AD-A086 704 NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER CHINA LAKE CA F/G 19/4
STORE SEPARATION TRAJECTORY ANALYSIS.(U)
JAN 80 A R MADDOX
UNCLASSIFIED NWC-TP-6067 NL

END
DATE
FILMED
8-80
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

5C

LEVEL II

NWC TP 6067

(12)

ADA086704

Store Separation Trajectory Analysis

by
Arthur R. Maddox
Ordnance Systems Department

DTIC
ELECTE
JUL 1 6 1980
S D
E

JANUARY 1980

NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER
CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA 93555

FILE COPY

80 7 14 225

Naval Weapons Center

AN ACTIVITY OF THE NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

FOREWORD

The work summarized in this report is the final phase of an extended program called the Store Separation Program Plan to evaluate and improve the methodology of assessing the result of launching a store from an aircraft. The overall program was directed by Dr. Arthur R. Maddox, formerly of Code 31604 in the Aeromechanics Division at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, Calif., and continued from Fiscal Year 1972 until 1978.

The program was funded and supported by Naval Air Systems Command under Airtask A03W-03P2/008B/7F32-3000-000 (appropriation 178 1319. 1981), and it was eventually brought under the Strike Warfare Weaponry Technology Block Program at the Naval Weapons Center. W. C. Volz, AIR-320C, was the cognizant NAVAIR Technology Administrator.

Approved by
C. L. SCHANIEL, *Head*
Ordnance Systems Department
15 November 1978

Under authority of
W. B. HAFF
Capt., U.S. Navy
Commander

Released for publication by
R. M. HILLYER
Technical Director

NWC Technical Publication [illegible]

Published by . . . . Technical Information Department
Collation . . . . [illegible]
First printing . . . . [illegible]

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER NWC TP 6067	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A086 704	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) STORE SEPARATION TRAJECTORY ANALYSIS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED FY 1972-FY 1978
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Arthur R. Maddox		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Weapons Center China Lake, CA 93555		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS AirTask A03W-03P2/008B/ [redacted]F32 300[redacted]
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Weapons Center China Lake, CA 93555		12. REPORT DATE Jan[redacted]80
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Aerodynamic, Airborne Balance, Aircraft, F-4, Flight Tests, Loads (Captive), Mathematical, Store (Captive), Wind Tunnel		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) See back of form.		

(14) (6) (10) (16) (11) (12) 24 (17) ZF32300000 (9) Rept. for 1972-1978 403019

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

(U) *Store Separation Trajectory Analysis*, by Arthur R. Maddox. China Lake, Calif., Naval Weapons Center, January 1980. 20 pp. (NWC TP 6067 publication UNCLASSIFIED.)

(U) A series of store drops was made at moderate to high subsonic speeds with the same configuration on the center position of a TER on an F-4 inboard pylon. The data were compared with wind tunnel and mathematical simulations. Both estimation techniques predicted the general nature of the motion, especially at low speeds, but failed to predict a minor collision observed at high speed.

CONTENTS

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK - NOT FILMED

INTRODUCTION

Store separation test data are difficult to obtain under controlled conditions. The most recent publication dealing with this problem[1] provides valuable information on various wind tunnel test techniques for a single-store configuration. Most earlier data are useful only in a qualitative sense.

In order to provide reliable quantitative data, a series of controlled drops using a multiple-store configuration with broad general implication has been conducted at speeds high enough for aerodynamic loads to be of the same order of magnitude as inertia loads and with trajectory data taken all the way to impact. Drops were made of a Mk 83 store shape over the Mach range 0.6 to 0.9 from the center station of a triple-ejector rack (TER) on the left inboard pylon of an F-4 aircraft. Various aircraft flight parameters, including ejector force-time information, were measured, so that certain results could be compared with those previously reported in NWC TP 6026 dated April 1978.[2]

Comparison of the flight data wind tunnel prediction methods shows generally good agreement. Occasionally, however, the wind tunnel results differ significantly from the full-scale result, and the reasons are not apparent. The most complete analytical model of this problem exhibits similar limitations.

DESCRIPTIONS OF TESTS

The drop tests were conducted at the Naval Air Test Center (NATC), Patuxent River, with an F-4J aircraft having a number of special features. First,

[1] H. R. Spahr, Roger N. Everett, and John K. Kryvoruka. "A Multifaceted Store Separation Analysis," in *Proceedings of 9th Aerodynamic Testing Conference.* Arlington, Tex., 7-9 June 1976. (Publication UNCLASSIFIED.)

[2] Naval Weapons Center. *In-Flight Measurements of Captive Loads on a Store as Compared With Wind Tunnel and Mathematical Simulations*, by A. R. Maddox, R. E. Dix, and G. R. Matasits. China Lake, Calif., NWC, April 1978. (NWC TP 6026, publication UNCLASSIFIED.)

the aircraft was equipped with a typical research boom mounted on the nose and coupled to the aircraft recording system for measurement of flight parameters. The aircraft was the same and the recording system similar to that used for the captive-loading tests.[2] Second, in order to match previous wind tunnel and captive-load data, an Air Force pylon was mounted on the left inboard station. This Air Force pylon carries the stores approximately 6 inches forward and 3 inches higher than the Navy pylon and thus allows it to be released from the center rack position. This is not normally an operational configuration, but the Air Force has certified carriage and release of the Mk 83, pictured in Figure 1, from this location over the speed range considered here. In addition, stores mounted in this location are known to have a significant level of mutual aerodynamic interference. Thus, this configuration represents a significant test condition.

The Air Force TER, mounted on the left inboard pylon, was that used in the captive-loads tests.[2] The two shoulder stations were fitted with dummy Mk 83 bombs, and special precautions were taken to determine the attitude of all the stores with respect to the aircraft. Even though the stores in some cases showed some camber, the axes were within 1/2 degree of the normal attitude on the ground. The drop stores were filled inert Mk 83 bomb shapes, but they were ballasted to have the center of gravity in a location consistent with the operational store. For all flights, the store weights were approximately 1,000 pounds with the center of gravity 7 inches behind the forward lug. The moments of inertia in pitch and roll were an average of 141 and 5.2 slug-ft^2, respectively. The standard Mk 83 weighs 985 pounds with moments of inertia of 106 and 4.8 slug-ft^2.



FIGURE 1. Mk 83 Test Configurations.

During release, close-in information on the store motion was recorded photographically with a single camera. The reduction of this photographic data to position and attitude information was accomplished by the Photographic Position and Attitude Measuring System (PAMS) in operation at NATC and described in NATC TM-1 TS/CS.[3] Down-range tracking by ground-based radar and long-range camera coverage all the way to impact were also provided.

PREVIOUS RESULTS

In establishing a data base for this configuration, a great deal of background work was done. Earlier comparative work on the effects of the sting mounting, by Arnold Engineering Development Center at 5% scale, is reported in AEDC-TR-76-122.[4] Grid data at 5 and 10% scale at Mach 0.6 and 0.8 were taken at the David Taylor Naval Ship Research and Development Center. Additional testing was done by AEDC at 5% scale to determine captive loading on a number of stores. Trajectories by the captive trajectory system (CTS) were also run at AEDC. Finally, full-scale captive loads were taken with an airborne balance. All these data are summarized and compared in NWC TP 6026.[2]

Unfortunately, these data, although consistent within any tunnel entry did not complement each other to give a clear picture of the loading field seen by the store. There were inconsistencies with the grid data, and they did not smoothly merge into the captive-loading data. The CTS information was taken at an aircraft angle of attack of 3.3 degrees which nearly matches the angle appropriate to flight at Mach 0.6 but is considerably different from that at Mach 0.8 and 0.9. Insufficient data were taken to correct the CTS information as was done in the publication cited in Footnote 1.

Theoretical studies were carried out with a mathematical model developed by Nielson Engineering and Research, Inc. (NEAR). The particular source-sink representation* for the F-4 aircraft was the same as that used by Spahr, Everett,

* Mr. Harold R. Spahr of Sandia Laboratories in Albuquerque supplied a revised version of the source-sink model of the F-4 and Mr. Calvin L. Dyer supplied a preliminary version of the ejector model.

[3] Naval Air Test Center. *Photographic Position and Attitude Measuring System*, by Max Houck and Richard Nelson. Patuxent River, Md., NATC, 1978. (NATC TM-1 TS/CS, publication UNCLASSIFIED.)

[4] Arnold Engineering Development Center. *Comparison of Two Methods Used to Measure Aerodynamic Loads Acting on Captive Store Models in Wind Tunnel Tests*, by R. E. Dix. Tullahoma, Tenn., AEDC, September 1976. (AEDC-TR-76-122, publication UNCLASSIFIED.)

and Kryvoruka,[1] but some simplifications were made to shorten the run time. Earlier comparisons including this program have shown some shortcomings, but it still is the most effective engineering tool available at this time.

Specific shortcomings noted in NWC TP 6026[2] were a poor representation of the effects of angle of attack on the store and the lack of a fin-to-fin interaction for a closely mounted adjacent store. Earlier versions of this program also lacked a detailed description of the ejector force-time history, but a revision (see asterisked footnote on p.) is now available.

DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS OF STORE MOTION NEAR AIRCRAFT

Release conditions are summarized in Table 1. The results of the ejector foot load cell output are given in Figure 2. It seems highly likely that the hesitant force buildup combined with the lower force level for flight 4 contributed to an unexpected collision between the ejected store and a still-attached shoulder store.

TABLE 1. Drop Flight Conditions.

Flight No.	Mach	Velocity, knots	Aircraft angle, deg	Altitude, ft
2,5	0.6	405	2.7	5,200 (avg.)
3	0.8	528	1.1	5,455
4	0.9	601	.33	5,425

Detailed close-in trajectory results for flights 2 and 5 are compared with various estimates in Figure 3. Small differences in full-scale results due to slightly differing initial conditions are apparent. Similar differences appear in the estimates.

Pitch angle results from the CTS at AEDC agree quite well with the flight test as well as the grid tests even though the captive loadings in all three cases were different. NEAR results, generated only for flight 2, were also a close representation of the full-scale results. Comparison of the yaw results, however, raises some question. Flight results, at first, follow the grid calculations but later approach the NEAR theoretical calculations which have the opposite sign. They deviate considerably from the CTS results. A part of this uncertainty comes from the fact that as the motion starts, and the roll builds up for this canted-fin configuration, the ejector forces show up in other places such as in the yaw plane. Neither the CTS nor the NEAR model are capable at this time of accounting for this feature. This is partially confirmed by unorthodox calculation with the NEAR model starting at conditions at the end of the ejector stroke with these conditions taken from the grid calculations for flight 5. This calculation, labeled "adjusted" NEAR, had a rate of roll imposed on the motion from the grid trajectory results, and the angular motions of the store are considerably improved. Other degrees of freedom, however, do not have commensurate improvement.

Further results are shown in Figure 3b where all analyses of the translational motion in the z-plane are shown to approach each other and differ only slightly from flight results. The z-motion is a poor parameter with which to compare separation motion because of the effect of gravity. In fact, the point marked as special in Figure 3b is the result of a point-mass trajectory with only the ejector and gravity considered. The interference effects must be large before this general trend would change appreciably. Sidewise motion results, shown in Figure 3b, again have large differences possibly due to the ejector interaction.

Roll results, shown in Figure 3c, also indicate some conflicts. Flight results indicate an initial low rate of roll buildup followed by an acceleration. This is opposite to the analysis and captive-load data, both of which show the reverse. NEAR results, not accounting for the canted fins, showed the interference effects to be opposite to the direction of roll due to fin cant and hence similar to the flight results.

Results for Mach = 0.8, shown in Figure 4, are not greatly different from those for Mach = 0.6. Unfortunately, CTS results which were done for angle of attack of 3.3 degrees were not applicable to this flight condition. The results, in fact, indicated some undefined contact almost immediately after launch terminating the trajectory. Flight results for the pitch and yaw angles, shown in Figure 4a, are no longer bracketed by the wind tunnel grid and NEAR theoretical calculations. Thus, the simulations, especially those by NEAR, are somewhat optimistic. Yaw results indicate more agreement in trend between wind tunnel grid and NEAR results, but both differ from the flight results. Again the z-translational results are not too informative for the reason mentioned before, and the sideways motion shows some disagreement. This disagreement, however, is probably within the accuracy of the data. Roll and drag results, shown in Figure 4c, are similar to those for Mach = 0.6.

At this time, it seems appropriate to examine the trend exhibited by the results. There is a clear indication of an increasing divergence between the simulations and the flight test results. This is not likely to be a transonic effect, since neither the wind tunnel nor the captive-loads tests showed anything peculiar to transonic flow until strong shocks began to form in the flow field surrounding the store. The divergencies are much more likely to be the result of the relatively small discrepancies in the interference loading being magnified by the increasing "q". Thus, the aerodynamic loading is beginning to dominate the inertia loading.

The simulations, at this point, are not accurate enough to give the exact set of conditions for an upper limit of the safe separating store and thus become more qualitative than quantitative. The increasing pitch angle would lead one to conclude that this store might at some higher dynamic pressure pitch too rapidly and strike the rack with the tail, but the z-translational motion is sufficiently rapid that this is not a likely occurrence soon in the speed buildup. The yaw and side motions do not seem to be a problem at all. In fact, this configuration has been cleared operationally through most of the transonic speed range, and this is considered a safe launch condition. Nevertheless, at the next drop condition of M = 0.9, a minor collision occurred. This collision is graphically illustrated in Figure 5c in the roll history of the store. The roll virtually stops at about 0.25 second. The mode of collision was not in the pitch plane as might have been expected. Instead, the suddenly enhanced yawing motion allowed the store to roll into an adjacent shoulder-mounted store with the tail fins making contact. After some fin scraping and deflection of the whole system, the store continued on its way.

The overall comparison of M = 0.9 flight test results with simulations is shown in Figure 5. Here again, the captive-trajectory information was not beneficial.

The pitch and yaw angles seen in Figure 5a indicate a considerable disagreement between the flight results and both the NEAR and the grid calculations. Earlier work[2] clearly established the shortcomings of the theoretical calculation in the pitch plane for captive loadings of this complex configuration. Apparently the entire flow field representation is not adequate for this high "q" condition. Although the wind tunnel captive loads included in the same reference indicated a better representation of the flight data, the wind tunnel data used here in the grid information was an extrapolation of the data at Mach 0.6 and 0.8, and this is apparently quite inappropriate for the high "q" releases. Even though the flight data show a much higher amplitude of pitching motion than expected, the tail did not rise sufficiently fast to contact the rack or other structure. The contact came in the yaw plane from the much larger than expected yawing motion. Again the theoretical as well as wind tunnel simulations gave considerably less amplitude of motion. The same can be said, to a lesser extent, of the other modes of motion shown in Figures 5b and 5c.

IMPACT POINT RESULTS

A calculation of the trajectory to the impact point brought out a sensitivity to aerodynamic data, including the drag, not illustrated in the previous work. Wind was also a factor, but since the aircraft was not tracked for heading, only the down-range components were considered. The large effect of the drag coefficient on the trajectory led to some investigation of that value in widespread use for this store. The wind tunnel data base, assembled in support of these drops, gave a drag coefficient between 0.2 and 0.23 for the Mach range of these tests. Scale and mounting effects would have some correction on this value. Older wind tunnel data, however, give a drag coefficient over this same range as low as 0.11, while the ballistic tables in the Joint Munitions Effectiveness Manual were generated using a value of 0.13. Captive-loads data, on the other hand, yielded a value in excess of 0.2, and if the wind tunnel decay to free stream data are used, the final value for the drag coefficient over this range would be about 0.17. This later value appears most likely for the representative drag coefficient for these tests, but the calculations were carried out for a range of values as summarized in Table 2.

In the ballistic calculation above, all the aerodynamics were taken out except for the drag giving the trajectory for a point mass with drag corresponding to the real store. After adding all the components due to aerodynamics, including the mutual store/aircraft interference, ejector, and average wind, the drag coefficient appears higher than 0.17 in two of the cases and lower in one. This would indicate the current trajectory tables used in aiming data need some reexamination for effects of a greater than expected variation in all aerodynamics.

TABLE 2. Impact Point Comparison, Downrange Distance Traveled.

Flight No.	C_D	Ballistic impact, no aero/eject/wind, ft	Full aero (interference + eject), ft	Wind component, ft	Calculated impact, ft	Flight results, ft
	.13	12,280	12,353	259	12,612	
2	.17	12,158	12,267	260	12,527	12,615
	.20	12,068	12,217	261	12,478	
	.13	15,788	15,909		15,800	
3	.17	15,602	15,794		15,685	14,818
	.20	15,467	15,714		15,604	
	.13	17,836				
4	.17	17,609				14,290
	.20	17,443				
	.13	11,424	11,444	68	11,512	
5	.17	11,317	11,383	68	11,451	11,401
	.20	11,239	11,342	69	11,411	

Flight 4 is included only for completeness. The impact was anomalous from the effects of the collision, and the calculations cannot take this into account.

Trajectories for these same drops were generated using representations for the interference to determine if some simple representation of interference could be used in aiming tables. To be specific, the loading indicated by the captive results of NWC TP 6026[2] was allowed to decay to the free stream in an exponential manner as was done earlier in the general computational study by Maddox.[5] It was found that the impact point is not sensitive to the form in which the interference is expressed as long as the magnitude is generally correct. With such a representation, the above impact points were just as well represented with this approximate manner, although the close-in motion was not represented nearly as well. Thus, simple approximations to the interference could be used in generating nonballistic corrections to the aiming calculations.

CONCLUSIONS

In this complex case of close-coupled, multiple carriage of stores, the conventional wind tunnel simulation is good for the general nature of the separation motion at moderate subsonic Mach numbers, but there are occasional large anomalies in some planes of motion (in this case, the yaw plane). Improvements in the wind tunnel simulations could undoubtedly be made with greater attention to the geometric representation. The techniques in general use to simulate store separation, however, are not very flexible and do not lend themselves to a variation of parameters around a sensitive condition.

Quite surprisingly, after captive results indicated otherwise, the best engineering mathematical model of store separation showed a capability approaching that of the wind tunnel in simulating the low Mach number separation motion for this configuration. As the Mach number increased to the high subsonic range, however, neither the wind tunnel nor the mathematical model was adequate enough to clearly indicate a collision situation.

It is clearly important to include the store/aircraft mutual interference as well as accurate basic aerodynamics in the downrange trajectory. The exact analytical representation of this interference is not critical in the calculation of the impact point; therefore, it would appear possible to include rough approximations of this effect in aiming data.

[5] A. R. Maddox. "A Parametric/Sensitivity Study of Store Separation," *Proceedings of Aircraft/Stores Compatibility Symposium*. Sacramento, Calif., 18-20 September 1976. (Publication UNCLASSIFIED.)



FIGURE 2. Ejector Force Time Histories.



FIGURE 3a. Comparison of Results for Pitch and Yaw Motion; Mach = 0.6.



FIGURE 3b. Comparison of Downward and Sideways Movement; Mach = 0.6.



FIGURE 3c. Comparison of Roll and Axial Movement; Mach = 0.6.



FIGURE 4a. Comparison of Results for Pitch and Yaw Motion; Mach = 0.8.



FIGURE 4b. Comparison of Downward and Sideways Movement; Mach = 0.8.



FIGURE 4c. Comparison of Roll and Axial Movement; Mach = 0.8.



FIGURE 5a. Comparison of Results for Pitch and Yaw Motion; Mach = 0.9.



FIGURE 5b. Comparison of Downward and Sideways Movement; Mach = 0.9.



FIGURE 5c. Comparison of Roll and Axial Movement; Mach = 0.9.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION

67 Naval Air Systems Command
- AIR-03A (1)
- AIR-03B (1)
- AIR-03E (1)
- AIR-03P2 (1)
- AIR-30212 (2)
- AIR-320 (1)
- AIR-320C (55)
- AIR-5108 (1)
- AIR-5323 (1)
- AIR-53242 (1)
- AIR-950D (2)

1 Chief of Naval Operations

5 Naval Sea Systems Command
- SEA-033 (1)
- SEA-03513 (1)
- SEA-6543 (1)
- SEA-99612 (2)

1 Chief of Naval Research, Arlington (ONR-461)

2 Naval Air Development Center, Warminster
- Code 01A (1)
- Technical Library (1)

1 Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst

1 Naval Air Test Center (CT-165), Patuxent River (Aeronautical Publications Library)

1 Naval Avionics Center, Indianapolis (Technical Library)

1 Naval Ocean Systems Center, San Diego (Code 1311)

1 Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head

1 Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey

1 Naval Research Laboratory (Code 2021)

3 Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Bethesda
- Code [illegible] (1)
- Code [illegible] (1)
- Code [illegible] (1)

9 Naval Surface Weapons Center, White Oak
G-41 (1)
K-04 (1)
K-21 (1)
K-80 (1)
K-81 (1)
K-82 (1)
R-44 (1)
Technical Library (2)
1 Operational Test and Evaluation Force
3 Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu
Code 0101 (1)
Code 3132 (1)
Technical Library (1)
3 Army Missile Research and Development Command, Redstone Arsenal (Redstone Scientific Information Center)
4 Aberdeen Proving Ground
Dr. B. Karpov (2)
Development and Proof Services (2)
1 Army Ballistics Research Laboratories, Aberdeen Proving Ground
1 Tactical Air Command, Langley Air Force Base (TPL-RQD-M)
1 Air University Library, Maxwell Air Force Base
3 Armament Development and Test Center, Eglin Air Force Base
AFATL/ADLA (1)
Directorate of Ballistics, A. S. Galbraith (1)
12 Defense Technical Information Center
1 Weapons Systems Evaluation Group
1 Lewis Research Center
2 ARO, Inc., Arnold Air Force Station
R. E. Dix (1)
G. R. Mattasits (1)
1 Applied Physics Laboratory, JHU, Laurel, MD (Document Library)
1 Chemical Propulsion Information Agency, APL, Laurel, MD
1 Jet Propulsion Laboratory, CIT, Pasadena, CA (Technical Library)
1 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Aerophysics Laboratory, Cambridge, MA
1 The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA (Aero-Astronautics Department)

END

DATE
FILMED

8-80

DTIC