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Abstract

The TF-CLAWS is a two-spool, mixed flow, low bypass ratio turbofan engine designed as a candidate for an advanced trainer capable of replacing the T-38. The performance of the TF-CLAWS is shown to be superior to the engine currently installed on the T-38, the J85-GE-5A afterburning turbojet engine.

The TF-CLAWS offers extreme performance gains over the baseline engine, providing a significantly lower TSFC for all major flight conditions, less overall engine weight, significantly lower fuel costs, and drastic increases to range and supersonic dash flight time duration. The improvements and technologies employed in the TF-CLAWS are presented as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine Component</th>
<th>Improvements and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inlet System</td>
<td>• Diverterless Supersonic Inlet (DSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• S-Duct Subsonic Diffuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Honeycomb Aluminum Composite Acoustic Liner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transonic Fan</td>
<td>• SiC/SiC CMC Fan Blades with Titanium Leading Edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Pressure Compressor</td>
<td>• SiC/SiC CMC Compressor Blades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion System</td>
<td>• Hybrid Diffuser (VCD and Conventional Post-Diffuser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RQL Combustor Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Convective Film Cooling via SiC/SiC CMC Tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Pressure Turbine</td>
<td>• SiC/SiC CMC Turbine Blades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Pressure Turbine</td>
<td>• SiC/SiC CMC Turbine Blades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixer</td>
<td>• Forced Flow Lobe Mixer Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust System</td>
<td>• Variable Area Ratio C-D Nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helmholtz Resonators and Chevron Vanes for Noise Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2-D Thrust Vectoring Capabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional Area</td>
<td>ft(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Aspect Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_t/A_h)</td>
<td>Blade Taper Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_0/A_g)</td>
<td>Exhaust Nozzle Area Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Reaction Rate Parameter</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPR</td>
<td>Bypass Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Blade Chord</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Absolute Flow Velocity</td>
<td>ft/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_D)</td>
<td>Drag Coefficient</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_{D_0})</td>
<td>Parasite Drag Coefficient</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_{D_0,cr})</td>
<td>Parasite Drag Coefficient for Cruise</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_L)</td>
<td>Lift Coefficient</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_{L_{\text{max}}})</td>
<td>Maximum Lift Coefficient for Landing</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_{L_{\text{max,TO}}})</td>
<td>Maximum Lift Coefficient for Takeoff</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((C_h)_{ef})</td>
<td>Stalling Effective Pressure Rise Coefficient</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c_p)</td>
<td>Specific Heat at Constant Pressure</td>
<td>ft-lbf/slug-°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c_v)</td>
<td>Specific Heat at Constant Volume</td>
<td>ft-lbf/slug-°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_2)</td>
<td>Absolute Axial Flow Velocity</td>
<td>ft/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_0)</td>
<td>Absolute Swirl Flow Velocity</td>
<td>ft/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGR</td>
<td>Climb Gradient</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Combustor Loading Parameter</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diffusion Factor</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Oswald Efficiency Factor</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Polytropic Efficiency</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F_n)</td>
<td>Net Force</td>
<td>lbf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Net Force</td>
<td>lbf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPR</td>
<td>Fan Pressure Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Channel Height</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\theta)</td>
<td></td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\xi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_L$</td>
<td>Combustor Liner Height</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_T$</td>
<td>Combustor Dome Height</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>Blade Incidence Angle</td>
<td>deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L/D$</td>
<td>Lift-to-Drag Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(L/g_2)$</td>
<td>Average Diffusion Length Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>Mass Flow Rate</td>
<td>lbm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_c$</td>
<td>Corrected Mass Flow Rate</td>
<td>lbm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>Mach Number</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Number of Engines</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_R$</td>
<td>Number of Rotor Blades</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_S$</td>
<td>Number of Stator Blades</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o$</td>
<td>Throat Opening</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OPR$</td>
<td>Overall Pressure Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>lbf/in$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T$</td>
<td>Total Pressure</td>
<td>lbf/in$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{q}$</td>
<td>Dynamic Pressure</td>
<td>lbf/ft$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Gas Constant</td>
<td>ft-lbf/slug-°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>nmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Re$</td>
<td>Reynolds Number</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Degree of Reaction</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>Blade Row Pitch</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Wing Planform Area</td>
<td>ft$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S'$</td>
<td>Swirl Number</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{T TOG}$</td>
<td>Ground Run Takeoff Distance</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{max}/c$</td>
<td>Maximum Thickness to Chord Ratio</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_t$</td>
<td>Total Temperature</td>
<td>°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{ET}$</td>
<td>Turbine Entry Temperature</td>
<td>°R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSFC .................... Thrust Specific Fuel Consumption .................................. lbm/hr/lbf
T/W .......................... Thrust-to-Weight Ratio ............................................. ~
U ........................ Rotor Rotational Speed .................................................... ft/s
V ........................ Velocity ................................................................. ft/s
V_s ................................ Stall Velocity for Landing .................................... ft/s
W ........................ Flowrate ......................................................... lbm/s
W ........................ Relative Flow Velocity .................................................... ft/s
W ........................ Weight ................................................................. lbf
W_e ........................ Aircraft Empty Weight ................................................ lbf
W_TO ........................ Aircraft Takeoff Weight ........................................... lbf
W_z ........................ Relative Axial Flow Velocity .................................... ft/s
W_θ ........................ Relative Swirl Flow Velocity .................................... ft/s
W_F ........................ Fuel Flowrate ......................................................... lbm/s
W_Rstd ........................ Corrected Flowrate ................................................ lbm/s
W/S ........................ Wing Loading ........................................................ lbf/ft^2
W_e/W_TO ................ Empty Weight to Takeoff Weight Ratio ............................. ~
W_i/W_f ........................ Weight Fraction ....................................................... ~

Greek Symbols

α ................................. Absolute Flow Angle ............................................. deg
α .................................... Bypass Ratio .................................................. ~
α_opt ............................. Optimal Ratio of Dome Height to Annulus Height ........ ~
α_sw ............................... Swirl Angle ................................................ deg
β ................................. Relative Flow Angle .............................................. deg
γ ................................. Specific Heat Ratio ............................................. ~
γ° ................................. Blade Stagger Angle ........................................ deg
δ° ................................. Blade Deviation Angle ....................................... deg
η ................................. Isentropic Efficiency .......................................... ~
θ ................................. Combustor Loading Parameter ................................ ~
θ ................................. Deflection Angle .................................................... deg
\( \kappa_1 \) Blade Leading-Edge Angle  
\( \kappa_2 \) Blade Trailing-Edge Angle  
\( \lambda \) Engine Bypass Ratio  
\( \mu_g \) Ground Friction Coefficient  
\( \pi \) Total Pressure Ratio  
\( \pi_f \) Fan Pressure Ratio  
\( \rho \) Density  
\( \rho_{\text{blade}} \) Blade Material Density  
\( \sigma \) Blade Row Solidity  
\( \sigma_c \) Blade Centrifugal Stress  
\( \sigma_t \) Blade Thermal Stress  
\( \tau \) Total Temperature Ratio  
\( \varphi \) Flow Coefficient  
\( \phi \) Equivalence Ratio  
\( \Phi \) Cooling Effectiveness Parameter  
\( \psi \) Loading Coefficient  
\( \omega \) Shaft Speed  

**Subscripts**

DZ Dilution Zone  
f Fan  
h Hub  
HPC High-Pressure Compressor  
HPT High-Pressure Turbine  
LPT Low-Pressure Turbine  
m Pitchline  
PZ Primary Zone  
r Relative Frame of Reference  
SZ Secondary Zone  
t Tip
th ........................................ Throat .................................................................---
z........................................ Axial Direction .........................................................---
θ........................................... Relative (Swirl) Direction ................................------

**Acronyms**

AIAA............. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics ..........................---
APU.......................... Auxiliary Power Unit .........................................................---
ATS.......................... Air Turbine Starter .............................................................---
BPF.......................... Blade Passing Frequency .........................................................---
CAD.......................... Computer-Aided Design .........................................................---
CD.......................... Convergent-Divergent .............................................................---
CDA.......................... Controlled Diffusion Airfoil ...................................................---
CMC.......................... Ceramic Matrix Composite .....................................................---
CO............................ Carbon Monoxide ...............................................................---
DCA.......................... Double Circular Arc ...............................................................---
DoD.......................... Department of Defense ............................................................---
DSI.......................... Diverterless Supersonic Inlet .....................................................---
EPNL.......................... Effective Perceived Noise Level ...........................................---
FAA.......................... Federal Aviation Administration ................................................---
FADEC.......................... Full Authority Digital Engine Control ................................------
FAR.......................... Federal Aviation Regulation .......................................................---
FOD.......................... Foreign Object Damage .............................................................---
FRP.......................... Fiber Reinforced Polymer ........................................................---
HPC.......................... High-Pressure Compressor .........................................................---
HPT.......................... High-Pressure Turbine ..............................................................---
LCC.......................... Life Cycle Cost ..............................................................---
LPC.......................... Low-Pressure Compressor ........................................................---
LPT.......................... Low-Pressure Turbine ..............................................................---
MATLAB.......................... Matrix Laboratory .............................................................---
NASA.......................... National Aeronautics and Space Administration ...........................---
NOx.......................... Nitric Oxides ..............................................................---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OEI</td>
<td>One Engine Inoperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;S</td>
<td>Operation and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPM</td>
<td>Rotations per Minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQL</td>
<td>Rich-Quench-Lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiC</td>
<td>Silicon Carbide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMPED</td>
<td>Statistical Time and Market Predictive Engineering Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Thermal Barrier Coating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>Total Pressure Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Technology Readiness Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHC</td>
<td>Unburned Hydrocarbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCD</td>
<td>Vortex Controlled Diffuser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

This report presents the preliminary design of the mixed flow, two spool, low bypass ratio turbofan engine, designated the TF-CLAWS. The TF-CLAWS is a candidate engine for the proposed next generation trainer capable of replacing the T-38A as per the Request for Proposal (RFP). Currently, the T-38A is powered by two J85-GE-5A afterburning turbojet engines, which will serve as the baseline engine model for this report. The next generation trainer should allow for the advancements of 5th generation fighters for pilot training, and thus offer a lower cost-per-mile than the T-38A. The current T-38A and the baseline engine schematic are shown in Figure 1.1.

![Figure 1.1: T-38A Trainer Layout with Baseline Engine [1]](image)

The in-flight thrust requirements for the trainer (total of two engines) are shown in Table 1.1, the design requirements and characteristics for the next generation trainer in the RFP are shown in Table 1.2, and key fifth generation fighters characteristics are shown in Table 1.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Condition</th>
<th>Mach Number and Altitude</th>
<th>Thrust Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>Sea Level Static +27°F Std. Day</td>
<td>8,000 lbf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise</td>
<td>Mach 0.85, 35,000 feet</td>
<td>1,270 lbf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic Flight</td>
<td>Mach 1.3, 40,000 feet</td>
<td>3,000 lbf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter</td>
<td>Mach 0.5, 15,000 feet</td>
<td>2,460 lbf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: General Characteristics of the Next Generation Trainer [1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP Design Requirements</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>46.0 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingspan</td>
<td>25.25 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>13.8 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing Area</td>
<td>170 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Fan Diameter</td>
<td>20 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Takeoff Weight</td>
<td>12,000 lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>2 x low bypass ratio turbofans; 4,000 lbf each @ SLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speed</td>
<td>Mach 1.3 at 40,000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise Speed</td>
<td>Mach 0.85 at 35,000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>At Mach 0.85: 1,500 nmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter</td>
<td>Mach 0.5 @ 15,000 feet for 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Ceiling</td>
<td>51,000 ft (16,000 m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Key Characteristics of Fifth Generation Fighters [2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5th Generation Fighter Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic Cruise Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Maneuverability: T/W &gt; 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Avionics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multirole Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networked Data Fusion from Sensors and Avionics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequent sections demonstrate the cycle analysis and optimization of the TF-CLAWS at design and off-design conditions. A combat patrol mission is assumed for the TF-CLAWS and the new aircraft engine performance results are compared with the baseline engine. Furthermore, a detailed engine component design is also presented, which demonstrates and provides justification for the use of new materials and advanced technologies in the TF-CLAWS. Finally, this report presents a detailed CAD model of the next generation trainer, as well as a number of future promising areas and technological advances that will improve the TF-CLAWS in future design considerations.

2  Cycle Analysis

This chapter describes the basic structure of the TF-CLAWS engine and documents the cycle analysis program that was used to aid in the design of the low bypass ratio turbofan. The optimal cycle design is
presented in this chapter. The analysis code used to complete the cycle analysis was the gas turbine simulation software GasTurb 12, and the simulation of the TF-CLAWS is available from the authors upon request.

2.1 Advanced Engine Cycle Concepts for the TF-Claws

The first step in developing the optimal cycle for the TF-CLAWS is to consider a number of different, but promising cycle concepts and determine which cycle concept will provide the optimal combination of performance, complexity, technology readiness level (TRL), and cost. To this end, a number of different novel cycles were considered. The first of these novel concepts is a turbofan engine that incorporates a fan duct burner, in a mixed-flow turbofan configuration with an ejector nozzle, which is shown in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1: Mixed-Flow Turbofan Engine with a Fan Duct Burner and Ejector Nozzle [3]](image1)

This turbofan engine configuration would increase performance through the combustion and subsequent expansion of the bypass air, in addition to the core flow. However, this concept would increase fuel consumption, akin to an afterburner, to unacceptable levels, as the fan duct burner thermodynamically behaves as an afterburner, and afterburners are inherently inefficient, leading to lower cycle thermal efficiencies. In addition to the fan duct burner concept, another novel engine cycle considered was a mixed-flow turbofan engine with an aft fan (direct drive), again with an ejector nozzle configuration. This aft fan concept is shown in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: Novel Mixed-Flow Turbofan Engine with an Aft Fan (Direct Drive) [3]](image2)
This novel turbofan engine configuration would introduce significant weight savings compared to a traditional turbofan engine configuration, as the shaft connecting the low-pressure turbine to the low-pressure compressor would no longer be required. However, this concept would decrease the performance of the engine core, as the air flow entering the core would not be compressed by the fan and thus the overall pressure ratio of the engine would be decreased, thrust would be reduced, and fuel consumption would be increased. A second consideration against the use of this novel engine concept stemmed from development cost, as no fighter engine uses aft fan technology. Due to the inherent drawbacks of both the fan duct burner concept and the aft fan concept, the engine design team decided that a conventional mixed-flow turbofan engine would best suit the needs of the next generation trainer. While the fan duct burner concept would generate more thrust and the aft fan concept would reduce weight, a conventional mixed-flow turbofan engine design offers the lowest costs while still generating the required levels of thrust and offering low weight. Since the TF-CLAWS is being utilized on a military trainer aircraft, the most sensible option is to produce a conventional mixed-flow turbofan engine that is relatively inexpensive with emphasis on technological advances that will be proven ready by 2025. To this end, we have adopted promising technologies with TRL > 9.

2.2 Engine Components and Diagrams

The TF-CLAWS is a low bypass ratio, mixed flow, two-spool turbofan engine composed of the following eight main components:

1. Air Intake System  
2. Transonic Fan  
3. High-Pressure Compressor  
4. Advanced Combustor & Fuel System  
5. High-Pressure Turbine  
6. Low-Pressure Turbine  
7. Mixer  
8. Exhaust System

In addition to these eight main components, engine auxiliary systems (e.g., APU, FADEC, anti-icing) are fully designed and integrated in the aircraft. The location of these engine components is indicated in Figure 2.3 (from GasTurb 12 Analysis Code). As stated in the RFP, one of the major requirements for the TF-CLAWS is the ability to fit within the required engine envelope, which allows for a maximum fan diameter of less than 20”
and an overall nacelle length of 51" [1]. With this geometrical constraint in hand, then the engine components are designed and detailed flow through the TF-CLAWS determined. The TF-CLAWS performance superiority over the conventional low bypass ratio turbofan engine is that it has supercruise capabilities, and as such there is no afterburner installed in the TF-CLAWS, which drastically reduces fuel consumption and engine weight.

![Diagram of TF-CLAWS engine](image)

**Figure 2.3:** Station Numbers for the TF-CLAWS – A Mixed-Flow Turbofan Engine [4]

### 2.3 Baseline Engine Cycle Analysis and Validation

This section briefly describes the on-design and off-design cycle analysis and validation of the baseline engine in the selected analysis code, GasTurb 12 [4].

#### 2.3.1 On-Design Analysis of Baseline Engine: Simulation Validation

As per the RFP, the design point for the baseline engine is a required takeoff thrust of 4,000 lbf at 27°F over the standard sea level static day. Table 2.1 presents the baseline engine characteristics at the takeoff condition. The exact cycle parameters for the takeoff condition are provided in the RFP, and are verified by the team through usage of the gas turbine engine simulation software GasTurb 12. GasTurb 12 will serve as the primary design code for the cycle analysis of the TF-CLAWS.
2.3.2 Off-Design Analysis of Baseline Engine: Simulation Validation

As per the RFP, the aircraft must takeoff at 27°F over the standard sea level static day, cruise at Mach 0.85 at 35,000 feet, fly supersonically at Mach 1.3 at 40,000 feet, and loiter at Mach 0.5 at 15,000 feet. These become the off-design points for the cycle analysis of the baseline engine. Using GasTurb 12, an off-design analysis using a set of “Mission” points is carried out for the baseline engine. To generate the required thrust for each of the three off-design points, the turbine entry temperature is varied from the takeoff design point until the required thrust level is matched. For the subsonic cruise and loiter flight conditions, the afterburner is turned off. For the supersonic dash flight condition, the afterburner is engaged. The key parameters of the baseline engine off-design performance are summarized in Table 2.2. With the off-design performance of the baseline engine determined, the validation of the GasTurb 12 analysis code is now complete.

Table 2.2: Baseline Engine Performance at Off-Design Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mach Number</th>
<th>0.85</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altitude (ft)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_n$ (lbf)</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSFC (lbfm/hr/lbf)</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t_4}$ ($^\circ$R)</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t_7}$ ($^\circ$R)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2739</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>6.136</td>
<td>6.268</td>
<td>6.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 TF-CLAWS Cycle Analysis: New Engine Optimization

Now that we have established parametric validation of the baseline engine using GasTurb 12, we proceed to develop a model for the TF-CLAWS. Rather than an afterburning turbojet engine that served as the baseline engine model, the TF-CLAWS is a mixed flow, two spool, low bypass ratio turbofan engine. The cycle analysis of the TF-CLAWS aims to reduce specific fuel consumption at all flight conditions, as well as to reduce the weight of the powerplant using advanced technology component design utilizing advanced materials and manufacturing techniques. To minimize the specific fuel consumption of the TF-CLAWS, we conduct trade studies to determine the optimal combination of bypass ratio, fan pressure ratio, turbine entry temperature, and overall pressure ratio. One of the most important design limits implemented in this cycle analysis is a maximum turbine entry temperature of 3300 °R. The basis for this design limit is that silicon carbide (SiC) ceramic-matrix-composite (CMC) material has been tested by GE Aviation to be able to withstand service temperatures upwards of 3300 °R without the need for traditional cooling techniques [5]. This represents a breakthrough technology in future gas turbine engine designs, in which turbines are uncooled. The prospect of using an uncooled turbine and the corresponding performance gains are validated at GE Aviation, and the design team has rated this technology with a TRL of 9 for the entry-into-service date of 2025 [5].

2.4.1 On-Design Analysis of the TF-CLAWS: Exploring Parametric Space

The on-design condition for the next generation trainer is defined as “top-of-climb,” which is at Mach 0.85 and 35,000 feet, the subsonic cruise condition. Generally speaking, engines with supersonic capabilities are normally sized at “top-of-climb” conditions, rather than at takeoff, and the TF-CLAWS follows this practice [1]. To begin this analysis, a few constraints and assumptions were made. First, the fan diameter of the new engine is limited to 20” by the existing engine envelope. This limits the cross-sectional area at the engine face (station 2), which thus limits the corrected mass flow rate at the engine face with a reasonable axial Mach number, i.e., ~0.5-0.6. For this reason, the corrected mass flow rate at all flight conditions (on-design and off-design points) was held below 50 lbm/s, to ensure that the fan diameter did not exceed the 20” limit. From here,
we then used the optimization program featured in GasTurb 12 to address the impact of bypass ratio, fan pressure ratio, HPC pressure ratio, and nozzle area ratio on TSFC. Some of the most critical trade studies to determine the optimal parameters for the on-design condition of the TF-CLAWS are shown in Figure 2.4. The black square shown in the carpet plots of Figure 2.4 represents the location of the overall optimization.

![Figure 2.4: Parametric Studies of Cruise TET, BPR, FPR, OPR, and TSFC for the TF-CLAWS [4]](image)

We note in Figure 2.4 that TSFC decreases as fan pressure ratio increases (and thus overall pressure ratio increases). Furthermore, as bypass ratio increases, TSFC decreases, and as turbine entry temperature decreases, TSFC decreases. Thus, for the design point of subsonic cruise a TSFC of 0.824 lbm/hr/lbf was selected, as well
as a bypass ratio of 0.659 and a turbine entry temperature of 2400 °R. The choice of design bypass ratio is a function of maximum turbine entry temperature and the variation of TSFC at all four of the main flight conditions, and will be explained in more depth in Section 2.4.2. The cycle parameters for the TF-CLAWS at subsonic cruise are described in Table 2.3, and Table 2.4 shows a comparison of important cycle parameters for both the TF-CLAWS and the baseline engine at subsonic cruise.

**Table 2.3: Optimized Performance of the TF-CLAWS at Subsonic Cruise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle Parameter</th>
<th>Baseline: Subsonic Cruise</th>
<th>TF-CLAWS: Subsonic Cruise</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_n$ (lbf)</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf)</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>-22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pressure Ratio</td>
<td>6.136</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t_4}$ (°R)</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Pressure Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass Ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this comparison of cycle parameters at subsonic cruise between the TF-CLAWS and the baseline engine, we note that the TF-CLAWS improves fuel efficiency by 22.7%, which is quite a remarkable result. The other most notable feature of the design for the TF-CLAWS is the notable rise in overall pressure ratio, which increases the thermal efficiency of the engine significantly. Finally, the TF-CLAWS produces an excess thrust at cruise that positively impacts the new trainer aircraft performance. This and other performance gains are discussed in Section 3.1.
2.4.2 Off-Design Analysis of the TF-CLAWS

With the cycle parameters at the on-design point of subsonic cruise determined, it is necessary to assess the performance of the TF-CLAWS at major off-design conditions as well. The RFP states that the next generation trainer must takeoff at 27°F over the standard sea level static day (i.e., hot day), fly supersonically at Mach 1.3 and 40,000 feet, and loiter at Mach 0.5 and 15,000 feet. To conduct the off-design analysis, a series of mission points were defined in GasTurb 12, corresponding to the three above listed flight conditions. For the TF-CLAWS at off-design conditions, the goal was to obtain the required thrusts while achieving improved fuel efficiency from the baseline engine model. Figure 2.5 presents two critical trade studies that dictate the off-design cycle parameters for the TF-CLAWS: one showing the relationship between cruise bypass ratio and the turbine entry temperature required at takeoff to generate 4,000 lbf of thrust, and the other showing the relationship between cruise bypass ratio and TSFC at each of the four main flight conditions.

![Figure 2.5: Trade Studies Dictating Off-Design Cycle Parameters for the TF-CLAWS](image)

From Figure 2.5, we note that as on-design bypass ratio increases, the TSFC at cruise and loiter decreases, while the TSFC at takeoff and supersonic dash increases. The final on-design bypass ratio chosen was 0.659, as this value was the largest cruise bypass ratio in which the maximum turbine entry temperature across all flight conditions was held at 3300 °R or below. From this iterative cycle analysis relating on-design parameters to off-design performance, it was possible to generate the final cycle characteristics for each off-design condition. The key parameters of the TF-CLAWS off-design performance are summarized in Table 2.5.
### Table 2.5: Performance of the TF-CLAWS at Off-Design Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mach Number</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altitude (ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_n$ (lbf)</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf)</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t_4}$ (°R)</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>3102</td>
<td>2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_9/A_8$</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi_r$</td>
<td>2.411</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>1.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5 Performance Comparison with the Baseline Engine Model

Upon comparison of the on-design performance (subsonic cruise) of the baseline engine and the TF-CLAWS as shown in Table 2.4, we note that the TSFC is reduced by 22.7%, a remarkable increase in engine fuel efficiency. Table 2.6 shows a comparison of the most important cycle parameters at takeoff, supersonic dash, and loiter for both the baseline engine and the TF-CLAWS.

#### Table 2.6: Comparison of Engine Performance between the Baseline Engine and the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Condition</th>
<th>Cycle Parameter</th>
<th>Baseline Engine</th>
<th>TF-CLAWS</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>$F_n$ (lbf)</td>
<td>3856</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf)</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>-64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic Dash</td>
<td>$F_n$ (lbf)</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf)</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>-48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter</td>
<td>$F_n$ (lbf)</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf)</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2.6, we note that fuel efficiency of the TF-CLAWS completely dominates the baseline engine at every operating point. For takeoff, the TF-CLAWS decreases fuel consumption by nearly two-thirds of the baseline engine! This is a phenomenal performance gain and is one of the major selection criteria of this engine design. For supersonic dash, the TF-CLAWS cuts fuel consumption nearly in half compared to the baseline engine! This drastic fuel reduction for dash grants the next generation trainer the ability to supercruise very efficiently. These impressive performance gains are functions of the major design selections of the TF-CLAWS, namely the lack of an afterburner (which enables supercruise) and SiC/SiC CMC turbine blades (which eliminate cooling of the turbine blades). In addition to the gains in fuel efficiency of the TF-CLAWS.
over the baseline engine, the total weight of the TF-CLAWS is also significantly less than that of the baseline engine. Table 2.7 presents a comparison of major geometric parameters between the two engines.

Table 2.7: Comparison of Geometric Parameters between the Baseline Engine and the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Parameter</th>
<th>Baseline Engine</th>
<th>TF-CLAWS</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max. Engine Diameter (in)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (in)</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (lbf)</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>-21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these considerations, the TF-CLAWS absolutely dominates the baseline engine in terms of both fuel efficiency and operational limits, while also drastically reducing the overall weight.

3 Mission Specification and Profile

This chapter describes the assumed mission for the next generation trainer to approximate the total fuel required for the mission. The main mission assumed for the next generation trainer is a combat patrol mission.

3.1 Combat Patrol Mission

Through utilization of GasTurb 12, it is possible to generate a multi-segment mission for any aircraft/engine. The combat patrol mission that the next generation trainer equipped with two TF-CLAWS will fly is summarized as follows:

1. Warm-up and taxi for 15 minutes
2. Takeoff and ascent to cruise at 35,000 ft
3. Cruise for 1500 nmi at Mach 0.85, 35,000 feet
4. Dash for 60 seconds at Mach 1.3, 40,000 ft
5. Loiter at Mach 0.5, 15,000 ft for 30 minutes
6. Descend and Landing (7.5 minute duration)

From this combat patrol mission profile, as well as the cycle parameters for each of the operational points documented in Section 2, then it is possible to determine the fuel consumption over the course of the entire mission for both the TF-CLAWS and the baseline engine and to compare the results. To determine the fuel consumed for each portion of the mission, it is prudent to translate both range and flight time duration into overall fuel consumption. The weight of fuel for each leg of the mission that is controlled by flight time duration can be calculated through Equation 3.1. To determine the fuel consumed for legs of the mission that are controlled by range, the Breguet range equation must be utilized (Equation 3.2). This equation alone gives
the weight fraction of that leg of the mission. From that weight fraction, the fuel consumption can then be calculated (see Equation 3.3). As part of the Breguet range equation, the lift-to-drag ratio for the aircraft must be known. For a military trainer, a reasonable value of lift-to-drag ratio can be assumed to be 10, a value taken from Table 2.2 of Jan Roskam’s “Airplane Design, Part I: Preliminary Sizing of Airplanes” [6].

\[
\text{Fuel Weight} = F_n \times \text{TSFC} \times \text{Duration of Leg} \tag{3.1}
\]

\[
R = \left( \frac{V}{\text{TSFC}} \right) \times \left( \frac{L}{D} \right) \times \ln\left( \frac{W_i}{W_f} \right) \tag{3.2}
\]

\[
\text{Fuel Weight} = W_i \left( 1 - \frac{W_f}{W_i} \right) \tag{3.3}
\]

The additional parameters and assumptions are listed as follows:

1. The next generation trainer will have a takeoff weight of 10,486 lbm (see Section 14.2 for preliminary weight estimations for the next generation trainer);
2. Fuel consumption resulting from the climb from subsonic cruise to supersonic dash is considered negligible;
3. Fuel consumption resulting from the descent from supersonic dash altitude to loiter altitude is negligible;
4. The TSFC for the landing condition is the same as for warm-up and taxi conditions, which is a conservative estimate.

From these parameters, assumptions, and the equations listed previously, the fuel consumption for the combat patrol mission of the next generation trainer may be calculated. The fuel consumption of the next generation trainer using two baseline engines is shown in Table 3.1, and the fuel consumption of the next generation trainer using two TF-CLAWS engines is shown in Table 3.2. The baseline engine and TF-CLAWS are compared in Table 3.3.

**Table 3.1: Combat Patrol Mission Fuel Weight for Baseline Engine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>TSFC (lbm/hr/lbf)</th>
<th>Time (hr)</th>
<th>Range (nmi)</th>
<th>Total Thrust (lbf)</th>
<th>Fuel Weight (lbm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up and Taxi</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Power TO and Climb</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>0.0833</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7712</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise at M = 0.85</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>2129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dash at M = 1.3</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter at M = 0.5</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7016</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2: Combat Patrol Mission Fuel Weight for TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>TSFC (lbf/hr/lbf)</th>
<th>Time (hr)</th>
<th>Range (nmi)</th>
<th>Total Thrust (lbf)</th>
<th>Fuel Weight (lbm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up and Taxi</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Power TO and Climb</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.0833</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise at M = 0.85</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dash at M = 1.3</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter at M = 0.5</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>4843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Comparison of Combat Patrol Mission Fuel Weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Total Fuel Weight (lbm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Engine</td>
<td>7016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-CLAWS</td>
<td>4843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance results are very impressive. A reduction in total fuel weight of 32% is extremely promising and lends validity to the cycle analysis and design. The superiority of the TF-CLAWS over the baseline engine can also be demonstrated in terms of performance gains in lieu of raw fuel weight savings. If the TF-CLAWS were to use the same amount of fuel as the baseline engine (i.e. an increase in fuel consumption of 2173 lbf), then either the subsonic cruise range can be increased or the flight time spent in supersonic dash can be increased. Figure 3.1 presents the performance gains that the TF-CLAWS offers over the baseline engine. From Figure 3.1, we note that the next generation trainer, when equipped with the TF-CLAWS, can either increase cruise range by 2,188 nautical miles or increase supersonic dash flight time by 44 minutes (which represent major improvements in training missions)! Figure 3.1 serves to demonstrate the extreme favorability of the TF-CLAWS over the baseline engine.
Figure 3.1: Cruise Range and Dash Time Performance Gains Offered by the TF-CLAWS

4 Engine Inlet Design

The inlet for the TF-CLAWS is an external-compression supersonic inlet, and it is more advanced than the inlet from the baseline engine outlined in the RFP. The engine inlet has twin side-mounted external compressor apertures with a diverterless supersonic inlet (DSI). A two-ramp full external-compression inlet is selected and integrated into the DSI. The inlet configuration selection is based on the supersonic Mach range in the flight envelope as specified by the RFP. The external compression inlet is the best option to enable a higher total pressure recovery (TPR), as supersonic flow deceleration over multiple shocks is more efficient than deceleration through a normal shock. The RFP suggests two types of inlet cross-sections: axisymmetric and two-dimensional. The two-dimensional supersonic diffuser can provide larger variations in inlet integration. By comparing those two inlet cross-sections, the supersonic diffuser is selected to be two-dimensional [7].
The DSI uses a highly three-dimensional “bump” compression surface and forward-swept inlet cowl to redirect the boundary layer around the engine intake. It also compresses the air to lower airspeeds for the supersonic flight regime. Compared to older fighter aircraft, such as the F-16, F-22 and Su-27, the DSI reduces external installation drag, weight, manufacturing complexity, and costs [10]. The 3-D bump-type inlet improves total pressure recovery as well.

A two-ramp, full external compression inlet is first designed, then integrated into a “bump.” The ramp angles are calculated using the Oswatitsch optimization technique to maximize the shock pressure recovery. Oswatitsch optimization states that all shocks should have equal strengths to optimize pressure recovery [8]. The inlet is designed for the supersonic dash condition of Mach 1.3 at an altitude of 40,000 feet. By using the following Oswatitsch optimization expression:

$$M_1 \sin \theta_1 = M_2 \sin \theta_2 = \cdots = M_{n-1} \sin \theta_{n-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

The ramp angles are determined to be $\theta_1 = 2^\circ$ and $\theta_2 = 1.87^\circ$. From these ramp angles, the total pressure recovery is calculated to be 0.9967. A three-dimensional bump compression surface is generated based on the
double ramp system by MATLAB. For the subsonic flight condition, the inlet total pressure recovery is assumed by the military specification MIL-E-5008B to be 1, i.e., $\eta_{\text{spec}} = 1$ for $M_0 \leq 1$.

![Figure 4.2: 3-D “Bump” Generated by MATLAB as an Integral Component to DSI [11]](image)

An additional consideration in the design of the inlet is that the engine mass flow rate demands are different at the various Mach numbers and altitudes within the flight envelope. Therefore, the inlet throat must be able to satisfy all requirements for each flight condition. Table 4.1 presents the results of the inlet throat sizing for all flight conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Condition</th>
<th>Throat Area, $A_{th}(\text{ft}^2)$</th>
<th>Throat Mach Number, $M_{th}$</th>
<th>Mass Flow Rate, $\dot{m}$ (lbm/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>46.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsonic Cruise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic Dash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>26.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>24.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to position the normal shock at the ideal location, the mass flow which reaches the engine face must be carefully controlled. Thus, an air bleed valve at the throat is used to remove excess mass flow.

The subsonic diffuser of the TF-CLAWS serves two functions. First, it transitions the inlet duct cross-section from rectangular at the entrance to circular at the exit, and then decelerates the flow velocity and
delivers uniform flow to the engine face while maintaining minimal total pressure loss. The serpentine inlet duct (S-duct) was chosen for the subsonic diffuser. It reduces the radar cross section (RCS), while also mitigating fan noise. With the throat area, area at the engine face, and the flight conditions known, then the subsonic diffuser is sized and the key results of the design are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Design Parameters of the Subsonic Diffuser of the Inlet of the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diffuser Wall Angle</td>
<td>2.4°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_d/H_t</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuser Length</td>
<td>120 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Duct Bend Angle</td>
<td>25°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure of the inlet is viewed as a means of achieving minimal weight and noise. Inlet weight is driven by cross-sectional size, length, mechanical complexity, and structural loads. Main structural loads for the inlet are pressure, aircraft maneuvers, and “hammershock” load. The “hammershock” load from engine stall is the primary design load. The highest possible “hammershock” loads usually occur during stall at high dynamic pressures, supersonic speeds, and low altitude. However, findings from modern research, as well as historical data, denote that the possibility of stall at those conditions are very low. Therefore, the primary design load is reduced from 70 psi to 44 psi, which reduces the inlet duct weight by 40% [10]. The inlet of the TF-CLAWS employs 3D Fiber Reinforced Polymer (FRP) composites in the inlet duct to reduce weight and fabrication costs, as well as to improve the impact damage tolerance.

The fan noise from the supersonic fan blade tips is one of the major issues addressed in the inlet design. A 28-inch acoustic liner is designed and installed on the inner cowl of the inlet forward of the fan booster to reduce the blade-passing frequency (BPF) noise. The inlet acoustic liner will be a honeycomb aluminum composite in order to reduce weight and increase structural stiffness. With all of the major components of the inlet system of the TF-CLAWS designed, then a definition sketch of the inlet system is shown in Figure 4.3 and a 3-D representation of the inlet is shown in Figure 4.4.
Figure 4.3: Definition Sketch of the TF-CLAWS Inlet [12]

Figure 4.4: Inlet System for the TF-CLAWS

5 Compression System Design

This section documents the detailed design of the compression system for the TF-CLAWS. Included within this section are the design guidelines, assumptions, preliminary design properties, and structural/material analysis for each component of the compression system. The compression system of the TF-CLAWS is a two-spool concept, with a transonic fan and low-pressure compressor (LPC) operating on the low-speed spool and a high-pressure compressor (HPC) operating on the high-speed spool. To begin the design process for both the transonic fan and the HPC, the tip relative Mach number for the rotor of the first stage must be selected [8].
From this design selection of tip relative Mach number, it is pertinent to perform a detailed stage-by-stage design of the each component of the compression system at the hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces. To perform a detailed compression system stage design, we use the principles of blade vortex design, which describes the swirl velocity profile in the radial direction downstream of the rotor that is anchored at the pitchline radius [8]. For the purposes of the design of the stages of the compression system, a “free-vortex” design is applied to determine flow characteristics of the hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces [8]. The hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces may be described using the principle of “velocity triangles,” a concept which is shown in Figure 5.1.

![Figure 5.1: Definition of Velocity Triangles for a Compressor Stage [8]](image)

Once the flow profile at the three stream surfaces is known for each stage of the compression system, then the geometry of the rotor and stator blades is selected (e.g., cross-sectional shape, aspect ratio, solidity, etc.). The material for the blades is then selected, and stress analyses are conducted to determine the margin of safety for the blade material selection. With the design process of the compression system in mind, then the guiding criteria in the design of any compression system are tabulated in Table 5.1, which includes nominal ranges and typical values for each criterion [8].
### Table 5.1: Guidelines on the Range of Compressor Parameters [8]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Typical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow Coefficient, $\phi$</td>
<td>$0.3 \leq \phi \leq 0.9$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Factor</td>
<td>$D \leq 0.6$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial Mach Number, $M_z$</td>
<td>$0.3 \leq M_z \leq 0.6$</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip Tangential Mach Number, $M_T$</td>
<td>$1.0 \leq M_T \leq 1.5$</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Reaction, $^\circ R$</td>
<td>$0.1 \leq ^\circ R \leq 0.9$</td>
<td>0.5 (for $M &lt; 1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds Number Based on Chord</td>
<td>$300,000 \leq Re_c$</td>
<td>&gt; 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip Relative Mach Number (1st Stage)</td>
<td>$(M_{1\text{r}})_{\text{tip}} \leq 1.7$</td>
<td>1.3-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Average Solidity</td>
<td>$1.0 \leq \sigma \leq 2.0$</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Average Aspect Ratio</td>
<td>$1.0 \leq \text{AR} \leq 4.0$</td>
<td>&lt; 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytropic Efficiency, $e_c$</td>
<td>$0.85 \leq e_c \leq 0.92$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Coefficient, $\psi$</td>
<td>$0.2 \leq \psi \leq 0.5$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA Blade (Range)</td>
<td>$0.8 \leq M \leq 1.2$</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACA-65 Series (Range)</td>
<td>$M \leq 0.8$</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Haller Criterion</td>
<td>$W_2/W_1 \geq 0.72$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade Leading-Edge Radius</td>
<td>$r_{L,E} \sim 5\text{-}10% \text{ of } t_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>5% $t_{\text{max}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor Pressure Ratio per Spool</td>
<td>$\pi_c \leq 20$</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial Gap Between Blade Rows</td>
<td>$0.23c_z \text{ to } 0.25c_z$</td>
<td>$0.25c_z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect Ratio, Fan</td>
<td>$\sim 2\text{-}5$</td>
<td>$&lt; 1.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect Ratio, Compressor</td>
<td>$\sim 1\text{-}4$</td>
<td>$\sim 2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To arrive at a successful compressor design, a few of the design parameters listed in Table 5.1 are of special significance and dictate the selection of the other design parameters. These special design parameters are degree of reaction, blade row solidity, diffusion factor (D-Factor), and the De Haller criterion. In a successful compressor design, these four design parameters are iterated until they reach compliance with the range of values described in Table 5.1. Degree of reaction, blade row solidity, diffusion factor, and De Haller criterion are expressed in Equations 5.1 to 5.4, respectively.

$$^\circ R = 1 - \frac{C_{\theta 2} + C_{\theta 1}}{2U} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\sigma = \frac{c}{s} \quad (5.2)$$

$$D = 1 - \frac{W_2}{W_1} + \frac{|W_{\theta 2} - W_{\theta 1}|}{2\sigma W_1} \quad (5.3)$$

$$\frac{W_2}{W_1} \geq 0.72 \quad (5.4)$$

In addition to the importance of the four previously-described parameters, perhaps the other single-most important consideration for any compressor is stall margin. One effective methodology to assessing the stall margin of a compressor is to use a stage-by-stage approach, in which each compressor stage is evaluated on the
basis of stalling effective static-pressure rise coefficient to ensure that stall margin requirements are met. This stage-by-stage evaluation of the stall margin for a compressor was developed by Koch, in which he developed an analogy between the stalling pressure rise capability of an axial-flow compressor stage and two-dimensional diffusers [8]. The stall margin for a compressor stage is described by both the stalling effective static-pressure rise coefficient, \((C_h)_{ef}\), and the average diffusion length ratio of the stage, \(L/g_2\). These two critical parameters are calculated by Equations 5.5 and 5.6, respectively.

\[
(C_h)_{ef} = (C_h)_{ad} \left[ \frac{(V_1' ^2)_{rotor} + (V_1 ^2)_{stator}}{(V_1 ^2)_{rotor} - F_{ef} (V_1 ^2)_{stator}} \right] \quad (5.5)
\]

\[
\left( \frac{L}{g_2} \right)_{stage} = \left[ \frac{(L/g_2)_{rotor} q_1' + (L/g_2)_{stator} q_1}{q_1' + q_1} \right] \quad (5.6)
\]

Figure 5.2 shows a definition sketch which explains the geometric parameters required to calculate the average diffusion length of the stage, \(L/g_2\). These geometric parameters, in addition to the velocity vectors obtained from free vortex design, are then used to calculate the stalling effective static-pressure rise coefficient, \((C_h)_{ef}\). The average diffusion length of the stage and the stalling effective static-pressure rise coefficient are then plotted on Figure 5.3, a chart which relates the two parameters to the stall margin of a given compressor.
stage. In Figure 5.3, the 0-10% stall margin range is considered the “critical” range, and as such it is a design intent to exceed this critical range of stall margin.

![Axial-Flow Compressor Stall Margin Chart](image)

**Figure 5.3: Stall Margin Estimation Chart for a Compressor Stage [8]**

### 5.1 Fan (LPC) Design

Unlike the baseline engine, the TF-CLAWS is a low bypass, mixed flow turbofan engine, rather than a turbojet engine. Thus, the addition of a fan introduces both increased thrust potential as well as increased fuel efficiency. The fan of the TF-CLAWS is of transonic design, consisting of two stages with a pressure ratio of 2.411 at takeoff. The fan of the TF-CLAWS has a hub-to-tip radius ratio of 0.5 at the fan entrance and operates at a shaft speed of 19,271 RPM at takeoff. Table 5.2 summarizes the main global design parameters of the fan of the TF-CLAWS at takeoff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \pi_f )</td>
<td>2.411</td>
<td>( \tau_f )</td>
<td>1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e_f )</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>( \eta_f )</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_{t2} )</td>
<td>14.55 psi</td>
<td>( p_{t21} )</td>
<td>35.08 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{t2} )</td>
<td>545.7 °R</td>
<td>( T_{t21} )</td>
<td>752.4 °R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega )</td>
<td>19,271 RPM</td>
<td>Number of Stages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data shown in Table 5.2, the fan of the TF-CLAWS must be designed on the basis of the total temperature rise required per stage, which is calculated to be 105.1 °R per stage. With the thermodynamic characteristics of the fan in hand, then the geometric properties of the fan are readily determined. From design iterations performed in GasTurb 12, the major fan annulus dimensions are known and are presented in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: Annulus Dimensions for the Fan of the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Station</th>
<th>Hub Radius (in)</th>
<th>Tip Radius (in)</th>
<th>Area (in²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fan Inlet (Station 2)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Exit (Station 21)</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>56.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, GasTurb 12 simulations include calculations of the axial chord lengths for each rotor and stator blade row of the HPC. The TF-CLAWS design has resulted in a fan length of 7.89 inches, an acceptable length for a two-stage low-bypass fan.

5.1.1 Rotor and Stator Flow Calculations

In addition to the global design parameters of the fan, it is pertinent to perform a detailed stage-by-stage design of the fan at the hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces. To perform a detailed fan stage design, we use the principles of blade vortex design, which describes the swirl velocity profile in the radial direction downstream of the rotor that is anchored at the pitchline radius [8]. For the purposes of the design of the stages of the fan, a “free-vortex” design is applied to determine flow characteristics of the hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces [8]. Table 5.4 summarizes the three-stream analysis of the first stage of the fan (subscripts 1 and 2 denotes inlet and exit of the blade row, respectively).
Table 5.4: Free-Vortex Design for the Fan and Stator of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>First Rotor</th>
<th>First Stator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>Pitchline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (ft/s)</td>
<td>721.1</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r (in)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{1,abs}</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{1,rel}</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{z} (ft/s)</td>
<td>636.5</td>
<td>636.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_{1} (ft/s)</td>
<td>961.8</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{θ1} (ft/s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{θ2} (ft/s)</td>
<td>876.1</td>
<td>584.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{2} (ft/s)</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>863.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_{2} (ft/s)</td>
<td>655.1</td>
<td>807.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{12} (°R)</td>
<td>650.8</td>
<td>650.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{12} (psi)</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{2} (°R)</td>
<td>553.2</td>
<td>588.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{2,abs}</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{2,rel}</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α_{1} (deg)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α_{2} (deg)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β_{1} (deg)</td>
<td>-48.6</td>
<td>-59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β_{2} (deg)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°R</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Haller</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Factor</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Fan Rotor and Stator Blade Design

As the Mach number varies significantly from the hub-to-tip in the fan stages, it is pertinent to effectively split the blades into three unique sections: the subsonic stream surface at the hub, the transonic stream surface at pitchline, and the supersonic stream surface at the tip. Stated differently, the rotor blades in the fan will have a variable cross-section along the span of the blade.

Figure 5.4: Comparison of Fan Blade Profiles [8]
This discretization of the fan rotor blades necessitates the selection of a cross-section at the hub, pitchline, and tip on the basis of Mach number. Therefore, for the subsonic regime of the hub, the fan rotor blades are best served with a NACA-65-(21)10 airfoil [8]. For the transonic regime at pitchline, the fan rotor blades are best served using a controlled diffusion airfoil (CDA) [8]. For the supersonic regime at the tip, the fan rotor blades are best served using a double circular arc (DCA) profile [8]. Figure 5.4 demonstrates the differences between a NACA-65 series airfoil, a CDA, and a DCA profile. Finally, the stator blades of the fan will employ a DCA profile along the entire length of the blade for the sake of simplicity.

In addition to the calculation of the blade angles, then the blade height, aspect ratio, mean chord, and number of blades for the first stage of the fan are also determined from free-vortex stage design. In particular, the total number of blades needed for each stage are calculated via Equations 5.7 and 5.8. The selection of the number of stator blades is made to eliminate any resonance modes in the stage [8]. Table 5.5 summarizes the blade profile design selections for the first stage of the fan of the TF-CLAWS.

\[
N_r = \frac{2\pi r_m}{s_m} \quad (5.7) \quad N_s = 2N_r \pm 1 \quad (5.8)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Stator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blade Height (in)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Chord (in)</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial Chord (in)</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch (in)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Blades</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taper Ratio</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.3 Fan Stall Margin

Stall margin estimation for the first stage of the fan is performed using the procedures outlined in Section 5. Via Equations 5.5 and 5.6, the first stage of the fan has a stalling effective static-pressure rise coefficient of 0.381 and an average diffusion length of 1.201. Plotting these values in Figure 5.3 yields a stall margin of 13% for the first stage of the fan at takeoff, which is well within acceptable values.
5.1.4  Fan Blade Structural Analysis

The blades of the fan of the TF-CLAWS will make usage of the silicon carbide CMC described in Section 2. This usage of SiC/SiC CMC for the blades of the fan will reduce weight and increase the strength of the blades. To protect the composite from foreign object damage (FOD), a sheath of Ti-6Al-4V is added to the leading edge of the fan blades. The usage of this kind of titanium on the leading edge of the fan blades has been shown to be effective; in the GE90 high-bypass turbofan engine, the fan blades equipped with Ti-6Al-4V on the leading-edge were able to block two eight pound birds without blade separation or catastrophic failure [13]. In addition to the aerodynamic criteria discussed in the previous sections, the rotor blades at each stage of the fan must withstand a variety of stresses: centrifugal, bending, vibrational, and thermal stresses. The dominant stress in the rotor design, however, is centrifugal stress [8]; consequently, if the rotors have a positive margin of safety under centrifugal loading, then the rotor blades can be assumed safe in other stress modes. Equation 5.9 expresses the centrifugal stress on a compressor blade. In this expression, \( \rho_{\text{blade}} \) is the blade material density (0.0723 lbm/in\(^3\) for SiC/SiC CMC) [5], \( \omega \) is the angular speed of the compressor (in rad/s), \( A \) is the flow area at the blade row, and \( A_t/A_h \) is the blade taper ratio (previously selected as 0.8). With an allowable centrifugal stress of 40,000 psi for SiC/SiC CMC, then the centrifugal stress analysis of the fan blades is summarized in Table 5.6.

\[
\sigma_c = \rho_{\text{blade}} \frac{\omega^2 A}{4\pi} \left(1 + \frac{A_t}{A_h}\right) \quad (5.9)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter – Rotor, 1st Stage of Fan</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Centrifugal Stress, ( \sigma_{\text{all}} )</td>
<td>40,000 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Density, ( \rho_{\text{blade}} )</td>
<td>0.0723 lbm/in(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade Taper Ratio, ( A_t/A_h )</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Area, ( A )</td>
<td>173.3 in(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC Angular Speed, ( \omega )</td>
<td>19.271 RPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Centrifugal Stress, ( \sigma_c )</td>
<td>18.914 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Safety</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 High-Pressure Compressor (HPC) Design

The high-pressure compressor (HPC) of the TF-CLAWS consists of seven stages with a pressure ratio of 11.4 at takeoff. The HPC of the TF-CLAWS has a hub-to-tip radius ratio of 0.5 at the compressor entrance and operates at a shaft speed of 39,577 RPM at takeoff. Table 5.7 summarizes the main global design parameters of the HPC of the TF-CLAWS at takeoff.

### Table 5.7: Design Parameters of the HPC of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\pi_{HPC}$</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_{HPC}$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{t25}$</td>
<td>34.67 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t25}$</td>
<td>752.4 °R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>39,577 RPM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{HPC}$</td>
<td>2.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{HPC}$</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{t3}$</td>
<td>395.8 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t3}$</td>
<td>1600 °R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stages</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data shown in Table 5.7, the HPC of the TF-CLAWS must be designed on the basis of the total temperature rise required per stage, which is calculated to be 132.7 °R per stage. With seven stages in total, the total temperature requirement at the HPC exit, $T_{t3}$, is actually exceeded. The final stage is required, however, to ensure that the pressure ratio for the HPC is satisfied, which is indeed the case. With the thermodynamic characteristics of the HPC in hand, then the geometric properties of the compressor are readily determined. From design iterations performed in GasTurb 12, the major HPC annulus dimensions are known and are presented in Table 5.8.

### Table 5.8: Annulus Dimensions for the HPC of the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Station</th>
<th>Hub Radius (in)</th>
<th>Tip Radius (in)</th>
<th>Area (in²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPC Inlet (Station 25)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC Exit (Station 3)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, GasTurb 12 simulations include calculations of the axial chord lengths for each rotor and stator blade row of the HPC. The TF-CLAWS design has resulted in a HPC length of 13.33 inches – a significant reduction in length. This reduction in length, coupled with the use of SiC/SiC CMCs and fewer stages than the baseline engine has significantly decreased the weight of the HPC.
5.2.1 **HPC Rotor and Stator Flow Calculations**

In addition to the global design parameters of the HPC, it is pertinent to perform a detailed stage-by-stage design of the compressor at the hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces. To perform a detailed compressor stage design, we use the principles of blade vortex design, which describes the swirl velocity profile in the radial direction downstream of the rotor that is anchored at the pitchline radius [8]. For the purposes of the design of the stages of the HPC, a “free-vortex” design is applied to determine flow characteristics of the hub, pitchline, and tip stream surfaces [8]. Table 5.9 summarizes the three-stream analysis of the first stage of the HPC (subscripts 1 and 2 denotes inlet and exit of the blade row, respectively).

**Table 5.9: Free-Vortex Design for the First Stage of the HPC of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>First Rotor</th>
<th>First Stator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>Pitchline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (ft/s)</td>
<td>846.8</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r (in)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M_{1,abs})</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M_{1,rel})</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_z) (ft/s)</td>
<td>724.5</td>
<td>724.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W_1) (ft/s)</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C\theta_1) (ft/s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_{\theta_2}) (ft/s)</td>
<td>952.7</td>
<td>635.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_2) (ft/s)</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>963.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W_2) (ft/s)</td>
<td>732.2</td>
<td>963.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{12}) (°R)</td>
<td>885.1</td>
<td>885.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_{12}) (psi)</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>51.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_2) (°R)</td>
<td>767.3</td>
<td>808.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_2) (psi)</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>42.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M_{2,abs})</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M_{2,rel})</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_1) (deg)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_2) (deg)</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta_1) (deg)</td>
<td>-49.5</td>
<td>-60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta_2) (deg)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\theta) (°R)</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Haller</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Factor</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\phi)</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\psi)</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2  **HPC Rotor and Stator Blade Design**

As the relative Mach number at the inlet of the first rotor of the HPC is transonic at the hub stream surface and supersonic at the pitchline and tip stream surfaces, then a controlled diffusion airfoil (CDA) profile is selected for the hub and a double circular arc (DCA) profile is selected for pitchline and tip, as these geometric profiles offer the most favorable pressure distribution for each respective stream surface [8]. For a HPC blade profile, it is recommended to select a thickness to chord ratio of 9% at the hub, which is assumed to taper linearly to the tip, where the thickness to chord ratio is 3% [8]. Furthermore, the optimum incidence angle for the blade is selected on the basis of cascade loss “bucket curves,” and for a DCA blade with a solidity of 1.33 and a stagger of 42.5° the optimum incidence angle is 3° [8].

With the incidence angle determined, we proceed to the determination of the deviation angle of the blade. The deviation angle of the blade can be calculated through use of Carter’s rule [8]. With the deviation angle, incidence angle, and the relative flow angles determined from free-vortex stage design, the leading-edge and trailing-edge blade angles are calculated. Equations 5.10 through 5.12 describe the calculation process of all the necessary blades angles, namely deviation angle ($\delta^*$), blade leading-edge angle ($\kappa_1$), and blade trailing-edge angle ($\kappa_2$).

\[
\delta^* = \frac{\Delta \beta}{4\sqrt{\sigma}} \quad (5.10) \\
\kappa_1 = \beta_1 - i \quad (5.11) \\
\kappa_2 = \beta_2 - \delta^* \quad (5.12)
\]

In addition to the calculation of the blade angles, the blade height, aspect ratio, mean chord, and number of blades for the first stage of the HPC are determined from free-vortex stage design. In particular, the total number of blades needed for each stage can be calculated through use of Equations 5.7 and 5.8 in Section 5.1.2. The selection of the number of stator blades is made to eliminate any resonance modes in the stage [8]. Table 5.10 summarizes the blade profile design selections for the first stage of the HPC of the TF-CLAWS.
Table 5.10: HPC Blade Characteristics for the First Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Stator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blade Height (in)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Chord (in)</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial Chord (in)</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch (in)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Blades</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taper Ratio</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 HPC Stall Margin

Stall margin estimation for the first stage of the HPC is performed using the procedures outlined in Section 5. Via Equations 5.5 and 5.6, the first stage of the HPC has a stalling effective static-pressure rise coefficient of 0.36 and an average diffusion length of 1.359. Plotting these values in Figure 5.3 yields a stall margin of 21% for the first stage of the HPC at takeoff, which is well within acceptable values.

5.2.4 HPC Blade Structural Analysis

The blades of the HPC of the TF-CLAWS will make usage of the silicon carbide CMC described in Section 2, which will reduce weight and increase the strength of the blades. In addition to the aerodynamic criteria discussed in the previous sections, the rotor blades at each stage of the HPC must withstand a variety of stresses: centrifugal, bending, vibrational, and thermal stresses. The dominant stress in the rotor design, however, is centrifugal stress [8]; consequently, if the rotors have a positive margin of safety under centrifugal loading, then the rotor blades can be assumed safe in other stress modes. Following the same procedure outlined in Section 5.1.4, then the centrifugal stress analysis of the HPC blades is summarized in Table 5.11.

Table 5.11: HPC Blade Structural Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter – Rotor, 1st Stage of HPC</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Centrifugal Stress, ( \sigma_{\text{all}} )</td>
<td>40,000 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Density, ( \rho_{\text{blade}} )</td>
<td>0.0723 \text{lbm/in}^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade Taper Ratio, ( \frac{A_t}{A_h} )</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Area, ( A )</td>
<td>56.7 in²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC Angular Speed, ( \omega )</td>
<td>39,577 RPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Centrifugal Stress, ( \sigma_c )</td>
<td>26,083 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Safety</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Combustion System Design

The TF-CLAWS utilizes an annular combustion chamber, following the practices of commercial and 5th generation fighter aircraft engines such as the F-119, F-135, Pratt & Whitney 1000GTF and CFM International LEAP family series.

In addition to annular design, the TF-CLAWS will use the Rich Burn-Quick Quench-Lean Burn (RQL) combustion system configuration to address the issue of emissions. The RQL concept is a reliable, low cost approach with many advantages in meeting the full range of combustion system requirements. The performance advantages of this concept will be discussed at length in Section 6.2.

The TF-CLAWS combustor was designed over a wide operating range, from on-design and off-design flight conditions. Perhaps most importantly, the combustor must conform to the maximum turbine entry temperature of 3300 °R, which occurs at the off-design takeoff condition, as stipulated by the optimized engine cycle.

6.1 Combustor Pre-Diffuser Configuration

Compressor outlet axial flow velocity of as high as 370 ft/s (M = 0.5) must be ideally reduced within a short axial distance before combustion commences. This flow deceleration is accomplished by employing a diffuser between the compressor exit and burner entrance.

The TF-CLAWS combustor will use a hybrid diffuser that combines a vortex controlled diffuser (VCD) with a conventional wide-angled post-diffuser located at the exit. The hybrid diffuser boasts superior performance as it can achieve a static pressure recovery at least 25% higher than conventional diffusers of the same length [14].

According to Adkins, Motharu and Yost [14], even without bleed, the hybrid diffuser can match the static pressure recovery of a conventional diffuser with only half the diffusion length.
6.2 **RQL Combustor Configuration – Emissions Control**

Although U.S military aircraft are exempt from EPA emissions standards governing commercial aircraft, federal law provides states with an important measure of control over the emissions of military aircraft through the general conformity rule of the 1970 Clean Air Act (CAA) [15]. The pollutants emitted by engines that are of most interest are carbon monoxide (CO), unburned hydrocarbons (UHC), nitric oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (Smoke & Soot). The amount and type of pollutants emitted are dependent on engine power conditions.

The RQL (Rich Burn-Quick Quench-Lean Burn) is a combustion technique used to lower the local flame temperature and reduce NOx emissions by performing combustion in fuel-rich state, and a fuel-lean state. NOx emissions are significantly reduced during high power conditions by carrying out combustion in fuel-rich state, $\phi_{PZ} > 1$ in the primary zone. Afterwards, at the end of primary zone, an instantaneous shift occurs from fuel-rich burn to fuel-lean burn by introducing an excessive blast of dilution air, hence the term quick quench [17]. Due to short residence from high mixing rates, NOx formation is inhibited.

At low power conditions, combustion efficiency is high due to near-stoichiometric ($\phi_{PZ} \approx 1$) fuel-air ratio which minimizes unburned hydrocarbon and CO emissions. NOx formation rates are low due to the combined effects of low temperatures and oxygen depletion compared to high load conditions [19].

The RQL concept was chosen over the fuel-staged combustor for several reasons. These lean-stage systems, however, have the disadvantages of increased cost, weight and complexity along with the potential for
combustion instabilities and higher CO and UHC emissions due to quenching [20]. The RQL approach to combustor design is a traditional one, but years of development have optimized the key characteristics of RQL to meet increasingly stringent combustor requirements. The RQL combustor configuration is backed by industry, as it has been employed on the TALON X in the new Pratt & Whitney PW1000 series geared turbofan engine [20].

### 6.3 Liner Material Selection and Advanced Cooling Technique

Nickel-based super alloys like Hastelloy X, Nimonic 75 and 263 have been the standard choice of combustor liner material for decades. As demand for higher overall engine performance warrants higher combustor operating temperatures, the TF-CLAWS combustor will utilize the more superior HA188 cobalt-based super alloy, which has excellent high temperature strength and good oxidation resistance up to 2460 °R. It is also readily fabricated and formed by conventional techniques. The combustor of the Pratt & Whitney F100 engine used on the F-15 fighter jet is constructed using HA 188 super alloy [21].

![Figure 6.5: Tile Implementation on Liner Wall](image)

The highest turbine entry temperature of 3300 °R at takeoff, however, exceeds the maximum service temperature of the burner liner by 840 °R. To protect the burner liner during takeoff, the liner hot side is fitted with ultra-lightweight ceramic matrix composites, CMC (SiC/SiC) tiles. Thermal barrier coating (TBC) is also applied to provide an insulating layer that reduces base material temperature and mitigate the effects of hot streaking [22].

Together with CMC tiles, the convective film cooling method is employed whereby air enters through holes in the combustor walls and impinges on the tiles. The air then moves through a series of pedestals designed to improve the convective heat transfer, before exiting the front and rear of the tiles to form an insulating film.
The tiles are specifically designed to be removable for maintenance. Maintenance time and cost is reduced because changing the tile is simpler than repairing the liner [23]. The industry confidence of utilizing the tiled combustor cooling method and CMC material is increasing. The tile cooling method has been employed on Pratt & Whitney V2500, PW4000 and Rolls Royce Trent 1000 engines [23,16]. GE Aviation has begun ground testing their latest GE-9X engine which incorporates CMC material in the combustor liner in April this year [24].

6.4 Combustor Air Partitioning and Equivalence Ratios

The analytical methods used to estimate combustor air partitioning was derived from Mattingly, Heiser & Pratt Aircraft Engine Design [25]. The air partitioning was analyzed at cruise and at takeoff, the most stringent flight condition.

The tailoring between fuel-rich or fuel-lean equivalence ratios in the primary zone is a critical factor in RQL combustor system design. Consequently, the air partitioning is also dependent on equivalence ratios values. For the RQL combustor, the typical equivalence ratio of lean-burn combustion is between 0.5 to 0.8 and fuel rich primary zone is between 1.2 to 1.6 [18].

A near-stoichiometric equivalence ratio of 0.8 was selected for the low-load subsonic cruise condition. A fuel-rich equivalence ratio of 1.2 was selected for the high-load takeoff condition.

Table 6.1: Summary of the Combustor Air Partitioning and Equivalence Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Cond.</th>
<th>Fuel Proportion</th>
<th>$\phi_{PZ}$</th>
<th>$\phi_{SZ}$</th>
<th>$\phi_{exit}$</th>
<th>$\dot{m}_{PZ}$ (lb/s)</th>
<th>$\dot{m}_{SZ+DZ}$ (lb/s)</th>
<th>$\dot{m}_{total}$ (lb/s)</th>
<th>$\Phi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruise</td>
<td>Near-Stoichiometric</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cooling air requirement corresponding to different types of cooling methods is determined using Figure 6.9 [8]. As previously explained, the convective film cooling method was selected to cool the TF-CLAWS combustor liner. Transpiration cooling was not chosen due to problem of pore clogging.

![Figure 6.8: Example of RQL High-Load Operation [26]](image)

![Figure 6.9: Cooling Method, Effectiveness, & Cooling Air [8]](image)

### Table 6.2: Selection and Results of the Cooling Methodology for the Combustor of the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooling Method</th>
<th>Flight Condition</th>
<th>Cooling Air (% Total Airflow)</th>
<th>( \dot{m}_{\text{cooling}} ) (lb/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convection/Film</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convection/Film</td>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 Combustor Geometry

The methods used for combustor geometry determination follow the techniques of Mattingly, Heiser & Pratt Aircraft Engine Design [25]. The combustor geometry was compared at both subsonic cruise and at takeoff, which is the most stringent flight condition.

#### Table 6.3: Dome and Liner Geometric Characteristics of the Combustor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dome and Liner</th>
<th>Subsonic Cruise</th>
<th>Takeoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimum Ratio, ( \alpha_{\text{OPT}} )</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dome Height, ( H_r ) (in.)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liner Height, ( H_L ) (in.)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 6.4: Combustor Zone Geometric Characteristics of the Combustor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combustor Zone</th>
<th>Subsonic Cruise</th>
<th>Takeoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( L_{\text{PZ}} ) (in.)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{SZ} + L_{DZ} ) (in.)</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Length (in.)</td>
<td><strong>6.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Combustor Efficiency

Lefebvre in his publication on gas turbine combustion introduced a combustor loading parameter (CLP) which correlates well with combustor efficiency and is expressed via:

\[
\text{CLP} = \theta = \frac{P_t^{4/5} A_{\text{ref}} H_e^{1/4} T_{t3}^2}{m_3} \tag{6.1}
\]

The reaction rate parameter, \(b\), depends on the primary zone equivalence ratio, \(\phi_{PZ}\), and is expressed via the following equation by Herbert (1957):

\[
b = 382 \left( \sqrt{2} \pm \ln \frac{\phi_{PZ}}{1.03} \right) \tag{6.2}
\]

where (+) for \(\phi_{PZ} < 1.03\), (-) for \(\phi_{PZ} > 1.03\)

![Combustion Efficiency & CLP Correlation](image)

**Figure 6.10: Combustion Efficiency & CLP Correlation [8]**

**Table 6.5: Combustion Efficiency for the TF-CLAWS at Subsonic Cruise and Takeoff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Subsonic Cruise</th>
<th>Takeoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\phi_{PZ})</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>(9.5 \times 10^5)</td>
<td>(26.8 \times 10^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion Efficiency</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 Combustor Fuel Injection

The TF-CLAWS will utilize pre-filming type air blast atomizers in which fuel is first spread out into a thin continuous sheet and is then subjected to the atomizing action of high velocity air [23]. Air blast atomizers are advantageous over pressure atomizers as they require lower fuel pump pressures and produce a finer spray. The thorough mixture of fuel and air from air blast atomization also results in low soot formation and smoke. The methods used for quick combustor swirler-injector design was derived from Mattingly, Heiser & Pratt Aircraft Engine Design [25].
Table 6.6: Characteristics of the Combustor Fuel Injector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injection System</th>
<th>Subsonic Cruise</th>
<th>Takeoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fuel Injectors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swirler Tip Radius, (r_t) (in.)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swirler Hub Radius, (r_h) (in.)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swirler Area, (A_{SW}) (in(^2))</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swirl Blade Angle, (\alpha_{SW})</td>
<td>45(^\circ)</td>
<td>45(^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swirl Number, (S')</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.8 Combustor Ignition Source

The TF-CLAWS will utilize a surface discharge type igniter that consists of a central iridium electrode and outer electrode. This type is the most widely used and reliable form of ignition for gas turbine engines. The spark igniter is located within the primary zone near the location where fuel-air mixtures pass over the electrodes. To preserve the life of the igniter, it is located away from the hottest part of the primary zone [25]. Due to the rather small overall combustor size, only two igniters will be required and will be placed on opposite sides of the annulus.

### 6.9 Three-View of the Combustor of the TF-CLAWS

![Figure 6.11: Pre-Filming Airblast Atomizer [23]](image1)

![Figure 6.12: Surface Discharge Igniter [27]](image2)

![Figure 6.13: Side, Back, and Isometric Views of the Combustor of the TF-CLAWS](image3)
7 Turbine Design

7.1 High Pressure and Low Pressure Turbine

This candidate engine for a next generation trainer contains a high-pressure (HPT) and low-pressure (LPT) turbine. The HPT supplies power to the high-pressure compressor and the LPT provides power to the fan in a two-spool system. Primary considerations for designing a turbine include cycle analysis, material selection, manufacturing, blade and disk design, cooling, life, stress, and bearings.

![Figure 7.1: Representative Schematic of the Turbine of the TF-CLAWS](image)

7.2 Pitchline Design Parameters

The turbine is designed for constant axial velocity ($C_\alpha=$constant) and adiabatic flow through all turbine nozzles. All design choices and parameters are shown in Table 7.1. The angular speed of the HPT and LPT are determined by the HPC and transonic fan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m_1$ (lbm/s)</td>
<td>31.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{t1}$ (°R)</td>
<td>3296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{t1}$ (psi)</td>
<td>376.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_2$</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1$ (deg)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2$ (deg)</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{HPT}$ (rpm)</td>
<td>39,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{LPT}$ (rpm)</td>
<td>19,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Turbine Flow Calculations

This section describes the absolute and relative flow paths in the HPT and LPT. Beginning with design choices and parameters outlined in “GasTurb 12”, a step-by-step process was followed to calculate the velocity
triangles at every point in between the stators and rotors [8]. The turbine was designed to have zero pitchline swirl at the turbine exit. Figure 7.2 shows an example of the velocity triangles in a turbine. Table 7.2 presents the detailed stage design for the HPT and LPT, with Stations 41–44 corresponding to the HPT and Stations 45–47 corresponding to the LPT.

![Figure 7.2: Definition Sketch for the Velocity Triangles of a Turbine Station [8]](image_url)

**Table 7.2: Detailed Stage Design for the HPT and LPT of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station No.</th>
<th>C (ft/s), Absolute Velocity</th>
<th>W (ft/s), Relative Velocity</th>
<th>U (ft/s), Rotational Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>Pitchline</td>
<td>Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>2606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C (ft/s), Absolute Velocity</th>
<th>W (ft/s), Relative Velocity</th>
<th>Relative:Absolute Mach Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α (deg), Absolute Flow Angle</td>
<td>β (deg), Relative Flow Angle</td>
<td>Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-7.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 Material Selection

Material advancement has led gas turbine engines to become more powerful and efficient. Materials with high performance levels are highly sought after and are the primary focus of continuing research and development [28]. The ability of a material to withstand high temperatures and high stresses in service is important to a turbine material. Traditionally, nickel-based super-alloys are used in gas turbine blades and disks. However, as gas turbine technology advanced, these super-alloys became inadequate, and different coatings and cooling techniques became necessary to operate at the higher temperatures and stresses seen in service [29]. The new type of material being developed for use in gas turbine engines is ceramic matrix composites (CMCs) [30]. These materials consist of fibers cured in a matrix, usually carbon or silicon carbide.

Silicon carbide fibers and silicon carbide matrix CMCs (SiC/SiC) are attractive because they have favorable thermal properties, will require no cooling, and are 67% lighter than the lightest nickel-base superalloy (which is similar to Inconel) [31]. The silicon fibers can withstand higher temperatures if they are heat treated during manufacturing [32]. The ceramic matrix composite SiC/SiC was chosen to be the material for the turbine blades. This decision is justified as General Electric tested SiC/SiC turbine blades in 2015 in a GE F414 turbofan engine [5], seen in Figure 7.3. The CMC went through 500 “grueling” cycles in the LPT of the GE F414, generating confidence that it will be available in 2025, with a Technology Ready Level (TRL) of 9. Table 7.3 displays material properties of the SiC/SiC CMC [33].
Table 7.3: Material Properties of SiC/SiC Ceramic Matrix Composite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Service Temperature (°R)</td>
<td>3,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (lbm/in³)</td>
<td>0.0723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Strength (ksi)</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young's Modulus (Msi)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Turbine Aerothermodynamics

The same process used to solve the turbine velocity triangles was used for the turbine aerothermodynamics [8]. The turbine entry temperature and pressure derived from “GasTurb 12” are used to march through each stage of the turbine. The total temperature, total pressure, and degree of reaction at pitchline for each stage of the turbine can be seen in Table 7.4.

Table 7.4: Aerothermodynamic Analysis of Each Stage of the Turbine of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Number</th>
<th>Total Temperature (R)</th>
<th>Total Pressure (psi)</th>
<th>Degree of Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>376.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>373.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>184.9</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>182.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall cycle analysis and turbine material selection determined that the turbine blades do not need to be cooled. With a pattern factor of 0.11, and a ZrO₂ thermal barrier coating that increases the allowable service temperature by 150 °R, cooling is not necessary. Thus, the mass flow rate will remain constant throughout the turbine.

Table 7.5: Turbine Entry Temperature Comparison between the Baseline Engine and the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter Parameter</th>
<th>Baseline Engine</th>
<th>TF-CLAWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Turbine Entry Temperature (°R)</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>3296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Cooling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6 **Turbine Blade Design and Annulus Sizing**

Blade design and turbine stresses will be the focus as the design of the turbine progresses. The blade design consists of blade chord \(c\), throat opening \(o\), blade spacing \(s\), and stagger angle \(\gamma\). Throat opening and stagger angle are calculated using the following equations [8]:

\[
o = s \cdot \cos \alpha \quad (7.1) \quad \gamma^o(\text{Nozzle}) = \arctan \left( \frac{C_{thm}}{2C_z} \right) \quad (7.2) \quad \gamma^o(\text{Rotor}) = \arctan \left( \frac{W_{thm}}{2C_z} \right) \quad (7.3)
\]

Assuming a Zweifel Coefficient of 1, the blade design characteristics are shown in Table 7.6, along with a definition sketch of the blade characteristics in Figure 7.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turbine Stage</th>
<th>(s) (in)</th>
<th>(c_z) (in)</th>
<th>(\gamma) (deg)</th>
<th>(c) (in)</th>
<th>(o) (in²)</th>
<th>No. of Blades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-25.92</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-37.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>42.19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-6.49</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated earlier, the turbine configuration is of variable pitchline radius and variable hub radius design. The annulus sizing is crucial to efficiency as tip clearance and flow losses can wreak havoc on a gas turbine engine performance. The turbine makes use of a labyrinth seal, shown in Figure 7.5. The casing significantly decreases flow losses before and after stators. Labyrinth seals are also integrated in the rotating blade rows.

---

Figure 7.5: Turbine Blade Definition Sketch [8]

Figure 7.4: Labyrinth Casing for a Turbine Nozzle [34]
The annulus sizing makes use of the continuity equation, which can be used to solve for the flow areas through the stators and rotors.

\[
\dot{m} = \frac{\sqrt{\gamma R_t^A M}}{T_t} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M^2 \right)^{-\frac{\gamma - 1}{2(\gamma - 1)}}
\]  

(7.4)

Using Equation 7.4, and the design choice of the pitchline radius, the annulus was sized and is shown in Table 7.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>HPT (ft)</th>
<th>LPT (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitchline Radius</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Radius</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip Radius</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (ft²)</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.7 Stress Considerations

The turbine blades will be made from SiC/SiC CMC. Stresses in turbine blades are a major concern due to the high rotational speeds, corrosive environment, and high temperatures. These are the primary aspects to consider when choosing blade material. The equation for centrifugal stress in turbine blades is based on rotational speed, material density, and blade design; shown in Equation 7.5. Stresses in turbines include centrifugal, thermal, bending, and vibrational stresses. Along with stress analysis, it is crucial when designing a turbine to avoid resonance via vibration. Campbell diagrams are used to analyze the shaft speed in RPM and determine vibration frequencies. For the centrifugal stress calculation, the area ratio was assumed to be in the range of 0.8-0.9. The centrifugal stresses for the turbine are shown in Table 7.8.

\[
\sigma_c = \left( \frac{\rho A_{\omega^2}}{4\pi} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{A_t}{A_h} \right)
\]

(7.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stresses</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN² (ft²/s)</td>
<td>9.18E+08</td>
<td>1.55E+09</td>
<td>5.83E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σc (psi)</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td>38,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σt (psi)</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>5239</td>
<td>2169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.8 Smith Chart

A Smith Chart consists of the flow coefficients and stage loading parameters for each stage of the turbine. These values determine the efficiency of the turbine at each stage. The Smith Chart for the TF-CLAWS turbine yielded satisfactory results for the efficiency of the turbine at each stage, and is shown in Figure 7.6.

![Smith Chart for the Turbine of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff](image)

Figure 7.6: Smith Chart for the Turbine of the TF-CLAWS at Takeoff [34]

8 Mixer Design

The core flow is mixed with the fan flow from the bypass duct using a forced flow lobed mixer. This mixer has splitter guides with trailing edges. In order to ensure good vortex flow through the mixer, the peak regions of the large sinusoidal trailing edge should have a large slope. Also, a short lobed forced mixer induces minimal drag and has less weight [35]. The flow through the mixer is demonstrated in Figure 8.1.

The mixer designed for the TF-CLAWS engine has the following dimensions summarized in Table 8.1, and an isometric view of the mixer is shown in Figure 8.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (in)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter (in)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lobes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: TF-CLAWS Mixer Parameters
9 Exhaust System Design

9.1 Introduction

The requirements for the nozzle of the TF-CLAWS are as follows: the nozzle must fit within the footprint generally specified, approximately 20 inches or less in diameter; the nozzle must be convergent-divergent; the nozzle must feature noise attenuation; the nozzle should assist in emulating the flight characteristics of fifth generation fighter craft, within reason; the nozzle must be designed with cost of purchase and maintenance as a primary consideration; and the nozzle must be designed to operate without afterburning.

The requirements for the nozzle of the TF-CLAWS are as follows: accelerates flow with minimum total pressure loss; matches flow and atmospheric pressures at the exit as closely as desired; permits reheat operation without affecting primary operation; allows for nozzle wall cooling; mixes the core and bypass air; allows for thrust reversal; provides low observable characteristics; provides thrust vectoring capabilities; and provides all prior points with the minimum cost, weight, and boattail drag while meeting life and reliability goals.

The TF-CLAWS nozzle is divided into three sections: the subsonic convergent section, the throat, and the divergent section, as seen in Figure 9.1. The convergent section, shaded in red, is accepting air from the mixer.
9.2 Nozzle Sizing

Using the continuity equation for a sonic throat, we may size the throat area according to:

\[
A_8 = \left(\frac{m_8}{P_{t8}}\right) \sqrt{\frac{RT_{t8}}{\gamma}} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma+1}\right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma(\gamma+1)}}
\]

(9.1)

The area expansion ratio also follows the continuity equation according to:

\[
A_9 = A_8 \left\{\left[1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_8^2\right]^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma(\gamma-1)}}\right\} \left\{\left[\frac{\gamma+1}{2}\right]^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma(\gamma-1)}}\right\} M_9^{-1}
\]

(9.2)

The nozzle throat is sized initially to the subsonic cruise flight condition using Equation 9.1 assuming a gas constant for air of 1716 (ft−lb slug−°R) and an average ratio of specific heats in the exhaust section of 1.3. The nozzle exit is then sized via Equation 9.2. The throat size is fixed at this size and this is carried forward into all other flight conditions. The exit area at other flight conditions is then tuned using Equation 9.2 to produce choked flow in the throat at flight conditions while minimizing the static pressure difference between the exhaust flow and the freestream.

### Table 9.1: GasTurb 12 Flow Parameters and Sizing of the Nozzle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Condition</th>
<th>(\dot{m}_8) (lb/s)</th>
<th>(P_{t8}) (lb/ft²)</th>
<th>(T_{t8}) (°R)</th>
<th>(M_8)</th>
<th>(M_9)</th>
<th>(A_8) (ft²)</th>
<th>(A_9) (in²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>4630.8</td>
<td>1301.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsonic Cruise</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>501.2</td>
<td>812.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dash</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>424.3</td>
<td>946.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>1192.3</td>
<td>876.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 Design Considerations

The design process for the TF-CLAWS trainer engine follows the general outline described by Gamble, Terrell, and DeFrancesco of SPIRITECH [36]: the exhaust system geometry is selected, the method for nozzle scheduling is selected, methods for noise attenuation are selected, and thrust vectoring capability is selected. Additionally, the decision to discard an ejector nozzle and a thrust reversal system is made.

The design philosophy for the TF-CLAWS exhaust system is to design a lightweight, relatively inexpensive system that is capable of fifth generation flight characteristics.

9.3.1 Selection of Cross-Sectional and Axial Geometry

Selection of the geometry is heavily driven by the form factor of the baseline engine. The original engine houses an axisymmetric nozzle of less than twenty inches in diameter; strongly implying that the replacement engine nozzle should fit within the form factor of the original. Primary candidate geometries include axisymmetric, 2D, and plug.

Considerations:

Axisymmetric nozzles are found in most modern combat aircraft, such as the F-18 and F-35; although not inherently stealthy [37] these nozzles are the simplest to manufacture and design. An axisymmetric nozzle is ideal for containing a pressurized gas and produces a lighter weight and cheaper nozzle than equivalent 2D and plug designs.

Testing has shown that 2D nozzles suffer little in regards to performance [38] and the 2D nozzle, housed on aircraft such as the F-22, YF-23, and B-2 aircraft, provides major advantages in stealth capability and airframe integration [39]. 2D nozzles, however, are associated with weight penalties; the structure must be designed to resist bending loading across the nozzle caused by internal pressure. Also, large design cost penalties arise during airframe integration [40]. These nozzles can, as in the F-22, be used to produce two dimensional thrust vectoring across a large domain, but generally do not produce 3D thrust vectoring easily or relatively cheaply as a result of the complexity associated with maneuvering a non-symmetric shape.
Plug nozzles possess the advantages of noise control and relatively mechanically simple area scheduling [39]. Plug nozzles generally weigh more than their axisymmetric counterparts as a result of added material and often suffer from an inherent lack of cooling in the plug itself.

**Result:**

Out of all three primary candidate geometries this team selected the axisymmetric nozzle after careful consideration. The 2D nozzle would introduce relatively inexpensive thrust vectoring capability but, when compared with the axisymmetric, falls far outside the selection criteria due to expense of purchase and maintenance. The plug nozzle was discarded due to its weight and ultimate expense; the increasing amount of expensive heat resistant material contributes directly to weight and cost and makes effective and cheap thrust vectoring a difficult proposition.

### 9.3.2 Nozzle Scheduling Capability

**Considerations:**

For aircraft operations beyond sonic conditions, the area ratio of the exit to the throat is of great interest and is a primary method of controlling the pressure match between exhaust and ambient conditions. The mission requirements of the TF-CLAWS are not singular and therefore require a method of nozzle scheduling. Common methods of area control include: geometrically scheduling, passive control, and fully variable.

Geometric scheduling, such as on F-14 and F-18 nozzles, links exit area mechanically to throat area, reducing weight and complexity, but optimizes only for a few design points. Additionally, both the F-14 and F-18 possess afterburning capability, which is not included in the TF-CLAWS engine. Passive control, used on the original F-15 and F-16 nozzles, uses internal pressure to arrange linked divergent flaps in an ideal manner; the light weight, simplicity, and large optimized flight envelope are all advantages of a passive control system. A fully variable system, such as the F-22 uses, has the advantage of ideal performance across nearly the full range of a flight envelope but suffers from weight, complexity, and cost issues [36].
Additionally, as will be mentioned further, ejector nozzle and thrust vectoring concepts allow for effective nozzle scheduling.

**Result:**

The fully variable and fixed concepts were discarded out of hand; the variable due to cost and weight and the fixed due to its inability to optimize performance through more than one flight condition.

Both the geometrically scheduled and passively controlled methods show promise for integration in an inexpensive trainer engine, but ultimately a modified passive control method edges out geometric scheduling methods; the advantage of optimized flight through multiple flight conditions most closely matches the flight characteristics of fifth generation fighters while remaining relatively inexpensive.

### 9.3.3 Ejector Nozzle Considerations:

An ejector nozzle entrains high pressure air by introducing a pressure differential between low pressure core and high pressure ambient fluid streams which entrains ambient air into the ejector inlet, through a channel, and into the outlet \[41\]. When the two streams intermingle they are initially forced to remain separate due to the shear layer between the streams \[39\]. The intermixing increases with the axial distance along the divergent portion of the nozzle and the two streams are partially or fully mixed by the time they exit the nozzle, thereby reducing jet exit velocity and increasing mass flow through the nozzle \[42\]. The incoming high velocity core stream transfers kinetic energy of the exhaust stream into the large mass of entrained ambient air.

The performance augmentation associated with increased mass flow rate peaks at very low M and drops with airspeed \[41\][\[43\]. Ejectors have been successfully tested by GE as early as 1992 \[44\]. This also has, as seen on the F-111 engine, the capability to aerodynamically alter the area ratio in the nozzle \[40\] in addition to the added benefits of nozzle cooling \[45\] and increased propulsive efficiency \[43\].
Control volume theory can reasonably predict ideal values for the thrust augmentation generated by an ejector nozzle. Defining $\alpha$ as the ratio of secondary to primary mass flow rates ($\dot{m}_s/\dot{m}_p$), $\beta$ as the ratio of secondary to primary ejector areas ($A_s/A_p$), and $\delta$ as the ratio of forward airspeed to primary jet velocity ($V_A/V_p$), Equation 9.3 may be solved for an upper limit of ideal thrust gains.

\[
\Phi = \frac{(\alpha+1)^2 - (\beta+1)(\alpha+1)\delta}{(\beta+1)\left(1 - \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^2 + \delta\right)^2 - \delta}
\]  

(9.3)

A joint NASA Langley, Western New England College, and Stage III Technologies study in 2002 modeled non-ideal effects on the Alternating Lobed Mixer Ejector Concept nozzle on the Gulfstream GII, GIIB, and GIII [41], as seen in Figure 9.2.

**Result:**

Ultimately, although an ejector nozzle promises moderate performance gains and noise reduction (as seen in the following section) at takeoff conditions, the increase in weight and complexity coupled with minor performance gains resulted in the exclusion of an ejector from the final nozzle concept. This concept could possibly be included in a future version of the TF-CLAWS engine if the monetary and weight costs associated with increased mechanical complexity can be reduced.

### 9.3.4 Nozzle Cooling and Material Selection

**Considerations:**

The nozzle experiences a wide range of temperatures throughout the flight regime and across the length of the nozzle. The maximum expected temperature in the nozzle, barring the presence of shock, is found at the throat; temperatures in excess of 1300°F are expected during takeoff conditions. SiC CMC’s, mentioned...
Previously, are being actively studied as nozzle material by Boeing, Rolls-Royce, and Snecma, in conjunction with NASA as part of NASA’s ERA program [46]. These materials offer operating temperatures 200° to 300°F higher than conventional superalloys [46], have been tested at temperatures up to 700°F for long dwell periods [47], and do not require an oxidation resistant coating due to material composition [46]. Snecma, in separate testing of a CMC mixer nozzle, achieved a 45 lb reduction in weight from a comparable conventional metal mixer nozzle [46]. SiC/SiC CMC technology is nearly as ideal in a Nozzle environment as oxide/oxide CMC technology; GE is heavily invested in SiC/SiC CMC technology, has tested CMC technology extensively, and anticipates certification and flight by 2018 for a SiC/SiC CMC equipped GE-9X engine [48].

**Result:**

The capability of SiC/SiC CMC material to provide increased strength capability, elevated operating temperatures, and significantly reduced weight results in this material selected to line the nozzle. The likelihood this technology will be at a TRL of 9 by 2025 is good and the inclusion of this material removes the necessity to cool the nozzle.

9.3.5 **Thrust Vectoring Capability**

**Considerations:**

One of the primary characteristics of nearly all fifth generation fighter craft is the inclusion of thrust vectoring. Thrust vectoring grants an airframe a series of flight advantages such as extended conventional flight endurance through stationary flight trimming, a widened flight envelope, possible avenues of nozzle scheduling, transient flight maneuvering, increased safety, and a commensurate reduction in necessary flight controls, while reducing noise at takeoff. These advantages translate directly and indirectly to cost savings through the lifecycle of the fighter craft.

The F119 engines contained on the F-22 contain 2D thrust vectoring capability in a 20° arc on the pitch axis, while the Sukhoi PAKFA has the capability to vector in a cone about the nominal thrust axis, though the current state of its thrust vectoring capability is unknown. Additionally, the Chengdu J-20, powered by the WS-
10G engine, is supposedly capable of thrust vectoring, though, again, the current state of this engine is not public knowledge.

Producing effective thrust vectoring for an inexpensive trainer engine is a challenge, though a possibility. Industria de Turbo Propulsores S.A. (ITP) produced a series of thrust vectoring nozzles in the early 2000’s in an effort to improve on the EJ2000 engine. The nozzles produced ranged from full 3D thrust vectoring capability to a relatively simple two-ring ‘pitch only’ nozzle, capable of 2D vectoring, and were studied in deflection modes of up to 30°.

Result:

The current state of fifth generation fighters indicates that thrust vectoring is an integral characteristic; a feasible method of incorporating this into a low cost trainer is the two ring pitch only concept modeled by ITP. This is carried forward into final design.

9.4 Incorporated Nozzle Concept

The ultimate down selection process resulted in a nozzle concept with the following characteristics: axisymmetric nozzle; modified passive area scheduling, with additional effective area control provided by thrust vectoring capability; acoustic liners with Helmholtz resonators; rounded chevron vanes; pitch-only thrust vectoring provided by a two ring concept.

9.5 Exhaust System Geometry

![Figure 9.3: Side Section View of the Exhaust System of the TF-CLAWS](image-url)
10 Flow Path through the TF-CLAWS

With the major components of the TF-CLAWS designed, then the flow path through the engine may be presented. Figure 10.1 presents the flow path through the TF-CLAWS. Note that the “blue” components correspond to the transonic fan and low-pressure compressor, the “orange” components correspond to the high-pressure compressor and high-pressure turbine, and the “red” component corresponds to the combustion system.

![Image of TF-CLAWS flow path]

Figure 10.1: Flow Path through the TF-CLAWS

11 Identification and Selection of Engine Subsystems

This chapter describes the subsystems that are used on the TF-CLAWS. These subsystems provide important features that are critical for the successful design of any aircraft engine.

11.1 Starting

As with any engine, the TF-CLAWS requires a startup sequence. The compressor must rotate fast enough to supply enough air to the combustor for combustion to occur. A starter rotates the compressor until a sustained combustion occurs and the engine can operate on its own. The starter is pneumatically powered and only sends air first to ensure the air is flowing in the right direction before fuel is added. A diagram of a typical startup sequence can be seen in Figure 11.1.

![Image of typical startup sequence]

Figure 11.1: Typical Startup Sequence of the TF-CLAWS [49]
11.2 Bearings

The stability of rotating machinery relies on the type, quality, and placements of its bearings. Bearings also allow for very small tip clearances, an important design factor in gas turbine engines. Two types of bearings were investigated for this engine: classic ball/roller bearings and magnetic bearings. Classic bearings are known to be effective and work well. The main drawbacks of classic bearings are that they are heavy, take up space, and require an additional lubrication system to function. The location of the bearings is shown in Figure 11.2, to minimize bending stresses, as detailed by Kerrebrock.

Magnetic bearings were also investigated for possible use in the TF-CLAWS. They have been tested theoretically and experimentally, but it is uncertain if the technology will be ready by 2025 [50]. The classic bearings are proven to be reliable by the aircraft propulsion industry, and will be used in this engine. The material for the bearings will be M50NiL steel due to its fracture toughness, fatigue life, and ability to withstand high temperature environments [51].

11.3 Fuel System

The TF-CLAWS utilizes an electronically controlled fuel system with signals from FADEC. The fuel is pumped from the aircraft fuel tanks to a low pressure system. It is then transferred to a high pressure system to pressurize the fuel and inject it into the combustor. Both systems contain filters to ensure high quality fuel. These filters help the engine run efficiently and increase the life of the system. The fuel flow can be run manually and separate from FADEC in case of an emergency.

11.4 Fire Suppression System

Fire suppression is crucial in engine design because the engine requires combustion to operate and operates at very high temperatures. The first step in fire suppression is detection. Gas-filled detectors will be placed at
different locations in the engine. These detectors release gas into a tube and can sense temperature. A switch is released alarming the crew whenever dangerously high temperatures are detected. A fire in the engine requires an in-air restart or an emergency landing. These emergency procedures will not be necessary if fires are prevented. Fires will be prevented by routing all lines containing flammable fluid away from hot spots and designing the lines to have extra layers of flame retardant materials. Fluid line connections and condition should be inspected routinely to prevent a flammable line breaking and causing a fire.

11.5 Anti-Icing System

The ice protection system prevents ice formation in the engine and leading edges of the inlet duct. One of the major consequences of ice formation in the engine is that there will be inadequate airflow going through the engine, which will shorten the lifespan of the engine while also decreasing performance. There are two systems working in tandem to prevent ice formation and buildup: the electrical system and hot air supply system. The electrical system, specifically the heating pads bonded to the outer skin of the cowls on the engine, aid in the prevention of ice buildup on the engine. For deicing, the hot air supply system is used. The hot air is taken from the HPC stages and is dispersed through regulatory valves to the engine components. Finally, the DSI has a smaller inlet area which means less surface area for ice crystals to form.

11.6 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU)

The TF-CLAWS engine is started using an auxiliary power system (APS) which is a pneumatic link system that consists of an auxiliary power unit (APU), air turbine starter (ATS), flow control valve and airframe mounted accessory drive. The APU is a small gas turbine engine that provides pneumatic and shaft power. The compressed air from the APU is

![Figure 11.3: Schematic Diagram of T-50 APS System [52]](image-url)
delivered via airframe ducting to the ATS, which converts pneumatic power to shaft power that starts the main engine and main aircraft accessories [52]. This system is currently being used in the Korea Aerospace Industries (KAI) T-50 Golden Eagle which is a current candidate of the T-X program to replace the aged T-38 trainer.

11.7 Engine Control System

The distributed engine control currently under development is more of an advanced and evolutionary version of centralized energy control that works more efficiently and accurately compared to traditional centralized control. By converting the distributed engine control to a Full Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC) system, numerous operating factors or elements are taken into consideration when evaluating the efficiency of the engine, such as engine temperature, pressure ratio, fluid flow, etc. The mechanism of FADEC is to run various inputs/factors simultaneously and generate a high degree of optimization and reduce the number of operating errors. Additionally, a second FADEC system can be implemented to ensure the performance of engine control to be consistent and continuous.

Figure 11.4: Distributed Engine Control Employed on the TF-CLAWS [53]
12 Engine Noise Attenuation

Noise at takeoff is a serious issue for military craft (due to community noise); on the military side noise-induced hearing loss was, as of 2015, the Navy fleet’s number one occupational health expense [54]. The primary source of noise from gas turbine engines is the jet exhaust and turbomachinery noise.

Initially, the TF-CLAWS engine reaps a significant advantage from the decision to exclude an afterburner. A 2009 study found that usage of an afterburner increased effective perceived noise level (EPNL) by 5 to 10 dB above the levels found at military power [55], implying that perceived noise at takeoff could be halved if afterburner usage was removed.

A series of noise mitigation strategies are used in TF-CLAWS to reduce noise: a diverterless supersonic inlet (DSI), Helmholtz resonators in acoustic liners, an S-duct subsonic diffuser for the inlet system, blade sweep in the fan, use of sweep and lean in the fan stator blades, use of wide-chord, low-aspect ratio blades, and chevron vanes.

Helmholtz resonators target specific frequencies by using a trapped volume to absorb acoustic energy through harmonic oscillation of a mass slug in the neck [56]. These resonators are a function of speed of sound in the fluid medium coupled with the cavity volume.
The blade passing frequency of the fan and turbines provides a target frequency to design against.

\[ BPF = \frac{nt}{60} \quad (12.1) \]

In Equation 12.1, \( n \) is the angular speed of the turbine in RPM, \( t \) is the number of blades on the turbine rotor, and \( BPF \) is measured in Hz.

Table 12.1: Blade Passing Frequency of the TF-CLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turbine Component</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( BPF )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPT Rotor 1</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>88000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT Rotor 2</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>74700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT Rotor</td>
<td>18600</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing indicates that slight performance degradation, in the neighborhood of 1%, does occur when using an acoustic liner, primarily due to the drag characteristics of the liner [37].

Chevron noise reduction works by protruding the tips of chevron vanes into the exhaust stream. These protruding tips generate streamwise vorticity and promote mixing, thereby reducing noise. Noise reduction of chevron vanes is a strong function of shape; in a numeric study rounded vanes were predicted to reduce EPNL by 6 dB over sharp and flat vanes [57].

A study conducted by NASA and Learjet indicates that installing sharp chevrons into the core air reduces EPNL by 2.5 dB and reduces generated thrust by approximately 0.5% [58] and that even a very minor intrusion into the core can have drastic effects on EPNL [54] with minor performance impact. A 2012 study [41] investigating chevrons also found that chevrons assisted with total pressure recovery in a nozzle system, increasing total pressure recovery by more than 8%.

A difficulty found when designing a nozzle with chevrons is that the chevrons are most useful during takeoff, when the jet plume is normally overexpanded [59]. The overexpanded gas requires that chevrons be of sufficient length to intrude into the shear layer at takeoff, but this length is such that when the gas is fully expanded during nominal flight conditions performance penalties are found.
Finally, thrust vectoring, according to an analysis conducted in 2008, promises to reduce peak noise at takeoff by more than 7 dB [60].

Ultimately the engine will be designed using a passive acoustic liner in the turbine section with included Helmholtz resonators, coupled with rounded chevron vanes. The acoustic liner resonant frequency will be tuned to noise generated by internal turbomachinery, such as the blade passing frequency of the turbine. All these concepts trade favorably with cost vs return. In addition, the lack of an afterburner removes the large noise penalty associated with its usage. Thrust vectoring also promises to provide noise reduction benefits.

13 Fuel Cost Analysis

Through use of publicly available data from the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) Aerospace Forecasts for 2014-2034 [61], Figure 13.1 is generated to observe the trend in jet fuel prices from 2006 to 2034. The price of jet fuel from 2016 to 2034 are projections that account for economic such as inflation and GDP.

![Forecasted Trend of Jet Fuel Prices](image)

Figure 13.1: Forecasted Trend in Jet Fuel Prices [62]

We note from Figure 13.1 that jet fuel prices are going to cost approximately $3.42 per gallon in the entry-into-service year of 2025 for the next generation trainer. Through a simple conversion from gallons to pounds (i.e. the density of jet fuel is 6.71 lb/gal), jet fuel is projected to cost $0.51 per pound in 2025. From this projected cost of jet fuel in 2025, as well as the fuel weight calculations carried out in Section 3.1 for the combat patrol mission, a fuel cost analysis may be carried out for the baseline engine and the TF-CLAWS. Table 13.1 presents the fuel costs for a single combat patrol mission.
Table 13.1: Combat Patrol Mission Fuel Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Parameter</th>
<th>Baseline Engine</th>
<th>TF-CLAWS</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Fuel Weight (lb)</td>
<td>7016</td>
<td>4843</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Price ($/lb)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Fuel Cost ($)</td>
<td>3578</td>
<td>2422</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we note that the TF-CLAWS introduces a cost savings of nearly one-third of the fuel costs associated with using the baseline engine to fly the combat patrol mission, an absolutely striking reduction. While this cost savings for a single mission is impressive, the fuel savings associated with the TF-CLAWS become even more pronounced over the entire life of the next generation trainer. Currently, the average life for a T-38A is 15,000 flight hours [63]. From the flight time durations listed in Table 3.2 and the flight time associated with traveling 1500 nmi at Mach 0.85 and 35,000 feet, a single combat patrol mission has a flight time duration of approximately four hours. Making the assumption that the next generation trainer will have the same average life as the T-38A, then the next generation trainer will fly 3716 combat patrol missions in its lifetime. Thus, Figure 13.2 presents the total fuel costs over the life of the next generation trainer using either the baseline engine or the TF-CLAWS. We note that over the life of the next generation trainer, a whopping $4.3 million is saved in fuel costs by using the TF-CLAWS as opposed to the baseline engine. Figure 13.2 demonstrates the complete superiority of the TF-CLAWS over the baseline engine in terms of fuel efficiency.

![Fuel Cost over the Life of the Next Generation Trainer](image)

**Figure 13.2: Fuel Costs over the Life of the Next Generation Trainer**
14 Mission Weight Sizing for the Next Generation Trainer

In addition to the design of the TF-CLAWS engine, it is also pertinent to determine some of the preliminary sizing and performance characteristics of the next generation trainer. Specifically, it is necessary to determine a preliminary estimation of the empty and takeoff weights of the aircraft. The empty and takeoff weights are dictated by the mission profiles for the aircraft. For the purposes of the next generation trainer, a weight estimation of the combat patrol mission outlined in Section 3 will be performed. This weight estimation will be performed with an iterative process involving a Statistical Time and Market Predictive Engineering Design (STAMPED) analysis of market data on other military trainer aircraft.

14.1 STAMPED Analysis and Database for Similar Airplanes

In recent years, a new methodology for design has been developed that has the power to track any variable through time. The acronym for this methodology is STAMPED, statistical time and market predictive engineering design. A STAMPED analysis involves gathering both technical data and market share data of a particular product, and then mapping a market-weighted version of the technical data through time to project the future of the desired variable. This type of analysis is a useful technique to track the trends of military trainer properties. For mission weight estimations, two aircraft properties are of particular interest: empty-to-takeoff weight ratio ($W_E/W_{TO}$) and wing loading ($W/S$). Data on similar military trainers is then used to project the empty-to-takeoff weight ratio and wing loading of the next generation trainer as it enters service in 2025. Table 14.1 contains the database of all the aircraft included in the STAMPED analysis, as well as the projection for the next generation trainer in 2025.
### Table 14.1: Database of Similar Aircraft to the Next Generation Trainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>First Flight</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>( W_e ) (lbf)</th>
<th>( W_{TO} ) (lbf)</th>
<th>( W_e/W_{TO} )</th>
<th>( W/S ) (ft(^2))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aero L-139 Albatross</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>7617</td>
<td>10632</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soko G-4 Super Galeb</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>7165</td>
<td>13955</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMA IA 63 Pampa</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>6525</td>
<td>11464</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawasaki T-4</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8536</td>
<td>16534</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero L-159 Alca</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>9590</td>
<td>17637</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongdu L-15</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>9921</td>
<td>18960</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation Trainer Projection</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 14.2 Determination of Mission Weights

For the next generation trainer, it is necessary to determine the empty and takeoff weights corresponding to the combat patrol mission. To determine the mission weights, a modern approach may be summarized with the following procedure: [64]

1) Determine the sum of the payload weight and the weight of the crew;
2) Guess a likely value for the takeoff weight;
3) Determine the weight of the fuel;
4) Calculate a tentative operating empty weight by subtracting the fuel weight, payload weight, and crew weight from the guessed takeoff weight;
5) Calculate a tentative empty weight by subtracting the trapped fuel and oil weight from the tentative operating empty weight;
6) Calculate the empty weight by multiplying the guessed takeoff weight by the empty-to-takeoff weights ratio determined by STAMPED analysis in Section 14.1;
7) Compare the tentative empty weight to the calculated empty weight, and then iterate about the guessed takeoff weight to bring the empty weight to within 0.5% of the tentative empty weight.

Through utilization of the weight estimation approach outlined above, as well as the assumption of a crew of two 200 lb pilots and a payload weight of 150 lb between them [65], the mission weights of the next generation trainer are calculated and are then presented in Table 14.2.

### Table 14.2: Combat Patrol Mission Weights for the Next Generation Trainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Empty Weight (lbf)</th>
<th>Takeoff Weight (lbf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation Trainer</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>10486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 Performance Constraint Analysis

The second aspect of the preliminary sizing of any aircraft is a performance constraint analysis. It is critical to determine the characteristics of an aircraft in all operations. Thus, it is useful to develop constraining equations that relate wing loading to thrust-to-weight ratio. This then sizes an aircraft for all modes of operation. The constraining equations are developed from the following performance constraints: takeoff distance constraints, landing distance constraints, climb constraints, and dash speed constraints.

15.1 Drag Polar Estimation

For nearly all of the performance constraints, the drag polar for every flight configuration must be known to proceed. There are a total of five main flight configurations for the next generation trainer, including the clean configuration (cruise), takeoff with landing gear up or down, and landing with landing gear up or down. Using the previously estimated takeoff weight, the drag polar for each of the five main flight configurations of the next generation trainer can be determined using the techniques outlined in “Airplane Design, Part I: Preliminary Sizing of Airplanes” [6]. The drag polar for every flight configuration of the next generation trainer can be seen in Table 15.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Configuration</th>
<th>Drag Polar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Speed, Clean</td>
<td>$C_D = 0.0171 + 0.1029C_{L}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff, Gear Down</td>
<td>$C_D = 0.0521 + 0.1095C_{L}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing, Gear Down</td>
<td>$C_D = 0.1021 + 0.1171C_{L}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff, Gear Up</td>
<td>$C_D = 0.0321 + 0.1095C_{L}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing, Gear Up</td>
<td>$C_D = 0.0821 + 0.1171C_{L}^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.2 Takeoff Distance Constraints

Another one of the most important performance constraints to consider is takeoff distance. The takeoff criterion used for the next generation trainer was selected to be a minimum runway length of 6,000 ft, per the specifications in Ref. 65. Thus, the following, rearranged form of Equation 3.9 in Ref. 6 can be utilized to describe the takeoff performance constraint of the next generation trainer: [6]
\[
\left( \frac{T}{W} \right)_{\text{TO}} = \frac{4(4 + \lambda)}{3(5 + \lambda)} + \left[ \frac{0.0447(W/S)_{\text{TO}} + 0.72C_{D_0}}{s_{\text{TOG}}\rho} \right] + \mu_g
\]  

(15.1)

In this equation, \(\lambda\) is the bypass ratio of the engine at takeoff, \(C_{\text{L max,TO}}\) is the maximum lift coefficient at takeoff (selected from Ref. 6, Table 3.1, military trainer aircraft), \(\mu_g\) is the ground friction coefficient (value selected to be 0.03 from Ref. 6, pg. 103), \(s_{\text{TOG}}\) is the ground run takeoff distance (runway length of 6,000 ft), \(\rho\) is the density at sea level on a +27°F standard day, and \(C_{D_0}\) is the parasite drag coefficient for the takeoff, gears down flight configuration [6].

### 15.3 Landing Distance Constraints

Another one of the most important performance constraints to consider is landing distance. The landing criterion used for the next generation trainer was selected to be a minimum runway length of 6,000 ft, per the specifications in Ref. 65. The landing distance performance constraint is a single value that the wing loading cannot exceed. This landing constraint can be formulated from a form of Equation 3.1 in Ref. 6, and is as follows: [6]

\[
\frac{W}{S} = \frac{1}{2} \rho V_{\text{SL}}^2 C_{\text{L max,L}} \left( \frac{W_L}{W_{\text{TO}}} \right)
\]

(15.2)

In this equation, \(\rho\) is the density at sea level on a +27°F standard day, \(V_{\text{SL}}\) is the stall speed during landing, \(C_{\text{L max,L}}\) is the maximum lift coefficient during landing (selected from Table 3.1 of Ref. 6), and \(W_L/W_{\text{TO}}\) is the ratio of landing weight to takeoff weight (selected as 0.99 from Table 3.3 of Ref. 6) [6].

### 15.4 Climb Constraints

Another one of the most important performance constraints to consider is climb. Specifically, the next generation trainer is sized for climb by FAR 25.121 (OEI), which is a balked landing climb with one engine inoperative. For FAR 25.121 (OEI), the flaps of the next generation trainer are in the approach position, which is halfway between takeoff flaps with the landing gear down and landing flaps with the landing gear down.
Furthermore, for FAR 25.121 (OEI), the climb gradient (CGR) is constrained as 0.021 [6]. With this information, the next generation trainer climb constraint from FAR 25.121 (OEI) can be described using Equation 3.31a from Ref. 6 as follows: [6]

\[
\frac{T}{W} = \frac{N}{N-1} \left( \frac{1}{L/D} + \text{CGR} \right)
\]

(15.3)

In this equation, \(N\) is the number of engines on the aircraft, \(L/D\) is the lift-to-drag ratio in the approach position, and \(\text{CGR}\) is the climb gradient [6].

15.5 Dash Speed Constraints

Another one of the most important performance constraints to consider is dash speed. Per the performance specifications in the RFP [1], the next generation trainer has a defined dash speed of Mach 1.3. The dash speed constraint is defined in Ref. 6 as follows: [6]

\[
\frac{T}{W} = \frac{\bar{q}C_{D_{0,cr}}}{(W/S)} + \frac{(W/S)}{\bar{q}eAR}
\]

(15.4)

In this equation, \(\bar{q}\) is the flight dynamic pressure, \(e\) is the Oswald efficiency factor for the clean configuration, \(AR\) is the aspect ratio, and \(C_{D_{0,cr}}\) is the parasite drag coefficient for the dash flight condition [6].

15.6 Determination of Takeoff Wing Loading and Takeoff Thrust-to-Weight

With the performance constraint analysis for all flight conditions performed, then the highest possible wing loading and lowest possible thrust-to-weight ratio that aircraft can safely achieve are selected from the constraint diagram presented in Figure 15.1. From the constraint diagram, the next generation trainer has a takeoff thrust-to-weight ratio of 1.06 and a wing loading of 61.7 lbf/ft\(^2\).
Figure 15.1: Aircraft Constraint Diagram for the Next Generation Trainer
16 TF-CLAWS Engine Integration on the Next Generation Trainer

With the TF-CLAWS designed and the preliminary design characteristics of the next generation trainer determined, then we may present the next generation trainer equipped with two TF-CLAWS engines. The following figures present the integration of the TF-CLAWS on the next generation trainer.

Figure 16.1: Front and Rear View of the TF-CLAWS on the Next Generation Trainer

Figure 16.2: Side View of the TF-CLAWS on the Next Generation Trainer

Figure 16.3: Bottom View of the TF-CLAWS on the Next Generation Trainer
17 **Maintainability, Accessibility, and Serviceability**

To best describe the maintainability, accessibility, and serviceability aspects of the TF-CLAWS and the next generation trainer, it is pertinent to compare with the F-22. To maintain DoD standards for engine sustainability the TF CLAWS will follow the same model as the F-22 as laid out by Lockheed Martin. For engine maintenance, the Pratt & Whitney F119 engines on the F-22 are designed to allow standard flight line maintenance using just six common tools available at commercial hardware stores [66]. Additionally, Lockheed Martin makes usage of an “Integrated Maintenance Information System (IMIS),” a system that enables a maintenance crews to work off a centralized network that consolidates maintenance and repair data worldwide [66]. Maintainers can simply plug their laptop computer into the aircraft, log completed maintenance, and plug their computer back into the system to update the global database instantaneously [66]. This ensures proper and complete maintenance records are kept, no matter where the F-22 is deployed to on the globe [66].
18 Recommendations

Future growth models of the TF-CLAWS low bypass, mixed flow turbofan engine will employ several advanced materials and technologies. One of the more interesting potential additions to the TF-CLAWS is an ejector nozzle, which would provide an incremental increase to thrust output. Another technology which might have a significant impact on future iterations of the TF-CLAWS is that of 3D-printing. As the maximum engine diameter is fixed at 22”, several interior components of the TF-CLAWS are quite small and are candidates to be manufactured using the technique of 3D-printing. This could introduce cost savings in the manufacture of components like compressor or turbine blades. Yet another potential future modification to the TF-CLAWS is the usage of an aft fan as discussed previously. As engine noise restrictions continue to grow moving forward, the usage of an aft fan would increase the length of the inlet duct, allowing for more efficient sound absorption using liners. All things considered, the TF-CLAWS is an outstanding engine which will offer extreme fuel efficiency and exceptional performance on the next generation trainer, and the design will only improve moving forward with the advances of gas turbine technology.
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