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This contract is between the United States Atomic Energy Commission New York Office of Directed Operations and Harvard University through the above department. It represents a fundamental and applied research project with the following purposes:

I. Consultation service on problems of dust and fume control and atmospheric pollution related to the operations of the New York Office.

II. Basic laboratory research on methods of increasing particle size and aggregation by condensation from sprays, Joule-Thomson effect, or other suitable means with particular application to methods of collecting low concentrations of aerosols.

III. In conjunction with the laboratory project, field studies of the performance of various dust and fume collectors were to be undertaken.

IV. A literature survey of unclassified domestic and foreign publications on dust and fume collection was also considered a necessary part of this project.
V. A survey of manufacturers data on dust collecting and air cleaning equipment was also made a part of this project because of its relationship to the applied problem.

Progress to Date

I. Consultation:

Under this phase of the project we have been available for consultation at any time a request has been made. Advice and service has been rendered with regard to Brush Beryllium Corporation, Harshaw Chemical Company and an AEC ore sampling plant. We have spent some time advising other AEC contractors such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Kellex Corporation and Tracerlabs.

II. Basic research:

Under this phase of the project, considerable investigation has been made on use of sprays for air cleaning of light dust loadings. A progress report on this project is now being prepared and will be submitted at an early date.

III. Field studies:

The field study program has been hampered by limited personnel and funds but several installations have been contacted with regard to surveying and sampling this summer. Instruments for stack and effluent collection have been developed and assembled in preparation for this phase of the work.
IV. Literature survey:

The literature survey has been started and is still under investigation.

V. Manufacturers survey:

The results of the manufacturers survey and its relationship to test codes and their limitation is presented in the progress report attached to this summary of our activities to date.
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An Investigation of Specifications and Ratings of Commercial Air Cleaners

G. S. Reichenbach, Jr., Leslie Silverman and Philip Drinker

Introduction

This report presents a study made to determine the type and scope of information available from manufacturers of air cleaning and dust collection equipment. Over forty manufacturers were contacted, principally those listed in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1948 Mechanical Catalog.

To obtain as much specific information as possible and for ease in tabulating the data, specific forms were supplied to manufacturers (Figures 1 and 2). Limited data on general ventilation cleaners in 1940 was compiled by Carrier and others (1).

Air Cleaner Classifications

Commercial air cleaners may be grouped by usage into two basic categories:

A. Units for air cleaning installation in general ventilation systems (light dust loadings and high velocities (over 100 f.p.m.)).

B. Units controlling contaminants resulting from process equipment (heavy dust loadings with low to moderate velocities (3 to 50 f.p.m.)).
In certain instances there may be overlap of function when installation of general air cleaning devices are made for controlling (partially) dust generated by process equipment. Rarely, if ever, is the reverse of this true due primarily to the economics of the situation.

Each category may be sub-divided according to principle of collection as well as classification by usage.

I Mechanical:

(a) Settling chambers
   1. Dry
   2. Wet (Air Washers)

(b) Inertial separators
   1. Dry
   2. Wet

(c) Centrifugal
   1. Simple
      a. Dry
      b. Wet
   2. Multiple (Multiclon or Aerotec)
   3. Mechanically driven
      a. Dry
      b. Wet

(d) Scrubbers
   1. Simple
   2. Mechanical drive

II Filters:

(a) Wet
1. Renewable or throw away
2. Continuous

(b) Dry

1. Renewable or throw away
2. Continuous

III Electrical;

(a) Dry
(b) Wet

In selection of air cleaners for a given installation, the design engineer must decide which characteristic of the cleaner is paramount or the limiting factor.

In many process installations, the collector acts as a separator for large economically valuable air-borne particles while valueless small particles are discharged through a stack. Ordinary low efficiency cyclones are a typical example.

An important limiting condition is the pressure loss created by the filter, especially for general ventilation system air cleaning because low static pressure fans are used in this type of installation.

For other cases the criterion is absolute cleanliness of the discharged air. Examples of this are found in the manufacture of photographic film, biologicals, and in the assembly of precision instruments.

Methods of rating filters have stemmed from these items and other considerations. The usual methods of rating filters include one or more of the following criteria:
1. Efficiency:
   (a) Weight removal (arrestance)
   (b) Weight removal by particle size
   (c) Discoloration of a paper test filter
   (d) Decrease in particle count

2. Pressure loss (initial and final or loaded)

3. Dust holding capacities

4. Air velocity or filtration area

Methods of Rating Air Cleaners

The importance of rating air cleaners has been recognized by several professional societies, notably the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (A.S.M.E.) and the American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers (A.S.H.V.E.). Of the foreign groups, the German Engineering Society (V.D.I.) also published a standard.

In order of their appearance in the literature or their establishment, they are as follows:

A. The A.S.H.V.E. established a Standard Code for Testing and Rating Air Cleaning Devices Used in General Ventilation (not for rating units to be used in the field of industrial hygiene) which was adopted in January 1934 (2).

This code divided air cleaning devices into four groups according to pressure loss characteristics.

   Group A - Automatic type. In general all air cleaning devices which automatically maintain a constant resistance.
Group B - Low Resistance, Non-automatic type. Units designed for use where not more than 0.18 inch water gage pressure loss is allowable.

Group C - Medium Resistance, Non-automatic type. Units designed for use where not more than 0.5 inch water gage is allowable.

Group D - High Resistance, Non-automatic type. Units designed for use where 1.0 inch water gage or more is allowable as for the air intake of air compressors or internal combustion engines.

The dust loading was to be 0.35 grams of standard dust (50% by weight of powdered lamp black, containing 97.5% of free carbon minimum and having a bulking value of 3.5 pounds per cubic foot minimum, 50% by weight of ashes from Pocahontas bituminous coal screened to pass 200 mesh) for each 1000 cubic feet of air passed through the device.

Group A - 500 CFM (cubic feet per minute)
Group B - 250 CFM
Group C - 350 CFM
Group D - 350 CFM

The efficiency or arrestance was determined on a weight basis by determining the concentration of dust in the air with the cleaner in place and not in place. The arrestance concentration with cleaner is $1 - \frac{\text{concentration without cleaner}}{\text{concentration with cleaner}}$. 
The weakness of this code was in the establishment of a "test dust". A change in the "test dust" was suggested in 1942 but was not accepted by the society and afterwards the code was withdrawn. Research is now in progress at the A.S.H.V.E. Research Laboratory (sponsored by air cleaner manufacturers) to recommend a new code for the society. This research is worthwhile but is directed toward the adoption of a "test dust" satisfactory to all interested parties.

B. In 1936 the German Engineering Society (Vereines deutscher Ingeniure) published its "Standard for Investigation of the Performance of Dust Removing Apparatus" (3). This publication was intended primarily for the use of specialists in conducting acceptance tests on industrial units, but was made comprehensive enough for all engineers to appreciate the problems involved and to realize the pertinent specifications needed for this equipment.

All efficiencies of the apparatus were to be determined after installation of the equipment and were to be conducted in a manner specified by this standard. Exceptions and alternative procedures are based on agreement between the purchaser and supplier. Features covered include:

I. The defining of dust composition with regard to the free falling velocity of the particles.
II. Location of sampling areas in ducts.

III. Sampling devices utilizing a suitable cyclone alone or in conjunction with a filter material.

IV. Optional methods of determination of the degree of dust removal (weight basis).
   (a) From the dust quantity deposited in the remover and the dust content of the cleaned gas.
   (b) From the dust quantity deposited in the remover and the dust content of the raw gas.
   (c) From the dust contents of the raw gas and the clean gas.

V. Emphasis was laid on the need for the specifications of dust content to be maintained in the clean gas as well as specification of percentage dust removal.

C. After seven years of committee research and investigation, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in 1941, established a Test Code for Dust-separating Apparatus (4). In essence this code is similar to that of the V.D.I. in that it specifies testing equipment after its installation and gives several methods of sampling for this purpose. Neither code can be considered as practicable for routine testing of production units for selection purposes.

D. Other organizations have evolved methods of testing air cleaners of which the most notable is that employed by
the National Bureau of Standards (5). This method of rating utilizes a photometric method for determining efficiency and contains the following procedures:

"(1) Drawing air contaminated with test dust through the cleaner.

(2) Drawing samples of cleaned and uncleaned air simultaneously through filter papers high efficiency (100%).

(3) Comparing the two so obtained by means of a photometer using transmitted light.

(4) Changing the air flow per unit area of the spots during successive runs until they are equal or approximately equal in density.

(5) Computing the efficiency or arrestance on the basis of air flow upstream and downstream."

This method of testing has been used by many governmental agencies as a criterion in the purchase of air cleaning devices.

E. In 1926 the U. S. Bureau of Mines established (6) a routine testing method for gas mask filters which matched the intensity of a Tyndall beam from the effluent smoke with that of a known smokiness. This method has since been superseded by Schedule 21 (7) which utilizes the determination of the amount of material passing a filter during a given time at a known loading. This work
was all limited to respirator and gas mask filters.

Hill (8) published a method of rating respirators and filters which was used in England by the Chemical Defense Center at Porton. This was also a photoelectric method in which carbon black was the suspensoid used.

The methods of testing filters discussed are limited in their application to the overall problem of testing air cleaners. For this reason certain organizations such as the Eastman Kodak Company (9), Bell Telephone Laboratories (10) and Consolidated Edison Company of N. Y. (11,12) have developed their own testing procedure and methods of rating.

Test Dusts

A basic deficiency of the present proposed methods of rating air cleaners is that there has been no unanimity regarding the type of material to be used as a test suspension.

Early tests made on filters for general ventilation used ordinary household dust. This was later superceded because of non-uniformity and the fact that such settled dusts are easily filtered. The test dust of the original A.S.H.V.E. proved unsatisfactory because of lack of evidence that the suspensions were comparable to those met in practice and disagreement as to a satisfactory substitute led to withdrawal of the code.

The codas of the German Engineering Society (3) and the A.S.M.E. (4) avoid use of a specific test dust by measuring the per-
formance of the air cleaners after installation. This is a more funda-
mental way to test cleaners but is expensive and yields results in-
fluenced by the character of the material which the collector is
removing.

The N.B.S. test method (5) uses a test dust composed of a
Cottrell precipitate procured from one source, a local power plant
burning pulverized coal. A modification since the original speci-
fication has been the addition of 4% lamp black to 96% of the precipitated
fly ash.

Many other test dust have been suggested notably those by
Rowley and Jordan (13,14,15,16,17), Dalla Valle (18), Stern (19), Farr
(20) and Hill (8). Recommendations varied from the use of one specific
particle size and composition dust to the application of bacteria as
suggested by Dalla Valle. During World War II the U. S. Army used dust
obtained from the A. C. Spark Plug Company, Flint, Michigan. The
Eastman Kodak Company and Bell Telephone Laboratories use atmospheric
air for their testing media. In all cases there are pertinent reasons
for the selection of the dust, contingent upon which properties of the
cleaners were desired to be rated.

There is little prospect of accord at the present time be-
tween manufacturers and consumers of air cleaning devices concerning
the possible selection of a standard test dust because of the emphasis
which the inherent characteristics of the dust may play in favor of
one or another device. Dibble (21) in 1925 pointed out the varying
efficiencies of dry air filters for various types of dust.
Discussion of Manufacturers Data as Supplied from Questionnaire

Table 1 is a tabulation of the information obtained by the method outlined earlier in the report.

The equipment is listed according to the classifications as to usage and basic principle of operation. Units with the exception of those with definite volume limitations as noted in the table may be supplied or constructed to handle the desired air volumes. Flows cited correspond to the reported test results.

For reasons given previously, the material removed, its particle size and the basis of efficiency determinations make performance comparisons of the various units difficult. The remarks include the pertinent points of uniqueness or obvious deficiencies of the equipment from the A.E.C. standpoint.

The two most important factors in determining the needs of the A.E.C. with regard to air cleaners for radioactive air-borne wastes are absolute cleanliness of the effluent air and minimum maintenance. Information on particle size range of radioactive wastes is limited at the present time, hence the cleaner should remove the maximum amount possible for all size particles. Installations should perform with high and constant efficiencies with a minimum of maintenance and a maximum useful life before replacement. With regard to the removal of non-radioactive air-borne particles, it is felt that the present status of information regarding the efficiencies of col-
lectors is too sketchy to enable the designer to rigorously select the most economically satisfactory unit for a particular application.

At the present time, to our knowledge, the A.E.C. has not adopted a standard method of testing air cleaning devices prior to or after installation although it is and will continue to be a large purchaser of such equipment. It is therefore essential that specifications for air cleaners should be formulated for all types of problems in A.E.C. installations. The first part should embrace a suitable comparative testing basis for devices submitted by interested manufacturers. This test would be utilized as a screening device and units not satisfying these requirements would receive no further consideration, unless the units were modified.

The second specification would be similar in nature to the A.S.M.E. code although modified for the particular needs of the A.E.C. (such as setting a limit for the effluent concentration) and would be used for the acceptance of an installation as furnished by the manufacturer or contractor.
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Gentlemen:

A research program is being initiated in our department on the efficiency of air cleaning devices.

Our primary interest is in the cleanliness of the effluent air rather than the percentage efficiency.

Before starting our test program in our laboratory, we are polling the manufacturers of air cleaning units listed in the 1948 A.S.M.E. Directory.

The data which we receive will be tabulated. After critically reviewing the data, we shall then have a base line upon which to expand the data in this field.

For convenience we are enclosing forms which we would appreciate having your staff complete with respect to each of the types of equipment manufactured by your organization.

For our future reference, we should like to have any literature pertaining to this equipment.

We are grateful for your cooperation in this project.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

George S. Reichenbach, Jr.
Research Associate

GSR/ms
Enclosures
# AIR CLEANING RESEARCH PROGRAM

1. **Name of Manufacturer**

2. **Address**

3. **TRADE NAME of Equipment**

4. **Field or Laboratory Test**

5. **Material Removed**
   - **Chemical Composition**
   - **Particle Size Range**

6. **Overall Efficiency:**
   - **Weight Basis**
   - **Discoloration**
   - **Particle Count**
   - **Other**

7. **Quantity of Gas Handled**
   - **Temperature**

8. **Velocity of Gas Through Unit**
   - **Initial**
   - **Loaded**

9. **Pressure Loss Through Unit**
   - **Initial**
   - **Loaded**

10. **Efficiency of Separation According to Size of Particle:**
    - **Size**
    - **Efficiency**

11. **Concentration of Dust at Inlet and Outlet of Unit:**
    - **Inlet Concentration**
    - **Outlet Concentration**

**FIGURE II**
TABLE 1
DATA REPORTED BY MANUFACTURERS OF AIR CLEANING DEVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Trade Name</th>
<th>CFM</th>
<th>Temp °F</th>
<th>Material Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Air-Maze Corp.</td>
<td>Air-Maze P-5</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>N.B.S Dust 96% Cottrell 4% Lint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20'x20'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Air-Maze Corp</td>
<td>Air-Maze P-18</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20'x20'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Air-Maze Corp</td>
<td>Electro-Maze</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1' panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>American Air Filter Co.</td>
<td>Electro-Matic</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>50% smoke carbon 35% siliceous 5% coal dust 3% fibrous 7% misc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>American Air Filter Co.</td>
<td>Electro-Cell</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>American Air Filter Co.</td>
<td>Electro-Air Mat</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>50% smoke carbon 35% siliceous 5% coal dust 3% fibrous 7% misc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>Coppus Engineering Corp.</td>
<td>Type FU</td>
<td>1 (lab)</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Cottrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>Dollinger Corp.</td>
<td>Stay new type HE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>N.B.S Dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>Farr-Company</td>
<td>Ferr-Air type 44</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Stand. Army Fine Dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% &lt;5μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>Westinghouse Electric Co.</td>
<td>Industrial Precipitron</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120°F</td>
<td>Atmos. Dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>Hudson H. Bubar Co.</td>
<td>Type S</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Fly ash 85% 325m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>Buell Engineering Co.</td>
<td>Van Tongeren Cyclone</td>
<td>300 +</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Spec. Grav.2.0 0-5μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet.</td>
<td>Buffalo Forge Co.</td>
<td>scrubber</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Elec. Furn. Fume 0.2μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet.</td>
<td>Wet glass cell air washer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>&gt;10μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Basis</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Unit Characteristics</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>93-96</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>All metal - cleanable adhesive coated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>96-99</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>All metal - cleanable adhesive coated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discolor</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Viscous coat optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>99+</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Self-cleaning continuous precipitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discolor</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1/4-1μ-85</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Can be furnished with cleaner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discolor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Cleanable pleated filter cloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discolor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Automatic self-cleaning viscous filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Viscous coated metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discolor</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Periodic washing needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Continuous cleaning inertial separator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low maintenance cyclone of improved design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>High static press, drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>General ventilation ordinarily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Trade Name</td>
<td>CFM</td>
<td>Temp °F</td>
<td>Material Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Mech.</td>
<td>Duncan-Hudson Company</td>
<td>Fog-Filter</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Acid Fumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Green Fuel Economizer Co.</td>
<td>Cindortrap</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>to 700</td>
<td>Cinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech. &amp; Cloth</td>
<td>Ideal Industries</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Send</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>Koppers Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Kopper-Elex</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>to 1000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Leiman Bros., Inc.</td>
<td>567-A</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Grinding Dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>B &amp; S Fabricators</td>
<td>Linderoth Aerodyne</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>SiO₂, parting compd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>Pangborn Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>to 165</td>
<td>Dry Dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Mech.</td>
<td>Pease Anthony Equip. Co.</td>
<td>Venturi-Scrubber</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>600°F</td>
<td>Iron Fumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Mech.</td>
<td>Schmeig Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Centr-Merge</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>70-300</td>
<td>Na₂CO₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Mech.</td>
<td>Claude B. Schneible (Lab)</td>
<td>Multi-Wash</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Foundry Dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>W. W. Sly Company</td>
<td>Dust-Filters</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Thermix Corporation</td>
<td>Aerotec</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tooth-powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>Trion, Inc.</td>
<td>Electric Air Filters</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect.</td>
<td>Western Precipitation Co.</td>
<td>(Cottrell)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Unit Characteristics</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Velocity FPM</td>
<td>P.D. &quot;H₂O</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>All models in development stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.1-0.3</td>
<td>Nuisance eliminator for cinders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Unit type collector only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>to 99.9</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>0.5 Max.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Unit type collector only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>U. S. models in development stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>Several installations some in development stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Baghouse installations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10 FPM CF</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Wet collector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>inlet 99.7 FPM CF</td>
<td>outlet 0.6 MPM CF</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Wet cyclone plus wet impingement plates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>99+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Baghouse installations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Small radius cyclones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discolor</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Recent design electrostatic precipitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>99.9+</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Proven cottroll precipitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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