

AD-A116 774

AIR FORCE INST OF TECH WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH
LABYRINTH SEAL EFFECTS ON ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM STABILITY.(U)
MAY 82 A J PAVELKO


F/6 13/9

UNCLASSIFIED AFIT/NR/82-10T

NI

1 of 2

AD A
1-6724



①

UNCLASS

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS
BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER AFIT/NR/82-10T ✓		2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A116774		3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Labyrinth Seal Effects On Rotor Bearing System Stability		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED THESIS/DISSERTATION			
7. AUTHOR(s) Anthony John Pavelko		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER			
1. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS AFIT STUDENT AT: University of Texas at Austin		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)			
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS AFIT/NR WPAFB OH 45433		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS			
12. REPORT DATE May 1982		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 170			
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASS			
15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED					
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)					
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: IAW AFR 190-17 22 JUN 1982 LYNN E. WOLAVER Dean for Research and Professional Development AFIT, Wright-Patterson AFB OH					
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)					
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) ATTACHED					

FILED
JUL 9 1982

82-07 07 059

AD A116774

DTIC FILE COPY

ABSTRACT

↓ This thesis presents a stability analysis of rotor bearing system operation affected by a single labyrinth seal. Labyrinth seals, primarily intended for leakage control in turbines, have been observed to affect rotor stability in high pressure steam turbines. A small experimental rotor bearing system, existing in the Mechanical Engineering Department, and a compatible labyrinth seal are the subjects of this analysis. Linear analytical models of these rotor bearing and labyrinth seal systems, both isolated and coupled, are developed. Labyrinth seal geometry and pressure variations generate various affects on rotor bearing system stability. These affects can help develop labyrinth seal design criteria directed toward high pressure turbine stability enhancement.

AFIT RESEARCH ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to ascertain the value and/or contribution of research accomplished by students or faculty of the Air Force Institute of Technology (ATC). It would be greatly appreciated if you would complete the following questionnaire and return it to:

AFIT/NR
Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433

RESEARCH TITLE: Labyrinth Seal Effects On Rotor Bearing System Stability

AUTHOR: Anthony John Pavelko

RESEARCH ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS:

1. Did this research contribute to a current Air Force project?

☐ a. YES

☐ b. NO

2. Do you believe this research topic is significant enough that it would have been researched (or contracted) by your organization or another agency if AFIT had not?

☐ a. YES

☐ b. NO

3. The benefits of AFIT research can often be expressed by the equivalent value that your agency achieved/received by virtue of AFIT performing the research. Can you estimate what this research would have cost if it had been accomplished under contract or if it had been done in-house in terms of manpower and/or dollars?

☐ a. MAN-YEARS _____

☐ b. \$ _____

4. Often it is not possible to attach equivalent dollar values to research, although the results of the research may, in fact, be important. Whether or not you were able to establish an equivalent value for this research (3. above), what is your estimate of its significance?

☐ a. HIGHLY
SIGNIFICANT

☐ b. SIGNIFICANT

☐ c. SLIGHTLY
SIGNIFICANT

☐ d. OF NO
SIGNIFICANCE

5. AFIT welcomes any further comments you may have on the above questions, or any additional details concerning the current application, future potential, or other value of this research. Please use the bottom part of this questionnaire for your statement(s).

NAME _____

GRADE _____

POSITION _____

ORGANIZATION _____

LOCATION _____

STATEMENT(s): _____

FOLD DOWN ON OUTSIDE - SEAL WITH TAPE

AFIT/NR
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433
OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE. \$300



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 73236 WASHINGTON D.C.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

AFIT/ DAA
Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433



FOLD IN

S 7-10

LABYRINTH SEAL EFFECTS ON ROTOR
BEARING SYSTEM STABILITY

BY

ANTHONY JOHN PAVELKO
B.S. Mechanical Engineering

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

May, 1982

LABYRINTH SEAL EFFECTS ON ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM STABILITY

APPROVED:



Account for	☒
DATE	
TIME	
BY	
REMARKS	
A	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Nomenclature	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: System Description	14
2.A Rotor Bearing System	14
2.B Labyrinth Seal System	17
Chapter 3: Analytical Modeling	18
3.A Overview	18
3.B Rotor Bearing System Modeling	20
3.B.1 Non Linear Equation Derivation	20
3.B.2 Linearization	28
3.C Labyrinth Seal Modeling	33
3.C.1 Non Linear Equation Derivation	33
3.C.2 Linearization	38
3.D. Simulation Procedure	52
3.D.1 Isolated Rotor Bearing System Testing	53
3.D.1.A Nonlinear Model Programming (RW5).	53
3.D.1.B Linear Model Programming (RWE4)	59
3.D.2 Labyrinth Seal Testing	60
3.D.2.A Linear Model Programming - Coupled Labyrinth Seal and Rotor Bearing System (RWE4S)	60
3.D.2.B Linear Model Programming - Isolated Seal and Disc (RWE4P)	62
3.D.3 Parameter Variations	62
Chapter 4: Results	66

	Page
4.A Overview	66
4.B Rotor Bearing System Results	67
4.B.1 Nonlinear Modeling (RW5) Results	67
4.B.2 Linear Modeling (RWE4) Results	68
4.C Isolated Seal and Disc (RWE4P) Results	81
4.C.1 Overview	81
4.C.2 Seal Strip Separation (l) Variation	84
4.C.3 Disc Radius (r) Variation	88
4.C.4 Upstream Pressure (P_A) Variation	91
4.C.5 Disc to Seal Base Nominal Clearance (h_n) Variation	91
4.C.6 Disc Angular Velocity (ω) Variation	96
4.C.7 Seal Divergence ($a < b$) Variation	96
4.C.8 Seal Convergence ($a > b$) Variation	96
4.C.9 Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure	103
4.C.10 General Trends	103
4.D Coupled Rotor Bearing and Seal System (RWE4S) Results	107
4.D.1 Overview	107
4.D.2 Seal Strip Separation (l) Variation	107
4.D.3 Disc Radius (r) Variation	112
4.D.4 Upstream Pressure (P_A) Variation	116
4.D.5 Disc to Seal Base Nominal Clearance (h_n) Variation	120
4.D.6 Disc Angular Velocity (ω) Variation	120
4.D.7 Seal Divergence Variation	130
4.D.8 Seal Convergence Variation	130
4.D.9 Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure	134
4.D.10 Speed (ω) Variation at Extreme Seal Divergence	138
4.D.11 Seal and Rotor Bearing System Interactions. 4.D.11.A Seal Influence on Rotor Bearing System Modes	138
4.D.11.B Rotor Bearing System Influence on Seal Modes	142
4.E Summary	147
Chapter 5: Conclusions	149
Appendix A: Computer Program Listings	150

A.1 Nonlinear Rotor Bearing System Programming (RW5) .	150
A.2 Linear Rotor Bearing System Programming (RWE4) . .	154
A.3 Linear Rotor Bearing System and Labyrinth Seal - Coupled (RWE4S) and Isolated Seal and Disc (RWE4P) Programming	157
Appendix B:	164
B.1 Beaman Bearing Coefficients	164
B.2 XY Bearing Coefficients (Equation 3.28)	164
B.3 Incremental Seal Strip Mass Flow Rate Terms (Equation 3.49)	165
B.4 Friction Coefficients in Seal Momentum Equation (Equation 3.52)	166
Bibliography	168
Vita	170

NOMENCLATURE

- a Seal strip dimension (in)
- A Area (in^2), Matrix descriptor, Variable, Seal position identifier
- b Damping coefficient (lbf sec/in), Seal strip dimension (in)
- B Damping coefficient (lbf sec/in), Variable, Seal position identifier
- c Bearing to journal radial clearance (in)
- C Seal position identifier, Variable
- $\mathcal{F}$ Function
- e Eccentricity (in), Natural logarithm base = 2.718
- E Modulus of elasticity (lbf/in²)
- f Friction factor (dimensionless), Function
- F Force (lbf)
- h Minimum bearing to journal or seal base to disc radial clearance (in)
- H Related to h
- I Moment of inertia (lbf in sec²)
- k Stiffness factor (lbf/in), Specific heat ratio (dimensionless)
- K Stiffness coefficient (lbf/in), Constant coefficient
- l Seal chamber length (in), Journal length (in)
- L_{spt} Rotor-bearing system overall length (in)
- m Mass (lbf sec²/in)
- M Mass coefficient (lbf sec²/in), Mach number (dimensionless)
- n Exponent in seal friction relations, Integer
- O Fixed reference point
- P Pressure (lbf/in²), Momentum (lbf sec)
- q Generalized coordinate

r	Disc radius (in), Journal radius (in)
R	Gas constant ($\text{in}^2/\text{sec}^2 \text{ } ^\circ\text{R}$)
Re	Reynolds number (dimensionless)
s	Seal circumferential distance independent variable (in)
t	Time (sec)
T	Temperature ($^\circ\text{R}$), Kinetic energy (lbf in)
u	Seal circumferential fluid velocity (in/sec)
U	Disc or journal surface velocity (in/sec)
v	Eigenvector element (dimensionless), Velocity (in/sec)
V	Potential energy (lbf in)
W	Weight (lbf)
x	Variable, Coordinate
y	Variable, Coordinate
Y	Related to y
z	Variable, Coordinate

Greek

Δ	Finite increment
γ	Seal angular position variable (radians)
δ	Variation
ϵ	Eccentricity ratio (dimensionless) = e/c
θ	Bearing angular position variable (radians)
λ	Eigenvalue (dimensionless)
μ	Dynamic viscosity (lbf sec/in ²)
$\hat{F}$	Generalized force (lbf)
ν	Kinematic viscosity = $\mu RT/P$ (in ² /sec)
π	Constant ≈ 3.14

ρ	Density (lbf sec/in ⁵)
τ	Frictional shear stress (lbf/in ²)
ϕ	Journal attitude angle (radian)
ω	Angular velocity (rad/sec)

Subscripts

letters Identification

numbers Identification

A	Seal location, Axial
B	Seal location, Bearing
C	Seal location, Chamber
d	Disc
e	Eccentricity direction
f	Related to friction
h	High clearance area, Related to bearing or seal minimum clearance
i	Inside, Particular value
j	General value
J	Journal
L	Low clearance area, Left
n	Nominal value
o	Outside, Initial value
P	Related to seal chamber pressure
R	Right
s	Seal, Steady
S	Stiffness, Seal circumferential distance

T	Total, Differentiating subscript
u	Related to seal circumferential fluid velocity
W	Whirl, Discharge coefficient
x	Coordinate frame direction
y	Coordinate frame direction
z	Coordinate frame direction

Greek

ϕ	Related to journal attitude angle
--------	-----------------------------------

Other

—	Vector or matrix
---	------------------

Superscripts

•	$\frac{d}{dt}$
••	$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}$
/	Other value, $\frac{d}{dk}$ ($\tau = tU/r$)
*	Coenergy
number/variable	Exponentiation

Steam Turbine (Figure 1.1) instability in the form of precession or whirl ($\dot{\phi}$) of a rotor about a fixed reference position (Figure 1.2 - Turborotor, circumferential cross section) has received extensive study throughout this century. Such instability is characterized by cross coupled orthogonal forces acting on a turborotor to promote rotor precession (Figure 1.2) [1]. Such instability is generally classified as either forced or self excited.

Forced rotor whirl is caused by mass unbalance. It is characterized by: (1) a whirl frequency that equals rotor rotational frequency, (2) whirl amplitudes that peak within a narrow speed band (Figure 1.3 - Forced vibration attributes in Rotating Machinery), and (3) an absence of oscillatory rotor fiber stress [2]. This form of instability is usually corrected through the use of balance weights. When balance weight application does not restore turborotor stability, self excited vibrations exist.

Self excited vibrations generally are caused by flow or friction energy that generates rotor whirl [3]. Such vibrations are characterized by: (1) a whirl frequency that is nearly constant and independent of rotor rotational speed and is at or near a rotor natural frequency, (2) whirl amplitudes that suddenly increase as a particular rotor rotational speed value is achieved and continue to increase with increasing rotor speed, (3) alternating stresses in rotor fibers, caused by nonsynchronous whirl, that make self excited whirl more destructive than forced whirl [2].

[17]

O - Static Rotor Position

O' - Steady Running Rotor

Position




Figure 1.2 - Cross coupled Orthogonal Forces Acting on a Turborotor

Simplified Circumferential Cross-sectional View




Fig. 1.3 - ATTRIBUTES OF FORCED VIBRATION OR RESONANCE IN ROTATING MACHINERY [5]

Because this instability form is as complicated as it is destructive it requires additional attention.

Instability phenomena such as Oil Whip and steam excited whirl are common forms of self excited rotor whirl. Oil Whip is journal bearing induced rotor whirl that occurs when a pressurized bearing film thickens and begins to trail the position of minimum journal to bearing clearance. (Figure 1.4 - Oil Whip) [4].

This trailing high pressure fluid region imposes a force, F_w , on the journal's centroid, normal to rotor eccentricity, e (OO' in Figure 1.4), and in the direction of rotor rotation. Rotor whirl at a frequency of $\frac{1}{2}$ that of rotor rotational speed (ω) results. This whirl is further




Figure 1.4 - Oil Whip Transverse cross-sectional view

defined as "forward" whirl since precession ($\dot{\phi}$) occurs in the same direction as rotor rotation. Oil Whip occurs when rotor rotational frequency is increased beyond a system particular value known as the "Stability Threshold" [4]. Although improvements in bearing design have increased this threshold value in many rotor bearing systems, steam turbines must still contend with other sources of self excited whirl.

Self excited whirl energy transformed from steam flow has increasingly affected steam turbine stability with the advent of increasing upstream turbine pressures. Whirl forces (Figure 1.2), necessary to cause "Steam Whirl", are produced by unbalanced torques [3]. This torque unbalance results from higher turbine blade energy losses at high shroud to blade row clearance areas. Caused by an initial rotor deflection, steam leakage at these large clearance areas will exceed leakage at opposite smaller clearance areas (Figure 1.5). Consequently, the turbine blades nearest these high clearance annular sections will receive less fluid energy than will opposite small clearance annular section blading. The resulting unbalanced torques produce a force that acts on the rotor's centroidal axis and is orthogonal to rotor eccentricity (e).

Nonsynchronous forward whirl at the fundamental natural frequency of the rotor results. This whirl form is load dependent because degree of torque unbalance increases with increasing upstream pressure. Since Steam Whirl is a relatively new phenomenon present correction methods are limited to bearing modification and/or rotor stiffening [3]. These techniques, such as the use of tilting pad bearings, often introduce new problems. For example, tilting pad bearings provide a reduced defense against mass unbalance instability with respect to standard cylindrical




Figure 1.5 - Steam Leakage Between Turbine Shroud and Blade Row

journal bearings [5]. Therefore, alternate stabilization methods, with minimal effects, are needed to enhance whirl protection for high pressure steam turbines.

One source of such whirl protection has existed since the inception of the steam turbine. It is derived from cross coupled orthogonal forces generated by steam flow through labyrinth seals. Labyrinth seals were originally intended to reduce steam leakage between rotor and stator turbine elements by providing flow resistance [6]. Alford [7] suggested that these seals were a source of instability when rotor deflection caused seal flow area at a longitudinal cross section to be converging (Figure 1.6b). Correspondingly, he also believed that divergent seal flow area enhanced rotor stability (Figure 1.6c).




Figure 1.6 - Labyrinth Seal Geometries


Unfortunately, his analyses neglected circumferential flow through the seal cavity. Spurk and Keiper [8] made a claim directly opposite to Alford's -- that divergent seal geometry promoted instability. Unfortunately, their analysis was also incomplete. They neglected rotor rotation. Because of such disagreement, as well as potential for stability enhancement, labyrinth seal forces require more thorough study.

Shatoff [5] provides an explanation supporting Alford while still suggesting that divergent and convergent seal geometries can be either stabilizing or destabilizing depending upon other operating conditions. Figure 1.7a depicts convergent seal geometry. Here, F_e and F_ϕ are components of the resultant force produced by the seal (F_{Ls}). Since the whirl component of F_{Ls} (F_ϕ) exceeds the bearing damping force, forward whirl at the rotor's fundamental natural frequency results. Alternately, divergent seal geometry (Figure 1.7b) induces backward whirl at an otherwise stable rotor speed (ω).*

This suggests that "negative" bearing damping (reversed br ϕ vector direction with respect to Figure 1.7a), associated with rotor speed increase beyond the threshold of Oil Whip can be offset (Figure 1.7c). Therefore, by increasing the Oil Whip stability threshold, divergent seal geometry enhances rotor bearing system stability. Similarly, since Steam Whirl is a forward whirl phenomenon that enhances oil whip instability, it too might be counteracted by backward whirl inducing divergent seal geometry. Although seemingly plausible, experimental verification is needed to prove such a theory. Wright's [9] development and operation of a seal and disc test apparatus partially

* As defined by Oil Whip

a) Convergent Seal



F_B = Resultant Bearing Fluid Force


$F_{bs} = k_s e + k_b e$
= Shaft and Bearing Elastic Forces

F_e = Static (elastic) Seal Force

F_ϕ = Dynamic (damping) Seal Force

br_ϕ = Bearing Damping Force

b) Divergent Seal



c) Divergent Seal Beyond Oil Whip Threshold




Figure 1.7 - Labyrinth Seal Forces

satisfies this requirement.

Wright's model was not representative of actual high pressure steam turbines. Its 8-inch diameter disc and .05 inch nominal seal strip to disc clearance were much smaller than their high pressure steam turbine counterparts. Additionally, he did not attempt to accurately scale rotor surface speed and friction factors. However, his experimental efforts did provide a basis for follow-on experimentation with actual high pressure turbine seals.

Wright's work also provides verification of Alford's theory that divergent seal geometry is stabilizing. Therefore, his results are probably, at least, qualitatively reliable and warrant some discussion.

With divergent seal geometry, Wright produced strong, self excited backward whirl -- an effect possibly capable of counteracting the forward whirl of Steam Whirl and Oil Whip. Although his model was not ideally suited for accurate convergent seal geometry experimentation, his results did indicate reduced forward whirl stability for convergent geometry relative to divergent and straight ($a=b$ in Figure 1.6) geometries. Such consistency and apparent plausibility encouraged him to consider using his results as a basis for alternate turbine seal design. He believed that if seal geometry affected rotor stability, then design of labyrinth seals to enhance stability was possible.

Such design information must provide formulas for seal parameters and materials and be applicable for the high pressures and speeds of today's high pressure turbines. Analytical modeling is required to provide such mathematical relations. The first step in such modeling is analytical verification of Wright's results, particularly, that of stabilizing divergent seal geometry. Additionally, information

explaining the effect that other seal parameters have on rotor stability is needed. For example, increasing seal diameter is expected to enhance stability because increasing rotor and seal surface area should increase fluid friction -- an energy dissipating and, therefore, stabilizing phenomenon. Similarly, increasing seal strip separation (δ in Figure 1.6) should also be stabilizing.

If the individual effects of such parameters can be isolated, then design criteria will have a basis for development. Such information can allow derivation of formulas relating seal parameters and rotor stability.

The purpose of this thesis was to provide such information. Analytical verification of stability threshold increase due to divergent seal geometry was its principle aim. Since stability was defined in




Figure 1.8 - Myrick Rotorbearing System Model with
Single Labyrinth Seal [4]

terms of frequency the analytical model developed in this thesis produced root locus output. This model used a rotor bearing system similar to one described by Myrick, adding a single labyrinth seal (Figure 1.8). It was also similar to Wright's experimental apparatus. It simulated divergent, convergent, and straight seal geometries as well as variations in seal dimensions, pressure, and rotor speed. Stabilizing or destabilizing trends were available after each parameter was separately incremented.

This thesis presentation will first describe its model physically. Components will be identified and located relative to each other. Operating conditions such as pressure and temperature will be presented.

Derivation of the analytical model will follow system description. This chapter will present assumptions, derive equations of motion, and prepare these equations for computer programming. The schemes needed for such programming, as well as a listing of model parameter exercises, will also be presented. General information needed to understand these computer programs will be made available.

Test results will present and explain output generated by these computer programs. Eigenvalues will be graphed on root locus plots. Trends will be identified and explained.

Finally, conclusions based upon test results will be presented. This final chapter will, ultimately, satisfy the aim of this thesis. It will state its success or failure.

2.A Rotor Bearing System

The rotor bearing system described by Myrick served as the basis of this study (Figure 1.8). It consisted of 3 masses (2 journals and a disc) separated by 2 flexible shafts. Myrick's purpose was the study of rotor bearing system whirl using realistic incompressible film hydrodynamic journal bearings. Since analytical description of such bearings was complex, lengthy, and required considerable computer simulation time, Myrick's bearing model was modified to assure an infinitesimally short bearing, i.e., a bearing with fluid flow in the circumferential direction only (Figure 2.1) described by the following reduced version of the Reynold's equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(h^3 \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{6\mu U}{r} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} + 12\mu U \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \quad (2.1)$$

Here, θ was an independent variable representing circumferential angular distance. Its datum, per Figure 2.1, coincided with the line of centers at the position of maximum journal to bearing clearance. Minimum journal to bearing clearance was represented by h . Dynamic viscosity was represented by μ , journal surface speed by U , and bearing fluid pressure by P . Axial distance was represented by z .

This short bearing simplification is supported by Myrick's

conclusion that hydrodynamic moments in finite length journal bearings




Figure 2.1 - Short Bearing Circumferential Cross-section

are small compared with shaft bending moments. Additional approximations consistent with this short bearing assumption are: [10]

- (1) Bearing and journal curvatures are small compared with film thickness.
- (2) The pressure and journal to bearing clearance (h) gradients in the axial direction are much less than those in the vertical direction (y in Figure 2.1). i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \ll \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} \text{ and } \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \ll \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \quad (\text{Short Bearing})$$

(3) $h = c + e \cos \theta$ = minimum journal to bearing clearance where c equals radial clearance between a concentric journal and bearing.

(4) The bearing fluid is incompressible and has constant viscosity.

(5) Bearings are rigid and stationary.

The two flexible shafts were assumed to be massless. They had circular cross sections, homogeneous compositions, and no damping properties (completely elastic). These assumptions were consistent with finite element modeling necessary for computer simulation. Shaft stiffness in bending was described by the relation:

$$k_s = \frac{48EI}{L_{sp}^3} \quad (2.2)$$

The centrally located disc and both journals were assumed to behave as point masses. i.e., tilting and/or deformation was neglected. Furthermore, axial displacement was also neglected. Because eccentricity ratios ($\epsilon = e/c$) in this analysis did not exceed .5, Myrick's assumption of constant rotor speed (ω) applied for this model.* This implied an absence of shaft twist since constant rotational speed for all masses required identical rotational speed for all masses. Therefore, elastic shaft deformation occurred in bending only and mass displacement occurred only in a plane transverse to its axial steady state rotor position.

* Myrick's upper limit for constant rotor speed was $\epsilon = .7$

2.B Labyrinth Seal System

The model labyrinth seal (Figure 2.2) was concentrically located about the central disc for any and all rotor bearing system steady running conditions (constant speed). Air was used as the working fluid through and within the seal to facilitate possible experimental duplication of this analysis. Downstream pressure, P_B , was constant and identical for most simulations. It represented exhaust into an ambient environment. In accordance with Kearton [11] and Kostyuk [12], fluid temperature was considered constant and axial fluid kinetic energy was considered to be completely destroyed within the seal chamber.




Figure 2.2 - Model Labyrinth Seal

3.A Overview

Analytical modeling of this system was actually accomplished in three phases. Each phase consisted of equation derivation and computer simulation for a particular analytical model. Equation derivation for all models occurred first followed by explanations of simulation procedures.

Phase 1 developed the nonlinear rotor bearing system model. Equations of motion were derived for the rotor bearing and labyrinth seal systems separately. Using a finite difference time integration scheme, rotor bearing system operation was compared with Myrick's observation of stability threshold.

In phase 2, these rotor bearing system equations were linearized, reduced to first order form, and assembled in matrix form [1]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \underline{I} \\ -\underline{M}^{-1}\underline{K} & -\underline{M}^{-1}\underline{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \underline{q} \end{Bmatrix} = \lambda \begin{Bmatrix} \underline{q} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

This formulation allowed the eigenvalues, λ , to be determined using the QR algorithm.* Corresponding eigenvectors were then obtained by subjecting the matrix in equation 3.2 to Gaussian Elimination.

* QRHMOD - available on METAPE and DYNSSYS Mechanical Engineering
Department computer files.

$$[\underline{M}\lambda^2 + \underline{B}\lambda + \underline{K}] \{\underline{v}\} = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

Eigenvalues allowed root locus system representation while eigenvectors described relative state variable magnitudes in each discrete mode of system behavior. When results from these formulations matched those of Shapiro and Colsher [1] rotor bearing system modeling verification was confirmed since they similarly modeled Myrick's system*. With this assurance, a labyrinth seal model was incorporated into this rotor bearing system model during the third phase.

Labyrinth seal nonlinear modeling was more difficult than that for the rotor bearing system since both time and circumferential seal distance were bases for state variable integration. It required the use of a finite element labyrinth seal model, needed to effect seal circumferential distance integration. The expense of such an effort, in computer simulation time, was unjustified. Contrary to experience with the rotor bearing system nonlinear modeling, comparison with a nonexistent and proven seal model was impossible. Comparison of nonlinear and linear seal models' results had little value since both models derive from the same equations. Therefore, nonlinear labyrinth seal modeling did not occur beyond derivation of system equations as required for linear modeling.

Linear labyrinth seal modeling took a form somewhat different

* Calculation details are not available. Figures 4.4b and 4.5b contain these results.

from that for the rotor bearing system. Since linearization of equations of motion could not eliminate partial derivative terms, assumed solution forms were substituted for each state variable. The result was four first order, time dependent differential equations with solution form coefficients as dependent variables. The resulting matrix was subjected to the QR algorithm and Gaussian Elimination both separately and coupled to the rotor bearing system's linear model matrix. As a result, eigenvalues and eigenvectors from coupled and isolated systems were compared for a complete stability analysis.

3.B Rotor Bearing System Modeling

3.B.1 Nonlinear Equation Derivation

Initial analytical modeling of Myrick's rotor bearing system required adequate description of bearing film forces on each journal. Beaman [13] has accomplished such an analysis.

Starting from the reduced Reynold's equation (equation 2.1), an expression describing bearing pressure per unit axial distance was obtained:

$$P = -\frac{\mu}{2} \left[\frac{4}{rh^3} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} + \frac{2}{h^3} \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \right] l^3 \quad (3.3)$$

where r = journal radius

Forces normal to and in the eccentricity direction (e - Figure 3.1) were derived by integrating bearing film pressure around the journal circumference:

$$F_e = \int_0^{\pi} P \cos \theta \, r \, d\theta \quad (3.4a)$$

$$F_\phi = \int_0^{\pi} P \sin \theta \, r \, d\theta \quad (3.4b)$$




Figure 3.1 - Bearing Description, Circumferential Cross Section

These forces are generated by the bearing film and act on each journal's centroid. After integration, equations 3.4 become:

$$F_e = -\frac{\mu l^3 U}{2c^2} \left[\frac{(1-2\phi')2\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} + \frac{\pi\varepsilon'(1+2\varepsilon^2)}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^{5/2}} \right] \quad (3.5a)$$

$$F_\phi = -\frac{\mu l^3 U}{2c^2} \left[\frac{(2\phi'-1)\pi\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon^2)^{3/2}} - \frac{4\varepsilon'\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} \right] \quad (3.5b)$$

(note: ε' and ϕ' involve differentiation with respect to $T = \frac{tU}{r}$)

Conversion to a standard x-y coordinate system (Figure 3.1) is easily accomplished using the following relations:

$$F_x = (F_e) \sin \phi + (F_\phi) \cos \phi \quad (3.6a)$$

$$F_y = -(F_e) \cos \phi + (F_\phi) \sin \phi \quad (3.6b)$$

Equations 3.6 apply to both left and right bearings. They can be considered to be generalized forces acting on each journal's centroid (Figure 3.2) [14].

Figure 3.2 depicts Myrick's model with nonlinear short bearing forces and linear x and y direction springs connecting each journal to the central disc. From this figure and Chapter 2 assumptions, two generalized coordinates for each mass were assigned (Figure 3.3).

Since all constraints imposed upon this system were holonomic, Lagrange's equations were used to derive its equations of motion [14]. Starting with the central disc, a kinetic coenergy expression was derived.

$$T_d^* = \frac{1}{2} m_d (\dot{x}_1^2 + \dot{x}_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} I_{Ad} \omega^2 \quad (3.7)$$

Disc potential energy was stated as:

$$V_d = \frac{1}{2} k_x [(x_1 - x_3)^2 + (x_1 - x_5)^2] + \frac{1}{2} k_y [(x_2 - x_4)^2 + (x_2 - x_6)^2] \quad (3.8)$$

Combining these expressions, the disc Lagrangian was expressed:

$$\mathcal{L}_d = T_d^* - V_d = \frac{1}{2} m_d (\dot{x}_1^2 + \dot{x}_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} I_{Ad} \omega^2 - \frac{1}{2} k_x [(x_1 - x_3)^2 + (x_1 - x_5)^2] - \frac{1}{2} k_y [(x_2 - x_4)^2 + (x_2 - x_6)^2] \quad (3.9)$$

Lagrange's equations (equation 3.10) for the disc were then formulated, realizing that all forces acting on the disc were conservative ($\hat{\mathbf{Q}} = 0$) and that rotor angular velocity, ω , was constant and, therefore, not a generalized coordinate.




Figure 3.2 - Analytical Rotor Bearing System Model




Figure 3.3 - Generalized Coordinate Assignment

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{x}_j} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_j} = \approx_j \quad (3.10)$$

For coordinate x_1 (Figure 3.3 - G.C. assignment):

$$\ddot{x}_1 = - \frac{k_x}{m_d} (x_1 - x_3) - \frac{k_x}{m_d} (x_1 - x_5) \quad (3.11)$$

Similarly, for coordinate x_2 :

$$\ddot{x}_2 = - \frac{k_y}{m_d} (x_2 - x_4) - \frac{k_y}{m_d} (x_2 - x_6) \quad (3.12)$$

Equations of motion for each journal were similarly derived. However, because bearing film forces include nonconservative damping they were represented as Generalized Forces, i.e.,

$$\approx_x = F_x \quad (3.13a)$$

$$\approx_y = F_y \quad (3.13b)$$

Proceeding for the left journal as in the derivation of disc equations:

$$T_{JL}^* = \frac{1}{2} m_J (\dot{x}_3^2 + \dot{x}_4^2) + \frac{1}{2} I_{AJ} \omega^2 \quad (3.14)$$

$$V_{JL} = \frac{1}{2} k_x (x_3 - x_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} k_y (x_4 - x_2)^2 \quad (3.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{JL} = \frac{1}{2} \left[m_J (\dot{x}_3^2 + \dot{x}_4^2) + I_{AJ} \omega^2 - k_x (x_3 - x_1)^2 \right. \\ \left. - k_y (x_4 - x_2)^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Employing Lagrange's Equations (equation 3.10) and incorporating equations 3.13.

$$\ddot{X}_3 = -\frac{k_x}{m_J} (X_3 - X_1) + \frac{F_{XL}}{m_J} \quad (3.17)$$

$$\ddot{X}_4 = -\frac{k_y}{m_J} (X_4 - X_2) + \frac{F_{YL}}{m_J} \quad (3.18)$$

Similarly, for the right journal:

$$T_{JR}^* = \frac{1}{2} (\dot{X}_5^2 + \dot{X}_6^2) + \frac{1}{2} I_{AJ} \omega^2 \quad (3.19)$$

$$V_{JR} = \frac{1}{2} k_x (X_5 - X_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} k_y (X_6 - X_2)^2 \quad (3.20)$$

$$\ddot{X}_5 = -\frac{k_x}{m_J} (X_5 - X_1) + \frac{F_{XR}}{m_J} \quad (3.21)$$

$$\ddot{X}_6 = -\frac{k_y}{m_J} (X_6 - X_2) + \frac{F_{YR}}{m_J} \quad (3.22)$$

Equations 3.11, 12, 17, 18, 21, and 22 were integrated with respect to time using a Runge Kutta finite difference technique. To do this, it was convenient to reduce these 2nd order differential equations to 1st order form. Defining the following additional variables allowed such reduction:

$$X_7 = \dot{X}_1 \quad (3.23a)$$

$$X_8 = \dot{X}_2 \quad (3.23b)$$

$$X_9 = \dot{X}_3 \quad (3.23c)$$

$$X_{10} = \dot{X}_4 \quad (3.23d)$$

$$X_{11} = \dot{X}_5 \quad (3.23e)$$

$$X_{12} = \dot{X}_6 \quad (3.23f)$$

Since these variables were not independent of x_1 through x_6 but still specified system behavior, they were labeled as state variables [14].

Rotor bearing system equations of motion were then restated:

$$\dot{X}_7 = -\frac{k_x}{m_d} (X_1 - X_3) - \frac{k_x}{m_d} (X_1 - X_5) \quad (3.24a)$$

$$\dot{X}_8 = -\frac{k_y}{m_d} (X_2 - X_4) - \frac{k_y}{m_d} (X_2 - X_6) \quad (3.24b)$$

$$\dot{X}_9 = -\frac{k_x}{m_J} (x_3 - x_1) + \frac{F_{xL}}{m_J} \quad (3.24c)$$

$$\dot{X}_{10} = -\frac{k_y}{m_J} (x_4 - x_2) + \frac{F_{yL}}{m_J} \quad (3.24d)$$

$$\dot{X}_{11} = -\frac{k_x}{m_J} (x_5 - x_1) + \frac{F_{xR}}{m_J} \quad (3.24e)$$

$$\dot{X}_{12} = -\frac{k_y}{m_J} (x_6 - x_2) + \frac{F_{yR}}{m_J} \quad (3.24f)$$

3.B.2 Linearization

Since equations 3.24c through f have nonlinear components they were not suited for a frequency domain solution, as required for root locus output. Therefore, these bearing film force terms had to be linearized.

Beaman [13] had linearized equations 3.5 to achieve the following form:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \tilde{F}_e \\ \tilde{F}_\phi \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{ee} & K_{e\phi} \\ K_{\phi e} & K_{\phi\phi} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \delta e \\ \delta \phi \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_{ee} & B_{e\phi} \\ B_{\phi e} & B_{\phi\phi} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \delta e' \\ \delta \phi' \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.25)$$

where $\delta e'$ and $\delta \phi'$ indicated differentiation with respect to $\tau = tu/r$

and:*

* Stiffness and damping coefficients appear in Appendix B.

$$\tilde{F}_e = \frac{F_e c^2}{\mu l^3 \omega r} \quad (3.26a)$$

$$\tilde{F}_\phi = \frac{F_\phi c^2}{\mu l^3 \omega r} \quad (3.26b)$$

Equation 3.25 was converted to the Figure 3.1 coordinate system using the following transformation:

$$x = e \sin \phi \quad (3.27a)$$

$$y = -e \cos \phi \quad (3.27b)$$

The following transformed solution resulted:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \tilde{F}_x \\ \tilde{F}_y \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{xx} & K_{xy} \\ K_{yx} & K_{yy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \delta x \\ \delta y \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_{xx} & B_{xy} \\ B_{yx} & B_{yy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \delta \dot{x} \\ \delta \dot{y} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.28)$$

where, after equations 3.26 were incorporated:*

$$\tilde{F}_x = \frac{F_x c^2}{\mu \omega r} \quad (3.29a)$$

* Stiffness and damping coefficients appear in Appendix B.

$$\tilde{F}_y = \frac{F_y c^2}{\mu \omega r} \quad (3.29b)$$

Bearing force terms in equations 3.24c through f were then expressed in linear form using the equation 3.28 revised bearing coefficients.

$$F_{XL} = \left[\frac{\mu \omega r}{c^2} (k_{xx} \delta x + k_{xy} \delta y + B_{xx} \delta \dot{x} + B_{xy} \delta \dot{y}) \right]_L \quad (3.30a)$$

$$F_{XR} = \left[\frac{\mu \omega r}{c^2} (k_{xx} \delta x + k_{xy} \delta y + B_{xx} \delta \dot{x} + B_{xy} \delta \dot{y}) \right]_R \quad (3.30b)$$

$$F_{YL} = \left[\frac{\mu \omega r}{c^2} (k_{yx} \delta x + k_{yy} \delta y + B_{yx} \delta \dot{x} + B_{yy} \delta \dot{y}) \right]_L \quad (3.30c)$$

$$F_{YR} = \left[\frac{\mu \omega r}{c^2} (k_{yx} \delta x + k_{yy} \delta y + B_{yx} \delta \dot{x} + B_{yy} \delta \dot{y}) \right]_R \quad (3.30d)$$

With these substitutions, equations 3.23 and 3.24 became linear rotor bearing system equations of motion. They were then arranged per equations 3.1 and 3.2.

The square matrix in equation 3.1 is an algebraic manipulation of the more fundamental linear homogeneous matrix equation of motion: [18]

$$M\ddot{\underline{a}} + B\dot{\underline{a}} + K\underline{a} = 0 \quad (3.31a)$$

Where, $\underline{a}$ represents a generalized coordinate column vector and $\underline{q}$, in equation 3.1, represents a state variable column vector (not all variables are independent):

$$\underline{q} = \begin{Bmatrix} \underline{x} \\ \underline{\dot{x}} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.31b)$$

Equation 3.31a is reduced to 1st order form by doubling the number of variables as in equation 3.23. Equation 3.1 is further rearranged to facilitate solution:

$$[\lambda \underline{I} - \underline{A}] \begin{Bmatrix} \underline{x} \end{Bmatrix} = 0 \quad (3.32a)$$

where:

$$\underline{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \underline{I} \\ -\underline{M}^{-1}\underline{K} & -\underline{M}^{-1}\underline{B} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.32b)$$

and, [19]

$$\underline{\dot{x}} = \underline{A} \underline{x} \quad (3.32c)$$

Equation 3.32a was solved for λ , the system eigenvalues.

These eigenvalues were then used in the following formulation to determine the system eigenvectors ($\underline{v}$) corresponding to each eigenvalue:

$$[\lambda_i \underline{I} - \underline{A}] \{v_i\} = 0 \quad (3.33)$$

$\underline{A}$ was then developed from equations 3.23, 3.24, and 3.32b:

$$\underline{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{2K_x}{m_d} & \frac{K_x}{m_d} & \frac{K_x}{m_d} & & & & & & \\ & -\frac{2K_y}{m_d} & \frac{K_y}{m_d} & & & & & & \\ \frac{K_x}{m_d} & \frac{K_y}{m_d} & -\frac{(K_{xx}+K_x)}{m_J} & -\frac{K_{xy}}{m_J} & & & & & \\ & \frac{K_y}{m_d} & -\frac{K_{yx}}{m_J} & -\frac{(K_{yy}+K_y)}{m_J} & & & & & \\ -\frac{K_x}{m_J} & & & & -\frac{(K_{xx}+K_x)}{m_J} & -\frac{K_{xy}}{m_J} & & & \\ & \frac{K_y}{m_J} & & & -\frac{K_{yx}}{m_J} & -\frac{(K_{yy}+K_y)}{m_J} & & & \\ & & & & & & -\frac{B_{xx}}{m_J} & -\frac{B_{xy}}{m_J} & \\ & & & & & & -\frac{B_{yx}}{m_J} & -\frac{B_{yy}}{m_J} & \\ & & & & & & & & -\frac{B_{xx}}{m_J} & -\frac{B_{xy}}{m_J} \\ & & & & & & & & -\frac{B_{yx}}{m_J} & -\frac{B_{yy}}{m_J} \end{bmatrix}$$


(assume blank spaces contain zeros)

(3.34)

3.C Labyrinth Seal Modeling

3.C.1 Derivation of Equations of Motion

Figure 3.4 depicts the model labyrinth seal surrounding the central rotor bearing system disc. In this analysis the following additional assumptions were required:



(Note: h now represents minimum seal base to disc radial clearance)

Figure 3.4 - Single Labyrinth Seal Model

- 1) Working fluid (air) behaves as an ideal gas: [12]

(3.35)

$$P = \rho RT$$

(ρ = Fluid Density, R = Gas Constant)

- 2) The disc is concentric within the rigid and stationary seal during steady running.
- 3) Fluid axial kinetic energy is completely destroyed within the seal chamber. [15]
- 4) This flow process is adiabatic [15] .
- 5) Fluid temperature (T) is constant throughout the seal [6] .
- 6) Circumferential fluid velocity during steady running is $\frac{1}{2}$ that of disc surface speed and is in the direction of disc rotation: (Figure 3.5).

$$u_n = \frac{rw}{2} \quad (3.36)$$

- 7) Friction factors for shear forces on circumferential disc and seal surfaces are per Kostyuk [12] .

$$f_i = K_{fi} \left[\frac{(rw - u)h}{2\nu} \right]^{-\frac{1}{n_i}} \quad (3.37a)$$

$$f_o = K_{fo} \left[\frac{uh}{2\nu} \right]^{-\frac{1}{n_o}} \quad (3.37b)$$



where,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} K_f = .04176 \\ n = 4.38 \end{array} \right\} 10^3 < Re < 10^5$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} K_f = .01423 \\ n = 7.4 \end{array} \right\} 10^5 < Re < 10^8$$

- 8) Flows through seal strips A and B (Figure 3.4) are each modeled as that of an isentropic nozzle affected by a discharge coefficient [12]
- 9) Fluid dynamic viscosity is assumed constant.
- 10) Axial flow is always positive, i.e., $P_A > P_B$ (constant pressures),

$$P_A > P_C, \text{ and } P_C > P_B$$



γ = seal angular distance (independent variable)

s = seal circumferential distance $\approx r\gamma$

Figure 3.5 - Labyrinth Seal Control Volume

As in any compressible fluid mechanics analysis, the concepts of continuity, momentum, state, and previous assumptions were applied to the control volume of Figure 3.5. Because of the adiabatic flow assumption an energy balance was not necessary. One differential equation for each generalized coordinate resulted. In this case, two equations were expected corresponding to the generalized coordinates of chamber pressure (P) and circumferential fluid velocity (u). Minimum disc to seal base clearance (h), although variable, was not independent since it was directly related to disc behavior.

Equation 3.38 expressed the mass flow balance or continuity of the system:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho h l) + \frac{\partial}{\partial s} (\rho h l u) = \dot{m}_A - \dot{m}_B \quad (3.38)$$

[1-Cont]

Considering shear forces on circumferential and radial interior (within chamber) seal surfaces only, a momentum balance was performed:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\rho h l)_s - (\rho h l)_{s+ds} - \tau_i l ds + \tau_o (l+2h) ds \\ & = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho u h l ds) - (\rho u^2 h l)_s + (\rho u^2 h l)_{s+ds} \end{aligned} \quad (3.39a)$$

[2-Mom]

where friction stresses were represented by:

$$\tau_i = \frac{1}{2} f_i \rho (rw - u)^2 \quad (3.39b)$$

$$\tau_0 = \frac{1}{2} f_0 \rho u^2 \quad (3.39c)$$

Differentiating equation 3.38 and substituting equation 3.35 yielded:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ell h}{RT} \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = (\dot{m}_A - \dot{m}_B) - \frac{\ell P}{RT} \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \\ - \frac{\ell}{RT} \left[P \left(h \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + u \frac{\partial h}{\partial s} \right) + h u \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

[1-Cont]

Equation 3.39a was also differentiated. After substituting equations 3.39b and c it became equation 3.41:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ell P h}{RT} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = - \ell \left[P \frac{\partial h}{\partial s} + h \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} \right] + \frac{f_i P \ell}{2 RT} (rw - u)^2 \\ - \frac{f_0 P u^2 (\ell + 2h)}{2 RT} - \frac{\ell}{RT} \left[P \left(u \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + u^2 \frac{\partial h}{\partial s} + 2 u h \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} \right) \right. \\ \left. + u h \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} + u^2 h \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

[2-Mom]

Equation 3.40 required the following mass flow rate substitutions [16]:

$$\dot{m}_A = (h-a) 2\pi r \sqrt{\frac{k}{RT}} P_A C_{WA} \left[\frac{M_A}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_A^2\right)^{(k+1)/2(k-1)}} \right] \quad (3.42) \quad 38$$

$$\dot{m}_B = (h-b) 2\pi r \sqrt{\frac{k}{RT}} P_B C_{WB} \left[\frac{M_B}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_B^2}} \right] \quad (3.43)$$

Where C_{WA} and C_{WB} represented empirical discharge coefficients for seal strips A and B respectively:

$$C_{WA} = f(P/P_A) + \text{constant} \quad (3.44a)$$

$$C_{WB} = f(P/P_B) + \text{constant} \quad (3.44b)$$

Mach numbers M_A and M_B were functions of chamber pressure, P . (see equations B.23 and B.24)

3.C.2 Linearization

Since a linear solution of equations 3.40 and 3.41 was desired, these equations were linearized and arranged in a form compatible with equation 3.32C. To begin linearization, the small motion substitutions of equations 3.45 were made:

$$P = P_n + \delta P \quad = \text{Chamber pressure} \quad (3.45a)$$

$$h = h_n + \delta h \quad = \text{Seal Base to Disc Clearance} \quad (3.45b)$$

$$u = u_n + \delta u \quad = \text{Circumferential fluid velocity} \quad (3.45c)$$

$$f_i = f_{in} + \delta f_i \quad = \text{Friction Factor at Disc surface} \quad (3.45d)$$

$$f_o = f_{on} + \delta f_o \quad = \text{Friction Factor at Seal Base} \quad (3.45e)$$

$$\dot{m}_A = \dot{m}_{An} + \delta \dot{m}_A \quad = \text{Mass Flow Rate at Seal Strip A} \quad (3.45f)$$

$$\dot{m}_B = \dot{m}_{Bn} + \delta \dot{m}_B \quad = \text{Mass Flow Rate at Seal Strip B} \quad (3.45g)$$

$$M_A = M_{An} + \delta M_A \quad = \text{Mach number at Seal Strip A} \quad (3.45h)$$

$$M_B = M_{Bn} + \delta M_B \quad = \text{Mach number at Seal Strip B} \quad (3.45i)$$

$$C_{WA} = C_{WAN} + \delta C_{WA} \quad = \text{Discharge Coefficient at A} \quad (3.45j)$$

$$C_{WB} = C_{WBn} + \delta C_{WB} \quad = \text{Discharge Coefficient at B} \quad (3.45k)$$

Mass flow rates in equation 3.40 were linearized. Therefore, $\dot{m}_A$ and $\dot{m}_B$ required definition. Since these were axial flow rates only, they were not functions of circumferential velocity, u . The following general relations applied and were substituted into equations 3.45f and g:

$$\delta \dot{m}_A = \left[K_{pMA} \right] \delta P + \left[K_{hMA} \right] \delta h \quad (3.46a)$$

$$\delta \dot{m}_B = \left[K_{pMB} \right] \delta P + \left[K_{hMB} \right] \delta h \quad (3.46b)$$

The "K" coefficients in equations 3.46 were derived from linearization of equations 3.42 and 3.43 with the following substitutions:

$$f(M_A) = \frac{M_A}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2} \right) M_A^2 \right)^{(k+1)/2(k-1)}} \quad (3.47a)$$

$$\tilde{f}(M_B) = M_B \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2} \right) M_B^2} \quad (3.47b)$$

$$K_A = \sqrt{\frac{k}{RT}} \quad P_A \quad (3.47c)$$

$$K_B = \sqrt{\frac{k}{RT}} \quad P_B \quad (3.47d)$$

$$C_{WA} = -.3179464 \left(\frac{P}{P_A} \right) + .91723729 \quad (3.47e)$$

$$C_{WB} = -.3179464 \left(\frac{P_B}{P} \right) + .91723729 \quad (3.47f)$$

$$A_{An} = (h - a) 2\pi r \quad (3.47g)$$

$$A_{Bn} = (h - b) 2\pi r \quad (3.47h)$$

Equations 3.47e and f represented linearized approximations of J.A. Perry's graphical discharge coefficient relation for sharp edged orifice meters.* Incorporating equations 3.47 into equations 3.46 yielded equations 3.48.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \dot{m}_A = K_A \{ & A_{An} [C_{wAn} \delta(f(M_A)) + f(M_A)_n \delta C_{wA}] \\ & + C_{wAn} f(M_A)_n \delta A_A \} \end{aligned} \quad (3.48a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \dot{m}_B = K_B \{ & A_{Bn} [C_{wBn} \delta(\tilde{f}(M_B)) + \tilde{f}(M_B)_n \delta C_{wB}] \\ & + C_{wBn} \tilde{f}(M_B)_n \delta A_B \} \end{aligned} \quad (3.48b)$$

Previously undefined terms in equations 3.48 required definition:**

$$\delta A_A = 2\pi r \delta h \quad ; \quad A_{An} = (h_n - a) 2\pi r \quad (3.49a)$$

* This graph appears on page 100 of [20] .

** "K" coefficient expressions appear in Appendix B.

$$SA_B = 2\pi rh \quad ; \quad A_{Bn} = (h_n - b) 2\pi r \quad (3.49b)$$

$$C_{wAn} = -.3179464 \left(\frac{P_n}{P_A} \right) + .91723729 \quad (3.49c)$$

$$C_{wBn} = -.3179464 \left(\frac{P_B}{P_n} \right) + .91723729 \quad (3.49d)$$

$$\delta C_{wA} = K_{\delta C_{wA}} \delta P \quad (3.49e)$$

$$\delta C_{wB} = K_{\delta C_{wB}} \delta P \quad (3.49f)$$

$$\delta(f(M_A)) = K_{\delta f M_A} \delta M_A \quad (3.49g)$$

$$\delta(\tilde{f}(M_B)) = K_{\delta \tilde{f} M_B} \delta M_B \quad (3.49h)$$

$$\delta M_A = K_{\delta M_A} \delta P \quad (3.49i)$$

$$\delta M_B = K_{\delta M_B} \delta P \quad (3.49j)$$

$$f(M_A)_n = f(M_{An}) \quad (3.49k)$$

$$\tilde{f}(M_D)_n = \tilde{f}(M_{Dn}) \quad (3.49l)$$

Therefore;

$$\delta(f(M_A)) = K_{\delta fMA} K_{\delta MA} \delta P = K_{\delta fMAT} \delta P \quad (3.49m)$$

$$\delta(\tilde{f}(M_D)) = K_{\delta \tilde{f}MD} K_{\delta MD} \delta P = K_{\delta \tilde{f}MBT} \delta P \quad (3.49n)$$

Coefficients in equations 3.46 were then described in terms of equations 3.47, 3.48, and 3.49:

$$K_{pMA} = \frac{K_A}{2\pi r} \left[A_{An} (C_{WAN} K_{\delta fMAT} + f(M_A)_n K_{\delta CWA}) \right] \quad (3.50a)$$

$$K_{pMB} = \frac{K_B}{2\pi r} \left[A_{Bn} (C_{WOB} K_{\delta \tilde{f}MBT} + \tilde{f}(M_D)_n K_{\delta CWB}) \right] \quad (3.50b)$$

$$K_{hma} = K_A C_{WAN} f(M_A)_n \quad (3.50c)$$

$$K_{hMB} = K_B C_{wan} \tilde{F}(M_B)_n \quad (3.50d)$$

Realizing that, during steady motion, nominal axial flow rates at A and B (Figure 3.5) were equal ($\dot{m}_{An} = \dot{m}_{Bn}$), equations 3.40 and 3.41 were expressed in terms of the small motion substitutions of equations 3.45:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[l h_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial t} &= \left[(K_{PmA} - K_{PmB}) RT \right] \delta P \\ &+ \left[(K_{hmA} - K_{hMB}) RT \right] \delta h + \left[-l P_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial t} + \left[-l P_n u_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial s} \\ &+ \left[-l P_n h_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta u}{\partial s} + \left[-l h_n u_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial s} \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

[1-Cont]

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\frac{f_{in}}{2RT} ((rw)^2 - 2u_n rw + u_n^2) l - \frac{f_{on} u_n^2}{2RT} (l + 2h_n) + K_{sfir} + K_{sfor} \right] \delta P \\ &+ \left[-\frac{f_{on} P_n u_n^2}{RT} + K_{sfih} + K_{sfoh} \right] \delta h \\ &+ \left[\frac{f_{in} P_n}{RT} (rw - u_n) l - \frac{f_{on} P_n u_n (l + 2h_n)}{RT} + K_{sfiu} + K_{sfo u} \right] \delta u \\ &+ \left[\frac{-l}{RT} u_n h_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial t} + \left[-\frac{l u_n^2 h_n}{RT} - l h_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial s} \\ &+ \left[\frac{-l}{RT} P_n u_n \right] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial t} + \left[-l P_n - \frac{l P_n u_n^2}{RT} \right] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial s} \\ &+ \left[\frac{-l P_n h_n}{RT} \right] \frac{\partial \delta u}{\partial t} + \left[\frac{-2l P_n u_n h_n}{RT} \right] \frac{\partial \delta u}{\partial s} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.52)$$

[2-Mom]

The friction related coefficients in equation 3.52 exist because friction factors f_i , f_o are functions of state variables - p , u , and h .*

$$K_{sf_{xx}} = f(p, u, h) \quad (3.53)$$

Equations 3.51 and 3.52 were then expressed more compactly:

$$\begin{aligned} & -[K_{1PT}] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial t} + [K_{1P}] \delta P + [K_{1h}] \delta h + [K_{1ht}] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial t} + [K_{1hs}] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial s} \\ & + [K_{1us}] \frac{\partial \delta u}{\partial s} + [K_{1Ps}] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial s} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.54)$$

[1-Cont]

$$\begin{aligned} & [K_{2P}] \delta P + [K_{2h}] \delta h + [K_{2u}] \delta u + [K_{2Pt}] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial t} \\ & + [K_{2Ps}] \frac{\partial \delta P}{\partial s} + [K_{2ht}] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial t} + [K_{2hs}] \frac{\partial \delta h}{\partial s} + [K_{2ut}] \frac{\partial \delta u}{\partial t} \\ & + [K_{2us}] \frac{\partial \delta u}{\partial s} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

[2-Mom]

These linearized continuity and momentum equations were not compatible with the linearized rotor bearing system model (equation 3.32c) because partial derivations with respect to both time and circumferential distance existed. The linear rotor bearing system model was based upon time as the only independent variable. Consequently, these linearized seal equations could not be coupled within the A matrix of equation 3.34. Therefore, it was necessary to reconfigure equations 3.54 and 3.55 such that partial derivatives no longer appeared and time became the only independent variable. One approach involved substitution of the following assumed solution forms into equations 3.54 and 3.55:

$$\delta P = (A_p \cos \gamma + B_p \sin \gamma) e^{\lambda t} \quad (3.56a)$$

$$\delta u = (A_u \cos \gamma + B_u \sin \gamma) e^{\lambda t} \quad (3.56b)$$

$$\delta h = H_h e^{\lambda t} \quad (3.56c)$$

Referring to Figure 3.4 (Seal Model) and remembering that, during steady running, the disc is concentric within the seal, equation 3.56c was rewritten:

$$\delta h = -\delta y \cos \gamma e^{\lambda t} ; \text{ for } e_n = 0 \text{ and } \phi_n = 0$$

$$\delta h = \delta e \cos \gamma e^{\lambda t} \quad (3.57)$$

$$\delta h = -H \cos \gamma e^{\lambda t}$$

Therefore, H represents disc displacement in the y direction (Figure 3.4), i.e.,

$$\delta y = Y e^{\lambda t} \quad (3.58a)$$

and, from equation 3.56c:

$$H_h = -H \cos \gamma \quad (3.58b)$$

therefore,

$$\delta h = -Y \cos \gamma e^{\lambda t} \quad (3.58c)$$

or,

$$H = Y \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{H} = \dot{Y} \quad (3.58d)$$

Substituting equations 3.56 into equations 3.54 and 3.55 yields time dependent differential equations without partial derivatives;

$$\dot{A}_P = \left(\frac{K_{1P}}{K_{1Pt}} \right) A_P + \left(\frac{K_{1Ps}}{r K_{1Pt}} \right) B_P + \left(\frac{K_{1us}}{r K_{1Pt}} \right) B_u + \left(\frac{-K_{1h}}{K_{1Pt}} \right) H + \left(\frac{-K_{1hs}}{K_{1Pt}} \right) \dot{H} \quad (3.59a)$$

$$\dot{B}_P = \left(\frac{-K_{1Ps}}{r K_{1Pt}} \right) A_P + \left(\frac{K_{1P}}{K_{1Pt}} \right) B_P + \left(\frac{-K_{1us}}{r K_{1Pt}} \right) A_u + \left(\frac{K_{1hs}}{r K_{1Pt}} \right) H \quad (3.59b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{A}_u = & \left(\frac{-K_{2P}}{K_{2ut}} - \frac{K_{2Pt} K_{1P}}{K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} \right) A_P + \left(\frac{-K_{2Pt} K_{1Ps}}{r K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} - \frac{K_{2Ps}}{r K_{2ut}} \right) B_P \\ & + \left(\frac{-K_{2u}}{K_{2ut}} \right) A_u + \left(\frac{-K_{2Pt} K_{1us}}{r K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} - \frac{K_{2us}}{r K_{2ut}} \right) B_u \\ & + \left(\frac{K_{2Pt} K_{1h}}{K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} + \frac{K_{2h}}{K_{2ut}} \right) H + \left(\frac{K_{2Pt} K_{1ht}}{K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} + \frac{K_{2ht}}{K_{2ut}} \right) \dot{H} \end{aligned} \quad (3.59c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{B}_u = & \left(\frac{K_{2Pt} K_{1Ps}}{r K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} + \frac{K_{2Ps}}{r K_{2ut}} \right) A_P + \left(\frac{-K_{2P}}{K_{2ut}} - \frac{K_{2Pt} K_{1P}}{K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} \right) B_P \\ & + \left(\frac{K_{2Pt} K_{1us}}{r K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} + \frac{K_{2us}}{r K_{2ut}} \right) A_u + \left(\frac{-K_{2u}}{K_{2ut}} \right) B_u \\ & + \left(\frac{-K_{2Pt} K_{1hs}}{r K_{1Pt} K_{2ut}} - \frac{K_{2hs}}{r K_{2ut}} \right) H \end{aligned} \quad (3.59d)$$

Linearized seal equations were then present in a form similar to equation 3.32c:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \dot{A}_p \\ \dot{B}_p \\ \dot{A}_u \\ \dot{B}_u \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{aAP} & K_{aBP} & 0 & K_{aBu} \\ K_{bAP} & K_{bBP} & K_{bAu} & 0 \\ K_{cAP} & K_{cBP} & K_{cAu} & K_{cBu} \\ K_{dAP} & K_{dBP} & K_{dAu} & K_{dBu} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} A_p \\ B_p \\ A_u \\ B_u \end{Bmatrix}$$

$$+ \begin{Bmatrix} K_{aH} \\ K_{bH} \\ K_{cH} \\ K_{dH} \end{Bmatrix} H + \begin{Bmatrix} K_{aHd} \\ 0 \\ K_{cHd} \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix} \dot{H}$$

(3.60)

Because $H=Y$ represented disc displacement in the y direction it also corresponded to X_2 . Consequently, $\dot{H} = \dot{X}_2$. Equation 3.60, therefore, included the effect that the disc has upon the seal. To complete coupling between seal and rotor bearing systems, seal force exerted on the disc was also specified.

Since linearization involved infinitesimal variations of state variables, seal force acting on the disc was so represented. (See Figure 3.4 - Seal Model)

$$\delta F_x = \int_0^{2\pi} P \sin \gamma \, l r \, d\gamma$$

(3.61a)

$$\delta F_y = \int_0^{2\pi} P \cos \gamma \, l r d\gamma \quad (3.61b)$$

To accommodate these integrations, equation 3.56a can be expressed as in equation 3.62:

$$P = \bar{A}_p(t) \cos \gamma + \bar{B}_p(t) \sin \gamma \quad (3.62)$$

Substitution into equations 3.61 yields:

$$\delta F_x = \bar{B}_p \pi r l \quad (3.63a)$$

$$\delta F_y = \bar{A}_p \pi r l \quad (3.63b)$$

Since the datum for independent variable time in equation 3.32c was arbitrary, $t_0 = 0$ was chosen. Consequently, $e^{\lambda t_0} = 1$ and:

$$\bar{A}_p(t_0) = A_p \quad (3.64a)$$

$$\bar{B}_p(t_0) = B_p \quad (3.64b)$$

Therefore, seal to rotor bearing system coupling was accomplished. Equation 3.65 depicted the A matrix of equation 3.34 expanded to 16 x 16 to include equations 3.60 and 3.63:

A =

$$(3.65)$$

3.D Simulation Procedure

* Listed in Appendix A.

exercise the nonlinear rotor bearing system (equations 3.23 and 3.24) and the A matrices of equations 3.34 and 3.65. Programming of the nonlinear rotor bearing system model will be discussed first. Programming of both rotor bearing and labyrinth seal systems linear models will be explained next to be followed by a description of parameter variations.

The parameter variations section of this chapter will focus primarily upon labyrinth seal physical variables. Myrick's rotor bearing system will experience minor changes only, to minimize impact on possible follow on experimental verification. Such testing will provide data for analysis in Chapter 4.

3.D. 1 Isolated Rotor Bearing System Testing

3.D.1.A Nonlinear Model Programming (RW5)

As previously mentioned, nonlinear rotor bearing system modeling was intended as a modeling accuracy check. Its basis was a 4th order Runge Kutta finite difference integration of equations 3.23 and 3.24. Although ϵ and ϕ in Figure 3.1 (Bearing description) were directly related to bearing generalized coordinates X_3 through X_6 , they were also separately integrated to simplify bearing force calculations (equations 3.5). The coordinate assignments of equations 3.23 and 3.24 did not change. Additional bearing state variable assignments were per equations 3.66:

$$X_{13} = \epsilon_L = \frac{(X_3^2 + X_4^2)}{C} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{= Left Journal} \\ \text{Eccentricity ratio} \end{array} \quad (3.66a)$$

where c = Journal to bearing radial clearance

$$X_{14} = \phi_L = \tan \left(\frac{X_3}{-X_4} \right) \quad \begin{array}{l} = \text{Left Journal} \\ \text{Attitude Angle} \end{array} \quad (3.66b)$$

$$X_{15} = \varepsilon_R = \frac{(X_5^2 + X_6^2)}{c} \quad \begin{array}{l} = \text{Right Journal} \\ \text{Eccentricity ratio} \end{array} \quad (3.66c)$$

$$X_{16} = \phi_R = \tan \left(\frac{X_5}{-X_6} \right) \quad \begin{array}{l} = \text{Right Journal} \\ \text{Attitude Angle} \end{array} \quad (3.66d)$$

First derivative expressions for these new state variables were also required:

$$F_{13} = \frac{(X_2 X_9 + X_4 X_{10})}{X_{13} c^2} = \dot{\varepsilon}_L \quad (3.66e)$$

$$F_{14} = -\frac{(X_4 X_9 - X_2 X_{10})}{(X_{13} c)^2} = \dot{\phi}_L \quad (3.66f)$$

$$F_{15} = \frac{(X_5 X_{11} + X_6 X_{12})}{X_{15} c^2} = \dot{\epsilon}_R \quad (3.66g)$$

$$F_{16} = -\frac{(X_6 X_{11} - X_5 X_{12})}{(X_{15} c)^2} = \dot{\phi}_R \quad (3.66h)$$

Since journal surface speed ($U = r\omega$) in equations 3.5 required specification of angular velocity an expression from Cameron [10] was used:

$$\omega = \frac{4 W c^2 (1 - \epsilon^2)^2}{\pi \mu l \epsilon r \left\{ \left(\frac{16}{\pi^2} - 1 \right) \epsilon^2 + 1 \right\}^{1/2}} \quad (3.67)$$

($W = \frac{1}{2}$ total rotor bearing system weight)

(l = Journal length, r = Journal Radius)

Equation 3.67 was compatible with bearing assumptions made in Chapter 2 and applied to all rotor bearing system mass elements.* Cameron had also derived an expression for journal attitude angle, ϕ :

$$\phi = \tan^{-1} \left\{ \frac{\pi}{4} \left(\frac{(1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/2}}{\epsilon} \right) \right\} \quad (3.68)$$

* Constant speed assumed in Chapter 2.

Since both left and right journals (Figure 3.2 - Rotor Bearing System Model) were physically identical and since their angular velocities were also equal, ϵ and ϕ were expected to be identical for both journals, i.e., symmetry should prescribe identical behavior for both journals. For verification, however, angular velocity was defined for each journal.

As in any time dependent simulation, initial conditions were prescribed. These were defined in terms of an assumed journal eccentricity ratio, ϵ , and attitude angle, ϕ -- the same values at both bearings. Disc initial circumferential position was assumed equal to that of both journals. Since equations 3.67 and 3.68 were defined for steady running only*, the initial value for ϕ did not satisfy equation 3.68. Otherwise, mass displacement and, therefore, potential system instability could not be observed. Instead, steady running conditions were defined separately and differently with respect to these initial conditions.

Steady running conditions were defined in terms of an assumed eccentricity ratio and corresponding journal angular velocity (equation 3.67) and attitude angle (equation 3.68). Steady journal positions, therefore, were based upon: (1) static deflection due to rotor weight and (2) angular displacement (ϕ) due to journal interaction with bearing fluid. Steady running disc position was assumed equal to that of both journals. Steady bearing film forces added in the line of centers direction (Figure 3.1). The vector sum of these forces equaled rotor bearing system weight. Steady running conditions, in effect, established a temporary coordinate reference frame (Figure 3.6). With

* Rotor operation without displacement of mass element centroids.

steady conditions defined, computer simulation could begin by applying different initial conditions.




Figure 3.6 - Fixed Inertial and Steady Running (x', y')

Coordinate Reference Frames

Simulation commenced with 4th order Runge Kutta finite difference integration of equations 3.23 and 3.24. State variable increments were calculated for an assumed time step (Δt) and added to previous values to yield state variable values at time, $t = t_0 + n\Delta t$. Bearing force equations 3.5 appeared twice, embodied with equations 3.66 -- once for each journal. These equations were first calculated using

ε and ϕ state variables converted to a $\tau = t\omega$ integration basis:

$$\varepsilon' = \left(\frac{\Delta \varepsilon}{\Delta t} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\omega} \right) \quad (3.69a)$$

$$\phi' = \left(\frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta t} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\omega} \right) \quad (3.69b)$$

ε' and ϕ' were later multiplied by ω to allow finite difference time integration -- a Runge Kutta requirement! Bearing force equations 3.6 appeared next, again, once for each journal. Steady bearing film forces were subtracted from each bearing force (equations 3.6) -- necessary when force increments due to transient loading were being calculated. Rotor bearing system state variable equations 3.23 and 3.24, therefore, contained state variable and bearing force values relative to a particular steady running position (Figure 3.6).

Model accuracy tests were performed by setting steady running conditions that were just above and below (2 simulations) the stability threshold predicted by Shapiro and Colsher [1]. This was accomplished by prescribing steady running eccentricity ratios such that ω in equation 3.67 was less than 93 rev/sec for one simulation and greater than 93 rev/sec for the other. Different initial conditions were applied and time dependent state variable values were monitored using a simple plot routine.*

* MINIPLT--See Mechanical Engineering Dept. Computer Files.

To be compatible with Shapiro and Colsher, testing below the stability threshold should yield slightly damped state variable response. Testing above the stability threshold should yield ever increasing (exploding) state variable values with time.

3.D.1.B Linear Model Programming (RWE4)

As mentioned earlier, linear modeling was intended to produce eigenvalues and eigenvectors. Subjecting the A matrix of equation 3.34 to the QRHMOD routine accomplished this task. QRHMOD was available by calling METAPE or DYNSSYS which appeared on Mechanical Engineering Department computer file tapes.

To prepare equation 3.34 for QRHMOD, several preliminary calculations were performed. Beaman's [13] linearized bearing coefficients (equations 3.25) were calculated and converted to x-y reference frame form (equations 3.28). Since linear analysis deals only with infinitesimal state variable variations from a steady running position, equations 3.67 and 3.68 were used to describe rotor speed (ω) and attitude angle (ϕ) respectively, for an assumed eccentricity ratio (ϵ). As before, ϵ values for both left and right journals were assumed identical. This routine was used for further comparison with Shapiro and Colsher's results and to obtain performance data for the isolated rotor bearing system.

Since labyrinth seal effects were the focus of this thesis and since changing the physical parameters of Myrick's rotor bearing system nullified comparison of results, performance data, here, were restricted

to rotor speed variation. This was best accomplished by iterating eccentricity ratio from about $\epsilon = .5$ ($\omega = 45.8$ rad/sec) to about $\epsilon = .005$ ($\omega = 8745$ rad/sec).

3.D.2 Labyrinth Seal Testing

This section discusses linear labyrinth seal model programming separately and in the context of coupling to the rotor bearing system linear model program (RWE4). Although explanation of isolated seal and disc programming appears to be a logical next step in this discussion, this programming is actually more conveniently accomplished by modifying the coupled system program. Therefore, coupled system programming will be discussed first.

3.D.2.A. Linear Model Programming - Coupled Labyrinth Seal and Rotor Bearing System (RWE4S)

The ultimate intent of linear model programming was to subject the A matrix of equation 3.65 to the QRHMOD routine. Since this A matrix contained the unaltered rotor bearing system A matrix of equation 3.34 in its upper left corner, expression of seal equation 3.60 coefficients and their proper placement within equation 3.65 were accomplished.

To do this, several intermediate tasks were performed. Initially, nominal (steady) chamber pressure (P_n) was established. This was accomplished by first assuming a Mach number at seal strip A (M_{An}) and then solving for P_n using equation 3.70. This pressure (equation 3.70) was then used to calculate the nominal discharge coefficient at

$$P_{n3.70} = \frac{P_A}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{An}^2\right)^{1/k}} \quad (3.70)$$

seal strip A (C_{wAn} - equation 3.49c) and chamber pressure. A Mach number at seal strip B (M_{Bn}) was calculated using equation B.24. Chamber pressure was recalculated using equation 3.71. $P_{n3.71}$ was compared with

$$P_{n3.71} = \frac{A_{An} C_{wAn} M_{An}}{A_{Bn} C_{wBn} M_{Bn}} \left\{ \frac{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{Bn}^2\right)^{\frac{k+1}{2(k-1)}}}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{An}^2\right)} \right\} \quad (3.71)$$

$P_{n3.70}$. If they differed by more than $.0005 \times P_{n3.70}$, then M_{An} was incremented accordingly and the process was repeated until both P_n values satisfied equation 3.72.* Since seal strips had been assumed to act only

$$P_{n3.70} (1 - .0005) \leq P_{n3.71} \leq P_{n3.70} (1 + .0005) \quad (3.72)$$

as converging nozzles both Mach numbers could not exceed 1.0. Mach numbers were also made greater than zero to avoid trivial solutions, i.e.:

$$0 < M \leq 1 \quad (3.73)$$

Once P_n was established, the axial flow coefficients in

*.0005 factor chosen to provide 3 digit accuracy

equations 3.50 could be calculated. Nominal circumferential seal fluid velocity (u_n) was determined from equation 3.36. Since steady running disc position had been assumed to be concentric within the seal, nominal disc to seal base clearance (h_n) was constant for all simulations. All that remained was to describe the coefficients in equation 3.60 and arrange them together with rotor bearing system coefficients per equation 3.65.

3.D.2.B. Linear Model Programming-Isolated Seal and Disc (RWE4P)

With the coupled system A matrix of equation 3.65 completely programmed, modifications for isolated seal and disc tests were then described. All that was necessary was to replace the coupled system A matrix with the seal PC matrix, consisting of the 4x4 lower right corner of equation 3.65. In order to properly reset this matrix between simulations, it was filled with zeros. The calculation routines within QRHMOD made this necessary whenever parameter variations required repeated use of QRHMOD.

3.D.3. Parameter Variations

In order to fully understand labyrinth seal and rotor bearing system interaction, certain seal and disc parameters were varied separately. Corresponding linear model programs, both isolated and coupled (RWE4P and RWE4S), were used. Generally, straight seal geometry ($a=b$) applied.

Disc Speed (ω) variation was accomplished by iterating eccentricity ratio (ϵ) as in RWE4. Variation of seal chamber axial length (l) was more restrictive, however, since too narrow a seal chamber




Figure 3.7 - Isolated Labyrinth Seal Surrounding Rotor
Bearing System Disc

would violate the Chapter 2 assumption requiring complete axial kinetic energy destruction within the seal chamber. To determine this transition point, l was incremented upward starting at $l = .001$ in. It did not exceed axial disc length prescribed by Myrick (1.423 in.).

Disc radius was also incremented. Seal diameter was assumed to

increase accordingly such that h , a , and b remained constant. Since Shapiro and Colsher's analysis of Myrick's system also assumed point masses at bearing and disc stations, enlarging the disc did not affect comparison with this thesis' results provided that mass values remained unchanged.

Nominal disc to seal base clearance (h_n) was next to be individually varied. The upper limit for this parameter was expected to be very restrictive because, beyond a certain h value, complete kinetic energy destruction within the seal could not be assured.

Upstream pressure (P_A) variation was next. Both the upper and lower limits for this parameter were expected to be sensitive. The upper limit was prescribed by choked flow at seal strip B. The lower limit was restricted by assumed constant seal exit pressure (P_B). i.e., Should P_A become too small, unrealistic flow reversal would occur. As with l and h_n variations, these limits were determined through analysis of a complete range of upstream pressures.

Finally, a and b seal strip heights were varied together to achieve variable seal convergence ($a > b$) and divergence ($a < b$). For comparability, average axial flow area was maintained. i.e., An increase in the " a " dimension was offset by a decrease in " b " (Figure 3.7). To establish the stabilizing nature of a divergent seal, another speed variation exercise was accomplished for an extreme divergent seal geometry. To maximize stability threshold increase, P_A was set to provide choked flow at seal strip B. Straight, divergent, and convergent seal geometry simulations were also conducted with exit pressure set at one atmosphere (14.7 psi). These simulations indicated whether or not this model is suited for testing at higher ambient pressures -- a useful

feature when developing high pressure turbine seal design criteria.

4.A Overview

This chapter will present and discuss data produced from Chapter 3 simulations. For every simulation, parameter values will be listed followed by a graphical generalization of the data and observations of system behavior trends.

Nonlinear rotor bearing system (RW5) results discussion will be first and briefest because of its limited value to the purpose of this thesis. Linear rotor bearing system (RWE4) results discussions will follow and are limited to comparison with Shapiro and Colsher's speed variation results. Isolated seal and disc linear modeling (RWE4P) results will be next. Here, system behavior observations will take the form of discussions of trends exhibited by this system while several parameters are individually varied. The coupled rotor bearing and labyrinth seal model (RWE4S) results will be similarly discussed. Some attention will be focused upon seal and rotor bearing systems interaction. Such discussion provides qualitative understanding only. Ultimately, coupled system model speed will be increased with the seal at extreme divergence in an effort to prove stability threshold increase.

Table 4.1

Nonlinear Rotor Bearing System Parameter Values

Constant Parameters

$k_x = k_y = 5348.6 \text{ lbf/in.}$	= Shaft Stiffness
$m_{JL} = m_{JR} = .0096 \text{ lbf sec}^2/\text{in.}$	= Journal Mass
$m_d = .0875 \text{ lbf sec}^2/\text{in.}$	= Disc Mass
$W = 20.625 \text{ lbf}$	= $\frac{1}{2}$ Rotor Bearing System Weight
$l = 1.603 \text{ in.}$	= Journal Length
$r = 1.081 \text{ in.}$	= Journal Radius
$c = .003 \text{ in.}$	= Bearing to Journal Radial Clearance
$\Delta t = 10^{-5} \text{ sec}$	= Time Step

Variable Parameters

Simulation 1: $\omega = 86 \text{ rev/sec,}$	$\epsilon_i = .08,$	$\epsilon_j = .0797$
Simulation 2: $\omega = 98.3 \text{ rev/sec,}$	$\epsilon_i = .078,$	$\epsilon_j = .07$
Simulation 3: $\omega = 92.87 \text{ rev/sec,}$	$\epsilon_i = .09$	$\epsilon_j = .074$

4.B Rotor Bearing System

4.B.1. Nonlinear Modeling (RW5) Results

As mentioned in Chapter 3, nonlinear rotor bearing system simulations were intended only as a modeling accuracy check. Such verification was best accomplished by operating this nonlinear model at or near Myrick's stability threshold.

Simulation 1 was conducted below Myrick's stability threshold of 93 rev/sec. Damped half frequency whirl was observed (see Figure

4.1). Angular velocities for both journals were observed to be identical for this and all other simulations.

Simulation 2 was conducted above Myrick's stability threshold. Explosive half frequency whirl was observed. (see Figure 4.2).


Simulation 3 was conducted very close to Myrick's stability threshold. Half frequency whirl was observed. However, neither damped nor explosive whirl could be confirmed (see Figure 4.3). Therefore, mass precession approaching a limit cycle at steady state was assumed. This condition establishes 92.87 rev/sec as at, or very close to, the system stability threshold. Because of inaccuracies inherent in visual graph sighting, a limited number of operating cycles and computer calculations this result was not expected to compare exactly with Myrick's.


Additionally, lengthy simulation time makes more accurate definition of this stability threshold, using iterative simulations, unwarranted. Therefore, simulation 3 provided practical confirmation of Shapiro and Colsher's stability threshold calculation.


4.B.2. Linear Modeling (RWE4) Results

Linear rotor bearing system simulation results are a bit more extensive with respect to nonlinear results. In addition to a stability threshold comparison, model frequency versus rotor speed and some mode shapes must also be compared with the results of Shapiro and Colsher.

These results identify 4 primary modes for Myrick's system. (see Figure 4.5a) Mode 1 is most susceptible to self excited whirl. It is characterized by mass displacement due to both rotor bending and rigid








body translation. Mode 2 is least susceptible to any excitation source. It is characterized by rigid body motion because of relatively large journal displacements since it is affected predominantly by bearing coefficient changes. Mode 3 is most susceptible to mass unbalance, but only marginally affected by Oil Whip as suggested by a relatively large disc displacement. Mode 4 is well damped and is characterized by a combination of rotor bending and translation.

Rotor speed variation revealed a stability threshold of 92.58 rev/sec (see Figure 4.4). This was indicated by a near zero eigenvalue real part for Mode 1. It does not differ appreciably from the nonlinear model result of 92.87 rev/sec. Both results are not completely accurate. Linear model accuracy required a Mode 1 eigenvalue real part of exactly zero and nonlinear accuracy required a large number of cycles of operation. However, since they both compare reasonably with Shapiro and Colsher, RW5 and RWE4 accuracies are acceptable.

Comparing modal frequency vs rotor speed, RWE4 results and those of Shapiro and Colsher are in general agreement. Figure 4.4a closely duplicates their plot (Figure 4.4b). Per Shapiro and Colsher, a critical speed for Modes 3 and 4 occurs at a rotor speed of 55 rev/sec. RWE4 results indicate a similar critical speed near 55.6 rev/sec. Both graphs show a Mode 1 and 2 intersection at their respective stability thresholds (93 and 92.58 rev/sec). Mode 1 "growth factors" (eigenvalue real parts) are also reasonably similar.

Mode shape comparisons are not as close as were previous comparisons (Figure 4.5). RWE4 rotor speeds cannot be precisely matched to those of Shapiro and Colsher because of the requirement to increment rotor speed by adjusting eccentricity ratio (equation 3.67). However,






Figure 4.4b - Shapiro & Colsher [1] Linear Results





Figure 4.5a1 - RWE4 Mode Shapes - Mode 1






Figure 4.5a3 - RWE4 Mode Shapes - Mode 0




Figure 4.5a4 - RBE4 Mode Shapes - Mode 4




Figure 4.5b1 - Mode 1




Figure 4.5b2 - Mode 2

Figure 4.5b - Shapiro and Colsher Mode Shapes [1]




Figure 4.5b3 - Mode 3




Figure 4.5b4 - Mode 4

Figure 4.5b - Shapiro and Colsher [1] Mode Shapes

general modal characteristics are similar. Modes 1 and 3 compare closest with Shapiro and Colsher. Their shapes and relative displacements are similar. Mode 2 shapes compare in that they both reflect rigid rotor behavior.

Considering the astonishing similarity between modal frequency vs rotor speed plots, these Mode 2 differences might be attributed to phase changes occurring between 80 and 80.13 rev/sec for this mode. Mode 4's shape is most radically different from that of Shapiro and Colsher. But, since modal frequencies and growth factors are similar, these mode shape differences might also be attributed to phase differences caused by non-precise speed duplication. Generally, therefore, this rotor bearing system model practically resembles Myrick's system (Figure 1.8).

4.C. Isolated Seal and Disc (RWE4P) - Results

4.C.1. Overview

This section will discuss results of parameter variations for the isolated and rigidly mounted seal and disc system. This system has only 2 modes because of such rigid seal and disc mounting. Consequently, these modes relate to flow behavior only. To identify each mode, isolating phenomena must be identified.

When fluid friction (K_{2p} , K_{2h} , and K_{2u} coefficients in equation 3.55) against disc and seal surfaces was eliminated, the "Axial" flow eigenvalue was practically unaffected, but, the "Circumferential" flow eigenvalue radically destabilized (real part became positive) with little affect on modal frequency. Since friction within the seal affects

Table 4.2

Isolated Seal and Disc Nominal Parameter Values

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Program Coding</u>	<u>Value</u>
l = Seal Strip Separation	CLC	.1 in.
r = Disc Radius	RD	10.0 in.
P_A = Seal Inlet Pressure	PSI (HP)	2.55 psi 15.00 psi
P_B = Seal Exit Pressure	PSE (HP)	1.00 psi 14.70 psi
h_n = Nominal Seal Base to Disc Clearance	DC	.200 in.
ω = Disc Angular Velocity	PSDR	579.45 rad/sec
a = Height of Seal Strip A	A	.195 in.
b = Height of Seal Strip B	B	.195 in.

Table 4.3
Constant Seal Parameter Values

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Program Coding</u>	<u>Value</u>
R = Gas Constant	R	247104 in ² /sec ² °R
k = Specific Heat Ratio	CK	1.4
T = Seal Fluid Temperature	TI	560°R
μ = Dynamic Viscosity	DV	2.8 x 10 ⁻⁹ lbfsec/in ²

AD-A116 774

AIR FORCE INST OF TECH WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH
LABYKINTH SEAL EFFECTS ON ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM STABILITY. (U)
MAY 82 A J PAVELKO

F/6 13/9

UNCLASSIFIED

AFIT/NR/82-10T

NI

2 OF 2

AD A
116774

END
DATE
FILMED
08-82
DTIC

circumferential flow predominantly these modes have been labeled "Axial" and "Circumferential" accordingly. The Axial mode is, generally, the more stable of these modes as this section's discussion will illustrate.

The parameter variations examined in this analysis are: (1) seal strip separation in the axial direction (ℓ in Figure 3.7), (2) disc radius (r), (3) upstream pressure (P_A), (4) disc to seal base nominal clearance (h_n), (5) disc rotational speed (ω), and (6) radial projections of seal strips toward the disc (a , b). Each of these parameters were varied individually leaving all others at nominal value (Table 4.2). These nominal values were selected to produce realistic results. The high pressure simulation (HP), by definition, involved different nominal pressures.

Nominal values in Table 4.2 were also chosen to resemble the seal used by Wright. The Myrick rotor bearing system disc radius was increased to provide stable operation with other nominal parameter values. Since disc mass and position were left unchanged rotor bearing system performance was not affected by this change.

Throughout this discussion, the terms "stabilize" and "destabilize" will be used to indicate the direction of change of eigenvalue position on a root locus plot as a parameter is incremented. A "stabilizing" trend is directed toward the left, "destabilizing" toward the right. "Stable" eigenvalues appear to the left of the imaginary axis. "Unstable" eigenvalues exist to the right of this axis.

4.C.2 Seal Strip Separation (ℓ) Variation


Figure 4.6 presents seal strip separation variation results.


For both Axial and Circumferential modes, stability decreases with increasing seal strip separation. This result appears to contradict the expectation* that increasing fluid to interacting surfaces friction with increasing seal surface area would be stabilizing. It should be noted, however, that once coupled to the rotor bearing system, this system will have 6 modes. A proper stability assessment must consider all modal reactions together.

Circumferential modal frequency decreases with increasing l . This could represent declining circumferential fluid velocity as chamber widening makes this seal behave more like a subsonic diffuser by reducing velocity of subsonic circumferential flow. Corresponding Axial modal frequency increase suggests that increasing seal width provides increasing time and distance for acceleration (and deceleration) of axial flow. For any of these simulations, both seal modal frequencies add to equal disc rotational frequency (ω).

Such a consistent event suggests that disc rotational frequency is the "driving" frequency for this isolated seal and disc system. Since both seal and disc are rigidly mounted and seal pressure drop is constant only the Axial and Circumferential "degrees of freedom" are available to distribute disc momentum ($I_{Ad}\omega$). Should either modal frequency exceed the frequency of this sole momentum source, energy creation must have occurred. Obviously, such an event is unrealistic. Its computer predicted occurrence for $l < .051$ in. suggests, possibly, that the assumption of complete kinetic energy dissipation within the seal chamber is invalid below this seal strip separation value.

* See Chapter 1.






4.C.3 Disc Radius (r) Variation


Figure 4.7 presents the results of disc radius variation. With increasing disc radius, the Axial mode stabilizes while the Circumferential mode destabilizes. Since Circumferential mode stabilization occurs about the imaginary axis its affect on system stability is more important, i.e., increasing disc radius enhances seal stability.

As predicted earlier (Chapter 1), this stabilization can be attributed to increasing friction between fluid and adjoining surfaces. Because friction increases with both fluid velocity and interacting area -- both characteristics of increasing disc radius -- fluid flow through the seal should be stabilized.

Another expected characteristic of increasing r is increasing Circumferential modal frequency. Increasing circumferential fluid velocity is intuitively associated with increasing disc surface speed. Axial modal frequency must decrease because of increased axial flow area associated with increasing disc (and seal) radius. It is also physically conceivable that a gain in Circumferential modal frequency should offset a reduction in Axial modal frequency since transfer of fluid momentum involves corresponding changes in fluid velocity.*

* Each fluid particle has axial and circumferential velocity components. Therefore, "mass transfer" during such a "momentum transfer" ($P = mv$) does not occur.





4.C.4 Upstream Pressure (P_A) Variation


Figure 4.8 presents upstream pressure variation results. Both Axial and Circumferential modes destabilize when P_A is increased. Increasing upstream pressure implies increasing force applied against seal and disc. Since both disc and seal are physically constrained only flow modes can react to this increasing force. Such a reaction should reflect reduced stability.


Unfortunately, actual destabilization (left to right crossing of imaginary axis) is not illustrated here. At $P_A = 2.55$ psi, flow through seal strip B (Figure 3.7) chokes. Further increase in P_A , until flow through seal strip A chokes, should destabilize the Circumferential Mode. In addition to this upper realistic limit, a lower realistic limit was also encountered.


Circumferential modal frequency exceeds disc rotational frequency when $P_A < 1.3108$ psi. As explained in 4.C.2, such a condition is unrealistic. This condition, possibly, corresponds to a reversal of flow direction thereby violating a system constraint -- $P_A > P_C$.


4.C.5. Disc to Seal Base Nominal Clearance (h_n) Variation

Figure 4.9 presents results of h_n variation simulations. Within realistic limits, both Axial and Circumferential modes are stabilized by increasing h_n . This result might be attributed to a reduced rate of change of chamber pressure. As h_n increases, axial fluid velocity and modal frequency decrease thereby reducing rate of change of









chamber pressure (equation 3.51 - δP coefficient).

This effect is valid between narrow limits only. The obvious lower limit is $h_n = a$ and/or $h_n = b$ resulting in complete cessation of flow. The upper limit is $h_n \approx .27$ in. (interpolated result). This limit corresponds to an unrealistic Circumferential modal frequency greater than ω . Consequently, this limit corresponds to a clearance so great that the assumption of complete kinetic energy destruction within the seal chamber is violated.

4.C.6. Disc Angular Velocity (ω) Variation


Figure 4.10 presents disc angular velocity variation results. Both Axial and Circumferential modes stabilize with increasing ω . This stabilization can, again, be attributed to increasing friction between seal fluid and interacting surfaces with increasing disc surface speed.


4.C.7. Seal Divergence ($a > b$) Variation


Figure 4.11 presents seal divergence variation results. Both seal modes are stabilized by increasing seal divergence. Decreasing nominal chamber pressure with increasing seal divergence suggests that greater exit with respect to inlet mass flow area, reducing chamber pressure, is responsible for this stabilizing trend.

4.C.8 Seal Convergence ($a < b$) Variation

Figure 4.12 presents seal convergence variation results. Seal







Seal Strip Parameters

- ① $a = .195$ in, $b = .195$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$
- ② $a = .196$ in, $b = .194$ in, $P_n = 1.69$ psi,
 $M_A = .817$, $M_B = .874$
- ③ $a = .197$ in, $b = .193$ in, $P_n = 1.34$ psi,
 $M_A = 1.0$, $M_B = .667$

Nominal Values

$$P_A = 2.55 \text{ psi}$$

$$P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$$

$$h_p = .200 \text{ in}$$


$$L = .100 \text{ in}$$

$$r = 10.0 \text{ in}$$

$$\omega = 579.45 \text{ Rad/Sec}$$

$$= 92.22 \text{ Rev/Sec}$$

Figure 4.11a - RVE4P Results - Seal Divergence Variation,
 Eigenvalues - Axial Mode




Seal Strip Parameters

- ① $a = .195 \text{ in}$, $b = .195 \text{ in}$, $P_n = 1.89 \text{ psi}$
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$
- ② $a = .196 \text{ in}$, $b = .194 \text{ in}$, $P_n = 1.69 \text{ psi}$
 $M_A = .817$, $M_B = .874$
- ③ $a = .197 \text{ in}$, $b = .193 \text{ in}$, $P_n = 1.34 \text{ psi}$
 $M_A = 1.0$, $M_B = .667$

Nominal Values

$P_A = 2.55 \text{ psi}$ $h_n = .200 \text{ in}$ $r = 10.0 \text{ in}$
 $P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$ $R = .100 \text{ in}$ $\omega = 579.45 \text{ Rad/Sec}$

Figure 4.11b - RWE4P Results - Seal Divergence Variation,
 Eigenvalues - Circumferential Mode



Seal Strip Parameters

- ① $a = .195$ in, $b = .195$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$
- ② $a = .194$ in, $b = .196$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$
- ③ $a = .193$ in, $b = .197$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$

Nominal Values

$P_A = 2.55$ psi

$r = 10.0$ in

$P_B = 1.00$ psi


$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

$h_n = .200$ in

$= 92.22$ Rev/Sec

$l = .100$ in

Figure 4.12a - RWE4P Results - Seal Convergence Variation,
 Eigenvalues - Axial Mode



Seal Strip Parameters

- ① $a = .195$ in, $b = .195$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$
- ② $a = .194$ in, $b = .196$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$
- ③ $a = .193$ in, $b = .197$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi,
 $M_A = .667$, $M_B = 1.000$

Nominal Values

$P_A = 2.55$ psi $h = .200$ in $r = 10.0$ in
 $P_B = 1.00$ psi $\delta = .100$ in $\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

Figure 4.12b - RWE4P Results - Seal Convergence Variation,
 Eigenvalues - Circumferential Mode


convergence destabilizes both seal modes. Convergence results are expected to be equal and opposite to seal divergence results. Unfortunately, identical support pressures (P_A and P_B) for both simulations causes choked flow at seal strip B and, therefore, constant nominal chamber pressure with increasing seal convergence. However, evident reduced stabilization, with respect to seal divergence, can be attributed to rate of change of chamber pressure per equations 3.48. These mass flow rate variation relations are affected by axial flow area. They are also strong coefficients of δP in continuity equation 3.51.


4.C.9 Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure

The results in Figure 4.13 indicate that straight seal geometry is not as stable as convergent or divergent geometries for seal modes at high chamber pressure. This result might indicate that any unequal seal geometry is stabilizing at high pressure and/or low axial fluid velocity. However, it is believed that, for flow Mach Numbers closer to 1.0, these results would be similar to those in Figures 4.11 and 4.12.

4.C.10 General Trends

The most obvious trend among these RWE4P simulations is the Circumferential mode's role as the least stable seal mode. In every simulation, it is either the least stable or the only unstable seal mode. Eigenvector analysis further supports this observation. For all simulations, the largest eigenvector component is the " A_u " component (equation 3.56b). This cosine related circumferential velocity





Seal Strip Parameters

(S)	$a = .195$ in,	$b = .195$ in,	$P_n = 14.85$ psi
	$M_A = .1196$	$M_B = .1208$	
(D)	$a = .196$ in,	$b = .194$ in,	$P_n = 14.79$ psi
	$M_A = .1409$	$M_B = .0951$	
(C)	$a = .194$ in,	$b = .196$ in,	$P_n = 14.91$ psi
	$M_A = .0938$	$M_B = .1418$	

Nominal Values

$P_A = 15.0$ psi	$h_n = .200$ in	$r = 10.0$ in
$P_B = 14.7$ psi	$l = .100$ in	$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

Figure 4.13b - RW42 Results - Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure, Eigenvalues - Circumferential Mode

coefficient exceeds axial pressure components (A_p and B_p in equation 3.56a) by, at least, a factor of 10^4 . Consequently, the Circumferential mode, as the most volatile seal mode, deserves maximum attention when stability is discussed. Additionally, its modal frequency always exceeds that of the Axial mode.

One more pattern common to all RWE4P simulations is that of Axial and Circumferential modal frequencies adding to equal disc rotational frequency (ω). Explained earlier, this criterion is responsible for locating many realistic limits for seal parameters.

Of all parameter variations performed with this isolated disc and seal system, increasing seal divergence and disc speed are the most stabilizing. Increasing disc radius also has an overall stabilizing affect on the seal. The stabilizing effects of increasing both ω and r are due to consequent increasing friction between seal fluid and interacting surfaces. Although seal base to disc nominal clearance increase also stabilizes both seal modes, its limited realistic range made its usefulness as a stabilizing design parameter unpromising.

Because most RWE4P results have satisfactory physical explanations they can serve somewhat as a modeling accuracy verification. Their primary purpose, however, is, still, to provide information describing affects that individual seal parameters have on seal stability. In the next section, these parameter variations will be evaluated in the context of a coupled seal and rotor bearing system.

4.D Coupled Rotor Bearing and Seal System (RWE4S) - Results

4.D.1 Overview

Now that both rotor bearing and labyrinth seal models have been operationally proven, coupled system reactions to seal parameter variations can be discussed. First, the behavior of Myrick's 4 modes will be presented graphically. All modes are identified by comparing RWE4S eigenvalues with RWE4 and RWE4P eigenvalues obtained under the same operating conditions.* When an RWE4S eigenvalue pair more closely equals one RWE4 or RWE4P eigenvalue pair than any other, it is assigned that RWE4 or RWE4P mode's designator. Secondly, differences in behavior for these modes between coupled and rotor bearing (RWE4) systems will be discussed. Such a discussion will explain seal influence on the rotor bearing system. Finally, rotor bearing system influence on seal modes will be discussed by relating coupled system results with those for the isolated seal and disc.

The format of this discussion will parallel that used for discussing RWE4P results. The same seal and disc parameters will be varied individually. Corresponding plots for Modes 1 through 4 will be presented and explained.

4.D.2 Seal Strip Separation (ℓ) Variation

Figure 4.14 presents seal strip separation variation results

* Parameter values in Tables 4.1 and 4.2


for Myrick's first 4 modes.

Mode 1 behaves as expected for ℓ values that are near nominal (Table 4.2). Increasing ℓ beyond .1 in. (nominal) stabilizes this fundamental Myrick mode. This event might be interpreted as a "stability transfer" between Mode 1 and destabilizing seal modes (Figure 4.6). However, Mode 1 promptly begins to destabilize for $\ell > .1255$ in., indicating an upper limit for such a stability transfer. This stability turning point also corresponds closely to actual destabilization of the Circumferential seal mode. Another eigenvalue real part direction change toward increasing stability at $\ell = .2002$ in. could be either an aberration or an indication that seal strip separation growth cannot, by itself, destabilize Mode 1. However, an absence of eigenvalue real part direction change for seal modes at $\ell = .2002$ in. suggests that Mode 1 destabilization will continue with continued increase in ℓ . Further speculation of such a stability transfer must await presentation of remaining ℓ variation results.

The remarkable stability of Mode 2 justifies Shapiro and Colsher's high appraisal of this mode (Figure 4.5). Despite computational accuracy to 7 digits (single precision), no change in stability or modal frequency is noticeable.

Mode 3's behavior is similar to that of Mode 1, but, with larger real part variation and reversal of modal frequency change direction. It, too, stabilizes with ℓ increase up to .1255 in. However, its modal frequency decreases for $\ell > .1006$ in., after a gradual increase for $\ell < .1006$ in., and then begins another gradual increase for $\ell > .1504$ in.

Mode 4 destabilizes with increasing ℓ . Its range of eigenvalue



Parameter Values

$P_A = 2.55$ psi
 $P_B = 1.00$ psi
 $a = .195$ in
 $b = .195$ in
 $h_n = .200$ in
 $\Delta l = .0249$ in
 $r = 10.0$ in
 $\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec = 92.22 Rev/Sec

Figure 4.14a - RWE4S Results - Seal Strip Separation Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 1






Figure 4.14b - RWE4S Results - Seal Strip Separation Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 2



Parameter Values (Modes 2 and 3)

$P_A = 2.55$	psi	$\Delta l = .0249$	in
$P_B = 1.00$	psi	$\omega = 579.45$	Rad/Sec
$h_n = .200$	in	$= 92.22$	Rev/Sec
$a = .195$	in		
$b = .195$	in		
$r = 10.0$	in		

Figure 4.14c - RWE4S Results - Seal Strip Separation Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 3



Parameter Values

$P_A = 2.55$ psi

$P_B = 1.00$ psi

$h_n = .200$ in

$a = .195$ in

$b = .195$ in

$r = 10.0$ in

$\Delta l = .0249$ in

$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

$= 92.22$ Rev/Sec

Figure 4.14d - RWEAS Results - Seal Strip Separation Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 4

real part variation is between that for Modes 1 and 3. At $l = .1255$ in., its rate of destabilization decreases. Its modal frequency also begins to decrease at this point after a previous gradual increase.


For rotor bearing system Modes 1, 3, and 4, $l \approx .1255$ in. represents a transition point. Modes 1 and 3 begin destabilization while Mode 4 continues its destabilization. This point also roughly corresponds to actual Circumferential seal mode destabilization. It is plausible, therefore, that the straight geometry seal has a stabilizing effect on the rotor bearing system's most delicate modes (1 and 3) until the seal itself becomes unstable. Such an effect might also be described as a "stability transfer" from seal modes to Modes 1 and 3. This suggests that unstable circumferential flow within the seal acts, through friction, to destabilize all rotor bearing system modes. Therefore, $l \approx .1255$ in. represents an upper design limit for RWE4S straight seal stability.

4.D.3 Disc Radius (r) Variation

Figure 4.15 presents r variation results for Modes 1 through 4.

Mode 1 stabilizes normally with increasing r, i.e., it follows a smooth trend without observed aberrations. Its modal frequency also increases with increasing r.

Mode 2 is, again, unaffected. However, Mode 3 behaves almost in an equal and opposite manner with respect to l variation results. Here, $r = 10$ in. (nominal value) is close to a transition toward destabilization. Since this value also represents near instability for the seal's Circumferential mode (Figure 4.7) a "stability transfer"



(No perceptible change from
 $\lambda_2 = -55.72384 \pm 291.6852j$
 due to r variation)





Figure 4.15b - RWE4S Results - Disc Radius Variation,
 Eigenvalues - Mode 2



Parameter Values (Modes 2 and 3)

$P_A = 2.55$ psi

$P_B = 1.00$ psi

$h = .200$ in

$a = .195$ in

$b = .195$ in


$Q = .100$ in

$\Delta r = 1.0$ in

$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

$= 92.22$ Rev/Sec

Figure 4.15c - RWE4S Results - Disc Radius Variation,
 Eigenvalues - Mode 3



theory similar to that proposed for ℓ variation, again, appears plausible.

Mode 4 destabilizes with increasing r . Its modal frequency simultaneously increases. The value $r = 10$ in. appears to have no special significance for this mode. However, this root locus plot is more erratic than that for Mode 1, for either seal mode, or for Mode 4 during ℓ variation. Considering also Mode 1's relatively smooth stabilizing behavior and the similarity in form between Mode 3 in both r and ℓ variations, increasing disc radius seems to have an approximately opposite effect on rotor bearing system behavior than does increasing seal strip separation.


Since increasing both ℓ and r should increase disc to seal fluid friction and since the rotor bearing system disc is modeled as a point mass, such friction is not responsible for this difference. Instead, some other feature of the Circumferential seal mode should be considered responsible. This is the only seal mode that destabilizes with increasing ℓ while stabilizing with increasing r .

4.D.4 Upstream Pressure (P_A) Variation

Figure 4.16 presents P_A variation results for Myrick's modes. These results are much less erratic than those for ℓ and r variations.

Mode 1 stabilizes with increasing P_A . Its modal frequency simultaneously decreases slightly. Mode 2 is unaffected. Mode 3 destabilizes with increasing P_A . Mode 4 stabilizes with increasing P_A while its modal frequency decreases.

Increasing pressure difference across the seal is intuitively



Parameter Values

$P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$

$\Delta P_A = .1549 \text{ psi}$

$h_n = .200 \text{ in}$

$a = .195 \text{ in}$

$b = .195 \text{ in}$

$l = .100 \text{ in}$

$r = 10.0 \text{ in}$

$\omega = 579.45 \text{ Rad/Sec}$

$= 92.22 \text{ Rev/Sec}$

Figure 4.16a - RWE4S Results - Seal Upstream Pressure Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 1






Figure 4.16b - RWE4S Results - Seal Upstream Pressure Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 2



Parameter Values (Modes 2 and 3)

$P_B = 1.00$ psi	$a = .195$ in	$r = 10.0$ in
$\Delta P_A = .1549$ psi	$b = .195$ in	$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec
$h_n = .200$ psi	$l = .100$ in	$= 92.22$ Rev/Sec

Figure 4.16c - RWE4S Results - Seal Upstream Pressure Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 3



believed to be destabilizing. Accordingly, Mode 1 should be destabilized by such increasing pressure since it is the most susceptible mode to self excited instability. However, these results challenge such a belief. This surprising result is significant in that increasing upstream pressure might help reduce the nemesis of Mode 1 -- speed induced or self excited instability. By increasing upstream pressure when rotor speed approaches the stability threshold, Mode 1 instability might be postponed.


4.D.5 Seal Base to Disc Nominal Clearance (h_n) Variation Results.


Figure 4.17 presents h_n variation results. As in isolated disc and seal simulations, an upper realistic limit is encountered. Root locus plots reflect unrealistic eigenvalues with dotted lines.


Mode 1 is stabilized by increasing h_n within realistic limits while its modal frequency is decreased. Mode 2 is finally affected by a seal parameter variation. It is slightly stabilized. Its modal frequency is increased with increasing h_n . Mode 3 is destabilized with increasing h_n while its modal frequency is increased. Mode 4 is also destabilized. Its modal frequency is decreased.

4.D.6 Disc Angular Velocity (ω) Variation

Figure 4.18 presents disc speed variation results. Mode 1 demonstrates a stability threshold (92.69 rev/sec) slightly higher than the RWE4 result (92.56 rev/sec). It also exhibits a stabilizing trend







Parameter Values

$P_A = 2.55 \text{ psi}$

$P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$

$a = .195 \text{ in}$

$b = .195 \text{ in}$


$Q = .100 \text{ in}$


$r = 10.0 \text{ in}$


$\omega = 579.45 \text{ Rad/Sec}$

$= 92.22 \text{ Rev/Sec}$

Figure 4.17c - RWE4S Results - Nominal Disc to Seal Base
Clearance Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 3









Parameter Values

$P_A = 2.55 \text{ psi}$	$b = .195 \text{ in}$
$P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$	$\ell = .100 \text{ in}$
$h_n = .200 \text{ in}$	$r = 10.0 \text{ in}$
$a = .195 \text{ in}$	

Figure 4.18b - RWE4S Results - Disc Speed Variation,
Eigenvalues - Mode 2





for ω values less than 38.22 rev/sec (240 rad/sec). Its modal frequency increases smoothly with increasing ω .

Mode 2 behaves similarly. Its transition toward destabilization with increasing ω begins at about 69 rev/sec (435 rad/sec). Although beyond range of physical operation, its stability threshold is about 464 rev/sec (2915 rad/sec).*

Mode 3 behaves erratically during speed variation. Initially, it stabilizes with ω increases up to 76 rev/sec (477 rad/sec). This eigenvalue plot changes direction 3 more times before starting a destabilizing journey that, apparently, never quite reaches the imaginary axis (eigenvalue real part at 1392 rev/sec = $-.63$, corresponding to $\epsilon = .005$). Such erratic behavior supports Mode 3's reputation as a lightly damped mode readily destabilized by mass unbalance but not by increasing speed.

Mode 4 is stabilized by increasing ω during the useful range of this simulation. However, like Modes 1 and 2, it also turns toward the imaginary axis. This turning point occurs at about 126 rev/sec (790 rad/sec). Its fictitious stability threshold is just below that of Mode 2 thereby supporting eventual convergence of Modes 2 and 4 with increasing ω (Figure 4.4 -- RWE4 Results). Similarly, at another large ω value, Modes 1 and 3 converge -- Mode 1, presumably, transverses the imaginary axis several times while Mode 3 approaches it asymptotically.

* Mode 1 periodically becomes unstable and then stable as speed increases toward this "threshold". Therefore, physical failure is expected well before this speed is achieved.

4.D.7 Seal Divergence Variation

Figure 4.19 presents seal divergence results. As noted, simulation 1 represents a straight geometry seal. Simulations 2 and 3 represent divergent seal geometries. Total flow area through both seal strips is maintained.

Mode 1 is stabilized by increasing seal divergence. Its modal frequency is also increased. Mode 2, again, proves itself resistant to change. Mode 3 reexhibits its penchant for erratic behavior. It is stabilized by moderate seal divergence, but, destabilized by continued divergence. Mode 4 is destabilized by increasing seal divergence.


Since stabilization of Mode 1 is required to increase stability threshold seal divergence is, apparently, beneficial. Since degree of seal divergence is physically limited^{*}, actual destabilization of Mode 3 or 4 is unlikely with increasing seal divergence.

4.D.8 Seal Convergence Variation

Figure 4.20 presents seal convergence variation results. Conditions stated for seal divergence apply here also.

As expected, Mode 1 is destabilized by increasing seal convergence. Its small degree of destabilization relative to variable divergence induced stabilization (Figure 4.19) can be attributed to constant nominal chamber pressure caused by choked flow at seal strip B.

* .19 in. $< a, b < h_n$




Parameter Values


$P_A = 2.55 \text{ psi}$
 $P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$
 $h_n = .200 \text{ in}$
 $l = .100 \text{ in}$
 $r = 10.0 \text{ in}$
 $\omega = 579.45 \text{ Rad/Sec}$

Seal Strip Dimensions

(1) $a = .195 \text{ in}, P_n = 1.89 \text{ psi}$
 $b = .195 \text{ in}$
 (2) $a = .196 \text{ in}, P_n = 1.69 \text{ psi}$
 $b = .194 \text{ in}$
 (3) $a = .197 \text{ in}, P_n = 1.34 \text{ psi}$
 $b = .193 \text{ in}$

Figure 4.19a - RWE4S Results - Seal Divergence Variation,
Eigenvalues - Mode 1





Mode 3 is stabilized by increasing seal convergence while mode 4 is destabilized. Again, rates of eigenvalue real part change relative to variable seal divergence simulations are marginal due to constant nominal chamber pressure.


4.D.9 Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure

Figure 4.21 presents high chamber pressure results. Here, seal geometry varies from convergent to divergent while relative pressure drop across the seal* is maintained at a relatively low level. Nominal chamber pressure is increased approximately by a factor of 10. The stability reversals evident for seal modes (Figure 4.13) are not exhibited by rotor bearing system modes.

Mode 1 is stabilized by decreasing seal convergence (or increasing divergence) thereby maintaining predicted behavior (Figure 4.19). Mode 3 also stabilizes as expected. Mode 4 satisfies the prediction of Figure 4.19 by destabilizing with increasing divergence.

It should be remembered that these results, particularly Mode 1's, are of primary interest when considering stability threshold enhancement. Here, predicted Mode 1 stabilization with diverging seal geometry is encouraging. Unfortunately, the seal Circumferential mode is unstable during all of these high pressure simulations making experimental verification impossible. Additionally, more simulations at other pressure (P_A , P_B) and pressure drop ($P_A - P_B$) values are needed to provide confidence in maintaining this assertion of improved stability at

* $(P_A - P_B)/P_A$



Parameter Values

$P_A = 2.55 \text{ psi}$
 $P_B = 1.00 \text{ psi}$
 $h_n = 200 \text{ in}$
 $l = 100 \text{ in}$
 $r = 10.0 \text{ in}$
 $\omega = 579.45 \text{ Rad/Sec}$

Seal Strip Dimensions

(1) $a = .195 \text{ in}, P_n = 1.89 \text{ psi}$
 $b = .195 \text{ in}$
 (2) $a = .194 \text{ in}, P_n = 1.89 \text{ psi}$
 $b = .196 \text{ in}$
 (3) $a = .193 \text{ in}, P_n = 1.89 \text{ psi}$
 $b = .197 \text{ in}$

Figure 4.20a - RWEAS Results - Seal Convergence Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 1





Figure 4.20b - RWE4S Results - Seal Convergence Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 2




Parameter Values

(Modes 2 and 3)

Seal Strip Dimensions

$P_A = 2.55$ psi	①	$a = .195$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi
$P_B = 1.00$ psi	②	$b = .195$ in
$h_n = .200$ in		$a = .194$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi
$l = .100$ in		$b = .196$ in
$r = 10.0$ in	③	$a = .193$ in, $P_n = 1.89$ psi
$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec		$b = .197$ in

Figure 4.20c - RWE4S Results - Seal Convergence Variation, Eigenvalues - Mode 3



high chamber pressure using divergent seal geometry.

4.D.10 Speed (ω) Variation at Extreme Seal Divergence

Figure 4.22 presents root locus results for Myrick modes at extreme seal divergence and for variable rotor speeds starting near the Mode 1 stability threshold of Figure 4.18. This simulation is intended to determine a revised stability threshold due to seal divergence and to verify improved, divergence induced, coupled system stability per Figure 4.19.


Mode 1's stability threshold is increased to 93.13 rev/sec (585.16 rad/sec) because of seal divergence. This represents a .47% increase from the revised stability threshold achieved with a straight seal (Figure 4.18) and a .6% increase relative to the stability threshold for Myrick's rotor bearing system without seal (Figure 4.4).

Stability of Modes 2 and 3 is marginally degraded, but not enough to discourage further stabilization of Mode 1. Mode 4 continues its stabilizing behavior with increasing ω (Figure 4.18).

4.D.11 Seal and Rotor Bearing System Interactions

4.D.11.A Seal Influence on Rotor Bearing System Modes

Myrick modes are not radically affected by coupling with a labyrinth seal. Generally, points on root locus plots in Figures 4.14 through 4.22 are affected equally by seal modes. Although such affects cannot be positively attributed to any particular seal mode, the relative



Parameter Values

$P_A = 15.0$ psi
 $P_B = 14.7$ psi
 $h_n = .200$ in
 $\ell = .100$ in
 $r = 10.0$ in
 $\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

Seal Strip Dimensions

(S) $a = .195$ in, $P_n = 14.85$ psi
 $b = .195$ in
 (D) $a = .196$ in, $P_n = 14.79$ psi
 $b = .194$ in
 (C) $a = .194$ in, $P_n = 14.91$ psi
 $b = .196$ in

Figure 4.21a - RWE4S Results - Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure, Eigenvalues - Mode 1






Figure 4.21b - RWE4S Results - Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure, Eigenvalues - Mode 2



Parameter Values	Seal Strip Dimensions
(Modes 2 and 3)	
$P_A = 15.0$ psi	(S) $a = .195$ in, $P_n = 14.85$ psi
$P_B = 14.7$ psi	$b = .195$ in
$h_n = .200$ in	(D) $a = .196$ in, $P_n = 14.79$ psi
$l = .100$ in	$b = .194$ in
$r = 10.0$ in	(C) $a = .194$ in, $P_n = 14.91$ psi
$\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec	$b = .196$ in

Figure 4.21c - RWE4S Results - Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure, Eigenvalues - Mode 3



Parameter Values

$P_A = 15.0$ psi
 $P_B = 14.7$ psi
 $h_n = .200$ in
 $l = .100$ in
 $r = 10.0$ in
 $\omega = 579.45$ Rad/Sec

Seal Strip Dimensions

(S) $a = .195$ in, $P_n = 14.85$ psi
 $b = .195$ in
 (D) $a = .196$ in, $P_n = 14.79$ psi
 $b = .194$ in
 (C) $a = .194$ in, $P_n = 14.91$ psi
 $b = .196$ in

Figure 4.21d - RWE4S Results - Variable Seal Geometry at High Chamber Pressure, Eigenvalues - Mode 4

volatility of the Circumferential mode suggests its predominance. Therefore, curve shapes and relative distances among points remain practically unchanged.

Mode 1 is stabilized by the seal. The seal also acts to increase its modal frequency.

As most RWE4S simulations reveal, the seal has little perceptible effect on Mode 2. Only speed variations (not a seal parameter) significantly affects Mode 2 (Figures 4.18 and 4.22).


Mode 3 is destabilized and has decreasing modal frequency for $\omega < 477$ rad/sec (76 rev/sec) due to seal influence. For $\omega > 477$ rad/sec, Mode 3 is, conversely, stabilized and has increasing modal frequency as a result of seal influence.


Mode 4 is destabilized by the seal. Its modal frequency is increased.

4.D.11.B Rotor Bearing System Influence on Seal Modes

Rotor bearing system influence on seal modes is similar to seal influence on rotor bearing system modes in that RWE4P seal mode curve shapes and relative distances among points are unaffected. The Axial mode is stabilized while the Circumferential mode is destabilized when seal and rotor bearing systems are coupled. Again, because rotor bearing system modes were not isolated, no particular mode can be identified as having a predominant affect on these seal behavior changes.

Another such seal behavior change deals with affects on seal modal frequencies. When seal modes are stable, the rotor bearing system acts to reduce modal frequencies for both seal modes. Such an event





Parameter Values

P_A	=	2.55	psi
P_B	=	1.00	psi
h_n	=	.200	in
a	=	.197	in
b	=	.193	in
l	=	.100	in
r	=	10.0	in

Figure 4.22b - RWE4S Results - Disc Speed Variation at
Extreme Seal Divergence - Mode 2





Figure 4.22c - RWE4S Results - Disc Speed Variation at
Extreme Seal Divergence - Mode B



suggests "frequency transfer" from the seal to the rotor bearing system since seal modal frequencies now add to be less than ω . However, when the seal (Circumferential mode) is unstable, seal modal frequencies add to exceed ω . In this case, Axial (still stable) modal frequency is still reduced, but Circumferential modal frequency increases. Since this result was not encountered during isolated seal and disc simulations this excess frequency must be assumed to have the form of disc whirl. Because both systems are coupled with an unstable seal mode this whirl must be explosive--a dangerous but still realistic condition!

4.E Summary

RW5 and RWE4 rotor bearing system results compare favorably with those of Myrick and Shapiro and Colsher. Such success establishes Chapter 3's analytical rotor bearing system model as both accurate and similar to Myrick's experimental model.

RWE4P results reveal increasing disc radius, disc rotational speed, seal base to disc nominal clearance and seal divergence as having stabilizing influences on seal fluid flow. Conversely, increasing seal strip separation, chamber pressure, and seal convergence destabilize fluid flow through the seal. At high pressure and low axial flow rate, both diverging and converging seal geometries stabilize seal modes relative to straight seal geometry. These results, generally, have plausible physical explanations thereby verifying seal modeling accuracy.

Coupled system results also compare favorably with earlier predictions. Because Mode 1 is most susceptible to self excited instability, parameter variation affects on it determine coupled system

stability.

Mode 1 is stabilized by increasing disc radius, seal pressure drop, nominal seal base to disc clearance, and seal divergence. It is destabilized by increasing seal convergence. In the vicinity of nominal parameter values (Table 4.2), increasing seal strip separation stabilizes Mode 1. However, an unstable seal, with further increase in ℓ , soon causes Mode 1 to destabilize. The destabilizing effect of increasing disc speed on Mode 1 is caused primarily by Oil Whip. Straight seal geometry postpones the onset of Oil Whip marginally.

Similarly, diverging seal geometry increases system stability threshold. Although still marginal in degree, this increase satisfies expectations in that, amount of stability threshold increase exceeds that of both straight and convergent seals. This marginal increase cannot be considered within range of modeling error, indicated in 4.B.2, because RWE4 and RWE4S both contain the same rotor bearing system programming. Additionally, by increasing stability threshold the least relative to seal absence, convergent seal geometry results further reinforce this prediction of increasing stability threshold with increasing seal divergence. This trend appears to apply also at increased chamber pressure and reduced axial flow rate. Unfortunately, additional data at different combinations of such higher chamber pressure and lower flow rates are needed for verification. Such verification was not accomplished using this model because of an unstable Circumferential seal mode at high chamber pressure.

The principle aim of this thesis has been achieved. Rotor bearing system stability has been improved by divergent seal geometry. Although such improvement was marginal (.47%), it should be noted that a specific maximized stability threshold increase was not sought. System adjustment to achieve such a threshold is warranted only when dealing with models directly proportionate with operational steam turbines.

Seal parameter affects on system stability were discovered and presented for possible later use in developing seal design criteria. Such information might be used to optimize stability of both seal and rotor bearing system modes toward the goal of turbine efficiency enhancement.

These specific and notable conclusions were developed:

- 1) Performances of nonlinear (RW5) and linear (RWE4) analytical rotor bearing system models are similar to that of Myrick's experimental model.
- 2) Labyrinth seal stability is governed primarily by its Circumferential mode.
- 3) Straight seal geometry increases rotor bearing system stability.
- *4) Divergent seal geometry increases rotor bearing system stability threshold beyond that of straight seal geometry.
- 5) Convergent seal geometry destabilizes the Myrick rotor bearing system relative to straight and divergent seal geometries.
- 6) This coupled rotor bearing and labyrinth seal system model is not suited for experimental testing at atmospheric pressure.

APPENDIX A

A.1 Nonlinear Rotor Bearing System Programming

```

PROGRAM RW5(RW5,OUTPUT,TAPE5=RW5,TAPE6=OUTPUT)
DIMENSION X(20),F(20),TS(100),X3(100),K(7),X1(100),X2(100)
COMMON/DR/SKX,SKY,BC,W,PI,SPI,DVR,DVL,CL,BR,PSDR,PER,PEL
1,ERR,ERL,XS(20),H,DM,BM,FXLS,FYLS,FXRS,FYRS
DATA X,F,TS,X5,XS/452*0./ $DATA K/7*0/
C THIS PROGRAM SIMULATES ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM OPERATION USING FINITE
C DIFFERENCE TIME INTEGRATION
C H=TIME STEP=1.E-05 SEC
C DV=DYNAMIC VISCOSITY OF BEARING FLUID=5.E-06LBFSEC/IN2
C CL=JOURNAL LENGTH=1.063IN
C W= $\frac{1}{2}$ (JOURNAL+DISC)WEIGHT
C BC=RADIAL BEARING CLEARANCE=.003IN
C BR=JOURNAL RADIUS=1.081IN
C SKX=X DIRECTION ROTOR SHAFT STIFFNESS=5348.6LBF/IN
C SKY=Y DIRECTION ROTOR SHAFT STIFFNESS=5348.6LBF/IN
C DM=DISC MASS=.0875LBFSEC2/IN
C BM=JOURNAL MASS=.0096LBFSEC2/IN
C ERI=INITIAL JOURNAL ECCENTRICITY RATIO
C ERS=STEADY JOURNAL ECCENTRICITY RATIO
C PEI=INITIAL ATTITUDE ANGLE
C IH=TIME STEP COUNTER
C ITP=PRINT COUNTER
C MT=MAX NUMBER OF TIME STEPS
C NN=NUMBER OF STATE VARIABLES=12
C M=NUMBER OF PLOT POINTS
C NP=PLOTTING OPTION(MINIPLT)
READ(5,1)H,DV,CL,W,BC,BR,SKX,SKY,DM,BM,ERI,PEI,ERS
READ(5,2)IH,ITP,MT,NN,M,NP
PI=3.1415927
SPI=9.8696044
C INITIALIZE ECCENTRICITY RATIO
XS(15)=ERS $ XS(13)=ERS
DVR=5.DE-06 $DVL=5.DE-D6
D1=(1.-(XS(15)**2))
D2=XS(15)/(D1**2)
D3=((16./SPI)-1.)
D4=(D3*(XS(15)**2)+1.)
C CALCULATE JOURNAL ANGULAR VELOCITY
PSDR=4.*W*(BC**2)*(D1**2)/(PI*DVR*CL*XS(15)*SQRT(D4)*BR)
C CALCULATE ATTITUDE ANGLE
XS(16)=ATAN((PI/4.)*SQRT(D1)/XS(15))
C LEFT BEARING
21 D1=(1.-(XS(13)**2))
D2=XS(13)/(D1**2)
D3=((16./SPI)-1.)
D4=(D3*(XS(13)**2)+1.)
PSDL=4.*W*(BC**2)*(D1**2)/(PI*DVL*CL*XS(13)*SQRT(D4)*BR)

```

```

XS(14)=ATAN((PI/4.)*SQRT(D1)/XS(13))
T=0.0
C  STEADY CONDITIONS
XS(3)=XS(13)*BC*SIN(XS(14))
XS(4)=-XS(13)*BC*COS(XS(14))
XS(5)=XS(3)
XS(6)=XS(4)
XS(1)=XS(3)
XS(2)=XS(4)
C  STEADY BEARING FILM FORCES
FXLS=W*SIN(XS(14))
FYLS=W*COS(XS(14))
FXRS=W*SIN(XS(14))
FYRS=W*COS(XS(14))
WRITE(6,6)T,H,XS(15),XS(16),PSDR
WRITE(6,8)XS(13),XS(14),PSDL
C  WRITE(6,7)(XS(I),I=1,NN)
C  INITIAL CONDITIONS
X(3)=ERI*BC*SIN(PEI)
X(4)=-ERI*BC*COS(PEI)
X(5)=X(3)
X(6)=X(4)
X(1)=X(3)
X(2)=X(4)
X(13)=SQRT((X(3)**2)+(X(4)**2))/BC
X(15)=SQRT((X(5)**2)+(X(6)**2))/BC
X(14)=PEI
X(16)=PEI
.. WRITE(6,6)T,H,X(15),X(16),PSDR
WRITE(6,8)X(13),X(14),PSDL
C  WRITE(6,7)(X(I),I=1,NN)
KI=0
DO 10 II=1,MT,ITP
KI=KI+1
TS(KI)=T
X1(KI)=X(1)
X2(KI)=X(2)
X3(KI)=X(3)
C  CALCULATE STATE VARIABLE VALUES
DO 11 JJ=1,ITP,IH
CALL RK4(F,X,T,NN,H)
11 CONTINUE
WRITE(6,6)T,H,X(15),X(16),PSDR
WRITE(6,8)X(13),X(14),PSDL
C  WRITE(6,7)(X(I),I=1,NN)
10 CONTINUE
33 K(1)=1 $ K(3)=NP
K(6)=10HX1 VS T
C  PLOT STATE VARIABLE VALUES
CALL MINIPLT(TS,X1,M,K)
K(6)=10HX2 VS T
CALL MINIPLT(TS,X2,M,K,)
K(6)=10HX2 VS X1

```

```

CALL MINIPLT(X1,X2,M,K)
      K(6)=10HX3 VS T
CALL MINIPLT(TS,X3,M,K)
7 FORMAT( E23.6)
6 FORMAT( /,5X,'T = ',E10.3,5X,'H = ',E15.6,3X,'ERR=',E12.6,3X,
1 'PER=',E12.5,3X,'PSDR=',E12.5)
8 FORMAT(46X,"ERL=",E12.6,3X,'PEL=',E12.5,3X,'PSDL=',E12.5,/)
1 FORMAT(E20.7)
2 FORMAT(I10)
STOP
END

SUBROUTINE DERIV(F,X,T)
  DIMENSION X(20),F(20)
  COMMON/DR/SKX,DKY,BC,W,PI,SPI,DVR,DVL,CL,BR,PSDR,PER,PEL
1,ERR,ERL,XS(20),H,DM,BM,FXLS,FYLS,FXRS,FYRS
C  ECCENTRICITY AND ATTITUDE ANGLE INCREMENTS
  E=X(13)*BC $ ES=E**2
  F(13)=(X(3)*X(9)+X(4)*X(10))/(X(13)*(BC**2))
  F(14)=-((X(4)*X(9)-X(3)*X(10))/ES
  E=X(15)*BC $ ES=E**2
  F(15)=(X(5)*X(11)+X(6)*X(12))/(X(15)*(BC**2))
  F(16)=-((X(6)*X(11)-X(5)*X(12))/ES
21 D1=(1.-(X(13)**2))
  D2=X(13)/(D1**2)
  D3=((16./SPI)-1.)
  D4=(D3*(X(13)**2)+1.)
  DO 46 I=13,14
    K I+2
    F(I)=F(I)/PSDL
46 F(K)=F(K)/PSDR
C  BEARING FORCE CALCULATION
  FEL=-(((1.-2.*F(14))*2.*(X(15)**2)/(D1**2))+(PI*F(13)*
1 (1.+2.*(X(13)**2)/(D1**2.5))))
  FPL=-(((2.*F(14)-1.)*PI*X(13)/(2.*(D1**1.5)))
1 -(4.*F(13)*X(13)/(D1**2)))
  FM=DVL*PSDL*BR/(2.*(BC**2))
  FXL=((FEL*SIN(X(14))+FPL*COS(X(14)))*FM)-FXLS
  FYL=(-FEL*COS(X(14))+FPL*SIN(X(14)))*FM)-FYLS
  D1=(1.-(X(15)**2))
  D2=X(15)/(D1**2)
  D3=((16./SPI)-1.)
  D4=(D3*(X(15)**2)+1.)
  FER=-(((1.-2.*F(16))*2.*(X(15)**2)/(D1**2))+(PI*F(15)*
1 (1.+2.*(X(15)**2)/(D1**2.5))))
  FPR=-(((2.*F(16)-1.)*PI*X(15)/(2.*(D1**1.5)))
1 -(4.*F(15)*X(15)/(D1**2)))
  FM=DVR*PSDR*BR/(2.*(BC**2))
  FXR=((FER*SIN(X(16))+FPR*COS(X(16)))*FM)-FXRS
  FYR=(-FER*COS(X(16))+FPR*SIN(X(16)))*FM)-FYRS
  DO 49 I=13,14
    K=I+2
    F(I)=F(I)*PSDL

```

```

49 F(K)=F(K)*PSDR
   DO 57 I=1,6
57 X(I)=X(I)-XS(I)
C  STATE VARIABLE INCREMENTS
   F(1)=X(7)
   F(2)=X(8)
   F(3)=X(9)
   F(4)=X(10)
   F(5)=X(11)
   F(6)=X(12)
   F(7)=(-SKX*(X(1)-X(3))-SKX*(X(1)-X(5)))/DM
   F(8)=(-(X(2)-X(4))-(X(2)-X(6)))*SKY/DM
   F(9)=(-SKX*(X(3)-X(1))+FXL)/BM
   F(10)=(-SKY*(X(4)-X(2))+FYL)/BM
   F(11)=(-SKX*(X(5)-X(1))+FXR)/BM
   F(12)=(-SKY*(X(2))+FYR)/BM
   DO 58 I=1,6
58 X(I)=X(I)+XS(I)
   RETURN
   END

```

```

SUBROUTINE RK4(F,Y,X,NN,HH)
C  4TH ORDER RUNGE-KUTTA
   DIMENSION Y(20),F(20)
   DIMENSION SAVEY(20),PHI(20)
   N=NN $ H=HH
   M=0
1  M=M+1
   CALL DERIV(F,Y,X)
   GO TO (2,3,4,5),M
2  DO 22 J=1,N
   SAVEY(J)=Y(J)
   PHI(J)=F(J)
22 Y(J)=Y(J)+.5*F(J)*H
   X=X+.5*H
   GO TO 1
3  DO 33 J=1,N
   PHI(J)=PHI(J)+2.0*F(J)
33 Y(J)=SAVEY(J)+.5*H*F(J)
   GO TO 1
4  DO 44 J=1,N
   PHI(J)=PHI(J)+2.0*F(J)
44 Y(J)=SAVEY(J)+H*F(J)
   X=X+.5*H
   GO TO 1
5  DO 55 J=1,N
55 Y(J)=SAVEY(J)+(PHI(J)+F(J))*H/6.0
   RETURN
   END

```

A.2 Linear Rotor Bearing System Model Programming

```

PROGRAM RWE4(RWE4,OUTPUT,TAPE5=RWE4,TAPE6=OUTPUT)
DIMENSION A(40,40),XR(40),XI(40),BRE(40,40),BI(40,40)
C THIS PROGRAM GENERATES EIGENVALUES AND EIGENVECTORS FOR THE MYRICK
C ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM
C SKX=SHAFT STIFFNESS IN X DIRECTION=5348.6 LBF/IN2
C SKY=SHAFT STIFFNESS IN Y DIRECTION=5348.6 LBF/IN2
C BM=JOURNAL MASS=.0096 LBFSEC2/IN
C DM=DISC MASS=.0875 LBFSEC2/IN
C W = 1/2(JOURNAL + DISC) WEIGHT=20.625 LBF
C DVL=BEARING FLUID DYNAMIC VISCOSITY (LBFSEC/IN2)
C CL=JOURNAL LENGTH=1.603 IN
C BR=JOURNAL RADIUS=1.081 IN
C BC=JOURNAL TO BEARING RADIAL CLEARANCE=.003 IN
READ(5,11)SKX,SKY,BM,DM,W,CL,BR,BC
PI=3.1415927
SPI=9.8696044
DVL=5.0E-06 $ DVR=5.0E-06
C SET INITIAL ECCENTRICITY RATIO
ERR=.075 $ ERL=.075
PRINT 11,DM,BM
PRINT 11
21 D1=(1.-(ERR**2))
D2=ERR/(D1**2)
D3=((16./SPI)-1.)
D4=(D3*(ERR**2)+1.)
C CALCULATE ANGULAR VELOCITY
PSDR=-4.*W*(BC**2)*(D1**2)/(PI*DVR*CL*ERR*SQRT(D4)*BR)
FM=DVR*PSDR*BR/(BC**2)
FMD=FM/PSDR
PER=ATAN((PI/4.)*SQRT(D1)/ERR)
C CALCULATE BEARING COEFFICIENTS
BKEER=FM*(-2.*D2-(D2*(ERR**2)*4./D1))/BC
BKEPR=-PI*FM*ERR/(4.*(D1**1.5)*ERR*BC)
BDEER=-PI*FMD*(1.+2.*(ERR**2))/(2.*(D1**2.5)*BC)
BDEPR=2.*ERR*D2*FMD/(ERR*BC)
BKPER=FM*((PI/(4.*(D1**1.5)))+(0.75*PI*(ERR**2)/((D1**2.5))))
1/BC
BKPPR=-ERR*D2*FM/(ERR*BC)
BDPER=2.*(D2/BC)*FMD
BDPPR=-PI*FMD*ERR/(2.*(D1**1.5)*ERR*BC)
S=SIN(PER)
C=COS(PER)
C BEARING COEFFICIENTS IN X-Y FORM
BKXXR=((BKEER*S+BKEPR*C)*S+(BKPER*S+BKPPR*C)*C)
BKXYR=((-BKEER*C+BKEPR*S)*S+(-BKPER*C+BKPPR*S)*C)
BKYYR=(-(BKEER*S+BKEPR*C)*C+(BKPER*S+BKPPR*C)*S)
BKYYR=(-(BKEER*C+BKEPR*S)*C+(-BKPER*C+BKPPR*S)*S)
BDXXR=((BDEER*S+BDEPR*C)*S+(BDPER*S+BDPPR*C)*C)
BDXYR=((-BDEER*C+BDEPR*S)*S+(-BDPER*C+BDPPR*S)*C)
BDYYR=(-(BDEER*S+BDEPR*C)*C+(-BDPER*S+BDPPR*C)*S)
BDYYR=(-(BDEER*C+BDEPR*S)*C+(-BDPER*C+BDPPR*S)*S)

```

```

      NC=0 $ N=12
C    INITIALIZE A MATRIX
      DO 26 I=1,N
      DO 27 J=1,N
27   A(I,J)=0.0
26   CONTINUE
      DO 3 I=1,6
      KI=I+6
      A(I,KI)=1.
      3 CONTINUE
C    LOAD A MATRIX
      A(7,1)=-(SKX*2.)/DM
      A(7,3)=SKX/DM
      A(7,5)=SKX/DM
      A(8,2)=-(SKY*2.)/DM
      A(8,4)=SKY/DM
      A(8,6)=SKY/DM
      A(9,1)=SKX/BM
      A(9,3)=-(SKX+BKXXR)/BM
      A(9,4)=-BKXYR/BM
      A(9,9)=-BDXXR/BM
      A(9,10)=-BDXYR/BM
      A(10,2)=SKY/BM
      A(10,3)=-BKXYR/BM
      A(10,4)=-(SKY+BKYR)/BM
      A(10,9)=-BDXYR/BM
      A(10,10)=-BDYYR/BM
      A(11,1)=SKX/BM
      A(11,5)=-(SKX+BKXXR)/BM
      A(11,6)=-BKXYR/BM
      A(11,11)=-BDXXR/BM
      A(11,12)=-BDXYR/BM
      A(12,2)=SKY/BM
      A(12,5)=-BKXYR/BM
      A(12,6)=-(SKY+BKYR)/BM
      A(12,11)=-BDYXR/BM
      A(12,12)=-BDYYR/BM
      DO 89 II=1,12
      DO 88 JJ=1,12
88   A(II,JJ)=-A(II,JJ)
89   CONTINUE
      J=1
C    CALCULATE EIGENVALUES AND EIGENVECTORS
      CALL QRHMOD(A,N,J,XR,XI,BRE,BI)
      PSDR=-PSDR
      PRINT 2,PSDR,ERR,PER
C    PRINT EIGENVALUES
      PRINT 30,(XR(I),XI(I),I=1,N)
      PRINT 11
      PRINT 11
C    INCREMENT ECCENTRICITY RATIO
      ERR=ERR-.0001

```

```
IF(ERR.LT..074)GO TO 23
IF(ERR.GE..25) GO TO 23
GO TO 21
23 CONTINUE
C PRINT EIGENVECTORS
PRINT 30,((BRE(I,J),BI(I,J),I=1,N),J=1,N)
2 FORMAT(9X,'PSDR = ',E12.4,3X,'ERR = ',E12.4,3X,'PER = ',E12.4/)
30 FORMAT(5X,E15.6,5X,E15.6)
11 FORMAT(E15.6)
6 FORMAT(10X,7E15.5/)
STOP
END
```

A.3 Linear Rotor Bearing System and Labyrinth Seal - Coupled (RWE4S)
and Isolated Seal and Disc (RWE4P) Programming

```

PROGRAM RWE4S(RWE4S,OUTPUT,TAPE5=RWE4S,TAPE6=OUTPUT)
DIMENSION AM(40,40),XR(40),BRE(40,40),BI(40,40),PC(4,4)
DATA PC/16*0./
C THIS PROGRAM GENERATES EIGENVALUES AND EIGENVECTORS FOR A ROTOR
C BEARING SYSTEM WITH SINGLE LABYRINTH SEAL
C SKX= X DIRECTION ROTOR ELASTICITY=5348.6 LBF/IN
C SKY= Y DIRECTION ROTOR ELASTICITY=5348.6 LBF/IN
C BM = JOURNAL MASS=.0096 LBF*SEC2/IN
C DM = DISC MASS=.0879 LBF*SEC2/IN
C W = 1/2 WEIGHT OF ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM ROTATING PARTS=20.625 LBF
C CL = JOURNAL LENGTH=1.000 IN
C BR = JOURNAL RADIUS=1.081 IN
C BC = RADIAL BEARING CLEARANCE=.003 IN
C CLC= LABYRINTH SEAL AXIAL LENGTH
C WD = LABYRINTH SEAL CIRCUMFERENTIAL LENGTH=PI*RD*2.
C PSI= UPSTREAM SEAL PRESSURE
C TI = SEAL TEMPERATURE=560R
C R = GAS CONSTANT (AIR)=247104 IN2/SEC2R
C A = UPSTREAM SEAL STRIP HEIGHT
C B = DOWNSTREAM SEAL STRIP HEIGHT
C DC = DISC TO SEAL RADIAL CLEARANCE
C AMNI= INITIAL UPSTREAM MACH# (ASSUMED)
C CK = SPECIFIC HEAT RATIO
C CWB= DOWNSTREAM SEAL STRIP DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT
C PSE= SEAL DISCHARGE PRESSURE
C DV = SEAL FLUID DYNAMIC VISCOSITY
C SPI= PI**2
C ERR,ERL= JOURNAL ECCENTRICITY RATIOS, RIGHT&LEFT JOURNALS
C RD = DISC RADIUS
C VK = KINEMATIC VISCOSITY
READ(5,11)SKX,SKY,BM,DM,W,CL,BR,BC,CLC,WD,PSI,TI,R,A,B
1,DC,AMNI,CK,RD,CWB,PSE
DV=2.8E 09
PI=3.1415927
SPI=9.8696044
CK1=(CK-1.)/CK $ CK1R=1./CK1 $ CKR=1./CK
CK2=(CK+1.)/(2.*(CK-1.))
CK3=(3.-CK)/(2.*(CK-1.))
CK4=(CK-1.)/2. $ CK5=(CK+1.)/2. $ CK5R=1./CK5
CK6=CK2*2. $ CK7=(1.-2.*CK)/CK
CK8=SQRT(1.+CK4)
CK9=(1./CK5)**CK1R
CK10=1./((1.+CK4)**CK2)
CK11=SQRT((CK/R)*(CK5R**CK6))
C BEARING FLUID DYNAMIC VISCOSITY
DVL=5.0E-06 $ DVR=5.0E-06
C INITIALIZED JOURNAL ECCENTRICITY RATIO (VALUE AS REQUIRED)
ERR=.076
C ITERATE SEAL PARAMETERS
DC 22 IBI=1,10

```

```

C   SEAL ENTRANCE/EXIT AREAS
21 AB=(DC-B)*WD
   AA=(DC-A)*WD
C   CALCULATE SEAL CHAMBER PRESSURE
   AMNS=AMNI
24 FMAS=AMNS/((1.+CK4*(AMNS**2))**CK2)
   PNP=1./((1.+CK4*(AMNS**2))**CK1R)
   CWA=-.3179464*PNP+.9123729
   IF(AMNS.LE.0.)AMNS=0.
   IF(AMNS.LE.0.)GO TO 37
   PN=PNP*PSI
   AMN=SQRT((1./CK4)*((PSI/PN)**CK1)-1.)
   CWB=-.3179464*(PSE/PN)+.9123729
   BMNS=SQRT((1./CK4)*((PN/PSE)**CK1)-1.)
   IF(BMNS.GE.1)BMNS=1.
   IF(BMNS.GE.1)CWB=.74
   FMBS=BMNS/((1.+CK4*(BMNS**2))**CK2)
   PNN=AA*PSI*FMAS*CWA/(AB*FMBS*CWB)
   IF(BMNS.GE.1)PNN=PSE/CK9
   IF(PNN.GT.PN)AMNS=AMNS-.00001
   IF(PNN.LT.PN)AMNS=AMNS+.00001
   IF(PNN.LE.(PN+.0005*PN).AND.PNN.GE.(PN-.0005*PN) GO TO 37
   IF(AMN.GE.1.)AMNS=1.
   GO TO 24
37 IK=1 $ N=16 $ NN=20 $ MM=10 $ NP=4
   PRINT 11,AMN,AMNS,BMNS,PN,PNN
   PRINT 11
   AMNI=AMN
   D1=(1.-(ERR**2))
   D2=ERR/(D1**2)
   D3=((16./SPI)-1.)
   D4=(D3*(ERR**2)+1.)
C   CALCULATE ROTOR ANGULAR VELOCITY
   PSDR=-4.*W*(BC**2)*(D1**2)/(PI*DVR*CL*ERR*SQRT(D4)*BR)
   FM=DVR*PSDR*BR/(BC**2)
   FMD=FM/PSDR
C   CALCULATE JOURNAL ATTITUDE ANGLE
   PER=ATAN((PI/4.)*SQRT(D1)/ERR)
C   CALCULATE BEARING COEFFICIENTS
   BKEER=FM*(-2.*D2-(D2*(ERR**2)*4./D1))/BC
   BKEPR=-PI*FM*ERR/(4.*(D1**1.5)*ERR*BC)
   BDEER=-PI*FMD*(1.+2.*(ERR**2))/(2.*(D1**2.5)*BC)
   BDEPR=2.*ERR*D2*FMD/(ERR*BC)
   BKPER=FM*((PI/(4.*(D1**1.5)))+(0.75*PI*(ERR**2)/((D1**2.5))))
1/BC
   BKPPR=-ERR*D2*FM/(ERR*BC)
   BDPER=2.*(D2/BC)*FMD
   BDPPR=-PI*FMD*ERR/(2.*(D1**1.5)*ERR*BC)
   S=SIN(PER)
   C=COS(PER)
   BKXXR=((BKEER*S+BKEPR*C)*S+(BKPER*S+BKPPR*C)*C)
   BKXYR=((-BKEER*C+BKEPR*S)*S+(-BKPER*C+BKPPR*S)*C)
   BKYXR=(-(BKEER*S+BKEPR*C)*C+(BKPER*S+BKPPR*C)*S)

```

```

BKYR=(-(-BKEER*C+BKEPR*S)*C+(-BKPER*C+BKPPR*S)*S)
BDXXR=((BDEER*S+BDEPR*C)*S+(BDPER*S+BDPPR*C)*C)
BDXYR=(-BDEER*C+BDEPR*S)*S+(-BDPER*C+BDPPR*S)*C)
BDYXR=(-(BDEER*S+BDEPR*C)*C+(BDPER*S+BDPPR*C)*S)
BDYYR=(-(-BDEER*C+BDEPR*S)*C+(-BDPER*C+BDPPR*S)*S)
ACH=CLC*WD
ED=ERR*BC
C   ZERO A MATRIX
    DO 26 I=1,N
    DO 27 J=1,N
27  AM(I,J)=0.0
26  CONTINUE
C   X1 THRU X6 INITIALIZATION IN AM
    DO 3 I=1,6
    KI=I+6
    AM(I,KI)=1.
3   CONTINUE
    RD2=RD/2.
    PSDU=-PSDR*RD
    HN=DC
    AA=(HN-A)*WD
    AB=(HN-B)*WD
C   SEAL FRICTION COEFFICIENTS
    UN=(PSDU/2.)
C   REO=REYNOLDS# AT SEAL BASE
    REO=ABS(PN*UN*HN/(2.*R*TI*DV))
    FFEO=-1./4.38
    AFO=.04176
    IF(REO.GT.1.E+05)FFEO=-1./7.4
    IF(REO.GT.1.E+05)AFO=.01423
C   REI=REYNOLDS# AT DISC
    REI=ABS(PN*(PSDU-UN)*HN/(2.*R*TI*DV))
    FFEI=-1./4.48
    AFI=.04176
    IF(REI.GT.1.E+05)FFEI=-1./7.4
    IF(REI.GT.1.E+05)AFI=.01423
    FFNI=-1./FFEI
    FFNO=1./FFEO
C   DISC AND SEAL BASE FRICTION FACTORS
    FFI=(REI**FFEI)*AFI
    FFO=(REO**FFEO)*AFO
    RT=R*TI
C   SEAL AXIAL FLOW COEFFICIENTS
    BK=SQRT(CK/RT)*PSE
C   DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT AT B
    CWBN=-.3179464*(PSE/PN)+.9123729
    CWBK=.3179464*PSE/(PN**2)
C   MACH# .LE.1
    IF((PSE/PN).LE.CK9)CWBN=.74
    IF((PSE/PN).LE.CK9)CWBK=0.
C   MACH# AT B .LE.1
    BMN=SQRT((1./CK4)*(((PN/PSE)**CK1)-1.))
    IF((PSE/PN).LE.CK9)BMN=1.

```

```

GMB1=(1.+CK4*(BMN**2))
GMB=SQRT(GMB1)
FMB=BMN*GMB
FMBK=((CK4*((BMN**2))+GMB1)/GMB)*(PSE**CK7)/
1((PN**CKR)*CK*BMN)
C AXIAL FLOW AT B-COEFFICIENTS
PMBK=BK*AB*(CWBN*FMBK+FMB*CWBK)
HMBK=BK*CWBN*FMB*WD
C DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT AT A
CWAN=-.3179464*(PN/PSI)+.9123729
AK=SQRT(CK/(R*TI))*PSI
CWAK=-.3179464/PSI
IF((PN/PSI).LE.CK9)CWAN=.74
IF((PN/PSI).LE.CK9)CWAK=0.
AMN=SQRT((1./CK4)*(((PSI/PN)**CK1)-1.))
IF((PN/PSI).LE.CK9)AMN=1.
GMA1=(1.+CK4*(AMN**2))
GMA=GMA1**CK2
FMA=AMN/GMA
FMAK=-(GMA-(AMN**2)*CK5*(GMA1**CK3))*(PN**CK7)/((GMA1**CK6)
1*(PSI**CKR)*CK*AMN)
C AXIAL FLOW AT A-COEFFICIENTS
PMAK=AK*AA*(CWAN*FMAK+FMA*CWAK)
HMAK=CWAN*FMA*WD*AK
C CONTINUITY EQUATION COEFFICIENTS
CLPT=CLC*HN
CLP=(PMAK-PMBK)*RT/WD
CLH=(HMAK-HMBK)*RT/WD
CLUS=-CLC*PN*HN
CLPS=CLC*HN*UN
CLHT=-CLC*PN
CLHS=-CLC*PN*UN
FFOE=(FFNO+1.)*FFEO
FFIE=(FFNI+1.)*FFEI
VK=DV*RT/PN
C MOMENTUM EQUATION FRICTION TERMS
FIPK=-(AFI/FFNI)*(REI**FFIE)*((PSDU-UN)**3)*HN*PN*CLC
1/(4.*DV*(RT**2))
FOPK=(AFO/FFNO)*(REO**FFOE)*(UN**3)*HN*PN*(CLC+2.*HN)
1/(4.*DV*(RT**2))
FIHK=((AFI*UN/FFNI)*(((PSDU-UN)*HN/(2.*VK))**FFIE))
1*PN*(PSDU-UN)**2)*CLC/(4.*RT*VK)
FIUK=((AFI*HN/FFNI)*(((PSDU-UN)*HN/(2.*VK))**FFIE))
1*PN*(PSDU-UN)**2)*CLC/(4.*RT*VK)
FOHK=((AFO*UN/FFNO)*((UN*HN/(2.*VK))**FFOE))
1*PN*(UN**2)*(CLC+2.*HN)/(4.*RT*VK)
FOUK=((AFO*HN/FFNO)*((UN*HN/(2.*VK))**FFOE))
1*PN*(UN**2)*(CLC+2.*HN)/(4.*RT*VK)
C MOMENTUM EQUATION COEFFICIENTS
C2P=(.5*(FFI*((PSDU-UN)**2)*CLC FFO*(UN**2)*(CLC+2.*HN))/RT
1)+FIPK+FOPK
C2H=(-FFO*FN*(UN**2)/RT)+FIHK+FOHK
C2U=(-FFI*PN*(PSDU-UN)*CLC/RT)+(-FFO*PN*UN*(CLC+2.*HN)/RT)+FIUK+

```

```

1FOUK
  C2PT=-CLC*UN*HN/RT
  C2PS=-CLC*HN*((UN**2)/RT-1.)
  C2UT=-CLC*PN*HN/RT
  C2US=-CLC*PN*2.*UN*HN/RT
C   C2HT=-CLC*PN*UN/RT
  C2HS=-CLC*PN*(1.+(UN**2)/RT)
C   ZERO SEAL MATRIX
  DO 100 IP=1,NP
  DO 101 JP=1,NP
101 PC(IP,JP)=0
100 CONTINUE
C   SEAL MATRIX LOADING
  PC(1,1)=C1P/C1PT
  PC(1,2)=C1PS/(RD*C1PT)
  PC(1,4)=C1US/(RD*C1PT)
  PC(2,1)=-C1PS/(RD*C1PT)
  PC(2,2)=C1P/C1PT
  PC(2,3)=-C1US/(RD*C1PT)
  PC(3,1)=-(C2P+(C1P*C2PT/C1PT))/C2UT
  PC(3,2)=-(C2PS+(C1PS*C2PT/C1PT))/(RD*C2UT)
  PC(3,3)=-C2U/C2UT
  PC(3,4)=-(C2US+(C1US*C2PT/C1PT))/(RD*C2UT)
  PC(4,1)=(C2PS+(C1PS*C2PT/C1PT))/(RD*C2UT)
  PC(4,2)=-(C2P+(C1P*C2PT/C1PT))/C2UT
  PC(4,3)=(C2US+(C1US*C2PT/C1PT))/(RD*C2UT)
  PC(4,4)=-C2U/C2UT
C   DISC TO SEAL COUPLING COEFFICIENTS
  CAH=-C1H/C1PT
  CCH=(C1H*C2PT/(C1PT*C2UT))+C2H/C2UT
  CBH=C1HS/(RD*C1PT)
  CDH=-(C2PT*C1HS/(RD*C1PT*C2UT))-(C2HS/(RD*C2UT))
  CAHD=-C1HT/C1PT
  CCHD=(C2PT*C1HT/(C1PT*C2UT))+(C2HT/C2UT)
  KP=13
  KP3=KP+3
C   A MATRIX LOADING WITH SEAL COEFFICIENTS
  DO 50 I=KP,KP3
  DO 51 J=KP,KP3
  KPJ=J-KP+1
  KPI=I-KP+1
51 AM(I,J)=PC(KPI,KPJ)
50 CONTINUE
C   SEAL TO DISC COUPLING
  AM(7,14)=PI*RD*CLC/DM
  AM(8,13)=PI*RD*CLC/DM
C   DISC TO SEAL COUPLING
  AM(13,2)=CAH
  AM(15,2)=CCH
  AM(14,2)=CBH
  AM(16,2)=CDH
  AM(13,8)=CAHD
  AM(15,8)=CCHD

```

C A MATRIX LOADING WITH ROTOR BEARING SYSTEM COEFFICIENTS

```

AM(7,1)=- (SKX*2.) /DM)
AM(7,3)=SKX/DM
AM(7,5)=SKX/DM
AM(8,2)=- (SKY*2.) /DM)
AM(8,4)=SKY/DM
AM(8,6)=SKY/DM
AM(9,1)=SKX/BM
AM(9,3)=- (SKX+BKXXR) /BM
AM(9,4)=-BKXYR/BM
AM(9,9)=-BDXXR/BM
AM(9,10)=-BDXYR/BM
AM(10,2)=SKY/BM
AM(10,3)=-BKYXR/BM
AM(10,4)=- (SKY+BKYR) /BM
AM(10,9)=-BDYXR/BM
AM(10,10)=-BDYYR/BM
AM(11,1)=SKX/BM
AM(11,5)=- (SKX+BKXXR) /BM
AM(11,6)=-BKXYR/BM
AM(11,11)=-BDXXR/BM
AM(11,12)=-BDXYR/BM
AM(12,2)=SKY/BM
AM(12,5)=-BKYXR/BM
AM(12,6)=- (SKY+BKYR) /BM
AM(12,11)=-BDYXR/BM
AM(12,12)=-BDYYR/BM
73 DO 89 II=1,12
DO 88 JJ=1,N
88 AM(II,JJ)=-AM(II,JJ)
89 CONTINUE
J=1
C CALCULATE EIGENVALUES & EIGENVECTORS FOR AM
C RWE4P ONLY
CALL QRHMOD(PC,NP,J,XR,XI,BRE,BI)

C RWE4S ONLY
CALL QRHMOD(AM,N,J,XR,XI,BRE,BI)
PSD=-PSDR
PRINT 11,A,B,PSI,PSE
PRINT 6,CLC,RD,DC,REI,REO,FFI,FFO
PRINT 2,PSD,ERR,PER
C PRINT EIGENVALUES
PRINT 30,(XR(I),XI(I),I=1,N)
PRINT 11
C SEAL PARAMETERS VARIATIONS
A=A+.0005
CLC=CLC+.0249
RD=RD+1.
PSI=PSI+.1549
DC=DC+.0802
22 CONTINUE
C GO TO 23

```

```
C   SPEED VARIATIONS
    ERR=ERR-.01
    IF(ERR.LT..074)GO TO 23
    IF(ERR.GT..5)GO TO 23
    GO TO 21
23  CONTINUE
C   PRINT EIGENVECTORS
    PRINT 30,((BRE(I,J),BI(I,J),I=1,N),J=1,N)
    2  FORMAT(9X,'PSDR = ',E12.4,3X,'ERR = ',E12.4,3X,'PER = ',E12.4/)
30   FORMAT(5X,E15.6,5X,E15.6)
11   FORMAT(E15.6)
    6  FORMAT(10X,7E15.5/)
    STOP
    END
```

APPENDIX B

B.1 Beaman [13] Bearing Coefficients (Equation 3.25)

$$K_{ee} = \left[\frac{-2\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} - \frac{4\varepsilon^3}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^3} \right]_n \quad (B.1)$$

$$K_{e\phi} = \left[\frac{-\pi\varepsilon}{4(1-\varepsilon^2)^{3/2}} \right]_n \quad (B.2)$$

$$K_{\phi e} = \left[\frac{\pi}{4(1-\varepsilon^2)^{3/2}} + \frac{3\pi\varepsilon^2}{4(1-\varepsilon^2)^{5/2}} \right]_n \quad (B.3)$$

$$K_{\phi\phi} = \left[\frac{-\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} \right]_n \quad (B.4)$$

$$B_{ee} = \left[\frac{-\pi(1+2\varepsilon^2)}{2(1-\varepsilon^2)^{3/2}} \right]_n \quad (B.5)$$

$$B_{e\phi} = \left[\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} \right]_n \quad (B.6)$$

$$B_{\phi e} = \left[\frac{2\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} \right]_n \quad (B.7)$$

$$B_{\phi\phi} = \left[\frac{-\pi\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon^2)^{3/2}} \right]_n \quad (B.8)$$

B.2 XY Bearing Coefficients (Equation 3.28)

$$K_{xx} = \left[\left(K_{ee} \sin \phi + \frac{K_{e\phi}}{\varepsilon} \cos \phi \right) \sin \phi + \left(K_{\phi e} \sin \phi + \frac{K_{\phi\phi}}{\varepsilon} \cos \phi \right) \cos \phi \right]_n \quad (B.9)$$

$$K_{xy} = \left[\left(-K_{ee} \cos \phi + \frac{K_{e\phi}}{\varepsilon} \sin \phi \right) \sin \phi + \left(-K_{\phi e} \cos \phi + \frac{K_{\phi\phi}}{\varepsilon} \sin \phi \right) \cos \phi \right]_n \quad (B.10)$$

$$K_{yx} = \left[-\left(K_{ee} \sin \phi + \frac{K_{e\phi}}{\varepsilon} \cos \phi \right) \cos \phi + \left(K_{\phi e} \sin \phi + \frac{K_{\phi\phi}}{\varepsilon} \cos \phi \right) \sin \phi \right]_n \quad (B.11)$$

$$K_{yy} = \left[\begin{aligned} & - \left(-K_{ee} \cos \phi + \frac{K_{ef}}{e} \sin \phi \right) \cos \phi \\ & + \left(-K_{fe} \cos \phi + \frac{K_{ff}}{e} \sin \phi \right) \sin \phi \end{aligned} \right]_n \quad (B.12)$$

$$B_{xx} = \left[\begin{aligned} & \left(B_{ee} \sin \phi + \frac{B_{ef}}{e} \cos \phi \right) \sin \phi \\ & + \left(B_{fe} \sin \phi + \frac{B_{ff}}{e} \cos \phi \right) \cos \phi \end{aligned} \right]_n \quad (B.13)$$

$$B_{xy} = \left[\begin{aligned} & \left(-B_{ee} \cos \phi + \frac{B_{ef}}{e} \sin \phi \right) \sin \phi \\ & + \left(-B_{fe} \cos \phi + \frac{B_{ff}}{e} \sin \phi \right) \cos \phi \end{aligned} \right]_n \quad (B.14)$$

$$B_{yx} = \left[\begin{aligned} & - \left(B_{ee} \sin \phi + \frac{B_{ef}}{e} \cos \phi \right) \cos \phi \\ & + \left(B_{fe} \sin \phi + \frac{B_{ff}}{e} \cos \phi \right) \sin \phi \end{aligned} \right]_n \quad (B.15)$$

$$B_{yy} = \left[\begin{aligned} & - \left(-B_{ee} \cos \phi + \frac{B_{ef}}{e} \sin \phi \right) \cos \phi \\ & + \left(-B_{fe} \cos \phi + \frac{B_{ff}}{e} \sin \phi \right) \sin \phi \end{aligned} \right]_n \quad (B.16)$$

B.3 Incremental Seal Strip Mass Flow Rate Coefficients

From Equation 3.49e:

$$K_{scwA} = \left[- \frac{.3179464}{P_A} \right] \quad (B.17)$$

From Equation 3.49f:

$$K_{scwB} = \left[.3179464 \left(\frac{P_B}{P_A^2} \right) \right] \quad (B.18)$$

From Equation 3.49g:

$$K_{sfMA} = \frac{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{An}^2\right)^{\frac{(k+1)}{2(k-1)}} - M_{An}^2 \left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{An}^2\right)^{\frac{(3-k)}{2(k-1)}}}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{An}^2\right)^{(k+1)/(k-1)}} \quad (B.19)$$

From Equation 3.49h:

$$K_{sfMB} = \frac{\left[(k-1) M_{Bn}^2 + 2 \left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{Bn}^2\right) \right]}{\left[2 \left(1 + \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) M_{Bn}^2\right) \right]^{1/2}} \quad (B.20)$$

From Equation 3.49i:

$$K_{sMA} = \left[\frac{-P_n \left(\frac{1-2k}{k}\right) P_A \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)}{k M_{An}} \right] \quad (B.21)$$

From Equation 3.49j:

$$K_{sMB} = \left[\frac{P_B \left(\frac{1-2k}{k}\right)}{P_n \left(\frac{1}{k}\right) k M_{Bn}} \right] \quad (B.22)$$

where:

$$M_{An} = \left[\left(\frac{2}{k-1}\right) \left\{ \left(\frac{P_A}{P_n}\right)^{\frac{(k-1)}{k}} - 1 \right\} \right]^{1/2} \quad (B.23)$$

and:

$$M_{Bn} = \left[\left(\frac{2}{k-1}\right) \left\{ \left(\frac{P_n}{P_B}\right)^{\frac{(k-1)}{k}} - 1 \right\} \right]^{1/2} \quad (B.24)$$

B.4 Friction Coefficients in Seal Momentum Equation (Equation 3.52)

$$K_{sfip} = -\frac{K_{fi}}{n_i} \left[\frac{(rw - u_n) h_n}{2 v_n} \right]^{\left(\frac{-(n_i+1)}{n_i}\right)} \left(\frac{(rw - u_n)^3 h_n P_n l}{4 \mu (RT)^2} \right) \quad (B.25)$$

$$K_{sfop} = \frac{K_{fo}}{n_o} \left[\frac{u_n h_n}{2V_n} \right]^{\frac{-(n_o+1)}{n_o}} \left(\frac{u_n^3 h_n P_n (l + 2h_n)}{4\mu (RT)^2} \right) \quad (B.26)$$

$$K_{sfih} = \frac{K_{fi}}{n_i} \left[\frac{(rw - u_n) h_n}{2V_n} \right]^{\frac{-(n_i+1)}{n_i}} \left(\frac{u_n P_n (rw - u_n)^2 l}{4V_n RT} \right) \quad (B.27)$$

$$K_{sfoh} = \frac{K_{fo}}{n_o} \left[\frac{u_n h_n}{2V_n} \right]^{\frac{-(n_o+1)}{n_o}} \left(\frac{u_n^3 P_n (l + 2h_n)}{4V_n RT} \right) \quad (B.28)$$

$$K_{sfiu} = \frac{K_{fi}}{n_i} \left[\frac{(rw - u_n)}{2V_n} \right]^{\frac{-(n_i+1)}{n_i}} \left(\frac{h_n P_n (rw - u_n)^2 l}{4V_n RT} \right) \quad (B.29)$$

$$K_{sfou} = \frac{K_{fo}}{n_o} \left[\frac{u_n h_n}{2V_n} \right]^{\frac{-(n_o+1)}{n_o}} \left(\frac{h_n P_n u_n^2 (l + 2h_n)}{4V_n RT} \right) \quad (B.30)$$

where:

$$V_n = \frac{\mu RT}{P_n} \quad (B.31)$$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Shapiro, W. and Colsher, R., "Rotor Whirl in Turbomachinery: Mechanisms, Analysis, and Solution Approaches"
Turbomachinery Developments in Steam and Gas Turbines
ASME Winter Annual Meeting, 27 Nov.-2 Dec. 77, pp 89-98
2. Ehrich, F.F., "Self Excited Vibration", Shock and Vibration Handbook, Harris, C.M. and Crede, C.E. (editors)
Chapter 5, pp 1-14, 2nd edition, McGraw Hill, NY
3. Pollman, E., Schwardfeger, H. and Termuehlen, H., "Flow Excited Vibrations in High Pressure Turbines"
ASME Journal of Engineering for Power, vol. 100, Apr. 78, pp 219-228
4. Myrick, S.T. Jr., "Transient and Steady State Response of a Flexible Rotor: Real Hydrodynamic Bearing Systems", PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, Aug. 73
5. Shatoff, J., "Using Vibration Analysis to Determine the Dynamic Health of Turbine Generators", Power, vol. 120, No. 5, May 76 pp 23-28
6. Sneek, H.J., "Labyrinth Seal Literature Survey", ASME
Journal of Lubrication Technology, Oct. 74, pp 579-582
7. Alford, J.S., "Protecting Turbomachinery from Self Excited Rotor Whirl", Journal of Engineering for Power, Oct. 65, pp 333-344
8. Spurk, J.H. and Keiper, R., "Selbsterregt Schwingungen bei Turbomaschinen infolge der Labyrinthströmung", Ingenieur-Archiv, vol. 43, 1974, pp 127-135
9. Wright, D.V., "Air Model Tests of Labyrinth Seal Forces on a Whirling Rotor"
Turbomachinery Developments in Steam and Gas Turbines
ASME Winter Annual Meeting, 27 Nov.-2 Dec. 77, pp 61-73
10. Cameron, A., Basic Lubrication Theory, Ellis Harwood Limited, 1976
11. Kearton, W.J., "The Flow of Air through Radial Labyrinth Glands", Proceedings of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers, vol. 169, no. 30, 1955, pp 539-550
12. Kostyuk, A.G., "A Theoretical Analysis of the Aerodynamic Forces in the Labyrinth Glands of Turbomachines", Teploenergetika, 1972, 19 (11), pp 39-44

13. Beaman, J.J., "Journal Bearing Forces-Short Bearing", Unpublished, University of Texas at Austin, 1980
14. Crandall, S.H., Karnopp, D.C., Kurtz, E.F. Jr., and Pridmore-Brown, D.C., Dynamics of Mechanical and Electromechanical Systems, McGraw Hill, 1968
15. Egli, A., "The Leakage of Steam through Labyrinth Seals", Trans ASME, vol. 57, 1935, pp 115-122
16. Shapiro, A.H., The Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Compressible Fluid Flow, vol. 1, Ronald Press Co., NY, 1953
17. Saarlal, Mado, Steam and Gas Turbines for Marine Propulsion, Naval Institute Press, Annapolis, MD, 1978
18. Meirovitch, Leonard, Analytical Methods in Vibrations, The MacMillan Company, Collier-MacMillan Limited, London, 1967
19. Shultz, D.G. and Melsa, J.L., State Functions and Linear Control Systems, McGraw-Hill, 1967

VITA

Anthony John Pavelko was born in Patuxent River, Maryland, on February 3, 1953, to Anthony J. Pavelko and Mary E. Pavelko. He completed secondary school at the Archbishop John Carroll High School, Radnor, Pennsylvania, in 1971. He then attended and completed course work leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at the Pennsylvania State University in 1975. Since then, he has served as an officer in the U.S. Air Force including time spent in The Graduate School of The University of Texas, beginning in September, 1979.

Permanent Address: 2100 Oakmont Avenue
Havertown, Pennsylvania

This thesis was typed by Joan K. Kellogg.

FILMED
8-8