



UNCLASSIFIED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A. Approved for public release; unlimited public distribution.



TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Alternative Fuels for Use in DoD / Army Tactical Ground Systems

ARC Collaborative Research Seminar Series – Winter 2011

Patsy A. Muzzell, Alternative Fuels Team Leader

4 February 2011

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the 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 this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 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 a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 03 FEB 2011		2. REPORT TYPE briefing		3. DATES COVERED 03-02-2011 to 03-02-2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE ALTERNATIVE FUELS FOR USE IN DOD/ARMY TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEMS				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) patsy muzzell; nicholas johnson				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army RDECOM-TARDEC ,6501 E.11 Mile Rd,Warren,MI,48397-5000				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER #21501	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army RDECOM-TARDEC, 6501 E.11 Mile Rd, Warren, MI, 48397-5000				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) #21501	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT n/a					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 67	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

****Disclaimer:** Reference herein to any specific commercial company, product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the Department of the Army (DoA). The opinions of the authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the DoA, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.**

- TARDEC / NAC Overview
- The need to qualify alternatives to JP-8
 - Army Bulk Fuels Roadmap
 - The need to qualify
 - Tri-Services Energy Security Plans
 - Army Energy Security Implementation Strategy
 - TARDEC RDT&E supporting qualification of alternative fuels
 - Commercial vs. military diesel engine market
- JP-8 logistical fuel
 - What is JP-8?
 - What does it look like?
- Alternatives to JP-8
 - Terminology
 - What are the current alternatives to JP-8?
 - What do they look like?
 - When will they be available?
 - Environmental compliance and life cycle analysis of greenhouse gases
- The process to qualify
 - Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs)
 - ASTM-based process for qualification and approval of new fuels
- What has been done so far – some examples
 - TRL 1-4: Fuel properties
 - TRL 5-6: Component / engine evaluations
 - TRL 7-8: System evaluations
- Approval of alternatives to JP-8
 - Army requirements and JP-8 spec
 - Status of approvals for aviation platforms (JP-8, Jet A-1)

- Provides full life-cycle engineering support and is provider-of-first-choice for all DOD ground combat and combat support vehicle systems.
- Develops and integrates the right technology solutions to improve Current Force effectiveness and provide superior capabilities for the Future Force.

*Ground Systems Integrator
for the Department of Defense*



Responsible for Research, Development and Engineering Support to **2,800** Army systems and many of the Army's and DOD's Top Joint Warfighter Development Programs

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

unclassified



Force Projection

- Fuel & Water Distribution
- Force Sustainment
- Construction Equipment
- Bridging
- Assured Mobility Systems



Combat Vehicles

- Heavy Brigade Combat Team
- Strykers
- MRAPs
- Ground Combat Vehicles (Future)
- Abrams Main Battle Tank
- Bradley Fighting Vehicle



Tactical Vehicles

- HMMWVs
- Trailers
- Heavy, Medium & Light Tactical Vehicles
- Joint Tactical Vehicle (Future)


Robotics

- TALON
- PackBot
- MARCbot
- Gladiator
- Demonstrators
- Technology Components

TARDEC Engineers Provide Cradle-To-Grave Engineering Support

unclassified


Chartered by Secretary of the Army 21 June 1993



Mission: “The Center will serve as the Army focal point for the development of dual-use automotive technologies and their application to military ground vehicles. It will focus on facilitating joint efforts between industry, government and academia in basic research, collaboration, technology, industrial base development and professional development.”

“Leveraging Opportunities to Fill Technology Gaps.”

The need to qualify alternatives to JP-8



NOTE:

Army primarily uses JP-8 (jet fuel). Diesel fuel, regionally sourced, is likely alternate if JP-8 is not available or accessible.

Core Characteristics defining the **Energy Security** necessary for the full range of Army missions:

Surety:

Preventing loss of access to power and fuel sources.

Survivability:

Ensuring resilience in energy systems.

Supply:

Accessing alternative and renewable energy sources available on installations.

Sufficiency:

Providing adequate power for critical missions.

Sustainability:

Promoting support for the Army's mission, its community, and the environment.

ARMY ENERGY SECURITY
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY




January 13, 2009

The Army Senior Energy Council
and the
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for
Energy and Partnerships
Washington, D.C. 20301-3140

Strategic Energy Security Goals (ESGs)

- ESG 1:** Reduced energy consumption.
- ESG 2:** Ensuring resilience in energy systems.
- ESG 3:** Increased use of renewable/alternative energy.
- ESG 4:** Assured access to sufficient energy supplies.
- ESG 5:** Reduced adverse impacts on the environment.



ARMY ENERGY SECURITY
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY



January 13, 2009

The Army Senior Energy Council
and the

Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for
Energy and Partnerships
Washington, D.C. 20301-3140

Strategic Energy Security Goal 3

Increased Use of Renewable / Alternative Energy

Objective 3.3

Transition from fossil fuel based tactical mobility/power generation to renewable and alternative energy/sources.



AR 5-5 Study

Tactical Fuel and Energy Implementation Plan

Contract Number: W91QF5-09-P-0193

24 September 2010

Prepared for
U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
2221 A Ave
Fort Lee, VA 23801-1809



Prepared by
Expeditionary Logistics, Inc.
13203 North Enon Church Road, B Wing
Chester, Virginia 23035

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

Implementation Plan per AR 5-5 Study:

By 2028, 50% of the fuel requirement in the training base for the tactical mobility fleet (surface and air) is met by alternative fuel blends.


- Intended outcomes focused on integrating the use of alternative fuels in vehicle and aircraft engines in the training base
- Percent of fuel requirement met by alternative fuel blends:
 - 15% by FY18
 - 30% by FY23
 - 50% by FY28

- 2009: *Energy Management: Air Force Policy Directive 90-17 and Air Force Instruction 90-1701*
 - Lays out goals, objectives and metrics for Air Force Energy
 - Cross functional governance over the whole command
- 2011: Certification of all systems on 50%/50% FT SPK/JP-8 blend
- 2013: Certification of all systems on 50%/50% HRJ/JP-8 blends
- 2016: Obtain 50% of CONUS fuel from domestic synthetic and renewable fuels that are greener than petroleum baseline and are cost competitive





Navy Energy Strategy



- 2009: Navy Energy Plan released by Chief of Naval Operations
 - Plan with aggressive 5, 10, 20 and 30 year targets for tactical shore operations
- 2012: Demonstrate the Green Strike Group (“Great Green Fleet”)
- 2015: Reduce petroleum use in non-tactical fleet by 50%
- 2016: Sail the “Great Green Fleet”
- 2020: 50% of Navy Energy use from alternative energy sources

EMERGING ALTERNATIVE FUELS MARKET

- DOD
- DOE
- Industry
- Academia
- Fuel Producers
- Equipment OEMs
- Other Government Agencies
- Standards Development Organizations



Fuel / Component Evaluations

- Chemical composition
- Physical properties
- Component performance / durability



Engine Evaluations

- Fuel ignitability
- Fuel combustion
- Performance / durability



System Evaluations

- Operability
- Performance
- Demonstrations



Market Connection

- Fuels: process technology, data, test volumes
- Engines: combustion/fuel injection technology
- Market: regulations, policies, initiatives

Develop fuel specifications and qualify new fuels to ensure their suitability for use in ground equipment.

Develop engines more adaptable to changes in fuel quality/supply.

Fuel Qualification Process for approval of new fuels


Self-adjusting engine operation with changes in fuel quality to maintain desired engine performance



Wayne State University Photo courtesy of N. A. Henein, WSU

Acceptance of alternative fuels for use in ground vehicles/equipment.

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.




Diesel engine technologies will continue to evolve and alternative fuels will continue to emerge into the fuels supply. As these changes occur, the Army needs to understand the extent and nature of them to ensure Army capability is not adversely affected, but rather it is enhanced by knowing how to integrate them.

JP-8 logistical fuel

Used with permission from Rick Kamin, Fuels Lead, Navy Energy Coordination Office
(modified)


Basic Refinery Process




- Jet A / Jet A-1
 - Majority of commercial jet fuel used worldwide
 - Manufactured to meet ASTM D1655 or UK Def Stan 91-91 specifications
 - Jet fuel specifications are highly harmonized to accommodate the international nature of aviation travel
- Jet Propellant 8 (JP-8)
 - Primary fuel used by USAF and USA, including tactical/combat ground equipment
 - Manufactured to meet MIL-DTL-83133 (USAF-maintained)
 - Commercial Jet A-1 containing mandatory military-approved additives (discussed in upcoming slides)
- Jet Propellant 5 (JP-5)
 - Used by USN ship-based aircraft
 - Manufactured to meet US MIL-DTL-5624 (USN-maintained) or UK DEF STAN 91-86
 - Key difference from JP-8 is a higher flash point to improve safety for onboard ship-use


- Commercial
 - Jet A or Jet A-1 (same except freeze point)
 - ASTM D1655 and UK Def Stan 91-91 are key specifications
- Military JP-8
 - Specified by MIL-DTL-83133
 - JP-8 is Jet A-1 containing three military-approved additives
 - 1) Fuel System Icing Inhibitor (FSII)
 - 2) Static Dissipator Additive (SDA)
 - 3) Corrosion Inhibitor/Lubricity Improver (CI/LI)
 - Minimum concentration of CI/LI in QPL-25017 and qualified according to MIL-PRF-25017 should result in BOCLE wear scar diameter of no more than 0.65mm
 - Optional Additives
 - a. Metal Deactivator Additive (MDA)
 - b. Anti-oxidant (AO)

- **PQIS: Petroleum Quality Information System**
 - Facilitates collection and dissemination of standard fuel quality data
 - Annual reports issued by Defense Logistics Agency – Energy (DLA-E), formerly Defense Energy Support Center (DESC)
 - World split into 12 geographical regions
- **JP-8 purchased in 2008**
 - 2.3 Billion gallons worldwide
 - Only from Regions 1-8
 - None from Regions 9-12
 - JP-8 properties vary by region based upon crude and processing (see slides 20-26)




from PQIS 2008 Annual Report








* Calculated from spec minimums for density and lower heating value




* Cetane Number (ASTM D613)







Used with permission from CRC, Executive Director





How Do Jet and Diesel Fuels Differ?

(some key requirements in their specifications)



	Diesel Fuel Specification ASTM D975				Jet Fuel Specifications					
	DF-1		DF-2		Jet A-1		JP-8		JP-5	
<i>Property (unit)</i>	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
<i>Cetane Number</i>	40	---	40	---	---	---	Report (Cetane Index)		Report (Cetane Index)	
<i>Viscosity @ 40°C (mm²/s)</i>	1.3	2.4	1.9	4.1	---	---	---	---	---	---
<i>Viscosity @ -20° C (mm²/s)</i>	---	---	---	---	---	8.0	---	8.0	---	8.5
<i>Density @ 15°C (kg/L)</i>	---	---	---	---	0.775	0.840	0.775	0.840	0.788	0.845
<i>Sulfur Content (ppm)</i>	---	15	---	15	---	3000	---	3000	---	3000
<i>Flash Point (°C)</i>	38	---	52	---	38	---	38	---	60	---
<i>Lubricity HFRR @ 60°C (μm)</i>	---	520	---	520	---	0.85 BOCLE (mm)	---	0.65* BOCLE (mm)	---	0.65* BOCLE (mm)

* As provided by minimum effective treat rate of mandatory lubricity improver additive per QPL-25017 and MIL-PRF-25017

unclassified

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Alternatives to JP-8

Terminology	Acronym	Definition
Biomass-to-Liquids	BTL	Conversion of biomass to synthetic liquid hydrocarbons via the Fischer-Tropsch reaction
Coal-to-Liquids	CTL	Conversion of coal to synthetic liquid hydrocarbons via the Fischer-Tropsch reaction
Coal-and-Biomass-to-Liquids	CBTL	Conversion of co-fed coal and biomass to synthetic liquid hydrocarbons via the Fischer-Tropsch reaction
Gas-to-Liquids	GTL	Conversion of natural gas to synthetic liquid hydrocarbons via the Fischer-Tropsch reaction
Fischer-Tropsch Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene	FT SPK	Kerosene manufactured synthetically via the Fischer-Tropsch reaction and subsequent processing steps
Hydroprocessed Fatty Acid Esters and Free Fatty Acids	HEFA	Esters and fatty acids derived from various feedstocks that are subsequently upgraded to components intended for use in transportation fuels (e.g., jet fuel)
Hydroprocessed Renewable Jet	HRJ	Kerosene (intended as a jet fuel component) manufactured from renewable feedstock and processed via selective hydrocracking and subsequent fractionation

- Two alternative fuels for which evaluations are being completed to assess their impacts on tactical ground systems
 - **Blends** of JP-8 and up to 50% by volume of
 - Fischer-Tropsch Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene (FT SPK)
 - Hydroprocessed Renewable Jet (HRJ)
 - Both products (FT SPK and HRJ) are very similar compositionally
 - Resultant properties are very similar
 - Evaluations thus conducted using one of these blends will be representative of evaluations for the other by similarity
 - Evaluations are conducted using nominal 50%:50% volumetric blends
 - Blends are meant to be “**drop-in**” fuels
 - Meets fuel performance requirements (in spec)
 - Requires no change to vehicles/equipment
 - Requires no change to infrastructure
 - Can be mixed or alternated with petroleum-derived fuel



Biomass Feedstock
(renewables)



Fossil Energy Feedstock
(large U.S. resource)



Petroleum Crude Oil

(increasingly difficult discovery and unfriendly-nation production)



- Various conversion processes dependent on feedstock
- Product meeting commercial and/or military specifications
- Specs evolving to address alternatively sourced hydrocarbons



Jet Fuel

- ASTM D1655: conventional jet fuel
- ASTM D7566: blends of synthetic kerosene with conv. jet fuel
- MIL-DTL-83133: JP-8, also blends of synthetic kerosene with JP-8

Diesel Fuel

- ASTM D975: up to 5% v. FAME biodiesel (B100) allowed in diesel fuel
- ASTM D6751: B100 spec
- ASTM D7467: blends of 6%-20% v. FAME biodiesel (B100) with diesel

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Can alternative jet fuels
be made on large-scale and
be cost competitive?

Goal:
<\$3/gal
at
production
capacity

2006

- **Biofuels Phase 0**
 - Proof of concept: flexible process for agricultural crop oil feedstocks

2008

- **Biofuels Phase 0**
 - Resulted in HRJ
- **Biofuels Phase I & II**
 - Cellulosic Phase I Award – Goal of 30% conversion efficiency
 - Algae RFP – Demonstrate algal triglyceride production
- **Coal-to-Liquid RFP**


2010

- **Biofuels Phase I & II**
 - Cellulosic Phase II Award – Goal of 50% conversion efficiency
 - Algal Phase I Award
- **Coal-to-Liquid Award** – Study on feasibility of acceptable environmental and economic proof of concept


2012+

- **Biofuels Phase I & II**
 - Cellulosic Phase II Completion
 - Algae Phase II Award – Demonstrate algal oil production at \$1/gal

****CTL / GTL / BTL / CBTL: All use Fischer-Tropsch Processes****



Very similar processes also used in traditional petroleum JP-8 Production



Because of the similar end-processing, FT SPK and HRJ are chemically similar blendstocks

Used with permission from Mark Rumizen, FAA



Sugar



forest waste

Lignocellulose

Synthetic Biology



Fermentation



Genetically Engineered Microbes



Jet Fuel-Like Product

Alcohol Oligomerization



Fermentation




Dehydration



Olefins

Conventional Refinery Processes



Polymerization



Hydroprocessing



Jet Fuel-Like Product

Pyrolysis



Pyrolysis




Bio-Crude

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

unclassified

Courtesy of Rick Kamin, Fuels Lead, Navy Energy Coordination Office



*ASTM D2425 –
GC/MS Indicates Similarity of
Size & Type of Hydrocarbon
Molecules in Fuel*

	JP-8	HRJ	FT SPK
aromatics	20%	<0.5%	<0.1%
n-paraffins	59%	>84.5%	99%
iso-paraffins			
cyclo-paraffins	20%	<15%	<0.1%

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

unclassified

Property	JP-8		Blend		SPK	
	min	max	min	max	min	max
Aromatics (vol %)		25.0	8.0	25.0		0.5
Sulfur total (mass %)		0.30		0.30		0.0015
Cycloparaffins (mass %)						15.0
Distillation temperature, °C						
10% recovered (T ₁₀)		205		205		205
Final boiling point		300		300		300
T ₅₀ -T ₁₀			15			
T ₉₀ -T ₁₀			40		22	
Density @ 15°C (kg/L)	0.775	0.840	0.775	0.840	0.751	0.770
Calculated cetane index	Report		Report		Report	
Viscosity @ -20°C (mm ² /s)		8.0		8.0		8.0
Viscosity @ 40°C (mm ² /s)					Report	
Net Heat of Combustion (MJ/kg)	42.8		42.8		42.8	
Lubricity, BOCLE (WSD, mm)		0.65*		0.65*		

* As provided by minimum effective treat rate of mandatory lubricity improver additive per QPL-25017 and MIL-PRF-25017

- Requirements for all three products are found in MIL-DTL-83133G
- Most requirements for the blend, including all of those not shown, are the same as JP-8 for “drop-in” capability of the blends

		AF-7117	FL-12972-08	POSF 6406	POSF 6184
Properties	JP-8 / FT SPK Blend Specification MIL-DTL-83133G	Shell FT SPK Blend ¹	Syntroleum FT SPK Blend ²	UOP HRJ Blend Tallow	UOP HRJ Blend Camelina
Aromatics (vol %)	8.0 - 25.0	9.3	14.0	9.3	10.1
Sulfur total (mass %)	0.30 max	ng	ng	0.02	0.02
Distillation Temperature, °C					
10% recovered (T ₁₀)	205 max	170	179	180	170
FBP	300 max	239	257	261	275
T ₅₀ -T ₁₀	15 min	15	22	30	29
T ₉₀ -T ₁₀	40 min	64	53	64	72
Density @ 15°C (kg/L)	0.775 - 0.840	0.774	0.792	0.781	0.778
Viscosity @ -20°C (mm ² /s)	8.0 max	-	4.4	5.0	4.0
Viscosity @ 40°C (mm ² /s)		1.2	1.3	1.4	1.2
Net Heat of Combustion (MJ/kg)	42.8 min	43.4	43.3	43.8	43.8
Derived Cetane Number ³		48.8	47.0	49.4	49.2
Calculated cetane Index	Report	46.6	48.0	57.1	55.1
Lubricity - BOCLE (mm)		0.55	0.53	0.55	0.53


NOTES:


1. Shell FT SPK purchased on waiver – density did not meet minimum requirement per MIL-DTL-83133 REV F; this product does not meet REV G either, but is being tested (50%:50% v. blend) as “worst case” scenario.

2. Syntroleum “S-8” FT SPK is a nominal representative blend stock meeting MIL-DTL-83133G.


3. While not a required property, Derived Cetane Number is a more accurate representation of Cetane Number (ASTM D613) than is Calculated Cetane Index (ASTM D976, ASTM D4737) for some fuels such as synthetic fuels.


TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.








* Calculated from spec minimums for density and lower heating value












Viscosity: JP-8 CRC Average vs. Fuel Blends

Used with permission from CRC, Executive Director




TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

unclassified

- Currently minimal US industrial base for either FT SPK or HRJ but . . .
- There are several ***proposed operational demonstrations for new production facilities*** throughout the US that leverage demand from both the commercial and military (mainly USAF and USN) sectors
 - **Hawai'i** – GIFT-PAC initiative for supply 50% of PACOM tactical fuel with non-fossil sustainable alternative fuel blends from local suppliers
 - **Pacific Northwest** – 14 airlines signed MOU to purchase output from ***new HRJ facility*** (AltAir Fuels)
 - **California** – 8 US Airlines agree to purchase output from ***new BTL plant producing FT SPK*** and FT Diesel for use at LAX (Rentech / UOP)
 - **Gulf Coast Region** – 13 airlines signed MOU to purchase output from ***new FT SPK facility*** (Rentech)
 - **Alaska** – DLA-E initiative for a ***new FT SPK facility*** on hold pending further DOD decisions


GIFT-PAC = Green Initiative for Fuels Transition Pacific

DLA-E = Defense Logistics Agency-Energy



- Per the Energy and Independence Security Act of 2007, Section 526 . . .
 - No Federal Agency shall enter into a contract for procurement of an alternative or synthetic fuel for any mobility-related use **unless the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions (LC GHG) of the fuel supplied under contract are no greater than such emissions of the equivalent petroleum-based fuel**
- USAF leading a working group comprised of government agencies, academia and industry that is developing framework / guidance of LC GHG emissions of alternative aviation fuels for use in aviation equipment
 - Peer reviewed and released in Dec 2009, “Framework and Guidance for Estimating Greenhouse Gas Footprints of Aviation Fuels”
 - Case studies being conducted per this framework will include language for aviation fuel use (JP-8) in tactical/combat ground equipment
 - “Because complete combustion of the fuel has been assumed, (i.e., all fuel carbon is assumed to be converted to CO₂ via combustion), the life cycle inventory results would be the same whether the fuel were used in a jet aircraft or a diesel engine.”

- Peer reviewed report of 16 feedstocks-to-jet fuel pathways conducted by PARTNER
 - Screening level study
 - Taken into account were various land use change (LUC) scenarios for biofuels
 - Examined low, baseline, and high emissions scenarios
- Conventional petroleum has lowest emissions among fossil fuels
- Large variability due to unknowns i.e. production processes, LUC, feedstock growth
- Data from report used as part of USAF led group developing framework for LC GHG emissions of alternative jet fuels



The process to qualify

EMERGING ALTERNATIVE FUELS MARKET

- DOD
- DOE
- Industry
- Academia
- Fuel Producers
- Equipment OEMs
- Other Government Agencies
- Standards Development Organizations



Market Connection

- Manufacturing technology
- Fuel data, samples
- Market drivers

Poor lubricity fuel may cause increased wear rates in fuel injectors and injection pumps.



Fuel / Component Evaluations

- Chemical composition
- Physical properties
- Component performance / durability

Engine Evaluations

- Fuel ignitability
- Fuel combustion
- Performance / durability



System Evaluations

- Operability
- Performance
- Demonstrations



Fuel Qualification


Fuel with low cetane ratings may cause cold-starting problems, and misfire and combustion instability, esp. for lt-med load operation.

Low fuel viscosity may result in fuel pump internal leakage and associated loss of power.


Approval and acceptability of alternative fuels for use in DOD ground equipment.

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.


Only a partial representation of TRL tests and evaluations.




Evaluation



PM / OEM Review



Specification Change




What has been done so far – some examples

Completed

- TARDEC elastomer compatibility evaluations supported a blends implementation path*
- Blends of up to 50% by volume FT SPK with JP-8 allowed
 - Blends minimize/eliminate risk of fuel leaks due to change in fuel aromatic content
- Actual FT SPK content possible in a blend, with a given JP-8 batch, may be less than 50 v% since blend properties must meet
 - Minimum density same as for JP-8 fuel (0.775 kg/L)
 - Minimum aromatic content of 8.0 v%

* SAE Paper 2007-01-1453




- Nitrile components swell in JP-8, then shrink when switched into FT SPK (FT "JP-8")
- O-ring shrinkage increases risk of sealing failures
- Using unaffected o-ring elastomers or FT SPK in blends with JP-8 are ways to reduce this risk

Completed

- FT SPK/JP-8 blend properties*
 - Compared properties of blends with those of typical JP-8 (CONUS, 2004)
 - Properties of blends (up to 50 v% FT SPK) generally fell within JP-8 “property box”
- Follow-on study of typical JP-8 at five Army CONUS installations
 - Maximum FT SPK content possible (50 v%) at four of these installations
 - Only 42 v% FT SPK content possible at fifth installation

FUEL BLENDS STUDY BASED ON JP-8 USED AT FIVE U.S. ARMY INSTALLATIONS

ONE IN EACH DEFENSE ENERGY SUPPORT CENTER (DESC) DEFENSE REGION IN
CONTINENTAL U.S.




- Why are certain FI systems considered to be high risk?
 - Synthetic fuels are known to have poor lubricity characteristics
 - Because of the lack of certain heteroatoms and trace compounds,
 - Some FI systems rely on the lubricity of the fuel to prevent high wear rates of components and premature failures
 - These components nominally include pumps and fuel injectors
- What about the use of lubricity improver additive (LIA)?
 - ULSD and JP-8 require LIA in order to meet specification requirements for lubricity
 - Synthetic fuel blends will also require LIA to meet specification requirements for lubricity

In-progress

- Bench-top lubricity testing
 - ASTM Test Methods: BOCLE, SLBOCLE, and HFRR
 - BOCLE developed for jet fuels, HFRR for diesel fuels
 - FT SPK untreated and treated with military approved lubricity improver additive (CI/LI) per QPL-25107
 - BOCLE results indicate treated FT SPK lubricity is improved, HFRR and SLBOCLE results do not
- Rotary fuel injection pump test rig testing
 - Ambient temperature, 500-hr durability*
 - Untreated FT SPK results showed excessive wear of pump components
 - Treated FT SPK results indicative of acceptable field performance
 - Elevated temperature, 1000-hr durability
 - Baseline fuels (ULSD and Jet A-1), FT SPK, and FT SPK/Jet A-1 blend


Correlation
of results
between
bench-top
and rig tests
at **ambient T**

Rotary fuel injection pump test rig



TARDEC photo by E. Frame,
TARDEC Fuels & Lubricants Research Facility

chipped roller shoe



TARDEC photo by E. Frame,
TARDEC Fuels & Lubricants Research Facility



* SAE Paper 2004-01-2961

Completed

- Test protocol (performance and durability)
 - 2 X Army and Coordinating Research Council 210-hr TWV Test Cycle
 - Equivalent to 40,000 miles proving ground operation
 - Two tests: JP-8 and FT SPK (100%)
 - Coolant, oil, fuel and inlet air temperatures elevated to maintain an oil sump temperature of 260°F
- CATERPILLAR C7 engine results (report in DTIC)
 - Power curves for four fuels are all similar, both at start and end of test
 - ULSD
 - JP-8
 - FT SPK (S-8)
 - JP-8/FT SPK blend
 - Post-test engine tear-down found no unusual results for JP-8 or FT SPK
 - Used oil condition similar for JP-8* and FT SPK

* JP-8 test fuel had low sulfur content of 78 ppm; spec allows up to 3000 ppm sulfur.


Full Load Power Curves




In-progress

- HMMWV engine
- JP-8 and JP-8/FT SPK blend (50:50 v%) evaluated under modified NATO duty cycle
 - Testing done at ambient temperature
 - NATO duty cycle modified to accommodate for JP-8 and JP-8/FT SPK blend
- Slight power differences between fuels at ambient conditions
- Pre-/post-test checks of fuel pumps and injector tolerances
 - Performed by manufacturer
 - No fuel related differences observed beyond normal wear
- Additional test using a JP-8/HRJ (50:50 v%) fuel blend

Engine 1 Ambient Temperature Power Curves 0hr and 400hr on DF-2 and JP-8



Engine 2 Ambient Temperature Power Curves 0hr and 400hr on DF-2, JP-8 and Blend



Completed

- Demo not intended to assess long-term performance or durability of components or engines operating on synthetic fuel blends
- Demo fleet at Ft. Bliss, Aug 08 to Jul 09, operating on FT SPK/JP-8 blend (50:50 v%)

- ✓ M998 - HMMWV Truck Utility
- ✓ M915A4 - Line Haul Truck
- ✓ M925A2 - 5 Ton Truck Cargo
- ✓ M1075 - 2.5 Ton LMTV Cargo
- ✓ M1083A1 - 5 Ton MTV Cargo
- ✓ M1089A1 - FMTV Wrecker
- ✓ M978/M984 - HEMTT Tanker/Wrecker

- Over 86,000 cumulative miles total
 - > Test vehicles: 47,000 miles and 9,500 gallons of synthetic fuel blend
 - > Control vehicles: 39,000 miles and 6,900 gallons of JP-8
 - > Individual vehicles: A couple operated nearly 5100 miles, many a few hundred miles
- **No issues with vehicle operation throughout demo, no discernible differences to drivers and mechanics between operation of test vehicles versus control vehicles**

This demo served to introduce synthetic fuel blends to the end user and to build acceptance of their use.




TARDEC photo by R. Alvarez,
TARDEC Fuels & Lubricants Research Facility

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Completed

- HMMWV (6.5L N.A.) operated on four test fuels
 - DF-2, JP-8, FT SPK and JP-8/FT SPK blend (50:50 v%)
 - Vehicle instrumented to capture data
- 1000 miles total accumulation
 - On-road and off-road
 - Vehicle acceleration
 - Flat and hills
 - Loaded and unloaded
- Results (report in DTIC)
 - Differences in performance of vehicle in line with expectations based on operating this particular engine/FI system on these fuels and their variation in properties from one to the other




Test results show minimal performance differences between JP-8 and blend; unlikely these will be noticed by driver in the field.

Approval of alternatives to JP-8

- **Army conversion from diesel fuel to Single Fuel in the Battlefield (SFB)**
 - Began in 1980's, fully implemented in 1988
 - Army equipment has **generally maintained acceptable levels of performance/durability**, but
- **Some issues; relate to two requirements in diesel spec that are not in JP-8 spec**

1. **Cetane No. (minimum of 40, No. 1-D and 2-D)**


Cetane no. of fuel
is too low



Cold engines take longer to start, or may not start at all!
Engines* misfire or combustion is unstable!

2. **Viscosity at 40°C (minimum of 1.3 mm²/s, No. 1-D)**


Viscosity of fuel
is too low



Some engines/components do not last as long!
Some engines produce less power!

- **For FT SPK (and soon HRJ), Army wants two requirements added to JP-8 spec:**
 1. **Minimum Derived Cetane No. of 50**
 2. **Minimum Viscosity at 40°C of 1.3 mm²/s**
- **Current JP-8 spec (REV G) includes notes about desired Army requirements**

Used with permission from Dr. Tim Edwards, AFRL
(modified)



Fischer-Tropsch Synthetic Paraffinic Kerosene (FT SPK)
Hydroprocessed Renewable Jet (HRJ)
Semi-Synthetic Jet Fuel (SSJF)
Fully Synthetic Jet Fuel (FSJF)

unclassified

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Completed TARDEC Evaluations Reports and Papers Available



Document Title	Publication Date	Publication Reference	
		DTIC	Other
Synthetic Fuel Lubricity Evaluations	Sep-03	ADA421822	Interim Report TFLRF No. 367
Synthetic JP-5 Aviation Turbine Fuel Elastomer Compatibility	Nov-03	--	TARDEC Report No. 13978
Exhaust Emissions From a 6.5L Diesel Engine Using Synthetic Fuel and Low-Sulfur Diesel Fuel	Dec-03	ADA426513	Interim Report TFLRF No. 370
Alternative Fuels: Assessment of Fischer-Tropsch Fuel for Military Use in 6.5L Diesel Engine	Jan-04	--	SAE Paper No. 2004-01-2961
Evaluation of Ball on Three Disks as Lubricity Evaluator for CI/LI in Synthetic JP-5	Apr-04	ADA462280	TARDEC Report No. 13977
Synthetic Fischer-Tropsch (FT) JP-5/JP-8 Aviation Turbine Fuel Elastomer Compatibility	Feb-05	ADA477802	TARDEC Report No. 15043
Bench Top Lubricity Evaluator Correlation with Military Rotary Fuel Injection Pump Test Rig	Oct-05	ADA524925	SAE Paper No. 2005-01-3899
Properties of Fischer-Tropsch (FT) Blends for Use in Military Equipment	Apr-06	ADA521910	SAE Paper No. 2006-01-0702
Elastomer Impact When Switch-Loading Synthetic Fuel Blends and Petroleum	Jul-06	ADA459513	TARDEC Report No. 16028
The Effect of Switch-Loading Fuels on Fuel-Wetted Elastomers	Jan-07	ADA497968	SAE Paper No. 2007-01-1453
Evaluation of Synthetic Fuel in Military Tactical Generators	Jun-08	ADA482914	Interim Report TFLRF No. 392
Engine Durability Evaluation Using Synthetic Fuel, Caterpillar C7 Engine	Oct-08	ADA494498	Interim Report TFLRF No. 391
Fischer-Tropsch Synthetic Fuel Evaluations: HMMWV Test Track Evaluation	Sep-09	ADA509165	Interim Report TFLRF No. 400
Evaluation of the Fuel Effects of Synthetic JP-8 Blends on the 6.5L Turbo Diesel V8 from General Engine Products (GEP) 6.5L Engines Using the NATO Standard Engine Laboratory Test AEP-5, Edition 3, May 1988	Dec-09	--	TARDEC Report, Distribution A
Synthetic Fuel Blend Demonstration Program at Fort Bliss, Texas	May-10	ADA533890	Interim Report TFLRF No. 407
Lubricity and Derived Cetane Number Measurements of Jet Fuels, Alternative Fuels and Fuel Blends	Jul-10	ADA529442	Interim Report TFLRF No. 405