UNCLASSIFIED AD 419544

DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER

FOR

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA. VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.



)

ł

AN EXFERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF NOZZLE COOLING FOR A SMALL ROCKET ENGINE

•

THESIS

GAE/ME/63-1 Donald J. Alser Capt USAF

.

ł

.

•

AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF NOZZLE COOLING FOR A SMALL ROCKET ENGINE

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering of The Institute of Technology Air University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

By

)

1

Donald J. Alser, B.S.E. Captain USAF Graduate Agronautical Engineering August 1963

l

Preface

In this report, I have presented a method for applying gaseous film cooling to a rocket nozzle. Also, I have shown how variations in coolant flow, velocity and angle of injection affect engine performance and cooling effectiveness. By experimentally demonstrating the advantages of a reacting coolant gas, it is hoped that future investigators will find the results and technique of value in exploring other areas of rocket propulsion.

The introduction and bibliography, I think, provide a fairly complete coverage of cooling methods thus far developed and should provide a good source of more advanced information for those interested in the cooling problem.

I would like to express my gratitude to Lt P. Meyfarth for his technical assistance in solving the calibration problems and improving the instrumentation of the test facility. I am indebted to Mr. J. Parks for his efficient maintenance of the test equipment and the many hours he willingly devoted to assist me in the experimental work. My thanks also go to my advisor, Lt Colonel W. McKenna, who provided timely support and suggestions for this project; and finally, I would like to express special thanks to my wife, Sanay, for her efforts in editing and typing the original draft and her encouragement and patience which led to the completion of this work.

Donald J. Alser

ii

1

Å

L

,

CONTENTS

Page

Prefac	е.	• • •	•	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	•	ii
List o	f Fig	ures	•	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	v
List o	f Sym	bols	•	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	viii
Abstra	ct .	• • •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	x
1.	Intr	oduct	ion		• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	1
	C C	oolin oolin	g T g M	eci ieti	h ni hod	qu U	es nac	• ert	ak		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1 5
II.	Rock	et En	gin	e]	Des	ig	n e	and	i M	ío d	iif	(i.c	a	tic	one	3	•	•	•	•	•	•	12
	0 M P C I	ydrog ozzle ropel oolan gniti	In en s lan t C on	je In t it	cto jec Fee fig	rs to: d ur:	r Syn at:	ste ior	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •	12 14 15 19 19 21
III.	Inst	rumen	tat	io	n.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	22
1V.	Meth	od of	Ev	alı	ıat	io	a	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	26
	E C	ngine oolan	re t P	rf(er:	orm for	an Mai	ce ace	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	26 33
٧.	Disc	ussio	n o	f	Res	ul	ts	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	36
	T C G E	est F alibr enera xperi	roc ati 1 D men	ed on is ta	ure Pr cus L P	oc si er:	• on foi	rms		•	• • •	• • •	• • •		• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	•	• • •	36 37 38 44
VI.	Conc	lusio	ns	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	52
VII.	Reco	mmend	ati	on	6	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	53
Biblio	graph	у	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•		54

iii

١

1

CONTENTS

		Page
Appendix	A	57
	Figures	58
	Table I - Rocket Engine Data	94 97
	Table III - Coolant Performance Summary	104
Appendix	B	111
	Engineering Drawings of Engine Components	112
Vita	•••••••	119

1

5

١

÷

iv

-

ŝ

¥.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page Oxygen Injector Water Spray Tests water Spray Test -- Impinging/Showerhead Oxygen Hydrogen Injector Aft Chamber Liners Assembled Chamber Liners Showing Fuel and Coolant Assembled Rocket Engine on Thrust Stand Theoretical Performance for Gaseous Injection of Theoretical Exit Pressure Ratio vs. Mixture Ratio . . Variation of Theoretical Specific Impulse From Theoretical Gas Temperatures for Gaseous Injection Engine Performance for Nozzle A Engine Performance for Nozzle B

¥

l

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

Figu	<u>re</u>	Page
20	Engine Ferformance for Nozzle C (Characteristic Velocity)	77
21	Engine Performance for Nozzle A (Specific Impulse)	78
22	Engine Performance for Nozzle B (Specific Impulse)	79
23	Engine Performance for Nozzle C (Specific Impulse)	80
24	Engine Performance for Nozzle A (Thrust Coefficient)	81
25	Engine Performance for Nozzle B (Thrust Coefficient)	82
26	Engine Performance for Nozzle C (Thrust Coefficient)	83
27	Performance Loss vs. Coolant Flow Ratio	84
28	Wall Temperature vs. Mixture Ratio (Nozzle Entrance) .	85
29	Wall Temperature vs. Mixture Ratio (Nozzle Throat)	86
30	Wall Temperature vs. Mixture Ratio (Nozzle Exit)	87
31	Nozzle Wall Temperature vs. Area Ratio (MR = 2.0)	88
32	Nozzle Hall Temperature vs. Area Ratio (MR = 3.0)	89
33	Nozzle Wall Temperature vs. Area Ratio (MR = 4.0)	90
34	Cooling Effectiveness for Various Coolant Configurations (MR = 3.0)	91
35	Visicorder Data (Test # 82)	92
36	Oscillograph Data (Test # 82)	93

.

6

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

Table Page Ι 94 Rocket Engine Data 94 94 Propellant Injector Data . . . • • . . . Coolant Configurations • 55 . . Thermocouple Location • 96 II Engine Performance Summary 97 97 Coolant Configuration A-A Coolant Configuration A-B • • • • • • • 98 . . . • • Coolant Configuration 5-A 99 • Coolant Configuration B-B 100 ٠ • . . • . . . • Coolant Configuration B-C 101 • • • . ٠ . . ٠ . 102 Coolant Configuration C-D • ٠ . ٠ • ٠ • • • • • 103 Coolant Configuration C-E • • III 104 Coolant Ferformance Summary Coolant Configuration A-A 104 • • • • • • • • • • . . . Coolant Configuration A-B 105 • • ٠ . . Coolant Configuration B-A 106 • • • • • • • • • • . . . Coolant Configuration B-B 107 • • Coolant Configuration B-C 108 • • ٠ . Coolant Configuration C-D 109 . ٠ Coolant Configuration C-E 110 . .

vii

١

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Area, sq. in. A C* Characteristic velocity, ft/sec С Frictional discnarge coefficient Nozzle thrust coefficient $C_{\mathbf{F}}$ D Diameter, inches F Thrust,1b Gravitational conversion factor, 32.174 (lbm-ft/lbf-sec²) g Film heat transfer coefficient, Btu/ft²-sec-⁹F h Optimum specific impulse ($P_e = P_a$), lbf-sec/lbm (sec) Is Isentropic exponent (specific heat ratio, C_p/C_y) k Thermal conductivity, Btu/ft-sec-^oF K Characteristic length (V_c/A_t) , inches $(V_c$ includes volume of the nozzle convergent section) L* M Molecular weight, 1b/1b-mole Mixture ratio, wo/wf MR P Static pressure, psia Specific rate of heat flow, Btu/ft²-sec Q Nozzle convergent area ratio, Ac/At r Universal gas constant, 1545.4 ft-lbf/lb-mole F R Temperature, ^oF or ^oR Т Wall thickness, inches V Volume, cubic inches; Velocity, ft/sec Weight-flow rate, lb/sec Nogzle axial distance from entrance, inches

Ŧ

4

.

ł

1

LIST OF SYMBOLS (Continued)

Ya	Compressibility correction factor
×	Nozzle half-angle of divergence degrees
ß	Diameter ratio, A/A _t
٢	Nozzle half-angle of convergence degrees
E	Nozzle expansion area ratio, A_{e}/A_{t}
η	Characteristic velocity quality factor, $C_{\mathbf{x}}^{\bullet}/C_{\mathbf{x}}^{\bullet}$
λ	Thrust coefficient quality factor, C _{FX} /C _{FT}
£	Specific impulse quality factor, I /I sr sT
م	Density, 1b/cu. in.
ω	Coolant flow ratio, w _i /w _h
Subs	cripts:
	Atmospheric
i	Coolant
с	Combustion chamber

- e Nozzle exit
- f Fuel
- h Hydrogen
- in Injection
- o Oxidizer (oxygen)
- s Freestream
- T Theoretical
- t Nozzle throat
- w Nozzle wall
- x Experimental

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation was to determine experimentally the effect of film-cooling a rocket engine nozzle with a reactant gas. Coolant quantities, injection velocities and angles, and axial injection location were varied to determine the conditions under which adequate film cooling could be achieved.

For various cooling schemes engine performance was evaluated to determine coolant effects on engine performance, and nozzle wall temperatures were measured to determine cooling effectiveness. The experimental data showing rocket performance efficiencies (based upon equilibrium isentropic flow) and nozzle wall temperature reductions are presented in tables and graphs.

Testing was conducted on a 100 pound thrust engine using gaseous $H_2 \sim O_2$ bi-propellants and operating at a nominal chamber pressure of 300 psia. A self-impinging oxygen injection pattern was used in conjunction with radial injection of hydrogen which also served to film cool the combustion chamber.

Five basic coolant configurations consisting of three De Laval type nozzles and three coolant chamber liners provided coolant injection at the nozzle entrance and/or near the nozzle throat. Decreasing the injection velocity resulted in increased wall temperature reductions so that critical areas of the nozzle could be adequately film cooled.

x

For the range of mixture ratios from 1.5 to 6.5, coolant flow ratios (with respect to total hydrogen flow) were varied from .084 to .178 while hydrogen flow rates ranged from .126 lb/sec to .040 lb/sec. Thrust coefficients were near 100% of theoretical performance; and characteristic velocity and specific impulse efficiencies from 82% to 89% were obtained for the coolant configurations where adequate film cooling was realized.

At a mixture ratio of 3.0, experimental results showed average wall temperature reductions of 30% from the nozzle entrance to a point half-way through the nozzle divergent section, for tangential coolant injection at the nozzle entrance and 45° radial injection near the nozzle throat. At the same time, performance loss was less than 3%.

Engine performance loss was dependent only upon coolant flow rate while wall temperature reductions were a function of coolant flow rate and coolant injection location. For equal coolant flow rates, small angles of injection resulted in practically no change in wall temperatures from that of tangential coolant injection.

xi

AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF NOZZLE COOLING FOR A SMALL ROCKET ENGINE

I. Introduction

Advances in rocket engine development for space exploration and missile weapon systems have created new environments of extremely high temperatures. The flame temperatures in combustion chambers are on the order of 5000°F and heat transfer rates as high as 14 Btu/in²-sec have been observed. Associated with this severe engineering environment is the containment and control of the hot combustion gases in a rocket nozzle to provide the necessary propulsive thrust. In addition to adverse temperature gradients and extremely high heat transfer rates near the throat, the nozzle is subjected to high gas pressures and convective shear forces, chemical corrosion and sometimes particle erosion. Thus, the exposure of rocket engine components to such an environment will ultimately result in their destruction unless some form of thermal protection is provided.

Cooling Techniques

きな

Several thermal protection techniques have been designed and tested which offer possible solutions to the heating problem.

Heat Sinks. Conductive heat sinks are an absorptive type system whereby incident energy is stored in a large mass of

material by sensible temperature rise. This method is usually not practical from a weight requirement point of view.

<u>Refractories</u>. Materials capable of withstanding severe temperatures have been developed and employed in nozzle throats and combustion chambers. However, available refractories rapidly fail in the presence of high pressures and shear forces, and therefore provide a relatively short service life.

<u>Regenerative Cooling</u>. Convective regenerative cooling is another absorptive type cooling system. Heat is absorbed by the exposed surface and conducted to a regulated flowing fluid, thereby maintaining the surface at a temperature below the structural failure temperature of the material. This method is widely used in liquid propellant systems since the fuel or oxidizer can often function as the coolant prior to injection into the combustion chamber. Regenerative cooling, which increases propellant pumping requirements, is not time limited but is subject to the undesirable characteristic of bubbling due to heating prior to injection. In addition, many propellants do not have the capacity for absorbing the required neat flux (Ref 3:447-462).

<u>Transpiration Cooling</u>. This cooling technique uses either a regulated or passive mass transfer system. A gaseous or liquid coolant is passed through a porous wall material with the injected mass flowing in a direction opposite to the inclaent heat flow. Energy absorption takes place through temperature rise, and

sometimes, mass phase change. Skin friction and surface neating is reduced by the continual mixing of the coolant and hot combustive gases. Although this method has received increased emphasis as a cooling scheme for the combustion chambers of gaseous, plasma, and nuclear rocket engines, there has been only limited usage to date. The limited use of transpiration cooling is attributed to non-availability of high temperature uniformly porous materials, pore clogging by combustion products and residues, susceptibility to local hot spots, and high coolant weight and bulk requirements (Ref 14:36-40).

Ablative Cooling. (Ref 21:2-8) Ablation of a material is another means of mass transfer cooling. This method involves the sacrificial erosion of plastic materials and can be employed with both liquid and solid propellant rocket systems. Cooling of the surface is accomplished when the hot gas stream heats the exposed material, thereby forming gases within the surface layers. The released gases then create a transpiration type cooling process. At the same time, a charred insulative surface is formen which is ultimately swept away by the high shear force gas stream. Ablative cooling is desirable in that the materials utilized are light weight, have a low thermal conductivity (nigh thermal insulation), and have the ability to accommodate intensive neating without failure. Factors limiting the use of ablative cooling are: a susceptibility to high gas stream sucar forces, high

temperature corrosion and a finite material service life under 30 seconds. Present applications of ablative cooling are found in re-entry thermal shields and rocket nozzle skirts and throats.

1

Film Cooling. Last of the mass transfer cooling methods being investigated is that of film cooling. It is based on forcing a coolant through a series of slots or perforations, and onto a wall surface to form a thermal insulating layer between an exposed surface and a hot gas stream. The insulating layer is formed adjacent to the injection area and is carried downstream until it evaporates and/or diffuses with the hot gas stream. In the case of liquid film cooling, heat is transferred principally by means of evaporation (Ref 8:301-302). With gaseous film cooling, heat transfer occurs by means of sensible heat exchange. In both cases, the film coolant serves to insulate and protect the hot surface from excessive heating. Liquid film cooling has a decided advantage over gaseous film cooling in that the density storage requirements are less, and the utilization of the latent heat of evaporation of a liquid significantly improves the cooling technique. Film cooling has been successfully and efficiently used in liquid propulsion systems and has good possibilities for future applications to solid propellant rockets (Ref 14:29-36).

The previously described cooling techniques have all contributed in the effort to solve the rocket heating problem and have aided the development of more advanced rocket propulsion systems. However,

Sec. 1

it must be born in mind that no one method can always be described as the best. Thus, the rocket engineer is faced with the problem of deciding which cooling scheme, or combination of schemes, is the best to fulfill the mission requirement and, at the same time, meet economical restraints.

Cooling Method Undertaken

In considering the application of a cooling technique to a rocket nozzle, transpiration and ablative cooling appear to offer the most promising means for effective cooling and overall performance optimization. However, an extensive program to evaluate ablative nozzles has been conducted by the Aerojet-General Corporation (Ref 25), and the non-availability of acceptable porous materials to facilitate nozzle transpiration cooling dictated the use of some other cooling scheme. Eckert suggested that film cooling be used where cooling of a specific location is required, or where average rather than maximum temperatures are important (Ref 9:210). Therefore, the film cooling scheme was undertaken as a possible method for reducing average wall temperatures throughout the noszle while decreasing the maximum-incurred temperatures at the nozzle throat.

Several experimental investigations on <u>liquid</u> film-cooled nozzles have been conducted by Boden, Zucrow and Graham, Morrell, Welsh, Abramson, and Ferri. Some of the more important results are summarized:

1. Film cooling can reduce wall heat transfer rates up to 85% (Ref 5:355 and Ref 26:1).

2. Heat transfer rates are greatest at nozzle throats (Ref 5:388).

3. Higher reduction in wall heat transfer rates is obtained with organic coolants than with inorganic coolants due to gaseous dissociation and wall coating characteristics (Ref 26:1).

4. Adequate nozzle cooling is obtained with coolant flow rates from 5 to 15% of total mass flow rate (Kef 17, Ref 5:390, and Ref 26:1).

5. High rocket efficiency is obtained at the low coolant mass transfer rates (Ref 17 and Ref 16:362).

6. Coolant injection near the nozzle throat requires the least coolant flow rate to obtain the maximum local and total cooling effect (Ref 5:369 and Ref 26:7).

7. Radial coolant injection is least effective at the nozzle entrance and most effective near the nozzle throat where the rate of change of mainstream velocity and heat transfer increases rapidly (Ref 23 and Ref 5:359).

8. Tangential injection is the most effective method for coolant injection at any location (kef 26:1 and Ref 5:389).

9. Effective liquid film attachment is obtained with simple radial hole injectors so that a more complex means of injection is unnecessary (Ref 16:362).

10. Critical injection velocity, defined as velocity above which the coolant film begins to detach from the wall surface at the point of injection, is a determining factor in cooling effectiveness (Ref 16:362, Ref 29:650, and Ref 12:2).

11. Reacting coolants cause a lower decrease in rocket performance than do non-reactants since a reacting coolant may also function as an injected propellant (Ref 17, Ref 16:360, Ref 1:7 and Ref 26:7).

12. Film cooling can prevent hot gas stream deposits and chemical reaction on the nozzle surface (Ref 16:359).

13. Coolants made up of light elements are better than those containing heavier elements since their sonic velocity is higher and rocket performance is less effected (Ref 12:1).

There has been some theoretical and experimental work performed with <u>gaseous</u> film cooling but these investigations have been confined to flow over a flat plate. Theoretical results of Eckert and Livingood, with air as a film coolant, show that cooling effectiveness increases with the number of injection slots and that, for equal maximum surface temperature and equal coolant flow rate per slot, the slot spacing must increase in the downstream direction (Ref 10). Papell and Trout, in their experiments, used two appreciably different temperature levels of injected gaseous coolants and observed that both the low-temperature and hightemperature injections produced about the same wall temperature

distributions beyond a short distance downstream of the point of injection. They explained that the coolant gas having the higher temperature possesses higher injection velocity which tends to improve the persistance of the cooling film (Ref 19).

Due to greater mixing between the mainstream and the coolant jet, normal (radial) gaseous injection has been recognized as much inferior to tangential injection. Sevan, Chan, and Scesa observed that the reduction in wall temperature effectiveness from tangential injection to normal injection amounted to 50% (Ref 22). Thus, wall temperature reductions due to injection at an angle to the main stream flow direction should be between the effects due to normal injection and tangential injection.

Analytical investigations by Eckert and Schneider show that light-weight gases of high thermal capacity are the most promising means for gaseous film cooling. They point out that helium injection is better for ease of application and is more effective than air injection, but is less effective than hydrogen injection since it has higher density and lower thermal capacity. Hydrogen influences heat transfer by increasing the boundary layer thickness caused by injection, and providing a high thermal capacity which tends to markedly decrease the heat transfer rate. In addition, the low density at the surface with hydrogen injection over-shadows poorer conductivity effects (Ref 11:35).

In view of the lack of experimental work on gaseous film

cooled nozzles, further study was deemed necessary to: (a) determine the effects of gaseous film cooling on overall rocket performance, (b) correlate experimental heat transfer results to analytical film cooling theories, and (c) obtain more insight into liquid film cooling effects after vaporization. Thus, this investigation was undertaken. It involves the modification of a small gaseous H_2-O_2 rocket engine, designed originally by Ow (Ref 18), to incorporate a film cooled nozzle employing gaseous hydrogen as a reacting coolant. The design and evaluation of the film cooled nozzles is based upon the results obtained from <u>liquid</u> film cooled nozzles and <u>gaseous</u> cooling over a flat plate (See Pages 5-8).

Ow designed the basic rocket engine to investigate gaseous film cooling of the combustion chamber. He was successful in his efforts to cool the chamber walls and determined the optimum cooling configuration for the chamber. However, Ow found it necessary to cool the nozzle with exterior water flow. During the following year Pickitt applied gaseous film cooling to the nozzle by modifying the aft combustion chamber liner for hydrogen injection tangential to the nozzle entrance (Ref 20). He was unsuccessful in this attempt, as he encountered propellant surge problems which caused a high mixture ratio, low coolant mass flow, and thus resulted in nozzle failure.

For this study, in order to investigate the various possibilities

for applying the film cooling technique, three nozzles comprising five coolant configurations were used. Two coolant configurations provided coolant injection at the nozzle entrance, a third configuration introduced the film coolant near the throat, and a fourth configuration provided a combination of the first three methods. A fifth configuration, which involved an uncooled nozzle, provided a means for comparing the effects of the various coolant configurations on rocket engine performance and coolant efficiency.

Rocket engine evaluation is based upon a comparison of performance parameters (specific impulse, characteristic velocity and thrust coefficient) versus mixture ratio and the reduction of specific impulse versus coolant flow ratio. The effectiveness of gaseous film cooling is based upon a comparison of axial wall temperature profiles as a function of mixture ratio and coolant flow ratio.

The limitations imposed by using gaseous propellants and coolant in this investigation should not in itself prevent the general extrapolation of film cooling results to other liquid propellant rockets even though specific injector requirements may differ.

In spite of the fact that rocket system optimization has stressed the use of liquids for propellants and coolants, indications are that future rocket systems will continue to use

high energy fuels but in gaseous form, regaraless of the cost in weight factor. This may be the case in small low-thrust rockets intended for indefinite use in stabilization and attitude control of space vehicles. Also, the use of gaseous reacting coolants would eliminate the need for an additional coolant system, thereby partially offsetting the low density disadvantage.

The following sections of this study describe the design and modifications of the basic rocket engine, instrumentation and test procedures, data reduction, and evaluation.

II. Rocket Engine Design

and Modifications

1

The basic engine used in this investigation was designed by Ow (Ref 18) following a design example given by Sutton (Ref 24:256). It was later modified by Pickitt in an attempt to film cool the rocket nozzle (Ref 20).

Ow selected the size of the rocket engine to provide a thrust of 100 pounds and a chamber pressure of 300 psis for an ideal weight flow rate of .286 lb/sec and specific impulse of 350 seconds.

To be compatible with existing facilities, the engine was designed to use gaseous hydrogen and gaseous oxygen as the propellant combination.

In this study, all nozzle cooling tests were performed on the basic engine with the film cooled combustion chamber, except as noted in the following paragraphs.

Oxygen Injectors

The original oxygen injector was of the self-impinging type. It was designed for maximum momentum exchange with the radially injected hydrogen and to impinge at a point near the nossle entrance (See Figure 1 and Drawing 1B). The injector consisted of a single ring of eight 1/16 inch diameter injection holes.

Fickitt designed a second injector which was a combination showerhead and self-impinging type. This was a modification of the original injector which added eight additional 1/16 inch diameter holes for axial injection. The purpose of this injector was to decrease the oxygen momentum and increase oxygen dispersion in order to bring the flame front closer to the injector face, improve mixing, and prevent hot spots in the nozzle. Pickitt found this design necessary since he determined that one of the major causes for burnout of his nozzle was due to the original injector not providing the desired spray pattern. The modified injector geometry is illustrated in Figure 1 and Drawing 2B.

n.

In order to improve oxygen injection, two corrective steps were taken. First, the original injector design was corrected to provide closer tolerances in production. Second, the modified injector (not completed by Pickitt) was redesigned and built. Then the completed injectors were subjected to water tests to determine the spray patterns. The results of these tests are enown in Figures 2 and 3. The improved impingement and diffusion seen in the spray pattern of the modified injector is visibly apparent.

The oxygen injector used in this investigation was the improved version of the original injector. The requirement that combustion chamber configuration remain constant for all tests did not allow time to evaluate the performance of the monified injector.

}

ĺ

Hydrogen Injector

The original hydrogen injector was designed for radial injection. Seventy-two 1/16 inch diameter holes were spaced circumferentially along the full length of the combustion chamber in order to provide chamber film cooling as well as fuel injection. The complete injector was made up of a forward and aft chamber liner designed to provide injection velocities near .4 Mach at a mixture ratio of about 1. This hydrogen injector, which conforms to Ow's configuration 5, is shown in Figure 6 and Drawing 65.

Some modifications to the aft chamber liner were necessary to facilitate nozzle film cooling. Therefore, to provide various configurations for coolant injection three aft chamber liners were designed as follows:

1. One liner was made to provide sixteen, equally-spaced, 1/16 inch diameter holes, which were drilled in the rear of the liner. These injector holes allowed 17.0% of the total hydrogen flow to be directed tangential to the nozzle entrance (convergent section). This liner is illustrated in Drawing 30, and is shown mated to the forward chamber liner (hydrogen injector) in Figure 6.

2. A second liner was designed for sixteen 3/64 inch diameter injector holes, in a manner similar to the first. This liner permitted 10.9% of the total hyurogen flow to be directed tangential, or at an angle of 15 degrees, to the nozzle entrance depending on the convergent angle of the nozzle.

a fairly optimum angle for conical nozzles when considering wall friction and radial component velocity losses (Ref 3:87-88).

The nozzles were designed with large convergent area ratios (greater than 25) to permit very low mainstream velocities at the nozzle entrance and to provide a value of L^{*} greater than 100. Static temperatures and pressures at the nozzle entrance would then more closely approach isentropic stagnation values of the combustion chamber and nozzle. In addition, by using values of L^{*} greater than 100, rocket engine performance parameters would not tend to be a function of different engine geometries; in effect, this ensured adequate residence time of the propellants for complete combustion in the chamber (Ref 3:102, 401-403).

All nozzles were designed to slightly overexpand the exhaust gases. For a costant chamber pressure (300 psia), this would result in a large exit pressure differential at the low mixture ratios but would approach optimum expansion as the mixture ratio was increased to higher values. See Figure 15. In any case, the designed over-expansion would not cause separation or shock wave interaction at the exit since the separation point for these nozzles is at an exit pressure ratio (P_e/P_a) of about .4 (Ref 3:77).

The original nozzle, Ow's configuration D, with an exit expansion ratio \in = 4.25, was available and designated nozzle A for the purpose of testing (Figure 7). It had a convergent halfangle of 45 degrees, with a short straight throat section, and a constant wall thickness of 1/8 inches.

A second nozzle, designed by Pickitt, was designated nozzle B. For this nozzle, the throat section was rounded so that the diameter of the throat was equal to the throat radius of curvature (Ref 3:70). This ensured a more progressive velocity increase than that of nozzle A. Nozzle B, with $\epsilon = 4.41$, had a convergent half-angle of 45 degrees and a constant wall thickness of 3/16 inches. This nozzle is illustrated in Drawing 5B and Figure 7.

The third nozzle, designated nozzle C, was designed to provide film cooling near the nozzle throat (Drawing 43 and Figure 8). The half-angle of convergent was changed to 30 degrees to provide a smoother transition of gas flow from chamber to throat conditions. Also this convergent angle would permit the use of chamber liners for 15 degree coolant injection at the nozzle entrance. Nozzle C was designed with an exit expansion area ratio $\epsilon = 4.25$ and a throat similar to nozzle B. The wall thickness, however, was constant at 3/16 inches only from the exit to the coolant section. This created some difficulty in temperature measurement which will be discussed in the instrumentation section.

The throat coolant section, of nozzle C, was located at an area ratio $A/A_t = 7.43$. It consisted of twelve 3/64 inch diameter holes, equally spaced circumferentially, to provide film coolant injection at an angle of 45 degrees to mainstream flow direction. The coolant section was connected to the aft combustion chamber section by means of a short external line. See Figure 9.

All nozzles were made of copper primarily because of its high thermal conductivity. This enabled rapid temperature stabilization and small temperature gradients through the nozzle wall. In addition, the soft copper material facilitated nozzle instrumentation.

The variation in nozzle geometry resulting from modifications should not cause any major differences in performance parameters. Zucrow pointed out that: correctly designed conical nozzles with smooth polished interior surfaces have efficiencies between 96 and 98 percent; the exact geometry of convergent sections is not critical so that a smooth transition to the throat is sufficient; the throat section need not be well rounded and can be short; and that no measurable loss of thrust will result from a variation of the nozzle convergent half-angle between 30 and 60 degrees (Ref 28:375).

Initially, the nozzles were to be cooled externally with a water spray system. Then, if the film cooling schemes proved successful, the coolant water could be eliminated thereby permitting heat transfer only to the ambient atmosphere.

For easy reference, the design data for all nozzles is summarized in Table I. Illustrations are provided in Figures 7 and 8.

وارعا بالمحاف المحتة

S. Frank Const. So.

Propellant Feed System

The propellant lines leading to the rocket engine were modified to decrease run condition transient time and pressure loss. Pickitt found that the large volume in the hydrogen manifold plus the extensive network of small tubing and connectors gave a hydrogen pressure drop fifty times larger than that of oxygen. In addition, the transient time from hydrogen start pressure to run pressure was about two seconds longer than that for oxygen pressure. Pickitt indicated that these two factors were primary causes of nozzle burnout since the propellant mass flows surged to a high mixture ratio while only one percent coolant mass flow was available (Ref 20:20-22).

As a result of Pickitt's observations, the hydrogen manifolding was modified to provide larger diameter, but shorter length, feed lines and to substantially reduce the number of elbows, tees, and reducers. The results of a preliminary test showed that this modification corrected the surge problem, so that the transient time from start to run pressure was about the same for both hydrogen and oxygen feed systems.

Coolant Configurations

With three noszles and three combustion chamber liners, a number of possibilities existed for applying the film cooling technique. The final combinations selected made up five basic coolant configurations.

Nozzle A was used with the two coolant chamber liners to provide tangential injection at the nozzle entrance for coolant flow ratios $\omega = .178$ and $\omega = .109$. These coolant configurations were designated A-A and A-B, respectively.

Nozzle B was used with all three chamber liners (one without cooling provisions). Similar to nozzle A, and with identical coolant flow ratios, two of the configurations enabled coolant injection tangential to the nozzle entrance. These coolant configurations were designated B-A and B-B, respectively. The third chamber liner provided a coolant flow ratio $\omega = 0$, and was designated configuration B-C. This configuration could then be used as a standard for comparing the rocket performance and cooling effectiveness of the other configurations.

Nozzle C was used with two of the chamber liners (A and C of nozzle B) to provide coolant mass flow ratios $\omega = .084$ and $\omega = .176$, and were designated coolant configurations C-D and C-E, respectively. These configurations differed from those of nozzle A and B in that part of the coolant flow was diverted to the throat cooling section. Thus, for configuration C-D all coolant flow was injected near the throat, while for configuration C-E part of the coolant flow was injected near the throat and part injected at an angle of 15 degrees to the nozzle entrance.

The five basic coolant configurations, with pertinent data, are illustrated in Table I.

GAE/HE/63-1

Ignition

Ignition was accomplished in the same manner as that used by Ow (Ref 18:9); an initial hydrogen flow was ignited external to the rocket nozzle by means of an electric arc. Then the oxygen flow rate was increased until the flame flashed back into the combustion chamber. The pre-selected run settings were then electrically initiated to provide the desired run conditions. By using this ignition procedure, a fuel-rich mixture ratio was ensured and the danger of premature nozzle or combustion chamber burnout was prevented.

III. Instrumentation

The experimental work performed in this investigation was conducted in the Rocket Test Facility of the Mechanical Engineering Department.

The original design, construction, and calibration of the test facility was completed in a joint project by Keller, Macko and Pickitt. The results of their work were published in the <u>Facility Operation Manual</u> (Ref 15). This manual provided equipment lists, operation checklists, a description of the test facility, calibration procedures, and applicable wiring schematics.

In general, the Rocket Test Facility consisted of:

1. Two propellant manifolds for gaseous oxygen and gaseous hydrogen, and a gaseous nitrogen manifold to provide a purge and control system.

2. Check valves, dome valves and solenoids for control of mass flow rates and pressures.

3. Two Hershell venturis, with associated pressure transducers and thermocouples, for measurement of mass flow rates.

4. A test console to control and synchronize the test sequence, and to provide a continuous means of observing important measurements.

5. An oscillograph and visicorder for recording test sequence data.
6. Necessary piping, wiring, instrumentation, and calibration equipment.

A detailed description of the above components is given in the Facility Operation Manual.

Thrust measurements were obtained using a constant stress, cantilever mounted aluminum beam in a manner similar to that given by Ow (Ref 18:10-11). A bridge of four active strain guages was mounted on the engine thrust beam with two guages balanced on either side of the beam. The thrust signal was amplified and recorded on a visicorder where the trace deflection would be proportional to the thrust.

Two pressure transducers were used to measure chamber and coolant pressures. Chamber pressure was measured at the oxygen injector face as shown in Figure 1. The signal was sent directly to the visicorder and to the test console through a Microsen Electronic Pressure Transmitter. The coolant pressure was measured at the aft chamber liner and the signal furnished to the visicorder.

Nozzles A and B were instrumented with six iron constantan thermocouples, as illustrated in Figure 7 and Table I. The thermocouples were spaced axially and circumferentially on the surface of the nozzle to furnish a profile of nozzle wall temperatures for evaluation of coolant configuration effectiveness.

Nozzle C was provided with nine iron constantan thermocouples as shown in Drawing 7B and Figure 8; however, only three

thermocouples were mounted on the nozzle surface while six were installed approximately 1/32 inch from the inside nozzle wall. This installation method was required since the coolant section would cause inaccurate wall surface temperatures for comparison with those of other coolant configurations (nozzles A and B).

The two methods of mounting the thermocouples are shown in Figure 10. The installation method for each type is described below:

1. <u>Surface Thermocouples</u>. First, the leads of the thermocouple were fused together, into a spherical bead, by means of a jewelers torch. Then a small hole, the same size as the thermocouple bead, was drilled in the wall to a point just below the surface. After the thermocouple was inserted, the hole was closed with a punch. Finally, the thermocouple was sealed and insulated with glyptal or furnace cement.

2. <u>Inside Wall Thermocouples</u>. A small hole was drilled in the wall to within 1/32 inch of the inside surface. The thermocouple leads were silver soldered to a short piece of small copper tubing, which had the same diameter as the drilled hole. Then the thermocouple, with cylinder, was inserted into the hole, and pressed firmly into place with another piece of copper tubing. Finally, the installation was sealed and insulated with glyptal or furnace cement.

To provide a valid comparison of nozzle wall temperature profiles, all thermocouples were located at the same respective

ŝ

area ratio of each nozzle. In addition, the thermocouples for each nozzle were spaced circumferentially in the same relative position, and the nozzles were mounted to the combustion chamber with the same orientation. Therefore, any error resulting from this type of thermocouple installation would be common to all tests. A summary of thermocouple data is given in Table I.

IV. Method of Evaluation

Engine Performance

The method of engine performance evaluation involves a comparision of experimental rocket parameters with those determined theoretically. The basic rocket performance paramenters are defined below:

1. <u>Characteristic velocity</u> (C*), depends only on the characteristics of the reaction used, and is a function of chamber temperature (T_c) and molecular weight (M). It is relatively independent of chamber pressure (P_c) , and indicates the energy available after combustion.

2. <u>Thrust coefficient</u> $(C_{\mathbf{F}})$, measures the ability of the nozzle to convert the random thermal energy of gases in the combustion chamber into linear momentum, and therefore, directed thrust (F). $C_{\mathbf{F}}$ is nearly constant for a given nozzle.

3. <u>Specific impulse</u> (I_s) , combines the first two parameters and is characteristic of overall rocket engine performance. It implies a knowledge of the expansion pressure ratio (P_c/P_e) or exit area ratio (\in) , and is usually computed for optimum expansion $(P_e = P_e)$.

Theoretical values of specific impulse, characteristic velocity and thrust coefficient were determined by a method quite different from that used by Ow (Ref 18:12). Briefly, Ow obtained thermochemical data and isentropic flow functions from the

ġ.

1

experimental results of Bollinger and Edse (Ref 6). He first determined an average isentropic coefficient (k) from the isentropic equation, Pv^k = constant, for each mixture ratio. Then, pressure ratio (Pc/Pe) was found for the applicable area ratio (Ae/At) and average k. Hence, exit velocity (Ve) and, therefore, specific impulse (I_g) could be determined from the nozzle isentropic flow equation. Finally, (I_g) was corrected to account for non-optimum expansion (Pe \neq Pa) by means of the thrust equation. These steps were followed for each test condition assuming average k, T_c and optimum expansion.

For this study theoretical values of I_g , C* and C_F were determined by aerothermochemical methods (considering the high energy of the hydrogen-oxygen combination). These methods accountfor dissociation phenomena and allow for different combustion product characteristics in each section of the rocket engine. For each mixture ratio, and assumed temperature and pressure, the properties at a point are determined from equations of equilibrium constants and conservation of mass. Computed properties, in terms of enthalpy and entropy, are then applied to the perfect gas law and energy equation to provide values of velocity and specific impulse (Ref 3:130-188).

The results of these computations for the hydrogen-oxygen system are found in tables and Mollier diagrams published by Jet Propulsion Laboratory (Ref 2:App A). This report includes

data for liquid or gaseous injection of components under various conditions of chamber pressure and temperature. In addition, nozzle expansion properties are provided for equilibrium or constant composition flow.

For the aerothermochemical method the assumptions made in determining point properties are as follows:

1. There is complete combustion in the chamber.

2. The combustion process is adiabatic at constant pressure.

3. The combustion products are in equilibrium at the entrance to the nozzle.

4. Expansion through the nozzle takes place isentropically.

5. The perfect gas law applies.

6. The convergent area ratio of the nozzle is of such a value that the kinetic energy of the gases in the chamber is negligible $(V_c \rightarrow 0)$.

7. The flow is steady, homogeneous, and one-aimensional.

Theoretical values of characteristic velocity, specific impulse, and thrust coefficient were computed from data of Ref 2: App A, for gaseous injection of components at 300 psi chamber pressure and expansion to 14.7 psia. These parameters were plotted as a function of mixture ratio (MR) as shown in Figure 14. Equilibrium flow was assumed for optimum expansion, and the small variations in nozzle area ratios (6) and throat areas (At) were neglected.

Since specific impulse varies with chamber pressure, mixture ratio, exit velocity and exit pressure, it would be more accurate to determine theoretical values of I_g , for each test condition, from the thrust equation:

$$I_{aT} = \beta I_{a} - \frac{A_{o}}{V} (P_{a} - P_{o})$$
(1)

where β is a correction factor to account for 2-dimensional flow in the conical divergent section of the nozzle, and has a value of .983 when the half-angle of the divergent (α) is 15° (Ref 3:87-88). I is computed for the test conditions of area expansion ratio (ϵ), chamber pressure (P_c) and expansion pressure ratio (P_c/P_e). The second term in equation (1) accounts for overexpansion in the nozzle and is computed for each exit area (A_e), exit pressure (P_e), atmospheric pressure (P_a) and weight flow rate of propellants ($\frac{1}{2}$).

A graphical analysis of equation (1), for each A and the assumed test conditions of $\frac{1}{2} = .286$ lb/sec and P_a = 14.4 psia, is shown in Figure 16. Because exit pressure is a function of mixture ratio for a given-geometry overexpanded nossle, optimum expansion is approached as the mixture ratio is increased (See Figure 15). Therefore, the plotted curves show that corrections to optimum I_s can be neglected and still maintain accuracy near one percent in the operating range of mixture ratios. An analysis of equation (1) for constant composition flow provided similar results. In addition, actual flow conditions lie somewhere between constant

composition and equilibrium flow (Ref 7:385), and the chamber pressure varies somewhat from ideal (300 psia), so that a rigorous computation for each test condition was not considered worthwhile.

Experimental values of characteristic velocity $\binom{0}{x}$ were determined, for each test condition, from measured values of chamber pressure $\binom{P}{c}$, nozzle throat area (A_t) , and total weight flow rate $(\frac{1}{x})$:

$$C_{\mathbf{x}}^* = \frac{P_{\mathbf{c}}^{\mathbf{A}} t^{\mathbf{g}}}{\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}}}$$
(2)

where $\mathbf{\dot{w}} = \mathbf{\dot{w}}_{o} + \mathbf{\dot{w}}_{f} + \mathbf{\dot{w}}_{i}$

Experimental values of specific impulse (I) were calculated from the defining equation

$$I_{ax} = \frac{F}{*}$$
(3)

Thrust coefficient (C_{F_X}) for each test condition, was computed from the equation

$$C_{Fx} = \frac{F}{P_{c}A_{t}} = \frac{I_{gx}g}{C_{x}}$$
(4)

Performance comparison, for each coolant configuration, was obtained by employing the quality factors given below:

(1) Characteristic velocity quality factor (%), a measure of combustion efficiency, is defined

$$\eta = \frac{C^*}{C^*_{\rm T}} \tag{5}$$

101.53

(2) Thrust coefficient quality factor (λ), characteristic of nozzle efficiency, is given by

$$\lambda = \frac{C_{FX}}{C_{FT}}$$
(6)

(3) Specific impulse quality factor (§), a measure of the overall rocket engine-propellant combination, is defined

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{\mathbf{I}_{SX}}{\mathbf{I}_{ST}} = \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \tag{7}$$

Weight flow rates were computed from measured venturi pressures and temperatures by applying the equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}} = 0.525 \, \mathrm{Y_a} \, \mathrm{C} \, \frac{\mathrm{D}^2}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^4}} \, \sqrt{\beta(\mathrm{P_1} - \mathrm{P_2})}$$

from the <u>ASME Fluid Meters Report</u> (Ref 13: 65). Tables of Flow rate for oxygen and hydrogen were provided in the <u>Facility Operation</u> <u>Manual</u> (Ref 15). The validity of these tables was verified by computing several arbitrary mass flows using a standard squareedged orfice. Values were found in agreement to within one percent accuracy.

For the computation of coolant flow rate (\dot{w}_i) incompressible flow was assumed so that flow rates would be a function of area only. Then the continuity equation

$$\mathbf{\hat{w}}_{h} = \mathbf{\hat{w}}_{f} + \mathbf{\hat{w}}_{i} \tag{9}$$

becomes

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{i} = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{h} \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}_{i}}{\mathbf{A}_{i} + \mathbf{A}_{f}} \right)$$
(10)

where $\dot{\mathbf{w}}_{h}$ is the total flow rate of hydrogen, $A_{\underline{i}}$ is the coolant 31

area, and Af is the fuel injection area. For this calculation all hydrogen flow directed radially into the combustion chamber was considered fuel flow rate $(\mathbf{\hat{w}_f})$ even though a small portion of the hydrogen provided chamber wall cooling as determined by Ow (Ref 18:14). In addition, Ow found experimentally that

$$\left(\frac{\Delta P}{P}\right)_{i} \approx \left(\frac{\Delta P}{P}\right)_{f}$$

which was confirmed in this investigation. Therefore, equation (10) should give a close approximation to \dot{w}_i .

In applying equation (10) to nozzle C, the provision for coolant injection near the throat section required an additional assumption. An estimated calculation of mainstream static pressure (P_B), for coolant injection at A/At = 7.43, showed that .

$$\frac{P_{s}}{P_{o}} \approx 1$$

where P_0 is the mainstream isentropic stagnation pressure. This fact, coupled with a small pressure drop from the aft chamber liner to the nozzle coolant section, resulted in the assumption

$$P_{\rm g} \approx P_{\rm c}$$

Coolant injection velocities (V_i) were determined from the Bernoulli incompressible flow equation

$$V_{i} = \sqrt{2g T_{0} \frac{R}{M} \left(\frac{P_{i}}{P_{c}} - 1\right)}$$
(11)

when $\Delta P/P < .1$, and from the compressible isentropic equation

書き、美

$$V_{1} = \sqrt{2g T_{0} \frac{R}{M} \frac{k}{k-1} \left[\frac{P_{1}}{(\frac{1}{M})^{k-1}} - 1 \right]}$$
(12)

when $\Delta P/P > .1$. For the cases where low injection velocities were obtained using equation (11), the measured pressure differences approached the reading error so that computed velocities could not be considered accurate. These values are marked with a double asterisk in Table III.

Coolant Performance

The method of coolant performance evaluation involves the comparison of nozzle wall temperature profiles with those obtained from the uncooled nozzle. This method was selected because present analytical equations for determining wall temperatures give only approximate results. For example, Bartz, Colburn, Mayer, Sibulkin, Greenfield, and Long offer relationships for the nozzle local heat transfer coefficient (h) in the form

$$Nu = \frac{hD}{K} = C (R_e)^a (P_r)^b (\frac{T_s}{T_s})^c$$
(13)

which is similar to the pipe flow heat transfer relation.

Equation (13) is generally used in conjunction with Newton's equation, q = h (T-T_w), and measured specific rate of heat flow (q), to provide theoretical values of wall temperature (T_w). However, these equations apply to convective/conductive heat transfer only and assume the following conditions (Ref 4:49):

1. No gas or wall radiation.

۱

١

2. No gaseous dissociation with subsequent recombination near the wall.

3. No high frequency flow instabilities.

4. No compustion product deposits on the wall.

5. Complete combustion in the chamber.

Welsh and Witte made a comparison of analytical and experimental local neat fluxes in a nozzle and found variations in analytical estimates from 45% below to 80% above those determined experimentally. They indicated that combustion and flow non-uniformities, resulting from propellant-injector flow characteristics and combustion chamber configuration, were a major factor in these deviations (Ref 27:14). Therefore, as a result of these non-uniformities and assumptions, theoretical determination of wall temperature profiles was not attempted.

Theoretical values of gas stream static temperatures that could be used in this analysis were obtained from Ref 2: App A. These values were plotted as a function of mixture ratio (MR) for the combustion chamber, nozzle throat, and nozzle exit, as shown in Figure 17. The main purpose of Figure 17, then, is to indicate temperature magnitudes and gradients that might be expected within the nozzle.

Experimental values of wall temperature were determined for each coolant configuration by measuring nozzle surface temperatures, as discussed in Section III, Instrumentation. These values can be

「「「「「「「」」」

assumed to closely approximate the temperature of the nozzle inside wall. For this assumption the high thermal conductivity of copper and small wall thickness (t_w) coupled with a low film heat transfer coefficient of out-side air lead to a small temperature gradient through the nozzle wall. This assumption was confirmed with inside wall and surface thermocouples installed at the entrance, throat, and exit of nozzle C. Differences in temperature through the wall were only $5 - 50^{\circ}$ F throughout the range of mixture ratios. Then, for all coolant configurations the wall temperature profiles could be compared with those obtained for configuration B-C (no film cooling) without introducing major errors in thermocouple installation and testing conditions.

Finally, the coolant configuration providing the greatest local and overall wall temperature decrease for the least coolant flow rate and loss in engine performance would be considered the optimum.

V. Discussion and Results

Test Procedure

A series of tests were made for each nozzle/coolant configuration by varying the propellant pressures, and therefore. mixture ratio for each test. The five basic coolant configurations comprising three nozzles and three chamber liners were used to provide various coolant flow ratios (ω). Two series of tests were made with each nozzle, A and B, for tangential coolant injection at the nozzle entrance ($\omega = .178$ and .109). Two test sequences were made with nozzle C, for 45° coolant injection upstream of the throat ($\omega = .084$), and for a combination of throat injection and 15° coolant injection at the nozzle entrance (ω = .176). A final test series was made with nozzle B in the uncooled condition to provide a basis for comparison. Mixture ratios ranged from 1.5 to 6.5 while total hydrogen flow rates and coolant flow rates varied from .126 lb/sec to .040 lb/sec, and .022 lb/sec to .004 lb/sec, respectively. Visicorder data was evaluated immediately after each test to ensure the attainment of the desired conditions of chamber pressure (300 psia) and mixture ratio. Also, the rocket engine was inspected for damage to components, signs of discoloration and oxidation, and change of critical dimensions. Discrepancies detected were corrected prior to the following test.

Calibration Procedure

Calibration of pressure channels was accomplished using amplifier precision resistors and checked by loading pressure transducers and calibrated pressure guages simultaneously. The linearity of the transducers and recorder galvanometers produced a trace deflection which was proportional to the calibration load, thereby providing a calibration factor. This calibration factor, when applied to trace deflections obtained during a test, would then yield corrected pressure readings.

The thrust channel was calibrated in a manner similar to that of the pressure channels. In this case, the thrust beam was loaded with known weights and the output from the strain guages was sent through the amplifier system to the recorder. This calibration was performed without propellant flow to the engine. However, a check was made for developed thrust due to propellant flow alone under prevailing conditions that occurred during the tests. The maximum thrust thus obtained was less than + .3 pounds. Therefore, this small variable error, caused by propellant flow in the feed lines, was neglected in the thrust calculations.

Temperature channel calibration was accomplished using a potentiometer in conjunction with a variable resistor bank and a specially devised calibration circuit. A known voltage corresponding to the thermocouple temperature equivalent was impressed on the thermocouple circuit, thereby providing a trace deflection on the recorder. No load and balance conditions were furnished by the special calibration

circuit. The variable resistors were used to establish circuit critical damping conditions for the recorder galvonometers. The trace deflections then provided calibration curves which could be used to determine thermocouple temperatures for each test.

After completion of each test series, load calibration of all data channels was reaccomplished. In addition, recalibration was accomplished whenever a channel component was changed or when experimental data showed unaccountable trends. Differences between initial calibration curves and those obtained after each test series where within $\pm .02$ inch trace deflection, which is the attainable reading accuracy. Corresponding data errors for a $\pm .02$ inch trace deflection are: ± 2 psia for pressures, $\pm 5^{\circ}F$ for temperatures, $\pm .5\%$ for thrust, $\pm 1.5\%$ for mass flow rates, $\pm 2.0\%$ I_{SX}, $\pm 3.5\%$ C^{*}_X, and $\pm 3.5\%$ C^{*}_{Fx}.

General Discussion

Experimental data for each test series is presented in Table II, Engine Performance Summary, and Table III, Coolant Performance Summary. A typical data test run is shown in Figures 35 and 36. All data listed was used in the experimental evaluation, except as noted under each coolant configuration. Tests 1-3 were not listed since burning occurred entirely outside of the nozzle and equilibrium chamber conditions were never reached. This problem was corrected by using larger oxygen start pressures to maintain combustion in the chamber when shifting from start to run conditions.

Tests 4-6 of 10 second duration were conducted for rocket engine shakedown and to evaluate the nozzle water cooling system. Tests 4 and 5 proved successful in demonstrating overall rocket engine operation, but the water cooling system froze during test 6 due to a $20^{\circ}F$ ambient temperature. An indirect result of these tests was that the film cooling configuration effectively decreased nozzle wall temperature so that the water cooling scheme could be eliminated. Another result was that steady state engine operation and wall temperature stabilization occurred in about 3 seconds. Experimental data for tests 7, 8, 50 and 58 was not obtained because of a jammed oscillograph or visicorder, as indicated in Table II.

For some of the initial tests with nozzles A and B, an instability problem was encountered in that steady state engine operation could not be achieved at the low mixture ratios (high hydrogen flow rates). This instability was eventually traced to the hydrogen supply manifold. Although the hydrogen supply pressure available was 1200-1800 psia, and only 500-600 psia run pressure was required, the use of 2 hydrogen bottles was insufficient to fulfill volume/mass flow requirements. By placing 10 or more hydrogen bottles on the supply manifold, steady state conditions were obtained in less than 3 seconds for all mixture ratios. In addition, better utilization was made of available gas supplies since the pressure differential between available and

required hydrogen run pressures could be reduced to about 100 psia and still allow stable engine operation.

Several temperature and injection velocity discrepancies are noted in Table II. As explained in Section IV, the coolant injection velocities marked with a double asterisk are inaccurate due to a small injection pressure differential. However, these velocities can be definintely categorized in the low velocity class for coolant effect analysis. Various temperature points, indicated under "Remarks", were not obtained because of faulty thermocouple installation or an oscillograph channel malfunction. Since all temperature data was provided by the oscillograph, some delay was encountered in correcting temperature channel discrepancies due to lag time for development of oscillograph film. This is evident in the series of missing data points for a particular thermocouple channel.

Table III also shows several non-steady temperature readings, indicated by a single asterisk. These temperatures occurred at a mixture ratio near five for the coolant configurations and at a mixture ratio of four for the uncooled configuration. In both cases, the temperatures were increasing at a moderate rate. Except for the non-steady temperature points used to evaluate configuration B-C (no cooling) these temperatures were not used in the cooling effect analysis. Nevertheless, the non-steady temperatures of cooled configurations provided an estimate of higher mixture ratios attainable without nozzle failure.

required hydrogen run pressures could be reduced to about 100 psia and still allow stable engine operation.

Several temperature and injection velocity discrepancies are noted in Table II. As explained in Section IV, the coolant injection velocities marked with a double asterisk are inaccurate due to a small injection pressure differential. However, these velocities can be definintely categorized in the low velocity class for coolant effect analysis. Various temperature points, indicated under "Remarks", were not obtained because of faulty thermocouple installation or an oscillograph channel malfunction. Since all temperature data was provided by the oscillograph, some delay was encountered in correcting temperature channel discrepancies due to lag time for development of oscillograph film. This is evident in the series of missing data points for a particular thermocouple channel.

Table III also shows several non-steady temperature readings, indicated by a single asterisk. These temperatures occurred at a mixture ratio near five for the coolant configurations and at a mixture ratio of four for the uncooled configuration. In both cases, the temperatures were increasing at a moderate rate. Except for the non-steady temperature points used to evaluate configuration B-C (no cooling) these temperatures were not used in the cooling effect analysis. Nevertheless, the non-steady temperatures of cooled configurations provided an estimate of higher mixture ratios attainable without nozzle failure.

のない

In order to ensure a valid comparison of nozzle wall temperatures, similarity of test operation conditions was maintained in addition to the thermocouple installation similarities previous described in Section IV. All engine test times were restricted to $4.5 \pm .7$ sec, and measured from the initiation of run settings to purge shutdown. Also, initial wall temperatures and ambient conditions of air velocity and temperature were approximately the same for each test. These conditions of similarity are particularly important where non-steady temperature occurred. Even so, the manner of thermocouple installation, the impossibility of reproducing identical engine operating conditions for each configuration and mixture ratio and the variation of test times created some errors in the coolant configuration comparisons. However, it is felt that the sum of these errors was not significant so that experimental results should provide a reasonably accurate evaluation of performance.

Burnout of nozzle A occurred during test 26, for coolant configuration A-B (ω = .109). The burnout was first detected by a gradual fall-off of chamber pressure. Subsequent inspection showed that melted copper had started to flow from the convergent section near the throat, as shown in Figure 11. A throat temperature of 1760°F was recorded at the test run time of 4.3 seconds. The falure of this nozzle did not necessarily signify film cooling ineffectiveness since this test was made under the non-steady operating conditions previously discussed. The rapid decrease of hydrogen flow rate (increasing MR) resulted in a decreasing coolant

۱

l

flow rate while mainstream static temperature was rapialy increasing. Therefore, the performance data of this test was used only in estimating the mixture ratio (6.49) and associated failure conditions. A direct result of this test was the inadequacy of the film cooling scheme to provide required coolant flow rate at the high mixture ratios.

Nozzle B in the uncooled configuration (B-C) sustained a throat burnout during test 71, similar to that of nozzle A (See Figure 12). For this test (MR = 4.17) equilibrium chamber conditions were reached, but nozzle wall temperatures were rapidly increasing at the time of burnout (4.9 sec). The highest wall temperature recorded was 1780° F at the nozzle throat.* This nozzle wall temperature profile was used to evaluate coolant performance since the effect of a comparison with coolant configuration profiles would give conservative results.

Two test series consisting of 28 test runs were made with no apparent difficulties using nozzle C (coolant configurations C-D and C-E). For these tests the effects of film cooling were particularly noticable in the throat section of the nozzle. From the location of injected coolant in the convergent section to a point half-way through the aivergent section the inside wall surface remained a bright copper color while other portions of the nozzle surface were coated with dark deposits. The lack of the dark

"The melting temperature of copper is 1981"F at standard conditions.

2

deposits in the film cooled area was attributed to the coolant effect of preventing such formations while providing a thermal insulating boundary layer. Additionally, the light-colored area showed the extent of the cooling film layer prior to diffusion into the main gas stream. The film cooling effects are shown in Figure 13 but are barely discernible due to poor photographic lighting. The film coolant stains indicate that the hole spacing is at a maximum for auequate cooling in the throat area. Therefore, an increase in hole spacing would lead to only partial film cooling coverage.

The effects of film cooling in the combustion chamber are illustrated in Figure 4. Here, the discoloration around the fuel injector holes show that this film cooling scheme is at a minimum acceptable level for the higher hydrogen flow rates (high injection velocities).

Some questions may arise as to the manner of determining mixture ratio in this investigation. It should be noted that all hydrogen injected radially into the combustion chamber was considered fuel flow rate (\dot{w}_f) , for computing mixture ratio (MR = \dot{w}_o/\dot{w}_f), while hydrogen flow that entered the nozzle by tangential or 45° radial injection was considered coolant flow rate (\dot{w}_i) . However, it is likely that some portion of the injected coolant diffused immediately into the main gas stream, especially near the nozzle entrance, where it probably reacted with the oxygen to slightly

alter the mixture ratio, and therefore, theoretical data. This would result in a fuel-rich mixture ratio, particularly in the neighborhood of the wall, and increase the possibilities of recombination (energy release). For the extreme condition, if all hydrogen flow $(\dot{w}_{\rm f} + \dot{w}_{\rm i})$ had been considered as fuel flow in the mixture ratio calculation, the experimental mixture ratios would have been lower than those shown in the data tables by $8_{\rm p}$ for configuration C-D, 11% for configurations A-B and B-B, and 17% for configurations A-A, B-A and C- ϵ (the maximum at the low mixture ratios). Nevertheless, it was felt that the actual case was much closer to the assumed conditions of no coolant reaction so that only small deviations would result at the low mixture ratios and practically no variations would occur in the high mixture ratio range.

Experimental Performance

For each test condition characteristic velocity, specific impulse and thrust coefficient were computed from the data presented in Table II. These experimental values were compared with theoretical values (Figure 14) and expressed as the quality factors \mathcal{N} , λ , and $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. The results were then plotted to provide the curves of Figures 18-26.

For nozzle A (coolant injection at the entrance) the characteristic velocity performance level \mathcal{H} was about 83% for $\omega = .109$ and 81% for $\omega = .178$ at the lower mixture ratios (Figure 18). The increase in performance with increasing mixture

ratio was attributed to the decreasing cooling flow rate (\hat{w}_1) which resulted in improved combustion. Since the thrust coefficient quality factor, λ , for this nozzle was near 99% (Figure 24), combustion inefficiencies were the major factors affecting the specific impulse performance level, as shown in Figure 21. Here, the performance quality factor $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, was on the order of 82% for ω = .109 and 80% for ω = .178. The similarity of the 77 and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ curves should be noted. The decrease in performance level for the higher coolant flow ratio was only about 2%. The small decrease indicated that the low overall performance level of 83% must be a result of some factor other than coolant flow. This fact became apparent in the experimental evaluation of nozzle B.

The performance results for nozzle B are shown in Figures 19, 22 and 25. For this nozzle (coolant injection at the entrance) coolant flow ratios were identical to that of nozzle A, but the mixture ratio range was extended to lower values; in addition, engine performance with no cooling was evaluated. The results again show the dependency of characteristic velocity and specific impulse on coolant flow ratio. Especially noticable is the fall-off in the performance curves at the lower mixture ratios where coolant flow rates were greatest. However, a portion of this performance fall-off is probably due to the manner in which mixture ratio was computed; considering hydrogen reaction near the nozzle entrance at the high coolant flow rates with subsequent change in mixture ratio.

ł

This would cause a leftward shift in the performance curves $(C^{\circ}, I_{g} \text{ and } C_{g})$ at the low mixture ratios and result in a smaller decrease in performance efficiencies $(\mathcal{N}, \mathfrak{g}, \text{ and } \lambda)$ below a mixture ratio of about 2.5.

Performance efficiencies of nozzle B were about 25 higher than those of nozzle A. This higher performance efficiency arises mainly from improved nozzle design which increased the thrust coefficient quality factor to the 100% level (See Figure 24 and 25).

Figure 19 provides another important result concerning combustion efficiency. The characteristic velocity quality factor, for the uncooled configuration (B-C) was at a performance level of about 87%. This revealed that 13% of the performance loss associated with the coolant configurations was caused by combustion inefficiencies in the combustion chamber, separate from those due to nozzle coolant injection. These combustion inefficiencies were explained by Ow in his analysis of the film cooled combustion chamber (Ref 18:20). Ow found that the radial method of fuel injection plus the fact that a portion of the injected fuel also provided some film cooling effects, led to maximum combustion efficiencies near 88%. Therefore, these effects were reflected in the coolant configuration performance levels of this investigation.

Nozzle C performance results are shown in Figures 20, 23 and 26. The coolant configurations for coolant injection near the nozzle throat (C-D) as well as coolant injection at both nozzle throat and entrance (C-D) demonstrated performance levels and curve shapes

蓉

similar to those of nozzles A and B. However, λ for nozzle C was about 1% higher than that of nozzle B. The slightly higher thrust coefficient most likely resulted from the difference in expansion area ratios for the two nozzles since all other geometry factors and test conditions were equal. Thus, the expansion area ratio for nozzle C, being closer to optimum thoroughout the mixture ratio range, enabled somewnat higher performance efficiencies.

Since specific impulse is dependent upon characteristic velocity and thrust coefficient, the loss in overall performance is best represented by this parameter. Therefore, the specific impulse of each coolant configuration was compared with that of the uncooled configuration and the resulting difference plotted as a function of coolant flow ratio. See Figure 27. A mixture ratio of three was selected since experimental and theoretical results have proved this mixture ratio to be near the optimum for the H_-O_ system. The performance loss curves clearly indicate that specific impulse decreases with increasing coolant flow ratio. However, in all cases the performance loss was relatively low, a maximum of 3.5% for $\omega = .187$ (nozzle B). This result points out the advantage of using reactive coolants. Also, it was observed (Figure 27) that cooling configurations C-D and C-E provided the desired larger coolant flow ratios for the least reduction in performance, about 1% and 2.5% respectively. This can be explained by noting that the thrust coefficient of nozzle B was about 2% higher than that of nozzle A and 1% lower than that of nozzle C. Since comparisons were based on the

uncooled nozzle B, nozzle A and C thrust efficiencies were reflected in the performance loss curves. In addition, higher performance appears to be dependent upon injection location, although not significantly. This possibly accounts for the 1% difference in curves for coolant injection at the nozzle entrance (coolant configurations B-B), and coolant injection near the nozzle throat (coolant configuration C-D). See also Figures 19 and 20. Finally, it should be noted that the performance loss curves of Figure 27 represent coolant flow ratios based on total hydrogen flow rates, \dot{w}_1/\dot{w}_h , which are somewhat higher than those based on total propellant flow rates, \dot{w}_1/\dot{w} . The \dot{w}_1/w scale was provided to show this relationship. The latter flow ratio percentages are approximately 6% for coolant configurations A-A, B-A, and C-E, 4% for coolant configurations A-B and B-B, and 3% for coolant configuration C-D.

Nozzle wall temperatures for the entrance, throat and exit were plotted as a function of mixture ratio in Figures 28, 29, and 30, respectively. These figures show that wall temperature increases with increasing mixture ratio (increasing mainstream static temperature), but at a level dependent upon the coolant flow ratio. Note that the wall temperature curves in Figure 28 for coolant configuration B-A (tangential injection) and C-E (15 degree angle of injection) are nearly identical. The small difference in wall temperature arises mainly from different coolant mass flows for each case, recalling that part of the coolant flow (about 1/3 for configuration C-E) was injected near the nozzle throat. Apparently, coolant injection at

۱

small angles to mainstream flow, as compared with tangential injection, has little effect on wall temperature for the same coolant flow rate.

The slopes of the curves in Figures 28 and 29 demonstrate the influence of injection velocity on wall temperature; since coolant injection area was constant, injection velocity decreased with increasing mixture ratio (decreasing hydrogen flow rate). No velocity influence was noted until a mixture ratio of about three was reached where injection velocities approached 800 ft/sec. Then, the wall temperature remained nearly constant until a mixture ratio of about four was reached, although mainstream static temperature and wall temperature of the uncooled nogele (B-C) were rapidly increasing at this mixture ratio. Evidently, injection velocities below 800 ft/sec improve the stability of the coolant film due to decreasing diffusion into the main gas stream. Absolute wall temperatures were much lower than expected, as indicated by uncooled configuration B-C. These lower temperatures apparently arise from lower mainstream gas temperatures and are attributed to the 85% combustion efficiencies previously discussed.

Nozzle wall temperature profiles for mixture ratios 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 are provided in Figures 31-33. These profiles were plotted as a function of area ratio rather than axial distance since axial distance varied for each nozzle while area ratio, where temperature was measured, remained constant. The wall temperatures are seen to be proportional to the quantity of coolant injected. Also, it should

)

be observed that wall temperature continually increased with distance from the point of coolant injection. This brings out the fact that a constant wall temperature is not possible using a gaseous film coolant. The slopes of these temperature profiles, as compared with the uncooled nozzle (configuration B-C), demonstrated the persistance and extent of the film coolant with distance from the point of injection, i.e., coolant injection at the nozzle entrance had little affect on wall temperature at the nozzle throat, whereas coolant injection near the nozzle throat considerably lowered the throat wall temperature. However, the difference in wall temperature levels was not as great as might be expected. This evidently resulted from the lower coolant flow rate near the throat and the fact that the coolant was injected at 45° to the mainstream flow direction, rather than tangentially. Even so, the decrease in throat wall temperature emphasizes the importance of renewing the gaseous coolant film at various locations along the nozzle.

The influence of injection velocity was again noted in the wall temperature profiles of Figures 31 and 33. Here, the coolant effects were greatest at the higher mixture ratio where coolant injection velocities were lowest.

Cooling effectiveness of the various coolant configurations is summarized in Figure 34, for a mixture ratio of 3.0. This analysis was derived from a comparison of wall temperatures for each coolant configuration with those of the uncooled nozzle. Wall temperature

1

"Feductions at the nozzle entrance were about 38% for 15° and tangential injection (coolant configurations C-E and B-A), while a decrease of 28% was noted at the nozzle throat for 45° injection (coolant configurations C-D and C-E). Practically no reductions occurred at the nozzle exit for any of the coolant configurations. In addition, it was observed that coolant configuration C-E, with coolant injection at both nozzle entrance and throat, provided the largest overall wall temperature reductions throughout the nozzle.

In the final analysis reference is made to Figures 27 and 34 which show the effects of coolant flow ratio on engine performance and cooling effectiveness. It is apparent, that coolant configurations C-E ($\omega = .176$) for coolant injection at the noszle entrance and throat provided the best cooling method for the least loss in engine performance. For a performance loss near 3% this cooling scheme reduced average wall temperatures about 30% from the noszle entrance to a point past the noszle throat. In addition, some wall temperature reductions were realized in the latter half of the noszle divergent section (approximately 10%).

Because of the assumptions imposed on performance calculations and the manner of determining cooling effectiveness discussed in other sections of this study, the values given above should be considered conservative estimates. Also, it is felt that film cooling configuration C-E can be considerably improved to provide wall temperature reductions greater than 40% without additional loss in performance (no increase in coolant flow rate). This could

1

ł

be accomplished by reducing the 45° radial injection angle to a point nearer the tangential direction, decreasing the spacing of injection holes, and maintaining injection velocities below 800 ft/sec. Nevertheless, coolant configuration C-E fulfills the cooling requirements established for this study, i.e., to effectively and efficiently reduce the wall temperature throughout the nozzle, especially in the most critical area—the nozzle throat.

VI. Conclusions

1. A small rocket engine nozzle can be effectively filmcooled with a gaseous coolant.

2. Rocket engine overall performance is only slightly affected by the injection of a reacting coolant gas in the nozzle.

3. Cooling effectiveness increases proportional to the coolant flow rate.

4. Engine performance is relatively independent of coolant injection location for equal coolant flow rates, but is dependent upon the coolant quantities injected.

5. Tangential coolant injection at the nozzle wall is the most effective means of establishing a gaseous cooling film.

6. Coolant injection near the nozzle throat provides the greatest decrease in throat wall temperatures.

7. Good cooling effectiveness and nigh rocket engine performance can be obtained over a wide range of mixture ratios.

8. Low injection velocities at the nozzle entrance increase cooling effectiveness.

9. Overall nozzle cooling is improved by increasing the number of axial coolant injection locations.

第二

VII. <u>Recommendations</u>

It is recommended that:

1. Further work be conducted to optimize the gaseous film cooling technique. This could be accomplished by providing additional coolant injection locations in the convergent and divergent sections of the nozzle.

2. Work be performed to investigate optimum coolant flow rates, injection velocities, and injection hole spacing at a constant mixture ratio.

3. The wall temperature data provided in Table III be analyses to determine nozzle heat transfer coefficients and fluxes for the H_2-O_2 system. Subsequently, a comparison with theoretical heat transfer equations could be made and an applicable equation fitted to the experimental data. Such an analysis would be of value in predicting future heat transfer rates.

4. The engine be modified to investigate gaseous transpiration cooling in the combustion champer.

In addition, efforts should be made to improve combustion efficiencies. The modified impingin:/showerhead oxyten injector was not evaluated but an investigation of this part could possibly lead to improved engine performance. Also, unfinished spare injectors are available to permit investigation of other types of injection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, Andrew E. "Investigation of Internal Film Cooling of Exhaust Nozzles of a 1000-Pound Thrust Liquid-Ammonia/ Liquid-Oxygen Rocket." <u>NACA Research Memorandum</u>, RM E52C26 (June 17, 1952).
- Baker, Dwight I. "Mollier Diagrams for the Hydrogen-Oxygen System and Experimental Results of Tests on a Rocket Motor of 500-Pound Thrust." <u>Jet Propulsion Laboratory Report</u>, No. 20-127. California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California (May 4, 1959).
- Barrere, M., Jaumotte, A., Deveubeke, B., and Vandenkerckhove, J. <u>Rocket Propulsion</u>. New York: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1960.
- Bartz, D. R. "A Simple Equation for Rapid Estimation of Nozzle Convective Heat Transfer Coefficients." Jet Propulsion, 27: 49-51. (January 1957).
- 5. Boden, R. H. "Heat Transfer in Rocket Motors and Applications of Film and Sweat Cooling." <u>Jet Propulsion</u>, <u>73</u>: 385-390. (May 1951).
- Bollinger, L. E. and Edse, R. "Research on a Premixed Gaseous Rocket Propellant." <u>WADC TN 55-388</u>. (August 1955).
- Bollinger, L. E. et al. "Non-equilibrium Chemical Conduction Recombination Effects in Exhaust Nozzle Flow." <u>Liquid Rockets</u> and <u>Propellants</u>. New York: Academic Press, 1960. pp 385-403.
- 8. Eckert, E. R. G. <u>Heat and Mass Transfer</u> (Second Edition). New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc. (1959).
- 9. Eckert, E.R. G. "Transpiration and Film Cooling." <u>Heat</u> <u>Transfer Symposium</u>. University of Michigan: University of Michigan Press, (1952) pp 173-192.
- Eckert, E. R. G. and Livingood, J. B. "Comparison of Effectiveness of Convection-, Transpiration-, and Film-Cooling Methods with Air as a Coolant." <u>NACA Technical Mote</u>, TM 3010 (October 1953).
- 11. Eckert, E. R. G. and Schneider, P. J. "Mass Transfer Cooling of a Laminar Boundary Layer by Injection of a Light-Weight Foreign Gas." <u>Jet Propulsion</u>, 28: 34. (January 1958).

a bibliother and the box is a

いた見

BIBLIOGRAPHY - (Continued)

- 12. Ferri, A. and Libby, P. A. "The Use of Helium for Cooling Nozzles Exposed to High Temperature Gas Streams." <u>WADC TH</u> <u>55-318</u> (July 1955).
- 13. <u>American Society of Mechanical Engineers Fluid Meters</u>. ASME Research Publication of Fluid Meters - Their Theory and Application.
- 14. Hyman, S. C., et al. "Transpiration and Film Cooling for Solid Propellant Rocket Nozzles." <u>United Nuclear Corporation</u> <u>Report</u>, NDA 2150-1. United Nuclear Corporation Development Division, White Plains, New York (1961).
- 15. Keller, R. G., Macko, R. F. and Pickitt, J. L. <u>Operations</u> <u>Manual for the Rocket Engine Test Facility of the Department of</u> <u>Mechanical Engineering</u>. Air Force Institute of Technology. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio (August 1961).
- 16. Knuth, E. L. "The Mechanics of Film Cooling." Jet Propulsion, 24: 359-365. (November-December 1954).
- Morrell, G. "Investigation of Internal Film Cooling of a 1000-Pound Thrust Liquid-Ammonia Liquid-Oxygen Rocket-Engine Combustion Chamber." <u>HACA Research Memorandum</u>, RM E51E04 (July 17, 1951).
- 18. Ow, Y. W. <u>An Evaluation of a Film Cooled Gaseous Hydrogen and</u> <u>Oxygen Rocket Engine of 100 Pounds Thrust</u>. An unpublished thesis for degree of Master of Science in Astronautical Engineering at the Air Force Institute of Technology, (August 1960).
- 19. Papell, S. and Trout, A. M. "Experimental Investigation of Air Film Cooling Applied to an Adiabatic Wall by Means of an Axially Discharging Slot." <u>MASA TN-D-9</u> (August 1959).
- Pickitt, J. L. <u>Design of</u>, and <u>Proposed Test Program for a</u> <u>Film-Cooled Nozzle</u>. An unpublished thesis for degree of Master of Science in Aeronautical Engineering at the Air Force Institute of Technology, (August 1961).
- 21. Schmidt, D. L. "Ablation of Plastics". <u>ASD-TR-61-650</u> February 1962).

BIBLIOGRAPHY - (Continued)

- 22. Seban, R. A., Chan, H. W., and Scesa, S. "Heat Transfer to a Turbulent Boundary Layer with Tangential Fluid Injection" ASME 59-A-177 (August 1959).
- 23. Sibulkin, M. "Heat Transfer to an Incompressible Turbulent Boundary Layer and Estimation of Heat Transfer Coefficients at Supersonic Nozzle Throats." Journal of the <u>Aero. Sciences</u>, 23: 162-172 (February 1956).
- 24. Sutton, G. P. <u>Rocket Propulsion Elements</u> (Third Edition). New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc. (1963).
- 25. "Thermal Erosion of Ablative Materials." <u>ASD-TR-61-307</u> (April 1962).
- 26. Welsh, W. E. Jr. "Review of Results of an Early Rocket Engine Film-Cooling Investigation at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory." Jet Propulsion Laboratory Technical Report, No. 32-58. California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California (1961).
- 27. Welsh, W. E. Jr. and Witte, A. B. "A Comparison of Analytical and Experimental Local Heat Fluxes in Liquid-Propellant Rocket Thrust Chambers". <u>Jet Propulsion Laboratory Technical</u> <u>Report</u>, No. 32-43. California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California (1961).
- 28. Zucrow, M. J. <u>Aircraft and Missile Propulsion</u> (Volume I). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (1958).
- 29. Zucrow, M. J. and Graham, A. R. "Some Considerations of Film Cooling for Rocket Motors." <u>Jet Propulsion</u>, <u>27</u>: 650-656 (June 1957).
the states of

APPENDIX A

GAE/ME/63-1



Assembled modified injector showing chamber pressure tap



Original impinging injector Impinging/showerhead injector

Figure 1 - Oxygen Injectors and Assembly

)

۱



Original injector



Modfied injector Figure 2 - Oxygen Injector Water Spray Tests



Figure 3 - Water Spray Test -- Inpinging/showerhead Oxygen Injector





Liner used with coolant configurations A-B, B-B and C-E. (Taken after completion of test 61)



Liner used with coolant configurations A-A and B-A. (Taken after completion of test 41)

Figure 4 - Hydrogen Injector Aft Chamber Liners 61



Liner used with uncooled configuration B-C. (Taken after completion of test 71)

Figure 5 - Hydrogen Injector Aft Chamber Liner

ł



Figure 6 - Assembled Chamber Liners Showing Fuel and Coolant Injectors.

Ì



Convergent section -- Nozzle B



Divergent section -- Nozzle A

Figure 7 - Nozzles A and B 64



1

Figure 8 - Nozzle C with Coolant Section

1.11.20



ļ

Ì

l



Figure 9 - Assembled Rocket Engine on Thrust Stand





copper wall

combustion gases ____>

Figure 10 - Thermocouple Installations

GAE/ME/63-1

I

l



Figure 11 - Nozzle A, Burnout. Throat Melted During Test 26

GAE/ME/63-1

1



Figure 12 - Nozzle B, Burnout. Throat Melted During Test 71

GAE/ME/63-1

ł



Figure 13 - Nozzle C, Cooling Effects. Taken After Completion of Test 99

GAE/ME/63-1

Ş

)

.





Figure 15 - Theoretical Exit Pressure Ratio vs. Mixture Ratio

.

.



Figure 16 - Variation of Theoretical Specific Impulse from Optimum Expansion





.

.

.

GAE/ME/63-1

74

.

•



l

ł

Figure 18 - Engine Performance for Nozzle A (Characteristic Velocity)



Figure 19 - Engine Performance for Nozzle B (Characteristic Velocity)



اليان اليويونو والدينية وبيوا الالتعامية المتعا

5 U S

Figure 20 - Engine Performance for Nozzle C (Characteristic Velocity)



÷

ł

1

ţ

Figure 21 - Engine Performance for Nozzle A (Specific Impulse)

教育ないない してき シント・

1

.



Figure 22 - Engine Performance for Nozzle B (Specific Impulse)



1

ł

ł

١

ļ

Figure 23 - Engine Performance for Nozzle C (Specific Impulse)

GAE/ME/63-1

}



Figure 24 - Engine Performance for Nozzle A (Thrust Coefficient)



Figure 25 - Engine Performance for Nozzle B (Thrust Coefficient)

GAE/HE/63-1

1

1



Figure 26 - Engine Performance for Nozzle C (Thrust Coefficient)

1

GAE/ME/63-1

)

ł

)



$$\phi = \frac{I_{sx}(\omega=0) - I_{sx}}{I_{ex}(\omega=0)}$$

Figure 27 - Performance Less vs. Coolant Flow Katie

I.

ł

1

1

Coolant Configurations

	+	 B-A,	ω		.178
*****	0	 C-E,	ω		.176
*****	0	 B-B,	ω	=	.109
*****	X	 B-C,	no	c	oling



Figure 28 - Wall Temperature vs. Mixture Ratio (Nossle Entrance)

ł

1



Figure 29 - Wall Temperature vs. Mixture Ratio (Nossle Throat)

42.44

		1 1 2 12	
· +	 B-A,	ω=	.178
0	 C-E,	ω =	.176
0	 B-B,	ω=	.109
۵	 C-D,	ω =	.084
X	 B-C,	no co	ooling







ł

1

)

1



٠

.

Figure 31 - Mozzle Wall Temperature vs. Area Ratio (MR = 2.0)

GAE/HE/63-1

1800

۱

Coolant Configurations









Figure 33 - Nossle Wall Temperature vs. Area Ratio (MR = 4.0)

$$\theta = \frac{T_{\psi}(\omega=0) - T_{\psi}}{T_{\psi}(\omega=0)}$$

we need



Figure 34 - Cooling Effectiveness for Various Coolant Configurations(MR = 3.0)




Ì

ł

••

			E.	LABLE I. ROC	CKET ENG	INE DATA					
Design Crite	riæ: F	11 001 =	нч О	c = 300 psta	_	ů = .286	1b/sec	• •	I _{sp} = 39	50 sec	
				Engine	Configur	ation					
Nozzle Code Symbol	D _c (1n)	V _c (1n ³)	v (deg)	V _c (TOTAL) (in ³)	र्भ (deg)	Dt (11)	De (1n)	54	ω	L* (1n)	H B Ct
Y	2.75	23.5	99	25.1	15	.500	1.032	30.2	4.25	128	.125
£	2.75	23.5	99	25.1	15	.512	1.078	28.7	14.4	121	.188
υ	2.75	23.5	45	26.2	15	.514	1.058	28.7	4.25	127	.188
				Propellant	t Inject	or Data					
		Injecto	ų		₽ E	<u>R</u>			A1n (in ²)		
		0xygen			ging:	8- 1 D1	- .a. holes	_	.0246	1	
		Hydroge	a	Radis	י-11 זנו	<u>16</u> Dia.	holes				
					ę	<u>1</u> Dia. 32 Dia.	holes		.2273		

.

*

*

*

GAE/ME/63-1



GAE/ME/63-1

•

2

.

.



.

.

•

.

TABLE I. (Cont'd) ROCKET ENGINE DATA

Thermocouple Location

6

× (¥)	96.96	98.8	99.0	99.4	99.4	98.5	98.9	97.5
m æ	80.3	80.2	79.9	81.4	6.61	80.5	80.4	80.2
لا (۶)	82.9	81.3	80.7	81.9	81.6	81.8	81.3	82.4
CF.X	1.35	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.37	1.39	1.39	1.37
C* (ft/sec)	6630	6765	6760	6855	6815	6745	6670	6600
I _{sx} (sec)	291	290	5 80	295	289	289	288	281
Pc (psia)	272	278	292	762	282	274	250	255
F (1b)	75.2	78.7	82.7	83.7	79.2	78.0	71.2	72.2
•>	.257	.270	.284	.282	272	.267	.247	.254
••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	.190	-201	-205	.206	-201	.205	.190	.204
•r (1b ∕ •	.0566	.0570	.0650	.0628	.0586	0160.	.0459	0140.
.چ	.0688	.0693	0620.	.0763	.0713	.0620	.0558	.0499
MR	3.36	3.53	3.15	3.28	3.43	4.02	41.4	4.98
Test No.	6	10	ц	12	EI	14	15	16

· .

•

TABLE II. ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY Coolant Configuration A-A; w = .178

•

.

1

k

Remarks :

Tests 1-3; Burning outside nozzle. Test 4, 5, 6; Shakedown and nozzle water cooling. Test 7, 8; Oscillograph malfunction, non-steady operation.

GAE/ME/63-1

				Coola	nt Con	figurati	on A-B;	. = ∧	6				
Test No.	MR	,ru R	• (1b / s	0 (0 g	•>	F (1b)	Pc (psia)	I _{si} (sec)	Cx (ft∕sec)	°F¥ C	ج با	m <u>æ</u>	× 😪
18	2.45	.0815	.0726	.178	.260	77.5	288	298	7010	1.36	83.0	82.1	98.9
19	3.29	.0628	.0560	.184	.247	73.2	273	296	7000	1.36	83.6	81.6	7.79
รา	5.32	0270.	.0374	.199	172.	69.7	261	289	6810	1.37	86.2	83.2	96.6
22	3.33	.0681	.0607	.202	.270	79.8	298	296	0669	1.36	83.9	81.6	97.4
れ	3.72	.0681	.0607	.226	.294	87.2	321	297	6910	1.38	83.3	82.3	99.2
25	2.73	.0748	.0667	.182	.257	77.2	274	301	7005	1.38	83.0	82.8	99.8
26	67.9	0070.	.0356	.231	.271	78.5	39 ()	290	6775	1.39	89.4	86.4	96.7

Remarks: (a) Tests 17, 20, 23: Non-steady. (b) Test 26: Nozsle throat burn-out, non-steady.

98

.

.

GAE/ME/63-1

TABLE II. (Cont'd) ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

ł

ŀ

Z7 Z.65 .0874 .0717 .190 .Z77 82.7 301 299 7255 1.33 86. Z8 2.555 .0864 .0709 .181 .267 79.7 287 298 7175 1.34 84. 30 3.95 .0864 .0709 .181 .267 79.6 6910 1.33 85. 31 3.95 .0603 .0490 .181 .255 73.0 264 286 6910 1.33 84. 32 6.04 .0431 .0798 .172 .256 71.4 251 279 6540 1.34 84. 33 2.116 .0071 .0798 .172 .269 78.0 286 7010 1.31 83. 34 2.11 .0936 .181 .273 78.0 286 7010 1.31 83. 35 2.14 .1018 .0816 .184 847 298 7060	Test No.	MR	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	ir (1b /	• •	•>	F (1b)	Pc (paia)		55/88	CFX (c)	F (%)	m 🛞	~ 🕅
28 2.55 .0864 .0709 .181 .267 79.7 287 298 7175 1.34 84. 30 3.995 .06603 .0490 .195 .255 73.0 264 286 6910 1.33 84. 32 6.04 .0431 .0798 .172 .269 78.0 281 279 6540 1.34 84. 33 2.116 .0971 .0798 .172 .269 78.0 281 279 6540 1.34 82. 34 2.111 .0995 .0818 .173 .273 78.0 281 290 6970 1.34 82. 35 2.118 .1018 .0818 .173 .284 84.7 298 7000 1.34 83. 36 2.118 .1018 .0810 .187 .286 7000 1.31 83. 37 2.118 .1018 .0810 .191 286 7000	2	2.65	.0874	7170.	06 T.	.277	82.7	301	562	7255	1.33	86.1	82.3	95.7
30 3.95 .0603 .0490 .195 .255 73.0 264 286 6910 1.33 83. 32 6.04 .0431 .0353 .213 .256 71.4 251 279 6540 1.38 84. 33 2.16 .0971 .0798 .172 .269 78.0 281 270 6970 1.34 82. 34 2.11 .0995 .0818 .173 .273 78.0 286 7010 1.31 83. 35 2.18 .1018 .0836 .187 .284 84.7 298 297 7000 1.37 83. 36 2.239 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7080 1.36 83. 37 2.293 .0931 .292 87.7 310 304 7100 1.37 83. 38 2.245 .0907 .314 303 7100	28	2.55	.0864	.0709	.181.	.267	7.97	287	298	7175	1.34	84.9	82.1	95.7
32 6.04 .0431 .0353 .213 .256 71.4 251 279 6540 1.38 84. 33 2.16 .0971 .0798 .172 .269 78.0 281 290 6970 1.34 82. 34 2.11 .0995 .0818 .172 .269 78.0 287 700 1.34 82. 35 2.11 .0995 .0818 .173 .284 84.7 298 7000 1.31 83. 36 2.18 .1018 .0836 .187 .286 85.0 303 7000 1.31 83. 36 2.139 .0994 .0810 .197 .286 85.0 303 7060 1.36 83. 37 2.39 .0996 .0810 .193 .293 7060 1.36 83. 38 2.45 .096 .0810 .193 .293 7100 1.36 83.	8	3.95	.0603	.0490	.195	.255	73.0	264	286	69 10	1.33	83.7	1.61	95.3
33 2.16 .0971 .0798 .172 .269 78.0 281 290 6970 1.34 82. 34 2.111 .0995 .0818 .173 .273 78.0 287 286 7010 1.31 63. 35 2.18 .1018 .0836 .182 .284 847 298 7000 1.37 83. 36 2.29 .0994 .0616 .187 .286 85.0 303 297 7060 1.37 83. 37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7060 1.36 83. 38 2.39 .0986 .0811 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 1.36 83. 38 2.45 .0986 .0910 .131 304 7100 1.36 84. 39 2.65 .0951 .287 87.7 301 305 7100	32	6.04	.0431	.0353	.213	. 256	71.4	251	279	6540	1.38	87.9	\$ 2.3	96.9
34 2.11 .0995 .0818 .173 .273 78.0 286 7010 1.31 83. 35 2.18 .1018 .0836 .182 .284 84.7 298 7000 1.37 83. 36 2.29 .0996 .0816 .187 .286 85.0 303 297 7060 1.37 83. 37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7060 1.36 83. 37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7060 1.36 83. 38 2.45 .0996 .0814 .199 .298 90.7 317 304 7100 1.36 84. 39 2.65 .0926 .0761 .202 .291 303 7100 1.36 84. 40 2.69 .0851 .87.7 307 305 71.00	33	2.16	11,60.	8670.	.172	. 269	78.0	281	290	01.69	1.34	82.7	80. 3	97.1
35 2.18 .1018 .0836 .182 .284 84.7 298 7000 1.37 83. 36 2.29 .0994 .0816 .187 .286 85.0 303 297 7060 1.35 83. 37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .285 87.7 310 300 7060 1.35 83. 37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7060 1.36 83. 38 2.45 .0990 .0814 .199 .298 90.7 317 304 7100 1.36 84. 39 2.65 .0926 .0761 .202 .295 99.3 314 303 7100 1.36 84. 40 3.71 .0677 .0700 1.37 84. 7100 1.36 84. 41 3.71 .0677 .077 307 305 7140 <t< th=""><th>34</th><td>2.11</td><td>.0995</td><td>.0818</td><td>671.</td><td>.273</td><td>78.0</td><td>287</td><td>286</td><td>7010</td><td>1.31</td><td>83.2</td><td>79.3</td><td>95.3</td></t<>	34	2.11	.0995	.0818	671.	.273	78.0	287	286	7010	1.31	83.2	79.3	95.3
36 2.29 .0994 .0616 .187 .286 85.0 303 297 7060 1.35 83.1 37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7080 1.36 83.1 38 2.45 .0996 .0814 .193 .298 90.7 317 304 7100 1.36 83.1 38 2.45 .0990 .0814 .199 .298 90.7 317 304 7100 1.36 84. 39 2.65 .0926 .0761 .202 .295 99.3 314 303 7100 1.37 84. 40 2.89 .0851 .0700 .205 .287 87.7 307 305 7140 1.36 64. 41 3.71 .0677 .0556 .206 .274 83.7 295 7090 1.39 84.	35	2.18	.1018	.0836	.182	.284	84.7	298	298	7000	1.37	83.1	82.3	0.66
37 2.39 .0986 .0810 .193 .292 87.7 310 300 7080 1.36 83.1 38 2.45 .0990 .0814 .199 .298 90.7 317 304 7100 1.38 83.4 39 2.45 .0926 .0761 .202 .295 99. 3 314 303 7100 1.37 84 40 2.89 .0851 .0700 .202 .287 87.7 307 306 7140 1.38 84 40 3.71 .0677 .0556 .206 .214 83.7 291 305 7140 1.39 85.	36	2.29	7660.	.0816	.187	.286	85.0	303	297	7060	1.35	83.7	81.8	97.8
38 2.45 .0990 .0814 .199 .298 90.7 317 304 7100 1.38 63. 39 2.65 .0926 .0761 .202 .295 89 .3 314 303 7100 1.37 84. 40 2.69 .0926 .0761 .202 .295 89 .3 314 303 7100 1.37 84. 40 2.89 .0851 .0700 .202 .287 8 7.7 307 306 7140 1.38 8 4. 41 3.71 .0677 .0556 .206 .274 83.7 291 305 7090 1.39 6 5.	37	2.39	9860.	.0810	.193	. 292	87.7	310	300	7080	1.36	83.5	82.7	98.8
39 2.65 .0926 .0761 .202 .295 89.3 314 303 7100 1.37 84. 40 2.89 .0851 .0700 .202 .287 87.7 307 306 7140 1.38 84. 41 3.71 .0677 .0556 .206 .274 83.7 291 305 7090 1.39 85.	38	2.45	0660.	,0814	.199	.298	90.7	317	304	7100	1.38	83.0	83.8	0.101
40 2.89 .0851 .0700 .202 .287 87.7 307 306 7140 1.38 84. 41 3.71 .0677 .0556 .206 .274 83.7 291 305 7090 1.39 85.	39	2.65	.0926	.0761	. 202	.295	6 .9	314	303	7100	1.37	84.5	83.4	98.7
41 3.71 .0677 .0556 .206 .274 83.7 291 305 7090 1.39 85.	9	2.89	.0851	.0700	. 202	.287	87.7	307	306	0712	1.38	84.8	84.1	99.3
	4	3.71	.0677	.0556	.206	.274	83.7	291	305	70 9 0	1.39	85.2	84.6	7.66

TABLE II. (Cont'd) ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

٠

.

.

)

)

Coolant Configuration B-A; w = .178

99

Remarks: (a) Tests 29, 31: Non-steady.

1

GAE/ME/63-1

			f	ABLE II.	(Cont	d) ENG	INE PERFOI	RMANCE SI	MMARY					G
Ē				00	lant C	onfigura	tion B-B	u = .10	8				,	E/ME
No.	MR	· 5	, dí)	500 · · ·	• >	F (1b)	Pc (psia)	Isx (sec)	Ct (ft/sec)	C.F.	(ع ع	m\$	لم) (۶)	/63-1
3	2.57	.0753	1290.	.172	.247	72.0	265	292	7160	1.31	84.8	80.5	95.0	
47	3.18	1670.	1790.	.204	.277	81.3	294	294	7080	1.34	84.5	81.0	95.9	
48	3.65	.0643	.0573	.209	.274	81.7	292	562	0117	1.36	85.5	80.8	9.46	
49	1.93	,1054	0760.	.181	.286	80.7	3 96	282	6910	1.31	82.4	78.5	95.3	
51	1.97	.1053	0760.	.185	.290	83.3	304	287	0669	1.32	83.2	6.67	96.1	
52	2.16	.0986	.0879	.190	.289	85.3	306	295	7065	1.34	83,8	81.7	97.5	
53	2.27	8960.	.0862	.196	.293	88.4	310	302	7060	1.38	83.8	83.4	99.5	
54	2.46	££60°	.0833	.205	.299	93.0	327	311	7295	1.37	86.3	85.7	7.66	
55	2.70	.0881	.0785	.212	.300	92.2	322	307	7160	1.38	84.9	84.5	7.96	
56	2.80	.0858	.0765	.214	.300	91.7	321	306	0714	1.38	84.7	84.3	99.5	
57	3.00	.0806	8170.	.215	.296	90.3	314	305	7080	1.39	84.2	83.9	7.99	
59	3.12	.0782	.0697	712.	. 295	. 1.06	314	307	7105	1.39	84.6	84.6	100.0	
3 6	3.44	7170.	.0636	.219	. 290	87.4	306	301	0702	1.38	84.3	83.2	98.8	
61	3.73	.0662	0650.	.220	.286	87.7	304	307	0601	1.40	85.4	85.1	99.8	
Rem	urka ı	(a) (b) Ru	ns 43-461 ns 50, 58	Non-st visic	ceady.	malfunct	don.							

.

TABLE II. (Cont'd) ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

}

GAE/	'me/	63-1
------	------	------

TABLE II. (Cont'd) ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

)

\$

	. ~ 😥	95.4	96.8	6.7ę	0.66	98.0	98.8	99.8	6.66	99.3	99.8
	mæ	79.8	81.7	83.6	85.6	85.5	85.7	86.3	86.5	85.7	85.8
	F)	83.7	84.5	85.4	86.5	87.3	86.8	86.5	86.6	86.3	86.0
	CPX	1.31	1.33	1.34	1.36	1.35	1.37	1.38	1.39	1.39	1.40
oling	C# (ft/sec)	6895	0702	7160	7280	7360	7330	7300	7280	7185	7060
i no co	Isx (sec)	280	5 90	5 62	308	309	311	313	314	310	307
ation B-C	P (pafa)	279	590	308	312	313	313	314	313	306	2962
nfigur	F (1b)	75.6	7.97	85.8	88.0	87.9	88.5	8,98	0.06	88.0	86.0
lant Co	• >	.270	.275	.287	. 286	.284	.285	.287	.287	.284	. 280
000	••• •••	.160	.172	.187	161.	.193	.199	.207	.216	.222	. 226
	, vr (1b /	.1096	.1033	.1003	.0954	0160.	.0858	797.	117.	.0620	.0543
	. ۲ <mark>۳</mark>	1	ł	I	I	I	ł	I	ł	t	I
	MR	1.46	1.67	1.87	2.00	2.13	2.32	2.60	3.04	3.58	4.17
	Test No.	62	63	Ę	65	3	67	8 9	\$	20	4

Remarks: (a) Test 71; Nossle throat burnout.

GA	e/m	e/63- 1	-					<u>.</u> .	~		o '	4	•	•	د	~	•	د
		~ (¥	98.6	99.5	100.6	101.2	101.3	101.2	101.0	100.7	100.2	[.00[100.7	95.9	98.]	98.8	8	100.1
		m æ	80.1	81.3	82.6	85.2	85.9	86.8	86.7	86.2	83.8	85.9	84.7	81.1	85.1	84.9	85.7	86.9
		(J)	81.3	81.7	82.1	84.2	84.8	85.8	85.9	85.6	83.6	85.7	84.1	84.7	86.8	86.0	85.8	86.7
		CFx	1.35	1.37	1.39	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.39	1.40	1.41	1.32	1.37	1.39	1.41	1.42
TUVIM	2	C [*] (ft/sec)	6760	6840	6910	7100	7160	7250	7225	7210	7030	7160	7000	7050	7210	1040	6895	6805
WANCE SU	<u>u = .08</u>	Isac)	284	291	298	308	311	315	315	313	304	311	306	288	307	303	302	300
NE FERFUI	tion C-D	Pc (psia)	272	281	292	301	307	302	302	293	295	295	297	282	305	306	311	303
d) ENGI	nfigura	F (1b)	76.2	7.97	84.0	87.2	89.0	87.6	87.7	84.8	85.2	85.6	86.7	77.0	86.7	88.0	0.16	89.3
(Cont'	ant Co	• 3	.268	.274	.282	.283	.286	.278	.279	175.	.280	.275	. 283	.267	.282	. 290	.301	.297
	Cool	ec) •	.162	.172	.184	.190	.193	.194	.203	.196	.206	.209	712.	.162	.218	.231	.246	.248
TAB			.0973	.0937	.0897	.0851	.0849	.0773	.0692	.0691	.0675	.0607	.0606	1960.	.0589	.0543	.0508	.0448
		. द	1901.	.1022	6260.	.0928	.0926	.0843	.0755	.0754	.0736	.0662	.0661	.1048	.0643	.0593	.0554	.0489
		MR	1.66	1.84	2.05	2.23	2.27	2.51	2.93	2.84	3.05	3.44	3.58	1.69	3.70	4.26	4.84	5.54
		Test No.	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	\$	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87

\$

٤

.

TABLE II. (Cont'd) ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

GA	e/me	/63-1	۲.	.	e.	4.	ч.	ч.	4.	9.	e.	9.	г.	9.
		~ %	98	8	98	lot	102	101	101	101	101	IOI	101	100
		r 8	78.3	81.0	2.62	83.3	84.6	82.7	83.5	83.5	83.3	84.2	85.6	85.3
		لع (لا)	79.4	81.2	80.9	82.1	82.8	81.8	82.3	82.2	82.1	82.9	84.7	84.8
		CF X	1.35	1.37	1.39	1.40	1.41	1.40	1.40	1.41	1.42	1.42	1.43	1.42
TYTE	2	C# (ft/sec)	6580	6745	0629	6920	0669	69 10	0569	0069	6830	6830	6745	6740
mance so	<u> </u>	Isec)	276	287	293	301	306	300	303	303	301	302	299	298
E FERIO	ion C-E;	Pc (psia)	285	291	298	306	308	296	302	304	302	301	294	302
I) ENGIN	figurat	F (1b)	79.8	82.7	85.3	88.8	8,98	85.8	87.7	89.0	89.0	0.68	87.2	89.3
(Cont'o	lant Cor	•>	.289	.288	162.	. 295	. 294	.286	. 290	.294	. 295	.294	.291	.299
BLE II.	0000	38c)	.163	.165	771.	.189	.194	.192	.196	.212	.221	.226	.235	272
V I.		, dí)—	.1037	.1016	1760.	.0877	.0822	<i>TTT0.</i>	.0773	.0672	.0608	.0561	.0458	.0470
		. द	.1258	.1233	2711.	.1062	.1990	.0942	7660.	.0815	.0737	.0680	.0556	.0570
		MR	1.57	1.63	1.88	2.15	2.36	2.47	2.54	3.15	3.63	4.03	5.13	5.16
		Test No.	88	6 8	8	16	92	93	64	95	96	67	98	8

TABLE II. (Cont'd) ENGINE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

1

,

103

,

			Coola	nt Conf	<u>igurati</u>	n A-A;	<u>11. = w</u>	το			
Tes No.	t MR	V1 (ft/sec)	T13 (°F)	T14 (T)	Γ 15 (°F)	T16 (F)	T17 (°F)	Γ 18 (°F)	Ta (°F)	Pa (psia)	Test Time (sec)
6	3.36	5711	I	535	705	1220	1085	10 5 5	55	14.5	4.5
10	3.53	1210	ı	545	715	1245	5 7TI	0111	57	14.5	4.1
Π	3.15	1025	ı	525	710	57 11	1045	1030	57	14.5	4.0
12	3.28	834	ı	530	700	3 7 11	1075	1045	59	14.5	4.0
13	3.43	846	ı	530	705	1235	0011	1065	59	14.5	4.0
15	4.14	639**	ı	530	775	1280	1200	0711	59	14.5	4.0
16	4.98	**867	ı	615	880*	1460*	1230*	1180*	59	14.5	4.0
14	4.02	679	I	535	765	1265	0811	1125	59	14.5	4.0
*	Non-s teady	temperature	readi	ng.							

TABLE III. COOLANT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

** Inaccurate due to small ΔP_{1n}

Remarks: (a) Tests 9-16: $\Gamma_{1,3}$ thermocouple faulty.

•

,

ð

GAE/ME/63-1

I

Ì

j.

.

Test	Pa Time (psia) (sec)	14.5 3.5	14.5 3.7	14.5 3.9	14.5 3.9	14.5 3.8	14.5 5.7	14.5 4.3	
- 1	T (J. L	45	45	\$	43	2 †	7	75	
m = .109	T16 (F)	925	1025	1130	0701	1125	965	1310*	
A-B;	T17 (F)	955	1085	1260*	0011	0911	66 5	1610*	
guration	T16 (°F)	1070	1180	1380*	1200	1265	1120	1760*	
t Confis	T15 (F)	710	765	885*	770	062	725	1075*	
Coolan	11 (T)	630	655	765*	675	700	079	*096	
	T13	420	445	*087	450	455	430	*009	
	V1 (ft/sec)	1215	1030	627**	869	773	953	715	
	MR	2.45	3.29	5.32	3.33	3.72	2.73	67.9	
	Test No.	18	19	ร	22	24	25	26	

* Non-steady temperature reading.

105

** Inaccurate due to small Δ^{P}_{1n} .

Remarks: (a) Test 26; Nozzle throat burnout, non-steady.

TABLE III. (Cont'd) COOLANT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

:

															annel sulty.
	Test Time (sec)	5.4	5.4	5.3	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	ć.4	. 5.1	ograph chu scouple fe
	Pa (psia)	14.4	14.4	14.5	14.5	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	L3 OSCÍLIC L3 thermo
۳	T (F)	52	52	4	75	78	78	78	77	77	77	76	76	76	14–39: T ₁ 10, 32: ₁
ω = .178	T ₁₈ (F)	965	096	0911	645*	800	785	830	860	890	950	975	1000	0711	Tests 3 faulty. Tests 3
B-A;	$\begin{bmatrix} T_{17} \\ (T) \end{bmatrix}$	066	086	1200	ł	845	825	865	895	930	086	365	(201	0/11	s: (a) (b)
guration	${}^{\mathrm{T}_{16}}_{(\mathrm{F})}$	1080	1060	1330	1430*	895	865	945	975	1030	1050	0 6 01	0711	1270	Remark
t Config	T ₁₅ (F)	685	680	870	1000*	670	670	675	680	069	0 6 9	069	069	815	
Coolan	T1 4 (T)	470	460	560	795*	514	505	430	740	445	460	780	485	525	ding. in
	T13 (T)	375	360	515	515*	320	I	I	ł	I	١	I	700	014	ure rea mall ΔP
	V1 (ft/sec)	1080	1060	868	**077	1345	1290	1235	932	1295	1220	0211	1125	1270	ly temperat se due to s
	MR	2.65	2.55	3.95	6.04	2.16	2.11	2.18	2.29	2.39	2.45	2.65	2.89	3.71	Non-stead Inacourat
	Test No.	21	28	8	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	4	41	* *

ŧ

GAE/ME/63-1

TABLE III. (Cont'd) COOLANT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

1

)

·			·	Coolant	Cenfig	urstin	B-B;	. = .109	1		+ • • •
Test No.	MR	V1 (ft∕sec)	τ, Έ	Ĩ.	(T) (T)	Γ1.6 (Ť)	1,1 (T)	118 (T)	₽ ₽	Pa (peia)	
a	2.57	**677	445	505	750	1075	366		46	14.5	4.6
47	3.18	**879	767	565	860	1160	1070	I	4 6	14.4	4.0
87	3.65	**679	485	635	#006	1085*	1030*	1	97	14.4	4-0
67	1.93	831	390	455	710	840	780	071	S	14.5	4.2
51	1.97	1050	395	455	720	880	820	262	50	14.5	4.1
52	2.16	οτοτ	415	465	735	960	06 8	875	ŝ	14.5	4.3
53	2.27	OITI	430	480	745	1005	930	915	8	14.5	4.2
54	2.46	973	077	495	750	1065	86	980	ŝ	14.5	4-4
55	2.70	981	455	5 10	760	1095	1005	66	ጽ	14.5	4.3
56	2.80	927	465	535	061	1100	1020	1010	8	14.5	4.4
57	3.00	277##	485	580	825	1125	1055	1040	ጽ	14.5	4.4
59	3.12	##179	485	585	850	1150	1065	1050	8	14.5	4.5
33	3.44	\$06**	485	600	88 0	1185	0011	1080	S	2.415	4.5
61	3.73	300##	48 5	645	945	1300	0/11	1125	R	14.5	4.4

TABLE III. (Cont'd) COOLANT FERFORMANCE SUMMARY

.

* Non-steady temperature reading.

** Inaccurate due to small $\Delta P_{\rm in}$.

Remarks: (a) Tests 42, 47, 48: $T_{1,6}$ oscillograph channel faulty.

GAE/ME/63-1

				Coolan	t Conf1	guration	B-C; I	to cooli			
Test No.	MR	V ₁ (ft/sec)	T13 (T)	T14 (T)	T ₁₅ (T)	$\begin{bmatrix} T_{16} \\ (T) \end{bmatrix}$	T17 (F)	T18 (F)	Ta (T)	P _a (psia)	Test Time (sec)
62	1.46	•	450	500	5 69	- 795	725	999	54	14.4	4.5
63	1.67	1	495	515	710	855	765	710	54	14.4	4.5
7 9	1.87	I	515	545	750	076	860	785	54	14.4	4.5
65	2.00	1	535	565	795	066	895	835	55	14.4	4.5
99	2.13	· 1	560	595	845	3101	076	880	55	14.4	4.5
67	2.32	1	600	625	860	1055	096	920	55	14.4	4.5
8 9	2.60	ı	625	0 99	890	1130	066	026	56	14.4	4.6
69	3.04	ı	645	745	1060	1360	1055	1030	56	14.4	4.5
02	3.58	I	660	805	1165	1565	0/11	1115	57	14.4	4.2
11	4.17	I	675*	*006	1330*	1780*	1320*	1205*	58	14.4	4.9

TABLE III. (Cont'd) COOLANT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

* Non-steady temperature reading.

.

Remarks: (a) Test 71: Nozzle throat burnout.

ŧ

.

,

-

			TABLE	.111	(Cont'd	() COOLA	NT PERF	ORMANCE	SUMMAR	¥	
				Coolai	nt Confi	guratio	n C-D;	780° = m	_+		+00
Test	đŅ	V.4	, L	Ľ	4	T.	Τ, ,	T, a	Ĕ	а С	Time
.0N	ML	(ft/sec)	Ê	Æ	1 (F)	Ĵ.	- E	J.	E.	(psia)	(sec)
72	1.66	1715	365	480	505	585	615	590	53	14.3	4.5
73	1.84	1385	077	485	525	650	700	650	54	14.3	5.0
74	2.05	1365	475	500	550	710	765	715	55	14.3	5.0
75	2.23	0111	505	550	645	770	845	855	55	14.3	5.1
76	2.27	1235	510	560	655	820	920	945	56	14.3	5.1
77	2.51	1015	525	590	730	890	096	1000	56	14.3	5.8
78	2.93	0121	540	615	760	960	980	1030	56	14.3	5.0
62	2.84	0611	535	605	750	950	970	1020	17	14.3	4.9
80	3.05	1070	555	625	785	1050	066	1050	73	14.2	4.3
81	3.44	1040	590	695	835	1075	1010	1090	75	14.2	4.5
82	3.58	603	009	705	880	0111	1035	2011	76	14.2	4.5
83	1.69	1825	400	ł	515	615	665	019	8 9	14.4	6.2
84	3.70	1085	610	I	885	0911	1055	1125	67	14.4	5.4
85	4.26	1045	630	I	026	1250	57 11	0711	8 9	14.4	4.5
86	4.84	913	665	I	666	1370*	1235*	1155*	88	14.4	4.2
87	5.54	1250	06 9	ı	1035	1440*	1260*	1200*	88	14.4	4.2

* Non-steady temperature reading. Remarks: (a) Tests 83-67: T₁₄ oscillograph channel faulty. ¥

£

,

GAE/ME/63-1

.

				Coolan	t Confi	guratio	с-В; В)/I. = W	. ol		
Test No.	MR	V ₁ (ft/sec)	T ₁ 3	T1.4 (F)	(T)	Γ 1 6 (F)	T ₁ ,	T ₁₈ (T)	Ta (T)	P _a (psia)	Test Time (sec)
88	1.57	1005	285	340	465	019	590	620	72	14.2	5.1
68	1.63	1000	310	350	485	650	615	645	72	14.2	6.0
8	1.88	926	330	385	510	\$6 9	655	017	72	14.2	5.3
16	2.15	882	345	430	580	760	745	775	72	14.2	5.4
92	2.36	835	365	445	655	810	770	850	72	14.2	5.2
63	2.47	772	375	450	675	860	800	885	72	14.2	5.1
64	2.54	662	385	760	720	880	830	- 915	72	14.2	5.5
95	3.15	653	425	510	825	οτοτ	645	1005	12	14.2	5.1
96	3.63	278**	435	535	845	1065	1055	1080	70	14.2	5.1
6	4.03	832	445	570	860	0/11	1085	57 11	20	14.2	5.2
98	5.13	732	445	685	016	1215*	1125*	1165*	9	14.1	4.9
8	5.16	277**	455	60 5	935	124,0*	1135*	*0/11	93	14.1	4.7

TABLE III. (Cont'd) COOLANT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

7

GAE/ME/63-1

1

)

l

110

Non-steady temperature reading. Inaccurate due to small ΔP_{1n} .

* *

GAE/ME/63-1

APPENDIX B

 $^{\circ}$





)







GAE/ME/63-1

ł,





GAE/ME/63-1



ç-16













AMC Form No. 1168 (20 Nov 47)

The Form replaces AMC form He. 27-5-28, estating

		gyman	ALTERATION		DATE	APPROVED
		I				
RON/CONSTANTAN,						
32 FROM INSIDE						
			COOLANT	HOLES ON		
		~_	INSTOR	F		
		· · · ·				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
/	*					
/	" (\sim	CODLA	ANT INLET I	FITTING	
/			1			
	151	•	1			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					-
		le c	6			
		•				
	* * * · · ·					
\backslash						
\backslash				1		
DICATES						
(ANNEL						
	I					
	(0.001			TYPE HEAT ASSY I	NO. NEXT A	SSY FINAL ASSY
WORK ORDER -	62-304	1		USED ON		ANTITY REQD. C.
UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED DIMENSIONS ARE IN MCHES. TOLERANCES ON	D. J. ALSER 7/1/6	3		U. S.	AIR FOR	Œ
PRACTIONS. DECIMALS. ANGLES.	CHECKER		KMULUJALE	AIR MAT	ERIEL COM	MAND
Ca4- NATERIAL	ENGINEER ALSER	η ι	OCATION			
TREATMENT	EXAMINED	1		[7	
71K1\$8	PRO. APPRYD.				/ RAWING 110.	
		SCALE FULL	j wr.	8در		N-L-17 BEC 41 948
This Form replaces AMC Form No. 57-6-58, ex	enne			TT.		

th will be used until each

.