

SOME THEORETICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON PRESSURE INTERACTION OF HYDROFOIL BOAT COMPONENTS

by

Wilburn L. Moore

November 1965

Report No. 2131
SS-600-000 **Task 1703**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

l,

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

LIST OF TABLES

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

ABSTRACT

The Douglas Neumann program for non-lifting three-dimensional fluid flow is used to calculate the potential flow pressure distribution for some hydrofoil boat components in various combinations. The calculated results are compared with pressure measurements on crossed non-lifting foils, and on a lifting foil of large span in conjunction with a pod. The calculated results were corrected for lift in the latter case. These comparisons indicate that the Douglas program can be usefully applied to hydrofoil-boat problems.

Pressure calculations are presented for non-lifting strut-foil, pod-foil, and strut-pod-foil configurations. These results show that the effect of a strut on the pressure distribution of a pod-foil is appreciable, and that a pod can be used to increase the cavitation-inception speed of a strut-foil.

A discussion of how to select input points for the Douglas program for intersecting bodies is also presented.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

This work was undertaken under Bureau of Ships Subproject SS-600-000, Task 1703.

vi

INTRODUCTION

In order to design a subcavitating hydrofoil system without going to the time and expense of extensive experiments, it is necessary to be able to calculate the pressure distribution on a hydrofoil-strut-pod configuration. The critical (minimum) pressure calculated can then be used to predict the cavitation-inception speed of the configuration. There are many uncertainties in this last step¹ making it difficult to rely on a prediction of cavitationinception speed, especially in a seaway, but the value of the pressure distribution to determine the relative merits of designs is unquestioned.

The general problem attacked here is: calculation of the pressure distribution on an arbitrary lifting body, excluding effects of the free surface.

The Douglas Aircraft Company has conducted studies of various parts of this problem. The most notable result of their work is a computer program to calculate the potential flow pressure distribution about a non-lifting (but otherwise arbitrary) three-dimensional shape.² They also have developed a program to calculate the pressure distribution about lifting two-dimensional shapes. 3

It is the purpose of this report to show that by a proper correction method, the Douglas program for three-dimensional shapes can be used to calculate the pressure distribution about an arbitrary lifting hydrofoilstrut-pod configuration. Cavitation-inception speed may then, for given design requirements, be maximized.

 1 References are listed on page 19.

In addition, comparisons are presented to show the effect of a strut on the pressure distribution of a pod-foil configuration, and the effect of a pod on the pressure distribution of a strut-foil.

To facilitate use of the approach suggested here, an appendix is included describing how to choose the computer input points for a complicated configuration.

THE DOUGLAS NEUMANN PROGRAM FOR THREE-DIMENSIONAL FLOW

When using the Douglas program, one inputs a set of x, y, z coordinates defining the configuration whose pressure distribution is to be computed. The program then forms quadrilateral elements from these points, calculates the induced velocities due to unit singularities placed on each quadrilateral, and adjusts the strengths of the singularities so that the induced velocities from all the quadrilaterals when added to the free-stream velocity, give a normal velocity of zero at each element. The total velocity at each element is then calculated by adding the total induced velocity to the free-stream velocity.

When incompressible inviscid flow is being considered, the pressure coefficient $(\frac{P - P\infty}{1/2\rho \text{ V}\infty^2})$ may be calculated from $C_p = 1 - (\frac{V}{V\infty})^2$, where V is the local velocity and V_{∞} is the free-stream velocity. Any body, the nonredundant part of which can be defined by approximately 600 quadrilateral elements or fewer, can be handled by the program. A pressure calculation for complicated bodies such as those discussed in this report requires from one to four hours of IBM 7090 computing time. A detailed description of this pressure-calculation method can be found in Reference 2. Additional discussion on its use may be found in References 4 and **5.**

 $\overline{2}$

The Douglas Neumann Program can also be used to calculate, to a first order approximation, the compressible flow about three-dimensional bodies. (See Appendix A.)

CROSSED FOILS

Hess and Smith² presented many experimental comparisons to demonstrate the accuracy of their pressure calculations. However, no comparison was given for an area very close to the intersection between two bodies. Since this is a critical area, a test was made at the David Taylor Model Basin to determine whether the Douglas Neumann Program could predict these pressures adequately. The configuration chosen consisted of two uncambered largeaspect-ratio foils of equal chord and unequal thickness intersecting at right angles, The configuration is described in detail in Appendix B.

This crossed-foil model was built and tested for pressure distribution in the DTMB 8-ft x 10-ft Subsonic Wind Tunnel with each foil fully spanning the tunnel. The tests were run at a free-stream Mach number of 0.221; the pressure coefficient was based on local tunnel static pressure; the results were corrected for blockage effects; and no artificial turbulence stimulators were used.

Since the configuration had fwo planes of symmetry, pressure measurements were necessary only in one quadrant of the configuration. However, to check for symmetry and to compensate for any imperfect alignment, some orifices were located on each side of each foil leg. Some of the pressure results were corrected slightly for these effects.

 $\overline{3}$

The pressure distribution for this configuration was calculated by the Douglas Neumann Program using the Goethert transformation to compensate for compressibility effects. (See Appendix A.) Note that these compressibility corrections are not part of any hydrofoil problem but are a consequence of the decision to run these tests in air.

Comparisons of the calculated results with the experimental results are presented in Figures 1 and 2. (The calculated pressure values are slightly different from those previously published **by** Faulkner 6 since the calculated values used by Douglas were not corrected for compressibility.) At the intersection the results agree quite well for about the forward 1/3 of the chord length. Aft of this region the boundary layer interference is so large that it causes large increases in the measured pressures. The aft results agree better farther out along the span where the boundary layers do not interact.

The two-dimensional pressure distribution for each of the foil shapes was calculated using the isolated two-dimensional airfoil option of Reference 3, with the Karman-Tsien correction applied for compressibility.⁷ These curves (Figures **I** and 2) show that the interference effects due to the thin foil are almost negligible at two chords distance from the intersection on the thick foil. The interference effect of the thick foil on the thin foil is slightly larger at two chords along the span.

The differences in the intersection critical pressures between the calculated and measured results correspond to a difference of 1/2 of a knot (1.3%) in cavitation-inception speed in salt water at 5-foot depth (talculated **by** assuming that the critical pressure is equal to the water vapor pressure).

POD-FOIL WITH LIFT

Since all hydrofoils of practical interest operate at non-zero lift, a problem of primary interest is the interference effect of pods and struts on a lifting foil. The Douglas program has been shown to be useful in predicting interference effects on non-lifting configurations, so a logical next step is an-attempt to correct results of a non-lifting calculation for effects of lift. No satisfactory pressure data for interference flow in water were found, necessitating the use of aerodynamic data and a compressibility correction for the theoretical calculations.

The Goethert transformation has been shown to be a useful correction technique for compressibility (See Appendix A.) but it is not very convenient for bodies at non-zero angle of attack. For this reason, the most useful experimental data were from Reference 9, which used a model at zero angle of attack, with lift provided by wing camber. This test configuration consisted of a modified NACA fuselage form 111 with an unswept, untapered, large-aspectratio, modified NACA 65-210 wing whose chord line coincided with the axis of the fuselage. The details of the configuration are presented in Appendix C. Since this work is directed to hydrofoil boat application, the wing will be referred to as the foil and the fuselage will be called the pod.

In order to have the configuration in a form that the Douglas threedimensional program could handle (i.e., no lift), the non-lifting foil from which 65-210 was derived, the 65-010, was used in conjunction with the fuselage form 111 as the input shape for the Douglas non-lifting three-dimensional program. The Goethert transformation was used to correct for compressibility. (See Appendix A.)

To correct for lift the pressure calculations on the foil part of the pod-foil, two-dimensional pressure distributions were calculated 3 for the 65-010 at a lift coefficient (C_L) of zero, and for the 65-210 at $C_L = 0.17$ which is the two-dimensional C_{L} for zero incidence. Each of these pressure distributions was then corrected for compressibility by the Karman-Tsien method.⁷ The difference between these two pressure distributions was then used to correct the non-lifting pressure calculations on the foil.

The same lift correction was used all along the span since, in the tests, the configuration spanned the entire tunnel. The comparison of the theoretical and experimental results will show whether this approach was valid. Obviously, for the usual hydrofoil design case, a method would have to be used to calculate the distribution of lift along the span.

The results of the theoretical and experimental comparison on the wing are presented in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3 gives the results essentially right at the intersection of the pod and foil. (See Figure 16, discussed in Appendix C.) The theoretical results agree quite well with the measurements on the suction side (the critical area for cavitation), and are appreciably in error on the pressure side. It may be noted that the problem of boundary layer interaction is not nearly so apparent here as it was on the crossed foil. This is due in part to the fact that the pressure orifices were not located right at the intersection in the pod-foil but rather were along a line parallel to the free-stream direction. Also the intersection itself is less curved in the pod-foil than in the crossed-foil.

The pressure comparison at approximately half a foil chord away from the pod intersection, (See Figure 16 discussed in Appendix C.) where most of the interference effects have died out, is presented in Figure 4. Here the agreement between the experimental and calculated results is somewhat better than

it was nearer the intersection. The cavitation-inception speed difference between the calculated critical pressure and the measured one is about 1/3 knot here, $(0.7%)$ whereas it is 1 knot $(2.5%)$ at the intersection.

A similar method was used to correct the pod pressures for the effect of the foil lift. Using the isolated airfoil option of the Douglas Neumann two-dimensional cascade program,3 which can also calculate pressures at points not on the body surface, the pressures were calculated at points the same distance above the two-dimensional foil as the points on the pod are above the actual foil. This was done for both the **65-010** shape and the 65- 210 shape. These pressures were each corrected for compressibility by the Karman-Tsien method.⁷ The pressure at each point induced by the 65-010 foil was then subtracted from that induced by the 65-210 foil. This difference was then multiplied by \mathbf{z}/R where \mathbf{z} is the distance the point on the pod is above the foil and R is the three-dimensional distance from the point on the pod to the nearest point on the foil. These values were used to correct the non-lifting pressures on the pod for effects of lift on the foil. The results of these calculations are presented in Figure 5 along with the measured pressures. As could be expected, since the lift correction technique is less justified, the results on the pod do not agree as well as those on the wing. The calculated critical pressure predicted a cavitation speed about 2 knots (4.2%) too high on the pod. The results near 25 percent of the pod length, which is where the leading edge of the foil intersects the pod, are appreciably in error. This is partly due to the nature of the quadrilaterals chosen to define the configuration in this area. For this reason the pressures in the area near 25 percent of the length are unreliable.

 $\overline{7}$

STRUT-POD-FOIL, 0 POD-FOIL, **AND** STRUT-FOIL

In analyzing the pressure distribution on the foil of a strut-pod-foil configuration, the presence of a thin strut is often ignored to simplify the analysis.¹¹ Similarly, it is occasionally asserted that the installation of an otherwise unneeded pod at the intersection of a strut and foil may increase the cavitation-inception speed of the configuration.¹²

To test the validity of these hypotheses, a series of calculations were made using the Douglas Neumann Program. The basic components used were: a foil with semi-span = 1000 (dimensionless), chord = 50 , and thickness = 5 ; a strut of the same dimensions except that 1000 was the full span; a pod of length = 100 , and diameter = 20 . Each of these components was a derivation of the DTMB Series 58, Model 4162 shape. 17

A pressure calculation was run on the strut-foil configuration (an inverse T shape) shown in Figure 17 (discussed in Appendix **D).** The pressure distribution on the foil part of this configuration is presented in Figure 6.

A pressure calculation was run on the pod-foil configuration shown in Figure 18 (discussed in Appendix D). The pressure distribution on the upper foil surface is presented in Figure 7, and that of the pod in Figure **8.**

A pressure calculation was run on the strut-pod-foil configuration shown in Figure 19 (discussed in Appendix D). The pressure distribution for the foil upper surface is presented in Figure 9, for the pod upper surface in Figure 10, for the pod lower surface in Figure **11,** and for the pod nose and tail in Figure 12. A detailed description of the strut-pod-foil configuration is presented in Appendix D, and a description of the procedure for choosing the input points for the computer program is presented in Appendix E.

Figure 13 shows the effect of the 10 percent thick strut on the pressure distribution of a pod-foil. It can be seen that, far from being negligible, the strut causes a large decrease in pressure at the intersection. At a depth of 5 feet in salt water, this pressure decrease would decrease the cavitation-inception speed of the configuration **by** 5 knots (8.5%).

Heretofore, the strut in a strut-pod-foil configuration was dealt with rather lightly from a hydrodynamic point of view since the critical pressure clearly would not occur there. These results indicate that the strut should be made as thin as possible, consistent with structural requirements, in order that the detrimental effect on the foil pressure may be minimized.

The effect of a pod on the pressure distribution of a strut-foil can be seen in Figure 14. (The configuration is sketched in Figure 19, discussed in Appendix **D.)** Figure 14 shows that the installation of this pod increases slightly the cavitation-inception speed of the configuration. This is true despite the large thickness of the pod $(L/D = 5)$. However, this large pod thickness is beneficial in one way—it separates the foil from the strut a larger distance than would a finer pod of the same length.

CONCLUSIONS

i. The Douglas Neumann Program can predict accurately the pressure at the intersection in a complex configuration for about one-third the length of the intersection, at which point the boundary layer interaction begins to dominate the flow.

2. When finite wing effects are not present, a simple lift correction to the Douglas non-lifting three-dimensional program applied to a pod-foil

configuration gives very good correlation with measured pressures on the suction side of the foil, but does not give good correlation on the pressure side.

3. The addition of an otherwise unneeded pod at the intersection of a strut and foil can be utilized to delay the onset of cavitation.

4. A strut has an appreciable adverse effect on the pressure distribution of a pod-foil.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Struts on a strut-pod-foil configuration should be designed for maximum cavitation-inception speed so that the adverse effect of the strut on the foil pressure distribution will be minimized.

2. Further calculations should be made to determine appropriate lengths and fineness ratios for pods to be used for raising the cavitationinception speeds of strut-foil configurations.

3. A comparison should be made between measured pressures on a strutpod-foil configuration with a finite lifting wing, and a pressure calculation **by** the present method with a suitable technique for predicting the spanwise distribution of lift.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges the assistance of personnel of the Subsonic Division of the TMB Aerodynamics Laboratory, especially Messrs. Elmer T.

Burgan and John T. Matthews, who conducted the crossed foil tests; Mr. George H. Smith of the Applied Mathematics Laboratory; and Mr. Douglas R. Harry of the Hydromechanics Laboratory, who prepared the figures.

APPENDIX **A -** PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FOR COMPRESSIBLE FLOW

The Douglas Neumann Program can be used to calculate, to a first order approximation, the compressible flow about three-dimensional bodies. This can be done **by** using the Goethert transformation technique which has been shown to be accurate, especially for low Mach numbers. (See Sears 13 and references cited.) This method involves "stretching" the configuration in the streamwise direction by dividing its streamwise coordinates by $\sqrt{1}$ - M $_\infty^{\ 2}$ where M_{\odot} is the free-stream Mach number. The potential flow velocities are then calculated for this stretched body using the Douglas program. The induced velocity components for compressible flow are then $U = U' / (1 - M_{\infty}^2)$ $V = V'/\sqrt{1 - M_{\infty}^2}$, $W = W'/\sqrt{1 - M_{\infty}^2}$, where the primes denote induced velocities calculated about the stretched body.¹⁴ The total velocity is calculated by adding the free-stream velocity to the induced velocities. The pressure coefficient for compressible flow is not simply 1 - $(V/V_{\infty})^2$ since the density is no longer constant. If one assumes isentropic flow the pressure coefficient can be calculated by ¹⁵ C_p = $\frac{2}{\gamma M_{\infty}^2} \left\{ \left[1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_{\infty}^2 \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{\sqrt{\zeta^2}} \right) \right] \frac{2\gamma}{\gamma - 1} - 1 \right\}$ where δ is the ratio of specific heat at constant pressure to specific heat at constant volume, which is 1.4 for air in the temperature range of present interest.16

This Goethert transformation is built into some versions of the Douglas Neumann three-dimensional program. **A** separate program (DTMB Open Shop No. XKI4) was written for this correction at the David Taylor Model Basin.

APPENDIX B **- CROSSED** FOIL CONFIGURATION

The basic shape used for this configuration was the **DTMB** Series **58** Model 4162, whose meridional (or two-dimensional, as the case may be) shape is defined by $y^2 = a_1x + a_2x^2 + a_3x^3 + a_4x^4 + a_5x^6 + a_6x^6$, where x is the dimensionless axial offset based on body length (or chord length) and **y** is the dimensionless transverse offset based on maximum diameter, and

$$
a_1 = +1.0000000
$$
 $a_4 = +20.564584$
 $a_2 = +0.44469380$ $a_5 = -20.948726$
 $a_3 = -8.9197388$ $a_6 = 7.8591877$.

The "a" values are slightly different from those values reported **by** Gertler¹⁷ for the same shape. So many offsets of this shape were needed for the present work that the "a" values were recalculated to higher precision, and used to generate a larger number of axial offsets. Near the trailing edge of the shape, the generating function involves square roots of small differences of large numbers, so every bit of precision helps. Even with these new coefficients, there is an error of the order of 0.001L in the transverse offsets near the tail.

In the theoretical model, the basic dimensions were: horizontal thick foil **-** length **= 100** (dimensionless), thickness **=** 20, semi-span **= 1000.** Vertical thin foil **-** length **= 100,** thickness **= 10,** semi-span = **1000.** Since the configuration has two planes of symmetry, it was only necessary to input one quadrant.

A proper balance of computer time and calculation accuracy led to the choice of coordinates listed in Table 1, which were input at the following spanwise locations: at the intersection, 0.1 along the span away from the intersection, **11,** 20, 40, 60, 140, 260, 1000. (The numbers refer to distance to the plane of symmetry, except for the first two values which refer to the intersection.)

In the wind tunnel, the model was built with each foil having a 1-ft chord, the 20 percent thick horizontal foil spanning the 10-ft width and the 10-percent thick vertical foil spanning the 8-ft height of the tunnel. There were no fillets at the intersections. A picture of the configuration is presented in Figure 15.

APPENDIX **C** - NACA POD-FOIL CONFIGURATION

This configuration consisted of a modified NACA fuselage form **111** and an unswept, untapered, large-aspect-ratio modified NACA 65-210 wing whose chord coincided with the axis of the fuselage. The modification of the wing (or foil) for the wind tunnel tests consisted of removing 2.22 percent of the chord length of the wing from the trailing edge. This alleviated the structural problem created by the extreme thinness of this part of the model wing. This modification was not made to the configuration used for the theoretical pressure distribution because the discontinuity would make the calculations more difficult, and no more reliable. (Where dimensionless wing lengths are used they are based on the unmodified length.)

The basic pod shape was a variation of the NACA fuselage form 111 whose shape was modified for the purposes of the NACA tests (See Reference 9.) to

improve the fairing in the area near 20 percent of the length. Its fineness ratio was 6 and its length was approximately 2.6 wing chords. The wing leading edge was at 25 percent of the pod length, and the trailing edge at 63.46 percent. The configuration for which the calculations were made corresponds to position C_3 of Reference 9, with no filleting of the intersection.

The offsets for the pod are presented in Table 2_r those for the foil in Table 3.. The spanwise locations of the pressure orifices are shown in Figure 16. The theoretical results are presented for the same locations.

Further details on the configuration are available in Reference 9.

APPENDIX D - STRUT- POD-FOIL CONFIGURATION

The basic function generating each of the shapes in this configuration is the same as that which was used for the crossed-foil configuration. (See Appendix B.) The pod length was 100 (dimensionless), with maximum diameter equal to 20. The offsets used are given in Table 4 . The foil chord was 50 with a maximum thickness of 5. The leading edge of the foil intersected the pod at 25 percent of the pod length, the trailing edge at 75 percent of the pod length.

The strut dimensions were identical with those of the foil. For both foil and strut, the span was chosen large enough (2000, 1000) that the tip effects were negligible in the region of the pod. The arrangements of the components in the strut-foil, pod-foil, and strut-pod-foil configurations are shown in Figures 17, 18, and 19.

APPENDIX **E -** INPUT POINT DISTRIBUTION FOR INTERSECTING **9HAPES**

How to choose input points in the Douglas Neumanr three-dimensional program for a configuration with an intersection will be discussed in some detail since this is an application that is likely to recur often. The strut-pod-foil configuration will be used as an example.

The x -axis is the axis of the pod with the $x = 0$ plane at the pod nose. The y-axis runs along the horizontal foil span with the $y = 0$ plane coincident with the chord plane of the vertical strut. The z-axis runs along the span of the vertical strut with the $z = 0$ plane (z positive upwards) coincident with the chord plane of the horizontal foil.

The configuration has a vertical plane of symmetry permitting it to be described by offsets for only one side.

For ease of input the configuration was divided up as follows: The strut was one section, the foil was divided into an upper surface section and a lower surface section; the pod was cut up into three parts, the nose which was a section, the tail which was a section, and the middle portion which extended over that part intersected by the strut and foil $(x = 25$ to $x = 75$). The pod middle portion was further divided into an extreme lower section, a section intersecting the lower foil surface, a section intersecting the upper foil surface, a section intersecting the strut, and a section between the latter two.

These sections were chosen because of different input point density requirements in the different areas. To save computer time (or in this case, to describe the configuration within the input limits of the program), one should distribute points sparsely in geometrically smooth areas and in areas of little interest.

In the strut-pod-foil configuration, the areas of maximum interest are the foil upper surface near the pod, and the pod surface near the foil. These are also areas of abrupt change in geometry. **A** large number of input points are clearly needed there.

The pod near the strut is an area of some interest and also of abrupt curvature. The intersection of the lower surface of the foil with the pod is of no real interest, but is an area of abrupt geometric change. On the other hand, the strut is of minimal interest and of simple geometry, as is the lower surface of the foil.

With these considerations in mind the point spacing was made very sparse on the strut except very near the pod intersection. The lower surface of the foil was treated similarly. The pod nose and tail were of no major interest so just enough points were chosen to define the curvature smoothly enough that the pressure results in the areas of interest were not adversely affected. The lower 60-degrees of the middle portion of the pod was treated similarly.

The upper surface of the foil, being the area of main interest, required a large number of input points even at appreciable distances from the pod intersection, so that the pressure could be calculated at enough points to define the pressure distribution along the chord and span. The area, both on the foil **and** on the pod, near the intersection of the foil upper surface with the pod presented the greatest problem. This is an area of great interest since the critical pressure for the configuration is likely to occur there, and there is a discontinuity in geometry there, also.

Longitudinally, 21 points were considered sufficient to define the curvatur of the lines near the intersection. Points were concentrated near the forward part of the intersection where the curvature was greater.

Transversely, in addition to economy of points, there are two opposing considerations which must be weighed. On the one hand is the fact that the more densely one distributes the points in a region of abrupt change in geometry, the more precisely will the body be defined. On the other hand, the Neumann problem is only solvable for bodies with continuous values of normal derivative on the body contour.¹⁸ It is clear that at the intersection of the foil and pod, the normal derivative is discontinuous. Practically though, the normal derivative will never be evaluated right at the intersection **by** the program since the derivative is evaluated at the null point, 19 rather than at the corners of an element. (The null point is usually close to the centroid of the element.) Therefore, the denser the distribution of points (transversely) near the intersection, the closer the program gets to evaluating a normal derivative at the intersection, and the more abrupt will be the change in the normal derivative. Thus the requirements as to transverse density of input points near the intersection reduce to these: dense enough to define the shape fairly well, but not dense enough to produce too drastic a variation in the normal derivative.

In **a** given calculation, one can tell after the calculation whether the distribution chosen was appropriate **by** comparing the pressure values of the points closest to the intersection on the pod and the points closest on the foil. If the points were too sparse, the values will differ noticeably; if the points were too dense, the values will differ drastically.

After much experimentation, the following distribution chosen for the upper foil-pod intersection was found to be satisfactory. The other intersections in this problem were treated less carefully since they were of less interest. At the upper foil-pod intersection the input points were distributed

thusly: one line at the intersection; one line 0.2 (or 0.004 wing chords), measured circumfuentially along the surface of the pod, away from the intersection; 0.5 away from the intersection; at 30 degrees (measured from the plane of the foil chord and the pod axis); and between 0.5 away and 30 degrees a line representing the mean distance along the pod surface between 0.5 away and 30 degrees. On the foil, a line was placed at the intersection; 0.2 along the span away from the intersection; and at the following spanwise stations (measured from the vertical plane of symmetry of the configuration), 11, 20, 40, 60, 140, 260, and **1000.**

All of the offsets for the strut-pod-foil are given in Table 5.

REFERENCES

1. "Handbook of Fluid Dynamics," Edited by V. L. Streeter, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York (1961), "Mechanics of Cavitation," (Phillip Eisenberg), pp. 12-16.

2. Hess, J. L. and Smith, A. M. 0., "Calculation of Non-Lifting Potential Flow about Arbitrary Three-Dimensional Bodies," Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Report E.S.-40622 (1962).

3. Giesing, J. P., "Extension of the Douglas Neumann Program to Problems of Lifting, Infinite Cascades," Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Report LB 31653 (1964).

4. Denny, **S.** B., "Applicability of the Douglas Computer Program to Hull Pressure Problems," David Taylor Model Basin Report 1786 (1963).

5. Faulkner, **S.,** et al, "Comparison of Experimental Pressure Distributions with Those Calculated **by** the Douglas Neumann Program," Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Report No. LB 31831 (1964).

6. Reference 5, pp. 86, **87.**

7. Dwinnell, **J.** H., "Principles of Aerodynamics," McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York (1949), **p.** 180.

8. Reference 5, pp. 79-84, **92.**

9. McLellan, C. H. and Cangelosi, J. I., "Effects of Nacelle Position on Wing-Nacelle Interference," NACA T.N. 1593 (1948).

10. Abbott, I. H. and von Doenhoff, A. **E.,** "Theory of Wing Sections," McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York (1949), p. 612.

11. Johnson, R. S., "Prediction of the Lift and Cavitation Characteristics of Hydrofoil-Strut Arrays," Paper presented at the Southern California Section, Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers (Mar 1964), p. 12.

12. Clement, E. P., "Research to Eliminate Cavitation on the PC(H) Hydrofoil Boat Design," David Taylor Model Basin Report C-1233 (1960), p. 7 (CONFIDENTIAL).

13. Sears, W. R., editor, "General Theory of High-Speed Aerodynamics," Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. (1954), p. 88.

14. Reference 13, p. 81.

15. Liepmann, H. W. and Roshko, A., "Elements pf Gasdynamics," John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York (1957), p. **55.**

16. Kuethe, A. M. and Schetzer, J. **D.,** "Foundations of Aerodynamics," Second Edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York (1959), p. 133.

17. Gertler, M., "Resistance Experiments on a Systematic Series of Streamlined Bodies of Revolution -- For Application to the Design of High-Speed Submarines," David Taylor Model Basin Report **C-297** (1950), p. 56 (CONFIDENTIAL).

18. Kellogg, **0. D.,** "Foundations of Potential Theory," Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York (1929), p. 311.

19. Reference 2, p. 74.

Figure 1 - Comparison of Experimental Values with Calculated Values of Pressure Coefficient for
Crossed Foils of Equal Chords and Unequal Thicknesses at Zero Lift: Pressures on
Thick Foil (20%) Thick)

X IN PERCENT OF FOIL CHORD

 \mathbf{r}

Figure 2 - Comparison of Experimental Values with Calculated Values of Pressure Coefficient for Crossed Foils of Eaual Chords and Unequal Thicknesses at Zero Lift: Pressures on Thin Foil (10% Thick)

NO 4520-L 20x20 TO THE INCH

 \sim

Figure 4 - Comparison of Experimental Values with Calculated Values of Pressure Coefficient for Pod-Foil Configuration with Lift: Points on Foil away from Intersection

Figure 5 - Comparison of Experimental Values with Calculated Values of Pressure Coefficient for Pod-Foil Configuration with Lift: Points on Pod

Figure 6 - Potential Flow Pressure Distribution on Foil Upper Surface of Strut-Foil Configuration at Zero Lift

 \bullet

Figure 7 - Potential Flow Pressure Distribution on Foil Upper Surface of Pod-Foil Configuration at Zero Lift

Figure 8 - Potential Flow Pressure Distribution on Pod Surface of Pod-Foil Configuration at Zero Lift

 F_{S} - F_{S} and F_{S} are F_{S} and F_{S} on F_{S} of F_{S} and F_{S}

Configuration at Zero Lift

Figure 11 - Potential Flow Pressure Distribution on Pod Lower Surface of Strut-Pod-Foil

Figure 12 - Potential Flow Pressure Distributions on Pod Nose and Tail Surfaces of Strut-Pod-Foil Configuration at Zero Lift

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}$

 \sim \sim

Figure 13 - Potential Flow Pressure Distributions on Foil Upper Surface of Pod-Foil Configuration at Zero Lift with And without Strut

Figure 14 - Potential Flow Pressure Distributions on Foil Upper Surface of Strut-Foil Configuration at Zero Lift with and without Pod

Offsets for Crossed-Foil Model

 $\frac{1}{\mathbb{B}^2}\cup \varepsilon$

Figure 15 - Crossed Foil Model in TMB Wind Tunnel

Figure 16 - Spanwise Positions at which Theoretical and Experimental Pressures are Compared on NACA Pod-Foil with Lift.

Figure 17 - Strut-Foil Configuration

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

Figure 18 - Pod-Foil Configuration

Figure 19 - Strut-Pod-Foil Configuration

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}$

MACA Pod Ordinates

$[**Statistics and radii in percent of pod length**]$

NACA 65-210 Airfoil Ordinates

$\begin{bmatrix}$ Stations and ordinates given in percent of airfoil chord¹

a2. ² 2 percent of the chord was removed at the trailing edge for experimental mode 1.

 \hat{z}

 $\bar{}$

 \sim

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}$

TMB Series 58 Pod Offsets

(Stations and radii in percent of **pod** length)

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\sim 8\, \mu$.

Strut-Pod-Foil Offsets

 ~ 100

 ~ 100

TABLE 5 - CONTINUED

 \sim

 \sim

 $\langle \rangle$

 ~ 100

المعجابي المدارات \sim

 $\ddot{}$

TABLE 5 - CONTINUED

 $\sim 10^4$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

TABLE 5 - CONTINUED

 46

 $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$.

TABLE 5 - CONTINUTO

 \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim

 \sim

 \cdot

 \sim

**UPPER
SURFAC**
OF FOI
(CONT.

 \sim

 \sim

 \sim

 Δ $\ddot{}$

 \sim

 \sim

 \mathcal{L}

 47

 \sim

 α

 \sim


```
1 Scientific and Technical Information Facility
            Attention NASA Representative (SAK/DL-504), Bethesda
1 Oceanics, Inc.
            Attention Dr. Paul Kaplan
1 Stanford University
            Attention Head, Civil Engineering
1 Boeing Airplane Company, Aero-Space Div., Marine Systems Group, Seattle
1 CIT, Hydrodynamics Laboratory
2 Hydronautics, Inc.
1 Univ of Minnesota, St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Lab., Minneapolis
1 TRG
1 Aerojet General Corp., Azusa
            Attention Mr. J. Levy
1 Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Hydrodynamic Group, Sunnyvale
            Attention Mr. R. Waid
1 Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Marine Engineering Section, Bethpage
2 DIR, USNRL (Code 2027)<br>1 Commander. Planning De
      1 Commander, Planning Dept., Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, U. S. Naval
      Base, Philadelphia 12
1 Superintendent, USNAVPGSCOL, Monterey
1 Superintendent, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis
            Attention Library
2 MARAD
      1 Attention Division of Ship Design
      1 Attention Division of Research
1 CO&D, USNMDL, Panama City<br>1 CO. MIT
      CO, MIT
            Attention NROTC and Naval Administrative Unit
1 NASA, Washington
            Attention Mr. J. B. Parkinson
1 DIR, National Science Foundation
            Attention Engineering Sciences Division
3 DIR, National Bureau of Standards
      1 Attention Dr. G. B. Schubauer
      1 Attention Dr. G. H. Keulegan
      1 Attention Dr. J. M. Franklin
1 Office of Technical Services, Dept of Commerce, Washington
3 CIT, Pasadena
      1 Attention Prof. M. S. Plesset<br>1 Attention Prof. T. Y. Wu
            1 Attention Prof. T. Y. Wu
      1 Prof. A. J. Acosta
2 University of California, Berkeley, Dept of Engineering
      1 Attention Dr. A. Powell
      1 Attention Prof. R. Paulling
3University of Iowa, Iowa City
            Attention Dr. H. Rouse
      1 Attention Dr. L. Landweber
      1 Attention Inst of Hydraulic Research
```


 $\ddot{}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

Unclassified

Security Classification

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization *(corporate author)* issuing the report.

2a. REPORT **SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200. **10** and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group **3** and Group 4'as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassiff a meaningful title cannot be selected without classition, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE **NOTES: If** appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle in
If military, show rank and branch of service. The name the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT *DATE:* Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. **If** more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. TOTAL **NUMBER** OF **PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER** OF **REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT** OR GRANT **NUMBER: If** appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, **&** *8d.* PROJECT **NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT **NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number **by** which the document will be identified and controlled **by** the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT **NUMBER(S): If** the report has been assigned any other report numbers *(either by the originator or by the sponsor),* also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION **NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed **by** security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of report from DDC."
	- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report **by DDC** is not authorized."
	- **(3) "U. S.** Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from **DDC.** Other qualified **DDC** users shall request through
	- (4) **"U. S.** military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from **DDC.** Other qualified users shall request through
	- **(5) "All** distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified **DDC** users shall request through

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING** MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring *(pay ing for)* the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though
it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is **highly** desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as *(TS), (S), (C), or (U).*

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from **150** to **225** words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. 'Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

Security Classification

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{dx}{y}dydx$