

Design of an Object-oriented Turbomachinery Analysis Code



Initial Results

Scott Jones, NASA Glenn Research Center

Presentation Outline

justification - why write yet another turbomachinery code?

• approach - what does an object-oriented turbomachinery code look like?

results - how do I know the code works?

Justification

- there is still a need for 2-D design/analysis
- codes tend to be focused on one aspect



specific, individual codes may have undesirable features



Problem Description and Assumptions

CODE REQUIREMENTS:

OTAC is applicable for

- compressors and turbines
- design and analysis
- meanline and streamline
- axial, centrifugal/radial, and mixed



CODE ASSUMPTIONS:

flow going through a blade row in an annulus from station (1) to station (2):

- steady-state, throughflow
- circumferentially uniform
- adiabatic, simple radial equilibrium
- no change in mass flow rate
- no streamline curvature

ADDITIONAL GOALS:

modular (loss models), good thermo, simulate unconventional architectures

OTAC Written in NPSS Environment

- allows re-use of Numerical Propulsion System Simulation objects
- model structure similar to NPSS engine cycle model



FlowStation Object Extended from NPSS



Streamtube in an Annulus



Multiple Streamtubes



NPSS BladeRow Objects

the *BladeRow* represents the entire blade row and contains its own "sub-objects"

each *BladeSegment* tracks a streamtube through a section of blade

each *FlowStation* contains the entire state of the fluid at its particular location



NPSS Solver

Independents represent variables the NPSS solver is allowed to vary

Dependents represent equations or conditions the NPSS solver must satisfy

 \dot{m}_2

 h_{t2}

 P_{t2}

α₂ radius₂

 MN_2

BladeRow

Dependents



FlowStation

Independents

10

OTAC

Empirical Effects

 BladeRows contain Sockets, placeholders to insert code that calculates a certain variable such as non-dimensional pressure loss



 this allows for considerable versatility in applying losses to the simulation; other benefits include testing and proprietary considerations

Results

- comparison against other codes and calculations
- investigation to determine even if the NPSS solver could reliably converge with matrix sizes over 50x50
- more test cases have been run than shown here

• comparison of OTAC and HT0300 for a compressor IGV plus rotor, streamline, losses input



Program HT0300, Richard M. Hearsey, 2011

 comparison of OTAC and Ainley-Mathieson single stage turbine calculation, meanline, losses calculated



A Method of Performance Estimation for Axial-Flow Turbines, D.G. Ainley and G.C.R. Mathieson, 1957

14

 comparison of OTAC and HT0300 5-stage turbine calculation, streamline, losses calculated using Ainley-Mathieson with Kacker/Okapuu modifications



• OTAC analysis of 5-stage turbine (from previous slide), streamline





• OTAC analysis of 2-stage compressor, streamline, losses calculated using Aungier correlations



Axial-Flow Compressors: A Strategy for Aerodynamic Design and Analysis, Ronald H. Aungier, 2003

 comparison of OTAC and Japikse & Baines centrifugal compressor calculation, meanline, losses input

impeller exit	OTAC	Japikse
Pt, psi	31.17	31.17
Tt, R	653.5	653.7
Vm, ft/s	342.4	342.4
Vθ, ft/s	843.8	843.8
β flow, degrees	19.04	-19.04
α flow, degrees	67.91	67.91
slip factor	0.8772	0.8772
diffuser exit		
Pt, psi	30.04	30.04
Ps, psi	26.71	26.64
α flow, deg	55.99	50.94

Introduction to Turbomachinery, David Japikse and Nicholas C. Baines, 1994

Summary

- OTAC proof of concept verified correct results for compressors, turbines, axial, centrifugal, meanline, streamline, design and analysis
- extensive work on turbine loss models: Ainley-Mathieson, Kacker-Okappu, Dunham-Came, Moustapha-Kacker-Tremblay
- compressor loss model based on Aungier's method implemented
- further work includes additional loss models, improved logic for choked flow operation



Backup Slides

Meanline BladeRow Equation Set

continuity conservation of energy/Euler non-ideal process loss non-ideal process turning geometry constraint (radius) geometry constraint (area)

note: at design, β_{blade} and $A_{machine}$ may be input (direct-design) or varied to produce specific performance (indirect-design)

 $\dot{m}_{m2} = \dot{m}_{m1}$ $h_{t2} - h_{t1} = \omega(r_2 V_{\theta 2} - r_1 V_{\theta 1})$ $P_{t2} = P_{t2_{ideal}} - \Delta P_t$ $\beta_2 = \beta_{blade} + \delta$ $r_2 = r_{machine}$ $A_{flow2} = A_{machine} - A_{blockages}$



Streamline BladeRow Equation Set

- *n* continuity
- n energy/Euler
- *n* loss condition
- *n* flow follows blade
- *n-1* geometry constraint
- *1* geometry constraint
- *n-1* spanwise eq. $\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{dp}{dr} = \frac{V_{\theta}^2}{r}$
- *1* geometry constraint

n = number of streams i = stream number, 1 to *n* sum = aggregate value
$$\begin{split} \dot{m}_{m2_{i}} &= \dot{m}_{m1_{i}} \\ h_{t2_{i}} - h_{t1_{i}} &= \omega(r_{2_{i}}V_{\theta2_{i}} - r_{1_{i}}V_{\theta1_{i}}) \\ P_{t2_{i}} &= P_{t2_{ideal\,i}} - \Delta P_{t_{i}} \\ \beta_{2_{i}} &= \beta_{blade_{i}} + \delta_{i} \\ r_{2inner_{i+1}} &= r_{2outer_{i}} \\ r_{2sum} &= r_{machine} \\ \frac{1}{\rho_{i}} \frac{\Delta p_{i}}{\Delta r_{i}} &= \frac{V_{\theta_{i}}^{2}}{r_{i}} \\ A_{flow2sum} &= A_{machine} - A_{blockages} \end{split}$$



BladeSegment Object

responsible for differences between certain flow states entrance exit - actual exit - ideal h_t exit - ideal P_t



BladeSegment Object

multiple BladeSegments allow for radial variation of flow properties



BladeRow Object

responsible for differences between BladeSegments

holds blade row specific variables: annulus areas, number of blades, blade angles, power, etc.



Slide Master