



UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD906467
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies only; Administrative/Operational Use; 10 AUG 1970. Other requests shall be referred to Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, DC.
AUTHORITY
FAA ltr, 6 May 1973

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction

BOEING



DISTRIBUTION LIMITED TO U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ONLY.
OTHER REQUESTS FOR THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE REFERRED TO
COMMERCIAL AIRPLANE GRP THE BOEING COMPANY. PROPRIETARY INFO.

Seattle, Wash. 98124

aw
D D C
RECEIVED
JAN 27 1974
REGISTERED
B


Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction

Best Available Copy

2

AD906467

AD 100-111111
LEGIBLE COPY



Approved for		
HTIS	White Section ☐	
DDC	Black Section ☒	
UNANNOUNCED	☐	
JUSTIFICATION		
BY		
DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY CODES		
Dist. ☐ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.		

1323

Best Available Copy

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction

THE **BOEING** COMPANY

COMMERCIAL AIRPLANE GROUP

DDC
RECEIVED
JAN 17 1973
B

CONTRACT NUMBER

FA-SS-67-03

DOCUMENT NO

D6A11786-5

TITLE:

PRODUCTION SST PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDIES-

MISSION ANALYSIS

MODEL 2707-300

ISSUE NO

TO:

DDC

DATE

"This data may contain sensitive information relating to the United States Supersonic Transport Development Program and is not to be reproduced or released outside of your organization without the prior written permission of The Boeing Company, Supersonic Transport Division, Attention: Contracts Department."

DISTRIBUTION LIMITED TO U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ONLY.

OTHER REQUESTS FOR THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE REFERRED TO

COMMERCIAL AIRPLANE GRP. THE BOEING COMPANY. PROPRIETARY INFO.

Seattle, Wash, 98124

PREPARED BY

A. Moruss

SUPERVISED BY

J. D. Vachal

APPROVED BY

A. H. Eldridge

APPROVED BY

W. T. Kehr

APPROVED BY

H. E. Orton

W. C. Swan

CONTROLLING ORG

G-8000

REV SYM

BOEING

NO. D6A11786-5

PAGE

1

LIST OF ACTIVE PAGES																	
SECTION	PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM	ADDED PAGES						SECTION	PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM	ADDED PAGES					
			PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM	PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM	PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM				PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM	PAGE NUMBER	REV SYM		
2	1									51							
	2									52							
	3									53							
	4									54							
	5									55							
	6									56							
	7									57							
	8									58							
	9									59							
	10									60							
3	11									61							
	12									62							
4	13									63							
	14									64							
5	15									65							
	16																
6	17																
	18																
7	19																
	20																
8	21																
	22																
9	23																
	24																
	25																
	26																
	27																
	28																
	29																
	30																
	31																
	32																
	33																
	34																
	35																
	36																
	37																
	38																
	39																
	40																
	41																
	42																
	43																
	44																
	45																
	46																
	47																
	48																
	49																
	50																

Appen.

2013488

REV SYM

BOEING

NO. D6A11786-5

PAGE 2



1-788

REVISIONS

REV SYM	DESCRIPTION	DATE	APPROVAL

NO 1348 C

REV SYM

BOEING

NO. D6A11786-5

PAGE 3



ABSTRACT

This document presents the results of a parametric engine cycle study which evaluates the effect of engine cycle on noise and performance of the Production SST. The engine cycles considered are duct burning turbofans, dry turbojets, and afterburning turbojets.

KEY WORD LIST

Parametric
Engine
Cycle
Noise
Performance
Production

BOEING

NO. D6A11736-3

PAGE 4



8-7000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
1.0	SUMMARY	6
2.0	LIST OF FIGURES	9
3.0	REFERENCES	11
4.0	NOMENCLATURE	12
5.0	INTRODUCTION	13
6.0	STUDY GROUND RULES	15
7.0	SELECTION OF AFTERBURNING TURBOJET CYCLE	19
8.0	SELECTION OF DRY TURBOJET CYCLE	22
9.0	SELECTION OF DUCTBURNING TURBOFAN CYCLE	27
10.0	CYCLE COMPARISON & CONCLUSIONS	40
Appendix 1	DETAILED MISSION COMPARISONS	46
Appendix 2	APPROXIMATION TO G.E. TURBOFAN	52
Appendix 3	HIGH BYPASS RATIO, LOW FAN RATIO AFTERBURNING TURBOFANS	54
Appendix 4	PCD DRAG COMPARISON	61
Appendix 5	ENGINE PARAMETER COMPARISON	64

AD 1346 D

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of engine cycle parameters on airport noise and airplane performance to determine whether a change in engine cycle from an afterburning turbojet could be considered for the production SST. This document is the fifth of a series of five documents prepared for this study. The other documents are:

Allison-1, SST Parametric Engine Library - Design

Allison-2, SST Parametric Engine Library - Installed Engine Performance

Allison-3, SST Parametric Engine Library - Acoustics

Allison-4, SST Parametric Engine Studies - Weight Analysis

The engine cycles that have been considered include selected turbofans, dry turbojets and afterburning turbojets. Each engine cycle was evaluated on the production airplane configuration with 100 passengers and at a maximum taxi weight of 150,000 lbs. The mission analysis was based on the "Potential Production Technology" level (Ref. 1) which includes the effects of technology improvements in the areas of aerodynamics, structures, propulsion, together with reduced fuel reserves. Parametric studies were made to select the best engine for each engine cycle consistent with a maximum airport noise objective of 116.5 EPNdB at 1500 ft. and a community noise objective of 125 EPNdB (Ref. 2). The 116.5 EPNdB noise value was arbitrarily chosen because it was the best that could be achieved by the General Electric Company from tests on a jet type suppressor. The effect of engine size of using a simple jet type suppressor to meet the noise objective of 116.5 EPNdB was also evaluated on each engine.

relative to the 633 lb/sec unsuppressed afterburning turbojet (side-line noise = 120 EPNdb), the range losses to achieve 118.5 EPNdb side-line noise and 108 EPNdb community noise were:

		$\Delta R \sim$ N.Mi. NO SUBSONIC LEG	$\Delta R \sim$ N.Mi. 300 N.Mi. SUBSONIC LEG
1 Afterburning turbojet:	Multi-tube Suppressor	-290 to -305	-250 to -265
2 Dry Turbojet:	Unsuppressed	-320	---
	4 EPNdb Suppressor	-210	-260
3 Duct burning turbofan:	Unsuppressed	-320	---
	4 EPNdb Suppressor	-320	-305

The above data show that the dry turbojet with a 4 EPNdb suppressor will give the best range when no subsonic legs are considered in the mission. However, these results indicate that the current afterburning cycle incorporating a tubular suppressor is competitive with the dry turbojet and with the duct burning turbofan for a side-line noise objective of 118.5 EPNdb when additional subsonic legs are considered.

No accounting was made for the increased complexity of control for the turbofan engine or the degree of risk of these new engines when compared to an already operating engine. Furthermore, possible tolerances in the parametric engine weights and performance could lead to individual engine differences of 1 to 2 EPNdb.

Whether or not the above conclusion would hold for even lower side-line noise level constraints of say 120 EPNdb (current LAX for new subsonic aircraft) is unknown. It is recommended that the study should be expanded to include side-line noise levels down to 108 EPNdb.



This study made range comparisons upon standard day conditions. The objective is Paris-New York capability on a hot day ($STT + 50^\circ$). Previous studies have shown that some fan engines may have less range loss on hot days than turbojets. This factor should be considered in further studies.

Also it is recommended that this study be expanded to include single and dual rotor mixed burning fans.



<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Acoustic of Mission Profile	17
	General Arrangement	18
	Afterburning T/W Range vs. Airflow	21
	By T/W, Range vs. Airflow Comparison	24
	By T/W, Mission Range vs. Mission Range	25
	By T/W, Effect of R_p on Mission Range	26
	Carbocation, Range vs. Airflow, Effect of R_p	31
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	32
	Carbocation, Range vs. Airflow, Effect of R_p	33
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	34
	Carbocation, Range vs. Airflow, Effect of R_p	35
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	36
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	37
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	38
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	39
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	44
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	45
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	53
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	55
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	56
	Carbocation, Range vs. Mission Range, Effect of R_p	57

AD-1346 D

LIST OF VICTIMS (Cont'd)

<u>Figure No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
10	Turboprop Engine Comparison, Effect of Cruise Altitude on Range Due to Climb, Cruise and Descent	9
11	Turboprop Engine Comparison, Effect of Cruise Altitude on Range Due to Climb and Descent	10
12	Jet Engines	11

<u>Figure No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
13	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	12
14	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	13
15	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	14
16	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	15
17	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	16
18	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	17
19	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	18
20	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	19
21	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	20
22	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	21
23	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	22
24	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	23
25	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	24
26	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	25
27	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	26
28	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	27
29	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	28
30	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	29
31	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	30
32	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	31
33	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	32
34	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	33
35	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	34
36	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	35
37	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	36
38	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	37
39	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	38
40	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	39
41	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	40
42	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	41
43	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	42
44	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	43
45	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	44
46	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	45
47	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	46
48	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	47
49	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	48
50	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	49
51	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	50
52	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	51
53	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	52
54	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	53
55	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	54
56	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	55
57	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	56
58	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	57
59	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	58
60	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	59
61	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	60
62	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	61
63	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	62
64	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	63
65	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	64
66	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	65
67	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	66
68	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	67
69	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	68
70	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	69
71	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	70
72	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	71
73	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	72
74	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	73
75	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	74
76	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	75
77	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	76
78	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	77
79	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	78
80	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	79
81	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	80
82	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	81
83	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	82
84	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	83
85	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	84
86	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	85
87	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	86
88	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	87
89	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	88
90	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	89
91	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	90
92	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	91
93	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	92
94	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	93
95	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	94
96	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	95
97	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	96
98	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	97
99	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	98
100	Jet Engines, J-47, J-48, J-49 Comparison	99

Best Available Copy

3.0

REFERENCES

1. DALL-1, "Production Airplane Performance (236 and 238 Passenger Versions", April 24, 1969.
2. Letter - 1000-1-176 from H. W. Withington to J. C. Pirtle, Subject: "Noise Objective for the SST", dated June 17, 1969.
3. 1000-1, "ex. A, "Production Airplane Performance Objectives, Design Criteria and Requirements", December 18, 1968.
4. SST Noise Suppression and Engine Cycle Study 969-00 and -001 Configurations, Presented to G.E., August 1968.
5. Airline SST Committee (Mentzer Committee) Meeting October 16, 1968.
6. Letter from E. Silverstein of NASA-Lewis to H. W. Withington, Subject: "SST Engine Selection", Date: March 17, 1969.
7. Letter from G. L. Blake of SST SAA Office to H. W. Withington, Subject: "NASA Lewis Comparison of Engines for Boeing SST", dated July 8, 1969.
8. DALL-1, "SST Parametric Engine Library - Design."
9. DALL-3, "SST Parametric Engine Library - Acoustics".
10. DALL-4, "SST Parametric Engine Library - Weights".

AD 1546 D

ABBREVIATIONS

A/B	afterburning	
A/P	airplane	
BPR	bypass ratio	
CD _{FOE}	drag coefficient for four pods	
EPNdb	unit of effective perceived noise level	
F _h	installed hot thrust	lb
L/D	airplane lift to drag ratio	
M	Mach number	
MTX	maximum taxi weight	lb
NMI	nautical miles	
OW	operating empty weight	lb
P/L	payload	
PNdb	unit of perceived noise level	
q	dynamic pressure	lb/ft ²
R/C	rate of climb	ft. min.
RF	range factor	
R ₂₉₀	ram pressure ratio	
R _p	overall compressor pressure ratio	
T ₀₁	total thrust over drag	
T ₀₂	thrust specific fuel consumption	lb/hr/lb
V ₀	sea level static engine airflow	lb/sec

AD 1145 D

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1964 Boeing changed from the 2707-200 variable sweep SST concept to the 2707-300; an aft-tail, fixed wing configuration.

At that time General Electric and Boeing reopened the whole discussion of proper SST engine cycle. The results of the 1965 studies (Refs. 1 and 5) indicated that the basic mission performance is about the same

for a suppressed afterburning turbojets and unsuppressed turbofans.

But turbojets, when sized to meet minimum climb thrust margin requirements were deficient in range when compared to an unsuppressed after-

burning turbojet. NASA Lewis studies (Refs. 6 & 7) in March and June 1969 confirmed these results but noted two important differences:

- a) Turbofans appear superior to turbojets when large subsonic legs are included (Ref. 6).
- b) In the absence of an effective noise suppression device, a dry turbojet is somewhat superior to the afterburning turbojet when engine noise is a consideration (Ref. 7).

This study re-examines the relative merits of afterburning turbojets, turbofans, and dry turbojets with respect to range, subsonic per-

formance and airport sideline noise constraints of 125 and 115.5 PNdB

at 1500 ft. The 125 PNdB sideline noise constraint is the initial

Joint-JAA contract objective and the 115.5 PNdB noise constraint was the Boeing-D.C. production airplane objective at the time this study was started, Ref. 2.

This study differs from previous ones in three important respects:

- 1) engine teching is based on high turbine inlet temperatures consistent with initial service in the 1975-80 time period.

The engines were selected from a parametric family of study

engines developed by Boeing (Ref. 1).

- 2) the effect of large subsonic legs has been considered.
- 3) an attempt has been made to include detailed configuration effects such as rebound, secondary NM effects, and gear location, for constant tail clearance.

AD 1546 0

6.0 STUDY GROUND RULES

Baseline Airplane

The baseline for this study was the 298 passenger production airplane described in Ref. 1. The "Potential Production Technology" aerodynamic and weight improvement programs as well as the reduced reserves assumed in Ref. 1 were retained. The basic mission profile is shown in Figure 1. A general arrangement drawing of the airplane is shown in Figure 2.

Engine Sizing Criteria

The parametric engines were initially sized for maximum range subject to the following constraints:

- Airport noise = 118.5 PNdb at 1500 ft. sideline. (Std. +10°C day) (Ref. 2)
- FAR take-off field length $\leq$ 12,400 ft. (Std. +15°C day). (Ref. 3)
- $\left(\frac{T-1}{T-1}\right)_{\min} \geq .3$ (Std. day).
- Initial cruise corridor $\geq$ 4000 ft. (Std. day).

After a best engine was selected for each cycle, additional constraints were added:

- Community noise $\leq$ 118 EPNdb at 3.5 n.m.l., 3/0 1500 ft., Std. +10°C.
- Community height $\geq$ 1500 ft.
- Airport noise at 1500 ft. sideline (Std. +10°C)
 - a) unrestricted
 - b) 125 PNdb (Contract objective)
 - c) 118.5 PNdb (Boeing-C.F. objective).

Acoustics data for airport and community noise evaluation for engine sizing are given in Ref. 9.

OEW Effects

Each parametric engine was substituted for the baseline GE4/JC suppressed afterburning turbojet. Total weight and balance effects on the configuration due to engine pod substitutions were accounted for. These included secondary OEW effects, landing gear length changes for constant ground clearance and sliding the wing on the body to maintain constant center of gravity limits (Ref. 10).

Drag Analysis

Detailed pod drag evaluations were made and formulae were devised for specific pod shapes and sizes for each engine cycle. These pod drag formulae are presented in Appendix 4. These formulae were then used to calculate pod drags for other pods of a family of engine cycles. Since pod drags were only evaluated at $M = 2.7$, a generalized variation of $\Delta C_{D_{pod}}$ with Mach number was devised to account for pod drag changes throughout the flight regime. This variation was applied to the $\Delta C_{D_{pod}}$ at $M = 2.7$ between the parametric pod being studied and the J5F validation pod which was in the airplane drag polar.

Pod drag comparisons of the best engine of each cycle sized to meet 118.5 PNdb sideline noise and 108 EPNdb community noise are shown in Table A7 of Appendix 4. In addition pod sketches of these engines are shown in Figure 24 in Appendix 4.

BASIC MISSION RULES

POTENTIAL PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGY





FIG. 1

ENGR			REVISED	DATE	BASIC MISSION RULES POTENTIAL PRODUCTION TECH.	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APP					THE BOEING COMPANY RENTON, WASHINGTON	
APP						
PLT	A.M	9/28/70				17

FIGURE 2

GENERAL DIMENSIONS



U6A1786-5

SELECTION OF AFTERBURNING TURBOJET CYCLE

An afterburning turbojet cycle (TJ-2A) with cruise compressor pressure ratio (R_p) of 5 was selected because it most nearly resembled the current General Electric offered production engine and, hence, offered a comparison between the parametric study engines and a real life engine. A brief preliminary study was carried out on afterburning turbojets with R_p 's of 4, 5 and 6 to verify range trends only. The results showed range decreasing with increasing R_p , but the range improvement for $R_p = 6$ as compared to $R_p = 5$ was only about 10 n.mi. and it was decided to retain $R_p = 5$ as the baseline afterburning turbojet for comparison with the dry turbojets and ducted fan turbofans.

Figure 1 shows supercruise range performance, climb thrust margin, and airport noise versus engine airflex for the afterburning turbojet. To meet an airport noise level of 125 PNdB, a 4 PNdB sound suppressor was used. The engine with the 4 PNdB sound suppressor was estimated to have an 8% thrust loss on takeoff and a slight penalty of about 200 lb. per engine was assessed for the suppressor.

To meet airport noise levels of 115.5 PNdB, a large multi-tube suppressor of a design evolved within Boeing was used on the afterburning turbojet. The range loss with this suppressor was estimated to be about 290 to 305 n.mi. This suppressor offered about a 150 n.mi. range advantage over the current General Electric design.

The ground rules for the afterburning turbojet evaluation were to keep engine size small and use jet expression to reduce sideline noise. To reduce sideline noise 10 PNdB by just throttling

alone would require an engine sized at about 935 lbs/sec. At this large size the range falls off sharply, but some alleviation is obtained by using partial burning in the climb segment from $M = .85$ to $M = 2.7$. Despite this, the dry turbojet appears to be the better choice (about 140 n.mi. better) when noise attenuation is sought by throttling. For a proposed follow-on study evaluating lower compressor pressure ratio afterburning turbojets, range optimization for partial burning in climb will be included as part of the study to further understand the impact of augmentation on range.

AD 1548 D

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

M₀W = 750,000 LB

P/L = 29.8 PASS.

STD. DAY, M = 2.70

CUTBACK THRUST AT COMMUNITY FOR R/C-500 FPM
AIRPORT NOISE AT 1500 FT. FROM RUNWAY &




FIG. 3

AM

3/20/70

AFTERBURNING T/J-2A
RANGE vs AIRFLOW

D6A11786-5

SELECTION OF DRY TURBOJET CYCLE

Dry turbojets with cruise compressor pressure ratio (R_p) of 4.5 and 6 were examined. Figure 4 shows the supersonic range performance and climb thrust margins for these three dry turbojets. The dry turbojet with $R_p = 5$ has the best range performance at a given engine size but is thrust limited in climb. Oversizing of the engine is required to meet a climb requirement of a 4000 foot climb corridor at 60,000 feet and a minimum thrust margin of 0.2.* The dry turbojet with $R_p = 4$ has the best climb thrust margin of the three turbojets considered and has the best range performance when sized for 118.5 PNdB sideline noise.

Figure 5 shows the effect of subsonic legs on mission range for the three dry turbojets sized for 118.5 PNdB airport noise and a 4000 foot climb corridor capability at initial cruise. These data show that increasing cruise R_p slightly alleviates the fall off of range with subsonic leg length. However, the differences in mission range loss with, say, a 600 n.mi. subsonic leg are small. The $R_p = 4$ dry turbojet (TJ-1D, PTID-112) was, therefore, selected as the best dry turbojet for the engine cycle comparison.

Figure 6 shows the effect of climb, cruise, and reserves on range as a function of cruise R_p for the dry turbojets sized at 1000 l.s. sea airflow. Also shown are the weight and drag effects on range as a function of cruise R_p . A comparison of detailed mission calculations of the three dry turbojets is shown in Figure A.2 of the Appendix.

*Grand rule devised for afterburning turbojet cycle. It has not been justified for alternate cycles and will be studied further in the follow-on cycle study. The present concern is for range loss at temperatures above std. day if the margin is relaxed.

The selected optimum dry turbojet (TJ-10) was evaluated for three levels of airport noise while meeting 108 EPNdb community noise restrictions. These results are shown in Figure 16 of Section 10, Cycle Comparison. Both the effect of throttling the engines on takeoff and using a 4 PNdb sound suppressor were investigated. The engines with the 4 PNdb suppressor were estimated to have an 8% thrust loss on takeoff and the weight penalty for the suppressor was estimated to be $300 \times \left(\frac{W_a}{33} \right)^{1.12}$ lb. per engine.

The suppressor is retracted at power cutback for community noise evaluation. The use of a sound suppressor to reduce airport noise is more efficient than oversizing the engine and then throttling it to reduce airport noise. Using a 4 PNdb suppressor on the dry turbojet TJ-10, the required engine airflow for 118.5 PNdb airport noise and 108 EPNdb community noise, is 850 lb/sec. With out the suppressor, the required engine airflow for the same noise restrictions is 920 lbs/sec. The smaller engine size with the 4 PNdb suppressor provides a 140 n.mi. range increase relative to the engine using throttling only to reduce airport noise.

AD 1460

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 750,000 LB

STD. DAY

P/L = 298 PASS.




FIG. 4

CALC	MORUOS	2-23-70	REVISED	DATE	DRY TURBOJET COMPARISON	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
	DJDEK	2-23-70			THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 24

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

DRY TURBOJET COMPARISON
AIRPORT NOISE = 118.5 PNdb

NOTE: ENGINE AIRFLOW SIZED FOR
118.5 PNdb AIRPORT NOISE AND
RC = 200 FPM @ 6400 FT,




FIG. 5

CALC	AM	3/10/70	REVISED	DATE	DRY TURBOJET COMPARISON, EFFECT OF SUBSONIC LEGS ON MISSION RANGE	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APP						
APP						
THE BOEING COMPANY					PAGE	25

PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS

DRY TURBOJET COMPARISON
ENGINES COMPARED AT AIRFLOW = 1000 LB/SEC.




FIG. 6

CALC	AM	3/17/70	REVISED	DATE	DRY TURBOJET COMPARISON, EFFECT OF R_p ON RANGE	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 26

9.0

SELECTION OF DUCT-BURNING TURBOFAN CYCLE

The parametric engine family contained 71 duct-burning turbofan engines for mission analysis, Ref. 6. The first group of 4 engines evaluated had cruise bypass ratio between 2 and 3, cruise compressor pressure ratio between 4 and 5, and low cruise fan pressure ratio. The range performance of these "first cut" turbofan engines was 300-600 n.mi. worse than an unsuppressed afterburning turbojet, Appendix 3. From these "first-cut" turbofans, parametric range trends were established that indicated improved range performance with decreasing bypass ratio and increasing fan pressure ratio.

Nearest neighbors around a turbofan with bypass ratio = 1.0, compressor pressure ratio = 5.0, and medium fan pressure ratio were evaluated to select the optimum engine. The nearest neighbor method of selecting an optimum was based on the assumption that only one maximum exists. This reduced the number of additional turbofan engines to evaluate to 7.

The 7 duct burning turbofans were examined to evaluate the effect on range of cruise bypass ratio (BPR), cruise compressor pressure ratio (R_p), and cruise fan pressure ratio (R_{fan}). Figure 7 shows supersonic range performance and climb thrust margins for duct burning turbofans with cruise BPR = 0.5, 1.0, and 1.5. Cruise R_p = 1.0 and cruise R_{fan} = 2.5 were held constant. These data show that turbofan TF7 with BPR = 1.0 has the best range performance with engines sized for 118.5 dBA airport noise and 12,400 foot I.A.R. takeoff field length.

AD 1546 D

Figure 8 shows the effect of subsonic legs on mission range for the three turbofans with cruise BPR = 0.5, 1.0, 1.5. These data show that subsonic cruise performance improves sharply by increasing cruise BPR from 0.5 to 1.0; then moderately by increasing BPR from 1.0 to 1.5. TF7 with a BPR = 1.0 (max. range all supersonic) is a good compromise choice for subsonic performance.

Figure 9 shows supersonic range performance and climb thrust margin for cruise BPR = 1.0 duct burning turbofans with cruise $R_{Fan} = 2.5$ and cruise $R_p = 4, 5$, and 6. These data show that turbofan TF7 with cruise $R_p = 5.0$ has the best range performance with engines sized for 118.5 PMdB airport noise and 12,400 foot F.A.R. takeoff field length.

Figure 10 shows the effect of subsonic legs on mission range for the three turbofans with cruise $R_p = 4, 5$, and 6. These data show that subsonic cruise performance improves sharply by increasing cruise R_p from 4 to 5, then moderately by increasing cruise R_p from 5 to 6. These data show TF7 with a $R_p = 5$ (max. range all supersonic) to be good compromise choice for subsonic performance.

Figure 11 shows supersonic range performance and climb thrust margin for cruise BPR = 1.0 duct burning turbofans with cruise $R_p = 5.0$ and cruise $R_{Fan} = 2.0, 2.5$, and 3.0. These data show that increasing cruise R_{Fan} improves supersonic range performance at a given engine size. However, when the engines are sized for 118.5 PMdB airport noise, turbofan TF7 with cruise $R_{Fan} = 2.5$ has the best range performance.

AD 1546 D

The effect of subsonic legs on mission range for the above turbofans are shown in Figure 12. These data show that turbofan TF7 with cruise $R_{Fan} = 2.5$ has the best subsonic cruise performance.

Parametric range trends showing the effect of cruise BPR, R_p , and R_{Fan} for the duct burning turbofans are shown in Figure 13. With the engines compared at a constant airflow, these data indicate optimum range performance for a turbofan with cruise BPR = 1.0, $R_p = 5.0$, and $R_{Fan} = 2.5$ to 3.0.

Figure 14 shows the incremental effect of cruise BPR, R_p , and R_{Fan} on the climb, cruise, and reserve portions of the mission range. These data show that cruise range increases with decreasing BPR and R_p but increasing R_{Fan} . Climb range increases with decreasing cruise BPR but increasing cruise R_p and R_{Fan} . Increasing cruise BPR and R_p reduces reserve fuel, thus increasing range, but cruise R_{Fan} has little effect on reserves.

Figure 15 shows the incremental effects of cruise BPR, R_p , and R_{Fan} on mission range because of weight and cruise pod drag changes. These data show that weight decreases with increasing cruise BPR and R_{Fan} , thus increasing range. Weight increases with cruise R_p . These data show that engine pod drag is a minimum at cruise BPR = 1.0, $R_p = 5.0$, and $R_{Fan} = 2.5$.

The selected optimum duct burning turbofan TF7 was evaluated for sideline noise levels of 118.5 PNdB, 125 PNdB, and 129 PNdB while

AD 1546 D

meeting 108 EPNdB at the community. These results are shown in Figure 16 of Section 10, Cycle Comparison. Both unsuppressed and suppressed data were evaluated. The penalty for a 4 PNdB sideline noise suppressor is an 8% takeoff thrust loss and a weight increase of $300 \times \left(\frac{W_a}{633}\right)^{1.12}$ lb per engine.

Figure 16 shows that to meet 118.5 PNdB sideline noise, the use of a 4 PNdB sideline noise suppressor allows a 70 n.mi. range increase over the unsuppressed engine.

Tables A.3, A.4, A.5 in the Appendix show detailed mission tabulations of the duct burning turbofans showing the effect of cruise BPR, R_p , and R_{Fan} , respectively. These data are compared at engines sized for 118.5 PNdB sideline noise and 12,400 ft F.A.R. field length.

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 150,000 LB

STD DAY, M = 2.7

P/L = 298 PASS




FIG. 7

CALC	AM	5/1/70	REVIEWED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON, EFFECT OF CRUISE BPR	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
THE BOEING COMPANY					PAGE	31

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 750,000 LB

STD. DAY

AIRPORT NOISE = 118.5 PNdB

T.O. F.L. = 12,400 FT




FIG. 8

CALC	AM	3/16/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON EFFECT OF <u>BPR</u> ON MIXED MISSION RANGE	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 32

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 750,000 LB
P/L = 298 PASS.
STD. DAY, M = 2.7




FIG. 9.

CALC	AM	3/11/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON, EFFECT OF 'COMPRESSOR PRESSURE RATIO	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 33

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 150,000 LB

STD. DAY

AIRPORT NOISE = 118.5 PNdB




FIG. 10

CALC	AM	3/4/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON, EFFECT OF <u>R_p</u> ON MIXED MISSION RANGE	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 34

M = 2.7, STD. DAY



CALC	AM	8/11/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON EFFECT OF FAN PRESSURE RATIO	D6A11736-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 35

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 150000 LB
STD. DAY

AIRPORT NOISE = 118.5 PNdB
T.O. FL. 2400 FT.

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction




FIG. 12

CALC	AM	3/16/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON EFFECT OF <u>R_{FAN}</u> ON MIXED MISSION RANGE	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APP						
APP						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 36




FIG. 13

CALC	AM	3/12/10	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN, PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS, EFFECT OF CRUISE BPR, R_p & R_{fan}	D6A11786-
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 37




FIG. 14

CALC	AM	3/12/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN, PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS, EFFECT ON CLIMB CRUISE & RESERVES	D6A11786-
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 38

PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS

TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON

ENGINES COMPARED AT AIRFLOW = 940 LB/SEC




FIG. 15

CALC	AM	5/12/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN, PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS, EFFECT OF WEIGHT 'AND POD DRAG	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 39

10.

CYCLE COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This section presents comparisons of the best engine selected from each cycle with the engines sized to meet 118.5 PNdb sideline and 108 EPNdb community noise. In addition, the study was expanded to include cycle comparisons with unrestricted sideline noise (about 129 PNdb) and 125 PNdb sideline noise. The benefit of using a simple 4 PNdb suppressor to meet these sideline noise objectives was also evaluated.

The best engines selected from each type of engine considered were:

1. An afterburning turbojet with cruise compressor pressure ratio (π_p) = 5 which most nearly resembled the GE offered production engine (Section 7).
2. A dry turbojet with cruise compressor pressure ratio (π_p) = 4 which had the best range performance of the three dry turbojets considered (Section 8.0) when sized for airport noise and climb thrust margin.
3. A duct-burning turbofan with cruise bypass ratio (BPR) = 1, cruise compressor pressure ratio (π_p) = 5, and cruise fan pressure ratio (π_{fan}) = 2.5. This turbofan had the best range performance of all the turbfans considered (Section 9.0) when sized for airport noise.

The results of this study are shown in Figures 16 and 17.

Figure 16 shows comparisons of the three engine cycles and the effects of meeting noise objectives on climb and range performance. Figure 17 shows the effect of subsonic legs on total mission range for each engine.

Figure 16 shows that:

1. For unrestricted sideline noise (about 129 PNdb) the duct burning turbofan accounts for about 70 n. mi. more range than the afterburning turbojet while range with the dry turbojet which is oversized for a 0.3 climb thrust margin is 130 n. mi. less than with the afterburning turbojet.
2. With sideline noise restricted to 125 PNdb, the range with the dry turbojet which is oversized to meet 0.3 climb thrust margin is 90 n. mi. less than range with the afterburning turbojet with 4 PNdb suppression. The range with the turbofan with 4 PNdb suppression is 50 n. mi. more than the range with the afterburning turbojet with 4 PNdb suppression. Without a suppressor, the range with the turbofan is about 30 n. mi. less than the suppressed afterburning turbojet.
3. With sideline noise restricted to 118.5 PNdb, the range with the suppressed dry turbojet and suppressed duct burning turbofan is 80 n. mi. more and 30 n. mi. less respectively than with the suppressed afterburning turbojet. Without a suppressor, the range with the dry turbojet and duct burning turbofan is 60 and 100 n. mi. less respectively than the range with the afterburning turbojet with a multistage suppressor

Figure 17 shows the effect of subsonic legs on mission range for the three selected engines. With the engines sized to meet 118.5 PNdb sideline noise, these data show the turbofan has the best subsonic performance, and the dry turbojet has the worst with range losses of

AD 1346 D

65 n.mi. and 150 n.mi. respectively, for a nominal 350 n.mi. subsonic leg. With the afterburning turbojet with a parametric convergent-divergent nozzle, the range loss was 90 n.mi. for a 350 n.mi. subsonic leg which makes it fairly competitive with the duct burning turbofan.

The data in Figure 16 show that the dry turbojet with a 4 PNdb suppressor has the least range loss to achieve 118.5 PNdb sideline noise when no subsonic legs are considered in the mission. However, the results of Figure 17 indicate that when subsonic legs are considered the current afterburning cycle is competitive with the dry turbojet and duct burning turbofan for sideline noise objectives of 118.5 PNdb.

Whether or not this conclusion would hold for even lower sideline noise level constraints of say 108 EPNdb (current FAR 36) is unknown. Therefore, it is recommended that the study should be expanded to include sideline noise levels down to 108 EPNdb. In addition, mixed burning turbofans with open nozzle and throttling should be studied as well as lower compressor pressure ratio afterburning turbojets and dry turbojets. Since the use of 4 PNdb jet suppression to reduce airport noise was shown to be more efficient than oversizing and then throttling the engine, it is also recommended that suppressors that achieve more than 4 PNdb sideline noise reduction be studied.

This study based range comparisons upon standard day conditions. The objective is Paris-New York capability on a hot day (STD. + 5°C). Previous studies have shown fan engines to have considerably less

range loss on hot days than turbojets. This factor should be considered in further studies.

COPY available to DDC does not
contain fully legible reproduction

AD 1586 2

REV 5YM

BOEING

NO. D6A11786-5

PAGE 43



67030

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 150,000 LB

P/L = 298 PASS.

STD. DAY, M = 2.7

CUTBACK THRUST AT COMMUNITY FOR R/C = 500 FPM.
AIRPORT NOISE AT 1500 FT FROM RUNWAY C




FIG. 16

CALL	1/1	3/20/70	REVISED	DATE	ENGINE CYCLE COMPARISON	DATA 1700
CHECK					RANGE VS. AIRFLOW SUMMARY	
APP						
APP						
THE BOEING COMPANY						PAGE 44

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

ENGINES SIZED FOR: AIRPORT NOISE ≤ 118.5 PNdB
COMM. NOISE ≤ 108 PNdB
F.L. $\leq 12,400$ FT.

MTW = 750,000 LB

P/L = 298 PASS.

STD. DAY




FIG. 17

FILE ENG. CXC 1-2

CALC	AM	3/12/70	REVISED	DAYS	EFFECT OF SUBSONIC LEGS ON MISSION RANGE	D6A11786-
CHECK						
APP						
APP						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 45

APPENDIX 1

DETAILED MISSION TABULATIONS

1. A/B turbojet vs. dry turbojet vs. turbofan.
2. Dry turbojet.
3. Fan, Effect of
 - a. bPR
 - b. Rp
 - c. Rfan

A/P = -300 PRODUCTION
M.T.W. = 750,000 LB
TEMP = STD.

TABLE A.1

ENGINE - / AIRFLOW		TJ-2A / 433	TJ-1D / 870	TF7 / 940
CRUISE BPR		15.0	4.0	1.0
CRUISE RPM				5.0
CRUISE R/PAN				2.5
WEIGHTS:				
O.E.W.				
A.O.E.W.				
O.E.W. + A.O.E.W. ~ LB		308,100	326,140	327,730
RANGE ~ N.MI.		3969	3752	3871
TAXI FUEL ~ LB		4131	4983	3741
TAKEOFF FUEL ~ LB		4786	3195	2400
SUBSONIC CLIMB. (TO M=0.85)				
FUEL ~ LB		18395	17601	15437
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		38	24.4	46.3
SUPERSONIC CLIMB:				
FUEL ~ LB		66550	66852	57442
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		260	407	220
CRUISE				
C _D PROGRAM = 2.7 ~ COUNTS (N.MI./LB) INITIAL		1.8 .01234	3.5 .01258	3.3 .01239
ALTITUDE ~ FT.		60000	68217	63020
L/D MAX		8.10	7.855	7.950
L/D CRUISE		7.763	7.837	7.841
TSFC		22.890	33.484	26.135
RF		1.492	1.4903	1.4873
FUEL ~ LB		8053	8158	8164
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		227156	205809	225937
(N.MI./LB) FINAL		3426	3074	3370
DESCENT				
FUEL ~ LB		3628	3739	3863
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		246	247	235
ILS FUEL ~ LB		1312	1606	1029
RESERVE FUEL ~ LB		53459	58976	50129
6% MISSION FUEL ~ LB		19569	18161	18591
MISSED APPROACH FUEL ~ LB				
ALTERNATE (2.00 N.MI.)				
FUEL ~ LB		17193	20458	15980
AVG. RF		6003	5339	6742
L/D		13.92	13.41	13.68
TSFC		1.197	1.2971	1.0472
WEIGHT ~ LB		399,000	421,994	416,093
HOLD				
MACH		.475	.475	.475
FUEL ~ LB		16,697	20,357	15,558
L/D		14.80	14.32	14.35
TSFC		1.296	1.4537	1.1171
AVG. WT. ~ LB		382,000	401,586	400,324
ILS APPROACH				

A/P = 300 PRODUCTION

MT.W. = 750,000 LB

TEMP = STD

TABLE A.2

ENGINE / AIRFLOW		TJ-10 / 870	TJ-20 / 950*	TJ-30 / 1135*
CRUISE BPR CRUISE R/F CRUISE R/FAN		4	5	6
WEIGHTS:				
O.E.W. A.O.E.W. O.E.W. + ΔO.E.W. ~ LB		326140	337,760	365100
RANGE ~ N.MI.		3752	3629	3091
TAXI FUEL ~ LB.		4983	4872	5123
TAKEOFF FUEL ~ LB.		3195	2966	2820
SUBSONIC CLIMB: (TO M=0.85)				
FUEL ~ LB.		17601	15164	13,979
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		24.4	21.5	17.3
SUPERSONIC CLIMB:				
FUEL ~ LB.		66852	72780	119,740
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		407	519	1145.
CRUISE				
C _D 0.00 @ M=2.7. (N.MI./LB) INITIAL		3.5 .01258	4.4 .01271	6.4 .01331
WT = 550,000 LB	ALTITUDE ~ FT.	68217	67473	67,767
	(L/D) MAX	7.855	7.825	7.721
	(L/D) CRUISE	7.837	7.822	7.717
	TSFC	33.484	32.384	33.285
	R/F	1.4903	1.4812	1.4965
	FUEL ~ LB	8158	8188	7997
	DISTANCE ~ N.MI.	205,606	191,135	115,510
	(N.MI./LB) FINAL	3074	2848	1695
		.01797	.01763	.01623
DESCENT				
FUEL ~ LB.		3739	4005	4650
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		247	242	234
ILS FUEL ~ LB.		1606	1541	1859
RESERVE FUEL ~ LB		58976	57551	58914
6% MISSION FUEL ~ LB.		18161	17548	15821
MISSED APPROACH FUEL ~ LB				
ALTERNATE (260 N.MI.)				
FUEL ~ LB		20458	19888	21220
AVG. CRUISE	R/F	5339	5638	5655
	L/D	13.41	13.29	12.78
	TSFC	1.2971	1.2168	1.1669
	WEIGHT ~ LB	421,990	433,130	463,500
HOLD				
MACH		.475	.175	.500
FUEL ~ LB.		20,357	20115	21,874
L/D		14.32	14.08	13.88
TSFC		1.4537	1.3731	1.376
AVG. WT. ~ LB		401,586	413,130	441,966
ILS APPROACH				

* SIZED TO HAVE 200 FPM. R/C CAPABILITY @ 6400 FT.

D6A11786-3

A/P =
M.T.W. = 750,000 LB
TEMP = STD.

TABLE A.3

ENGINE / AIRFLOW		TF2 / 1090	TF7 / 940	TF10 / 955
CRUISE SPR		0.5	1.0	1.5
CRUISE R _{PM}		5.0	5.0	5.0
CRUISE R _{PM}		2.5	2.5	2.2
WEIGHTS:				
O.E.W.				
A.O.E.W.				
O.E.W. + A.O.E.W. ~ LB		351,750	327,730	326,650
RANGE ~ N.MI.		3518	3871	3776
TAXI FUEL ~ LB		4406	3741	3505
TAKEOFF FUEL ~ LB		2525	2400	2316
SUBSONIC CLIMB: (TO M=0.85)				
FUEL ~ LB		14005	15437	16535
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		26.3	46.3	60.7
SUPERSONIC CLIMB:				
FUEL ~ LB		48613	57,442	58646
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		183	220	202
CRUISE				
CD POD @ M=2.7 ~ COUNTS		4.4	3.3	3.5
(N.MI./LB) INITIAL		.01265	.01239	.01205
WT = 550,000 LB	ALTITUDE	65716	63020	63433
	(L/D) MAX	7.85	7.950	7.929
	(L/D) CRUISE	7.84	7.841	7.841
	FN/2	29.702	26.135	26.661
	TSFC	1.4372	1.4873	1.5349
	RF	8448	8164	7911
	FUEL ~ LB	206,178	225,977	226,014
	DISTANCE ~ N.MI.	3073	3370	3278
	(N.MI./LB) FINAL	.01771	.01813	.01765
DESCENT				
FUEL ~ LB		4506	3863	3929
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		236	235	235
ILS FUEL ~ LB		1319	1029	966
RESERVE FUEL ~ LB		54450	50,129	49141
6% MISSION ~ LB		18697	18,591	18713
MISSED APPROACH FUEL ~ LB				
ALTERNATE (260 N.MI.)				
FUEL ~ LB		18697	15980	15719
AVG. CRUISE	RF	6164	6742	6820
	L/D	13.24	13.68	13.65
	TSFC	1.1091	1.0472	1.0393
	WEIGHT ~ LB	445,253	416,093	413,996
HOLD				
MACH		.500	.475	.475
FUEL ~ LB		18860	15,558	14708
L/D		14.37	14.85	14.35
TSFC		1.2728	1.1171	1.0608
AVG. WT. ~ LB		426,474	400,324	398,782
ILS APPROACH				

A/P =
M.T.W. = 750,000 LB
TEMP. = STD.

TABLE A.4

ENGINE / AIRFLOW		TF 25 / 930	TF 7 / 940	TF 43 / 960
CRUISE BPR		1.0	1.0	1.0
~~CRUISE BPR~~		~~4.0~~	~~5.0~~	~~6.0~~
CRUISE RPM		2.5	2.5	2.5
WEIGHT:				
O.E.W.				
A.O.E.W.				
O.E.W. + A.O.E.W. ~ LB		325,600	327,730	331,870
RANGE ~ N.MI.		3859	3871	3704
TAXI FUEL ~ LB		4015	3741	3613
TAKEDOFF FUEL ~ LB		2600	2400	2276
SUBSONIC CLIMB (TO M=0.85)				
FUEL ~ LB		17,445	15,437	14,115
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		52.3	46.3	43.8
SUPERSONIC CLIMB:				
FUEL ~ LB		57236	57442	59,252
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		201	220	239
CRUISE				
CD 900 @ M=2.7 ~ COUNTS		4.0	3.3	5.6
(N.MI./LB) INITIAL		.01260	.01239	.01194
WT. 350,000 LB	ALTITUDE ~ FT.	64192	63020	62786
	(L/D) MAX	7.300	7.950	7.627
	(L/D) CRUISE	7.845	7.841	7.841
	FN/g	27.599	26.135	26.305
	TSFC	1.4684	1.4873	1.5115
	RF	8274	8164	7886
	FUEL ~ LB	222,770	225,937	222,097
	DISTANCE ~ N.MI.	3370	3370	3191
	(N.MI./LB) FINAL	.01837	.01813	.01739
DESCENT				
FUEL ~ LB		3836	3863	3867
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		236	235	230
ILS FUEL ~ LB		1113	1029	1008
RESERVE FUEL ~ LB		93070	50,129	49,173
6% MISSION FUEL ~ LB		18542	18,591	18,401
MISSED APPROACH				
ALTERNATE (260 N.MI.)				
FUEL ~ LB		17716	15980	15578
AVG. CRUISE	RF	6078	6742	6977
	L/D	13.55	13.68	13.36
	TSFC	1.151	1.0472	0.9882
	WEIGHT ~ LB	415,888	416,093	419633
HOLD				
MACH		.475	.475	.475
FUEL ~ LB		16,812	15,558	15,194
L/D		14.28	14.35	14.03
TSFC		1.2061	1.1171	1.0561
AVG. WT. ~ LB		398,624	400,324	404,247
ILS APPROACH				

A/P 2
MT.W. = 150,000 LB
TEMPERATURE STD.

TABLE A.5

ENGINE / AIRFLOW		TF 6 / 1065	TF 7 / 940	TF 8 / 1000
CRUISE SFR		1.0	1.0	1.0
CRUISE R.F.		5.0	5.0	5.0
CRUISE R.F.AN		2.0	2.5	3.0
WEIGHTS				
O.E.W.				
A.O.E.W.				
O.E.W. + A.O.E.W. ~ LB		342730	327730	332160
RANGE ~ N.MI.		3541	3871	3790
TAXI FUEL ~ LB		3791	3741	3951
TAKEOFF FUEL ~ LB		2382	2400	2387
SUBSONIC CLIMB: (TO M=0.85)				
FUEL ~ LB		14699	15437	15280
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		36.9	46.3	44.6
SUPERSONIC CLIMB:				
FUEL ~ LB		52940	57442	53091
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		174	220	192
CRUISE				
CD POP & M=2.7 ~ COUNTS (N.MI./LB) INITIAL		5.1 .01224	3.3 .01239	3.9 .01234
WT. 150,000 LB	ALTITUDE ~ FT.	64596	63020	63356
	(L/D) MAX	7.836	7.950	7.913
	(L/D) CRUISE	7.792	7.841	7.818
	L/D	28.330	26.135	26.629
	TSFC	1.4873	1.4873	1.4804
	R/F	8113	8164	8178
	FUEL ~ LB	213,286	225,937	224,280
	DISTANCE ~ N.MI.	3097	3370	3321
	(N.MI./LB) FINAL	.01740	.01813	.01793
DESCENT				
FUEL ~ LB		4346	3863	4080
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		233	235	233
ILS FUEL ~ LB		1157	1029	1110
RESERVE FUEL ~ LB		52190	50,129	51325
6% MISSION FUEL ~ LB		17568	18,591	18251
MISSED APPROACH				
ALTERNATE (260 N.MI.)				
FUEL ~ LB		17573	15,980	16514
AVG. CRUISE	R/F	6393	6742	6618
	L/D	13.29	13.68	13.58
	TSFC	1.0729	1.0472	1.0595
	WEIGHT ~ LB	433,671	416,093	421,986
HOLD				
MACH		.475	.475	.475
FUEL ~ LB		17049	15,558	16561
L/D		14.01	14.35	14.23
TSFC		1.1491	1.1171	1.1645
AVG. WT. ~ LB		416,360	400,324	405,448
ILS APPROACH				

APPENDIX 2

Approximation to G. E. Turbofan

In a meeting with The Boeing Company on alternate cycles, the General Electric Co. discussed a mixed burning turbofan that they were evaluating. From its family of parametric engines, Boeing selected a duct burning turbofan with cruise BPR = .7, cruise $R_p = 4.7$ and cruise $R_{Fan} = 2.0$ (TFGE3) that more closely resembled the turbofan cycle that G.E. was evaluating. This turbofan cycle was compared against other Boeing parametric turbofans with similar engine parameters. The results, shown in Figure 18, show that to meet 118.5 airport noise and 108 EPNdb community noise, the optimum turbofan selected in this study with BPR = 1.0, $R_p = 5.0$, and $R_{Fan} = 2.5$ (TF7) is superior to the simulated G.E. turbofan.

AD 1546 D

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

MTW = 750,000 LB

P/L = 298 PASS.

STD. DAY, M=2.7

CUTBACK THRUST AT COMMUNITY FOR R/C = 500 FPM
AIRPORT NOISE AT 1500 FT FROM RUNWAY C




FIG. 18

CALC	AM	7/6/70	REVISED	DATE	APPROXIMATION TO GE TURBOFAN ENGINE, RANGE VS. AIRFLOW	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APP						
APP						
THE BOEING COMPANY					PAGE	53

APPENDIX 3

HIGH BYPASS RATIO, LOW FAN RATIO AFTERBURNING TURBOFANS


This appendix presents the results of the "first-cut" high BPR, low R_{fan} afterburning turbofan evaluation. Figure 18 shows supersonic range performance and climb thrust margin for turbofans with cruise BPR = 2.0 and 2.5 with cruise R_p = 4.0, and for turbofans with cruise BPR = 2.5 and 3.0 with cruise R_p = 5.0. The cruise R_{fan} for these four engines is about 1.5. These data show that decreasing BPR at a constant R_p increases range and that increasing R_p at constant BPR increases range. For comparison purposes, turbofan TF7 with cruise BPR = 1.0, R_p = 5.0, and R_{fan} = 2.5 is also shown. Figure 19 shows the effect of subsonic legs on mission range for the four "first-cut" turbofans. These data show that subsonic cruise performance improves by increasing cruise R_p from 4.0 to 5.0 and by decreasing cruise BPR.

Parametric range trends showing the effect of cruise BPR and cruise R_p for the ductburning turbofans are shown in Figure 20. Figure 21 shows the incremental effect of cruise BPR and R_p on the climb, cruise, and reserve portions of the mission range. Figure 22 shows the incremental effects of cruise BPR and R_p on mission range because of weight and pod drag changes. Detailed mission tabulations of the four "first-cut" afterburning turbofans are shown in Table A.6.

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

PRODUCTION AIRPLANE (298 PASS)

MTW = 150,000 LB



ENGINE AIRFLOW ~ LB/SEC.

FIG. 19

CALC	AM	1/21/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON, EFFECT OF CRUISE BPR AND CRUISE R_p ON RANGE	D6A11786-
CHECK			AM	1/26/70		
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 55

PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY

EFFECT OF SUBSONIC LEGS

MTW = 75000 LB


STD DAY

SUPERSONIC CRUISE M=2.7

SUBSONIC CRUISE M=0.9

AIRPORT NOISE = 115.5 PNdB

T.O. FL = 12,400 FT.



* SUBSONIC LEG CRUISE ALTITUDE IS PLACARD LIMITED AT 27000 FT.
I.E. BCA AT M=0.9 IS BELOW 27,000 FT.)

FIG. 20

CALC	MURUSS	1/21/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON, EFFECT OF SUBSONIC LEGS ON MISSION RANGE	D6A11786-5
CHECK			AM	1/26/70		
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 56

PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS

ENGINES SIZED FOR AIRPORT NOISE = 118.5 PNdB
AT 5,000 LB/ENGINE

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction




FIG 21

CALC	MORJSS	1/23/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN, PARAMETRIC RANGE TRENDS	D6A11786-5
CHECK			AM	1/26/70	EFFECT OF CRUISE BPR & CRUISE R _p ON NET RANGE	
APR						
APR						
					THE BOEING COMPANY	PAGE 57

PARAMETRIC ENGINE TRENDS ENGINE PERFORMANCE EFFECTS

ENGINES SEED FOR AIRPORT NOISE = 111.5 PNdB




FIG. 22

CALC	MORLIS	1/22/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON EFFECT OF CRUISE BPR AND CRUISE R_p ON RANGE DUE TO CLIMB CRUISE AND RESERVES. THE BOEING COMPANY	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APR						
APR						
						PAGE 58

PARAMETRIC ENGINE TRENDS
WEIGHT AND DRAG EFFECTS
ENGINE SIZED FOR AIRPORT NOISE = 114.5 PNdB





FIG. 23

CALC	MORLESS	1/22/70	REVISED	DATE	TURBOFAN ENGINE COMPARISON, EFFECT OF CRUISE BPR AND CRUISE R_p ON RANGE DUE TO WEIGHT AND PDB DRAG THE BOEING COMPANY	D6A11786-5
CHECK						
APP						
APP						PAGE 59

A/P = PROD A/P (298 MASS)

MTW = 750,000 LB

TEMP = STD. DAY

TABLE A-6

ENGINE - AIRFLOW		33-940	15-950	18-940	30-916
CRUISE BPR		2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0
CRUISE RP		4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
WEIGHTS					
OEW		322760	324530	324600	320940
ΔOEW					
OEW + ΔOEW					
RANGE ~ N.MI.		3390	3435	3282	3604
TAXI FUEL ~ LB		3398	3182	2825	3434
TAKEOFF FUEL ~ LB		4877	4582	5109	4324
SUBSONIC CLIMB (TO M=0.95)					
FUEL ~ LB		22916	20794	23613	20415
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		60.6	54.5	66.4	52
SUPERSONIC CLIMB					
FUEL		71590	69601	75127	67221
DISTANCE		201.7	204.1	209.1	208.4
CRUISE					
CD PD & M=27, COUNTS (N.MI./LB) INITIAL		4.7 .01195	4.5 .01174	4.7 .01170	4.3 .01206
(ALTITUDE ~ FT)		64503	63404	63547	63278
(L/D) MAX		7.803	7.776	7.775	7.795
(L/D) CRUISE		28.163	26.848	27.040	26.595
FN/g		1.5931	1.6017	1.6240	1.5569
TSFC		7585	7518	7414	7754
RF		204,699	210,625	200265	215762
FUEL ~ LB		2895.5	2945.7	2775.6	3111.5
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		.01695	.01683	.01654	.01744
(N.MI./LB) FINAL					
DESCENT					
FUEL ~ LB		3818	3837	3797	3711
DISTANCE ~ N.MI.		232.5	231	231.4	231.7
ILS FUEL ~ LB		1129	924	1023	945
RESERVE FUEL ~ LB		52512	49620	51340	51010
6% MISSION FUEL ~ LB		18746	18813	18706	18945
MISSED APPROACH					
ALTERNATE (260 N.MI.)					
FUEL ~ LB		19474	17369	19595	17575
RF		5489	6158	5457	6029
L/D		12.89	13.22	12.41	13.38
TSFC		1.2199	1.1083	1.1909	1.1455
WEIGHT ~ LB		411539	411257	412041	408828
HOLD					
M		.450	.475	.450	.475
FUEL		14292	13438	13039	14489
L/D		13.69	14.15	13.68	14.20
TSFC		.9931	.9619	.9025	1.0494
AVG. WT.		394656	395854	395725	392796
ILS APPROACH					

D6A12786-5

60

APPENDIX 4.0

Pod Drag Comparisons

This appendix presents the formulae that were used to calculate pod drags for this parametric study. In addition, pod drag comparisons of the best engine of each cycle are shown in Table A7. Pod sketches of these engines are shown in Figure 24.

The pod drag formulae for cruise conditions at $M = 2.7$, altitude = 60,000 ft and $S_{Ref.} = 7700 \text{ ft}^2$ are:

- o Afterburning Turbojet (Base Pod PPID - 108)

$$C_D \times 10^4 = .0070 A_{wet} - .00152(D_{max}^2 - D_{inlet}^2) + .000162\alpha^2(D_{max}^2 - D_{exit}^2) + 1.0$$

- o Dry Jet (Base Pod PPID-112)

$$C_D \times 10^4 = .0105 A_{wet} - .001505(D_{max}^2 - D_{inlet}^2) + .0001012\alpha^2(D_{max}^2 - D_{exit}^2) + 1.0$$

- o Duct Burning Turbofan (Base Pod PPID-105, Rev. A)

$$C_D \times 10^4 = .00711 A_{wet} - .001285(D_{max}^2 - D_{inlet}^2) + .000153\alpha^2(D_{max}^2 - D_{exit}^2) + 1.0$$

Where

- A_{wet} = External wetted area of one pod (ft^2)
- D = Diameter (inches)
- α = Boattail angle (degrees)

TABLE A7
DRAG COMPARISON

ENGINES SELECTED FOR:


118.5 PNdb AIRPORT NOISE

108 EPNdb COMMUNITY NOISE

ENGINE TYPE	AIRFLOW ~LB./SEC.	MAX. DIAMETER ~IN.	BOATAIL ANGLE ~DEG	Δ DRAG  ~COUNTS
AFTERBURNING TURBOJET WITH SUPPRESSOR	710	99.2	3.0	+1.1
DRY TURBOJET	920	101	3.25	+1.9
TURBOFAN	1100	107	2.50	+2.0

 RELATIVE TO UNSUPPRESSED AFTERBURNING TURBOJET
 AT 633 LB./SEC.

FIGURE 24
PARAMETRIC ENGINE STUDY



ENGINE TYPE	POD DRAWING	AIRFLOW ~ LB/SEC	MAX. DIAMETER ~ INCHES	Δ GEAR LENGTH REQUIRED * INCHES
AFTERBURNING TURBOJET	PPID-108	633 ▽	85.0	-3.9
DRY TURBOJET	PPID-113	920	101.0	+8.2
TURBOFAN	PPID-105A	1100	107.0	+17.7

* LENGTH TO BE ADDED TO PPD LANDING GEAR TO MAINTAIN 14°
LANDING ROTATION CLEARANCE.

▽ UNSUPPRESSED, F.L. < 10,500 FT.

APPENDIX 5.0

Engine Parameter Comparison

This appendix presents a tabulation of cruise and sea level static values of BPR, R_p and R_{Far} for the engines evaluated in this study.

AD 1544 D

REV SYM

BOEING

NO.

D6A11796-5

PAGE

64

6-7000

TABLE A8

ENGINE TYPE	ENGINE NUMBER	CRUISE $M = 2.7$ 60,000 ft.			SEA LEVEL STATIC		
		Bypass Ratio BPR	Compressor Pressure Ratio R_p	Fan Pressure Ratio R_{Fan}	Bypass Ratio BPR	Compressor Pressure Ratio R_p	Fan Pressure Ratio R_{Fan}
Afterburning Turbojet	TJ-2A	-	5	-	-	12.66	-
Dry Turbojet	TJ-1D	-	4.0	-	-	9.24	-
	TJ-2D	-	5.0	-	-	12.66	-
	TJ-3D	-	6.0	-	-	16.29	-
Ductburning Turbofan	TF-2	0.5	5.0	2.5	.487	12.7	4.96
	TF-6	1.0	5.0	2.0	.879	13.21	3.66
	TF-7	1.0	5.0	2.5	.974	12.81	4.99
	TF-8	1.0	5.0	3.0	1.055	12.28	6.26
	TF-10	1.5	5.0	2.2	1.381	13.16	4.24
	TF-25	1.0	4.0	2.5	1.062	8.97	4.71
	TF-43	1.0	6.0	2.5	.918	16.85	5.18

AD 1346 D

