

2120

# SANDIA REPORT

SAND94-1117 • UC-1302, 1303  
Unlimited Release  
Printed November 1995

RECEIVED  
MAR 04 1996  
OSTI

## Test Results Industrial Solar Technology Parabolic Trough Solar Collector

Vernon E. Dudley  
EG&G MSI  
Albuquerque, NM 87119

Lindsey R. Evans, Chauncey W. Matthews  
Solar Thermal Test Department  
Sandia National Laboratories  
Albuquerque, NM 87185

Prepared by  
Sandia National Laboratories  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185 and Livermore, California 94550  
for the United States Department of Energy  
under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

SF29000(8-81)

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

Issued by Sandia National Laboratories, operated for the United States Department of Energy by Sandia Corporation.

**NOTICE:** This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government, any agency thereof or any of their contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, any agency thereof or any of their contractors.

Printed in the United States of America. This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from  
Office of Scientific and Technical Information  
PO Box 62  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Prices available from (615) 576-8401, FTS 626-8401

Available to the public from  
National Technical Information Service  
US Department of Commerce  
5285 Port Royal Rd  
Springfield, VA 22161

NTIS price codes  
Printed copy: A04  
Microfiche copy: A01

## Test Results Industrial Solar Technology Parabolic Trough Solar Collector

Vernon E. Dudley  
E G & G MSI  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87119

Lindsey R. Evans  
Chauncey W. Matthews  
Solar Thermal Test Department  
Sandia National Laboratories  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185

### Abstract

Sandia National Laboratories and Industrial Solar Technology are cost-sharing development of advanced parabolic trough technology. As part of this effort, several configurations of an IST solar collector were tested to determine the collector efficiency and thermal losses with black chrome and black nickel receiver selective coatings, combined with aluminized film and silver film reflectors, using standard Pyrex® and anti-reflective coated Pyrex® glass receiver envelopes.

The development effort has been successful, producing an advanced collector with 77% optical efficiency, using silver-film reflectors, a black nickel receiver coating, and a solgel anti-reflective glass receiver envelope.

For each receiver configuration, performance equations were empirically derived relating collector efficiency and thermal losses to the operating temperature. Finally, equations were derived showing collector performance as a function of input insolation value, incident angle, and operating temperature.

**MASTER**

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

65



## Contents

Summary of Test Results.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Test Results.....	4
Performance Equations .....	4
Appendix A: The IST Collector Test Article.....	A-1
IST Parabolic Trough Solar Collector Test Article.....	A-3
Appendix B: Test Facility Descriptions.....	B-1
Test Facility Description .....	B-3
AZTRAK Azimuth Tracking Platform.....	B-3
Heat Transfer Fluid Supply System.....	B-4
Test Instrumentation.....	B-8
Data Acquisition System .....	B-8
Heat Transfer Fluid Flow .....	B-8
Fluid Property Calculations .....	B-8
Temperature.....	B-8
Tracking Angle .....	B-9
Weather Data.....	B-9
Appendix C: Test Plan.....	C-1
Test Procedures.....	C-3
Peak Efficiency Measurements .....	C-3
Procedure for Efficiency Measurement (Elevated Temperature).....	C-4
Procedure for Efficiency Measurement (Near-Ambient-Air Temperature).....	C-5
Incident Angle Modifier Tests .....	C-5
Thermal Loss Tests .....	C-6
Test Data Analysis .....	C-9
Appendix D: Test Results.....	D-1
Test Results.....	D-3
Introduction.....	D-3
Receiver Response Time .....	D-6
Efficiency Tests With Black Chrome Receiver .....	D-6
Efficiency Tests With Black Nickel Receiver .....	D-11
Thermal Loss Tests -- Black Chrome .....	D-13
Thermal Loss Tests -- Black Nickel.....	D-18
Incident Angle Tests.....	D-18
Performance of the Sun Tracking System .....	D-32
Data Analysis .....	D-38
Appendix E: Theoretical Model.....	E-1
Theoretical Model .....	E-3
Introduction .....	E-3
Model Definition.....	E-3
Model Results .....	E-6
Appendix F: Error Analysis .....	F-1
Error Analysis.....	F-3

Introduction .....	F-3
Heat Gain Errors.....	F-7
Efficiency Errors .....	F-9
Incident Angle Modifier .....	F-9
Sample Efficiency Error Analysis.....	F-10


## Figures

1. Row of IST Collector Modules.....	2
2. IST Collector Field at Tehachapi, CA .....	3
3. Efficiency Comparison - Black Nickel and Black Chrome Receivers.....	5
4. Thermal Loss Comparison of Black Chrome and Black Nickel Receivers .....	6
5. IST Incident Angle Modifier for All Receivers .....	7
6. IST Collector vs Temperature & Insolation at Zero Incident Angle .....	9
7. IST Collector vs. Temperature & Insolation at 50 Deg Incident Angle .....	10
8. IST ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Receiver at Zero Incident Angle .....	11
B-1. Schematic of High Temperature Fluid Supply Loop .....	B-6
C-1. Ideal Receiver Heat Gain and Thermal Losses.....	C-10
C-2. IST In-Focus Thermal Loss—Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass Receiver .....	C-11
C-3. IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Glass at Zero Incident Angle .....	C-14
C-4. IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Glass at 50 Deg Incident Angle .....	C-15
D-1. IST Collector on AZTRAK Rotating Platform .....	D-4
D-2. Reynolds Number vs Temperature .....	D-5
D-3. IST Receiver Time Constant to In-focus .....	D-7
D-4. IST Receiver Time Constant to Out-of-focus .....	D-8
D-5. IST Efficiency—ECP-305/Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass .....	D-10
D-6. IST Black Chrome Efficiency Comparison - Solgel Glass/Pyrex Glass.....	D-12
D-7. IST Black Nickel Efficiency Comparison - Solgel Glass/Pyrex Glass .....	D-15
D-8. IST Efficiency Comparison - All Receiver Combinations.....	D-16
D-9. IST Thermal Loss—Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass Receiver .....	D-17
D-10. IST Thermal Loss—Black Nickel/Solgel Glass Receiver .....	D-19
D-11. IST Thermal Loss Comparison - Black Nickel/Black Chrome .....	D-20
D-12. IST Incident Angle Modifier (+) Black Chrome/Solgel Glass .....	D-22
D-13. IST Incident Angle Modifier (-) Black Chrome/Solgel Glass .....	D-23
D-14. IST Incident Angle Modifier (+) Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass .....	D-24
D-15. IST Incident Angle Modifier (-) Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass .....	D-25
D-16. IST Incident Angle Modifier (+) Black Nickel/Solgel Glass.....	D-26
D-17. IST Incident Angle Modifier (-) Black Nickel/Solgel Glass .....	D-27
D-18. IST Incident Angle Modifier for All Receivers .....	D-28
D-19. Tracking Angle and Tracking Error .....	D-34
D-20. Incident Angle, Cosine, and Incident Angle Modifier.....	D-35
D-21. Incident Angle, Cosine, and Incident Angle Modifier.....	D-36
D-22. Tracking Angle and Tracking Error .....	D-37
D-23. Example Tracking Angle Updates.....	D-39
D-24. IST Tracking Angle Updates for 24 August .....	D-40

D-25.	Tracking Angle Updates -- Expanded Scale .....	D-41
D-26.	IST Collector vs Temp & Insolation at Zero Incident Angle.....	D-43
D-27.	IST Collector vs Temp & Insolation at 50 Deg Incident Angle.....	D-44
D-28.	IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Glass at 50 Deg Incident Angle .....	D-45
E-1.	Model Flow Chart .....	E-4
E-2.	Comparison of Predicted Trough Efficiency to Test Data for the IST Trough with a Black Chrome Receiver and a Pyrex Glass Envelope.....	E-7
E-2.	Comparison of Predicted Trough Efficiency to Test Data for the IST Trough with a Black Chrome Receiver and a Pyrex Glass Envelope Coated with Sol Gel.....	E-8
E-2.	Comparison of Predicted Trough Efficiency to Test Data for the IST Trough with a Black Nickel Receiver and a Pyrex Glass Envelope Coated with Sol Gel.....	E-9
E-5.	Comparison of the Out-of-Focus Thermal Loss for the IST Trough with a Black Chrome Receiver .....	E-10
E-6.	Comparison of the Out-of-Focus Thermal Loss for the IST Trough with a Black Nickel Receiver .....	E-11

## Tables

1.	IST Collector Performance Equations for Silver Film Reflector.....	12
A-1.	IST Parabolic Trough Solar Collector .....	A-4
B-1.	Data Menu for IST on Aztrak Platform.....	B-10
C-1.	Changes in Efficiency With Insolation .....	C-12
D-1.	Measured Efficiency Test Data -- Black Chrome Selective Coating, Solgel Glass, Aluminum Film Reflector .....	D-6
D-2.	Measured Efficiency Test Data -- Black Chrome Selective Coating, Solgel Glass, Silver Film Reflector .....	D-9
D-3.	Measured Efficiency Test Data -- Black Chrome Selective Coating, Pyrex™ Glass, Silver Film Reflector .....	D-11
D-4.	Measured Efficiency Test Data -- Black Nickel Selective Coating, Solgel Glass, Silver Film Reflector .....	D-14
D-5.	Measured Thermal Loss Data -- Black Chrome Selective Coating, Pyrex™ Glass .....	D-14
D-6.	Measured Thermal Loss Data -- Black Nickel Selective Coating, Solgel Glass .....	D-18
D-7.	Incident Angle Modifier Test Data -- Black Chrome/Solgel Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector .....	D-29
D-8.	Incident Angle Modifier Test Data -- Black Chrome/Pyrex™ Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector .....	D-30
D-9.	Incident Angle Performance Test Data -- Black Nickel/Solgel Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector .....	D-32
D-10.	IST Collector Performance Equations for Silver Film Reflector.....	D-42
F-1.	Black Chrome/Solgel Efficiency Test Data for Cold Water at 30°C .....	F-4
F-2.	Black Chrome/Pyrex™ Efficiency Test Data at 150°C .....	F-5
F-3.	Black Nickel/Solgel Thermal Loss Test Data at 200°C.....	F-6



# Summary of Test Results

## Introduction

The Sandia National Laboratories and Industrial Solar Technology (IST) are cost-sharing a series of component developments, tests and analytical models to characterize the performance of the IST parabolic trough solar collector over the complete range of operating temperatures and incident angles. Fields of these collectors are currently installed at Aurora and Brighton, Co and at Tehachapi, Calif., supplying energy for domestic hot water. The Sandia tests were also designed to measure progress in the cost-shared development of an advanced design receiver assembly, using a black nickel selective coating and a solgel anti-reflective coated glass envelope. The test effort was part of the Department of Energy Industrial Heat Program and the Solar Thermal Electric Program.

The IST collector module tested at Sandia was the smallest portion of the complete collector that could be operated independently, consisting of a single mirror module, receiver, and the drive system. As tested, the mirror aperture width was 2.3 m and the length was 6.1 m. A complete IST collector would include several rows of collectors driven by a single drive system. Each row usually has two or three of the mirror modules on each side of the drive wheel, with four to six rows moved by cables from a single drive motor and tracking system. Figure 1 is a photograph of an IST collector; Figure 2 shows the IST collector field at Brighton, Co.

Two different reflector assemblies were delivered for testing: one using a 3M SA-85 aluminized film reflector, and another using 3M ECP-305 silver film reflector material. Shortly after testing began, the aluminized reflector was discovered to have been damaged. Since this reflector was unable to focus all the light on the receiver, and was not field repairable, it was removed. The silver film reflector was used for most of the tests covered by this report.

Two different receiver selective coatings -- black chrome and black nickel -- were tested. The black chrome receivers are currently used in the operational collector fields; the black nickel is a proposed receiver that may have a longer lifetime and better optical properties than the black chrome version. Black chrome selective coatings have been used for a number of years on both concentrating and non-concentrating solar collectors. The coating is applied by an electroplating process, which must be very carefully controlled for a reasonable coating lifetime at high operating temperatures.

Two different receiver glass envelopes were also tested: a conventional borosilicate Pyrex® glass, and a solgel anti-reflective coated Pyrex® glass.



**Figure 1. Row of IST Collector Modules**



Figure 2. IST Collector Field at Tehachapi, CA.

## Test Results

Figure 3 summarizes the efficiency test results for the black chrome and black nickel receivers, with both plain glass and anti-reflective glass envelopes. Optical property measurements of the receiver surfaces confirmed that the black nickel receiver had a higher absorptivity than the black chrome, which leads directly to the improved optical efficiency observed during the test series. Similarly, the solgel anti-reflective coated receiver glass transmitted more concentrated light to the receiver, again improving the optical efficiency for both receiver types. Optical efficiency points were obtained using cold water as the heat-transfer fluid, prior to connecting the receiver to the oil system. All elevated temperature testing was done with Dow Corning's Syltherm® 800 silicone oil as the heat-transfer fluid.

Figure 4 shows the measured thermal losses from the black chrome and black nickel receivers. The measured emissivity of the two receiver surfaces was similar, but the glass envelopes were different. The presence of the anti-reflective solgel coating on the black nickel glass envelope was not expected to change the glass properties for infra-red heat radiation, and nearly identical measured thermal losses were measured for the two receivers. All thermal loss testing was done with Syltherm® oil as the heat-transfer fluid.


Change in collector performance for a range of solar beam incident angles was measured with both glass types and both receiver coatings, at both positive and negative incident angles. The tests did not detect any change in incident angle modifier with the two different receivers, and essentially no difference between positive and negative incident angles. All the measured incident angle performance data is summarized in Figure 5. All incident angle testing was done with cold water at near ambient air temperatures to minimize any errors due to thermal losses from the receiver assembly. Incident angle test data were corrected for end loss to compensate for the short length of the test collector.

The equations shown in the Figures were obtained from a least-squares regression analysis of the measured data points. The complete sets of measured data are in Appendix D. The error bars on the data points are the expected worst-case uncertainty resulting from instrument bias, measurement errors, and thermal stability of the test system. A discussion of the test errors is in Appendix F.

A theoretical heat-transfer computer model of the IST collector was constructed (see Appendix E) using the measured physical parameters of the system. Calculated heat gain and heat loss using this theoretical model are in reasonable agreement with the actual test results. This indicates that the theoretical model might be useful for calculating the performance of other collectors that differ slightly from the tested equipment.

## Performance Equations

The operating efficiency data and equations shown in the previous figures are valid only for a narrow range of insolation values near those existing during the tests.. The thermal losses shown are valid only for an essentially zero value of incident direct insolation on the receiver. These



**Figure 3. Efficiency Comparison - Black Nickel and Black Chrome Receivers**




Figure 4. Thermal Loss Comparison of Black Chrome and Black Nickel Receivers




Figure 5. IST Incident Angle Modifier for All Receivers

equations will not correctly predict collector performance when insolation differs by hundreds of  $\text{W/m}^2$  from the Sandia test conditions, as happens daily in an operational solar field. The efficiency equation can be extended as outlined in Appendix C to cover the complete range of expected solar irradiance. Figure 6 shows a plot of the final performance equation for several levels of insolation, using the black nickel receiver with a solgel anti-reflective glass envelope. Incident angle was zero for the curves in Figure 6.

Collector performance will decrease with increasing incident angle. Figure 7 shows the same collector as Figure 6, but now for an incident angle of 50 degrees, which would occur at noon in mid-December for a North-South field of these collectors. High incident angles combined with low insolation values also occur during early morning and late afternoon hours for a collector field that is oriented East-West.

Figure 8 illustrates the same performance equation as Figures 6 & 7, but shows the complete range of possible operating temperatures and insolation values for a zero incident angle. A performance equation in this form has been shown to correctly predict the all-day, steady-state output from a single collector module, and from a small collector field (Ref. 1 and 2). We believe the equation can also be successfully used with larger solar installations (See Ref. 3).

The general shape of Figure 8, and the equation used to draw the figure, shows that collector efficiency varies in a hyperbolic fashion with changing values of insolation; and as a quadratic polynomial with changes in operating temperature. The performance equations shown for efficiency and incident angle modifier are not exact physical models of the collector, but instead are empirical fits to the experimental test data. The first term in the performance equation represents the approximate optical efficiency of the collector. Some experience with the Acurex collector (Ref. 2) indicates that the optical efficiency term can be varied slightly to account for accumulated soiling of the collector mirrors and receiver glass.

It is possible to read an expected collector efficiency for a given insolation and operating temperature from a graph such as Figures 6, 7, and 8, but not very accurately, and a new graph would be needed for each different incident angle. A more practical way to use this data is to solve the equations (1) to (5) shown in below in Table 1 for each operating parameter set of interest. Note that the incident angle modifier  $K$  is the same for all the receiver variations. Also note that the equations are valid only for steady-state conditions, and include only the collector itself -- thermal losses from interconnecting piping must be considered separately. If the collector field is increasing or decreasing in temperature, a separate calculation is necessary to account for heat being stored in (or removed from) the mass of oil and pipe in the field.

The equations below summarize the test performance of the IST collector, and should apply to any temperature between ambient and 350°C, at any insolation level from 100 to 1100  $\text{W/m}^2$ , and at any incident angle from 0 to 70 degrees.




Figure 6. IST Collector vs Temp & Insolation at Zero Incident Angle




Figure 7. IST Collector vs Temp & Insolation at 50 Deg Incident Angle

$$Eff = 76.25 - 0.00684 (dT) - 14.68 (dT^2/I) - 0.1672 (dT^2/I^2)$$




Figure 8. IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Receiver at Zero Incident Angle

**Table 1**  
**IST Collector Performance Equations For Silver Film Reflector**

<b><u>Black Nickel selective absorber, Solgel receiver glass</u></b>	
$\eta$	$= K \{76.25 - 0.006836 (\Delta T)\} - 14.68 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1672 (\Delta T^2/I)$ (1)
<b><u>Black Nickel selective absorber, Pyrex receiver glass</u></b>	
$\eta$	$= K \{72.36 - 0.006836 (\Delta T)\} - 14.68 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1672 (\Delta T^2/I)$ (2)
<b><u>Black chrome selective absorber, Solgel receiver glass</u></b>	
$\eta$	$= K \{74.52 - 0.009764 (\Delta T)\} - 23.26 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1355 (\Delta T^2/I)$ (3)
<b><u>Black chrome selective absorber, Pyrex receiver glass</u></b>	
$\eta$	$= K \{70.75 - 0.01028 (\Delta T)\} - 23.27 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1355 (\Delta T^2/I)$ (4)
<b><u>Incident Angle Modifier, K</u></b>	
$K$	$= \cos (Ia) + 0.0003178 (Ia) - 0.00003985 (Ia)^2$ (5)

In Table 1 performance equations (1) through (5):

$\eta$	=	Collector efficiency, in percent
$K$	=	Incident angle modifier
$I$	=	Incident direct normal solar irradiance, $\text{W/m}^2$
$\Delta T$	=	Avg. receiver fluid temperature above ambient air temperature, $^{\circ}\text{C}$
$Ia$	=	Solar beam incident angle, in degrees

## References

Dudley, V. E., and Workhoven, R. M., 1982. SAND81-0984, Performance Testing of the Solar Kinetics T-700 Solar Collector. Albuquerque, N.M, Sandia National Laboratories.

Cameron, C. P., and Dudley, V. E., 1985. SAND85-2316, Acurex Solar Corporation Modular Industrial Solar Retrofit Qualification Test Results. Albuquerque, N. M, Sandia National Laboratories.

Lippke, F., 1995. SAND95-1293. Simulation of the Part-Load Behavior of a 30 Mwe SEGS Plant. Albuquerque, N. M, Sandia National Laboratories.

**APPENDIX A**

**IST COLLECTOR TEST ARTICLE**

## APPENDIX A

Intentionally Left Blank

## IST Parabolic Trough Solar Collector Test Article

In a field installation, an IST collector system may have 4 to 6 rows of mirror modules, all driven by cables from a single drive motor and tracking system. Each row would typically have 2 to 3 mirror modules on each side of the drive wheel. For testing at Sandia Laboratories, only a single mirror module was used, with a control/tracking system and drive motor. The mirror module was about 2.3 m wide by 6.1 m long, providing a net mirror aperture of 13.2 m<sup>2</sup>. The mirror module was constructed with a welded aluminum angle framework supporting a 1 mm thick aluminum mirror sheet. The reflector surface was either 3M SA-85 aluminized acrylic film, or 3M ECP-305 silvered acrylic film bonded to the aluminum backing sheet.

Concentrated light from the mirror assembly is focused on the receiver, which is a steel tube surrounded by a glass envelope. Two different receiver glass envelopes were tested; one was conventional borosilicate Pyrex glass, the other had a solgel anti-reflective coating on both surfaces. The glass protects the selective surface coating on the steel receiver, and also serves to reduce convection and conduction thermal losses from the heated tube. The space between the receiver surface and the glass envelope was not sealed, and contained air at atmospheric pressure.

Two different receiver selective coatings were tested on the IST collector: black chrome and black nickel. Black chrome is an electroplated coating, which is not recommended for long term use much above about 300 °C, and depending on the process control used in the plating process, sometimes changes in color and selective properties in use. Black nickel is an electroplated chemical conversion coating, which is being evaluated as a possible alternative to black chrome.

The 6 m long receiver module was made up of two 3 m steel receiver tubes and glass envelopes. The receiver was modified from the normal configuration by inserting a 31.75 mm diameter closed-end plug tube inside the steel receiver in order to reduce the flow area and increase fluid velocities. This change was necessary because the heat transfer fluid flow rates available for testing were less than those normally used in a field installation.

The collector's sun-tracking system is manufactured by IST under a license from Honeywell. The tracker/controller is a microprocessor based optical system; sensing concentrated light at the receiver tube.

## APPENDIX A

**Table A-1**  
**IST Parabolic Trough Solar Collector**

Manufacturer:	Industrial Solar Technology Corporation 4420 McIntyre Street Golden, CO 80403
Operating Temperature:	100-300 °C
Module size:	2.3 m x 6.1 m (as tested at Sandia)
Rim Angle:	72 degrees
Reflectors:	Second-surface silvered acrylic film, 3M ECP-305 Solar reflectivity : 0.93
	Second surface aluminized acrylic film, 3M SA-85. Solar reflectivity: 0.83
Aperture Area:	13.2 m <sup>2</sup> (as tested at Sandia)
Focal Length:	76.2 cm
Concentration Ratio:	45 (Reflector width/absorber diameter)
Receiver:	Absorber diameter: 51 mm length: 6.1 m Pyrex® glass envelope: 75 mm diameter Solgel anti-reflective coated: Transmittance: 0.96 Plain glass, no AR coating: Transmittance: 0.91 Black chrome selective surface Absorptance: 0.94 Emittance: 0.25 @ 300°C 0.10 @ 100°C Black nickel selective surface Absorptance: 0.97 Emittance: 0.30 @ 300°C 0.14 @ 100°C
Sun Tracking:	Optical, viewing reflected light at the receiver.
Tracking Drive System:	230 v, 3 Ø, 850 rpm drive motor Jack screw driving cables to move collectors.

**APPENDIX B**

**TEST FACILITY DESCRIPTION**

## APPENDIX B

Intentionally Left Blank

## Test Facility Description

### AZTRAK Azimuth Tracking Platform

During testing of a linear-cylindrical parabolic trough solar collector, one of the performance parameters that must be measured is the peak efficiency of the collector at zero incident angle. When the collector is mounted with a fixed East-West orientation of the trough rotational axis, zero incident angle occurs only once each day, at solar noon. If the trough rotational axis has some other orientation, such as North-South, a zero incident angle may not occur at all on some days of the year.

Because of the limited times that zero incident angles are available, completing a test series with a fixed collector orientation can be a frustrating experience. Some past tests have dragged on for months while waiting for a few days when no clouds were present during the times zero incident angles were also available. Since each test must be repeated at several different temperatures (usually 4-6) to define the operating curve, considerable wasted time is inevitable.

Another important operating parameter is the collector's performance over a range of incident angles, usually 0-60 degrees. Sufficient data to define this parameter can be even more frustrating than peak performance, since clear skies and stable insolation must be available over at least an entire half-day in order to complete the test.

The remaining parameter that must be measured is thermal loss from the collector's receiver as a function of operating temperature. Thermal loss should be measured with zero insolation incident on the receiver. Even though the collector is defocused such that no concentrated light from the reflector assembly falls on the receiver, some heat gain will still result if the direct beam from the sun can reach the receiver surface. The heat gain from unconcentrated sunlight is small, but can significantly change measured heat loss. To obtain a true measure of receiver thermal loss, the receiver must be shaded from direct sunlight.

Because the receiver exchanges infra-red energy with any object in view, it is also not possible to aim the reflector assembly at the ground in order to shade the receiver from sunlight. The ground temperature is considerably higher than the sky temperature to which the receiver is normally exposed, which would again lead to an error in a thermal loss measurement. For the same reason, it is not possible to cover the receiver with some sort of shadow shield without changing the thermal loss properties of the receiver.

Zero incident insolation is easy if the test is done at night; otherwise it is usually difficult or impossible to accomplish during daylight hours when the test collector has a fixed orientation. The reflector structure never seems to be in the right place to shadow the receiver from incident sunlight.

All the test difficulties mentioned above can be avoided if the solar collector is on a two-axis sun-tracking mount. Since linear-cylindrical parabolic trough concentrating collectors already have a solar elevation tracking capability, only an azimuth-tracking platform is needed to complete a

## APPENDIX B

two-axis system. The AZTRAK rotating platform, located at the Solar Thermal Test Facility, Sandia National Laboratories, is an azimuth-tracking platform with unique capabilities for testing solar collectors.

The AZTRAK platform is microcomputer controlled, and can position a collector at zero incident angle at any hour of any day of the year. In addition, the platform can track so that any given incident angle from 0-90 degrees can be maintained for as long as necessary to obtain test data. During thermal loss testing, the collector can be aimed at the sky away from the sun, thus shading the receiver, while the platform tracks the sun to maintain the receiver shading.

The AZTRAK platform incorporates provisions for electrical power to an installed collector, heat-transfer fluid flow to and from the receiver, and a large variety of instrumentation lines for test instrumentation. The platform is hydraulically driven from local or remote manual control stations, or by the tracking microcomputer. Provisions are included for automatic defocusing of the test collector and rotation away from the sun upon an overtemperature condition or if heat-transfer fluid flow is lost.

The platform construction is large square steel beams, welded into a rectangular assembly. The platform's collector mounting surface is 4m (13.1 ft) wide and 13m (42.6 ft) long. It is designed to support a collector weighing up to 3600 kg (8000 lb.) with a mirror aperture up to 50 sq. m (538 sq ft), with a center of pressure 1.8m (6 ft) above the top surface of the platform. Sun tracking operation is possible in winds up to 13.4 m/sec (30 mph), and the platform is designed to support the collector in winds up to 40 m/sec (90 mph). Platform rotation is 115 degrees in either direction from true South.

### Heat Transfer Fluid Supply System

Two heat-transfer fluid supply systems are available for solar collector testing on the AZTRAK platform. Domestic cold water is used for optical efficiency and incident angle testing; a specially designed hot-oil supply system is used for the elevated temperature tests.

Domestic cold water has often been used directly into the collector inlet, with only a flow-control valve needed. During the present test series, we found that the water supply pressure varied randomly due to unknown causes; producing variations in fluid flow rates, and subsequent unacceptable receiver temperature changes. The water supply also contained numerous air bubbles, which also contributed to unstable flow and erratic flowmeter operation. The automatic flow-control valve was unable to maintain a constant flow rate, so a portable pump cart was used to supply water to the collector.

Essential components of the water pump cart are a 1135 liter (300 gallon) water tank, a multi-stage centrifugal pump, and a pressure-control valve. Water was delivered from the pump at 1 mPa (150 psi), and was throttled by a pressure regulator to about 0.7 mPa (100 psi) at 23 L/min (6 gpm) into the collector. Water flow output from the collector was regulated by an automatic flow-control valve, then dumped to the surface. We found that both the inlet pressure regulator and the output flow regulator were required for the most stable flow rates. A garden hose served to keep the water tank filled. The large water tank allowed the air bubbles to separate from the

water before reaching the pump. This simple system delivered extremely stable water flow rates and temperatures and was largely responsible for the excellent optical efficiency and incident angle data obtained.

The hot-oil fluid system was specifically designed for solar collector testing after considerable experience with the shortcomings of other oil systems. Vital components are a 190 liter (50 gal) oil tank, centrifugal pump and drive motor, a 40 kW electric oil heater, a water-cooled heat exchanger, an oil filter, flow meters, and several control valves. Operation of the oil system is remotely controlled from the nearby data-acquisition trailer. At present, the system uses Dow Corning's Syltherm® 800 silicone-based heat-transfer fluid; other heat-transfer oils are compatible with the system and could be used if desired. Water cannot be used in this fluid-supply system.

In operation, the oil system pumps oil from the supply tank through the heater and heat-exchanger, out through the solar collector being tested, and return to the supply tank. Both automatic and manual temperature and flow control systems are provided; as well as local and remote temperature and pressure indicators. Oil is supplied to the collector inlet at temperatures from 50 to 400°C, as selected by the operator. Oil pressure at the pump outlet is about 1 mPa (150 psi), and is throttled to about 0.7 mPa (100 psi) at the system outlet. Fluid flow rates from 4 to 57 L/min (1-15 gpm) are available. Figure B-1 shows a flow diagram of the high-temperature fluid loop.

Several of the fluid system's operating characteristics may appear excessive to those not familiar with the difficulties of solar collector testing. For example, the 20 hp fluid pump is quite large, considering that only 40-50 L/min fluid flow is needed through the collector under test. The pump actually pumps about 230 L/min (60 gpm) at a pressure approaching 1 mPa. Most of the fluid flow does not go out to the test collector, but is returned to the supply tank after passing through the heating and cooling heat exchangers. One objective of the high flow-rate through the heater, cooling heat-exchanger, and supply tank is to keep the fluid supply extremely well stirred and uniform in bulk fluid temperature. Close temperature control is also facilitated; since the fluid temperature seen by the heater controller is always an accurate measure of bulk fluid temperature throughout the system. Collector input temperature regulation to 0.1°C is routinely achieved.

Another objective of the large fluid pump is obtaining a highly stable fluid flow-rate through the collector. The fluid flow-control valves throttle the 1 mPa pump pressure to about 140 kPa at the collector inlet. Fluid flow stability to less than 0.2 L/min is easily achieved. Constant fluid flow is ultimately a major factor in temperature stability of the test collector.

Fluid temperature control over a wide temperature range by using either a fluid heater or cooler alone is inherently more difficult than using both together. For example, at a low operating temperature, the temperature controller will have difficulty getting small amounts of heat from the large electric heater. Thermal losses will be low, resulting in very slow correction rates as the temperature setpoint is overshot by the controller. The problem is a very high rate of response to a temperature below the setpoint, and a very slow rate of response to a temperature above the setpoint.

## APPENDIX B




Figure B-1. Schematic of High Temperature Fluid Supply Loop

At the highest operating temperatures, the control problem is reversed. Only a very small amount of cooling will be needed, as thermal losses from the entire heated system may dissipate most of the heat input. The cooling controller may find it impossible to open the cooling water valve by a small enough amount to achieve the required small amount of fluid cooling.

The temperature control scheme incorporated into this high temperature fluid loop is the nearly continuous use of simultaneous heating and cooling. For a given operating temperature, the fluid loop and the collector are first allowed to reach a rough state of temperature equilibrium under automatic control. The control system is set such that the cooling heat exchanger is always dissipating slightly more heat than is produced by the collector being tested. The cooling control is then placed under manual control so that the amount of cooling cannot change. The fluid flow-rate controller is also switched to manual control to improve flow stability. This procedure leaves the heater temperature as the only variable in the system. The heater is thus forced to always operate near the middle of its control range, with a continuous requirement for added heat. Some experience with the fluid loop is needed by the test operator, in order to judge the amount of cooling to use at various operating temperatures.

Examples of the fluid flow and temperature stability achieved can be seen in the test results section of this report.

## **References**

Solar Thermal Test Facility, 1992. NSSTF OP #038, *Operating Procedure for AZTRAK Rotating Platform*. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories, Div. 6215.

Solar Thermal Test Facility, 1992. NSSTF OP #039 *Operating Procedure for High Temperature Fluid Loop*. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories, Div. 6215.

## APPENDIX B

# Test Instrumentation

### Data Acquisition System

The data acquisition system used was based upon a Hewlett Packard 9845B desktop computer. Instrumentation channels were scanned with an HP3497A data acquisition unit, and the analog signals were then measured with an HP3456A digital voltmeter. The accuracy of the voltmeter is better than 0.01%. Voltage measurements were converted to engineering units, recorded on a hard disk, and selected data items were printed and displayed for the test operator. Each day's data file was later transferred to floppy disk for permanent archive. Data was normally measured and recorded at 15 - 20 second intervals during a test.

Table B-1 lists the test data items included in the data files, the transducer used to measure the item, and the data acquisition system channel numbers used for the measurements.

### Heat Transfer Fluid Flow

Both domestic water and Dow Corning's Syltherm®-800 were used as heat transfer fluids. Fluid flow was measured by two Flow Technology turbine flow meters installed near the collector fluid inlet. Flow Technology Pulse Rate Converters were used to convert the voltage pulses from the flow meters to a 0-5 volt signal, which was then read by the data acquisition system. When high temperature Syltherm®-800 oil was being used, an additional two flow meters measured the oil flow leaving the fluid loop skid. Calibration of these flow meters was performed by Flow Technology immediately before beginning the test series, and their calibration was confirmed to be within 1% by timing and weighing the flow into a 30 gal bucket during the water tests.

### Fluid Property Calculations

Equations for the properties of water were obtained by polynomial fits to data from Keenan & Keyes (Ref. 1). Sufficient terms were included to provide agreement within 0.2% over the range of temperatures used.

Equations for the properties of Syltherm®-800 heat transfer fluid were supplied by Dow Corning (Ref. 2). Accuracy of these equations is not specified. Density, specific heat, viscosity, and Reynolds number were calculated for each flow measurement data point. All the calculated data was recorded as part of the collected test data.

### Temperature

Performance data was measured using type T thermocouples. To obtain the best accuracy possible, a number of type T thermocouples were compared by Sandia's Standards Lab; two pairs were selected from the lot which were within 0.1°C over the temperature range 0 to 400 °C. These two pairs were used to determine the input and output temperatures of the heat transfer fluid. An additional thermocouple was installed at the flow meters for temperature input to fluid property calculations.

## Tracking Angle

Tracking angle is the rotation angle of the collector's aim point above the local horizon that is necessary to focus on the sun. Collector elevation tracking angle was measured with a Lucas Shaevitz mass-balance inclinometer mounted on the collector. The resolution of the inclinometer is 0.1 arc second. Linearity of the instrument is 0.05%.

The azimuth tracking angle of the AZTRAK platform (which determines the azimuth angle of the collector rotational axis) is controlled by a microcomputer as required by an individual test objective. The angle was measured by a 10-bit BEI optical shaft encoder, which has a resolution of 0.35 degrees. Calculated azimuth and elevation of the sun, calculated tracking and incident angles, and measured collector positions were included in the data files.

## Weather data

Solar energy input to the collector was measured with an Eppley Normal Incidence Pyrheliometer calibrated against a Kendall secondary standard, active cavity radiometer. Accuracy of the pyrheliometer is 1 - 2%, including uncorrected temperature effects. Wind speed and direction at the test site was measured by a Weathertronics instrument, located at 10 m elevation about 30 m west of the installed collector. Ambient air temperature was measured with a type T thermocouple in a shaded enclosure.

## References

Keenan, J H., Keys, F. G., Hill, J. G., Moore, J. G. 1978. *Steam Tables*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

*Properties of Syltherm 800 Heat Transfer Liquid*. Midland, Michigan: Dow Corning Corporation, 1985.

## APPENDIX B

**Table B-1**  
**DATA MENU FOR IST ON AZTRAK PLATFORM**

Menu	Chan	S/C	#	#	#	Transdu	Description	(Units)
401							Test system number	(#5, IST trough on Aztrak)
402						Clock	Date of test	(Menu revised 29 Nov 93)
403						Clock	Mountain Standard Time	(HH:MM:SS)
404						Calc	Site Solar time	(HH:MM:SS)
405						Calc	Collector solar time	(HH:MM:SS)
406	021	S01C01				NIP	Direct normal insolation	(W/m <sup>2</sup> )
407	372	S23C12				TCamb	Ambient air temperature	(Deg C)
408	023	S01C03				WS100	Wind speed	(m/s)
409	024	S01C04				WD100	Wind direction	(degrees CW from North)
410	305	S20C05				AZ100	Platform Azimuth	(Degrees from South, +East, -West)
411	306	S20C06				FT100	Collector flow #1	(L/min)
412	307	S20C07				FT101	Collector flow #2	(L/min)
413	308	S20C08				FIC 1A	Fluid loop high flow	(L/min)
414	309	S20C09				FIC 1B	Fluid loop Low flow	(L/min)
415	310	S20C10				IN100	Inclinometer Voltage	(Volts)
416	311	S20C11				IN100	Collector elevation Inclinometer	(Deg above horizon)
417	312	S20C12				PDI 6	Collector delta pressure	(kPa)
418	313	S20C13				PI3	Collector Inlet pressure	(kPa)
419	314	S20C14				Manual	Water / Oil Test?	1 = Water, 0 = Oil
420	315	S20C15				Spare		
421	316					Calc.	Mass Flow #2	(kg/hr)
422	317					Calc.	Efficiency (#470) corrected for end loss	(%)
423	318	S20C18				TC1/10	Collector Diff. Delta-T Volts #1	(TC 01/TC 10) (mv)
424	319	S20C19				TC2/09	Collector Diff. Delta-T Volts #2	(TC 02/TC 09) (mv)
425	360	S23C00				TC001	Collector inlet temperature #1	(Deg C)
426	361	S23C01				TC002	Collector inlet temperature #2	(Deg C)
427	362	S23C02				TC003	Spare T-Type Thermocouple #3	(Deg C)
428	363	S23C03				TC004	Spare T-Type Thermocouple #4	(Deg C)
429	364	S23C04				TC005	Spare T-Type Thermocouple #5	(Deg C)
430	365	S23C05				TC006	Spare T-Type Thermocouple #6	(Deg C)
431	366	S23C06				TC007	Spare T-Type Thermocouple #7	(Deg C)
432	367	S23C07				TC008	Flowmeter temperature	(Deg C)
433	368	S23C08				TC009	Collector Outlet temperature #2	(Deg C)
434	369	S23C09				TC010	Collector Outlet temperature #1	(Deg C)
435						Calc.	Average Receiver Temperature	(TC #1) (Deg C)
436						Calc.	Average Receiver Temp above ambient	(TC #1) (Deg C)
437						Calc.	Solar azimuth	(Degrees from South, +East, -West)
438						Calc.	Solar elevation	(degrees above horizon)
439						Calc.	Solar Incident angle	(degrees from normal)
440						Calc.	Solar tracking angle	(degrees above horizon)
441						Calc.	Collector delta-T	(Diff. dT #1) (TC 01/10)(Deg C)
442						Calc.	Collector delta-T	(Sub. dT #1) (TC 01/10)(Deg C)
443						Calc.	Mass flow #1	(@ Flowmeter temp) (kg/hr)
444						Calc.	Heat gain (Flow #1)	(Diff. dT #1) (TC 01/10)(W/m <sup>2</sup> )

**Table B-1 (Continued)**  
**DATA MENU FOR IST ON AZTRAK PLATFORM**

Menu	Chan	Slot					
#	#	#	Transdu	Description			(Units)
445			Calc.	Heat gain (Flow #1)	(Sub. dT #1)	(TC 01/10)	(W/m <sup>2</sup> )
446			Calc.	Efficiency (Flow #1)	(Diff. dT #1)	(TC 01/10)	(%)
447			Calc.	Efficiency (Flow #1)	(Sub. dT #1)	(TC 01/10)	(%)
448			Calc	Density of Heat Transfer Fluid			kg/m <sup>3</sup> )
449			Calc.	Specific Heat of Heat Transfer Fluid			(J/kg °C)
450			Calc.	Viscosity of Heat Transfer Fluid			(N sec/m <sup>2</sup> )
451			Calc.	Reynolds Number, Collector HTF flow			(Thousands)
452			Calc.	Mirror Aperture of Collector under test			(m <sup>2</sup> )
453	380	S24	Calc.	Cosine of Incident Angle			
454	381	S24	Calc.	Absolute value of Incident Angle			(Deg)
455	382	S24	Calc.	Efficiency (Flow #1)	(Sub. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)	(%)
456	383	S24	Calc.	Efficiency (Flow #2)	(Sub. dT #1)	(TC 01/10)	(%)
457	384	S24		Spare			
458	385	S24	Calc.	Heat Gain (Flow #2)	(Sub. dT #1)	(TC 01/10)(W/m <sup>2</sup> )	
459	386	S24	Calc.	Heat Gain (Flow #1)	(Sub. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)(W/m <sup>2</sup> )	
460	387	S24		Spare			
461	388	S24	TC019	Collector Outlet Temp - K TC # 9			(Deg C)
462	389	S24	TC020	Syltherm tank Sight Gage TC - Bottom			(Deg C)
463	390	S24	TC021	Syltherm tank Sight Gage TC - Mid			(Deg C)
464	391	S24	TC022	Loop Cooling Water - Output temp			(Deg C)
465			Calc.	Collector delta-T	(Diff. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)(Deg C)	
466			Calc.	Collector delta-T	(Sub. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)(Deg C)	
467			Calc.	Heat gain (Flow #2)	(Diff. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)(W/m <sup>2</sup> )	
468			Calc.	Heat gain (Flow #2)	(Sub. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)(W/m <sup>2</sup> )	
469			Calc.	Efficiency (Flow #2)	(Diff. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)	(%)
470			Calc.	Efficiency (Flow #2)	(Sub. dT #2)	(TC 02/09)	(%)
471			Calc.	Tracking Error - (#440 - # 416)			(Deg)
472			Calc.	Efficiency (#447, corrected for end loss)			(%)

## **APPENDIX B**

Intentionally Left Blank

**APPENDIX C**

**TEST PLAN**

## APPENDIX C

Intentionally Left Blank

## TEST PROCEDURES

The operating characteristics of a concentrating parabolic trough solar collector can be determined with only a few selected tests. These are:

- Measure peak efficiency at near-ambient-air temperature.
- Measure peak efficiency at several elevated temperatures.
- Measure receiver thermal loss as a function of temperature.
- Measure collector performance as a function of incident angle.

Peak efficiency of a concentrating solar collector can be determined only when the solar beam incident angle is zero. For single-axis tracking devices such as the IST parabolic trough collector, zero incident angles usually occur only once per day if the rotational axis is oriented East-West; or twice per day if the axis is oriented North-South. To allow continuous testing at any desired incident angle, the test collector was mounted on the AZTRAK rotating platform. For details on this device, see Appendix B.

All the calculations for heat gain or loss from an operating hot fluid system assume that the system is in thermal equilibrium -- constant fluid flow-rate, and constant input and output temperatures. If equilibrium has not been established, then heat is either being stored in the mass of the system, or heat is being extracted from the system. In either case, calculations of heat gain or loss will be inaccurate. Because of the absolute necessity for highly stable flow and temperatures, a special hot-fluid supply source was used for the IST collector tests. For details on the Sandia high-temperature fluid loop, see Appendix B.

Even with a stable temperature source, long operating times are still necessary before all parts of the heated system are at their equilibrium temperatures. Time to reach temperature stability was longer than normal for the IST collector as installed for testing because an inner plug tube had to be inserted inside the receiver tube. The internal plug was necessary to restrict flow to a small annulus in order to achieve acceptable Reynolds numbers with the fluid flow-rates that are available from the test fluid loop. The internal plug was filled with the heat transfer fluid, but was closed at one end; so the internal fluid mass was heated only by conduction from the outer annulus. After about an hour at a given temperature setpoint, the system would stabilize to variations on the order of 0.1 °C. Heat gain/loss measurements were then deemed stable enough to be believed, and a data set was recorded for a time equal to about three collector time-constants.

### Peak Efficiency Measurements

Measurements of zero-incident-angle efficiency were made with the heat-transfer fluid at approximately ambient-air temperature, and at approximately 50 °C intervals up to 300 °C. Data was continuously recorded at 15-20 sec intervals while the system was in operation. In order to establish temperature stability, the system was operated at each fixed temperature until the stability objectives below were attained. Achieving this level of temperature stability usually required an hour or more. Operation was then continued at stable temperatures and flow rates to

## APPENDIX C

obtain a reportable data point. Each data point listed in the data tables in Appendix D and shown in the performance figures is the mean of all data measured over a time span of about three collector time-constants. For examples of collected data sets, see Figures 1-3 in Appendix F. The objective of each data set was to obtain stability of all variables that could cause significant changes in the desired measurements. The stability objectives were:

- Fluid temperatures constant to about 0.1 °C.
- Fluid flow-rate constant to about 0.2 L/min.
- Insolation constant to about 1%.

Performance measurements made within the system stability limits listed above produce data that is repeatable from day to day, with the magnitude of instability induced errors that are less than those produced by the instruments in the data acquisition system. The same stability criterion was applied to all data measurements made on the collector under test.

The near-ambient-air temperature measurement using cold water was used to define the approximate optical efficiency of the collector. The higher-temperature efficiency measurements document the decrease in efficiency caused by increasing thermal losses as the operating temperature is increased. Data from all of the efficiency measurements were used in a least-squares curve fit to obtain a performance equation of efficiency vs. temperature under bright sunshine, zero incident angle, stable temperature and flow conditions. The equation fitted to the data is normally a second order polynomial, which is not an exact physical model of the collector, but will correctly represent the measured performance data.

$$\eta = A + B (dT) + C (dT)^2 \quad (1)$$

Where:

$\eta$  = Efficiency of collector

A = Optical efficiency of collector

B = Coefficient for linear term

C = Coefficient for non-linear term

$dT$  = Average receiver fluid temperature above ambient air temperature

### Procedure for Efficiency Measurement (Elevated Temperature)

The objective of these tests was documenting changes in efficiency as operating temperature increases. Inlet temperature to the collector was set to a constant value, such that the output temperature would approximate the desired test temperature. The exact temperature achieved was not important; but temperature stability was extremely important during these tests.

Heat-transfer fluid flow was set to a constant value (usually the maximum obtainable for these tests). As for temperature, the exact flow-rate value was not very important; but flow stability was extremely important, because any change in fluid flow-rate would also cause changes in collector temperatures.

For the series of peak efficiency measurements, it is highly desirable for all the measurements to be made at the same level of solar irradiance. If the individual efficiency test points are obtained with a solar irradiance that differs more than about  $100 \text{ W/m}^2$  between points, data extrapolation to other operational conditions will be less accurate. The solar irradiance levels during the efficiency tests should also be as high as are available at the test site, and constant in level to about 1% during an individual test point. This last requirement essentially eliminates very-early-morning and late-afternoon efficiency tests. These hours are more profitably used for thermal loss testing.

### **Procedure for Efficiency Measurement (Near-Ambient-Air Temperature)**

The objective of this test was determination of approximate optical efficiency for the IST collector. True optical efficiency could be measured only if thermal losses from the collector system could be reduced to zero. Zero thermal loss probably cannot be achieved during an in-focus test of a real solar collector. However, a reasonable attempt can be made by operating the system at a low temperature as close as possible to the ambient air temperature.

Since the oil-supply fluid loop could not be operated at temperatures much below  $60^\circ\text{C}$ , another source of heat-transfer fluid was needed. City water from local supply mains was used; see Appendix B for a description of the water supply system. Note that water flow was restricted to the collector only; no water was introduced into the oil supply system.

Ideally, water flow through the system would be adjusted such that the average temperature of the collector's receiver was approximately equal to local ambient air temperature. Because of the limited flow-rates and temperatures of the available water, this was not always possible. We used the closest approximation obtainable.

Two test results were needed from the tests performed with cool water:

1. Peak efficiency at zero incident angle.
2. Efficiency variation with incident angles up to about 60 degrees.

Given a cloud-free sky; data satisfying both test criteria can be obtained during a single test day.

### **Incident Angle Modifier Tests**

The object of the incident angle modifier test was to document changes in operating efficiency as a function of incident angle. Measured efficiency of a parabolic trough collector decreases as the solar beam incident angle increases; with collector efficiency at a maximum only when the incident angle is zero. The decrease in collector efficiency with increasing incident angle is nearly proportional to the cosine of the incident angle. Efficiency data was usually measured at five degree intervals from zero to 60 degrees incident angle. The AZTRAK rotating platform was used to maintain each selected constant incident angle for as long as necessary to obtain stable data. The incident angle modifier K was defined as the ratio of the measured efficiency at a given

## APPENDIX C

incident angle to the measured efficiency at a zero incident angle. A regression analysis of the data was then used to obtain an equation of the form:

$$K = \cos(A) - B(A) - C(A)^2 \quad (2)$$

Where:

K = Incident angle modifier, value ranges from 0 to 1  
A = Solar beam incident angle (0 to 60 degrees)  
B = Coefficient for linear term  
C = Coefficient for non-linear term

As noted in the previous section, incident angle data was measured with cold water as the heat-transfer fluid, in conjunction with testing for optical efficiency.

If the collector and the sun-tracking system were perfectly symmetrical, the incident angle modifier would be the same for both positive and negative incident angles. As installed at Sandia for testing, the IST collector module was not exactly symmetrical because of a small shadowed area at one end of the receiver caused by the cable drive wheel. With zero or positive incident angles, the drive wheel shadow was not on the reflector. At negative incident angles, the shadow became a larger and larger fraction of the illuminated receiver length as the angle increased. This non-symmetrical behavior was peculiar to the test installation, and was not representative of a full collector field. Because of the drive wheel's open construction, the resulting shadow was not very dense, and was not expected to have a major effect.

When a beam of sunlight falls on a collector mirror at other than zero incident angle, the reflected beam will not fully illuminate the length of the receiver. The non-illuminated length 'x' is dependent on the reflector focal length 'f' and the incident angle 'Ia' of the sunlight:

$$x = f \tan(Ia) \quad (3)$$

The missing sunlight is usually called 'end loss', and is one of the factors that reduce the efficiency of a row of parabolic trough collectors with increasing incident angle. A row of IST collectors in a field installation would be 4 to 6 times the 6.1 meter length of the test collector module, resulting in an end loss of about 1-2% at high incident angles. However, during an incident angle performance test of a single 6 m module, the end loss of the test module would be on the order of 21% at 60 degree incident angles. When calculating collector efficiency for the incident angle tests in this report, end loss was corrected such that the collector appeared to be of infinite length.

Incident angle test data obtained is shown in Appendix D.

### Thermal Loss Tests

The objective of the thermal loss test series was determination of steady-state heat losses from the collector receiver as a function of operating temperature. Good thermal loss data is more difficult to obtain than heat gain (efficiency) data, because the fluid temperature change through the collector receiver is smaller by as much as an order of magnitude. But the measuring instrument

errors, temperature instabilities and flow variations remain about the same, therefore the possible errors in the thermal loss measurements are larger.

The three components of thermal loss (conduction, convection and radiation losses) are changed in different ways depending on the receiver's configuration and operating conditions. When a vacuum is present in the annulus between the receiver surface and the glass envelope, conduction and convection across the annulus are effectively eliminated. When air is introduced into the vacuum space, measured losses increase significantly as conduction and convection begin to transfer heat to the glass envelope. Radiation loss from the heated receiver's metal surface to the glass envelope is not changed very much by the presence of air in the annulus. The IST collector design tested does not incorporate a vacuum receiver, although such a receiver is being designed for future use.

Since the glass receiver envelope is opaque to the infra-red radiation from the receiver surface, all three loss components serve to transfer heat from the receiver surface to the glass envelope. A second loss series then transfers heat by convection and conduction from the glass to the ambient air, and by radiation to the sky. Presence of an anti-reflective coating on the receiver glass will change the amount of concentrated visible light passing through the glass during in-focus operation. The coating should not normally change the thermal loss characteristics of the receiver.

Surface temperature of the glass is significantly lower than the receiver's metal surface. If the glass envelope is removed, conduction and convection losses to the ambient air will be greatly enhanced, and wind effects will be much larger. (See Ref. 4, SAND94-1884) Radiation losses will also increase when the glass is removed because the higher temperature metal surfaces now radiate directly to the sky.

Thermal loss from radiation effects is a problem for solar collector testing, because radiation loss is not necessarily dependent on ambient air temperature in the same way as conduction and convection losses. Some of the heat radiated by the collector's receiver is focused back in the direction the reflector is aimed, so temperature of the aim point becomes a factor in the radiation loss.

The temperature of the ground surface or other nearby objects is certain to be different (usually higher) than the sky temperature. Since the collector is always aimed at the sky when in operation, only a sky aim-point is suitable for reasonably accurate test results. The effective sky temperature is also changed by the presence of clouds; thermal loss tests made with an overcast sky show lower losses than those made with a clear sky. For our test purposes, the sky temperature was unknown, but is probably always lower than the ambient air temperature around the collector. A true measure of receiver thermal loss with zero contribution due to direct or scattered light absorption by the receiver can be obtained by aiming the reflector at a clear sky, at night. Other tests have also shown that an approximately equivalent thermal loss value occurs during more normal daylight hours when the receiver is shaded from direct sunlight and the reflector is aimed at a clear sky. (See Ref. 1, SAND 83-0984).

## APPENDIX C

The receiver must be shaded from direct sunlight because the receiver surface would absorb energy equivalent to that from a non-concentrating collector with an aperture area equal to that of the receiver surface. This small amount of absorbed energy is not negligible when compared to the receiver thermal loss. Receiver shading must be done in such a way that there is no change in the receiver's view angle to the sky, or radiation losses will be changed.

The measured temperature drop across the receiver can be quite small during some loss tests (less than one degree C for the IST receiver). A test operator may therefore wish to reduce fluid flow rates from normal in-focus flow values in order to increase the delta-temperature. However, changing fluid flow will introduce another measurement error, because fluid pressure drop across the receiver is converted to heat, which tends to cancel some part of the thermal loss. Therefore, for minimum thermal loss measurement error, the same fluid flow rates used for efficiency testing should also be used during loss tests. In this respect, the IST tests at Sandia do not exactly reproduce thermal losses of this collector in a field installation, because fluid flow rate was not exactly the same, and receiver configuration was not the same (added plug tube inside the receiver). Both these receiver changes could change fluid pressure drop through the receiver.

Thermal loss from the IST collector receiver was measured at approximately the same temperatures used for peak efficiency measurements. As in all the tests, an exact value of temperature was not important; stability of fluid temperature and flow rate were the most important criteria for the test. The following test conditions were established for the loss tests:

- Clear or nearly clear sky.
- Collector defocused.
- Receiver shaded, reflector aimed at the sky.
- Losses measured at approx. 50 °C intervals, 60-300 °C.
- At each temperature, the system was operated until temperatures were stable to within about 0.1 °C over a measurement period equal to about three receiver time constants. At least one hour was usually required to achieve temperature stability.

Upon completion of the thermal loss tests, the measured data is used in a least-squares regression analysis to obtain a second-order-polynomial curve fit to the data. As for the efficiency data, the equation obtained is not an exact physical model of the receiver, but is an empirical fit to the experimental data.

$$Q_L = A + B (dT) + C (dT)^2 \quad (4)$$

Where:

$Q_L$  = Thermal loss from receiver,  $\text{W/m}^2$  of aperture area

$A$  = Constant, normally approximately zero

$B$  = Coefficient for linear term

$C$  = Coefficient for non-linear term

$dT$  = Average receiver fluid temperature above ambient air temperature, °C

## Test Data Analysis

Figure C-1 illustrates some of the factors that result in the operating heat gain (or efficiency) of a solar collector. By measuring collector efficiency at a low enough temperature, thermal losses will be reduced to zero (or at least a very small value), and we can determine the approximate optical efficiency. At any given higher operating temperature, we should be able to measure total thermal losses, subtract these losses from the heat gain at optical efficiency, and end up with the operating heat gain at the new temperature. Or alternatively, we should be able to measure heat gain (efficiency) at some high temperature, and derive the losses by the decrease in heat gain from that expected at optical efficiency. We will soon find out that the real collector is not that simple.

Figure C-2 shows what actually happens when we make some loss measurements. Measured thermal loss in Figure C-2 is that measured with the receiver shaded, at approximately zero incident sunlight. The "in-focus" curve is derived by calculating the heat gain difference between the operating efficiency and the measured optical efficiency. In Figure C-2, the in-focus loss resulted from tests at an average value of  $960 \text{ W/m}^2$  insolation. Tests at other insolation values result in different in-focus loss curves. Tests that were done over a large range of incident solar irradiance have shown that the operating thermal loss scales approximately linearly between zero and  $1000 \text{ W/m}^2$  insolation. (See Ref. 1)

During a thermal loss test, the receiver is shaded from direct sunlight, and the receiver surfaces are slightly cooler than the heat-transfer oil inside the receiver pipe. When the collector is in focus, the receiver surfaces are hotter than the oil inside the receiver. The surface temperature differences scale approximately linearly with the value of incident insolation, and since thermal losses depend on the surface temperature, this is the cause of the in-focus loss differences outlined above. We can take advantage of linear loss scaling with insolation to calculate the performance of the collector at any value of insolation. For example, the in-focus thermal loss at  $480 \text{ W/m}^2$  insolation would be half way between the out-of-focus curve and the  $960 \text{ W/m}^2$  in-focus curve in Figure C-2. For an accurate prediction of total solar field heat output, solar irradiance changes must be considered, since insolation changes by about a factor of three on nearly every day the field is in operation.

Table C-1 below shows a sample calculation of collector heat gain and efficiency at  $300^\circ\text{C}$  and  $960 \text{ W/m}^2$  insolation, first using the in-focus loss equation from Figure C-2, and then the equation from measured loss at zero insolation. The calculation was then repeated for  $480$  and  $300 \text{ W/m}^2$  insolation. Since  $480 \text{ W/m}^2$  insolation is half way between the two loss curves in Figure C-2, in-focus loss was also calculated as exactly half way between the two curves.

The table illustrates that collector heat gain and efficiency change with insolation even if the receiver surface temperatures are not considered. With a constant thermal loss at any given temperature, and a decreasing heat gain with decreasing insolation, collector efficiency must fall with decreasing insolation. In either case, there is some relatively low value of insolation where the heat gained in focus is equal to the ongoing thermal loss, and the collector efficiency is zero. Changes in surface temperature with insolation just operate to lower the efficiency below what would otherwise be expected from out-of-focus, zero insolation, measured thermal losses.

## APPENDIX C




Figure C-1. Ideal Receiver Heat Gain and Losses




Figure C-2. IST In-Focus Thermal Loss—Black Chrome/Pyrex Receiver

## APPENDIX C

Note that linear scaling between in-focus and out-of-focus loss curves has been confirmed only for collector designs that are not sensitive to changes in solar spectrum with insolation. This appears to be approximately true for aluminum and silver reflectors, Pyrex glass receiver envelopes, and black receivers; such as the IST collector design. Changes of in-focus thermal loss may scale differently for other collectors, such as a Fresnel lens concentrator.

**Table C-1**  
**Changes in Efficiency With Insolation**

Direct Normal Insolation W/m <sup>2</sup>	Optical Efficiency %	Optical Heat Gain W/m <sup>2</sup>	Measured Heat Loss @ 300 °C W/m <sup>2</sup>	In-focus loss @ 300 °C W/m <sup>2</sup>	Calculated Heat Gain W/m <sup>2</sup>	Calculated Efficiency %
960	70.17	673.6		216.5	457.1	47.6
960	70.17	673.6	191.7		481.9	50.2
480	70.17	336.8		204.1	132.7	27.6
480	70.17	336.8	191.7		145.1	30.2
300	70.17	210.5		199.45	11.1	3.7
300	70.17	210.5	191.7		18.8	6.3

To derive a performance equation for a tested collector, calculations similar to the above table were made to generate a large matrix of insolation, operating temperature, and heat gain. A multiple linear regression of the data table then produces a heat gain equation of the following form:

$$Q = A(I) - B(I)(\Delta T) - C(\Delta T) - D(\Delta T^2) \quad (5)$$

Where:

$Q$  = Operating heat gain (W/m<sup>2</sup>) at zero incident angle

$\Delta T$  = Average fluid temperature (°C) above ambient air temperature

$I$  = Direct normal insolation (W/m<sup>2</sup>)

For the IST collector tests, equation (5) should be valid for operating temperatures from ambient to about 350 °C, and for direct insolation values from zero to about 1100 W/m<sup>2</sup>.

Equation (5) is valid only at zero incident angle. An incident angle modifier term must be added to obtain collector heat gain at any other incident angle. Since the end effect of incident angle is to reduce the value of insolation arriving at the receiver absorber surface, the incident angle modifier,  $K$ , can be applied to the insolation in the first two terms of equation (5):

$$Q = K[A(I) - B(I)(\Delta T)] - C(\Delta T) - D(\Delta T^2) \quad (6)$$

When the heat gain from equation (6) is divided by the incident insolation, the result is an efficiency equation for the collector. The equation should be valid over the full expected range of operating temperature, insolation, and incident angles.

$$\eta = K [A - B(\Delta T)] - C(\Delta T/I) - D(\Delta T^2/I) \quad (7)$$

Equations (5), (6), and (6) are not complete physical models of the collector; rather they are empirical fits to experimental data. Equations like (7) have been used to predict all-day, steady state thermal output from small solar collector fields; the predictions were within about 1% of actual measurements. (See Ref. 2 and 3). Note that the equation is valid only for the collector itself, and only for steady state operation. Other calculations must be made to include the thermal mass and heat capacity of the collector field and other equipment. Including all equipment is necessary if the result is to correctly reflect the collector field during warm-up and the temperature variations of a typical intermittently cloudy day.

Because the test at Sandia included only a single collector module, the added thermal loss from any field interconnecting fluid pipe is also not included in Equation (7).

Figure C-3 shows Equation (7) for the IST collector, with a silver film mirror and black nickel/solgel glass receiver, at a zero incident angle. Collector efficiency decreases along a hyperbolic path as insolation is reduced, and along a quadratic polynomial path with increases in temperature. A small "floor" area is visible, where heat gain is zero or negative. The floor defines combinations of temperature and insolation where positive heat gain is not possible. For another way to show the same equation for a more limited range of insolation, see Figures 6 and 7 in the introduction to this report.

Figure C-4 illustrates the same collector equation, but now for an incident angle of 50 degrees, which would occur in mid-December for a North-South IST collector field.

## References

Dudley, V. E., and Workhoven, R. M., 1982. SAND81-0984, *Performance Testing of the Solar Kinetics T-700 Solar Collector*. Albuquerque, N. M.: Sandia National Laboratories.

Cameron, C. P., and Dudley, V. E., 1986. SAND85-2316, *Acurex Solar Corporation Modular Industrial Solar Retrofit Qualification Test Results*. Albuquerque, N. M.: Sandia National Laboratories.

Cameron, C. P., and Dudley, V. E., 1986. SAND85-2320, *Solar Kinetics, Incorporated Modular Industrial Solar Retrofit Qualification Test Results*. Albuquerque, N. M.: Sandia National Laboratories.

Dudley, V. E., Kolb, G. J., Sloan, M., and Kearney, D. 1994. SAND94-1884, *Test Results: SEGS LS-2 Solar Collector*. Albuquerque, N. M.: Sandia National Laboratories.

## APPENDIX C

$$Eff = 76.25 - 0.00684 (dT) - 14.68 (dT/I) - 0.1672 (dT^2/I)$$




Figure C-3. IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Glass at Zero Incident Angle




Figure C-4. IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Glass at 50 Deg Incident Angle

## APPENDIX C

Intentionally Left Blank

**APPENDIX D**

**TEST RESULTS**

## **APPENDIX D**

**Intentionally Left Blank**

# TEST RESULTS

## Introduction

Initial testing of the IST collector module was done with a 3M SA-85™ aluminized-film reflector. After a few days of initial checkout testing, concentrated light spilling past the receiver made it obvious that the mirror was not focusing well on one end of the receiver tube. When the reflector is viewed in the focal plane from a long distance, the black image of the receiver should appear to fill the entire reflector. In this case, about 10% of the reflector area was not focused on the receiver. The unfocused mirror appears as white areas in a photograph (see Figure D-1); the black area is the magnified image of the black chrome receiver. Inspection of this area of the reflector revealed a buckle running diagonally across the mirror, apparently due to damage by wind loads after installation. The reflector was not field repairable, so it was replaced by another reflector using 3M ECP-305™ silvered acrylic film. Except for Table 1, all the data reported here was obtained using the silver-film reflector assembly.

For field installations, IST uses heat-transfer fluid flow-rates that are much higher than is possible with the fluid system available at the Sandia test site. To promote turbulent flow within the receiver with our maximum 50 liters/minute flow rate, a closed-end, 31.75 mm diameter plug tube was installed within the IST receiver. This plug tube confined the fluid flow to a narrow annulus next to the heated surface. Figure D-2 shows the Reynolds numbers attained with the test setup as a function of the fluid temperature.


The first receiver installed for testing used a black chrome selective surface, and was enclosed in a solgel anti-reflective coated glass envelope. Air at ambient atmospheric pressure filled the space between the glass and the receiver surface. This receiver was used with both the aluminized film reflector and the silver film reflector.

Initial testing was done with cold domestic water as the heat transfer fluid. These tests were made to obtain the approximate optical efficiency of the collector, and to measure the change in performance of the collector as the incident angle was increased from zero to 60 degrees. After completing tests with the solgel anti-reflective glass receiver envelope, testing was repeated using a conventional borosilicate Pyrex® glass receiver envelope to access how much improvement is realized by anti-reflective coating the glass.

After testing was completed with the black chrome receiver tube, it was replaced with another receiver tube with a black nickel selective coating. All the black nickel tests were done with the original solgel glass receiver envelope.

Included with each data point in the data tables below is the estimated error in collector efficiency or thermal loss. The error shown includes estimates of calibration (bias) error and data scatter (statistical) error; these errors are discussed further in Appendix F.

## APPENDIX D



**Figure D-1. IST Collector on AZTRAK Rotating Platform**




Figure D-2. Reynolds Number vs Temperature

## APPENDIX D

### Receiver Response Time

Two tests were made to determine the receiver response time, i.e., the time required for the system to stabilize after a step change in heat input. Figure D-3 shows the receiver efficiency and heat gain as the collector was placed into focus. Figure D-4 was obtained as the collector was defocused. In both cases the heat transfer fluid was cold water at near-ambient air temperatures. The tests illustrated in the figures were done with the original aluminum reflector; later tests with the silver mirror produced somewhat higher final efficiencies, but did not appreciably change the time constant. The receiver's response to a large ( $\sim 930 \text{ W/m}^2$ ) step change in insolation was substantially complete within two minutes.

For the data included in this report, the system was operated for approximately one hour at each test temperature, until fluid flow and all temperatures were stabilized. To obtain a reportable data point, data collection was then accomplished for a minimum of three time constants, while maintaining stable flow and temperatures. An example of a data run is shown in Appendix F, Table F-1.

### Efficiency Tests With Black Chrome Receiver

Testing began with an aluminum-film mirror and cold domestic water as the heat transfer fluid. After only a few days during the setup and checkout period, efficiency was found to have decreased, as mentioned in the introduction to this section. Some data was obtained during initial checkout, and is given in Table D-1 below.

**Table D-1**  
**Measured Efficiency Test Data**

**Black Chrome Selective Coating, Solgel Coated Glass, Aluminum Film Reflector**

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Wind speed m/sec	Air Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/min	Meas Effic %	Est Error ±%
14/05	916.2	3.5	21.1	21.7	27.1	3.32	21.3	66.15	3.09

The 66.1% optical efficiency obtained in this test is approximately what would be expected from a mirror of 0.84 reflectivity, so this test point is believed to represent the undamaged mirror. The damaged reflector was not repairable; it was replaced with a silver-film mirror for continued testing.

Testing continued using the silver-film reflector and the original black chrome receiver. Five peak efficiency test points were obtained in four test days; these are shown in Table D-2. The average near-optical efficiency using anti-reflective receiver glass with a black chrome receiver and silver film reflector was 74.06%, measured with the average receiver fluid temperature at 1.2 °C above ambient-air temperature.




Figure D-3. IST Receiver Time Constant to In-focus

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-4. IST Receiver Time Constant to Out-of-focus

**Table D-2**  
**Measured Efficiency Test Data**

**Black Chrome Selective Coating, Solgel Coated Glass, Silver Film Reflector**

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Wind speed m/sec	Air Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/min	Meas. Effic. %	Est. Error ±%
11/08	962.4	3.7	31.9	30.06	35.51	0.91	24.7	73.40	3.28
11/08	941.0	3.1	32.9	30.05	35.35	-0.22	24.9	73.76	3.37
12/08	942.3	2.4	32.9	30.14	35.56	-0.09	24.8	74.81	3.32
23/08	977.7	0.1	28.3	29.05	34.60	3.52	24.8	74.12	3.26
24/08	981.9	1.8	30.3	29.34	34.91	1.82	24.9	74.20	3.26

After completing tests with the anti-reflective glass receiver envelope, tests were repeated using the conventional Pyrex® glass envelope. The black chrome receiver tube and silver film reflector were not changed. Four efficiency points were obtained in two days of cold water testing; these points are shown in Table D-3. Efficiency average with a plain glass receiver envelope was 70.33%, a decrease of 3.7 points, or about 5%. Receiver temperature during these tests averaged 4.4 °C above ambient air temperature.

On 3 Sept. 1993, an attempt was made to compare performance with clean and dirty mirrors. A recent high wind and dust, followed by light rain, had visibly coated the silver film reflector with dirt. The collector optical efficiency was first measured with the dirty reflector. After cleaning the reflector and receiver glass with deionized water, the efficiency was measured again. The efficiency difference was only about 1 percentage point, or about 1.4% degradation due to the dirty reflector.

Incident angle performance data was also obtained with both types of receiver glass on the black chrome receiver tube. The type of receiver glass appeared to make little difference. The measured incident angle modifier data points are shown later in this section, beginning at Table 7.

On 15 Sept., 1993, cold water plumbing was removed, and the system was replumbed to the high-temperature oil fluid loop for elevated temperature testing. Testing was then delayed for more than a month due to failure of the electric fluid-heater controller. After replacing the controller, 12 test points were obtained in five test days, covering the temperature range from approximately 100°C to nearly 330°C. These test data are included in Table D-3 and are shown in graphical form in Figure D-5.

An equation for the efficiency curve is also shown in Figure D-5. The equation was obtained from a second-order-polynomial least-squares regression of the data in Table D-3. The curve and the test data points show the expected decrease in collector efficiency due to increasing thermal losses from the heated receiver. Note that the efficiency equation is valid only at the average insolation present during the tests, as noted in the figure.

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-5. IST Efficiency—ECP-305/Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass

**Table D-3**  
**Measured Efficiency Test Data**

**Black Chrome Selective Coating, Pyrex™ Glass, Silver Film Reflector**

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Wind speed m/sec	Air Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/min	Meas. Effic. %	Est. Error ±%
25/08	940.7	1.8	31.4	29.25	34.40	5.16	24.7	71.07	3.31
25/08	936.0	2.1	29.6	29.18	34.26	2.11	24.6	70.20	3.26
03/09	987.1	0.1	25.4	27.88	33.23	5.14	24.6	69.93	3.22
03/09	991.2	0.3	25.4	27.93	33.31	5.20	24.6	70.10	3.12
20/10	995.1	2.9	11.8	100.20	107.38	91.94	48.2	67.01	2.54
20/10	1005.7	3.9	14.1	151.38	158.09	140.67	50.4	64.26	2.52
20/10	875.5	1.8	16.1	200.65	206.16	187.28	51.0	60.35	2.91
21/10	927.2	3.7	10.2	251.34	256.69	243.80	51.9	54.82	2.54
21/10	994.9	4.1	14.0	297.75	303.11	286.41	52.5	50.04	2.30
21/10	977.1	4.4	16.0	338.16	342.86	324.55	53.0	43.27	2.30
22/10	920.3	1.2	11.4	63.27	70.35	55.46	45.5	67.46	2.68
27/10	927.9	3.1	7.8	62.76	69.87	58.48	45.9	67.60	2.57
27/10	969.6	2.4	8.8	99.47	106.25	94.04	48.4	65.12	2.47
27/10	972.7	2.5	10.2	152.42	158.73	145.40	50.3	62.37	2.49
27/10	933.0	3.1	11.4	202.14	207.74	193.54	51.7	58.24	2.62
01/11	1001.3	1.5	15.5	298.57	303.95	285.73	52.3	49.73	2.28

Figure D-6 shows a comparison of the black chrome / solgel glass receiver with the black chrome / Pyrex® glass receiver. The curve for Pyrex® is the same one as in Figure D-5. Since only the optical efficiency was measured for the solgel configuration, elevated temperature data is not directly available for the comparison. Thermal loss measurements with the two different glass envelopes were essentially identical; see below. For the elevated temperature solgel efficiency curve in Figure D-6, we assume that the difference in efficiency for the two receiver configurations over this temperature range will remain approximately the same as the difference in optical efficiencies.

#### **Efficiency Tests With Black Nickel Receiver**

On completion of efficiency and thermal loss tests with the black chrome receiver, it was removed and replaced with a new receiver that had a black nickel selective coating. At the same time, the solgel anti-reflective coated receiver glass was installed, and the fluid plumbing was changed back to cold water. This collector configuration was of particular interest because it was to be used in a current solar field construction project.

Testing resumed on 19 Nov. 1993; two optical efficiency points are shown in Table D-4. Incident angle modifier data was obtained during the same test days; this data is covered later in this report. The black nickel receiver was visibly a deeper dull black than the black chrome, indicating

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-6. IST Black Chrome Efficiency Comparison - Solgel Glass/Pyrex Glass

a higher absorptivity. This observation was supported by the average 77.32% measured efficiency, 3.3 percentage points better than the black chrome/solgel receiver, or 4.4% improvement. Only about 2% difference was expected between black nickel and black chrome; however, the black chrome quality is quite sensitive to plating bath parameters, and may not have been an optimum coating. Later absorptivity and emittance measurements confirmed the lower than expected black chrome absorptivity. The black nickel / solgel configuration was also seven percentage points better than the black chrome / Pyrex® receiver, or a 10% improvement.

On 1 Dec. 1993, cold water plumbing was removed from the collector and hot oil plumbing replaced. Eight high temperature test points were obtained in three more test days, as shown below in Table D-4. These data points are also shown in Figure D-7; the plotted curve is from a least-squares polynomial fit to the data. Again note that the equation is valid only for insolatation values near the insolatation given in the figure.

Also shown in Figure D-7 is a curve for the black nickel / Pyrex glass configuration. Performance of this receiver configuration was measured with cold water, but was not directly measured at high temperature. As for the black chrome receiver, there should be no difference in the thermal loss characteristics of the two receiver glasses. The operating efficiency difference at temperature is assumed to be the same as the optical efficiency difference measured with cold water.

Finally, Figure D-8 summarizes the efficiency data for all four receiver configurations.

### Thermal Loss Tests -- Black Chrome

The difference in solar-averaged transmittance between the solgel anti-reflective glass and plain Pyrex glass receiver covers was not expected to change the measured thermal losses. The solgel coating process does not change the infrared transmittance of the glass; therefore, no loss measurements were made with the black chrome / solgel configuration. Concurrently with the black chrome / Pyrex efficiency testing at elevated temperatures, heat losses from the receiver assembly were also measured. Ten test points were obtained in five test days. The complete set of measured thermal loss data is shown in Table D-5, and a graph is shown in Figure D-9. A least-squares regression of the data in Table D-5 produced the equation shown in Figure D-9. For each black chrome efficiency data point in Table D-5, we can calculate the thermal loss required to lower the measured efficiency from the optical efficiency (first points in Table D-5) to the observed value at elevated temperature. These calculated "in-focus loss" points are also plotted in Figure D-9. Because the receiver surface temperatures are higher when concentrated sunlight is focused on the receiver, the in-focus losses are higher than the measured out-of-focus losses with no light on the receiver. Note that the in-focus losses are valid only at the value of insolatation present during the efficiency tests, because the receiver surface temperatures change with changes in insolatation. See Appendix C of this report for a discussion of in-focus losses and their use in deriving a general performance equation for the collector.

## APPENDIX D

**Table D-4**  
**Measured Efficiency Test Data**

**Black Nickel Selective Coating, Solgel Glass, Silver Film Reflector**

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Wind speed m/sec	Air Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/min	Meas. Effic. %	Est. Error ±%
19/11	856.4	0.5	4.3	16.47	22.06	14.94	22.4	77.52	3.81
19/11	924.3	5.7	9.4	18.60	25.73	12.81	19.1	77.13	3.12
01/12	907.5	2.0	5.5	61.36	69.33	59.83	44.3	73.44	2.73
01/12	957.9	2.3	6.7	98.82	106.45	95.89	48.0	70.95	2.65
01/12	966.7	5.6	9.7	150.82	157.91	144.65	50.2	67.43	2.93
01/12	939.8	5.8	10.2	200.93	207.44	193.96	51.7	63.97	2.71
01/12	902.5	5.1	10.8	249.00	254.95	241.13	52.3	59.29	2.84
02/12	904.4	2.6	10.1	298.15	303.80	290.84	52.8	54.40	2.64
07/12	995.3	2.2	9.9	150.56	164.01	147.37	27.0	69.45	1.95
07/12	990.0	2.3	10.3	150.83	158.30	144.30	49.6	70.82	2.60

**Table D-5**  
**Measured Thermal Loss Data**

**Black Chrome Selective Coating, Pyrex™ Glass**

Test Date 1993	Wind speed m/sec	Air Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/min	Meas. Loss W/m <sup>2</sup>	Est. Error W/m <sup>2</sup>
14/10	3.7	21.3	98.81	98.46	77.37	48.2	32.07	18.60
14/10	4.9	24.5	152.83	152.23	128.07	50.4	58.07	20.54
15/10	3.0	16.4	200.56	199.54	183.62	51.3	97.76	19.69
18/10	3.1	13.5	251.68	250.40	237.57	51.8	121.84	19.76
18/10	2.9	10.9	299.99	298.12	288.13	52.5	173.31	19.25
21/10	3.7	16.9	339.12	336.59	320.92	53.2	228.33	18.83
28/10	0.9	4.4	99.48	98.86	94.78	31.4	37.50	12.54
28/10	4.5	10.7	152.05	150.98	140.79	33.5	67.42	12.95
28/10	2.3	13.6	203.30	202.05	189.04	35.1	81.51	13.73
28/10	2.3	15.8	251.43	249.64	234.71	36.0	118.13	13.97





Figure D-7. IST Black Nickel Efficiency Comparison - Solgel Glass/Pyrex Glass

## APPENDIX D



**Figure D-8. IST Efficiency Comparison - All Receiver Combinations**




Figure D-9. IST Thermal Loss—Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass Receiver

## APPENDIX D

### Thermal Loss Tests -- Black Nickel

Eighteen thermal loss test points were obtained in five test days, covering the temperature range from 60°C to nearly 300°C. These data are shown below in Table D-6, and are plotted in Figure D-10. Also shown in Figure D-10 are the "in-focus" loss points and equations for both curves. A least-squares curve fit to the data points was used to derive the equations.

**Table D-6**  
**Measured Thermal Loss Data**  
**Black Nickel Selective Coating, Solgel Glass**

Test Date 1993	Wind speed m/sec	Air Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/min	Meas. Loss W/m2	Est. Error W/m2
01/12	3.5	11.2	250.02	248.98	238.31	52.3	134.91	20.05
01/12	4.4	10.3	249.30	247.03	237.84	27.4	132.34	10.31
02/12	0.7	0.3	61.28	61.07	60.86	23.0	16.74	8.88
02/12	2.1	3.7	96.48	96.01	92.55	25.0	33.46	9.74
02/12	2.7	1.3	151.73	150.80	149.93	26.4	61.69	10.41
02/12	2.6	6.2	152.17	151.77	145.72	49.8	64.71	19.17
02/12	2.4	9.1	199.90	198.08	190.06	26.9	91.40	10.29
02/12	1.9	8.4	200.57	199.96	191.90	51.2	91.86	19.48
02/12	2.5	10.1	298.29	296.75	287.41	52.9	178.51	19.45
02/12	2.2	8.7	297.52	294.48	287.27	28.9	174.29	10.63
07/12	2.5	-2.2	63.24	63.06	65.37	36.1	12.59	13.97
07/12	0.1	5.4	95.94	95.50	90.33	25.5	21.27	9.94
07/12	3.3	8.5	150.07	149.07	141.04	27.0	51.34	10.44
10/12	1.7	6.5	98.30	98.07	91.65	46.9	20.39	18.25
10/12	1.3	8.7	98.71	98.37	89.79	33.4	22.23	12.95
10/12	2.1	12.1	149.42	148.14	136.67	20.4	49.28	8.18
10/12	1.7	12.6	150.09	149.59	137.23	49.6	46.94	19.45
13/12	6.2	2.8	199.98	198.98	196.69	51.4	95.62	20.43

Figure D-11 compares the measured thermal loss curves for both black nickel and black chrome. There is little difference between the two, as would be expected from the similar values of emittance measured for the two receivers. The two sets of thermal loss data were also obtained with different receiver glass envelopes: solgel anti-reflective glass on the black nickel receiver and plain Pyrex® glass on the black chrome receiver. The two glass types were not expected to make any difference in measured thermal loss, and little was seen.

### Incident Angle Tests

Incident angle modifier is defined as the ratio of collector performance (efficiency) at any given incident angle to the performance at a zero incident angle. Domestic cold water was used as the




Figure D-10. IST Thermal Loss—Black Nickel/Solgel Glass Receiver

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-11. IST Thermal Loss Comparison - Black Nickel / Black Chrome

heat-transfer fluid for all incident angle tests. These tests were made to obtain the approximate optical efficiency of the collector, and the change in performance of the collector as the incident angle was increased from zero to more than 60 degrees. Test points were obtained every five degrees to identify any difference in positive or negative incident angles. Also of interest was any difference that might be caused by the two different receiver glasses and receiver absorptive surface coatings. Some tests several years ago with a different type of anti-reflective glass coating had seemed to show a larger improvement at high incident angles than at zero angle. No such difference was noted during the current tests.

The IST collector uses a large diameter drive-wheel and cables to rotate the collector to point at the sun. This arrangement allows several rows of collectors to be tracked by a single drive motor. The drive-wheel is normally located in the center of a collector row, with several mirror modules on each side. As installed for tests at Sandia, only a single mirror module was used, with the drive wheel located at the East end. Initially we thought that the drive wheel would cause a shadow on the mirror when the sun was off the East end of the collector. No wheel shadow would be present when the sun was toward the West. The drive wheel shadow could cause the measured incident angle performance to be non-symmetrical. However, the drive-wheel shadow was not extensive or dense, and no discernible performance difference was noted between positive and negative incident angles.

Figures D-12 through D-17 show the positive and negative incident angle data obtained for three of the receiver configurations. Figure D-18 combines all the incident angle data; any differences in the receivers are within the measurement errors. The complete set of incident angle modifier data are shown in Table D-8 and Table D-9. All calculated efficiencies in these tables are corrected for the short test-collector end-loss as outlined in Appendix C. The incident angle modifier K is thus intended for use with a long collector row.

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-12. IST Incident Angle Modifier (+) Black Chrome/Solgel Glass




Figure D-13. IST Incident Angle Modifier (-) Black Chrome/Solgel Glass

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-14. IST Incident Angle Modifier (+) Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass




Figure D-15. IST Incident Angle Modifier (-) Black Chrome/Pyrex Glass

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-16. IST Incident Angle Modifier (+) Black Nickel/Solgel Glass




Figure D-17. IST Incident Angle Modifier (-) Black Nickel/Solgel Glass

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-18. IST Incident Angle Modifier for All Receivers

**Table D-7**  
**Incident Angle Performance Test Data**  
**Black Chrome / Solgel Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector**

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Amb Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/m	Incid. Angle °	Calc. Effic %	Effic. Ratio	Ratio Error
13/08	981.9	30.31	29.34	34.91	1.82	24.9	0.00	74.6	1.0000	0.0889
13/08	904.2	32.61	29.94	35.05	-0.15	24.8	5.36	74.41	0.9965	0.0794
13/08	907.8	32.21	29.93	34.91	0.20	24.8	8.99	73.13	0.9794	0.0777
13/08	898.9	30.7	29.7	34.0	1.1	24.8	21.42	66.01	0.9164	0.0769
13/08	885.0	29.9	29.52	33.57	1.64	24.8	30.03	64.42	0.8627	0.0831
13/08	871.3	29.0	29.38	33.07	2.21	24.8	35.03	60.75	0.8136	0.0823
13/08	864.1	27.4	29.21	32.47	3.39	24.9	39.99	55.44	0.7426	0.0662
13/08	828.6	26.7	28.93	31.56	3.51	24.8	47.30	48.17	0.6451	0.0678
13/08	827.8	25.9	28.75	31.17	4.05	24.9	49.97	45.29	0.6066	0.0705
13/08	806.5	24.8	28.57	30.52	4.71	24.9	53.94	38.57	0.5166	0.0664
23/08	977.7	28.3	29.05	34.60	3.52	24.9	0.00	74.12	1.0000	0.0620
23/08	844.9	20.4	27.91	32.59	9.89	24.9	-4.99	73.38	0.990	0.0649
23/08	894.5	21.6	28.47	33.36	9.28	24.9	-9.99	73.18	0.9872	0.0649
23/08	931.0	23.6	28.79	33.73	7.63	24.8	-15.0	71.49	0.9664	0.0629
23/08	958.5	24.9	29.00	33.87	6.51	24.8	-20.0	69.58	0.9386	0.0603
23/08	949.9	29.7	28.91	33.52	1.53	25.0	-25.01	67.93	0.9164	0.0621
23/08	940.2	29.7	29.00	33.20	1.35	25.0	-30.01	63.52	0.8569	0.0712
23/08	934.2	29.4	28.91	32.74	1.42	24.9	-35.03	59.17	0.7983	0.0734
23/08	928.7	29.9	28.92	32.33	0.68	24.9	-40.04	54.09	0.7297	0.0543
23/08	915.1	30.9	28.92	31.80	-0.59	24.9	-45.00	47.52	0.6410	0.0520
23/08	895.3	30.9	28.89	31.52	-0.64	24.9	-48.97	45.43	0.6128	0.0539
23/08	872.6	30.9	28.83	30.77	-1.09	25.0	-55.02	35.85	0.4836	0.0590
24/08	981.9	30.3	29.34	34.91	1.82	24.9	0.00	74.20	1.0000	0.0619
24/08	990.3	29.9	29.31	34.83	2.19	24.9	5.01	73.79	0.9946	0.0620
24/08	990.7	28.8	29.26	34.58	3.09	24.9	10.01	71.87	0.9687	0.0607
24/08	988.0	28.6	29.23	34.32	3.19	25.0	15.02	70.22	0.9465	0.0592
24/08	982.3	28.3	29.18	34.04	3.28	25.0	20.00	68.21	0.9193	0.0649
24/08	977.7	28.0	28.94	33.61	3.26	25.0	25.01	66.82	0.9006	0.0584
24/08	967.8	27.3	28.86	33.25	3.71	25.0	30.05	64.70	0.8721	0.0576
24/08	958.9	27.0	28.82	32.84	3.86	25.0	35.00	60.71	0.8182	0.0597
24/08	949.1	25.6	28.69	32.33	4.92	24.8	40.03	56.00	0.7548	0.0685
24/08	935.2	24.6	28.53	31.76	5.52	24.7	45.06	51.70	0.6968	0.0560
24/08	918.9	23.9	28.36	31.09	5.82	24.8	50.02	46.04	0.6205	0.0596
24/08	900.0	22.4	28.21	30.21	6.77	24.8	55.15	35.76	0.4820	0.0811
24/08	869.6	21.3	28.07	29.59	7.57	24.8	60.04	29.57	0.3985	0.0550
24/08	831.3	20.7	27.95	28.78	7.70	24.9	64.99	18.34	0.2473	0.0730
24/08	767.6	20.5	27.99	28.47	7.69	24.9	70.02	12.98	0.1750	0.0537
24/08	979.3	30.6	29.39	34.82	1.52	24.9	-5.04	73.50	0.9906	0.0620
24/08	979.9	31.1	29.40	34.73	0.91	24.9	-9.99	72.77	0.9808	0.0615
24/08	980.4	32.2	29.46	34.67	-0.13	24.9	-14.99	71.96	0.9699	0.0614
24/08	963.3	31.5	29.42	34.30	0.37	24.9	-20.02	69.50	0.9367	0.0598

## APPENDIX D

**Table D-7 (continued)**

### Incident Angle Performance Test Data

#### Black Chrome / Solgel Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Amb Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/m	Incid. Angle °	Calc. Effic %	Effic. Ratio	Ratio Error
24/08	959.4	32.5	29.38	34.06	-0.77	24.8	-24.96	67.88	0.9149	0.0616
24/08	959.5	33.1	29.38	33.74	-1.56	24.9	-30.02	64.30	0.8667	0.0582
24/08	957.7	32.7	29.35	33.27	-1.37	24.8	-35.01	58.82	0.7927	0.0589
24/08	952.1	33.3	29.40	32.80	-2.21	24.9	-40.03	52.60	0.7090	0.0619
24/08	936.5	32.4	29.33	32.29	-1.61	24.9	-44.99	47.55	0.6408	0.0575
24/08	917.7	31.9	29.28	31.87	-1.37	24.9	-50.00	43.70	0.5890	0.0542
24/08	889.3	32.6	29.21	31.21	-2.43	24.9	-55.00	36.27	0.4888	0.0517

**Table D-8**

### Incident Angle Performance Test Data

#### Black Chrome / Pyrex® Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Amb Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/m	Incid. Angle °	Calc. Effic %	Effic. Ratio	Ratio Error
25/08	940.7	31.4	29.25	34.41	0.38	24.7	0.00	71.07	1.0000	0.0659
25/08	942.4	32.3	29.30	34.35	-0.49	24.8	-5.01	70.59	0.9932	0.0652
25/08	939.2	32.7	29.38	34.27	-0.85	24.7	-10.01	69.18	0.9734	0.0647
25/08	929.8	33.0	29.36	34.11	-1.28	24.7	-15.03	68.76	0.9675	0.0649
25/08	933.6	33.3	29.42	33.96	-1.64	24.7	-20.00	66.30	0.9329	0.0624
25/08	924.3	33.4	29.46	33.73	-1.82	24.7	-25.02	63.95	0.8998	0.0630
25/08	915.1	33.7	29.45	33.37	-2.28	24.7	-31.02	60.37	0.8494	0.0617
25/08	912.6	34.4	29.48	33.10	-3.11	24.7	-35.02	56.92	0.8009	0.0620
25/08	900.1	34.0	29.41	32.59	-3.02	24.7	-39.99	51.44	0.7238	0.0557
25/08	872.2	34.3	29.39	32.27	-3.46	24.7	-43.02	48.84	0.6872	0.0587
26/08	936.2	29.7	28.99	34.01	1.77	24.7	-5.03	70.27	0.9887	0.0657
01/09	961.1	24.5	28.81	33.62	6.76	24.8	-15.03	67.52	0.9500	0.0641
01/09	939.0	24.9	28.44	32.70	5.63	24.8	-25.07	63.02	0.8868	0.0645
02/09	971.3	26.9	28.14	33.25	3.76	24.6	-5.02	68.97	0.9705	0.0643
02/09	945.3	27.6	28.26	33.18	3.12	24.6	-10.03	68.79	0.9680	0.0672
02/09	941.1	27.6	28.26	32.84	2.99	24.5	-19.78	65.88	0.9270	0.0622
02/09	934.1	28.9	28.35	32.64	1.58	24.6	-25.03	63.16	0.8888	0.0626
02/09	925.6	30.4	28.53	32.56	0.14	24.6	-30.02	60.90	0.8570	0.0603
02/09	916.9	30.4	28.59	32.33	0.10	24.7	-34.35	58.23	0.8193	0.0639
02/09	900.4	28.7	28.14	30.99	0.84	24.7	-45.21	47.37	0.6665	0.0576
02/09	897.7	29.5	28.25	30.60	-0.07	24.6	-50.03	40.25	0.5663	0.0585
02/09	846.5	29.5	28.05	29.36	-0.75	24.6	-60.01	25.82	0.3633	0.0565

Table D-8 (continued)

## Incident Angle Performance Test Data

Black Chrome / Pyrex® Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector

Test Date 1993	NIP W/m <sup>2</sup>	Amb Temp °C	Temp In °C	Temp Out °C	Delta Air °C	Flow rate L/m	Incid. Angle °	Calc. Effic. %	Effic. Ratio	Ratio Error
25/08	940.7	31.4	29.25	34.41	0.38	24.7	0.00	71.07	1.0000	0.0659
25/08	936.0	29.6	29.18	34.26	2.11	24.6	0.00	70.24	1.0000	0.0651
25/08	946.0	31.5	29.23	34.33	0.30	24.7	4.99	70.77	0.9957	0.0649
25/08	942.6	30.8	29.24	34.12	0.84	24.7	10.02	68.83	0.9685	0.0643
25/08	940.5	30.8	29.31	33.91	0.79	24.7	15.01	65.87	0.9268	0.0629
26/08	808.9	21.5	28.61	29.90	7.77	24.8	60.01	26.93	0.3789	0.0527
26/08	774.8	20.4	28.81	29.68	8.85	24.8	64.01	20.09	0.2827	0.0521
30/08	956.4	20.9	28.63	33.43	10.09	24.9	10.32	67.57	0.9508	0.0650
30/08	946.3	20.4	28.57	32.91	10.33	24.9	20.01	63.28	0.8903	0.0620
30/08	906.3	19.2	28.18	31.33	10.52	25.1	41.20	51.73	0.7279	0.0627
30/08	892.6	19.0	28.10	30.81	10.40	25.0	45.01	45.92	0.6461	0.0592
30/08	844.9	17.7	27.90	29.62	11.04	25.1	54.99	32.96	0.4638	0.0598
03/09	983.2	25.3	26.14	29.04	2.24	45.8	0.00	70.98	1.0000	0.0885
03/09	991.0	25.5	27.92	33.30	5.14	24.6	0.00	70.31	1.0000	0.0883
03/09	961.0	22.0	27.54	32.59	8.10	24.7	5.01	68.94	0.9700	0.0878
03/09	943.2	21.0	27.32	32.13	8.69	24.7	9.99	67.78	0.9538	0.0868
03/09	928.3	20.3	27.28	31.74	9.16	24.8	15.01	64.90	0.9132	0.0849
03/09	913.0	19.6	27.39	31.44	9.78	24.8	20.00	60.76	0.8550	0.0823
02/09	960.1	24.1	27.89	32.20	6.00	24.9	25.02	62.42	0.8782	0.0606
02/09	952.9	23.9	27.84	31.85	5.95	24.8	30.01	59.39	0.8356	0.0596
02/09	945.1	23.6	27.81	31.43	5.99	24.8	35.03	55.07	0.7749	0.0578
02/09	930.7	23.2	27.73	30.93	6.13	24.8	40.01	50.40	0.7091	0.0580
02/09	915.5	22.4	27.65	30.37	6.63	24.8	45.01	44.78	0.6300	0.0565
02/09	896.9	21.7	27.55	29.80	6.97	24.8	49.99	38.75	0.5452	0.0560
02/09	869.4	20.9	27.40	29.07	7.34	24.8	55.05	30.83	0.4337	0.0767
02/09	839.4	20.1	27.28	28.52	7.83	24.9	59.99	25.22	0.3548	0.0507
02/09	802.2	19.3	27.30	28.00	8.34	24.9	65.03	15.93	0.2242	0.0890
02/09	747.0	18.7	27.46	27.87	9.00	24.9	69.99	11.29	0.1589	0.0540

## APPENDIX D

**Table D-9**  
**Incident Angle Performance Test Data**  
**Black Nickel / Solgel Glass Receiver, Silver Film Reflector**

Test Date	NIP	Amb. Temp	Temp In	Temp Out	Delta Air	Flow rate	Incid. Angle	Calc. Effic.	Effic. Ratio	Ratio
1993	W/m <sup>2</sup>	°C	°C	°C	°C	L/m	°	%		Error
19/11	856.4	4.3	16.47	22.07	14.94	22.4	0.00	77.53	1.00	0.0712
19/11	894.0	9.6	18.48	25.14	12.19	19.4	4.99	76.95	0.9927	0.0661
19/11	966.0	9.3	18.69	25.79	12.98	18.5	10.01	73.53	0.9485	0.0613
19/11	977.5	9.0	18.77	25.75	13.31	18.5	15.01	72.18	0.9311	0.0587
19/11	965.6	8.7	18.85	25.42	13.47	18.6	20.01	70.08	0.9040	0.0573
19/11	973.8	8.5	18.94	25.34	13.63	18.4	25.02	67.96	0.8767	0.0555
19/11	97909	8.2	19.09	25.02	13.85	18.5	30.02	64.07	0.8265	0.0531
19/11	994.3	7.9	19.36	24.99	14.23	18.8	33.04	61.34	0.7912	0.0527
19/11	989.3	7.3	19.01	27.46	15.94	10.5	41.07	53.48	0.6898	0.0568
19/11	987.7	7.1	18.44	24.83	14.51	12.1	45.01	46.95	0.6057	0.0598
19/11	971.2	6.6	17.89	21.23	13.00	19.2	49.99	41.15	0.5308	0.0656
19/11	955.01	6.1	17.68	19.93	12.69	21.4	55.02	32.71	0.4220	0.0827
19/11	946.4	5.8	17.46	19.30	12.62	21.8	60.01	28.95	0.3735	0.0646
19/11	921.1	5.3	17.16	18.26	12.40	22.2	64.03	19.11	0.2464	0.0599
29/11	993.8	5.9	16.34	22.88	13.72	22.3	0.00	77.62	1.0	0.0561
29/11	969.9	4.8	16.44	22.63	14.71	22.0	4.99	75.15	0.9682	0.0674
29/11	1013.6	6.5	16.47	22.95	13.21	22.3	-5.00	76.18	0.9814	0.0549
29/11	1021.0	7.5	16.54	22.93	12.22	22.3	-9.98	75.59	0.9739	0.0543
29/11	1021.5	8.5	16.51	22.81	11.20	22.3	-14.99	75.32	0.9704	0.0543
29/11	1022.6	9.5	16.64	22.56	10.11	22.3	-20.01	71.72	0.9240	0.0525
29/11	1024.5	10.0	16.71	22.41	9.57	22.3	-25.01	69.77	0.8988	0.0521
29/11	1023.0	10.7	16.70	22.07	8.66	22.3	-30.00	66.87	0.8615	0.0512
29/11	1028.7	11.0	16.74	21.68	8.25	22.3	-34.96	62.20	0.8014	0.0476
29/11	1018.2	11.5	16.80	21.18	7.53	22.3	-40.00	57.05	0.7350	0.0474
29/11	1006.7	11.8	16.82	20.58	6.87	22.3	-45.03	50.72	0.6534	0.0445
29/11	993.9	12.1	16.85	20.09	6.40	22.3	-50.02	45.61	0.5876	0.0461
29/11	956.7	12.3	16.89	19.39	5.88	22.3	-55.01	37.87	0.4879	0.0580
29/11	922.3	12.6	16.83	18.52	5.03	22.3	-60.02	27.89	0.3593	0.0418
29/11	878.6	13.0	16.81	17.93	4.35	22.3	-64.98	20.87	0.2689	0.0446

### Performance of the Sun Tracking System

The IST sun-tracking system uses two photocells; one mounted on each side of the receiver glass near the center of the collector module. These cells sense concentrated light focused onto the receiver. For adequate tracking sensitivity, one cell would ideally be located such that the cell would be half illuminated by light from the very top edge of the mirror. The other cell would be half illuminated by light from the bottom edge of the mirror. If the cells are moved such that they see light reflected from some mirror location inward from the edges, there is not enough difference in the received light, unless the mirror moves a relatively large distance away from the true sun position. Since a typical parabolic trough must point at the sun within about 0.2 degrees

for optimum performance, the sun-tracking system must be capable of very small corrections to the apparent motion of the sun.

Figure D-19 shows data taken during one of the low-temperature water tests. The sun elevation position was increasing smoothly; the collector must follow this motion with minimum error. From the figure, collector elevation can be seen to move in small steps of about 0.1 degree. The tracking error line in the plot is the difference between sun elevation and collector elevation. The tracking accuracy shown here is quite good, and should keep the collector properly focused.

Because the tracking system used light reflected from the edges of the mirror, the reflected light may not be balanced at the sensing photocells if there are any imperfections in the mirror surface at either edge. As the incident angle of the incoming solar beam changes, the reflection point moves along the length of the mirror edge. Over the range of incident angles from -70 deg to + 70 deg, the reflection point on the IST test collector moved almost the entire length of the mirror edge. There were slight imperfections along the mirror edge at several places; in general these were small enough that no significant mistracking occurred. There were a few problem areas that are discussed below.

Figures D-20 and D-21 show incident angle, cosine of the incident angle and incident angle modifier on two different test days. The incident angle modifier curve should be a smooth curve approximately paralleling, but slightly less than the cosine curve (for example, see Figure D-14). The variations in the curve are caused by slight changes in the system that are causing the heat gain to change. The small constant variations in the curve are a result of noise and slight fluctuations in the measured flow and temperatures, and are not significant. Two larger variations were seen on all test days; these are at about 60-70 deg incident angle in the morning, and at about 10 deg incident angle in the morning.

At about 60-70 deg angles, the shadows from the drive wheel and other structure at the end of the trough were being reflected to the tracking sensors, resulting in some mistracking. The event at about 10 degrees, most visible in Figure D-21, is the result of shadows from structural bars crossing the front of the mirror. These bars can be seen in the collector photo, Figure D-1. A detail plot of the tracking error from Figure D-20 is shown in Figure D-22.

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-19. Tracking Angle and Tracking Error




Figure D-20. Incident Angle, Cosine, and Incident Angle Modifier

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-21. Incident Angle, Cosine, and Incident Angle Modifier




Figure D-22. Tracking Angle and Tracking Error

## APPENDIX D

There is little that can be done to correct these problems with a reflected light tracking system. The errors can be made to move to other times of the day by moving the sensors to a different location along the length of the receiver tube. However, the errors will still be there, just occurring at a different time. Fortunately, the worst errors occur at very high incident angles, where there is little impact on total energy output, since there is little energy that can be collected in any case. The other tracking errors at incident angles less than 50 degrees are much smaller, last for shorter times, and can cause only a small loss of collected energy.

Figure D-23 shows a different way of plotting the tracking corrections a collector makes to follow the sun. The figure is from test data of a different type of optical tracking system, from a different collector manufacturer (See Ref. 1, pp.74). The plot shows time, direction of tracking correction, and magnitude of the correction. Ideally, each tracking update would be evenly spaced in time, and have the same magnitude. Since sun elevation is increasing from sunrise to noon, morning corrections should all be in the same direction. For an East-West collector axis, afternoon corrections would be in the opposite direction. The tracking shown in Figure D-23 was not perfect, but still very good.

Figure D-24 shows a similar tracking plot for the IST reflected light system. The large corrections in early morning correspond to the tracking errors shown at the same time in Figure D-20. Figure D-25 shows an hour of Figure D-24, with an expanded time scale. Tracking error sensitivity may have been set slightly too small, as many of the corrections shown in Figure D-24 are 0.05 degree or less. More important are the track corrections that are too large, which causes the system to have to back up with an opposite correction. Some of these can also be caused by very small irregularities in the edge of the reflecting mirror surface.

### Data Analysis

The efficiency and thermal loss equations directly derived from the measured data in this Appendix are of limited use by themselves, because they are limited to narrow ranges of incident solar irradiance. For application to a collector field under constantly changing values of incident sunshine, an extension of the performance equations is needed.

By linear scaling of thermal losses between the in-focus loss (high value of insolation on receiver) and the measured thermal loss (zero insolation) we can derive the collector heat gain and efficiency for any desired incident solar irradiance. This scaling procedure (see Appendix C) was performed for a matrix of insolation and temperatures. A multiple regression of the data matrix then produced a performance equation for the collector. This equation should predict performance over the temperature range from ambient to 350 °C, and for insolation from zero to about 1100 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Repeated for each of the receiver configurations tested, four equations resulted, and are shown in Table D-11.

A performance equation for the aluminized-film reflector is not shown because of the limited test data obtained. Since the thermal losses would have been the same as the silver-film / black chrome / solgel glass receiver, a close approximation for an aluminized film collector would be the equation for the silver film configuration, with an optical efficiency (first equation term) of about 66-67%.




Figure D-23. Example Tracking Angle Updates

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-24. IST Tracking Angle Updates for 24 August




Figure D-25. Tracking Angle Updates -- Expanded Scale

## APPENDIX D

Table D-10

### IST Collector Performance Equations For Silver Film Reflector

#### Black Nickel selective absorber, Solgel receiver glass

$$\eta = K [76.25 - 0.006836 (\Delta T)] - 14.68 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1672 (\Delta T^2/I) \quad (1)$$

#### Black Nickel selective absorber, Pyrex receiver glass

$$\eta = K [72.36 - .006836 (\Delta T)] - 14.68 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1672 (\Delta T^2/I) \quad (2)$$

#### Black chrome selective absorber, Solgel receiver glass

$$\eta = K [74.52 - 0.009764 (\Delta T)] - 23.26 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1355 (\Delta T^2/I) \quad (3)$$

#### Black chrome selective absorber, Pyrex receiver glass

$$\eta = K [70.75 - 0.01028 (\Delta T)] - 23.27 (\Delta T/I) - 0.1355 (\Delta T^2/I) \quad (4)$$

#### Incident Angle Modifier, K

$$K = \cos (Ia) + 0.0003178 (Ia) - 0.00003985 (Ia)^2 \quad (5)$$

In Table 10 performance equations (1) through (5):

$\eta$  = Collector efficiency, in percent

$K$  = Incident angle modifier

$I$  = Incident direct normal solar irradiance,  $\text{W/m}^2$

$\Delta T$  = Avg. receiver fluid temperature above ambient air temperature,  $^{\circ}\text{C}$

$Ia$  = Solar beam incident angle, in degrees

Figure D-26 is a plot of the complete performance equation for the silver mirror / black nickel / solgel receiver, for several values of insolation, at zero incident angle. Efficiency is significantly reduced with increases in the sunlight incident angle. Figure D-27 is for the same collector configuration as D-26, but now for a 50 degree incident angle.

Figure D-28 shows the silver mirror / black nickel / solgel collector efficiency for the complete range of temperature and insolation. Performance equation plots for the other three receiver configurations are not shown here; they look very similar to Figure D-28, but are reduced somewhat in heat collection efficiency.




Figure D-26. IST Collector vs Temp & Insolation at Zero Incident Angle

## APPENDIX D




Figure D-27. IST Collector vs Temp & Insolation at 50 Deg Incident Angle




Figure D-28. IST - ECP-305/Black Nickel/Solgel Glass at 50 Deg Incident Angle

## APPENDIX D

### References

Cameron, C. P., and Dudley, V. E., 1986. SAND85-2317, *BDM Corporation Modular Industrial Solar Retrofit Qualification Test Results*. Albuquerque, N. M.: Sandia National Laboratories.

**APPENDIX E**

**THEORETICAL MODEL**

## APPENDIX E

Intentionally Left Blank

## Theoretical Model

### Introduction

Test data from the IST trough performance tests were compared to results of a heat transfer code used for modeling trough collectors. This code (ref. 1) was originally developed for analyzing the thermal performance of KJC Operating Company's parabolic trough collectors at Boron, California. The model is based on thermal analysis provided by Sandia National Laboratory's Solar Thermal Department. One dimensional, steady-state heat losses and heat gain of the heat transfer fluid are calculated per unit length of a trough receiver. Calculations are a function of fluid flow rate, bulk fluid temperature, and solar conditions (direct normal insolation, date and time). The model was developed by Sloan Solar Engineering, Austin, Texas. It has been validated by comparing Sandia's performance test results of KJC's trough collectors with the model's predicted performance results.

A summary of the model and direct comparisons of IST performance test results to the predicted performance of IST collectors are presented below.

### Model Definition

The heat available at the receiver surface is determined directly from specified solar conditions and the trough's optical properties. Under steady state conditions, some portion of this energy will result in sensible heating of the fluid. The remainder of the heat flow will be given up to the environment through conduction, convection and radiation losses. The following outlines the methodology used in this model:

Given:

- Direct normal insolation, site location, date, time, ambient conditions
- Geometric configuration and material optical property data
- Fluid flow rate and bulk inlet temperature

Calculation Method:

- Assume an envelope temperature and an receiver surface temperature
- Iterate for envelope temperature until the net heat flow in the envelope annulus region matches the external heat loss to the environment
- Using the available insolation, calculate the heat loss at the receiver and the heat gain of the fluid
- Compare heat losses from the above two steps and re-iterate on these steps as necessary until the two heat loss calculations are equal.

A flow chart of the model structure is shown in Figure E-1.

## APPENDIX E




Figure E-1. Model Flow Chart

For the purpose of comparing the model results with empirical data, the optical efficiency test results for the IST collectors were used as the optical efficiency inputs to the model. Comparisons are for an IST collector using ECP-305 silver reflective film, with the following receiver configuration:

- 5.08 cm OD, 4.76 cm ID black chrome receiver with either Pyrex® glass envelope or Pyrex® glass envelope coated with a solgel anti-reflective film (AR)
- 5.08 cm OD, 4.76 cm ID black nickel receiver with AR coated Pyrex® glass envelope
- 3.18 cm flow restriction plug centered inside the receiver tube
- flow rate of 49 L/min of Syltherm® 800 heat transfer oil

The following material optical properties, based on Sandia's test measurements, were used for modeling the IST collector:

- black chrome solar averaged absorptivity of 0.92
- black nickel solar averaged absorptivity of 0.96
- ECP-305 solar averaged reflectivity of 0.93
- Pyrex® glass solar averaged transmissivity of 0.91
- Pyrex® AR glass solar averaged transmissivity of 0.94

Syltherm® 800 fluid properties were based on manufacturer's specifications.

Emissivity values for the different receiver tubes were based on measured emittance of black chrome and black nickel receiver tube samples. A two-point linear fit of the measured emissivity data was used in the model. Black chrome emissivity used was 0.1 at 100°C and 0.25 at 300°C. Black nickel emissivity used was 0.14 at 100°C and 0.35 at 300°C.

There are several conditions specific to Sandia's test procedure that differ from the normal operating conditions of the IST collector; these are summarized below:

- Sandia's tests incorporate a horizontal axis tracking platform that effectively converts a single axis tracking trough into a two-axis tracking collector.
- The performance tests at Sandia used Syltherm® 800 as the fluid; however, IST plans to use Caloria as a heat transfer fluid. These two types of oil have different fluid properties, thus the thermal characterization will be somewhat different. The overall trough performance should be similar with either type oil.
- Performance tests were conducted at a nominal flow rate of 22.7 L/min of water flow for characterizing optical efficiency and incident angle modifier. A nominal oil flow of 49 L/min, which is about 43% of normal flow conditions for an IST

## APPENDIX E

system, was used to characterize trough performance at elevated temperatures. To accommodate the reduced volumetric flow rates, a 3.18 cm diameter flow restriction was centered in the 4.76 cm inside diameter receiver tube. This restriction helped increase the fluid velocity, thus increasing the Reynolds number. All of the performance tests were operated with Reynolds numbers in either the transition or turbulent regions.

Due to the differences in fluid properties and the reduced Reynolds numbers, the thermal performance tests might over predict thermal losses, and thus report lower thermal efficiencies. To investigate this point, an IST collector without a flow restriction plug was analyzed at 113.6 L/min Syltherm® flow. Results of this analysis are discussed later in this section. The results presented below are direct comparisons between measured and modeled data. The figures are plots of either trough receiver efficiency or thermal loss versus fluid temperature above ambient air temperature. All model runs presented are based on the following assumptions:


- ambient air temperature of 22°C (72°F),
- ambient air pressure of 1 atm,
- direct normal irradiance of 950 W/m<sup>2</sup> for on-sun conditions,
- L/min flow rate, no winds,
- Albuquerque as the site location.

### Model Results

Figures E-2, E-3 and E-4 are plots showing on-sun trough efficiency comparisons for either black chrome or black nickel receivers. Within the uncertainty bounds of the test data, a good agreement is shown between the predicted performance and the measured data. The significant factor for the on-sun case is the proper modeling of the fluid internal convection. For the off-sun condition, (Fig. E-5 and E-6) fluid temperatures are generally only a few degrees greater than receiver surface temperatures. Because of small delta-T's when off-sun, the influence of fluid internal convection on the overall heat loss solution is small.


For the on-sun case, the model predicted the receiver surface temperatures to be 8°C to 23°C greater than the bulk fluid temperatures. Since the model is based upon one-dimensional heat flow methods and not two-dimensional heat flow, the actual receiver surface temperature could be much greater than what the model predicts. Clearly, the magnitude of both the measured and predicted heat loss values are dependent upon the actual or assumed receiver surface temperature.

Note that the predicted efficiencies for the black nickel receiver shown in figure E-4 is just outside the uncertainty bounds of the test results. This is not significant enough to be of major concern, since several factors may contribute to this. No wind conditions were assumed for the model, whereas wind was present during some of the tests. Wind during a test would slightly increase the heat losses from the receiver, thus a lower efficiency would be reported. Another factor is the receiver emittance. Emittance values used for the receiver tubes were based on the measurements of small tube sections and not the actual receiver tube used in the test. In addition, the model predicts somewhat higher efficiency values within the temperature range 75-250 C above ambient. If the assumed emittance values within this range were too low, then the model would predict




**Figure E-2. Comparison of predicted trough efficiency to test data for the IST trough with a black chrome receiver and a Pyrex glass envelope.**

## APPENDIX E




**Figure E-3. Comparison of Predicted Trough Efficiency to Test Data for the IST Trough with a Black Chrome Receiver and a Pyrex Glass Envelope Coated with Sol Gel**




**Figure E-4. Comparison of Predicted Trough Efficiency to Test Data for the IST Trough with a Black Nickel Receiver and a Pyrex Glass Envelope Coated with Sol Gel**

## APPENDIX E



**Figure E-5. Comparison of the Out-of-Focus Thermal Loss for the IST Trough with a Black Chrome Receiver**



**Figure E-6. Comparison of the Out-of-Focus Thermal Loss for the IST Trough with a Black Nickel Receiver**

## APPENDIX E

higher than measured efficiency values. Assuming a linear dependence of emittance with temperature over this temperature range probably under estimated the emittance -- thus the over prediction of the thermal performance.

A comparison of the thermal losses, no-sun condition, is presented in figure E-5. Again a good agreement is shown between the predicted losses and the test data. External heat losses are relatively small due to small delta T's between the receiver surface and the fluid temperatures. Since both the fluid and ambient temperatures were measured during a test, the only significant uncertainty is the emittance of the receiver. Predicted radiation losses are directly proportional to the emittance values. Therefore, more detailed characterization of emittance of the actual receiver tube could significantly impact the predicted performance of a trough collector, as previously discussed.

The model was also used to investigate the effect of the flow restriction used in the performance tests. The model was setup to analyze the efficiency of a non-restricted black-nickel receiver with a flow rate of 49 L/min of Syltherm® 800. The results obtained from this test case were essentially the same as the test runs made with the flow restriction placed inside the receiver tube. It would seem that using the flow restriction plug in the trough performance tests did not significantly change the test result. For both the restricted flow and full flow conditions, the predicted receiver surface temperatures ranged from 8-23°C higher than the receiver fluid temperatures.

Overall agreement between the predicted trough performance and the test data is very good. However, reproducing the absolute value of trough performance test data is not the main detail to be gained. The objective in trough performance tests is to achieve stable and reproducible results so that the steady-state boundary of trough performance can be characterized. The use of a one-dimensional model for comparing predicted and measured trough performance can give some indication of how well the test data characterizes trough performance. The comparisons presented in this section indicate that the test results provide a good indication of the level of performance for IST's trough collector.

**APPENDIX F**

**ERROR ANALYSIS**

## APPENDIX F

Intentionally Left Blank

## Error Analysis

### Introduction

An error analysis was carried out for measurements of collector efficiency, thermal loss, and incident angle modifier. All these measurements include a combination of fluid mass flow, specific heat and temperature. Insolation was also included for efficiency and incident angle modifier measurements. Both measuring instrument error and statistical data variability were considered in this analysis. There is some uncertainty in the equations for Syltherm® heat-transfer fluid properties (Dow-Corning, 1982); the magnitude of these is unknown, and was not considered in this analysis. The effect of temperature measurement error on fluid properties was included.

The error analysis applies to a single measurement set, i.e., a computer data scan. These measurement sets were repeated at 15-20 second intervals during each test. In the analysis of the data to obtain a value such as efficiency, the measured data were averaged over a period of several minutes. To determine the length of the averaging period for each data point, receiver time constants were measured at the beginning of the test series; see Figures D-3 and D-4. The IST receiver time constant was found to be about two minutes; data averaging time was then set at a minimum of three time constants, or about 6 minutes. Except for incident angle data, most data point averaging was longer than the minimum, usually about 10 minutes, as in the data samples shown below.

Even though the system was operated at each temperature for a long time (usually an hour or more) to obtain maximum system stability of flow and temperature prior to an averaging period, there is always some scatter in the data during the averaging period due to measuring instrument electrical noise and remaining instabilities in flow, temperature or insolation. In estimating the errors of the averaged data points, the errors associated with each point in the average are assumed to be correlated, since instrument calibration errors are not expected to vary over such short periods of time.

A sample of data from a cold water optical efficiency test with the silver film mirror/black chrome receiver/solgel receiver glass is shown in Table F-1; the mean data values are reported as an efficiency point in Table D-1, line 1. A sample of data from an elevated temperature efficiency test is shown in Table F-2; the mean data values are reported as an efficiency point in Table D-3, line 14. A sample of data taken during a thermal loss test is shown here in Table F-3; the mean data from Table F-3 is shown as a thermal loss data point in Table D-6, line 7. All the data points in Appendix D data tables were obtained from calculated mean values similar to those shown in Tables F-1, F-2, and F-3. Again note that the system was operated at a constant temperature and flow rate for about an hour before the time periods shown in the sample data tables.

For each averaging period, such as those shown in the sample data tables, the population standard deviation of each measurement was calculated as a check on the stability of the system under test. Also, the data range from minimum value to maximum value during the averaging period had to be within the stability criteria outlined in the Test Plan, Appendix C. For example, in Table F-3, the input and output temperature range of about 0.1°C ( $\pm 0.05^\circ$ ) is our usual requirement for a

## APPENDIX F

Table F-I. Black Chrome/Solgel Efficiency Test Data for Cold Water at 30°C

IST Test	93/08/11	Increment of 1 record					METRIC UNITS	
		#403 Clock Standard Time HH:MM:SS	#406 NIP Solar Flux W/m^2	#411 FT100 Collector Flow #1 L/min	#436 Calc. Rec Temp above amb Deg C	#426 TC002 Temp Inlet #2 Deg C	#433 TC009 Temp Out #2 Deg C	#466 Calc. Sub. dT #2 Deg C
13:19:56	963.66	24.68	1.15	30.07	35.51	5.44	73.17	
13:20:16	964.24	24.70	1.17	30.08	35.50	5.42	72.92	
13:20:36	964.12	24.70	1.20	30.07	35.53	5.45	73.35	
13:20:56	964.12	24.71	1.21	30.08	35.49	5.42	72.89	
13:21:16	964.01	24.68	1.23	30.07	35.50	5.43	73.01	
13:21:36	963.54	24.69	1.23	30.10	35.52	5.42	72.91	
13:21:55	964.01	24.68	1.22	30.11	35.53	5.43	72.96	
13:22:15	963.77	24.71	1.21	30.10	35.52	5.42	73.01	
13:22:35	964.01	24.68	1.20	30.07	35.54	5.46	73.46	
13:22:55	963.54	24.68	1.15	30.06	35.52	5.46	73.51	
13:23:15	964.12	24.65	1.13	30.06	35.54	5.48	73.58	
13:23:35	964.24	24.70	1.09	30.06	35.49	5.43	73.01	
13:23:55	962.85	24.69	1.06	30.05	35.49	5.44	73.31	
13:24:14	962.38	24.67	1.06	30.04	35.50	5.47	73.61	
13:24:34	961.46	24.66	0.99	30.04	35.49	5.45	73.45	
13:24:54	962.27	24.69	1.01	30.06	35.49	5.44	73.28	
13:25:14	963.31	24.72	0.96	30.07	35.52	5.45	73.47	
13:25:34	963.31	24.68	0.91	30.06	35.49	5.43	73.08	
13:25:54	962.27	24.70	0.89	30.07	35.53	5.46	73.64	
13:26:14	961.23	24.70	0.83	30.06	35.50	5.44	73.36	
13:26:34	960.42	24.70	0.82	30.07	35.54	5.46	73.77	
13:26:53	960.88	24.70	0.77	30.06	35.52	5.46	73.74	
13:27:13	961.57	24.70	0.69	30.06	35.48	5.42	73.15	
13:27:33	961.92	24.70	0.67	30.07	35.50	5.43	73.19	
13:27:53	959.95	24.71	0.61	30.06	35.50	5.44	73.51	
13:28:13	960.76	24.72	0.59	30.08	35.52	5.44	73.54	
13:28:33	960.42	24.73	0.51	30.03	35.51	5.48	74.14	
13:28:53	960.65	24.70	0.47	30.04	35.49	5.45	73.60	
13:29:13	960.76	24.68	0.43	30.04	35.50	5.46	73.67	
13:29:32	960.53	24.73	0.41	30.05	35.51	5.47	73.91	
13:29:52	959.03	24.71	0.33	30.02	35.49	5.47	74.09	

### Statistics for 31 data values.

Largest data value 964.236	24.734	1.226	30.108	35.538	5.481	74.139
Smallest data value 959.028	24.654	0.331	30.016	35.483	5.416	72.893
Range of data 5.208	0.080	0.896	0.092	0.055	0.065	1.247
Arithmetic mean 962.366	24.696	0.909	30.063	35.509	5.446	73.397
Population Standard Deviation 1.569	0.018	0.288	0.020	0.016	0.019	0.341
3-Sigma 4.708	0.055	0.863	0.061	0.049	0.058	1.024
Population Variance 2.463	0.000	0.083	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.116

## APPENDIX F

Table F-2. Black Chrome/Pyrex Efficiency Test Data at 150°C

IST Test	93/10/27	Increment of 1 records				METRIC UNITS		
#40 3	#406	#411	#436	#426	#433	#466	#470	
Clock	NIP	FT100	Calc.	TC002	TC009	Calc.	Calc.	
Standard	Solar	Collector	Rec Temp	Temp	Temp	Sub	Efficiency	
Time	Flux	Flow #1	above amb	Inlet #2	Out #2	dT #2	Sub 2, Flo2	
HH:MM:SS	W/m^2	L/min	Deg C	Deg C	Deg C	Deg C	%	
12:21:34	972.57	50.33	145.56	152.42	158.67	6.25	61.82	
12:21:54	972.45	58.32	145.52	152.42	158.71	6.28	62.10	
12:22:13	973.03	58.35	145.51	152.39	158.70	6.31	62.38	
12:22:33	972.45	58.37	145.47	152.41	158.70	6.29	62.28	
12:22:53	972.34	50.37	145.53	152.43	158.70	6.27	62.05	
12:23:13	973.03	58.35	145.58	152.48	158.70	6.30	62.27	
12:23:33	972.92	58.34	145.47	152.48	158.70	6.30	62.29	
12:23:53	973.38	58.33	145.47	152.42	158.71	6.29	62.16	
12:24:13	972.92	58.34	145.46	152.43	158.71	6.29	62.15	
12:24:32	973.38	58.34	145.47	152.42	153.72	6.30	62.28	
12:24:52	973.26	58.34	145.43	152.48	158.72	6.32	62.48	
12:25:12	972.92	58.33	145.43	152.39	158.72	6.33	62.59	
12:25:32	972.11	58.28	145.42	152.40	158.72	6.32	62.42	
12:25:52	972.80	58.31	145.42	152.48	158.73	6.33	62.57	
12:26:12	972.11	58.34	145.40	152.41	158.76	6.35	62.84	
12:26:32	972.34	50.33	145.38	152.43	158.77	6.34	62.68	
12:26:51	971.76	58.34	145.33	152.39	158.72	6.33	62.67	
12:27:11	971.53	58.34	145.33	152.42	158.72	6.30	62.41	
12:27:31	971.99	58.29	145.34	152.42	158.74	6.32	62.52	
12:27:51	971.99	50.33	145.34	152.45	158.75	6.30	62.36	
12:28:11	972.69	50.33	145.35	152.46	158.76	6.30	62.30	
12:28:31	971.76	50.28	145.36	152.46	158.76	6.30	62.28	
12:28:51	972.92	58.36	145.34	152.46	158.76	6.29	62.23	
12:29:11	972.11	50.25	145.35	152.47	158.79	6.32	62.39	
12:29:30	971.99	58.40	145.38	152.47	158.79	6.32	62.65	
12:29:50	973.96	58.35	145.33	152.44	158.75	6.30	62.24	
12:30:10	973.03	58.37	145.34	152.45	158.78	6.32	62.54	
12:30:30	973.26	58.33	145.34	152.41	158.74	6.33	62.52	
12:30:50	972.92	58.30	145.31	152.41	158.70	6.29	62.12	
12:31:10	974.19	58.33	145.31	152.41	158.70	6.29	62.08	
12:31:30	973.73	58.34	145.28	152.37	158.72	6.34	62.66	

Statistics for 31 data values.

Largest data value	974.190	50.397	145.556	152.469	158.788	6.351	62.843
Smallest data value	971.528	50.246	145.275	152.374	158.672	6.252	61.823
Range of data	2.662	0.151	0.281	0.095	0.116	0.099	1.020
Arithmetic mean	972.704	58.333	145.402	152.422	158.729	6.307	62.366
Population Standard Deviation	0.661	0.030	0.076	0.026	0.030	0.022	0.227
3-Sigma	1.983	0.089	0.228	0.077	0.089	0.066	0.681
Population Variance	0.427	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.052

## APPENDIX F

Table F-3. Black Nickel/Solgel Thermal Loss Test Data at 200°C

IST Test	93/12/02	Increment of 1 records			METRIC	UNITS	
#403	#425	#434	#407	#436	#408	#411	#445
Clock	TC001	TC010	Tcamb	Calc.	WS100	FT100	Calc.
Standard	Temp	Temp	Ambient	Rec Temp	Wind	Collector	Heat Gain
Time	Inlet #1	Out #1	Temp	above amb	Speed	Flow #1	Sub 1, Flo1
HH:MM:SS	Deg C	Deg C	Deg C	Deg C	m/s	L/min	W/m <sup>2</sup>
12:49:51	199.87	198.04	8.98	190.14	2.67	26.87	-91.56
12:50:10	199.86	198.05	8.98	190.14	2.33	26.94	-91.24
12:50:30	199.89	198.05	8.98	190.17	1.79	26.85	-92.19
12:50:50	199.92	198.08	8.99	190.17	1.68	26.87	-92.59
12:51:10	199.94	198.09	8.99	190.20	2.18	26.85	-93.00
12:51:30	199.93	198.12	8.99	190.20	1.99	26.89	-90.68
12:51:50	199.94	198.12	9.00	190.20	4.18	26.88	-91.34
12:52:10	199.94	198.12	9.01	190.19	3.36	26.86	-91.06
12:52:29	199.91	198.09	9.03	190.14	2.94	26.88	-91.33
12:52:49	199.88	198.08	9.03	190.12	2.22	26.87	-90.34
12:53:09	199.88	198.06	9.03	190.11	2.16	26.86	-91.16
12:53:29	199.91	198.05	9.05	190.11	1.95	26.89	-93.41
12:53:49	199.91	198.05	9.06	190.10	2.05	26.91	-93.30
12:54:09	199.98	198.07	9.07	190.10	1.82	26.89	-91.91
12:54:29	199.91	198.08	9.09	190.07	2.00	26.86	-91.67
12:54:48	199.91	198.07	9.11	190.06	1.80	26.85	-92.45
12:55:08	199.91	198.09	9.11	190.07	1.63	26.86	-91.36
12:55:28	199.98	198.09	9.12	190.06	1.53	26.86	-98.86
12:55:48	199.89	198.10	9.14	190.03	1.57	26.88	-90.03
12:56:08	199.98	198.09	9.16	190.01	1.85	26.86	-90.88
12:56:28	199.89	198.10	9.16	190.01	1.80	26.88	-89.72
12:56:48	199.89	198.09	9.17	190.00	2.06	26.98	-90.31
12:57:08	199.92	198.11	9.17	190.03	2.04	26.86	-90.91
12:57:27	199.93	198.12	9.18	190.02	2.17	26.85	-91.12
12:57:47	199.91	198.10	9.20	189.99	2.12	26.87	-90.75
12:58:07	199.94	198.12	9.20	190.00	3.14	26.88	-91.12
12:58:27	199.92	198.09	9.22	189.95	3.24	26.89	-91.78
12:58:47	199.91	198.08	9.23	189.94	3.22	26.83	-91.47
12:59:07	199.88	198.07	9.24	189.90	3.62	26.84	-90.76
12:59:27	199.98	198.05	9.24	189.91	4.17	26.86	-92.77
12:59:47	199.84	198.04	9.28	189.83	3.58	26.86	-90.40

### Statistics for 31 data values

Largest data value	199.940	198.121	9.282	190.203	4.181	26.944	-89.716
Smallest data value	199.841	198.038	8.977	189.827	1.534	26.830	-93.406
Range of data	0.099	0.083	0.305	0.376	2.647	0.113	3.690
Arithmetic mean	199.904	198.082	9.104	190.064	2.412	26.871	-91.402
Population Standard Deviation	0.024	0.825	0.894	0.897	0.772	0.022	0.936
3-Sigma	0.072	0.076	0.283	0.291	2.316	0.067	2.807
Population Variance	0.001	0.001	0.009	0.009	0.596	0.000	0.875

stable data point, and is also about the best the fluid supply system can maintain, and the best we can reasonably measure with current equipment. Operation for less than an hour at a given temperature produces less stable temperatures, operation for a longer time results in little improvement. An important stability requirement for the data averaging period is that there be no trend of temperatures (or flow rates) toward higher or lower values, which would indicate that energy is being stored in (or removed from) the mass of the test system.

Even a stringent  $\pm 0.05^{\circ}\text{C}$  temperature stability requirement is not as good as would be desirable; as the result is a 4% scatter in the measured thermal losses shown in Table F-3.

Data measurement errors were calculated using the root-sum-square method, defined as: (Ref. 2; Ref. 3):

$$E_{rss} = \sqrt{\left[ \Delta\mu_1 \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_1} \right) \right]^2 + \left[ \Delta\mu_2 \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_2} \right) \right]^2 + \dots + \left[ \Delta\mu_n \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_n} \right) \right]^2} \quad (1)$$

Where:  $E_{rss}$  = root-sum-square error

$\mu_i$  = measured quantity

$\Delta\mu_i$  = error in measured quantity

$\partial F/\partial \mu_i$  = partial derivative of the calculated function with respect to the measured quantity.

Two error sources were considered: the instrument calibration (bias) errors, and statistical errors due to scatter in repeated measurements of the same quantity. Instrument errors were calculated using equation (1) above. Statistical error was calculated by using the measurement standard deviation multiplied by the Student's T statistic for the measurement degrees of freedom ( $n$  measurements -1). The two errors were then combined using the root-sum-square method for a final error estimate.

## Heat Gain Errors

The following equation was used in calculating heat gain (or loss):

$$Q = (\text{flow rate}) * (\text{density}) * (\text{specific heat}) * (\text{delta-temperature}) \quad (2)$$

Density of the heat transfer fluid:

$$\rho = A + B(\text{temperature}) + C(\text{temperature})^2 + D(\text{temperature})^3 \quad (3)$$

For water, coefficients A, B, C and D were obtained from an equation fitted to data from Keenan and Keys (Ref. 4); for Syltherm®, the coefficients were from Dow Corning (Ref. 1). In each case, the temperature used was the temperature of the fluid at the flow meter. For density, the coefficients are:

## APPENDIX F

	<u>Water</u>	<u>Syltherm® oil</u>
A	0.99971 kg/L	954.0 kg/m <sup>3</sup>
B	-1.42399 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	-0.919
C	-2.69909 x 10 <sup>-6</sup>	4.25 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>
D	0.0	-1.67 x 10 <sup>-6</sup>

For specific heat of the heat transfer fluid, the equation is:

$$C_p = E + F \text{ (temperature)} + G \text{ (temperature)}^2 \quad (4)$$

Coefficients for specific heat are from the same sources as for density. The average temperature of the fluid in the collector's receiver tube was used to evaluate the equations. For specific heat, the coefficients are:

	<u>Water</u>	<u>Syltherm® oil</u>
E	4.0803 kJ/kg°C	1575 J/kg°C
F	-6.379 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	1.708
G	4.487 x 10 <sup>-6</sup>	0.0

Instrument calibration errors were as follows:

Temperature	$E_t$	=	0.5°C	(Calibrated type T thermocouples)
Delta-temperature	$Edt$	=	0.2°C	(Matched pair, type T thermocouples)
Flow rate	$E_f$	=	1% of flow	(Liters/minute)
Insolation	$E_i$	=	2% of DNI	(Watts/m <sup>2</sup> )

For heat gain Q, the error equation (1) due to instrumentation bias error becomes:

$$Eq = \sqrt{\left[ E_p \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial p} \right) \right]^2 + \left[ Edt \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial dt} \right) \right]^2 + \left[ Ef \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial f} \right) \right]^2 + \left[ Ecp \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial cp} \right) \right]^2} \quad (5)$$

Where:

$\partial q / \partial p$	=	Flow * Cp * dt
$\partial p / \partial t$	=	B + 2C * Temp + 3D * Temp <sup>2</sup>
$\partial cp / \partial t$	=	F + 2G * Temp
$\partial q / \partial dt$	=	$\rho * Flow * Cp$
$\partial q / \partial f$	=	$\rho * Cp * dt$
$\partial q / \partial cp$	=	$\rho * Flow * dt$
$\rho$	=	fluid density, kg/m <sup>3</sup>
$E_p$	=	$E_t * \partial p / \partial t$
$E_{cp}$	=	$E_t * \partial cp / \partial t$
Flow	=	fluid flow in m <sup>3</sup> /sec

$E_f$  = flow measurement error,  $\text{m}^3/\text{sec}$   
 $\text{Temp}$  = fluid temperature,  $^{\circ}\text{C}$   
 $E_t$  = temperature measurement error,  $^{\circ}\text{C}$   
 $d_t$  = receiver fluid delta temperature,  $^{\circ}\text{C}$   
 $E_{dt}$  = delta temperature measurement error,  $^{\circ}\text{C}$   
 $C_p$  = fluid specific heat,  $\text{J/kg}^{\circ}\text{C}$   
 $q$  = Heat gain (Loss), Watts

### Efficiency Errors

Efficiency is derived from heat gain and input insolation:

$$\eta = \text{heat gain} / \text{heat input} = Q / \text{insolation} * \text{collector aperture}$$

For an efficiency measurement, the error equation due to instrumentation bias error is:

$$E\eta = \sqrt{Eq \left[ \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial q} \right]^2 + Ei \left[ \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial i} \right]^2} \quad (6)$$

Where:

$Eq$  = error in heat gain  
 $Ei$  = error in insolation  
 $\partial \eta / \partial q = 1 / (\text{insolation} * \text{aperture})$   
 $\partial \eta / \partial i = -q / (\text{insolation}^2 * \text{aperture})$

### Incident Angle Modifier

Incident angle modifier  $K$  is the ratio of efficiency performance at some incident angle to the efficiency at zero incident angle:

$$K = \eta_{IA} / \eta_0 \quad (7)$$

The incident angle modifier instrument bias error equation is:

$$E_k = \sqrt{E_A \left[ \frac{\partial k}{\partial \eta_A} \right]^2 + E_0 \left[ \frac{\partial k}{\partial \eta_0} \right]^2} \quad (8)$$

Where:

$E_k$  = Error in incident angle modifier  $K$   
 $E_A$  = Error in efficiency at incident angle  $A$   
 $E_0$  = Error in efficiency at incident angle zero  
 $\partial k / \partial \eta_A = 1 / \eta_0$   
 $\partial k / \partial \eta_0 = -\eta_A / \eta_0^2$

## APPENDIX F

### Sample Efficiency Error Analysis

When the equations above are evaluated at 150 °C inlet temperature (last entry in Table D-4), the values are:

Inlet temp	= 150.83 °C
Outlet temp	= 158.30 °C
Delta-Temp	= 7.43°C
Ambient air	= 10.28 °C
Oil flow rate	= 0.000827217 m <sup>3</sup> /sec
Density	= 819.30 kg/m <sup>3</sup> @ 150.86 °C
Specific heat	= 1839.02 J/kg °C @ 154.57 °C
Insolation	= 990.0 W/m <sup>2</sup>
Heat gain Q	= 701.31 W/m <sup>2</sup>
Efficiency	= 70.82 %
Et	= 0.6058 °C
Edt	= 0.206 °C
Ei	= 20.14 W / m <sup>2</sup>
Ef	= 0.00000839 m <sup>3</sup> /sec
Ecp	= 1.03 J/kg °C
Eρ	= -0.5481 kg/m <sup>3</sup>
$\partial q/\partial cp$	= 5.03761
$\partial q/\partial dt$	= 1246.37
$\partial q/\partial f$	= 11199322
$\partial q/\partial p$	= 11.3076
$\partial p/\partial t$	= -0.90479
$\partial cp/\partial t$	= 1.708
Eq	= 20.74 W / m <sup>2</sup> gain error
$\partial \eta/\partial Q$	= 0.0010101
$\partial \eta/\partial i$	= -0.00071554
$E_\eta$	= 2.60 % efficiency error due to instrumentation & data scatter

For the measurement analyzed above, 31 data measurements were made over a period of 10 minutes. The efficiency standard deviation for the data set was 0.367 %, and the 95% confidence T statistic for 31 measurements was 2.042.

The calculations for estimated error outlined above were repeated for each entry in the data tables; the results are listed in the 'Est Error' column of each data table in Appendix D, and are also used to size the error bars shown on the curves.

The critical measurements which have the most effect on error magnitude are fluid flow rate, delta-temperature, and insulation. A large sample size with a small standard deviation is also needed for a small error bound, again reinforcing the requirement for maximum system stability before data measurements begin.

**References**


Dow Corning; 1985. Properties of Syltherm 800 Heat Transfer Liquid. Midland, Michigan.

Doebelin, E. O., 1983. Measurement Systems; Application and Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Bevington, P. R., 1969. Data Reduction and Error Analysis for the Physical Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Dieck, Ronald H., 1992. Measurement Uncertainty: Methods and Applications. Instrument Society of America

Keenan, J H., Keys, F. G., Hill, J. G., Moore, J. G. 1978. Steam Tables. New York: Wiley-Interscience.



Attn: Tom Tracey  
6922 S. Adams Way  
Littleton, CO 80122

AAA Solar Service and Supply, Inc.  
Attn: Chuck Marken  
2021 Zearing Avenue, NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87104

Attn: Tom Brumleve  
1512 Northgate Road  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Acurex Corporation  
Attn: Hans Dehne  
555 Clyde Avenue  
Mountain View, CA 94039

Attn: Jamie Chapman  
Number 402  
15 Sleeper Street  
Boston, MA 02210

Acurex Corporation  
Attn: John Schaeffer  
555 Clyde Avenue  
Mountain View, CA 94039

Attn: Karl Thomas Feldman, Jr.  
Mechanical Engineering Consultant  
1704 Stanford Drive NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106

Advanced Energy Systems  
Attn: Charles Bensinger  
P.O. Box 2685  
Santa Fe, NM 87504

Attn: Hilda Frazier  
2740 Centerview Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

Advanced Thermal Systems  
Attn: Dave Gorman  
7600 East Arapahoe Road, Suite 215  
Englewood, CO 80112

Attn: David Hagen  
134 Kitchener Street  
Garran, ACT 2605, AUSTRALIA

Alabama Energy Office  
Attn: Terri Adams  
401 Adams Avenue  
P.O. Box 5690  
Montgomery, AL 36103-5690

Attn: Pat Montoya  
625 Silver Avenue SW, Suite 130  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Alabama Power Company  
Attn: J.G. Boyles  
P.O. Box 2641  
Birmingham, AL 35291

Attn: Ricardo Xavier Zuniga  
119 East Marcy, Suite 101  
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Alabama Solar Energy Center  
Attn: Leonard Adcock  
University of Alabama in Huntsville  
Huntsville, AL 35899

3M - Solar Optics Program  
Attn: Paul Jaster  
3M Center  
Building 225-2N-06  
St. Paul, MN 55144-1000

Alliance to Save Energy  
Attn: Malcolm Verdict  
1725 K Street NW, Suite 509  
Washington, DC 20006

American Energy Technologies, Inc.  
Attn: Greg Peebles  
3530 Enterprise Way  
Green Cove Springs, FL 32043-1865

Arizona Solar Energy Office  
Attn: Frank P. Mancini, Ph.D.  
Department of Commerce  
3800 N. Central  
Suite 1200  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

American Hydrogen Assoc.  
Attn: Roy McCalister  
216 S. Clark, MS-103  
Tempe, AZ 85281

Arizona State University  
Attn: Paul Russell  
College of Engineering  
Tempe, AZ 85287

American Institute of Architects  
Attn: Richard C. Depta  
Director Energy Information  
1735 New York Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Arizona State University  
Attn: Byard D. Wood, Ph.D., P.E.  
College of Engineering & Applied Sciences  
Tempe, AZ 87287-5806

American Solar Energy Society  
Attn: Larry Sherwood  
2400 Central Avenue, Suite G-1  
Boulder, CO 80301

Arkansas Energy Office  
Attn: Chris Benson  
One State Capitol Mall  
Suite 4B-215  
Little Rock, AR 72201

American Sun Co.  
Attn: Miles Maiden  
777 Parker Point Road  
Blue Hill, ME 04614

Ascension Technology  
Attn: Ed Kern  
Box 314  
Lincoln Center, MA 01773

AMTECH  
Attn: Jeffrey Keating  
7441 NW 8th Street  
Bay M  
Miami, FL 33126

Australian National University  
Attn: Stephen Kaneff  
Information Technology  
0200 Canberra ACT, AUSTRALIA

Argonne National Laboratory  
Attn: Robert Baker  
9700 S. Cass Avenue  
Building 900  
Argonne, IL 60439

Bechtel National, Inc.  
Attn: Pascal (Pat) DeLaquil III  
P. O. Box 193965  
San Francisco, CA 94119-3965

Arizona Public Service Co.  
Attn: Scott McLellan  
P.O. Box 53999  
MS 1424  
Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999

Bechtel National, Inc.  
Attn: Stuart Fry  
50 Beale Street  
50/15 D8  
P.O. Box 193965  
San Francisco, CA 94119-3965

Bechtel National, Inc.  
Attn: Bruce Kelly  
50 Beale Street  
50/15 D25  
P.O. Box 193965  
San Francisco, CA 94119-3965

Carizzo Solar Corporation  
Attn: Mike Elliston  
P.O. Box 10239  
1011-C Sawmill Road NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87184-0239

Bergquam Energy Systems  
Attn: Jim Bergquam  
8611 Folsom Boulevard  
Sacramento, CA 95826

Carizzo Solar Corporation  
Attn: John Kusianovich  
P.O. Box 10239  
1011-C Sawmill Road NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87184-0239

Brookhaven National Laboratories  
Attn: John Andrews  
National Center for Analysis of Energy Systems  
Upton, NY 11973

Central and South West Services  
Attn: E. L. Gastineau  
1616 Woodall Rogers Freeway  
MS 7RES  
Dallas, TX 75202

California Energy Commission  
Attn: Alec Jenkins  
Energy Technology Development Div. R&D Office  
1516 9th Street  
MS-43  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

CIEMAT - PSA  
Attn: Manuel Sanchez-Jimenez  
Apartado 22  
E-04200 Tabernas (Almeria), SPAIN

California Energy Commission  
Attn: Promod Kulkarni  
Energy Technology Development Div. R&D Office  
1516 9th Street  
MS-43  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

City of Albuquerque  
Attn: Mike Minturn  
Resource Management Division  
General Services Department  
P.O. Box 1293  
Albuquerque, NM 87103-1293

California Energy Commission  
Attn: Phil Misemer  
Energy Technology Development Div. R&D Office  
1516 9th Street  
MS-43  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

City of Las Cruces  
Attn: Jerry Trojan  
P.O. Drawer CLC  
Las Cruces, NM 88004

California State Polytechnic University  
Attn: William B. Stine  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
3801 West Temple Avenue  
Pomona, CA 91768-4062

Colorado State University  
Attn: Allan T. Kirkpatrick  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
Ft. Collins, CO 80523

Commonwealth of Virginia  
Attn: Susie Thomas  
Institutional Conservation Program  
Ninth Street Office Blvd., 8th Floor  
202 North Ninth Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

Condumex  
Attn: Enrique B. Hill  
So juana ines de la Cruz  
34402o. Piso Tiainepantia. Edo. de Mexico  
C.P. 54000, MEXICO

DEO Enterprises  
Attn: Dave Ochenreider  
P.O. Box 2110  
26443 Corona Drive  
Helendale, CA 92342

County of Hawaii  
Attn: Steve Burns  
Dept. of Research and Development  
25 Aupuni Street  
Hilo, HI 96720

Department of Natural Resources  
Attn: Diane Smith  
Energy Division  
625 N. 4th Street  
P.O. Box 44156  
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Cummins Power Generation Inc.  
Attn: Isoroku (Rocky) Kubo  
Mail Code 60125  
P.O. Box 3005  
500 Jackson Street  
Columbus, IN 47202-3005

Department of Natural Resources  
Attn: Cher Stuewe-Portnoff  
Divison of Energy  
P.O. Box 176  
1500 Southridge  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Cummins Power Generation South  
Attn: Monte McGlaun  
150 Tannehill Drive  
Abilene, TX 79602

Dept. of Business, Economic Dev. & Tourism  
Attn: Maurice H. Kaya  
Energy Program Administrator  
335 Merchant Street, Room 110  
Honolulu, HI 96813

Daggett Leasing Corporation  
Attn: Bill Ludlow  
35100 Santa Fe St.  
P.O. Box 373  
Daggett, CA 92327

Distributed Utility Associates  
Attn: Joseph J. Iannucci  
3170 Crow Canyon Place  
Suite 140  
San Ramon, CA 94583

Daggett Leasing Corporation  
Attn: Wayne Luton  
35100 Santa Fe St.  
P.O. Box 373  
Daggett, CA 92327

DLR  
Attn: Berthold Oberle  
Pfaffenwaldring 38-40  
7000 Stuttgart 80, GERMANY

Daggett Leasing Corporation  
Attn: Eric Wills  
35100 Santa Fe St.  
P.O. Box 373  
Daggett, CA 92327

DLR - Kohn MD - ET  
Attn: Manfred Becker  
Linder Hohe  
P.O. Box 90 60 58  
D-51140 Kohn, GERMANY

Delaware Energy Office  
Attn: John Posdon  
P.O. Box 1401  
O'Neill Building  
Dover, DE 19903

DLR - Kolin MD - ET  
Attn: Klaus Hennecke  
Linder Hohe  
P.O. Box 90 60 58  
D-51147 Kolin, GERMANY

Energy Division  
Attn: Jimmy Johnston  
320 6th Avenue North  
6th Floor  
Rachel Jackson Building  
Nashville, TN 37243-0405

DLR - Stuttgart EN - TT  
Attn: Reiner Buck  
Pfaffenwaldring 38-40  
D-70569 Stuttgart, GERMANY

Energy Foundation  
Attn: Bill Keepin  
75 Federal Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Electric Ideas Clearinghouse  
Attn: Douglas Kilpatrick  
809 Legion Way SE FA-11  
Olympia, WA 98504

Environmental Technology & Education Center  
(ETEC)  
Attn: Jon Nimitz, Ph.D.  
3300 Mountain Road NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106-1920

Electric Power Research Institute  
Attn: Ed DeMeo  
P.O. Box 10412  
3412 Hillview Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

FAFCO  
Attn: Freeman Ford  
2690 Middlefield Road  
Redwood City, CA 94063

Electric Power Research Institute  
Attn: Dick Holl  
1938A Avenida Del Oro  
Oceanside, CA 92056

Florida Energy Office  
Attn: Michael Ashworth  
Dept. of Community Affairs  
2740 Centerview Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

Electric Power Research Institute  
Attn: Doug Morris  
P.O. Box 10412  
3412 Hillview Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Florida Solar Energy Center  
Attn: David Block  
300 State Road, Suite 401  
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920-4099

Electric Power Research Institute  
Attn: J. Schaeffer  
P.O. Box 10412  
3412 Hillview Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Florida Solar Energy Center  
Attn: Library  
300 State Road, Suite 401  
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920-4099

Energy Concepts Co.  
Attn: Don Erickson  
627 Ridgely Ave.  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Florida Solar Energy Center  
Attn: Bruce Nimmo  
300 State Road, Suite 401  
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Florida Solar Energy Center  
Attn: Mark Thornbloom  
1679 Clearlake Road  
Cocoa, FL 32922-5703

Hawaii Energy Extension Service  
Attn: Andrea Beck  
Dept. of Business & Economic Development  
Hawaii Business Center  
99 Aupuni Street #214  
Hilo, HI 96720

Georgia Institute of Technology  
Attn: Sheldon Jeter  
School of Mech. Engr.  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Heliodyne, Inc.  
Attn: Jurg H. Bieri, Ph.D.  
4910 Seaport Avenue  
Richmond, CA 94804

Georgia Power Co.  
Attn: D. Keebaugh  
7 Solar Circle  
Shenandoah, GA 30265

Heliotrope  
Attn: Malcolm Herbert  
3733 Kenora Drive  
Spring Valley, CA 92077

Gould Inc.  
Attn: Greg Ringle  
Foil Division  
2929 W. Chandler Blvd.  
P.O. Box 190  
Chandler, AZ 85244-0190

Idaho Dept. of Water Resources  
Attn: Joan Sipple  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0098

Governor's Office of Economic Development  
Attn: David M. O'Hara  
711 E. Wells Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501-3369

Idaho Power  
Attn: Jerry Young  
P.O. Box 70  
Boise, ID 83707

Governor's Office of Energy/Comm Sys  
Attn: Norwood Kenney, III  
57 Regional Drive  
Concord, NH 03301-8519

Indiana Dept. of Commerce  
Attn: Sharon Storms  
Energy Policy Division  
One N. Capitol Avenue  
Suite 700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Governor's Office of Housing, Energy &  
Intergovernment Rel  
Attn: Joan Carbone  
State House, Room 111  
Providence, RI 22903

Industrial Solar Technology  
Attn: Randy Gee (5)  
4420 McIntyre Street  
Golden, CO 80403

Harris Corporation  
Attn: Byron F. Knight  
P.O. Box 91000  
Melbourne, FL 32902-9100

Inner Solar Roof Systems, Inc.  
Attn: Joseph Allegro  
731 NE 69th Street  
Boca Raton, FL 33487

Institute of Gas Technology  
Attn: Library  
34245 State Street  
Chicago, IL 60616

Kramer Junction Company  
Attn: Stuart Lawson  
900 19th St. NW  
Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20006

Instituto de Investigaciones Electricas  
Attn: Jorge M. Huacuz Villamar  
Interior Internado Palmira  
Apartado Postal 475  
62000 Cuernavaca, Mor., MEXICO

LA Department of Natural Resources  
Attn: Dionne Bordes  
P.O. Box 44156  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4156

Inter-Island Solar Supply  
Attn: Cully Judd  
345 N. Nimitz Hwy  
Honolulu, HI 96817

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
Attn: Arlon Hunt  
University of California  
MS 90-2024  
One Cyclotron Road  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Iowa Dept. of Natural Resources  
Attn: Ward Lenz  
Energy Bureau - 4th Floor  
Wallace State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Attn: Donald Neeper  
Advanced Engineering Technology Group  
P.O. Box 1663, MS F576  
Los Alamos, NM 87545

JWK Associates, Inc.  
Attn: J. Willard King  
112 Cloister Drive  
Peachtree City, GA 30269

Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power  
Attn: Daryl Yonamine  
Alternate Energy Systems  
111 North Hope Street, Rm. 661A  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Kearney & Associates  
Attn: David W. Kearney (5)  
14022 Condessa Drive  
Del Mar, CA 92014

Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton  
Attn: Steve Szorka  
Assistant Chief of Staff Facilities  
P.O. Box 555013  
Camp Pendleton, CA 92055-5013

KJC Operating Company  
Attn: Bob Cable  
41100 Highway 395  
Boron, CA 93516

Maui Economic Opportunity, Inc.  
Attn: Doreen M.K. Galam  
Molokai Branch Office  
P.O. Box 677  
Kaunakakai, HI 96748

KJC Operating Company  
Attn: Gilbert E. Cohen  
41100 Highway 395  
Boron, CA 93516

McDonnell-Douglas Astronautics Co.  
Attn: Bob Drubka  
5301 Bolsa Avenue  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647-2048

Mechanical Technologies, Inc.  
Attn: G.R. Dochat  
968 Albany Shaker Road  
Latham, NY 12110

Mississippi Technology Transfer Center  
Attn: Clay Griffith  
Stennis NASA Center  
Bay St. Louis, MS 39529

Meridian Corporation  
Attn: Anil Cabraal  
4300 King Street  
Suite 400  
Alexandria, VA 22302-1508

Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
Attn: Pam Barkhaus  
P.O. Box 176  
1500 Southridge  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Meridian Corporation  
Attn: Chris Rovero  
4300 King Street  
Suite 400  
Alexandria, VA 22302-1508

Municipality of Anchorage  
Attn: Larry Roetto  
4831 Old Seward Highway #104  
Anchorage, AK 99503

Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources  
Attn: S.K. Gupta  
Block No. 14  
CGO Complex  
Lodhi Road  
New Delhi, 110003 INDIA

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: John Anderson  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/133  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources  
Attn: R.S. Sharma  
Block No. 14  
CGO Complex  
Lodhi Road  
New Delhi, 110003 INDIA

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Mark Bohn  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/132  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources  
Attn: Narendra Singh  
Block No. 14  
CGO Complex  
Lodhi Road  
New Delhi, 110003 INDIA

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Mary Jane Hale  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/105-03  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Mississippi Dept. of Economic & Community  
Development  
Attn: Betty Norman  
P.O. Box 850  
Energy Division  
Jackson, MS 39205-0850

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Steve Hauser  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4700/217  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Russ Hewett  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/122  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: James G. Jones  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

National Technology Transfer Center  
Attn: Sergio Lopes  
Wheeling Jesuit College  
316 Washington Ave.  
Wheeling, WV 26003

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Chuck Kutscher, P.E.  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Nature Conservancy  
Attn: Will Murray  
1815 N. Lynn Street  
Arlington, VA 22209

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Allan Lewandowski  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/130  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

NCAT  
Attn: Jeff Birkby  
P.O. Box 3838  
Butt, MT 59702

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Hank Price (2)  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/115  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Nebraska Dept. of Economic Development  
Attn: Rex A. Martin  
University of Nebraska at Lincoln  
W191 Nebraska Hall  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0535

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Steve Rubin  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Nebraska State Energy Office  
Attn: Robert Harris  
P.O. Box 95085  
State Capitol Building, 9th Floor  
Lincoln, NE 68509-5085

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Tim Wendelin  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4710/105-11  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Nevada Energy Office  
Attn: DeeAnn Parsons  
1050 East Williams Street  
Suite 435  
Carson City, NV 89710

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Attn: Tom Williams  
1617 Cole Blvd.  
Branch 4700/118  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Nevada Power Co.  
Attn: Eric Dominguez  
P.O. Box 230  
Las Vegas, NV 89151

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association  
Attn: Ron Orozco  
5a. Avenida 16-28  
Zona 10, 01010  
Guatemala, C.A., GUATEMALA

New & Renewable Energy Authority  
Attn: Adel Tawfik Soliman, Ph.D.  
P.O. Box 39 El-Souk El-Togary  
Maadi 11693 Cairo, EGYPT

New Mexico Manufacturing Extension Program  
Attn: Ken Manicki  
1009 Bradbury Drive, SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106

New Mexico State University  
Attn: G. Mulholland  
New Mexico Solar Energy Institute  
Box 3 SOL  
Las Cruces, NM 88003

New Mexico Manufacturing Productivity Center  
Attn: Graham Bartlett  
1009 Bradbury Drive, SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106

North Carolina Alternative Energy Corp.  
Attn: Bob Weiss  
P.O. Box 12699  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

New Mexico Natural Resources Dept.  
Attn: Harold Trujillo  
2040 South Pacheco  
Santa Fe, NM 87503

North Carolina Department of Commerce  
Attn: David Smith  
Energy Division  
430 N Salisbury Street  
Raleigh, NC 27611

New Mexico R&D Forum  
Attn: Richard Cole  
University of New Mexico  
R&D Communication Office  
Albuquerque, NM 87131-6076

North Dakota Energy Office  
Attn: Kim Christianson  
600 East Blvd., 14th Floor  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0170

New Mexico Solar Energy Industries Association  
Attn:  
C/O AAA Solar  
2021 Zeoring NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Northwest Power Planning Council  
Attn: Tom Truelove  
851 SW 6th Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Portland, OR 97204

New Mexico State University  
Attn: Robert O. Coppedge, Ph.D.  
Cooperative Extension Service  
Box 3AE  
Las Cruces, NM 88003-0001

Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
Attn: Marilyn Brown  
P.O. Box 2008  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6070

New Mexico State University  
Attn: Nick Deveraux  
Astronomy Dept.  
Box 30001  
Dept. 4500  
Las Cruces, NM 88003-0001

Office of Energy Conservation  
Attn: Tom Brotherton  
1675 Broadway, #1300  
Denver, CO 80202

New Mexico State University  
Attn: Steve Durand  
Southwest Technology Development Institute  
Box 30001, Dept. 3 SOL  
Las Cruces, NM 88003-0001

Office of Policy and Management  
Attn: David Lavine  
Policy Development & Planning Div.  
80 Washington Street  
Hartford, CT 06106

Office of Technical Assessment  
Attn: Sam Baldwin  
U. S. Congress  
Washington, DC 20510-8025

Public Service Electric & Gas  
Attn: Harry Roman  
P.O. Box 570  
Newark, NJ 07101

Ohio Department of Development  
Attn: Robert Garrick  
Office of Energy Efficiency  
77 South High Street, 26th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43266-0413

Radco Products, Inc.  
Attn: George O. Radford  
2877 Industrial Parkway  
Santa Maria, CA 93455

Oklahoma Department of Commerce  
Attn: Sherwood Washington  
Division of Community Affairs and Development  
P.O. Box 26980  
6601 North Broadway  
Oklahoma City, OK 73126

Reliable Inspection  
Attn: Michael Weir  
2429 South Shelton St.  
Santa Ana, CA 92707

Oregon Department of Energy  
Attn: Suzanne Dillard  
625 Marion Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310-1313

Renewable Energy Training Institute  
Attn: Jeff Keas  
122 C St. NW, Suite 520  
Washington, DC 20001

Packerland Solar System  
Attn: Richard Lane  
P.O. Box 8262  
Green Bay, WI 54308

Renewable Energy Training Institute  
Attn: Jeffrey S. Ross  
122 C St. NW, Suite 520  
Washington, DC 20001

Pennsylvania Energy Office  
Attn: Joe Deklinski  
116 Pine Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1227

Research Triangle Institute  
Attn: Carl Parker  
P.O. Box 12194  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Pennsylvania Energy Office  
Attn: Phillip Schuller  
116 Pine Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1227

Roan Corporation  
Attn: James L. Abolt  
177 Bovet Road  
Suite 520  
San Mateo, CA 94402

Public Service Company of New Mexico  
Attn: Becky Kilbourne  
Alvarado Square  
Retail Electric Marketing Center  
Albuquerque, NM 87158

Rockwell International Corp.  
Attn: Bob Musica  
Energy Technology Engineering Center  
P.O. Box 1449  
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Rockwell International Corp.  
Attn: R. D. (Dale) Rogers  
Rocketdyne Division  
P.O. Box 7922  
6633 Canoga Avenue  
Canoga Park, CA 91309-7922

Rockwell International Corp.  
Attn: Bill Wahl  
Rocketdyne Division  
P.O. Box 7922  
6633 Canoga Avenue  
Canoga Park, CA 91309-7922

Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
Attn: Bud Beebe  
Generation Systems Planning  
Power Systems Dept.  
6201 'S' St.  
P.O. Box 15830  
Sacramento, CA 95852-1830

Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
Attn: Don Osborne  
Generation Systems Planning  
Power Systems Dept.  
6201 'S' St.  
P.O. Box 15830  
Sacramento, CA 95852-1830

Salt River Project  
Attn: Bob Hess  
Generation Engineering  
P.O. Box 52025  
Mail Station PAB358  
Phoenix, AZ 85072-2025

Salt River Project  
Attn: Ernie Palomino  
Research & Development  
P. O. Box 52025  
Mail Station ISB664  
Phoenix, AZ 85072-2025

San Diego Gas & Electric Co.  
Attn: Skip Fralick  
P.O. Box 1831  
San Diego, CA 92112

SBP - Schlaich, Bergermann und. Partner  
Attn: Wolfgang Schiel  
Hohenzollernstr. 1  
D-70178 Stuttgart, GERMANY

Science Applications International Corp.  
Attn: Kelly Beninga  
15000 W. 6th Avenue  
Suite 202  
Golden, CO 80401

Science Applications International Corp.  
Attn: Barry L. Butler  
Room 2043, M/S C2J  
10260 Campus Point Dr.  
San Diego, CA 92121

Science Applications International Corp.  
Attn: Dave Smith  
15000 W. 6th Avenue  
Suite 202  
Golden, CO 80401

Scientific Information Service, Inc.  
Attn: Patricia Gunkle  
7 Woodland Ave.  
Larchmont, NY 10538

Sloan Engineering  
Attn: Michael Sloan  
4306 Ramsey Ave.  
Austin, TX 78756

Solar Energy Industries Association  
Attn: Linda Ladas  
122 C Street, NW  
4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20001-2109

Solar Energy Industries Association  
Attn: Mac Moore  
122 C Street, NW  
4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20001-2109

**Solar Energy Industries Association**  
Attn: Ann Polansky  
122 C Street, NW  
4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20001-2109

**South Coast AQMD**  
Attn: Ranji George  
21865 Copley Drive  
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

**Solar Energy Industries Association**  
Attn: Ken Sheinkopf  
122 C Street, NW  
4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20001-2109

**Southern California Edison Co.**  
Attn: Mark Skowronski  
P.O. Box 800  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770

**Solar Energy Industries Association**  
Attn: Scott Sklar  
122 C Street., NW  
4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20001-2109

**Southern California Edison Co.**  
Attn: Paul Sutherland  
6090 North Irwindale Avenue  
Irwindale, CA 91702-3271

**Solar Kinetics, Inc.**  
Attn: Gus Hutchison  
10635 King William Drive  
P.O. Box 540636  
Dallas, TX 75354-0636

**Spencer Management Associates**  
Attn: Byron J. Washom ( 5 )  
P.O. Box 724  
Diablo, CA 94528-0724

**Solar Steam**  
Attn: Doug E. Wood  
P.O. Box 32  
Fox Island, WA 98333

**State Energy Conservation Office**  
Attn: Michael Wiley  
211 E. 11th Street  
Austin, TX 78701

**Solar Stirling Industries**  
Attn: Jack Stearns  
2822 Highridge Road  
La Crescenta, CA 91214

**State of California**  
Attn: Harry Franey  
Dept. of Corrections  
3116 Pleasant Grove Rd.  
Pleasant Grove, CA 95668

**Solar Uno**  
Attn: Ellis Perez  
Ave. Sarasota No. 54, Apto. 102  
Santo Domingo, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

**State of Colorado**  
Attn: Howard Andy Walker, Ph.D., M.E.  
Office of Energy Conservation  
1675 Broadway, Suite 1300  
Denver, CO 80202-4613

**Solel Solar Systems, Ltd.**  
Attn: Har Hotzvim  
Science-Based Park  
P.O. Box 23577  
Jerusalem, 91234 ISRAEL

**State of Florida**  
Attn: Daryl O'Connor  
Executive Office of the Governor  
The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001

**State of Hawaii**  
Attn: Maurice H. Kaya, P.E.  
Dept. of Business and Economic Development  
335 Merchant Street, Room 108  
Honolulu, HI 96813

**State of Hawaii**  
Attn: David A. Rezacheck, Ph.D., P.E.  
Dept. of Business and Economic Development  
335 Merchant Street, Room 110  
Honolulu, HI 96813

**State of Hawaii**  
Attn: Carolyn Shon  
Energy Division  
335 Merchant Street, Room 110  
Honolulu, HI 96813

**State of New Mexico**  
Attn: Brian K. Johnson, P.E.  
Energy Information Services  
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Dept.  
2040 S. Pacheco Street  
Santa Fe, NM 87505

**State of New Mexico**  
Attn: Ingrid Kelley  
Energy Information Services  
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Dept.  
2040 S. Pacheco Street  
Santa Fe, NM 87505

**State of New Mexico**  
Attn: Harold Trujillo  
Energy Information Services  
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Dept.  
2040 S. Pacheco Street  
Santa Fe, NM 87505

**State of Tennessee**  
Attn: David Edmunds  
Department of General Services  
312 8th Ave N  
8th Floor  
Nashville, TN 37243-0554

**State of Texas**  
Attn: Charles Nichols  
Dept. of Commerce  
Office of Advanced Technology  
P.O. Box 12728  
Austin, TX 78711

**State University of New York**  
Attn: R. Perez  
Atmospheric Sciences Research Center  
Albany, NY 12222

**Sterling Grogan**  
Attn:  
3128-2 Glenwood Drive  
Albuquerque, NM 87107

**Stirling Technology Co.**  
Attn: Jack Noble  
2952 George Washington Way  
Richland, WA 99352

**Stirling Thermal Motors**  
Attn: Lennart Johansson  
275 Metty Drive  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

**Strategies Unlimited**  
Attn: R. Winegarner  
201 San Antonio Circle  
Suite 205  
Mountain View, CA 94040

**Sun Steam**  
Attn: Allen Bronstein  
765 San Antonio  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

**Sun Utility Network, Inc.**  
Attn: Les Hamasaki  
510 W. 6th Street  
Suite 417  
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Sustainable Energy Systems  
Attn: David N. Borton, Ph.D.  
Hilltop Road  
Troy, NY 12180

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Attn: Robert S. Gorham, Jr.  
P.O. Box 9005  
Champaign, IL 61826-9005

Technology Ventures Corporation  
Attn: W. Robert Gibson  
1601 Randolph Road SE, Suite 220  
Albuquerque, NM 87106

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Attn: Larry D. Lister  
P.O. Box 4005  
Champaign, IL 61820-1305

Ted Lewis & Associates  
Attn: Edward G. Lewis  
556 East Gill Way  
Superior, CO 80027

U.S. Army Engineering & Housing Support Center  
Attn: Robert G. O'Brien, P.E.  
Chief Utilities Engineering Division  
CEHSC-FU  
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-5580

Tennessee Dept. Economic & Comm Dev  
Attn: Chyralle Dawson  
320 Sixth Avenue North, 6th Floor  
Energy Division  
Nashville, TN 37243-0405

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Attn: Stanley Hightower  
Code D-3710  
P.O. Box 205007  
Denver, CO 80225

Texas State Energy Conservation Office  
Attn: Terina Veasey  
P.O. Box 13047  
Austin, TX 78711-3047

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Dan Alpert  
2140 L Street, #709  
Washington, DC 20037-1530

The Solar Letter  
Attn: Allan L. Frank  
9124 Bradford Road  
Silver Spring, MD 20901-4918

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Gary Burch  
EE-132  
Forrestal Building  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Trane Company  
Attn: Lee Burgett  
3600 Pammel Creek Road  
LaCrosse, WI 54601

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Ernie Chabot  
Office of Grants' Management  
EE-53  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Attn:  
Mobile District  
CESEAM-EM-CM  
P.O. Box 2288  
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Mark Ginsberg  
Federal Energy Management Activities  
EE-44  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Fred King  
San Francisco Regional Support  
1301 Clay Street  
RM 1060-N  
Oakland, CA 94612-5219

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Andrew Krantz  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
EE-10  
Washington, DC 20585

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Bob Martin  
Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, CO 80401

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: James Powell  
Atlanta Support Office  
730 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 876  
Atlanta, GA 30308

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: D.A. Sanchez  
Albuquerque Operations Office  
P.O. Box 5400  
Albuquerque, NM 87115

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Denise Swink  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

U.S. Department of Energy  
Attn: Frank (Tex) Wilkins  
Office of Industrial Technologies  
Forrestal Building, MS EE-222, Room 5F-035  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Attn: Cindy Jacobs  
401 M Street, SW  
GCD 6202J  
Washington, DC 20460

UC Operating Services  
Attn: Jan Hansen  
43880 Harper Lake Road  
Hinkley, CA 92347

Union of Concerned Scientists  
Attn: Donald Aitken  
20100 Skyline Boulevard  
Woodside, CA 94062

University of Arizona  
Attn: George V. Mignon  
Environmental Research Lab  
Tucson, AZ 85706-6985

University of Central Florida  
Attn: Gerard G. Ventre  
Institute for Simulation and Training  
12424 Research Parkway  
Suite 300  
Orlando, FL 32826

University of Chicago  
Attn: Joe O'Gallagher  
Enrico Fermi Institute  
5640 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60637

University of Colorado at Boulder  
Attn: Jan F. Kreider, P.E.  
Dept. of Civil, Environ. & Arch. Engr.  
Boulder, CO 80309

University of Houston  
Attn: Lorin Vant-Hull  
Physics Department 5506  
4800 Calhoun Road  
Houston, TX 77204-5506

University of Minnesota  
Attn: E.A. Fletcher  
1111 Church Street, SE  
Dept. of Mech. Engr.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

University of Nevada at Las Vegas  
Attn: Bob Boehm  
Dept. of Mech. Engr.  
4505 Maryland Parkway  
P.O. Box 454027  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-4027

University of New Mexico  
Attn: M.W. Wildin  
Dept. of Mech. Engr.  
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Utah Dept. of Community & Economic Development  
Attn: Michael Glenn  
Office of Energy Services  
Division of Community Development  
324 South State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Vermont Dept. of Public Service  
Attn: Scudder H. Parker  
Energy Efficiency Division  
120 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05602

Virgin Islands Energy Office  
Attn: Claudette Young-Hinds  
Old Customs House  
Frederiksted  
St. Croix, 00840 U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Attn: Saifur Rahman, Ph.D.  
Dept. of Elec. Engr.  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Virginia Power Co.  
Attn: Tim Bernadowski  
Corp. Tech. Assess.  
5000 Dominion Blvd.  
Glen Allen, VA 23060

Wall Street Journal  
Attn: David Stipp  
10 Post Office Square  
Suite 715  
Boston, MA 02109

Weizmann Institute of Science  
Attn: Michael Epstein  
P.O. Box 26  
IS-76100 Rehovot, ISRAEL

Weizmann Institute of Science  
Attn: Doron Lieberman  
P.O. Box 26  
Rehovot, 76100 ISRAEL

Wyoming Energy Office  
Attn: John F. Nunley, III  
Barrett Building  
4th Floor North  
Dept. of Commerce  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Zentrum fur Sonnenenergie-und Wasserstoff-Forschung  
Attn: Frank Lippke  
P.O. Box 80 11 49  
D-70511  
Stuttgart, GERMANY

Zentrum fur Sonnenenergie-und Wasserstoff-Forschung

Attn: Jurgens Rheinlander  
Hessbruhlstrasse 21 C  
Postfach 80 11 49  
D-70511 Stuttgart, GERMANY

Internal Distribution:

MS 0100	Document Proc. for DOE/OSTI, 7613-2 (2)
MS 0619	Technical Publications, 12613
MS 0702	D.E. Arvizu, 6200
MS 0703	J.R. Anderson, 6216
MS 0703	C.E. Andraka, 6216
MS 0703	R.B. Diver, 6216
MS 0703	D.R. Gallup, 6216
MS 0703	G.J. Kolb, 6216 (5)
MS 0703	T.R. Mancini, 6216
MS 0703	D.F. Menicucci, 6216 (15)
MS 0703	J.B. Moreno, 6216
MS 0703	T.A. Moss, 6216
MS 0703	J.E. Pacheco, 6216
MS 0703	M.R. Prairie, 6216
MS 0703	T.O. Reynolds, 6216
MS 0703	C.E. Tyner, 6216
MS 0704	C.J. Hanley, 6201
MS 0704	P.C. Klimas, 6201
MS 0704	E.H. Richards, 6201
MS 0752	M.L. Tatro, 6219
MS 0753	C.P. Cameron, 6218
MS 0753	H.N. Post, 6218
MS 0899	Technical Library, 13414 (5)
MS 1127	J.M. Chavez, 6215
MS 1127	V.E. Dudley, 6215 (5)
MS 1127	Library, 6215 (5)
MS 1127	A.R. Mahoney, 6215
MS 1127	E.E. Rush, 6215
MS 1127	J.W. Strachan, 6215
MS 9014	S. Faas, 5371
MS 9018	Central Technical Files, 8523-2
MS 9402	S. Goods, 8714
MS 9404	B. Bradshaw, 8716