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Overview

• Project Maturation
  – Spinoff of QueSST

• Tech Development for LNP Tech Challenge
  – Evolution of VCE system studies
  – Exploration of low-noise nozzles for VCE
  – Modeling and prediction tool development
  – Validating current best solutions

• Looking Ahead
CST Project Maturation

• QueSST
  – The single-pilot X-plane to mimic sonic boom of commercial airliner
• Goals:
  – Demonstrate design prowess for low-boom design with real-world complications
  – Allow testing of community response to guide regulations for certification
Low-Noise Propulsion Tech Challenge 2016

- Supported by years of research:
  - S-Duct
  - 3-Stream, Externally Mixed, Offset Streams
  - Inverted Velocity Profile
  - LES validation
  - CFD validation
  - Fun3D
  - PIV
  - Jet-Surface Interaction Tests and Modeling (JSI)
  - RISN Acoustic Analogy
  - Empirical Modeling (TSS)
  - Non-axisymmetric Green F’n
Level 1 Milestone

- CST1.1.02.L1: Low Noise Propulsion for Low Boom Aircraft
- **Exit Criteria:** Design tools and innovative concepts for integrated supersonic propulsion systems with noise levels of 10 EPNdB less than FAR 36 Stage 4 demonstrated in ground test.

- Based on Lockheed-Martin 1044 airframe (L/D, cruise, boom)
- Explore propulsion cycle/nozzle options; focus on installed exhaust noise
- Validate in scaled model test with simulated planform

LM1044 N+2 vehicle
Design Tools

- Empirical Codes
  - Creation of NPSS engine model, ModelCenter aero model
  - Developed & validated TSS code to predict noise of many VCE nozzles
  - Developed & validated JSI code to predict acoustic impact of installation
  - Integration of models with ModelCenter system optimizer ongoing
  - Used to design low-noise/low-boom vehicle, final Tech Challenge configs

- RANS-based Acoustic Analogies
  - Developed non-axisymmetric Green’s function
  - Developed hot jet source models
  - Qualified several RANS codes (Wind US, FUN3D, FloEFD)
  - Quantitatively apply to isolated nozzles and qualitatively to installed propulsion
  - Primarily used for design guidance, insight (relative noise prediction)

- Large Eddy Simulations
  - Supported external community of developers (academic, SBIR, industry)
  - Explored spectrum of schemes from URANS to LES for noise capability
  - Making NRL’s JENRE code operational at NASA
  - Primarily used to diagnose unexpected resonance phenomena
Innovative Concepts

• Variable Cycle Engine (VCE)
  – Innovative variable cycle architecture based on DoD investment
  – Variable specific thrust attractive for higher BPR at airport, lower BPR at cruise
  – In-house and industry exploration. In-house designs used for Tech Challenge
  – Compare against state of art mixed flow turbofan (MFTF)

• Multiple nozzle concepts explored
  – Externally mixed nozzles
  – Offset stream tertiary nozzle
  – Inverted velocity profile (IVP)
  – Buffer flow on IVP
  – Mixer-ejector

• Impact of installations explored
  – Benefit of shielding/Cost of reflection
  – Jet-by-jet shielding

• Optimization of cycle vs range vs sonic boom
10dB below Stage 4

- Assume exhaust noise dominates at Lateral (sideline) certification point, not significant at Approach point
- FAR Part 36 Chapter 3 requires **99.3EPNdB** max at lateral for LM1044 airliner. Chapter 4 is 10dB (cumulative), with reduction at all points.
- Assuming that Approach is not dominated by exhaust noise, split remainder between Lateral and Flyover points.
  - Ch4 would require Lateral to be 95.3EPNdB.
  - Ch4 – 10 would require Lateral to be 92.3EPNdB
- **Ch4–10dB** equates to **92EPNdB** for the Lateral observer with an installed three-engine exhaust system
Engine Design

- Engine model exercised using design variables: # fan stages, nozzle type, FPR, BPR, T4
- Output lateral noise EPNL, range, engine diameter, emissions index
- Pick off designs that meet noise goal with and without PLR.

![Graph showing single-stage and two-stage fans with design points](image-url)
Noise vs Nacelle Diameter

- Engine diameter quantitatively impacts Range
- Engine diameter is soft limiter on sonic boom
  - At some point small adjustments cannot compensate
Validation of Empirical Models for VCE Nozzles

- Candidate nozzles from Isolated Nozzle Test (Iso16)
  - Externally mixed core, fan, tip flows
  - Internally mixed core & fan, conventional tipflow
  - Internally mixed core & fan, inverted tip flow
  - Optional; split tip flow to outer buffer
Impact of Nozzle Types on VCE engines

- Given cycle that gets close to target, compare impact of nozzle type
- ENPL vs throttle for two FPR = 1.9 engines (differ in BPR), different nozzle types in color
  - IVP, CVP nozzles make same noise at full throttle; IVP diverges at low throttle
  - Externally mixed is louder at full throttle; joins internally mixed nozzles at lowest throttle
  - Bypass ratio relatively unimportant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setpoint</th>
<th>At/Ap</th>
<th>Ab/Ac</th>
<th>At/Ac</th>
<th>(Ab+At)/Ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VCE vs MFTF

• Compare MFTF at FPR = 1.95
• Add MFTF engine/nozzle at same FPR

Compared to VCE with IVP or CVP nozzle:
- MFTF is EPNdB louder than IVP/CVP
- MFTF gains 50nmi
- MFTF is 6% larger diameter

Final integrated test:
- IVP and IVPS on three VCE engines cycles
- MFTF on two engine cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>FanD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFTF</td>
<td>8.177</td>
<td>4297.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCE</td>
<td>7.708</td>
<td>4241.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCE</td>
<td>7.685</td>
<td>4211.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstrated in Ground Test

- In 2015 a ‘static’ (no flight stream) test was conducted (JSI1044).
- Part of the test objective was to evaluate some critical aspects of the aircraft approximation.
  - How much of the vehicle has to be represented?
  - How many orientations must be measured?

Center Engine Configuration, 0° orientation  Outer Engine Configuration, 0° orientation
Matching flight stream for integrated propulsion on LM1044 vehicle

- Looking for
  - Disparities between nacelle diameter and jet rig diameter
  - Cross-stream flow from lifting body

CFD of full vehicle to characterize flow around nozzles

CFD of AAPL test article

Initial design

Refined design
Integrated Propulsion Test

- Test deliverables
  - EPNL for all certification observers, multiple engine solutions, to confirm milestone deliverable
  - Phased array of noise source distributions, confirmation of shielding/reflection
  - PIV of turbulent flow to validate CFD
Looking Ahead

• Complete LNP Tech Challenge—Sept 2016
• New Tech Challenge for CST Airport Noise
  – New aircraft configurations
  – Consider all noise components in system studies
  – More computation, less experiment
• Continue system modeling to guide tech investment
• Possible technologies for focus
  – Inlet design for low noise fans with efficient cruise performance
  – Nozzle designs to complement topside engine mounting
  – Increased fidelity of predictions in system modeling
  – Improved test methods for integrated propulsion