NASACONTRACTOR


NASA CR-2446

HIGHLY LOADED MULTI-STAGE
FAN DRIVE TURBINE - PERFORMANCE OF FINAL THREE CONFIGURATIONS
by D. G. Cherry and M. W. Thomas

Prepared by
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
Cincinnati, Ohio 45215
for Lewis Research Center

national aeronautics and space administration - washington, d. C. - september 1974

*For sale by the National Technical Informạtion Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151
Page
SUMMARY ..... 1
INTRODUCTION ..... 2
AERODYNAMIC EVALUATION ..... 3
Test Vehicle ..... 3
Requirements ..... 3
Configurations Tested ..... 3
Test Apparatus and Instrumentation ..... 4
Test Facility ..... 4
Data Acquisition System ..... 5
Instrumentation ..... 5
Test Procedure ..... 6
Data Reduction Procedure ..... 8
Overall Performance ..... 8
Rotor Exit Survey Calculations ..... 8
Experimental Results and Discussion ..... 9
Test Cell Repeatability ..... 9
Overall Performance ..... 9
Stage Performance ..... 11
Rotor Exit Survey ..... 12
Recommended Improvements ..... 12
MECHANICAL EVALUATION ..... 14
SUMMARY OF RESULTS ..... 15
APPENDICES ..... 16
A OVERALL PERFORMANCE CALCULATION PROCEDURE ..... 16
B STAGE EFFICIENCY CALCULATION PROCEDURE ..... 20
C ANALYSIS OF INCIDENCE LOSSES ..... 23
D LIST OF SYMBOLS ..... 25
REFERENCES ..... 28
TABLES ..... 29
ILLUSTRATIONS ..... 42

## LIST OF TABLES

Table Page
I Reduced Test Data and Calculated Performance Parameters, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 29
II Reduced Test Data and Calculated Performance Parameters, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 32
III Reduced Test Data and Calculated Performance Parameters, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 35
IV Reduced Test Data and Calculated Performance Parameters, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). ..... 38
V Reduced Test Data and Calculated Performance Parameters, Configuration 5A (PPTP). ..... 39
VI Overall and Stage Performance Summary. ..... 41
Figure Page
1 Turbine Design.Velocity Diagrams. ..... 42
2 Three-Stage Turbine Flowpath. ..... 43
3 Two-Stage Turbine Flowpath. ..... 4445
Plain Blade Airfoils. ..... 45
Stage Two Tandem Stator Assembled. ..... 46
Stage Three Tangentially Leaned Stator Airfoils Viewed Aft Looking Forward. ..... 46
Stage Three Rotor Plain Blade. ..... 47
Stage Three Rotor Tandem Blade. ..... 47
Three-Stage Turbine Plain Blade Rotor Assembled. ..... 48
Typical General Electric, Evendale Air Turbine Test Facility Configuration. ..... 49
Air Turbine Test Instrumentation. ..... 50
Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratioat Design Equivalent Speed, Base Cases Compared.52
Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio at Design Equivalent Speed, Base Cases Compared. ..... 53
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio at Design Equivalent Speed, Base Cases Compared. ..... 54
Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 55
Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 56
Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 57
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 58
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 59
Figure Page
20 Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Weight Flow-Speed Parameter, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 60
21
Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 61Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total PressureRatio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).62
ivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total PressureRatio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).63
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 64
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 65
Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Weight Flow-Speed Parameter, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 66
Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 67
Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 68
Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 69
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 70
Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 11
Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Weight Flow-Speed Parameter, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 72
Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). ..... 73
Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). ..... 74
Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). ..... 75

| Figure |  | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). | 76 |
| 37 | Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). | 77 |
| 38 | Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Weight-Flow Speed Parameter, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). | 78 |
| 39 | Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration SA (PPTP). | 79 |
| 40 | Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total. Pressure Ratio, Configuration 5A (PPTP). | 80 |
| 41 | Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 5A (PPTP). | 81 |
| 42 | Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 5A (PPTP). | 82 |
| 43 | Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 5A (PPTP). | 83 |
| 44 | Predicted and Actual Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-toTotal Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). | 84 |
| 45 | Predicted and Actual Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). | 85 |
| 46 | Predicted and Actual Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration lA (PPPPPP). | $.86$ |
| 47 | Predicted and Actual Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). | 87 |
| 48 | Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio at Design Equivalent Speed, Three-Stage Turbine Configurations Compared. | 88 |
| 49 | Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio at Design Equivalent Speed, Three-Stage Turbine Configurations Compared. | 89 |
| 50a | Total-to-Total Efficiency Based on Measured Temperature Drop and Measured Inlet and Exit Total Pressures Vs. Measured Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio at. Design Speed, Configuration 2 (PPPP) and Configuration 4 (PPTP) Compared | 90 |

Figure Page
50b Total-to-Total Efficiency Based on Measured Torque and Calculated Inlet and Exit Total Pressures Vs. Calculated Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio at Design Equivalent Speed, Configuration 2 (PPPP) and Configuration 5A (PPTP) Compared. ..... 90
51 Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Config- uration 1A (PPPPPP), at Design Equivalent Speed. ..... 91
52
Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Config- uration 2A (PPPPLT), at Design Equivalent Speed. ..... 92
53
Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Config- uration 3A (PPTPLP), at Design Equivalent Speed. ..... 93
54
Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Config- uration 4A (PPTPPP), at Design Equivalent Speed. ..... 94
55 Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 95
56 Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 96
57 Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 9758 Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration 5A(PPTP).98
59
Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP). ..... 99
60 Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT). ..... 100
61 Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP). ..... 101
62 Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). ..... 102
63 Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 5A (PPTP). ..... 103
64 Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 2 (PPPP). ..... 104
Figure Page
65 Radial Efficiency Profile, Configuration 7 (PPPPLP) Compared with Configuration 1 (PPPPPP). ..... 105
66 Stage Three Incidence Angle Contour Plot, Typical for Two-Stage Tandem Turbine (PPTP). ..... 106
67 Stage Three Incidence Angle Contour Plot, Typical, for Two-Stage Plain Turbine (PPPP). ..... 107
68. Cascade Efficiency Vs. Incidence Angle, Typical for a Plain Stator. ..... 108

This report describes additional experimental results for a program which was originally conducted to investigate aerodynamic means for increasing turbine stage loading and turbine blade loading consistent with high efficiency (Reference 1). Four additional highly loaded fan drive turbines were tested: 1) a threestage turbine using all plain blading (base case), 2) a three-stage turbine with a ten-degree tangentially leaned stator and tandem rotor in stage three, 3) a three-stage turbine using a tandem stator in stage two, and 4) a threestage turbine using a tandem stator in stage two and a ten-degree tangentially leaned stator in stage three. Each turbine was designed to the same velocity diagram, and each used the same constant inside-diameter flowpath.

At design equivalent speed ( $3169.0 \mathrm{rev} / \mathrm{min}$ ) and design total-to-total pressure ratio (3.47) the turbine utilizing the stage two tandem stator (with all other bladerows plain) achieved an overall total-to-total efficiency of approximately 0.887 as compared to 0.886 for the all plain blade turbine. Although this represented the highest level of efficiency yet attained for a three-stage turbine in this program, it is well below the level predicted on the basis of previous tests results. Incidence loss on the stage three vane has been identified as the primary cause.

Retest of a two-stage turbine utilizng the stage two tandem stator confirmed the significant increase in two-stage total-to-total efficiency afforded by the use of this bladerow.

The development of high-bypass-ratio turbofan engines for future aircraft propulsion schemes requires the development of fan turbines with increasingly higher work output. The requirements of smaller turbine diameters and reduced rotative speeds generate the need for turbines with higher aerodynamic loadings.

The NASA Highly Loaded Multi-Stage Fan Drive Turbine Program was established to investigate advanced turbine afrfoil concepts to meet the requirements of higher loading while maintaining a high level of turbine aerodynamic performance.

During the initial planning of the program seven air turbine configurations were selected for testing which best represented the optimum test plan to evaluate the effects on overall turbine performance of the high lift devices which consisted of tandem stator and rotor airfoils and tangentially leaned stator airfoils.

The seven turbine configurations tested are described in detail in Reference 1. Test results are presented in tabular form in Table VIII of that report.

In view of the configurations that were tested, it became apparent that the testing of additional configurations with the existing airfoil hardware was required in order to completely isolate the individual effects of the tandem and leaned airfoils on the overall performance of the three stage turbine.

The program described herein was a nine-month follow-on investigation to provide additional experimental information on the performance of the existing airfoil bladerows.

The program was divided into three task items of activity. Under Task IA, Testing, five air turbine configurations were assembled and tested. Determination of the overall operating characteristics of these five configurations was accomplished under Task IIA, Data Reduction and Analysis. Task IIIA, Reporting, has as its purpose the orderly'presentation of all test results and analyses and is completed with this report.

## TEST VEHICLE

Requirements - The analysis and design of the three fan drive turbines which were investigated are presented in detail in References 3 through 5.. An existing highly-loaded fan drive turbine rotating rig was modified for the test and performance phase of the program. The turbine design requirements were scaled for a turbine exit tip diameter of 28.4 inches in order to utilize the existing test rig. The full-size and scaled turbine design requirements are presented below:

| Parameter | Full Size | Scaled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average Pitch Loading, $\frac{\mathrm{gJ} \mathrm{\Delta h}}{2 \Sigma \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{p}}} 2$ | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Equivalent Specific Work, E/ $\theta_{\text {cr }}$, (Btu/lbm) | 33.0 | 33.0 |
| Equivalent Rotative Speed, $\mathrm{N} / \sqrt{\theta_{\mathrm{cr}}}$, (rev/min) | 2000 | 3169 |
| Equivalent Weight Flow, $\mathrm{W} \sqrt{\theta_{\mathrm{cr}}} \mathrm{e} / \delta,(1 \mathrm{bm} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) | 70 | 28 |
| Inlet Swirl Angle (degrees) | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Swirl Angle Without Guide Vanes (degrees) | $\leq 5$ | $\leq 5$ |
| Maximum Tip Diameter (inches) | 45.0 | 28.4 |
| Number of Stages | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{W} \sqrt{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}}$ at Inlet | 108.4 | 43.16 |
| $\Delta h / T_{T}$ | 0.0635 | 0.0635 |
| $\mathrm{N} / \sqrt{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}}$ | 87.7 | 138.98 |

Configurations Tested - All bladerows tested in this program were designed to the three-stage turbine velocity diagrams presented in Figure 1. In order to further isolate the effects of the stage two tandem stator, the stage three tangentially leaned stator, and the stage three tandem rotor, a total of five configurations were tested. These configurations are described below.

| Configuration | Symbol <br> PPPPPP | Three-stage turbine with plain blading <br> in all bladerows. This configuration is <br> shown in Figure 2 and is the same as Con- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

figuration l of the original test series.
This turbine was run to verify test cell
repeatability from the original test
series.

Test Facility - The five turbine configurations were tested in the same General Electric Company's Evendale Air Turbine Test Facility as the original seven
configurations. A typical test facility configuration is shown in Figure 10. A detailed description of the facility as configured for this program is presented in Reference 1.

Data Acquisition System - The data acquisition system for the test facility is capable of recording up to 200 temperatures and 350 pressures, in addition to other specific turbine performance parameters.

Temperature measurements are obtained using Chromel-Alumel thermocouple wire. Corrections for temperature recovery over the expected range of Mach numbers and for flow incidence angles are made in the cell data reduction program.

Pneumatic pressure signals from the turbine rig are fed to precision strain gage pressure transducers within the control room.

For a detailed description of the test cell data acquisition system and calibration techniques, see Reference 1.

Instrumentation - Figure 11 shows the location of the instrumentation used in the testing of the five turbine configurations. An instrumentation scheme was used which permitted removal of downstream turbine stages without requiring the reinstrumentation of upstream stages.

Turbine inlet instrumentation was affixed to the leading edge of the inlet strut frame on each of ten struts located 36 degrees apart, and approximately ten inches upstream of the first stage stator. Turbine inlet temperature was measured with 25 Chromel-Alumel thermocouples mounted in high recovery stagnation tubes affixed to the leading edge of the inlet strut frame on each of five struts 72 degrees apart. They were located radially at the area centers of five equal annular areas.: Inlet total pressure was measured with 25 Kiel-type probes located in an identical manner as the total temperatures above, but on five alternate struts 72 degrees apart. These pressures were measured independently by means of the scanner-transducer system and then arithmetically averaged in the data reduction program. They were also pneumatically averaged, using a specially designed averaging block, measuring an average output on a single pressure transducer.

Inlet static pressure was measured with five equally spaced static pressure taps located on both the inner and outer flowpaths in a straight annular section about 1.7 inches upstream of the first stage stator. These static pressure taps were used to check the circumferential uniformity of the flow and to calculate the turbine inlet total pressure.

Interstage static pressures were measured with four static pressure taps installed on both inner and outer flowpath casings, approximately 90 degrees removed, in the cavity area before and after each stator.

Turbine outlet total temperature and total pressure were measured with six fixed circumferential arc rakes 60 degrees apart, located radially at the centers of six equal annular areas, and approximately four inches downstream of the last stage rotor. A total of 36 total temperatures and 72 total pressures
were measured. Each rake contained twelve Kiel-type pressure elements located side-by-side, and six shielded thermocouple elements side-by-side. The total pressures were averaged both arithmetically and pneumatically in the same manner as the inlet pressure measurements.

Six turbine outlet static pressures were measured on both the inner and ourer flowpaths. Elements were spaced 60 degrees apart and were located approximately four inches downstream of the last stage rotor.

Turbine outlet total temperature and total pressure were additionally measured by a radially and circumferentially traversing combination probe. A fast response pressure differential servo-system aligned the probe with the flow and provided an electrical output proportional to the flow angle. Total temperature, total pressure and flow angle were recorded on $X-Y$ chart recorders as functions of either radial immersion or circumferential position. The probe was located approximately one inch downstream of the last stage rotor.

Air flow to the turbine was measured using a calibrated circular arc venturi which was operated at critical flow conditions. The venturi inlet pressure and temperature were measured using wall static pressure taps and Chromel-Alumel air thermocouple probes located upstream of the venturi throat.

Three independent speed measurements were provided by an indicating system consisting of a 60 -tooth gear attached to the turbine shafting and three stationary magnetic sensors located very close to the gear teeth. Electrical impulses resulting from the passing of each tooth provided an electrical frequency proportional to turbine speed. Electrically time integrating this signal provided the speed indication, accurate within $\pm 1 \mathrm{rpm}$. During the course of each data reading, twelve different samples of speed were recorded and arithmetically averaged.

The torque measurement system consisted of a dual bridged shaft-mounted tdrque sensor. The strain sensitive spool section was located between the turbine shaft and the waterbrake shaft with a specially designed silp ring mounted behind the waterbrake to transmit electrical signals to the digital recorder. Each bridge was excited with its own independent electronics system and read out or displayed through the digital data acquisition system.

Torque calibrations were performed in place using a precision torque arm and dead weights, whose weight values are traceable to the National Bureau of Standards. Dead weight calibrations were conducted prior to each test run to verify repeatability of torque zeros and bridge linearity. In addition, extensive temperature calibrations were made to define torque zero and modulus changes over the operational temperature range, even though these effects are less than 0.25 percent.

## TEST PROCEDURE

The turbine inlet conditions were set at $700^{\circ} \mathrm{R}$ and 30 psia at all test points.

The performance mapping of the turbine was accomplished by selecting test points within the following range of variables:

- Speed - from 80 to 120 percent of design speed
- Pressure ratio - from that corresponding to approximately 75 percent design ideal enthalpy drop to a pressure ratio corresponding to approximately 105 percent design ideal enthalpy drop except configuration 4A which was not tested below a pressure ratio corresponding to approximately 93 percent of design ideal enthalpy drop.

The following performance data were obtained at each test point:

- Turbine weight flow
- Rotative speed
- Torque
- Inlet total temperature
- Inlet total and static pressures
- Exit absolute flow angles
- Exit total and static pressures
- Exit total temperatures
- Flowpath hub and tip interstage static pressures

Three complete sets of data were recorded at each test point and processed through the on-line computer which permitted an immediate evaluation of the reduced data.

Key performance parameters were continually monitored to insure accuracy and consistency of the test data. The design point was periodically reset throughout the testing to monitor the repeatability of the facility and the design point calculations.

One radial and three circumferential traverses were made at each test point to record the turbine exit total pressure, total temperature and absolute flow angle. The circumferential traverses were taken at 10,50 , and 90 percent of the last stage rotor blade height.

A detailed rotor exit survey was made at the design speed and design pressure ratio for each of the four three-stage turbine configurations tested. The survey for each configuration included seven circumferential traverses of total temperature, total pressure, and flow angle at the radial centers of seven equal annular areas. The traverses encompassed at least two last stage stator wakes.

## DATA REDUCTION PROCEDURE

Overall Performance - Two calculation schemes were used to reduce the overall performance data. The two methods differed in only one respect. The preliminary test cell data reduction program used measured exit total pressures for all performance calculations while the final data reduction was performied using calculated exit total pressure. This exit total pressure was calculated using continuity by determining an integrated average flow angle from the traverses and combining it with the exit total temperature based on measured torque and the average of measured exit hub and tip static pressures.

A more detailed description of all the calculation procedures used in the data reduction may be found in Appendix A.

The following overall performance parameters were calculated for each of the three readings taken at each test point.

1. Calculated total-to-total pressure ratio as obtained from indirect measurement.
2. Calculated total-to-static pressure ratio as obtained from indirect measurement.
3. Equivalent speed.
4. Equivalent weight flow.
5. Equivalent weight flow-speed parameter (product of equivalent speed and weight flow).
6. Equivalent torque
7. Equivalent specific work
8. Ideal equivalent specific work
9. Efficiency (total-to-total).
10. Blade-jet speed ratio

These parameters are presented in Tables $I$ through $V$ for turbine configurations la through 5A respectively.

Stage Performance - Calculations were performed to determine the efficiency of each stage of the various turbine configurations when the three stage turbine was operating at its design speed and design total-to-total pressure ratio. Design total-to-total pressure ratio for the three stage plain ©lade turbine (Configuration 1A) was defined to be that at which the design equivalent specific work of $33.0 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{lbm}$ was extracted. All stage efficiency calculations were performed with a three-stage turbine total-to-total pressure ratio of 3.47. In
order to determine the stage efficiencies, it was necessary to determine the key performance parameters of the two-stage and one-stage turbine when the three-stage turbine was operating at its design point. Basic to the stage efficiency calculation was the assumption that removal of downstream turbine stages did not alter the design point performance of the two-stage and onestage turbines, e.g., the two-stage turbine behaved identically when run by itself and when run in the three-stage turbine.

A detailed outline of the stage efficiency calculation along with a sample calculation is presented in Appendix B.

Rotor Exit Survey Calculations - The rotor exit surveys of total pressure, total temperature, and absolute flow angle, which were taken at the design point of each turbine configuration, were used to construct contour plots of local efficiency and local absolute flow angle. Local efficiencies were calculated from the following parameters:

- Measured inlet total temperature
- Calculated inlet total pressure based on continuity using measured inlet static pressure and measured airflow
- Local exit total pressure measured by the traverse probe
- Local exit total temperature measured by the traverse probe

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Test Cell Repeatability - In order to verify the consistency of air turbing test facility data acquired during this test series with that acquired during the original test series, the three-stage turbine with all plain bladerows was rerun as a base case. Figures 12 through 14 present design speed curves of equivalent torque, equivalent weight flow, and turbine total-to-total efficiency versus turbine total-to-total pressure ratio for Configuration 1A (PPPPPP) of this series and Configuration 1 (also PPPPPP) of the original series. These plots confirm the test cell repeatability, thus establishing a base for comparison between the original turbine test series and this follow-on test series.

Overall Performance - The reduced data and calculated parameters are presented in the following curves for each turbine configuration:

1. Equivalent torque versus calculated total-to-total pressure ratio.
2. Equivalent weight flow versus calculated total-to-total pressure ratio.
3. Equivalent specific work versus calculated total-to-total pressure ratio.

4: Total-to-total effieiency versus calculated total-to-total pressure ratio.
5. Total-to-total effieiency versus blade-jet speed ratio.
6. Equivalent specific work versus equivalent weight flow - speed parameter with lines of constant calculated total-to-total pressure ratio, constant speed, and constant efficiency.

The above curves utilize constant values of equivalent speed as a parameter and are shown in Figures 15 through 43.

In Figures 44 through 47 , some of the reduced data for the plain blade turbine build (Configuration 1A) are compared to the pretest predictions which were originally presented in Reference 3. The data show reasonable agreement with predictions in the vicinity of the design point, with some divergence occurring at far off-design points. The predictions were made with the use of an off-design turbine computer program (Reference 6) and some disagreement was expected because of the assumptions used in the program. The computer program uses constant loss coefficients (such as bladerow efficiencies and rotor and stator total pressure recovery factors) at each operating point. The differences seen in the equivalent weight flow versus pressure ratio curves was attributed partially to the coefficients used in the computer program, and partially to variations in bladerow throat areas in the assembled hardware compared to design intent.

In Figure 48, total-to-total efficiency versus total-to-total pressure ratio for the design equivalent speed line is compared for all three-stage turbine configurations. At the design point (Pressure ratio $=3.47$ for Configuration 1A) the efficiencies fell within four-tenths of one-percent of each other. Configuration 2A (PPPPLT) exhibited the lowest design point efficiency of all the three-stage builds, due primarily to a lower bladerow efficiency for the stage three tandem rotor (see Stage Performance). Configuration 3A (PPTPLP) showed no significant increase in design point efficiency over the base case (Configuration 1A-PPPPPP), and Configuration 4A (PPTPPP) demonstrated an advantage of less than one-tenth of one-percent in design point efficiency over the base case. While this represents the highest level of efficiency yet attained in this program, it is well below the full one-percent increase predicted for Configuration 4A on the basis of test results from a two-stage turbine utilizing the stage two tandem stator (Table VIII, Reference 1). The discrepancy between the expected level of performance and the level realized during actual test can be partially explained by the fact that a high stage exit swirl from the two-stage turbine with a tandem stage two stator (see Rotor Exit Survey, this report) resulted in excessive positive incidence on the stage three stator, a bladerow which is characterized by its extreme sensitivity to positive incidence. A detailed analysis of the losses associated with the higher positive incidence is presented in Appendix C. Results of that analysis indicate that a loss of approximately one-half of one-percent in three-stage turbine efficiency is attributable to excessive positive incidence on the stage three stator. Thus most of the benefit derived from the improved performance of the tandem stage two is masked in the three-stage build by a poorly performing stage three. The fact that Configuration 3A (PPTPLP) performance is below that of Configuration 4 A seems to indicate that the incidence problem is accentuated somewhat by stator lean.

In Figure 49, equivalent weight flow versus total-to-total pressure ratio for the design equivalent speed line is compared for all three-stage configurations. Note that the equivalent weight flow for the configurations utilizing the tandem stage two stator is lower than that for the configurations utilizing the plain stator in stage two. This difference in flow was also noticed during the original test series and is reported in Reference 1.

Figures 50a and 50b present total-to-total efficiency versus total-to-total pressure ratio for the two-stage turbines. Figure 50a compares efficiency based on measured total temperature drop across the turbine and measured inlet and exit total pressures for Configuration 4 (PPTP) and Configuration 2 (PPPP), both from the original test series. This is included to further substantiate the improved performance of the two-stage tandem turbine which was originally reported in Reference 1. Figure 50b compares efficiency based on measured torque and calculated inlet and exit total pressures for Configuration 5A (PPTP) and Configuration 2 (PPPP). Again, the advantage afforded by the tandem stator is obvious.

In Figures 51 through 54 , curves of static pressure normalized by inlet total pressure versus axial station are presented for various turbine pressure ratios to illustrate the interstage hub and tip static pressure behavior of the 3-stage turbine configurations. Figure 51 (Configuration 1A - PPPPPP) indicates that the stage one rotor hub at lower pressure ratios had positive reaction and as pressure ratio increased, the reaction became negative. Stage one was designed for approximately eight percent positive hub reaction, while test data indicated slightly negative hub reaction at the design point. Figure 51 also indicates that the stage three rotor hub at lower pressure ratios had positive reaction which became negative reaction as the pressure ratio increased. In this case, the stage three rotor hub was designed for approximately twenty percent negative reaction. Figures 52 and 53 , normalized static pressure for Configurations 2A (PPPPLT) and 3A (PPTPLP) respectively, illustrate the influence of the stage three tangentially leaned stator on reaction. Both of these leaned stator configurations had a positive reaction stage three rotor throughout their entire operating range.

Stage Performance - Stage performance calculations were performed to evaluate the performance of the all-plain third stage in Configuration 4A (PPTPPP) and of the leaned/tandem (/LT) third stage in Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).

In Appendix $B$ of Reference 1 , the stage efficiency of the all-plain third stage (/PP) was calculated to be 0.923 while operating in Configuration 1 (PPPPPP). In Appendix B of this report, however, the efficiency of that same state was calculated to be only 0.877 while operating in Configuration: 4A (PPTPPP). The major part of this third stage performance decrement has been attributed to the positive incidence problem, previously discussed, that arises when the stage two tandem stator is used in the three-stage builds. The reader is again referred to Appendix $C$ of this report for a more detailed analysis of the incidence loss problem.

The combination of the stage three tangentially leaned stator and stage three tandem rotor was calculated to have a stage efficiency of 0.909 while operating in Configuration 2A (PPPPLT), while the combination of the stage three plain stator and the stage three tandem rotor exhibited a stage efficiency of 0.918 operating in Configuration 5 (PPPPPT) of the original test series. Stage three efficiency attained utilizing all plain blading was 0.923 . These results indicate that the stage three tandem.rotor is inherently less efficient than the stage three plain rotor, even when operating in the improved pressure field generated by the leaned stator.

Results of stage performance calculations for this program and for the original program are summarized in Table VI of this report.

Rotor Exit Survey - Turbine efficiency contour plots showing local efficiency as a function of radius ratio and circumferential position for each turbine configuration design point are presented in Figures 55 through 58. These plots are useful for observing trends in so far as they indicate the regions of high efficiency at the pitchline between the last stage stator wakes and the regions of low efficiency in the vicinity of the tip, with a large decrease in efficiency toward the hub.

The temperature and pressure data used to construct these plots were manually read from the $X-Y$ charts produced by the traversing survey probe. The accuracy of this technique is only sufficient to determine local trends and not absolute level of local efficiency; thus, the reader is cautioned against drawing conclusions about the relative performance of the various turbine configurations from these contour plots.

Figures 59 through 64 present contour plots showing local exit swirl angle as a function of radius ratio for each turbine configuration design point. The distinguishing characteristic among the three-stage turbines is the difference in swirl gradient from hub to tip for those turbines utilizing the stage three tangentially leaned stator (Configuration 2A-PPPPLT, and Configuration 3A-PPTPLP) as opposed to those utilizing the plain stator (Configuration 1A-PPPPPP, and Configuration 4A-PPTPPP). The stator lean tends to bring the hub and tip swirls closer to the pitch value. This trend was also reported in Reference 1.

The swirl contour for Configuration 2 (PPPP) of the original test series is included. as Figure 64 to provide a comparison with Configuration 5A (PPTP), shown in Figure 63. This comparison clearly illustrates the increased level of swirl for the two-stage tandem turbine.

Recommended Improvements - The results of this follow-on series of air turbine tests together with the test results from the original program (see Reference l) suggest the following areas of potential improvement in three-stage turbine performance:

1. Stator Redesign
a) Redesign the stage two and stage three stators for slightly negative incidence as indicated by the results of the rotor exit survey and cascade test results (see Reference 2). The anticipated improvement in three-stage turbine design point efficiency fesulting from such a redesign is one-half of one-percent (see Appendix C).
b) Investigate a tandem arrangement for the stage three stator using the same solidity as the stage three plain stator.
c) Redesign all stators using a curvilinear lean distribution, with positive lean at the hub and negative lean at the tip. Figure 65 presents the radial efficiency profiles for Configuration 1
(PPPPPP) and Configuration 7 (PPPPLP) of the original program. This comparison illustrates the improved performance in the hub region realized by using a stator with constant $10^{\circ}$ positive tangential lean (see Figure 6). Note, however, that a definite performance penalty was incurred at the tip. Similar results were noted in Reference 7, where stators with curvilinear lean reduced losses significantly in annular cascades with sloped outer walls:
2. Rotor Redesign

Redesign all rotors for slightly negative incidence to provide a high level of performance at both design and off-design operating conditions. Cascade test results reported in Reference 2 indicate a high sensitivity to angle of attack.
3. Non-Free Vortex Velocity Diagram

Establish a radial work distribution to extract more work in the high performance pitch region and to unload the hub and tip regions. This would effectively decamber the bladerows near the endwalls, resulting in lower secondary losses in these regions. The radial efficiency profiles in Figure 65 provide some indication of the need to reduce the strong endwall secondary flow fields.
4. Redesign the Three-Stage Turbine to Include Outlet Guide Vanes (O.G.V.'s)

Addition of 0.G.V.'s to the three-stage turbine would allow a more highly loaded third-stage, resulting in a more uniform stage energy split and a positive reaction stage three rotor, while keeping turbine exit swirl within desired limits. Reference 8 reports the test results for a very highly loaded 4-1/2-stage turbine in which the use of o.G.V.'s resulted in a loss of approximately one-half of one-percent in measured total-to-total efficiency relative to a four-stage con-.. figuration without 0.G.V.'s. The concept of a 3-1/2-stage turbine involves a tradeoff between diffusion losses in the O.G.V.'s and the anticipated advantages to be gained from redistribution of energy splits. A parametric study incorporating the experimental results of Reference 8 into several different 3-1/2-stage turbine velocity diagrams is suggested to determine the practicality of such a design.

## MECHANICAL EVALUATION

The plain and tandem rotor blades were vibration and fatigue tested as part of the original program in order to insure their mechanical integrity during test.

The vibration analysis consisted of bench testing to confirm analytically established natural frequencies and node patterns (see References 3 and 4) for the plain and tandem airfoils.

Bench fatigue endurance testing was carried out to isolate possible failure regions and corresponding stress levels.

Results of this testing are presented in Reference 1 and indicated that the blade rows possessed sufficient mechanical integrity for successful operation in the air turbine.

Four highly loaded fan drive turbines were tested: (1) a three-stage turbine using all plain blading (base case), (2) a three-stage turbine with a ten-degree tangentially leaned stator and a tandem rotor in stage three, (3) a three-stage turbine using a tandem stator in stage two, and (4) a three stage turbine using a tandem stator in stage two and a ten-degree tangentially lean stator in stage three. Each turbine was designed for the same velocity diagram and each used the same flowpath. The most significant results of the testing and evaluation are summarized below:

1. At the design speed and pressure ratio $\left(P_{T_{0}} / P_{T 3}=3.47, N / \sqrt{\theta_{c r}}=3169.0\right)$ the plain blade turbine (Configuration $1 A$ - PPPPPP) achieved an overall total-to-total efficiency of 0.886 .
2. The significant increase in design point total-to-total efficiency which was predicted for the tandem turbines (Configuration 3A PPTPLP and Configuration 4A - PPTPP) on the basis of previous testing of the stage two tandem stator did not materialize during test. Excessive positve incidence on the stage three stator in these configurations has been identified as the primary cause. Configuration 4 A (PPTPPP) did, however, exhibit a design point efficiency of approximately 0.887 , the highest level of performance yet attained in this program.
3. The use of a stage three tandem rotor in Configuation 2A (PPPPLT) resulted in a penalty of approximately two-tenths of one percent in total-to-total efficiency.
4. Retest of the two-stage tandem turbine (Configuration 5A-PPTP) confirmed the significant increase in two-stage turbine total-to-total efficiency afforded by the use of a tandem stator in stage two.

## APPENDIX A

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE CALCULATION

Flow Angle - In order to evaluate turbine performance on the basis of turbine exit total pressure calculated from continuity, an average turbine exit flow angle was determined. The turbine exit flowpath was divided into streamtubes, and measured values of swirl angles, total pressure, and total temperature were used to satisfy continuity within each streamtube. The turbine exit measured static pressure was assumed to vary linearly from hub to tip. The determination of the average turbine exit flow angle processed as follows:

$$
\rho_{a v g} V_{a v g} A_{a n n} \cos \Gamma_{a v g}=\sum_{i=1} \rho_{i} V_{i} A_{i} \cos \Gamma_{i}
$$

where:


$$
\begin{aligned}
v_{a v g} & =\binom{v_{u}^{2}+v_{z a v g}^{2}}{\text { where } \quad v_{a v g}}^{1 / 2} \\
v_{a v g} & =\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} W_{i} v_{i} \sin \Gamma_{i}\right) / \sum_{i=1}^{m} W_{i} \\
v_{z a v g} & =\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} W_{i} v_{i} \cos \Gamma_{i}\right) / \sum_{i=1}^{m} W_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\quad V_{i}=\sqrt{2 g J c_{p} T_{T_{i}}\left[1-\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}_{S}}{P_{T}}\right)_{i}^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}\right]}$
$V_{u}=$ Tangential component of absolute velocity
$V_{z} \quad=$ Axiai component of absolute velocity
$W_{i} \quad=$ Weight flow through $i-t h$ streamtube $=\rho_{i} V_{i} A_{i} \cos \Gamma_{i}$
The average turbine exit total temperature was determined through an energy balance of the annular streamtubes.

$$
T_{T_{a v g}}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} W_{i} T_{T_{i}}\right) / \sum_{i=1}^{m} W_{i}
$$

The average density at the turbine exit was obtained from the equation of state.

$$
\rho_{\text {avg }}=\frac{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{S}_{\text {avg }}}}{\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{S}}}}
$$

where

$$
T_{S_{a v g}}=T_{T_{a v g}}-\frac{v_{a v g}^{2}}{2 g J c_{p}}
$$

Overall Performance - After obtaining the average turbine exit flow angle, the exit total pressure was calculated in the following manner:

$$
P_{T_{3}}=P_{S_{3}}\left(1+\frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_{3}^{2}\right)^{\gamma / \gamma-1}
$$

Turbine exit Mach number, $M_{3}$, was determined from the following relationship:

$$
\frac{\sqrt[W]{R T_{T}}}{P_{S} A_{a n n} \cos \Gamma_{a v g}}=\sqrt{\gamma g} M_{3} \sqrt{1+\frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_{3}^{2}}
$$

Turbine exit total temperature, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{3}}$, was determined as follows:
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{3}} & =\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{\infty}}-\frac{\Delta \mathrm{h}}{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}} \\
\Delta \mathrm{~h} & =\frac{2 \pi \mathrm{NT}}{60 \mathrm{JW}} \\
\mathrm{~N} & =\text { Turbine rotative speed, rev/min } \\
\tau & =\text { Measured torque, ft-lbf } \\
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{OO}}} & =\text { Measured turbine inlet total temperature, }{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{R} \\
\mathrm{~W} & =\text { Measured turbine weight flow, lbm/sec }
\end{aligned}
$$

Turbine inlet total pressure was calculated in the same manner as the turbine exit total pressure. The calculation used measured airflow, measured inlet total temperature, the average of measured hub and tip static pressures, and the assumption of zero inlet swirl angle.

The remaining parameters used in the overall performance calculation were obtained as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta & =\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{O}}} / 14.696 \\
\theta_{\text {cr }} & =\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{OO}}} / 518.688 \\
\varepsilon & =1.0(\text { for } \gamma=1.4)
\end{aligned}
$$

Equivalent Speed, $N$ EQV $=N / \sqrt{\theta_{c r}}$
Equivalent Weight Flow, $W A E Q V=W \sqrt{\theta} \mathrm{cr} \varepsilon / \delta$
Weight Flow-Speed Parameter, WAN EQV $=\mathrm{WN} \varepsilon / 60 \delta$

Equivalent Torque, $T Q E O V=\tau \varepsilon / \delta$
Equivalent Specific Work, $D H E Q V=\frac{E}{\theta_{c r}}=\frac{2 \pi \mathrm{~N} \tau}{60 \mathrm{~J} \theta_{c r}} \mathrm{~W}$
Ideal Equivalent Specific Work, DHI EQV =

$$
\left(\frac{E}{\theta_{c r}}\right)_{\text {ideal }}=c_{p} T_{T_{o o}}\left[1-\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}_{3}}{{ }_{P_{T}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}\right] / \theta_{\mathrm{cr}}
$$

Total-to-total Efficiency, ETA.TT =

$$
\Pi_{\mathrm{TT}}=\left(\frac{\mathrm{E}}{\theta_{\mathrm{cr}}}\right) /\left(\frac{\mathrm{E}}{\theta_{\mathrm{cr}}}\right)_{\text {ideal }}
$$

Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, U/CO $=$

$$
v=\left\{\frac{\mathrm{KN}^{2}}{\left.\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{oo}}\left[1-\left(\frac{\mathrm{P}_{3}}{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{0}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}\right]}^{,}\right\}^{1 / 2} .}\right.
$$

where:

$$
K=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\pi D_{P_{i}}}{720}\right)^{2} / 2 g J
$$

where:

$$
\mathrm{m} \text {. = number of turbine stages }
$$

$D_{p} \quad=$ pitchline diameter of the i-th rotor

## APPENDIX B

STAGE EFFICIENCY CALCULATION

Calculations were performed to determine the efficiency of the third stage of Configuration 2A (PPPPLT) and of Configuration 4A (PPTPPP) with both three stage turbines operating at the design point. In order to compare the stage efficiencies on an equal basis, calculations were performed for a three-stage turbine total-to-total pressure ratio of 3.47 . This is the pressure ratio at which the design equivalent specific work of $33.0 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{lbm}$ is extracted when the three-stage plain blade turbine operates at the design equivalent speed.

The calculation procedure is outlined below:

1. Enter curves of equivalent specific work versus total-to-total pressure ratio at design equivalent speed for the three-stage turbines to obtain equivalent specific work at a pressure ratio of 3.47 .
2. Enter three-stage turbine curves of normalized static pressure versus total-to-total pressure ratio at a pressure ratio of 3.47 to determine normalized static pressure at the hub and tip of stage two exit.
3. At the stage two normalized hub and tip exit static pressures, enter curves of normalized static pressuer versus total-to-total pressure ratios across the two-stage turbines.
4. Enter curves of equivalent specific work versus total-to-total pressure ratio for the two-stage turbine to determine its equivalent specific work.
5. Using the above information and Keenan and Kaye's Gas Tables (Reference 9), calculate the stage efficiencies.

The following example shows how the efficiency of the all plain third stage (/PP) operating behind the two-stage tandem combination ( $\mathrm{PP} / \mathrm{TP}$ ) was calculated using test results for configuration 4A (PPTPPP) and Configuration 5A (PPTP).

1. At $\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{0}} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{3}}\right)_{4 \mathrm{~A}}=3.47$, $\left(\mathrm{E} / \theta_{\mathrm{cr}}\right)_{4 \mathrm{~A}}=33.05 \mathrm{Btu} / 1 \mathrm{bm}$.
2. At Stage Two exit, $P_{s} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{O}}}=0.300$
3. For the two-stage turbine, $\left({ }_{\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{o}}\right.} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{1.5}}\right)_{5 \mathrm{~A}}=2.66$
4. For the two-stage turbine, $\left(E / \theta_{c r}\right)_{5 A}=26.78$
5. Stage efficiencies are calculated from the above information and the accompanying sketch which was constructed using Table 1 of Reference 9 .

| Configuration 4A | $\mathrm{E} / \theta_{\text {cr }}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Stage 1 \& Stage 2 | 26.78 | 36.141 |
| Stage 3 | 6.27 | 8.462 |
| Total | 33.05 | 44.603 |



Stage Three Efficiency Calculation

$$
n_{\mathrm{TT}}^{4 \mathrm{~A}}, \frac{\mathrm{~h}_{2}-\mathrm{h}_{3}}{\mathrm{~h}_{2}-\mathrm{h}_{31}}=\frac{131.419-122.957}{131.419-121.773}=.877
$$

Similar calculations for Configuration 2A (PPPPLT) yield the following results:

| Configuration 3A | $E / \theta_{c r}$ | $\Delta h$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Stage $1+$ Stage 2 | 26.38 | 35.601 |
| Stage 3 | 6.52 | 8.799 |
| Total | 32.90 | 44.400 |

$$
\eta_{T T}=\frac{\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{T} 1.5}-\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{T} 3}}{\mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{T} 1.5}-\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{T}_{3 i}}}=\frac{131.959-123.16}{131.959-122.276}=.909
$$

These results have been incorporated into Table VIII of Reference 1 which is presented as Table VI of this report.

## ANALYSIS OF INCIDENCE LOSSES


#### Abstract

As a result of the significant increase in performance of the two-stage tandem turbine (PPTP) over the two-stage plain turbine (PPPP) which was noted during the original test series, it became highly desirable to test the stage two tandem stator in a three-stage build. Based on stage performance analyses a full one-percent increase in design point total-to-total efficiency was expected. During actual test of this turbine (Configuration 4A-PPTPPPP), however, less than one-tenth of one-percent increase in efficiency was realized (see Figure 48).


Data reduction and analysis have revealed that excessive positive incidence on the stage three plain stator accounted for approximately one-half of onepercent of this performance decrement. A review of that analysis is presented below.

Figures 66 and 67 present contour plots showing incidence of the stage three stator as a function of radius ratio and percent circumferential location. Figure 66 shows that, at the design point, a typical two-stage tandem turbine (PPTP) produces an average of about five and one-half degrees positive incidence on the stage three vane, while Figure 67 shows an average of about three degrees for the two-stage plain turbine (PPPP).

Figure 68 presents a plot of vane cascade efficiency, $\eta_{v}$, versus incidence angle, $i$, for a typical plain stator as cross-plotted from cascade data in Reference 2, Note the sharp drop off in $\eta_{v}$ with increasingly positive incidence, a result of suction side separation.

Using Fígures 66, 67, and 68, the incidence angle, 1 , and stage three stator cascase efficiency, $\eta_{v 3}$, can be tabulated as follows:

| Configuration | (i) Stage 3 | $\eta_{\mathrm{V} 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PPPPPP | $3.0^{\circ}$ | .9580 |
| PPTPPP | $5.5^{\circ}$ | .9375 |

A velocity diagram study was conducted using Reference 6 to determine the derivative of three-stage turbine efficiency, $\eta_{T T}$, with respect to stage three vanes efficiency, $\eta_{v 3}$. Results of this study indicate that, for a one-percent change in stage three vane efficiency, a resulting change of one-quarter of one-percent in three-stage turbine efficiency would occur.

Applying this efficiency derivative to the values of $\eta_{v 3}$, in the table, the penalty in three-stage turbine efficiency due to excessive positive incidence can be calculated as follows:

$$
\Delta \eta_{\mathrm{TT}}=\frac{\partial \eta_{\mathrm{TT}}}{\partial n_{\mathrm{v} 3}} \quad \Delta \eta_{v 3}=(.25)(.9375-.9580)=-.0051
$$

The results of this analysis, therefore, indicate that a loss of one-half of one percent in three-stage turbine total-to-total efficiency is attributable to incidence loss.

## APPENDIX D

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A
$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}_{3}} \quad$ Turbine exit total pressure

R
${ }^{T}$ S
Area (in. ${ }^{2}$ )

Diameter (in.)
Bladerow throat dimension (in.)
Turbine energy extraction (Btu/lbm)
Stage energy extraction (Btu/lbm)
Height of bladerow at exit (in.)
Height of bladerow at throat (in.)
Incidence angle (degrees)
Tangetially leaned bladerow

Mach number

Number of bladerows, streamtubes, or stages

Rotational speed (rev/min)

Turbine exit static pressure
Total pressure (psia)

Turbine inlet total pressure

Gas constant ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \sec ^{2}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{R}$ )
Tandem bladerow
Static temperature ( ${ }^{\circ}$ R)

Specific heat at constant pressure ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{R}$ )

| $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | Total temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{R}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{0}}}$ | Turbine inlet total temperature |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}_{3}}$ | Turbine exit total temperature |
| $t$ | Spacing (in.) |
| U | Wheel speed. (ft/sec) |
| V | Absolute velocity (ft/sec) |
| W | Mass flow rate ( $1 \mathrm{bm} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) |
| $\mathrm{E} / \theta_{\text {cr }}$ | Equivalent specific work (Btu/lbm) |
| $\mathrm{W} \sqrt{\theta_{\mathrm{cr}}} \mathrm{E} / \delta$ | Equivalent weight flow (lbm/sec) |
| $\mathrm{N} / \sqrt{\theta_{\mathrm{cr}}}$ | Equivalent rotative speed (rev/min) |
| WN $\varepsilon / 60 \delta$ | Weight flow - speed parameter ( $1 \mathrm{bm} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}$ ) |
| $g J \Delta h / 2 U^{2}$ | Loading factor |
| $\alpha_{0}$ | Vane inlet absolute flow angle (degrees) |
| $\alpha_{1}$ | Vane exit absolute flow angle (degrees) |
| $\beta_{1}$ | Blade inlet relative flow angle (degrees) |
| $\beta_{2}$ | Blade exit relative flow angle (degrees) |
| $\Gamma$ | Stage leaving swirl angle (degrees) |
| $\gamma$ | Specific heat ratio |
| $\delta$ | Ratio of turbine pressure to pressure at standard sea level conditions |
| $\varepsilon$ | $\text { Function of } \gamma \text { defined as } \frac{\gamma_{S L}}{\gamma}\left[\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{2}\right)^{\gamma / \gamma-1} /\left(\frac{\gamma_{S L}+1}{2}\right)^{\gamma_{S L} / \gamma_{S L}-1}\right]$ |
| ${ }^{7} \mathrm{TT}$ | Total-to-total efficiency based on measured torque and calculated inlet and exit total pressures. |
| ${ }^{7} \mathrm{TT}^{\prime}$ | Total-to-total efficiency based on measured temperature drop and measured inlet and exit total pressures. |
| ${ }^{7} \mathrm{~V}$ | Cascade efficiency |
| $\theta_{C I}$ | Squared ratio of critical velocity at turbine inlet temperature to critical velocity at standard sea level temperature |

$\mu \quad$ Viscosity ( $1 \mathrm{bm} / \mathrm{sec}-\mathrm{ft}$ )
Blade-jet speed ratio
$\rho \quad$ Density ( $1 \mathrm{bm} / f t^{3}$ )
$\tau$
Torque (ft-lbf)
$\tau_{\text {eq }} \quad$ Equivalent torque (ft-lbf), $\tau_{e q}=\tau \varepsilon / \delta$

## Subscripts

| h | Hub |
| :--- | :--- |
| i | Current axial station, stage, streamtube, or ideal |
| p | Pitch |
| $r$ | Radial component |
| $t$ | Tip |
| $u$ | Tangential component |
| $z$ | Axial component |
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[^0]|  | ble | I. | Reduced Test (Concluded). |  |  | Calculated |  | Performance Parameters |  |  |  |  | 1 A (PPPPPP) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RDG | PCT | NDES | PTo | PTOAPTS | PTo/Ps3 | n Eby | wa Eay | wan egy | TOEOY | DH EQY | Ohl Ear | ETA tit | U/Co | Flowang |
| 143 |  | 120 | 29.97 | 3,093 | 4.106 | . 3798.01 | 27.492 | 1740,26 | 1859.06 | 34.573 | 38.781 | 0.8915 | 0.4351 | 11.29 |
| 144 |  | 110 | 29.97 | 3.686 | 4.008 | 3088.34 | 27.796 | 1616:04 | 2049.72 | 34.617 | 38.731 | 0.8938 | 0,3999 | 8.50 |
| 105 |  | 110 | 29.97 | 3.690 | 4.105 | 3482,12 | 27.803 | 1013,54 | 2054.79 | 34.632 | 38.761 | 0.8935 | 0,3990 | 0.67 |
| 146 |  | 110 | 29.97 | 3.693 | 49.108 | 3485,07 | 27.800 | 1614.73 | 2053.39 | 34.642 | 38.777 | 0,8934 | 0.3992 | 8.51 |
| 147 |  | 90 | 29.98 | 3.665 | 4.098 | 2849.12 | 28,056 | 1332.26 | 2035.66 | 33,286 | 38,592 | 0.8625 | 0,3266 | 11.84 |
| 148 |  | 90 | 29.98 | 3,669 | 4.109 | 2849.99 | 28.059 | 1332.78 | 2437.18 | 33,314 | 38.621 | 0.8626 | 0.3266 | 11.99 |
| 149 |  | 90 | 29.97 | 3.669 | 4.103 | 2850,08 | 28.062 | 1332.99 | 2436.34 | 33.299 | 38.619 | 0.8622 | 0.3266 | 1.1.62 |
| 150 |  | 80 | 29.97 | 3.643 | 4.098 | 2531.37 | 28.075 | 1184.47 | 2615.08 | 31.731 | 38.445 | 0.8254 | 0,2902 | 15.99 |
| 151 |  | 80 | 29.97 | 3.645 | 4.100 | 2531.09 | 28.085 | 1184.78 | 2615,32 | 31.718 | 38.456 | 0.8248 | 0.2901 | 15.91 |
| 152 |  | 80 | 29.91 | 3.640 | 4,094 | 2531.02 | 28.087 | 1184.79 | 2613.30 | 31.692 | 38.428 | 0,8247 | 0,2902 | 15.97 |
| 153 |  | 100 | 29.96 | 3.476 | 3.826 | 3163.69 | 27.986 | 1475.63 | 2178.28 | 33.138 | 37.285 | 0.8888 | 0,3701 | 0.94 |
| 154 |  | 100 | 29,97 | 3.483 | 3.834 | 3163.01 | 27.980 | 1475.01 | 2172.43 | 33.049 | 37.331 | 0.8853 | 0.3698 | 8.62 |
| 155 |  | 100 | 29,96 | 3.482 | 3.834 | 3163.81 | 27.985 | 1475.68 | 2175.07 | 33.091 | 37,328 | 0.8865 | 0.3699 | 8.62 |
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(PPTPLP)

| RnG | PCT AnES | PTA | PTOIPT3 | PTO/PS3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { N FAY } \\ \vdots \end{gathered}$ | Wa EGY | WAN EQY | re Eev | DHESY | OHI EQV | ETA TV | UノO | FLOWANG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 516 | 80 | 29.92 | 3.616 | 4.085 | 2536.99 | 28.078 | 1187.24 | 2.000 .03 | 31.615 | 38.264 | 0,8262 | 0.2911 | 19,76 |
| 517 | 80 | 29.92 | 3.616 | 4.084 | 2529.98 | 28,081 | 1184.07 | 2603.47 | 31.566 | 38,260 | 0.8250 | 0.2903 | 19.61 |
| 518 | 100 | 29.95 | 3.473 | 3.834 | 3161.3? | 27.912 | 1470.67 | 2164.52 | 32.991 | 37.262 | 0.8854 | 0.3696 | 13.45 |
| 519 | 100 | 29.94 | 3.469 | 3.829 | 3160.53 | 27.912 | 1470.30 | 2164.10 | 32.976 | 37.235 | 0.8856 | 0.3697 | 13.36 |
| 520 | 100 | 29.96 | 3.460 | 3.816 | 3160.81 | 27.909 | 1470.23 | 2158.19 | 32.893 | 37.166 | 0.8850 | 2.3701 | 13.28 |
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Table VI. Overall and Stage Performance Summary.

| Stage | Configuration | Equivalent Specific Work, $E / \theta_{\text {cr }}$ | Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio | Total-to-Total Efficiency, $\eta_{\text {TT }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OVERALL PERFORMANCE |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3-PP | 13.76 | 1.604 | 0.875 |
| $1+2$ | 2-PPPP | 26.38 | 2.66 | 0.868 |
| $1+2$ | 4-PPTP | 26.78 | 2.66 | 0.880 |
| $1+2+3$ | 1-PPPPPP | 33.00 | 3.47 | 0.886 |
| $1+2+3$ | 5-pppppt | 32.97 | 3.47 | 0.885 |
| $1+2+3$ | 6 -PPTPTT | 32.90 | 3.47 | 0.883 |
| $1+2+3$ | 7-PPPPLP | 33.00 | 3.47 | 0.886 |
| $1+2+3$ | 2A-PPPPLT | 32.90 | 3.47 | 0.883 |
| $1+2+3$ | 3A-PPTPLP | 33.00 | 3.47 | 0.886 |
| $1+2+3$ | 4A-PPTPPP | 33.05 | 3.47 | 0.887 |
| STAGE PERFORMANCE |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | PP/ | 13.76 | 1.604 | 0.875 |
| 2 | /PP/ | 12.62 | 1.658 | 0.846 |
| 2 | /TP/ | 13.02 | 1.658 | 0.873 |
| 3 | $/ \mathrm{PP}^{1}$ | 6.62 | 1.305 | 0.923 |
| 3 | /PT | 6.62 | 1.305 | 0.918 |
| 3 | /TT | 6.12 | 1.305 | 0.856 |
| 3 | /LP ${ }^{2}$ | 6.62 | 1.305 | 0.923 |
| 3 | /LT | 6.52 | 1.305 | 0.909 |
| 3 | $/ \mathrm{PP}^{3}$ | 6.35 | 1.305 | 0.877 |
| ${ }^{1}$ As tested in Configuration 1 (PPPPPP). <br> ${ }^{2}$ As tested in Configuration 7 (PPPPLP). <br> ${ }^{3}$ As tested in Configuration 4A (PPTPPP). |  |  |  |  |
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Figure 1. Turbine Design Velocity Diagrams.

Figure 2. Three-Stage Turbine Flowpath.


Figure 3. Two-Stage Turbine Flowpath.


Figure 4. Plain Blade Airfoils.


Figure 5. Stage Two Tandem Stator Assembled.


Figure 6. Stage Three Tangentially Leaned Stator Airfoils Viewed Aft Looking Forward.


Figure 7. Stage Three Rotor Plain Blade.


Figure 8. Stage Three Rotor Tandem Blade.

Figure 9. Three-Stage Turbine Plain Blade Rotor Assembled.


Figure 10. Typical General Electric, Evendale, Air Turbine Test Facility Configuration.

Figure 11. Air Turbine Test Instrumentation.



Figure 11. Air Turbine Test Instrumentation (Concluded).
Figure 12



Figure 15. Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP).



Figure 17. Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration la (PPPPPP).


Figure 19. Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio,
Configuration 1 A (PPPPPP).



Figure 21. Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).




Figure 23. Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).





$$
\text { Configuration } 3 \mathrm{~A} \text { (PPTPLP). }
$$
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { Figure 27. Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, } \\
& \text { Configuration } 3 A \text { (PPTPLP) }
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$$



Figure 28. Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP).


Figure 29. Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP).

Figure 30. Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP).



Figure 33. Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).


Figure 34. Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-toTotal Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).


Figure 35. Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-toTotal Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).


Figure 36. Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).


Figure 37. Total-to-Total Efficiency vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).

Figure 38. Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Weight - Flow Speed Parameter, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).


Figure 39. Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure
Ratio; Configuration 5A (PPTP).


Figure 40. Equivalent Weight Flow Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 5A (PPTP).


Figure 41. Equivalent Specific Work Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 5A (PPTP).

Figure 42. Total-to-Total Efficiency Vs. Blade-Jet Speed Ratio,


Figure 44. Predicted and Actual Equivalent Torque Vs. Total-to-Total Pressure Ratio, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP).

 Configuration 1A (PPPPPP).







Figure 51. Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Configuration 1A (PPPPPP), at Design Equivalent Speed.


Figure 52. Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT), at Design Equivalent Speed.


Figure 53. Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP), at Design Equivalent Speed.


Figure 54. Normalized Static Pressure Vs. Axial Station, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP), at Design Equivalent Speed.


Figure 55. Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration $1 A$ (PPPPPP).


Figure 56. Turbine Efficiency Contour plot, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).


Figure 57. Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP).


Figure 58. Turbine Efficiency Contour Plot, Configuration 5A (PPTP).


Figure 59. Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration la (PPPPPP).


Figure 60. Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 2A (PPPPLT).


Figure 61. Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 3A (PPTPLP).


Figure 62. Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 4A (PPTPPP).


Figure 63. Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 5A (PPTP).


Figure 64. Turbine Exit Swirl Contour Plot, Configuration 2 (PPPP).


[^1]

Figure 66. Stage Three Incidence Angle Contour Plot, Typical for Two-Stage Tandem Turbine (PPTP).


Figure 67. Stage Three Incidence Angle Contour Plot, Typical for Two-Stage Plain Turbine (PPPP).
(
"The aeronautical and space activities of the United States shall be conducted so as to contribute . . . to the expansion of buman knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space. The Administration shall provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning its activities and the results thereof." -National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958
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