# **TFAWS Interdisciplinary Paper Session**



#### A Streamlined Approach to Spatial Mapping of Complex 3D Thermal Boundary Condition Data

Robert F. Hawkins (NASA/MSFC)

TFAWS LaRC 2019 Thermal & Fluids Analysis Workshop TFAWS 2019 August 26-30, 2019 NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA



# **Objective**



- The objective of this presentation is to outline the modeling techniques used with the integrated thermal analysis of a terrestrial lunar lander demonstrator. Specifically, the techniques outlined here will focus on spatial mapping of convective and radiative exhaust plume results from a computational fluid dynamics (CFD) analysis. Two cases were investigated:
  - Lunar lander demonstrator firing on-pad (worst case).
  - Lunar lander demonstrator hovering at an elevated position above the launch pad.

• For the purposes of information control, this presentation will focus on the modeling techniques only, using altered/dimensionless data where necessary.



## Background



- The lunar lander demonstrator modeled is known as XL-1T (terrestrial), born from a collaborative effort between Masten Space Systems (MSS) and NASA, under NASA's Lunar CATALYST (also known as Lunar Cargo Transportation and Landing by Soft Touchdown) initiative.
- The lander is a reusable vertical takeoff/vertical landing (VTVL) test bed which is controlled by four throttleable main engines utilizing green hypergolic propellants.







## Background



- The positioning of the engines creates a unique environment where baseflow physics creates a fountain plume that impinges directly on the base of the vehicle, greatly increasing convective plume loads.
- The two plume study cases differ in that the fountain plume reacts differently to the nozzle plumes. This difference is primarily attributed to the Coanda effect.
  - On-pad: the fountain plume oscillates between nozzle plumes, moving about the center of the vehicle base.
  - Elevated: the fountain plume attaches to two of the nozzle plumes, reducing base heating.





TFAWS 2019 - August 26-30, 2019





- The asymmetric geometry of XL-1T combined with the complex plume interactions creates a difficult plume environment to map to the thermal model.
- The Coanda effect is the tendency of a fluid jet to be attracted to an adjacent flat or curved surface. In this instance, the four adjacent nozzle plumes caused the fountain plume to oscillate across the vehicle base in the on-pad case and attach to two of the nozzle plumes during the elevated case. This phenomenon makes mapping plume flux data difficult in a spatial sense due to varying flux values at any given point on the vehicle surface.
- The plume data obtained from the CFD analysis was broken down by body points according to Cartesian coordinates on the vehicle surface. With each point the following data was provided:
  - Pressure (P)
  - Adiabatic Wall Temperature  $(T_{aw})$ , or Recovery Temperature  $(T_{rec})$
  - Incident Radiative Plume Flux  $(q_r)$
  - Cold Wall Convective Plume Flux  $(q_{cw})$
  - Ambient Temperature ( $T_{am}$ ), or Cold Wall Temperature ( $T_{cw}$ )





- Radiative flux values were incident values calculated using estimated optical properties, so the values could be applied directly to the corresponding points. However, convective flux values and accompanying convective heat transfer coefficients change depending on the vehicle temperature, requiring constant recalculation throughout the analysis.
- For these calculations the convective heat transfer formula can be written as the following:
- To account for the changing convective heat transfer, the same equation can be written with respect to the cold wall flux:

▶  $q_{cw} = h_c \cdot (T_{rec} - T_{cw})$ , where Tcw is the ambient temperature of the vehicle.

• Combining the two equations yields a relationship which calculates the convective flux while accounting for the change in the convective coefficient:

$$\succ \quad \frac{q_c}{q_{cw}} = \frac{T_{rec} - T_{surface}}{T_{rec} - T_{cw}} \text{ ,or } q_c = q_{cw} \cdot \frac{T_{rec} - T_{surface}}{T_{rec} - T_{cw}}$$



#### **Focused Model Overview**

 A select group of components were chosen for the focus area of plume application in the thermal model. These components were the highest risk areas and the ultimate goal of the analysis is to provide design inputs and recommendations for plume shielding and general thermal protection for the vehicle.





## **Plume Application**



- Thermal modeling was performed using Siemens Simcenter3D(SC).
- The fields capability of SC allowed direct inputs of the .csv raw data from the CFD analysis via embedded Excel files. These were separate Cartesian based fields with dependent variables representing  $q_{cw}$ ,  $q_r$ , and  $T_{rec}$ . Furthermore, these fields were delimited by associated component geometry of the vehicle (e.g.  $q_{cw}$  linked to plume shielding,  $q_{cw}$  linked to legs, etc.).

🗘 Table Field				×	185	0- +			
Name				^	HOM	E INSERT	PAGE LAYOU	T FORMULAS	DATA
Leg Cold Wa	ll Flux Data - Example			Pa	ste	Painter B	. <u>u</u> • <u>u</u> 1		
Label			3	5	Clipboard	6	Font	5	
Description			×	✓ G	5 *	1 × 4	✓ fx		
Domain				v				~ ~	
Domain				· .	A	B	C tin) has	D	E
Data Points				A 1	x (in)	y(in)	z (in) nea	55.4	
				3	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	69.5	
				4	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	56.4	
				5	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	69.1	
Page Contro	l: 1 of 5		N 1	V 6	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	54.8	
				7	-4.9	-6.0	-5,5	69.3	
Row ID	x (in) y (in) z (in) heat flux (	W/m²) *		0	4.5	-6.0	-0.0	54.Z	
1	4.876.05.4 55.3952		4	10	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	69.5	
2	-4.86.05.4 69.4784			11	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	45.5	
2	4.94 6.0 5.4 56.4056			12	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	56.3	
2	4.640.03.4 30.4030			13	-4.7	-6.0	-5.4	90.4	
4	-4.86.05.4 69.0904			14	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	83.3	
5	4.906.05.4 54.7954			15	4.7	-6.0	-5.4	71.0	
6	-4.9 -6.0 -5.4 69.284			17	-4.7	-6.0	-5.4	106.2	
-	4.5 5.4. 5.4.5.0			18	5.0	-6.0	-5.4	53.4	
/	4.806.05.4 54.1542			19	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	110.4	
8	-4.76.05.4 75.7614			20	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	115.0	
9	-4.96.05.4 69.4996			21	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	110.0	
10	4.02 6.0 5.4 45.500			22	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	\$4.6	
10	4.930.03.4 43.3008			24	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	86.2	
11	4.776.05.4 56.2728			25	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	116.8	
12	-4.76.05.4 90.4384			26	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	117.3	
12	-4.8 -6.0 -5.4 92.2012			27	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	91.8	
15	-4.00.03.4 85.2812		•	- 28	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	91.2	
				30	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	89.6	
			<b>∨ ∨</b>	31	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	115.8	
				32	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	122.6	
Options				33	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	84.4	
				34	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	114.4	
		ОК	Apply Carcel		4. 4	Leg Cold Wa	all Flux Data - I	éxa 🛞	
				RE	ur 🔝				

-	X Cut	Cali	bri	• 11 • A *	= = 🛄
Past	Copy			- 1 A . A .	
	* Format	Painter	1.11.1		
	Clipboard	6	F	ont ra	
HS	*	IX .	/ fx		
				220	1.22
4	A	6	C	D	E
1	x (in)	y (in)	z (in)	temperature (K) *	
4	4.9	-0.0	-3.3	332.3	
2	-4.3	-0.0	-3.5	200.4	
5	-4.9	-6.0	-3.3	375.0	
6	4.0	-6.0	.5.5	315.5	
7	-49	-6.0	.55	235.7	
8	4.8	-6.0	.5.5	383.1	
0	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	358.6	
10	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	224.0	
11	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	333.6	
12	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	388.7	
13	-4.7	-6.0	-5.4	392.3	
14	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	279.5	
15	-5.0	-6.0	-5.4	218.1	
16	4.7	-6.0	-5.4	405.7	
17	-4.7	-6.0	-5.4	402.2	
18	5.0	-6.0	-5.4	331.1	
19	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	230.1	
20	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	233.5	
21	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	240.1	
22	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	340.3	
23	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	346.1	
24	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	342.5	
25	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	254.6	
26	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	237.3	
27	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	353.9	
28	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	343.1	
29	4.9	-6.0	-5.5	338.8	
30	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	340.6	
31	-4.9	-6.0	-5.5	226.8	
32	-4.8	-6.0	-5.5	230.2	
33	4.8	-6.0	-5.5	345.7	
24	.4.8	-6.0	.55	245.1	

and



## **Plume Application**



- With the data represented in appropriate fields, loads can be created and mapped to applicable geometry.
- To utilize the preceding equations to recalculate convective flux values as the vehicle temperatures change, conditional statements can be used in the value field directly.





## **Plume Application**



• The radiative plume loading is more straight forward, requiring only to recall the field data stored for each set of geometry, along with time controls.





#### **Model Check**



 To check the mapping and convective calculations, the plume loads can be plotted via contour plots. This feature provides options to manually input surface temperatures for the calculations, or animating across a span of surface temperatures.

Boundary Condition Contour F	Plot OX	O Boundary Condition Contour Plot	υx
Solution Boundary Conditions	^	Solution Boundary Conditions	^
Name		Name	
DomeConvFluxFormula		DomeConvFluxFormula	<u>^</u>
BaseConvFluxFormula		BaseConvFluxFormula	
LegsConvFluxFormula		LegsConvFluxFormula	
EnginesConvFluxFormula		DomeBadElux	
DomeRadFlux		LegsRadFlux	
LegsRadFlux		BaseRadFlux	
BaseRadFlux		EnginesRadFlux	
EnginesRadFlux		Convection to Environment(2)	-
Convection to Environment(2)	-	Selected Boundary Conditions	^
Selected Boundary Conditions	^	Name Proj	perty
Name	Property	DomeConvFluxFormula Hea	it Flux
DomeConvEluxFormula	Heat Flux	BaseConvFluxFormula Hea	it Flux
BaseConvFluxFormula	Heat Flux		
		•	•
•	•	Plot Options	~
		Overlap Options Add	•
Plot Options	^	Value 0.0	
Overlap Options Add	-		
Value		Piot Type Animation	•
0.0	×	Independent Variable Temperature	•
Plot Type Static Plot	•	Start 300	К • •
Evaluation Points	^	Stop 900	К
		Number of Frames 600	
Temperature 0	К • •	Evaluation Points	•
V Time 0	s • •		~
		V Time 1	5 • •
	Close		Close



#### **Results/Conclusions**



- Plume loads mapped closely relative to CFD results and integrated thermal analysis results tracked as expected.
- The application of plume loads sped significantly by utilizing .csv raw data without data manipulation or external script routines.
- Running plume cases with plume loading can result in extended solve times.









- Carl J. Poplawsky (MAYA Heat Transfer Technologies)
- Jean-Frederic Ruel (MAYA Heat Transfer Technologies)
- Ten-See Wang (NASA/MSFC)
- Kyle Knox (NASA/MSFC)
- Matt Bergman (Masten Space Systems)
- Dan Popok (Jacobs ESSSA/MSFC)



#### References



 T.S. Wang, F. Canabal, K.S. Knox, R.F. Hawkins (NASA/MSFC), and M. Bergman (MSS). "Analysis of Base-Heating Environment During Ground Testing of a Lunar Lander Demonstrator". JANNAF 2019