

HYPersonic INLET FOR A LASER POWERED PROPULSION SYSTEM

Alan Harrland

Master of Philosophy (Engineering)

March 2012

School of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences



THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

Statement of originality

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to Alan Harrland and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I also permit use and modification of the codes contained in the appendices of this body of work, on the provision that any modifications are made available in the public domain.

Alan Harrland

March 2012

Abstract

The idea of laser powered lightcraft was first conceptualised in the early 1970's as a means of launching small scale satellite payloads into orbit at a much lower cost in comparison to conventional techniques. Propulsion in the lightcraft is produced via laser induced detonation of the incoming air stream, which results in the energy source for propulsion being decoupled from the vehicle. In air breathing mode the lightcraft carries no onboard fuel or oxidiser, allowing theoretically infinite specific impulses to be achieved. Recently interest has been renewed in this innovative technology through cross-continent and industry research programs aimed at making laser propulsion a reality.

In a ground launched satellite, the vehicle must travel through the atmosphere at speeds greatly in excess of the speed of sound in order to achieve the required orbital velocities. Supersonic, and in particular hypersonic, flight regimes exhibit complicated physics that render traditional subsonic inlet design techniques inadequate. The laser induced detonation propulsion system requires a suitable engine configuration that offers good performance over all flight speeds and angles of attack to ensure the required thrust is maintained throughout the mission. Currently a hypersonic inlet has not been developed for the laser powered lightcraft vehicle.

Stream traced hypersonic inlets have demonstrated the required performance in conventional hydrocarbon fuelled scramjet engines. This design technique is applied to the laser powered lightcraft vehicle, with its performance evaluated against the traditional lightcraft inlet design. Four different hypersonic lightcraft inlets have been produced employing both the stream traced inlet design methodology, and traditional axi-symmetric inlet techniques. This thesis outlines the inlet design methodologies employed, with a detailed analysis of the performance of the lightcraft inlet at angles of attack and off-design conditions. Fully three-dimensional turbulent computational fluid dynamics simulations have been performed on a variety of inlet configurations. The performance of the lightcraft inlets have been evaluated at differing angles of attack. An idealised laser detonation simulation has also been performed to verify that the lightcraft inlet does not unstart during the laser powered propulsion cycle.

Acknowledgements

Firstly and foremost I would like to sincerely thank my supervisors Con, Vince and Dave. All have helped the development of my research and thesis farther than what I had ever thought capable of. I would particularly like to thank Con for his continued guidance, patience and encouragement above and beyond what would be reasonably expected from a supervisor. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the University of Adelaide staff within the School of Mechanical engineering for making all the other necessary house-keeping tasks as smooth as possible.

I would secondly like to thank the Asian Office for Aerospace Research and Development for their generous support of this research. Without their support it would not have been possible to simulate and build the lightcraft inlet design.

Finally I would like to thank my friends and family for their support and guidance throughout my research. Without their help I would not have been able to get to where I am today.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background information	1
1.1.1	What is a lightcraft	1
1.1.2	Current flight achievements	3
1.1.3	Current limitations/design challenges	3
1.2	Aim of thesis	4
1.3	Remainder of thesis	5
1.4	Outline of new work contained in thesis	6
2	Literature review	7
2.1	Introduction	7
2.2	Laser propulsion system	7
2.2.1	Introduction	7
2.2.2	Modelling of the laser induced detonation process	9
2.2.3	Research developments	14
2.3	The lightcraft vehicle inlet	15
2.4	Hypersonic inlet design	19
2.4.1	Introduction	19
2.4.2	Stream traced inlet design	22
2.4.3	Hypersonic inlet design issues	33
2.5	Summary and conclusions	37
2.5.1	Gap statement	38
3	System level analysis	40
3.1	Introduction	40
3.2	Flight path model	40
3.3	Aerodynamic model	42
3.4	Propulsion model	45
3.4.1	Numerical simulation verification	48
3.5	Flight path results	49
3.6	Summary and Conclusions	56

4	Inlet design	58
4.1	Introduction	58
4.2	Conical forebody	59
4.3	Axi-symmetric inlet	60
4.4	Stream traced axi-symmetric inlet	62
4.4.1	Inlet design methodology	63
4.4.2	Stream traced inlet design code - streamTracer	67
4.4.3	Inlet truncation	71
4.5	Stream traced modular axi-symmetric inlet	75
4.6	Stream traced modular scalloped inlet	77
4.7	Inlet performance parameters	79
4.8	One dimensional self-starting analysis	80
4.9	Summary and conclusions	81
5	Numerical Analysis	82
5.1	Introduction	82
5.2	Mesh refinement study	84
5.3	Axi-symmetric inlet design	87
5.3.1	Numerical results at Mach 8 conditions	87
5.3.2	Numerical results at Mach 5 conditions	96
5.4	Axi-symmetric stream traced inlet design	99
5.4.1	Numerical results at Mach 8 conditions	99
5.4.2	Numerical results at Mach 5 conditions	105
5.5	Stream traced axi-symmetric modular inlet design	110
5.5.1	Numerical results at Mach 8 conditions	110
5.5.2	Numerical results at Mach 5 conditions	116
5.6	Stream traced modular ‘scalloped’ inlet design	119
5.6.1	Numerical results at Mach 8 conditions	119
5.6.2	Numerical results at Mach 5 conditions	125
5.7	Summary and conclusions	130
6	Inlet performance evaluation	132
6.1	Summary and conclusions	143

7	Additional inlet numerical investigations	145
7.1	Laser induced detonation wave simulation	145
7.2	Gun tunnel model	149
7.2.1	Test specimen geometry	150
7.2.2	Inlet gun tunnel start verification	151
7.2.3	Inlet angle of attack simulations	154
8	Conclusions and future work	157
8.1	Conclusions	157
8.2	Future Work	159
8.2.1	Numerical simulations	159
8.2.2	Experimental work	159
9	References	161
A	Trajectory analysis code	167
B	streamTracer code	168

NOTE: Pagination of the digital copy does not correspond with the pagination of the print copy.

List of Figures

- 1.1 Current lightcraft configuration 3
- 2.1 Schematics of flow regimes: a) LSD wave; b) LSC wave (Reilly *et al.* , 1979). 10
- 2.2 $x - t$ diagrams of constant flux LSD (Reilly *et al.* , 1979). 10
- 2.3 Radial pressure and velocity profiles at time t (Reilly *et al.* , 1979). 11
- 2.4 Laser induced flowfield in supersonic cross-flow (Woodroffe *et al.* , 1979). . . 12
- 2.5 Pressure contours of a laser supported detonation wave (Katsurayama *et al.* , 2003). 14
- 2.6 Time history of the generation and extinction of two laser supported DEAS in medium enthalpy flow (Minucci, 2008). 15
- 2.7 Schematic of two-dimensional laser propulsion experimental setup (Minucci, 2008). 15
- 2.8 Current lightcraft inlet configuration; internal laser induced detonation (Ushio *et al.* , 2004). 16
- 2.9 Current lightcraft inlet configuration; external laser induced detonation. . . 16
- 2.10 Lightcraft nozzle configuration utilised in flight experiments performed in Germany (Bohn & Schall, 2003). 17
- 2.11 Laser propulsion testing inlet configurations (Myrabo *et al.* , 1998). 18
- 2.12 Coefficient of drag for lightcraft forebody configurations (Langener *et al.* , 2009). 19
- 2.13 Lightcraft configuration. 20
- 2.14 The Busemann inlet (Molder & Szpiro, 1966). 24
- 2.15 Generating flow field for modular stream traced inlet design (Billig & Kothari, 2000). 25
- 2.16 Generating flow field for modular stream traced inlet design (Smart, 1999). 25
- 2.17 Generating flow field for modular stream traced inlet design (Matthews & Jones, 2006). 25
- 2.18 Stream traced inlet capture area profile (Smart, 1999). 26
- 2.19 Sector capture shapes for the modular waverider inlet (Matthews & Jones, 2006). 27
- 2.20 Stream traced inlet capture profile (You & Liang, 2009). 27
- 2.21 Stream traced inlet capture profile (Gollan & Smart, 2010). 27
- 2.22 Stream traced modular inlet geometry (Billig, 1995). 28

2.23	Stream traced modular inlet geometry (Smart, 1999).	28
2.24	Stream traced modular inlet geometry (Matthews & Jones, 2006).	28
2.25	Stream traced modular inlet geometry (You & Liang, 2009).	28
2.26	Symmetry plane pressure contours for the Mach 6.0 REST inlet at $M =$ a) 3.6, b) 4.8, and c) 6.0 Smart (1999).	31
2.27	Mach number contours and Schlieren imaging for a stream traced inlet (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2010).	31
2.28	Comparison of inlet designs Matthews & Jones (2006).	31
2.29	Final modular intake shape (Billig & Kothari, 2000).	32
2.30	Final modular intake shape (Smart & Trexler, 2003).	32
2.31	Final modular intake shape (Matthews & Jones, 2006).	32
2.32	Final modular intake shape (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2010)	33
2.33	Maximum contraction limits for inlet self-startability (adapted from Van Wie (2000)).	34
2.34	Flow patterns of supersonic and hypersonic inlets at unstarted conditions (Tan & Guo, 2007).	35
2.35	Schlieren imagery of inlet unstart in a hypersonic inlet (Tan <i>et al.</i> , 2009).	36
2.36	Two and three-dimensional shockwave/boundary layer interactions (Van Wie (2000), reproduced from Stollery (1990) and Delery (1985)).	36
3.1	Forces acting on the lightcraft during flight.	41
3.2	Coefficient of drag for a 30° half angle cone (Hoerner, 1965).	43
3.3	Newtonian theory (Anderson, 2000).	44
3.4	Newtonian theory applied to simplified lightcraft geometry.	45
3.5	Typical blast wave simulation results. a) Impulsive force; b) Wave front pressure; c) Wave front velocity; d) Position	48
3.6	Analytical and Computational result comparison.	49
3.7	Flight path geometries for varying thrust and lift inputs.	51
3.8	Mach number vs time for varying flight trajectories.	52
3.9	Flight conditions for varying flight path geometries.	53
3.10	Flight conditions for varying flight path geometries.	54
3.11	Range vs altitude plot for varying flight path geometries.	55
3.12	Required density compared to stagnation density over flight envelope.	56
4.1	Inlet geometries investigated.	58

4.2	Coefficient of drag for lightcraft forebody configurations (Davis & Mead Jr, 2007).	60
4.3	Axi-symmetric inlet design.	61
4.4	CAD representation of axi-symmetric inlet geometry employed in this study.	62
4.5	Technical CAD drawing of axi-symmetric inlet geometry.	62
4.6	Stream traced methodology.	64
4.7	Generating flow field for lightcraft inlets.	66
4.8	Stream tracing technique.	67
4.9	Stream traced inlet geometry from generating stream lines.	67
4.10	streamTracer code flowchart.	68
4.11	Position of an arbitrary particle within the generating flowfield.	69
4.12	Flat plate verification.	70
4.13	Boundary layer displacement thickness correction.	71
4.14	Generating flow fields of turning angles 7.58° and 15° , respectively.	72
4.15	Original and truncated inlet simulations illustrating amount of total compression lost.	74
4.16	CAD representation of Stream traced axi-symmetric inlet geometry employed in this study.	75
4.17	Dimensioned CAD drawing of the Stream traced axi-symmetric inlet geometry.	75
4.18	CAD representation of Stream traced axi-symmetric inlet geometry employed in this study.	76
4.19	Technical CAD drawing of Stream traced modular axi-symmetric inlet geometry.	77
4.20	Three dimensional streamline tracing of scalloped inlet module	78
4.21	Modified generating flow field geometry used in stream traced modular scalloped inlet geometry.	78
4.22	CAD representation of Stream traced modular scalloped inlet geometry employed in this study.	79
4.23	Dimensioned CAD drawing of Stream traced modular scalloped inlet geometry.	79
4.24	Contraction ratio of each inlet design relative to previously determined starting criteria (adapted from Van Wie (2000)).	81
5.1	Computational domain for numerical simulations.	83

5.2	Density profile at mesh outlet for different mesh densities.	85
5.3	Contours of Mach number for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° for three dimensional mesh at Mach 8.	89
5.4	Close up of inlet contours of static pressure for an angle of attack of 0° at Mach 8 - 2D high resolution grid (top) and 3D grid (bottom).	90
5.5	Static pressure profiles at isolator exit for 0° angle of attack and Mach 8.	91
5.6	Contours of density for an angle of attack of 0° , 3D mesh (top) and 2D mesh (bottom).	92
5.7	Contours of density for an angle of attack of 3° , 3D mesh.	93
5.8	Contours of density for an angle of attack of 6° , 3D mesh.	93
5.9	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 8.	94
5.10	Contours of surface pressure along lightcraft walls for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 8.	95
5.11	Contours of Mach number for 3D mesh at angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° and Mach 5.	96
5.12	Contours of density for 3D mesh at angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° and Mach 5.	98
5.13	Contours of Mach number for the 3D mesh at angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° and Mach 8.	100
5.14	Contours of density for an angle of attack of 0° at Mach 8 - 3D mesh (top) and 2D mesh (bottom).	101
5.15	Contours of density for an angle of attack of 3° at Mach 8 - 3D mesh.	102
5.16	Contours of density for an angle of attack of 6° at Mach 8 - 3D mesh.	102
5.17	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6°	103
5.18	Close up of isolator flow field, Mach 8 at 0° angle of attack for the 2D mesh.	104
5.19	Illustration of flow processes about separation bubble. (Segal, 2009)	105
5.20	Contours of Mach number for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6°	106
5.21	Contours of density for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6°	107
5.22	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6°	109
5.23	Contours of Mach number for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 8.	111
5.24	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6°	113
5.25	Surface contours of density for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 8 (logarithmic scale).	115

5.26	Contours of Mach number for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 5.	116
5.27	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 5.	118
5.28	Contours of Mach number, illustrating three-dimensional shock structure for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 8.	120
5.29	Contours of Mach number for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 8.	122
5.30	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6°	124
5.31	Contours of Mach number, illustrating three-dimensional shock structure for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 5.	126
5.32	Contours of Mach number for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 5.	127
5.33	Contours of density for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 5.	129
5.34	Contours of density at isolator outlet for angles of attack of 0° , 3° and 6° at Mach 5.	130
6.1	Inlet performance comparison, Mach 8 flight conditions.	137
6.2	Inlet performance comparison, Mach 8 flight conditions.	138
6.3	Inlet performance comparison, Mach 8 flight conditions.	139
6.4	Inlet performance comparison, Mach 5 flight conditions.	141
6.5	Inlet performance comparison, Mach 5 flight conditions.	142
6.6	Inlet performance comparison, Mach 5 flight conditions.	143
7.1	LTD inlet geometry at $M=9.43$ with laser induced breakdown (Salvador, 2010)	146
7.2	Laser induced detonation wave simulation initial setup.	147
7.3	Contours of pressure for detonation wave evolution.	148
7.4	Inlet isolator normal wave.	149
7.5	CAD representation of lightcraft configuration	150
7.6	CAD representation of inlet geometry with outer surface of cowl removed	150
7.7	Lightcraft geometry section through inlet	151
7.8	Transient gun tunnel simulation, contours of density	153
7.9	Static pressure values along pressure transducer locations of 0° and 180° for a lightcraft angle of attack of 0°	155
7.10	Static pressure values along pressure transducer locations of 0° and 180° for a lightcraft angle of attack of 3°	155
7.11	Static pressure values along pressure transducer locations of 0° and 180° for a lightcraft angle of attack of 6°	156

List of Tables

- 3.1 Flow conditions for blast-wave analytical solution. 47
- 3.2 Trajectory code input parameters, flight path 1. 50
- 3.3 Trajectory code input parameters, flight path 2. 50
- 3.4 Trajectory code input parameters, flight path 3. 50
- 3.5 Trajectory code input parameters, flight path 4. 51
- 3.6 Trajectory code input parameters, flight path 5. 51
- 3.7 Inlet design parameters. 56

- 5.1 Inlet off design simulation values. 83
- 5.2 Mesh sizes employed in mesh refinement study. 85
- 5.3 Grids employed in mesh refinement study. 87

- 7.1 Laser induced detonation wave initial conditions 146
- 7.2 Pressure far field boundary conditions 152
- 7.3 Transient gun tunnel simulation initial conditions 152
- 7.4 Comparison on inlet design conditions in flight and gun tunnel 154