



AFRL-RX-TY-TR-2009-4510

EVALUATION OF SUPPRESSION OF SYNTHETIC PARAFFINIC KEROSENE (SPK) FUEL FIRES WITH AQUEOUS FILM FORMING FOAM (AFFF)

Parren F. Burnette, Christopher P. Menchini, Steven P. Wells
Applied Research Associates
PO Box 40128
Tyndall AFB, FL 32403

Brent M. Pickett
Post-Doctoral ORISE Participant
139 Barnes Dr. Suite 2
Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5323

DECEMBER 2009

Interim Report for 14 February 2008 – 29 May 2008

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.**

**AIRBASE TECHNOLOGIES DIVISION
MATERIALS AND MANUFACTURING DIRECTORATE
AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY
AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND
139 BARNES DRIVE, SUITE 2
TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FL 32403-5323**

NOTICE AND SIGNATURE PAGE

Using Government drawings, specifications, or other data included in this document for any purpose other than Government procurement does not in any way obligate the U.S. Government. The fact that the Government formulated or supplied the drawings, specifications, or other data does not license the holder or any other person or corporation; or convey any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may relate to them.

This report was cleared for public release by the Air Force Research Laboratory Airbase Technologies Division Public Affairs Office and is available to the general public, including foreign nationals. Copies may be obtained from the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) (<http://www.dtic.mil>).

AFRL-RX-TY-TR-2009-4510 HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND IS APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASSIGNED DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT.

____//signature//____
R. CRAIG MELLERSKI
Work Unit Manager

____//signature//____
SANDRA R. MEEKER, DR-IV
Chief, Deployed Base Systems Branch

____//signature//____
ALBERT N. RHODES, PhD
Acting Chief, Airbase Technologies Division

This report is published in the interest of scientific and technical information exchange, and its publication does not constitute the Government's approval or disapproval of its ideas or findings.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.						
PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.						
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 11-DEC-2009		2. REPORT TYPE Interim Technical Report			3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 14-FEB-2008 -- 29-MAY-2008	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Evaluation of Suppression of Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene (SPK) Fuel Fires with Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF)				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER FA4819-07-D-0001		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER 		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 62102F		
6. AUTHOR(S) *Burnette, Parren F.; *Menchini, Christopher P.; *Wells, Steven P.; **Pickett, Brent M.				5d. PROJECT NUMBER 4915		
				5e. TASK NUMBER D1		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER 4915D11D		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) *Applied Research Associates, P.O. Box 40128, Tyndall Air Force Base, FL 32403 **Post-Doctoral ORISE Participant, 139 Barnes Dr. Suite 2, Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5323					8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER 	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory Materials and Manufacturing Directorate Airbase Technologies Division 139 Barnes Drive, Suite 2 Tyndall Air Force Base, FL 32403-5323					10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) AFRL/RXQD	
					11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) AFRL-RX-TY-TR-2009-4510	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Ref AFRL/RXQ Public Affairs Case # 09-200. Document contains color images.						
14. ABSTRACT <p>Synthetic fuels have been selected as an alternative energy source to petroleum-based fuels by the United States Air Force (USAF) and have been recently performance tested in both aircraft and ground vehicles by the USAF. Pending successful evaluation, the wide spread usage of these fuels is expected to increase throughout the military in the near future. In response to this transition, the USAF Fire Panel requested the Air Force Research Laboratory Fire Research Team (AFRL/RXQD) to evaluate the extinguishment performance of Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF) on synthetic fuel fires to aid Air Force firefighters' response to an incident. Results show that AFFF can extinguish synthetic fuel fires with the same level of success as compared to conventional fuel fires. Consequently, USAF fire protection services will not have to make significant modifications to fire fighting equipment or procedures when combating synthetic fuel spill fires.</p>						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Synthetic fuels, JP-8, Synthetic JP-8, Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene (SPK), Synthetic Diesel, Blended fuels, Shell FT-IPK, Syntroleum S-8, Syntroleum S-2						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 28	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON R. Craig Mellerski	
a. REPORT U	b. ABSTRACT U	c. THIS PAGE U			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 	

Reset

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgments	v
1.0 Summary	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Scope	1
1.3 Conclusions	1
2.0 Introduction	2
2.1 Background	2
2.2 Scope	2
2.3 Fuels Tested	2
3.0 Lab-Scale Evaluations	5
3.1 Description	5
3.2 Procedures	5
3.3 Results	6
4.0 Medium-Scale Evaluations	10
4.1 Description	10
4.1.1 Test Pans	10
4.1.2 Extinguisher and Nozzle	10
4.1.3 Firefighting Agent	11
4.1.4 Fuels Tested	11
4.2 Procedures	12
4.3 Results	14
4.3.1 Conventional JP-8 Fuel	15
4.3.2 SPK Jet Fuel	16
4.3.3 SPK/JP-8 Blended Jet Fuel	16
4.3.4 Synthetic Diesel Fuel	17
4.3.5 Discussion	17
5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations	20
5.1 Conclusions	20
5.2 Recommendations	20
6.0 References	21
7.0 List of Symbols, Acronyms, and Abbreviations	22

List of Figures

	<u>Page</u>
1 Lab-scale evaluations set up	6
2 Incident heat flux of JP-8 and S-8 jet fuel fires	7
3 Incident heat flux of JP-8 and Shell jet fuel fires	7
4 Incident heat flux of diesel fuel fires	8
5 Mass Loss of JP-8, diesel and synthetic fuel fires	9
6 Fire Hanger at Tyndall Air Force Base	10
7 The 28 ft ² test pan and the one-foot burnback pan	10
8 Ten gallon flightline extinguisher and the 2 gpm nozzle	11
9 Commercially available 3% AFFF	11
10 Firefighter pouring the fuel into the 28 ft ² pan	12
11 Firefighter aggressively fighting the fire	13
12 Continuing to apply foam after extinguishing the fire	13
13 Placing the burnback pan	14
14 Unleaded gasoline flame propagation	14
15 JP-8 flame propagation	14
16 SPK flame propagation	15
17 Average extinguishment times (with 95% confidence intervals) for various fuels	18
18 Average burnback times (with 95% confidence intervals) for various fuels	19

List of Tables

1 Physical properties for fuels used in fire suppression experiments	3
2 Commercially available fuels used in fire suppression experiments	4
3 Test matrix for the lab-scale fire evaluations	5
4 Measured Density and Flash Point	6
5 Measured mass loss rate during laboratory fires	8
6 Fuel test matrix	11
7 MIL-F-24385F specifications for unleaded gasoline in a 28 ft ² pan	14
8 JP-8 fuel results	16
9 SPK fuel results	16
10 SPK/JP-8 blended fuel results	17
11 Synthetic diesel fuel results	17
12 Average results	18

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by an appointment to the Postgraduate Research Participation Program at U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory administered by the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education through an interagency agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy and AFRL.

1.0 Summary

1.1 Background

As an alternative to JP-8 fuel for aircraft, evaluations have commenced to certify synthetic fuels in all United States Air Force (USAF) aircraft, as demonstrated in recent test flights. Used in the trial flights was a 50/50 blend of conventional JP-8 and Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene (SPK) derived from a Fischer-Tropsch (FT) process. The FT process converts gases, such as hydrogen and carbon monoxide, into liquid hydrocarbons. With the increased interest in synthetic fuels, there are questions of whether existing Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) firefighting agents and equipment are capable of extinguishing synthetic fuel fires or if firefighters will need additional or new tools to successfully extinguish these fires.

1.2 Scope

This program was designed to determine if Military Specification MIL-F-24385F (MIL-SPEC) AFFF has the capability of extinguishing synthetic fuel fires and SPK/JP-8 blended fuel fires. The fuel and blended fuel fires were evaluated for their ability to be suppressed by existing military fire fighting agents and techniques. The assessment included extinguishment effectiveness, extinguishment time, and burn-back time. Fuels evaluated in this program were conventional JP-8 jet fuel (specified by MIL-DTL-83133F), two synthetic jet fuels produced by Syntroleum Corporation (S-8) and Shell (FT-IPK), Synthetic Diesel (S-2), and Conventional Diesel.

1.3 Conclusions

Test results show AFFF and existing firefighting equipment will extinguish the tested synthetic fuel fires just as effectively as conventional fuel fires. It is recommended that each new fuel undergo a minimum series of evaluations using the methods discussed in this report to ensure the safety of firefighters and effectiveness of firefighting equipment and agents.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 Background

The United States Air Force (USAF) has an interest in minimizing dependency on foreign oil. As an alternative to JP-8 fuel for aircraft, evaluations have commenced to certify synthetic fuels in all USAF aircraft, as demonstrated in recent test flights. Used in the trial flights was a 50/50 blend of conventional JP-8 and Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene (SPK) derived from a Fischer-Tropsch (FT) process. The FT process converts gases, such as hydrogen and carbon monoxide, into liquid hydrocarbons.

Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) is used by Air Force fire departments to extinguish fuel spill fires involving jet fuel (JP-8), diesel, or gasoline. With the increased interest in synthetic fuels, there are questions of whether existing AFFF firefighting agents and equipment are capable of extinguishing synthetic fuel fires or if firefighters will need additional or new tools to successfully extinguish these fires.

2.2 Scope

To aid Air Force firefighters' response to an incident involving SPK fuels, this program was designed to determine if Military Specification MIL-F-24385F (MIL-SPEC) AFFF has the capability of extinguishing SPK fuel fires and SPK/JP-8 blended fuel fires. This evaluation mostly followed parameters set forth in the MIL-SPEC guidelines, MIL-F-24385F, Section 4.7.13 for a 28 ft² fire test. The fuel and blended fuel fires were evaluated for their ability to be suppressed by existing military fire fighting agents and techniques. The assessment included extinguishment effectiveness, extinguishment time, and burn-back time as well as qualitative information about the smoke thickness for these synthetic fuels compared to JP-8.

2.3 Fuels Tested

Fire tests were performed on various commercially available fuels that can be divided into two categories: kerosene fuels and diesel fuels. The kerosene fuels consisted of the conventional JP-8 jet fuel (MIL-DTL-83133F) that is currently used by the Air Force and two synthetic jet fuels produced by Syntroleum Corporation (S-8) and Shell's Fischer-Tropsch iso-paraffinic kerosene (FT-IPK). The synthetic kerosene fuels are also known as SPK or synthetic paraffinic kerosene. Diesel fuels consisted of conventional diesel as well as a synthetic diesel (S-2) produced by Syntroleum Corporation. All of these fuels, except conventional diesel, were evaluated for fire suppression. Conventional JP-8 was used as a baseline to which all other fuels were compared.

The physical properties of these kerosene (Moses 2001) and diesel (Woodward 2001) fuels have been previously studied. Some physical properties pertinent to combustion have been tabulated and are presented in Table 1. Since the data in Table 1 came from various sources, not all test methods in Table 1 were performed at the same location, nor were the same methods used to determine the same physical parameter. However, this data gives a reasonable estimate of overall properties of the various fuels.

Table 1: Physical properties for fuels used in fire suppression experiments

Property	SPK Test Method	S-8	SHELL (FT-IPK)	JP-8		JP-8/ S-8	JP-8/ FT-IPK	Diesel Test Method	S-2	EPA #2
				Edwards	Dyess	Edwards	Dyess			
COMPOSITION										
Aromatics (volume %)	NA	0	0.2	16.5	19.1	8.3	8.7	ASTM D - 1319	ND	30
Olefins (volume %)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	ASTM D - 1319	ND	1
Saturates (volume %)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	ASTM D - 1319	> 99	69
Total sulfur (mass %)	ASTM D - 4294/2622*	0.002	< 0.01	0.06	0.09	0.029	0.05	ASTM D - 2622	ND	0.05
Hydrogen content (mass %)	NA	15.4	NA	13.8	13.7	14.5	14.6	NA	NA	NA
Particulate matter (mass %)	NA	1.3E-04	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	ASTM D - 482	< 0.001	0.01
VOLATILITY										
Initial boiling point (°C)	ASTM D - 86	144	154.1	145	182	148	160	ASTM D - 86	160	184
10% recovered (°C)	ASTM D - 86	167	160.8	172	196	170	171	ASTM D - 86	199	216
20% recovered (°C)	ASTM D - 86	177	162.3	181	200	179	175	NA	NA	NA
50% recovered (°C)	ASTM D - 86	206	168.0	205	209	206	188	ASTM D - 86	256	258
90% recovered (°C)	ASTM D - 86	256	183.3	252	224	253	216	ASTM D - 86	316	310
Final boiling point (°C)	ASTM D - 86	275	195.2	277	244	275	236	ASTM D - 86	350	341
Residue (%)	ASTM D - 86	1.5	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.0	NA	NA	NA
Loss (%)	ASTM D - 86	0.9	1.0	1.3	0.6	1.1	0.3	NA	NA	NA
Flash point (°C)	NA	45	43	48	64	48	50	ASTM D - 93	64	69
OTHER TESTS										
Density (kg/m³)	ASTM D - 4052	756	736	807	808	782	773	ASTM D - 1298	770	845
Freezing point (°C)	ASTM - 2386/5972*	-51	-53.8	-52	-52	-52	-61	NA	NA	NA
Viscosity (cSt)	ASTM D - 445†	4.9	2.49	4.8	4.9	4.6	3.6	ASTM D - 445‡	2.1	2.5
Net heat of combustion (MJ/kg)¥	ASTM D - 3338/4809/4529*	43.9	44.2	43.2	43.1	43.4	43.5	ASTM D-240	42.4	NA
Lubricity (mm)	ASTM D - 5001	0.58	0.92	0.56	0.53	0.54	0.54	ASTM D - 6079	< 0.37	NA
Acidity (mg KOH/g)	ASTM D - 3242	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.005	0.003	NA	NA	NA

NA - Not Available, ND - Not Detectable, *Test methods varied between fuels or multiple tests were performed and an average was given, †@ -20°C, ‡@ 40°C, ¥High heating value
SPK Fuels taken from Moses (2008), Diesel Fuels taken from Woodward (2001)

The flash point of a liquid is the lowest temperature at which its flammable vapors will ignite when an ignition source is applied. It is indicative of the overall flammability of the fuel. Those fuels with higher flash points are less volatile. Fuels that are below their flash point temperature typically take longer to ignite and burn than fuels that are above their flash points. The flash points found in the manufacturer's MSDS for these various fuels are shown in Table 2. These flash point values varied somewhat from those found in Table 1.

Table 2: Commercially available fuels used in fire suppression experiments

FUEL	MANUFACTURER	FLASH POINT
Synthetic JP-8 (S-8)	Syntroleum Corporation	100-125°F (37.8 - 51.5°C)
Synthetic JP-8 (FT-IPK)	Shell Oil Products	100°F (38°C)
Conventional Jet Fuel (JP-8)	Shell Oil Products/ Mobil	> 100°F (> 38°C)
Synthetic Diesel (S-2)	Syntroleum Corporation	141°F (> 60.5°C)
Conventional Diesel	Shell Oil Products	143°F (> 62°C)

3.0 Lab-Scale Evaluations

3.1 Description

A series of laboratory evaluations were performed to examine the relative heat output of the flames in small-scale fires before larger scale fire suppression evaluations were conducted. The small-scale fires were performed inside an 8-foot x 10-foot walk-in laboratory hood. Incident heat flux measurements were recorded using a total heat flux gauge. The heat flux gauge was strategically placed facing the flames from burning fuel in the porcelain pan, which simulates a firefighter fighting a MIL-SPEC AFFF fire. The data from the behavior of synthetic fuels versus traditional fuels was measured to compare flame performance.

Flash point and density tests were also conducted on the synthetic fuels to verify the properties of each fuel.

3.2 Procedures

A 6.5-inch diameter porcelain pan (0.23 ft²) was placed in the center of the hood, on a mass balance (Ohaus EP 8100), with a heat flux gauge (Medtherm 64-25-20) positioned 12-inches above the outer border of the pan and six-inches outside of the outer border of the pan. Approximately 6 fluid ounces of water and 12 fluid ounces of fuel were poured into the pan; the mixture was then ignited by a hand-held propane torch. Heat flux was recorded in one second increments starting when the fuel was ignited. Mass of the pan was manually recorded in 10 second increments to record mass loss of the fuel. Table 3 shows the order in which testing took place. Figure 1 displays the laboratory set-up.

The flash point test was conducted per ASTM D93-07 “Standard Test Methods for Flash Point by Pensky-Martens Closed Cup Tester”.

Table 3: Test matrix for the lab-scale fire evaluations

Test Number	Fuel Tested
1	JP-8
2	50/50 Blend (JP-8/S-8)
3	Synthetic JP-8 (S-8)
4	Synthetic Diesel (S-2)
5	Diesel
6	50/50 Blend (JP-8/ Shell FT-IPK)
7	Synthetic JP-8 (FT-IPK)




Figure 1: Lab-scale evaluations set up

3.3 Results

Table 4 shows densities and flash points of each fuel measured in the laboratory along with the MSDS values. Both the densities and flash points were comparable to the MSDS values. These values provided confidence that the fuels received were the fuels planned for the test evaluations.

Table 4: Measured density and flash point

Fuel	Measured Density	MSDS Reported Density	Measured Flash Point	MSDS Reported Flash Point
Synthetic Diesel (S-2)	0.76 g/cm ³	0.77 g/cm ³	59 - 60 °C	> 60.5°C
Synthetic JP-8 (S-8)	0.75 g/cm ³	0.76 g/cm ³	52°C	37.8 - 51.5 °C
Synthetic JP-8 (FT-IPK)	0.73 g/cm ³	0.80-0.82 g/cm ³	39 - 40 °C	38°C

Figures 2 - 4 represent the incident heat flux recorded for both jet fuels and diesel fuels burning in a typical diffusion flame pattern characteristic of standard small-scale pool fires. The initial heat flux spike on each chart was used to record the time 0 on all charts. The intent of this controlled laboratory testing was to ensure that the heat release of all experimental fuel combinations is on the same order of magnitude as standard fuels to ultimately reduce firefighting risk in the full-scale fire suppression test application. Fluctuations in the data can be attributed to the oscillating laminar flame structure at the base of the fire driving the high energy turbulent release at the top of the plume. This interaction coupled with the cyclic ingestion of cool ambient air drive this inherently unsteady flow pattern. This analysis showed that the synthetic fuels did not have substantially higher heat flux values than JP-8; it was determined that existing fire test and safety equipment would be appropriate for larger scale fire suppression evaluations.




Figure 2: Incident heat flux of JP-8 and S-8 jet fuel fires




Figure 3: Incident heat flux of JP-8 and FT-IPK jet fuel fires




Figure 4: Incident heat flux of diesel fuel fires

Mass loss of the fuels was recorded during combustion starting when the fuel was ignited. The 6.5-inch diameter porcelain pan was positioned on a mass balance. Normalized mass results (by initial mass) are shown in Figure 5. In order to determine a mass loss rate for each fuel, the mass data during the initial part of each fire was discarded. During this time period mass loss rates fluctuate as the liquid fuel temperature varies. Mass loss for each fuel was determined based upon results during the last 60 seconds of the fire (Table 5). These results show a minor but observable difference in the fuel mass release rate with the diesel fuels (conventional and S-2) having 0.18 g/s on average and other jet fuels (including blends) having 0.20 g/s on average.

Table 5: Measured mass loss rate during laboratory fires

Fuel Tested	Mass loss rate during 100 -160 seconds (g/s)
JP-8	0.20
Synthetic JP-8 (S-8)	0.19
50/50 Blend (JP-8/S-8)	0.21
Synthetic JP-8 (FT-IPK)	0.20
50/50 Blend (JP-8/ Shell FT-IPK)	0.20
Diesel	0.19
Synthetic Diesel (S-2)	0.18




Figure 5: Mass Loss of JP-8, diesel and synthetic fuel fires

4.0 Medium-Scale Evaluations

4.1 Description

All medium-scale evaluations were conducted in the Fire Hanger at AFRL Test Range II, Tyndall AFB, FL. The Fire Hanger building is 75-feet x 75-feet with a maximum height of 31-feet (Figure 6). This facility provides an indoor fire test environment conducive to repeatable results and eliminates the impact of adverse weather conditions on the fire. All evaluations were performed with the hanger doors closed to eliminate the effect of air currents on the fires.



Figure 6: Fire Hanger at Tyndall Air Force Base

4.1.1 Test Pans

The test pans were assembled using ¼-inch thick stainless steel. Figure 7 illustrates the six-foot diameter (28 ft²) pan with a four-inch high side and the one-foot diameter burnback pan with a two-inch high side. The pans were fabricated as specified in MIL-F-24385F.



Figure 7: The 28 ft² test pan and the one-foot burnback pan

4.1.2 Extinguisher and Nozzle

To ensure a consistent 100 psi nozzle pressure with a 2 gallons per minute (gpm) flow rate, a ten gallon volume flightline extinguisher was used as a pressure vessel attached to a regulated nitrogen gas cylinder. Shown in Figure 8 are the flightline extinguisher and the 2 gpm nozzle utilized in the tests. The pressure at the nozzle was verified before each test and the agent flow rate verification was performed after every two tests to ensure consistency in testing. A 50-foot, one-inch diameter hose was connected between the extinguisher and the nozzle.



Figure 8: Ten-gallon flightline extinguisher and the 2 gpm nozzle

4.1.3 Firefighting Agent

Chemguard 3% qualified products list (QPL-24385-26) MIL-SPEC AFFF (Figure 9) was used as the firefighting agent in all tests. To eliminate the fire suppression agent as a variable in these evaluations, the agent and the concentration that the agent was mixed with water (3%) did not vary throughout the testing.



Figure 9: Commercially available 3%AFFF

4.1.4 Fuels Tested

Table 6 reveals the test matrix for the fuels evaluated. The S-8 and S-2 fuels were delivered from the manufacturer without Air Force corrosion inhibitor and anti-icing additives. These additives were included in the remaining fuels that were evaluated; their exclusion from the two fuels was not believed to have a negative impact on these tests or to adversely affect the burning characteristics of the fuels.

Table 6: Fuels test matrix

Type of Fuel	Number of Tests
S-8	4
JP-8	4
Shell (FT-IPK)	5
JP-8 / S-8 Blend	5
JP-8 / FT-IPK Blend	6
S-2	2

4.2 Procedures

Medium-scale evaluations followed the procedures in MIL-F-24385F, Section 4.7.13 for a 28 ft² fire test with the exception of preburn times. Preburn times varied as explained below.

Evaluations began by filling the 10-gallon fire extinguisher with 9.7 gallons of water and 0.3 gallons of Chemguard AFFF. The extinguisher was then pressurized to 100 psi with nitrogen. To insure a successful test, the nozzle was verified to disburse 2 gpm of solution.

A shallow layer of freshwater, approximately 0.25-inches deep, was dispensed in the bottom of the six-foot diameter pan to guarantee complete coverage of the area with fuel and to protect the pan's bottom. Ten gallons of fuel was poured into the 28 ft² pan (Figure 10) to provide an approximate 0.5-inch fuel layer. The quantity of fuel specified ensures that results will not be affected by all of the fuel being consumed during the test. Within 30 seconds of pouring, the fuel was ignited.



Figure 10: Firefighter pouring the fuel into the 28 ft² pan

The preburn for this type of test with unleaded gasoline is typically 10 seconds before the firefighter is permitted to attack the fire. Preburn is measured from fuel ignition until agent is applied to the fire. With unleaded gasoline, 10 seconds is sufficient for the fuel in the test pan to be considered fully involved in flames. Due to the less volatile nature of each of the fuels evaluated in this test series, a different method was devised to ensure a fully involved fire each test.

After ignition, the fuel was allowed to burn freely until the flames spread across the pan and exhibited pulsing behavior. The test director then allowed the fire to burn for an additional five seconds before instructing the firefighter to attack the fire. With this preburn method, the total time from ignition to full involvement may vary significantly from test to test with the same fuel or different fuels for reasons such as initial fuel temperature, flash points, or how long the ignition source is applied to the fuel. These variations are not significant. By ensuring a consistent, fully involved fire before beginning agent application, reliable extinguishment and burnback results were ensured.

After the preburn, the fire was “attacked and extinguished as expeditiously as possible” (IAW MIL-F-24385F), with agent first applied to the center and then the outer edges to effectively coat

and extinguish the flames (Figure 11). The moment of extinguishment was recorded and foam application continued for a total of 90 seconds (Figure 12), which ensures a consistent agent volume of three gallons used in each test.



Figure 11: Firefighter aggressively fighting the fire



Figure 12: Continuing to apply foam after extinguishing the fire

Within 60 seconds of completing the foam application, the one-foot diameter pan containing flaming unleaded fuel was placed in the center of the six-foot diameter pan to begin the burnback portion of the evaluation (Figure 13). This portion of the test provides information on the relative safety of a fuel spill that is covered by a foam blanket. When the fire had spread outside the small pan and was burning steadily, the small pan was removed. The burnback time was recorded when 7 ft² (25%) of the total area was covered in flames.



Figure 13: Placing the burnback pan

4.3 Results

Unleaded gasoline is typically used in this six-foot diameter test pan to evaluate AFFF performance. MIL-F-24385F has the following specifications (Table 7) for an AFFF fire suppression test in the 28 ft² pan:

Table 7: MIL-F-24385F specifications for unleaded gasoline in a 28 ft² pan

Fuel	Preburn Time (sec)	Extinguishing Time (sec)	25% Burnback Time (min)
Unleaded Gasoline Standard	10	30	6:00

Figure 14 shows a typical preburn for an unleaded fuel fire. The 28 ft² pan is fully involved after three seconds and fire suppression begins after ten seconds. Figures 15 and 16 show the slower propagation of higher flash point fuels. In each test the fires were allowed to become fully involved before fire suppression was initiated.



Ignition

Ignition + 0.5 seconds

Ignition + 3 seconds

Figure 14: Unleaded gasoline flame propagation



Ignition

Ignition + 10 seconds

Ignition + 15 seconds

Figure 15: JP-8 flame propagation



Figure 16: SPK flame propagation

The extinguishment time and burnback time for JP-8 was compared to each fuel or fuel mixture. This was done by performing t-tests on the recorded data, comparing JP-8 with corresponding fuels or mixtures. The hypotheses tested were that the time to extinguish (t_{ex}) the synthetic fuels and the burnback time (t_{bb}) of the synthetic fuels were no different than the times for JP-8. If the probability resulting from the t-test was less than 5%, the comparison was statistically significant. If the probability values were greater than 5%, no statistical difference in the times could be determined from the sample sets. The t-test assumes that the samples have equal variance and follow a normal distribution. A t-statistic (t) is calculated by

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_{JP-8} - \bar{X}_i}{\sigma_{X_{JP-8}X_i} \sqrt{1/n_{JP-8} + 1/n_i}} \quad (1a)$$

$$\sigma_{X_{JP-8}X_i} = \sqrt{\frac{(n_{JP-8} - 1)\sigma_{JP-8}^2 + (n_i - 1)\sigma_i^2}{DF}} \quad (1b)$$

$$DF = n_{JP-8} + n_i - 2 \quad (1c)$$

where the subscripts $JP-8$ and i represent the data sets for JP-8 and the comparison fuel (named i in Eq. 1), respectively. \bar{X} is the average, σ is the standard deviation, and n is number of data points collected for the particular data set. $\sigma_{X_{JP-8}X_i}$ is a common standard deviation between the two fuel samples, and DF are the degrees of freedom for the two data sets. The probability is determined by a two-tailed normal distribution which is a function of t and DF .

$$p = f(t, DF) \quad (2)$$

If the probability resulting from that t-test was greater than 5%, the hypothesis was rejected indicating that no difference in the extinguishment or burnback times could be determined from the sample sets. The average values as well as confidence intervals (95%) were also determined. Figures showing these values will be discussed below in Section 4.3.5.

4.3.1 Conventional JP-8 Fuel

JP-8 was evaluated to establish a baseline for comparison with synthetic fuels and conventional/synthetic blended fuels. JP-8 required a mean preburn time of 23.5 seconds to become fully involved. AFFF extinguished the JP-8 fires in an average time of 23.8 seconds and had a burnback average time of 11 minutes and 19 seconds. Table 8 shows the results from the

JP-8 fires. Although not measured, the smoke emerging from the JP-8 fires qualitatively appeared denser than for the other fuels.

Table 8: JP-8 fuel results

Test Number	Preburn Time (sec)	Extinguishment Time (sec)	25% Burnback Time (min)
1	24	26	10:38
2	16	21	12:18
3	21	20	10:01
4	33	28	12:21

4.3.2 SPK Jet Fuels

The S-8 and FT-IPK alternative fuels required a preburn time mean of 21.8 seconds. The S-8 and FT-IPK average extinguishment time were 25.3 and 25.6 seconds respectively. The burnback averages were 13:17 and 13:57 respectively. Table 9 displays the results of the two SPK fuels tested. Although not measured, there was a noticeable decrease in the amount of smoke produced as compared to JP-8 fires.

Table 9: SPK fuel results

SPK Jet Fuel Tested	Preburn Time (sec)	Extinguishment Time (sec)	25% Burnback Time (min)
S-8	20	27	13:53
S-8	20	26	14:15
S-8	26	21	12:25
S-8	33	27	12:35
FT-IPK	23	22	14:02
FT-IPK	20	27	13:31
FT-IPK	20	20	14:18
FT-IPK	20	30	NBB*
FT-IPK	15	29	NBB

*NBB – No Burnback

The probability for extinguishment time between JP-8 and the SPK fuels was calculated as described in 4.3. Results were probabilities of 55.6% for the S-8 fuel and 53.0% for the FT-IPK fuel. Since the probability was greater than 5%, hypothesis that these fuels were different was rejected. It can be assumed that AFFF can extinguish both of these SPK fuels equal to that of JP-8. Similarly for the burnback time, the probability for burnback time of the S-8 fuel was 4.0% and the FT-IPK fuel was 1.5%. This shows that the burnback time was significantly different for both fuels with the SPK fuels having the higher average. With the longer burnback time for the SPK fuels as compared to JP-8, these results indicate that there is increased safety when using the synthetic fuels.

4.3.3 SPK/JP-8 Blended Jet Fuels

The 50/50 mixture of SPK and conventional JP-8 outcome varied. The FT-IPK/JP-8 blend required an average 24.3 second preburn in order to have a fully engulfed fire, and the S-8/JP-8 blend averaged 22.2 seconds. The S-8 blend extinguishment mean was 23 seconds and the FT-

IPK blend mean was 25.5 seconds. The burnback times reflected more significant differences. The FT-IPK blend had an average burnback time of 11 minutes and 18 seconds. The S-8 blend had a 13 minutes and 55 seconds average burnback time. The results from the tested blends are listed in Table 10.

Table 10: SPK/JP-8 blended fuel results

50/50 Blend Tested	Preburn Time (sec)	Extinguishment Time (sec)	25% Burnback Time (min)
S-8/JP-8	18	18	13:36
S-8/JP-8	24	24	13:50
S-8/JP-8	25	24	14:00
S-8/JP-8	27	24	14:30
S-8/JP-8	17	25	13:40
FT-IPK/JP-8	23	29	11:21
FT-IPK/JP-8	28	26	10:52
FT-IPK/JP-8	20	24	13:18
FT-IPK/JP-8	26	23	10:58
FT-IPK/JP-8	26	24	11:01
FT-IPK/JP-8	23	27	10:23

The calculated probability for extinguishment time between JP-8 and a blend of S-8 and JP-8 was 74.6%. For the FT-IPK/JP-8 blend the probability was 38.7%. The probability for burnback time of the S-8 blend was 0.2% and the FT-IPK blend was 98.8%. The S-8 blend performed similar in burnback to the SPK fuels by themselves. However, the FT-IPK blend performed similar to JP-8 for burnback. This may be due to the flash point for the FT-IPK fuel being lower than the flash point of S-8 (see Tables 1, 2, and 4).

4.3.4 Synthetic Diesel Fuel

Two tests were conducted with the synthetic diesel (S-2). S-2 had an average extinguishment time of 27.5 seconds. The burnback mean was 14 minutes and 3 seconds. The results are shown in Table 11. Like the results of the synthetic jet fuels, AFFF was effective on this fuel as compared to JP-8. The probability for extinguishment was 26.7% while the burnback time was 4.4%. Again because of its higher flash point, the burnback time showed improved performance for the S-2 fuel than JP-8.

Table 11: Synthetic diesel fuel results

Test Number	Preburn Time (sec)	Extinguishment Time (sec)	25% Burnback Time (min)
1	27	28	13:33
2	26	27	14:33

4.3.5 Discussion

Table 12 displays the average results of each fuel evaluated. The average for extinguishment and burnback time as well as their confidence intervals (95%) are plotted in Figures 17 and 18. The results show that AFFF is a very effective firefighting agent against synthetic fuel fires and that the performance of AFFF on synthetic fuel is similar to that of JP-8 fuel. The higher flash

points, slow surface flame propagation (as evidenced by longer required preburns), as well as the longer burnback times of the SPK jet fuels and SPK blends indicate the safer nature of these fuels. The synthetic fuels with lower volatility showed improved fire suppression behavior than the JP-8 fuels.

Table 12: Average results

Fuel	Average Pre-Burn Time (sec)	Average Extinguishing Time (sec)	Average 25% Burnback Time (min)
JP-8	23.5	23.8	11:19
S-8	24.8	25.3	13:17
FT-IPK	19.6	25.6	13:57
S-8/JP-8 Blend	22.2	23	13:55
FT-IPK/JP-8 Blend	24.3	25.5	11:18
S-2	26.5	27.5	14:03




Figure 17: Average extinguishment times (with 95% confidence intervals) for various fuels




Figure 18: Average burnback times (with 95% confidence intervals) for various fuels

5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Test results show AFFF with current firefighting equipment will extinguish the tested synthetic fuel fires just as effectively as conventional fuel fires. The prolonged burnback times indicate that AFFF is equal to or more effective at preventing burnback of the tested synthetic fuels and fuel blends than with JP-8 fuel.

5.2 Recommendations

As novel combustible energy sources emerge as viable replacement candidates for traditional petroleum-based fuels, it is recommended that each new fuel undergo a minimum series of evaluations using the methods discussed in this report to ensure the safety of firefighters and effectiveness of firefighting equipment and agents. A larger number of experiments should be conducted if increased data confidence levels are required.

6.0 References

1. Military Specification, MIL-F-24385F. “Fire Extinguishing Agent, Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF) Liquid Concentrate, For Fresh and Sea Water”, 7 January 1992.
2. Military Specification, MIL-DTL-83133F, “Turbine Fuel, Aviation, Kerosene Type, JP-8 (NATO F-34), NATO F-35, and JP-8+100 (NATO F-37)”, 11 April 2008
3. Moses, Clifford A. (2008) “Comparative Evaluation of Semi-synthetic Jet Fuels”, Report for Coordinating Research Council, Inc. and Universal Technology Corporation. CRC Project No. AV-2-04a. September 2008.
4. Woodward, Steven R. (2001) “Letter to Ms. Linda Bluestein of the Alternative Fuel Transportation Program of the US-DOE concerning EPAct Petition of Syntroleum Fuels”, Dated September 12, 2001, Received September 18, 2001.
5. ASTM D93-07, American Society for Testing and Materials. “Standard Test Methods for Flash Point by Pensky-Martens Closed Cup Tester”.
6. MIL-HDBK-510(USAF), “Aerospace Fuels Certification”.

7.0 List of Symbols, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Description
°C	Degrees Celsius
°F	Degrees Fahrenheit
50/50	Half & Half
AFFF	Aqueous Film Forming Foam
AFRL	Air Force Research Laboratory
DF	Degrees of freedom
ft ²	Square Feet
FT	Fischer-Tropsch
gpm	Gallons Per Minute
in ²	Square Inches
JP-8	Jet Propellant i.e. Jet Fuel
kW	Kilowatts
lpm	Liters Per Minute
m ²	Square Meters
mL	Milliliters
Mil-Spec	Military Specification
Min	Minute
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
mV	Millivolts
NBB	No Burnback Tested
p	Probability
Psi	Pounds Per Square Inch
QPL	Qualified Products List
RXQD	Fire Research Team
SPK	Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene
S-2	Syntroleum Synthetic Diesel
S-8	Syntroleum SPK Jet Fuel
Sec or s	Seconds
t _{bb}	Burnback time
t _{ex}	Extinguishment time
FT-IPK	Shell Oil SPK Fischer-Tropsch
	Iso-Paraffinic Kerosene
USAF	United States Air Force