

NFPA No.

412

EVALUATING FOAM EQUIPMENT

AIRCRAFT RESCUE & FIRE FIGHTING VEHICLES 1964



Fifty Cents

Copyright © 1964

NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION
International

60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass. 02110

3M-6-64

FP

Printed in U.S.A.

National Fire Protection Association

International

The National Fire Protection Association was organized in 1896 to promote the science and improve the methods of fire protection. Anyone interested may become an Associate Member; the annual dues are \$20.00. National and regional societies and associations are eligible to be Organization Members. Full membership information is available on request.

This is one of a large number of publications on fire safety issued by the Association. All NFPA codes, standards, and recommended practices are prepared by NFPA Technical Committees and adopted at an Annual Meeting of the Association. They are intended to prescribe reasonable measures for minimizing losses of life and property by fire.

This and other NFPA codes, standards, and recommended practices are published in the **National Fire Codes**, a compilation of NFPA's official technical material. Write the Association for full information.

Official NFPA Definitions

Adopted Jan. 23, 1964. Where variances to these definitions are found, efforts to eliminate such conflicts are in process.

SHALL is intended to indicate requirements.

SHOULD is intended to indicate recommendations or that which is advised but not required.

APPROVED means acceptable to the authority having jurisdiction. The National Fire Protection Association does not approve, inspect or certify any installations, procedures, equipment or materials nor does it approve or evaluate testing laboratories. In determining the acceptability of installations or procedures, equipment or materials, the authority having jurisdiction may base acceptance on compliance with NFPA or other appropriate standards. In the absence of such standards, said authority may require evidence of proper installation, procedure or use. The authority having jurisdiction may also refer to the listings or labeling practices of nationally recognized testing laboratories,* i.e., laboratories qualified and equipped to conduct the necessary tests, in a position to determine compliance with appropriate standards for the current production of listed items, and the satisfactory performance of such equipment or materials in actual usage.

*Among the laboratories nationally recognized by the authorities having jurisdiction in the United States and Canada are the Underwriters' Laboratories, Inc., the Factory Mutual Engineering Division, the American Gas Association Laboratories, the Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada, the Canadian Standards Association Testing Laboratories, and the Canadian Gas Association Approvals Division.

LISTED: Equipment or materials included in a list published by a nationally recognized testing laboratory that maintains periodic inspection of production of listed equipment or materials, and whose listing states either that the equipment or material meets nationally recognized standards or has been tested and found suitable for use in a specified manner.

LABELED: Equipment or materials to which has been attached a label of a nationally recognized testing laboratory that maintains periodic inspection of production of labeled equipment or materials, and by whose labeling is indicated compliance with nationally recognized standards or the conduct of tests to determine suitable usage in a specified manner.

AUTHORITY HAVING JURISDICTION: The organization, office or individual responsible for "approving" equipment, an installation, or a procedure.

Copyright and Republishing Rights

This publication is copyrighted© by the National Fire Protection Association. Permission is granted to republish in full the material herein in laws, ordinances, regulations, administrative orders or similar documents issued by public authorities. All others desiring permission to reproduce this material in whole or in part shall consult the National Fire Protection Association.

Multiple Copy Price Reduction For Six or More Copies Available on Request.

Standard for
Evaluating Foam Fire Fighting Equipment on
Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Vehicles

NFPA No. 412 — 1964

1964 Edition of NFPA No. 412

This standard, prepared by the NFPA Sectional Committee on Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting and submitted to the Association through the NFPA Committee on Aviation, was approved by the Association at its 1964 Annual Meeting held May 18-22 in Dallas, Texas. It is a complete editorial rewrite of the 1960 Edition and incorporates new test criteria.

Origin and Development of No. 412

Work on this material started in 1955 when the NFPA Subcommittee on Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (as then constituted) initiated a study on methods of evaluating aircraft rescue and fire fighting vehicles. A tentative text was adopted by the Association in 1957. A revision was made in 1960 to clarify the intent of the text and a rewrite was made in 1964 based on improved test procedures.

The intent of this standard is to produce test data useful to those in the field in determining the suitability of existing equipment to meet the operational requirements which might be imposed on the equipment during an actual emergency. It is *not* intended to establish specifications of equipment or to set performance requirements, but merely to provide guidance on appropriate test methods to evaluate the capabilities and limitations of equipment in service.

Companion NFPA publications dealing with aircraft rescue and fire fighting services include: NFPA No. 402 on Standard Operating Procedures, Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting; NFPA No. 403, Suggestions for Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Services for Airports and Heliports; and NFPA No. 414, Standard for Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Vehicles.

Particular acknowledgment is made to the assistance given by the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory in the development of this standard by its representative on the Committee, Mr. H. B. Peterson.

Committee on Aviation

Jerome Lederer,† *Chairman*,

Flight Safety Foundation, 468 Park Avenue, South, New York 16, N. Y.

Harvey L. Hansberry, *Vice-Chairman*,

Federal Aviation Agency, DS-44, Washington, D. C.

George H. Tryon,† *Secretary*

National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch St., Boston, Mass. 02110

- | | |
|---|--|
| J. C. Abbott , British Overseas Airways Corp. (Personal) | R. Dan Mahaney ,† Federal Aviation Agency. |
| H. F. Blumel, Jr. , American Airlines. Chairman of Sectional Committee. | James S. Matthews , Associated Aviation Underwriters. |
| Henry G. Bone, Jr. , The Boeing Co. (Personal) | C. M. Middlesworth ,† Federal Aviation Agency. |
| E. Thomas Burnard , Airport Operators Council. | Willard Northrop , Association of Casualty & Surety Companies. |
| H. L. Butler , Eastern Air Lines. (Personal) | J. A. O'Donnell , American Airlines. Chairman of Sectional Committee. |
| R. C. Byrus , University of Maryland. Chairman of Sectional Committee. | F. E. Parker , Australian Dept. of Civil Aviation. |
| John J. Carroll , Civil Aeronautics Board. | R. C. Petersen , Port of New York Authority. (Personal) |
| J. M. Chase , Flight Safety Foundation. Chairman of Sectional Committee. | H. B. Peterson , U. S. Naval Research Laboratory. |
| N. L. Christoffel , United Air Lines. (Personal) | W/C B. C. Quinn , Canadian Department of National Defence. |
| William L. Collier , Air Line Pilots Association. | E. E. Reed , American Petroleum Institute. |
| C. W. Conaway , Factory Insurance Association. | George Schrank , Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association. |
| G. T. Cook , Department of the Air Force. | S. W. Sheat , United Kingdom, Ministry of Aviation. |
| Carl Dreesen , Bureau of Naval Weapons. Department of the Navy. | John T. Stephan , American Association of Airport Executives. |
| Robert F. Farrell , United States Aviation Underwriters. | E. F. Tabisz , Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada. |
| Charles Froesch , Society of Automotive Engineers. | R. H. Tolson , American Petroleum Institute. |
| H. Prater Hogue , The Boeing Company. (Personal) | Douglas C. Wolfe , American Association of Airport Executives. |
| G. C. Koth , Factory Mutual Engineering Division. | |

Alternates.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Alternate to Mr. Burnard
Ross A. Knight (Airport Operators Council) | Alternate to Mr. Northrop
Charles S. Rust (Association of Casualty and Surety Companies) |
| Alternate to Mr. Collier
B. V. Hewes (Air Line Pilots Association) | Alternate to Mr. Tabisz
G. L. Toppin (Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada) |
| Alternate to Mr. Conaway
F. J. McClain (Factory Insurance Association) | Alternate to Mr. Tolson and Mr. Reed
C. F. Reinhardt (American Petroleum Institute) |
| Alternate to Mr. Cook
Roscoe L. Bell (Dept. of the Air Force) | |

Liaison Representatives.†

- Allen W. Dallas**, Air Transport Association
S. Krzyczkowski, International Air Transport Association
W. A. McGowan, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
J. A. Pope, National Business Aircraft Association
Dr. A. F. Robertson, National Bureau of Standards
E. J. C. Williams, Air Ministry, United Kingdom
Chief, Aerodromes, Air Routes and Ground Aids Section, International Civil Aviation Organization

†Non-voting member.

Sectional Committee on Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting

Robert C. Byrus, *Chairman,*

Fire Service Extension, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

J. C. Abbott, British Overseas Airways Corp. (Personal)

Deputy Chief Charles W. Bahme, Los Angeles Depart. of Fire (Personal)

J. J. Brenneman, United Air Lines. (Personal)

John W. Bridges,† Federal Aviation Agency, Martin P. Casey, Hdqrs. Air Force Systems Command, USAF.

N. L. Christoffel, United Air Lines. (Pers.)

William L. Collier, Air Line Pilots Assn.

Gifford T. Cook, Hdqrs. USAF, Fire Protection Group, Deputy Director for Civil Engineer Operations.

John Dando, Fire Apparatus Manufacturers Association.

Chief John P. Dowd, Westover Air Force Base Fire Dept. (Personal)

Carl Dreesen, Bureau of Naval Weapons, Department of the Navy.

H. A. Earsy, United Aircraft Corp. (Pers.)

Francis W. Flagg, Monroe County Airport (Personal)

Capt. John F. Gill, Eastern Air Lines. (Personal)

Harvey L. Hansberry† (ex-officio), Fenwal.

Vic Hewes, Air Line Pilots Association.

H. Prater Hogue, The Boeing Company (Personal)

W. S. Jacobson, North American Aviation Fire Dept. (Personal)

Harold M. Karrmann, Sperry Gyroscope Co. (Personal)

Ross A. Knight, Airport Operators Council.

K. R. Laidley, Fire Extinguisher Manufacturers' Institute of Canada.

Hervey F. Law, Consultant.

Jerome Lederer (ex-officio), Flight Safety Foundation.

Capt. R. Macdonald, Canadian Air Line Pilots Association.

Donald G. MacKinnon, Canadian Department of Transport, Air Services.

R. Dan Mahaney,† Federal Aviation Agency.

Chief Claude J. McGlamery, Chance Vought Aircraft, Inc. (Personal)

J. A. O'Donnell, American Airlines. (Pers.)

John A. Peloubet, Dow Metal Products Co. (Personal)

H. B. Peterson, U. S. Naval Research Laboratory.

W/C B. C. Quinn, Canadian Department of National Defence.

W. D. Robertson, Seattle-Tacoma Airport. (Personal)

James Rogers, Firemen's School of Instruction, Nassau County (New York).

J. K. Schmidt, Air Proving Ground Center, USAF. (Personal)

William T. Schmidt, South Bend Fire Department. (Personal)

George Schrank, Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association.

E. Sorensen, The Port of New York Authority. (Personal)

John T. Stephan, American Association of Airport Executives.

E. F. Tabisz, Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada.

Eugene Von Loesch,† United States Army Mobility Command.

Douglas C. Wolfe, American Association of Airport Executives.

Alternates.

Alternate to Mr. Cook
ROSCOE L. BELL

Alternate to Mr. Hewes
DON HAINES

Alternate to W/C Quinn
F/L A. E. GRAHAM

Alternate to Mr. Rogers
CHIEF PAUL KOWALL

Alternate to Mr. Tabisz
G. L. TOPPIN

Liaison Representatives.

G. A. Brelle, The Ansul Company

George R. Cooper, Jr., Walter Motor Truck Company

J. P. Dunne, Chicago-O'Hare International Airport

Henry W. Marryatt, Wormald Brothers (Victoria) Pty., Ltd.

D. N. Meldrum, National Foam System, Inc.

James O'Regan, Rockwood Sprinkler Company

L. E. Rivkind, Mearl Corporation

George Scharbach, Willys Motors Inc.

M. S. Stuart, Chrysler Corporation

Marvin C. Tyler, Aeronautical Systems Division, USAF

Hubert Walker, American LaFrance, Div. of Sterling Precision Corp

H. V. Williamson, Cardox Corporation, Division of Chemetron

J. H. Yankie, Yankee Motor Bodies Corp.

†Non-voting members.

Table of Contents

100. General

110. Purpose	412-5
------------------------	-------

200. Ease of Operation of Controls

210. Purpose	412-5
220. Testing Foam Equipment Controls	412-6

300. Foam Performance Testing

310. Purpose	412-6
320. Testing Procedures	412-6
330. Judging Effectiveness of Foam Patterns from Turrets	412-8
340. Basic Extinguishing Capability	412-9
350. Supplementary Tests	412-10

400. Report of Results of Tests

410. Content of Reports	412-10
420. Submission of Reports	412-10

Appendix

A-100. General	412-11
A-200. Foam Physical Property Tests	412-11
A-300. Foam Pattern Tests	412-15
A-400. Heat Radiation Tests	412-19
A-500. Supplementary Tests	412-21

Standard for
Evaluating Foam Fire Fighting Equipment on
Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Vehicles

NFPA No. 412

100. GENERAL

110. Purpose

111. This standard provides standard test procedures for evaluating the foam fire fighting equipment installed on aircraft rescue and fire fighting vehicles designed in accordance with the applicable portions of the NFPA Standard for Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Vehicles (No. 414) and used for the purposes described in the NFPA Suggestions for Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Services of Airports and Heliports (No. 403). Standard Operating Procedures for Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting are given in NFPA No. 402.

112. The test procedures are for field application and are intended to produce data useful for determining the capability of the foam fire fighting equipment to meet the operational requirements likely to be imposed on such equipment prior to an actual emergency. It is acknowledged that in actual emergencies many variables are involved (weather and terrain are two obvious variables encountered in every accident), so that these test procedures are summarily incomplete. By using these methods, however, operating personnel should become familiar with the *basic capabilities and limitations* of the foam fire fighting equipment available to them and be able to operate such equipment at maximum advantage.

200. EASE OF OPERATION OF CONTROLS

210. Purpose

211. The ease with which qualified fire fighters are able to operate the controls on equipment available to them will be an indication of the utility of the equipment during an actual emergency.

212. Vehicular performance test procedures are given in the NFPA Standard on Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Vehicles (No. 414).

213. This article outlines the tests to be conducted to evaluate the ease of operation of controls for the foam fire fighting equipment supplied on the vehicle.

220. Testing Foam Equipment Controls

221. Tests shall include all crew functions in operating, servicing and charging the foam extinguishing system supplied.

222. Following indoctrination, crews should perform complete fire fighting cycles with studies made of the operational procedures, the time factors involved, any difficulties experienced, and the teamwork needed to gain maximum efficiency in the operation of the foam equipment.

223. Selection and operation of controls should be as required under anticipated service usage. Turrets should be operated over their entire area of coverage and in all available ranges, while hand lines should be fully extended, moved as required in actual emergencies, and put back.

224. Charging and servicing the vehicle should include discharge, flushing, and recharging.

225. During the tests, fire fighters should wear their standard protective clothing and masks or headgear and assume at the start of the test their assigned positions on the vehicle.

226. Simulated runs to an accident site should be accomplished in each instance and varied imaginary accident locations selected.

300. FOAM PERFORMANCE TESTING

310. Purpose

311. Effective performance of the foam available for fire fighting depends on its physical characteristics of expansion, the viscosity of the foam, the heat and solvent resistance of the foam, and the concentration of the foam concentrate required. All of these characteristics cannot be readily determined by field tests. However, expansion, 25 per cent drainage time (which is an indication of the viscosity of the foam), and foam concentration are measurable properties that give a relative indication of foam quality and are the characteristics that should be determined during the performance tests. The equipment used to dispense the foam should provide for optimum utilization of good quality foam. The tests recommended are designed to gage:

- a. the physical properties of the foam dispensed;
- b. the foam patterns that are established; and
- c. the effectiveness of the application in reducing heat radiation and the calculated fire control area which the vehicle can handle.

320. Testing Procedures

321. Foam Physical Property Tests — Turrets:

- a. Starting with full tank contents and with the turrets in normal fire

fighting position, generate foam, discharging it on a hard, paved surface at the recommended pressures and rates for the particular equipment being tested.

NOTE: The foam liquid concentrate, the ratio of the concentrate introduced, and the water used shall be the same as would be employed in actual emergencies. Any change in these factors should result in new performance tests. In order to standardize results, the temperatures of the foam concentrate and water should be between 70° and 80° F.

b. Obtain foam samples in duplicate according to the methods given in Section A-210 of the Appendix.

c. Analyze the foam samples for expansion and viscosity (drainage rate) according to the methods given in Sections A-220 and A-230 of the Appendix.

d. Analyze the concentration of foam liquid in the foam solution which drains from the foam samples taken according to Section A-240 in the Appendix.

e. If variations are to be expected when only part of the foam generating equipment is operated, the above tests shall be repeated to evaluate the effect of these variations. If rates of discharge vary during operation, foam samples shall be taken at several points during the run.

NOTE: All these foam physical property tests may be conducted with the foam pattern tests outlined in Paragraph 323.

322. Foam Physical Property Test — Hand Lines:

a. Operate the nozzles in a manner outlined in Paragraph 324 and obtain foam samples as done in the turret tests (Paragraph 321). Tabulate the results for expansion, viscosity and concentration.

323. Foam Pattern Tests — Turrets:

a. These tests should be run under "no wind" conditions or as close to this as possible. The turrets should be elevated to 30 degrees and foam generated on a hard ground surface at the different nozzle settings available (such as, dispersed-stream, mid-position and straight-stream). Foam generation should be continued for 30 seconds to clearly define the foam pattern falling on the ground. By the use of a grid of guide stakes set on 3-foot centers, the foam depth is measured at 3-foot intervals throughout the pattern area. Foam measurements to the nearest inch are then plotted on a scaled grid laid out on cross section paper. Points of equal depth are joined together in the manner of a contour map. This plot will indicate the uniformness of foam distribution from the nozzle. The vertical axis should show the reach in feet and the horizontal axis the pattern width in feet for each nozzle setting. (See Figures in Section A-300 of the Appendix as typical pattern plots.)

324. Foam Pattern Tests — Hand Lines and Auxiliary Nozzles:

a. These tests should be handled in a similar manner to those for the turrets. Hand-line nozzles should be mounted on a stand 3 feet above the ground and elevated to 30 degrees to the horizontal. Outlines of the ground patterns established for straight stream and maximum dispersed-stream should be noted as done in the turret tests (Paragraph 323.a.) Measure the outlines secured and plot them on cross section paper.

b. Auxiliary nozzles such as bumper and undertruck nozzles (if any) should be operated elevated for maximum range (if applicable) to establish their protective patterns. If variation is to be expected in nozzle performance due only to partial component operation, this condition should be reproduced and tested.

330. Judging Effectiveness of Foam Patterns from Turrets

331. Pattern tests of the foam-making equipment shall be conducted as described in Paragraphs 323 and 324. The outline of the 1-inch foam depth on the contour plot (see Appendix A-311) shall determine the boundary and dimensions of the effective foam patterns. These can be compared for conformance with the requirements expressed in the Table in Paragraph 334 according to turret discharge rate.

332. The characteristics for foam discharge patterns differ according to the particular application need. The straight stream is normally used for long reach and/or height application of a "spot" nature. This dictates a well-consolidated stream, and a "rooster tail" or weeping characteristic is undesirable. Therefore, the farthest out point of the 1-inch depth contour shall be at least that required in the Table under the "Far Point" column. The nearest distance from the turret to the 1-inch depth contour with the nozzle in the same elevated position shall not be closer than that required in the Table under the "Near Point" column.

333. The fully dispersed or spray pattern is that most commonly used for extinguishing areas of spilled fuel. This pattern provides the most gentle application of foam and covers the largest area. Extreme reach is not important because the pattern is continuously variable to the straight stream pattern; however, a certain reach is necessary in order to permit the vehicle to remain at a safe distance from the fire. The total area of effective pattern should be large enough that the foam solution (water) application density be held to 0.60 gpm per sq. ft. or lower (see Table in Paragraph 334). Higher densities will require more turret movement and greater operator skill. Therefore, the pattern requirements are set up in the Table in Paragraph 334 so that the width of the 1-inch effective contour shall be at least that required under the "Full Width" column; the full width of the 1-inch depth contour shall extend outward from the

turret to at least the distance required under the "Full Width Extend Out" column; the foam solution application density shall not exceed that given in the "Solution Density" column.

334. The NFPA Standard on Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Vehicles No. 414, establishes that turrets shall be capable of discharging foam or water in continuously variable streams from a straight stream to a fully dispersed or spray stream in accordance with the following table:

TURRET FOAM PATTERN REQUIREMENTS

Foam Solution Discharge Rate (gpm)	Straight Stream		Fully Dispersed or Spray		
	Far Point at Least (ft.)	Near Point No Closer Than (ft.)	Full Width at Least (ft.)	Full Width Extend Out at Least (ft.)	Maximum Solution Density (gpm/ft. ²)
250	125	60	25	25	0.30
500	130	40	35	65	0.33
1000	175	40	35	70	0.60

340. Basic Extinguishing Capability

341. Position the vehicle to discharge foam from one turret onto a hard-surfaced area. Outline the perimeter of the maximum dispersed-stream pattern or that pattern judged most effective (established for the turret from the tests outlined in Paragraph 321) with a mud dike $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 inches in height. Flood the area with gasoline to a depth of $\frac{1}{2}$ inch.

342. After ignition of the gasoline and a 15-second preburn period, apply foam from the previously positioned turret *without further movement of the turret or vehicle*. The foam should reach all areas of fire in a fairly uniform manner under such conditions. Application should continue until the fire is virtually extinguished (95 per cent or more).

343. During the extinguishment process, the rate of radiation decline should be noted by radiation heat recording device similar to that described in Section A-410 in the Appendix.

344. From the foam application time and the water application rate, the total amount of water consumed for the fire of measured area is calculated. From the number of square feet of fire area extinguished and the total water used, calculate the number of gallons of water required to extinguish one square foot of burning fuel, divide this figure into the gallons of water aboard the vehicle and record this value.

345. A chart should then be made to indicate the rapidity of the reduction in heat radiation. Plot the per cent of total radiation (based on full radiation just before foam application was started) against the time of foam application.

NOTE: See Section A-420 in the Appendix for typical calculations of the number of gallons of water used to extinguish a square foot of fire with a method of relating this to the total water aboard an ordinary crash truck and a chart showing a typical rate of reduction of radiation from a test fire.

350. Supplementary Tests

351. Article A-500 in the Appendix gives test methods for foam "burn-back" characteristics on new foam, aged foam, and fire-aged foam.

400. REPORT OF RESULTS OF TESTS

410. Content of Reports

411. All test reports should include a statement of the operating conditions encountered (such as pressures, temperatures, wind velocities, etc.) and a full description of the materials and equipment used.

420. Submission of Reports

421. In the interest of promoting this program of standardization to indicate the effectiveness of foam fire fighting equipment on aircraft rescue and fire fighting vehicles, a full and complete report of the tests conducted on such equipment should be submitted to the Committee on Aviation, National Fire Protection Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass. 02110, U. S. A. with photographs and diagrams as may be available.

Appendix — Suggested Test Methods and Calculations

A-100. GENERAL

A-110. Purpose of Appendix

A-111. The following field tests for foam agent capabilities on aircraft rescue and fire fighting vehicles are given in order that standardization may be achieved in testing procedures.

A-120. Organization of Appendix

A-121. The test methods given are presented in the order of their mention in this Standard (see Section 300).

A-200. FOAM PHYSICAL PROPERTY TESTS

A-210. Foam Sampling (Reference Paragraphs 321. b. and 322. a.)

A-211. The treatment of a foam after it has left the turret or nozzle has an important bearing on its physical properties. It is, therefore, extremely important that the foam samples taken for analysis represent as nearly as possible the foam reaching the burning surface in normal fire fighting procedure. Foam for analysis from a straight stream should be collected from the center of the ground pattern formed with the nozzle aimed for maximum reach. Similarly, for dispersed stream application foam should be sampled from the center of the resulting ground pattern area with the nozzle set for dispersed stream operation. In order to standardize and facilitate the collecting of foam samples a special collector is used as shown in Figure 1.

A-212. The collector should be placed at the proper distance from the nozzle to be in the center of the pattern to be sampled. The nozzle should be placed in operation with the foam pattern off to one side of the collector until equilibrium is reached and then swung over onto the center of the backboard. When sufficient foam volume has accumulated to fill the sample containers (usually only a few seconds), a stop watch should be started for each of the samples to provide the zero time for the drainage tests described in Section A-230 and then the foam pattern should be directed off to one side again. Immediately after the nozzle has been swung away from the board, the sample pans are removed, the top struck off with a straight edge, and all foam wiped off from the outside of the container. The sample is then ready for analysis.




Figure 1. Foam Collector




Figure 2. Foam Container




Figure 3. Stand

A-213. The standard sample container is 2 inches deep and $7\frac{3}{8}$ inches inside diameter (capacity of 1400 milliliters) preferably made of $\frac{1}{16}$ inch thick aluminum or plastic. In the bottom at the edge, a $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch drain tube with a rubber tube and pinch cock is provided to draw off the foam solution as it accumulates. This device is shown in Figure 2.

A-220. Foam Expansion Determination (Reference Paragraphs 321.c. and 322.a.)

A-221. The sample obtained as described previously should be accurately weighed to the nearest gram. The expansion of the foam in the sample is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{1400}{\text{full wt. minus empty weight}} = \text{expansion}$$

(all weights expressed in grams)

A-222. Apparatus Needed

- a. 2 — 1400 milliliter sample containers
- b. 1 — foam collector
- c. 1 — balance, triple beam, 1000 gram capacity

A-230. Foam Drainage Rate Determination (Reference Paragraphs 321.c. and 322.a.)

A-231. The rate at which the liquid drops out from the foam mass is called the drainage rate and is a direct indication of degree of stability and the viscosity of the foam. A single value used to express the relative drainage rates of different foams is the "25 per cent Drainage Time." It is the time in minutes that it takes for 25 per cent of the total liquid contained in the foam in the sample containers to drain out.

A-232. This test is performed on the same sample as used in the expansion determination. Dividing the net weight of the foam sample by four will give the 25 per cent volume in milliliters of liquid contained in the foam. In order to find the time required for this volume to drain off, the sample container should be placed on a stand as shown in Figure 3 and at regular suitable intervals the accumulated solution in the bottom of the pan is drawn off into a graduate. The time intervals at which the accumulated solution is drawn off are dependent on the foam expansion. For foams of expansion 4 to 10, one minute intervals should be used and for foams of expansion 10 and above, two minute intervals should be used because of the slower drainage rate of foams in this category. In this way a time-drainage volume curve is obtained and after the 25 per cent volume has been exceeded, the 25 per cent drainage time is interpolated from the data. The following example shows how this is done:

The net weight of the foam sample has been found to be 200 grams.

$$\text{Expansion} = \frac{1400\text{g}}{200\text{g}} = 7$$

$$25\% \text{ Volume} = \frac{200\text{g}}{4} = 50 \text{ ml.}$$

Then if the time-solution volume data has been recorded as follows:

Time Min.	Drained Solution Volume Ml.
0	0
1.0	20
2.0	40
3.0	60

It is seen that the 25 per cent volume of 50 ml. lies within the 2 to 3 minute period. The increment to be added to the lower value of 2 minutes is found by interpolation of the data:

$$\frac{50 \text{ ml. (25\% Volume)} - 40 \text{ ml. (2 min. Volume)}}{60 \text{ ml. (3 min. Volume)} - 40 \text{ ml. (2 min. Volume)}} = \frac{10}{20} = 0.5$$

Therefore, the 25 per cent drainage time is found by adding 2.0 min. + 0.5 min. and gives a final value of 2.5 min.

A-233. In the handling of unstable foams it must be remembered that they lose their liquid rapidly and the expansion determination must be carried out with speed and dispatch in order not to miss the 25 per cent drainage volume. It may even be necessary to defer the expansion weighing until after the drainage curve data has been recorded. The stop watch is started at the time the foam container is filled and continues to run during the time the sample is being weighed.

A-234. Apparatus Needed

- a. 2 — 100 milliliter graduates
- b. 2 — stop watches
- c. 1 — sample stand

A-240. Concentration Determination (Reference Paragraphs 321.d. and 322.a.)

A-241. This test is to determine the concentration of foam liquid in the water being used to generate foam. It is useful for checking the accuracy

of a unit's proportioning system and also if the concentration deviates too widely from the 6 per cent level,* it will abnormally influence the expansion and drainage time values. The test is based on the change of refractive index of the solution with change in concentration as measured by a refractometer.

A-242. The first step in this procedure is to prepare a calibration curve for the intended use. This has been found necessary because the source of water and brand or mixture of foam concentrate will affect the results. Using water from the tank and foam concentrate from the tank, standard solutions of 3, 6, and 9 per cent are made up by pipetting 3, 6, and 9 milliliters of foam concentrate respectively into three 100 milliliter graduates and then filling to 100 milliliter mark with the water. After thoroughly mixing, a refractive index reading is taken of each standard. This is done by placing a few drops of the solution on the refractometer prism with a medicine dropper, closing the cover plate and observing the scale reading at the dark field intersection. A plot is made on graph paper of scale reading against the known foam solution concentrations and serves as a calibration curve for this particular foam test series. Portions of solution drained out during the previously described drainage rate test are conveniently used as a source of sample for the refractometer in analysis. Refractive readings of the unknown are referred to the calibration curve and the corresponding foam solution concentration read off.

A-243. Apparatus Needed

- a. 3 — 100 milliliter graduates
- b. 1 — measuring pipette (10 milliliter capacity)
- c. 1 — 100 milliliter beaker
- d. 1 — 500 milliliter beaker
- e. 1 — Refractometer (Hand Juice Refractometers such as made by Bausch and Lomb are convenient for this use) with a range of 0 to 25 per cent sugar content (1.3330 to 1.3723 index of refraction).

A-300. FOAM PATTERN TESTS

A-310. Typical Turret Pattern Plot (Reference Paragraph 323)

A-311. Figures 4A, 4B, 4C and 4D show typical plots of the ground patterns of the foam discharge of a turret nozzle which may be used as a model for reporting these and similar patterns. Figure 4E shows how stakes are laid out for measuring the pattern, Figure 4F illustrates a foam turret application, and Figure 4G how measurements are made.

*A 6 per cent concentration is used for purposes of illustration.




Figure 4A (left) and 4B (right). A plot of the values from a foam pump discharge looks like this. The discharge rate is 250 gpm of foam solution. The straight stream pattern (4B) is compact and of good range and shows a minimum of "weeping." The full spray pattern (4A) shows a width of about 25 ft. out to a distance of about 28 ft. Area within the 1-inch depth line is slightly over 800 square feet. Water density 0.30 gpm per square foot.




Figure 4C (left) and 4D (right). This shows a 1,000 gpm dual capacity, aspirating nozzle discharge. For the straight stream (4C) note the maximum and minimum reach. For the spray (4D), note the maximum width and best reach.




Figure 4E. Stakes are laid out on 3-foot centers forming a grid over the expected foam ground pattern.



Figure 4F. Foam is discharged over the grid area for a period of 30 seconds.




Figure 4G. Immediately after applying foam, measurements are taken of the foam at each marker. Speed is important here as the foam tends to slide around as the foam solution drains out and begins to run off.

A-400. HEAT RADIATION TESTS

A-410. Description of Radiation Device (Reference Paragraph 343)

A-411. Fire intensity during the extinguishment process is measured by means of a total radiation pyrometer. Such devices are available commercially as the Brown Instrument's Radiamatic Series 939A1 Type RH. Radiation energy from the fire, proportional to its size, is converted through a thermopile to electrical energy which may be conveniently measured and recorded against a time axis. Two radiation receivers may be connected in parallel electrically (as shown in Figure 5) and mounted so that two response circles, of equal diameter and at right angles to each other, result in a complete radiation picture of the test fire.