

UNCLASSIFIED  
UNLIMITEDMeeting to Discuss CF-105 Problems  
Held December 20 and 21, 1964  
atNational Advisory Committee For Aeronautics  
1512 H Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C.Introduction

A meeting was held at NACA Headquarters on December 20 and 21, 1964, between Canadian officials, representatives of A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd., and NACA staff members to discuss technical problems in connection with the CF-105 airplane design. The following were in attendance:

Abbott, Ira H. - Headquarters, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (Chairman)  
Ames, M. E., Jr. - Headquarters, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (part time)  
Armstrong, A. W. - Squadron Leader, Royal Canadian Air Force  
Chamberlin, J. A. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Crowley, John W. - Headquarters, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (part time)  
Dobranski, J. Stalony - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Dryden, Hugh L. - Headquarters, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (part time)  
Floyd, J. C. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Footitt, H. R. - Group Captain, Royal Canadian Air Force  
Frick, Charles W. - Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, NACA  
Gilchrist, A. W. R. - Defence Research Board  
Green, J. J. - Defence Research Board  
Lindley, R. N. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Lucas, J. H. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
MacPhail, D. C. - National Aeronautical Establishment, Canada  
Morris, J. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Pearson, E. O. - Headquarters, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (part time)  
Plant, J. L. - Vice Marshal, Royal Canadian Air Force  
Smye, F. T. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Templin, R. J. - National Aeronautical Establishment, Canada  
Toll, Thomas A. - Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, NACA  
Whitcomb, Richard - Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, NACA  
Woodward, F. A. - A. V. Roe (Canada) Ltd.  
Wyatt, D. D. - Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, NACA

Chamberlin was later responsible for all of the aerodynamic design of NASA's Project Mercury and i, and collaborated with Bob Lindley in the design of the Gemini Spacecraft.

He went on to lead SST design and advanced projects, including space shuttle, at Hawker Siddeley in England (etc.).

McDonnell team on the Gemini Spacecraft, later major involvement with the Shuttle, and he ran the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center and was involved in the founding of the European Space Agency and their SpaceLab.

Chief of Performance on Arrow, came at Hawker Siddeley APG with Floyd on SST (etc) designs, later went to the USA in a similar position.

# 126599

SECRET  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

2

The following paragraphs summarize the discussion.

Drag

It was basically agreed that, in line with the area distribution curves at Mach 1.5 submitted by AVRO, and provided that (a) the intake and ramp bleed area is investigated and cleaned up where necessary, and (b) the afterbody is well faired in after the nozzles, the zero lift drag at Mach 1.5 may be as low as .020. This value may be approached by further model investigations. The AVRO estimate from area distribution and skin friction considerations was .0184. The configuration is considered to be generally reasonable with regard to drag.

**JOINT PAPER produced after Avro's engineers visit NACA to discuss their earlier, harsh, condemnation of the Arrow design.**

Hugh Dryden chaired, the NASA Dryden Flight Research Centre at Edward's Air Force base is named after him. Jack Ames was also there, and the NASA Ames Research Centre is named after him. R. Richard Whitcomb was there, and he had invented the "area rule" theory, and later the supercritical wing. Avro's Jim Chamberlin had an excellent understanding of the concept, and the Arrow wing was actually a supercritical airfoil, the negative camber being designed to reduce trim drag, just as the underside curve of Whitcomb's much later supercritical airfoil did.

WingPositive Camber

It was agreed that there is little to be gained by conical positive camber for the particular mission of this aircraft, i.e. Mach 1.5 at 50,000 feet, and there might be some loss of maximum supersonic speed. It was agreed, however, that to get the maximum flexibility in the aircraft, it would be a good thing to provide structurally for the possible future application of positive camber at the leading edge in case the emphasis shifted from the supersonic mission to a long-range type of mission, provided that the structural penalties are not too severe. AVRO's reasons for going to negative camber were also understood and appeared reasonable.

Pitch-up

It was agreed that the notch or leading edge extension proposed by AVRO should alleviate pitch-up, and that there would be a drag increment of between .001 and .002 at supersonic speeds to be added to the above estimate.

Intakes

It was generally agreed that the amount of diffusion and the diffusion angle involved at the intake were not excessive. AVRO pointed out that if tests later showed that a parallel section of duct was necessary to provide stabilization, this could be done without extensive structural modification.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

The problem of intake instability was agreed to be difficult and even vicious, and this required extensive test work prior to flight since it could have catastrophic effects in flight.

Stability

It was generally agreed that while artificial lateral stabilization is undesirable in itself, the obvious aerodynamic cures such as a large increase in fin area could be unacceptable so far as performance of the aircraft is concerned. A concentrated test program was recommended to explore aerodynamic means of providing lateral stability, particularly fin and rudder effectiveness.

It was particularly suggested that AVRO examine the effect of low directional stability. AVRO is doing a dynamic analysis. It was recommended that five degrees of freedom should be examined since the state of the art has now reached a point where the dynamic behavior of aircraft cannot be predicted from a cursory examination of the configuration and derivatives. AVRO agreed and is checking those areas of the flight envelope which are considered to be critical. It was noted that problems of this type are not peculiar to the CF-105 configuration but appear to be associated with the mass distributions of modern high performance fighters.

12/22/64

Ira H. Abbott  
Assistant Director for Research  
National Advisory Committee for AeronauticsPLEASE RETURN  
LOAN COPY

SECRET

(3)