-10.	-,214	14.1-	1%	.245J
9	33.8	0	-13.66	L182. ± 201	46.6-	- 116	-1.72	17	103
2	67.6	0	-18.2	2005 ± .8113	-9.82	702	-1.72	- 162	0623
Ø	101.5	0	-25.7	261 ± 1.063	-10.52	-,124	OLJ	-1-35	± .2851
6	169.	0	-34.1	4005 ± 1.513	-10.65	095	026	-1-52	± .7323
ŝ	26.6	-90-	152.	-115 ± -3273	-9.76	-616	-1.92	-02Sh	1.92. 1
8	33 <b>.</b> 8	-58-3	-6.38	-141 ± .472	-9.78	18		60	594
- 1	67.8	-25.1	-16.14	· ++++ + + + +++++++++++++++++++++++++	-9.92	0%	174	-1.057	+ .3123
5	101.5	-16.6	<b>-</b> 24.45	- 306 - 1.031	-9.72	-1.78	515-	- 365	1.12. 1
22	169.	-9.61	-34.	-453 ± 1.54	-9.57	-018	- 138	-1-402	• • 836J

The change in the sign of the root-locus gain is not significant, because of the change in the number of right-half plane zeros. The zero at s = +0.549 is likely to induce a poor step response in level flight, but this should be less troublesome in descent. However, the presence of these zeros will cause difficulty in closing the  $h \rightarrow 0$ loop, so at 100 knots the pusher propeller is not a desirable alternative to the usual  $h \rightarrow B_{1s}$  and  $h \rightarrow 0$  loop closures.

At low speeds the pusher propeller shows better promise for control of height error. For example, at 40 knots and  $\gamma = -25.1$  degrees, the  $h/\theta_{op}$  transfer function is, approximately,

$$\frac{h}{\theta_{op}} = \frac{-8.6}{s(s+0.526)}$$

This avoids the awkward nonminimum phase characteristics of the h/collective transfer functions listed on Table XXVIII. Hence the pusher propeller may provide a useful method of flight path control at low speeds.

# Sumery

The control characteristics of compound helicopters have 'een studied by examining the AH-56A with the all-mechanical stability augmenter system (the "gyro") removed. From calculations of derivatives, transfer functions, and residues, the AH-56A open-loop behavior is seen to be generally that of a typical single-rotor helicopter. Strong coupling occurs between longitudinal and lateral motions, and there is not much effect of descent angle on the eigenvalues except at very low speed. In slow, steep descents, control of flight path with collective is difficult because of the appearance of nonminimum phase zeros in the appropriate transfer functions. This effect is similar to that described for the single-rotor helicopter. However the compound has a possible alternative method of flight path control, through variations of collective pitch of the pusher propeller. This circumvents the nonminimum phase effects and appears to provide a satisfactory method of controlling the flight path.

#### CHAPTER IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The principal results of this report are contained in the tables of derivatives and transfer functions given in the Appendixes. A large part of the value of the report lies in these detailed numerical results and in the presentation of the analytic and computational methods used to obtain them, e.g., the MOSTAB program. However, certain general conclusions have been reached, and these are presented below, together with recommendations for further work.

- 1. A new method for predicting the boundaries of the vortex-ring state is presented, using only simple concepts but giving good agreement with experiment.
- 2. The tip losses on a rotor in vertical descent can be predicted by momentum and blade-element theory, using a flow model which incorporates a sheath of vorticity surrounding the slipstream. The method gives good agreement with experiment in vertical descent; no suitable experimental data are available for inc inclined descent to check the theory for that condition, for which it predicts a cyclically varying tip loss factor.
- 5. In calculating helicopter derivatives, the perturbations in interference velocities induced by each element on each other element must be included. All lateral-longitudinal crosscoupling derivatives should be included on single-rotor and compound configurations.
- <sup>4</sup>. Derivatives calculated for steep descents are generally appreciably different from derivatives calculated for the same airspeed and level flight. The use of level-flight derivatives for simulations of moderate and steep descents can give seriously misleading results.
- 4. For tandem-rotor configurations, the principal effects of descent are to cause the dutch roll to degenerate into an aperiodic pair of roots and to worsen the nonminimum phase characteristics of the roll-to-lateral-cyclic numerator. The net effect is to worsen the open-loop dynamics, increasing the need for multiloop feedbacks. Longitudinally the effects of descent angle are generally minor, except for changes in the speed/longitudinal cyclic numerator referred to cockpit axes. This could be important for stability augmenter systems using air data sensors.

- 6. For single-rotor helicopters, lateral-longitudinal crosscoupling effects are important in the transfer function numerators but have little effect on the denominators. The most significant effect of descent angle occurs at low speeds, where control of the flight path by collective pitch becomes seriously degraded due to nonminimum phase effects, causing "wrong-way" responses. This is believed to be the principal cause of the difficulties encountered by helicopters attempting to follow steep approach paths at low speeds. Remedies involving multiloop feedback or elaborate compensation of single-loop feedbacks do not appear feasible.
- 7. The behavior of compound helicopters is similar to singlerotor helicopters at low speeds, where the wing has little influence. The propeller provides an alternative method of flight path control which shows promise of alleviating the above-mentioned difficulties.

# BECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK

Despite the widespread use of helicopters, and the vast production runs of certain types, research on helicopter dynamics consumes only a tiny percentage of the total aerospace budget. It is wise to recognize this situation in presenting a list of topics deserving further research. For example, from a purely technical viewpoint, a good case could be made for a method of calculating derivatives based on a "free-wake" analysis. making the minimum number of assumptions regarding slipstream geometry and interference effects. However, the computer time required to use such a program renders it less desirable than a simpler alternative using "assumed wake" representations. The technical areas listed below have been selected because of their practical importance, and the recommended approaches to solving the problems have been chosen with a realization of the probable financial constraints.

The scope of the items listed below is confined to the area of helicopter steep approaches, but some of the recommendations are sufficiently general to apply to other phases of helicopter operation or even other types of aircraft, such as tilt-rotor configurations.

### The Vortez-Ring State

The vortex-ring state is important as a limiting condition on low-speed descent/deceleration capabilities and as the possible cause of accidents. A better understanding of this state is required to define it more precisely and to indicate methods of alleviating the unsteady flow. In addition, some unsteadiness is known to occur even at shallow angles of descent, and a knowledge of this self-induced turbulence is required to fully define the helicopter turbulence environment.

Full-scale flight tests are recommended, plus more refined theoretical investigations using more sophisticated analytic techniques than those employed in Chapter II. The result would be a reliable data base (available data is very incomplete), plus a nonempirical explanation of the causes of unsteady flow in steep descents.

## Aerodynamics of Rotor in Steep Descents Outside the Vortez-Bing State

Virtually no published experimental data exist on the forces and moments experienced by helicopter rotors in vertical and inclined descent. Model-scale experiments are needed on isolated rotors, measuring steady and unsteady loads and the induced velocities at moderate rates of descent. The flow model presented in Chapter III contains empirical assumptions, but there seems little point in producing a more complicated theory without experimental data which are suitable for correlation. Such experiments should be instrumented to measure the tip losses, including possible cyclic variations. The number of independent variables and the desirability of minimizing interference effects virtually dictate that the tests be conducted at model scale in a large wind tunnel on an isolated rotor. Tests on a complete configuration would be disadvantageous because interference effects from other components would complicate the results.

## Stability Derivatives

As shown in this report, marked differences exist between stability derivatives in level flight and descent, causing important changes in the dynamics of the helicopter. It is therefore misleading to use stability derivatives calculated for level flight to analyze descent problems. Given adequate flow models for descending rotors, derivatives can be calculated with ease by MOSTAB or similar programs. The prime question is: how accurate are these calculations? Since derivatives describe only the low-frequency behavior of helicopters in small perturbations from a fixed trim condition, accuracy of  $\pm$  20% should suffice. However, it is not known whether even this accuracy is being obtained. Published flight test measurements are few, and systematic correlations of estimated and measured derivatives in descending flight are conspicuous by their absence.

To remedy this situation, a research program involving correlation of estimated derivatives with existing flight test data should be undertaken. The scope should be broad, including single-rotor, compound, and tandem configurations in level flight and descent. The results should be used to refine the derivative calculation process, particularly the estimation of interference velocities, which at present is more of an art than a science. Particular attention should be paid to low-speed descending flight because the requirements for flight path control on the approach are particularly stringent, requiring the most accurate derivatives for analysis.

### Transfer Punctions

Transfer functions provide an accurate description of helicopter dynamics over a limited frequency and amplitude range. The upper frequency limit is set by considerations of blade modes other than first flapping. Such modes are essentially "nuisance" modes, i.e., they have no value for flight control. Thus they can be ignored in flight control system preliminary design, but must be included in detail design of system hardware to avoid unwanted coupling effects. The lower frequency limit is set by time-variations of the nominal operating condition around which the perturbations are performed. This limit is less restrictive for descent than for level flight, since the available deceleration is less, because the helicopter is closer to  $(D/L)_{max}$ . Thus there is a broad range of frequencies for which transfer functions are useful. The following recommendations apply for this frequency range. Transfer functions <u>including lateral-longitudinal</u> <u>cross-coupling</u> should be used as the basis for future studies of manual and automatic control. Because of computational difficulties, cross-coupling has been ignored in many previous studies; however as shown here cross-coupling effects are quite large and significantly influence closed-loop behavior. Currently the effects of cross-coupling are countered on an <u>ad hoc</u> basis by offsetting the  $A_{1s}$ ,  $B_{1s}$  servos. The cross-coupling phenomenon must be more clearly defined to permit a systematic study of its importance to handling qualities and to determine the best method of counteracting it. The present report used manufacturer's derivatives for the tandem-rotor helicopter, which neglect cross-coupling. Although this appears to be more justifiable for the tandem configuration than for single-rotor helicopters, cross-coupling may still be significant. Flight test data should be examined to verify this.

The significant features of certain transfer functions (i.e., the height error to collective numerator discussed in Chapter VII) should be related to the helicopter geometry. The usual way of doing this is through the use of literal approximate transfer functions (e.g., approximating dutch roll natural frequency as  $\omega_d = \sqrt{N_B}$ ). Similar expressions should be developed

for the critical right-half plane zero of the height error to collective transfer function and other important parameters. The task is complicated because it is necessary to include laterallongitudinal cross-coupling; however, it is essential to be able to trace the cause of significant dynamic characteristics to design the helicopter and its stability augmenter together for good flying qualities.

#### Time-Varying Dynamics Representations

The need for a good method of representing the dynamic interaction of the control system with modes other than first flapping is generally recognized. No special emphasis on steep descents seems necessary here, since development of a method suitable for level flight should meet the requirements for descent. Of more special relevance to approach is the question of the validity of small-perturbation equations about a time-invariant trim condition.

For steep descents the deceleration capability is smaller than in level flight since the helicopter is operating closer to (D/L). Accordingly, the effect of time variations in the trim conditions should be less important. The net recommendation is that this area is less pressing for steep descents than for level flight.

# Flying Qualities

Most published research on helicopter flying qualities has concentrated either on hover or on level flight. Significant differences have been shown to exist between open-loop dynamics in level flight and descent, and correspondingly large differences will occur in flying qualities. This area requires investigation by simulation in conjunction with analytic studies of the man-in-theloop. For example, flight tests indicate that handling qualities are significantly degraded in slow, steep descents (see Chapter II); the cause has been identified in Chapters VII and VIII as the "wrong way" height control characteristics. More work involving detailed loop closures, backed up by simulation, is required to verify this hypothesis.

To obtain specific results, it was necessary to consider only three helicopters, in this report. These are believed to be representative to their general types, but no information has been generated on the effects of helicopter size <u>per se</u>. One would like to know how descent angle affects the flying qualities of the Heavy Lift Helicopter. It is possible that for very large helicopters, bodybending modes may be of sufficiently low frequency to interact with handling qualities. Derivatives should be calculated and assessments made of handling qualities problems in steep descents for such vehicles.

#### TATERRAFTURE GILLED

- Winick, A. B., <u>V/STOL All-Weather Guidance</u>, J. Aircraft, Vol. 5 No. 5, September-October 1968, pp. 510-511.
- Deckert, W. H., and D. H. Hickey, <u>Summary and Analysis of</u> <u>Feasibility-Study Designs of V/STOL Transport Aircraft</u>, J. Aircraft, Vol. 7, No. 1, January-February 1970, pp. 66-71.
- Seckel, E., J. J. Traybar, and G. E. Miller, <u>A Note on the</u> <u>Effect of Helicopter Dynamics on Steep Instrument Approaches</u>, Princeton University Aero. Eng. Rept. 600, 1962.
- Seckel, E., J. J. Traybar, and G. E. Miller, <u>An Exploratory</u> <u>Study of Instrument Approaches with Steep Gradient Aircraft</u>, Princeton University Aero. Eng. Rept. 630, 1962.
- 5. Heyson, Harry h., <u>Nomographic Solution of the Momentum Equation</u> for VTOL/STOL Aircraft, NASA TN D-814, April 1961.
- Mil, M. L., et al., <u>Helicopters; Calculation and Design, Vol. I</u>, Aerodynamics, NASA TTF-494, September 1967.
- 7. Washizu, Kyuichiro, Akira Azuma, Jiro Koo, and Toichi Oka, Experiments on a Model Helicopter Rotor Operating in the Vortex Ring State, Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 3, No. 3, May-June 1966, pp. 225-230.
- 8. Payne, P. R., <u>Helicopter Dynamics and Aerodynamics</u>, Sir Isacc Pitman & Sons, London, 1959.
- 9. Castles, Walter, and Robin B. Gray, Empirical Relation Between Induced Velocity, Thrust, and Rate of Descent of a Helicopter Rotor as Determined by Wind-Tunnel Tests on Four Model Rotors, NASA TN 2474, October 1951.
- 10. Shapiro, Jacob, <u>Principles of Helicopter Engineering</u>, McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- 11. Prees, J. Meijer, and W. P. Hendal, The Field of Flow Through <u>A Helicopter Rotor Obtained From Wind Tunnel Smoke Tests</u>, Report A.1205, Versl. Nat. Luchtvlab., Amsterdam, February 1950.
- 12. Drees, J. Meijer, <u>A Theory of Airflow Through Rotors and Its</u> <u>Application to Some Helicopter Problems</u>, Journal of the Helicopter Association of Great Britain, Vol. 3, No. 2, July-September 1949, pp. 79-104.

- 13. Drees, J. Meijer, and W. P. Hendal, <u>Airflow Patterns in the</u> <u>Neighborhood of Helicopter Rotors</u>, Aircraft Engineering, April 1951, pp. 107-111.
- 14. Drees, J. Meijer, L. R. Lucassen, and W. P. Hendal, <u>Airflow</u> <u>Through Helicopter Rotors in Vertical Flight</u>, N.L.L. Report V.1535/Amsterdam, December 1949.
- 15. Lock, C. N. H., H. Bateman, and H. C. H. Townsend, <u>An Extension of the Vortex Theory of Airscrews with Applications to Airscrews of Small Pitch</u>, Including Experimental Results, British A.R.C. R & M 1014, September 1925.
- 16. Azuma, Akira, and Akira Obata, <u>Induced Flow Variation of the</u> <u>Helicopter Rotor Operating in the Vortex Ring State</u>, Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 5, No. 4, July-August 1968, pp. 381-386.
- 17. Washizu, Kyuichiro, Akira Azuma, Jiro Koo, and Toichi Oka, Experimental Study of the Unsteady Aerodynamics of a Tandem Rotor Operating in the Vortex Ring State, Proc. 22nd Annual National Forum, American Helicopter Society, Washington, D.C., May 1966, pp. 215-220.
- 18. Yaggy, Paul F., and Kenneth W. Mort, <u>Wind-Tunnel Tests of Two</u> <u>VTOL</u> Propellers in Descent, NASA TN D-1766, March 1963.
- 19. Brotherhood, P., <u>Flight Measurements of the Stability and Control</u> of a Westland Whirlwind Helicopter in Vertical Descent, R.A.E. Technical Report 68021, January 1968.
- 20. Brotherhood, P., <u>Flow Through a Helicopter Rotor in Vertical</u> <u>Descent</u>, British A.R.C. R & M No. 2735, July 1949.
- 21. Stewart, W., Flight Testing of Helicopters, J.R.Ae.S., Vol. 52, May 1948, pp. 261-304.
- 22. Stewart, W., <u>Helicopter Behavior in the Vortex-Ring Conditions</u>, British A.R.C., C.P. No. 99, 1952.
- 23. Fanucci, J. B., et al., <u>Rotor Downwash in Ground Effect in the</u> <u>Presence of a Step</u>, AIAA Paper 69-225, February 1969.
- 24. Seckel, Edward, <u>Stability and Control of Airplanes and Helicopters</u>, Academic Press, 1964.
- 25. Seckel, Edward, and Curtiss, H. C., <u>Aerodynamic Characteristics</u> of <u>Helicopter Rotors</u>, Princeton University, Department of Aerospace and Hechanical Sciences Report No. 659, 1963.

- 26. Leverton, John W., <u>Helicopter Noise Blade Slap</u>, NASA CR-1221, October 1968.
- 27. Gessow, Alfred, and Myers, Garry C., <u>Aerodynamics of the</u> Helicopter, Macmillan, 1952.
- 28. Yaggy, Paul F., and Rogallo, Vernon L., <u>A Wind-Tunnel Investigation</u> of Three Propellers Through an Angle-of-Attack Range From 0° to 85°, NASA TND-318, May 1960.
- 29. Anon, <u>Aircraft Stability Derivatives</u>, NASA Electronics Research Center RFP Number ERC/R&D GCC-0015, October 31, 1968, pp. II-19 to II-38.
- 30. Kelly, James K., and Matthew M. Winston, <u>Stability Characteristics</u> of a Tandem-Rotor Transport Helicopter as Determined by Flight <u>Test</u>, NASA Technical Note TN D-2847, June 1965.
- 31. Abzug, M. J., <u>Steady Sideslip Solutions of the Equations of</u> <u>Aircraft Motion</u>, TRW Systems Group, Redondo Beach, California, <u>Memo No. 99900-6886-R0-00</u>, 1969.
- 32. Hayden, J. S., and R. G. Ferry, <u>H-34A Phase IV Stability Test</u>, AFFTC TR 56-15, ASTIA AD 96919, 1956.
- 33. Griffin, J. M., <u>Digital Computer Solution of Aircraft Longitudinal</u> and Lateral-Directional Dynamic Characteristics, Air Force Systems Command, Systems Engineering Group, SEG-TR-66-52, 1966.
- 34. Wolkovitch, J., and R. P. Walton, VTOL and Helicopter Approximate <u>Transfer Functions and Closed-Loop Handling Qualities</u>, STI TR 128-1, ASTIA 470137, 1965.
- 35. Wolkovitch, J., <u>An Introduction to Hover Dynamics</u>, Society of Automotive Engineers, Paper 660476, Trans. S.A.E., 1967.
- 36. Craig, S. J., and A. Campbell, <u>Analysis of VTOL Handling Qualities</u> <u>Requirements - Part I. Lontitudinal Hover and Transition</u>, AFFDL-TR-67-179.
- Dillow, J. D., <u>The "Paper Pilot" A Digital Computer Program</u> to Predict Ratings for the Hover Task, AFFDL-FDCC-TH-69-3, 1969.
- 38. Wolkovitch, J., R. A. Peters, and D. E. Johnston, <u>Lateral Control</u> of <u>Hovering Vehicles With and Without Sling Loads</u>, STI TR 145-1, AD 483743, 1906.
- 39. Wolkovitch, J., <u>Analytic Study of Limitations on V/STOL Terminal</u> <u>Guidance Caused by Aircraft Response Characteristics</u>, Mechanics Research, Inc. Report 2383-1, forthcoming NASA Contractor Report.