



COMMITTEE D02 on PETROLEUM PRODUCTS, LIQUID FUELS, AND LUBRICANTS

CHAIRMAN:	Scott Fenwick, National Biodiesel Board, PO Box 104848, Jefferson City, MO 65110-4898, United States (800) 841-5849, Fax: (537) 635-7913, e-mail: sfenwick@biodiesel.org
FIRST VICE CHAIRMAN:	Gregory C Miiller, Tannas Co, 4800 James Savage Rd, Midland, MI 48642, United States (989) 496-2309, Fax: (989) 496-3438, e-mail: gmiiller@savantgroup.com
SECOND VICE CHAIRMAN:	James J Simnick, Bp Global Fuels Technology, 150 Warrenville Rd, BP Technology Center Mail Stop 603-2W, Naperville, IL 60563, United States (331) 702-4071, Fax: (630) 420-4831, e-mail: simnicji@bp.com
MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY:	Ian P Mylrea, Stanhope-Seta, 70 Bramley Drive, Hampshire, RG27 8ZF, United Kingdom (193) 2 5-4589, e-mail: im@stanhope-seta.co.uk
STAFF MANAGER:	Alyson Fick, (610) 832-9710, e-mail: afick@astm.org

Fuels task Force Minutes

No comments on the minutes from last meeting.

Sequence VI fuel specifications were previously agreed to in the Fuels Task Force meeting but then objected by Haltermann Solutions when brought up at the Sequence VI Surveillance Panel Meeting because the limits for aromatics were too narrow, 31 to 34% on D5769.

Prasad said that for ASTM D5769 standard, the reproducibility of the aromatics is 3.1 and the window that is proposed is 3.0. This can produce a problem and suggested we should reconsider from 30 to 35.

Later during the discussion the question was asked where the D5769 limits of 31-34% come from? We reviewed the data set that was provided by Haltermann and the statistical box plot provide by SwRI at the time when the decision of 31-34% was made.

Bob Campbell said we should define the specs around where the fuel has been; allowing a wider spec could result in a change to the fuel. Why should we extend the range? We should keep it where we have been based on the data that was shown.

Jens Schaak proposed using ASTM D3244 for determining acceptance limit, spec limit value, reproducibility; it gives you a fix number 90 to 95% and is very easy to calculate. This is a good reference procedure to settle a dispute when a customer tests product and finds it to be outside specification limits.

Mike Lochte proposed to the group to review the D3244 method and then come back to the aromatics limit discussion.

Bob Campbell didn't agree with deferring the discussion on the limits.

Prasad will review the D3244 and wants to wait for more data before making a decision because he sees potential problems. He stated that it had a range of 6 for so many years and now we want it to make it 3. The study made is based on limited data. Reconsider D1319.

Bob Campbell doesn't agree with Prasad that there is not enough data to change to D5769.

Prasad doesn't agree with the range of 3.1 -3.5 for repeatability.

Nathan Siebert suggested to consider raising the spec limit window on repeatability from 3.0 to 3.1 and then Haltermann should be able to support the limit?

Bob Campbell: until there is enough data to support it, why widen it?

Jarvis Brown has to find out where the D5769 data from the EEE batches are coming from, whether it was from one lab or various labs?

Charlie Leverett stated that the group already agreed to the spec in previous calls; he recommended that someone consider making a motion to accept what was previously agreed to.

MOTION: to proceed with aromatics 31-34:

Nobody was willing to make the motion.

Nathan Siebert of GM stated that he has concerns that a change in the spec could result in a change in test results and this could cause problems with the EPA.

Andrew Stevens asked if GM had any recommendations for the aromatics limits. Nathan stated that they are in the process of pulling together their internal data to see where the numbers are. GM will comment after reviewing the data.

Jeff Hsu asked if there would be any harm to use the D5769 as the EPA references at their website. They show limits and it will be a good place to start.

Andrew Stevens recommended that the group consider the request that was discussed on the May 14 Sequence VI conference call where Bob Campbell suggested that we consider taking fuel samples before and after the test. The heavy duty guys do this to check for sulfur and gravity. This is really done to ensure that the correct fuel is being used (PC9 vs. PC10). We could take sample of the Sequence VI fuel but look for items that may correlate to severity.

Nathan commented that GM is not against an alternate supplier but GM feels more work needs to be done on the specification and gathering more data to understand what matters in the fuel relative to the test results. Nathan has not seen an agreement among group on this fuel specification and finds it concerning.

Jim Carter feels that D3244 will solve a lot of the problems. Can be used for spot checks and the initial delivery?

Bob Campbell suggested that we consider taking a fuel sample and everyone run the CofA on the sample and see the ranges that are observed.

Jens Schaak suggested we should take one sample and run CofA in home lab and send a second sample to a different lab so we can determine repeatability and reproducibility.

Mike Lochte suggested we draw two samples at the same time, run in our lab and then discuss with other labs. Andrew volunteered to the Sequence VI labs to get together to discuss the logistics through the Sequence VI panel on the sampling process and where to send the second sample for the repeatability part of the study.

Tim Cushing asked if unwashed gums was in the spec. Mike Lochte advised that the current spec doesn't have unwashed gums as a requirement but the proposed spec does have it.

Items 4 and 5 on the agenda were not discussed due to lack of time remaining.

Final thoughts ... none.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Michael Lochte". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mike Lochte, Chairman
TGC Fuel Task Force

Attachment 1

Attachment 1

Attendees TGC meeting / May 19, 2020

("Y" next to name =present on call)

1	Mike Lochte (SwRI)	Y
2	William Buscher (Intertek)	Y
3	Alfonso Lopez (Intertek)	Y
4	Bob Campbell (Afton)	Y
5	Chris Taylor (pslservicesinc@gmail.com)	Y
6	Mark Cooper (Chevron)	Y
7	Frank Farber (ASTM)	N
8	James Harlow (VP Racing Fuels)	N
9	James Matasic (Lubrizol)	Y
10	Jason Bowden (OH Technologies)	N
11	Robert Legg (SwRI)	Y
12	Jim Carter (Gage Products)	Y
13	Jeff Clark (ASTM)	N
14	Tracey King (Tking@h-c-s-group.com)	N
15	Patrick Lang (SwRI)	Y
16	Marissa Macagnone (BASF)	N
17	Michael Madalian (Infineum)	N
18	Prasad Tumati (Haltermann)	Y
19	Rebecca Monroe (GM)	N
20	Rich Grundza (ASTM)	Y
21	Dr. Jens Schaak (JSchaak@h-c-s-group.com)	Y
22	Scott Parke (ASTM)	N
23	Sean Moyer (ASTM)	Y
24	Tim Cushing (GM)	N
25	Jonathan VanScoyoc (ConocoPhillips)	Y
27	Nathan Siebert (GM)	Y
28	Jarvis Brown, (Haltermann Solutions)	Y
29	Jeff Hsu (Shell)	Y
30	Jim Linden	N
31	Andrew Stevens (Lubrizol)	Y
32	Travis Kostan (SwRI)	Y
33	Mark Sutherland (MSutherland@tei-net.com)	N
34	Andrew Ritchie (Andrew.Rithie@infineum.com)	N
35	Mike Raney (GM)	Y
36	Aleise Gauer (GM)	Y
37	George Sappanos (Lubrizol)	