AD 729330

AD

USAAMRDL TECHNICAL REPORT 71-29

SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS

By

L. Maurice Shaw

June 1971



193

EUSTIS DIRECTORATE D U. S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

CONTRACT DAAJ02-69-C-0030 DYNAMIC SCIENCE (THE AVSER FACILITY) A DIVISION OF MARSHALL INDUSTRIES PHOENIX, ARIZONA





NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE Springfield, Va. 22151

¥

Control (Second of UND, body of altitude of indexing a modeling must be setted than the second ingent of calculation of Marshall Industries Unclassified Dynamic Science (The AvSER Facility) M. Second Unclassified A Division of Marshall Industries M. Second Unclassified Phoenix, Arizona 85027 M. Second M. Second SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED F	Becunity Classification DOCUM	ENT CONTROL DATA - R & D		
The arrival control of the arrival and the arrival arri	(Security classification of title, body of abstract	and indexing annotation must be entered	when th	he overall report is classified)
A Division of Marshall Industries Phoenix, Arizona 85027 ARFORT VILE SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS Descriptive words (Dye of repet and actuality dams, Pinal Report Automotive (Dye of repet and actuality dams, Pinal Report L. Maurice Shaw Automotive (Dye of repet and actuality dams, Pinal Report L. Maurice Shaw Automotive (Dye of repet and actuality dams, Pinal Report L. Maurice Shaw Automotive (Dye of repet and actuality dams, Pinal Pinal L. Maurice Shaw Automotive (Dye of repet and actuality dams, Pinal Pinal L. Maurice Shaw Automotive for anony no. Pinal Pinal Pinal States Pinal Pinal Dynamic Science Report 71-29 Bustis Directorate, U. S. Army Ai Mobility Research and Development L. Works Artered for the pinal for the safety performance of emulified and Development L. Wattis of the safety performance of emulified for the service of second performance of emulified and Development L. Vation fails in a simulation for there for the safety performance of emulified and Development Astract Accomprised for public release; distribution unlimited. Accomprised in a simulation for the safety performance of emulified and Development La vractory, Fort Eustis, Virginia Accomprised in a simulation for the safety performance of emulified and Development La vractory, Fort Eustis, Virginia Accomprised in a simulation for the safety performance of emulified and Development La vractory, Fort Eustis, Virginia Accomprised in a simulation for the safety performance of emulified mol affecty evaluation criteria Accomprised in a simulation for the safety of simulation for the safety evaluation criteria Accomprised in a simulation for the safety of simulation criteria Accomprised in a simulation for the safety of simulation criteria Accomprised in the safety of simulation as a function of the safety of simulation criteria Accomprised in the safety of simulation and the safety of simulation criteria Accomprised in the safety of simulation and the safety of simulation criteria Accompri	Dynamic Science (The AvSER F	acility)	Unc	lassified
ACTIONAL STRONG SD027 AFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS Inal Report University of the offeed infection dama, inal Report WINDERD (First according to the backwise dama, inal Report of a dama, indicated to the backwise dama, indi	Division of Marshall Indus	tries 20. o	ROUP	
ARETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS	noenix, Arizona 85027			
International production of a properties of report and methods dense. International production of the producting the production of the production of the production	FRAVE FULLIANTON OF FMILLETF	TED FUELS		
The second seco	EDIT DVALUATION OF DAUBIT.			
nal Report THORNED (Phoriman, addet with the former) Maurice Shaw PONT Date me 1971 190 0017Macr on GRANT NO. AD02-69-C-0030 masser No. 162203A529 16230405 16230405 16230400 162304000 162304000 162400000 16240000000 1624000000000000000000000000000000000000	SCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive day			
UTION (Plot man, alde hild, Lat many) . Maurice Shaw SPONT DATE Ine 1971 190 Status SPONT DATE Ine 1971 Southact on snaw no. ALJO2-69-C-0030 Southact on snaw no. Pi62203A529 Status Status Status Dynamic Science Report 9130-71-3 Status Status None Status Status None Status Status None Status Status <td>inal Report</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	inal Report			
. Maurice Shaw secar care une 1971 190 190 190 190 190 190 190 190 190 19	WTHOR(3) (First name, middle initial, last name)			
A CONTRACT ON GRANT NO. AND C2-69-CC-00 30 MONECT NO. SAMA TO CASH THE CASH	. Maurice Shaw			
une 1971 190 8 CONTRACT ON STATUTED. 190 8 CONTRACT ON STATUTED. 190 8 CONTRACT ON STATUTED. USAAMRDL Technical Report 71-29 PROJECT NO. Dynamic Science Report 9130-71-3 Determine States of the state of t				
CONTRACT ON STATUS. AAJ02-69-C-0030 PROJECT NO. F162203A529 WE ORIGINATION'S REPORT NUMBER(S) USAAMRDL Technical Report 71-29 WORDSTNO(S) (Ary share makers fail may be assign Dynamic Science Report 9130-71-3 MATERIAL SCIENCE REPORT NUMBER(S) MORE None STATUS IN SCIENCE REPORT NUMBER(S) None STATUS IN SCIENCE REPORT NUMBER(S) None STATUS IN SCIENCE REPORT NUMBER(S) SCIENCE REPORT 9130-71-3 MATERIAL SCIENCE REPORT 913	une 1971	190	2.9	8
DAJU2-09-CC-0030 Product vo. Product vo. P162203A529 USAAMRDL Technical Report 71-29 Dynamic Science Report 9130-71-3 Dynamic Science Re	CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	Se. ORIGINATOR'S REP	ORT NU	MBER(5)
FIG2203A529	AAJ02-69-C-0030	USAAMRDL T	echni	ical Report 71-29
B. Griffs REFORM TOUS (App data making the same to active to active the second processing of the second procese of t	F16220 3A529			-
bynamic Science Report 9130-71-3 bynamic Science Report 9130 bynamic Science Report 91		SO. OTHER REPORT NO	(S) (Any	other numbers that may be assign
ANTAINSUVION STATEMENT pproved for public release; distribution unlimited. UPPLEMENTARY NOTES None None La vratory, Fort Eustis, S. Army Ai Mobility Research and Development La vratory, Fort Eustis, Virginia Savaer comprehensive test program was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures, t bain cafety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelled viation fuels in a simulated full-scale crash environment. A series of screening test procedures, to bain cafety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelled viation fuels in a simulated full-scale crash environment. A series of screening tests was formu- diamed from these screening tests were used to establish emulsified fuel safety evaluation criteri sisuasted hull-scale experiment was designed to simulate the full-scale helicopter crash environment is fuely is these screening tests revealed that, for the emulsified fuels tested, safety was directly dependent up fuel vial is a trast and its internal phase base fuel. The screening test date Sollowed the expect rends within the data scatter associated with the type of tests conducted. A safety evaluation of a nonharardous listing value for the ignition susceptibility parameter which was deriver built on the related o an empirical equation containing fuel properties. The data was shown to be relate to an empirical equation crash conditions. "Turther, tests were performed on gelled fuels to offer a differentia stiffied fuels tested were found to result in a nonharardous postcrash fire: (1) EPS were of the emulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A RPA emulsion. The gelled fuels id diving advantage over is using as the emulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A RPA emulsion. The gelled fuels diving advantage over is used as the emulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A RPA emulsions. The gelled fuels id diving the con- tor of this evaluation.		Dynamic Sci	ence	Report 9130-71-3
proved for public release; distribution unlimited.	ISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	•		
None Eustis Directorate, U. S. Army Ai Mobility Research and Development La vratory, Fort Eustis, Virginia work of the substance of this program was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures, to basin rafety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelled visition fuels in a simulated full-scale crash environment. A series of screening tests was formu- ated and conducted to obtain fuel characteristics as a function of hot-surface ignition, wind shear ated and conducted to obtain fuel characteristics as a function of hot-surface ignition. The data basined from these screening tests were used to establish emulsified fuel safety evaluation criteria dequately and, in addition, to be reproducibly controllable at minimal cost. The screening tests revealed that, for the emulsified fuels tested, safety was directly dependent up the fuel yield stress and its internal phase base fuel. The screening test data followed the expect rands within the data scatter associated with the type of tests conducted. A safety evaluation criteria is unlated full-scale operimons of an ignition susceptibility parameter which was shown to be related o an empirical equation containing fuel properties. The data obtained from the simulated full-scale ests provided definition of a nonhazardous limiting value for the ignition susceptibility parameter whis allowed the screening test results to bacome, maningful in predicting the performance of emulsi defines in the estified fuels tested were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EFE of the emulsified fuels tested were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EFE of the emulsified fuels tested were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EFE of the emulsified fuels tested were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EFE of the emulsified fuels in hereing confirmed that aircraft fuel emulsions can be formulated whin a nonhazardino. (20 EFE-104 emulsion, and 13)	pproved for public release; distribut	ion unlimited.	ARY AC	TIVITY
None Mobility Research and Development La vratory, Fort Eustis, Virginia AsvMact A comprehensive test program was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures, to obtain safety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelied aviation fuels in a simulated full-scale crash environment. A series of screening tests was formu- lated and conducted to obtain fuel characteristics as a function of hot-swiface injuition, wind shear and impact dynamics associated with fuel breakup, atomization/dispersion, and ignition. The data obtained from these screening tests were used to establish emulsified fuel safety evaluation criteri A simulated full-scale experiment was designed to simulate the full-scale helicopter crash environme adequately and, in addition, to be reproducibly controllable at minimal cost. The screening tests revealed that, for the emulsified fuels tested, safety was directly dependent up the fuel yield stress and its internal phase base fuel. The screening test data followed the expect ternds within the data scatter associated with the type of tests conducted. A safety evaluation cri- terion was established in terms of an ignition susceptibility parameter which was shown to be relate tests provided definition of a nonhazardous limiting value for the ignition susceptibility parameter fied fuels under actual crash conditions. Further, tests were performed on gelied fuels to offer a comparison between the safety of emulsified and gelied fuels. Three of the emulsified fuels testad were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EPE 1046 suison, (7f EPER-104 emulsion, and 15J Jet-A EXP-4 emulsion. The gelied fuels did not perfor as well as the emulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A gel \$1, indicated a sizeable advantage over 11 as the exulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A gel \$1, indicated a sizeable advantage over 11 as the exulsified fuels to the sprogram confirmed that aircraft fuel emulsions can be formulated whi		Eustis Direc	tora	te, U. S. Army Ai
Asymact A comprehensive test program was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures, to obtain safety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelled writion fuels in a simulated full-scale crash environment. A series of screening tests was formu- lated and conducted to obtain fuel characteristics as a function of hot-surface ignition, wind shear and impact dynamics associated with fuel breakup, atomization/dispersion, and ignition. The data obtained from these screening tests were used to establish emulsified fuel safety evaluation criteria A simulated full-scale experiment was designed to simulate the full-scale helicopter crash environme adequately and, in addition, to be reproducibly controllable at minimal cost. The screening tests revealed that, for the emulsified fuels tested, safety was directly dependent up the fuel yield stress and its internal phase base fuel. The screening test data followed the expect ternds within the data scatter associated with the type of tests conduced. A safety evaluation criteria tests provided definition of an ignition susceptibility parameter which was shown to be relate to an empirical equation containing fuel properties. The data obtained from the simulated full-scale tests provided definition of a nonhazardous limiting value for the ignition susceptibility parameter fied fuels under actual crash conditions. Yourther, tests wore performed on gelled fuels to offer a comparison between the safety of emulsified and gelled fuels. Three of the emulsified fuels tested were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EPE field fuels. In summary, the results of this program confirmed that aircraft fuel emulsions can be formulated whi are nonhazardous within the helicopter survivable crash limit envelope as reproduced during the con- duct of this evaluation. Unclassified Unclassified	None	Mobility Res	earcl	h and Development
comprehensive test program was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures, to bain cafety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelled vision fuels in a simulated full-scale orash environment. A series of screening tests was formu- teed and conducted to obtain fuel characteristics as a function of hot-surface ignition, wind shear obtained from these screening tests were used to establish emulsified fuel safety evaluation criteri simulated full-scale experiment was designed to simulate the full-scale helicopter crash environme dequately and, in addition, to be reproducibly controllable at minimal cost. As affety was directly dependent up to fuel stress and its internal phase base fuel. The screening test data followed the expectented within the data scatter associated with the type of tests conducted. A safety evaluation criteries a majorical equation containing fuel properties. The data obtained from the simulated full-scale helicopter as nontaining fuel properties. The data obtained from the simulated full-scale experiment was designed to simulate the reproducibility parameter which was shown to be relate to a majorical equation containing fuel properties. The data obtained from the simulated full-scale fuels under actual crash conditions. Yourther, tests were performed on gelled fuels to offer a comparison between the safety of emulsified and gelled fuels. The screening test scale is independent of emulsified and gelled fuels.	BSTRACT	La ratory,	FOLC	Eustis, virginia
All emulsion, (2) EPER-104 emulsion, and (3) Jet-A EXP-4 emulsion. The gelied fuels did not perfor well as the emulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A gel \$1, indicated a sizeable advantage over quid fuels. In summary, the results of this program confirmed that aircraft fuel emulsions can be formulated whi is nonharardous within the helicopter survivable crash limit envelope as reproduced during the con- lot of this evaluation.	comprehensive test program was conductor tain Safety evaluation criteria, and to riation fuels in a simulated full-scale thed and conducted to obtain fuel charac- and impact dynamics associated with fuel trained from these screening tests were simulated full-scale experiment was der lequately and, in addition, to be repro- te screening tests revealed that, for the sublevel stress and its internal pl rends within the data scatter associate orion was established in terms of an ign o an empirical equation containing fuel- sts provided definition of a nonhazard this allowed the screening test results (ed fuels under actual crash conditions imparison between the safety of emulsif: aree of the emulsified fuels tested were	ed to establish emulsified fu o evaluate the safety perform crash environment. A series teristics as a function of h breakup, atomization/dispers used to establish emulsified signed to simulate the full-s- iducibly controllable at minim the emulsified fuels tested, so hase base fuel. The screenin- i with the type of tests cond withon susceptibility parameter properties. The data obtain to bacome meaningful in predi- co bacome meaningful in predi- ied and gelled fuels.	el scre ance of of scro bt-surf ion, ar fuel s cale he al cost afety w y test icted. er whice d from ition ting t sed on ardous	eening test procedures, to f emulsified and gelled reening tests was formu- face ignition, wind shear, nd ignition. The data safety evaluation criteris elicopter crash environmer t. was directly dependent up data followed the expecte A safety evaluation cri- ch was shown to be related susceptibility parameter. the performance of emulsi- gelled fuels to offer a
In summary, the results of this program confirmed that aircraft fuel emulsions can be formulated whi are nonhazardous within the helicopter survivable crash limit envelope. As reproduced during the con- buct of this evaluation. D. Mon 1473 Supplement 1975, 1 Jan 64, WHICH 18 Unclassified - Becenty Classification	04H emulsion, (2) EPSR-104 emulsion, and as well as the emulsified fuels; however, liquid fuels.	t t t J Jet-A EXP-4 emulsion. 5 , one gel, Jet-A gel \$1, indi	the gel the gel	postcrash fire: (1) Ers lled fuels did not perform a sizeable advantage over
D 1 NOV 00 1473 SEPLACE PER ANNY USE. JAN 66, WHICH 18 Unclassified Becauty Classification	In summary, the results of this program of are nonhazardous within the helicopter su duct of this evaluation.	confirmed that aircraft fuel (prvivable crash limit envelop)	mulsic . hs re	ons can be formulated whic eproduced during the con-
Unclassified . Security Classification		1, 1 JAN 84, WHICH 18		
	0. 1473 SELANE R. M.	[h	ICTUE	SSIIled ·
	D		Secon	
	D		Socur	

•

· · · · · ·

DISCLAIMERS

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the US Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission, to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

Trade names cited in this report do not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial hardware or software.

DISPOSITION INSTRUCTIONS

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

CESSION	for	i
CFSTI DDC ITAH. (IJSTIFICATI	WHITE SECTION BUFF SECTION CFD.	
	94/AVÁILABILITY CODES AVAIL. 2nj/or Speciál	

Unclassified

ł

1

A* 8. * *

.

4	LIN	K A	LIN	K P	L
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROL
Aircraft Postcrash Fire Protection		İ			
Fuel Systems Safety					ļ
Emulsified Fuels					
Gelled Fuels					1
Laboratory Screening Tests					
Simulated Full-Scale Tests					
Ignition Susceptibility Parameter					
			L		



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY EUSTIS DIRECTORATE FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA 23604

This report was prepared by Dynamic Science (The AvSER Facility), a Division of Marshall Industries, under the terms of Contract DAAJ02-69-C-0030. The technical monitor for this program was Mr. W. J. Nolan, of the Safety and Survivability Division, Euscis Directorate.

Since 1966, the U.S. Army has been conducting research in the areas of emulsified fuels composition, manufacture, rheology, combustion, and safety. This work was accomplished in the belief that fuel emulsions, because of their non-New: onian characteristics, would provide an increased margin of safety in the aircraft flight and crash environments.

The purpose of this effort was to qualitatively evaluate the performance of emulsified fuels under realistically reproduced aircraft crash conditions. A series of laboratory tests was conducted in which the performance of fuels under dynamic conditions was observed. Based on these observations, a fuels susceptibility parameter was established as a means of predicting a fuel's behavior in the crash environment. Sixty full-scale fuel cell impact tests subsequently proved the validity of the susceptibility parameters. In addition, the impact tests conclusively demonstrated that emulsified kerosene fuels (JP-8, Jet A) significantly reduce the fire hazard associated with the aircraft postcrash environment.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are concurred in by this Directorate. Also, this Directorate believes that the safety potential of amulsified kerosene fuels is of sufficient magnitude to warrant expedited program prosecution in an effort to develop usable systems for U.S. 4rmy aircraft at the earliest possible date.

¥

Project 1F162203A529 Contract DAAJ02-69-C-0030 USAAMRDL Technical Report 71-29 June 1971

SAFETY EVALUATION OF EMULSIFIED FUELS

Final Report

Dynamic Science Report 9130-71-3

By

L. Maurice Shaw

Prepared by

Dynamic Science (The AvSER Facility) A Division of Marshall Industries Phoenix, Arizona

for

EUSTIS DIRECTORATE U. S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ABSTRACT

Anny tray and the second descent block and any tradition of the second se

A comprehensive test program was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures, to obtain safety evaluation criteria, and to evaluate the safety performance of emulsified and gelled aviation fuels in a simulated full-scale crash environment. A series of screening tests was formulated and conducted to obtain fuel characteristics as a function of hot-surface ignition, wind shear, and impact dynamics associated with fuel breakup, atomization/dispersion, and ignition. The data obtained from these screening tests were used to establish emulsified fuel safety evaluation criteria. A simulated full-scale experiment was designed to simulate the full-scale helicopter crash environment adequately and, in addition, to be reproducibly controllable at minimal cost.

The screening tests revealed that, for the emulsified fuels tested, safety was directly dependent upon the fuel yield stress and its internal phase base fuel. The screening test data followed the expected trends within the data scatter associated with the type of tests conducted. A safety evaluation criterion was established in terms of an ignition susceptibility parameter which was shown to be related to an empirical equation containing fuel properties. The data obtained from the simulated full-scale tests provided definition of a nonhazardous limiting value for the ignition susceptibility parameter. This allowed the screening test results to become meaningful in predicting the performance of emulsified fuels under actual crash conditions. Further, tests were performed on gelled fuels to offer a comparison between the safety of emulsified and gelled fuels.

Three of the emulsified fuels tested were found to result in a nonhazardous postcrash fire: (1) EF8R-104H emulsion, (2) EF8R-104 emulsion, and (3) Jet-A EXP-4 emulsion. The gelled fuels did not perform as well as the emulsified fuels; however, one gel, Jet-A gel #1, indicated a sizeable advantage over liquid fuels.

In summary, the results of this program confirmed that aircraft fuel emulsions can be formulated which are nonhazardous within the helicopter survivable crash limit envelope as reproduced during the conduct of this evaluation.

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

х.,

6.0

Same Harrison Barrison

a plana

S. Partician .

Pa	ge
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xx
	1
APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM	3
ANALYTICAL CONSIDERATIONS	6
Rheological Considerations Ignition and Vulnerability Autoignition Postcrash Fire Temperature Scaling	6 8 18 18
TEST METHODOLOGY	21
Nozzle Shear Tests	22 23 27 35 43
TEST RESULTS	61
Results of Nozzle Shear Tests	61 72 79 99 09
TEST CORRELATION AND SAFETY EVALUATION CRITERIA 1	30
CONCLUSIONS	49
RECOMMENDATIONS	50
LITERATURE CITED	51

v

.....

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTD.)

APPENDIXES

.

152 II. IMPACT DISPERSION/ATOMIZATION TEST DATA . . . 159 III. IMPACT IGNITION TEST DATA 165 IV. SIMULATED FULL-SCALE TESTS DATA 171 DISTRIBUTION 174 ٠ • • • •

vi

¥

Page

•

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

è,

Section of the section of

Figure	Page
1	Shear Stress Versus Shear Rate
2	Shear Stress Versus Shear Rate for Emulsified Fuel
3	Critical Ignition Energy 10
4	Critical Dependence of Ignition Energy on Fuel/Air Ratio for Typical Hydrocarbons 11
5	Interrelation of Processes Leading to Ignition
6	Schematic of Emulsified Fuel Impingement Apparatus
7	Front View of the Impingement Apparatus 24
8	Close View of the Nozzle Section
9	Hot-Surface Ignition Apparatus
10	Wind Shear Tunnel Test Apparatus
11	Refrigeration Unit for Wind Shear Tunnel Test Apparatus
12	Wind Tunnel Fuel Supply System
13	Photographic Layout for Wind Shear Tunnel Test Apparatus
14	Chromatograph Instrumentation Setup 34
15	Fuel Impact/Dispersion Atomization Test Devices
16	Fuel Piston for Impact/Dispersion Atomization Test Device
17	Impact Dispersion/Atomization Facility 39
18	Impact Dispersion/Atomization Apparatus With Impact Area Inclosure 40
19	Impact Ignition Configuration.

vii

10.11

5

١

ŝ,

Figure		Page
20	Overall Test Setup	44
21	Impact Barrier	45
22	Test Fixture and Associated Equipment	47
23	View of Test Fixture From Side That is Next to Barrier on Impact	48
24	Fuel Tank Mount Pivot Arm and Energy- Absorption System	49
25	Fuel Tank and Fuel Tank Bladder	50
26	Tank Fabrication (Vacuum Formed Sandwich Construction)	` 51
27	Calorimeter Design	53
28	Fuel Temperature Regulation Assembly	55
29	Fuel Temperature Regulation Systems	56
30	On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Configuration	57
31	On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Assembly	58
32	On-Board Ignition Source Sequence	59
33	JP-4 Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities	62
34	JP-8 Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities	63
35	EF4R-104 Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities	64
36	EF4R-104H Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities	65
37	EF8-104H Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities	66

viii

¥

13

and the firm of the second second

and ministerio

See.

Figure		Page
38	Variation of Ligament and Droplet Charac- teristic Dimension for Different Fuel Impinging Velocities	68
39	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Nozzle Shear Fuel Velocity for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104 ($\tau_{y} = 900$ Dynes/cm ²)	69
40	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Nozzle Shear Fuel Velocity for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H (τ = 1570 Dynes/cm ²)	70
41	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Based on JP-8 Versus Nozzle Shear Fuel Velocity for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H ($\tau = 800$ Dynes/cm ²)	71
42	Autoignition Characteristics for Liquid JP-4 Fuel	73
43	Autoignition Characteristics for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104 (τ_y = 509 Dynes/cm ²)	74
44	Autoignition Characteristics for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H (τ = 1153 Dynes/cm ²)	76
45	Autoignition Characteristics for Liquid JP-8 Fuel	77
46	Autoignition Characteristics for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H ($\tau_y = 750$ Dynes/cm ²)	78
47	JP-4 Wind Shear Ereakup, Wind Velocity = 40 fps	81
48	JP-4 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 80 fps	81
49	JP-4 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 40 fps	82
50	JP-4 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps	82
51	EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 40 fps (τ_{y} = 475 Dynes/cm ²)	83

ix

Figure		Page
52	EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 50 fps (τ = 475 Dynes/cm ²)	83
53	EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 60 fps (τ = 475 Dynes/cm ²)	84
54	EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 70 fps (τ_y = 475 Dynes/cm ²)	84
55	EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 100 fps (τ = 400 Dynes/cm ²)	85
56	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps (τ = 600 Dynes/cm ²)	85
57	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps (τ = 600 Dynes/cm ²)	86
58	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps (τ = 1200 Dynes/cm ²)	86
59	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps (τ = 1300 Dynes/cm ²)	87
60	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps (τ_y = 1050 Dynes/cm ²)	87
61	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 50 fps (τ = 1733 Dynes/cm ²)	88
62	EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps (τ = 1733 Dynes/cm ²)	88
63	EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 70 fps (τ = 1733 Dynes/cm ²)	89
64	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps (τ_y = 1733 Dynes/cm ²)	89
65	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 90 fps (τ = 1733 Dynes/cm ²)	90
66	EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps ($\tau_v = 1733$ Dynes/cm ²)	90

ومراجع والمتحدثين

ومعالية فالخري ستعمر مستعمر مناوي مادي أحدكت

х

Figure			Page
67	EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 120 fps ($\tau_y = 1733$ Dynes/cm ²).	٠	91
68	EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Veloci $y = 60$ fps ($\tau_y = 2470$ Dynes/cm ²)	•	91
69	EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps (τ_y = 2470 Dynes/cm ²)	•	92
70	EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps (τ_y = 2470 Dynes/cm ²)	•	92
71	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Wind Shear Velocity for JP-4 Base Emul- sion EF4R-104 ($\tau_y = 437$ Dynes/cm ²)	•	94
72	Ignition Susceptibility Paramater Versus Wind Shear Velocity for JP-4 Base Emul- sion EF4R-104 (τ_{y} = 645 Dynes/cm ²)	•	95
73	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Wind Shear Velocity for $_{P-4}$ Base Emulsion EF4R-104 (τ_y = 1400 Dynes/cm ²)	•	97
74	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Wind Shear Velocity for JP-4 Base Emul- sion EF4R-104H (τ_{y} = 1192 Dynes/cm ² and 1886 Dynes/cm ²).	•	98
75	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Wind Shear Velocity for JP-8 Liquid Fuel and JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H $(\tau_{y} = 1000 \text{ Dynes/cm}^{2})$	•	100
76	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Based on JP-8 Versus Wind Shear Velocity for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H (τ_{y} = 1000 Dynes/cm ²)	•	101
77	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104 (τ_y = 508 Dynes/cm ²)	•	103
78	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H (τ_y = 1143 Dynes/cm ²)	•	105

xi

زها تخذمه

ž

のないである

A LANDARY AND A

Figure		Page
79	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity for Liquid JP-8	106
80	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H (τ = 755 Dynes/cm ²)	. 106
81	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Based on Liquid JP-8 Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H $(\tau = 755 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2) \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots$. 107
82	Ignition Rating Value Versus Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Obtained From Impact Ignition Tests	110
83	Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Open-Flame Igniter Tests	. 111
84	Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Open-Flame Igniter Tests	112
85	Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope)	. 116
86	Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope)	. 117
87	Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope) .	. 118
88	Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope) .	. 123
89	Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope) .	. 124
90	Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope) .	. 125

xii

السبية بأورج فعاصرون

i.

1.12K.a.....

nionen singsle

A LALL PRIME IN-

Figure		Page
91	Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From On-Board Igniter Test on the Jet-A Gel #2	126
92	Yield Stress Versus K for Wind Shear Data	131
93	Yield Stress Versus V for Wind Shear Data	132
94	Yield Stress Versus K for Impact Dispersion/Atomization Data	133
95	Yield Stress Versus V _i for Impact Dispersion/Atomization Data	134
96	Simulated Full-Scale Test Results for the Open-Flame and Spark/Hot-Surface Igniter Tests	137
97	Simulated Full-Scale Test Results for the On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests	138
98	Simulated Full-Scale Test Results for the Gelled Fuel Tests	143
99	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Time for Test Temperature to Reach 400°F for the Open-Flame and Spark/Hot-Surface Igniter Tests	144
100	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Time for Test Temperature to Reach 400°F for On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests	146
101	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Extrapolated Time to Reach Aluminum Melting Temperature for Open-Flame and Spark/Hot-Surface gniter Tests	147
102	Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Extrapolated Time to Reach Aluminum Melting Temperature for On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests	148

xiii

LIST OF TABLES

.

Table		Page
I	Wind Shear Safety Performance	136
II	Impact Dispersion/Atomization Safety Performance	136
III	Simulated Postcrash Fire Results	141
IV	Wind Shear Test Conditions and Associated Data	152
V	Impact Dispersion/Atomization Test Conditions and Associated Data	159
VI	Impact Ignition Test Conditions and Associated Data	165
VII	Simulated Full-Scale Test Conditions	171

xiv

LIST OF SYMBOLS

l

an and a set the foregoing a set

.....

.

1.0.13

Α	Airstream cross-sectional area (wind tunnel cross- sectional area), Equation 14; constant related to acti- vation energy, Equation 25; constant, Equation 30.
A _n	Fuel droplet surface area
Å	Total fuel surface area formation rate
A s	Total exposed area of fuel
В	Constant, Equation 30
с _р	Specific heat
F/A	Fuel-to-air ratio
K	Fluid consistency
ĸ	Windshear-fuel relationship constant
^к 2	Fuel-impact relationship constant
ĸ _E	Kinetic energy
0	Constant related to diffusion rate and vapor pressure
т	Spontaneous ignition temperature
т _і	Calorimeter temperature at maximum heating rate
то	Ambient or initial temperature
T skin	Aircraft skin temperature
v	Impact velocity
V _{air}	Air velocity
Ů _F	Total volume rate of flow of fuel
v _i	Fuel-impact velocity constant
v _j	Fuel-wind shear velocity constant
v _n	Droplet volume
w _F	Fuel flow rate

xv

.

LIST OF SYMBOLS (CONTD.)

Section to g

,

The second s

d	Droplet diameter
h	Gas film coefficient
k	Ignition delay constant
n	Degree of non-Newtonian behavior, Equation 2; carbon subscript, Equation 5
'n	Fuel droplet formation rate
ġ	Heating rate
t	Time
ti	Time between initial impact and time to reach maximum heating rate
tn	Ignition lag time at an infinite spontaneous ignition temperature
x	Formation distance
Ŷ	Shear rate
ε	Surface emittance
θ	Impact angle, Equation 20; aircraft skin thickness, Equation 29
θ _i	Impact angle
μ	Viscosity
μ _α	Apparent viscosity
^μ ρ	Plastic viscosity
μ _∞	Viscosity at infinite shear rate
ρ	Aircraft skin density
ρ _F	Fuel density of ^p Fuel
σ	Stefan-Boltzmann constant
τ	Shear stress

xvi

≽

LIST OF SYMBOLS (CONTD.)

 τ Yield stress or τ yield ψ Ignition susceptibility parameter

less and so

- lens

and the second
and the states

and be a conference international terminet and the second statements of


INTRODUCTION

A significant number of injuries and fatalities that occur in light aircraft accidents are a result of postcrash fire, because the aviation fuels presently being used are readily dispersed, atomized, and ignited, resulting in extensive fire envelopes over damaged aircraft. Various approaches to this problem are being investigated. Included are:

- Component/system improvements to upgrade the functional performance of all flammable fluids systems in the crash environment.
- Inerting systems that sense the imminence of a crash, then actuate integral devices to prevent ignition of postcrash fires by curtailing the fuel supply, deenergizing the host of potential electrical ignition sources, cooling hot surfaces, and/or releasing agents which will make the ambient environment incapable of supporting combustion.
- Fuels technology research devoted to identification of fuels that possess properties less conducive to crash fire ignition and propagation.

This report details an extensive effort that was made in the fuels technology area.

A recognized method for decreasing postcrash fire casualty rates is to decrease the susceptibility of aircraft fuel to disperse and atomize. This can be achieved by the use of thickened fuels such as emulsified or gelled fuels. The thixotropic nature of emulsified fuels embodies a decreased tendency to flow after crash-induced fuel system failures. The viscous nature of gelled fuels also tends to decrease flow after crashinduced fuel system failures. For these types of fuel, less fuel is released for burning. Also, fire propagation is retarded through the resistance of the emulsified and gelled fuels to break up and atomize during exposure to shearing forces such as wind shear and surface impact.

Various fuel emulsions and gels have been formulated and manufactured that possess the basic viscous properties desired. Outwardly, these fuels all possess desirable traits from a fire retardation standpoint. Research over the past several years in modifying liquid fuels has proven the feasibility of manufacturing fuels without degrading their combustion efficiency in operating turbine engines. Before any modified fuel can be designated as a safe fuel for aircraft, it is necessary to identify the individual combustibility characteristics. This will facilitate selection of optimum candidate fuels that are worthy of consideration and further refinement.

A good way to accomplish this goal is to establish a set of rules, i.e., criteria, which, when applied equally to any modified fuel, will assess its safety performance. Such criteria must evolve from both laboratory and full-scale testing under conditions that close'y simulate the actual crash environment in a realistic and repeatable manner.

The purpose of the test program reported herein was to devise emulsified fuel screening test procedures, establish fuel safety evaluation criteria, and conduct a comprehensive, simulated full-scale, fuel tank impact test effort to define emulsified fuel performance in a helicopter crash environment. Simulated full-scale tests were also performed for two gelled fuels. The program entailed design and construction of laboratory facilities which were then utilized to test and study emulsified fuels under simulated crash environments. These tests involved fundamentals tests resulting in basic fuel characteristic data which were used primarily to guide the performance of simulated postcrash environmental testing. The fuel fundamentals tests consisted of (1) nozzle shear tests to help define the breakup of emulsified fuels as a function of input kinetic energy and (2) hot-surface ignition tests to define the ignition characteristics of the fuels. The postcrash environmental tests consisted of wind shear tests to simulate fuel spillage from a moving, crashed aircraft and impact dispersion/ atomization tests to simulate fuel impact on surrounding surfaces in a crash environment.

Full-scale tests are desirable to define the crash environment effects on the dispersion and ignition of a fuel and to determine a postcrash fire hazard limit associated with the above screening test results. Unfortunately, it is probably financially prohibitive to test enough cases to adequately cover the range of test variables. Therefore, tests were designed to simulate the actual full-scale crash environments which a helicopter fuel tank experiences during a crash impact. These tests were conducted at a large enough scale to adequately represent the full-scale crash environment and still provide an economical test program.

This report describes the test methodology used for the program and presents the results obtained therefrom. Analytical considerations, the test results, and the resultant safety evaluation criteria are presented herein. Recommendations and areas requiring further research are also discussed.

APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

The actual safety that a particular fuel displays can best be determined by full-scale crash testing. However, with the advent of many different fuel compositions and flammability characteristics, the amount of full-scale testing to determine safety criteria covering all such fuels is economically pro-If a scaled-down or screening test program can be hibitive. formulated to obtain safety criteria involving the basic fuel characteristics, the ability to screen out undesirable fuels (from a fire-hazard standpoint) can be obtained inexpensively. Although the results of such testing may not offer the actual ability for a fuel to be designated "safe" in a postcrash environment, such results will determine the fuel formulas and characteristics which perform in the most optimum manner. With these safer (from a screening criterion standpoint) fuels, fewer scaled-up tests can be performed with a great decrease in the funding involved.

Some fuels will perform better than others in the postcrash environment. Therefore, the purpose of screening tests is to eliminate potentially hazardous fuels from further investigation.

To study screening test procedures and obtain safety criteria for investigating emulsified fuels, a systematic step-by-step program was formulated to study the emulsified fuel characteristics under simulated postcrash fire environments. The results of the screening tests were then used to determine safety criteria to measure the performance of emulsified fuels.

Although the screening test results offer an approach to determining a safety evaluation parameter for emulsified fuels, the actual value of such a safety parameter which represents a safe limit must be determined from full-scale or simulated full-scale environmental tests. With the determination of this safety limit, further screening tests can be related to the full-scale crash condition.

As with any criteria, a baseline must be determined. The obvious choice was to use the performance of a standard presently used fuel. JP-4 was selected because of its extensive use in Army aircraft. The existence of extensive postcrash fire data on aircraft which use JP-4 was also considered in this selection.

The overall program involved the conduct of three different test series: (1) fuel fundamentals testing, (2) fuel environmental testing, and (3) simulated full-scale testing. The fuel fundamentals tests were designed as an inexpensive method of

determining basic fuel characteristic data to guide the design and testing of the fuel environmental tests. The fuel environmental tests offered the development of safety performance criteria which could be finalized and verified by the simulated full-scale testing.

The fuel fundamentals tests were not designed to yield a direct method for determining fuel safety criteria, but were utilized to help correlate the results of fuel environmental tests. Two types of fuel fundamentals tests were conducted: (1) nozzle shear tests and (2) hot-surface ignition tests. The nozzle shear tests provided basic emulsified fuel breakup data as a function of the kinetic energy imparted to the fuel. The hot-source ignition tests were conducted to measure the ignition susceptibility of the fuels in contact with hot surfaces as they might be exposed during the postcrash environment. The test configurations, procedures, and results are discussed in detail later in this report.

The mechanics involved in producing combustible mixtures of fuel during a crash environment can be classified into two (1) wind shear during fuel tank spillage and (2) fuel areas: impact with surrounding environment. Accordingly, two types of fuel environmental tests were designed and performed: (1) wind shear tests and (2) impact dispersion/atomization The wind shear tests were designed to simulate overtests. board spillage and, therefore, to show the effects of wind shear energies imparted to the fuel escaping from ruptured fuel lines and tanks during the deformation of a crashing aircraft. The impact dispersion/atomization tests were designed to simulate the fuel impact with surrounding crash surfaces and the associated fuel dispersion and atomization.

With JP-4 as a standard baseline fuel, the comparison of the test results obtained from modified fuels provides guidelines on which safety evaluation criteria can be based. Here we assume the JP-4 test results to be a maximum hazardous condition.

Previously established knowledge of screening test values of a safety performance parameter provides the means to determine a fire hazard limit based on the simulated full-scale test results. By using the full-scale data to correlate the results of the screening tests, evaluative criteria can be formulated that will qualitatively and accurately assess the safety performance of a given fuel. Thus, the desired objective of relating the screening test results to a full-scale crash situation can be accomplished.

Simulated full-scale crash tests can be effectively scaled-up to the full-scale situation, provided attention is given to detailed simulation of the crash environment physics. This not only reduces costs but allows a suitably controlled evaluation. To simulate the full-scale crash environment, several conditions must be met: (1) testing at a sufficiently large scale to simulate the full-scale impact, dispersion, ignition, and resulting fire environment; (2) conducting tests with impact energy conditions which approximate the maximum crash survival impact limit; (3) reproducing ignition sources that simulate all potential ignition sources in a full-scale environment such as electrical sparks, friction sparks, hot metal surfaces, engine flaming, and residual flame sources such as those propagating from oil spillage, etc.; and (4) testing fuel tank structures that correspond to the full-scale fuel tank configuration.

NAME AND A DESCRIPTION OF
The basic test procedure for the simulated full-scale tests was to impact simulated helicopter fuel tanks, filled with various fuels, onto a barrier which simulates terrain corresponding to a full-scale impact environment. The fuel tanks, each containing 13 gallons of fuel, were mounted on a sled fixture and accelerated into the barrier. Each fuel tank was constructed to simulate the tank structure of a typical U. S. Army helicopter. A 65-ft/sec impact velocity with a 45-degree impact was used in each test. Three types of igniters were used to reproduce full-scale ignition sources: open-flame igniters, spark igniters, and hot-surface igniters.

ANALYTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Accurate analytical solutions for the characteristics and combustion processes involved for fuels in a postcrash environment are difficult to model for a liquid (or Newtonian fluid) fuel and become prohibitive for the fuel properties characteristic of emulsified fuels. However, basic analytical approaches exist which can be used to understand modified fuel characteristics and to enhance their data reduction and correlation when applied to the postcrash environment. Several such analytical considerations discussed in this section are characteristic of all postcrash environments.

RHEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Solidified fuels, such as emulsified or gelled fuels, fall under a non-Newtonian fluid classification. Several analytical models have been classified as the result of current and past investigations (1,2,3,4). Three of these classifications are the Bingham plastics, pseudo-plastics, and real plastics (see Figure 1). Each of these is a departure from the Newtonian fluid in that the shear stress can no longer be related to shear rate as

where τ is shear stress, μ the viscosity of the fluid, and γ the shear rate.

Bingham Plastics have the characteristic that a yield stress must be overcome before the fluid can flow. Once the yield stress is exceeded, the material structure disintegrates and behaves as a Newtonian fluid. The relationship between shear stress and shear rate then takes on the following form:

$$\tau - \tau_{\text{yield}} = \mu_{\text{p}} \dot{\gamma} \tag{1}$$

where $\mu_{\rm p}$ is the plastic viscosity or coefficient of rigidity. Materials composed of micro-visible particles and liquid droplets suspended in a liquid medium contain these characteristics.

Fluid structures such as gels, fluids with suspensions of asymmetric particles, or solutions of high polymers can be generally classed as pseudo-plastics. This viscoelastic fluid model assumes no yield stress value as in Bingham plastics, but the apparent viscosity, μ_a , decreases progressively with an increase in shear rate. The value of μ_a approaches linearity and becomes μ_{∞} as an infinite shear



- 2. TYPICAL EMULSIFIED FUEL (REAL PLASTIC)
- 3. PSEUDO-PLASTIC
- 4. NEWTONIAN FLUID



SHEAR RATE



rate is approached. The relationship between the shear stress and shear rate is generally taken as

$$\tau = K \dot{\gamma}^{n}, \quad (n < 1) \tag{2}$$

where K and n are constants and are the respective measures of the consistency of the fluid and the degree of non-Newtonian behavior of the fluid.

Emulsified fuels studied during this program are known to exhibit traits which compare to a Bingham fluid model for low shear rate values in that they possess a yield stress and are thixotropic. However, the shape of the shear stress versus shear rate curve (Figure 1), once the yield stress is overcome, compares with that of a pseudo-plastic fluid model. The resulting curve is like that associated with real plastic

fluid models. It follows, then, that the relacionship between shear stress and shear rate can be empirically formulated as

$$\tau - \tau_{\text{yield}} = K \hat{\gamma}^{"}, (n < 1)$$
(3)

where, if τ_{yield} approaches zero, the shear characteristics approach a pseudo-plastic.

Although other empirical relations have been generated for non-Newtonian models, these illustrate the general form and expected tendencies for such materials.

From data obtained from "capillary" tube viscometer studies, (5) it is known that emulsified fuels follow a Bingham fluid model for shear stresses below some critical value. Above the critical shear stress, the shear rate increases substantially, finally becoming rearly linear with shear stress (see Figure This behavior can be modeled initially by a Bingham 2). fluid which, on reaching a critical shear stress, reverts to a Newtonian fluid or possibly a pseudo-plastic fluid. U.S. Army Fuels and Lubricants Research Laboratory researchers* have determined in preliminary analyses that this critical shear stress decreases with increasing yield stress, introducing the possibility that high yield-stress emulsified fuel would be less stable. The amount of energy necessary to break up an emulsified fuel should be a function of the difference between the critical yield stresses. Therefore, if the yield stress of the emulsion is increased and, in turn, the critical stress is decreased, then the energy required to break up the emulsion is decreased. U. S. Army Fuels and Lubricants Research Laboratory researchers felt that this type of phenomenon may be a function of the fact that the fuel globular diameter decreases with increased yield stress. As an emulsion is worked, the globular diameter decreases, increasing the fuel surface area. As this process continues, an inadequate amount of water to form a water matrix results. The breakdown in the matrix then accounts for the existence of the critical stress.

IGNITION AND VULNERABILITY

The actual safety a fuel displays in a crash environment is dependent on the ability of that fuel to not form combustible fuel-to-air mixtures in the vapor phase. Ignition will not occur unless certain fuel/air ratios are present, either in the surrounding crash environment or in the tank ullage. However, for fuel-air mixtures within the combustible range, it is possible for safety to exist. This is demonstrated by

*Personal communication



1.

SHEAR RATE



the large increase in energy required for ignition for several hydrocarbon fuels as illustrated in Figure 3.

The fraction of stoichiometry in Figure 3 can be converted to fuel/air weight ratio by the relation

$$F/A = (Fraction) \frac{(14n + 2)}{(216n + 62)}$$
 (4)

where n represents the carbon subscript associated with the equation

$$C_{n} H_{2n} + 2 + \left(\frac{3n+1}{2}\right) O_{2} + (6n+2) N_{2} = nCO_{2} + (n+1) H_{2}O + (6n+2) N_{2}$$
(5)

As illustrated in Figure 4, the fuel/air ratio terms shown in Figure 3 are more meaningful. Therefore, to prevent postcrash fire, it is necessary that formation of combustible fuel/ air ratios does not occur and then, failing this, that insufficient ignition potentials are present.



Figure 3. Critical Ignition Energy.

The interaction of properties and events leading up to an ignition hazard are outlined in Figure 5. The governing parameters are fuel properties, crash kinematics, ignition hazards, and ignition sources. Each element of Figure 5 can be characterized by certain physical properties. For example, the fuel properties are characterized by vapor pressure, viscosity (μ) , surface tension (σ), and yield stress (τ). The crash kinematics can be characterized by crash configuration and input kinetic energy to the fuel. Although the statistical nature of a crash causes much difficulty, the fire hazard can be related to fuel properties even if the mechanism for formation of ignitable fuel/air ratios is not understood. If an ignitable fuel/air ratio is not generated, no ignition source can cause a fire hazard. Of special concern is how to determine the generation of fuel/air ignition limits for emulsified fuels. This demands testing to determine the fuel/air formation of emulsified fuels in postcrash environments.

If the formation of ignitable fuel/air ratios can be related to emulsified fuel properties, the fire hazard can be minimized by adopting emulsified fuels whose properties correspond to limited fuel/air ratio formation. Further, the understanding of both fuel/air and dispersion mechanisms will simplify the understanding of ignition sources. An electric or



Figure 4. Critical Dependence of Ignition Energy on Fuel/Air Ratio for Typical Hydrocarbons.

arresta in an in



,

Figure 5. Interrelation of Processes Leading to Ignition.

こうたいしょう くろうない ひかんたいたいしょう うちの ひとうたい

• • •

.

. . .

> : 1

12

×

friction spark may cause fuel/air ignition, while heat sources can create fuel/air ratios which, in turn, can be ignited by spark or hot-surface sources.

The extent of atomization during a crash environment determines the mean fuel droplet size, which determines, in turn, the fuel vaporization rate and thereby governs the formation of fuel/air ignition limits. Basically, the crash environment can be divided into two mechanisms for atomizing and dispersing fuel: (1) atomization due to wind shear (i.e., interaction between spilled fuel and a moving airstream) and (2) fuel impact with the surrounding crash environment.

The relationship between the mean fuel/air ratio and pertinent parameters in a wind shear environment is quite complicated to handle analytically. To simplify the analytical model, several simplifying assumptions must be made and, even with this, some empirical relations through data correlation are required. We first assume that the mean fuel droplets are spherical and that the formation of the droplets occurs at time zero. We further assume that the vapor pressures and diffusion rates do not vary between the fuels being studied. This, of course, is not the case. The results, however, will offer expected trends regarding the formation of fuel/a r ratios in a wind shear environment which may be useful for data correlation. One further assumption, which is correct for the wind shear tests presented in this report, is that the fuel flow rate into the airstream is held constant.

The volume of each droplet can be expressed as

$$V_{\rm n} = 4/3\pi \left(\frac{\rm d}{2}\right)^3 \tag{6}$$

where d is the droplet diameter. The total volume rate of flow issuing into the airstream is then

$$\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathbf{F}} = \frac{\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{F}}}{\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\mathbf{F}}} = \overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{n}}$$
 (7)

where \dot{W}_{p} and ρ_{p} are the fuel flow rate and density and \dot{n} is the droplet formation rate. The amount of vaporization and, in turn, the fuel/air ratio of a mixture of fuel droplets and air are a function of the exposed fuel surface area. For one droplet, the surface area is just

$$A_{n} = 4\pi \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{2}$$
(8)

We can now show that the total surface area formed per second is

$$\dot{A}_{F} = \dot{n} A_{n} = \frac{3V_{F}}{(\frac{d}{2})}$$
(9)

If we assume a time (t) which represents the exposure time in which the flowing air and fuel droplets mix before they reach the ignition source or, in test, the point of measurement, then the total area of fuel exposed can be expressed as

$$A_{s} = \mathring{A}_{F}t = \frac{3\mathring{V}_{F}t}{\langle \frac{d}{2} \rangle}$$
(10)

For large formation distances (x), the exposure time becomes

$$t \approx \frac{x}{V_{air}}$$
(11)

where V_{air} is the airstream velocity. Therefore,

$$A_{s} = \frac{6\tilde{V}_{F}x}{d V_{air}}$$
(12)

The fuel/air ratio can be expressed as

$$F/A = \frac{Volume \text{ of Vaporized Fuel}}{Volume \text{ of Air}}$$
(13)

The volume of vaporized fuel will be some function of the exposed surface area, while the volume of air will be a function of stream velocity. The fuel/air ratio then becomes

$$F/A = \frac{QAs}{AV_{air}} = \frac{6QV_Fx}{AdV_{air}^2}$$
(14)

where Q is a constant containing a diffusion rate relation and vapor pressure and A is the airstream cross-sectional area. Due to our initial assumptions and in our wind tunnel tests, Q, V_F , x, and A are constants related to the test procedures. We can now express fuel/air ratio functionally as

$$F/A = f(\frac{1}{d V_{air}^2})$$
(15)

The relationship between fuel/air ratio and $(\frac{1}{d V_{air}^2})$ can be

experimentally determined. However, since we have chosen a baseline fuel for the determination of evaluation criteria, the ratio between the fuel/air ratio of a specific emulsified fuel and the standard fuel (JP-4) for the same wind shear conditions is more appropriate. We can then define a r w parameter (ψ) which is equated as

والمرادة سليم الكوانية ال

$$\psi_{JP-4} = \frac{(F/A)_{Fuel}}{(F/A)_{JP-4}}$$
(16)

For the same wind shear conditions (V_{air} constant), we also observe that

$$\psi_{JP-4} = \frac{(F/A)_{Fuel}}{(F/A)_{JP-4}} = \frac{d_{JP-4}}{d_{Fuel}}, \qquad (17)$$

which states that the ratio of the measured fuel/air ratios is directly proportional to the inverse ratio of the measured droplet diameters. It must be understood, however, that this relation is only valid if the emulsified fuel's base fuel is JP-4. Similar relationships can be used for other base emulsified fuels as long as the reference fuel is the base fuel for the emulsion.

It has been determined through examination of test data that a relation between ψ and wind shear velocity exists for each emulsified fuel structure tested. This relation takes the form

$$\psi = \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(V_{j} - V_{Air}\right)^{2}}{K_{1}}\right\}, \quad V_{Air} \leq V_{j}$$
(18)

where V_j and K_1 are constants and are functions of the emulsified fuel yield stress. The term (V_j) also represents the lowest airstream velocity in which the emulsified fuel acts or demonstrates the same fuel/air ratio and droplet diameter as its base fuel. The test results illustrating these phenomena are presented in the Test Results section.

For the emulsion formulations studied in this program, the values of V_j and K_1 could be expressed as functions of yield stress. This allows the above equation for the wind shear ignition susceptibility parameter to be written as

$$\psi = \exp\left\{-\left(\sqrt{27.2 \tau_{y}} - V_{Air}\right)^{2}/(23 + 0.029 \tau_{y})^{2}\right\}, \\ V_{Air} \leq \sqrt{27.2 \tau_{y}}$$
(19)

The extent of the atomization and dispersion of a fuel when impacting surfaces in a crash environment is dependent upon the kinetic energy imparted to the fuel from its interaction with its environment. The generation of an accurate physical combustion/interaction model is difficult, but the mechanisms initiating the atomization and dispersion are relatively simple for uncomplicated surfaces. Here the amount of atomization and dispersion for a given fuel is a direct function of the imparted kinetic energy where

K.E. =
$$\frac{1}{2}\rho_{\text{Fuel}} V_{\text{Fuel}}^2 \sin^2\theta$$
 (20)

and θ is the impingement angle with the impact surface (which is assumed to be flat). For curved impact surfaces, the Sin² θ term must be integrated over the surface.

Considering the formation of ignitable fuel/air ratios, we can assume that fuel/air ratios after impact are generated from two sources. The first is the initial fuel/air ratio formation resulting from atomization of the fuel by the input kinetic energy. Here, similar to the wind shear, the resulting fuel/air ratio can be expressed functionally as

$$(F/A)_{\text{Initial}} = f(\frac{1}{d})$$
 (21)

where d, the mean droplet diameter, is a complicated function of the input kinetic energy.

The second source for the formation of fuel/air ratio results from the dispersion of the fuel after impact. Here the fuel/ air ratio formation depends on the total surface area of the spilled fuel and the distribution of this exposed area on the impacted surface. Thus,

 $(F/A)_{secondary} \approx f(A)$ (22)

Of course, the above fuel/air ratios are functions of fuel properties such as yield stress, viscosity, surface tension, vapor pressure, and diffusion rates.

The fuel/air ratios accompanying the nozzle shear tests presented in this report can be expressed only by the first formation process. The impact dispersion/atomization tests must
include both processes. It should be understood that under certain conditions the initial fuel/air ratio could generate combustible mixtures whereas the secondary fuel/air ratio may not. In this situation, ignition might occur but would be self-extinguishing and not propagate a flame. Conversely, it is also possible that the initial fuel/air ratio formation may not generate combustible mixtures, whereas the secondary fuel/air ratic process may form combustible mixtures. In this situation, complete combustion is possible, producing a hazardous situation. Of course, the most hazardous situation results when both mechanisms produce combustible fuel/air ratios. The actual results of these processes are experimentally illustrated in the Test Results section of this report. Although the above discussion is analytically sound, one must not overlook the possibility that combustion of the initial (or mist phase) fuel/air ratio formation heats the distributed spill to aid the production of a combustible This more closely represents the actual crash mixture. environment where "fireballing" of the mist phase usually results in high-energy combustion.

In the impact dispersion/atomization tests conducted for this study, it was possible to measure only an average fuel/air ratio over a specific period of time after impact. As a result, the definition of the above process (as a function of fuel/air ratio) was not possible. It was determined through examination of test data, however, that a relation similar to that observed for wind shear between (ψ) and (VFuel Sin θ) exists for each emulsified fuel structure where θ is the fuel impingement angle. This relation holds between the emulsion and its base fuel as

$$\psi = \exp \left\{ -\frac{\left(v_{i} - v_{Fuel} \sin \theta \right)^{2}}{K_{2}} \right\}, \quad v_{Fuel} \sin \theta \leq v_{i} \quad (23)$$

where V_i and K_2 are constants which are functions of the emulsifield fuel yield stress. As in the wind shear results, V_i also represents the lowest value of V_{Fuel} Sin θ in which the emulsified fuel demonstrates the same fuel/air ratio as its base fuel. Data illustrating these phenomena are also presented in the Test Results section.

For the e ulsion formulations studied in this program, the values o V_i and K_2 could be equated as functions of yield stress. This allowed the above equation for the impact dispersion/atomization ignition susceptibility parameter to be expressed as

$$\psi = \exp \left\{ - \left(\sqrt{10.63 (\tau_y - 212)} - V \sin \theta_i \right)^2 / (9.5 - 0.035 \tau_y)^2 \right\}, \\ V \sin \theta_i \leq \sqrt{10.63 (\tau_y - 212)}$$
(24)

AUTOIGNITION

In any powered aircraft crash, hot-surface sources that will ignite flammable fuels are always present. These sources can range from hot tailpipes to shorted electrical wires. It is therefore necessary to understand fuel ignition characteristics in order to determine not only the minimum autoignition temperature of the fuel but also the ignition characteristics of a fuel in contact with hot surfaces.

The minimum autoignition temperature as well as the ignition delay times associated with different surface temperatures for a fuel in air, is dependent upon the physical processes of diffusion, mixing with the oxidant, fuel heat conductivity, surface properties, and geometry as well as chemical processes. In aircraft crashes, the air pressure can, in general, be assumed constant at one atmosphere. Most hot surfaces in light Army aircraft are stainless steel.

The dependence of ignition delay time on the surface temperatures has been mathematically represented in Reference 6 as

$$\ln t = A/T + \ln k \tag{25}$$

where t is the ignition delay time, T is the spontaneous ignition temperature, k is a constant, and A is a constant related to the apparent "Activation Energy" of the controlling process.

Based on the test data contained in this report (Test Results section), a modified version of this mathematical relation was found to represent the data more accurately:

$$\ln(t - t_R) = \frac{A}{T} + \ln k \qquad (26)$$

where t_R is a constant for a given fuel which can be interpreted as the ignition lag time associated with an infinite spontaneous ignition temperature due to interface heat transfer resistance.

POSTCRASH FIRE TEMPERATURE SCALING

It is advantageous to relate the temperature and heating rate data obtained during the simulated tests to those expected in

an actual full-scale environment. Such an analysis not only allows the extrapolation of the scaled data, but offers an approach to validate the approach used in the design of the simulated tests.

Although the resulting ignition characteristics should be nearly identical between scaled and full-scale conditions, the resulting temperatures reached in the scaled test are limited by the burn time of the fuel and, therefore, by the amount of fuel. The heating rates associated with a scaleddown fire test should be nearly identical to those imposed in a full-scale postcrash fire. This has been shown to be the case for JP-4 fires in the test data presented herein. Thus, the full-scale fire environment should produce maximum heating rates (using JP-4) on the order of 10.5 Btu/ft² - sec. Approximately 89 percent of this total heating rate is due to radiation and the remainder is due to convection. The JP-4 scaled data gave heating rates on this order of magnitude. This can be expressed as

$$T_{skin} = \frac{\dot{q}(t)}{\rho C_{p} \theta} - T_{o}$$
(27)

where T_{skin} is the aircraft skin temperature, T_0 is the initial or ambient temperature, ρ is the skin material density, C_p is the skin material specific heat, θ is the skin thickness, t is the time to reach a temperature T_{skin} , and \mathring{q} is the total heating rate. The total heating rate from a fuel fire can be expressed as

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}} = \sigma \varepsilon (\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{flame}}^{4} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{o}}^{4}) + \mathbf{h} \Delta \mathbf{T}$$
(28)

where σ is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, ε is the surface emittance, h is the hot gas film coefficient, T_o is the ambient or surface temperature, and ΔT is the temperature difference between gas and surface.

If it is assumed that the heating rates obtained for various fuels in the scaled tests are representative and that an infinite amount of fuel is available for combustion in the fullscale environment, then analytical extrapolation of aircraft skin burn-through time to the full-scale conditions is possible from the test data. It should be apparent that long burn-through times represent a less hazardous condition than short burn-through times. A skin temperature of 1100°F (melting point of aluminum) is chosen as the burn-through temperature. The burn-through time from initial impact can then be calculated as

$$t_{\text{burn}} = \frac{\rho C_{p} \theta (1100 - T_{i})}{q_{\text{max}}} + t_{i}$$
(29)

where ρ , C_p , and θ are the aluminum skin density, specific heat, and skin thickness, respectively, and \dot{q}_{max} is the maximum heating rate obtained in the scaled test, T_i is the calorimeter temperature corresponding to the point at which \dot{q}_{max} is observed. The term t_i is the time between initial impact and the point at which \dot{q}_{max} was observed.

This analysis is somewhat conservative from a heating standpoint since the actual heating rate decreases as the skin temperature increases; however, it does indicate a maximum condition. The actual heating rate distribution with increasing skin temperature cannot be obtained without knowing the radiation characteristics of the environment. It was found in the test data that the extrapolated burn-through times for JP-4 were on the order of 20 seconds. This value corresponds to fuselage burn-through times of 20 to 35 seconds.⁽⁸⁾

It was found when plotting the extrapolated burn-through time versus the ignition susceptibility parameter for each fuel that a curve fit resulted which could be expressed as

t
$$= A + \exp(B/\psi)$$
 (30)
through

where A and B are constants. Although there is no apparent analytical basis for this curve fit, it does portray a trend which would be expected from ignition observations of the tests.

TEST METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive test effort was conducted to establish emulsified fuel screening test procedures for safety evaluation criteria. This entailed the design and construction of test facilities which were utilized to test emulsified fuels under simulated crash environments to obtain data for defining the safety characteristics of specific fuels.

The mechanics involved in producing combustible mixtures of fuel during a crash environment can be classified into two basic areas: (1) wind shear during fuel tank spillage and (2) fuel impact with the surrounding environment. With these mechanisms and the economics involved in mind, the following sequence of testing was developed:

ومرجوعة الاستعمادة لارام

Nozzle Shear Tests	Fuel Fundamentals Tosts
Hot Surface Ignition Tests	ruer rundamentars rests
Wind Shear Tests	Fuel-Crash Environment Tests
Impact Dispersion/ Atomization Tests	

A second, equally comprehensive test effort was conducted to (1) establish a limiting value for the screening test safety parameter and (2) study the performance of emulsified fuels in a full-scale crash environment. This entailed the design and construction of a test facility which was used to test emulsified fuels under a simulated full-scale helicopter crash environment.

The mechanics involved in duplicating and simulating the fullscale crash environment can be classified into three basic areas: (1) duplication of impact kinetics and impact velocity, (2) duplication of tank structural design, and (3) simulation of full-scale ignition sources. With these mechanisms in mind, simulated crash tests were conducted at a velocity equal to the maximum crash-survivable velocity for helicopters using a fuel tank structure corresponding to full-scale helicopter fuel tank design, and ignition sources which represent those possible in a full-scale crash. The various ignition sources used to accomplish the latter item were:

Open flame igniter tests (one test per fuel)

Spark and hot-surface igniter tests (two tests per fuel)

On-board (engine simulator) igniter tests (three tests per fuel)

Descriptions follow of the theories and techniques devised to accomplish the required testing.

NOZZLE SHEAR TESTS

Nozzle shear tests were designed to enable a quick preliminary study of the flow properties and atomization processes of emulsified aircraft fuels for comparison with liquid aircraft fuels. Further, the nozzle shear test data provided information to enhance the fuel environmental tests. The experimental technique involved photographic observation of the flow region resulting from impinging a fuel stieam onto a lucite rod surface.

A schematic of the flow system is shown in Figure 6. It consists of a l-gallon volume Freon tank and an emulsified fuel tank. Freon was chosen as the "pushing" liquid because of its immiscibility with emulsified fuel. The flow rate of the emulsified fuel was based on the measured volumetric flow rate of the Freon. Pressurization of the Freon tank was controlled by a hand regulator. Different fuel flow rates were easily attained by varying the pressure of the Freon tank. Freon flow rates, which in turn determined the emulsified fuel flow rates, were measured with turbine-type flowmeters. The signals of the flowmeters were fed via amplifiers into a recording oscillograph.

A 2-gallon aluminum cylinder, 8 inches in diameter, was used as the fuel tank. A well-fitted aluminum piston, 3 inches in length, was utilized in the fuel tank as a moving diaphragm to separate the Freon from the emulsified fuel. A 0.180-inch I.D. tube was used as the fuel nozzle. Nozzle alignment with the lucite rod surface was refined on the basis of flow patterns. The gap spacing between the nozzle exit and the lucite surface was maintained at 0.750 inch. Ball valves were used along the emulsified fuel flow lines to avoid small restrictions which could cause the breakdown of the emulsified fuel. Figure " presents a front view of the impingement apparatus. A detailed view of the nozzle and the impingement surface is shown in Figure 8.

The data were recorded with a 4-inch x 5-inch still camera and consisted of photographic observation of the fuel sheet that resulted from impinging the fuel stream onto the lucite surface. A micro-flash system was used to provide the proper lighting. Flash duration was approximately 1.0 microsecond



Figure 6. Schematic of Emulsified Fuel Impingement Apparatus.

with mean peak light intensity of 50,000,000-beam candlepower. The microsecond flash duration stopped the motion of fuel ligaments and droplet sizes. The camera was positioned perpendicular to the fuel sheet with the center of the film approximately 7 inches from the nozzle centerline.

HOT-SOURCE IGNITION TESTS

States and a state of the state

The measurement of a minimum autoignition temperature is dependent upon the type and geometric configuration of the test apparatus. Therefore, a minimum autoignition temperature



Figure 7. Front View of the Impingement Apparatus.



Figure 8. Close View of the Nozzle Section.

cannot be regarded as a physical constant but is dependent on such factors as vessel materials, vessel size, and oxidant mixing characteristics.

For the tests performed in this report, a heated vessel or "static" crucible method was used. A modification of the ASTM designation, D-2155-66 "Autoignition Temperature of Liquid Petroleum Products", was designed and incorporated. Because the majority of the hot surfaces existing in an aircraft crash are constructed of stainless steel, the heated vessel chosen was a 600-ml stainless steel beaker, replacing the 200-ml Erlenmeyer borosilicate glass flask. The static crucible method was chosen for its simplicity and ability to adequately simulate fuel spillage on hot crash surfaces. With this approach, no forced mixing of oxidant (air) is used. The static air in the test apparatus provides oxidant to the fuel.

The test apparatus is illustrated in Figure 9. A crucible furnace with a rheostat temperature control was used for heating the test crucible. The 600-ml beaker was instrumented with three iron-constantan thermocouples: (1) one located on the bottom and center of the beaker, (2) one located 2-1/2inches from the top of the beaker, and (3) one located 1 inch from the top of the beaker. The test crucible was separated from contact with the bottom of the furnace by a 1/2-inch asbestos insulating ring. The top of the furnace was fitted with a 3/4-inch-thick asbestos cover with a 1-1/2-inch diameter hole provided to allow injection of the fuel sample and observation of ignition through the use of a mirror as shown. A 5cc hypodermic syringe calibrated in 0.lcc increments and equipped with a 3-inch No. 12 stainless needle was used to inject the fuel into the crucible. The ignition delay time was measured by a hand-operated stop watch.

The operational procedure for conducting the autoignition tests was similar to that set down by ASTM designation D-2155-The furnace temperature was adjusted so that the tempera-65. tures of the three thermocouple locations were within 5°F of the desired test temperature. A 0.10cc sample of the desired fuel was injected into the test crucible with the hypodermic syringe, and the syringe was quickly withdrawn. The time on the stop watch was started as the sample was injected into the Observation of the ensuing ignition, if any, was crucible. made with the aid of the observation mirror, at which time the ignition delay time was recorded on the stop watch. If a flame was not observed within 5 minutes, the sample was considered not flammable at the temperature measured. This procedure was repeated at various test temperatures.



ļ

and the second
Figure 9. Hot-Surface Ignition Apparatus.

WIND SHEAR TESTS

The wind shear tests were designed to determine the breakup and general flow field dispersion characteristics of fuels when subjected to air velocities typical of the crash environment. The basic wind shear tunnel test apparatus is shown in Figure 10. A blower, powered by an internal combustion engine, supplied air for the tunnel at velocities up to 146 fps. The blower flowed through a settling chamber provided with flow straightening devices. The 1-ft x 2-ft (cross section) test section had Plexiglas windows on one side along its 8-foot length for visual observation and photographic instrumentation. A smaller window was provided on the opposite side to allow the use of a strobe light for microphotography. Fuel was injected into the airstream through a port in the floor of the test section. Tunnel wind velocities were measured by a Pitot-static pressure probe, located at the forward end of the test section, that was connected to a water manometer. Air temperatures were measured by a thermocouple probe, also located at the forward end of the test section.

Test fuel temperature regulation was provided by the refrigeration unit shown in Figure 11. Tank No. 1 was a water reservoir fitted with refrigeration coils. The cooled water from Tank No. 1 was pumped through cooling coils in Tank No. 2 which contained the test fuel. The temperature-regulated fuel was transferred to the tunnel fuel pressurization tank (Tank No. 3) (shown in Figure 12) by a hand-operated vane pump. The temperature of Tank No. 3 was also controlled by pumping cooled water from Tank No. 1 through coils in the tank. The fuel pressurization tank was fitted with a pressure overload safety valve, a pressure relief valve, and a solenoid valve connected to the fuel flow rate pressure regulation system.

Fuel flow into the test section was provided by pressurizing the fuel pressurization tank. This flowed the fuel into a linch flexible hose, through an on/off solenoid fuel valve, and into the test section through a 0.42-inch I.D. aluminum injection tube. The fuel line, solenoid valve, and injection tube were designed to provide adjustment of the injection tube with respect to the wind tunnel test section. A fuel drain with valve was provided at the bottom of the tank to allow measurement of emulsified fuel yield stresses prior to testing and to drain the tank.

The fuel flow rate was controlled by a pressure regulator valve fitted with a downstream orifice to insure a constant flow rate of air into the tank ullage. A second pressure regulator was connected to the tank to allow presetting of the







~







tank pressure to the steady-state pressure value downstream of the orifice.

Because the consistency and viscosity of the various fuels tested were different, it was necessary to calibrate the flow rate control system for each fuel. This was accomplished by flowing fuel into the flow rate calibration drum shown in Figure 10, which was weighed for a specific pressure setting and time. When required, the emulsified fuels were worked to higher yield stresses using the recycle apparatus shown in Figure 12.

Six basic types of data were obtained during wind shear testing: (1) wind tunnel condition data such as wind velocity and air temperature, (2) fuel property data, (3) spark ignition susceptibility data, (4) fuel droplet size data, (5) mean fuel/ air ratio data, and (6) general fuel-wind flow field characteristic data.

The fuel property data consisted of type of fuel, yield stress value, and fuel temperature. The yield stress of the fuels was measured by a cone penetrometer technique developed by the U. S. Army Fuels and Lubricants Research Laboratory and described in USAAVLABS Technical Report 69-24, "Emulsified Fuels Characteristics and Requirements," March 1969.

The ignition susceptibility of wind-sheared fuel was obtained by placing spark igniter probes (70,000-volt capacitor discharge) aft of the test section as shown in Figure 10. Fuel ignition was observed and recorded visually.

Fuel droplet size measurements were obtained from microphotography of the dispersion flow field. The location of the microphotographic setup is illustrated in Figure 13. The setup consisted of a still camera with the field of view as shown in Figure 13, backed up by a 1 msec strobe light for capturing the flowing fuel droplets. The camera and strobe light were programmed to fire 4 seconds after injecting the fuel into the airstream.

The mean fuel/air ratio data were obtained from 11 sampling probes located at the aft end of the tunnel test section as illustrated in Figure 13. The probes were designed to sample an average fuel/air ratio over the full wind tunnel cross section. Each probe was constructed of 0.030-inch I.D. stainless steel tubing that incorporated a 60-degree scarfed end to minimize the digestion of solid fuel particles. The 11 probes were manifolded into a 3/8-inch-diameter stainless steel tube which was connected to a vacuum pump. A second vacuum pump

31



Photographic Layout for Wind Shear Tunnel Test Apparatus. Figure 13.

. .

32

×

è

pulled a sample from the input manifold of the first vacuum pump through the chromatograph sampling coils. A chromatograph, connected to a recorder with integrator as shown in Figure 14, was used to record the sampled fuel/air ratio. The chromatograph was fitted with a silicone column which allowed the separate tracing of fuel compositions of varying molecular weight.

The general fuel dispersion patterns and fuel-air flow field interaction characteristics were obtained from three cameras. The flow field and fuel breakup kinetics were recorded by a hand-triggered still camera located as illustrated in Figure 13. A hand-triggered motion camera (65 frames per second) was also used to record fuel-wind interactions. A second motion camera (500 frames per second) was used as illustrated in Figure 13 to record the fuel breakup pattern and fuel dropletair flow characteristics, and to determine the extent of fuel breakup downstream of the fuel injection point.

The data acquisition test procedure for the wind shear tests varied slightly depending upon the data being taken. The wind tunnel operating procedure, however, remained constant. Pretest preparations were as follows:

Cameras were checked and loaded.

- Fuel/air sample vacuum pumps were turned on.
- The chromatograph was zeroed and set on the correct range.
- The yield stress of the fuel was taken.
- The fuel temperature was recorded.
- The fuel flow rate regulation system was set at the correct pressures which would produce a 10 fps fuel flow rate into the test section.
- The wind tunnel blower was started and set at a designated wind velocity.

The fuel flow rate regulator solenoid value and fuel injection solenoid value were programmed, through the use of an electronic counter, to open and close simultaneously 1 cause a 10-sccond fuel injection period into the wind tunnel test section.

Four seconds after fuel flow was started, the same counter system triggered the microphotograph camera and strobe light.



Figure 14. Chromatograph Instrumentation Setup.

AND REAL PROPERTY OF THE PROPE

The flow field still camera was hand triggered approximately 5 seconds after flow commenced. For motion camera data (which were taken without the two still cameras), the electronic counter triggered the flow field motion camera (500 frames per second) 4 seconds after flow was started and continued for 4 seconds. The full-view motion camera (65 frames per second) was hand operated and turned on for the complete 10-second run.

For spark ignition data, the spark was turned on prior to fuel flow injection and left on through the 10-second test period. Ignition was observed visually and recorded. Fifteen seconds after fuel flow commenced, the gas sample was switched into the chromatograph column to be analyzed. The wind tunnel test section was cleaned of residual fuel after each test before preparations for the next test commenced.

IMPACT DISPERSION/ATOMIZATION TESTS

The impact dispersion/atomization test setup was designed to simulate fuel impact conditions of the crash environment on a laboratory scale. This was accomplished by impacting a slug of fuel onto a flat surface, representing the conditions existing when a fuel tank or fuel line ruptures during an actual crash.

The device for obtaining fuel impact velocities (Figure 15) was a 4-ft x 2-in. I.D. steel driver tube that inclosed a piston which contained the fuel sample. The sample was driven down the tube at a predesignated velocity by air pressure. The air supply entering the driver tube was fitted with a sonic orifice such that a known flow rate of air entered the tube for a given air supply pressure. Two 1/2-inch-diameter relief holes were located near the end of the piston travel to release the driver tube pressure when the fuel piston impacted a shock ring at the bottom of the driver tube. This prevented any flow of air through the piston into the fuel impact area.

The fuel piston was made of aluminum and held 3 cubic inches of fuel (Figure 15). The details of the fuel piston are illustrated in Figure 16. Fuel was held in the piston by placing an aluminum foil diaghragm over the face of the piston and clamping the diaphragm with a clamping ring. The clamping ring was constructed with an 85-degree knife edge to allow clean shearing of the diaphragm when the piston impacted the shock ring. O-rings were placed around the piston circumference to provide an air seal. A secondary piston was fitted inside the fuel piston to release the vacuuming effects of



Figure 15. Fuel Impact/Dispersion Atomization Test Devices.



÷

1

1

:

Status Change Instrum

Fuel Piston for Impact/Dispersion Atomization Test Device. Figure 16.

the fuel exiting the piston. The O-ring face seal initially eliminated any liquid fuel leakage through the rear of the piston. The spring provided the initial seating force for the face seal as well as reduced the impact inertia forces on the secondary piston. The rubber shock absorber further attenuated these forces.

The driver tube-fuel piston assembly was mounted on the frame at the desired angle of impact (90, 45, or 15 degrees) as shown in Figure 17. The mounting frame was designed so that the fuel slug travel distance from the driver to its impact point was 1 foot for all three impingement angles.

Air to the driver tube was obtained from a supply bottle through an adjustable pressure regulator which fed an accumulator bottle. A solenoid valve programmed with the 500-frameper-second camera released the air supply to the driver tube.

The sampling probes shown in Figures 15 and 17 contained 11 stainless steel tube probes (0.030-in. I.D.) which were connected to a vacuum pumping system for pulling a sample of vaporized gas. Care was taken to design the probes with a scarfed end so that ingestion of liquid fuel particles was held to a minimum. The 11 probes were located 2 inches from the impact surface and 6 inches from the impact centerline, starting adjacent to the point of impact.

To control wind and extraneous effects, a Plexiglas container was fitted over the impact area as shown in Figure 18. Inside, this container was 1 foot high, 2 feet wide, and 5 feet 7-1/2 inches long. These dimensions were based on a volume which, for JP-4, would give a fuel/air ratio of 0.1 by weight if all of the JP-4 fuel were vaporized for standard atmospheric conditions.

Data recorded for the impact dispersion/atomization tests consisted of: (1) fuel slug impact velocity, (2) air temperature, (3) impact surface temperature, (4) pressure regulator pressure, (5) fuel temperature, (6) fuel yield stress, and (7) mean fuel/ air ratio.

A 500-frame-per-second camera, shown in Figure 18, recorded the actual fuel velocity and impact characteristics. Fuel yield stress was measured by a cone penetrometer.

The mean fuel/air ratios were measured by a chromatograph connected to a recorder with integrator as shown in Figure 14. A silicone column was used to trace various fuel molecular compositions. The chromatograph setup was the same as for the wind shear tests discussed earlier.



Figure 17. Impact Dispersion/Atomization Facility.

39

eav r



The operational procedure for the impact dispersion/atomization tests was as follows:

• The camera was checked and loaded.

Sec. Value

- Fuel/air sample vacuum pumps were turned on.
- The chromatograph was zeroed and set on the correct range.
- The yield stress of the fuel was taken.
- The fuel temperature was recorded.
- The impact surface and ambient air temperature were recorded.
- The air supply pressure regulator was set at the prescribed pressure to obtain specified impact velocity.
- The piston was filled with fuel and placed in the driver tube.
- The driver tube assembly was installed on the mounting frame.
- The camera was turned on for 3 seconds. After 1 second from camera start, the solenoid valve was automatically opened, accelerating the fuel to the impact point. When the camera was turned off, the solenoid valve closed.
- Fifteen seconds after the camera commenced, the gas sample was switched into the chromatograph column to be analyzed.
- Before the next test was run, the facility was cleaned of all residual fuel.

Only slight modification of the previously discussed facility and operational procedure was required to incorporate the ignition sources, a hot-surface source and a spark ignition source. The hot-surface ignition source was a stainless steel sheathed, nichrome heater strip (2 feet long and 3/8 inch in diameter) mounted on a frame as shown in Figure 19. The hotsurface ignition source was located at the same relative location as the gas sample pickups discussed previously. The heater strip was brought up to 1100°F by a rheostat while the temperature was measured by an iron-constantan thermocouple.



The spark igniter was powered y a 12,000-volt transformer with an approximate spark gap of 0.1 inch. The spark igniter was located 5 inches from the fuel impact point and 1-3/4inches from the surface.

The pretest operational procedure was similar to that already discussed except that chromatographic data were not obtained and the hot-surface and spark igniters were activated as required. The Plexiglas container was not used. The camera was set for a 4-second run period rather than a 3-second period so that complete combustion coverage could be obtained.

Recorded ignition characteristics were obtained from the 500frame-per-second camera and visual observations and recordings.

Immediately after each run, the fire, if any, was extinguished, the spark igniter was turned off, and the hot surfaces were removed from the area. The facility was then cleaned and made ready for the next test.

SIMULATED FULL-SCALE TESTS

1. S. S.

The basic overall test setup is illustrated in Figure 20. The test procedure consisted of accelerating a fuel tank mounted on a test fixture along a monorail, impacting the tank on a barrier, and recording ignition data photographically and in terms of electric analogs for the associated fire heating data.

A crash velocity of 65 ft/sec at an impact angle of 45 degrees was chosen to conduct the simulated full-scale tests. By conducting tests at the approximate crash-survivable energy limit, any fuel or test condition which indicated "safe" during these tests would be considered within the survival envelope during a full-scale crash.

The test impact barrier was an earth in fill constructed adjacent to a monorail as illustrated in Figure 21. The face of the barrier was constructed of concrete at a 45-degree incline with the horizontal and was 32 inches long and 5-1/2 feet wide. It was fitted with two steel tank cutters to insure that the fuel tank bladder would rupture as in full-scale crashes onto A concrete block wall was constructed adjacent rough terrain. to the monorail to provide a near vertical surface to contain the earthen fill, and to allow the impact area to be as close to the test fixture as possible within barrier-fixture clearance limits. The maximum height of the dirt fill was 3 feet 7 inches from ground level. The overall length of the impact barrier test area was 33 feet.



. . . .



14 . 2

7

-

Figure 21. Impact Barrier.

 \mathcal{L}_{S}

Fifteen-hundred feet of monorail was used to accelerate the test fixture to a velocity of 65 ft/sec. Steel straps (48 feet long, 1/4 inch thick, and 2-1/2 inches wide) were attached to each side of the monorail in the vicinity of the impact barrier to provide a friction surface for the fixture stopping brake.

The test fixture was constructed to ride on the monorail, position the fuel tanks, and allow simulation of the impact kinetics and aircraft stopping distance after impact. The fixture is illustrated in Figures 22, 23, and 24. The tank mount and supporting structure consisted of a swinging pivot arm. An energyabsorbing brake system was incorporated to hold the pivot arm and fuel tank at the desired position prior to impact and to provide rotational energy absorption to duplicate impact kinetics during and after impact.

A rail caliper brake system was designed to stop the test fixture and fuel tank within 18 to 30 feet from initial impact. This system was designed to duplicate the stopping distance a crashing helicopter travels in the horizontal after initial impact at the energy condition tested. The brake system consisted of two brake shoes (2-1/2 in. x 12 in.) which clamped onto the steel strips attached to the monorail; see Figure 23. The brake was actuated by air pressure through use of a solenoid-actuated valve. A breaker wire switch triggered by a metal stake initiated brake actuation at a specific point in the fixture's travel into the barrier. The brake shoe material consisted of asbestos mil-board brake lining.

The simulated fuel tanks were constructed to duplicate the crash kinetics of actual full-scale configurations. Figure 25 shows the test fuel tank configuration and the tank bladder. The tanks were of honeycomb sandwich construction as illustrated in Figure 26, and were typical of those found on many U. S. Army helicopters. The dimensions of the tanks allowed an approximate fuel volume of 13 gallons (1 ft x 1 ft x 2 ft). The outer skin of the tank structure was made from 0.016-inchthick 7075-T6 aluminum panels. The core was of aluminum honeycomb (1/2 in. x 1/8 in. x 0.07N). A 2-ply fiberglass cloth provided the inner skin material. These materials were bonded with epoxy resin to form the sandwich-constructed panels as illustrated in Figure 26. A 1-inch lip was provided at the panel edges to allow rivet attachment to the 0.06-inch angle framework. The top end frames were constructed of two 0.06inch "T" sections to provide mounting brackets and attachment of the tank to the fixture mount. A thin-wall fuel cell bladder was constructed to fit inside the tank structure. 2-inch filler cap was vulcanized to the top center of the fuel cell bladder and attached through a 3-inch-diameter hole cut into the tank top panel.

the strate watch and











~



Instrumentation was provided to measure and record the impact velocity, the fire intensity, and the test conditions. The impact velocity was obtained by towing the test fixture with a vehicle using a 1,500-foot cable; see Figure 20. The tow vehicle was instrumented with a fifth wheel velocity indicator and a speed control device. The speed control device provided accurate velocity regulation which eliminated the possibility of human error. This system provided an impact velocity of 65 ft/sec within ±2 ft/sec. An electrical breaker speed trap was placed just forward of the impact barrier to measure the actual impact velocity.

The fire intensity accompanying the impact and ignition of the fuel was measured versus time. Ten calorimeter probes, located as shown in Figure 21, were positioned vertically 1 foot from the barrier surface. The calorimeter devices were constructed as shown in Figure 27. They measured the environmental temperature versus time to allow computation of resulting heating rates. This system allowed the determination of relative fire intensity and provided a means to extrapolate the simulated test fire intensity to a full-scale condition.

Pretest environmental conditions were determined by measuring impact barrier surface temperature, fuel temperature, barometric pressure, air temperature, relative humidity, wind velocity, wind direction, and hot-surface igniter temperature when applicable. Impact barrier and fuel temperature were measured with a mercury thermometer prior to test initiation. Ambient wind velocity and direction were measured by a portable anemometer and direction indicator. Ambient air temperatures were recorded by an enclosed U. S. Weather Bureau ambient thermometer. The relative humidity and barometric pressure were obtained from the U. S. Weather Bureau at the Phoenix airport. The hot-surface igniter temperature was measured with a thermocouple.

Five high-speed cameras were used to provide photographic coverage of each test. Three cameras were installed on the test fixture for on-board photographic coverage as illustrated in Figures 20 and 22. Camera 5 was attached to the tank support pivot arm and Camera 3 was positioned to photograph a close-up side view of the impact sequence. Camera 4 was located to photograph a semioverhead view of the impact se-Two ground cameras were located as shown in Figure quence. Camera 1 provided an overall view of the impact test and 20. Camera 2 was positioned to record a close-up view of the impact event. An alternate position for Camera 2 is illustrated in Figure 20. It was used in the on-board (engine simulator) igniter tests to provide coverage of both the igniter and impact sequence.




Fuel temperature was maintained throughout the tests between 97° and 103°F. This was accomplished by storing the test fuels in two identical fuel temperature regulation systems. The system is illustrated schematically in Figure 28, and photographically in Figure 29. Each fuel regulation system consisted of an insulated 55-gallon barrel which enclosed a 30gallon fuel barrel. The space between the 55- and 30-gallon barrels was filled with water to allow a regulated heating control liquid. A barrel heater that was powered by a thermostat control device which regulated the water temperature by a thermometer submerged in the water was wrapped around the base of the 55-gallon barrel. The 30-gallon barrel was filled with the desired fuel and brought up to the desired fuel temperature.

Yield stress of the emulsified fuels was measured three times when the tank was filled for testing and then averaged. An ASTM D217 conepenetrometer (30-gram cone assembly) was used to measure the yield stress in dynes/cm².

وتعفينا فالمستخذي ومعقدة مستحيا فيلاط سألحم عالاته وسيمت فروستان مكالم لاتحالب مستسما ومراسم والمتعاد فالمتلاك كمرسكس لانات

Ignition sources were provided which simulated those sources observed in full-scale crashes. Basically, three types of ignition tests were studied: (1) a ground-based spark and hotsurface igniter configuration, (2) ground-based open flame igniters, and (3) an on-board (engine simulator) hot-surface and open-flame igniter system.

The spark igniter source was located 1 foot from the barrier surface as illustrated in Figure 21. Spark was obtained from a 12,000-volt transformer driving a 0.1-inch spark gap. The hot-surface igniter source, located as illustrated in Figure 21, was a stainless steel sheathed, nichrome heater strip (2 ft long and 3/8 inch I.D.), temperature controlled with a rheostat and monitored with a thermocouple. The heater strip was positioned level to the barrier surface and was maintained at 1100°F.

The open-flame igniter sources, five smudge pots burning JP-4, are illustrated in Figure 21.

The on-board ignition source (see Figure 30) was located over the fuel tank on the pivot arm as shown in Figure 31. This ignition source simulated the crash environment associated with turbine tailpipe conditions and was sequenced to simulate observed full-scale tailpipe conditions as illustrated in Figure 32. The ignition source sequence consisted of an initial hot-surface or tailpipe condition of approximately 900°F. At 0.7 second after impact, the propane burner was ignited to simulate the engine flaming which is observed as the engine spools are halted by friction. The open flame was



Ļ

والمعرب المحافر

and the second second







MUMA, ANIALISA







1

Figure 32. On-Board Ignition Source Sequence.

59

ر

sustained for 2.0 seconds and then turned off. The time sequencing of this system was obtained with an electric timing device which was triggered at impact. The propane burner was left on prior to impact to keep the simulated tailpipe at the desired temperature. Just prior to impact, a triggering device shut off the propane burner and started the relight cycle. A spark plug was used to ignite the propane burner which was energized concurrently with the propane supply solenoid valve.

and the second particular of the second s

and a second state of the second state of the second of the second state of the second state of the second stat

こうちょう ちょうちょう ちょうちょう ちょうちょう しょうちょう しょうちょう ちょうちょうちょう

Adda to the state

TEST RESULTS

Using the laboratory screening test methodology detailed in the previous section, test data were obtained on five fuels:

- 1. Referee Grade JP-4
- 2. JP-4 Ease Emulsion EF4R-104

the contraction of the second se

- 3. JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H
- 4. JP-8
- 5. JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8R-104H

Using the simulated full-scale test methodology detailed in the previous section, test data were obtained on ten fuels:

- 1. Referee Grade JP-4
- 2. JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104
- 3. JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H
- 4. JP-4 Base Emulsion JP-4 EXP-4
- 5. Referee Grade JP-8
- 6. JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8R-104
- 7. JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8R-104H
- 8. Jet-A Base Emulsion Jet-A EXP-4
- 9. Jet-A Gel #1
- 10. Jet-A Gel #2

RESULTS OF NOZZLE SHEAR TESTS

Nozzle shear tests were performed on the five fuels at various flow velocities. Typical flow patterns that resulted from liquid JP-4 or JP-8 are shown in Figures 33 and 34, respectively. For both fuels, the dependence of droplet size on impinging fuel flow velocity is insignificant for the velocities tested.

The typical flow patterns resulting from impinging streams of EF4R-104, EF4R-104H, and EF8-104H fuel emulsions are shown in Figures 35, 36, and 37, respectively. The droplet diameter or

Figure 33. JP-4 Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities.





Figure 34. JP-8 Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities.

6 <u>3</u>

Figure 35. EF4R-104 Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities.







Figure 37. EF8-104H Spray Atomization at Various Flow Velocities.

characteristic ligament dimensions illustrate a direct dependence upon fuel velocity. It is apparent from comparison of EF4R-104 and EF4R-104H that the breakup is also a function of the emulsified fuel yield stress. It was observed during testing that, for fuel flow velocities less than 20 ft/sec, the emulsions appeared to "creep" out of the nozzle without impinging the lucite surface. For flow velocities greater than 20 ft/sec, the spray consisted mainly of large filaments with smaller ligaments. The particle size approached the liquid sizes as the fuel velocity increased. The measured yield stress was 900 dynes/cm² for the JP-4 base EF4R-104 emulsion and 1570 dynes/cm² for the EF4R-104H emulsion. The JP-8 base EF8-104H emulsion measured a yield stress of 800 dynes/cm².

Figure 38 shows the variation of mean droplet diameter or characteristic ligament size as a function of impinging fuel velocity for both emulsified and liquid fuels. It is observed that there is very little difference between the droplet diameters for the two liquid fuels. The emulsified fuels tend to generate an exponential relation between droplet diameter and fuel velocity. Using the empirical relation discussed in the Test Methodology section,

$$\Psi_{\text{Base Fuel}} = \frac{d_{\text{Base Fuel}}}{d_{\text{Fuel}}} = \exp\left\{-\frac{(v_j - v)^2}{K}\right\}, \quad v = v_j, \quad (31)$$

the data presented in Figure 38 can be replotted in terms of an ignition susceptibility parameter (ψ_{Base} Fuel). Figure 39 presents this data correlation (ψ_{JP-4} versus fuel velocity) for JP-4 base EF4R-104 emulsified fuel at a yield stress of 900 dynes/cm². Using the above equation to fit a mean curve, it was found that (V_j) and (K) equalled 73.6 ft/sec and 1203, respectively. It may be observed that the data fit is very good for this type of testing.

Figure 40 presents the results plotted $(\psi_{JP-4} \text{ versus fuel} \text{ velocity})$ for JP-4 base EF4R-104H emulsified fuel with a yield stress of 1570 dynes/cm². The resulting constants (V_j) and (K) were found to equal 82.25 ft/sec and 1345, respectively. In comparing these two fuels, it is apparent that an increase in yield stress decreases the corresponding fuel breakup. Again, the scatter is minimal for this type of testing. Figure 41 presents the corresponding curve for the JP-8 base EF8-104H emulsified fuel. The constants (V_j) and (K) were found to be equal to 56.25 ft/sec and 524 respectively at a yield stress of 800 dynes/cm².

Figures 39, 40, and 41 illustrate the dependence of the emulsified fuel breakup on the fuel impingement velocity. Each fuel



.

j,





68

¥



Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Nozzle Shear Fuel Velocity for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104 ($r_y = 900 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2$). Figure 39.

69

`,



Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Nozzle Shear Fuel Velocity for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H (τ_Y = 1570 Dynes/cm²). Figure 40.

(1,1,2,1) is the second second second structure of the second
the bits that we see to see a set

0ت

¥



•

. . . .

Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Based on JP-8 Versus Nozzle Shear Fuel Velocity for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H ($\tau_{\rm Y}$ = 800 Dynes/cm²). Figure 41.

was characterized by a velocity at which a sharp decrease in droplet diameter began with a further increase in fuel veloc-The diameter approached the droplet diameters associated ity. with the liquid base fuels. A rational comparison between the EF8-104H emulsion and JP-4 and its emulsions cannot be made unless the ignition susceptibility characteristic between JP-4 and JP-8 is known for the same conditions. As shown in the preceding section, when the base fuel is changed, the constant Q, which is a function of the vapor pressure and diffusion rate, changes. This variation must be known before the comparative ignition susceptibility characteristic between JP-4 and JP-8 can be computed. However, the results show the expected tendencies in that the fuel reaction to an input kinetic energy causes shear loads and, consequently, shear thinning of the emulsions.

RESULTS OF HOT-SURFACE IGNITION TESTS

Using the methodology discussed previously, hot-surface ignition tests were performed on all five fuels. Figure 42 presents the hot-surface ignition data obtained for referee grade JP-4. The data is presented in terms of crucible temperature (degrees versus ignition delay time (seconds)). The modified mathematical relation discussed under Analytical Considerations was used to generate the curve representing the mean data results illustrated in Figure 42. Here (A) in the equation was found to be 2.342 x 10^4 , ln k was found to be -20.52, and t_r was equal to 0.9. Using this curve as a mean, the data were found to fall within the 5°F error tolerance incorporated in the tost procedures.

Other methods of determining autoignition characteristics for liquid JP-4 have been studied.⁽⁷⁾ The results of a dynamic autoignition test on JP-4 are illustrated by the dashed curve in Figure 42. This curve, taken from Reference 7, was obtained using a stainless cylinder with a flow-through fuel-air mixture. It may be observed that the two correlation curves compare favorably. References 6 and 7 indicate a minimum spontaneous ignition temperature of 468°F for JP-4. The test data obtained in this analysis indicate an autoignition temperature approximately 20°F higher than this.

The minimum autoignition temperature for emulsified fuels should not differ greatly from that of their base fuel. The data obtained for the JP-4 emulsions (EF4R-104 and EF4R-104H) indicate this trend. Figure 43 presents the autoignition data generated for the EF4R-104 fuel. Comparing the EF4R-104 data with the mean JP-4 data curves indicates that the emulsion autoignition data approached that obtained from JP-4. The



Figure 42. Autoignition Characteristics for Liquid JP-4 Fuel.



and a group of the second s

Figure 43.



¥

EF4R-104 emulsion does, however, indicate a longer ignition delay time of approximately 1.0 second for a given crucible temperature. This effect is to be expected since the water matrix present in the emulsion should change the heat transfer characteristics of the fuel in contact with the hot surface and result in slower fuel vaporization characteristics. The EF4R-104 tests were conducted with a mean yield stress of 509 dynes/cm², which is representative for this fuel in a nearrelaxed state.

Figure 44 presents the autoignition data obtained from the EF4R-104H emulsion. Like that of EF4R-104, the autoignition temperature curve approaches that obtained for JP-4. Likewise, the ignition delay time is found to be longer for a given crucible temperature by about 1.0 second. It is noted, however, that the EF4R-104H emulsion curve approached the JP-4 curve at a higher temperature than the EF4R-104 emulsion. This might possibly be due to the higher yield stress (1153 dynes/ cm²) which is characteristic of the relaxed EF4R-104H fuel. The water matrix of the EF4R-104H surrounds smaller fuel globs; therefore, the thermal boundary layer is thinner and yields higher heat transfer rates. However, it is noted that this is only a hypothesis since this effect is not conclusively established by the data.

Vaporization and subsequent ignition are functions of various fuel properties such as hydrocarbon composition, diffusion rates, and heat transfer coefficient. The JP-8 fuel has a different hydrocarbon mixture than JP-4. The results of ignition tests on JP-8 are indicated in Figure 45 together with the mean autoignition curve for JP-4. Not only did the minimum autoignition temperature decrease, but the ignition delay time was much less for the JP-8 fuel. The indicated minimum autoignition temperature was approximately 40°F lower than for JP-4 or, from extrapolation, was 448°F. This lowering of the overall autcignition temperatures was contrary to expectations based on the ignition and fuel/air ratio data generated in the wind shear and impact dispersion/atomization tests as well as those based on the relative vapor pressure values (0.35 psi for JP-8 as compared to 3.0 psi for JP-4). All indications were that JP-8 was difficult to ignite at normal ambient temperatures. However, for the elevated temperatures used in the hot-surface tests, the data of Figure 45 show that JP-8 is a more easily ignitable fuel than JP-4.

Figure 46 presents the autoignition characteristics obtained from testing the EF8-104H emulsion. The data obtained for this fuel had considerable scatter. There appeared to be a temperature range between 600° and 800°F in which the autoignition



1.1.1

Autoignition Characteristics for JP-4 Base Emulsion EF4R-104H (τ_{y} = 1153 Dynes/cm²). Figure 44.



y



Figure 45. Autoignition Characteristics for Liquid JP-8 Fuel.

77

and the second second

an full and and the of the second full and a soft full second to the soft full second to the soft full second to

.

Ŀ



and in a second seco

•

Autoignition Characteristics for JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H ($\tau_{\rm Y}$ = 750 Dynes/cm²).

:

behavior deviated from the characteristic trends of liquid or previously tested emulsified fuels. One explanation for the results obtained is that the EF8-104H emulsified fuel developed sporadic outgassing at the fuel/hot-surface interface, causing heat transfer delays in this temperature range. Once the temperature was dropped to below 600°F, the autoignition characteristics followed the expected trend and approached the JP-8 autoignition characteristics. As with the JP-4 emulsions, the ignition delay time for the JP-8 emulsion increased when compared to the base fuel.

It was observed that the emulsified fuels, in general, possessed more data scatter than their liquid base fuels. This is probably due to their more complicated structure.

RESULTS OF WIND SHEAR TESTS

.

Wind shear tests were performed on referee grade JP-4, JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104, JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104H, JP-8, and JP-8 base emulsion EF8-104H. The test wind velocities ranged from 30 to 120 ft/sec, enveloping the approximate maximum crash survivable velocity of 65 ft/sec. In all tests the fuel was injected into the airstream at 10 ft/sec. Wind shear test conditions and data results from each test are presented in Appendix I.

No fuel or velocity combination was found which would ignite with the spark ignition probes due to the absence of a combustible fuel/air ratio. It should be borne in mind, however, that this is a facility characteristic and does not necessarily lead to a noncombustible conclusion for a fullscale condition where much more fuel is involved. More important, however, are the relative trends developed in these tests in which the fuels performance is compared to the JP-4 standard.

Using the data correlation results obtained previously (Analytical Considerations), the droplet diameter and fuel/ air ratio data are presented in terms of ψ , where

1 - 1 - 1

$$\Psi_{\text{Base Fuel}} = \frac{(F/A)_{\text{Fuel}}}{(F/A)_{\text{Base Fuel}}} = \frac{a_{\text{Base Fuel}}}{a_{\text{Fuel}}}$$
(32)

Basically, two types of test data were measured for fuel crashworthiness performance. These consisted of mean fuel/air ratio data and photographic data of the breakup, atomization, and dispersion of the fuels versus wind velocity. Photographic data were obtained from four cameras. The most important photographic data were obtained with the microphotographic camera where actual fuel droplet diameters were determined. The full-view still camera gave secondary data results as to fuel flow characteristics. The data obtained from the two motion cameras were used to back up the droplet diameter data and indicate any trends not observed with the other types of data systems.

Figures 47 and 48 show the fuel droplet breakup for referee grade JP-4 fuel just downstream of the injection point. The fuel was injected at 10 ft/sec into the airstream at velocities of 40 and 80 ft/sec, respectively. Both figures show high amounts of breakup and dispersion for JP-4 with the mean droplet size being reduced slightly as the velocity increases. Figures 49 and 50 show the results from the full-view still camera for the same JP-4 tests and illustrate the overall flow pattern of the wind shear mechanism.

Figures 51 through 55 illustrate a sequence of tests performed on EF4R-104 emulsified fuel with yield stresses ranging from 400 to 500 dynes/cm². The five figures illustrate the breakup and dispersion characteristics of EF4R-104 emulsion when it was injected into a 40 to 100 ft/sec wind flow field. For the lower velocities, no breakup is visible and the fuel stays in a continuous strand. As the velocity is increased, small amounts of breakup and atomization are visible. At 100 ft/sec, the breakup and atomization are still small compared to liquid JP-4 at the same wind velocity. Even the smaller particles are still in an emulsified state. Figures 56 and 57 show the full view of the EF4R-104 fuel during wind shear for wind shear velocities of 60 and 100 ft/sec. These figures further illustrate the breakup susceptibility as the wind shear velocity increases.

To study the effects of yield stress on the breakup and atomization characteristics, the EF4R-104 emulsified fuel was worked to a yield stress of approximately 1200 dynes/cm² and tested at various wind shear velocities. Figures 58, 59, and 60 show the accompanying fuel-air flow field at wind velocities of 60, 80, and 100 ft/sec. It can be seen that the fuel breakup is less pronounced than the data shown in Figures 56 and 57. This indicates a potential increase in safety with increasing yield stress.

Figures 61 through 67 illustrate a sequence of tests performed on EF4R-104H emulsified fuel with an average yield stress of 1733 dynes/cm² for wind velocities from 50 to 120 ft/sec. It is evident that less breakup occurs with the higher yield stress of this fuel. Figures 68, 69, and 70 show photographs of EF4R-104H emulsified fuel which has been worked to a yield



Figure 47. JP-4 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 40 fps.



Figure 48. JP-4 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 80 fps.



Figure 49. JP-4 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 40 fps.



Figure 50. JP-4 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps.



and a static set of the set of the



Figure 53. EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 60 fps $(\tau_y = 475 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 54. EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 70 fps: $(\tau_y = 475 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 55. EF4R-104 Wind Shear Breakup, Wind Velocity = 100 fps $(\tau_y = 400 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 56. EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps $(\tau_y = 600 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 57. EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps $(\tau_y = 600 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 58. EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps $(\tau_y = 1200 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2).$

¥



.....

Figure 60. E

EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps $(\tau = 1050 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.

.

*

5

87

.

.



Figure 61. EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 50 fps $(\tau_y = 1733 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 62. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps $(\tau_y = 1733 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.






Figure 64. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps $(\tau_y = 1733 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 65. EF4R-104 Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 90 fps $(\tau_y = 1733 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 66. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps $(\tau = 1733 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 67. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 120 fps $(\tau_y = 1733 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 68. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 60 fps $(\tau_y = 2470 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2).$



.

Figure 69. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 80 fps $(\tau = 2470 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2)$.



Figure 70. EF4R-104H Wind Shear/Fuel Flow Field, Wind Velocity = 100 fps $(\tau_{y} = 2470 \text{ Dynes/cm}^{2})$.

Þ

The actual safety a fuel displays is its ability to restrict formation of ignitable fuel/air mixtures in the crash environment. The best way to illustrate this point is to compare the performance of a tested fuel with that of a standard fuel, or with one for which much crash data is available. As was shown previously, a parameter (ψ) could be defined in which both fuel/air ratio data and droplet diameter data could be correlated to obtain a safety evaluation.

Figure 71 presents the fuel/air ratio data and droplet diameter data plotted in terms of ψ_{JP-4} (as defined previously) versus wind shear velocity for the EF4R-104 emulsified fuel at an average yield stress of 437 dynes/cm²(400 $\leq \tau_{y} \leq 475$ dynes/cm²). Very good correlation between the fuel/air ratio data and the droplet diameter data is evident which supports the analytical model generated previously. It was further found that the data presented in Figure 71, as well as the data presented in the forthcoming figures, can be represented by the relation

1- 1

$$\Psi_{\text{Base Fuel}} = \frac{(F/A)_{\text{Fuel}}}{(F/A)_{\text{Base Fuel}}} = \frac{d_{\text{Base Fuel}}}{d_{\text{Fuel}}} = \exp\left[-\frac{(V_{j} - V)^{2}}{K}\right], V \leq V_{j}$$
(33)

For the EF4R-104 emulsified fuel at an average yield stress of 437 dynes/cm², V_i was found to equal 120.6 ft/sec and K was found to equal 1190. It can be seen in Figure 71 that the atomization and, therefore, fuel/air ratio increases rapidly and approaches that of liquid JP-4 when the wind shear velocity is increased beyond $6\overline{0}$ ft/sec. V_i can be interpreted as the wind shear velocity at which breakup and atomization would occur at the same rate for EF4R-104 as for liquid JP-4. Since it is known that liquid JP-4 is highly combustible in a crash environment, the value of ψ_{JP-4} for a given wind shear velocity illustrates a fraction of the ignitability and combustibility expected for JP-4. There exists a value of the ignitability parameter (ψ_{JP-4}) under which ignition could not occur (at least to a hazardous extent) in a crash environment. Fuels with values equal to or less than this critical value of $\psi_{\text{TP}-4}$ for the approximate maximum crash survivable velocity (65 ft/sec) would be considered safe.

Figure 72 presents the fuel/air ratio data and droplet diameter data plot 3d in terms of $\psi_{JP}-4$ versus wind shear velocity for





94

×



. . .

providence) [house further statistics



.

EF4R-104 emulsified fuel with an average yield stress of 645 dynes/cm². (The yield stress for these data varied between 600 and 690 dynes/cm²). Within the data scatter expected for this type of testing, the correlation between fuel/air ratio and droplet diameter was good. Using the equation for ψ_{JP-4} to obtain a mean curve through the data resulted in a value for V; of 137 ft/sec and for K of 1700. Figure 72 indicates a sharp increase in ψ_{JP-4} for wind shear velocities above 70 ft/sec. The increase in yield stress, as compared to Figure 71, offers an improvement in safety (i.e., lower values of ψ).

Figure 73 presents the fuel/air ratio data and droplet diameter data plotted in terms of ψ_{JP-4} versus wind shear velocity for EF4R-104 emulsified fuel worked to an average yield stress of 1400 dynes/cm². The yield stress for these data varied between 1200 and 1700 dynes/cm⁴ Within the data scatter expectation this type of testing, the fuel/air data and droplet diameter data correlation was good. Using the equation for ψ_{JP-4} to obtain a mean curve through the data resulted in a value for V_{j} of 190 ft/sec and for K of 4140. Figure 73 indicates a more gradual increase in ψ_{JP-4} than observed in Figures 71 and 72 for wind shear velocities above 90 ft/sec. As the velocities increase, the value of ψ_{JP-4} approaches 1.0, which represents liquid JP-4. Again, the increased yield stress appears to offer an improvement in safety.

Figure 74 presents the fuel/air ratio data and droplet diameter data f. seted in terms of ψ_{JP-4} versus wind shear velocity for EF4R-104H emulsified fuel. Two average yield stress curves are presented. The first average yield stress is 1192 dynes/cm² with a yield stress variation between 1125 and 1290 dynes/cm² and the second average yield stress is 1886 dynes/cm² with a yield stress variation between 1525 and 2520 dynes/cm². It is seen that quite a bit of data scatter is present. This is not unexpected for this type of testing; however, the wider range of yield stresses in these cases accounts for much of the scatter. For the average yield stress of 1192 dynes/cm², the mean curve obtained using the equation for ψ_{ijp-4} was found to give a value for V_j of 180 ft/sec and for K of 3350. For the average yield stress of 1886 dynes/cm², the mean data curve resulted in a value for V_j of 225.5 ft/sec and for K of 6100. As shown in Figure 74, the curve of ψ_{JP-4} versus wind shear velocity indicates a gradual increase in ψ_{JP-4} for velocities above 85 ft/sec for the 1192 dynes/cm² yield stress data and an even more gradual increase in ψ_{JP-4} for velocities above 100 ft/sec for the 1886 dynes/cm² yield stress data. As was indicated in Figures 71, 72, and 73, the results shown in Figure 74 further confirm the potential safety improvement with increasing yield stress.



aber and set

97

in the states

1.





Figure 75 presents fuel/air ratio data plotted in terms of ψ_{JP-4} for liquid JP-8 and EF8-104H. The yield stress for liquid JP-8 is zero; however, the deviation of JP-8 from JP-4 is a function of the fuel properties such as vapor pressure, diffusion rates, and chemical composition. The average yield stress of the EF8-104H JP-8 base emulsified fuel is 1000 dynes/ cm² with a yield stress variation between 750 and 1100 dynes/ cm^2 . The mean curve for the liquid JP-8 was taken as a straight line parallel to JP-4 data with a value of ψ_{JP-4} corresponding to 0.8. These data do contain a fair amount of scatter, but it is within that expected for this type of testing. The mean curve representing EF8-104H was obtained from the equation for ψ_{JP-8} using the JP-8 data to obtain the results shown in Figure 76 for ψ_{JP-8} versus wind shear velocity. The mean EF8-104H data curve in Figure 75 was transferred from Figure 76 by a value of 9.8, representing the relationship between JP-8 and JP-4. Because JP-8 is the base fuel for EF8-104H, one would expect that UJP-4 for EF8-104H would not become higher than 0.8. This mean data curve for EF8-104H resulted in a value for Vi of 150 ft/sec and for K of 2700. The EF8-104H data scatter is a little greater than should be expected. No definite explanation is available; however, the hot-source ignition data presented previously also resulted in large amounts of scatter for this high yield stress fuel.

RESULTS OF IMPACT DISPERSION/ATOMIZATION TESTS

Impact dispersion/acomization tests were performed on referee grade JP-4, JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104, JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104H, JP-8, and JP-8 base emulsion EF8-104H. The impact velocities tested ranged from 20 to 70 ft/sec. The tests were performed for each fuel a. 45- and 90-degree impact angles. The results of each test are presented in Appendix II.

Using the data correlation results obtained from the analysis, the fuel/air ratio data is presented in terms of an ignition susceptibility parameter ψ , where

$$\Psi_{\text{Base Fuel}} = \frac{(F/A)_{\text{Fuel}}}{(F/A)_{\text{Base Fuel}}}$$
 (34)

Two types of impact tests were performed and will be discussed separately. The first consisted of measuring mean fuel/air ratio results versus impact kinetic velocity and the second consisted of recording impact ignition susceptibility versus impact kinetic velocity.



Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Wind Shear Velocity for JP-8 Liquid Fuel and JP-8 Base Emulsion EF8-104H (τ_Y = 1000 Dynes/cm^2). Figure 75.

100

>



on the second



Fuel/Air Ratio Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity Tests

and the second second second second and the second
The mean fuel/air ratio data resulting from fuel impact with a surface, fucl impact velocity measurements, and test procedures were discussed in the Test Methodology section. The impact velocities were measured from the high-speed (500 frameper-second) camera data.

The actual safety potential a fuel displays is its ability to restrict formation of ignitable fuel/air mixtures in the crash impact environment. The parameter (ψ) can be used to illustrate this ability by comparing the tested fuel with a standard fuel or with one for which crash data are available.

Figure 77 presents the fuel/air ratio data plotted in terms of ψ_{JP-4} versus kinetic velocity (V Sin0) for the JP-4 base, EF4R-104 emulsified fuel at an average yield stress of 508 dynes/cm². The yield stress varied between 480 and 536 dynes/cm². Figure 77 consists of data taken for both 45 and 90 degrees; therefore, these results indicate that the impact dispersion and atomization dependence are a direct function of kinetic velocity for a given yield stress. Very little data scatter is present. It is found in Figure 77, as well as in the data presented in the forthcoming figures, that a similar relationship to that observed in the wind shear tests can represent the mean data, e.g.,

$$\Psi_{\text{Base Fuel}} = \frac{(F/A)_{\text{Fuel}}}{(F/A)_{\text{Base Fuel}}} = \exp\left[-\frac{(V_{j} - V \text{SIN}\theta)^{2}}{K}\right], V \leq V_{j}$$
(35)

Based on the results of the EF4R-104 data presented in Figure 77, the mean curve resulted in a value of 60 ft/sec for V_j and a value of 747.5 for K. It can be seen in Figure 77 that the atomization and dispersion and, therefore, the mean fuel/air ratio, increased rapidly when the kinetic velocity was increased beyond 15 ft/sec. Also, the data approached $\psi = 1.0$ (i.e., equal to that of liquid JP-4) near a kinetic velocity of 60 ft/sec. At this velocity, the impacted EF4R-104 would have atomization and dispersion characteristics similar to those expected for liquid JP-4. Since it is known that liquid JP-4 is highly combustible in a crash environment, the value of ψ_{JP-4} for a given kinetic velocity illustrates a fraction of the ignitability and combustion expected for JP-4. It should be clear that there will exist a value of the ignitability parameter (ψ_{JP-4}) under which ignition could not occur (at least to a hazardous extent) in a crash environment. If we assume that the maximum survivable conditions for a crash



A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR



وما روات

environment are a velocity of 65 ft/sec at a 45-degree angle, then the maximum survivable kinetic velocity is 46 ft/sec. Fuels with values equal to or less than this critical value of ψ_{JP-4} would be considered safe.

Figure 78 presents the fuel/air ratio data plotted in terms of UJP-4 versus kinetic velocity for the JP-4 base EF4R-104H emulsified fuel at an average yield stress of 1143 dynes/cm². The yield stress varied between 1100 and 1185 dynes/ cm^2 for the As in Figure 77, the data plotted in Figure 78 consists data. of tests run at both a 45- and 90-degree impact angle. Data scatter is not severe for this type of testing. Using the equation for ψ_{JP-4} to obtain a mean data correlation curve resulted in a value for $V_{\rm j}$ of 100 ft/sec and a value of 2450 for ĸ. It can be seen in Figure 78 that the ignitability parameter ψ_{JP-4} increases with increasing kinetic velocity less rapidly than the parameter in Figure 77. It is evident, as was the case in the wind shear test results, that increasing the yield stress of the emulsified fuel apparently enhances its safety characteristics.

Figure 79 presents the fuel/air ratio data plotted in terms of ψ_{JP-4} versus kinetic velocity for liquid JP-8. The data presented in this figure were obtained for both a 45- and a 90-degree impact angle. Because the yield stress of JP-8 is zero, the lower fuel/air ratio data obtained, compared to JP-4, are the result of the inherent characteristics of JP-8, such as vapor pressure, diffusion rates, and chemical composition. Data scatter is no more than to be expected for this type of testing, especially at the lower fuel/air ratio ranges. The value of ψ_{JP-4} for liquid JP-8 appears to taper off to a value between 0.2 and 0.3 for the larger kinetic velocities. This would correlate with the difference between vapor pressure of JP-8 and JP-4 (0.35 psi for JP-8 and 2.90 psi for JP-4).

Figure 80 presents the fuel/air ratio data plotted in terms of ψ_{TP-4} versus kinetic velocity for the JP-8 base EF8-104H emulsified fuel with an average yield stress of 755 dynes/cm². The yield stress varied between 730 and 780 dynes/cm² for the data presented, which also included 45- and 90-degree impact angles. Using the equation for ψ_{JP-8} and the mean JP-8 results, a mean data curve was generated for the EF8-104H data in terms of ψ_{JP-4} . This curve is shown in Figure 81. From this result, the values for V_j and K were estimated at 73 ft/ sec and 1310, respectively. As illustrated in Figure 81, there was considerable scatter. However, for the very low fuel/air ratios obtained with this fuel, such scatter is not unusual. As with the wind shear test and hot-surface ignition test results, it appears that this fuel will characteristically yield greater data scatter when compared to the others tested.





• · · · • •

.

ş





KINETIC VELOCITY (V SIN0) - FPS

80

70

60

50

ŝ

20

10

ò

0

0

Ο

d

000

 $\left[\frac{(73 - V SIN0)^2}{1310}\right]$

UJP-8 = exp

. . 0

≱-ar_ф

0.2-

106

1

うちょうないない かんちょう へいてんかん ちょうしょう あんかい いちたんちょう ちょうちょうちょう



Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Based on Liquid JP-8 Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity for JP-8 Base Emulsio. EF8-104H ($\tau_{\rm Y}$ = 755 Dynes/cm²). Figure 81.

Impact Ignition Susceptibility Versus Impact Kinetic Velocity Tests

An impact ignition test program was conducted to record ignition characteristics for referee grade JP-4, JP-4 base EF4R-104 emulsion, JP-4 base EF4R-104H emulsion, JP-8, and JP-8 base EF8-104H emulsion.

High-speed motion pictures (500 frames per second) were taken of each test to record the extent of fuel ignition from the spark and/or hot-surface ignition source and to determine the actual fuel impact velocity. Test conditions and data are presented in Appendix III.

It must be realized that the ignition results obtained in this test series do not necessarily represent the ignition expected in a full-scale crash environment. However, the ignition study does illustrate the ignition trends and how these trends relate to the impact dispersion/atomization results.

To illustrate graphically the ignition results, an ignition rating system numbering from 0 to 4 was devised. A rating of 0 indicated no ignition whereas a rating of 4 indicated a violent complete ignition, characteristic of the JP-4 results. A rating of 3 indicated a delayed complete ignition, lacking the initial fireball associated with light fuel spray. An ignition rating of 2 indicated a semi-fireball ignition which did not propagate a flame and was self-extinguishing. An ignition rating of 1 indicated only slight ignition without flame spreading.

Three tests were run for each fuel (except JP-4), velocity setting, and impact angle to obtain an adequate statistical analysis. Only two tests per condition were required for JP-4, as every velocity and impact angle tested resulted in an ignition rating of 4. It was found after analyzing the data that the actual impact velocities for nominally the same setting were not close enough to substantiate averaging for each test condition. Further, the yield stress of the fuels varied slightly during testing. Therefore, all the data were plotted rather than statistically averaged at a given condition.

To illustrate the effect of the ignition susceptibility parameter ψ_{JP-4} , the ignition rating of the test data was plotted versus the ignition susceptibility parameter ψ_{JP-4} . The value of ψ_{JP-4} for each test was obtained from the governing equation using the measured kinetic velocity and the appropriate constants associated with yield stress (see section on Test Correlation and Safety Evaluation Criteria). The results are

presented in Figure 82. The data scatter is as expected in this type of data acquisition; however, there does appear to be a distinct border line which represents the limit of the occurrence of a specific ignition rating. If we assume that an ignition rating of 2 or under represents a nonhazardous condition, then it can be concluded that values of ψ_{JP-4} equal to or less than 0.09 represent a safe condition. For values of ψ_{JP-4} above this value, there is a finite probability of complete ignition. Figure 82 also allows prediction of ignition characteristics of other fuels if we know the appropriate value of ψ_{JP-4} for the fuel.

To be able to define the limiting value of ψ_{JP-4} from results with greater precision, either a much larger data sample or preferably much better reproducibility of the test condition would be required. It was observed in the tests that all ignitions were caused by the spark igniter rather than the hot-surface ignition source. Although the hot surface was kept at 1100°F, the contact time of the fuel apparently was not long enough to initiate combustion. The effect the hot source had on ignition by the spark igniter was not directly determined; however, it is possible that data with an ignition rating of 3 may have been affected by the hot source.

RESULTS OF SIMULATED FULL-SCALE TESTS

The simulated full-scale test conditions and results are tabulated in Appendix IV.

Results of Open-Flame Igniter Tests

One simulated full-scale impact test was performed using openflame igniters for each of the ten fuels at an impact velocity of 65 ft/sec. The only environmental variable causing any change between the ten tests was the wind velocity and direction. Each test was conducted with a wind velocity of less than 10 mph. The maximum temperature observed at any position is illustrated for each test as a function of time from impact in Figures 83 and 84. Four tests resulted in no indicated temperature increase (zero heat rate). *P* malfunction occurred in the temperature data recorder in one test (liquid JP-8).

The ignition and postcrash fire resulting from the liquid JP-4 fuel test produced a violent reaction and a large fireball. A large amount of misted fuel ignited while airborne, and the fire spread over the test barrier, resulting in complete ignition of all the fuel. The maximum heating rate was found to be on the order of that expected for JP-4 postcrash fires (10 Btu/ft²-sec).



ومتقصيبهم منعقب ومعلولهم والمعلوم



110

×

٠.



`. .



>

The JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104, with a yield stress value of 283 dynes/cm², resulted in a violent ignition and postcrash fire of nearly the same magnitude as the JP-4 fuel. The resulting fireball was slightly smaller, which was as expected because fuel misting was reduced due to the emulsion's yield The small globs of fuel, however, appeared to have stress. been almost completely ignited while airborne. The resulting fire and fuel spread covered a somewhat larger area than JP-4 and also resulted in complete ignition of all the fuel. The postcrash fire burn time was increased over JP-4 as the emulsion tended to lay small globs over the ground which burned longer than the misted JP-4 fuel. The maximum heating rate was found to be nearly equal to that found for the JP-4 test. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great or perhaps slightly greater than that of liquid JP-4.

The JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104H, with a yield stress value of 807 dynes/ cm^2 , resulted in a violent ignition and postcrash fire. The resulting fireball was slightly reduced from the fireballs observed for JP-4 and EF4R-104 since the fuel globs were slightly increased in size. This resulted in a reduction in the available fuel in the vapor phase. However, nearly all the fuel globs were ignited while still airborne. The result-ing fire and fuel spread covered a somewhat larger area than for JP-4 and resulted in nearly complete ignition of all the fuel with only small isolated unburned fuel globs. The postcrash fire burn time was increased as the larger globs of fuel lay on the barrier and burned until completely consumed. This longer burn time accounts for the higher temperatures acquired for this test over the JP-4 test since the JP-4 tended to be consumed in the initial fireball on impact. As with the EF4R-104 emulsion, the observed maximum heating rate was found to be nearly the same as JP-4. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that of liquid JP-4.

The JP-4 base emulsion JP-4 EXP-4, with a yield stress of 800 dynes/ cm^2 , resulted in an ignition and postcrash fire nearly identical to that of the EF4R-104H fuel. The resulting temperatures, however, did not indicate as high an energy release as did the EF4R-104H fuel. However, the wind direction during this test may have been a factor since it was blowing the fire away from the temperature-calorimeter probes.

The liquid JP-8 fuel resulted in a violent ignition and postcrash fire that was nearly identical to the JP-4 test. The resulting fireball size was observed to be somewhat smaller than JP-4, which could be expected due to the reduced vaporization rate of JP-8. The fuel misting after impact appeared much the same as JP-4, but the resulting flame speed through the mist was slower. Once the mist was heated by fire, the flame speed appeared to increase. As a result, fire spread was slower; however, nearly all the fuel was consumed by fire. No valid temperature or heating data were obtained in this test, as a malfunction occurred in the data recorder. It is expected that the heating data found in the spark hot-surface data would be representative of that expected here. The concluded postcrash fire hazard potential was considered slightly less than that for JP-4.

The Jet-A base emulsion Jet-A EXP-4, with a yield stress value of 1467 dynes/cm², resulted in a nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fire. An initial pilot ignition was observed as fuel glubs impacted the open-flame igniters, but the fire did not propagate and tended to be self-extinguishing. Only the fuel that made direct contact with the igniters ignited and burned slowly around the igniters. Large fuel globs were formed after impact, and no visible misting occurred. The indicated temperature (Figure 84) resulted in a small localized burn in the vicinity of a temperature probe. The resulting heating rates were very low compared to JP-4 except for the one probe which indicated less than half the heating rate observed for JP-4. This occurred about 12 seconds after impact, as compared to 2 to 3 seconds after impact for JP-4. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire condition resulted with this fuel.

The JP-8 base emulsion EF8R-104H, with a yield stress value of 1570 dynes/cm², resulted in a nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fire. An initial pilot ignition was observed as fuel globs impacted the open-flame igniter, but the fire did not propagate and tended to be self-extinguishing. Large fuel globs were formed after impact, and no visible misting occurred. The temperature data (Figure 84) indicated very little heating, with a maximum heating rate of one order of magnitude less than that observed for JP-4. This occurred 18 seconds after impact. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire condition resulted with this fuel.

The JP-8 base emulsion EF8R-104, with a yield stress of 665 dynes/cm², resulted in a nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fire. An initial pilot ignition was observed off the first smudge pot as globs of fuel impacted the smudge pot igniter. The associated pilot fire did not propagate and tended to be self-extinguishing. Large to medium fuel globs, somewhat smaller than for the EF8R-104H fuel, were formed after impact, and no visible misting occurred. No temperature change was noted from the thermocouple calorimeters. An ignition susceptibility parameter of 0.1052 was calculated for this fuel and

test condition. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire condition resulted with this fuel.

The Jet-A base gel #1, with a viscosity of 68 centipoise, resulted in a nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fire. An initial pilot ignition was observed off the first two smudge pots as the fuel impacted these igniters directly. The associated pilot fire did not propagate and tended to be selfextinguishing. Droplet formation after impact appeared to be relatively large with average fuel droplets the size of marbles. No visual misting was observed. No temperature change was noted from the thermocouple calorimeters. An ignition susceptibility parameter could not be calculated due to the lack of screening test data for gels. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire condition resulted with this fuel.

The Jet-A base gel #2, with a viscosity of 40.7 centipoise, resulted in a potential hazardous ignition but with a nonhazardous postcrash fire. A small mist-phase fireball resulted from ignition off the first smudge pot igniter. A small ground fire resulted outside the thermocouple locations but did not propagate and therefore burned itself out. No temperature change was recorded. Fuel droplet sizes ranged from a mist phase to droplets somewhat smaller than for the gel #1. The presence of the mist-phase fireball provided an ignition potential for the rest of the fuel if more fuel had been available. Therefore, a hazardous postcrash fire rating must be recorded for this fuel.

For each of the above emulsified fuel tests, the ignition susceptibility parameter was computed using screening test criteria and the measured yield stress of each fuel. The value of the respective ignition susceptibility parameter is indicated for each fuel in Figures 83 and 84.

Results of Spark/Hot-Surface Tests

وتربو الفاصان فرافنا أحا ألأفادته أمتد وترجوع تعمارا وتندهم تسريته والانتخار والكريشان كالمرافكة

Two simulated full-scale impact tests were performed using the spark/hot-surface igniters for each of the ten fuels at an impact velocity of 65 ft/sec. The only environmental variable causing any change between the tests was the wind velocity and direction. Each test was conducted with a wind velocity of less than 10 mph. The maximum average temperature condition and associated maximum temperature envelope for each test are illustrated in Figures 85, 86, and 87. Two fuels resulted in no temperature increase (zero indicated heat rate).

The subsequent ignition and postcrash fire from the two liquid JP-4 tests resulted in a violent reaction and large fireball.

115

I



¥



Landard Control of the second s

namith securior interintering the state of the security



Figure 87. Average Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From Spark and Hot-Surface Igniter Tests (Shaded Area Denotes Temperature Envelope),

: '

¥

Nearly all the fuel was formed into a mist phase after impact. This fuel mist was ignited by the spark source, resulting in nearly complete combustion of the misted fuel while airborne. The fire spread over the test barrier, resulting in complete ignition of all the fuel. The maximum heating rates obtained in the tests were of the same order as those expected in JP-4 postcrash fires. The maximum average temperature condition, along with the maximum temperature envelope obtained in the two tests is presented in Figure 85.

Both of the JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104 tests, with an average yield scress value of 301 dynes/cm², resulted in a violent ignition and postcrash fire of nearly the same magnitude as the JD-4 tests. The resulting fireball size was slightly smaller than for JP-4, but ignition off the spark resulted in nearly complete engulfment of the fuel in flame before reaching the ground. Small globs of fuel were observed with some fuel misting. The fire and fuel spread covered a larger area than that for JP-4 due to the fuel droplet size but resulted in complete burning of all the fuel. The postcrash fire burn time was longer than for JP-4 since the fuel globs slowed the burning rate of the fuel. The associated maximum heating rates were the same to slightly larger than those for the JP-4. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that for the JP-4.

The JP-4 base emulsion EF4R-104H tests, with an average yield stress value of 793 dynes/cm², both resulted in a violent ignition and postcrash fire. The resulting fireball size was less than observed for JP-4. Ignition by the spark source was observed, and flame propagation through the airborne fuel globs was rapid. Much of the fuel was ignited before contacting the ground. Larger fuel globs were noted than were observed for the EF4R-104 with less fuel misting. The postcrash fire burn time was longer than for JP-4 due to the fuel droplet size; however, nearly complete burning of all fuel resulted. The associated maximum heating rates were the same to slightly larger than for the JP-4 fires. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that for the liquid JP-4.

The JP-4 base emulsion JP-4 EXP-4 tests, with an average yield stress value of 662 dynes/cm², resulted in one test producing a violent ignition off the spark source and the other producing a slower ignition off the spark igniter with a hazardous postcrash fire as the fuel became heated. The fireball size for the former was nearly identical to the EF4R-104H fireball, whereas the latter resulted in a reduced fireball due to the slower ignition. The fuel glob sizes were nearly the same as for EF4R-104H. The fire and fuel spread covered a larger area

than the JP-4 tests but resulted in nearly complete burning of all the fuel. The associated maximum heating rates were the same to slightly larger than the JP-4 rates. The postcrash fire burn time was about the same as for EF4R-104H fuel. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that for the liquid JP-4.

The liquid JP-8 fuel resulted in one test producing a violent ignition off the spark igniter and one test producing no ignition off the spark igniter but an ignition on the hot-source igniter followed by a slow flame propagation. Fuel misting from impact for both tests was similar to that observed with liquid JP-4. Flame spread in the violent reaction was slightly slower than for JP-4 with much the same characteristics observed in the open-flame igniter test. The observed heating rate for the violent reaction was found to be the same as for JP-4, whereas the nonviolent test resulted in heating rates of one order of magnitude less than those for JP-4. The average maximum temperature is illustrated in Figure 86. It was concluded that postcrash fire hazard potentials for the separate tests were (1) nearly as hazardous as JP-4 and (2) nonhazardous. Since one test resulted in a fire hazard, it was concluded that a hazardous rating must be placed on liquid JP-8 for this ignition source configuration.

Both of the Jet-A base fuel emulsion Jet-A EXP-4 tests, with an average yield stress value of 1307 dynes/cm², resulted in nonhazardous postcrash fires. Both tests produced slight ignition on the hot-surface igniter with little to no flame propagation. The ignition delay times compared with results reported in the screening tests for an 1100°F hot source. Maximum heating rates were one order of magnitude less than those obtained with JP-4. This is illustrated by the temperature data presented in Figure 86. Fuel globs were large, with no ignition from the spark igniter. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted for this fuel and igniter source configuration.

The JP-8 base fuel emulsion EF8R-104H tests, with an average yield stress of 1615 dynes/cm², as with the Jet-A EXP-4 fuel tests, resulted in nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fires. Both tests produced light ignition on the hot-surface igniter with little to no flame propagation. Flame propagation was slightly less than that of Jet-A EXP-4. No spark ignition was observed. The ignition delay times compared with those found in the screening tests for 1100° F hot surface. The maximum heating rates were one order of magnitude to less than those found for JP-4. Maximum temperature data are illustrated in Figure 87. Large fuel globs were observed after impact. It

was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted for this fuel and igniter source configuration.

The JP-8 base fuel emulsion EF8R-104 tests, with an average yield stress of 605 dynes/cm², both resulted in nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fires. Both tests resulted in no ignition from either the spark or hot-surface igniters. Misting was observed from fuel which contacted the hot surface. Fuel glob size following impact was observed to be slightly less than for the EF8R-104H fuel. No temperature increase was recorded due to the absence of fire. The calculated ignition susceptibility parameter was found to average 0.1092. A nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted from these tests.

The tests of the Jet-A based gel #1 with an average viscosity of 98 centipoise resulted in nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fires. Both tests resulted in a very slight fire on the spark igniter which did not propagate further. No ignition was observed off the hot surface; however, misting of fuel on hot surfaces was noted. Droplet formation resulted in an average size comparable to marbles, and little to no misting occurred. No temperature data were recorded due to a lack of fire. No ignition susceptibility parameter could be obtained due to lack of screening test results for gels. A nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted from these tests.

The tests of the Jet-A based gel #2 with an average viscosity of 26.6 centipoise resulted in hazardous ignition and postcrash fires. Both tests resulted in a small mist-phase fireball propagating from the spark igniter. One test resulted in a second fire from the hot-surface igniter. Fire spread was relatively slow but hazardous. Fuel droplet formation ranged from mist phase to droplets slightly smaller than gel #1. The maximum temperature data are shown in Figure 87. A maximum heating rate on the order of 5 times less than for a JP-4 fire was noted. No ignition susceptibility parameter could be obtained due to lack of screening test results for gels. A hazardous postcrash fire resulted from these tests.

For each of the spark and hot-surface tests just discussed, the ignition susceptibility parameter was computed for the emulsified fuels by using the screening test criteria and the average measured yield stress of each fuel. The value of the respective ignition susceptibility parameters is indicated for each fuel in Figures 85, 86, and 87, where applicable.

Results of On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests

To provide a valid statistical analysis for the on-board igniter tests, three simulated full-scale impact tests were

performed for each of the ten fuels. Each test was conducted at an impact velocity of 65 ft/sec. The only environmental variable between the ten tests was the wind velocity and direction. Each test was conducted with a wind velocity of less than 10 mph. The average maximum temperature condition, along with the associated maximum temperature envelope for each fuel, is illustrated in Figures 88, 89, 90, and 91.

The ignition and postcrash fires from two of the three liquid JP-4 tests resulted in instant ignition when the igniter flame was produced. A violent postcrash fire resulted with rapid flame propagation on the ground. The timer for the on-board ignition device was incorrectly set and a 2- to 3-second delay time between impact and engine flaming (Figure 32) occurred rather than the desired 0.7-second delay time. The third JP-4 test resulted in a void run, as the burner device malfunctioned and did not ignite. The maximum heating rates for the two successful tests resulted in heating rate values that were slightly less than expected for JP-4 postcrash fires.

All the JP-4 base fuel emulsion EF4R-104 tests, with an average yield stress value of 351 dynes/cm², resulted in instant ignition when the burner flame was produced, followed by violent postcrash fires. Rapid flame propagation over the ground resulted. One test did not ignite on the initial igniter cycle. It appeared that the onslaught of fuel over the igniter either shorted the spark plug or produced too rich a fuel mixture to ignite. A relight cycle was made with a successful ignition by the flame, followed by a violent postcrash fire. Small fuel globs were produced upon impact. Maximum heating rate values were nearly the same as those experienced with JP-4 fires. Burn time was longer than for JP-4. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that for liquid JP-4.

The JP-4 base fuel emulsion EF4R-104H tests, with an average yield stress value of 789 dynes/cm², all resulted in an instant ignition when the burner flame was produced, followed by a violent postcrash fire. A rapid flame propagation over the ground resulted. One test did not ignite on the initial igniter cycle. It appeared that the onslaught of fuel over the igniter either shorted the spark plug or produced too rich a fuel mixture to ignite. A relight cycle was made with a successful ignition by the flame, followed by a violent postcrash fire. Medium-sized fuel globs were produced upon impact. The burn time was longer than for JP-4 fuel. Maximum heating rate values were equal to those expected for JP-4 fires. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that for liquid JP-4.





.



¥


e puverope



•

ł.

÷

Figure 91. Maximum Temperature Data Obtained From On-Board Igniter Test on the Jet-A Gel #2.

The JP-4 base fuel emulsion JP-4 EXP-4 tests, with an average yield stress value of 712 dynes/cm², all resulted in an instant ignition when the burner flame was produced, followed by a violent postcrash fire. A rapid flame propagation over the ground resulted. One test did not ignite on the initial igniter cycle. It appeared that the onslaught of fuel over the igniter shorted the spark plug or produced too rich a fuel mixture to ignite. A relight cycle was made with a successful ignition by the flame, followed by a violent postcrash fire. Medium-sized fuel globs were produced upon impact. The maximum heating rates were the same as those experienced during JP-4 fires. Burn time was longer than for JP-4. It was concluded that the postcrash fire hazard potential was as great as or greater than that for liquid JP-4.

The liquid JP-8 fuel resulted in ignition and postcrash fire characteristics which ranged from no ignition to instant ignition from the burner flame, with light fire and very slow flame propagation over the ground. The maximum observed heating rates for this fuel and igniter configuration were found to be one order of magnitude less than those observed for JP-4 fires. The maximum average temperature with the maximum temperature envelope is illustrated in Figure 89. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted from JP-8 for this igniter configuration.

All the Jet-A base fuel emulsion (Jet-A EXP-4) tests, with an average yield stress value of 1493 dynes/cm², resulted in light ignition from the burner flame with zero to very slow flame propagation over the ground. Very little fuel was consumed by fire. Fuel globs produced from impact were large. The maximum heating rates observed were approximately one order of magnitude smaller than for JP-4 fires. The maximum average temperature and associated maximum temperature envelope are presented in Figure 89. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted with this fuel and igniter configuration.

The JP-2 base fuel emulsion EF8R-104H tests, with an average yield stress value of 1623 dynes/ cm^2 , all resulted in very light ignition on the fuel tank support arm (from either the flame or hot surface) with zero to very little postcrash fire and flame propagation. Large fuel globs were produced upon impact. The maximum heating rates observed were one order of magnitude less than for JP-4 fires. The maximum average temperature and associated maximum temperature envelope are presented in Figure 90. It was concluded that a nonhazardous postcrash fire resulted with this fuel and igniter configuration.

The JP-8 base fuel emulsion (EF8-104) tests, with an average yield stress value of 661.4 dynes/cm², resulted in two tests having a nonhazardous ignition and postcrash fire and a third test having a hazardous postcrash fire. The two nonhazardous tests resulted in a small flame on the support arm but the fire did not propagate. No temperature data were recorded for these tests due to the absence of sufficient fire. The hazardous test resulted in an initial small fire over the support arm with slow flame propagation. The fixture stopping distance for this test (10 feet) was considerably below the design values (18-30 feet) which resulted in a greater quantity of fuel in the vicinity of the support arm. Once enough heat was generated, the fuel vaporized sufficiently to support combustion and the fire spread more rapidly. The maximum temperature data for this test, along with the average for the three tests, are illustrated in Figure 90. Fuel globs slightly smaller than for the EF8R-104H fuel were noted after impact. The maximum heating data were in the order of five times less than for a JP-4 fire. Due to the atypical circumstances of the third test, it was concluded that a moderately hazardous postcrash fire rating should be given to this fuel.

The Jet-A base fuel gel #1 tests, with an average viscosity of 74 centipoise, all resulted in hazardous postcrash fires. Each test resulted in flame on the support arm with moderately

slow flame propagation until sufficient heat was generated to form a more combustible condition, at which time flame propagated readily. Droplet formation was much the same as the previous gel #1 tests with little to no mist phase observed. The maximum average temperature data are illustrated in Figure 90. The maximum heating data were just less than half that expected for JP-4 fires. It was concluded that a hazardous postcrash fire resulted for this fuel.

The Jet-A base fuel gel #2 tests, with an average viscosity of 33.1 centipoise, all resulted in hazardous ignition and postcrash fires. Each test resulted in flame on the support arm with moderately slow flame propagation until sufficient heat was generated to sustain continued combustion. Some fireballing was observed as fuel fell onto the igniter flame with a resultant increase in the fire spread rate. Fuel droplet formation was not unlike that observed in previous tests with this fuel, and some misting was observed. The maximum temperature data obtained from one of the tests are illustrated in Figure 91. No temperature rise data were obtained from two of the tests because the test fixture traveled out of the thermocouple range past the barrier. The maximum heating rate was found to be in the order of five times less than for JP-4 fires. It was concluded that a hazardous postcrash rating should be applied to this fuel.

For each of the above sets of tests, the ignition susceptibility parameter was computed for the emulsified fuels using screening test criteria and the average measured yield stress of each fuel. The value of the respective ignition susceptibility parameter is indicated for each fuel in Figures 88, 89, 90, and 91, except for the gelled fuel which could not be obtained due to insufficient knowledge of gelled fuel characteristics.

Several physical characteristics regarding emulsions and gels were observed in all the simulated full-scale tests but appeared to be particularly important for the on-board (engine simulator) igniter. From the previously discussed results, it was found that the on-board igniter produced a higher relative hazard rating with gelled fuel than with emulsified fuel or even liquid JP-8. A discussion of the various types of igniters with regard to combustible fuel characteristics therefore appears to be in order.

It was felt, throughout the screening and simulated full-scale tests, that the emulsified fuels tended to slip off hot surfaces readily. This is probably due to the weight associated with fuel globs as compared to fuel droplets or fuel film.

Another factor is the ability of the heat to break down the interface between the fuel glob and hot surface to form a very low viscosity medium. Although the emulsions ignite readily in a contained environment, such as the autcignition tester, the time which the fuel stays on an uncontained not surface is generally shorter than the ignition delay time, especially in a dynamic environment. Contrary to this, however, the gelled fuels tested tended to stick to hot surfaces and also did not have the heavier globular form, thus allowing time for ignition. For the on-board ignition device in particular, fuel impacting and sticking to the igniter and support arm (which is also hot in the vicinity of the igniter) is easily ignited by the hot surface or flame.

The various types of ignition sources used in the simulated full-scale test covered nearly every type of physical combustion between fuel and igniter. For fuels which form a mist phase upon impact, the spark source provides a catastrophic ignition source in which the fuel mist is ignited while following its trajectory after impact. This condition allows the ensuing high-energy fireball to propagate throu, the fuel in flight and descend upon any unburned fuel on the ground. The open-flame igniters, although igniting the fuel in either a fuel mist phase or fuel droplet phase, do so mainly as the fuel descends onto the barrier. The hot-surface igniter ignites fuels after the main portion of the fuel is on the ground (for instance in pools) according to their autoignition characteristics. For a hazardous fire to result from this igniter, flame speeds on the ground or in pools must be rapid.

The on-board igniter contains three different sources for ignition of fuel after the fuel has reached the ground: (1) the fuel on the hot surface can autoignite. (2) the belching flame can ignite any fuel in its vicinity, and (3) the hot surface can cause the fuel on it to form a mist which then can be readily ignited by the flame. In most cases, the third sequence of ignition resulted, and this generally resulted in a more hazardous situation, especially for those fuels which stayed in the vicinity of the igniter.

With the above types of igniters, some fuels were more hazardous with one ignition system, while others were more hazardous with another ignition system. For example, a fuel which forms a fuel mist is generally more hazardous with a spark igniter, while a fuel which does not form a mist and slips off hot surfaces is more hazardous when accompanied by open-flame igniters. Further, a fuel which does not form a mist and sticks to hot surfaces is generally more hazardous when accompanied by a hot-surface or the on-board type of igniter.

TEST CORRELATION AND SAFETY EVALUATION CRITERIA

The laboratory screening test data presented in the Test Results section illustrate the performance and characteristics of several emulsified fuels under simulated crash conditions. The measure of safety has been shown to be a function of an ignitability parameter (ψ) which has also been related to an empirical equation. This equation includes 1 function of the characteristic kinetic energy and two constants which appear to be related to the yield stress and type of test conducted. If it can be shown that the constants (V_j , V_i and K_1 , K_2) in the equations for the ignitability parameter (ψ_{Base} Fuel) can be related anlytically or graphically to fuel yield stress from the test results, then an estimated value of (ψ_{Base} Fuel) versus input wind shear velocity and/or impact kinetic velocity can be calculated for any emulsified fuel where the yield stress is known.

Figure 92 presents the constant K_1 obtained from the mean data resulting from the wind shear tests versus emulsified fuel yield stress. A definite correlation between K_1 and yield stress exists. The bars accompanying the data points represent the range of measured yield stresses for which the mean $\Psi_{\text{Base Fuel}}$ versus wind shear velocity curves for a particular emulsified fuel were obtained. Figure 93 presents a similar relationship for V_j obtained from the wind shear data. As with Figure 72, a definite dependence of V_j on yield stress is apparent.

Figure 94 presents the constant K_2 obtained from the relation for the mean data resulting from the impact dispersion/atomization tests versus emulsified fuel yield stress. As with the wind shear results, a definite correlation between K_2 and yield stress is apparent. Figure 95 presents the constant V_i versus emulsified fuel yield stress; again, V_i illustrates a definite dependence on emulsified fuel yield stress.

If the ψ relationship is known between liquid JP-4 and the liquid base fuel of a given emulsified fuel, then the values of ψ_{JP-4} for the emulsified fuel can be estimated from the following equation:

 $\psi_{JP-4} = (\psi_{JP-4}) \times (\psi_{Base Fuel})$ Base Fuel Emulsified Fuel (36)

As shown previously, for wind shear,



Figure 92. Yield Stress Versus K for Wind Shear Data.



Figure 93. Yield Stress Versus V for Wind Shear Data.



Figure 94. Yield Stress Versus K for Impact Dispersion/Atomization Data.



Sec. 654

LA. A. L. S. S. S.



$$\psi_{jP-4} = (\psi_{jP-4})_{\text{Base Fuel}} \exp\left[-\frac{(v_j - v)^2}{K_1}\right], \quad v \le v_j \quad (37)$$

or, if one equates the relationship between the constants and yield stress, this becomes

$$\psi_{JP-4} = (\psi_{JP-4})_{\text{Base Fuel}} \exp - \left[(\sqrt{27.2\tau_y} - V_{\text{Air}})^2 / (23 + 0.029 \tau_y)^2 \right], \quad V_{\text{Air}} \leq \sqrt{27.2\tau_y}$$
(38)

and for impact dispersion/atomization,

$$\psi_{JP-4} = (\psi_{JP-4})_{Base Fuel} \exp \left[-(V_i - V SIN\theta)^2 / K_2\right], V SIN\theta V_i$$
(39)

or

$$\psi_{JP-4} = (\psi_{JP-4})_{\text{Base Fuel}} \exp \left\{ \sqrt{10.63(\tau_y - 212)} - V \sin \theta_i \right]^2 / (9.5 + 0.035 \tau_y)^2 \right\}, V \sin \theta_i \leq \sqrt{10.63(\tau_y - 212)}$$
(40)

Assuming a maximum crash survivability velocity of 65 ft/sec, the maximum expected wind shear veloc..ty would also equal 65 ft/sec. Using a 45-degree average impact angle, the maximum impact survivable kinetic velocity is 46 ft/sec. Thus, the safety performance criterion for wind shear can be based on the value of ψ_{JP-4} at a wind shear velocity of 65 ft/sec. Likewise, the safety performance criterion for fuel impact can be based on the value of ψ_{JP-4} at a kinetic velocity of 46 ft/sec.

For the fuels tested .n the laboratory screening tests study, Table I lists the safety performance of these fuels from a wind shear standpoint.

Table II lists the safety performance of the fuels tested obtained from an impact dispersion/atomization standpoint.

The smaller the value of ψ_{JP-4} , the safer the fuel is expected to be. In both types of crash environments, a characteristic value of ψ_{JP-4} exists below which the performance is considered safe from a postcrash fire standpoint. This limiting value

TABLE I. WIND SHEAR SAFET	Y PERFORMANCE
Fuel	Safety Performance Parameter, ψ_{JP-4}
JP-4	1.000
EF4R-104 ($\tau_y = 437 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2$)	0.074
EF4R-104 ($\tau_y = 645$ Dynes/cm ²)	0.044
EF4R-104 ($\tau_{y} = 1400 \text{ Dynes/cm}^{2}$)	0.028
EF4R-104H ($\tau_y = 1192$ Dynes/cm ²)	0.020
EF4R-104H ($\tau = 1886$ Dynes/cm ²)	0.014
JP-8	0.80,
EF8-104H ($\tau_{y} = 1000 \text{ Dynes/cm}^{2}$)	0.053

TABLE II. IMPACT DISPERSION/ATOMI	ZATION SAFETY PERFORMANCE
Fuel	Safety Performance Parameter, ψ_{JP-4}
JP-4	1.0
EF4R-104 ($\tau_y = 508 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2$)	0,763
EF4R-104H ($\tau_y = 1143 \text{ Dynes/cm}^2$)	0.303
JP-8	0.166
EF8-104H ($\tau = 755$ Dynes/cm ²)	0.099

was quite precisely determined as the primary result of the simulated full-scale tests (see Figures 96 and 97). The actual limiting value ψ_{JP-4} in a full-scale environment could not be obtained without the simulated full-scale verification. With

136

.



Figure 96. Simulated Full-Scale Test Results for the Open-Flame and Spark/Hot-Surface Igniter Tests.

SHADED POINTS DENOTE NONHAZARDOUS EURNING CONDITION the first state of the state of the state of the

SUBSCRIPT "R" DENOTES RELIGHT CONDITION



Figure 97. Simulated Full-Scale Test Results for the On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests.

this additional information, the screening tests can be used to assess the full-scale safety performance of a specific fuel. An alternate approach to the determination of this limit was also illustrated in the impact ignition tests where specific ignition limits were found as a function of the parameter ψ_{JP-4} . This lacter method was much less reliable, as pointed out previously.

In comparing the results of the nozzle shear tests, it was found that the data from these tests indicated the same trends as those found in the wind shear and impact tests. A direct correlation was not apparent, as was the case between wind shear and impact data, since the mechanisms were characteristic to each test system. It is significant, however, that the data from each type of test resulted in the same general trends and could be represented by the same form of empirical equation. The constants V_i , V_i and K_1 , K_2 , therefore, are not only a function of input shear loads and yield stress but depend upon test facility conditions also.

In comparing the safety performance parameter results between wind shear and impact dispersion/atomization as illustrated in Tables I and II for JP-8 and emulsified JP-8, there appears to be a discrepancy. The values of the safety parameters for these fuels should correlate more closely with respect to the other fuel data. For example, the value of 0.8 for JP-8 in the wind shear results should more closely represent the ratio of vapor pressure between JP-4 and JP-8, as was the case for the impact dispersion/atomization results. It is felt that this discrepancy may be due to an instrumentation error in the calibration of fuel/air ratio for the JP-8 and EF8-104H wind shear data. Investigation of the calibration data results in a possible change in these values by a factor of 0.57 which would result in a wind shear safety parameter value of 0.43 for JP-8 and of 0.028 for EF8-104H.

It has been shown that safety apparently increases with an increase in yield stress for the same base fuel. However, other sources, as discussed under Analytical Considerations, have indicated mechanisms which might reduce the safety of an emulsified fuel by increasing its yield stress. Here it was hypothesized that increasing the yield stress decreases the critical stress and, in turn, decreases the shear energy necessary to break up the fuel. The physics for these effects appears to be sound. However, such a situation was not observed directly in the data obtained in this program, except possibly in the impact ignition tests where ignition of the higher yield stress EF4R-104H occurred more readily than the lower yield stress EF4R-104. Although, generally, no trend to more extensive breakup and atomization with the higher yield

stress fuels was observed, the yield stress values tested may not have been high enough to display this effect under the test conditions studied. Therefore, it is felt that if higher yield stress emulsions (in the relaxed state) than those tested here are to be considered, they should be screened through testing to verify the absence of these effects.

The discussion of the simulated full-scale tests in the Test Results section presented the observed (visual and photographic) and recorded results associated with the three igniter configurations and the 10 fuels tested. The performance of the fuels was presented as either a hazardous or nonhazardous postcrash fire condition. The ground rules on which a nonhazardous condition exists were based on the probability of whether there would be sufficient time available to allow a surviving human to egress the aircraft. In most cases for the test resulting in a nonhazardous condition, fire intensity was so small that neither an aircraft burn-through hazard or a ground fire hazard for occupant egress would have been enccuntered. For border-line observations, the temperature data were extrapolated to a full-scale condition to insure at least an order of magnitude increase in aircraft burn-through time.

Table III presents a synopsis of the postcrash fire hazard results for all three igniter configurations used in the simulated full-scale impact tests. These results for emulsified fuels may be generalized through the application of screening test criteria as discussed below.

By computing and comparing the ignition susceptibility parameters Ψ for each of the fuels tested, a value can be obtained for ψ which represents the limiting, nonhazardous condition. This limiting value of ψ (above which a hazardous condition may exist and below which a nonhazardous condition exists) allows full-scale safety performance predictions on the basis of the screening test results. Figure 96 presents the simulated full-scale data obtained from the open-flame and spark/ hot-surface igniter tests. For each test, a value of ψ was computed using the measured yield stress and the screening test performance equation applicable to the impact dispersion/ atomization condition. This computed value was plotted versus impact kinetic velocity (VSIN θ_i). In Figure 96, the shaded data points denote nonhazardous postcrash fire conditions while the open data points denote hazardous postcrash fire conditions. The indicated limiting value of ψ from Figure 96 is 0.12.

It is observed that the test results for the open-flame igniter tests did not differ appreciably from those of the spark and hot-surface ignition tests. Although the open-flame test was

	TABLI	E III. SIMU	LATED POSTCRA	SH FIRE RESU	LTS	
	Open-Flame	Spark/Hot-S	urface Tests	On-Board (E	ngine Simula	tor) Tests
Fuel	Tests	Test l	Test 2	Test l	Test 2	Test 3
JP-4	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	*
EF4R-104	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous**
EF4R-104H	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous**
JP-4 EXP-4	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous**
JP-8	Hazardous	Hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous
Jet-A EXP-4	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous
EF8R-104H	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous
EF8R-104	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Hazar- dous***	Non- hazardous
Jet-A Gel #1	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Non- hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous
Jet-A Gel #2	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous
*On-board **On-board successf1 ***Stopping	igniter mal igniter mal 1. distance too	function. function or a o short.	swamped with	fuel, ignite	r relight wa	Q

(Dertschiefter dit

initially considered more severe from an ignition standpoint, this observation allowed the data from both series of tests to be plotted together in Figure 96.

Figure 97 presents the simulated full-scale data obtained from the on-board (engine simulator igniter) tests. As in Figure 96, the value of ψ for each test is plotted versus kinetic velocity. The shaded data points denote nonhazardous postcrash fire conditions while the open data points denote hazardous postcrash fire conditions. With the on-board igniter, a limiting value of ψ was obtained as 0.16. However, since it must be assumed that any ignition source could happen during a crash, the resultant limiting value of ψ must be chosen as 0.12.

Figure 98 presents the simulated, full-scale data obtained from the Jet-A gels. The data are plotted in terms of the impact kinetic viscosity in centipoise. Specification of an ignition susceptibility parameter similar to that obtained for emulsified fuels was not possible due to the lack of information on the safety characteristics of the gels. There appears to be no definite limiting value of viscosity for which the gelled fuel performs in a nonhazardous manner. A hazardous condition existed for every on-board igniter test performed on The chemical structure of the two gels was unknown; howdels. ever, it was known that each manufacturer had a different formulation. This would further complicate the correlation between the two gels. The intent of testing the two gelled fuels was to offer a safety comparison between emulsions and gels under identical test conditions. The Jet-A gel #1 performed much better than the Jet-A gel #2. In the open-flame and spark/hot-surface igniter tests, the Jet-A gel #1 performed equally as well as the JP-8 emulsions; however, the on-board igniter tests all yielded a hazardous rating.

In addition to the fuel formulation, it was found that wind velocity and direction had a great deal to do with the heating rates and temperatures measured in the tests. Therefore, accurate temperature-heating rate evaluation becomes difficult. However, with the temperature data obtained, definite trends were apparent as to the effects the parameter ψ had on probable energy release and aircraft burn-through characteristics. Although many tests did not indicate a temperature greater than $400^{\circ}F$ at the temperature probes, Figure 99 presents an approximation of the effect of ψ on the time to reach $400^{\circ}F$ for openflame and spark/hot-surface igniter data. The data shown follows an empirical equation involving ψ which may be expressed as

$$t = 2.8 + \exp((0.19/\psi))$$
 (41)

142

when the the state of the states



 \triangle SPARK AND HOT-SURFACE IGNITER TESTS

D ON-BOARD (ENGINE SIMULATOR) IGNITER TESTS

SHADED DATA POINTS DENOTE A NONHAZARDOUS BURNING CONDITION



KINETIC VELOCITY - V SIN θ

Figure 98. Simulated Full-Scale Test Results for the Gelled Fuel Tests.



Ignition susceptibility Parameter Versus Time for Test Temperature to Reach 400°F for the Open-Flame and Spark/Hot-Surface Igniter Tests. Figure 99.

144

O OPEN-FLAME IGNITER TESTS

▲ SPARK AND HOT-SURFACE IGNITER TESTS SUBSCRIPT "P" DENOTES PILOT IGNITION Although no apparent scientific basis exists for this equation, it does portray the trend which was observed in the tests.

Figure 100 presents a similar curve for the on-board igniter tests with ψ plotted versus the time to reach 400°F at the temperature probes. The empirical equation fitting this data takes the form

$$t = 6.0 + \exp(0.162/\psi)$$
 (42)

An analysis was conducted to extrapolate the simulated fullscale situation to an actual full-scale environment. This involved utilizing the maximum indicated heating rate for each test, assuming an unlimited supply of fuel, and calculating the time at which aircraft burn-through occurred (skin temperature = 1100° F). The analysis presented in the Analytical Considerations section of this report was employed for this The extrapolated resultant times were plotted extrapolation. versus ψ in Figure 101 for the open-flame and spark/hotsurface igniter data and in Figure 102 for the on-board igniter data. In both cases, the effect of ψ on burn-through time is an exponential function with the exponential constants being equal to those found in Figures 99 and 100, respectively. The curve-fit equations for each set of data are shown in each figure.

The data obtained in this test program back up those obtained in the prior screening test analysis. The safety performance of a given emulsified fuel in both test programs has been shown to follow a yield stress dependence. Furthermore, the results obtained in the simulated full-scale tests provided empirical definition of the limiting value for the ignition susceptibility parameter. Knowledge of this limit allows the screening tests conducted previously to be utilized in determining the safety of any fuel. A value of 0.12 for the ignition susceptibility parameter was found to be the upper limit of a nonhazardous environment. The only fuels tested which exhibited a value of 0.12 or less at the maximum crash survivable conditions were the JP-8 base fuel emulsion EF6R-104H, the JP-8 base fuel emulsion EF8R-104, and the Jet-A base fuel emulsion Jet-A EXP-4.



Susceptibility Parameter Versus TIME for Test Temperature 400°F for On-Board (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests. Ignition Stach Figure 100.

146





「「日本」というないのでいたのではないである」をなっていたが、



ц С Ignition Susceptibility Parameter Versus Extrapolated Time Reach Aluminum Melting Temperature for On-Boará (Engine Simulator) Igniter Tests. Figure 102.

148

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are drawn as a result of this test program:

- 1. The results of this test program verified that kerosene-base emulsified fuels are an effective method of reducing the postcrash fire hazard.
- 2. The screening test configurations and procedures that were designed and utilized in this program are valid correlative mechanisms representative of the crash environment on a laboratory scale.
- 3. As opposed to the high-rate atomization and dispersion characteristics of liquid fuels, emulsified fuels were found to resist atomization and dispersion when subjected to identical crash environmental conditions.
- 4. Once certain physical properties are known, emulsified fuel fire-hazard susceptibility ratings can be predicted based on the empirical relationships generated during this program.
- 5. A critical ignition susceptibility parameter value was obtained which allows screening test criteria to be useful in predicting crash impact performance in the full-scale environment.
- 6. For the emulsified fuels tested, the dependence of yield stress and internal phase, base fuel composition on the safety of fuels was shown.
- Three emulsified fuels were found which portray a nonhazardous postcrash fire environment within the crash survival envelope: (1) EF8R-104H, (2) EF8R-104, and (3) Jet-A EXP-4.
- Gelled fuels, although not performing as well as emulsions in a crash environment, strongly indicated a sizeable safety advantage over liquid fuels.
- 9. The Jet-A gel #1 performed much better in a crash/ postcrash fire environment than the Jet-A gel #2.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this program, it is recommended that:

- Screening tests be conducted on the EF8R-104 emulsion to further verify its safety performance criteria.
- Screening tests be conducted on the Jet-A gel #1, the Jet-A gel #2, and one or more higher viscosity gels to obtain safety performance criteria for gelled fuels.
- 3. Development of a JP-8 or Jet-A internal phase emulsion with a yield stress in the order of 300 to 400 dynes/cm² be pursued to ease aircraft fuel systems compatibility, if followed by an appropriate safety screening evaluation.
- 4. Full-scale helicopter crash tests be conducted using an optimal nonhazardous emulsified fuel and an optimal gelled fuel to further verify the safety of modified fuels.
- 5. Aircraft fuel system compatibility tests be performed to determine system operational criteria when emulsified fuels are used.

LITERATURE CITED

- Wilkinson, W. L., NON-NEWTONIAN FLUIDS, FLUID MECHANICS, MECHANICS, MIXING AND HEAT TRANSFER, Pergamon Press, New York, 1960.
- Harrison, V. G. W., PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON RHEOLOGY, Oxford 26-31, July 1953, Academic Press, New York, 1964.
- 3. Eirich, F. R., RHEOLOGY THEORY AND APPLICATION, Academic Press, New York, 1956, Vol. 1, 2, 3, 4.
- 4. Green, Henry, INDUSTRIAL RHEOLOGY AND THEOLOGICAL STRUC-TURES, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1949.
- 5. U. S. Army Fuels and Lubricants Research Laboratory Paper II.F., STUDIES RELATING TO FUEL SAFETY, 1 March -1 April 1969.
- Kuchta, Joseph M., et.al., FLAMMABILITY CHARACTERISTICS FOR HIGH TEMPERATURE HYDROCARBON FUELS, WADC Technical Report 59-663, Wright Air Development Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, February 1960, AD 236661.
- Zabetakis, Michael G., et.al., RESEARCH ON THE FLAMMA-BILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF AIRCRAFT FUELS, WADC Technical Report 52-35, Supplement 4, Wright Air Development Center, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, January 1956, AD 91875.
- 8. Rothe, Victor E., POSTCRASH FIRE RESEARCH, Aviation Safety Engineering and Research, a Division of Flight Safety Foundation, a paper presented at the Flight Safety Foundation International Air Safety Seminar, New York, New York, October 1964.

			TABL	E IV. WINI	D SHEAR TEST	CONDITIONS	S AND ASSOCIATE	D DATA		
Run No.	Fuel	Yield Stress (T)	T _{Fuel} (°f)	T _{Rmb} (•F)	V _{Air} (fps)	F/A	Droplet Diameter d(in)	Photographs Taken*	Comments	
MT001	JP-4		66	77	80		0.030	T		
WT002	JP-4		66	77	75		0.035	ч		
WT003	JP-4		99	82	80		0.038	I		
WT004	JP-4		99	88	75		0.030	I		
WT005	4-4C		99	88	70		0.0375	T		
WT006	JP-4		99	88	65		0.060	I		
WT007	JP-4		66	88	60		0.025	T		
WT008	JP - 4		66	88	55		0.030	T		
WT009	JP-4		66	88	50		0.030	I		_
WT010	JP-4		66	88	45		0.050	1		
MT011	JP-4		99	88	40		0.045	-1		
WT012	JP-4		66	87	35		0.045	1		
WT013	JP-4		66	86	30		0.041	I		
WT014	EF 4-104	680	14	82	80				Calibration Run	
WT015	EF 4-104	1800	74	88	80		0.62	I	Calibration Run	_
WT016	EF 4-104	1800	74	88	80			I	Photo Missed Data	
HT017	EF4-104	1800	74	86	80			J	Photo Missed Data	_
WTC18	2F4-104	1800	74	84	50			т	Photo Missed Data	
WT019	EF4-104	3000	68	84	80		Large Strands	I	Fuel Strand Ran of Photo	_
WT 020	EF4-104	1700	68	84	75		Large Strands	ч	Fuel Ștrand Ran of Photo	
WT021	ZF 4-104	1500	68	84	80		Large Strands	I	Fuel Strand Ran of Photo	
WT 022	EF 4-104	1470	68	84	70		Large Strands	r	Fuel Strand Ran of Photo	
*Photo	ograph Desig	gnation: 1 C	- Microphot amera, 4 - 5	ographic C 00 Prame-P	amera, 2 - P er-Second Mo	ull View S vie Camera	till Camera, 3	- Full View 65 E	rame-Per-Second Novie	

APPENDIX I WIND SHEAR TEST DATA

.

152

¥

,

					TABLE IV.	Continue	Q		
		Yield Stress (r)	^T Fuel (•F)	TAmb (°F)	V _{Air} (fps)	F/A	Droplet Diameter d(in)	Photographs Taken*	Comments
1 ×	4	1350	68	84	65			1	Photo Missed Flow
	••	1300	68	82	80		9.211	r	
-	5	1300	68	81	76		0.035	l	Void Run
	04	4 75	65	85	80		0.60	r	
-	04	475	65	85	70		ŋ.356	l	
	90	475	65	85	60		0.875	r	
	104	475	65	85	50			I	Photo Missed Flow
-	104	475	65	85	40		>1.50	l	Continuous Strand
	-104	400	68	67	100	(-1) 0.01225 (-2) 0.00788	0,04	г	
~	-104	400	68	6¥	08	(-2) 0.00417 (-4) 0.0102	0.125	T	
	-104	400	68	.76	80		0.025	r	Photo Missed Flow
~	104	400	69	76	80	0.000417			
1	-104	100	69	76	100				Void
~	-104	400	69	11	90	0.00147			
~	-104	600	70	74	100				
1	-104	600	70	74	100	0.00588	0.04	1, 2	
7	-104	600	70	74	60	0.00358	0.70	1, 2	
<u>.</u>	-104	600	70	73	30	0.0051	0.475	1	
1	-104	620	66	78	100				Void
- A	-104	620	66	1.1	100	0.00185			
	-104	620	66	75	100			8	Void
	-104	≈620	66	73	100		0.05	1, 2	
	-104	504	66	72	100			2	Void

					TABLE I	V. Continue	ąđ		
Run No.	Pue l	Yicld Stress (1)	TFuel (*P)	TAch (∘F)	V _{Air} (fps)	F/A	Droplet Diameter d(in)	Photographs Taken*	Comments
HT046	JP-4		68	67	100	0.01162		1, 2	Photo Missed Flow
WT047	J5		68	69	80	0.0207		1, 2	Photo Missed Flow
HT048	JP-4		68	72	160	0.0143	0.035	I	
WT049	JP-4		68	72	80	0.00715	0.025	1, 2	
WT 050	-4-		68	74	60	0.0362	0.035	ı	
WTC 51	JP-4		68	75	9	0.0	0.035	1, 2	
WT052	16-4		P ;	75	80	0.0415	0.025	1, 2	
WT053	EF 4R-104	2000	68	77	100			2	Worked, Vacuum Pumps Off
WT054	BF4R-104	(1775) 2000	69	77	100	0.00233		6	Worked, Vacuum Pumps Off
WT055	EP 4R-104	(1600) 2000	68		80	0.0007		7	Worked, Vacuum Rumpa Off
WT056	BF4R0104	(1350) 2000	68	76	60			7	Void
WT057	EP4R-104	(1250) 2000	68	75	120			2	Void
WT 058	EP &R-104	(1200) 2000	68	74	120	0.00187	0.380	1, 2	
W ¹ 59	EF4R-104	(1200) 2000	68	74	100	0.00208	0.06	1, 2	
WT060	EP4R-104H	1600	68	r≈70	100		0.10	1	
WT 061	EF4R0104H	1870	68	≈70	100		0.26	1, 2	
WT062	EF4R-104H	1.820	68	æ70	80		1.0	1, 2	
WT063	EF4R0104H	1670	68	≈70	60		Contin- uous Strand	1, 2	
WT064	EP 4R-) 04H	1650	67	a70	40		Contin- uous Strand	1, 2	
WTU65	BF4R-104H	USLI	68	≈70	20		Contin- uous Strand	1, 2	Photo Missed Flow

_	and the second se			-	_						فكالب وليوجون ويشاغه	-			_	_		-	_	_	_	-	_	_	~~~	
	Comments	Void, Ran Cut of Fuel										void														
	Photographs Taken*	ì, 2	1, 2	l, 2	8], 2	1, 2	1, 2	1, 2	1, 2	м	1, 2	2	0	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4		£			
eđ	Droplet Diameter d(in)		1,06	0.10	0.25	0.20	0.30	0.55	0.40	0.25	Contin- uous Strand		9.25	Contin- uous Strand												
IV. Continu	F/A																	0.000347	0.000187	0.000673	0.000474	C.000568	0.000344	0.000423	0.000435	0.000287
TABLE	V _{Air} (fps)	70	70	06	120	120	100	80	60	100	80	60	120	60	100	80	60	60	100	40	30	60	80	80	100	120
	TAmb (*F)	≈ 70	æ 70	≈70	59	60	60	62	62	72	72	73	75	76	76	76	76	77	78	82	82	82	84	84	85	84
	(4°) (°P)	68	89	68	63	64	94	64	64	68	68	69	69	69	68	68	68	70	70	70	70	74	74	74	74	76
	Yield Stress (T)	16/0	1775	1830	1800	1775	1660	1700	1700	2520	2470	2350	2400	2620	1790	1790	1790									
	Fuel	ZF4R-104H	EP 4R-104H	EP4R-104H	Br48-104H	EF4R-104P	EF4R-104H	EF4R-104H	ZF 4R-104H	CF 4R-104H	BF4R-104H	C74R-104H	ZF 4R-104H	EF 4R-104H	EP4R-104H	ZF4R-104H	EF4R-104H	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP - 4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4
	Run No.	MT066	WT067	WT068	WT063	WT 070	WT071	WT 072	WT 07 3	WT 074	WT 07 5	WT076	WT 077	MT 07 8	9 TO TW.	080 I.M	WT 081	WT 082	WT 083	WT 084	WT085	WT 086	WT 087	WT 088	WT089	060TM

 $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

	Comments					Impact on Tunnel Floor									Velocity Shifted	May not have had Film for 4 - Velocity Shifteû				Ran Out of Fuel		Inconsistent Chromato- graph Trace	Inconsistent Chromato- graph Trace	Inconsistent Chromato graph Trace
	Photographs Taken*	1	1	3, 4	3, 4			3, 4	3, 4			3, 4	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4	3, 4								
q	Droplet Diameter d(in)																		No Breakup					
IV. Continue	F/A	0.000149	0.000257	0.000441	0.000606	0.000366	0.000286	0.000389	0.000341	0.00005	0.00084	0.000166	0.00004	0.000118	0.090154	0.000157	0.000068	0.000044	0.0000474.		0.000147	0.000269	0.000174	n.000185
TABLE	Vair (fre)	100	80	60	40	30	120	100	80	100	80	60	40	80	100 80	100 - 20	100	120	40	60	100	80	60	40
	TAmb (°F)	66	68	70	72	73	74	76	77	62	63	70	70	70	68	70	68	67	62	53	18	82	83	85
	TFuel (°F)	66	99	66	99	66	66	99	66	64	64	68	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	68	72	11	70
	Yield Stress (1)									1020	1130	1100	1050	950	1020	1020	1020	1020	750	1050	670	650	069	560
	Fuel	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	3 P-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	ef 3-104h	EP8-104H	SP 8- 104H	EF 8-404H	EF 8-104H	EF8-104H	RP 8-1 0 4 H	BP8-104H	ef 8-104H	BF8-104H	BF01-843	EF4R-104	EP4R-104	EF 4R-104	EF4R-104
	Run No.	MT091	WT092	80 TW	MT094	WT095	960TM	WT097	860 TM	660TM	WT 100	WTIOI	WT102	WT103	WT104	WT105	KT106	WT 107	WT 108	601 IM	WIIIO	HT111	WT112	WT 113

156

¥

Fuel Flow Rate Too High Fuel Flow Rate Toc High Inconsistent Chromato-graph Trace Inconsistent Chromato-graph Trace Inconsistent Chromato-graph Trace Inconsistent Chromato-graph Trace Void - High SW Wind, 10-40 mph Void - High SW Wind, 10-40 mph Vcid - High SW Wind, 10-40 mph Void - high SW Wind, 10-40 mph Void - High SW Wind, 10-40 mph Voiû - High SW Wind, 10-40 mph Void - High SW Wind, 10-40 mpn Vuid - High SW Wind, 10-40 mph Connents Void Photographs Taken* Droplet Diameter d(in) No Breakup TABLE IV. Continued 0.0000574 0.0000238 0.0000818 0.0000419 0.0000528 0.0002196 0.000243 0.0000387 0.000324 0.000145 6.000166 0.000296 0.000193 0.000266 0.000169 0.000051 0.00033 0.000171 F/A v_{Air} (fps) 100 120 60 100 100 100 120 80 60 8 40 60 80 100 120 30 60 80 83 86 <u>?</u> 6 84 8.7 89 63 68 39 69 72 7 88 86 87 88 87 6 TFuel (•F) 72 72 22 22 66 39 <u>68</u> 68 68 68 20 68 8 92 92 92 90 92 92 Yield Stress (T) 640 1220 1325 2030 448 440 440 975 1240 1525 1300 1190 1480 1250 1130 1210 1125 1290 1160 ZF4R-104H EF 4R-104H EF4R-104H EF 4R-1 04H EF4R-104H EF 4R-104H EF4R-104H EF4R-104H EF 4R-104H EF 4R -104H EF4R-104H EF4R-104H CF4R-1048 SF4R-104H EF4R~104H EF4R-104 EF4R-104 EF4R-104 EF4R-104 Fuel WT 123 WT116 WT119 WT11 & WT118 WT120 WT121 WT124 WT115 WT117 WT125 WT128 MT131 WT122 WT 126 WT129 WT130 WT132 WT127 Run No.

0.000063

80

6

1210

EF4R-104H

WT133

ومعالماتها ومتعادية والمتكلية للمتحافظ والمتحافظ والمتحافظ والمستعادين والمتحافظ والمعالية والمعالية

www.usahubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hubaa.hu

157

ł

				-	TABLE IV	/. Continued			
Run No.	Fuel	Yield Stress (1)	Truel (*F)	Т Ать (•F)	V _{Air} (fps)	F/A	Droplet Diameter d(in)	Photographs Taken*	Comments
WT134	SF4R-104H	1220	16	89	60	0.0000633			Erratic Fuel Flow
WT135	EF4R-104H	1125	94	63	40	0.000084			Fuel Flow Too High
WT136	2 F4 R-104 <i>A</i>	1125	16	93	40				Void

.

158

.

Run No.	Puel	Yield Stress ^T y (Dynes/cm ²)	Fiston Velocity (fps)	Fuel Velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- åture (°F)	Fuel Temper- ature (*F)	Surface Temper- ature (*P)	Fuel/Air Ratio By Volume	Impinge- nent Angle (Degrees)	Comments
IT001	JP-4		30	33.3		60			90	Ignition Occurred
IT002	JP-4		50	50		67			06	No Ignition
IT003	4-4C		70	62.5		68			06	Ignition Occurred
IT004	₽4C		60	59.0		68			90	Ignition Occurred
IT005	JP-4		4 0	45.5		70			06	Ignition Occurred
IT006	JP-4		07	40		72			45	Ignition Occured
17007	JP-4		33.3	30		70			45	Ignition Occurred
IT008	JP-4		50	50		70			45	No Ignition
17009	JP-4		60	55.5		70			45	Ignition Occurred
17010	JP-4		70	71.0		70			45	Nc Ignition
ITOII	JP-4		70	77.0		70			15	Ignition Occurred
17012	JP-4		30	35.6		30			15	No Ignition
IT013	JP-4		40	41.7		84			15	No Ignition
IT014	JP-4		50	50		80			15	Ignition Occurred
IT015	JP-4		60	62.0		80			15	Ignition Occurred
1T016	JP-4		40	43.5		80			15	Ignition Occurred
17017	JP-4		30	33.3		63			15	No Ignition
1TU18	EF4R-104	464	30	38.5		68			06	No Ignition
11019	EF4R-104	464	40	45.5		68			06	No Ignition
IT020	EP4R-104	464	50	50		70			06	Slight Ignition
IT021	EF 4R-104	464	60	62.0		70			06	Slight Ignition
IT022	EF4R-104	464	70			70			90	Slight Ignition - No Photo
IT023	EP4R-104	464	70	62.0		74			06	Slight Ignition
IT024	EF4R-104	464	50	62.0		78			45	Ignition Occurred
IT025	EF4R-104	472	30	31.2		62			45	No Ignition

APPENDIX II IMPACT DISPERSION/ATOMIZATION TEST DATA

antonia das

159

					TABLE	V. Conti	laued			
Run No.	Fuel	Yield Stress ^T (Uynes/cm ²)	Fiston Velocity (fps)	Fuel Velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- ature (°F)	Fuel Temper- ature (°F)	Surface Temper- ature (•F)	Fuel/Air Ratio By Volume	Impinge- ment Angle (Degrees)	Comments
IT026	EF4R-104	472	4 0	40.0		62			45	No Ignition
IT027	EF4R-104	472	60	62.5		62			45	No Ignition
IT028	EF 4R-104	472	70	83		62			45	Wo Ignition
IT029	EF 4R-104	472	50	50		68			45	No Ignition
IT030	EF4R-104	472	50	50		63			15	No Ignition
IT631	EF4R-104	472	60	60		68			15	No Ignition
IT032	EP4R-104	504	70	75		64			15	No Ignition
IT033	EF 4R-104	504	40	38.5		66			15	No Ignition
IT034	EF 4R-104	504	30	31.0		66			15	No Ignition
IT035	EF 4R-104H	1225	30	33.3		66			06	No Ignition
IT036	EF4R-104H	1 1225	04	45.5		99			06	No Ignition
IT037	EP4R-104H	1225	50	62.5		72			06	Slight Ignition
IT038	EF 4R-104H	1225	60	66.6		72			06	Ignition Occurred
IT039	EF 4R-104H	1225	70	83		72			06	No Ignition
IT040	EP4R-104H	1225	50	50		72			45	No Ignition
IT041	EF 4R-104H	1225	60	62.5		72			45	No Ignition
IT042	EF 4R-104H	1225	70	71.0		72			45	No Ignition
IT043	EF 4R-104H	1225	70	83.0		72			06	No Ignition (Bad Spark)
IT044	JP-8		30			68			06	No Ignition, No Film
IT045	JP-8		9			68			06	Vo Ignition, No Film
IT046	JP-8		50			68			06	No Ignition, No Film
IT047	4-4C		50			68			60	Ignition Occurred, No Film
I7048	JP-8		60			68			06	No Ignition, No Film
IT049	JP-8		60			63			06	Vo Ignition, No Film
IT050	JP-4		60			68			06	Ignition Occurred
ITOSI	JP-4		30			68			06	Ignition Occurred

.

160

• • •

≯
	Comments	No Ignition	Ignition Occurred	Slight Ignition	Slight Ignition	No Ignition	No Ignítion	do Ignition.	No Ignition	No Ignition	No Film, Chromatograph Calibration Run	No Film, Void Run	No Film, Chromatograph Calibration Run	Chromatograph Callbration Run		Chrumatograph Calibration Run	Chromatograph Callbration Run	Chromatograph Calibration Run			
	Impinge- ment Angle (Degrees)	90	45	45	06	45	06	06	06	45	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06	06
	Fuel/Air Ratio By Volume																				
tinued	Surface Temper- ature (°F)										64										
E V. Con	Fuel Temper- aturc (°F)	68	68	69	68	68	68	64	65	66	70	70	76	75	76	76	62	64	66	72	72
TABL	Ambient Temper- ature (°F)										74		75					69	70	78	74
	Fuel Velocity (fps)																				
	Piston Velocity (fps)	30	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60	30	30	40	30	40	40	40	50	47	60	60
	Yield Stress ¹ (Dynes/cm ²)				504	504	504	660	660	660											
	Fuel	JP-8	JP-4	JP-8	JF4R-104	JF4R-104	CF 4R-104	3F8-104H	EF 8-104H	EF 8-104H	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP - 4	JP - 4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4
	Run 110 .	IT052	IT053	IT054	IT055	IT056	IT057	IT058	IT 059	IT360	I7061	IT062	IT063	IT064	IT065	IT066	IT067	IT068	IT069	17070	17071

ľ

	Comments	Chromatograph Calibration Run												Ko Film								
	Impinge- ment Angle (Degrees)	06	06	06	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	06	06	06	06	06	06	06
	Fuel/Air Ratio By Volume								0.000875	0.001432	0.001635	0.002040	0.002744	0.001439	0.002628	0.002074	0.002301	0.001967	0.001915	0.002326	0.0002053	0.J006644
ttinued	Surface Temper- ature (*F)						80	80	69	69	11	11	75	86	9 <i>6</i>	86	87	87	87	82	67	67
Z V. Con	Fuel Temper- ature (*P)	73	74		74		74	74	99	66	67	66	99	19	79	79	79	79	61	79	60	62
TABL	Ambient Temper- ature (*F)	75	74				74	74	68	64	G5	99	65	75	78	78	79	79	79	76	68	68
	Puel Velocity (fps)								33.3	41.7	50	62.5	69.0	38.4	59.0	59.8	70.0	27.0	32.1		22.35	29.60
	Piston Velocity (fps)	70	30	30	30	9	56	6(1	30	0	50	63	70	40	60	60	70	30	40	50	30	40
	Yield Stress ^T (Dynús/cm ²)																				1 536	1 536
	Fuel	JP-4	1 -65	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	₹-4£	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	4-25	JP-4	1- 40	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	EF4R-104	EP 4R-104
	Run No.	17072	17073	11074	IT075	IT076	IT077	IT078	IT079	IT080	11081	IT082	IT083	IT064	IT085	IT'086	IT087	IT088	IT089	060TI	1607I	IT092

					TABLE	v. Cont	inued			
Run No.	fuel	Yield Stress ^T (Dynes/cm ²)	Piston Velocity (fps)	Fuel Velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- ature (•F)	Fuel Temper- ature (*F)	Surface Temper- ature (*P)	Fuel/Air Ratio By Volume	Impinge- ment Angle (Degrees)	Comments
IT093	EP4R-104	536	50	38.3	69	64	67	0.001082	96	
IT094	EP4R-104	536	60	49.0	70	69	73	0.001712	06	
IT095	EF 4R-104	512	70	56.0	78	64	80	0.000863	06	
17096	DF4R-104	512	70	57.5	77	65	80	017100.0	06	
17097	EF4R-104	512	30	26.6	77	68	80	0.000390	45	
860TI	EF 4R-104	512	40	32.0	77	74	80	0.0007135	45	
660TI	EP4R-104	480	50	40.0	76	63	77	0.0004817	45	
IT 100	EF4R-104	480	50	40.0	76	66	77	6.000373	45	Designated Run No. 17099 on Film
10171	EF 4R-104	48.0	60	53.4	76	67	77	0.001007	45	
IT102	ZF4R-104	480	70	60.0	75	70	77	0.001416	45	
IT103	EF JR-104	480	40		75	74	11	0.000653	45	No Film
IT104	EF4R-104H	1175	30	26.9	67	64	68	0.0000354	45	
IT 105	EP 4R-104H	1175	40	34.3	68	64	68	0.000204	45	
IT106	EP 4R-104H	1175	50	49.4	69	66	69	0.000390	45	
IT107	EF 4R-104H	1175	60	56.6	70	66	14	0.000447	45	
IT108	ZP4R-104H	1175	60	56.6	70	66	74	0.000436	45	
17109	CP4R-104H	1100	70	62.0	73	64	80	0.000680	45	
11110	ZF4R-10411	1100	30	30.5	72	64	80	0.0001456	45	
IIITI	Z24R-104H	0011	40	35.7	74	63	<u>\$0</u>	0.000466	45	
11112	EF4R-104H	1100	50	43.85	74	70	81	0.000409	45	
IT113	EF 4R-104H	1185	40	33.0	74	64	81	0.000203	06	
17114	CF 4R-104H	1185	50	34.0	12	65	80	0.000245	06	
ILIIS	ZF 4R-104H	1185	60	44.7	74	70	80	0.000475	06	
IT116	ZF4R-104H	1185	70	52.5	74	70	80	0.000592	06	
11117	JP-8		30	32	58	58	60	0.0000375	90	

.

					TABLE	V. Cont	inued			
Run No.	Fuel	Yield Stress ^T Y (Dynes/cm ²)	Piston Velocity (fps)	Fuel Velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- ature (*F)	Fuel Temper- ature (*F)	Surface Temper- ature (°F)	Fuel/Air Ratio By Volume	Impinge- ment Angle (Degroes)	Connents
17118	JP-8		00	35	58	58	60	0.000125	96	
IT119	°₽-8		07	35.7	60	58	60	0.000101	06	
IT120	JP-8		50	41.5	66	62	11	0.000221	06	
ITI21	JP-8		60	50.0	66	62	11	0.000340	06	
IT122	JP-8		70	52.5	66	64	83	0.000408	06	
I1 123	JP-8		70	55.5	66	64	83	0.000422	06	
IT124	JP-8		30	32.0	54	54	59		45	Void Run
IT125	JP-8		30	23.8	58	65	66	0.000114	45	
IT126	JP-8		40	38.5	64	64	75	0.000142	45	
IT127	JP-8		50	45.5	63	64	75	0.000184	45	
IT128	JP-8		60	43.5	63	64	75	0.000395	45	
IT129	JP-8		70	50.0	63	66	63	0.000231	45	
IT130	JP8		78	59.0	64	65	64	0.000385	45	
16171	EF8-104H	740	30	19.2	65	60	70	0.000225	45	Void Run, Possible Fuel Digestion
IT132	EF8-104H	740	40	31.2	68	62	70	0.000226	45	Void Run, Possible Fuel Digestion
IT133	EF8-104H	730	50	37.0	72	62	60 8	0.000162	45	
IT134	EF8-104H	730	60	50.0	74	65	84	0.000197	45	
IT135	EF8-104H	730	70	52.6	72	۲,	84	0.000194	45	
IT136	EF 8-104H	730	78	56.0	74	74	84	0.000203	45	
IT137	EF8-104H	730	40	29.5	72	74	84	0.000119	45	
IT138	EF-8-104H	780	30	23.8	58	54	64	0.000034	06	
IT139	EP8-104H	780	40	29.4	56	55	64	0.000088	6	
17140	EF 8-104H		50	41.0	59	59	74	0.0000743	06	
1111	EF 8-104H	780	60	50.0	58	62	74	0.000132	90	
IT142	EF8-104H	780	70	55.5	60	63	78	0.000177	06	
IT143	EF8-104H	780	78		62	62	78	0.000176	90	No Film

			TABLE VI	. IMPACT 1	L NOILIND)	RES ? COND.	ITIONS ANI	ASSOCIATE	D DATA			
Run No.	Fuel	Yield Stress2 (Dynes/cm ²)	Piston Velocity (fps)	Fuel Velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- ature (°F)	Fuel Temper- ature (•F)	Surface Temper- ature (°F)	Impact Angle (Degrees)	[∀] JP-4 (Calculated)	Ignition Rating	Comments	
IT144	JP-4		30	35.7	61	62	76	96	1.0	4.0		
IT145	5-4C		40	96	65	63	76	06	1.0	4.0		
IT146	JP-4		50	55.5	64	64	76	06	1.0	4.0		
IT147	JP-4		60	58.9	66	64	76	06	1.0	4.0		
IT148	JP-4		70	58.9	66	66	76	90	1.0	4.0		
IT149	JP-4		30	31.25	65	66	78	45	1.0	4.0		
IT150	JP-4		40	38.5	66	66	78	45	1.0	4.0		
ITISI	JP-4		50	45.4	66	66	78	45	1.0	4.0		
IT152	JP-4		60	58.8	65	66	82	45	1.0	4.0		
IT153	JP-4		70	55.6	66	66	82	45	1.0	4.0		
17154	JP-4		70	58.9	68	68	82	45	1.0	4.0		
IT155	3F4R-104	480	30	25.0	70	60	82	06	0.2725	0		
IT156	EP4R-104	480	40	31.3	72	64	82	06	0.442	0		
IT157	EP4R-104	480	50	41.6	71	68	80	06	0.774	0		
IT158	CF4R-104	480	60	43.5	72	68	80	06	0.822	0		
IT159	EP4R-101	407	70	50.0	78	64	85	06	1.0	0		
IT160	ZF4R-104	407	30	22.7	78	67	85	45	0.133	1.0		
1911J	EP4R-104	407	40	32.3	78	70	05	45	0.273	0		
IT162	2F4R-104	487	50	35.7	76	66	85	45	0.259	0		
IT163	EP4R-104	487	60	38.5	76	60	85	45	0.306	1.0		
IT164	EF4R-104	487	70	55.5	76	66	85	45	0.670	1.0		
IT165	JP-8		30	20 5	64	74	86	06	0.078	1.0		
IT166	JP-8		10	40.0	75	74	86	06	0.14	1.0		
IT167	JP-4		50	50.0	74	74	86	06	1.0	4.0		

APPENDIX III IMPACT IGNITION TEST DATA

.

ľ

* |

↓ ↓

165

•

																											1
	Comments																										
	Ignition Rating	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	0	1.0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	1.0	0	1.0	0	3.0	3.C	0	1.0	0	0	o	0	1.0	1.0
	[∲] JP-4 (Calculated)	(.179	0.198	0.202	0.09	0.12	0.148	0.13(0.18	0.086	0.106	0.224	0.369	0.496	0.092	0.138	0,148	• 0.190 ·		61E0.0	0.135	0.122	0.177	0.190	0.0113	0.0375	0.0791
	Impact Angle (Degrees)	06	06	06	45	45	45	45	45	06	96	90	96	06	45	45	45	45		06	96	96	06	06	45	45	45
Concinued	Surface Tumper- ature (•F)	8ú	82	82	06	06	92	92	92	92	92	\$ 6	94	67	57	96	96	96	, 96	102	102	102	102	192	102	106	106
ILE VI.	Fiel emper- ature (*F)	2	۲۶	75	83	83	84	84	84	78	78	78	84	84	76	78	80	82	84	80	80	85	16	95	73	78	11
TAE	Ambient Tempe. ature (°F)	75	75	75	84	84	86	85	85	86	86	86	89	06	68	06	06	92	06	97	86	100	86	96	86	66	66
	Fuel Velocity (fpm)	50.0	58.8	62.5	31.2	50.0	58.8	55.5	71.5	20.8	23.8	35.7	45.5	52.6	31.2	40.0	41.6	47.6	55.5	26.3	43.5	41.6	50.0	55.5	22.7	38.4	50.0
	Fiston Velocity (fps)	50	60	70	30	07	50	60	70	30	07	50	60	70	30	40	50	60	70	30	40	50	60	20	30	40	50
	Yield Stress ²) (Dynes/cm ²)									970	970	970	970	970	1020	1020	1020	1020	1020	440	440	940	440	440	425	425	425
	Fuel	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP8	JP-8	CF4R-104H	EP4R-104H	EF 4R-104H	EF 4R-104H	EF 4R-104H	3P4R- 04H	ier 4R-104H	EF 4R-104H	EF4R-104H	SP4R-104H	EF 8-104H	EF 8-104H	EF 8-10 4H	EP 8-104H	EF8-104H	EF8-104H	EF 8-104H	EF8-104H
	Run Jo.	IT168	IT 169	IT170	IT171	IT172	IT173	IT174	IT175	IT176	IT177	IT178	17179	IT180	IT181	IT182	IT183	IT184	IT185	IT186	IT187	IT188	IT189	1T190	IT191	IT192	IT193

19. A.	

A State of the second second second

International conditional conditiconal conditional conditional conditional conditional cond	-			_								_	_														_	
		Corments														Void Run												
Rin Yield Intervet Patient Stream Patient Stream Patient Stream Stream St		Ignition Rating	0	0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.0		1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	0	0	IJ	0
		ψ _J P-4 (Calculated)	0.0791	0.0858	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.088		0.178	0.173	0.190	0.136	0.085	0.095	0.125	0.148	0.472	0.128	1.0	1.0
Ministration Yitatid Piaton Partial Partial Surface Surface <thsurface< th=""></thsurface<>		Impact Angle (Degrees)	45	45	06	06	96	06	96	45	45	45	45	45	06	06	06	06	06	45	45	45	45	45	06	06	06	90
Run No. Fuel Fuel Yield Streak Piaton (fps) Fuel Fuel (fps) Valoatity (fps) Mabiant fuelocity (fps) Fuel fuelocity (fps) Fuel fuelocity (fp		Surfuce Temper- ature (*F)	106	106	108	108	301	104	104	96	96	96	96	96	\$6	9 6	94	94	86	86	96	96	96	96	107	107	107	107
Rin Yteld Factor Fuel Ambient Ro. Fuel (Dynes/cms ²) (Djrify (fps) (fyp) (fyp) IT196 EF9-104H 425 60 50.0 99 IT197 JP-4 425 60 52.7 98 IT196 JP-4 425 70 52.7 98 IT197 JP-4 425 50 96 96 IT2010 JP-4 40 35.5 96 96 IT2010 JP-4 70 52.7 98 96 IT201 JP-4 70 52.6 96 96 IT201 JP-4 70 52.6 96 96 IT202 JP-4 70 52.7 88 97 IT203 JP-4 70 52.6 96 96 IT203 JP-8 70 52.0 86 97 IT203 JP-8 70 50.0		Fuel Temper- ature (°F)	76	77	78	75	73	74	74	64	64	65	66	66	80	70	68	68	68	68	70	11	72	72	84	82	81	18
Run Yteidd Piaton Fuel Run Fuel (Dynee/Gm ²) Valocity valocity Tr194 Er9-104H 425 60 50.0 Tr195 Er9-104H 425 70 52.7 Tr196 JP-4 425 70 52.0 Tr197 JP-4 42 30 25.0 Tr198 JP-4 42 50 50.0 Tr199 JP-4 70 55.5 50.0 Tr201 JP-4 70 55.6 50.0 Tr203 JP-4 70 55.6 50.0 Tr201 JP-4 70 55.6 50.0 Tr202 JP-4 70 50.0 50.0 Tr203 JP-4 70 55.6 50.0 Tr204 JP-4 70 50.0 50.0 Tr205 JP-4 70 50.0 50.0 Tr205 JP-4 70 50 50.0 <th></th> <td>Ambient Temper- ature (•F)</td> <td>66</td> <td>46</td> <td>86</td> <td>96</td> <td>95</td> <td>96</td> <td>96</td> <td>88</td> <td>85</td> <td>86</td> <td>85</td> <td>85</td> <td>86</td> <td>67</td> <td>87</td> <td>88</td> <td>68</td> <td>86</td> <td>63</td> <td>63</td> <td>63</td> <td>69</td> <td>93</td> <td>94</td> <td>93</td> <td>92</td>		Ambient Temper- ature (•F)	66	46	86	96	95	96	96	88	85	86	85	85	86	67	87	88	68	86	63	63	63	69	93	94	93	92
Run Yield Piston ICIJ9 ErelodH 425 60 ITI96 EF8-L04H 425 70 ITI97 JP-4 42 30 ITI96 JP-4 425 70 ITI97 JP-4 42 30 ITI98 JP-4 42 30 ITI99 JP-4 40 30 ITI90 JP-4 70 70 IT201 JP-4 70 70 IT203 JP-4 70 70 IT203 JP-4 70 70 IT204 JP-4 70 70 IT205 JP-4 70 70 IT206 JP-4 70 70 IT205 JP-4 70 70 IT206 JP-4 70 70 IT208 JP-8 70 70 IT208 JP-8 70 70 IT211 JP-8 70		Fuel Velocity (fps)	50.0	52.7	25.0	35.7	50.0	55.5	55.6	26.3	32.3	50.0	52.7	59.0	20.0		0.02	50.0	55.6	55.6	23.8	37.0	52.6	58.9	22.7	34.5	41.7	50
Run Fuel Yield Ko Fuel Chras/cm2) ITL96 EF9-104H 425 ITL96 JP-4 425 ITL96 JP-4 425 ITL96 JP-4 425 ITL96 JP-4 425 ITL99 JP-4 425 ITL99 JP-4 425 IT200 JP-4 425 IT201 JP-4 425 IT203 JP-4 425 IT203 JP-4 425 IT203 JP-4 425 IT204 JP-4 425 IT205 JP-4 425 IT206 JP-4 425 IT205 JP-4 425 IT206 JP-8 425 IT210 JP-8 425 IT211 JP-8 472 IT213 JP-8 472 IT214 JP-8 472 IT215 JP-8 472	and the second se	Piston Velocity (fps)	60	70	30	40	20	60	70	30	40	50	90	70	30	40	50	60	70	70	9C	40	50	60	30	01	50	60
Run Fuel IT194 EF8-104H IT195 EF8-104H IT196 JP-4 IT196 JP-4 IT197 JP-4 IT199 JP-4 IT199 JP-4 IT199 JP-4 IT199 JP-4 IT201 JP-4 IT203 JP-4 IT201 JP-4 IT203 JP-8 IT204 JP-8 IT205 JP-8 IT206 JP-8 IT201 JP-8 IT213 JP-8 IT214 JP-8 IT213 JP-8 IT214 JP-8 IT215 JP-8 IT215 JP-8 IT215 JP-8 IT215 JP-8		Yield Stress ²) (Dynes/cm ²)	425	425																					290	2.0	290	290
Run No. IT196 IT196 IT196 IT196 IT196 IT196 IT201 IT201 IT201 IT206 IT206 IT206 IT206 IT208 IT208 IT208 IT208 IT208 IT208 IT208 IT210 IT211 IT215 IT216 IT208 IT20		Fuel	EP8-104H	EF 8-104H	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	J-40	JP-4	JP-4	JP-4	JP-8	3P8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP8	JP-8	JP-8	SF4R-104	EF4R-104	EF4R-104	CF4R-104
		Run No.	IT194	IT195	17196	TT197	17196	17199	IT200	IT201	IT202	IT203	TT204	IC205	IT206	IT207	1T208	IT209	IT210	IT211	JT212	IT213	IT214	IT215	IT216	IT217	IT218	IT219

					4	ABLE VI.	Continued				
Run No.	Fuel	Yield Stress 2) (Dynes/cm ²)	Piston Velocity (fps)	Fuel Velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- ature (°F)	Fuel Temper- ature (•F)	Surtace Temper- ature (°F)	Impact Angle (Degrees)	^ψ JP-4 (Calculated)	Ignition Ratıng	Comments
IT220	EF4R-104	290	70	55.6	93	78	107	06	1.0	3.0	
IT221	EF4R-104	376	30	29.4	83	73	94	45	0.254	1.0	
IT222	EF4R-104	3.5	40	38.5	î8	72	94	45	0.457	0	
IT223	EF 4R-104	376	50	45.5	83	72	54	45	0,640	0	
IT224	2F4R-104	376	60	50.0	84	72	94	45	0.763	1.0	
IT 225	EF4R-104	376	70	55.5	84	72	94	45	0.887	2.0	
17226	EF 45-10 4H	1055	30	32.2	86	78	94	45	0.088	C	
IT227	EF 4R-104H	1055	40	40.0	87	77	94	45	0.131	1.0	
IT228	EP4R-104H	1055	50	47.6	86	77	94	95	0.179	3.0	
IT229	EP 4R-104H	1055	60	55.6	86	76	94	45	0.244	1.0	
1T230	EF 4R-104H	1055	70	62.5	86	77	94	45	0.310	0	
17231	EF 4R-104H	1055	50	47.6	89	76	94	45	0.179	0	
IT232	EP 4R-104H	1055	30	31.2	88	76	94	45	0.156	0	
IT233	EF 4R-104H	970	40	37.0	84	78	88	06	0.242	0	
IT234	EF 4R-104H	970	50	43.5	83	76	88	06	0.336	3.0	
IT235	EF 4R-104H	07.6	60	55.6	80	74	88	06	0.554	1.0	
IT236	EF42-104H	970	70	52.6	81	73	16	06	0.497	1.0	
IT237	EF8-104H	535	30	29.4	85	78	16	06	0.0323	0	
I2238	EF8-104H	535	40	38.5	82	77	16	06	0.0755	0	
IT239	EF8-104H	535	50	41.7	82	72	86	06	0.100	э	
IT240	EF¢-104H	535	60	50	ري د	72	86	06	0.160	0	
J.1241	EF8-104H	535	70	55.6	82	72	86	06	0.186	1.0	
IT242	EF8-104H	465	30	23.8	83	78	102	45	0,0109	0	
IT243	EF8-104H	465	40	40.0	84	78	102	45	0.0364	0	
IT244	EF8-104H	465	50	47.6	84	78	102	45	0.0603	1.0	
IT245	EF8-104H	465	60	50.0	85	72	102	45	0.0715	•	
IT246	EF8-104H	465	70	55.6	86	72	102	45	0.099	0	

,

168

y

	Craments																										
	Ignition Rating	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.L	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.6	0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	6	1.0	3.0	1.0	0	1.0	3.0
	^ψ JP-4 (Calculated)	0.16	0,092	0.090	0.113	0.101	0.113	0.149	0.089	0.105	0.163	0.179	0.190	0.190	0.237	0.190	0.560	0.904	0.951	0.310	0.733	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.080	0.119	0.223
	Impact Angle (Degrees)	45	4,	45	45	45	45	45	06	90	06	06	06	96	45	45	45	45	45	45	06	06	06	96	45	45	45
Continued	Surface Temper- ature (°F)	102	102	102	102	108	108	108	108	102	108	108	108	108	94	94	94	₽4	100	100	100	100	100	100	110	011	011
BLE VI.	Fuel Temper- ature (°F)			66	64	65	66	66	66	66	67	68	68	68	76	74	72	72	72	76	78	78	78	78	80	80	38
TA	Ambient Temper- ature (°F)	87	89	96	68	94	63	92	92	92	63	63	93	93	82	82	84	84	86	86	87	86	87	87	89	16	16
	Fuel Velocity (ff3)	62.5	34.5	33.3	47.6	41.7	47.6	58.9	21.7	31.2	45.5	50.0	55.6	55.6	27.8	25.0	41.7	55.6	58.8	33.3	35.7	50.0	50.0	58.8	27.8	35.7	50.0
	Piston Velocity (fps)	70	30	30	40	50	60	70	30	40	50	60	70	78	30	40	50	60	70	40	40	50	60	70	30	40	50
	Yield Stress 2) (Dynes/cm ²)														370	370	370	370	370	390	390	390	3~0	390	950	950	950
	Fuel	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	JP-8	EF4R-104	EF 4R-104	EF4R-104	EF4R-104	CF4R-104	EF 4R-104	EF4R-104	EF 4R-104	LF4R-104	ZF 4R-104	CF4R-104H	ZF4R-104H	EF 4R-104H
	Run No.	IT247	IT248	IT249	IT250	IT251	IT252	IT253	IT254	IT255	IT256	IT257	IT258	1T259	IT260	IT261	IT262	IT263	IT264	IT265	17266	IT267	IT268	IT269	IT270	IT271	IT272

PERSONAL DAY

					TAB	LE VI. C	ontinued				
Run 30.	Fue l	Yield Stress 2) (Dynes/cm ²)	Piston Velocity (fps)	Fuel velocity (fps)	Ambient Temper- ature (*F)	Fuel Temper- ature (*F)	Surface Temper- ature (*P)	Impact Angle (Døgrees)	♦ ₅ P-4 (Calculated)	Ignition Rating	Comments
IT273	EF4R-104H	950	60	57.2	92	78	110	45	0.295	1.0	
IT274	EF4R-104H	950	70	55.6	92	78	110	45	0.278	1.0	
IT275	EP4R-104H	1000	40	41.6	9 6	81	110	06	0.295	0	
IT276	EP4R-104H	1000	50	50.0	94	80	110	06	0.432	0	
IT277	ZF4R-104H	975	60	50.0	92	83	100	06	0.440	1.0	
IT278	CF4R-104H	975	70	58.8	92	80	100	96	0.608	1.0	
IT279	EF4R-104H	975	30	31.2	92	78	100	96	0.167	0	
IT280	EF8-104H	455	30	31.2	53	16	106	45	0.0195	0	
IT281	EF8-104H	455	9	38.5	94	06	106	45	0.0332	0	
IT282	CF8-104H	455	50	55.6	9 6	86	106	45	0,099	1.0	
IT283	EF 8-104H	455	60	55.6	94	79	106	45	0,099	O	
IT284	EF 8-104H	455	70	58.8	¥ 6	78	109	45	0.120	1.0	
IT285	EF8-104H	455	40	41.6	56	79	109	06	0.120	1.0	
IT296	CF8-104H	450	50	50.0	96	16	109	96	0.177	1.0	
IT287	EF8-104H	450	60	55.6	96	88	109	06	0.190	Q	
IT288	ZF8-104H	450	70	62.5	86	85	109	90	0.202	1.0	

.

	· ۱																<u></u>							-	
	Comments	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	- Nonhazardous	Nonhazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hezardous	Ncnhazardous	Hazardous	Hazardovs	Hazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Nonhazardous	Nonhazardous	Nonhazardous	Nonhazardous	Hazardous	Hazardous	Haztrdous	Hazardous	imulator.
	I gní ter Type**	-	H	ч	ч	, T	ч	ч	3	2	3	(1)	2	2	3	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	m	Э	engine s
DATA	Calculated ∜JP-4	1.0	0.16	1.0	0.408	0.025	0.032	0.49	1.0	1.0	0.16	6.16	1.0	1.0	0.534	0.50	0.032	0.0358	0.051	0.0411	0.69	0.58	1.0	1.0	3 - on-board
ASSOCLATED	Relative Humidity (1)	15	26	11	20	26	27	21	42	27	26	14	11	11	11	19	13	11	15	12	24	22	37	15	iter, and
TTIONS AND 7	Barometric Reading (in. Hg)	29.91	28.65	28.57	28.66	28.89	30.03	29.93	28.78	28.71	28.69	28.88	28.78	28.78	28.68	28.81	28.77	28.71	28.67	28.65	28.77	28.76	28.88	29.87	surface ign
C TEST COND	Impact Velocity (ft/sec)	63.7	64.7	615	60.2	60.5	62.5	65.6	66.6	66.6	66.6	65.7	65.2	66.2	67.8	65.5	66.0	66.2	65.4	64.1	65.2	66.0	65.2	65.0	ntipoise. spark/hot-
FULL-SCALE	Wind Velocity (MPH) and Direction	0~6 W	7-10 W-SW	MS-8 8-0	0-7 S-SE	MS-M 6-0	0-5 S-SE	MN-M 8-0	0-6 E-NE	0-6 W-SW	MS-M 9-0	0-6 E-SE	0-7 S-SW	5-10 S-SW	W5 W5K	0-5 S	U-5 W-SW	0-5 W	5-7 S-SW	0-6 W-SW	0-7 S-SE	5-7 S-SE	W2-W 2-0	7-10 W-SW	given in cer liters, 2 -
SIMULATE	Surface Temp. (°F)	110	111	113	117	103	112	115	100	110	113	16	109	93	100	105	114	011	113	115	96	011	16	63	osity is -flame ig
E VII.	Mar Dient Temp.	9 6	88	90.5	86	84	87	88	81	85	85	68	74.5	74	80	80	85	86	86	68	80	82.5	74	71	m ² ; visc 1 - open
TABI	Fuel Temp.	86	86	86	100	TOT	103	101	98	100	102.5	103	102	66	100	103	103	101.5	5.66	98.0	66	101	101	97	Dynes/C
,	Average Vield Stress or Viscosity	:	ı	283	807	1570	1467	800	1	1	1	ı	253	349	825	191	1680	1570	1253	1360	601	723	ı	\$	given in design a te
	Puel	JP-4	JP-8	EF4R-104	EF4R-104H	EF8R-104H	Jet-A EXP-4	JP-4 EXP-4	JP-4	₽-4C	JP-8	JP-8	EF4R-104	EF4R-104	EF4R- 10 4H	EF4R-104H	EF8R-104H	EF8R-104H	Jet-A EXP-4	Jet-A EXP-4	JP-4 EXP-4	JP-4 EXP-4	JP-4	JP-4	ild stress is iter type is
	Run No.	F	8	m	4	ŝ	9	15	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	10	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	* Yie * Ign

APPENDIX IV SIMULATED FULL-SCALE TESTS DATA

بالانداد ويكالا تعاديك

						TABLE VII	(. Continu	ed				
Run No.	Fuel	Average Yield Stress or Viscosity*	Fuel Temp. (*F)	Am- bient Temp. (*F)	Surface Temp. (*F)	Wind Velocity (NPH) and Direction	Impact Velocity (ft/sec)	Barometric Reading (in. Hg)	Relative Humidity (1)	Calculated ^{\$JP-4}	Igniter Type**	Com ants
24	JP-6	ŧ	101	76	16	0-6 W	66.2	28.92	9	0.162	e	Nonhazardous
25	JP-8	ı	103	78	66	5 SW	65.5	28.88	11	0.161	£	Nonhazardous '
26	EF4R-104	349	16	78	63	6 W-SW	64.1	28.82	6	1.0	۴	Hazardous
27	EF4R-104	325	101	79	97	5 5	65.0	ı	:	1.0	ñ	Hazardous ***
28	EF4R-104H	877	103	81	66	7 E-SE	65.4	ı	ı	0.44	٣	Hazardous ***
29	EF4R-104K	693	102	78	16	ୟ ର	65.5	29.01	22	0.589	۳	Hazardous
30	EF8R-104H	1533	102	80	101	7 S-SE	61.1	28.89	17	0.0312	m	Nonhazurdous
31	EF8R-104H	1520	103	74	06	3 5 8	64.5	28.93	28	0.0363	'n	Nonhazardous
32	Jet-A EXP-	4 1207	103	75	57	SS	65.8	28.90	16	0.047	e	Nonhazardous
33	Jet-A EXP-	4 1517	103	78	66	S NW	65.5	28.82	13	0.0368	ñ	Nonhazardous
34	JP-4 EXP-4	735	103	79	95	5 S	65.5	28.79	11	0.498	٣	Hazardous***
35	JP-4 EXP-4	690	100	76	95	7 S	66.2	28.78	14	0.607	m	Hazardous
36	JP-4	1	86	75	57	S SW	65.7	28.77	14	1.0	e	Nonhazardous
37	EF4R-104	381	100	77	101	6 S-SW	64.5	28.82	14	1.0	e	Hazardous
38	EF4R-104H	198	100	74	06	0	64.75	28.95	14	0,387	e	Hazardous
66	JP-8	ı	57	73	63	6 SW	64.5	28.92	13	0.16	m	Nonhazardous
40	EF8R-104H	1810	86	72	86	7 S-SW	65.0	28.92	17	0.0283	٣	Nonhazardous
41	Jet-A EXP-	4 1.755	96	73	107	NN-W L	65.0	28.90	14	0.0308	۳	Nonhazardous
42	JP-4 EXP-4	800	100	70	63	7 SW	63.5	28.61	16	0.47	n	Hazardous
43	EF8R-104	665	103	66	86	8	66.6	28.31	19	0.105	ч	Nonhazardous
44	EF8R-104	568	103	60	71	0-6 S-SE	64.5	28.84	25	0.1185	2	No-hazardous
45	EF8R-104	643	102	63	83	8-13 SW	63.5	28.77	16	0.100	2	Nonhazardous
.::	Yield strees Igniter type Burner malfur	is given in is designation, reli	Dynes/ ed as: ght secc	m ² ; vist 1 - open	cosity is n-flame h ation of	given in c gniters, 2 burner cycl	centipoise. - spark/ho te.	t-surface ig	miter, and	3 - on-boar	d engine	simulator.

¢

ţ

Testine with a

.