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Overall Agenda

- Review Action Items from last PMS meeting
- Experimental Update
- CFD Update
- Wrap-up/future work
Action items, from 12/06/2018

- No-cost extension: Eric to follow up with TC to request vote (last status: 2 votes missing)
- Analyzing data for different inlet plenum case and also for floor distance
  - Currently by varying floor distance, data is only from without plenum case
  - Need to think about varying the floor distance also for 8” and 16” plenum case
  - Discuss at TC in Atlanta
  - How does side flow affect fan power – show results from experimental tests!
- Send out book chapter (done, 12/10/18) and ASHRAE draft paper (done, 12/14/18)
- Follow up with Darryl on Unit selection (CTM vs ECM – what is more stable?)
  - Discussed about reducing plan to one 1.5-ton unit, either CTM or ECM
  - Need at least one draw through unit
  - Either 1.5 ton or 3 ton draw through for comparison with blow through
- Check into additional help for running tests – MAE 4010, RP1785 student to operate both rooms, etc. (currently repairing damage caused by other project’s student) (several students involved in repairs, one part-time UG student to support Yeam)
- Follow up with Vance next week on fan power/system resistance/measurement position (12/12/2018, no response, yet – government shutdown?)
  - CB check with Loren Cook – fan effects from different inlet flow field?
- How much does mean air velocity change for inlet flow area of units with different capacity?
  - Yeam- add data from unit selection table that included duct cross-section for different units
Agenda- Experimental part

- Project goals
- Test plan
- Results
- Summary and future work
Background and Project Goals

- Height limitations in existing testing facilities
  - Develop inlet duct work designs with reduced length
  - Reduce design space to configurations acceptable to the PMS

- Reduce the risk of false testing failures
  - Evaluate fan performance (power consumption, air flowrate) for proposed candidate designs
  - Acceptable inlet ductwork candidate designs should lead to similar performance as for the applicable reference design (e.g. 10 CFR Appendix M to Subpart B of Part 430)
    - Per PMS request for 3-ton AHU: ± 3W (preferred) and ±9W (acceptable)

- Develop inlet duct guideline for the AHRI and ASHRAE testing standards

- Develop guideline for duct CFD simulations (draft submitted to PMS for review F18)
Schematic of experimental setup
Hysteresis and uncertainty

- Measurement uncertainties are: $u_{\text{power}} \approx 1 \text{ to } 1.89 \text{ [W]}, \Delta u_{\Delta P} = \pm 0.006 \text{ [in WC]}
- Hysteresis $\approx 0 \text{ to } 10 \text{ [W]}$ on direction of reversing static pressure direction
  - These values are for “interpolated” values between measurement points

![Graph showing hysteresis and power vs. external static pressure.](image-url)
Overall uncertainty calculations

- **average power** = \[
\frac{[\text{power(increasing static)} + \text{power(decreasing static)}]}{2}
\]

- **power meter uncertainty** = 0.16% \(MV\) + 0.04% \(MR\)
  - \(MV\) = measured value
  - \(MR\) = maximum range (max. voltage \cdot max. current)
  - Maximum voltage = 400V, maximum current = 4.44 amps

- **Hysteresis** = \[\text{power(decreasing static)} - \text{power(increasing static)}\]
For each average power value:

- hysteresis adds uncertainty but is independent of power uncertainty
- power meter uncertainty (assuming perfect repeatability) will not be reduced by averaging the values for increasing and decreasing pressure) since same measurement device

For fan power:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_{total} & \approx \pm \sqrt{\left(\text{hysteresis}/2\right)^2 + (\text{power meter uncertainty})^2} \\
    \Delta u_{\text{difference}} & \approx \pm \sqrt{u_{total,A}^2 + u_{total,B}^2}
\end{align*}
\]
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Effect of Inlet Plenum Length (1350 CFM)
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Change in fan power with floor distance (1050 cfm): Sensitivity to static pressure (no plenum case)

Note: External static pressure is measured from exit plenum to ambient since no static pressure ports at inlet.
Flow rate vs plenum length at 0.15” wc (nominal 1050 cfm)
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Effect of velocity profile

### Effect of Velocity Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>config.</th>
<th>inlet configurations (all with standard plenum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>conditioning bays on (baseline test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>conditioning bays off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>air sampler and cardboard extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>config. 4 with side flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>config. 4 with conditioning bays on and reduced floor distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>air sampler, damper and conditioning bays on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>air straightener, side flow and cardboard surrounding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Power [W]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in power [W]</th>
<th>Asymmetry [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-uniformity [%]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-uniformity [%]</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (232W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distance [in]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distance [in]</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x velocity [fpm]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Summary of the experimental subproject

- Quick recap of tested cases

- Test results
  - Varying the inlet plenum length, include side flow to determine effect
  - Varying floor distance for without plenum case
  - Hysteresis on increasing/decreasing pressure prior to measurement
    - same order of magnitude as PMS suggested acceptable range for power change

- Re-establish facility and setup operation (target: 03/11/2019)
  - Repair damage of psychrometric rooms and experimental setup
  - Investigate hysteresis further
    - duct leakage test (started prior to winter break)
    - fan wheel speed sensor (purchased)
  - Varying the floor distance for other plenum length cases (16”, 8”)

- Overall progress
  - New target with second no-cost extension: February 29, 2020
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Computational domain

A flow rate of 1050 CFM tested in all simulations

Flow has high curvature
Computational modeling

- Steady state simulations of the computational domain using StarCCM+
- Utilizes k-omega turbulence model – appropriate for high rotation in flow (but requires very fine near wall mesh).
- Uses trimmed cell mesh – i.e. a mesh that utilizes on hexahedral elements (suitable for relatively small domains)
Domain cross-section, side flow

Inlet (p=const)

Outlet

Walls

Baseline BCs

ZX-Plane

0.25 m/s inlet velocity

0.25 m/s inlet velocity
Domain cross-section

ZY-Plane

Sampler trunk located at 0.012 m from origin

ZY plane view
Curved dampers (thickness 0.5” at center and 0.2” at edges)
Velocity Contours – no Side Flow

![Velocity Contours](image)

**Velocity (m/s)**
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ZX-Plane
Velocity Contours – with Side Flow
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Velocity Contours – no Side Flow
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Velocity Contours – with Side Flow
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Quantitative comparisons

Line probe (z=0.6m)

0.815 m

0.495 m

Sampler at z = 0.012 m

Walls
Inlets
Outlet

Sampler and damper not shown

0.25 m/s inlet velocity

ZX Plane

Slice - x plane of symmetry

2.476 m

0.04 m
ZX Plane velocity comparisons
ZY Plane velocity comparisons

![Velocity profile - ZY Section](image-url)

- **No sideflow**
- **0.25 m/s sideflow**
Conclusions & Future work

- **Conclusions:**
  - Side flow perturbs velocity magnitudes in flow direction.
  - Increases separation zone within the duct side facing the inlet.

- **Future work**
  - The effects of side flow onto fan power were investigated in the experimental part of the study
    - Assessment in CFD is too complex

- **Publications**
  - CFD Guideline was sent to PMS as part of October meeting invite (10/22/2018)
  - Received some feedback for ASHRAE summer 19 conference paper (12/14/2018)
  - We are working on a draft for a paper for the International Congress for Refrigeration, to be shared with the PMS soon