General Disclaimer

One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

Produced by the NASA Center for Aerospace Information (CASI)

N82-26279 $(NASA-CR-169027)$ USE OF OPTIMIZATION TC PREDICT THE EFFECT OF SELECTED PARAMETERS ON COMMUTER AIRCRAFT PERFORMANCE Final Report Unclas (Stanford Univ.) 61 p HC A04/MF A01 CSCL 01C G3/05 28083

Department of AERONAUTICS and ASTRONAUTICS **STANFORD UNIVERSITY**

SUDAAR 534

USE OF OPTIMIZATION TO PREDICT THE EFFECT OF SELECTED PARAMETERS ON **COMMUTER AIRCRAFT PERFORMANCE**

by

Valana L. Wells and Richard S. Shevell

This Research Was Supported By **NASA Langley Research Center** Hampton, Virginia 23665 Grant NAG 1-202

USE OF OPTIMIZATION TO PREDICT THE EFFECT OF SELECTED PARAMETERS ON COMMUTER AIRCRAFT PERFORMANCE

r I $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{I}}$ 1 1

> Final Report for NASA Research Grant NAG-1-202

Valang L. Wells and Richard S. Shevell

Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics Stanford University Stanford, California 94305

June 1982

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

Abstract

An optimizing computer program, developed as part of this study, determined the turboprop aircraft with **lowest direct operating cost for various sets of cruise speed and field length constraints. External variables included wing area, wing aspect ratio and engine sea level static** horsepower; tail sizes, climb speed and cruise altitude were varied within the function evaluation program. Direct operating cost was minimized for a 150 n, mi typical mission. Generally, DOC increased with increasing speed and decreasing field length but not by a large amount. Ride roughness, however, increased considerably as speed became higher and field length became shorter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

W

iV

. I. Introduction

The resurgence of interest in small, propeller-driven aircraft has sparked renewed analysis of the aerodynamics, structures and propulsion systems of such planes. Along with advanced technology research, which is the bent of much of the recent concern, there remains a need for the answer to a, perhaps, more basic question—that is, for what mission should this airplane be designed? The "mission" includes not just stage iength (which is determined by the actual leg distances flown by commuter airlines) but also the speed at which to climb and cruise and the field length from which the aircraft must takeoff and land.

This study, rather than seeking to prescribe a particular design or mission, discovers the relationships between field length and cruise speed and aircraft direct operating cost. To do this, a gradient optimizing computer program was developed to minimize direct operating cost (DOC) as a function of airplane geometry. In this way, one can compare the best airplane operating under one set of constraints with the best operating under another. Best, in this case, means having the minimum DOC.

To compare different airplanes, one can make use of relatively simple techniques for some parameter estimation. For example, a complete stability and control analysis for tail size determination is superfluous for preliminary design when statistical correlations of tail sizes with wing and fuselage characteristics exist for similar airplanes. Thus several such statistical correlations methods appear in the program. However, one must also use more sophisticated procedures when a high degree of accuracy is required or when the particular calculation may have a major influence on the performance index. The program, therefore, has extensive and detailed routines for drag, climb, range and other critical values.

For this study a constant 30-passenger fuselage and "rubberized" engines based on the General Electric CT-7 were used as a baseline. All aircraft had to have a 600 nautical mile maximum range and were designed to FAR part 25 structural integrity and climb gradient regulations. Direct operating cost was minimized for a typical design mission of 150 nautical miles. For purposes of C_{Lmax} calculation, all aircraft had double-slotted flaps but with no Fowler action.

-1-

II. Procedure

A. The Optimizer

The optimizer minimizes direct operating cost as a function of wing area, aspect ratio and engine sea-level static horsepower rating through use of a variable metric algorithm which is, in fact, a quasi-Newton's method. A true Newton's method utilizes the following strategy for size and direction of step:

$$
\vec{x}_{j+1} = \vec{x}_j - H_j^{-1} \hat{g}_j
$$

where x represents the vector of variables, H ⁱ is the Hessian (matrix of second derivatives) at step J. and gj is the gradient vector at step J. In the absence of second derivative information, a numerical approximation of the Hessian using known values of the first derivatives provides an adequate substitute. The variable metric method follows exactly this procedure.

Of course, for such a complicated function as the one in this study (the "function" is a thirty page FORTRAN program), even first derivatives do not exist in closed form. Thus,the program must calculate a gradient estimate using a forward difference approximation. The differencing step size is constrained to be rather large (one percent of the variable value) since noise in the function evaluation leads to incorrect gradients for small steps.

The variable metric method solves unconstrained problems only. Thus, in order to account for the inequality constraints which must hold in order for the aircraft to meet such mission requirements as maximum takeoff distance, minimum engine-out climb gradient, etc., the program uses what is termed the "penalty function" or "soft constraint" approach. In a mathematical sense, this method changes the problem to an unconstrained one by including the constraints in the goal function. The goal function becomes,

GOAL **=** DOC + K|constraint value - constraint value required|

-2-

where $DOC =$ direct operating cost

K w penalty coefficient

if constraint is met

large if **constraint is not met.**

A penalty is added to the goal function for each of the five inequality constraints:

- **takeoff f:istance**
- **landing distance**
- **available cruise power**
- **second segment climb gradient**
- **enroute climb gradient**

B. The Function Evaluation

.

The function evaluation program, which comprises the bulk of the calculations involved in the optimization, acts as a mathematical aircraft Model. This routine determines, for a prescribed wing **area, sea level** static horsepower rating, and wing aspect ratio, the complete geometry, performance, and operating cost of the resulting airplane. For simplicity, it employs preliminary design methodology for **estimating such parameters** as zero-lift equivalent drag area, tail sizes, C_{Lmax}, and airplane effi**ciency factor. The direct operating cost calculation is based on the 1967** ATA DOC method with corrections for **inflation and commuter operation. The following outline briefly describes the function evaluation scheme.**

1. Airplane Geometry and Drag Parameters

In order to compute the airplane geometry (wing span, wing mean aerodynamic chord, vertical and horizontal tail **areas) the program assumes as constants:**

-3-

To avoid a complex iteration involving weight and balance, the horizontal and vertical tail lengths are estimated as 32 ft. and 30 ft., respectively, and a center of gravity range of 25% of the wing mac is allowed. Using these estimates, the program calculates tail areas as a function of fuselage and wing sizes according to ref. 1.

Once all surface areas are known, the program computes the zero-lift equivalent drag area, f. The formula for f of a component has the form

 $f_i = C_{f_i} K_i$ Swet_i

where C_f = friction coefficient; function of Reynolds number

 $K =$ form factor; function of fineness ratio or thickness ratio

Swet $=$ component wetted area ⁱ refers to the ith component such as wing, fuselage,

nacelle, etc.

A summation of all component drag areas, plus a 6% addition for miscellaneous components, gives the total airplane equivalent parasite drag area;

$$
f = \sum_i f_i / .94
$$

The zero-lift or parasite drag coefficient, C_{D_D} , is just: $C_{D_D} = f/Sw$, Sw $=$ wing reference area.

The program computes airplane efficiency factor, e, from:

$$
e = \frac{1}{\pi R \left(\frac{1}{\pi R u s} + .43 C_{Dp}\right)}
$$

- where $u =$ induced drag factor due to planform; function of R , taper ratio, sweep.
	- s = induced drag factor due to fuselage interferences function of wing span/fuselage diameter.

Inclusion of C_{Dp} in this formula accounts for the increase in profile drag **with angle of attack.**

2. Range and Maximum Takeoff Weight

For any combination of wing area, sea level horsepower, and wing aspect ratio (other possible variables assumed constant) there exists a takeoff weight necessary to travel a given distance at a given speed. This routine **determines** that takeoff weight required for the airplane described by those three variables to cover a maximum range of 600 N mi. at a prescribed cruising speed. The takeoff weight depends rather heavily on two other variables - cruise altitude and climb **speed.** Thus, in order to include these as variables, the program performs a two dimensional grid search on altitude and climb speed and saves the combination of the two which uses the least fuel to complete the 600 N mi. mission.

Determining the maximum takeoff weight is an iterative procedure completed through the use of a one dimensional minimization routine. The minimizer employs a "linear search with parabolic inverse interpolation" with the goal function defined as the square of the difference between the actual range and the desired range.

The range calculation itself has four major parts:

- (a) calculation of empty weight
- (b) climb
- (c) descent
- (d) cruise

The weight is calculated using a statistical method based on data from large and small commercial aircraft, (ref. 1).

The time, fuel, and distance to climb are calculated according to:

time to climb
$$
=\int_{h_{\text{min}}}^{h_{\text{max}}}\frac{dh}{R/c}
$$

-5-

$$
fuel \tto \tcl \timb = \int_{r_{\min}}^{h_{\max}} \frac{\text{SHP} \cdot \text{SFC}}{3600 \cdot \text{R/C}} \, \text{dh}
$$

distance to c14% =
$$
\int_{h_{\text{min}}}^{h_{\text{max}}} \frac{v}{R/C} dh
$$

The climb routine numerically evaluates these integrals making the following assumptions;

- . climb at constant equivalent airspeed
- climb at maximum continuous power
- SFC constant at maximum continuous power

The numerical integration uses a forward Euler technique and an altitude step size of 200 ft.

The descent method assumes:

- descent at constant equivalent airspeed
- descent at constant rate of descent
- . idle (minimum) power at 10% of maximum power

The aircraft rate of descent corresponds to a 300 feet per minute cabin pressure descent where the cabin has a 6000 foot pressure altitude in cruise. The program computes fuel and distance to descend using the following integrals:

fuel to descend =
$$
\int_{h_{\text{min}}}^{h_{\text{max}}} \frac{\text{SHP} \star \text{SFC}}{3600 \star \text{R/D}} \, dh
$$

-6

distance to descend =
$$
\int_{\text{hmin}}^{\text{hmax}} \frac{v}{R/D} dh
$$

where $h = a$ ititude

 $SFC =$ = specific fuel consumption

 $R/D = m$ rate of descent, ft/sec

V **n** descent true airspeed, ft/sec

 $SHP = shaffb power$

Since the airplane descends at constant equivalent airspeed and constant rate of descent, the distance integral becomes;

C rhmax distance to descend = $\frac{V_E}{B/0} \int^{1}^{100A} (1 - 6.8634 \times 10^{-6} h)^{-2.1324}$ h) dh "hmin

a

where V_F = equivalent airspeed for descent $V = V_E$ (1 - 6.8634 x 10⁻⁰ h)^{-2.1324}

Integrating gives;

Integrating gives:
distance to descend =
$$
\frac{V_E}{R/D} \left(\frac{1}{6.8634 \times 1.1324 \times 10^{-6}} \right)
$$

hmax $x\left[(1 - 6.8634 \times 10^{-6})^{-1.1324}\right]_{\text{hmin}}$

Letting h min = 0.

distance to descend =
$$
\frac{V_E}{R/D} \left(\frac{1}{6.8634 \times 1.1324 \times 10^{-6}} \right)
$$

 $\times \left[(1 - 6.8634 \times 10^{-6} \text{ hmax})^{-1.1324} - 1 \right]$

$$
-7-
$$

Fuel to descend is numerically calculated using an explicit Euler integration and an altitude step size of 500 ft. The fuel integral begins at the end of the descent and integrates backwards until the aircraft reaches the cruising altitude. The weight at the bottom of descent is the zero fuel weight plus additional fuel weight for an appropriate reserve mission (100 n,mi. at best specific range plus 45 minutes at best endurance).

The distance covered in the cruising portion of the mission depends on the weights at the end of climb and at the top of descent. For propeller. driven aircraft,

$$
R = \int_{1/f}^{M1} 325 \frac{p}{sF} \frac{dM}{D}
$$

where $n =$ propeller efficiency in cruise $D = draq$ Wi = weight at beginning of cruise Wf = weight at end of cruise SFC **a** specific fuel consumption R = range, n. miles

Letting SFC be approximately constant and equal to the average SFC during cruise, and noting that

$$
D = C_{D_p} q S + \frac{w^2}{qnb^2e},
$$

and letting

$$
A1 = C_{D_p} q S
$$

$$
A2 = \frac{1}{qnb^2e}
$$

-8-

the integral becomes,

$$
R = 325 \frac{m}{\text{SFC}} \int_{\text{Wf}}^{\text{W1}} \frac{dW}{A1 + A2 W^2}
$$

for constant cruise speed and cruise altitude. Integrating gives:

R = 325
$$
\frac{n}{SFC}
$$
 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{A1 A2}} \left[\tan^{-1} \frac{W}{\sqrt{A1/A2}} \right]_{MF}^{WT}$

or
\n
$$
R = 325 \frac{n}{\text{SFC}} b \sqrt{\frac{\pi e}{C_{D_p} S}} \left[\tan^{-1} \frac{W}{\text{q} b \sqrt{C_{D_p} \pi e S}} \right]_{\text{Mf}}^{\text{M1}}
$$

This formula holds only for the case of constant dynamic pressure, q. Since the commuter cruises at constant speed and altitude, it satisfies the condition of invariant q.

3. Evaluation of Constraint Parameters

Five acceptability criteria constrain the aircraft design.

(a) Maximum Cruise Thrust

To fly at the prescribed cruising speed, the maximum thrust produced by the engines must equal or exceed the cruise drag. Maximum thrust depends on maximum cruise power according to the relation

$$
TH = 550 \text{ n } \frac{\text{SHP}}{\text{V}}
$$

where $n =$ propeller efficiency

 $V = true$ airspeed, ft/sec

 $TH = thrust$, 1b.

Maximum cruise shaft horsepower is determined as a function of airspeed, cruise altitude, and static sea level power rating. Power calculations are based on the General Electric CT-7 turboprop engine.

-9-

(b) Takeoff Distance

Allowed takeoff distances range from 3500 feet to 4500 feet. FAR takeoff field lengths depend on the parameter:

$$
\frac{\text{row}^2}{\text{oc}_{L_{\text{max}}} s_w \text{TH}}
$$

where $\sigma = \sqrt{\rho/\rho_o}$

 S_w = reference wing area, ft^2

Takeoff distance is calculated for a hot day (ISA + 30.8 $^{\circ}$ F) sea level.

(c) Landing Distance

The allowed FAR landing distances range from 3500 feet to 4500 feet, and they depend on the square of the airplane's stalling speed. Since commuter airplanes do not usually have the ability to jettison fuel, the studied aircraft must land at their takeoff weights.

(d) Second Segment Climb Gradient

To comply with the Federal Air Regulation, part 25, a twinengined airplane must have a second segment climb gradient of 2.4%. The gradient is computed for hot day conditions (ISA + 30.8[°]F) at takeoff power and with one engine inoperative. The drag in this configuration includes that due to a feathered propeller, due to excess rudder deflection as a consequence of asymmetric thrust, and due to a 25 degree takeoff flap deflection.

(e) Enroute Climb Gradient

According to FAR part 25, a twin-engined airplane must have a one engine-out enroute climb gradient of 1.1%. Since speed for best climb gradient for aircraft of this type is less than the minimum allowable speed, enroute climb gradient is computed at 1.3 times the stalling speed in the clean configuration. The obstacle clearance height used is 11,000 feet.

4. Typical Mission

To optimize the commuter design with respect to operating cost, one must compute DOC (direct operating cost) for a typical shorthaul mission. Using a characteristic stage length of 150 N mi., the program finds the corresponding block fuel and block time for the airplane designed to meet the restrictions outlined above. Such values as takeoff weight necessary to Meet the range are calculated according to the method described in the "Range and Maximum Takeoff Weight" section.

The direct operating cost routine assumes that commuter pilot pay rates are about one-third that of trunk carrier pilots. It also uses the following cost estimates:

The cost calculation proceeds as suggested in Ref. 2. Appendix I contains a complete listing of the program.

C. Ride Roughnesz

Though ride-roughness was not considered in the optimization portion of the study, a relative ride-roughness parameter was computed for each optimum airplane. This parameter, taken from the FAR gust-response/ structures regulations is given by

$$
\Delta n = K \frac{d}{498(W/S)}
$$

where U_{de} = equivalent gust velocity, ft/s $V\acute{e}$ = equivalent speed, knots $W/S =$ wing loading, lb/ft² $a = dC_1/d\alpha$

$$
K = \frac{.88\mu}{5.3 + \mu}
$$

$$
\mu = \frac{2(W/S)}{\rho ca g}
$$

Reference 7 provides further discussion of this parameter.

iII . Results

The results of the optimization program'show that the airplane with the lowest direct operating cost flies at 290 knot TAS with an allowed field length greater than or equal to 4,060 feet, Figure 1. For field lengths less than 3,650 feet, the 250 knot airplane fares best in terms of DOC as the large wings required for short landing distances cause excessive drag at the higher speeds. At greater than 3,650 foot field lengths, 290 knots is the best speed. The best 330 knot airplane, however, with a landing distance of 4,275 feet has only one percent worse direct operating cost than the best airplane overall. Direct operating cost as a function of field length and cruise speed is presented in Figure 1.

The optimization, aside from determining the effect of cruise speed and field length on DOC,'produced the following crucial results:

A. Critical Field Lengths

Although, generally, direct operating cost decreases with increasing field length (for **a given speed),** for **each speed there exists a critical** field length beyond which there is no further improvement in DOC; the field length constraint becomes non-active. Two factors contribute to this phenomenon. First, though the wing area can decrease with increased takeoff or landing distance, the aircraft must still maintain **a span adequate to meet climb gradient standards.** The resulting increase in aspect ratio increases the weight enough to counteract the beneficial effects of the lower wing **area. Secondly, a** smaller wing area forces the aircraft to an inefficient C_1 far from that for best L/D (which indicates best specific range for propeller-driven aircraft). A drop in cruise altitude improves the C_L but increases the non-lift dependent drag so the altitude modification is not worthwhile.

-12-

B. Active Constraints and Optimal Variable Values_

Q

A rough rule of thumb governing the selection of aircraft geometry states that the landing field length requirement determines the wing area **and the other operative constraint, whichever one it is, fixes the proper combination of aspect ratio (span) and engine power. In fact, though wing area is not quite independent of cruise speed for a given field length, wing loading (takeoff weight divided by wing area) does not vary with speed. Thus the landing distance has only secondary effect on aspect ratio and horsepower required.**

Table 1 presents a list of the active constraints—that is, those limiting the design-for each cruise speed and field length tested. The table includes the critical field length for each speed. At the lower speeds, **the required enroute climb gradient sizes the aspect ratio and engine power Since, previously, commuter aircraft have not been designed to meet FAR part 25 regulations, they have not encountered as much difficulty with the one-engine-out enroute climb restriction. Though enroute climb rarely presents a problem for turbofan aircraft, the turboprop airplane, because its speed for best climb is lower than the minimum allowable speed (30% above the stall speed), is often restricted by this regulation if it is designed according to part 25 rules.**

At the highest cruise speed, in most cases, minimum cruise power to fly at 330 knot determines both engine power and aspect ratio. Obviously, increasing the horsepower increases the maximum cruise speed, but, though not as important a factor in the power-restricted cases, increasing the aspect ratio also increases the maximum cruise speed due to the reduced induced drag. So, whether the second active constraint is minimum enroute climb gradient or power to cruise at a given cruise velocity, several **combinations of aspect ratio and engine power exist to satisfy that constraint. The optimizer chooses the best, or Lowest cost, combination of the two.**

At a cruise speed of 330 knot and landing distance 4,275 feet or more, enroute climb gradient rather than available cruise power becomes the second operational constraint. This occurs because the wing area has decreased enough that the cruise drag (and, therefore, cruise power required) has also decreased to the extent that power to climb is greater than the power to maintain a 330 knot cruise speed.

-13-

Figure 2 shows the variations of optimal wing area, aspect ratio, and horsepower with field length *and* cruise velocity. As expected, wing area decreases as the field length gets longer. The aspect ratio, however, increases in an attempt to keep the same span in order to maintain the same climb gradient *or* **induced drag. The 250 knot airplanes have higher aspect ratios than the 290 knot planes because they must meet identical climb gradients but with lower power levels. The slower airplanes have lower power ratings but higher spans than the 290 knot aircraft. The 330 knot airplanes have aspect ratios lying between those of the other two speed aircraft since the cruise speed constraint affects choice of aspect ratio differently from the enroute climb constraint.**

Figure 2c provides an interesting insight into the effects of differing active constraints on optimum engine *power.* As wing areas decrease with increasing field length, the aspect ratios increase but, in general, not enough to maintain constant span. If enroute climb is critical, then, the engine power must increase for the airplane to meet the climb gradient for reduced span. At 250 knot and 290 knot this indeed happens. However, if meeting the required cruise velocity is critical, the smaller wing area reduces the parasite drag much more than the smaller span increases induced drag. Therefore, the aircraft requires less power to overcome the cruise drag, and the curve indicating a 330 knot aircraft follows this trend.

C. Sensitivity Studies

1. Grid Search About an Optimal Point. Although the optimizing program chooses a lowest-cost airplane for a given set of constraint parameters, it gives little information about the effects of small changes in variable values about that optimum. Figures 3a-c show cost for values of wing area, *aspect* ratio, and engine power above and below those calculated as the optimum for cruise speed equal to 330 knot and a field length of 4,000 feet. Constraint barriers are included in these figures **to** indicate areas of impossible choices. At the smallest wing area (345 ft²) no airplane can meet the 4,000 foot field length constraint whereas, at a wing area of 385 ft^2 , all airplanes easily fall below the field length requirement,

-14-

As these figures illustrate, the optimizer chooses the lowest cost configuration which can meet all requirements. At the optimum point, the design is bounded by both cruise power and field length, and, as a consequence, it cannot move in a direction of lower cost. (See Figure 3b.)

The "kinks" in the highest power curves of Figures 3b and 3c occur because the program allows only discrete values of cruise altitude which leads to slight discontinuities in the goal function.

2. Non-Optimal Operation, The previous discussion deals with aircraft operation under the conditions for which that aircraft is designed. Possibly, however, a commuter operator would like to have the ability to fly his airplanes at a fast **speed even if he normally flies much more** slowly,

Figure 4 shows the cost penalty incurred for two cases of non-optimal operation. The costs for the optimum airplanes designed for cruise at 330 knots and field lengths of 3,500 and 4,000 feet, but actually **flown** at several lower cruise speeds over the 150 nautical mile typical stage length, are shown. Although the cost does decrease as the airplane slows down, it does not reach the economy level achieved for the optimized airplane at each speed. The difference in DOC between the optimized aircraft and the high-speed airplane flown at a lower speed reaches as high as $1.4%$ for airplanes meeting a 4,000 foot landing distance and as high as 5% *for* airplanes with 3,500 foot field lengths. The non-optimized airplanes cost more to operate at a given speed since their larger engines and higher wing areas contribute to higher weight and drag and, thus, to more fuel burned per mission.

D. Ride **Roughness**

Figure 5 shows ride roughness parameter, en, as a function of field length for the airplanes generated by the optimizing portion of this study. The plot does not form a family of smooth curves with speed **as a** parameter due to the discrete altitudes allowed in the optimizing routine. In particular, the lowest field length, 330 knot airplane flies at 25,000 feet because of the extremely sub-optimal C_L produced at lower altitude. As the field length increases and the wing becomes smaller, the airplanes **come down to ⁴**

-15-

20,000 feet since smaller engines provide the required power at the lower altitude.

Also shown in figure 5 are the roughness parameters of several comparable-mission aircraft. Notice that, according to **the method employed here, three of the optimum commuters would, in fact, have more favorable** gust **response than the 0C-9-30 If indeed trues this** suggests that commuters need only **increase wing loading by using a good flap system, or slow down to 260 kts, in order to solve the ride roughness problem. Because of qualitative assessments of commuter ride roughness, however, some skepticism** remains as to the validity of using this particular parameter to compare these somewhat different aircraft.

The theory for response to **a sharp-edged gust (see Jones, ref, a)** can be applied to the optimum aircraft and to the DC-9-30. Figure 6 shows the theoretical curves for maximum ΔC_1 vs. mass ratio and those points corresponding to the optimal commuters from this study. The ordinate for this plot, maximum ΔC_1 , is obtained from:

$$
\Delta n = \frac{\Delta L}{L} = \frac{\Delta C_L}{C_L}
$$

$$
\Delta C_1 = \Delta n C_1
$$

Since, however, Δn is computed for a 30 ft/sec equivalent airspeed gust and the theory shows response to a ;unit gust, the result must **be normalized by**

$$
\text{maximum } \Delta C_L = \Delta n C_L \frac{V}{U}
$$

where $U = true$ gust velocity for which an is computed $V = true$ airplane speed

The theoretical plot indicates, first of all, that the gust response method of reference 7 coincides quite well with the theory for a sharpedged gust. Secondly, it shows that the OC-9, with comparable mass ratio

 $-16-$

and aspect ratio to the optimal commuters, should indeed have comparable gust response. Even with this evidence, however, a need remains for verification of An as a useful gust response parameter, especially since the theoretical curve in figure 6 has been computed only up to mass ratios of 280 - far less than those of present-day airplanes.

Figure 7 shows a diagram of the optimal airplane for 330 knot cruise speed and a 4,000 feet field length.

IV. Conclusions

- Increasing cruise speed (beyond **290 knot) and decreasing allowable field length tend to increase direct operating cost, but only a six percent difference in DOC exists between the best** and worst airplanes studied. This occurs because each airplane is optimized with respect to direct operating cost for its particular mission.
- **One-engine-out enroute** climb gradient requirements restrict the commuter aircraft with turboprops more than they do a turbofan aircraft because the commuter's speed for best climb gradient is less than its enroute minimum allowable speed.
- The maJor drawback to increasing speed and decreasing runway length is the increased ride roughness due to both higher velocity and lower wing loading. The worst ride roughness calculated for an optimal airplane represents a 45 percent increase in the relative parameter An over the lowest value.
- . Some work remains to verify the FAR value Δn , as a useful parameter for comparing airplane ride roughness.

Y. References

- C1) **Shevell,** Richard S., **"Aerospace Systems Synthesis and Analysis", Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Stanford University, September 1978.**
- **[2) "Standard Method of Estimating Comparative Direct Operating Costs of Turbine Powered Transport Airplanes",** Air Transport Association of America, December 1967.
- [31 Nash, J.C., Compact Numerical Methods for **Computers, New York: John Wiley** & **ons, 1979.**
- Eul Lockheed-California Company, <u>Application of Advanced Technolog</u>
Small Short-Haul Transport Aircraft, NASA CR 152363, June 1980.
- [5] Smith, C.E., Hirschkron, R., Warren, R.E., <u>Propulsion System Study</u> for Small Transport Aircraft Technology (STAT), General Electric Company, NASA CR 165330, May 1981.
- [6) Ebeling, A., The Determination of Airolane Maximum Lift Coefficients, Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc., July
- [7] Shevell, Richard S., Bayan, Fawzi P., "A Brief Ride Roughness Analysis", Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Stanford University, SUDAAR No. 526, May 1981.
- (8) Jones, Robert T., "The Unsteady Lift of a I-ling of Finite Aspect Ratio", NACA Report No. 681, 1940.

Table 1. Active Constraints

- 1. This column contains the second active constraint. The first active constraint is landing distance at the field length listed in column 2.
- 2. Critical field length above which field length does not determine wing area, power or aspect ratio.

Figure 1. Direct Operating Cost vs. Field Length

 $-22-$

 $-23-$

Ride Roughness vs. Field Length Figure 5.

Appendix I

Program Listing

)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

 51.47

J.

 $\ddot{}$

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

 $\overline{}$

 $\overline{}$

 $\big)$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

j

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

)

)

∢

 \mathcal{S}^4

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

 λ

 $\overline{\mathbf{)}$

J

 $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{1}}$

Þ

€

 $\mathbf{\mathbf{I}}$

Ç

J

 λ

 \mathbf{y}

PAGE 004

 $\overline{}$

SHOSS

CALL INFO(FLEN) CONTINUE
STOP
END $\begin{smallmatrix}&&0\\&&0\\0&&0\\0&&0\end{smallmatrix}$ **ISN 0106**
ISN 0107
ISN 0108 **ISH 0105**

 λ

 λ

<u>)</u>

 \mathcal{L}

 $\overline{}$

▶

€

 λ

<u>)</u>

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

is and the search of the contract of the contr

Ŋ

D

J

λ

COMPILER OPTIONS - NAMES - MAIN.OPT=02.LIMECHT=58.SIZE=0000K.
Sources - Names Ebcdic.Nolist.Modeck.Load.Map.Noedit.Id.NoxRef

SUBPROGRAM TO COMPUTE THE GRADIENT OF THE FUNCTION AT A FOINT. SUBROUTINE GROENT(S,B,N,G,FLEN) $H = ABC(BCI) + 1.E-2H1.E-2$ DIMENSION B(15), G(15), D(15) CALL EVAL(D, N, SP, FLEN) $G(1) = (SP - SM)$ $D(L) = D(L) + H$ **M1 = 1.4**
B0 10 10 10
D0 20 10 10 $D(3) = D(3)$ CONTINUE CONTINUE RETURN
END $rac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ ن ن ú ū υ **ISN 0013**
ISN 0014 **13N 0005**
0005 0000 0000 0000
13N 0000 0000 0000
13N 0000 0000 0000
13N 0000 0000 **EGOO NSI 15H 0002**

FUNTILLE SOME SE SONO SE

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

)

 \mathbf{I}^{\dagger}

J

DATE 82.016/13.51.58 888888 **Básana** = 111 $\frac{4}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{6}{3}$ **Eaga** $\frac{7}{100}$ **5888 hanananan sananan dina dina dina dikenalam** 5. 233. $\ddot{\mathbf{z}}$ COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME= MAIN.OPT=02.LINECNT=58.SIZE=0000K,
Sompiler options - Source,EbcDic,Nolist.Nodeck,LoAD,Nap.Noedit,Id,NoxRef CHANGE VARIABLES IN THE X PATRIX; WIICH HAVE BEEN NORPALIZED TO COMPUTE THE GOAL FUNCTION. IF THE CONSTRAINTS ARE NOT MET, THE
FUNCTION HILL BE VERY LARGE DUE TO THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS OF ABS(TOFL-FL) + XNL*ABS(XLFL-FL) + XNS*ABS(GAMSS-.024) + $\bm{\lambda}$ CO/310N/CONSTR/D1ST,DJFF,TOFL,XLFL,GA1SS,GA1ER,CENT 0S/360 FORTRAN H COMMON/VARIAB/TOW, S, SLSHP, AR, VCLIMB, HCRUS COINON/BLOCK1/BLOCKT, BLOCKF, VCRUS, STAGE **BLOCKIVCRUS, BLOCKT, BLOCKF, STAGE)** COAL1 = CENT + XXX: ABSIDIFF) + XXIT* DEFINES GOAL FUNCTION FOR MINIM PROGRAM CALL DOC(STAGE,BLOCKT,BLOCKF,CENT) IF (GAMSS .LT. .024) XXS = 10000.
IF (GAMER .LT. .011) XXE = 10000. (GAMER .LT. .011) XXIE = 10000. CALL MAXTHR(KC, VCRUS, HMAX, DIFF) SUBROUTINE EVAL(X, H, GOAL!, FL) IF (DIFF \cdot LT. 0.) XMH = 10.
IF (TOFL \cdot GT. FL) XMT = 1.
IF (XLFL \cdot GT. FL) XML = 1. CALL RANGE(DIST, HC, VCRUS) $SLSHP = X(2) + 4000$ XIE*ABS(GAMER-.011) CALL SECSEG(GAISS) ENRCLMIGAMER) CALL TAKOFF(TOFL) LANDNG(XLFL) ONE, TO THEIR VALUES. DIMENSION X(15) $5 = X(1) + 400.$ AR = $X(3)$ # 10. $=$ HCRUS THE COEFFICIENTS PLAKE $\frac{1}{2}$ = $\frac{1}{2}$ = $\frac{1}{2}$ ó RETURNI
END u s mx ・コンス CALL I CALL I $U₁$ $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ **HITAX** 一耳交 LEVEL 21.8 (JUR 74) ٨ł \mathbf{u} ده ں \mathbf{u} ن ن uuuu ں ں U \mathbf{o} \mathbf{o} \mathbf{o} ω ü Ü **1SN 0004**
ISN 0005 8888 0013 **TEN 0027**
IEN 0029
IEN 0031
IEN 0033 0007 0010 **TSN 0036**
TSN 0037 0003 0006 0012 0014 0015 0016 0019 0020 0022 0023 **PIOD** 0017 0018 0024 **ISN 0002** 0025 **ISN 0035 ISN 0021** $\ddot{\mathbf{z}}$ $\overline{3}$ 555 **EEEE** $\overline{3}$ \vec{B} $\overline{5}$ $\overline{5}$ $57₁$ $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ $\frac{2}{5}$ ថ្មីថ្មី ត្ត $-33-$ P I 1 J $\mathbf{)}$ λ))))

ORIGINAL PAGE IS

 $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$

 λ

 $-34-$

 \mathbf{P}

 \mathbf{E}

 \rightarrow

И

 λ

 λ

)

,

J

 λ

 λ

NAKE DOG!

١

1

 \mathbf{r}

ı

¥

 $\overline{}$

LEVEL 21.0 $\frac{1}{2}$ JUN 74 1

ŋ

05/360 FORTRAN H

)

DATE 82.016/13.51.58

 $\boldsymbol{\mu}$

 \bigcup

J.

,

┚

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY.

 $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{I}}$

J

 \mathbf{i}

€

 \mathbf{y}

,

℩

 $-39-$

)

 $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{t}}$

 \blacktriangleright

 $\overline{\mathbf{y}}$

ı

 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$

 \bullet

1

 $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$

 λ

I

 $\big)$

05/360 FORTRAN H

 $\mathcal Y$

DATE 82.016/13.52.01

SOURCE, EBCDIC, NOLIST, NODECK, LOAD, MAP, NOEDIT, ID, NOXREF CONPUTES SECOND SEGHENT CLIMB GRADIENT (MUST BE GREATER THAN
OR EQUAL TO 2.4% FOR THIN ENGINE AIRPLANES TO HEET PART 25).
ETA IS CONSIDERED TO BE .75 FOR 2ND SEGHENT CLINB. CALCULATED
FOR HOT DAY (ISA + 30.8 DEGREES F) BUT (1894)
1994 — Нрм(*6020°5-211/м9-30922°5+Лир-3155°°5-10169*) DVDH = 1.4636E-5*V*(1.-6.8634E-6*H)**(-3.1324)
GAMSS = (TH - DJ/(TGN*(1.-(V/G)*DVDH)) COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME= MAIN, OPT=02.LINECNI=56.SIZE=0000K, $CDO = COP + .0003*69*8175 + .0027 + .0155$ CLMAX = 2.25
V = 1.2 * SCRT((2*TOH)/(.002244*S*CLMAX))
HP = SLSHP/2. CONNOUVARIAS/TOM, S. SLSHP, AR, VCLIVB, HCRUS $D = DRAGH$, TOH, V, CDPO. S SUBROUTINE SECSEGIGAMSS) CONNOW/CHARAC/CDP.E.B $\overline{1}$ H = 550.*ETA*SIP/V CONTON/CONST/PI.G CHANGING DENSITY. ETA = $.7$ $M = 400.$ LEVEL 21.8' JUN 74 1 Ü ن ن Ü ن U ى υ 0015 0100 0011 **CO12** 0013 0014 0009 0008 ISN 0003
ISN 0004
ISN 0004 0006 **2000 ISN 0002** $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ **EEEEEEEE** $\overline{3}$ Y

្នាំ ទំនាំទំនាំទំនាំទំនាំ
ព្រឹត្តិព្រឹត្តិពិធី និងពិធី និង

ន្លឹក្តុំ
ធ្លូឡូ

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY.

ដូដូ វូដូ
តែធំធំធំ

 570.571

567.63.
568.63

 $\bm{\mathcal{Y}}$

f f

0016

RETURN 2

U

ISN 0017
ISN 0018

016/13.52.03 ś $\frac{1}{2}$

J

 λ

J

נ

 \blacktriangleright

 \mathbf{I}

)

€

 \mathbf{P}

ă

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

.

,

 ϵ

. .

и.

 \cdot

 $\ddot{}$

715.
712.723. $714.$ $\frac{712}{713}$ 706. 708. $\overline{710}$. \ddot{z} $\frac{699}{700}$. 704. \ddot{a} $\frac{1}{2}$ 697. 698. 695. 690. 696. $\frac{65}{652}$. 689. 692. $693.$ 694. 654.
685. $rac{1}{665}$ 677.83. 680. 575. $rac{2}{571}$ 568. 670. $\overline{5}$ 565. CF = {78.868-26.463*(RELOG)+3.1025*(RCLOG)**2-.12417*(RELOG) FGAP = .0042*(BII*(COS(SHEEPH))**2+BV*(COS(SHEEPV))**2+B/4.} RELOG = ALOG10(RE)
CF = (70.668-26.453W(RELOG)+3.1025W(RELOG)WW2-.12417W(RELOG) CF = {78.868-26.4634(RELOG)+3.1025¤(RE\OG)#42-.12417#(RELOG)
##3)#1.E-3 FIND THE EXPOSED INC AND THE REYNDLDS NUMBER ASSOCIATED HITH THAT
LENGTH AT A CRUISE SPEED OF 290 KT AT 25,000 FT. FIND THE FORM FACTOR USING THE FORMULA GIVEN IN THE AA241 NOTES. FRICTION COEFFICIENT IS A FUNCTION OF THE LOGIBASE 10) OF THE
REYNOLD NUMBER. EXPOSED AREA IS THE TOTAL AREA MINUS THAT AREA COVERED BY THE
FUSELAGE. : = 1.75×COS(SHEEPV)/SQRT(1.-.25×(COS(SHEEPV))**2)
= 1. + Z*TCV + 100.*TCV**4 $z = 1.75*COS(SREEHI)/SQRT(13 - .25*(COS(SIEEEHI))+42)$ K = 1. + Z#TCH + 100.*TCH*44 I = 1.75¤COS(SKEEP)/SGRT(1.-.25¤(COS(SKEEP))##2) XHACE = $.6667*$ (CRF+.4*CR-.4*CRF*CR/(CRF+.4*CR)) FIND THE GAP DRAG USING THE METHOD OF AA241. THE CONSTANT F'S HAVE BEEN DETERMINED AS' DO THE SAME THING FOR THE HORIZONTAL TAIL-NOW DO THE SAME FOR THE VERTICAL TAIL. SE = ((B - 8.116)/2.)H(CRF + .4HCR) $= 1. + 2$ *ICH + 100.*ICH**4 KRITE(6,#)SHET,CF,K,TCH,Z NOW FIND THE F OF THE WING-RE = 1.867E6*SVE/BV RE = 1.667E6*SIE/BH $RELOG = ALOGIO(RE)$ $FHORLZ = CF*K*SLET$ **FVERT = CF*K*SHET** RE = 1.867E6*XIACE FHING = CF*K*SHET SHET = 2.04 ^{xSVE} SHET = $2.04*5HE$ **SHET = 2.04*SE** E-3.1×1.E-3 <u>ں</u> Ű Ü O U ပ္ပေပ ūü $\ddot{}$ ບ ບ ပ္ပ္လုပ္ခဲ \dot{u} $\ddot{}$ Ü üΰ ن ن \bullet u ω ပ္ပေပ **ISN 0042**
ISN 0044
ISN 0044
ISN 0045 **ESH 0049 Choo** 0048 0039
0040
0040 0036 0037 0038 **2200 NSI**
2200 NSI 0035 ISN 0034 **TEN 0030**
IEN 0031 15N 0020
15N 0029 **ISN 0026**
ISN 0027 ⟩ ត្តិគ្នី $\overline{5}$ _
ប៊ូ **EEE គ្គីក្តី** Ĩ $-43-$ Ĺ 7 Þ ٦ \mathbf{r} J,

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

PAGE 002

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

 $-44-$

 $\overline{}$

 \blacktriangleright .

 $\pmb{\rangle}$

 \mathbf{P}

€

I

J

 λ

 $\mathbf{\hat{J}}$

J

 \mathbf{I}

 λ

 λ

 $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$

 $\begin{matrix} \color{blue}\end{matrix}$

 $\int\limits_{\omega}^{\delta}$

 $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$

 $\overline{}$

323821111 $rac{1}{2}$ 816. 323. $\ddot{5}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ DETERMINE ZFH. COMPARE HITH ESTIMATED ZFH. IF NOT SAME, KENG = 2x1-16.56 + 12.58*SQRT1SLSHPH) + .0618*SLSHPH) VERTICAL TAIL AND RUDDER NEIGHT; VERTICAL AVG T/C = .12 XI3=(F2*BV**3*(8.+.44*T0W/S)*1E-3)/(.12*.96*.75*SVE)
KI3 = (.0145*XI3 + 3.51)*.75*SVE 22 = НІЧН2•Н3•Н4•Н5•Н6•Н7•.65×5•Н9•6270.
IF (ABS((Z2 – Z1)/Z1) .GT. .0001) GO TO 10 I1 = "Q*Li*(\$1-H0)*60'\(bI*0'i19**\$) IF (T2 .LT. 0.) T2 = 0.
XI6 = (T7 + (T2H42/(2.4T1)))+1E-3
K6 = (.1024XI6 + 1.051)+1472.47 **HTAF = 22 - 7270. - HENG** IF $(F1, 11, 2.5)$ $F1 = F3$ SURFACE CONTROLS NEIGHT **INS = 1.7"(SHG+SVG)** N9 = 6528. + HEMG
N0 = 1948. + HEMG **SLSIPH = SLSHP/2.** IN = 1.6*H3/3. $12 = 11 - 17$ FUSELAGE MEIGHT $ZFH = Z2$ RETURN ITERATE. $\frac{8}{11}$ u u u u u u Ü \bullet ں ں Ù U Ü \bullet U **1581 0039**
1581 0040
1581 0041 **ISN 0032
ISN 0033**
ISN 0034 **ISN 0035 1SN 0036** 0038 0042 0043 0043 0046
0047 0048 0051 **0053**
0054 **EEEE** $\overline{5}$ **គ្គីគ្គីគ្គីគ្គី** នីនី $-46-$

 λ

Í

ì

I

f

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

PAGE OOE

℩

J,

¥

J

١

J,

X

 λ

DATE 82.016/13.52.89 d
88888888\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ COMPILER OPTIONS - NAMES MAIN,OPT=02,LINECHT=58,SIZE=0000K;
SOURCE,EBCDIC,NOLIST,NODECK,LOAD,MAP,NOEDIT,ID,NOXREF \mathcal{E} RHO = 2.3769E-34() - 6.8634E-64H)4K(4.2648)
Q = .54RHO4V442 05/360 FORTRAIL H DRAS = CDPONQNS + (HNN2)/(QNPIN(BNN2)NE) CONPUTES DRAG FOR A GIVEN FLIGHT CONDITION REAL FUNCTION DRAG(H.H.Y.CDPO.S) CONNAVCHARAC/CDP,E,B
CONNOVCONST/PI,G RETURN
End LEVEL 21.56 JUN 74) Ü û Ű \bullet Ü \bullet ü TSN 0008
ISN 0009 **15N 0005**
ISN 0006 ISN 0003
ISN 0004 **ISN 0007** ISN 0002

 \bigcup

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

 $-47-$

)

 λ

 λ

 λ

 λ

Y

٦

 \blacktriangleright

J

 \bullet

 λ

℩

 λ

 $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{t}}$

S2.12

℩

držuje posester $\frac{4}{5}$ $\frac{6}{5}$ $\frac{6}{5}$ $\frac{6}{5}$ HRITEI6,100)
?Op%XT(IX,'AIRPLANE CANNOT CLIMB -- INADEQUATE FUEL OR HP.')
RETURN
END IF (H .EQ. 0.) GO TO 25
Deltaf = (ShP=SCC)/[3600.*RC)*DH
FC = FC + Deltaf
H = H - Deltaf $H = H + DH$
If $(H$. Le. Hyux) go to io CALCULATE DISTANCE TO CLIMB CALCULATE FUEL TO CLIMB CALCULATE TIME TO CLIMB DELTAT = DH/RC
TC = TC + DELTAT $DC = DC + DELTAD$ DELTAD = V*DH/RC RC = VHGAITIAC CONTINUE
GO TO 70 ERROR MESSAGE TAKE A STEP ន្តខ្ព \$ 6Z a نه ن ပ Ü ü ü ü Ō. Ü **15N 0031**
15N 0032 ISN 0034 **13H 0040**
15H 0041
15H 0042
15H 0044
15H 0044 102020
002020
00000 **855**
8036 8839 15N 8025 3883 $\overline{5} \overline{5}$ ធីដី

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

 $-49-$

 \mathbf{H}

 \mathbf{I}

PAGE 002

 $\mathbf{\hat{}}$

 $\bm{\lambda}$

 $\overline{}$

CONCLUTE: PAGE IS

℩

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

DATE 02.616/13.52.28 1919. 1829. 1021. 1023. 1024.
1025. $\begin{array}{c}\n\mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \\
\mathbf{2} & \mathbf{1} \\
\mathbf{3} & \mathbf{3}\n\end{array}$ 1014. 1915.
1913. 1007. $\frac{3}{2}$ ion₁. 1009. 1019. 1006. C2= .5921H(-1.156E-4-1.443E-84H+3.268E-134H**2+5.133E-184H**3)
C3 = .3505H(1.904E-6+1.758E-104H-5.875E-154H**2) COMPILER OPTIONS – NAME= MAIN,OPT=02,LINECHT=58,SIZE=0000X,
SOURCE SOURCE,EDCDIC,NOLIST,NODECK,LOAD,NAP,NOEDIT,ID,NOXREF CALCULATES AVAILABLE MAX CRUISE AND CLIMB NORSEPOMER AS A
FUNCTION OF ALTITUDE AND SPEED (IN FT/SEC). CURVES ARE FIT
FOR GENERAL ELECTRIC CT-7 ENGINE. CALCULATES RATID OF AVAIL-
ABLE POMER TO SEA LEVEL STATIC POMER RATING. λ C4 = .20754(-3.315E-9-2.26E-134H9.301E-104H442) DS/360 FORTRAN H SHISS + Carvela + Vacs + Carvela + Carvela REAL FUNCTION POWER(SLSHP.V.H) $C1 = .8461 - 1.802E-54H$ POWER = SLSIP * SIPR RETURN $\frac{8}{11}$ LEVEL 21.8' JUN 74) $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}$ ပမမ υ \mathbf{u} ω ū Ü ISN 0004
ISN 0005
ISN 0006 **E000 PEZ** 15N 0009 15% 0010 ISN 0003 **ISN 0007** ISN 0002 1

 $-51-$

Ì

 \bullet

ı ł

◗

LEVEL 21.8' JUN 74)

DS/360 FORTRAN H

 $\bm{\mathcal{C}}$

DATE 82.016/13.52.21

2222211225 049. **5053** 055.
056.
057. **050.
0500.1** 036. 671. 072. 076.
076.
0078. 1079. WHERE F2 IS LESS THAN F1 AND F3, FIT A PARABOLA, FIND MINIMUM AND
USE That as the next x2 NAME= MAIN.OPT=02.LINECNT=58.SIZE=0000K,
SOURCE,EBCDIC.NOLIST.NODECK,LOAD.NAP.NOEDIT.IO.NOXREF CALCULATES BLOCK TIME AND BLOCK FUEL FOR THE STAGE LENGTH TO BE ASSUNE A TAKEOFF NEIGHT. CALCULATE CLIMB AND CRUISE UNTIL THE CALL DISTN(XI,F1,HHAX,VCLIMB,HO,Q,STAGEM,HC,FI,TC,FC,VCRUS)
CALL DISTN(X3,F3,HHAX,VCLIMB,HD,Q,STAGEM,HC,FI,TC,FC,VCRUS) CALL DISTN(X2,F2,HMAX,VCLIHB,HD,Q,STAGEM,HC,FI,TC,FC,VCRUS) CALCULATE TIME, FUEL, AND DISTANCE TO DESCEND ASSUMING HEIGHT
AT END OF DESCENT IS ONE + PAYLOAD + RESERVES. OPTINIZED. USES AN ITERATIVE FROCEDURE TO DETERNINE THE TOA
FOR THE GIVEN RANGE. BLOCK TIME AND FUEL ARE NECESSARY FOR E 2-37692-1146-3050.0 - 112590-2020-2020 CALL DESENT(SLSHP,S,NINX,ETA,FD,TD,DD,ND,ONEPL) SUBROUTINE BLOCK (VERUS, BLOCKT, BLOCKF, STAGE) CONTON/VARIAB/TON.S.SLSHP.AR.VCLIMB.NCRUS FINDING THE DIRECT OPERATING COSTS. IF (INTHE .50) SO TO BE $-00/6072.$ Connon/Neight/Onepl, Afhi
Connon/Const/Pi, G $Q = .5$ * RHO * VCRUS**2 $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ IF (F) .LT, F2) GO TO
IF (F3 .LT, F2) GO TO COMMON/CHARAC/CDP, E, B + ENTRE = INTREE MINIMIZATION ROUTINE $xz = xz + s$ $x2 = k0 + 1000$. STAGEN = STAGE
INTNUM = 0 CONPILER OPTIONS - NAIE= $x_1 = x_2 - s_1e$ $Step = x2/100.$ NEIGHT IS RIGHT. $HMAX = 15000$. VEQ = VCLIMB **STAGE = 150.** $COW = .1$ ETA = $.8$ RIIO \bullet ပ ပ ပ **OOOO** ں ں ں ب ပေ $\ddot{}$ فه \mathbf{u} ம்ப ω <u>ب</u> ü 0009 **ISN 0027**
ISN 0029 8000
2000 **assis** 0012 0014 0015 0016 0017 0020 0024
0025 0003 0018 0223
0823 ISN 0013 0019 ISN 0002 **BBBB 886666 EEEEE EREEE** $\overline{5}$ $-52-$ Įſ I Ì J 1

ORIGINAL PAGE IS **POOR QUALITY OF**

PAGE 002 1105. 1107. 1109. **BEE** 1896. 1097.
1093. 1099. 1100. $\frac{1}{2}$ 1104. 1106. mil. III2. iii4. 1087. 1089. 1090. 1091. 1092. 183. 1055. 1086. 1084. $\ddot{3}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ MIERE F2 IS BETKEEN OR GREATER THAN F1 AND F3, MAKE X2 THE VALUE CALL DISTN(XI,FI,HNX,VCLIMB,HD,Q,STAGEM,HC,FI,TC,FC,VCRUS)
GO TO 3 CALL DISTN(X3,F3,HTMX,VCLIMB,MD,Q,STAGEM,WC,FI,TC,FC,VCRUS) X2 = X2 + .5#STEP¤(F1-F3)/(F3-2.*F2+F1)
CALL DISTN(X2,F2,HHAX,VCLII:3,H0,Q,STAGEM,HC,FI,TC,FC,VCRUS)
IF (F2 .LE, CON) GO TO 99 BLOCKT = TD/60. + TC/3600. + FI*6072./(VCRUS*3600.) + .25 λ $FORIMI$ ^{f} INTIMI f = 50, CONTINUING \ldots ¹ BLOCKF = $F0 + FC + (KC - KD) + .002*T04$ IF (F3 .LT. F1) GO TO 2 $x_1 = x_1 - 5$ TEP $R = 13$
 $R = 13 + 5$ **ARITE(6,302)** STEP = STEP/4. FOR A MINIMUM $\begin{array}{l} \chi_1 = \chi_2 \\ \chi_2 = \chi_2 \\ \chi_3 = \chi_4 \end{array}$ E 01.09 22 = FI
F2 = FI 50 10 10 CONTINUE RETURN g c $\frac{2}{3}$ ç, $\omega^{(n)}$ oυ د ပ္ပေ ن ب $\bm{\lambda}$ **ISN 0053
ISN 0054
ISN 0055** ISN 0056
ISN 0057 **ISN 0051**
ISN 0052 **15N 0037**
 15N 0039
 15N 0044
 15N 0042
 15N 0042
 15N 0043 0033 0035 0032 0031 **EEEEE** -53 ĭ

 \ldots

 ϕ'

ORIGINAL PAGE IS POOR QUALITY OF

J

I

D

I

I

156. 161. $151.$ 152.
153. 154. $\dot{5}3.$ 159. 160. 162. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. **150.** 134. 137. \dot{a} 139. 140. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. $\frac{1}{2}$ 136. 141. \dot{p} 135. 1120. 1121. $\frac{339}{222}$ 126. 127. 128. $\ddot{50}$ 1122. 1118. 1117. 1119. 116. <u>ist</u>
115 FULCST = 1.02*(BLOCKF*DOLGAL/6.7 + 2.*.135*10.*BLOCKT)/STAGES COSTEN=2.5¤(61.747+1.65592E5/SLSIHI- 8.38354E7/SLSIH##2)#SLSIH
COSTAF = 200. # AFNT SOURCE, EBCDIC, NOLIST, NODECK, LOAD, NAP, NOEDIT, ID, NOVREF COMPUTES THE DIRECT OPERATING COSTS FOR A TURBOPROP FOR THE
STAGE LENGTH PRESCRIBED IN THE SUBROUTINE BLOCK . USES THE
1967 ATA METHOD. CONSTANTS INCLUDE NO OF ENGINES (2), NO OF XLAGAF = .OS*AFNT/1000. + 6. - 1630./(AFNT/1000.*120.1)
XLAGAI = .S9 * XLAGAF THE ENGINE COST IS DETERMINED BY FITTING THE LOCKHEED SHP
VS COST PER SHP CURVE FOUND IN THEIR 1980 CONNUTER SILDY.
THE COSTS ARE INFLATED BY 25% TO ACCOUNT FOR 1979 DOLLARS.
AIRFRAME HEIGHT IS ASSUNED TO DE 200 DOLLARS FO $\mathcal Y$ CONPILER OFTICHS - NAME= MAIN.OPT=02, LINECHT=58, SIZE=0000K, DEFINE STAGE LENGTH IN STATUTE MILES, PRICE OF FUEL XINCST = .02#(COSTAF+COSTEN)/(2800.#BLOCKS) OS/360 FORTRAN H CONNIVARIAB/TOH, S. SLSHP, AR, VCLIMB, HCRUS SUBROUTINE DOC(STAGE, BLOCKT, BLOCKF, CENT) AFLAB = (XLABAH*TI+XLABAF)/STAGES * 12. CRHCST = (.05*(TOH/1000.)+63.1/BLOCKS ENGINE AND AIRFRAME ACQUISITION COSTS CREW (2) AND NO OF PASSENGERS (30). CONNOIVWEIGHT/OUEPL.AFWT BLOCKS = STAGES/BLOCKT STAGES = 1.15 \neq STAGE $T1 = BLOCKT - .25$ $stsum = stsnP/2$. FUEL AND GIL COST **TAINTENAICE COST**
AIRFRAIE LABOR DOLGAL = 1.5 INSURANCE COST **BLOCK SPEED DF AIRFRARE.** CREN COST LEVEL 21.8'1 JUN 74 1 Ü ပ ပ Ü Ü $\ddot{}$ ω ပ \bullet Ü \bullet نه ت ω \bullet .ပ ပ 0016 **ISM 0010**
ISM 0011 **0015** 0017 ISN 0013 **1SN 0014** 0000 **ISI 0012** 0005
0006 0007 0009 ISN 0004 **2000 NSI** ត្តិគ្និ $\tilde{5}$ $\overline{\mathbf{5}}\overline{\mathbf{5}}$ **565** ţ t I $-54-$

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

DATE 82.016/13.52.25

⟩

I

J

)

I

 $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{E} & \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E$

المادية المستعمل الماد

<u>Security Security Secu</u> 1221 Executed 1169. DEPR= ((COSTAF+COSTEN)+.1NCOSTAF+.4NCOSTEN)/(DLOCKSM15.N2800.) AFMAT = (13.00MCOSTAFNT1)+(6.24MCOSTAF))/(1E6MSTAGES) ENGINT = (12.5NCOSTEN)NT1 + 2.NCOSTEN)/(1E5NSTAGES) CENTS = (CRNCST+FULCST+XINCST+TOTHAI+DEPR) *100./30. TOTHAI = AFLAB + AFHAT + ENGLAB + ENGINIT + BURDEN XLABEF = {.65+(.03*SLSHH)/1000.}#2.
XLABEH = {.3+{.03*SLSHH)/1000.}#2.
ENGLAB = {XLABEF*T1+XLABEH)/STAGES # 12. BURDEN = $1.8 + (AFLAB + EFGLAD)$ CENTS PER SEAT NAUTICAL MILE CENIS PER SEAT STATUTE HILE CENT = CENTS $*$ 1.15 TOTAL MAINTENNAE COST MAINTENNACE BURDEN DEPRECIATION COST AIRFRAME MATERIAL EKSTHE MATERIALS ENGINE LABOR RETURN
END Ü $\mathbf u$ \bullet u u В \mathbf{d} ۵J Ō Ü Ü Ù ü ပ္ပ ده \bullet Ü Ü $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}$ é k \bullet **ISN 0028**
ISN 0029) **125N 0019**
125N 0020
125N 0021 1511 0024 **ISN 0025** 1511 0026 ISH 0027 ISN 0023 **S100 NSI** ISN 0022

URIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

 $-55-$

 $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{t}}$

I

 \mathcal{Y}

 λ

TEART SI'ER (THI 10 1

 λ

 $\bar{\textbf{t}}$

 λ

05/360 FORTRAILH

 λ

 I^{I}

Ý

I

Ì

J

€

ORIGINAL PACE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

きくいめい ひパ・コニア こうじゅっしゅ

246. 247. 2513. 356. 253. 1262. $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 271.
1272. $\ddot{3}$ 1237. 1238. 1239. 240. 241. **283** 244. 250. 354. **35. CS7.** 259. 1264. 270. 274. 275. 276.
277. **1255** SUBROUTINE DISTR(X,F,NHAX,EAS,ND,Q,NAXRNS,NC,F1,VCRUS,ZFN,HTAF) COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME= MAIN,OPT=02,LINECHT=56,SIZE=000K,
SOURCE,EBCOIC.NOLIST,NOOECK,LOAD,NAP,NOEOIT,ID,NOXREF FUNCTION EVALUATION FOR FINDING THE TON FOR THE REQUIRED RANGE. IF AIRPLANE CANNOT CLIMB, LET THE RANGE BE EQUAL TO GAISLAC. CALL POUNDSIX,S,SLSHP,ZFH,HTAF)
CALL DESENT(SLSHP,S,IHUX,ETA,FD,TD,DD,HD,ZFH)
CALL CLIIBIS,SLSHP,X,IHUX,EAS,CDPO,ETA,FC,TC,DC,GC,HC) $24.43 + 2.076 - 2.026 - 2.026 - 2.026 - 2.45 - 2.64$ FI = AIN(ATAN(HC/A2) - ATAN(HD/A2)) + (DD + DC)/6072. $\ddot{}$ OVA = CDbada2 + (MCanS+MOH45)/(S+DabraShEE) **EL CENTROL DOUGLAS** CONNOVARIAD/ION, S, SLSKP, AR, VCLIND, HCRUS A1 = 325.W(.65/SFC)MBWSQRT(PIWE/(CDPWS)) COIZXVGECALVANC, SIE, SIG, BH, SVE, SVG, BV SIIFTUX = PONERI SLSIIP, VCRUS, HTUX) $SIPAV = DAVAVCRUS/ (550.4.65)$ **IXANT . THE. 01 GO TO 10** $(142 - 67 - 122)$ **KAIT** = 1 A2 = Q=D=SQRT(CDP=PI=E=S) CONTON/HEIGIT/OREPL, AFNT $F = (F1 - H1)$ CONNON/CHARAC/CDP, E.B Z = SHPAV/SHPMX **CONNOIVFLAG/KANT** COMMON/CONST/PI.G REAL MAXRIKS 60 10 20 $COPO = COP$ FI = GC ETA = .8 RETURN $rac{1}{36}$ 9
Ei ă H ■ FF FM FM # 2:14 #### ໍ່
^{ຈັ}ບ $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ <u>ں</u> Ü ن ن ں ں Ű Ù U 8888 0015 0026
0027 0005 0006 0007 0014 0019 0020 0023 0024 **15H 9002** 0003 0004 0010 0012 0013 0017 0022 **SCO0 1651 ESN 0028 ISN 0029 DEOD ISS** 0011 **ISO 1451** 0021 **BEZEZEE 388 EBBEE** $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\overline{5}$ $\overline{5}$ $\frac{3}{2}$ -57- $\qquad \qquad \blacktriangleright$ λ λ λ Ĵ Ĵ Ì $\overline{\mathbf{y}}$ \mathbf{y} λ λ $\overline{\mathbf{y}}$)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS POOR QUALITY Ö۴

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\mathbf{\mathbf{\mathbf{\mathbf{y}}}}$

 $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{i}}$

Ş

∢