NASA/TM-2020-5003178



# Investigation of a Tandem Tilt-wing VTOL Aircraft in the NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel

Steven C. Geuther, David D. North and Ronald C. Busan Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia

#### NASA STI Program... in Profile

Since its founding, NASA has been dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and space science. The NASA scientific and technical information (STI) program plays a key part in helping NASA maintain this important role.

The NASA STI Program operates under the auspices of the Agency Chief Information Officer. It collects, organizes, provides for archiving, and disseminates NASA's STI. The NASA STI Program provides access to the NASA Aeronautics and Space Database and its public interface, the NASA Technical Report Server, thus providing one of the largest collection of aeronautical and space science STI in the world. Results are published in both non-NASA channels and by NASA in the NASA STI Report Series, which includes the following report types:

- TECHNICAL PUBLICATION. Reports of completed research or a major significant phase of research that present the results of NASA programs and include extensive data or theoretical analysis. Includes compilations of significant scientific and technical data and information deemed to be of continuing reference value. NASA counterpart of peer-reviewed formal professional papers, but having less stringent limitations on manuscript length and extent of graphic presentations.
- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM. Scientific and technical findings that are preliminary or of specialized interest, e.g., quick release reports, working papers, and bibliographies that contain minimal annotation. Does not contain extensive analysis.
- CONTRACTOR REPORT. Scientific and technical findings by NASA-sponsored contractors and grantees.

- CONFERENCE PUBLICATION. Collected papers from scientific and technical conferences, symposia, seminars, or other meetings sponsored or co-sponsored by NASA.
- SPECIAL PUBLICATION. Scientific, technical, or historical information from NASA programs, projects, and missions, often concerned with subjects having substantial public interest.
- TECHNICAL TRANSLATION. Englishlanguage translations of foreign scientific and technical material pertinent to NASA's mission.

Specialized services also include organizing and publishing research results, distributing specialized research announcements and feeds, providing information desk and personal search support, and enabling data exchange services.

For more information about the NASA STI Program, see the following:

- Access the NASA STI program home page at http://www.sti.nasa.gov
- E-mail your question to help@sti.nasa.gov
- Phone the NASA STI Information Desk at 757-864-9658
- Write to: NASA STI Information Desk Mail Stop 148 NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23681-2199

NASA/TM-2020-5003178



# Investigation of a Tandem Tilt-wing VTOL Aircraft in the NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel

Steven C. Geuther, David D. North and Ronald C. Busan Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

## Acknowledgments

This work was funded by NASA's Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate (ARMD) under the Transformative Aeronautics Concepts Program. In particular, this research was part of the Convergent Aeronautics Solutions (CAS) and Transformational Tools and Technologies (TTT) Projects. The authors thank the Flight Dynamics Branch at NASA Langley Research Center for the operation of the 12 Foot Low-Speed Tunnel and discussions throughout the testing. The authors thank NASA for their support of the LA-8.

The use of trademarks or names of manufacturers in this report is for accurate reporting and does not constitute an official endorsement, either expressed or implied, of such products or manufacturers by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Available from:

NASA STI Program / Mail Stop 148 NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23681-2199 Fax: 757-864-6500

#### Abstract

The emerging Urban Air Mobility market imposes new design requirements on aircraft, including the ability to have vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) capabilities with the ability to transition into fast and efficient forward flight. Industry has proposed many different vehicle configurations, which have many different challenges. A primary challenge facing many of these concepts is flight through the transition corridor from vertical to horizontal flight and back. In an effort to better understand and help improve vehicle safety in the complex transition corridors, NASA Langley Research Center has proposed to characterize the transition corridor with wind tunnel and flight tests for a variety of unmanned aircraft system sized VTOL configurations. The first vehicle of this series is the Langley Aerodrome 8 (LA-8). LA-8 is a high-risk/high-reward tandem tilt-wing vehicle with distributed electric propulsion and a partially deflected slipstream aircraft. The LA-8 vehicle has gone through a preliminary wind tunnel test in NASA Langley's 12-Foot Low-Speed Wind Tunnel. The results of the aerodynamic data collected, including the longitudinal, lateral, and directional force and moment aerodynamic coefficients, from these tests during different phases of flight are presented.

# Contents

1	Introduction	<b>24</b>
<b>2</b>	Langley Aerodrome 8 Configuration Description	<b>24</b>
3	NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel Test Setup	28
4	Langley Aerodrome 8 Wind Tunnel Tests4.1Airframe Performance and Stability4.2Hover Performance and Stability4.3Transition Performance and Stability4.4Forward Flight Performance and Stability	<b>30</b> 31 31 31 32
5	Wind Tunnel Test Results5.1Airframe Performance and Stability5.2Hover Performance and Stability5.3Transition Performance and Stability5.4Forward Flight Performance and Stability	<b>32</b> 33 37 39 56
6	Concluding Remarks	64
7	Future Work	<b>65</b>
$\mathbf{A}_{j}$	ppendix A Airframe Performance and Stability Plots	66
$\mathbf{A}_{j}$	ppendix B Hover Performance and Stability Plots	83
<b>A</b> ]	pendix C Transition Performance and Stability PlotsC.1Transition Wing Angles 56 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.2Transition Wing Angles 51 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.3Transition Wing Angles 47 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.4Transition Wing Angles 43 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.5Transition Wing Angles 38 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.6Transition Wing Angles 35 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.7Transition Wing Angles 32 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.8Transition Wing Angles 30 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.9Transition Wing Angles 27 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.10Transition Wing Angles 23 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.11Transition Wing Angles 14 Degrees Performance and Stability PlotsC.13Transition Wing Angles 14 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots	<ul> <li>99</li> <li>99</li> <li>115</li> <li>131</li> <li>147</li> <li>163</li> <li>179</li> <li>195</li> <li>211</li> <li>227</li> <li>243</li> <li>259</li> <li>275</li> <li>291</li> <li>307</li> </ul>

Appendix D Forward Flight Performance and Stability Plots 323

# List of Figures

1	LA-8 UAS in the 12-foot low-speed tunnel.	25
2	LA-8 top view, forward flight mode configuration	25
3	LA-8 isometric view, forward flight mode configuration.	26
4	LA-8 top view, hover mode configuration.	26
5	LA-8 isometric view, hover mode configuration.	27
6	NASA Langley 12-foot low-speed tunnel cutaway	29
7	NASA Langley 12-foot low-speed tunnel view of tunnel and control	
	room.	29
8	Model balance and sting arrangement.	30
9	Propellers off $C_L$ vs angle of attack.	34
10	Propellers off $C_D$ vs angle of attack	35
11	Propellers off $C_m$ vs angle of attack.	35
12	Propellers off $C_{l_{\theta}}$ vs angle of attack with Q variation.	36
13	Propellers off $C_{n_e}$ vs angle of attack with Q variation	36
14	Propellers off $C_m$ vs angle of attack with wing 1 incidence at 10 degrees.	37
15	Hover trim point normal force vs angle of attack.	38
16	Hover trim point axial force vs angle of attack.	39
17	Trimmed wing sweep $C_L$ vs angle of attack	41
18	Trimmed wing sweep $C_D$ vs angle of attack	41
19	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs angle of attack	42
20	Trimmed wing sweep $C_{l_s}$ vs angle of attack	42
21	Trimmed wing sweep $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack.	43
22	Trimmed wing sweep $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	43
23	Trimmed wing sweep $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	44
24	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	44
25	Trimmed wing sweep $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle	45
26	Trimmed wing sweep $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle	45
27	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle	46
28	Trimmed wing sweep $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	46
29	Trimmed wing sweep $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	47
30	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle	47
31	Trimmed wing sweep $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	48
32	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	48
33	Trimmed wing sweep $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	49
34	Trimmed wing sweep $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.	49
35	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.	50
36	Trimmed wing sweep $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.	50
37	Trimmed wing sweep $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	51
38	Trimmed wing sweep $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	51
39	Trimmed wing sweep $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	52
40	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.	52
41	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.	53
42	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.	53

43	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon and rudder-	
	vator deflection.	54
44	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon and rudder-	
	vator deflection.	54
45	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon and rudder-	
	vator deflection.	55
46	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.	55
47	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.	56
48	Trimmed wing sweep $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.	56
49	Forward flight trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	57
50	Forward flight trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	58
51	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack.	58
52	Forward flight trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	59
53	Forward flight trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}^{p}$ vs angle of attack	59
54	Forward flight pitch stability with motor RPM.	60
55	Forward flight yaw stability with motor RPM	60
56	Forward flight lift coefficient with motor RPM.	61
57	Forward flight drag coefficient with motor RPM	61
58	Forward flight roll stability with motor RPM	62
59	Center of gravity change in forward flight for $C_m$ vs angle of attack.	63
60	Center of gravity change in forward flight for $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack.	63
61	Center of gravity change in forward flight for $C_{n_{\beta}}^{\mu}$ vs angle of attack.	64
62	Propellers off $C_L$ vs angle of attack.	66
63	Propellers off $C_D$ vs angle of attack	66
64	Propellers off $C_m$ vs angle of attack.	67
65	Propellers off $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	67
66	Propellers off $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	68
67	Propellers off $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	68
68	Propellers off $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles	69
69	Propellers off $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles	69
70	Propellers off $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles	70
71	Propellers off $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	70
72	Propellers off $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	71
73	Propellers off $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	71
74	Propellers off $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack with Q variation.	72
75	Propellers off $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack with Q variation	72
76	Propellers off $C_L$ vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection	73
77	Propellers off $C_D$ vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection	73
78	Propellers off $C_m$ vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection	74
79	Propellers off $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.	74
80	Propellers off $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.	75
81	Propellers off $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.	75
82	Propellers off $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles with all	
	flaps' deflection.	76
83	Propellers off $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles with all	
	flaps' deflection	76

 flection. s' de-  s' de-  	77 77 78 78 78
flection. s' de- s' de-   	77 78 78 78
s' de-  s' de-  	78 78 70
 s' de-  	78 78 70
s' de-  	78 70
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	$78 \\ 70$
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	70
· · · · ·	- 4 - 4
· · · · ·	79
	80
	80
	81
	81
	82
	83
	83
	84
	84
	85
	85
	86
	86
	87
	87
••••	88
	88
	89
	89
	90
	90
	91
ection	01
	91
leflec-	-
	92
ection	0-
	92
le	93
ngle.	93
rle	94
levon	01
	94
levon	51
	95
elevon	50
	95

121	Hover trim point $\Delta$ rolling moment vs angle of attack for elevon and	
	ruddervator deflection	96
122	Hover trim point $\Delta$ pitching moment vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection	96
123	Hover trim point $\Delta$ yawing moment vs angle of attack for elevon and	
	ruddervator deflection	97
124	Hover trim point $\Delta$ rolling moment vs angle of attack for ruddervator	
	deflection.	97
125	Hover trim point $\Delta$ pitching moment vs angle of attack for rudder-	
	vator deflection	98
126	Hover trim point $\Delta$ yawing moment vs angle of attack for ruddervator	
	deflection.	98
127	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	99
128	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	99
129	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	100
130	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	100
131	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	101
132	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	101
133	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	102
134	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	102
135	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	103
136	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	103
137	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	104
138	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	104
139	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	105
1/0	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	105
1/1	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_{m}$ vs all hap deflection angle.	106
141	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs eleven deflection angle	106
142	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs eleven deflection angle	100
140	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs eleven denection angles	107
144	wing angles 50 degrees trim point $O_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	107
145	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point C we aleven and muddementor	107
140	wing angles 50 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	100
140	denection angles.	108
140	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	100
–	deflection angles.	108
147	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	109
148	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	.109
149	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	110
150	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	110
151	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection. $\ldots$	111
152	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection	111
153	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	112

154	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	112
155	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	113
156	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection	113
157	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Lambda$ C <sub>m</sub> vs angle of attack for rud-	110
101	dervator deflection	114
158	Wing angles 56 degrees trim point $\Lambda$ C, vs angle of attack for rud.	111
100	wing angles 50 degrees trim point $\Delta O_n$ vs angle of attack for rud- dervator deflection	11/
150	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point C <sub>x</sub> us angle of attack	115
160	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	115
100	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	110
101	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	110
162	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	110
103	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	117
164	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	117
165	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	118
166	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	118
167	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	119
168	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	119
169	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	120
170	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	120
171	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	121
172	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	121
173	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	122
174	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	122
175	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	123
176	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	123
177	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	124
178	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles	124
179	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_i$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	125
180	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_{ij}$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	125
181	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	126
182	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for eleven	120
102	wing angles of degrees trun point $\Delta O_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection	196
192	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , we angle of attack for eleven	120
100	wing angles 51 degrees thin point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for eleven deflection	197
104	$W_{intropy} = V_{intropy} = V_{intropy} + $	12(
184	wing angles 51 degrees true point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	107
105		127
185	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	1.00
100	and ruddervator deflection.	128
186	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	128

187	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	129
188	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	129
189	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	130
190	Wing angles 51 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	130
191	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	131
192	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	131
193	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	132
194	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	132
195	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_{n_e}$ vs angle of attack	133
196	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	133
197	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle.	134
198	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle.	134
199	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle	135
200	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle	135
200	Wing angles $47$ degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle	136
201	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs if for deflection angle.	136
202	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs att hap deflection angle	137
203	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs att hap deflection angle.	197
204	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs att hap denection angle.	101
205	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	138
206	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	138
207	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	139
208	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	190
000	nection angles.	139
209	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	1.40
010	deflection angles.	140
210	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
~ · ·	deflection angles.	140
211	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	141
212	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	141
213	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	142
214	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection	142
215	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection	143
216	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	143
217	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	144
218	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	144
219	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	145

220	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	145
221	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	146
222	Wing angles 47 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	146
223	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_I$ vs angle of attack	147
224	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	147
225	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	148
226	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{l_2}$ vs angle of attack	148
227	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\alpha}}$ vs angle of attack	149
228	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_I$ vs all flap deflection angle.	149
229	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle.	150
230	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle.	150
231	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_I$ vs front flap deflection angle.	151
232	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	151
233	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{\rm m}$ vs front flap deflection angle.	152
234	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{II}$ vs aft flap deflection angle	152
235	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	153
236	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	153
237	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{ij}$ vs elevon deflection angle	154
238	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{i}$ vs elevon deflection angle	154
239	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	155
$\frac{200}{240}$	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_h$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	100
- 10	flection angles	155
241	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_{m}$ vs elevon and ruddervator	100
- 11	deflection angles $\dots$	156
242	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	100
	deflection angles $\dots$	156
243	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_i$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	157
244	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	157
245	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	158
246	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
-	deflection.	158
247	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	100
	deflection. $deflection$	159
248	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	100
	deflection. $\ldots$	159
249	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	160
250	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	160
251	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	100
	and ruddervator deflection. $\dots \dots \dots$	161
252	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	161

253	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection	162
254	Wing angles 43 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection	162
255	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	163
256	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	163
257	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	164
258	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	164
259	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}^{\nu}$ vs angle of attack	165
260	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_L^{\checkmark}$ vs all flap deflection angle	165
261	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	166
262	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	166
263	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	167
264	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	167
265	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	168
266	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	168
267	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	169
268	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	169
269	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	170
270	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	170
271	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	171
272	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	171
273	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	172
274	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	172
275	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	173
276	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	.173
277	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	174
278	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	174
279	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	175
280	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection. $\ldots$	175
281	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	176
282	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	176
283	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	177
284	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	177
285	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	178

286	Wing angles 38 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	178
287	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	179
288	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	179
289	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	180
290	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_{l_a}$ vs angle of attack	180
291	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\alpha}}$ vs angle of attack	181
292	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	181
293	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	182
294	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	182
295	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	183
296	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	183
297	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	184
298	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	184
299	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	185
300	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	185
301	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	186
302	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	186
303	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	187
304	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	187
305	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	188
306	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles	188
307	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	189
308	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angles	189
309	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	190
310	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection	190
311	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	191
312	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	191
313	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	192
314	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection	192
315	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection	193
316	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection	193
317	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	194
318	Wing angles 35 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection	194

319	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	195
320	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	195
321	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	196
322	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	196
323	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	197
324	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	197
325	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	198
326	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	198
327	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	199
328	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	199
329	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	200
330	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	200
331	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	201
332	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	201
333	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	202
334	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	202
335	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	203
336	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	203
337	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	204
338	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	204
339	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	205
340	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	.205
341	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	206
342	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	206
343	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	207
344	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	207
345	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	208
346	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
0 - 0	and ruddervator deflection.	208
347	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
011	and ruddervator deflection. $\dots \dots \dots$	209
348	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	-00
010	dervator deflection	209
349	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Lambda$ C <sub>m</sub> vs angle of attack for rud-	200
010	dervator deflection	210
350	Wing angles 32 degrees trim point $\Lambda$ C <sub>-</sub> vs angle of attack for rud-	<b>_</b> ±0
550	dervator deflection	210
351	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point Cr vs angle of attack	211
359	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_{\rm D}$ vs angle of attack	211 911
004	wing angles so degrees this point $\bigcirc D$ vs alight of attack. $\ldots$	411

353	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	212
354	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	212
355	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_{n_s}$ vs angle of attack	213
356	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	213
357	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	214
358	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle.	214
359	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	215
360	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	215
361	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	216
362	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_I$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	216
363	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	217
364	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_{m}$ vs aft flap deflection angle	217
365	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_{i}$ vs elevon deflection angle	218
366	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	218
367	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle.	210
368	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deneedon angle	215
300	Wing angles 50 degrees trini point $O_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	210
360	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point C vs elevon and ruddervator	210
303	wing angles 50 degrees trim point $O_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles	220
270	Wing angles $20$ degrees trip point $C$ we also and rudder even	220
370	wing angles 50 degrees thin point $O_n$ vs elevon and fuddervator deflection angles	220
271	Wing angles 20 degrees trim point C. vs ruddervator deflection angle	220
071 979	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs fuddervator deflection angle.	221
014 979	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	.221 000
070 974	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\mathcal{O}_n$ vs fuddervator denection angle.	<i>444</i>
374	wing angles 50 degrees trun point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	000
975	Wing angle 20 demonstration which A C and angle of attack for all and	<i>LLL</i>
373	wing angles 50 degrees trun point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	000
276	Wing apples 20 degrees this point $\Lambda C$ as apple of attack for eleven	223
370	wing angles 50 degrees trun point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	000
977	$W_{intropy} = 20  d_{intropy} = 1  d_{introp$	223
377	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	004
270	Windervator deflection.	224
378	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	004
970	and ruddervator deflection.	224
379	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	005
000	and ruddervator deflection.	225
380	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	225
0.01	dervator deflection.	225
381	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	226
382	Wing angles 30 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	226
383	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	227
384	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	227
385	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	228
386	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	228

387	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	229
388	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	229
389	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	230
390	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	230
391	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	231
392	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	231
393	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	232
394	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	232
395	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	233
396	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	233
397	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	234
398	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	234
399	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	235
400	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	235
401	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	236
402	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	236
403	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	237
404	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	237
405	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	238
406	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	238
407	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	239
408	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	239
409	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	240
410	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	240
411	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	241
412	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	241
413	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	242
414	Wing angles 27 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	242
415	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	243
416	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	243
417	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	244
418	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_{l_{q}}$ vs angle of attack	244
419	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\alpha}}$ vs angle of attack	245
420	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	245

421	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	246
422	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	246
423	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	247
424	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	247
425	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	248
426	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	248
427	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	249
428	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	249
429	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	250
430	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	250
431	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	251
432	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	251
433	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	252
434	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	252
435	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	253
436	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	.253
437	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	254
438	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	254
439	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	255
440	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	255
441	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	256
442	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	256
443	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	257
444	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	257
445	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	258
446	Wing angles 23 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	258
447	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_I$ vs angle of attack	259
448	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack.	259
449	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack.	260
450	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_{L_2}$ vs angle of attack.	260
451	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\alpha}}$ vs angle of attack.	261
452	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_I$ vs all flap deflection angle.	261
453	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	262
454	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angles .	262

455	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	263
456	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	263
457	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	264
458	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	264
459	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	265
460	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	265
461	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	266
462	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	266
463	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	267
464	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	267
465	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles. $\ldots$	268
466	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles. $\ldots$	268
467	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	269
468	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angles	.269
469	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	270
470	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection	270
471	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	271
472	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	deflection.	271
473	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	272
474	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	272
475	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	
	and ruddervator deflection.	273
476	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	273
477	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	~ - (
	dervator deflection.	274
478	Wing angles 21 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	<b>a-</b> 4
	dervator deflection.	274
479	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	275
480	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	275
481	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	276
482	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	276
483	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	277
484	wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	277
480	wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all hap deflection angle Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all hap deflection angle	218
480 497	wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all hap deflection angle Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front for deflection angle.	218
481	wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	219
488	wing angles 18 degrees true point $C_D$ vs front hap denection angle.	219

489	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	280
490	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	280
491	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	281
492	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	281
493	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	282
494	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle.	282
495	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle.	283
496	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	283
497	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles	284
498	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point C <sub>m</sub> vs elevon and ruddervator	-01
100	deflection angles	284
499	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_1$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	285
500	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	285
501	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	286
502	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Delta C_i$ vs angle of attack for elevon	200
002	deflection	286
503	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , vs angle of attack for eleven	200
000	wing angles to degrees trun point $\Delta O_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection	287
504	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ we angle of attack for eleven	201
004	wing angles to degrees truit point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection	287
505	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Lambda$ C, us angle of attack for eleven	201
909	wing angles to degrees thin point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	100
506	Wing angles 18 degrees twim point $\Lambda C$ , we angle of attack for eleven	200
000	wing angles to degrees thin point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	200
507	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $A_{C}$ , we angle of attack for eleven	200
307	wing angles to degrees thin point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon and middometer deflection	<u> </u>
508	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Lambda$ C, us angle of attack for rud	209
308	wing angles 18 degrees thin point $\Delta O_l$ vs angle of attack for fud-	280
500	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , $\mu_{\rm S}$ angle of attack for rud	209
009	wing angles to degrees trun point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for fud- dervator deflection	200
510	Wing angles 18 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , as angle of attack for rud	230
010	wing angles to degrees thin point $\Delta O_n$ vs angle of attack for fud- dervator deflection	200
511	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point C <sub>x</sub> vs angle of attack	290
519	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	291
512	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	201
514	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	292
515	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	292
516	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	290
517	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all hap deflection angle	235
519	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	294
510	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs an nap deflection angle.	294 205
520	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_{\rm D}$ vs front flap deflection angle.	290 205
520 591	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	290 206
521 599	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front hap deflection angle.	290 200
022	wing angles to degrees trun point $O_L$ vs att nap denection angle	290

523	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	297
524	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	297
525	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	298
526	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	298
527	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	299
528	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles	299
529	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_{m}$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
0_0	deflection angles	300
530	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point C <sub>n</sub> vs elevon and ruddervator	000
000	deflection angles	300
531	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_{i}$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	301
532	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	301
532	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	301
524	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs ruddervator denection angle.	302
004	wing angles to degrees thin point $\Delta O_l$ vs angle of attack for eleven deflection	209
595	Wing angles 16 degrees trips point $\Lambda C$ , us angle of attack for eleven	302
999	wing angles to degrees thin point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	202
596	With a second s	303
530	wing angles 10 degrees trun point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	202
597		303
991	wing angles 16 degrees trum point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	204
<b>59</b> 0	and ruddervator deflection.	304
538	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon	904
500	and ruddervator deflection.	304
539	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon	~~~
- 10	and ruddervator deflection.	305
540	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for rud-	~~~~
	dervator deflection.	305
541	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	306
542	Wing angles 16 degrees trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for rud-	
	dervator deflection.	306
543	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	307
544	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	307
545	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	308
546	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	308
547	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	309
548	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs all flap deflection angle	309
549	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	310
550	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	310
551	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle.	311
552	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle.	311
553	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle.	312
554	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_L$ vs aft flap deflection angle	312
555	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	313
556	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle.	313

557	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	314
558	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	314
559	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	315
560	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator de-	
	flection angles.	315
561	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	316
562	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator	
	deflection angles.	316
563	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_i$ vs ruddervator deflection angle.	317
564	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	317
565	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	318
566	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	010
000	deflection	318
567	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $\Delta C_{m}$ vs angle of attack for elevon	010
001	deflection	310
568	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , vs angle of attack for eleven	515
000	deflection	310
560	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $\Lambda C_{\rm r}$ we angle of attack for eleven	515
009	wing angles 14 degrees trun point $\Delta O_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon	220
570	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , we angle of attack for eleven	320
510	wing angles 14 degrees thin point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddemater deflection	220
571	Wing angles 14 degrees trim point $\Lambda C$ , we angle of attack for eleven	320
571	wing angles 14 degrees truit point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddemater deflection	201
579	Wing angles 14 degrees this point $\Lambda$ C vs angle of attack for and	321
512	wing angles 14 degrees thin point $\Delta O_l$ vs angle of attack for fun-	201
579	Wing angles 14 degrees trips point $\Lambda$ C , we angle of attack for mid	321
979	wing angles 14 degrees trun point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for fud-	วาา
574	Wing angles 14 degrees trip point $\Lambda$ C , as angle of attack for mid	322
074	wing angles 14 degrees trun point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for fud-	วาา
575	Termand fight trim point C we apple of attack	044 202
575	Forward hight trim point $C_L$ vs angle of attack	<b>ა∠ა</b> აია
570	Forward hight trim point $C_D$ vs angle of attack	ა∠ა აი∡
571	Forward hight trim point $C_m$ vs angle of attack	324
578	Forward flight trim point $C_{l_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack.	324
579	Forward flight trim point $O_{n_{\beta}}$ vs angle of attack	325
580	Forward hight trim point $C_L$ vs all hap deflection angle	325
581	Forward flight trim point $C_D$ vs all flap deflection angle	326
582	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs all flap deflection angle	326
583	Forward flight trim point $C_L$ vs front flap deflection angle	327
584	Forward flight trim point $C_D$ vs front flap deflection angle	327
585	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs front flap deflection angle	328
586	Forward flight trim point $C_L$ vs att flap deflection angle	328
587	Forward flight trim point $C_D$ vs aft flap deflection angle	329
588	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs aft flap deflection angle	329
589	Forward flight trim point $C_l$ vs elevon deflection angle	330
590	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs elevon deflection angle	330

591	Forward flight trim point $C_n$ vs elevon deflection angle	331
592	Forward flight trim point $C_l$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.	331
593	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection	
	angles	332
594	Forward flight trim point $C_n$ vs elevon and ruddervator deflection	
	angles	332
595	Forward flight trim point $C_l$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	333
596	Forward flight trim point $C_m$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	333
597	Forward flight trim point $C_n$ vs ruddervator deflection angle	334
598	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.	334
599	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.	335
600	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.	335
601	Forward flight trim point $\Delta$ C <sub>l</sub> vs angle of attack for elevon and	
	ruddervator deflection	336
602	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for elevon and	
	ruddervator deflection	336
603	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for elevon and	
	ruddervator deflection	337
604	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_l$ vs angle of attack for ruddervator	
	deflection.	337
605	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_m$ vs angle of attack for ruddervator	
	deflection.	338
606	Forward flight trim point $\Delta C_n$ vs angle of attack for ruddervator	
	deflection.	338

# List of Tables

1	Hover Trim Motor RPMs at 0 Degrees Angle of Attack	38
2	Transition Trim Motors RPMs at 0 Degrees Angle of Attack	40
3	Forward Flight Trim Motor RPMs at 0 Degrees Angle of Attack	59

21

## Nomenclature

- $\alpha$  Angle of Attack, deg
- $\beta$  Angle of Sideslip, deg
- $\rho$  Density, slug/ft<sup>3</sup>
- b Wing Span, ft
- c Wing Chord, ft
- $C_D$  Drag Coefficient, Axial Force/Q\*S
- $C_D$  Thrust Coefficient, Axial Force/ $\rho^* n^{2*} D^4$
- $C_{l_{\beta}}$  Variation of Rolling-moment Coefficient with Sideslip Angle,  $C_l$  per deg
- $C_L$  Lift Coefficient, Normal Force/Q\*S
- $C_l$  Rolling-moment Coefficient, Rolling Moment/Q\*S\*b
- $C_m$  Pitching-moment Coefficient, Pitching Moment/Q\*S\*b
- $C_{n_{\beta}}$  Variation of Yawing-moment Coefficient with Sideslip Angle,  $C_n$  per deg
- $C_n$  Yawing-moment Coefficient, Yawing Moment/Q\*S\*b
- CG Center of Gravity
- D Propeller Diameter, ft
- DEP Distributed Electric Propulsion
- DOE Design of Experiments
- ESC Electronic Speed Controller
- LA-8 Langley Aerodrome 8
- n Propeller Speed, Rev/s
- PWM Pulse Width Modulation
- Q Free-stream Dynamic Pressure,  $lb/ft^2$
- S Wing area, ft<sup>2</sup>
- TED Trailing Edge Down
- TEI Trailing Edge In
- TEO Trailing Edge Out
- TEU Trailing Edge Up

- $U\!A\!M\,$ Urban Air Mobility
- $U\!A\!S$   $\,$  Unmanned Aircraft System  $\,$
- $VTOL\,$  Vertical Takeoff and Landing

#### 1 Introduction

The Langley Aerodrome 8 (LA-8) unmanned aircraft system (UAS) is the first in a planned series of electric vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) high-risk/highreward testbeds from NASA Langley Research Center to support Urban Air Mobility (UAM) research [1]. Because of the large number of control features inherent to VTOL aircraft and the interaction of the propulsion system with aerodynamic surfaces in distributed electric propulsion (DEP) designs, there are a corresponding large number of unknowns in the performance and control characteristics of these vehicles. These unknowns are often difficult to model and analyze with current techniques. In an effort to assist industry in both the development of aircraft configurations and validation of tools for unconventional aircraft, NASA has developed the capability to rapidly produce electric VTOL wind tunnel and flight models to gather the data necessary to characterize these vehicles. The first wind tunnel test of LA-8 is described in this report, with additional configurations of the vehicle and subsequent wind tunnel tests planned to be performed at a later date. The wind tunnel data and experimentation in this first test helps inform upcoming wind tunnel test limits and best practices. In addition, this initial wind tunnel test provides information on characterizing the vehicle in order to understand the control power and stability to prepare for flight testing. With this data, conceptual design tools can be validated for complex configurations, including post-stall conditions and blown wings for DEP aircraft. Finally, the wind tunnel test data provides insight into the stability and performance of LA-8 in order to inform design iterations or modifications prior to a second wind tunnel entry.

## 2 Langley Aerodrome 8 Configuration Description

Langley Aerodrome 8 is a tandem tilt-wing UAS with DEP that can be utilized as a wind tunnel model and free flight testbed. The LA-8 is not a scale model of a full scale UAM concept. However, non-dimensional scaling laws can be used for prediction of the behavior of larger scale, similar vehicles. The vehicle can be seen in Figure 1. The LA-8 geometry, build characteristics, and development can be found in Reference [2]. For all data presented in this report, the reference center of gravity (CG) of the wind tunnel model remains constant at a location of 1.9 feet aft of (positive x-direction) the nose of the fuselage and 0.65 feet vertically (positive z-direction) from the waterline of the nose of the aircraft. This CG location is the analytically determined CG for static stability in forward flight in all three axes. The vehicle has two rotatable wings, eight propellers and motors, four single-slotted Fowler flaps, four hinged elevons, and two hinged ruddervators. The top view of the vehicle with all of the controllable features, except for ruddervators, can be seen in Figure 2. The elevons and flaps are approximately drawn to scale. Throughout this paper, the referencing of each controllable feature will be identical to the numbering in Figure 2. Additionally, the numbering convention for the ruddervators is identical, where ruddervator 1, which can be seen in Figure 3, is located on the left side of the vehicle under wing 2. Ruddervator 2 is located on the right side in a similar

manner for symmetry. Additionally, in Figures 4 and 5 the LA-8 can be seen in its hovering mode configuration.



Figure 1. LA-8 UAS in the 12-foot low-speed tunnel.



Figure 2. LA-8 top view, forward flight mode configuration.



Figure 3. LA-8 isometric view, forward flight mode configuration.



Figure 4. LA-8 top view, hover mode configuration.



Figure 5. LA-8 isometric view, hover mode configuration.

All propellers on the vehicle are 3-bladed. Propellers on motors 5 and 8 are 21.5 inch diameter with a 7.5 inch pitch and were purchased through commercial vendors. These two propellers were implemented to solely propel the vehicle in the cruise configuration. The motors used in conjunction with these propellers were commercially available 220 KV brushless motors. The remaining propellers are 16 inch diameter with an 8 inch pitch (16x8). These propellers could only be procured in the clockwise (aft looking forward) configuration. Custom propellers, which are geometrically mirrored versions of the clockwise propellers, were designed and manufactured for the counter-clockwise propellers. Motors 1-4, 6, and 7, which have the 16x8 propellers, are commercially available 450 KV brushless motors. For this wind tunnel test, motors 1, 2, 5, and 6 used counter-clockwise propellers and motors 3, 4, 7, and 8 used clockwise propellers. In order to maintain proper and consistent terminology of the wing reference and vehicle reference, both wing angles are specified by a wing incidence or wing angle taxonomy, while the vehicle will use angle of attack,  $\alpha$ , which is referenced from the waterline of the nose of the fuselage. The sideslip angle,  $\beta$ , is referenced from the symmetry plane of the vehicle. For all wings, flaps, and elevons, the sign convention for deflections is trailing edge up (TEU) as negative and trailing edge down (TED) as positive. Due to the construction of the wings and flaps, these surfaces will not exhibit a TEU. At zero degrees, the wings are positioned into forward flight conditions, and at approximately 90 degrees incidence angle the wings are in hover conditions. The ruddervators follow the convention of trailing edge in (TEI) and trailing edge out (TEO), which indicates the direction of the trailing edge compared to the symmetry plane of the aircraft. Therefore, the ruddervators are in positive deflection when they are TEI and negative for TEO.

For this aircraft and due to the design of the single-slotted Fowler flaps, flaps are not used for control of the vehicle. The convention of controlling the aircraft in the hover configuration with wing incidence angles at approximately 90 degrees is done by traditional means. In order to roll the vehicle, differential thrust is used on the left and right side of the vehicle. Yaw control utilizes differential elevons and ruddervators on the left and right side of the vehicle as well as differential thrust on the clockwise and counterclockwise rotating propellers. The vehicle has the ability to use either differential thrust on the front and back wing or the ruddervators in unison to produce a pitching moment in hover. In forward flight, the vehicle utilizes differential elevon on the left and right side of the vehicle to roll. To pitch the vehicle in forward flight, differential elevons and thrust between the front and aft wing along with ruddervators are used. Finally, yaw control uses left and right differential ruddervator and thrust inputs. All transition points and wing angles in between 0 and 90 degrees utilize a mixing of the control effectors based upon the percentage of the transition in order to control the vehicle.

#### 3 NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel Test Setup

The Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel (12-ft LST) is an atmospheric pressure, open circuit tunnel enclosed in a 60-foot diameter sphere (Figures 6 and 7) [3]. The test section is octagonal with a width and height of 12 feet and a length of 15 feet with each octagonal side measuring 5 feet. The maximum operating dynamic pressure (Q) is seven pounds per square foot (psf) (V=77 ft/sec at standard sea level conditions), which corresponds to a Reynolds number of approximately 492,000 per foot. However, for the LA-8 tests the dynamic pressure was limited to 6 psf to keep the tunnel's main fan motor heating within bounds for the longer runs. The longitudinal center-line-flow in the test section has a turbulence level of about 0.6 percent. Test section airflow is produced by a 15.8 ft diameter, 6-blade drive fan powered by a 280 HP, 600 volt, 600 RPM DC motor which is controlled by a 500 HP AC motor that drives a field controlled generator.

The size of the model was limited to an 8 foot span, as measured from left propeller tip to right propeller tip, to avoid blockage issues in the 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel. Electrical power, at 32 volts, was supplied to the model through electrical lines attached to the tunnel sting. Power was supplied to the eight motor electronic speed controllers (ESCs) at that voltage. Additional voltage regulators within the model supplied power to the twelve model servos, control board, and data recording systems. Motor ESCs and servos were sent pulse width modulation (PWM) commands from an Arduino Mega microcontroller within the model, which were connected via Ethernet to a computer in the control room. The motor RPM values were recorded from each ESC using a Teensy microcontroller board. The tunnel sting mechanism can move the model in both the pitch ( $\alpha$ ) and yaw ( $\beta$ ) planes. In total, there were 23 control parameters for testing ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , Q, 12 servo signals, and 8 motor signals).



Figure 6. NASA Langley 12-foot low-speed tunnel cutaway.



Figure 7. NASA Langley 12-foot low-speed tunnel view of tunnel and control room.

The model balance measured forces in the X, Y, and Z directions and measures torques around the same three axes. The balance is limited to normal forces of

400 lb and axial and side forces of 200 lb. Pitch and yaw moments are limited to 2000 lb-inch and roll moments to 1248 lb-inch. With this balance, the associated resolutions are 0.48 lb for normal force, 0.20 lb for axial force, 0.32 lb for side force, 2.40 lb-inch for pitching moment, 2.46 lb-inch for rolling moment, and 2.00 lb-inch for yawing moment all with a 95% confidence. The maximum balance loads set constraints on model operating conditions, such as high wing angles with high dynamic pressures. Non-flight mounting hardware was used to mount the balance. The additional mounting structure allowed the transfer of model loads through the balance to a "dog leg" sting, which exited through a clearance hole in the bottom of the model and can be seen in Figure 8. The sting positioning mechanism allows rotation of the model in both the longitudinal and lateral planes.



Figure 8. Model balance and sting arrangement.

The tunnel data recording system in the control room records all model command signals (20 total), tunnel dynamic pressure, alpha, beta, and balance force and moments. Wind tunnel dynamic pressure is set manually and all other model control parameters can be set up to run a series of model settings automatically from a spreadsheet. Data is recorded automatically at each test point after a five second period for model movement and two seconds of flow settling.

## 4 Langley Aerodrome 8 Wind Tunnel Tests

In order to characterize the vehicle performance and stability, the wind tunnel test matrix was split up into 4 main sections. The first section included test points with the propellers removed from the vehicle in order to examine the airframe aerodynamics independently from the propulsion system. The propellers were then installed on the vehicle and the next three sections used propulsion to achieve hover, transition, and forward flight conditions. For all of these tests, the vehicle went through a tare run to remove the change in moments and forces from the shifting of the CG while varying wing and control surface angles.

#### 4.1 Airframe Performance and Stability

With the propellers removed from the vehicle, the test matrix investigated controllability and stability using control surface deflections with both wings in the forward flight configuration. LA-8 has a nominal 3.5 degrees incidence on the root of wing 1 and 1 degree incidence on the root of wing 2 when the vehicle fuselage angle of attack is at zero degrees. Additionally, both wings have a 2 degree washout at the tips. However, when the vehicle's wing angles are physically at these incidence angles, the angles are referenced as an angle of "zero" in all plots. Vehicle fuselage angle is measured from the flat portion of the fuselage just forward of wing 2. The vehicle design creates a vertical spacing of 12 inches between wing 1 and wing 2 in forward flight. The test matrix also included several angle of attack sweeps at different dynamic pressures and sideslip angles. Finally, the transition corridor was investigated by preforming an incidence angle sweep on both wings at the same time. This data allows for a better understanding of non-propulsive flight. In addition, this set of testing benefits tool validation for basic aerodynamics and performance. The results from this test block can be seen in Section 5.1.

#### 4.2 Hover Performance and Stability

In order to determine the hover performance and stability of LA-8, the wing angle and motor RPM had to be determined. For hover performance and stability, where dynamic pressure is zero, angle of attack is used to describe the fuselage angle relative to the ground. In these discovery runs, both wing 1 and wing 2 were set to equal incidence angles. Initially, all motors and propellers were set to an approximately equal thrust output in order to find an acceptable wing angle, where net axial force is approximately equal to zero. Next, the constraint of normal force equal to model weight was examined in order to determine the average propeller thrust combination for the specific wing angles. Finally, the average thrust on each wing was varied, while maintaining the total average thrust on the aircraft, to provide differential thrust in order to satisfy a requirement of zero pitching moment. The tests resulted in an aircraft where lift was approximately equal to the estimate flight weight of the vehicle (60 lbs), the thrust of the propellers was approximately equal to the drag of the vehicle, and the pitching moment coefficient was approximately zero at a fuselage angle between zero and 2 degrees for a specific dynamic pressure. In addition, the thrust from all of the propellers were approximately equal. This configuration of the vehicle is referred to as the hover trim point. After these vehicle settings were determined, control power, performance and stability of the vehicle were measured by varying angle of attack, sideslip angle, and control surface deflections in a dynamic pressure of zero. The results of the performance and stability after determining the hover trim point are presented in Section 5.2.

#### 4.3 Transition Performance and Stability

Similar to the hover trim points, the investigatory tests were performed for the transition corridor to determine the correct trim RPMs of forward motors (1-4) relative to rear motors (5-8). A number of wing angle settings were investigated

to characterize the transition corridor. It was assumed that wing incidence angles above 60 degrees were considered a hover condition due to the dominance in propulsion control and, therefore, were not investigated. Fourteen transition trim points were investigated in this wind tunnel test including and between 56 and 14 degrees incidence angle on the wings. Each transition trim point maintained the requirements of lift approximately equal to weight, thrust approximately equal to drag, and  $C_m$  equal to zero with all propellers on a given wing providing approximately equal thrust. (The differential between the wing 1 and wing 2 total thrusts was adjusted to achieve  $C_m$  equal to zero.) As previously stated, wing 1 and wing 2 incidence angles remain equal throughout the transition. During these tests, the dynamic pressure was estimated for each of the transition trim points based upon the expected flight speed at that transition point. After the transition trim points were determined for the respective dynamic pressures, angle of attack and sideslip sweeps, and control surface deflections were performed. The performance and stability results of the transition trim points can be seen in Section 5.3.

#### 4.4 Forward Flight Performance and Stability

Incidence angles below 14 degrees on both wings were considered to be within the forward flight regime. Therefore, the next wing angle settings would be the forward flight trim point. The tunnel was briefly taken to a dynamic pressure of 6 psf and an exploratory test was performed to assure the vehicle could maintain level flight at the predicted required cruise speed. However, a comprehensive investigation of forward flight trim points could not be performed due to wind tunnel motor overheating concerns at that dynamic pressure. Therefore, a full investigation was performed at a dynamic pressure of 4 psf. This exploration at a lower dynamic pressure is considered the forward flight trim point for this report. It should be noted that in order to achieve the necessary constraints of lift approximately equal to weight and drag equal to thrust with minimal pitching moment, the dynamic pressure needs to be above the tunnel limitations. The actual cruise Reynolds number is approximately 550,000, while the testing of the vehicle is at a Reynolds number of approximately 425,000, with respect to the aft wing. Also, due to limitations on the balance, angles of attack in stall and post-stall conditions could not be explored. For completeness of the control power, stability, and performance investigation, the vehicle performed control surface deflections, angle of attack and sideslip sweeps at the lower dynamic pressure. The results of this test are presented in Section 5.4.

## 5 Wind Tunnel Test Results

In these wind tunnel tests, a single force balance was used as described in Section 3. The forces and moments were used to calculate the coefficients that are presented in this section. The use of DEP, custom built propellers, and two differently sized propellers prevented non-dimensional coefficient derivation for individual propellers. The thrust or axial force measured by the balance uses all force components in the x-axis. Therefore at different wing incidence angles, angles of attack, and side slip angles, the axial force is a component of the wing lift from the freestream
velocity (i.e. induced drag), thrust from the propeller, and blowing of the wing from the propeller, which creates difficulty in determining the contribution of each force with a single force balance. In subsections 5.2-5.4, the RPMs for each motor and propeller combination at all wing incidence angles will be provided for the trimmed configuration due to this complexity. For each plot, if the vehicle attitude is not being varied, the vehicle angle is zero degrees.

For the control surfaces, standard airplane convention was used. When looking at maximum control authority with the elevons only, there is a differential elevon deflection input (left elevons and right elevons go in opposite directions) in order to create maximum rolling capability, which is typically done in a fixed wing aircraft. Similarly for ruddervators, maximum vawing capability was determined using the opposite deflection angle on each ruddervator. Finally, symmetric elevon and ruddervator deflections were used to investigate maximum pitching capability. The x-axes on each plot determine the combination and type of control surface deflections being tested. If ruddervator is the only control surface shown, the ruddervators are being deflected for a yawing moment (in forward flight) and the elevons are neutral. This is the same case for the elevons and rolling moment. Finally, some plots will show both elevon (on the lower x-axis) and ruddervator (on the upper x-axis) control surfaces in order to showcase pitching moment ability. However, it should be noted, as the angle of the wings increase or decrease, the axis of importance changes and there will be coupling between all axes. Therefore, lateral, longitudinal, and directional plots will be shown for all wing angles. If the control surface (ruddervator, elevon, or flap) is not being deflected in the results, the surface is set to nominal zero degrees. This was performed at an angle of attack of zero degrees, negative six degrees, and positive six degrees. Both the nominal control power with deflecting the control surfaces at zero degrees angle of attack and the maximum control delta through the range of angles of attack is presented in this paper. Maximum control delta is defined as the change in moment or moment coefficient with a maximum control surface deflection angle and of a minimum control surface deflection angle (e.g.  $[C_m \text{ with } -25 \text{ degrees elevon deflection}] - [C_m \text{ with } +25 \text{ degrees elevon deflection}]$ tion]). The maximum control delta is plotted versus angle of attack to show the influence of angle of attack and control power.

#### 5.1 Airframe Performance and Stability

In Appendix A, a full set of plots referencing only the airframe testing can be seen. The plots include the coefficients of lift, drag, pitching moment, rolling moment with sideslip angle and yawing moment with sideslip angle ( $C_L$ ,  $C_D$ ,  $C_m$ ,  $C_{l_{\beta}}$ ,  $C_{n_{\beta}}$ ) vs angle of attack at different dynamic pressures. This study was performed to check for data consistency. The  $C_L$  is investigated to determine the stall characteristics of the vehicle. The  $C_L$  vs angle of attack curves in Figure 9 indicate that there is a soft stall at approximately 15 degrees angle of attack and then a second stall at approximately 25 degrees. Figure 10 shows consistent  $C_D$  values throughout the dynamic pressures. Due to the design of LA-8 using a tandem wing, wing 1 stalls first at 15 degree angle of attack and then wing 2 at 25 degrees. It is known that the first wing stalls by referencing the large pitch down moment at 15 degrees angle of

attack and then a pitch break for the second stall at approximately 25 degrees angle of attack as seen in Figure 11. The stability of the vehicle in the lateral, longitudinal, and directional directions are all examined. Figure 11 indicates a negative slope for pitching moment, however, the trim point of the vehicle approaches -20 degrees angle of attack. In terms of lateral and directional stability, the format of these plots include  $C_{n_{\beta}}$  vs  $\alpha$  and  $C_{l_{\beta}}$  vs  $\alpha$  which follows the format for future work in order to contribute to handling qualities similar to Reference [4]. The  $C_{l_{\beta}}$  values that are negative prove a stable aircraft laterally for a range of angles of attacks up to the second stall point as seen in Figure 12. Similarly, positive  $C_{n_{\beta}}$  values indicate a stable aircraft directionally for a range of angles of attack. Nearing 10 degrees angle of attack, the aircraft begins to approach directional instability as seen in Figure 13. The remainder of the plots in Appendix A show the control power of each control surface (with and without flap deflections) and performance and stability for a variation of wing angles between zero and 50 degrees. When there is an indicated flap deflection in the airframe performance plot, all flaps are being actuated identically on both wings. The wing variation assumes that wing 1 and wing 2 are at the same incidence angle.



Figure 9. Propellers off  $C_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 10. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 11. Propellers off  $C_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 12. Propellers off  $C_{l_{\beta}}$  vs angle of attack with Q variation.



Figure 13. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack with Q variation.

In addition to gathering data based upon the current design, flight conditions were considered including a non-propulsive landing. In this case, the intent was being able to correct the  $C_m$  vs angle of attack to have a reasonable trim point by either using flaps or by trimming one wing to a different incidence angle for a given CG. A CG shift was also considered, with the knowledge that the CG will be shifting forward approximately 1.5 inches during the full transition from hover to forward flight from the rotation of the wings and motors with the actual flight model. Using the front wing to trim the aircraft, the wing 1 incidence angle would need to be set to approximately 10 degrees. The results of this investigation can be seen in Figure 14. Changing the wing 1 incidence angle can be used in extreme conditions, but should not be used for any non-propulsive flight due to the proximity to the stall point, which can be seen in the extreme pitching moment change in the figure. A more appropriate approach would be to use flaps 1 and 2 or a combination of wing incidence angle and flaps.



Figure 14. Propellers off  $C_m$  vs angle of attack with wing 1 incidence at 10 degrees.

#### 5.2 Hover Performance and Stability

At the hover trim point, the dynamic pressure is set to zero for the wind tunnel. Both wing incidence angles and RPMs were varied until the conditions explained in subsection 4.2 were met. The resultant RPMs can be seen in Table 1 for wing incidence angles of 82 and zero degrees angle of attack. Due to the propulsion dominated configuration, the hover static stability criteria were loosely defined with knowledge that a flight controller would typically be used for active stability control, similar to a multirotor. The main driving constraints were providing a configuration that met the approximately 60 lb normal force with no forward or backwards movement (i.e. axial force on the balance equals zero). Results are shown in Figures 15 and 16. The y-axis scales on both figures are finely numerated and may mislead results, however, these results show that there was an approximately constant normal and axial force on the model through the range of angles of attack. It is important to note that the y-axis on all plots in the hover section use forces and moments instead of aerodynamic coefficients due to the dynamic pressure of zero psf. The aerodynamic coefficient values are computed from the balance force and moments due to a single force balance and therefore cannot be calculated for a dynamic pressure of zero psf. The full performance, stability, and control power during this mode of flight is presented in Appendix B. The control surface deflection figures are all performed at an angle of attack of zero degrees.

	(psf)	Motor 1 RPM	Motor 2 RPM	Motor 3 RPM	Motor 4 RPM
Hover Trim	0	6111	5841.69	6026.31	5969.63
	Dynamic Pressure (psf)	Motor 5 RPM	Motor 6 RPM	Motor 7 RPM	Motor 8 RPM
Hover Trim	0	3004	6381.25	5976.88	3112.25

 Table 1. Hover Trim Motor RPMs at 0 Degrees Angle of Attack

 Dynamic Pressure

 Motor 1 RPM

 Motor 2 RPM

 Motor 4 RPM



Figure 15. Hover trim point normal force vs angle of attack.



Figure 16. Hover trim point axial force vs angle of attack.

#### 5.3 Transition Performance and Stability

In this section, figures are presented with multiple wing incidence angles for easy trend comparison. Appendix C includes additional wing incidence angles individually for more resolution on the data. Table 2 lists motor RPMs for all 14 trim combinations of wing incidence angles and dynamic pressures that are presented in Appendix C and this section. The summary results of performance and stability, shown in this section in Figures 17 - 39, show the general trend of performance and stability throughout the transition corridor. In general, the plots show that throughout the transition corridor, the aircraft maintains lateral, longitudinal, and directional stability. There is a small instability at high wing incidence angles for lateral stability, where the propellers have a significant influence on the roll of the vehicle. As explained prior in subsection 5.2, the  $C_L$  values that are provided at high wing incidence angles utilize the normal force to calculate the aerodynamic coefficient due to a single force balance. Therefore, at 56 degrees wing incidence angle, the vehicle has a large  $C_L$ , which is mostly contributed by the thrust of the propellers. The same coefficient plots for an  $\alpha$  of zero degrees were performed by deflecting the control surface in order to achieve a specific command on the vehicle, as discussed earlier in Section 5, and to investigate the control surface influence and determine the control power throughout the transition corridor. Finally, the trends of the maximum control surface deflections show the influence of angle of attack on the control power in each axis in Figures 40 - 48.

	Pressure (psf)	Motor 1 RPM	Motor 2 RPM	Motor 3 RPM	Motor 4 RPM
56° Incidonco Trim	0.5	5184.04	4880.60	5170.04	5118.69
51° Incidence Trim	0.5	5100.12	4808.12	5181 38	5120.38
47° Incidence Trim	1.0	5042.25	4750.56	5025.5	4986 31
43° Incidence Trim	1.0	4975.5	4675 75	4926	4902.19
38° Incidence Trim	1.20	4970.0	4526.69	4520	4765.94
35° Incidence Trim	1.0	4818.69	400 62	4733.94	4730 56
32° Incidence Trim	2.0	4820.38	4496.44	4742.81	4739 75
30° Incidence Trim	2.0	4600.25	4377 38	4630	4635 31
27° Incidence Trim	2.20	4035.25	4365.10	4030	4630
23° Incidence Trim	2.0	4716.31	4374.06	4625	4030
23 Incidence Trim	2.10	4638 10	4202.04	4025	4564 21
18° Incidence Trim	3.0	4038.19	4292.94	4545.75	4504.60
16° Incidence Trim	2.5	4073	4324.23	4571	4594.09
10 Incidence Irim	3.0	4723.31	4594.02	4028.00	4002.81
14 Incidence 1rim	4.0	4870	4532.09	4772.00	4790.02
	Dynamic				
	Dynamic Pressure	Motor 5 RPM	Motor 6 RPM	Motor 7 RPM	Motor 8 RPM
	Dynamic Pressure (psf)	Motor 5 RPM	Motor 6 RPM	Motor 7 RPM	Motor 8 RPM
56° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44
56° Incidence Trim 51° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06
56° Incidence Trim 51° Incidence Trim 47° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim32° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4822.06	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim32° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12 2638.94	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44 4993.19	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4822.06 4776.69	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81 2693.62
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim32° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim27° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25 2.5	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12 2638.94 2722.06	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44 4993.19 4601.19	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4822.06 4776.69 4397.37	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81 2693.62 2749
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim27° Incidence Trim23° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25 2.5 2.75	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12 2638.94 2722.06 2873.56	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44 4993.19 4601.19 4474.69	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4822.06 4776.69 4397.37 4242.06	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81 2693.62 2749 2900.25
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim27° Incidence Trim23° Incidence Trim21° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25 2.5 2.75 3.0	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12 2638.94 2722.06 2873.56 2977.25	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44 4993.19 4601.19 4474.69 4349.38	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4822.06 4776.69 4397.37 4242.06 4052.94	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81 2693.62 2749 2900.25 2999.81
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim23° Incidence Trim23° Incidence Trim23° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25 2.5 2.75 3.0 3.25	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12 2638.94 2722.06 2873.56 2977.25 3111.44	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44 4993.19 4601.19 44601.19 4474.69 4349.38 4442.5	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4855.88 4822.06 4776.69 4397.37 4242.06 4052.94 4092.31	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81 2693.62 2749 2900.25 2999.81 3134.56
56° Incidence Trim51° Incidence Trim47° Incidence Trim43° Incidence Trim38° Incidence Trim35° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim30° Incidence Trim23° Incidence Trim21° Incidence Trim18° Incidence Trim16° Incidence Trim	Dynamic Pressure (psf) 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25 2.5 2.75 3.0 3.25 3.5	Motor 5 RPM 2712.62 2680.94 2569.25 2547.75 2530.94 2532.31 2564.12 2638.94 2722.06 2873.56 2977.25 3111.44 3165	Motor 6 RPM 5712.69 5619.56 5342.31 5259.31 5158.44 5090.81 5048.44 4993.19 4601.19 4474.69 4349.38 4442.5 4492.94	Motor 7 RPM 5402.88 5315.88 5085.19 5005.62 4919.5 4855.88 4822.06 4776.69 4397.37 4242.06 4052.94 4092.31 4129.81	Motor 8 RPM 2798.44 2749.06 2653.56 2627.87 2608.38 2609.75 2630.81 2693.62 2749 2900.25 2999.81 3134.56 3193.06

# Table 2. Transition Trim Motors RPMs at 0 Degrees Angle of Attack Dynamic Pressure Motor 1 RPM Motor 2 RPM Motor 3 RPM



Figure 17. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 18. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 19. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 20. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 21. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 22. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 23. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 24. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 25. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 26. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 27. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 28. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 29. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 30. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 31. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 32. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 33. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 34. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 35. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 36. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 37. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 38. Trimmed wing sweep  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 39. Trimmed wing sweep  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 40. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 41. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta C_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 42. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 43. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 44. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 45. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 46. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.



Figure 47. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta C_m$  vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.



Figure 48. Trimmed wing sweep  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.

### 5.4 Forward Flight Performance and Stability

Due to the limitations of the 12-Foot Low-Speed Wind Tunnel at NASA Langley Research Center, the performance and stability of the vehicle at a representative flight speed while matching Reynolds number and Mach number could not be examined. Alternatively, testing was completed at a dynamic pressure of 4 psf. The basic aerodynamic coefficients for no control surface deflections can be seen in Figures 49 - 53. The remainder of the forward flight performance, stability, and control power plots can be seen in Appendix D. The plots in Appendix D are all with the LA-8 vehicle in a dynamic pressure of 4 psf. The associated motor RPMs can be seen in Table 3. The average  $C_T$  with these RPMs is 0.32. With an average  $C_T$  of 0.32, the vehicle would be in a state of accelerating, climbing flight. With an average  $C_T$  of 0.16, the vehicle would be in a state of steady, non-accelerating flight. A single thrust coefficient is being used as an average of the propeller RPMs and diameters due to the variation in diameters on the vehicle and measured RPMs from similar propellers. The thrust coefficients are using the assumption that the propeller blowing effect on the wing has no additional benefit to the axial force. This average  $C_T$  of 0.32 is used for all forward flight figures unless otherwise noted in the legend of the figure. None of these runs were taken to stall due to constraints on the model and balance.



Figure 49. Forward flight trim point  $C_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 50. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 51. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 52. Forward flight trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 53. Forward flight trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.

Table 3. F	orward Flight T	rim Motor RI	PMs at 0 Deg	rees Angle of	f Attack
	Dynamic Pressur	e Motor 1 BPM	Motor 2 BPM	Motor 3 BPM	Motor 4 RPM
	( 0)		$100001 \ 2 101 M$		$100001 \pm 101 m$

	(psf)	MOTOL 1 ITLEM	MOTOL 2 ITL M	MOTOL 2 IVI M	MOTOL 4 ICI M
Forward Flight Trim	4.0	6199	5892.12	6109.12	6071.25
	Dynamic Pressure (psf)	Motor 5 RPM	Motor 6 RPM	Motor 7 RPM	Motor 8 RPM
Forward Flight Trim	4.0	3606.69	6137.31	5757.25	3638

The most notable concern in the forward flight stability and performance is that the vehicle is unstable longitudinally and directionally. Comparing the airframe-only result, which is indicated by the "Propellers Off" curve in Figures 54 and 55, with the propeller RPMs at two different settings, where the forward flight trim motor RPMs run is labeled as "Average  $C_T = 0.32$ ", it can be seen that the propellers and the blowing over the wing can change the stability and the trim point unfavorably. Additional plots 56 - 58 show the lift, drag, and lateral stability with the influence of different propeller settings. In all of these figures, the "Average  $C_T = 0.32$ " tests were only taken to an angle of attack of eight degrees due to balance limitations.



Figure 54. Forward flight pitch stability with motor RPM.



Figure 55. Forward flight yaw stability with motor RPM.



Figure 56. Forward flight lift coefficient with motor RPM.



Figure 57. Forward flight drag coefficient with motor RPM.



Figure 58. Forward flight roll stability with motor RPM.

In order to achieve a longitudinally and directionally stable aircraft in forward flight, a change in the CG was considered. In Figures 59 - 61, using the raw aerodynamic forces and moments from the balance, the moment coefficients were recalculated based upon two different offsets, 0.2 and 0.4 ft forward in the x-direction (towards the nose of the aircraft). With a shift of the CG 0.4 ft forward, the vehicle becomes stable and trims at a more appropriate angle of attack. As previously stated in Section 4, the tare from the tunnel procedures removes the physical CG shifting from the wind tunnel data and therefore the reference CG is held constant for all of the wing angles throughout this report. This reference CG can be postprocessed to represent a different CG. If the CG location for hover is the reference CG of 1.9 ft in the x-direction from the nose, then the CG location for forward flight would land approximately at the results of the CG offset of 0.2 ft from the rotation of the wings and motors, which provides marginal amounts of longitudinal stability. This shift does not impact the lateral stability and corrects the directional stability for angles of attack between -6 and 6 degrees as seen in Figures 60 and 61. All three of these plots use the forward flight trim motor RPMs presented in Table 3.



Figure 59. Center of gravity change in forward flight for  $C_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 60. Center of gravity change in forward flight for  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 61. Center of gravity change in forward flight for  $C_{n_{\beta}}$  vs angle of attack.

# 6 Concluding Remarks

Significant investigation of the LA-8 flight characteristics took place in the NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Wind Tunnel. The major findings from this initial wind tunnel testing of the LA-8 electric VTOL UAS are:

1) Longitudinal and directional stability is influenced significantly by the inclusion of a blown wing and can cause the vehicle to become unstable in the longitudinal (pitch) and directional (yaw) axis at cruise thrust conditions.

2) While using constant pitch propellors, there is a trade-off of maintaining static stability and obtaining a favorable trim point without control surface deflections. For the LA-8, there are potential issues with non-propulsive forward flight landings as the pitch trim angle is approximately -20 degrees without the propellers installed on the aircraft. This would require a very high speed descent and a precision flare to safely land the vehicle.

3) Lift on the vehicle is created by a) direct lift from propellers b) lift from wings, and c) lift from wing sections blown by propellers. Additional testing of motors and propellers not attached to the airframe is needed to accurately determine the contributions from each component.

4) The center of gravity location as determined by analysis tools for the initial LA-8 design does not support the required stability in forward flight conditions. Therefore, the stability can be corrected through a combination of wing angle, flap deployment, and differential RPM. An alternative solution is to move the center of gravity approximately 0.4 ft forward from the design location in order to achieve longitudinal and directional stability.

## 7 Future Work

A second tunnel entry for LA-8, with slight modifications<sup>1</sup>, in the NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel has been completed and will be documented. This second entry used a design of experiments approach to investigate the performance and control characteristics of the vehicle in a more detailed but concise test matrix. A future free flight test of the LA-8 is also planned that will use the data from these wind tunnel tests and will investigate the dynamic performance of the vehicle. In addition, future configurations will be built and tested in order to support the vast array of designs and technologies from industry.

## References

- Meade, D., Langley Aerodrome Created to Explore Urban Air Mobility, https://www.nasa.gov/feature/langley/ langley-aerodrome-created-to-explore-urban-air-mobility, April 2019.
- McSwain, R., Geuther, S., Howland, G., Patterson, M., Whiteside, S., and North, D. An Experimental Approach to a Rapid Propulsion and Aeronautics Concepts Testbed, NASA TM-2020-220437, January 2020.
- 3. NASA Langley Research Center, Research Directorate, 12-foot-low-speed-tunnel-12-ft-lst/, Accessed July 2019.
- 4. Jackson, E., Raney, D., Glaab, L., and Derry, S., *Piloted Simulation Assessment* of a High-speed Civil Transport Configuration, NASA TP-2002-211441, 2002.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>All propellers were changed to be identical in size and pitch in order to more accurately determine approximate non-dimensional coefficients for each propeller.

# Appendix A

# Airframe Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 62. Propellers off  $C_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 63. Propellers off  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 64. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 65. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 66. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 67. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.


Figure 68. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 69. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 70. Propellers off  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 71. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 72. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 73. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 74. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack with Q variation.



Figure 75. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack with Q variation.



Figure 76. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 77. Propellers off  $C_D$  vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 78. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 79. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 80. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 81. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 82. Propellers off  $C_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 83. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 84. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 85. Propellers off  $C_l$  vs ruddervator deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 86. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 87. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 88. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 89. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack with all flaps' deflection.



Figure 90. Propellers off  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs wing angle variation.



Figure 91. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_D$  vs wing angle variation.



Figure 92. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs wing angle variation.



Figure 93. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs wing angle variation.



Figure 94. Propellers off  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs wing angle variation.

## Appendix B

## Hover Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 95. Hover trim point normal force vs angle of attack.



Figure 96. Hover trim point axial force vs angle of attack.



Figure 97. Hover trim point pitching moment vs angle of attack.



Figure 98. Hover trim point rolling moment  $_\beta$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 99. Hover trim point yawing moment  $_\beta$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 100. Hover trim point normal force vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 101. Hover trim point axial force vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 102. Hover trim point pitching moment vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 103. Hover trim point normal force vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 104. Hover trim point axial force vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 105. Hover trim point pitching moment vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 106. Hover trim point normal force vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 107. Hover trim point axial force vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 108. Hover trim point pitching moment vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 109. Hover trim point rolling moment vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 110. Hover trim point pitching moment vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 111. Hover trim point yawing moment vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 112. Hover trim point rolling moment vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 113. Hover trim point pitching moment vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 114. Hover trim point yawing moment vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 115. Hover trim point rolling moment vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 116. Hover trim point pitching moment vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 117. Hover trim point yawing moment vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 118. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  rolling moment vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 119. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  pitching moment vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 120. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  yawing moment vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 121. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  rolling moment vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 122. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  pitching moment vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 123. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  yawing moment vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 124. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  rolling moment vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.



Figure 125. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  pitching moment vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.



Figure 126. Hover trim point  $\Delta$  yawing moment vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.

## Appendix C

## **Transition Performance and Stability Plots**

C.1 Transition Wing Angles 56 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 127. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 128. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathrm{C}_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 129. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 130. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 131. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 132. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 133. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 134. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 135. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 136. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 137. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 138. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.


Figure 139. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 140. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 141. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 142. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 143. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 144. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 145. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 146. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 147. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 148. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 149. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 150. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 151. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 152. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 153. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 154. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 155. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 156. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 157. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 158. Wing angles 56 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.2 Transition Wing Angles 51 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 159. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 160. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 161. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 162. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 163. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 164. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 165. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 166. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 167. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 168. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 169. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 170. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 171. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 172. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 173. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 174. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 175. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 176. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 177. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 178. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 179. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 180. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 181. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 182. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 183. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 184. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 185. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 186. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 187. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 188. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 189. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 190. Wing angles 51 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.3 Transition Wing Angles 47 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 191. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 192. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 193. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 194. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 195. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 196. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 197. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 198. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 199. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 200. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 201. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 202. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 203. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 204. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 205. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 206. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 207. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 208. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 209. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 210. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.


Figure 211. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 212. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 213. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 214. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 215. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 216. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 217. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 218. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 219. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 220. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 221. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 222. Wing angles 47 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.4 Transition Wing Angles 43 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 223. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 224. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 225. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 226. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 227. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 228. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 229. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 230. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 231. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 232. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 233. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 234. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 235. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 236. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 237. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 238. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 239. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 240. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 241. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 242. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 243. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 244. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 245. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 246. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 247. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 248. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 249. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 250. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 251. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 252. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 253. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 254. Wing angles 43 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.5 Transition Wing Angles 38 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 255. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 256. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 257. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 258. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 259. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 260. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 261. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 262. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 263. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 264. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 265. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 266. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 267. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 268. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 269. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 270. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 271. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 272. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 273. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 274. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 275. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 276. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 277. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 278. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 279. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 280. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 281. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 282. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.


Figure 283. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 284. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 285. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 286. Wing angles 38 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.6 Transition Wing Angles 35 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 287. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathrm{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 288. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 289. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 290. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 291. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 292. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 293. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 294. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 295. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 296. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 297. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 298. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 299. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 300. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 301. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 302. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 303. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 304. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 305. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 306. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 307. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 308. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 309. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 310. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 311. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 312. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 313. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 314. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 315. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 316. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 317. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 318. Wing angles 35 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.7 Transition Wing Angles 32 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 319. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 320. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 321. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 322. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 323. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 324. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 325. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 326. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 327. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 328. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 329. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 330. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 331. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 332. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 333. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 334. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 335. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 336. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 337. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 338. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 339. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 340. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 341. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 342. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 343. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 344. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 345. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 346. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 347. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 348. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 349. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 350. Wing angles 32 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.8 Transition Wing Angles 30 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 351. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 352. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 353. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 354. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.


Figure 355. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 356. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 357. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 358. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 359. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 360. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 361. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 362. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 363. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 364. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 365. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 366. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 367. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 368. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 369. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 370. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 371. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 372. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 373. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 374. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 375. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 376. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 377. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 378. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 379. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 380. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 381. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 382. Wing angles 30 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.9 Transition Wing Angles 27 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 383. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 384. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 385. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 386. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 387. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 388. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 389. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 390. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 391. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 392. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 393. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 394. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 395. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 396. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 397. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 398. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 399. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 400. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 401. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 402. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 403. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 404. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 405. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 406. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 407. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 408. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 409. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 410. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 411. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 412. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 413. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 414. Wing angles 27 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.10 Transition Wing Angles 23 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 415. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 416. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 417. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 418. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 419. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 420. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 421. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 422. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 423. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 424. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 425. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 426. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.


Figure 427. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 428. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 429. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 430. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 431. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 432. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 433. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 434. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 435. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 436. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 437. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 438. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 439. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 440. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 441. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 442. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 443. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 444. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 445. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 446. Wing angles 23 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.11 Transition Wing Angles 21 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 447. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 448. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 449. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 450. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 451. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 452. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 453. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 454. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 455. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 456. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 457. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 458. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 459. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 460. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 461. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 462. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 463. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 464. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 465. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 466. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 467. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 468. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 469. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs ruddervator deflection angle.



Figure 470. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 471. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 472. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 473. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 474. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 475. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 476. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 477. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 478. Wing angles 21 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.12 Transition Wing Angles 18 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 479. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 480. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathrm{C}_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 481. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 482. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 483. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 484. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 485. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 486. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 487. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 488. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 489. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 490. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 491. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 492. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 493. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 494. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 495. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 496. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 497. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 498. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.


Figure 499. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 500. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 501. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 502. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 503. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 504. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 505. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 506. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 507. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 508. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 509. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 510. Wing angles 18 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.13 Transition Wing Angles 16 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 511. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 512. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 513. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 514. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 515. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 516. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 517. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 518. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 519. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 520. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 521. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 522. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 523. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 524. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 525. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 526. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 527. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 528. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 529. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 530. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 531. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 532. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 533. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 534. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 535. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 536. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 537. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 538. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 539. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 540. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 541. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 542. Wing angles 16 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## C.14 Transition Wing Angles 14 Degrees Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 543. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 544. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 545. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 546. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 547. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 548. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 549. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 550. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 551. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 552. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 553. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 554. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 555. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 556. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 557. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 558. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 559. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 560. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 561. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 562. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $C_n$  vs elevon and ruddervator deflection angles.



Figure 563. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 564. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 565. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 566. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathrm{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 567. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 568. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 569. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 570. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.


Figure 571. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 572. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   ${\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 573. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.



Figure 574. Wing angles 14 degrees trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for rudder-vator deflection.

## Appendix D

## Forward Flight Performance and Stability Plots



Figure 575. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 576. Forward flight trim point  $C_D$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 577. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 578. Forward flight trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{l_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 579. Forward flight trim point  $\mathcal{C}_{n_\beta}$  vs angle of attack.



Figure 580. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 581. Forward flight trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 582. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs all flap deflection angle.



Figure 583. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 584. Forward flight trim point  $C_D$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 585. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs front flap deflection angle.



Figure 586. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_L$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 587. Forward flight trim point  $\mathcal{C}_D$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 588. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs aft flap deflection angle.



Figure 589. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 590. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 591. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon deflection angle.



Figure 592. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 593. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 594. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs elevon and rudder vator deflection angles.



Figure 595. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_l$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 596. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_m$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 597. Forward flight trim point  $\mathbf{C}_n$  vs rudder vator deflection angle.



Figure 598. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 599. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 600. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta C_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon deflection.



Figure 601. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_l$  vs angle of attack for elevon and rud-dervator deflection.



Figure 602. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta C_m$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 603. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for elevon and ruddervator deflection.



Figure 604. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta~{\rm C}_l$  vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.



Figure 605. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_m$  vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.



Figure 606. Forward flight trim point  $\Delta$   $\mathcal{C}_n$  vs angle of attack for ruddervator deflection.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE						Form Approved OMB No. 0704–0188	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.							
<b>1. REPORT DAT</b> 01-06-2020	<b>REPORT DATE</b> (DD-MM-YYYY) <b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> -06-2020 Technical Memorandum					3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Investigation of a Tandem Tilt-wing VTOL Aircraft in the NASA Langley					5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel					5b. GRANT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Steven C. Geuther, David D. North and Ronald C. Busan					5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
					5e. TASK NUMBER		
					10949	109492.02.07.01.10	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) NASA						8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	
						L-	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)						10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001						NASA	
						11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT	
					NASA/TM-2020-5003178		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT							
Subject Category							
Availability: NASA STI Program (757) 864-9658							
An electronic version can be found at http://ntrs.nasa.gov.							
14. ABSTRACT							
The emerging Urban Air Mobility market imposes new design requirements on aircraft, including the ability to have vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) capabilities with the ability to transition into fast and efficient forward flight. Industry has proposed many different vehicle configurations, which have many							
different challenges. A primary challenge facing many of these concepts is flight through the transition corridor from vertical to horizontal flight and back. In an effort to better understand and help improve vehicle safety in the complex transition corridors. NASA Langley Research Center has proposed to							
characterize the transition corridor with wind tunnel and flight tests for a variety of unmanned aircraft system sized VTOL configurations. The first vehicle of							
deflected slipstream aircraft. The LA-8 vehicle has gone through a preliminary wind tunnel test in NASA Langley's 12-Foot Low-Speed Wind Tunnel. The							
results of the aerodynamic data collected, including the longitudinal, lateral, and directional force and moment aerodynamic coefficients, from these tests uring different phases of flight are presented							
15. SUBJECT TERMS							
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT OF 18. NUMBER 19a. NAME OF 19a. NAME					A CF RESPONSIBLE PERSON		
			TTTT	PAGES	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)		
U	U	U	00	343	(757) 8	364-9658	
						Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/98)	