KYLE RAILROAD COMPANY
A Subsidiary of KYLE RAILWAYS, INC.

KYLE

June 4, 1997

Larry Graves
FPC Technology, Inc
2399 South Orchard
Suite 205
Boise, Idaho 83705

Dear Larry,

I am writing this letter to advise you of what trends we have seen while using FPC-2 fuel additive. As you know we have been using the additive for about two years. Our units selected for the initial test were a group of six General Electric U30C locomotives, as I recall this was your first test on General Electric locomotives.

After performing the baseline test on the six GE units, we manually added treatment to these units each time the fuel was topped. All mixing was done at the manufacturers recommended ratio. During this same time we had been experiencing some wet stacking problems with our unit 1125, an SW1000 switch engine with a 8-645E engine.

I decided to treat the fuel in this unit to see if the treatment might help, in less than a week the stack had dried. No other repairs were made to this unit at this time, the results must be credited to FPC-2. Also visual observations were made of this unit when pulling cars from our Industry Spur 2 track in Phillipsburg. This track has a grade approaching four percent that loaded cars must be pulled up. Before the treatment the exhaust from the unit would erupt like a volcano and the putrid white smoke would drift a significant distance. After the FPC-2 had been added the smoke was notably less and barely discernable most of the time.

When the carbon mass balance test was again performed on the GE units, the results were significant enough to warrant a fleet wide test which was undertaken. We began treating our fuel while it was being transferred to our storage tanks. After the tanks had been treated for some time, several units that were stored were placed back in service. I noticed on one of the first runs out of storage that the units with treated fuel smoked significantly less than another unit in the consist that did not have treated fuel. Although part of this may be attributed to the fact that the unit had been out of service and may have been "carboned up", I feel that the real reason for the difference was the FPC-2.

We continued using FPC-2 adding at the manufactures recommended ratio. Unfortunately, after using the product for a several months

P.O. Box 566 • Third and Railroad Avenue • Phillipsburg, Kansas 67661
Phone: (913) 543-6527 • FAX: (913) 543-6530

our supply was exhausted and in a cost cutting measure our request for additional FPC-2 was denied. During the time when the units were running with untreated fuel we experienced several significant right of way fires. We decided to reintroduce the FPC-2 to our fuel at this time, shortly afterwards the right of way fires became non existent. I credit the abrupt end to the fires at least partially to the FPC-2.

Due to the fact that we are a small railroad with a lean staff, we do not have facilities, equipment or adequate manpower to perform the tests that would be necessary to evaluate fuel economy. We have not based our continued purchase of FPC-2 on the fuel economy aspect but rather on the improved performance of the locomotives, any additional fuel economy is simply an added bonus. Our EMD units with roots blowers have made great improvements in the cleanliness of the air boxes, and the spark retention traps have much less carbon accumulation than before. Our turbocharged units very seldom if ever have oil out of the stack problems.

Although I am unable to substantiate the benefits of FPC-2, I have a "gut feeling" that the product is performing at least as well as expected and probably better than expected. I plan to continue the use of the FPC-2 additive.

Sincerely,

Rick Briney
Superintendent of Locomotives