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#### Abstract

Simplified calculation procedures for determining heat exchange between the earth and a multiplicity of buried pipes having different temperature and thermal insulation are presented. The procedures deal with cases where pipes are buried side by side, as well as those when several pipes are bundled in a conduit. The effects of seasonal variation of earth temperature are treated in a quasi-steady-state equation that includes the soil thermal properties, depth of burial, pipe sizes, and relative locations of pipes. Sample calculations are included, together with the Fortran program listing and thermal properties of earth to be used for the calculations.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Although underground heat distribution systems for a complex of buildings, such as college campuses and military bases, have been widely used in the United States for the past several decades, not much attention has been given to heat transfer analysis other than to such technical problems as the possibility of failure of the piping system from corrosion, thermal expansion difficulties, or moisture penetration through the thermal insulation. This is largely because many of the underground installations designed to distribute steam or hot water are purposely well insulated. Until recently, heat loss from these pipes has been considered small when compared with the total heat energy being transmitted through the pipe, providing that the thermal insulation is not damaged and rendered ineffective by leaking pipe fluid or from ground moisture. Thus, the main emphasis is placed on the preservation of a dry insulation around the pipe, corrosion protection of the conduit which houses the piping system, and the design of the piping system to minimize stress caused by the thermal expansion and contraction.

Since the early part of the 1960's when underground chilled water distribution systems began to gain popular acceptance for district cooling, the economic consideration as to whether the chilled water pipes should be insulated or not has required a careful reevaluation of the heat transfer problem [1].

Underground chilled water pipes are sometimes installed uninsulated, allowing a considerable savings in capital investment, especially for a large district cooling system. The uninsulated chilled water system appears justified on the following basis:
a. Ground temperature is not severely affected by the presence of a deeply buried uninsulated chilled water pipe, and soil ecology and plant life are not unduly affected.
b. Heat gain from the surrounding earth to large chilled-water pipes is usually a very small part of the total refrigeration load, and increases in the temperature of the chilled water being circulated in the underground piping network are not significant.
c. There is no heat source such as an underground heat distribution system in the vicinity of the chilled water pipe.

Although item a is unquestionably valid, item b may be less so, particularly when the pipe diameter is small, long lengths of pipe are used, and when the earth surrounding the pipe remains warm and conductive for long periods of time. Item $c$ is often invalid because in many instances underground chilled water lines run parallel and close to the steam and/or hot water lines.

The question is under what conditions is it necessary to insulate underground chilled-water pipes? If insulation becomes necessary, how much is needed? In order to answer this question, a comprehensive heat transfer calculation methodology is needed to analyze the situation whereby several underground pipes of different temperatures are buried side by side. This report presents a
recommended procedure and sample calculation to solve multiple pipe underground heat and chilled water distribution systems.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND FOR UNDERGROUND PIPE HEAT TRANSFER

Except for the work of Loudon [2], very few papers have been published in the past treating the realistic conditions applicable to the analysis of underground pipe heat transfer. Most of the analytical solutions readily available for estimating heat transfer to and from underground pipes are either steadystate solutions for a pipe at shallow depths or transient heat conduction solutions for a single deep underground pipe. All of these solutions are based upon the assumption that the earth surrounding the pipe is homogeneous, the thermal properties of the earth are constant, and the temperature of the earth at reasonable distances from the pipe is constant and unaffected by the existence of the pipe.

It has been well known that these assumptions are unrealistic because thermal properties as well as earth temperatures change with respect to time and space due to seasonal change of the earth surface temperature and also due to movement of the soil moisture or ground water around the pipe. Analytical solutions which take into account these realistic situations are, however, extremely difficult to obtain and are not expected to be available in the near future. Therefore, the approach here was to examine quasi-steady-state heat transfer theories applicable to seasonal change of earth temperature. The method would provide approximate solutions for several practical problems, inclusive of multiple-pipe situations.

### 2.1 SINGLE SHALLOW PIPE SYSTEM (figure 1)

The solution for steady-state heat conduction from an underground pipe installed horizontally at a finite depth in homogenous soil of constant property can be found in several heat transfer texts [3,4]. This solution is based upon the potential flow theory and is obtained by the use of the "mirror-image" technique [3]. According to this technique, the heat loss $Q$ from the unit length of the pipe of temperature $T_{p}$ to the undisturbed ground at an average temperature $T_{G}$ can be approximated by following equation:

$$
Q=\frac{2 \pi k_{\mathrm{S}}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{P}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}\right)}{\ln \left(\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{r}  \tag{1}\\
\mathrm{r}
\end{array}+\sqrt{\left(\begin{array}{r}
\mathrm{d}
\end{array}\right)^{2}-1}\right)}
$$

where $k_{s}=$ average thermal conductivity of earth surrounding the pipe (see figure 2)
$\mathrm{d}=$ depth of the pipe measured from the ground surface to the centerline of the pipe
$r$ = external radius of the pipe where the pipe temperature is $T_{P}$
ln $=$ natural logarithm
Another form of the above equation usually cited is


Figure 1. Single-pipe system (Nomenclature).


Figure 2. Thermal conductivity versus moisture content for soils.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Q}=\frac{2 \pi \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{P}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}\right)}{\ln \left(\frac{2 \mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{r}}\right)} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a further approximate representation of equation (l) when $d / x \gg 1$, or when the radius of the pipe is sufficiently smaller than the depth.

Equations (1) and (2) were developed for the average pipe surface temperature $T_{P}$ and the average temperature $T_{G}$ of the undisturbed earth at some distance from the pipe inclusive of the ground surface.

When the pipe is insulated, a term for the thermal resistance of the insulation layer must be added to the above equations. If the pipe is uninsulated and the pipe material has high thermal resistance, such as non-metallic pipes, the thermal resistance term for the pipe wall should also be included in the pipe heat transfer equation in such a way that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Q}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}\right) \\
& \frac{1}{\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{p}}}=\frac{1}{2 \pi k_{\mathrm{S}}}\left\{\frac{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}}{\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{W}}}+\frac{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}}{k_{\mathrm{W}}} \ln \left(\frac{\mathrm{r}-\mathrm{t}}{\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{w}}}\right)\right.  \tag{3}\\
& +\frac{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}}{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{I}}} \ln \left(\frac{\mathrm{r}}{\mathrm{r}-\mathrm{t}}\right)+\ln \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{r}}+\sqrt{\left.\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{r}}\right)^{2}-1\right)}\right\},
\end{align*}
$$

in consistent units where
$K_{p}=$ pipe heat transfer factor
$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{F}}=$ pipe fluid temperature
$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}=$ undisturbed average earth temperature surrounding the pipe
$r_{W}=$ inside radius of the pipe
$r$ = external radius of the insulation
$t=$ thickness of the pipe insulation
$h_{W}=$ heat transfer coefficient of the pipe fluid
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}=$ thermal conductivity of the earth surrounding the pipe
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{W}}=$ thermal conductivity of the pipe wall
$k_{I}=$ thermal conductivity of the pipe insulation.
The above expression is, however, only approximately correct since actual heat flow is not radial and may result in error if $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}} / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{I}} \gg 1$. The extent of the error due to this approximation, is however, unknown.

Moreover, for the calculation of pipe heat transfer factor for metallic pipe $K_{p}$, it is customary to ignore the terms involving $h_{W}$ and $k_{W}$ because of their very small numerical value. Even for the non-metallic pipes, the term involving $h_{W}$ is usually neglected unless the pipe fluid velocity is extremely small.

### 2.2 MULTIPLE PIPE SYSTEM: (figure 3)

The foregoing discussion is for a single isolated underground pipe. In practice, several pipes may be installed in the same vicinity. Thus, heat

transfer around each pipe is affected by the presence of its neighbor. The steady-state heat transfer for a multiple-pipe system was explored in detail during this study and is presented in this report because little information was available from reference material. The multiple-pipe system considered in this section is shown schematically in figures 3 and 4. The undisturbed earth temperature is designated by $T_{G}$, whereas the earth temperature at any point ( $x,-y$ ) in the region of pipe heat transfer is designated by $T$.

The difference in temperature $T-T_{G}$, due to $M$ number of heat sources (or sinks) can be obtained by the superposition of mirror image technique employed for the single pipe problem (such as found in reference 3) in consistent units as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T-T_{G}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{Q_{i}}{4 \pi k_{S}} \ln \left\{\frac{\left(x-a_{i}\right)^{2}+\left(y-d_{i}\right)^{2}}{\left(x-a_{i}\right)^{2}+\left(y+d_{i}\right)^{2}}\right\} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Q_{i}=$ strength of the i-th heat source (if plus) or sink (if minus). It is the total heat loss (if plus) or heat gain (if minus) of the i-th pipe per unit length.
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}=$ thermal conductivity of earth surrounding all the pipes.
$a_{i}$ and $d_{i}=$ coordinates of the center of the $i-t h$ pipe referring to an arbitrary origin of the coordinate system ( $x,-y$ ). If, for instance, the coordinates were so chosen that $x_{1}=0$ and $y_{1}=-d_{1}$, the origin of the coordinates for the multiple pipe system would be at the ground surface above the centerline of the first pipe.

By denoting the exterior radius of the $k$-th pipe as $r_{k}$, the pipe surface can be expressed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x-a_{k}\right)^{2}+\left(y+d_{k}\right)^{2}=r_{k}^{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Or with the use of the polar coordinate system

$$
\begin{align*}
& x=a_{k}+r_{k} \sin \theta  \tag{6}\\
& y=r_{k} \cos \theta-d_{k}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\theta$ is the angular position of a point on the surface around the $k$-th pipe as shown in figure 3. Equations (5)/(6) represent a point on a circle of radius $r_{k}$, the center of which is the line heat source of strength $Q_{k} B t u / h r . f t$. The temperature of the point defined by ( $x,-y$ ), however, would be influenced by all the other $m$ lines heat sources such as $Q_{i}(i=1,2, \ldots m)$ and would vary from point to point over the circle as a function of $\theta$. By substituting (6) into (4), the surface temperature distribution for the $k$-th pipe can be obtained as a function of $\theta$ as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{k}(\theta)-T_{G}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{Q_{i}}{4 \pi k_{S}} \ln \left\{\frac{\left(a_{k}-a_{i}+r_{k} \sin \theta\right)^{2}+\left(r_{k} \cos \theta-d_{k}-d_{i}\right)^{2}}{\left(a_{k}-a_{i}+r_{k} \sin \theta\right)^{2}+\left(r_{k} \cos \theta-d_{k}+d_{i}\right)^{2}}\right\} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By denoting further that

$$
\begin{align*}
& A_{k i}^{2}=\frac{\left(a_{k}-a_{i}\right)^{2}+\left(d_{k}-d_{i}\right)^{2}}{r_{k}^{2}} \\
& A_{k i}^{\prime 2}=\frac{\left(a_{k}-a_{i}\right)^{2}+\left(d_{k}+d_{i}\right)^{2}}{r_{k}^{2}} \\
& \tan \zeta_{i k}=\frac{a_{k}-a_{i}}{d_{k}-d_{i}}  \tag{8}\\
& \tan \zeta_{i k}^{\prime}=\frac{a_{k}-a_{i}}{d_{k}+d_{i}}
\end{align*}
$$

equation (7) becomes

$$
\begin{align*}
T_{k}(\theta)-T_{G}= & \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\
i \neq k}}^{m} \frac{Q_{i}}{4 \pi k_{S}} \ln \left\{\frac{A_{i k}^{-2}-2 A_{i k}^{\prime} \cos \left(\theta+\zeta_{i k}^{\prime}\right)+1}{A_{i k}^{2}-2 A_{i k} \cos \left(\theta+\zeta_{i k}\right)+1}\right\} \\
& +\frac{Q_{k}}{4 \pi k_{S}} \ln \left\{1-4 \frac{d_{k}}{r_{k}} \cos \theta+\left(\frac{2 d_{k}}{r_{k}}\right)^{2}\right\} \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

With the assumption also that the circle represented by equations (5)/(6) is the cross section of a pipe which is losing heat $Q$ Btu/hr.ft at average surface temperature $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{k}}$, one can approximate the value of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{k}}$ by integrating with respect to $\theta$ as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& T_{k}-T_{G}=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(T_{k}(\theta)-T_{G}\right) d \theta  \tag{10}\\
& =\frac{1}{4 \pi k_{S}} \sum_{i=1}^{M} Q_{i} \ln \left(\frac{A_{i k}^{\prime}}{A_{i k}}\right)^{2}+\frac{Q_{k}}{4 \pi k_{S}} \ln \left(\frac{2 d_{k}}{r_{k}}\right)^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Although this equation is consistent with the approximate solution for the case of the single-pipe heat transfer (equation 2) if $M=1$, it is not recommended for the shallow large pipe problems where $d_{k} / r_{k} \approx 1$.

By defining matrix elements $P_{i, k}$ in such a manner that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{i k}=\ln \left(\frac{A_{i k}^{\prime}}{A_{i k}}\right)^{2} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
P_{k k}=\ln \left(\frac{2 \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{k}}}{\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{k}}}\right)^{2}
$$

the values of $Q_{1}, Q_{2} \ldots Q_{M}$ can now be obtained as a solution of the following simultaneous equations

$$
\frac{1}{4 \pi \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}}\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathrm{P}_{11} & \mathrm{P}_{12} & \ldots & \mathrm{P}_{1 \mathrm{M}}  \tag{12}\\
\mathrm{P}_{21} & \mathrm{P}_{22} & \ldots & \mathrm{P}_{2 \mathrm{M}} \\
\cdot & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & \cdot \\
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M} 1} & \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M} 2} & \ldots & \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{MM}}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{Q}_{1} \\
\mathrm{Q}_{2} \\
\\
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{M}}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{T}_{1}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}} \\
\mathrm{~T}_{2}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}} \\
\\
\\
\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{M}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}
\end{array}\right)=\left[\begin{array}{l} 
\\
\\
\\
\\
\\
\\
\\
\end{array}\right]
$$

provided that the values of $T_{1}, T_{2} \ldots T_{M}$ are known.
The above equations are for bare steel pipe systems where the average exterior pipe surface temperature may safely be approximated as equal to the pipe fluid temperature.

When the system includes non-metallic pipes or insulated pipes, the external surface temperatures (pipe-earth interface temperatures) $\mathrm{T}_{1}, \mathrm{~T}_{2} \ldots \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{M}}$ must be calculated first. Assuming, for the time being, that the values of $T_{1}$, $T_{2} \ldots T_{M}$ are known as well as the pipe fluid temperatures, $T_{F 1}, T_{F 2} \ldots T_{F M}$, the heat transfer from the pipes $Q_{1}, A_{2} \ldots Q_{M}$ may then be calculated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{k}=C_{k}\left(T_{F k}-T_{k}\right) \quad \text { for } k=1,2, \ldots . . M \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{k}=$ is the heat transfer coefficient for the $k$-th pipe for use with the thermal resistance between the pipe fluid and the external radius of the pipe or the pipe insulation where it interfaces with soil. The value of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}}$ may be approximated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{C_{k}}=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \frac{1}{k_{I k}} \quad \ln \left(\frac{r_{k}}{r_{I k}}\right)+\frac{1}{k_{M k}} \quad \ln \left(\frac{r_{I k}}{r_{M k}}\right)+\frac{1}{r_{M k} h_{W}} . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

In equation (14), $k_{I}$ and $k$ and $k_{m D k}$ are the thermal conductivities of insulation and wall for the $k$-th pipe, whereas $r_{I k}$ and $r_{M k}$ are the external radii of the insulation and the wall, respectively.

The symbol $h_{W}$ refers to the heat transfer coefficient between the pipe fluid and the pipe wall. The value of $h_{W}$ is usually very high unless the pipe fluid velocity is extremely small, and consequently the last term of equation (14) is usually neglected.

By substituting equation (13) into (12) and rearranging the terms with respect to the pipe average surface temperature $\mathrm{T}_{1}, \mathrm{~T}_{2} \ldots \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{M}}$, the following simultaneous equations can be derived.
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{i k}^{\prime}=\frac{C_{k} P_{i k}}{4 \pi k_{S}} \\
& P_{k k}^{\prime}=\frac{C_{k} P_{k k}}{4 \pi k_{S}}+1 \\
& B_{i}=T_{G}+\frac{1}{4 \pi k_{S}} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \quad C_{k} P_{i k} T_{F k}
\end{aligned}
$$

The solution of (15) yields a set of pipe-soil interface temperatures $T_{1}, T_{2}$ ... $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{M}}$, thus permitting the calculation of pipe heat transfer by equation (13).

When equation (15) is to be solved for the multiple pipe system where some of the pipes are non-insulated steel pipes, fictitious insulation of arbitrary thickness with thermal conductivity identical to the surrounding soil may be assumed for the bare pipes. This procedure is necessary because the values of $P_{i}, k$ and $B_{i}$ are meaningless otherwise.

Computer programs have been developed during the course of this study to implement this derivation for the multiple pipe system. The Fortran listing of this program is included in Appendix $B$, which includes the life-cycle cost analysis of pipe insulation. A sample case selected is illustrated in figures 4 and 5 with the results of the calculations given in figure 5 to show relative effect between heat transfer and distance between pipes. The values in parentheses indicate percentage change from case 5 , where each pipe is considered to be a single separate pipe system.

$T_{f}=$ PIPE TEMPERATURE
$T_{G}=$ EARTH TEMPERATURE, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$
$k_{s}=$ THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY OF EARTH BTU/HR, FT ${ }^{2},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F} / I N$

KI = THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY OF PIPE INSULATION BTU/HR,FT2, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F} / \mathrm{IN}$

THREE-PIPE SYSTEM

Figure 4. Multiple-pipe system (insulated pipes).


| CASE | $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ <br> in | $\mathrm{a}_{2}$ <br> in | $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ <br> $\mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{ft}$ | $\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ <br> $\mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{ft}$ | $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ <br> $\mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{ft}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 60 | 110 | $-17.89(16) *$ | $-20.30(72)$ | $81.24(2)$ |  |
| 2 | 55 | 100 | $-18.15(12)$ | $-21.46(98$, | $81.57(3)$ |  |
| 3 | 55 | 90 | $-18.48(14)$ | $-22.82(111)$ | $82.00(3)$ |  |
| 4 | 45 | 80 | $-18.89(16)$ | $-24.46(126)$ | $82.55(4)$ |  |
| 5 |  |  | $-16.23(0)$ | -10.82 | $(0)$ | $79.40(0)$ |

[^0]Figure 5. Sample calculation for multiple-pipe system (insulated pipe).

### 2.3 PIPES IN AN UNDERGROUND CONDUIT (figure 6)

When a group of pipes (some insulated and others non-insulated) are installed in the unvented underground conduit such as illustrated in figure 3, the following heat balance equation in consistent units would approximate the overall heat transfer process

$$
\sum_{\mathrm{k}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} 2 \pi \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{Fk}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)=\mathrm{K}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}\right)
$$

where $M=$ total number of pipes in the conduit
$r_{k}=$ outside radius of insulated or non-insulated pipes ( $k-t h$ pipe)
$U_{k}=$ overall heat transfer coefficient of the $k$-th pipe calculated by the following formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{U_{K}}=\frac{r_{k}}{k_{I k}} \quad \ell_{n}\left(\frac{r_{k}}{r_{k}-t_{k}}\right)+\frac{1}{h_{A}} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

$k_{\text {IDk }}=$ thermal conductivity of the insulation around the $k$-th pipe
$t_{k}=$ thickness of the insulation around the $k$-th pipe
$h_{A}=$ outside surface heat transfer coefficient around the pipe (if no data are available)
$T_{F k}=$ temperature of the $k$-th pipe
$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}=$ air temperature in the conduit
$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}=$ undisturbed ground temperature surrounding the conduit $\mathrm{K}=$ overall heat transfer factor of the conduit calculated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{K}=\frac{1}{2 \pi k_{S}} \frac{k_{S}}{(R-t) h_{A}}+\frac{k_{S}}{k_{W}} \ln \left(\frac{R}{R-t}\right)+\ln \left(\frac{d}{R}+\sqrt{\left(\frac{d}{R}\right)^{2}-1}\right) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{S}}=$ thermal conductivity of earth surrounding the conduit
$\mathrm{R}=$ outside radius of the conduit*
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{W}}=$ effective thermal conductivity of the conduit wall
$\mathrm{t}=$ thickness of the conduit wall
$\mathrm{d}=$ depth of the conduit, distance between the ground surface and the center-line of the conduit

In equation (17), the value of heat transfer coefficient of air space $h_{A}$ is not well known. For a concentric annular space, natural convection coefficient such as determined by formula developed by Grigull and Hauf [5] may be used in conjunction with standard radiation exchange formula. Figures 7 and 8 are obtained by such calculations.

In equations (17) and (18) the thermal resistance across the walls of the metallic pipe and metallic conduit were neglected from the formulas. If the metallic pipe or conduit is uninsulated, terms such as

[^1]

Figure 6. Pipes in a conduit.
(Inner pipe temperature $250^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\left(121^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$

Figure 7. Conduit air space heat transfer coefficient with respect to air space thickness.


Figure 8. Conduit air space heat transfer coefficient with respect to inner pipe diameters.

$$
\frac{T_{k}}{k_{I k}} \ln \left(\frac{r_{k}}{r_{k}-t_{k}}\right) \text { or } \frac{k_{S}}{k_{W}} \operatorname{\ell n}\left(\frac{R}{R-t}\right)
$$

may be dropped for the uninsulated non-metallic pipes or conduit; the wall thickness and its thermal conductivity value should be retained for the values for $t_{k}$ and $t$, and $k_{I k}$ and $k_{W}$, respectively.

Solving for $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ from equation (16) and rearranging it, the heat transfer from k -th pipe in the conduit can be obtained as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{k}}=2 \pi \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{Fk}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}\right) \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{A}=\frac{K T_{G}+\sum_{k=1}^{M} 2 \pi r_{k} U_{k} T_{F k}}{K+\sum_{k=1}^{M} 2 \pi r_{k} U_{k}} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the conduit is ventilated and the ventilation mass flow rate is known to be $G, 1 b / h r$, equation (20) may be modified to yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T_{A}=\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{M} 2 \pi r_{k} U_{k} T_{F k}+\frac{{ }^{G C}{ }_{p}}{L} T_{V}+{ }_{K T}}{M} \\
& \sum_{k=1} 2 \pi r_{k} U_{k}+\frac{G C_{p}}{L}+K \\
& \text { where } C_{p}=\text { specific heat of air } \\
& \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{V}}=\text { the ventilation air temperature } \\
& \mathrm{L}=\text { total vented length of the conduit. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Data on ventilation rates for underground conduits are extremely scarce. Possible natural ventilation (without the wind effects) for a vented underground conduit system may be estimated as follows:

The theoretical natural draft $\Delta \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}}$, chimney effect, for an underground conduit of $\mathrm{d} f \mathrm{ft}$ depth may be calculated by [6]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}}=0.52 \cdot \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{B}} \cdot \mathrm{~d}\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{~T}_{0}}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{A}}}\right) \text {, inches of water } \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{B}} & =\text { atmospheric pressure, } \mathrm{psi} \\
\mathrm{~d} & =\text { depth of the conduit, } \mathrm{ft} \\
\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{O}} & =\text { absolute temperature of outdoor air, Rankine } \\
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}} & =\text { absolute temperature of conduit air, Rankine. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Also, the pressure drop $\Delta \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}$ of ventilation air flowing within an underground conduit can be calculated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}=\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{o}}+\frac{\mathrm{fL}}{\mathrm{D}}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\mathrm{V}}{4005}\right)^{2}\left(\frac{\rho}{0.075}\right) \text { inches of water } \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{i}=$ entrance pressure loss coefficient
$C_{0}=$ exit pressure loss coefficient
f = frictional pressure loss coefficient
$\mathrm{L}=$ length of the pipe between two consecutive vents along the pipe, ft
$\mathrm{D}=$ hydraulic diameter of the air passage within the conduit, ft
$\mathrm{V}=$ velocity of the air flow, ft/min
$\rho=$ density of the air within the conduit, $1 b / f t^{3}$
By noting that the net ventilation flow G (lb/hr) can be expressed by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}=60 \mathrm{\rho VA} \mathrm{C}, \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{C}$ represents the cross sectional area for air passage within the conduit, and by noting the fact that $\Delta \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\Delta \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}}$ should be equal, it is possible to write
$G=240300$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho A_{C} \sqrt{\frac{0.52 P_{B} d\left(\frac{1}{T_{0}}-\frac{1}{T_{A}}\right)}{\left(C_{I}+C_{0} \frac{f L}{D}\right)\left(\frac{\rho}{0.075}\right)}} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

For evaluation of $G$ it is necessary to have data on $C_{I}, C_{0}$, and $f$. Moreover, equation (21) requires calculation of the value of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$, conduit air temperature. Thus, the process of estimating the air temperature in a vented conduit requires iterative procedures which are cumbersome for manual calculation.

### 2.4 UNDERGROUND PIPE IN AN INSULATED TRENCH (figures 9 and 10)

In some installations, pipes are installed in a trench and an insulating material is poured over and around the pipes, as illustrated in figures 9 and 10. For the case of a single pipe system (fig. 9), a square region insulated in the trench may be treated as an equivalent annular ring of exterior radius 0.56 W (Loudon [2]), whereby W denotes the exterior width of the insulated region. The formulas and tables discussed in section 2.1 can then be used to approximate the pipe heat transfer. For the case shown in figure 10, or the multiple-pipe system, the computational method developed in section 2.2 can be used if the insulated region is assumed to consist of two equivalent annular zones such as shown by the dotted circles in figure 10. This assumption can be expected to yield erroneous results if the distance(s) between the pipes is (are) very small as compared with the total dimensions of the insulated zone. The precision can be improved, however, in the following manner. Repeat the above calculation on the premise that uninsulated pipes are buried in soil whose thermal properties are equal to those of the insulating material. The actual pipe heat transfer value should lie between the two sets of values thus calculated.


Figure 9. Pipe in an insulated trench.


Figure 10. Two pipes in an insulated trench.

When evaluating underground pipe heat transfer, it is essential that the temperature of the earth surrounding the pipe be known.

It has been customary when designing a heating pipe system to assume that the earth temperature is equal to the well water temperature for any given region, and that the well water temperature is close to the annual average air temperature. This concept appears reasonable as long as the annual average heat transfer from the heat distribution system is what is desired to be estimated. Moreover, well water temperature data, such as those compiled by Collins [7], are readily available for many localities in the United States. If, however, the maximum heat loss or heat gain of the underground pipes is desired, the well water temperature, which is the annual average earth temperature, is not adequate [8]. This is because the majority of the underground pipes are installed at a depth less than 10 ft from the surface, where the seasonal change of the ambient air temperature affects the heat transfer process.

Penrod's data [9] show, for instance, at a depth of 10 ft the temperature of the earth at Lexington, Kentucky is at its minimum in April, approximately $50^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, and at its maximum in October, approximately $65^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. Thus, it is considered to be impractical to evaluate the maximum heat gain to a chilled water pipe which was buried at a depth of 5 ft on the basis of the well water temperature, or on the annual average air temperature, which in this particular example is $58^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$.

According to reference [8], the annual earth temperature cycle, $T$, of a given thermal diffusivity, $\alpha$, may be approximated by a simple harmonic function such as

$$
\begin{equation*}
T=A-B e^{-\sqrt{\pi}{ }_{\alpha P}^{y}} \cos \left(\frac{2 \pi t}{P}-\phi-\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha P} y}\right) \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

```
where y = depth
    P = period of the annual cycle, 365 days
    t = time in days
    A = annual average earth temperature ~ well water temperature
    B = amplitude of the earth surface temperature cycle
    \phi = phase angles of the earth temperature cycle relative to a datum
        point
```

Reference [8] lists the values of $A, B$ and $\phi$ for various earth temperature stations in the United States. While A and B depend on the monthly normal temperature cycle of a given climatic region, the value of $\phi$ is relatively constant at 0.6 radians.

The thermal diffusivity appearing in equation (26) is dependent upon the type of soil and its moisture content, as shown, for example, in figure 11.

The average earth temperature, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{G}}$, as used in previous discussions can be evaluated by taking the integrated average of equation (26) to the depth of


Figure 11. Thermal diffusivity versus moisture content for several soils.
interest. The following equation yields an integrated value of T between $0<y<1$

$$
\begin{align*}
& T=A-B \cdot \gamma \cdot \cos \left(\frac{2 \pi}{P} t-\phi-\psi\right)  \tag{27}\\
& \text { where } \gamma=\sqrt{\frac{x^{2}-2 x \cos \beta+1}{2 \beta^{2}}} \\
& \beta=\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha P} \ell} \\
& x=e^{-\beta} \\
& \psi=\tan ^{-1}\left(\frac{1-x \cdot(\cos \beta+\sin \beta)}{1-x \cdot(\cos \beta-\sin \beta)}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Since the center-line depth for most underground pipes is at around 10 ft , the integrated average temperatures for $\ell=10 \mathrm{ft}$ were obtained for many places in the United States where the earth temperature records were maintained. The results of this integration calculation are presented in Appendix $A$ for Winter (January 1), Spring (April 1), Summer (July 1) and Fall (October 1), representing the seasonal average values. Reference [8] shows that the majority of the thermal diffusivity values deduced from the measured earth temperatures in the United States are in the neighborhood of $0.025 \mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{hr}$. Appendix A was, therefore, obtained for $\alpha=0.025$.

## 4. SAMPLE PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

This section presents some typical heat transfer problems and solutions to illustrate the use of the formulas and tables developed in section 2 .

Evaluate the heat gain of a double pipe system (fig 12)--one pipe is for the supply of $42{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ chilled water and another is for the return of $57^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ water. These two pipes are bare steel pipes of 24 -in diameter, and both are installed at the depth of 72 in from the ground surface to the center lines of the pipes and separated by a distance of 4 ft on center. Assume that the average undisturbed earth temperature around the pipe is $68^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ and the thermal conductivity of the earth is $5 \mathrm{Btu}-\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{ft}^{2}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$.

## Solution

Setting the origin of the coordinate system to be as shown in figure 3, the constants indicated in formulas (8) and (11) can be numerically evaluated as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{1}=0, a_{2}=4 \\
& d_{1}=d_{2}=-6 \\
& r_{1}=r_{2}=1
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{12}=16, A_{12}{ }^{2}=160 \\
& P_{12}=P_{21}=\frac{1}{4 \pi\left(\frac{5}{12}\right)} \ln \left(\frac{160}{16}\right)=0.440 \\
& P_{11}=P_{22}=\frac{1}{4 \pi\left(\frac{5}{12}\right)} \ln \left(\frac{12}{1}\right)^{2}=0.949 \\
& T_{1}-T_{G}=42-66=-34 \\
& T_{2}-T_{G}=57-66=-9
\end{aligned}
$$

The pipe heat transfer $Q_{1}$ and $Q_{2}$ can then be solved from the following simultaneous equation (12)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0.949 Q_{1}+0.440 Q_{2}=-34 \\
& 0.440 Q_{1}+0.949 Q_{2}=-9
\end{aligned}
$$

The solutions to these equations are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Q}_{1}=-26.6 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{ft} \\
& \mathrm{Q}_{2}=2.84 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{ft.}
\end{aligned}
$$

If these two pipes are separated at a distance so that each pipe is considered a single pipe sytem, $Q_{1}$ would have been $-25.3 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{ft}$ and $\mathrm{Q}_{2}=-9.48 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}$ ft . It is interesting to observe that the supply chilled-water pipe, $42^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, gains more heat by being in the vicinity of the return water pipe, $57^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, and the return water pipe actually loses heat instead of gaining it from the warmer earth.

The total system heat gain for the double pipe system is, however, $23.76 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}$ ft , much less than $34.76 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{ft}$ had they been separated at a distance from each other.

Thus, there is a definite advantage by installing the chilled-water lines near each other. The advantage will be offset, however, if the two pipes are too close together, because then the supply water would be warmed up too much before it reaches its destination, by gaining heat from the return pipe.

Figure 12 also includes a table showing the effect of distance on heat transfer rates between the two pipes for values of $4 \mathrm{ft}, 5 \mathrm{ft}, 10 \mathrm{ft}$ and infinity, and earth thermal conductivities of 10 and $5 \mathrm{Btu} \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{ft}^{2},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$.


| CASE | 0 | $k_{s}$ | $Q_{1}$ | $Q_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 10 | -50.79 | 0.565 |
| 2 | $\infty$ | 10 | -50.57 | -18.96 |
| 3 | 4 | 10 | -53.21 | 5.687 |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | -26.60 | 2.843 |
| 5 | $\infty$ | 5 | -25.29 | -9.48 |
| 6 | 10 | 5 | -24.37 | -5.11 |

Figure 12. Sample double-pipe problem.

Calculation methods were developed with sample problems as well as with computer program listings to approximate heat transfer of multiple pipe systems. Several pipes of different temperatures, insulations, and sizes installed in the same vicinity can be evaluated to study the heat transfer of each pipe affected by its neighboring pipes.

Seasonal average earth temperature data (from surface to approximately 10 ft depth) for underground piping distribution systems were developed for selected stations in the United States and for the thermal diffusivity of earth of 0.025 $\mathrm{ft}{ }^{2} / \mathrm{hr}$. These data will permit the appraisal of the heat gain of chilled water systems as well as the heat loss of the hot water or steam pipes.
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## 7. UNIT CONVERSION FACTOR

English units are used throughout the text because of the fact that this report has been prepared for American practicing engineers and underground system manufacturers. The conversion multipliers to SI units for the pertinent variables are found as follows


## Table A

Illustrative Thermal Conductivities for Some Pipe Insulation Materials

Thermal Conductivity, $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{I}}{ }^{*}$ $\mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{ft}^{2}$, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F} / \mathrm{in}$

| Insulating Materials |  | $\frac{\text { Temperature Level }}{}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^2]Appendix A. Earth Temperature Tables for Underground Heat-Distribution-System Design

The following list presents the average earth temperature in deg F from 0 to 10 feet below the surface for the four seasons of the year and for the whole year for the indicated locales. The temperatures were computed on the basis of the method described in the 1965 ASHRAE technical paper entitled "Earth Temperature and Thermal Diffusivity at Selected Stations in the United States" by T. Kusuda and P. R. Achenbach (in ASHRAE Transactions, Volume 71, Part I, p. 61, 1965) using the monthly average air temperatures published by the U.S. Weather Bureau for the listed localities in the United States. Earth temperatures are expressed in Fahrenheit degrees.
Location Winter Spring Summer Autumn Annual

Alabama

| Anniston $\mathrm{AP}^{\text {a }}$ | 55. | 58. | 70. | 67. | 63. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Birmingham AP | 54. | 58. | 71. | 68. | 63. |
| Mobile AP | 61. | 63. | 74. | 71. | 67. |
| Mobile $\mathrm{CO}^{\text {b }}$ | 61. | 64. | 75. | 72. | 68. |
| Montgomery AP | 58. | 61. | 73. | 70. | 65. |
| Montgomery CO | 59. | 62. | 74. | 71. | 66 |

Arizona
Bisbee COOPC 55
Flagstaff AP 35.
Ft Huachuca (proving ground)
55.

Phoenix AP
Phoenix $C 0$
Prescott AP
Tucson AP
Winslow AP
Yuma AP
Arkansas
Fort Smith AP 52
Little Rock AP
Texarkana AP
California
Bakersfield AP 56
Beaumont CO
Bishop AP
Blue Canyon AP
Burbank AP 58.
56.
53.
47.
43.
58.
56.
53.
47.
43.
58.
56.
53.
47.
43.
58.
53.
56.
.
61.
46.
59.
45.
65.
3.

60
56.
51.
46.
60.
70.
67.
62.
58.
54.
50.
45.
58. 71. 68. 63.
64. 79. 75. 69.
65. 80. 76. 70.
49. 65. 61. 55.
62. 76. 73. 68.
49. 65. 61. 55.
69. 84. 80. 75.
56. 72. 68. 62.
57. 72. 68. 62.
60. 74. 71. 65.

[^3]California
Eureka CO

Fresno AP
Los Angeles AP
Los Angeles CO
Mount Shasta CO
Oakland AP
Red Bluff AP
Sacramento AP
Sacramento CO
Sandberg CO
San Diego AP
San Francisco AP
San Francisco CO
San Jose COOP
Santa Catalina AP
Santa Maria AP

## Colorado

Alamosa AP
Colorado Springs AP
Denver AP
Denver CO
Grand Junction AP
Pueblo AP

Connecticut
Bridgeport AP
Hartford AP
Hartford AP（Brainer）

Delaware
Wilmington AP
Washington，D．C．
Washington AP
Washington CO
Silver Hill OBS ${ }^{\text {d }}$
Florida
Apalachicola CO
Daytona Beach AP
Fort Myers AP
Jacksonville AP
Jacksonville CO
Key West AP
Key West CO
Lakeland CO

50
54.
58.

60 。
41.
53.

54 。
53.
54.
47.
59.
53.
55.
55.
57.

54 ．

| 51. | 54. | 54. | 52. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58. |  | 68. | 63. |
| 59. | 64. | 63. | 61 |
| 61. | 68. | 66. | 64 |
| 44. | 57. | 54. | 49. |
| 54. | 60. | 59. | 56. |
| 58. | 72. | 69. | 63. |
| 56. | 67. | 64. | 60. |
| 57. | 68. | 65. | 61 |
| 50. | 63. | 60. | 55. |
| 60. | 66. | 65. | 62. |
| 54. | 59. | 57. | 56 |
| 55. | 59. | 58. | 57 |
| 57. | 64. | 62. | 59 |
| 58. | 64. | 62. | 60. |
| 55. | 60. | 59. |  |

58. 51 ．
59. 
60. 

51 ．
40.
39.
39.

40 ．
44.

47
47.
46.

63
65.
70.
63.
64.
74.
75.
68.
44.
61.
61.

57 。
50.
43.
43.
44.
48.
51.
66.
63.
56.

51．66．63． 57.
50.
65.
61.
55.
65.
67.
71.
66.
66.
75.
76.
69.
75.
75.
78.
75.
76.
80.
81.
77.
57.
50.

56 ． 50 ．
56 ． 50 ．

| Florida |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Melbourne AP | 68. | 70. | 77. | 75. | 72. |
| Miami AP | 72. | 74. | 79. | 78. | 76. |
| Miami Co | 72. | 73. | 78. | 77. | 75. |
| Miami Beach COOP | 74. | 75. | 80. | 78. | 77. |
| Orlando AP | 68. | 70. | 77. | 75. | 72. |
| Pensacola CO | 62. | 64. | 74. | 72. | 68. |
| Tallahassee $\mathrm{A}^{\text {T }}$ | 61. | 64. | 74. | 72. | 68. |
| Tampa AP | 68. | 69. | 77. | 75. | 72. |
| West Palm Beach | 71. | 73. | 79. | 77. | 75. |
| Georgia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albany AP | 60. | 63. | 75. | 72. | 67. |
| Athens AP | 54. | 58. | 71. | 68. | 63. |
| Atlanta AP | 54. | 57. | 70. | 67. | 62. |
| Atlanta CO | 54. | 57. | 70. | 67. | 62. |
| Augusta AP | 56. | 59. | 72. | 69. | 64. |
| Columbus AP | 56. | 59. | 72. | 69. | 64. |
| Macon AP | 58. | 61. | 74. | 71. | 66. |
| Rome AP | 53. | 56. | 70. | 67. | 61. |
| Savannah AP | 60. | 63. | 74. | 71. | 67. |
| Thomasville CO | 62. | 64. | 74. | 72. | 68. |
| Valdosta AP | 61. | 64. | 74. | 72. | 68. |
| Idaho |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boise AP | 40. | 44. | 62. | 58. | 51. |
| Idaho Falls 46 W | 30. | 35. | 55. | 50. | 42. |
| Idaho Falls 42 NW | 28. | 33. | 54. | 49. | 41. |
| Lewiston AP | 42. | 46. | 63. | 59. | 52. |
| Pocatello AP | 35. | 40. | 59. | 55. | 47. |
| Salmon CO | 32. | 37. | 56. | 52. | 44. |
| Illinois |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cairo CO | 49. | 53. | 70. | 66. | 60. |
| Chicago AP | 38. | 43. | 62. | 57. | 50. |
| Joliet AP | 37. | 42. | 61. | 56. | 49. |
| Moline AP | 38. | 43. | 62. | 58. | 50. |
| Peoria AP | 39. | 44. | 63. | 58. | 51. |
| Springfield AP | 41. | 45. | 64. | 60. | 52. |
| Springfield CO | 43. | 47. | 66. | 62. | 54. |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evansville AP | 47. | 51. | 67. | 63. | 57. |
| Fort Wayne AP | 39. | 43. | 61. | 57. | 50. |
| Indianapolis AP | 41. | 46. | 64. | 59. | 52. |
| Indianapolis CO | 43. | 48. | 65. | 61. | 54. |
| South Bend AP | 38. | 42. | 61. | 56. | 49. |
| Terre Haute AP | 42. | 47. | 65. | 60. | 53. |

Iowa

> Burlington AP

Charles City CO
Davenport CO
Des Moines AP
Des Moines CO
Dubuque AP
Sioux City AP Waterloo AP

Kansas
Concordia CO
Dodge City AP

Kansas
Goodland AP 38.
Topeka AP
Topeka CO
Wichita AP

Kentucky
Bowling Green AP
Lexington AP
Louisville AP
Louisville CO

Louisiana
Baton Rouge AP
Burrwood CO
Lake Charles AP
New Orleans AP
New Orleans CO
Shreveport AP
Maine
Caribou AP
Eastport CO
Portland AP
Maryland
Baltimore AP
Baltimore CO
Frederick AP

Massachusetts
Boston AP
Nantucket AP
Pittsfield AP
Worcester AP

39． 44
33． 38.
39． 44.
37． 42 ．
38． 43.
34． 39 。
35．40．
35.
42.
43.
43.
44.
45.
47.
44.
46.
47.
61.
65.

61 ．
63.
64.
58.

24
33.
33.
45.

47 。
44.
41.
41.
34.
36.
29.
37.
38.
49.

51 ．
48.
44.

44 ．
38.

40 ．
64.
60.

63 ．
64.
60.

62 ．
61.
67.

67．62．

62 。
54.
55.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 57．} & 50 . \\ \text { 62．} & 55 .\end{array}$
59.
55.
59.
58.
59.
55.
57.
56. 49. 48.

## 51 ．

46. 
47. 

50 ．
51 ．
47 ．
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 57．} & 50 . \\ \text { 62．} & 55 .\end{array}$
62．
56.
57.

62
66.
68.
68.
67.
65.
67.
67.
74.

77 。
75.
75.

77 ．
75.
50.

51 ．
56.
65.
67.
65.
61.
57.
55.

58 ．
57.
54.
56.

57 ．

| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alpena CO | 33. | 37. | 54. | 50. | 43. |
| Detroit Willow Run AP | 38. | 42. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| Detroit City AP | 38. | 43. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| Escanaba CO | 30. | 35. | 53. | 49. | 42. |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flint AP | 36. | 40. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Grand Rapids AP | 36. | 40. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Grand Rapids CO | 38. | 42. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| East Lansing CO | 36. | 40. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Marquette CO | 31. | 35. | 53. | 49. | 42. |
| Muskegon AP | 36. | 40. | 57. | 53. | 47. |
| Sault Ste Marie AP | 28. | 32. | 51. | 47. | 39. |
| Minnesota |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crookston COOP | 25. | 31. | 55. | 49. | 40. |
| Duluth AP | 25. | 30. | 52. | 47. | 38. |
| Duluth CO | 26. | 31. | 52. | 47. | 39. |
| International Falls | 22. | 27. | 51. | 45. | 36. |
| Minneapolis AP | 32. | 37. | 60. | 54. | 46. |
| Rochester AP | 31. | 36. | 58. | 53. | 44. |
| Saint Cloud AP | 28. | 33. | 56. | 51. | 42. |
| Saint Paul AP | 32. | 37. | 60. | 54. | 46. |
| Mississippi |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jackson AP | 57. | 61. | 73. | 70. | 65. |
| Meridian AP | 57. | 60. | 72. | 69. | 64. |
| Vicksburg CO | 58. | 61. | 74. | 71. | 66. |
| Missouri |  |  |  |  |  |
| Columbia AP | 43. | 48. | 66. | 62. | 55. |
| Kansas City AP | 44. | 49. | 68. | 64. | 56. |
| Saint Joseph AP | 42. | 47. | 67. | 62. | 54. |
| Saint Louis AP | 45. | 49. | 67. | 63. | 56. |
| Saint Louis CO | 46. | 50. | 68. | 64. | 57. |
| Springfield AP | 45. | 49. | 66. | 62. | 56. |
| Montana |  |  |  |  |  |
| Billings AP | 35. | 40. | 59. | 55. | 47. |
| Butte AP | 27. | 31. | 50. | 45. | 38. |
| Glasgow AP | 27. | 33. | 56. | 51. | 42. |
| Glasgow CO | 28. | 34. | 57. | 52. | 43. |
| Great Falls AP | 34. | 38. | 56. | 52. | 45. |
| Havre CO | 31. | 36. | 57. | 52. | 44. |
| Helena AP | 31. | 36. | 55. | 50. | 43. |
| Helena CO | 32. | 36. | 55. | 50. | 43. |
| Kalispell AP | 32. | 37. | 54. | 50. | 43. |
| Miles City AP | 32. | 37. | 59. | 54. | 45. |


| Montana |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Missoula AP | 33. | 37. | 56. | 51. | 44. |
| Nebraska |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Island AP | 38. | 43. | 64. | 59. | 51. |
| Lincoln AP | 39. | 44. | 64. | 60. | 52. |
| Lincoln CO University | 40. | 45. | 65. | 61. | 53. |
| Norfolk AP | 35. | 40. | 62. | 57. | 48. |
| North Platte AP | 37. | 42. | 62. | 57. | 49. |
| Omaha AP | 39. | 44. | 65. | 60. | 52. |
| Scottsbluff AP | 36. | 41. | 60. | 56. | 48. |
| Valentine CO | 35. | 40. | 61. | 56. | 48. |
| Nevada |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elko AP | 34. | 39. | 57. | 53. | 46. |
| Ely AP | 35. | 39. | 56. | 52. | 45. |
| Las Vegas AP | 56. | 60. | 78. | 74. | 67. |
| Reno AP | 40. | 44. | 58. | 55. | 49. |
| Tonopah | 41. | 45. | 61. | 57. | 51. |
| Winnemucca AP | 38. | 42. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| New Hampshire |  |  |  |  |  |
| Concord AP | 33. | 38. | 56. | 52. | 45. |
| Mt. Washington COOP | 17. | 21. | 37. | 33. | 27. |
| New Jersey |  |  |  |  |  |
| Atlantic City CO | 45. | 49. | 63. | 60. | 54. |
| Newark AP | 43. | 47. | 63. | 59. | 53. |
| Trenton CO | 43. | 47. | 64. | 60. | 53. |
| New Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albuquerque AP | 46. | 50. | 67. | 63. | 57. |
| Clayton AP | 43. | 47. | 63. | 59. | 53. |
| Raton AP | 38. | 42. | 58. | 54. | 48. |
| Roswell AP | 51. | 54. | 69. | 66. | 60. |
| New York |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albany AP | 36. | 40. | 59. | 54. | 47. |
| Albany CO | 38. | 43. | 61. | 56. | 49. |
| Bear Mountain CO | 38. | 42. | 59. | 55. | 48. |
| Binghamton AP | 34. | 38. | 56. | 52. | 45. |
| Binghamton CO | 38. | 42. | 59. | 55. | 48. |
| Buffalo AP | 37. | 41. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| New York AP (La Guardia) | 44. | 48. | 64. | 60. | 54. |
| New York CO | 44. | 47. | 63. | 59. | 53. |
| New York Central Park | 44. | 48. | 64. | 60. | 54. |
| Oswego CO | 36. | 40. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Rochester AP | 37. | 41. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Schenectady COOP | 35. | 40. | 59. | 55. | 47 。 |


| Location | Winter | Spring | Summer | Fall | Annual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York |  |  |  |  |  |
| Syracuse AP | 38. | 42. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| North Carolina |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asheville CO | 48. | 51. | 64. | 61. | 56. |
| Charlotte AP | 52. | 55. | 69. | 66. | 60. |
| Greensboro AP | 49. | 53. | 67. | 64. | 58. |
| Hatteras CO | 56. | 59. | 70. | 68. | 63. |
| Raleigh AP | 51. | 55. | 69. | 65. | 60. |
| Raleigh CO | 52. | 56. | 70. | 66. | 61. |
| Wilmington AP | 56. | 59. | 71. | 69. | 64. |
| Winston Salem AP | 50. | 53. | 67. | 64. | 58. |
| North Dakota |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bismarck AP | 27. | 33. | 56. | 51. | 42. |
| Devils Lake CO | 24. | 29. | 54. | 48. | 39. |
| Fargo AP | 26. | 32. | 56. | 50. | 41. |
| Minot AP | 25. | 31. | 54. | 49. | 39. |
| Williston CO | 27. | 33. | 56. | 50. | 41. |
| Ohio |  |  |  |  |  |
| Akron-Canton AP | 39. | 43. | 60. | 56. | 50. |
| Cincinnati AP | 43. | 47. | 64. | 60. | 54. |
| Cincinnati CO | 46. | 50. | 66. | 63. | 56. |
| Cincinnati ABBE OBS | 45. | 49. | 65. | 61. | 55. |
| Cleveland AP | 40. | 44. | 61. | 57. | 51. |
| Cleveland CO | 41. | 45. | 62. | 58. | 51. |
| Columbus AP | 41. | 46. | 62. | 59. | 52. |
| Columbus CO | 43. | 47. | 64. | 60. | 53. |
| Dayton AP | 42. | 46. | 63. | 59. | 52. |
| Sandusky CO | 41. | 45. | 62. | 58. | 51. |
| Toledo AP | 38. | 43. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| Youngstown AP | 39. | 43. | 60. | 56. | 50. |
| Oklahoma |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma City AP | 50. | 54. | 71. | 67. | 60. |
| Oklahoma City CO | 50. | 55. | 71. | 68. | 61. |
| Tulsa AP | 50. | 54. | 71. | 67. | 61. |
| Oregon |  |  |  |  |  |
| Astoria AP | 47. | 48. | 56. | 54. | 51. |
| Baker CO | 36. | 40. | 56. | 52. | 46. |
| Burns CO | 36. | 40. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Eugene AP | 46. | 48. | 59. | 57. | 52. |
| Meacham AP | 34. | 38. | 52. | 49. | 43. |
| Medford AP | 46. | 49. | 62. | 59. | 54. |
| Pendleton AP | 42. | 46. | 63. | 59. | 53. |
| Portland AP | 46. | 49. | 60. | 57. | 53. |
| Portland CO | 48. | 50. | 61. | 59. | 55. |


| Oregon |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roseburg AP | 47. | 49. | 60. | 57. | 53. |
| Roseburg CO | 48. | 51. | 61. | 59. | 55. |
| Salem AP | 46. | 49. | 60. | 57. | 53. |
| Sexton Summit | 42. | 44. | 55. | 52. | 48. |
| Troutdale AP | 45. | 48. | 59. | 57. | 52. |
| Pennsylvania |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allentown AP | 40. | 44. | 62. | 58. | 51. |
| Erie AP | 38. | 42. | 58. | 55. | 48. |
| Erie CO | 40. | 44. | 60. | 56. | 50. |
| Harrisburg AP | 43. | 47. | 63. | 59. | 53. |
| Park Place CO | 36. | 40. | 57. | 53. | 46. |
| Philadelphia AP | 44. | 48. | 64. | 61. | 54. |
| Philadelphia CO | 46. | 50. | 66. | 62. | 56. |
| Pittsburgh Allegheny | 42. | 46. | 62. | 58. | 52. |
| Pittsburgh Grtr Pitt | 40. | 44. | 61. | 57. | 51. |
| Pittsburgh CO | 44. | 48. | 64. | 60. | 54. |
| Reading CO | 43. | 47. | 64. | 60. | 54. |
| Scranton CO | 40. | 44. | 61. | 57. | 50. |
| Wilkes Barre-Scranton | 39. | 43. | 60. | 56. | 49. |
| Williamsport AP | 40. | 44. | 61. | 57. | 51. |
| Rhode Island |  |  |  |  |  |
| Block Island AP | 41. | 45. | 59. | 55. | 50. |
| Providence AP | 39. | 43. | 59. | 56. | 49. |
| Providence Co | 41. | 45. | 62. | 58. | 51. |
| South Carolina |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charleston AP | 58. | 61. | 72. | 70. | 65. |
| Charleston CO | 60. | 62. | 74. | 71. | 67. |
| Columbia AP | 56. | 59. | 72. | 69. | 64. |
| Columbia C0 | 57. | 60. | 72. | 69. | 64. |
| Florence AP | 55. | 59. | 72. | 69. | 64. |
| Greenville AP | 53. | 56. | 69. | 66. | 61. |
| Spartanburg AP | 53. | 56. | 70. | 66. | 61. |
| South Dakota |  |  |  |  |  |
| Huron AP | 31. | 37 | 60. | 55. | 46. |
| Rapid City AP | 34. | 39. | 58. | 54. | 46. |
| Sioux Falls AP | 32. | 37. | 60. | 55. | 46. |
| Tennessee |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bristol AP | 48. | 51. | 65. | 62. | 56. |
| Chattanooga AP | 51. | 55. | 69. | 65. | 60. |
| Knoxville AP | 50. | 54. | 68. | 65. | 59. |
| Memphis AP | 52. | 56. | 71. | 68. | 62. |
| Memphis CO | 53. | 57. | 72. | 68. | 62. |
| Nashville AP | 51. | 54. | 69. | 66. | 60. |
| A-8 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Tennessee |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oak Ridge CO | 49. | 52. | 67. | 64. | 58. |
| Oak Ridge 8 S | 49. | 52. | 67. | 64. | 58. |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abilene AP | 55. | 58. | 73. | 70. | 64. |
| Amarillo AP | 47. | 50. | 67. | 63. | 57. |
| Austin AP | 60. | 63. | 76. | 73. | 68. |
| Big Springs AP | 56. | 59. | 74. | 70. | 65. |
| Brownsville AP | 68. | 70. | 79. | 77. | 74. |
| Corpus Christi AP | 65. | 68. | 78. | 76. | 72. |
| Dallas AP | 57. | 61. | 76. | 72. | 66. |
| Del Rio AP | 62. | 65. | 77. | 75. | 70. |
| E1 Paso AP | 54. | 58. | 72. | 69. | 63. |
| Fort Worth AP (Amon |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carter) | 57. | 60. | 75. | 72. | 66. |
| Galveston AP | 63. | 66. | 77. | 74. | 70. |
| Galveston CO | 63. | 66. | 77. | 74. | 70. |
| Houston AP | 62. | 65. | 76. | 73. | 69. |
| Houston CO | 63. | 66. | 77. | 74. | 70. |
| Laredo AP | 67. | 70. | 81. | 79. | 74. |
| Lubbock AP | 50. | 54. | 69. | 65. | 59. |
| Midland AP | 55. | 59. | 73. | 70. | 64. |
| Palestine CO | 58. | 62. | 74. | 71. | 66. |
| Port Arthur AP | 61. | 64. | 75. | 72. | 68. |
| Port Arthur CO | 63. | 65. | 76. | 74. | 69. |
| San Angelo AP | 58. | 61. | 74. | 71. | 66. |
| San Antonio AP | 61. | 64. | 77. | 74. | 69. |
| Victoria AP | 64. | 67. | 78. | 76. | 71. |
| Waco AP | 58. | 62. | 76. | 73. | 67. |
| Wichita Falls AP | 53. | 57. | 73. | 69. | 63. |
| Utah |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blanding CO | 39. | 43. | 60. | 56. | 50. |
| Milford AP | 37. | 42. | 61. | 56. | 49. |
| Salt Lake City AP | 40. | 44. | 63. | 59. | 51. |
| Salt Lake City CO | 41. | 46. | 65. | 60. | 53. |
| Vermont |  |  |  |  |  |
| Burlington AP | 32. | 37. | 57. | 52. | 44. |
| Virginia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cape Henry CO | 51. | 55. | 68. | 65. | 60. |
| Lynchburg AP | 48. | 51. | 66. | 62. | 57. |
| Norfolk AP | 51. | 54. | 68. | 64. | 59. |
| Norfolk CO | 52. | 56. | 69. | 66. | 61. |
| Richmond AP | 48. | 52. | 67. | 63. | 58. |
| Richmond CO | 50. | 53. | 68. | 64. | 59. |
| Roanoke AP | 48. | 51. | 66. | 62. | 57. |


| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ellensburg AP | 37. | 41. | 59. | 55. | 48. |
| Kelso AP | 45. | 47. | 57. | 54. | 51. |
| North Head L H ReSVN | 47. | 49. | 54. | 53. | 51. |
| Olympia AP | 44. | 46. | 56. | 54. | 50. |
| Omak 2 mi N W | 36. | 40. | 59. | 55. | 47. |
| Port Angeles AP | 45. | 46. | 53. | 52. | 49. |
| Seattle AP (Boeing Field) | 46. | 48. | 58. | 56. | 52. |
| Seattle CO | 47. | 50. | 59. | 57. | 53. |
| Seattle-Tacoma AP | 44. | 47. | 57. | 55. | 51. |
| Spokane AP | 37. | 41. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Stampede Pass | 32. | 35. | 48. | 45. | 40. |
| Tacoma C0 | 46. | 48. | 58. | 55. | 52. |
| Tattosh Island CO | 46. | 47. | 52. | 51. | 49. |
| Walla Walla CO | 44. | 48. | 65. | 61. | 54. |
| Yakima AP | 40. | 44. | 61. | 57. | 50. |
| West Virginia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charleston AP | 47. | 50. | 65. | 61. | 56. |
| Elkins AP | 41. | 45. | 59. | 56. | 50. |
| Huntington CO | 48. | 52. | 67. | 63. | 57. |
| Parkersburg CO | 45. | 49. | 65. | 61. | 55. |
| Petersburg CO | 44. | 48. | 63. | 60. | 54. |
| Wisconsin |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Bay AP | 31. | 36. | 56. | 51. | 44. |
| La Crosse AP | 32. | 38. | 60. | 55. | 46. |
| Madison AP | 34. | 39. | 59. | 54. | 47. |
| Madison CO | 34. | 39. | 60. | 55. | 47. |
| Milwaukee AP | 35. | 40. | 58. | 54. | 47. |
| Milwaukee CO | 36. | 41. | 59. | 55. | 48. |
| Wyoming |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casper AP | 34. | 38. | 57. | 52. | 45. |
| Cheyenne AP | 35. | 39. | 55. | 51. | 45. |
| Lander AP | 31. | 35. | 56. | 51. | 43. |
| Rock Springs AP | 31. | 35. | 54. | 50. | 42. |
| Sheridan AP | 33. | 37. | 56. | 52. | 44. |
| Hawaii |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hilo AP | 72. | 72. | 74. | 74. | 73. |
| Honolulu AP | 74. | 75. | 77. | 77. | 76. |
| Honolulu CO | 74. | 74. | 77. | 76. | 75. |
| Lihue AP | 72. | 73. | 76. | 75. | 74. |
| Alaska |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anchorage AP | 25. | 29. | 46. | 42. | 35. |
| Annette AP | 40. | 42. | 51. | 49. | 46. |
| Barrow AP | 4. | 7. | 16. | 14. | 10. |

Alaska
Bethe1 AP
Cold Bay AP
Cordova AP
Fairbanks AP
Galena AP
Gambell AP
Juneau AP
Juneau Co
King Salmon AP
Kotzebue AP
McGrath AP
Nome AP
Northway AP
Saint Paul Island AP
Yakutat AP

West Indies
Ponce Santa Isabel AP
San Juan AP
San Juan CO
Swan Island

Virgin Islands
St．Croix，V．I．AP

Pacific Islands
Canton Island AP
Koror
Ponape Island AP Truk Moen Island Wake Island AP Yap
18.
33. 32. 14. 13. 15. 34. 36 。 25. 10. 14. 16. 12. 31 ． 33.
75. 77. 77 ． 80 ．

78 ．
83.
81.
81.
81.
79.
81.

23
35
35.
19.
18.
19.
36.

39 。
28.
14.
18.
20.
16.
32.
36.
76.
77.

77 ．
80.
78.
81.
78.

79
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 79．} & \text { 79．} \\ \text { 82．}\end{array}$
79．
82．
37.
30.
38.

43． 41 ．
45．43．
39.
26.

38． 34.
33.
25.
37.
34.
47.

49．
44.
31.
37.
37.
32.
40.
45.
80.

79 。

| 84． | 84． | 84． | 84． |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 81． | 81． | 81． | 81. |
| 81． | 81． | 81． | 81． |
| 81． | 81． | 81． | 81. |
| 79． | 81． | 81． | 80． |
| 81． | 82． | 82. | 82. |

Appendix B. Computer Program Listing for Multiple Pipe Heat Transfer and Economic Analysis

The attached computer program calculates pipe heat loss (heat gain) for an underground heat distribution system, for which up to fifteen different pipes are buried. Each of the pipes covered in turn contains up to five inner pipes. All the pipes could be either insulated or uninsulated. The uninsulated pipes are considered to be insulated by material having the same thermal conductivity as that of the surrounding soil. The economic analysis requires the energy cost per million Btu's and capital cost in terms of dollar per linear foot of the installed system. The life-cycle-cost calculation includes the effect of the given discount rate and cost escalation rate. The program allows the determination of minimum life cycle cost with respect to the variation of insulation thickness of one pipe, which may be the subject of major importance.

The following input data will have to be read on the interactive console in response to the questions. The input data will be displayed on the console for validation and correction (if necessary). The sequence of this interactive operation is illustrated at the end of the program listing.

M: number of pipes in the trench
A: horizontal distance of each pipe from a reference pipe, inches
D: depth of each pipe, inches
$R$ : external radius of the pipe (inclusive of insulation and air space if applicable), inches
KS: thermal conductivity of soil, Btu-in/hr.ft ${ }^{2} .{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$
TG: ground temperature, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$
TPF: pipe fluid temperature, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$

For each pipe the layer-by-layer data on

TH: thickness, inches
KI: thermal conducitivty, Btu-in/hr.ft ${ }^{2} .{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$
are required in the sequence of carrier pipe wall, insulation, air space, and conduit wall.

The program would output at this point
$C$ : thermal conductance of each pipe, Btu/hr.ft. ${ }^{\circ}$ F
TP: pipe/soil interface temperature, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$
Q: heat loss/gain from each pipe, Btu/hr, ft
QP: heat loss/gain from each pipe when all the pipes are completely insolated from each other, Btu/hr, ft.

If the cost calculation is required, the following input must be provided:

```
pipe cost in terms of $/ft installed
cost of heat in terms of $/million Btu
total pipe length, ft
annual interest rate, %
price escalation rate, %
the terms of payment in years.
```

The program would output the percent-worth factor, pipe cost, heat cost and total cost.

If the optimization analysis is required for the insulation thickness for one of the pipes, that particular pipe should be identified. Five steps of insulation thickness, thermal conductivity, and corresponding incremented cost (installed cost) are then inputted to observe the total cost profile, which will in turn provide the optimum insulation thickness.
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PEAD , IERR
IF(IERK.GE. 1) GO TO 15
CONTINUE

## CALI TEANS (PHI, PHS, CAIL SOLIP (IT, $\mathrm{I}+1, \mathrm{PES}, \mathrm{TC}, \mathrm{Q}, 5)$ <br> Te(i) $=$ TP (K) -TG CALL TRANS

PRINT *, Q=FEAT TLATGEER TO AND FROM THE KTH PIPE,BTU/HR,FT,

$\stackrel{1}{2}$
D0 $16 \mathrm{~K}=1, \mathrm{M}$
61
0
0
10
$\stackrel{0}{-}$
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$\stackrel{8}{2}$
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INS
$10{ }^{\circ}$
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5.2
$=0$.
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## CAI <br> TYPE 1 OTHERNISE, <br> cid <br> LSDD OI J9 <br> 
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IF YOU WISA TO OPTIMIZE INSULATION THICKNESS,
TYPE 1 OTMERNISE TYPE O,
GE. 1) CALL OPT(PEI,TPF,TG,M)
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COMMON/ACOMM/RI $(15,5), \operatorname{KII}(15,5), \operatorname{THII}(15,5), \operatorname{TPFI}(15,5), \operatorname{NP}(15)$

0
10
4
$\square$

UTRUTT=0.
4
IIC

| SUBROUTINE COST( $Q, M, I N S$ ) |
| :---: |
| IFENSION R(15), TH\{ 15), CI( 15), CH( 15), Q(15), C(15), KI (15), RP(15) |
|  |
| CONLION/BCOPEDR, TH, C I , CH, CESTIN, COSTHT, TOTAL, KI , C, ZL, Z I , ZY, P I , RP |
| REAL KI, KI I |
| IF(INS.NE.0) GO TO 10 |
| PRINT *, WE NEED COST OF PIPES AND HEAT GAIN OR LOSS' |
| PRINT *, $\mathrm{PROVIDE} \mathrm{THE} \mathrm{COET} \mathrm{CF} \mathrm{PIPE} \mathrm{IN} \mathrm{S/FT'}$ |
| PRINT *,' FOR EACH OF',I,'PIPES' |
| RTAD *, (CI (I), $\mathrm{I}=1, \mathrm{M})$ |
| PRINT *, PIPI COST $=$, (CI(I), $\mathrm{I}=1, \mathrm{M})$ |
| RINT $*$, IF ERSOR TYPE 1 OTHERWISE TYPE 0, |
| PAD *, IERA |
| IF(IERR. GE. 1) GO TO 1 |
| PRINT *, HEAT COST FOR EACH PIPE IN S PER MILLION BTUH' |
| REA *, ( $\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{I}), \mathrm{I}=1, \mathrm{~F})$ |
|  |
| PRINT *,' IF ERORR TYPE 1: OTHERWISE TYPE 0' |
| READ *, IER |
| [F(IERF. GE. 1) GO TO 2 |
| RINT *, ' PROVIDE TOTAL PIPE LENGTH IN FT' |
| READ *, ZL |
|  |
| PRINT *, IF ERZOR TYPE 1 OTHERWISE 0, |
| READ *,IERS |
| IF (IERR. $C E .1) ~ G O T O S$ |




## WICI PIPE IFESULATION DO YOU WISH TO OPTIM!ZE ? INOUT PIPE FTENR COUNTING FROM LEFTMOST PIPE ?

TIGUTATICN ANCJND PIPE , , IP, WILL BE OPTIMIZED'

$$
\begin{gathered}
10 \\
\text { CNS } \\
\text { TYP } \\
\text { TE }
\end{gathered}
$$

TYPS IN IUTENA OF INSULATION SYSTEMS TO BE STUDIED'
TES NUTMER CAN BE AS HIGH AS 10 SYSTEMS, a
MBIR OR THE INSULATION SYKTEMS TO BE STUDIED IS' I2)
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[^0]:    * percentage change from the single-pipe system.

[^1]:    * If the conduit is square in cross section instead of circular, equivalent radius may be approximated by $R=0.56 \mathrm{~W}$, where W is the external width of the square conduit [2].

[^2]:    * Multiplier to obtain SI unit $\mathrm{W} / \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{K}$ is 0.144 .

[^3]:    a AP = Airport Data
    b CO = City Office Data
    c COOP = Cooperative Weather Station

[^4]:    0

