	AD-A156 999	ANAL	YSIS	OF A C LAB AE	AS GE	NERATO N PROV	R SYST ING GR	EM(U)	ARMY MD	BALLIS	STIC	1/	1
	UNCLASSIFIED	ιw	NELSU	N C) F	<u>. </u>	к ој Б	KL-1K-	-2040		F/G :	13/7	NL	
		,											
								_					
											Ŧ	EN ^{IN} MAG	
ļ													
ļ					<u> </u>	_		_				-	



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

AD-A156 999

		2	.)
AD			



US ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-2648

ANALYSIS OF A GAS GENERATOR SYSTEM

Carl W. Nelson Douglas E. Kooker

April 1985



7 10 017

PPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

US ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.

REPORT NUMBER Discrete Contribution in the procession wolds Discrete Contribution of the procession wolds Discrete Contribution of the procession wolds TITLE and Subvitted 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO PERFORMING ONCOMPART NUMBER TITLE and Subvitted 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE Inallysis of a Cas Generator System 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE AUTHOR(0) 6. PERFORMING ONCOMPERSIS 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE AUTHOR(0) 6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(F) 5. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(F) Cast W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker 9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(F) Starms Ballistic Research Laboratory 11. L161102AH43 Ibberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 12. REPORT AFE Controlling Origing And Address 36 MUNITORING AGENEY NAME & ADDRESS() 12. REPORT AFE MUNITORING AGENEY NAME & ADDRESS() 13. REPORT AFE Distribution Statement for the Report) 36 Construction Statement for the Report) 13. Source Castle Catlor, DownORADING Scheduling Office Distribution Statement for the Report 2005-5066 Construction Statement for the Report 10. Statement for the Report UNCLASSIFIED 13. Source Castle Catlor, DownORADING Scheduling Different Internodynamics Subpleter table tests and Identify by Mock number) 20. State Catlor, DownORADING Scheduling Report <t< th=""><th>PEPOPT DOCUMENTATION DAGE</th><th>READ INSTRUCTIONS</th></t<>	PEPOPT DOCUMENTATION DAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVY ACCESSION DO 1. PREDENTS CATALOG NUMBER TYLE Fund Subtrities (1.5, A, I.5, C, 3.9) TYLE Fund Subtrities (1.5, A, I.5, C, 3.9) Interview Final AUTHOR(*) 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*) Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker 9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*) PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT, TASK JS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 11.161102AH43 VENTRE, TAXE Douglas E. Kooker 11.161102AH43 Defined Deproving Cround, MD 21005-5066 12. REPORT ON THE AND ADDRESS VENTRE, AND ADDRESS 13. NUMBER OF PACES Appril 1985 13. NUMBER OF PACES Abordeen Droving Cround, MD 21005-5066 13. NUMBER OF PACES Monitorine A ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 14. REPORT OATE MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13. NUMBER OF PACES MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13. NUMBER OF PACES MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13. NUMBER OF PACES MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13. NUMBER OF PACES MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different fr	REFURI DUCUMENTATION PAGE	BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
Technical Report BRU-TR-2048 V:0. A:15 6 999. TTTLE 'mai Submits) TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE Inalysis of a Gas Generator System Final AUTHUR(s) 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker 9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) S Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 11. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT. TASK VITTN: AMXR-IBD Controlling Office Name And Address US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 11. NUMBER OF PASES TTT: AVXRN-DP-ST 12. REPORT DATE Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 36 Controlling Office Name And Address 10. NUME(s PASES) MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) 13. NUME(s OF PASES) MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) 14. SECONT CLASS (of the report) UNCLASSIFIED 15. DECLASSE CATION DOWNGRADING Costraigution Statement (of the Report) 20. If different from Report) Approved for Public Kelease; Distribution Unlimited. 15. DECLASSE CATION DOWNGRADING Costraigution Statement (of the Report) 20. If different from Report) as Generator Combustion The	REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCESSIC	DN NO. 3 RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
TTLE - and Submitta) 5 TYPE OF REPORT & PENIOD COVERE Inalysis of a Gas Generator System 6 PERFORMING ORG. REPORT & DENOS COVERE AJTNON(s) 8 CONTRACT OF GRANT NUMBER(s) Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker 9 PENFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 9 PENFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS IS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 110 PENORAM ELEMENT PENDECT TASK AREA & ADDRESS(I different loss Controlling Office) US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 112 REPORT DATE ADTN: AXXBR-OD-ST 30 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different loss Controlling Office) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different loss Controlling Office) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different loss Controlling Office) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different loss Controlling Office) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY COSTRUEUTON STATEMENT (of the Abstract entered in Block 20, If different loss Report) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY COSTRUEUTON STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different loss Report) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY COSTRUEUTON STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different loss Report) 10 PEOPARASE, CATOR CONTROLOGY	Technical Report BRL-TR-2648	. 799
ALTHOR(S) Final ALTHOR(S) S. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S) Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker S. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S) PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS S. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S) IS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory NIL161102AH43 US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory IL161102AH43 Harrison AVER-IBD April 1985 MATTS: AVER-DD-ST Jo ADTR: AVER-DEG Cound, MD 21005-5066 Jo CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) Jo MUNITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) Jo MUNITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) Jo JoSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) UNCLASS (if the report) Approved for Public Kelease; Distribution Unlimited. JostRibution Statement (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JostRibution Statement (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES JostRibution Thermodynamics Active to the superstor Combustion Thermodynamics JostRibution Statement (of the freacency and identify by block number)	TITLE (and Subility)	5 TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
AUTWOR(s) 6 PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER(s) Contract or grant and Douglas E. Kooker 8 CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 10 PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBER(s) IS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 11161102AH43 USTRY BAND OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12 REPORT DATE US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory 11161102AH43 11161102AH43 MUNTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13 NUMBER of PAGES MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 14 REPORT OATE MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 14 REPORT OATE MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 15 ECURITY CLASS. For the report) UNCLASSIFIED 15 000000000000000000000000000000000000	Analysis of a Gas Generator System	Final
AUTHOR(*) Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS JS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory VTTN: AMXBR-IBD US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory VTTN: AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS/// different from Controlling Office MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS/// different from Controlling Office Screeoule		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
ALTERAT Contract on owner numbers Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker In Contract on owner numbers PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS In PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT. TASK JS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory IL161102AH43 VITN: ANXBR-IBD IL161102AH43 Derdeen Proving Cround, MD 21005-5066 In Amena a Work unit Numbers CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS In Amena a Work unit Numbers MAXBR-IBD In State and AdDRESS MATT: AMXBR-OD-ST Approved For Proving Cround, MD 21005-5066 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (I different from Controlling Office) In Number of Proces MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (I different from Controlling Office) In Stecurity CLASS. (Inf the report) UNCLASSIFIED Ise GecLassific Afficition Downormation Ise GecLassific Afficit on Downormation Controlling Office) In Stecurity CLASS. (Inf the report) Approved for Public Kelease; Distribution Unlimited. In Stecurity CLASSIFIED Distribution Statement (of the obstreet antered in Block 20, If different from Report) In Stecurity CLASSIFIED Supplementator Combustion The models number) Ise Generator Combustion Thermodynamics Bistribution Statement (of the obstreet antereff and Block 20, If di	A . T	
PERFORMING ONGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT. TASK ARE A & BORN WIT NUMBERS JS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory XTTN: AMXBR-DB. 11.161102AH43 ControlLing Office NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT OATE Aperideen Proving Cround, MD 21005-5066 12. REPORT OATE Aperideen Proving Cround, MD 21005-5066 WONTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 13. Number of PAGES WONTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 15. ECUPITY CLASS. (wit have report) UNCLASSIFIED 15. ECUPITY CLASS. (wit have report) Distraigution STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, # different from Report) 10.00000000000000000000000000000000000	Carl W. Nelson and Douglas E. Kooker	6. CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBERIES
IS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory NTN: AMXBR-IBD ControlLing Ground MD 21005-5066. ControlLing Ground MD 21005-5066. IS Army Ballistic Research Laboratory Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Report) Schebule Costraigution Statement (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ACC Conduct on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) AGE TRAIS for Combustion Thermodynamics Supplementary Notes ACC Conduct on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) ACC Conduction Intermodynamics ACC Conduction Intermodynamics ACC Conduction State Fluid Mechanics ACC Conduction Said that heat transfer A the State State astring of Accessars. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer A the Cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the Accessaries.	PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
AMARETIBD IL161102AH43 Uberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 12. REPORT DATE CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AN ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE MAXER-IBD 36 MAXER-OD-ST 36 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 15. GECUPITY CLASS. (II this report) WONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 15. GECUPITY CLASS. (II this report) WONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 15. GECUPITY CLASS. (II this report) WONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 15. GECUPITY CLASS. (II this report) OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) 36 Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. 15. GECUPITY CLASS. (II this report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the sbateset entered in Block 20, II different from Report) 15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Supplementary NOTES Combustion Supplementary NOTES Combustion ALTARY NOTES FLACT Continue on reverse side If necessary and (dentify by block number) Ass Generator Combustion Generator Combustion Bat Models FLACT Continue on reverse side If necessary and (dentify by block number) Assall gas generator s	15 Army Ballistic Research Laboratory	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obsersed on terred in Block 20, if different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Supplementation Supplementat	ATTN: AMXRR-IRD	1L161102AH43
CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE US ATMY Ballistic Rescurch Laboratory April 1985 ATTN: AMUREOOFST 36 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) 15. RUMBER OF PAGES MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) 15. COUNTY CLASS. Cit Intersepont) UNCLASSIFIED 15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) 15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the sources and if fractions and identify by block number) SCREDULE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SCREDULE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AGE TRACE (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AGE TRACE (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AGE TRACE (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AGE TRACE (Continue on reverse side if neclossary and identify by block number) S	berdeen Proving Ground MD 21005-5066	
US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: AVXBR-0D-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) TorstRigution STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, II different from Report) Supplementary NOTES AFEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number) Combustion Team for Combustion Thermodynamics Supplementary NOTES At TRAST Continue in reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number) Assall gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of Nuccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the net a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the surration among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different from Controlling Office) MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different from Controlling Office) IS SECURITY CLASS. ((I thus report) UNCLASSIFIED IS DECLASSIF.CATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE OUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Kelease; Distribution Unlimited. OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Constrained to reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory	April 1985
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066	ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
UNCLASSIFIED UN	Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066	
UNCLASSIFIED 15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) ACTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i	MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Of	
Is. DECLASSIF.CATION DOWNGRADING CUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Kelease; Distribution Unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Combustion Combustion Leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Apprint Rate Fluid Mechanics At FRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Case Generator Combustion Leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Approved to suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of accesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the number of transfer. and fluid mechanics		UNCLASSIFIED
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) as Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics hurning-Rate Fluid Mechanics lath Models AF-TRACT Continue an reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) a small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of Accesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the number combustion. heat transfer.		150. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES XEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) ias Generator ias Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics iurning-Rate Fluid Mechanics At TRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) As small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of uccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nt-raction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Uni	limited.
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AE Y WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Gas Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics lath Models At TRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Assall gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of nuccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the net transfer.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un Distribution Statement (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 differ	limited.
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Gas Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics Stath Models Fluid Mechanics At TRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of buckesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the networking among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 differ	limited.
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Gas Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics Stath Models Fluid Mechanics At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At CRACT Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) At Small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of buccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the network of the reaction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un Distribution Statement (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ Supplementary Notes	limited.
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Gas Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics Stath Models Fluid Mechanics At tRACT Continue an reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of successes. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer to the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the net raction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	limited.
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Gas Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics Stath Models Fluid Mechanics At TRACT Continue an reverse side H necessary and identify by block number) Small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of successes. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the network among combustion, heat transfer. and fluid mechanics	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	limited.
At works tantate in reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics fath Models At TRACT Continue an reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of successes. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer to the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the net raction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered in Block 20, 11 diffe SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	limited.
leat Transfer Combustion Thermodynamics burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics lath Models At TRACT Combust on reverse eigent in receivery and identify by block number) a small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of buckesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer to the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	limited.
Fluid Mechanics Fluid Mechanics At TRACT Continue on reverse eide H necessary and identify by block number) small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of accesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer to the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Kelease; Distribution Uni DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r cas Generator Combustion	limited. rent from Report)
At TRACT Continue an reverse eide H necessary and identify by block number) a small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of accesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r has Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermody	limited. rent from Report)
At TRACT Continue an reverse wide If necessary and identify by block number) small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of uccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r as Generator Combustion Transfer Combustion Thermody urning-Rate Fluid Mechanics	limited. rent from Report) number) namics
At TRACT Continue an reverse with H necessary and Identify by block number) small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of uccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block r as Generator Combustion eat Transfer Combustion Thermody urning-Rate Fluid Mechanics ath Models	limited. rent from Report)
small gas generator suddenly failed in acceptance tests after a string of accesses. Intensive tests and rough calculations said that heat transfer o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 diffe SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r as Generator Combustion eat Transfer Combustion Thermody urning-Rate Fluid Mechanics ath Models	limited. rent from Report) number) namics
o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model nd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 diffe SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r as Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermody urning-Rate Fluid Mechanics ath Models At TRACT (Continue on reverse side H necessary and identify by block r	limited. rent from Report) number) namics umber)
o the cold surroundings, coupled with a change in burning-rate exponent at ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the interaction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 differ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLEM	limited. rent from Report) number) namics umber)
ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math models, a lumped parameter model and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the interaction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: Distribution statement (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, 11 differences and identify by block relation to the second state of the electron	limited. rent from Report) number) namics umber) tance tests after a string of ione coid that bot
and a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics model were devised to explain the interaction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r Gas Generator Combustion Heat Transfer Combustion Heat Transfer Combustion Thermody Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics fath Models AR TRACT Continue on reverse side H necessary and identify by block r A small gas generator suddenly failed in accept Successes. Intensive tests and rough calculat to the cold surroundings coupled with a share	limited. rent from Report) number) namics umber) tance tests after a string of ions said that heat transfer a in hurningerate excepted at
nteraction among combustion, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics.	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, If differ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, If differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r Gas Generator Combustion leat Transfer Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermody Burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics fath Models At TRACT Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block r Assall gas generator suddenly failed in acception increases. Intensive tests and rough calculat to the cold surroundings, coupled with a chang ow pressure caused the failure Two meth me	Limited. rent from Report) number) namics umber) tance tests after a string of ions said that heat transfer e in burning-rate exponent at dels a lumped parameter model
	Approved for Public Release; Distribution Un: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstrect entered in Block 20, If differ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstrect entered in Block 20, If differ SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r Supplementary NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r Supplementary NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block r Combustion leat Transfer Combustion leat Transfer Combustion Thermody burning-Rate Fluid Mechanics lath Models At TRACT Continue on reverse side H necessary and identify by block r small gas generator suddenly failed in accep uccesses. Intensive tests and rough calculat a the cold surroundings, coupled with a chang ow pressure, caused the failure. Two math mo rd a full one-dimensional fluid mechanics	<pre>limited. rent from Report) number number umber umber tance tests after a string of ions said that heat transfer e in burning-rate exponent at dels, a lumped parameter model el wore devised to evoluin the</pre>

· · · · · ·

.

DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 15 OBSOLETE

•

. .

· · ·

• •

.

.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

20. Abstract (Cont'd):

The models predict that a reasonable estimate of heat loss does not, by itself, explain the failures. The success of an isolation venturi can only be partially explained by heat transfer. Suspicion then rests on the assumption of equilibrium combustion thermodynamics at the very cold temperatures where the failures occurred. Variations with age and propellant batch are still not exonerated, even though the critical problem seems to have been solved.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE/When Data Entered)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	LIST OF FIGURES	5
I.	INTRODUCTION	7
II.	THE GENERATOR DESIGN	7
[[[.	MODELING APPROACH	8
IV.	A LUMPED-PARAMETER MODEL	8
۷.	ONE-DIMENSIONAL FLOW MODEL	12
VI.	RESULTS	19
VII.	QUESTIONS STILL LURKING	25
VIII.	QUANDARY	•••26
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	27
	DISTRIBUTION LIST	29







Ŗ

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Schematic of Generator	.8
2.	Schematic and Notation for Combustion Chamber Model	15
3.	Schematic and Notation for Choked Nozzle Element	17
4.	Schematic and Notation for Venturi-Valve Element	18
5.	Predicted Pressures at Early Time	20
6.	Test Pressures at Early Time	20
7.	Typical Cold-Temperature Test Pressures	21
8.	Calculated Pressure History	21
9.	Pressure Time-History Predicted by One-Dimensional Model. Solid Line = Combustion Chamber, Dashed Line = Nozzle Entrance Plane	23
10.	Temperature Time-History Predicted by One-Dimensional Model. Solid Line = Exit of Dual Chambers, Dashed Line = Nozzle Entrance Plane	. 24
11.	Pressure Time-History Predicted by One-Dimensional Model. Incomplete Combustion. Solid Line = Combustion Chamber, Dashed Line = Nozzle Entrance Plane	.25

)



I. INTRODUCTION

September started badly. A string of 14 successful tests of a gas generator at its cold-temperature limit ended in the simultaneous failure of two units. The meager data suggested four plausible causes: moisture intrusion, gas leak, depressurization extinguishment, or marginal design. A diagnostic test program was designed to isolate the most likely cause among moisture, leaks, and ignition overdrive. Elliott at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory started building a mathematical model of the generator.

October ended badly. Only one test condition (moisture) duplicated the failure. But all tests with the entire generator soaked at the coldtemperature limit failed by dropping below the minimum acceptable pressure. Although moisture probably caused the specific September failures, a fatal design flaw had been exposed. Tests discredited the prime suspect, leakage. If it wasn't moisture or leaks, what was it?

The clearest clue came from Elliott's model where the low pressure could be explained by a steeper than expected dependence of propellant burning rate on pressure at low pressure. But there were essentially no useful data on cold-temperature burning rate at that low pressure. If the slope were high, any drop in pressure would tend to continue. Thus when the cold hardware cooled the gases, the pressure drop from its ignition peak would not stop at the design limits calculated with the slope obtained from higher pressure burning-rate data.

Two changes were considered: a new design or a higher cold temperature limit. Schedule demands said raise the limit, which had been -25 F, to where the problem disappeared. No one knew that limit yet. But when a conservative limit of 20 F also failed, design change awakened. The easiest change added a venturi to isolate the combustion chamber from pressure loss in the downstream tubing. Meanwhile, the propellant lot that had been used for two years had run out and newly made propellant was being delivered. The combination of the venturi and new propellant ended the failures.

The hardware now worked even at the lowest temperature but it was not yet clear why. Would it still work two years later? What were the variation limits of combustion? Burning-rate tests validated the slope-break hypothesis and found some lot-to-lot variation in the low-pressure slope and the break point.

Three circumstances created the mystery: (1) inadequate knowledge of the low-pressure burning rate, (2) no useful simulation of the generator operation, and (3) inadequate recognition of the coupling among heat transfer, pressure, and burning rate. What remained was to explain the success, the failure, and the probability of repeating the failure.

II. THE GENERATOR DESIGN

The generator burns an ammonium-nitrate-oxidized rubber propellant in an end-burning grain to produce a clean, cool (1300 K) gas. The gas passes through a coarse pre-filter, a swirl flow centrifugal filter, a massive valve, and 40 cm of metal tubing to exit a deLaval nozzle. In the ignition sequence,



a squib-activated igniter spews hot gas and particles onto a pellet of an ammonium-perchlorate-based propellant (denoted as Ignition Pellet) which, in turn, furnishes enough hot gas to ignite the main propellant grain and a booster pellet of the same composition. After about one centimeter of burning of the main grain, the propellant geometry becomes a constant-area end-burning grain. All tubing is large enough to keep the flow velocity below 20 m/s.

A venturi of throat area slightly larger than the nozzle was inserted just upstream of the valve and the last 30 cm of tubing.

ļ





III. MODELING APPROACH

Two models were developed in this study: a one-dimensional-flow model and a lumped-parameter model. The lumped-parameter model divides the generator into two chambers separated by the venturi. It ignores axial variation of the flow except as the downstream chamber is separate from the upstream chamber. The one-dimensional-flow approach addressses the axial dependence of the fluid mechanics from propellant surface to the exit nozzle. The one-dimensional model is more accurate, but expensive. The crude but thrifty lumped-parameter model allows many arbitrary changes of input data or equations for sensitivity tests. In retrospect the two model approach proved wise.

IV. A LUMPED-PARAMETER MODEL

The generator will be treated as two chambers separated by a venturi. The upstream chamber (denoted 1) includes the propellant combustion chamber, the filters, and the tubing up to the venturi. The downstream chamber (denoted 2) includes the valve, and the downstream tubing to the nozzle. Ordinary differential equations describe conservation of mass and energy in each chamber.

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\rho V)_{1} = \omega_{prop} - \omega_{ven}$$
(1)

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\rho V)_2 = \omega_{ven} - \omega_{noz}$$
(2)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\rho V c_V T\right)_1 = \omega_{prop} c_p T_{prop} - \omega_{ven} c_p T_1 - q_1$$
(3)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\rho V c_v T\right)_2 = \omega_{ven} c_p T_1 - \omega_{noz} c_p T_2 - q_2$$
(4)

where ω_{prop} , ω_{ven} , and ω_{noz} are mass fluxes from the propellant, through the venturi, and nozzle, respectively. The term q is heat loss from the volume in question.

Heat transfer from the gas to its bounding surfaces is by convection,

$$q_w = h_c (T_g - T_w)$$
⁽⁵⁾

where the coefficient, h_c , depends on gas properties and velocity. Heat loss to the surroundings is by unsteady convection to the combustion-chamber head, the phenolic filter, and the valve. It is by free convection and radiation from the tube walls.

The internal convective coefficient was taken from a design analysis where it depended only on mass flow rate, once all other conditions were fixed. Wide variance in flow velocity from the reference condition would introduce additional error.

$$h_c = 110 \left(\frac{m}{.003}\right)^{0.8} [BTU/(hr-ft^2-sec)]$$
 (6)

where m is mass flow rate in lbm/sec. Unsteady conduction may be approximated by Goodman's cubic profile to yield surface temperature,

$$T_{w} = T_{o} - n + [(T_{o} - n)^{2} + 2nT_{g} - T_{o}^{2}]^{1/2}$$
(7)
where $n = \frac{2}{3} h_{c} H/k^{2}$,

T.R. Goodman, "Application of Integral Methods to Transient Nonlinear Heat Transfer," <u>Advances in Heat Transfer</u>, Ed. By T.F. Irvine and J.P. Hartnett, Vol. 1, Academic Press, 1964.

$$H = \int_{0}^{t} \alpha h_{c} (T_{g} - T_{w}) dt , \qquad (8)$$

and α is thermal diffusivity. Radiation is by the standard,

$$q_r = \sigma (T_w^4 - T_o^4)$$
 (9)

where the temperature of the surroundings, T_0 , is the initial temperature.

Burning rate of the propellant comes from the propellant-maker's test data. The rate is fitted to the usual power-law dependence on pressure,

 $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{n}} \qquad (10)$

This generator had a peculiarity in that the burning rate of the main-grain propellant had a much higher exponent (n) at low pressure than at high pressure (see Table 1). No problem is introduced to the modeling once the data are available and correctly interpreted.

Flow through the nozzle is assumed choked, quasi-steady, and isentropic and thus calculated by

$$\omega_{noz} = A_{t_n} P_2 \left[\frac{\gamma}{RT_2}\right]^{1/2} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma+1}\right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}}$$
(11)

where P_1 and P_2 are pressures in the upstream and downstream chambers,

respectively. A_{t_n} is the cross-sectional area of the nozzle throat. The gas temperature (T₂) used here was not the average chamber temperature. Instead, the axial temperature drop through the downstream chamber was estimated, and a nozzle inlet temperature calculated. The result is a lower temperature and higher mass flow rate than would be calculated by a purely lumped-parameter approach.

Mass input to the upstream chamber from propellant combustion is

$$\omega_{\text{prop}} = r\rho_{s}S \quad . \tag{12}$$

Flow through the venturi from upstream to downstream chamber depends on whether the venturi is choked. The criterion for choking comes from isentropic flow. The venturi is choked (and obeys an equation similar to Eq. (11)) whenever

$$P_2 \leftarrow P_1 [1 + (\frac{\gamma - 1}{2}) M^2] (\frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma})$$
 (13)

where M satisfies

$$\frac{A_{t}}{A_{2}} = G_{f} M \left[1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M^{2}\right] - \frac{\gamma + 1}{2(\gamma - 1)} , \qquad (14)$$

 G_f is defined in Eq. (28), and A_2 is the cross-sectional area of the cubing just downstream of the venturi. In principle, it is unchoked under any other condition. In practice, the numerics behave badly when the flow depends on both upstream and downstream pressure. Smooth calculations must either restrict the time step or revamp the integration. The model chooses between two venturi flow conditions, fully choked or no flow. The effect should be small in the upstream chamber which is the target of this analysis. For designs with no venturi or a small area ratio from tube to venturi, the model is inadequate.

Burning surface comes from geometric calculations of the generator designers. The surface is essentially constant after 3 cm burned and no longer dominates pressure changes. Expected variations in area after the 3 cm should affect the steady pressure level only by a factor of a few percent. A coning effect may increase the area by five percent which translates to a 10% pressure increase IF the burning rate were the same on all parts of the exposed surface. Slower burning at the edges, due to heat loss through the side wall, will cause the coning. The net result: a small effect on the steady pressure.

Ignition of the two pellets and the main grain need not be simultaneous. A reasonable starting condition is ignition of the hot pellet (AP propellant) and both chambers filled with that combustion product gas. Ignition of the AN propellant (booster pellet and main grain) can then be calculated from heat transfer to the surface and an ignition criterion. Heat transfer for ignition is by the same convection and unsteady conduction. The simplest ignition criterion is surface temperature. Since there seem to be no ignition data for the propellant, the ignition temperature is arbitrary. Temperatures below 800K assure ignition and do not violate widely-held theories. At higher temperatures ignition depends strongly on heat transfer competition. A high coefficient helps heat the propellant faster but also cools the gas faster. The race frequently goes to the cooling.

The heat transfer coefficient inside the combustion chamber is itself uncertain. Gas velocity is low near the grain and convective heat transfer is inefficient. But the grains ignite even when the generator fails later. The coefficient must then be high enough to assure ignition. A simpler approach would be immediate and simultaneous ignition of all surfaces. The debate is probably academic since test failures seem unconnected to ignition.

The uncertain heat transfer affects more than ignition. Heat transfer to the generator head and filters depends intimately on the coefficient. The centrifugal filter will have a higher gas velocity and thus a considerably higher coefficient than the gas in contact with the propellant surfaces. The phenolic filter has a low thermal conductivity and therefore heats rapidly at its surface, reducing the heat transfer quickly. Data obtained from various sources for nominal conditions for the generator design are given in Table 1 (see page 14). Propellant burning rate measurements showed evidence of lot-to-lot variation. The data given here are for a 'new' lot.

V. ONE-DIMENSIONAL FLOW MODEL

The lumped-parameter model above is based on assumptions which trade accuracy for simplicity and economy. However, some questions about system behavior demand a more detailed analysis. Substantial heat loss to cold boundaries can lead to axial property variations throughout the system. The behavior of both the nozzle and the venturi will be sensitive to the local flow properties at their entrance planes. Since the system failure can apparently be reversed by addition of the venturi, it is important to explain how this device alters the flow field.

The flow field is assumed one-dimensional and unsteady. One-dimensional flow is a reasonable assumption everywhere except in the combustion chamber and separator chamber (centrifugal filter) which involve low speed threedimensional flow. To avoid this complication, the flow in each chamber is modeled as a reservoir problem, i.e., the influx is assumed to stagnate in the chamber and the outflux is accelerated from the local stagnation condition. However, a further complication arises when the usual equations of motion are applied to the tubing, venturi, and nozzle. The fact that both the venturi and nozzle have large values of entrance area/throat area (33 for venturi, 67 for the nozzle) requires extremely small grid spacing within these devices to resolve the flow field, particularly if the operation may switch between unchoked and choked. Stability then forces a prohibitively small maximum time step, making the simulation impractical. A reasonable alternative is construction of special flow field elements which assume inviscid, quasisteady flow. Note here that quasi-steady means the interior flow of the element responds instantaneously to changes at its boundaries; it does not mean steady-state flow. These elements are explained in greater detail below. Finally, combustion products from both kinds of solid propellant are treated as ideal gases. Mixture properties for the system flow field are adjusted (artificially) in proportion to the mass flow rate from each propellant, ignoring the propagation of these changes along streamlines.

A. Continuous Flow Field

The pipe or tubing flow field is described by the solution to the onedimensional unsteady equations of motion (accounting for wall heat loss) given in conservative form by

mass

 $\mathcal{L}_{t} + \mathcal{L}_{z} = 0$

(15)

propellant. If there is an age effect, the margin provided by the venturi may not be enough. A slightly larger venturi (3%) with the old propellant failed. The safety margin cannot be estimated from the data and analysis to date. On the plus side, the propellant has long been used in other applications with no strong evidence of aging.

4. What causes the pressure difference between venturi and nozzle? Neither model calculates it. Nominal model input calculates unchoking of the venturi just after peak pressure with nearly equal pressures thereafter; but tests typically show a continuous difference of about 0.7 MPa.

VIII. QUANDARY

Is the probability of failure of the present design high enough to justify more investment in understanding? The models do not presently qualify as an engineering tool. Continued success in tests will make the problem seem moot. But the issue of age-related change will not be answered until two vears pass and test results are then compared to early production results. If and when the first test failure appears, the models will be asked to steer the engineering of the repair. But only if the manifest inaccuracies are removed can their answers be trusted to be any better than the crude calculations on which the design already rests.



Figure 11. Pressure Time-History Predicted by One-Dimensional Model. Incomplete Combustion. Solid Line = Combustion Chamber, Dashed Line = Nozzle Entrance Plane.

VII. QUESTIONS STILL LURKING

1. How did heat transfer cause the failures? Its guilt was demonstrated in tests that succeeded when the valve and downstream tubing remained at the ambient California fall temperatures and only the parts upstream of the valve were conditioned to cold temperature. Simple sensible heat loss through an ideal equation of state for equilibrium combustion products does not explain it. Incomplete combustion may. The investigation ended without a useful post-mortem. Also unexplained was a gradual decline in pressure for about 25 seconds to the unacceptably low but steady pressure.

2. How did the venturi solve the problem? The basis for the predictions of the venturi's performance is attacked by the finding that only incomplete com^Lustion recreates the measured pressure. Venturi design calculations were done with equilibrium composition assumptions.

3. Will the fix stay fixed? Propellant aging cannot be ruled out on the evidence. The transition from success to failure happened with two-year-old probellant. All the successful tests of the venturi occurred with new



Figure 10. Temperature Time-History Predicted By One-Dimensional Model. Solid Line = Exit of Dual Chambers, Dashed Line = Nozzle Entrance Plane.

Because heat loss seems unable to explain the system behavior, attention focused on the possible lack of gas-phase thermodynamic equilibrium as suggested by trials with the lumped-parameter model. Setting the heat transfer coefficients at their nominal values and then imposing a fixed state of incomplete combustion (γ -l = half value, \mathfrak{M} = three times nominal, $T_f = 60\%$ nominal) for both propellants produces the results shown in Figure 11 (also on Figure 9 to scale). These pressure time-history predictions are much closer to the experimental data, although the simulation again insists that the venturi will unchoke (at t = 0.45 sec) after maximum chamber pressure is attained.

The dramatic improvement in the predictions strongly suggests that the gas-phase combustion products may be undergoing a complex "shifting" equilibrium, possibly with condensation. This could have an important influence on the presence of a shock wave in the venturi. The addition of this complicated chemistry to the flow field was beyond the scope of the present study.

system behavior is the same. It should be emphasized that doubling the heat loss to the valve and tubing which separates the venturi from the nozzle is not sufficient to keep the venturi choked.

Given the constraints of the model, the simulations demonstrate that only a shock wave downstream of the choked venturi is capable of creating the magnitude of total pressure loss measured in the actual gas generator.



Figure 9. Pressure Time-History Predicted by One-Dimensional Model. Solid Line = Combustion Chamber, Dashed Line = Nozzle Entrance Plane.

However, fluid mechanics coupled with the assumption of gas-phase equilibrium thermochemistry predicts the venturi will not remain choked after maximum pressure has been achieved.

An objective for the modeling was to predict the influence of heat loss on the flow field temperatures. Figure 10 shows a comparison of temperature time-histories for the two cases discussed above. The solid lines represent gas temperature at the exit of the dual chambers, and the dashed lines denote gas temperature at the nozzle entrance plane. The difference between these two values measures the effect of heat loss. Note that in both cases, the temperatures become nearly time invariant after the order of 1 sec. Thus, thermal equilibrium with the surroundings is established much sooner than the time required for the system to "fail." Flow equations seem an unlikely source of the pressure disagreement, and burning rate was well characterized by independent tests. Heat transfer offers the best first guess for the difference since it was suspected that heat transfer caused the problem in the first place. But reasonable variations in the heat transfer descriptions do not produce a credible change in the peak pressure without obliterating some other aspect of the problem. Enough heat transfer to reduce the pressure peak leads to gas temperatures well below the limits of equilibrium thermodynamics.

This led to the speculation that the gas thermodynamics vary from the expected equilibrium. Some incomplete combustion or subsequent condensation will significantly change the thermodynamic properties of the product gas. Arbitrary variations in thermodynamics could easily be made to test hypotheses about gas chemistry in numerical experiments. Full and defensible chemical effects are left for another day. Physical evidence for a non-equilibrium condition comes from window-bomb tests by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (Leon Strand). Films of the combustion show hot ash, a less visible flame, and a larger ash residue at lower pressures.

For thermodynamic consistency, a mixture of gases was assumed to consist of fully reacted equilibrium products and an arbitrary intermediate product of incomplete combustion. The progress variable that controlled the conversion of intermediate to final products could also be arbitrary. Only simple linear time dependence was tried. Trial and error variations in γ , \mathcal{M} , T_f were made until calculated pressures matched test results. The values to produce this agreement were: (γ -1.) half nominal value, \mathcal{M} three times nominal, and T_f 60% of nominal. Time dependence of the progress variables ended arbitrarily at 2 sec.

Ignition of only part of the propellant surface is another candidate for error source. If the burn rate exponent (Eq. (10)) is 0.45, a pressure drop by a factor of three would need surface area of roughly half the geometric area. Given the highly gaseous igniter pellet products, a half ignited surface seems unlikely.

B. One-Dimensional Flow Model

Figure 9 shows a comparison of pressure time-histories predicted by the one-dimensional model for three different cases. The solid lines represent combustion chamber pressure, while the dashed lines denote static pressure at the entrance plane to the nozzle. Two important results are demonstrated by the predictions for the nominal case. First, maximum chamber pressure is greater than 7 Kpsi, in the range predicted by the lumped-parameter model. Second, the venturi unchokes soon after the combustion chamber achieves maximum pressure, e.g., approximately 0.2 sec in this case. (When the dashed and solid lines become coincident on the scale of the plot, the venturi is operating subsonic.) Both features are in direct conflict with the experimental data. Because of the uncertainty associated with some appects of the heat transfer, the case was rerun after setting all heat transfor coefficients to twice their nominal values. These results (labeled bouble Heat Loss) are shown in Figure 9 and confirm the conclusion from the lumpedparameter model that system behavior is relatively insensitive to changes to heat transfer. The venturi remains choked for a longer time, but the general

in the model results. Choking in the venturi is one possible explanation as is a pressure flow loss in the tubing. Unfortunately, neither explanation is supported by model findings or by fluid mechanics intuition.



Figure 7. Typical Cold-Temperature Test Pressures

At long times the predicted and measured pressures agree. Figure 8 shows calculated pressures out to 65 seconds for the upstream chamber.



Figure 8. Calculated Pressure History

Figure 5. Predicted Pressures at Early Time

Figure 6. Test Pressures at Early Time

Figure 7 shows a typical cold-temperature test history. The results also miss the measured difference between venturi entrance and nozzle pressures. A consistent difference gap of at least 0.7 MPa appears in the test data but not momentum

$$P_2 + \omega_2 u_2 = P_3 + \omega_3 u_3$$
(32)

energy

$$\omega_2 (h_2 + u_2^2/2) = \omega_3 (h_3 + u_3^2/2) + \frac{2L_v}{r_w} q_{wv}$$
.

The jump equations for flow through the area change, 3+4, are similar to the above set. The system is completed by the addition of Eq. (19) written along the left-running characteristic line which intersects point 4; this provides the communication link to the flow in the downstream tube and nozzle. The total system of equations was hand reduced to four equations in four unknowns and solved with the stiff-equation root finder.

The equations governing the unchoked (subsonic) operation of this element are similar to the above, without the complication of the normal shock wave.

The crucial decision whether the venturi element is choked or unchoked is based on the solution to the <u>complete</u> equation system. If, during the choked solution, the upstream shock Mach number is driven below unity, the solution procedure switches to the unchoked equations and retries the solution. If, during the unchoked solution, the effective choked area [implicit in Eq. (31)] falls below the geometric throat area, a switch is made to the choked equations.

Convective heat transfer to the steel value and tubing assumes fullydeveloped turbulent pipe flow; the heat transfer coefficient [for Eq. (5)] is given by

$$h_c = 0.025 \frac{k}{D} Pr^{0.4} (Re_D)^{0.8}$$
.

The massive steel value is assumed to be an infinite sink, but the outer surface of the tubing is allowed to radiate as a black body to the cold ambient temperature. A compromise solution in the combustion chamber assumes heat loss to infinitely thick steel walls at a rate ten times that for stagnant flow, i.e., Nusselt number = 20.

VI. RESULTS

A. Lumped-Parameter Model

For the nominal design and conditions (see Table 1) the predicted early pressure is shown in Figure 5. Peak pressure far exceeds the measured peak as soon in Figure 6, although the time of the peak nearly coincides with test lata. Time to peak depends weakly on pressure because it depends on burning rate of the pellet which itself has a low pressure dependence.

Figure 4. Schematic and Notation for Venturi-Valve Element

For the case when the venturi is choked, the solution for the entrance flow (1) is uncoupled from the flow downstream of the throat and can be found in the manner described in paragraph C above for the choked nozzle. In the region downstream of the throat, Eq. (28) becomes a relationship between the area location of the normal shock wave, A_{sw} , and the upstream Mach number, M_{Sl} , ie.,

$$A_{sw} = \{A_{tv}/G_{f} M_{S1}\} [1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_{S1}^{2}]^{\frac{\gamma + 1}{2(\gamma - 1)}} .$$
(30)

Further algebraic manipulation provides a transcendental expression between the downstream shock Mach number, $M_{\rm S2}$, and the exit plane Mach number, M_2

$$A_{sw} M_{S2} F_{M2} \frac{\gamma + 1}{2(\gamma - 1)} - A_2 M_2 F_{MS2} \frac{\gamma + 1}{2(\gamma - 1)} = 0$$
(31)

where $F_{M2} \equiv 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_2^2$

$$F_{MS2} \equiv 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_{S2}^2$$

When the Mach numbers are determined, total pressure loss across the shock wave and the new stagnation conditions are simple to compute. The equations describing flow in the valve, accounting for heat loss to the boundary, are given by

mass

 $\omega_2 = \omega_3$

Figure 3. Schematic and Notation for Choked Nozzle Element

Isentropic flow provides a unique relationship between area ratio and Mach number, viz.

$$\frac{\text{choked area}}{\text{local area}} = \frac{A^{\star}}{A} = G_{f} M \left\{ 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M^{2} \right\}$$
(28)

where
$$G_f \equiv (\frac{\gamma + 1}{2})^{\frac{\gamma + 1}{2(\gamma - 1)}}$$

Given the area ratio, Eq. (28) is a transcendental expression for M which changes only when gas composition, γ , changes. At the entrance plane, Eq. (28) determines M₁ which also must satisfy

$$u_1 u_1^2 - \gamma P_1 M_1^2 = 0 \qquad .$$
 (29)

This relationship, along with Eqs. (18) and (20) evaluated at the entrance plane, uniquely determine the flow properties at 1. It is important to note that this choked nozzle solution responds (instantaneously) to any changes in entrance-plane properties; it does not enforce a time-independent value of choked mass flow rate.

D. Venturi-Valve Element

Construction of this element follows that of the nozzle but is more complex. It consists of a converging and diverging section which is attached to a constant-area valve terminated by an area change to match the diameter of the tubing section leading to the nozzle (see Figure 4). Depending upon the overall static pressure difference, this element can operate unchoked with subsonic flow throughout, or choked with a normal shock wave standing somewhere in the divergent section. In both cases, the flow field is assumed quasi-steady and isentropic, with provisions for the shock wave (if present) and wall heat loss in the valve. q_{wc} = heat loss through wall area A_{wc} of combustion chamber Obviously, chamber pressure, P_c , follows from the equation of state, $P=P(\rho,e)$.

The separator chamber contains no combustible material and hence has constant volume, V_{sc} . The remaining equations are:

mass

40

$$\frac{d\nu_{sc}}{dt} = \frac{1}{V_{sc}} \left[\omega_{c1} A_{c1} - \omega_{T2} A_{T2} \right]$$
(24)

energy

$$\frac{d(\rho_{sc}^{e}sc)}{dt} = \frac{1}{v_{sc}} \left[\omega_{c1} A_{c1} \left(h_{c1} + u_{c1}^{2}/2 \right) - \omega_{T2} A_{T2} \left(h_{T2} + u_{T2}^{2}/2 \right) - q_{wsc} A_{wsc} \right]$$
(25)

For low speed flow, the mass flux $\omega_{\rm C1}$ between chambers can be written as [e.g., see Ref. 2, p. 95]

$$\omega_{C1} = C_{D_{C1}} P_{C} \left[\frac{\gamma \beta}{RT_{C}} \right]^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{4} \beta \right)$$
(26)

where β is the solution to

$$\beta (1 + \beta/4) = \frac{2}{\gamma} \left(\frac{P_{c} - P_{sc}}{P_{c}} \right)$$
(27)

with a similar construction for ω_{T2} . The influence of the pipe/tubing flow is communicated by the compatibility condition [Eq. (19)] along the left-running line reaching the plane T2. With this addition, the dual-chamber flow is uniquely determined. The resulting equation system, however, is quite stiff; a special stiff-equation root finder is required for solution.

C. Choked Nozzle Element

This special solution element (see Figure 3) assumes that the nozzle remains choked, the flow field is quasi-steady, and isentropic. The implication of quasi-steady is that the ratio of nozzle length to local sound speed is much less than the time required for a change in the system flow field. This should be a good assumption here.

²A.H. Shapiro, <u>Compressible Fluid Flow</u>, Vol. I, Ronald Press, 1953.

Figure 2. Schematic and Notation for Combustion Chamber Model

Low speed flow $(M^4 << 1)$ is a reasonable assumption, as are spatially uniform pressure and zero mass-average velocity in each chamber. Real-world flow losses in transfering mass between chambers and into the tubing entrance are modeled with "orifice-loss" coefficients.

For the combustion chamber:

volume change

Þ

$$\frac{dV_{c}}{dt} = Z_{v_{I}} + Z_{v_{II}}$$
(21)

where
$$Z_{v_{I}} = A_{S_{I}} r_{I}$$
 (21a)
 $Z_{v_{II}} = (A_{S_{II}} + A_{MG}) r_{II}$

mass

$$\frac{d(\rho_c V_c)}{dt} = \rho_I Z_{V_I} + \rho_{II} Z_{V_{II}} - \omega_{CI} A_{CI}$$
(22)

energy

$$\frac{d(\rho_c V_c e_c)}{dt} = \rho_I Z_{V_I} h_I^{\circ} + \rho_{II} Z_{V_{II}} h_{II}^{\circ}$$
(23)

$$-\omega_{C1} A_{C1} (h_{C1} + u_{C1}^2/2) - q_{wc} A_{wc}$$

where ω_{C1} = mass flux through orifice area A_{C1}

 h_I^{o} , h_{II}^{o} = flame enthalpies of the two propellants

TABLE 1. Nominal Data

Pronellants	Tonit	tion Pellet (AP)	Main Grain and Booster	Pellet	
Densitv	g/cin ³	1.688	1 .4 39		
Specific Heat Ratio		1.184	1.28		
Molecular Weight		25 .6	18.35		
Flame Temperature	¥	2857.	1306.		
Temperature Sensitivity	1/F	•0014	•0013		
Burning Rate (for - 25 F)	cm/s	00	0 71		
Function	P in MPa	4422P ^U 4422P	.04579 P ^{0 .41} for .06375 P 0.46 for	P < 3.71MPa P > 3.71MPa	
Rate at 6.9MPa	cm/s	.92	.155	; ; ; ;	
System					
Chamber Volume	сm ³	9.10	Main Grain Volume	cn Cn	6 .25
Nozzle Area	cm ²	.00245	Venturi Area	cm ^Z	00 30
Tube Density	g/cm ³	7.76	Phenolic Density	g/cm ³	1.85
Tube Specific Heat	cal/g/C	.11	Phenolic Specific Heat	cal/g/C	•025
Tube Conductivity	cal/cm/s/C	.001	Phenolic Conductivity	cal/cm/s/C	•000
Tube Diameter	CB	.457	Ambient Temperature	F	-25 .0

	~		:	ŝ	
Chamber Volume	L E C	9.10	Main Grain Volume	CE)	
Nozzle Area	cm ²	. 00245	Venturi Area	cm ² 3	•
Tube Density	g/cm ³	7 .76	Phenolic Density	g/cm ²	
Tube Specific Heat	cal/g/C	.11	Phenolic Specific Heat	cal/g/C	•
Tube Conductivity	cal/cm/s/C	•00 I	Phenolic Conductivity	cal/cm/s/C	•
Tube Diameter	C III	.457	Ambient Temperature	ч	1

14

momentum

$$\omega_{t} + (\omega_{u} + P)_{z} = 0 \tag{16}$$

energy

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{t} + \left[(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} + P) u \right]_{z} + \frac{2}{r_{w}} q_{w} = 0$$
where $w \equiv \rho u$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} \equiv \rho (e + u^{2}/2)$
(17)

and $P=P(\rho,e)$ is prescribed by the equation of state. The numerical solution is predicted with MacCormack's explicit scheme. Coupling between this unsteady solution and the special flow field elements discussed below is accomplished with method-of-characteristics compatibility conditions along characteristic directions, all of which follow from the above equation system written in characteristic form:

$$dP + \rho a \, du = -Qdt \tag{18}$$

along
$$\frac{dz}{dt} = u + a$$
 (right-running characteristic line)

$$dP - \rho a \ du = -Qdt \tag{19}$$

along
$$\frac{dz}{dt} = u - a$$
 (left-running characteristic line)

$$dP - a^2 d\rho = -Qdt$$
 (20)

along
$$\frac{dz}{dt} = u$$
 (streamline)

where $Q \equiv \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial e}\right|_{\rho} \left(\frac{2}{r_{w}}\right) q_{w}$ and $a^{2} \equiv \left.\frac{\partial P}{\partial \rho}\right|_{e} + \left.\frac{P}{\rho^{2}} \left.\frac{\partial P}{\partial e}\right|_{\rho}$.

B. Combustion Chamber and Separator Chamber

The dual chamber problem is modeled as two reservoirs connected by an orifice, Cl. The tubing inlet is an outflux boundary, T2, to the separator chamber (see Figure 2).

а	local sound velocity [see Eq. 20]
А	cross sectional area
A _{MG}	surface area of main propellant grain
Atn	nozzle throat area
^A t _v	venturi throat area
As	propellant surface area
°p, °v	specific heat at constant pressure, volume
C _D C1	orifice loss coefficient [see Eq. 26]
D	diameter of circular cross section (2r _w)
е	specific internal energy
8	total energy per unit volume
^G f	defined in Eq. 28
h	specific enthalpy (e + P/p)
h^{o}	reference enthalpy (heat of formation)
h _c	convective heat transfer coefficient
k	thermal conductivity
L _v	axial length of valve
м	Mach number
M	molecular weight
Р	static pressure
Pr	Prandtl number
q _w	boundary heat flux
r	solid propellant regression rate
rw	wall radius of circular cross section
Ren	Reynolds number based on diameter

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Ţ

(Ç

ĩ

|O|

٠.-

t	time
τ	temperature
u	velocity
v	volume
z	axial distance
Z_v	volume burned, defined in Eqs. 21a & 21b
γ	isentropic index
ρ	density
ω	mass flux (pu)
() _t	partial derivative wrt time
() _z	partial derivative wrt distance
() _c	pertaining to combustion chamber
() _{sc}	pertaining to separator chamber
() _v	pertaining to valve
() _{I,II}	pertaining to propellant l (Ignition Pellet) II (Main Grain)

.

Y

1

.

I

ŧ

No. Of Copies	Organization	No. Of Copies	Organization
<u></u>			
12	Administrator	1	Director
	Defense Technical Info Center		USA Air Mobility Research and
	AllN: DILC-DDA		Development Laboratory
	Cameron Station $22304-6145$		Ames Research Center
	Alexandria, VA 22504 0115		Milett Fleid, CA 94059
1	HQ DA	4	Commander
	DAMA-ART-M		US Army Research Office
	Washington, DC 20310		ATTN: R.Ghirardelli D.Mann
1	Commander		R. Singleton
	US Army Material Command		R. Shaw
	ATTN: AMCDRA-ST		P.O. Box 12211
	5001 Eisenhower Avenue		Research Triangle Park, NC
	Alexandria, VA 22333-0001		27709
1	Commenter	1	Commander
1	Commander Armamost R&D Conter		USA Communications -
			LIECTIONICS COMMAND
	$\Delta TTN \cdot SMC \Delta R - TDC$		AIIN: AMBEL-ED Fort Morrowth NI 07703
	Dover, NJ 07801		Fort abraiden, NJ 07705
		1	Commander
1	Commander	-	USA Electronics Research and
	Armament R&D Center		Development Command
	USA AMCCOM		Technical Support Activity
	ATTN: SMCAR-TSS		ATTN: DELSD-L
	Dover, NJ 07801		Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5301
1	Commander US Army Armamont Munitions	2	Commander
	and Chemical Command	2	
	ATTN: SMCAR-ESP-L		ATTN: SMCAR-LCA-G
	Rock Island, IL 61299		D.S. Downs
	, ,		J.A. Lannon
1	Director		Dover, NJ 07801
	Benet Weapons Laboratory		
	Armament R&D Center	1	Commander
	USA AMCCOM		USA AMCCOM, ARDC
	ATTN: SMCAR-LCB-TL		ATTN: SMCAR-LC-G,
	Watervillet, NY 12189		L. Harris
1	Commander		Dover, NJ 07801
-	USA Aviation Research and	1	Commander
	Development Command	•	USA AMCCOM. ARDC
	ATTN: AMSAV-E		ATTN: SMCAR-SCA-T.
	4300 Goodfellow Blvd.		L. Stiefel
	St. Louis, MO 63120		Dover, NJ 07801

0

F

ŕ

O

No. Of Copies	Organization	No. Of Copies	Organization
1	Commander	1	Commander
	USA Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-R		Naval Air Systems Command ATTN: J. Ramnarace,
1	Commender		AIR-54IIIC Washington, DC 20360
L	USA Missile Command	2	Commander Naval Ordanaca Station
	Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898		ATTN: C. Irish
2	Commander USA Missile Command		Indian Head, MD 20640
	ATTN: AMSMI-RK, D.J. Ifshin	1	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center
,	Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898		ATTN: J.L. East, Jr., G-23 Dahlgren, VA 22448
1	Commander USA Tank Automotive	2	Commander
	Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL Warren, MI 480 9 0		Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: R. Bernecker, R-13 G.B. Wilmot, R-16
1			Silver Spring, MD 20910
I	USA TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity	1	Commander Naval Weapons Center
	ATTN: ATAA-SL WSMR, NM 88002		ATTN: R.L. Derr, Code 389 China Lake, CA 93555
1	Commandant	2	Commander
	US Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905		Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Code 3891, T. Boggs
			China Lake, CA 93555
1	USA Army Development and	5	Commander
	ATTN: MODE-TED-SAB Fort Lewis, WA 98433		ATTN: L. Harvey
ī	Office of Naval Research		E. Oran
	Department of the Navy ATTN: R.S. Miller, Code 432		R.J. Doyle, Code 6110 Washington, DC 20375
	800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217	1	Commanding Officer
	in ringcon, in 2221/	I	Naval Underwater Systems Center Weapons Dept.
			ATTN: R.S. Lazar/Code 36301 Newport, RI 02840

Burlington VT

÷.

05401

No. Of		No. Of	
Coptes	Organization	Copies	Organization
1	Superintendent Naval Postgraduate School	1	Applied Combustion Technology, Inc.
	Dept. of Aeronautics		ATTN: A.M. Varney
	ATTN. D.W. Netzer		P.O. Box 17885
	Monterey, CA 93940		Orlando FL 32860
6	AFRPL (DRSC)	1	Atlantic Research Corp
	ATTN: R. Geisler		ATTN: M.K. King
	D. George		5390 Cherokee Avenue
	B. Goshgarian J. Levine		Alexandria, VA 22314
	W. Roe	1	Atlantic Research Corn.
	D Weaver	-	ATTN · R.H.W. Waesche
	Edwards AFB, CA 93523		7511 Wellington Road
			Caineeville VA 22065
,	Air Force Armament Laboratory		Gainesville VA 22007
1	ATTN. AFATI /DI ODI	1	AVCO Everatt Rech Lab Div
	$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}$	1	ATTN: D Sticklar
	Egiin Arb, FL 52542-5000		2385 Poyoro Booch Parkway
>	AFOSP		Euomote MA 021/0
£-	ATTN · I H Caveny		Everett. MA 02149
	I M Tiebkoff	1	Debbells Memorial Techters
	Bolling Air Force Base	1	Battelle Memorial Institute
	Mashington DC 20.322		lactical lechnology Center
	wasnington DC 20332		ATTN: J. Huggins
			505 King Avenue
1			Columbus, OH 43201
	KITCIANG AFB, NM 8/11/	_	
	Disco NACA	2	Exxon Research & Eng. Co
1	Langlev Research Center		ATTN: A. Dean
	Langley Station		M. Chou
	ATTN: G.B. Northam/MS 168		P.O. Box 45
	Hampton, VA 23365		Linden NJ 07036
4	Director National Bureau of Standards	1	Ford Aprospace and
	ATTN J. Hastie	1	Communications Corp
	M. Jacox		DIVAD Division
	T Kashiwayi		
	H Semerijan		$\Delta T T N_{1}$ D Ut 111 and
	US Department of Commerce		Main Chruck (Fand Bood
	Washington $DC = 20.234$		Normant Bach CA 02662
	washington, bc 20254		Newport Beach, CA 92003
		1	General Electric Armament
			& Electrical Systems
			ATTN: M.J. Bulman
			Lakeside Avenue

31

Organization
Aerojet Solid Propulsion Co. ATTN: P. Micheli Sacramento, CA 95813
Strategic Systems Program Office ATTN: SP 2731 Washington, DC 20376
General Motors Rsch Labs Physics Department ATTN: R. Teets Warren, MI 48090
Hercules, Inc. Allegany Ballistics Lab. ATTN: R.R. Miller P.O. Box 210 Cumberland, MD 21501
Hercules, Inc. Bacchus Works ATTN: K.P. McCarty P.O. Box 98 Magna, UT 84044
Hercules, Inc. AFATL/DLDL ATTN: R.L. Simmons Eglin AFB, FL 32542
Honeywell, Inc. Defense Systems Division ATTN: D.E. Broden/ MS MN50-2000 600 2nd Street NE Hopkins, MN 55343
IBM Corporation ATTN: A.C. Tam Research Division 5600 Cottle Road San Jose, CA 95193

No. Of Copies

1

Organization

- Director Lawrence Livermore Laboratory P.O. Box 808 ATTN: C. Westbrook Livermore, CA 94550
- 1 Lockheed Missiles & Space Co. ATTN: George Lo 3251 Hanover Street Dept. 52-35/B204/2 Palo Alto, CA 94304
- I Los Alamos National Lab ATTN: B. Nichols T7, MS-B284 P.O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87544
- 1 Olin Corporation Smokeless Powder Operations ATTN: R.L. Cook P.O. Box 222 St. Marks, FL 32355
- I Paul Gough Associates, Inc. ATTN: P.S. Gough 1048 South Street Portsmouth, NH 03801
- 2 Princeton Combustion Research Laboratories, Inc. ATTN: M. Summerfield N.A. Messina 475 US Highway One Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852
- Hughes Aircraft Company ATTN: T.E. Ward 8433 Fallbrook Avenue Canoga Park, CA 91303
- 1 Rockwell International Corp. Rocketdyne Division ATTN: J.E. Flanagan/HB02 6633 Canoga Avenue Canoga Park, CA 91304

No. Of					
Copies	Organization				
3	Sandia National Laboratories Combustion Sciences Dept. ATTN: R. Cattolica D. Stephenson P. Mattern Livermore, CA 94550				
1	University of Florida Dept. of Chemistry ATTN: J. Winefordner Gainesville, FL 32611				
1	Science Applications, Inc. ATTN: R.B. Edelman 23146 Cumorah Crest Woodland Hills, CA 91364				
1	Science Applications, Inc. ATTN: H.S. Pergament 1100 State Road, Bldg. N Princeton, NJ 08540				
1	University of Texas Dept. of Chemistry ATTN: W. Gardiner Austin, TX 78712				
3	<pre>SRI International ATTN: G. Smith D. Crosley D. Golden 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025</pre>				
1	Stevens Institute of Tech. Davidson Laboratory ATTN: R. McAlevy, III Castle Point Station Noboken, NJ 07030				
I	Teledyne McCormack-Selph ATTN: C. Leveritt 3601 Union Road Hollister, CA 95023				
I	Thiokol Corporation Elkton Division ATTN: W.N. Brundige P.O. Box 241 Elkton, MD 21921				

No. Of	
Copies	Organization

- 1 Thiokol Corporation Huntsville Division ATTN: D.A. Flanagan Huntsville, AL 35807
- Polytechnic Institute of NY ATTN: S. Lederman Route 110 Farmingdale, NY 11735
- 1 United Technologies ATTN: A.C. Eckbreth East Hartford, CT 06108
- 2 United Technologies Corp. Chemical Systems Div. ATTN: R.S. Brown R.O. McLaren P.O. Box 358 Sunnyvale, CA 94086
- 1 Universal Propulsion Company ATTN: H.J. McSpadden Black Canyon Stage 1 Box 1140 Phoenix, AZ 85029
- 1 Veritay Technology, Inc. ATTN: E.B. Fisher P.O. Box 22 Bowmansville, NY 14026
- I Brigham Young University Dept. of Chemical Engineering ATTN: M.W. Beckstead Provo, UT 84601
- I California Institute of Tech. Jet Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: MS 125/159 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91103
- 1 California Institute of Technology ATTN: F.E.C. Culick/ MC 301-46 204 Karman Lab. Pasadena, CA 91125

No. Of Copies	Organization	No. Of Copies
1	University of California, Berkeley Mechanical Engineering Dept. ATTN: J. Daily Berkeley, CA 94720	1
1	University of California Los Alamos National Lab. ATTN: T.D. Butler P.O. Box 1663, Mail Stop B216 Los Alamos, NM 87545	2
2	University of California, Santa Barbara Quantum Institute ATTN: K. Schofield M. Steinberg Santa Barbara, CA 93106	1
l	University of Southern California Dept. of Chemistry ATTN: S. Benson Los Angeles, CA 90007	1
l	Case Western Reserve Univ. Div. of Aerospace Sciences ATTN: J. Tien Cleveland, OH 44135	1
1	Cornell University Department of Chemistry ATTN: E.Grant Baker Laboratory Ithaca, NY 14853	4

1 Univ. of Dayton Rsch Inst. ATTN: D. Campbell AFRPL/PAP Stop 24 Edwards AFB, CA 93523

Copies Organization

- Georgia Institute of Technology School of Aerospace Engineering ATTN: E. Price Atlanta, GA 30332
- Georgia Institute of Technology School of Aerospace Engineering ATTN: W.C. Strahle B.T. Zinn Atlanta, GA 30332
- Professor Herman Krier University of Illinois Dept. of Mech. Engr./Indust. Engr. 144MEB, 1206 W. Green St. Urbana, IL 61801
- I Johns Hopkins University/APL Chemical Propulsion Information Agency ATTN: T.W. Christian Johns Hopkins Road Laurel, MD 20707
- l University of Minnesota Dept.of Mechanical Engineering ATTN: E.Fletcher Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 4 Pennsylvania State University Applied Research Laboratory ATTN: G.M. Faeth K.K. Kuo H. Palmer M. Micci University Park, PA 16802

No. Of		No. Of	
Copies	Organization	Copies	Organization
2	Princeton University Forrestal Campus Library ATTN: K. Brezinsky I. Glassman P. O. Box 710	1	University of Utah Dept. of Chemical Engineering ATTN: G. Flandro Salt Lake City, UT 84112
	Princeton, NJ 08540	1	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
I	Princeton University MAE Dept. ATTN: F.A. Williams Princeton, NJ 08544		State University ATTN: J.A. Schetz Blacksburg, VA 24061
2	Purdue University School of Aeronautics and Astronautics ATTN: R. Glick J.R. Osborn	2	Commander USA AMCCOM, ARDC ATTN: W. Painter J.H. Wander Dover, NJ 07801
	Grissom Hall West Lafayette, IN 47906	1	Commander USA AMCCOM, ARDC ATTN: SMCAR-LC
2	Purdue University School of Mechanical Engineering		J.H. Grundler Dover, NJ 07801
	ATTN: N.M. Laurendeau S.N.B. Murthy TSPC Chaffee Hall West Lafayette, IN 47906	1	California Institute of Technology Jet Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: L. Strand 4800 Oak Grove Dr
1	Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. Dept. of Chemical Engineering	2	Pasadena, CA 91103
	Troy, NY 12181	2	Martin Marietta Corp. ATTN: M. Kosar R. Classen MP246
2	Southwest Research Institute ATTN: R.E. White A.B. Wenzel		P.O. Box 5837 Orlando, FL 32805
	8500 Culebra Road San Antonio, TX 78228	2	Talley Defense Systems ATTN: J. Pietz
1	Stanford University Dept. of Mechanical Engineering		P.O. Box 849 Mesa, AZ 85201
	ATTN: R. Hanson Stanford, CA 94305	1	Avco Systems Division ATTN: V. Suozzo

35

201 Lowell Street Wilmington, MA 01887

No. Of Copies Organization

- 2 Air Research Mfg Co ATTN: C. Stancliffe E. Nickel 2525 W 190 Street Torrance, CA 90509
- 2 Olin Corporation ATTN: L. Markowitz I. Mishra Drawer G Marion, IL 62959
- I Commander USA Missile Command Pershing Project Manager ATTN: C. Tidwell Redstone ArsenaL, AL 35898

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: AMSTE-TO-F Cdr, CRDC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-SPS-IL

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This Laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers to the items/questions below will aid us in our efforts. 1. BRL Report Number_____ Date of Report_____ 2. Date Report Received 3. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.)_____ 4. How specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.) _____ 5. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate. 6. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.) Name Organization CURRENT ADDRESS. Address City, State, Zip 7. If indicating a Change of Address or Address Correction, please provide the New or Correct Address in Block 6 above and the Old or Incorrect address below. Name _____ OLD. Organization ADDRESS. _____

Address

City, State, Cip

(Remove this sheet along the perforation, fold as indicated, stable or tape closed, and mail.)

- FOLD HERE ---NO POSTAGE 3 Army Ballistic Research Laboratory NECESSARY AMXBR-OD-ST IF MAILED berdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066 IN THE UNITED STATES OFFICIAL BUSINESS **BUSINESS REPLY MAIL** ENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE. \$300 FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO 12062 WASHINGTON, DC POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Director

----- --

irector

FTN:

US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-9989

FOLD HERE -

END

FILMED

8-85

DTIC