https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=20170005216 2020-05-08T20:24:02+00:00Z

Approach to Modeling Boundary Layer Ingestion using a Fully Coupled Propulsion-RANS Model

Justin Gray,
Charles A. Mader, Gaetan K.W. Kenway,
Joaquim R. R. A. Martins

January 12th, 2017

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY of MICHIGAN ■ COLLEGE of ENGINEERING

Boundary Layer Ingestion (BLI) offers between 5% and 12% fuel burn savings

Aft-mounted BLI propulsor

Aft-mounted BLI engines



Mail-slot inlet BLI propulsors

NASA's Starc-ABL configuration applies BLI to a traditional airframe

Tube-with-wings configuration

Under-wing engines and generator



Electric BLI propulsor

The BLI propulsor is powered by an electric motor delivering a constant 3500 hp



Turboelectric propulsion system has an electric BLI propulsor powered by generators mounted on the under-wing turbofans

We simplified the configuration to focus on the coupled performance of the BLI propulsor



- Loosely based on 737 fuselage dimensions
- Removed wing, tail, and under-wing engines to simplify the analysis

BLI propulsor performance was compared to a podded configuration



Exact same propulsor geometry, including inlet, was used for both BLI and podded configurations

The propulsion analysis was a 1D thermodynamic cycle model



- modeled with pyCycle, a modular propulsion cycle tool built in the OpenMDAO framework

The aerodynamic analysis was a 2D axisymmetric RANS model

Mach contours



- ~170,000 cell mesh
- a single solve takes ~2 minutes

The analyses were coupled via a Gauss-Seidel iteration



- **pyCycle** $\rightarrow$ **ADflow**: fan-exit P_t and T_t and required $\dot{m}$ for 3500 hp
- **ADflow** $\rightarrow$ **pyCycle**: mass-averaged fan-face P_t and T_t
- GS and Broyden iterations implemented with OpenMDAO solvers

For any given FPR the propulsor is resized and the mass-flow across the propulsor is balanced



FPR = 1.2

FPR = 1.35

baseline

Performance is examined via net force coefficient

$$C_{F\text{-}x} = \frac{2f}{\rho_\infty V_\infty^2 A_{\text{ref}}}$$



- $C_{F\text{-fuse}}$ should be negative, a decelerating force (i.e. drag)
- $C_{F\text{-prop}}$ should be positive, an accelerating force (i.e. thrust)
- $C_{F\text{-}x}$ can be positive or negative

BLI offers 5 to 6 more force counts for the same 3500 hp to the propulsor



Propulsion-aerodynamic interactions cause the boundary layer height to vary with FPR



FPR = 1.2

FPR = 1.35

baseline

Propulsion-aerodynamic interactions cause the boundary layer height to vary with FPR



Improved propulsor performance accounts for 50-60% of the BLI performance gain

- Of the 5 to 6 total counts of improvement $C_{F\text{-}x}$, 3 counts come from increased $C_{F\text{-prop}}$



Fuselage drag reduction contributed 40-50% of the BLI performance gain

- Of the 5 to 6 total counts of improvement $C_{F\text{-}x}$, 2 to 3 counts come from smaller $C_{F\text{-fuse}}$



Reduction in $C_{F\text{-fuse}}$ comes from an increased surface static pressure on the aft-fuselage



- the change in surface static pressure profile is a strong function of FPR

The performance gains from BLI come from a combination of propulsion and aerodynamic effects

- Capturing BLI effects requires a coupled simulation
- Aerodynamic effects are strongly influenced by inlet design and throttle setting

The performance gains from BLI come from a combination of propulsion and aerodynamic effects

- Capturing BLI effects requires a coupled simulation
- Aerodynamic effects are strongly influenced by inlet design and throttle setting

Next step is to perform optimization of this configuration with propulsion and shape design variables

Thank you to:

- Transformational Tools and Technologies Project (TTT) for funding the OpenMDAO framework and pyCycle development
- Advanced Aviation Transportation Technologies (AATT) for funding my PhD research
- Jim Felder for his guidance and advice

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY of MICHIGAN ■ COLLEGE of ENGINEERING