

NOTICE

Please do not request copies of this report from HQ AFESC/RD (Engineering and Services Laboratory). Additional copies may be purchased from:

> National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161

Federal Government agencies and their contractors registered with Defense Technical Information Center should direct requests for copies of this report to:

> Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314

REPORT DOCUMENTAT	ION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO	D. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
ESL-TR-80-56	AD- A10 930-	-7
TITLE (and Subtitie)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
	TTD / Tata Thursd	Final Technical Report
Evaporation and Groundfall of C	JP-4 Jet fuel	Feb 78 - Jun 80
Settisoned by USAF Afferdit		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(s)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S)
Harvey J. Clewell, III, Capt, U	USAF, BSC	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADD	RESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
HQ AFESC/RDVC		AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Engineering and Services Labora Tyndall AFB, FL 32403	atory	Program Element 62601F Project 19004C02
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Air Force Engineering and Serv:	ices Center	12. REPORT DATE September 1980
Tyndall AFB, FL 32403		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
		131
S. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESSTIL di	Iterent from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of the eport)
		LINCI ASST ET ED
с. Х		15a DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
		SCHEDULE
5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on	istribution unlimit	ed.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on	istribution unlimit	ed.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 6. OPA LUMENTARY NOTES	istribution unlimit	ed.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract on 6. UP: LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso	ed. rom Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on E OF LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is	istribution unlimit	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shatract on 6. OF LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different in specified on verso	ed. Tom Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 6. OPA LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso any and identify by block numbe Aircraft Emissio Environmental Ou	ed. from Report) front cover. r) ns Dispersion Modeling ality Droplet Evenoration
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different in specified on verso any and identify by block numbe Aircraft Emissio Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons	ed. from Report) front cover. ns Dispersion Modeling ality Droplet Evaporation Droplet Fall Rates
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shatract on E OF LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso Aircraft Emissio Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on Availability of this report is Puel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso ary and identify by block numbe Aircraft Emissio Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch	ed. from Report) front cover.) ns Dispersion Modeling ality Droplet Evaporation Droplet Fall Rates emistry Jet Fuel Composition
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessar Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessar	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso ary and identify by block number Aircraft Emissio Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number for t undo widentify by block number	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shatract on 6. OF LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessa Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessa An experimental and modeling ef- fate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso any and identify by block number Aircraft Emissio Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on 4. OPA COMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessa Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessa An experimental and modeling efforts of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapo	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso any and identify by block number Aircraft Emission Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessa Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessa An experimental and modeling effate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapo atmosphere. In order to apply	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso ary and identify by block number Aircraft Emission Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal this model to jetti	ed. Tom Report) front cover. front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shetrect en 8. NEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess 9. NEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necesse An experimental and modeling eff fate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapo atmosphere. In order to apply study was performed to determine	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso any and identify by block number Aircraft Emissio Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal this model to jetti e the droplet size	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessa Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 0. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessa An experimental and modeling eff fate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapo atmosphere. In order to apply study was performed to determine jettisoning process. This study	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso any and identify by block number Aircraft Emission Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal this model to jetti e the droplet size y featured in-fligh Sampling was also	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: Approved for public release; d: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract on Availability of this report is Availability of this report is Evaporation for the every of the increase Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necesses An experimental and modeling eff fate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapo atmosphere. In order to apply study was performed to determine jettisoning process. This study from a KG-135 tanker aircraft. determine whether the jettisoned	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso ary and identify by block number Aircraft Emission Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal this model to jetti e the droplet size y featured in-fligh Sampling was also d fuel reached the	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shetrect en E OF LUMENTARY NOTES Availability of this report is 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics 9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necesse An experimental and modeling ef fate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapo atmosphere. In order to apply study was performed to determine jettisoning process. This study from a KC-135 tanker aircraft. determine whether the jettisoned D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS C	istribution.unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso ary and identify by block number Aircraft Emission Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal this model to jetti e the droplet size y featured in-fligh Sampling was also d fuel reached the DBSOLETE	ed. from Report) front cover.
Approved for public release; d: Approved for public release; d: DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shaftest en Availability of this report is Availability of this report is Fuel Jettisoning Fuel Dumping Evaporation Modeling Environics ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessar An experimental and modeling effate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged was developed to simulate evapor atmosphere. In order to apply study was performed to determine jettisoning process. This study from a KG-135 tanker aircraft. determine whether the jettisoned D form 1473 Edition of 1 Nov 65 is c	istribution unlimit mered in Block 20, if different for specified on verso any and identify by block number Aircraft Emission Environmental Qu Hydrocarbons Environmental Ch my and identify by block number fort was undertaken d from an aircraft ration and free-fal this model to jetti e the droplet size y featured in-fligh Sampling was also d fuel reached the DBSOLETE U SECURITY CL	ed. from Report) front cover.

and a second second

مواند المادين المحمد محمد معاملية مسكلة مراجعة <mark>محمد مرابط أعراض محمد المرابع المحمد المرابع المحمد المرابع</mark> والم

1 ÷ I

. . ; ; 10.200-44-

-}

į

:

1

. . . .

and the state of the . . .

E. S. C. Balan

þ

• .

•

UNCLASSIFIED

Accession

RY-

NTIS DTIC TAB N:Natio: 1100.4 Just 1= 1000 10F

GF. A&I

01°*

Distrinit and

Avallan 13.57 Codes

plustic estator ephoial

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

concentrations. For fuel jettisoning as low as 750 meters above the ground at temperatures around 11°C, no liquid fuel could be detected by ground observers and no significant hydrocarbon concentrations (greater than a few ppm C) were measured by the sampling.

The predictions of the field droplet model concerning the evaporation and groundfall of jettisoned fuel are presented along with an estimate of the atmospheric dispersion which takes place. For JP-4 fuel jettisoned higher than 1,500 meters at ground-level temperatures above freezing ($0^{\circ}C$), more than 98% of the fuel should evaporate before reaching the ground. Droplets and vapor are widely dispersed by atmospheric turbulence, quickly resulting in a fuel density too low to create any perceptible environmental changes.

Formulas and graphs are included for estimating the likelihood of significant ground-level concentrations of fuel vapor or liquid following a specific fuel jettisoning incident.

UNCLASSIFIED

PREFACE

This report was prepared by HQ AFESC Engineering and Services - Laboratory, Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida. It documents work performed during the period February 1972 through June 1980 under Program Element 62601F, Project 19004C02. The author and project officer since June 1976 was Capt Harvey J. Clewell; previous project officers were Captains James T. Haney and Edward R. Ricco.

This report describes the work which was performed to determine the physical fate of JP-4 jet fuel discharged from an aircraft in flight. The principal results of this effort have already been included in a general analysis of the environmental effects of fuel jettisoning by Air Force aircraft (Reference 1). This report is intended to document the experimental basis for part of that analysis. In addition, the information presented in this report can be used to estimate the likelihood of significant ground-level concentrations of fuel vapor or liquid following a fuel jettisoning incident.

The author acknowledges the contributions of several co-investigators in this effort. Development of the fuel droplet model was initiated by Captain Edward R. Ricco. Dr Daniel A. Stone helped plan the experimental study at Edwards Air Force Base, and along with AlC Gregory A. Urda, was instrumental in carrying out the ground sampling. The gas-chromatographic analysis of the samples was developed and performed by Mr. Thomas B. Stauffer. The airborne sampling was performed by Meteorology Research, Incorporated,

i

under contract to the Air Force Ceophysics Laboratory, Dr R. E. Good and Mr Charles A. Forsberg project officers.

This report has been reviewed by the Public Affairs Office and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS it will be available to the general public, including

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

foreign nations.

HARVEY J, CLEWELL, III, Capt, USAF, BSC

Air Quality Research Chemist

John T. Slankas

JOHN T. SLANKAS, Maj, USAF

Chief, Environmental Sciences Branch

MICHAEL J. RYAN, Lt Col, USAF, BSC

Chief, Environics Division

Francis B. CROWLEY, III, Jolonel, USAF

Director, Engineering and Services Laboratory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	נ	Title	Page
I	INTR	ODUCTION	1
II	FUEL MO	DROPLET EVAPORATION AND FREE-FALL DELING	3
· · ·	2.1	Description of the Model	3
	2.2	Single-Droplet Results	6
	2.3	Comparison with Experimental Data	13
III	EXPE	RIMENTAL FUEL JETTISONING STUDY	15
	3.1	Background	15
	3.2	Description of the Experimental Program	18
••	3.3	In-Flight Sampling	20
	-	3.3.1 Analysis of Droplet Measurements	26
	-	3.3.2 Analysis of Vapor Measurements	35
		3.3.3 Effect of Ignoring the Wake in the Model	38
	3.4	Ground-level Sampling	43
		3.4.1 Predicted Concentration and Location of the Fuel at the Ground	45
		3.4.2 Description of the Analytical Technique	48
		3.4.3 Analysis of Sampling Results	53
IV	PRED	ICTED GROUNDFALL OF JETTISONED JP-4	57
	4.1	Fraction of the Fuel Reaching the Ground	57
	4.2	Other Model Predictions	63
	4.3	Dispersion of the Fuel	67

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section		ction Title	Page
		4.3.1 Vapor Dispersion	71
		4.3.2 Droplet Dispersion	73
••••	V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	76
	APP	ENDIX	
	Α.	EFFECT OF DROPLET TEMPERATURE CALCULATIONS IN THE FUEL DROPLET EVAPORATION MODEL	• 80
	Β.	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE FUEL DROPLET MODEL	. 85
	C.	FUEL DROPLET PROGRAM	, 97
	D.	SAMPLE FUEL DROPLET PROGRAM RESULTS	. 107

.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
1	Evaporation and Free-Fall of a JP-4 Fuel Droplet	7
2	Effect of Initial Droplet Diameter on Evaporation and Free-Fall	9
3	Differential Evaporation of Fuel Components from a Droplet of JP-4	-10
4	Evaporation of Single-Component Droplets Versus a Mixture	11
5	Comparison of Model Predictions with Experiment],4
6	Reported Fuel Droplet Size Distributions	17
7	Fuel Dump Plume	22
- 8	KC-135 Fuel Droplet Size Distributions	24
9	Comparison of Fuel Droplet Size Distributions	33
10	Comparison of Observed and Calculated Fuel Droplet Size Distributions 90 Seconds after Jettisoning	40
11	Calculated Ground Imprint of Fuel Dumps	44
12	Diagram of Charcoal Tube Desorption Technique	50
13	Typical Gas-Chromatograms of Hydrocarbon Samples	52
14	Percent of Jettisoned Fuel Reaching the Ground.	58
15	Effect of Temperature on the Percent of Fuel Reaching the Ground	59
16	Experimental Fuel Droplet Size Distributions for Aircraft Fuel Jettisoning	61
17	Effect of Initial Droplet Size Distribution on the Percent of Fuel Reaching the Ground	62

v

LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure	Title	Page	
18	Evaporation of a Distribution of Droplets	64	
19	Time-Spread of Liquid Fuel Reaching the Ground from 1500 Meters	68_	
20	Droplet Size Distribution at the Ground for Fuel Released at 1500 Meters	69	•
- A-1	Difference Between Droplet and Ambient Tempera- tures for Different Calculations	81	
A-2	Predicted Evaporation Rates for Different Droplet Temperature Calculations	81	
A-3	Predicted Mass Remaining for Different Droplet Temperature Calculations	83	
B-1	Relation Between the Reynolds Number and the Drag Coefficient	89	···· ;
B-2	Flow-Chart of Fuel Droplet Model	96	

vi

als the state of each of the state of

and the

ar isolah kan Ali sangaran kan bi

1.000 (Sec. 1.

Sold and a second

LIST OF TABLES

21

17 C 18 T 18 C

Table	e Title	Page
	Synthetic JP-4	• • 5
2	KC-135 Fuel Jettisoning Parameters	19
۰ . 3	Major Fuel Dump Plume Encounters	27
	Calculation of the Initial Droplet Mass Density for the Fuel Dumps at 1500 Meters	29
5	Summary of Droplet Mass Density Calculations	31
6	Estimation of Typical Droplet Acceleration in Wakes	42
	Atmospheric Conditions during Ground-Sampling Studies	46
	Calibration of Hydrocarbon Analysis	51
9	Ambient Background Samples	53
	Summary of Ground-Sampling Results	54
11	Estimated JP-4 Concentrations at the Ground from Fuel Dump 3/7	55
12	Time of Fall for the First Droplets to Reach the Ground	66
13	Residual Composition of Fuel Droplets after 90 Percent of the Original Mass has Evaporated	70
14	Worst-Case Ground-Level Vapor Concentrations	72
15	Examples of Liquid Fuel Contamination of the Ground	75
B-1	Comparison of Experimental and Calculated Vapor Pressures	91
• B-2	Comparison of Experimental and Calculated Diffusivities	93
C-1	Identification of Program Variables	103

vii (The reverse of this page **is** blank)

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

Due to in-flight emergencies or other unforseen events it occasionally becomes necessary for Air Force aircraft to discharge unburned fuel directly into the atmosphere while airborne. The primary reason for jettisoning fuel is to reduce the aircraft's gross weight to facilitate a safe landing. As a result of a growing awareness of fuel jettisoning's potential for environmental degradation, the Air Force initiated a study in 1972 to determine the nature, the extent and the environmental affects of fuel jettisoning by Air Force aircraft. The overall results of that study are reported in Reference 1. The present report documents the experimental and modelling efforts which were undertaken to determine the physical fate of the jettisoned fuel in support of one aspect of that study.

Jet feel, when jettisoned from an aircraft, readily breaks up into small droplets and begins to evaporate. The fuel vapor and droplets are subject to entrainment in the aircraft wake, dispersion by atmospheric turbulence, and (in the case of droplets) gravitational settling. The principal question to be answered by the work described in this report was what fraction of the jettisoned fuel can be expected to reach the ground in liquid form. The environmental affects due to liquid fuel contamination of the ground are very different from those associated with the airborne fuel vapors. Therefore, a knowledge of the fraction of

fuel in each form is essential for estimation of the cerall impact of fuel jettisoning.

いたいというないというないというないです。

Section II describes a computer model which was developed to simulate the evaporation and free-fall of fuel droplets in the atmosphere. In order to apply this model to fuel jettisoning it is necessary to know the distribution of droplet sizes which is produced by the jettisoning process; the experimental study which was performed to determine this information is described in Section III. As noted there it was necessary to use the droplet evaporation model to interpret the experimental findings. During this experiment, sampling was also performed at ground level to determine whether the jettisoned fuel reached the ground in signi-

ficant concentrations. The results of the ground-sampling are also presented in this section.

In Section IV the predictions of the droplet model concerning the evaporation and groundfall of jettisoned fuel are presented along with an estimate of the atmospheric dispersion. A detailed description of the droplet model, together with a program listing and sample output, is provided in the appendices.

SECTION II

FUEL DROPLET FREE-FALL AND EVAPORATION MODELLING

The evaporation of a fuel droplet is complicated by the fact that as the droplet evaporates its composition changes. The lighter, more volatile components are stripped away preferentially while the denser, slower-evaporating components remain. Also, as the droplet evaporates it becomes smaller, reducing the surface area available for evaporation. Therefore the evaporation rate decreases markedly at first, but later levels off. A further complication arises when the droplet is allowed to fall. As it falls the droplet experiences changing atmospheric temperature, pressure, and viscosity, since these properties are a function of altitude. These changing atmospheric properties modify the droplet's evaporation rate as well as its rate of fall. In addition, the rate of fall varies with the droplet's size and density, which in turn depend on its evaporative history. As a result, the evaporation and free-fall of the droplet are interdependent processes.

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL

The model which was developed to simulate the simultaneous evaporation and free-fall of a fuel droplet is based on the pioneering work of Lowell (References 2 and 3). Lowell's method has been refined and extended chiefly by the incorporation of experimental data provided by the Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC)

and by the use of a more detailed fuel composition. The data obtained by AEDC (Reference 4) includes measurements of the drag coefficients and evaporation rates of JP-4 fuel droplets as well as the physical properties of JP-4 as a function of temperature. Data on the composition of JP-4 provided by the Air Force Aero-Propulsion Laboratory was used to prepare a theoretical 33 component "synthetic JP-4" mixture as shown in Table 1. The calculated physical properties of this mixture (density, average carbon number, and Reid vapor pressure) caree well with typical analyses of JP-4. Each component in the synthetic mixture represents a class of compounds in real JP-4. Lowell used ten equal volume distillate fractions to represent JP-4; the more detailed composition allows modelling of the droplet to continue until virtually all (99.9%) of the mass is gone. Additional refinements include a complete energy balance, and an initial droplet temperature estimate. The effect of these two calculations is assessed in Appendix A.

Essentially, the model breaks up a droplet's fall into a series of small time intervals. The distance of fall during each interval is calculated assuming the droplet is falling at the terminal velocity for its current diameter, density and altitude. Loss of mass through evaporation is calculated assuming Raoult's law; that is, each component evaporates independently. An energy balance routine adjusts the droplet temperature to allow for evaporative cooling, radiation, conduction, and insolation effects. The new droplet composition, mass and altitude are used as initial

TABLE 1. SYNTHETIC JP-4

Compound	Volume — <u>Percent</u>	Molecular Weight	Boiling Point(C)	Density (g/ml)	
so-pentane	3.9	72.2	27.9	.62	، ، ، میں ایک ایک ایک میں جو ایک ایک
iso-hexane	8.1	86.2	60.2	.66	, · ·
cyclohexane	2.1	84.2	80.7	.78	
benzene	0.3	78.1	80.1	. 88	1.5
3-methylhexane		100.2	= 91.8	.69	
methylcyclohexane	7.1	98.2	100.9		
toluene	0.7	- 92.1	1,0.8	87	
	10.1	114.2	117.7		17.2
cis-l.4-diethvlcvclohexane	7.4	112.2	124.3	.78	
m-xvlene	1.6	106.2	139.1	.87	
4-methyloctane	9.1	128.3	142.4	•72	
isopropylcyclohexane	4.3	126.2	154.5	.80	
1-ethy1-2-methy1benzene	2.4	120.2	165.2	•88	_
2,7-dimethyloctane	7.3	142.3	159.6	•72	
p-menthane (cis)	3.7	140.3	170.9	• 80	
p-cymene	1.8	134.2	177.1	•86	
napthalene		128.2	=217.9	-1. 03	
undecane	4.8	156.3	195.9	•74	
3-methylbutylcyclohexane	2.5	154.3	196.5	•30	
2-methylenedecalin (trans)	-3•4	150.3	201.0	89	
l-butyl-3-methylbenzene	1.1	148.2	205.0	•86	
l-methylnapthalene	-0.2	-142.2	-244.6	1.02	·
dodecane	2.8	170.3	216.3	•75	
3-ethylbutylcyclohexane	1.2	168.3	211.0*	-80 *	
1,3,5-triethylbenzene	0.5	162.3	216.0	•86	
2,3-dimethylnapthalene	0.2	156.2	268.0	1.00	
tridecane	1.1	184.4	235.4	•76	
3-isopropylbutylcyclohexane	0.4	182.4	225.0*		
3,5-disthyl-l-propylbenzene	0.1	176.3	234.0*	•87*	
tetradecane	0.2	198.4	253•7	75	-
pentadecane	0.1	212.4	270.6	•77	
perhydrophenanthrene	1.8	192.4	290.0*	•94	
pyrene	0.1	202.3	393.0	1.27	

Density = 0.75 g/mlAverage Carbon # = 8.7Reid vapor pressure (100F) = 2.5 psia Aromatics = 9.2%Napthalenes = 0.7% NOTE: Olefins can be considered present in the paraffinic fractions at a level of 1%. _____

*estimated

conditions for the next interval. This stepwise approximation continues until the droplet impacts on the ground or loses 99.9 percent of its initial mass. The initial conditions which must be known are the droplet's original composition, altitude and diameter, the temperature at local ground level, and the aircraft's air speed. The initial droplet temperature is then taken as the corresponding stagnation temperature, assuming equilibration of the fuel tanks with the skin of the aircraft. In the early intervals the droplet is then allow to cool through evaporation until an energy balance is achieved.

A more detailed description of the model is presented in Appendix B, and a listing of the computor program is included as Appendix C. The program reports the droplet's status at the end of each time interval or a selected period of time. Output for a singledroplet case includes the elapsed time since release; the droplet altitude, velocity, diameter and fraction of initial mass remaining; and the fractional mass of each component. Sample output for several single-droplet cases as well as for a distribution of droplets is provided in Appendix D.

2.2 SINGLE-DROPLET RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the predicted evaporation and free-fall of a 270micron droplet released at 1500 meters for three different groundlevel temperatures. Initially evaporation dominates, and in the first few minutes the droplet loses from 60 to 90 percent of its mass, depending on the temperature. Thereafter evaporation becomes less important, and the droplet falls without a substantial

मन्त्र त्या संसंक्रियने प्रश्नेती हि आदेश्वित विवासित करत्ये स्वाप्त



d-1.

change in mass. The duration of the evaporation phase for all three temperatures is around five minutes, while the free-fall phase ranges from 50 minutes at -20°C to over 11 hours at +20°C. At the higher temperature the droplet evaporates more completely in the first phase; and therefore, being smaller, it falls more slowly during the second phase. The dots on the curve for 0°C show the actual intervals used by the model in performing its stepwise simulation. The model maintains roughly constant increments of mass and then altitude by increasing the duration of the intervals from less than a tenth of a second initially to more than 30 min-

utes at the end.

The effect of a droplet's initial size is shown in Figure 2 for an initial altitude of 1500 meters and a ground-level temperature of 0°C. On a relative basis, a 100-micron droplet appears to evaporate more quickly than a 500-micron droplet. However, this is only an artifact, caused by the fact that the mass of a droplet is proportional to its diameter cubed while the evaporation rate is proportional to the diameter squared. On an absolute basis, the larger droplet is actually evaporating much faster than the smaller droplet, as can be seen from the more rapid change in diameter. Due to its larger size, the 500-micron droplet also falls much faster than the 100-micron droplet.

As mentioned earlier, the more volatile components in the fuel evaporate preferentially. Figure 3 demonstrates this effect for







a 270-micron droplet released at 1500 meters when the ground-level temperature is -20°C. The lighter compounds (containing less than eight carbon atoms) are lost almost immediately, while the heavier components (containing more than twelve carbons) hardly evaporate at all. This results in the different fuel components being distributed vertically: the lighter compounds are left at the initial release height, the heavier compounds reach the ground, and the intermediate compounds are spread out in between.

Finally, Figure 4 examines the related question of whether the evaporation of a complex mixture can be approximated by a single compound. In Figure 3 the curves C6 through C14 represented different components in the same droplet. In Figure 4, however, curves C6 through C14 represent different droplets, each of which contain only one component. These curves show that no singlecomponent droplet matches the behavior of a droplet of JP-4. During the early stages of evaporation, a JP-4 droplet resembles hexane or octane. But then the JP-4 droplet evaporation slows down until it eventually parallels that of a dodecane or tetradecane droplet. From inspection of the results for 0°C and -20°C it can be seen that no single-component droplet could be used to predict the fraction of JP-4 reaching the ground under different conditions. For the same reason, the ability of a mixture of several compounds to represent JP-4 is limited when the number of compounds in the mixture is small. For example, a mixture of ten equal fractions could not simulate a JP-4 droplet beyond 90 percent evaporation, because at that point the simulated droplet would essentially consist of just one component.

2.3 COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTAL DATA

One of the experiments carried out by AEDC in support of this fuel jettisoning study consisted of suspending small droplets of JP-4 from a glass filament and measuring their rates of evaporation when subjected to a controlled airflow (Reference 4). The results obtained for several droplets are shown as points in Figure 5. These data were obtained at a temperature of 20°C and with an airflow of 3 meters per second, which is close to the terminal velocity of the size droplets studied. The curves in Figure 5 show the predictions of the fuel droplet model under the same conditions. The agreement is excellent.

The AEDC effort also attempted to measure evaporation rates in cooled airflows (-10° to -20°C). Unfortunately, water condensation at these temperatures led to severe experimental problems, bringing the validity of the few results obtained into question. The reported evaporation rates are extremely low, roughly a factor of five lower than the fuel droplet model would predict. Since the temperature dependent parameters in the fuel droplet model have been checked against experimental values (see Appendix B), the disagreement solely with AEDC's low-temperature data indicates that the low-temperature experiments may have been compromised by the water condensation problems. However, these problems were not encountered during the tests at $+20^{\circ}$ C, so the use of the roomtemperature results to validate the fuel droplet model appears to be justified.



Figure 5. Comparison of Model Predictions with Experiment

SECTION III

EXPERIMENTAL FUEL JETTISONING STUDY

The fuel droplet model described in the previous section begins with an initial droplet diameter, altitude and temperature and predicts the ensuing history of the droplet. Therefore the application of this model to the question of fuel jettisoning requires a knowledge of the droplet sizes involved. It can be assumed that in the process of being discharged through an orifice into a high velocity airstream, the fuel would be atomized into a distribution of droplet sizes. However, the droplets produced could range from only a few microns in diameter (the size that scatter light) up to several thousand microns in diameter (the size of raindrops). The actual droplet size distribution produced by the jettisoning process cannot be predicted from theory. Therefore it must be determined experimentally.

3.1 BACKGROUND

An initial attempt to determine the droplet size distribution produced by fuel jettisoning was performed in 1973 (Reference 5). This study, which was conducted at the AEDC, simulated the fuel jettisoning process by injecting JP-4 into a high-velocity airstream in a wind tunnel. Airflows of 100 to 200 meters per second were used, representing typical aircraft airspeeds during jettisoning. The droplets produced were then measured using holography. The observed droplet size distribution is shown in

Figure 6 ("AEDC-experimental"). All of the droplets detected were less than 100 microns in diameter, with a mass median diameter of only 32 microns. However, due to the constraints imposed by the size of the wind tunnel these tests were conducted with fuel flow rates of only 0.02 to 2.2 kilograms per second, compared to typical aircraft jettisoning rates of 5 to 50 kilograms per second. Therefore, it was not certain that these results were representative of full-scale fuel jettisoning, where the airstream might not possess sufficient energy to thoroughly atomize all of the

fuel.

During the same period another study was conducted in England by =Cross and Picknett (Reference 6). In this study a small jet aircraft (a British "Buccaneer") jettisoned fuel at 7.5 kilograms per second from wing tanks while flying at 120 meters per second. The aircraft was flown less than 15 meters above the ground, and the fuel spray was sampled by filter papers laid on the ground. A fluorescent dye was added to the fuel so that the droplet spots on the filter paper could be visualized. The fuel used was Avtur, a British commercial fuel similar to JP-8 and much less volatile than JP-4. A typical droplet size distribution observed for one of their flights is shown in Figure 6 ("Cross and Picknett experimental"). The mass median diameter was 240 microns with droplets ranging from 40 to 400 microns. Cross and Picknett considered this distribution to be a lower bound for fuel jettisoning, since the fuel was jettisoned perpendicular to the airstream. As an upper bound, they presented a composite distribution based on



previous studies for other aircraft with rearward projecting jettison-tubes. This distribution is also shown in Figure 6 ("Cross and Picknett - Composite"). The mass median diameter in this case is 270 microns, with some droplets as large a 650

microns.

Although the aircraft-generated droplet size distributions measured by Cross and Picknett were more likely to be representative of aircraft fuel jettisoning than the wind tunnel data from AEDC, there was still some concern about the wide disparity of the two results. Also, the Cross and Picknett study suffered from two shortcomings: first, the technique used to visualize the droplets could not detect droplets less than 40 microns in diameter; and second, in all of the trials, no more than 55 percent of the jettisoned fuel could ever be accounted for. In an attempt to resolve the discrepant results, Dawbarn (Reference 4) suggested that the actual fuel droplet distribution was somewhere between the two extremes. His proposed intermediate distribution is shown in Figure 6 as "AEDC - Suggested Compromise." Due to the uncertainty still surrounding the size distribution question, the decision was made to perform another study in which an aircraft would be used to jettison the fuel. The distinguishing feature of this study would be in-flight sampling by a second aircraft.

3.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The in-flight sampling program was conducted jointly by the Air Force Engineering and Services Center and the Air Force Geophysics

Laboratory, at Edwards Air Force Base, California, in December 1976. A sampling aircraft equipped with optical droplet-sizing instrumentation and a hydrocarbon vapor analyzer was flown directly into the cloud of fuel jettisoned by an Air Force KC-135 tanker aircraft. Direct measurements of the fuel droplet size distribution and density were obtained and average droplet fall rates were estimated. Flights were conducted at three altitudes (approximately 1500, 3600, and 6000 meters above mean sea level) to determine whether the fuel droplet size distribution was a function of release height. Ground-level sampling for hydrocarbons was also performed during the low-level flights (which were roughly 750 meters above the ground) to determine whether any of the jettisoned fuel reached the ground. In all cases, typical KC-135 jettisoning practices were followed. Table 2 lists the conditions under which the fuel was jettisoned in this program.

TABLE 2. KC-135 FUEL JETTISONING PARAMETERS

Fuel:JP-4Dump-nozzle diameter:10.1 centimetersAircraft airspeed:170 meters per secondJettison rate:56 kilograms per second
or 330 grams per meter

Duration of dump:

15-30 seconds

The KC-135 jettisons fuel through the boom normally used to refuel other aircraft. Usually the boom is lowered for jettisoning as well as refueling, but in some emergency situations fuel might be

jettisoned with the boom stowed. Therefore, the experimental program included jettisoning in both configurations.

3.3 IN-FLICHT SAMPLING RESULTS

The in-flight sampling was carried out by Meteorology Research, Incorporated (MRI), using a specially instrumented Piper Navajo aircraft. The droplet sizing instrumentation consisted of three particle spectrometers manufactured by Particle leasuring Systems, Incorporated. These spectrometers, which size particles as they intercept a beam of laser light, cover the size ranges 2-30, 20-300, and 300-4500 microns. A foil impactor was also used on some flights to provide a larger cross-section for detecting droplets greater than 250 microns in diameter. Other instrumentation included a hydrocarbon analyzer and an integrating nephelometer to detect vapor and fine particles, respectively. A two-volume report describes the MRJ sampling effort and presents in detail the data obtained (Reference 7).

After the tanker performed each fuel dump, the sampling aircraft was vectored in for perpendicular passes through the fuel dump plume. In the later sorties, better sampling results were obtained by flying the sampling aircraft directly down the length of the fuel dump. Flying at 80 meters per second, the aircraft was then able to obtain continuous particle counts for as long as 30 to 45 seconds on a single pass. The fuel dump could be seen initially as a long, white cloud resembling a contrail. For favorable sun angles the fuel cloud was still visible more than 10

minutes after the dump, but usually the sampling aircraft could no longer follow the cloud visually after the first two to four minutes. Real-time radar tracking of the tanker's position during the fuel dump and of the location of the sampling aircraft during successful passes through the plume was used to direct the search after visual sighting was no longer possible. Unexpectedly, drizzle-sized droplets (around 100 microns) could be detected even after the fuel cloud was no longer visible. In fact "splash on the windshield" of the Navajo became the most definitive mark of entry into the fuel cloud.

Figure 7 shows a typical plume produced by fuel jettisoning. During the first minute the plume quickly expands to nearly 100 meters in diameter and takes on a markedly coiled appearance under the influences of the aircraft wake vortex. This long spiral tube maintains its integrity for several minutes, but eventually begins to fold on itself as the plume dissipates. The position of the refueling boom greatly affects the initial growth of the fuel dump plume. When the boom is up in the stowed position, the fuel is immediately engulfed in one of the expanding wing tip vortices, leading to rapid expansion and coiling. However, with the boom lowered the plume initially lies below the aircraft wake and, therefore, expands more slowly with little sign of coiling. Finally, after approximately 60 seconds the plume does become entrained in one of the wake vortices and from then on is identical to the boom-up plume. The pilot of the Navajo reported that visually there appeared to be greater vertical dispersion of the



b. Sampling Aircraft in the Plume Two Minutes Later

Figure 7. Fuel Dump Plume

plume and possible "rainout" of larger droplets with the boom down, but no sampling or photographic evidence of this effect could be obtained. Sampling passes below the visible fuel clouds were performed to search for any rainout of larger droplets, but no such phenomenon was ever detected.

Overall planning, direction and analysis of the MRI sampling effort was performed by the Air Force Geophysics Laboratory (AFGL). Using a statistical analysis, AFGL was able to distinguish actual droplet encounters from fluctuations in the atmospheric particulate background. The droplet size distribution observed in these encounters was then corrected for evaporation (using the droplet evaporation model described in Section II of this report) to obtain an estimate of the "original" droplet size distribution. This correction was necessary to allow for the length of time the fuel droplets were free to evaporate before the sampling aircraft entered the fuel dump plume. Due to flying safety considerations, the first pass by the sampling aircraft through the fuel dump usually occurred as much as 90 seconds after the tanker had passed. Based on the evaporation model, a typical fuel droplet had lost more than 80 percent of its original mass by this time and had been reduced to about half of its original size.

Composite experimental and corrected droplet size distributions based on all of the sampling flights are shown in Figure 8. (The curve entitled "This Report" will be discussed later.) No clear distinction was found between results for different altitudes and



「語り」でなる

「「「「「「「」」」」」



boom configurations; therefore, all of the encounters were averaged together to obtain these composites. Individual sampling results for each fuel dump plume encounter are included in the AFGL report (Reference 8). A full range of droplets from 2-600 microns were observed, with a composite mass median diameter of 165 microns. After correcting for evaporation, the mass median diameter becomes 265 microns, with a significant number of droplets as large as 500 microns.

Ground-level photography was used by AFGL to estimate the dimensions of the fuel dump plume during the sampling operation. Their analysis indicates that the fuel dump plumes were typically 100 meters in diameter after 90 seconds. For a jettisoning rate of 330 grams per meter, the nominal density of fuel dumped would then be 0.042 grams per cubic meter. Correcting the observed fuel droplet densities for evaporation, AFGL was able to account for only 0.010 grams per cubic meter, or about 25 percent of the known mass. Similarly, assuming the fuel droplets were 80 percent evaporated at the time the plume was sampled, the measured JP-4 vapor density should have been 80 percent of the nominal fuel density, or 0.034 grams per cubic meter (about 6.4 part per million). The highest concentration recorded by the hydrocarbon analyzer on the Navajo was only 4 parts per million, and average concentrations for passes down the length of the plume were closer to 2 parts per million. Since both of these discrepancies diminished confidence in the validity of the sampling results, they will be examined further in the following sections.
3.3.1 ANALYSIS OF THE DROPLET MEASUREMENTS

During the first experimental sortie, only perpendicular passes through the fuel dump plume were performed. However, it soon became apparent that these perpendicular encounters were too short to provide significant particle counts. Thereafter, parallel passes down the length of the fuel dump plume were also carried out. The parallel passes are preferred not only because they encountered a larger number of particles, but also because they would tend to average out any local fluctuations in the fuel dump plume density. The longest continuous encounter with each fuel dump plume is listed in Table 3. Fuel dumps not listed did not include any long sampling passes.

Two of the fuel dump encounters listed in Table 3 were not used in the mass balance calculation that follows. In fuel dump 3/5, the plume rose above the initial jettisoning height under the influence of a high level inversion with a vertical wind component. Apparently, in pushing the plume upward, the inversion also compressed it vertically, because the observed fuel droplet density was considerably greater than that observed in any of the other fuel dumps. In fuel dump 3/6, the only lengthy encounter with the plume recorded an anomalous droplet distribution. All of the observed mass was in very large droplets (between 230 and 300 microns). Since these results are contradictory to the observations of all the other fuel dumps, they were rejected.

The mass densities listed in Table 3 are those observed by the Cloud Particle Spectrometer (CPS) only. This instrument sizes

 ENCOUNTERS
PLUME
DUMP
FUEL
MAJOR
m
TABLE

Boom Position	a d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Ир Down Down	Down	
Observed Mass Density (g/m ³)	007 002 006 0004 010	.013 (.037)# (.013)# .009	.000 .000 .007	
Duration of Encounter (seconds)	5555 555 555 555 555 555 555 555 555 5	27 20 57	51	
Elapsed Time Since Dump (seconds)	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	76 (96)* 91 84	52 208 130 92	
Start of Encounter (hr:min:sec)	22:31:53 22:46:56 23:00;46 23:17:40 21:09:29 21:29:12	22:17:46 22:44:17 23:06:08 19:12:46	20:29:32 21:29:43 Average	ions (see text)
Sortie/Dump	2/2 2/3 2/5 3/3 Average	3/4 3/5 3/6 4/1 Average	4/3 4/5 Average Overall	from calculat
Dump Altitude (meters)	1500	3600	6000	*excluded

droplets with diameters ranging from 10 to 310 microns by sorting the droplets into 15 channels, each of which includes a particle diameter range of 20 microns. As can be seen from the experimental curve in Figure 8, practically all of the observed droplet mass was within the range of the CPS. Eliminating consideration of the smail (2-20 micron) and large (300-4500 micron) particle instruments simplifies the mass balance calculations without significantly changing the result.

Calculation of the average intial droplet mass density for the six fuel dumps at 1500 meters is shown in Table 4. The average mass density observed in each CPS channel, taken directly from Reference 7, was multiplied by a correction factor. This factor was necessary because in converting from corrected (raw minus background) droplet counts to mass of JP-4, MRI used the wrong density for JP-4 (0.92 instead of 0.76). Also, their conversion to mass neglected the effect of the median diameter offset which they had noted for the first five channels. These discrepancies were also corrected in the AFGL analysis (cf. Table 2 in Reference 8 versus Table 2 in Reference 7). The fuel droplet evaporation model was used to determine the initial droplet diameter which would evaporate to each channel's median diameter in the time available and at the observed ambient temperature. Using the percent mass remaining calculated by the model, the observed mass density for each channel was then scaled up to obtain the initial droplet mass densities.

 	Cumulative Percent	886833999388813629355568	۳.	• .	 		n na ben an
HE HE	Calculated Initial Density (g/m ³ x10 ³)	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	0.043 g/m				in pairs of sealing provide the sea
ALSO DENSITY	Percent + Mass Remaining	22.6666661957255555555555555555555555555555555555	–				1
AL DROPLET P	Initial + Diameter (microns)	20000000000000000000000000000000000000		see text)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	:
OF THE INITIA	Cumulative Percent	10.28 89.33 10.58 10.59 86.53 10.55 10 10.55 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		Reference 7 (odel		Androne and .
CALCULATION	Observed Density (g/m3x105)		0.006 g/m	reported in	vaporation m		
TABLE 4.	Correction Factor*	111 410,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,0	IOTAL:	rect masses	el droplet e		
	Median Diameter (microns)	300 250 300 255 250 11 160 1150 1150 2550 2550 2550 2550 2550 255	-	used to cori	ted with fu		-
	CPS Channel	られまででのののようられらい いたまでに		* factor	t calcula		

.1

100 C

ALCON STREET

100 4 Ξ

1111 ~~ 1410 ~~ 1-1

المعالمين من المراجع المراجع المراجع عنه، ومن المراجع عنه، من عنه المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع الم وقد من من المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع عليه المراجع عليه المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع الم

al had all a

dentation of the

The resulting mass balance at all three altitudes is shown in Table 5. The ratio of the calculated initial mass density to the nominal density, based on a plume diameter of 100 meters, ranges from 0.6 to 1.8, with an average of 1.1. The composite initial distribution for all ten encounters is shown in Figure 8 ("This Report - Corrected"). This distribution differs from the initial distribution derived by AFGL only in the smaller droplet diameter range. Where they differ, the AFGL distribution is probably the more accurate for two reasons: first, the AFGL distribution is based on data obtained by all three spectrometers, not just the CPS; and second, AFGL used a more sophisticated method of background subtraction to obtain the corrected droplet counts than that used by MRI in Reference 7.

The total initial density derived by AFGL was only 0.010 grams per cubic meter, compared to an average of 0.046 derived here. However, the curves of initial droplet density versus diameter in the AFGL report (Reference 8) are consistent with the results obtained here. For example, the initial droplet density curve in the AFGL report for the fuel dumps at 1500 meters rises from 1.5×10^{-3} grams per cubic meter at 100 microns to a maximum of 8.3×10^{-3} grams per cubic meter at 350 microns, and then falls to around 1×10^{-3} grams per cubic meter at 500 microns. From Table 4, the corresponding densities are 1.7×10^{-3} grams per cubic meter at 100 microns, 4.7×10^{-3} grams per cubic meter at 340 microns, and 1.41×10^{-3} grams per cubic meter at 500 microns. The discrepancy, then, only appears when these droplet density curves are integrated to obtain the total liquid density.

	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9 (2019 ALC) 78 7.2 (7)	تحديق في المعالم المرابع المعالم الم	220 (A) -> +4 (A)	Mighton and Arabi	Here on the actual	1995)	N7 - 200-000	
	··	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
	<u>Overall</u>	 1		0•001 15	0.046	1+1	·····	170	510	
	6000 meters	8	7	0•007 26	0•026	0 •9		110	560	
SITY CALCULATIO	3600 meters	8	Ţ	0.011	0.074	1•8		150	250	
ROPLET MASS DEN	1500 meters	۰ ۰ ۰ ب	ý	0•006 14	0•043	1•0	·	175	5 30	
TABLE 5. SUMMARY OF DI	Altitude:	Number of encounters:	Typical ambient temperature (C): 3	Observed liquid density (g/m ⁻): Calculated percent mass remaining when sampled:	Calculated initial liquid density (g/m^3):	Ratio to nominal density:	Mass median diameters (microns)	- measured:	- initial:	
							31			

in the second

As can be seen from Table 4, in the process of correcting for evaporation the significance of the actual instrument channel width is lost, and the question of what "bin size" to use in the integration arises. The analysis performed here was able to simply add the results for each channel of the CPS. Since the AFGL analysis was based on three overlapping spectrometers with different channel widths, it was necessary to perform the integration analytically. To accomplish this, expressions for the droplet density as a function of diameter (D) were fit to the curves. Based on discussions with the AFGL project officer, these expressions were then divided by D and integrated, yielding the total of 0.010 grams per cubic meter. The usual procedure would be to divide the density function by the bin size (if it were known) rather than by D. If the density functions from Reference 8 are integrated and divided by an "effective" bin size of 30 microns (from inspection of Table 4), the total initial liquid density becomes 0.088 grams per cubic meter. This alternative calculation is somewhat arbitrary, but the resultant density is more in line with the results in Table 5, and the proper way to arrive at an effective bin size for this case is not known. At any rate, the observed droplet mass densities, based on CPS data, appear to be within expectations.

As shown in Figure 9, the initial fuel droplet size distribution obtained for the KC-135 in this study agrees very well with the distributions reported by Cross and Picknett (Reference 6). The smaller droplet size distribution found by AEDC (Reference 5) is



evidently not representative of full scale jettisoning by aircraft. The agreement with Cross and Picknett's results is even more -remarkable if the possible effect of evaporation on their results is considered. As mentioned earlier, Cross and Picknett could never account for more than 55 percent of the jettisoned fuel. To

investigate the extent of evaporation, they measured the concentration of dye in the spots on the filter paper and compared this with the amount of dye added to the fuel. On one trial it appeared that drops initially 117 microns in diameter had evaporated to 100 microns before being sampled, but they were unable to confirm this result in two subsequent trials. They therefore concluded that no significant evaporation took place. However, a change in size from 117 to 100 microns amounts to the loss of 40 percent of the droplet's mass. Therefore, to further examine the possibility of evaporation, the fuel droplet evaporation model was run for the conditions of their experiment.

Since Gross and Picknett's study was performed in August in England, an ambient temperature of 25°C was assumed. To simulate the relatively non-volatile Avtur fuel used in their study, a composition based on analyses of JP-8 and Jet A-1 was input to the model instead of the synthetic JP-4 composition shown in Table 1. The model was then run starting with the fuel droplet size distribution found for the KC-135. For a release height of 15 meters, the model predicts that approximately 40 percent of the fuel will have evaporated before it reaches the ground. The predicted droplet distribution at the ground is shown in Figure 9 ("KC-135

Distribution - After 40 Percent Evaporated"). Although the mass median diameter of the distribution is not significantly altered by the evaporation, the relative contribution from smaller droplets is greatly reduced. Thus allowing for the possibility of evaporation in Cross and Picknett's experiment not only accounts for their missing mass, but also reduces the difference between their distribution and the distribution observed in this study. Based on the agreement between these two studies it is postulated that the distribution obtained for the KC-135 aircraft is representative of most other aircraft as well.

3.3.2 ANALYSIS OF VAPOR MEASUREMENTS

The average hydrocarbon vapor concentrations measured during long passes through the fuel dumps were a factor of two to three below the levels calculated assuming 80 percent evaporation of the fuel and a plume diameter of 100 meters. Since the droplet measurements have been shown to be consistent with both of these assumptions, the discrepancy is probably due to some deficiency in the vapor measurements. Therefore, the adequacy of the technique used was re-examined.

The instrument used to obtain the hydrocarbon measurements was a Century Portable Organic Vapor Analyzer (OVA) Model 108. This instrument features a logarithmic scale covering the range from 1 to 10,000 parts per million and a response time under two seconds. For use in this study an in-line carbon filter was removed from the inlet hose and the inlet hose was then positioned in an

ambient air inlet on the skin of the aircraft. A reverse flow inlet was used to avoid sampling particulates larger than 60 microns. Also, to assure continuous operation of the OVA's flame ionization detector at the altitudes included in this study, it was necessary to increase the hydrogen supply pressure from 8 pounds per square inch to 15 pounds per square inch. Surprisingly, this modification resulted in about a ten-fold increase in response to methane standards.

Before the in-flight sampling program was performed, the OVA was calibrated in an altitude chamber at each of the planned altitudes. Aluminum clyinders containing three concentrations of methane in dry air were used: 10, 102.4, and 1054 parts per million. These standards were transferred to polyethlyene bags for sampling. These studies indicated a reduction in response of approximately 20 and 40 percent in going from sea-level to 3600 and 6000 meters, respectively. However, actual in-flight calibration with the same standards indicated much more severe reductions in response: 73 percent at 3600 meters and 96 percent at 6000 meters. The contractor assumed this difference was due to the low ambient temperatures encountered during the in-flight sampling. Therefore this "temperature effect" was incorporated into the OVA calibration equation.

- Asial 🕆 - Inclair an Arthough all

Lit. Abili

The relative response of the OVA to JP-4 vapor was determined by injecting a known amount of JP-4 liquid into a plastic bag and allowing the J-P4 to evaporate. In calculating the concentration

thus obtained, the contractor unfortunately used an incorrect value for the density and mean molecular weight of JP-4. Instead of 0.92 grams per milliliter and 170 grams per mole, the contractor should have used 0.76 grams per milliliter and 127 grams per mole. However, the effects of these two errors partially cancel and the overall effect is to raise the concentrations reported in Reference 7 by only 9 percent. The relative response of the OVA to JP-4 vapor, as determined by the above method, is 92 percent of the response to methane.

After the sampling program, when it was found that observed hydrocarbon vapor levels had been less than expected, possible explanations for the discrepancy were studied. Although the actual instrument used in the in-flight sampling was no longer available, an identical OVA Model 108 was obtained and tested. A relatively flat response to hydrocarbons of varying molecular weight was verified, eliminating any concern about differences between the composition of the vapor sampled in flight and that produced during the calibration. The increase in response reported by the contractor when the hydrogen supply pressure was raised was also reproduced. However, the decrease in response with temperature suggested by the contractor to explain the difce between the in-flight and altitude chamber calibration fr. results was not found. The response of this second OVA to methane and propane standards was unaffected by lowering the ambient temper le from 23°C to 2°C. Of course, this does not completely exclude the possibility that the instrument used by MRI did indeed possess a temperature dependence.

The in-flight calibrations were performed by filling plastic bags from the standards in aluminum cylinders. The OVA inlet hose was then removed from the air inlet on the skin of the aircraft and introduced into the bag. If, as suggested by the contractor, the response of their OVA was a function of temperature, then the inflight calibration would not be completely accurate. Although the sampling aircraft's heater was not on, the warming effect of the personnel and equipment on board would tend to keep the interior of the aircraft well above ambient temperatures, particularly at the higher altitudes where outside temperatures were below 0°C. Thus the response of the instrument to the standards inside the aircraft would be greater than its response to the JP-4 vapor outside where it was colder. This effect would then explain the failure to observe the anticipated vapor levels. On the other hand, if the response of the OVA was not affected by temperature, as was the case for the second OVA studied later, then there is no explanation why the response of the OVA during in-flight calibration was so much lower than during the altitude chamber runs. In this case it could only be assumed that some unidentified instrument malfunction occurred, compromising the in-flight measurements.

3.3.3 EFFECT OF IGNORING THE WAKE IN THE MODEL

During the first few minutes after being jettisoned, fuel droplets are subject to the complex forces present in the aircraft wake. Therefore, the droplets are not in "free-fall" until the wake dissipates. The fuel droplet evaporation and free-fall model,

however, assumes that from the start gravitational settling is the only force acting on the droplets. Nevertheless, this model was used to estimate the evaporation which occurred during the first few minutes before the droplets were sampled, in order to arrive at an initial droplet size distribution. It is reasonable then to question the propriety of ignoring the effect of the wake in the model. This question will be considered from two viewpoints: first, the empirical evidence for the sufficiency of the model is given; and second, the theoretical basis for this sufficiency is suggested.

From the standpoint of using the model to predict the later history of the fuel droplets, the accuracy of the calculated initial distribution is of secondary importance. Since the model that was used to work backwards from the observed distribution at 90 seconds to an initial distribution is the same model used to obtain the later predictions, the purpose of obtaining an initial distribution is only to assure that the model passes through the observed distribution and mass remaining at the obervation time. After this point the droplets are essentially in free fall and the model assumptions are valid. The calculated fuel droplet distributions at 90 seconds (the typical observation time) for the three altitudes included in this study are compared in Figure 10 with the experimentally observed distributions. The calculated initial distribution is also shown for contrast. At all three altitudes the agreement is considered satisfactory. The percentage of mass remaining at 90 seconds calculated by the droplet evaporation





model for the 1500, 3600, and 6000 meter cases is 12, 15, and 30 percent, respectively. The corresponding observed values, based on a nominal dump rate of 330 grams per meter and a plume diameter of 100 meters at 90 seconds, were 14, 26, and 17 percent. Once again, this rough agreement is considered satisfactory, given the variability of the experimental results.

In order to explain the apparent similarity of droplet evaporation in the wake and in free-fall, it is necessary to consider the forces involved in each case. As discussed in Appendix A, the rate of evaporation of a droplet is the product of the vapor pressure of its components, the surface area available for evaporation, and the mass transfer coefficient. The mass transfer coefficient depends in part on the droplet's terminal yelocity, which is determined by the external forces acting on the droplet. Whether the droplet is experiencing the wake vortex or just gravitational settling, an equilibrium is reached between the forces accelerating the droplet and the drag resisting its motion. This equilibrium determines the droplet's terminal velocity and thus, indirectly, its evaporation rate. During free-fall the acceleration is simply that due to gravity, or 9.8 meters per square second. For a stable orbit in the wake, the centripetal acceleration is V^2/r , where V is the angular velocity in the wake, and r is the orbit radius. This stable orbit is maintained by the strong influx of air being entrained into the growing vortex.

TABLE 6. ESTIMATION OF TYPICAL DROPLET ACCELERATION IN WAKES

Aircraft	Orbit	Angular	Centripetal
	Radius	Velocity	Acceleration
	(meters)	(m/s)	(m/s ²)
DC-6B (wake age = 25 sec	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 4 \\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 12 \end{array}$	8 4 3 3 2	64 4 1.5 1.1 0.3
C-141 (wake age = 10 sec	2) 2 4 6 8 12	15 11 7 6 5 3	225 60 12 6 3 0.8
C-141	2	5	12
(older wake)	14	3	

Table 6 shows typical values of acceleration that a droplet can experience in an aircraft wake (Reference 9). The aircraft shown are roughly the same size and weight as a KC-135, and therefore the wake energies should be similar. Although the range of acceleration appears large, the net effect on the droplet evaporation rate is small. If the droplet evaporation calculations in Appendix A are carried out using the centripetal accelerations from Table 6 instead of the gravitational acceleration (g), the resulting evaporation rates range from 0.6 to 2.1 times the rate for free-fall, with typical values lying near unity. In other words, the average environment experienced by fuel droplets while in the aircraft wake does not significantly alter their evaporation rate from that which occurs during simple gravitational settling.

Ignoring the aircraft wake does substantially underestimate the initial fall rate of the droplets, however. From windshield splash encounters and radar records the initial fall rate of the fuel droplets was around 150 centimeters per second, but after approximately 100 seconds the observed fall rate had reduced to around 35-50 centimeters per second (Reference 8). The faster initial fall rate is due to the downward force of the aircraft wake. Thereafter, the droplets are in free-fall and the observed fall rate is consistent with the predictions of the model for droplets on the order of 120 to 160 microns in diameter. Thus, ignoring the wake effect only underestimates initial droplet fall-rates, and the overall error of about 100 meters is not significant for most uses of the model.

Ę

3.4 GROUND-LEVEL SAMPLING

In parallel with the in-flight sampling program, a separate program of ground-level sampling was also performed. Whereas the purpose of the in-flight sampling was to measure the initial fuel droplet size distribution, the ground-level sampling was designed to determine whether any of the jettisoned fuel reached the ground in significant concentrations, either as vapor or liquid. For this purpose 18 sampling stations were set up in a two-mile square grid, as shown in Figure 11. Several of the low-altitude fuel dumping sorties for the in-flight sampling were positioned so that the fuel would reach the ground in the area of the sampling grid. Air samples were obtained with small diaphram pumps, using



charcoal adsorption tubes to collect any hydrocarbons present. The hydrocarbons were later desorbed from the charcoal in the laboratory and analyzed by gas chromatography.

The positioning of the fuel dumps was excellent, and in all cases personnel on the ground at the sampling grid were able to smell JP-4 vapor approximately 13 minutes after release. However, none of the ground observers were ever able to detect any sign of liquid fuel at ground-level. These observations, which are for fuel dumped approximately 750 meters above the ground at temperatures around ll°C, substantiate the prediction of the fuel droplet evaporation and free-fall model that under such conditions essentially all of the fuel will evaporate before it reaches the ground.

3.4.1 PREDICTED CONCENTRATION AND LOCATION OF THE FUEL AT THE GROUND

Four ground-sampling runs were performed in all. During the second in-flight sampling sortie on 6 December, ground samples were obtained for fuel dumps 2/1 and 2/3 (using the notation from Reference 8). On 10 December, fuel dumps 3/2 and 3/3 were sampled together and a final dump, which will be referred to as 3/7, was performed (with the boom down) for the ground-level sampling alone. The winds and temperatures at the time of the sampling are shown in Table 7.

Date and Local Time	Altitude (meters, MSL)	Temperature (C)	Wind Direction (degrees)	Wind Speed (m/s)	
6 Dec, 1430	1500 1200 900 725 *	7.5 8.4 12.7 15.4	62 65 53 45	7.3 5.0 4.0 3.5	
10 Dec, 1300	-1500 1200 900 725*	4.5 7.1 11.1 14.3	61 72 72 70	8.5 7.0 4.5 3.0	

*local ground-level

TABLE 7. ATMOSPHERIC CONDITIONS DURING GROUND-SAMPLING STUDIES

Based on a Gaussian dispersion model, the maximum concentration of fuel at ground-level can be expected to occur when the vertical standard deviation (σ_z) of the fuel cloud is equal to 0.707 H, where H is the height of the release above the ground (Reference 10). In this case H is 775 meters, making the desired σ_z 548 meters. For a sunny winter day in Southern California with surface winds around 3 meters per second, the atmospheric stability category is probably B or C. From Reference 10, for stability B-C, σ_z will equal 548 meters when the plume has been blown approximately 7 kilometers downwind, and at this point the width of the central plume at the ground will be at least 1500 meters. That is, the maximum concentration of fuel at ground level will occur 7 kilometers downwind of the aerial dump location.

Figure 11 shows the aerial location of each of the fuel dumps and the predicted location of the maximum ground-level concentrations for each. The locations of the ground imprints were determined

by integrating the effects of the wind direction and speed from the release height to the ground. The maximum ground imprints for the fuel dumps performed on 10 December cross the northwest corner of the sampling grid. The maximum ground concentrations for the fuel dumps performed on 6 December fall beyond the grid. However, initial contact of the fuel cloud with the ground would occur well before the point where the maximum concentration was reached. Therefore, some of the fuel could be expected to reach the sampling grid, as is supported by the ability of personnel in the sampling area to smell JP-4 after each dump.

Based on the fuel droplet evaporation and free-fall model, the fuel will have been more than 99 percent evaporated before it reaches the ground. Nevertheless, the droplets that still remain are predicted to reach the ground after about 20 minutes. For the wind profiles shown in Table 7, in 20 minutes the droplets will be blown roughly 7 kilometers downwind. Thus the maximum ground imprints shown in Figure 11 are indicative of droplet impact as While the fuel dumps on 10 December are better positioned well. to look for the predicted maximum ground impact, those on 6 December serve as a check for anomalously high ground contamina-If the fuel were to reach the ground sooner than expected, tion. either from slower evaporation leading to faster fall rates or from an unexpected mechanism mixing the fuel to the ground prematurely, much greater ground impact would result. However, in this event, the early ground-fall could be detected in dumps 2/1 and 2/3.

The highest ground concentrations which can be anticipated for these fuel dumps can be calculated following the procedure from Reference 10:

 $Xmax = Q/\pi\sigma_V\sigma_Z Ue$

Where	Q =	the emission rate
· ·	=	56 kilograms per second
с. 	σ y =	the horizontal standard deviation
	-	730 meters at 7 kilometers
	σ ₂ =	the vertical standard deviation
	=	548 meters at 7 kilometers
	U =	the windspeed (here the aircraft speed)
	=	175 meters per second

The maximum concentration calculated in this way is 0.11 milligrams per cubic meter, which is equivalent to 0.021 parts per million of JP-4, or 0.19 parts-per-million-carbon (ppmC). The duration of this concentration at a sampling point depends on the length of the fuel plume and the rate at which the wind sweeps the plume past the sampling point. The longest imprint of a fuel plume on the sampling grid is about 3 kilometers. For a surface wind of 3 meters per second, the duration would be roughly 17 minutes. The shortest sampling times used in this study were around 30 minutes. Therefore, the highest time-weighted average concentration that could be obtained with the charcoal tubes is predicted to be on the order of 0.1 ppmC.

3.4.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUE

Small diaphragm pumps of the type used for personnel monitoring were used to draw air samples through standard charcoal sampling tubes. The sampling rate of each pump was calibrated to 1.0 liters per minute using a soap-bubble burette. The pumps were started before, or within ten minutes after, the fuel was jettisoned, and were allowed to run until approximately 30 minutes after the jettisoning. On 10 December, background samples were also obtained before any fuel had been jettisoned.

The hydrocarbons adsorbed on the charcoal were analyzed by gas chromatography. The technique used to transfer the hydrocarbons from the charcoal to the gas chromatograph is shown in Figure 12. The charcoal tube was flushed with inert gas and was heated to approximately 200°C in a heater block to desorb any hydrocarbons present. The desorbed hydrocarbons were trapped in a sample loop cooled to liquid nitrogen temperatures before the inert gas stream was vented to the atmosphere. To analyze the sample, the gas flow through the sample loop was diverted into the chromatograph, while the sample loop itself was heated with a hot air gun to revolatilize the trapped hydrocarbons. The hydrocarbons were then separated on a Porapak-Q micro-column programmed from 50° to 240°C at 5°C per minute. The flame ionization detector response was output to an electronic integrator to provide quantification.

Standards containing 13 ppmC of JP-4 vapor were prepared by injecting 0.5 microliters of liquid JP-4 into a 50 liter bag and allowing the fuel to vaporize. A typical gas chromatogram is





shown in Figure 13a. The three major peaks have retention times of approximately 60, 240, and 860 seconds. The response and standard deviation for the calibration runs are shown in Table 8. Due to the excessive variability of the peak at 860 seconds, this peak was not used to quantify the experimental results.

TABLE 8. CALIBRATION OF HYDROCARBON ANALYSIS

	Response (area/ppmC/liter)
Total Area:	110 <u>+</u> 12
Major Peaks	
60 seconds: 240 seconds: 860 seconds:	$\begin{array}{r} 24 + 4 \\ 31 + 9 \\ 11 + 8 \end{array}$

The results for the four ambient backgrounds collected on 10 December appear in Table 9. Three of these samples resembled Figure 13b. Note that all of the major peaks for JP-4 are also present in ambient air. The background taken at T4 had several additional peaks, notably ones at 180, 210, 430, and 730 seconds. Many of the samples collected during the ground-sampling on both 6 and 10 December contained these additional peaks, and they were also present in ambient air samples collected in the Los Angeles basin as well as near the flightline at Tyndall Air Force Base. A typical chromatogram is shown in Figure 13c. It appears that these additional peaks may be indicative of hydrocarbon pollutants from automobile and aircraft exhaust. Their appearance in some of the ground samples on 6 and 10 December could be due to the



42 Z Sin



exhaust from the trucks used to get between sampling stations. The background in the Los Angeles basin calculated for the peaks of interest is also shown in Table 9. Fortunately, although the presence of these additional hydrocarbons does of course increase the total hydrocarbon concentration, it does not appear to affect the peaks at 60 and 240 seconds. These two peaks were therefore used to analyze the ground-sampling results.

Sampling	Background	Concentration	(ppmC) Bas	ed On:
Location	Total Area	<u>Peak_60</u>	Peak 240	<u>Peak 860</u>
Tl	0.70	0.70	0.43	1.07
T2	0.63	0.42	0.29	2.15
T4*	3.46	1.06	0.37	4.62
T7	1.19	1.15	0.50	3.86
Average	1.50	0.83	0.40	2.93
Pasadana	* +	0.20	0 53	13.35

TABLE 9. AMBIENT BACKGROUND SAMPLES

*includes additional peaks associated with automobile exhaust.
tintegrator overflow

3.4.3 ANALYSIS OF SAMPLING RESULTS

The results of the four sampling runs are summarized in Table 10. Only on the last run were concentrations greater than the background obtained. From the negative results on 6 December we can conclude that there is no evidence for the premature arrival of the fuel at the ground and the increased ground concentrations which would result. The fact that higher concentrations were observed on the second 10 December run but not the first may be due to the difference in sampling times. While all the other samples and backgrounds were obtained over 30-50 minutes, the

samples for the first run on 10 December were collected for 90 minutes in order to encompass two fuel dumps. However, later studies indicated that increasing sampling time from 50 to 90 minutes decreased the apparent concentrations by roughly a factor of three. This decrease is probably due to saturation of the charcoal or displacement of the hydrocarbons by other compounds in ambient air.

TABLE 10. SUMMARY OF GROUND-SAMPLING RESULTS

	-			
	Background	Concentrati Total Area	on (ppmC) <u>Peak 60</u>	Based On: Peak 240
6 December - fuel dump average: maximum:	p 2/1	0.57 1.02	0.18 0.25	0.14 0.24
<pre>6 December - fuel dump average: maximum: 10 December - fuel dum</pre>	p 2/3 np 3/1	0.35 0.75	0.26 0.26	0.37 0.37
and 3/2 average: maximum:	nn 2/7	0.62 0.98	0.45 0.77	0.19 0.37
average: maximum:	μ Γ ΣΥ (2.04 4.79	1.77 3.15	0.53 1.09

The chromatogram for station T4 obtained in the final run is shown in Figure 13d. The quantitative results from this run for all of the stations are listed to Table 11. Here the average background levels from Table 9 have been subtracted out. Concentrations greater than the variation of the background have been underlined for emphasis. Depending on the peak used, concentrations on the order of several tenths of a ppmC or even as high as 2 ppmC were seen at several sampling stations. The highest

Station	Total Hydrocarbon Concentration (ppmC)	JP-4 Concentration (ppmC) Based on:		
Background:	1.5 ± 2.0 [†]	$0.8 + 0.4^{\dagger}$	reak 240	
Sample minus b	ackground:		0.4 - 0.1	
- TO	ан тара тара на	0.4		
T2 T3*		0.8	-	
T4*		1.6	0.1	
T6*	1.8	2.0	0.4	
T7*	1.3	1.8	0.3	
T8*	3.3	2.4	0.7	
T9*	1.3	1.2	0.2	
T12	1.0	0.4		
T13	~	-	-	
T14	0.2	1.2	<u>0.15</u>	
T15*	-	0.6	-	
T16	-	-	0.1	
T17	-	1.4	0.2	
•m , t , e	-	0.2	-	
Trotal range of 1	background samples.			
*Sample includes	additional species associat	ted with pol	luted at-	
NUTE: Underlined	concentrations are great.		ver atl.	

۰. ·

55

.

that is within the

- 6

.*

and the second and the second

:

results were obtained along the western edge of the sampling grid (T4-T8), but positive results were also seen along the centerline (T16 and T13). These observations indicate that the wind direction probably shifted slightly from the time it was measured (13:00) to the time of the last fuel dump (15:15). It is interesting that some stations saw concentrations well above the expected levels while adjacent stations saw nothing. This variation is probably due in part to the non-uniformity of the fuel dump plume after the vortex structure begins to break-up and fold on itself under the influence of large scale atmospheric eddies. The overall results are felt to be in general agreement with expectations, demonstrating that only minimal concentrations of fuel vapor are reached at the ground, even for very low altitude releases.

SECTION IV

PREDICTED GROUNDFALL OF JETTISONED JP-4

Coupling the fuel droplet evaporation and free-fall model with the experimentally determined initial size distribution, it is now possible to predict the fate of fuel jettisoned under differing circumstances. In all cases these predictions apply only for jettisoning of JP-4 fuel, although estimates for other fuels will be provided where possible. Atmospheric dispersion, which is not considered in the droplet model, will also be treated in order to fully describe the physical fate of the fuel.

4.1 FRACTION OF THE FUEL REACHING THE GROUND

Figures 14 and 15 show the percentage of JP-4 fuel which can be expected to reach the ground before evaporating, based on the release altitude and the temperature at ground-level. These curves indicate that except for very low altitude releases, the fraction of fuel reaching the ground as liquid droplets is primarily determined by the temperature. For JP-4 fuel jettisoned higher than 1500 meters and at temperatures above freezing (0°C), more than 98 percent of the fuel should evaporate before reaching the ground. For less volatile fuels, such as the Air Force's JP-8, commercial Jet-A, or the Navy's JP-5, much more of the fuel will reach the ground as liquid droplets than would be the case for JP-4 under the same conditions. Preliminary calculations suggest that the percentage of JP-8, Jet-A, or JP-5 reaching the ground at, for



UNA TALKS



example, 0° C would be somewhat between the curves for JP-4 at -20°C and -40°C in Figure 14.

Figure 16 compares the fuel droplet size distribution for the KC-135 ("Good - Corrected") which was used in these calculations, with the smallest experiment distribution obtained for the Buccaneer ("Cross and Picknett - Experimental") and the suggested larger distribution for other aircraft ("Cross and Picknett -Composite") from Reference 6. These distributions probably represent the range of droplet sizes that can be expected for most aircraft. The effect of these different distributions on the predicted amount of liquid fuel reaching the ground is shown in Figure 17. Also shown are the predictions for a single droplet whose diameter is equal to the mass median diameter of the KC-135 distribution (270 microns). The difference between the predictions based on the KC-135 distribution and those obtained with the other aircraft distributions is generally less than 40 percent. That is, the ground-fall of fuel from different aircraft should not vary more than 0.6 to 1.4 times the estimates shown in Figures 14 and 15. The surprising agreement of the predictions for a single droplet at the mass median diameter with those for the whole distribution indicates that the central tendency or spread of the droplet sizes is relatively unimportant for determing the composite evaporation and free-fall of the distribution.

In addition to experimentally determining an initial droplet size distribution for fuel jettisoning, Cross and Picknett also estimated the fraction of fuel reaching the ground as a function of




Figure 17. Effect of Initial Droplet Size Distribution on the Percent of Fuel Reaching the Ground

in division

release height and temperature (Reference 6). Their estimates were based on the droplet modelling results of Lowell (Reference 2) for a fall of 300 meters. Unfortunately, to model release heights greater than 300 meters they calculated the evaporation during successive 300 meter intervals by assuming that the droplets would follow the same curve of percent evaporation versus diameter used for the first 300 meters. However, as discussed in Section 2.2 of this report the evaporation of a fuel droplet changes not only due to its decreasing diameter, but also due to its changing composition. The more volatile components are stripped away in the early evaporation, leaving only the slower evaporating components in the droplet. By ignoring composition changes Cross and Picknett grossly underestimated the fraction of fuel reaching the ground for release heights of greater than 300 meters; therefore, their predictions cannot be used.

4.2 OTHER MODEL PREDICTIONS

As can be seen in Figure 18, the vast majority of the fuel evaporates in the first few minutes after release. For fuel released at 1500 meters when the ground-level temperature is above freezing, less than 10 percent of the fuel remains after 10 minutes. During this short time interval even the largest droplete only fall 700-900 meters, and most of the vapor is generated within a few hundred meters of the release height. The implication of these calculations for dispersion modeling is that the fuel dump can be





64

entered between

approximated as an elevated vapor source at the release height without seriously degrading the accuracy of the estimated groundlevel concentrations. This approximation was used for the dispersion calculations in this report.

Due to the different settling velocities of droplets with varying diameters, not all of the liquid fuel reaches the ground at the same time. Two examples of the time spread over which liquid fuel reaches the ground from 1500 meters are shown in Figure 19. At a ground-level temperature of -20°C, 10 percent of the fuel reaches the ground in liquid form. The largest droplets, on the order of 300 microns, reach the ground in less than 20 minutes. Most of the unvaporized fuel reaches the ground during the first hour after release, but a significant fraction takes much longer.

Raising the ground-level temperature reduces the fraction of fuel reaching the ground in liquid form, and also delays the onset of ground-fall. Although increasing the release altitude above 1500 meters does not substantially lower the fraction of liquid fuel reaching the ground, it greatly increases the time required for the droplets to reach the ground. The time of fall for the first droplets to reach the ground at several altitudes and temperatures is shown in Table 12. These predictions of the fuel droplet model can be approximated by the formula T = NH, where T is the time of fall in minutes, H is the release height in kilometers, and N is 18, 12, and 10 minutes per kilometer for ground-level temperatures of 0°C, -20°C, and -40°C, respectively. These results can be used

TIME OF FALL FOR THE FIRST DROPLETS TO REACH THE GROUND TABLE 12.

A STATE OF A

Average Fall Rate (Minutes/ Kilometer)	115 20 12 20	128833	01110 001100 001000
Time of Fall (Minutes)	103 60 29 16	65 37 11 3.5	74 30 9.30 .03 .03
Maximum Droplet Diameter (Microns)	151 154 173 202 267	286 288 301 359	381 381 389 424
Release Altitude (Kilometers)	۵. ۱. ۵. ۳. ۵.	u o o o u u u u u u	۵ ۳۰ ۳۰۰ ۳۰۰
Ground-Level Temperature (C)	o	-20	04-

6**6**

A State State of State

to estimate the effect of winnowing by the wind on the dispersion of the fuel.

For a ground-level temperature of -20°C, slightly over 10 percent of the fuel released at 1500 meters will reach the ground as droplets. The different size droplets will be distributed in time, as indicated by the upper scale in Figure 19. This same distribution is shown on a linear scale in Figure 20. The modal diameter at -20°C is 190 microns. For a ground-level temperature of 0°C evaporation is more complete, and the modal diameter at the ground is less than 100 microns.

The composition of the fuel droplets which reach the ground is no longer the same as that of the JP-4 fuel which was jettisoned. The more volatile, lower molecular weight components will have evaporated off, leaving a residual mixture of the higher molecular weight components. A typical composition for a distribution of droplets which has evaporated to 10 percent of the original mass is shown in Table 13. As can be seen in this table, the final droplet composition resembles kerosene rather than JP-4, in that it is composed chiefly of hydrocarbons having a molecular weight greater than 150 grams per mole.

4.3 DISPERSION OF THE FUEL

Ł

Once the fraction of fuel reaching the ground in liquid form has been determined, the fate of the liquid and vapor fractions can be investigated separately. The next step in assessing the environmental consequences of a jettisoning incident is to estimate the





TABLE 13. RESIDUAL COMPOSITION OF FUEL DROPLETS AFTER 90 PERCENT OF THE ORIGINAL MASS HAS EVAPORATED

A: 1-4

Component	Original Percent <u>Droplet</u>	Percent of Remaining of Mass Component	Percent of Initial Droplet Mass	Percent of Fina Droplet	l Mass
iso-pentane	3.2	0	-	-	
iso-hexane	7.1	Ō	-	-	•
cyclohexane	2.2	0	-		
benzene	0.3	0	-		
3-methylhexane	.8.6	0		-	
methylcyclohexane	7.3	0	-		
toluene	0.8	0	. 🖿	-	
4-methylheptane	9.4	0	-	-	
cis-1, 4-dimethyl-					
cyclohexane			····		
m-xylene	1.8	0			-
4-methyloctane	8.7	0	-	-	
isopropyl-					-
cyclohexane	4.6	0.3	0.01	0.1	
1-ethy1-2 methy1-					
benzene	2.8	1.6	0.05	0.5	
2,7-dimethyloctane	7.0	1.0	0.07	0.7	
p-methane (cis)	3.9	4.2	0.17	1.6	
p-cymene	2.1	7.4	0.15	1.5	:"
napthalene	0.3	46.4	0.13	1.3	
undecane	4.7	26.9	1.59	12.6	
3-methylbutyl-					
cyclohexane	2.7	27.0	0.73	7.1	
3-methylenedecalin					
(trans)	4.0	31.0	1.26	12.3	
1-buty1-3-methy1-				_	
benzene	1.2	35.4	0.45	4.4	
1-methylnapthalene	0.3	66.8	0.18	1.7	
dodecane	2.8	48.3	1.36	13.3	
3-ethylbutyl-		-			
cyclohexane	1.3	42.9	0.55	5.4	
1,3,5-triethyl-		-	· · ·	-	
benzene	0.6	47.0	0.27	2.6	
2,3-dimethyl-					
napthalene	0.3	78.9	0.21	2.0	
tridecane	1.1	63.2	0.71	6.9	
3-isopropylbutyl-					
cyclohexane	0.4	55.7	0.24	2.3	
3.5-diethyl-1-					
propylbenzene	0.1	61.6	0.07	0.7	
tetradecane	0.2	73.8	0.15	1.5	
pentadecane	0.1	81.4	0.08	c. 8	
perhydro-		·	·····	~ ~ ~	
phenanthrene	2.2	86.7	1.96	19.1	
residual	0.2	99.8	0.16	1.6	

extent to which the fuel vapor and droplets are dispersed prior to reaching ground-level.

4.3.1 VAPOR DISPERSION

Since most of the fuel jettisoned from an aircraft will evaporate within a few hundred meters of the release height, the concentration of hydrocarbons at ground-level is primarily determined by the ability of atmospheric diffusion processes to transport the vapors downward. The highest ground-level concentrations will be obtained under unstable atmospheric conditions, since the vertical transport is then a maximum. The longest exposures will occur when the fuel is jettisoned parallel to the wind.

The gradient-transfer (K) theory of atmospheric diffusion can be used to estimate the "worst-case" vapor concentrations at the ground. According to K theory, the vertical spread of a plume (as measured by its standard deviation, σ_z) can be related to the vertical component of the atmospheric eddy diffusivity, K_z , by the formula $K_z = \sigma_z^2/2T$, where T is the time since release (Reference 11). A profile of eddy diffusivity in the mixing layer (Reference 12) shows that K_z is generally less than 100 square meters per second, even under relatively unstable conditions. For a Gaussian plume profile, the maximum ground concentration is reached when $\sigma_z = 0.707$ H, where H is the release height. Using a value for K_z of 100 square meters per second to represent strong vertical mixing, the time at which the maximum ground concentration is reached

is given by Tmax = $\sigma_z^2/2K_z = H^2/400$. Expressing T in minutes and H in kilometers, this formula becomes T = $40H^2$.

The horizontal spread (σ_y) of the plume during this period can be estimated by $\sigma_y = 0.5t$ (Reference 13). This value provides a good fit to experimental data on σ_y for plume travel periods from 1-100 hours (Reference 11). Assuming that the highest concentrations in the plume occur over a width W = $2\sigma_y$, the width of the plume at the time the maximum ground-level concentrations are reached is W = $H^2/400$. For W and H in kilometers, W = $2.4H^2$. Using a simple box model and ignoring upward diffusion of the plume, we can then conservatively estimate the ground concentration with the formula X = 1000Q/VWH, where X is the concentration in micrograms per cubic meter, Q is the jettison rate in kilograms per second, and V is the aircraft velocity in meters per second. Substituting for W from the formula derived above yields X = $400Q/VH^3$. The predications of this box-model for several fuel jettisoning scenarios are shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14. WORST-CASE GROUND-LEVEL VAPOR CONCENTRATIONS

Release	Aircraft	Jettison	Maximum Groun	nd-Level
Height	Velocity	Rate	Concentration	n (ug/m ³)
(kilometers)	(m/s)	(kg/s)	K-Theory/Box	<u>Gaussian</u>
• 3	175	17	1439	298
• 775	175	56	275	147
1.5	175	5	3.4	3.5
6		56	0.6	0.4

An alternative technique for estimating the worst-case concentrations of vapor at ground-level is to rely solely on a

Gaussian diffusion analysis (Reference 10). In this case the maximum ground-level concentration is given (as in Section 3.4.1) by X = Q/ $\pi\sigma_y\sigma_z$ Ue, where normally U is the windspeed, but here U = V. Then assuming $\sigma_v = \sigma_z$ (true within a factor of two for moderately unstable atmospheric conditions), $X = 2Q/\pi eVH^2$. For X in micrograms per cubic meter, Q in kilograms per second, and H in kilometers, this formula bedcomes $X = 276Q/VH^2$. The predictions of this Gaussian model are also shown in Table 14. The two models agree for a release height of 1.5 kilometers and diverge elsewhere. The theoretical basis for the two models is quite different: the Gaussian model is most valid for low altitudes, whereas the K-theory box-model applies best to high altitudes near the top of the mixing layer. Thus the two analyses are complimentary. As a means of comparison with a more exacting model, the Environmental Protection Agency's "Point-Area-Line" (PAL) computer dispersion model (Reference 14) was run for the case in Table 14 for 1.5 kilometers. Under moderately unstable conditions (stability category B) with a windspeed of 2 meters per second, the highest ground-level concentration predicted by the PAL model was 8.5 micrograms per cubic meter, in reasonable agreement with the two simplified approximation techniques.

4.3.2 DROPLET DISPERSION

At temperatures below freezing the fraction of fuel reaching the ground as liquid droplets can become significant. As in the case of fuel vapor, however, natural atmospheric dispersion would

reduce the droplet density at the ground. For jettisoning parallel to the wind, the droplets would be spread over nearly as wide a path as the vapor: $W = 2.4H^2$, where W and H are in kilometers. Therefore, the maximum liquid fuel contamination of the ground, C, (in milligrams per square meter) would be given approximately by the formula C = 10PQ/(VW), where P is the percentage of fuel reaching the ground in liquid form from Figure 14 or 15.

For jettisoning in any direction other than parallel to the wind, the droplets would be further separated by the process of winnowing: as the dr. let are carried along by the wind the larger droplets fall factors and are deposited sooner (closer to the jettisoning location) than the smaller droplets, which tend to be transported more like the vapor. The distance in kilometers that the fuel will be carried downwind before reaching the ground is given by L = 0.06UT, where U is the average windspeed (in meters per second) between the jettisoning altitude and the surface. and T is the time of fall in minutes. As stated earlier, $T = 40H^2$ for the vapor, while for the largest droplets T = NH, where N is 18, 12 and 10 minutes per kilometer at 0°C, -20°C, and -40°C, respectively. Therefore, for fuel jettisoned crosswind, the droplets will be spread by winnowing over a distance $W = 0.06U(40H^2 - NH)$. Several cases comparing jettisoning parallel and perpendicular to the wind are shown in Table 15. Generally, the average liquid-fuel ground contamination is reduced by a factor of three to four when jettisoning crosswind.

TABLE 15. EXAMPLES OF LIQUID FUEL CONTAMINATION OF THE GROUND

Aircraft: Airspeed (m/s): Jettison Rate (kg/s): Release Height (km): Ground-Level Temperature (C): Windspeed (m/s):	<u>F-4</u> 175 5 1.5 0 5	<u>F-111</u> 175 17 1.5 0 5	<u>FB-111</u> 175 17 6 -20 3	<u>KC-135</u> 175 50 6 -20 4	F-111 175 17 • 3 20 4
Parallel to Wind: Width at Ground (km): Concentration (mg/m ²):	.08	-28	90 •09	90 • 27	•2 3•1
Perpendicular to Wind: Width at Ground (km): Concentration (mg/m ²):	19 •02	19 .08	250 •03	330 • 07	.2 3.1

75

WATER HELEN

and the second second

Standard Barristin and State

and a second second

SECTION V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A computer model has been developed which simulates the evaporation and free-fall of fuel droplets in the atmosphere. This model gives good agreement with evaporation rates of fuel droplets measured experimentally. A study of fuel jettisoning by a KC-135 tanker aircraft was performed to obtain a fuel droplet size distribution for input to the model. The droplet size distribution was measured directly in flight, but only after significant evaporation was known to have occurred. The observed droplet sizes were therefore corrected for evaporation using the fuel droplet evaporation model. Correcting the observed droplet mass densities for evaporation, all of the jettisoned fuel was accounted for. The original distribution thus obtained has a mass median diameter of 265 microns with a maximum droplet size of around 500 microns. During this study, sampling was also performed at ground level to determine whether the jettisoned fuel reached the ground in significant concentrations. For fuel jettisoned as low as 750 meters above the ground at temperatures around 11°C, no liquid fuel could be detected by ground observers and no significant hydrocarbon concentrations (greater than a few ppmC) were measured by the sampling.

Based on the fuel droplet evaporation and free-fall model, more than 98 percent of JP-4 fuel will evaporate before reaching the ground if jettisoned higher than 1500 meters when the ground-level

temperature is above freezing. The droplets and vapor will be widely dispersed by atmospheric turbulence, quickly resulting in a fuel density too low to create any perceptible environmental changes. The formulas and graphs in Section IV can be used to estimate the likelihood of significant ground-level concentrations of fuel vapor or liquid following a specific fuel jettisoning incident.

This report has dealt only with the short-term physical fate of the jettisoned fuel. The possible longer-term fates of the fuel vapor in the atmosphere are discussed in Reference 1. Since the vapor is quickly dispersed and diluted below the levels at which it could be harmful in itself (around 500 ppm), its environmental impact derives principally from its role in the production of photochemical oxidant pollution (ozone and smog). Studies of this role are currently in progress. The possible long-term fate of any liquid fuel which reaches the ground is also under study, with particular emphasis on the chemical and biological fate of the hydrocarbons in an aqueous environment. When these studies are completed the overall environmental consequences of fuel jettisoning can be determined.

REFERENCES

- 1. Clewell, H. J., "Fuel Jettisoning by US Air Force Aircraft. Volume I: Summary and Analysis," ESL-TR-80-17, March 1980. (Unclassified)
- 2. Lowell, H., "Free Fall and Evaporation of JP-4 Jet Fuel Droplets in a Quiet Atmosphere," NASA-TN-D-33, 1959. (Unclassified)
- 3. Lowell, H., "Free Fall and Evaporation of JP-1 Jet Fuel Droplets in a Quiet Atmosphere," NASA-TN-D-199, 1960. (Unclassified)
- 4. Dawbarn, F., Nutt, K. W., and Pender, C. W., "A Study of the Jettisoning of JP-4 Fuel in the Atmosphere," AEDC-TR-75-49, November 1975. (Unclassified)
- 5. Wasson, R. A., Darlington, C. R., and Billingsly, J. C., "Droplet Diameter and Size Distribution of JP-4 Fuel Injected into a Subsonic Airstream," AEDC-TR-74-117, April 1975. (Unclassified)
- 6. Cross, N. L., and Picknett, R. G., "Ground Contamination by Fuel Jettisoned from Aircraft," AGARD CP-125, 1972. (Unclassified)
- 7. Merritt, M. J., "Fuel Dump Plume Characterization," (Volume I and II), AFGL-TR-77-085, March 1977. (Unclassified)
- 8. Good, R. E., Forsberg, C. A., and Bench, P. M., "Breakup Characteristics of JP-4 Vented from KC-135 Aircraft," AFGL-TR-78-0190, August 1978. (Unclassified)
- 9. Donaldson, C. duP, Snedeker, R. S., and Sullivan, R. D., "Calculation of the Wakes of Three Transport Aircraft in Holding, Takeoff, and Landing Configurations and Comparison with Experimental Measurements," AFOSR-TR-73-1594, March 1973. (Unclassified)
- 10. Turner, D. B., "Workbook of Atmospheric Dispersion Estimates," Environmental Protection Agency Publication #AP-26, 1970. (Unclassified)
- 11. Slade, D. H., editor, <u>Meteorology and Atomic Energy -- 1968</u>, US Atomic Energy Commission/Division of Technical Information, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, July 1968. (Unclassified)
- 12. Pasquill, F., "The Dispersion of Material in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer -- The Basis for Generalization," <u>Lectures on</u> <u>Air Pollution and Environmental Impact Analysis</u>, Boston, <u>Massachusetts</u>, <u>American Meteorological Society</u>, 1975. (Unclassified)

- 13. Telegadas, K., "Estimation of Maximum Credible Atmospheric Radio - Activity Concentrations and Dose Rates from Nuclear Tests," <u>Atmospheric Environment</u>, Volume 13, Number 2, 1979. (Unclassified)
- 14. Petersen, W. B., "User's Guide for PAL -- a Gaussian-Plume Alogrithm for Point, Area, and Line Sources, " EPA-600/4-78-013, February 1978. (Unclassified)

والأسريكين أنهرافها التراري سيمرس كمناقله فالأساع الهلب المارات

at diff a dia.

e tra hikkedt a sa araa taa

- B-1. US Standard Atmosphere, 1976, NOAA-S/T76-1562, 1976. (Unclassified)
- B-2. Pasion, A., and Thomas, J., "Preliminary Analysis of Aircraft Fuel Systems for Use with Broadened Specification Fuels," NASA-CR-135198, 1977. (Unclassified)
- B-3. Lowell, H., "Free Fall and Evaporation of JP-4 Jet Fuel Droplets in a Quiet Atmosphere", NASA-TN-D-33, 1959. (Unclassified)
- B-4. Lowell, H., "Free Fall and Evaporation of JP-1 Jet Fuel Droplets in a Quiet Atmosphere," NASA-TN-D-199, 1960. (Unclassified)
- B-5. Dawbarn, F., Nutt, K. W., and Pender, C. W., "A Study of the Jettisoning of JP-4 Fuel in the Atmosphere," AEDC-TR-75-49, November 1975. (Unclassified)
- B-6. Bird, R. B., Stewart, W. E., and Lightfoot, E. N., <u>Transport Phenomena</u>, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, 1966. (Unclassified)
- B-7. Perry, R. H., and Chilton, D. H., <u>Chemical Engineers' Hand-</u> book, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973. (Unclassified)
- B-8. Mackay, D., and Matzugo, R. S., "Evaporation Rates of Liquid Hydrocarbon Spills on Land and Water," <u>Can J Ch Eng</u>, pp. 434-439, 1973. (Unclassified)

APPENDIX A

EFFECT OF DROPLET TEMPERATURE CALCULATIONS IN THE FUEL DROPLET EVAPORATION MODEL

The evaporation rate of a fuel droplet depends in part on the vapor pressure of its components at the droplet temperature. As described in Appendix B, the fuel droplet model performs an energy balance to derive the steady state droplet temperature. This energy balance considers heat transfer by conduction with the air, absorbtion and emission of radiation, solar insolation, and evaporative cooling. In addition the model calculates an initial droplet temperature higher than that of the ambient air, assuming equilibration of the fuel in the tank with the skin of the aircraft before release. The model could be greatly simplified by eliminating these calculations and assuming instead that the droplet temperature is always equal to to the temperature of the ambient air. Therefore, it is worthwhile to investigate the importance of the energy balance and initial droplet temperature routines.

The effect of these two calculations on the droplet temperature is shown in Figure A-1. Due to the dominant effect of evaporative cooling in the energy balance, the droplet cools appreciably below the ambient air temperature during the initial moments when the highly volatile components are being stripped away. However, the combined effects of solar insolation and heat conduction from the air rapidly restore the droplet to the ambient temperature when



evaporation slows. The entire droplet cooling and warming cycle lasts less than a minute in most cases. The assumption of an initial droplet temperature above ambient tends to delay and partially offset the maximum cooling effect, but does not eliminate it. Figure A-2 shows the resulting variation in the droplet evaporation rates. Although assuming an initial droplet temperature above ambient produces a larger change in instantaneous evaporation rate, the opposing effect of the energy balance is of longer The net effect on the predicted mass remaining in the duration. droplet as a function of time is shown in Figure A-3. The raised initial temperature causes the droplet mass to fall off much more rapidly at first, but evaporative cooling quickly counters this effect, and after the first few seconds the droplet mass is greater than it would be if both effects were ignored. Regardless of the calculations used, the droplet mass remaining is essentially the same after the first minute. The reason the three different calculations come back together after initially diverging is that the changing composition of the droplet is a factor in the evaporation rate. For example if the droplet is made to evaporate more slowly, its composition will include more of the volatile components. Then when the restraint on evaporation is removed the more volatile composition of the droplet will accelerate its evaporation, counteracting the effect of the earlier restraint.

The primary conclusion which can be drawn from these results is that for predictions of droplet evaporation over periods greater



than one minute, the droplet temperature can be assumed to be identical to the ambient air temperature. Only for predictions of the droplet evaporation rate and history during the first minute are the energy balance and initial droplet temperature calculation important.

APPENDIX B

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE FUEL DROPLET MODEL

The fuel droplet evaporation and free-fall model breaks a given droplet's fall into a series of small time intervals. The distance of fall during each interval is calculated assuming the droplet is falling at the terminal velocity for its current diameter, density and altitude. Loss of mass through evaporation is calculated assuming Raoult's law; that is, each component evaporates independently. An energy balance routine adjusts the droplet temperature to allow for evaporative cooling, radiation, conduction and insolation effects. The new droplet composition, mass, and altitude are used as initial conditions for the next interval. This stepwise approximation continues until the droplet impacts on the ground or loses 99.9 percent of its initial mass.

The initial conditions which must be known are the droplet's original composition, altitude and diameter; the temperature and altitude at local ground level; and the aircraft's air speed. The initial droplet temperature is then taken as the corresponding stagnation temperature, assuming equilibration of the fuel tanks with the skin of the aircraft. In the early intervals the droplet is allowed to cool through evaporation until an energy balance is achieved.

At the beginning of each interval, the droplet's current mass composition and altitude are known. (For the first interval, the mass

is determined from the droplet's diameter and density; calculation of the latter is discussed below). The local air temperature is derived from the droplet altitude and the temperature at the ground using the standard lapse rate of 6.5 K/km. Atmospheric pressure, density, and viscosity are then calculated as recommended in the US Standard Atmosphere, 1976 (Reference B-1):

$$P_a = P_o (T_o/T_a) (gM_a/R_oL)$$

where $P_a =$ the local atmospheric pressure (N/m²)

 $P_o = atmospheric pressure at sea level = 101325 N/m^2$

 $T_o = sea level temperature (K)$ $T_a = local air temperature (K)$

g = acceleration of gravity = 9.81 m/s^2

 M_a = molecular weight of air = 28.96 kg/kmol

 R_{o} = universal gas constant = 8314 N^{*}m/K^{*}kmol

L = standard lapse rate = 0.0065 K/m

$$\rho_a = P_a M_a / R_o T_a$$

where ρ_a = the local air density (kg/m³)

$$\mu_{a} = \frac{1.458 \times 10^{-6} T_{a}^{1.5}}{110.4 + T_{a}}$$

where $\mu_a =$ the local air viscosity (N.s/m²) For the first interval the droplet temperature is assumed to be

at the equilibrium temperature of the aircraft fuel tanks, which is approximately the stagnation temperature corresponding to the aircraft velocity and local air temperature (Reference B-2). The stagnation temperature, T_s (K), can be calculated from the true air speed, V (m/s), and the local air temperature:

 $T_s = T_a (1 + V^2 / 5C_s^2)$

where C_s is the local speed of sound (m/s) calculated as in Reference B-1:

 $C_s = (1.4 R_0 T_a / M_a)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ The density, P_i (kg/m³) is calculated for each component in the mixture using a linear expansion coefficient:

 $\rho_1 = \frac{20}{\rho_1} / (1 + 0.001 (T_d - 293.15))$

where ${}^{20}\rho_1$ = the component's density at 20C (kg/m³)

 T_d = the droplet temperature (K)

An expansion coefficient of 0.001 was chosen to give the best fit for a variety of hydrocarbons. Assuming an ideal solution, the droplet's volume is then a sum of its components.

The droplet terminal velocity, $U_t(m/s)$ is determined following the method of Lowell (References B-3 and B-4): A parameter "q" (equivalent to Lowell's $\phi^{1/2}$) is defined:

 $q = \text{ReC}_{D} \frac{V_{2}}{2} = (4\rho_{a}\rho_{d}gd^{3}/3\mu_{a}^{2})^{\frac{1}{2}}$

where Re = the Reynolds number of the system C_D = the drag coefficient ρ_d = the droplet density (kg/m³)

d = the droplet diameter (m)

An empirical relation between q and Re is then used to find Re:

$$\ln Re = -3.13 + 2.06 \ln q - 0.083(\ln q)^2$$

This relation was chosen to fit the AEDC data (Reference B-5) for Reynolds numbers over 100, while agreeing with Stoke's law (Re = $q^2/24$) for Re < 1. A plot showing the success of this fit is presented in Figure B-1. The droplet terminal velocity is then:

 $U_t = \mu_a \text{Re}/d\rho_a$

and the distance the droplet falls during the interval is approximated by the product of U_t with the duration of the interval, $\Delta t(s)$.

The evaporation of a falling single-component drop is treated in Bird, Stewart, and Lightfoot (Reference B-6). To treat the multicomponent fuel droplet the contribution from each component is calculated separately assuming independent transport and ignoring any internal resistance:

$$\Delta m_{i} = \pi d^{2}h_{i}p_{i}\varepsilon_{i}\Delta t$$

縠

where Δm_i = the mass of component "i" evaporated during the time Δt (kg)

- $h_1 =$ the mass transfer coefficient for the component (s/m)
- p_i = the true vapor pressure of the component (N/m²)
- ϵ_i = the mole fraction of the component in the droplet



The component vapor pressure is calculated using a modified Antoine equation:

 $\ln p_{i} = 20.53 - 2899/(385.15 T_{d}/T_{b,i} - 62.3)$

where $T_{b,i}$ = the normal boiling point of component "i" (K) The constants is this equation were obtained by using 3,3-dimethylhexane as a reference compound. This single Antoine equation can be used for all of the components through the use of the Ramsey-Young Relation, which states that for similar substances (e.g. hydrocarbons) the ratio of the temperatures at which the substances exert equal vapor pressures is the same for any vapor pressure. As used in the Antoine equation, the relation takes the form:

 $T_r = T_{b,r}(T_d/T_{b,i})$

where T_r is the temperature at which the reference compound (3,3-dimethylhexane) will have the same vapor pressure that component "i" has at the droplet temperature, and $T_{b,r}$ and $T_{b,i}$ are the normal boiling points of the reference compound and component "i", respectively. Table B-1 compares the vapor pressure predicted in this manner with experimental vapor pressures for several fuel components (from Reference B-7). The agreement is generally within 10 percent.

The mass coefficient is a function of the component's diffusivity, D (m^2/s) , the Schmidt number, Sc, and the Nusselt number, Nu:

TABLE B-1. COMPARISON OF EXPERMENTALAND CALCULATED VAPOR PRESSURES

		Vapor Pressure (Pa)		
Compound	Temperature(K)	Experimental	Calculated	Calc/Exp
	<u>^</u>	1000	1107	0.00
n-pentane	223	1333	1197	0.90
n-pentane	201	13332	13400	1.01
n-pentane	309	101325	103039	1.02
1so-nexane	214	133	109	0.02
1so-nexane	243	1333	1241	0.93
1so-nexane	284	13332	13594	1.02
cyclohexane	228	133	138	1.04
cyclohexane	257	1333	1326	0.99
cyclohexane	299	13332	13462	1.01
benzene	236	133	292	2.20
benzene	262	1333	1925	1.44
benzene	299	13332	13990	1.05
2-methylhexane	233	133	128	0.96
2-methylhexane	264	1333	1367	1.03
2-methylhexane	307	13332	13702	1.03
methylcyclohexane	237	133	98	0.74
methylcyclohexane	270	1333	1204	0.90
toluene	246	133	123	0.92
toluene	280	1333	1429	1.07
4-methylheptane	253	133	151	1.14
4-methylheptane	285	1333	1420	1.07
dimethylcyclohexane	254	133	113	0.85
dimethylcyclohexane	288	1333	1253	0.94
m-xylene	266	133	145	1.09
2,7-dimethyloctane	279	133	139	1.05
cis-decalin	296	133	- 94	
diethylbenzene	294	133	147	0.71
napthaline	326	133	255	1,92
undecane	306	133	180	1,35
triethylbenzene	321	133	184	1.38
tridecane	333	122	206	1.55
isopropylnanthal(ne	240	122	154	1.16
rochrobly ruch and all	עדע			T + T O

91

and a state of the state of the

$$D_{1} = \frac{2.66 \times 10^{-5} T_{F}^{2} \left(\frac{1}{M_{1}} + \frac{1}{M_{a}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{Pa (V_{b}^{1/3} + 0.31)^{2}}$$

where $T_F =$ the temperature of the evaporating film (K) = $1/2(T_a + T_d)$ $M_i =$ the molecular weight of compound "i" (kg/kmol) $V_b =$ the molar volume of compound "i" at its normal boiling point

$$= M_{i} (1 + 0.001 (T_{b,i} - 293.15))/20 P_{i}$$

 $Sc_{i} = \mu_{a} / (\rho_{a}B_{i})$ Nu_{i} = 2 + 0.6 Re^{1/2} Sc_{i}^{1/3} h_{i} = Nu_{i}D_{i}M_{i} / (dR_{o}T_{a})

The equation for the diffusivity is derived from the one given in Bird, Stewart, and Lightfoot by using a typical value of the Lennard-Jones function, Ω , for hydrocarbon-air pairs at 273K and including the functional dependence of Ω on $T_F^{-1/2}$ (in the temperature range of interest) explicitly. The error introduced by these approximations is estimated to be less than 10 percent. A comparison of experimental and predicted diffusivities for several pure hydrocarbons is shown in Table B-2.

As the droplet falls it cools through evaporation and heat transfer until it is accommodated to the local air temperature. The mass lost through evaporation is included in a total energy balance equation (Reference B-8) to determine the new droplet temperature:

TABLE B-2, COMPARISON OF EXPERMENTAL AND CALCULATED DIFFUSIVITIES

:

Compound	Temperature(K)	Diffusiv Experimental	ity $(m^2/s \times 1)$ Calculated	06)
n-hexane 2,3-dimethylbutane methylcyclopentane cyclohexane cyclohexane benzene toluene n-octane n-octane 2,2,4-trimethylpentane ethylbenzene mesitylene propylbenzene n-decane napthalene dodecane diphenyl	288 288 288 288 318 273 273 303 273 303 273 303 273 273 273 273 363 273 399 273	7.6 7.5 7.6 7.6 8.6 7.7 7.6 8.8 5.0 7.1 7.1 6.6 5.6 4.9 8.4 5.1 8.1 6.1	6.9 7.0 7.4 7.5 9.0 7.2 6.5 8.0 5.3 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 8.4 5.9 9.2 5.0	0.91 0.93 0.97 0.99 1.05 0.94 0.86 0.91 1.06 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.91 0.98 1.14 1.00 1.16 1.14 0.82

 $Q = \pi d^{2} \Delta t (e_{a} \sigma T_{a}^{4} + 1/4(1-a)L + k(T_{a}-T_{d}) - e_{d} \sigma T_{d}^{4}) - \Delta H_{v} \Delta m$ where e_{a} = the emissivity of air = 0.75 e_{d} = the emissivity of the droplet = 0.95 σ = the Stefan-Boltzmann constant $= 5.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ J/s} \cdot \text{m}^{2} \cdot \text{K}^{4}$ a = the droplet albedo = 0.14 L = the solar insolation rate $(J/m^{2} \cdot \text{s})$ k = the heat transfer coefficient $(J/m^{2} \cdot \text{s} \cdot \text{K})$ $= k_{a} (2 + 0.6 \text{ Re}^{1/2} \text{Pr}^{1/3})/d (\text{Reference 6})$ where k_{a} = the thermal conductivity $(J/m^{*} \text{s} \cdot \text{K})$ Pr = the Prandtl number

 $\Delta H_{\rm r}$ = the latent heat of vaporization (J/kg)

The values chosen for e_a , e_d , and a are those recommended in Reference B-8. For most calculations a fairly high solar rate of 1000 watts per square meter is used since the fuel droplets are released at high altitude. The thermal conductivity and Prandtl number at the evaporating film are essentially those of air, and these were approximated from tabular data by the expressions:

 $k_a = 0.024 (1 + 0.0034 (T_a - 273.15))$ $Pr = 0.713 (1 - 4.6 \times 10^{-4} (T_a - 273.15))$

From inspection of the heats of vaporization for a range of individual hydrocarbons as well as JP-4 itself, it was determined that in the temperature range of interest (-40° to +40°C), ΔH_V can be approximated quite well by the linear formula:

$$\Delta H_v = 3.7 \times 10^5 (1 - 0.0013 (T_d - 273.15))$$

Once Q has been calculated, the amount, T(K), that the droplet cools during the interval is simply:

 $T = Q/m_d C_p$ where m_d = the droplet mass (kg) C_p = the droplet heat capacity (J/kg/K)

The heat capacity of petroleum fuels can be estimated by (Reference B-7):

 $C_{p} = 4.84 (181 + 0.8 T_{d})/\rho_{d}$

The new droplet temperature, mass, composition, and height are then used as the initial conditions for the next interval. This process continues until the droplet has accommedated itself to the ambient air temperature. The steady-state difference, $\Delta T'$ (K), between the droplet temperature and the air temperature is determined by setting Q equal to zero and solving for $\Delta T'$ using the Newton-Raphson iterative method. The droplet temperature thus obtained is compared with the droplet temperature which was assumed for the evaporation calculations and if the discrepancy is greater than 0.5K the interval is rerun using the new value of T_d . This step is repeated until a self-consistent droplet temperature is obtained.

A flow chart of the model is shown in Figure B-2.



.

State of the

2

· · · · ·

Figure B-2. Flow Chart of Fuel Droplet Model

APPENDIX C

FUEL DROPLET PROGRAM

The FORTRAN IV computer program developed to simulate the evaporation and free-fall of a fuel droplet is listed in this appendix. The variable names used in the program are described in Table C-1 which follows the listing.

Contraction of the second second
С		PROGRAM FREFAL (INPUT+OUTPUT+TAPF7=INPUT+TAPF6=OUTPUT) SIMULATES THF FREE FALL AND EVAPORATION OF FUEL DROPLETS REAL M(40)+MD+MEV(40)+MI+MULES+MOLF(40)+MR(40)+MREL+MS+MSAVE(40)+ 2MSTEP+MW(40)+NUM+NUM1+NAM2+NAM3 DIMENSION DENS(40)+PCV(40)+TB(40)+VC(40)+K(9)+PCT(50)+PCR(40)+
с		22 34(9) SET CONSTANTS NMAX=10000 TMAX=500000. RMMIN=.005 DMMIN=10. DHMAX=100. EA=.75 ED=.95 ALB=.14
С	100 105	RS=1000. INPUT COMPOSITION READ(7,10) NCOMP IF(EOF(7)) 330,105 WRITE(6,5) DO 110 I=1,NCOMP READ(7,20) NAM1,NAM2,NAM3,PCV(I),MW(I),TB(I),DENS(I) WRITE(6,30) I,NAM1,NAM2,NAM3,PCV(I),MW(I),TB(I),DENS(I) T9(I)=TB(I)+273,15 DENS(I)=1000.*DENS(I) DCEB=1,4(I)+2001*(IM(I)=293,15))
c	110	VC(I)=MW(I)/(DENS(I)+DCFB) READ(7,25)K K CONTAINS THE LIST OF COMPONENT NUMBERS TO BE PRINTED OUT
c		READ(7,31)IND IND=1 FOR SINGLE DROP, 0 FOR DISTRIBUTION
С		IF(IND.EQ.1) GO TO 122 INPUT_DISTRIBUTION (MULTIPLE DROPLET CASE)
	115	READ(7,32)NB+DD+DX IF(EOF(7))330+116 DEAD(7,34)/DET(1)+7-1-NB)
	110	WRITE(6,36) D0 118 I=1.NR WRITE(6,38)DD,PCT(I)
с	118	DD=DD+DX DMAX=DD-DX DMIC=DU DSAVE=DU INPUT CASE TO BE RUN (MULTIPLE DROPLET)
•	120	READ(7,40)HI.HG.TG.V IF(EOF(7)) 330,121
	121	IF(V.€Q.0.) V=175. WRITE(6,50)DX.HI,HG.TG.V WRITE(6,51) WRITE(6,55)K WRITE(6,56) GQ TQ 130
С	122	ÎNPUT CĂŠE TO HE RUN (SINGLE DROPLET) READ(7,42) DMIC,HI,HG,TG.V
	123	IF(EOF(7)) 330,123 WRITE(6,44) DMIC,HI,HG,TG WRITE(6,46) K WRITE(6,48) TMAY=40000
С	130	INITIALIZE VARIAHLES TO=TG+.0065*HG+273.15 IF(V.EQ.0.)V=175. J=1
	132 137	TOT=0. DO 132 I=1.NCOMP PCR(I)=0. DI=.000001*DMIC D=DI H=HI T=HSTEP=MSTEP=MI=UT=0.
		TSAVE=-1. TDONF=0

TSTEP=1. NPAS=1 TA=T0-.0065+H CS=20.+SURT(TA) DISAV=-TA+V+V/CS/CS/5. TSTEP=1. Yest: 0006*H CS:20.*500T(TA) TSTEP: 140YOYCS/CS/S. DTEDTEAM TECTOR DENSA: 10026*H Partol: 35.*(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 100354.*FA/TA:*TA**1.5 TTE: 5(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 10054.*FA/TA:*TA**1.5 TTE: 5(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 10054.*FA/TA:*TA**1.5 TTE: 5(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 10054.*FA/TA:*TA**1.5 TTE: 5(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 10054.*FA/TA:*TA**1.5 TTE: 5(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 10057.*FA/TA:*TA**1.5 TTE: 5(TA/TO)**5.256 DENSA: 10057.*FA/TA**1.5 DENSA: 10057.*FA/ C C С С С Ĉ C

IF DONE + PRINT TOTALS AND CHECK FOR ANOTHER CASE WRITE(6+70)TOT WRITE(6+75)(I+PCR(I)*PCV(I)*DENS(I)*DCFD/DENSI/100+I=1+NCOMP) DU=DSAVE DMIC=DU G0 TO 120 SINGLE DROPLFT PRINTOUT WRITE(6+80)T/60++H+DMIC+UT+MREL DO 219 I=1+9 KK=K(I) PMR(I)=MR(KK) C 216 C 218 KK=K(I)
219 PMR(I)=MR(KK)
WRITE(6+81)(PMR(I)+I=1+9)
WRITE(6+82)DT
IF DONE+ CHECK FOR ANOTHER CASE (SINGLE DROPLET)
IF(IDONE+GE+1) GO TO 325
CALCULATE FREE FALL AND EVAPORATION
220 G=SGRT((4+*DENSA*DENSD*9+8*D**3)/3+)/VISCA
OL N=ALOG(D) С C QLN=ALOG(Q) REY=EXP(-3.13+2.06*QLN-.083*QLN*QLN) UT=VISCA*REY/(D*DENSA) HSTEP=UT*TSTEP MSTEP=0. DO 225 I=1+NCOMP DIFY=2.56E-5*SQRT(1./MW(I)+.0345)*TF*TF/(PA*(VC(I)**(1./3.)+.31)** 12) NUM=2.*.6*SQRT(REY)*(VISCA/(DENSA*DIFY))**(1./3.) HM=NUM*DIFY*WW(I)/(8314.34*D*TA) PV=EXP(20.53-2899./(35.15*TD/TB(I)-62.3)) MEV(I)=3.1416*D*D*HM*PV*MOLF(I)*TSTEP MS=MEV(I) IF(MS.GT.M(I)) MS=M(I) 225 MSTEP=MSTEP+MS NPAS=NPAS+1 IF(NPAS.LE.NMAX) GO TO 230 INONE=2 SKIP HEAT BALANCE IF CALCULATING DROPLET COOLING 230 IF(IDS.EQ.1)GO TO 234 CALCULATE STEADY-STATE TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE OLDT=DT 125 C CALÇULATE QLDT=DT C CALCOLATE STEADY-STATE TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE OLDT=DT TKA=.024+8.1F-5*(TA-273.15) PR=.713-3.3E-4*(TA-273.15) NUH=2.*.6*SORT(REY)*PR**(1./3.) HH=TKA*NUH/O DHVAP=3.7E5*(1.-.0013*(TD-273.15)) 231 DTNW=5.67E-8*EA*TA**4-5.67E-8*ED*TD**4.25*(1.-ALB)*RS+HH*DT-DHVAP 1*MSTEP/(3.1416*D*D*TSTEP) TB=TD+DTNW/(HH+2.7E-7*ED*TD**3) IF (A8S(TA-DT-TD).LE..1) GO TO 232 DT=TA-TD GO TO 231 232 IF(ABS(TA-DT-TD).LE..5)GO TO 234 DT=(TA-TD+OLDT)/2. GO TO 140 234 DT=(TA-TD SKIP DROPLET COOLING AFTER STEADY-STATE TEMPERATURE IS REACHED IF (IDS.EG.2)GO TO 236 IF (OT.GT.DTSAV)GO TO 236 SET INDICATOR THAT DROPLET COOLING IS NO LONGER NEEDED IOS=2 GO TO 240 C C IDS=2 GO TO 240 RESTORE DT AND SET INDICATOR TO CALCULATE DROPLET COOLING IDS=1 DT=DTSAV GO TO 140 CALCULATE DROPLET COOLING AND RESET INDICATOR TO HEAT BALANCE C 236 C CALCULATE DHUPLE: GOULTE IDS=0 CP=4184.*(181.**.8*TD)*VU DHVAP=3.7E5*(1.**.0013*(TD-273.15)) DCOOL=(EA*5.67E-8*TA**4-ED*5.67E-8*TD**4+.25*(1-ALB)*RS*TKA*NUH* 2DTSAV/D)*3.1416*D*D*TSTEP DCOOL=(DCOOL-MSTEP*DHVAP)/CP DTSAV=DTSAV-DCOOL DCSAV=DCOOL DT=DTSAV 238

100

4. 49/4

С	240	HALVE INCREMENT UNTIL WITHIN LIMITS IF (HSTEP.GT.DHMAX) GD TO 250
	250	ÍF(MSTĚP/MI∙LE+DMMAX) 60 TO 275 TSTEP±TSTEP/2+ USTEP:
		MSTEP=0. DQ 260 T=1.NCOMP
		MEV(I)=MEV(I)/2. MS=MEV(I)
	260	IF(MS.GT.M(I)) MS=M(I) MSTEP=MSTEP+MS TO DIA
		IF(IDS.tU.2)60 10 240 DCSAV=DCSAV/2. DTSAV=DTSAV+DCSAV
		DT=DTSAV GO TO 240
С	275	UPDATE VARIABLES WITH RESULTS FOR INCREMENT
		HEH-HSTEP JF(H,LT,HG) GO TO 310 T-TATETED
		IF(T.GE.TMAX)GO TO 321 MD=MD-MSTEP
		DO 280 I=I,NCOMP IF(MEV(I).GI.M(I)) MEV(I)=M(I)
С	280	M(I)=M(I)-MEV(I) Increase Duration of Next increment
		IF(MD/MI.GE.RMMIN) GO TO 285 IDONE=3
	285	ĞÖ TÖ 140 IF(HŞIEP-LI-DHMIN) GO TO 290
	204	IF (MSTEP/MI.LI.UMMIN) GO TO 290 GO TO 140 TETED-3 #TETED
с	290	GO TO 140 END OF CALCULATION LOOP
Ċ	310	INTERPOLATE POINT OF GROUND IMPACT
	315	IOUNE=1 TSTEP=TSTEP+FAC HSTEP=HSTEP+FAC
		MSTEP=0. DO 320 I=1.NCOMP
		MEV(Î)=MEV(I)*FAC IF(MEV(I).GT.M(I)) MEV(I)=M(I)
	320	MSTEP=MSTEP+MEV(I) M(I)=M(I)-MEV(I) T-TATETED
С		GO TO 140 INTERPOLATE POINT OF TERMINATION BY TIME
	321	
	325	GO TO 315 WRITE (6,85) NPAS
	330	.IF(IND.EQ.1) GO TO 122 GO TO 214 WENTER (AAN)
	330	STOP FORMAT(*)*.//.47X.* COMPOSITION OF SIMULATED FUEL MIXTURE *.///.19
		2X,* COMPONENT*,35X,*VOLUME*,10X,*MOL*,10X,*BOILING*,7X,*DENSITY*, 3,20X,* NUMBER*,8X,*SPECIES*,22X,*PERCENT*,8X,*WEIGHT*,8X,*PT. (C)*
	10	\$\$8X\$*G/(C\$\$/) FORMAT(12) FORMAT(21)0.49.F5.2.5X.2/F5.1.5X).F5.2)
	25	FORMAT(912) FORMAT(4 * +22X, 12, 10X, 2A10, A9, 1X, F5, 2, 10X, 2(F5, 1, 9X), F5, 2)
	31 32	FORMAT(11) FORMAT(1228×15500,5×1500)
	34 36	FORMAT(5(F5+1+5X)) FORMAT(////+56X++ DROPLET DISTRIBUTION ++///+56X++ DIAMETER++5X++W DETGUT++/+56X++ (MICHONS)++4X++PEPCENT++/)
		2CTAN11.41.401/41

ľ

A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACT OF

TABLE C-1. IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAM VARIBLES

Name Description

the state of the state of the

- ALB droplet albedo
- CP droplet heat capacity
- CS local speed of sound
- D droplet diameter
- DCFB density correction factor at boiling point

DCFD density correction factor at droplet temperature

DCOOL droplet cooling during interval

DCSAVE same as DCOOL, for use during interval halving

DD droplet diameter in microns (during input of distribution)

- DENS(I) density of component I
- DENSA density of air
- DENSD droplet density
- DENSI initial droplet density
- DHMAX maximum droplet fall during interval
- DHMIN minimum droplet fall during interval
- DHVAP heat of vaporization
- DI initial droplet diameter
- DIFY diffusivity
- DMAX diameter of largest droplet in distribution
- DMIC droplet diameter in microns
- DMMAX maximum evaporation during interval
- DMMIN minimum evaporataion during interval
- DSAVE diameter of smallest droplet in distribution

DT	difference between air and droplet temperature
DTNW	new guess for steady state droplet temperatuare
DTSAV	saved value of DT
DU	initial droplet diameter in microns
DX	diameter interval for distribution of droplets
EA	emissivity of air
ED	emissivity of droplet
FAC	fraction of interval before droplet reached the ground
Н	droplet altitude
HG	altitude at ground
нн	heat transfer coefficient
HI	initial droplet altitude
НМ	mass transfer coefficient
HS	saved value of H
HSTEP	change in altitude during interval
IDONE	flag for completion of calculation
IDS	flag for droplet cooling calculation
IND	flag for single droplet versus distribution
K(I)	number of component to be printed out in I'th position
KK	same as K(I) (during printout)
M(I)	mass of component I
MD	mass of droplet
MEV(I)	mass evaporated during interval (of component I)
MI	initial mass of droplet
MOLES	total number of moles in droplet
MOLF(I)	mole fraction of component I

.....

MR(I)	fraction of mass remaining of component I
MREL	fraction of mass remaining of droplet
MS	saved value of MD
MSAVE(I)	saved value of M(I)
MSTEP	mass evaporated during interval (of droplet)
MW(I)	molecular weight of component I
NAMI	name of component (during input and printout)
NAM2	name of component (during input and printout)
NAM 3	name of component (during input and printout)
NB	number of bins in droplet distribution
NCOMP	number of components
NMAX	maximum number of iterations
NPAS	number of iterations
NUH	Nusselt number for heat transfer
NUM	Nusselt number for mass transfer
OLDT	previous value of DT
PA	local air pressure
PCR(I)	fraction of mass remaining in droplet distribution bin I
PCT(J)	percent mass in droplet distribution bin J
PCV(I)	percent by volume of component I
PMR(I)	fraction of mass remaining of component I (during printout)
PR	Prandtl number
PV	vapor pressure
ବ	variable used to calculate Reynolds number
QLN	log of Q
REY	Reynolds number

.- **k**

• •

RMMIN	minimum fractional mass remaining of droplet
RS	solar insolation rate
T	time
TA	local air temperature
TB(I)	normal boiling point of component I
TD	droplet temperatuare
TF	temperature of evaporating film
TG	temperature at ground-level
TKA	thermal conductivity of air
TMAX	maximum time permitted
TOT	total mass reaching ground
TSAVE	saved value of time
TSTEP	duration of interval
TO	temperature at zero altitude
UT	terminal velocity of droplet
V	true airspeed of aircraft
VC(I)	molar volume of component I at its normal boiling point
VD	droplet volume
VISCA	local viscosity of air

. .

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE FUEL DROPLET PROGRAM RESULTS

This appendix presents the predictions of the fuel droplet evaportion and free-fall program for five cases involving a single droplet and for five cases involving a distribution of droplets. The assumed initial droplet composition and, for the latter cases, the droplet size distribution is shown before the first case.

107

and the second second

	12.1
90 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	0.595
СССССОО С С С С С С С С С С С С С С С С	5*282
M MM MM	.19
SPECIES ISO-PENTAME Sigo-PENTAME CYCLOHERAME CYCLOHERAME CYCLOHERAME Sigo-FENTURE SIGO-FENTUR	
CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS C	

COMPOSITION OF SIMULATED FUEL MIXTURE

DROPLET DISTRIBUTION

VE IGHT PERCENT	~0000++000000+++++++++++++++++++++++++
DJANESER (HECRONS)	●●●●●● ●●●●●● ●●●●●● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

100

AFLATYCE Image: Construction of the cons			
No No No No No No <t< th=""><th>Contract Contract Contract Contract Contr</th><th></th><th></th></t<>	Contract Contract Contr		
Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale Ale	File File <th< td=""><td></td><td>Colour Graduation Colour Graduation Colour Graduation Colour Graduation Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Langua</td></th<>		Colour Graduation Colour Graduation Colour Graduation Colour Graduation Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Language Langua
RELATIVE IN RELATIVE IN RELAT	FIGE RS.11 Z00 FIGE RS.12 Z00 FIGE RS.11 FIGE RS.12 FIGE RS.12 FIGE RS.12 FIGE RS.13 FIGE RS.12 FIGE RS.13 FIGE RS.12 FIGE RS.14 FIGE RS.12	Construction Constructin Construction Construction </td <td>Clocal Ground Level Interest Colour Contract Interes Colour Contract Interest Colo</td>	Clocal Ground Level Interest Colour Contract Interes Colour Contract Interest Colo
	Contract Contract <td< td=""><td></td><td>Local Ground Level Level</td></td<>		Local Ground Level
RELATIVE RASSING RASSI	Current	Contraction Contraction <thcontraction< th=""> <thcontraction< th=""></thcontraction<></thcontraction<>	LOCAL GROund LEVEL TENER IN RELATIVE IN LOCAL GROund LEVEL TENER IN RELATIVE IN ALTITUSE NUCRONS VELOCAT ALTITUSE NUCRONS VELOCAT ISOUND LEVEL TENER NUCRONS VELOCAT ISOUND LEVEL NUCRONS VELOCAT ISOUND LEVEL NUCRONS NUCRONS ISO
₩ 2 00000000000000000000000000000000000	Каналананананананананананананананананана	0 1 <td>LOCAL GROUND FE VILLE TE ROUND FE VILLE TE ROUND</td>	LOCAL GROUND FE VILLE TE ROUND

TOTAL NUMBER OF ITERATIONS =

أانبين المتلخظ

ومتعادية والمسركين والمعادينية

	1 (C)	ער איז
	DELTA	
	32	
	27	88888888888888888888888888888888888888
	53	
	16	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
	1	
	11	
	•	
	ENT S	
	IN COMPON	28228222222222222222222222222222222222
	RELATIVE MASS REMAININ	1966 1966 1966 1966 1966 1966 1966 1966
150	114	ວທວ⊢໙ສ−ວວ⊆໙ທ∿¢ທໍ≄ 4 4 5 ທີ⊄ທາວ⊳ ພາງ 4 2 4 6 5 ⊢ ສວ ດ 6 8 ວທວ⊢໙ສ−ວວ⊆໙ທ∿¢ທໍ≄ 4 4 5 ທີ⊄ທາວ⊳ ພາງ 4 2 4 6 5 ⊢ ສວດ ສວດ ອີດ
ONSI: TERS): TERS): RE (C):	VELOC (M/SE	0,000,000,04-00,000,040,000,000,000,000,
ameter (mICR UDE• WSL {ME ND LEVEL IME EL TEMPERATU	DI AMETER (MICRONS)	0.104N34020 BM6M34LN4LL060LLLL14M6495MMN-C88L45 N945W4444MMNNN-C6666LL041.06662LLL14M6495MMN-C88L45 NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN
HISTORY FOR INITIAL DI DUMP ALTIT LOCAL GROU GROUMD-LEV	AL TITUDE (METERSI	CCCGGGEFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGFGGGGGGGG
DROPLET	(MIN)	

FOTAL NUMBER OF ITERATIONS =

القشعب ا

2

	DELTA T (C)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	32	
	27	
	23	6666666666666666666666666666666666666
	16	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
	1	*************************************
	1	888888855588588555 8888885555855558 88885555555558 8889555555555558 88895555555555 HTT
	¢	888888853886558555555555555555555555555
	NENT 5	88888858555556688555558855555555555555
	IN COMPO	98899999999999999999999999999999999999
	RELATIVE MASS REMAINIA	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
NS): 21 (ERS): 150 (C): -21	VELOCITY IM/SEC)	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
SANETER (MJCRC AMETER (MJCRC UDE MSL (ME) ND LEVEL (ME) EL TEMPERATUR	DI ANETER (MI CRONS)	00-04-00040000000-450-00-400-500-5004000 52000-44-000000
MISTORY FOR INITIAL DI RUMP ALTIT LOCAL GROU GROUND-LEV	ALTITUDE ANETERS)	
DAOPLET	(NIN)	00000000000000000000000000000000000000

TOTAL NUMBER OF ITERATIONS =

INTORY INTORY<

TOTAL NUMBER OF ITERATIONS =

÷

д,

TOTAL NUMBER OF ITERATIONS =

at the second second

 $T_{\lambda^{i}}$

113

- .:..

	PERCENT OF TOTAL INITIAL MASS	00000000000000000000000000000000000000		
	32	80000000000000000000000000000000000000	AL MASSI	
	27		INITI	
	23		ENT OF	
	16		L PERC	
	41		OVERAL	
	11			
	60			14444 10000 10000 10000
	NENT 5			
	IN COMPO			
	RELATIVE Mass Remaining	CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC	NUMBERt	
1500. 1500. 175.	AL TUDE ERS)		NPONENT	
	ALTI ALTI (MET		RY CO	
VAL (MJCRO) MSL (METE) EVEL (METE) EMPERATURE ITY (MET/SI	ELAPSED Time (min)	00140400000000000000000000000000000000	REMAINING,	######## 00000000 •••••••
ETER INTER ALTITUDE C GROUND L ND LEVEL T AAFT VELOC	FINAL I AMETER MICRONS)	0+00-00+00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00	FLAL MASS	8 # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #
	AL TFR ONS) (1	50666655665666556665566655	NT OF INI	
	INITI DIAME (HICR	な くうどうち くららし やくうて くう とう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう くろろろろ うましょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しょう	PERCE	

Sec. 1

in San

114

DROPLET-HISTORY

	PENCENT DETITAL 18 23 27 32 INTITAL WASS	
	4	
	11	
	VENT 5	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
	COMPON	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
	RELATIVE MASS REMAINING	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
	FINAL ALTITUDE (METERS)	01140000000000000000000000000000000000
RVAL (MICRON MSL (METER ENEL (METER TEMEL (METER TEMEL TEMER CITY (MET/SE	ELAPSED Time (min)	
STORY FOR : JIAMETER INTER DUMP ALTITUDE OCAL GROUND L FROUND LEVEL J ATRCRAFT VELO(FINAL DIAMETER (MTCRONS)	₹1000000000000000000000000000000000000
OROPLET HI	INITIAL DIAMETER (MICRONS)	

ಹತ

A CALL CONTRACTOR OF A CALL CONTRACTOR

47.725

PERCENT OF INITIAL MASS REMAINING, BY COMPONENT NUMBER:

j

	PFACENT OF TOTAL INITIAL MASS		19.21
	32	660966NNJ37FJ66666666666666666666666666666666666	AL MASS:
	27	0000000-000-0000000-000000000000000000	14171
	23	90909090000000000000000000000000000000	90 IM3.
	16	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	
	4	80008000000000000000000000000000000000	OVEDAD
	=		
	60		
	VENT ₅		
	COMPO	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	
DROPLET HISTORY FOR : DIAMETER INTERVAL (MICRONS): 200 DUAMETER INTERVAL (METERS): 1500 Local Ground Level (Meters): 1500 Sround Level Temperiture(C): -20 Algeraft Velocity (Met/Sec): 175.	RELATIVE Mass Remaiving	- 000000000000000000000000000000000000	
	FINAL ALTITUDE (METERS)	0	
	ELAPSED Tive (MIN)	**************************************	
	FINAL FINAL (#[CRONS)	๛ฅ๚๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛	
	TNETTAL DIAMETER (MICRONS)	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	

PERCENT OF INITIAL MASS REMAINING. BY COMPONENT NUMBER!

0000000 000000 000000

*********** 00000000 00000000 00000000

0.000 1.2005

######## @@@@UN~#@ @@@@~#**?N@** %*******

22224 Million a set a la la contrata della Mattania di la anche settana anche settana.

	PFRCENT OF TOTAL INITTAL MASS		5: J.22	
	32	66666666666666666666666666666666666666	IAL HASS	
	27	55555555555555555555555555555555555555	TINI -	
	23	60202600000000000000000000000000000000	CENT O	
	18	6656655555665555555555555555555555555	LL PER	
	. 41		OVERA	
	11	66666 6666666666666666666666666666666		
	۲			22222 1000000
	MENT 5			
	COMPC COMPC			
	RELATIVE MASS Remaining.	NNNNA-NNNNMSM3S-N460000 606800000000NNNNNNMMM 6068000000000NNNNNNNMMM 6068000000000NNNNNNNMMM 606800000000NNNNNNNMMM 60680000000	NUMBER:	46 46 46 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88
6009 175	NAL TTUDE TERS)	04	DMPONENT	
Sec:		የባለት መሳ	. AV C	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
RVAL (MICF + MSL (MEL LEVEL (MET TEMPERATUR CITY (MET)	ELAPSED TIME (MIN)		REMAINING	######################################
CORY FOR 1 LANETER INTE MP ALTITUDE MOLA GROUND NOLA LEVEL RCRAFT VELO	FINAL DIANETER (MICRONS)	-M&F& HV&F&	NITIAL MASS	2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010
0R0#LET MIST	INITIAL DIAMETER (MICRONS)	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	PERCENT OF 1	4400 4400 4400 4400 4000 4400 4000 4400 4000000

ř

117

6
0000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000
200-10 200-10 200-10 200-10 200-10 200-10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION

Hq TAC/SGPA Hq SAC/SGPA Hq USAFE/SGB Hq PACAF/SGPE Hq AAC/SGB Hq AFLC/SGB FAA/AEQ-10 Hq TAC/DEEV Hq USAFE/DEPV AMRL/CC USAFSAM/CC ASD/CC AFOSR/CC AEDC/CC USAFRCE/WR/DEEV USAFRCE/CR/DEEV USAFRCE/ER/DEEV DTIC/DDA Hq AFSC/SGB NAPC/Code PE 71 AFK Hq AFSC/DLWM Hq AFSC/sdne Hq USAF/LEEV OSAF/M.Q OSAF/OI AFIT/LSGM AFIT/Library AFIT/DE R&D/EQ/Code 3021 OEHI./CC Hq AFESC/DEV USAFSAM/EDE Hq AFISC AUL/LSE 71-249 HqUSAFA/Library Hq AFESC/TST OL-AD/OEHL OUSDR&E Hq AAC/DEV Hq AFLC/DEPV Hq USAF/SGES EPA/ORD AMD/RDU Hq AFSC/SGPA Hq USAF/LEEVP Hq USAF/LGYF AFIT/DEM Hq ATC/DEEV

-	•• • • • • • • • •
_ 1	USAF Hosp/SGB
٦	RED /FO /DAPD ADE F
	NOU/ EQ/ DARD-ARE-E
1	Ha AFESC/RDVC
٦	
+	AND/ ADD
1	Ha AFSC/DEV
٦	HEADEAM /WAIT
-	USAFSAM/ VNL
- 2	AFGL/LKD
٦	ASDIDEP
•	
1	NEPSS
1	Ho SAC /DEV
-	
Ξ.T	HQ PACAF/DEEV
1	AMRL/THE
7	
<u> </u>	AFAFL/SFF
1	AFOSR/N
٦	
-	AEDC/DOIR
.L.	Hq MAC/DEEV
٦	AFOSB
T5.	Hq USAFE/DEVS
٦	HO MAC/SCPF
÷	
1	23 CES/DEEV
1	USCG (G-WEP-1/73)
1	
1	ng AFESU/RU
1	Ha AFESC/RDVA
٦	Army Environmental
÷	army Environmental
T	Hygiene Agency-HSE-EA
٦	OASD/(T&L)EFS
5	
1	ARPA
1	AFMSC/SGPA
٦	Ha AFPEC/DE
- <u>+</u> -	IL AFRESIDE
4	EPA/ESRL
4	O'CGDQ (MEP)
6	ng AFESC/RDV
	Ha AFESC/WE
.1	AFATL/DLODL
1	AFWL/SUL (Tech Lib)
1	AFTEC/SGB
1	
Т	ng AFRES/SGB
1	4TFW/DOV
٦	HO AFFSC /PDVCA
÷	IN AFESO/ADVCA
T	I Med Svc Wg/SGB
1	NAVFAC/Code 111
 ٦	Cham Abstract 7
<u>+</u>	onem Austracts Ser
1	NCEL/Code 15111
٦	USCG/GDD
-	
T	EPA/Corvallis
1	EPA/Athens
1	
1	ny ALC/SGRAP
1	

1

1

].

2

1

119

.

(The reverse of this page is blank)