

Emission Laboratory Correlation Study Between  
EPA and Honda Motor Company, Inc.

by

Richard E. Lowery

April 1974

Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Air Programs  
Office of Mobile Source Air Pollution Control  
Emission Control Technology Division  
Procedures Development Branch  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

## ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a laboratory correlation study between EPA and the Honda Motor Company, Inc. It specifically compares Honda's certification test site at its Suzuka laboratory to EPA's certification test site #6.

In general, the test sites compared in this study showed a high degree of equivalency. No significant differences were discovered in dynamometer or CVS characteristics, and vehicle emission test results correlated rather well. The only significant discrepancy was laboratory measurement of vehicle CO emissions, which could have been the result of laboratory barometric pressure differences. Vehicle variability made an accurate assessment of this effect very difficult.

## Emission Laboratory Correlation Study Between EPA and Honda Motor Company, Inc.

### Introduction:

The goals of a laboratory correlation program are inherently two-fold; to identify differences in equipment, techniques, and procedures, and to relate the effect of these differences to emission levels of various motor vehicles. In this program, emphasis was placed on evaluating the effects of laboratory differences on vehicle emissions rather than isolating the differences. This report will discuss probable differences between EPA's certification test site #6 and a test site of the Honda Motor Company, Inc. and explore the effect of these differences on the emission levels of several Honda vehicles.

### Purpose:

It is the intent of this report to present the findings of the correlation study between EPA and Honda and to derive from those findings conclusions regarding the usage of production vehicles as correlation tools.

### Test Vehicles and Equipment:

During this correlation study, four Honda vehicles were tested at EPA. All were front wheel drive vehicles equipped with four-cylinder engines, and all were tested in the 2000 pound inertia class. Data of these vehicles are tabulated below:

V.I.D.	657LF-1009	657LF-1004	SBA-2112073	SG-1000249
Model	Civic CVCC	Civic CVCC	Civic	Civic CVCC
C.I.D.	90.8	90.8	75.5	90.8
Transmission	4-speed	4-speed	4-speed	2-speed
System	Engine Modification	Engine Modification	Air Injection	Engine Modification
Standard	Federal Statutory	California Interim	Federal Interim	California Interim

The model Civic CVCC vehicle employs Honda's stratified-charge engine.

Other equipment used in this study included nine calibration gas cylinders, a Honda critical-flow orifice for CVS calibration, timing devices to measure dynamometer characteristics, and appropriate transducers to measure vehicle speed, manifold vacuum, and temperatures.

### Sequence of Correlation Testing:

All vehicles tested at EPA in this program were previously tested at Honda's Suzuka laboratory in Japan. The calibration gases provided by Honda were not analyzed in Japan prior to EPA's analysis.

### Test Procedures:

Emission Tests - All vehicles involved in this correlation study underwent the same types of emission tests. These tests may be categorized as three types: (a) 1975 certification tests, without evaporative measurements, (b) steady-state dilute exhaust samples, and (c) steady-state raw exhaust samples. In conducting the 1975 certification tests, the Federal Test Procedure was modified to eliminate unnecessary procedures. Each vehicle was preconditioned before its first test, but not before subsequent tests. No evaporative measurements were taken on any vehicle, but before each test, the vehicle's fuel was heated from 60°F to 84°F as specified in the evaporative section of the Federal Test Procedure. Each vehicle underwent three valid 1975 tests, the second of which was driven by a Honda technician. The Honda driver was used in an attempt to identify the effect of driver differences on vehicle emissions.

The steady-state dilute samples were obtained from each vehicle at constant speeds of 50, 30, and 10 mph. The vehicle was warmed on the dynamometer and then run at each steady state speed for five minutes. A separate set of collection bags was deployed for each steady-state speed, and these bags were analyzed by EPA following normal certification procedures. All of these tests were driven by the Honda driver.

The steady-state raw samples were obtained from each vehicle at speeds of 60, 50, 40, 30, 20, 10, and idle. A sample probe was placed directly in the vehicles exhaust and the emission levels were measured by Honda technicians. These tests were also driven by the Honda driver.

Calibration Gas Check - The calibration gases provided by Honda were analyzed at EPA on certification train 21.

Dynamometer Check - Honda technicians obtained characteristics of EPA dynamometer #6 by running a series of coast-downs and accelerations at the 2000 pound inertia weight. Coast-downs were run both with the vehicle on and off the dynamometer rolls. Accelerations were run, using a 4-speed Honda Civic CVCC, from 30 to 50 mph in 4th gear and 20 to 40 mph in 3rd gear. Both accelerations were at wide open throttle.

CVS Check - With the aid of EPA technicians, Honda engineers conducted a check of EPA's CVS unit 9C. A Honda critical-flow orifice was used to calibrate the flow rate of the CVS system.

Data Sources:

All data presented in this report were generated at EPA test site #6 or at Honda's Suzuka laboratory. Data relating to the dynamometer check were generated and analyzed by Honda engineers.

Analysis of Data:

Emission Tests - Two types of emission tests will be used to compare EPA and Honda test sites - 1975 certification tests and steady-state dilute sample tests. Data of these tests may be found in Appendix I.

The four vehicles used in this laboratory correlation produced greatly different data comparisons, but some general trends can be seen. Using average certification test emissions of the vehicles at the two laboratories, NO<sub>x</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> values appear to be equivalent. The maximum NO<sub>x</sub> discrepancies occurred on the last two vehicles tested, with Honda's lab reporting a 13% lower value than EPA on vehicle SG-1000249, but a 13% higher value on vehicle SBA-2112073. CO<sub>2</sub> levels were higher at Honda's facility than at EPA on three vehicles (maximum 6%), but vehicle 657LF-1004 showed a 10% lower CO<sub>2</sub> value at Honda.

More consistent certification test emission differences were seen between laboratories in CO and HC measurements. Average levels of the four vehicles tested showed Honda's CO values to be 10-31% lower than EPA's, and Honda's HC values to be 27%, 24%, and 19% lower and 1% higher on the respective vehicles. The vehicle with only 1% HC difference between laboratories was the CVCC model designed to meet the 1975 federal statutory standards.

The steady-state emission tests tended to show very small differences in emission levels of the two laboratories. CO<sub>2</sub> levels at Honda's laboratory were consistently lower than at EPA's, especially at the 10 mph speed (4-25% lower). Differences in other emittants were not consistent as speeds and vehicles varied.

Calibration Gases - Because the calibration gas cylinders were analyzed at EPA prior to analysis in Honda's laboratory, no data comparison is available at this time. Results of EPA's analysis are tabulated in Appendix II.

Dynamometer Checks - The dynamometer coast-down data acquired by Honda was used to derive a comparison with their dynamometer in

Japan. (See Appendix III) EPA's dynamometer #6 was characterized as absorbing greater horsepower over the entire speed range, with a maximum difference of approximately 0.9 horsepower at 40 mph.

Discussion:

Because of the design of this correlation study, an accurate assessment of the effects of test site differences is not easy to make. No data are available which would compare the effects of analysis system differences, and the use of four vehicles increases the variability which an analysis must consider.

Some differences between test sites can be isolated, but their effects can only be approximated, at best. Dynamometer tests revealed that EPA's dynamometer #6 exerted a slightly greater load than Honda's test dynamometer, but that added loading did not seem to affect CO<sub>2</sub> or NO<sub>x</sub> levels significantly. Data acquired by Honda technicians in their CVS check are not available for this report, but their analysis indicated no significant differences would be experienced because of variations in the CVS systems. Another possible difference, that of driver characteristics, was not experienced in a comparison of tests driven by EPA and Honda drivers. One difference which is very obvious is the test site barometric pressure, but the effect of this difference could vary between vehicles, making its isolation quite difficult.

Using the vehicle emission tests as comparators, Honda's laboratory produced significantly lower CO and slightly lower HC levels than EPA's laboratory. Twice during testing, vehicle problems caused unusually high HC values. The first test on vehicle SBA-2112073 produced high HC because an engine vacuum line was leaking. The problem was found by Honda technicians and corrected. Vehicle SG-1000249 made use of a throttle control valve which was sensitive to barometric pressure, and that valve was adjusted prior to the final test on that vehicle. Reasons for the trend toward lower HC and CO at Honda's laboratory are not clear, but the effect of barometric pressure may be the main cause of the discrepancy.

As has been the case in previous EPA correlation programs, vehicle variability poses the major problem in judging test site equivalency. If one looks at the most repeatable vehicles used in this study, CO discrepancies seem to be the only problem. Vehicle #657LF-1004 was most repeatable on HC, CO and NO<sub>x</sub>, and Honda's discrepancies with EPA's average values on that vehicle were only 1%, 10%, and 3.4% respectively. The most repeatable CO<sub>2</sub> vehicle, #657LF-1009, showed only a 2% difference in average CO<sub>2</sub> levels. Other vehicles showed larger deviations, but they also exhibited less operational consistency. Unfortunately, one cannot rely on vehicles to isolate test site differences, but, in this study, vehicles were used in an attempt to reach that end.

Conclusions:

Results of this correlation study indicate a high degree of equivalency between Honda's test site and EPA's site #6. The only major discrepancy observed was Honda's tendency to produce lower CO emission levels than EPA. The large difference in barometric pressure between the two facilities may be a major contributor to that discrepancy, but the variability between test vehicles and the small number of tests on each vehicle make an accurate estimation of this barometric effect impossible.

Summary and Recommendations:

Results of the laboratory correlation study between EPA and Honda Motor Company, Inc. have been presented and discussed. In general, there was a very good correlation between the test sites of the facilities involved.

In future correlation studies, programs should be designed to use vehicle emission tests as a final check of site equivalency. Prior to any vehicle tests, both EPA and the manufacturer should identify differences relating to CVS, dynamometers, and analyzers. In this program, there was no confidence that the laboratories' equipment was equivalent before vehicles were tested. Unless this confidence is established before vehicles are tested, emissions tests will not be helpful in isolating the effects of test site differences.

## APPENDICES



APPENDIX I

Emission Test Data

<u>Section</u>	<u>Vehicle</u>
IA	657LF-1009
IB	657LF-1004
IC	SBA-2112073
ID	SG-1000249

Section IA  
Véhicule 657LF-1009  
Federal Statutory Standard



Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic CVCC 657LF-1009

Test Lab. EPA

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor				
Cold Transient (g)	1	2.64	18.94	5.63	1266.37	24.4	/	/				
	2	3.55	26.82	5.62	1253.11	24.4						
	3	2.93	19.72	6.20	1284.26	24.0						
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	0.91	11.30	4.08	1512.27	22.6			/	/		
	2	1.02	13.68	3.98	1488.24	22.9						
	3	0.82	8.83	4.42	1524.85	22.5						
Hot Transient (g)	1	1.48	10.15	5.79	1173.20	26.7					/	/
	2	1.77	15.28	5.54	1162.55	26.7						
	3	1.51	11.54	5.94	1158.50	27.0						
Total (g/mile)	1	0.385	3.36	1.31	363.42	24.4	29.19	0.8114				
	2	0.475	4.52	1.27	358.63	24.5	28.83	0.8151				
	3	0.392	3.19	1.40	364.99	24.3	29.09	0.8237				

Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic CVCC 657LF-1009

Test Lab. Suzuka

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	2.65	16.98	6.85	1324		/	/
	2	2.52	15.65	6.46	1305			
	3	3.03	16.55	6.08	1289			
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	0.44	9.08	4.60	1513		/	/
	2	0.51	9.97	4.54	1501			
	3	0.50	9.80	4.40	1521			
Hot Transient (g)	1	1.08	7.73	6.29	1187		/	/
	2	1.80	8.65	6.49	1205			
	3	1.79	9.55	6.65	1218			
Total (g/mile)	1	0.29	2.77	1.48	368		30.36	
	2	0.35	2.88	1.47	367		30.12	
	3	0.37	2.98	1.44	369		30.09	



Section IB  
Vehicle 657LF-1004  
California Interim Standard





Honda Correlation Data

Vehicle Civic CVCC 657LF-1004

Test Lab. EPA

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	4.81	31.42	5.96	1179.62	25.6	/	/
	2	4.83	33.16	6.43	1159.31	26.0		
	3	5.14	29.27	6.34	1179.83	25.6		
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	2.47	21.49	4.88	1373.26	24.5	/	/
	2	2.77	20.55	4.54	1308.88	25.7		
	3	2.55	19.65	4.91	1356.20	24.9		
Hot Transient (g)	1	1.93	15.87	6.04	1076.56	28.8	/	/
	2	2.09	18.08	6.10	1029.49	29.9		
	3	2.28	16.12	6.52	1064.13	29.0		
Total (g/mile)	1	0.752	5.87	1.45	332.55	26.1	28.94	0.8128
	2	0.806	6.02	1.44	319.22	27.0	29.19	0.8013
	3	0.808	5.52	1.51	329.34	26.4	28.89	0.8031

Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic CVCC 657LF-1004

Test Lab. Suzuka

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	5.37	29.42	5.68	1055		/	/
	2	4.64	25.98	5.90	1077			
	3	5.54	29.88	5.82	1071			
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	2.64	18.26	4.66	1201		/	/
	2	2.72	18.68	4.48	1198			
	3	2.63	21.20	4.80	1202			
Hot Transient (g)	1	1.97	13.01	5.88	981		/	/
	2	2.05	12.89	6.07	964			
	3	2.06	13.23	6.51	970			
Total (g/mile)	1	0.81	5.11	1.39	295		30.31	
	2	0.78	4.96	1.39	295		30.06	
	3	0.82	5.54	1.47	295		30.08	



Section IC  
Vehicle SBA-2112073  
Federal Interim Standard



Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic SBA-2112073

Test Lab. EPA

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	6.94	54.53	6.52	1108.73	26.2	/	/
	2	4.78	59.00	6.31	1104.88	26.3		
	3	5.58	49.72	6.62	1087.80	26.9		
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	8.99	47.90	3.88	1352.69	23.8	/	/
	2	6.04	47.46	3.55	1316.11	24.6		
	3	7.66	46.30	3.76	1328.98	24.3		
Hot Transient (g)	1	7.52	38.21	6.97	1018.54	28.9	/	/
	2	4.87	38.23	6.95	996.95	29.7		
	3	5.36	30.32	7.53	988.87	30.2		
Total (g/mile)	1	2.17	12.4	1.42	321.33	26.1	28.82	0.9121
	2	1.45	12.6	1.36	314.60	26.6	28.48	0.8926
	3	1.75	11.3	1.45	314.72	26.9	29.20	0.8508

Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic SBA-2112073

Test Lab. Suzuka

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	4.34	41.35	7.85	1209		/	/
	2	5.55	43.86	7.46	1184			
	3	3.77	48.50	6.46	1156			
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	5.28	32.00	4.56	1400		/	/
	2	5.48	38.62	4.10	1385			
	3	5.54	39.85	4.02	1361			
Hot Transient (g)	1	4.43	23.39	8.49	1074		/	/
	2	5.18	24.47	8.09	1081			
	3	5.12	27.19	7.75	1098			
Total (g/mile)	1	1.29	8.42	1.71	338		30.19	
	2	1.44	9.52	1.59	335		30.07	
	3	1.35	10.16	1.50	331		29.86	





Section ID  
Vehicle SG-1000249  
California Interim Standard



Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic SG-1000249

Test Lab. EPA

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	4.93	44.47	8.55	1244.54	23.9	/	/
	2	4.12	39.14	8.19	1254.53	24.0		
	3	3.65	37.55	9.33	1335.54	22.7		
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	2.08	21.31	6.58	1398.29	24.1	/	/
	2	2.06	19.50	5.87	1361.74	24.8		
	3	1.89	18.11	6.78	1417.17	23.9		
Hot Transient (g)	1	1.89	18.00	8.71	1137.99	27.2	/	/
	2	1.98	19.92	7.80	1119.38	27.5		
	3	1.92	14.79	8.75	1114.25	27.9		
Total (g/mile)	1	0.70	6.8	2.03	344.28	25.0	28.83	0.9295
	2	0.661	6.36	1.85	338.56	25.3	28.50	0.8924
	3	0.61	5.7	2.10	350.21	24.6	29.19	0.8485

Honda Correlation Data (LA4)

Vehicle Civic SG-1000249

Test Lab. Suzuka

	Test No.	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel Consumption (mpg)	Barometric Pressure (in. Hg)	K-Factor
Cold Transient (g)	1	3.26	25.33	7.69	1378		/	/
	2	3.53	31.19	7.53	1381			
	3	2.91	30.52	8.26	1374			
Cold Stabilized (g)	1	1.30	13.86	5.56	1428			
	2	1.38	14.14	5.44	1434			
	3	1.39	14.17	5.63	1416			
Hot Transient (g)	1	1.37	9.76	7.02	1216			
	2	1.55	10.77	7.17	1253			
	3	1.59	10.37	7.46	1221			
Total (g/mile)	1	0.47	4.04	1.72	362		30.22	
	2	0.51	4.49	1.70	366		30.14	
	3	0.47	4.43	1.79	361		29.87	



APPENDIX II  
Calibration Gas Data

## Honda Calibration Gases

---

Gas	Cylinder No.	Scott Laboratory	EPA	Honda	
C <sub>3</sub> H <sub>8</sub> in air (ppm)	C-4552	7.31	7.2		
	C-4508	22.46	22.6		
	C-4599	27.52	27.7		
C <sub>3</sub> H <sub>8</sub> in N <sub>2</sub> (ppm)	C-4546	44.15	43.9		
CO in N <sub>2</sub> (ppm)	C-674	70.2	68.2		
	C-690	222	215.4		
CO <sub>2</sub> in N <sub>2</sub> (%)	C-1260	0.93	0.919		
NO in N <sub>2</sub> (ppm)	C-192	24.1	23.0		
NO <sub>x</sub> in N <sub>2</sub> (ppm)		24.4	23.3		
NO in N <sub>2</sub> (ppm)	C-1288	46.0	43.2		
NO <sub>x</sub> in N <sub>2</sub> (ppm)		46.5	44.2		
EPA Analysis - Train 21					

APPENDIX III  
Dynamometer Data





