

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

ADB010389

LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

FROM:

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies only; Test and Evaluation; JUL 1975. Other requests shall be referred to Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory, FER, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433.

AUTHORITY

afwal ltr, 9 aug 1985

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

AD

B010389

Authority - AFWAL 1tr,  
9 Aug 85



✓

AFFDL-TR-75-129 ✓

2

B

ADBO10389

**A STUDY TO IDENTIFY DATA VOIDS IN THE APPLICATION OF HI-GLIDE CANOPIES TO REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES (RVP)**

*RECOVERY AND CREW STATION BRANCH  
VEHICLE EQUIPMENT DIVISION ✓*

JANUARY 1976

TECHNICAL REPORT AFFDL-TR-75-129  
FINAL REPORT FOR PERIOD 23 OCTOBER 1974 - 30 JUNE 1975

AU NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
DDC FILE COPY

Distribution limited to U.S. Gov't Agencies only; test and evaluation; July 1975. Other requests for this document must be referred to Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory (FER), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433.

AIR FORCE FLIGHT DYNAMICS LABORATORY ✓  
AIR FORCE WRIGHT AERONAUTICAL LABORATORIES  
Air Force Systems Command  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

DDC  
RECEIVED  
APR 21 1976  
A

NOTICE

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the United States Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

*Laurence Gleason*

LAURENCE L. GLEASON  
Project Engineer

FOR THE COMMANDER

*William D. Clarke III*

WILLIAM D. CLARKE III, Lt. Colonel, USAF  
Actg. Chief, Recovery and Crew Station Branch  
Vehicle Equipment Division  
Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory

Copies of this report should not be returned unless return is required by security considerations, contractual obligations, or notice on a specific document.



*Continued*

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

ABSTRACT (Cont'd)

and program outlines for filling selected data voids are presented. A comprehensive literature search was made which resulted in the tabulation of Hi-Glide canopy characteristics and capabilities. A number of data voids were found to exist which would prevent the accomplishment of a meaningful comparative analysis of the application of Hi-Glide canopies to RPV's. A Hi-Glide canopy bibliography, originally published as AFFDL-TM-73-25-FER, is included. Bibliographies extracted from two NASA Parawing publications are included.

AFFDL-TR-75-129

FOREWORD

This Technical Report was prepared by the Recovery and Crew Station Branch, Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory (AFFDL/FER), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, under Project 1964, "Advanced Launch and Recovery", within the scope of a Memo of Agreement between AFFDL and the Aeronautical Systems Division's Remotely Piloted Vehicle (RPV) Systems Program Office (SPO). The work covered the period from 23 October 1974 to 30 June 1975.

This report was submitted in October 1975.

ACCESSION OF	
NTIS	With Section <input type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Full Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	Avail. and/or Special
B	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	1. Background	1
	2. Purpose, Scope, and Approach of the Study	3
II	IDENTIFICATION OF DATA REQUIREMENTS	7
	1. Potential Applications	7
	2. Operational Sequence/Data Requirements	9
III	ANALYSIS OF DATA VOIDS	12
	1. Identification of Hi-Glide Canopy Characteristics/Capabilities	12
	2. Identification/Categorization of RPV Related Data Requirements	22
	3. Identification of Data Voids Which Prevent a Hi-Glide Canopy Comparative Analysis	22
	a. Canopy Related Data Voids	24
	(1) Packing	24
	(2) Canopy Wing Area/Payload/Wing Loading	24
	(a) Canopy Wing Area	24
	(b) Canopy Payload	25
	(c) Wing Loading	25
	(3) Reefing	26
	(4) Canopy Control Data	26
	(5) Scaling Techniques	26
	(6) Reliability, Maintainability, and Cost	27



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

SECTION	PAGE
(7) Miscellaneous Data Voids	27
(a) Materials	27
(b) Canopy Design	27
b. RPV Related Data Voids	28
(1) Acceptable Impact Condition	28
(2) RPV Operational Requirements	28
IV PROGRAM OUTLINES TO FILL SELECTED DATA VOIDS	29
1. Hi-Glide Canopy Aerodynamic Reefing Program	29
2. Hi-Glide Canopy Wing Loading Program	31
3. Hi-Glide Canopy Hi-Density Packing Program	32
4. Ram-Air Canopy Wing Area/Payload Program	33
5. Ram-Air Canopy Landing Flare Control Program	34
V CONCLUSIONS	36
REFERENCES	38
BIBLIOGRAPHIES	
1. AFFDL-TM-73-25-FER	43
2. Flexible Wings For Transportation	66
3. Recent Flexible Wing Research	79

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE		PAGE
1	Hi-Glide Canopy Configurations	
	a. Parawing	2
	b. Ram-Air	2
	c. Sailwing	2
2	Hi-Glide Canopy Sketches	4
3	Hi-Glide Canopies as Applied To RPV's	8

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		
1	Recovery Applications-Phase of Operation and Data Requirements	10
2	Identification of Hi-Glide Canopy Characteristics/Capabilities	13-20
3	Identification/Categorization of RPV Related Data Requirements	23

## LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AR	Aspect Ratio ( $\frac{b^2}{S}$ )
aero	aerodynamic
b	Span; feet
bal	balance
$C_D$	Drag Coefficient ( $\frac{\text{drag force}}{q S}$ )
$C_L$	Lift Coefficient ( $\frac{\text{lift force}}{q S}$ )
$C_M$	Pitching Moment Coefficient ( $\frac{\text{pitching moment}}{q S l_{\text{ref}}}$ )
$C_R$	Resultant Force Coefficient ( $\frac{\text{resultant force}}{q S}$ )
$C_{T_o}$	Opening Force Coefficient ( $\frac{\text{opening force}}{q S}$ )
$C_{T_R}$	Reefed Opening Force Coefficient ( $\frac{\text{reefed opening force}}{q S}$ )
cu. ft.	cubic feet
F.F	Free Flight
fps	feet per second
Ft <sup>2</sup> or sq. ft.	Square feet
g or g's	$\frac{\text{applied force}}{\text{body weight}}$
GN&C	Guidance, Navigation, and Control
h	Altitude; feet
KEAS	Knots Equivalent Airspeed
l	Reference Length; feet
L/D	Lift to Drag Ratio

## LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Cont'd)

$l_k$	Parawing Keel Length; feet
MH	Manhours
psf	pounds per square foot
q	dynamic pressure ( $\frac{1}{2} \rho V^2$ ); psf
RPV	Remotely Piloted Vehicle
S	Reference Area; sq. ft.
SPO	Systems Program Office
T/O	Take-Off
V	Velocity; feet per second
W or wt.	Weight; pounds
W/S	Wing-Loading ( $\frac{\text{body weight}}{\text{reference wing area}}$ )
$\rho$	air density (0.002378 slug/cu. ft.)
$\Lambda_0$	flat planform leading edge sweep; degrees
$\gamma$	flight path angle; degrees
#	pounds

## SUBSCRIPTS

depl	deployment
FF	Free Flight
L.S.	Line Stretch
max	maximum
min	minimum
Par	Parawing
ref	reference
TOT	Total
V	Vertical

SECTION I  
INTRODUCTION

1. BACKGROUND

The current Air Force use of a conventional parachute system for Remotely Piloted Vehicle (RPV) recovery, either midair or surface impact, provides for a minimum descent rate/impact velocity of approximately 13 to 15 feet per second and provides no control over the system's trajectory during descent. The substitution of an all-flexible Hi-Glide ( $L/D \geq 2.25$ ) canopy for the conventional parachute system could provide a reduced descent rate and impact velocity, flight path control, homing to a precise surface impact location (automatic or manual), a wind offset capability, and the possibility of powered flight utilizing the RPV propulsion system during the recovery operation to increase the period of time available for recovery. Hi-Glide canopies could also be used to augment the RPV wing during take-off, thus significantly improving RPV launch performance. However, prior to the incorporation of a Hi-Glide canopy system(s) into RPV's, a comparative analysis of the various canopies available should be conducted to select the optimum configuration for a given application. This requires a determination be made that sufficient data is available to conduct such an analysis.

The candidate Hi-Glide canopies which represent the third generation of advanced lifting decelerators (References 1 and 2) are categorized as:

1. Parawing (Figure 1b)
2. Ram-Air (Figure 1a and d)
3. Sailwing (Figure 1c)




Figure 1. Hi-Glide Canopy Configurations

The Parawing Hi-Glide canopy is characterized by a single membrane surface of single or twin keel design (Figure 2a) which inflates to a cambered airfoil section by proper rigging of the suspension lines. Suspension lines are attached along the leading edges and keel(s). Directional control is accomplished by deflection of the outboard tip lines.

The Ram-Air Hi-Glide canopies are characterized, in general, by an upper and lower membrane and internal airfoil shaped fabric ribs, forming cells (Figure 2b). The planform is rectangular and the leading edge is open to allow ram-air to inflate the cells and shape the canopy. Suspension lines are attached to the lower surface. Various methods of directional control have been attempted; among these are trailing edge deflection and leading edge collapse.

The Sailwing Hi-Glide canopy is characterized by a single membrane surface of essentially a rectangular planform with rolled leading edge which is inflated by ram-air (Figure 2c). The planform is divided into lobes by suspension line flares. Directional control is accomplished by deflecting lines which change the shape of the outer lobe.

## 2. PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND APPROACH OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is the identification of potential Hi-Glide canopy applications for RPV's, the definition of data voids which would prevent a comparative analytical evaluation of the various Hi-Glide canopies for application to RPV's, the development of program




Figure 2. Hi-Glide Canopy Sketched



AFFDL-TR-75-129

outlines for filling selected data voids, and the documentation of the study results. It should be stressed at this point that the study was not to conduct a Hi-Glide canopy comparative analysis but rather to identify the data voids which would prevent such an analysis.

The RPV chosen by the RPV SPO for this study as representative of the current generation of RPV's was the AQM-34V. This RPV has a maximum gross weight of 4520 lbs. with a maximum allowable g limit established for the study of 3.72 g's at maximum gross weight. A target deployment q value for the Hi-Glide canopy was established at 100 psf. Vertical descent velocity should be less than the 15 fps currently available with the ability to minimize total velocity for surface impact to minimize impact damage. A landing accuracy for surface impact recovery of 1/2 mile diameter circle is desired.

The approach adopted for this study was to first establish the candidate Hi-Glide canopies available and their potential applications for RPV's. An analysis of the various phases (as defined in Table 1) of each application (e.g. midair recovery) led to identification of the system data requirements for the various phases of each application. A literature search was then conducted to identify the capabilities of each candidate canopy. It should be stressed at this point that only data documented in the published literature was considered in this study. A comparison of data requirements and data available resulted in identification of the data voids. Programs were developed which would attempt to fill selected voids.

AFFDL-TR-75-129

It should be emphasized here that the programs outlined are those required to fill the selected Hi-Glide canopy data voids; this does not imply that the entire program outline for a given void must be accomplished as a single effort. The outlined programs may be subdivided into smaller efforts.

SECTION II  
IDENTIFICATION OF DATA REQUIREMENTS

1. POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

A review of current RPV operations resulted in the identification of the general categories of recovery and take-off as potential areas for Hi-Glide canopy application. For recovery, Hi-Glide canopies offer the potential of reduced descent rates (including the possibility of zero descent rate under powered flight), increased wind penetration capability, flight path control, homing (manual or automatic) to a specific impact point, and reduced impact velocities. For take-off, a Hi-Glide canopy offers additional wing area to reduce the required take-off speed, thus reducing take-off distance.

The potential applications are depicted in Figure 3 and include midair recovery and surface impact recovery. Midair recovery will utilize an uncontrolled canopy, be powered or unpowered, and be conducted in daytime under visual (good weather) flight conditions. Surface impact recovery will be accomplished through automatic homing or manual guidance of a powered or unpowered vehicle. Under each of these categories of guidance, a possibility of two further subdivisions exists - use of canopy control surfaces or use of RPV control surfaces. Automatic homing will be accomplished in daytime or night and in all weather. Manual guidance will be limited to daytime/good weather only.




Figure 3. Hi-Glide Canopies as Applied to RPV's

## 2. OPERATIONAL SEQUENCE/DATA REQUIREMENTS

A consideration of the RPV operations during each of the potential applications led to identification of a sequence of events or phases of operation occurring during each application. An analysis of each phase of operation resulted in the identification of the system data requirements necessary to perform a Hi-Glide canopy comparative analysis. Through this analysis it was determined that all data requirements identified for a recovery application encompassed those identified for a take-off application. Therefore, only the recovery application will be addressed in the remaining sections of this study. It should be noted that a program to fill a data void under the recovery applications will, in general, be more extensive than one to fill the same data void under the take-off application due to the additional restrictions imposed on the recovery application (e.g. volume constraint).

The phases of the recovery system utilization and the data required for evaluation of the recovery system within each phase are given in Table 1:

TABLE 1  
 RECOVERY APPLICATIONS-PHASES OF OPERATION  
 AND DATA REQUIREMENTS

<u>PHASE</u>	<u>DATA REQUIREMENTS</u>
1. Packed and stored in the RPV	a. Achievable packing densities for Hi-Glide materials. b. Material types for Hi-Glide application. c. RPV weight and balance data. d. RPV aerodynamic data. e. RPV structural data. f. RPV recovery system volume available.
2. Deployed from the RPV	a. RPV "g" limitations for all axes. b. RPV recovery envelope. c. RPV recovery weight. d. Hi-Glide canopy deployment capabilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Dynamic Pressure</li> <li>. Reefing</li> <li>. Opening Forces</li> <li>. Reliability</li> </ul>
3. Steady state flight/descent	a. Hi-Glide canopy aerodynamic data. b. Hi-Glide canopy stability data. c. Hi-Glide canopy control data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Forces</li> <li>. Travel</li> </ul>

TABLE 1 (Concluded)

<u>PHASE</u>	<u>DATA REQUIREMENTS</u>
4. Flight Termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Hi-Glide canopy turn data.</li> <li>e. Desired/allowable descent rate.</li> <li>f. Desired wind offset capability.</li> <li>g. Ability to design a canopy for a given weight range.</li> <li>h. RPV aerodynamic data.</li> <li>i. RPV stability data.</li> <li>j. RPV control data.</li> <li>k. RPV engine data.</li> <li>l. RPV guidance, navigation, and control capabilities.</li> <li>a. All items of Number 3 above.</li> <li>b. RPV "g" limits.</li> <li>c. Midair recovery constraints.</li> <li>d. Acceptable impact conditions.</li> <li>e. Impact accuracy requirements.</li> <li>f. Surface based control equipment requirements.</li> </ul>
5. Turnaround	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Packing time.</li> <li>b. Packing facilities required.</li> </ul>
6. Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Canopy cost.</li> <li>b. Reliability.</li> <li>c. Maintainability.</li> </ul>

SECTION III

ANALYSIS OF DATA VOIDS

1. IDENTIFICATION OF HI-GLIDE CANOPY CHARACTERISTICS/  
CAPABILITIES

Following compilation of the data required for conducting a comparative analysis (Table 1), a literature search was conducted to determine which of these data are available for each of the candidate Hi-Glide canopies. This information is presented in Table 2.

The available data has been divided into several categories in Table 2. Table 2a presents various physical characteristics of the candidate Hi-Glide canopies as they exist today. Free flight wing loading,  $(W/S)_{FF}$ , is indicated as having a potential lack of data due to its interrelationship with other factors such as wing area, payload weights, and overall system performance requirements. For example, volume constraints might be such that a canopy of sufficient area could be stowed which would carry the payload within the demonstrated  $(W/S)_{FF}$  capability. However, the requirement for a smaller recovery system volume or for increased system wind offset capability might easily push the  $(W/S)_{FF}$  requirement above the current demonstrated capability. It should be noted at this time that due to the flexible nature of Hi-Glide canopies an increase in wing loading tends to distort the canopy as the increased load is distributed into the canopy, causing a degradation in performance. This shortcoming is partially due to the inability to analytically predict the stress distribution throughout the canopy for a given application. Table 2b presents Hi-Glide canopy deployment



TABLE 2  
IDENTIFICATION OF HI-GLIDE CANOPY CHARACTERISTICS/CAPABILITIES\*

a. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

	ACHIEVABLE PACKING DENSITY	MATERIAL TYPES	WING AREAS DEMONSTRATED	ASPECT RATIOS INVESTIGATED	PAYLOAD WEIGHTS	FREE FLIGHT WING LOADING
PARAMING	Hand Packed	(Rip-Stop Nylon, coated)	Up to 4000 Ft <sup>2</sup> (3)	Up to 3.0 ( $\Lambda_0 = 45^\circ$ ) 4.0 ( $\Lambda_0 = 0^\circ$ ) (4)	Up to 6000 # (3)	Up to 1.5 psf** (3)
RAM-AIR	Hand Packed	(Rip-Stop Nylon, coated)	Up to 864 Ft <sup>2</sup> (5)	Up to 3 Personnel 1.5+2.0 (6)	Up to 2000 # ? (5)	Up to 2.7 psf** (5)
SAILWING	Hand Packed	(Rip-Stop Nylon, coated)	Up to 2700 Ft <sup>2</sup> (7)	Up to 4.0 (8)	Up to 1000# (7)	Up to .75 psf (8)

\* Numbers in parentheses denote a reference.

\*\* Potential data void depending on other factors.

TABLE 2. (Cont'd)  
 b. CANOPY FREE FLIGHT DEPLOYMENT CAPABILITIES - PARAWING

	MAXIMUM SPEED SUCCESSFUL DEPLOYMENT	ASSOCIATED CANOPY AREA (FT <sup>2</sup> )	ASSOCIATED MAXIMUM OPENING FORCES (g's)
REEFED (9)	220 KEAS $q_{max} = 93$ to 20000'	400	4.2 - 6 to 20000'
UNREEFED (10)	160 KEAS $q_{max} = 87$ to 1000'	276.5	24 - 37 (Minimal Data)

ARE METHODS AVAILABLE TO SCALE OPENING FORCES

A method has been demonstrated for unreefed parawings up to  $L_k = 24'$ ,  $S = 400 \text{ Ft}^2$  (11.)

	MAXIMUM CANOPY AREA (FT <sup>2</sup> )	ASSOCIATED SPEED SUCCESSFUL DEPLOYMENT	ASSOCIATED MAXIMUM OPENING FORCES (g's)
REEFED (3)	4000	180 KEAS to 22000' $q_{L.S.} = 76$	2.8 - 4 to 22000'
UNREEFED (3)	4000	NO DATA	NO DATA

TABLE 2. (Cont'd)  
 b. CANOPY FREE FLIGHT DEPLOYMENT CAPABILITIES - RAM-AIR

	MAXIMUM SPEED SUCCESSFUL DEPLOYMENT	ASSOCIATED CANOPY AREA (FT <sup>2</sup> )	ASSOCIATED MAXIMUM OPENING FORCES (g's)
(12) REEFED	200 KEAS to 15000', $q_{max} = 1.00$	230	14 - 18 to 15000' (Higher at 22000')
(12) UNREEFED	100 KEAS to 3000', $q_{max} = 32$	230	NO DATA

ARE METHODS AVAILABLE TO SCALE OPENING FORCES

?

(5)

Possible Scaling of  $\frac{C_{To}}{C_{Tr}}$

(Minimal Data)

	MAXIMUM CANOPY AREA (FT <sup>2</sup> )	ASSOCIATED SPEED SUCCESSFUL DEPLOYMENT	ASSOCIATED MAXIMUM OPENING FORCES (g's)
(5) REEFED	864	130 KEAS TO 3000'	8 - 10 Low Altitude (Minimal Data)
(5) UNREEFED	864	NO DATA	NO DATA

TABLE 2. (Cont'd)  
 b. CANOPY FREE FLIGHT DEPLOYMENT CAPABILITIES - SAILING

	MAXIMUM SPEED SUCCESSFUL DEPLOYMENT	ASSOCIATED CANOPY AREA (FT <sup>2</sup> )	ASSOCIATED MAXIMUM OPENING FORCES (g's)
(8) REEFED	119KEAS to 1500', q = 46	400	UNAVAILABLE*
UNREEFED	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA

ARE METHODS AVAILABLE TO SCALE OPENING FORCES
none

	MAXIMUM CANOPY AREA (FT <sup>2</sup> )	ASSOCIATED SPEED SUCCESSFUL DEPLOYMENT	ASSOCIATED MAXIMUM OPENING FORCES (g's)
(7) REEFED	2700	q = 20 psf	2.2
UNREEFED	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA

\* Tests at 59KEAS and 1500' (q=12psf) produced  $g_{max} = 13.5$

TABLE 2. (Cont'd) c. AERODYNAMIC PERFORMANCE AND CONTROL DATA\*\* - PARAWING

PERFORMANCE	
Wind Tunnel	Free Flight
S	Up to 4000 Ft <sup>2</sup>
AR <sub>Par</sub>	Up to 3
q	Up to 2 psf
C <sub>L</sub>	✓
C <sub>D</sub>	✓
C <sub>M</sub>	✓

CANOPY CONTROL	
S	UP TO 400 FT <sup>2</sup>
q	UP TO 2 psf
<u>TURN CONTROL</u> •Aero Data •Force •Stroke •Response Time	✓
	✓
	✓
	✓
<u>LANDING CONTROL</u> •Aero Data •Force •Stroke •Δ V	✓
	✓
	✓
	✓
Methods Available to Scale Steady State Performance	Not specifically; but much data on many sizes is available

NOTE: (1) A check (✓) indicates that this data is available.

(2) Stability\*: W. T. - Stability data shows only trends due to types of testing techniques (constraints) used.

F. F. - Stability data is qualitative in most instances.

\* This applies to all three types of Hi-Glide Canopies.

\*\* This information is contained in many sources in the bibliographies

Are Methods Available to Scale Control Characteristics	SOME
--	------

TABLE 2. (Cont'd)  
 C. AERODYNAMIC PERFORMANCE AND CONTROL DATA-RAM AIR

PERFORMANCE		CANOPY CONTROL	
	Wind Tunnel	Free Flight	
S	Up to 300 Ft <sup>2</sup>	Up to 864 Ft <sup>2</sup>	LARGE 2 (> 300 ft <sup>2</sup> )
AR	Up to 3	Up to 2	
q	Up to 4.3 psf	Up to 4.3 psf	
C <sub>L</sub>	✓	✓	
C <sub>D</sub>	✓	✓	
C <sub>M</sub>	✓		
TURN CONTROL			
•Aero Data		✓	NO DATA
•Force		✓	NO DATA
•Stroke		✓	NO DATA
•Response Time		✓	NO DATA
LANDING CONTROL			
•Aero Data		NO DATA	NO DATA
•Force		NO DATA	NO DATA
•Stroke		NO DATA	NO DATA
•Δ V		NO DATA	NO DATA
Methods Available to Scale Steady State Performance		No, but much data is available from which methods may be developed	
Methods Available to Scale Control Characteristics		NONE	

TABLE 2. (Cont'd)  
AERODYNAMIC PERFORMANCE AND CONTROL DATA - SAILING

	PERFORMANCE	
	Wind Tunnel	Free Flight
S	Up to 2 328 Ft	Up to 2 2700 Ft
AR	NO DATA	NO DATA
q	Up to 12 psf	Up to 1.5 psf
C <sub>L</sub>	LIMITED DATA	NO DATA
C <sub>D</sub>	LIMITED DATA	NO DATA
C <sub>M</sub>	LIMITED DATA	NO DATA

CANOPY CONTROL		
S	95.5 FT <sup>2</sup>	328 FT <sup>2</sup>
q	1 psf	UP TO 6 psf
TURN CONTROL		
•Aero Data	LIMITED DATA	LIMITED DATA
•Force	NO DATA	NO DATA
•Stroke	LIMITED DATA	LIMITED DATA
•Response Time	NO DATA	NO DATA
LANDING CONTROL		
•Aero Data	NO DATA	NO DATA
•Force	NO DATA	NO DATA
•Stroke	NO DATA	NO DATA
•A V	NO DATA	NO DATA
Methods Available to Scale Steady State Performance		NONE

Are Methods Available to Scale Control Characteristics	NO
--	----

TABLE 2 (Concluded)

d. MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION

	DEMONSTRATED FIELD PACKED CAPABILITY	COST ESTIMATING DATA BASIS	RELIABILITY*	MAINTAINABILITY
PARAWING	Personnel size only	Cost for fabri- cating personnel sized wings	NO DATA	NO DATA
RAM-AIR	Personnel size only	Cost for fabri- cating personnel sized wings	NO DATA	NO DATA
SAILWING	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA

\*NOTE: Hi-Glide Canopies are inherently reliable in their opening. Efforts to control the opening forces creates problems in reliability.



capabilities. The Sailwing data presented is based on a minimal amount of test information (e.g. only one successful test at  $q = 20$  psf for the 2700 ft<sup>2</sup> Sailwing). The 4000 sq. ft. Parawing was developed under a NASA program (Reference 3) and employed a complex five-stage pyrotechnic reefing system which would probably be unacceptable for the RPV application under consideration. Under this and other NASA programs the ability to scale the opening forces for Parawings up to 400 sq. ft. ( $l_k = 24$  ft.), Reference 11, from model results has been demonstrated. This scaling technique has not been verified for other Hi-Glide canopies. An attempt to predict the reefed opening forces of the 4000 sq. ft. Parawing from test results of a 400 sq. ft. "model" were largely unsuccessful due in part to a mismatch between desired and actual test conditions of the verification tests, Reference 3. Under an Air Force program, Reference 5, a possible scaling of the ratio of opening force to reefed opening force for a Ram-air canopy was demonstrated; however, this is based on minimal data. Table 2c presents the aerodynamic performance and control data. As indicated in the table, no specific methods are presently available to directly scale the steady state flight performance of Hi-Glide canopies. The limited wind tunnel aerodynamic performance data for the Sailwing is contained in References 13, 14, and 15. However, the range and numbers of variables included are not considered sufficient to adequately predict the aerodynamic performance of other Sailwing configurations. No free flight aerodynamic performance data or canopy control data is available for the Sailwing. Table 2d represents additional miscellaneous information

required to round out the complete comparative analysis. Due to the limited investigation of large scale (>300 sq. ft.) Hi-Glide canopies, cost, reliability, and maintainability information is virtually non-existent.

## 2. IDENTIFICATION/CATEGORIZATION OF RPV RELATED DATA REQUIREMENTS

The information presented in Table 3 represents the RPV related information required to conduct a Hi-Glide canopy comparative analysis. A check mark (✓) indicates that sufficient data is available. The term GN&C stands for guidance, navigation, and control. These terms are defined (Reference 16) as follows:

Navigation - Ability to determine position relative to a given position.

Guidance - Ability to establish a suitable ground track and flight condition in order to reach the given position.

Control - Ability to cause the vehicle to follow the desired flight path.

RPV Operational Requirements include, but are not limited to:

Acceptable system descent velocity.

Acceptable impact conditions.

Acceptable weather conditions.

Acceptable turn capabilities and response.

Acceptable recovery envelope.

## 3. IDENTIFICATION OF DATA VOIDS WHICH PREVENT A HI-GLIDE CANOPY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Having identified (1) the potential applications and data requirements for evaluation of the RPV recovery system and (2) the

TABLE 3  
IDENTIFICATION/CATEGORIZATION OF RPV RELATED DATA REQUIREMENTS

WT & BAL DATA	AERO DATA	STRUCTURAL DATA	G LIMITS	RECOVERY WT.
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
ACCEPTABLE IMPACT CONDITIONS				
NO DATA		STABILITY DATA	CONTROL DATA	ENGINE DATA
		✓	✓	✓

RPV

ABILITY TO DESIGN NAVIGATION & GUIDANCE SUBSYSTEM	ABILITY TO DESIGN ON-BOARD CONTROL SUBSYSTEM
✓	✓

GN&C

TAKE-OFF	MID-AIR	GROUND IMPACT
NO DATA	✓	NO DATA

RPV OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

published Hi-Glide canopy characteristics/capabilities, the latter can be balanced against the former to establish the canopy data voids which exist. It is recognized that many areas are interrelated (e.g. the successful flight demonstration of a large Ram-Air canopy will not insure its ability to meet all the requirements of the RPV application under consideration). However, for the sake of simplicity, the data voids will be addressed separately.

a. Canopy Related Data Voids - The following canopy data voids have been identified and, unless specifically stated otherwise, apply to all Hi-Glide canopy configurations. An additional lack of data in the area of aerodynamic performance data and canopy control data also exist for the Sailwing.

(1) Packing - To meet the RPV recovery system volume constraints the Hi-Glide canopy system may have to be pressure packed to densities greater than those currently demonstrated for low-permeability materials. No data is currently available of the effects on material and canopy performance of pressure packing the low-permeability materials currently utilized in Hi-Glide canopy fabrication.

(2) Canopy Wing Area/Payload/Wing Loading

(a) Canopy Wing Area - An estimate of the canopy area required for application of the RPV recovery can be calculated as follows:

given,  $W_{\max} = 4520\#$

$V_{V_{\max}} = 24$  fps based on midair recovery requirement

AFFDL-TR-75-129

assume,  $L/D = 3.0$

$h = 10,000 \text{ ft.}$

$C_{R_{\text{ram-air}}} = 0.65$

$$V_{\text{TOT}} = V_V / \sin \gamma = \frac{24}{\sin [\text{arc tan } (\frac{1}{3.0})]}$$

$\approx 76 \text{ fps}$

$$V_{\text{TOT}} = \frac{2W}{\rho S C_R}$$

$$S_{\text{min}} = \frac{2(4520)}{(0.001756)(0.65)(76)^2} = 1371 \text{ sq. ft.}$$

Parawings have been successfully demonstrated to wing areas of 4000 sq. ft. The demonstration of Ram-Air canopies of areas up to only 864 sq. ft. have been documented, resulting in a data void in this category for Ram-Air canopies. The data available on the 2700 sq. ft. Sailwing is minimal.

(b) Canopy Payload - Ram-Air canopies have successfully flown with payloads up to 2000 lbs. This represents only approximately 1/2 of the payload (4520 lbs) under consideration. Parawing payloads to 6000 lbs have been successfully demonstrated.

(c) Wing Loading - This category represents a possible data void for all Hi-Glide canopies depending upon other factors in the RPV application (e.g. available volume, achievable packing density). Due to the interrelationship among the various factors it cannot definitely be determined that a data void exists in this area for the application under consideration. However, due to the desire for wind offset

capability (a function, in part, of wing loading) and minimum volume for recovery system, it is felt that wing loadings above those in Table 2a will be desirable. The inability to predict the effect of increased wing loading on canopy performance is due, in part, to the lack of accurate methods to predict the stress distribution in the all-flexible canopy under a given loading. Thus, wing loading is identified as a potential data void for all Hi-Glide canopies.

(3) Reefing - The Hi-Glide canopy deployment  $q$  has been established as 100 psf for the application under consideration with a  $g$  limit of 3.72 at maximum gross weight. No reefing system has been demonstrated to date which will meet these conditions. The five stage pyrotechnic system used by NASA on the 4000 sq. ft. Parawing comes closest to meeting them; however, reefing system complexity would probably preclude its use for RPV application.

(4) Canopy Control Data - Ram-Air canopy turn control data is nonexistent for systems larger than approximately 300 sq. ft. and landing flare control data is minimal or nonexistent for systems larger than 300 sq. ft. Data on Parawings up to 4000 sq. ft. is available.

(5) Scaling Techniques - Scaling techniques for unreefed opening forces have been validated for Parawings of areas up to 400 sq. ft. An attempt to extend these techniques to reefed opening forces of a 4000 sq. ft. Parawing system was not completely successful due, in part, to a mismatch between desired and actual test conditions. No scaling techniques for opening forces have been documented for Ram-Air canopies. Specific techniques are not available for accurate scaling of Hi-Glide canopy free-flight performance.

(6) Reliability, Maintainability, and Cost - Hi-Glide canopies are inherently reliable in their opening; efforts to control or reduce the opening forces create problems in reliability. All Hi-Glide canopy types are capable of gliding (with reduced performance) with considerable damage (e.g. holes in the canopy fabric). Production costs are available only for personnel sized canopies. Limited quantity costs are available for larger sized canopies.

(7) Miscellaneous Data Voids

(a) Materials - Materials, per se, may not be a factor preventing a comparative analysis of Hi-Glide canopies unless system constraints (e.g. volume) are such that, for a given material, one canopy could be incorporated and another one not. If this were the case, utilization of a different material might allow for incorporation of both canopies. The predominant material used to date in the construction of Hi-Glide canopy systems has been a coated and/or calendered rip-stop nylon. An evaluation of alternate materials may yield others equally suited for Hi-Glide canopy application but with possible advantages of increased packing efficiency, decreased weight, etc.

(b) Canopy Design - The ability to successfully design a Hi-Glide canopy larger than personnel size,  $\approx 300$  sq. ft., for a specific application has not been demonstrated. This inability is a result of many of the data voids previously presented.

AFFDL-TR-75-129

b. RPV Related Data Voids

(1) Acceptable Impact Conditions - A definition of acceptable impact conditions is required to allow the establishment of recovery systems parameters such as acceptable impact velocity/acceleration.

(2) RPV Operational Requirements - A definition of the RPV operational requirements is needed for surface impact recovery and take-off applications. These requirements include such items as weather conditions, turn capability and response, recovery envelope, etc.



SECTION IV  
PROGRAM OUTLINES TO FILL SELECTED DATA VOIDS

Following identification of existing Hi-Glide canopy data voids, programs were outlined which attempt to fill specific voids or combinations of voids. The general format of the program outlines which follow is: title, background/payoff, and approach. To reiterate a previous statement, it should not be interpreted that an entire program must be accomplished as outlined; most of the programs outlined are capable of being broken into subprograms. If all data voids are not filled before a comparative analysis is conducted, the program outlines are listed below in a prioritized order which attempts to minimize the effect on the analysis of the assumptions required by those voids which are not filled.

All programs generated to fill selected data voids as outlined below also apply to the Sailwing with the exception of the manhour estimates. The estimates given do not include the Sailwing since programs to fill most Sailwing data voids will be much more extensive than those for the Parawing and/or Ram-Air canopies due to the minimal amount of published information currently available.

1. TITLE: HI-GLIDE CANOPY AERODYNAMIC REEFING PROGRAM

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate an aerodynamic reefing system(s) for  
Hi-Glide canopy systems applicable to RPV recovery.

BACKGROUND/PAYOFF: A pyrotechnic reefing system was developed by NASA for a 4000 ft<sup>2</sup> Parawing Hi-Glide canopy system. This reefing

system comes closest to meeting RPV recovery requirements; however, it consists of five stages and is probably unacceptable for RPV recovery application due to its complexity. Other pyrotechnic systems used to date on Parawings and Ram-Air Hi-Glide canopy systems will not limit opening forces to those required throughout the entire RPV recovery envelope encompassed by this study. An aerodynamic reefing system is currently used successfully on personnel sized Ram-Air canopies; however, little data is available to determine its applicability to other Hi-Glide canopy systems or larger Ram-Air systems. This type reefing system offers the potential of a simple reefing system which is dynamic pressure sensitive, an attribute which a pyrotechnic system lacks.

APPROACH: The overall approach to this program involves three phases. Phase 1 involves the review of available data on dynamic pressure sensitive reefing systems and the analysis and testing of model (20-40 ft<sup>2</sup>) Hi-Glide canopy systems. An attempt will be made to develop a scaling technique for the deployment loads of unreefed and reefed Hi-Glide canopies. Model canopies will be designed and fabricated for wind tunnel deployment testing and drop testing. The drop testing would be similar to that accomplished by NASA in testing unreefed Parawings inside a large building. These tests will provide input to the deployment force scaling technique to predict deployment forces on a small scale (200 to 300 ft<sup>2</sup>) system. Phase 2 involves a program similar to Phase 1 but for a small scale system(s). Free flight drop tests are included

in this phase to provide, in conjunction with the "building" drop tests, a data base for comparison and modification, if required, of the predicted deployment forces. Phase 3 represents a follow-on evaluation of aerodynamic reefing applied to a full scale ( $> 1000 \text{ ft}^2$ ) system(s) involving the design, fabrication, flight testing and documentation of this system(s).

2. TITLE: HI-GLIDE CANOPY WING LOADING PROGRAM

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate the performance of Hi-Glide canopy systems at high wing loadings (2 to 5 psf) for application to RPV recovery.

BACKGROUND/PAYOFF: To minimize recovery system stowed weight and volume for mid-air recovery applications, it is desirable to utilize the maximum Hi-Glide canopy wing loading consistent with the vertical descent rate constraints of the recovery vehicle. To maximize system wing penetration (offset) capability for RPV ground impact applications it is desirable to utilize the maximum Hi-Glide canopy wing loading consistent with the RPV ground impact velocity requirements and canopy landing flare capabilities.

The current demonstrated wing loading capabilities for the various Hi-Glide canopy systems are:

Parawing - 1.5 psf

Ram-Air - 2.7 psf

Providing an increased W/S capability could significantly reduce the recovery system stowed volume/weight requirements and increase the system wind offset capabilities.

APPROACH: The overall approach to this program involves four phases. Phase 1 involves the acquisition and analysis of existing data, development of a structural (stress) analysis methodology for both Parawing and Ram-Air Hi-Glide canopy systems, the prediction of steady state glide performance for the higher wing loadings on small scale systems (200 to 300 ft<sup>2</sup>), and develop scaling techniques for steady state glide performance for larger canopies. These developments will be applicable to the entire W/S range in question. Phases 2 through 4 involve the design, fabrication, testing, and documentation of these efforts for W/S of 2, 3, and 4, respectively, for both small scale Parawing and Ram-Air Hi-Glide canopy systems. During Phases 2 through 4 the result of the prediction techniques will be compared with test results and modified as required. Testing will include wind tunnel (if applicable), tow, and drop tests. Drop test will be conducted on an instrumented range to acquire the data necessary to evaluate system performance.

### 3. HI-GLIDE CANOPY HI-DENSITY PACKING PROGRAM

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate the effect of high density packing on the properties of low permeability materials and on the Hi-Glide canopy deployment and free flight performance.

BACKGROUND/PAYOFF: To date, the primary method of packing Hi-Glide canopy systems has been by hand. This method results in relatively low packing densities which may not meet the Hi-Glide canopy volume constraints for application to RPV recovery. The ability to pack a Hi-Glide canopy system to sufficient density to allow it to be used in an RPV

AFFDL-TR-75-129

recovery system could provide the RPV system with a decreased descent rate, wind offset capability, homing capability (trajectory control), multiple recovery capability, and decreased vertical impact velocity.

APPROACH: The overall approach to the program involves three phases. Phase 1 would evaluate the hi-density packing of Hi-Glide canopy materials. Here the problems associated with the pressure packing of low permeability materials would be identified and resolved. Phase 2 involves the high-density packing of candidate Hi-Glide canopies themselves, addressing the problems of pressure packing system components in addition to the low permeability material. Phase 3 provides for the flight testing of high density packed Hi-Glide canopy systems to evaluate the effect of hi-density packing on canopy deployment and flight performance.

4. TITLE: RAM-AIR CANOPY WING AREA/PAYLOAD PROGRAM

OBJECTIVE: To demonstrate a Ram-Air Hi-Glide canopy applicable to RPV recovery (> 3000 lb payload) and to evaluate this design for application to a 4520 lb vehicle at increased wing loadings.

BACKGROUND/PAYOFF: Ram-Air Hi-Glide canopies are currently being used by sport parachutists at wing loadings of less than 2.0. The largest documented wing loading to date is 2.7 psf on an 864 ft<sup>2</sup> Parafoil. This combination is insufficient for the desired application. An effort is currently underway in the RPV SPO to demonstrate a 3200 ft<sup>2</sup> Parafoil for recovery of an RPV. Successful completion of this effort will substantially fill this data void for Ram-Air canopies if sufficient/ acceptable data is obtained.

APPROACH: It is difficult to break this program into phases since it deals only with the demonstration of one size (large) canopy. The program consists of an analysis of existing data, turn control, landing flare control, and scaling technique for steady state performance; the design and fabrication of a large scale system(s); tow and drop tests of this system; and documentation of all of the above. The drop tests will include steady state glide evaluation, turn control tests, and landing flare tests.

5. TITLE: RAM-AIR CANOPY LANDING FLARE CONTROL PROGRAM

OBJECTIVE: To quantify the landing flare capability of a small scale (300 ft<sup>2</sup>) Ram-Air canopy.

BACKGROUND/PAYOFF: A limited landing flare capability for Parawing Hi-Glide canopy systems was established under the NASA 4000 ft<sup>2</sup> system tests. Manned application of Ram-Air canopies indicates, at least qualitatively, better landing flare control capability with Ram-Air canopies than with Parawing canopies. Providing a Hi-Glide system with landing flare capability for RPV recovery offers the potential of increased wind penetration while maintaining a given ground impact velocity, reducing recovery system weight and volume, or reducing impact velocity.

APPROACH: The overall approach to this program involves two phases. Phase I involves the analysis and tow testing of a small scale Hi-Glide Ram-Air canopy system(s). The analysis will consider existing control information and establish possible techniques for accomplishing landing flare. Following design and fabrication of the canopies and

AFFDL-TR-75-129

control system, tow tests will be conducted on an instrumented range. It is possible that the control system might be eliminated by performing instrumented manned tests on an instrumented test range. Phase 2 involves drop tests on an instrumented test range.

SECTION V

CONCLUSIONS

As a result of this study a number of data voids were found to exist which may prevent the accomplishment of a meaningful comparative analysis of Hi-Glide canopies as applied to RPV's.

Hi-Glide Canopy related data voids include:

	Parawing	Ram-Air	Sailwing
Pressure Packing	X	X	X
Canopy Wing Area		X	X
Canopy Payload		X	X
Canopy Wing Loading	X	X	X
Reefing	X	X	X
Canopy Control Data		X	X
Opening Force Scaling Techniques	X	X	X
Reliability, Maintainability, Cost	X	X	X
Materials	X	X	X
Canopy Design	X	X	X

RPV related data voids include:

Acceptable Impact Conditions

RPV Operational Requirements

The nature of the above data voids is such as to prevent the accomplishments of a meaningful comparative analysis of the application of Hi-Glide canopies to RPV's.



AFFDL-TR-75-129

It should be noted that additional information may be available on the various canopies (especially the Sailwing) in unpublished form through manufacturers or other government agencies.

REFERENCES

1. Knacke, T. W., Steerable Parachutes, Paper presented at the Symposium for Aerodynamic Deceleration, Braunschweig, Germany, September 1969.
2. Speelman III, R. J., Bradshaw, C., Sobczak, J., Menard, G., Hi-Glide Personnel Canopies - Efforts Toward Identification of Requirements, AIAA Paper No. 70-1194, September 1970.
3. Moeller, J. H., Linhart, E. M., Gran, W. M., Parson, L. T., Free-Flight Investigation of Large All-Flexible Parawings and Performance Comparison With Small Parawings, NASA CR-66918, 1970.
4. a. Naseth, R. L., Recent Flexible-Wing Research, Paper presented at the course on Aerodynamic Deceleration at the Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, July 17, 1969.  
 b. Fournier, P. G., Sleeman Jr., W. C., Wind-Tunnel Studies of Effects of Construction Methods, Wing Planform, and Canopy Slots on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of All-Flexible Parawings, NASA TN D-5974, October 1970.
5. Speelman III, R. J., et al, Para-Foil Steerable Parachute, Exploratory Development for Airdrop System Application, AFFDL-TR-71-37, April 1972.
6. Ware, G. M., Hassell Jr., J. L., Wind-Tunnel Investigation of Ram-Air-Inflated All-Flexible Wings of Aspect Ratios 1.0 to 3.0, NASA TM SX-1923, December 1969.
7. Barish, D., "Development of Large Sailwings", NASA contract NAS 9-6504, monthly progress reports, November 1966 through July 1967.
8. Menard, G., Performance Evaluation Tests of a Sailwing Maneuverable, Personnel Gliding Parachute Assembly, NARF TN 1005-70, June 1970.
9. Croom, D. R., Deployment Loads Data From a Free-Flight Investigation of All-Flexible Parawings at Small Scale, NASA TM X-2307, August 1971.
10. Morgan Jr., H. L., Bradshaw, C. F., Aerodynamic and Deployment Characteristics of Single-Keel Solid and Single-Keel Slotted Personnel Parawings, NASA TN D-5911, July 1970.

REFERENCES (Cont'd)

11. a. Linhart, E. M., Buhler, W. C., Wind Tunnel and Free Flight Investigation of All-Flexible Parawings at Small Scale, NASA CR-66879, June 1969.
  - b. Moore, R. H., Eichblatt, D. L., Hughes, T. F., Experimental Verification of Scale Factors for Parawing Opening Characteristics with Dimensional Ratios from 1:13 to 1:3, NASA TN D-5071, March 1969.
  - c. Eichblatt, D. L., Moore, R. H., Barton, R. L., Experimental Verification of Scale Factors for Parawing Opening Characteristics, NASA TN D-4665, August 1968.
12. DoD Joint Parachute Test Facility Test Report (Project 2-73)
- |          |           |
|----------|-----------|
| #0303N74 | 30 Apr 74 |
| #0302N74 | 30 Apr 74 |
| #0301N74 | 8 Apr 74  |
| #0300N74 | 8 Apr 74  |
| #0225N74 | 4 Apr 74  |
| #0224N74 | 4 Apr 74  |
13. Ware, G. M., Libbey, C. E., Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the State Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Multilobe Gliding Parachute, NASA TN D-4672, July 1968.
14. Weiberg, J. A., Mort, K. W., Wind-Tunnel Tests of a Series of Parachutes Designed for Controllable Gliding Flight, NASA TN D-3960, May 1967.
15. Barish, D., Sailwing Wind Tunnel Investigation of Four Foot Models, Army TR 65-2, May 1965, AD 360 746.
16. Stengel, R. F., Klein, D. W., Guidance, Navigation, and Control Concepts for a Flyable Ejection Seat, AFAL-TR-73-396, Vol. I, January 1974.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The following bibliographies dealing with Hi-Glide canopies have been extracted in whole from their respective reports, as indicated. No attempt has been made to remove duplicate listings.

AFFDL-TR-75-129

STEERABLE PARACHUTE  
FLEXIBLE WING BIBLIOGRAPHY

AFFDL-TM-73-25 (FER)

Compiled by:

M. Higgins  
R. Speelman

SEPTEMBER 1971

This bibliography is limited to steerable parachutes/flexible wings intended to operate non-rigidized in the subsonic flight regime.

AIR FORCE FLIGHT DYNAMICS LABORATORY  
VEHICLE EQUIPMENT DIVISION  
RECOVERY AND CREW STATION BRANCH  
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO 45433

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abbott, N. J.; Lannefeld  
Development of Low Permeability Fabrics  
AD 853 228
2. Abbott, N. J.; Lannefeld, T. E.  
Fabrics for Gliding Decelerators  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1180
3. Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems Conference Proceedings  
Technical Report No. 69-11  
Air Force Flight Test Center
4. All American Engineering Company  
Extracts from a Study of Mid-Air Retrieval of a 500 Pound Target  
Drone
5. Anderson, Melvin S.; Bohon, Herman L.; Mikulas, Martin M.  
A Structural Merit Function for Aerodynamic Decelerator  
NASA TN-D-5535
6. Automated Pressure Analysis of Impact Attenuators  
1971
7. Barish, D. T.  
Phase III Deployment Investigation of Full Scale Sailwing Models  
X67-83502 TR 65-4
8. Barish, D. T.  
Preliminary Drop Tests of the Barish Sailwing for Personnel Applications
9. Barish, D. T.; Erlandsen, P.O.  
Sailwing Glide Dispersion Investigations  
X66-17264# TR-66-1 AD 369 556
10. Barish, D. T.; Erlandsen, P. O.  
Sailwing Wind Tunnel Investigation of Four Foot Span Models - Phase I  
X65-19903# TR 65-2 AD 360 746
11. Barte, George R.  
Flexible Wings for Maneuvering and Landing Application in the De-  
Coupled Concept  
AIAA Paper No. 67-200
12. Bass, Robert L.; Bertin, John J.  
Theoretical Investigation of the Lift and Drag Characteristics  
of Flexible Parawings at Subsonic Speeds  
Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 7, No. 2 pp 130-137

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

AFFDL-TR-75-129

13. Bass, W. W.; David, F. L.; Gundling, D. R.  
Cost-Effectiveness Analyses of Paraglider Delivery Concepts  
X66-21146# CORG-M-196 AD 371 928
14. Belknap, S.  
Gliding Parachute Flight Performance Capability - Final Report  
X67-86809 PTM-565A
15. Benson, H. E.; McCullough, J. E.; Stafford, F. A.  
Attenuation of Landing Impact for Manned Spacecraft  
N65-3525\*# NASA-CR-53291
16. Berndt, R. J.; Metres, S. R.; Speelman, R. J.; DeWeese, J. H.;  
Babish, C. A.; Pinnell, W. R.; Watson, L.L.  
Project Pinpoint Review Report
17. Bloetscher, F.  
Slow Descent Deployment Systems
18. Boeing Company  
Parafoil Fog Dispersal System
19. Boeke, Joseph R.; Fratini, Nancy  
Users Guide to Legendre Fitting Program
20. Boisseau, P.C.; Chambers, J. R.  
A Theoretical Analysis of the Dynamic Lateral Stability and  
Control of Parawing Vehicle  
N66-29211\*# NASA-TN-D-3461
21. Brown, D. L.; Norman, L. C.; West, R. B.  
Development of the Para-Sail Parachute as a Landing System for  
Manned Spacecraft  
N65-88479\*# NASA-TM-X-51586
22. Bryant, L. W.; Brown, M. A.; Sweeting, N. E.  
Collected Researches on the Stability of Kites and Towed Gliders  
London Tech Report R&M 2303
23. Bugg, Frank M.  
Effects of Aspect Ratio and Canopy Shape on Low-Speed Aerodynamic  
Characteristics of 50.0 Swept Parawings  
NASA TN-D-2922
24. Bugg, F. M.; Sleeman, W. C.  
Low Speed Tests of an All-Flexible Parawing for Landing a Lifting-  
Body Spacecraft  
Langley Working Paper LWP-311
25. Burk, S. M.  
Free Flight Investigation of the Deployment, Dynamic Stability, and  
Control Characteristics of a 1/2 Scale Dynamic Radio-Controlled  
Model of a Large Booster and Parawing  
N63-19607\*# NASA-TN-D-1932

26. Burk, S. M. and Ware, G. M.  
Static Aerodynamic Characteristics of Three Ram-Air-Inflated  
Low-Aspect-Ratio Fabric Wings  
NASA-TN-D-4182
27. Burnell, J. A.; Nielsen, J. N.  
Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds Pt. V -  
Engineering Method for Estimating Parawing Performance  
VIDYA Rep. 209(NONR-3728/00) AD628 79
28. Burnell, J. A.; Nielsen, J. N.  
Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds, Part IV -  
Experimental Program and Comparison with Theory  
VIDYA Rep. 172 (NONR-3728/00) AD 617 925
29. Burnell, J. A.; Nielsen, J. N.  
Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds  
V - Engineering Method for Estimating Parawing Performance - Final Rpt
30. Burns, T. A.; Eichel, D. A.  
Data Report - Wind Tunnel Evaluation of Radioplane Glidesail  
Parachute No. 62SD4572
31. Campbell, C. C.; Kiker, J. W.  
Spacecraft Landing Systems - Design Criteria and Components  
A65-12561\*
32. Chambers, J. R.  
An Investigation of the Dynamic Lateral Stability and Control of a  
Parawing Vehicle (M.S. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Inst)  
N66-29712\*# NASA-TM-X-57693
33. Clemmons, Dewey L.  
Some Analysis of Parawing Behavior During Free Flight Deployment  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1189
34. Cook Technological Center  
Proposal for Investigation of Steerable Parachute Configurations
35. Cook Technological Center  
Proposal for the Investigation of Steerable Parachutes to Achieve  
Landing Point Control
36. Cook Technological Center  
Proposal for the Investigation of Steerable Parachutes to Achieve  
Landing Point Control  
1P3989A
37. Coonce, C. A.  
Para-Foil Free-Flight Test Data  
SC-TM-66-2616



38. Coskren, R. J.; Chu, C. C.  
Investigation of the High Speed Impact Behavior of Fibrous Materials  
Technical Report AFML-TR-66-30
39. Coskren, Robert J.; Chu, C. C.  
Investigation of the High Speed Impact Behavior of Fibrous Materials  
Part II: Impact Characteristics of Parachute Materials  
ASD Technical Report 60-511, Part II
40. Coskren, R. J.; Chu, C. C.  
Investigation fo the High Speed Impact Behavior of Fibrous Materials  
Part III: Impact Characteristics of Parachute Materials  
Tech Documentary Rpt No. WADD-TR-60-511, Part III
41. Cota, G.; Sakamoto, N.  
Flexible Wing Air Cargo Glider Delivery System Final Summary Report  
N65-29838# TRECOM-TR-65-11 AD 615 908
42. Cota, G.; Sakamoto, N.  
Flexible Wing Light Utility Glider - Final Report  
N67-15968# USAAVLABS-TR-66-2 Rpt 64B139 AD 640 987
43. Croom, Delwin P.  
Deployment Loads Data from a Free-Flight Investigation of All-  
Flexible Parawings at Small Scale  
NASA TM X2307
44. Croom, Delwin R.  
Deployment Loads Data from a Free-Flight Investigation of 4000  
Square Foot Wing Area All-Flexible Parawings  
Proposed NASA Tech Memo L-7843
45. Croom, D. R.; Naeseth, R. L.; Sleeman, W. C.  
Effects of Canopy Shape on Low-Speed Aerodynamic Characteristics  
of a 55 Degree Swept Parawing with Large Diameter Leading Edges  
N65-11341\*# NASA-TN-D-2551
46. Davidson, D. A.  
The Mechanical Behavior of Fabrics Subjected to Biaxial Stress  
Part I: Theoretical Analysis of the Plain Weave  
Tech Document Rpt No. ASD-TDR-63-485, Part I
47. Defense Documentation Center  
Ring Wings Report Bibliography Aug 1953-Aug 1969  
X70-15078# AD 867 100 DDC-TAS-69-76
48. Dunlop, John W.  
Survey and Evaluation of Electrical Power Sources as to Their  
Potential Application with the 500-Pound Controlled Airdrop  
Cargo System

AFFDL-TR-75-129

49. Dylewski, T. J.  
Criteria for Selectin Curves for Fitting to Data  
AIAA Journal, Vol. 8, No. 8
50. Eichblatt, David L.; Moore, Robert H.; Barton, Richard L.  
Experimental Verification of Scale Factors for Parawing Opening  
Characteristics  
NASA TN D-4665
51. Engelland, J. A.; Peterson, G. L.; Simmons, C. E.  
Design Study in Techniques of Recovery of Target Avionics  
Packages from Rocket Powered Targets  
Technical Rpt AFATL-TR-69-75
52. Epple, Henry K.  
Results of Tests with a Tandem Recovery System Using a Gliding  
Main Parachute  
Aerospace Report No. TOR-0200(4110-01)-27
53. Epple, H. K.; McClow, J. H.  
A Study on Defining Minimum Weight Two-Stage Deceleration Systems  
for Aerial Recovery  
Aerospace Rpt No. TR-0158(3110-01)-4/AF Rpt No. SAMSO-TR-68-406
54. Erlandsen, P. O.  
Sailing Trajectory Analysis, Phase II  
X66-11990# TR-65-3 AD 366 550
55. Everett, W. J.  
The Design and Development of the Parasail Parachute
56. Ewing, E. G.  
Deployable Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems  
NASA SP-8066
57. Ewing, E. G.  
Ringsail Parachute Characteristics  
N64-84336
58. Falarski, Michael D.; Mort, Kenneth W.  
Wind Tunnel Investigation of Several Large Scale All-Flexible  
Parawings  
NASA TN D-4708
59. Faulders, C. R.; Lekawa, E. R.; McNary, R. L.  
Aerodynamic Requirements for Flare and Landing of Low-L/D Glide  
Vehicles  
A68-37886 AIAA Paper 67-575
60. Feldman, Lewis; Lane, Frank  
A Two-Dimensional Theory of Sails

AFFDL-TR-75-129

61. Ferris, Alice T.; Kelly, H. N.  
Free-Flight and Wind Tunnel Studies of Deployment of a Dynamically  
and Elastically Scaled Inflatable Parawing Model  
NASA TN D-4724                      N68-33879
62. Fibrous Materials Branch, AFML  
Evaluation Techniques for Fibers and Yarns Used by the Fibrous  
Materials Branch, Non-Metallic Materials Div, Air Force Materials  
Laboratory  
AFML-TR-67-159
63. Fisher, C. W.  
Performance Evaluation of Pioneer 23 ft. Diameter Steerable  
Personnel Parachute  
Technical Report No. 69-28
64. Forehand, Everett J.; Bair, Herbert Q.  
Parawing Precision Aerial Delivery System  
AIAA Paper No. 68-958
65. Forehand, J. E.  
The Precision Drop Glider  
X65-10842
66. Foteyev, A. M.; Glushkov, I. L.; et al  
A Controlled Gliding Parachute  
FTD-TT-62-349
67. Fournier, Paul G.  
Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation of All-Flexible Twin-Keel  
Tension Structure Parawings  
NASA TN D-5965                      N70-40688
68. Fournier, Paul G.; Sleeman, W. C.  
Wind Tunnel Studies of Effects of Construction Methods, Wing Planform,  
and Canopy Slots on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of All-Flexible  
Parawings  
Langley Working Paper LWP-349
69. Franklin, Billy R.  
Service Test of Maneuverable Troop Rack Personnel Parachute, Modified  
AD 868 721L                      Rpt No. USAAESW BD-AB-9569
70. Gainer, Thomas G.  
Investigation of Opening Characteristics of an All-Flexible Parawing  
NASA TN D-5031
71. Gainer, Thomas G.  
Wind Tunnel Investigation of the Opening Characteristics of an  
All-Flexible Parawing  
Langley Working Paper LWP-344

AFFDL-TR-75-129

72. Gardner, Clarence L.  
Telemetering Facilities - 6511 Test Group (P)
73. Garrison, Dave; Holze, Dick; Logie, L. C.  
Aerodynamic Properties and Applications of the Parafoil  
Boeing Co. Rpt No. D162-10306-2
74. Garrison, Dave  
Aerodynamic Properties of the Para-Foil  
Boeing Co. Rpt No. D162-10306-1
75. General Design, Inc.  
Flight Path Recording of Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems by Means  
Of Cinetheodolite Range Space Positioning Methods
76. General Dynamics  
Guided Parachute Aerial Delivery System
77. Gersten, K.; Hucho, W. H.  
Theoretical and Experimental Investigations on Flexible Wings  
X67-16155\*            NASA-TT-F-10853
78. Gionfriddo, Maurice P.  
Two Body Trajectory Analysis of a Parachute-Cargo Airdrop System
79. Glauert, H.  
Heavy Flexible Cable for Towing a Heavy Body below an Aircraft  
R&M No. 1592
80. Gloss, Blair B.  
The Determination of the Shape and Inertial Properties of an All-  
Flexible Parawing  
NASA-TN-D-5900            N70-23359
81. Goodrick, Thomas F.  
Wind Effect on Gliding Parachute Systems with Non-Proportional  
Automatic Homing Control  
Tech Rpt 70-28
82. Goodyear Aerospace Corporation  
Proposal for 500 to 2000 lb Precision Aerial Delivery System  
GAP-67-4397S1
83. Gorin, Barney F.  
A Wind Tunnel Testing Technique for the Para-Foil Including a Summary  
of the Wind Tunnel Tests of the Para-Foil Conducted at Wright Field
84. Graham, Carl R.  
Steerable Parachute Informal Technical Data    Folders 1, 2, 3, 4

AFFDL-TR-75-129

85. Graham, C. R.; Petit, D.; Willer, E. J.  
Large Cloverleaf Controllable Parachute Aerial Drop Test Plan  
NVR-3964
86. Graham, C. R.; Riley, V. F.; Linhart, E. M.  
Investigation of Various Textile Parachutes and Control Systems to  
Achieve Steerability, Phase II  
Tech Documentary Rpt FDL-TDR-64-81 Part II
87. Graham, C.; Riley, V.; Linhart, E.; Coe, D.  
Large Controllable Parachute, Cloverleaf Structural Analysis Report  
NVR-3981 - NAS 9-5088
88. Greenberg, Harry  
A Survey of Methods for Determining Stability Parameters of an  
Airplane from Dynamic Flight Measurements  
NACA TN 2340
89. Greco, James R.  
An Analysis of the Static Wind Tunnel Testing of Full Scale Para-  
Foil Models
90. Gruber, J. R.  
Strength Analysis Project 6036 Cloverleaf Parachute, Steerable  
Model 502-56  
NVR-4071 - NAS 9-5088
91. Haak, E. L.; Niccum, R. J.; Buchanan, K. B.  
Development of the Para-Sail Parachute for Applications an Earth  
Landing System for Second Generation Space Craft Final Tech Rpt:  
The Pressure Distribution on Idealized Shapes of an Inflating Para-Sail.  
Tech Docu No. 65-25
92. Haak, E. L.; Niccum, R. J.; Buchanan, K. B.  
Final Tech Rpt - The Mass Follow Through Idealized Shapes of an  
Inflating Para-Sail Parachute  
Tech Document No. 65-26
93. Harms, G.  
On Aerodynamic and Flight Mechanics Evaluation of Recoverable High  
Altitude Research Rockets (Project 621)  
N68-13983
94. Hassell, J. L.; Johnson, J. L.  
Full-Scale Wind Tunnel Investigation of a Flexible-Wing Manned  
Test Vehicle  
N63-19736\*                      NASA-TN-D-1946
95. Hatch, Howard G.; McGowan, William A.  
An Analytical Investigation of the Loads, Temperatures and Ranges  
Obtained During the Recovery of Rocket Boosters by Means of a  
Parawing  
NASA TN-D-1003

AFFDL-TR-75-129

96. Heinrich, H. G.; Nietz, Thomas; Lipa, Harvey  
Aerodynamic Characteristics of the Parafoil Glider and Other  
Gliding Parachutes  
Tech Documentary Rpt No: RTD-TDR-63-4022
97. Hicks, D. A.  
Design and Development of a Precision Steerable Parachute Aerial  
Delivery System  
NVP-3673
98. Highley, Frank M.; Long, Robert T.  
Recovery, Sea and Air  
M1181
99. Hinson, J. K.; Kiker, J. W.  
Laboratory and Full-Size Studies with Steerable Parachutes  
A65-20613\*#
100. Hinson, J. K.; Kiker, J. W.  
Laboratory and Full-Size Studies with Steerable Parachutes  
A66-13529\*
101. Huckins, Earle K.  
Techniques for Selection and Analysis of Parachute Deployment Systems  
NASA TM-D-5619
102. Irvine, J. F.  
Inspections, Repairs, Modifications, and Flight Test of the Flexible-  
Wing Manned Test Vehicle, XV-8A  
USAAVLABS TR-68-30                      AD 680 316
103. Jailer, Robert W.; Greilich, Gerald; Norden, M. L.  
Analysis of Heavy-Duty Parachute Reliability
104. Jamison, L. R.; Heinrich, H. G.; Rose, R. E.  
Stress Analysis of the 70 ft Para-Sail During Inflation and Steady  
State Descent  
Tech Document Number 65-22
105. Jaquet, B. M.; Miller, G. K.; Price, D. B.  
Fixed-Base Visual Simulation of Pilot Controlled Descents of an  
Advanced Apollo Spacecraft with an All-Flexible Parawing  
N69-20936\*#      NASA-TN-D-5049                      125-19-01-22-23
106. Jehn, Lawrence A.  
Maximum Likelihood Solution to Theodolite Data
107. Johnson, J. L.; Sleeman, W. C.  
Lift and Drag, Stability and Control Characteristics of Parawings  
X63-12578\*
108. Johnson, J. L.  
Low-Speed Force and Flight Investigation of Various Methods for  
Controlling Parawings  
N66-12158\*#                      NASA-TN-D-2998

AFFDL-TR-75-129

109. Johnson, J. L.  
Low-Speed Force and Flight Investigation of Various Methods for  
Controlling Parawings  
N66-12151\*#      NASA-TN-D-2998
110. Johnson, J. L.; Libbey, C. E.  
Stalling and Tumbling of a Radio-Controlled Parawing Airplane Model  
N64-25807\*#      NASA-TN-D-2291
111. Jolly, A. G.  
A Method of Investigating the Deployment Characteristics of Man-  
Carrying Parachutes  
Tech Rpt No. 66280
112. Kane, Milton T.; Dicken, H. K.; Buehler, R. C.  
A Homing Parachute System  
SC-4537(RR)
113. Kehlet, A. B.  
Parachute Glider - Patent  
N70-36804\*      NASA-CASE-XLA-00898
114. Kenner, Paul M.  
Structural Analysis of a Parawing During Deployment  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1196
115. Kenner, Paul M.; Churchill, Frederic, T.; Holt, Ralph B.  
Geometric, Aerodynamic, and Kinematic Characteristics of Two Twin-  
Keel Parawings During Deployment  
NASA CR-1788
116. Kinzy, R. F.  
Final Rpt - Research and Development of Gliding Parachutes (Aerosail)  
NVR 2818
117. Knacke, T. W.  
Controlled Landing With Steerable Parachutes  
X65-10837
118. Knacke, T. W.  
Steerable Parachutes
119. Knapp, Charles F.; Barton, W. R.  
Controlled Recovery of Payloads at Large Glide Distances, Using  
the Para-Foil.
120. Kriebel, A. R.; Nielsen, J. N.  
Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds Part III -  
Approximate Results for Wings of Large Aspect Ratio  
N65-14052#    VIDYA-146      AD 606 059      NONR-3728(00)

AFFDL-TR-75-129

121. Kurz, B. E.  
Flexible Wings, a Nonstop, Multiple Address, Aerial Delivery System  
A65-12975 SAE Paper 915D
122. Landweber, L; Prother, M.  
The Shape and Tension of a Light Flexible Cable in a Uniform Current  
Journal of Applied Mechanics, Jun 1947, PP A-121 to A-126
123. Lashbrook, R. V.  
Materials Investigation for the A11-Flexible Parawing Proj-Part III  
NVR-6211
124. Lashbrook, R. V.; Mabry, C. M.  
An Investigation of Low Permeability Fabrics and of Suspension and  
Control Lines for the A11-Flexible Parawing  
AIAA Paper No. 69-953
125. Lau, Richard A.  
Preliminary Investigation of Concepts for Low-Altitude Airdrop of  
Personnel-Exploratory Development (Final Rpt)  
Rpt No. GER-12888
126. Law, E. H.  
The Longitudinal Equations of Motion of an Airborne Towed Vehicle  
Incorporating an Approximation of Cable Drag and Inertia Effects  
Rpt No. 687
127. Layton, G. P.; Thompson, M. O.  
Flare and Landing Performance and Control Characteristics of Low-  
Speed Paragliders  
X63-14592\*
128. Lee, J. B.  
Earth-Landing Systems-Systems Applications  
A65-12562\*
129. Libbey, C. E.  
Deployment of Parawings for Use as Recovery System  
A65-20976\*# AIAA Paper No. 64-472
130. Libbey, C. E.  
The Deployment of Parawings for Use as Recovery Systems  
A64-19963# AIAA Paper 64-472
131. Libbey, C. E.  
Flexible Wing Deployment Device - Patent  
N70-41863\* NASA-CASE-XLA-01220
132. Libbey, C. E.  
Free Flight Investigation of the Deployment of a Parawing Recovery  
Device for a Radio-Controlled 1/5 Scale Dynamic Model Spacecraft  
N64-11236\*# NASA-TN-D-2044



AFFDL-TR-75-129

132. Libbey, Charles E.  
Reefing Tests of a 5-Foot All Flexible Parawing  
Langley Working Paper LWP 417
133. Libbey, Charles, E.; Johnson, Joseph L.  
Stalling and Tumbling of a Radio-Controlled Parawing Airplane  
Model  
NASA-TN-D-2291
134. Libbey, C. E.; Ware, G. M.; Naeseth, R. L.  
Wind Tunnel Investigation of the Static Aerodynamic Characteristics  
of an 18-foot All-Flexible Parawing  
NASA TN D-3856 N67-27271
135. Linhart, E. M.; Buhler, W. C.  
Wind Tunnel and Free Flight Investigation of All-Flexible Parawings  
at Small Scale  
NASA CR66879 N70-19796
136. Linhart, E.; Coe, D.  
Large Controllable Parachute Wind-Tunnel Test Program - Final Report  
NVR-3989
137. Linhart, E. M.; Riley, V. F.  
Wind Tunnel Test Program for Tests of 12 ft Do Models of ASD  
Steerable Parachute  
N64-32423# PTM-754 AD 442 743
138. Linhart, E. M.; Riley, V. F.; Graham, C. R.  
Investigation of Various Textile Parachutes and Control Systems  
to Achieve Steerability, Parts III and IV  
Technical Documentary Report FDL-TDR-64-81, Part III
139. Lovel, Calvin J.; Lipson, Stanley  
An Analysis of the Effect of Lift-Drag Ratio and Stalling Speed on  
Landing-Flare Characteristics  
Technical Note 1930
140. Mabry, C. M.; Lashbrook, R. V.  
Materials Investigation for the Flexible Parawing Project - Part I  
NVR 6211
141. Mabry, C. M.; Lashbrook, R. V.  
Materials Investigation for the All-Flexible Parawing Project - Part II  
NVR 6211
142. McCarty, B.  
Parachutes  
A66-43197

AFFDL-TR-75-129

143. McClow, J. H.  
Development of a 57 Foot Parachute for Aerial Retrieval  
Report No. TOR-0066 (5110-01)-21
144. McClow, John H.  
Preliminary Development Testing of 53 ft Parachute with Conical  
Extension for Aerial Retrieval  
Aerospace Report No. TR-669 (6110-01)-1  
Air Force Report No. SSD-TR-66-204
145. McIntyre  
Development of Recovery Systems for AN/USD-501 Drone  
Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 7, No. 3, P. 240
146. Menard, George L.  
Performance Evaluation Tests Para-Foil Maneuverable Personnel Gliding  
Parachute Assembly Aspect Ratio 2 Area 360 ft<sup>2</sup>  
Technical Report No. 2-69 AD 864 272L
147. Menard, G. L.C.  
Performance Evaluation Tests of Sailwing, Maneuverable, Personnel,  
Gliding Parachute Assembly Aspect Ratio: 4 Area 400 ft<sup>2</sup>  
Technical Note 1005-70
148. Menard, G.L.C.  
Performance Evaluation Tests of 16 Ft Keel Length Twin Catenary  
Keel Parawing Maneuverable, Personnel, Gliding Parachute Assembly  
Technical Note 1009-70
149. Menard, G. L.C.  
Performance Evaluation 35 ft Diameter Extended Skirt Maneuverable  
Personnel Parachute Canopy Assembly with "TU" Orifice  
AD 815 808 Technical Report No. 8-66
150. Menard, G.L.C.  
Performance Evaluation Tests of 22.5 Ft. Single Keel, Slotted  
Parawing Maneuverable, Personnel Gliding Parachute Assembly  
Technical Note 1007-70
151. Menard, G.L.C.  
Performance Evaluation Tests of Volplane Maneuverable Personnel  
Gliding Parachute Assembly; Aspect Ratio: 2.2 Area: 312 ft<sup>2</sup>  
Technical Note 1006-70
152. Menard, G.L.C.; Ternes, M.N.  
Performance and Evaluation Tests of 20 and 24 Feet Parawings  
AD 848 979L Technical Report No. 8-67
153. Mendenhall, M. R.; Spangler, S. G.; Nielsen, J. N.  
Review of Methods for Predicting the Aerodynamic Characteristics  
of Parawings  
AIAA Paper No. 68-10

AFFDL-TR-75-129

154. Miller, G. K.  
Fixed-Base Visual Simulation of Obstacle Avoidance During  
Terminal Descent of Advanced Apollo Spacecraft with an All-  
Flexible Parawing  
NASA-TN-D-5940 N70-35927
155. Misc. Parawing Data and Slides
156. Moeller, J. H.; Linhart, E. M.; Gran, W. M.; Parson, L. T.  
Free Flight Investigation of Large All-Flexible Parawings and  
Performance Comparison with Small Parawings  
Final Report NASA CR-66918
157. Moore, Robert H.; Eichblatt, David L.; Hughes, T. F.  
Experimental Verification of Scale Factors for Parawing Opening  
Characteristics with Dimensional Ratios from 1:1.3 to 1:3  
NASA TN D-5071
158. Morgan, Harry L.  
Performance and Deployment Characteristics of a Twin-Keel Parawing  
with Various amounts and Permeabilities  
NASA TN-D-5793
159. Morgan, Harry L.; Bradshaw, Charles F.  
Aerodynamic and Deployment Characteristics of Single-Keel Solid  
and Single-Keel Slotted Personnel Parawings  
NASA TN D-5911
160. Morgan, Harry L.; McHatton, Austin D.  
Aerodynamic and Deployment Characteristics of Multistage Canopy  
and Suspension-Line Reefing Systems for a Twin-Keel All-Flexible  
Parawing  
NASA-TN-D-6306
161. Morgan, Harry L.; Naeseth, Rodger L.  
Low Speed Wind Tunnel Investigation of the Effects of Canopy and  
Rigging Modifications on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of 40 and  
45 swept All-Flexible Parawings
162. Moss, B.  
Lifting and Non-Lifting Decelerators for Boosters and  
Satellite Recovery  
A64-27828
163. Mueller, Wolfgang R.; Everett, William J.  
Materials Test Report on a 90 ft Sailwing for Barish Associates
164. Musil, Jay  
Gliding Canopy Analyses  
RSE-10222-36
165. Myers, Earl C.  
Symposium on Parachute Technology & Evaluation Proceedings - Vol. I  
AD 452 430

AFFDL-TR-75-129

166. Myers, Earl C.  
Symposium on Parachute Technology & Evaluation Proceedings - Vol. II  
AD 452 431
167. Myers, Phillip F.; Voracheck, Jerome J.  
Definition of Tethered Balloon Systems  
AFCRL-71-0213
168. Naeseth, Rodger L.  
Low-Speed Wing-Tunnel Investigation of a Series of Twin-Keel  
All-Flexible Parawings  
Langley Working Paper LWP-347
169. Naeseth, Rodger L.  
Recent Flexible-Wing Research
170. Naeseth, Rodger L.; Fournier, Paul G.  
Low-Speed Wind Tunnel Investigation of Tension Structure Parawings  
NASA-TN-D-3940
171. Naeseth, Rodger L.  
Model Wind Tunnel and Flight Investigation of a Parawing-Lifting  
Body Landing System  
NASA TN-D-5893
172. NASA  
Compilation of Papers Presented to Meeting on Space Vehicle  
Landing and Recovery Research and Technology  
X65-84330\* NASA-TM-X-51728
173. Nathe, Gerald A.  
Analysis of the Para-Foil  
AIAA Student Journal, Vol. 5, No. 1, P. 4
174. Nichols, Charles W.  
Performance Evaluation of Para-Commander Mark I Personnel Parachute  
Technical Report No. 66-16
175. Nicolaides, John D.  
Improved Aeronautical Efficiency through Packable Weightless Wings  
AIAA Paper No. 70-880
176. Nicolaides, John D.  
On the Discovery and Research of the Para-Foil
177. Nicolaides, John D.  
Para-Foil Performance in Tethered, Gliding, and Towed Flight
178. Nicolaides, J. D.  
Parafoil Wind Tunnel Tests  
AFFDL-TR-70-146
179. Nicolaides, John D.; Knapp, Charles F.  
Para-Foil Design

AFFDL-TR-75-129

180. Nicolaides, John D., and Knapp, Charles F.  
A Preliminary Study of the Aerodynamics and Flight Performance  
of the Parafoil
181. Nicolaides, John D.; Nathe, Gerald A.; Knapp, Charles F.  
A Summary of the Tests Conducted on the Para-Foil
182. Nicolaides, John D.; Speelman, R. J.; Menard, George L.  
A Review of Para-Foil Programs
183. Nicolaides, J. D.; Tragarz, M. A.  
Parafoil Flight Performance  
A70-41826#
184. Nicolaides, J. D.; Tragarz, Michael A.  
Parafoil Flight Performance  
AFFDL-TR-71-38
185. Nielsen, Jack N.; Kriebel, Anthony R.; Goodwin, Frederick K.  
Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds - I - One  
Lobed Parawings
186. Nielsen, Jack N.; Barakat, Richard; Goodwin, Frederick K., Rudin, Morton  
Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds - II -  
Two Lobed Parawings
187. Nielsen, Jack N.; Burnell, Jack A.; Sacks, Alvin H.  
Investigation of Flexible Rotor Systems-Results of Phases I and II  
ASD Technical Rpt 61-660
188. Nielsen, J. N.; Spangler, S. B.; Stahara, S.S.; Lee, A. L.  
An Exploratory Aerodynamic and Structural Investigation of All-  
Flexible Parawings  
NASA CR-1674
190. Nielsen, N.  
Theory of Flexible Aerodynamic Surfaces  
A63-26086
191. Nielsen, J. N.  
Theory of Flexible Aerodynamic Surfaces  
A63-22111
192. North American Aviation, Inc.  
Slot Wing Reference Data
193. Packing and Rigging Procedure for 500 lb. and 2000 lb "Jalbert"  
Multi-Cell Airfoil
194. Pepper, William B.; Holt, Ira T.  
Development of a Gliding Guided Ribbon Parachute for Transonic Speed  
Deployment

AFFDL-TR-75-129

195. Perkins, Courtland D.  
Development of Airplane Stability and Control Technology  
Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 7, No. 4, P. 290
196. Phillips, N. S.  
Measurement of Wind Shear  
X64-16459#
197. Phillips, W. H.  
Theoretical Analysis of the Oscillations of a Towed Cable  
NACA TN 1796
198. Pilipets, S.  
IKAR-67 Flexible Glider  
AD 684 703
199. Pioneer Parachute Co.  
Technical Proposal for an All Flexible, Gliding Surface-to-Air  
Pickup Station
200. Pioneer Parachute Co.  
Towed Para-Foil Performance
201. Polhamus, Edward C.; Naeseth, Rodger L.  
Experimental and Theoretical Studies of the Effects of Camber and  
Twist on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings having Nominal  
Aspect Ratios of 3 and 6  
NASA TN-D-972
202. Popper, Peter  
Criteria for Rupture of Certain Textile Structures under Biaxial  
Stress  
Technical Documentary Report No. ASD-TDR-62-613
203. Reynolds, J. F.  
Pitching Moment Corrections from Axial Forces on Isolated Ring  
Wings at Angle of Attack  
N66-11624#      NAVWEPS-8667
204. Riley, V. F.  
Final Report - Glidesail Development Program  
NVR PTM-524A
205. Riley, V. F.; Linhart, E. M.  
Investigation of Various Textile Parachutes and Control Systems  
To Achieve Steerability  
Technical Documentary Report No. FDL-TDR-68-81 Phase I
206. Rogallo, Francis  
Flexible Wings

AFFDL-TR-75-129

207. Rogallo, F. M.  
Flexible-Wing Research and Development
208. Rogallo, F.M.  
NASA Research on Flexible Wings  
N68-25293\*#            NASA-TM-X-59738
209. Rogallo, F. M.; Sleeman, William C.; Croom, Delwin R.  
Resume of Recent Parawing Research
210. Rogallo, F. M.  
Flexible Wings Red-Stability and Control of Paragliders as Decelerators  
for Spacecraft Recovery
211. Rogallo, F. M.  
NASA Research on Flexible Wings  
A69-15568\*
212. Rogallo, F. M.  
Paraglider Recovery Systems  
N62-12819\*#
213. Rogallo, F. J.  
Parawings for Astronautics  
A64-27805\*
214. Rogallo, F. M.  
Parawings for Astronautics  
N65-88967\*            NASA-TM-X-51047
215. Rogallo, F. M.; Sleeman, W. C.  
Control for Flexible Parawing - Patent  
N71-11038\*            NASA-CASDE-XLA-06958
216. Rosenberg, Isadore; Gold, David  
Steerable Parachute  
Technical Note FTL-55-1
217. Ryan Aeronautical Company  
Flexible Wing Precision Drop Glider - Final Report  
N64-14978#
218. Ryan Aeronautical Company  
Flex Wing Precision Delivery Glider System  
RAC Rpt No. 65B021
219. Ryan Aerospace  
Flexible-Wing Cargo GLiders-Volume I  
TCREC Technical Report 62-3A
220. Ryan Aerospace  
Flexible - Wing Cargo Gliders - Volume II  
TCREC Technical Report 62-3B

221. Shanks, Robert E.  
Experimental Investigation of the Dynamic Stability of a Towed Parawing Glider Model  
NASA TN-D-1614
222. Shanks, R. E.  
Experimental Investigation of Towed Paraglider Air Cargo Delivery System  
N64-26416\*#      NASA-TN-D-2292
223. Siviter, James H.  
Flight Investigation of a Capacitance - Type Meteoroid Detector Using an Inflatable Paraglider  
NASA-TN-D-4530
224. Slayman, R. G.; Bair, H. Q.; Rathbum, T. W.  
500 Pound Controlled Airdrop Cargo System  
USAAVLABS Technical Report 70-31      AD 877 587
225. Sleeman, W. C.  
Glide Performance of Advanced Parawings  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1186
226. Sleeman, W. C.  
Low-Speed Investigation of Cable Tension and Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Parawing and Spacecraft Combination  
NASA TN-D-1937      N63-18667
227. Sleeman, William C.  
A Selected Bibliography of Parawing Publications
228. Sleeman, W.C.; Gainer, Thomas G.  
Status of Research on Parawing Lifting Decelerators  
Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 6, No. 5
229. Sleeman, William C.; Johnson, Joseph L.  
Aerodynamics of the Parawing
230. Smith, C. C.; Ware, G. M.  
Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Flight Characteristics of a Model of an Aspect Ratio - 6 Conical Parawing Utility Vehicle  
NASA-TN-D-3673      N67-16684
231. Sobczak, John W.  
Investigation of Deployment and Landing Loads with a Limp Paraglider  
U.S.A. Aviation Material Laboratories Tech Report 66-82
232. Speelman, Ralph J.  
Steerable Parachutes - The Key to Overcoming Current Airdrop System Limitations
233. Speelman, R. J.; Bradshaw, C.; Sobczak, J.; Menard, G.L.C.  
Hi-Glide Personnel Canopies: Efforts toward Identification of Requirements  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1194



AFFDL-TR-75-129

234. Speth, R. F.; Rust, J. L.; Coles, A. V.  
Parawing AERCAB Feasibility Flight Demonstration  
AFFDL-TR-71-4
235. Stencil Aero Engineering Corp.  
Sixty-four Foot Ultra Precision Parachute - Final Report  
X67-15432 AD 805 985
236. Stone, J. W.; Highley, F. M.  
Air-To-Air Recovery of Re-entry Vehicles  
AIAA Paper No. 68-1163
237. Stone, J. W.; Highley, F. M.  
Mid-Air Retrieval: Optimizing Performance and Weight of the  
Aircraft-Borne and Descent Systems  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1201
238. Summa, James Michael  
Theoretical Dynamic Stability of a Tethered Parafoil  
AIAA Student Journal, Vol. 6, No. 3
239. Summers, D. O.  
Inertia Tests of a 22.7 foot Twin Keel Parawing (Model 1 Rpt No. 3)  
X70-12388\*# NASA-CR-66851
240. Systems Engineering Grp - Research and Tech Div/AFSC/WPAFB  
Tests of a Standard Type C-9 Parachute Canopy with Four Suspension  
Lines Severed  
Tech Memorandum - SEM-TM-64-1
241. Tactical Air Command  
Operational Test & Evaluation of Halo Parachute Techniques  
TAC-TR-63-18
242. Terry, John E.  
Aerodynamic Characteristics of Ring Wings - A Bibliography  
RSIC-285 AD 452 725
243. Tischler, A. A.  
Paraglider Development Program Emergency Parachute Recovery Test  
Full Scale Test No. 2.  
X64-10226\*# NASA-CR-52487 SID-62-1071-5 NAS9-167
244. USMC  
Marine Corps Tactical Parachuting  
AD 808 498L
245. USMC  
Plan of Test for Evaluation of Steerable Parachute  
AD 878 006L
246. USMC  
Steerable Parachute  
AD 821 181L Rpt No. SOR-IT-3.4

AFFDL-TR-75-129

247. Vaughn, H. R.; Reis, G. E.; Stark, J. A.  
Analog Simulation of a Guided Parachute-Payload System  
SC-DR-71 0097
248. Vehicle Equipment Division, AFFDL  
Performance of and Design Criteria for Deployable Aerodynamic Decelerators  
ASD-TR-61-579
249. Vickery, E. D.  
Aerodynamics of the Para-Sail
250. Vickery, E. D.  
Live Testing of Various Gliding Devices  
AIAA Paper No. 68-933
251. Vickery, E. D.  
Several Reefing Techniques for Various Gliding Devices  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1192
252. Walker, R. Harley  
Static and Dynamic Longitudinal Stability of a Semi-Rigid Parafoil  
AIAA Paper No. 70-1191
253. Ware, George M.  
Wind Tunnel Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of  
a Twin-Keel Parawing  
NASA TN D-5199
254. Ware, G.M.; Hassell, J. L.  
Wind Tunnel Investigation of Ram-Air-Inflated All-Flexible Wings  
of Aspect Ratios 1.0 to 3.0  
NASA TM SX-1923
255. Ware, G. M.; Libbey, C. E.  
Wind Tunnel Investigation of the Static Aerodynamic Characteristics  
of a Multilobe Gliding Parachute  
NASA TN-D-4672
256. Weiberg, J. A.; Mort, Kenneth W.  
Wind Tunnel Tests of a Series of Parachutes Designed for  
Controllable Gliding Flight  
NASA TN-D-3960
257. White, F. M.; Wolf, D. F.  
A Theory of Three-Dimensional Parachute Dynamic Stability  
A66-40593
258. White, F. M.; Wolf, D. F.  
A Theory of Three-Dimensional Parachute Dynamics Stability  
A68-16605

AFFDL-TR-75-129

**FLEXIBLE WINGS FOR TRANSPORTATION**

**Francis M. Rogallo, Delwin R. Croom,  
and William C. Sleeman, Jr.**

**NASA Langley Research Center  
Hampton, Virginia**

**Presented at the International Congress of Transportation Conferences**

**Washington, D.C.  
May 31-June 2, 1972**

#### A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PARAWING PUBLICATIONS

Recent requests for a bibliography of parawing publications have prompted a computer search of literature on flexible wings available from 1962 to the present. This literature search and a working list of references previously compiled have provided the information from which the present bibliography was selected. A comprehensive listing of references on flexible wings has not been attempted because it was believed that a more concise bibliography of basic research information would be more useful. Inasmuch as a large part of the present technology for parawings was developed by the NASA or under its sponsorship, a complete listing of available NASA publications on parawings has been attempted. In like manner, a significant amount of work on applications of parawings and paragliders for military use has been conducted by the U.S. Army Transportation Research Command (TRECOCOM), Ft. Eustis, Virginia, and basic references reporting this work are included.

Many talks and papers on flexible wings have been sponsored by various technical societies. A few of these papers have been included in this bibliography; however, this type of reference has not been generally included because many of these papers were based on research that was later published in a more complete form in a formal report.

A definitive and complete bibliography can be assembled only when the technology has become static. In this respect, it is hoped that the present compilation represents a status report on information presently available and

that it will prove useful to those interested in flexible-wing technology.

#### TERMINOLOGY

There has always appeared to be some confusion in regard to the terminology used at different times to identify various flexible-wing configurations. It may be helpful, therefore, to provide some definitions of terminology that have evolved over the past decade.

**PARAGLIDER** - The originators of the flexible-wing concept in the late 1940's created a completely flexible lifting surface with a parachutelike tension structure in which the wing surface shape is maintained by the balance of forces between the airload on the surfaces and the tension in the suspension lines, and flexible wings that could have several types of localized stiffening. The early experimental work was conducted largely by flying the wings as kites; consequently, the first flexible wings tested in NASA wind-tunnel and flight investigations in the late 1950's were known as flexible kites.

Early applications under study by NASA for flexible kites, such as recovery of the Saturn booster and manned spacecraft, appeared to warrant a more suitable name for the recovery system. The term "paraglider" was used, therefore, to identify the gliding, deployable wing being investigated in studies of recovery of the Saturn booster and other space and aeronautics applications underway at about the same time. Inasmuch as the wing configurations being investigated in these studies had rigid-tube or inflated-tube leading edges and keel and a sweptback planform with a flexible fabric canopy, the term "paraglider" was generally accepted as descriptive of this type of wing.

**PARAWING** - Early potential applications for flexible wings involved their use as a gliding descent system for various space and aeronautical vehicles. Other applications that involved powered or towed vehicles, however, did not use gliding flight over the major portion of their operation, and the gliding connotation did not appear appropriate. It also appeared desirable to use a term that described the lifting surface without regard to the type of use for it, and the name "parawing" was derived to meet this need. The term "parawing"

was originally intended to refer to a broad class of aeroflexible lifting surfaces, with both stiffened and unstiffened leading edges and keels. In general practice, however, the names "parawing and paraglider" came to be used interchangeably to describe wings with stiffening members, and the broad-class connotation of parawing was not widely recognized.

**ALL-FLEXIBLE PARAWING** - A new term was needed to differentiate between parawings that had rigid or inflated stiffening members and parawings that were completely flexible with no structural or stiffening members. The name "all-flexible parawing" was selected to denote a class of flexible wings that had a flexible fabric lifting surface, a pure tension structure, and for which the shape of the surface is determined by the balance of forces between the airloads on the canopy and the tension in the suspension lines, that is, the original concept in its purest form.

**GLIDING PARACHUTE** - The advantages of being able to steer or change heading on a personnel parachute have long been recognized, and techniques and modifications to standard personnel parachutes to provide steering capability have been explored for many years. In the 1950's and 1960's, parachutes were modified to provide some forward velocity by venting air from the rear portion of the canopy. Many of these gliding parachutes could be steered with relative ease and were capable of providing about half as much lift as drag. Later design refinements increased ratios of lift to drag to near 1.0 for gliding parachutes of roughly hemispherical shape. The term "gliding parachute" can be considered to identify a class of descent devices that produce lift in gliding flight that is equal to, or less than, the drag.

**FLEXIBLE WINGS** - The term "flexible wings" identifies a broad class of fabric or membrane lifting surfaces that provide more lift than drag in gliding or powered flight. Included in this definition are paragliders, parawings, and several other gliding, fabric wings of various planforms and shapes that have been developed since the introduction of the flexible-wing concept.

## NASA TECHNICAL NOTES

1. Rogallo, Francis M.; Lowry, John G.; Croom, Delwin R.; and Taylor, Robert T.: Preliminary Investigation of a Paraglider. NASA TN D-443, 1960.
2. Naeseth, Rodger L.: An Exploratory Study of a Parawing as a High-Lift Device for Aircraft. NASA TN D-629, 1960.
3. Hewes, Donald E.: Free-Flight Investigation of Radio-Controlled Models With Parawings. NASA TN D-927, 1961.
4. Polhamus, Edward C.; and Naeseth, Rodger L.: Experimental and Theoretical Studies of the Effects of Camber and Twist on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings Having Nominal Aspect Ratios of 3 and 6. NASA TN D-972, 1963.
5. Fournier, Paul G.; and Bell, B. Ann: Low Subsonic Pressure Distributions on Three Rigid Wings Simulating Paragliders With Varied Canopy Curvature and Leading-Edge Sweep. NASA TN D-983, 1961.
6. Taylor, Robert T.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of Paraglider Models at Supersonic Speeds. NASA TN D-985, 1961.
7. Hatch, Howard G., Jr.; and McGowan, William A.: An Analytical Investigation of the Loads, Temperatures, and Ranges Obtained During the Recovery of Rocket Boosters by Means of a Parawing. NASA TN D-1003, 1962.
8. Fournier, Paul G.; and Bell, B. Ann: Transonic Pressure Distributions on Three Rigid Wings Simulating Paragliders With Varied Canopy Curvature and Leading-Edge Sweep. NASA TN D-1009, 1962.
9. Penland, Jim A.: A Study of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Fixed Geometry Paraglider Configuration and Three Canopies With Simulated Variable Canopy Inflation at a Mach Number of 6.6. NASA TN D-1022, 1962.
10. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation to Determine the Flight Characteristics of a Model of a Parawing Utility Vehicle. NASA TN D-1255, 1962.
11. Shanks, Robert E.: Experimental Investigation of the Dynamic Stability of a Towed Parawing Glider Model. NASA TN D-1614, 1963.
12. Fournier, Paul G.: Pressure Distributions on Three Rigid Wings Simulating Parawings With a Varied Canopy Curvature and Leading-Edge Sweep at Mach Numbers From 2.29 to 4.65. NASA TN D-1618, 1963.

13. Wornom, Dewey E.; and Taylor, Robert T.: Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Flexible-Canopy Paraglider Model at a Mach Number of 4.5 for Angles of Attack to  $360^{\circ}$  and Sideslip Angles From  $0^{\circ}$  to  $90^{\circ}$ . NASA TN D-1776, 1963.

14. Layton, Garrison P.; and Thompson, Milton O.: Preliminary Flight Evaluation of Two Unpowered Manned Paragliders. NASA TN D-1826, 1963.

15. Burk, Sanger M., Jr.: Free-Flight Investigation of the Deployment, Dynamic, Stability, and Control Characteristics of a 1/12-Scale Dynamic Radio-Controlled Model of a Large Booster and Parawing. NASA TN D-1932, 1963.

16. Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Low-Speed Investigation of Cable Tension and Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Parawing and Spacecraft Combination. NASA TN D-1937, 1963.

17. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.; and Hassell, James L., Jr.: Full-Scale Wind-Tunnel Investigation of a Flexible-Wing Manned Test Vehicle. NASA TN D-1946, 1963.

18. Naeseth, Rodger L.; and Gainer, Thomas G.: Low-Speed Investigation of the Effects of Wing Sweep on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings Having Equal-Length Leading Edges and Keel. NASA TN D-1957, 1963.

19. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Subsonic Characteristics of a Model of a Supersonic-Airplane Configuration With a Parawing as a Landing Aid. NASA TN D-2031, 1963.

20. Libbey, Charles E.: Free-Flight Investigation of the Deployment of a Parawing Recovery Device for a Radio-Controlled 1/5-Scale Dynamic Model Spacecraft. NASA TN D-2044, 1963.

21. Libbey, Charles E.; and Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Stalling and Tumbling of a Radio-Controlled Parawing Airplane Model. NASA TN D-2291, 1964.

22. Shanks, Robert E.: Experimental Investigation of the Dynamic Stability of a Towed Parawing Glider Air Cargo Delivery System. NASA TN D-2292, 1964.

23. Phillips, W. Pelham: Low-Speed Longitudinal Aerodynamic Investigation of Parawings as Auxiliary Lifting Devices for a Supersonic Airplane Configuration. NASA TN D-2346, 1964.

24. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Speed Force and Flight Investigation of a Model of a Modified Parawing Utility Vehicle. NASA TN D-2492, 1965.



25. Croom, Delwin R.; Naeseth, Rodger L.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Effects of Canopy Shape on Low-Speed Aerodynamic Characteristics of a 55° Swept Parawing With Large Diameter Leading Edges. NASA TN D-2551, 1964.

26. Gamse, B.; Mort, K. W.; and Yaggy, P. F.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Tests of Large-Scale Inflatable Structure Paraglider. NASA TN D-2859, 1965.

27. Bugg, Frank M.: Effects of Aspect Ratio and Canopy Shape on Low-Speed Aerodynamic Characteristics of 50.00° Swept Parawings. NASA TN D-2922, 1965.

28. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Speed Force and Flight Investigation of Various Methods for Controlling Parawings. NASA TN D-2998, 1965.

29. Croom, Delwin R.; and Fournier, Paul G.: Low-Subsonic Wind-Tunnel and Free-Flight Drop-Test Investigation of a Paraglider Configuration Having Large Tapered Leading Edges and Keel. NASA TN D-3442, 1966.

30. Chambers, Joseph R.; and Boisseau, Peter C.: A Theoretical Analysis of the Dynamic Lateral Stability and Control of a Parawing Vehicle. NASA TN D-3461, 1966.

31. Bugg, Frank M.: Low-Speed Tests of 50°-Swept Parawings Applied to a 0.17-Scale Model of a Manned Flight Vehicle. NASA TN D-3493, 1966.

32. Smith, Charles C., Jr.; and Ware, George M.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Flight Characteristics of a Model of an Aspect-Ratio-6 Conical-Parawing Utility Vehicle. NASA TN D-3673, 1967.

33. Libbey, Charles E.; Ware, George M.; and Naeseth, Rodger L.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Static Aerodynamic Characteristics of an 18-Foot (5.49-Meter) All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-3856, 1967.

34. Naeseth, Rodger L.; and Fournier, Paul G.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation of Tension-Structure Parawings. NASA TN D-3940, 1967.

35. Weiberg, James A.; and Mort, Kenneth W.: Wind-Tunnel Tests of a Series of Parachutes Designed for Controllable Gliding Flight. NASA TN D-3960, 1967.

36. Bugg, Frank M.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Low-Speed Tests of an All-Flexible Parawing for Landing a Lifting-Body Spacecraft. NASA TN D-4010, 1967.

37. Fink, Marvin P.: Full-Scale Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Model Employing a Sailwing Concept. NASA TN D-4062, 1967.

38. Burk, Sanger M., Jr.; and Ware, George M.: Static Aerodynamic Characteristics of Three Ram-Air-Inflated Low-Aspect-Ratio Fabric Wings. NASA TN D-4182, 1967.
39. Siviter, James H., Jr.: Flight Investigation of Capacitance-Type Meteoroid Detector Using an Inflatable Paraglider. NASA TN D-4530, 1968.
40. Barton, Richard L.; Eichblatt, David L.; and Moore, Robert H.: Experimental Verification of Scale Factors for Parawing Opening Characteristics. NASA TN D-4665, 1968.
41. Ware, George M.; and Libbey, Charles E.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Static Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Multilobe Gliding Parachute. NASA TN D-4672, 1968.
42. Ferris, Alice T.; and Kelly, H. Neal: Free-Flight and Wind-Tunnel Studies of Deployment of a Dynamically and Elastically Scaled Inflatable Parawing Model. NASA TN D-4724, 1968.
43. Gainer, Thomas G.: Investigation of Opening Characteristics of an All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-5031, 1969.
44. Miller, G. Kimball, Jr.; Jacquet, Byron M.; and Price, Douglas B.: Fixed-Base Visual Simulation of Pilot-Controlled Descents of an Advanced Apollo Spacecraft With an All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-5049, 1969.
45. Moore, Robert H.; Eichblatt, David L.; and Hughes, Theodore F.: Experimental Scale Factors for Parawing Opening Characteristics With Dimensional Ratios From 1:1.3 to 1:3. NASA TN D-5071, 1969.
46. Ware, George M.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Twin-Keel Parawing. NASA TN D-5199, 1969.
47. Falarski, Michael D.; and Mort, Kenneth W.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of Several Large-Scale All-Flexible Parawings. NASA TN D-5708, 1970.
48. Morgan, Harry L. Jr.: Performance and Deployment Characteristics of a Twin-Keel Parawing With Various Amounts and Permeabilities of Porous Material in Outer Lobes. NASA TN D-5793, 1970.
49. Naeseth, Rodger L.: Model Wind-Tunnel and Flight Investigation of a Parawing-Lifting-Body Landing System. NASA TN D-5893, 1970.
50. Gloss, Blair B.: The Determination of the Shape and Inertial Properties of an All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-5900, 1970.

51. Morgan, Harry L., Jr.; and Bradshaw, Charles F.: Aerodynamic and Deployment Characteristics of Single-Keel Slotted Personnel Parawings. NASA TN D-5911, 1970.

52. Naeseth, Rodger L.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation of a Series of Twin-Keel All-Flexible Parawings. NASA TN D-5936, 1970.

53. Miller, G. Kimball, Jr.: Fixed-Base Visual Simulation of Obstacle Avoidance During Terminal Descent of Advanced Apollo Spacecraft With an All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-5940, 1970.

54. Fournier, Paul G.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation of All-Flexible Twin-Keel Tension Structure Parawings. NASA TN D-5965, 1970.

55. Fournier, Paul G.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Wind-Tunnel Studies of Effects of Construction Methods, Design Details, and Canopy Slots on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Small-Scale All-Flexible Parawings. NASA TN D-5974, 1970.

56. Morgan, Harry L., Jr.; and McHatton, Austin D.: Aerodynamic and Deployment Characteristics of Multi-Stage Canopy and Suspension-Line Reefing Systems for a Twin-Keel All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-6306, 1971.

#### NASA TECHNICAL MEMORANDUMS (X)

1. Croom, Delwin R.: Deployment Loads Data From a Free-Flight Investigation of All-Flexible Parawings at Small Scale. NASA TM X-2307, 1971.

2. Croom, Delwin R.: Deployment Loads Data From a Free-Flight Investigation of 4,000-Square Foot Wing Area All-Flexible Parawings. NASA TM X-2326, 1971.

#### NASA CONTRACTOR REPORTS

1. Mendenhall, M. R.; Nielsen, J. N.; and Spangler, S. B.: Investigation of Methods for Predicting the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Two-Lobed Parawings. NASA CR-1166, 1968.

2. Nielsen, J. N.; Spangler, S. B.; Stahara, S. S.; and Lee, A. L.: An Exploratory Aerodynamic and Structural Investigation of All-Flexible Parawings. NASA CR-1674, 1970.

3. Milgram, Jerome H.: Section Data for Thin, Highly Cambered Airfoils in Incompressible Flow. NASA CR-1767, 1971.

4. Kenner, Paul M.; Churchill, Frederic T.; and Holt, Ralph B.: Geometric Aerodynamic, and

Kinematic Characteristics of Two Twin-Keel Parawings During Deployment. NASA CR-1788, 1971.

5. Linhart, Eugene M.; and Buhler, W. Carey: Wind-Tunnel and Free-Flight Investigation of All-Flexible Parawings at Small Scale. NASA CR-66879, 1969.

6. Moeller, John H.; Linhart, Eugene M.; Gran, Warren M.; and Parson, Larry T.: Free-Flight Investigation of Large All-Flexible Parawings and Performance Comparison With Small Parawings. NASA CR-66918, 1970.

7. Christensen, N. R.; and Snodgrass, R. R.: Paraglider Landing System Test Program. NASA CR-92224, 1965.

U.S. ARMY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH COMMAND  
(FT. EUSTIS, VA.)

1. Givens, E. Rouzee: Flexible-Wing Cargo Gliders. Vol. I-Final Program Summary Report TCREC TR-62-3A, Sept. 1962.

2. Givens, E. Rouzee: Flexible-Wing Cargo Gliders. Vol. II-Design Criteria and Aerodynamics. TCREC TR-62-3B, Sept. 1962.

3. Landgraf, F.; Everett, W. L.; and Burich, J. H.: Flexible-Wing Manned Test Vehicle. TCREC TR 62-25, June 1962.

4. Kurz, B. E.: Flexible-Wing Individual Drop Glider. TRECOM TR-63-26, July 1963.

5. Ryan Aeronautical Co.: Flexible-Wing Precision Drop Glider. TRECOM TR-63-64, Dec. 1963.

6. Gibson, R.; and Kurz, B. E.: Flexible-Wing Precision Drop Glider Operational Test and Evaluation Program. TRECOM TR-63-78, March 1964.

7. Forehand, J. Everett: The Precision Drop Glider (PDG). TRECOM Res. Tech. Paper 64-21, April 1964.

8. Kredit, H.: XV-8A Flexible Wing Aerial Utility Vehicle. USATRECOM TR 64-55, Feb. 1965.

9. Landgraf, F.; and Girard, P. F.: XV-8A Flexible Wing Aerial Utility Vehicle. USATRECOM TR-64-74, Feb. 1965.

10. Sakamoto, N.; and Cota, G.: Flexible Wing Air Cargo Glider Delivery System. USATRECOM TR-65-11, May 1965. (Also available from DDC as AD-615908.)

11. Cota, G.; and Sakamoto, N.: Flexible-Wing Light Utility Glider. USAAVLABS TR-66-2, Aug. 1966. (Also available from DDC as AD-640987.)

12. Sobczak, John W.: Investigation of Deployment and Landing Loads With a Limp Paraglider. USAAVLABS TR 66-82, Sept. 1966. (Also available from DDC as AD-646578.)

13. Ryan Aeronautical Co.: Flexible-Wing Towed Universal Glider. USAAVLABS TR-67-57, Oct. 1967. (Also available from DDC as AD-666248.)

14. Irvine, J. F.: Inspections, Repairs, and Modifications, and Flight Test of the Flexible-Wing Manned Test Vehicle, XV-8A. USAAVLABS TR-68-30, 1968. (Also available from DDC as AD-680316.)

15. Slayman, Robert G.; Bair, Herbert Q.; and Rathburn, Thomas G.: 500-Pound Controlled Airdrop Cargo System. USAAVLABS TR-70-31, Sept. 1970.

#### U. S. NAVY-OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

1. Goodwin, F. K.; Kriebel, A. R.; and Nielsen, J. N.: Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds. Pt. I- One-Lobed Parawings. Vidya Rep. 84 (NONR-3728/00), 1963. (Also available from DDC as AD-422736.)

2. Barakat, R.; Goodwin, F. K.; Nielsen, J. N.; and Rudin, M.: Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds. Pt. II- Two-Lobed Parawings. Vidya Rep. 133 (NONR-3728/00). (Also available from DDC as AD-601848.)

3. Kriebel, A. R.; and Nielsen, J. N.: Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds. Pt. III- Approximate Results for Wings of Large Aspect Ratio. Vidya Rep. 146 (NONR-3728/00), 1964. (Also available from DDC as AD-606059.)

4. Burnell, J. A.; and Nielsen, J. N.: Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds. Pt. IV- Experimental Program and Comparison With Theory. Vidya Rep. 172 (NONR-3728/00), 1965. (Also available from DDC as AD-617925.)

5. Burnell, J. A.; and Nielsen, J. N.: Theoretical Aerodynamics of Flexible Wings at Low Speeds. Pt. V- Engineering Method for Estimating Parawing Performance. Vidya Rep. 209 (NONR-3728/00). (Also available from DDC as AD-628579.)

#### TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS

1. Rogallo, Francis M.: Paraglider Recovery Systems. Paper presented at IAS Mtg. on Man's Progress in the Conquest of Space (St. Louis, Mo.), Apr. 30-May 2, 1962.

2. Rogallo, Francis M.: Flexible-Wing Research and Development. Paper presented at Aero. Sys. Div. Proceedings of Retardation and Recovery Symposium (Dayton, Ohio), Nov. 13-14, 1962, pp. 195-213.

3. Rogallo, Francis M.: Parawings for Astronautics. Paper presented at Specialists Mtg. on Space Rendezvous, Rescue, and Recovery (Edwards AFB, Calif.), Sept. 10-12, 1963. (Also available as NASA TM X-51047.)

4. Fralich, Robert W.: Stress and Shape Analysis of a Paraglider Wing. Paper presented at ASME Winter Ann. Mtg. (New York, N.Y.), Nov. 29-Dec. 4, 1964. (Also available as NASA TM X-51958.)

5. Groom, Delwin R.; Rogallo, Francis M.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Resume of Recent Parawing Research. Paper presented at Course on Aerodynamic Deceleration at the Univ. of Minnesota, July 8, 1965. (Also available as NASA TM X-56747.)

6. Rogallo, Francis M.: NASA Research on Flexible Wings. Paper presented at International Congress of Subsonic Aeronautics (New York, N.Y.), Apr. 3-6, 1967. (Also available as NASA TM X-59738.)

7. Sleeman, William C., Jr.; and Gainer, Thomas G.: Status of Research on Parawing Lifting Decelerators. J. Aircraft, Vol. 6, 1968, pp. 405-409. (Also available as AIAA Paper 68-10.)

8. Mendenhall, M. R.; Nielsen, J. N.; and Spangler, S. B.: A Review of Methods for Predicting the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings. J. Aircraft, Vol. 5, 1968, pp. 597-605. (Also available as AIAA Paper 68-10.)

9. Forehand, J. Everett; and Bair, Herbert Q.: Parawing Precision Aerial Delivery System. J. Aircraft, Vol. 6, No. 5, 1968, pp. 463-469. (Also available as AIAA Paper 68-958.)

10. Pittelkow, W.: A Recoverable and Reusable Sounding Rocket. U.N. Paper 68-95445, U.N. Conference on Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (Vienna, Austria), 1968.

11. Rogallo, Francis: Flexible Wings. Astronautics and Aeronautics, August 1968, pp. 50-54.

12. Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Glide Performance of Advanced Parawings. AIAA Paper 70-1186, Aero. Decel. Systems Conf. (Dayton, Ohio), 1970.

13. Linhart, E. M.; and Moeller, J. H.: Parawing Technology for Spacecraft Land Landing -

A Progress Report. AIAA Paper 70-1187, Aero. Decel. Systems Conf. (Dayton, Ohio), 1970.

14. Bradshaw, Charles F.; Menard, George L. C.; Sobczak, John; and Speelman, Ralph J., III: Hi-Glide Personnel Canopies - Efforts Toward Identification of Requirements. AIAA Paper 70-1194, Aero. Decel. Systems Conf. (Dayton, Ohio), 1970.

15. Kenner, P. M.: Structural Analysis of a Parawing During Deployment. AIAA Paper 70-1196, Aero. Decel. Systems Conf. (Dayton, Ohio), 1970.

16. Clemmons, D. L., Jr.: Some Analysis of Parawing Canopy Behavior During Free-Flight Deployment. AIAA Paper 70-1189, Aero. Decel. Systems Conf. (Dayton, Ohio), 1970.

17. Bass, R. I., III; and Bertin, J. J.: Theoretical Investigation of the Lift and Drag Characteristics of Flexible Parawings at Subsonic Speeds. J. of Aircraft, Vol. 7, 1970, pp. 130-137.

AFFDL-TR-75-129

RECENT FLEXIBLE-WING RESEARCH

By Rodger L. Naeseth

NASA Langley Research Center  
Langley Station, Hampton, Va.

Presented at the Course on Aerodynamic Deceleration  
at the Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota

Minneapolis, Minnesota  
July 17, 1969



## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FLEXIBLE-WING PUBLICATIONS

1. Rogallo, Francis M.: Introduction to Aeroflexibility. Presented April 21, 1954 to ARDC Reserve Unit at Langley Field, Va.
2. Rogallo, Francis M.: Paraglider Recovery Systems. Presented at IAS Meeting on Man's Progress in the Conquest of Space. St. Louis, Missouri, April 30, May 1-2, 1962.
3. Rogallo, Francis M.: Flexible Wing Research and Development. Presented at the Symposium on Retardation and Recovery. Dayton, Ohio, November 13-14, 1960.
4. Rogallo, Francis M., Lowry, John G., Croom, Delwin R., and Taylor, Robert T.: Preliminary Investigation of a Paraglider. NASA TN D-443, 1960.
5. Naeseth, Rodger L.: An Exploratory Study of a Parawing as a High-Lift Device for Aircraft. NASA TN D-629, 1960.
6. Hewes, Donald E.: Free-Flight Investigation of Radio-Controlled Models With Parawings. NASA TN D-927, 1961.
7. Polhamus, Edward C., and Naeseth, Rodger L.: Experimental and Theoretical Studies of the Effects of Camber and Twist on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings Having Nominal Aspect Ratios of 3 and 6. NASA TN D-972, 1963.
8. Fournier, Paul G., and Bell, B. Ann: Low Subsonic Pressure Distributions on Three Rigid Wings Simulating Paragliders With Varied Canopy Curvature and Leading-Edge Sweep. NASA TN D-983, 1961.
9. Taylor, Robert T.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of Paraglider Models at Supersonic Speeds. NASA TN D-985, 1961.
10. Hatch, Howard G., Jr., and McGowan, William A.: An Analytical Investigation of the Loads, Temperatures, and Ranges Obtained During the Recovery of Rocket Boosters by Means of a Parawing. NASA TN D-1003, 1962.
11. Fournier, Paul G., and Bell, B. Ann: Transonic Pressure Distributions on Three Rigid Wings Simulating Paragliders With Varied Canopy Curvature and Leading-Edge Sweep. NASA TN D-1009, 1962.
12. Penland, Jim A.: A Study of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Fixed Geometry Paraglider Configuration and Three Canopies With Simulated Variable Canopy Inflation at a Mach Number of 6.6. NASA TN D-1022, 1962.
13. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation to Determine the Flight Characteristics of a Model of a Parawing Utility Vehicle. NASA TN D-1255, 1962.

14. Shanks, Robert E.: Experimental Investigation of the Dynamic Stability of a Towed Parawing Glider Model. NASA TN D-1614, 1963.
15. Fournier, Paul G.: Pressure Distributions on Three Rigid Wings Simulating Parawings With a Varied Canopy Curvature and Leading-Edge Sweep at Mach Numbers From 2.29 to 4.65. NASA TN D-1618, 1963.
16. Wornom, Dewey E.; and Taylor, Robert T.: Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Flexible-Canopy Paraglider Model at a Mach Number of 4.5 for Angles of Attack to  $360^{\circ}$  and Sideslip Angles From  $0^{\circ}$  to  $90^{\circ}$ . NASA TN D-1776, 1963.
17. Layton, Garrison P.; and Thompson, Milton O.: Preliminary Flight Evaluation of Two Unpowered Manned Paragliders. NASA TN D-1826, 1963.
18. Burk, Sanger M., Jr.: Free-Flight Investigation of the Deployment, Dynamic Stability, and Control Characteristics of a 1/12-Scale Dynamic Radio-Controlled Model of a Large Booster and Parawing. NASA TN D-1932, 1963.
19. Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Low-Speed Investigation of Cable Tension and Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Parawing and Spacecraft Combination. NASA TN D-1937, 1963.
20. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.; and Hassell, James L., Jr.: Full-Scale Wind-Tunnel Investigation of a Flexible-Wing Manned Test Vehicle. NASA TN D-1946, 1963.
21. Naeseth, Rodger L., and Gainer, Thomas G.: Low-Speed Investigation of the Effects of Wing Sweep on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings Having Equal-Length Leading Edges and Keel. NASA TN D-1957, 1963.
22. Sleeman, William C., Jr.; and Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Parawing Aerodynamics. Astronautics and Aerospace Engineering, June 1963.
23. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Subsonic Flight Characteristics of a Model of a Supersonic-Airplane Configuration With a Parawing as a Landing Aid. NASA TN D-2031, 1963.
24. Libbey, Charles E.: Free-Flight Investigation of the Deployment of a Parawing Recovery Device for a Radio-Controlled 1/5-Scale Dynamic Model Spacecraft. NASA TN D-2044, 1963.
25. Ryan Aeronautical Company: Flexible-Wing Precision Drop Glider. U. S. Army Transportation Research Command Technical Report 63-64, 1963.
26. Rogallo, Francis M.: Parawings for Astronautics. Presented at the Specialist Meeting on Space Rendezvous, Rescue and Recovery. Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., Sept. 10-12, 1963.
27. Libbey, Charles E.: Deployment of Parawings for Use as Recovery Systems. Presented at the AIAA Aerospace Science Meeting, AIAA Paper No. 64-472, June 29-July 2, 1964.

AFFDL-TR-75-129

28. Libbey, Charles E.; and Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Stalling and Tumbling of a Radio-Controlled Parawing Airplane Model. NASA TN D-2291, July 1964.
29. Shanks, Robert E.: Experimental Investigation of the Dynamic Stability of a Towed Parawing Glider Air Cargo Delivery System. NASA TN D-2292, Aug. 1964.
30. Phillips, W. Pelham: Low-Speed Longitudinal Aerodynamic Investigation of Parawings as Auxiliary Lifting Devices for a Supersonic Airplane Configuration. NASA TN D-2346, July 1964.
31. Fralich, R. W.: Stress and Shape Analysis of a Paraglider Wing. Presented at the Am. Soc. of Mech. Engineers Winter Annual Meeting, Paper 64, Nov. 29-Dec. 4, 1964.
32. Croom, Delwin R.; Naeseth, Rodger L.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Effects of Canopy Shape on Low-Speed Aerodynamic Characteristics of a 55° Swept Parawing With Large-Diameter Leading Edges. NASA TN D-2551, Dec. 1964.
33. Gamse, B.; Mort, K. W.; and Yaggy, P. F.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Tests of Large-Scale Inflatable Structure Paraglider. NASA TN D-2859, June 1965.
34. Bugg, Frank M.: Effects of Aspect Ratio and Canopy Shape on Low-Speed Aerodynamic Characteristics of 50.0° Swept Parawings. NASA TN D-2922, July 1965.
35. Croom, Delwin R.; Rogallo, Francis M.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Resume of Recent Parawing Research. Presented at the Course on Aerodynamic Deceleration, University of Minnesota, NASA TM X-56747, July 1965.
36. Johnson, Joseph L., Jr.: Low-Speed Force and Flight Investigation of Various Methods for Controlling Parawings. NASA TN D-2998, Dec. 1965.
37. Keville, J. F.: Development of Manufacturing Techniques for a Metal Fabric Reinforced Reentry Paraglider. AFSC Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, Aerospace Expandable Struct., 1966, pp. 235-247.
38. Boisseau, P. C.; and Chambers, J. R.: A Theoretical Analysis of the Dynamic Lateral Stability and Control of a Parawing Vehicle. NASA TN D-3461, June 1966.
39. Sobczak, John W.: Investigation of Deployment and Landing Loads With a Limp Paraglider. USAAVLABS Tech. Rep. 66-82 (AD-646578), Sep. 1966.
40. Croom, Delwin R.; and Fournier, Paul G.: Low-Subsonic Wind-Tunnel and Free-Flight Drop-Test Investigation of a Paraglider Configuration Having Large Tapered Leading Edges and Keel. NASA TN D-3442, Oct. 1966.
41. Barte, George R., Jr.: Flexible Wings for Maneuvering and Landing Application in the De-Coupled Concept. Presented at the AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, AIAA Paper No. 67-200, Jan. 1967.

42. Smith, Charles C., Jr.; and Ware, George M.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Flight Characteristics of a Model of an Aspect-Ratio-6 Conical-Parawing Utility Vehicle. NASA TN D-3673, Feb. 1967.
43. Rogallo, Francis M.: NASA Research on Flexible Wings. Presented at the International Cong. of Subsonic Aero., NASA TM X-59738, April 1967.
44. Libbey, Charles E.; Ware, George M.; and Naeseth, Rodger L.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Static Aerodynamic Characteristics of an 18-Foot (5.49-Meter) All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-3856, June 1967.
45. Bugg, Frank M.; and Sleeman, William C., Jr.: Low-Speed Tests of an All-Flexible Parawing for Landing a Lifting-Body Spacecraft. NASA TN D-4010, June 1967.
46. Naeseth, Rodger L.; and Fournier, Paul G.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation of Tension-Structure Parawings. NASA TN D-3940, July 1967.
47. Fink, Marvin P.: Full-Scale Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Model Employing a Sailwing Concept. NASA TN D-4062, July 1967.
48. Mendenhall, M. R.; Nielsen, J. N.; and Spangler, S. B.: Review of Methods for Predicting the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Parawings. Presented at the AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, AIAA Paper 68-10, Jan. 1968.
49. Ware, George M.; and Libbey, Charles E.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Static Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Multilobe Gliding Parachute. NASA TN D-4672, July 1968.
50. Barton, R. L.; Eichblatt, D. L.; and Morre, R. H.: Experimental Verification of Scale Factors for Parawing Opening Characteristics. NASA TN D-4665, Aug. 1968.
51. Rogallo, Francis M.: Flexible Wings. Published in *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, vol. 6, Aug. 1968, pp. 50-54.
52. Vickery, E. D.: Live Testing of Various Gliding Devices. Presented at the AIAA Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems Conf., AIAA Paper No. 68-953, Sep. 1968.
53. Lashbrook, R. V.; and Mabry, C. M.: An Investigation of Low Permeability Fabrics and of Suspension and Control Lines for the All-Flexible Parawing. Presented at the AIAA Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems Conf., AIAA Paper No. 68-953, Sep. 1968.
54. Bair, Herbert Q.; and Forehand, J. Everette: Parawing Precision Aerial Delivery System. Presented at the AIAA Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems Conf., AIAA Paper No. 68-958, Sep. 1968.

55. Morgan, Harry L., Jr.: The Theoretical Aerodynamic Characteristics of Two-Lobed Parawings With Straight Rigid Leading-Edge Spars and Cambered Keels. M. S. Thesis, North Carolina State University, Feb. 1968.
56. Sleeman, William C., Jr.; and Gainer, Thomas G.: Status of Research on Parawing Lifting Decelerators. Presented at the AIAA Aerodynamic Deceleration Systems Conf., AIAA Paper No. 68-967, Sep. 1968.
57. Mendenhall, M. R.; Nielsen, J. N.; and Spangler, S. B.: Investigation of Methods for Predicting the Aerodynamic Characteristics of Two-Lobed Parawings. NASA CR-1166, Sep. 1968.
58. Gainer, Thomas G.: Investigation of Opening Characteristics of an All-Flexible Parawing. NASA TN D-5031, Feb. 1969.
59. Ware, George M.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Twin-Keel Parawing. NASA TN D-5199, May 1969.
60. Gloss, Blair B.: The Determination of the Shape and Inertial Properties of an All-Flexible Parawing. M. S. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, June 1969.

**THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED  
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE  
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND  
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON  
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE.**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

**APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE,  
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.**