

NIST Special Publication 1069

Advanced Technology for

Fire Suppression in Aircraft

**The Final Report of the Next Generation
Fire Suppression Technology Program**

Richard G. Gann, Editor
Building and Fire Research Laboratory

June 2007



U.S. Department of Commerce
Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary

Technology Administration
Robert C. Cresanti, Under Secretary for Technology

National Institute of Standards and Technology
William A. Jeffrey, Director



Page intentionally left blank

Certain commercial entities, equipment, or materials are identified in this document in order to describe an experimental procedure or concept adequately. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology or the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, nor is it intended to imply that the entities, materials, or equipment are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

The policy of NIST is to use metric units of measurement in all its publications, and to provide statements of uncertainty for all original measurements. In this document, however, data from organizations outside NIST are shown. These data may include measurements in non-metric units or measurements without uncertainty statements.

National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication 1069
Natl. Inst. Stand. Special Publication 1069, 1240 pages (June 2007)
CODEN: NSPUE2

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov — Phone: (202) 512-1800 — Fax: (202) 512-2250
Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

ABSTRACT

Fires and explosions were, and continue to be, among the greatest threats to the safety of personnel and the survivability of military aircraft both in peacetime and during combat operations. Production of halon 1301 (CF_3Br), long the fire suppressant of choice, ceased as of January 1, 1994 due to its high ozone depleting potential (ODP). By 1997, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) had identified the best available replacement for halon 1301 in aircraft, HFC-125 ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{F}$), but it requires two to three times the mass and storage volume and contributes to global warming. Meanwhile, new aircraft were in various stages of design, and the international community was questioning the necessity of maintaining the large reserves of halon 1301.

A new undertaking, the Next Generation Fire Suppression Technology Program (NGP), was created to identify, through research, fire suppression technologies with reduced compromises. Supported primarily by the DoD Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) as Project WP-1059, the NGP goal was to “Develop and demonstrate technology for economically feasible, environmentally acceptable and user-safe processes, techniques, and fluids that meet the operational requirements currently satisfied by halon 1301 systems in aircraft.” The multiple demands on the new technologies were daunting.

In its decade of systematic research (1997-2006), the NGP revitalized the field of fire suppression science. This book tells the story of how the NGP came about, what research was performed, how it modernized the thinking in the field, and the technical findings that emerged related to fire suppression in aircraft. The enclosed CD compiles the collected publications from the program.

Keywords: flame inhibition, fire research, fire suppression, halon, aircraft

Page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	xvii
List of Tables	xlv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 The Evolution of Fire Suppression	1
1.3 The Rise of Halons.....	3
1.4 The Atmospheric Threat	5
1.5 History of the NGP	9
1.6 This Book.....	15
1.7 References.....	16
Chapter 2: History of Fire Suppression in Aircraft	19
2.1 Fire Threats to Military Aircraft	20
2.2 Protected Compartments on Aircraft	24
2.2.1 Engine Nacelles	24
2.2.2 Other Powerplant-type Compartments	28
2.2.3 Dry Bay Compartments	31
2.2.4 Cargo Compartments	34
2.2.5 Other Compartments.....	36
2.2.6 Fuel Tank Ullage.....	37
2.3 Types of Fires Experienced	41
2.3.1 Safety-related Fires	43
2.3.2 Ballistically-induced Fires	45

2.3.3	Spray Fires	47
2.3.4	Pool Fires	49
2.3.5	Fire Characteristics	50
2.3.6	Aircraft Operational Temperature Environment.....	54
2.3.7	Reignition.....	79
2.4	Fire Suppressants Used on Aircraft	80
2.4.1	Powerplant Compartments.....	81
2.4.2	Dry Bay Compartments	86
2.4.3	Certification	86
2.5	Halon Alternative Technology Development Program (TDP).....	92
2.5.1	Phase 1 – Operational Parameters Study	93
2.5.2	Phase 2 – Operational Comparison of Selected Extinguishants	94
2.5.3	Phase 3 – Establishment of Design Criteria Methodologies.....	94
2.5.4	Impact of Halon Alternative Fire Suppression to the Aircraft.....	96
2.6	References.....	109
Chapter 3: Flame Suppression Chemistry		119
3.1	Introduction.....	120
3.2	Halogen-containing Compounds	121
3.2.1	Previous Understanding of the Inhibition Mechanism of CF ₃ Br.....	121
3.2.2	Suppression of Nonpremixed Flames by Fluorinated Ethanes and Propanes.....	124
3.3	Metal-containing Compounds.....	142
3.3.1	Background.....	142
3.3.2	Metals with Demonstrated Flame Inhibition Potential	155
3.3.3	Flame Inhibition by Iron-containing Compounds.....	156
3.3.4	Flame Inhibition by Tin and Manganese	178
3.3.5	Complexation/Matrix Absorption of Super-effective Agents.....	199
3.3.6	Potential for Loss of Effectiveness of Other Metals.....	224
3.3.7	Flame Inhibition and Loss-of-effectiveness Summary.....	232
3.3.8	Conclusions.....	235

3.4	Phosphorus.....	236
3.4.1	Introduction.....	236
3.4.2	Inhibition of Non-premixed Flames by Phosphorus-containing Compounds.....	238
3.4.3	Effects of Dimethyl Methylphosphonate on Premixed Methane Flames.....	267
3.4.4	Summary: Phosphorus-containing Compounds in Flames.....	281
3.5	Comparative Flame Inhibition Mechanisms of Candidate Moieties.....	282
3.5.1	Introduction.....	282
3.5.2	Spectroscopic Studies of Inhibited Opposed Flow Propane/Air Flames.....	282
3.5.3	CF ₃ Br and Other Suppressants: Differences in Effects on Flame Structure.....	291
3.5.4	Influence of Bond Energies on Catalytic Flame Inhibition.....	299
3.5.5	Temperature Regions of Optimal Chemical Inhibition of Premixed Flames.....	307
3.6	Insights on Flame Inhibition.....	316
3.7	References.....	318
Chapter 4: Aerosol Properties.....		339
4.1	Introduction.....	340
4.2	Previous Knowledge.....	341
4.2.1	Water.....	341
4.2.2	Powders.....	341
4.2.3	Combined Agents - Water Additives.....	342
4.2.4	Burning Surfaces.....	344
4.2.5	Large-scale Studies.....	345
4.2.6	Modeling.....	348
4.3	The Nature of Aerosols.....	348
4.3.1	Quantitative Descriptors.....	348
4.3.2	Generation Techniques.....	350
4.3.3	Quantification of Aerosols.....	351
4.3.4	Aerosol Size and Velocity Characterization.....	351

4.3.5	Aerosol Properties Affecting Behavior.....	355
4.4	The Nature of Flames.....	358
4.4.1	Flame Characteristics.....	358
4.4.2	Premixed Bunsen Type Flames	359
4.4.3	Non-premixed Flames.....	360
4.5	Aerosol Flame Suppression Studies.....	363
4.5.1	Water, a Physical Suppression Agent.....	363
4.5.2	Alkali Metal Bicarbonates, Chemically Active Fire Suppressants.....	397
4.5.3	Aqueous Metal Salt Solutions, Combined Chemical and Physical Suppression.....	412
4.5.4	Dendrimers, Combined Chemical and Physical Flame Suppression.....	430
4.6	Surface Cooling	438
4.6.1	Introduction.....	438
4.6.2	Evaporation of Liquid Droplets	440
4.6.3	Spray Cooling	443
4.6.4	Convective Regime.....	444
4.6.5	Nucleate Boiling Regime.....	445
4.6.6	Critical Heat Flux.....	446
4.6.7	Transition and Film Boiling Regimes.....	446
4.6.8	Summary	448
4.7	Aerosols and Burning Surfaces.....	448
4.7.1	Flame Spread Studies.....	449
4.7.2	Droplet Interaction with a Hot Surface.....	458
4.7.3	Summary and Conclusions	466
4.8	The New State of Knowledge of Flame Extinguishment by Aerosols.....	467
4.9	Relation of Findings to Practical Fires.....	468
4.10	References.....	469
Chapter 5: Instrumentation for Bench- and Large-scale Test Fixtures.....		481
5.1	Introduction.....	482
5.2	Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy for Measurement of Fire Suppressants.....	483

5.3	Tunable Diode Laser Absorption Spectroscopy (TDLAS) for Measurement of Combustion Products, Fuels, and Oxygen.....	485
5.3.1	General.....	485
5.3.2	HF.....	486
5.3.3	Oxygen.....	490
5.3.4	Fuels.....	490
5.3.5	Observations.....	501
5.4	Measurement of Fire Suppressant Concentration Using a Differential Infrared Rapid Agent Concentration Sensor (DIRRACS).....	502
5.4.1	Introduction.....	502
5.4.2	Original Instrument Design – DIRRACS I.....	502
5.4.3	Improved Hardware Design – DIRRACS II.....	505
5.4.4	Data Acquisition and Analysis.....	507
5.4.5	Calibration Experiments.....	507
5.4.6	Release Tests of HFC-125 in the TARPF Facility.....	508
5.4.7	HFC-125 Release Tests in a Bradley Vehicle.....	509
5.4.8	Assessment.....	513
5.5	Conclusion.....	513
5.6	References.....	514
Chapter 6: Screening Tests for Candidate Fire Suppressants		517
6.1	The Need for Screening Tests.....	518
6.2	General Approach.....	519
6.3	Agent Properties to be Screened.....	519
6.4	Fire Suppression Efficiency Screening.....	521
6.4.1	Estimation of Values.....	521
6.4.2	Cup Burner.....	522
6.4.3	Dispersed Liquid Agent Fire Suppression Screen (DLAFSS).....	525
6.4.4	Transient Application, Recirculating Pool Fire Apparatus (TARPF).....	535
6.4.5	Summation.....	557
6.5	Atmospheric Lifetime Screen.....	557
6.5.1	Factors Affecting Atmospheric Harm.....	557

6.5.2	Prior Estimation Methods	558
6.5.3	The Screening Protocol.....	561
6.5.4	Removal by Hydroxyl Radical Reaction	561
6.5.5	Measurement of Photolysis Rates.....	565
6.5.6	Estimation of Reactivity	568
6.5.7	Solution of Fluoroalkylamines.....	571
6.5.8	Reactivity of Alkyl Phosphates towards Radicals in Water	571
6.6	Volatility Screen	572
6.6.1	Extinguishant Volatility	572
6.6.2	Extinguishant Evaporation Equilibrium	572
6.6.3	Extinguishant Evaporation Rate	574
6.6.4	Boiling Temperature	576
6.7	Toxicity Screen	577
6.7.1	Hazards and Regulation	577
6.7.2	Screening Process	578
6.7.3	Literature Values.....	579
6.7.4	Quantitative Structure Activity Relationships	581
6.7.5	Non-animal Laboratory Testing.....	584
6.7.6	In vitro Tests	589
6.7.7	PBPK Modeling of Cardiotoxic Effects	590
6.7.8	Limit Tests	596
6.8	Application of Screen Tests.....	597
6.9	References.....	598
Chapter 7: Search for New Fire Suppressant Chemicals		611
7.1	Fire Suppressant Replacement Knowledge prior to the NGP.....	612
7.1.1	Overview of Early Halon Replacement Efforts	612
7.1.2	Fire Suppressant Research - 1974 through 1993	613
7.1.3	DoD Technology Development Plan (1993 through 1997).....	615
7.1.4	Advanced Agent Working Group (AAWG).....	616
7.1.5	Summary: Alternative Agents and Selection Criteria prior to the NGP.....	622

7.2	The NGP Approach to New Chemicals Screening.....	623
7.3	NGP Surveys of Inorganic Chemical Families.....	626
7.3.1	Main Group Elements - Group I.....	626
7.3.2	Main Group Elements - Group II.....	627
7.3.3	Main Group Elements - Group III.....	627
7.3.4	Main Group Elements - Group IV.....	628
7.3.5	Main Group Elements - Group V.....	634
7.3.6	Main Group Elements - Group VI.....	645
7.3.7	Main Group Elements - Group VIII.....	646
7.3.8	Transition Metal-based Compounds.....	646
7.3.9	Inorganic Chemicals - Conclusions.....	647
7.4	NGP Surveys of Organic Compounds.....	647
7.4.1	Highly Efficient Thermal Agents.....	647
7.4.2	Tropodegradable Candidate Compounds.....	658
7.4.3	Bromofluoroalkenes.....	662
7.4.4	Fluoroalkoxide and Fluoroalkyl Phosphorus Compounds.....	665
7.4.5	Fluoroalkyl Nitrogen-based Candidates.....	680
7.4.6	Bromofluoroalkyl Nitrogen-based Candidates.....	685
7.4.7	Fluorinated Ethers.....	687
7.4.8	Bromofluoroethers.....	691
7.4.9	Bromofluorooxiranes.....	694
7.4.10	Bromofluoro/Fluorinated Aldehydes and Ketones.....	695
7.4.11	Bromofluoro Alcohols.....	695
7.4.12	Iodinated Hydrocarbons.....	696
7.5	Chemical Family Options and Replacement Issues.....	700
7.5.1	Suppressant Criteria and Selection Constraints.....	700
7.5.2	General Conclusions.....	701
7.6	References.....	702
Chapter 8: Fluid Dispensing and Dispersion.....		721
8.1	Introduction.....	722
8.1.1	Characteristics of Aircraft Engine Nacelle Fires.....	722

8.1.2	Summary of Suppressant Fluid Dynamics.....	723
8.1.3	Scope.....	724
8.2	Fluid Storage.....	725
8.3	Fluid Transport through Piping.....	726
8.3.1	Introduction.....	726
8.3.2	Previous Work	728
8.3.3	Base Code Selection	730
8.3.4	Code Development Work	732
8.3.5	Code Theory.....	733
8.3.6	Supporting Laboratory Data	753
8.3.7	Comparison of Code Predictions to Experimental Data	786
8.3.8	Assessment of Fluid Transport Model.....	804
8.4	Dynamics of Fluid Transport in Cluttered Spaces.....	805
8.4.1	Spray Transport past Generic Clutter Elements.....	805
8.4.2	Spray Interaction with Unheated and Heated Clutter Elements	809
8.4.3	Transport around Clutter and Recirculation Zones.....	821
8.4.4	Low Temperature Effects on Agent Dispersion	829
8.5	Modeling of Fluid Dispersion in a Nacelle.....	839
8.5.1	Background.....	839
8.5.2	CFD Models.....	839
8.5.3	Code Assessment Using Quarter-Scale Nacelle Tests and Simulations	847
8.5.4	Assessment of VULCAN Fire Suppression Sub-model	854
8.5.5	Assessment of VULCAN in Suppressant Distribution in a Full-scale Nacelle	863
8.5.6	Assessment of VULCAN in Pool Fire Suppression in a Full-scale Nacelle	868
8.6	Full-scale Nacelle Fire Suppression Tests	871
8.6.1	Experimental Design.....	871
8.6.2	Test Facility	872
8.6.3	Test Matrices and Decision Tree	876
8.6.4	Actual Test Program	878
8.6.5	Instrumentation	879

8.6.6	Test Procedure	879
8.6.7	Test Results and Comparisons to Simulations.....	882
8.7	Improved Transport of Water to Fires	889
8.7.1	Background.....	889
8.7.2	Electrically Charged Water Mist	889
8.7.3	A Self-atomizing Form of Water	909
8.8	Summary of Lessons Learned.....	916
8.9	References.....	918
Chapter 9: Powder Panel and Propellant Discharge Technologies		927
9.1	Introduction.....	927
9.2	Enhanced Powder Panels	929
9.2.1	NGP Objectives	929
9.2.2	Background on Powder Panel Technology.....	930
9.2.3	Operating Principle	931
9.2.4	Technical Issues	933
9.2.5	Survey of Powder Panel Applications	934
9.2.6	Powder Dispersion Screening Experiments.....	937
9.2.7	Live-fire Proof-of-concept Demonstrations.....	947
9.2.8	Optimization Program.....	951
9.2.9	Live-fire Demonstration Testing of Optimized Enhanced Powder Panels	957
9.2.10	Mass-trade Comparison Analysis	970
9.2.11	Summary of Powder Panel Research Program	974
9.3	Solid Propellant Gas Generators.....	976
9.3.1	Brief History	976
9.3.2	Operating Principles.....	977
9.3.3	Experimental Techniques.....	978
9.3.4	Results: General Behavior of Propellants	990
9.3.5	Results: Cooled Propellant Formulations	994
9.3.6	Results: Chemically Active Fire Suppressants	1003
9.3.7	Results: Hybrid Fire Extinguishers.....	1013

9.3.8	Summary of Solid Propellant Gas Generator Research	1020
9.4	References.....	1023
Chapter 10: Life Cycle Costing of Fire Suppression Systems.....		1025
10.1	Background.....	1025
10.1.1	Technical Concept	1025
10.1.2	NGP Tasks	1026
10.1.3	General Methodology	1027
10.2	Agent Properties.....	1027
10.3	Current System Description (Halon 1301) for Legacy Aircraft	1028
10.3.1	Cargo Aircraft	1028
10.3.2	Fighter Aircraft	1034
10.3.3	Rotary-wing Aircraft.....	1038
10.4	Proposed System Description (HFC-125) for Future Aircraft.....	1042
10.4.1	Design Guide	1042
10.4.2	Cargo Aircraft	1045
10.4.3	Fighter Aircraft	1048
10.4.4	Rotary-wing Aircraft.....	1052
10.5	Costs of Current and Replacement Systems	1054
10.5.1	Life-Cycle Cost Estimate (LCCE) Summary for Legacy Aircraft	1056
10.5.2	Life-Cycle Cost Estimate (LCCE) Summary for Future Aircraft.....	1058
10.5.3	Detailed Cost Element Structure (CES).....	1061
10.5.4	Cost Element Structure Data Development	1061
10.6	Cost Savings.....	1066
10.7	Cost Analysis Using Altered Fire Suppression Performance	1068
10.7.1	Factor of Safety Testing.....	1068
10.7.2	System Description	1069
10.7.3	Altered Fire Suppression Performance	1070
10.7.4	Cost Analysis	1073
10.8	Conclusions.....	1082
10.9	References.....	1083

Chapter 11: Verification of Fire Suppression Principles	1087
11.1 Context.....	1088
11.2 Complexity of In-flight Fires and Their Suppression	1088
11.3 New Understanding of the Fire Suppression Process	1090
11.3.1 Overview of Fire Suppression	1090
11.3.2 Control of the Air Supply to the Fire	1090
11.3.3 Delivery of the Fire Suppressant to the Fire	1090
11.3.4 Effectiveness of a Fire Suppressant at Quenching Flames	1094
11.4 Evaluation of Candidate Fire Suppressant Technologies	1098
11.4.1 Screening Measures	1098
11.4.2 Measurements during Fire Tests	1100
11.4.3 Life-cycle Cost Assessment.....	1101
11.5 Potential for New, Viable Suppressants.....	1101
11.6 Fire Suppression Principles to be Tested	1103
11.7 Methodology for Real-scale Testing and Validation	1106
11.7.1 Aircraft Engine Nacelle Test Facility Features and Capabilities.....	1106
11.7.2 Design of Experiments Methodology	1112
11.7.3 “Bracketing” Procedure for Testing.....	1115
11.7.4 Experimental Approach, Configuration and Procedure.....	1115
11.8 Results and Analysis.....	1125
11.8.1 Summary of General Data Collected	1125
11.8.2 Principle 1	1126
11.8.3 Principle 3	1127
11.8.4 Principle 5	1128
11.8.5 Principle 6	1128
11.8.6 Principle 7	1129
11.8.7 Extinguishing Mixing Models	1130
11.8.8 Principle 4	1134
11.8.9 Principle 2	1137
11.8.10 Phase III Results.....	1141
11.9 Summary	1141

11.10	References.....	1143
Chapter 12:	Afterword.....	1145
12.1	A View Ahead.....	1145
12.2	References.....	1148
Appendix A:	Acknowledgements.....	1149
Appendix B:	NGP Projects.....	1151
Appendix C:	NGP Publications.....	1155
Index	1175

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1–1. Interior of an Aircraft Engine Nacelle.....	11
Figure 1–2. Projects Contributing to Deliverable 1: Best Alternative Suppressant Chemicals.....	13
Figure 1–3. Projects Contributing to Deliverable 2: Guidelines for Optimal Application of Extinguishants.....	14
Figure 1–4. Projects Contributing to Deliverable 3: Alternative Extinguishment Technologies.....	14
Figure 1–5. Projects Contributing to Deliverable 4: Technology Options Assessment Protocol.....	15
Figure 2–1. Significant Non-combat Fire Locations on U.S. Navy Aircraft 1977-1993.....	21
Figure 2–2. Combustion Threats in and around an Aircraft Fuel Tank.....	21
Figure 2–3. Illustration of Notional Reduction in Overall Rotorcraft Vulnerable Area.....	22
Figure 2–4. Known Ejection Locations of Navy Aircrewmembers Who Became POWs during the Southeast Asia Conflict.....	23
Figure 2–5. Locations of Navy Rescues of Navy Aircrewmembers during the Southeast Asia Conflict.....	23
Figure 2–6. Example Turboshaft Engine.....	25
Figure 2–7. A Fighter Aircraft Engine Nacelle.....	26
Figure 2–8. Diagram of an Aircraft Fire Suppression System Installation.....	26
Figure 2–9. An Aircraft Engine Nacelle Fire Suppression System Installation, Suppressant Bottle External to the Nacelle.....	27
Figure 2–10. An Aircraft Engine Nacelle Fire Suppression System Installation, Suppressant Bottle Within the Nacelle.....	28
Figure 2–11. A Transport Aircraft Auxiliary Power Unit Installation.....	29
Figure 2–12. A Fighter Aircraft Accessory Compartment With Fire Suppression System Installation.....	30
Figure 2–13. An Aircraft Gearbox Compartment with APU.....	30
Figure 2–14. A Secondary Power System (SPS) Installation.....	31
Figure 2–15. Typical Dry Bay Locations in a Fighter Aircraft.....	32
Figure 2–16. A Dry Bay Compartment Adjacent to a Fuel Tank; Fire Detector and Fire Suppressor Installed within the Dry Bay Compartment.....	32
Figure 2–17. Top View of a Wing Dry Bay Containing Drive, Hydraulic, and Electrical Systems Components.....	33
Figure 2–18. A Wing Leading Edge Dry Bay Containing Hydraulic and Electrical Systems Components, Leading Edge Structure Removed.....	33

Figure 2–19. Non-DoD Aircraft Halon 1301 Dry Bay Fire Protection System.....	35
Figure 2–20. Diagram of a Cargo Fire Suppression System Installation on a Transport Aircraft.....	36
Figure 2–21. Illustration of Ullage Fire/Explosion Protection Devices.....	38
Figure 2–22. F-16 Aircraft Inerting System Diagram.....	40
Figure 2–23. Imperial Japanese Navy Dry Bay and Ullage Fire Suppression System Concept, Late World War II.....	46
Figure 2–24. Ignition and growth of a flame in 7 % H ₂ , 1.4 % C ₃ H ₈ Jet A Simulant Mixture at 295 K and 84.1 kPa.....	47
Figure 2–25. Spark-Initiated Ullage Combustion Process.....	48
Figure 2–26. Stabilized Pool Fire Formation within an Aircraft Dry Bay Compartment.....	49
Figure 2–27. Flame Temperature vs. Equivalence Ratio.....	50
Figure 2–28. Hydrocarbon Flame Emission Spectra.	52
Figure 2–29. Turbulent Fire within Aircraft Dry Bay Compartments.	53
Figure 2–30. Variation in Halon 1301 Peak Flammability Limits for Isobutane with Temperature.....	54
Figure 2–31 Variation in Halon 1301 and Three Halon Alternative Mass Fractions (Beta) Required to Suppress JP-8 Spray Flames with Temperature.....	55
Figure 2–32. Commercial Aviation Standard Climates vs. DoD WWAE Design Guidance.	56
Figure 2–33. DoD Land Environment Design Guidance.....	57
Figure 2–34 Variation of Ambient Pressure vs. Pressure and Geopotential Altitudes on Standard-day and Non-standard-day Temperature Conditions.....	61
Figure 2–35. Flammability Limits of Jet-A and Jet-B Fuels vs. Altitude and Standard Atmospheres.	62
Figure 2–36. Plot of Standard Climate Profiles and WWAEs vs. All DoD Aircraft Fire Events and Suppressant Releases where Both Altitude and OAT Were Provided.....	63
Figure 2–37. Plot of 1988-2000 Commercial Aircraft Fire Events vs. Altitude and OAT, Events for which NTSB Database Provided Both Altitude and OAT.....	64
Figure 2–38. Rotary Aircraft Nacelle/APU Compartment Fire Suppressant Releases by Altitude.....	64
Figure 2–39. Rotary Aircraft Nacelle/APU Compartment Fire Suppressant Releases by OAT.....	65
Figure 2–40. Fixed-wing Aircraft Nacelle/APU Compartment Fire Suppressant Releases by Altitude.....	65
Figure 2–41. Fixed-wing Aircraft Nacelle/APU Compartment Fire Suppressant Releases by OAT.....	65
Figure 2–42. Peak Nacelle Temperature at 50 knots Airspeed vs. Altitude.....	67
Figure 2–43. Peak Nacelle Temperature at 400 knots Airspeed vs. Altitude.....	67
Figure 2–44. Initial OAT per JAR-1 Arctic Standard Climate.....	71

Figure 2–45. OAT at Takeoff is -40 °C (-40 °F) with Bias Applied to OAT.	71
Figure 2–46. Fixed-Wing Aircraft Fire Mishaps and Incidents by Phase of Operation.	74
Figure 2–47. Distribution of DoD Rotary Aircraft Ground Fire Locations.	75
Figure 2–48. Distribution of DoD Fixed-Wing Aircraft Ground Fire Locations.	75
Figure 2–49. Distribution of DoD In-Flight Rotary Aircraft Fire Locations.	76
Figure 2–50. Distribution of DoD In-Flight Fixed-Wing Aircraft Fire Locations.	76
Figure 2–51. DoD Rotary Aircraft Fire Data vs. Atmospheric Profiles, Flammability Limit Profiles, Operational Ceiling, and Suppressant Release.	77
Figure 2–52 DoD Fixed-Wing Aircraft Fire Data vs. Atmospheric Profiles, Flammability Limit Profiles, Potential Stall Condition and Suppressant Release.	78
Figure 2–53. Example Conventional Halon 1001 Powerplant Fire Suppression System Distribution Installation, USN Turboprop Powerplant.	82
Figure 2–54. Example Conventional Halon 1011 Fire Extinguishing System Distribution Installation, Turboprop Powerplant.	83
Figure 2–55. Example Conventional Halon 1011 Fire Extinguishing System Distribution Installation, USAF Turbojet Powerplant.	84
Figure 2–56. Minimum Discharge Duration from an HRD System Using Halon 1011.	85
Figure 2–57. Zones Protected by the Nitrogen Fire Suppression System on C-5 Aircraft.	89
Figure 2–58. Fire Suppressant Concentration Analyzer Sampling Probe Installation.	90
Figure 2–59. Example Fire Suppression System Suppressant Concentration Measurement.	90
Figure 2–60. MIL-HDBK-221 Design Guidance for Explosion Suppression.	91
Figure 2–61. Typical Legacy OBIGGS Qualification Test Oxygen Concentration Measurement Location.	92
Figure 2–62. Comparison of Halon 1301 Certification Requirement and HFC-125 Design Equation Limits vs. Published Flammability Limits.	97
Figure 2–63. Example of Non-optimized Halon 1301 Nacelle Concentration Distribution.	98
Figure 2–64. Example of Non-optimized HFC-125 Nacelle Concentration Distribution.	98
Figure 2–65. Examples of HFC-125 Nacelle Concentrations.	100
Figure 2–66. Summary of HFC-125 and SPGG Fire Suppression Results from C-130J Live Fire Testing.	103
Figure 2–67. Time Sequence of Dry Bay Compartment Fire Suppression by Inert Gas Generators.	104
Figure 2–68. V-22 Inert Gas Generator Fire Suppression System.	104
Figure 2–69 NGP Testing Results Comparing Solid Propellant Inert Gas Generator Propellant Mass vs. Chemically Active Gas Generator Propellant Mass.	105
Figure 2–70. Effect of Suppressant Concentration and Mass Fraction on Peak Explosive Pressure for LFEs Pressurized to 1,000 psi, 12.7 mm API Threat and 3 % JP-4S.	107

Figure 3–1. Comparison of Local Strain Rates Measured by Laser Doppler Velocimetry in Non-premixed Counterflow Flames and Calculated Global Strain Rates.....	129
Figure 3–2. Extinction Strain Rate vs. Agent Molar Concentration for Non-premixed Methane-air Flames Suppressed by: a) Fluorinated Ethanes, SF ₆ , and N ₂ ; and b) Fluorinated Propanes.	130
Figure 3–3. Extinction Strain Rate vs. Agent Molar Concentration for Non-premixed Propane-air Flames Suppressed by: a) Fluorinated Ethanes, SF ₆ , and N ₂ ; b) Fluorinated Propanes; and c) Bromine- or Iodine-containing Methanes.	131
Figure 3–4. Reaction Pathways for Premixed Methane/air Flames Doped with 3.81 Volume % of: (a) HFC-134 and (b) HFC-134a.....	136
Figure 3–5. Extinction Concentrations for Agents Suppressing: (a) n-heptane/air Cup Burner Flames; (b) Methanol/air Cup Burner Flames; (c) Methane/air Counterflow Flames at a Strain Rate of 80 s ⁻¹ ; (d) Propane/air Counterflow Flames at a Strain Rate of 80 s ⁻¹	139
Figure 3–6. Effect of Fuel Type on Agent Extinction Concentration.....	141
Figure 3–7. Mole Merit Number of Metal-containing Compounds for the Oxidizer Velocities in the Range of 50 cm/s to 60 cm/s.....	147
Figure 3–8. Main Catalytic Radical Recombination Cycle of Iron Found to be Important for Methane-air Flames.	156
Figure 3–9. Radical Recombination Reaction Pathways Found to be Important for CO-H ₂ -O ₂ -N ₂ Flames.....	157
Figure 3–10. Different Classes of Reactions Which May Contribute to Iron's Super-efficient Flame Suppression Ability through the Catalytic Recombination of Radical Species.....	158
Figure 3–11. Calculated H-atom Super-equilibrium Ratio and Peak Temperature in a Counterflow Diffusion Flame as a Function of Strain Rate.....	158
Figure 3–12. Schematic Diagram of the Low Pressure Burner and Optical Measurement Arrangement.	160
Figure 3–13. Emission Image Collected from the Centerline of the Low Pressure, Opposed Flow, CH ₄ -air flame with 10 % of the Fe(CO) ₅ Concentration Required to Extinguish the Flame.....	163
Figure 3–14 LIF [OH] Profiles Collected from Inhibited CH ₄ -air Flames Containing Nominally Half of the Concentration Required for Extinguishment.	163
Figure 3–15. Dependence of Normalized Maximum OH LIF Intensity on Inhibitor Concentration.....	165
Figure 3–16. Calculated and Measured Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed CH ₄ /O ₂ /N ₂ Flames.....	167
Figure 3–17. Normalized Burning Velocity and Maximum Measured Scattering Signal Q _w for φ=1.0 CH ₄ Flame with X _{O₂,ox} = 0.21 and 0.24.....	168
Figure 3–18. Maximum Scattering Signal and Normalized Burning Velocity for CO-H ₂ Flames as Fe(CO) ₅ Concentration Varies.	168
Figure 3–19. Maximum Q _w for Flames of CH ₄ and CO as a Function of Burning Velocity.	169

Figure 3–20. Calculated Normalized Burning Velocity for Several Diameters of Ideal Heterogeneous Inhibitor, $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ data, and Calculated Normalized Burning Velocity using the Perfect Gas Phase Inhibitor Mechanism.....	169
Figure 3–21. Normalized Extinction Strain Rate for Counterflow Diffusion Flames.	170
Figure 3–22. Correlation between Inhibition Effect in Counterflow Diffusion Flames and Maximum Measured Scattering Signal Q_{vv}	171
Figure 3–23. Volume Fraction of CO_2 Required for Extinction ($X_{\text{CO}_2,\text{ext}}$) of Methane-air Cup Burner Flames as a Function of the Volume Fraction of Catalytic Inhibitor Added to the Air Stream.	172
Figure 3–24. Particle Light Scattering as a Function of Radial Position and Height above Cup Burner for Four Loadings of $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$	173
Figure 3–25. Calculated Temperature and Velocity Vectors for Methane-air Cup Burner Flame with an Oxidizer Stream CO_2 Volume Fraction of 0.1, with and without an Added $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ Volume Fraction of 100 $\mu\text{L}/\text{L}$	174
Figure 3–26. Map of Calculated Temperatures in Cup Burner Methane-air Flames with 10 % CO_2 in the Oxidizer Stream and (a) 0.011 and (b) 0.012 $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ Volume Fraction in the Air Stream, Illustrating the Blowoff Phenomenon.	174
Figure 3–27. Experimental and Calculated Extinction Volume Fraction of CO_2 and Peak Measured Scattering Cross Section as a Function of the Volume Fraction of $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ in the Air Stream.	175
Figure 3–28. (a) Calculated Volume Fractions, X_i , of Iron-containing and Other Major Species as a Function of Radial Position at 4.8 mm above the burner (corresponding to the location of the reaction kernel in the flame base); and (b) the Supersaturation Ratio, S_i , for Fe, FeO, and $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2$	176
Figure 3–29. Calculated Particle Trajectories for Free Molecular Regime Particles in a CH_4 -air Flame with 10 % CO_2 in the Oxidizer Stream.	177
Figure 3–30. Visible Images of Methane-air Premixed Flames.	186
Figure 3–31. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by TMT for $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}}=0.21$ and $\phi=0.9, 1.0,$ and 1.1	187
Figure 3–32 – Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ flames Inhibited by TMT for $\phi=1.0$ and $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}}=0.20, 0.21,$ and 0.244	188
Figure 3–33. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by MMT with $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}}=0.21$ and $\phi=0.9, 1.0,$ and 1.1	189
Figure 3–34. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by MMT, with $\phi=1.0$ and $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}}=0.19, 0.20, 0.21,$ and 0.244	189
Figure 3–35. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by CO_2 , CF_3Br , $\text{Sn}(\text{CH}_3)_4$, SnCl_4 , MMT, and $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$. $T_{\text{in}} = 353$ K for all data except $\text{Sn}(\text{CH}_3)_4$ and SnCl_4 which are at 298 K.	190
Figure 3–36. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by Pure MMT and $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$, and by a Blend of the Two.	191
Figure 3–37. Reaction Pathways for Sn, Mn, and Fe in a Premixed Methane-air Flame ($\phi=1.0, X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}}=0.21, T_{\text{in}}=353$ K).....	192

Figure 3–38. First-order Sensitivity Coefficient of the Burning Velocity to the Specific Reaction Rate Constant for Reactions with Tin-containing Species (1963 $\mu\text{L/L}$ of TMT).....	194
Figure 3–39. First-order Sensitivity Coefficient of the Burning Velocity to the Specific Reaction Rate Constant for Reactions with Manganese-containing Species (150 $\mu\text{L/L}$ of MMT).....	195
Figure 3–40. Volume Fractions of O, and OH Radicals and Metal Species Intermediates as a Function of Temperature in Flame for $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$, MMT, and TMT	197
Figure 3–41 Fractions of Sn-, Mn-, and Fe-species at Equilibrium in Methane-air Flames as a Function of Temperature.....	198
Figure 3–42. Schematic of the Experimental Setup for $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ Absorption.....	201
Figure 3–43. High Resolution Transmission Electron Micrograph Images of Zeolite-NaX Particles.....	204
Figure 3–44. Schematic Diagram of Counterflow Diffusion Flame Burner with Provision for Addition of Particles to the Air Stream.....	206
Figure 3–45. Calculated and LDV-measured Velocity Profiles at Exit of Premixed Burner Nozzle for Total Flows of 7.4 and 9 L/min.....	207
Figure 3–46. Methane-air Counterflow Diffusion Flames: Pure and with NaHCO_3 Particles	208
Figure 3–47. NaHCO_3 and Silica Mass Fraction vs. Methane-air Nonpremixed Extinction Strain Rate.....	208
Figure 3–48 – Laser Scattering of NaHCO_3 Particles in a Counterflow Diffusion Flame of Methane and Air, Showing that the Particles Pass Through the Flame.	209
Figure 3–49. Premixed Methane-air Nozzle Burner Flames: Pure and with NaHCO_3 Particles	210
Figure 3–50. Comparison of Normalized Burning Velocities with Added Particles.....	210
Figure 3–51. Normalized Flame Strength as a Function of Added NaHCO_3 Mass Fraction for Premixed and Counterflow Diffusion Flames.	211
Figure 3–52. Normalized Flame Speed for a Methane-air Flame with Added Silica Gel Particles (14 to 40) μm , with and without I_2 Impregnated in the Particles.	212
Figure 3–53. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by Ferrocene and $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$, Together with Modeling Predictions (dotted lines).	216
Figure 3–54. Normalized Burning Velocity of Stoichiometric $\text{CH}_4\text{-O}_2\text{-N}_2$ Flames at 400 $\mu\text{L/L}$ of Ferrocene as a Function of the Activation Energy of the One-step Ferrocene Decomposition Reaction.....	217
Figure 3–55. Normalized Burning Velocity of $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames, a) $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}} = 0.21$, b) $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}} = 0.244$, Inhibited by CO_2 , by CO_2 -ferrocene Blends, and by CF_3Br	219
Figure 3–56. Normalized Burning Velocity of $\text{CH}_4/\text{N}_2/\text{O}_2$ Flames, a.) $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}} = 0.21$, b.) $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{ox}} = 0.244$, with 0, 2, and 6, or 0, 6, and 12 Volume Percent of CO_2 , Respectively, Added to the Reactant Stream, as a Function of Added Ferrocene.....	220
Figure 3–57. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed $\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$ Flames Inhibited by Pure CF_3H and by CF_3H with 0.35 % Ferrocene, Together with Data for CF_3Br	221

Figure 3–58. Equilibrium Mole Fraction of Active Inhibiting Species (Fe, FeO, FeOH, Fe(OH) ₂) and Iron-fluorine Species with 1 % to 4 % CF ₃ H (Containing 0.35 % Ferrocene) Added to a Stoichiometric Methane-air Reaction Mixture.....	222
Figure 3–59. Linear Contribution of Burning Velocity from Each Component of a two-Component Blend of Inhibitors, Together with the Actual Reduction from the Blend.	223
Figure 3–60. Ratio of the Actual Reduction in SL from the Two-component Mix to the Predicted Reduction Based on Linear Combination of the Effect from Each Component.....	224
Figure 3–61. Volume Fraction of Cr-containing Species. Cr, CrO, CrO ₂ , and CrO ₃ above Cr ₂ O ₃ at 10.133 kPa under Neutral and Oxidizing Conditions above Cr ₂ O ₃ and Cr above itself	225
Figure 3–62. Pb Species Gas Phase Volume Fractions at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase (at 101.3 kPa).....	226
Figure 3–63. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed CH ₄ /O ₂ /N ₂ Flames Inhibited by MMT with X _{O_{2,ox}} = 0.21 and φ = 0.9, 1.0, and 1.1.....	227
Figure 3–64. Mn Species Gas Phase Volume Fraction at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase at 101.3 kPa	227
Figure 3–65. Tungsten-containing Species Gas Phase Volume Fraction at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase at 101.3 kPa.....	228
Figure 3–66. Mo-containing Species Gas Phase Volume Fraction at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase at 101.3 kPa.....	229
Figure 3–67. Normalized Burning Velocity of Premixed CH ₄ /O ₂ /N ₂ Flames Inhibited by TMT with X _{O_{2,ox}} = 0.21 and φ = 0.9, 1.0, and 1.1.....	229
Figure 3–68. Sn-containing Species Gas Phase Volume Fractions at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase at 101.3 kPa.....	230
Figure 3–69 Co-containing Species Gas Phase Volume Fraction at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase at 101.3 kPa.....	230
Figure 3–70. Cu-containing Species Gas Phase Volume Fractions at Equilibrium over the Condensed Phase at 101.3 kPa.....	231
Figure 3–71. Equivalent N ₂ /O ₂ Limiting Oxygen Index for Extinction of Polyethylene (PE)-halogen- Sb ₂ O ₃ Blends and Methane-air Cup Burner Flames with MMT, Fe(CO) ₅ , and Sn(CH ₃) ₄	232
Figure 3–72. Schematic of Opposed-jet Burner.....	239
Figure 3–73. Schematic of LIF Apparatus.....	241
Figure 3–74. Variation of Global Extinction Strain with Observed Flame Position at Extinction.....	246
Figure 3–75. Variation of Global Extinction Strain with Observed Flame Position at Extinction for Non-premixed CH ₄ /N ₂ -O ₂ /N ₂ Flames, with Z _{st} = 0.50.	247
Figure 3–76. Observed Flame Positions as a Function of Predicted Distance to the Stagnation Plane for Non-premixed Flames of CH ₄ -air (Z _{st} = 0.054), and CH ₄ /N ₂ -O ₂ /N ₂ Flames, (Z _{st} = 0.50) Near Extinction.	248

Figure 3–77. Inhibition of Non-premixed Methane-air Flames, Based on Reduction in the Global Extinction Strain Rate by Oxidizer-side Addition of Nitrogen, with and without Preheated Reactants.	249
Figure 3–78. Inhibition of Non-premixed Methane-air flames, Based on Reduction in the Global Extinction Strain Rate, by Oxidizer-side Addition of Trimethyl Phosphate (TMP), and Dimethyl Methylphosphonate (DMMP).	250
Figure 3–79. Adiabatic Flame Temperature vs. Stoichiometric Mixture Fraction for a Methane-nitrogen-oxygen-nitrogen Flame with the Extinction Strain Rate Held Constant at $350 \pm 10 \text{ s}^{-1}$	252
Figure 3–80. Flame Suppression Effectiveness of 25,000 $\mu\text{L/L}$ Argon as an Oxidant-side or Fuel-side Additive vs. Stoichiometric Mixture Fraction.	253
Figure 3–81. Normalized Flame Suppression Effectiveness of Argon-doped Flames vs. Stoichiometric Mixture Fraction at Fixed.	253
Figure 3–82. Flame Suppression Effectiveness of 500 $\mu\text{L/L}$ DMMP as an Oxidant-side or Fuel-side Additive vs. Stoichiometric Mixture Fraction.	254
Figure 3–83. Normalized Flame Suppression Effectiveness of DMMP-doped Flames vs. Stoichiometric Mixture Fraction.	255
Figure 3–84. Normalized effectiveness of DMMP-doped Flames as a Function of Adiabatic Flame Temperature.	256
Figure 3–85. Calculated Major Species and Temperature Profiles for Flame 1 and Flame 4, both undoped.	258
Figure 3–86. Calculated and Measured OH Concentration Profiles for Flames 1 and 4.	258
Figure 3–87. [OH] Profile Widths (FWHM).	259
Figure 3–88. Effect of 572 $\mu\text{L/L}$ of DMMP on [OH] in Flame 1. 260	
Figure 3–89. Effect of DMMP Loading for All Flames.	261
Figure 3–90. Temperature Dependence of Effectiveness.	262
Figure 3–91. Effect of 572 $\mu\text{L/L}$ of DMMP on Calculated OH, H, and O Concentration Profiles in Flame 1 ($\text{CH}_4/\text{O}_2/\text{N}_2$).	263
Figure 3–92. Temperature Dependence of Effectiveness Defined as in Terms of Reduction in total [OH].	264
Figure 3–93. OH, H, and O Production Rates in Flame 1 and Flame 4, Summed over All Reactions Involving Phosphorus.	264
Figure 3–94. Total OH Production Rates in Flame 1 by Reactions Not Involving Phosphorus.	265
Figure 3–95. Influence of the Addition of 572 $\mu\text{L/L}$ of DMMP on OH Production Rates in Flame 1.	266
Figure 3–96. H and O Production Rates by All Reactions Involving Phosphorus and by Individual Reactions in Flame 1.	267
Figure 3–97. Temperature Profiles Measured in (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames.	274
Figure 3–98. CH_4 in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.	275

Figure 3–99. CO ₂ in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	275
Figure 3–100. CO in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	276
Figure 3–101. CH ₂ O in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	276
Figure 3–102. C ₂ H ₂ in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	277
Figure 3–103. C ₂ H ₄ in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	277
Figure 3–104. C ₂ H ₆ in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	278
Figure 3–105. CH ₃ OH in Doped and Undoped (a) Rich and (b) Near-stoichiometric Flames, with GRI and Babushok and Glaude Predictions.....	278
Figure 3–106. Schematic Diagram of the Experimental Apparatus.	283
Figure 3–107. Representative PLIF Images and the Corresponding OH Intensity Profiles from an Opposed Flow Propane-air Flame Seeded with 0 % (by volume) CF ₃ Br and 1.5 % (by volume) CF ₃ Br.....	284
Figure 3–108. Normalized OH LIF Profile Areas vs. Inhibitor Agent Delivery Concentrations. □: N ₂ , O: HFC-227ea, Δ: HFC-236, : PN, ◇: CF ₃ Br, ■: DMMP, and ●: Fe(CO) ₅ . Insert: Expanded data for PN, CF ₃ Br, DMMP, and Fe(CO) ₅ Concentrations up to 0.75 % by Volume.	286
Figure 3–109. Peak LIF Measured Temperatures vs. Inhibitor Delivery Concentrations..	288
Figure 3–110. Calculated Burning Velocities vs. Delivered Inhibitor Concentration for a Numerical, Stoichiometric, Premixed, Propane-air Flame.	289
Figure 3–111. Normalized OH Concentrations vs. Delivered Inhibitor Concentrations.	290
Figure 3–112. Burning Velocity, Final Flame Temperature, Inhibition Parameter, and Superequilibrium Concentrations of Flame Radicals Computed for Atmospheric Pressure Stoichiometric Methane-air Mixtures Inhibited by NaOH.....	293
Figure 3–113. Burning Velocity, Final Flame Temperature, Inhibition Parameter, and Superequilibrium Concentrations of Flame Radicals Computed for Atmospheric Pressure Stoichiometric Methane-air Mixtures Inhibited by CF ₃ Br.	293
Figure 3–114. Burning Velocity and Differential Inhibition Parameter computed for Atmospheric Pressure Stoichiometric Methane-air Mixtures Inhibited by N ₂ and FeO ₂ in Combination.	295
Figure 3–115. Relationship between Burning Velocity and Peak Concentration of Atomic Hydrogen for Methane-air Flames Inhibited by Various Compounds.....	296
Figure 3–116. Mole Fraction of Atomic Hydrogen as a Function of Local Flame Temperature for an Uninhibited and Uninhibited Atmospheric Pressure Methane-air Flame.....	298
Figure 3–117. Calculated Flame Velocity as a Function of Hypothetical Variation of the H-Br Bond Energy for Premixed Methane-air Flames Inhibited by 0.5 % HBr Using the H + H and H + OH Scavenging Cycles of Table 3.	304

Figure 3–118. Calculated Flame Velocity as a Function of Hypothetical Variation of the Na-OH Bond Energy for Premixed Methane-air Flames Inhibited by 0.1 % (NaOH) ₂ using the H + OH scavenging cycle of Table 3	305
Figure 3–119. Calculated Flame Velocity as a Function of Hypothetically Variation of Fe-O Bond Energy for Premixed Methane-air Flames Inhibited by 500 μL/L FeO ₂ Using the Three-step O + O Scavenging Cycle of Table 3	306
Figure 3–120. Shapes of the Reaction Rate Profile Bi Used to Describe: a) Perturbation of Chain Branching and Heat Release Rates, b) Addition of Perfect Inhibitor or CF ₃ Br , c) Rapid Inhibitor Activation, and d) Rapid Inhibitor Deactivation.	308
Figure 3–121. Variation of Flame Speed for Four Types of Perturbation.	311
Figure 3–122. Net H-atom Reaction Rate for Three Important Reactions in Stoichiometric Methane-air Flames.	312
Figure 3–123 Effect of damping the rate of the H+O ₂ reaction on normalized flame speed for φ=0.7, 1.0, and 1.3.	313
Figure 3–124. Calculated Volume Fraction Profiles for H, OH and O in Uninhibited Methane-air Flames for Three Stoichiometric Ratios.....	313
Figure 3–125. Effect of the Location of Perfect Inhibition on Normalized Flame Speed for φ=0.7, 1.0, and 1.3.....	314
Figure 3–126. Variation of Flame Speed for Stepwise Inhibitor Activation or Deactivation for a Stoichiometric Methane-air Mixture.....	315
Figure 4–1. Water Mist Size Histogram and Values of Several Mean Diameters.....	349
Figure 4–2. Lognormal and Rosin-Rammler Expressions Fit to the Water Mist Histogram Presented in Figure 4–1.	350
Figure 4–3. Schematic Diagram for Diffraction-based Particle Sizing.	352
Figure 4–4. Diagram for 1-D Phase Doppler Interferometry System for Obtaining Size and Velocity of “Spherical” Aerosol Particles.	353
Figure 4–5. Schematic Diagram for Imaging-based Particle Sizing.....	354
Figure 4–6. Predicted Evaporation Times for Water Droplets in Air at the Indicated Temperature as a Function of Initial Droplet Diameter.....	357
Figure 4–7 Predicted Terminal Settling Velocity for Water Droplets and Sodium Bicarbonate Particles in Air at 20 °C.....	357
Figure 4–8. Relationship of Flame Dimensionality and Modeling Complexity.	359
Figure 4–9. Representations of Aerosol Suppressed Premixed Flames.....	359
Figure 4–10. Experimental Schematic for Studying the Effects of Aerosols on the Extinction Strain Rate of Counterflow Non-Premixed Flames.	361
Figure 4–11. Schematic of Tsuji Burner and Flame Configuration.....	362
Figure 4–12. Cup Burner Apparatus Modified for Water Mist Suppression Studies.	363
Figure 4–13. Schematic of Water Aerosol Generation Methods.....	364

Figure 4–14. PDPA-determined Droplet Diameter Histogram 2 mm above the Air Tube Exit for Three Water Mists.....	364
Figure 4–15. Schematic for Liquid Aerosol Inhibited Burning Velocity Determination in Premixed Flames.....	365
Figure 4–16. Predicted Burning Velocity for a Stoichiometric, Premixed, Methane-air Flame as a Function of Initial Droplet Diameter and Water Mass Loading.....	367
Figure 4–17. (a) Image of Premixed Methane-air Flame Stabilized on Burner; (b) Image of Water Mist (no flame) as it Exits the Burner; (c) Image of Laser-illuminated Water Mist and Methane-air Flame Showing Disappearance of the Mist at the Flame Boundary.....	367
Figure 4–18. Normalized Burning Velocity Reduction vs. Mass of Added Inhibitor for an Inhibited Methane-Air Premixed Flame.	368
Figure 4–19. Premixed Methane-air Burning Velocity as a Function of Agent Mass Fraction, Normalized by the Uninhibited Burning Velocity.....	369
Figure 4–20. Measurements of Water Droplet Diameter and Number Density in a Stoichiometric Premixed Methane-air Flame as a Function of Height above the Burner Exit.....	370
Figure 4–21. Multi-phase Predictions of Water Mist Droplet Diameter and Number Density in a Stoichiometric Premixed Methane-air Flame.	370
Figure 4–22. Predicted Comparison of the Maximum Flame Temperature, T_{\max} , vs. Flow Strain Rate, a , for a Dry Flame and for Four Flames with Different Inflow Water Vapor Partial Pressures.	373
Figure 4–23. Calculated Gas Velocity, Velocities for Varied Water Droplet Diameters, and Gas Temperature (thick solid line) in a 130 s^{-1} Methane/air Flame with Droplet Source Terms turned “off”.....	375
Figure 4–24. Comparison of U of Gas and U_d of Different Droplet Diameters, with Droplet Source Terms Turned “off”.	376
Figure 4–25. Comparison of Droplet Temperature, T_d , of Different Droplet Diameters, with Droplet Source Terms Turned “off”.	377
Figure 4–26. Comparison of Flux Fraction Function, F , of Different Droplet Diameters, with Droplet Source Terms Turned “off”.	377
Figure 4–27. Typical S_m Profiles of Different Droplet Diameters, with $Y_0 = 0.02$ and Droplet Source Terms Turned “off”.....	378
Figure 4–28. Typical $S_U - U_{S_m}$ Profiles of Different Droplet Diameters, with $Y_0 = 0.02$ and Droplet Source Terms Turned “off”.....	379
Figure 4–29. Typical $S_h - h_i S_m$ Profiles of Different Droplet Diameters, with $Y_0 = 0.02$ and Droplet Source Terms Turned “off”.....	379
Figure 4–30. Comparison of T_{\max} vs. Strain Rate for Different Droplet Diameters, with Water Mass Fraction = 0.01.....	379
Figure 4–31. Comparison of T_{\max} vs. Strain Rate for Different Droplet Diameters, with Water Mass Fraction = 0.02.	380

Figure 4–32. Comparison of T_{\max} vs. strain rate for Different Droplet Diameters, with Water Mass Fraction = 0.03.	380
Figure 4–33. Comparison of a_{ext} vs. Droplet Diameter for Different Droplet Mass Fractions in the Condensed Phase at Inflow.	381
Figure 4–34. Comparison of $(\chi s)_{\text{ext}}$ vs. Droplet Diameter for Different Droplet Mass Fractions in Condensed Phase at Inflow.	382
Figure 4–35. Calculated Droplet Trajectory as a Function of Time, for $d = 50 \mu\text{m}$ and $Y_0 = 0.03$	383
Figure 4–36. Apparatus for Aerosol-inhibited, Non-premixed Counterflow Flames.	384
Figure 4–37. Droplet Diameter Distribution Evolution of a $30 \mu\text{m}$ Mist in a 170 s^{-1} Strain Rate Flame	387
Figure 4–38 Droplet Diameter Distribution Evolution of an $18 \mu\text{m}$ Mist in a 170 s^{-1} Strain Rate Propane/air Counterflow Flame.	388
Figure 4–39. Profiles of Number Density and Velocity of $30\mu\text{m}$ Droplets vs. Location in a 170 s^{-1} Strain Rate Propane/air/ $30\mu\text{m}$ Mist Counterflow Flame.	389
Figure 4–40. Profiles of Number Density) and Velocity of $18 \mu\text{m}$ Droplets vs. Location in a Propane/air/water mist Counterflow Flame.	389
Figure 4–41. Droplet Flux Profile for a $30\mu\text{m}$ Mist in a 170 s^{-1} Strain Rate Propane/air Flame.	390
Figure 4–42. Water Mist Effects on the Extinction of Non-premixed, Counterflow Propane/air Flames: (a) Flame Extinction Strain Rate as a Function of Mass of Water or Halon 1301 in the Air Flow; (b) Mass Fraction of Water Needed to Extinguish the Flames as a Function of Droplet Diameter, Compared to Mass of Gas-phase Halon 1301.	391
Figure 4–43. Variation of the Predicted Flame Temperature as a Function of the Flow Strain Rate for Propane-air, Non-premixed Counterflow Flames for Dry Air, Air Saturated with Water Vapor, and Saturated Air with Monodisperse Water Droplets.	393
Figure 4–44. Measured Extinction Strain Rate for Water Mist Suppressed Propane-air, Non-premixed Counterflow Flames vs. % Mass of Condensed-phase Water in the Air and Calculated Results for $14 \mu\text{m}$, $30 \mu\text{m}$, and $42 \mu\text{m}$ Diameter Monodisperse Water Mists in Saturated Air at 300 K.	394
Figure 4–45 Calculated Humidification Levels of a 296 K Air Stream Containing $14 \mu\text{m}$, $30 \mu\text{m}$, or $42 \mu\text{m}$ droplets, Following a Residence Time of 750 ms Starting in Dry Air, as a Function of the Mass Fraction of Liquid Water Remaining after Droplet Evaporation.	395
Figure 4–46. Schematic of the Non-premixed Counterflow Burner and Calculated Temperature, O, H, and OH Profiles for the Low Strain Flame.	398
Figure 4–47. Powder Delivery System.	399
Figure 4–48. Typical Micrographs of NaHCO_3 Powder Samples.	400
Figure 4–49. Typical Micrographs of KHCO_3 Powder.	400
Figure 4–50. Extinction Mass Concentration as a Function of Strain Rate for Various Particle Sizes Ranges of NaHCO_3 and KHCO_3 Powders in a Propane/air, Counterflow, Non-premixed Flame.	401

Figure 4–51. Data from Figure 4–50 Plotted to Show Extinction Mass Concentration as a Function of Particle Size Range for Each Flame Strain Rate and Added Powder.....	402
Figure 4–52. Extinction Mass Concentration as a Function of (a) Average Particle Diameter and Average Particle Surface Area for NaHCO_3 and KHCO_3 Powders in a Medium Strain Rate (310 s^{-1}) Propane/air Counterflow Non-premixed Flame.....	403
Figure 4–53. Calculated Particle Asymptotic Location as a Function of Particle Diameter for the Flow Conditions of the Low Strain Propane/air Flame.....	405
Figure 4–54. Schematic of the Counterflow Flame Apparatus with the Particle Seeder.....	407
Figure 4–55. % NaHCO_3 by Mass in air as a Function of Extinction Strain Rate for Different Size Groups of Particles.....	409
Figure 4–56. Numerical Prediction of NaHCO_3 Mass Fraction as a Function of Extinction Strain Rate, for Selected Particle Sizes.....	411
Figure 4–57. Schematic of the Counterflow Burner Configuration with the Water Droplet Atomizer.....	413
Figure 4–58. (a) Normalized Droplet Diameter Distribution of the Ultrasonic Atomizer as Reported by the Manufacturer; (b) and (c) Normalized Water Droplet Diameter Distributions Measured Using a PDPA at the Exit of the Air Nozzle for an Air Flow Corresponding to Counterflow Strain Rates of 285 s^{-1} and 160 s^{-1} , Respectively.....	415
Figure 4–59. Variation of Water Droplet Mass Fraction in the Condensed Phase as a Function of Flame Extinction Strain Rate.....	417
Figure 4–60. Droplet Mass Fraction in the Condensed Phase as a Function of Flame Extinction Strain Rate for Different Mass Loadings of NaOH in Water.....	418
Figure 4–61. Variation of the Maximum Flame Temperature as a Function of Local Flow Strain Rate for Constant Droplet Mass Fractions and Constant Water Mass Flux Rates.....	419
Figure 4–62. Droplet Mass Fraction as a Function of Extinction Strain Rate of a Methane/air Non-premixed Flame for Several NaOH Mass Fractions in Water.....	422
Figure 4–63. Y_0 and Mole Fraction of NaOH in Air as a Function of y_{NaOH} for the Extinction Strain of 125 s^{-1} in Figure 4–62.....	423
Figure 4–64. Droplet Mass Fraction as a Function of Extinction Strain Rate of a Methane/air Non-premixed Flame for Several KOH Mass Fractions in Water.....	424
Figure 4–65. Droplet Mass Fraction as a Function of Extinction Strain Rate of a Methane/air Non-premixed Flame for NaCl and FeCl_2 in Water.....	425
Figure 4–66. Upper panel: Mole Fraction of Alkali Metal Atoms in Air as a Function of Non-premixed Methane/air Flame Extinction Strain Rate for NaOH and KOH Mass Fractions of 0.055 shown in Figure 4. Lower panel: Mole Fraction of Am in Air as a Function of Non-premixed Methane/air Flame Extinction Strain Rate for NaOH and NaCl Mass Fractions of 0.03 Shown in Figure 4–63 and Figure 4–66 (upper panel).....	425
Figure 4–67. Square of the Normalized Burning Velocity of a Premixed Flame Inhibited with Fine Droplets of Water Solution for Several NaOH Mass Fractions in Water.....	427
Figure 4–68. Normalized Flame Strength of Non-premixed and Premixed Methane/air Flames Inhibited with Droplets of Water with a Median Diameter of $20 \mu\text{m}$	428

Figure 4–69. Non-premixed and Premixed Flame Structures Corresponding to Inhibited Conditions of Water Droplet Mass Fraction of $Y_0 = 0.01$.	429
Figure 4–70. Setup for JP-8 Fire Suppression Experiments.	432
Figure 4–71. Blow-off Velocity Ratios for Various Candidate Agents to Air, and Reference Ratios for Water to Air Measured under the Same Conditions.	434
Figure 4–72. Blow-off Velocity Ratios for Various Candidate Agents to Air, and Reference Ratios for Water to Air Measured under the Same Conditions	434
Figure 4–73. Times for Various Experimental Fire Suppressants to Extinguish a 200 mL JP-8 Pan Fire.	436
Figure 4–74. Mass of Various Experimental Fire Suppressants to Extinguish a 200 mL JP-8 Pan Fire.	437
Figure 4–75. Mass flows for Various Fire Suppressants Deployed during JP-8 Screening Experiments.	437
Figure 4–76. Droplet Evaporation Time as a Function of Initial Droplet Diameter for Five Fluids.	442
Figure 4–77. Typical Boiling Curve Associated with Quenching of a Hot Surface by Liquid Droplets.	443
Figure 4–78. Calculated Boiling Curves in the Convective Regime for Five Liquids.	445
Figure 4–79. Calculated Boiling Curves for Five Liquids for the Transition and Film Boiling Regimes.	447
Figure 4–80. Wind Tunnel Used for Fire Spread Studies.	449
Figure 4–81. Flame Spread Experiment with Water Mist.	450
Figure 4–82. Schematic of the Two-color Planar Pyrometer.	451
Figure 4–83. Typical Flame Spread Time Trace Obtained using Focal Plane Array Imaging.	452
Figure 4–84. Flame Spread Rates without Water Mist.	452
Figure 4–85. Flame Spread Rate as a Function of Surface Loading for 3.2 mm Thick PMMA.	454
Figure 4–86. Flame Spread Rate as a Function of Surface Loading for 0.64 cm Thick PMMA.	455
Figure 4–87. Mean Droplet Size and Velocity as a Function of Spray Nozzle Discharge Rate.	456
Figure 4–88. Variation in Normalized Flame Spread with Liquid Loading.	457
Figure 4–89. Mean Flame Temperature Obtained Using the TCPP.	457
Figure 4–90. Experimental Arrangement for the Measurements.	458
Figure 4–91. Configuration of the Piezoelectric Atomizer.	459
Figure 4–92. Schematic Diagram of the Heater Assembly.	460
Figure 4–93. Temperature Measurement Locations on the Heater.	460
Figure 4–94. Steady State Temperature Field above the Hot Plate.	463
Figure 4–95. Change in Sauter Mean Diameter of the Water Droplets with Axial Distance.	464
Figure 4–96. Change in Sauter Mean Diameter of the Droplets with Axial Distance for Fluid 510.	464

Figure 4–97. Variation in Velocity with Axial Distance for Water Spray.....	465
Figure 4–98. Variation in Velocity with Axial Distance for Fluid 510.	465
Figure 5–1. Schematic of Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy (LIBS) Measurement Apparatus.	484
Figure 5–2. Measured Concentrations of Fluorinated Fire Suppressants using LIBS.	484
Figure 5–3. Successive Signal Improvements in the Detection of HF using TDLAS.	487
Figure 5–4. Schematic of TDLAS Apparatus for Measurement of Gases Produced during Fire Suppression in Ground Vehicles.	487
Figure 5–5. HF Gas Produced during Suppression of Heptane Pan Fires by HFC-236 with and without the Addition of Ammonium Polyphosphate).	489
Figure 5–6. Oxygen Concentration Measured Within the Crew Compartment of a Bradley Fighting Vehicle During Suppression by C_3F_8 of a Spark-Initiated JP-8 Spray Fire.....	491
Figure 5–7. FT-IR Spectra of Dry Air Saturated at 294 K with Vapor from Unleaded gasoline, JP-8, and DF-2.	492
Figure 5–8. Schematic Diagram of the Laser Mixing Apparatus Used to Measure Fuel Vapor Concentrations.	495
Figure 5–9. Absorption Spectrum of Air Saturated with JP-8, DF-2, or Gasoline Vapor at 294 K Superimposed upon the Emission from the Optical Fiber Carrying the Mixed Wavelength Laser Beam.	496
Figure 5–10. Concentrations of Gasoline Vapor and Oxygen, Measured as Dry Air Saturated with JP-8 Vapor Displaces the Dry Air in a 13.7 L Optical Cell.	497
Figure 5–11. Loss of Lighter Hydrocarbons from JP-8 Caused by Repeated Fills of the Optical Cell Used for Testing the Mixed Laser Fuel Vapor Sensor.	497
Figure 5–12. Two Laser Interferogram Measured at the Detector for the Second Generation Fuel Vapor Sensor.	498
Figure 5–13. Experimental Apparatus Used for Fourier Transform Laser Spectroscopy.	500
Figure 5–14. Absorption of 1.71 μm Laser Radiation as Air is Displaced by Air Saturated with Gasoline Vapor in a 2 m Cell.	500
Figure 5–15. Schematic of a 10-laser FT-LS Source in the Near Infrared.	501
Figure 5–16. Schematic of the DIRRACS I.	503
Figure 5–17. Schematic of the Optical Design Used in DIRRACS I.	503
Figure 5–18. Absorption Spectrum of HFC-125 Superimposed with the Transmittance Spectrum for the Bandpass Filter.	504
Figure 5–19. Schematic of DIRRACS II.	506
Figure 5–20. Photograph of the DIRRACS II with the Periscope Mounted within the Flow Channel of the TARP Facility.	506
Figure 5–21. Calibration Plot of Average Normalized Peak-to-valley Signals vs. Volume Fraction of HFC-125.	508

Figure 5–22. Normalized Peak-to-valley Signals Resulting from Processing the Raw Signal from the DIRRACS II for Two Releases of HFC125.....	510
Figure 5–23. HFC-125 Volume Fraction vs. Time for Two Releases of HFC-125 in the TARPF Facility.....	510
Figure 5–24. Bradley Armored Personnel Carrier Modified for Performing Agent Release and Fire Suppression Studies.....	511
Figure 5–25. Interior of the Bradley Vehicle Showing the Periscope of the DIRRACS II in the “High” Location.....	511
Figure 5–26. HFC-125 Volume Fraction and Cylinder Pressure vs. Time at the Upper Measurement Position.....	512
Figure 5–27. HFC-125 Volume Fractions vs. Time at the High and Low Positions During Two Different Releases.....	512
Figure 6–1. Schematic of the Cup Burner Apparatus.....	523
Figure 6–2. Photographs of a Standard Cup Burner.....	523
Figure 6–3. Schematic of Sample Nebulizer.....	524
Figure 6–4. Heated Cup Burner for Appraising High-boiling Flame Suppressants.....	525
Figure 6–5. Schematic of the DLAFSS Wind Tunnel.....	526
Figure 6–6. Photograph of the DLAFSS Wind Tunnel.....	527
Figure 6–7. Cut-away View of the DLAFSS Burner Insert.....	528
Figure 6–8. Photograph of the DLAFSS Burner Assembly.....	528
Figure 6–9. An Enveloped Flame and a Wake Flame.....	529
Figure 6–10. Schematic of the DLAFSS Nebulizer.....	531
Figure 6–11. Screening Results for Various Aqueous Fluids.....	533
Figure 6–12. Schematic of Step-stabilized Pool Fire Apparatus.....	537
Figure 6–13. Photograph of the TARPF.....	538
Figure 6–14. Photograph of a Baffle-stabilized Propane Flame in the TARPF.....	538
Figure 6–15. Liquid Aerosol Agent Injection System.....	540
Figure 6–16. Schematic Diagram of the SPGG Injection System.....	541
Figure 6–17. Photograph of TARPF Injection System with Housing Cover Removed.....	541
Figure 6–18. Disruption of a Stabilized Flame by the Injection of Nitrogen Upstream of 25 mm High Obstacle.....	543
Figure 6–19. Impact of Air Speed on Extinction of a 25 mm Baffle-stabilized Flame.....	545
Figure 6–20. Mass and Rate of Nitrogen Addition to Extinguish a 45 mL/s Propane Flame in 3.9 m/s Air Flow.....	545
Figure 6–21. Mass and Rate of Nitrogen Addition Required to Extinguish High Flow and Low Flow Propane/Air Flames Stabilized Behind a 25 mm Step.....	546

Figure 6–22. Mass and Rate of Nitrogen Addition Required to Extinguish High Flow and Low Flow Propane/Air Flames Stabilized Behind a 10 mm Baffle.....	547
Figure 6–23. Mass and Rate of Nitrogen Addition Required to Extinguish High Flow and Low Flow Propane/Air Flames Stabilized Behind a 55 mm Baffle.....	547
Figure 6–24. Impact of Obstacle Height on the Total Mass and Rate of Addition of Nitrogen Required to Suppress an Obstacle-stabilized Pool Fire.	548
Figure 6–25. Mole Fraction of Suppressants (N ₂ and CF ₃ Br) Added to Air at Extinction Boundary for High and Low Flow Conditions, as a Function of Injection Time Interval and Obstacle Geometry.	549
Figure 6–26. Injection interval and Calculated Mass Delivered to Flame as a Function of Area Ratio Times Total Mass of Gas Generated	551
Figure 6–27. Percentage of Flames Extinguished as a Function of Mass Delivered to Flame by an SPGG	552
Figure 6–28. Impact of Injection Time Interval on the Mass of Agent Required to Suppress a Step-stabilized Propane Pool Fire.	553
Figure 6–29. Percentage of Flames Extinguished as a Function of Estimated Mass Fraction of Agent.....	553
Figure 6–30. Normalized Volume Fraction as a Function of Non-dimensional Injection Interval, Comparing N ₂ , CF ₃ Br, and SPGG.....	555
Figure 6–31. Suppression Volume Fraction of Agent (N ₂ or CF ₃ Br) Normalized by Cup Burner Values as a Function of Injection Time Interval Normalized by Characteristic Residence Time.....	556
Figure 6–32. Schematic of Flash Photolysis Resonance Fluorescence Apparatus for Measuring Reactivity of Compound with OH Radicals.	563
Figure 6–33. Apparatus for Measuring the Absorption Cross Section of Candidate Fire Suppressants.....	567
Figure 6–34. Estimated Maximum Boiling Points That Can Achieve Selected Values of Volume % in Air as a Function of Ambient Temperature.	573
Figure 6–35. Comparison of Two Difluorobromopropene Log(K _{OW}) Calculation Methods.....	587
Figure 6–36. Comparison of Two Trifluorobromopropene Log(K _{OW}) Calculation Methods.....	588
Figure 6–37. Hypothetical Time Dependence of a Toxic Response to Exposure to a Fire Suppressant	590
Figure 6–38. Monte Carlo Simulations of Humans Exposed to Halon 1301.....	593
Figure 6–39. Monte Carlo Simulations of Humans Exposed to HFC-125.	593
Figure 7–1. Groups and Elements Studied.....	626
Figure 7–2. Resorcinol.....	635
Figure 7–3. Vinyl Phosphonates.	636
Figure 7–4. Example of a Fluoro-substituted Bis(dimethylamino) Cyclotriphosphonitrile.	637
Figure 7–5. Tris(hydroxymethyl)propane Bicyclic Phosphite.....	644

Figure 7–6. Relative Contributions of Liquid Heating, Vaporization, and Gas Heating to 1400 K to the Total Heat Absorbed by Various Thermal Agents.....	652
Figure 7–7. Air Velocities at Extinguishment of the DLAFFS Flame as a Function of Liquid Application Rate for Lactic Acid/water Mixtures.....	653
Figure 7–8. Air Velocities at Extinguishment of the DLAFFS Flame as a Function of Liquid Application Rate for HFE-7100.....	654
Figure 7–9. Maximum Flame Temperatures as a Function of the Equal Fuel and Air Velocity Magnitudes for a Methane/Air Opposed-Flow Diffusion Flame for Three Versions of the GRI-Mech Mechanism.....	656
Figure 7–10. Groups Required for Significant Tropospheric Photodissociation.....	662
Figure 7–11. Formation of a Six-membered Ring Transition State.....	670
Figure 7–12. Structural and Optical Isomerism of Bromopentafluoropropene Oxide.....	694
Figure 7–13. Vertical Profiles of CF ₃ I Emissions for Fuel Tank Inerting in Military Aircraft	699
Figure 8–1. Schematic of Storage and Distribution System for Fire Suppression.....	723
Figure 8–2. Staggered Mesh Numerical Method.....	737
Figure 8–3. Curve Fit for Henry’s Constant.....	746
Figure 8–4. Effect of Release Coefficient on Calculated Pressure Response.....	746
Figure 8–5. Comparison of Calculated and Measured Bottle Pressure for Test.....	748
Figure 8–6. Void Fraction Responses in Lower Portion of Bottle.....	749
Figure 8–7. 90° Tee Model with Crossflow Junction.....	751
Figure 8–8. Tee Model with Normal Junctions.....	752
Figure 8–9. Schematic of Test Facility: Source Vessel, Discharge Piping, and Collection Vessel.....	754
Figure 8–10. Schematic of Source Vessel Showing Mass Inventory Measurement.....	755
Figure 8–11. Pressure vs. Temperature Saturation Curve for HFC-227ea and HFC-125.....	756
Figure 8–12. Schematic of a Marotta valve.....	757
Figure 8–13. Top View of Test Facility; Schematic of Discharge Piping System.....	757
Figure 8–14. Schematic of Pressure Fittings for Temperature and Pressure Ports.....	758
Figure 8–15. Schematic of Rack Used to Hold the Source Vessel.....	759
Figure 8–16. Picture of Test Facility: Source Vessel, Discharge Piping, Collection Vessel, Support Structure and Instrumentation	760
Figure 8–17. Pressure Traces for Experimental Run #5.....	761
Figure 8–18. Repeatability of the Source Vessel Pressure Traces.....	762
Figure 8–19. Schematic of Alternate Piping Configuration #1.....	763
Figure 8–20. Schematic of Alternate Piping Configuration #2.....	763

Figure 8–21. Transient Pressure Drop across a 90° Elbow from Run #9.....	764
Figure 8–22. Diagram of Transducer Setup for Mass Inventory Measurement.....	765
Figure 8–23. Transient Mass Inventory of Run #5.....	766
Figure 8–24. Schematic of Thermocouple Construction.....	767
Figure 8–25. Transient Temperature Trace from Film Thermocouples of Run #5.....	768
Figure 8–26. Transient Temperature Trace from Shielded Thermocouples of Run #5.....	769
Figure 8–27. Schematic of Capacitance Probe for Bench Setup.....	770
Figure 8–28. Bench Setup to Test Capacitance Sensor.....	771
Figure 8–29. Void Fraction from Bench Tests of Capacitance Sensor.....	771
Figure 8–30. Schematic of Capacitance Probe for Test Facility.....	772
Figure 8–31. Cross-section of Capacitance Setup Showing Electrical Field.....	772
Figure 8–32. Transient Void Fraction of Run #5.....	773
Figure 8–33. Cumulative Mass as a Function of Time for Runs #1 and #8.....	779
Figure 8–34. Pressure Drops across Top and Bottom Branch Tees from Run #13.....	781
Figure 8–35. Comparison of Temperature Traces in the Collection Vessel from Runs #5 and #16.....	782
Figure 8–36. Void Fraction Measurements from Run #5.....	782
Figure 8–37. Void Fraction Measurements from Run #16.....	783
Figure 8–38. Pressure Traces from Run #5.....	784
Figure 8–39. Pressure Traces from Run #16.....	784
Figure 8–40. Mass Inventory in the Source Vessel from Run #18.....	785
Figure 8–41. Temperature Traces at Various Positions from Run #18.....	785
Figure 8–42. Void Fraction Measurements from Run #19.....	786
Figure 8–43. NIST Test Apparatus.....	787
Figure 8–44. Piping Configurations for NIST Experiments.....	788
Figure 8–45. FSP Input Model.....	789
Figure 8–46. Comparison of Calculated and Measured Bottle Pressure for B-59.....	790
Figure 8–47. Comparison of Calculated and Measured Bottle Pressure for B-68.....	790
Figure 8–48. Comparison of Calculated and Measured Bottle Pressure for B-61.....	791
Figure 8–49. Comparison of Calculated and Measured Bottle Pressure for B-60.....	791
Figure 8–50. Comparison of Experimental and Predictive Source Vessel Pressure Data in Sensitivity Study on Critical Radius Value for Conditions of Run #4.....	793
Figure 8–51. Comparison of Experimental and Predictive Source Vessel Pressure Data in Sensitivity Study on Gas Release Rate Value for Conditions of Run #4.....	793

Figure 8–52. Comparison of Experimental and Predictive Void Fraction Data in Sensitivity Study on Gas Release Rate Value for Conditions of Run #4.....	794
Figure 8–53. Comparison of Experimental (in black) and Predictive Pressure Data Using Final Values for Code Operating Parameters for Conditions of Run #4.	795
Figure 8–54. Comparison of Experimental (in black) and Predictive Void Fraction Data Using Final Values for Code Operating Parameters for Conditions of Run #4.....	793
Figure 8–55. Comparison of Cumulative Mass for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data.....	796
Figure 8–56. Comparison of Void Fraction for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data	797
Figure 8–57. Comparison of Source Vessel Pressure for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data.....	798
Figure 8–58. Comparison of Pipe Position #1 Pressure for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data	798
Figure 8–59. Comparison of Pipe Position #2 Pressure for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data	799
Figure 8–60. Comparison of Pipe Position #3 Pressure for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data	799
Figure 8–61. Comparison of Collection Vessel Pressure for Experimental Run #5 and Predictive Computer Code Data	800
Figure 8–62. Comparison of Pressure Drop across a Capped Tee for Experimental Run #9 and Predictive Computer Code Data.....	801
Figure 8–63. Comparison of Pressure Drop across a 90° Elbow for Experimental Run #9 and Predictive Computer Code Data	801
Figure 8–64. Comparison of Pressure Drop across a Union for Experimental Run #9 and Predictive Computer Code Data	802
Figure 8–65. Comparison of Source Vessel Fluid Temperature for Experimental Run #16 and Predictive Computer Code Data.	803
Figure 8–66. Comparison of Pipe Position #1 Fluid Temperature for Experimental Run #16 and Predictive Computer Code Data.....	803
Figure 8–67. Comparison of Collection Vessel Gas Temperature for Experimental Run #16 and Predictive Computer Code Data.....	804
Figure 8–68. Zone A of the Test Section.	806
Figure 8–69. Clutter Recovery vs. Airspeed.....	808
Figure 8–70. Plenum Recovery vs. Airspeed.....	808
Figure 8–71. Heated Cylinder Test Section.....	809
Figure 8–72. Heated Cylinder. (A) Schematic and (B) Front View.	810
Figure 8–73. Body-centered Cube of Spheres.	811
Figure 8–74. Photographs of Seed/droplet-laden Flow Fields around Obstacles.	812

Figure 8–75. Variation of the Mean Streamwise and Cross-stream Velocities with Downstream Distance for the Unheated Cylinder.	813
Figure 8–76. Variation of the Mean Streamwise and Cross-stream Velocities with Downstream Distance for the Body-centered Cube of Spheres.	814
Figure 8–77. View and Schematic of the Experimental Arrangement with the Laser from the Phase Doppler Interferometry System.	816
Figure 8–78. Schematic of the Measurement Grid around the Cylinder.	816
Figure 8–79. Variation of Water Droplet (A) Sauter Mean Diameter and (B) Mean Streamwise Velocity with Streamwise Position at Different Cross-stream Positions for the Unheated Cylinder.	818
Figure 8–80. Variation of the Streamwise Velocity with Time upstream of the Unheated Cylinder at $Z = -15$ mm and along the Centerline.	818
Figure 8–81. Variation of the Streamwise Velocity with Time at Two Streamwise Positions of (A) $Z = 25$ mm and (B) $Z = 76$ mm along the Centerline, downstream of the Unheated Cylinder within the Recirculation Region.	819
Figure 8–82. Variation of Water Droplet (A) Sauter Mean Diameter and (B) Mean Streamwise Velocity for the Unheated (22 °C) and Heated (150 °C) Cylinders.	820
Figure 8–83. Comparison of the Droplet Mean Size and Streamwise Velocity for the Three Agents.	820
Figure 8–84. USNA Wind Tunnel Schematic.	822
Figure 8–85. Low-speed, High-turbulence, Open Jet USNA Wind Tunnel.	822
Figure 8–86. Photograph of the Wire Bundle Model.	824
Figure 8–87. Photograph of the Tandem Medium Cylinder Model.	824
Figure 8–88. Photograph of the Cube Model.	825
Figure 8–89. Strouhal Number vs. Reynolds Number for the Various Tested Configurations.	828
Figure 8–90. Schematic of the Test Fixture (ELEFANT).	830
Figure 8–91. Absorption Spectrum of CF_3I	833
Figure 8–92. Calibration Curve at 300 nm.	834
Figure 8–93. Variation of Bottle Pressure during Discharge at Room and Cold Temperatures.	834
Figure 8–94. CF_3I Concentration Profiles at the Forward Port.	836
Figure 8–95. CF_3I Concentration Profiles at the Aft Port.	836
Figure 8–96. Calculated Liquid Fraction as a Function of Bottle Temperature.	838
Figure 8–97. Photograph of the Quarter-Scale Nacelle Test Facility with LDV apparatus.	848
Figure 8–98. Measurement Stations in the Quarter-Scale Nacelle.	848
Figure 8–99. VULCAN Gridding for the Quarter-Scale Nacelle.	850
Figure 8–100. Section of the CFD-ACE Grid Used in the Simulation.	851
Figure 8–101. Inlet Velocity Profile.	851
Figure 8–102. Inlet Turbulence Intensity Profile.	852

Figure 8–103. Velocity and Turbulence Intensity Profiles at Measurement Station 4.	852
Figure 8–104. Velocity and Turbulence Intensity Profiles at Mid-nacelle.	853
Figure 8–105. Comparison of Simulation and Experimental Data at the Exit Cone.	853
Figure 8–106. Velocity and Turbulence Intensity Profiles Flow in the Exit Pipe.	854
Figure 8–107. Ray Tracing Image of Case A1 before Agent Injection and 0.2 s after Injection of 10% HFC-125 Images of Case A3 and A5 before Agent Injection.....	856
Figure 8–108. Centerline Contour Plots Showing (from top to bottom) the Temperature, Oxygen Mass Fraction, Fuel Mass Fraction and the Computational Grid for Case A1.	857
Figure 8–109. (a) Evolution of the Maximum Fluid Cell Temperature in the Domain for Case A1 for Various HFC-125 Mole Fractions. (b) Suppression Times as a Function of Added HFC-125 for Cases A1, A3 and A5. (c) Mass Fraction and Temperature Evolution in the Recirculation Zone (8 mm above pool and 8 mm behind step) for Case A1 with 10 % HFC-125 by Volume Injected at 5 s.	858
Figure 8–110. Centerline Contour Plots of Temperature and HFC-125 Mass Fraction at 0.1 s and 0.2 s after Suppressant Injection for Case A1 with 0.1 HFC-125 Mole Fraction Injected.....	859
Figure 8–111. Centerline Pressure Contours and Velocity Vectors for Cases A1, A3 and A5 prior to Suppressant Injection.....	860
Figure 8–112. Raytracing images of Cases B1 and B2.....	862
Figure 8–113. (a) Temporal Evolution of HFC-125 Mass Fraction in the Recirculation Zone at a Point 0.012 m above the Lower Surface and 0.05 m behind the Rib along the Centerline. (b) Suppression Times as a Function of HFC-125 Mole Fraction for Cases B1, B2, C1, and C2.	862
Figure 8–114. Locations of the Suppressant Nozzles and the Pools in the Nacelle Simulator.....	863
Figure 8–115. Contour Plots of C_2HF_5 at 3.0 s after Start of Suppressant Injection in Vertical Planes near Starboard Side near Nacelle Centerline and near Port Side.....	864
Figure 8–116. Simulation Results of Various Injection Periods.....	866
Figure 8–117. Simulation Results Showing the Effect of Nozzles on Agent Distribution.....	867
Figure 8–118. Simulated Agent Distribution along the Nacelle Centerline.	867
Figure 8–119. Ground Test Nacelle ‘Iron Bird’ Simulator.....	873
Figure 8–120. Drawing of Front Face of Ground Test Nacelle.	874
Figure 8–121. Transient Bottle Pressure during Discharge for Various Initial Pressures with Nozzles Discharging a Total of 3.2 kg of HFC-125.	880
Figure 8–122. Nacelle Configuration Used in FDS Simulations.....	883
Figure 8–123. Nacelle Configuration Used in FPM Simulations.	883
Figure 8–124. Results of Tests with All Nozzles Used.	887
Figure 8–125. Results of Tests with One Nozzle Capped.	888
Figure 8–126. Extinguishment of Heptane Pool Fires by Uncharged Water Mist.	892
Figure 8–127. Schematic Sketch of Fire Test Chamber	895

Figure 8–128. Electron Induction Electrode.....	895
Figure 8–129. Attraction of Charged Droplets to Grounded Metal Screen.....	896
Figure 8–130. Motion of Charged Droplets near Fires.....	898
Figure 8–131. 7N Seven Hollow Cone Nozzle Setup.....	899
Figure 8–132. Spray Charging Set-up.....	900
Figure 8–133. Effect of Center Nozzle Size on 7N Nozzles Water Flux.....	901
Figure 8–134. Effect of Electrical Charging on Water Flux Distribution of the 7N Nozzles with the 0.063 L/min Center Nozzle.....	902
Figure 8–135. Initial Data on Effect of Electrical Charging for a 10 cm Diameter Heptane Pool Fire.....	903
Figure 8–136. All Electrical Charging Data for a 10 cm Diameter Heptane Pool Fire.....	904
Figure 8–137. Schematic of Single Nozzle Electron Emission Electrode.....	905
Figure 8–138. Effect of Electrical Charging on Extinguishment for a 5 cm Diameter Heptane Pool Fire.....	906
Figure 8–139. AeroChem 5 cm and 10 cm and NMERI 5 cm Heptane Extinguishment Data.....	907
Figure 8–140. Experimental Setup for Testing the Relative Effectiveness of Fire Extinguishing Agents.....	911
Figure 8–141. Experimental Setup for Testing Agents Against an Obstructed Flame.....	912
Figure 8–142. Extinction of a Candle Flame by CO ₂	914
Figure 8–143. Extinction of a Candle Flame by Halon 1211.....	914
Figure 9–1. Typical Powder Panel Arrangements.....	928
Figure 9–2. Experimental Test Device and Powder Collection Methods.....	935
Figure 9–3. AVSF Range A Light-gas Gun.....	936
Figure 9–4. Test Example of Significant Panel Fracture and Material Loss.....	941
Figure 9–5. Test Example of Effective Powder Release and Dispersion.....	941
Figure 9–6. Effect on Powder Panel Fracture Area of Standard Design Features and Enhanced Designs.....	942
Figure 9–7. Effect on Powder Delivery of Standard Design Features and Enhanced Designs.....	943
Figure 9–8. Effect on Powder Dispersion of Standard Design Features and Enhanced Designs.....	943
Figure 9–9. JTCG/AS Test Article.....	946
Figure 9–10. Schematic of the FAA Test Article.....	946
Figure 9–11. Enhanced Powder Panel Fire Mitigation Capability.....	947
Figure 9–12. Comparison of Commercial and Enhanced Powder Panel Agent Release in JTCG/AS Dry Bay Fire Extinguishing Testing.....	948

Figure 9–13. Entire Contents of Enhanced Powder Panel Released During FAA Test in Which the Fire Was Prevented.	948
Figure 9–14. Enhanced Powder Panel Mass Reduction.....	952
Figure 9–15. Enhanced Powder Panel Thickness Reduction.....	953
Figure 9–16. Comparison of Enhanced and Commercial Panel Powder Released.....	953
Figure 9–17. Comparison of Enhanced and Commercial Panel Percent Powder Released.....	954
Figure 9–18. Comparison of Enhanced and Commercial Panel Front Face Area Removal.....	954
Figure 9–19. Range 2 at the WPAFB Aerospace Vehicle Survivability Facility.....	956
Figure 9–20. Test Article.....	956
Figure 9–21. Schematic of Test Article.....	957
Figure 9–22. Test Article Setup in Range 2.....	958
Figure 9–23. 12.7 mm API Type B-32 Projectile Description.....	959
Figure 9–24. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-03 Commercial Powder Panel.....	961
Figure 9–25. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-04 Enhanced Powder Panel.....	962
Figure 9–26. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-05 Enhanced Powder Panel.....	963
Figure 9–27. Powder Suspension in the Dry Bay Well After the Test.....	964
Figure 9–28. Powder Dispersion on Striker Plate and Side Lexan Panel.....	964
Figure 9–29. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-06 Enhanced Powder Panel.....	965
Figure 9–30. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-07 Enhanced Powder Panel.....	965
Figure 9–31. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-08 Enhanced Powder Panel.....	963
Figure 9–32. Powder Evident in Dry Bay More Than 5 min after EPP-09 Test.....	967
Figure 9–33. Post-Test Damage Image of EPP-09 Enhanced Powder Panel.....	967
Figure 9–34. NAWS-China Lake Propellant Burn Rate Apparatus.....	978
Figure 9–35. Aerojet Fire Test Fixture (FTF).....	979
Figure 9–36. Photograph of Fire Test Fixture.....	979
Figure 9–37. FTF Test Facility Schematic.....	980
Figure 9–38. Fire Test Fixture Operational Configurations.....	981
Figure 9–39. Aerojet Slow Discharge Solid Propellant Gas Generator Test Unit.....	983
Figure 9–40. Cutaway of Aerojet Slow Discharge Solid Propellant Gas Generator Test Unit.....	984
Figure 9–41. Aerojet Reusable Rapid Discharge Solid Propellant Fire Extinguisher Unit.....	985
Figure 9–42. Arrangement of a Typical Hybrid Fire Extinguisher.....	985
Figure 9–43. Consecutive Frames during SPGG Suppression of a Fire in the FTF.....	986
Figure 9–44. SPGG Installed in Sponson Test Article for Live-fire Demonstration.....	987
Figure 9–45. SPGGs Installed in Mid-wing Test Article for Live-fire Demonstration.....	987
Figure 9–46. Typical Setup of Preliminary Vise Shot for Hybrid Extinguisher.....	988

Figure 9–47. Chamber Pressure for Different Propellant Surface Areas (CA-04).	990
Figure 9–48. Housing Temperatures for Different Propellant Surface Areas (CA-04).	990
Figure 9–49. High-nitrogen Fuels Used in China Lake/Aerojet Propellant Development.	993
Figure 9–50. Synthetic Route to BTATZ.....	995
Figure 9–51. Temperature Dependence of Propellant Burn Rates for Different FS01-40/additive Combinations.	998
Figure 9–52. Effect of Coolant Percentage on Burning Rate (in./s) and Adiabatic Temperature of High Nitrogen Propellants Listed in Table 9–18.....	999
Figure 9–53. Representative SPGG Pressure-time Curve Obtained during Delivery of Candidate Chemically Active Agents.....	1004
Figure 9–54. Representative P-t Curve for SPGG Chamber Pressure.	1009
Figure 9–55. Representative P-t Curve for Fire Test Fixture Pressure before, during, and after SPGG discharge.	1009
Figure 9–56. Threshold Mass of Inert Propellant Plus Potassium Compound for Suppression in the FTF.....	1010
Figure 9–57. Schematic of Hybrid Extinguisher Workhorse Hardware Configuration.....	1012
Figure 9–58. Mounting Configuration of Multiple Hybrid Extinguishers Used to Bracket Threshold Levels.....	1012
Figure 9–59. Effectiveness of Various Hybrid Extinguisher Propellant/fluid Combinations.....	1017
Figure 9–60. Relative Effectiveness of Various SPGG Fire Extinguishers over the Span of the NGP Research.....	1020
Figure 9–61. Evolution of SPGG Fire Suppression Application Technologies.....	1020
Figure 10–1. Typical Cargo Aircraft Engine Nacelle Fire Protection System Location (Wing Leading Edge).....	1030
Figure 10–2. Close-up of Typical Engine Nacelle Fire Protection System Bottle.	1030
Figure 10–3. Typical Cargo Aircraft Engine Nacelle Fire Suppressant Storage and Distribution System (Wing Leading Edge).....	1031
Figure 10–4. Typical Auxiliary Power Unit Fire Protection System Location.....	1034
Figure 10–5. Typical General Location of Fighter Aircraft Fire Extinguisher Bottle.	1034
Figure 10–6. Schematic of Typical Fighter Aircraft Engine Bay.	1035
Figure 10–7. Typical Fighter Aircraft Fire Suppression System Installation.	1035
Figure 10–8. Typical General Location of Rotary-Wing Aircraft Fire Extinguisher Bottles.	1039
Figure 10–9. Typical Future Fighter Aircraft Agent Distribution System.....	1049
Figure 10–10. F-22 Factor of Safety Data.	1070
Figure 10–11. Legacy and Future Cargo Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for Halon 1301.....	1074

Figure 10–12. Legacy Cargo Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for HFC-125.	1074
Figure 10–13. Future Cargo Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for HFC-125.	1075
Figure 10–14. Legacy and Future Cargo Aircraft Cost Savings vs. System Effectiveness.	1075
Figure 10–15. Legacy Fighter Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness.	1077
Figure 10–16. Future Fighter Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness.	1077
Figure 10–17. Legacy and Future Fighter Aircraft Cost Savings vs. System Effectiveness.	1078
Figure 10–18. Legacy Rotary-wing Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for Halon 1301.	1079
Figure 10–19. Legacy Rotary-Wing Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for HFC-125.	1080
Figure 10–20. Future Rotary-Wing Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for Halon 1301.	1080
Figure 10–21. Future Rotary-Wing Aircraft Net Costs vs. System Effectiveness for HFC-125.	1081
Figure 10–22. Legacy and Future Rotary-Wing Aircraft Cost Savings vs. System Effectiveness.	1081
Figure 11–1. AENTF Primary Mechanical Components.	1107
Figure 11–2. Photograph of Universal Test Fixture.	1107
Figure 11–3. Cutaway View of the Engine Core inside the Nacelle Fixture.	1108
Figure 11–4. Vertical Extinguisher Unit Attached to the Nacelle Fixture.	1108
Figure 11–5. AENTF Control Room.	1109
Figure 11–6. Semi-Transparent View of Components in Fire Section of the Test Fixture.	1110
Figure 11–7. Pool Fire Pan in Nacelle.	1110
Figure 11–8. Schematic of Spray Fire Vicinity.	1111
Figure 11–9. 7.6 cm Ribs Mounted on the Underside of the Nacelle and the Engine Core.	1111
Figure 11–10. Discharge “T” and with Nozzles Added for Phase II.	1119
Figure 11–11. Halonyzer Probe Mounting in Flame Region.	1120
Figure 11–12. Halonyzer Probes in Nacelle Fixture.	1120
Figure 11–13. Phase II Nacelle Concentration Measurement Quadrants.	1123
Figure 11–14. Layout for Multi-Port Discharge.	1123
Figure 11–15. Variation of Moles of Injected Chemical per Fire Zone Volume Percent with Relative Air Temperature.	1127
Figure 11–16. Variation of Concentration Standard Deviation with Number of Discharge Sites.	1127
Figure 11–17. Variation of Concentration Standard Deviation with Rib Height.	1128

Figure 11–18. Reduction in Moles/Concentration with Increasing τ , Residence Time.....	1129
Figure 11–19. Effect of Agent Type and Relative Temperature on Extinguishing Concentration.....	1130
Figure 11–20. Notional Graphs of Concentration in the Free Stream and Recirculation Zone.....	1133
Figure 11–21. Sample Halonyzer Traces.....	1134
Figure 11–22. Influence of Flame Stabilizing Rib Height on Value of τ	1136
Figure 11–23. Influence of Fire Type on Value of τ	1136
Figure 11–24. Influence of Agent and Air Temperature on Value of τ	1137
Figure 11–25. Variability in Peak Concentration Required Due to Extinguisher Flow.....	1140
Figure 11–26. Variability in Peak Concentration Required Due to Rib Height.....	1141

Page intentionally left blank

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1–1. Flame Suppression by Halon 1301 and Other Chemicals	5
Table 1–2. Use of Halon 1301 in Fielded Weapons Systems.....	7
Table 2–1. Evolution of Aircraft Vulnerability Based on Live Fire Test Vulnerability Assessments (API Threats).....	22
Table 2–2. Tabulation of Aircraft Fire Types.....	42
Table 2–3. Number of Mishaps and Incidents.....	60
Table 2–4. Percentage of Fire Mishaps and Incidents Occurring in Geographic Cold or Severe-Cold Environments.....	60
Table 2–5. Comparison of Modeled vs. Measured Nacelle Air Temperatures	68
Table 2–6. Estimate of Rate of Occurrence of Aircraft Lost Due to Failure to Extinguish a Nacelle Fire, Any Time	72
Table 2–7. Estimate of Rate of Occurrence of Aircraft Lost Due to Failure to Extinguish a Nacelle Fire, Any Time	72
Table 2–8. Estimate of Rate of Occurrence of Aircraft Lost Due to Failure to Extinguish a Nacelle Fire in a Climatic Extreme.....	73
Table 2–9. Estimate of Rate of Occurrence of Aircraft Lost Due to Failure to Extinguish a Nacelle Fire in a Climatic Extreme.....	73
Table 2–10. Fire Suppressants on DoD Aircraft.....	87
Table 2–11. Most Significant Fire Suppression Parameters Identified During Phase 1.....	93
Table 2–12. Halon Alternative Fire Suppressants Identified for Phase 2 Evaluation.	94
Table 2–13. Most Significant Fire Suppression Parameters Identified During Phase 2.....	94
Table 2–14. Fire Suppression Parameters in Design Guidance Developed from Phase 3.	95
Table 2–15. Minimum Fire Suppressant Quantities from F-22 Main Landing Gear Dry Bay Live Fire Testing, 150-grain Fragment Threat and Jet Fuel Except Where Noted.	103
Table 3–1. Agents Tested.	125
Table 3–2. Cup Burner Extinction Concentrations.....	137
Table 3–3. Catalytic Efficiency of Different Metals in Promoting Radical Recombination.	149
Table 3–4. Metals Which Have Shown Flame Inhibiting Properties.	155

Table 3–5. Inhibitor Concentrations ($\mu\text{L/L}$) and Uncertainty ($\pm \mu\text{L/L}$) at Flame Extinction.....	161
Table 3–6. Uninhibited Laminar Burning Velocities SL and Adiabatic Flame Temperatures TAFT from 1-D Planar Numerical Calculations, Together with the Average Burning Velocity Measured in the Bunsen-type Flames.....	180
Table 3–7. Reaction Rate Data for Tin Inhibition of Premixed Methane-air Flames.....	182
Table 3–8. Thermodynamic Properties of Tin- and Manganese-containing Species (298 K).....	183
Table 3–9. Reaction Rate Data for Manganese Inhibition of Premixed Methane-air Flames.....	184
Table 3–10. Summary of the Fe and Na Mass Loadings in Unheated and Heated Particles.....	203
Table 3–11. Components of Metallic Complexes.....	213
Table 3–12. Current State of Knowledge Relevant to Inhibition Potential of Metals, and Loss of Effectiveness due to Condensation.....	233
Table 3–13. Flame Conditions.....	256
Table 3–14. Probe Orifice Diameters Used in Specific Experiments.....	269
Table 3–15. FTIR Detection Limits and Wavenumber Ranges.....	270
Table 3–16. Operating Conditions.....	272
Table 3–17. Inhibitor Concentrations and Uncertainty at Flame Extinction.....	285
Table 3–18. Measured OH Profile Widths for the Uninhibited Flame and Inhibited Flames at 50 % of the Inhibitor Extinction Concentrations.....	287
Table 3–19. Comparison of Calculated Burning Velocities.....	297
Table 3–20. Kinetic Mechanisms for Suppressants.....	302
Table 3–21. Efficiencies and Sensitivities to Bond Energies of Catalytic Cycles.....	306
Table 3–22. Input Parameters and Calculated Temperatures and Flame Speeds.....	310
Table 4–1. Mean Diameter Definitions, Symbols, and Notations used to Describe Aerosol Size Distributions.....	348
Table 4–2. Thermodynamic Quantities for Physical Suppressants Compared to CF_3Br	368
Table 4–3. Number Density and Droplet Separation Lengths for Some Selected Water Mass Fractions.....	374
Table 4–4. Stokes Number (S_t) for Different Droplet Sizes for $a = 130 \text{ s}^{-1}$	376
Table 4–5. PDPA Derived Diameter Information for the Experimental Mists Studied Measured at 2 mm from the Air Tube Exit.....	386

Table 4–6. Flow and Strain Rate Conditions for Extinction Experiments.	398
Table 4–7. Propane-air Counterflow Non-premixed Flame Extinction Mass Concentrations for Powders and Halon 1301.	401
Table 4–8. Experimental and Predicted Global Flame Extinction Strain Rates (s^{-1}) for Different Droplet Size Distributions and Water Droplet Mass Fraction of 0.01.	420
Table 4–9. Elemental Composition of Pure Dendrimers and Dendrimer Salt Complexes.	431
Table 4–10. Average Blow-off Velocities for of Various Candidate Agents.	433
Table 5–1. Optical Diagnostics for Fire Species.	483
Table 6–1. Calculated Nominal Agent Mass Fractions at Reference Blow-off Air Velocity of 30 cm/s.	534
Table 6–2. Estimated and Reported ODP Values (Relative to CFC-11) for Selected Halocarbons.	559
Table 6–3. Atmospheric Lifetimes (years), from Theory and from OH Reactivity Measurements, for Selected Molecules.	570
Table 6–4. Reactions of Phosphates.	571
Table 6–5. Estimated Equilibrium Vapor Pressure as a Function of Boiling Point and Ambient Temperature.	573
Table 6–6. Estimated Maximum Boiling Point That Can Achieve a Given Volume Percent of Chemical in Air.	573
Table 6–7. Cardiac Sensitization Values for Fluorocarbons and Hydrofluorocarbons.	580
Table 6–8. Cardiac Sensitization Values for Br-, Cl-, and I-containing Alkanes.	581
Table 6–9. Cardiac Sensitization Values for CFCs and HFCs.	581
Table 6–10. Availability of QSARs for Various Chemical Classes and Toxic Endpoints.	583
Table 6–11. Air Concentration Inducing Cardiac Sensitization in 50 % of Animals.	585
Table 6–12. Partitioning (K_{OW}) and Arrhythmia Properties of Selected Anesthetics.	586
Table 6–13. Comparison of Calculated and Measured Values of Log K_{OW} of Selected Halocarbons.	588
Table 6–14. In vitro Cardiac Cell Systems.	589
Table 6–15. Time for Safe Human Exposure at Stated Concentrations for Halon 1301 and HFC-125.	592
Table 6–16. Nominal Quantities of Chemicals Needed for Screening Tests.	597

Table 7-1. Tropospheric Removal Mechanisms.	612
Table 7-2. NIST List of Recommended Chemical Families (1990).	615
Table 7-3. AAWG Preliminary List of Compounds.	617
Table 7-4. TOPKAT Toxicity Predictions.	618
Table 7-5. DEREK Toxicity Predictions.	619
Table 7-6. Acute Inhalation Toxicity Tropodegradable Bromofluoroalkenes.	621
Table 7-7. Ames Mutagenicity Test Results.	621
Table 7-8. Chromosomal Aberration Test Results.	621
Table 7-9. Cardiac Sensitization Testing of Bromofluoropropenes.	621
Table 7-10. Anesthesiology Testing of Fluoroalkenes.	622
Table 7-11. Chemical Families Selected for Further Study.	625
Table 7-12. Chemical Families Not Pursued Further.	625
Table 7-13. Silicon-containing Compounds.	628
Table 7-14. •OH Rate Constants for Silicon Compounds.	631
Table 7-15. Tetra(fluoroalkoxy)silanes.	633
Table 7-16. Phosphonitrile Flame Extinguishment.	637
Table 7-17. Phosphorus Halide Flame Extinguishment.	638
Table 7-18. Rate Constants •OH Reactions With Phosphorus Compounds.	640
Table 7-19. Toxicity Studies of Chlorophosphazenes.	642
Table 7-20. Perfluoroalkyl Sulfur Compounds.	646
Table 7-21. Family Types in the DIPPR Database.	648
Table 7-22. Compounds with High ΔH_{Total} (Molar Basis).	649
Table 7-23. Compounds with High ΔH_{Total} (Mass Basis).	650
Table 7-24. Extinguishing Volume Fractions of Inert Gases for CH ₄ /Air Diffusion Flames.	657
Table 7-25. Extinguishing Volume Fractions of Inert Gases for C ₃ H ₈ /Air Diffusion Flames.	657
Table 7-26. Tropodegradable Brominated Candidates.	659
Table 7-27 Bromofluoropropenes.	663
Table 7-28 Bromofluoropropene Cup Burner Flame Extinguishment Data.	664
Table 7-29 Low Boiling Bromofluoroalkene Cup Burner Values.	664
Table 7-30 Phosphorus Compound Toxicity (Safety) Information.	665
Table 7-31. FID Extinguishment Estimates of Phosphorus Acids and Esters.	670

Table 7–32. Properties of Phosphorus-Containing Compounds.....	671
Table 7–33. Flame Extinguishment Values for Trimethylphosphite Blends with HFCs.....	672
Table 7–34. Enthalpy of Reaction for $\text{PF}_3 + 3 \text{O}=\text{CF}_2 \rightarrow \text{P}(\text{OCF}_3)_3$	674
Table 7–35. Perfluoroalkyl Phosphines.....	675
Table 7–36. Amino Fluoroalkylphosphines.....	677
Table 7–37. Phosphorus-containing Compound Performance.....	679
Table 7–38. $\bullet\text{OH}$ Rate Constants for Nitrogen-containing Compounds.....	681
Table 7–39. Rate Constants for Reactions of O_3 with Amines.....	681
Table 7–40. Acute Inhalation Toxicity of Hydrofluoroamines.....	683
Table 7–41. Toxicity and Safety Information for Selected N, F Compounds.....	683
Table 7–42. Fluoroalkylamine Boiling Points.....	684
Table 7–43. Bromofluoroamine Candidate Compounds.....	685
Table 7–44. Bromofluoroamine Boiling Points and Flame Suppression Results.....	687
Table 7–45. Rate Constants for Hydrofluoroether Reactions with $\bullet\text{OH}$	688
Table 7–46. Atmospheric Lifetimes for Fluorine-containing Ethers.....	688
Table 7–47. Fluoroether Cup Burner Extinguishment Data.....	691
Table 7–48. Bromofluoroether Cup Burner Testing Summary.....	693
Table 7–49. Bromofluoropropene Oxide Cup Burner Testing Summary.....	695
Table 7–50. Bromofluoro Alcohol Boiling Points.....	696
Table 7–51. Iodoalkane Boiling Points.....	697
Table 7–52. Compilation of Historic Firefighting Emissions of CF_3Br	698
Table 7–53. Estimated Ozone Depletion Effects of CF_3I for Two Emission Profiles.....	699
Table 8–1. PROFISSY Results for Henry’s Constants.....	745
Table 8–2. Operating Condition for Repeatability Tests.....	761
Table 8–3. Matrix of Experimental Runs Conducted.....	775
Table 8–4. Comparison of Experimental Pressure Drop Values to Literature Values.....	780
Table 8–5. Test Matrix from NIST Experiments.....	789
Table 8–6. Model Geometry and Test Conditions.....	823
Table 8–7. Summary of Drag Coefficients.....	826
Table 8–8. Frequency and Strouhal Number Resolution.....	827
Table 8–9. Selected Thermophysical Properties of CF_3I and CF_3Br	829

Table 8–10. Experimental Matrix.....	832
Table 8–11. Liquid Fraction of CF_3I/N_2 Mixture after Isentropic Expansion to 0.101 MPa.....	835
Table 8–12. Description of Simulations of Pool Fires Stabilized behind a Backwards-facing Step.....	855
Table 8–13. Pool Characteristics.....	868
Table 8–14. Summary of Test Results with Four Nozzles.....	869
Table 8–15. Summary of Test Results with Individual Nozzles Capped.....	870
Table 8–16. Comparison of Predicted vs. Measured Pressures and Flows.....	876
Table 8–17. Summary of Full-Scale Tests Conducted.....	881
Table 8–18. Comparison of Fire Test Results and Pretest Simulations.....	882
Table 8–19. Effectiveness of Charged Water Mist Expressed as Percent of Successful Pool Fire Extinguishments.....	893
Table 8–20. Hollow Cone Nozzle Characteristics.....	894
Table 8–21. High Flow Capacity Seven Nozzle Assembly.....	899
Table 8–22. Low Flow Capacity Seven Nozzle Assembly.....	899
Table 8–23. Solid Cone Nozzle Characteristics.....	905
Table 9–1. Examples of Previously Tested Powder Panel Materials.....	933
Table 9–2. Phase I Powder Panel Configurations Tested.....	937
Table 9–3. More Effective Powder Panel Designs in Experimental Testing.....	939
Table 9–4. Less Effective Powder Panel Designs in Experimental Testing.....	940
Table 9–5. Phase II Optimization Tests.....	950
Table 9–6. Phase II Enhanced Powder Panel Live Fire Demonstration Tests.....	960
Table 9–7. C-130 Wing Leading Edge Dry Bay Fire Extinguishing System Component Mass Estimates.....	970
Table 9–8. C-130 Wing Leading Edge Dry Bay Total Fire Extinguishing System Mass Estimates.....	970
Table 9–9. V-22 Outboard Tip Rib Dry Bay Fire Extinguishing System Component Mass Estimates.....	971
Table 9–10. V-22 Outboard Tip Rib Dry Bay Total Fire Extinguishing System Mass Estimates.....	971
Table 9–11. Fire Test Fixture Operating Conditions.....	982
Table 9–12. Comparison of Aerojet FTF to Other Fire Test Fixtures.....	982
Table 9–13. Temperature Dependence of Burn Rate for Baseline Propellant, FS-0140.....	991

Table 9–14. Adiabatic Temperatures of High Nitrogen Propellant Fuels in Stoichiometric Mixtures with $\text{Sr}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ Oxidizer.....	994
Table 9–15. Adiabatic Temperatures of Oxidizers in Stoichiometric Mixtures with.....	996
Table 9–16. Development Propellant Compositions and Burning Parameters.....	997
Table 9–17. Effect of Different Coolants on Adiabatic Flame Temperature of 5AT- $\text{Sr}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ Propellant Mixture.....	999
Table 9–18. High Nitrogen Content Developmental Propellants with MgCO_3 Coolant: Compositions and Burning Parameters.....	1000
Table 9–19. Candidate Chemically Active Agents.....	1002
Table 9–20. Summary of SPGG Fire Suppression Testing with Chemically Active Agents.....	1004
Table 9–21. Chemically Active Developmental Propellants.....	1006
Table 9–22. Threshold Mass of Propellant and Potassium-based Additive for Fire Suppression in the FTF.....	1011
Table 9–23. Properties of Hybrid Fluid Candidates.....	1013
Table 9–24. Hybrid Extinguisher Fluorocarbon System Data Summary.....	1014
Table 9–25. Hybrid Extinguisher Aqueous System Data Summary.....	1015
Table 10–1. Properties of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 Used in Life-cycle Costing.....	1029
Table 10–2. Additional Legacy Cargo Aircraft Fire Protection System Information.....	1031
Table 10–3. Additional Legacy Fighter Aircraft Fire Suppression System Information.....	1036
Table 10–4. Legacy Rotary-wing Aircraft Specific Parameters.....	1040
Table 10–5. Additional Legacy Rotary-wing Aircraft Fire Suppression System Information.....	1041
Table 10–6. Design Guide Estimates of HFC-125 Concentration and Mass for Future Cargo Aircraft Engine Nacelles.....	1045
Table 10–7. Design Guide Estimates of HFC-125 Concentration and Mass for Future Cargo Aircraft Auxiliary Power Units.....	1046
Table 10–8. Future Cargo Aircraft Proposed System Estimates.....	1046
Table 10–9. Future Cargo Aircraft Extinguisher Container and Agent Mass.....	1047
Table 10–10. Future Fighter Aircraft Engine Nacelle Fire Protection System Components.....	1050
Table 10–11. Fighter Aircraft Fire Suppression System Mass Comparison.....	1050
Table 10–12. Future Fighter Aircraft Specific Parameters.....	1051
Table 10–13. Estimates of System Parameters for Proposed Future Fighter Aircraft System Description.....	1051

Table 10–14. Future Fighter Aircraft Extinguisher Container and Agent Mass.....	1052
Table 10–15. Future Rotary-wing Aircraft Specific Parameters.	1053
Table 10–16. Future Rotary-wing Aircraft Analysis of Increase in Total Mass.	1053
Table 10–17. Comparison of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 System Life-cycle (FY00 to FY22) Cost Estimates for Legacy Cargo Aircraft.	1056
Table 10–18. Comparison of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 System Life-cycle (FY00 to FY28) Cost Estimates for Legacy Fighter Aircraft.....	1057
Table 10–19. Comparison of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 System Life-cycle (FY03 to FY35) Cost Estimates for Legacy Rotary-wing Aircraft.....	1058
Table 10–20. Comparison of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 System Life-cycle (FY00 to FY31) Cost Estimates for Future Cargo Aircraft.....	1059
Table 10–21. Comparison of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 System Life-cycle (FY00 to FY32) Cost Estimates for Fighter Cargo Aircraft.....	1060
Table 10–22. Comparison of Halon 1301 and HFC-125 System Life-cycle (FY03 to FY41) Cost Estimates for Future Rotary-wing Aircraft	1061
Table 10–23. Detailed Cost Element Structure.....	1062
Table 10–24. Cargo Aircraft Cost Savings Estimation.....	1067
Table 10–25. Fighter Aircraft Cost Savings Estimation.	1067
Table 10–26. Rotary-wing Aircraft Costs Savings Estimation.....	1067
Table 10–27. Estimated Cargo Aircraft System Description.....	1069
Table 10–28. Estimated Fighter Aircraft System Description.....	1069
Table 10–29. Estimated Rotary-wing Aircraft System Description.	1070
Table 10–30. Cargo Aircraft Altered System Description.....	1071
Table 10–31. Fighter Aircraft Altered System Description.....	1072
Table 10–32. Rotary-wing Aircraft Altered System Description.	1072
Table 10–33. Legacy Cargo Aircraft Net Costs.....	1073
Table 10–34. Future Cargo Aircraft Net Costs.....	1073
Table 10–35. Legacy Fighter Aircraft Net Costs.....	1076
Table 10–36. Future Fighter Aircraft Net Costs	1076
Table 10–37. Legacy Rotary-wing Aircraft Net Costs	1078
Table 10–38. Future Rotary-wing Aircraft Net Costs	1079
Table 11–1. Local Conditions Fire Test (Phase I) Matrix.	1121
Table 11–2. Factors and Values for Phase I Fire Test Matrix.	1121
Table 11–3. Extinguishant Dispersion Optimization (Phase II) Test Matrix.	1124

Table 11–4. Factors and Values for Phase II Agent Distribution Test Matrix.	1124
Table 11–5. Phase I Summary Data.....	1126
Table 11–6. Phase II Summary Data.	1126
Table 11–7. Values of X_{F} and τ from Prior Experimentation.	1131
Table 11–8. Rank Order of τ Values in All Test Run Conditions for Both Mixing Models.....	1135
Table 11–9. Flame Extinguishment Concentrations. (% by Volume).....	1137
Table 11–10. Calculated Peak Concentrations under Fire Extinguishment Conditions.	1139
Table 11–11. Results of Fire Experiments with HFC-227ea and 2-bromo-3,3,3- trifluoropropene.	1141

Page intentionally left blank