OAR Box 1219

Prepped by Ollie Stewart

Document Number:

209) IV-B-16

Docket Number:

A-91-46

P.2

A-91-46
IV-B-16
Attach 4
276

SAE Technical Paper Series

FREEDOM THROUGH MOBILITY 1905-1980 SAE 75th anniversary

ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH
LIBRARY
FORD MOTOR COMPANY

790706

Results of Coordinating Research Council MMT Field Test Program

J. D. Benson
Fuels and Lubricants Department
General Motors Research Laboratories

R. J. Campion
Exxon Company U.S.A.

L. J. Painter
Chevron Research Company

RECEIVED
JUN 4

Passenger Car Meeting
Hyatt Regency, Dearborn
June 11-15, 1979

SOCIETY OF AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, INC.
400 COMMONWEALTH DRIVE
WARRENDALE, PENNSYLVANIA 15096

790706

Results of Coordinating Research Council MMT Field Test Program

J. D. Benson
Fuels and Lubricants Department
General Motors Research Laboratories

R. J. Campion
Exxon Company U.S.A.

L. J. Painter
Chevron Research Company

SINCE 1975, MOST CARS PRODUCED IN THE U.S. have been equipped with catalytic converters for reducing exhaust emissions. These cars require the exclusive use of unleaded gasoline. As older cars are replaced by new, converter-equipped cars, the demand for unleaded gasoline increases. To meet this demand and provide the desired octane quality, petroleum refiners in 1976 began using the fuel antiknock additive methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonyl (MMT) in unleaded gasoline. A prior study (1)* and a review by the Environmental Protection Agency (2), had indicated that the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline did not adversely affect emissions, emission control systems, or other automotive components. The tests leading to these conclusions were carried out on vehicles equipped with first-generation oxidation catalysts; those vehicles were designed to meet the 1.5 g/mile hydrocarbon emission standard. As the use of MMT became more widespread, the EPA decided in 1977 (3) to include MMT in vehicle certification fuel for model year 1979. Concurrently, additional tests run by the automotive industry (4-5) had indicated that MMT increased hydrocarbon emissions and could, under some conditions, cause plugging of catalytic converters in advanced emission control systems. Thus, the automotive industry became concerned that they could not meet the 0.41 g/mile hydrocarbon standard as legislated for California in 1977 and nationwide by 1980.

The available data on MMT effects were reviewed extensively in early 1977, primarily at EPA-sponsored public meetings. These data from the automotive and petroleum industries and government laboratories were conflicting. To resolve this issue, the Coordinating Research Council (CRC), in mid-1977, undertook a comprehensive experimental program to determine whether MMT is detrimental to emission control in 1977-78 California vehicles. This cooperative CRC program was directed by technical representatives of the automotive and petroleum

*Numbers in parentheses designate References at end of paper.

ABSTRACT

The effect of the gasoline antiknock additive, MMT, on automotive emission control systems was studied in a 63-car field test. The cars were operated for 50 000 miles, and the effects of MMT on hydrocarbon, CO and NO_x emissions, catalyst plugging and spark plug life were determined.

Two concentration levels of MMT in a clear base fuel were studied, 1/32 g Mn/gal and 1/16 g Mn/gal. Seven 1977-78 model year cars, all calibrated to meet California standards, were included in the statistical design.

The results of this study indicate that the use of MMT at either test concentration increases both engine and tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions, compared to clear fuel. At 50K miles, the average tailpipe hydrocarbon increase was 0.09 g/mile for 1/32 MMT fuel, and 0.11 g/mile for 1/16 MMT fuel. This increase was pronounced at low mileage intervals, and significant differences continued for the duration of the test. CO and NO_x emissions, catalyst plugging, and spark plug life were not affected by MMT.

0148-7191/79/0811-0703$02.50

industries, and included representatives of EPA and the California Air Resources Board as participating observers.

With the start of the CRC program, the EPA removed its requirement for the inclusion of MMT in certification fuel, pending completion of these tests. Also, in August of 1977, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977. These amendments included a ban of gasoline additives introduced after 1975 unless the EPA Administrator waived this prohibition under Section 211 of the Act. This ban was to be effective on September 15, 1978. Thus, the CRC program was aimed at providing both industries and the EPA with sound technical information upon which to judge the merits of the continued use of MMT. Ethyl Corporation, the sole manufacturer of MMT, applied for such a waiver in March of 1978.

To review all available data, EPA held a Public Hearing in June of 1978 on the Ethyl request. Although the CRC test was incomplete at that time, preliminary information obtained during 22 500 (22.5K) miles of testing was presented at the Public Hearing. In September 1978, the EPA Administrator rejected Ethyl's waiver request and a ban on the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline went into effect in October of 1978.

This paper presents the final results of the CRC program, which was probably the largest and most comprehensive test of its kind ever attempted. The program involved 63 cars which accumulated over 3 million miles. The primary objective was to determine the effect, relative to clear fuel, of MMT at two different concentration levels on exhaust hydrocarbon emissions. Secondary objectives were to determine MMT effects on catalytic converter plugging, catalyst conversion efficiency, oxygen sensor life, and spark plug life. All exhaust emission tests were conducted by Systems Control, Inc. (SCI)--formerly Olson Laboratories--and the cars accumulated mileage at the Riverside International Raceway (RIR) under contract with SCI (6). A complete record of test details, experimental results, and data analysis can be obtained from the Coordinating Research Council (7).

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

Because of the importance to both industries and the Nation of the continued use of MMT, it was recognized at the outset that the accuracy and precision of the test results were critical to the program's goal. Small differences in already low exhaust emission levels would have to be determined with high statistical confidence. After consultation and review with the EPA, a fleet of 63 vehicles was chosen. This fleet size was designed to provide a statistically powerful test for detecting MMT-related emissions effects as small as a difference of approximately 0.1 g/mile hydrocarbon after 50K miles and/or a 40 percent difference in regression slopes*. Details of several approaches for estimating fleet size are included in the CRC Report (7).

The test design included the use of three fuels and seven vehicle models, six domestic and one foreign. All vehicles were designed to meet 1977-78 California exhaust emission standards. Three vehicles of each model were tested per fuel, resulting in a total of nine vehicles for each model. To involve the most advanced emission control systems available, two three-way catalyst equipped models were included. The six domestic models were divided among the three major U.S. manufacturers in approximate proportion to market share.

Vehicles selected by the car manufacturers for the fleet were those considered to be sensitive to MMT and/or representative of future large volume products. The vehicle fleet is described in Table 1.

Fuels selected for the program were Indolene clear (HO III) for emission testing and Chevron certification fuel for mileage accumulation. The Chevron fuel was tested clear (0 MMT), with 1/32 g Mn/gal (1/32 MMT), and with 1/16 g Mn/gal (1/16 MMT). The 1/16 MMT level was selected because that was the maximum concentration recommended by Ethyl Corporation at the time this test program was finalized.

Originally, triplicate emission tests were conducted. Later it was decided, based on observed test precision, that duplicate emission tests were adequate at 0.3K, 5K, 10K, 15K, 22.5K, 30K, 37.5K, 45K, and 50K miles. Tests were run according to EPA exhaust emission certification procedures which includes preconditioning prior to emission testing, except that evaporative emission tests were not run. Scheduled maintenance was conducted at the manufacturer-recommended mileage. Emission testing at the maintenance intervals was conducted with each vehicle as received and after maintenance had been performed. Maintenance procedures are discussed in a later section of this paper.

Vehicles accumulated mileage using the EPA driving schedule. Cars were driven a maximum of 19 hours per day. The vehicles were transported by car carriers between the laboratory and the test track, which were 50 miles apart.

An elaborate quality control and data management system was developed at the contracted laboratory, SCI, and at the test track, RIR. Before the program began, several CRC member companies assisted the SCI laboratory in setting up equipment, refining test procedures, and verifying test results to ensure that high quality emission test data would be obtained (6).

*Slope of the regression line for tailpipe HC emissions versus miles.

In addition, CRC hired a resident project manager and two full-time assistants to monitor the program on-site. This three-man staff was responsible only to CRC.

The CRC also formed a Data Analysis Panel composed of member-company representatives with extensive experience in emission measurements and statistical methods. This Panel is responsible for the data analyses included in this paper.

DATA ANALYSIS

ANALYTICAL METHODS - The data analysis was directed primarily at fuel effects on emission levels averaged over the full 50K miles of testing and at fuel effect changes as a function of test mileage.

Two different types of analyses were performed:

- Analysis of variance of emission levels, simultaneously accounting for fuel, mileage, and model effects.
- Regression analysis of emissions levels versus test miles to obtain linear rates of change of emissions with mileage which were subsequently analyzed to estimate fuel effects.

Each of these approaches makes a different use of the observed data base. Detailed descriptions of the analysis methods and the appropriate data sets are given in the CRC report (7).

DATA BASE - A complete listing of data from the 1801 valid Federal Test Procedure (FTP) tests is also given in the CRC Report (7). In this paper, these data are summarized primarily in the form of graphs.

Of the complete set of valid FTP data, only those tests meeting the following criteria were selected for use in the analyses:

1. Data at scheduled test mileages, starting with 0.3K miles.
2. Data after unscheduled maintenance.
3. Data before and after scheduled maintenance.
4. Data not involved in diagnostic checks.

A few sets of data were rejected because of obvious mechanical problems with the vehicles, such as a melted catalyst, a broken piston, or a malfunctioning carburetor.

TEST VARIABILITY - The test variabilities associated with duplicate and triplicate FTP tests and with the car to car differences were found to be within the estimates used in the design of the test program, assuring that the test as conducted was as powerful as originally planned.

Test Repeatability - The overall FTP test repeat error, defined as $\hat{\sigma}$ (repeat) = standard deviation/mean x 100 percent, was 9.0 percent for tailpipe hydrocarbon (TPHC) and 5.2 percent for engine-out hydrocarbon (EOHC), based on over 1 100 degrees of freedom each. The car models differed in their test repeatability for TPHC, falling into three groups as shown in Table 2.

The engine-out HC precision shown in Table 2 does not exhibit any such strong grouping and does not correlate with the tailpipe precisions.

Car-Mileage Error - The car x mile error term from this program, $\hat{\sigma}$ (car x miles), was 0.073 g/mile for tailpipe HC, giving 0.20 x 10^{-5} g/mile/mile as the error for the difference between HC slope values for two fuels. These are slightly higher than, but within the uncertainty of the original estimates (0.056 g/mile and 0.15 x 10^{-5} g/mile/mile) used to design the program (7).

The several car models form two definite groups with respect to the magnitude of this TPHC car x miles error term as shown in Table 3.

The original estimate of 0.056 g/mile is between the values found for the low and high error groups. No such groupings were found for the other emission constituents.

EXHAUST EMISSIONS

Exhaust emissions of hydrocarbons (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) were measured simultaneously at the engine ahead of the catalytic converter (engine-out) and at the tailpipe. Catalytic converter efficiencies were calculated from engine-out and tailpipe emission measurements. The effect of MMT on each of these emission constituents will be discussed in the following sections. For this discussion, data have been separated into three categories: 1) all car data; 2) data from all cars with conventional oxidation catalysts (COC) which includes the Buick Century, Oldsmobile Cutlass, Ford Granada, Ford LTD, and Plymouth Volare; and 3) data from cars with three-way catalysts (TWC) which includes the Pontiac Sunbirds and Volvos.

TAILPIPE HC EMISSIONS - Plots of tailpipe HC emissions from all cars, COC cars, and TWC cars are shown in Figures 1, 2, and 3, respectively. From these figures it is apparent that tailpipe HC emissions from the clear-fueled cars were consistently lower than emissions from the corresponding MMT-fueled cars throughout the 50K mile test. Furthermore, emissions with 1/32 MMT fuel were usually somewhat lower than those with 1/16 MMT fuel.

Another way to look at fuel effects is to plot the difference in tailpipe HC between MMT fuel and clear fuel at each mileage interval for each car group as is shown in Figures 4, 5, and 6. The MMT fuels averaged consistently higher tailpipe HC levels than did the clear fuel. As shown in Figure 4, the differences in emissions for MMT fuels compared to clear fuel increased linearly for the first 15K miles and then remained relatively constant at about 0.1 g/mile through 50K miles. At 15K miles the differences in tailpipe HC emissions for 1/32 MMT compared to clear fuel was 0.09 g/mile and the difference for 1/16 MMT compared to

clear fuel was 0.12 g/mile. Corresponding differences at 50K miles were 0.09 g/mile and 0.11 g/mile. These differences are all significant at levels above 95 percent.

The COC cars showed the same general pattern as the all-car results as shown in Figure 5. The difference in the tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions for the MMT fuels versus clear fuel increased through 15K miles and then leveled off at about 0.1 g/mile through 50K miles.

The TWC cars also showed the same general patterns as the all-car results, except that there was a substantial peak at 30K miles (Figure 6). This peak is due to high emissions before the oxygen sensor change at scheduled maintenance.

The tailpipe HC data were analyzed using analysis of variance techniques, the details of which can be found in the CRC Report (7). From this analysis it was determined that fuel effects (higher tailpipe HC emissions with MMT fuel) were significant at levels greater than 95 percent.

These data were also analyzed by linear regressions of tailpipe HC emissions versus miles. Average regression slopes for each car model and for all cars on each fuel are summarized in Table 4. The 1/32 MMT mean slope is 41 percent greater than that for clear fuel over the 0.3K to 50K mile range. For the 1/16 MMT fuel, the mean slope is 45 percent greater than that for clear fuel for 0.3K to 50K miles. The MMT effect on regression slopes was significant at a level greater than 95 percent.

Another method of analyzing the tailpipe HC data is to determine the mileage at which the emissions first exceed the California legislated standard of 0.41 g/mile (violation mileage). Tailpipe HC emissions were adjusted for the methane allowance permitted by California, averaged for each car model, and compared to the California standard. The results are shown in the bar graph of Figure 7. A nonparametric analysis of variance showed that the average violation mileages for the clear-fueled cars are highest, the 1/32 MMT-fueled cars are next highest, and the 1/16 MMT-fueled cars are lowest. The significance levels were 88 percent for the separation between clear and 1/32 MMT fuels, 97 percent for the separation between 1/32 MMT and 1/16 MMT fuels, and 99 percent for the separation between clear and 1/16 MMT fuels.

ENGINE-OUT HC EMISSIONS - Figures 8, 9, and 10 show the engine-out hydrocarbon (EOHC) emission averages for all cars on each fuel, all COC cars on each fuel, and all TWC cars on each fuel. The emissions with 1/32 MMT fuel are approximately midway between those with clear fuel and 1/16 MMT fuel in the 30K to 50K mile range. This probably corresponds to the mileage range for which engine deposits have stabilized.

The differences in EOHC between MMT fuels and clear fuel are plotted in Figures 11, 12, and 13 for the three different car categories. For all cars (Figure 11), the fuel differences show a rapid rise up to 15K miles after which the 1/16 MMT fuel difference continues to rise somewhat more slowly to about 0.7 g/mile from 30K to 50K miles, while the 1/32 MMT fuel difference levels out at about 0.4 g/mile above clear fuel for the duration of the test. The differences at 50K miles were 0.48 g/mile for 1/32 MMT versus clear fuel and 0.79 g/mile for 1/16 MMT versus clear fuel. The COC cars (Figure 12) show the same basic trends: a rapid rise above clear fuel up to 15K miles with fairly constant differences from clear fuel between 30K and 50K miles. The TWC cars (Figure 13) show the same trends as the other cars.

The EOHC data were analyzed using an analysis of variance, and the MMT fuel effects were significant above the 90 percent level. In addition, it was determined that EOHC increased linearly with MMT concentration in the fuel.

The EOHC data in the 30K to 50K mile range were regressed against engine-out CO (EOCO) and mileage as independent variables. Averaged EOCO was used because this is not affected by MMT in the fuel as will be discussed later. This is a method of correcting for carburetor differences between individual cars as reflected by EOCO. A regression equation was then obtained with 30K to 50K mile range data for each model and each fuel. These equations represent the best fit of the data over this mileage and can be used to calculate a "best estimate" for a specific mileage and EOCO value. Table 5 shows the "best estimates" of engine-out HC at 50K miles using the average EOCO value for all cars of that model at 50K miles. From Table 5, EOHC are essentially linear with MMT concentration except for the Volares and Volvos. Table 5 also shows the levels of significance at which MMT fuel regression slopes minus clear fuel regression slopes are different from zero. The consistently high levels indicate that both MMT fuels significantly increased EOHC emissions for all models.

HYDROCARBON CATALYTIC CONVERTER EFFICIENCY - Figures 14, 15, and 16 show the hydrocarbon catalytic converter efficiency averages for all cars on each fuel, all COC cars on each fuel, and all TWC cars on each fuel. There is an indication that catalytic converter efficiencies with MMT fuels tend to be somewhat higher than for clear fuel at the high mileages.

Regression analyses similar to those for EOHC were performed for HC catalytic converter efficiencies over the 30K to 50K mile range. This range was selected because efficiencies appear to have stabilized. Efficiencies were regressed against miles as well as EOCO and EOHC (to represent feed gas conditions to the

converter). "Best estimates" at 50K miles were calculated with the average value of EOCO for all cars of each model and the 50K-mile EOHC average for each fuel. These are shown in Table 6. Higher converter efficiencies are observed with MMT for all models and fuels except the 1/32 MMT Granadas and Volvos. Analysis for significance shows that the differences between MMT and clear fuel are all different from zero at the 95 percent or higher level.

After completion of the program, the AC Spark Plug Division of General Motors determined hot stabilized efficiency and the time to achieve 50 percent conversion for the catalytic converters from the Buicks, Oldsmobiles, and Pontiacs. These are laboratory tests (8) whereby converter performance is evaluated using an exhaust feedstream of constant HC and CO composition. Table 7 shows the results for stabilized efficiency. Higher efficiencies were observed with the MMT fuels. Results from the tests for time to achieve 50 percent conversion showed no difference between the fuels.

The results from the regression analysis and the AC tests show an increase in catalytic converter efficiency for HC whenever MMT was used in the fuel with the Buicks, Oldsmobiles, and Pontiacs. Converters from the other car models were not checked in similar laboratory tests at the end of the 50K mile program.

CO AND NO_x EMISSIONS - Tailpipe emissions of CO are plotted in Figure 17 for all cars, COC cars, and TWC cars. Both tailpipe and engine-out CO data were analyzed using an analysis of variance, and no significant fuel effects were found. Also, MMT did not significantly affect CO converter efficiency.

Similarly, tailpipe NO_x emissions are plotted in Figure 18; no significant fuel effects were found. Furthermore, MMT did not affect NO_x converter efficiency with the TWC cars.

INSTANTANEOUS EFFECT OF MMT ON EMISSIONS - To evaluate instantaneous MMT effects, the MMT cars were tested for emissions with MMT-spiked Indolene test fuel as well as with clear Indolene, at 0.3K and 22.5K miles. The 1/32 MMT-fueled cars were tested with 1/32 MMT-spiked Indolene; the 1/16 MMT-fueled cars with 1/16 MMT-spiked Indolene.

Thirty cars were tested at 0.3K miles and 36 (all MMT cars except the Granadas) at 22.5K miles. The results are summarized in Table 8. No consistent instantaneous MMT effects were found. Even the statistically significant engine-out effect for the 1/16 MMT tests represents an increase of less than 4 percent.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS

In addition to exhaust emissions, data for vehicle maintenance, oxygen sensor performance, catalytic converter plugging, fuel economy, and oil consumption were also analyzed. Results are discussed briefly in the following sections.

SCHEDULED VEHICLE MAINTENANCE - The manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule was followed for all vehicles in the fleet. Scheduled maintenance consisted of such items as:

- Spark plug changes.
- Camshaft/valve adjustment.
- Fuel filter replacement.
- Carburetor adjustment.
- PCV system checks.
- Air filter replacement.

Maintenance intervals among the models varied as follows:

Buick, Oldsmobile,
Ford LTD, Plymouth.....30K miles
Ford Granada.....22.5K and 45K miles
Pontiac and Volvo.....15K, 30K, 45K
(includes O_2 sensor replacement)

An analysis of variance was performed on the effect of scheduled maintenance on emissions. The effect of this maintenance was insignificant both for the overall effect and specifically for fuel effects. The effect of scheduled oxygen sensor replacement on the Pontiacs and Volvos is discussed later.

UNSCHEDULED VEHICLE MAINTENANCE - Several unscheduled emission-related mechanical repairs and adjustments were made throughout the test. Unscheduled emissions-related maintenance was any adjustment, repair, or part replacement which could affect exhaust emissions and which was not included in scheduled maintenance. Typical problems involved carburetor replacement, resetting idle A/F ratios, and choke adjustments. These repairs were made because it was recognized that these factors could substantially affect exhaust emissions and potentially mask any effect of MMT. Therefore, to minimize test variability, spark timing, idle speed, and mixture ratio were checked and adjusted, if necessary, before each test. In addition, unscheduled maintenance was performed whenever inspections or emission tests indicated a problem.

The unscheduled maintenance data show that the maintenance performed affected HC and CO emissions sometimes resulting in effects larger than those found from fuel differences. These results indicate that the repairs and adjustments were necessary to isolate the effect of MMT.

OXYGEN SENSOR PERFORMANCE - Oxygen sensors were replaced at 15K, 30K, and 45K miles on the TWC vehicles (Pontiacs and Volvos). Also, if unusually high CO emissions were noted at any of the emission check mileages, the oxygen sensor was replaced.

All of the Pontiac sensors and eight sensors from the Volvos were returned to the manufacturers for inspection. For the Pontiacs, one clear fuel, six 1/32 MMT, and four 1/16 MMT sensors were reported as failed. In every case when a sensor failed, CO and HC emissions decreased markedly after a new sensor was

installed. The Pontiac sensor data were analyzed using a sign test (counting failures and non-failures), and it can be concluded at the 90 percent confidence level that MMT had an adverse effect on Pontiac sensor life. No conclusion can be drawn from the data on Volvo sensor life, since two sensors showed decreased performance with 1/32 MMT fuel but none with 1/16 MMT fuel. However, both the tailpipe HC and CO emissions from the Volvos with MMT fuels decreased after oxygen sensor changes.

CATALYTIC CONVERTER PLUGGING - A secondary objective of the MMT fleet test program was to determine whether the combustion products from MMT fuels plug catalysts. A simple test procedure was devised whereby the pressure drop (ΔP) across the catalyst was measured during a wide-open throttle acceleration from 0 mph to 50 mph. The ΔP was monitored by a differential pressure gage, and the maximum ΔP was recorded. In most cases, the maximum ΔP occurred at the transmission shift point from first to second gear at about 30 mph to 35 mph.

Analysis of the data showed no differences in pressure drop between the fuels. There was no indication of catalyst plugging with any of the fuels.

FUEL ECONOMY - Throughout the 50K-mile test, fuel economy was monitored at various mileages by two methods: the 1975 FTP using the carbon balance measurement concurrent with emissions testing, and direct track mileage measurement versus fuel consumed. No effect of MMT on fuel economy was noted with either method.

OIL CONSUMPTION - The oil consumption for all 63 cars was monitored over the 50K mile test. Oil consumption rates were computed by taking the quarts of oil added (including oil changes and makeup oil) minus the quarts of oil drained and dividing by the miles accumulated in the test interval. The oil consumption for each car model was obtained by averaging the individual car results according to fuel type.

The data (7) showed that oil consumption varied markedly from one car model to another. However, there is no indication with any of the models that fuel type has an effect on the amount of oil consumed.

CONCLUSIONS

The data from the 63-car fleet test were analyzed several different ways. The major conclusions based on these analyses are as follows:

1. Both 1/32 MMT and 1/16 MMT fuels increased tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions in comparison to the clear fuel as summarized in Table 9. At 50K miles, the average increase was 0.09 g/mile HC for 1/32 MMT fuel, and 0.11 g/mile HC for 1/16 MMT fuel. This increase was most pronounced at 15K miles, and significant differences between MMT-fuel and clear-fuel tailpipe hydrocarbons continued for the duration of the test.

2. For four car models, MMT at either concentration significantly reduced the mileage at which tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions first exceed the California emission standard of 0.41 g/mile.

3. Engine-out hydrocarbons increased with the MMT fuels, and that increase was proportional to the MMT concentration in the fuel. The average differences for all car models at 50K miles, relative to clear fuel, were 0.48 g/mile for 1/32 MMT fuel and 0.79 g/mile for 1/16 MMT fuel. These differences were significant above the 90 percent confidence level.

4. MMT had no effect on tailpipe or engine-out CO and NO_x for all cars throughout the 50K-mile test.

5. The catalytic converter efficiency for hydrocarbons was 2 to 3 percent higher with the MMT fuels than with clear fuel for all cars at 50K miles. However, the increased converter efficiencies with MMT were not sufficient to compensate for the increase in engine-out hydrocarbons at the MMT concentrations used in this test. MMT did not affect converter efficiency for CO with all cars or for NO_x with the TWC cars.

6. Emission tests with MMT-spiked Indolene showed no instantaneous effect on tailpipe or engine-out hydrocarbons compared to Indolene without MMT.

7. MMT affected the oxygen sensors of two car models equipped with TWC systems. With the Pontiacs, MMT fuels at either level decreased the life of the oxygen sensor, resulting in a marked increase in tailpipe hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions. With the Volvos, both the tailpipe hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide emissions with MMT fuels decreased after oxygen sensor changes.

8. Manufacturer's recommended scheduled maintenance, including spark plug changes, had no discernible effect on emissions with any fuels. Spark timing and idle adjustments were checked before each emissions test and various mechanical repairs were made whenever needed throughout the 50K-mile test. These unscheduled repairs were made since mechanical malfunctions could substantially affect exhaust emissions independent of fuel type, and thus mask an assessment of any MMT effect.

9. Catalyst pressure drop measurements indicated no instances of catalyst plugging with any fuel.

10. Oil consumption and fuel economy data indicated no detectable MMT effect.

REFERENCES

1. J. E. Faggan, J. D. Bailie, E. A. Desmond, and D. L. Lenane, "An Evaluation of Manganese as an Antiknock in Unleaded Gasoline," SAE Preprint 750925, Detroit, Michigan, October 13-17, 1975.

2. J. B. Moran, "The Environmental Implications of Manganese as an Alternate Antiknock," SAE Preprint 750926, Detroit, Michigan,

October 13-17, 1975.

3. Mobile Source Air Pollution Control Advisory Circular 26-B, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air and Waste Management, January 7, 1977.

4. J. D. Benson, "Manganese Fuel Additive (MMT) Can Cause Vehicle Problems," 1977 SAE Transactions, Volume 86, pp. 2442-2464.

5. L. J. Faix, "A Study of the Effects of Manganese Fuel Additive on Automotive Emissions," SAE Preprint 780002, Detroit, Michigan, February 27-March 3, 1978.

6. R. R. Carlson, R. E. Pilkington, J. L. Politzer, "Conduct of Mileage Accumulation and Emission Testing for CRC/MMT Test Program," SAE Preprint 790703, Detroit, Michigan, June 13, 1979.

7. "CRC MMT Field Test Program," Report No. 503, Coordinating Research Council, 1979.

8. D. M. Herod, M. V. Nelson, W. M. Wang, "An Engine Dynamometer System for the Measurement of Converter Performance," SAE Preprint 730557, Detroit, Michigan, May 1973.

Table 1 - Description of Test Vehicles

Model Year	Total No. Vehicles	Vehicles	Engine Size, Cu. In.	Config.	Inertia Weight, Lb.	Type of Emission Controls*
1977	9	Buick Century	231	V-6	4 000	AIR, COC, EGR
1977	9	Olds Cutlass	350	V-8	4 500	AIR, COC, EGR
1978	9	Pontiac Sunbird	151	L-4	3 000	TWC, EGR
1978	9	Ford Granada	302	V-8	3 500	AIR, COC, EGR
1978	9	Ford LTD II	351	V-8	4 500	AIR, COC, EGR
1977	9	Plymouth Volare	225	L-6	4 000	AIR, COC, EGR
1977	9	Volvo 242	130	L-4	3 000	TWC, EFI

* AIR = Air Injection Reactor
COC = Conventional Oxidation Catalyst
EGR = Exhaust Gas Recirculation
TWC = Three-way Catalyst with Oxygen Sensor
EFI = Electronic Fuel Injection

NOTE: All vehicles were designed to meet 1977-78 California emission standards of 0.41 g/mi HC, 9.0 g/mi CO, and 1.5 g/mi NO_x.

Table 2 - Test Repeatability

Model	$\hat{\sigma}$ (Repeat) - % Tailpipe HC		$\hat{\sigma}$ (Repeat) - % Engine-out HC
Pontiac Sunbird	5.2	- Low	4.2
Buick Century	8.5		4.9
Ford Granada	7.1	- Average	6.5
Volvo	8.2		3.8
Ford LTD II	10.4		6.8
Olds Cutlass	10.3	- High	5.0
Plymouth Volare	11.1		4.2
Average	9.0		5.2

Table 3 - Car x Mile Errors - Tailpipe HC

Low Error Group		High Error Group	
Model	$\hat{\sigma}$ (Car x Miles), g/mi	Model	$\hat{\sigma}$ (Car x Miles), g/mi
Buick Century	0.043	Ford Granada	0.090
Ford LTD II	0.039	Plymouth Volare	0.094
Olds Cutlass	0.042	Pontiac Sunbird	0.116
Volvo	0.039		
Average Low	0.041	Average High	0.101

Pooled Average 0.073

Table 4 - Tailpipe Hydrocarbon Regression Slopes
Combined Cars of the Same Model

	Slope for 0.3K to 50K Miles (10^{-5} g/mile/mile)	Seven Car Models Mean	Seven Car Models Std. Deviation
0 MMT			
Buick	0.270		
Oldsmobile	0.146		
Pontiac	0.288		
Granada	1.303		
LTD	0.488		
Volare	0.623		
Volvo	0.040	0.450	0.270
1/32 MMT			
Buick	0.433		
Oldsmobile	0.206		
Pontiac	0.354		
Granada	2.093		
LTD	0.324		
Volare	0.864		
Volvo	0.179	0.636	0.205
1/16 MMT			
Buick	0.641		
Oldsmobile	0.312		
Pontiac	0.737		
Granada	1.668		
LTD	0.603		
Volare	0.572		
Volvo	0.027	0.651	0.275

Table 5 - Effect of MMT on Engine-Out Hydrocarbons

Model	Fuel	Best Estimate of EOHC at 50K Miles, g/mile	Significance Level That MMT Fuel EOHC is Different Than Clear Fuel
Buick	Clear	1.476	
	1/32 MMT	1.748	99+
	1/16 MMT	2.076	99+
Oldsmobile	Clear	1.759	
	1/32 MMT	2.050	99+
	1/16 MMT	2.581	99+
Pontiac	Clear	1.484	
	1/32 MMT	2.286	99+
	1/16 MMT	2.407	99+
Granada	Clear	4.410	
	1/32 MMT	5.217	99+
	1/16 MMT	5.699	99+
LTD	Clear	2.103	
	1/32 MMT	2.313	92
	1/16 MMT	3.342	99+
Volare	Clear	2.321	
	1/32 MMT	2.927	99+
	1/16 MMT	2.642	98+
Volvo	Clear	1.018	
	1/32 MMT	1.413	99+
	1/16 MMT	1.291	99+

Table 6 - Effect of MMT on Hydrocarbon Catalytic Converter Efficiency

Make	Fuel	Best Estimate of Efficiency (%) at 50K Miles	Significance Level (%) That MMT Fuel is Different Than Clear Fuel
Buick	Clear	67.2	
	1/32 MMT	71.8	99+
	1/16 MMT	70.3	97
Oldsmobile	Clear	75.5	
	1/32 MMT	79.2	99+
	1/16 MMT	77.9	99+
Pontiac	Clear	73.8	
	1/32 MMT	79.5	99+
	1/16 MMT	77.2	99+
Granada	Clear	79.8	
	1/32 MMT	76.1	99+
	1/16 MMT	81.4	98
LTD	Clear	77.8	
	1/32 MMT	82.0	99+
	1/16 MMT	83.9	99+
Volare	Clear	76.6	
	1/32 MMT	78.1	98
	1/16 MMT	79.8*	99
Volvo	Clear	82.1	95
	1/32 MMT	78.9	98
	1/16 MMT	83.6	98

*Two cars

Table 7 - Summary of AC Laboratory Tests for HC Catalytic Converter Efficiency

Model	Fuel	Hot Stabilized HC Converter Efficiency - %		
		Average	Minimum	Maximum
Buick	Clear	80.7	79.2	82.3
	1/32 MMT	82.0	81.0	83.3
	1/16 MMT	82.3*	82.3	82.3
Oldsmobile	Clear	83.8	83.3	84.3
	1/32 MMT	86.5	86.4	86.7
	1/16 MMT	85.5	85.0	85.7
Pontiac	Clear	80.3	76	84
	1/32 MMT	87.0	84	89
	1/16 MMT	87.7	87	88

*Value for Car 121 (46.9%) rejected as outlier

Table 8 - Instantaneous Effect of MMT on Hydrocarbon Emissions

Test Mileage	MMT in Mileage Accumulation Fuel	No. of Cars	MMT in Indolene Test Fuel	Emission Source	HC Emissions, g/mile	ΔHC	Significant at What Confidence Level?, %
0.3K	1/32 MMT	14	1/32 MMT	Engine	2.79	-0.07	90
			0		2.86		
			1/32 MMT	Tailpipe	0.28	-0.01	10
			0		0.29		
	1/16 MMT	16	1/16 MMT	Engine	2.11	0.02	33
			0		2.09		
			1/16 MMT	Tailpipe	0.30	-0.04	23
			0		0.34		
22.5K	1/32 MMT	18	1/32 MMT	Engine	2.09	-0.05	81
			0		2.14		
			1/32 MMT	Tailpipe	0.41	0.00	13
			0		0.41		
	1/16 MMT	18	1/16 MMT	Engine	2.25	0.07	99
			0		2.18		
			1/16 MMT	Tailpipe	0.46	0.01	74
			0		0.45		

Table 9 - Summary of Differences in Tailpipe Hydrocarbons for All Car Models

	1/32 MMT Minus Clear	1/16 MMT Minus Clear
0.3K to 50K Mile Regression Slopes, %	+41	+45
ΔHC at 15K Miles, g/mile	+0.09	+0.12
ΔHC at 50K Miles, g/mile	+0.09	+0.11

NOTE: All differences are significant at levels greater than 90 percent.



Fig. 1 - Tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions - average for all cars on each fuel



Fig. 2 - Tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions - average for all COC cars on each fuel

Fig.
emiss
cars

Significan
at What
Confidence
Level?, %

90

10

33

23

81

13

99

74



Fig. 3 - Tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions - average for all TWC cars on each fuel



Fig. 5 - Differences in tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions (MMT fuel minus clear fuel) - COC cars



Fig. 4 - Differences in tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions (MMT fuel minus clear fuel) - all cars



Fig. 6 - Differences in tailpipe hydrocarbon emissions (MMT fuel minus clear fuel) - TWC cars



Fig. 7 - Mileage at which tailpipe HC emissions first exceed the California standard of 0.41 g/mi.



Fig. 8 - Engine-out hydrocarbon emissions - average for all cars on each fuel



Fig. 9 - Engine-out hydrocarbon emissions - average for all COC cars on each fuel



Fig. 10 - Engine-out hydrocarbon emissions - average for all TWC cars on each fuel



Fig. 11 - Differences in engine-out hydrocarbon emissions (MMT fuel minus clear fuel) - all cars



Fig. 13 - Differences in engine-out hydrocarbon emissions (MMT fuel minus clear fuel) - TWC cars



Fig. 12 - Differences in engine-out hydrocarbon emissions (MMT fuel minus clear fuel) - COC cars



Fig. 14 - Catalytic converter efficiencies for hydrocarbons - average for all cars on each fuel



Fig. 15 - Catalytic converter efficiencies for hydrocarbons - average for all COC cars on each fuel



Fig. 16 - Catalytic converter efficiencies for hydrocarbons - average for all TWC cars on each fuel



Fig. 17 - Tailpipe carbon monoxide emissions



Fig. 18 - Tailpipe nitrogen oxide emissions

This paper is subject to revision. Statements and opinions advanced in papers or discussion are the author's and are his responsibility, not the Society's. Discussion will be printed with the paper if it is published in SAE Transactions.

For permission to publish this paper in full or in part, contact the SAE Publications Division.

Persons wishing to submit papers to be considered for presentation or publication through SAE should send the manuscript or a 300 word abstract of a proposed manuscript to: Secretary, Engineering Activities Board, SAE.

Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc.
400 COMMONWEALTH DRIVE, WARRENDALE, PA 15096

16 page booklet

Printed in U.S.A.