A study determining the effectiveness (23% fuel savings and improved comfort levels) of a two-stage infrared heating system and how it meets heat requirements more efficiently versus forced air heating systems.
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DESCRIPTION:
A three-year study was conducted at a commercial facility with frequent overhead door openings. Participant installed both a Forced-Air unit heater (FA) and a tube-type Infrared heater (IR). Units were operated by a common thermostat, with a manual override switch, to allow for either forced air or infrared operation. This evaluation method allowed for an accurate side-by-side evaluation of the different heating systems.

PROCEDURES & METHODS:
• Measure temperatures at 10 minute intervals, outside and a variety of inside and slab locations.
• Measure gas usage daily at designated times, conduct regular interview with staff on comfort.
• Predetermined operating cycles for Forced Air and Infrared heater (i.e. alternate weeks, etc.).

Figure 1 - Hours per year of High Fire and Low Fire Operation.

Figure 2 - Infrared vs. Forced Air Temperature Cycling

IR = Infrared Heating on
FA = Forced Air Heating on
In June 2004, the AHR Committee presented its distinguished “Best Poster Award” to Agviro, Inc. for their work on this study.

## TESTS:

**TEST 1** - (10-1-99 to 2-17-00) - Target Set Point -17°C.
- The method of testing was established using the system and verifying the controls.
- Systems operated equally at 1-2 week alternating intervals during the heating season.
- Energy savings comparing FA and IR proved minimal.

**TEST 2** - (2-18-00 to 4-28-00).
Set Point - IR=16°C & FA=19°C; Actual Avg. Temp.- IR 13.2°C & FA 17.7°C.
- Systems operated during the heating season at 1 week alternating intervals.
- IR savings measured 19.5%, savings influenced by the lower set-point of IR.

**TEST 3** - (10-16-00 to 4-12-01).
Set Point - IR=14°C & FA=17°C; Actual Avg. Temp.- IR 21.2°C & FA 18.9°C.
- Systems operated during the heating season at 1 week alternating intervals.
- Infrared savings measured 23.0% (Note average higher temperature for IR).

**TEST 4** - (12-15-01 to 3-25-02).
Avg. Actual ‘Delta T’ to OAT was 31.3°C and 21.8°C.
- Saved 25.4% with continuous Infrared vs. weekly interval Infrared vs. Forced Air.

## CONCLUSIONS:

1. Infrared heating saved up to 23% energy usage over a conventional forced air heating system.
2. The thermal flywheel effect in the slab contributes to energy use efficiency.
3. A weekly cycle of forced air vs. infrared is not a useful method of evaluating potential in either system due to the flywheel effect.
4. Two-stage infrared heat system ran on low fire longer than forced air per on-cycle; plus only used high fire 8-23% of the total on-time for heating.
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