



On August 23<sup>rd</sup> & 24<sup>th</sup> 2006 at the request of Mr. Bill Dwyer, in a cooperative effort instituted by Mr. Gordon Ginzel 🐼 Intermodal Facility & a Measurement and Verification Analysis was conducted at the above facility in accordance with the Florida ENERGY **CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS Designation: ECAP-CUL-1-03** Method for Comparing Utility Loads in Structures and Buildings. The objective of this analysis is to determ ine the impact of the "As Built Conditions and As Installed *Components / Equipment*" on the energy producing loads on occupied residential, commercial, government building and other struct ures. The focus of this procedure is to provide *a comparison* to known standards for all parties interested in using *alternative* and conventional conservation products and devices to displaced energy loads. This report reflects the perform ance characteristics of the EGTCO KE 'Eqc kpi, as applied to the structures external surfaces, as a possible passive *Energy C*onservation *M*easure *(ECM)* to reduce internal Energy Loads and reduce the Heat Island Effects caused by exposed surfaces in urban areas.

• Our data indicated that at the tim e of this survey the test specim en container inside surface *conduction related energy loads* were reduced approximately 46 to 52% by applying y g'Egtco le'Eqclipi as an Energy Conservation Measure (ECM) to outside surfaces. The chart below shows a synopsis of our findings;



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In all over 4,320 data points that were collected simultaneously over a 24 hour test period were analyzed.



TYPICAL STANDARD CONTAINER AS TESTED

The container retrofitted with the *y* g'Egt co le 'Eqc lpi PRODUCT demonstrated reduced loads normally associated with Energy Consumption and Coating Maintenance as follows;



TYPICAL RETROFITTED y g'Egtco ke'Eqcvkpi CONTAINER

- INSIDE CONTAINER AMBIENT TEMPERATURE 22 DEGREES COOLER
- THERMAL CONDUCTANCE TO OUTSIDE ENVIRONMENT 50% LESS
- EXTERNAL SURFACE TEMPERATURE 47 DEGREES COOLER
- INTERNAL SURFACE TEMPERATURES 37 DEGREES COOLER
- OUTSIDE SURFACE REFLECTIVITY *50% HIGHER*
- ULTRAVIOLET ABSORPTION RATE 92% LESS
- INTERNAL MOISTURE LEVELS 28.5% DRYER



### Average SITE Weather conditions during the analysis period were as follows:

THE COMBINED DATA INDICATES THAT THE THERMAL ENERGY NECESSARY TO COOL THE CONTAINER COATED WITH THE Ceramic Coating PRODUCT WOULD REQUIRE <u>46 to 52% LESS ENERGY</u> at the time of this survey.

## PRECISION & BIAS

In an effort to insure repeatable results additional test were conducted as follows;



Infiltration factors around all door seals were equal (  $0\ {\rm CFM}\ \&\ 0\ {\rm PA}$  ) and had no adverse effect on the recorded data.

The *EXTERNAL SURFACE Energy Flow Analysis* also parallel the Internal Surface data as seen in the chart below;



\* Cooling source 43 Degree/F water at a 6.5 GPM flow rate supplied by a calibration flow tube.

# Field Test Results

The location of the test specimens was adequate. Both containers were of standard construction consisting of Carbon Steel side wall, roof and deck sheeting's with a standard wood flooring overlay. The calculate d R-Value of the existing Steel parent materials was found to be approximately an R-1.70. The only difference between the two containers consisting of approximately 2,690 Cubic Feet of *Control Zone Area* was the external *the Ceramic Coating*.



As noted in the test results on the prior pages of this report the differences created by the *SUPER THERM PRODUCT concerning load reductions produced by thermal conduction, convection and absorption <u>WERE SIGNIFICANT</u>.* 

Additionally, *significant reductions in <u>internal moisture levels</u> were also noted.* In every instance the *Field Test results concur with the manufacturers published data on the products anticipated performance curves* obtained using in laboratory test methods. Our Energy Flow, Heat Flux and Therm ographic analysis indicated that the *standard container* would require a minimum of <u>46% more BTU's</u> of cooling energy to maintain a comfort level below 70 Degrees/ F with the conditions present at the time of this survey.

In retrospect, the container coated with the <u>Ceramic Coating PRODUCT</u> reduce these loads to manageable levels to maintain the same comfort level. The <u>Ultraviolet</u> absorption test also showed a possible reduction in <u>SURFACE MAINTENANCE</u> as the majority of the <u>Harmful UV</u> that norm ally reduces coatings service life is not being absorbed by the Ceramic Coating itself. The aforem entioned internal Humidity reduction factors took place regardless of the amount of direct solar gain.

#### **CLOSING COMMENTS**

Let me **thank** Intermodal Facility & for giving us the opportunity to use their facility as a field test site. The data collected is a valuable asset to our **ECAP** program in building a comprehensive profiling of **actual energy related loads** that occur in **real life applications**. This type of data is critical to other Engineers facing decision making tasks, where published measurement and verification data is not yet available **or inaccurate**.

This report is m eant to be an educational guide to fam iliarize you *with the actual performance curves of your chosen Energy Conservation Measures* based on your supplied data and our field test results.





This is the third time we have had the pleasure to test *the Ceramic Coatings PRODUCTS*, it is rare that a single product will show such *Repeatable Results* in three totally different environments, South Florida, Denver Colorado and LaPorte Texas a true testim onial to your products *ENERGY STAR* rating. Please feel free to contact our offices if we can be of any assistance in helping you meet your future conservation goals.

Alexander E. Othmer CEA / CBA / NDE III Dir. Florida Energy Conservation Assistance Program