other. The connection from the larger device should be reasonably low, and that from the smaller should be up near the ceiling, so that each device can be serviced as well as possible, regardless of the treatment of the other.

Even where such precautions are taken, there is, under unusual conditions, some possibility of flow of combustible gases from one appliance into another. Reverse flow of cooled gases has been demonstrated in a chimney at very low rates of flow.[7] Under certain similar quiescent conditions, accidental discharge of combustible gases from a defective device into a chimney could result in flow of these gases counter current into the combustion chamber of another device attached to the same chimney. If ignition occurred in this second device, an explosion could result.

Excessive height in a chimney does no harm, but means for controlling the draft are more than ordinarily essential if the chimney is too tall. Coal-burning devices often have air leaks around the firebox, and the draft doors sometimes fit so poorly that the fire cannot be controlled at a low rate. The simplest remedy for such cases is the barometric damper which admits air into the flue pipe and thus reduces draft.

Where a chimney serves a fireplace, it is important that no other heating device be connected to it unless the fireplace is effectively sealed.

REFERENCES

[1] R. H. Sherlock and B. A. Stalker: *A Study of Flow Phenomena in the Wake of Smokestacks* (University of Michigan, *Department of Engineering Research Bulletin* No. 29, 1941).

[2] E. F. Miller and James Holt: *Notes on Power Plant Design* (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1930).

[3] L. F. Moody: Friction factors for pipe flow (*ASME Transactions*, Vol. 66, 1944, p. 671).

[4] R. T. Kent (ed.): *Mechanical Engineers' Handbook* (John Wiley & Sons, New York).

[5] G. A. Hool and N. C. Johnson: *Handbook of Building Construction* (McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1929).

[6] R. S. Dill, P. R. Achenbach, and J. T. Duck: Observed performance of some experimental chimneys (ASHVE Transactions, Vol. 48, 1942, p. 351).

[7] L. B. Schmitt and R. B. Engdahl: Performance of residential chimneys (ASHVE Transactions, Vol. 55, 1949, p. 241).

[8] P. R. Achenbach and S. D. Cole: Performance of fourteen masonry chimneys under steady state conditions (ASHVE Transactions, Vol. 55, 1949, p. 129).

[9] R. D. Thulman and W. H. Shenkle: A theoretical and experimental investigation of the performance of some short flues under steady-state conditions (Thesis at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June 1951).

[10] P. R. Achenbach: Physics of chimneys (*Physics Today*, Vol. 2, December 1949).

[11] R. K. Thulman: *Performance of Masonry Chimneys for Houses* (*Housing and Home Finance Agency Technical Paper* No. 13, August 1949).

[12] CS101-43 *Oil-Burning Space Heaters Equipped with Vaporizing Pot-Type Burners*, CS75-42 *Automatic Mechanical Oil Burners Designed for Domestic Installations*, CS(E)104-43 *Warm Air Furnaces Equipped with Vaporizing Pot-Type Burners*, CS109-44 *Solid-Fuel Burning Forced Air Furnaces*, CS113-44 *Oil-Burning Floor Furnaces Equipped with Vaporizing Pot-Type Burners* (National Bureau of Standards Commercial Standards).

[13] *American Standard Installation of Gas Piping and Gas Appliances in Buildings* (American Standards Association, Z21.30-1950).

[14] *Comfort Heating* (American Gas Association, 1938, p. 71).

[15] C. G. Segeler: *Sizing of Chimneys and Flues Used for Gas Appliances* (American Gas Association; Sixth International Gas Conference, 1955).

[16] N. D. Mitchell: Fire hazard tests with masonry chimneys (*National Fire Protection Association Quarterly*, October 1949).

[17] S. Konzo: Chimneys and draft (*Winter Air Conditioning*, National Warm Air Heating and Air Conditioning Association, 1939, Chapter 32).

CHAPTER 37

ESTIMATING FUEL CONSUMPTION FOR SPACE HEATING

Bases of Fuel Estimates; Efficiency of Utilization; Calculated Heat Loss Method: Computation and Application, Short Methods for Estimating Heat Loss; Degree-Day Method: Computation and Application, Unit Fuel Consumption per Degree Day, Estimating Consumption for Various Fuels, Degree Day as an Operating Unit; Industrial Degree Days; Maximum Demand and Load Factors

IT IS often necessary to estimate the anticipated heat requirements and fuel consumptions of heating plants for either short or long terms of operation. These quantities can be much more difficult to calculate than design heat loss or required system capacity, since they involve essentially the summing up of the net result over the period in question of the influence of many factors which may vary greatly with time. It will seldom be possible to predict with any great accuracy the way in which all the factors involved will vary throughout the prediction period. In addition to this, the calculations required to take all such variations into account become very involved. For these and other reasons records of past operating experience, when these are available, provide the most reliable and usually the most accurate basis for the prediction of future requirements.

Records of past heat requirements or of fuel consumption of a particular building are a better basis for estimates than are averages of records from similar buildings. In the absence of past records for a particular building the data from similar plants in the same locality may have to be used. Averages of consumption figures taken from many types of plants in many types of buildings in various localities can only produce an average estimate which may prove to be inaccurate when applied to a particular building.

Where unusual operating conditions exist due to factors such as excessive ventilation, abnormal inside temperatures, and heat gains from external sources, or where, in the case of proposed buildings of unusual design, no information is available regarding former consumption, it is necessary to estimate fuel consumption from the computed heat losses.

In preparing fuel consumption estimates it is well to realize that any estimating method used will produce a more reliable result over a long period operation than over a short period. Nearly all of the methods in common use will give trustworthy results over a full *annual* heating season, and in some cases such estimates will prove consistent within themselves for monthly periods. As the period of the estimate is shortened, there is more chance that some factor not taken into account directly in the estimating method will deviate from its long-time average value, and thus lead to serious error in the predicted heat requirement.

EFFICIENCY OF UTILIZATION

Any method of estimating fuel requirements based primarily on calculation of heat losses must, of necessity, also take into account considerations of the efficiency with which the heat in the fuel is used. Efficiency can be defined in a variety of ways for various purposes, and the values in any given case can vary widely depending on the conditions. For estimating purposes, as will be shown later, it is the *efficiency of utilization* of the fuel over the calculation period which is wanted. This is distinct from *furnace efficiency* which expresses the heat delivered by a furnace unit as a percentage of the heat provided in the fuel and which is the efficiency normally used in describing the performance of a unit under rated, or stated, load conditions. It has been shown, at the University of Illinois for example,[1] that in the case of a dwelling with an inside chimney, as much as 35 percent of the heat delivered to the chimney which is normally considered to be a loss so far as efficiency of the furnace is concerned may be delivered to the house through the heated chimney walls. This recovered heat amounted to as much as 12 percent of the heat required by a house. Much of this recovered heat may be available for heating. It has been said in connection with the same study that at times only about 50 percent of the heat utilized by a house was supplied by radiators, while the other 50 percent of the heat utilized was supplied from such sources as chimney, piping, boiler jacket and smoke pipe, people, lights, etc. A summary[2,3] of many tests in two research residences at the University of Illinois using many fuels and systems give values of 67 to 90 percent for overall house efficiency (the ratio of the heat loss from the structure to the heat input to the unit for an average day).

The efficiency of utilization of the fuel burned can at times be relatively very high for houses. It can also vary quite widely from one house to another because of variations in chimney location and design, in the utilization of heat lost to the basement from the heating unit and smoke pipe, and for other reasons. The efficiency of utilization may also vary with time of year as the average load on the furnace varies. Some of the reasons for this in the case of intermittently-fired oil furnaces have been demonstrated.[4]

In buildings other than houses the efficiency of utilization of the heat supplied in the fuel may also vary widely. There will, in general, be less tendency in many larger buildings toward effective use for heating purposes of the heat which is normally lost from chimney, furnace, and piping surfaces, and efficiency is seldom likely to be as high as in the case of many houses.

The average fuel consumption of various types of approved gas-fired equipment has been obtained from a large number of heating systems.[5] Corresponding efficiencies of