

Summary of Wind Tunnel Tests and Vehicle Analysis for Open Rotor Propulsion Systems

Presentation to ICAO's Noise Technology Independent Expert Panel February 1, 2012

National Aeronautics and Space Administration U.S.A.



General Electric/CFM International

NASA Subsonic Fixed Wing Project Environmentally Responsible Aviation Project Aeronautics Test Program Arctic Slope Research Corporation

Federal Aviation Administration

Specific NASA Contributors: Aeropropulsion Division Structures and Materials Division Facilities Division Testing Division



Model Scale Open Rotor Wind Tunnel Tests



NASA/FAA/GE Open Rotor Collaboration



- **Objective:** Explore the design space for lower noise while maintaining the high propulsive efficiency from a counter-rotating open rotor system.
- **Approach:** A model scale, low-noise open rotor system was tested in collaboration with General Electric (GE) and CFM International. Candidate technologies for lower noise were investigated. Installation effects such as pylon integration were investigated in partnership with GE and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Gen-1 Blade Sets (NASA/GE) Historical Baseline Modern Baseline 4 Advanced Designs Gen-2 Blade Sets (NASA/FAA/GE) 6 GE Advanced Designs Pylon wake mitigation



Historical Baseline (12 x 10 Blade Count)

History (1/3)





| Image: Constant of the second secon | | First Researce Oct 28 | ch Run | Influence Body Dec 14 | / Tests |
|--|------------|-------------------------|--------|--------------------------|---------|
| Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | |
| Drive | e Ria Chec | kout | Lin | ear Array Checko | ut |

Drive Rig Checkout Sep 24 – Oct 27



Linear Array Checkout Dec 7-11







Continued Influence Body Tests Concluded – Apr 28

Flow Measurements Jul 19 – Sep 7

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|----------------|-----------------|--------|-----|-----|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| Drive Imple | Rig M ementa | uffler | | | NASA Glenn Annual Facility Shutdown | | | | | | Open Rotor Installed In the 8x6 Wind Tunnel |

History (3/3)

2011





Diagnostic Tests





Flow Measurements & Diagnostic Tests





The 3D **PIV** measurements provide a wealth of information about the blade wakes and vortex track.

> The location of peak noise level in the **Phased Array** map changes in the presence of the CFMI pylon indicating a change in the relative strength of sources.



A canonical **Shielding** configuration provides code validation data.





The **Pressure Sensitive Paint** measurements show phase locked static pressure on the surface of the rotating blade.

Approved for Public Release



Systems Analysis Results of an Open Rotor Propulsion System on an Advanced Single Aisle Transport



Background



- NASA's systems analysis team has been investigating potential environmental benefits of advanced propulsion systems on "Advanced" Single Aisle aircraft
 - Direct Drive
 - Geared Turbofan
 - Open Rotor
- Open Rotor assessment is joint effort between NASA's Subsonic Fixed Wing (SFW) & Environmentally Responsible Aviation (ERA) projects
 - SFW had FY11 milestone to assess fuel burn/noise characteristics of an open rotor propulsion system
 - ERA measured advanced open rotor blade performance/acoustic data
- ERA funded task with General Electric was conduit to NASA/industry partnership
 - Enabled NASA access to data for use in system assessment
 - Allowed coordination with industry on modeling approaches/technical assumptions

Historical Look at Propulsion Studies



- NASA has been conducting an on-going engine trade study to assess propulsion options for advanced single-aisle (B737/A320 class) aircraft
 - Multi-year, Multi-phase effort
 - Initial focus on ultra-high bypass ratio (UHB) turbofan concepts, followed by investigation of open-rotor engine architectures
 - Multiple interactions with industry over the years to obtain feedback
 - Numerous technical reports and conference papers produced, plus 1 journal article



Open Rotor Cycle Model (NASA Notional Engine)



- A complete Numerical Propulsion System Simulation (NPSS) model was created for a geared, pusher open rotor engine
- Core component performance assumptions are similar to those used in a recent NASA advanced turbofan study
- Counter-rotating propeller data from a favored Gen-1 rotor set was used to create performance maps NPSS component

| Component | Parameter | Value |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | Pressure Ratio | 4.2 |
| LPC | Adiabatic Efficiency (%) | 89.6 |
| | Pressure Ratio | 10.0 |
| прс | Adiabatic Efficiency (%) | 88.6 |
| НРТ | Adiabatic Efficiency (%) | 91.9 |
| LPT | Adiabatic Efficiency (%) | 94.2 |
| Power Turbine | Adiabatic Efficiency (%) | 94.0 |
| Counter- | Net Efficiency (%) | |
| Rotating | Front Tip Speed (ft/s) | Proprietary Data |
| Propellers | Power Loading (shp/ft ²) | |
| | | |



Open Rotor Engine Performance



| Flight Condition | Engine Performance Parameter | Value |
|--|--|---|
| Top of Climb (M0.78, 35kft) | Net Thrust (lbf) TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf) OPR OR Advance Ratio OR Power Coefficient OR Thrust Coefficient OR Net Efficiency (%) | 5000 0.428 42.0 Proprietary Data |
| Rolling Takeoff (M0.25, 0 ft, +27F) | Net Thrust (lbf) TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf) OPR OR Advance Ratio OR Power Coefficient OR Thrust Coefficient OR Net Efficiency (%) | 19,000 0.229 28.5 Proprietary Data |
| Sea Level Static (M0.0, 0 ft, +27F) | Net Thrust (lbf) TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf) OPR OR Advance Ratio OR Power Coefficient OR Thrust Coefficient | 27,300 0.158 29.4 Proprietary Data |

Engine Flowpath and Weight

- Key cycle parameters passed to flowpath tool (WATE++) to calculate engine core weight
- Turbomachinery aeromechanical limits and materials consistent with those of previous N+1 turbofan studies
- Propeller weight estimates derived from data developed during the Advanced Turboprop Project in the 1980's
- Gearbox (6:1 gear ratio) weight derived from NASA gearbox weight model (based on actual gearbox weight data from over fifty rotorcraft, tiltrotors, and turboprop aircraft).



| Weights and Dimensions | Value |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Open Rotor Weight (Ibm) | 3244 |
| Gearbox Weight (Ibm) | 1028 |
| Total Engine Pod Weight (Ibm) | 9219 |
| Propeller Diameter (ft) | 13.76 |
| Nacelle Diameter (ft) | 5.6 |
| Overall Length (ft) | 23.2 |



Airframe Modeling and Analysis





NASA Open Rotor Airplane





See AIAA-2011-7058 for airplane design details

Results (System Performance)



• Engine models combined with airframe models

| | Airframe: | MD90-30like | CSAT-re | ASAT-re | ASAT-or | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | Engine: | V2525-D5 | V2525-D5 | Adv. GTF | Geared OR | | |
| Design Mission: | | | | | | | |
| Design Mission Range | nm | 2040 | 3250 | 3250 | 3250 | | |
| OWE | lb | 88162 | 94450 | 79646 | 87817 | | |
| Mission Fuel | lb | 36825 | 49164 | 35803 | 31056 | | |
| Passengers | | 158 | 162 | 162 | 162 | | |
| Payload | lb | 31000 | 32400 | 32400 | 32400 | | |
| Ramp Weight | lb | 155987 | 176014 | 147849 | 151273 | | |
| Wing Area | ft ² | 1278 | 1530 | 1240 | 1250 | | |
| W/S | lb/ft ² | 122 | 115 | 119 | 121 | | |
| Thrust(SLS) | lb | 25033 | 25195 | 23075 | 26914 | | |
| Engine scale factor | | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | | |
| T/W | | 0.321 | 0.286 | 0.312 | 0.356 | | |
| Cruise Mach | | 0.760 | 0.780 | 0.780 | 0.780 | | |
| ~Cruise L/D | | 14.0 | 17.0 | 16.2 | 16.6 | | |
| ~Cruise SFC | lb/(lb-h) | 0.601 | 0.603 | 0.494 | 0.432 | | |
| Land field length | ft | 5527 | 5802 | 5944 | 6006 | | |
| T.O. field length | ft | 7000 | 7000 | 6996 | 6262 | | |
| Block Fuel | lb | 29410 | 41550 | 30396 | 26710 | | |
| Block NOX | lb | 217.18 | 292.38 | 205.16 | 215.73 | | |
| LTO NOX | lb/cycle | 27.59 | 27.77 | 9.96 | 6.41 | | |
| | | Takeoff | Takeoff | Takeoff Performance, | 10.1.0 | | |
| Active Sizing Constraint | | Performance | Performance | ICAC | ICAC | | |
| Economic Mission: 1000 nm, | | | | | | | |
| Ramp Weight | lb | 140543 | 146252 | 126064 | 131868 | | |
| Block Fuel | lb | 14711 | 13205 | 9648 | 8229 | | |
| Block NOX | lb | 120.17 | 114.86 | 90.52 | 75.95 | | |



Advanced Geared Turbofan (GTF) (fan pressure ratio = 1.5)

Nomenclature

CSAT: Current technology Single-Aisle Transport ASAT: Advanced technology Single-Aisle Transport

re – rear engine

or - open rotor



Advanced Geared Open Rotor (OR)

Relative Improvements





- ASAT relative to 1990s technology...
 - Empty Weight: -16%(GTF); -7%(OR)
 - Gross Weight: -16%(GTF); -14%(OR)
 - Block Fuel: -27%(GTF); -36%(OR)
 - Total NO_X: -30%(GTF); -26%(OR)
 - LTO NO_X: -64%(GTF); -77%(OR)

- Open rotor relative to advanced turbofan...
 - Empty Weight: +10%
 - Gross Weight: +2%
 - Block Fuel: -12%
 - Total NO_X: +5%
 - LTO NO_X: -36%

Acoustic Data Processing Steps





Part 36 Noise Certification





- Tonal content penalties
- Ground observer noise-time history

Perceived Noise Level

Trajectory Modeling



2050 ft

1000 ft

- Open rotor propulsion system and airplane performance modeled
- Detailed takeoff and landing trajectory analysis using Flight Optimization System performance code



2.5

Altitude, 1000 ft AFE 1.5 1.0 0.5

0.0

394 ft

Impact of AoA and Pitch on Flyover EPNL

Flyover EPNL, EPNdB





22

Rotor Inflow Angle and Airplane Angle of Attack

- Rotor inflow angle (α_{Inflow}) is needed to infer the correct rotor noise from wind tunnel data
- Vortex-lattice code analysis used to determine relationship of open rotor inflow angle to airplane angle of attack (α)
- Nose-up engine mounting angle $(\alpha_{Cant} = 2 \text{ deg}, \text{ re clean airplane waterline})$ gives $\alpha_{Inflow} = 0$ at cruise
- Downwash angle into rotor at $\alpha = 0$ (ε_0) and $d\varepsilon/d\alpha$ are functions of airplane configuration (i.e., C_L with flaps/slats degree of extension)
- $\alpha_{\text{Inflow}} = \alpha_{\text{Cant}} \varepsilon_0 + \alpha [1 d\varepsilon/d\alpha]$



Departure:

- $d\varepsilon/d\alpha = 0.336$
- $\varepsilon_0 = 2.342 \deg$
- *α* ≈ 7 deg
- $\alpha_{\text{Inflow}} \approx 4 \text{ deg}$

Approach:

- $d\varepsilon/d\alpha = 0.349$
- $\mathcal{E}_0 = 5.194 \deg$
- *α* ≈ 7 deg
- $\alpha_{\text{Inflow}} \approx 1.5 \text{ deg}$



13.67 foot diameter rotor

| | Approach | Lateral | Flyover | Cumulative |
|----------------------------|----------|---------|---------|------------|
| Isolated | 88.8 | 88.2 | 80.1 | 257.1 |
| AoA Effects | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.5 |
| Flight Mach Effects | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 2.6 |
| Pylon Effects ⁺ | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| Mitigation [‡] | -1.4 | -0.7 | -1.4 | -3.5 |
| Overall | 90.0 | 91.2 | 83.5 | 264.7 |
| | | | | |
| Stage 3 Rule** | 100.3 | 96.5 | 91.0 | 287.8 |
| Stage 3 Margin | -10.3 | -5.3 | -7.6 | -23.1 |
| Stage 4 Margin | | | | -13.1 |

[†]Estimated from F31/A31 data [‡]Assumed "70%" reduction of the pylon penalty ^{**}Rule based on NASA's 151.3 klb airplane

NASA Study Results – Fuel Burn vs. Noise





% Fuel Burn Benefit

Relationship to Prior UHB Study





