

AD-A076 253

BOEING WICHITA CO KS
JET ENGINE DEMOUNTABLE TEST CELL EXHAUST SYSTEM PHASE - COANDA/--ETC(U)
APR 79 R E BALLARD , W F BYERS
D3-11527-1

F/G 1/5

N00140-76-C-1229

UNCLASSIFIED

NAEC-92-112

NL

1 OF 1
AD-A076253





LAKEHURST, N.J.
08733

NAVAL AIR ENGINEERING CENTER

REPORT NAEC-92-112

AD A076253

LEVEL

JET ENGINE DEMOUNTABLE TEST CELL
EXHAUST SYSTEM PHASE

COANDA/REFRACTION NOISE SUPPRESSION CONCEPT
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT

Propulsion Support Equipment Division
Ground Support Equipment Department
Naval Air Engineering Center
Lakehurst, New Jersey 08733

April 1979

Technical Report
Airtask A3400000/051C/6WSL57001

DDC
RECEIVED
NOV 7 1979
A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

DDC FILE COPY

Prepared for:
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command
AIR-340E
Washington D.C. 20361

79 11 05 104

JET ENGINE DEMOUNTABLE TEST CELL
EXHAUST SYSTEM PHASE

COANDA/REFRACTION NOISE SUPPRESSION CONCEPT
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT

Prepared by: Robert E. Ballard

R. E. Ballard, Boeing Wichita Company

William F. Byers

W. F. Byers, Boeing Wichita Company

D. L. Armstrong

D. L. Armstrong, Boeing Wichita Company

Reviewed by: [Signature]

D. D. Croce

Advanced Technology Section, Propulsion
Support Equipment Requirements Branch

Approved by: F. S. Evans

F. S. Evans

Ground Support Equipment Superintendent

NOTICE

Reproduction of this document in any form by other than naval activities is not authorized except by special approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Chief of Naval Operations as appropriate.

The following espionage notice can be disregarded unless this document is plainly marked CONFIDENTIAL or SECRET.

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Laws, Title 18, U.S.C., Sections 793 and 794. The transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

10-24-79 da

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

19 REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER 18) NAEC-92-112	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) 6) Jet Engine Demountable Test Cell Exhaust System Phase - Coanda/Refraction Noise Suppression Concept - Advanced Development		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 9) Technical Report July 1976 - December 1976	
7. AUTHOR(s) 10) R. E. Ballard, W. F. Byers and D. L. Armstrong		6) 14) D3-11527-1	
8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Boeing Wichita Company Division of The Boeing Company Wichita, Kansas 67210 059 650		15) N00140-76-C-1229	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Air System Command (AIR-340E and AIR-53431B) Washington, D.C. 20361		12. REPORT DATE 11) April 1979 13) 91	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Naval Air Engineering Center Ground Support Equipment Department (92623) Lakehurst, New Jersey 08733		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 91	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		16. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE N/A	
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Coanda jet deflection, ground run up noise suppression, jet engine exhaust noise, test cell acoustic enclosures, acoustic refraction, aerodynamics, thermodynamics, acoustics.			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) → The successfully demonstrated Coanda/refraction air-cooled exhaust noise suppressor system is applied to the Navy requirement for effective exhaust noise suppression in jet engine demountable test cells. The technical approach consists of analytical studies and one-sixth scale model tests using simulated afterburning engine exhausts. Revisions are made to the previously developed system to improve noise suppression capability while reducing the system overall size and initial cost. Revisions include moving secondary air inlets to reduce enclosure size and improve cooling, shortening the Coanda surface to provide more acoustically treated exhaust stack and providing variations in exhaust			

DD FORM 1473

1 JAN 73

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

059 650

alt

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. Abstract (Cont'd)

→ stack configuration such as single and dual acoustic splitters and acoustic wedges up the back wall. Extensive data were recorded and analyzed to identify the aerothermodynamic and acoustic trends related to these configuration changes. Results present recommendations for an air-cooled Coanda/refraction exhaust system for application to demountable test cells. →

S/N 0102- LF-014-6601

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

SUMMARY

A one-sixth scale model test program was conducted in the Boeing-Wichita Acoustic Arena with the purpose of improving the previously developed Coanda exhaust suppressor system by reducing the size and cost without reducing noise suppression capability. This improved exhaust suppressor system would then be placed behind a test stand enclosure to form a complete demountable test cell system. The reduction in size of the exhaust suppressor system was accomplished by: (1) moving the secondary air inlets from the side to above the ejector/Coanda which greatly reduced the width and (2) by reducing the Coanda surface length from a 90° turn to 65° which shortens the Coanda height and allows a shorter stack weight while maintaining the required length of acoustically treated exhaust stack.

Flow dynamics and acoustic testing were accomplished with several exhaust muffler (stack) configurations including short versions with single and dual acoustic splitters and acoustic wedges at the back wall and a tall stack without splitters or wedges. These tests were run using a nozzle flow that reproduced (as near as possible) the afterburning flow conditions ($T_{jet} = 3170^{\circ}\text{F}$, $P_t/P_a = 1.943$) for the TF30-PW-412A engine. The model nozzle diameter was one-sixth that of the full scale engine nozzle throat at full afterburning.

The results of these tests indicated that the exhaust stack configurations with acoustic baffles (splitters) in the flow should not be used in production with the current Coanda configuration. This was concluded because of local hot areas on these splitters with measured temperatures as high as 1370°F . The dual wedge configuration did not demonstrate any such temperature problem; however, the improvement in acoustic attenuation was not significant enough to allow a reduction in stack height to the 30-foot full scale height simulated. It is possible that configurations with acoustic splitters could be used if the mixing in the ejectors and Coanda turning were increased to lower the temperature of flow into the stack. It may be possible to do this with the development of a wider ejector/Coanda system.

The recommended configuration from the results of these tests was a 40-foot stack height with no splitters or wedges in the stack, the 65-degree Coanda surface and three-ejector transition with an enclosure that places the secondary air intakes above the Coanda/ejector set.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DDC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Code	
Dist	Avail and/or special
A	

PREFACE

The development of the Navy Coanda exhaust suppressor system began in 1971 with the awarding of a feasibility study contract to Boeing-Wichita. Existing ground range suppressors for military afterburning engines were water-cooled units pumping up to 800 gallons of water per minute into the exhaust plume to cool the 3000°F exhaust gases and reduce the flow velocity. This resulted in excessive maintenance problems due to corrosion and a dirty, sooty exhaust and compounded operational and system complexity with controls, plumbing, pumps, etc. The Navy recognized the life cycle cost advantages of an air-cooled system and that the Coanda effect may be the key to development of an operationally successful afterburning jet deflector since it requires no components of the suppressor in the exhaust flow.

The success of the original feasibility study resulted in follow-on development work by Boeing-Wichita for the Navy, culminating in a full-scale Coanda exhaust suppressor demonstration unit that was successfully demonstrated in late 1975.

Since that successful full-scale demonstration of a demountable suppressor, the Navy has awarded Boeing-Wichita a contract to develop specific adaptations of the Coanda suppressor for improved demountable configurations, retrofit of existing class "C" test cells and "hush-house" (aircraft enclosed) type ground runup suppressors. This document reports the results of the analysis and tests performed to improve the demountable test cell configuration by reducing size and cost.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
	SUMMARY	i
	PREFACE	ii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
	LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	iv-v
	LIST OF TABLES	vi
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	TEST EQUIPMENT AND PROCEDURES	3
	A. Test Equipment	3
	1. Test Facility	3
	2. Data Acquisition Equipment	3
	3. Model Description	7
	4. Instrumentation	24
	B. Test Procedures	34
III.	TEST RESULTS	39
	A. Aerothermodynamics	39
	B. Acoustics	49
IV.	CONCLUSIONS	76
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS	77
VI.	REFERENCES	78
VII.	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS AND SYMBOLS	79

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Title	Page
1	Acoustic Arena Model Scale Test Facility	4
2	Burner and Airflow Controls	5
3	Data Acquisition Equipment	5
4	Acoustic Arena Data Acquisition System	6
5	Far Field Acoustic Microphone Array	8
6	Example of Individual Microphone Acoustic Data	9
7	Example of Acoustic Summary Data	9
8	Example of Tabulated Pressure and Temperature Data	10
9	Example of Exhaust Velocity, Inlet Airflow Velocity and Airflow Data	10
10	Coanda Demountable Test Cell (Cutaway)	11
11	Coanda Enclosure Model Installed on Support Floor	12
12	Coanda Demountable Test Cell Model Installed in Test Arena Facility	13
13	Acoustically Treated Test Cell Model Inlet Cover	14
14	Schematic of Single Splitter Exhaust Stack Configuration	15
15	Single Splitter Exhaust Stack Model	15
16	Schematic of Single Splitter Exhaust Stack Configuration	16
17	Dual Splitter Exhaust Stack Model	16
18	Typical Exhaust Stack Splitter Construction	17
19	Schematic of Acoustic Wedge Exhaust Stack Configuration	18
20	Acoustic Wedge Exhaust Stack Model	18
21	Dimensional Schematic of Model Ejectors and Coanda	20
22	Ejector Set Installed on Ground Plane and Support Structure	21
23	Coanda and Ejector Set Installed on Ground Plane and Support Structure with Burner Acoustic Cover	21
24	View Showing Interior of Burner Acoustic Cover	22
25	Relationship of Nozzle, Ejectors and End Plate of Burner Acoustic Cover	22
26	Model with Short Exhaust Stack, Wall Transmission Isolation (Sandbags) and Burner Acoustic Cover	23
27	Model with Tall Exhaust Stack, Wall Transmission Isolation (Sandbags), Burner Acoustic Cover and Secondary Air Inlet Acoustic Cover	23
28	Schematic of Ejectors and Coanda Surface Test Setup and Instrumentation	25
29	Coanda Exit P_T and T_T Rake Installation	26
30	Exhaust Stack Exit P_T and T_T Rake Installation	26
31	Schematic of Enclosure Instrumentation - Single Splitter Exhaust Stack Configuration	27
32	Schematic of Enclosure Instrumentation - Dual Splitter Exhaust Stack Configuration	28
33	Schematic of Enclosure Instrumentation - Acoustic Wedges Exhaust Stack Configuration	29
34	Secondary Airflow Inlet P_S Rake Installation	30
35	Short Exhaust Stack Model with Near Field Microphones Installed	31
36	Tall Exhaust Stack Model with Near Field Microphones Installed	32
37	Arena Facility Afterburner Schematic	35
38	Secondary Air Inlet Pressure Loss Versus Inlet Airflow	41
39	Coanda Surface Pressures and Temperatures - No Acoustic Enclosure Configuration	43
40	Coanda Surface Pressures and Temperatures - Short Exhaust Stack with Single Splitter Configuration	44

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (CONT'D)

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
41	Coanda Surface Pressures and Temperatures - Short Exhaust Stack with Dual Splitter Configuration	45
42	Coanda Surface Pressures and Temperatures - Short Exhaust Stack with and without Dual Wedges	46
43	Coanda Surface Pressures and Temperatures - Tall Exhaust Stack without Splitters or Wedges	47
44	Coanda Exit Flow Velocity, Mach Number and Temperature Profiles - No Acoustic Enclosure	48
45	Exit Flow Velocity, Mach Number and Temperature Profiles - Short Exhaust Stack with Single Splitter Configuration	50
46	Exit Flow Velocity, Mach Number and Temperature Profiles - Short Exhaust Stack with Dual Splitter Configuration	51
47	Exit Flow Velocity, Mach Number and Temperature Profiles - Short Exhaust Stack with Dual Wedge Configuration	52
48	Ground Plane Reflective Interference Correction Factor for Five-Foot Microphone Height	62
49	Far Field Acoustic Data - 15°, 30°, 45° and 60° Positions - Short Exhaust Stack with Single Splitter Configuration	63
50	Far Field Acoustic Data - 75°, 90°, 105° and 120° Positions - Short Exhaust Stack with Single Splitter Configuration	64
51	Far Field Acoustic Data - 135°, 150°, 165° and 180° Position - Short Exhaust Stack with Single Splitter Configuration	65
52	Far Field Acoustic Data - 15°, 30°, 45° and 60° Positions - Tall Exhaust Stack Without Splitter Configuration	66
53	Far Field Acoustic Data - 75°, 90°, 105° and 120° Positions - Tall Exhaust Stack Without Splitter Configuration	67
54	Far Field Acoustic Data - 135°, 150°, 165° and 180° Positions - Tall Exhaust Stack Without Splitter Configuration	68
55	Far Field Acoustic Data - 15°, 30°, 45° and 60° Positions - Effects of Stack Height and Lining Thickness	69
56	Far Field Acoustic Data - 75°, 90°, 105° and 120° Positions - Effects of Stack Height and Lining Thickness	70
57	Far Field Acoustic Data - 135°, 150°, 165° and 180° Positions Effects of Stack Height and Lining Thickness	71
58	Far Field Acoustic Data - 15°, 30°, 45° and 60° Positions - Comparison of Single and Dual Splitters and Acoustic Wedges	72
59	Far Field Acoustic Data - 75°, 90°, 105° and 120° Positions - Comparison of Single and Dual Splitters and Acoustic Wedges	73
60	Far Field Acoustic Data - 135°, 150°, 165° and 180° Positions - Comparison of Single and Dual Splitters and Acoustic Wedges	74
61	Near Field Acoustic Data - Short Exhaust Stack Configuration with Single Splitter and all Hardwall Lined	75

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Instrumentation Requirement List	33
2	Environmental and Flow Condition Data Requirements	34
3	Model Test Configuration and Run Table	37 & 38
4	Model Afterburner Exit Temperature Calculated from Enthalpy Rise	40
5	Secondary Air Entrainment Data	42
6	Ejector Surface Temperatures - Top, Centerline	53
7	Ejector Surface Temperatures - Side, Centerline	54
8	Exhaust Stack Wall Temperatures - Short Stack with Single Splitter Configuration	55
9	Exhaust Stack Wall Temperatures - Short Stack with Dual Splitter Configuration	56
10	Exhaust Stack Wall Temperatures - Short Stack with Dual Acoustic Wedge Configuration	57
11	Exhaust Stack Wall Temperatures - Tail Stack Configuration	58
12	Acoustic Panel Properties	59
13	Acoustic Test Configuration Summary	60

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1971 Boeing-Wichita was awarded a competitive Navy contract (N00156-72-C-1053) to study the feasibility of utilizing the Coanda effect as an afterburning jet exhaust deflector in an air-cooled ground runup noise suppressor. Most U.S. military ground runup suppressors existing at that time were water-cooled, utilizing up to 800 gallons of water per minute to cool the higher than 3000°F afterburning exhaust plume. This resulted in corrosion problems, a dirty, sooty exhaust and compounded operational and system complexity with controls, plumbing, pumps, diffusers and water supply. Military suppressor users preferred an air-cooled system but none had been developed that were operationally successful.

The 1971 Navy contract was the first of four Navy Coanda noise suppressor contracts awarded to Boeing-Wichita. The analysis and model tests accomplished under that contract (reported in Reference (a)) proved the feasibility of using the Coanda effect for jet deflection and illustrated the advantageous noise directivity change due to refraction. The second contract (N00156-73-C-1794 awarded in 1973) made use of scale model testing to develop a configuration suitable for full-scale demonstration. The results of that contract were reported in Reference (b). In 1974 the third Navy contract (N00156-74-C-1710) was awarded under which a full-scale Coanda suppressor demonstration unit was built and successfully demonstrated. The full-scale test program was reported in Reference (c). Additional model scale testing included in that program was reported in Reference (d).

The fourth Navy contract, under which the work described in this report was accomplished, was awarded in 1976. This contract (N00140-76-C-1229) had the following multiple task objectives:

- Jet Engine Demountable Test Cell Phase – Improve the demountable test cell configuration by increasing exhaust muffler noise suppression to allow a reduction in exhaust system size and cost.
- Jet Engine Class "C" Test Cell Exhaust System Phase – Develop a configuration for retrofit of existing "C" test cells to the Coanda air-cooled exhaust suppressor system.
- Aircraft "Hush-House" Exhaust System Phase – Develop a means of adapting the Coanda air-cooled exhaust suppressor system to a "hush-house" application.
- Coanda Exhaust Suppressor System Design Handbook – Develop the necessary procedures and parametric data necessary to provide a comprehensive outline of the method used to make a "first cut" design of a Coanda exhaust suppressor system with a given set of exhaust conditions.

Each of these tasks is reported in separate final reports. The task results reported in this document are for the Jet Engine Demountable Test Cell Phase.

References

- a. Ballard, R. E., Brees, D. W., and Sawdy, D. T., "Feasibility and Initial Model Studies of a Coanda/Refraction Type Noise Suppressor System," The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, Document D3-9068, January 1973.
- b. Ballard, R. E., and Armstrong, D. L., "Configuration Scale Model Studies of a Coanda/Refraction Type Noise Suppressor System," The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, Document D3-9258, October 1973.
- c. "Test Cell Experimental Program Coanda/Refraction Noise Suppression Concept – Advanced Development," Final Technical Report for Navy Contract N00156-74-C-1710, Navy Document Number NAEC-GSED-97, The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, March 1976.
- d. "Aircraft System One-Sixth Scale Model Studies, Coanda/Refraction Noise Suppression Concept – Advanced Development," Final Technical Report for Scale Model Portion of Navy Contract N00156-74-C-1710, Navy Document Number NAEC-GSED-98, The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, March 1976.

The primary objective of this task was to "streamline" the operational configuration of the existing full-scale demonstration unit by reducing the overall suppressor size while maintaining or improving its noise suppression capabilities. This was to be accomplished with analytic studies and one-sixth scale model tests. The principal configuration changes attempted were:

- Reduction of Coanda surface turning angle from 90° to 65° thus allowing a shorter stack height.
- Reduction of the Coanda enclosure size.
- Movement of the secondary air inlets from the sides to the top of the enclosure. This allows a large reduction in suppressor width.
- Several exhaust muffler configurations such as single and dual acoustic splitters and acoustic wedges at the back wall of the enclosure.

This work will finalize the recommended design for a production version of the recently developed Coanda exhaust suppressor system for demountable test cell application.

II. TEST EQUIPMENT AND PROCEDURES

A. Test Equipment. The following paragraphs describe the test facility, the data acquisition equipment and the test model, including the instrumentation used.

1. **TEST FACILITY.** The model testing was accomplished in the Boeing-Wichita Acoustic Arena facility shown on Figure 1. The Arena wall is 16 feet high, inclined at an angle of 30 degrees to the vertical and is 100 feet in diameter at the base. The burner (hot gas generator) is a two-stage configuration. The first stage is a J47 jet engine burner can and spray nozzles, capable of reaching gas temperatures of 1500°F at the 15-pound per second maximum airflow rate. The second, or afterburning stage, consists of a central fuel spray nozzle and eight radial spray bars and a flame holder. This stage is water jacketed and can boost the jet exhaust temperature to 3300°F. The primary airflow source has 300 psia line pressure. A secondary airflow source is available with a 60 psia line pressure with a maximum flow rate of 40 pounds per second of cold air to simulate fan flows. The burner control instrumentation, fuel and airflow controls are housed in a small building next to the Arena with a window for visual observation of the model. These controls and instrumentation are shown on Figure 2.

2. DATA ACQUISITION EQUIPMENT

a. The data acquisition instrumentation, computer and printer are housed at a remote site and are shown on Figure 3. A pictorial block diagram of the Acoustic Arena data acquisition system is shown on Figure 4.

b. The Arena data acquisition system is built around the Varian 620/L Mini-Computer, which is a general purpose digital computer. The central processing unit of the computer has a 12K memory system. The input/output system provides the interface between the computer electronic system and the electro-mechanical devices that input data to the computer or output the computed results. The Beehive CRT (cathode ray tube) terminal enables control of the computer and the printer lists the data. The Tri-Data model 4036 provides program loading or storage of data on magnetic tape. The multiplexer allows each channel to be sampled sequentially or randomly, as required. The A/D converter converts the analog signal to a digital voltage level. A pressure scanner valve allows all the total pressures to be measured by the same ± 5.0 psid transducer. Ambient pressure was measured by a 15 psia transducer. A second pressure scanner valve and a ± 2.5 psid transducer were used to measure static pressures. Statham pressure transducers were used.

c. Temperature measurements were taken through four temperature scanners. Thermocouples were Iron-Constantan and Chromel-Alumel; Pace and Research Incorporated reference junctions were used.

d. For both temperatures and pressures, signal processing was accomplished by use of a B & F Instruments, Inc. signal conditioner and a Dynamics amplifier. The conditioned signal was connected to a monitor panel which permitted manual monitoring capability as well as calibration monitoring.




FIGURE 1: BOEING-WICHITA ACOUSTIC ARENA TEST FACILITY



FIGURE 2: BURNER AND AIRFLOW CONTROLS




FIGURE 3: DATA ACQUISITION EQUIPMENT




FIGURE 4: ACOUSTIC ARENA DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEM

e. The fuel flow was measured by a 1 gpm turbine-type flow transducer in the primary fuel line and a 5 gpm turbine-type flow transducer in the afterburner fuel line. The signal was conditioned by a Cox signal conditioner and the signal sent to the monitor panel. The flow rates were also displayed on digital voltmeters in the test control room. The monitor panel inputs were paralleled to the multiplexer input panel where further monitoring was possible. The signals then went into the multiplexer for processing.

f. The acoustic instrumentation system begins with the Bruel & Kjaer Models 4135 and 4136 microphone buttons. These are coupled to General Radio Model 560-P42 preamplifiers. A microphone scanner selects the proper channel for input to the autogain amplifier for signal processing. The General Radio Model 1925 Real-time Analyzer integrates the signal over an eight-second time interval and the computer interfaces the signal to the computer input. The far field acoustic microphones are flush mounted in disks, as shown on Figure 5, to obtain ground plane data that are free of reflective interference. Two computer programs were used for data acquisition. One program was used for performance data and the other for acoustic data, when recorded.

g. The acoustics program allows manual selection of the microphone data to be recorded. When the data from each microphone are analyzed, the computer signals the microphone scanner to advance one position. Data are taken sequentially. The analyzed acoustic data are printed in tabular form and plots of SPL versus frequency in one-third octave bands. Compilations of OASPL and PNL converted to full-scale equivalent distances are also provided. Examples of the acoustic data output format are illustrated on Figures 6 and 7.

h. The performance program provided automatic data acquisition. Once the program was started, all parameters were sampled and the scanners automatically controlled by the computer. The raw performance data, in the form of digital voltages, were converted to engineering units and calculation performed in the CPU. The data were then listed in tabulated form. Typical sample performance data output formats are illustrated on Figures 8 and 9.

3. MODEL DESCRIPTION

a. The Coanda demountable test cell has two enclosure sections: the test stand enclosure, including the primary air intake; and the ejector/Coanda enclosure, including the secondary air intake and exhaust muffler (stack). Only the latter enclosure was simulated in these model tests. A cutaway drawing of the complete test cell as it is currently visualized is shown on Figure 10.

b. The ejector/Coanda enclosure was fabricated in two sections. The forward section, which includes the secondary air intake, was fabricated of wood and simulates the internal lines of the enclosure and the secondary air intake. The aft section of the ejector/Coanda enclosure which includes the exhaust muffler (stack) was fabricated of sheet steel and simulates the enclosure and stack internal lines. Both sections are shown on Figures 11 and 12 with a short stack configuration.

c. The secondary air intake baffles were fabricated with wooden frames, an impervious septum in the center and 50 percent open area perforated steel plate face sheets on each side. The acoustic backing material was one inch thick Johns-Manville Glas-Mat 1200 fiberglass. The baffle leading edges are rounded to produce inlet bellmouths. The secondary air intake consists of 17 flow passages that simulate full-scale dimensions of 4.875 inches by 14 feet (96.69 ft²). The baffles are 24 inches long which simulates 12 feet at full scale. An acoustically treated secondary air intake cover was provided with an opening facing forward for the purpose of isolating the noise emitting from this inlet from the far field microphone measurements. It also shields the microphone placed above the inlet (to measure the attenuation provided by the intake baffles) from noise emitting from the exhaust stack. Figure 13 shows the intake cover installed on the model.

d. Several exhaust stack configurations were tested, as shown on Figures 14 through 20. For each configuration, the sidewalls of the lower aft enclosure, as well as all inner surfaces of the exhaust stack, are acoustically treated with Johns-Manville Glas-Mat 1200 fiberglass backing and 50 percent open area perforated face sheet.




FIGURE 5: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC MICROPHONE ARRAY





FIGURE 6: EXAMPLE OF INDIVIDUAL MICROPHONE ACOUSTIC DATA

1/6 SCALE NAVY CORNER DEMOUNTABLE CELL
SH STR-EXIT MK FWD INLET MK 9" LEFT C/L
RUN NO. 29
CONO. NO. 1
PH(P(SIA)) 14.00
TH(DEF) 61.2
MD(DEF) 355
MS(NPH) 9

DATE 28 SEPT 76
TIME 13 43 00
CONO. NO. 1
R H (%) 64.0

NOZZLE PARAMETERS
PTN(P(SIA)) 27.69
NPR 1.96
TH(DEF) 60.5
NPH(LB/SEC) 899
MFW(LB/SEC) 6.93
MFW(LB/SEC) 313



1/6 SCALE NAVY CORNER DEMOUNTABLE CELL
PERF SHIRT STACK & DUAL WEDGE-HO COVER
RUN NO. 31
CONO. NO. 23
PH(P(SIA)) 14.14
TH(DEF) 44.2
MD(DEF) 358
MS(NPH) 18

DATE 19 OCT 76
TIME 17 07 50
CONO. NO. 1
R H (%) 55.0

NOZZLE PARAMETERS
PTN(P(SIA)) 27.47
NPR 1.94
TH(DEF) 47.0
NPH(LB/SEC) 100
MFW(LB/SEC) 6.95
MFW(LB/SEC) 312

LOC	PRESS (PSIA)	LOC	TEMP (DEG F)	LOC	PRESS (PSIA)	LOC	TEMP (DEG F)
01EJ01	13.69	01EJ01	284.3	41N201	14.12	641PB1	1111.4
02EJ02	13.23	02EJ02	189.4	42N202	14.11	65CF01	179.2
03EJ03	12.90	03EJ03	183.6	43N203	14.12	BK06R	47.7
04EJ04	12.81	04EJ04	736.9	44N204	14.12	SPHRE	43.1
05EJ05	13.11	05EJ05	128.7	SPHRE	14.14	BK06R	43.1
06EJ06	12.84	06EJ06	692.4	SPHRE	14.14	BK06R	43.1
07EJ07	13.58	07EJ07	568.2	SPHRE	14.14	850502	43.1
08EJ08	13.92	08EJ08	884.1	SPHRE	14.14	860503	43.1
09EJ09	14.17	09EJ09	648.2	451R01	14.09	970504	43.1
10EJ10	13.74	10EJ10	774.3	461R02	14.10	860505	43.1
11EJ11	13.62	11EJ11	884.1	471R03	14.08	850506	43.1
12EJ12	13.97	12EJ12	838.0	481R04	14.08	980507	43.1
SPHRE	14.14	62EJ13	145.5	491R05	14.08	910508	43.1
SPHRE	14.14	63EJ14	1817.5	501R06	14.09	920509	43.1
13CD01	13.44	SPHRE	46.7	511R07	14.09	930510	43.1
14CD02	13.28	65EN01	521.2	521R08	14.08	940511	43.1
15CD03	13.42	78EN02	444.2	531R09	14.07	950512	43.1
16CD04	12.40	68EN03	46.7	541R10	14.09	960513	43.8
17CD05	12.45	13CD01	185.7	551R11	14.08	SPHRE	43.1
18CD06	12.65	14CD02	493.0	561R12	14.08	CHLSUB	921.2
19CD07	12.79	15CD03	835.2	571R13	14.07	SPHRE	43.8
20CD08	13.45	16CD04	937.4	581R14	14.09	970411	930.6
SPHRE	14.14	17CD05	955.4	591R15	14.08	980412	834.7
SPHRE	14.14	18CD06	949.9	601R16	14.09	990413	573.9
SPHRE	14.14	19CD07	1025.0	611R17	14.08	100044	394.3
SPHRE	14.14	20CD08	869.1	SPHRE	14.14	101045	818.0
23EN01	14.01	SPHRE	46.7	SPHRE	14.14	102046	727.0
24EN02	13.99	40SP01	55.6	SPHRE	14.14	103047	433.1
25EN03	13.95	41SP02	57.0	SPHRE	14.14	SPHRE	47.7
26EN04	13.95	42SP03	57.0	SPHRE	14.14	480501	47.7
PREF	15.12	SPHRE	46.7	SPHRE	14.14	490502	48.5
27EN01	14.15	725502	893.3	PREF	15.14	500503	47.7
28EN02	14.14	735503	982.9	SPHRE	14.14	510504	47.7
29EN03	14.14	745504	834.5	SPHRE	14.14	520505	47.7
30EN04	14.14	755505	740.4	SPHRE	14.14	530506	48.5
31EN05	14.14	765506	357.4	SPHRE	14.14	540507	48.5
32EN06	14.14	775507	122.0	SPHRE	14.14	550508	48.5
33EN07	14.14	785508	520.2	SPHRE	14.14	560509	48.5
34EN08	14.14	795509	533.8	SPHRE	14.14	570510	47.7
35EN09	14.14	805510	873.9	SPHRE	14.14	580511	47.7
36ER10	14.14	815511	882.9	SPHRE	14.14	590512	47.7
37ER11	14.14	825512	831.1	SPHRE	14.14	600513	47.7
38ER12	14.14	835513	819.3	SPHRE	14.14	610514	47.7
39ER13	14.14	TREF	989.2	SPHRE	14.14	SPHRE	47.7
40ER14	14.14	SPHRE	0	SPHRE	14.14	TREF	988.7

FIGURE 8: EXAMPLE OF TABULATED PRESSURE AND TEMPERATURE DATA

FIGURE 9: EXAMPLE OF EXHAUST VELOCITY, INLET AIRFLOW VELOCITY AND AIRFLOW DATA




FIGURE 10: COANDA DEMOUNTABLE TEST CELL (CUTAWAY)




FIGURE 11: COANDA ENCLOSURE MODEL INSTALLED ON SUPPORT FLOOR




FIGURE 12: COANDA DEMOUNTABLE TEST CELL MODEL INSTALLED IN TEST ARENA FACILITY




FIGURE 13: ACOUSTICALLY TREATED TEST CELL MODEL INLET COVER




FIGURE 14: SCHEMATIC OF SINGLE SPLITTER EXHAUST STACK CONFIGURATION




FIGURE 15: SINGLE SPLITTER EXHAUST STACK MODEL




FIGURE 16: SCHEMATIC OF DUAL SPLITTER EXHAUST STACK CONFIGURATION




FIGURE 17: DUAL SPLITTER EXHAUST STACK MODEL



FIGURE 18: TYPICAL EXHAUST STACK SPLITTER CONSTRUCTION




FIGURE 19: SCHEMATIC OF ACOUSTIC WEDGE EXHAUST STACK CONFIGURATION



FIGURE 20: ACOUSTIC WEDGE EXHAUST STACK MODEL

e. The single splitter exhaust stack configuration (Figures 14 and 15) has a single splitter attached to the forward and aft stack walls and centered on the Coanda flow. The splitter is equivalent to 36 inches thick (full scale) with a center impervious septum, Johns-Manville Glas-Mat 1200 backing material and 50 percent open area perforated plate face sheet. A sloping back wall that reaches to the floor has similar acoustic treatment that is equivalent to 24 inches thick (full scale). An exhaust stack extension that is equivalent to 24 feet (full scale) was provided that is acoustically treated and has the same cross sectional dimensions as the lower stack outer walls. This stack height provides a configuration with the same L/H ratio ($1/2 \times$ acoustically treated area/flow area) as a stack with a total height of 40 feet and an internal width dimension equal to 80 inches (full scale). This is the same flow passage width as the configuration with the splitter when the splitter width is excluded. Both the sort stack outer walls and the stack extension are provided with the capability of varying the backing depth between 2.75 inches and 4.13 inches (model scale). All configurations are provided with the capability of hard wall covering the acoustic treatment.

f. The dual splitter configuration (Figures 16 and 17) is similar to the single splitter except that two splitters, each equivalent to 18 inches (full scale) thick, are placed in the short exhaust stack. The same acoustic treatment as was used for the single splitter is used, only half as thick. The stack walls are left the same as with the single splitter.

g. Figure 18 illustrates the typical construction of the exhaust stack splitter with the perforated face sheet and acoustic backing material removed.

h. The acoustic wedges up the back wall of the enclosure and stack, shown on Figures 19 and 20, have the effect of producing a large L/H ratio while removing the splitter from the hottest and highest velocity flow. These two wedges are equivalent to eight feet deep (full scale) and each has a base width that is half the width of the back wall. The face sheet is 50 percent open area perforated plate and the backing material is Johns-Manville Glas-Mat 1200. The remainder of the stack and enclosure walls is left the same as in previous tests.

i. A dimensional schematic of the ejector set and Coanda surface used inside the enclosures described above is shown on Figure 21. The ejector set is fabricated of .090-inch thick stainless steel and the Coanda of .25-inch thick mild steel. A support structure and ground plane are provided for the ejectors, Coanda and acoustic enclosures. The ground plane simulates a 60-inch (full scale) distance below the engine centerline. Figure 22 shows the ejector set installed on the ground plane and support structure, and Figure 23 shows the addition of the Coanda surface and an acoustic burner cover. The purpose of the burner cover was to isolate any burner noise generated from the microphone locations since only the exhaust noise was to be measured. Figure 24 shows the interior of the burner cover and Figure 25 shows the exhaust nozzle, ejector and burner cover end plate interface. The burner cover end plate was used only when no ejector/Coanda enclosure was present. The forward wall of the ejector/Coanda enclosure became the divider between the burner cover and enclosure whenever an enclosure was being tested (see Figure 11).

j. Burlap bags filled with sand were used around the entire lower enclosure, as shown on Figures 26 and 27, to isolate the wall transmitted noise. This was necessary since it is very difficult to simulate full-scale wall transmission characteristics in model scale, and previous full-scale testing has shown adequate wall transmission loss capability.




FIGURE 21. DIMENSIONAL DRAWINGS OF SCALE MODEL COANDA SURFACE AND EJECTORS




FIGURE 22: EJECTOR SET INSTALLED ON GROUND PLANE AND SUPPORT STRUCTURE




FIGURE 23: COANDA AND EJECTOR SET INSTALLED ON GROUND PLANE AND SUPPORT STRUCTURE WITH BURNER ACOUSTIC COVER




FIGURE 24: VIEW SHOWING INTERIOR OF BURNER ACOUSTIC COVER




FIGURE 25: RELATIONSHIP OF NOZZLE, EJECTORS AND END PLATE OF BURNER ACOUSTIC COVER




FIGURE 26: MODEL WITH SHORT EXHAUST STACK, WALL TRANSMISSION ISOLATION (SANDBAGS), AND BURNER ACOUSTIC COVER




FIGURE 27: MODEL WITH TALL EXHAUST STACK, WALL TRANSMISSION ISOLATION (SANDBAGS), BURNER ACOUSTIC COVER AND SECONDARY AIR INLET ACOUSTIC COVER

4. INSTRUMENTATION

a. Figure 28 shows the relationship of the exhaust nozzle to the ejectors and Coanda surface. The location of the ejector and Coanda surface pressure and temperature instrumentation is also shown. Each of the three ejectors has four static pressure ports and four outside surface temperature thermocouples. The Coanda surface has eight each of static pressure ports and outside surface temperature thermocouples at approximately 10-degree intervals on the centerline starting at the entrance to the Coanda.

b. The exhaust flow characteristics above the center of the Coanda surface were measured by an exit rake (shown on Figure 29) which has 14 each of total pressure probes and total temperature probes. The probe positions are incremented based on a logarithmic scale with the smallest increment nearest the forward wall of the Coanda. This was required to measure the most number of points where the velocity gradient was largest. Figure 30 shows the exit rake installed at the exhaust stack exit indicating how exhaust flow characteristics were measured with the enclosure around the Coanda surface.

c. Figures 31, 32 and 33 show the location of the thermocouples added to the enclosure and exhaust stack for the single splitter, dual splitter and acoustic wedge configuration, respectively. These thermocouples were to measure the surface temperatures attained by the enclosure and exhaust stack inner walls.

d. Four static pressure probes were located in the enclosure interior with two centrally located below the inlet (one on each sidewall) and two centrally located below the exhaust stack (one on each sidewall). The probes were positioned 10 inches above ground. These probes determined the cell depression in the inlet and exhaust areas of the Coanda enclosure system.

e. The enclosure inlet(s) was instrumented to determine the secondary flow entrainment. Each channel in the inlet had a static pressure port at the centerline approximately 0.75 channel widths downstream from the start of the constant area section after the bellmouth. These static pressure pickups were placed on a movable inlet rake as shown on Figure 34.

f. The acoustic instrumentation included 12 far field and 3 near field microphones. The far field positions were at 15-degree intervals between 15 degrees and 180 degrees from the nozzle exit plane at a radial distance of $250/6 = 41.67$ feet. The far field microphone array was shown in the photo on Figure 5. The near field positions included two exterior and one interior to the enclosure as shown on Figures 31, 32 and 33 in the photos on Figures 35 and 36. Acoustic data recorded was 24 one-third octave bands between 315 Hz and 65 KHz (model scale) which was converted by the computer to full-scale equivalents between 50 Hz and 10 KHz.

g. Table 1 is a list of the instrumentation used and the accuracy requirement placed on that instrumentation.




FIGURE 28: SCHEMATIC OF EJECTORS & COANDA SURFACE TEST SETUP AND INSTRUMENTATION




FIGURE 29: COANDA EXIT P_T AND T_T RAKE INSTALLATION




FIGURE 30: EXHAUST STACK EXIT P_T AND T_T RAKE INSTALLATION





FIGURE 32: SCHEMATIC OF ENCLOSURE INSTRUMENTATION -
DUAL SPLITTER EXHAUST STACK CONFIGURATION



**FIGURE 33: SCHEMATIC OF ENCLOSURE INSTRUMENTATION -
ACOUSTIC WEDGE EXHAUST STACK CONFIGURATION**




FIGURE 34: SECONDARY AIRFLOW INLET P_s RAKE INSTALLATION




FIGURE 35: SHORT EXHAUST STACK MODEL WITH NEAR FIELD MICROPHONES INSTALLED




FIGURE 36: TALL EXHAUST STACK MODEL WITH NEAR FIELD MICROPHONES INSTALLED

TABLE 1
INSTRUMENTATION REQUIREMENT LIST

Location and Measurements	Units	No.	Range	Accuracy
Ejector static pressure	pela	12	10.0 to Amb.	±1%
Coanda surface static pressure	pela	8	10.0 to Amb.	±1%
Enclosure inlet static pressure	pela	17	13.0 to Amb.	±1%
Enclosure interior static pressure	pela	4	13.0 to Amb.	±1%
Exit rake total pressure	pela	14	Amb. to 17.0	±1/2%
Ejector metal surface temperature	°F	12	Amb. to 1300	±2%
Coanda metal surface temperature	°F	8	Amb. to 1200	±2%
Enclosure interior sidewall temperature	°F	3	Amb. to 600	±2%
Exhaust stack metal surface temperature:				
• Tall stack without splitter	°F	17	Amb. to 1000	±2%
• Short stack with single splitter	°F	17	Amb. to 1200	±2%
• Short stack with dual splitter	°F	16	Amb. to 1200	±2%
• Short stack with dual wedges	°F	19	Amb. to 1000	±2%
Exit rake total temperature	°F	14	Amb. to 1400	±2%
Far field microphones	*dB	12	50 to 140	±1 dB
Near field microphones	*dB	3	70 to 160	±1 dB

* Data are recorded in one-third octave SPL (re. 0.002 dyne/cm²)

h. In addition to the instrumentation listed, the following (Table 2) environmental and flow condition data were recorded:

TABLE 2
ENVIRONMENTAL AND FLOW CONDITIONS REQUIRED

Location and Measurements	Units	No.	Range	Accuracy
Ambient pressure	psia	1	13.8 - 14.2	$\pm 1/2\%$
Nozzle exhaust total pressure	psia	1	Amb. to 35	$\pm 1/2\%$
Nozzle exhaust pressure ratio	-	1	1.2 - 2.5	$\pm 1\%$
Ambient temperature	$^{\circ}\text{F}$	1	-	$\pm 2\%$
Nozzle exhaust gas temperature	$^{\circ}\text{F}$	1	Amb. to *	$\pm 2\%$
A/B cooling water in temperature	$^{\circ}\text{F}$	1	40 to 80	$\pm 2\%$
A/B cooling water out temperature	$^{\circ}\text{F}$	1	40 to 180	$\pm 2\%$
Nozzle airflow	lb/sec	1	0 to 7.5	$\pm 1\%$
Primary burner fuel flow	lb/sec	1	0 to .1	$\pm 2\%$
Afterburner fuel flow	lb/sec	1	0 to .3	$\pm 2\%$
A/B cooling water flow	lb/sec	1	9 to 12	$\pm 2\%$
Wind speed	mph	1	0 to 20	$\pm 5\%$
Wind direction	deg.	1	0 to 360	$\pm 15^{\circ}$
Relative humidity	%	1	0 to 100	$\pm 2\%$

*Afterburner temperature is calculated from airflow and fuel flow data used to set up afterburner condition.

B. Test Procedures.

a. The target values of afterburner nozzle pressure ratio and exhaust gas total temperature were 1.943 and 3630 $^{\circ}\text{R}$, respectively, for simulation of the exhaust of a TF30-P-412A engine. Exit temperature was set for each run by setting to a constant value of burner fuel flow at the target afterburner nozzle pressure ratio. This method of setting exhaust temperature was necessary due to lack of instrumentation capable of measuring the extremely high exhaust gas temperatures used for the test.

b. A calculation procedure was developed to determine the exhaust gas temperature based on the burner fuel flow, airflow, water jacket heat loss and an assumed burner efficiency of 95 percent. A heat balance was written about the afterburner shown schematically in Figure 37, resulting in Equation (1).




FIGURE 37: ARENA AFTERBURNER SCHEMATIC

$$\dot{W}_{f A/B} (h_{fa} + \eta_B H_v) = \dot{W}_{out} h_{out} + \dot{W}_{H_2O} C_{P_{H_2O}} (\Delta T_{H_2O}) - \dot{W}_{in} h_{in} \quad (1)$$

Solving Equation (1) for exhaust flow enthalpy (h_{out}) results in Equation (2):

$$h_{out} = \frac{\dot{W}_{f A/B} (h_{fa} + \eta_B H_v) - \dot{W}_{H_2O} C_{P_{H_2O}} (\Delta T_{H_2O}) + \dot{W}_{in} h_{in}}{\dot{W}_{out}} \quad (2)$$

Equations (3) and (4) below are stated equations for combustion products from Reference (e).

$$h_a = R_8 T^8 + R_7 T^7 + R_6 T^6 + R_5 T^5 + R_4 T^4 + R_3 T^3 + R_2 T^2 + R_1 T + R_0 \quad (3)$$

(R_0 through R_8 are constants defined in Section VII.)

$$h_{fc} = R_{f8} T^8 + R_{f7} T^7 + R_{f6} T^6 + R_{f5} T^5 + R_{f4} T^4 + R_{f3} T^3 + R_{f2} T^2 + R_{f1} T + R_{f0} \quad (4)$$

(R_{f0} through R_{f8} are constants defined in Section VII.)

Equations (3) and (4) from Reference (e) have a stated temperature range of 300° to 4000°R. However, the effects of disassociation are not believed to be included in the equations.

$$h = \frac{h_a + (f/a) h_{fc}}{1 + (f/a)} \quad (5)$$

Using Equations (2), (3), (4) and (5) with appropriate test data allows an iterative solution for jet exit temperature.

Ref. e: "GENEG-A Program for Calculating Design and Off-Design Performance for Turbojet and Turbofan Engines," NASA - Lewis Research Center Document Number TND-6552, February 1972.

b. The model configurations tested and the data recorded during those test runs are shown in Table 3. Each test condition was set up as near the desired nozzle pressure and exhaust temperature as was practical. A period of time for thermal stabilization was allowed at each power setting prior to recording data. Measurements were recorded for all instrumentation within each data column checked for each configuration.

c. Tabulations of the standard environmental and flow condition data were recorded for each test condition, as well as model configuration identifying information. All static pressure probes, metal surface temperature thermocouples, and Coanda exit rake total pressure and temperature probes were assigned identification coding. The measured data were recorded in tabular form for each test condition in the units specified by the instrumentation requirements.

d. Total secondary air inlet airflow was obtained by calculating and summing the airflow through each channel. Cross sectional area for each channel at the probe location was determined by the channel width and increment between probe movements. A discharge coefficient for the secondary air inlet bellmouth of 0.98 was used in the airflow calculation.

e. Exit rake total temperature and total pressure data were used to calculate Mach number and velocity of flow at each probe location. These data were tabulated and the velocity profiles computer plotted.

f. Acoustic data reduction included conversion of the 24 one-third octave band model scale measured data to full-scale equivalent frequencies, including conversion to standard day conditions and application of absorption coefficients for the model scale frequencies and distance. The data were tabulated in one-third and full octave band SPL as well as computed OASPL and "A" weighted SPL. The one-third octave SPL values were computer plotted.

TABLE 3
TEST CONFIGURATIONS & DATA REQUIREMENTS

Conf. Run No.	Nozzle Conditions			Encl. Walls		Stack Config.			Splitter Configuration				Acoustic Cover		Performance Data										Acoustic Data	
	Dia	P ₁ /P _a	T ₁	Perf	Hard	Walls		Height	No. Split	Single Split	Dual Split	Dual Wedge	Perf	Hard	Inlet	Burner	Eject. & Coanda		End. Stack		Splitter or Wedge		Rakes		Far Field	Near Field
						Perf	Hard										P	T	P	T	P	T	Inlet	Exit		
1 4	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Heat Rejection - No Model - Nozzle Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1 10	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Baseline - No Model - Nozzle Only (TF30)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
1 11	6.18 In.	2.43	3095 °F	—	—	—	—	Baseline - No Model - Nozzle Only (J75)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
2 15	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle & Ejectors Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
3 21	4.31 In.	2.105	703 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—	—
3 20, 24	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	(20) X	(24) X	—
4 25	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
5 26-30	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(26) X	(27) X
6 31	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
7 33	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
8 32	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
9 36	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
9 37	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
10 38	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
11 39	6.18 In.	1.943	3170 °F	—	—	—	—	Nozzle, Ejectors & Coanda Only	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	—

1 Setup on A/B Fuel Flow = .27 Lb/Sec With Primary Burner Exit Temp. = 1000 °F 2 Move Inlet Rake to Positions of 0.0, 4.0, 8.0 and 12.0 Inches From Model 3 Hardwall Cover Lower Back Wall

TABLE 3 (CONTD)
TEST CONFIGURATIONS & DATA REQUIREMENTS

Conf. No.	Run No.	Nozzle Conditions			Encl. Walls			Stack Config.			Splitter Configuration					Acoustic Cover		Performance Data						Acoustic Data	
		Die	P ₁ /P _a	T ₁	Perf	Hard	Walls	Height	No. Split	Single Split	Dual Split	Dual Wedge	Perf	Hard	Inlet Burner	P	T	P	T	P	T	Splitter for Wedge	Rakes	Far Field	Near Field
12	40	6.18 in.	1.943	3170 °F	X		X	X	X						X									X	X
13	41				X		X	X	X						X									X	X
14	44				X	4.12 Thk		X	X						X									X	X
15	45				X	4.12 Thk		X	X						X									X	X
16	46				X	4.12 Thk		X	X						X									X	X
17	1					4.12 Thk																			
18	48				4.12 Thk		X	X	X						X									X	X
19	59				4.00 Thk			X	X				X		X									X	X
20	58				4.00 Thk			X	X						X									X	X
21	60				4.00 Thk			X	X				X		X									X	X
22	50				4.00 Thk			X	X				X		X									X	X
23	51-55				4.00 Thk			X	X				X		X									(55) X	(55) X
24	61				4.12 Thk		X	X	X				X		X									X	X
25	69-71				X			X	X				X		X									(71) X	(71) X
26	62-65	6.18 in.	1.943	3170 °F	X		X	X	X				X		X									(62) X	(62) X

4 Exterior Sandbags Removed

5 Position Exit Rake at Center and One Side Flow Passage

III. TEST RESULTS

The pertinent results of the testing previously outlined are discussed in the following paragraphs:

A. Aerothermodynamics

1. The calculation procedure described in VII.B. above was used to calculate the exhaust gas temperature for each valid data run based on the pressure ratio and fuel flow values recorded. The resulting exit temperatures are listed in Table 4. The average exhaust temperature of 3551°R was deemed adequate although it was about 80 degrees below the target temperature of 3630°R.

2. Figure 38 compares the measured secondary inlet pressure loss with the predicted loss calculated from boundary layer solutions for the inlet flow. The secondary airflow rate was calculated from the inlet rake static pressure measurements taken in the constant area section of the inlet flow passages. The rake was positioned on the inlet centerline for Runs 26, 46 and 48. The rake was located in four different positions for Runs 27 through 30 and 51 through 54 to measure inlet flow profiles for each position. The resulting area weighted flow rates were summed to obtain an estimate of the total secondary air inlet flow rate.

3. Table 5 presents secondary air entrainment data including a breakdown of entrainment by individual components. The entrainments at the ejector inlets ($\dot{W}_{e1}$, $\dot{W}_{e2}$, $\dot{W}_{e3}$) are calculated values obtained with Boeing computer codings. These values could not be accurately measured without costly additional instrumentation. The total secondary air entrainment at the second and third ejectors and the Coanda surface is a value measured at the secondary air inlet ($\dot{W}_s$). The total system entrainment would include the calculated first ejector entrainment and the measured inlet airflow ($\dot{W}_{e1} + \dot{W}_s$). The Coanda surface secondary air entrainment ($\dot{W}_{cs}$) is the measured inlet secondary airflow ($\dot{W}_s$) minus the calculated second and third ejector entrainment ($\dot{W}_{e2} + \dot{W}_{e3}$). The Coanda surface entrainment coefficient (α), shown as Equation (6), is the ratio of Coanda surface secondary air entrainment to the total airflow entering the Coanda surface ($\dot{W}_{cp}$).

$$\alpha = \frac{\dot{W}_{cs}}{\dot{W}_{cp}} = \frac{\dot{W}_s - (\dot{W}_{e2} + \dot{W}_{e3})}{\dot{W}_{jet} + \dot{W}_{e1} + \dot{W}_{e2} + \dot{W}_{e3}} \quad (6)$$

4. Figure 39 gives surface temperatures and pressures along the centerline of the Coanda surface at the locations shown on Figure 28 without the acoustic enclosure. The static pressure data indicate good flow attachment through the length of the surface. The surface temperature data indicate a peak temperature of 1628°R (1168°F) which exceeds the design goal by 168 degrees.

5. Figures 40 through 43 present Coanda surface temperatures and pressures along the centerline at the locations shown on Figure 28 for configurations with the enclosure. These data show that the stack configuration had little effect on the Coanda surface pressures and temperatures which indicate, in turn, a negligible effect on Coanda flow attachment and mixing. However, when these data are compared to Figure 39, it is apparent that the presence of the enclosure is beneficial to Coanda surface cooling. With the enclosure, the peak surface temperature was 1481°R (1021°F) which is 147 degrees cooler than without the enclosure. The reason for the increased cooling is the position of the secondary air inlets. The ejectors and Coanda surface are immersed in the cool secondary air being entrained by the Coanda surface mixing. Efforts to normalize the Coanda surface temperatures by referring to ambient or primary jet temperature were abandoned because the mixing process precludes agreement throughout the temperature range. Actual measured surface temperatures are therefore presented on Figures 39 through 43.

6. Figure 44 shows the flow conditions at the exit of the Coanda surface with no enclosure present as illustrated on Figure 29. These flow velocity, Mach number and exit total temperature profiles indicate excellent flow attachment to the Coanda surface at the exit (65-degree) position. The peak flow velocity is seen to be only five inches (model scale) from the Coanda surface. Coanda surface cooling is also excellent as seen by the peak flow total temperature of 1750°F at approximately two inches from the Coanda surface while the metal surface temperature of the Coanda at that point was only 1425°R (average from last thermocouple - see Figure 39).

TABLE 4
MODEL A/B EXIT TEMPERATURE CALCULATED FROM ENTHALPY RISE*

Run No.	Exit Temp. °R
10	3515
15	-
20	3573
21	1170
24	3581
25	3529
26	3390
27	3496
28	3492
29	3572
30	3606
31	3507
32	3578
33	3522
34	3553
36	3561
37	3548
38	3645
39	3585
40	3558
41	3509
42	3543
43	3555
44	3506

Run No.	Exit Temp. °R
45	3521
46	3540
47	3559
48	3523
50	3528
51	3586
52	3562
53	3620
54	3538
55	3573
56	3648
57	-
58	-
59	-
60	3563
61	3534
62	3582
63	3569
64	3551
65	3588
66	3568
67	3528
68	3514
69	3566
71	3571

*Enthalpy rise based on fuel flow, LHV = 18,400 BTU/Lb and a burner efficiency of 95 percent.

Test average exit temperature = 3551 °R
 Standard Deviation = ± 43.4 °F




FIGURE 38: SECONDARY AIR INLET PRESSURE LOSS VS. INLET AIRFLOW


TABLE 5
SECONDARY AIRFLOW ENTRAINMENT

Run Number	Model Configuration	A/B Nozzle Mass Flow $\dot{W}_{jet}$ (Lbs/Sec)	Secondary Inlet Airflow $\dot{W}_s$ (Lbs/Sec)	1st Ejector Secondary Entrainment $\dot{W}_{e1}$ (Lbs/Sec)	2nd & 3rd Ejector Entrainment $\dot{W}_{e2} + \dot{W}_{e3}$ (Lbs/Sec)	Total Flow Entering Coanda $\dot{W}_{cp}$ (Lbs/Sec)	Coanda Secondary Entrainment $\dot{W}_{cs}$ (Lbs/Sec)	Coanda Entrainment Coefficient $\dot{W}_{cs}/\dot{W}_{cp}$
26	Short stack with single splitter	7.41	20.96	2.35	1.51	11.27	19.45	1.73
27-30	Short stack with single splitter	* 7.33	19.97	2.32	1.50	11.15	18.47	1.66
46	Tall stack without splitter	7.45	17.87	2.34	1.51	11.30	16.36	1.45
48	Short stack without splitter	7.44	16.56	2.35	1.53	11.32	15.03	1.33
51-54	Short stack with dual wedges	* 7.42	17.65	2.33	1.52	11.27	16.13	1.45

* Average values for the run numbers shown

 Burner inlet airflow plus fuel flow

 Referred to standard day conditions ($\dot{W}\sqrt{\theta_a}/\delta_a$)






FIGURE 39: COANDA SURFACE PRESSURES AND TEMPERATURES - NO ACOUSTIC ENCLOSURE CONFIGURATION




FIGURE 40: COANDA SURFACE PRESSURES AND TEMPERATURES - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION




FIGURE 41: COANDA SURFACE PRESSURES AND TEMPERATURES – SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH DUAL SPLITTER CONFIGURATION




FIGURE 42: COANDA SURFACE PRESSURES AND TEMPERATURES – SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH AND WITHOUT DUAL WEDGES




FIGURE 43: COANDA SURFACE PRESSURES AND TEMPERATURES - TALL EXHAUST STACK WITHOUT SPLITTER OR WEDGES




FIGURE 44: COANDA EXIT FLOW VELOCITY, MACH NUMBER AND TEMPERATURE PROFILES - NO ACOUSTIC ENCLOSURE

7. Figures 45 through 47 present exhaust stack exit flow velocity, Mach number and temperature profiles for each of the three short stack configurations tested (single splitter, dual splitter and dual wedges). All three configurations illustrated a region of reverse flow (shown by negative velocities) near the forward wall of the exhaust stack. This is caused by the 65-degree exit from the Coanda surface into a vertical (90-degree) exhaust stack. The velocity in these reverse flow regions was estimated using the pressure reading from the exit total pressure rake as a static pressure and ambient pressure as the total pressure. This procedure was used when rake pressure measurements were below ambient which indicates local reverse flow. Use of these rake pressure readings as static pressures is an acceptable procedure due to the low velocities in the reverse flow regions.

8. Tables 6 and 7 list the ejector surface temperatures along the top and side centerlines, respectively, for the various model configurations. The locations of these thermocouples were shown on Figure 28. The values shown are averages for all test runs of that particular configuration, along with the maximum and minimum deviation from that average. The ambient and afterburning nozzle temperatures are also presented. In general, there is no significant change in ejector surface temperatures due to changes in stack configuration or removal of the acoustic cover from the secondary air inlet. There is a significant change in ejector surface temperatures, however, between the configuration without an enclosure and those that are enclosed. The reduced ejector temperatures with the enclosure present are due to the secondary air inlet position just as was discussed earlier for the Coanda surface temperatures. With the enclosure installed, the maximum average temperature was at the exit of the first ejector and was 986°F which is below the design goal of 1000°F.

9. Tables 8 through 11 list the exhaust muffler internal surface temperatures for the various model configurations at afterburning primary nozzle conditions. The location of the thermocouples where the measurements were taken was shown on Figures 31, 32 and 33. The values listed are averages of all test runs of that particular configuration. Also listed are the maximum and minimum deviations from that average. The large deviations shown are not the result of poor instrumentation but rather from the large fluctuations within the exhaust stack due to turbulent flow. These data indicate that Coanda surface mixing has to be improved before a configuration with splitters could be used. The single splitter had local areas that reached 1295°F average temperature while the dual splitter configuration reached 1370°F. These temperatures exceed the 1000°F design goal by too much to ensure expected life cycles. The dual wedge configuration did not demonstrate any such high temperature regions because there were no components immersed directly in the hottest portion of the exhaust flow. This was also true for the tall stack configuration which had no splitters or wedges.

B. Acoustics.

1. The use of models for acoustic testing will give indications of configuration superiority when the same acoustic lining design is used. The magnitude of the attenuation obtained from model testing may not be attributed to full-scale hardware since the lining materials were not physically scaled; for example, the ratio of fiber diameter to wavelength or the scaling of perforated sheet hole diameter and thickness. Therefore, the direct comparison of model acoustic results to full-scale criterion must not be interpreted as having or not having satisfied a particular full-scale criterion, since the linings were not and possibly cannot be precisely scaled. However, as stated above, indications can be gained as to which configurations are superior acoustically. Full-scale linings must then be optimized and designed to provide the necessary suppressor noise reduction to satisfy the acoustic criterion.

2. The primary acoustic objective of this program was to compare (by one-sixth scale model tests) several configurations of exhaust muffler for a demountable exhaust suppressor system utilizing the Coanda air-cooled concept as applied to a Model TF30-P-412 nozzle at afterburning operation. Two lining thicknesses of stack wall lining were tested for relative acoustic performance to determine the additional low frequency attenuation of the thicker lining, if any. Four different short stack configurations were tested to establish which design was acoustically superior. These consisted of no splitter, single splitter, dual splitter and dual wedge short stack configurations. The test results were compared to MIL-N-83155B, Grade II criterion on a 250-foot scale radius.




FIGURE 45: EXIT FLOW VELOCITY MACH NUMBER AND TEMPERATURE PROFILES - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION




FIGURE 46: EXIT FLOW VELOCITY, MACH NUMBER AND TEMPERATURE PROFILES - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH DUAL SPLITTER CONFIGURATION






FIGURE 47: EXIT FLOW VELOCITY, MACH NUMBER AND TEMPERATURE PROFILE - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH DUAL WEDGE CONFIGURATION

TABLE 6
TOP CENTERLINE EJECTOR SURFACE TEMPERATURES
TEST AVERAGE TEMPERATURE (°F) WITH MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DEVIATION

Model Configuration	Ambient Temperature T_a	Ambient Temperature T_{jet}	Ejector No. 1		Ejector No. 2		Ejector No. 3	
			T_1	T_3	T_5	T_7	T_9	T_{11}
Ejectors and Coanda only, no acoustic enclosure	79^{+4}_{-5}	3101^{+20}_{-32}	380^{+19}_{-25}	1060^{+46}_{-34}	190^{+12}_{-15}	674^{+31}_{-28}	780^{+38}_{-35}	932^{+33}_{-28}
Short stack without splitter and without inlet acoustic cover	56	3063	292	880	139	552	644	763
Short stack without splitter and with inlet acoustic cover	64^{+11}_{-11}	3089^{+29}_{-43}	314^{+53}_{-32}	909^{+55}_{-39}	145^{+16}_{-17}	556^{+35}_{-29}	641^{+41}_{-35}	782^{+48}_{-29}
Short stack with single splitter and without inlet acoustic cover	70^{+17}_{-12}	3060^{+86}_{-130}	307^{+27}_{-20}	916^{+71}_{-64}	147^{+17}_{-13}	574^{+27}_{-41}	652^{+41}_{-30}	783^{+59}_{-50}
Short stack with single splitter and with inlet acoustic cover	70^{+23}_{-10}	3100^{+85}_{-53}	298^{+10}_{-11}	885^{+27}_{-36}	145^{+24}_{-9}	549^{+28}_{-28}	617^{+32}_{-36}	766^{+28}_{-29}
Short stack with dual splitters and without inlet acoustic cover	45^{+2}_{-2}	3087^{+24}_{-33}	285^{+34}_{-24}	986^{+26}_{-26}	129^{+6}_{-3}	597^{+16}_{-13}	672^{+15}_{-17}	854^{+20}_{-22}
Short stack with dual wedges and without inlet acoustic cover	48^{+2}_{-1}	3113^{+15}_{-22}	288^{+19}_{-17}	985^{+11}_{-9}	136^{+2}_{-2}	606^{+4}_{-7}	686^{+8}_{-5}	854^{+7}_{-5}
Short stack with dual wedges and with inlet acoustic cover	44	3068	274	860	127	548	612	775
Tall stack without splitter and without inlet acoustic cover	71^{+14}_{-14}	3084^{+4}_{-4}	294^{+4}_{-4}	886^{+17}_{-18}	144^{+16}_{-16}	549^{+22}_{-22}	627^{+28}_{-29}	764^{+15}_{-16}
Tall stack without splitter and with inlet acoustic cover	64^{+18}_{-11}	3078^{+23}_{-29}	305^{+32}_{-43}	908^{+30}_{-27}	140^{+23}_{-14}	551^{+13}_{-4}	625^{+23}_{-26}	783^{+23}_{-25}

TABLE 7
SIDE CENTERLINE EJECTOR SURFACE TEMPERATURES
TEST AVERAGE TEMPERATURE (°F) WITH MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DEVIATION

Model Configuration	Ambient Temperature T_a	Ambient Temperature T_{jet}	Ejector No. 1		Ejector No. 2		Ejector No. 3	
			T_2	T_4	T_6	T_8	T_{10}	T_{12}
Ejectors and Coanda only, no acoustic enclosure	79 ± 4 -5	3101 ± 20 -32	179 ± 26 -25	694 ± 65 -56	693 ± 48 -49	804 ± 56 -50	765 ± 49 -55	862 ± 56 -50
Short stack without splitter and without inlet acoustic cover	56	3063	175	712	677	794	753	835
Short stack without splitter and with inlet acoustic cover	64 ± 11 -11	3089 ± 29 -43	166 ± 27 -36	640 ± 65 -65	631 ± 43 -64	734 ± 58 -71	702 ± 42 -61	780 ± 52 -64
Short stack with single splitter and without inlet acoustic cover	70 ± 17 -12	3060 ± 86 -130	174 ± 13 -18	690 ± 39 -48	651 ± 44 -68	774 ± 47 -61	718 ± 40 -61	814 ± 41 -57
Short stack with single splitter and with inlet acoustic cover	70 ± 23 -10	3100 ± 85 -53	174 ± 19 -17	660 ± 54 -97	644 ± 54 -93	753 ± 59 -104	705 ± 51 -86	787 ± 53 -91
Short stack with dual splitters and without inlet acoustic cover	45 ± 2 -2	3087 ± 24 -33	156 ± 12 -14	661 ± 31 -32	625 ± 41 -33	744 ± 40 -34	699 ± 35 -30	799 ± 73 -46
Short stack with dual wedges and without inlet acoustic cover	48 ± 2 -1	3113 ± 15 -22	167 ± 6 -7	680 ± 10 -16	641 ± 9 -20	757 ± 9 -18	716 ± 9 -23	791 ± 12 -20
Short stack with dual wedges and with inlet acoustic cover	44	3068	172	701	664	782	745	815
Tall stack without splitter and without inlet acoustic cover	71 ± 14 -14	3094 ± 4 -4	167 ± 12 -13	636 ± 39 -39	606 ± 28 -28	713 ± 42 -42	680 ± 23 -23	759 ± 34 -35
Tall stack without splitter and with inlet acoustic cover	64 ± 18 -11	3078 ± 23 -29	166 ± 22 -17	637 ± 48 -33	624 ± 35 -22	730 ± 47 -23	685 ± 36 -20	768 ± 50 -26

TABLE 8
EXHAUST MUFFLER TEMPERATURES -
SHORT STACK WITH SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION ($T_a = 70^{+17}_{-10}$ °F)

Thermocouple Number (See Fig. 31)	General Location (See Figure 31 for Exact Location)	Average Measured Temperature With Maximum and Minimum Deviation (°F)
T ₂₃	Stack Forward Wall - Lower	781 + 64 - 47
T ₂₄	Stack Forward Wall - Upper	386 + 38 - 42
T ₂₅	Stack Sidewall - Upper Forward	837 + 23 - 33
T ₂₆	Stack Sidewall - Upper Aft	963 + 49 - 22
T ₂₇	Stack Sidewall - Center	1023 + 21 - 45
T ₂₈	Stack Sidewall - Lower Forward	802 + 54 - 76
T ₂₉	Stack Sidewall - Lower Aft	888 + 60 - 59
T ₃₀	Stack Aft Wall - Lower	884 + 32 - 36
T ₃₁	Stack Aft Wall - Upper	986 + 53 - 59
T ₄₀	Splitter Leading Edge - Forward	1294 + 32 - 32
T ₄₁	Splitter Leading Edge - Center	1129 + 38 - 27
T ₄₂	Splitter Leading Edge - Aft	- -
T ₄₃	Splitter Sidewall - Upper Forward	922 + 26 - 16
T ₄₄	Splitter Sidewall - Upper Aft	1034 + 37 - 51
T ₄₅	Splitter Sidewall - Center	1136 + 31 - 58
T ₄₆	Splitter Sidewall - Lower Forward	1295 + 26 - 31
T ₄₇	Splitter Sidewall - Lower Left	812 + 58 - 61
T ₆₅	Enclosure Floor - Aft	208 + 45 - 38
T ₆₆	Aft Enclosure Sidewall - Upper	568 + 113 - 41
T ₆₇	Aft Enclosure Sidewall - Lower	497 + 46 - 25

TABLE 9
EXHAUST MUFFLER TEMPERATURES -
SHORT STACK WITH DUAL SPLITTER CONFIGURATION ($T_a = 54 \begin{smallmatrix} +10 \\ -9 \end{smallmatrix} ^\circ\text{F}$)

Thermocouple Number (See Fig. 32)	General Location (See Figure 32 for Exact Location)	Average Measured Temperature With Maximum and Minimum Deviation ($^\circ\text{F}$)
T ₆₅	Enclosure Floor - Aft	210 $\pm$ 8
T ₆₉	Aft Enclosure Sidewall	738
T ₇₀	Aft Enclosure Sidewall	649
T ₇₁	Stack Sidewall - Upper Forward	772 $\pm$ 28
T ₇₂	Stack Sidewall - Upper Aft	970 $\pm$ 31
T ₇₃	Stack Sidewall - Center	1019 $\pm$ 33
T ₇₄	Stack Sidewall - Lower Forward	803 $\pm$ 9
T ₇₅	Stack Sidewall - Lower Aft	901 $\pm$ 23
T ₇₆	Stack Forward Wall - Upper Outboard Passage	317 $\pm$ 19
T ₇₇	Stack Forward Wall - Upper Center Passage	924 $\pm$ 20
T ₇₈	Stack Forward Wall - Lower Outboard Passage	1164 $\pm$ 11
T ₇₉	Stack Forward Wall - Lower Center Passage	1318 $\pm$ 7
T ₈₀	Stack Aft Wall - Upper Outboard Passage	982 $\pm$ 27
T ₈₁	Stack Aft Wall - Upper Center Passage	1005 $\pm$ 4
T ₈₂	Stack Aft Wall - Lower Outboard Passage	925 $\pm$ 27
T ₈₃	Stack Aft Wall - Lower Center Passage	870
T ₈₄	Splitter Sidewall - Upper Forward Outboard Passage	737 $\pm$ 40
T ₈₅	Splitter Sidewall - Upper Forward Center Passage	1302 $\pm$ 14
T ₈₆	Splitter Sidewall - Upper Aft Outboard Passage	1043 $\pm$ 31
T ₈₇	Splitter Sidewall - Upper Aft Center Passage	1088 $\pm$ 11
T ₈₈	Splitter Sidewall - Center Outboard Passage	1115 $\pm$ 37
T ₈₉	Splitter Sidewall - Center - Center Passage	1229 $\pm$ 10
T ₉₀	Splitter Sidewall - Lower Forward Outboard Passage	1197 $\pm$ 33
T ₉₁	Splitter Sidewall - Lower Forward Center Passage	1370 $\pm$ 12
T ₉₂	Splitter Sidewall - Lower Aft Outboard Passage	860 $\pm$ 23
T ₉₃	Splitter Sidewall - Lower Aft Center Passage	899 $\pm$ 5
T ₉₄	Splitter Leading Edge Forward	1368 $\pm$ 26
T ₉₅	Splitter Leading Edge - Center	1219 $\pm$ 21
T ₉₆	Splitter Leading Edge - Aft	893 $\pm$ 12

TABLE 10
EXHAUST MUFFLER TEMPERATURES -
SHORT STACK WITH DUAL ACOUSTIC WEDGE CONFIGURATION ($T_a = 45 \begin{smallmatrix} +2 \\ -6 \end{smallmatrix} ^\circ\text{F}$)

Thermocouple Number (See Fig. 33)	General Location (See Figure 33 for Exact Location)	Average Measured Temperature With Maximum and Minimum Deviation ($^\circ\text{F}$)
T ₆₉	Aft Enclosure Sidewall - Upper	517 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 65 \\ - 35 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₀	Aft Enclosure Sidewall - Lower	418 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 26 \\ - 42 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₁	Stack Sidewall - Upper Forward	588 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 41 \\ - 43 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₂	Stack Sidewall - Upper Aft	874 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 28 \\ - 25 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₃	Stack Sidewall - Center	902 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 23 \\ - 21 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₄	Stack Sidewall - Lower Forward	810 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 27 \\ - 33 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₅	Stack Sidewall - Lower Aft	722 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 18 \\ - 19 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₆	Stack Forward Wall - Upper Corner	331 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 37 \\ - 31 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₇	Stack Aft Wall - Upper Center	119 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 20 \\ - 17 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₈	Stack Forward Wall - Lower Corner	517 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 40 \\ - 35 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₇₉	Stack Forward Wall - Lower Center	519 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 27 \\ - 17 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₈₀	Stack Aft Wall - Upper Corner	865 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 46 \\ - 29 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₈₁	Stack Aft Wall - Upper Center	876 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 54 \\ - 34 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₈₂	Stack Aft Wall - Lower Corner	807 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 41 \\ - 38 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₈₃	Stack Aft Wall - Lower Center	808 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 62 \\ - 42 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₉₇	Wedge Leading Edge - Upper	924 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 36 \\ - 32 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₉₈	Wedge Leading Edge - Upper Center	840 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 67 \\ - 36 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₉₉	Wedge Leading Edge - Lower Center	545 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 41 \\ - 43 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₁₀₀	Wedge Leading Edge - Lower	392 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 33 \\ - 32 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₁₀₁	Wedge Sidewall - Upper Center	795 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 52 \\ - 42 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₁₀₂	Wedge Sidewall - Lower Center	671 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 56 \\ - 59 \end{smallmatrix}$
T ₁₀₃	Wedge Sidewall - Lower	464 $\begin{smallmatrix} + 61 \\ - 49 \end{smallmatrix}$

TABLE 11
EXHAUST MUFFLER TEMPERATURES -
TALL STACK CONFIGURATION ($T_a = 82^\circ\text{F}$)

Thermocouple Number (See Fig. 31)	General Location (See Figure 31 for Exact Location)	Average Measured Temperature With Maximum and Minimum Deviation ($^\circ\text{F}$)
T ₂₃	Forward Stack Wall - Lower Section	855
T ₂₄	Forward Stack Wall - Lower Section	958
T ₂₅	Stack Sidewall - Lower Section	1058
T ₂₆	Stack Sidewall - Lower Section	954
T ₂₇	Stack Sidewall - Lower Center	119
T ₂₈	Stack Sidewall - Lower Section	1043
T ₂₉	Stack Sidewall - Lower Section	641
T ₃₀	Aft Stack Wall - Lower Section	151
T ₃₁	Aft Stack Wall - Lower Center	929
T ₃₂	Forward Stack Wall - Upper Section	464
T ₃₃	Forward Stack Wall - Upper Section	746
T ₃₄	Stack Sidewall - Upper Section	577
T ₃₅	Stack Sidewall - Upper Section	888
T ₃₆	Stack Sidewall - Upper Section	952
T ₃₇	Stack Sidewall - Upper Section	1028
T ₃₈	Aft Stack Wall - Upper Section	941
T ₃₉	Aft Stack Wall - Upper Section	1001
T ₆₅	Enclosure Floor - Aft	216
T ₆₆	Aft Enclosure Sidewall - Upper	415
T ₆₇	Aft Enclosure Sidewall - Lower	193
T ₆₈	Forward Enclosure Sidewall	94

3. All lined surface areas consisted of Johns-Manville Glas-Mat 1200 material covered with perforated sheet of 45 percent open area, 5/64-inch diameter holes and .047-inch thickness. This material is a mechanically bonded glass fiber insulating blanket for use to 1200°F. It is manufactured entirely of long textile glass fibers and contains no binders, thereby assuring mechanical integrity during extended exposure at elevated temperatures.

4. No attempt was made to optimize the lining design experimentally to obtain improved acoustic performance. The material selected was based on temperature requirements and lead time availability. The acoustically preferred material (J-M Cerafelt) had a lead time incompatible with the test schedule. It is anticipated that the Cerafelt would perform better than the Glas-Mat 1200 but the magnitude of improvement is uncertain without testing.

5. The lining material, as manufactured and delivered, was not of uniform thickness and density. Therefore, the material for each acoustic panel was weighed and an average density calculated. The lining material acoustic properties are thus given in terms of the average density (pcf) and average resistivity (rayl/cm). The resistivity was determined by flow resistance testing and defined as a function of density by:

$$R = .118 \rho^{2.75} \text{ (rayl/cm)}$$

where ρ is the density (pcf).

The acoustic panels for the suppressor components had the properties given in Table 12.

TABLE 12
ACOUSTIC PANEL PROPERTIES

	Lining Thickness (Inches)	Average Density (PCF)	Average Resistivity (RAYL/CM)
Short stack walls (1)	2.75	11.63	100.5
Short stack walls (2)	4.13	11.58	99.33
Tall stack extension (1)	2.75	11.48	96.99
Tall stack extension (2)	4.13	11.79	104.4
Single splitter	2.75	11.7	102.2
Dual splitter	1.38	11.26	92.0
Dual wedge	*	10.59	77.69
Enclosure back wall	4.13	12.18	114.1
Enclosure lower sidewalls	4.13	11.43	95.8
Secondary air inlet	.94	10.45	74.9

*See Figure 19

Note: Lining thicknesses are model scale.

TABLE 13
ACOUSTIC TEST CONFIGURATION SUMMARY

	Run Number																				
	10	26	31	32	33	36	37	38	39	40	41	44	45	46	55	58	59	60	61	62	71
1. Model nozzle	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Secondary air cover			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X								
3. Short stack (1)		X	X	X	X			X	X	X											
4. Short stack (2)												X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5. Tall stack (1)						X	X				X										
6. Tall stack (2)													X	X							
7. Back wall lining		X	X	X	*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	*
8. Lower wall lining															X	X	X	X	*	*	*
9. Single splitter		X	X		X			*	*									X			
10. Dual splitter																	X		X		*
11. Dual wedge														X							

Notes:

All runs had burner cover except Run No. 10

* Denotes hard wall elements

(1) Denotes 2.75-inch lining thickness (16.5-inch full scale)

(2) Denotes 4.13-inch lining thickness (24.8-inch full scale)

6. The test configurations that produced significant acoustic results are defined in Table 13. These configurations represent a parametric variation of suppressor elements to determine which combination produced the best noise suppression using the lining design discussed above. The short stack (full-scale 30-foot height) and tall stack (full-scale 54-foot height) utilized two lining thicknesses, 2.75-inch and 4.13-inch model scale (16.5-inch and 24.8-inch) full scale, respectively). The acoustic effectiveness of each lining element was determined by testing with hard walls substituted for the linings.

7. The walls of the suppressor were sandbagged (Figures 26 and 27) to prevent sound transmission through the walls from establishing the acoustic noise floor for the suppressor system. An acoustically treated burner cover (Figures 23, 24 and 25) was placed around the primary burner and afterburner section to stimulate the engine test cell. The sandbagged walls and the burner cover permitted the acoustic evaluation of the secondary air inlet and exhaust stack without significant noise contribution from the walls and simulated engine enclosure. This condition was verified experimentally.

8. The one-sixth scale model sound pressure levels were measured at ground level on a 41.67-foot radius (250-foot full scale) at 15-degree intervals from 15 degrees to 180 degrees. The atmospheric absorption was removed from the third octave band model scale data, the frequencies translated to full scale and the standard day (77°F and 70 percent relative humidity) atmospheric corrections applied to obtain the full-scale 250-foot data. The third octave band data were converted to full octaves so that direct comparison could be made to the Grade II criterion of MIL-N-83155B.

The Grade II criterion applies to a microphone height of five feet above the ground plane. Sound pressure levels measured near the ground plane will not exhibit the amplitude interference produced at the five-foot microphone by acoustic path length differences between the direct and ground plane reflected signals. Therefore, the ground plane acoustic data presented here will be conservatively high. A theoretical estimate of the magnitude that the ground plane microphone exceeds that of a five-foot high microphone for source heights of 30 feet and 54 feet (exit of short and tall stacks) at a horizontal distance of 250 feet is shown on Figure 48. These corrections should be subtracted from the ground plane measured data for a more accurate comparison to the MIL-N-83155B, Grade II criterion.

The far field data are presented in four sets so that direct comparisons can be made to determine the relative acoustic efficiencies between configurations. The baseline data for the TF30-P-412 model nozzle at afterburner condition and the MIL-N-83155B, Grade II far field criterion are represented on each data set for the 12 angles between 15 degrees and 180 degrees.

The first data set, Figures 49 to 51, determines the lining efficiencies for the short single splitter stack configurations with the 2.75-inch wall lining. Refer to Table 13 for the exact configuration definition. These comparisons show the effectivity of the lined stack walls and the lined splitter relative to their hard wall counterparts. The data indicate that the suppressor redirected the sound radiation producing levels higher than the baseline at several angular locations. This set of data shows that significant attenuation (10 to 15 db in the midfrequency range) can be obtained with a single splitter short stack using the lining design discussed previously. The overall A-weighted sound pressure level (OA dBA) is also given for each configuration.

The second data set, Figures 52 to 54, compares the performance of the tall stack configurations utilizing 2.75-inch and 4.13-inch wall linings and with and without the secondary air inlet cover. The effectiveness of the wall lining was determined relative to the hard wall configuration. The comparisons show that the 4.13-inch lining does not produce significantly higher attenuations than the 2.75-inch lining and, therefore, for this lining design, the thinner lining was as effective. The configurations with and without the secondary air inlet cover indicate that the air inlet did not contribute significantly to the far field levels. Therefore, the far field levels are determined by the noise radiated from the exhaust stack, since the noise radiated from the sandbagged suppressor walls was insignificant.

The third data set, Figures 55 to 57, compares the configurations that show the transition from the 30-foot (no splitter) to the 54-foot full-scale stack height. Originally, two full-scale stack heights were selected to be tested, a 30-foot stack with one or two splitters and a 40-foot stack without splitters. The 30-foot stack single splitter divided the flow area into two passages with 40-inch full-scale duct heights. The proposed 40-foot stack was to have the same flow area. To prevent the necessity of modifying the structure of the model at the stack location, the length of the short stack was extended to a height of 45 feet (full-scale) which results in an equivalent length to duct height ratio to that of the proposed 40-foot stack. Therefore, the 54-foot and 40-foot stack will provide similar acoustic attenuation; however, the 14-foot increase in stack height will result in lower levels on the ground plane at the 250-foot full-scale radius due to the directivity of the stack. Assuming a linear relationship between the stack height and directivity effect, the amount to be added to the measured 54-foot stack data to obtain the approximate 40-foot stack levels can be obtained. Thus, comparing Runs 40 and 41 for the 30-foot and 54 foot hard wall stacks and adding 14/24 of the difference to the levels for the lined 54-foot stack data will give the approximate levels for the 40-foot lined stack. This computation was not applied to the data since the important feature of the comparisons is the relative performance of the different configurations. The spectrum differences between the hard wall and lined configurations for the two stack heights give the respective lining attenuations.

The fourth data set, Figures 58 through 60, compares those short stack configurations that utilize either splitters or wedges. The wedges were tested to determine their low frequency effectivity. The comparisons show that they provide more attenuation at the low frequencies (below 500 Hz) but less at the high frequencies than the dual splitter configuration.

Symbol	Acoustic Configuration
○	30-Ft. Source Height, 5-Ft. Microphone Height @ 250 Ft.
□	54-Ft. Source Height, 5-Ft. Microphone Height @ 250 Ft.




FIGURE 48: GROUND PLANE REFLECTION CORRECTION FACTOR FOR 5-FOOT MICROPHONE HEIGHT

Symbol	Run	OA DBA			
		15°	30°	45°	60°
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00
□	10	104.46	108.06	110.50	114.39
○	26	97.85	95.21	97.57	98.77
△	31	100.23	94.68	94.64	96.29
+	33	99.63	94.70	96.56	98.54
×	38	97.49	94.98	98.24	99.84
◇	39	101.71	101.38	104.37	107.91

Identification (See Table 3)

Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
 Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
 Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover
 Total Stack Lined W/Inlet Cover
 Total Stack Lined, Hard Back Wall
 Hard Wall Splitter, Stack Walls & Back Wall Lined
 Total Hard Wall Stack, Lined Back Wall




FIGURE 49: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 15°, 30°, 45° AND 60° POSITIONS - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION

Symbol	Run	OA DBA				Identification (See Table 3)
		75°	90°	105°	120°	
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
□	10	116.49	120.56	124.73	133.08	Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
○	26	99.05	98.13	102.83	101.90	Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover
△	31	97.46	100.40	102.28	102.15	Total Stack Lined W/Inlet Cover
+	33	100.26	99.99	103.70	103.35	Total Stack Lined, Hard Back Wall
x	38	100.89	101.12	105.15	104.25	Hard Wall Splitter, Stack Walls & Back Wall Lined
◇	39	108.31	110.60	111.96	110.87	Total Hard Wall Stack, Lined Back Wall







FIGURE 50: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 75°, 90°, 105° AND 120° POSITIONS - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION

Symbol	Run	OA DBA			
		135°	150°	165°	180°
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00
□	10	128.74	122.47	108.71	98.71
○	26	101.45	103.52	104.47	102.58
△	31	102.71	103.36	105.02	103.09
+	33	104.06	104.72	105.98	104.10
x	38	105.15	106.18	107.26	106.28
◇	39	112.16	112.73	113.31	111.87

Identification (See Table 3)

Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
 Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
 Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover
 Total Stack Lined W/Inlet Cover
 Total Stack Lined, Hard Back Wall
 Hard Wall Splitter, Stack Walls & Back Wall Lined
 Total Hard Wall Stack, Lined Back Wall







FIGURE 51: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 135°, 150°, 165° AND 180° POSITIONS - SHORT EXHAUST STACK WITH SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION

Symbol	Run	OA DBA				Identification (See Table 3)
		15°	30°	45°	60°	
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
□	10	104.46	108.06	110.50	114.39	Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
○	36	97.33	92.11	89.89	89.39	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
△	37	96.96	91.45	90.46	89.86	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover
+	41	102.99	101.35	102.43	102.75	54 Ft. Total Hard Wall Stack
×	45	97.78	94.03	91.22	89.32	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining
◇	46	97.75	92.57	89.68	89.90	Run 45 W/O Inlet Cover







FIGURE 52: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 15°, 30°, 45° AND 60° POSITIONS -
TALL EXHAUST STACK WITHOUT SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION

Symbol	Run	OA DBA				Identification (See Table 3)
		75°	90°	105°	120°	
- -	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
□	10	116.49	120.56	124.73	133.08	Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
○	36	89.73	87.77	90.01	90.59	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
△	37	90.14	90.31	90.50	90.45	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover
+	41	104.13	103.69	104.29	104.31	54 Ft. Total Hard Wall Stack
x	45	90.54	90.29	91.48	90.48	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining
◇	46	90.64	88.56	90.73	89.87	Run 45 W/O Inlet Cover







FIGURE 53: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 75°, 90°, 105° AND 120° POSITIONS -
TALL EXHAUST STACK WITHOUT SINGLE SPLITTER CONFIGURATION

OA DBA

Symbol	Run	135°	150°	165°	180°
- -	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00
□	10	128.74	122.47	108.71	98.71
○	36	90.17	89.41	89.47	90.02
△	37	90.40	89.64	89.36	89.79
+	41	103.00	101.70	101.65	101.23
x	45	91.11	89.83	88.15	90.33
◇	46	90.25	90.03	90.11	89.40

Identification (See Table 3)

Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
 Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
 54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
 54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover
 54 Ft. Total Hard Wall Stack
 54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining
 Run 45 W/O Inlet Cover







FIGURE 54: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 135°, 150°, 165° and 180° POSITIONS - TALL EXHAUST STACK WITHOUT SPLITTER CONFIGURATION

Symbol	Run	OA DBA			
		15°	30°	45°	60°
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00
□	10	104.46	108.06	110.50	114.39
○	32	100.97	95.81	96.72	99.22
△	36	97.33	92.11	89.89	89.39
+	37	96.96	91.45	90.46	89.86
×	40	100.66	101.27	104.30	106.53
◇	41	102.99	101.35	102.43	102.75
◆	44	98.37	95.68	96.72	98.00
⊗	45	97.78	94.03	91.22	89.32

Identification (See Table 3)

Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II

Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle

30 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining

54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining

54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/O Inlet Cover

30 Ft. Hard Wall Stack

54 Ft. Total Hard Wall Stack

30 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining

54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining







FIGURE 55: FAR FIELD ACOUSTICAL DATA - 15°, 30°, 45° AND 60° POSITIONS - EFFECTS OF STACK HEIGHT AND LINING THICKNESS

Symbol	Run	OA DBA				Identification (See Table 3)
		75°	90°	105°	120°	
-	-	90.00	90.00	-	90.00	Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
□	10	116.49	120.56	124.73	133.08	Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
○	32	98.68	98.38	102.85	103.02	30 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
△	36	89.73	87.77	90.01	90.59	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
+	37	90.14	90.31	90.50	90.45	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined, W/O Inlet Cover
×	40	107.67	108.14	110.10	110.96	30 Ft. Hard Wall Stack
◇	41	104.13	103.69	104.29	104.31	54 Ft. Total Hard Wall Stack
⊕	44	99.70	101.07	103.30	103.34	30 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining
⊗	45	90.54	90.29	91.48	90.48	54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining




FIGURE 56: FAR FIELD ACOUSTICAL DATA - 75°, 90°, 105° AND 120° POSITIONS - EFFECTS OF STACK HEIGHT AND LINING THICKNESS

Symbol	Run	OA DBA			
		135°	150°	165°	180°
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	
□	10	128.74	122.47	108.71	98.71
○	32	104.04	106.00	107.11	107.07
△	36	90.17	89.41	89.47	90.02
+	37	90.40	89.64	89.36	89.79
X	40	110.25	112.16	113.73	112.94
◇	41	103.00	101.70	101.65	101.23
⊕	44	105.05	106.24	108.02	108.36
⊗	45	91.11	89.83	88.15	90.33

Identification (See Table 3)

Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
 Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
 30 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
 54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/16.5-in. Wall Lining
 54 Ft. Total Stack Lined, W/O Inlet Cover
 30 Ft. Hard Wall Stack
 54 Ft. Total Hard Wall Stack
 30 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining
 54 Ft. Total Stack Lined W/24.8 in. Wall Lining







FIGURE 57: FAR FIELD ACOUSTICAL DATA - 135°, 150°, 165° AND 180° POSITIONS - EFFECTS OF STACK HEIGHT AND LINING THICKNESS

Symbol	Run	OA DBA				Identification (See Table 3)
		15°	30°	45°	60°	
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
□	10	104.46	108.06	110.50	114.39	Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
○	55	98.81	97.34	94.71	94.07	Dual Wedge
△	58	99.97	98.50	97.45	97.31	W/O Dual Wedge or Splitters
+	59	98.68	94.99	95.76	97.90	Dual Splitter
×	60	97.87	94.95	96.22	97.81	Single Splitter
◇	61	99.19	96.63	96.27	98.67	Dual Splitter W/Hard Lower Walls
⬆	62	105.25	106.94	107.13	106.72	Dual Wedge, Total Hard Wall
⊗	71	105.86	105.64	108.18	109.84	Dual Splitter, Total Hard Wall







FIGURE 58: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 15°, 30°, 45° and 60° POSITIONS - COMPARISON OF SINGLE AND DUAL SPLITTERS AND ACOUSTIC WEDGES

Symbol	Run	OA DBA				Identification (See Table 3)
		75°	90°	105°	120°	
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
□	10	116.49	120.56	124.73	133.08	Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
○	55	95.59	97.40	98.81	99.65	Dual Wedge
△	58	97.93	99.03	100.57	102.25	W/O Dual Wedge or Splitters
+	59	99.06	101.43	104.45	102.47	Dual Splitter
×	60	98.28	101.00	102.78	102.45	Single Splitter
◇	61	99.07	101.43	103.51	102.52	Dual Splitter W/Hard Lower Walls
⊕	62	108.17	109.06	110.47	112.30	Dual Wedge, Total Hard Wall
⊗	71	110.64	112.31	113.08	112.97	Dual Splitter, Total Hard Wall




FIGURE 59: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 75°, 90°, 105° and 120° POSITIONS - COMPARISON OF SINGLE AND DUAL SPLITTERS AND ACOUSTIC WEDGES

OA DBA

Symbol	Run	135°	150°	165°	180°
-	-	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00
□	10	128.74	122.47	108.71	98.71
○	55	99.86	100.20	104.19	103.28
△	58	101.94	102.14	105.96	106.01
+	59	101.64	102.57	105.41	104.21
×	60	100.68	101.22	104.30	102.95
◇	61	101.74	102.41	103.71	103.52
⊕	62	112.68	112.60	114.26	114.36
⊗	71	112.66	113.30	115.50	115.33

Identification (See Table 3)

Far Field Criteria MIL-N-83155B Grade II
 Baseline, TF-30-P-412 Afterburner Nozzle
 Dual Wedge
 W/O Dual Wedge or Splitters
 Dual Splitter
 Single Splitter
 Dual Splitter W/Hard Lower Walls
 Dual Wedge, Total Hard Wall
 Dual Splitter, Total Hard Wall







FIGURE 60: FAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - 135°, 150°, 165° and 180° POSITIONS - COMPARISON OF SINGLE AND DUAL SPLITTERS AND ACOUSTIC WEDGES

The near field data are presented on a one-third octave band basis on Figure 61. The microphone locations and identification are given on Figure 31. These data are representative of the sound pressure levels that exist interior to the suppressor system. These data are from Run 39 for the short single splitter stack configuration with the stack and splitter walls hard. The effectivity of the secondary air inlet lining is indicated by the difference between the levels of microphones N4 and N6. The acoustic performance of the secondary air inlet was adequate relative to the performance of the exhaust suppressor system. An accurate determination of the sound radiated from the secondary air inlet could not be obtained since the noise radiated from the exhaust stack exit was the dominant noise source of the suppressor system.




FIGURE 61: NEAR FIELD ACOUSTIC DATA - SHORT EXHAUST STACK CONFIGURATION WITH SINGLE SPLITTER - ALL HARDWALL LINED

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions that may be drawn from his series of model tests are:

- The 65-degree Coanda flow turning was sufficient to allow the flow to exit vertically from the stack without detrimental impingement of the aft stack wall. The acoustic wedges seem to cause more attachment to the aft stack wall than the other configurations. For that configuration, a greater turning angle (i.e., 73 degrees) would cause a more uniform stack flow. However, for acoustic reasons, this would probably require an increase in stack height.
- Movement of the secondary air inlets to above the ejectors and Coanda surface proved advantages because of the additional cooling provided to those components.
- The configuration utilizing acoustic splitter panels in the exhaust muffler is not acceptable (as currently designed) from a metal surface temperature standpoint. The tail stack without splitters and the acoustic wedge configuration, however, demonstrated acceptable exhaust muffler surface temperatures.
- The 2.75-inch stack lining performed comparable to the 4.13-inch lining. This indicates that these lining designs have thicknesses such that, for the frequency range tested, the surface impedance of the linings approximates the characteristic impedance of the material (J-M Glass-Mat 1200). This indicates a possibility that the thickness of the model lining could be reduced further. Additional testing would be required to determine the minimum lining thickness.
- The tall (54-foot) stack was the superior acoustic configuration tested.
- The best short stack configurations, from the acoustic standpoint, were the dual wedge and dual splitter configurations. The superior configuration of the two would have to be decided from full scale optimization studies.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made based on the results of the testing described in this report and the primary goals of the Navy Coanda ground noise suppressor program:

- Model testing should be accomplished with the goal of improving the mixing in the ejectors and Coanda flow turning. The result of improved mixing would be lower temperature and lower velocity flow through the exhaust's muffler (stack) so that configurations with splitters could be used. This could possibly be accomplished by widening the ejectors and Coanda surface thereby increasing the area of flow available for mixing, reducing the height of the sheet of hot flow entering the Coanda surface which, in turn, would reduce the mixing length.
- The recommended production configuration consists of an exhaust stack without splitters or wedges and with a flow exit area equal to that used for the configurations with splitters (6.67 feet wide by 19.67 feet deep which is 131 square feet full scale). The stack height above ground should be at least 40 feet with the capability of adding to this height, if necessary, to improve acoustic suppression. The exhaust muffler stack walls and lower enclosure back wall should be lined with at least 35 percent open perforated sheet backed by 18 inches of acoustic treatment (Johns-Manville 1000 series Spinglas or equivalent). The lower enclosure should be the double, isolated wall construction developed previously and reported in Reference 3. The secondary air inlets should be placed above the ejectors and Coanda surface as in the model tested. The ejector and Coanda surface configurations shown on Figure 21 scaled up to full size (6 x model) should be used. This recommended configuration is presented in more detail on the Reference (f) configuration control drawings supplied to the Navy.

Reference (f): Naval Air Engineering Center Drawing 690AS108, "Drawing Tree - Noise Suppressor System, Coanda/Refraction."

VI. REFERENCES

- a. Ballard, R. E., Brees, D. W., and Sawdy, D. T., "Feasibility and Initial Model Studies of a Coanda/Refraction Type Noise Suppressor System," The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, Document D3-9068, January 1973.
- b. Ballard, R. E., and Armstrong, D. L., "Configuration Scale Model Studies of a Coanda/Refraction Type Noise Suppressor System," The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, Document D3-9258, October 1973.
- c. "Test Cell Experimental Program Coanda/Refraction Noise Suppression Concept - Advanced Development," Final Technical Report for Navy Contract N00156-74-C-1710, Navy Document Number NAEC-GSED-97, The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, March 1976.
- d. "Aircraft System One-Sixth Scale Model Studies, Coanda/Refraction Noise Suppression Concept - Advanced Development," Final Technical Report for Scale Model Portion of Navy Contract N00156-74-C-1710, Navy Document Number NAEC-GSED-98, The Boeing Company, Wichita, Kansas, March 1976.
- e. "GENEG-A Program for Calculating Design and Off-Design Performance for Turbojet and Turbofan Engines," NASA - Lewis Research Center Document Number TND-6552, February 1972.
- f. Naval Air Engineering Center Drawing 690AS108, "Drawing Tree - Noise Suppressor System, Coanda/Refraction."

VII. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS AND SYMBOLS

A.R.	Ejector area ratio - ratio of ejector minimum flow area to primary exhaust nozzle area
C_{PH_2O}	Specific heat of water
f/a	Fuel-to-air ratio
h	Total enthalpy, btu/lb
h_a	Total enthalpy for air, btu/lb
h_{fa}	Enthalpy of incoming fuel (assumed to be 23 btu/lb)
h_{fc}	Enthalpy correction factor for combustion products, btu/lb
h_{in}	Total enthalpy of afterburner inlet airflow, btu/lb
h_{out}	Total enthalpy of afterburner exhaust, btu/lb
H_v	Lower heating value of fuel, 18,400 btu/lb
P_a	Ambient pressure, psia
P_s	Static pressure, psia
P.R.	Nozzle pressure ratio - exit total pressure/ambient
R	Resistivity, rayl/cm
R_0	-1.7558886
R_1	2.5020051×10^{-1}
R_2	-2.576844×10^{-5}
R_3	2.1839826×10^{-8}
R_4	$-1.6794594 \times 10^{-12}$
R_5	$-3.0256518 \times 10^{-15}$
R_6	1.270263×10^{-18}
R_7	$-2.0752522 \times 10^{-22}$
R_8	1.264425×10^{-26}
R_{t0}	30.58153
R_{t1}	7.3816638×10^{-2}
R_{t2}	6.129315×10^{-4}
R_{t3}	$-4.5906332 \times 10^{-7}$

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS AND SYMBOLS (CONT'D)

R_{t4}	$2.4921698 \times 10^{-10}$
R_{t5}	$-8.4102208 \times 10^{-14}$
R_{t6}	$1.7021525 \times 10^{-17}$
R_{t7}	$-1.9050949 \times 10^{-21}$
R_{t8}	$9.0848388 \times 10^{-26}$
T	Temperature, °R or °F
T_{in}	Afterburner inlet temperature, °R
T_{out}	Afterburner exhaust temperature, °R
T_{LH_2O}	Cooling water inlet temperature, °R
T_{HH_2O}	Cooling water outlet temperature, °R
ΔT_{H_2O}	Cooling water temperature rise, degrees
$\dot{W}_{cp}$	Total airflow at Coanda entrance, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{cs}$	Secondary airflow entrained along Coanda surface, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{e1}$	Secondary airflow entrained at first ejector entrance, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{e2}$	Secondary airflow entrained at second ejector entrance, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{e3}$	Secondary airflow entrained at third ejector entrance, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{f A/B}$	Afterburner fuel flow, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{fp}$	Primary burner fuel flow, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{H_2O}$	Cooling water flow rate, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_{A/B}, \dot{W}_{jet}$	Total jet exhaust flow, lb/sec
$\dot{W}_s$	Measured secondary air intake airflow, lb/sec
α	Coanda entrainment coefficient - $\dot{W}_{cs}/\dot{W}_{cp}$
θ_a	Ambient temperature (°R)/518.67
δ_a	Ambient pressure (psia)/14.696
ρ	Density, pcf
η_B	Afterburner efficiency

DISTRIBUTION LIST

REVISION LIST

REVISION	PAGES AFFECTED	DATE OF REVISION