

THE USE OF AOTF-NIR SPECTROMETERS TO ANALYZE FUELS

PHASE I. INSTRUMENT SELECTION AND PRELIMINARY CALIBRATIONS

**INTERIM REPORT
TFLRF No. 313**

By

S.R. Westbrook

S.A. Hutzler

**U.S. Army TARDEC Fuels and Lubricants Research Facility (SwRI)
Southwest Research Institute
San Antonio, Texas**

Under Contract to
**U.S. Army TARDEC
Mobility Technology Center-Belvoir
Fort Belvoir, Virginia**

Contract No. DAAK70-92-C-0059


Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

April 1996

19960510 099

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

Disclaimers

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

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

DTIC Availability Notice

Qualified requestors may obtain copies of this report from the Defense Technical Information Center, Attn: DTIC-OCC, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 0944, Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6218.

Disposition Instructions

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

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, 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 this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE April 1996	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Interim October 1993 through September 1995	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Use of AOTF-NIR Spectrometers to Analyze Fuels Phase I. Instrument Selection and Preliminary Calibrations		5. FUNDING NUMBERS DAAK70-92-C-0059; WD 21	
6. AUTHOR(S) Westbrook, Steven R. and Hutzler, Scott A.		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER TFLRF No. 313	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army TARDEC Fuels and Lubricants Research Facility (SwRI) Southwest Research Institute P.O. Drawer 28510 San Antonio, Texas 78228-0510		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of the Army Mobility Technology Center-Belvoir 10115 Gridley Road, Suite 128 Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060-5843		11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The U.S. Army has a need for analytical instrumentation that can assess the quality of fuels and lubricants both in the field and in near-the-battlefield conditions. Near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy was identified as one analytical technique with the potential to meet the Army's requirements. The Army initiated a program to rigorously evaluate the feasibility of using NIR in the analysis of diesel fuels. For this program, the Army specified the use of acousto-optic tunable filter (AOTF)-based NIR instruments. Fuel samples totaling 427 were collected and analyzed for several common fuel properties. Three AOTF-NIR spectrometers were evaluated, and an additional six instruments were purchased based on the initial evaluation. This report presents the results of the fuel analyses and the instrument evaluations.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Acousto-optic tunable filters Near-infrared spectroscopy Chemometrics Diesel fuel analysis		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 115	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Problem: The evaluation of fuel quality in the field has been a continuous problem, even in recent military operations in Grenada and Panama. The 1991 operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm emphasized the necessity of identifying a method to evaluate specific fuel properties both rapidly and accurately.

Objective: The objective of this project is to evaluate and demonstrate the usefulness of AOTF-NIR spectroscopy to measure several common properties of diesel fuel and kerosene.

Importance of Project: The capability to rapidly determine several important engine fuel properties can reduce the frequency and severity of fuel-related equipment failures. It will also increase the confidence of the user when using undocumented fuel sources.

Technical Approach: AOTF-NIR spectrometers were purchased and comparatively evaluated using previously analyzed fuel samples. Instrument calibration and validation calculations were made and used to evaluate the performance of each instrument.

Accomplishments: Fuel samples totaling 427 were collected and analyzed for several common fuel properties. AOTF-NIR spectrometers were purchased from three instrument manufacturers. The three instruments were comparatively evaluated to determine the source for purchase of additional spectrometers. Based on the preliminary evaluation results, six additional spectrometers were purchased: three instruments were purchased from each of two of the original instrument manufacturers.

Military Impact: The results of this phase of the project provided both a demonstration of the capability of NIR to measure the desired fuel properties and a basis for selection of the sources of additional instrument purchases, thus assuring that the additional instruments will meet Army requirements.

FOREWORD/ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was performed by the U.S. Army TARDEC Fuels and Lubricants Research Facility (TFLRF) located at Southwest Research Institute (SwRI), San Antonio, Texas, during the period October 1993 through September 1995 under Contract No. DAAK70-92-C-0059. The work was funded by the U.S. Army TARDEC, Mobility Technology Center-Belvoir (MTCB), Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Mr. T.C. Bowen (AMSTA-RBFF) of MTCB served as the contracting officer's representative. Mr. M.E. LePera (AMSTA-RBF) of MTCB served as the project technical monitor.

The authors would like to acknowledge the efforts of TFLRF personnel, including Mses. L.A. McInnis and M.S. Voigt and Messrs. H.W. Marbach, Jr., K.E. Hinton, J.J. Dozier, K.H. Childress, M.R. Gass, R. Pena, R.G. Grinstead, A. Dominguez, and T.E. Loyd. The facility operations and editorial efforts of Mr. J.H. Marshall and Ms. M.M. Clark, respectively, are greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
II. APPROACH	5
III. INSTRUMENT SELECTION	5
IV. PRELIMINARY CALIBRATIONS	6
V. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK	10
VI. LIST OF REFERENCES	12
APPENDICES	
A. Calibration Results	15
B. Results of Analyses	97

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	NIR spectra of four diesel fuels (transmittance mode, 900 nm to 1,800 nm) . . .	2

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	AOTF-NIR Instruments	6
2	Fuel Analyses	7
3	Descriptive Statistics for Test Fuels	8
4	Results of Instrument Calibrations	9
5	R ² Values for Validation Results	10

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Military operations in Grenada and Panama in the 1980's and the 1991 Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm (ODS) all suffered from the lack of proper fuel quality evaluation in the field, especially with regard to fuels provided by host nations.

Based on this experience, the U.S. Army expressed the urgency in identifying equipment that could assess the quality of fuels and lubricants both in the field and in near-battlefield conditions.(1-4)* Since that time, the Army has been working to develop a highly mobile test capability.(5) A recent project described a best technical approach (BTA) to meet the Army's proposed mobile petroleum testing requirement, known as the Petroleum Quality Analysis System (PQAS).(6) According to this BTA, the testing equipment should perform relatively quick and simple analyses and preferably be commercially available. The key guidelines for the PQAS may be summarized as follows:

- Emphasis is placed on the evaluation of fuels used in Army aviation and ground vehicles and support equipment.
- While primary interest is placed on the evaluation of fuels, the determination of lubricant suitability for specific use is also important.
- Both quick, on-the-spot determinations and in-depth analytical capabilities should be assessed.
- Procedures and technology should be developed where needed.

Near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy was identified as one analytical technique with the potential to meet the requirements of the PQAS. Several characteristics of NIR make it useful for this application. These include the use of quartz optics and fiber optics, which make it less sensitive

* Underscored numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of this report.

to environmental conditions and more readily adaptable to field use; and high energy light sources and low noise detectors for a relatively high signal-to-noise ratio. State-of-the-art microcomputers, together with new computer software to perform multivariate statistical analysis/chemometrics, make it possible to quantitate these small differences in spectra, i.e., differences in the chemical composition and structure of the samples.

Figure 1 is the NIR spectra of four diesel fuels. As shown in this figure, the peaks in a near-infrared spectrum are typically broad and often overlapping. Historically, this characteristic of NIR spectra has kept them from yielding significant amounts of useful information. However, the NIR spectroscopic region is attractive for the analysis of hydrocarbon fuels since most of the absorption bands in this region are the result of overtones or combination bands of carbon-hydrogen (C-H) stretching vibrations. In addition, the absorptivity of these bands is largely independent of the remainder of the molecule but is dependent upon the concentration of the absorbing functionality.⁽⁷⁾ Despite the relatively poor peak resolution, the vibrations of C-H




Figure 1. NIR spectra of four diesel fuels (transmittance mode, 900 nm to 1,800 nm)

bonds in different functional groups and different molecular environments will yield distinct transitions. Each of these transitions will make an accompanying contribution to the total spectrum for the sample. If the sample contains C-H, nitrogen-hydrogen (N-H), or oxygen-hydrogen (O-H) bonds and the analyte concentration is greater than about 0.1 percent of the total, then NIR will very likely be a useful analytical method for that analyte. In those instances where a property is being measured (such as cetane number) and not a specific component (such as aromatic hydrocarbons), a relationship must exist between the bulk chemical structure of the sample and the property being measured in order for NIR to be used in the measurement of that property. For example, in the relationship between chemical structure of a gasoline and the octane rating of the gasoline, higher aromatic and branched chain hydrocarbon content will increase the octane rating, while higher straight chain content will lower the octane rating. The opposite relationship is true for diesel fuels and cetane rating.

Much of the earliest work with NIR was in the field of agriculture in applications such as the measurement of the amount of protein in wheat.(8-10) Recently, NIR was investigated as a tool for analyzing gasoline. Typical uses for NIR in the analysis of gasoline include the measurement of octane number, aromatics content, density, vapor pressure, distillation, and oxygenate content.(11-17) In a similar study, Lysaght et al (18) evaluated the use of NIR in measuring the saturate and aromatic content and the freezing point of jet fuels. To date, little work has been reported on the use of NIR to measure the properties of diesel fuel and/or kerosene type fuels used for ground vehicle propulsion.

A preliminary study was conducted by the Army to evaluate the usefulness of NIR in measuring various properties of diesel fuel.(19) In this study, calibration results varied from poor to excellent. Flash point was not successfully modeled whereas density had a correlation coefficient of 0.99. Some properties such as cetane number and aromatics content achieved acceptable correlations that were lower than those for the other properties. Much of the reduced accuracy of these calibrations was attributed to the imprecision of the standard laboratory test methods utilized in measuring these properties. As the primary calibration data are improved, the correlations using NIR will also improve. Calibration models for each property were developed

and entered into the NIR spectrometer. Using these models, it was shown that a single NIR analysis could estimate values for several fuel properties at one time.

Based on the success of the preliminary study, the Army initiated a program to more rigorously evaluate the feasibility of using NIR spectroscopy in the analysis of diesel fuels. The funding for this project was specified in the U.S. House of Representatives, Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 1993, Report of the Committee of Appropriations to accompany H.R. 5504, June 29, 1992. The appropriation included the following wording:

"To assure the quality of fuel supplies, the Army employs extensive laboratory and field test facilities...New technology has been developed that automates many of the laboratory tests and significantly reduces investment for equipment and manpower. Acousto-Optic Tunable Filter (AOTF) technology achieves a consolidated multipurpose test capability in a single highly portable unit."

For this program, the Army specified the use of acousto-optic tunable filter (AOTF)-based NIR instruments. The AOTF is a compact, solid-state monochromator. It consists of a piezo electric transducer bonded to a propagating crystal. Sound waves are produced in the propagating crystal by applying a radio frequency drive to the transducer. Periodic pressure variations produced by the acoustic wave create corresponding variations in the refractive index of the crystal. The crystal then acts like a thick diffraction grating: light of a specific wavelength is bent and rotated in polarization. Since the line spacing is a function of frequency, it is possible to tune the optical frequency by tuning the input frequency. AOTF-NIR offers several advantages over non-AOTF instruments. These include the absence of moving parts, lower maintenance costs, greater spectral resolution, reduced size, and increased ruggedness. A more detailed discussion of AOTF technology can be found in References 20 through 23.

II. APPROACH

The initial phase of the project entailed the writing of a purchase specification, statement of work, and a request for quotation (RFQ) for the purchase of AOTF-NIR instruments for evaluation. The RFQ responses were studied and those instruments which met the Army's needs were identified. An evaluation instrument was purchased from each of three instrument suppliers. These instruments were evaluated head-to-head using a selected set of fuel samples. Based on these results, six additional instruments were purchased for more detailed evaluation, calibration transfer studies, and field tests.

For this phase of the project, 427 middle distillate fuel samples were collected from a wide range of sources. This resulted in a large and diverse set of test fuels. Each fuel was tested according to a predetermined protocol. Preliminary calibration models were developed with a selected subset of the test fuels. The preliminary calibration models were used for the comparative evaluation of the first three instruments prior to the purchase of additional instruments.

III. INSTRUMENT SELECTION

For the first round of instrument purchases, RFQ's were sent to eight instrument manufacturers. Responses were received from five companies; however, only three of the five responders offered to supply an AOTF-NIR. One instrument was purchased from each of those three instrument manufacturers. TABLE 1 contains a description of the three instruments purchased.

TABLE 1. AOTF-NIR Instruments

<u>Manufacturer and Model</u>	<u>Spectral Range</u>	<u>Additional Information</u>
Bran & Luebbe, InfraPrime Lab	900 to 1,700 nanometers	Dual beam instrument. Uses cuvettes. 1-cm path length.
Brimrose, Luminar 2000	900 to 1,600 nanometers	Transreflectance. Fiber optic probe. 1-cm path length.
Infrared Fiber Systems, Prizma 2600 M	900 to 2,600 nanometers	Transreflectance. Fiber optic probe. 1-cm path length.

IV. PRELIMINARY CALIBRATIONS

For this phase of the project, 427 fuel samples were obtained and analyzed according to the list of properties in TABLE 2: 214 samples were used to calibrate the instruments, and the remaining 213 samples were used for validation of the instrument calibration models. TABLE 3 lists descriptive statistics for these test fuels. The test fuels were first ranked by density. Every other fuel was then assigned to the validation set. This procedure assured a wide range of properties in both the calibration and validation sets. (See Reference 24 for a description and discussion of the fuels used in this project.)

Calibration models were developed on each instrument and then used to estimate the properties of the validation fuels. All of the chemometric calculations (calibrations and validations) were conducted using the Grams/386 software from Galactic Industries Corporation. The standard error of prediction (coefficient of variation) and coefficient of determination, R^2 , were calculated for each of the models on each of the instruments. These values were then used to compare the models from the respective instruments. TABLE 4 summarizes the standard error of prediction (SEP) and R^2 values obtained. Appendix A contains plots of all calibration results. Examination of these results shows that the calibration models for any given fuel property were essentially equivalent regardless of the instrument used.

TABLE 2. Fuel Analyses

<u>Property</u>	<u>Test Method</u>
Fuel Lubricity, Wear Scar Diameter, mm	High Frequency Reciprocating Rig (HFRR) (proposed ISO and ASTM test method)
Fuel Lubricity, Scuffing Load, g	U.S. Army Scuffing Load Wear Test (SLWT) (proposed ASTM test method)*
Wear Scar Diameter, mm	ASTM D 5001†, Ball-on-Cylinder Lubricity Evaluator (BOCLE)
Sulfur, mass%	ASTM D 4294
Aromatic Hydrocarbons, mono-, di-, tri-, and total, mass%	ASTM D 5186
Kinematic Viscosity at 40°C, mm ² /s	ASTM D 445
Cloud Point, °C	Automatic Tester
Freeze Point, °C	Automatic Tester
Pour Point, °C	ASTM D 97
Distillation, °C	ASTM D 86
Density at 15°C, g/mL	ASTM D 4052 and ASTM D 1298
Cetane Number	ASTM D 613
Steam Jet Gum, mg/100 mL	ASTM D 381
Carbon and Hydrogen Content, mass%	ASTM D 5291
Total Water, ppm	Karl Fischer Titration, ASTM D 1744
Flash Point, °C	ASTM D 93
Net Heat of Combustion, MJ/kg	ASTM D 240

* A more complete description of the U.S. Army Scuffing Load Wear Test can be found in Reference 25.

† Test methods beginning with D refer to ASTM standards found in Volume 5 of the Book of Standards.

Three properties (density, 50% boiling point, and aromatics content) were selected for the validation phase. (The calibration results for these three properties are highlighted in TABLE 4.) An NIR spectrum was collected for each of the validation fuels using each of the three instruments. Using the appropriate calibration models from each instrument, the fuel property values were calculated from the NIR spectra of the validation fuels. The predicted fuel property values were then plotted against the property values measured in the laboratory. The R² values, based on a standard least squares fit of the data, are given in TABLE 5. The plots are presented in Appendix B. As with the calibration results, there were essentially no differences between instruments regarding the validation results.

TABLE 3. Descriptive Statistics for Test Fuels

Property	Mean	Range	Maximum	Minimum	Median
Manual Density, g/L (D 1298)	0.844	0.0823	0.870	0.788	0.847
Automatic Density, g/L (D 4052)	0.845	0.0845	0.872	0.787	0.848
Flash Point, °C (D 93)	61.984	47.000	87.000	40.000	62.000
Cloud Point, °C (D 1500)	-16.744	60.200	-0.300	-60.500	-14.100
Freeze Point, °C (D 2386)	-13.259	61.800	2.400	-59.400	-10.600
Pour Point, °C (D 97)	-30.767	69.000	-6.000	-75.000	-27.000
Viscosity at 40°C, mm ² /s (D 445)	2.493	2.790	3.930	1.140	2.545
Initial Boiling Point, °C (D 86)	175.680	75.300	214.000	138.700	176.450
10% Recovered	212.177	98.000	256.400	158.400	213.700
50% Recovered	258.001	114.800	297.000	182.200	262.650
90% Recovered	312.293	116.700	340.000	223.300	317.000
95% Recovered	326.870	128.000	359.100	231.100	331.150
End Point	341.100	134.400	375.500	241.100	344.900
Cetane Number (D 613)	48.713	24.400	61.300	36.900	48.400
Carbon Content, mass% (D 5291)	86.538	2.870	87.610	84.740	86.600
Hydrogen Content, mass% (D 5291)	13.089	2.040	14.330	12.290	13.050
Carbon/Hydrogen	6.616	1.146	7.097	5.951	6.638
Heat of Combustion, MJ/kg (D 240)	42.683	1.159	43.458	42.299	42.662
Steam Jet Gum, mg/100 mL (D 381)	6.564	202.200	202.200	0.000	4.700
Total Water, ppm (D 1744)	59.874	97.000	122.000	25.000	59.000
Aromatics, mass%					
Mono-, (D 5186)	24.286	29.900	38.900	9.000	25.000
Di-, (D 5186)	5.791	12.200	12.800	0.600	5.800
Tri-, (D 5186)	1.101	3.400	3.400	0.000	1.100
Total Aromatics, mass% (D 5186)	31.173	36.500	47.200	10.700	32.400
Total Sulfur, mass% (D 4294)	0.0334	0.390	0.400	0.01000	0.0300
Fuel Lubricity, Wear Scar Diameter, mm (HFRR)	0.262	0.610	0.740	0.130	0.230
Fuel Lubricity, Scuffing Load, g (SLWT)	3155.814	4400.000	5400.000	1000.000	3150.000
Wear Scar Diameter, mm (D 5001, BOCLE)	0.579	0.360	0.800	0.440	0.580

TABLE 4. Results of Instrument Calibrations

Component	Standard Error of Prediction			R ²		
	Bran & Luebbe	Brimrose	IFS	Bran & Luebbe	Brimrose	IFS
API Gravity, (D 1298)	0.39949	0.43669	0.37153	0.97826	0.97402	0.98119
Density, g/mL (D 1298)	0.0019638	0.0021287	0.0018974	0.97853	0.97476	0.97995
API Gravity, (D 4052)	0.36292	0.40268	0.35143	0.98237	0.97829	0.98346
Density, g/mL (D 4052)	0.0018185	0.0019638	0.0017674	0.98183	0.97881	0.98284
Flash Point, °C (D 93)	6.0261	6.0502	5.9534	0.42408	0.42195	0.43753
Cloud Point, °C (D 1500)	4.5347	4.57	5.1308	0.75955	0.75554	0.69204
Freeze Point, °C (D 2386)	4.6629	4.7407	5.0789	0.75231	0.74407	0.7063
Viscosity at 40°C, mm ² /s (D 445)	0.12482	0.13866	0.14935	0.9338	0.91833	0.90589
Boiling Point at 50° Distilled, °C (D 86)	5.2821	5.4387	5.3055	0.92008	0.91514	0.91938
Cetane Number (D 613)	2.3431	2.3288	2.3332	0.57179	0.57728	0.58127
Carbon, mass% (D 5291)	0.2971	0.28839	0.3041	0.48384	0.51363	0.45949
Hydrogen, mass% (D 5291)	0.099009	0.092481	0.097232	0.90065	0.91332	0.90418
Carbon/Hydrogen	0.048944	0.045407	0.046524	0.92364	0.93427	0.931
Heat of Comb., (D 240)						
MJ/kg	0.070759	0.070382	0.072452	0.82716	0.82896	0.8188
Btu/lb	30.256	30.074	30.949	0.82906	0.83108	0.82116
Gums, mg/100 mL (D 381)	6.6754	6.6714	6.656	0.0013694	0.000785	0.0033346
Total Aromatics, mass% (D 5186)	1.278	1.3142	1.3196	0.95762	0.95518	0.95485
Sulfur, mass% (D 4294)	0.016234	0.01711	0.01766	0.31841	0.20572	0.1541

TABLE 5. R² Values for Validation Results

<u>Property</u>	<u>Bran & Luebbe</u>	<u>Brimrose</u>	<u>IFS</u>
Density, g/mL (D 4052)	0.977058	0.974275	0.987715
Boiling Pt. at 50%, °C (D 86)	0.915609	0.902124	0.936409
Total Aromatics, mass% (D 5186)	0.986774	0.985630	0.991295

Ease of use was not considered a deciding factor in the purchase decision of the instruments because each possessed good and poor features. Additionally, each of the three instrument suppliers indicated a willingness to consider small design changes to better meet Army needs.

Since there were no statistical differences in the results from the three instruments, the selection and purchase of NIR spectrometers for the follow-on work were based on instrument price. The quoted purchase prices for the Brimrose and Infrared Fiber Systems (IFS) instruments were similar. The quoted purchase price for the Bran & Luebbe instrument, however, was approximately 1.6 to 2.3 times greater than those for the other instruments. These prices were exclusive of computer costs, which were essentially equivalent for all three spectrometers. One other factor which entered into the purchase decision was a suggestion from the contract monitor that it would be beneficial to the overall program to include instruments from more than one supplier in the follow-on purchase.

For these reasons, six new AOTF-NIR instruments were purchased: three from Brimrose and three from IFS. Each of the instrument suppliers was also contacted prior to the purchase to discuss possible design changes as well as price discounts for multiple purchases.

V. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

Three AOTF-NIR spectrometers were purchased from three instrument manufacturers. The instruments were comparatively evaluated to determine the best source for purchase of additional spectrometers.

Based on the preliminary evaluation results, six additional spectrometers were purchased: three instruments each were purchased from two of the original instrument manufacturers. Four hundred thirty fuel samples were then collected and analyzed for several common fuel properties.

The following work is planned:

- Optimize instrument calibrations for each of the fuel properties. This will involve use of alternative calibration techniques such as locally weighted regression.
- Obtain and analyze gasoline samples for calibration of the instruments.
- Evaluate methods for calibration transfer between the spectrometers.
- Conduct field trials at selected military installations with fully calibrated spectrometers.
- Develop and submit to ASTM for standardization proposed methods for the analysis of diesel fuels and kerosenes using NIR spectrometers.

VI. LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Telecon Summary From LTC Demby to Maurice E. LePera, STRBE-VF, dated 23 May 1991.
2. Visit Memorandum on AOAP-Visit AMC HQ, 22 May 1991, by Albert D. Rasberry, STRBE-VF, dated 31 May 1991.
3. Telecon Summary on Automated Fuels Analysis to Sidney J. Lestz, BFLRF (SwRI) from Maurice E. LePera, STRBE-VF, dated 01 July 1991.
4. Visit Memorandum on "ADPA's Army Logistics Research Exposition and the 'Fueling Panel'," by Maurice E. LePera, STRBE-VF, dated 03 July 1991.
5. Fodor, G.E., "Advanced Analytical Methodology for Mobility Fuels and Lubricants Applications," Interim Report BFLRF No. 273 (AD A239650), Belvoir Fuels and Lubricants Research Facility (SwRI), Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, June 1991.
6. Fodor, G.E. and Westbrook, S.R., "Best Technical Approach for the Petroleum Quality Analysis (PQA) System," Interim Report BFLRF No. 300 (AD A285864), Belvoir Fuels and Lubricants Research Facility (SwRI), Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, August 1994.
7. Hibbard, R.R. and Cleaves, A.P., *Anal. Chem.*, 1949, **21**, pp. 486-492.
8. Robert, P., et al, *Anal. Chem.*, **64**, pp. 664-667, 1992.
9. Bertrand, D. and Scotter, C.N.G., *Appl. Spec.*, **46**, No. 9, pp. 1420-1425, 1992.
10. Isaksson, T., et al, *Appl. Spec.*, **46**, No. 11, pp. 1685-1694, 1992.
11. Swarin, S.J. and Drumm, C.A., "Prediction of Gasoline Properties with Near-Infrared Spectroscopy and Chemometrics," SAE Paper No. 912390, 1991.
12. Carduner, K.R., et al, "Near Infrared Absorption Sensor for In-Vehicle Determination of Automotive Fuel Composition," SAE Paper No. 920698, 1992.
13. Kelly, J.J. and Callis, J.B., "Nondestructive Analytical Procedure for Simultaneous Estimation of the Major Classes of Hydrocarbon Constituents of Finished Gasolines," *Anal. Chem.*, **62**, pp. 1444-1451, 1990.
14. DiFoggio, R., Sadhukhan, M., and Ranc, M.L., *Oil and Gas Journal*, **91**, No. 18, pp. 87-90, 1993.

15. Crawford, N.R., Hellmuth, W.W., Marcellus, D.H., and Chou, K., *J. Process Control Qual.*, **4**, No. 1, pp. 13-20, 1992.
16. Lang, G.A., *Hydrocarbon Process., Int. Ed.*, **73**, No. 2, pp. 69-71, 1994.
17. Swarin, S.J. and Drumm, C.A., *Spectroscopy*, **7**, No. 7, pp. 42-46 and 48-49, 1992.
18. Lysaght, M.J., Kelly, J.J., and Callis, J.B., *Fuel*, **72**, No. 5, pp. 623-631, 1993.
19. Westbrook, S.R., "Army Use of Near-Infrared Spectroscopy to Estimate Selected Properties of Compression Ignition Fuels," Society of Automotive Engineers Paper No. 930734, 1993.
20. Tran, C.D., *Anal. Chem.*, **64**, No. 20, pp. 971A-981A, 1992.
21. Hume, M., Eschenauer, U., and Siesler, H.W., *Appl. Spec.*, **49**, No.2, pp. 177-180, 1995.
22. Sapriel, J., *Acousto-Optics*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1976.
23. Korpel, A., *Acousto-Optics*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1988.
24. Westbrook, S.R., Hutzler, S.A., McInnis, L.A., and Voigt, M.S., "The Use of AOTF-NIR Spectrometers to Analyze Fuels, Phase II – Test Fuels," in progress, Interim Report TFLRF No. 320, U.S. Army TARDEC Fuels and Lubricants Research Facility (SwRI), Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas.
25. Lacey, P.I., "Development of a Lubricity Test Based on the Transition From Boundary Lubrication to Severe Adhesive Wear in Fuels," *Lubrication Engineering*, **50**, No. 10, October 1994.

APPENDIX A
Calibration Results

Definition of Terms

The following definitions apply to the terms found in Appendix A:

Factor – Factors are mathematical "spectra" that are derived from the calibration spectra. These factors, when combined with the mean spectrum and some scalar values (scores), can be used to regenerate the original spectra. Selection of the proper number of factors is made based on how many factors are needed to sufficiently model the component of interest. Since the scores and factors are related to the concentration of the components, they can be used to measure the property values of an unknown sample. A calibration model consists of a collection of factors and scores.

Standard Error of Prediction (Cross-Validation), SEP (CV) – During the calibration process, one sample is removed from the calibration set and the remaining samples are used to build a calibration model. The calibration model is then used to measure the component values(s) for the sample that was removed, treating it as if it were an unknown. This process, known as cross-validation (CV), is carried out until each sample has been left out once. SEP (CV) is a measure of the performance of the calibration model and is given in the same units as the component being modeled.

Total Error, TE – The Total Error is the sum of the absolute value of the error for all of the samples. The error is determined as the difference between the known value and the measured value.

Root Mean Squared Difference, RMSD – The Root Mean Squared Difference gives an indication of the average error in the calibration model for a given component.

Squared Correlation Coefficient, R^2 – The Squared Correlation Coefficient indicates the quality of fit of the predicted values to the known values for a given component. A value of 1 indicates a perfect match between the measured and known values.

H. Bjorsvik and H. Martens, "Data Analysis: Calibration of NIR Instruments by PLS Regression," in Handbook of Near-Infrared Analysis, Burns and Ciurczak, ed., p. 158, Marcel Dekker, New York, NY (1992).

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in the predicted vs. actual plots in Appendix A:

<u>Component Name</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>
Density, g/mL (D 1298)	d1298
Density, g/mL (D 4052)	d4052
Flash Point, °C (D 93)	flash
Cloud Point, °C (D 1500)	cloud
Freeze Point, °C (D 2386)	freeze
Pour Point, °C (D 97)	pour
Viscosity at 40°C, mm ² /s (D 445)	visc
Boiling Point at 50%, °C (D 86)	bp50
Cetane Number (D 613)	cetane
Carbon, mass% (D 5291)	c
Hydrogen, mass% (D 5291)	h
Carbon/Hydrogen	ch
Net Heat of Comb., MJ/kg (D 240)	mjkg
Gums, mg/100 mL (D 381)	gums
Total Water, ppm (D 1744)	water
Aromatics, Mono-, (D 5186)	mono
Aromatics, Di-, (D 5186)	di
Aromatics, Tri-, (D 5186)	tri
Total Aromatics, mass% (D 5186)	total
Sulfur, mass% (D 4294)	sulfur
Fuel Lubricity, mm (HFRR)	hfrr
Fuel Lubricity, g (SLWT)	scuff
Wear Scar Diameter, mm (D 5001, BOCLE)	bocle

Instrument:
Calibration Summary:


Bran & Luebbe
 23 components, 214 spectra, 401 points, 1 rotation sample,
 PLS1, mean centering

Component	Factor(recommended)	SEP(CV)	R ²
DENSITY (D 1298)	18	0.0011312	0.99234
DENSITY(D 4052)	19	0.000885	0.995405
FLASH	4	5.84	0.393074
CLOUD	13	4.3581	0.759682
FREEZE	12	4.8491	0.723783
POUR	13	5.6535	0.736876
VISCOSITY	18	0.11987	0.930608
BOILING PT @50%	18	3.9616	0.950576
CETANE	7	2.1861	0.573877
CARBON	4	0.27835	0.910966
HYDROGEN	7	0.090366	0.505413
CARBON/HYDROGEN	10	0.044013	0.934009
NET Ht. Comb. MJ/Kg	5	0.068153	0.825757
GUMS	1	14.567	0.0235143
WATER	1	14.364	0.0422699
AROMATICS, mono-	14	0.63095	0.980212
AROMATICS, di-	12	0.43956	0.952065
AROMATICS, tri-	13	0.28873	0.6819
TOTAL AROMATICS	16	0.58032	0.990761
SULFUR	17	0.017518	0.288277
HFRR	9	0.069191	0.566213
SLWT	4	639.07	0.18038
BOCLE	1	0.03203	0.000169532

TE: .0129162

R²: .995405

RMSD: .00082933




Actual : d4052

Total Factors: 19

Component: d4052

TE: 85.2326
 R²: .393074
 RMSD: 5.82638



Actual : Flash


Component: Flash

Total Factors: 4

TE: 63.6039

R²: .759682

RMSD: 4.34787




Actual : cloud

Component: cloud

Total Factors: 13

TE: 70.7706
 R²: .723783
 RMSD: 4.83778



Actual : freeze


Total Factors: 12

Component: freeze

TE: 82.5107


R²: .736876

RMSD: 5.64032



Total Factors: 13

TE: 1.74952
 R²: .930608
 RMSD: .119595




Actual : visc

Total Factors: 18

Component: visc

TE: 57.8182
R²: .950576
RMSE: 3.95237




Actual : bp50

Total Factors: 18
Component: bp50

TE: 31.9056

R²: .573877


RMSD: 2.18102



TE: 4.06242

R²: .505413

RMSD: .277702




Total Factors: 4

Component: c

TE: .642355

R²: .934009

RMSD: .0439105




Actual : ch

Total Factors: 10

Component: ch

TE: .994665
 R²: .825757
 RMSD: .0679939



Actual : mjkg


Total Factors: 5

Component: mjkg

TE: 212.606

R²: .0235143

RMSD: 14.5335



Actual : gums


Total Factors: 1

Component: gums

TE: 9.20843

R²: .980212

RMSD: .629475




Actual : mono

Total Factors: 14

Component: mono

TE: 6.41515
 R²: .952065
 RMSD: .43853



Actual : di


Total Factors : 12

Component: di

TE: 4.21383

R²: .6819

RMSD: .288052




Actual : tri

Total Factors: 13

Component: tri

TE: 8.46948
 R²: .990761
 RMSD: .578962



Actual : total


Total Factors: 16

Component: total

TE: .255674

R²: .288277

RMSD: .0174775




Actual : sulfur

Total Factors: 17

Component: sulfur

TE: 1.00982
 R²: .566213
 RMSD: .0690297



Actual : hfrf


Total Factors: 9

Component: hfrf

TE: 9326.99

R²: .18038

RMSD: 637.58




Actual : scuff

Component: scuff

Total Factors: 4

TE: .46746
 R²: .000169532
 RMSD: .0319549



Actual : bocle

Total Factors: 1

Component: bocle

Instrument:


Brimrose

Calibration Summary:

23 components, 214 spectra, 351 points, 1 rotation sample,
PLS1, mean centering

Component	Factor(recommended)	SEP(CV)	R ²
DENSITY (D 1298)	15	0.0014953	0.986615
DENSITY(D 4052)	16	0.0012824	0.990349
FLASH	3	6.0044	0.358277
CLOUD	11	4.6293	0.728989
FREEZE	11	4.9564	0.711955
POUR	11	5.8482	0.718489
VISCOSITY	18	0.12842	0.920352
BOILING PT @50%	17	4.3022	0.941754
CETANE	10	2.1716	0.581289
CARBON	3	0.27072	0.531725
HYDROGEN	7	0.091891	0.907951
CARBON/HYDROGEN	8	0.042985	0.937044
NET Ht. Comb. MJ/Kg	4	0.066309	0.83504
GUMS	1	14.52	0.000010116
WATER	11	12.648	0.267377
AROMATICS, mono-	18	0.86759	0.962601
AROMATICS, di-	10	0.54963	0.925082
AROMATICS, tri-	10	0.26714	0.726121
TOTAL AROMATICS	14	0.72578	0.985547
SULFUR	4	0.019246	0.0779117
HFRR	9	0.068022	0.580857
SLWT	6	616.02	0.241847
BOCLE	2	0.031217	0.0336625

TE: .0218233
R²: .986615
RMSD: .00149181



Actual : d1298


Total Factors: 15

Component: d1298

TE: .0187167

R²: .990349


RMSD: .00127944



Total Factors: 16

Component: d4052

TE: 87.6312
 R²: .358277
 RMSD: 5.99034




Actual : Flash

Total Factors: 3

Component: Flash

TE: 67.5627
 R²: .728989
 RMSD: 4.61849




Actual : cloud

Component: cloud

Total Factors: 11

TE: 72.3363
 R²: .711955
 RMSD: 4.94481



Actual : freeze


Total Factors: 11

Component: freeze

TE: 85.3525

R²: .718489

RMSE: 5.83458




Actual : pour

Total Factors: 11

Component: pour

TE: 1.87418
 R²: .920352
 RMSD: .128117



Actual : visc


Total Factors: 18

Component: visc

TE: 62.7887

R²: .941754

RMSD: 4.29215



Actual : bp50


Total Factors: 17

Component: bp50

TE: 3.95109

R²: .531725


RMSD: .270091



Total Factors: 3

Component: c

TE: 1.3411
 R²: .907951
 RMSD: .0916758



Actual : h


Total Factors: 7

Component: h

TE: .62735

R²: .937044


RMSD: .0428848



Total Factors: 8

Component: ch

TE: .967751
 R²: .83504
 RMSD: .0661541




Actual : m/kg

Total Factors: 4

Component: m/kg

TE: 184.59
R²: .267377
RMSE: 12.6183



Actual : water


Total Factors: 11

Component: water

TE: 3.89875

R²: .726121

RMSD: .266513




Actual : tri

Total Factors: 10

Component: tri

TE: 10.5924
 R²: .985547
 RMSD: .724079




Total Factors: 14
 Component: total

TE: .280883

R²: .0779117

RMSD: .0192008




Actual : sulfur

Component: sulfur

Total Factors: 4

TE: .992749
 R²: .580857
 RMSD: .0678629



Actual : hfrf


Total Factors: 9

Component: hfrf

TE: 8990.54

R²: .241847

RMSD: 614.58



Actual : scuff

Component: scuff

Total Factors: 6


Instrument:

Infrared Fiber Systems(IFS)

Calibration Summary:23 components, 214 spectra, 600 points, 1 rotation sample,
PLS1, mean centering

Component	Factor(recommended)	SEP(CV)	R ²
DENSITY (D 1298)	17	0.0011091	0.99266
DENSITY(D 4052)	19	0.00085204	0.99575
FLASH	5	5.85	0.39149
CLOUD	12	4.5187	0.74104
FREEZE	11	4.8941	0.71792
POUR	11	6.1248	0.6907
VISCOSITY	19	0.14993	0.89274
BOILING PT @50%	17	4.3547	0.94078
CETANE	7	2.2337	0.55461
CARBON	4	0.27784	0.50718
HYDROGEN	8	0.090071	0.91154
CARBON/HYDROGEN	9	0.040927	0.94291
NET Ht. Comb. MJ/Kg	7	0.067131	0.83102
GUMS	1	14.501	0.00075542
WATER	1	14.39	0.038936
AROMATICS, mono-	17	0.60914	0.98156
AROMATICS, di-	16	0.46653	0.94615
AROMATICS, tri-	13	0.28669	0.68649
TOTAL AROMATICS	19	0.54743	0.99178
SULFUR	14	0.018429	0.19924
HFRR	8	0.069555	0.56146
SLWT	6	633.18	0.20243
BOCLE	1	0.03172	0.0036392

TE: .0161876
R²: .992659
RMSD: .00110656



Actual : d1298


Total Factors: 17

Component: d1298

TE: .0124352

R²: .995747


RMSD: .000850051



Total Factors: 19

Component: d4052

TE: 85.3783
 R²: .39149
 RMSD: 5.83634



Actual : Flash


Total Factors: 5

Component: Flash

TE: 65.9479

R²: .741044

RMSD: 4.50811




Actual : cloud

Total Factors: 12

Component: cloud

TE: 71.4268
 R²: .717918
 RMSD: 4.88263



Actual : freeze


Total Factors: 11

Component: freeze

TE: 89.3892

R²: .690697

RMSD: 6.11052



Actual : pour


Total Factors: 11

Component: pour

TE: 63.5549

R²: .940784


RMSD: 4.34453



Total Factors: 17

Component: bp50

TE: 32.6002
 R²: .554611
 RMSD: 2.2285




Total Factors: 7

TE: 4.05491

R²: .507183

RMSD: .277188




Total Factors: 4

Component: c

TE: .597316

R²: .942913


RMSD: .0408317



Total Factors: 9

Component: ch

TE: .979746
 R²: .831021
 RMSD: .066974



Actual : m/kg


Total Factors: 7

Component: m/kg

TE: 211.641

R²: .000755416

RMSD: 14.4675




Actual : gums

Total Factors: 1

Component: gums

TE: 210.016
 R²: .038936
 RMSD: 14.3564



Actual : water


Total Factors: 1

Component: water

TE: .268965

R²: .199239

RMSD: .018386




Actual : sulfur

Component: sulfur

Total Factors: 14

TE: 1.01512
 R²: .561464
 RMSD: .0693925




Actual : hfr

Component: hfr

Total Factors: 8

TE: .46294
 R²: .00363924
 RMSD: .0316459




Actual : bocle

Component: bocle


Total Factors: 1

APPENDIX B
Results of Analyses


**BOILING POINT @50%
BRAN+LUEBBE**




**DENSITY (ASTM D 4052)
BRAN+LUEBBE**




**TOTAL AROMATICS
BRAN+LUEBBE**




**BOILING POINT @50%
BRIMROSE**




TOTAL AROMATICS BRIMROSE




**BOILING POINT @50%
INFRARED FIBER SYSTEMS**



**DENSITY (ASTM D 4052)
INFRARED FIBER SYSTEMS**



**TOTAL AROMATICS
INFRARED FIBER SYSTEMS**



Department of the Navy

OFC CHIEF NAVAL OPER ATTN: DR A ROBERTS (N420) 2000 NAVY PENTAGON WASHINGTON DC 20350-2000	1	CDR NAVAL RSCH LABORATORY ATTN: CODE 6181 WASHINGTON DC 20375-5342	1
CDR NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS CMD ATTN: SEA 03M3 2531 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY ARLINGTON VA 22242-5160	1	CDR NAVAL PETROLEUM OFFICE 8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD STE 3719 FT BELVOIR VA 22060-6224	1
CDR NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CTR ATTN: CODE 63 CODE 632 CODE 859 3A LEGGETT CIRCLE ANNAPOLIS MD 21402-5067	1 1 1		

Department of the Navy/U.S. Marine Corps

HQ USMC ATTN: LPP WASHINGTON DC 20380-0001	1	PROG MGR ENGR SYS MARINE CORPS SYS CMD 2033 BARNETT AVE QUANTICO VA 22134-5080	1
PROG MGR COMBAT SER SPT MARINE CORPS SYS CMD 2033 BARNETT AVE STE 315 QUANTICO VA 22134-5080	1	CDR MARINE CORPS SYS CMD ATTN: SSE 2030 BARNETT AVE STE 315 QUANTICO VA 22134-5010	1
PROG MGR GROUND WEAPONS MARINE CORPS SYS CMD 2033 BARNETT AVE QUANTICO VA 22134-5080	1	CDR MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BA ATTN: CODE 837 814 RADFORD BLVD ALBANY GA 31704-1128	1

Department of the Air Force

HQ USAF/LGSF ATTN: FUELS POLICY 1030 AIR FORCE PENTAGON WASHINGTON DC 20330-1030	1	AIR FORCE MEEP MGMT OFC OL ZC AFMC LSO/LOT PM 201 BISCAYNE DR BLDG 613 STE 2 ENGLIN AFB FL 32542-5303	1
HQ USAF/LGTV ATTN: VEH EQUIP/FACILITY 1030 AIR FORCE PENTAGON WASHINGTON DC 20330-1030	1	SA ALC/SFT 1014 BILLY MITCHELL BLVD STE 1 KELLY AFB TX 78241-5603	1
AIR FORCE WRIGHT LAB ATTN: WL/POS WL/POSF 1790 LOOP RD N WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7103	1 1	SA ALC/LDPG ATTN: D ELLIOTT 580 PERRIN BLDG 329 KELLY AFB TX 78241-6439	1

WR ALC/LVRS 1
225 OCMULGEE CT
ROBINS AFB
GA 31098-1647

Other Federal Agencies

NASA
LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER 1
CLEVELAND OH 44135

RAYMOND P. ANDERSON, PH.D., MANAGER 1
FUELS & ENGINE TESTING
BDM-OKLAHOMA, INC.
220 N VIRGINIA
BARTLESVILLE OK 74003

DOT
FAA
AWS 110 1
800 INDEPENDENCE AVE SW
WASHINGTON DC 20590

DOE
CE 151 (MR RUSSELL) 1
1000 INDEPENDENCE AVE SW
WASHINGTON DC 20585

EPA
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL 1
2565 PLYMOUTH RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48105