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Overview: Fuel Properties and Chemical Kinetics

Central Fuel Properties Hypothesis

Development of Fuel Property Database (Fioroni in collaboration with LGHG Fuels Team)

Development of Fuel Screening Criteria – Thrust I (McCormick, Szybist, Miles in collaboration with LGHG Fuels Team)

Heat of Vaporization Measurement (Fioroni)

Measurement of Autoignition Properties with Small Volumes (Fioroni/McCormick, Goldsborough, McNenly)

Fuel Structure-Property Correlations (Bays)

Fuel Property Blending Models (McCormick)

Kinetic Mechanism Development (Pitz, Zigler)
Milestones: Fuel Properties and Chemical Kinetics

Tracked Milestones:

Analysis of up to 20 molecules that represent as many functional groups as possible which will increase our capacity to understand how chemical properties (functional groups) correlate to needed fuel properties and materials compatibility. (Owner NREL, due FY16 Q2) – Complete

Provide up to five fuels and 4 blending levels for blend determination studies. (Owner NREL, due FY16 Q4) – On Track

Provide a report to DOE and Optima documenting the current development status and potential for each of the three small volume autoignition testing techniques. (Owner LLNL, due FY16 Q4) – On Track

Develop a preliminary chemical kinetic mechanism for anisole, a compound relevant to pyrolysis oil-derived fuels. (Owner LLNL, due FY16 Q4) – On Track
Central Fuel Properties Hypothesis

If we correctly identify the critical fuel properties that affect efficiency and emissions performance for downsized, boosted SI engines, then fuels that have those properties will provide optimal engine performance. Also applies to Thrust II advanced compression ignition engines, but at a much lower level of development.

- With the correct properties, performance is a function of properties not composition or molecular structure
- Hypothesis may be true or very nearly true for petroleum-derived fuels
- Tested using engine experiments on biomass-derived fuels (oxygenates, targeted hydrocarbons) with fuel property values beyond the range exhibited by today’s petroleum-derived fuels.
NREL (Fioroni) $100k: Development of Fuel Property Database (BETO)

Objectives
• Create a publically-accessible Fuel Property Database for conventional new candidate fuels

Approach
• Filemaker Pro platform with on-line access
• Fuel molecules and mixtures proposed by LGHG Fuels Team
• Data measured or from literature

Accomplishment
• 366 pure compound and 12 mixtures – so far
• Fields for 25 specific fuel properties
• Used extensively in preparing Q2 Co-Optima Milestone Report (BETO)
Objectives

• Develop strategy for screening large numbers of candidate bio-blendstocks to select most promising based on fuel properties

Approach

• Three tier evaluation protocol
Tier 1 Screening for Thrust I Candidates

- Determine Boiling Point and Melting Point
  - Reject if outside of gasoline and diesel boiling ranges ($0^\circ C < T_b < 338^\circ C$)

- Apply Solubility Criteria (e.g., solubility parameter)
  - Reject if insoluble in hydrocarbon fuels within required temperature range

- Apply Corrosion Metric
  - Reject if the material is too corrosive for metals in fueling systems

- Identify Known Toxicity Issues
  - Reject if Category 1 or 2 carcinogen or reproductive toxin

- Determine Fuel Handling Safety (e.g., rapid peroxide former)
  - Reject if fuel is hazardous or unstable, not addressed with antioxidants

- Biodegradation
  - Flag for additional examination if less biodegradable than MTBE

Gasoline-Like $T_b<190^\circ C$ or $T_{90}<190^\circ C$
- Autoignition Reactivity Metrics
  - SI Engine High RON

Diesel-Like $T_b<338^\circ C$ or $T_{90}<338^\circ C$
- ACI Engine Wide range of ON/CN
  - Diesel Engine CN>40
Accomplishment: Selection of Most Promising Thrust I Bio-Blendstocks

For Thrust I (advanced SI engines) apply Tier 1 Criteria:
• Melting point/cloud point below -10°C
• Boiling point between 20°C and 165°C
• Measured or estimated RON ≥ 98
• Meet toxicity, corrosion, solubility, and biodegradation requirements
• 34 promising bio-blendstocks from all functional group classes – strong matrix for testing central fuel properties hypothesis

Database Future Developments
• Fully populate property data for most promising candidates
• Add capability for data on finished fuel blends
NREL (Fioroni) $250k: Heat of Vaporization Measurement

Objective

• Develop methods for measuring heat of vaporization (HOV) of complex mixtures
• Measure HOV as a function of fraction evaporated
• High HOV fuels may extend knock limit, reduce need for spark retard beyond knock limit, reduce need for rich operation

- Pure compound HOV easily measured
  - Measure vapor pressure vs temperature and apply Clausius-Clapeyron equation
- Not applicable to blends such as gasoline

\[
\ln \left( \frac{P_{T_1,\text{vap}}}{P_{T_2,\text{vap}}} \right) = \left( \frac{\Delta H_{\text{vap}}}{R} \right) \left[ \frac{1}{T_2} - \frac{1}{T_1} \right]
\]

- \( P \) = Vapor pressure
- \( T \) = temperature in Kelvin
- \( \Delta H_{\text{vap}} = \text{HOV} \)
- \( R \) = ideal gas constant

- The vapor pressure is determined by the most volatile components of the fuel which make up only a small portion of the fuel
- This yields an unrealistically low value for HOV
**Fioroni: HOV Measurements**

**Approach**
- Directly measure HOV by DSC/TGA
- Calculate HOV from detailed hydrocarbon analysis of gasoline (mole fraction weighted sum of pure component HOV)

**Challenge:** highly volatile samples evaporate as they are loaded into the instrument

**Solution:** Syringe injection of sample, larger sample pans, covered with pin-hole lids

- DSC/TGA measurements agree well with DHA
- Values calculated using the CP equation fall below DSC/TGA or DHA, especially at high ethanol content
- Very similar HOV for wide range of gasolines and ethanol blends
Fioroni: HOV as a Function of Fraction Evaporated

- Effect of ethanol on HOV20 may be negligible
- Increasing ethanol has significant effect on HOV50
- Working to improve precision of this measurement under project with CRC (AVFL-27)

Collaborations:
Coordinating Research Council
University of Colorado

HOV Future Work FY16/17
- Improve precision of DSC/TGA measurements
  - New dedicated instrument
  - Couple with much greater precision DSC measurements
- Couple with Advanced Distillation Curve experiments and DSC/TGA-MS to reveal composition as fuel evaporates
- Collaboration with NREL engine group on actual HOV effects
Measurement of Autoignition Properties with Small Volumes

Background
- Providing early-stage feedback to identify promising fuel candidates, accelerate progress and eliminate effort and expense associated with unnecessary scale-up.
- Focused on using milliliter volume samples to characterize the autoignition behavior of fuels, the property that is the most problematic to predict.

Objectives
- Measure autoignition kinetics, or a variable correlated with common autoignition metrics such as RON or CN, using a very small volume of material

Three projects in various stages:
- LLNL (McNenly): Flames with Repetitive Extinction & Ignition
  - Ongoing Collaboration with Louisiana State University
- NREL (McCormick): Flow Reactor for Small Volume Autoignition Experiments
  - FY16 Start
- ANL (Goldsborough): RCM as a Small Volume Autoignition Experiment
  - FY16 Start
LLNL (McNenly) $75k: \mu$FIT: Micro-liter Fuel Ignition Tester
Flames with Repetitive Extinction & Ignition (FREI)

MEMS microphone
Quartz Tube (with imposed wall temperature profile)

Translation stage for wall temperature characterization (thermocouple not shown)
Monitoring thermocouple
High-Speed and Machine Vision Cameras

High Speed Videos (2000 fps; 2mm ID tube)
with 430 nm bandpass (CH*)

FREI (CH*) OH* Plume of external flame
Flow

Tube inlet manifold (mixture of interest)
60 mm McKenna Burner (H₂/Air) (external heating)

\[ T_{\text{max}} \approx 1300 \text{ K} \]
McNenly: \( \mu \text{FIT}: \) Micro-liter Fuel Ignition Tester

Flames with Repetitive Extinction & Ignition (FREI)

TC data plus low-speed images yield temperatures

FREI characteristics \((T^+ \text{ and } T^-)\) depend on fuel

Fuel consumption:
gases: 1-10 sccm/min
liquids: 1-5 \(\mu\)l/min

Remaining work plan for FY 2016:

- Reduce temperature measurement uncertainty
- Continue and improve measurements for liquid reference fuels (iso-octane, n-heptane & toluene)
- Redesign burner to prepare for experiments at elevated pressures
Objective – Correlate fuel performance properties to chemical & solution structures in complex fuels

Impact – Achieve the ability to rapidly predict properties, like DCN, from < 1 mL of fuel

Approach
— Use NMR/2D-GC to investigate fuel structure-property correlations, emphasizing DCN/RON prediction
— Understand high-pressure phase behavior of fuels

Future Work
— Correlations to other properties, e.g., distillation or $P_{\text{vap}}$
— P-T behavior beyond diesel surrogate fuels to fuels relevant to Co-Optima

Final Melting Point of $n$-Octadecane Crystals in Surrogate 3 at 10,000 psi*

$^{13}$C and $^1$H NMRs of an Upgraded Biomass Hydrothermal Liquefaction Oil

Two NMR regions having very strong correlation with DCN

DCN Prediction from a Single $^{13}$C NMR Region (24.5-22 ppm)

*Results are preliminary. Final results are expected to be within 10% of presented values.

Work conducted in collaboration with CRC Project AVFL-18a.
Objective:
- Develop and validate chemical kinetic models for various bio-blendstocks and fuel surrogates

Approach:
Pitz: Development of kinetic mechanism for anisole, a bio-derived fuel

- Surrogate for methylated phenolics stream produced from biomass
- On Co-Optima list of most promising Thrust I candidates
- RON = 119, Sensitivity = 21
- LLNL preliminary mechanism complete
- Comparison of mechanism with intermediate species data
- Collaborators measuring ignition delay times (NREL), laminar burning velocities (Lund Univ.) and more intermediate species at high pressure (CNRS, Orleans) for additional validation

**Jet stirred reactor experimental data:**
Pitz: Investigation of the effect of molecular structure on ignition behavior at RON-like engine conditions

- RON-like pressure history from Magnus Sjöberg’s DISI engine at Sandia
- Heat release curves for different alcohol chain-lengths for a RON-like engine pressure trajectory:
- RON predictions for a series of fuels in different chemical classes using RON-like pressure history
ANL (Goldsborough) $250k: Rapid compression machine (RCM) investigation of gasoline mixtures with ethanol and validation of surrogate mechanism

- ANL rapid compression machine
- CRC FACE-F / Ethanol blends (E0–E30, E100)
- LLNL kinetic mechanism for gasoline surrogate

**Fuels for Advanced Combustion Engines (FACE)-F:**
- RON = 94.4
- Sensitivity = 5.6
- Aromatics: 8.6%
- n-Paraffins: 4.2%
- Naphthenes: 11.0%
- Olefins: 8.9%
ANL (Goldsborough) $250k: Rapid compression machine (RCM) investigation of gasoline mixtures with ethanol and validation of surrogate mechanism

- ANL rapid compression machine
- CRC FACE-F / Ethanol blends (E0–E30, E100)
- LLNL kinetic mechanism for gasoline surrogate
NREL (Zigler) $550K: Chemical Kinetics and SI Autoignition Behavior

**Objectives**

- Assist in *development and validation of chemical kinetic mechanisms for blends* through ignition delay experiments and simulations.
- Combine bench-scale autoignition studies with engine experiments to *more extensively quantify fuel blend ignition performance* than possible with RON and MON.

**Approach**

- Employ a modified Ignition Quality Tester (IQT) to measure ignition performance of biofuel compounds blended into both key simple surrogate mixtures, and more complex gasoline range research fuels.
- Perform computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations of IQT to evaluate reduced kinetic mechanisms for blends against experimental data.
- Evaluate IQT-based data to highlight key kinetic behavior related to how ignition delay increases at low temperatures in relation to increased octane sensitivity.
- Characterize all fuels used in NREL’s engine experiments (and several engine studies from other labs, including gasoline compression ignition) with the IQT.
- Begin correlation of IQT data to fuel chemistry and engine results.
Zigler: Ignition delay experiments assist in development of kinetic mechanisms for biofuel blends

- Temperature sweeps at several fixed pressures provide experimental data to develop accurate *kinetic mechanisms for blends* of biofuels into key gasoline surrogates.
- Simulations of IQT enable a development feedback loop for validation of mechanisms against engine-relevant experimental data.

- The critical negative temperature coefficient (NTC) region is mapped.
Zigler: Ignition delay experiments assist in development of kinetic mechanisms for biofuel blends

- Temperature sweeps at several fixed pressures provide experimental data to develop accurate kinetic mechanisms for blends of biofuels into key gasoline surrogates.
- Simulations of IQT enable a development feedback loop for validation of mechanisms against engine-relevant experimental data.

- The critical negative temperature coefficient (NTC) region is mapped.
- Note ethanol (109 RON) has shorter ignition delay at high T than iso-octane (100 RON).
Zigler: Ignition delay experiments assist in development of kinetic mechanisms for biofuel blends

- Temperature sweeps at several fixed pressures provide experimental data to develop accurate kinetic mechanisms for blends of biofuels into key gasoline surrogates.
- Simulations of IQT enable a development feedback loop for validation of mechanisms against engine-relevant experimental data.

- The critical negative temperature coefficient (NTC) region is mapped.
- Note ethanol (109 RON) has shorter ignition delay at high temperature than iso-octane (100 RON).
- A 10% ethanol blend increases ignition delay while maintaining NTC behavior.
Ignition delay experiments assist in development of kinetic mechanisms for biofuel blends

- Temperature sweeps at several fixed pressures provide experimental data to develop accurate kinetic mechanisms for blends of biofuels into key gasoline surrogates.
- Simulations of IQT enable a development feedback loop for validation of mechanisms against engine-relevant experimental data.

- The critical negative temperature coefficient (NTC) region is mapped.
- Note ethanol (109 RON) has shorter ignition delay at high T than iso-octane (100 RON).
- A 10% ethanol blend increases ignition delay while maintaining NTC behavior,
- But a 20% ethanol blend eliminates NTC behavior while increasing ignition delay over neat ethanol in that region.
Zigler: Ignition delay experiments provide more insight to engine results beyond RON and octane sensitivity

• Temperature sweeps at several fixed pressures provide experimental ignition delay data (rather than just RON or MON), including how ignition delay increases at low temperatures in relation to increased octane sensitivity ($S$).

• The IQT data will be correlated with engine data focusing on load extension possible using spark retard with high S fuels.

• In this study of ~100 RON fuels, increasing octane sensitivity correlates with increased ignition delay at lower temperatures.

• IQT data offer insight why increased load is possible with retarded spark timing, where end-gas follows lower temperature trajectory with increased ignition delay times.

• Engine studies show that higher S enables increased load via spark retard (following presentation).

iso-octane
PRF100
100 RON
100 MON

TSF 99.8
99.8 RON
$S = 11.1$

E20 in PRF 85
100.3 RON
estimated
$S = 8$ estimated
• Temperature sweeps at several fixed pressures provide experimental ignition delay data (rather than just RON or MON), to examine biomass-oxygenate structure effects on engine knock resistance.

• IQT data is being correlated with engine data to explain oxygenate structure effects.

## Future work: kinetics

### Pitz
- Develop surrogate mixture models for gasoline fuels to be used in Co-Optima:
  - Three RON 98 reference gasoline fuels: alkylate, reformate and ethanol-containing
  - Base fuel(s) selected for blending with bio-derived blendstocks
- Simulate SI and CI engine experiments:
  - with RON 98 gasolines for
    - constant octane sensitivity obtained from aromatics or ethanol
    - octane sensitivity varied
  - using basefuel(s) combined with Tier 2 bio-derived blendstocks
- Use kinetic models to investigate high-sensitivity fuels deriving octane sensitivity from aromatics or olefins. Is there a significant difference autoignition resistance at Thrust 1 conditions?
- Develop/validate component kinetic models to represent missing chemical classes in Tier 2 blendstocks (ketones and methyl furan)
- Investigate blendstocks that can probe the most beneficial fuel properties (resistance to autoignition and high flame speed) for Thrust 1 conditions.

### Zigler
- Expand IQT ignition kinetics studies of key surrogate blends beyond ethanol to include other biofuel compounds of interest, in coordination with kinetics sub-team (within FP team), and AED and LGGF teams
- Incorporate IQT-based parametric ignition delay data in engine simulation knock integral calculations to correlate to engine-based experimental data
- Focus more experimental studies and kinetic model simulations on relationship between octane sensitivity, increased ignition delay time at lower temperatures, and engine load extension possible with spark retard and high S (includes tighter collaboration with LLNL)
- Expand collaboration with other labs on studying fuels used in their engine experiments in the IQT (e.g., collaboration with ANL on gasoline compression ignition)
- Begin industry collaboration (including via CRC) of using IQT-based experimental studies to provide more ignition performance data for fuel / engine studies
Fuel Properties Team Research Summary

Relevance

Fuel Properties research is the crucial link between fuel production (LGHG Fuels Team) and engine combustion (Advanced Engine Development Team) and testing of the central fuel properties hypothesis investigated within “Co-Optima.”

Approach

Careful measurement of fuel properties, development of new fuel property measurement methods, and targeted engine experiments directed at revealing fuel property effects – all based on a fuel matrix designed to go well beyond the chemistry represented by conventional petroleum-derived fuels.

Accomplishments

• In collaboration with LGHG Fuels Team, a fuel property database was constructed and populated
• A three tier fuel screening process was developed. Tier 1 screening for Thrust I (SI) fuels was performed and a list of most promising advanced SI engine bio-blendstocks developed
• New methods for measuring fuel heat of vaporization were developed and are being refined
• Small volume autoignition testers are being developed for rapid fuel screening using milliliter volumes
• Correlations between easily measured chemical parameters and fuel properties are being developed
• Validated combustion kinetic models for important bio-blendstocks and fuel surrogates are being developed based on RCM and IQT kinetic data

Collaborations

• “Co-Optima” has 9 National Labs, stakeholder engagement, and external advisory board
• Projects presented also represent extensive collaborations with industry and universities

Future Work – A portfolio of ongoing and future work is described
Co-Optimization of Fuels and Engines
Fuel Property and Advanced Engine Development Team
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Thrust I engine projects focus on Spark Ignition combustion strategies with a focus of understanding the effects of fuel properties.

**Overarching Fuel Property Hypothesis:** If we understand the *critical fuel properties* correctly, then fuels with those properties will provide comparable performance regardless of the chemical composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merit Function</th>
<th>ORNL Sluder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Benefits of High Octane Fuels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of RON, HoV, and Octane Sensitivity</td>
<td>NREL Ratcliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANL Kolodziej/Ickes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilution Limits on SI Combustion</td>
<td>ORNL Szybist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANL Kolodziej/Wallner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Effects on LSPI</td>
<td>ORNL Splitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
milestones for Thrust I engine projects are either complete or on-track

Tracked co-optima milestones

Q2.  Quantify vehicle fuel efficiency gains from the use of a ~98 RON gasoline in combination with increased compression ratio using the Ford 1.6L engine (ORNL Sluder)  **Complete**

Q3.  Determine the strengths and deficiencies that exist in using flame speed to predict dilution tolerance through experimental and kinetic modelling studies (ANL Kolodziej/Wallner)  **On-track**

- Additional project level milestones are also on-track
The goal of Thrust 1 engine research is to develop a robust and quantitative understanding on how efficiency is impacted by fuel properties.

\[
\text{Merit Function} = RON - \frac{Octane Sensitivity \times Flame Speed}{Heat of Vaporization} \\
\text{LFV} = \frac{(RON_{mix} - 92) - K(S_{mix} - 10)}{0.01\text{[ON} / \text{kJ/kg]}(HoV_{mix} - 415)[\text{kJ/kg}] + 0.67 + 0.5(PMI - 2.0)} \\
\]

- This is an approach on how to value properties for efficiency
- This is not a finished product, the merit function will continuously evolve
- We are working to determine if these are the right fuel properties whether we adequately understand their impacts
- The fuel property hypothesis will be tested with biofuels that introduce different chemistry (structures and functional groups)
Objectives

– Quantify fuel efficiency impacts of octane number
– Test central fuel property hypothesis using fuels with different chemistry

Approach

**Engine Experiments**

– Experiments with a 1.6L Ecoboost engine using three different compression ratios (10:1 (stock), **12:1**, and 13:1)
– Map engine performance with multiple fuel formulations

**Vehicle Simulations**

– Experimental data used in Autonomie vehicle simulations to quantify vehicle energy consumption and fuel economy
at fixed compression ratio, the benefit of increased octane rating for high-torque cycles can be significant

- Increasing octane rating reduces spark retard for knock avoidance
  - Improvement is limited to knock-limited load range
- Important to match RON to CR with desired torque
  - Downsizing/downspeeding trend demands increasing torque
- Energy consumption improvement for 5 RON points
  - UDDS cycle (light load): 2%
  - US06 city portion (higher load): 11%
- 3.5% energy consumption decrease needed to achieve volumetric fuel economy parity for E20 compared to E10
• Inconsistencies in literature regarding HoV impact on knock propensity
  – HoV effect only been observed when covariant with octane sensitivity
• Expanded with new experimental results from ORNL and NREL
• Main conclusion: HoV is a thermal contributor to sensitivity
  – Aligns the findings of seemingly contrary literature findings
  – Consistent with the vaporization effects in the RON and MON tests

**Graphs:**
- **Top Graph:** CA50 [aTDC] vs. Brake Mean Effective Pressure [kPa] showing the influence of different RON values with varying HoV.
- **Bottom Graph:** Effect of Volumetric Ethanol Content on Octane Sensitivity, showing the relationship between ethanol content and octane sensitivity.
NREL (Ratcliff) $250k: effects of S, HoV and RON on GDI Performance

Objectives

– Test null hypothesis: At a given octane sensitivity, HoV impact on knock resistance is included in S

Approach

– Single cylinder version of GM Ecotec 2.0L, 9.2: CR
– Side-mounted DI or upstream fuel injection
– Load sweeps at an intake manifold temp of 50 °C
– Sweep intake manifold T for max load at 2 different CA50 phasing

Fuel Matrix

– Matched RON and S at variety of HoV
– Fuels with different S and RON included to bound results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>RON</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>HOV [kJ/kg]</th>
<th>Oxygen wt%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isooctane (PRF 100)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSF99.8 (74% Toluene)</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25 in TRF88 (23% Toluene)</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40 in TRF6x (24% Toluene)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 + 2% p-Cresol in TRF88</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 + 6% Anisole in TRF88</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25- FACE B</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Load sweeps reveal that performance of fuels with matched RON and S is independent of HoV

- Using direct injection (DI) all 100 RON, S ≈ 11 fuels have similar knock-limited performance gains over iso-octane; no evident HoV benefit
- S ≈ 11 allows more than half the combustion phasing advance available with 106 RON fuel, between 1200 – 1500 kPa NMEP
HoV appears to improve performance at elevated intake air temperatures

- Increasing HoV improves DI performance at late combustion phasing and intake manifold temperatures greater than 50 °C
- Performance of upstream injected (UI) 100 RON, S ≈ 11 fuels is significantly higher than DI of isoctane

Plot shows peak IMEP at a constant CA50 phasing

| RON = 99.2-101.6 |
| S = 10.7-12.2 |

| HoV |
| 595 kJ/kg |
| 472 kJ/kg |
| 390 kJ/kg |

- RON = 100
  - S = 0

| TSF 99.8, DI |
| TSF 99.8, UI |
| E40-TRF6x, DI |
| E40-TRF6x, UI |
| E20+2%p-Cresol-TRF88, DI |
| E20+2%p-Cresol-TRF88, UI |
Objectives

- Develop a better understanding of how fuel properties, particularly RON and HoV, impact auto-ignition for conventional, stoichiometric SI combustion
- Isolate effects of entangled fuel properties, such as RON and HoV, on SI combustion and knock

Project Plans

- Use the well-established CFR engine (identifies fuel RON and MON) as a research platform to develop scientific understanding of isolated fuel effects on SI combustion
- Investigate HoV effects on RON as a function of operating parameters (intake air temperature, compression ratio, and spark timing) for a range of fuels
collaborations established, CFR engine and test cell prep nearing completion

• Progress
  – Collaboration established with Marathon Petroleum Corporation
  – CFR engine refurbished and installation underway
  – Test cell data acquisition installed
  – Test matrix and analytical method defined

• Deliverables
  – Completion of initial test matrix by Sep 30, 2016
  – Boundary conditions of CFR engine for modeling to toolkit team
  – Development of a two-parameter knock behavior characteristic which takes HoV into account is a potential outcome of this work
**Objectives**
- Determine the magnitude and causes of fuel-specific differences in extending the EGR dilution limit

**Methodology**
- Single cylinder version of GM Ecotec 2.0L, 9.2: CR
  - 2000 rpm, nominal load of 3.5 bar IMEP<sub>g</sub>
- Side-mounted DI, laboratory air handling with external cooled EGR loop
- 6 fuel blends from pure components designed to vary flame speed, enable kinetic modeling
- Dilution limit defined by stability metric (COV) through EGR/combustion phasing space

**Future Work:** Continuing work will be focused on high load dilution tolerance and pressure effects (>15 bar)
EGR dilution tolerance is defined by combustion stability, fuel specific differences are observed.

Fuel 1
95% iso-octane, 5% n-heptane

Fuel 5
24% iso-octane, 25% n-heptane, 21% toluene, 30% ethanol

- Response to EGR is the similar for all fuels (similar slopes)
- Fuels-specific differences are due to different starting points
highest dilution tolerance fuels have highest flame speed

- Dilution tolerance correlates to laminar flame speed
  - Energy fraction mixing rule and kinetic calculations agree
  - Kinetics allow flame speed calculations at relevant temperature and pressure conditions
- Flame speed at ignition provides a good indication of spark-to-CA5, combustion stability
  - Experimental spark-to-CA5 represents early flame growth
  - Rapid early flame kernel growth critical for combustion stability
  - Calculated flame speed in excellent agreement with experimental spark-to-CA5

Calculated Flame Speed at Ignition Timing is Insensitive to Spark Timing

Agrees with Experimental Results of Spark-to-CA5 duration
Fuel-specific effects can be significant, HoV identified as possible dilution tolerance detractor

- Fastest flame speed fuel enables a 50% relative increase in EGR at a constant COV of 3% compared to the slowest flame speed fuel
  - 8% EGR to 12% EGR
  - Absolute EGR dilution tolerance will change with engine design and operating condition
  - Relative ranking between fuels is expected to remain for all homogeneous SI engines
- HoV may detract from dilution tolerance
  - Flame speed is a function of temperature
  - Up to 15°C of additional charge cooling expected for 30% ethanol
  - Flame speed calculations reveals this temperature reduction has a large impact on flame speed
- This project to move to high loads FY16 FY17
- ANL to investigate flame speed effects
**Objectives**

- Identify the influence of fuel properties on SI combustion lean and EGR dilution tolerance
- Quantify the relative impact of fuel properties on dilution tolerance compared to engine design parameters

**Methodology**

- Single cylinder version of Ford engine, 0.63L, 12.2:1 CR
  - 1500 rpm, loads of 3.2 and 5.6 bar IMEP, constant combustion phasing (8 CA aTDC$_f$)
- PFI and DI fueling

**Project Plans**

- Evaluate hypothesis that laminar flame speed (LFS), at nominal conditions, can be used to predict dilution tolerance (lean and EGR) of a fuel in SI combustion
- Determine the impact of HoV on dilution tolerance
- Compare fuel LFS lean/dilute tolerances against engine design parameters
*Progress*

- Developed a method to identify fuel blends with target HoV and flame speed
- Derived fuel matrix and test program
- Preliminary results confirm positive correlation of flame speed with dilution tolerance

*Deliverables*

- Comparison of fuel and engine design parameters on SI combustion lean dilution tolerance
- Completion of LFS hypothesis testing by June 30, 2016
**Objectives**

- To improve the understanding of fuel properties on low speed pre-ignition (LSPI)

**Project Plans**

- Single cylinder version of Ford 1.6L EcoBoost engine
  - Dedicated LSPI engine
  - Leverages lubricants LSPI activity
  - Automated LSPI test cycle
- Initial work focused on boiling point, HoV, and fuel structure on LSPI
  - Input to fuel merit function and co-optima down selection
- Extend focus to down selected co-optima fuels
engine system is operational, on-track to meet Q4 project-level milestone

- **Progress**
  - Initial scoping fuels identified
  - DAQ system collecting 15,000 consecutive cycles is operational through the leveraged lubricant project
  - Engine failure occurred under LSPI conditions
    - New engine installed and operational

- **Deliverables**
  - Initial molecular structure effects on LSPI tests Sept 30 2016
  - Feed forward of findings into fuels merit function
numerous overarching and portfolio-level collaborations
additional project-level collaborations

- **Co-Optimization of Fuels and Engines** brings together expertise from across the National Laboratory system, working toward a common purpose. This effort has stakeholder engagement at a high level to ensure relevance.
  - 9 laboratories, engines, fuels, kinetics, simulation, biofuel development, LCA & TEA, market transformation
  - Monthly stakeholder engagement phone calls, industry listening days, external advisory board
- Projects presented at the semi-annual AEC program review meetings
- Engagement with ACEC Tech Team activities

### Additional project-level collaborations with industry and academia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sluder**    | Ford – Hardware and technical guidance  
USDRIVE Fuels Working Group – multiple OEMs and energy companies |
| **Kolodziej/Ickes** | Marathon Oil – Hardware, fuels, technical guidance |
| **Szybist**   | FCA – Cody Baldwin-Squibb  
University of Michigan – Yan Chang (student) |
| **Kolodziej/Wallner** | Ford - Hardware |
| **Splitter**  | Driven Racing Oils – custom lubricants |
| **Ratcliff**  | General Motors – Hardware and Technical Guidance |
Relevance

Thrust I engine experiments are critical to understanding the role of fuel properties on efficiency. This information is critical to knowing how to value various fuel properties within “Co-Optima.”

Approach

Perform engine experiments that test the overarching “Co-Optima” fuel property hypothesis. Provide quantitative results that will aid in refining the Thrust I merit function. Interact with other teams within “Co-Optima” for modeling support, fuel selection, and fuels critical to the overall goal of reduced GHG emissions.

Accomplishments

- Once octane sensitivity has been accounted for, the role of HoV on KLSA is significantly diminished
- Multi-lab effort provided insight into the role of HoV as a thermal component to octane sensitivity
- EGR dilution tolerance is dominated by flame speed, related to early flame kernel growth

Collaborations

- “Co-Optima” has 9 National Labs, stakeholder engagement, and external advisory board
- Projects presented at AEC semi-annual program review, engaged with ACEC TT
- Numerous other project-level collaborations

Future Work

Continue to test the overarching “Co-Optima” fuel property hypothesis by incorporating biofuels with a wide range of chemical compositions into experiments, with support from modeling and kinetics efforts, in coordination with additional “Co-Optima” teams.