

USAAEFA PROJECT NO. 81-01-3

FUEL CONSERVATION EVALUATION OF U.S. ARMY HELICOPTERS, PART 3 UH-1H FLIGHT TESTING

FINAL REPORT

FLOYD DOMINICK PROJECT OFFICER

FRED STELLAR CPT, AR US ARMY PROJECT ENGINEER DONALD L. UNDERWOOD MAJ, AD US ARMY PROJECT PILOT



AUGUST 1982

DTIC FILE COPY

the day in the

AD A 1 25667

÷

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

UNITED STATES ARMY AVIATION ENGINEERING FLIGHT ACTIVITY EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA 93523

095

the second s

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

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

DISPOSITION INSTRUCTIONS

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

TRADE NAMES

The use of trade names in this report does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of the commercial hardware and software.

AND LAND

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCE	SSION NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
USAAEFA PROJECT NO. 81-01-3 AD-A/2	5667
4. TITLE (a d Subilitio)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE
FUEL CONSERVATION EVALUATION OF U.S. ARMY	FINAL Feb-Mar 1981
HELICOPTERS, PART 3 UH-1H FLIGHT TESTING	
	5. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(=)	B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(B)
FRED STELLAR DONALD L. UNDERWOOD	
FLOID DOMINICK	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAS
US ARMY AVN ENGINEERING FLIGHT ACTIVITY	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE. CA 93523	
20	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
US ARMY AVN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT COMMAND	AUGUST 1982
4300 GOODFELLOW BOULEVARD	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
ST. LOUIS, MO 63120	86
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling	Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
	UNCLASSIFIED
	ISA DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING
	SCHEDULE
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 de	Limited.
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	limited.
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	limited.
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by block 11. June 1. Flight Desfermence	Limited.
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebatteet entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by bloc UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum	Limited. Illerent from Report) ck number) h Altitude Potor Steed
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by block UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise	limited. Ilferent from Report) ck number) h Altitude h Rotor Speed
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by block UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise	limited. ((ferent from Report) ck number) 1 Altitude 1 Rotor Speed
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstrect entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary and identify by block UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise	limited. ((ferent from Report) ck number) h Altitude h Rotor Speed
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by bloc UH-IH Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if mercenary and identify by bloc	limited. Illerent from Report) ck number) h Altitude h Rotor Speed h mumber)
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by block UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 24. ABSTRACT (Canthus an reverse aide if necessary and identify by block The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-1H helico the most fuel efficient operating characteries sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-1H performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM)	<pre>limited. limited. limited</pre>
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse alde if necessary and identify by bloc UH-IH Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse alde H messersty and identify by bloc The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-IH helico the most fuel efficient operating characteris sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-IH performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM) were significant at all test conditions.ex-	<pre>limited. if(ferent from Report) ck number) A Altitude Rotor Speed ck number) Flight Activity conducted leve pter to provide data to determin istics. Hot and cold weather tes ach number data range to suplemen oreliminary analysis, range can b and rotor speed compared to 0. Rotor compressibility effects </pre>
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered to Black 20, 11 de 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide 11 necessary and identify by block UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse aide 11 necessary and identify by block The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-1H helico the most fuel efficient operating characteris sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-1H performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM) were significant at all test conditions are DD, JAM 75 1473 EDITION OF ' NOVES IS OPPOLETE UNC	<pre>limited. ((forent from Report) (forent from Report) () () () () () () () () () () () () ()</pre>
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by bloc UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 24. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse aide if measures and identify by bloc The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-1H helico the most fuel efficient operating characteris sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-1H performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM) were significant at all test conditions are DD, JAM 75 1473 EDITION OF ' NOV SE IS OBSOLETE UN SECU	<pre>((forent from Report) ((forent from Report) ck number) Altitude Rotor Speed ck number) (Flight Activity conducted leve pter to provide data to determin istics. Hot and cold weather tes ach number data range to supplemen preliminary analysis, range can b and rotor speed compared to). Rotor compressibility effect: CLASSIFIED mity CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Dete En </pre>
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary and identify by bloc UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 24. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse at if measured y and identify by bloc The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-1H helico the most fuel efficient operating characteris sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-1H performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM) were significant at all test conditions. DD, JAM 75 1473 EDITION OF ' NOV 65 IS OPEOLETE UNK SECU	<pre>ifferent from Report) ck number) Altitude Rotor Speed k number) Flight Activity conducted leve pter to provide data to determin istics. Hot and cold weather tes ach number data range to supplemen preliminary analysis, range can be and rotor speed compared to . Rotor compressibility effect: CLASSIFIED mity CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date En</pre>
Approved for public release; distribution uni 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by bloc UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 24. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by bloc The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-1H helico the most fuel efficient operating characteris sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-1H performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM) were significant at all test conditions DD , JAM 73 EDWINCH OF 1 MOVES IS OBSOLETE DATA	Ifferent from Report) (ferent from Report) a Altitude a Rotor Speed (Flight Activity conducted leve pter to provide data to determin istics. Hot and cold weather tes ach number data range to supplemen preliminary analysis, range can be and rotor speed compared to). Rotor compressibility effect: CLASSIFIED mity CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data En
Approved for public release; distribution unl 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in Block 20, if di 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by bloc UH-1H Level Flight Performance Optimum Expanded Rotor Mach Number Range Optimum Optimum Cruise 24. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse aide if necessary and identify by bloc The United States Army Aviation Engineering flight performance tests of the UH-1H helico the most fuel efficient operating characteris sites were used to extend the advancing tip Ma existing YUH-1H performance data. Based on p increased significantly at optimum altitude sea level and normal rotor speed (324 RPM) were significant at all test conditions DD, "ONE 1473 EDMON OF ' NOV SE IS OFFICE TON SECU	Ifferent from Report) ck number) A Altitude A Rotor Speed th number) Flight Activity conducted leve pter to provide data to determin- istics. Hot and cold weather tes ach number data range to supplemen- preliminary analysis, range can b- and rotor speed compared to b. Rotor compressibility effect: CLASSIFIED mity CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data En-

the state of the second st



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY HQ, US ARMY AVIATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND 4300 GOODFELLOW BOULEVARD, ST. LOUIS, MO 63120

DRDAV-D

SUBJECT: Directorate for Development and Qualification Position on the Final Report of USAAEFA Project No. 81-01-3, Fuel Conservation Evaluation of US Army Helicopters, Part 3, UH-1H Flight Testing

SEE DISTRIBUTION

1. The purpose of this letter is to establish the Directorate for Development and Qualification position on the subject report. The report documents part 3 of a 5 part effort which involves performance flight testing of the UH-1H to obtain performance data and determine the most efficient operating characteristics. Part 1 involved conducting a flight operation improvement analysis. Part 2 was initiated to develop and evaluate flight manual data designed for optimizing fuel conservation. Parts 3, 4 and 5 entail flight testing of the UH-1H, OH-58C, and AH-1S which is specifically oriented towards obtaining performance data applicable to fuel conservation. The part 3 evaluation conducted by the US Army Aviation Engineering Flight Activity (USAAEFA) consisted of obtaining detailed comprehensive performance data for the UH-1H in both hot and cold temperatures. The UH-1H Operator's Manual is currently being revised to increase the basic drag level defined in this report. A future change will incorporate performance data to emphasize optimum cruise techniques.

2. This Directorate agrees with the report conclusions and recommendations.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

CHARLES C. CRAWFORD, JK. Director of Development and Qualification

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

;

12

Contra in value of an and

Background	1
Test Objectives	1
Description	l
Test Scope	2
Test Methodology	2

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GeneralGeneral	3
Level Flight Performance	3
General	3
Comparison with YUH-1H	4
Configuration Variation	4
Engineering Parameter Validation	4
Rotor Speed Effects	5
Optimum Cruise Mission	5
Engine Performance	6
Power Available	6
Fuel Consumption	6
Handling Qualities	7
General	7
Simulated Engine Failures	7
Controllability	8
Vibration	9
Optimum Cruise Analysis	9
Engine Effects	9
Rotor Speed Effects	10
Altitude and Temperature Effects	11
Airspeed - Windspeed Effects	14
Optimum Clicb and Descent Schedules	14
Optimum Cruise Summary	15
CONCLUSIONS	16
RECOMMENDATIONS	17



Clei

۰.

Page

APPENDIXES

۸.	References	- 18
Β.	Detailed Helicopter Description	19
с.	Test Instrumentation	27
D.	Test Techniques and Data Analysis Methods	31
Ε.	Graphical Test Data	41

DISTRIBUTION

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The US Army is emphasizing fuel conservation in the operation 1. of aircraft. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DCSLOG), Aviation Logistics Office/Special Assistant (DALO-AV) requested the US Army Aviation Engineering Flight Activity (USAAEFA) provide data concerning the potential fuel savings of flying helicopters with doors closed. Analysis of existing data indicated the effect of door position on fuel consumption was negligible. However, it was suggested (ref 1, app A) that cruising at optimum rotor speed and altitude could reduce fuel consumption on specific flights up to 50 percent and overall Army Aviation fuel consumption by 5 percent or more. The US Army Aviation Research and Development Command (AVRADCOM) requested USAAEFA conduct the fuel conservation program on the UH-1H (refs 2, 3, and 4, app A). A project proposal (ref 5) and test plan (ref 6) were prepared in response to these requests.

TEST OBJECTIVES

2. The overall objective was to obtain flight test data to determine the most fuel efficient operating characteristics.

3. Specific test objectives were as follows:

a. Provide quantitative and qualitative flight test data for determining optimum cruise techniques.

b. Evaluate the production test aircraft performance and update the performance baseline on the 1960 model prototype aircraft (ref 7, app A).

c. Gather additional data to investigate rotor blade compressibility and its effect on fuel consumption.

DESCRIPTION

4. The UH-1H is a thirteen-place single engine helicopter using a single two-bladed teetering main rotor and a two-bladed pusher tail rotor. The maximum gross weight is 9500 pounds. Power is provided by a Lycoming T53-L-13B free turbine engine rated at 1400 shaft horsepower (SHP) at sea level standard day conditions. The main rotor transmission is limited to 1100 SHP for continuous operation. The test aircraft, US Army serial number 69-15532, is a standard production UH-1H. A more complete description of the aircraft is presented in appendix B, the detail specification (ref 8, app A) and the operator's manual (ref 9, app A).

TEST SCOPE

5. During this evaluation, level flight performance tests were conducted. A total of 31 flights yielded 28.5 productive test hours. Eleven cold we ther $(-7^{\circ}C \text{ to } -16^{\circ}C)$ flights were conducted in the vicinity of St. Paul, Minnesota from 18 February through 13 March 1981. Ten hot weather (16°C to 33°C) flights were the vicinity of El Centro, California from conducted in ll August through 17 August 1981, and ten test flights were performed at Edwards Air Force Base, California from 25 August through 18 December 1981. Some test conditions of the previously tested YUH-1H (ref 7, app A) were duplicated. Flight restrictions in the airworthiness release issued by AVRADCOM and operating limitations contained in the operator's manual (ref 9, app A) were observed during the evaluation.

6. These tests were conducted at various referred rotor speeds $(N_R/\sqrt{\theta})$ over an actual rotor speed range from minimum (294 rpm) to maximum (324 rpm). To allow maximum possible variation of airspeed and rotor tip Mach number, tests were conducted at low to moderate thrust coefficients (C_T) of 26.0 to 35.5 x 10⁻⁴. Most of the tests were conducted in a clean configuration (windows and doors closed), mid average longitudinal and lateral center of gravity (cg) (FS 137.0, BL 0.0), with engine bleed air OFF, and zero sideslip. One flight was conducted with an Infrared (IR) Suppressor and IR jammer installed. Hot weather tests were flown with cockpit windows and vents open.

TEST METHODOLOGY

7. Established engineering flight test techniques and data reduction procedures were used (ref 10, app A). Test methods are also briefly discussed in the Results and Discussion section of this report. A Vibration Rating Scale (VRS) (fig. D-1, app D) was used to augment crew comments relative to aircraft vibration levels. Ratings of handling qualities were based on a Handling Qualities Rating Scale (HQRS) (fig. D-2, app D). Flight test data were obtained from calibrated test instrumentation and were recorded on magnetic tape. A detailed listing of the test instrumentation is contained in appendix C. Data analysis methods are described in appendix D.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GENERAL

8. Level flight performance tests were conducted to provide data to determine the most fuel efficient operating characteristics. Emphasis was placed on expanding the Mach number range of data available to aid the analysis of compressibility effects and supplement data available for the prototype YUH-IH. The basic test configuration was clean with doors and windows closed, mid lateral and longitudinal center of gravity, and zero sideslip. The production UH-1H test aircraft showed a drag increase of approximately one ft^2 (~5%) equivalent flat plate area over the prototype. The referred rotor speed technique of flying level flight performance test was found to be valid for the UH-1H and should be used for most of future level flight performance tests. The constant rotor speed technique should still be used to achieve maximum Mach number range at the extreme temperature conditions. The validity of the $C_{\rm T}$ and $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ parameters should be checked near their extreme test values. Analysis indicates that a potential range improvement of more than 100% and fuel saving as much as 50% exists for certain conditions. Optimum cruise data should be made available to operational units as early as practical.

LEVEL FLIGHT PERFORMANCE

General

9. Level flight performance tests were conducted to determine the power required for level flight and specific range versus airspeed. Emphasis was placed on expanding the Mach number range to the maximum extent practical. The thrust coefficient range was from 26 to 35.5×10^{-4} . This allowed for maximum possible airspeed (and Mach number) variation. An advancing tip Mach number range from .69 to .96 was achieved using the full allowable rotor speed range of 294 to 324 rpm. The power available from the test engine was approximately 13% lower than that available for the reference 7 tests which precluded expanding the thrust coefficient range to investigate blade stall (as requested in ref 3). One test was conducted to determine the effect of an infrared (IR) Suppressor and Jammer installation. Constant C_T was maintained for each test by using either the constant rotor speed or the constant referred rotor speed technique. Test results are shown on figures 1 through 31, appendix E.

Comparison with YUH-1H

10. The power required for the YUH-1H is compared to the UH-1H test data on figures 1, 10 through 16, and 25 through 30 in appendix E for those conditions within the Mach number range of the reference 7 tests. At typical cruise speeds the UH-1H shows slightly higher power required than the YUH-1H. Converted to equivalent flat plate area, the power increase varies from 0 to 2.1 square feet with an average of approximately 1.0 square feet. Several external equipment changes from the prototype to the production airframe might account for the drag difference. These include: roof mounted pitot~static probe, roof mounted FM homing antenna, and tailboom mounted anticollision light. A more complete description of the differences is included in appendix B. The baseline data from reference 7, appendix A, should be corrected by the apparent one square foot drag difference ence for operator's manual use.

il. The low speed range also shows a difference in power required. Although there is substantial variation, the general trend at the lowest speeds tested is less power required for the production aircraft than the prototype. The reason for this has not been determined.

Configuration Variation

12. One level flight performance test was conducted with the Garrett Hot Metal Plus Plume IR Suppressor and AN/ALQ-144 IR Jammer installed. Results are compared to the clean YUH-1H data (ref 7) on figure 30, appendix E. The data indicates an increase in drag of approximately 2.2 square feet at cruise speed. The hot weather flights were conducted with cockpit windows and vents open. Figures 22 and 23, appendix E at similar conditions show no apparent drag change for this configuration variation.

Engineering Parameter Validation

13. This test program was flown using both the constant referred rotor speed $(N/\sqrt{\theta})$ and constant actual rotor speed (W/σ) methods. Those tests using the $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ method are designated on the appendix E data by noting the average $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ value. From the test results it appears the best procedure for most conditions is to use the $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ technique. The W/σ technique should be used with the highest rotor speed at the coldest temperature, and the lowest rotor speed at the warmest temperature to obtain the maximum possible variation of blade tip Mach number. The validity of the engineering parameters, C_T and $N/\sqrt{\theta}$, was clacked by repeating some tests at the

same C_T and $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ but differing conditions of pressure altitude, ambient temperature, rotor speed, and gross weight. An example of such a comparison is shown on figure 31. Within the range of data the $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ and C_T parameters appear valid for the UH-1H. The validity of the C_T and $N/\sqrt{\theta}$ parameters should be checked near the extreme values by repeating them at as widely different dimensional conditions as possible.

Rotor Speed Effects

14. The effect of rotor speed on UH-IH cruise power and fuel flow at fairly typical conditions was directly demonstrated on one flight. The purpose of the test flight was to define the level flight power required from 20 knots to maximum airspeed at an aim gross weight to air density ratio of 7400 lb, for rotor speeds of 294 and 324 rpm. Temperature varied from -11.4 °C to -6.0 °C over the flight. Results are shown on figures 1 and 6, appendix E. For the 324 rpm test, average fuel flow was 77 gal/hr. Maximum speed achieved was 123 knots true airspeed (KTAS) and this required 1140 SHP. Fuel flow at this point was 105 gal/hr or 714 lb/hr. For the 294 rpm test, average fuel flow was 45 gal/ hr. Maximum speed achieved was 126 KTAS, which required 824 SHP. Fuel flow at this point was 82 gal/hr or 564 lb/hr. Comparison of maximum and average fuel consumption rates provides a graphic example of the effects of rotor speed.

Optimum Cruise Mission

15. Operational type missions were flown to provide a more realistic comparison of potential fuel savings than derived from engineering data. No corrections were made for winds or route of flight. On the ferry flight from Edwards AFB, to El Centro, California, (198 nautical miles) approximate optimum profiles were flown. Takeoff weight was 7900 lb. A maximum power cruise climb was made to an enroute altitude of 9500 feet at a free air temperature of 16°C using 314 rotor rpm. Wind was forcast as a 15 knot quartering tailwind. Optimum rotor speed (below 7500 lb) would have been 294 rpm at an optimum altitude of approximately 7000 feet. This rotor speed was undesirable because of degraded flying qualities in the existing moderate turbulence (para 22). The 314 rotor rpm used, required the higher optimum altitude. The direct flight took 1.5 hours and consumed 122 gallons. On the return flight to Edwards AFB "normal" low level (1000-1500 ft above ground level (AGL)) flight procedures were used at a rotor speed of 324 rpm. Air temperature was approximately 25°C and wind was forcast as calm. Takeoff weight was again 7900 lbs. A fuel stop was made at Palm Springs, California to insure adequate reserves. The flight took 2.1 hours (total of 3.5 hours

Strang - Baran & R. PE

enroute time), consuming a total of 207 gallons. Distance was 201 nautical miles. The comparison flights illustrate the general benefit of increased range which in this case reduced both flight time and total trip time in addition to saving fuel by eliminating a fuel stop.

ENGINE PERFORMANCE

16. Test engine performance data were obtained throughout these tests. The test engine (T53-L-13B S/N LE 20825B) was calibrated by the Corpus Christi Army Depot prior to the tests. This engine had two major overhauls and at the start of the test had 2343 total hours and 623 hours since overhaul. Relatively low maximum power (as limited by maximum N₁ setting) was available, compared to those engines used for the reference 7 tests. Fuel consumption, however, was still low compared to the model specification (ref 11) applicable at the time of the reference 7 tests. Accessory bleed air useage has changed since the prototype tests. The prototype used a bleed air driven fuel boost pump, while the production boost pumps are electrical. The production aircraft uses bleed air to scavenge the particle separator, while the prototype did not. Referred engine characteristics are shown in figures 32 through 34, appendix E.

Fower Available

17. The test engine just met the field acceptance criteria for military power available (3% less than specification power). To achieve this power, the engine was set at 101.1% gas producer speed (with 101.5% maximum allowable). By comparison, the test engines used during earlier tests (ref 7) produced approximately 10% more than specification power at gas producer speed trim values of approximately 96%.

Fuel Consumption

18. Although power available is significantly degraded, the test engine fuel consumption is comparable to the early T53-L-13 engines. Specific fuel consumption data from the engine calibration are compared to the model specification (fight 11) at 6600 output shaft rpm on figure A. Measured fuel flow rate was less than the model specification curve.



Figure A. T53-L-13 Engine Specific Fuel Consumption

At a given power the engine calibration data shows a fuel flow decrease of 15 to 25 lb/hr as output shaft speed is reduced from 6600 to 6000 rpm. The specific fuel consumption (SFC) curve (ref 11 for 6600 rpm) on figure A can be closely approximated by:

SFC = $0.4933 + 2791/(SHP/\delta_1 \sqrt{\theta_1})^{1.4}$

In the absence of a current model specification computer program, this was used to define the specific range fairings on figures 1 through 30, appendix E.

HANDLING QUALITIES

General

7

19. A limited qualitative handling qualities evaluation was conducted throughout these tests. Particular emphasis was placed on operations at the lower rotor speeds (below 3 4 rpm) for which little recent experience exists. The following paragraphs discuss simulated engine failures, controllability and vibration.

Simulated Engine Failures

20. Autorotational entry characteristics of the UH-14 helicopter to simulated power failure were evaluated by rapidly turning the throttle twist grip to the flight idle position, with the collective control position held fixed for a period of 2 seconds or

7

AND AND AND

until pilot corrective action was required, whichever came first. Tests were conducted in level flight at 86 KTAS at an average gross weight of 7320 pounds, a density altitude of 5000 feet, and rotor speeds of 324 and 300 rpm. Main rotor speed was the determining factor in initiating corrective action. Rotor speed dropped rapidly following throttle chop to a minimum of 267 rpm. Corrective action was initiated as rotor speed passed through 294 rpm by lowering the collective, lowering the nose, rolling level and correcting for heading. To regain rotor speed, the collective was lowered in a smooth continuous motion. During all tests, rotor speed was re-established between 314 and 324 rpm within 2-3 seconds after collective was lowered. No unusual handling qualities or vibrations were experienced during the test and the autorotational entry characteristics were satisfactory.

21. An Army study (ref 12) indicated mast separation accidents might be caused by excessive flapping at low rotor speeds following sudden engine failures. This question should be resolved. To Insure an operational low rotor speed warning, the threshold was reset to 293 rpm for this project. This was an easily accomplished organizational maintenance procedure. The low rotor speed warning threshold is currently set at 300 to 310 rpm. The normal setting should be lowered to 290 to 294 rpm so the warning system will be active at the proposed lower cruise rotor speeds.

Controllability

Level Marsh

22. The handling qualities of the UH-IH were qualitatively evaluated and compared with previous UH-1H tests to determine if the handling characteristics were significantly affected by operation at lower rotor speeds. The only appreciable difference in handling qualities noted at lower rotor speeds was reduced controllability in all three axes at rotor speeds below 314 rpm. The reduced controllability characteristics were perceived as aircraft response becoming more sluggish with decreasing rotor speed during maneuvering flight, and increasing yaw and roll gust response during flight in turbulent conditions. The overall effect was an increase in pilot workload to maintain trim flight while maneuvering or operating in light to moderate turbulence (HQRS 4). Rotor speeds below 314 rpm should be used only for cruise flight in less than moderate turbulence and aggressive maneuvering should be avoided. No low airspeed tests were accomplished. However, based on the directional control difficulties reported in reference 7, all low airspeed operations should be conducted with maximum rotor speed (324 rpm).

Vibration

23. Vibration characteristics were evaluated qualitatively during all tests. The vibration characteristics did not appear to change significantly with changes in density altitude at the limit airspeeds. At the colder temperatures (below 0°C), pilot station 2/rev vibration levels at 324 and 314 rpm were generally low (VRS 3) at minimum airspeeds and increased continuously to severe at maximum airspeed (123 KTAS) (VRS 7). At rotor speeds from 314 rpm to the minimum tested (294 rpm) vibration levels were very low (VRS 2) throughout the airspeed range, except at maximum airspeed (above 116 KTAS) where they abruptly changed to very high amplitudes (VRS 7). The high vibration levels at 324 rpm are thought to be due to compressibility effects (advancing tip Mach number above 0.95 at the maximum airspeeds) which is well beyond wind tunnel test drag and moment divergence for the rotor airfoil section. The sudden increase in vibration levels at the maximum airspeed at 294 rpm may have been due to blade stall or Mach divergence on the retreating blade. Although not necessarily related to the high vibration levels, accelerated pitch-change-link rod-end-bearing wear became apparent during preflight inspections. This may have been caused by the high Mach numbers, lower rotor speeds or some other factor. The bearings were replaced during the cold weather tests. They were approaching maximum wear tolerance at the end of the project. Loads associated with the lower (294) rotor rpm should be reviewed. The impact of increased use of low rotor speed on component lives should be determined.

OPTIMUM CRUISE ANALYSIS

24. The majority of the information in this section is based on data derived from the level flight summary data in reference 7 and the engine model specification (ref 11) available during the reference 7 tests. The derivation methods are described in paragraph 17, appendix D.

Engine Effects

25. A large part of the gain in cruise performance comes from operating the engine at more efficient conditions. This is best illustrated by the engine specific fuel consumption curve in figure A (para 18). Examining the referred power parameter, SHP/ $\delta_1 \sqrt{\theta_1}$, implies that higher power, lower inlet pressure (higher altitude) and lower inlet temperature improve engine fuel efficiency.

Rotor Speed Effects

26. Primary factors influencing optimum cruise rotor speed are advancing blade drag effects, retreating blade drag effects and optimum engine power turbine speeds relative to rotor operating speeds. If retreating blade effects dominate, optimum rotor speed will tend to be high. If advancing blade effects dominate, optimum rotor speed will tend to be low. Optimum turbine speed may shift optimum rotor speed either way or have no effect. The UH-1H optimum rotor speed is always at or below minimum allowable rotor speed. Optimum turbine speed for the T53-L-13 engine is generally below allowable equivalent rotor speed. From the test engine calibration data, fuel flow at equivalent power decrease 15 to 25 lb/hr with reduced output shaft speed from 6600 to 6000 rpm (324 to 294 rotor rpm). Sufficient data were not available to develop a reliable relationship of fuel flow variation with turbine speed. This relationship is normally obtained from the engine model specification computer program. The predominant effect of rotor speed for the UH-1H is variation of power required with advancing rotor tip Mach number (compressibility) because of the relatively high rotational tip speed. This effect is shown for typical cruise conditions on figure B over the possible operational ambient temperature range as power required versus ambient temperature for three rotor speeds with advancing rotor tip Mach number noted. Compressibility effects for the UH-IH were significant at all test conditions and considerable fuel savings resulted from operating at minimum rotor speeds.



Figure B. Effect of Rotor Speed and Temperature on YUH-1H Power Required for Level Flight

时,这种的时候,我们

Altitude and Temperature Effects

27. The primary effect of altitude is the improvement in engine fuel efficiency through the pressure ratio parameter δ_1 . An additional effect is through the $\sqrt{\theta}_1$ parameter since temperature normally decreases with increasing altitude. The effect of altitude on fuel flow at a constant power is shown on figure C for three temperature conditions.





The variation of power required for level flight with altitude depends on the particular helicopter design and conditions of weight, altitude, temperature, rotor speed and airspeed. The general trend, for airspeeds near cruise speed, is approximately constant power (slight increase or decrease depending on conditions) up to some altitude above which a sharp increase in power required for level flight occurs. The altitude at which this increase occurs also depends on flight conditions. An example

11

LANK CARDY F ANY

of the variation in power required with altitude at typical cruise conditions is shown on figure D.



Figure D. Effect of Altitude and Temperature on YUH-1H Level Flight Power

12

. Lu

BARKEL NOT A THREE

The combined effects on cruise performance of the variation of the power required for level flight and the improvement in engine fuel efficiency with increased altitude are shown on figure E as specific range versus pressure altitude. Optimum altitude occurs where the increase in fuel flow caused by increasing power with altitude equals the decrease in fuel flow caused by the improving engine fuel efficiency with increased altitude.



Figure E. Effect of Altitude and Temperature on YUH-1H Specific Range

Airspeed - Windspeed Effects

28. Wind speed can have a significant effect on optimum cruise airspeed. To obtain maximum range in terms of ground distance cruise airspeed for the UH-IH must be varied approximately 40% of the effective wind speed (difference between airspeed and ground speed). Because of the possible large cruise airspeed variation and therefore cruise power variation, optimum altitude will also be a function of wind speed. This effect has not been fully analyzed.

CROSSER & RITE

Optimum Climb and Descent Schedules

29. Optimum climb and descent profiles for helicopters have not yet been thoroughly investigated. Preliminary analysis shows the best climb schedule is a constant indicated airspeed 10 knots below optimum altitude maximum range cruise speed and maximum available power. Optimum descent schedule is to maintain optimum altitude cruise power and increase airspeed to obtain a normal descent rate (~500 ft/min). Where airspeed limits or turbulence preclude this schedule, airspeed should be the maximum practical with power reduced to achieve normal descent rates.

Optimum Cruise Summary

30. The optimum cruise results at rotor speeds of 294 and 314 rpm are summarized in figure F for the YUH-1H.



Figure F. YUH-1H Optimum Cruise Gains Compared to Sea Level and 324 Rotor rpm

Potential fuel savings for a given mission vary from 20% to more than 50% and range can be increased more than 100% depending on mission weights and ambient temperatures. Overall fuel savings will depend on operational requirements which may limit optimum technique use. Low level tactics and training preclude optimizing altitude and airspeed. Lack of oxygen systems and psychological factors may reduce the use of optimum altitudes. Even with

14

的。由于法律的专用性

these limitations actual fuel savings are estimated to be on the order of 10%. This estimate is based on the following assumptions: reduction of normal rotor speed from 324 to 314 rpm for cruise, climb and descent; full use of optimum cruise procedures 10% of the time; partial use (for 50% of potential savings) 25% of the time; average mission conditions of 8600 lb takeoff weight (full fuel, two crew members and 1500 lb payload); and standard temperatures. Another benefit from optimum cruise will be the extended range or endurance. Optimum endurance charts are yet to be developed but endurance gains will be even greater than the range benefits. Optimum cruise data should be made available to operational units as soon as practical.

والمهو معاولات المراجع والمراجع المائية المحافظ المراجع

CONCLUSIONS

31. The following conclusions in order of importance were reached as a result of these tests and the optimum cruise analysis.

a. Optimum cruise techniques can increase range more than 100% depending on conditions. Fuel savings for a given mission can be as much as 50% (para 30).

b. Compressibility effects for the UH-lH were significant at all test conditions and considerable fuel savings resulted from operating at minimum rotor speeds (para 26).

c. The production UH-1H has approximately one ft² (\sim 5%) equivalent flat plate area drag increase compared to the prototype YUH-1H (para 10).

d. Handling qualities in cruise flight were degraded but acceptable in less than moderate turbulence at rotor speeds below 314 rpm (para 22).

e. The thrust coefficient and referred rotor speed parameters were determined to be valid for the UH-1H within the range of conditions of these tests (para 13).

f. Two-per-rotor-revolution vibration levels at cold temperatures could be reduced by decreasing rotor speed (para 23).

RECOMMENDATIONS

w partia and change have been and a sheet

32. The following recommendations are made with regard to the operator's manual.

a. Optimum cruise data should be included in the operator's manual as soon as practical (para 30).

b. UH-1H data should be corrected based on the increased drag determined from these tests (para 10).

c. For the UH-1H, rotor speeds below 314 rpm should be used only in cruise flight in less than moderate turbulence. Aggressive maneuvering should be avoided at low rotor speeds (para 22).

33. The following additional studies should be conducted:

a. The question of excessive rotor flapping at low rotor speeds should be resolved (para 22).

b. Flight loads data at low rotor speeds should be reviewed. The impact of increased use of low rotor speeds on component lives should be determined (para 23).

34. The following recommendations are made with regard to future level flight performance:

a. The referred rotor speed technique should be used for most tests. The constant rotor speed technique should be used at extreme temperatures to achieve the maximum practical Mach number range (para 13).

b. The validity of thrust coefficient and referred rotor speed should be checked (para 13).

1998-14

APPENDIX A. REFERENCES

1. USAAEFA Message to DALO-AV, subject: Aviation Fuel Conservation, 18 August 1980.

2. Letter, AVRADCOM, DRDAV-DI, 22 December 1980, subject: Test Request No. 80-22, Fuel Conservation Evaluation of US Army Helicopters.

3. Letter, AVRADCOM, DRDAV-DI, 27 March 1981, subject: Test Request No. 81-01-3, Fuel Conservation Evaluation of US Army Helicopters, Part 3, UH-1H Flight Testing.

4. Letter, AVRADCOM, DRDAV-DI, 27 March 1981, subject: Test Request No. 81-01-2, Fuel Conservation Evaluation of US Army Helicopters, Part 2, Development and Evaluation of Fuel Conservation Formatted Data.

5. USAAEFA Project Proposal: Blade Stall/Compressibility Investigation, submitted 9 January 1981.

5. Letter, DAVTE-M, 4 September 1981, subject: Test Plan, Fuel Conservation Evaluation (UH-1H Flight Testing), USAAEFA Project No. 81-01-3.

7. Final Report, USAAEFA Project No. 66-04, Engineering Flight Test of the YII4-1H Helicopter (Phase D Limited) November 1970.

8. Detail Specification, Bell Helicopter Textron, No. 205-947-177, UH-1H Utility Helicopter FY-74 Procurement, 15 May 1973.

9. Technical Manual, TM 55-1520-210-10, Operator's Manual, US Army Models UH-1D/H and EH-1H Helicopters 18 May 1979, change 15, 25 February 1982.

10. Flight Test Manual, Naval Air Test Center, FTM No. 101, Helicopter Stability and Control 10 June 1968.

11. Report, Lycoming, Model Specification 753-1-13, Shaft Turbine Fnaine. September 1964, revised May 1966.

12. Summary Report, Air Mobility R&D Laboratory AVSCOM, UH-1H/ AH-1 Rotor System Technical Risk Assessment, March 1974.

18

CANE AND A REAL

APPENDIX B. DETAILED HELICOPTER DESCRIPTION

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. The information contained in this appendix was obtained from the operator's manual (ref 9), the airframe model specification (ref 8), the engine model specification (ref 11), the airframe manufacturer, the engine manufacturer or directly by measurement on the test aircraft.

COMPARISON WITH PROTOTYPE AIRCRAFT

Data and other comparisons of the production test aircraft 2. used for these tests with the prototype aircraft used for the reference 7 tests are made throughout this report. The current test aircraft, UH-1H S/N 69-15532 is shown in photo A. The prototype aircraft YUH-1H S/N 60-6029 is shown in photo B. The only significant external instrumentation was the test airspeed boom that included swiveling pitot-static source, ram air temperature probe, angle of attack vane and sideslip vane. The boom installation was similar on both aircraft. Boom drag was not determined for either aircraft. There was a difference in engine bleed air driven accessories. The prototype had an engine bleed air driven fuel boost pump. The boost pump and oil cooler fan used 1.15% of engine airflow. The production aircraft has electrically powered boost pumps. The production aircraft has a bleed air scavenged inlet particle separator (bleed air amount unknown). The prototype inlet particle separator was manually cleaned and did not require engine bleed air. Apparent external differences of the two aircraft are listed below.

ltem	Production	Prototype
Cargo Hook	Not Installed	Installed
Pitot-Static Probe	Roof Mounted	Nose Mounted
FM Homing Antenna	Roof Mounted	Nose Mounted
Anti-Collision Lights(s)	Engine Cowl and Tailboom	Engine Cowl Only

DESIGN DATA

Overall Dimensions

Length	57 ft, 1.1 in.
(rotor turning)	
Length	41 ft, 11.1 in.
(nose to tail)	
Widt! of skids	9 ft, 6.6 in.
(maximum width except rotor)	



Photo A. Test Aircraft, Production UH-IH S/N 69-15532



Height	14 ft, 5.5 in.
(to top of turning tail rotor) Height	14 ft, 0.7 in.
(to top of rotor mast) Fuselage around clearance	l ft, 3.0 in.
(at design weight) Main rotor clearance (rotor tip to tail boom, static)	l ft, 10.7 in.

Weights

Manufacturer's empty weight	4973 lb
User's empty weight	5350 lb
Design gross weight	6600 lb
Maximum gross weight	9500 lb

Main rotor

Blade twist

Lateral cyclic

Number of blades	2		
Rotor diameter (blades)	48 ft		
Rotor diameter	48 ft, 3.2 in.		
(including tracking tips) Blade chord (root to tip)	21 in.		

-10 deg

(root to tip)
Preconing angle 2.75 deg
Mast angle 5 deg forward tilt
(relative to horizontal reference)
Control travel:

(measured at center of grip)
Collective10.75 in. (27 deg)Longitudinal cyclic12.2 in. (30 deg)Lateral cyclic12.3 in. (30 deg)Blade travel:
Flapping (any direction)+11 degCollective (measured at 75%
radius)
Longitudinal cyclic+12 deg

22

 $\overline{\pm}10$ deg

Tail Rotor

Number of blades	2
Rotor diameter	8 ft, 6 in.
Blade chord	8.41 in.
(root to tip)	
Blade twist	0 deg
Blade airfoil	NACA 0015
(root to tip)	
Pedal travel	6.8 in.
Blade travel:	
Thrust to right (left yaw)	+19 deg
Thrust to left (right yaw)	-7 deg

DERIVED DATA

Main Rotor

£,

All in the start of the investment of the

1809 ft ²
82 ft ²
0.0464
3.65 1b/ft ² 5.25 1b/ft ²
80.5 1b/ft ² 115.9 1b/ft ²
5.80 lb/shp 8.36 lb/shp
814.3 fps (482.1 kt) 738.9 fps (437.5 kt)
1023.0 fps (605.7 kt) 1068.0 fps (628.1 kt)

12:00

1

Des ARTA AT

TATT KOLOL	Ta:	i1	Ro	tυ	r
------------	-----	----	----	----	---

.1.

Disk area	56.7 ft^2	
(total swept area) Blade area (including bub)	5.96	5 ft ²
Solidity	0.10)5
Tip speed in a hover: 324 rotor rpm 294 rotor rpm	736 fps (436 kt) 668 fps (395 kt)	
Gear Ratios	Ratio	Teeth
Power turbine to output shaft	3.2105:1	(
Output shaft to main rotor	20.38306:1	$\frac{62}{29} \times \left(\frac{57+119}{57}\right)^{-2}$
Output shaft to tail rotor	3 .99 0229:1	$\frac{62}{29} \times \frac{41}{55} \times \frac{26}{27} \times \frac{39}{15}$
Tail rotor to main rotor	5.108239:1	$\frac{15}{39} \times \frac{27}{26} \times \frac{55}{41} \times \left(\frac{57+119}{57}\right)^2$
Gas producer turbine to tach pad (100% = 25,150 rpm)	5.9863:1	
Output shaft to tach pad	1.5627:1	
Tach pad to main rotor	13.28143	$\frac{27}{26} \times \frac{55}{41} \times \left(\frac{57+119}{57}\right)^2$
FLIGHT LIMITATIONS		
Engine and Drive Train		
Power ratings: Military power (30-minute	limit) 1400	shp derated to
Maximum continuous power	1100 1250 1100	shp shp derated to shp
Torque limits:		

orque limits: Maximum continuous 50 psi Transient overtorque 50 to 54 psi (not to be used intentionally) (no maintenance required)

Transient overtorque	54 to 61 psi
(inspect drive train) Transient overtorque (replace all drive train and rotor components) Output shaft speed:	Over 61 psi
Maximum steady state	6600 rpm
Minimum steady state	6400 rpm
Minimum steady state below 7500 lb Maximum transient (below 91% N _l) (not to be used intentionally)	6000 грм 6750 грм
Exhaust Gas Temperature	
Maximum continuous	625°C
30-min limit	625° to 645°C
5-second limit for starting and acceleration	675°C
Maximum for starting and acceleration	760°C
Gas Producer	
Maximum speed	25,600 rpm (101.8%)
Flight idle speed	15,900 to 17,00 rpm (63 to 68%)
Ground Idle/start speed	(05 to 13,100 rpm (48 to 52%)
Rotor Speed	
Maximum power on	324 rpm
Power on transient	331 rpm
Power off	339 rpm
Minimum power on	314 rpm
Power on less than 7500 lb	294 rpm

25

294 rpm

Power off

Airframe

i

ł

1

. .

Loading:

Design weight Maximum overload weight Maximum floor loading Maximum cargo hook capacity Maximum forward cg	6600 1b 9500 1b 300 1b/ft ² 4000 1b Sta 130
Maximum aft cg Maximum lateral cg (see ref 9 for complete cg envelope)	Sta 144 <u>+</u> 5 in.
Limit load factors:	
Positive 6600 lb	+3.0 g
9500 lb	+2.1 g
Negative 6600 lb	-0.5 g
9500 1b	-0.35 g
Airspeed:	
Forward flight	
Maximum	123.6 KTAS at 2000 ft
(see ref 9, for complete	
airspeed envelope)	
Sideward and rearward flight	00.1
Maximum	30 Kt

26

the trained

and stand and

APPENDIX C. TEST INSTRUMENTATION

1. All instrumentation was calibrated and installed prior to commencing the test program and periodically recalibrated. All quantitative data obtained during this flight test program were derived from special instrumentation. A boom, mounted on and extending 92 inches forward from the nose of the aircraft, equipped with a swiveling pitot-static tube provided airspeed, altitude, angle of attack, and sideslip information. A detailed tabulation of calibrated instrumentation, equipment, and recorded data is listed below.

Pilot Station

Event switch

Copilot Station

Instrumentation controls and displays Event switch

Instrument Panel

Airspeed Pressure altitude Radar altitude Angle of sideslip Free air temperature Dew point temperature Control positions Longitudinal Lateral Directional Collective Rotor speed Engine torque pressure Gas generator speed Measured gas temperature Fuel used Time Record counter

Recorded data

Airspeed (boom system) Altitude (boom system) Angle of sideslip Angle of attack Free air temperature Dew point temperature

27

(P14)、外生

8. R

Control positions Longitudinal Lateral Directional Collective Engine condition (twist grip) Stabilator Positon Tail rotor collective blade angle Rotor speed Engine torque pressure Gas generator speed Measured gas temperature Fuel flow Fuel used Fuel temperature (at flowmeter) Pitch attitude Pitch rate Roll Attitude Roll rate Aircraft heading Yaw rate Center of gravity acceleration Vertical Longitudinal Lateral Pilot's event Copilot's event Time

.]

1

ĺ

5



a the second second


-

APPENDIX D. TEST TECHNIQUES AND DATA ANALYSIS METHODS

General

Conventional level flight performance test techniques were 1. used to conduct this evaluation. Two techniques were used to achieve constant thrust coefficient throughout each test. The constant rotor speed technique required maintaining the gross weight to air density ratio constant. The referred rotor speed technique required maintaining constant the ratio of rotor speed to square root of static air temperature ratio, and the ratio of gross weight to static air pressure. Both techniques required that altitude be increased for each data point as fuel was consummed. Those tests using the referred rotor speed technique are indicated on the appendix E data figures by noting the average referred rotor speed. All tests were conducted in nonturbulent atmospheric conditions to preclude uncontrolled disturbances influencing the results. Ten second records were taken at the beginning and end of approximately 1 minute stable points.

Weight and Balance

2. Prior to testing, the aircraft empty weight (including full oil and trapped fuel) and horizontal center-of-gravity location were determined with calibrated scales. Vertical cg was determined by suspending the helicopter from the top of the rotor mast and measuring the resulting attitude. Vertical cg was then calculated from the intersection of the suspension point with the horizontal CG. The empty weight was 5818 lb. The center-of-gravity was: FS 143.36, BL - 0.02, WL 64.0.

3. A manometer-type external sight gauge was calibrated and used to determine fuel volume. Fuel specific gravity was measured with a hydrometer. The fuel loading for each test flight was determined both prior to engine start and following engine shutdown. Fuel used in flight was recorded by a test fuel-used system and compared with the pre- and post flight sight gauge reading. Fuel cg versus fuel volume contained in the fuel cell (208.5 gallon capacity) had been previously determined. This calibration was used to calculate aircraft cg for each test point. Aircraft gross weight and cg were also controlled by ballast installed at various locations in the aircraft.

Level Flight Performance and Specific Range

4. The helicopter level flight performance data were generalized by the following nondimensional coefficients:

Los Anni Arti

a. Coefficient of power (Cp):

$$C_{\rm P} = \frac{\rm SHP (550)}{\rho A(\Omega R)^3} = 8.05518 \ \rm SHP/\sigma N^3$$
(1)
= 8.05518 (SHP/ $\delta\sqrt{9}$)/(N/ $\sqrt{6}$)³

b. Coefficient of thrust (C_T) :

$$C_{\rm T} = \frac{W}{\rho A(\Omega R)^2} = 0.0368089 \ W/\sigma N^2$$

$$= 0.0368089 \ (W/\delta)/(N/\sqrt{3})^2$$
(2)

c. Advance ratio (μ):

μ

$$= \frac{1.68781 \text{ V}_{\text{T}}}{\Omega \text{R}} = 0.671558 \text{ V}_{\text{T}}/\text{N}$$
(3)
$$= 0.671558 (\text{V}_{\text{T}}/\sqrt{\theta})/(\text{N}/\sqrt{\theta})$$

d. Advancing blade tip Mach number (M_{tip}):

$$M_{\text{tip}} = \frac{1.68781 \text{ V}_{\text{T}} + (\Omega \text{R})}{a} = 0.00225113 (\text{N} + 0.671558\text{V}_{\text{T}})/\sqrt{\theta}}$$
(4)

STATE STRATE

Where:

SHP = Engine output shaft horsepower 550 = Conversion factor (ft-lb/sec/shp) $\rho = Air density (slug/ft^3)$ ρ_{o} = Standard day sea level density (.00237689 slugs/ft³) σ = Air density ratio = ρ / ρ_0 δ = Ambient pressure ratio (test point to sea level standard) A = Main rotor disc area $(ft^2) = 1809.5$ $2 = Main rotor angular velocity (radian/sec) = <math>\frac{2\pi}{50} \times N$ N = Main rotor angular velocity (rpm) R = Main rotor radius (ft) = 24.0W = Gross weight (1b) $\theta = (T_a + 273.15)/288.15$ $T_a = Ambient air temperature (°C)$ 1.68781 = Conversion factor (ft/sec/knot) V_T = True airspeed (knot) a = Speed of sound (ft/sec) = 1116.45 $\sqrt{\theta}$ a_0 = Speed of sound at sea level standard (ft/sec) = 1116.45

5. Test-day (measure') level flight power was corrected to average flight conditions for each set of speed-power data by 32

assuming the test-day dimensionless parameters C_p , C_T , and μ t are identical to C_p , C_T , and μ avg, respectively. From equation 1, the following relationship can be derive³:

$$SHP_{avg} = SHP_{t} \left(\underbrace{\stackrel{\rho \ avg}{}}_{\rho \ t} \right)$$
(5)

Where:

Subscript t = test day (measured for each data point) Subscript avg = average over each set of speed power data

6. Test specific range was calculated using level flight performance data and the measured fuel flow.

$$SR = \frac{V_{\rm T}}{W_{\rm F}} \tag{6}$$

Where:

SR = Specific range (nautical air miles per pound of fuel)
VT = True airspeed (knot)
Wf = Fuel flow (lb/hr)

Shaft Horsepower Required

7. The engine output shaft torque was determined from the engine manufacturer's torque system. The relationship of measured torque pressure (psi) to engine output shaft torque (ft-lb) was determined from the engine test cell calibration is shown in figure C-1, appendix C. The output shp was determined from the engine output shaft orque and rotational speed by equation (7).

SHP =
$$\frac{2\pi \times N_P \times Q}{33,000} = \frac{N_P \times Q}{5252.113}$$
 (7)

Where :

Np = Engine output shaft rotational epeed (rpm)
Q = Engine output shaft torque (ft-l)
33,000 = Conversion factor (ft-lb/min/shp)

33

Indicated Airspeed and Pressure Altitude

8. Total pressure, static pressure, and total temperature were measured from sensors mounted on a flight test boom installed on the nose of the aircraft. The output signals were recorded on magnetic tape, and the following expressions were used to calculate the parameters:

a. Indicated airspeed corrected for instrument error (V_{ic}) :

$$V_{ic} = a_0 \{ 5 [(qc_{ic}/Pa_0 + 1) -1] \}$$
 (8)

b. Indicated pressure altitude corrected for instrument error (HP_{ic}):

$$HP_{ic} = 145,442.2 \left[1 - (Pa_{ic}/Pa_{o})^{0.1902632} \right]$$
(9)

Where:

 V_{ic} = Indicated airspeed corrected for instrument error (kt) a_0 = Speed of sound at standard day, sea level = 661.479 kt qc_{ic} = Indicated differential pressure corrected for instrument error (in. Hg)

 Pa_0 = Atmospheric pressure at standard day, set level = 29.92125 in. Hg

 HP_{1c} = Indicated pressure altitude corrected for instrument error (ft)

(Pa_{ic}) = Indicated static pressure corrected for instrument error (in. Hg)

Airspeed Calibration

9. The boom pitot-static system was calibrated using the trailing bomb method to determine the airspeed position error. This calibration is shown in figure C-2, appendix C. Calibrated airspeed (V_{cal}) was obtained by correcting indicated airspeed (V_i) using instrument (ΔV_{ic}) and position (ΔV_{pc}) error corrections.

$$V_{cal} = V_i + \Delta V_{ic} + \Delta V_{pc}$$
(10)

True Airspeed

10. True airspeed was computed using the following relationship:

$$V_{T} = a \left\{ 5 \left[(\eta c / Pa + 1)^{2/7} - 1 \right] \right\}^{-5}$$
(11)

Where:

a = Speed of sound (knots)

qc = Corrected differential pressure (in.Hg)

Pa = Corrected static pressure (in.Hg)

Corrected Pressure Altitude and Altitude Position Error

11. HP_{ic} was corrected for position error by using ΔV_{pc} . The assumption was made that position error (ΔP_p) was produced entirely at the static source. Since both airspeed and altitude systems utilize the same static source, the following relationships were used:

$$qc = Pa_0 \{ [.2(V_{cal}/a_0)^2 + 1]^{3.5} - 1 \}$$
(12)

$$\Delta P_{\rm P} = q_{\rm C} - q_{\rm C_{\rm IC}} \tag{13}$$

$$Pa = Pa_{ic} - \Lambda P_P \tag{14}$$

$$H_{P} = 145, 442, 2 \left[1 - (Pa/Pa_{o})^{1902632} \right]$$
(15)

Where:

qc = Differential pressure corrected for position and instrument error (in. Hg)

qcic = Indicated differential pressure corrected for instrument error (in. Hg)

V_{cal} = Calibrated airspeed (knots)

 a_0 = Speed of sound at standard day sea level = 661.479 knots Pa₀ = Atmospheric pressure at standard day, sea level = 29.92125 in. Hg

 ΔP_P = Pressure position error (in. Hg)

Pa = Atmospheric pressure at corrected altitude (in. Hg) $<math>Pa_{ic} = Indicated static pressure corrected for instrument$ error (in. Hg)

 H_p = Corrected pressure altitude (ft)

Static Temperature

12. Static temperature was obtained by correcting the measured total temperature for temperature rise due to compressibility. The following relationships were used:

$$T_{tic} = 0AT_{ic} + 273.15$$
(16)

$$T_{a} = T_{tic} / \{ 1 + K_{t} [(qc/P_{A} + 1)^{2/7} - 1] \}$$
(17)

SAT = Ta - 273.15

Where:

 T_{tic} = Instrument corrected measured air temperature (°K)

Ta = Static air temperature (°K)

 K_T = Temperature probe recovery factor = 0.97 (from previous tests)

 P_A = Corrected static air pressure (in.Hg)

SAT = Corrected static air temperature (°C)

Rumidí ty

13. For tests above 0° C where humidity effects could have a significant effect on air density and the speed of sound, dew point temperature was measured and humidity correct ons made. The following relationships were used:

 $P_{V} = e^{-(69.5137 - 7246.6/T + .0057449T - 8.247 \ln T)}$ (19)

Where:

 P_V is the vapor pressure (in.Hg)

e is the base for Napierian logarithm = 2.71828...

T is dew point temperature $(T_d, {}^{\circ}K)$ for existing vapor pressure, P_{VD} (in.Hg) or T is static air temperature $(T_i, {}^{\circ}K)$ for saturation vapor pressure P_{VS} (in.Hg).

The density correction factor, K_d, is:

 $K_d = 1 - 0.3779 P_{VD}/P_A$ (20)

The mixing ratio, M_R is:

$$M_{\rm R} = 0.62201 \ P_{\rm VD} / (P_{\rm A} - P_{\rm VD}) \tag{21}$$

36

DOM: AND THAT

And the sound speed correction factor, K_a is:

$$K_a = [(1 + 1.8375 M_R)/K_d (1 + 1.9357 M_R)]^{5}$$
 (22)

Air Density

14. Air density, p, was computed as follows:

$$\rho = 0.0228901 \text{ K}_{d} P_{a}/T_{a} (slugs/ft^{3})$$
 (23)

for cold temperatures or where dew point was not measured $K_d = K_a = 1.0$.

Sound Speed

15. Sound speed, a, was computed as follows:

$$a(Kts) = 38.96785 K_a \sqrt{T_a}, ^{\circ}K$$
 (24)

Drag

16. The following relationships were used to compute differential drag in terms of equivalent flat plate area (EFPA):

$$\Delta F_{e} = \frac{228.782 \text{ } \Delta SHP}{\alpha V^{3}} = 2 \text{ } \Delta C_{p}/\mu^{3}$$

Where:

AFe = differential equivalent flat plate area (ft²) ASHP = differential engine shaft horsepower (horsepower) (note: drag area based on wind tunnel tests (thrust horse- power) would be smaller). ρ = air density (slugs/ft³) V = true airspeed (knots) A = main rotor disk area (ft²) ACp = differential power coefficient (based on engine power)

 μ = advance ratio

Drag comparisons were made to reference 7 data. No corrections were made for airspeed boom drag (similar booms on both aircraft). Past attempts to determine boom drag have been unsuccessful because of the loss of sideslip reference.

17. The optimum cruise analysis used the following procedure:

a. Derive speed-powers from level flight summary data for the full range of weights, altitudes, temperatures, and rotor speeds.

37

CARLE FRAME AND

b. Derive specific range for a, using engine model specifica-tion.

c. Find optimum airspeed and maximum specific range for each b.

d. Repeat c for limit airspeed (V_{NE}).

e. Repeat c for continuous power limited airspeed ($V_{\rm H}$).

f. Determine regions of weight, altitude, temperature, and rotor speed for applicable (lowest) airspeed (c, d, or e).

g. For each weight, temperature, and rotor speed; plot specific range versus altitude. Fair and determine altitude for maximum specific range (optimum altitude).

h. For each rotor speed, fair optimum altitude versus weight at each temperature.

i. For each rotor speed, fair optimum altitude versus temperature at each weight.

j. Crossplot h and i for continuous variation with weight and temperature.

k. Repeat h through j for specific range at optimum altitude.

1. For each weight-temperature condition plot specific range and optimum altitude versus rotor speed.

m. Check j, k, and l against test data.

n. Iterate to smooth and minimize errors.

o. Convert specific range to fuel flow.

This process was very lengthy and complex. An effort is being made to develop a simplified helicopter power required analysis methodology.

38



A start and a

14

State States & ATU

Ľ





40

.

;

Contractory States Artiful S

APPENDIX E. GRAPHICAL TEST DATA

Figure

Level Flight Performance $C_T = 26 \times 10^{-4}$	1
Level Flight Performance $C_T = 30$ to 32×10^{-4}	2 - 16
Level Flight Performance $C_T = 34$ to 36×10^{-4}	17 - 29
Level Flight Performance IR Suppressor Installed	30
Level Flight Performance Referred Rotor Speed Comparison	31
Referred Engine Characteristics	32 - 34

Abbreviations Used on Figures

C_T: Thrust coefficient (non-dimensional)

 T_A : Air temperature (°C)

T_D: Dew point temperature (°C)

Data are arranged in increasing order of referred rotor speed within each thrust coefficient group. Average referred rotor speed is noted on each figure where the referred rotor speed test technique was used. For those not so noted, the constant rotor speed technique was used. The minimum or maximum tabulated values did not necessarily occur on the same data point. They are included only to indicate the maximum range of the parameter for the entire test. Tabulated data are presented to the full precision of the measurement.



-`.

THE REAL PROPERTY AND

And a state of a state of the



4 <u>5</u> 8 - 81

÷ 1

Ŧ



and see that is a second second second to be a second to be a second second second second second second second

<u>م</u>د

Contraction of Array of A



La serie de la constance de la serie de la constance de la constance de la constance de la constance de la const



÷ 1

ويودي فتشف

A STREET



and the second second



and the second secon



Late Victor a visit As in the sector descent matter

Service States

¥



A THE REAL PROPERTY AND A THE PARTY OF

and the second secon

.

E.

S Strains

٠

- · _



Ĩ 1

and the state of the second states of the second states of the second states of the second states of the second

ttas_ rikr

а.

R i

A LEALANDER



A STATE OF STATES A STATE

T.

in a second the second the second the second to be the second second second second second second second second



of the second second





President Street Str

The carrie in

5- **#**

ATTA STATEMENT



-. Sec. 1

Resource Charge Fig Trans



Manager Barres Burres Barres and B

the state of the second se



and the second second



1. . •

. . .

A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OF

Mar interiorist

•



Late is the second s

.

.

Manager and Annual States





a star was such a margaret the second star was a second to be a second to be a second to be a second a second



11

history and the second states





All and the she was a second of the second second

A LANDAR SHE CARD F STUDIE


STATE A ABOUT A THE REAL



Laz







A chip has a second state and the second state of the second state of the second state of the second s



. .

4

Π

in the country

A STOL OF THE STOL OF THE STOL OF THE STOL

. 1.



the second of the second of

- 19 de la



and the second second



1 seci



DISTRIBUTION LIST

	eadquarters, DARCOM (DALO)	5
	eputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DALO-SMM, DALO-AV)	1
	eputy Chief of Staff Operations (DAMO-RQ)	1
	eputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DAPE-HRS)	ı
	eputy Chief of Staff for Research Development and	
	Acquisition (DAMA-PPM-T, DAMA-RA, DAMA-WSA)	3
	omptroller of the Army (DACA-EA)	1
	S Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command	
	(DRCDE-SA, DRCQA-E, DRCDE-I, DRCDE-P)	4
	5 Army Training and Doctrine Command (ATTG-U, ATCD-T,	
	ATCD-ET, ATCD-B)	4
	5 Army Aviation Research and Development Command	
	(DRDAV-DI, DRDAV-EE, DRDAV-EG)	10
	S Army Test and Evaluation Command (DRSTE-CT-A,	
	DRSTE-TO-O)	2
	5 Army Troop Support and Aviation Materiel Readiness	
	Command (DRSTS-Q)	1
	S Army Logistics Evaluation Agency (DALO-LEI)	1
	S Army Materiel Systems Analysis Agency (DRXSY-R, DRXSY-MP)	1
	Army Operational Test and Evaluation Agency (CSTE-POD)	1
	Army Armor Center (ATZK-CD-TE)	1
I	Army Aviation Center (ATZQ-D-T, ATZQ-TSM-A, ATZQ-ES-SL	
	ATZQ-TSM-S, ATZQ-TSM-U)	9
	Army Combined Arms Center (ATZLCA-DM)	1

US Army Safety Center (IGAR-TA, IGAR-Library)	2
US Army Research and Technology Laboratories/Aeromechanics	
Laboratory (DAVDL-AL-D)	}
Defense Technical Information Center (DDR)	12
US Military Academy (MADN-F)	1
Solvery Research and Technology Laboratories/Applied	
Technology Laboratory (DAVDL-ATL-D, DAVDL-Library)	2
US Army Research and Technology Laboratories/Proplusion	
Laboratory (DAVDL-PL-D)	1
Sterny Research and Technology Laboratories	
NAVUL-AS, DAVDL-POM (Library))	2
MTMC-TEA (MTT-TRC)	i
ASD AFTE	1