CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED

TECHNICAL NOTES

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

No. 836

HYDRODYNAMIC TESTS OF A 1/10-SIZE MODEL OF THE HULL

OF THE LATÉCOÈRE 521 FLYING BOAT - NACA MODEL 83

By Roland E. Olson and Lindsay J. Lina
Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory

Washington
December 1941

# NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

## TECHNICAL NOTE NO. 836

## HYDRODYNAMIC TESTS OF A 1/10-SIZE MODEL OF THE HULL

## OF THE LATÉCOÈRE 521 FLYING BOAT - NACA MODEL 83

### By Roland E. Olson and Lindsay J. Lina

## SUMMARY

A 1/10-size model of the hull of the French flying
boat Latécoère 521 was tested in the NACA tank. This
model is one of a series of models of the hulls of actual
flying boats of both foreign and domestic type that are
being tested in the NACA tank to provide information re-
garding the water characteristics of a variety of forms
of hull and to illustrate the development of present-day
types of flying boat. The lines and the offsets of the
hull were obtained from the manufacturer through the
Paris Office of the NACA. The form of the stub-wing
stabilizers was not furnished and, therefore, the model
was tested without them.

The model was tested free to trim at the design ini-
tial load (initial load coefficient of 0.428) and by the
general method at load coefficients from 0.025 to 0.6.
The spray characteristics of the model are good. (The
form of the bow would be particularly desirable for rough-
water use. The interference of the afterbody and the tail
extension is excessive, causing very high resistance at
high speeds. A violent vertical instability is present
at trims of 4° and 6° with light loads and high speeds)

## INTRODUCTION

Tests of models of hulls of successful flying boats
are included in the program of research conducted at the
NACA tank (references 1 to 8). The results of these
tests are intended to provide information regarding the
water characteristics of a variety of forms of hull and
to illustrate the development of present-day types of fly-
ing boat.

The subject tests were made on a model of the hull
of the flying boat Latécoère 521 ("Lt. de Vaisseau de
Paris"), designated NACA model 83. This flying boat,
which was built in France in 1934 and which at one time
held the long-distance record for flying boats, was con-
structed primarily for trans-Atlantic operation.

The lines and offsets of the hull were furnished by
the manufacturers through the Paris Office of the NACA.
Data for the stub-wing stabilizers were not included in
the data furnished to the NACA; consequently, the tank
model did not have stub-wing stabilizers.

These tests of the hull without the stub-wing sta-
bilizers are of special interest because the form of the
hull differs from that generally used on American flying
boats. It has a rounded bottom instead of the usual
sharp keel; the main step is extremely shallow and of
unusual form; and the angle of afterbody keel is very
small.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL

The model, 1/10-full size, was built of laminated
wood according to the lines shown in figure 1 and the
offsets given in table I. Photographs of the model are
shown in figure 2.

The model has a relatively long forebody with the
keel carried low and well forward and with sharp V sec-
tions at the bow. The angle of dead rise at the main
step is 20° 15' and the bottom sections are arched to
give a large chine flare. The keels of the forebody and
the afterbody are transversely rounded, as in NACA model
74 (reference 9), but a sharp keel is formed near the bow
and near the second step. The angle of dead rise on the
afterbody increases toward the stern post. Chine flare
is also used on the afterbody bottom just aft of the main
step. The tail appendage has straight V sections with
no curvature at the chine.

The main step is shallow (0.37 in., 0.021 beam) and
is not vertical, as in American designs, but slopes aft
from the forebody to the afterbody. The second step
(0.46 in.) fades out at the chine and also slopes toward
the tail extension. (See fig. 1.)

The angle of afterbody keel is 2° 11' with respect to the straight portion of the forebody. The keel of the tail extension is straight and at an angle of 12° 48' with respect to the forebody.

The lateral stability of the full-size flying boat was provided by stub wings attached to the hull. Lack of information as to the size and the form of the stub wings prevented their being used on the model.

The particulars of the model and of the full-size flying boat are as follows:

|  | Model | Full-size |
|---|---|---|
| **Length:** | | |
| Over-all . . . . . . . . . . . | 116.65 in. | 97.21 ft |
| Forebody . . . . . . . . . . | 54.53 in. | 45.44 ft |
| Afterbody . . . . . . . . . | 26.37 in. | 21.98 ft |
| Tail extension . . . . . . . | 35.75 in. | 29.79 ft |
| Maximum beam . . . . . . . . | 17.72 in. | 14.77 ft |
| **Center of moments:** | | |
| Forward of main step . . . . . | 7.48 in. | 6.23 ft |
| Above keel . . . . . . . . . | 12.80 in. | 10.67 ft |
| Depth of main step . . . . . . | 0.37 in. | 0.31 ft |
| Depth of second step at keel . . | 0.46 in. | 0.38 ft |
| Angle of afterbody keel . . . . | | 2° 11' |
| Angle of tail-extension keel . . | | 12° 48' |
| Gross load . . . . . . . . . . | 87.4 lb | 88,184 lb |
| Get-away speed . . . . . . . . | 37.5 fps | 80.8 mph |
| Linear ratio of model to full size | | 1/10 |

Additional tests of the model were made with the tail extension removed at the second step. For this portion of the investigation, the model was designated model 83A.

## APPARATUS AND PROCEDURE

A detailed description of the tank, the towing equipment, and the method of testing are given in reference 10. The model was tested, free to trim, at one gross load and one get-away speed. Fixed-trim tests were made by the general method. Inasmuch as the investigation was intended to study the behavior of the hull rather than to provide design data, the tests did not include all possible conditions of operation.

The position of the center of gravity of the complete flying boat as shown on the original lines was used as the center of gravity for the free-to-trim tests and the center of moments for the fixed-trim tests. The free-to-trim tests of the model with tail extension removed (model 83A) were made with the model balanced about the center of gravity by placing weights on the afterbody. The proper load on the water was also maintained.

Photographs were taken for a qualitative record of the wave form and the spray characteristics.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the tests were reduced to the usual coefficients based on Froude's law in order to make them independent of size. In this case, the maximum beam was chosen as the characteristic dimension. The nondimensional coefficients are defined as follows:

Load coefficient,   $C_\Delta = \Delta/wb^3$

Initial load coefficient,   $C_{\Delta_0} = \Delta_0/wb^3$

Resistance coefficient,   $C_R = R/wb^3$

Speed coefficient,   $C_V = V/\sqrt{gb}$

Get-away speed coefficient, $C_{V_G} = V_G/\sqrt{gb}$

Trimming-moment coefficient, $C_M = M/wb^4$

Rise coefficient, $C_r = r/b$

where

    $\Delta$    load on water, pounds

    $\Delta_0$    initial load on water, pounds

    w    specific weight of water, pounds per cubic foot
        (63.4 for these tests, usually taken as 64 for
        sea water)

    b    maximum beam, feet

    R    water resistance, pounds

    V    speed, feet per second

    $V_G$    get-away speed, feet per second

    g    acceleration of gravity, 32.2 feet per second
        per second

    M    trimming moment, pound-feet

    r    rise at center of gravity (height above position
        at rest), feet

Any consistent system of units might have been used.
The trimming-moment data are referred to the center of
moments shown in figure 1. Tail-heavy moments are con-
sidered positive. Trim ($\tau$) is the angle between the base
line of the model and the horizontal.

Free to trim, model 83.- The results of the free-to-
trim tests for the design condition of loading ($C_{\Delta_0} =$
0.428) and get-away speed ($C_{V_G} = 5.50$) are plotted in fig-
ure 3. The photographs in figure 4 show the spray pattern
at typical speeds.

The wave formation and the spray at low speeds are
shown in figure 4(a).  The fine entrance resulting from
the low keel and the sharp sections at the bow produces
only a low spray, and the flying boat will probably run
very cleanly in rough water.  This low spray may be due
in some extent to the unusually low load coefficient at
which the test was made.  The tests of the model show no
indication of any lateral instability when the flow
breaks away from the after portion of the hull at low
speeds.

The maximum in the resistance curve (the hump)
occurs at a speed coefficient of 2.4.  At the speed rep-
resented by this coefficient, the model planes on the
forebody and the afterbody and the tail extension is still
wetted by spray from under the second step.  The small
angle of afterbody keel is effective in keeping the trim
at the hump at the low value of only 7.3°.  The load-
resistance ratio  $\Delta/R$  at the hump is about 5.  This
rather high value of  $\Delta/R$  for a free-to-trim test may be
accounted for by the fact that the attitude of the hull
is near the trim for minimum water resistance (best trim)
at this speed.  Photographs (fig. 4(b)) show the wave pat-
tern at the hump speed.  The forward portion of the spray
from the forebody is low and almost horizontal.

Over the hump, the trim and the resistance decrease
slightly and the afterbody and tail extension are clear
for only a limited range of speeds.  The model had a
slight tendency to porpoise as the afterbody came clear,
but readings of resistance, trim, etc. could be made with-
out restraining the model in pitch.

At high speeds the trim increases, resulting in a
large departure from trim for minimum water resistance
(see fig. 6(b)) and a second hump occurs in the resistance
curve.  The low angle of afterbody keel and the shallow
step do not provide clearance for the afterbody, and the
after planing surfaces are heavily wetted near get-away
speed (fig. 4(c)).  The shallow second step, which fades
out at the chines, is ineffective in breaking the flow
from the tail extension.

Free to trim, model 83A (tail extension removed).-
The free-to-trim curves for model 83A are included in fig-
ure 3 with the free-to-trim curves for model 83.

Below the hump speed, the resistance and the trim for model 83A are greater than for model 83. This result indicates that at low speeds the tail extension of model 83 produces an effective lifting force and causes a greater positive (bow up) moment. The hump is shifted to a lower speed ($C_V = 2.0$) but the magnitude of the hump resistance is not changed. At high speeds the trim and the resistance for model 83A are reduced, showing that, in model 83, the tail extension produces a downward force causing higher trim and resistance. The same hump in the resistance curve at high speeds occurs for model 83A but to a lesser degree.

Fixed-trim tests.- The fixed-trim results for the model with the tail extension are presented in figure 5. The resistance coefficients for a series of loads are plotted against the speed coefficient for several trims. A few cross plots of the type generally used by the NACA are included in figure 6. The use of these curves is described in reference 8.

The resistance characteristics of model 83 are somewhat different from those of most models tested in the NACA tank. Instead of an appreciable decrease in resistance just beyond the hump speed, which is generally associated with a decrease in wetted area over the after portion of the hull, the resistance remains practically the same ($\tau = 6°$ or $\tau = 8°$) or continues to increase ($\tau = 10°$). With the low angle of afterbody keel and the shallow step, the after planing surfaces are in such a position that the water from the main step generally will not clear the afterbody. With the heaviest loads, however, the trough formed by the forebody is deep and for a very small range of speeds the afterbody and the tail extension are clear of the water. At low angles and high speeds the resistance is high because the wetted length forward of the step increases and more than compensates for any reduction in afterbody interference. At a trim of $10°$ the light loads are supported by the after planing surfaces.

Figures 7(a) to 7(c) show the spray at a fixed trim of $8°$ for three loads and speeds. At low speed, $C_V = 1.30$ and $C_\Delta = 0.4$, the sides of the model are wetted and the tail deck is almost under water (fig. 7(a)). As the speed increases over the hump the afterbody tends to clear, but a further increase in speed causes the water

from the main step again to strike the afterbody chines
(fig. 7(b)).  For the light loads the main step is very
ineffective in breaking the flow from the afterbody and
as a result the afterbody just behind the step is wetted.
At high speeds (fig. 7(c)) the afterbody and the tail ex-
tension are heavily wetted.

Best trim.- The force characteristics at trim for
minimum water resistance are given in figure 8.

Vertical instability.- At high speeds and light loads
a violent vertical instability was evident at trims of 4°
and 6°.  The model appeared to be sucked down into the
water until the flow changed and sufficient lift was de-
veloped to cause the model to jump completely clear of the
water.  This same type of instability was noted for tests
reported in reference 9.  These and other tests indicate
that the instability appears when the step is not of suf-
ficient depth.  The instability occurs over a range of
trims of several degrees.  The instability does not appear
at 2°, where the afterbody keel is slightly above the hor-
izontal.

The instability prevented complete data being taken
at high speeds for the light loads.  The free-to-trim
tests did not show this characteristic because the trim,
throughout the high-speed range, was above that at which
the vertical instability occurred.  (See fig. 6(b).)

The effect of this type of vertical instability on
porpoising characteristics should be investigated by use
of a dynamically similar model; that is, a model with the
mass and moment of inertia corresponding to the full-size
airplane.  No information has been received on the corre-
sponding behavior of the full-size flying boat.

Sticking.- At trims of 6° and 8° (model 83) the mo-
ments change from negative (bow down) to positive (bow up)
values at high speeds.  A change of moment in this direc-
tion does not occur in most models at high speeds.  This
change of moment indicates that the model is probably
sticking because of the flow over the after planing sur-
faces.

The resistance and moment coefficients for model 83A
(tail extension removed), at a trim of 8°, are shown in
figure 9.  With the tail extension removed, the moments
become and remain negative at high speeds.  When figure
5(d) (model 83) is compared with figure 9 (model 83A),

the difference in moments indicates that a downward, or suction, force is developed at high speeds because of the presence of the tail extension. Photographs in figure 7 show an increase in wetted area forward when the tail extension is present.

In figure 10 the position, the magnitude, and the direction of the resultant force are shown at several loads and speeds for model 83 and model 83A. The trim of the hull is 8°. These vectors were computed from the fixed-trim data.

At low speeds ($C_V = 2.0$) the position of the resultant force (fig. 10) is farther aft for model 83 (with the tail extension), indicating a lifting force over the planing surface of the tail extension. (Note the roach in the low-speed photographs, figs. 7(a) and 7(b).) As the tail extension tends to come clear of the water ($C_V = 3.0$) the force vectors for the two models approach one another. As the speed increases, the water again flows over the tail planing surface (model 83, figs. 7(b) and 7(c)), and the resultant force moves forward with decreasing slope. The vectors for model 83 at speed coefficients from 4.5 to 7.0 show the resultant force intersecting the forebody; whereas the resultant force for model 83A intersects the afterbody at all loads except $C_\Delta = 0.1$.

## CONCLUSIONS

Because of the absence of the stub wings, the characteristics of the model are not completely indicative of the performance of the full-size flying boat.

The spray characteristics of the hull are good, but this result may be due in some extent to the unusually low load coefficients at which the tests were made. On the basis of water performance, the form of the bow appears to be good. The chine flare is effective in holding down the spray.

Because of the low angles of afterbody keel and tail extension, a lift is produced at low speeds that is advantageous in reducing the trim at the hump where the available control moment is small.

The high-speed resistance is excessive because of the lack of clearance in the afterbody and tail extension.

At fixed trims of 4° and 6° a violent vertical instability appears at light loads and high speeds.  This instability is probably caused mainly by the shallow step. Knowledge of the full-scale behavior is desirable for interpretation of this type of instability.


Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory,
    National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,
        Langley Field, Va., October 13, 1941.

## REFERENCES

1.  Shoemaker, James M.:  A Complete Tank Test of a Model
    of a Flying-Boat Hull - N.A.C.A. Model 16.  T.N.
    No. 471, NACA, 1933.

2.  Dawson, John R.:  A Complete Tank Test of the Hull of
    the Sikorsky S-40 Flying Boat - American Clipper
    Class.  T.N. No. 512, NACA, 1934.

3.  Bell, Joe W.:  Tank Tests of a Model of the NC Flying-
    Boat Hull - N.A.C.A. Model 44.  T.N. No. 566, NACA,
    1936.

4.  Allison, John M.:  Tank Tests of a Model of the Hull
    of the Navy PB-1 Flying Boat - N.A.C.A. Model 52.
    T.N. No. 576, NACA, 1936.

5.  Dawson, John R., and Truscott, Starr:  A General Tank
    Test of a Model of the Hull of the British Singapore
    IIC Flying Boat.  T.N. No. 580, NACA, 1936.

6.  Ward, Kenneth E.:  Hydrodynamic Tests in the N.A.C.A.
    Tank of a Model of the Hull of the Short Calcutta
    Flying Boat.  T.N. No. 590, NACA, 1937.

7.  Allison, John M.:  Tank Tests of a Model of One Hull
    of the Savoia S-55-X Flying Boat - N.A.C.A. Model
    46.  T.N. No. 635, NACA, 1938.

8.  Dawson, John R.:  A General Tank Test of a Model of
    the Hull of the P3M-1 Flying Boat Including a
    Special Working Chart for the Determination of Hull
    Performance.  T.N. No. 681, NACA, 1938.

9.  Truscott, Starr, Parkinson, J. B. Ebert, John W., Jr.,
    and Valentine, E. Floyd:  Hydrodynamic and Aero-
    dynamic Tests of Models of Flying-Boat Hulls De-
    signed for Low Aerodynamic Drag - N.A.C.A. Models
    74, 74-A, and 75.  T.N. No. 668, NACA, 1938.

10. Truscott, Starr:  The Enlarged N.A.C.A. Tank, and
    Some of Its Work.  T.M. No. 918, NACA, 1939.

TABLE I
MODEL 85 OFFSETS, INCHES

| Sta-tion | Dis-tance from F.P. | Keel | B1 a0.08 | B2 a0.64 | B3 a1.28 | B4 a2.46 | B5 a3.64 | B6 a4.82 | B8 a6.00 | B9 a7.19 | B10 a8.37 | B7 a4.92 | Chine | Deck | Chine | WL1 b10.04 | WL2 b10.93 | WL3 b11.61 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Half-breadths | | | |
| F.P. | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | 11.02 | 12.05 | 0.00 | | | |
| d | 1.38 | 5.72 | 6.13 | 8.80 | | | | | | | | | 9.76 | | .84 | | | |
| 0 | 2.46 | 4.43 | 4.71 | 6.58 | 8.52 | | | | | | | | 9.00 | 11.24 | 1.45 | | | |
| a | 3.74 | 3.58 | 3.70 | 5.16 | 6.74 | | | | | | | | 8.27 | | 2.13 | | | |
| 1 | 4.92 | 3.15 | 3.23 | 4.22 | 5.69 | 7.45 | | | | | | | 7.71 | 10.78 | 2.70 | | | |
| 2 | 7.38 | 2.49 | 2.51 | 3.10 | 4.15 | 5.85 | 6.76 | | | | | | 6.82 | 10.45 | 3.77 | | | |
| 3 | 9.84 | 1.97 | 1.98 | 2.35 | 3.18 | 4.66 | 5.67 | | | | | | 6.14 | 10.24 | 4.68 | | | |
| 5 | 15.27 | 1.41 | | 1.61 | 2.18 | 3.44 | 4.49 | 5.11 | | | | | 5.39 | 10.09 | 5.75 | | | |
| 8 | 17.32 | .91 | .91 | 1.04 | 1.42 | 2.45 | 3.39 | 4.12 | 4.55 | | | | 4.72 | 10.04 | 6.76 | | | |
| 12 | 22.05 | .50 | .50 | .60 | .91 | 1.75 | 2.59 | 3.33 | 3.85 | 4.11 | | | 4.17 | | 7.66 | | | |
| 16 | 26.77 | .23 | .23 | .31 | .59 | 1.35 | 2.12 | 2.84 | 3.40 | 3.69 | | | 3.83 | | 8.33 | | | |
| 19 | 30.61 | .10 | .10 | .17 | .43 | 1.16 | 1.90 | 2.61 | 3.17 | 3.48 | 3.60 | | 3.62 | | 8.64 | | | |
| 22 | 35.04 | .02 | .02 | .09 | .34 | 1.06 | 1.80 | 2.49 | 3.05 | 3.37 | 3.49 | | 3.51 | | 8.82 | | | |
| 25 | 39.57 | .00 | .00 | .08 | .33 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 2.48 | 3.03 | 3.34 | 3.44 | | 3.45 | | 8.86 | | | |
| 28 | 44.29 | .00 | .00 | .08 | .33 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 2.48 | 3.03 | 3.34 | 3.41 | | 3.40 | | 8.86 | | | |
| 31 | 49.02 | .00 | .00 | .08 | .33 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 2.48 | 3.03 | 3.33 | 3.37 | | 3.34 | | 8.86 | | | |
| 34 | 53.74 | .00 | .00 | .08 | .33 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 2.48 | 3.03 | 3.33 | 3.35 | | 3.29 | | 8.86 | | | |
| 35 | 54.53 | .00 | .00 | .08 | .33 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 2.48 | 3.03 | 3.33 | 3.34 | | 3.28 | | 8.85 | | | |
| Step | | .37 | .37 | .46 | .74 | 1.48 | 2.22 | 2.93 | 3.50 | 3.89 | 4.08 | | 4.12 | | 8.85 | | | |
| 36 | 55.91 | .41 | .41 | .50 | .80 | 1.54 | 2.28 | 2.99 | 3.56 | 3.94 | 4.12 | | 4.17 | | 8.82 | | | |
| 38 | 58.46 | .51 | .51 | .61 | .94 | 1.71 | 2.46 | 3.19 | 3.77 | 4.15 | 4.33 | | 4.36 | | 8.72 | | | |
| 42 | 63.19 | .69 | .69 | .84 | 1.20 | 2.03 | 2.82 | 3.57 | 4.18 | 4.56 | 4.75 | | 4.75 | | 8.38 | | | |
| 45 | 67.62 | .86 | .87 | 1.07 | 1.48 | 2.34 | 3.18 | 3.97 | 4.60 | 5.00 | | | 5.16 | | 7.91 | | | |
| 48 | 72.05 | 1.03 | 1.05 | 1.33 | 1.79 | 2.69 | 3.57 | 4.40 | 5.06 | 5.54 | | | 5.60 | | 7.33 | | | |
| 51 | 76.48 | 1.20 | 1.23 | 1.61 | 2.12 | 3.06 | 4.00 | 4.91 | 5.68 | | | | 6.07 | | 6.68 | | | |
| 54 | 80.90 | 1.38 | 1.45 | 1.92 | 2.47 | 3.49 | 4.50 | 5.52 | 6.54 | | | 11.19 | 6.54 | 10.04 11.81 | 6.00 | | | 3.54 |
| Step | | 1.84 | 1.90 | 2.35 | 2.85 | 3.76 | 4.68 | 5.60 | 6.54 | | | | 6.54 | | 6.00 | | | 3.54 |
| 55 | 83.86 | 2.44 | 2.50 | 2.95 | 3.45 | 4.39 | 5.33 | 6.28 | | | | 10.93 | 6.85 | | 5.54 | | | 3.52 |
| 56 | 86.81 | 3.11 | 3.18 | 3.62 | 4.13 | 5.07 | 6.01 | 6.95 | | | | 10.44 | 7.16 | | 5.09 | | 4.57 | 3.46 |
| 58 | 92.72 | 4.45 | 4.51 | 4.96 | 5.47 | 6.42 | 7.36 | | | | | | 7.79 | | 4.17 | | 3.85 | 3.23 |
| 60 | 98.62 | 5.79 | 5.85 | 6.30 | 6.82 | 7.77 | | | | | | | 8.41 | | 3.26 | | 3.10 | 2.82 |
| 62 | 104.92 | 7.22 | 7.28 | 7.74 | 8.26 | | | | | | | | 9.07 | | 2.28 | | 2.26 | 2.19 |
| 64 | 109.84 | 8.33 | 8.40 | 8.86 | 9.39 | | | | | | | | 9.60 | | 1.52 | | 1.53 | |
| 66 | 114.76 | 9.45 | 9.51 | 10.01 | | | | | | | | | 10.12 | | .76 | | .76 | |
| 66a | 115.25 | 9.56 | | | | | | | | | | | 10.17 | | .70 | | | |
| 66b | 115.77 | 9.68 | | | | | | | | | | | 10.23 | | .57 | | | |
| 66c | 116.29 | 9.80 | | | | | | | | | | | 10.28 | | .32 | | | |
| A.P. | 116.65 | 9.88 | | | | | | | | | | | 10.32 | 11.81 | R=.10 | | | |

*Note: columns between B8 and Chine contain the notation "Deck for tail appendage" and "Same as chine" written vertically.*

a Distance of buttocks from center line.
b Distance of water line from base line.

National Advisory
Committee for Aeronautics

Table 1

Half-breadth

Maximum beam — 17.72

WL3
WL2
WL1

10.04

Step

Body plan

Center of moments

6.54

Chine

4.12    Chine

3.28

1.38    1.84

0.3

Detail of main step

Detail of second step

Profile

12.05
11.02

7.48

12.80

Chine

Chine

2°11'    12° 48'

Chine

Base Line

54.53

26.37

35.75

116.65

Figure 1.- Lines of NACA model 83.

Fig. 1

(a) Side view.

(b) Three-quarter view.

Figure 2.- NACA model 83.

Fig. 2

Figure 3.- Models 83 and 83A.  Free-to-trim
characteristics.

Figure 5(a).- Model 83.  Resistance
and trimming-moment
coefficients, $\tau=2°$.

Fig. 4

(a) $C_V = 0.80$,     $\tau = 1.0°$,     $C_\Delta = 0.42$.

(b) $C_V = 2.35$,     $\tau = 7.3°$,     $C_\Delta = 0.34$.

(c) $C_V = 4.60$,     $\tau = 8.4°$,     $C_\Delta = 0.11$.

Figure 4.- Model 83. Free-to-trim.

Figure 5(b,c).- Resistance and trimming-moment coefficients.

(d) $\tau = 8°$                                  (e) $\tau = 10°$

Figure 5(d,e).- Model 83.  Resistance and trimming-moment coefficients.

(a)   Near hump speed.
(b)   At high speeds.

Figure 6.- Model 83.   Variation of resistance and trimming-moment
coefficients.

Fig. 7

(a) $C_\Delta = 0.4$, $C_V = 1.30$.      (d) $C_\Delta = 0.4$, $C_V = 1.30$.

(b) $C_\Delta = 0.05$, $C_V = 4.90$.      (e) $C_\Delta = 0.05$, $C_V = 5.10$.

(c) $C_\Delta = 0.05$, $C_V = 7.40$.      (f) $C_\Delta = 0.05$, $C_V = 7.40$.

Model 83      Model 83A

Figure 7.- Model 83 and 83A. Fixed trim. $\tau = 8^\circ$.

NACA Technical Note No. 836



Figure 8.- Model 83. Variation of resistance, trim, and trimming moment at trim for minimum water resistance. (Best trim)

Figure 9.- Model 83A. Resistance and trimming-moment coefficients, $\tau=8°$.

Figure 10.— Models 83 and 83A. Vector diagram of resultant force, $\tau=8°$.
Resultant-force coefficient $= \sqrt{C_A{}^2 + C_R{}^2}$; direction of resultant
force, $\theta = \tan^{-1} A/R$; beam of model, b = 17.72 inches.

Fig. 10