

# Non-Contacting Finger Seals Static Performance Test Results at Ambient and High Temperatures

#### Margaret P. Proctor NASA Glenn Research Center Cleveland, OH 44135

52nd AIAA/SAE/ASEE Joint Propulsion Conference, AIAA Propulsion and Energy Forum and Exposition 2016 Salt Lake City, Utah July 25–27, 2016

#### Baseline Non-Contacting Finger Seal (NCFS)



2

### Non-Contacting Finger Seal—Pre-Test



- Haynes-188
- Temperatures up to 1089 K
- Radial clearance to rotor =  $24 \mu m$  (0.0009 in.)
- Lift pads ride over herringbone grooves

# Herringbone Grooves on Seal Test Rotor—Pre-Test



- Rotor O.D.: 216 mm (8.5 in.)
- Grainex Mar-M–247 rotor
- Chrome carbide coating (HVOF)
- Surface finish: 0.2 μm (8 μin.)
- 536 grooves (268 around circumference)
- Groove depth: 20 µm (0.0008 in.)
- Groove ends:
  - Begin at middle of circumferential groove on lift pads
  - Extend past low pressure edge of lift pads

# Builds 1 to 7



# High-Temperature, High-Speed Turbine Seal Rig



# Test Seal Configuration and Location of Research Measurements



7

#### **Flow Factor**



# **Test Procedure**

- Initial room temperature static test
- Bind-Up test
- Repeat room temperature static test
- Static test with bigger clearance
- Static performance test at 533, 700, and 922 K

# Static Leakage Performance of Non-Contacting Finger Seals at ~300 K



Pressure drop across seal, kPa

# Factors Contributing to Effect of 2X Aft Finger

#### 2X Aft Finger:

- Radial clearance is 6.35 µm smaller
- Seal land is 1.36 times longer
- Radial stiffness is 2 times greater
- Axial stiffness is 8 times greater

# Static Leakage Performance of Build 4 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 862 to 911 K



### Comparison of Static Leakage Performance of NCFS on Herringbone-Grooved Rotor to Smooth Rotor at ~300 K





# Static Leakage Performance of NCFS With Tapered Lift Pads and No Circumferential Groove



#### For Builds 6 & 7:

- Above 300 kPa, flow factor is similar to Build 4.
- At lower pressures, there is more hysteresis than Build 4 and a different curve shape.
- The peak at ~20 kPa suggests the lift pad initially moves away from rotor.
- Entire lift pad is the seal land.
- Tapers create a different pressure distribution under the lift pad.
- At 900 K, the peak in flow factor doesn't occur when decreasing pressure.



# **Bind-Up Test Results**

Table 6 Bind-up test results: Pressure differential across the seal, kPa											
	Build no.	Less free wheeling	Free wheeling stopped	Tight	Comment						
	1	83	124	248 (faint squeak)	2 N-m at 248 kPa						
	2	55	83	165-248	At 248 kPa light squeak						
	3	96.5	317	386							
	4	96.5	303	344	At 517 kPa very hard to turn						
	4 at 672 K	317	358	414							
	5a	68.9	262	372							
	5b	83	138	345	At 150 kPa, 6.8 N-m						
	6	83	248	414	At 414 kPa, 4 N-m						
	7	96.5	276	317 (faint squeak)							

- Maximum  $\Delta P$  Capability at 300 K ranged from ~100 to 300 kPa.
- Builds 3 & 4 with 2X Aft Finger had the greatest  $\Delta P$  Capability. •
- At 672 K, Build 4 radial clearance increased due to different • coefficients of thermal expansion and has more  $\Delta P$  Capability.

# Inspection of Build 1 After 922 K Static Performance Test

Heat marks Rub spots from bind-up test

 Heat marks indicate that flow fans out from point sources.

Damage from bind-up test ¬

 Bind-up is due to contact of seal land at the heel of aft finger.

# Conclusions

- 1.  $\Delta P$  and some rotation is needed to seat the seal for repeatable flow measurements.
- 2.  $\Delta P$  across the seal deflects the fingers to contact and bind the rotor.
  - Contact occurs at the heel of the aft finger.
  - Wear pattern suggests the aft finger may deflect axially and twist slightly and/or that the forward finger contacts the rotor as well.
  - The ΔP at which bind-up occurs increases with increased radial clearance.
- 3. Completely covering the gaps between aft fingers with forward fingers of the same ID significantly reduces leakage.
- 4. Longer seal lands as in the tapered lift pads can cause more leakage with increasing pressure due to lift of the fingers. The taper provides a path for more high pressure to access the lift pad ID and there is more area for the high pressure to act compared to lift pads with a circumferential groove.

# **Conclusions Continued**

5. The maximum ΔP capability of the NCFS tested at static conditions was ...

```
between ~100 to 300 kPa at 0 rpm.
```

Due to centrifugal growth of the rotor, the maximum  $\Delta P$  capability should be adjusted downward as speed is increased.

- 6. Build 4 (2X Aft Finger and same ID Forward Finger)
  - had the lowest flow factor of ~7 kg-K<sup>0.5</sup>/(MPa-m-s)
  - and the least hysteresis.
- 7. Performance testing below the maximum  $\Delta P$  capability is needed to determine if hydrodynamic lifting forces will prevent contact as the shaft grows with rotational speed.

# Backup slides

# Leakage Flow Model



#### Assumptions

- Isentropic flow
- Seal leakage area is sum of areas of each flow path
- Geometry is fixed
- Lift pads remain concentric to rotor
- Finger elements held tightly to each other and seal dam so there is no leakage between contacting areas
- Pressure in balance cavity equals seal inlet pressure

# Flow Areas

Build	Max to Min Ranking         No.       Flow area, mm²         3       50.0         5b       44.0         1       42.4         4       37.6         5a       36.4         2       30.0         5       14.9         7       14.9			Flow 1	Flow 2		
Build	ild Description		Flow areas (mm <sup>2</sup> )				
no.		A	At seal dam	Pin holes	Under lift pads	Total	
1	Baseline		13.8	13.0	15.6	42.4	
2	Baseline with same ID		13.8	0.6	15.6	30.0	
3	3 Baseline with two times aft finger		25.5	13.0	11.5	50.0	
4	Two times aft finger and same ID		25.5	0.6	11.5	37.6	
5a	Build 1 on smooth rotor		13.8	12.8	9.8	36.4	
5b	5b Build 3 on smooth rotor		25.5	12.8	5.7	44.0	
6	0.0127 mm circum. taper		13.0	0.3	1.6	14.9	
-	0.0127 mm axial taper		12.0	0.2	1.6	140	

### Predicted Flow Factor for Build 4



# Static Leakage Performance of Baseline Non-Contacting Finger Seal, Build 1, 276 to 294 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 2 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 297 to 299 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 3 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 301 to 303 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 4 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 303 to 304 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 5a Average Inlet Air Temperature = 280 to 292 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 5b Average Inlet Air Temperature = 282 to 289 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 6 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 283 to 294 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 7 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 275 to 298 K



# Static Leakage Performance of Build 7 Average Inlet Air Temperature = 866 to 908 K



## Leakage Flow Model

$$\dot{m} = \frac{P_u}{\sqrt{RT_u}} \cdot A\sqrt{\gamma}M\left(1 + \left(\frac{\gamma - 1}{2}\right)M^2\right)^{1/2\frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1}}$$
where
$$M = \left[\left(\left(\frac{P_u}{P}\right)^{\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma}} - 1\right)\frac{2}{\gamma - 1}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

For air ( $\gamma$  = 1.4), when P/P<sub>u</sub> ≤ 0.5283 the flow is choked

$$\dot{m} = \frac{P_u}{\sqrt{RT_u}} \cdot A \cdot (0.6847)$$