The overall goal of this study was to compare a gas-fired infrared radiant heating system with a conventional forced-air convection heater for supplying supplemental heat to pig production rooms. Forced-convection air heaters that are widely used in commercial barns typically heat the air near the ceiling, and in turn the heated air has to be physically moved, using fans and inlets, to the animal occupied zones. A radiant heater transmits heat to surfaces (i.e. floor, pen wall, animals, etc) through radiation heat transfer, thus facilitating the heating process at the pig’s level and at the same time the heated surfaces serve as a thermal reservoir that help maintain the setpoint conditions in the room. Because of this difference in mode of heat transfer, it is hypothesized that infra-red radiant heating could help reduce heating costs in pig production rooms.

**Experimental approach**

The two heating systems (forced-convection vs. radiant heating) were compared for energy efficiency and impact on indoor air quality and hog performance. The comparative evaluation will be conducted over three trials, two of which are already completed. The study will cover the seasonal variation in ambient environmental conditions throughout the year.

Two grow-finish rooms at PSCI research facility were used; one room had a 80,000 BTUh forced-air heater (Control) while a 80,000 BTUh gas-fired infrared radiant heater (Treatment) was installed in the other room (shown in Figure 1). Both heater units were brand new when installed. Each room has inside dimensions of 66 x 24 x 10 ft and has 20 pens that could accommodate 5 pigs per pen, each pig averaging between 25-30 kg starting weight. The rooms were identical in terms of building construction, pen configuration, animal capacity, and care and management.

Various monitoring instruments were set up in each room to assess the performance of the two heater types. A gas meter equipped with a pulser was installed in each room to monitor gas consumption. Energy loggers were also used to record electrical energy consumption of ventilation fans, lights, and heater blower motor. Sensors used to monitor air temperature and relative humidity, ventilation rate and gas concentrations were also deployed in the room. In addition, performance indicators for the pigs were recorded throughout each trial.

**Results from completed trials**

**Gas and electrical energy consumption**

The first trial was started in late spring in 2008, during which the ambient conditions became warm enough that the infrared radiant heater was needed only for the first 2 weeks while the forced-air heater ran intermittently only for the first 3 weeks. Gas consumption by the radiant heater was slightly higher in the first week but lower in the following 2 weeks than the forced-air heater. Trial 2 was started in early winter and the gas consumption of both heaters is shown in Figure 2. It can be observed that both heaters were barely
in operation after Week 7, which was expected since the setpoint room temperature at this stage of growth is lower and the pigs are large enough to generate adequate heat to meet the setpoint. However, for the weeks of the trial when both heaters were operating, the infrared radiant heater consumed 98 m³ gas more than the forced-air heater.

The average amount of electrical energy consumed (Trial 1 and 2) in both the infrared radiant heater and forced-air heater rooms is shown in Figure 3. Throughout the 12-week test period, electrical consumption was relatively similar in both rooms. However, total electricity use was 205 kWh higher in the Control room than the Treatment room. This could be attributed to the additional electrical energy consumed by the recirculation fan in the Control room. It should be noted that the recirculation fan is part of the heating and ventilation system necessary to distribute heat more uniformly throughout the Control room; no recirculation fan was required for the Treatment room.

**Indoor air quality**

Air quality parameters monitored within each room include air temperature, relative humidity, ventilation rate and gas concentrations. Figure 4 shows the average temperature readings at the different locations within the Control and Treatment rooms during the first 3 weeks of each trial when both heaters were in operation. It can be observed that temperatures near the middle of the room were slightly higher than those at the peripheral locations of the room, especially near the exhaust fan. This slight temperature variation could be due to heat loss through the outside wall where the exhaust fans were installed. A comparison between the first and second trials (Comparative evaluation ... continued on page 11)

**Figure 2. Gas consumption of infrared radiant heater and forced-air convection heater in Trial 2.**

**Figure 3. Total electrical energy consumption in the rooms with forced-air convection heater and with infrared radiant heater.**

**Figure 4. Average temperature distribution within the Treatment (A) and Control (B) rooms during the first 3 weeks of the test period.**
“...compared to a grow-finish room with conventional forced-air convection heater, the room with infrared radiant heating system has consumed more gas but used less electrical energy ...”

showed that temperature variation was slightly higher in the second trial; this could be due to the colder ambient temperature since the average ambient temperature during the trial was 19.2 °C colder than during the first trial. Additionally, the setpoint temperatures for both rooms during the first 3 weeks of the test period was 23.7, 22 and 20 °C for the first, second and third week, respectively. The observed range of deviation above and below the setpoint temperature in all the locations in the Treatment room were 0.9 and 1.8 °C respectively, while the corresponding values in the Control room were 0.4 and 1.3 °C, respectively.

The average relative humidity readings recorded in the middle and near the exhaust fan in the forced-air heater room (59%) was slightly higher than those in the radiant heater room (57%). With regard to ventilation, average rates observed in the Control and Treatment rooms were 3269.7 and 3125.0 L/s, respectively during the first trial and 836.7 and 644.8 L/s, respectively in the second trial.

Overall the course of the trials, hydrogen sulphide (H₂S) and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations in both rooms were usually at levels barely detectable by the sensors with average concentrations of less than 1 ppm for either gas. However, during pit pulling events, concentrations of H₂S were observed to spike to considerably high levels with peak concentration of 91 and 97 ppm in the Control and Treatment rooms, respectively. Ammonia and carbon dioxide levels were relatively similar in both rooms with average concentrations below 10 and 2000 ppm, respectively.

Pig performance
The average daily gain (ADG), average daily feed intake (ADFI), and mortality rate were monitored during the two trials to evaluate the effect on hog performance. Both ADG and ADFI were found to be relatively similar in both Control and Treatment rooms. Average ADG values from the two trials were 0.95 and 0.94 kg/pig-day, while ADFI values were 2.64 and 2.55 kg/pig-day for the Control and Treatment rooms, respectively.

Feed intake of pigs in the Control room was slightly higher than in the Treatment room, hence resulting to a slightly faster growth rate. During the first trial, average mortality rates of 1.8% and 4.0% were recorded in the Control and Treatment rooms, respectively, and zero mortality was recorded in both rooms during the second trial. Based on observations during daily animal health checks, mortalities in both rooms were health related, such as incidence of lameness and infections, and were unlikely to be related to heater performance.

The Bottom Line
Observations from the two completed trials so far indicated that compared to a grow-finish room with conventional forced air convection heater, the room with infrared radiant heating system has consumed more gas but used less electrical energy, had a more uniform temperature distribution within the room, and had no adverse impact on the growth performance of the pigs. These observations will need to be verified after all trials are completed and appropriate statistical tests are conducted.
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