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This report covers an evaluation of ethyl bromide in mixture with dichlorodifluoromethane for extinguishing incipient Class B, liquid fuel fires. The evaluation was made using bromotrifluoromethane, a mixture of dichlorodifluoromethane and methyl bromide, and mixtures of ethyl bromide and bromotrifluoromethane (halon 1301) as the comparators.

The report concludes that the Bromo-Fluor, ethyl bromide and dichlorodifluoromethane mixture, is not an effective agent for hand portable fire extinguishers, and that, as a basic fire fighting material, it is not as effective as bromotrifluoromethane or methyl bromide.

The report recommends that no further consideration be given to ethyl bromide mixtures as fire extinguishing charges for hand portable fire extinguishers.
SMALL-SCALE EVALUATION OF BROMO-FLUOR
(ETHYL BROMIDE-DICHLORODIFLUOROMETHANE
MIXTURE) AND OTHER MIXTURES AS FIRE
EXTINGUISHING AGENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Subject. This report covers evaluation of ethyl bromide as a fire extinguishing agent component, in mixture\(^1\) with dichlorodifluoromethane\(^2\) (halon 122), for extinguishing incipient Class B, liquid fuel fires. The evaluation was made using bromotrifluoromethane\(^3\) and a mixture of dichlorodifluoromethane and methyl bromide as the comparators. Mixtures of ethyl bromide and bromotrifluoromethane (halon 1301) were also evaluated.

The authority for conducting this work is contained in Project 8-76-04-003, "Fire Extinguishing Agent, Improved, Self-Contained." A copy of the project card is included in the appendix to this report.

2. Background. Prior to World War II, vaporizing liquids used as fire extinguishing agents included carbon tetrachloride (halon 104), methyl bromide (halon 1001) and carbon dioxide. Methyl bromide was, however, never extensively used as a fire extinguishing agent in the United States because of its high toxicity. (It was used as a rodenticide fumigant.) Just prior to, or during, the war, I. G. Farben, AG, developed a formulation of chlorobromomethane (halon 1011) for use as a fire extinguishing agent, which became known to the Corps of Engineers upon termination of World War II.

In view of this development and wartime progress in this country in the field of fluorine chemistry, a research and development project was undertaken in which it was proposed to evaluate the fire fighting effectiveness of a number of halocarbon type compounds, including chlorobromomethane and those containing fluorine (since the uses of the "Freon" type agents in refrigeration and aerosols had demonstrated the high degree of chemical inertness possible in such compounds). Work conducted in this research and development project

---

1. Proprietary name for the mixture of ethyl bromide and dichlorodifluoromethane, as marketed by the Société Industrielle D'Extinction Scientifique (SIDES) in France, is Bromo-Fluor.

2. Dichlorodifluoromethane is produced and marked by E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, under the trade name of Freon 12.

has been reported in previous Engineer Research and Development Laboratories Reports: "Vaporizing Liquid Fire Extinguishing Agents," Report 1177, 18 August 1950; "Demonstration Tests of Winterized Carbon Dioxide Fire Extinguishers," Report 1249, 8 August 1952; and "Investigation of Two Halogenated Hydrocarbons as Inhibitors on the Flammability of Ethylene Oxide," Report 1309, 20 July 1953.

In the previous work, the particular suitability of bromotrifluoromethane for military application has been demonstrated. The investigation currently reported consists of a brief series of practical tests comparing bromotrifluoromethane (halon 1301) with a proprietary agent formulation. The Engineer Research and Development Laboratories received reports of tests conducted in France and Belgium on Bromo-Fluor (or Di-Fluor, as it is known in Belgium) through an American representative of the Société Industrielle D'Extinguissance Scientifique (SIDES). SIDES is the holder of French patent claims on the Bromo-Fluor formulation. One such test, conducted at Orly Airport on 25 March 1952, resulted in successful extinguishment of a hydrocarbon fire approximately 70 by 25 ft (23 by 8 m) in 13 sec, using about 45 lb (20 kg) of the Bromo-Fluor agent.

Subsequent to these reports, it was deemed desirable to make small-scale tests with bromotrifluoromethane and with a mixture of dichlorodifluoromethane and methyl bromide, which is also covered by SIDES patent claims.

SIDES developed Bromo-Fluor to meet requirements for a fire extinguisher agent of low toxicity and, at the same time, good extinguishment abilities, using ethyl bromide as the extinguishing agent and dichlorodifluoromethane as the "atomizing" agent.

3. Personnel. Tests were conducted by A. N. Williams, Group Leader; E. A. Helms, Fire Test Fighter; and J. M. Hayden, Chief, Fire Test Station. Collation of the data and preparation of the report were accomplished by W. P. Lebans, under the supervision of J. E. Malcolm, Chief, Agents and Techniques Section, Fire Fighting Branch.

II. INVESTIGATION

4. Evaluation Procedure. The test fire used in these tests was essentially the Standard B2 tub fire, as used by the Underwriters' Laboratories, in which a steel tub, having a 2-ft (61-cm) diameter, was filled with water to a point 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (26.7 cm) from the top of the tub and 2 qt (1.9 liters) of motor fuel (74 Octane) approximately 70 percent ethyl bromide and 30 percent dichlorodifluoromethane by weight.
was floated on the water. A burning period of 20 sec was allowed before initiating extinguishment by the unit under test. The type of test fire used is shown in Fig. 1.

Each extinguisher was held in one position during discharge, with the nozzle angled over the edge of the tub, so that the method of application would be consistent for each test.

Fig. 1. Test of mixture consisting of 70 percent ethyl bromide (halon 2001) and 30 percent bromotrifluoromethane (halon 1301). Top: initiating extinguishment; extinguisher charged with ethyl bromide-bromotrifluoromethane mixture. Bottom: same type fire after 3-sec extinguisher application; intensity has not been significantly changed. Time required for extinguishment with bromotrifluoromethane, alone, is about 1.5 sec.
5. **Extinguisher Used.** Units of a modified version of the 69-cu-in. (1.15 liters) Walter Kidde Model bromotrifluoromethane extinguisher were used in the tests.

6. **Agent Formulation Charged.** The formulations charged into the test extinguisher are presented in Table I.

The less volatile component (i.e., the preliminary charge) was first charged into the extinguisher unit described in paragraph 5, and then the dispersing component, as indicated in Table I, was charged. All units were then pressurized with nitrogen gas to give a pressure of 400 psig (28 kg per cm$^2$) at 70 F (21 C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation</th>
<th>Weight of Primary Agent Charged (lb)</th>
<th>Weight of &quot;Dispersing&quot; or Low Boiling Point Agent Charged (lb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bromo-Fluor</td>
<td>2.00 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.34)$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl Bromide</td>
<td>2.00 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.34)$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl Bromide</td>
<td>2.00 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.34)$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromotrifluoromethane</td>
<td>2.75 (1.25)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Measured to the nearest 1/2 ounce  
b. CF$_2$Cl$_2$  
c. CF$_3$Br

7. **Other Test Conditions.** Tests were conducted in the open air on a clear day, at ambient temperature of 50 F (10 C) and with a wind velocity of 0 to 5 mph (8 km per hr).

8. **Results of Tests.** Results of tests are shown in Table II. The ethyl bromide and bromotrifluoromethane mixture was evaluated by four tests. Two trials were failures, with the extinguisher being completely discharged on the fire. Average extinguishment time of 10 sec on successful trials was noted, with an application rate of 4 oz per sec (112 g per sec). Results are shown in Fig. 1.

Of the four trials made on Bromo-Fluor, no extinguishments were made. Average time for complete discharge of the unit was
Table II. Performance of Halon Mixtures as Extinguishing Agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of Mixturea</th>
<th>Net Amount Used</th>
<th>Discharge Time</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lb) (oz)b</td>
<td>(sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl Bromide, Halon 2002 (C2H5Br) and Bromotrifluoromethane, Halon 1301 (CF3Br)</td>
<td>2 10.0 (1.19)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Test fire extinguished in first two tests. No extinguishment in 20 sec and total discharge in final tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl Bromide, Halon 2002 (C3H7Br) and Dichlorodifluoromethane, Halon 122 (CF2Cl2) (Bromo-Fluor)</td>
<td>2 15.0 (1.29)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>No extinguishments accomplished on any of the four test fires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-percent Bromotrifluoromethane, Halon 1301 (CF3Br) (Extinguisher was not re-charged during any phase of the test. Total amount used in nine trials was 2 lb, 11 oz (1.22 kg).)</td>
<td>5.5 (0.15)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Test fire extinguished in eight tests; insufficient agent remained to extinguish fire in last test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methy1 Bromide, Halon 1001 (CH3Br) and Dichlorodifluoromethane, Halon 122 (CF2Cl2)</td>
<td>13.0 (1.26)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>The unit was completely discharged against each fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 11.0 (1.22)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 11.0 (1.22)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. All mixtures were charged into modified Walter Kidde extinguishers and pressurized with nitrogen gas to 400 psi (28 kg per cm²) at 70 F (21 C).
- b. Measured to the nearest 1/2 ounce.
20 sec. The application rate was approximately 10 oz per sec (280 g per sec). Results are shown in Fig. 2.

For comparison purposes, nine trials were made with 100-percent bromotrifluoromethane, using the same extinguisher, with no recharging at any stage of the test. Eight extinguishments were effected, with the last trial resulting in failure due to insufficient agent remaining in the extinguisher. Average extinguishment

Fig. 2. Test of Bromo-Fluor mixture consisting of 70 percent ethyl bromide (halon 2001) and 30 percent dichlorodifluoromethane (halon 122). Top: initiating extinguishment, with the extinguisher charged with Bromo-Fluor. Bottom: extinguisher exhausted after attempt to extinguish test fire with Bromo-Fluor, with failure to put out fire.
time was 1 to 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) sec, with an application rate of 4 oz per sec (112 g per sec).

Tests were also made with a mixture of methyl bromide and dichlorodifluoromethane. Six trials were made, five of which resulted in successful extinguishment. The last trial failed because insufficient agent remained in the extinguisher to effect the extinguishment. Average extinguishment time was 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) sec, with an application rate of 8 to 10 oz per sec (224 to 280 g per sec).

### III. DISCUSSION

9. Performance. In no case did ethyl bromide mixtures perform as satisfactorily as the methyl bromide mixture with dichlorodifluoromethane. Bromotrifluoromethane displayed the greatest effectiveness in the tests.

Ethyl bromide was previously found to be less toxic than methyl bromide; however, it is more flammable. Flammable limits of 6.75 to 11.25 percent by volume are reported\(^5\), as compared to 13.5 to 14.5 percent by volume for methyl bromide\(^5\). Previous evaluations of ethyl bromide indicated flammability of this compound in actual attempts in extinguishing the tub type fire.

Previous studies indicated that dichlorodifluoromethane is at least as effective as carbon tetrachloride, which is a common vaporizing liquid fire extinguishing agent.

The success of this Bromo-Fluor agent on the large-scale fires appears to be a result of the relatively high rates of application used, and good fire approach techniques, with multiple points of application. Rates of up to about 5 lb per sec have evidently been used.

10. Future Plans. Under separate project, it is proposed to compare bromotrifluoromethane (halon 1301) with such agents as methyl bromide (halon 1001), chlorobromomethane (halon 1011), dichlorodifluoromethane (halon 1202), "Bromo-Fluor", and carbon dioxide to establish relative merits in this type fire fighting. Though tests to date indicate superiority of halons 1301 and 1202, the relative advantage with the other "comparator" agents should be demonstrated in this application so that justification of this use of one of the more costly agents may be made.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

11. Conclusions. It is concluded that Bromo-Fluor, ethyl bromide and dichlorodifluoromethane mixture, is not an effective agent for hand portable fire extinguishers, and that, as a basic fire fighting material, it is not as effective as bromotrifluoromethane or methyl bromide.

12. Recommendation. It is recommended that no further consideration be given to ethyl bromide mixtures as fire extinguishing charges for hand portable fire extinguishers.
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