

## © Copyright Statement

All rights reserved. All material in this document is, unless otherwise stated, the property of **FPC International, Inc.** Copyright and other intellectual property laws protect these materials. Reproduction or retransmission of the materials, in whole or in part, in any manner, without the prior written consent of the copyright holder, is a violation of copyright law.

**EVALUATION OF FPC-1<sup>®</sup> FUEL  
PERFORMANCE CATALYST**

**at**

**BFI HOLDING  
Oosterbeek, Netherlands**

Report Prepared by

UHI CORPORATION  
PROVO, UTAH,  
and  
FPC LIMITED  
HOUSTON, TEXAS

NOVEMBER 18, 1994

Report No. SOTR 112R

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
EQUIPMENT	3
TEST INSTRUMENTS	3
TEST PROCEDURE	4
DISCUSSION	4
CONCLUSION	5
APPENDICES:	7
Carbon Balance Method Technical Approach	
Computer Printouts and Calculation of Engine Performance Factors (Exhaust Mass Flow Rates).	
Table 1: Summary of Carbon Mass Balance Fuel Consumption Changes	
Table 2: Comparison of Smoke Numbers	
Table 3: Comparison of Carbon Monoxide Levels	
Figure 1: Carbon Balance Formulae	
Figure 2: Sample Calculation	
Raw Data Work Sheets	

## INTRODUCTION

FPC-1<sup>®</sup> is a combustion catalyst which, when added to liquid hydrocarbon fuels at a ratio of 1:5000, improves the combustion reaction resulting in increased engine efficiency and reduced fuel consumption. The products of incomplete combustion are also positively affected.

Field and laboratory tests alike indicate a potential to reduce fuel consumption in diesel fleets in the range of 5% to 10%. Smoke and carbon monoxide emissions are typically reduced 15 to 30%. This report summarizes the results of controlled back-to-back field tests conducted by UHI Corporation, FPC Limited, and BFI Holding, with and without FPC-1<sup>®</sup> added to the diesel fuel. The fuel consumption determination procedure applied was the Carbon Balance Exhaust Emission Test at a given engine load and speed. This same method also measures the exhaust concentrations of carbon monoxide and unburned hydrocarbons. Smoke testing was also conducted using the Bacharach Smokemeter method.

## EQUIPMENT TESTED

2 x DAF 75S 240 Trucks  
1 x DAF 75 Truck  
1 x DAF 2500 Truck  
3 x DAF 2300 Trucks  
1 x DAF 65 180 Truck  
2 x DAF 85 330 Trucks  
1 x Scania 81 Truck  
1 x Scania 93H 280 Truck  
1 x Mercedes 3528 Truck

## TEST INSTRUMENTS:

The equipment and instruments involved in the carbon balance test program were:

Sun Electric SGA-9000 non-dispersive, infrared analyzer (NDIR) for measuring the exhaust gas constituents, HC (unburned hydrocarbons as hexane gas), CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, and O<sub>2</sub>.

Scott Specialty BAR 90 calibration gases for SGA-9000 internal calibration of the SGA-9000.

A Fluke Model 51 type "k" thermometer and wet/dry probe for measuring exhaust, fuel, and ambient temperature.

A Dwyer magnehelic and pitot tube for exhaust pressure differential measurement and exhaust air flow determination (CFM).

A Monarch phototachometer to determine and control engine speed (rpm).

A Bacharach True-Spot smokespot meter to determine the density of exhaust smoke from diesel engines.

A hydrometer for fuel specific gravity (density) measurement.

A Gateway 2000 Colorbook Notebook computer and Excel Pro program to calculate the engine performance factors.

A Snap On throttle control for setting and holding engine speed at a fixed rpm.

## **TEST PROCEDURE**

### **Carbon Balance**

The carbon balance technique for determining changes in fuel consumption has been recognized by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) since 1973 and is central to the EPA-Federal Test Procedures (FTP) and Highway Fuel Economy Test (HFET). The method relies upon the measurement of vehicle exhaust emissions to determine fuel consumption rather than direct measurement (volumetric or gravimetric) of fuel consumption.

The application of the carbon balance test method utilized in this study involves the measurement of exhaust gases of a stationary vehicle under steady-state engine conditions. The method produces a value of engine fuel consumption with FPC-1<sup>®</sup> relative to a baseline value established with the same vehicle.

Engine speed and load are duplicated from test to test, and measurements of carbon containing exhaust gases (CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, HC), oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>), exhaust and ambient temperature, and exhaust and ambient pressure are made. A minimum of five readings are taken for each of the above parameters after engine stabilization has taken place (rpm, and exhaust, oil, and water temperatures have stabilized). The technical approach to the carbon balance method is detailed in the Appendices.

Fuel specific gravity or density is measured enabling corrections to be made to the final engine performance factors based upon the energy content of the fuel reaching the injectors.

Smoke density was determined by drawing a fixed quantity of exhaust gases through a filter medium. The particulate's were collected onto the filter surface and the density determined by comparing the discoloration of the filter paper to a color calibrated scale.

Thirteen trucks made up the FPC-1<sup>®</sup> treated test fleet. Table 1 in the Appendices summarizes the percent change in fuel consumption based upon the change in carbon flow rate in the exhaust.

## DISCUSSION

### The Effect of FPC-1® Upon Smoke Density and Carbon Monoxide Emissions

Smoke density was determined using the Bacharach smoke spot method. The Bacharach True-Spot Smokemeter measures smoke density by drawing a specific volume of exhaust gas through a fine paper filter medium (5 micron) while the engine is operating at a fixed rpm and under steady-state engine conditions. The smoke particles are trapped on the surface of the filter paper as the exhaust gases are drawn through it forming a darkened area called a "smoke spot". The filter paper is then removed from the smoke tester and the smoke spot visually compared to a precoded smoke scale. A smoke number is then assigned to the smoke spot according to the darkness of the spot. The smoke number scale ranges from 0 to 9. Higher smoke numbers correspond to darker smoke spots, which correspond to a greater smoke density in the exhaust. The baseline and treated fuel smoke spot numbers are found on Table 2 in the Appendices.

Carbon monoxide (CO) levels were measure using the Sun Electric SGA-9000 non-dispersive infrared analyzer. Like the Bacharach Smokemeter, this too is a recognized method for determining carbon monoxide levels in the exhaust of an internal combustion engine. The SGA-9000 measures CO as a percent of the total volume of gases in the exhaust stream. The baseline and treated fuel CO percentages are found on Table 2.

A reduction in smoke and CO is prime evidence of improved combustion (Germane, SAE Technical Paper # 831204). Further, reduced exhaust smoking has been shown to be one of first evidences that engine carbon residue and soot blowby into the motor oil are also being reduced (ibid). The reductions in exhaust smoke and CO are logical extensions of improved combustion created by FPC-1.

## CONCLUSIONS

- 1) The fuel consumption change determined by the carbon balance method ranged from + 3.45 to - 13.37%. **The fleet averaged a 7.40% reduction in fuel consumed after FPC-1® fuel treatment and engine preconditioning.** The average reduction on fuel consumption is virtually identical to that realized by dozens of fleets in the U.S. and Australia.
- 2) **Smoke density was reduced approximately 18% with FPC-1® treated fuel.**
- 3) Carbon Monoxide levels were reduced approximately 18.5% with treated fuel.
- 4) The reductions in smoke and carbon monoxide emissions support the fuel consumption reductions.

# **APPENDICES**

## **CARBON BALANCE METHOD TECHNICAL APPROACH:**

All test instruments were calibrated and zeroed prior to both baseline and treated fuel data collection. The SGA-9000 NDIR exhaust gas analyzer was internally calibrated using Scott Calibration Gases (BAR 90 Gases), and a leak test on the sampling hose and connections was performed. The same procedure was repeated after each test segment to determine any instrument drift.

Each vehicle's engine was brought up to operating temperature at a set rpm and allowed to stabilize as indicated by the engine water and exhaust temperature, and exhaust pressure. No exhaust gas measurements were made until each engine had stabilized at the rpm selected for the test. Engine rpm was set using the dash mounted tachometer and checked periodically to prevent any change in engine speed during the data collection period. #2 diesel was used exclusively throughout the evaluation. Fuel specific gravity (density) was also taken.

The baseline fuel consumption test consisted of a minimum of five sets of measurements of CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, HC, O<sub>2</sub>, and exhaust temperature and pressure made at 90 second intervals. Each engine was tested in the same manner. Engine rpm were also recorded at approximately 90 second intervals.

After the baseline test the fuel storage tanks were treated with FPC-1<sup>®</sup> at the recommended level of 1 oz. of catalyst to 40 gallons of fuel (1:5000 volume ratio). Each succeeding fuel shipment was also treated with FPC-1<sup>®</sup>. The equipment was operated on treated fuel until the final test was run.

During the two test segments, an internal self-calibration of the exhaust analyzer was performed after every two sets of measurements to correct instrument drift, if any.

From the exhaust gas concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, HC, and O<sub>2</sub> measured during the test, the average molecular weight of these gases, and the temperature and volumetric flow rate of the exhaust stream, the mass flow rate of the fuel to the engine (rate of fuel consumption) may be expressed as a engine "performance factor" which relates the fuel consumption of the treated fuel to the baseline. The calculations are based on the assumption that engine operating conditions are essentially the same throughout the test. Engines with known mechanical problems or having undergone repairs affecting fuel consumption are removed from the sample.

A sample calculation is found in Figure 2.



# **COMPUTER PRINTOUTS**











**Company Name:** BFI      **Location:** Duiven, Netherlands      **Date:** 7-Sep-94  
**Test Portion:** Baseline      **Stack Diam.:** 3.5      Inches  
**Engine Type:** DAF 65 180      **Mile/Hrs:** 41146  
**Equipment Type:** Garbage Truck      **ID #:** VX-34-DK      **Baro:** 29.71  
**Fuel Sp. Gravity(SG):** .835      **Temp:** 65.4      **Time:** 1814

RPM	Exh Temp	Pv Inch	CO	HC	CO2	O2	
2000	281.8	0.75	0.03	12	2.03	17.8	
2000	285.4	0.75	0.03	12	1.99	17.9	
2000	288.4	0.8	0.03	15	1.96	17.7	
2000	290.6	0.8	0.03	17	1.94	17.6	
2000	290.8	0.8	0.03	15	1.94	18.1	
2000	291	0.8	0.03	15	1.93	18	
2000	291.6	0.8	0.03	17	1.93	17.9	
<b>2000.000</b>	<b>288.514</b>	<b>.786</b>	<b>.030</b>	<b>14.714</b>	<b>1.960</b>	<b>17.857</b>	Mean
<b>0</b>	<b>3.653</b>	<b>.024</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>2.059</b>	<b>.037</b>	<b>.172</b>	Std Dev

**VFHC**      **VFCO**      **VFCO2**      **VFO2**      **Mtw1**      **pf1**      **PF1**  
 1.47E-05      0.0003      .020      .179      29.029      308,589      816,347

**Company Name:** BFI      **Location:** Duiven, Netherlands      **Test Date:** 17-Nov-94  
**Test Portion:** Treated      **Stack Diam.:** 3.5      Inches  
**Engine Type:** DAF 65 180      **Mile/Hrs:**  
**Equipment Type:** Garbage Truck      **ID #:** VX-34-DK      **Baro:** 29.71  
**Fuel Sp. Gravity:** .837      **Temp:** 49  
**SG Corr Factor:** .998      **Time:** 6:25

RPM	Exh Temp	Pv Inch	CO	HC	CO2	O2	
2000	269	0.7	0.03	15	1.91	17.8	
2000	269	0.7	0.03	15	1.91	17.7	
2000	267	0.7	0.04	15	1.91	17.7	
2000	267	0.7	0.03	17	1.91	17.7	
2000	268	0.7	0.03	17	1.91	17.8	
2000	268	0.7	0.03	15	1.91	17.8	
<b>2000.000</b>	<b>268.000</b>	<b>.700</b>	<b>.032</b>	<b>15.667</b>	<b>1.910</b>	<b>17.750</b>	Mean
<b>0</b>	<b>.894</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.004</b>	<b>1.033</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.055</b>	Std Dev

**VFHC**      **VFCO**      **VFCO2**      **VFO2**      **Mtw2**      **pf2**      **PF2**  
 1.57E-05      0.000316667      .019      .178      29.017      316,002      873,438

Performance factor adjusted for fuel density: 871,346

**\*\*% Change PF = 6.74 %**

\*\* A positive change in PF equates to a reduction in fuel consumption.



















**Table 1:**  
**Summary of Carbon Balance Fuel Consumption Changes**

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Engine</u>	<u>% Change Fuel Consumption</u>
BBDL84	DAF	- 5.12
BBGJ76	DAF	- 6.15
BBDR35	DAF	- 13.37
VB65DY	DAF	+ 3.45 (1)
VF10BG	DAF	- 9.45
VN52RX	DAF	- 11.84
BN05XD	DAF	- 9.10
VX34DK	DAF	- 6.74
BBGI03	DAF	- 8.81
VX15HX	DAF	- 6.94
86NB64	Scania	- 3.65
VJ72KH	Scania	- 10.19
VB43NS	Mercedes	- 8.79
	<b>Average:</b>	<b>- 7.40%</b>

(1) Statistical Anomaly, however included in the fleet average

---



**Table 2:**  
**Comparison of Smoke Spot Numbers**

<u>Unit No.</u>	<u>Base SS#</u>	<u>Treated SS#</u>	
BBDL84	4.0	4.0	
VX15HX	5.0	4.5	
BBGI03	5.0	4.0	
BN05XD	4.5	3.5	
VX34DK	3.5	3.0	
BBGJ76	3.5	4.0	
VJ72KH	3.5	2.5	
VB43NS	6.5	5.0	
BBDN35	4.5	4.0	
VN52RK	5.0	4.0	
VF10BG	3.5	3.0	
VB65DY	4.0	3.5	
86NB64	5.5	3.0	
<b>Average:</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>% Chg: - 17.8</b>

**Table 3:**  
**Summary of Carbon Monoxide (CO) Changes**

<u>Unit No.</u>	<u>Base CO</u>	<u>Treated CO</u>
BBDL84	.030	.023
VX15HX	.026	.020
BBGI03	.030	.023
BN05XD	.060	.060
VX34DK	.030	.032
BBGJ76	.030	.027
VJ72KH	.030	.020
VB43NS	.030	.023
BBDN35	.040	.030
VN52RX	.040	.032
VF10BG	.050	.040
VB65DY	.070	.053
86NB64	.030	.021
<b>Average:</b>	<b>.038</b>	<b>.031 %Chg: -18.4</b>

---

**Figure 1**  
**CARBON MASS BALANCE FORMULAE**

**ASSUMPTIONS:** C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>26</sub> and SG = 0.82  
Time is constant  
Load is constant

**DATA:**

Mwt = Molecular Weight  
 pf1 = Calculated Performance Factor (Baseline)  
 pf2 = Calculated Performance Factor (Treated)  
 PF1 = Performance Factor (adjusted for Baseline exhaust mass)  
 PF2 = Performance Factor (adjusted for Treated exhaust mass)  
 CFM = Volumetric Flow Rate of the Exhaust  
 SG = Specific Gravity of the Fuel  
 VF = Volume Fraction  
 d = Exhaust stack diameter in inches  
 Pv = Velocity pressure in inches of H<sub>2</sub>O  
 P<sub>B</sub> = Barometric pressure in inches of mercury  
 Te = Exhaust temperature °F

VFHC = "reading" ÷ 1,000,000  
 VFCO = "reading" ÷ 100  
 VFCO<sub>2</sub> = "reading" ÷ 100  
 VFO<sub>2</sub> = "reading" ÷ 100

**EQUATIONS:**

Mwt = 
$$(VFHC)(86) + (VFCO)(28) + (VFCO_2)(44) + (VFO_2)(32) + [(1 - VFHC - VFCO - VFCO_2 - VFO_2)(28)]$$

pf1 or pf2 = 
$$\frac{3099.6 \times Mwt}{86(VFHC) + 13.89(VFCO) + 13.89(VFCO_2)}$$

CFM = 
$$\frac{(d/2)^2 \pi}{144} \left( 1096.2 \sqrt{\frac{Pv}{1.325(PB/ET + 460)}} \right)$$

PF1 or PF2 = 
$$\frac{pf \times (Te + 460)}{CFM}$$

FUEL ECONOMY:  
 PERCENT INCREASE (OR DECREASE) 
$$\frac{PF2 - PF1}{PF1} \times 100$$

**Figure 2.**

**SAMPLE CALCULATION FOR THE CARBON MASS BALANCE**

**BASELINE:**

**Equation 1 (Volume Fractions)**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFHC} &= 13.20/1,000,000 \\ &= 0.0000132 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFCO} &= 0.017/100 \\ &= 0.00017 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFCO}_2 &= 1.937/100 \\ &= 0.01937 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFO}_2 &= 17.10/100 \\ &= 0.171 \end{aligned}$$

**Equation 2 (Molecular Weight)**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mwt1} &= (0.0000132)(86) + (0.00017)(28) + (0.01937)(44) + (0.171)(32) \\ &\quad + [(1-0.0000132-0.00017-0.01937-0.171)(28)] \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Mwt1} = 28.995$$

**Equation 3 (Calculated Performance Factor)**

$$\text{pf1} = \frac{3099.6 \times 28.995}{86(0.0000132) + 13.89(0.00017) + 13.89(0.01937)}$$

$$\text{pf1} = 329,809$$

**Equation 4 (CFM Calculations)**

$$\text{CFM} = \frac{(d/2)^2 \pi}{144} \left( 1096.2 \sqrt{\frac{P_v}{1.325(P_B/ET+460)}} \right)$$

d = Exhaust stack diameter in inches  
P<sub>v</sub> = Velocity pressure in inches of H<sub>2</sub>O  
P<sub>B</sub> = Barometric pressure in inches of mercury  
T<sub>e</sub> = Exhaust temperature °F

$$\text{CFM} = \frac{(10/2)^2 \pi}{144} \left( 1096.2 \sqrt{\frac{.80}{1.325(30.00/313.100+460)}} \right)$$

$$\text{CFM} = 2358.37$$

**Equation 5 (Corrected Performance Factor)**

$$\text{PF1} = \frac{329,809(313.1 \text{ deg F} + 460)}{2358.37 \text{ CFM}}$$

$$\text{PF1} = 108,115$$

**TREATED:**

**Equation 1 (Volume Fractions)**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFHC} &= 14.6/1,000,000 \\ &= 0.0000146 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFCO} &= .013/100 \\ &= 0.00013 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VFCO}_2 &= 1.826/100 \\ &= 0.01826 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} VFO_2 &= 17.17/100 \\ &= 0.1717 \end{aligned}$$

### Equation 2 (Molecular Weight)

$$\begin{aligned} Mwt2 &= (0.0000146)(86) + (0.00013)(28) + (0.01826)(44) + (0.1717)(32) \\ &+ [(1-0.0000146-0.00013-0.01826-0.1717)(28)] \end{aligned}$$

$$Mwt2 = 28.980$$

### Equation 3 (Calculated Performance Factor)

$$pf2 = \frac{3099.6 \times 28.980}{86(0.0000146) + 13.89(0.00013) + 13.89(0.01826)}$$

$$pf2 = 349,927$$

### Equation 4 (CFM Calculations)

$$CFM = \frac{(d/2)^2 \pi}{144} \left( 1096.2 \sqrt{\frac{P_v}{1.325(P_B/ET + 460)}} \right)$$

- d = Exhaust stack diameter in inches
- P<sub>v</sub> = Velocity pressure in inches of H<sub>2</sub>O
- P<sub>B</sub> = Barometric pressure in inches of mercury
- Te = Exhaust temperature °F

$$CFM = \frac{(10/2)^2 \pi}{144} \left( 1096.2 \sqrt{\frac{.775}{1.325(29.86/309.02 + 460)}} \right)$$

$$CFM = 2320.51$$

### Equation 5 (Corrected Performance Factor)

$$PF2 = \frac{349,927(309.02 \text{ deg F} + 460)}{2320.51 \text{ CFM}}$$

$$= 115,966$$

### **Fuel Specific Gravity Correction Factor**

Baseline Fuel Specific Gravity - Treated Fuel Specific Gravity / Baseline Fuel Specific Gravity + 1

$$.840 - .837 / .840 + 1 = 1.0036$$

$$PF2 = 115,966 \times \text{Specific Gravity Correction}$$

$$PF2 = 115,966 \times 1.0036$$

$$PF2 = 116,384$$

### **Equation 6 (Percent Change in Engine Performance Factor:)**

$$\% \text{ Change PF} = \frac{PF2 - PF1}{PF1} \times 100$$

$$\% \text{ Change PF} = [(116,384 - 108,115) / 108,115] (100)$$

$$= +7.65$$

**Note: A positive change in PF equates to a reduction in fuel consumption.**

# **RAW DATA WORK SHEETS**