.

AFWAL-TR-82-3036



PERFORMANCE METHODS FOR LIFTING ENTRY VEHICLE RANGE ANALYSIS

David T. Johnson Charles H. Bursey Richard C. Nash

High Speed Aero-Performance Branch Aeromechanics Division

November 1982

Final Report for Period March 1979 to September 1981

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited.

DTIC FILE COPY

FLIGHT DYNAMICS LABORATORY AIR FORCE WRIGHT AERONAUTICAL LABORATORIES AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE OHIO 45433



83 03 08 009

#### NOTICE

. . 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.

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Public Affairs (ASD/PA) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS, it will be available to the general public, including foreign nations.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

DAVID T. JOHNSON Project Engineer

FOR THE COMMANDER

JOHN R. CHEVALIER, Colonel, USAF Chief, Aeromechanics Division AF Wright Aeronautical Laboratories (AFSC)

"If your address has changed, if you wish to be removed from our mailing list, or if the addressee is no longer employed by your organization please notify AFWAL/FIMG, W-PAFB, OH 45433 to help us maintain a current mailing list".

Copies of this report should not be returned unless return is required by security considerations, contractual obligations, or notice on a specific document.

J. CHRISTOPHER BOISON Chief, High Speed Aero Perf Br. Aeromechanics Division

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
AFWAL-TR-82-3036	AD-A125406	
. TITLE (and Subtitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
PERFORMANCE METHODS FOR LIFTING		Final Report
ENTRY VEHICLE RANGE ANALYSIS		<u>Mar 79 to Sep 81</u>
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(#)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(#)
David T. Johnson		
Charles H. Bursev		
Richard C. Nash		1
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADD	RESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
AF Wright Aeronautical Laborato	ML/FIMU)	PE 6,201 F
Whight Battonson AFR ON 45433	er ies	Project 2404, Task 240407
Wright-Patterson Arb, on 45455		Work Unit 24040732
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	ΔI /FTM)	12. REPORT DATE
AF Wright Aeronautical Laborato	nries	
Wright-Patterson AFB. OH 45433		144
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II dl	ferent from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di	stribution unlimite	ld.
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abotract on	stribution unlimite	d. m Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abotract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	stribution unlimite	d. m Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	stribution unlimite	d. m Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess	stribution unlimite lered in Block 20, 11 different fro	d. m Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract en 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 6. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necesso Lifting Entry Footprints	stribution unlimite fered in Block 20, 11 different fro	om Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessi Lifting Entry Footprints Temperature Constraints	stribution unlimite lered in Block 20, 11 dillerent fro	d. m Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necession Lifting Entry Footprints Temperature Constraints Range Optimization	stribution unlimite lered in Block 20, if different fro	d. m Report)
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Lifting Entry NOTES Temperature Constraints Range Optimization Simplified Control	stribution unlimite tered in Block 20, if different fro	d. m Report)
5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessa Lifting Entry Footprints Temperature Constraints Range Optimization Simplified Control Mapping and display	stribution unlimite fored in Block 20, 11 dillerent fro	d. m Report)
5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; di 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necession Lifting Entry Footprints Temperature Constraints Range Optimization Simplified Control Mapping and display D. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necession - Parameter Optimization meth and without down-range constrai lifting entry vehicles with max respectively, were used.	stribution unlimite tered in Block 20, il dillerent for ury and identify by block number, ods were applied to nts to produce perf imum lift-to-drag r	maximize lateral range with ormance footprints. Three atios of 1.89, 2.2, and 2.6,

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

. . . . . .

### UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

20. Abstract (Continued)

were imposed. This method is easy to use and is efficient in terms of computer resources required to generate a near optimal footprint. No simple method was found to handle heating constraints, however the parameter optimization procedure was able to produce solutions for the single heating point considered. Footprint shrinkage when applying the temperature constraint was most noticeable at the front and back portions with less shrinkage in maximum cross-range. For the most stringent temperature constraint considered the results were a 19% loss in maximum down-range, a doubling of the minimum down-range and a 9.4% loss in maximum cross-range. An automated procedure was developed to display and move the footprint on world maps. This technique shows promise in relating results to functional performance and can be used separately or in conjunction with the footprint data.

بر از بار از بار از مراجع بار می از مربخ بار می از مربخ بار از مربخ بار از از از مربخ بار از مربخ بار از مربخ از مربح باری باری مربخ باری مربخ باری میشون می مربخ باری مربخ باری مربخ باری مربخ باری مربخ باری مربخ مربخ مربخ

## UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

 

#### FOREWORD

This technical report summarizes research performed in-house at the High Speed Aero-Performance Branch, Aeromechanics Division, Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Air Force Wright Aeronautical Laboratories, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. The work was performed under Project No. 2404 "Aeromechanics," Task No. 240407 "Aeroperformance and Aeroheating Technology," Work Unit 24040732 "Reentry Vehicle Performance Analysis Methods." The study period was March 1979 to September 1981.

The report was written by David T. Johnson, Charles H. Bursey, and Richard C. Nash of the Flight Performance Group. Data runs were accomplished with the assistance of Everett M. Marshall. Special thanks are extended to Gerald L. Burke for the heating methods of Section III and to Mr. Fay Young of ASD/AD for the programming.

:	Acces	sion fo	T
	NTIS	GRASI	K
$\frown$	PTIC '	гав	
	Uann	ounced	
2 2 2 2	Justi	ficatio	
a Sy /			
$\checkmark$	By		
	Distr	ibution	n/
	Avai	lab1111	y Codes
		Avail	and/or
	Dist	Spec	ial
	Δ		

.

Ì

TABL	E OF	CONT	ENTS
------	------	------	------

SECTION		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	FOOTPRINT GENERATOR DEVELOPMENT	3
	1. Reentry Vehicles	3
	2. Assumptions	3
	3. Equations of Motion	7
	4. Optimization Procedure	8
	5. Cross-range Optimization	9
	6. Footprint Generation	18
	7. Some Comparisons and Perturbations	23
III	IMPACT OF HEATING CONSIDERATIONS	33
	1. Approach and Procedures	33
	2. Results	36
	3. Summary and Comments	39
IV	APPLICATION AND DEPLAY	48
	1. Calculating a New Footprint	48
	2. Plotting a Footprint	51
	3. Earth Rotational Effects	53
	4. Other Plotting Considerations	56
۷	CONCLUSIONS	57
	APPENDIX A COORDINATE SYSTEM TRANSFORMATIONS	59
	APPENDIX B AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS	63
	APPENDIX C REENTRY APPLICATIONS	74
	REFERENCES	131
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	132

• - · · · · - •

- -

. . .

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

•••••

FIGU	RE	PAGE
la	L/D = 1.89 Configuration	4
16	L/D = 2.2 Configuration	5
1c	L/D = 2.6 Configuration	6
2	Bank Angle Control Schedule	10
3	Convergence for Maximizing Cross-range	12
4	Optimal and Linearized Bank Angle Control	13
5	Two Parameter Control	14
6	Two Parameter Bank Angle Control	15
7	Optimal and Parametric Comparisons	16
8	Single Parameter Control	17
9	Optimal and Parametric Comparisons	19
10	Optimal Bank Angle Schedules	20
11	Comparison of Optimal and Parametric Data	21
12	Optimal and Parametric Comparisons	22
13	Effects of Bank Initiation on Footprint	24
14	Comparisons of Single Parameter and Constant Bank Angle Controls	26
15	Effects of Initial Path Angle on Footprint	27
16	Initial Pull-out Altitude	28
17	Comparison of C. Max and (L/D) Max Pull-out Trajectories	29
18	Comparison of Smoothed and (L/D) Max Trajectories	31
19	Lateral Range Using Bank Angle Control	32
20	Control Philosophies Used for Reentry Trajectories	35
21	Reentry Footprint (No Temperature Constraints)	37
22	Variation of Cross-range with Maximum Allowable Surface Temperature	38

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (Continued)

FIGUR	RE	PAGE
23	Unconstrained Case, Surface Temperature History	40
24	Unconstrained Case, Angle-of-Attack and Bank History	41
25	Allowable Temperature 2600°R, Surface Temperature History	42
26	Allowable Temperature 2600°R, Angle-of-Attack and Bank History	43
27	Allowable Temperature 2550°R, Surface Temperature History	44
28	Allowable Temperature 2550°R, Angle-of-Attack and Bank Histories	45
29	Sensitivity of Temperature Constraint on Reentry Footprint	46
30	Down-range - Cross-range Geometry	49
31	Sample Plots L/D = 1.89 Reduced Footprint	52
32	Sample Plots L/D = 2.6 Footprint	54
33	Shift Due to Earth Rotation	55
C-1	Low (L/D) Configuration	77
C-2	Medium (L/D) Vehicle	78
C-3	High (L/D) Configuration	79
C-4	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -1.5°	80
C-5	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -2°	81
C-6	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = $-3^{\circ}$	82
C-7	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -4°	83
C-8	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -5°	84
C-9	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -7.5°	85
<b>C-1</b> 0	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -10°	86
C-11	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -15°	87
C-12	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -20°	88
C-13	Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -25°	89

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (Continued)

FI	GURE
----	------

C-25

C-26

C-27

C-28

C-29

C-30

C-31

C-32

C-33

C-34

C-35

C-36

FIGU	RE	PAGE
C-14	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -1.5°	90
C-15	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -2°	91
C-16	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle ≈ -3°	92
C-17	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -4°	93
C-18	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -5°	94
C-19	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -7.5°	95
C-20	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle ≈ -10°	96
C-21	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle ≈ -15°	97
C-22	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle ≈ -20°	98
C-23	Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -25°	99
C-24	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -1.5°	100
C-25	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -2°	101
C-26	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -3°	102
C-27	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -4°	103
C-28	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -5°	104
C-29	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -7.5°	105
C-30	High (L/D) Footprint Entry Angle = -10°	106
C-31	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -15°	107
C-32	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -20°	108
C-33	High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -25°	109
C-34	Medium (L/D) Pull-Out Altitudes	110
C-35	Medium (L/D) Range to Initial Pull-Out	111
C-36	Medium (L/D) Iso-Velocity Contours, $(V_I)_i = 12,000$ fps, $\gamma_e = -5^\circ$	112

C-37 Medium (L/D) Iso-Velocity Contours,  $(V_I)_i = 16,000$  fps,  $\gamma_e = -5^{\circ}$ 113

----

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (Concluded)

FIGUR	RE					PAGE
<b>C-</b> 38	Medium (L/D) <sup>Y</sup> e <sup>= -5°</sup>	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =20,000	fps,	114
C-39	Medium (L/D) <sub>Ye</sub> = -10°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> );=12,000	fps,	115
<b>C-4</b> 0	Medium (L/D) <sub>Ye</sub> = -10°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =16,000	fps,	116
C-41	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -10°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =20,000	fps,	117
C-42	Medium (L/D) <sup>Y</sup> e <sup>= -10°</sup>	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =25,800	fps,	118
C-43	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -15°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>1</sub> =12,000	fps,	119
C-44	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -15°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =16,000	fps,	120
C-45	Medium (L/D) $\gamma_e$ = -15°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>1</sub> =20,000	fps,	121
C-46	Medium (L/D) <sub>Ye</sub> = -15°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> );=25,800	fps,	122
C-47	Medium (L/D) $\gamma_e = -20^\circ$	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>1</sub> =12,000	fps,	123
C-48	Medium (L/D) <sub>Ye</sub> = -20°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =16,000	fps,	124
C-49	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -20°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =20,000	fps,	125
C-50	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -20°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =25,800	fps,	126
C-51	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -25°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =12,000	fps,	127
C-52	Medium (L/D) Y <sub>e</sub> = -25°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =16,000	fps,	128
C-53	Medium (L/D) <sub>Ye</sub> = -25°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =20,000	fps,	129
C-54	Medium (L/D) <sub>Ye</sub> = -25°	Iso-Velocity	Contours,	(V <sub>I</sub> ) <sub>i</sub> =25,800	fps,	130

•

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
۱	Heating Variation with Vehicle Attitude	34
2	Initial Entry Conditions	36
B-1	L/D = 1.89 Configuration Lift Coefficient Data	64
B-2	L/D = 1.89 Configuration Drag Coefficient Data	65
B-3	L/D = 2.2 Configuration Lift and Drag Coefficient Data	66
B-4	L/D = 2.6 Configuration Normal Force Coefficient	67
B-5	L/D = 2.6 Configuration Axial Force Coefficient	68
B-6	Low (L/D) Configuration Normal Force Coefficient	70
B-7	Low (L/D) Configuration Axial Force Coefficient	71
B-8	High (L/D) Configuration Axial and Normal Force Coefficient	73

÷

Ľ

# LIST OF SYMBOLS

\_\_\_\_\_

•

- - -

. •

Alt	Altitude
A(1), -A(4)	Polynomial Coefficient
С	Change in Longitude
с <sub>D</sub>	Drag Coefficient
с <sub>L</sub>	Lift Coefficient
F	Force
g	Acceleration of Gravity
h	Altitude and Heat Transfer Coefficient
Н	Enthalpy, also Gravity Coefficient in Appendix A
J	Gravity Coefficient in Appendix A
К	Slope of Bank Angle versus Heading also Units of 1000, also Gravity Coefficient in Appendix A
L/D	Lift/Drag Ratio
m	Vehicle Mass
М	Mach number
n.mi.	Nautical Miles
psf	Lb/ft <sup>2</sup>
q	Dynamic Pressure
ģ	Heat Rate
R	Earth Radius
°R	Degrees Rankine
R'	Average Radius of Earth
S	Aerodynamic Reference Area
T	Temperature
t	Flight Time
v	Velocity

xi

-

# LIST OF SYMBOLS (Continued)

х <sub>D</sub>	Down-range
Υ <sub>D</sub>	Cross-range
i,j,k	Direction Cosines
r,s,t,	Direction Cosines
X,Y,Z	Position Coordinates
x,y,Z	Velocity Components in X,Y,Z Directions
W/S	Wing Loading
х,Y,Z	Accelerations in X,Y,Z Directions
α	Angle of attack
σ	Heading
θ	Longitude
ω <sub>p</sub>	Earth Rotation Angular Rate
Wi	Weighting Matrix
γ	Flight Path Angle
φ	Payoff Function
φ*	Augmented Performance Function
φ <sub>B</sub>	Bank Angle
<sup>φ</sup> L	Latitude
ε	Emissivity
u	Universal Gravity Constant
ψ	Constraint Function
ζ	Remaining Heading Change also Heading of Great Circle from Initial Point to Present Position (Figure 30)
ξ	Heading Angle Between Initial Great Circle and Present Position of Vehicle; Downrange and Crossrange Calculations (Figure 30)

.

# LIST OF SYMBOLS (Concluded)

1

SUBSCRIPTS

٩. .

A	Aerodynamic Reference	
AW	Adiabatic Wall	
с	Control on Flight Path	
e or E	Entry Conditions and Earth Reference Axes System	
f	Final Condition	
F&R	Fay and Riddell	
ROT	Rotating	
g	Local Geocentric, Horizon Reference	
I	Inertial	
i,0	Initial Conditions	
L	Latitude	
М	Modified	
NROT	Nonrotating	
Ρ	Polar	
W	Wall	
X <sub>e</sub> ,Y <sub>e</sub> ,Z <sub>e</sub>	Indicates Direction of Force Components in Earth-Referenced Coordinate System	
1,2,3	Matrix Row Numbers	
X <sub>A</sub> , Y <sub>A</sub> , Z <sub>A</sub>	Indicates Direction of Aerodynamic Force Components in Wind Axes Coordinate System	
X <sub>g</sub> , Y <sub>g</sub> , Z <sub>g</sub>	Indicates Direction of Force Components in Local Geocentric Horizon Coordinate System	

### SECTION I

### INTRODUCTION

The ability of high speed maneuvering vehicles to perform military missions has been a subject of interest over the last two decades. Studies have been made of concepts ranging from space transportation and on-demand rescue to boost glide maneuvering missiles. A great deal of effort has gone into the development of aerodynamic shapes for these purposes. To determine which concepts were most suited some sort of performance measure was needed. With the advent of the digital computer as a practical engineering tool a performance "footprint" as a measure of maneuvering capability was selected. This cross range-down range footprint of a vehicle concept shows the landing or impact versatility which can be gained by maneuvering in the earth's atmosphere. The footprint is directly dependent on lift-to-drag (L/D) capability of the vehicle and shrinks to the ballistic impact point in the limit where L/D = 0. Generally the first of these footprints to be studied used a constant L/D and bank angle with the footprint generated by varying the bank angle in successive cases. This was followed by a staged bank angle, i.e. bank set at a constant value until the heading changed 90° and then set to zero during the remaining glide range, again with the footprint generated by varying the constant bank portion parametrically. This staged bank approach yielded slightly larger cross-ranges than the constant bank. Variable L/D aerodynamics were also generally factored into the analysis at this time ( $C_1$  and  $C_n$  varying as a function of altitude and Mach number).

The next step in footprint development evolved with the construction of flight path optimization methods. Computer programs were generated and applied to the problem of maximizing cross-range (unconstrained). The optimization program used within the Flight Dynamics Laboratory was based on the steepest descent technique and is still available although not much used today, Reference 1. The optimum cross-range solutions obtained from this program were higher than any developed by the previous methods. However, to obtain a solution for just the maximum cross-range point on the footprint through steepest descent optimization was time consuming in terms of computer resources, and to optimize the complete

footprint for each vehicle and entry condition was out of the question. Footprints were hence estimated by fairing a curve through the maximum cross-range point and the parametric points generated by the staged bank procedure described previously. Reference 2 contains a partial list of references in the performance area.

The objective of this effort was to develop a reliable method for rapidly analyzing entry vehicle performance (see also Reference 3). Development of the control laws stressed the use of realistic vehicles in the medium to high L/D range, that is those which are supported by analysis and wind tunnel data, rather than hypothetical vehicles which were much used in the past. The impact of heating considerations was also addressed.

The approach used was to develop optimal cross-range solutions for a footprint both without constraints and with down-range constraints. Parameter optimization on bank angle was used to develop these solutions using the optimization procedures described in References 4 and 5 and the trajectory program described in Reference 6. Observation of the variation of the optimal bank angle control schedule with respect to turn angle then led to the development of a simplified control for rapid footprint generation. Comparisons between the simplified control results and the optimization results were then made for three conceptual vehicles. Section II contains these results.

In Section III optimal solutions with heating constraints were sought and the effect on the footprint was noted. The heating method employed was a reference heat transfer procedure similar to that used in Reference 7 in conjunction with the optimization and trajectory programs. In Section IV a display concept is presented to aid in translating footprint data to functional performance. This procedure allows plotting and manipulating of data on world maps and can be used separately or in conjunction with the performance calculation procedure. Study conclusions are shown in Section V. Mathematical details are shown in Appendix A, vehicle aerodynamics in Appendix B, and a footprint data base in Appendix C.

## SECTION II

## FOOTPRINT GENERATOR DEVELOPMENT

#### 1. REENTRY VEHICLES

Three lifting entry vehicles with maximum lift/drag (L/D) ratios of 1.89, 2.2, and 2.6, respectively, were selected for analysis. These L/D values were measured at Mach = 20 and 200,000 feet altitude. All three vehicles are realistic in terms of system type analysis supported by a broad base of aerodynamic experimental data. Sketches of these configurations are shown in Figures la through lc. Aerodynamic characteristics used in this analysis are shown in Appendix B. These data were obtained from References 8 through l0. The Reference 9 data were supplemented by theoretical calculations at Mach = 10 and 20. A wing loading of 70 psf was used for the low L/D vehicle and 40 psf was used for the other two.

## 2. ASSUMPTIONS

Atmospheric entry was initiated at 60 nautical miles (364,566 feet) altitude heading east on the equator (heading  $\sigma$  = 90 degrees). An earth relative velocity of 24,480 feet/second was used. This corresponds to an inertial velocity of 26,032 feet/second, which is slightly above circular velocity. Although aerodynamic heating considerations limits the entry path angle corridor that is practical for lifting entry vehicles, entry paths angles from -2.0 to -5.0 degrees were investigated for the purpose of methodology development. An entry path angle of -2.0 degrees was used for the purpose of footprint generator development and for trajectories with heating constraints imposed. A rotating oblate earth with the 1959 standard atmosphere was used in the trajectory computations. Coordinated turns (zero side-slip angle) were assumed. Unconstrained trajectories were flown at zero bank angle to the initial pull-out altitude ( $\gamma = 0$ ); bank angle was then allowed to vary for the remainder of the trajectory. Unconstrained optimal solutions and maximum cross-range under down-range constraints used the angle-of-attack for maximum L/D. This varied with Mach and altitude for the particular vehicle. The optimal solution with heating constraints in Section III varied the bank angle after the initial pull-out and the angle-of-attack over the entire trajectory.



Figure 1a. L/D = 1.89 Configuration



۰.

•

Ϊ,



Figure 1c. L/D = 2.6 Configuration

## 3. EQUATIONS OF MOTION

The equations of motion are solved in an earth-referenced cartesian coordinate system. The relation between local-geocentric-horizon, inertial and earth-referenced coordinate systems is illustrated in the following sketch.



X, Y, Z,	Inertial Coordinates
X <sub>e</sub> , Y <sub>e</sub> , Z <sub>e</sub>	Earth-referenced coordinates
X <sub>g</sub> , Y <sub>g</sub> , Z <sub>g</sub>	Local-geocentric-horizon coordinates

The origin of these systems lies on the polar axis in the equatorial plane. The Z and  $Z_e$  axes are collinear with the polar axes and positive toward the south pole. The  $X_e$  axis is in the equatorial plane and is fixed at the longitude of the vehicle at time equal zero. The  $Y_e$  axis is positive to form a right-handed system. The inertial coordinates X,Y,Z and the earth-referenced coordinates  $X_e$ ,  $Y_e$ ,  $Z_e$  coincide at time zero. The earth-referenced axes rotate with the planet whereas the inertial axes remain fixed.

The equations of motion solved in an earth-referenced cartesian coordinate system are as follows:

$$\ddot{X}_{e} = F_{xe}/m - 2\dot{y}_{e}\omega_{p} + x_{e}\omega_{p}^{2}$$
(1)

$$\ddot{Y}_{e} = F_{y_{e}}/m + 2\dot{x}_{e}\omega_{p} + y_{e}\omega_{p}^{2}$$
<sup>(2)</sup>

$$Z_e = F_z / m$$
(3)

These equations were integrated to obtain the velocity  $X_e$ ,  $Y_e$ ,  $Z_e$  and position  $X_e$ ,  $Y_e$ ,  $Z_e$ .

The transformations necessary to relate the axes systems employed are developed in Appendix A.

#### 4. OPTIMIZATION PROCEDURE

The control variables used for optimization were bank angle  $(\phi_B)$  and angle-of-attack ( $\alpha$ ). These variables were input to the computer program in tabular form as "control parameters". The parameter optimization procedures then vary these control parameters to maximize or minimize a given function. The control used by the program is formed by a linear interpolation between the discrete control parameter points varied by the optimizer. In this section, eight parameters were used on bank angle with angle-of-attack set to L/D max. Additional parameters were used on angle-of-attack when temperature constraints were considered, as will be shown in Section III.

The methods considered for parameter optimization are those described in Reference 4. After some early experimentations with these parameter optimization methods, a sequential combination of two searches was found to produce satisfactory results. This combination was an adaptive "creeping" search followed by a "pattern" search. The adaptive creeping search operates by introducing perturbations in the control parameters varying one parameter at a time seeking improvement in the function to be optimized. If improvement is not found when a parameter is perturbed

L.

J

ė

in one direction the other direction is searched. The size and direction of the perturbations are determined adaptively by the search algorithm as the search progresses. After one complete cycle of the creeping search, with perturbations in all parameters having been explored, the pattern search was used. The pattern search attempts to accelerate convergence by exploring the direction revealed by the creeping search and moves <u>all</u> the parameters simultaneously. The creeping search is then repeated and followed by another pattern search, etc. Constraints are handled by a penalty on the payoff, forming an augmented performance function of the form:

$$\phi^* = \phi + \Sigma_i \omega_i (||\psi_i| - \overline{\psi}_i| - \operatorname{TTOL}_i/2)^2$$
(4)

where

φ	is the value of the pay-off function	(cross-range used in this study)
ω <sub>i</sub>	is the weighting matrix	(unit matrix used)
Ψ <sub>i</sub> Ψ̃i	is the value of constraint i	(down-range and/or temperature used)
	is the desired value of constraint i	(down-range 2,000 - 14,000 nmi) (temperature 2550 - 2600°R)
TTOL <sub>i</sub> is the tolerance		(5° on temperature, 50 nmi on duwn-range)

#### 5. CROSS-RANGE OPTIMIZATION

The controls used to maximize cross-range were angle-of-attack for L/D max and bank angle as a function of turn angle. Figure 2 shows the nominal control used for the bank angle. The circles show the nominal value of the parameters used for an eight parameter optimization. The heading angle points were selected from -15° to 90° in 15° increments. The bank angle at these points was then varied by the optimizer. Linear interpolation between points was used. The first problem considered was finding maximum unconstrained cross-range. The down-range constraints were then introduced and the problem re-run seeking maximum cross-range under a series of down-range constraints to develop the footprint. This process was repeated for each of the three vehicles studied.





Figure 2. Bank Angle Control Schedule

Typical convergence for maximizing unconstrained cross-range is shown in Figure 3 for the L/D = 2.2 vehicle. This figure shows "steps" in cross-range at several places. These steps occur where the convergence process switches from creep to pattern. Approximately 110 iterations were used in this example. Note that over 95% of the maximum cross-range was obtained in 30 iterations. The inset to Figure 3 shows the nominal control schedule used to start the optimization and the final control determined by the optimization process.

- 1 -

. . .

This optimized control and the resulting controls for maximizing cross-range under down-range constraints are shown by the circles connected by the solid lines in Figure 4. The form of the control resulting from the optimization suggests that a linearization might yield satisfactory results. The control was then linearized as shown by the dashed lines in the figure and the problem re-run. The difference in cross-range between using the linearized and the optimal control was less than five percent in all cases. A two-parameter linear control was then investigated. The control used was  $\phi_{R} = K(\sigma - \sigma_{f})$  where K is the slope of bank angle versus heading,  $\sigma$  is the instantaneous value of heading, and  $\sigma_{\textbf{f}}$  is the final heading where the bank angle reduces to zero. This control is illustrated by Figure 5. In keeping the slope, K, constant and varying  $\sigma_{r}$ , a parametric control set was generated as shown in Figure 6. As shown in the figure, the maximum bank angle was arbitrarily limited to 75 degrees since this seemed to be a reasonable upper limit. Three different parametric sets were run using K values of .5, .67, and 1.0. This was done for all three vehicles and the results are shown in Figure 7. The optimum results are shown by the squares. The solid lines are fairings through the outer boundary of the parametric data. This figure shows fairly good agreement between the parametric and optimum results at the forward part of the footprint, but poor agreement at the back part. In an attempt to improve the agreement on the back part of the footprint, the two-parameter control was changed by: (1) increasing the bank angle limit from 75 to 85° and (2) by setting  $\sigma_{f}$  = 0°, which results in  $\phi_{\mathbf{B}}$  = Ko. By varying the parameter K, a parametric control set was generated as shown in Figure 8. The parameter K was varied from 0. to 1.5.

C

C



Figure 3. Convergence for Maximizing Cross-range



Г



.

Figure 5. Two Parameter Control

C

ĩ



HEADING,  $\sigma \sim DEG$ 

Figure 6. Two Parameter Bank Angle Control

D

1



CBOSS- RANGE  $\sim$  1000 M  $_{\odot}$  M I

۰.

1

۱



Figure 8. Single Parameter Control

1

The higher values of K (K>1.0) provide a bank angle control which initially follows the 85° boundary (Figure 8) and then is reduced linearly to zero as the turning angle approaches 90° ( $\sigma = 0$ ). This type of control results in fast initial turning and short down-range. The results are shown by the circles in Figure 9. The squares are again the optimized results and the solid lines are the results from the previous parametrics. The figure shows that the results from the  $\phi_{\rm B} = K\sigma$  control compare closely over the entire region with both the optimized results at the short to mid ranges and with the best cross-range achieved by the previous parametrics at the longer ranges for all three vehicles being studied. Use of the bank control equation  $\phi_{\rm B} = K\sigma$  is called a "single parameter" control as K is the only parameter being varied.

#### 6. FOOTPRINT GENERATION

The footprint generator development thus far has dealt with maximizing cross-range for the portion of the footprint that has down-ranges of 4000 nmi and greater. Attention is now given to ranges of less than 4000 nmi. Using the L/D = 1.89 configuration, the cross-range was maximized using the optimization process where down-range was constrained to 3000 and then 2000 nmi. The resulting optimal bank angle controls are shown in Figure 10 for these ranges plus the 4000 nmi range developed previously. It was found that these results could be closely approximated using the linear control  $\phi_{\rm B}$  = K $\sigma$  if the maximum bank angle limit were removed, i.e., allowing the vehicle to bank greater than 85 degrees. The results are shown in Figure 11. Note that all trajectory data points were run at (L/D) max except for the zero lift data point. Complete footprints for the three configurations are shown in Figure 12. This figure shows good agreement between the optimal results shown by the hexagonal points and the single parameter control solutions.

From Figure 12 each footprint was generated with 13 points, each point requiring a trajectory. In contrast, each of the optimization points shown in the figure represents about 110 trajectory iterations before converging to a solution. Forming part of a footprint using three optimized points would require about 110 X 3 = 330 trajectories.



 Figure 9. Optimal and Parametric Comparisons

CR055-RANGE ~ 1000 N.MI.

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

C

E

E

)



Figure 10. Optimal Bank Angle Schedules





Figure 11. Comparison of Optimal and Parametric Data

٠.

ľ

÷.,





\_\_\_\_
Use of the linear control to produce a complete footprint hence requires less computer resources by a factor of 330/13 = 25. Converting this to computer solution time using an average of 30 seconds computer time per trajectory on a CDC CYBER-175 yields a decrease in time from 9900 seconds for the three optimized points to only 390 seconds for the complete footprint using the linear control.

Summarizing then, developing a footprint by the single parameter control procedure was found to closely approximate optimization results for the vehicles studied. The procedure outlined below is for an initial equatorial orbit heading east. For other inclinations,  $\zeta$  (remaining heading change) must be substituted for  $\sigma$  in the bank angle control, where  $\zeta$  is the angle between the component of the velocity vector parallel to the earth and the cross-range axis. Single parameter control procedure:

a. The initial heading and position are set. For the equatorial orbit heading east,  $\sigma = 90$  degrees and the position is fixed on the equator.

b. The independent variable for the bank angle control is heading,  $\sigma$  (or in general  $\zeta$ ). Two points are required, one at the beginning  $(\sigma_0)$ and one at the end  $(\sigma_f)$  of the turn (for initial equational orbits  $\sigma_f = 0$ ). Linear interpolation between these points forms the bank control.

c. The initial bank angle (at  $\sigma_0$ ) is varied parametrically in 15-degree increments from 0 to 150 degrees to form the footprint. The final heading angle  $\sigma_f$  is 0; hence the term "single parameter control" as only the bank angle at  $\sigma_0$  is being varied to form the linear control.

d. One more point (minimum down-range) is needed to complete the footprint. In this study the minimum down-range point was run at zero lift (pull downs were not considered).

### 7. SOME COMPARISONS AND PERTURBATIONS

The remaining work to be discussed involves the comparison of various entry conditions and control schedules. Figure 13 shows how the footprint



E

Figure 13. Effects of Bank Initiation on Footprint

changes due to initiating bank at the beginning of the sensible atmosphere, 295K ft, and at pull-out,  $\gamma = 0$ . Both footprints were generated using the single parameter control schedule and the L/D = 2.2 vehicle.

A bank angle control schedule much used in the past for footprint generation was to hold a constant bank angle until the heading changed by 90 degrees and then reduce the roll to zero. By varying the amount of bank, a footprint is generated. Figure 14 compares a footprint using this type of control with the single parameter control. For this case the L/D = 1.89 vehicle was used.

The effect of initial path angle on the footprint area available is shown in Figure 15 for the  $L/D \approx 1.89$  vehicle. The single parameter control was used to generate this plot. The corresponding pull-cut altitudes,  $\gamma = 0$ , are shown in Figure 16. It should be noted that for a given set of entry conditions the initial pull-out altitude is a function of the parameter  $W/(C_1S)$  rather than L/D. The Figure 16 data are for entry at L/D max, and the altitudes shown are approximately the same for the L/D = 2.2 and L/D = 2.6 vehicles. The pull-out altitude can vary appreciably depending upon the angle-of-attack schedule used during entry. The lower the value of  $W/(C_1 S)$  the higher the initial pull-out altitude will be. This illustrated by Figure 17 which shows entry trajectories flown both at  $C_L$  max and at (L/D) max to the pull-out point,  $\gamma$  = 0. This figure shows that the C max entry, having a lower value of  $W/(C_1S)$ , results in pull-out at an appreciably higher altitude than the (L/D) max trajectory. Range is also increased for the  $C_1$  max entry for the case where altitude is held constant after pull-out.

Trajectories that are flown at L/D max or at a constant angle-of-attack typically oscillate in altitude. These oscillations can be damped using bank angle and/or angle-of-attack control. To maintain leve? flight after pull-out, the lift is reduced such that the lift plus the centrifugal force is equal to the weight. For straight down-range (no bank) the angle-of-attack is reduced to the proper value at pull-out and is increased as the speed decreases due to aerodynamic drag. The angle-of-attack for



C

• .

٠.



Figure 14. Comparisons of Single Parameter and Constant Bank Angle Controls •

٠.

•



•

1

· ·

C

T

•

· · ·



Figure 16. Initial Pull-out Altitude



ALTITUDE  $\sim$  1000 FT

L/D max is flown once the L/D max equilibrium glide trajectory is reached. In the equilibrium glide trajectory the vertical forces (lift plus centrifugal force) nearly equal the gravitational forces and hence the vehicle descends without altitude oscillations. One disadvantage of this type of trajectory is a great reduction in range since only a small part of the profile is flown at L/D max. Other variations for smoothed trajectories would be to raise the pull-out altitude by flying at  $C_L$  max until pull-out and/or flying a very small positive or negative path angle after pull-out. The effects of flying small controlled flight path angles after pull-out are shown in Figure 18. This figure also shows the (L/D) max trajectory for comparison.

Cross-range can be obtained either at constant altitude or at small flight path angles afer pull-out by using bank angle control and (L/D) max for the turn. By rolling out to wings level and switching to angle-of-attack control once a given heading change is reached, a footprint can be generated, as shown by Figure 19. The maximum amount of turn available is to maintain the turn using bank control until the wings are level. This is shown by the dashed lines in Figure 19. The altitude · profiles for the down-range points with no turn in Figure 19 are the same as those shown in Figure 18 for corresponding values of the flight path angle control,  $\gamma_c$ .

The single parameter control and the constant altitude control have been used to generate a footprint data base. These data are shown in Appendix C.

· •

C

C



Figure 18. Comparison of Smoothed and (L/D) Max Trajectories

J

•



Figure 19. Lateral Range Using Bank Angle Control

## SECTION III

### IMPACT OF HEATING CONSIDERATIONS

In an effort to assess the impact of aerodynamic heating constraints on entry vehicle maneuvering capability, the low (L/D) configuration was selected for study. The temperatures discussed in this section were computed at a point approximately ten feet aft of the nose on the lower surface centerline of the vehicle using a one-dimensional conduction analysis on a simplified structure.

#### 1. APPROACH AND PROCEDURES

The approach used was to calculate the heat input to the surface through the use of a "reference" heat transfer coefficient which accounted for the location of the vehicle on the entry trajectory (altitude and velocity) and a ratio of local-to-reference heating coefficient to account for vehicle attitude and point of interest on the vehicle. This approach is similar to that used in Reference 7. The following heating relationships were used to compute the radiation equilibrium wall temperature.

$$(h/h_{FLD}) = f(\alpha) \tag{5}$$

$$\dot{q} = h_{F\&R} (h/h_{F\&R}) (H_{AW} - H_{W})$$
 (6)

 $T = [\dot{q}/(4.75 \times 10^{-13} \times \epsilon)]^{.25}$ (7)

where the ratio  $(h/h_{F&R})$  is obtained from theory or wind tunnel data correlations and  $(h_{F&R})$  is calculated using the Fay and Riddell theory. Values of  $(h/h_{F&R})$  with vehicle attitude used in this study are shown in Table 1.

To maintain continuity, the same parameter optimization techniques used previously, namely "creep" and "pattern", were used for the heating analysis. To provide the capability for constraining the equilibrium wall temperature to specified values, the same penalty function approach used previously for the down-range constraint was employed.

TAB	LE	1
-----	----	---

# HEATING VARIATION WITH VEHICLE ATTITUDE

(h/h <sub>F&amp;R</sub> )	α
.17	0
.175	20
.20	25
.23	30
.23	40
.26	45
.30	50

The control philosophies employed to generate the unconstrained and temperature constrained reentry footprints are outlined in Figure 20. For the unconstrained footprint (no heating constraints), problems were formulated whereby the vehicle flew an angle-of-attack schedule for maximum lift-to-drag ratio over the entire reentry trajectory. A bank angle of zero degrees was maintained from entry to the initial flare point ( $\gamma$ =0 degrees). From the initial flare point to trajectory termination (H=50,000 feet), the program modulated the bank angle to maximize the cross-range. For the temperature constrained problems, both of the control parameters were modulated over the entire trajectory with the exception that during the initial plunge into the atmosphere the bank angle was set to zero degrees. Using this steering philosophy ensured that the heating criteria would not be violated at any point along the entry flight profile. Listed in Table 2 are the initial entry conditions used for the aerodynamic heating analysis.

ς,\*

. .

.

• .•



## TABLE 2

INITIAL ENTRY CONDITIONS

h <sub>o</sub> =	: 364,800 feet
۲ <sub>0</sub> =	26,031 feet per second (Inertial)
۷ <sub>0</sub> =	<pre>24,480 feet per second (Relative)</pre>
Υ <sub>0</sub> =	-2.0 degrees
σ <sub>0</sub> =	· 90 degrees
$\phi_0 = \theta_0$	, = 0 degrees
(W/S) =	= 70 #/ft <sup>2</sup>

All of the trajectories were terminated at 50,000 feet altitude.

To investigate the impact of aerodynamic heating constraints on reentry vehicle maneuverability, it was desired to generate a footprint with temperature constraints to compare to the unconstrained footprint. Shown in Figure 21 is the unconstrained reentry footprint for the low lift-to-drag ratio configuration. Except for the maximum down-range point, all of the points on the footprint were obtained by maximizing the lateral range at various down-range distances. Although the radiation equilibrium temperature (RET) was not constrained it was computed on all of the reentry trajectories. The maximum value of crossrange (1964 nmi) was attained at approximately 6000 nmi down-range. For this case the maximum radiation equilibrium temperature was 2670°R.

# 2. RESULTS

The initial problem investigated, with temperature constraints, was the maximum cross-range case. 2670°R was considered to be the upper limit since that value was obtained for the unconstrained case. Figure 22 illustrates the maximum cross-range sensitivity to changes in the maximum allowable surface temperature. As noted in Figure 22 two cases were run with temperature constraints of 2550 and 2600°R. The curve shows that decreasing the temperature from 2670°R to 2550°R results in a 9.4 percent



AFWAL-TR-82-3036 -2° L/D = 1.892000 CROSS-RANGE~n.MI. 1500 1000 2700 2550 2500 2600 2650 MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE SURFACE TEMPERATURE ~ °R

Œ

Figure 22. Variation of Cross-range with Maximum Allowable Surface Temperature

decrease in cross-range. The time histories of the surface temperature, angle-of-attack, and bank angle are shown in Figures 23 through 28 for the three cases. Analysis of the results indicated that, as the temperature constraint used in this analysis becomes more stringent, the vehicle is forced to enter at a lift-to-drag ratio considerably less than maximum, approaching  $(C_1)$  max for the 2550°R constraint case. Also, the shape of the entry flight profile is highly influenced by the temperature constraint in that the initial pull-out altitude occurred approximately on the constraint boundary. To show the impact of temperature constraints on the complete footprint, the most stringent temperature limit, namely 2550°R was used in conjunction with down-range constraints to generate the reduced entry footprint shown in Figure 29. Inspection of these entry footprints shows the large amount of geographic coverage that is lost as the result of the temperature constraints. The reason for this reduction in maneuverability is that the vehicle reentering the earth's atmosphere, flying a temperature constrained flight profile, is forced to reenter at a higher altitude than the unconstrained case, therefore a lower dynamic pressure and lift/drag ratio.

It is interesting to note that although the maximum cross-range of the footprint was reduced only 184 nmi out of 1964 when the maximum temperature was reduced from the unconstrained condition to 2550°R, significant amounts of down-range were lost. On the forward part of the footprint the maximum down-range was reduced from 14500 to 11700 nmi and on the rear portion of the footprint the minimum range increased from around 1000 to 2000 nmi. The footprint collapses towards the center but not as much as one might expect considering that the limit of 2550°R is about the lowest that can be achieved on the initial plunge from the initial entry conditions outlined in Table 2.

## 3. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS

In conclusion, the footprint generated by imposing a temperature constraint of 2550°R compared to the unconstrained footprint of Section II loses 9.4% of the maximum cross-range capability, 19% of the maximum down-range, and the minimum down-range is doubled from 1000 to 2000 nmi.

R

SURFACE TEMPERATURE ~ R

·. .

· ·



Figure 23. Unconstrained Case, Surface Temperature History

R.

.

...



.

•

•••

.

SURFACE TEMPERATURE ~ • R

é

1





-



Figure 26. Allowable Temperature 2600°R, Angle-of-Attack and Bank History





. . .

· · · ·





C





. .

Due to the substantial amount of computer time involved to run optimal solutions, constrained footprints were not generated for other initial conditions. The heating method used in the trajectory model has provision for simultaneously constraining temperature on more than one point on the vehicle. However, the lack of data for the heating model on the other points of the low L/D vehicle or the other vehicles prevented running them with temperature constraints.

.

.

C

## SECTION IV

.

# APPLICATION AND DISPLAY

The work shown to this point has been to develop a procedure for rapid, accurate, footprint calculations under the various flight constraints. However, to determine the utility of a vehicle concept in performing a given function, the footprint data must be related and applied to that function. For such concepts as an orbital based maneuvering entry vehicle, questions of interest might include the following: (1) What is the landing coverage from a specified deorbit point? (2) What are the effects of node rotations and inclination change? (3) What portions of which orbits allow landing in a set of designated landing sites? A similar set of questions could be phrased for a boost glide missile system. The procedure developed for the display and analysis portion of the footprint generator was designed as a tool to find answers to those questions.

Options are provided to display the footprint on two types of world maps and calculate a modified footprint to allow the user to change the node location, orbital inclination, or increase down-range for stepping the deorbit point around an orbit. An option is also provided to allow input of only half of a symmetrical footprint and computer generate the other half. Required inputs to the procedure are longitude, latitude, and heading angle of a reference point on the initial orbit and the longitude, latitude points of the previously calculated footprint. If a modified footprint is to be calculated, the procedures shown below on "calculating a new footprint" are used first, if display only of the generated footprint is desired this section is skipped.

### 1. CALCULATING A NEW FOOTPRINT

The first step is to take the longitude-latitude points from the footprint boundary calculated by the footprint generator and convert this data into cross-range and down-range from a reference such as the deorbit condition (longitude, latitude of the deorbit point plus the heading angle of the orbit at that point to define the initial great circle for down-range calculation).



Figure 30. Down-range - Cross-range Geometry

The geometry of the problem is shown in Figure 30 where point L is the initial point, arc LP is the initial great circle, and point F is a point on the footprint boundary. The cross-range of point F is defined as the perpendicular distance from the point to the initial great circle, shown in the figure as the arc PF. The down-range is then the distance along the initial great circle from the initial point to the point at which the cross-range is measured (arc LP).

From spherical trigonometry, the great circle range LP to the point F is computed

$$LF = \cos^{-1}[\sin \phi_{L} \sin \phi_{L0} + \cos \phi_{L} \cos \phi_{L0} \cos (\theta_{L} - \theta_{LC})] \qquad (8)$$

The heading  $\zeta$  of the great circle from the initial point to the point F is computed from the spherical triangle LNF:

$$\tan \zeta = \frac{\sin (\theta_{L} - \theta_{L0}) \cos \phi_{L} \cos \phi_{L0}}{\sin \phi_{L} - \sin \phi_{L0} \cos (LF)}$$
(9)

and the triangle LPF is solved for the down-range  $X_{n}$ , and cross-range  $Y_{n}$ :

$$X_{D} = R' \cos^{-1} [\cos (LF)/\cos(\sin^{-1} (\sin(LF) \sin \xi))]$$
 (10)

$$Y_{D} = R' \sin^{-1} [\sin (LF) \sin \xi]$$
 (11)

where:  $\xi = \zeta - \sigma_0$ 

and R' is the average radius of the earth

The next step is to modify, through input, the node location (by changing  $\theta_{LO}$  of the initial point), the inclination angle of the initial orbit (by changing  $\sigma_0$ ), or the down-range ( $X_D$  which was just calculated for stepping around the orbit). These parameters may be changed singly or in combination.

Next, this revised condition is then converted back to a new longitude, latitude point for plotting and analysis. However, what was a straightforward calculation going to cross-range and down-range now requires an interation converting back to longitude and latitude. Starting from the new down-range  $(X_{DM})$  and heading at the initial point  $(\sigma_{OM})$  holding the cross-range (arc PF) constant and rearranging Equations 3 and 4:

$$LF_{M} = \cos^{-1} [\cos (PF) \cos (X_{DM}/R')]$$
 (12)

where  $LF_M$  is the new value of arc LF

$$\xi_{M} = \sin^{-1} [\sin (PF)/\sin (LF_{M})]$$
 (13)

$$\operatorname{ind} \zeta_{\mathsf{M}} = \xi_{\mathsf{M}} + \sigma_{\mathsf{O}\mathsf{M}} \tag{14}$$

where  $LF_M$ ,  $\xi_M$ , and  $\zeta_M$  are the new values of LF,  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ .

ľ

Now a guess at a new latitude of the footprint point is made  $(\phi_{LM})$ , and  $(\theta_L - \theta_{LO})_M$  is computed from Equation 8. Putting this in Equation 9 yields a  $\zeta$  which is compared with the result obtained from Equation 14. If the values of  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta_M$  are not equal, a new  $\phi_{LM}$  is chosen and the process repeated until it converges.

The new longitude is then computed by:

$$\theta_{LM} = (\theta_{L} - \theta_{LO})_{M} + \theta_{LOM}$$
(15)

where the subscript M denotes the new value of the variables. This procedure is repeated until all points of the footprint have been processed. At this point the new footprint is available for plotting.

## 2. PLOTTING A FOOTPRINT

Display of the footprint is accomplished by plotting the longitude and latitude points on a map from the world mapping capability available through the DISSPLA integrated software system and plotting language (Reference 12). From the 15 map projections available in this system two were chosen to display the results, the cylindrical equidistant and the orthographic projection. All or any portion of the world can be projected. The cylindrical equidistant shows the coordinates as they are on a flat map and in the orthographic projection one views the globe from far away-projection pole at infinity.

The plotting program is structured to make both these maps for each condition desired to be plotted. As only half the earth is visible on the orthographic projection, the viewing angle is varied so that all the footprint (or most for large footprints) can be seen unless the user instructs otherwise. Some sample results as presented in the following paragraphs were copied from a Tektronix terminal.

Figure 31 shows the footprint for the L/D = 1.89 vehicle when operated at a high angle-of-attack to reduce heating loads. The footprint was run with the starting point taken as the entry conditions of Table 2 and

ß

.

18

•.

. .



Figure 31. Sample Plots L/D = 1.d9 Reduced Footprint

heading due east at 0° latitude and longitude. Note the starting point did not lie on the footprint. The positive latitude half of the footprint was input and the other half was calculated by symmetry in the display program. The left side of the figure shows plotting on the cylindrical equidistant projection. At the top in Figure 31 (a) is the footprint "as run" at a heading angle of 90° (inclination 0°), the starting point at 0° latitude and longitude is shown by the filled circle. In Figure 31 (b) the initial heading has been changed to 30° (inclination 60°), and at the bottom in Figure 31(c) a heading of -90° is shown. The right side of the figure shows inclination 0° in Figure 31 (d) and inclination 60° in Figure 31(e) on the orthographic projection.

Figure 32 shows similar plots for the larger footprint, this for the L/D = 2.6 vehicle. The starting point was again the conditions from Table 2 and heading east at 0° longitude and latitude. The left side of the figure on the cylindrical equidistant projection shows inclination of 0° in Figure 32 (a) and 30° in 32 (b). Note, that the points are not connected when the lines would cross longitude 180°, The right side shows the same plots on the orthographic projection. The area of the footprint is so large it won't fit on half the globe so only a portion can be shown on the orthographic projection. The area of the map not covered by the footprint is shaded for ease of viewing. Figure 32(c) shows the inclination 0° and 32(d) inclination 30°.

## 3. EARTH ROTATIONAL EFFECTS

An approximation to earth rotational effects has been included as an option in the computer model. To correctly include rotation it would be necessary to re-run trajectories for each case being considered. However, if it is assumed that the basic trajectory is unchanged by a rotating earth and the predominate effect is that of the earth rotating below the trajectory a first order approximation of the shift due to the rotation can be obtained. This is a shift in the longitude of the end point, with the latitude unchanged, and is computed by  $\theta_{LROT} = \theta_{LNROT} - \omega_p t$ ; where  $\theta_{LROT}$  is the new longitude of the end point in degrees,  $\theta_{LNROT}$  is the



· · · ·

• • •

.

ľ

C

Figure 32. Sample Plots L/D = 2.6 Footprint

.

longitude of the nonrotating and point  $\omega_p$  is earth angular rotation rate = .004178 deg/sec, and t is the flight time of the trajectory. The flight time (t) is obtained from the nonrotating trajectory runs which developed the footprint.

Typical flight times range from 2000 to 4000 seconds and are generally shorter on the back portion of the footprint than they are on the forward portion. This then produces a longitude shift of 8.4 to 16.7 degrees. Note that the longitude shift is toward the west, that is toward more negative values. This has the effect of stretching the footprint when the initial conditions are heading west on the equator, compacting it when heading east, and distorting it at other inclinations as shown in Figure 33. The starting point in Figure 33 taken as the entry conditions of Table 2, was at 0° longitude, 0° latitude and is out of view in the diagram. This point corresponds to the time = 0 cordition and would not be moved by earth rotation.



Figure 33. Shift Due to Earth Rotation

T

## 4. OTHER PLOTTING CONSIDERATIONS

This system as described represents an attempt to automate a procedure for display and manipulation of footprints requiring little user knowledge of the DISSPLA system and a minimum of input data. Many other different things may be done to tailor a program to produce the most useful plots for a particular application. Among these would be: other types of projections, mapping of only a portion of the earth, labeling and titling plots, shading of footprints, insertion of vehicle pictures, display of more than one footprint on the same map, or structuring of the analysis program to generate and plot mission oriented features. Many of these can be done with very little effort.

The footprint generator developed in this report shows potential as a powerful tool for rapid calculation of entry vehicle maneuvering capability. The application and display work developed here provides a first step towards rapidly analyzing vehicle application to a required mission and producing high quality plots.

I

### SECTION V

### CONCLUSIONS

 Parameter optimization methods were applied to maximize lateral range with and without downrange constraints to produce performance footprints. Good convergence was obtained from using the methods "creeper" and "pattern" on the bank angle control schedule, angle-of-attack was set to L/D max.

2. A simplified bank control procedure was developed which closely approximated the optimal footprint results where no heating constraints were imposed. The procedure is outlined in Section II. The method is easy to use and is efficient requiring less computer resources than the optimization procedure by a factor of about 25 to 1.

3. No simple method was found to handle heating constraints. However, the parameter optimization procedure was able to produce solutions for the single heating point considered. Footprint shrinkage when applying the temperature constraint was most noticeable at the front and back portions with less shrinkage in maximum cross-range. For the most stringent temperature constraint considered the results were a 19% loss in maximum down-range, a doubling of the minimum down-range and a 9.4% loss in maximum cross-range.

4. An automated procedure was developed to display and move the footprint on world maps. This technique shows promise in relating results to functional performance and can be used separately or in conjunction with the footprint data.

### APPENDIX A

## COORDINATE SYSTEM TRANSFORMATIONS

This appendix develops the transformations necessary to relate the coordinate systems employed.



To describe body motion relative to the planet, a local-geocentrichorizon coordinate system was employed. To locate the  $X_g$ ,  $Y_g$ ,  $Z_g$  axes with respect to the  $X_e$ ,  $Y_e$ ,  $Z_e$  axes, rotation was first about  $Z_e$  by an angle (180° + C) and then about  $Y_g$  through the angle (90° -  $\phi_L$ ) where  $\phi_L$ is vehicle latitude and the angle C is related to the vehicle position by the expression:

$$C = \tan^{-1} \left( Y_{e} / X_{e} \right)$$
 (A1)
ĺŧ

The complete transformation reduced to a single matrix is given by:



Aerodynamic forces are conveniently summed in a wind axis coordinate system  $(X_A, Y_A, Z_A)$ . Since the equations of motion are solved in  $(X_e, Y_e, Z_e)$  coordinates the wind axis components of force must then be resolved into this basic system. The transformation from local-geocentric-horizon coordinates to wind axes is given by:

$$\begin{array}{c|c} X_{A} \\ Y_{A} \\ Z_{A} \end{array} = \left| \begin{array}{c} \cos(\gamma_{A})\cos(\sigma_{A}) & \cos(\gamma_{A})\sin(\sigma_{A}) & -\sin(\gamma_{A}) \\ -\sin(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) & \cos(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) & \cos(\gamma_{A})\sin(\phi_{B}) \\ +\sin(\gamma_{A})\cos(\sigma_{A})\sin(\phi_{B}) & +\sin(\alpha_{A})\sin(\phi_{B}) \\ \sin(\sigma_{A})\sin(\phi_{B}) & -\cos(\sigma_{A})\sin(\phi_{B}) & \cos(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) \\ +\sin(\gamma_{A})\cos(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) & +\sin(\gamma_{A})\sin(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} X_{g} \\ Y_{g} \\ Z_{g} \\ +\sin(\gamma_{A})\cos(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) & +\sin(\gamma_{A})\sin(\sigma_{A})\cos(\phi_{B}) \\ \end{array} \right|$$

which defines a direction cosine set

the resolution from wind axes to local-geocentric then become

$$\begin{vmatrix} F_{x_{g}} \\ F_{y_{g}} \\ F_{z_{g}} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} r_{1} & r_{2} & r_{3} \\ s_{1} & s_{2} & s_{3} \\ t_{1} & t_{2} & t_{3} \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} F_{x_{A}} \\ F_{y_{A}} \\ F_{z_{A}} \end{vmatrix}$$
(A6)

.

The local-geocentric components are then resolved into the  $X_e$ ,  $Y_e$ ,  $Z_e$  system through a transposition of the i,j,k matrix, as follows:

$$\begin{vmatrix} F_{x_{e}} \\ F_{y_{e}} \\ F_{z_{e}} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\ j_{1} & j_{2} & j_{3} \\ k_{1} & k_{2} & k_{3} \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} F_{x_{g}} \\ F_{y_{g}} \\ F_{z_{g}} \end{vmatrix}$$
(A7)

\_· • • •

The forces acting on the vehicle are the sum of the aerodynamic and gravity forces.

$$\Sigma F_{\chi} = D + mg_{\chi}$$

$$\Sigma F_{y} = Y = 0$$

$$\Sigma F_{z} = L + mg_{z}$$
(A8)

The side force, Y, is zero since only coordinated turns with zero side slip were considered. The drag and lift terms are:

$$D = C_{D} q S$$

$$L = C_{1} q S$$
(A9)

Where the dynamic pressure, q, is a function of velocity and altitude and the lift and drag coefficients are functions of Mach, angle-of-attack, and altitude. Thrust was not used in this analysis.

The gravity equations used are as follows:

$$g_{Z_{g}} = \frac{\mu}{R^{2}} \left[ 1 + J \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{2} P_{2} + \frac{4H}{5} \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{3} P_{3} + \frac{K}{6} \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{4} P_{4} \right]$$
(A10)  
$$g_{X_{g}} = \frac{\mu}{R^{2}} \left[ -2J \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{2} P_{5} + \frac{3H}{5} \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{3} P_{6} + \frac{2K}{3} \left(\frac{R_{e}}{R}\right)^{4} P_{7} \right]$$

. . .

.

where

-----

0

$$P_{2} = 1 - 3 \sin^{2} \phi_{L}$$

$$P_{3} = 3 \sin \phi_{L} - 5 \sin^{3} \phi_{L}$$

$$P_{4} = 3 - 30 \sin^{2} \phi_{L} + 35 \sin^{4} \phi_{L}$$

$$P_{5} = \sin \phi_{L} \cos \phi_{L}$$

$$P_{6} = \cos \phi_{L} (1 - 5 \sin^{2} \phi_{L})$$

$$P_{7} = \sin \phi_{L} \cos \phi_{L} (-3 + 7 \sin^{2} \phi_{L})$$

The constants used for the planet earth are as follows:

$$\mu = 1.407698 \times 10^{16} \text{ ft}^3/\text{sec}^2$$

$$R_e = 20,925,631 \text{ ft}$$

$$J = 1623.41 \times 10^{-6}$$

$$H = 6.04 \times 10^{-6}$$

$$K = 6.37 \times 10^{-6}$$

1

The polar radius used in the oblate earth calculations for latitude and altitude is  $R_p = 20,885,965$  ft.

#### APPENDIX B

## AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS

This appendix presents the aerodynamic coefficient data used for trajectory calculations. Sketches of the configurations are shown in Figure 1a through 1c in the main part of this report and in Figures C-1 through C-3 in Appendix C. These data were obtained from References 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14.

Tables B-1 and B-2 present the aerodynamics for the vehicle shown in Figure 1a, Table B-3 for the vehicle of 1b, and Tables B-4 and B-5 for the vehicle of 1c. Tables B-6 and B-7 show the aerodynamics for the vehicle shown in Figure C-1 and Table B-8 for the vehicle of C-3.

The configuration shown in Figure C-2 is the same as the configuration shown in Figure 1c in the main part of this report and its aerodynamics were given in Tables B-4 and B-5.

÷.,-



.

TABLE B-1

(L/D) = 1.89 CONFIGURATION LIFT COEFFICIENT DATA

TABLE B-2

(L/D) = 1.89 CONFIGURATION DRAG COEFFICIENT DATA

	to 100,000 ft				000 ft				000 ft				000 ft				000 ft			,
	h = 0. t			·	h = 185,			-	h = 220,				h = 250,				h = 300,	<b></b>		
.04	1.0	.891	.844	.821	.821	.821	.821	.821	.827	.827	.827	.827	.839	.839	.839	.839	.908	606'	606.	606.
35.	1.0	.673	.636	.624	.624	.624	.624	.624	.630	.630	.630	.630	.643	.643	.642	.642	.717	.717	.717	.717
30.	.675	.492	.458	.443	.443	643.	.443	.443	.450	.450	.450	.450	.463	.463	.463	.463	.542	.542	.542	.542
25.	.498	.339	.309	.304	.304	.304	.304	.304	.310	.310	.310	.310	.323	.323	.323	.323	.398	8é£.	.398	.398
20.	.359	.225	.196	.192	.192	.192	.192	.192	.198	.198	.198	.198	.210	.210	.210	.210	.283	.283	.283	.283
17.5	.301	.181	.157	.153	.301	.181	.157	.153	.301	.181	.157	.153	.301	.181	.157	.153	.301	.181	.157	.153
12.5	.210	.118	.098	.095	.210	.118	.098	.095	.210	.118	.098	.095	.210	.118	.098	.095	.210	.118	.098	.095
(deg)→ 7.5	.156	.086	.074	.074	.156	.086	.074	.074	.156	.086	.074	.074	.156	.086	.074	.074	.156	. uč6	.074	.074
Mach a		5.	<b>%</b>	20.	2.	5.	8.	20.	2.	5.	8.	20.	2.	5.	<b>%</b>	20.	2.	•••	<b>.</b>	20.

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

• • • •

 2

.

TABLE B-3

(L/D) = 2.2 CONFIGURATION LIFT AND DRAG COEFFICIENT DATA

<u>Mach</u> α (deg)→	<b>.</b>	4.	8.	12.	16.	20.	40.
		(Drag	Coeffici	ent <sup>C</sup> D)			
0.2	.0417	.0421	.0433	.0701	.1134	.1757	.300
1.2	.085	.086	060.	.114	.159	.247	.590
5.	.040	.045	.050	.0655	.0972	.146	.723
10.	.029	.025	.034	.0584	.089	.134	.622
20.	.032	.030	.035	.061	.0924	.136	.613
		(Lift	Coeffici	ent <sup>C</sup> L)			
0.2	075	.040	.159	.291	.448	.580	1.00
1.2 -	030	.078	.185	.297	.387	.530	1.00
5.	025	.034	.095	.167	.244	.326	.745
	028	.028	.033	.143	.209	.288	.697
20.	026	.017	.054	.134	.201	.276	.680

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

۰,

٠.

۰.

· '. '

.

C

		•			•	
Macha	(deg)→ 0.	4.	8.	12.	16.	20.
	02	.039	.100	.226	.350	.485
1.89	02	.039	.113	.204	.310	.420
3.0	04	.016	.113	.175	.274	.380
6.0	04	10.	.085	.137	.214	.295
8.0	045	.003	.065	.140	.219	.300
10.	045	.003	.065	.140	.219	.300

(L/D) = 2.6 CONFIGURATION NORMAL FORCE COEFFICIENT

TABLE B-4

-

.

•.

			- 1.1								- 3.0					
	ŀ	<b>.</b>	Mach -				<u></u>	┙		<b></b>	Mach -					≯
20.	.0628	.0638	.0660	.0672	.0842	.1292	.3092	.7592	.0246	.0252	.0263	.0272	.0280	.0350	.0545	.1416
16.	.0665	.0675	.0697	.0709	.0879	.1329	.3129	.7629	.0275	.0281	.0292	.0301	.0309	.0379	.0574	.1445
12.	.0700	.0710	.0732	.0744	.0914	.1364	.3164	.7664	.0313	.0319	.0330	.0340	.0347	.0417	.0612	.1483
8.	.0730	.0740	.0762	.0774	•0944	.1394	.3194	.7694	.0366	.0372	.0383	.0392	.0400	.0470	.0665	.1536
4.	.0755	.0765	.0787	.0799	•0960	.1419	.:2219	.7719	.0435	.0441	.0452	.0461	.0469	.0539	.0734	.1605
	.0778	.0788	.0810	.0822	.0992	.1442	.3242	.7742	.0506	.0512	.0523	.0532	.0540	.0601	.0805	.16/6
Ķft)\α(deg) →	· ·		·	·		·				·						
Alt (		4	8	10	15	20(	25(	30(	-	4(	õ	10	15(	20(	25(	30(

TABLE B-5

(L/D) = 2.6 CONFIGURATION AXIAL FORCE COEFFICIENT

	-		Mach 🚽 6	-				-			Mach = 10					
20.	.0140	-0144	.0155	.0160	.0167	.0228	.0377	.1069	.0130	.0133	.0139	.0143	.0149	.0184	.0299	.0842
16.	.0140	.0144	.0155	.0160	.0167	.0228	.0377	.1069	.0130	.0133	.0139	.0143	.0149	.0184	.0299	.0842
12.	.0140	.0144	.0155	.0160	.0167	.0228	.0377	.1069	.0130	.0133	.0139	.0143	.0149	.0184	.0299	.0842
8.	.0156	.0160	.0170	.0176	.0182	.0243	.0393	.1084	.0145	.0148	.0154	.0158	0165.	.0199	.0314	.0857
4.	.0188	.0192	.0203	.0208	.0215	.0275	.0425	.1116	.0178	.0181	.0187	.0191	.0198	.0232	.0347	.0890
	.0230	.0234	.0245	.0250	.0257	.0318	.0467	.1159	.0220	.0223	.0229	.0233	.0239	.0274	.0389	.0932
lt (K ft)/a (deg)	.0	40.	80.	100.	150.	200.	250.	300.	0.	40.	80.	100.	150.	200.	250.	300.

\_

TABLE B-5 (Concluded)

È.

į

C

TABLE B-6

LOW (L/D) CONFIGURATION NORMAL FORCE COEFFICIENT

Macha (deg) 🗕	•	5.	10.	15.	20.
<b>1€</b> 3	<b>.</b>	.030	.060	.117	.203
2.0	<b>.</b>	.032	.075	.168	.285
2.5	<b>.</b>	.035	.098	191.	.288
3.95	о.	.041	.093	.165	.248
4.63	<b>.</b>	.042	060.	.158	.225
10.	0	.032	.076	.136	.214

÷

C

TABLE B-7 LOW (L/D) CONFIGURATION AXIAL FORCE COEFFICIENT

1

← (đeš) →	0. .03559	5. .03559	10. .03484	15. .03258	20. .02808	Mach = 1.3
	.03664	.03664	.03589	.03363	.02913	
	.03874	.03874	.03799	.03573	.03123	
	.03934	.03934	.03859	.03633	.03183	
	.04054	.04054	.03979	.03753	.03303	
	.04310	.04310	.04335	.04009	.03559	
	.05754	.05754	.05679	.05453	.05003	
	.10699	.10699	.10624	.10398	.09948	
	.28699	.28699	.28624	.28398	.27948	>
	.02778	.02703	.02703	.02628	.02553	Mach = $2$ .
	.02816	.02741	.02741	.02666	.02591	
	.02868	.02793	.02793	.02718	.02643	
	.02943	.02868	.02868	.02793	.02718	
	.13048	.02973	.02973	.02898	.02923	
	.03153	.03078	.03078	.03003	.02928	
	.03348	.03273	.03273	.03198	.03123	
	.04293	.04218	.04218	.04143	.04068	
	.09568	.08493	.08493	.08418	.08343	
	.22218	.22143	.22143	.22068	.21993	►
	.02375	.02375	.02375	.02375	.02375	Mach = 2
	.02412	.02412	.02412	.02412	.02412	
	.02465	.02465	.02465	.02465	.02465	
	.02540	.02540	.02540	.02540	.02540	
	.02622	.02622	.02622	.02622	.02622	
	.02/35	.027.35	.02735	.02735	.02735	
	.02832	.02832	.02832	.02832	.02832	
	.03852	.03852	.03852	.03852	.03852	
	.07452	.07452	.07452	.07452	.07452	
	.20802	.20802	.20802	.20802	.20802	≯

. - .

.

.

`-. TABLE B-7 (Concluded)

	3.95				<u>-</u>			4.63							_			<b>10.</b>									
	Mach -						-	Mach =										Mach -									
20.	.02615 .02648	.02738	.02813	.02903	.03758	.06023	.07898	.02488	.02518	.02556	.02608	.02676	.02788	.02863	.03748	.05698	.07048	.01979	.01942	.01963	.01995	.02029	.02071	.02146	.02544	.04344	-09294
15.	.02314 .02347	.02437	.02512	.02602	.03457	.05722	.07597	.02112	.02142	.02180	.02232	.02300	.02412	.02487	.03372	.05322	.06672	.01596	.01609	.01630	.01662	.01696	.01738	.01813	.02211	.04011	.08961
10.	.02089 .02122 02156	.02212	.02287	.03377	.03232	.05497	.07372	.01812	.01842	.01880	.01932	.02000	.02112	.02187	.03072	.05022	.06372	.01331	.01344	.01365	.01397	.01431	.01473	.01548	.01946	.03746	.08696
5.	.02014 .02047	.02137	.02212	.02302	.03157	.05422	.07297	.01662	.01672	.01730	.01782	.01850	.01962	.02037	.02922	.04872	.06222	.01198	.01211	.01232	.01264	.01298	.01340	.01415	.01813	.03613	.08563
0.	.01864 .01897 01031	.01787	.02062	.02152	.03007	.05273	.07147	.01512	.01542	.01580	.01632	.01700	.01812	.01887	.02772	.04722	.06072	.01065	.01078	.01099	.01131	.01165	.01207	.01282	.01680	.03480	.08430
a(deg) 🗕																											
Alt (K ft)	20. 50.	وں . اور	80. - 20	150.	200.	250.	300.	0.	20.	40.	60.	80.	100.	150.	200.	250.	300.	0.	20.	40.	60.	80.	100.	150.	200.	250.	300.

.

••••

.

.

•...

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

. . .

2

ő
à
Щ
B
T

HIGH (L/D) CONFIGURATION AXIAL AND NORMAL FORCE COEFFICIENT

	c	0	000	001					
TACUTATE (RIE)		40.	80 <b>.</b>	·001	• DCT	200.	250.	300.	
6.0	.01050	.01120	.01270	.01400	.01332	.02087	.04280	.13394	
1.0	.01220	.01295	.01460	.01550	.01332	.02087	.04280	.13394	
1.5	.01060	.01130	.01250	.01350	.01332	.02087	.04280	.13394	
2.0	.00960	.01000	.01120	.01200	.01332	.02087	.04280	.13394	
3.0	.00780	.00825	.00930	.01000	.01110	.01751	.03580	.11413	
4.0	.00675	.00720	.00800	.00870	.00927	.01454	.02920	.09471	
6.0	.00490	.00520	.00600	.00640	.00692	.01147	.02272	.07470	
8.0	.00370	.00400	.00460	.00490	.00538	.00872	.01826	.06098	
10.0	.00260	.00285	.00330	.00360	.00408	.00669	.01533	.05614	
	Normal Fo	rce Coel	[[[clent						
a(deg) Mach 🔸	6.	1.0	1.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	8.0	10.
	<b>.</b>	••	<b>.</b>	<b>.</b>	•	0.	••	••	•
20.	.54	.62	.540	.480	.380	.330	.240	.180	.136

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

.

#### APPENDIX C

### REENTRY APPLICATIONS

### C-1. INTRODUCTION

Two different sets of data are presented to show the maneuvering capability available for lifting entry when two different types of controls are used. The first shown as data set 1 below, uses the single parameter control  $\phi_B = K\sigma$  discussed in the main part of this report. The second shown as data set 2 uses a combination of bank and angle-of-attack control to hold altitude constant after pull-out.

Three vehicles were used for this analysis: (1) a conventional circular missile having "low" (L/D) characteristics, (2) a reentry configuration having "medium" (L/D) characteristics, and (3) an aero-configured missile shape having "high" (L/D) characteristics. Sketches of these vehicles are shown in Figures C-1 through C-3 and the aerodynamic characteristics used are given in Appendix B. All three vehicles were used in developing data set 1 and the medium (L/D) vehicle was used to develop data set 2. All trajectories were initiated at 300,000 feet altitude and were terminated at a speed of 2,000 feet/second. This speed termination allowed the terminal altitude to vary from 50,000 to 80,000 feet. The data shown represent aerodynamic capability only. No constraints, such as aerodynamic heating have been imposed.

#### C-2. DATA SET 1, (L/D) MAX TRAJECTORIES

Reentry footprints were generated using (L/D) max and the single parameter control for the major portion of the footprint boundary and  $C_L$  max for minimum down-range. Initial conditions include entry velocities (inertial) which vary from 20,000 to 24,800 feet/second and entry path angles from -1.5 to -25 degrees. These data are shown in Figures C-4 through C-33. Data set 1 therefore contains a complete set of footprints for the three configurations and can be used as a reference for maneuvering capability available for a range of configuration types and initial conditions.

## C-3. DATA SET 2, CONSTANT ALTITUDE TURNS

This data set is for trajectories where the altitude is held constant during the turn. All trajectories were flown at zero bank angle and at L/D max until the initial pull-out,  $\gamma = 0$ . For straight down-range with no turns, the angle-of-attack was set 'o hold level flight after pull-out until L/D max was reached. From this point on the trajectories were flown at L/D max. For three-dimensional trajectories, turns were initiated at the pull-out point. The angle-of-attack was set to that required for L/D max and level flight was maintained by varying the bank angle. The footprints were generated by varying the amount of turn allowed. Once a specified heading change had been reached, the bank was set to zero and the altitude allowed to vary for the remainder of the trajectory.

Entry conditions include variations in initial velocity (inertial) from 12,000 to 25,800 feet/second and entry path angles from -5 to -25 degrees. Constant velocity (iso-velocity) contours are shown for 2000, 4000, 6000, 8000, and 10,000 feet/second.

The altitude at the initial pull-out point and the corresponding range are shown in Figures C-34 and C-35, respectively, for the parametric variations in entry velocity and path angle considered. The iso-velocity contours are shown in Figures C-36 through C-54. The dashed lire closing the back side of these contours represents the maximum amount of turn possible when using bank angle to maintain constant altitude during the turn with the angle-of-attack set for L/D max. To obtain a faster rate of turn than shown by the dashed line without increasing angle-of-attack a steeper bank angle would be required allowing altitude to decrease during the turn. A heading can be obtained for any of the possible trajectories within the envelope by taking a tangency point to this dashed line and drawing a straight line through the iso-velocity contours. An example is shown in Figure C-36 for changes in heading  $\Delta \sigma$ , of 30, 45, and 90 degrees.

ŝ

Data set 2 (Figures C-36 through C-54) then contains a set of footprints for the medium L/D configuration showing the maneuvering capability available if the turn is performed at level altitude after pull-out. The pull-out altitude is the same as used in data set 1. Hence, a comparison of data set 2 with the medium L/D configuration of data set 1 (Figures C-14 to C-23) shows the large loss in maneuvering due to the constant altitude turn.

For example comparing an entry velocity of 25800 feet/second it can be seen that the maximum cross-range of 3200 nmi of Figure C-21 is much larger than the 930 nmi of Figure C-46.



E,

ן -די







\_\_\_\_

 · · · ·

۰.





AFWAL-TR-82-3036

Ý



Figure C-7. Low (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -4°

**CIRCULAR MISSILE** 

83

5

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

÷.,





٠v'

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

C

84



LOW (L/D)

δ<sub>E</sub> =-7.5°

**θ = 0 = 0**°

σ<sub>i</sub> = 90°





•

LOW (L/D) Y<sub>E</sub>=-10.0° G<sub>i</sub>=90.0°



(



AFWAL-TR-82-3036

•

.



Ċ



MEDIUM (L/D)

¥E=-1.5°

06 = 90°





MEDIUM (L/D)  $\delta_{E} = -2.0^{\circ}$   $\sigma_{i} = 90^{\circ}$   $\Theta = \phi = 0^{\circ}$ W/S = 70 PSF



CROSS-RANGE~KN.MI.

Figure C-15. Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -2°

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

AFWAL-TR-82-3036 9 (V<sub>1</sub>)<sub>i</sub>=25,800 fps 14 12 **9** DOWN- RANGE~KN.MI. 24,000 W/S=70 PSF MEDIUM (L/D) λ<sub>E</sub> = -3.0° 00 0¦=90° **⊖=∅=**0° 22,000 ø 20,000 4 00 2 CROSS-RANGE~KN.MI.

Figure C-l6. Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -3°

÷.



Ċ

.....

Ū

MEDIUM (L/D)

لا<sub>E</sub>=-5.0°

06=10°

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

•**0=∅=**0°

W/S=70 PSF



Figure C-i8. Medium (L/U) Footprint, Entry Angle = -5°

÷

CROSS-RANGE~KN.MI.



-----

•

MEDIUM (L/D)

°0=∅=0°

95

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

.

.

.

11 - 11 - 11 1

. .

. .

T
MEDIUM (L/D)

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

٠Ľ

0¦=90°





.

Figure C-20. Medium (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -10°

•

1

•

· · .



MEDIUM (L/D)

T







.



CROSS-RANGE~KN.MI.

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

.

C

1



Figure C-26. High (L/D) lootprint, Entry Angle 7 -3°





. . . .

.

<u>.</u>

HIGH (T/D)

**ξ**E=-7.5°

06=10°

14



Figure C-29. High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -7.5°

AFWAL-TR-82-3036  $(V_{1})_{i} = 25,800$  fps 16 4 Figure C-30. High (L/U) Footprint, Entry Angle =  $-10^{\circ}$ 12 DOWN-RANGE ~KN.MI. 24,000 10 HIGH (L/D) ¥e=-10° 0 = Ø = 0° 0;= 90° ω 22,000 G 20,000 ¢ 2 5 0 N 0 4 CROSS-RANGE~KN.MI.

. .

ļ

1.

-

HIGH (L/D)

**χ<sub>E</sub> = - 15°** 

C







Figure C-32. High (L/D) Footprint, Entry Angle = -20°

•





\_\_\_\_

.

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

.

.

T

HIGH (L/D)

C



Figure C-34. Medium (L/D) Pull-Out Altitudes

.







ſ



AFWAL-TR-82-3036



CROSS-RANGE~100 N.MI.

MEDIUM L/D

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

. 



AFWAL-TR-82-3036

. . .



.









ß





٠.



Figure C-45. Medium (L/D) Iso-Velocity Contours, (V<sub>I</sub>)<sub>i</sub>=20,000 fps,  $\gamma_e^{}$  = -15°

 **ISO-VELOCITY CONTOURS** 

MEDIUM L}D

j

J

· \_ ·

(t





MEDIUM LID

1

## **ISO-VELOCITY CONTOURS**





figure C-43. Medium (L/D) Isu-Velouity Contours, (V\_I)  $_1$ -16,000 fps,  $\gamma_e$  = -20°

7

.



•

Figure C-49. Medium (L/D) Iso-Velocity Contours, (V $_{I})_{i}$ =20,000 fps,  $\gamma_{e}$  = -20°

MEDIUM LÌD

AFWAL-TR-82-3036



C

· .



.



•.

- -

DOMN-BANGE~N.MI.

127

AFWAL-TR-82-3036

÷.,

...

MEDIUM LO

`•



Figure C-52. Medium (1/D) Iso-Velocity Contours,  $(V_{i})_{i}$ =16,000 fps, Ye = -23<sup>3</sup>



MEDIUM LO

# **ISO-VELOCITY CONTOURS**

**T** 

1

.



I.

`\_ • •

## REFERENCES

- L. D. Peterson, <u>Trajectory Optimization by Method of Steepest</u> <u>Descent: Formulation</u>, <u>AFFDL-TR-67-108 Vol I</u>, Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, December 1967.
- D. T. Johnson, <u>Performance Estimation of Unpowered High Lifting</u> <u>Reentry Vehicles</u>, FDMG TM 65-16, Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, February 1965.
- 3. C. Bursey, D. Johnson, R. Nash, "Lifting Entry Vehicles Performance Analysis Methods,: AIAA Paper No. 1665, Astrodynamics Conference, Danvers, Massachusetts, August 1980.
- D. S. Hague, "An Introduction to Multivariable Search Technique for Parameter Optimization," N68-19041, The Boeing Co., Seattle, Washington, 1968.
- D. Hague, R. Jones, C. Glatt, <u>Combat Optimization and Analysis</u> <u>Program-COAP-Parameter Optimization Subprogram Manual</u>, AFFDL-TR-71-52 Vol. IV, Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AF3, Ohio, August 1971.
- 6. F. O. Young, <u>Six-Degree-of-Freedom Flight Path Study Generalized</u> Computer Program (SDFCP), AFFDL-TR-75-1, Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, July 1975.
- A. Thomas, A. Perlbachs, A. Nagel, <u>Advanced Re-entry Systems Heat</u> <u>Transfer Manual for Hypersonic Flight</u>, AFFDL-TR-65-195, <u>Lir Force</u> Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, October 1966.
- 8. Rockwell International, Space Division, <u>Aerodynamic Design Data</u> Book, Vol. I, October 1978.
- 9. J. H. Porter, Jr, <u>Static Force Tests of the MRRV Hypersonic</u> <u>Configuration at Mach Numbers 2-5, AEDC-TSR-79-V43</u>.
- 10. Valentine Dahlem, <u>Summary of Aerodynamic Characteristics of the</u> FDL-6 High L/D Configuration, AFFDL-TR-72-48, July, 1972
- 11. Private communication with G. L. Burke of AFWAL/FIMG.
- 12. DISSPLA User Information Manual, Integrated Software Systems Corporation and Control Data Corporation, 1974.
- 13. E. B. Graves, <u>Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Monoplanar Missile</u> <u>Concept with Bodies of Circular and Elliptical Cross Section</u>, NASA TM-74079, 1977.
- AFWAL-TR-80-3071. Vol IV, <u>Aero-Configured Missile Development</u>, Phase I, Experimental Program, 1980.
AFWAL-TR-82-3036

0

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, R., Bruelle, R., Griffin, G., <u>Six-Degree-or-Freedom Flight</u> <u>Path Study Generalized Computer Program</u>, WADD-TR-60-781, Flight Dynamics Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, May 1961.
- Fay, J. A., Riddell, F. R., "Theory of Stagnation Point Heat Transfer in Disassociated Air," Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, Vol. 25, No. 2, Feb 1958.

+U.E. COVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1889 - 659-062/754

132